



Supreme Court of California
350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102-4797
www.courts.ca.gov/supremecourt

NEWS RELEASE

Contact: [Cathal Conneely](mailto:Cathal.Conneely@supremecourt.ca.gov), 415-865-7740

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

March 1, 2019

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of February 25, 2019

[This news release is issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has accepted and of their general subject matter. The statement of the issue or issues in each case set out below does not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]

#19-22 *Hart v. Keenan Properties, Inc., S253295.* (A152692; 29 Cal.App.5th 203; Alameda County Superior Court; RG16838191.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in civil action. This case presents the following issues: (1) Was a witness's testimony about his recollection of seeing invoices regarding the supply of products containing asbestos to plaintiff's worksite inadmissible hearsay? (2) Could secondary evidence of the invoices be authenticated by the witness's statements and other circumstantial evidence?

#19-23 *Kaanaana v. Barrett Business Services, Inc., S253458.* (B276420, B279838; 29 Cal.App.5th 778; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC496090, BC594050.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed a judgment in a civil action. The court limited review to the following issue: Should the phrase "work done for irrigation, utility, reclamation, and improvement districts, and other districts of this type" in Labor Code section 1720, subdivision (a)(2), of California's Prevailing Wage Law (Lab. Code, § 1720 et. seq.) be interpreted to cover any type of work regardless of its nature, funding, purpose or function, including belt sorting at recycling facilities?

#19-24 *In re Hector V., S253645.* (F076985; nonpublished opinion; Tulare County Superior Court; JJD070960.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed orders in a juvenile wardship proceeding. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *In re Ricardo P.*, S230923 (#16-41) and *People v. Trujillo*, S244650 (#17-335), which present issues concerning the imposition of an "electronics search condition" of probation if the devices subject to the condition had no relationship to the crime or crimes committed and use of the devices would not itself involve criminal conduct, but access to the devices might facilitate supervision of the probationer.

STATUS

People v. Mendez, S129501. The court directed the parties to file supplemental briefs addressing the following issues in light of *People v. Sanchez* (2016) 63 Cal.4th 665: (1) Did the trial court err by allowing the People’s gang expert to testify about Mendez’s alleged prior contacts with police? (2) Was any such error prejudicial as to the guilt phase of the trial” (3) Was any such error prejudicial as to the penalty phase?

#

The Supreme Court of California is the state’s highest court and its decisions are binding on all other California state courts. The court’s primary role is to decide matters of statewide importance and to maintain uniformity in the law throughout California by reviewing matters from the six districts of the California Courts of Appeal and the fifty-eight county superior courts (the trial courts). Among its other duties, the court also decides all capital appeals and related matters and reviews both attorney and judicial disciplinary matters.