

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES  
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2023  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

**S272129**      H049016 Sixth Appellate District

**RODRIGUEZ (MARIO) v. S.C.  
(PEOPLE)**

Opinion filed: Judgment reversed

We hold that an incompetency commitment does not end with the filing of a certificate of restoration. Instead, the two-year maximum commitment period set by Penal Code section 1370(c)(1) continues past the filing of the certificate and includes the time between such filing and the court's decision whether to accept the certificate. Accordingly, we reverse the judgment of the Court of Appeal and remand the matter for further proceedings consistent with this opinion. Upon remand, the court shall consider whether the two-year limit of section 1370(c)(1) was exceeded in this case. To answer that question, the court may consider whether good cause continuances can toll the limit of section 1370(c)(1). (Cf. *Camacho, supra*, 15 Cal.5th at pp. 378-379.) If the court finds that the two-year statutory period has indeed been exceeded, it shall further consider the nature of the remedy Rodriguez is entitled to at this point. In particular, the court should examine whether Rodriguez is entitled to dismissal of the charges pending against him or whether other relief is appropriate. (Cf. *Camacho*, at p. 382, fn. 5; *Jackson v. Superior Court, supra*, 4 Cal.5th at p. 106 [holding that “a defendant may be rearrested, and a trial court may order a new competency hearing, following the prosecution’s dismissal and refiling of felony charges pursuant to section 1387 even if the defendant was previously committed for [the statutory maximum period permitted by section 1370(c)(1)]”].)

Majority Opinion Guerrero, C. J.

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

**S274943**      B312001 Second Appellate District, Div. 5      **IN RE N.R.**

Opinion filed: Judgment reversed

We reverse the judgment of the Court of Appeal and remand the cause to that court for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

Majority Opinion by Guerrero, C. J.

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

**S225017****PEOPLE v. KING (COREY LYNN)**

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Deputy Attorney General Stacy S. Schwartz's representation that the respondent's brief is anticipated to be filed by May 17, 2024, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to February 13, 2024. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 94 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).)

**S277628** D079364/D079369 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **MORGAN (BARBARA) v. YGRENE ENERGY FUND, INC.**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondents and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the responses to amicus curiae briefs is extended to February 20, 2024.



**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR  
SAN FRANCISCO SESSION  
JANUARY 4, 2024**

In accordance with [Administrative Order 2023-05-11](#), the Supreme Court has resumed in-person oral argument sessions. Counsel have the option to appear in person at these sessions, or remotely via video. The public may attend in person and will also continue to have access to argument via live-streaming on the judicial branch website: <https://supreme.courts.ca.gov/>.

The following cases are placed upon the calendar of the Supreme Court for hearing at its courtroom in the Ronald M. George State Office Complex, Earl Warren Building, 350 McAllister Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California, on January 4, 2024.

**THURSDAY, JANUARY 4, 2024 — 10:00 A.M.**

- (1) Huerta (George) v. CSI Electrical Contractors, Inc., et al., S275431
- (2) Logan (Charles) v. Country Oaks Partners, LLC, et al., S276545

---

**GUERRERO**  
*Chief Justice*

If exhibits are to be transmitted to this court, counsel must apply to the court for permission. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.224(c).)