



**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR
SAN FRANCISCO SESSION
JUNE 7 AND 8, 2022**

Due to the COVID-19 coronavirus pandemic and related public health directives from state and local authorities, the procedures specified by Administrative Orders Nos. [2020-03-13 \(Mar. 16, 2020\)](#), [2020-03-27 \(March 27, 2020\)](#), and [2020-08-19 \(August 19, 2020\)](#) apply. Counsel will appear remotely and courtroom seating for the press will be strictly limited to achieve appropriate distancing. The public will continue to have access to argument via live-streaming on the judicial branch website: <https://www.courts.ca.gov/>.

The following cases are placed upon the calendar of the Supreme Court for hearing at its courtroom in the Ronald M. George State Office Complex, Earl Warren Building, 350 McAllister Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California, on June 7 and 8, 2022.

TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 2022 — 9:00 A.M.

- (1) People v. Renteria (Cristian), S266854
- (2) Guardianship of Saul H., S271265

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 2022 — 9:00 A.M.

- (3) Coast Community College District et al. v. Commission on State Mandates (Department of Finance, Real Party in Interest and Respondent), S262663
- (4) Geiser (Gregory) v. Kuhns (Peter) et al., S262032
- (5) Hoffmann (Mikayla), a Minor, etc. v. Young (Christina M.) et al., S266003

1:30 P.M.

- (6) People v. Hendrix (Isaiah), S265668
- (7) People v. Aguayo (Veronica), S254554
- (8) People v. Ramirez (Juan Villa), [Automatic Appeal], S099844

CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice

If exhibits are to be transmitted to this court, counsel must apply to the court for permission. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.224(c).)

**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR
SAN FRANCISCO SESSION
JUNE 7 AND 8, 2022**

The following case summaries are issued to inform the public about cases that the California Supreme Court has scheduled for oral argument and of their general subject matter. In most instances, the descriptions set out below are reproduced from the original news release issued when review in each of these matters was granted and are provided for the convenience of the public. The descriptions do not necessarily reflect the view of the court or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.

TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 2022 — 9:00 A.M.

(1) *People v. Renteria (Cristian), S266854*

#21-160 People v. Renteria, S266854. (F076973; nonpublished opinion; Tulare County Superior Court; VCF304654.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. This case presents the following issue: Was the evidence sufficient to support the criminal street gang enhancements imposed under Penal Code section 186.22, subdivision (b)?

(2) *Guardianship of Saul H., S271265*

#21-572 Guardianship of S.H.R., S271265. (B308440; 68 Cal.App.5th 563, mod. 69 Cal.App.5th 85a; Los Angeles County Superior Court; 19AVPB00310.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed orders in a guardianship proceeding. This case presents issues relating to petitions for Special Immigrant Findings under Code of Civil Procedure section 155.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 2022—9:00 A.M.

(3) *Coast Community College District et al. v. Commission on State Mandates (Department of Finance, Real Party in Interest and Respondent), S262663*

#20-205 Coast Community College Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates, S262663. (C080349; 47 Cal.App.5th 415; Sacramento County Superior Court; 34201480001842CUWMG DS.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issues: (1) Is the cost of complying with regulations that establish minimum conditions for community college districts to receive state aid a reimbursable state mandate within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6, of the state

Constitution? (2) Does a trial court lack jurisdiction under article XIII B, section 6, to make subvention findings as to statutes that were not specifically identified in an initial test claim? (3) Does a trial court lack jurisdiction to remand a test claim based on a statute that was the subject of a prior final decision by the Commission on State Mandates?

(4) *Geiser (Gregory) v. Kuhns (Peter) et al., S262032*

#20-188 Geiser v. Kuhns, S262032. (B279738; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BS161018, BS161019, BS161020.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order awarding attorney fees in a civil action. The court limited review to the following issue: How should it be determined what public issue or issue of public interest is implicated by speech within the meaning of the anti-SLAPP statute (Code of Civ. Proc., § 425.16, subd. (e)(4)) and the first step of the two-part test articulated in *FilmOn.com Inc. v. DoubleVerify Inc.* (2019) 7 Cal.5th 133, 149-150, and should deference be granted to a defendant's framing of the public interest issue at this step?

(5) *Hoffmann (Mikayla), a Minor, etc. v. Young (Christina M.) et al., S266003*

#21-48 Hoffman v. Young, 266003. (B292539; 56 Cal.App.5th 1021; San Luis Obispo County Superior Court; 16CVP0060.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Can an invitation to enter by a non-landowner — here, the landowner's child — that was made without the landowner's knowledge or express approval satisfy the requirements of Civil Code section 846, subdivision (d)(3), and abrogate the landowner's immunity from liability for damages suffered during permissive recreational use of the property?

1:30 P.M.

(6) *People v. Hendrix (Isaiah), S265668*

#21-21 People v. Hendrix, S265668. (B298952; 55 Cal.App.5th 1092; Venture County Superior Court; 2018037331.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. This case includes the following issue: Does the standard of *People v. Watson* (1956) 46 Cal.2d 818 or the standard of *Chapman v. California* (1967) 368 U.S. 818 apply to error in instructing on the defense of mistake of fact?

(7) *People v. Aguayo (Veronica), S254554*

#19-47 *People v. Aguayo*, S254554. (D073304; 31 Cal.App.5th 758; San Diego County Superior Court; SCS295489.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal conditionally reversed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses and remanded for further proceedings. This case includes the following issues: Is assault by means of force likely to produce great bodily injury a lesser included offense of assault with a deadly weapon? (See *People v. Aledamat* (2019) 8 Cal.5th 1, 16, fn. 5.) If so, was defendant's conviction of assault by means of force likely to produce great bodily injury based on the same act or course of conduct as her conviction of assault with a deadly weapon? Are Penal Code section 245, subdivision (a)(1) and section 245, subdivision (a)(4) merely different statements of the same offense for purposes of section 954? If so, must one of defendant's convictions be vacated?

(8) *People v. Ramirez (Juan Villa), [Automatic Appeal], S099844*

This matter is an automatic appeal from a judgment of death.