



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

September 19, 2014

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions for Week of September 15, 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.]

#14-107 *In re Benavides*, S111336. Original proceeding. In this case, which is related to the automatic appeal in *People v. Benavides* (2005) 35 Cal.4th 69, the court issued an order to show cause why petitioner is not entitled to relief because (1) material false evidence was admitted at the guilt phase of his trial; and (2) trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance in that respect.

#14-108 *Lewis v. Superior Court*, S219811. (B252032; 226 Cal.App.4th 933; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BS139289.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in an action for writ of administrative mandate. This case includes the following issues: (1) Do a physician's patients have a protected privacy interest in the controlled substance prescription data collected and submitted to the California Department of Justice under Health and Safety Code section 11165? (2) If so, is disclosure of such data to the Medical Board of California justified by a compelling state interest?

#14-109 *People v. Dunckhurst*, S219745. (C074341; 226 Cal.App.4th 1034; Shasta County Superior Court; 05F1322.) 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 *Braziel v. Superior Court*, S218503 (#14-86), and *People v. Machado*, S219819 (#14-88), which present the following issue: Is an inmate serving an indeterminate term of life imprisonment under the Three Strikes Law (Pen. Code, §§ 667, subds. (b)-(j), 1170.12), which was imposed for a conviction of an offense that is *not* a serious or violent felony, eligible for resentencing on that conviction under the Three Strikes Reform Act if the inmate is also serving an indeterminate term of life

imprisonment under the Three Strikes Law for a conviction of an offense that *is* a serious or violent felony?

#14-110 *Uriarte v. Scott Sales Co., S220088.* (B244257; 226 Cal.App.4th 1396; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC452512.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *Ramos v. Brenntag Specialties, Inc., S218176* (#14-71), which presents the following issue: Are negligence and strict liability claims by an employee of a processing company against a supplier of raw materials for injuries allegedly suffered in the course of processing those materials barred by the component parts doctrine?

###

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.