



**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR  
SAN FRANCISCO SESSION  
NOVEMBER 2, 2022**

Pursuant to Administrative Order No. [2022-10-05 \(October 5, 2022\)](#), commencing with this session the Supreme Court will resume in-person oral argument in its San Francisco courtroom. Under this order, which supersedes Administrative Orders Nos. [2020-03-13 \(March 16, 2020\)](#), [2020-03-27 \(March 27, 2020\)](#), and [2020-08-19 \(August 19, 2020\)](#), counsel will have the option to appear in person, or remotely via video. The public will continue to have access to argument via live-streaming on the judicial branch 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 November 2, 2022.

**WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2022 — 9:00 A.M.**

- (1) In re D.P., S267429
- (2) People v. Espinoza (Juventino), S269647
- (3) People v. Thomas (Justin Heath), [Automatic Appeal], S161781

**1:30 P.M.**

- (4) People v. Waldon (Billy Ray), [Automatic Appeal], S025520

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  
NOVEMBER 2, 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.*

**WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2022 — 9:00 A.M.**

**(1) *In re D.P., S267429***

#21-251 *In re D.P., S267429.* (B301135; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; 19CCJP00973). Petition for review after the Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal in a juvenile dependency proceeding. The court ordered the parties to brief and argue the following issues: (1) Is an appeal of a juvenile court’s jurisdictional finding moot when a parent asserts that he or she has been or will be stigmatized by the finding? (2) Is an appeal of a juvenile court’s jurisdictional finding moot when a parent asserts that he or she may be barred from challenging a current or future placement on the Child Abuse Central Index as a result of the finding?

**(2) *People v. Espinoza (Juventino), S269647***

#21-453 *People v. Espinoza, S269647.* (F079209; nonpublished opinion; Tulare County Superior Court; VCF109133B-03.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter. This case presents the following issue: Did the Court of Appeal err in ruling that defendant failed to demonstrate prejudice within the meaning of Penal Code section 1473.7 from trial counsel’s failure to properly advise him of the immigration consequences of his plea?

(3) *People v. Thomas (Justin Heath)*, [Automatic Appeal], S161781

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

**1:30 P.M.**

(4) *People v. Waldon (Billy Ray)*, [Automatic Appeal], S025520

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