

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
MONDAY, MARCH 25, 2024
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S275431**HUERTA (GEORGE) v. CSI
ELECTRICAL
CONTRACTORS**

Opinion filed

In response to the Ninth Circuit’s certification request, we conclude as follows: First, when an employee is required to spend time on his employer’s premises awaiting and undergoing an employer-mandated exit security procedure that includes the employer’s visual inspection of the employee’s personal vehicle, the time is compensable as “hours worked” within the meaning of Wage Order No. 16.

Second, the time that an employee spends traveling between the Security Gate and the employee parking lots is compensable as “employer-mandated travel” under Wage Order No. 16, section 5(A) if the Security Gate is the first location where the employee’s presence is required for an employment-related reason other than the practical necessity of accessing the worksite.

Separately, this travel time is not compensable as “hours worked” because an employer’s imposition of ordinary workplace rules on employees during their drive to the worksite in a personal vehicle does not create the requisite level of employer control.

Third, when an employee is covered by a collective bargaining agreement that complies with Labor Code section 512, subdivision (e) and Wage Order No. 16, section 10(E), and that agreement provides for an “unpaid meal period,” that time is nonetheless compensable under the wage order as “hours worked” if the employer prohibits the employee from leaving the employer’s premises or a designated area during the meal period and if this prohibition prevents the employee from engaging in otherwise feasible personal activities. An employee may bring an action under Labor Code section 1194 to enforce the wage order and recover unpaid wages for that time.

Majority Opinion by Liu, J.

-- joined by Guerrero, C. J., Corrigan, Kruger, Groban, Jenkins, and Evans, JJ.

S120382**PEOPLE v. SANCHEZ
(VINCENT HENRY)**

Extension of time granted

Upon application of counsel Michael Snedeker, an extension of time in which to serve and file appellant’s supplemental opening brief is granted to May 28, 2024. After that date, only one further 60-day extension is contemplated. Counsel is reminded of the obligation to provide a good faith estimate of the percentage of work accomplished on the brief and an estimate of the amount of time the remaining work will take. (See Appendix to Supreme Court Policies

Regarding Cases Arising From Judgments of Death Concerning Appointed Counsel's Duties, part II.B.1.c.) 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.

S211045**PEOPLE v. PEREZ
(CHRISTIAN TOMAS)**

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Michael Lasher's representation that the appellant's reply brief is anticipated to be filed by January 30, 2025, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to May 24, 2024. After that date, only four further extensions totaling about 251 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).)

S248590**PEOPLE v. BRACAMONTES
(LUIS ENRIQUEZ MONROY)**

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 May 28, 2024.

S277962 H049413 Sixth Appellate District**PEOPLE v. ARELLANO (LUIS
RAMON MANZANO)**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondents and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the response to amici curiae briefs is extended to April 26, 2024.

No further extensions are contemplated.

S280479**LOPEZ (EDGAR FRAUSTO)
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 informal response is extended to April 25, 2024.

S282576

**AGUILAR (DAVID
TRUJILLO) ON H.C.**

Extension of time granted

On application of the Attorney General and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the informal response is extended to May 3, 2024.

S273887

**HIMES (MICHELLE);
BENJAMIN (MARCIA);
BENJAMIN (DANIEL);
RIERA (JOSE); CHASE
(DEBORAH); SCURRAH
(DIANE) v. SOMATICS, LLC;
MECTA CORPORATION**

Motion for judicial notice granted