



Supreme Court of California  
350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102-4797  
[www.courts.ca.gov/supremecourt](http://www.courts.ca.gov/supremecourt)

**NEWS RELEASE**

Contact: [Merrill Balassone](mailto:Merrill.Balassone@courts.ca.gov), 415-865-7740

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

February 13, 2026

---

## **Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of February 9, 2026**

*[This news release is issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has accepted and of their general subject matter. The statement of the issue or issues in each case set out below does not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]*

**#26-18 *Li v. Arcsoft, Inc.*, S294190.** (9th Cir. Nos. 24-2531, 24-2964; 160 F.4th 1063; Northern District of California; D.C. No. 4:19-cv-05836-JSW.) Request under California Rules of Court, rule 8.548, that this court decide a question of California law presented in a matter pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The question presented is: Do the appraisal requirements of California Corporations Code section 1312, subdivision (a) and *Steinberg v. Amplica, Inc.* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 1198 preclude a shareholder from seeking buyout-related damages when the facts leading to the shareholder's cause of action were not known until after the buyout was consummated?

**#26-19 *Lorenzo v. San Francisco Zen Center*, S294565.** (A171659; 116 Cal.App.5th 258; San Francisco County Superior Court; CGC22602047.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. The court limited review to the following issue: Does the ministerial exception arising under the Religion Clauses of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution categorically preclude wage and hour claims by a minister against a religious organization without any inquiry into whether the claim touches upon any ecclesiastical concern?

**#26-20 *People v. Dozier*, S294597.** (B336625; 116 Cal.App.5th 700; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BA143017.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a post-judgment order in a criminal matter.

**#26-21 *People v. Redondo*, S294507.** (B335729; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; MA061451.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal

affirmed an order granting in part and denying in part a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

**#26-22 *People v. Young*, S294548.** (B337677; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; KA115524.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order granting in part and denying in part a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

The court ordered briefing in *Dozier*, *Redondo*, and *Young* deferred pending decision in *People v. Eaton*, S289903 (#25-129), which presents the following issue: May a trial court reimpose a previously imposed upper term sentence under Penal Code section 1172.75, subdivision (d)(4) where the facts underlying one or more aggravating circumstances were neither stipulated to by the defendant nor found true beyond a reasonable doubt at trial by the jury or by the judge in a court trial (cf. Pen. Code, § 1170, subd. (b)(2); *id.*, § 1172.75, subd. (d)(2))?

**#26-23 *People v. Jimenez*, S294546.** (E084583; nonpublished opinion; Riverside County Superior Court; RIF1600919.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *In re Hernandez*, S282186 (#23-261), which presents the following issue: Does the totality of the circumstances establish that defendant meaningfully understood the immigration consequences of her plea?

#### SEPARATE STATEMENT ON DENIAL OF REVIEW

***People v. Castaneda-Morales*, S294254.** (B341744; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; MA077249-01.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses and remanded with directions.

#### DISPOSITIONS

The following case was transferred for reconsideration in light of *Taking Offense v. State of California* (2025) 18 Cal.5th 891:

<b>#23-175 <i>Raju v. Superior Court</i>, S281001</b>	(A164736; 92 Cal.App.5th 438, mod. 92 Cal.App.5th 1222 [non-citable]; Contra Costa County Superior Court; MSRA210005)
---	---

Review in the following case, which was granted and held for *Leeper v. Shipt, Inc.*, S289305 (#25-91), was dismissed at the joint request of the parties in light of the settlement of the matter:

<b>#25-328 <i>Resendiz v. Canyon Restaurant, Ltd.</i>, S293166</b>	(B342091; nonpublished opinion; Santa Barbara County Superior Court; 24CV00190)
--	---

###

*The Supreme Court of California is the state's highest court and its decisions are binding on all other California state courts. The court's primary role is to decide matters of statewide importance and to maintain uniformity in the law throughout California by reviewing matters from the six districts of the California Courts of Appeal and the fifty-eight county superior courts (the trial courts). Among its other duties, the court also decides all capital appeals and related matters and reviews both attorney and judicial disciplinary matters.*