

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
MONDAY, JULY 29, 2024
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S265223 A153520 First Appellate District, Div. 1 **BAILEY (TWANDA) v. SAN
FRANCISCO DISTRICT
ATTORNEY'S OFFICE**

Opinion filed: Judgment reversed

For the reasons stated above, we conclude that an isolated act of harassment is actionable if it is sufficiently severe under the totality of the circumstances, and that a coworker's use of an unambiguous racial epithet, such as the N-word, may be found to suffice. Applying this standard, there exists a triable issue of fact whether the harassing conduct at issue here was sufficiently severe so as to alter the conditions of Bailey's employment. As to the matter of the City's liability for the harassment, the Court of Appeal erred in failing to consider the effect of Taylor-Monachino's conduct. We find it appropriate to remand the matter to the Court of Appeal for reconsideration of that issue in light of this opinion. We further conclude that there exists a triable issue of fact whether Taylor-Monachino's course of conduct adversely affected the terms and conditions of Bailey's employment by, among other things, withdrawing Bailey's right to avail herself of the human resources process available to other employees. We therefore reverse the judgment of the Court of Appeal and remand the cause to that court for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

Majority Opinion by Evans, J.

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

S274147 D079451 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **MEINHARDT (DAVID) v.
CITY OF SUNNYVALE
(SUNNYVALE
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC
SAFETY)**

Opinion filed: Judgment reversed

We reverse the judgment of the Court of Appeal and remand the matter for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

Majority Opinion by Jenkins, J.

-- joined by Corrigan, Liu, Kruger, Groban, Evans, and Sanchez*, JJ.

* Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Three, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.

S286169 B330022 Second Appellate District, Div. 8 **PEOPLE v. GERONIMO
(ABRAHAM)**

Time for ordering review extended on the court's own motion

The time for ordering review on the court's own motion is hereby extended to September 30, 2024. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(c).)

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

Application to file over-length brief granted

Appellant Chhoun's "Application for Permission to File an Overlength Supplemental Opening Brief," filed on July 29, 2024, is granted.

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 September 30, 2024. After that date, no further extensions will be contemplated. Within 30 days after any supplemental opening brief has been filed pursuant to this order, the People may serve and file a supplemental answering brief, not to exceed 50 pages in length. Appellant may thereafter serve and file a reply, not to exceed 25 pages in length, within 20 days after the People have filed their supplemental answering brief.

S201205 **PEOPLE v. MOORE (RYAN
T.)**

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Michael R. Snedeker's representation that the appellant's opening brief is anticipated to be filed by September 12, 2024, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to September 12, 2024. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

S248590 **PEOPLE v. BRACAMONTES
(LUIS ENRIQUEZ MONROY)**

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 30, 2024.

S283924 A168286 First Appellate District, Div. 2
Extension of time granted

PEOPLE v. DAIN (YACOB)

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the opening brief on the merits is extended to September 2, 2024.

S285479
Extension of time granted

**MOORE, JR., (CLAYTON) ON
H.C.**

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the informal response is extended to September 9, 2024.