



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**

September 28, 2018

---

## Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of September 24, 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.]*

**#18-131 *Rockefeller Technological Investments (Asia) VII v. Changzou Sinotype Technology Co., Ltd.*, S249923.** (B272170; 24 Cal.App.5th 115; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BS149995.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order denying a motion to set aside the judgment in a civil action. The court limited review to the following issue: Can private parties contractually agree to legal service of process by methods not expressly authorized by the Hague Convention?

**#18-132 *Skidgel v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd.*, S250149.** (A151224; 24 Cal.App.5th 574, mod. 25 Cal.App.5th 277a; Alameda County Superior Court; RG16810609.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Are In Home Supportive Services workers (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 12300 et seq.) who are providers for a spouse or a child eligible for unemployment insurance benefits?

**#18-133 *In re Anthony A.*, S250770.** (D073256; nonpublished opinion; San Diego County Superior Court; J240254.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed orders in a juvenile wardship proceeding. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *In re Ricardo P.*, S230923 (#16-41) and *People v. Trujillo*, S244650 (#17-335), which present issues concerning the imposition of an “electronics search condition” of probation if the devices subject to the condition had no relationship to the crime or crimes committed and use of the devices would not itself involve criminal conduct, but access to the devices might facilitate supervision of the probationer.

**DISPOSITIONS**

The following cases were transferred for reconsideration in light of *People v. Buycs* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 857:

<b>#16-144 <i>People v. Triplett, S233172.</i></b>	(C078492; 244 Cal.App.4th 824; Sutter County Superior Court; CRF140664, CRF140901.)
<b>#16-174 <i>People v. McPherson, S233815.</i></b>	(C078083; nonpublished opinion; Shasta County Superior Court; 12F6348, 14F4595.)
<b>#16-287 <i>People v. Acosta, S235773.</i></b>	(B263849; 247 Cal.App.4th 1072; Ventura County Superior Court; 2012039886.)
<b>#16-326 <i>People v. Smith, S236295.</i></b>	(B261140; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; MA063719.)
<b>#16-352 <i>People v. Rocheleau, S236866.</i></b>	(F071948; nonpublished opinion; Shasta County Superior Court; 1463797.)
<b>#17-81 <i>People v. Inatowitz, S239693.</i></b>	(H043055; nonpublished opinion; Monterey County Superior Court; SS121036A, SS121332A.)
<b>#17-149 <i>In re Diaz, S240888.</i></b>	(B269048; 8 Cal.App.5th 812; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BA404022.)
<b>#17-192 <i>People v. Ibarra, S241834.</i></b>	(C080231; nonpublished opinion; Sacramento County Superior Court; 12F00954.)
<b>#17-310 <i>People v. Bamford, S244612.</i></b>	(C079957; nonpublished opinion; Shasta County Superior Court; 13F2661, 13F2842, 14F3951)
<b>#17-317 <i>People v. Hicks, S244616.</i></b>	(F071016; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BF155264A)
<b>#17-343 <i>People v. Trimble, S245217.</i></b>	(A147345; nonpublished opinion; Solano County Superior Court; FCR291074)

Review in the following cases was dismissed in light of *People v. Buycs* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 857:

<b>#16-246 <i>People v. Gleason, S234766.</i></b>	(E063256; nonpublished opinion; Riverside County Superior Court; RIF1306276.)
<b>#16-337 <i>People v. Bristow, S236270.</i></b>	(F071926; nonpublished opinion; Merced County Superior Court; CRL007104.)

<b>#16-350 <i>People v. Kirsch</i>, S236926.</b>	(B265318; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; MA062121.)
<b>#16-421 <i>People v. Isaia</i>, S237778.</b>	(G051739; nonpublished opinion; Orange County Superior Court; 14NF1892.)
<b>#17-10 <i>People v. Penilla</i>, S238608.</b>	(E064445; nonpublished opinion; San Bernardino County Superior Court; FWV1303255.)
<b>#17-41 <i>People v. Ramos</i>, S239094.</b>	(B265543; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; NA093937.)
<b>#17-42 <i>People v. Wallace</i>, S239006.</b>	(B268821; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; KA094768, BA369068.)
<b>#17-66 <i>People v. Evans</i>, S239635.</b>	(E064243; 6 Cal.App.5th 894; Riverside County Superior Court; SWF1402787).
<b>#17-129 <i>People v. Johnson</i>, S240509.</b>	(F071140; 8 Cal.App.5th 111; Fresno County Superior Court; F14901527.)
<b>#17-154 <i>People v. Salazar</i>, S241034.</b>	(E065540; nonpublished opinion; Riverside County Superior Court; INF1201546.)
<b>#17-282 <i>People v. Davis</i>, S243109.</b>	(B265537; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; TA136469)
<b>#18-21 <i>People v. Vicario</i>, S245701.</b>	(E066353; nonpublished opinion; San Bernardino County Superior Court; FWV1303140)

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

<b>#16-380 <i>People v. Quirino</i>, S237307.</b>	(G050926; nonpublished opinion; Orange County Superior Court; 14CF1858.)
---	--

The following case was transferred for reconsideration in light of *People v. Gallardo* (2017) 4 Cal.5th 170 and *People v. Buycks* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 857:

<b>#16-444 <i>People v. Wells</i>, S237810.</b>	(F070212; nonpublished opinion; Fresno County Superior Court; F14903226.)
---	---

Review in the following case was dismissed in light of *Liberty Surplus Ins. Corp. v. Ledesma & Meyer Construction Co., Inc.* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 216:

<b>#18-37 Traveler's Property Casualty Co. of America v. Actavis, Inc., S245867.</b>	(G053749; 16 Cal.App.5th 1026; Orange County Superior Court; 30-2014-00746842)
--	--

## STATUS

***People v. Miracle, S140894.*** The court requested the parties to file supplemental briefs addressing the following question: Assuming that the term “counsel” in the second sentence of Penal Code section 1018 does not encompass advisory counsel, does the statute violate the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution (see *McCoy v. Louisiana* (2018) 584 U.S. \_\_ [138 S. Ct. 1500]; *Faretta v. California* (1975) 422 U.S. 806) in light of the Eighth Amendment’s requirement of reliability in death judgments (see *Woodson v. North Carolina* (1976) 428 U.S. 280; *Beck v. Alabama* (1980) 447 U.S. 625; *People v. Bloom* (1989) 48 Cal.3d 1194, 1228)?

###

*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.*