



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

April 17, 2026

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of April 13, 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.]

#26-60 *Doe v. Coronado Unified School District*, S295043. (D084342; nonpublished opinion; San Diego County Superior Court; 37-2021-00006011-CU-PO-CTL.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part the judgment in a civil action and remanded for further proceedings. This case presents the following issue: What, if any, information must the parents of a minor have regarding the threat of sexual misconduct posed by a school district employee to support a finding of negligence against the parents for failing to protect the minor from that person?

#26-61 *People v. Lant*, S294875. (C101318; nonpublished opinion; Siskiyou County Superior Court; SCCR-CRF-2018-1446-2.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court limited review to the following issues: (1) Did the trial court err under *People v. Arbuckle* (1978) 22 Cal.3d 749 by denying defendant's motion to withdraw his plea where the judge who accepted his plea was not available to impose sentence due to matters beyond the trial court's control? (2) Did the Court of Appeal err by holding that, because defendant failed to appear at certain hearings, defendant bore the risk that the judge who accepted his plea would become unavailable for sentencing and therefore defendant could not rely on the judge's unavailability to seek to withdraw his plea?

#26-62 *People v. Brammer*, S295037. (B336058, B339829; 117 Cal.App.5th 675; Los Angeles County Superior Court; PA066631.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed a postjudgment order in a criminal matter and dismissed an appeal. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Andrews*, S290832 (#25-268), which presents the following issues: (1) If a trial court recalls a defendant's sentence upon recommendation of the Secretary of the Department of

Corrections and Rehabilitation pursuant to Penal Code section 1172.1, is there a presumption that the defendant will not be resentenced to the same effective term?
(2) Did the trial court abuse its discretion by resentencing defendant to the same effective term?

#26-63 *People v. Brissette*, S295090. (B338984; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; KA062643.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed post-judgment orders in a criminal matter and remanded with directions. The court ordered briefing 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))? and pending decision in *People v. Mitchell*, S277314 (#22-305), which presents the following issue: Does Senate Bill No. 567 (Stats. 2021, ch. 731), which limits a trial court's discretion to impose upper term sentences, apply retroactively to defendants sentenced pursuant to stipulated plea agreements?

#26-64 *People v. Brown*, S295513. (B337987; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; SA088181.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part an order granting in part and denying in part a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter and remanded for further proceedings.

#26-65 *People v. Hegwood*, S295549. (C102311; nonpublished opinion; Sacramento County Superior Court; 12F00998.) 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.

#26-66 *People v. Osuna*, S295576. (B340274; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; PA085514, PA086641.) 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.

#26-67 *People v. Solomon*, S295598. (C102214; nonpublished opinion; Sacramento County Superior Court; 97F05780.) 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 *Brown*, *Hegwood*, *Osuna*, and *Solomon* 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))?

#26-68 *People v. Marquez*, S295110. (D086920; nonpublished opinion; Riverside County Superior Court; INF2000509, SWF1907470.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order revoking probation in a criminal matter, affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses, and remanded for further proceedings. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Mitchell*, S277314 (#22-305), which presents the following issue: Does Senate Bill No. 567 (Stats. 2021, ch. 731), which limits a trial court's discretion to impose upper term sentences, apply retroactively to defendants sentenced pursuant to stipulated plea agreements?

###

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.