

**CERTIFIED FOR PARTIAL PUBLICATION**

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ROBERT A. CAMPOS,

Defendant and Appellant.

---

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

WILLIAM EDWARD HOGAN,

Defendant and Appellant.

---

B191256

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. MA027171)

B192771

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. MA027171)

**ORDER MODIFYING OPINION**

**[NO CHANGE IN JUDGMENT]**

THE COURT:\*

It is ordered that the opinion filed herein on November 14, 2007, be modified as follows:

1. On page 20, line 1, the first full sentence, the words “the Court of Appeal” are changed to “the Supreme Court.” The sentence is modified to read as follows:

In rejecting that argument, the Supreme Court explained that “in order for the jury to convict defendant of the attempted murder of the baby, it had to find, beyond a reasonable doubt, that he acted with intent to kill that victim, i.e., that he purposely shot into the vehicle with ‘a deliberate intent to unlawfully take away [the baby’s] life’ [citation] or knowledge that his act of shooting into the vehicle would, ““to a substantial certainty,”” result in the baby’s death. [Citation.] . . . Under the case law . . . , evidence that defendant purposefully discharged a lethal firearm at the victims, both of whom were seated in the vehicle, one behind the other, with each directly in his line of fire, can support an inference that he acted with intent to kill both. [Citations.]” (Id. at p. 743.)

There is no change in judgment.