



NEWS RELEASE

Contact: [Teresa Ruano](mailto:Teresa.Ruano@courts.ca.gov), 415-865-7740

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

August 2, 2013

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions for Week of July 29, 2013

[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.]

#13-63 *Teal v. Superior Court, S211708.* (B247196; 217 Cal.App.4th 308; Los Angeles County Superior Court; NA026415.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal denied a petition for peremptory writ of mandate. This case presents the following issue: Did defendant have the right to appeal the trial court's denial of his petition to recall his sentence under Penal Code section 1170.126, part of the Three Strikes Reform Act of 2012, when the trial court held he did not meet the threshold eligibility requirements for resentencing?

#13-64 *Daimler AG v. Superior Court, S210847.* (C073449; unpublished order; Sacramento County Superior Court; 34200900041066.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal denied a petition for peremptory writ of mandate. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Bauman v. DaimlerChrysler Corp.*, No. 11-965, cert. granted Apr. 22, 2013, __ U.S. __ [133 S.Ct. 1995, 185 L.Ed.2d 865], which presents issues concerning a state court's exercise of personal jurisdiction over a foreign corporation based on services performed in the forum state by a wholly-owned subsidiary on behalf of the foreign corporation.

#13-65 *People v. Hurtado, S212017.* (B246330; 216 Cal.App.4th 941; Los Angeles County Superior Court; VA085141.) Review on the court's own motion after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a petition to recall sentence. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *Teal v. Superior Court, S211708* (#13-63), which presents the following issue: Did defendant have the right to appeal the trial court's denial of his petition to recall his sentence under Penal Code section 1170.126, part of the Three Strikes Reform Act of 2012, when the trial court held he did not meet the threshold eligibility requirements for resentencing?

DISPOSITIONS

Review in the following cases was dismissed in light of *City of Riverside v. Inland Empire Patients Health and Wellness Center, Inc.* (2013) 56 Cal.4th 729:

#12-04 *People v. G3 Holistic, Inc., S198395.*

#12-99 *420 Caregivers, LLC v. City of Los Angeles, S204684.*

#12-118 *City of Temucula v. Cooperative Patients Services, Inc., S206085.*

The following cases were transferred for reconsideration in light of *City of Riverside v. Inland Empire Patients Health and Wellness Center, Inc.* (2013) 56 Cal.4th 729:

#12-55 *City of Lake Forest v. Lake Forest Wellness Center, S201372.*

#12-56 *City of Lake Forest v. Evergreen Holistic Collective, S201454.*

#12-98 *County of Los Angeles v. Alternative Cannabis Collective, S204663.*

###