



**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR
SAN FRANCISCO SESSION
NOVEMBER 8, 2023**

In accordance with [Administrative Order 2023-05-11](#), the Supreme Court has resumed in-person oral argument sessions. Counsel have the option to appear in person at these sessions, or remotely via video. The public may attend in person and will also 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 8, 2023.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2023 — 9:00 A.M.

- (1) Estrada (Jorge Luis) et al. v. Royalty Carpet Mills, Inc., S274340
- (2) Romero (Tatana Spicakova) et al. v. Shih (Li-Chuan) et al. (U.S. Bank National Association, Cross-defendant and Respondent), S275023
- (3) In re Vaquera (Oscar Manuel) on Habeas Corpus, S258376

1:30 P.M.

- (4) People v. Helzer (Glen Taylor), [Automatic Appeal], S132256

GUERRERO

Chief Justice

**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR
SAN FRANCISCO SESSION
NOVEMBER 8, 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.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2023 — 9:00 A.M.

(1) *Estrada (Jorge Luis) et al. v. Royalty Carpet Mills, Inc., S274340*

#22-170 Estrada v. Royalty Carpet Mills, Inc., S274340. (G058397, G058969; 76 Cal.App.5th 685; Orange County Superior Court; 30-2013-00692890.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part the judgment in a civil action. The court limited review to the following issue: Do trial courts have inherent authority to ensure that claims under the Private Attorneys General Act (Lab. Code, § 2698 et seq.) will be manageable at trial, and to strike or narrow such claims if they cannot be managed?

(2) *Romero (Tatana Spicakova) et al. v. Shih (Li-Chuan) et al. (U.S. Bank National Association, Cross-defendant and Respondent), S275023*

#22-218 Romero v. Shih, S275023. (B310069; 78 Cal.App.5th 326; Los Angeles County Superior Court; EC064933.) Petitions for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part a judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Did the trial court correctly find the existence of an implied easement under the facts?

(3) *In re Vaquera (Oscar Manuel) on Habeas Corpus, S258376*

#19-195 *In re Vaquera, S258376*. (G056786; 39 Cal.App.5th 233; Orange County Superior Court; 12NF0653.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal denied a petition for writ of habeas corpus. This case presents the following issues: (1) Did the Court of Appeal err by disagreeing with *People v. Jimenez* (2019) 35 Cal.App.5th 373 and endorsing as mandatory the sentencing practice prohibited in that case; (2) Is the Court of Appeal's decision incorrect under *People v. Mancebo* (2002) 27 Cal.4th 735; (3) Did the Court of Appeal err by failing to address petitioner's claims as to the issues of waiver and estoppel?

1:30 P.M.

(4) *People v. Helzer (Glen Taylor), [Automatic Appeal], S132256*

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