



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

June 15, 2018

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of June 11, 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.]

#18-78 *Big Oak Flat-Groveland Unified School District v. Superior Court*, S247975. (F074265; 21 Cal.App.5th 403; Tuolumne County Superior Court; CV59658.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal granted a petition for peremptory writ of mandate. This case presents the following issue: Does Government Code section 905, subdivision (m), exempt plaintiffs asserting causes of action for childhood sexual abuse under Code of Civil Procedure section 340.1 against a local public entity from compliance with the prefiling claim presentation requirements enacted by that entity pursuant to Government Code section 935, subdivision (a)?

#18-79 *People v. Foster*, S248046. (D071733; nonpublished opinion; San Diego County Superior Court; SCD204096.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a motion to vacate commitment as a mentally disordered offender. This case presents the following issue: Must a commitment or recommitment as an mentally disordered offender be vacated if the underlying offense supporting the initial commitment is redesignated as a misdemeanor under Proposition 47?

#18-80 *People v. Liu*, S248130. (B279393; 21 Cal.App.5th 143; Los Angeles County Superior Court; GA090351.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part an order denying a petition to recall sentence. This case includes the following issue: For the purpose of determining whether a conviction for theft of access card information in violation of Penal Code section 484e, subdivision (d), is eligible to be reduced to a misdemeanor under Proposition 47 when the information has been used to obtain property, is the value of the access card information limited to the fair market value of the information itself on the black market or can the value of the property obtained by the use of the information be considered? (See *People v. Romanowski* (2017) 2 Cal.5th 903, 914.)

#18-81 *Weiss v. People ex rel. Dept. of Transportation, S248141.* (G052735; 20 Cal.App.5th 1156; Orange County Superior Court; 30-2012-00605637.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Can the procedure permitted by Code of Civil Procedure section 1260.040 be used in an inverse condemnation action to determine in advance of a bench trial whether a taking or damaging of private property has occurred?

#18-82 *In re C.R., S248405.* (A150666; nonpublished opinion; Napa County Superior Court; JV18241.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed orders in a juvenile wardship proceeding.

#18-83 *People v. Paet, S248504.* (H043983; nonpublished opinion; Santa Clara County Superior Court; C1515557.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses.

#18-84 *People v. Ramirez, S248650.* (H043973; nonpublished opinion; Santa Clara County Superior Court; C1511453.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses.

The court ordered briefing in *C.R.*, *Paet*, and *Ramirez* 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?

DISPOSITIONS

Review in the following cases was dismissed in light of *People v. DeHoyos* (2018) 4 Cal.5th 594:

| | |
|---|--|
| #15-216 <i>People v. Sarwar, S229573</i> | (D066551; nonpublished opinion; San Diego County Superior Court; SCE327535, SCE327660) |
| #16-13 <i>People v. Lightle, S229934</i> | (C077831; nonpublished opinion; Siskiyou County Superior Court; MCYKCRF1412, MCYKCRF14047) |
| #16-48 <i>People v. Roberts, S231744</i> | (A143484; nonpublished opinion; Humboldt County Superior Court; CR1007331, CR1101730, CR1206025, CR1304138B) |
| #16-167 <i>People v. White, S233261</i> | (G050767; nonpublished opinion; Orange County Superior Court; 13WF3583) |

| | |
|--|---|
| #16-222 <i>People v. Ward</i>, S233871 | (D069303, D069304; nonpublished opinion; Riverside County Superior Court; BAF1200723, BAF1300051) |
| #16-278 <i>People v. Littrell</i>, S235563 | (F069661; nonpublished opinion; Kern County Superior Court; SC066590A) |
| #16-440 <i>People v. Pridemore</i>, S238331 | (A142419; nonpublished opinion; Sonoma County Superior Court; FCR302949) |
| #17-251 <i>People v. Matteucci</i>, S242140 | (F070491, nonpublished opinion; Tulare County Superior Court; VCF260283) |
| #18-32 <i>People v. Howard</i>, S245845 | (C077703; nonpublished opinion; Sacramento County Superior Court; 14F01395) |

The following cases were transferred for reconsideration in light of *People v. Contreras* (2018) 4 Cal.5th 349:

| | |
|--|---|
| #16-71 <i>People v. Ortega</i>, S230917 | (E061027; nonpublished opinion; Riverside County Superior Court ; RIF7223) |
| #16-170 <i>People v. Adams</i>, S233099 | (B257829; 245 Cal.App.4th 498; Los Angeles County Superior Court; YA084177) |
| #17-03 <i>People v. Bell</i>, S238339 | (B263022; 3 Cal.App.5th 865; Los Angeles County Superior Court; NA047579) |
| #17-318 <i>People v. Lewis</i>, S244211 | (A147849; nonpublished opinion; Alameda County Superior Court; C163699A) |

The following case was transferred for reconsideration in light of *People v. Romanowski* (2017) 2 Cal.5th 903:

| | |
|--|--|
| #16-268 <i>Caretto v. Superior Court</i>, S235419 | (B265256; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BA384603) |
|--|--|

Review in the following cases was dismissed in light of *People v. Romanowski* (2017) 2 Cal.5th 903:

| | |
|--|---|
| #16-314 <i>People v. Broyles</i>, S236380 | (E063020; nonpublished opinion; Riverside County Superior Court; RIF1203222) |
| #16-378 <i>People v. Leyva</i>, S237394 | (G051525; nonpublished opinion; Orange County Superior Court County Superior Court; 12NF0574, 14NF1396) |

| | |
|---|---|
| #17-170 <i>People v. Cotton</i>, S241253 | (C081289; nonpublished opinion; Sacramento County Superior Court; 09F03566) |
|---|---|

Review in the following cases was dismissed as moot:

| | |
|---|--|
| #17-32 <i>People v. Mendoza</i>, S238032 | (B259259; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BA396381) |
| #17-34 <i>People v. Padilla</i>, S239454 | (B265614; 4 Cal.App.5th 656; Los Angeles County Superior Court; TA051184) |

The following case was transferred for reconsideration in light of S.B. No. 620 (Stats. 2017, ch. 682):

| | |
|--|--|
| #17-319 <i>People v. Lopez</i>, S244149 | (A129664; nonpublished opinion; Sonoma County Superior Court; SCR538745) |
|--|--|

Review in the following case was dismissed in light of *People v. Soto* (2018) 4 Cal.5th 968:

| | |
|--|--|
| #18-26 <i>People v. Garcia</i>, S245270 | (E064957; nonpublished opinion; Riverside County Superior Court; SWF1203375) |
|--|--|

###

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.