

## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

RANDAL D. HAWORTH et al.,	)	
	)	
Petitioners,	)	
	)	S165906
v.	)	
	)	Ct.App. 2/5
THE SUPERIOR COURT	)	No. B204354
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY,	)	
	)	Los Angeles County
Respondent;	)	Super. Ct. No. SC082441
	)	
SUSAN AMY OSSAKOW,	)	
	)	
Real Party in Interest.	)	
_____	)	

### MODIFICATION OF OPINION

#### BY THE COURT:

The opinion herein filed on August 2, 2010, and appearing at 50 Cal.4th 372, is modified as follows: footnote 12 is deleted, and the second and third sentences of the first full paragraph on page 391 are revised to read as follows: “Although the Court of Appeal characterized Judge Gordon’s conduct as ‘disparaging women on account of their physical attributes,’ our opinion mentions only one incident involving a person’s appearance, in which he ‘referred to a fellow jurist’s physical attributes in a demeaning manner,’ and the opinion does not specify the gender of the jurist. (*In re Gordon, supra*, 13 Cal.4th at p. 474.) Even assuming the jurist was a woman, any number of speculative inferences might be made about Judge Gordon’s attitudes based upon that conduct.”