



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

April 27, 2018

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of April 23, 2018

[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.]

#18-64 *People v. Ovieda*, S247235. (B277860; 19 Cal.App.5th 614; Santa Barbara County Superior Court; 1476460.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. This case presents the following issue: Did the trial court err when it applied the community caretaking exception to the Fourth Amendment as the basis for denying defendant's motion to suppress evidence of drug manufacturing equipment and an assault weapon found in his residence after police officers responded to an emergency call involving his threats to commit suicide, encountered defendant outside the residence, and entered without a warrant or consent?

#18-65 *In re Webb*, S247074. (D072981; 20 Cal.App.5th 44; San Diego County Superior Court; HSC11619, SCS293150.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal granted relief on a petition for writ of habeas corpus. This case presents the following issue: Does the superior court have statutory or inherent authority to impose conditions of bail on felony defendants who post bail in the amount specified in the superior court's bail schedule or above that amount?

#18-66 *People v. Acosta*, S247656. (D071575; 20 Cal.App.5th 225; San Diego County Superior Court; SCD269653.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *In re Ricardo P.*, S230923 (#16-41), which presents the following issue: Did the trial court err imposing an "electronics search condition" on minor as a condition of his probation when it had no relationship to the crimes he committed but was justified on appeal as reasonably related to future criminality under *People v. Olguin* (2008) 45 Cal.4th 375 because it would facilitate his supervision?

###

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.