



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**

June 24, 2022

---

## Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of June 20, 2022

*[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.]*

**#22-170 *Estrada v. Royalty Carpet Mills, Inc.*, S274340.** (G058397, G058969; 76 Cal.App.5th 685; Orange County Superior Court; 30-2013-00692890.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part the judgment in a civil action. The court limited review to the following issue: Do trial courts have inherent authority to ensure that claims under the Private Attorneys General Act (Lab. Code, § 2698 et seq.) will be manageable at trial, and to strike or narrow such claims if they cannot be managed?

**#22-171 *Kuciamba v. Victory Woodworks*, S274191.** (9th Cir. No. 21-15963; 31 F.4th 1268; Northern District of California; D.C. No. 3:20-cv-09355-MMC.) Request under California Rules of Court, rule 8.548, that this court decide questions of California law presented in a matter pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The questions presented are: “1. If an employee contracts COVID-19 at his workplace and brings the virus home to his spouse, does California’s derivative injury doctrine bar the spouse’s claim against the employer? 2. Under California law, does an employer owe a duty to the households of its employees to exercise ordinary care to prevent the spread of COVID-19?”

**#22-172 *People v. Flores*, S274561.** (F081903; 77 Cal.App.5th 420; Kern County Superior Court; BF177597A.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Prudholme*, S271057 (#21-531), which presents the following issues: (1) Does Assembly Bill No. 1950 (Stats. 2020, ch. 328) apply retroactively under *In re Estrada* (1965) 63 Cal.2d 740? (2) If so, does the remand procedure of *People v. Stamps* (2020) 9 Cal.5th 685 apply?

**#22-173 *People v. Lopez*, S274160.** (H047254; nonpublished opinion; Monterey County Superior Court; SS121859.) 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 *People v. Reyes*, S270723 (#21-509), which presents the following issue: Does substantial evidence support the superior court's finding that petitioner is ineligible for relief under Penal Code section 1170.95?

**#22-174 *People v. Pimentel*, S274611.** (B312700; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; GA101592.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Faial*, S273840 (#22-133), which presents the following issue: Does Assembly Bill No. 1950 (Stats. 2020, ch. 328) apply retroactively to a defendant, serving a suspended-execution sentence, whose probation was revoked before the law went into effect?

**#22-175 *People v. Wilson*, S274371.** (A161420; nonpublished opinion; Solano County Superior Court; VCR187924.) 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 *People v. Strong*, S266606 (#21-101), which presents the following issue: Does a felony-murder special circumstance finding (Pen. Code, § 190.2, subd. (a)(17)) made before *People v. Banks* (2015) 61 Cal.4th 788 and *People v. Clark* (2016) 63 Cal.4th 522 preclude a defendant from making a prima facie showing of eligibility for relief under Penal Code section 1170.95?

###

*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.*