



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

NEWS RELEASE

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

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

May 17, 2019

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of May 13, 2019

[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.]

#19-53 *In re Gadlin*, S254599. (B289852; 31 Cal.App.5th 784; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BA165439, BH011480.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal granted relief on a petition for writ of habeas corpus. This case includes the following issue: Under Proposition 57 (Cal. Const., art. I, § 32), may the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation categorically exclude from early parole consideration all prisoners who have been previously convicted of a sex offense requiring registration under Penal Code section 290?

#19-54 *People v. Collins*, S253952. (E069430; nonpublished opinion; Riverside County Superior Court; RIF1701190, BAF1700728.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *In re Ricardo P.*, S230923 (#16-41) and *People v. Trujillo*, S244650 (#17-335), which present issues concerning the imposition of an “electronics search condition” of probation if the devices subject to the condition had no relationship to the crime or crimes committed and use of the devices would not itself involve criminal conduct, but access to the devices might facilitate supervision of the probationer.

#19-55 *People v. MacKenzie*, S255184. (B282720; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; YA089418.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal conditionally reversed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Frahs*, S252220 (#18-175), which presents the following issues: (1) Does Penal Code section 1001.36 apply retroactively to all cases in which the judgment is not yet final? (2) Did the Court of Appeal err by

remanding for a determination of defendant's eligibility under Penal Code section 1001.36?

#19-56 Sealutions, LLC v. Schwab, S254818. (B286897; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC546925.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal issued an order precluding former counsel for the appellant from filing a brief on appeal. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *K.J. v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist.*, S241057 (#17-180), which presents the following issue: Does the Court of Appeal lack jurisdiction over an appeal from an order imposing sanctions on an attorney if the notice of appeal is brought in the name of the client rather than in the name of the attorney?

#

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.