



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: [Cathal Conneely](mailto:Cathal.Conneely@courts.ca.gov), 415-865-7740

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

February 19, 2021

---

## Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of February 15, 2021

*[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.]*

**#21-71 *In re Christopher L., S265910.*** (B305225; 56 Cal.App.5th 1172; Los Angeles County Superior Court; 17CCJP02800.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed orders in a juvenile dependency proceeding. The court limited review to the following issue: Is it structural error, and thus reversible per se, for a juvenile court to proceed with jurisdiction and disposition hearings without an incarcerated parent's presence and without appointing the parent an attorney?

**#21-72 *People v. Delgadillo, S266305.*** (B304441; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BA436900.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal dismissed an appeal from an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter. The court limited review to the following issues: (1) What procedures must appointed counsel and the Courts of Appeal follow when counsel determines that an appeal from an order denying postconviction relief lacks arguable merit? (2) Are defendants entitled to notice of these procedures?

**#21-73 *People v. Austin, S266398.*** (B301152; nonpublished opinion; Santa Barbara County Superior Court; 1027776.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

**#21-74 *People v. Medina, S266456.*** (B304477; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; VA118471.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

**#21-75 *People v. Prado, S266609.*** (B304660; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles; BA379833.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

**#21-76 *People v. Sly, S266416.*** (E073972; nonpublished opinion; San Bernardino County Superior Court; FSB1203896.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

The court ordered briefing in *Austin, Medina, Prado, and Sly* deferred pending decision in *People v. Lopez, S258175* (#19-172), which presents the following issues: (1) Does Senate Bill No. 1437 (Stats. 2018, ch. 1015) apply to attempted murder liability under the natural and probable consequences doctrine? (2) In order to convict an aider and abettor of attempted willful, deliberate and premeditated murder under the natural and probable consequences doctrine, must a premeditated attempt to murder have been a natural and probable consequence of the target offense? In other words, should *People v. Favor* (2012) 54 Cal.4th 868 be reconsidered in light of *Alleyne v. United States* (2013) 570 U.S. 99 and *People v. Chiu* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 155?

**#21-77 *People v. Castro, S266558.*** (B304473; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; VA130990.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

**#21-78 *People v. Eads, S266515.*** (E074967; nonpublished opinion; Riverside County Superior Court; RIF102809.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

**#21-79 *People v. Lee, S266342.*** (B297947; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; TA034314.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

**#21-80 *People v. Muhammad, S266455.*** (B297043; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; YA003421.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

**#21-81 *People v. Rodriguez, S266627.*** (B301849; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; A638496.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

**#21-82 *People v. Swanson, S266262.*** (B299638; 57 Cal.App.5th 604; Los Angeles County Superior Court; NA015162.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

The court ordered briefing in *Castro, Eads, Lee, Muhammad, Rodriguez, and Swanson* deferred pending decision in *People v. Lewis, S260598* (#20-78), which presents the following issues: (1) May superior courts consider the record of conviction in

determining whether a defendant has made a prima facie showing of eligibility for relief under Penal Code section 1170.95? (2) When does the right to appointed counsel arise under Penal Code section 1170.95, subdivision (c)?

**#21-83 *People v. Griffin, S266521.*** (A159104; 57 Cal.App.5th 1088; Lake County Superior Court; CR952884, CR953175B, CR953305A.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed judgments of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Hernandez, S265739* (#21-36), which presents the following issues: (1) If a defendant's prior prison term enhancements are stricken under Senate Bill No. 136, does the remainder of the sentence agreed to under a plea agreement remain intact or must the case be remanded to allow the People to withdraw from the plea agreement and to obtain the trial court's approval (see *People v. Stamps* (2020) 9 Cal.5th 685)? (2) If the plea agreement is rescinded in light of Senate Bill No. 136, can the defendant be sentenced to a term longer than provided for in the original agreement?

**#21-84 *People v. Johnson, S266274.*** (D075649; nonpublished opinion; San Diego County Superior Court; SCD267741.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal remanded for recalculation of presentence credits, and otherwise affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Tirado, S257658* (#19-174), which presents the following issue: Can the trial court impose an enhancement under Penal Code section 12022.53, subdivision (b), for personal use of a firearm, or under section 12022.53, subdivision (c), for personal and intentional discharge of a firearm, as part of its authority under section 1385 and subdivision (h) of section 12022.53 to strike an enhancement under subdivision (d) for personal and intentional discharge of a firearm resulting in death or great bodily injury, even if the lesser enhancements were not charged in the information or indictment and were not submitted to the jury?

**#21-85 *People v. Johnson, S266506.*** (E073775; nonpublished opinion; Riverside County Superior Court; RIF10001758.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense.

**#21-86 *People v. Oliver, S266612.*** (B301487; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; MA067514.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense.

The court ordered briefing in *Johnson* and *Oliver* deferred pending decision in *People v. Raybon, S256798* (#19-121), which presents the following issue: Did Proposition 64 [the "Adult Use of Marijuana Act"] decriminalize the possession of up to 28.5 grams of marijuana by adults 21 years of age or older who are in state prison [as well as those not in prison]?

**SEPARATE STATEMENT ON DENIAL OF REVIEW**

*People v. Valliant*, S265734. (G058568; 55 Cal.App.5th 903; Orange County Superior Court; 14WF3768.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

**DISPOSITIONS**

Review in the following cases, which had been granted and held for *People v. Gentile* (2020) 10 Cal.5th 830, was dismissed:

<b>#19-165 <i>People v. Barrera</i>, S257431.</b>	(C085232; nonpublished opinion; El Dorado County Superior Court; P15CRF0067)
<b>#20-100 <i>People v. Garcia</i>, S260237.</b>	(C066714. C066716; nonpublished opinion; Sacramento County Superior Court; 07F09847)

The following case was transferred for reconsideration in light of *People v. Gentile* (2020) 10 Cal.5th 830:

<b>#19-162 <i>People v. Omega</i>, S257165.</b>	(C085437; nonpublished opinion; El Dorado County Superior Court; P15CRF0067)
---	--

# # #

*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.*