

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA**

LEA ALLISON, <i>et al.</i> , on behalf of)	
themselves and those similarly situated,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	Case No. 19-cv-1126
v.)	
)	(Class Action)
BRADLEY R. ALLEN, SR., in his official)	
capacity as Chief District Court Judge, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**MOTION FOR CLASS-WIDE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
AND REQUEST FOR HEARING**

Plaintiffs Lea Allison, Antonio Harrell, and Katherine Guill respectfully move this Court for entry of a preliminary injunction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65. Plaintiffs bring this action individually and on behalf of a prospective class of presumptively innocent individuals who are or will be unconstitutionally jailed in Alamance County solely because they do not have enough money to pay the secured bond that was set in their cases, without any individualized inquiry, as a condition of their pretrial release.¹ Plaintiffs seek a preliminary injunction requiring that Defendant Sheriff Terry

¹ As defined in Plaintiffs’ Motion for Certification of Class, filed simultaneously with their Complaint and the instant motion, the purported class is defined as:
All people who are arrested and charged with non-domestic violence offenses who are or will be detained in the Alamance County Detention Center post-arrest because they are unable to pay the monetary release conditions.

Johnson not enforce a secured financial condition of pretrial release upon an individual unless the bail order includes a finding pretrial detention is necessary because less restrictive conditions of release are inadequate and includes notice that the individual has received an individualized hearing that meets, at a minimum, the procedures laid out in paragraph 5 below. As more fully presented in their brief in support of their Motions for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction, and its accompanying evidentiary attachments,² Plaintiffs state the following in support of their Motion:

1. Plaintiffs and the proposed class are likely to succeed on the merits of their claims that Defendants' bail and pretrial detention policies violate their right to be free of wealth-based detention under the equal protection and due process clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment (Count I); their substantive due process right to pretrial liberty (Count II); their procedural due process rights (Count III); and their Sixth Amendment Right to Counsel (Count IV).

2. Without immediate injunctive relief from this Court, Plaintiffs and the proposed class will continue to suffer immediate, irreparable harm in the form of deprivation of their constitutional right to pretrial liberty and right to be free from wealth-based detention. They will also suffer resulting additional harms, including loss of jobs,

Individuals who are charged with domestic violence offense receive a different process for bail under state law. *See* N.C. Gen. Stat. §15A-534.1.

² For purposes of efficiency and the Court's convenience, Plaintiffs file, simultaneously with their Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and the instant motion, a single, combined memorandum in support of both motions.

loss of homes, disruption of medical care, and disruption to family life, as well as hindering individuals' ability to prepare for their own defense.

3. Entry of an injunction poses no harm to Defendants, as it would release individuals who are unconstitutionally held in Defendant Sheriff's custody and prevent the future unconstitutional pretrial detention of similarly situated individuals.

4. An injunction serves the public interest because it prevents the continued violation of constitutional rights, including such fundamental rights as the right to pretrial liberty and the right to be free of wealth-based detention.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs respectfully ask the Court to issue class-wide preliminary injunctive relief against the system of wealth-based detention that keeps Plaintiffs and proposed class members in jail because they cannot afford to pay a monetary release condition without an inquiry into or findings concerning ability to pay, without consideration of non-financial alternatives, and without any findings that a particular release condition—or pretrial detention—is necessary to meet a compelling government interest. Specifically, Plaintiffs request that the Court enjoin Defendant Sheriff from enforcing a secured financial condition of pretrial release upon an individual, unless Defendant Sheriff is notified in writing that the individual has received an individualized hearing that meets the following minimum requirements:

(a) Notice was provided to the individual at the individualized bail hearing of:

- i. The federal constitutional rights at issue: specifically the right against wealth-based detention and the right to pretrial liberty;

- ii. The applicable legal standard, which is that these rights cannot be infringed unless the government proves that there are no alternative conditions of release that could adequately serve the government's interests in court appearance or public safety; and
 - iii. Notice of the facts being relied on to make the decision.
- (b) Notice was provided to the individual that financial information will be collected at the individualized bail hearing, including an explanation of the significance of the financial information to be collected.
 - (c) The individual was provided an opportunity to be heard before a neutral factfinder and to present and confront evidence and argument on appropriate conditions of release or detention.
 - (d) If an order resulting in an arrestee's *de facto* or transparent detention is entered, there must be a finding that pretrial detention is necessary because there are no alternative conditions of release adequate to serve a compelling government interest in court appearance or public safety. This provision requires that, if a secured financial condition of release is required, there be either an individualized finding that the person can afford to pay it (such that it will not result in detention) or that the pretrial detention of the person is necessary.
 - (e) An order of *de facto* or transparent detention must be accompanied by on-the-record findings setting forth the reasons for the decision and made available to the individual.
 - (f) The individual was provided counsel free of charge at the hearing.

Under Local Rule 65.1(b), Plaintiffs request oral argument on this motion and leave to present the testimony of witnesses, including experts, as may be appropriate depending on the arguments Defendants may raise in their opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction.

Dated: November 12, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Katherine Hubbard
Katherine Hubbard (D.C. Bar 1500503)*
Eric Halperin (D.C. Bar 491199)*
CIVIL RIGHTS CORPS
1601 Connecticut Ave NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20009
Tel: 202-894-6124
Fax: 202-609-8030
Email: katherine@civilrightscorps.org
eric@civilrightscorps.org

/s/ Leah Kang
Irena Como (N.C. Bar 51812)
Leah J. Kang (N.C. Bar 51735)
Ann C. Webb (N.C. Bar 44894)
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF NORTH
CAROLINA LEGAL FOUNDATION
P.O. Box 28004
Raleigh, NC 27611
Tel: 919-834-3466
Email: icomo@acluofnc.org
lkang@acluofnc.org
awebb@acluofnc.org

/s/ Twyla Carter
Twyla Carter (WA Bar 39405)*
Brandon Buskey (AL Bar ASB2753-A50B)*
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
FOUNDATION
CRIMINAL LEGAL REFORM PROJECT
125 Broad Street, 18th Floor
New York, NY 10004
Tel: 212-284-7364
Email: tcarter@aclu.org
bbuskey@aclu.org

**Appearing by special appearance in
accordance with Local Rule 83.1(d).*

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on November 12, 2019, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system. I further certify that arrangements have been made to deliver a true and correct courtesy copy of the foregoing to the following via Certified U.S. Mail, Return Receipt Requested.

/s/ Irena Como
Counsel for Plaintiffs

Bradley Allen, Sr.,
Chief District Court Judge
Judge J.B. Allen Jr. Criminal Courthouse
212 W Elm St., Ste. 120
Graham, NC 27253

D. Thomas Lambeth,
Senior Resident Superior Court Judge
Judge J.B. Allen Jr. Criminal Courthouse
212 West Elm Street, Suite 245
Graham, NC 27253

Brenda Brown, Magistrate
Kelly Councilman, Magistrate
David Crabbe, Magistrate
Rhonda Crisp, Magistrate
Bertram Heathcote, Magistrate
Wendy Hunter, Magistrate
Amelia Knauff, Magistrate
Bobbie Nance, Magistrate
Helena Rodgers, Magistrate
Kimesha Thorpe, Magistrate
John Watterson, Magistrate
Susan Wortinger, Magistrate
Judge J.B. Allen Jr. Criminal Courthouse
212 W. Elm St.
Graham, NC 27253

Terry S. Johnson, Sheriff
Alamance County Detention Center
109 S Maple St.
Graham, NC 27253

The following relief is ordered against Defendant Alamance County Sheriff. Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(d)(2). The injunction covers and is binding on those “who are in active concert or participation” with the parties or the parties’ officers, agents, servants, employees, or attorneys. *Id.*

To remedy the constitutional violations found by the Court, the Court **ORDERS** as follows:

(1) The Sheriff must not enforce a secured financial condition of pretrial release upon an individual, unless the individual first receives an individualized hearing that meets the following minimum requirements:

- (a) Notice is provided to individuals at the individualized bail hearing of:
 - i. The federal constitutional rights at issue: specifically the right against wealth-based detention and the right to pretrial liberty;
 - ii. The applicable legal standard, which is that these rights cannot be infringed unless the government proves that there are no alternative conditions of release that could adequately serve the government’s interests in court appearance or public safety; and
 - iii. Notice of the facts being relied on to make the decision.

(b) Notice is provided to the individuals that financial information will be collected at the individualized bail hearing, and the notice includes an explanation of the significance of the financial information to be collected.

(c) Individuals are provided an opportunity to be heard before a neutral factfinder and to present and confront evidence and argument on appropriate conditions of release or detention.

(d) If an order resulting in an arrestee’s *de facto* or transparent detention is entered, there must be a finding that pretrial detention is necessary because there are no alternative conditions of release adequate to serve a compelling government interest in court appearance or public safety. This provision requires that, if a secured financial condition of release is required, there be

either an individualized finding that the person can afford to pay it (such that it will not result in detention) or that the pretrial detention of the person is necessary.

(e) An order of *de facto* or transparent detention must be accompanied by on-the-record findings setting forth the reasons for the decision and made available to the individual.

(f) Individuals must be provided counsel free of charge at the hearing.

(2) Defendant Sheriff must not enforce any de facto or transparent order of pretrial detention that is not accompanied by a record demonstrating that the substantive findings and procedural safeguards listed in above in paragraph 1 of this Order have been provided. Specifically, this provision requires that, if a secured financial condition of release is required, the Sheriff may not enforce that condition unless there is a finding on the record that the person can afford the amount of money required (such that it will not result in detention) or that the pretrial detention of the person is necessary.

The Court further **ORDERS** that the Sheriff abide by the following **REPORTING** mechanism. The Sheriff shall make weekly public reports to this Court that include:

(a) A list of all individuals who were required to pay a secured financial condition of pretrial release and a copy of the on-the-record findings showing that the individual either could afford the amount required or that detention was necessary; and

(b) A list of all arrestees who were detained prior to an individualized hearing and the reason for detention.

For purposes of ensuring transparency and effective monitoring, Defendants must produce additional relevant data to Class counsel upon reasonable request.

The Parties may move the Court for modification or clarification of these reporting requirements by written motion served on all parties and counsel and on a showing of good cause.

Dated: _____

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE