



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**

October 22, 2021

---

## Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of October 18, 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.]*

**#21-501 *People v. Gonzalez*, S270771.** (H046911; nonpublished opinion; Monterey County Superior Court; SS981989.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

**#21-502 *People v. Martinez*, S270851.** (B308793; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; GA071089.) 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 *Gonzalez* and *Martinez* 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? (3) What is the significance, if any, of Senate Bill No. 775 (Stats. 2021, ch. 551) to the issues presented in this case?

**#21-503 *In re M.K.*, S270424.** (B307066; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; 18CCJP04153, 18CCJP04153I, 18CCJP04153J, 18CCJP04153K, 18CCJP04153L, 18CCJP04153M, 18CCJP04153N, 18CCJP04153O, 18CCJP04153P.) Petitions for review after the Court of Appeal dismissed appeals as moot in a juvenile dependency proceeding. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *In re*

*D.P.*, S267429 (#21-251), which presents the following issues: (1) Is an appeal of a juvenile court's jurisdictional finding moot when a parent asserts that he or she has been or will be stigmatized by the finding? (2) Is an appeal of a juvenile court's jurisdictional finding moot when a parent asserts that he or she may be barred from challenging a current or future placement on the Child Abuse Central Index as a result of the finding?

**#21-504 *People v. Medina*, S270899.** (C091206; nonpublished opinion; Sacramento County Superior Court; 08F03645.) 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?

**#21-505 *People v. Parra*, S270904.** (B309749; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; NA003695.) 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. Espinoza*, S269647 (#21-453), which presents the following issue: Did the Court of Appeal err in ruling that defendant failed to adequately corroborate his claim that immigration consequences were a paramount concern and thus that he could not demonstrate prejudice within the meaning of Penal Code section 1473.7?

**#21-506 *People v. Quevedo*, S270879.** (B300862; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BA456662.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Renteria*, S266854 (#21-160), which presents the following issue: When a member of a criminal street gang acts alone in committing a felony, what evidence will suffice to establish the felony was “committed for the benefit of, at the direction of, or in association with any criminal street gang, with the specific intent to promote, further, or assist in any criminal conduct by gang members”? (Pen. Code, § 186.22, subd. (b)(1); see *People v. Albillar* (2010) 51 Cal.4th 47, 59-60.)

**#21-507 *People v. Slone*, S270690.** (E075821; nonpublished opinion; San Bernardino County Superior Court; FVI901230.) 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. Delgadillo*, S266305 (#21-72), which presents 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?

### DISPOSITIONS

*People v. Alcala*, S181535, an automatic appeal, was abated upon the death of the appellant.

Review in the following cases, which were granted and held for *People v. Lewis* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 952, was dismissed:

#20-104 <i>People v. Miller</i> , S260857.	(B295952; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; VA097054)
#20-123 <i>People v. Graham</i> , S260963.	(C089323; nonpublished opinion; San Joaquin County Superior Court; SF111544A, STKCRFE20096385)
#20-164 <i>People v. Oakley</i> , S262377.	(B297533; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; YA080803)
#20-183 <i>People v. Huynh</i> , S262635.	(D075588; nonpublished opinion; San Diego County Superior Court; SCD222832)
#20-199 <i>People v. Baqir</i> , S262367.	(B297662; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; YA023242)
#20-211 <i>People v. Jackson</i> , S263023.	(B296324; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BA244075)
#21-289 <i>People v. Romero</i> , S268592.	(F080588; nonpublished opinion; Fresno County Superior Court; F13905308)
#20-299 <i>People v. Miron</i> , S264286.	(B298821; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; GA037024)
#20-323 <i>People v. Santos</i> , S264649.	(G057886; nonpublished opinion; Orange County Superior Court; 02CF2639)
#20-358 <i>People v. Wooten</i> , S265018.	(B299935; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; TA065825)
#20-368 <i>People v. Milliken</i> , S265125.	(C089246; nonpublished opinion; San Joaquin County Superior Court; SF091235A, STKCRFE20040007094)
#21-95 <i>People v. Jones</i> , S266668.	(B300320; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; GA051109)

<b>#21-192 <i>People v. Telles</i>, S267450.</b>	(C089364; nonpublished opinion; San Joaquin County Superior Court; STKCRCNV19970017436, SP061709A)
<b>#21-247 <i>People v. Valdez</i>, S268130.</b>	(D078240; nonpublished opinion; San Diego County Superior Court; SCE333769)
<b>#21-263 <i>People v. Morton</i>, S268166.</b>	(G059414; nonpublished opinion; Orange County Superior Court; 99CF2224)
<b>#21-353 <i>People v. McCavitt</i>, S269097.</b>	(C090860; nonpublished opinion; El Dorado County Superior Court; P13CRF0303)
<b>#21-355 <i>People v. Mitchell</i>, S269103.</b>	(C091560; nonpublished opinion; Sacramento County Superior Court; 93F04222)
<b>#21-357 <i>People v. Reyes</i>, S269213.</b>	(B305418; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; KA058220)

Review in the following cases, which were granted and held for *Gonzalez v. Mathis* (2021) 12 Cal.5th 29 and *Sandoval v. Qualcomm* (2021) 12 Cal.5th 256, was dismissed:

<b>#19-88 <i>Strouse v. Webcor Construction, L.P.</i>, S256136.</b>	(A148863; 34 Cal.App.5th 703; Alameda County Superior Court; RG13670376)
<b>#20-260 <i>Horne v. Ahern Rentals</i>, S263309.</b>	(B299605; 50 Cal.App.5th 192; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC675950)

###

*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.*