



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**

December 21, 2018

---

## Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of December 17, 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.]*

**#18-171 *Bottini v. City of San Diego, S252217.*** (D071670; 27 Cal.App.5th 281; San Diego County Superior Court; 37-2013-00075491-CU-WM-CTL.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in a civil action. This case includes the following issue: Does the “substantially advances” formula used in *Landgate, Inc. v. California Coastal Com’n* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 1006 or the *Penn Central Transp. Co. v. New York City* (1978) 438 U.S. 104 test (see *Lingle v. Chevron U.S.A. Inc.* (2005) 544 U.S. 528) determine whether there has been a regulatory taking under the California Constitution?

**#18-172 *In re G.C., S252057.*** (H043281; 27 Cal.App.5th 110; Santa Clara County Superior Court; JV40902.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal dismissed an appeal from orders in a juvenile wardship proceeding. This case presents the following issue: Can the juvenile court’s failure to expressly declare whether an offense is a felony or a misdemeanor (see *In re Manzy W.* (1997) 14 Cal.4th 1199) be challenged on appeal from orders in a subsequent wardship proceeding?

**#18-173 *National Lawyers Guild v. City of Hayward, S252445.*** (A149328; 27 Cal.App.5th 937, mod, 28 Cal.App.5th 372e; Alameda County Superior Court; RG15785743.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a action for writ of administrative mandate. This case presents the following issue: Does the California Public Records Act permit a public agency to shift the cost of redacting exempt information from electronic records to the party making the request for the records although the cost of redaction cannot be required for paper records?

**#18-174 *People v. Glavish*, S252134.** (B287131; nonpublished opinion; Santa Clara County Superior Court; PA082516.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. McKenzie*, S251333 (#18-161), which presents the following issue: When is the judgment in a criminal case final for purposes of applying a later change in the law if the defendant was granted probation and imposition of sentence was suspended?

###

*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.*