



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@courts.ca.gov), 415-865-7740

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

March 28, 2014

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions for Week of March 24, 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.]

#14-34 *Greater Los Angeles Agency on Deafness, Inc. v. Cable News Network, Inc.*, S216351. (9th Cir. No. 12-15807; 742 F.3d 871; Central District of California; 3:11-cv-03458-LB.) Request under California Rules of Court, rule 8.548, that this court decide a question of California law presented in a matter pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The question presented is: “Does the California Disabled Persons Act’s reference to “places of public accommodation” [Civ. Code, § 54.1, subd. (a)(1)] include web sites, which are non-physical places?”

#14-35 *People v. Moran*, S215914. (H039330; nonpublished opinion; Santa Clara County Superior Court; C1243366.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. This case presents the following issue: Was the condition of probation barring defendant from all Home Depot stores and their parking lots after he was convicted of shoplifting at a single Home Depot store unconstitutionally overbroad as impinging on his constitutional right to travel?

#14-36 *People v. Martin*, S216139. (B242447; 222 Cal.App.4th 98; Los Angeles County Superior Court; MA054232.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *In re Alatraste*, S214652 (#14-21), and *In re Bonilla*, S214960 (#14-22), which include the following issues: (1) Did Senate Bill 260 (Reg. Sess. 2013-2014), which includes provisions for a parole suitability hearing after a maximum of 25 years for most juvenile offenders serving life sentences, render moot any claim that such a sentence violates the Eighth Amendment to the federal Constitution and

that the petitioner is entitled to a new sentencing hearing applying the mitigating factors for such juvenile offenders set forth in *Miller v. Alabama* (2012) 567 U.S. ___ [132 S.Ct. 2455]? If not: (2) Does *Miller* apply retroactively on habeas corpus to a prisoner who was a juvenile at the time of the commitment offense and who is presently serving a sentence that is the functional equivalent of life without the possibility of parole? (3) Is a total term of imprisonment of 77 years to life (Alariste) or 50 years to life (Bonilla) for murder committed by a 16-year-old offender the functional equivalent of life without possibility of parole by denying the offender a meaningful opportunity for release on parole? (4) If so, does the sentence violate the Eighth Amendment absent consideration of the mitigating factors for juvenile offenders set forth in *Miller*?

DISPOSITION

Review in the following case was dismissed in light of *In re Lira* (2014) 58 Cal.4th 573:

#12-105 *In re Batie*, S205057.

###

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.