## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

| OSCAR SANCHEZ, MARCUS | $\S$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| WHITE, TESMOND MCDONALD, | $\S$ |
| MARCELO PEREZ, ROGER | $\S$ |
| MORRISON, KEITH BAKER, PAUL | $\S$ |
| WRIGHT, TERRY MCNICKLES, | $\S$ |
| AND JOSE MUNOZ, on their own | $\S$ |
| behalf and on behalf of a class of | $\S$ |
| similarly situated persons, | $\S$ |
| Petitioners/Plaintiffs, | $\S$ |
|  | $\S$ |
| v. | $\S$ |
| DALLAS COUNTY SHERIFF | $\S$ |
| MARIAN BROWN, in Her Official | $\S$ |
| Capacity; DALLAS COUNTY, | $\S$ |
| TEXAS, | $\S$ |
| Respondents/Defendants. | $\S$ |
|  | $\S$ |

## Civil Action

Case No. 3:20-cv-00832

## BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' AMENDED MOTION TO DISMISS

Plaintiffs, all of whom are, or were, state detainees at the Dallas County Jail, challenge their conditions of confinement under the auspices of a Section 2241 habeas claim. The Fifth Circuit has held that habeas relief is not an appropriate vehicle to challenge conditions of confinement. As such, Plaintiffs have failed to state a claim for which relief can be granted, and their habeas claims should be dismissed. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).

Plaintiffs' habeas claims should also be dismissed because they have failed to exhaust their remedies in state court, and have not provided any basis on which one can reasonably conclude that Plaintiffs are excused from exhausting their state law remedies. Id.

Finally, the post-adjudication Plaintiffs may not use § 1983 to seek release because doing so would undermine the validity of their convictions. Those claims should also be dismissed. Id.

## I. Standard of Review

To survive a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim, a plaintiff must plead "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544,570 (2007). A claim is facially plausible when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw a reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged. Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). Assuming they are true, a plaintiff's allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level. Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555.

## II. Plaintiffs' habeas claims must be dismissed under Rule 12(b)(6) because they have not exhausted available state court remedies.

In order to be eligible for habeas relief a petitioner must have exhausted his or her available state remedies. Dickerson v. Louisiana, 816 F.2d 220, 224 (5th Cir. 1987). The common law exhaustion doctrine imposed on Section 2241(c)(3) was crafted based on concerns about the delicate state-federal balance in order to protect state courts' opportunity to confront and resolve initially any constitutional issues arising within their jurisdictions as well as to limit federal interference in the state adjudicatory process. Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court of Ky., 410 U.S. 484, 489-92 (1973).

Texas law provides for the reduction of bail and release thereon. TEX. Code Crim. P. art. 17.09 § 3. The Texas Code of Criminal Procedure provides factors that guide judicial discretion in setting bond amounts. Id. art. 17.15. Texas procedure also affords clear timeframes for mandatory bond reduction or imposition of a personal bond. Id. art. 17.151. Habeas relief is also available under Texas law. See, e.g., In re McCray, 324 S.W.3d 685 (Tex. App.-Dallas 2010, orig. proceeding).

Plaintiffs now allege both that "Section 2241 contains no exhaustion requirement conceivably applicable to prisoners seeking COVID-based discharge," ECF No. 39 at 44-45【 103, and that they have exhausted available state court remedies. ECF No. 39 at 40 ब 90. Plaintiffs' claim that Section 2241 contains no applicable exhaustion requirement is incorrect. Braden, 410 U.S. at 489-92; Dickerson, 816 F.2d at 224. Plaintiffs' allegation that Plaintiffs have exhausted state court remedies is conclusory and must be disregarded. Formulaic recitation of elements is never enough to meet the federal pleading standard. Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555.

The only exception to the exhaustion requirement that Plaintiffs cite is the exception for when state procedures do not afford swift vindication. Id. The pre-adjudication Plaintiffs do not contend that they sought expedited bond review hearings or initiated any state court remedy. The post-adjudication plaintiffs likewise do not allege that they initiated any state court proceedings to seek release. They merely say that these processes "would take months under normal circumstances, and certainly will now take longer." Id. Plaintiffs' argument fails for four reasons.

First, Plaintiffs pretend, without evidence, that they would lose at every stage of the habeas process and be forced to pursue appeals. Second, while Plaintiffs ignore the bond reduction process, they attach an e-mail from the Dallas County Criminal District Courts Manager, Keta Dickerson. ECF No. 1-11 at 4. Ms. Dickerson informed court-appointed counsel that the Criminal District Courts are:

- Currently open;
- Conducting essential hearings by any and all available means;
- Prioritizing bail hearings and jail pleas;
- Taking all reasonable steps to avoid exposing people to the threat of coronavirus; and
- Working to streamline an electronic system for hearing bond matters and jail pleas.

ECF No. 1-11 at 4. This evidence does not support a contention that available state law remedies, such as bond reduction or personal bonds, are futile or will take months; it supports a finding that state courts are "prioritizing bail hearings and jail pleas" and "taking all reasonable steps to avoid exposing people to the threat of coronavirus." Id.

Third, Plaintiffs' attempt to escape their obligation to seek adequate state law remedies fails because they offer no facts in support of their conclusory allegation that COVID-19 will lengthen the time it takes for them to obtain relief in state courts. ECF No. 1 at 38 【 $86 \& n .103$. Plaintiffs fail to mention that the only Dallas County courts that are closed are municipal courts. ${ }^{1}$ Municipal courts do not have jurisdiction over offenses that may result in incarceration. TeX. Gov'т Code § 29.003.

Finally, available state law remedies have been anything but futile or slow in the last month. Plaintiffs rely on the Dallas County Jail's daily population report data for April 6, 2020. ECF No. 1 at 30 ब 71 . A cursory review the daily population reports demonstrates that Texas courts are moving more quickly to safely release defendants during the COVID-19 situation.

The Supreme Court of Texas and the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals jointly issued their first order regarding court operations during COVID-19 on March 13, 2020. Misc. Order No. 20-9042 (Tex. Mar. 13, 2020); Misc. Order No. 20-007 (Tex. Crim. App. Mar. 13, 2020). ${ }^{2}$ The daily population report to which Plaintiffs refer shows a steep decline in Dallas County Jail population since March 13, 2020. On March 15, 2020, the total Jail population was 5,952. The

[^0]population declined to 5,618 on March 24 , and again to 5,225 on April 3, and finally to 5,180 on April 6. Today's Jail population is under 5,000. ${ }^{3}$

Plaintiffs' Complaint acknowledges that detainees have been released recently. ECF No.
1 at 26 『 61. The data to which Plaintiffs refer, however, demonstrates just how diligently the Dallas County Criminal Court at Law and State District Court judges have been working to release detainees when possible. ${ }^{4}$


Habeas relief is readily available in Texas state courts, as recent trends demonstrate.
Specific cases demonstrate just how swift the remedy has been in Dallas County courts during
COVID-19. Alberto Lopez filed a Petition for Habeas Corpus on April 2, 2020. Exhibit 2. Mr.
Lopez was released to a special program on April 10, 2020. Chad Ross filed a Petition for Writ

[^1]of Habeas Corpus on April 8, 2020. The Dallas County District Court lowered his bond, Mr. Ross was able to post the lowered bond amount, and he was released on April 14, 2020. Exhibit 3. Charged with felony evading arrest with a previous conviction, Michael Graves had his bond set at $\$ 25,000$. Four days later, his bond was reduced to personal recognizance, and he has been released. Exhibit $4 .{ }^{5}$

When habeas petitioners have not received relief in trial courts, the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals has processed habeas cases quite rapidly over the last few months. See, e.g., In re David Allen Mackley, No. WR-91, 105-02 (Tex. Crim. App. Apr. 15, 2020) (filed March 25, 2020, habeas relief granted April 15, 2020); ${ }^{6}$ In re Samuel Herschel Clauder No. WR-90, 70802 (Tex. Crim. App. Apr. 15, 2020) (writ received March 16, 2020, filed April 15, 2020, granted April 15, 2020); ${ }^{7}$ In re Robert Terrazas, No. WR-60, 286-02 (Tex. Crim. App. Apr. 8, 2020) (writ filed April 8, 2020, granted April 8, 2020); ${ }^{8}$ In re Danny Gipson, No. WR-90, 679-01 (Tex. Crim. App. Apr. 8, 2020) (Supplemental Clerk’s Record received April 7, 2020, writ filed April 8, 2020, granted April 8, 2020); ${ }^{9}$ In re Nuru Nathan Tinch, No. WR-91, 038-01 (Tex. Crim. App. Apr. 1, 2020) (writ received March 9, 2020, filed April 1, 2020, granted April 1, 2020). ${ }^{10}$

Plaintiffs have not alleged that they have exhausted state remedies. There is no support for Plaintiffs' conclusory allegation that state law remedies have been slow or unavailable. At a

[^2]minimum, it is incongruous for Plaintiffs to allege that state procedures do not afford swift vindication; attach evidence that Dallas County courts are open, using all available means to conduct essential hearings, and prioritizing bail hearings and jail pleas; and not allege or show that any plaintiff has sought any relief in state court.

Plaintiffs' choice to file suit in federal court-thereby delaying the availability of state court remedies-is not a reason for the Court to excuse Plaintiffs from complying with the exhaustion requirement. To conclude otherwise would create an exception that swallows the exhaustion requirement in derogation of the sovereignty of the States. The Court should not excuse Plaintiffs from seeking available remedies in state court.

There is no reason to depart from the well-established rule that habeas plaintiffs must exhaust state court remedies before seeking relief in federal court. Plaintiffs' habeas claims should be dismissed.

## III. Plaintiffs have not stated a claim for habeas relief because their claims raise questions unrelated to the myriad causes of their detention.

Habeas is not available to review questions unrelated to the cause of detention. The "sole function" of a writ of habeas corpus is to grant relief from unlawful imprisonment or custody and it cannot be used properly for any other purpose." Pierre v. United States, 525 F.2d 933, 935-36 (5th Cir. 1976). Plaintiffs complain about their conditions of confinement, not the cause for their detention. Plaintiffs do not allege that any order of confinement was procured or issued improperly. Plaintiffs do not allege that their convictions and the judgments thereon were entered in violation of their constitutional rights. Instead, they say the conditions of their confinement require release. Whatever their conditions of confinement, they are not related to Plaintiffs' "cause of detention." As such, Plaintiffs' Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus must fail, and the Court should dismiss those claims pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6).

Plaintiffs attempt to distinguish Pierre—which remains binding precedent-by saying that it is not clear how Section 2241 would apply in the context of COVID-19. This argument fails. "Allegations that challenge rules, customs, and procedures affecting conditions of confinement are properly brought in civil rights actions." Schipke v. Van Buren, 239 Fed. App'x 85, 85-76 (5th Cir. 2007). Even when a habeas petitioner alleges that inadequate conditions of confinement create the risk of serious physical injury, illness, or death, a petition for a writ of habeas corpus is not the proper vehicle for such a claim. See, e.g., Spencer v. Bragg, 310 Fed. App'x 678, 679 (5th Cir. 2009) (affirming the lower court's dismissal of petitioner's habeas claim even though he alleged that the conditions of confinement endangered his life). A petition for habeas corpus may not be used as a vehicle to challenge conditions of confinement. As such, Plaintiffs have not pleaded, and cannot plead, any set of facts under which they could conceivably obtain habeas relief. Their habeas claims should be dismissed. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).

## IV. The post-adjudication Plaintiffs fail to state a § 1983 claim because they challenge the fact of their confinement and seek immediate release.

Plaintiffs' Complaint makes no effort to hide what they seek: "immediate release is the only medically and legally sound remedy, rather than mere mitigation and/or further proceedings." ECF No. 1 at 37 ब 85 . "Plaintiffs . . request immediate release of all Plaintiffs and Class Members." Id. at 4 - 9 .

A prisoner in state custody cannot use a § 1983 action to challenge the fact or duration of confinement and seek immediate release. Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 489 (1973). He or she must seek federal habeas corpus relief or appropriate state relief instead. Id. When a prisoner's action demands immediate release or a shorter period of detention, it lies at the core of habeas corpus, and the prisoner may not pursue relief under § 1983. Id.

Under Preiser, the post-adjudication Plaintiffs may not seek release under § 1983. When they are not seeking relief contrary to Preiser or ancillary relief predicated on release, the postadjudication Plaintiffs' prayer seeks to alter the terms of their valid convictions and sentences. See, e.g., ECF. No. 1 at 42-43 9/T 2, 5(a), 5(d). This relief is unavailable because it would necessarily imply the invalidity of their convictions and sentences. Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477 (1994). Plaintiffs ask this Court to impose additional restrictions on the validity of state court judgments ordering Plaintiffs to serve terms of confinement. According to Plaintiffs, they may not be sentenced to a term of confinement absent judicially recorded findings by clear and convincing evidence that the individual poses a danger to others that no condition other than confinement can mitigate. See, e.g., ECF No. 1 at 42-43 9\| 2 , 5(a), 5(d). Plaintiffs cite no authority that this requirement arises from the Constitution, or that such a requirement can be retroactively applied to invalidate state court judgments. There is none. ${ }^{11}$ Because they seek release or additional findings to support their state court judgments, which would necessarily invalidate those judgments, the post-adjudication Plaintiffs have failed to state a § 1983 claim.

## V. The Court should abstain from entertaining Plaintiffs' claims.

In a recent memorandum opinion, Judge Rosenthal explained the prudential reasons for a federal court to abstain from wading into the fracas to interfere with ongoing state efforts to respond to dynamic conditions. ECF No. 31. Abstention is particularly warranted where Plaintiffs seek to deploy the blunt instrument of constitutional litigation to obtain crude courtfashioned remedies that carry the threat of contempt. Id.; see Benzman v. Whitman, 523 F.3d 119, 125 (2d Cir. 2008). Abstention is also counseled by the strong policy that federal courts should not intervene in pending state court proceedings, such as those in which the pre-

[^3]adjudication Plaintiffs are involved. Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37 (1971); Middlesex Cnty. Ethics. Comm'n v. Garden State Bar Ass'n, 457 U.S. 423, 431 (1983).

If the Court does not dismiss all of Plaintiffs' claims, the Court should nevertheless abstain from intervening at this juncture in order to allow state officials to weigh the competing interests at play in managing the Dallas County jail during this COVID-19 outbreak.

## Conclusion and Prayer

Under binding Fifth Circuit precedent, Plaintiffs cannot use habeas claims to challenge their conditions of confinement. As such, Plaintiffs' habeas claims should be dismissed under Rule 12(b)(6). Further, Plaintiffs do not allege that they have attempted to access state law remedies, much less exhaust them. Federal courts do not entertain state prisoners' habeas claims unless those petitioners first exhaust state court remedies. In light of the available state court remedies, and the fact that Plaintiffs' own evidence demonstrates the efficacy of those remedies, there is no good reason for the Court to excuse Plaintiffs from the exhaustion requirement. Their failure to exhaust is an additional and independent reason for which Plaintiffs' habeas claims should be dismissed.

Not only can Plaintiffs not use habeas as a vehicle to challenge the conditions of their confinement, the post-adjudication Plaintiffs may not use § 1983 to collaterally attack their conviction or seek relief. Because the post-adjudication Plaintiffs' § 1983 claim seeks release, those claims should be dismissed under Rule 12(b)(6) as well.

Regarding the remaining claims-the pre-adjudication § 1983 claims-the Court should abstain from ruling on the basis of Younger.

Defendants also pray for all other and further relief to which they are justly entitled.

Respectfully Submitted,

## Husch Blackwell LLP

/s/ Kate David
Katharine D. David
Texas Bar No. 24045749
kate.david@huschblackwell.com
Nick Stepp
Texas Bar No. 24077701
nick.stepp@huschblackwell.com
Ben Stephens
Texas Bar No. 24098472
ben.stephens@huschblackwell.com
600 Travis, Suite 2350
Houston, Texas 77002
Tel: 713.525.6200
Fax: 713.647.6884
/s/ Russell H. Roden
Russell H. Roden
Texas Bar No. 17132070
russell.roden@dallascounty.org
John Butrus
Texas Bar No. 03537330
john.butrus@dallascounty.org 133 N. Riverfront Blvd., LB 19
Dallas, Texas 75207
Tel: 214.653.3600
Fax: 214.653.5774
Counsel for Dallas County, Texas and Sheriff Marian Brown

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was served on all counsel of record via the ECF system of the Court on April 19, 2020.
/s/ Nicholas D. Stepp
Nicholas D. Stepp
DALLAS COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE INFORMATION STATISTICS

| Description | Currently in Jail | AVG-STAY DAYS | $\begin{aligned} & 1-10 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11-20 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21-30 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31-40 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41-50 } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51-60 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61-70 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | GT-70 <br> DAYS | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% OF } \\ \text { TOTAL POP } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A FELONY NOT FILED | 857 | 24.11 | 348 | 151 | 115 | 71 | 57 | 40 | 16 | 59 | 14.78\% |
| B FILED FELONY PENDING GRAND JURY | 492 | 36.55 | 50 | 95 | 96 | 89 | 64 | 26 | 26 | 46 | 8.49\% |
| C FELONY NOT INCLUDING SJF PENDING DISP. | 1,772 | 164.27 | 81 | 51 | 51 | 81 | 48 | 81 | 103 | 1,276 | 30.57\% |
| D STATE JAIL FELONY PENDING DISPOSTION | 287 | 66.21 | 32 | 27 | 33 | 22 | 17 | 32 | 21 | 103 | 4.95\% |
| E PROBATION VIOLATION -- FELONY | 323 | 27.93 | 132 | 63 | 47 | 22 | 13 | 8 | 7 | 31 | 5.57\% |
| F TDC > 10 YEARS ON APPEAL OR TDC NO APPEAL | 243 | 188.16 | 9 | 23 | 13 | 16 | 10 | 7 | 13 | 152 | 4.19\% |
| G BENCH WARRANTS | 36 | 123.73 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0.62\% |
| H TDC 10 YEARS OR LESS ON APPEAL | 14 | 224.60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 0.24\% |
| I SENTENCED SJF | 61 | 80.53 | 10 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 30 | 1.05\% |
| J SENTENCED SJF ON APPEAL | 1 | 170.50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| K SJF SERVING IN COUNTY JAIL | 41 | 36.07 | 9 | 11 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 0.71\% |
| L MISDEMEANOR NOT FILED | 76 | 3.71 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.31\% |
| M FILED MISDEMEANOR PENDING DISP. | 173 | 29.40 | 79 | 29 | 16 | 12 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 20 | 2.98\% |
| N PROBATION VIOLATION -- MISDEMEANOR | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| O SERVING IN COUNTY JAIL(COND. OF PROB.) | 64 | 35.83 | 23 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 1.10\% |
| P SERVING COUNTY TIME AND FINES | 26 | 28.63 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0.45\% |
| Q SERVING FINE AND COURT COST ONLY | 1 | 13.50 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.02\% |
| R OUT OF COUNTY/STATE HOLD | 52 | 25.17 | 42 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0.90\% |
| S PAROLE VIOLATION | 273 | 71.78 | 51 | 44 | 28 | 25 | 12 | 9 | 10 | 94 | 4.71\% |
| T SAFPF | 207 | 81.17 | 17 | 19 | 27 | 18 | 16 | 11 | 9 | 90 | 3.57\% |
| U SPECIAL PROGRAMS | 339 | 87.14 | 17 | 22 | 24 | 32 | 23 | 23 | 27 | 171 | 5.85\% |
| V OTHER -- (INCOMPETENT) | 203 | 184.03 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 11 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 157 | 3.50\% |
| W U S MARSHAL | 112 | 173.24 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 97 | 1.93\% |
| X CONTEMPT -- IN JAIL | 16 | 29.06 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.28\% |
| Y CONTEMPT -- ON FURLOUGH | 1 | 50.50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| Z PEACE BOND | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| AA TYC | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| BB IMMIGRATION | 14 | 39.47 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0.24\% |
| CC CLASS C ONLY | 23 | 30.13 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0.40\% |
| DD CONTRACT INMATES | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| EE U S MILITARY | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| ZZ DEFAULT -- IN ERROR | 90 | 25.66 | 73 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 1.55\% |
| TOTAL | 5,797 | 95.94 | 1,095 | 584 | 483 | 424 | 277 | 267 | 258 | 2,409 | 100\% |
| TOTAL LESS FURLOUGH | 5,796 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2/15/2020 } \\ \text { 7:00:11 AM } \end{gathered}$ |

DALLAS COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE INFORMATION STATISTICS

| Description | Currently in Jail | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AVG-STAY } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1-10 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11-20 } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21-30 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31-40 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41-50 } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51-60 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61-70 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GT-70 } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% OF } \\ & \text { TOTAL POP } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A FELONY NOT FILED | 889 | 23.73 | 351 | 194 | 111 | 80 | 31 | 25 | 31 | 66 | 15.11\% |
| B FILED FELONY PENDING GRAND JURY | 527 | 37.53 | 35 | 104 | 102 | 100 | 74 | 53 | 11 | 48 | 8.96\% |
| C FELONY NOT INCLUDING SJF PENDING DISP. | 1,825 | 162.65 | 80 | 59 | 59 | 84 | 71 | 108 | 71 | 1,293 | 31.02\% |
| D STATE JAIL FELONY PENDING DISPOSTION | 278 | 71.70 | 34 | 12 | 21 | 32 | 16 | 19 | 19 | 125 | 4.72\% |
| E PROBATION VIOLATION -- FELONY | 344 | 27.39 | 130 | 76 | 41 | 33 | 18 | 10 | 6 | 30 | 5.85\% |
| F TDC > 10 YEARS ON APPEAL OR TDC NO APPEAL | 262 | 167.73 | 13 | 19 | 18 | 23 | 8 | 17 | 5 | 159 | 4.45\% |
| G BENCH WARRANTS | 31 | 116.63 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 0.53\% |
| H TDC 10 YEARS OR LESS ON APPEAL | 14 | 247.07 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0.24\% |
| I SENTENCED SJF | 60 | 84.16 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 29 | 1.02\% |
| J SENTENCED SJF ON APPEAL | 1 | 178.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| K SJF SERVING IN COUNTY JAIL | 36 | 44.65 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 0.61\% |
| L MISDEMEANOR NOT FILED | 68 | 2.78 | 67 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.16\% |
| M FILED MISDEMEANOR PENDING DISP. | 171 | 27.78 | 84 | 29 | 13 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 20 | 2.91\% |
| N PROBATION VIOLATION -- MISDEMEANOR | 1 | 24.50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.02\% |
| O SERVING IN COUNTY JAIL(COND. OF PROB.) | 43 | 38.98 | 12 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0.73\% |
| P SERVING COUNTY TIME AND FINES | 21 | 30.64 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0.36\% |
| Q SERVING FINE AND COURT COST ONLY | 1 | 21.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.02\% |
| R OUT OF COUNTY/STATE HOLD | 49 | 23.62 | 36 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0.83\% |
| S PAROLE VIOLATION | 275 | 71.76 | 50 | 47 | 32 | 16 | 14 | 18 | 5 | 93 | 4.67\% |
| T SAFPF | 228 | 81.65 | 9 | 23 | 24 | 27 | 21 | 15 | 12 | 97 | 3.87\% |
| U SPECIAL PROGRAMS | 338 | 84.65 | 21 | 13 | 26 | 34 | 22 | 24 | 18 | 180 | 5.74\% |
| V OTHER -- (INCOMPETENT) | 196 | 193.54 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 154 | 3.33\% |
| W U S MARSHAL | 105 | 182.14 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 95 | 1.78\% |
| X CONTEMPT -- IN JAIL | 17 | 30.72 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0.29\% |
| Y CONTEMPT -- ON FURLOUGH | 3 | 29.50 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.05\% |
| Z PEACE BOND | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| AA TYC | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| BB IMMIGRATION | 1 | 0.50 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.02\% |
| CC CLASS C ONLY | 23 | 13.75 | 18 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0.39\% |
| DD CONTRACT INMATES | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| EE U S MILITARY | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| ZZ DEFAULT -- IN ERROR | 77 | 23.63 | 58 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1.31\% |
| TOTAL | 5,884 | 95.54 | 1,030 | 630 | 484 | 472 | 304 | 317 | 187 | 2,460 | 100\% |
| TOTAL LESS FURLOUGH | 5,881 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 3 / 1 / 2020 \\ \text { 7:00:12 AM } \end{array}$ |

DALLAS COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE INFORMATION STATISTICS

| Description | Currently in Jail | AVG-STAY DAYS | $\begin{aligned} & 1-10 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11-20 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21-30 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31-40 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41-50 } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51-60 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61-70 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | GT-70 DAYS | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% OF } \\ \text { TOTAL POP } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A FELONY NOT FILED | 871 | 24.21 | 357 | 170 | 127 | 57 | 41 | 20 | 27 | 72 | 14.85\% |
| B FILED FELONY PENDING GRAND JURY | 548 | 36.73 | 56 | 95 | 114 | 86 | 85 | 52 | 18 | 42 | 9.34\% |
| C FELONY NOT INCLUDING SJF PENDING DISP. | 1,813 | 161.68 | 69 | 52 | 78 | 84 | 75 | 116 | 79 | 1,260 | 30.91\% |
| D STATE JAIL FELONY PENDING DISPOSTION | 287 | 71.95 | 35 | 19 | 17 | 31 | 23 | 16 | 20 | 126 | 4.89\% |
| E PROBATION VIOLATION -- FELONY | 322 | 28.59 | 113 | 58 | 55 | 24 | 28 | 8 | 6 | 30 | 5.49\% |
| F TDC > 10 YEARS ON APPEAL OR TDC NO APPEAL | 259 | 154.59 | 17 | 15 | 21 | 16 | 12 | 16 | 8 | 154 | 4.42\% |
| G BENCH WARRANTS | 30 | 127.23 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 0.51\% |
| H TDC 10 YEARS OR LESS ON APPEAL | 16 | 233.71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0.27\% |
| I SENTENCED SJF | 57 | 86.64 | 7 | 4 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 27 | 0.97\% |
| J SENTENCED SJF ON APPEAL | 1 | 180.50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| K SJF SERVING IN COUNTY JAIL | 29 | 46.40 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0.49\% |
| L MISDEMEANOR NOT FILED | 90 | 2.41 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.53\% |
| M FILED MISDEMEANOR PENDING DISP. | 151 | 27.38 | 71 | 29 | 13 | 10 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 16 | 2.57\% |
| N PROBATION VIOLATION -- MISDEMEANOR | 2 | 18.33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.03\% |
| O SERVING IN COUNTY JAIL(COND. OF PROB.) | 45 | 38.28 | 16 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 0.77\% |
| P SERVING COUNTY TIME AND FINES | 31 | 32.00 | 14 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0.53\% |
| Q SERVING FINE AND COURT COST ONLY | 1 | 23.50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.02\% |
| R OUT OF COUNTY/STATE HOLD | 69 | 23.91 | 47 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 1.18\% |
| S PAROLE VIOLATION | 283 | 67.93 | 63 | 40 | 37 | 17 | 14 | 16 | 6 | 90 | 4.83\% |
| T SAFPF | 231 | 80.68 | 7 | 25 | 27 | 24 | 24 | 20 | 13 | 91 | 3.94\% |
| U SPECIAL PROGRAMS | 328 | 85.95 | 19 | 17 | 20 | 29 | 29 | 25 | 21 | 168 | 5.59\% |
| V OTHER -- (INCOMPETENT) | 198 | 189.75 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 12 | 6 | 151 | 3.38\% |
| W U S MARSHAL | 81 | 171.46 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 73 | 1.38\% |
| X CONTEMPT -- IN JAIL | 18 | 29.58 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0.31\% |
| Y CONTEMPT -- ON FURLOUGH | 1 | 60.50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| Z PEACE BOND | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| AA TYC | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| BB IMMIGRATION | 5 | 17.83 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.09\% |
| CC CLASS C ONLY | 20 | 49.33 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0.34\% |
| DD CONTRACT INMATES | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| EE U S MILITARY | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| ZZ DEFAULT -- IN ERROR | 78 | 24.78 | 64 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1.33\% |
| TOTAL | 5,865 | 93.82 | 1,079 | 559 | 553 | 407 | 347 | 328 | 214 | 2,378 | 100\% |
| TOTAL LESS FURLOUGH | 5,864 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 3 / 6 / 2020 \\ 7: 00: 11 \text { AM } \end{array}$ |

DALLAS COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE INFORMATION STATISTICS

| Description | Currently in Jail | AVG-STAY DAYS | $\begin{aligned} & 1-10 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11-20 } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21-30 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31-40 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41-50 } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51-60 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61-70 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | GT-70 DAYS | \% OF TOTAL POP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A FELONY NOT FILED | 925 | 23.60 | 375 | 194 | 120 | 75 | 48 | 29 | 12 | 72 | 15.54\% |
| B FILED FELONY PENDING GRAND JURY | 539 | 37.61 | 47 | 99 | 105 | 98 | 65 | 59 | 27 | 39 | 9.06\% |
| C FELONY NOT INCLUDING SJF PENDING DISP. | 1,821 | 161.04 | 80 | 60 | 63 | 80 | 84 | 92 | 117 | 1,245 | 30.59\% |
| D STATE JAIL FELONY PENDING DISPOSTION | 319 | 68.13 | 43 | 24 | 22 | 26 | 29 | 26 | 20 | 129 | 5.36\% |
| E PROBATION VIOLATION -- FELONY | 292 | 29.24 | 93 | 59 | 44 | 31 | 14 | 20 | 7 | 24 | 4.91\% |
| F TDC > 10 YEARS ON APPEAL OR TDC NO APPEAL | 301 | 150.24 | 15 | 25 | 20 | 26 | 13 | 17 | 13 | 172 | 5.06\% |
| G BENCH WARRANTS | 36 | 113.00 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 22 | 0.60\% |
| H TDC 10 YEARS OR LESS ON APPEAL | 15 | 254.44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0.25\% |
| I SENTENCED SJF | 55 | 93.98 | 4 | 11 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 25 | 0.92\% |
| J SENTENCED SJF ON APPEAL | 1 | 185.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| K SJF SERVING IN COUNTY JAIL | 27 | 45.96 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0.45\% |
| L MISDEMEANOR NOT FILED | 83 | 3.32 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.39\% |
| M FILED MISDEMEANOR PENDING DISP. | 142 | 32.04 | 54 | 30 | 15 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 18 | 2.39\% |
| N PROBATION VIOLATION -- MISDEMEANOR | 4 | 38.80 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.07\% |
| O SERVING IN COUNTY JAIL(COND. OF PROB.) | 39 | 45.55 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 0.66\% |
| P SERVING COUNTY TIME AND FINES | 36 | 26.22 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0.60\% |
| Q SERVING FINE AND COURT COST ONLY | 1 | 28.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.02\% |
| R OUT OF COUNTY/STATE HOLD | 63 | 46.11 | 33 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 1.06\% |
| S PAROLE VIOLATION | 294 | 69.85 | 50 | 57 | 32 | 26 | 11 | 12 | 14 | 92 | 4.94\% |
| T SAFPF | 240 | 80.64 | 11 | 15 | 28 | 28 | 20 | 27 | 17 | 94 | 4.03\% |
| U SPECIAL PROGRAMS | 345 | 83.89 | 15 | 28 | 15 | 29 | 26 | 33 | 25 | 174 | 5.80\% |
| V OTHER -- (INCOMPETENT) | 201 | 186.94 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 151 | 3.38\% |
| W U S MARSHAL | 80 | 181.19 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 72 | 1.34\% |
| X CONTEMPT -- IN JAIL | 10 | 22.73 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.17\% |
| Y CONTEMPT -- ON FURLOUGH | 1 | 65.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| Z PEACE BOND | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| AA TYC | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| BB IMMIGRATION | 1 | 23.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.02\% |
| CC CLASS C ONLY | 11 | 3.83 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.18\% |
| DD CONTRACT INMATES | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| EE U S MILITARY | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| ZZ DEFAULT -- IN ERROR | 70 | 27.99 | 56 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1.18\% |
| TOTAL | 5,952 | 94.31 | 1,005 | 651 | 492 | 460 | 344 | 338 | 282 | 2,380 | 100\% |
| TOTAL LESS FURLOUGH | 5,951 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3/15/2020 } \\ & \text { 7:00:07 AM } \end{aligned}$ |

DALLAS COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE INFORMATION STATISTICS

| Description | Currently in Jail | AVG-STAY DAYS | $\begin{aligned} & 1-10 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11-20 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21-30 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31-40 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $41-50$ <br> DAYS | $\begin{aligned} & 51-60 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61-70 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | GT-70 DAYS | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% OF } \\ \text { TOTAL POP } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A FELONY NOT FILED | 841 | 26.29 | 303 | 157 | 119 | 90 | 51 | 33 | 23 | 65 | 14.97\% |
| B FILED FELONY PENDING GRAND JURY | 594 | 37.28 | 37 | 142 | 126 | 84 | 74 | 44 | 35 | 52 | 10.57\% |
| C FELONY NOT INCLUDING SJF PENDING DISP. | 1,786 | 165.59 | 33 | 69 | 45 | 85 | 97 | 101 | 99 | 1,257 | 31.79\% |
| D STATE JAIL FELONY PENDING DISPOSTION | 299 | 72.25 | 34 | 31 | 21 | 19 | 19 | 27 | 16 | 132 | 5.32\% |
| E PROBATION VIOLATION -- FELONY | 267 | 37.94 | 53 | 49 | 48 | 40 | 21 | 13 | 14 | 29 | 4.75\% |
| F TDC > 10 YEARS ON APPEAL OR TDC NO APPEAL | 259 | 149.91 | 4 | 30 | 21 | 16 | 14 | 11 | 10 | 153 | 4.61\% |
| G BENCH WARRANTS | 33 | 119.44 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 0.59\% |
| H TDC 10 YEARS OR LESS ON APPEAL | 13 | 276.64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0.23\% |
| I SENTENCED SJF | 67 | 80.75 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 25 | 1.19\% |
| J SENTENCED SJF ON APPEAL | 1 | 189.50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| K SJF SERVING IN COUNTY JAIL | 23 | 43.88 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0.41\% |
| L MISDEMEANOR NOT FILED | 56 | 3.53 | 53 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00\% |
| M FILED MISDEMEANOR PENDING DISP. | 131 | 39.95 | 37 | 26 | 19 | 15 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 23 | 2.33\% |
| N PROBATION VIOLATION -- MISDEMEANOR | 2 | 31.33 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.04\% |
| O SERVING IN COUNTY JAIL(COND. OF PROB.) | 37 | 53.87 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 0.66\% |
| P SERVING COUNTY TIME AND FINES | 33 | 36.65 | 3 | 13 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0.59\% |
| Q SERVING FINE AND COURT COST ONLY | 1 | 32.50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0.02\% |
| R OUT OF COUNTY/STATE HOLD | 32 | 42.55 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 0.57\% |
| S PAROLE VIOLATION | 248 | 73.99 | 33 | 53 | 30 | 16 | 13 | 6 | 8 | 89 | 4.41\% |
| T SAFPF | 227 | 80.48 | 3 | 18 | 20 | 29 | 31 | 19 | 24 | 83 | 4.04\% |
| U SPECIAL PROGRAMS | 297 | 88.12 | 2 | 20 | 27 | 17 | 32 | 22 | 25 | 152 | 5.29\% |
| V OTHER -- (INCOMPETENT) | 204 | 192.68 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 12 | 6 | 9 | 160 | 3.63\% |
| W U S MARSHAL | 81 | 188.45 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 73 | 1.44\% |
| X CONTEMPT -- IN JAIL | 3 | 3.25 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.05\% |
| Y CONTEMPT -- ON FURLOUGH | 1 | 69.50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| Z PEACE BOND | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| AA TYC | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| BB IMMIGRATION | 11 | 17.58 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.20\% |
| CC CLASS C ONLY | 11 | 15.17 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0.20\% |
| DD CONTRACT INMATES | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| EE U S MILITARY | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| ZZ DEFAULT -- IN ERROR | 60 | 33.49 | 45 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1.07\% |
| TOTAL | 5,618 | 99.11 | 688 | 651 | 515 | 439 | 384 | 307 | 276 | 2,358 | 100\% |
| TOTAL LESS FURLOUGH | 5,617 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3/24/2020 } \\ & \text { 7:00:24 AM } \end{aligned}$ |

DALLAS COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE INFORMATION STATISTICS

| Description | Currently in Jail | AVG-STAY DAYS | $\begin{aligned} & 1-10 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11-20 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21-30 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31-40 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41-50 } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51-60 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61-70 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GT-70 } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% OF } \\ \text { TOTAL POP } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A FELONY NOT FILED | 472 | 21.21 | 226 | 94 | 43 | 33 | 18 | 17 | 16 | 25 | 9.03\% |
| B FILED FELONY PENDING GRAND JURY | 707 | 36.04 | 79 | 123 | 141 | 122 | 98 | 66 | 31 | 47 | 13.53\% |
| C FELONY NOT INCLUDING SJF PENDING DISP. | 1,726 | 173.73 | 20 | 31 | 78 | 43 | 80 | 93 | 99 | 1,282 | 33.03\% |
| D STATE JAIL FELONY PENDING DISPOSTION | 263 | 78.34 | 8 | 19 | 28 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 34 | 117 | 5.03\% |
| E PROBATION VIOLATION -- FELONY | 246 | 39.09 | 62 | 38 | 37 | 21 | 28 | 15 | 9 | 36 | 4.71\% |
| F TDC > 10 YEARS ON APPEAL OR TDC NO APPEAL | 294 | 154.23 | 2 | 7 | 31 | 24 | 20 | 15 | 16 | 179 | 5.63\% |
| G BENCH WARRANTS | 34 | 125.31 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 20 | 0.65\% |
| H TDC 10 YEARS OR LESS ON APPEAL | 15 | 254.19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0.29\% |
| I SENTENCED SJF | 84 | 77.39 | 2 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 30 | 1.61\% |
| J SENTENCED SJF ON APPEAL | 1 | 194.50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| K SJF SERVING IN COUNTY JAIL | 18 | 38.95 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0.34\% |
| L MISDEMEANOR NOT FILED | 53 | 3.31 | 51 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.01\% |
| M FILED MISDEMEANOR PENDING DISP. | 135 | 41.89 | 41 | 25 | 21 | 13 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 26 | 2.58\% |
| N PROBATION VIOLATION -- MISDEMEANOR | 3 | 34.25 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.06\% |
| O SERVING IN COUNTY JAIL(COND. OF PROB.) | 25 | 52.12 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 0.48\% |
| P SERVING COUNTY TIME AND FINES | 22 | 41.65 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0.42\% |
| Q SERVING FINE AND COURT COST ONLY | 1 | 37.50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| R OUT OF COUNTY/STATE HOLD | 56 | 60.39 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 18 | 1.07\% |
| S PAROLE VIOLATION | 240 | 75.48 | 34 | 34 | 30 | 21 | 13 | 13 | 4 | 91 | 4.59\% |
| T SAFPF | 204 | 86.90 | 3 | 3 | 17 | 17 | 29 | 30 | 17 | 88 | 3.90\% |
| U SPECIAL PROGRAMS | 276 | 91.04 | 13 | 0 | 21 | 27 | 21 | 26 | 19 | 149 | 5.28\% |
| V OTHER -- (INCOMPETENT) | 206 | 193.67 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 6 | 163 | 3.94\% |
| W U S MARSHAL | 84 | 191.73 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 73 | 1.61\% |
| X CONTEMPT -- IN JAIL | 1 | 11.00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.02\% |
| Y CONTEMPT -- ON FURLOUGH | 1 | 74.50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| Z PEACE BOND | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| AA TYC | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| BB IMMIGRATION | 11 | 34.08 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.21\% |
| CC CLASS C ONLY | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| DD CONTRACT INMATES | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| EE U S MILITARY | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| ZZ DEFAULT -- IN ERROR | 47 | 49.38 | 34 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0.90\% |
| TOTAL | 5,225 | 107.17 | 587 | 415 | 504 | 376 | 360 | 333 | 269 | 2,381 | 100\% |
| TOTAL LESS FURLOUGH | 5,224 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 4/3/2020 } \\ \text { 7:00:57 AM } \end{array}$ |

DALLAS COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE INFORMATION STATISTICS

| Description | Currently in Jail | AVG-STAY DAYS | $\begin{aligned} & 1-10 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11-20 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21-30 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31-40 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41-50 } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51-60 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61-70 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | GT-70 <br> DAYS | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% OF } \\ \text { TOTAL POP } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A FELONY NOT FILED | 494 | 20.94 | 246 | 91 | 49 | 33 | 14 | 12 | 21 | 28 | 9.54\% |
| B FILED FELONY PENDING GRAND JURY | 695 | 37.08 | 54 | 143 | 125 | 117 | 98 | 74 | 29 | 55 | 13.42\% |
| C FELONY NOT INCLUDING SJF PENDING DISP. | 1,719 | 175.31 | 15 | 35 | 56 | 67 | 66 | 86 | 109 | 1,285 | 33.19\% |
| D STATE JAIL FELONY PENDING DISPOSTION | 247 | 78.48 | 11 | 17 | 20 | 19 | 18 | 20 | 28 | 114 | 4.77\% |
| E PROBATION VIOLATION -- FELONY | 255 | 40.16 | 56 | 45 | 38 | 24 | 19 | 23 | 13 | 37 | 4.92\% |
| F TDC > 10 YEARS ON APPEAL OR TDC NO APPEAL | 299 | 156.51 | 3 | 6 | 15 | 35 | 21 | 12 | 15 | 192 | 5.77\% |
| G BENCH WARRANTS | 34 | 128.23 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 21 | 0.66\% |
| H TDC 10 YEARS OR LESS ON APPEAL | 15 | 257.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0.29\% |
| I SENTENCED SJF | 84 | 80.73 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 34 | 1.62\% |
| J SENTENCED SJF ON APPEAL | 1 | 196.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| K SJF SERVING IN COUNTY JAIL | 17 | 42.06 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0.33\% |
| L MISDEMEANOR NOT FILED | 59 | 3.58 | 57 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.14\% |
| M FILED MISDEMEANOR PENDING DISP. | 134 | 37.22 | 46 | 22 | 18 | 16 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 21 | 2.59\% |
| N PROBATION VIOLATION -- MISDEMEANOR | 2 | 40.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.04\% |
| O SERVING IN COUNTY JAIL(COND. OF PROB.) | 23 | 56.63 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0.44\% |
| P SERVING COUNTY TIME AND FINES | 19 | 41.40 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0.37\% |
| Q SERVING FINE AND COURT COST ONLY | 1 | 39.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| R OUT OF COUNTY/STATE HOLD | 62 | 59.48 | 10 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 19 | 1.20\% |
| S PAROLE VIOLATION | 255 | 74.76 | 40 | 30 | 23 | 33 | 14 | 15 | 6 | 94 | 4.92\% |
| T SAFPF | 173 | 92.37 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 16 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 83 | 3.34\% |
| U SPECIAL PROGRAMS | 244 | 93.19 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 29 | 24 | 14 | 17 | 134 | 4.71\% |
| V OTHER -- (INCOMPETENT) | 209 | 196.32 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 13 | 6 | 8 | 167 | 4.03\% |
| W U S MARSHAL | 87 | 188.89 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 73 | 1.68\% |
| X CONTEMPT -- IN JAIL | 4 | 10.40 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.08\% |
| Y CONTEMPT -- ON FURLOUGH | 1 | 76.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| Z PEACE BOND | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| AA TYC | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| BB IMMIGRATION | 4 | 5.00 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.08\% |
| CC CLASS C ONLY | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| DD CONTRACT INMATES | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| EE U S MILITARY | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| ZZ DEFAULT -- IN ERROR | 43 | 55.43 | 29 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0.83\% |
| TOTAL | 5,180 | 108.29 | 587 | 432 | 419 | 428 | 329 | 306 | 285 | 2,394 | 100\% |
| TOTAL LESS FURLOUGH | 5,179 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 4/6/2020 } \\ \text { 7:00:30 AM } \end{array}$ |

DALLAS COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE INFORMATION STATISTICS

| Description | Currently in Jail | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AVG-STAY } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1-10 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11-20 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21-30 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31-40 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41-50 } \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | 51-60 DAYS | $\begin{aligned} & 61-70 \\ & \text { DAYS } \end{aligned}$ | GT-70 DAYS | \% OF TOTAL POP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A FELONY NOT FILED | 444 | 19.70 | 235 | 71 | 51 | 26 | 18 | 7 | 7 | 29 | 8.94\% |
| B FILED FELONY PENDING GRAND JURY | 557 | 35.88 | 61 | 112 | 112 | 73 | 57 | 69 | 36 | 37 | 11.21\% |
| C FELONY NOT INCLUDING SJF PENDING DISP. | 1,774 | 174.75 | 29 | 14 | 56 | 91 | 83 | 76 | 113 | 1,312 | 35.71\% |
| D STATE JAIL FELONY PENDING DISPOSTION | 244 | 79.27 | 14 | 14 | 23 | 18 | 20 | 13 | 19 | 123 | 4.91\% |
| E PROBATION VIOLATION -- FELONY | 243 | 40.39 | 59 | 36 | 33 | 28 | 17 | 17 | 19 | 34 | 4.89\% |
| F TDC > 10 YEARS ON APPEAL OR TDC NO APPEAL | 319 | 160.41 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 20 | 34 | 21 | 14 | 212 | 6.42\% |
| G BENCH WARRANTS | 36 | 138.24 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 21 | 0.72\% |
| H TDC 10 YEARS OR LESS ON APPEAL | 16 | 256.94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0.32\% |
| I SENTENCED SJF | 92 | 83.02 | 6 | 1 | 10 | 12 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 37 | 1.85\% |
| J SENTENCED SJF ON APPEAL | 1 | 200.50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| K SJF SERVING IN COUNTY JAIL | 10 | 40.27 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0.20\% |
| L MISDEMEANOR NOT FILED | 75 | 3.50 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.51\% |
| M FILED MISDEMEANOR PENDING DISP. | 105 | 44.19 | 36 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 20 | 2.11\% |
| N PROBATION VIOLATION -- MISDEMEANOR | 1 | 22.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.02\% |
| O SERVING IN COUNTY JAIL(COND. OF PROB.) | 14 | 73.47 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0.28\% |
| P SERVING COUNTY TIME AND FINES | 24 | 51.56 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0.48\% |
| Q SERVING FINE AND COURT COST ONLY | 1 | 43.50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| R OUT OF COUNTY/STATE HOLD | 69 | 66.10 | 13 | 9 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 25 | 1.39\% |
| S PAROLE VIOLATION | 302 | 78.49 | 28 | 47 | 33 | 27 | 27 | 15 | 16 | 109 | 6.08\% |
| T SAFPF | 130 | 101.46 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 18 | 70 | 2.62\% |
| U SPECIAL PROGRAMS | 165 | 102.67 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 15 | 15 | 11 | 98 | 3.32\% |
| V OTHER -- (INCOMPETENT) | 199 | 207.56 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 167 | 4.01\% |
| W U S MARSHAL | 83 | 204.80 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 75 | 1.67\% |
| X CONTEMPT -- IN JAIL | 1 | 17.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.02\% |
| Y CONTEMPT -- ON FURLOUGH | 1 | 80.50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.02\% |
| Z PEACE BOND | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| AA TYC | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| BB IMMIGRATION | 6 | 11.57 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.12\% |
| CC CLASS C ONLY | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| DD CONTRACT INMATES | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| EE U S MILITARY | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| ZZ DEFAULT -- IN ERROR | 56 | 41.70 | 39 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 1.13\% |
| TOTAL | 4,968 | 113.77 | 616 | 340 | 366 | 356 | 323 | 278 | 281 | 2,408 | 100\% |
| TOTAL LESS FURLOUGH | 4,967 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 4/15/2020 } \\ \text { 7:00:01 AM } \end{gathered}$ |

## Cause No. F1977008

STATE OF TEXAS
V.

ALBERTO LOPEZ

IN THE 292 ${ }^{\text {ND }}$ JUDICIAL
DISTRICT COURT IN
DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

# APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS FOR RELEASE DUE TO TARRANT COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE REFUSING TO TAKE POSSESSION OF INMATE 

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

COMES NOW, Alberto Lopez, Defendant in the above-styled and numbered cause, by and through his attorney of record, Matthew Toback and files this Application for Writ of Habeas Corpus for Release due to Tarrant County Sheriff's Office Refusing to take Possession of Inmate, and, for good cause shows the following:
I.

Defendant is illegally confined and restrained of his liberty by the Sheriff of Dallas County, Texas in the Dallas County Jail in Dallas, Texas. Defendant is charged in Dallas County with Capital murder and has posted bond on this case. He is also being held for a charge in Tarrant County of Possession of a Controlled Substance 1G-4G PG2, a $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ degree felony. As of the date of this Writ's filing, defendant has posted a bond on the Dallas County case and Tarrant County Sherrifs Office has refused to pick him up.

On March 26, 2020, Defendant posted a bond for the Dallas County Capital Murder charge. On April 1, 2020, the Tarrant County Sheriffs Office came to Dallas County Jail to pick up defendant and refused to take possession of him saying that Dallas County Jail was unable to provide documentation that defendant was free of the COVID-19 virus, even though defendant had previously tested negative for COVID-19 at the jail. Defendant is being held against his will because Tarrant County refused to take possession of him and left the jail without him. Due to no fault of Mr. Lopez, he is still being held against his will in Dallas County Jail.

## III.

Defendant, a 19-year-old male, was born and raised in Dallas County, Texas. He also has family members residing in Dallas. Defendant has been continuously incarcerated at the Dallas County Jail since Dec. 20, 2019.

## IV.

Defendant respectfully requests this Court to release defendant from Dallas County Jail because Tarrant County will not take possession of him.

WHEREFORE, premises considered, defendant prays that this Court grant and issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to the Sheriff of Dallas County, Texas directing and commanding him to produce and have defendant before this court instanter, or at such time and place to be designated by this Court, then and there to show cause, if any he may have, why defendant should not be discharged from such illegal confinement; or that defendant be released directly from Dallas County Jail.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Matthew Toback
Matthew Toback
State Bar Number 24003266
330 S. Riverfront Blvd.

Dallas, Texas 75207
Phone (214) 720-9233
Fax (214) 752-4656

## Attorney for Defendant

Alberto Lopez

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing instrument has been furnished to counsel for the state via e-file and/or email on April 1, 2020 to Andrew Anagnostis via efile.
/s/ Matthew Toback
Matthew Toback

STATE OF TEXAS
V.

ALBERTO LOPEZ

| Cause No. F1977008 |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\S$ |  |
| $\S$ |  |
| $\S$ | DISTRICT COURT IN |
| $\S$ |  |
| $\S$ | DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS |

## ORDER

On this day came on to be considered Applicant's Application for Writ of Habeas Corpus to Reduce Bail and the Court has:
$\qquad$ set this matter for hearing on $\qquad$ , 2020, or
$\qquad$ GRANTED the Writ and ORDERS the accused be released subject to appear as required by the Court.
$\qquad$ DENIED the Writ.

SIGNED: $\qquad$

JUDGE PRESIDING

STATE OF TEXAS
V.

ALBERTO LOPEZ

Cause No. F1977008

## WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

TO THE SHERIFF OF DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS:

## GREETINGS:

YOU ARE HEREBY COMMANDED to produce before me at the DALLAS County Courthouse, $\qquad$ in the County of Dallas, State of Texas on the $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2020, at $\qquad$ o'clock $\qquad$ M., the person of
$\qquad$ , whom it is alleged you illegally restrain of his liberty, when and where you
will show why you hold the said $\qquad$ , in custody, or restrain him of his liberty.

HEREIN FAIL NOT, and return make hereof.

Signed on $\qquad$ .

STATE OF TEXAS
v.

CHAD ROSS

IN THE 363 ${ }^{\text {RD }}$ JUDICIAL
DISTRICT COURT IN
DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

# APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS FOR RELEASE DUE TO INMATES PAROLE BEING COMPLETE 

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

COMES NOW, Chad Ross, Defendant in the above-styled and numbered cause, by and through his attorney of record, Matthew Toback and files this Application for Writ of Habeas Corpus for Release due to Inmates Parole Being Complete, and, for good cause shows the following:

## I.

Defendant is illegally confined and restrained of his liberty by the Sheriff of Dallas County, Texas in the Dallas County Jail in Dallas, Texas. He was arrested and has been in custody since February 12, 2020. Defendant is charged in Dallas County with two felony theft charges, cause numbers F-2023954 and F-2024027, and has posted bond on these cases. As of the date of this Writ's filing, defendant has posted a bond on the two Dallas County felony theft cases and is still being held in Dallas County Jail on a parole violation, even though his parole expired on March 28, 2020.

## II.

Defendant, a 43-year-old male, was born and raised in Dallas County, Texas. He also has family members residing in Dallas. Defendant has been continuously incarcerated at the Dallas

County Jail since February 12, 2020.

## IV.

Defendant respectfully requests this Court to release defendant from Dallas County Jail because his parole ended on March 28, 2020 and he has posted bond on the two felony theft cases he is charged with in Dallas County.

WHEREFORE, premises considered, defendant prays that this Court grant and issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to the Sheriff of Dallas County, Texas directing and commanding him to produce and have defendant before this court instanter, or at such time and place to be designated by this Court, then and there to show cause, if any he may have, why defendant should not be discharged from such illegal confinement; or that defendant be released directly from Dallas County Jail.

Respectfully submitted, /s/ Matthew Toback
Matthew Toback
State Bar Number 24003266
330 S. Riverfront Blvd.

Dallas, Texas 75207
Phone (214) 720-9233
Fax (214) 752-4656

## Attorney for Defendant <br> Chad Ross

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing instrument has been
furnished to counsel for the state via e-file and/or email on April 8, 2020 to Maegan Westbrook via efile.
/s/ Matthew Toback
Matthew Toback

CAUSE NO. F-2023954

## STATE OF TEXAS

V.

CHAD ROSS
§ IN THE 363 ${ }^{\text {RD }}$ JUDICIAL
DISTRICT COURT IN
DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

## ORDER

On this day came on to be considered Applicant's Application for Writ of Habeas Corpus for Release due to Inmates Parole being Complete and the Court has:
$\qquad$ set this matter for hearing on $\qquad$ , 2020, or
$\qquad$ GRANTED the Writ and ORDERS the accused be released subject to appear as required by the Court.
$\qquad$ DENIED the Writ.

SIGNED: $\qquad$

JUDGE PRESIDING

Cause No. F-2023954

STATE OF TEXAS
V.

ALBERTO LOPEZ
§

IN THE 292 ${ }^{\text {ND }}$ JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT IN

DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

## WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

TO THE SHERIFF OF DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS:

## GREETINGS:

YOU ARE HEREBY COMMANDED to produce before me at the DALLAS County
Courthouse, $\qquad$ in the County of Dallas, State of Texas on the $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2020, at $\qquad$ o'clock $\qquad$ M., the person of
$\qquad$ , whom it is alleged you illegally restrain of his liberty, when and where you
will show why you hold the said $\qquad$ , in custody, or restrain him of his liberty.

HEREIN FAIL NOT, and return make hereof.

Signed on $\qquad$ .


A-EZ OUT BAIL BONDS $\qquad$ BAIL BOND
THE STATE OF TEXAS,COUNTY OF DALLAS
vs $\qquad$
MISDEMEANOR $\qquad$ FELONY $\qquad$
judge: Vanegas
$\qquad$
DATE: $\qquad$
$\qquad$ Chad Ross AS PRINCIPAL, AND THE
KNOWN ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS: THAT WE, $\qquad$ UNDERSIGNED AMEAICAN SURETY CO. agent- Eddie Salazar dog A-EZ Out Bail Bonds, AS SURETY; ARE HELD JIRMLY BOUND UNTO THE STATE
 $\qquad$ DOLLARS $\$$ $\qquad$ AND IN
ADDITION THERE TO, WE ARE BOUND FOR THE PAYMENT OF ALL FEES AND EXPENSES THAT MAY BE INCURRED BY ANY PEACE OFFICER IN RE-ARRESTING THE SAID PRINCIPAL IN THE EVENT OF THE STATED CONDITIONS OE THIS BOND ARE VIOLATED FOR THE PAYMENT OF WHICH SUM OR SUMS WILL AND TRULY TO BE MADE, WE DO BIND OURSELVES AND EACH OF US ; OUR HEIRS, EXECUTORS AND ADMINISTRATORS, JOINTLY AND SEVERALLY. THE CONDITION OF THIS BOND IS THAT THE DEFENDANT

$\qquad$ AND TO SECURE HIS/HER RELEASE FROM CUSTODY IS ENTERING INTO THIS OBLIGATION BINDING HIM/HER TO MAKE A PERSONAL APPEARANCE (INSTANTER) BEFORE COURT TO WHICH THE SAME MAY BE TRANSFERRED AND BASED ON SAID CHARGE. HABEAS CORPUS WITH WRIT-THAT IS SAID PRINCIPAL SHALL WELL AND TRULY APPEAR IN THE $\qquad$ instanter COURT OF $\qquad$ TEXAS, AT
$\qquad$ AM, ON THE $\qquad$ DAY OF $\qquad$ ADD. 20 $\qquad$ IN THE COURT ROOM OF SAID COURT, IN THE CITY OF DALLAS, COUNTY OF $\qquad$ , TEXAS, PURSUANT TO THE ORDER OF THE JUDGE THIS DAY MADE, GRANTING A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS ON APPLICATION OF SAID PRINCIPAL, IT HAVING BEEN CALLED TO HIS ATTENTION THAT SAID PRINCIPAL IS RESTRAINED OF MYS LEBERTY BY A PEACE OFFICER OF DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS UNDER ACCUSATION OF SAID CHARGE AGAINST THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF TEXAS, SAID WRIT BEING DEPART THERE PRON WITHOUT LEAVE OF SAID COURT, PENDING EXAMINATION OF AND HEARING OF SAID WRIT, IN ORDER TO ABIDE FINAL DETERMINATION THEREOF BY SAID COURT.

I, AMERICAN SURETY co, agent i Eddie Salazardha A-EZ Out Bail Bonds_ DO SWEAR THAT I AM WORTH AT LEAST THE SUM OF $\$ \quad 100,000$ $\qquad$ DOLLARS, AFTER DEDUCTING FROM MY PROPERTY ALL THAT WHICH IS EXEMPT BY THE CONSTITUTION AND OF THE STATE FROM FORCED SALE AND AFTER PAYMENT OF ALL BY DEBTS, WHETHER INDIVIDUAL OR SECURITY DEBTS AND AFTER SATISFYING ALL ENCUMBERANCES UPON MY PROPERTY WHICH ARE KNOWN TO ME AND THAT J RESIDE IN DALLAS COUNTY AND HAVE PROPERTY IN THIS STATE LIABLE TO FURTHER SWEAR THAT THERE ARE NO OUTSTANDING JUDGEMENTS IN DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS OR ELSEWHERE AGAINST THE AFFIANT AND THAT THE AFFIANT MAKES THIS STATEMENT FOR THE EXPRESS PURPOSE OF INDUCING THE APPROVALAND ACCEPTANCE OF SAID BOND WITH HIMSELF AS A SURETY THEREON, WELL KNOWING. BELIEVING AND INTENDING THAT THE MAKING OF THIS STATEMENT WILL INDUCE THE OFFICIAL CHARGED WITH THE DUTY OF ACCEPTING AND APPROVING SAID BOND TO ACCEPT AND APPROVE THE SAME AY向 THAT ALL STATEMENTS HEREIN ARE TRUE, SO HELP ME GOD.'

 KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE'PRESENTS: that AMERICAN SURETY COMPANY, "B, corporation duly, authorized and ex dating under the laws of the State of Indiana, does constitute "and appoint the below named agent le true and" lawful Attorney*n"Faci for it and in its name, place and stead, "to"execute, and








FIFTY THOUSAND ( $\$ 50,000.00$ ) DOLLARS
 insert in this Power-Of-Attornay the hame of the person on;whose behalf this bond was given. in WITNES'S WHEREOF, AMERICAN SURETY COMPANY hat caused these presents to be signed by its duly authorized officer, proper for the purpose and its corporate seal to the hereunto affixed this. $\qquad$ day ot $\qquad$ $1:$ inn $-2070$


AMERICAN SURETY COMPANY
William $B$ acmentue

No. F2044763

## THE STATE OF TEXAS

VS.
MICHAEL GRAVES
§
§
§

IN THE
292nd Judicial District Court (FV)
DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

## ORDER

The Court finds that bond in the above styled and numbered case should be: $\qquad$ set at \$25,000.00 $\qquad$ and it is so Ordered.

The Court further Orders that, as a condition of remaining on bond pending the disposition of this case, the following restrictions shall apply. The defendant shall:
$\qquad$ remain in $\qquad$ County, Texas at all times;
$\qquad$ not directly nor indirectly communicate with the alleged victim or any member of the victim's family, shall not go near the residence, school, place of employment or other place frequented by the victim or family;
have no contact with any minor child;
abide by the following home curfew;
__ be'restricted to home confinement; be placed on the Electronic Monitoring program to be paid for by the $\qquad$ ; submit to drug testing, to-wit: random ua
not consume alcohol;
not possess a deadly weapon;
surrender his passport to the Court;
Other Conditions

The defendant is hereby ORDERED to comply with the above-named conditions of bond or be subject to forfeiture and incarceration.

A copy of this Order was served upon defendant

Signed this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , .


# PERSONAL BAIL BOND THE STATE OF TEXAS, COUNTY OF DALLAS vS 

Micahel
Graves
First Niddle Last

Race $W$ Sex $M \quad$ Dов $10 / 16 / 1983$


KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS:
that i, Micahel
Graves
THE DEFENDANT/PRINCIPAL IN THIS CASE ABOVE, BIND MYSELF, MY HEIRS, EXECUTORS AND ADMINISTRATORS, JOINTLY AND SEVERALLY, TO THE STATE OF TEXAS IN THE PENAL SUM OF \$ $10,000^{\circ}$ AND TO APPEAR BEFORE THE COURT OR MAGISTRATE TO answer the accusations against me. I swear that i will appear before the court listed ABOVE IN DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS, AT THE FRANK CROWLEY COURTHOUSE, 133 N. RIVERFRONT BLVD., the city of dallas, dallas county, texas on the 8 _ day of june $\qquad$ , 2020 AT 9:00 O'CLOCK A.M., INSTANTER, OR UPON NOTICE BY THE COURT OR PAY TO THE COURT THE PRINCIPAL SUM OF S 10,000 dOLLARS PLUS ALL NECESSARY AND REASONABLE EXPENSES INCURRED IN ANY ARREST.FOR FAILURE TO APPEAR. THIS AMOUNT SHALL BE PAYABLE TO THE STATE OF TEXAS.

THIS BOND SHALL BIND ME TO APPEAR BEFORE ANY COURT IN WHICH THIS CAUSE MAY HEREAFTER BE pending at any time when, and place where, my presence may be required under the texas CODE OF CRIMNAL PROCEDURE OR BY ANY COURT OR MAGISTRATE AND FOR ANY AND ALL SUBSEQUENT COURT PROCEEDNGS FOR THIS CHARGE.

1 HAVE INCLUDED MY IDENTIFYING INFORMATION FOR A PERSONAL BOND, AS REQUIRED BY ARTICLE 17.04 OF THE TEXAS CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE:
DEFENDANT'S NAME:
$\frac{\text { Graves }}{\text { Lasi Name }}$

Micahel
First Name
Middle Name
HOME ADDRESS: $\frac{5302 \text { Harry Hines Blvd }}{\text { Street }}$
$\frac{\text { Dallas }}{\text { City }} \frac{\text { TX }}{\text { State }} \frac{75235}{\text { Zip Code }} \frac{(210) 224-8075}{\text { Home Telephone Number }}-\frac{\text { Apt. or Unil Number }}{\text { Cell Phone Number }}$

MAILING ADDRESS (IF DIFFERENT THAN HOME ADDRESS):

## Street

10/16/1983


CURRENT EMPLOYER: $\qquad$
$\overline{\text { Street }} \overline{\text { City }} \frac{\text { Suite or Floor }}{\text { State }} \frac{\text { Zip Code }}{\text { Work Number }}$

NAME OF NEAREST RELATIVE: $\qquad$
$\overline{\text { Street }} \overline{\text { City }} \frac{}{\text { State }} \frac{\text { Apr. or Unit }}{\text { Zip Code }}-$ Home Telephone

I HAVE VOLUNTARILY PREPARED ALL OF THIS INFORMATION IN THIS PERSONAL BOND TO SUBMIT TO THE COURT. I HAVE CAREFULLY CHECKED ALL OF THIS INFORMATION FOR ACCURACY AND UNDERSTAND THAT ANY FALSE STATEMENT MADE IN THIS PERSONAL BOND MAY BE THE GROUNDS FOR THE COURT TO WITHHOLD OR WITHDRAW MY PERSONAL BOND AT ANY TIME. I AGREE TO ALLOW) THE COURT TO CONTACT ANY OF THE PEOPLE THAT I HAVE LISTED ABOVE TO VERIFY THE INFORMATION FURNISHED BY ME.


Taken and Approved by me on this 14 day of ARI 2020 Marian Brown, Sheriff, Dallas County, Texas

By:



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Current \& Upcoming Closures, Texas Judicial Branch, https://www.txcourts.gov/ programs-services/court-security/emergency-court-preparedness/closures/ (last visited Apr. 15, 2020).
    ${ }^{2}$ Available at https://www.txcourts.gov/media/coronavirus-covid-19-emergency-orders/.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ In evaluating a Rule 12(b)(6) Motion, courts may consider not just documents named in Plaintiffs' Complaint, but also documents that, if not named, are pertinent, central, or integral to Plaintiffs' claim. Bryant v. Avado Brands, 187 F.3d 1271, 1281 (11th Cir. 1999). Documents relied on by a defendant are considered part of the pleadings if they are referred to in the plaintiffs' complaint and are central to plaintiffs' claims. Collins v. Morgan Stanley Dean Witter, 224 F.3d 496, 498-99 (5th Cir. 2000).
    ${ }^{4}$ For context, Defendants attach the remainder of the relevant public reports to which Plaintiffs refer. Those reports are attached as Exhibit 1.

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ The Court may, and is requested to, take judicial notice of Mr. Lopez's, Mr. Ross's, and Mr. Graves's habeas proceedings. Gen. Retail Servs., Inc. v. Wireless Toyz Franchise, LLC, 255 Fed. App'x 775, 785 (5th Cir. 2007) (unpublished) (citing 5C Charles Alan Wright \& Arthur R. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure § 1366 (3d ed. 2004)).
    ${ }^{6}$ Available at http://search.txcourts.gov/Case.aspx?cn=WR-91,105-02\&coa=coscca.
    ${ }^{7}$ Available at http://search.txcourts.gov/Case.aspx?cn=WR-90,708-02\&coa=coscca.
    ${ }^{8}$ Available at http://search.txcourts.gov/Case.aspx?cn=WR-60,286-02\&coa=coscca.
    ${ }^{9}$ Available at http://search.txcourts.gov/Case.aspx?cn=WR-90,679-01\&coa=coscca.
    ${ }^{10}$ Available at http://search.txcourts.gov/Case.aspx?cn=WR-91,038-01\&coa=coscca.

[^3]:    ${ }^{11}$ See also Daves v. Dallas Cnty., Tex., 341 F. Supp. 3d 688, 695-96 (N.D. Tex. 2018).

