

**[NO MINUTES WERE GENERATED FOR
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 2025,
IN OBSERVANCE OF VETERAN'S DAY.]**

1672

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2025
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S292989

F087362 Fifth Appellate District

**CAMARILLO SANITARY
DISTRICT v. STATE WATER
RESOURCES CONTROL
BOARD**

Petition for review granted; issues limited

The petition for review is granted.

The issues to be briefed and argued are limited to the issues raised in the petition for review.

Pending review, the opinion of the Court of Appeal, which is currently published at 113

Cal.App.5th 407, 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, and Evans, JJ.

S292702

B339387 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

**PEOPLE v. DUMAS (MARIO
DESHON)**

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. Eaton*, S289903 (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, and Evans, JJ.

S292860 C101402 Third Appellate District**PEOPLE v. ISAYEV
(MAKSIM YURYEVICH)**

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. Munoz*, S290828 (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, and Evans, JJ.

S292917 B337614 Second Appellate District, Div. 4**PEOPLE v. WATLER, JR.,
(RENALDO)**

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. Eaton*, S289903 (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, and Evans, JJ.

S293101 B336356 Second Appellate District, Div. 4**IN RE A.D.**

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 S.R.*, S285759 (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 8.250, is deferred pending further order of the court.

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

S293166 B342091 Second Appellate District, Div. 6**RESENDIZ (ASHAEL) v.
CANYON RESTAURANT,
LTD., L.P.**

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 *Leeper v. Shipt*, S289305 (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, and Evans, JJ.

S293216 D084176 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **NEUBECKER (EDWARD) v.
EVANS HOTELS, LLC**

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 *Leeper v. Shipt*, S289305 (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, and Evans, JJ.

S293227 B340589 Second Appellate District, Div. 7 **PEOPLE v. SALINAS, JR.,
(EFRAIN)**

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. Eaton*, S289903 (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, and Evans, JJ.

S289026 **WALKER (RODNEY
DWAYNE) ON H.C.**

Order to show cause issued, returnable in Superior Court

The Secretary of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation is ordered to show cause, returnable before the Orange County Superior Court, why petitioner is not entitled to appointment of counsel pursuant to Penal Code section 1473, subdivision (e), in light of statistical data provided by petitioner demonstrating racial disparities in Three Strikes sentences imposed in Orange County. The return must be served and filed on or before December 12, 2025.

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

S293404 F090101 Fifth Appellate District **BURNS (MARQUEZ LEE) v.
S.C. (PEOPLE)**

Petition for review granted; transferred to Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District, with directions to issue an alternative writ

The petition for review is granted. The matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District, with directions to vacate its order denying mandate and to issue an alternative writ. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(d).)

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

S280048 B315114 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 **LANIER (BRENDA) v. FORD MOTOR COMPANY**

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

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *Ford Motor Warranty Cases* (2025) 17 Cal.5th 1122, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S281237 B320477 Second Appellate District, Div. 7 **MONTEMAYOR (ROSANNA) v. FORD MOTOR COMPANY**

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

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *Ford Motor Warranty Cases* (2025) 17 Cal.5th 1122, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S281937 C096773 Third Appellate District **KIELAR (MARK) v. S.C. (HYUNDAI MOTOR AMERICA)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *Ford Motor Warranty Cases* (2025) 17 Cal.5th 1122, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S282228 A166537 First Appellate District, Div. 4 **YEH (JAQUELYN) v. S.C. (MERCEDES-BENZ USA, LLC)**

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

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *Ford Motor Warranty Cases* (2025) 17 Cal.5th 1122, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S283551 H050174 Sixth Appellate District

**BACON (JAY) v. BMW OF
NORTH AMERICA, LLC**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *Ford Motor Warranty Cases* (2025) 17 Cal.5th 1122, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S284697 D083006 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

**DAVIS (DAMIEN T.) v.
NISSAN NORTH AMERICA,
INC.**

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

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *Ford Motor Warranty Cases* (2025) 17 Cal.5th 1122, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S287725 B334522 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

**RIVERA (ISAI LOPEZ) v. S.C.
(FORD MOTOR COMPANY)**

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

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *Ford Motor Warranty Cases* (2025) 17 Cal.5th 1122, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S290583 B328270 Second Appellate District, Div. 7

PEOPLE v. MAGANA (JESUS)

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

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Cannon* (2025) 18 Cal.5th 497, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S290585 B327869 Second Appellate District, Div. 7

**PEOPLE v. WASHINGTON
(CLAYBORN)**

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

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Cannon* (2025) 18 Cal.5th 497, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S290724 A172271 First Appellate District, Div. 5 **BALLESTEROS (ARMANDO)
v. FORD MOTOR COMPANY**

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

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *Ford Motor Warranty Cases* (2025) 17 Cal.5th 1122, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S291041 H050677 Sixth Appellate District **PEOPLE v. MORRISON
(MATTHEW)**

Dismissed and remanded to Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District

Review in the above-captioned matter, which was granted and held for *People v. Cannon* (2025) 18 Cal.5th 497, is hereby dismissed. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.528(b)(1).)

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

S292327 D086053 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **VASHISHT-ROTA (APARNA)
v. ALLIANT
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY**

Petition for review denied

S292560 B334236 Second Appellate District, Div. 5 **ZOUGUB (MAHDI A.) v.
ROBINSON HELICOPTER
COMPANY, INC.**

Petition for review & publication request(s) denied

S292621 H050891 Sixth Appellate District **KATKIN (ANDREW) v.
KOMOREBI
(AMADASOPHIA)**

The request for judicial notice is granted.

The petition for review and application for stay are denied.

S292639 E082807 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 **HARRIS (STEPHEN) v. R.S.
BIR M.D., INC.**

Petition for review denied

S292682 A173263 First Appellate District, Div. 1

**WING INFLATABLES, INC. v.
CERTAIN UNDERWRITERS
AT LLOYD'S**

Petition for review denied

S292751 B334820 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

S. (S.) v. S. (J.)

Petition for review denied

Liu, J., is of the opinion the petition should be granted.

S292758 B332962/B335099 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 **BYRNE (DAVID) v. RULE (LESLIE)**

Petition for review denied

S292769 A170622 First Appellate District, Div. 4

**LARA (RICARDO) v.
CALIFORNIA INSURANCE
COMPANY**

The applications to appear as counsel pro hac vice are granted. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.40(a).)
The petition for review is denied.

S292770 B332340/B338473/B339442/B339811/B341244/B341247

Second Appellate District, Div. 2

**DONE! VENTURES, LLC v.
JAMGOTCHIAN (JERRY)**

Petition for review denied

S292772 B340501 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

IN RE E.G.

The request for judicial notice is granted.

The petition for review is denied.

S292780 F089604 Fifth Appellate District

**CALIFORNIA CAPITAL
INSURANCE COMPANY v.
S.C. (RUCKMAN)**

Petition for review denied

S292790 G063334 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

**HAGHIGHI (HOSSEIN) v.
SHEA PROPERTIES, LLC**

Petition for review denied

S292810 H053567 Sixth Appellate District

COLLIER (IRINA) v. S.C.;
COLLIER (CHARLES)

Petition for review denied

S292822 C093682 Third Appellate District

SHEETZ (GEORGE) v.
COUNTY OF EL DORADO

Petition for review denied; CA opinion decertified

The application to appear as counsel pro hac vice is granted. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.40(a).) The petition for review is denied. On the court's own motion, the Reporter of Decisions is directed not to publish in the Official Appellate Reports the opinion in the above-entitled appeal filed July 29, 2025, which appears at 113 Cal.App.5th 113. (Cal. Const., art. VI, section 14; Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.1125(c)(2).)

S292840 B341007 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

BROWN (THOMAS ROBERT)
v. FURGURSON (BONNIE)

Petition for review denied

S292846 B334571 Second Appellate District, Div. 6
Petition for review denied

K. (R. & G.), MARRIAGE OF

S292852 C101594 Third Appellate District

PEOPLE v. MARTINEZ
(HUMBERTO)

Petition for review denied

S292863 A170955 First Appellate District, Div. 1

IN RE KALEB M.

Petition for review denied

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

S292864 B336588 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

PEOPLE v. COWART
(TIMOTHY JAY)

Petition for review denied

S292870 C104184 Third Appellate District

NORLUND (RICHARD L.) v.
S.C.

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

S292877 G065651 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**KUBO (MAI) v. NILCHIAN
(NEIL)**

S292881 D082559 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**DALO (RANDY) v. HAY
(BRADLEY)**

S292883

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

**NORLUND (RICHARD L.) v.
COURT OF APPEAL, THIRD
APPELLATE DISTRICT**

S292913 F087895 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. HERNANDEZ
(ADRIAN PAUL)**

S292919 H052531 Sixth Appellate District

The request for judicial notice is denied.
The request to file supplemental materials is denied.
The petition for review is denied.

**WASHELESKI (PAWL) v. W.
(C.)**

S292925 B333254 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

Petition for review denied

**ORTIZ (DAVID) v. MORLEY
CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.**

S292928 G065900 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. S.C. (SAN
AGUSTIN)**

S292929

The petition for writ of mandate is denied.

S292930 C104324 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

S292952 D083483 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1
Petition for review denied**S292976** A174195 First Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

S293000 C104433 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

S293004 E083246 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

S293012 H052664 Sixth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

S293027

Petition for review denied

**AMEZQUITA (JOSE
GUADALUPE) v. COURT OF
APPEAL, SIXTH
APPELLATE DISTRICT
(SINGH)****GUERRERO (EDUARDO) v.
GREER (JAVANNA)****A. (MARIAN) v. G. (CORINA)****DONOVAN (MICHAEL J.) v.
S.C. (DONOVAN)****ABIOYE (ADEDAYO) v.
BRAIMOH (MOJISOLA)****ZORIKOVA (ALLA) v.
LAMEY (TINA)****PEOPLE v. GARCIA, JR.,
(EDUARDO CANEDO)****MOSSIGHI (DANIEL P.) v.
MUSIGHI (ISAAC)**

S293051 H051252 Sixth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. SAMPOGNARO
(MICHAEL SEBASTIAN)**

S293055 B337603 Second Appellate District, Div. 7

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. PATTERSON
(HARUM)**

S293059 A174182 First Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**WOMACK (RODNEY
JEROME) ON H.C.**

S293072

Petition for review denied

**ZORIKOVA (ALLA) v. PEASE
(BRYAN W.)**

S293075 F087499 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**KHOSHABA (NAHRAIN) v.
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT
OF SOCIAL SERVICES**

S293076

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. JEFFERSON
(OMAR MALIK)**

S293082 E083150 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. JACKSON
(DERWIN JULES)**

S293105 B333812 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**MORRIS (P. KEVIN) v.
ZIEGLER (GARRETT)**

S293112 B336607 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

Petitions for review denied

**PEOPLE v. RODRIGUEZ
(DAVID)**

S293124 A169579 First Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**DONG (YOU WEI) v. CHANG
(ALICIA); YEN (ZEHUI LI);
CSC FIDUCIARIES, INC.)**

S293134 B332168 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. WELLINGTON
(DUMAURIO DESHAWN)**

S293139 B334751 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. BEARD
(ROBERT)**

S293140

Petition for review denied

**DANIELS (SONYA) v. BODY
BY BATAL COSMETIC
SURGERY CENTER**

S293143 B332457 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. TRAUGHBER
(TOMMY ANTHONY)**

S293153 F089225 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. HESSELBERG
(SILAS MATTHEW)**

S293164 E083325 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. WATSON
(ALIJAH JAHMAAL)**

S293173 H051663 Sixth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. WILLIAMS
(MALI WENDELL)**

S293175 B338071 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. DODD (DANNY)

S293178 G062473 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. GONZALEZ
(EDUARDO GODOY)**

S293179 A168654 First Appellate District, Div. 5

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. RAMIREZ
(MARIO)**

S293181 A168697 First Appellate District, Div. 5

The request for consideration of an additional issue in the petition for review is granted.
The petition for review is denied.

**PEOPLE v. MENDEZ-
TORRES (JOSE ANGEL)**

S293182 D085872 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. WINKLE
(BENJAMIN FRANKLIN)**

S293183 F088105 Fifth Appellate District

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

**PEOPLE v. TASHCHYAN
(NERSES)**

S293186 B336375 Second Appellate District, Div. 7

Petition for review denied
Liu and Evans, JJ., are of the opinion the petition should be granted.

**PEOPLE v. DeJESUS (JUDE
CRISOSTOMO)**

S293187 A166820 First Appellate District, Div. 5

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. GROGAN-
ROBINSON (TAMMY SUE)**

S293188 B338702 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. FLORES (EFREN)

S293189 B344382 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. NIEBLAS
(REMIGIO)**

S293193

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. COOK
(DERRICK)**

S293202 A174212 First Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

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

S293205 B336340 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. WILLIAMS
(SHAWN RANSOME)**

S293210 C101179/C101196 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. WIMBERLY
(LARRY)**

S293217 A166451 First Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. DEJESUS-
GALINDO (JOSE LUIS)**

S293220 B343869 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**SEDAGHAT (S. DAVID) v.
TARZANA HEALTH &
REHABILITATION CENTER**

S293221 B338116 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. SHI (DEYUN)

S293223 C104545 Third Appellate District

The petition for review is denied without prejudice to any relief to which petitioner might be entitled after this court decides *In re Kowalczyk*, S277910.

**ROBINSON (JACQUECUR
DEVON) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)**

S293226	B336963 Second Appellate District, Div. 4	PEOPLE v. ST. PIERRE (JASON EDWARD)
Petition for review denied		
S293229	G063396 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3	PEOPLE v. BOUGHLALA (NOUREDDIN)
Petition for review denied		
S293232	B333221 Second Appellate District, Div. 5	PEOPLE v. MACHUCA (ROBBIN)
Petition for review denied		
S293235	B336397 Second Appellate District, Div. 5	PEOPLE v. DIAZ (FERNANDO ADRIAN)
Petition for review denied		
S293244	D083541 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1	PEOPLE v. BOWMAN (DEAUNDRE)
Petition for review denied		
S293246	A166803 First Appellate District, Div. 2	PEOPLE v. HALDEMAN (RANDOLPH MICHAEL)
Petition for review denied		
S293250	A165935 First Appellate District, Div. 4	PEOPLE v. CORDON (HENRY)
Petition for review denied		
S293252	E086900 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2	H. (L.) v. S.C. (SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY CHILDREN & FAMILY SERVICES)
Petition for review denied		

S293256 F088237 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. ROBLES, JR.,
(ANTONIO GONZALES)**

S293258 C100050 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. JOHNSON
(MICHAEL)**

S293260 G063356 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. KEBLIS (JOHN
ANTHONY)**

S293262 D082771 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. ROMERO (JOSE
LOZANO)**

S293265 B331242 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. MARTINEZ
(SANTOS)**

S293267 C104698 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**GOMEZ (CURTIS) v. S.C.
(PEOPLE)**

S293270 D083232 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. LEAL (AMBER)

S293272 B337091 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. CHOICE (BRIAN
KEITH)**

S293273 B335643 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. TRUJILLO
(STEVEN DANIEL)**

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

S293277 A170631 First Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. NICKERMAN
(CHARLES ARTHUR)**

S293278 D083937 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. PROCTOR
(MICHAEL)**

S293280 B334712 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. RAMSEY
(RASHAUD)**

S293282

The petition for writ of mandate/prohibition is denied.

**VANG (HUA) v. COURT OF
APPEAL, FIFTH APPELLATE
DISTRICT (PEOPLE)**

S293284 B339012 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

Evans, J., is of the opinion the petition should be granted.

**PEOPLE v. SMITH (ROBERT
LATRELL)**

S293287 F088572 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. RICHMOND
(ELDRICK)**

S293292 B337310 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. MORENO (RENE
RAY)**

S293301 G062957 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. TORRES
(ENRIQUE)**

S293303 B336405 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

**PEOPLE v. NOLAZCO-LOZA
(ANTHONY)**

Petition for review denied

S293310 A174175 First Appellate District, Div. 3

HAYNIE (DONELL) ON H.C.

Petition for review denied

S293318 A172535 First Appellate District, Div. 2

PEOPLE v. BRIM (COREY)

Petition for review denied

S293324 B331231 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

**ZAKHARIA (GEORGE) v.
KRZEMUSKI (PAUL)**

Petition for review denied

S293325

**SOPER III (JERRY
BENJAMIN) v. STATE BAR
OF CALIFORNIA (UNITED
AIRLINES, INC.)**

The motion for leave to file an amended petition for review and writ of mandate is denied.
The petition for writ of mandate/prohibition is denied.

S293327 E081941/E083495 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 **GOGER (DEBORAH) v. BENT
(JAMES)**

Petition for review denied

S293328 B333988 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

**PEOPLE v. BRACAMONTE
(LOUIE)**

Petition for review denied

S293330

**McCALL (ANTHONY RAY) v.
COURT OF APPEAL,
SECOND APPELLATE
DISTRICT, DIVISION TWO
(S.C.)**

The petition for writ of mandate/prohibition and “Motion for Enforcement of Article 6, § 20 of the California Constitution” are denied.

S293332 C099713 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. BINGAMAN, JR.,
(TIMOTHY MICHAEL)**

S293337 D085998 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. CORTEZ
(SALVADOR HUERTA)**

S293338 C100536 Third Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. SCOTT (THOMAS
CHARLES)**

S293340 D085997 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. GARAY (FABIAN)

S293341 B335759 Second Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. THOMAS
(DENNIS WAYNE)**

S293345 B334466 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

PEOPLE v. TUN (TOMAS)

S293347 B335979 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. BELEN
(ELDERJAIRUS STOTOMAS)**

S293349 A167158 First Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. MORAN
(ARMANDO IGNACIO)**

S293350 A174344 First Appellate District, Div. 5

Petition for review denied

**KELLEY (TSHOMBE) ON
H.C.**

S293355	B342325 Second Appellate District, Div. 2	IN RE H.H.
Petition for review denied		
S293359	B335448 Second Appellate District, Div. 8	PEOPLE v. RICHARDSON (ANTOINE LEON)
Petition for review denied		
S293362	F088175 Fifth Appellate District	IN RE K.B.
The request for judicial notice is denied.		
The petition for review is denied.		
S293367	B335647 Second Appellate District, Div. 1	PEOPLE v. WILLIAMS (SMITTY LEE)
Petition for review denied		
S293369	C101645 Third Appellate District	IN RE N.H.
Petition for review denied		
S293370	F090025 Fifth Appellate District	DELIS (MARIO) v. S.C. (THORN)
Petition for review denied		
S293371	C096487 Third Appellate District	PEOPLE v. WOODWARD (LOUIS RAY)
Petition for review denied		
S293373	A170498 First Appellate District, Div. 2	PEOPLE v. SCHUSTER (ROBERT ANDREWS)
Petition for review denied		
S293375	C100696 Third Appellate District	PEOPLE v. BRANDON (ERICK)
Petition for review denied		
Liu, J., is of the opinion the petition should be granted.		

S293379 F087792 Fifth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. MAGANA
(STEVEN)**

S293384 D083542 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. WASHINGTON
(TONY)**

S293385 A171075 First Appellate District, Div. 4

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. MISTLER
(BREANNA RAE)**

S293393 D086898 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**RYAN (JEREMY) v. S.C.
(BEST IN SLOT, LLC)**

S293397 B334216 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. PENA
(GILDARDO)**

S293399 D082809 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. AUSTIN
(ANTHONY)**

S293401 B331027 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. BATES (ANGELA
MARIE)**

S293405 H051854 Sixth Appellate District

Petition for review denied

**PEOPLE v. CHIOINO
(RICHARD LEWIS)**

S293408**QUINTERO (EDGAR ANDRES) v. COURT OF APPEAL, SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT, DIVISION FOUR (PEOPLE)**

The petition for writ of mandate is denied.

S293411 F090332 Fifth Appellate District**RODARTE (ALEXANDER) ON H.C.**

Petition for review denied

S293418 A171186 First Appellate District, Div. 5**PEOPLE v. COLEMAN (DANNIELLE HEATHER)**

Petition for review denied

S293422 G066020 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3**FUENTES (ALEXANDER) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)**

Petition for review denied

S293430 B348937 Second Appellate District, Div. 4**CATUN (JAIME) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)**

Petition for review denied

S293534 B349562 Second Appellate District, Div. 7**NORLUND (RICHARD L.) v. S.C. (NORLUND)**

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S293613 A174439 First Appellate District, Div. 3**ADJUDER (NICOLAS BARON) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)**

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S293683

B349417 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

**ROBERTS-SOKOL
(NATASHA) v. S.C.
(ROBERTS II)**

Petitioner's motion to file the unredacted volume of exhibits under seal is granted. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.47.) The clerk of this court is directed to file the unredacted volume of exhibits under seal.

The petition for review and application for stay are denied.

S293786

H053712 Sixth Appellate District

**DUONG (NGA) v. S.C. (TTWL
GUNTER LLC)**

The request for judicial notice is denied.

The petitions for review and application for stay are denied.

S287913**COOPER (DANTEA
TERRELL) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

The petition for writ of habeas corpus has been read and considered. Petitioner contends, among other claims, that he is entitled to relief under the Racial Justice Act of 2020. (Pen. Code, § 745.) In this respect, petitioner alleges that the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror in the case exhibited bias or animus toward petitioner because of petitioner's race; and, during in-court trial proceedings, the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror used racially discriminatory language about petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin. Petitioner specifically claims that "Officer John Swankosky labeled [him] the Black guy" and Judge Joan Weber "called [him] mentally ill[.]"

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts that would establish a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The request for counsel is denied.

Petitioner "has not established a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief" under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claim based on alleged exhibitions of racial bias. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(1)-(2).) Nor does petitioner attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. Petitioner also seeks disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act to obtain supporting evidence. (See Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d), 1473, subd. (e).) We granted review in *In re Montgomery*, S287339 (*Montgomery*) to consider issues related to discovery requests under the Racial Justice Act. Because our resolution of the issues presented in *Montgomery* may affect the availability of discovery under the Racial Justice Act, which may in turn affect the ability of a petitioner to plead claims under that statute, the petition for writ of habeas corpus and discovery request are denied without prejudice to any relief to which petitioner might be entitled after this court decides *Montgomery*. (See Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) ["A petition raising a claim [under the Racial Justice Act] on the basis of new discovery provided by the state or other new evidence

that could not have been previously known by the petitioner with due diligence, shall not be deemed a successive or abusive petition”].)

S288319

**HARPER (DANIEL JAMES)
ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

The petition for writ of habeas corpus has been read and considered. Petitioner contends, among other claims, that he is entitled to relief under the Racial Justice Act of 2020. (Pen. Code, § 745.) In this respect, petitioner alleges that the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror in the case exhibited bias or animus toward petitioner because of petitioner’s race; he was charged or convicted of a more serious offense than defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins who have engaged in similar conduct and are similarly situated; prosecutors in Sacramento County more frequently sought or obtained convictions for more serious offenses against people who share his race, ethnicity, or national origin; he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants who share petitioner’s race, ethnicity, or national origin in Sacramento County. The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts that would establish a violation of the Racial Justice Act].) The request for counsel is denied.

Petitioner “has not established a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief” under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claim based on alleged exhibitions of racial bias or that support a claim petitioner was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(1), (3)-(4).) Nor does petitioner describe or attach relevant supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims.

Petitioner also seeks disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act to obtain evidence supporting his claims. (See Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d), 1473, subd. (e).) We granted review in *In re Montgomery*, S287339 (*Montgomery*) to consider issues related to discovery requests under the Racial Justice Act. Because our resolution of the issues presented in *Montgomery* may affect the availability of discovery under the Racial Justice Act, which may in turn affect the ability of a petitioner to plead claims under that statute, the petition for writ of habeas corpus and discovery request are denied without prejudice to any relief to which petitioner might be entitled after this court decides *Montgomery*. (See Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [“A petition raising a claim [under the Racial Justice Act] on the basis of new discovery provided by the state or other new evidence that could not have been previously known by the petitioner with due diligence, shall not be deemed a successive or abusive petition”].)

S288320**BROWNLEE (TERRENCE)
ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

Petitioner's request for judicial notice is denied.

The petition for writ of habeas corpus has been read and considered. Petitioner contends, among other claims, that he is entitled to relief under the Racial Justice Act of 2020. (Pen. Code, § 745.) In this respect, petitioner alleges that an unnamed witness stated that “all [B]lack [people] look alike” and that he was charged or convicted of a more serious offense than defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins who have engaged in similar conduct and are similarly situated; prosecutors in Fresno County more frequently sought or obtained convictions for more serious offenses against people who share his race, ethnicity, or national origin; and he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants who share petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin in Fresno County.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts that would establish a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The request for counsel is denied.

Petitioner “has not established a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief” under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claim based on an alleged exhibition of racial bias or that support claims that he was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(2), (3)-(4)(A).) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. Petitioner also seeks disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act to obtain supporting evidence. (See Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d), 1473, subd. (e).) We granted review in *In re Montgomery*, S287339 (*Montgomery*) to consider issues related to discovery requests under the Racial Justice Act. Because our resolution of the issues presented in *Montgomery* may affect the availability of discovery under the Racial Justice Act, which may in turn affect the ability of a petitioner to plead claims under that statute, the petition for writ of habeas corpus and discovery request are denied without prejudice to any relief to which petitioner might be entitled after this court decides *Montgomery*. (See Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [“A petition raising a claim [under the Racial Justice Act] on the basis of new discovery provided by the state or other new evidence that could not have been previously known by the petitioner with due diligence, shall not be deemed a successive or abusive petition”].)

S288727**WASHINGTON (RODERICK
NATHANIEL) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

The petition for writ of habeas corpus has been read and considered. Petitioner contends, among other claims, that he is entitled to relief under the Racial Justice Act of 2020. (Pen. Code, § 745.) In this respect, petitioner alleges that the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror in the case exhibited bias or animus toward petitioner because of petitioner's race; during in-court trial proceedings, the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror used racially discriminatory language about petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin; he was charged or convicted of a more serious offense than defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins who have engaged in similar conduct and are similarly situated; prosecutors in Los Angeles County more frequently sought or obtained convictions for more serious offenses against people who share his race, ethnicity, or national origin; he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants who share petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin in Los Angeles County; and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants in cases with victims of one race, ethnicity, or national origin than in cases with victims of other races, ethnicities, or national origins in Los Angeles County.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts that would establish a violation of the Racial Justice Act].) The request for counsel is denied.

Petitioner "has not established a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief" under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claim based on alleged exhibitions of racial bias or that support a claim petitioner was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(1)-(4).) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims.

Petitioner also seeks disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act to obtain evidence supporting his claims. (See Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d), 1473, subd. (e).) We granted review in *In re Montgomery*, S287339 (*Montgomery*) to consider issues related to discovery requests under the Racial Justice Act. Because our resolution of the issues presented in *Montgomery* may affect the availability of discovery under the Racial Justice Act, which may in turn affect the ability of a petitioner to plead claims under that statute, the petition for writ of habeas corpus and discovery request are denied without prejudice to any relief to which petitioner might be entitled after this court decides *Montgomery*. (See Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) ["A petition raising a claim [under the Racial Justice Act] on the basis of new discovery provided by the state or other new evidence that could not have been previously known by the petitioner with due diligence, shall not be deemed a successive or abusive petition"].)

S289111**WASHINGTON (RODERICK
NATHANIEL) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

The petition for writ of habeas corpus has been read and considered. Petitioner contends, among other claims, that he is entitled to relief under the Racial Justice Act of 2020. (Pen. Code, § 745.) In this respect, petitioner alleges that the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror in the case exhibited bias or animus toward petitioner because of petitioner's race; during in-court trial proceedings, the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror used racially discriminatory language about petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin; he was charged or convicted of a more serious offense than defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins who have engaged in similar conduct and are similarly situated; prosecutors in Los Angeles County more frequently sought or obtained convictions for more serious offenses against people who share his race, ethnicity, or national origin; he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants who share petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin in Los Angeles County; and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants in cases with victims of one race, ethnicity, or national origin than in cases with victims of other races, ethnicities, or national origins in Los Angeles County.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts that would establish a violation of the Racial Justice Act].) The request for counsel is denied.

Petitioner "has not established a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief" under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claim based on alleged exhibitions of racial bias or that support a claim petitioner was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(1)-(4).) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims.

Petitioner also seeks disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act to obtain evidence supporting his claims. (See Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d), 1473, subd. (e).) We granted review in *In re Montgomery*, S287339 (*Montgomery*) to consider issues related to discovery requests under the Racial Justice Act. Because our resolution of the issues presented in *Montgomery* may affect the availability of discovery under the Racial Justice Act, which may in turn affect the ability of a petitioner to plead claims under that statute, the petition for writ of habeas corpus and discovery request are denied without prejudice to any relief to which petitioner might be entitled after this court decides *Montgomery*. (See Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) ["A petition raising a claim [under the Racial Justice Act] on the basis of new discovery provided by the state or other new evidence that could not have been previously known by the petitioner with due diligence, shall not be deemed a successive or abusive petition"].)

S289278**WASHINGTON (RODERICK
NATHANIEL) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus has been read and considered. Petitioner contends, among other claims, that he is entitled to relief under the Racial Justice Act of 2020. (Pen. Code, § 745.) In this respect, petitioner alleges that the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror in the case exhibited bias or animus toward petitioner because of petitioner's race; during in-court trial proceedings, the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror used racially discriminatory language about petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin; he was charged or convicted of a more serious offense than defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins who have engaged in similar conduct and are similarly situated; prosecutors in Los Angeles County more frequently sought or obtained convictions for more serious offenses against people who share his race, ethnicity, or national origin; he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants who share petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin in Los Angeles County; and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants in cases with victims of one race, ethnicity, or national origin than in cases with victims of other races, ethnicities, or national origins in Los Angeles County.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts that would establish a violation of the Racial Justice Act].) The request for counsel is denied.

Petitioner "has not established a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief" under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claim based on alleged exhibitions of racial bias or that support a claim petitioner was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(1)-(4); cf. *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. (cf. *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence].)

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S289308**WASHINGTON (RODERICK
NATHANIEL) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

The petition for writ of habeas corpus has been read and considered. Petitioner contends, among other claims, that he is entitled to relief under the Racial Justice Act of 2020. (Pen. Code, § 745.) In this respect, petitioner contends the trial judge and deputy district attorney demonstrated racial animus by fabricating evidence and failing to timely disclose all relevant discovery. Petitioner further alleges that the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror in the case exhibited bias or animus toward petitioner because of petitioner's race; during in-court trial

proceedings, the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror used racially discriminatory language about petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin; he was charged or convicted of a more serious offense than defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins who have engaged in similar conduct and are similarly situated; prosecutors in Los Angeles County more frequently sought or obtained convictions for more serious offenses against people who share his race, ethnicity, or national origin; he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants who share petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin in Los Angeles County; and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants in cases with victims of one race, ethnicity, or national origin than in cases with victims of other races, ethnicities, or national origins in Los Angeles County.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts that would establish a violation of the Racial Justice Act].) The request for counsel is denied.

Petitioner "has not established a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief" under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claim based on alleged exhibitions of racial bias or that support a claim petitioner was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(1)-(4).) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims.

Petitioner also seeks disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act to obtain evidence supporting his claims. (See Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d), 1473, subd. (e).) We granted review in *In re Montgomery*, S287339 (*Montgomery*) to consider issues related to discovery requests under the Racial Justice Act. Because our resolution of the issues presented in *Montgomery* may affect the availability of discovery under the Racial Justice Act, which may in turn affect the ability of a petitioner to plead claims under that statute, the petition for writ of habeas corpus and discovery request are denied without prejudice to any relief to which petitioner might be entitled after this court decides *Montgomery*. (See Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) ["A petition raising a claim [under the Racial Justice Act] on the basis of new discovery provided by the state or other new evidence that could not have been previously known by the petitioner with due diligence, shall not be deemed a successive or abusive petition"].)

S289975

**WASHINGTON (RODERICK
NATHANIEL) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

The petition for writ of habeas corpus has been read and considered. Petitioner contends, among other claims, that he is entitled to relief under the Racial Justice Act of 2020. (Pen. Code, § 745.) In this respect, petitioner contends he is actually innocent and was "racial[ly] discriminated against and subjected to racial bias prosecution." Petitioner further alleges that the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror in the case exhibited bias or animus

toward petitioner because of petitioner's race; during in-court trial proceedings, the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror used racially discriminatory language about petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin; he was charged or convicted of a more serious offense than defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins who have engaged in similar conduct and are similarly situated; prosecutors in Los Angeles County more frequently sought or obtained convictions for more serious offenses against people who share his race, ethnicity, or national origin; he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants who share petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin in Los Angeles County; and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants in cases with victims of one race, ethnicity, or national origin than in cases with victims of other races, ethnicities, or national origins in Los Angeles County.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts that would establish a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The request for counsel is denied.

Petitioner "has not established a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief" under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claim based on alleged exhibitions of racial bias or that support a claim petitioner was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(1)-(4).) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims.

Petitioner also seeks disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act to obtain evidence supporting his claims. (See Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d), 1473, subd. (e).) We granted review in *In re Montgomery*, S287339 (*Montgomery*) to consider issues related to discovery requests under the Racial Justice Act. Because our resolution of the issues presented in *Montgomery* may affect the availability of discovery under the Racial Justice Act, which may in turn affect the ability of a petitioner to plead claims under that statute, the petition for writ of habeas corpus and discovery request are denied without prejudice to any relief to which petitioner might be entitled after this court decides *Montgomery*. (See Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) ["A petition raising a claim [under the Racial Justice Act] on the basis of new discovery provided by the state or other new evidence that could not have been previously known by the petitioner with due diligence, shall not be deemed a successive or abusive petition"].)

S290030

**MALDONADO (JAIME
ARIAS) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

The petition for writ of habeas corpus has been read and considered. Petitioner contends, among other claims, that he is entitled to relief under the Racial Justice Act of 2020. (Pen. Code, § 745.) In this respect, petitioner alleges that the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror in the case exhibited bias or animus toward petitioner because of petitioner's race; he

was charged or convicted of a more serious offense than defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins who have engaged in similar conduct and are similarly situated; prosecutors in Santa Clara County more frequently sought or obtained convictions for more serious offenses against people who share his race, ethnicity, or national origin; he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants who share petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin in Santa Clara County; and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants in cases with victims of one race, ethnicity, or national origin than in cases with victims of other races, ethnicities, or national origins in Santa Clara County.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts that would establish a violation of the Racial Justice Act].) The request for counsel is denied.

Petitioner "has not established a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief" under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claim based on alleged exhibitions of racial bias or that support a claim petitioner was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(1), (3)-(4).) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. Petitioner also seeks disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act to obtain evidence supporting his claims. (See Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d), 1473, subd. (e).) We granted review in *In re Montgomery*, S287339 (*Montgomery*) to consider issues related to discovery requests under the Racial Justice Act. Because our resolution of the issues presented in *Montgomery* may affect the availability of discovery under the Racial Justice Act, which may in turn affect the ability of a petitioner to plead claims under that statute, the petition for writ of habeas corpus and discovery request are denied without prejudice to any relief to which petitioner might be entitled after this court decides *Montgomery*. (See Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) ["A petition raising a claim [under the Racial Justice Act] on the basis of new discovery provided by the state or other new evidence that could not have been previously known by the petitioner with due diligence, shall not be deemed a successive or abusive petition"].)

S290857

**WASHINGTON (RODERICK
NATHANIEL) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus has been read and considered. Petitioner contends, among other claims, that he is entitled to relief under the Racial Justice Act of 2020. (Pen. Code, § 745.) In this respect, petitioner contends that the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror in the case exhibited bias or animus toward petitioner because of petitioner's race; during in-court trial proceedings, the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror used racially discriminatory language about petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin; he was charged or convicted of a more serious offense than defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins who have engaged in similar conduct and are similarly situated; prosecutors in Los Angeles County more frequently sought or obtained convictions for

more serious offenses against people who share his race, ethnicity, or national origin; he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants who share petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin in Los Angeles County; and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants in cases with victims of one race, ethnicity, or national origin than in cases with victims of other races, ethnicities, or national origins in Los Angeles County.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts that would establish a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The request for counsel is denied.

Petitioner "has not established a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief" under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claim based on alleged exhibitions of racial bias or that support a claim petitioner was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(1)-(4); cf. *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. (cf. *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence].)

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S291138

**WASHINGTON (RODERICK
NATHANIEL) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

The petition for writ of habeas corpus has been read and considered. Petitioner contends, among other claims, that he is entitled to relief under the Racial Justice Act of 2020. (Pen. Code, § 745.) In this respect, petitioner contends he was "subjected to racial profiling by T-Mobile employee who called Chino Police Department who told T-Mobile employee to detain petitioner in violation of Racial Justice Act." Petitioner further alleges that the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror in the case exhibited bias or animus toward petitioner because of petitioner's race.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts that would establish a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The request for counsel is denied.

Petitioner "has not established a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief" under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claims based on alleged exhibitions of racial bias. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(1).) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. Petitioner also seeks disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act to obtain evidence supporting his claims. (See Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d), 1473, subd. (e).) We granted review in

In re Montgomery, S287339 (*Montgomery*) to consider issues related to discovery requests under the Racial Justice Act. Because our resolution of the issues presented in *Montgomery* may affect the availability of discovery under the Racial Justice Act, which may in turn affect the ability of a petitioner to plead claims under that statute, the petition for writ of habeas corpus and discovery request are denied without prejudice to any relief to which petitioner might be entitled after this court decides *Montgomery*. (See Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [“A petition raising a claim [under the Racial Justice Act] on the basis of new discovery provided by the state or other new evidence that could not have been previously known by the petitioner with due diligence, shall not be deemed a successive or abusive petition”].)

S291141**WASHINGTON (RODERICK
NATHANIEL) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See Pen. Code, § 745, subd. (j)(5).)

S291325**CAZARES (RENE) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus has been read and considered. Petitioner contends, among other claims, that he is entitled to relief under the Racial Justice Act of 2020. (Pen. Code, § 745.) In this respect, petitioner alleges he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts that would establish a violation of the Racial Justice Act].)

The request for counsel is denied.

Petitioner “has not established a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief” under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support a claim that petitioner was sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(4); *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. (*People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence].)

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S291327**SANDERS (PHILLIP
CONRAD) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

The petition for writ of habeas corpus has been read and considered. Petitioner contends, among other claims, that he is entitled to relief under the Racial Justice Act of 2020. (Pen. Code, § 745.) In this respect, petitioner alleges longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants who share petitioner’s race, ethnicity, or national origin in Los

Angeles County.

The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts that would establish a violation of the Racial Justice Act].) The request for counsel is denied.

Petitioner “has not established a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief” under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support a claim that petitioner was sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins in Los Angeles County. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(4)(A).) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning this claim.

Petitioner also seeks disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act to obtain evidence supporting his claims. (See Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d), 1473, subd. (e).) We granted review in *In re Montgomery*, S287339 (*Montgomery*) to consider issues related to discovery requests under the Racial Justice Act. Because our resolution of the issues presented in *Montgomery* may affect the availability of discovery under the Racial Justice Act, which may in turn affect the ability of a petitioner to plead claims under that statute, the petition for writ of habeas corpus and discovery request are denied without prejudice to any relief to which petitioner might be entitled after this court decides *Montgomery*. (See Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [“A petition raising a claim [under the Racial Justice Act] on the basis of new discovery provided by the state or other new evidence that could not have been previously known by the petitioner with due diligence, shall not be deemed a successive or abusive petition”].)

S291484

**SERNA (STEVEN ANTHONY)
ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S291592

**WASHINGTON (RODERICK
NATHANIEL) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See Pen. Code, § 745, subd. (j)(5).)

S291638

**DELGADO (FERNANDO) ON
H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S291644

**MILLENDER (DAVID LEE)
ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S291647**GONZALES (GONZALO
ROBERT) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

The petition for writ of habeas corpus has been read and considered. Petitioner contends, among other claims, that he is entitled to relief under the Racial Justice Act of 2020. (Pen. Code, § 745.) In this respect, petitioner alleges that the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror in the case exhibited bias or animus toward petitioner because of petitioner's race; during in-court trial proceedings, the judge, an attorney, a law enforcement officer, an expert, or a juror used racially discriminatory language about petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin; he was charged or convicted of a more serious offense than defendants of other races, ethnicities, or national origins who have engaged in similar conduct and are similarly situated; prosecutors in Santa Clara County more frequently sought or obtained convictions for more serious offenses against people who share his race, ethnicity, or national origin; and he received a longer or more severe sentence compared to similarly situated individuals convicted of the same offense and longer or more severe sentences were more frequently imposed for the same offense on defendants who share petitioner's race, ethnicity, or national origin in Santa Clara County. The petition does not satisfy the statutory requirements for the appointment of counsel under the Racial Justice Act. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) [providing for the appointment of counsel for an indigent petitioner who alleges facts that would establish a violation of the Racial Justice Act].) The request for counsel is denied.

Petitioner "has not established a prima facie showing of entitlement to relief" under the Racial Justice Act at this time. (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e).) Petitioner fails to allege particularized facts that support his claims based on alleged exhibitions of racial bias or that support a claim that petitioner was charged, convicted, or sentenced in a more severe manner than similarly situated individuals of other races, ethnicities, or national origins. (*Id.*, § 745, subd. (a)(1)-(4)(A).) Nor does petitioner describe or attach supporting documentary evidence concerning these claims. Petitioner also seeks disclosure of discovery under the Racial Justice Act to obtain evidence supporting his claims. (See Pen. Code, §§ 745, subd. (d), 1473, subd. (e).) We granted review in *In re Montgomery*, S287339 (*Montgomery*) to consider issues related to discovery requests under the Racial Justice Act. Because our resolution of the issues presented in *Montgomery* may affect the availability of discovery under the Racial Justice Act, which may in turn affect the ability of a petitioner to plead claims under that statute, the petition for writ of habeas corpus and discovery request are denied without prejudice to any relief to which petitioner might be entitled after this court decides *Montgomery*. (See Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (e) ["A petition raising a claim [under the Racial Justice Act] on the basis of new discovery provided by the state or other new evidence that could not have been previously known by the petitioner with due diligence, shall not be deemed a successive or abusive petition"].)

S291711**BARNETTE (KENNETH
WILSON) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S292073**GIX (FLOYD WAYNE) ON
H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S292082**STARKS (KEITH CHARLES)
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].)

S292084**MARTINEZ (RICHARD
RAYMOND) ON H.C.**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S293320**HAYNIE (DONELL) ON H.C.**

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Dexter* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 921, 925-926 [habeas petitioners must exhaust available administrative remedies]; *In re Miller* (1941) 17 Cal.2d 734, 735 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are repetitive].)

S292376

B339336 Second Appellate District, Div. 2

**LOPEZ (VICTOR IRENE) v.
1000 PALMS ASSOCIATES
GROUP**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S292549

H052184 Sixth Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. HUBBARD
(KETHEN KEYONO)**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S292786

B331228 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

**ZAZA (PASQUALE) v.
STOJANOV (PETER)**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S292856

G063959 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3

**JANE DOE v. LOS
ALAMITOS MEDICAL
CENTER, INC.**

Publication requests denied (case closed)

S292872 D084554 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **PEOPLE v. MENDOZA
(FILIBERTO FLORES)**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S293009 B334215/B336855 Second Appellate District, Div. 4 **STRATA PASADENA SHOPS,
LLC v. JOO (BYUNG SUL)**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S293039 D083623 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **LEAHY (ROBERT) v.
CAMERON (JOSHUA)**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S293121 D084661 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **MUNGUIA (FLORENCIO) v.
COUNTY OF SAN
BERNARDINO**

Publication request denied (case closed)

S293218 B334720 Second Appellate District, Div. 1 **KIM (PAUL) v. AIRSTREAM,
INC.**

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

S293125 A170297 First Appellate District, Div. 1 **PEOPLE v. GUERY
(MARCUS)**

The time for granting or denying review in the above-entitled matter is hereby extended to December 22, 2025.

S293144 G061647 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3 **PEOPLE v. TULI (JEFFREY)**

The time for granting or denying review in the above-entitled matter is hereby extended to December 24, 2025.

S127119**PEOPLE v. GIVENS (TODD)**

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Ronald F. Turner's representation that the appellant's second supplemental reply brief is anticipated to be filed by November 28, 2025, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to December 1, 2025. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

S162197**PEOPLE v. VICTORIANNE
(JAVIER WILLIAM)**

Extension of time granted

Upon application of counsel Deputy State Public Defender Craig Buckser, an extension of time in which to serve and file appellant's supplemental opening brief is granted to January 20, 2026. 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.

S212161**PEOPLE v. WALTERS
(MICHAEL J.)**

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's reply brief is extended to January 16, 2026.

S237549**PEOPLE v. THOMAS
(MICHAEL)**

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 January 16, 2026.

S287519**POTTS (TYRUS CARDELL)
ON H.C.**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the informal response is extended to December 17, 2025.

S287883**SMITH (JASON ANDREW)
ON H.C.**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the informal response is extended to December 22, 2025.

Petitioner will then have to and including January 6, 2026, to serve and file a reply to the informal response.

S293671**CLINTON (MARKEITH
ANTOINE) ON H.C.**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the informal response is extended to December 17, 2025.

S224265**McCURDY (GENE ESTEL)
ON H.C.**

Order filed

This petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed on behalf of a capital inmate was pending in this court on October 25, 2017. Pursuant to Penal Code section 1509, subdivision (g), the petition is transferred to the Superior Court of California, County of Kings.

S242792**PEOPLE v. ELLIS (JAMES
DAWNTAY)**

Order filed

It has come to the court's attention that the reporter's transcript in the copies of the record on appeal that were sent to the parties and others under rules 8.619(f) and 8.622(e) of the California Rules of Court may have included the personal identifying information of a trial juror in violation of the Code of Civil Procedure, section 237, subdivision (a), and rules 8.332 and 8.611 of the California Rules of Court. (See also Code of Civ. Proc., § 237, subd. (f) [prohibiting disclosure of unlawfully secured personal juror identifying information].) Within 30 days from the date of this order, counsel for both parties, the Habeas Corpus Resource Center, the Office of the State Public Defender, the California Appellate Project, and the Governor must inspect Volume 5, page 851 of the reporter's transcript on appeal and, if a juror's personal identifying information has been left unredacted, return to the Clerk of the superior court that volume of the reporter's transcript on appeal. If any copies of the record on appeal are returned to the Clerk of the superior court, the Clerk must, within 60 days from the date of this order, (1) prepare a new version of the volume of the reporter's transcript in which all personal identifying information of any trial juror has been

removed and replaced by appropriate identifying numbers, as required by section 237, subdivision (a), and rules 8.332 and 8.611, in particular such information appearing on Volume 5, page 851 of the reporter's transcript on appeal; and (2) send copies of the new redacted volume to counsel for the parties and others as required in rules 8.619(f) and 8.622(e).

S287285 C102071 Third Appellate District

**O. (J.) v. S.C. (SAN JOAQUIN
COUNTY PUBLIC
CONSERVATOR)**

Motion denied

Petitioner's "Motion To Strike Real Party's Response, Or, In The Alternative, To Deem All Factual Allegations As Admitted," filed on January 22, 2025, is denied.

S292803

CULPEPPER ON DISCIPLINE

Motion to file document under seal denied – THADDEUS JULIAN CULPEPPER

Petitioner's "Motion to Seal and to Authorize Filing of Redacted and Unredacted Petitions" and "Supplemental Motion to Seal and to Authorize Filing of Redacted and Unredacted Petitions," filed on October 30, 2025, are denied. Petitioner must notify the Clerk of this court within 10 days if the unredacted petition for review (lodged conditionally under seal on October 30, 2025) should be filed unsealed as part of the public record. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rules 8.46(d)(7), 8.47(c)(2)(D).)

S293233 C104506 Third Appellate District

A. (K.) v. S.C. (JAMS, INC.)

Order filed

The court is in receipt of petitioner's motion to file the unredacted petition for review under seal, filed on October 1, 2025. The motion is granted in part, and denied in part without prejudice. To the extent petitioner seeks to proceed under a pseudonym, the motion is denied. Petitioner may elect to proceed by initials only. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.90(b)(10).) The motion is granted in all other respects. Within 10 days of the issuance of this order, petitioner may either file a redacted version of the petition for review replacing the proposed pseudonym with the initials K.A., upon receipt of which the clerk shall file the unredacted exhibits under seal; or notify the court that the unredacted exhibits previously lodged with the court may be filed unsealed as part of the public record. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.46(d)(7).) If no conforming version of the exhibits or notification is filed within 10 days of this order, the clerk is directed to return the lodged, unredacted version of the exhibits to petitioner. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.46(d)(7).) The application for stay is denied.

S293557**HANSON (GLENN) ON
CLEMENCY**

Order filed

The clerk shall return the record to the Governor, who is hereby ordered to resubmit the record to the court no later than December 12, 2025, in the manner prescribed by California Rules of Court, rules 8.45 and 8.46(d)(2)-(5) and Administrative Order 2021-05-26. The court will review the proposed redactions and then make the findings required by California Rules of Court, rules 2.550(d) and (e) and 8.46(d)(6), if and as appropriate. Insofar as judicial direction may be required prior to the disclosure of probation reports, records containing summary criminal history information, and material drawn from the applicant's prison case records file, this order hereby provides such direction. (See Pen. Code, §§ 1203.05, subd. (c), 11105, subd. (h); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15, § 3370, subd. (e).) The Governor may seek leave to file portions of these reports and records under seal to the extent they qualify for such filing under the standards set forth in Administrative Order 2021-05-26 and the Rules of Court.

S293562**PERRY (LAURENCE) ON
CLEMENCY**

Order filed

The clerk shall return the record to the Governor, who is hereby ordered to resubmit the record to the court no later than December 12, 2025, in the manner prescribed by California Rules of Court, rules 8.45 and 8.46(d)(2)-(5) and Administrative Order 2021-05-26. The court will review the proposed redactions and then make the findings required by California Rules of Court, rules 2.550(d) and (e) and 8.46(d)(6), if and as appropriate. Insofar as judicial direction may be required prior to the disclosure of probation reports, records containing summary criminal history information, and material drawn from the applicant's prison case records file, this order hereby provides such direction. (See Pen. Code, §§ 1203.05, subd. (c), 11105, subd. (h); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15, § 3370, subd. (e).) The Governor may seek leave to file portions of these reports and records under seal to the extent they qualify for such filing under the standards set forth in Administrative Order 2021-05-26 and the Rules of Court.

S293579**WILLIAMS (T.) v. STATE
BAR OF CALIFORNIA**

Order filed

The court is in receipt of petitioner's motion to file unredacted exhibits to the petition for review and application for stay under seal, filed on October 20, 2025. The court has reviewed the motion and concludes that only pages 3-4 of exhibit 3 and exhibits 6-9, 11, 12, 14, and 16-18 contain confidential material that is subject to redaction. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6060.25.) In all other respects, petitioner's motion to seal is denied. Within 10 days of the issuance of this order, petitioner may either file a version of the exhibits with petitioner's proposed redactions on pages

3-4 of exhibit 3 and in exhibits 6-9, 11, 12, 14, and 16-18, upon receipt of which the clerk shall file the unredacted exhibits under seal; or notify the court that the unredacted exhibits previously lodged with the court may be filed unsealed as part of the public record. (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 8.46(d)(7), 8.47(c)(2)(C).) If no conforming version of the exhibits or notification is filed within 10 days of this order, the clerk is directed to return the lodged, unredacted version of the exhibits to petitioner. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.46(d)(7).)

S293884**BAR ADMISSION 2025 (JULY EXAM)**

General Bar admission order filed

The written motion # 1739 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 as attorneys at law in all courts of the State of California upon their taking the prescribed oath before a competent officer on or after November 12, 2025, and within the time limits specified by Title 4, Division 1 of the Rules of the State Bar of California, is hereby granted:

(SEE ATTACHED LIST OF NAMES)

S293215**ACCUSATION OF BENNETT**

Petition denied (accusation)

S293434**ACCUSATION OF GABINO**

Petition denied (accusation)

Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 TRANSFER ORDERS

The matters listed in Attachment 1, now pending in the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, are transferred from Division Two to Division One:

1. E086180 Timothy Stevens v. Sarah Houser
2. E086466 In re the Marriage of James and Karrisa Sciolla
3. E086473 Nicole Wooten v. County of San Bernardino
4. E086486 Raymond Robinson, Individually and as Executor, etc. v. Vip Bhola
5. E086507 French Medical Corporation et al. v. Universal Health Services, Inc. et al.
6. E086752 Trona Teachers Association, CTA/NEA et al. v. Board of Trustees of the Trona Joint Unified School District
7. E086846 Natalie Cooney v. Chino Valley Unified School District Board of Education et al.
8. E086444 People v. Edgar Gomez Garcia
9. E086469 People v. Thomas Velasquez

10. E086491 People v. Ricky Spivey
11. E084155 Joseph Watson v. Raymond Noda et al.
12. E084253 Mark McCoy v. Fleetwood Aluminum Products, Inc. et al.
13. E085351 Ann McMurtry et al. v. California Highway Patrol
14. E085405 Glenn Cohen v. Chandra Hospitality, LLC
15. E081870 People v. Earl Bowman
16. E084010 People v. Cameron Lewis
17. E084347 People v. Melvin Landry
18. E084831 People v. Salvador Cena
19. E085122 People v. James Renfroe
20. E085506 People v. Almara Parmach

Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 **TRANSFER ORDERS**

The matters listed in Attachment 1, now pending in the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, are transferred from Division Two to Division One:

1. E086228 Shahid Rahmatullah v. Sprint/United Management Company
2. E086294 Timothy Weathers et al. v. John C. Choe, DDS, Inc.
3. E086383 Jie Liu et al. v. Pacific Specialty Insurance Company
4. E086420 Pamela Shane v. Garfield Beach CVS, LLC
5. E086475 Rosaura Barajas Sanchez v. City of Ontario et al.
6. E086487 Julie Gertler v. Omni Hotels Management Corporation et al.
7. E086860 People v. Nicholas Mazzarino
8. E086249 People v. Ashton Hughes
9. E086278 People v. Ricardo Pardo
10. E086320 People v. Ashlii Cowan
11. E084421 Robert Manriquez-Gonzales v. Impact Logistics, Inc.
Consolidated w/ E084721 – Marcus Munoz v. Impact Logistics, Inc. and
E084882 – Marcus Munoz v. Impact Logistics, Inc.
12. E085708 Conservatorship of the Person of C.S.; Riverside County Public Guardian v. C.S.
13. E084712 People v. John Keene
14. E084981 People v. Norbert Sancho
15. E082665 People v. J.B.
16. E083752 People v. John Dickerson
17. E084163 People v. James Fidler III
18. E084483 People v. Jason Mendoza
19. E083161 People v. Oscar Ortiz, Jr.
20. E082558 People v. Christopher Tindall