



Supreme Court of California  
350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102-4797  
[www.courts.ca.gov/supremecourt](http://www.courts.ca.gov/supremecourt)

**NEWS RELEASE**

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

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

March 21, 2014

---

## **Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions for Week of March 17, 2014**

*[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.]*

**#14-32 *People v. Lowe, S215727.*** (D059007; 221 Cal.App.4th 1276; Riverside County Superior Court; RIF132717.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. This case presents the following issue: Does Penal Code section 296, which permits the collection of DNA from certain felony arrestees, violate the Fourth Amendment under the analysis of *Maryland v. King* (2013) \_\_ U.S. \_\_ [133 S.Ct. 1958]?

**#14-33 *South Coast Framing, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd., S215637.*** (D063945; nonpublished opinion.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal annulled a decision of the Board. This case presents the following issue: Does a claim for workers' compensation death benefits have a separate and distinct causation standard and burden of proof requiring that an industrial injury constitute a "material factor" contributing to the employee's death, or does the standard require only that the industrial injury be a "contributing cause"?

### **DISPOSITIONS**

Review in the following case was dismissed in light of the settlement of the action:

**#12-109 *American States Ins. Co. v. Ramirez, S205073.***

**STATUS**

***People v. Capistrano, S067394.*** The court directed the parties to file supplemental letter briefs addressing the following question that relates to appellant's claim that Gladys Santos's testimony about her conversation with defendant violated the *Aranda/Bruton* rule (see *People v. Aranda* (1965) 63 Cal.2d 518; *Bruton v. United States* (1968) 391 U.S. 123): Did the admission of Michael Drebart's statement to Gladys Santos regarding defendant's role in the killing of Koen Witters violate appellant's confrontation right in light of the United States Supreme Court's conclusion in *Crawford v. Washington* (2004) 441 U.S. 36, that the Sixth Amendment's confrontation clause applies only to testimonial statements?

**#13-82 *People v. Eid, S211702.*** The court invited the parties to file supplemental letter briefs addressing the significance, if any, of the decision in *People v. Solis* (Mar. 7, 2014, B244487) \_\_ Cal.App.4th \_\_ [2014 WL 897865].

###

*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.*