

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2024
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S283691 B334780 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 **CASTANEDA (OSIRIS) v. S.C. (RUIZ)**

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S283726 C096511 Third Appellate District **STATE WATER BOARD CASES**

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 11, 2024. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(c).)

S105403 **PEOPLE v. CHHOUN (RUN PETER) & PAN (SAMRETH SAM)**

Extension of time granted

Upon application of Deputy Attorney General Louis W. Karlin, an extension of time in which to serve and file a supplemental answering brief is granted to April 10, 2024. Appellant Samreth Sam Pan 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.

S152463 **PEOPLE v. HILL (IVAN J.)**

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Senior Deputy State Public Defender Jessica E. Oats' representation that the appellant's reply brief is anticipated to be filed by August 14, 2024, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to April 9, 2024. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 127 additional days are contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S180711**PEOPLE v. KLING
(RANDOLPH CLIFTON)**

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's supplemental opening brief is extended to April 15, 2024.

S185810**PEOPLE v. THREATS
(DERLYN RAY)**

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Senior Deputy State Public Defender Jessica E. Oat's representation that the appellant's opening brief is anticipated to be filed by April 15, 2025, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to April 9, 2024. After that date, only six further extensions totaling about 371 additional days are contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S225017**PEOPLE v. KING (COREY
LYNN)**

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Deputy Attorney General Stacy S. Schwartz's representation that the respondent's brief is anticipated to be filed by May 17, 2024, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to April 15, 2024. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 34 days is contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S239963**PEOPLE v. MEZA
(HERACLIO)**

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to April 15, 2024.

S241359

**PEOPLE v. RHOADES
(CHERIE LOUISE)**

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to April 15, 2024.

S281948

**NASH (ROBERT
CHRISTOPHER) ON H.C.**

Extension of time granted

On application of Attorney General and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the informal response is extended to March 18, 2024.

S282314

BRADSHAW ON DISCIPLINE

Extension of time granted – DREXEL ANDREW BRADSHAW

On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer to petition for review is extended to February 28, 2024.

S283259 F087108 Fifth Appellate District

ANGUIANO (JOSE) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted

On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply to answer to petition for review is extended to February 13, 2024.

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2024
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

The Supreme Court of California held remote session of oral argument on February 6, 2024, at 10:00 a.m.

Present: Chief Justice Guerrero, presiding, and Associate Justices Corrigan, Liu, Kruger, Groban, Jenkins, and Evans.

Officer present: Jorge Navarrete, Clerk and Executive Officer.

S277120 Armida Ruelas; De'Andre Eugene Cox; Bert Davis; Katrish Jones; Joseph Mebrahtu; Dahryl Lamont Reynolds; Monica Mason; Luis Nunez-Romero; Scott Abbey, Plaintiffs and Respondents,

v.

County of Alameda; Gregory J. Ahern; Aramark Correctional Services, LLC, Defendants and Appellants.

Cause called. Gary A. Watt argued for Appellants County of Alameda and Gregory J. Ahern.

Kevin F. King argued for Appellant Aramark Correctional Services, LLC. Dan Siegel argued for Respondents.

Mr. Watt replied.

Cause submitted.

S275940 The People, Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

Weldon K. McDavid, Jr., Defendant and Appellant.

Cause called. Raymond M. DiGuseppe, Court-Appointed Counsel, argued for Appellant.

Alan L. Amann, Office of the Attorney General, argued for Respondent.

Mr. DiGuseppe replied.

Cause submitted.

Court recessed until 1:30 p.m. this date.

Court reconvened pursuant to recess.

Members of the court and officer present as first shown.

S267522 The People, Plaintiff and Respondent,
 v.
 Marlon Flores, Defendant and Appellant.

Cause called. Richard Fitzer, Court-Appointed Counsel, argued for Appellant.

Shezad H. Thakor, Office of the Attorney General, argued for Respondent.

Mr. Fitzer replied.

Cause submitted.

S273797 The People, Plaintiff and Respondent,
 v.
 Raymond Gregory Reynoza, Defendant and Appellant.

Cause called. Katie L. Stowe, Office of the Attorney General, argued for Respondent.

Nancy Susan Brandt, Court-Appointed Counsel, argued for Appellant.

Ms. Stowe replied.

Cause submitted.

Court adjourned.