

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 2026
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S295765 D085334 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **PEOPLE v. RICHARDSON
(MICHAEL JARED)**

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.

S291966 **FULLER (KEITH) ON H.C.**

Order to show cause issued, returnable in Superior Court

The Secretary of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation is ordered to show cause before the Los Angeles County Superior Court when the matter is placed on calendar, why relief should not be granted, as conceded by the Attorney General in his informal response filed with this court on January 16, 2026, on the ground that the criminal street gang enhancements should be stricken pursuant to Assembly Bill No. 333 (Stats. 2021, ch. 699). The return must be served and filed on or before May 22, 2026.

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

S295316 B341706 Second Appellate District, Div. 3 **IN RE N.D.**
Petition for review granted; transferred to Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three

The petition for review is granted. The matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, with directions to vacate its decision and reconsider the cause in light of *In re S.R.* (2025) 18 Cal.5th 1042. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(d).)

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

S295366 A172898 First Appellate District, Div. 2

**PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC
CO. v. S.C. (CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF
FORESTRY & FIRE
PROTECTION)**

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

The application to appear as counsel pro hac vice is granted. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.40(a).) The petition for review is granted. The matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Two, 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).)

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

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

S291525 B339378 Second Appellate District, Div. 3 **IN RE B.M.**

Transferred to Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, after hold

The above-captioned matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, with directions to vacate its decision and to reconsider the cause in light of *In re S.R.* (2025) 18 Cal.5th 1042. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(d).)

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

S293101 B336356 Second Appellate District, Div. 4 **IN RE A.D.**

Transferred to Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Four, after hold

The above-captioned matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Four, with directions to vacate its decision and to reconsider the cause in light of *In re S.R.* (2025) 18 Cal.5th 1042. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(d).)

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

S293538 F087867 Fifth Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. SMITH (JOSEPH
JERMAINE)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Morgan* (2026) 19 Cal.5th 132, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S294495

Petition for writ of mandate/prohibition denied

**GRAY (DERRICK ELLIOT) v.
S.C. (PEOPLE)****S294851** G064064 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petitions for review denied

**HENGGELER (JERILYN) v.
DAUOD (OMAR)****S294915** G066390 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**RANDALL (TIMOTHY L.) v.
MAXWELL (ARMIRANDA)****S294932** B346539 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

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

**PETITIONER 1 v.
CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF
THE INSPECTOR GENERAL****S295081** D084362 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**ELLIS-SANDERS (OUDREE)
v. GUARDIA PIAZZA D'ORO
LLC****S295113** B346935/B344576/B346492

Second Appellate District, Div. 7

Petition for review denied

IN RE C.N.**S295116** E084844 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. SANTANA
(MANUEL)****S295134** C102901 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**RANDOLPH (TERESA) v.
TRUSTEES OF THE
CALIFORNIA STATE
UNIVERSITY**

S295166 D084206 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. PERKINS
(DARRIAN CLINT)**

S295236 B347084 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

Petition for review denied

**HAYNES (DEXTER L.) v.
WORKERS'
COMPENSATION APPEALS
BOARD; RETURN-TO-WORK
SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM)**

S295276 A171454 First Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**P. (J.) v. SUTTER BAY
HOSPITALS**

S295282 B342355 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

Petition for review denied

**HU (YONGQUAN) v. XPO
LOGISTICS, LLC**

S295296 D084282 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. BRZEZINSKI
(LEONARD JOSEPH)**

S295302 A173111 First Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**B. (A.), CONSERVATORSHIP
OF**

S295317 B339612 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. BAILEY (LAVELL
DANIEL)**

S295327 A173073 First Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

**WRIGHT (MICHAEL C.) v.
GREEN (COLTON L.)**

S295329	B342397 Second Appellate District, Div. 1	PEOPLE v. LIMON (ARNO SACRAMENTO)
Petition for review denied		
S295359	B334179 Second Appellate District, Div. 7	FISHMAN (JORDAN) v. ADVISORS, LLP
Petition for review denied		
S295363	B342601 Second Appellate District, Div. 8	VON BROCK (MATTHEW FREDERIC & AMY ELIZABETH), MARRIAGE OF
Petition for review denied		
S295369	G065120 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3	VAYA TELECOM, INC. v. PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (PACIFIC BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY)
Petition for review denied		
S295397	C100358 Third Appellate District	PEOPLE v. SMOOT (JOEL ALLEN)
Petition for review denied		
S295402	B347925/B349170 Second Appellate District, Div. 3	IN RE CHRISTOPHER H.
Petition for review denied		
S295410	G064286 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3	CALIFORNIANS FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP, INC. v. CITY OF LA HABRA
Petition for review & depublication request(s) denied		
S295447	G066428 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3	COOPER (TAWANA JEAN) v. OPTUMRX, INC.
Petition for review denied		

S295463 F090950 Fifth Appellate District

**TORRES (ISAAC) v.
WORKERS'
COMPENSATION APPEALS
BOARD**

Petition for review denied

S295481 B351949 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

**RAMIREZ (MICHAEL G.) v.
S.C. (PEOPLE)**

Petition for review denied

S295482 B336516 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

**PEOPLE v. CELAYA
(DANNY ROBERT)**

Petition for review denied

S295484 H052499 Sixth Appellate District

**CARRASCAL (FRANCISCO)
v. VEDAD (SAID)**

Petition for review & publication request(s) denied

S295501 H051344 Sixth Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. VARGAS (REYES
SEBASTIAN)**

Petition for review denied

S295522 A175728 First Appellate District, Div. 5

**KAUR (MANPREET) v. S.C.
(HITES)**

Petition for review denied

S295534 C101426 Third Appellate District

**OSUNDE (ESEOSA) v.
CALIFORNIA STATE
TEACHERS' RETIREMENT
SYSTEM**

Petition for review denied

S295537 C101514 Third Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. CROW
(BRENNON CHRISTOPHER)**

Petition for review denied

S295542 F089100 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. ZAMORA
(SANTIAGO MANUEL)**

S295546 E085278 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review & application for stay denied

**PEOPLE v. RAMIREZ
(VICTOR V.)**

S295551 B352000 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

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

**SARINANA (TOMAS) ON
H.C.**

S295553 E087767 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

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

**SIERRA (CHRIS MENJIVAR)
ON H.C.**

S295581 C101035 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**KUIGOUA (ARNO PATRICK)
v. BOARD OF REGISTERED
NURSING**

S295590 B335082 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. MACHLEIT
(KIMBERLY LYNN)**

S295602 B343731 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

Petition for review denied

**VARSITY PARK ESTATES
HOMEOWNERS
ASSOCIATION v. ANGLIN
(JAMES D.)**

S295605 C099252 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. HOEHL (ALFRED
ROBERT)**

S295610 A169638/A171754 First Appellate District, Div. 1 **EBO PROPERTIES NORTH, LLC v. SIROTT (MATTHEW N.)**

Petition for review denied

S295612 B336438 Second Appellate District, Div. 5 **PEOPLE v. CORONADO (EDUARDO MANUEL)**

Petitions for review denied

S295617 B340407 Second Appellate District, Div. 5 **PEOPLE v. LOPEZ (GREGORY JOSE)**

Defendant's application to file the unredacted petition for review under seal is granted. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.47.) The clerk of this court is directed to file the unredacted petition for review under seal.

The petition for review is denied.

S295627 D087756 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **WILLIAMS (CHARLES) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)**

Petition for review denied

S295643 B334404 Second Appellate District, Div. 1 **PEOPLE v. BUSTAMANTE (NICK)**

Petition for review denied

S295646 B342211 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 **DISNEY PLATFORM DISTRIBUTION, INC. v. CITY OF SANTA BARBARA**

Petition for review denied

S295648 **SOPER III (JERRY BENJAMIN) v. T-MOBILE USA, INC.**

The request for judicial notice is denied.

The motion for preliminary injunction is denied.

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

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

S295658	B351908 Second Appellate District, Div. 6	WISEMAN (RICHARD) ON H.C.
Petition for review denied		
S295666	G063338 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3	PEOPLE v. DAVIS (REGINALD JAMAL)
Petition for review denied		
S295676	E085152 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2	PEOPLE v. ENDICOTT (LEON)
The request for judicial notice is granted. The petition for review is denied.		
S295683	H052749 Sixth Appellate District	PEOPLE v. GARCIA (RUBI FLORENCIA)
Petition for review denied		
S295718	F086372 Fifth Appellate District	PEOPLE v. PARRA (MARIO JAVIER)
Petition for review denied		
S295720	H051995 Sixth Appellate District	PEOPLE v. JONES (CHEYENNE PATRICE)
Petition for review denied		
S295730	B337405 Second Appellate District, Div. 4	PEOPLE v. BROWN (KAREEM LAMAR)
Petition for review denied		
S295739	B343303 Second Appellate District, Div. 5	PEOPLE v. SIDEBOTTOM (TOMMY)
Petition for review denied Groban, J., is of the opinion that the petition should be granted.		

S295742 D084544 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

PEOPLE v. ESPINOZA (LUIS VASQUEZ)

Petition for review denied

S295744 C103127 Third Appellate District

PEOPLE v. PATTERSON (JAMES STANLEY)

Defendant's application to file the unredacted petition for review under seal is granted. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.47.) The clerk of this court is directed to file the unredacted petition for review under seal.

The petition for review is denied.

S295745 C100109/C101596 Third Appellate District

PEOPLE v. ENGELBRECHT (BETTY ANN)

Petition for review denied

S295749 B332997 Second Appellate District, Div. 8

RAMIREZ CANYON PRESERVATION FUND v. CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION (COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

Petition for review denied

S295758 D084052 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

PEOPLE v. MEALS (RAHEEM MALIK)

Petition for review denied

S295760 B333580 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

PEOPLE v. CORACERO (TEODORO ANTONIO)

Petition for review denied

S295783 H052945 Sixth Appellate District

IN RE J.S.

Petition for review denied

S295784 C105390 Third Appellate District

**ADKINS (TIMOTHY) v.
ADKINS (AMEY E.);
DEPARTMENT OF CHILD
SUPPORT SERVICES**

Petition for review denied

S295882

**PEOPLE v. MURPHY
(DOUGLAS)**

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

S295918 A175810 First Appellate District, Div. 3

**TAO (LIYING) v. S.C.
(MORELAND)**

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S295963 A175942 First Appellate District, Div. 5

**WANG (YINGQIAN) v. S.C.
(PRODESSE PROPERTY
GROUP)**

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S296084 C105813 Third Appellate District

**MITCHELL (FREDERICK) v.
S.C. (LANGSTON)**

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S296141 C105916 Third Appellate District

**DAVIS (BEE ROSA) v. S.C.
(GRINDR LLC)**

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S287883

**SMITH (JASON ANDREW)
ON H.C.**

Petitioner's application to file the reporter's transcript of the May 27, 2010, hearing held pursuant to *People v. Marsden* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 118, which is attached as Exhibit A to the habeas petition, under seal is granted. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.47.) The clerk of this court is directed to file Exhibit A to the habeas petition under seal.

The petition for writ of habeas corpus has been read and considered. Petitioner contends that he is entitled to relief under the Racial Justice Act of 2020. (Pen. Code, § 745.) In this respect, petitioner alleges the Los Angeles County District Attorney charged him with "more serious offenses than defendants of other races, ethnicity or national origin who commit similar offenses and are similarly situated," resulting in imposition of a harsher sentence than those similarly

situated offenders. (Petn., p. 4.) Petitioner also alleges “the prosecutor conveyed to [petitioner’s] deputy public defenders . . . that he (prosecutor) was unwilling to entertain any manslaughter plea agreement because [petitioner] was a foreign national.” (Petn., p. 21.)

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel or the disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, §§ 1473, subd. (e)(5) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who pleads a plausible allegation of a violation of the Racial Justice Act], 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to a potential violation of the Racial Justice Act in the possession or control of the state].) The requests for counsel and discovery are denied.

Petitioner “has not established a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief” under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e)(7)(A).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claims based on alleged exhibition of racial bias or animus or that support a claim that petitioner was charged, convicted or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(1), (3)-(4); cf. *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].) Nor does petitioner describe or attach sufficient supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. (Cf. *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 petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S290943

**LANG (DANTAY MALIK) 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). In this respect, petitioner alleges that he was charged or convicted of a more serious offense than defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins who have engaged in similar conduct and are similarly situated, and that prosecutors in Los Angeles County more frequently sought or obtained convictions for more serious offenses against people who share his race, ethnicity, or national origin.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel or the disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, §§ 1473, subd. (e)(5) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who pleads a plausible violation of the Racial Justice Act]; 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to a potential violation of the Racial Justice Act in the possession or control of the state].) The requests for counsel and discovery are denied.

Petitioner “has not established a prima facie showing” under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e)(7)(A).) The petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claim that petitioner was charged or convicted in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(3); cf. *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. (Cf. *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 petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S292218**NGUYEN (DAVIS) 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.) In this respect, petitioner alleges that during in-court trial proceedings, the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror used racially discriminatory language about petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin; and he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense in Sacramento County. The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel or the disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, §§ 1473, subd. (e)(5) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who pleads a plausible violation of the Racial Justice Act]; 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to a potential violation of the Racial Justice Act in the possession or control of the state].) The requests for counsel and discovery are denied.

Petitioner “has not established a prima facie showing” under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e)(7)(A).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claims based on alleged exhibitions of racial bias or that support a claim that petitioner was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(2)-(4); cf. *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. (Cf. *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 petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S292230**SANDERS (EDUARDO) 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.) In this respect, petitioner alleges that the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror in the case exhibited bias or animus toward petitioner because of petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin; and he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense in Sacramento County.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e)(5) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who pleads a plausible violation of the Racial Justice Act].) The request for counsel is denied.

Petitioner “has not established a prima facie showing” under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e)(7)(A).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claims based on alleged exhibitions of racial bias or that support a claim that petitioner was

charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 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].) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. (Cf. *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 petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S292249**SCARBROUGH (LEONARD)
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.) In this respect, petitioner alleges that the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror in the case exhibited bias or animus toward petitioner because of petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin; he was charged or convicted of a more serious offense than defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins who have engaged in similar conduct and are similarly situated; prosecutors in Sacramento County more frequently sought or obtained convictions for more serious offenses against people who share his race, ethnicity, or national origin; he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants who share petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin in Sacramento County; and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants in cases with victims of one race, ethnicity, or national origin than in cases with victims of other races, ethnicities, or national origins in Sacramento County.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel or the disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, §§ 1473, subd. (e)(5) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who pleads a plausible violation of the Racial Justice Act]; 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to a potential violation of the Racial Justice Act in the possession or control of the state].) The requests for counsel and discovery are denied.

Petitioner “has not established a prima facie showing” under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e)(7)(A).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claims based on alleged exhibitions of racial bias or that support a claim that petitioner was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 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].) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. (Cf. *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 petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S292285**TURNER, JR., (STEVEN
DEON) 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 counsel and discovery. In this respect, petitioner contends that because of racial bias and animus, his appellate attorney failed to raise viable claims on appeal after petitioner's resentencing pursuant to Penal Code section 1175.12, and instead filed a no-issue brief.

Petitioner additionally alleges that a judge, attorney, law enforcement officer, expert or juror exhibited racial bias, that he was charged or convicted of a more serious offense than defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins who have engaged in similar conduct and are similarly situated, that prosecutors in Los Angeles County more frequently sought or obtained convictions for more serious offenses against people who share his race, ethnicity, or national origin, that he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense, and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants who share petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin than on others in Los Angeles County.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel or the disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, §§ 1473, subd. (e)(5) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who pleads a plausible violation of the Racial Justice Act]; 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to a potential violation of the Racial Justice Act in the possession or control of the state].) The requests for counsel and discovery are denied.

Petitioner "has not established a prima facie showing" under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e)(7)(A).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts or provide any supporting evidence demonstrating that petitioner's attorney's decision to file a no-issue brief on appeal was motivated by racial bias. The petition also fails to allege particularized facts that support a claim that any state actor exhibited racial bias, or that petitioner was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(1), (3)-(4)(A); cf. *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. (Cf. *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 petition for habeas corpus is denied.

S293410**TATE, JR., (LEROY) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S293496**BLAKE (AUDWIN LERESE)
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.) In this respect, petitioner alleges that he was charged or convicted of a more serious offense than defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins who have engaged in similar conduct and are similarly situated; prosecutors in Los Angeles County more frequently sought or obtained convictions for more serious offenses against people who share his race, ethnicity, or national origin; and he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offenses in Los Angeles County.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel or the disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, §§ 1473, subd. (e)(5) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who pleads a plausible violation of the Racial Justice Act]; 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to a potential violation of the Racial Justice Act in the possession or control of the state].) The requests for counsel and discovery are denied.

Petitioner “has not established a prima facie showing” under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e)(7)(A).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claims that petitioner was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(3)-(4)(A); cf. *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. (Cf. *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 petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S293546**ORTIZ-ESTRADA (DANNY)
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.) In this respect, petitioner alleges that the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror in the case exhibited bias or animus toward petitioner because of petitioner’s race; during in-court trial proceedings, the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror used racially discriminatory language about petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin; he was charged or convicted of a more serious offense than defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins who have engaged in similar conduct and are similarly situated; prosecutors in San Luis Obispo County more frequently sought or obtained convictions for more serious offenses against people who share his race, ethnicity, or national origin; he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants who share petitioner’s race, ethnicity, or national origin in San Luis Obispo County; and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants in cases with victims of one race, ethnicity, or national origin than in cases with

victims of other races, ethnicities, or national origins in San Luis Obispo County.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, §§ 1473, subd. (e)(5) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who pleads a plausible violation of the Racial Justice Act].) The request for counsel is denied.

Petitioner “has not established a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief” under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e)(7)(A).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claims based on alleged exhibitions of racial bias or that support a claim that petitioner was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 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].) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. (Cf. *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 petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S293637

**GRAY (DERRICK ELLIOT)
ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S293651

**MOTTON (EDWARD JAMES)
ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S294003

**CANDLER (STEVEN RANAE
GLENN) 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.) In this respect, petitioner alleges that the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror in the case exhibited bias or animus toward petitioner because of petitioner’s race; during in-court trial proceedings, the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror used racially discriminatory language about petitioner’s race, ethnicity, or national origin; he was charged or convicted of a more serious offense than defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins who have engaged in similar conduct and are similarly situated; prosecutors in Tulare County more frequently sought or obtained convictions for more serious offenses against people who share petitioner’s race, ethnicity, or national origin; he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants who share petitioner’s race, ethnicity, or national origin in Tulare County. The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel or the

disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, §§ 1473, subd. (e)(5) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who pleads a plausible violation of the Racial Justice Act]; 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to a potential violation of the Racial Justice Act in the possession or control of the state].) The requests for counsel and discovery are denied.

Petitioner “has not established a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief” under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e)(7)(A).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claims based on alleged exhibition of racial bias or animus or that support a claim that petitioner was charged, convicted or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(1)-(4)(A); cf. *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. (Cf. *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 petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S294004**TATE, JR., (LEROY) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Miller* (1941) 17 Cal.2d 734, 735 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are repetitive].)

S295164**HERNANDEZ (VICTOR
MANUEL) 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.) In this respect, petitioner alleges the prosecutor told the jury that petitioner “didn’t look like some kid from Sunday school,” and that petitioner “was not a reasonable person.” Petitioner also alleges that the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror in the case exhibited bias or animus toward petitioner because of petitioner’s race, ethnicity, or national origin; during in-court trial proceedings, the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror used racially discriminatory language about petitioner’s race, ethnicity, or national origin; he was charged or convicted of a more serious offense than defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins who have engaged in similar conduct and are similarly situated; prosecutors in Kern County more frequently sought or obtained convictions for more serious offenses against people who share his race, ethnicity, or national origin; he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants who share petitioner’s race, ethnicity, or national origin in Kern County; and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants in cases with victims of one race, ethnicity, or national origin than in cases with victims of other races, ethnicities, or national origins in Kern County.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel or the

disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, §§ 1473, subd. (e)(5) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who pleads a plausible violation of the Racial Justice Act]; 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to a potential violation of the Racial Justice Act in the possession or control of the state].) The requests for counsel and discovery are denied.

Petitioner “has not established a prima facie showing” under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e)(7)(A).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claims based on alleged exhibitions of racial bias or that support a claim that petitioner was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 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].) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. (Cf. *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 petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S295926

**JOHNSON (DERRICK L.) ON
H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus & application for stay denied

S294294 H051522 Sixth Appellate District
Publication request denied (case closed)

PEOPLE v. LACHAN (ALAN)

S294714

**CAMINO VERDE
ASSOCIATES, LP v. NGUYEN
(THUCMINH)**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S295303 B324360 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

**TOWNS (DAEVIEON) v.
HYUNDAI MOTOR
AMERICA**

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.

S295691 C102070 Third Appellate District

**VALLEJO, CITY OF v. CITY
OF AMERICAN CANYON
(BUZZ OATES LLC)**

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

S295636 D085324 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **PEOPLE v. CARRILLO (JOE)**
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 July 6, 2026. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(c).)

S182278 **PEOPLE v. NELSON (TANYA JAIME)**

Extension of time granted

Upon application of counsel Andrew Parnes, an extension of time in which to serve and file appellant's supplemental opening brief is granted to June 29, 2026. After that date, no further extensions are contemplated. 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.

S293914 B335073 Second Appellate District, Div. 3 **MONTROSE CHEMICAL CORPORATION OF CALIFORNIA v. S.C. (CANADIAN UNIVERSAL INSURANCE COMPANY, INC.)**

Extension of time granted

On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply brief on the merits is extended to May 21, 2026.

S295348 **ACCUSATION OF AGUINIGA**
Petition denied (accusation)

S295875 **ACCUSATION OF CLARK**
Petition denied (accusation)

S295311**ALAEI ON DISCIPLINE**

Recommended discipline imposed

The court orders that MEHRAN DAVID ALAEI (Respondent), State Bar Number 283273, is suspended from the practice of law in California for two years, execution of that period of suspension is stayed, and Respondent is placed on probation for two years subject to the following conditions:

1. Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for the first year of probation (with credit given for the period of interim suspension which commenced on March 25, 2024);
2. Respondent must comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on January 26, 2026; and
3. At the expiration of the period of probation, if Respondent has complied with all conditions of probation, the period of stayed suspension will be satisfied and that suspension will be terminated.

Respondent must comply with California Rules of Court, rule 9.20 and perform the acts specified in (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the date this order is filed. (*Athearn v. State Bar* (1982) 32 Cal.3d 38, 45 [the operative date for identification of clients being represented in pending matters and others to be notified is the filing date of this order].) Failure to do so may result in disbarment or suspension. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.20(d).) Respondent must also maintain the records of compliance as required by the conditions of probation.

Respondent must pay monetary sanctions to the State Bar of California Client Security Fund in the amount of \$2,500 in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.13 and rule 5.137 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar. Monetary sanctions are enforceable as a money judgment and may be collected by the State Bar through any means permitted by law.

Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and are enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment, and may be collected by the State Bar through any means permitted by law.

Any monetary requirements imposed in this matter shall be considered satisfied or waived when authorized by applicable law or orders of any court.

S295312**CENCI ON DISCIPLINE**

Recommended discipline imposed

The court orders that RICHARD GERARD CENCI (Respondent), State Bar Number 79863, is suspended from the practice of law in California for one year, execution of that period of suspension is stayed, and Respondent is placed on probation for one year subject to the following conditions:

1. Respondent must comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on January 22, 2026; and

2. At the expiration of the period of probation, if Respondent has complied with the terms of probation, the period of stayed suspension will be satisfied and that suspension will be terminated.

Respondent must comply with the requirement to take and provide to the State Bar's Office of Case Management and Supervision proof of passage of the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination in the manner and as recommended by the Hearing Department in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on January 22, 2026. Failure to do so may result in suspension. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.10(b).)

Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and are enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment, and may be collected by the State Bar through any means permitted by law.

Any monetary requirements imposed in this matter shall be considered satisfied or waived when authorized by applicable law or orders of any court.

S295313**PIXTON ON DISCIPLINE**

Recommended discipline imposed: disbarred

The court orders that JAMES ANDREW PIXTON (Respondent), State Bar Number 193263, is disbarred from the practice of law in California and that Respondent's name is stricken from the roll of attorneys.

Respondent must comply with California Rules of Court, rule 9.20 and perform the acts specified in (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the date this order is filed. (*Athearn v. State Bar* (1982) 32 Cal.3d 38, 45 [the operative date for identification of clients being represented in pending matters and others to be notified is the filing date of this order].) Failure to do so may result in denial of any future application for reinstatement. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.20(d).)

Respondent must pay monetary sanctions to the State Bar of California Client Security Fund in the amount of \$5,000 in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.13 and rule 5.137 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar. Monetary sanctions are enforceable as a money judgment and may be collected by the State Bar through any means permitted by law.

Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and are enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment, and may be collected by the State Bar through any means permitted by law.

Any monetary requirements imposed in this matter shall be considered satisfied or waived when authorized by applicable law or orders of any court.

S296219

**BARAKATT ON
RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of MARINA KATHERINE BARAKATT, State Bar Number 302005, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296220

**BUDINGER ON
RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of VALERIE BUDINGER, State Bar Number 163780, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296224

BUSH ON RESIGNATION

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of MARY MARGARET BUSH, State Bar Number 60717, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296225

**CALVERT ON
RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of LORETTA M. CALVERT, State Bar Number 308835, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296227

**CATALDO ON
RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of DINA LYNN CATALDO, State Bar Number 247769, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296229**CRAWFORD ON
RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of SUSAN PATRICIA CRAWFORD, State Bar Number 152560, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296230**DeMARET ON
RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of TAD DeMARET, State Bar Number 155936, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296231**FORTINO ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of ANDREA LYNN FORTINO, State Bar Number 154598, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296232**GREENE ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of KERRY ELISABETH GREENE, State Bar Number 172746, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296233**HIGSON ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of ROBERT DANIEL HIGSON, State Bar Number 140551, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296234**JONES ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of GREG WILLIS JONES, State Bar Number 129235, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296235**KWON ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of GRACE HYOSANG KWON, State Bar Number 240103, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296237**MARKS ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of JEFFREY PAUL MARKS, State Bar Number 206310, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296238**MURPHY ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of LISABETH FEIX MURPHY, State Bar Number 110918, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296240**NGUYEN ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of MY N. NGUYEN, State Bar Number 273754, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296241**NOBLE ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of ANDREW FRANKLIN NOBLE, State Bar Number 136314, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296242**SELDEN III ON
RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of LYNDE SELDEN III, State Bar Number 207513, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296244**VOGELSTEIN ON
RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of DAVID MORRIS VOGELSTEIN, State Bar Number 73030, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S296246**WINTER ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of JEFFREY MARK WINTER, State Bar Number 129095, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

**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. 1759)**

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.)

Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 TRANSFER ORDERS

The matters listed in Attachment 1, now pending in the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, are transferred from Division Two to Division One:

1. E085666 James Sanchez et al. v. Mohammed Naji
2. E086980 Maria Menera Ramirez v. Humano, LLC
3. E087561 Jude Kapua v. Think Together
4. E087594 Sarah Buel v. Ryan Lenahan
5. E087595 County of Riverside v. Anthem Blue Cross Life & Health Insurance Company
6. E087436 People v. Hector Gonzalez
7. E087457 People v. Salvador Vargas
8. E087490 People v. Arshaad Rahh
9. E087491 People v. Quinn McKellips
10. E087494 People v. Efren Infante
11. E085984 Cheryl Ellis v. Perris Union High School District
12. E086161 Melissa Washington v. Alta Loma School District
13. E086226 The Regents of the University of California v. City of Riverside
14. E086304 Julie Franco v. PAG Ontario B1, Inc. et al.
15. E086792 Shannon Deasey v. Board of Trustees of the California State University

16. E085468 People v. Jessie Cornejo Ambriz
17. E085587 People v. Andrew Joseph
18. E085822 People v. Vincent Marples
19. E086220 People v. Jonathan Toca
20. E086397 People v. Brian Vaughn