

ISSUES PENDING BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT IN CRIMINAL CASES

[These case summaries are made available to inform the public of the general subject matter in cases that the Supreme Court has accepted for review. The statement of the issue or issues in each case set out below does not necessarily reflect the views of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court. This compilation is current as of Friday, April 18, 2025.]

People v. Allen, S286520. (B328333; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; NA104090.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. This case presents the following issues: (1) If a defendant has invoked his right to remain silent while being interrogated by a law enforcement officer, are incriminating statements obtained through a subsequent *Perkins* operation (i.e., the use of an undercover agent to question a jailed defendant) admissible as substantive proof of the defendant's guilt at trial? (See *Illinois v. Perkins* (1990) 496 U.S. 292; *Miranda v. Arizona* (1966) 384 U.S. 436.) (2) What effect, if any, does the fact that the interrogating officer continued questioning after petitioner invoked his Fifth Amendment right to silence have upon the admissibility of the statements subsequently obtained during the *Perkins* operation?

People v. Antonelli, S281599. (B321947; 93 Cal.App.5th 712; Ventura County Superior Court; CR27515-2.) 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 issues: (1) Is defendant entitled to resentencing pursuant to Penal Code section 1172.6 on the ground that malice could be imputed to the defendant under the provocative act theory of murder for convictions occurring before 2009 (see Sen. Bill No. 775 (2021–2022 Reg. Sess.); *People v. Concha* (2009) 47 Cal.4th 653)? (2) Did the trial court err by not considering the jury instructions in determining defendant was ineligible for resentencing as a matter of law for a provocative act murder?

People v. Cannon, S277995. (A163083; 85 Cal.App.5th 786; Mendocino County Superior Court; SCUKCR2010148692.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal conditionally affirmed a civil commitment order and remanded with directions. This case presents the following issue: What level of scrutiny applies in determining whether the Sexually Violent Predator Act (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6600 et seq.) violates equal protection because it does not require an advisement or personal waiver of a jury trial as afforded in other civil commitment statutes?

People v. Cofer, S286297. (H050122; 103 Cal.App.5th 333; Monterey County Superior Court; 20CR010763.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses and remanded for further proceedings. This case presents the following issue: When a defendant is sentenced to concurrent terms on multiple cases jointly resolved at a single hearing, does Penal Code section 2900.5, subdivision (b) entitle the defendant to duplicative presentence custody credits for time spent in custody on one or more of the cases, but not others?

People v. Dain, S283924. (A168286; 99 Cal.App.5th 399; Sonoma County Superior Court; SCR7090531.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order granting a motion in a criminal matter and remanded for further proceedings. The court limited review to the following issue: Did the Court of Appeal err in remanding the case with directions to reinstate the strike finding and to resentence defendant as a person who has suffered a prior strike conviction under the Three Strikes Law? (See *People v. Williams* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 148, 164, fn. 7; see also *People v. McGlothlin* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 468, 478; *People v. Humphrey* (1997) 58 Cal.App.4th 809, 814; but see *People v. Mayfield* (2020) 50 Cal.App.5th 1096, 1109; *People v. Strong* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 328, 347.)

People v. Emanuel, S280551. (H049147; nonpublished opinion; Santa Clara County Superior Court; C1246799.) 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: Does sufficient evidence support the trial court's finding that defendant acted with reckless indifference to human life and therefore was ineligible for resentencing pursuant to Penal Code section 1172.6?

People v. Esquivias, S286371. (B329800; 103 Cal.App.5th 969; Los Angeles County Superior Court; PA077370.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order granting in part and denying in part a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter. This case presents the following issue: Does the issuance of an order to show cause to review one aspect of a defendant's sentence in habeas corpus proceedings render applicable all ameliorative laws taking effect after the defendant's judgment became final?

People v. Faial, S273840. (A159026; 75 Cal.App.5th 738; San Mateo County Superior Court; SC083808.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal remanded for resentencing and otherwise affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. This case presents the following issue: Does Assembly Bill No. 1950 (Stats. 2020, ch. 328) apply retroactively to a defendant, serving a suspended-execution sentence, whose probation was revoked before the law went into effect?

People v. Fletcher, S281282. (E077553; 92 Cal.App.5th 1374; Riverside County Superior Court; BAF2001566.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court limited review to the following issues: (1) Does Assembly Bill No. 333 amend the requirements for a true finding on a prior strike conviction (Pen. Code, §§ 667, subs. (b)–(i) & 1170.12, subs. (a)–(d)) and a prior serious felony conviction (Pen. Code, § 667, subd. (a)), or is that determination made on “the date of that prior conviction”? (See Pen. Code, §§ 667, subd. (d)(1) & 1170.12, subd. (b)(1).) (2) Does Assembly Bill No. 333 (Stats. 2021, ch. 699), which modified the criminal street gang statute (Pen. Code, § 186.22), unconstitutionally amend Proposition 21 and Proposition 36, if applied to strike convictions and serious felony convictions?

People v. Superior Court (Guevara), S283305. (B329457; 97 Cal.App.5th 978; Santa Barbara County Superior Court; 1183843.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal granted a petition for peremptory writ of mandate. This case presents the following issues: (1) Do the revised penalty provisions of the Three Strikes Reform Act of 2012 (Pen. Code, § 1170.12) apply when a defendant is resentenced pursuant to Senate Bill No. 483 (Pen. Code, § 1172.75)? (2) Whether defendants qualify as “presently serving an indeterminate term” under Penal Code section 1170.126 if they were serving such a term on the effective date of the statute, or only if they are currently serving such an indeterminate term?

In re Hernandez, S282186. (F076752; nonpublished opinion; Kern County Superior Court; BF150639A.) 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: Does the totality of the circumstances establish that defendant meaningfully understood the immigration consequences of her plea?

People v. Hughey, S287455. (B325796; 105 Cal.App.5th 216; Ventura County Superior Court; 2021019944.) Petitions for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed judgments of conviction of criminal offenses. This case presents the following issue: Was there sufficient evidence of asportation to support defendants’ convictions for kidnapping (Pen. Code, § 207, subd. (a))?

People v. Kopp, S257844. (D072464; 38 Cal.App.5th 47; San Diego County Superior Court; SCN327213.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part judgments of conviction of criminal offenses. The court limited review to the following issues: (1) Must a court consider a defendant’s ability to pay before imposing or executing fines, fees, and assessments? (2) If so, which party bears the burden of proof regarding the defendant’s inability to pay?

In re Kowalczyk, S277910. (A162977; 85 Cal.App.5th 667; San Mateo County Superior Court; 21SF003700A.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal dismissed a petition for writ of habeas corpus as moot. The court limited review to the following issues: (1) Which constitutional provision governs the denial of bail in noncapital cases — article I, section 12, subdivisions (b) and (c), or article I, section 28, subdivision (f)(3), of the California Constitution — or, in the alternative, can these provisions be reconciled? (2) May a superior court ever set pretrial bail above an arrestee’s ability to pay?

People v. Lopez, S287814. (F085300; nonpublished opinion; Stanislaus County Superior Court; 1073884.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter. The court limited review to the following issue: Does Penal Code section 1172.6, subdivision (a)(3), which requires defendants to allege that they “could not presently be convicted of murder or attempted murder because of changes to section 188 or 189 made effective January 1, 2019,” render ineligible for relief petitioners who could have raised their challenges to imputed malice on prior direct appeal?

People v. Meno, S286092. (D081878; 102 Cal.App.5th 943; San Diego County Superior Court; SCD288239.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. This case presents the following issue: Does a trial court have discretion to dismiss either the greater or lesser included offense involving the same conduct of driving under the influence causing death in order to avoid the prohibition against multiple convictions based on necessarily included offenses?

People v. Mitchell, S277314. (A163476; 83 Cal.App.5th 1051; Mendocino County Superior Court; SCUKCRCR2021373081.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. This case presents the following issue: Does Senate Bill No. 567 (Stats. 2021, ch. 731), which limits a trial court’s discretion to impose upper term sentences, apply retroactively to defendants sentenced pursuant to stipulated plea agreements?

In re Montgomery, S287339. (D083970; 104 Cal.App.5th 1062; San Diego County Superior Court; HC25670.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal of a post-judgment order in a criminal matter. This case presents the following issue: Must a petitioner allege a prima facie case for relief under the Racial Justice Act (Pen. Code, § 745; RJA) before the trial court can consider a discovery request for disclosure of evidence under the RJA (*id.*, subd. (d))?

People v. Morgan, S286493. (A166435; 103 Cal.App.5th 488; Sonoma County Superior Court; SCR7469261.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses and remanded for resentencing. This case presents the following issue: Is assault (Pen. Code, § 240) a necessarily included lesser offense of resisting an executive officer by force or violence (Pen. Code, § 69, subd. (a))?

People v. Morris, S284751. (G061916; 100 Cal.App.5th 1016; Orange County Superior Court; 08CF1591.) 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 trial court correctly deny defendant’s Penal Code section 1172.6 resentencing petition at the prima facie stage on the ground that the actus reus of first degree felony murder requires that a defendant who is not the actual killer need only aid in the underlying felony and not in the killing itself (Pen. Code, § 189, subd. (e)(2))?

People v. Rhodius, S283169. (E080064; 97 Cal.App.5th 38; Riverside County Superior Court; RIF1502535.) 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: Does Senate Bill No. 483 (Stats. 2021, ch. 728) entitle a defendant to a full resentencing hearing under Penal Code section 1172.75 if the defendant's prior prison term enhancements (Pen. Code, § 667.5, subd. (b)) were imposed and stayed, rather than imposed and executed?

People v. Robinson, S288606. (C098299; 106 Cal.App.5th 854, mod. 107 Cal.App.5th 245a; San Joaquin County Superior Court; SF117220A.) 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: Is a transcript of grand jury proceedings admissible at a Penal Code section 1172.6 evidentiary hearing?

People v. SanMiguel, S287786. (B328160; 105 Cal.App.5th 880; Ventura County Superior Court (Ventura); 2022002116.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court limited review to the following issue: Did the trial court properly overrule defendant's Code of Civil Procedure section 231.7 objection to the People's peremptory challenge of a prospective juror?

Sellers v. Superior Court, S287164. (C100036; 104 Cal.App.5th 468; Sacramento County Superior Court; 21FE018661.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal denied a petition for writ of mandate. This case presents the following issues: (1) Does the presence of 0.36 grams of loose marijuana on the floor of a vehicle constitute an open container violation under Health & Safety Code, section 11362.3, subdivision (a)(4)? (2) Does the answer to this question affect whether there was probable cause for a warrantless vehicle search under the totality of the circumstances, such that remand would be required for reconsideration of the Court of Appeal's alternative analysis, *Sellers v. Superior Court* (2024) 104 Cal.App.5th 468, 478–479?

People v. Shaw, S286453. (C098821; nonpublished opinion; Placer County Superior Court; 62176716Z.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court limited review to the following issue: May two prior convictions arising out of a single act that harms multiple victims constitute two strikes under the Three Strikes law? (*People v. Vargas* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 635; *People v. Williams* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 148.)

Snap, Inc. v. Superior Court, S286267. (D083475, D083446; 103 Cal.App.5th 1031; San Diego County Superior Court; CN429787.) Petitions for review after the Court of Appeal granted in part and denied in part petitions for peremptory writ of mandate. This case presents the following issues: (1) Does the federal Stored Communications Act (18 U.S.C. § 2701 et seq.) bar a social media company from disclosing an individual's account information in response to a criminal defendant's subpoena? (2) Did the trial court abuse its discretion by finding that good cause supported the subpoena for third-party discovery?

The Association of Deputy District Attorneys v. Gascón, S275478. (B310845; 79 Cal.App.5th 503; Los Angeles County Superior Court; 20STCP04250.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part a petition for writ of mandate or prohibition. This case presents the following issues: (1) Does the Three Strikes law (Pen. Code, §§ 667, subs. (b)–(i), 1170.12) violate the separation of powers doctrine by requiring prosecutors to plead and prove prior qualifying felony convictions? (2) If there is a duty to plead prior qualifying convictions, is mandamus the proper remedy to compel a prosecutor to act?

People v. Wiley, S283326. (A165613; 97 Cal.App.5th 676; Humboldt County Superior Court; CR1902147B.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. This case presents the following issue: Did the sentencing court's consideration of circumstances in aggravation based on certified records of prior convictions, beyond the bare fact of the convictions, violate Penal Code section 1170, subdivision (b)(3) or defendant's Sixth Amendment right to a jury trial?