

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
THURSDAY, JULY 6, 2023
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S274191**KUCIEMBA (CORBY) v.
VICTORY WOODWORKS,
INC.**

Opinion filed

In conclusion, we answer the Ninth Circuit's questions as follows:

- (1) If an employee contracts COVID-19 at the workplace and brings the virus home to a spouse, the derivative injury rule of California's workers' compensation law does not bar a spouse's negligence claim against the employer.
- (2) An employer does not owe a duty of care under California law to prevent the spread of COVID-19 to employees' household members.

Majority Opinion by Corrigan, J

-- joined by Guerrero, C. J., Liu, Kruger, Groban, Jenkins, and Evans, JJ.

S185640**PEOPLE v. KELLEY (JIMMY
DALE)**

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Diane E. Berley's representation that the appellant's reply brief is anticipated to be filed by November 4, 2023, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to September 5, 2023. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 60 additional days is contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S217284**JONES (BRYAN MAURICE)
ON H.C.**

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Shelley J. Sandusky's representation that the reply to the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is anticipated to be filed by November 21, 2023, an extension of time in which to serve and file that document is granted to September 5, 2023. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 77 additional days are contemplated.

S224393**PEOPLE v. HARTS (TYRONE
LEVOID)**

Extension of time granted

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

Based upon counsel Rudolph J. Alejo's representation that the appellant's opening brief is anticipated to be filed by November 3, 2023, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to August 29, 2023. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 66 additional days is contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S239971**PEOPLE v. CHEARY
(CHRISTOPHER)**

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to September 8, 2023.

S277962 H049413 Sixth Appellate District**PEOPLE v. ARELLANO (LUIS
RAMON MANZANO)**

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer brief on the merits is extended to August 8, 2023.

S280598 C090463 Third Appellate District**MADRIGAL (OSCAR J.) v.
HYUNDAI MOTOR
AMERICA**

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer to petition for review and opposition to motion for judicial notice is extended to July 24, 2023.

S280640 B311573 Second Appellate District, Div. 7

**CASTELO (ELIZABETH) v.
XCEED FINANCIAL CREDIT
UNION**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer to petition for review is extended to July 21, 2023.

S279242 A165451 First Appellate District, Div. 5

**MAKE UC A GOOD
NEIGHBOR v. THE
REGENTS OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA (RESOURCES
FOR COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT)**

Order filed

The court on its own motion notes this case is entitled to calendar preference under Public Resources Code section 21167.1, subdivision (a). Preference is hereby granted as consistent with (1) attention to matters entitled to greater preference by law and (2) application of those provisions of the Internal Operating Practices and Procedures of the California Supreme Court that may necessarily affect scheduling of the case for oral argument (see Supreme Ct. Intern. Operating Practices & Procedures, sections V, VI).

The motion for calendar preference filed on June 30, 2023, by respondent Regents of the University of California is denied.