



**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR  
SAN FRANCISCO SESSION  
OCTOBER 3, 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 media will be strictly limited to achieve appropriate distancing. The public will continue to have access to argument via live-streaming on the court website: <https://supreme.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 October 3, 2022.

**MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2022 — 9:00 A.M.**

- (1) In re D.N., S268437
- (2) People v. Delgadillo (Jose), S266305
- (3) People v. Tacardon (Leon William), S264219

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  
OCTOBER 3, 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.*

**MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2022 — 9:00 A.M.**

(1) ***In re D.N., S268437***

#21-323 In re D.N., S268437. (F080624; nonpublished opinion; Fresno County Superior Court; 19CEJ600384-1.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed in part and affirmed in part orders in a juvenile wardship proceeding. This case presents the following issue: Did the trial court improperly delegate its authority to the probation department and violate the minor’s due process rights by permitting the probation department to offer the minor community service hours “to work off any alleged probation violations”?

(2) ***People v. Delgadillo (Jose), S266305***

#21-72 People v. Delgadillo, S266305. (B304441; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BA436900.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal dismissed an appeal from an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter. The court limited review to the following issues: (1) What procedures must appointed counsel and the Courts of Appeal follow when counsel determines that an appeal from an order denying postconviction relief lacks arguable merit? (2) Are defendants entitled to notice of these procedures?

(3) ***People v. Tacardon (Leon William), S264219***

#20-290 People v. Tacardon, S264219. (C087681; 53 Cal.App.5th 89; San Joaquin County Superior Court; STKCRFER20180003729.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order granting a motion to suppress evidence. This case presents the following issue: Was defendant unlawfully detained when the arresting officer used his spotlight to illuminate defendant's parked car and then directed a passenger who exited the car to remain outside and stay on the sidewalk near the car?