



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

June 19, 2015

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of June 15, 2015

[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.]

#15-90 *People v. Patterson*, S225193. (E060758; nonpublished opinion; Riverside County Superior Court; RIF1201642.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. This case presents the following issue: Was defendant entitled to withdraw his plea (Pen. Code, § 1018) because his trial counsel assertedly provided constitutionally inadequate assistance of counsel during plea negotiations by failing to investigate and advise defendant of the immigration consequences of his plea?

#15-91 *In re Patterson*, S225194. Original proceeding. The court issued an order to show cause why petitioner is not entitled to relief due to alleged constitutionally inadequate assistance of counsel with respect to the immigration consequences of his plea.

#15-92 *In re R.T.*, S226416. (B256411; 235 Cal.App.4th 795; Los Angeles County Superior Court; DK03719.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed orders in a juvenile dependency proceeding. The court limited review to the following issue: Does Welfare and Institutions Code section 300, subdivision (b)(1), authorize dependency jurisdiction without a finding that parental fault or neglect is responsible for the failure or inability to supervise or protect the child?

#15-93 *People v. Guzman*, S226410. (G049135; nonpublished opinion; Orange County Superior Court; 04SF0872.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a petition to recall sentence.

#15-94 *People v. Ingram, S225631.* (D064936; nonpublished opinion; San Diego County Superior Court; SCD122775.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a petition to recall sentence.

The court ordered briefing in *Guzman* and *Ingram* deferred pending decision in *People v. Chaney*, S223676 (#15-13), and *People v. Valencia*, S223825 (#15-14), which present the following issue: Does the definition of “unreasonable risk of danger to public safety” (Pen. Code, § 1170.18, subd. (c)) under Proposition 47 (“the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act”) apply on retroactivity or other grounds to resentencing under the Three Strikes Reform Act of 2012 (Pen. Code, § 1170.126)?

#15-95 *People v. Torres, S225639.* (F067249; nonpublished opinion; Kings County Superior Court; 11CM3885F.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Prunty*, S210234 (#13-55), which presents the following issue: Is evidence of a collaborative or organizational nexus required before multiple subsets of the Norteños can be treated as a whole for the purpose of determining whether a group constitutes a criminal street gang within the meaning of Penal Code section 186.22, subdivision (f)?

###

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.