



**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR
SACRAMENTO SESSION
FEBRUARY 4, 2026**

The following cases are placed upon the calendar of the Supreme Court for hearing at its courtroom in the Stanley Mosk Library and Courts Building, 914 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California, on February 4, 2026. 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, FEBRUARY 4, 2026 — 9:00 A.M.

- (1) In re Z.G. et al., S289430 and In re G. (A.) on Habeas Corpus, S289441
(*consolidated cases*)
(*justice pro tempore to be assigned*)
- (2) In re Kowalczyk (Gerald John) on Habeas Corpus, S277910
(*justice pro tempore to be assigned*)
- (3) People v. Morris (Richard Curtis, Jr.), S284751
(*justice pro tempore to be assigned*)

1:30 P.M.

- (4) People v. Lopez (Robert Anthony), S287814
(*justice pro tempore to be assigned*)
- (5) People v. Stayner (Cary Anthony), [Automatic Appeal], S112146
(*justice pro tempore to be assigned*)

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
SACRAMENTO SESSION
FEBRUARY 4, 2026**

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, FEBRUARY 4, 2026 — 9:00 A.M.

**(1) *In re Z.G. et al.*, S289430 and *In re G. (A.) on Habeas Corpus*, S289441
(consolidated cases)**

(justice pro tempore to be assigned)

#25-131 *In re Z.G. et al.*, S289430. (E083710; nonpublished opinion; San Bernardino County Superior Court; J286808.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed orders in a juvenile dependency proceeding. The court limited review to the following issue: Can parental rights properly be terminated pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 366.26, subdivision (c)(1) when a parent did not receive reunification services and was not bypassed for such services?

#25-128 *In re G. (A.) on Habeas Corpus*, S289441. (E084563; nonpublished order; San Bernardino County Superior Court; J286808.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal denied a petition for writ of habeas corpus in a juvenile dependency proceeding. The court issued an order to show cause why the relief sought in the petition should not be granted. This case presents issues relating to claims of ineffective assistance of counsel in connection with juvenile dependency proceedings resulting in the termination of petitioner's parental rights.

(2) *In re Kowalczyk (Gerald John) on Habeas Corpus, S277910*

(justice pro tempore to be assigned)

#23-42 *In re Kowalczyk (Gerald John) on Habeas Corpus, 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?

(3) *People v. Morris (Richard Curtis, Jr.), S284751*

(justice pro tempore to be assigned)

#24-132 *People v. Morris (Richard Curtis, Jr.), 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))?

1:30 P.M.

(4) *People v. Lopez (Robert Anthony), S287814*

(justice pro tempore to be assigned)

#25-2 *People v. Lopez (Robert Anthony), 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?

(5) *People v. Stayner (Cary Anthony), [Automatic Appeal], S112146*
(*justice pro tempore to be assigned*)

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