



**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR
LOS ANGELES SESSION
APRIL 6, 2026**

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 April 6, 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/>.

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 2026 — 9:00 A.M.

- (1) Sunflower Alliance v. California Department of Conservation et al. (Reabold California, LLC, Real Party in Interest), S287414
(justice pro tempore to be assigned)
- (2) John HR Doe et al. v. Marysville Joint Unified School District, S283639
(justice pro tempore to be assigned)
- (3) People v. Cofer (Christopher Lee), S286297
(justice pro tempore to be assigned)

1:30 P.M.

- (4) In re Spielbauer (Thomas John) on Discipline, S283172
(justice pro tempore to be assigned)

GUERRERO

Chief Justice

**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR
LOS ANGELES SESSION
APRIL 6, 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.

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 2026 — 9:00 A.M.

(1) *Sunflower Alliance v. California Department of Conservation et al. (Reabold California, LLC, Real Party in Interest), S287414*

(justice pro tempore to be assigned)

#24-260 Sunflower Alliance v. California Department of Conservation et al. (Reabold California, LLC, Real Party in Interest), S287414. (A167698; 104 Cal.App.5th 1135, mod. 105 Cal.App.5th 771; Contra Costa County Superior Court; N221503.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action and remanded for further proceedings. The court limited review to the following issues: (1) May an agency claim a categorical exemption from environmental review under CEQA while also adopting conditions of approval relating to potential environmental effects? (2) Does the term “negligible” in the California Environmental Quality Act’s Class 1 existing facilities exemption (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15301) pertain to a negligible change in use or to a change that presents a negligible risk of environmental harm?

(2) *John HR Doe et al. v. Marysville Joint Unified School District, S283639*

(justice pro tempore to be assigned)

#24-64 John HR Doe et al. v. Marysville Joint Unified School District, S283639. (C095446; 98 Cal.App.5th 95; Yuba County Superior Court; CVPO2100697.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issues: (1) Did the plaintiffs’ second voluntary dismissal of their federal court action preclude a subsequent state court action based on the same claims?

(2) Did the defendant's assertion of sovereign immunity over plaintiffs' state law claims in federal court divest that court of subject matter jurisdiction over those claims?

(3) *People v. Cofer (Christopher Lee), S286297*

(justice pro tempore to be assigned)

#24-188 *People v. Cofer (Christopher Lee), 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?

1:30 P.M.

(4) *In re Spielbauer (Thomas John) on Discipline, S283172*

(justice pro tempore to be assigned)

#24-119 *In re Spielbauer (Thomas John) on Discipline, S283172*. (State Bar Ct. No. 19-O-30700.) Petitions for review after a State Bar Court recommendation of discipline of an attorney. This case presents the following issue: If a victim of attorney misconduct suffers damages recoverable in tort and incurs attorney fees as a result of the misconduct, under what circumstances may the State Bar Court order restitution based on such damages and fees as a condition of the attorney's probation? (See *Sorensen v. State Bar* (1991) 52 Cal.3d 1036.)