

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 2024  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

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

Extension of time granted

Upon application of Supervising Deputy State Public Defender Alexander Post, an extension of time in which to serve and file appellant Run Peter Chhoun's supplemental opening brief is granted to July 29, 2024. 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 Chhoun 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.

**S124131****PEOPLE v. BARRETT  
(JOSEPH ANTHONY)**

Extension of time granted

Upon application of Senior Deputy State Public Defender Jessie S. Hawk, an extension of time in which to serve and file appellant's supplemental opening brief is granted to July 15, 2024. 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.

**S224710****PEOPLE v. ESPARZA  
(ANGEL ANTHONY)**

Extension of time granted

Upon application of counsel Patricia L. Brisbois, an extension of time in which to serve and file appellant Angel Anthony Esparza's reply brief is granted to July 29, 2024. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 120 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)(B)(ii).)

**S229694****PEOPLE v. RODRIGUEZ  
(LUIS JESUS)**

Extension of time granted

Based upon Deputy Attorney General Blake R. Armstrong's representation that the respondent's brief is anticipated to be filed by September 30, 2024, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to July 29, 2024. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 63 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).)

**S280598**

C090463 Third Appellate District

**MADRIGAL (OSCAR J.) v.  
HYUNDAI MOTOR  
AMERICA**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondents and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply brief on the merits is extended to June 28, 2024.

No further extensions will be contemplated.

**S277893****ANOTHER PLANET  
ENTERTAINMENT, LLC v.  
VIGILANT INSURANCE  
COMPANY**

Order filed

Appellant's April 3, 2023, application for leave to file an overlength appendix of materials cited in its opening brief is granted.

**S277893****ANOTHER PLANET  
ENTERTAINMENT, LLC v.  
VIGILANT INSURANCE  
COMPANY**

Order filed

The request for judicial notice filed by appellant Another Planet Entertainment, LLC (Another Planet) is granted in part and denied in part as follows. The first six items in Another Planet's request concern various characteristics of the virus that causes COVID-19. Given the procedural posture of these proceedings, we will construe these statements as additional factual allegations in support of Another Planet's claims. (Cf. *Milligan v. Golden Gate Bridge Highway & Transportation Dist.* (2004) 120 Cal.App.4th 1, 5, fn. 2.) Judicial notice is therefore denied as

unnecessary. The last two items in Another Planet's request seek judicial notice of (1) an insurance industry circular discussing a standard virus policy exclusion and (2) a regulatory filing by Chubb Limited. Without any dispute over their authenticity, we may properly take judicial notice of their existence and contents, though not the truth of any statements therein. (Evid. Code, §§ 452, subd. (h), 459; *StorMedia Inc. v. Superior Court* (1999) 20 Cal.4th 449, 456-457, fn. 9.) Another Planet's request for judicial notice is therefore granted as to these two items.

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 2024  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

The Supreme Court of California reconvened in the courtroom of the Earl Warren Building, 350 McAllister Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California, on May 22, 2024, at 9:00 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.

S276649

In re Kenneth D., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law.

---

Placer County Department of Health and Human Services, Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

J.T., Defendant and Appellant.

Cause called. Janette Freeman Cochran, Court-Appointed Counsel, argued for Appellant.

Jason M. Folker, Office of the County Counsel, argued for Respondent.

Ms. Cochran replied.

Cause submitted.

S280322

Jayde Downey, Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

City of Riverside et al., Defendants and Respondents.

Cause called. Greg Rizio argued for Appellant.

Edward J. Reid, Office of the City Attorney, argued for Respondent City of Riverside.

Shelby Kennick argued for Respondents Ara and Vahram Sevacherian.

Mr. Rizio replied.

Cause submitted.

S276303

The People, Plaintiff and Respondent,  
v.  
Scotlane McCune, Defendant and Appellant.

Cause called. Kaiya Pirolo, Court-Appointed Counsel, argued for Appellant.  
Amanda Lloyd, Office of the Attorney General, argued for Respondent.

Ms. Pirolo 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.

S281510

Katherine Rosenberg-Wohl, Plaintiff and Appellant,  
v.  
State Farm Fire and Casualty Company, Defendant and Respondent.

Cause called. David Rosenberg-Wohl argued for Appellant.  
**(VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE)**  
Christopher Hu, Office of the Attorney General, argued for Amicus Curiae  
Office of the Attorney General.  
Lisa Perrochet argued for Respondent.

Mr. Rosenberg-Wohl replied.  
Cause submitted.

S278309

The People, Plaintiff and Respondent,  
v.  
Maurice Walker, Defendant and Appellant.

Cause called. Jason Szydlik, Court-Appointed Counsel, argued for Appellant.  
Christopher G. Sanchez, Office of the Attorney General, argued for Respondent.

Mr. Szydlik replied.  
Cause submitted.

S265223

Twanda Bailey, Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

San Francisco District Attorney's Office et al., Defendants and Respondents.

Cause called. Daniel Ray Bacon argued for Appellant.

Stacy Villalobos argued for Amici Curiae Legal Aid at Work, ACLU Foundation of Northern California, Bet Tzedek Legal Services, Center for Workers' Rights, Earthlodge Center for Transformation, Equal Justice Society, Impact Fund, Maintenance Cooperation Trust Fund, National Employment Law Project, and Worksafe.

Tara M. Steeley, Office of the City Attorney, argued for Respondents.

Mr. Bacon replied.

Cause submitted.

Court adjourned.