

1
2
3
4
5 **BEFORE THE VICTIM COMPENSATION BOARD**
6 **OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
7

8 In the Matter of:

9 **Jane Dorotik**

10 Claim No. 26-ECP-26

Proposed Decision

Penal Code § 4900, subd. (b)

11 **I. Introduction**

12 On April 24, 2026, Jane Dorotik (Dorotik) submitted a claim to the California Victim
13 Compensation Board (CalVCB) seeking compensation as an erroneously convicted person under
14 Penal Code Section 4900. The claim was submitted via email by claimant's counsel, Paula Mitchell,
15 Director of the Los Angeles Innocence Project. The claim is based upon Dorotik's 2001 conviction for
16 murder in San Diego County Superior Court case number SCN109628, which was vacated in 2020 by
17 grant of habeas relief. Thereafter, on May 16, 2022, all charges were dismissed. Dorotik requests
18 compensation for 7,128 days of incarceration in the amount of \$997,920.¹

19 The Attorney General is represented by Deputy Attorney General Tami Falkenstein Hennick. By
20 letter dated July 24, 2026, which was received on July 27, 2026, the Attorney General declined to
21 object to Dorotik's claim.²

22 The administrative record closed on July 27, 2026. The claim was assigned to CalVCB Senior
23 Attorney Keri Klein. As required by subdivision (b) of Penal Code section 4900, CalVCB is mandated to
24 approve payment to Dorotik in the amount of \$997,920 if sufficient funds are available, upon
25

26
27 ¹ Claimant's Application (APP), p. 1.

28 ² Attorney General Response Letter (AGRL) dated July 24, 2026.

1 appropriation by the Legislature, as indemnification for the demonstrated injury sustained by her 7,128
2 days imprisonment for her vacated conviction.

3 II. Procedural Background

4 A. Trial Proceedings

5 Dorotik was arrested on February 17, 2000, and charged in San Diego County Superior Court
6 case number SCN109628 with murder.³ She was released on bail on March 1, 2000, but then returned
7 to custody on November 1, 2000, due to increased bail. On June 12, 2001, she was convicted of first-
8 degree murder after a jury trial. Dorotik was sentenced to prison for a term of 25 years to life.⁴

9 B. Appellate Proceedings

10 Dorotik appealed her conviction to the Court of Appeal, Fourth District, Division 1. She alleged
11 there was insufficient evidence to prove malice aforethought and premeditation and deliberation. She
12 also contended the trial court erred by failing to instruct the jury on the lesser included offense of
13 voluntary manslaughter. The court concluded no error had occurred and the evidence was sufficient to
14 support the conviction.⁵ On December 22, 2003, Dorotik filed a petition for review in the California
15 Supreme Court, which was denied on January 28, 2004.⁶

16 C. Post-Conviction Proceedings

17 On April 4, 2005, Dorotik filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in the San Diego County
18 Superior Court.⁷ The petition was denied on its merits and on procedural grounds. She then filed the
19
20
21

22 ³ Pen. Code, § 187 (murder).

23 ⁴ APP at p. 4, Ex. G at pp. 109-110; *People v. Dorotik*, California Court of Appeal, Fourth District,
24 Division 1, case number D038706, unpublished decision filed Nov. 18, 2003, available on Westlaw at
25 2003 WL 22708917; see also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 617.8 (official notice).

26 ⁵ *People v. Dorotik*, 2003 WL 22708917.

27 ⁶ *People v. Dorotik*, California Supreme Court, case number S121329; available online at
<https://appellatecases.courtinfo.ca.gov/index.cfm>; see also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 617.8 (official
28 notice).

⁷ *In re Dorotik*, San Diego Superior Court case number HCN0787.

1 habeas petition in the Court of Appeal on January 3, 2006.⁸ The petition was denied on March 1, 2006.
2 On November 20, 2006, Dorotik filed a petition for review in the California Supreme Court, which was
3 denied on May 16, 2007.⁹ On April 16, 2012, she filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in the
4 California Supreme Court.¹⁰ It was denied on September 19, 2012.

5 Eight years later on April 10, 2020, Dorotik filed another petition for writ of habeas corpus in the
6 Court of Appeal.¹¹ It was denied on April 23, 2020. On June 24, 2022, she filed a writ of mandate in the
7 Court of Appeal.¹² On July 12, 2022, it was denied. On July 22, 2022, Dorotik filed a petition for review
8 in the California Supreme Court.¹³ On August 24, 2022, the petition for review was denied.

9 Meanwhile, on August 12, 2019, Dorotik filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in the San
10 Diego County Superior Court based upon newly discovered evidence pursuant to Penal Code section
11 1473.¹⁴ In particular, advancements in DNA testing had led to new testing on physical evidence. The
12

13
14 ⁸ *Dorotik v. The People*; California Court of Appeal, Fourth District, Division 1, case number D047784;
15 available online at <https://appellatecases.courtinfo.ca.gov/index.cfm>; see also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, §
617.8 (official notice).

16 ⁹ *In re Dorotik*, California Supreme Court, case number S148249; available online at
17 <https://appellatecases.courtinfo.ca.gov/index.cfm>; see also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 617.8 (official
notice).

18 ¹⁰ *In re Dorotik*, California Supreme Court, case number S201722; available online at
19 <https://appellatecases.courtinfo.ca.gov/index.cfm>; see also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 617.8 (official
notice).

20 ¹¹ *In re Dorotik*, California Court of Appeal, Fourth District, Division 1, case number D077453; available
21 online at <https://appellatecases.courtinfo.ca.gov/index.cfm>; see also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 617.8
(official notice).

22 ¹² *Dorotik v. Superior Court*, California Court of Appeal, Fourth District, Division 1, case number
23 D080553; available online at <https://appellatecases.courtinfo.ca.gov/index.cfm>; see also Cal. Code
Regs., tit. 2, § 617.8 (official notice).

24 ¹³ *Dorotik v. Superior Court*, California Supreme Court, case number S275639; available online at
25 <https://appellatecases.courtinfo.ca.gov/index.cfm>; see also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 617.8 (official
notice).

26 ¹⁴ APP Ex. A at pp. 27-28. At that time, former subdivision (b)(3)(A) of Penal Code section 1473
27 authorized habeas relief for incarcerated defendants based upon new evidence “that is credible,
28 material, presented without substantial delay, and of such decisive force and value that it would have
more likely than not changed the outcome at trial.” (Former Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (b)(3)(A) (West
2020).) This subdivision was revised and relocated to current subdivision (b)(1)(C)(i) of section 1473,
which similarly authorizes relief if “New evidence exists that is presented without substantial delay, is

1 results undermined evidence produced at trial. The petition alleged additional trial errors, including
2 prosecutorial misconduct.¹⁵

3 On April 23, 2020, while her habeas petition remained pending, Dorotik was released from
4 custody due to a bond motion based upon the Covid-19 pandemic.¹⁶ She remained subject to electronic
5 monitoring. By then, she had been incarcerated for a total of 7,128 days, commencing with 14 days
6 from the date of her arrest on February 17, 2000, to and including the date of her bail release on March
7 1, 2020, plus an additional 7,114 days from the date of her return to pretrial custody on November 1,
8 2000, to and including the date of her release on April 23, 2020.¹⁷

9 On July 24, 2020, at a hearing on the petition, the San Diego County District Attorney's Office
10 conceded Dorotik's conviction must be vacated solely on the basis of new evidence pursuant to former
11 subdivision (b)(3)(A) of Penal Code section 1473, and the court vacated her conviction accordingly.¹⁸ In
12 October of 2020, the San Diego County District Attorney's Office announced they would re-try Dorotik.¹⁹
13 However, on May 16, 2022, after Dorotik was held to answer at the preliminary hearing, the prosecution
14 moved to dismiss the charges.²⁰ The court granted the motion.²¹

15 ///

16 ///

17 _____
18 admissible, and is sufficiently material and credible that it more likely than not would have changed the
19 outcome of the case." (Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (b)(1)(C)(i) (West 2026).)

20 ¹⁵ The writ petition was not provided to CalVCB. Therefore, this information is surmised from the
provided transcripts of the hearing on the petition.

21 ¹⁶ APP Ex. A at p. 28, Ex. G at p. 112.

22 ¹⁷ APP at p. 1. The number of days was confirmed using the online "Days Calculator" located at
<https://www.timeanddate.com/date/duration.html>.

23 ¹⁸ APP Ex. A at p. 28, Ex. F at pp. 85-87 (Reporter's Transcript of parties referencing former Pen.
24 Code, § 1473, subd. (b)(3)(A)); cf. APP Ex. F at p. 81 [minute order referencing Pen. Code, § 1473.7];
25 see also Pen. Code, § 1473.7, subd. (a)(2) (authorizing reversal of a conviction when the defendant is
no longer in custody if newly discovered evidence of "actual innocence" warrants vacatur in the
interests of justice).

26 ¹⁹ APP Ex. A at p. 28.

27 ²⁰ APP Ex. A at pp. 28-29, Ex. F at pp. 98-99.

28 ²¹ APP Ex. F at pp. 96-107.

1 **D. CalVCB Proceedings**

2 On April 24, 2026, CalVCB received a claim on behalf of Dorotik seeking compensation as an
3 erroneously convicted person under Penal Code Section 4900.²² The claim was based upon Dorotik's
4 vacated 2001 murder conviction for which she served 7,128 days in prison and requested \$997,920 in
5 compensation. The claim indicated a writ of habeas corpus was granted and the charges dismissed on
6 May 16, 2022. On April 27, 2026, the claim was deemed filed pursuant to Penal Code section 4900,
7 subdivision (b), and a response from the Attorney General was requested within 45 days.²³

8 On June 4, 2026, the Attorney General requested an extension of time, which was supported by
9 a sworn declaration from Deputy Attorney General Tami Falkenstein Hennick.²⁴ The Attorney General
10 stated their investigation was ongoing. They received voluminous portions of the trial record, the
11 appellate record, and files from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.
12 Furthermore, the San Diego County District Attorney's Office was still in the process of gathering their
13 file and producing it to the Attorney General. Deputy Attorney General Hennick also detailed two other
14 previously assigned matters that had required her attention. Receiving no objection to the request from
15 claimant's counsel, and good cause having been established, on June 9, 2026, the extension of time
16 was granted in accordance with subdivision (d) of Penal Code section 4902.²⁵ Accordingly, the Attorney
17 General's response was due July 27, 2026.

18 On Sunday, July 26, 2026, the Attorney General responded by letter dated July 24, 2026, that
19 was timely received on Monday, July 27, 2026. In it, the Attorney General declined to object to the
20 claim. Specifically, the "Attorney General's Office investigated the claim, and within the meaning of
21 Penal Code section 4902, subdivision (d), does not object to compensation in the amount requested by
22 claimant."²⁶ The administrative record closed thereafter on July 27, 2026.

23 _____
24 ²² APP at p.1.

25 ²³ CalVCB Request for Attorney General Response, April 27, 2026; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, §§ 640,
26 subd. (e), 642, subd. (c).

27 ²⁴ Attorney General Request for Extension of Time, June 4, 2026.

28 ²⁵ CalVCB Order on Extension of Time, June 9, 2026.

²⁶ Attorney General Declination, dated July 24, 2026, at p. 1.

III. Factual Summary

A. Trial evidence

Dorotik and Robert met in 1968, when they were neighbors.²⁷ They married in a civil ceremony on April 4, 1970, and had a family wedding on May 16, 1970.²⁸ Like many married couples, their relationship had ups and downs and they did argue.²⁹ By 1997, Dorotik and Robert separated, and he filed for divorce.³⁰ By 1998, they reconciled and were again living together. As finances were a sticking point in their marriage, they chose to keep their finances separate after their reconciliation.³¹ By February of 2000, Robert and Dorotik were married and living on a ranch near Escondido, California.³²

On the afternoon of February 13, 2000, Robert left his home to go running. He failed to return.³³ Dorotik called friends and asked if they had seen him.³⁴ She went out looking for him but could not find him.³⁵ As he was an avid long-distance runner, Dorotik did not report him missing to the San Diego County Sheriff's Department until evening.³⁶ On February 14, 2000, his body was found about two miles from the home he shared with Dorotik, with a rope wrapped around his neck.³⁷ According to the prosecution's expert, Robert died from multiple blunt force injuries to the head with ligature strangulation as a contributing factor. His injuries included skull fractures and lacerations on his head, possibly inflicted by a hammer, abrasions on his face and hands, and a ligature mark on his neck.³⁸

²⁷ APP Ex. B at p. 30. In an effort to preserve their privacy, the victim and civilian witnesses are referred to by first name only.

²⁸ APP Ex. B at p. 31.

²⁹ APP Ex. B at p. 30.

³⁰ *People v. Dorotik*, 2003 WL 22708917 at p. 1.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *Ibid.*

³³ APP Ex. B at p. 60; *People v. Dorotik*, 2003 WL 22708917 at p. 1

³⁴ *People v. Dorotik*, 2003 WL 22708917 at p. 1.

³⁵ APP Ex. B at p. 60.

³⁶ APP Ex. B. at pp. 60-61.

³⁷ APP Ex. A at pp. 13, 15.

³⁸ *People v. Dorotik*, 2003 WL 22708917 at pp. 1-2, 5.

1 When Dorotik was notified, she started crying and asked if he had suffered. She disclosed to the
2 officers that Robert had a \$250,000 life insurance policy and she was the beneficiary.³⁹ Dorotik
3 promptly became a suspect in his murder and was arrested on February 17, 2000.⁴⁰

4 A search of their home revealed bloodstains in the primary bedroom, including on the underside
5 of the mattress near the headboard, a towel between the mattress and box springs, a syringe
6 containing a horse tranquilizer, and a bed sheet in the hamper.⁴¹ Cleaning supplies were found in the
7 living room closet.⁴² Blood was allegedly found on them too. Alleged bloodstains were also found in the
8 bed of a truck used at the ranch. According to the prosecution's DNA expert, testing was performed on
9 these bloodstains, and many were consistent with Robert's blood.⁴³

10 An expert for the prosecution testified the blood splatter patterning was consistent with a beating
11 occurring in the room.⁴⁴ He indicated the patterning inside the primary bedroom demonstrated Robert
12 was struck at least twice on the bed. The expert opined that Robert remained there for some period of
13 time until he moved, or was moved, to another area of the bedroom, where he was struck at least once
14 more. The expert also testified there was no blood splatter on Robert's clothing but there was blood
15 transfer.⁴⁵

16 Dorotik did not testify at trial. The defense suggested that someone else killed Robert. Dorotik
17 was convicted by jury on June 12, 2001. She received a sentence of 25 years to life.⁴⁶

18 **B. The Habeas Corpus Proceedings**

19 On August 12, 2019, Dorotik filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus which alleged, inter alia,
20 newly discovered evidence would have changed the outcome of the trial within the meaning of Penal
21

22 ³⁹ *People v. Dorotik*, 2003 WL 22708917 at p. 1.

23 ⁴⁰ APP Ex. A at p. 13.

24 ⁴¹ *People v. Dorotik*, 2003 WL 22708917 at p. 2.

25 ⁴² *People v. Dorotik*, 2003 WL 22708917 at p. 2.

26 ⁴³ APP Ex. A at pp. 23-24.

27 ⁴⁴ APP Ex. A at pp. 21-23.

28 ⁴⁵ *People v. Dorotik*, 2003 WL 22708917 at p. 2.

⁴⁶ APP at p. 4.

1 Code section 1473.⁴⁷ Significantly, post-conviction DNA testing revealed the presence of foreign DNA
2 under Robert's fingernails, on the rope wrapped around his neck, and on the clothing he was wearing.⁴⁸
3 At a hearing held on July 24, 2020, the San Diego County District Attorney conceded habeas relief was
4 warranted as a result of this significant new evidence, especially when considered with recently
5 discovered impeachment evidence regarding the prosecution's DNA and blood spatter experts. In
6 particular the assigned Deputy District Attorney stated:

7 "The results of the retesting of some physical items of evidence and correlating new
8 DNA results qualifies as new evidence. The DNA evidence as it exists now in 2020 is
9 much different in quality and quantity than presented at trial in 2001. As it stands it
10 undermines the previous evidence presented at trial to the extent that a new trial would
be granted by this Court. This conclusion is further supported by new information
regarding lab personnel [who testified as experts in DNA and blood spatter] which our
office was previously unaware of but recently made known to us."⁴⁹

11 While agreeing the petition should be granted based upon the discovery of this new evidence, the
12 prosecutor objected to all other allegations in the petition.⁵⁰ In response, Dorotik agreed to habeas
13 relief on this narrow ground while preserving all other allegations of error in the event of a retrial. In
14 accordance with the parties' request, the court vacated Dorotik's conviction at the conclusion of the
15 hearing, without rendering any factual findings or credibility determinations.⁵¹

16 C. CalVCB Evidence

17 In this administrative proceeding, Dorotik presented various documents, including a cover letter
18 from her attorney, a completed Erroneously Convicted Person claim form, a 16-page statement of facts
19 outlining alleged problems with the investigation and conviction of Dorotik, a 46-page declaration of
20
21

22 ⁴⁷ APP Ex. F at p. 85; see also Pen. Code, § 1473, subd. (b)(1)(C)(i) (authorizing habeas relief to
23 vacate an incarcerated defendant's conviction where new evidence is presented that more likely than
24 not would have changed the outcome of the case). As previously noted, the petition was not submitted
25 to CalVCB and, therefore, any additional allegations may only be surmised from the Reporter's
Transcript of the hearing.

26 ⁴⁸ APP Ex. A at p. 28.

27 ⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

28 ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ APP Ex. F. at pp. 87-88.

1 Dorotik from her petition for writ of habeas corpus, a *Brady*⁵² alert from the San Diego County District
2 Attorney regarding the DNA expert's incompetence, an additional *Brady* alert from the San Diego
3 County District Attorney regarding the blood splatter pattern expert's incompetence, a minute order
4 documenting the grant of the writ of habeas corpus on July 24, 2020,⁵³ a reporter's transcript of the July
5 24, 2020, hearing, a reporter's transcript of the dismissal of charges on May 16, 2022, the verdict form
6 signed on June 11, 2001, the abstract of judgment, and the order releasing Dorotik from prison due to
7 the Covid-19 outbreak.

8 After investigating Dorotik's claim, the Attorney General declined to object.

9 IV. Determination of Issues

10 Penal Code section 4900 allows a person, who has been erroneously convicted and
11 imprisoned for a felony offense they did not commit, or a crime that did not occur, to submit a claim for
12 compensation to CalVCB for the injury sustained. Under subdivision (a) of section 4900, claimants
13 bear the burden to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that (1) the crime with which they were
14 convicted either did not occur or was not committed by them and (2) they suffered injury as a result of
15 their erroneous conviction.⁵⁴ Pursuant to Penal Code section 4901, the claim must be submitted within
16 ten years after release from prison but not until 60 days after the reversal of a conviction.⁵⁵

17 Once such a claim is timely received and filed, Penal Code section 4902 requires the Attorney
18 General to submit a written response.⁵⁶ Thereafter, under Penal Code section 4903, an informal
19 hearing before a Hearing Officer ensues, at which the claimant and Attorney General may present
20
21

22 ⁵² *Brady v. Maryland* (1963) 373 U.S. 83 (holding that suppression of exculpatory evidence by the
23 prosecution team is a denial of due process).

24 ⁵³ Although the minute order references relief under Penal Code section 1473.7, the Reporter's
25 Transcript confirms that habeas relief was granted pursuant to Penal Code section 1473. (See *People*
26 *v. Smith* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 596, 599 [When the record is in conflict, "that part of the record that will
prevail, which, because of its origin and nature or otherwise, is entitled to greater credence."].)

27 ⁵⁴ Pen. Code, §§ 4900, subd. (a), 4903, subd. (a).

28 ⁵⁵ Pen. Code, § 4901, subds. (a), (c).

⁵⁶ Pen. Code, § 4902, subd. (a); Cal Code of Regs., tit. 2, § 640.

1 evidence concerning innocence and injury.⁵⁷ Upon the requisite showing, CalVCB shall approve
2 payment pursuant to Penal Code section 4904 for the purpose of indemnifying the claimant for the
3 injury sustained if sufficient funds are available, upon appropriation by the Legislature, at a rate of
4 \$140 per day for their erroneous imprisonment.⁵⁸

5 Under subdivision (b) of Penal Code section 4900, CalVCB's approval is mandated for certain
6 claimants, even without a preponderance of evidence that the claimant did not commit the crime for
7 which they were convicted.⁵⁹ Specifically, subdivision (b) compels approval of the claim for
8 compensation, without a hearing and within 90 days, when the following three elements are met. First,
9 the claimant's conviction must have been vacated either by a writ of habeas corpus or pursuant to
10 Penal Code section 1473.6 or 1473.7, subdivision (a)(2). Second, the charges underlying the vacated
11 conviction must have been dismissed on remand, or the claimant must have been acquitted upon
12 retrial. Third, the Attorney General must decline to object to the application in this administrative
13 proceeding.⁶⁰ If all three of these elements are satisfied, and CalVCB finds the claimant has sustained
14 injury through their erroneous conviction, then CalVCB shall approve payment for the purpose of
15 indemnifying the claimant for the injury if sufficient funds are available, upon appropriation by the
16 Legislature.⁶¹ CalVCB's approval of the claim is statutorily required, regardless of whether or not the
17 record proves the claimant is more likely innocent than guilty.

18 If the Attorney General objects, he must do so in writing, within 45 days from when the claimant
19 files the claim, and with clear and convincing evidence the claimant is not entitled to compensation.
20 Only a single extension of time for 45 days is allowed for good cause. The Attorney General bears the
21 burden to prove, by clear and convincing evidence, the claimant committed the acts constituting the
22 offense. To meet that burden, the Attorney General may not rely solely on the trial record for the
23

24
25 ⁵⁷ Pen. Code, § 4903, subd. (a); Cal Code of Regs., tit. 2, § 644.

26 ⁵⁸ Pen. Code, § 4904, as amended by Stats.2022, c. 58 (A.B.200), § 19, eff. June 30, 2022.

27 ⁵⁹ Pen. Code, § 4900, subd. (b).

28 ⁶⁰ Pen. Code, §§ 4900, subd. (b), 4902, subd. (d).

⁶¹ Pen. Code, §§ 4900, subd. (b), 4902, subd. (d), 4904.

1 vacated conviction to establish that the claimant is not entitled to compensation. If the Attorney
2 General fails to meet this burden following a hearing on the claim, then CalVCB shall approve payment
3 to the claimant for their demonstrated injury, at the rate of \$140 per day, if sufficient funds are available
4 upon appropriation by the Legislature.

5 **A. Innocence**

6 Here, Dorotik's claim falls within the mandatory approval provision of subdivision (b) of Penal
7 Code section 4900, as all three of the required elements are met. First, Dorotik's conviction for murder
8 in San Diego County Superior Court case number SCN 109628 was vacated pursuant to a writ of
9 habeas corpus. Second, all charges against Dorotik in that case were dismissed. Third, the Attorney
10 General declined to object in this administrative proceeding. Consequently, CalVCB is required by
11 subdivision (b) to approve compensation for the injury sustained by Dorotik if sufficient funds are
12 available, upon appropriation by the Legislature.⁶² No finding is made as to the weight of evidence
13 offered in support of Dorotik's claim regarding innocence.

14 **B. Injury**

15 By statute, the amount of compensation "shall be a sum equivalent to one hundred forty dollars
16 (\$140) per day of incarceration served, and shall include any time spent in custody, including a county
17 jail, that is considered to be part of the term of incarceration."⁶³ This compensation is "for the purpose
18 of indemnifying the claimant for the injury" sustained "through their erroneous conviction and
19 imprisonment...."⁶⁴ The requisite injury "may be established by showing that, but for the erroneous
20 conviction, the claimant would not have been in custody."⁶⁵

21 Here, as agreed by the parties, Dorotik's injury amounts to \$997,920, representing \$140 per
22 day for each of her 7,128 days imprisonment. This custodial calculation includes 14 days from the date
23 of Dorotik's arrest on February 17, 2000, through and including, March 1, 2000, when she was
24

25 ⁶² Pen. Code, §§ 4900, subd. (b), 4904.

26 ⁶³ Pen. Code, § 4904.

27 ⁶⁴ Pen. Code, § 4904.

28 ⁶⁵ Cal. Code of Regs., tit. 2, § 640, subd. (f).

1 released on bail, plus 7,114 days from November 1, 2000, when she was taken back into custody on
2 an increased bail, to April 23, 2020, the date of her release.⁶⁶ But-for her erroneous conviction in case
3 number SCN109628, Dorotik would have been free for all 7,128 days of her imprisonment.

4 **V. Conclusion**

5 As mandated by subdivision (b) of Penal Code section 4900, the undersigned Hearing Officer
6 recommends that CalVCB grant Dorotik's claim and approve payment in the amount of \$997,920, if
7 sufficient funds are available, upon appropriation by the Legislature, as indemnification for the injury
8 sustained by her 7,128 days of imprisonment solely as a result of her vacated conviction for murder.

9
10 Date: August 7, 2026

Keri Klein

11 _____
12 Keri Klein
13 Senior Attorney
14 California Victim Compensation Board
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 _____
28 ⁶⁶ APP at p. 1; see also Pen. Code, § 2900.5 (credit for days spent in custody); *People v. King* (1992) 3
Cal.App.4th 882, 886 (construing "days" for custody credit to include partial days).

RESPONSE RECEIVED

LOS ANGELES INNOCENCE PROJECT

August 20, 2026

via email

Board Liaison
CalVCB
400 R Street
5th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95812
board.meeting@victims.ca.gov

**Re: Response to Proposed Decision, Penal Code Section 4900 Claim of
Jane Dorotik (26-ECP-26)**

Dear Board Liaison:

The Los Angeles Innocence Project as counsel for Ms. Jane Dorotik, encourages the Board to adopt the Proposed Decision in whole In the Matter of Jane Dorotik, Claim No. 26-ECP-26.

The facts stated in the Proposed Decision are supported by the evidence submitted by Ms. Dorotik in support of her claim. The Proposed Decision contains an accurate statement of the applicable law and correctly applies the applicable law. Ms. Dorotik has no further evidence for the Board to consider.

Ms. Dorotik appreciates the Board and Attorney General's diligence and professionalism in adjudicating her claim and, through counsel, urges the Board to adopt the Proposed Decision in whole, grant her claim, and approve payment in the amount of \$997,920 as indemnification for her more than 7,000 days in prison as a result of her vacated conviction for murder.

Sincerely,



Hannah Brown
Los Angeles Innocence Project