

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, MAY 29, 2024
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S283924 A168286 First Appellate District, Div. 2 **PEOPLE v. DAIN (YACOB)**
Petition for review granted; issues limited

The petition for review is granted.

The issue to be briefed and argued is limited to the following: Did the Court of Appeal err in remanding the case with directions to reinstate the strike finding and to resentence defendant as a person who has suffered a prior strike conviction under the Three Strikes Law? (See *People v. Williams* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 148, 164, fn. 7; see also *People v. McGlothlin* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 468, 478; *People v. Humphrey* (1997) 58 Cal.App.4th 809, 814; but see *People v. Mayfield* (2020) 50 Cal.App.5th 1096, 1109; *People v. Strong* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 328, 347.)

Pending review, the opinion of the Court of Appeal, which is currently published at 99 Cal.App.5th 399, may be cited, not only for its persuasive value, but also for the limited purpose of establishing the existence of a conflict in authority that would in turn allow trial courts to exercise discretion under *Auto Equity Sales, Inc. v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 450, 456, to choose between sides of any such conflict. (See *Standing Order Exercising Authority Under California Rules of Court, Rule 8.1115(e)(3), Upon Grant of Review or Transfer of a Matter with an Underlying Published Court of Appeal Opinion*, Administrative Order 2021-04-21; Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(e)(3) and corresponding Comment, par. 2.)

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

S284662 A167813 First Appellate District, Div. 3 **PEOPLE v. MONTGOMERY,
JR., (STEVEN LAURENT)**

Petition for review granted

The petition for review is granted.

Pending review, the opinion of the Court of Appeal, which is currently published at 100 Cal.App.5th 768, may be cited, not only for its persuasive value, but also for the limited purpose of establishing the existence of a conflict in authority that would in turn allow trial courts to exercise discretion under *Auto Equity Sales, Inc. v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 450, 456, to choose between sides of any such conflict. (See *Standing Order Exercising Authority Under California Rules of Court, Rule 8.1115(e)(3), Upon Grant of Review or Transfer of a Matter with an Underlying Published Court of Appeal Opinion*, Administrative Order 2021-04-21; Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(e)(3) and corresponding Comment, par. 2.)

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

S152556**PEOPLE v. OROZCO (JOSE
LUIS)**

Supplemental briefing ordered

If appellant contends any changes in the law (including any ameliorative statute) since the filing of the reply brief are relevant to this appeal, appellant shall serve and file a supplemental opening brief not to exceed 50 pages on or before July 22, 2024, addressing those changes and their relevance to this case. 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.

S167010**PEOPLE v. ARIAS
(LORENZO INEZ) &
MENDOZA (LUIS)**

Supplemental briefing ordered

If appellant Lorenzo Inez Arias or appellant Luis Mendoza contends any changes in the law (including any ameliorative statute) since the filing of appellant's reply brief are relevant to their respective appeals, appellant shall serve and file a supplemental opening brief not to exceed 50 pages on or before July 22, 2024, addressing those changes and their relevance to this case. The People may thereafter serve and file a supplemental answering brief, not to exceed 50 pages in length, to any supplemental opening brief filed pursuant to this order. Any supplemental answering brief must be served and filed within 30 days of the filing of the supplemental opening brief. Each appellant may thereafter serve and file a reply, not to exceed 25 pages in length, to the supplemental answering brief. Any reply brief must be served and filed within 20 days of the filing of the supplemental answering brief.

S169689**PEOPLE v. EVANS (STEVE
CARL)**

Supplemental briefing ordered

If appellant contends any changes in the law (including any ameliorative statute) since the filing of the reply brief are relevant to this appeal, appellant shall serve and file a supplemental opening brief not to exceed 50 pages on or before July 22, 2024, addressing those changes and their relevance to this case. 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.

S174232**PEOPLE v. KEMP (DARRYL THOMAS)**

Supplemental briefing ordered

If appellant contends any changes in the law (including any ameliorative statute) since the filing of the reply brief are relevant to this appeal, appellant shall serve and file a supplemental opening brief not to exceed 50 pages on or before July 22, 2024, addressing those changes and their relevance to this case. 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.

S284341 C096979 Third Appellate District**PEOPLE v. SANTOS (TIMOTHY MARVIN)**

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. Superior Court (Guevara)*, S283305 (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, Jenkins, and Evans, JJ.

S284401 B327727 Second Appellate District, Div. 1**PEOPLE v. ESCOBAR (MARK ANTHONY)**

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. McCune*, S276303 (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, Jenkins, and Evans, JJ.

S284423 B330204 Second Appellate District, Div. 4**IN RE RYDER S.**

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 *In re Dezi C.*, S275578 (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, Jenkins, and Evans, JJ.

S284601 C096502 Third Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. AIELLO
(JEFFERY KEITH)**

Petition for review granted; briefing deferred

The petition for review is granted. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of related issues in *People v. Bankston*, S044739 and *People v. Hin*, S141519 (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, Jenkins, and Evans, JJ.

S284631 A167801 First Appellate District, Div. 2

**PEOPLE v. ANDREWS
JOEHN)**

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. McCune*, S276303 (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, Jenkins, and Evans, JJ.

S284679 E079739 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

**PEOPLE v. HERNANDEZ
(GONZALO)**

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 *In re Hernandez*, S282186 (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, Jenkins, and Evans, JJ.

S284688 B324835 Second Appellate District, Div. 8

**PEOPLE v. KENNEDY (JOHN
FITZGERALD)**

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. Lopez*, S281488 (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, Jenkins, and Evans, JJ.

S284690 G061913 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3 **PEOPLE v. TRAN (THO HOANG)**

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 *In re Hernandez*, S282186 (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, Jenkins, and Evans, JJ.

S284697 D083006 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **DAVIS (DAMIEN T.) v. NISSAN NORTH AMERICA, INC.**

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 *Ford Motor Warranty Cases*, S279969 (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, Jenkins, and Evans, JJ.

S284724 B327562 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 **PEOPLE v. MARTIN (CURTIS GENE)**

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. Rhodius*, S283169 (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, Jenkins, and Evans, JJ.

S279197 C092147 Third Appellate District **PEOPLE v. JORDAN (DEANDREW)**

Transferred to Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, after hold

The above-captioned matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, with directions to vacate its decision with respect to Penal Code section 186.22 amendments and reconsider it in light of *People v. Clark* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 743. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(d).)

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

S280094 B319268 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 **PEOPLE v. HAMILTON
(RICKY)**

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

The above-captioned matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Six, with directions to vacate its decision with respect to Penal Code section 186.22 amendments and reconsider it in light of *People v. Clark* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 743, and *People v. Cooper* (2023) 14 Cal.5th 735. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(d).)

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

S283775 **HOLLINGSHEAD (JILLIAN)
v. STATE BAR OF
CALIFORNIA**

Petition for writ of mandate/prohibition denied

S284158 **ATAM (ESTHER TENDO) v.
S.C. (KAISER FOUNDATION
HOSPITALS)**

Petition for review denied

S284182 F085521 Fifth Appellate District **BAZZO (FRANK MONACO)
v. BRAZIL (S.)**

Petition for review denied

S284218 E080083 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 **PEOPLE v. LEWIS (PAUL
DIXON)**

Petition for review denied

S284248 A168942 First Appellate District, Div. 4 **FRIEDLI (ULRICH) v. TONG
(ERNESTO)**

Petition for review denied

S284250 G061535 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3 **BIOCORRX, INC. v. VDM
BIOCHEMICALS, INC.**

Petition for review denied

S284251

**ANDERSON (ASHLIE R.) v.
AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
("AAA") LLC**

Petition for review denied

S284258 G062526 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

**GOMEZ, JR., (EDDIE) v. S.C.
(PEOPLE)**

Petition for review denied

S284274 B319392 Second Appellate District, Div. 7

**ASHLOCK (BRADLEY) v.
BEREMESH (ARSEN)**

Petition for review denied

S284284 B316970 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

**M. (K.) v. CALIFORNIA
OFFICE OF
ADMINISTRATIVE
HEARINGS (LOS ANGELES
COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF
CHILDREN & FAMILY
SERVICES)**

Petition for review denied

S284294 B327366 Second Appellate District, Div. 7

**TSATRYAN (ARTHUR &
POLINA), MARRIAGE OF**

Petition for review denied

S284301 H050636 Sixth Appellate District

**McGILL (LOWRI) v.
HEARTHSTONE CA
PROPERTIES I, LLC**

Petition for review denied

S284309 B330861/B331617 Second Appellate District, Div. 2 **IN RE E.P.**

Petition for review denied

S284323 E078868 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

SAPP (ROSCOE), ESTATE OF

Petition for review denied

S284327	B329208 Second Appellate District, Div. 4	PEOPLE v. ORTEZ (MANUEL ECSAU)
Petition for review denied		
S284331	B326141 Second Appellate District, Div. 5	IN RE K.C.
Petition for review denied		
S284356	B314741 Second Appellate District, Div. 7	HENREID (PAUL) v. SKAGGS (RICHARD)
Petition for review denied		
S284376	A167503 First Appellate District, Div. 1	PEOPLE v. RIVAS (ADAN CONTRERAS)
Petition for review denied		
S284382	A165222/A166005 First Appellate District, Div. 5	GABATO (LARA) v. FUNG (DELFINA)
Petition for review denied		
S284391	B324847 Second Appellate District, Div. 3	PEOPLE v. PACHECO (MIGUEL FLORES)
Petition for review denied		
S284394	C098606 Third Appellate District	IN RE J.A.
Petition for review denied		
S284395	B322428 Second Appellate District, Div. 5	PEOPLE v. GASPAR (JUAN CARLOS)
Petition for review denied		
S284400	G061814 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3	SPIZZIRRI (MARC) v. MACH-1 AUTOGROUP, LLC
Petition for review denied		

S284404 C070706 Third Appellate District

PEOPLE v. TRAN (RICKY VAN)

Petition for review denied

S284405 E080145 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

PEOPLE v. OSBORNE (HEIDI ELIZABETH)

Petition for review denied

Guerrero, C. J., and Corrigan, J., were recused and did not participate.

S284408 D080978 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

ANDRADE (SANJUANA) v. WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Petition for review denied

S284410 B319573 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

PEOPLE v. MURDOCH, JR., (CHARLES FRANKLIN)

Petition for review denied

S284420 D082202 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

HAERING (KELLY) v. COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

Petition for review denied

S284427 E083340 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

TARBUTTON (THOMAS) v. S.C. (DEUTSCHE BANK TRUST COMPANY)

Petition for review denied

S284431 A166114 First Appellate District, Div. 3

PEOPLE v. WATTS (CAMREN)

Petition for review denied

S284433 B320388 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

AGOURA HILLS, CITY OF v. BINA (SHAHAZ)

Petition for review denied

S284450 F086992 Fifth Appellate District

**POTTS (KEVIN LYNN) v. S.C.
(PEOPLE)**

The request for judicial notice is denied.

Petitioner's application to file the transcript of the January 27, 2022, hearing held pursuant to *People v. Marsden* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 118 under seal is granted. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.47.)

The clerk of this court is directed to file the above-noted transcript under seal.

The petition for review is denied.

S284469 B322160 Second Appellate District, Div. 8

**SIMMONS (RUSSELL) v.
LEISSNER (TIM)**

Petition for review denied

S284476 C093763 Third Appellate District

**BEKKERMAN (ALINA) v.
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT
OF TAX & FEE
ADMINISTRATION**

Petition for review denied

S284492 H049688 Sixth Appellate District

**SINGH (BINDY H.S.B.) v.
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA**

Petition for review denied

S284494 A164463 First Appellate District, Div. 3

**SAN FRANCISCO FEDERAL
CREDIT UNION v. SAN
FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL
TRANSPORTATION
AUTHORITY**

Petition for review denied

S284500 A165269/A166497 First Appellate District, Div. 1

**LIBERTY LAW OFFICE, INC.
v. THE BLOOM FIRM**

Petition for review denied

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

S284502 D082001 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

**PEOPLE v. COOPER
(DANTEA TERRELL)**

Petition for review denied

S284507 F086307 Fifth Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. AVILA-GUZMAN
(ANGEL)**

The petition for review is denied without prejudice to any relief to which defendant might be entitled after this court decides *People v. Kopp*, S257844.

S284510 G063890 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3
Petition for review denied

LOPEZ (ARTHUR) ON H.C.

S284511 B316091/B317123 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

**JIMENEZ CHAVEZ
(ARCELIA) v.
NORMANDIE/WILSHIRE
RETIREMENT HOTEL, INC.**

Petition for review denied

S284513 B324008 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

**PEOPLE v. YOUNG (DENEAL
D.)**

Petition for review denied

S284514 C099076 Third Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. MONTEZ
(RONALD)**

Petition for review denied

S284536 C097084 Third Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. JONES
(VINCENT)**

Petitions for review denied

S284539 A165447 First Appellate District, Div. 4
Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. BATISTA (JOHN)

S284541 F085404 Fifth Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. GUINN (JOSEPH
DAVID)**

Petition for review denied

S284543 D081891 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

**PEOPLE v. SALIH
(SEYIDXAN)**

Petition for review denied

S284548 C098085 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. LEE (RICHARD ELMO)

S284550 G061788 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. FERGUSON (LUKE WILLIAM)

S284561 B325169 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. SARDIN (DEON LOREN)

S284574 A167792 First Appellate District, Div. 5

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. KNOWLES (RODERICK JAMES)

S284577 A167785 First Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

PARRISH (CB) v. LITTLE (MARILYN D.)

S284578 B321888 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

MATLOUBIAN (MORRIS) v. MANSUR (ZAHAL)

S284580 G062269 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. GUTIERREZ (DANIEL JUNIOR)

S284582 F084336 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. VANATTI (LYNDEN)

S284587 F085004 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. COOPER (COYETTA LYNN)

S284590 A166581 First Appellate District, Div. 2

**COUNTY OF ALAMEDA
DEPARTMENT OF CHILD
SUPPORT SERVICES v. O.
(T.); P. (J.)**

Petition for review denied

S284591 F085926 Fifth Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. SANCHEZ
(ROBERT)**

Petition for review denied

S284592 E082354 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

**PEOPLE v. BRAZIER (KEVIN
DEON)**

Petition for review denied

S284593 G061720 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

**PEOPLE v. REYES (VENICIO
LOPEZ)**

Petition for review denied

S284594 C099379 Third Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. THOMAS
(WILLIAM)**

Petition for review denied

S284604 C096536 Third Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. O'DONNELL
(JAMES THOMAS)**

Petition for review denied

S284605 C097888 Third Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. DUGGAN
(ROBERT DUANE)**

Petition for review denied

S284606 H049478 Sixth Appellate District

PEOPLE v. CID (JUAN SOTO)

Petition for review denied

S284609 B317559 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

**PEOPLE v. HUNTER
(BRANDON EUGENE)**

Petition for review denied

S284612 A162846 First Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. NELSON (ERICK LAMAR)

S284614 G060049 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. LEWIS (RODNEY TAUREAN)

S284617 F084260 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. SANCHEZ (JOHN GIL)

S284618 F084253 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. CASTILLO, JR., (MIGUEL ACOSTA)

S284626 A164154 First Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. PANIAGUA-ROJAS (JESUS)

S284627 B328403 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

NEWELL (ROBERT HARDY) v. GARLAND (MERRICK BRIAN)

S284628 C098359 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. ALLEN (CHARLES EDWARD)

S284630 F084957 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. BROWNMACE (NEAL GLEN)

S284632 B324829 Second Appellate District, Div. 7

Petition for review denied

IN RE DANTE C.

S284634 E080906 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. SPAUGY
(JEVERION WADE)**

S284649 B330018 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. VILLES CAS
(ALBERTO)**

S284650 B327326 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. JOHNSON
(EMMETT)**

S284651 C096465 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. VASQUEZ-
OROZCO (JUAN CARLOS)**

S284652 F084535 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. HERNANDEZ
(LEONARDO MONDRAGON)**

S284653 F084809 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. THOMASON
(SEANTAZZ DOMONIK)**

S284654 C098297 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. LOVELESS
(HOWARD)**

S284656 B329230 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. CASTELLANOS
(LISINIO ALFREDO)**

S284659 H051889 Sixth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**ROMERO (JEANCARLO) v.
S.C. (PEOPLE)**

S284667 A167667 First Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. WALKER
(JEREMY)**

S284669 E083134 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review & application for stay denied

**FINLEY (TYLER
LAWRENCE) v. S.C.
(PEOPLE)**

S284670 F084451 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. BRACKENRIDGE
(KEON ANDRE)**

S284671 E083589 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review & application for stay denied

**OCHOA (SEBASTIAN HUGO)
v. S.C. (PEOPLE)**

S284673 A165893 First Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. FRANKLIN
(WILLIS PETER)**

S284675 C096106 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. SIGLER (JEFF
LAMONTE)**

S284678 B325488 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. S. (K.)

S284681 G061657 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**DUFFY (JOHN) v.
WINTHROP (REID A.)**

S284687 C098061 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. VUE (BEE)

S284689 F085745 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. RICE (DERRICK LAMONTE)

S284692 D082755 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. ZUNIGA (MARTIN SOTO)

S284693 C097421 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. CAIN (RAY RAY)

S284694 F083948 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

GONZALEZ (RICARDO) v. HETTINGA TRANSPORTATION, INC.; ZENITH INSURANCE COMPANY

S284696 C098725 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. HARVEY (LAMAR ROBERT)

S284699 F084883 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. KNIGHT (JOSHUA)

S284705 D082264 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. ZAMORA (FRANCISCO URIAS)

S284707 G062194 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. LYBURTUS (JOSEPH)

S284708 F084930 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. DAVIS, JR.,
(ROBERT EARL)**

S284711 H051311 Sixth Appellate District

Petition for review denied
Evans, J., is of the opinion the petition should be granted.

**PEOPLE v. S.C.
(WOODWARD)**

S284716 B336187 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**BROWN (CHRISTOPHER J.)
ON H.C.**

S284719 C097248 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. HONEYCUTT
(DWIGHT STEWART)**

S284722 B315845 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v.
HOLLINGSWORTH
(MARQUECE LAMAR)**

S284723 H051230 Sixth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**RAMACHANDRAN (SATISH)
v. CITY OF LOS ALTOS**

S284726 B323346 Second Appellate District, Div. 7

Petition for review denied

**DOWLING (GREGORY) v.
URIOSTEGUI (DIANE)**

S284737 F084718 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. YEPEZ
(ALEJANDRO)**

S284744 H052020 Sixth Appellate District

**SEPEHRY-FARD (FAREED)
v. S.C. (U.S. BANK
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION)**

Petition for review denied

S284748 A167096 First Appellate District, Div. 2

**PEOPLE v. DANIELS
(DARRYL)**

Petition for review denied

S284758 B329331 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

**SCHWARTZ (SCOTT) v.
NOYA (DAVID)**

Petition for review denied

S284976 F087058 Fifth Appellate District

**REEVES (ALISHA M. &
WADE R.), MARRIAGE OF**

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S284980 A169663 First Appellate District, Div. 3

**SMOTHERS (SHERILL
LYNN) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)**

Petition for review denied

S284992 C100620 Third Appellate District

**RODRIGUEZ (MARIO) v. S.C.
(PEOPLE)**

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S280348

**WASHINGTON (RODERICK)
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 the disclosure of discovery. In this respect, petitioner alleges that he was subject to discriminatory prosecution; that the prosecutor deliberately destroyed evidence, fabricated a search warrant, engaged in racially motivated questioning, and improperly denied him discovery; and that the trial court made racist statements and engaged in racist conduct.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to violations of the Racial Justice Act; motion requesting such disclosure shall describe the types of records or information sought].)

The petition also fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial

Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or to support the claim that defendant was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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 request for discovery is denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S280356

**WHITSON (IAN JUSTIN) ON
H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S280463

**WASHINGTON (RODERICK)
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 the appointment of counsel. In this respect, petitioner alleges that he was subject to racial profiling, and that his telephone use while in custody was improperly limited.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts constituting a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The petition also fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or to support the claim that defendant was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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 request for counsel is denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S280820**WASHINGTON (RODERICK)
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 the disclosure of discovery and the appointment of counsel. Petitioner alleges that he “was subjected to racial discrimination, bias, and an unfair opportunity . . . to litigate his Fourth Amendment issue of illegal search and seizure and fabricated search warrants and affidavits . . . in violation of Racial Justice Act” He also alleges that he was charged and sentenced more harshly than other defendants due to his race, ethnicity, or national origin.

The Attorney General asserts that these claims have been forfeited. It is unnecessary to resolve that issue because petitioner has not established that he is entitled to discovery, appointment of counsel, or relief.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the disclosure of discovery or for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to violations of the Racial Justice Act; motion requesting such disclosure shall describe the types of records or information sought]; 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts constituting a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The petition also fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or to support the claim that defendant was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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 requests for discovery and counsel are denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S280976**WASHINGTON (RODERICK)
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 the appointment of counsel. In this respect, petitioner alleges that his trial counsel failed to bring a motion for a new trial and gave him erroneous legal advice; that the trial court improperly denied him access to transcripts; and that he was assaulted by sheriff’s deputies when he attempted to secure transcripts.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts constituting a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The petition also fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial

Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or to support the claim that defendant was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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 request for counsel is denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S281148

**WASHINGTON (RODERICK)
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 prosecutor gave perjured testimony; that petitioner was denied discovery; that evidence in his case was fabricated; that a search warrant was deficient; that the judge, prosecutor, and an investigator in his case exhibited bias; that the prosecution “overcharged” him and that the “LA County DA’s office has a pattern of fabricating, falsifying, and misrepresenting evidence in [cases involving] people of color and charging people who share his race, ethnicity, or national origin more harshly than other groups in LA county”; and that he received a harsher sentence than other similarly situated inmates.

The petition fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or to support the claim that defendant was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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.

S281149

**WASHINGTON (RODERICK)
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 misconduct in connection with the procurement and execution of a search warrant or warrants, and the presentation of evidence at his trial.

The petition fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that

adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or to support the claim that defendant was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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.

S281246

**WASHINGTON (RODERICK)
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 the disclosure of discovery. Petitioner alleges that the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department improperly issued a serious rules violation to petitioner for abusing his phone privileges, and that the prosecutor and the trial judge exhibited bias by indefinitely suspending his phone privileges.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to violations of the Racial Justice Act; motion requesting such disclosure shall describe the types of records or information sought].)

The petition also fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 745, subd. (a)(1)-(2); cf. *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity]; cf. also *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 request for discovery is denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S281349

**WASHINGTON (RODERICK)
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 misconduct in connection with the execution of a search warrant, and that he was "extorted" through a restitution order entered in his case.

The petition fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of

racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 745, subd. (a)(1)-(2); cf. *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity]; cf. also *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.

S281360

**WASHINGTON (RODERICK)
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 the disclosure of discovery. In this respect, petitioner alleges that he received an excessive sentence due to “racial discrimination and deliberate retaliation” by the trial judge and prosecutor.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the disclosure of discovery. (Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to violations of the Racial Justice Act; motion requesting such disclosure shall describe the types of records or information sought].)

The petition also fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or how they involved defendant being charged, convicted, or sentenced in a manner violative of the Racial Justice Act. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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 request for discovery is denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S281461

**WASHINGTON (RODERICK)
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 the appointment of counsel. In this respect, petitioner alleges that he “was subjected to intentional racial discrimination and retaliation” by a judge, prosecutor, and court personnel that “unjustifiably denied and obstructed judicial review in his criminal case in violation of the Racial Justice Act,” including an alleged failure by the superior court to properly address earlier habeas corpus petitions filed by petitioner.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts constituting a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The petition also fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial

Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 745, subd. (a)(1)-(2); cf. *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity]; cf. also *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 request for counsel is denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S281516**WASHINGTON (RODERICK)
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 the disclosure of discovery and the appointment of counsel. In this respect, petitioner alleges that he “was subject to racial discrimination, deliberate and purposeful retaliation and perjury” by several participants at his trial; that fabricated evidence was introduced against him; that discovery was improperly withheld from him; that the trial court improperly ordered victim restitution; and that he was charged more harshly than other similarly-situated defendants due to his race, ethnicity, or national origin.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the disclosure of discovery or for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to violations of the Racial Justice Act; motion requesting such disclosure shall describe the types of records or information sought]; 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts constituting a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The petition also fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or to support the claim that defendant was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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 requests for discovery and counsel are denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S281623**WASHINGTON (RODERICK)
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 the appointment of counsel. In this respect, petitioner alleges that he “was subject to racial discrimination and retaliation” by various judges, a prosecutor, and counsel; that there was a “fabricated bail hearing,” fabricated evidence, and a violation of his right to a timely preliminary hearing; that he was wrongly denied discovery and transcripts were improperly withheld from him; and that counsel provided him with ineffective assistance. Petitioner also alleges that his arrest and detention were racially motivated, and raises a Racial Justice Act “claim to challenge racial disparities in Los Angeles County arrest and detention and the downstream racially disparities in charging decision resulting in his illegal detention.”

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts constituting a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The petition also fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or to support the claim that defendant was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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 request for counsel is denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S281770**WASHINGTON (RODERICK)
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 the disclosure of discovery and the appointment of counsel. In this respect, petitioner alleges that false evidence was introduced at his trial; that he was subjected to an illegal arrest and detention; that property was stolen from him; and that the trial court did not properly assess victim restitution.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the disclosure of discovery or for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to violations of the Racial Justice Act; motion requesting such disclosure shall describe the types of records or information sought]; 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts constituting a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The petition also fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that

adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or to support the claim that defendant was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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 requests for discovery and counsel are denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S281838**WASHINGTON (RODERICK)
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 the appointment of counsel. In this respect, petitioner alleges that property was improperly seized and stolen from him. The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, §1473, subd (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts constituting a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The petition also fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 745, subd. (a)(1)-(2); cf. *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity]; cf. also *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 request for counsel is denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S282328**WASHINGTON (RODERICK)
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 subjected to racial bias by a judge, prosecutor, and counsel “who withheld evidence of restitution . . . to justify sentencing to prison as punishment and retaliation”; that he was “oversentenced under RJA as punishment for complaining” about the judge, prosecutor, and counsel; that the judge improperly limited defense argument regarding sentencing; that fabricated material was introduced against him; that a misdemeanor conviction was erroneously elevated to a felony; and that he was convicted upon perjured and insufficient evidence.

The petition fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice

Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or to support the claim that defendant was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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.

S282555

**WASHINGTON (RODERICK)
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 a judge, prosecutor, and his counsel “withheld discovery, fabricated sentence, and threatened” a witness and were complicit in a codefendant’s alleged perjury; that he was denied the opportunity to represent himself, that his trial counsel failed to consult with him and made other errors in the course of representation; that there was insufficient disclosure that a witness had been arrested and/or convicted; and that he and a codefendant were “racially profiled” by the district attorney.

The petition fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or to support the claim that defendant was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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.

S283105

HAYNES (DAMONE) ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S283251

**WASHINGTON (RODERICK
NATHANIEL) 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 subjected to oversentencing” and wrongful denial of

parole in retaliation “for exercising his First Amendment right in violation of the RJA.” The petition fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or to support the claim that defendant was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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.

S283360

**WASHINGTON (RODERICK
NATHANIEL) 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 the disclosure of discovery. In this respect, petitioner alleges that he “was subjected to racial bias by judge, attorney in the case, and jurors exhibited bias towards petitioner during trial”; that his conviction was obtained based on false testimony; that he was denied services when he elected to represent himself; and that “[t]he judge, attorney in the case, jurors, law enforcement officers subjected petitioner [to] bias, deliberate false charges, and committed perjury under oath. The petitioner alleges that judge, attorney in the case, law enforcement officer used false testimony to convict petitioner in front of an all white and Mexican jury panel who was biased toward petitioner.”

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to violations of the Racial Justice Act; motion requesting such disclosure shall describe the types of records or information sought].)

The petition also fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or to support the claim that defendant was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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 request for discovery is denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S283390**WASHINGTON (RODERICK
NATHANIEL) 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 the disclosure of discovery and the appointment of counsel. In this respect, petitioner alleges that he was subjected to “deliberate fabricated false information . . . in violation of the Racial Justice Act,” and that the denial of a prior habeas corpus petition involved racial profiling by law enforcement, the prosecution, and the judge who denied the petition. Petitioner also alleges that the failure to reduce his sentence is evidence of racial disparities in sentencing. The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the disclosure of discovery or for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to violations of the Racial Justice Act; motion requesting such disclosure shall describe the types of records or information sought]; 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts constituting a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The petition also fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or to support the claim that defendant was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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 requests for discovery and counsel are denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S283399**WASHINGTON (RODERICK
NATHANIEL) 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 the disclosure of discovery and the appointment of counsel. In this respect, petitioner alleges that he “was subjected to deliberate falsification of search warrant and racial[ly] discriminated against by” several judges, a prosecutor, investigators, and defense counsel, with the alleged misconduct including an allegedly improper interrogation by investigators and deficient performance by counsel.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the disclosure of discovery or for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to violations of the Racial Justice Act; motion requesting such disclosure shall describe the types of records or information sought]; 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts constituting a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The petition also fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or to support the claim that defendant was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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 requests for discovery and counsel are denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S283406

**WASHINGTON (RODERICK
WASHINGTON) 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 the disclosure of discovery and the appointment of counsel. In this respect, petitioner alleges that he “was subjected to deliberate factual false interaction by judge, DA and LAPD officer in his case in violation of Racial Justice Act,” and that his motion to reduce a prior conviction from a felony to a misdemeanor was denied due to racial bias.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the disclosure of discovery or for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d) [providing for disclosure of evidence relevant to violations of the Racial Justice Act; motion requesting such disclosure shall describe the types of records or information sought]; 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts constituting a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The petition also fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or to support the claim that defendant was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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 requests for discovery and counsel are denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S283565

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

**GEREAU (HANIF H.) ON
H.C.****S283592**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

**McGEE (HAWTHORNE) ON
H.C.****S283610**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

**TAFOYA (ROBERT
MICHAEL) ON H.C.****S283629**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

**TUCKER (JORDAN ALLEN)
ON H.C.****S283647**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

**WRIGHT (DERRICK
MUNZEL) ON H.C.****S283649**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

**MACHADO (DELFINO
CARDENAS) ON H.C.****S283653**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Waltreus* (1965) 62 Cal.2d 218, 225 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that were rejected on appeal]; *In re Miller* (1941) 17 Cal.2d 734, 735 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are repetitive].)

**LOYD (LAMAR EUGENE) ON
H.C.****S283671**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence]; *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].)

**GARCIA (NATALIE
ELIZABETH) ON H.C.**

S283677**CANDLER (KEITH WAYNE)
ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S283682**RAMIREZ (JOSEPH
WILLIAM) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Robbins* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 770, 780 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are untimely]; *In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 767-769 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are successive].)

S283716**OTINIANO (ALBERTO
MIGUEL) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S283724**LaVERGNE, JR.,
(HARRISON) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S283747**TAFOYA (ROBERT
MICHAEL) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S283756**HERRERA (ISRAEL) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence]; *In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 767-769 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are successive].)

S283794**RIVERA (LUIS) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S283795**BARBIR (RAJKO) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Robbins* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 770, 780 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are untimely]; *In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 767-769 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are successive].)

S283805**McDANIELS (SHELTON T.)
ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Waltreus* (1965) 62 Cal.2d 218, 225 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that were rejected on appeal].)

S283811**BURNETTE (BEAU MIKE)
ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Waltreus* (1965) 62 Cal.2d 218, 225 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that were rejected on appeal].)

S283825**SALAS (RAFAEL) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S283846**EMERSON (SCOTT RAY) ON
H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence]; *In re Lessard* (1965) 62 Cal.2d 497, 503 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that raise Fourth Amendment violations]; *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].)

S283849**GIBBS (TREMAINE) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence]; *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].)

S283858**JONES (CHARLES W.) ON
H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S283874**MACKEY (VINCENT
ROBERT) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S284074**WASHINGTON (RODERICK
NATHANIEL) 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 the appointment of counsel. In this respect, petitioner alleges that the superior court “deliberately and purposefully and unjustifiably obstructed the petitioner’s right of access to the court to file his writ of habeas corpus petition challenging racial profiling,” and withheld documents from him.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts constituting a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The petition also fails to make a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) The petition fails to allege particularized facts that adequately describe the alleged actions and how they reflected racial bias or animus, or to support the claim that defendant was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning racial bias or animus or the use of racially discriminatory language. (Pen. Code, § 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]; cf. also *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 request for counsel is denied. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S284460**SALAS (RAFAEL) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied as moot

S284581**SINGH (RAGHVENDRA) ON
H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].) Individual claims are denied, as applicable. (See *In re Miller* (1941) 17 Cal.2d 734, 735 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are repetitive].)

S284736**BENNETT (MARIO KEITH)
ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S284769**WASHINGTON (RODERICK
NATHANIEL) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See Pen. Code, § 745, subd. (j)(5).)

S284906**JOHNSON II (DANIEL
WEBSTER) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence].)

S283854 B322878 Second Appellate District, Div. 4**LOS ANGELES, CITY OF v.
GROUP IX BP PROPERTIES,
LP**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S283945 A163051 First Appellate District, Div. 2**ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION
INFORMATION CENTER v.
DEPARTMENT OF FISH &
WILDLIFE (GREEN
DIAMOND RESOURCE
COMPANY)**

Publication requests denied (case closed)

S284009 B326839 Second Appellate District, Div. 3**RAMIREZ (FERNANDO) v.
RAZO (NICHOLAS)**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S284184 E083216 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2**UTTERBACK (LILY) v. S.C.
(PEOPLE)**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S284201 B322703 Second Appellate District, Div. 2**CHAPMAN (DONNA) v.
ALOHA DIVE SHOP**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S284266 B324023 Second Appellate District, Div. 1**KAPUR (RAHUL) v. S.C.
(PAN)**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S284299 D082723/D082853 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **IN RE P.L.**
Depublication request denied (case closed)

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.

S284399

**PEOPLE v. KOREIE
(JOSEPH)**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S136171

**PEOPLE v. WESSON
(MARCUS DELON)**

Extension of time granted

Upon application of counsel Mark E. Cutler, an extension of time in which to serve and file appellant's supplemental opening brief is granted to July 29, 2024. 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.

S142959

**PEOPLE v. YOUNG
(DONALD RAY) & YOUNG
(TIMOTHY JAMES)**

Extension of time granted

Upon application of Assistant State Public Defender Denise Kendall, an extension of time in which to serve and file Donald Young's opening brief is granted to August 2, 2024. The court anticipates that after that date, only two further extensions totaling about 66 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).)

S182161

**PEOPLE v. JACKSON
(LLOYD EARL)**

Extension of time granted

Respondent's Application and Declaration of Good Cause for Extension of Time to File Response to Appellant's Motion for Stay of Appeal filed on May 29, 2024, is hereby granted. After that date, no further extensions are contemplated. Respondent shall serve and file the response on or

before July 1, 2024. Appellant may thereafter serve and file a reply within 10 days after the People have filed their response.

S281599 B321947 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 **PEOPLE v. ANTONELLI
(TIMOTHY PATRIC)**

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 July 8, 2024.

S282854 **GUTIERREZ (HECTOR
HERNANDEZ) ON H.C.**

Extension of time granted

On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply to informal response is extended to July 15, 2024.

S282643 **EVANS (JOHNNY EARL) ON
H.C.**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the informal response is extended to July 8, 2024.

S284306 **MATTHEWS (TONEY
ROBERT) ON H.C.**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the informal response is extended to July 3, 2024.

S277475 C094172 Third Appellate District **PEOPLE v. JARAMILLO
(JAMES PEDRO)**

Counsel appointment order filed

The order filed on February 8, 2023, appointing Gordon Brownell as counsel for appellant is hereby vacated.

Martin Kassman is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S282462 B308495 Second Appellate District, Div. 4 **PEOPLE v. PEREZ (FRANK RAFAEL)**

Counsel appointment order filed

The order filed on February 23, 2024, appointing Richard Levy as counsel for appellant Frank Rafael Perez is hereby vacated. California Appellate Project is hereby appointed to represent appellant Frank Rafael Perez on the appeal now pending in this court.

S283548 E080674 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 **PEOPLE v. THOMAS (KEITH W.)**

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Steven S. Lubliner is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S283660 E081067 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 **PEOPLE v. CASARES, JR., (EDWARD)**

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Steven A. Torres is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S283708 C097977 Third Appellate District **PEOPLE v. JACKSON (TAVARES DESHAWN)**

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Brad J. Poore is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S283851 E080670 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 **PEOPLE v. ORTEGA (RAFAEL)**

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Rex Williams is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S283899 F085253 Fifth Appellate District

PEOPLE v. RHYNES (BOBBIE DALE)

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Central California Appellate Program is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S284060 F084952 Fifth Appellate District

PEOPLE v. GONZALEZ (FRANCISCO)

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, William Safford is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S284083 F085425 Fifth Appellate District

PEOPLE v. BOYD (JONATHAN KEITH)

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Scott Concklin is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S284117 C096075 Third Appellate District

PEOPLE v. YU (ANTHONY)

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Byron Charles Lichstein is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S284124 E080221 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

PEOPLE v. BLOCKER (DAMIEN RAYSEAN LEWIS)

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Mark D. Johnson is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S284259 C097389 Third Appellate District**PEOPLE v. KIMBLE (KELLY VAUGHN)**

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, William Safford is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S284521**ACCUSATION OF BRASUELL III**

Petition denied (accusation)

S284622**ACCUSATION OF WELLS**

Petition denied (accusation)

S284749**ACCUSATION OF BENNETT**

Petition denied (accusation)

S284434**MIYAMOTO ON DISCIPLINE**

Recommended discipline imposed

The court orders that LYNN AKEMI MIYAMOTO (Respondent), State Bar Number 128313, 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 February 23, 2024; 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 provide to the State Bar's Office of Probation proof of taking and passing the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination as recommended by the Hearing Department in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on February 23, 2024. 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.

S284435**CHAIX ON DISCIPLINE**

Recommended discipline imposed

The court orders that JOHN EDMOND CHAIX (Respondent), State Bar Number 153894, 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 is suspended from the practice of law for the first 30 days of probation;
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 February 21, 2024; 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 provide to the State Bar's Office of Probation proof of taking and passing the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination as recommended by the Hearing Department in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on February 21, 2024. Failure to do so may result in suspension. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.10(b).)

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. 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 \$250 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. One-half of the costs must be paid with Respondent's annual fees for each of the years 2025 and 2026. If Respondent fails to pay any installment as described above, or as may be modified in writing by the State Bar or the State Bar Court, the remaining balance is due and payable immediately.

S284437**JUE ON DISCIPLINE**

Recommended discipline imposed: disbarred

The court orders that CRAIG ALLYN JUE (Respondent), State Bar Number 118093, 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].)

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.

S284438**LUETTO ON DISCIPLINE**

Recommended discipline imposed: disbarred

The court orders that ADAM J. LUETTO (Respondent), State Bar Number 264188, 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].)

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.

S285126**ABBOTT ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of JOHN HOWARD ABBOTT, State Bar Number 150788, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285128**ALIRE ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of CHRISTINE L. ALIRE, State Bar Number 200800, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285130**BAEK ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of ANNIE JIHYUN BAEK, State Bar Number 243730, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285138**CARSON ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of KAREN WALRAVEN CARSON, State Bar Number 172423, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285139**DREW ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of ALEXANDER EDWARD DREW, State Bar Number 268218, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285140**GALBRAITH ON
RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of JEAN WILSON GALBRAITH, State Bar Number 235609, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285141**GELBER ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of RICHARD SCOTT GELBER, State Bar Number 195195, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285157**GUYON ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of CYNTHIA ANNE MONROE GUYON, State Bar Number 111795, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285159**FINN ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of KATHRYN JOHNSON FINN, State Bar Number 163061, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285161**KUSHNICK ON
RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of ANDREW SETH KUSHNICK, State Bar Number 264027, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285167**LIMM ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of LAWRENCE STEPHAN LIMM, State Bar Number 81353, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285168**MEIER ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of WALTER S. MEIER, State Bar Number 219603, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285169**MUNCH ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of SHIRLEY CANNON MUNCH, State Bar Number 123487, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285173**NAKASHIMA ON
RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of MONA JANE NAKASHIMA, State Bar Number 136550, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285174**NELSON ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of MICHAEL JAMES NELSON, State Bar Number 131488, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285175**REPASY ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of ROBERTA D. REPASY, State Bar Number 154880, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285176**SEEGER ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of KJELL HOVDEN SEEGER, State Bar Number 155528, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285177**STARR ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of NICOLE JO STARR, State Bar Number 235336, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285178**WALSH III ON
RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of CHARLES HENRY WALSH III, State Bar Number 142264, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285181

WU ON RESIGNATION

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of IVY WEI WU, State Bar Number 142401, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.