

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2026
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S294146 D084870 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

**L. (T.) v. SAN DIEGO
COUNTY HEALTH &
HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY**

Petition for review granted; briefing deferred

The petition for review is granted. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of related issues in *K.C. v. County of Merced*, S290435 (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(d)(2)), or pending further order of the court. Submission of additional briefing, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.520, is deferred pending further order of the court. The request for an order directing publication of the opinion is denied.

Votes: Guerrero, C. J., Corrigan, Liu, Kruger, Groban, and Evans, JJ.

S294248 B341539 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

**PEOPLE v. MERAZ
(VICTOR)**

Petition for review granted; briefing deferred

The petition for review is granted. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of a related issue in *People v. Munoz*, S290828 (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(d)(2)), or pending further order of the court. Submission of additional briefing, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.520, is deferred pending further order of the court.

Votes: Guerrero, C. J., Corrigan, Liu, Kruger, Groban, and Evans, JJ.

S294258 B338142 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

**PEOPLE v. PINEDA (JORGE
DEL CARMEN)**

Petition for review granted; briefing deferred

The petition for review is granted. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of a related issue in *In re Hernandez*, S282186 (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(d)(2)), or pending further order of the court. Submission of additional briefing, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.520, is deferred pending further order of the court.

Votes: Guerrero, C. J., Corrigan, Liu, Kruger, Groban, and Evans, JJ.

S294276 C102353 Third Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. SMITH
(CHRISTOPHER JOHN)**

Petition for review granted; briefing deferred

The petition for review is granted. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of a related issue in *People v. Mitchell*, S277314 (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(d)(2)), or pending further order of the court. Submission of additional briefing, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.520, is deferred pending further order of the court.

Votes: Guerrero, C. J., Corrigan, Liu, Kruger, Groban, and Evans, JJ.

S294310 D084297 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

**PEOPLE v. VANBLARCOM
(JASON SCOTT)**

Petition for review granted; briefing deferred

The petition for review is granted. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of a related issue in *People v. Eaton*, S289903 (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(d)(2)), or pending further order of the court. Submission of additional briefing, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.520, is deferred pending further order of the court.

Votes: Guerrero, C. J., Corrigan, Liu, Kruger, Groban, and Evans, JJ.

S286215

**JONES (JEFFREY GERARD)
ON H.C.**

Order to show cause issued; returnable in Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District

The Secretary of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation is ordered to show cause, returnable before the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, why petitioner is not entitled to the relief sought in the petition. With respect to the claim under the Racial Justice Act of 2020 (RJA), the return should address both (1) whether the RJA applies to a prosecutor's use of a peremptory challenge against a prospective juror and (2) if so, whether petitioner is entitled to relief in this case because the prosecutor's exercise of a peremptory challenge against the sole remaining Black prospective juror violated the RJA. The return must be served and filed on or before February 13, 2026.

Votes: Guerrero, C. J., Corrigan, Liu, Kruger, Groban, and Evans, JJ.

S293723 C104445 Third Appellate District

**KJOLLER (KYLE) v. S.C.
(PEOPLE)**

Petition for review granted; transferred to Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, with directions to issue an order to show cause

The request for judicial notice filed October 30, 2025, is granted. The request for judicial notice filed November 12, 2025, is granted as to defendant's Attachments A through C and denied as to

Attachment D.

The petition for review is granted. The matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, with directions to vacate its order dated October 20, 2025, summarily denying the motion for sanctions, and to issue an order directing the District Attorney of Nevada County to show cause before it why sanctions should not be imposed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(d).) The Court of Appeal may appoint a referee to hear evidence and make findings on certain specified questions. (*Holt v. Kelly* (1978) 20 Cal.3d 560, 562.)

Votes: Guerrero, C. J., Corrigan, Liu, Kruger, Groban, and Evans, JJ.

S294760 D087218 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

**SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT
DISTRICT v. S.C.
(CASTANARES)**

Petition for review granted; transferred to Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One, with directions to issue an order to show cause

The petition for review is granted. The matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One, with directions to vacate its order denying mandate and to issue an order directing respondent superior court to show cause why the relief sought in the petition should not be granted. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(d).) The superior court's order dated November 12, 2025, is hereby stayed pending further order of the Court of Appeal.

Votes: Guerrero, C. J., Corrigan, Liu, Kruger, Groban, and Evans, JJ.

S293615 C101558 Third Appellate District

**BLEDSOE, SR., (DONNELL)
v. CITY OF STOCKTON**

Petition for review denied

S293688

A. (A.) v. P. (M.)

The request for judicial notice is denied.

The petition for review is denied.

S293697 F086901 Fifth Appellate District

**CASAREZ (CRISTINA) v.
IRIGOYEN FARMS, INC.**

The applications to appear as counsel pro hac vice are granted. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.40(a).) The petition for review is denied.

The request for an order directing depublication of the opinion is denied.

S293745 C101829 Third Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. STINSON (ERIC
CHARLES)**

Petition for review denied

S293746 G064002 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

**MOVING SOLUTIONS, INC.
v. CHARTWELL STAFFING
SERVICES, INC.**

Petition for review denied

S293792 B336232 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

**PEOPLE v. AMBRIZ
(FREDDY)**

The petition for review is denied.

(See Concurring Statement by Justice Liu)

Petitioner Freddy Ambriz was convicted in 2011 of murder and sentenced with a variety of enhancements, including two prior prison term enhancements. The Legislature subsequently restricted the use of these prior prison term enhancements. (See Stats. 2019, ch. 590, § 1, p. 5235; Stats. 2021, ch. 728, § 3, pp. 9077-9078.) In what is now Penal Code section 1172.75, the Legislature provided a process for recalling and resentencing defendants whose original sentences included prior prison term enhancements that are now unlawful. The Legislature instructed the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to identify defendants eligible for recall and resentencing by certain dates (March 1, 2022 for some individuals, then July 1, 2022 for others). (Pen. Code, § 1172.75, subd. (b).) In turn, courts in receipt of this information are ordered to resentence eligible defendants on a specified timetable - by October 1, 2022 for specific individuals, then by December 31, 2023 for the remaining eligible defendants. (*Id.*, subd. (c).)

Ambriz's resentencing hearing took place December 12, 2023. His counsel sought a continuance until after the new year because counsel had been and would continue to be in trials, preventing him from preparing a sentencing memorandum. The trial court offered a continuance until December 29, but it apparently thought it could not resentence Ambriz after the December 31 deadline. Deciding that the two-and-a-half-week continuance would not allow him to write the memorandum, Ambriz's counsel submitted the issue after brief oral comments. The court ultimately sentenced Ambriz to 60 years to life after striking his now-unlawful prior prison term enhancements.

Ambriz appealed, arguing, among other points, that the trial court abused its discretion because it proceeded on the erroneous belief that it could not resentence Ambriz after the December 31, 2023 deadline. (*People v. Ambriz* (B336232, Sept. 25, 2025) [nonpub. opn.].) The Court of Appeal declined to address that argument. Instead, it concluded that the trial court never denied Ambriz a continuance and that Ambriz lacked good cause for a longer continuance because his attorney did not have additional material to raise beyond what he said in court. (*Ibid.*) On this record, I concur with today's decision to deny Ambriz's petition for review, however nothing appears to preclude him from developing the factual record through a writ of habeas corpus and then seeking relief for ineffective assistance of counsel. (See *People v. Guevara* (2025) 338 Cal.Rptr.3d 625, 631-632; *People v. Grajeda* (2025) 111 Cal.App.5th 829, 837-839.)

In addition, I note that Ambriz has raised an important legal question: whether trial courts may resentence defendants after the December 31, 2023 deadline. We have long observed that failure to follow statutory procedures does not necessarily invalidate a subsequent governmental action. (See, e.g., *People v. McGee* (1977) 19 Cal.3d 948, 958.) Where failing to follow the statutory process has that “invalidating effect,” then the statute is “mandatory”; otherwise, it is merely “directory.” (*Ibid.*) “In California, it is not uncommon for obligatory statutory provisions to be accorded only directory effect.” (*City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez* (2008) 43 Cal.4th 905, 924.) Indeed, the statute does not appear to penalize noncompliance and instead offers an entitlement to defined individuals; it is hard to imagine why the Legislature would have wanted the deadline to bar relief to defendants affected by sentencing enhancements that are now “legally invalid.” (Pen. Code, § 1172.75, subd. (a); see *People v. Gray* (2014) 58 Cal.4th 901, 909-910.) Notably, the Court of Appeal in *People v. Cota* (2025) 112 Cal.App.5th 1118, 1129-1131, review granted October 1, 2025, S292637, relied on analogous reasons to conclude that the deadlines in section 1172.75, subdivision (b) - about the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation’s obligation to timely notify courts of eligible defendants - were directory rather than mandatory. Whether the deadlines in section 1172.75, subdivision (c) are similarly directory rather than mandatory is an important question that may call for our attention in a future case.

LIU, J.

We Concur:
GROBAN, J.
EVANS, J.

S293795 B337826 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

**PEOPLE v. GOMEZ
(RICHARD JOSEPH)**

Request for review on court’s own motion denied

The court declines to review this matter on its own motion. The matter is now final.

S293816 B335022 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

**PEOPLE v. TURNER III
(JACOB)**

Petition for review denied

S293820 A173383 First Appellate District, Div. 3

JOHN DOE v. ZOREA (LIOR)

Petition for review denied

S293832 G064095 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**HOANG (NAM NEIL) v.
VILLAGEWAY
MANAGEMENT, INC.**

S293835 B340557 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

The petition for review is denied without prejudice to any relief to which defendant might be entitled after this court decides *People v. Munoz*, S290828.

Liu and Evans, JJ., are of the opinion the petition should be granted.

**PEOPLE v. TAMAYO
(CHRISTIAN ALBERT)**

S293854 C100841 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. JACK (JEREMY
MICHAEL)**

S293876 G063377/G063512 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**HOANG (NAM NEIL) v.
HOME EXPO FINANCIAL,
INC.**

S293883 A168172 First Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**HUGHES (KIMBERLY) v.
LIBEU (NATHANIEL LEON)**

S293915 E084792 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**STEINER (CLEMENS & DINA
MARIE), MARRIAGE OF**

S293918 A172068 First Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

**LEVY (SUSANNAH) v. THE
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO**

S293922 C103184 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

S293926 A169906 First Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

S293950 G063896 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

S293965 B342430 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

S293981 A174603 First Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

S293993 D083765 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

S293996 A171937 First Appellate District, Div. 5

The request for judicial notice is denied.
The petition for review is denied.

ROCKLIN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT v. PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD (ROCKLIN TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION)

REDWOOD CITY INCOME PARTNERS LLC v. EVERNOTE CORPORATION

PEOPLE v. GONZALEZ (LUIS ARTURO)

PEOPLE v. BROWN (KENNETH WAYNE)

GODHIGH (EARL) ON H.C.

STATE FARM FIRE & CASUALTY COMPANY v. DIBLIN (CURTIS)

MOVE EDEN HOUSING v. CITY OF LIVERMORE (EDEN HOUSING, INC.)

S294000 B350075 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

Petition for review denied

S294013 G064777 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review & publication request(s) denied

S294048 E086932 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

S294049 A171126 First Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

S294051 B329873 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

Petition for review & publication request(s) denied

S294053 C101452 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

S294060 E082492 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

S294069 B333071 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

Petition for review denied

NORLUND (RICHARD) v. S.C. (EDWARDS)

GONZALEZ (JORGE) v. ATEN TECHNOLOGY, INC.

HASH (LAWRENCE GEORGE) ON H.C.

PEOPLE v. WARNER (RYAN SCOTT)

PEOPLE v. FLORES (PAUL RUBEN)

PEOPLE v. DIAZ (BARAK SKYLAR)

PEOPLE v. GARCIA (FERNANDO)

PEOPLE v. HERNANDEZ (SHAWN OTIS)

S294088 A167325 First Appellate District, Div. 4

The request for judicial notice is denied.

The petition for review is denied.

Liu, J., is of the opinion the petition should be granted.

S294089 C100747 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

S294093 B340899 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

Petition for review denied

S294096 G063353 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

S294107 C100565 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

S294109 F087483 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

S294113 A169669 First Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

S294117 D084830 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

S294120 B337334 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. SIBILIO (JULES LOUIS)

PEOPLE v. COX, JR., (ROBERT ANTHONY)

CROSBY (MISHA) v. HALL (JAMIE)

PEOPLE v. ZAKRZEWSKI (MATTHEW ANTONIO)

PEOPLE v. DOLCE (JAMES)

PEOPLE v. JOHNSON (ROGER KENNETH)

PEOPLE v. SEVILLA (FERNANDO)

RUSSO (ROCCO) v. DINNEEN (PATRICK)

PEOPLE v. BROASTER (DERROL SHELDON)

S294124

Petition for review denied

S294131 B340400 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

Petitions for review denied

S294133 A171137 First Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

S294138 A171252 First Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

S294139 B338892 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

S294140 B338884 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

S294148 C101018 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

S294150 G064036 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**TOLEDANO (JAMES) v.
STATE BAR OF
CALIFORNIA****PEOPLE v. MUMIN (KEVIN
AAMIR)****PEOPLE v. KRUEGER (SARA
LYNN)****PEOPLE v. TURNER
(DEREAK)****PEOPLE v. HONORE
(STEVEN LASHON)****PEOPLE v. JIMENEZ
(ALEJANDRO)****PEOPLE v. McCLUNG
(BRADLEY JAMES)****LEIBA (NED) v. GANN
(GREGG)**

S294151

The request for judicial notice is granted.
The petition for review is denied.

S294152 H052380 Sixth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

S294154 A170341 First Appellate District, Div. 4
Petition for review denied**S294158** B350267 Second Appellate District, Div. 8
Petition for review denied**S294159** A170228 First Appellate District, Div. 2
Petition for review denied**S294163** G063340 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3
Petition for review denied**S294170** C102062 Third Appellate District
Petition for review denied**S294171** D084188 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1
Petition for review denied**S294173** A170645 First Appellate District, Div. 1
Petition for review denied**YAKOVLEV (ALEX) v. S.C.
(COSTCO WHOLESALE
CORPORATION)****PEOPLE v. LOPEZ (PAUL
URQUIDEZ)****PEOPLE v. TUKES (KABARI)****COLVIN (DANIEL) ON H.C.****PEOPLE v. BEAL (CHARLES
CLIFTON)****PEOPLE v. PECH (MANUEL
JESUS)****PEOPLE v. HOLSTON
(THERON KENNETH)****PEOPLE v. TORKELSON
(JAMES DAVID)****PEOPLE v. JACKSON
(CLINTON)**

S294174 F088330 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. FERREL, JR.,
(DAVID MICHAEL)**

S294175 B335824 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied
Evans, J., is of the opinion the petition should be granted.

**PEOPLE v. LAWS (BRIAN
KEITH)**

S294177 B340561 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. SHALES
(BROOKE DOROTHY)**

S294180 G064067 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review & publication request(s) denied

**GENSLER (HOWARD) v.
BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
THE SOUTH ORANGE
COUNTY COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT**

S294181 B338953 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. LOPEZ (ELI)

S294184 C101640 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. ALEXANDER
(LEVI)**

S294188 B341355 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review & depublication request(s) denied

**LEEDS (FREDERICK H.) v.
CITY OF LOS ANGELES**

S294195 A169434 First Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. BATTIEST
(MARCELL LEROY)**

S294196 B334538 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

S294198 G065942 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

S294200 C100100 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

S294201 B336453 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

Petition for review denied

S294202 D083363 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

S294203 B337068 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

S294206 A170298 First Appellate District, Div. 5

Petition for review denied

S294207 H051988 Sixth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. BRASHEAR
(DEMETRIUS KING)**

**HONG (SON) v. BOARD OF
TRUSTEES OF THE
CALIFORNIA STATE
UNIVERSITY**

**PEOPLE v. CALAMBA
(ALLENRAY CASTILLANO)**

**PEOPLE v. SIQUEROS
(MICHAEL)**

**PEOPLE v. HERNANDEZ
(VICTOR CAMPUZANO)**

**PEOPLE v. CAPIENDO
(LUZON MATTHEW
MARTIN)**

**PEOPLE v. FERGUSON
(LEON ERNEST)**

PEOPLE v. OLEA (ANIANO)

S294208 H052058 Sixth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

S294212 B350411 Second Appellate District, Div. 7

Petition for review denied

S294214 A171880 First Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

S294217 D084457 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

S294219 B337106 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

S294233 C100826 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

S294234 C101129 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

S294244 C100499 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

S294245 C101769 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. SIMMONS
(JOSEPH)**

**PATTERSON (DONTE
QYWAN) ON H.C.**

**PEOPLE v. DUPCLAY
(DAMION J.)**

**PEOPLE v. BROWN, JR.,
(KENNETH)**

**PEOPLE v. HANCOCK
(MICHAEL)**

**PEOPLE v. VINCENT
(CHANCE ANDRE)**

PEOPLE v. AVILA (ISABEL)

**PEOPLE v. SMITHSON
(FARD)**

**PEOPLE v. HEINSOHN
(BRADLEY)**

S294246 C101938 Third Appellate District
Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. O'NEIL (OMARI)

S294249 B350432 Second Appellate District, Div. 7
Petition for review denied

**DAVIS (KENNARD LEE) ON
H.C.**

S294250 H052477 Sixth Appellate District
Petition for review denied
Liu and Kruger, JJ., are of the opinion the petition should be granted.

IN RE J.D.

S294251 F088005 Fifth Appellate District
Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. RIVERA (JOSE
GOMEZ)**

S294255 B340544 Second Appellate District, Div. 5
Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. SMITH (JOHNNY
EARL)**

S294257 A174878 First Appellate District, Div. 2

**MENDONES (ARIEL) v. S.C.
(CUSHMAN & WAKEFIELD,
INC.)**

The request for judicial notice is denied.
The petition for review is denied.

S294259 G062267 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3
Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. HOJREH
(BAHRAM)**

S294261 B349971 Second Appellate District, Div. 5
Petition for review denied

**WEAVER (KEYAUNA) v. S.C.
(PEOPLE)**

S294279 F085849 Fifth Appellate District
Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. OLSON (JEFFREY
LEON)**

S294283 B319033/B320763/B322002
Second Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

S294284 D084438 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

S294285 C100120 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

S294288 B334424/B334642 Second Appellate District, Div. 1 **SEIDEN (LEWIS) v. CMS CONSTRUCTION, INC.**

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S294293 D082871 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

Liu, J., is of the opinion the petition should be granted.

S294296 G063603 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

S294298 C104988 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

S294311 D084160 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

1851 SLAUSON, LLC v. LUTHRA (RICK)

PEOPLE v. LAWRENCE (KMAAL)

PEOPLE v. SEDLAR (ROBERT WAYNE)

PEOPLE v. GERMAN (LAMAR EUGENE)

PEOPLE v. MAGALLANES (GABRIEL ALEJANDRO)

TAYLOR (RONNIE K.) ON H.C.

PEOPLE v. CRAWFORD (DANNY RAY)

S294314 B350425 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S294316 D086784 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

S294321

Petition for writ of error coram nobis denied

S294329

Petition for writ of mandate/prohibition denied

S294331 D086682 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S294464 C101026 Third Appellate District

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S294527 B344540 Second Appellate District, Div. 8

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S294593 D087191 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review & application for stay denied

BOHM (FRASER MICHAEL) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)

BROWN (JONAS) ON H.C.

REMMERT (SHIRLEY VENOYA) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)

BOENZI (NICHOLAS SCOTT) v. COURT OF APPEAL, FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT, DIVISION ONE (PEOPLE)

SINCLAIR (RICHARD C.) v. OCHS (SHARON)

PIPER (CAMILLE) v. COMMISSION ON PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE (ELK GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT)

REED (KASEI) v. REED (ALONZO BILL)

LOPEZ (ARTHUR) v. S.C.

S294652 C105140 Third Appellate District

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S294742

Petition for writ of mandate/prohibition & application for stay denied

S293479 B347095 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

Publication request denied (case closed)

S293788 B332376 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Publication request denied (case closed)

S293889 B339358 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

Publication request denied (case closed)

S293947 B334746 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

Publication request denied (case closed)

S293961 A169769 First Appellate District, Div. 3

Publication request denied (case closed)

**OLFATI (PARVIN) v. S.C.
(PEOPLE)**

**BROWN (SUZANNE) v.
COURT OF APPEAL,
FOURTH APPELLATE
DISTRICT, DIVISION TWO
(MHC TT L.P.)**

**H. (J.) v. S.C. (LOS ANGELES
COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF
CHILDREN & FAMILY
SERVICES)**

**CIP JARDINETTE HOLDING,
LLC v. RCMF 2018-FL2
MARATHON STREET, LLC**

**PEOPLE v. MAKI
(SHERIDAN)**

**PRIME HEALTHCARE
CENTINELA, LLC v. UNITED
HEALTHCARE INSURANCE
COMPANY**

**HART (MELINDA & JASON),
MARRIAGE OF**

S294106 A172245 First Appellate District, Div. 4

**BERKELEY PEOPLE'S
ALLIANCE v. CITY OF
BERKELEY**

The request for an order directing depublication of the opinion in the above-entitled matter is denied. The court declines to review this matter on its own motion. The matter is now final.

(See Concurring Statement by Justice Groban)

Concurring Statement by Justice Groban

I agree with my colleagues that depublication of the Court of Appeal's decision in *Berkeley People's Alliance v. City of Berkeley* (2025) 114 Cal.App.5th 984 is unwarranted. I write separately, however, to voice my concerns that uncertainty regarding the meaning of certain provisions in the Ralph M. Brown Act (the Brown Act; Gov. Code, § 54950 et seq.)¹ leave legislative bodies in a difficult - and potentially dangerous - position when confronted with disruptive individuals who willfully interfere with the meeting of a public agency.

The Brown Act currently provides that in the event of a serious disruption by protestors during a public meeting, a legislative body is authorized to "order the . . . room cleared and continue in session. . . . Representatives of the press . . . shall be allowed to attend any session held pursuant to this section." (§ 54957.9.) The Court of Appeal held that this statutory language does not permit the legislative body to move the meeting to an adjacent room with the press present, which is what happened here.²

¹ All further statutory citations are to the Government Code.

² The Court of Appeal also left open the question whether a different provision of the Brown Act, section 54954, subdivision (e), allows for a change of meeting location when confronted with a serious disruption.

The City of Berkeley has not sought review as to whether the Court of Appeal properly interpreted section 54957.9. However, the California State Association of Counties, joined by the League of California Cities, urges us to depublish the case, arguing that "ordering that a meeting be relocated to a different room is the functional equivalent of clearing the original meeting room." They further contend (as did the City of Berkeley in the proceedings below) that the Court of Appeal's contrary interpretation will force legislative bodies to choose between cancelling a meeting entirely or risk a physical altercation with disorderly members of the public. While I express no definitive view on the merits of that question, I do not find the court's interpretation, which tracks the plain language of the statute, to be implausible or clearly wrong. (See, e.g., *Heckart v. A-1 Self Storage, Inc.* (2018) 4 Cal.5th 749, 757 [“ ‘ ‘ ‘ ‘ the language employed in the Legislature’s enactment generally is the most reliable indicator of legislative intent’ ’ ’ ’].) For those reasons, I agree with my colleagues that depublication is unwarranted.

I am, however, sympathetic to the concerns that the City of Berkeley and its amicus curiae have raised in these proceedings. It seems entirely reasonable that a legislative body would have legitimate concerns that attempting to clear a room of unruly members of the public could create a dangerous situation for attendees and government officials alike. Moreover, it is unclear what is to be gained by requiring the legislative body to remove (forcibly if necessary) the public from the original meeting room rather than allowing it to take the less confrontational approach of simply continuing the session in an adjacent room with the press present. Compelling the legislative body to physically remove every person from the room - including those engaged in disruptive behavior - seems more likely to force the body to choose instead to simply adjourn the meeting altogether, which is a resolution that serves no one. So why not provide the legislative body with an option that avoids the specter of physical confrontation? Those concerns seem particularly acute for smaller agencies that may lack the resources to safely clear the public from the original meeting room.

In sum, while I see no basis for depublishing the Court of Appeal's decision, I would encourage the Legislature to consider clarifying whether, when faced with a willful, widespread disruption, a legislative body's only option for carrying on the meeting is to order the public to be physically removed from the hearing.

GROBAN, J.

S294267 B342605 Second Appellate District, Div. 2 **SINGH (ROHIT) v. PATEL (DAHYABHAI M.)**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S294807 B337221/B341105 Second Appellate District, Div. 1 **RODRIGUEZ (JOSE LUIS) v. CITY OF LOS ANGELES**

Time for ordering review extended on the court's own motion

The time for ordering review on the court's own motion is hereby extended to March 26, 2026. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(c).)

S293846 B335206 Second Appellate District, Div. 4 **RIVAS (EDUARDO E.) v. VERIZON CALIFORNIA, INC.**

The time for granting or denying review in the above-entitled matter is hereby extended to February 23, 2026.

S293891 F088050 Fifth Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. CHAPMAN
(JOSEPH ROBERT)**

The time for granting or denying review in the above-entitled matter is hereby extended to February 23, 2026.

S294099 A170255 First Appellate District, Div. 4

**HASTINGS COLLEGE
CONSERVATION
COMMITTEE v. STATE OF
CALIFORNIA**

The time for granting or denying review in the above-entitled matter is hereby extended to February 20, 2026.

S294103 F088296 Fifth Appellate District

C. (S.) v. DOE 1

The time for granting or denying review in the above-entitled matter is hereby extended to February 23, 2026.

S294123

**ARAKELYAN (LUCIA) v.
MERCURY INSURANCE
COMPANY**

The time for granting or denying review in the above-entitled matter is hereby extended to February 24, 2026.

S294127 C101878 Third Appellate District

**TULARE LAKE BASIN
WATER STORAGE
DISTRICT v. DEPARTMENT
OF WATER RESOURCES**

The time for granting or denying review in the above-entitled matter is hereby extended to February 24, 2026.

S065877

**PEOPLE v. LOPEZ (BOBBY)
& TRUJEQUE (JAMES)**

Extension of time granted

The application of appellant Bobby Lopez for relief from default for the failure to timely file appellant's application for extension of time is granted.

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to March 9, 2026.

S170293**PEOPLE v. DENNIS (CALVIN
JERMAINE) & INGRAM
(REYON TWAIN)**

Extension of time granted

Upon application of counsel Supervising Deputy State Public Defender Nerissa Huertas, an extension of time in which to serve and file appellant Ingram's supplemental opening brief is granted to March 23, 2026. Within 30 days after any supplemental opening brief has been filed pursuant to this order, the People may serve and file a supplemental answering brief, not to exceed 50 pages in length. Appellant may thereafter serve and file a reply, not to exceed 25 pages in length, within 20 days after the People have filed their supplemental answering brief.

S170293**PEOPLE v. DENNIS (CALVIN
JERMAINE) & INGRAM
(REYON TWAIN)**

Extension of time granted

Upon application of counsel Patricia Brisbois, an extension of time in which to serve and file appellant Dennis's supplemental opening brief is granted to March 23, 2026. Within 30 days after any supplemental opening brief has been filed pursuant to this order, the People may serve and file a supplemental answering brief, not to exceed 50 pages in length. Appellant may thereafter serve and file a reply, not to exceed 25 pages in length, within 20 days after the People have filed their supplemental answering brief.

S186162**PEOPLE v. MEJORADO
(JOSE SERGIO)**

Extension of time granted

Upon application of counsel Eric S. Multhaup, an extension of time in which to serve and file appellant's supplemental opening brief is granted to March 20, 2026. Within 30 days after any supplemental opening brief has been filed pursuant to this order, the People may serve and file a supplemental answering brief, not to exceed 50 pages in length. Appellant may thereafter serve and file a reply, not to exceed 25 pages in length, within 20 days after the People have filed their supplemental answering brief.

S189992**PEOPLE v. SHORTS
(DONALD) & TUCKER
(JAMAR)**

Extension of time granted

Upon application of Senior Deputy State Public Defender Andrea Asaro an extension of time in which to serve and file appellant Donald Shorts' supplemental opening brief is granted to March 23, 2026. Within 30 days after any supplemental opening brief has been filed pursuant to this order, the People may serve and file a supplemental answering brief, not to exceed 50 pages in length. Appellant may thereafter serve and file a reply, not to exceed 25 pages in length, within 20 days after the People have filed their supplemental answering brief.

S291012**EVERETT ON DISCIPLINE**

Extension of time granted – DANIEL EVERETT

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer to petition for review and the opposition to the motions for judicial notice filed on January 2, 2026, and January 9, 2026, is extended to March 3, 2026.

S292396 D085454 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1**PEOPLE v. GOEHNER
(MICHAEL LESLIE)**

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Rachel Varnell is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S292969 G064274 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3**PEOPLE v. BALL (JACOB
FREDERICK)**

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of respondent for appointment of counsel, Michael Sampson is hereby appointed to represent respondent on the appeal now pending in this court.

Respondent's brief on the merits must be served and filed on or before thirty (30) days from the date of this order.

S293388 B312522 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

PEOPLE v. FLOWERS (RACE FARRELL)

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, California Appellate Project is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

Appellant's brief on the merits must be served and filed on or before thirty (30) days from the date of this order.

S293587 B329413 Second Appellate District, Div. 8

PEOPLE v. OROZCO (DANIEL)

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Patricia Lai is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

Appellant's brief on the merits must be served and filed on or before thirty (30) days from the date of this order.

S293647 B338130 Second Appellate District, Div. 7

PEOPLE v. DOWELL (BRADLEY JAMES)

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Steven Torres is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S293702 C101253 Third Appellate District

PEOPLE v. MITCHELL (CHARLES MAGIC)

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Aurora Elizabeth Bewicke is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S293705 B332859 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

PEOPLE v. MARENDE (KYLE HENRY)

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Alan Siraco is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S293921 B335309 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

**PEOPLE v. JUAREZ
(RICARDO DIAZ)**

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, California Appellate Project is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S291872

**STELLE III (STANFORD
JAMES) ON H.C.**

Order filed

Petitioner's "Notice of Motion and Motion to File Exhibits Under Seal" filed on July 14, 2025, is denied as to item (a), Exhibit 7, the Declaration of Christopher DeLong. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.550, 2.551, and 8.46.) Petitioner must notify the Clerk of this court within 10 days if Exhibit 7, the Declaration of Christopher DeLong lodged conditionally under seal on July 14, 2025, should be filed unsealed as part of the public record. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.46(d)(7).)

Petitioner's "Notice of Motion and Motion to File Exhibits Under Seal" filed on July 14, 2025 is granted as to items (b)-(r), Exhibits C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, M, O, P, Q, R, S, T, and U. (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.550(d), 8.45(b).) In ordering the sealing, this court makes the findings required by California Rules of Court, rules 2.550(d) and 8.46(d)(6). The clerk of this court is directed to file under seal Exhibits C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, M, O, P, Q, R, S, T, and U.

S294156

ACCUSATION OF GUPTA

Petition denied

(accusation)

S294189

ACCUSATION OF WHITE

Petition denied

(accusation)

S294194

ACCUSATION OF GRAY

Petition denied

(accusation)

S294205

ACCUSATION OF EBERTS

Petition denied

(accusation)

S294231

ACCUSATION OF PAGE

Petition denied

(accusation)



**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).)