



Supreme Court of California
350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102-4797
www.courts.ca.gov/supremecourt

NEWS RELEASE

Contact: [Merrill Balassone](mailto:Merrill.Balassone@courts.ca.gov), 415-865-7740

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

July 1, 2022

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of June 27, 2022

[This news release is issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has accepted and of their general subject matter. The statement of the issue or issues in each case set out below does not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]

#22-176 *People v. Ballardo*, S274469. (B290567; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; ZM008237.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a civil commitment order. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *Camacho v. Superior Court*, S273391 (#22-118), which presents the following issue: Does a 15-year delay in bringing a defendant to trial under the Sexually Violent Predator Act (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6600 et. seq) constitute a due process violation?

#22-177 *People v. Canedos*, S274244. (B308433; 77 Cal.App.5th 469; Los Angeles County Superior Court; MA066185.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order in a criminal case and remanded for resentencing.

#22-178 *People v. Hart*, S274724. (B311264; nonpublished opinion; Santa Barbara County Superior Court; 1501773.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order in a criminal case.

The court ordered briefing in *Canedos* and *Hart* deferred pending decision in *People v. Faial*, S273840 (#22-133), which 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1950 (Stats. 2020, ch. 328) apply retroactively to a defendant, serving a suspended-execution sentence, whose probation was revoked before the law went into effect?

#22-179 *People v. Cooper*, S274390. (D078345; nonpublished opinion; San Diego County Superior Court; CR127408.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

#22-180 *People v. Faulalo*, S274660. (C094142; nonpublished opinion; Sacramento County Superior Court; 04F02695.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

#22-181 *People v. Mabson*, S274681. (C093654; nonpublished opinion; Sacramento County Superior Court; 11F05321.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

#22-182 *People v. Taylor*, S274614. (B312057; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; LA033959.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

#22-183 *People v. Washington*, S274679. (C092937; nonpublished opinion; Sacramento County Superior Court; 08F04720.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

The court ordered briefing in *Cooper*, *Faulalo*, *Mabson*, *Taylor*, and *Washington* deferred pending decision in *People v. Strong*, S266606 (#21-101), which presents the following issue: Does a felony-murder special circumstance finding (Pen. Code, § 190.2, subd. (a)(17)) made before *People v. Banks* (2015) 61 Cal.4th 788 and *People v. Clark* (2016) 63 Cal.4th 522 preclude a defendant from making a prima facie showing of eligibility for relief under Penal Code section 1170.95?

#22-184 *People v. Gomez*, S274715. (E075214; nonpublished opinion; San Bernardino County Superior Court; FVI02462.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Espinoza*, S269647 (#21-453), which presents the following issue: Did the Court of Appeal err in ruling that defendant failed to adequately corroborate his claim that immigration consequences were a paramount concern and thus that he could not demonstrate prejudice within the meaning of Penal Code section 1473.7?

#22-185 *People v. Jimenez*, S274004. (H049329; nonpublished opinion; Santa Clara County Superior Court; CC624282.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Williams*, S262229 (#20-189), which presents 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?

#22-186 *People v. Montanez*, S274306. (F082023; nonpublished opinion; Tulare County Superior Court; PCF344311.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. McWilliams*, S268320 (#21-324), which presents the following issues: (1) Is the discovery of a parole or probation search condition an intervening circumstance that removes the taint of an illegal detention under the attenuation doctrine? (2) What constitutes purposeful and flagrant police misconduct under the attenuation doctrine analysis? and pending decision in *People v. Tacardon*, S264219 (#20-290), which presents the following issue: Was defendant unlawfully detained when the arresting officer used his spotlight to illuminate defendant’s parked car and then directed a passenger who exited the car to remain outside and stay on the sidewalk near the car?

DISPOSITIONS

The following case was transferred for reconsideration in light of *Naranjo v. Spectrum Security Services, Inc.* (2022) 13 Cal.5th 93:

<p>#20-225 <i>Betancourt v. OS Restaurant Services, LLC</i>, S262866</p>	<p>(B293625; 49 Cal.App.5th 240 [non-citable]; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC629916)</p>
--	---

###

The Supreme Court of California is the state’s highest court and its decisions are binding on all other California state courts. The court’s primary role is to decide matters of statewide importance and to maintain uniformity in the law throughout California by reviewing matters from the six districts of the California Courts of Appeal and the fifty-eight county superior courts (the trial courts). Among its other duties, the court also decides all capital appeals and related matters and reviews both attorney and judicial disciplinary matters.