

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES  
FRIDAY, MAY 2, 2025  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

**S290631**

**ELLIS-SANDERS (OUDREE)  
v. COURT OF APPEAL,  
FOURTH APPELLATE  
DISTRICT, DIVISION ONE  
(GUARDIA PIAZZA D'ORO  
LLC)**

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

**S290656**

G062427 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

**PEOPLE v. NGUYEN (NINH  
XUAN)**

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 21, 2025.  
(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(c).)

**S086355**

**PEOPLE v. LEWIS (KEITH  
ALLEN)**

Extension of time granted

Upon application of Pamala Sayasane, an extension of time in which to serve and file appellant's supplemental reply brief is granted to July 7, 2025. After that date, no further extensions will be granted.

**S217284**

**JONES (BRYAN MAURICE)  
ON H.C.**

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Shelley J. Sandusky's representation that the reply to the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is anticipated to be filed by August 8, 2025, an extension of time in which to serve and file that document is granted to July 3, 2025. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 36 additional days is contemplated.

**S226653****PEOPLE v. DUNSON  
(ROBERT L.)**

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Wayne C. Tobin's representation that the appellant's opening brief is anticipated to be filed by July 24, 2025, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to July 3, 2025. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 21 additional 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).)

**S252824****PEOPLE v. JIMENEZ (ERIC  
PATRICK)**

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 July 8, 2025.

**S287455** B325796 Second Appellate District, Div. 6**PEOPLE v. HUGHEY  
(MARQUISHON)**

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant Marquishon Hughey and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the opening brief on the merits is extended to May 23, 2025.

**S184521****PEOPLE v. DUNN (AARON  
NORMAN)**

Order filed

Defendant's motion to augment the record on appeal, filed December 28, 2018, is denied. (See *People v. Vargas* (2020) 9 Cal.5th 793, 834; *People v. Mendoza* (2016) 62 Cal.4th 856, 917.)

**S284498** B327524 Second Appellate District, Div. 8**HOHENSHELT (DANA) v.  
S.C. (GOLDEN STATE  
FOODS CORP.)**

Order filed

The request of counsel for petitioner to allocate to amicus curiae Attorney General of California 15 minutes of petitioner's 30-minute allotted time for oral argument is hereby granted.

**S290627      ADMIN. ORDER 2025-05-02****ORDER APPROVING RAW  
PASSING SCORE &  
SCORING ADJUSTMENT  
FOR THE FEBRUARY 2025  
CALIFORNIA BAR  
EXAMINATION**

Order filed

The Court is in receipt of the State Bar of California's Request to Approve a Proposed Raw Passing Score and Scoring Adjustments for the February 2025 California Bar Examination, filed on April 29, 2025.

The Court, having considered the State Bar's request, and in light of the particular issues encountered during the February 2025 California Bar Examination, sets the total raw passing score for that exam at 534 points or higher. The total raw score shall consist of the 700 possible raw points for the written portion plus the 171 points available for the multiple-choice components with each weighted equally (50 percent assigned to each).

For applicants who took the February 2025 Attorneys' Examination, the raw passing score shall be 420 points or higher.

The Court also approves psychometric imputation of scores as follows: for missing multiple-choice answers, where the test taker answered at least 114 of the 171 scored multiple-choice questions; and for missing essay or performance test answers, where the test taker answered at least four of six written sections of the examination, including 18 test takers who had content in the performance test response field, but did not have access to the file and library.

For purposes of the passing score, this order supersedes the Court's October 21, 2024 administrative order concerning the California Bar Examination.

Although the State Bar's petition indicates that the February 2025 examination contained a sufficient number of reliable multiple-choice questions, the Court remains concerned over the processes used to draft those questions, including the previously undisclosed use of artificial intelligence, and will await the results of the impending audits of the examination. At this time, the Court orders that the Multistate Bar Examination be used for the multiple-choice portion of the July 2025 California Bar Examination.

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