

# Exhibit A

Exhibit A

1 PAUL JOHN DENHAM  
2 P-16644 (E4-133)  
3 PO Box 5242  
4 SATF PRISON  
5 CORCORAN, CA 93212

6 PETITIONER IN PRO SE

7 CALIFORNIA SUPERIOR COURT IN AND  
8 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

9 IN RE PAUL JOHN DENHAM  
10 ON HABEAS CORPUS.

CASE No. NAO31090

11 APPLICATION AND DECLARATION OF PAUL JOHN  
12 DENHAM IN SUPPORT OF ORDER FOR  
13 REASSIGNMENT OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
14 HABEAS CORPUS FROM THE HONORABLE LAURA  
15 LAESECKE PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA CODE OF  
16 CIVIL PROCEDURE §170-1(a)(6)(iii)

17 Judge: Hon. James Otto, Jr. SJ  
18 Dept.: S24

19 DECLARATION OF PAUL JOHN DENHAM

20 I, PAUL JOHN DENHAM, DECLARE AS FOLLOWS:

- 21 1. I HAVE PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE FOLLOWING MATTERS AND COULD  
22 AND WOULD COMPETENTLY TESTIFY THERETO IF CALLED TO DO SO IN A COURT  
23 OF LAW.
- 24 2. I AM THE PETITIONER/DEFENDANT IN THE CASE PEOPLE V. PAUL JOHN  
25 DENHAM, FILED IN THE CALIFORNIA SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS  
26 ANGELES, CASE No. NAO31090. I AM PROCEEDING IN PROPRIA PERSONA ON A  
27 PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (HEREINAFTER "PETITION".)  
28 ATTACKING THE CONVICTION. THE PETITION IS CURRENTLY ASSIGNED TO THE  
HONORABLE LAURA LAESECKE IN DEPARTMENT S19. A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY  
OF SAID ASSIGNMENT MINUTE ORDER IS ATTACHED HERETO AND INCORPORATED  
HEREIN BY THIS REFERENCE, AT EXHIBIT A.
3. FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS I RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT THIS  
COURT FIND THAT A CONFLICT OF INTEREST EXISTS WHICH IS PREJUDICIAL  
TO ME SUCH THAT I CANNOT HAVE FAIR AND IMPARTIAL COURT PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE LAURA LAESECKE AND REASSIGNMENT TO A DIFFERENT

Application For Reassignment CCCP §170-1(a)(6)(iii)

Exhibit A, p-11

1 JUDGE IS PROPER AND APPROPRIATE. FURTHER, ON JANUARY 25, 2019,  
2 THE PETITION WAS REASSIGNED FROM THE HONORABLE RICHARD ROMERO  
3 BASED ON A CONFLICT OF INTEREST. A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF SAID  
4 ORDER IS ATTACHED HERETO AT EXHIBIT B, AND INCORPORATED HEREIN BY  
5 THIS REFERENCE. ACCORDINGLY, REASSIGNMENT SHOULD NOT BE TO THE  
6 HONORABLE RICHARD ROMERO.

7 4. THE PETITION ALLEGES, INTER ALIA, THAT TWO LOS ANGELES  
8 COUNTY SHERIFF DEPARTMENT CRIMINALISTS (MICHELLE LEPISTO AND DALE  
9 HIGASHI; THE PROSECUTOR'S TEAM) ALTERED PHYSICAL EVIDENCE, FILED  
10 FALSE POLICE REPORTS, SUPPRESSED EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE AND  
11 INTRODUCED FALSE TESTIMONY BEFORE AND DURING PETITIONER'S 1998  
12 CRIMINAL TRIAL. FURTHER, THAT SUCH ACTS WERE PERFORMED TO CREATE  
13 POSITIVE MATCHES WITH PETITIONER AND THE CRIME SCENE EVIDENCE  
14 THAT OTHERWISE WOULD NOT EXIST.

15 5. THE AFOREMENTIONED CLAIMS ARE RAISED IN THE PETITION  
16 UNDERPROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT BECAUSE THE INDIVIDUAL PROSECUTOR  
17 IS IMPUTED WITH KNOWLEDGE OF INFORMATION KNOWN TO THE  
18 PROSECUTOR'S TEAM UNDER UNITED STATES V. PAYNE (2ND CIR. 1995) 63  
19 F. 3D 1200, 1208.

20 6. I HAVE BEEN INFORMED, BELIEVE AND HEREIN ALLEGE THAT  
21 SUBSEQUENT TO THE ALLEGED ACTS CONTAINED IN THE PETITION, THESE  
22 SAME CRIMINALISTS WERE USED IN CRIMINAL CASES PROSECUTED BY THE  
23 LOS ANGELES DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE. INCLUDING CASES THAT WERE  
24 HANDLED, AND/OR ASSISTED BY THE HONORABLE LAURA LAESECKE AT A  
25 TIME WHEN SHE WAS A DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY FOR LOS ANGELES  
26 COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE. FURTHER, THAT A FAVORABLE  
27 RESULT IN MY PETITION; THAT THE ACTS ALLEGED DID OCCUR, WILL FORM  
28 THE BASIS FOR PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT CLAIMS AGAINST CASES  
HANDLED BY THE HONORABLE LAURA LAESECKE BY CONVICTED PERSONS  
WHERE SHE HAS OBTAINED CONVICTIONS USING THE AFOREMENTIONED  
CRIMINALISTS AND NOT DISCLOSED TO THE DEFENSE THAT SAID  
CRIMINALISTS HAVE ENGAGED IN DISHONEST ACTS AFFECTING THESE  
CRIMINALISTS' CREDIBILITY.

7. IT IS NOTED THAT NO JUDGE SHOULD PRESIDE IN CASE IN WHICH  
HE IS NOT WHOLLY FREE, DISINTERESTED, IMPARTIAL AND INDEPENDENT.

2.

---

Application For Reassignment CCCP §170-1 (a)(6)(iii)  
Exhibit A, p.12

1 (WICKOFF V. JAMES (1958) 159 CAL. APP. 2D 64; MAYO V. NEBER  
2 (1960) 177 CAL. APP. 2D 544.) FURTHER, PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA  
3 CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, (A)(6)(III), GROUNDS FOR  
4 DISQUALIFICATION EXIST IF A PERSON AWARE OF THE FACTS MIGHT  
5 REASONABLY ENTERTAIN A DOUBT THAT THE JUDGE WOULD BE ABLE TO BE  
6 IMPARTIAL.

7 8. I ALLEGE THAT A FAVORABLE RESULT IN MY CASE, THAT THE  
8 CRIMINALISTS ENGAGED IN THE CONDUCT HEREIN ALLEGED, WILL  
9 ESTABLISH THAT JUDGE LAURA LAESECKE ENGAGED IN PROSECUTORIAL  
10 MISCONDUCT BY NOT DISCLOSING SUCH MISCONDUCT IN THE CRIMINAL  
11 CASES THAT SHE PROSECUTED AS A DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY. AS SUCH,  
12 A PERSON AWARE OF THE FACTS WOULD REASONABLY ENTERTAIN A DOUBT  
13 THAT SHE WOULD BE ABLE TO BE IMPARTIAL PRESIDING OVER MY CASE.

14 9. BASED ON THE ABOVE, I RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT THIS COURT  
15 FIND THAT A CONFLICT OF INTEREST EXISTS, AND/OR APPEARS TO EXIST,  
16 AND THAT SUCH APPEARS TO AFFECT THE ABILITY OF THE HONORABLE  
17 LAURA LAESECKE IN HER ABILITY TO IMPARTIALLY PRESIDE OVER MY  
18 HABEAS PROCEEDINGS. SUCH THAT THERE IS GOOD CAUSE FOR AN ORDER  
19 REASSIGNING THE PETITION UNDER CALIFORNIA CODE OF CIVIL  
20 PROCEDURE, § 170 (A)(6)(III). AND THAT SUCH REASSIGNMENT IS NOT  
21 TO THE HONORABLE RICHARD ROMERO.

22 10. IN THIS SAME CASE I HAVE A PENAL CODE § 1405 MATTER PENDING  
23 IN THE CENTRAL DISTRICT, BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM C. RYAN,  
24 DEPARTMENT 100, THE WRIT CENTER. JUDGE RYAN HAS APPOINTED  
25 ATTORNEY JAMES M. CRAWFORD, 528 NORTH GLASSELL, ORANGE,  
26 CALIFORNIA 92867 TO ASSIST ME THEREIN. AS SUCH, IT MAY BE  
27 APPROPRIATE TO FORWARD THE PETITION TO THE WRIT CENTER TO  
28 CONSOLIDATE THE MATTERS AND CONSERVE SCARCE JUDICIAL RESOURCES.

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

3.

Application For Reassignment

CCCP § 170-1 (a)(6)(iii)

Exhibit A, p.13

1 11. I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE ABOVE IS TRUE  
2 AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE. EXCEPT AS TO MATTERS  
3 STATED UPON A BELIEF AND AS TO THOSE MATTERS I BELIEVE THEM TO BE  
4 TRUE. EXECUTED THIS TWENTY FOURTH DAY OF MARCH, 2021, AT  
CORCORAN, CALIFORNIA 93212.

5 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,  
6

7 

8 PAUL JOHN DENHAM  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Rec'd  
March 24, 2021  
Proctor

MINUTE ORDER  
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE PRINTED: 03/17/21

-----  
CASE NO. NA031090

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
VS.  
DEFENDANT 01: PAUL JOHN DENHAM  
-----

INFORMATION FILED ON 05/06/97.

COUNT 01: 187(A) PC FEL  
COUNT 02: 664-187(A) PC FEL

ON 03/17/21 AT 830 AM :

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS IS RECEIVED BY SUPERVISING  
JUDGE JAMES D. OTTO ON 03/17/2021.

JUDGE LAURA LAESECKE IS HEREBY ASSIGNED TO HANDLE THIS MATTER  
FOR ALL PURPOSES PURSUANT TO THE ORDER OF THE MASTER CALENDAR  
AND SUPERVISING JUDGE OF THE SOUTH DISTRICT.

THE DUPLICATE FILE WITH THE PETITION IS DELIVERED TO  
DEPARTMENT S19 ON 03/17/2021.

A COPY OF THIS MINUTE ORDER IS MAILED BY U.S.P.S. TO:

PAUL JOHN DENHAM  
P-16644 (E4-133)  
P.O. BOX 5242  
SATF PRISON  
CORCORAN, CA 93212

DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
HABEAS CORPUS LITIGATION TEAM  
320 WEST TEMPLE STREET ROOM 540  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

ENTRY MADE BY Y. LUCERO FOR IMELDA EVANCULLA, CLERK, DEPARTMENT

PAGE NO. 1

DOCKET LINE ENTRY  
HEARING DATE: 03/17/21

Exhibit A, p-18

CASE NO. NA031090  
DEF NO. 01

DATE PRINTED 03/17/21

S24.

PAGE NO. 2

DOCKET LINE ENTRY  
HEARING DATE: 03/17/21

Exhibit A, p. 18

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

Paul John Denham  
P-16644 (E4-133)  
SATF Prison  
P.O. Box 5242  
Corcoran, CA 93212

Petitioner in Pro se

I, Paul John Denham, hereby declare under penalty of perjury that I am the petitioner in this matter and on this date I served a copy of the foregoing:

Application and Declaration of Paul John Denham in  
Support of Order for Reassignment of Petition For writ of  
Habeas Corpus From the Honorable Laura Laesche  
Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 170-1  
(a)(6)(iii)

By depositing said document in a prepaid envelope and forwarding it to prison officials in accordance with established legal mail procedures for delivery to the United States Mail addressed to the following parties:

① Clerk, Superior Court, Dept. 524 275 Magnolia  
Avenue, Long Beach, CA 90802;

② District Attorney, Habeas Corpus Litigation Team  
320 West Temple Street, Room 540, Los Angeles  
CA 90012

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.  
Executed this March 28 2021, at SATF Prison in Corcoran, California 93212.

Respectfully submitted,

PD Denham

Paul John Denham  
Petitioner in Pro se

Exhibit A, p.17



# Exhibit B

Exhibit B

MINUTE ORDER  
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE PRINTED: 10/06/21

-----  
CASE NO. NA031090

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
VS.

DEFENDANT 01: PAUL JOHN DENHAM  
-----

NUNC PRO TUNC ORDER PREPARED. IT APPEARING TO THE COURT THAT THE MINUTE ORDER  
~~IN THE ABOVE ENTITLED ACTION~~ DOES NOT PROPERLY REFLECT THE COURT'S ORDER. SAID  
MINUTE ORDER IS AMENDED NUNC PRO TUNC AS OF THAT DATE. ALL OTHER ORDERS ARE TO  
REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. DETAILS LISTED AT END OF THIS MINUTE ORDER.

INFORMATION FILED ON 05/06/97.

COUNT 01: 187(A) PC FEL  
COUNT 02: 664-187(A) PC FEL

ON 06/02/21 AT 300 PM IN SOUTH DISTRICT DEPT S19

CASE CALLED FOR COURT CONSIDERATION

PARTIES: LAURA L. LAESECKE (JUDGE) SCOTT KINOSHITA (CLERK)  
NONE (REP) NONE (DDA)

DEFENDANT IS NOT PRESENT IN COURT, AND NOT REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL

THE COURT MAKES THE FOLLOWING RULING RE: ORDER STRIKING

STATEMENT OF DISQUALIFICATION

ON APRIL 6, 2021. PETITIONER FILED A PLEADING AS A STATEMENT  
OF DISQUALIFICATION FOR CAUSE, PURSUANT TO CCP 170.1(A)(6)(A)  
(III). THE STATEMENT IS BASED UPON THE COMPLAINING PARTY'S  
ASSUMPTION THAT THE COURT CANNOT BE FAIR WHEN RULING ON HIS  
HABEAS CORPUS PETITION BECAUSE IF SHE GRANTS THE PETITION,  
CASES SHE PROSECUTED PRIOR TO BEING APPOINTED TO THE BENCH WILL  
BE NEGATIVELY IMPACTED, WHICH WILL REFLECT POORLY ON HER, SINCE  
AS MATTER OF LAW, NEITHER A PARTY'S OPINION NOR A COURT'S  
RULING AND FINDINGS ARE LEGAL GROUNDS FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR  
CAUSE, THE PLEADING DEMONSTRATES ON ITS FACE NO LEGAL GROUNDS  
FOR DISQUALIFICATION. IT IS STRICKEN PURSUANT TO CODE OF CIVIL  
PROCEDURE SECTION 170.4, SUBDIVISION (B).

CASE NO. NA031090  
DEF NO. 01

DATE PRINTED 10/06/21

A PARTY'S BELIEF AS TO A JUDGE'S BIAS AND PREJUDICE IS IRRELEVANT AND NOT CONTROLLING IN A MOTION TO DISQUALIFY FOR CAUS, AS THE TEST APPLIED IS AN OBJECTIVE ONE. UNITED FARM WORKERS OF AMERICA AFL-CIO V. SUPERIOR COURT(1985) 170 CAL. APP. 3D 97, 104; STANFORD UNIVERSITY V. SUPERIOR COURT (1985) 173 CAL.APP.3D 403, 408 ("THE LITIGANTS' NECESSARILY PARTISAN VIEWS {DO} NOT PROVIDE THE APPLICABLE FRAME OF REFERENCE." {BRACKETS IN ORGINIAL.}) CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 170.3(C)(1) REQUIRES THAT THE DISQUALIFICATION STATEMENT SET FORTH "THE FACTS CONSTITUTION THE GROUNDS" FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF THE JUDGE. MERE CONCLUSIONS OF THE PLEADER ARE INSUFFICIENT. IN RE MORELLI (1970) 11 CAL.APP3D 819,843 (OVERRULED ON OTHER GROUNDS); URIAS V. HARRIS FARMS, INC. (1991) 234 CAL.APP.3D

415, 426.

RULINGS AND FINDINGS DO NOT CONSTITUTE A VALID BASIS FOR DISQUALIFICATION. AS STATED BY THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT IN PEOPLE V. GUERRA (2006) 37 CAL. 4TH 1067, 1112, "A TRIAL COURT'S NUMEROUS RULINGS AGAINST A PARTY-EVEN WHEN ERRONEOUS-DO NOT ESTABLISH A CHARGE OF JUDICIAL BIAS, ESPECIALLY WHEN THEY ARE SUBJECT TO REVIEW." (OVERRULED ON OTHER GROUNDS) MCEWEN V. OCCIDENTIAL LIFE INS. CO. (1916) 172 CAL. 6, 11 (ERRONEOUS RULINGS, EVEN WHEN NUMEROUS AND CONTINUOUS, ARE NOT GROUNDS FOR BIAS OR PREJUDICE, NOR ARE "JUDGES' EXPPRESSIONS OF OPINION UTTERED IN WHAT HE CONCEIVES TO BE THE DISCHARGE OF HIS JUDICIAL DUTY"). SEE ALSO, CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 170.2(B), WHICH PROVIDES WITH CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS NOT HERE APPLICABLE: "IT IS NOT GROUNDS FOR DISQUALIFICATION THAT THE JUDGE...(H)AS IN ANY CAPACITY EXPRESSED A VIEW ON A LEGAL OR FACTUAL ISSUE PRESENTED IN THE PROCEEDING..." CF., CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION ARTICLE VI, SECTION 10 WHICH PROVIDES ON PERTINENT PART WITH REGARD TO ALL COURTS: "THE COURT MAY MAKE SUCH COMMENT ON THE EVIDENCE AND THE TESTIMONY AND CREDIBILITY OF ANY WITNESS AS IN ITS OPINION IS NECESSARY FOR THE PROPER DETERMINATION OF THE CAUSE."

A PARTY'S REMEDY FOR AN ERRONEOUS RULING IS NOT A MOTION TO DISQUALIFY, BUT RATHER REVIEW BY APPEAL OR WRIT. SEE RYAN V. WELTE (1948) 87 CA. APP.2D 888, 893:" {A} WRONG OPINION ON THE LAW OF A CASE DOES NOT QUALIFY A JUDGE, NOR IS IT EVIDENCE OF BIAS OR PREJUDICE." OTHERWISE, THE COURT SAID, "NO JUDGE WHO IS REVERSED BY A HIGHER COURT ON ANY RULING OR DECISION WOULD BE QUALIFIED TO PROCEED FURTHER IN THE PARTICULAR CASE." THE PROPER REMEDY, OF COURSE WAS AN APPEAL FROM THE ERRONEOUSLY RULING. SEE 2 WITKIN, CALIFORNIA PROCEDURE (4TH ED.), COURTS, DISQUALIFYING OPINIONS, P. 157.

SINCE THE STATEMENT OF DISQUALIFICATION ON ITS FACE DISCLOSES NO LEGAL GROUNDS FOR DISQUALIFICATION, IT IS ORDERED STRICKEN

CASE NO. NA031090  
DEF NO. 01

DATE PRINTED 10/06/21

PURSUANT TO CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 170.4, SUBDIVISION (B). THE PARTIES ARE REMINDED THAT THIS DETERMINATION OF THE DISQUALIFICATION IS NOT AN APPEALABLE ORDER AND MAY BE REVIEWED ONLY BY A WRIT OF MANDATE FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL SOUGHT WITHIN 10 DAYS OF NOTICE TO THE PARTIES OF DECISION. CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 170.3(D). IN THE EVENT THAT A TIMELY FILED, SUCH AN ANSWER IS FILED HEREWITH. SEE PBA, LLC V. KPOD, LTD(2003) 112 CA;APP.4TH 965,972; ACCORD; FINE V. SUPERIOR COURT(2002) 97 CAL.APP.4TH 651, FN.3 AT 658.

GOOD CAUSE APPEARING THEREFORE, IT IS SO ORDERED.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

P.O. BOX 5242  
CORCORAN, CA. 93212

CDCR NO. P-16644

NEXT SCHEDULED EVENT:  
PROCEEDINGS TERMINATED

Verified Answer of Laura Laesecke

I, Laura Laesecke, declare:

1. I am a Judge of the Superior Court and as such have been assigned to preside over this case.

2. I am not prejudiced or biased against or in favor of any party to this proceeding or their counsel.

3. All rulings made by me in this action have been based upon facts and arguments officially presented to me and upon my understanding of the law. My statements and rulings are set forth in the records and the files herein, which are the best evidence hereof. To the extent the moving party's statement of those rulings and statements are inconsistent therewith, they are denied.

4. All statements made by me and all actions taken by me in this proceeding have been done in furtherance of what I believe were my judicial duties.

5. I know of no facts or circumstances which would require my disqualification or recusal in this case.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and of my own personal knowledge, except as to those matters stated to be on my information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true. Executed this 2 day of June, 2021, at 16110 Long Beach California.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Laura Laesecke

Exhibit B, p. 21

3 10/10/13

3 10/10/13

# Exhibit C

Exhibit C

ATTEST: I, the undersigned, being a duly qualified and sworn official of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original as the same appears from the records of said Court.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of said Court at the City of New York, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 19\_\_\_\_.

CLERK OF THE COURT

DEPUTY CLERK

CHIEF CLERK

DEPUTY CHIEF CLERK

CLERK OF THE COURT

DEPUTY CLERK

CHIEF CLERK

DEPUTY CLERK

CHIEF CLERK

DEPUTY CLERK

DEPUTY CLERK

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, will hold its next regular session on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 19\_\_\_\_, at the City of New York.

Attest: I, the undersigned, being a duly qualified and sworn official of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original as the same appears from the records of said Court.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of said Court at the City of New York, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 19\_\_\_\_.

CLERK OF THE COURT  
DEPUTY CLERK

CHIEF CLERK  
DEPUTY CHIEF CLERK

CLERK OF THE COURT  
DEPUTY CLERK

CLERK OF THE COURT



Rec'd  
August 27, 2021  
P. Damm

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

COURT OF APPEAL - SECOND DIST.

**FILED**

Aug 24, 2021

DANIEL P. POTTER, Clerk

kdominguez Deputy Clerk

In re

PAUL DENHAM

on

Habeas Corpus.

B314015

(Super. Ct. No. NA031090)

(Laura Laesecke, Judge)

**O R D E R**

THE COURT:

The court has read and considered the petition for writ of habeas corpus filed April 5, 2021. The petition is construed as a petition for writ of mandate and denied. (Code Civ. Proc., § 170.3, subd. (d).)



RUBIN, P.J.



BAKER, J.



MOOR, J.

Exhibit C, p 12

Exhibit D

Exhibit D

Rec'd  
3/22/22  
mde

SUPREME COURT  
**FILED**

MAR 16 2022

Jorge Navarrete Clerk

Deputy

S272346

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA**

**En Banc**

---

PAUL JOHN DENHAM, Petitioner,

v.

SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, Respondent;

THE PEOPLE, Real Party in Interest.

---

The petition for writ of mandate is denied.

---

CANTIL-SAKAUYE

*Chief Justice*

Exhibit D.p. 23