

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12, 2024
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

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

Petition for review granted

The petition for review is granted.

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

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

Petition for review granted

The petition for review is granted.

Pending review, the opinion of the Court of Appeal, which is currently published at 99 Cal.App.5th 1319, 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.

S168204 **PEOPLE v. MOSLEY (BARRY
WENDELL)**

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 29, 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.

S284629 H050599 Sixth Appellate District**PEOPLE v. SANCHEZ
(MANUEL MICHAEL)**

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.

S284661 D082990 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1**PEOPLE v. COOPER (LLOYD
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 *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.

S284817 E082177 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2**IN RE L.G.**

Petition for review granted; briefing deferred

The petitions for review are granted. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of a related issue in *In re Ja.O.*, S280572 (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.

S284836 G061630 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3**PEOPLE v. PATTERSON
(RAMON)**

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. Emanuel*, S280551 (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.

S284840 F086169 Fifth Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. HENDRIX
(JOSEPH JAMEL)**

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.

S284887 D081132 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

**BROOKLYN RESTAURANTS,
INC. v. SENTINEL
INSURANCE COMPANY,
LTD.**

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 *John's Grill, Inc. v. The Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc.*, S278481 (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.

The request for an order directing depublication of the opinion is denied.

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

S284964 E082124 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

IN RE C.B.

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 Ja.O.*, S280572 (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.

S284979 H050651 Sixth Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. TORRES (JOSE
JESUS)**

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.

S284862 C100422 Third Appellate District **D. (R.) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)**
Petition for review granted; transferred to Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, with directions to issue an order to show cause

The petition for review is granted. The matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, with directions to vacate its order denying mandate and to issue an order directing the respondent superior court to show cause why the relief sought in the petition should not be granted. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(d).)

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

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

S285055 B337359 Second Appellate District, Div. 5 **M. (S.) v. S.C. (LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT)**

Petition for review granted; transferred to Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Five, with directions to issue an order to show cause

Respondent's motion to file the unredacted exhibits in support of its answer under seal is granted. (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.550(d), 8.46(d).) In ordering the sealing, this court makes the findings required by California Rules of Court, rules 2.550(d) and 8.46(d)(6). The clerk of this court is directed to file respondent's unredacted exhibits under seal.

The petition for review is granted. The matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Five, with directions to vacate its order denying the writ of mandate and to issue an order directing the respondent superior court to show cause why the relief sought in the petition should not be granted. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(d).)

The temporary stay issued by this court on May 20, 2024, shall remain in place pending further order of the Court of Appeal.

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

S276858 A161579/A161644 First Appellate District, Div. 5 **PEOPLE v. GARCIA (ALEJANDRO)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Five

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

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

S277207 H049259 Sixth Appellate District **DUONG (SENH) ON H.C.**
Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District

The motion to expand briefing on review is denied.

The motion to file supplemental exhibits is denied.

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed, without prejudice to any relief that may be available for claims of racial disparities in sentencing. (See *id.* at p. 865, fn. 8.) (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S278726 B317490 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 **PEOPLE v. ALVAREZ
(DANIEL CHRISTOPHER)**
Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Six

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S278770 F079285 Fifth Appellate District **PEOPLE v. SUTTON
(CEDRIC JERMAINE)**
Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S279278 B322501 Second Appellate District, Div. 1 **PEOPLE v. WILSON
(KENNETH MICHAEL)**
Transferred to Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division One after hold

The above-captioned matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division One, with directions to vacate its decision and reconsider the cause in light of *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(d).)

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

S279311 H047892 Sixth Appellate District **PEOPLE v. BEJARANO III
(RODRIGO EDWARD)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S279335 B319762 Second Appellate District, Div. 4 **PEOPLE v. EVANS (TERRY
TYRONE)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Four

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S279458 E078723 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 **PEOPLE v. NGO (MY)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Two

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S280692 F084372 Fifth Appellate District **PEOPLE v. ANCHONDO
(GABRIEL)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S280745 B316996 Second Appellate District, Div. 5 **PEOPLE v. BUCHANAN, JR.,
(KEENON JAMAL)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Five

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S281258 F085642 Fifth Appellate District **PEOPLE v. PARKER (DAVID DUANE)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S281298 A166126 First Appellate District, Div. 5 **PEOPLE v. WASHINGTON (ISAIAH)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Five

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S281389 C093209 Third Appellate District **PEOPLE v. ETHERTON (KEVIN)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S281505 F083956 Fifth Appellate District **PEOPLE v. EDWARDS (MARLON DARNELL)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S281645 A165428 First Appellate District, Div. 1 **PEOPLE v. BROOKS (JERMAINE)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division One

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S281956 A165985 First Appellate District, Div. 3 **PEOPLE v. CLARK (JAMES ALLEN)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Three

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S282031 E080543 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 **PEOPLE v. JACKSON (STANLEY RUSSELL)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Two

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S282057 D081085 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **PEOPLE v. PALUMBO (JOHN MICHAEL)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S282271 B325218 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 **PEOPLE v. ALVEZ (JOHN CHARLES)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Six

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S282341 F084093 Fifth Appellate District **PEOPLE v. ESPINOZA (JOSEPH ANTONIO)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S282495 E080948 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 **PEOPLE v. SALGADO (ELIAS PERAZA)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Two

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S282701 G061931 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3 **PEOPLE v. PONCIO (KARINA LISSETH)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Three

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S282836 B325387 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 **PEOPLE v. CHAPPELL (ERIC LEE)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Six

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S282971 B326828 Second Appellate District, Div. 7 **PEOPLE v. RIOS (JUAN CARLOS)**

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

The above-captioned matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Seven, with directions to vacate its decision and reconsider the cause in light of *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(d).)

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

S283014 H050411 Sixth Appellate District **PEOPLE v. CARDENAS (RAYMOND ANTHONY)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S283134 B325028 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 **PEOPLE v. BARRASCOUT
(OSCAR RODOLFO)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Six

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S283283 B325929 Second Appellate District, Div. 1 **PEOPLE v. ESQUIVIAS
(JORGE)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division One

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S283401 B324331 Second Appellate District, Div. 5 **PEOPLE v. HUEZO (JUAN
CARLOS)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Five

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S283490 C097619 Third Appellate District **PEOPLE v. COLLINS
(JOHNNY PAUL)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S283574 E080712 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 **PEOPLE v. WALZ (PHILLIP
EDWARD)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Two

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

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

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Two

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S284187 G061598 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3 **A. (M.) v. F. (B.)**
Petition for review & depublication request(s) denied
Liu and Evans, JJ., are of the opinion the petition should be granted.

S284287 D083509 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **LOPEZ (ARTHUR) v. S.C.**
Petition for review denied

S284330 B321717 Second Appellate District, Div. 5 **IN RE A.G.**
Petition for review denied

Liu, Groban, and Evans, JJ., are of the opinion the petition should be granted.

(See Dissenting Statement by Liu, J.)

In re A.G.
S284330

Dissenting Statement by Justice Liu

For the reasons ably explained in Presiding Justice Rubin’s dissent, the circumstances surrounding A.G.’s plea raise serious questions as to whether his plea was voluntary. I would grant review.

The Legislature has made clear that the primary objectives of the juvenile justice system are rehabilitation and family reunification. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 202.) Detaining a minor in juvenile hall can compromise these objectives. Thus, a juvenile court “shall” order the release of a minor from custody unless the court finds specific facts warranting detention. (*Id.*, § 635, subd. (a).) A juvenile court may not ignore this clear directive and withhold releasing a minor from detention until the minor enters a guilty or no contest plea. When the juvenile court abuses its authority in such a manner, the voluntariness of the minor’s plea is dubious.

When the juvenile court initially ordered A.G.’s detention, it relied on a deficient detention report from the probation department. The court assured A.G. that it would base its ultimate detention decision on the upcoming pre-plea report. In that pre-plea report, the department changed its

position and recommended A.G.'s release. Contrary to its previous assurances, and despite the department's revised recommendation, the juvenile court refused to reconsider its detention order on two more occasions, including immediately before A.G. entered his plea. At that point, A.G. had been confined for over three weeks.

At the hearings on June 30, 2022, and July 1, 2022, A.G.'s counsel stated their understanding that the court would release A.G. once he entered the plea. The court responded by disabusing counsel of the notion that the court was promising A.G.'s release upon entry of the no contest plea, and the court confirmed that counsel had not promised A.G. that he would be released upon entering a plea. When the pre-plea report was again brought to the court's attention on June 30, the court took a break to read the report. But when the hearing resumed on July 1, the court again denied release. At that point, A.G. entered his plea, and the court immediately ordered his release based on the pre-plea report. As the prosecutor observed, nothing had changed in the circumstances bearing on whether A.G. should be released; the court had become aware of the probation department's release recommendation *before* A.G. entered his plea. The only change was that A.G. had gone ahead and entered his plea; only at that point did the court grant his release.

Additional circumstances suggest that A.G.'s plea was not voluntary and was instead made to obtain release. A.G. received no benefit from the prosecutor for admitting the allegation of second degree robbery, a strike offense. The lack of a benefit to A.G. is particularly significant as the record indicates A.G. potentially had a strong defense, including facts in the police report and video evidence that his involvement was minimal. In addition, A.G. entered into the plea agreement after he had advised the court that he feared for his safety. Direct or indirect fear or threats are relevant considerations when assessing whether an individual's plea was coerced. A.G. and his counsel repeatedly raised those fears with the court. During an earlier hearing, A.G.'s counsel stated probation officers allowed children to fight at juvenile hall, and there were indications A.G. was being pressured to do so. The juvenile court's offer to move A.G. to another facility or house him separately is beside the point. Indeed, A.G.'s mother had arranged for A.G. to be moved within juvenile hall, but A.G. continued to experience threats of violence.

(I note that A.G. was detained at Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall, one of two Los Angeles juvenile hall facilities that has been found unsuitable for detaining minors. (Ellis, *L.A. County Has 2 Months to Fix Problems in Juvenile Hall - or Get Everyone Out. Again*, L.A. Times (Feb. 15, 2024).) Numerous Los Angeles probation officers were recently placed on leave based on allegations of doing exactly what A.G.'s counsel reported - allowing or encouraging detained children to assault one another - and a video of such an incident has been released. (Queally & Ellis, *Video Shows Staff Allowing Assault by Youths at Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall*, L.A. Times (Apr. 12, 2024); Queally, *Juvenile Hall Fight Videos Raise Question: Can L.A. County Probation Reports be Trusted?* L.A. Times (May 30, 2024); see also County of Los Angeles Probation, *LA County Probation Puts Four More Officers on Leave at Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall after Finding Additional Incidents of Youth-on-Youth Violence* (Apr. 26, 2024) <<https://probation.lacounty.gov/lacountyprobationputsfourmoreofficersonleaveatlospadrinos/>> [as of June 12, 2024].))

Further, A.G. was 17 years old, was in ninth grade, and had no prior contact with the juvenile justice system. According to the probation department's reports, his mother said he was well-behaved at home, he had no gang associations, he had "a positive extended family," and his father had arranged for him to stay at his grandfather's house in Burbank upon release. It is a fair inference that A.G., realizing that the court was unwilling to release him despite these circumstances and the pre-plea report's recommendation, felt he had no option but to enter a no contest plea to obtain release.

The sequence of events in this case supports A.G.'s claim that after being detained for 24 days despite a pre-plea report recommending his release, he did not enter his plea voluntarily. Even after reading the report recommending A.G.'s release, the court inexplicably denied release until after A.G. entered his plea, even though nothing had changed. The upshot is that A.G. now has a strike offense, despite some evidence of his minimal involvement in the crime and no prior delinquency history. Because the trial court's refusal to release A.G. until he entered his plea raises serious questions as to whether the plea was voluntary, I would grant review.

LIU, J.

I Concur:

GROBAN, J.

EVANS, J.

S284375 G063906 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

**McDOUGAL (ROBERT
BOUTON) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)**

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S284390 B335197 Second Appellate District, Div. 7

**BARSEGIAN (HAIG) v. S.C.
(SCAN HEALTH PLAN)**

Petition for review denied

S284411 B335579 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

**CALHOON (ERNEST) v. S.C.
(CHA)**

Petition for review denied

S284413 B335793 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

**CALHOON (ERNEST) v. S.C.
(CHA)**

Petition for review denied

S284418 A167066 First Appellate District, Div. 5**PEOPLE v. POWELL
(DIANTAY)**

Petition for review denied

Liu and Evans, JJ., are of the opinion the petition should be granted.

(See Dissenting Statement by Evans, J.)

PEOPLE v. POWELL
S284418

Dissenting Statement by Justice Evans

This court recently held that Penal Code section 3051, subdivision (h)'s exclusion of youth offenders sentenced to life without the possibility of parole (LWOP) from the youth offender parole eligibility scheme does not - on its face or as applied to individuals serving LWOP for special circumstance murder - violate equal protection under a rational basis standard. (*People v. Hardin* (2024) 15 Cal.5th 834, 839, 866 (*Hardin*)). Powell's case presents two important issues the court left unaddressed in *Hardin*: first, whether excluding youthful offenders from the youth offender parole eligibility scheme constitutes cruel or unusual punishment under the California Constitution, and second, whether the LWOP exclusion constitutes cruel or unusual punishment by disproportionately impacting young African Americans, like Powell, and other young people of color. (See *id.* at p. 865, fn. 8.) Because Powell has raised serious concerns about the constitutionality of the LWOP exclusion, I would grant review.

When Diantay Powell was 18 years old, he shot and killed 16 year old Bobbie Sartain and 15-year-old Raquel Gerstel. On November 25, 2012, Powell was under the influence of alcohol and drugs. He and the two victims were passengers in a car, driven by Powell's cousin. At one point, Powell wanted the victims to exit his vehicle so he could pick up his girlfriend. The victims objected to getting out of the car. A verbal argument ensued. Powell forced the victims out of the car, and he ultimately shot them. A jury convicted Powell of various crimes including special circumstance murder, which carries a mandatory term of LWOP.

At sentencing, the trial court had no choice but to condemn Powell to life in prison without the possibility of parole. It could not consider whether LWOP was appropriate and just, in light of mitigating evidence such as Powell's youth, his alcohol and drug use, his experience being a victim of gun violence at 13 years old, and his traumatic experiences in the foster care system. Powell - now 30 years old - cannot ever go before the Board of Parole Hearings to demonstrate that he should be granted youth offender parole based on his youthful attributes at the time of the offense, his present day insight, and his rehabilitation.

The California Constitution prohibits cruel or unusual punishment. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 17, italics added.) Our state constitution's prohibition against cruel or unusual punishment is distinct from the federal constitution's prohibition against cruel *and* unusual. The distinction "is

purposeful and substantive.” (*People v. Carmony* (2005) 127 Cal.App.4th 1066, 1085.) We construe our state’s constitutional prohibition against cruel or unusual punishment separately from its Eighth Amendment analog. (See also Cal. Const., art. I, § 24 [“Rights guaranteed by this Constitution are not dependent on those guaranteed by the United States Constitution”]; *People v. Buza* (2018) 4 Cal.5th 658, 701-704 (dis. opn. of Liu, J.).)

The state constitutions of Massachusetts, Michigan, and Washington contain a similar prohibition against cruel or unusual punishment. The high courts in each of those states recently held their state constitutions prohibited imposing an LWOP sentence on youthful offenders who were over 17 years old. (*Commonwealth v. Mattis* (Mass. 2024) 224 N.E.3d 410, 416 (*Mattis*) [holding LWOP for 18 to 20 year olds violates the Massachusetts Constitution’s prohibition against “cruel or unusual punishment”]; *People v. Parks* (Mich. 2022) 987 N.W.2d 161, 169 (*Parks*) [holding mandatory LWOP for 18 year olds violates the Michigan Constitution’s prohibition against “cruel or unusual punishment”], italics omitted; *In re Pers. Restraint of Monschke* (Wn. 2021) 482 P.3d 276, 279 (*Monschke*) [holding mandatory LWOP for 18 to 21 year olds violates the Washington Constitution’s prohibition against “ ‘cruel punishment’ ”].) The analysis in each of those cases is compelling.

Stated plainly, “youth matters.” (*Mattis, supra*, 224 N.E.3d at p. 415.) As neuroscience shows and “any parent knows,” juveniles and younger adults lack maturity and a sense of responsibility, they are vulnerable to negative influences over which they have limited control, and their character is transitory and developing. (*Roper v. Simmons* (2005) 543 U.S. 551, 569; see *id.* at pp. 569-570 [discussion of three differences between offenders under 18 and adult offenders].) “Neuroscientists now know that all three of the ‘general differences between juveniles under 18 and adults’ recognized by *Roper* are present in people older than 18.” (*Monschke, supra*, 482 P.3d at p. 286; accord, *Mattis, supra*, at p. 421 [“the scientific record strongly supports the contention that emerging adults have the same core neurological characteristics as juveniles have”].) Legislatures, including ours in California, have “determined that emerging adults require different treatment from older adults, specifically in the penological context.” (*Mattis, supra*, at p. 424; see Welf. & Inst. Code, §607 [juvenile court retains jurisdiction until the person is 21, 23, or 25 years old]; see also Sen. Rules Com., Off. of Sen. Floor Analyses, 3d reading analysis of Assem. Bill No. 1308 (2017-2018 Reg. Sess.) as amended Mar. 30, 2017, pp. 4-5 [Legislature’s “rationale [in enacting and twice expanding section 3051] is that research shows that cognitive brain development continues into the early 20s or later”]; *Hardin, supra*, 15 Cal.5th at pp. 880-881 (dis. opn. of Liu, J.).) Various states, including California, Illinois, Colorado, and Wyoming, “recogniz[e] that emerging adult offenders require different treatment from older adult offenders.” (*Mattis, supra*, at p. 425 [citing Pen. Code, § 3051].) These laws, including California law, “distinguish[] emerging adults from older adults on a range of issues, granting rights and imposing responsibilities in a graduated manner” that “reflect[s] the commonly held view that emerging adults generally are not equipped to assume all the responsibilities of adulthood, especially with respect to high risk activities.” (*Mattis, supra*, at p. 426.)

Additionally, a significant number of states (22) and the District of Columbia “do not mandate [LWOP] in any circumstance.” (*Id.* at p. 426; see *id.* at pp. 426-427.) Some other countries have

similar laws. The United Kingdom prohibits LWOP for any person who was under 22 years of age at the time they committed the offense, and the Supreme Court of Canada has held that LWOP is unconstitutional for all convicted persons. (*Id.* at p. 428.) Lastly, the fate of being imprisoned without hope of release is “particularly acute for young persons . . . , because they will inevitably serve more time and spend a greater percentage of their lives behind prison walls.” (*Parks, supra*, 987 N.W.2d at p. 178.) In addition to more time spent behind bars, the conditions of confinement for youth can be particularly brutal and inhumane. (See Human Rights Watch, *When I Die, They’ll Send Me Home: Youth Sentenced to Life Without Parole in California* (Jan. 2008) Vol. 20, No. 1 (G) pp. 54-55 <<http://www.hrw.org/reports/2008/us0108/us0108web.pdf>> [as of June 12, 2024].) Largely due to these considerations, other high courts have held sentencing emerging adults to LWOP is unconstitutional.

Powell also asserts that the LWOP exclusion is cruel or unusual by disproportionately impacting young African Americans and other young people of color. Indeed, “[t]he LWOP exclusion perpetuates extreme racial disparities in our criminal and juvenile justice systems.” (*Hardin, supra*, 15 Cal.5th at p. 907 (dis. opn. of Evans, J.); see also *id.* at p. 887 (dis. opn. of Liu, J.)) Below, the Court of Appeal declined to consider Powell’s claim that his mandatory LWOP sentence violates our state constitution’s prohibition against cruel or unusual punishment under the California Racial Justice Act of 2020 (RJA) (Stats. 2020, ch. 317), on the grounds Powell was appealing the denial of his *Franklin* motion (*People v. Franklin* (2016) 63 Cal.4th 261) rather than his conviction or sentence. It noted, “Powell is not, however, precluded from raising his RJA claim through any other procedural mechanism allowed under section 745, subdivision (b).” (*People v. Powell* (Feb. 23, 2024, A167066) [nonpub. opn.])

I agree that Powell may file a petition for writ of habeas corpus asserting any RJA claims. However, I would consider Powell’s argument that the disproportionate application of the LWOP exclusion on youth of color violates our state constitution’s prohibition against cruel or unusual punishment. In enacting the RJA, our Legislature made clear that statistical evidence demonstrating disparate racial impact informs whether depriving Powell of a meaningful opportunity of release constitutes cruel or unusual punishment under the California Constitution. (*Mosby v. Superior Court* (2024) 99 Cal.App.5th 106, 123 [the RJA “was enacted, in part, to address *McCleskey v. Kemp* (1987) 481 U.S. 279, 295-299, 312, which found that there was ‘a discrepancy that appears to correlate with race’ in death penalty cases in Georgia, but the court would not intervene without proof of a discriminatory purpose” when considering an Eighth Amendment challenge]; see Stats. 2020, ch. 317, § 2, subd. (f).) In other words, statistical evidence showing the imposition of mandatory LWOP sentences on emerging adults disparately impacts youth of color may demonstrate the sentence is arbitrary and capricious and thus “cruel or unusual,” in violation of our state constitution.

Now is the time for our court to grapple with these important considerations and determine whether our constitution, too, prohibits condemning an 18-year-old to die in prison without any individualized consideration. With today’s denial of review, this court’s promise in *Hardin* of due consideration another day remains unfulfilled. (See *Hardin, supra*, 15 Cal.5th at p. 907 (dis. opn. of Evans, J.)) To the extent further development of the record would assist us, a remand for

factual development in the trial court would be the prudent course. (See *id.* at pp. 892-893 (dis. opn. of Liu, J.); see also *Mattis, supra*, 224 N.E.3d at p. 416.) Since this court has deferred consideration of these issues, I continue to “urge the Legislature to correct itself by ridding [Penal Code] section 3051 of the LWOP exclusion and extending youth offender parole eligibility to all individuals who were convicted in their youth.” (*Hardin*, at p. 907 (dis. opn. of Evans, J.).)

EVANS, J.

I Concur:
LIU, J.

S284429 A164895 First Appellate District, Div. 2

**SHAPIRO (STEPHEN) v.
HARBOR FREIGHT TOOLS
USA, INC.**

Petition for review denied

S284444 E079869 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

**PEOPLE v. CLAVANO
(AMANDO ZOSA)**

Petition for review denied

S284447 A166554 First Appellate District, Div. 3

**PEOPLE v. CLARKE (KEVIN
EDWARD)**

Petition for review denied

S284461 E080868 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

**THE RED BRENNAN GROUP
v. SHEA (STEPHANIE); (SAN
BERNARDINO COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS)**

Petition for review denied

S284464 A167919 First Appellate District, Div. 2

**B. (T.), CONSERVATORSHIP
OF**

Petition for review denied

S284473 B330200 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

**PEOPLE v. ORTIS (JOHN
ETHELDRED)**

Petition for review denied

S284479 C100657 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**KINDRED (LLOYD LESLIE)
ON H.C.**

S284482 A165202 First Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**U.S. BANK v. ELSTEAD
(JOHN CLIFTON)**

S284484 B335390 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

PAINIA (MANUEL) ON H.C.

S284493 C096203 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**FORD (TAMMY) v. SAN
JOAQUIN COUNTY
IN-HOME SUPPORT
SERVICES**

S284495 B325969 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**SATTLEY (JOSH) v.
MIRISCH (JOHN)**

S284499 B308382 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

**COLYEAR (RICHARD C.) v.
ROLLING HILLS
COMMUNITY
ASSOCIATION OF RANCHO
PALOS VERDES**

S284501 D080447 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**OVERLAND DIRECT, INC. v.
ESOLA CAPITAL
INVESTMENT, LLC; A&S
PARK BOULEVARD, LLC**

S284503 F085832 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**TRC OPERATING
COMPANY v. SHABAZIAN
(DAVID)**

S284512 D083309 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. INCHAUSTEQUI
(EDUARDO)**

S284523 F084914 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. HASLEY, JR.,
(GERRELL)**

S284538 E081738 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. FERGUSON
(BRIDGIT BREANN)**

S284576 C098256 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. WILBURN
(DONTAE ALFONSO)**

S284584 B327132 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**CAMPANA (WILLIAM) v.
SALDANA (CONSUELO)**

S284602 D080839 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. SOLORIO (JOSE
A.)**

S284603 A167739 First Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**SANDOVAL (GLORIA
CASTRO) v. MASALTA
(FLOYD)**

S284616 H050191 Sixth Appellate District

Petition for review & publication request(s) denied

**POMER (MARSHALL I.) v.
TEMMERMAN, JR.,
(ROBERT E.)**

S284635 A168877 First Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. COOPER
(DERRICK ANTOINE)**

S284639 G061917 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. MARES, JR.,
(LAWRENCE ALBERT)**

S284647 B328423 Second Appellate District, Div. 8

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. EVANGELISTA
(ROBERT FRANKES)**

S284648 A166001 First Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. BEAUDREAUX
(NICHOLAS)**

S284674 E080593 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. HAMPTON
(EDDIE LEE)**

S284676 B322561 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petitions for review denied

**PEOPLE v. HILL (BRIAN
TERRELL)**

S284680 B328913 Second Appellate District, Div. 7

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. BOONE
(VELTON)**

S284686 C095986 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. BARNER (OSCAR
DERAN)**

S284698 B322264 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**CHANG (IH HEEN BESS) v.
AEGIS ASSET BACKED
SECURITIES, LLC**

S284702 G061875 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. GRIFFIN (DEJON
VINCENT)**

S284706 D081463 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**R. (L.) & A. (K.), MARRIAGE
OF**

S284712 A167509 First Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. BURROWS, JR.,
(FRANK CARL)**

S284713 A164125 First Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**MANNING (JEREMIAH F.) &
KIM (LUCY J.), MARRIAGE
OF**

S284714 B321829 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. LEBEAU (PATRIC
DEMON)**

S284715 C097610 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. TANGONAN
(BEMIL)**

S284735 D081078 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review & publication request(s) denied

**PEOPLE v. ANDERSON
(RAYMOND CHARLES)**

S284745 D082220 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. WELCH
(KENNETH SCOTT)**

S284747 B336021 Second Appellate District, Div. 8
Petition for review denied

SANTOS (CRISTIAN) ON H.C.

S284750 D080301 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review & publication request(s) denied

**PRINCE (STEPHEN M. &
TERESA R. SUNDER),
MARRIAGE OF**

S284753 B335975 Second Appellate District, Div. 8

Petition for review denied

**MITCHELL, JR., (HENRY
MOSES) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)**

S284759 D082011 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. SALINAS
(MIGUEL)**

S284762 B328622 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. GEORGE
(TRAVIS EUGENE)**

S284763 A166353 First Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. MASON
(ANTHONY MAURICE)**

S284764 B323669 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**IN RE TALASSAZAN
CHILDREN'S TRUST**

S284765 B324074 Second Appellate District, Div. 7

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. WILLIAMS
(NORMAN)**

S284770 D080498 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. RAMIREZ, JR.,
(RICHARD JACK)**

S284771 D081360 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. KEROW
(MOHAMED ABDIAZIZ)**

S284772 C097887 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. WILSON
(STEVEN RYAN)**

S284773 D080934 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. SIRYPANGNO
(KONESAVANH DONALD)**

S284774 F085579 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. COKER (RICKY
LEE)**

S284779 B320851 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

The request for judicial notice is granted.
The petition for review is denied.

**TURNER (DARLEEN) v.
THOMAS (WILLIAM)**

S284794 D083341 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**KAKOWSKI (BRIAN
EUGENE) ON H.C.**

S284797 F085254 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. LEE (JONATHAN
ALRAY)**

S284803 C097629 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. FRAZIER
(ISAIAH)**

S284804 C097923 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. MARTINEZ
MOLINA (JORGE ENRIQUE)**

S284819 H051011 Sixth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. CUEVAS
(MARCOS)**

S284820 B323589 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. SPENGLER
(MATTHEW EDWARD)**

S284821 E082038 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. FLORES
(JOSHUA LEE)**

S284822 B336407 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review & application for stay denied

**PERRY (MICHAEL MOSHE)
v. S.C. (NASCH PROPERTIES
LLC)**

S284825 D082397 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. MENDOZA
(ALFREDO)**

S284829 H049215 Sixth Appellate District

Petitioner's motion to file the unredacted petition for review under seal is granted. (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.550(d), 8.46(d).) In ordering the sealing, this court makes the findings required by California Rules of Court, rules 2.550(d) and 8.46(d)(6). The clerk is directed to file under seal both the unredacted petition for review and the unredacted motion to file document under seal. The petition for review is denied.

**KHAZAELI (HAMID) v.
BREWER (DAVID)**

S284831 B303437 Second Appellate District, Div. 7

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. CHAPMAN
(GREGORY T.)**

S284832	G061935 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3	HAMIDA (RIDA) v. PAGE (BOB)
Petition for review denied		
S284833	B317846 Second Appellate District, Div. 6	PEOPLE v. CONTRERAS (ROBERTO CARLOS)
Petition for review denied		
S284838	D081982 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1	PEOPLE v. TATE (ELVIS EUGENE)
Petition for review denied		
S284846	B325051 Second Appellate District, Div. 8	PEOPLE v. DIXON (BRANDON J.)
Petition for review denied		
S284849	C096858 Third Appellate District	PEOPLE v. TORREZ (MICHAEL RAY)
Petition for review denied		
S284851	A165553 First Appellate District, Div. 3	HANLIN (GAVIN G.) v. X-PEST, INC.
Petition for review denied		
S284856	H050513 Sixth Appellate District	PEOPLE v. NUKIDA (TIM MAKOTO)
Petition for review denied		
S284860	B324674 Second Appellate District, Div. 6	PEOPLE v. EAVES (MICHAEL ALLEN)
Petition for review denied		
S284861	D081604 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1	PEOPLE v. HERNANDEZ (MARCO TORRES)
Petition for review denied		

S284865 F087806 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**LUNA (OSCAR CALDERON)
v. S.C. (ROJAS)**

S284867 B325430 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. CAMPER (JERRY
LOUIS)**

S284872 F086592 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. MONTANO (JOSE
ANTONIO)**

S284875 F086583 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. AUSTIN (STEVEN
OSCAR BLACKWELL)**

S284876 C098731 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. NGUYEN (DAI)

S284877 C097515 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. JOHNSON (KYLE
MARQUES)**

S284878 B322003 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**HOLLYWOOD GARDEN,
LLC v. LI (JI)**

S284881 C097567 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. ROBERTSON
(TEOTIS LAMARK)**

S284882 B332900 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. GALLOWAY
(JAYVION TERRELL)**

S284883 B324150 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

**OURFALI (GHOUGAS) v.
21ST CENTURY INSURANCE
COMPANY**

S284890 A166152 First Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. JOHNSON
(DAVID ANTHONY CALVIN)**

S284891 B330065 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. RIOS, JR.,
(REYES)**

S284893 C098291 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. JOHANSSON-
FULILANGI (ANDERS)**

S284894 C100915 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**FRANKLIN (CHRISTOPHER)
ON H.C.**

S284896 A167491 First Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

**APEX SOLUTIONS, INC. v.
FALLS LAKE INSURANCE
MANAGEMENT COMPANY,
INC.**

S284897 G061387 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**SACK (JOHN A.) v. PINNER
CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.**

S284899 F087452 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**WILLIAMS (HENRY DON)
ON H.C.**

S284911 A165292 First Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**PARK (JOHN) v. LAW
OFFICE OF TRACEY
BUCK-WALSH**

S284912 D082400 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. ADAM (GRANT
PARKER)**

S284913 B325977 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. EDDISON
(MARLON)**

S284918 B320282 Second Appellate District, Div. 8

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. DELRAY (ELI
TONEY)**

S284923 B317894 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. FERNANDEZ
(DENISE)**

S284924 B323356 Second Appellate District, Div. 8

Petition for review denied

**MEDALLION FILM LLC v.
LOEB & LOEB LLP**

S284937 H050553 Sixth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. ROMERO
(JULIAN DANIEL)**

S284955 F084919 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**LYNN DOE v. LUSTER
(ANDREW STUART)**

S284959 D082754 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. AYALA
(GABRIELA T. RANGEL)**

S284960 H049267 Sixth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. GRAY (JASON SCOTT)

S284965 A170141 First Appellate District, Div. 1

The request for judicial notice is granted.
The petition for review is denied.

LABOR & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY v. S.C. (COMERICA BANK)

S284968 B328698 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. BRAGGS (ARCHIE LEE)

S284973 B335910 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

TERRELL (DEMARICE) ON H.C.

S284977 B336827 Second Appellate District, Div. 5
Petition for review denied

THOMAS (HORACE) ON H.C.

S284981 A169587 First Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

LEVY(ALEXANDER) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)

S284982 B336954 Second Appellate District, Div. 7

Petition for review denied

KELLEY (TSHOMBE M.) ON H.C.

S284983 B336417 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

BRYANT (STANFORD PAUL) ON H.C.

S285119 B337512 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

**GHOBRIAL (GERGIS R.) v.
S.C. (LONG BEACH
MEMORIAL MEDICAL
CENTER)**

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S285256

**PHILLIPS, JR., (ERIC
JEROME) v. COURT OF
APPEAL, FOURTH
APPELLATE DISTRICT,
DIVISION TWO (PEOPLE)**

The petition for writ of mandate/prohibition, application for stay, and application for appointment of counsel are denied.

S283224

PRATT (ANTHONY) ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S283644

**YU (JASON CHUNGCHIEN)
ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S283681

**CROSS (GEORGE EUGENE)
ON H.C.**

The request for judicial notice is granted.
The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S283796

**CARRIZALES (ENRIQUE
ALFREDO) 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].)

S283814

**BROWN (GREGORY L.) ON
H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S283871**ARCHULETA (DANIEL A.)
ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S283873**McCLUNG (BRADLEY
JAMES) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S283877**ROSELL (KERRY LYNN) ON
H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Miller* (1941) 17 Cal.2d 734, 735 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are repetitive].)

S283878**SAECHAO (LAI FOU) ON
H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S283879**OWENS (CURTIS JAMES) 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].)

S283880**VOROBETS (VADIM
PAVLOVICH) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S283894**BENNETT (DAVID) 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].)

S283897**JIMENEZ (JORGE) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S283898**CIOTTA (STEVEN ALLEN)
ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S283972**ARIAS (RICARDO) 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].)

S284007**DINGMAN (EDWARD
WILBUR) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S284058**JOHNSON (GEORGE
DEVOY) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S284064**JONES (RAYON) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S284892**ROSELL (KERRY LYNN) ON
H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Miller* (1941) 17 Cal.2d 734, 735 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are repetitive].)

S284953**CIOTTA (STEVEN ALLEN)
ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S285001**SILVER (MICHAEL JOHN)
ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S285042**WHITSITT (WILLIAM J.) 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].) Individual claims are denied, as applicable. (See *In re Lessard* (1965) 62 Cal.2d 497, 503 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that raise Fourth Amendment violations].)

S285073**CABE (JOHN CECIL) 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].) Individual claims are denied, as applicable. (See *In re Dexter* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 921, 925-926 [a habeas corpus petitioner must exhaust available administrative remedies]; *In re Lessard* (1965) 62 Cal.2d 497, 503 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that raise Fourth Amendment violations].)

S285113**VU (GIANG) 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].)

S284113 D080166/D081686 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **GONZALEZ (JAZMIN) v.
HUDSON INSURANCE CO.**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S284172 B322136 Second Appellate District, Div. 4 **JAVIDIAN (BAHRAM) v.
SUBARU OF AMERICA, INC.**

Publication requests denied (case closed)

S284206 B307777 Second Appellate District, Div. 3 **LUNDAY-THAGARD
COMPANY v. CITY OF LOS
ANGELES**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S284267 A165330 First Appellate District, Div. 2

**D. (CAROL) v. WRIGHT
(JOE)**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S284318 A167346 First Appellate District, Div. 5

**MOVE EDEN HOUSING v.
CITY OF LIVERMORE
(EDEN HOUSING, INC.)**

Depublication request denied (case closed)

The requests for an order directing depublication of the opinion in the above-entitled appeal are denied. The court declines to review this matter on its own motion. The matter is now final. The request for an order directing further publication of the opinion in the above-entitled appeal is denied.

S284373 E080467 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

**FARLEY (NINA) v. NEXGEN
LIFT TRUCKS LLC**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S284478 D081654 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

**PEOPLE v. THE NORTH
RIVER INSURANCE
COMPANY (BAD BOYS BAIL
BONDS)**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S284518 C097353 Third Appellate District

**MWL SOLUTIONS, INC. v.
OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY &
HEALTH APPEALS BOARD
(DEPARTMENT OF
INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS)**

Publication requests denied (case closed)

S284552 A167472 First Appellate District, Div. 3

**CALIFORNIANS FOR
EQUAL RIGHTS
FOUNDATION v. COUNTY
OF ALAMEDA**

Publication request denied (case closed)

- S284579** D081530 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **BACKCOUNTRY AGAINST DUMPS v. SAN DIEGO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (BOULDER BRUSH, LLC)**
- Publication request denied (case closed)
- S284585** B326835 Second Appellate District, Div. 2 **GOODEN (TONI A.) v. ASTRIX TECHNOLOGY, LLC**
- Publication request denied (case closed)
- S284595** B327923 Second Appellate District, Div. 3 **MEDA (MONICA) v. AUTOZONERS, LLC**
- Publication request denied (case closed)
- S284624** H050910 Sixth Appellate District **SANBORN (ELIZABETH) v. KENNEDY (WILLIAM)**
- Publication request denied (case closed)
- S284304** G063623 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3 **LOPEZ (ARTHUR) v. S.C.**
The time for granting or denying review in the above-entitled matter is hereby extended to July 12, 2024.
- S284600** G061430 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3 **LOPEZ (ARTHUR) v. ELIAS (PERLA)**
- The time for granting or denying review in the above-entitled matter is hereby extended to July 12, 2024.
- S284621** G061429 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3 **LOPEZ (ARTHUR) v. GOROSPE (KRISTAL)**
- The time for granting or denying review in the above-entitled matter is hereby extended to July 12, 2024.
- S284645** C098602 Third Appellate District **IN RE S.R.**
The time for granting or denying review in the above-entitled matter is hereby extended to July 17, 2024.

S283614 A167721 First Appellate District, Div. 3

**CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL
DIVERSITY, INC. v. PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION
(PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC
COMPANY)**

Extension of time granted

On application of real parties in interest and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer brief on the merits is extended to August 9, 2024.

S277072 D079716 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

**TELLEZ (VICTOR RAUL) ON
H.C.**

Motion for judicial notice granted

Respondent's request for judicial notice, filed on July 20, 2023, is granted.

S284225

Petition denied (accusation)

ACCUSATION OF CHAVEZ

S284731

Petition denied (accusation)

ACCUSATION OF GOMEZ

S284830

Petition denied (accusation)

ACCUSATION OF BARBOZA

S284972

Petition denied (accusation)

ACCUSATION OF FEE

S284529

Recommended discipline imposed: disbarred

ABBOTT ON DISCIPLINE

The court orders that HOWARD BRUCE ABBOTT (Respondent), State Bar Number 210358, is summarily disbarred from the practice of law 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.

S284534**AL-HAQQ ON DISCIPLINE**

Recommended discipline imposed

The court orders that WAZIR-ALI MUHAMMAD AL-HAQQ (Respondent), State Bar Number 189683, is suspended from the practice of law in California for two-years, execution of that period of suspension is stayed, and Respondent is placed on probation for two-years subject to the following conditions:

1. Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for a minimum of the first two years of probation (with credit given for the period of inactive enrollment which commenced on June 6, 2022 (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6233)), and Respondent will remain suspended until the following requirement is satisfied:
 - i. Respondent provides proof to the State Bar Court of rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and present learning and ability in the general law. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. for Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, std. 1.2(c)(1).)
2. Respondent must also comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Decision filed on March 13, 2024.
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 Decision filed on March 13, 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. One-third of the costs must be paid with Respondent's annual fees for each of the years 2025, 2026, and 2027. 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.

S284553**CAMPBELL ON DISCIPLINE**

Recommended discipline imposed: disbarred

The court orders that BROOKE CAMPBELL (Respondent), State Bar Number 201389, is summarily disbarred from the practice of law 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.

S284555**GOMES ON DISCIPLINE**

Recommended discipline imposed

The court orders that TIMOTHY ELWOOD GOMES (Respondent), State Bar Number 168140, 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 90 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 March 19, 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 March 19, 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 \$1,500 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-third of the costs must be paid with Respondent's annual fees for each of the years 2025, 2026, and 2027. 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.

S284557**HUGHES ON DISCIPLINE**

Recommended discipline imposed: disbarred

The court orders that SCOTT DAVID HUGHES (Respondent), State Bar Number 253611, is summarily disbarred from the practice of law 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.

S285377**BALLARD ON
RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of DANIELLE MARIE BALLARD, State Bar Number 278902, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285378**BAYUS ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of ELAINE ROSE BAYUS, State Bar Number 81551, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285379**BOOTH ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of VINCENT JAMES BOOTH, State Bar Number 159429, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285380**BOYD ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of DEBORAH ANN BOYD, State Bar Number 136296, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285381**CECIL ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of THOMAS G. CECIL, State Bar Number 298730, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285382**CHO ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of CHI-HYOUNG CHO, State Bar Number 187426, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285383**CYPHER ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of JAMES ROBERT CYPHER, State Bar Number 30655, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285384**DEBS ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of JODY KATHALEEN DEBS, State Bar Number 172785, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285385**DOBSON ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of LYNN MARIE DOBSON, State Bar Number 111995, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285386**FUCHS ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of JACQUELINE L. FUCHS, State Bar Number 159637, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285387**GARDNER ON
RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of MICHELE KUTTNER GARDNER, State Bar Number 154855, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285388**LUPUL ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of DONALD KENNETH LUPUL, State Bar Number 66654, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285389**MARCUS ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of VERA MARCUS, State Bar Number 151596, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285391**SCHULTZ ON
RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of DOUGLAS EUGENE SCHULTZ, State Bar Number 85595, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285397**SLATER ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of DEBORAH RUTH SLATER, State Bar Number 129170, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285399**STARR ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of JENNY LEE STARR, State Bar Number 235422, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S285400**STEPHAN ON RESIGNATION**

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of BRUCE MICHAEL STEPHAN, State Bar Number 160387, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

**BAR MISC. 4186 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF THE COMMITTEE
OF BAR EXAMINERS OF THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
FOR ADMISSION OF ATTORNEYS (MOTION NO. 1669)**

The written motion of the Committee of Bar Examiners that the following named applicants, who have fulfilled the requirements for admission to practice law in the State of California, be admitted to the practice of law in this state is hereby granted, with permission to the applicants to take the oath before a competent officer at another time and place:

(SEE ORIGINAL APPLICATION FOR THE LIST OF NAMES ATTACHED.)