

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2023
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S065877**PEOPLE v. LOPEZ (BOBBY)
& TRUJEQUE (JAMES)**

Extension of time granted

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

Based upon counsel Joseph G. Baxter's representation that the appellant Bobby Lopez's opening brief is anticipated to be filed by November 9, 2023, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to November 9, 2023. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

S212477**PEOPLE v. FRAZIER
(TRAVIS) & NOWLIN
(KENNETH LEE)**

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant Travis Frazier, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to December 19, 2023.

S214917**PEOPLE v. NASO (JOSEPH)**

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 December 19, 2023.

S277962

H049413 Sixth Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. ARELLANO (LUIS
RAMON MANZANO)**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply brief on the merits is extended to November 22, 2023.

No further extensions are contemplated.

S280322 D080377 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1**DOWNEY (JAYDE) v. CITY
OF RIVERSIDE**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent, City of Riverside, and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer brief on the merits is extended to November 17, 2023.

S280322 D080377 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1**DOWNEY (JAYDE) v. CITY
OF RIVERSIDE**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondents, Ara Sevacherian and Vahram Sevacherian, and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer brief on the merits is extended to December 18, 2023.

S189992**PEOPLE v. SHORTS
(DONALD) & TUCKER
(JAMAR)**

Order filed

“Appellant Shorts’ Application for Leave to File Appellant’s Oversized Supplemental Opening Brief,” filed on October 13, 2023, is granted. Respondent must serve and file a supplemental respondent’s brief within 30 days from the date of this order. Appellant may serve and file a supplemental reply brief within 30 days after the supplemental respondent’s brief is filed.

S280959**McCABE ON DISCIPLINE**

Order filed

Due to error on the part of the State Bar of California. The order filed September 15, 2023, is hereby amended as to the State Bar case number SBC- 22- O-30927.

“The court orders that MICHAEL RALPH McCABE (Respondent), State Bar Number 120644, 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.

This order is entered nunc pro tunc to September 15, 2023.”

S282039

**RIAZ (SAMREEN) v. S.C.
(STATE OF CALIFORNIA)**

Transferred to Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District

The above-entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District, for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition must be denied.