



**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR  
SAN FRANCISCO SESSION  
FEBRUARY 7, 2023**

Pursuant to Administrative Order No. [2022-10-05 \(October 5, 2022\)](#), in November 2022 the Supreme Court resumed 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 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 February 7, 2023.

**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2023 — 9:00 A.M.**

- (1) Tansavatdi (Betty) v. City of Rancho Palos Verdes, S267453
- (2) Davis (Stephen K.) v. Fresno Unified School District et al., S266344
- (3) In re F.M., S270907

**1:30 P.M.**

- (4) People v. Wilson (Lester Harland), [Automatic Appeal], S189373

GUERRERO

---

*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  
FEBRUARY 7, 2023**

*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, FEBRUARY 7, 2023 — 9:00 A.M.**

(1) ***Tansavatdi (Betty) v. City of Rancho Palos Verdes, S267453***

#21-185 Tansavatdi v. City of Rancho Palos Verdes, S267453. (B293670; 60 Cal.App.5th 423; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC633651.) 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 a public entity be held liable under Government Code section 830.8 for failure to warn of an allegedly dangerous design of public property if the design itself is entitled to immunity under Government Code section 830.6?

(2) ***Davis (Stephen K.) v. Fresno Unified School District et al., S266344***

#21-128 Davis v. Fresno Unified School Dist., S266344. (F079811; 57 Cal.App.5th 911; Fresno County Superior Court; 12CECG03718.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. The court limited review to the following issue: Is a lease-leaseback arrangement in which construction is financed through bond proceeds, rather than by or through the builder, a “contract” within the meaning of Government Code section 53511?

(3) ***In re F.M., S270907***

#21-508 In re F.M., S270907. (H048693; nonpublished opinion; Santa Cruz County Superior Court; 19JU00191.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed an order in a juvenile wardship proceeding. This case presents the following

issue: Did the Court of Appeal err in ruling that the trial court adequately exercised its discretion to determine whether the juvenile's offenses were felonies or misdemeanors as required by Welfare and Institutions Code section 702 and *In re Manzy W.* (1997) 14 Cal.4th 1199?

**1:30 P.M.**

(4) ***People v. Wilson (Lester Harland), [Automatic Appeal], S189373***

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