



Supreme Court of California
350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102-4797
www.courts.ca.gov/supremecourt

NEWS RELEASE

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

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

February 28, 2025

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of February 24, 2025

[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.]

#25-56 *People v. Robinson*, S288606. (C098299; 106 Cal.App.5th 854, mod. 107 Cal.App.5th 245a; San Joaquin County Superior Court; SF117220A.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter. This case presents the following issue: Is a transcript of grand jury proceedings admissible at a Penal Code section 1172.6 evidentiary hearing?

#25-57 *People v. Carrasquillo*, S288882. (B334440; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; A462106.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

#25-58 *People v. Copon*, S288879. (H051607; nonpublished opinion; Santa Clara County Superior Court; C1225419.) 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 *Carrasquillo* and *Copon* deferred pending decision in *People v. Patton*, S279670 (#23-129), which presents the following issue: Did the trial court engage in impermissible judicial factfinding by relying on the preliminary hearing transcript to deny defendant's Penal Code section 1172.6 petition at the prima facie stage? (See *People v. Lewis* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 952.)

#25-59 *People v. Esparza*, S288797. (E082942; nonpublished opinion; Riverside County Superior Court; SWF10001676.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a post-judgment order in a criminal matter. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Rhodius*, S283169 (#24-34), which presents the following issue: Does Senate Bill No. 483 (Stats. 2021, ch. 728) entitle a defendant to a full

resentencing hearing under Penal Code section 1172.75 if the defendant's prior prison term enhancements (Pen. Code, § 667.5, subd. (b)) were imposed and stayed, rather than imposed and executed?

#25-60 *People v. Gonzalez*, S288935. (B329962; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; TA153731.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Allen*, S286520 (#24-224), which presents the following issues: (1) If a defendant has invoked his right to remain silent while being interrogated by a law enforcement officer, are incriminating statements obtained through a subsequent *Perkins* operation (i.e., the use of an undercover agent to question a jailed defendant) admissible as substantive proof of the defendant's guilt at trial? (See *Illinois v. Perkins* (1990) 496 U.S. 292; *Miranda v. Arizona* (1966) 384 U.S. 436.) (2) What effect, if any, does the fact that the interrogating officer continued questioning after petitioner invoked his Fifth Amendment right to silence have upon the admissibility of the statements subsequently obtained during the *Perkins* operation?

DISPOSITIONS

The following cases were transferred for reconsideration in light of *People v. Lynch* (2024) 16 Cal.5th 730:

#22-242 <i>People v. Fridley</i>, S275547	(C095304; nonpublished opinion; Yuba County Superior Court; CRF200101502, CRF2100975)
#22-288 <i>People v. Minick</i>, S276711	(C095111; nonpublished opinion; Yuba County Superior Court; CRF202485)
#22-227 <i>People v. Vaughn</i>, S274644	(E073346; 77 Cal.App.5th 609 [non-citable]; San Bernardino County Superior Court; FSB18003370)
#23-15 <i>People v. Williams</i>, S277569	(F082109; nonpublished opinion; Fresno County Superior Court; F20903481)

Review in the following cases, which were granted and held for *Capito v. San Jose Healthcare System, LP* (2024) 17 Cal.5th 273, was dismissed:

#23-155 <i>Capito v. San Jose Healthcare System LP</i>, S279862	(H049022; nonpublished opinion; Santa Clara County Superior Court; 20CV366981)
#23-216 <i>Moran v. Prime Healthcare Management, Inc.</i>, S281746	(G060920; 94 Cal.App.5th 166; Orange County Superior Court; 30-2013-00689394)
#24-194 <i>Salami v. Los Robles Regional Medical Center</i>, S286557	(B327348; 103 Cal.App.5th 1023; Ventura County Superior Court; 56-2021-00560715-CU-BC-VTA)

The following case was transferred for reconsideration in light of *Capito v. San Jose Healthcare System, LP* (2024) 17 Cal.5th 273:

#23-154 <i>Naranjo v. Doctors Medical Center of Modesto, Inc.</i>, S280374	(F083197; 90 Cal.App.5th 1193, mod. 91 Cal.App.5th 351b [non-citable]; Stanislaus County Superior Court; CV-21-001363.)
---	---

###

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.