



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

October 31, 2025

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of October 27, 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.]

#25-314 *Maqueda v. Kia Motors America*, S293119. (D083298; nonpublished opinion; San Diego County Superior Court; 37-2019-00070127-CU-BC-CTL.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed orders in a civil action and remanded for further proceedings. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *Gorobets v. Jaguar Land Rover North America, LLC*, S287946 (#25-1), which presents the following issue: Is a settlement offer under Code of Civil Procedure section 998 that contains two options inherently invalid, presumptively invalid, or invalid or partially or entirely valid depending on a separate and independent evaluation of each option?

#25-315 *Medina v. Sood Enterprises*, S292924. (B333390; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; 22STCV06210.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order denying a motion to compel arbitration in a civil action and remanded with directions. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *Leeper v. Shipt, Inc.*, S289305 (#25-91), which presents the following issues: (1) Does every Private Attorneys General Act (Lab. Code, § 2698 et seq.) (PAGA) action necessarily include both individual and non-individual PAGA claims, regardless of whether the complaint specifically alleges individual claims? (2) Can a plaintiff choose to bring only a non-individual PAGA action?

#25-316 *People v. Medrano*, S293151. (B340959; nonpublished opinion; Ventura County Superior Court; CR28216.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order granting a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

#25-317 *People v. Peredia*, S293184. (D085186; nonpublished opinion; San Bernardino County Superior Court; FVI025720.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order granting a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

#25-318 *People v. Ransom*, S292893. (E083988; nonpublished opinion; San Bernardino County Superior Court; FSB702709.) Review ordered on the court's own motion after the Court of Appeal reversed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter and remanded for further proceedings.

The court ordered briefing in *Medrano*, *Peredia*, and *Ransom* deferred pending decision in *People v. Munoz*, S290828 (#25-209), which presents the following issue: Is a juvenile homicide offender sentenced to 50 years to life in prison entitled to recall and resentencing under Penal Code section 1170, subdivision (d)(1) on the ground that the sentence is the functional equivalent of life imprisonment without parole?

#25-319 *People v. Mosley*, S293081. (B336486; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; PA074598.) 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 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))?

#25-320 *Severo v. Forest River, Inc.*, S292374. (B336863; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; 23NWCV01462.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order in a civil action and remanded with directions. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *Lathrop v. Thor Motor Coach, Inc.*, S287893 (#25-12), which presents the following issues: (1) Where a party alleges that enforcement of a forum selection clause would result in a waiver of the party's unwaivable statutory rights, what is the showing necessary to enforce (or avoid enforcement) of such a clause, and which party bears the burden of proof on the issue? (2) Under what circumstances, if any, does a stipulation to apply California law in the selected forum rebut an allegation that enforcement of a forum selection clause would result in a waiver of a party's unwaivable statutory rights? (3) If enforcement of a choice of law clause would result in a waiver of a party's unwaivable statutory rights, is the choice of law clause severable from the remainder of the agreement?

DISPOSITIONS

Review in the following case, which was granted and held for *People v. Faial* (2025) 18 Cal.5th 199 and *People v. Prudholme* (2023) 14 Cal.5th 961, was dismissed:

#22-150 <i>People v. Butler</i> , S273773	(B313121; 75 Cal.App.5th 216; Los Angeles County Superior Court; MA071773)
---	--

Review in the following cases, which were granted and held for *People v. Faial* (2025) 18 Cal.5th 199, was dismissed:

#22-177 <i>People v. Canedos</i> , S274244	(B308433; 77 Cal.App.5th 469; Los Angeles County Superior Court; MA066185)
#22-293 <i>People v. Hernandez</i> , S276725	(B310557; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; VA144413)
#23-178 <i>People v. Jackson</i> , S281267	(A164649; 93 Cal.App.5th 207; San Mateo County Superior Court; 16SF014002A)
#22-174 <i>People v. Pimentel</i> , S274611	(B312700; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; GA101592)
#25-143 <i>People v. Taylor</i> , S290267	(B335451; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; PA087551)

The following cases were transferred for reconsideration in light of *People v. Faial* (2025) 18 Cal.5th 199:

#22-178 <i>People v. Hart</i> , S274724	(B311264; nonpublished opinion; Santa Barbara County Superior Court; 1501773)
---	---

#22-154 <i>Kuhnel v. Superior Court</i> , S274000	(A163307; 75 Cal.App.5th 726 [non-citable]; Contra Costa County Superior Court; 11754951, 52106011)
---	---

STATUS

***People v. Demolle*, S159120.** The court vacated submission in this automatic appeal and directed the parties to file supplemental briefs addressing the following questions: (1) Once a violation of Penal Code section 745, subdivision (a)(2) is established on direct appeal, is an analysis for harmless error required under article VI, section 13 of the California Constitution before relief can be granted under Penal Code section 745, subdivision (e)(2), regardless of whether there is a statutory obligation to conduct a harmless error analysis under Penal Code section 745? (2) Does the Legislature have authority to declare that certain errors are a “miscarriage of justice” within the meaning of article VI, section 13 of the California Constitution and thereby obligate courts to reverse a judgment whenever such an error is found, even when the error in question would otherwise be subject to review for harmless error? (3) If a Racial Justice Act violation has occurred, is the defendant ineligible for the death penalty under Penal Code section 745, subdivision (e)(3) regardless of whether the violation was prejudicial? If so, would reversal of a death judgment under Penal Code section 745, subdivision (e)(3) without possibility of retrial on penalty be barred by the “Briggs Initiative” (Prop. 7, as approved by voters, Gen. Elec. (Nov. 7, 1978))? (4) What is the effect, if any, of Assembly Bill No. 1071 (Stats. 2025, ch. 721) on the issues in this case?

###

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.