



**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR
SAN FRANCISCO SESSION
MAY 8 and 9, 2024**

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 May 8 and 9, 2024.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2024 — 9:00 A.M.

- (1) Legislature of the State of California et al. v. Weber (Shirley N.) (Thomas W. Hiltachk, Real Party in Interest), S281977
- (2) Golden State Water Company v. Public Utilities Commission (Consolidated Cases), S269099
- (3) Turrieta (Tina) v. Lyft, Inc. (Million Seifu et al., Interveners and Appellants), S271721

1:30 P.M.

- (4) Ramirez (Angelica) v. Charter Communications, Inc., S273802
- (5) People v. Arellano (Luis Ramon Manzano), S277962
- (6) People v. Lamb (Michael Allan), [Automatic Appeal], S166168

THURSDAY, MAY 9, 2024 — 9:00 A.M.

- (7) People v. Lynch (Deandre), S274942
- (8) People v. Wilson (Javance Mickey), [Automatic Appeal], S118775

1:30 P.M.

- (9) People v. Frazier (Robert Ward), [Automatic Appeal], S148863

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
MAY 8 and 9, 2024**

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. The descriptions set out below are, in most instances, 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, MAY 8, 2024 — 9:00 A.M.

(1) *Legislature of the State of California et al. v. Weber (Shirley N.) (Thomas W. Hiltachk, Real Party in Interest), S281977*

#23-238 Legislature of the State of California v. Weber (Hiltachk), S281977. Original proceeding. The court issued an order to show cause why the relief sought in the petition should not be granted. This case presents the following issues: (1) Does the Taxpayer Protection and Government Accountability Act constitute an impermissible attempted revision of the California Constitution by voter initiative? (2) Is this initiative measure subject to invalidation on the ground that, if adopted, it would impair essential government functions?

(2) *Golden State Water Company v. Public Utilities Commission (Consolidated Cases), S269099*

#22-134 Golden State Water Co. v. Public Utilities Commission, S269099. Original proceeding. The court issued a writ of review regarding notice and due process requirements in proceedings before the Public Utilities Commission. (See also *California-American Water Co. v. Public Utilities Commission*, S271493.)

#22-132 California-American Water Co. v. Public Utilities Commission, S271493. Original proceeding. The court issued a writ of review regarding notice and due process requirements in proceedings before the Public Utilities Commission. (See also *Golden State Water Co. v. Public Utilities Commission*, S269099.)

(3) *Turrieta (Tina) v. Lyft, Inc. (Million Seifu et al., Interveners and Appellants), S271721*

#22-03 Turrieta v. Lyft, Inc., S271721. (B304701; 69 Cal.App.5th 955; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC714153.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in a civil action. The court limited review to the following issue: Does a plaintiff in a representative action filed under the Private Attorneys General Act (Lab. Code, § 2698 et seq.) (PAGA) have the right to intervene, or object to, or move to vacate, a judgment in a related action that purports to settle the claims that plaintiff has brought on behalf of the state?

1:30 P.M.

(4) *Ramirez (Angelica) v. Charter Communications, Inc., S273802*

#22-141 Ramirez v. Charter Communications, Inc., S273802. (B309408; 75 Cal.App.5th 365; Los Angeles County Superior Court; 20STCV25987.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a petition to compel arbitration in a civil action. This case includes the following issues: Did the Court of Appeal err in holding that a provision of an arbitration agreement allowing for recovery of interim attorney's fees after a successful motion to compel arbitration, was so substantively unconscionable that it rendered the arbitration agreement unenforceable?

(5) *People v. Arellano (Luis Ramon Manzano), S277962*

#23-41 People v. Arellano, S277962. (H049413; 86 Cal.App.5th 418; Santa Clara County Superior Court; 159386.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed a post-judgment motion and remanded for resentencing in a criminal matter. This case presents the following issue: When a defendant obtains resentencing of a conviction under Penal Code section 1172.6, subdivision (e), is the trial court permitted to impose not only the target offense or underlying felony, but also corresponding enhancements?

(6) *People v. Lamb (Michael Allan), [Automatic Appeal], S166168*

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

THURSDAY, MAY 9, 2024 — 9:00 A.M.

(7) *People v. Lynch (Deandre), S274942*

#22-217 *People v. Lynch, S274942.* (C094174; nonpublished opinion; Sacramento County Superior Court; 20FE009532.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. This case presents the following issue: What prejudice standard applies on appeal when determining whether a case should be remanded for resentencing in light of newly-enacted Senate Bill No. 567 (Stats. 2021, ch. 731)?

(8) *People v. Wilson (Javance Mickey), [Automatic Appeal], S118775*

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

1:30 P.M.

(9) *People v. Frazier (Robert Ward), [Automatic Appeal], S148863*

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