



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**

November 14, 2025

---

## Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of November 10, 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.]*

**#25-321 *Camarillo Sanitary Dist. v. State Water Resources Control Bd.*, S292989.**

(F087362; 113 Cal.App.5th 407; Fresno County Superior Court; 22CECG02195.)

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. The court limited review to the following issues: (1) Whether the adoption by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) of a statistical approach for measuring water toxicity — called the Test of Significant Toxicity or “TST” — recommended in guidance issued by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) violates federal regulations implementing the Clean Water Act. (See 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.44, 136.3(a).) (2) Whether the interpretations of those regulations provided by the EPA and the State Board are entitled to deference under *Auer v. Robbins* (1997) 519 U.S. 452 and *Yamaha Corporation of America v. State Board of Equalization* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 1, respectively.

**#25-322 *In re A.D.*, S293101.** (B336356; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; 23CCJP04283, 23CCJP04283A.)

Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed orders in a juvenile dependency proceeding. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *In re S.R.*, S285759 (#24-165), which presents the following issues: (1) When a juvenile court’s jurisdictional findings establish that a parent committed an offense that the law requires be reported to the statewide Child Abuse Centralized Index (CACI), should an appellate court presume, on an otherwise silent record, the offense has been or will be reported to CACI? (2) If un rebutted, is this presumption sufficient to avoid dismissal for mootness?

**#25-323 *People v. Dumas*, S292702.** (B339387; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BA445219.)

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.

**#25-324 *People v. Salinas*, S293227.** (B340589; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; KA109609.) 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.

**#25-325 *People v. Watler*, S292917.** (B337614; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; KA097971.) 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 *Dumas*, *Salinas*, and *Watler* 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))?

**#25-326 *People v. Isayev*, S292860.** (C101402; 113 Cal.App.5th 1117; Sacramento County Superior Court; 05F09184.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order granting a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter and remanded with directions. The court ordered briefing 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?

**#25-327 *Neubecker v. Evans Hotels, LLC*, S293216.** (D084176; nonpublished opinion; San Diego County Superior Court; 37-2023-00051797-CU-OE-CTL.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a motion to compel arbitration in a civil action.

**#25-328 *Resendiz v. Canyon Restaurant, Ltd.*, S293166.** (B342091; nonpublished opinion; Santa Barbara County Superior Court; 24CV00190.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a motion to compel arbitration in a civil action.

The court ordered briefing in *Neubecker* and *Resendiz* 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?

### DISPOSITIONS

Review in the following cases, which were granted and held for *Ford Motor Warranty Cases* (2025) 17 Cal.5th 1122, was dismissed:

<b>#24-42 <i>Bacon v. BMW of North America</i>, S283551</b>	(H050174; nonpublished opinion; Santa Clara County Superior Court; 19CV350387)
<b>#25-179 <i>Ballesteros v. Ford Motor Company</i>, S290724</b>	(A172271; 109 Cal.App.5th 1196; San Bernardino County Superior Court; CIVSB2208834)
<b>#24-91 <i>Davis v. Nissan North America</i>, S284697</b>	(D083006; 100 Cal.App.5th 825; Riverside County Superior Court; CVRI2203733)
<b>#23-209 <i>Kielar v. Superior Court (Hyundai Motor America)</i>, S281937</b>	(C096773; 94 Cal.App.5th 614; Placer County Superior Court; SCV0048230)
<b>#23-151 <i>Lanier v. Ford Motor Company</i>, S280048</b>	(B315114; nonpublished opinion; San Luis Obispo County Superior; 21CVP-0042)
<b>#23-184 <i>Montemayor v. Ford Motor Company</i>, S281237</b>	(B320477; 92 Cal.App.5th 958; Los Angeles County Superior Court; 19STCV37946)
<b>#24-264 <i>Rivera v. Superior Court</i>, S287725</b>	(B334522; 105 Cal.App.5th 288; Ventura County Superior Court; 56-2022-00568507-CU-BC-VTA)
<b>#23-232 <i>Yeh v. Superior Court</i>, S282228</b>	A166537; 95 Cal.App.5th 264; Contra Costa County Superior Court; MSC2200170)

Review in the following cases, which were granted and held for *People v. Cannon* (2025) 18 Cal.5th 497, was dismissed:

<b>#25-205 <i>People v. Magana</i>, S290583</b>	(B328270; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; ZM033875)
<b>#25-220 <i>People v. Morrison</i>, S291041</b>	(H050677; 110 Cal.App.5th 702; Santa Clara County Superior Court; 216087)
<b>#25-206 <i>People v. Washington</i>, S290585</b>	(B327869; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; ZM023624)

###

*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.*