



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 26, 2014

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions for Week of September 22, 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.]

#14-111 *In re A.S., S220280.* (H039825; 227 Cal.App.4th 400; Santa Clara County Superior Court; JV39630.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed orders in a juvenile wardship proceeding. The court limited review to the following issue: Must no-contact probation conditions be modified to explicitly include a knowledge requirement?

#14-112 *People v. Robinson, S220247.* (G048155; 227 Cal.App.4th 387; Orange County Superior Court; 11WF0857.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court limited review to the following issue: Is misdemeanor sexual battery (Pen. Code, § 243.4, subd. (e)(1)) a lesser included offense of sexual battery by fraudulent representation (Pen. Code, § 243.4, subd. (c))?

#14-113 *People v. Garrett, S220271.* (C067436, C069886; 227 Cal.App.4th 675; Sacramento County Superior Court; 08F09401.) 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 *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 (Alatraste) 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*?

#14-114 *Sabia v. Orange County Metro Realty, Inc., S220237.* (B243141; 227 Cal.App.4th 11; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC469744.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order granting a petition to compel arbitration in a civil action. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *Sanchez v. Valencia Holding Co. LLC*, S199119 (#12-33), which includes the following issue: Does the Federal Arbitration Act (9 U.S.C. § 2), as interpreted in *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion* (2011) 563 U. S. 321, preempt state law rules invalidating mandatory arbitration provisions in a consumer contract as procedurally and substantively unconscionable?

DISPOSITIONS

The following case was transferred for reconsideration in light of *In re Conservatorship of McQueen* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 602:

#14-74 *Gray1 CPB, LLC v. SCC Acquisitions, Inc., S218699.*

###

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.