



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

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

May 23, 2014

---

## Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions for Week of May 19, 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.]*

**#14-51 *People v. Miami National Enterprises, S216878.*** (B242644; 223 Cal.App.4th 21; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC373536.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Is a payday loan company owned by a federally recognized Indian tribe entitled to tribal sovereign immunity, and thus exempt from state regulation, if the day-to-day management of the business is handled by a third party management company that is not affiliated with the tribe and pays the tribe a small percentage of the gross revenues?

**#14-52 *People v. Lara, S217787.*** (G048951; nonpublished opinion; Orange County Superior Court; BAF1100313.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal remanded for resentencing and otherwise affirmed judgments of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Conley, S211275* (#13-70), which presents the following issue: Does the Three Strikes Reform Act of 2012 (Pen. Code, §§ 667, subd. (e)(2)(C), 1170.12, subd. (c)(2)(C)), which reduces punishment for certain non-violent third-strike offenders, apply retroactively to a defendant who was sentenced before the Act's effective date but whose judgment was not final until after that date?

**#14-53 *People v. Superior Court (Flores), S217404.*** (D064350; 223 Cal.App.4th 1535; San Diego County Superior Court; CR110487.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal granted a petition for writ of mandate. 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 (Alatrisme) 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:

***#12-83 People v. Wright, S202433.***

###

*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.*