

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
MONDAY, AUGUST 19, 2024
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S275578 B317935 Second Appellate District, Div. 2 **IN RE DEZI C.**
Opinion filed: Judgment reversed

The Court of Appeal's judgment is reversed with directions to conditionally reverse the order terminating parental rights. The matter is remanded to the juvenile court for compliance with the inquiry and notice requirements of sections 224.2 and 224.3 and the documentation provisions of rule 5.481(a)(5), consistent with this opinion. If the juvenile court thereafter finds a proper and adequate further inquiry and due diligence has been conducted and concludes ICWA does not apply (§ 224.2, subd. (i)(2)), then the court shall reinstate the order terminating parental rights. If the juvenile court concludes ICWA applies, then it shall proceed in conformity with ICWA and California implementing provisions. (See 25 U.S.C., § 1912, subd. (a); §§ 224.2, subd. (i)(1); 224.3, 224.4.)

Majority Opinion by Evans, J.

-- joined by Corrigan, Liu, Kruger, and Jenkins, JJ.

Concurring Opinion by Kruger, J.

-- joined by Corrigan, J.

Dissenting Opinion by Groban, J.

-- joined by Guerrero, C. J.

S276649 C096051 Third Appellate District **IN RE KENNETH D.**
Opinion filed: Judgment reversed

The Court of Appeal's judgment is reversed with directions to conditionally reverse the juvenile court's order terminating parental rights. The matter is to be remanded to the juvenile court for compliance with the inquiry and notice requirements of sections 224.2 and 224.3. If the juvenile court thereafter finds a proper and adequate further inquiry, conducted with due diligence, has taken place and there is no reason to know minor is an Indian child, making ICWA inapplicable, (§ 224.2, subd. (i)(2)), the court shall reinstate the order terminating parental rights. If the juvenile court concludes ICWA applies, it shall proceed in conformity with ICWA and California implementing provisions. (See 25 U.S.C. § 1912(a); Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 224.2, subd. (i)(1), 224.3, 224.4.)

Majority Opinion by Corrigan, J.

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

Concurring Opinion by Groban, J.

-- joined by Guerrero, C. J.

S166737**PEOPLE v. FLORES (RALPH STEVEN)**

Extension of time granted

Upon application of counsel John L. Dodd, an extension of time in which to serve and file appellant's supplemental opening brief is granted to October 25, 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.

S175720**PEOPLE v. MARTINEZ (CARLOS)**

Extension of time granted

Upon application of counsel Kathy R. Moreno, an extension of time in which to serve and file appellant's supplemental opening brief is granted to October 30, 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.

S213242**PEOPLE v. SMITH (CHARLES RAY)**

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 October 25, 2024.

S223978**PEOPLE v. FULLER (ROBERT DALE)**

Extension of time granted

Based upon Deputy Attorney General Ross K. Naughton's representation that the respondent's brief is anticipated to be filed by March 17, 2025, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to October 18, 2024. After that date, only three further extensions totaling about 150 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).)

S239552**PEOPLE v. WASHINGTON
(DARNELL KEITH)**

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 October 21, 2024.

S239948**PEOPLE v. GORDON
(STEVEN DEAN)**

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 October 25, 2024.

S280752 F084913 Fifth Appellate District**NORTH AMERICAN TITLE
COMPANY v. S.C.
(CORTINA)**

Order filed

The joint request of counsel for Carolyn Cortina, Judith Bates, Tina Texeira, Janet Doran, Kimberly Baker, Laurel Johnstone, Mary Wetdmark, Cheryl Fuller, Melodie Benton, Robin Johnson, Catherine Bell, Teresa Spencer, and Martha Dominguez in the above-referenced cause to allow two counsel to argue on behalf of real parties in interest at oral argument is hereby granted. Lawrence M. Artenian will be allocated 20 minutes and Patrick D. Toole will be allocated 10 minutes of the 30-minute allotted time for oral argument.

S285884 G064273 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3**RUIZ (EDWARD) v. S.C.
(PEOPLE)**

Order filed

The request filed on August 14, 2024, by petitioner to lodge late received transcripts is hereby granted.