



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**

July 1, 2016

---

## Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of June 27, 2016

*[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.]*

**#16-229 *California Cannabis Coalition v. City of Upland*, S234148.** (E063664; 245 Cal.App.4th 970; San Bernardino County Superior Court; CIVDS1503985.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in an action for administrative mandate. This case includes the following issue: Is a proposed initiative measure that would impose a tax subject to the requirement of California Constitution, article XIII C, section 2 that taxes “imposed by local government” be placed on the ballot at a general election?

**#16-230 *In re Roldan*, S185447.** Original proceeding. In this case, which is related to the automatic appeal in *People v. Roldan* (2005) 35 Cal.4th 646, the court issued an order to show cause why relief should not be granted on the ground that a juror concealed on pretrial voir dire that she was acquainted with the prosecutor and had previously worked with him.

**#16-231 *In re A.D.*, S234829.** (A146136; nonpublished opinion; Alameda County Superior Court; SJ152500101.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed orders in a juvenile wardship proceeding. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Hall*, S227193 (#15-157), which concerns whether probation conditions prohibiting a defendant from possessing specified items are unconstitutionally vague and must have an explicit knowledge requirement, and *In re Ricardo P.*, S230923 (#16-41), which concerns whether the trial court erred by 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.

**#16-232 *People v. Baker*, S234770.** (F070902; nonpublished opinion; Kern County Superior Court; SC077324B.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a petition to recall sentence.

**#16-233 *People v. Lopez*, S234827.** (B262908; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BA143618.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a petition to recall sentence.

The court ordered briefing in *Baker* and *Lopez* deferred pending decision in *People v. Chaney*, S223676 (#15-13), and *People v. Valencia*, S223825 (#15-14), which present the following issue: Does the definition of “unreasonable risk of danger to public safety” (Pen. Code, § 1170.18, subd. (c)) under Proposition 47 (“the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act”) apply on retroactivity or other grounds to resentencing under the Three Strikes Reform Act of 2012 (Pen. Code, § 1170.126)?

**#16-234 *In re R.C.*, S234295.** (A143376; 245 Cal.App.4th 1288; Contra Costa County Superior Court; J1400437.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed orders in a juvenile wardship proceeding. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *In re A.S.*, S220280 (#14-111), which presents the following issue: Must no-contact probation conditions be modified to explicitly include a knowledge requirement?

**#16-235 *People v. Smedley*, S234752.** (H042345; nonpublished opinion; Santa Clara County Superior Court; CC773030.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a petition to recall sentence. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Romanowski*, S231405 (#16-24), which present the following issue: Does Proposition 47 (“the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act”), which reclassifies as a misdemeanor any grand theft involving property valued at \$950 or less (Pen. Code, § 490.2), apply to theft of access card information in violation of Penal Code section 484e, subdivision (d)?

## DISPOSITIONS

Review in the following cases, which were granted and held for *Baltazar v. Forever 21, Inc.* (2016) 62 Cal.4th 1237, was dismissed:

**#13-80 *Leos v. Darden Restaurant, Inc.*, S212511.**

**#14-114 *Sabia v. Orange County Metro Realty, Inc.*, S220237.**

###

*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.*