



**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR
LOS ANGELES SESSION
JUNE 4 and 5, 2024
FIRST AMENDED**

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 Reagan State Office Building, 300 South Spring Street, Third Floor, North Tower, Los Angeles, California, on June 4 and 5, 2024.

TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 2024 — 9:00 A.M.

- (1) In re Dezi C., S275578
- (2) Stone (Tamelin) et al. v. Alameda Health System, S279137
(*Evans, J., not participating; Segal, J., assigned justice pro tempore*)
- (3) In re Tellez (Victor Raul) on Habeas Corpus, S277072

1:30 P.M.

- (4) Rattagan (Michael R.) v. Uber Technologies, Inc., S272113
- (5) JJD-HOV Elk Grove, LLC v. Jo-Ann Stores, LLC, S275843

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 2024 — 9:00 A.M.

- (6) City of Los Angeles v. PricewaterhouseCoopers, LLC, S277211
(*Groban, J., not participating; Snauffer, J., assigned justice pro tempore*)
- (7) People v. Williams (Jeremiah Ira), S262229
(*Evans, J., not participating; Smith, J., assigned justice pro tempore*)
- (8) Meinhardt (David) v. City of Sunnyvale (Sunnyvale Department of Public Safety, Real Party in Interest and Respondent), S274147
(*Guerrero, C. J., not participating; Sanchez, J., assigned justice pro tempore*)

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
JUNE 4 and 5, 2024
FIRST AMENDED**

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.

TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 2024 — 9:00 A.M.

(1) *In re Dezi C., S275578*

#22-254 *In Re Dezi C., S275578.* (B317935; 79 Cal.App.5th 769; Los Angeles County Superior Court; 19CCJP08030.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed orders in a juvenile dependency proceeding. This case presents the following issue: What constitutes reversible error when a child welfare agency fails to make the statutorily required inquiry concerning a child’s potential Indian ancestry?

(2) *Stone (Tamelin) et al. v. Alameda Health System, S279137*

(Evans, J., not participating; Segal, J., assigned justice pro tempore)

#23-94 *Stone v. Alameda Health System, S279137.* (A164021; 88 Cal.App.5th 84; Alameda County Superior Court; RG21092734.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part an order in a civil action. This case presents the following issues: (1) Are all public entities exempt from the obligations in the Labor Code regarding meal and rest breaks, overtime, and payroll records, or only those public entities that satisfy the “hallmarks of sovereignty” standard adopted by the Court of Appeal in this case? (2) Does the exemption from the prompt payment statutes in Labor Code section 220, subdivision (b), for “employees directly employed by any county, incorporated city, or town or other municipal corporation” include all public entities that exercise governmental functions? (3) Do the civil penalties available under the Private

Attorneys General Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698 et seq., apply to public entities?

(3) *In re Tellez (Victor Raul) on Habeas Corpus, S277072*

#23-10 *In re Tellez, S277072*. (D079716; 84 Cal.App.5th 292; San Diego County Superior Court; SCE369196.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal denied a petition for writ of habeas corpus. The court ordered the following issues to be briefed and argued: (1) Does constitutionally effective assistance of counsel require defense counsel to advise a defendant that a guilty plea may subject the defendant to commitment proceedings under the Sexually Violent Predator Act (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6600 et seq.; SVPA)? If so, did petitioner in this case suffer prejudice? (2) In the alternative, should this Court, in the exercise of its supervisory powers (see, e.g., *People v. Howard* (1992) 1 Cal.4th 1132, 1175; *Bunnell v. Superior Court* (1975) 13 Cal.3d 592, 605), require that a defendant be advised that a guilty plea may subject him to SVPA commitment proceedings? If so, is petitioner entitled to relief?

1:30 P.M.

(4) *Rattagan (Michael R.) v. Uber Technologies, Inc., S272113*

#22-29 *Rattagan v. Uber Technologies, S272113*. (9th Cir. No. 20-16796; Northern District of California; No. 3:19-cv-01988-EMC.) Request under California Rules of Court, rule 8.548, that this court decide a question of California law presented in a matter pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The question presented is: Under California law, are claims for fraudulent concealment exempted from the economic loss rule?

(5) *JJD-HOV Elk Grove, LLC v. Jo-Ann Stores, LLC, S275843*

#22-263 *JJD-HOV Elk Grove, LLC v. Jo-Ann Stores, LLC, S275843*. (C094190; 80 Cal.App.5th 409; Sacramento County Superior Court; 34201900248163CUBCGDS.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issues: (1) What analytical framework should be applied in determining the enforceability of co-tenancy provisions in retail lease agreements? (2)

Did the Court of Appeal correctly determine that the co-tenancy provision in this case is enforceable?

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 2024 — 9:00 A.M.

(6) *City of Los Angeles v. PricewaterhouseCoopers, LLC, S277211*

(Groban, J., not participating; Snauffer, J., assigned justice pro tempore)

#23-17 *City of Los Angeles v. PricewaterhouseCoopers, LLC, S277211*. (B310118; 84 Cal.App.5th 466; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC574690.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Is a court's authority to impose monetary sanctions for misuse of the discovery process limited to circumstances expressly delineated in a method-specific provision of the Civil Discovery Act, or do courts have independent authority to impose monetary sanctions for such discovery misconduct, including under Code of Civil Procedure sections 2023.010 and 2023.030?

(7) *People v. Williams (Jeremiah Ira), S262229*

(Evans, J., not participating; Smith, J., assigned justice pro tempore)

#20-189 *People v. Williams, S262229*. (D074098; 47 Cal.App.5th 475; San Diego County Superior Court; SCD268493.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court limited review to the following issue: Does Penal Code section 3051, subdivision (h), violate the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment by excluding young adults convicted and sentenced for serious sex crimes under the One Strike law (Pen. Code, § 667.61) from youth offender parole consideration, while young adults convicted of first degree murder are entitled to such consideration?

(8) Meinhardt (David) v. City of Sunnyvale (Sunnyvale Department of Public Safety, Real Party in Interest and Respondent), S274147

(Guerrero, C. J., not participating; Sanchez, J., assigned justice pro tempore)

#22-158 Meinhardt v. City of Sunnyvale, S274147. (D079451; 76 Cal.App.5th 43; Santa Clara County Superior Court; 19CV346911.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal dismissed an appeal from the judgment in an action for writ of administrative mandate. The court limited review to the following issue: Did the Court of Appeal correctly dismiss the appeal as untimely?