2

1

4

5

6 7

9

8

11

10

13

12

1415

16

17

18

1920

2122

23

24

2526

27

28

Plaintiffs and Defendant the San Francisco Sheriff are pleased to inform the Court that, with the assistance of Chief Magistrate Judge Spero, they have reached agreement as to the appropriate remedy to be imposed in this case, with two exceptions. The Stipulated Final Judgment Remedying Constitutional Violation is attached as **Exhibit A**.

First, the parties have agreed to modify the procedures for seeking alterations on release, as currently reflected in California Penal Code § 1269c, in two ways: (1) pursuant to Section IV.A of Exhibit A, for arrestees charged with an offense not enumerated in California Penal Code § 1270.1, a peace officer may file a declaration to extend the 18-hour automatic release deadline by 12 hours if there is reasonable cause to believe that an arrestee may not appear at arraignment, or poses a threat to public safety; and (2) pursuant to Section IV.B of Exhibit A, for arrestees charged with offenses not enumerated in California Penal Code § 1270.1(a), the arrestee or their attorney, friend or family member shall have the right to submit an application under § 1269c to the magistrate or commissioner seeking a swifter judicial determination and release than the automatic 18-hour release provision. Plaintiffs also seek to modify these procedures a third way (Section IV.C), which is to provide all arrestees charged with offenses enumerated in California Penal Code § 1270.1(a) the right to submit an application (by the arrestee or their attorney, friend or family member) under § 1269c to the magistrate or commissioner seeking OR release prior to arraignment. The Sheriff does not stipulate to this provision and takes no position on whether the Court should adopt it. The parties agree that the Court's decision on this issue shall not impact any other provision of the stipulated final judgment.

Second, per Section VI of Exhibit A, the parties have not reached agreement as to attorneys' fees and costs, and expect to submit briefs on the matter to the Court following the entry of final judgment if an agreement as to fees and costs cannot ultimately be reached.

We respectfully request that the Court enter final judgment at its earliest convenience, so that the relevant time periods for implementation can begin. We would of course be pleased to address any questions the Court may have.

//

8 || //

Case 4:15-cv-04959-YGR Document 368 Filed 08/30/19 Page 3 of 4 Dated: August 30, 2019 Respectfully submitted, 1 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP 2 Robert E. Sims Sadik Huseny 3 Tyler P. Young 4 By: <u>/s/ Sadik Huseny</u> Sadik Huseny 5 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 6 Riana Buffin and Crystal Patterson 7 8 Respectfully submitted, Dated: August 30, 2019 DENNIS J. HERRERA 9 City Attorney 10 By: /s/ Jeremy M. Goldman Jeremy M. Goldman 11 Attorneys for Defendant 12 Sheriff Vicki Hennessy 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

1	SIGNATURE ATTESTATION
2	I, Sadik Huseny, am the ECF user whose ID and password are being used to file this
3	Notice of Stipulated Final Judgment Remedying Constitutional Violation. In compliance with
4	Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has
5	been obtained from each of the other Signatories.
6	
7	Dated: August 30, 2019 /s/ Sadik Huseny Sadik Huseny
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	