

**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR
SPECIAL SESSION—SAN FRANCISCO
JANUARY 10, 2012**

The following case summary has been issued to inform the public and the press of the case that the Supreme Court has scheduled for oral argument and of its general subject matter. The description set out below is reproduced from the original news release issued when the order to show cause in this matter was issued and is provided for the convenience of the public and the press. The description does not necessarily reflect the view of the court or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2012—9:00 A.M.

(1) Julie Vandermost v. Debra Bowen, as Secretary of State, etc. (Citizens Redistricting Commission, Intervener), S198387

#11-137 Vandermost v. Bowen, S198387. Original proceeding. The court issued an order to show cause directing the parties to brief and argue the following issues: In addition to addressing issues relating to what relief, if any, this court should order in the event the referendum regarding the Senate redistricting map qualifies for the November 2012 ballot, the parties are directed to address the following jurisdictional issues:

(1) What standard or test should this court apply in determining whether a referendum is “likely to qualify” within the meaning of article XXI, section 3, subdivision (b)(2) of the California Constitution, for purposes of deciding when a petition for writ of mandate may be filed in this court under that constitutional provision? (2) Is this court’s authority to entertain a petition for writ of mandate prior to the formal qualification of a referendum petition limited to the circumstances set forth in article XXI, section 3, subdivision (b)(2), or does this court have other authority (including inherent authority) to entertain such a petition even if it cannot yet be determined whether such a referendum is “likely to qualify” for placement on the ballot?