



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

December 18, 2020

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of December 14, 2020

[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.]

#20-379 *Conyer v. Hula Media Services, LLC, S264821.* (B296738; 53 Cal.App.5th 1189; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC718750.) 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. This case includes the following issues: (1) Did the Court of Appeal err in severing some terms in the defendant employer's mandatory employment arbitration agreement and remanding for arbitration under the remaining terms, or was the agreement permeated by unconscionability such that enforcement of the remaining terms would not be in the interests of justice? (2) Did Court of Appeal err in holding that the employee's signature on a one-page employee handbook receipt and acknowledgment form, which made no reference to arbitration or to waiver of the right to pursue statutory employment law claims in court, constituted binding assent to arbitrate specified claims pursuant to the arbitration agreement?

#20-380 *People v. Bentley, S265455.* (B299678; 55 Cal.App.5th 150; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BA224537.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

#20-381 *People v. Roberts, S265143.* (B302244; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BA295768.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

#20-382 *People v. Silva, S265446.* (E073150; nonpublished opinion; San Bernardino County Superior Court; FVA701548.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

#20-383 *People v. Williams, S265368.* (E072975; nonpublished opinion; Riverside County Superior Court; RIF088153.) 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 *Bentley, Roberts, Silva, and Williams* deferred pending decision in *People v. Lewis, S260598 (#20-78)*, which presents the following issues: (1) May superior courts consider the record of conviction in determining whether a defendant has made a prima facie showing of eligibility for relief under Penal Code section 1170.95? (2) When does the right to appointed counsel arise under Penal Code section 1170.95, subdivision (c)?

#20-384 *People v. Love, S265445.* (B302892; 55 Cal.App.5th 273; Los Angeles County Superior Court; TA138408.) The court ordered briefing 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?

#20-385 *People v. Sanchez, S265467.* (D076755; nonpublished opinion; Imperial County Superior Court; JCF27926.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a post-judgment motion in a criminal matter.

#20-386 *People v. Young, S265313.* (D077228; nonpublished opinion; Imperial County Superior Court; JCF26171.) 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 *Sanchez* and *Young* deferred pending decision in *People v. Raybon, S256798 (#19-121)*, which presents the following issue: Did Proposition 64 [the “Adult Use of Marijuana Act”] decriminalize the possession of up to 28.5 grams of marijuana by adults 21 years of age or older who are in state prison [as well as those not in prison]?

###

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.