SUPREME COURT MINUTES
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2001
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Orders were filed in the following matters extending the time within which to grant or deny a petition for review to and including the date indicated, or until review is either granted or denied:

A078462/S100534 People v. Lawrence Adam Reeves – December 11, 2001.

A085590/S100467 People v. Kevin Deroi Sawyer – December 6, 2001.

A089604/S100596 People v. Wayne Hughes – December 13, 2001.

A089733/S100538 People v. John W. Acridge; In re John W. Acridge on Habeas Corpus – December 7, 2001.

A090839/S100611 People v. Rick Anthony Fermandez – December 12, 2001.

A090846/S100566 People v. Danny D. Fields – December 11, 2001.

A092133/S100583 People v. Alberto Barragan Esquivel – December 10, 2001.

A094667/S100509 Royce Ford Jr. v. Alameda County Superior Court; People, RPI – December 6, 2001.

A096041/S100501 Benjamin Moore v. Contra Costa County Superior Court; People, RPI – December 6, 2001.

A096055/S100612 Michelle Lyn Michaud v. Alameda County Superior Court; People, RPI – December 12, 2001.

B138003/S100602 People v. Patrick Sullivan – December 13, 2001.

B140458/S100367 People v. Glen Quintrell Love et al. – December 6, 2001.

B142865/S100629 People v. David Joseph Brylla – December 12, 2001.

B146265/S099753 Young H. Kim v. America Online, Inc. et al. – November 28, 2001.

C032079/S100190 People v. Michael Aaron Smith et al. – December 3, 2001.

C032823/S100441 People v. Moses White – December 11, 2001.

C033272/S100402 People v. Jacob Charles Sanchez – December 3, 2001.

D035066/S100568 People v. John Ronald Brown – December 7, 2001.

D035552/S100582 People v. Scott Robert Hoffman – December 7, 2001.

E026886/S100722 People v. Christian Alfonso Bracamontes – December 12, 2001.

F032334/S100533 People v. Johnny Yang – December 11, 2001.

F032859/S100537 People v. Vang Cha Yang – December 11, 2001.

F034191/S100520 People v. Sopheap Sopa Chhoeung - December 7, 2001.

F035325/S100351 People v. Jose Huro Criado – December 3, 2001.

F036261/S100469 People v. Gregory Eugene Bisel – December 12, 2001.

H020739/S100594 People v. George Gutierrez Coronado – December 11, 2001.

H020857/S100510 People v. Carlos Albert Perez – December 7, 2001.

S094596 In re Jesse Calhoun
on
Habeas Corpus
The application of petitioner for an extension of time is hereby granted and it is ordered that the time to serve and file petitioner's reply to the Attorney General's informal response is extended to and including November 16, 2001.

S095000 Louis Navellier et al., Respondents
v.
Kenneth G. Sletten, Appellant
On application of respondents and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer to amicus brief of California Newspaper Publishers Association et al. is extended to and including November 5, 2001.

S082782 Hartwell Corporation et al., Petitioners
v.
Ventura County Superior Court, Respondent
Kristin Santamaria, Real Party in Interest

The joint request of counsel in the above-referenced cause to allow multiple counsel to argue on behalf of the parties at oral argument is hereby granted:

Oral argument time shall be allocated as follows:

David A. Rosen, for Santamaria Plaintiffs, twelve and one-half minutes.

Thomas V. Girardi, for Plaintiffs Adler et al., twelve and one-half minutes.

John R. Reese, for Industrial Defendants, ten minutes.

Joseph F. Butler, for defendants non-regulated water companies, ten minutes.

Mary Hulett, for defendants regulated utilities, fifteen minutes.

S091069 Amelco, Plaintiff and Respondent
v.
The City of Thousand Oaks, Defendant and Appellant

The request of counsel for appellant in the above-referenced cause to allow two counsel to argue on behalf of appellant at oral argument is hereby granted.

S091069 Amelco, Plaintiff and Respondent
v.
The City of Thousand Oaks, Defendant and Appellant

The request of appellant to allocate to amicus curiae Constituent Cities to League of California Cities 10 minutes of appellant's 30-minute allotted time for oral argument is granted.

S091097 Brian McKown, Plaintiff and Respondent
v.
Wal-Mart Stores, Defendant and Appellant

The request of counsel for appellant in the above-referenced cause to allow two counsel to argue on behalf of appellant at oral argument is hereby granted.

S091097 Brian McKown, Plaintiff and Respondent
v.
Wal-Mart Stores, Defendant and Appellant
The request of appellant to allocate to amicus curiae Civil Justice Association of California 10 minutes of appellant's 30-minute allotted time for oral argument is granted.

S091601 Roseanne Hooker, Plaintiff and Appellant
v.
California Department of Transportation, Defendant and Respondent
The request of counsel for respondent in the above-referenced cause to allow two counsel to argue on behalf of respondent at oral argument is hereby granted.

S091601 Roseanne Hooker, Plaintiff and Appellant
v.
California Department of Transportation, Defendant and Respondent
The request of respondent to allocate to amicus curiae Associated General Contractors of California 10 minutes of respondent's 30-minute allotted time for oral argument is granted.

6th Dist. Fink
H021174 v.
Pacific Specialty Insurance
The above-entitled matter, now pending in the Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District, is transferred to the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District.

S055024 In the Matter of the Suspension of Attorneys
Pursuant to Rule 962, California Rules of Court
Todd Robert Corren, #85790, was listed by the State Department of Social Services as being in arrears in payment of support obligations. He later obtained the necessary release from the appropriate District Attorney. He has subsequently been identified by the Department of Social Services as again being delinquent. Pursuant to Rule 962(a) of the California Rules of Court, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that **Todd Robert Corren, #85790,** be suspended from membership in the State Bar of California and from the rights and privileges of an attorney to act from November 26, 2001;
IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that upon receipt by the State Bar

of California of a release issued by the appropriate District Attorney pursuant to Family Code 17520, the State Bar shall certify the fact of the receipt of such release to the Clerk of the Supreme Court and the suspension shall be terminated by order of this Court and he shall be fully restored to membership in the State Bar of California, and to all rights and privileges, duties and responsibilities incident thereto;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that until restored as above provided, he shall be precluded from practicing as an attorney at law, or an attorney or agent of another in and before all the courts, commissions and tribunals of this state, and from holding himself out to the public as an attorney or counsel at law.

S090057 In the Matter of the Suspension of Attorneys
Pursuant to Rule 962, California Rules of Court

Having been provided proof of compliance pursuant to Family Code 17520, the suspension of **William Reyes, #170971,** pursuant to our order filed on July 21, 2001, and effective August 24, 2000, is hereby terminated

This order is final forthwith.

S099547 In the Matter of the Suspension of Attorneys
For Nonpayment of Dues

Due to clerical error on the part of the State Bar of California, and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the order of suspension for nonpayment of dues filed on August 17, 2001, effective September 1, 2001, be amended *nunc pro tunc* to strike the name of **Dudley Randall Kerr.**

S100104 In re **Paul Harry Steele** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Paul Harry Steele**, **State Bar No. 72798**, be suspended from the practice of law for three years and until he provides proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, including one year abstinence from alcohol and illegal drugs while not incarcerated, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for five years on condition that he be actually suspended for two years until he complies with standard 1.4(c)(ii) and one year of abstinence from alcohol and illegal drugs as specified above. Credit toward the period of actual suspension shall be given for the

period of interim suspension which commenced on November 30, 2000 (*In re Young* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 257, 270), but not toward the one-year period of abstinence from alcohol and illegal drugs while not incarcerated. Respondent is further ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on June 27, 2001. It is also ordered that respondent take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination during the period of his actual suspension. (See *Segretti* v. *State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Respondent is further ordered to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

*(See Bus. and Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)