

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES  
THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 2026  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

**S284378**      B319895 Second Appellate District, Div. 6      **SHEAR DEVELOPMENT CO.,  
LLC v. CALIFORNIA  
COASTAL COMMISSION**

Opinion filed: Judgment reversed

We conclude that: (1) a court must exercise its independent judgment to decide whether the Commission properly exercised jurisdiction on the ground that the development is in an SCRA; (2) no deference to the Commission's or the County's interpretation of the LCP is warranted on this record; (3) the proposed development is not in an SCRA; and (4) the Commission does not have appellate jurisdiction on the ground that the site is designated with several principal permitted uses. Consistent with these conclusions, we hold that the Commission had no appellate jurisdiction over Shear's permit application. Accordingly, we reverse the judgment of the Court of Appeal and remand with directions. The Court of Appeal is directed to reverse the order of the trial court denying the petition for writ of administrative mandate and remand with directions to issue the writ of administrative mandate. The writ shall direct the Commission to vacate its decision and dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

Majority Opinion by Guerrero, C. J.

-- joined by Corrigan, Liu, Kruger, Groban, Evans, and Stone\*, JJ.

\* Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Seven, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.

**S288606**      C098299 Third Appellate District      **PEOPLE v. ROBINSON  
(PRENTICE)**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the response to amicus curiae brief is extended to June 2, 2026.

**S283172**      **SPIELBAUER ON  
DISCIPLINE**

Order filed – THOMAS JOHN SPIELBAUER

The request of counsel for petitioner to allocate to amicus curiae Lawyers' Mutual Insurance Company 15 minutes of petitioner's 30-minute allotted time for oral argument is hereby granted.

**S294391**  
**ADMIN. ORDER 2026-04-22-02**

**REQUEST THAT THE  
SUPREME COURT OF  
CALIFORNIA REVIEW &  
APPROVE THE PROPOSED  
AMENDMENTS TO  
CALIFORNIA RULES OF  
PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT,  
RULES 8.2 AND 8.4**

Request re rule denied

The State Bar of California’s “Request that the Supreme Court of California Review and Approve the Proposed Amendments to California Rules of Professional Conduct, Rules 8.2 and 8.4” is denied. On its own motion, the court proposes amendments to the comments for Rules of Professional Conduct, Rules 8.2 and 8.4, as set forth in the Attachment to this order. The court directs the State Bar to solicit public comment on the court’s proposed comments for a 45-day period and thereafter consider whether to recommend to the court any changes to the court’s proposed comments.

It is so ordered.

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

**S294427**  
**ADMIN. ORDER 04-22-26-01**

**REQUEST THAT THE  
SUPREME COURT OF  
CALIFORNIA REVIEW &  
APPROVE PROPOSED  
AMENDMENTS TO  
CALIFORNIA RULES OF  
PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT,  
RULE 7.3**

Rule adopted as modified

The State Bar of California’s “Request that the Supreme Court of California Review and Approve the Proposed Amendments to California Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 7.3” is granted as modified.

The approved amendments to rule 7.3 and its comments, as modified by the court, are set forth in the Attachment. The amendments are effective June 1, 2026.

It is so ordered.

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