

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN DOE,)	Court of Appeal
)	No.
Petitioner,)	
)	Sup. Court
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,)	No.
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,)	
)	IMMEDIATE
Respondent,)	STAY
)	REQUESTED
PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA,)	HON. JOHN
)	JUDGE
Real Party in Interest.)	Tel.: (310)
)	

**Los Angeles County Superior Court
Honorable John Judge, Judge**

**PETITION FOR REVIEW OF DENIAL OF PETITION
FOR WRIT OF MANDATE**

FAY ARFA, A LAW CORPORATION
Fay Arfa, Attorney at Law
State Bar No. 100143
10100 Santa Monica Blvd., #300
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel.: (310) 841-6805
Fax: (310) 841-0817

Attorney for Petitioner
JOHN DOE

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN DOE,)	Court of Appeal
)	No.
Petitioner,)	
)	Sup. Court
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,)	No.
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,)	
)	IMMEDIATE
Respondent,)	STAY
)	REQUESTED
PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA,)	HON. JOHN
)	JUDGE
Real Party in Interest.)	Tel.: (310)
_____)	_____

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
HONORABLE JOHN JUDGE, JUDGE**

**PETITION FOR REVIEW OF DENIAL OF PETITION
FOR WRIT OF MANDATE**

FAY ARFA, A LAW CORPORATION
Fay Arfa, Attorney at Law
State Bar No. 100143
10100 Santa Monica Blvd., #300
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel.: (310) 841-6805
Fax: (310) 841-0817

Attorney for Petitioner
JOHN DOE

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN DOE,)	Court of
)	Appeal No.
Petitioner,)	B211430
)	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,)	Superior Court
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,)	No. TA090164
)	
Respondent,)	
)	
PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA,)	
)	
Real Party in Interest.)	
)	

TO THE HONORABLE PRESIDING JUSTICE AND
ASSOCIATE JUSTICES OF THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME
COURT:

Petitioner JOHN DOE, through counsel, petitions this
Honorable Court for review after an Order issued by the Court

of Appeal, Second Appellate District, on October 21, 2008
denying his Petition for Writ of Mandate and a request for
immediate stay. The Court of Appeal's Order is attached as an
Appendix.

STATEMENT OF PROCEDURAL FACTS

The prosecution filed an information alleging that, April 7, 2007, JOHN DOE committed the crimes of assault with a deadly weapon, spousal abuse and attempted murder against Maria. (Pen. Code, §§ 245, 273.5, 664/187.) The prosecution also alleged a prior “strike” conviction. (Pen. Code, § 422; Pen. Code, §§ 1170.23 (a) - (d), 667(b) - (l).)

On August 4, 2008, Petitioner issued a subpoena duces tecum to Medi - Cal Custodian of Records requesting the accuser’s Medi - Cal records. On August 4, 2008, the Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department personally served the subpoena duces tecum. On or about August 25, 2008, Petitioner’s trial counsel received a telephone call from Ms. Debra Garrick, who represented the Medi-Cal records’ department.

Mr. Garrick stated that she could not comply with the subpoena and that she needed a court order in order to comply with the subpoena. Petitioner’s trial counsel agreed that she need not appear in court and that she would be notified when any appearance would be required. On August 28, 2008,

respondent superior court issued an order releasing the Medi - Cal records to the Clerk of the Court.

On August 29, 2008, Petitioner, through counsel, faxed a copy of the Court's August 28, 2008 order to Ms. Garrick. On September 9, 2009, Petitioner's trial counsel spoke to Anthony Lewis, from the Medi - Cal's legal office in Sacramento and, pursuant to his request, faxed the August 28, 2008 court order to him.

On or about September 25, 2008, the records arrived in the superior court. On that date, the prosecutor orally objected to the release of the records to Petitioner's counsel. The trial court continued the matter until October 2, 2008. On October 2, 2008, the trial court conducted a brief hearing in open court and, without reviewing the records themselves and instead reviewing a summary of the records, denied Petitioner's request for the Medi - Cal records. The trial court found the Medi - Cal billings to be "irrelevant."

STATEMENT OF RELEVANT FACTS ELICITED AT THE PRELIMINARY HEARING

On April 7, 2007, at about 5:00 p.m., nine-year-old John Reyes heard a woman screaming and saw her running down a storage aisle away from Mr. Doe, who had a knife in his hand. (PHT 6-7.) Ten minutes later, from a distance of 14 feet, Reyes saw Mr. Doe stab the woman in the back of her head with a knife “once or twice.” A month earlier, Reyes had not been sure he saw a knife. (PHT 9-10, 13, 35, 38, 49, 51.)

Nine year old Reyes’ mother heard, but could not see, a man and woman cussing at each other. Then she heard a woman scream, “Help. Somebody help me” and saw the woman running as fast as she could with “fear in her eyes.” Within seconds, she saw the woman, face down, on the ground. Reyes’ mother never saw a knife in Mr. Doe’s hands. She had been talking to her son at the time. (PHT 57, 59, 67, 75.)

Reyes’ mother approached the woman. Mr. Doe told the woman, “She’s having a convulsion, She’s having convutions [sic].” (PHT 75.) He bent over whispering and saying, “It’s okay. It’s okay. I got it.” (PHT 80.)

Los Angeles Sheriff's Deputy Kari Bandi arrived at the scene. At the preliminary hearing, she testified that she transported Mr. Doe to jail and secured his car. She also testified that she found a knife, containing a "red substance resembling blood" in the center console of his car. ¹ (PHT 84-85)

Maria , who had been married to Mr. Doe for four years, testified that she got the laceration when she tripped, fell back and hit the corner of the steel building. She denied that her husband never stabbed her. (PHT 97, 98.)

¹

The prosecution provided a subsequent laboratory test of the knife that showed that the laboratory failed to find any blood on the knife. The laboratory test results had not been presented at the preliminary hearing.

ARGUMENT

- I. **THIS COURT SHOULD GRANT REVIEW BECAUSE THE TRIAL COURT DEPRIVED PETITIONER OF HIS RIGHT TO THE COURT'S SUBPOENA POWER, TO DUE PROCESS, TO EFFECTIVE COUNSEL, TO PREPARE A DEFENSE AND TO A FAIR TRIAL UNDER THE FIFTH, SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BY REFUSING TO ENFORCE ITS OWN ORDER**

- A. **Introduction**

Petitioner intends to show at trial that Maris fell and injured her head on the ground. Petitioner intends to show that the nine-year-old witness never saw Petitioner ever strike his wife with a knife. Petitioner also intends to show that Maria fell on the ground because of a pre-existing health condition that caused her to fall.

In order to prove Maria's pre-existing condition, Petitioner needed her medical records. Maria used the services of Medi-Cal. After Petitioner subpoenaed the Medi - Cal records, Petitioner learned that Medi-Cal only keeps billing records and not the medical records, themselves. However, Petitioner also learned that, by reviewing the Medi - Cal billings, Petitioner could

get the names of Maria's medical providers and then subpoena Ms Bergman's medical records directly from the providers.

Without the information, Petitioner cannot prepare an adequate defense to the charges because Petitioner would have no way of presenting Maria's pre-existing condition. (U.S. Const., Amends. 5, 6.) Therefore, the trial court denied Petitioner his rights to counsel, to a defense, to due process and to a fair trial by refusing to enforce its own order issued subsequent to the defense subpoena.

B. A Defendant Has the Constitutional Right to Compel the Attendance of Witnesses under the Sixth Amendment, and to Due Process, Guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment

The state and federal Constitutions guarantee the defendant a meaningful opportunity to present a defense. (*Crane v. Kentucky* (1986) 476 U.S. 683, 690 [90 L. Ed. 2d 636, 644-645, 106 S. Ct. 2142]; *In re Martin* (1987) 44 Cal. 3d 1, 30) A defendant has the constitutional right to compel the attendance of witnesses under the Sixth Amendment, and to due process, guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment (*People v. Mincey* (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 408, 460; see also *Crane v. Kentucky, supra*,

476 U.S. at p. 690 [90 L. Ed. 2d at pp.644-645]; see also, Cal. Const., Art. I, § 15; Pen. Code, §§ 686 subd. (3), 1327.)

Penal Code sections 1326 and 1327 empower either party in a criminal case to serve a subpoena duces tecum requiring the person or entity in possession of the materials sought to produce the information in court for the party's inspection. (*People v. Blair* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 640, 651; *People v. Superior Court (Barrett)* (2000) 80 Cal.App.4th 1305, 1315; *Pacific Lighting Leasing Co. v. Superior Court* (1976) 60 Cal.App.3d 552, 560.)

C. The Defendant Is Entitled to Discovery of All Relevant Information

The basis for pretrial discovery is the right of the defendant to a fair trial. (*Hill v. Superior Court* (1974) 10 Cal.3d 812, 816)

The defendant is entitled to all relevant information which will facilitate a fair trial. (*Pitchess v. Superior Court* (1974) 11 Cal.3d

531, 535) The defendant is entitled to discovery of all information

which is relevant or may lead to relevant evidence. (*Kelvin L. v. Superior Court* (1976) 62 Cal.App.3d 823, 828)

The defendant must be provided with the maximum information to illuminate the case, including any unprivileged

evidence or information if it may reasonably assist in the preparation of the defense. The defendant need not state the defense or elect between available ones: all that is required is a showing of relevancy; necessity--that the defense cannot obtain the material on its own; and specificity-- a list of items desired. (*State of California ex rel Dept. of Transportation v. Superior Court (Hall)* (1985) 37 Cal.3d 847, 855-6.)

D. The California Supreme Court Has Held that Criminal Proceedings Trump Any Privilege to Medical Records

Medical records are discoverable and not privileged. (Evid. Code, § 998.) The physician-patient privilege (Evid. Code, § 994) is inapplicable in criminal cases. (Evid. Code, § 998; see *Menendez v. Superior Court* (1992) 3 Cal.4th 435, 457, fn. 18; *People v. Lane* (1894) 101 Cal. 513, 516; *People v. Dutton* (1944) 62 Cal.App.2d 862, 863 [1]; *People v. West* (1894) 106 Cal. 89, 91.)

Any constitutional right to privacy may be outweighed by concerns for the truth. The State's interest in discovering the truth in legal proceedings may compel disclosure of confidential

material. (*Brillantes v. Superior Court* (1996) 51 Cal.App.4th 323, 338.) '[A]n individual's medical records may be relevant and material in the furtherance of this legitimate state purpose. . . .' [Citation.]" (*Ibid.*)

E. The Defense Needs the Medi - Cal Billings in Order to Obtain the Accuser's Medical Records In order to Prepare a Defense

Based on communications with Medi - Cal, Petitioner believes that the Medi - Cal records will lead to Maria's medical records. The medical records contain critical information to show that Maria fell and injured her head. The medical records would also show that Maria suffered from a pre-existing condition that caused her to fall.

Maria's Medi -Cal records are expected to lead to relevant information about Maria's medical history. To deprive the defense of the opportunity to obtain Maria's medical records would be to require it to defend a serious criminal case without any knowledge whether Maria suffered from a pre-existing condition that created a propensity for her to fall.

Defendant has no other means by which to obtain this

information. Therefore, under the facts of this case, when the accusers' privacy rights are weighed against Petitioner's legitimate interest in preparing their defense, the Petitioner's interest must prevail. (*Palay v. Superior Court* (1993) 18 Cal. App. 4th 919.)

F. This Court Should Grant Review Because the Trial Court, by Improperly Finding the Documents "Irrelevant" Deprived Petitioner of His Constitutional Right to Compel the Production of Documents, Due Process, a Fair Trial and the Effective Assistance of Counsel under the Fifth, Sixth and Fourteen Amendments

The defense properly issued and served subpoenas duces tecum on Medi - Cal. The trial court subsequently issued an order requiring the Medi - Cal custodian of records to produce the requested documents. The prosecutor, in open court and without written notice to the defense, held a hearing in open court.

The law permitted the defense to argue such motions in an ex camera proceeding. (Cf. *People v. Superior Court (Barrett)*, *supra*, 80 Cal.App.4th 1305 [party seeking discovery of materials in possession of third party by means of subpoena duces tecum not required to provide opposing party with notice of theories of

relevancy of materials sought].)" (*Alford v. Superior Court* (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 1033, 1045, fn. 5.)

In the context of a subpoena duces tecum, "the defense is not required, on pain of revealing its possible strategies and work product, to provide the prosecution with notice of its theories of relevancy of the materials sought, but instead may make an offer of proof at an in camera hearing. (*People v. Superior Court (Barrett)*, *supra*, at pp. 1320-1321; see *Smith v. Superior Court (San Diego)* (2007) 152 Cal.App.4th 205 [excluding People from participating in proceedings on defendant's efforts to obtain third party discovery.]

During the October 2, 2008 hearing, the trial court summarily found the Medi - Cal documents "irrelevant" and refused to release the documents to the defense. The trial court applied the wrong standard. The law requires only a finding that the items would lead to admissible evidence, not whether or not the items themselves would be "relevant." (See, *Kelvin L.*, *supra*, 62 Cal.App.3d at p. 828)

Therefore, this Court should grant relief pursuant to

Petitioner's constitutional right to compel the production of documents, to due process, to a defense, to counsel and a fair trial under the Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

///

///

///

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, petitioner prays for this Court to grant an immediate stay and grant review.

DATED: July 11, 2008

Respectfully Submitted,
FAY ARFA, A LAW CORPORATION

/s/ Fay Arfa

By: _____
FAY ARFA, Attorney for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Counsel certifies that the Petition for Writ of Mandate is proportionately spaced, in 14 point Arial typeface, and contains 2989 words.

Dated: October 21, 2008

Respectfully Submitted,
FAY ARFA, A LAW CORPORATION

/s/ Fay Arfa

By _____
FAY ARFA, Attorney for Petitioner

TOPICAL INDEX

	Page
STATEMENT OF PROCEDURAL FACTS	3
STATEMENT OF FACTS - THE PRELIMINARY HEARING ..	5
ARGUMENT	7
I. THIS COURT SHOULD GRANT REVIEW BECAUSE THE TRIAL COURT DEPRIVED PETITIONER OF HIS RIGHT TO THE COURT’S SUBPOENA POWER, TO DUE PROCESS, TO EFFECTIVE COUNSEL, TO PREPARE A DEFENSE AND TO A FAIR TRIAL UNDER THE FIFTH, SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BY REFUSING TO ENFORCE ITS OWN ORDER	7
A. Introduction	7
B. A Defendant Has the Constitutional Right to Compel the Attendance of Witnesses under the Sixth Amendment, and to Due Process, Guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment ..	8
C. The Defendant Is Entitled to Discovery of All Relevant Information	9
D. The California Supreme Court Has Held that Criminal Proceedings Trump Any Privilege to Medical Records	10

E.	The Defense Needs the Medi - Cal Billings in Order to Obtain the Accuser’s Medical Records In order to Prepare a Defense	11
F.	This Court Should Grant Review Because the Trial Court by Improperly Finding the Documents “Irrelevant” Deprived Petitioner of His Constitutional Right to Compel the Production of Documents, Due Process, A Fair Trial and the Effective Assistance of Counsel under the Fifth, Sixth and Fourteen Amendments	12
	CONCLUSION	15
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

FEDERAL CASES

Crane v. Kentucky (1986) 476 U.S. 683 8, 9

STATE CASES

Alford v. Superior Court (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 1033 13

Brillantes v. Superior Court (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 323 . . . 11

Hill v. Superior Court (1974) 10 Cal. 3d 812 9

In re Martin (1987) 44 Cal. 3d 1 8

Kelvin L. v. Superior Court (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 823 . . 9, 13

Menendez v. Superior Court (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 435 10

Pacific Lighting v. Superior Court (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 552 9

Palay v. Superior Court (1993) 18 Cal. App. 4th 919 12

People v. Blair (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 640 9

People v. Dutton (1944) 62 Cal. App. 2d 862 10

People v. Lane (1894) 101 Cal. 513 10

People v. Mincey (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 408 8

People v. Superior Court (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 1305 . . . 9, 12

People v. West (1894) 106 Cal. 89 10

<i>Pitchess v. Superior Court</i> (1974) 11 Cal.3d 531	9
<i>State of California v. Superior Court</i> (1985) 37 Cal. 3d 847	10

STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS

U.S. Const., Amend. 5	passim
U.S. Const., Amend. 6	passim
U.S. Const., Amend. 14	passim
Cal. Const., Art. I, § 15	9

STATE STATUTES

Evid. Code, § 994	10
Evid. Code, § 998	10
Pen. Code, § 686	9
Pen. Code, § 1326	9
Pen. Code, § 1327	9

ATTORNEY'S CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify: that I am an active member of the State Bar of California and not a party to the cause, and my business address is 10100 Santa Monica Blvd., #300, Los Angeles, CA 90067, that on October 22, 2008 I served the: **PETITION FOR REVIEW FROM DENIAL OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE** by depositing a copy, enclosed in a separate, sealed envelope, with postage fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, California, each of which envelopes was addressed as follows:

Clerk for delivery to the Honorable
John Cheroske
Department D
Compton Courthouse
200 W. Compton Blvd.
Compton, CA 90220

Martha A. Carrillo
Deputy District Attorney
200 W. Compton St., Room 700
Compton, CA 90220

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Dated: October 22, 2008

/s/ Fay Arfa

Fay Arfa, Attorney