



**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR  
SAN FRANCISCO SESSION  
May 21 and 22, 2025  
SECOND AMENDED**

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 21 and 22, 2025. The public may attend in person and also have access to argument via live-streaming on the judicial branch website: <https://supreme.courts.ca.gov/>.

**WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 2025 — 11:00 A.M.**

- (1) Holland (Jonie A.) et al. v. Silverscreen Healthcare, Inc., S285429

**1:30 P.M.**

- (2) Hohenshelt (Dana) v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (Golden State Food Corp., Real Party in Interest), S284498
- (3) Los Angeles Police Protective League v. City of Los Angeles et al., S275272
- (4) Gutierrez (Francisco) v. Tostado (Uriel) et al., S283128

**THURSDAY, MAY 22, 2025 — 9:00 A.M.**

- (5) People v. Cannon (William Joseph), S277995
- (6) People v. Chhuon (Run Peter) and Pan (Samreth Sam), [Automatic Appeal], S105403
- (7) People v. Cardenas (Refugio Ruben), [Automatic Appeal], S151493

**2:30 P.M.**

- (8) People v. Alvarez (Francisco Jay), [Automatic Appeal], S089619

**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 21 and 22, 2025  
SECOND 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.*

**WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 2025 — 11:00 A.M.**

**(1) *Holland (Jonie A.) et al. v. Silverscreen Healthcare, Inc., S285429***

#24-153 Holland (Jonie A.) et al. v. Silverscreen Healthcare, Inc., S285429. (B323237; 101 Cal.App.5th 1125; Los Angeles County Superior Court; 22STCV01945.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order denying a motion to compel arbitration in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: In a lawsuit against a skilled nursing facility arising from the facility’s alleged failure to protect a decedent from falls and infection, can the facility rely on an arbitration agreement signed only by the decedent to compel the decedent’s heirs to arbitrate a wrongful death claim?

**1:30 P.M.**

**(2) *Hohenshelt (Dana) v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (Golden State Food Corp., Real Party in Interest), S284498***

#24-98 Hohenshelt (Dana) v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (Golden State Food Corp., Real Party in Interest), S284498. (B327524; 99 Cal.App.5th 1319; Los Angeles County Superior Court; 20PSCV00827.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal granted a petition for writ of mandate. This case presents the following issue: Does the Federal Arbitration Act (9 U.S.C. § 1 et seq.) preempt state statutes prescribing the procedures for paying arbitration fees and providing for forfeiture of the right to arbitrate

if timely payment is not made by the party who drafted the arbitration agreement and who is required to pay such fees?

**(3) *Los Angeles Police Protective League v. City of Los Angeles et al.*, S275272**

#22-228 *Los Angeles Police Protective League v. City of Los Angeles et al.*, S275272.

The court restated the questions in this case as follows: (1) Does Penal Code section 148.6, subdivision (a), particularly subdivision (a)(2), constitute improper viewpoint discrimination in violation of the First Amendment? (2) Does Penal Code section 148.6, subdivision (a), particularly subdivision (a)(2), impose an impermissible burden on the ability to file, or on the City to accept, police misconduct complaints? (3) Is it error to compel the City to comply with a statute that has been ruled unconstitutional by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit?

**(4) *Gutierrez (Francisco) v. Tostado (Uriel) et al.*, S283128**

#24-59 *Gutierrez (Francisco) v. Tostado (Uriel) et al.*, S283128. (H049983; 97 Cal.App.5th 786; Santa Clara County Superior Court; 20CV361400.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Does the one-year statute of limitations in the Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act (MICRA; Code Civ. Proc., § 340.5) apply to a personal injury claim alleging that the plaintiff's vehicle was struck by a negligently driven ambulance?

**THURSDAY, MAY 22, 2025 — 9:00 A.M.**

**(5) *People v. Cannon (William Joseph)*, S277995**

#22-26 *People v. Cannon (William Joseph)*, S277995. (A163083; 85 Cal.App.5th 786; Mendocino County Superior Court; SCUKECR2010148692.) 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?

**(6) *People v. Chhuon (Run Peter) and Pan (Samreth Sam)*, [Automatic Appeal], S105403**

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

**(7) *People v. Cardenas (Refugio Ruben)*, [Automatic Appeal], S151493**

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

**2:30 P.M.**

**(8) *People v. Alvarez (Francisco Jay)*, [Automatic Appeal], S089619**

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