



NEWS RELEASE

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

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

March 22, 2013

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions for Week of March 18, 2013

[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.]

#13-30 *Cordova v. City of Los Angeles, S208130.* (B236195; 212 Cal.App.4th 243; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC442048, BC443948, BC444004.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in a civil action. The court limited review to the following issue: May a government entity be held liable if a dangerous condition of public property existed and caused the injuries plaintiffs suffered in an accident, but did not cause the third party conduct that led to the accident?

#13-31 *Baltazer v. Forever 21, Inc., S208345.* (B237173; 212 Cal.App.4th 221; Los Angeles County Superior Court; VC059254.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order denying a petition to compel arbitration in a civil action. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *Wisdom v. Accentcare, Inc.*, S200128 (#12-35), which includes the following issue: Is an arbitration clause in an employment application that provides “I agree to submit to binding arbitration all disputes and claims arising out of the submission of this application” unenforceable as substantively unconscionable for lack of mutuality, or does the language create a mutual agreement to arbitrate all such disputes? (See *Roman v. Superior Court* (2009) 172 Cal.App.4th 1462.)

#13-32 *People v. Siackasorn, S207973.* (C065399; 211 Cal.App.4th 909; Sacramento County Superior Court; 07F11789.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Gutierrez*, S206365 (#13-01), and *People v. Moffett*, S206771 (#13-03), which present issues concerning the sentencing of juvenile offenders under Penal Code section 190.5, subdivision(b), in light of *Miller v. Alabama* (2012) 567 U.S. __ [132 S.Ct. 2455].

DISPOSITIONS

Review in the following cases was dismissed in light of *People v. Brown* (2012) 54 Cal.4th 314:

#10-73 *People v. Rodriguez*, S181808.

#10-89 *People v. Otubuah*, S184314.

#10-104 *People v. Sonnier*, S183604.

#10-113 *People v. Eusebio*, S184957.

#11-77 *People v. Nychay*, S192551.

#11-93 *People v. Sanchez*, S193084.

#12-84 *People v. Borg*, S202328.

#12-89 *People v. Olague*, S203298.

Review in the following case was dismissed in light of *Aryeh v. Canon Business Solutions, Inc.* (2013) 55 Cal.4th 1185:

#12-91 *People v. E*Poly Star, Inc.*, S203477.

###