



**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR
SPECIAL SESSION – SAN FRANCISCO
AUGUST 24, 2026**

The following cases are placed upon the calendar of the Supreme Court for hearing at a Special Session at the courtroom in the Ronald M. George State Office Complex, Earl Warren Building, 350 McAllister Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California, on August 24, 2026. The public may attend in person and also have access to argument via live-streaming on the judicial branch website: <https://supreme.courts.ca.gov/>.

MONDAY, AUGUST 24, 2026 — 10:00 A.M.

- (1) Cervantes (Clarissa) et al. v. Bianco (Chad) et al. (Riverside County Citizens et al., Real Parties in Interest), S295866
(Burns, J., assigned justice pro tempore)
- (2) Attorney General of the State of California v. Bianco (Chad) et al., S295901
(Burns, J., assigned justice pro tempore)

GUERRERO

Chief Justice

**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR
SPECIAL SESSION – SAN FRANCISCO
AUGUST 24, 2026**

The following case summaries are issued to inform the public about cases that the California Supreme Court has scheduled for oral argument and of their general subject matter. The descriptions set out below are, in most instances, reproduced from the original news release issued when review in each of these matters was granted, and are provided for the convenience of the public. The descriptions do not necessarily reflect the view of the court or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.

MONDAY, AUGUST 24, 2026 — 10:00 A.M.

(1) *Cervantes (Clarissa) et al. v. Bianco (Chad) et al. (Riverside County Citizens et al., Real Parties in Interest), S295866*

(Burns, J., assigned justice pro tempore)

#26-77 Cervantes (Clarissa) et al. v. Bianco (Chad) et al. (Riverside County Citizens et al., Real Parties in Interest), S295866. Original proceeding. The court issued an order to show cause why the relief sought in the petition should not be granted. This case presents the following issue: Are petitioners entitled to writ relief directing that cast ballots be returned to the county registrar of voters, on the ground that their seizure by law enforcement pursuant to search warrants violated the Elections Code? The court also directed the parties to address, the effect, if any, of Senate Bill No. 73 (2025–2026 Reg. Sess.) on the issues presented in this matter.

(2) *Attorney General of the State of California v. Bianco (Chad) et al., S295901*

(Burns, J., assigned justice pro tempore)

#26-59 Attorney General of the State of California v. Bianco (Chad) et al., S295901.

(E088096; nonpublished order; Riverside County Superior Court; RI031920261.)

Petition for review after the Court of Appeal denied a petition for writ of mandate. The court issued an order to show cause why the relief sought in the petition should not be granted. This case presents the following issues: (1) What is the scope of the Attorney General’s constitutional and statutory authority to supervise and direct the activities of a county sheriff? (See Cal. Const., art. V, § 13; Gov. Code, § 12560.) (2) Is the Attorney

General entitled to a writ of mandate directing the Riverside County Sheriff to comply with the Attorney General's directives, including the Attorney General's directive to cease the Sheriff's investigation into the November 2025 special election? (3) Is the Attorney General entitled to a writ of mandate directing the superior court to quash or stay execution of a search warrant if the warrant was issued in contravention of the Attorney General's directives or deficient on its face? The court also directed the parties to address, in addition to the other issues presented, the effect, if any, of Senate Bill No. 73 (2025–2026 Reg. Sess.) on the issues presented in this matter.

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM