

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 31, 2024
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S282866 A166176 First Appellate District, Div. 1 **ESCAMILLA (DANIEL) v.
VANNUCCI (JOHN)**

Petition for review granted

The petition for review is granted.

Pending review, the opinion of the Court of Appeal, which is currently published at 97 Cal.App.5th 175, may be cited, not only for its persuasive value, but also for the limited purpose of establishing the existence of a conflict in authority that would in turn allow trial courts to exercise discretion under *Auto Equity Sales, Inc. v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 450, 456, to choose between sides of any such conflict. (See *Standing Order Exercising Authority Under California Rules of Court, Rule 8.1115(e)(3), Upon Grant of Review or Transfer of a Matter with an Underlying Published Court of Appeal Opinion*, Administrative Order 2021-04-21; Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(e)(3) and corresponding Comment, par. 2.)

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

S165894 **PEOPLE v. PENUELAS
(JESUS GUADALUPE
VELAZQUEZ)**

Supplemental briefing ordered

If appellant contends any changes in the law (including any ameliorative statute) since the filing of the reply brief are relevant to this appeal, appellant shall serve and file a supplemental opening brief not to exceed 50 pages on or before March 18, 2024, addressing those changes and their relevance to this case. 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.

S282832 B301780 Second Appellate District, Div. 5 **PEOPLE v. CHWEYA
(RODNEY D.)**

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, Jenkins, and Evans, JJ.

S283126 A164370 First Appellate District, Div. 1 **PEOPLE v. VILLEGAS
(LUCIO)**

Petition for review granted; briefing deferred

The People's petition for review is granted. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of a related issue in *In re Vaquera*, S258376 (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. Defendant's petition for review is denied.

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

S283247 A164946 First Appellate District, Div. 3 **PEOPLE v. OROZCO
(FRANCISCO JAVIER)**

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. McCune*, S276303 (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, Jenkins, and Evans, JJ.

S278711 **JIMENEZ (GIOVANNY A.)
ON H.C.**

Order to show cause issued; returnable in Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Five

The Secretary of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation is ordered to show cause, returnable before the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Five, why relief should not be granted on the ground that instructing petitioner's jury on the kill zone theory, in violation of *People v. Canizales* (2019) 7 Cal.5th 591, was not harmless beyond a reasonable doubt under *Chapman v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 18. The return must be served and filed on or before March 1, 2024.

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

S275530 B307156/B312647 Second Appellate District, Div. 1 **GERRO (GEORGE J.) v. BLOCKFI LENDING, LLC**

Dismissal order filed

Review in the above-captioned matter is dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)
Votes: Guerrero, C. J., Corrigan, Liu, Kruger, Groban, Jenkins, and Evans, JJ.

S282089 **SAMM (STERLING) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)**

Petition for writ of mandate/prohibition denied

S282598 D081840 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **HUTCHERSON (NICOLE D.) v. G&P ENTERPRISES, LLC**

Petition for review & publication request(s) denied

S282693 B321616 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 **BRANCATI (DANA) v. CACHUMA VILLAGE, LLC**

Petition for review & depublication request(s) denied

S282756 D081458 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **PHAIR (JEFFREY D.) v. RENZULLI PROPERTIES, LLC**

Petition for review & publication request(s) denied

S282812 C090409 Third Appellate District **PEOPLE v. CURRY (DAVID HENRY)**

The petition for review is denied without prejudice to any relief to which defendant might be entitled after this court decides *People v. Kopp*, S257844.

S282820 D080846 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **MARTINO (NICK), ESTATE OF**

Petition for review denied

S282827 B320039 Second Appellate District, Div. 7 **GLEASON (CAROLE), ESTATE OF**

Petition for review denied

S282837 B316420 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

**ACOSTA (LOUIS) v. MAS
REALTY, LLC; HORIZON
LIGHTING, INC.**

Petition for review denied

S282848 D082920 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

**SGARLATO (CAMELIA) v.
REGENTS OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA**

Petition for review denied

S282852 E079021 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

**PEOPLE v. GUZMAN
(SERGIO LOPEZ)**

Petition for review denied

S282899 B324207 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

**PEOPLE v. ALLEN
(CHARLES JOSEPH)**

Petition for review denied

S282922 A167290/A167606 First Appellate District, Div. 3

IN RE MARK M.

Petition for review denied

S282961 D083140 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

**HARTER (DAVID N.) v. S.C.
(RANCHO RIOS
HOMEOWNERS
ASSOCIATION)**

Petition for review denied

Guerrero, C. J., was recused and did not participate.

S282987 B321576 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

**PEREZ (SARAH) v.
CALIFORNIA HERBAL
REMEDIES, LLC**

Petition for review denied

S282995 B331893 Second Appellate District, Div. 2 **SVO BUILDING ONE LLC v. S.C. (TYSON & MENDES, LLC)**

Petition for review denied

S283006 C099852 Third Appellate District **ZIMMERMAN (BEN) v. DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES (COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY)**

Petition for review denied

S283017 D081200 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **PEOPLE v. FLORES (EDGAR ANTONIO)**

Petition for review denied

S283036 F085451 Fifth Appellate District **PEOPLE v. COTA (CHARLES)**

Petition for review denied

S283052 B323412 Second Appellate District, Div. 1 **LOS ANGELES, COUNTY OF v. ROWE (KARL M.)**

Petition for review denied

S283054 C098228 Third Appellate District **PEOPLE v. S.C. (RAWLINS)**

Petition for review denied

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

S283073 F084689 Fifth Appellate District **HART (BETH MAE) v. HART (ROBERT)**

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S283082 A164642 First Appellate District, Div. 3 **PEOPLE v. MARMAN (DESHON)**

Petition for review denied

Guerrero, C. J., and Corrigan, J., were recused and did not participate.

S283086	B333503 Second Appellate District, Div. 1	ENG (AMELIA) v. ENG (MARGARET)
Petition for review denied		
S283120	B322544 Second Appellate District, Div. 6	PEOPLE v. THOMPSON (MAURICE LAMAR)
Petition for review denied		
S283122	C097915 Third Appellate District	PEOPLE v. GARCIA (DAVID RICHARD)
Petition for review denied		
S283137	E078421 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2	PEOPLE v. HUPP (PAUL HOWARD)
The petition for review or “petition for writ of certiorari” is denied.		
S283143	A167065 First Appellate District, Div. 2	HATOUM (MARWAN SAJIH) ON H.C.
Petition for review denied		
S283150	B327520 Second Appellate District, Div. 6	PEOPLE v. BEADLE (JEFFERY F.)
Petition for review denied		
S283160	G062725 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3	PEOPLE v. CARRILLO (MIGUEL)
Petition for review denied		
S283163	B312618 Second Appellate District, Div. 6	PEOPLE v. BANKS (LUCION LEE EDWARD)
Petition for review denied		
S283167	B328043 Second Appellate District, Div. 7	PEOPLE v. PATTERSON (DONTE QYWAN)
Petition for review denied		

S283179 F084750 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. HENDERSON
(GERMAN DWAYNE)**

S283194 A164994 First Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**LAND (JUSTIN) v.
CALIFORNIA
UNEMPLOYMENT
INSURANCE APPEALS
BOARD**

S283203 A166871 First Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. MOORE (SEAN
DEMETRIUS)**

S283204 B325280 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. MARTINEZ
(SANTOS)**

S283206 B317048 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. RUFINO (EDSON
EDUARDO)**

S283207 A164374 First Appellate District, Div. 5

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. GOMEZ
(ANTHONY SALVADOR)**

S283212 H047877 Sixth Appellate District

The petition for review is denied without prejudice to any relief to which defendant might be entitled after this court decides *People v. Kopp*, S257844.

PEOPLE v. GUZMAN (JESUS)

S283222 H050061 Sixth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. GOMEZ (IVAN
GERONIMO)**

S283233 F086043 Fifth Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. LARA
(WILFREDO)**

Petition for review denied

S283240 H050743 Sixth Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. MERCER
(DAMON)**

The petition for review is denied without prejudice to any relief to which defendant might be entitled after this court decides *People v. Kopp*, S257844.

S283241 C097497 Third Appellate District

PEOPLE v. MORRIS (JAMES)

Petition for review denied

S283248 B326396 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

IN RE S.D.

Petition for review denied

S283349

**PERRY (MICHAEL MOSHE)
v. NASCH PROPERTIES, LLC**

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S283351

**ANDERSON (ASHLIE) v.
NASCH PROPERTIES LLC**

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S283409 B333881 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

**MAHJOBI (DJAMILEH) v.
S.C. (FERMELIA)**

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S283455

**WASH (JOHN) v. COURT OF
APPEAL, FIFTH APPELLATE
DISTRICT (BANDA-WASH)**

The petition for writ of mandate and application for stay are denied.

S283456 B333364 Second Appellate District, Div. 8

**WARD (PAUL) v. S.C. (LA
PARK LA BREA A, LLC)**

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S276024**DIAZ (CESAR) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

Dissenting Statement by Justice Groban

I disagree with the majority, and I would issue an order to show cause in this matter. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.385(d).) I write separately to highlight the troubling nature of this case. In 2007, as a juvenile, defendant Cesar Diaz inexplicably pled no contest to the *maximum* possible seven-year-to-life sentence for the only charges he faced of witness intimidation (Pen. Code, § 136.1, subd. (a)(1)) with a street gang enhancement (*id.*, § 186.22, subd. (b)(4)(C)). Diaz was charged after he wore a t-shirt that said “Stop snitching. Kills rats instantly,” while he was in a courtroom during a prosecution witness’s testimony. Diaz was 16 years old at the time of the offense. The prosecution witness later said that he felt intimidated by Diaz’s presence in the courtroom, but that he did not look at him. The prosecution witness also did not indicate that he had noticed the t shirt. Before Diaz’s plea, a probation report concluded that all five factors pertaining to juvenile fitness (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 707, subd. (a)(3)) favored treating Diaz as a juvenile. However, the court disagreed and found him fit to be tried as an adult.¹ Diaz has already been in custody for over 16 years. By comparison, the median time served in state prison before initial release for murder is 17.5 years. (Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Dept. of Justice, Time Served in State Prison, 2018 (Mar. 2021) table 1, p. 2.)

¹ If Diaz were charged today, he would be entitled to a Proposition 57 transfer hearing, which contains a number of reforms that make it more difficult to prosecute a juvenile as an adult. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 707, subd. (a); Prop. 57, as approved by voters, Gen. Elec. (Nov. 8, 2016).)

Diaz’s sentence is particularly concerning because there is existing case law indicating that the seven-year-to-life sentence he received does not apply to the offense to which he pled no contest. (See *People v. Lopez* (2012) 208 Cal.App.4th 1049; *People v. Anaya* (2013) 221 Cal.App.4th 252.) *Lopez* held that “the plain meaning of [Penal Code] section 186.22, subdivision (b)(4)(C) is that a seven-year-to-life sentence can be imposed only if the jury convicts the defendant of attempting to dissuade a witness by use of an implied or express threat of force pursuant to [Penal Code] section 136.1, subdivision (c)(1).” (*Lopez, supra*, 208 Cal.App.4th at p. 1065; accord, *Anaya, supra*, 221 Cal.App.4th at p. 270.) Here, Diaz did not specifically plead to violating Penal Code section 136.1, subdivision (c), which involves witness intimidation by *force or threat*, but rather pled to witness intimidation under Penal Code section 136.1, subdivision (a)(1). Penal Code section 136.1, subdivision (a)(1) notably does not contain a force or threat requirement. The Attorney General does not contend that Diaz specifically admitted to using force or threat, but argues that the fact that Diaz pled no contest rather than going to trial makes these cases distinguishable. However, in light of *Lopez* and *Anaya* and given that any determination at this stage is “truly ‘preliminary’ ” (*In re Sassounian* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 535, 547), I would issue an order to show cause.

I also write separately to highlight that our denial of the petition for writ of habeas corpus does not necessarily preclude Diaz from obtaining relief at some point in the future, including:

- (1) a potential referral for recall and resentencing by the Secretary of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, the Board of Parole Hearings, or the district attorney (see Pen. Code, § 1172.1, subd. (a)(3) [“The resentencing court may, in the interest of justice and regardless of whether the original sentence was imposed after a trial or plea agreement,” reduce or vacate the sentence]);
- (2) at a future parole suitability hearing (see Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15, § 2281, subd. (b) [“All relevant, reliable information available to the panel shall be considered in determining suitability for parole. Such information shall include . . . the base and other commitment offenses”]; Pen. Code, § 4801, subd. (c));
- (3) at a future youth offender parole hearing (see Pen. Code, § 3051, subd. (b)(2));² or

² Diaz may also be entitled to a hearing that allows him to develop evidence relevant to an eventual youth offender parole hearing. (See *People v. Franklin* (2016) 63 Cal.4th 261, 284; *In re Cook* (2019) 7 Cal.5th 439, 458.)

- (4) pursuant to a commutation recommendation (see Pen. Code, § 4801, subd. (c) [“The Board of Parole Hearings may report to the Governor, from time to time, the names of any and all persons imprisoned in any state prison who, in its judgment, ought to have a commutation of sentence or be pardoned and set at liberty on account of good conduct, or *unusual term of sentence*, or any other cause, including evidence of intimate partner battering and its effects” (italics added)]).

GROBAN, J.

We Concur:

LIU, J.

EVANS, J.

S281491

**EBERLY (GARY ALAN) ON
H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Robbins* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 770, 780 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are untimely]; *In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 767-769 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are successive]; *In re Miller* (1941) 17 Cal.2d 734, 735 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are repetitive].)

S281637

**JORDAN (KRISTOPHER
RYAN) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S281704**NGUON (HUNG DUONG) ON
H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus has been read and considered. Petitioner contends, among other claims, that he is entitled to relief under the Racial Justice Act of 2020 (Pen. Code, § 745) and requests the appointment of counsel. The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts constituting a violation of the Racial Justice Act].) Petitioner does not describe or attach trial court transcripts concerning displays of racial bias or use of racially discriminatory language, and he does not explain why he believes he was charged or convicted of a more serious offense or had a longer or more severe sentence imposed as a result of his race, ethnicity, or national origin. (Pen. Code, § 745, subd. (a)(1)-(4); cf. *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity]; cf. also *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence].) The request for counsel is denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S281852**EBERLY (GARY ALAN) ON
H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Robbins* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 770, 780 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are untimely]; *In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 767-769 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are successive]; *In re Miller* (1941) 17 Cal.2d 734, 735 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are repetitive].)

S282059**GRIGORYAN (AZNAUR) ON
H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S282080**BLACKWELL (COSTELLO)
ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S282097**PATTON (DERRICK
TERRELL) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S282102**EBERLY (GARY ALAN) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Robbins* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 770, 780 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are untimely]; *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence]; *In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 767-769 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are successive]; *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity]; *In re Miller* (1941) 17 Cal.2d 734, 735 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are repetitive].)

S282103**JONES (RAYON) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Robbins* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 770, 780 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are untimely]; *In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 767-769 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are successive].)

S282140**ROBINSON (TIEKEI) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence]; *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].)

S282142**CLEVELAND (DARREN ANDRE) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S282161**HOWARD (TERRI WANE) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence]; *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].)

S282178**EBERLY (GARY ALAN) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Robbins* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 770, 780 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are untimely]; *In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 767-769 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are successive]; *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence]; *In re Lessard* (1965) 62 Cal.2d 497, 503 [courts will not

entertain habeas corpus claims that raise Fourth Amendment violations]; *In re Dixon* (1953) 41 Cal.2d 756, 759 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that could have been, but were not, raised on appeal]; *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].)

S282311**GIBSON (JOHN R.) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence].)

S282338**DOW (LA CARL MARTEZ)
ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S282346**KINDLE (DRAMECO) ON
H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence].)

S282348**GOODEN (ANTHONY
GEORGE) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S282355**NUÑO (GUILLERMO) ON
H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Robbins* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 770, 780 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are untimely]; *In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 767-769 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are successive].)

S282367**LOYD (LAMAR E.) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S282369**ADAMS (RONALD) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S282390

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

JIMENEZ (DANIEL) ON H.C.**S283007**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence].)

**EDWARDS (RONNIE LEVON)
ON H.C.****S283008**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

**HERRERA (ROBERTO) ON
H.C.****S283092**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

CONWAY (BOB) ON H.C.**S283114**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

DAY (JUSTIN) ON H.C.**S283386**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence]; *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].) Individual claims are denied, as applicable. (See *In re Dixon* (1953) 41 Cal.2d 756, 759 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that could have been, but were not, raised on appeal].)

**DYER (JEWEL EVERAN) ON
H.C.****S283464**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Lessard* (1965) 62 Cal.2d 497, 503 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that raise Fourth Amendment violations].)

**BOSLEY (JACOB MICHAEL)
ON H.C.**

S282336 A166124 First Appellate District, Div. 1 **PEOPLE v. CODDINGTON
(JAMES McKENZIE)**

The requests for an order directing depublication of the opinion in the above-entitled appeal are denied. The court declines to review this matter on its own motion. The matter is now final. Evans, J., is of the opinion review should be granted on the court's own motion.

S282737 C096236 Third Appellate District **CHAVIRA (NELSON) v.
MARK III CONSTRUCTION,
INC.**

Publication requests denied (case closed)

S282821 G061890 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3 **J. (L.) v. J. (R.)**
Publication request denied (case closed)

S283636 A166490 First Appellate District, Div. 3 **PEOPLE v. POTTER HANDY
LLP**

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 April 8, 2024. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(c).)

S283391 B321638 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 **VELASQUEZ (JOSE) v.
WORKERS'
COMPENSATION APPEALS
BOARD; THE SALVATION
ARMY**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondents and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer to petition for review is extended to February 16, 2024.

S282264 B315302 Second Appellate District, Div. 8 **RANGER (BRIAN) v.
ALAMITOS BAY YACHT
CLUB**

Order filed

The application of appellant for permission to file an untimely opening brief on the merits, filed January 30, 2024, is hereby granted.

S282889**COLLINS ON
REINSTATEMENT**

Petitioner reinstated

Upon recommendation of the State Bar Court, the court orders that TERRY ROMERO COLLINS be reinstated as an attorney of the State Bar of California upon payment of fees and taking the oath required by law.

Jenkins, J., was recused and did not participate.

S282958**ACCUSATION OF SETO**

Petition denied

(accusation)

**BAR MISC. 4186 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF THE COMMITTEE
OF BAR EXAMINERS OF THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
FOR ADMISSION OF ATTORNEYS (MOTION NO. 1651)**

The written motion of the Committee of Bar Examiners that the following named applicants, who have fulfilled the requirements for admission to practice law in the State of California, be admitted to the practice of law in this state is hereby granted, with permission to the applicants to take the oath before a competent officer at another time and place:

(SEE ORIGINAL APPLICATION FOR THE LIST OF NAMES ATTACHED.)