1 2	LAW OFFICE OF MARK E. MERIN Mark E. Merin, SBN 043849 2001 P Street, Suite 100	
3	Sacramento, CA 95814 Telephone: 916/443-6911 Facsimile: 916/447-8336	
4	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
5	PORTER, SCOTT, WEIBERG & DELEHANT	
6	350 University Avenue, Suite 200	
7 8	Sacramento, CA 95825 Telephone: 916/929-1481 Facsimile: 916/927-3706	
9	Attorneys for Defendants	
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12	EMILY ROBINSON, et al.,	CASE NO: CIV.S-04-1617 FCD/PAN
13	Plaintiffs,	ORDER AND JUDGMENT OF
14	VS.	DISMISSAL
15	SACRAMENTO COUNTY, et al.,	
16	Defendants.	
17	KIMBERLY KOZLOWSKI, et al.,	CASE NO: CIV.S-04-2381 FCD DAD
18	Plaintiffs,	
19	VS.	
20	SACRAMENTO COUNTY, et al.,	
21	Defendants.	
22	This matter came on regularly for a Fairness Hearing on March 2, 2007, in Courtroom2 of	
23	the above-entitled Court, the Honorable Frank C. Damrell, Jr. presiding. Plaintif f Class was	
24	represented by Class Counsel Mark E. Merin of the Law Office of Mark E. Merin; and Defendants	
25	were represented by Terence J. Cassidy of the law firm of Porter, Scott, Weiberg & Delehant.	
26	After considering the s ubmissions of the pa rties, including the Stipulated Motion for	
27	Preliminary Approval of Provisional Settlement Class and Settlement of Class Action, together with	

28

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

Award of Attorneys' Fees and Costs; the Joint Submission of the Parties in Support of Final Approval of the Stipulation of Settlement; the arguments of counsel; and the submission from the Class Claims Administrator,

## IT IS NOW ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. On August 11, 2006, this Court entered its order preliminarily approving settlement of the above-captioned consolidated class action. Since the entry of the Court's Prelimary Order, in accordance with the Stipulation of Settlem ent as proved to the sat isfaction of the Court, the requisite notice of the Settlem ent, with opt-out and objection information, was published in the Sacramento Bee on Septem ber 11, 21, and 24, 2006, in the Sacramento News and Review on September 14, 21, and 28, 2006, and in the Comic Press News on October 20, 2006. The notice of the Settlement and approved claimforms, were posted by First Class Mail to the last-known address of each person in the Settlement Class. Both the published notice and the mailed notice specified that Claim Forms had to be delivered to the Claims Administrator, postmarked no later than January 8, 2007.
- 2. Both the published and nailed notices specified that any person who chose to object to the Settlement, either personally or through counsel, and desired to appear at the Fairness Hearing, was required to submit a Notice of Intention to appear, together with written arguments in support of any objection, by February 16, 2007. Nowritten objections were received by the Court. Furthermore, although opportunity was given by the Court to voice objections at the time of the Fairness Hearing, no objections were stated by any member of the Class or representative of any such Class Member.
- 3. The Court is satisfied from all of the memoranda of law, declarations, and exhibits submitted to the C ourt, that the Stipulation of Settlement is, and the C ourt now finds, that the Stipulation of Settlement is fair and finally approves it as such. The Stipulation of Settlement is incorporated herein by this reference as if set out in full.
- 4 The "Settlement Class" includes: all of those persons who are members of the following defined class and/or sub-classes who, during the class period from January 1,1998, to and including October 1, 2004, were booked at Sacramento County Juvenile Hall, assigned to a Unit,

and strip searched at the facility:

- All juveniles booked and assigned to a Unit at Sacramento County Juvenile
   Hall and strip searched, including juveniles strip-searched in groups, during
   the Class Period;
- b. The sub-class of juveniles who, during the Class Period, were booked on misdemeanor, infraction, ordinance violation, or other non-felony offenses not involving violence, dr ugs or weapons, assigned to a Unit, and strip searched during the period of their incarceration;
- c. The sub-class of all juveniles who, during the Class Period, were booked at Sacramento County Juvenile Hall on felony charges not involving violence, drugs or weapons, assigned to a Unit, and strip searched during the period of their incarceration.
- 5. Persons who previously commenced civil litigation challenging the legality of any strip search at the Sacramento County Juvenile Hall during the class period and have prevailed, settled or had their complaints denied on their merits, and persons who have given timely notice of their election to be excluded from the Settlement Class are not included in the Settlement Class.
- 6. With the exception of the individuals who submitted timely requests to the Court to opt out of the Stipulation of Settlement, all claims and complaints of the named representative Plaintiffs, together with all persons in the Settlement Class, are now dismissed with prejudice as to all of the Released Persons defined to include Defendants, their predecessors, successors, and/or assigns, together with past, present and future fficials, employees, representatives, attorneys and/or agents of the County of Sac ramento or Sacramento County Probation Department. Claims and complaints of such persons are now forever barred, and all Settlement Class Members are enjoined from asserting against any released persons anyand all claims which the Settlement Class Members had, have, or may have in the future arising out of the facts alleged in the complaints.
- 7. Each Released Person is released f rom the claims which any Settlem ent Class Member has had or may in the future have againstany such Released Persons arising out of the facts in the complaints.

- 8. This Court explicitly finds that the Stipulation of Settlement, which is now made final by this Judgment, was entered into in good faith, is reasonable, fair, and adequate, and is in the best interest of the Class. The Court expressly approves payment to class counsel, the Law Office of Mark E. Merin, the amount of One Million, Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$1,500,000.00), for attorney fees, and costs for the representation of Settlement Class Members herein, to be paid as provided in the Stipulation of Settlement.
- 9. The Court further explicitly approves paynent from the payment fund a total of Two Hundred Eighty Thousand Dollars (\$280,000.00) to be divided among the representative Plaintiffs, as specified in the Stipulation of Settlement. The Court finds the amount is fair and adequate in view of the dam ages suffered by the representative Plaintiffs and the efforts they expended in litigating this case in the more than two and one-half years it has been pending.
- 10. Claims have been submitted and, in accordance with the claim processing procedure specified in the Stipulation of Settlement, will be reviewed, valued, and paid by the Claim Administrator from funds provided by the defendants as soon as practicable following the effective date of this Judgment, meaning the date it is entered and becomes final. Such Judgment will be deemed final only upon the expiration of the time to appeal or, if a notice of appeal is filed in this matter, upon exhaustion of all appeals and petitions for writ of certiorari.
- 11. The Court reserves continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over the parties in this action, including Defendants and all Settlement Class Members, to administer, supervise, construe and enforce the Settlement in accordance with the terms for the mutual benefit of all of the parties.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the complaints in these related actions be dismissed with prejudice and that judgment be and the same hereby is entered pursuant to the terms of this Order.

25 Dated: March 2, 2007

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

26

27