## SUPREME COURT MINUTES WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 2023 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

S118775

PEOPLE v. WILSON (JAVANCE MICKEY)

Extension of time granted

Based upon Deputy Attorney General Donald W. Ostertag's representation that the second supplemental respondent's brief is anticipated to be filed by June 26, 2023, an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to June 26, 2023. After that date, no further extension is contemplated. Any reply by the appellant must be served and filed by July 26, 2023.

S146528

PEOPLE v. SNYDER (JANEEN MARIE) & THORNTON (MICHAEL FORREST)

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Deputy Attorney General Stephanie H. Chow's representation that the respondent's brief is anticipated to be filed by November 17, 2023, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to July 25, 2023. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 115 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).)

S151493

PEOPLE v. CARDENAS (REFUGIO RUBEN)

Extension of time granted

Based upon Deputy Attorney General Tia M. Coronado's representation that the second supplemental respondent's brief is anticipated to be filed by July 24, 2023, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to July 24, 2023. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

S208429

PEOPLE v. FOWLER (RICKIE LEE)

Extension of time granted

Based upon Deputy Attorney General Tami Falkenstein Hennick's representation that the supplemental respondent's brief is anticipated to be filed by June 29, 2023, an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to June 29, 2023. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

S217774

PEOPLE v. THOMSON (JOHN WAYNE)

Extension of time granted

The application of appellant for relief from default for the failure to timely file appellant's application for extension of time is granted.

Based upon counsel Paul Couenhoven's representation that the appellant's reply brief is anticipated to be filed by January 17, 2024, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to July 17, 2023. The court anticipates that after that date, only three further extensions totaling about 186 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).)

S221158

PEOPLE v. CISNEROS (LEONARDO ALBERTO)

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Michael Lasher's representation that the appellant's reply brief is anticipated to be filed by January 26, 2024, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to July 25, 2023. After that date, only three further extensions totaling about 186 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).)

S225020

PEOPLE v. MURTAZA (IFTEKHAR)

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Deputy Attorney General Junichi P. Semitsu's representation that the respondent's brief is anticipated to be filed by July 21, 2023, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to July 21, 2023. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

## S226760

## PEOPLE v. LIGHTSEY (CHRISTOPHER CHARLES)

Extension of time granted

Upon application of counsel Supervising Deputy State Public Defender Alexander Post, an extension of time in which to serve and file appellant's reply brief is granted to July 31, 2023. The court anticipates that after that date, only three further extensions totaling about 107 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).)

S271057 E076007 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 PEOPLE v. PRUDHOLME (RICKY)

Order filed

Due to clerical error, the order filed on May 18, 2023, is hereby amended to reflect the above title.

S279162 BUCK ON DISCIPLINE

Recommended discipline imposed: disbarred

The court orders that FRANK THOMAS BUCK (Respondent), State Bar Number 68417, 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 subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the date 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].)

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.