

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.

Table of Contents

I. RECITALS 1

 (A) Parties 1

 (B) Definition of the Class 1

 (C) Jurisdiction 1

 (D) Intention of the Parties 1

 (E) Effective Date 2

II. NEW CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION
 (“RENEWED SUSPENSION”) 2

 (A) Definition of “Eligible class members” 2

 (B) Relief provided to eligible class members 3

 (1) Relief for All Eligible Class Members 4

 (2) If Immigration Court Has Jurisdiction Over Case 4

 (3) If BIA Has Jurisdiction Over the Case 4

 (4) If Motion to Reopen/Reconsider Already Denied 5

 (5) Sua Sponte Reopening If EOIR Already Decided Case 6

 (a) EOIR Identification and reopening 6

 (b) Procedure following remand 7

 (i) Notice of Hearing and Administrative Closure 7

 (ii) Recalendaring and Administrative Closure 7

 (iii) Appropriate Resolution 7

 (c) Motions to Reopen Permitted 7

 (6) Limitation on Appeals 7

 (7) Notification by EOIR of Determinations of Ineligibility 8

 (C) Other Considerations 8

 (1) Stay of Deportation and Dissolution of Injunction 8

 (2) Publication and Notice 9

 (3) Monitoring 9

 (4) Attorneys’ Fees 10

 (5) Dismissal of Complaint 10

 (6) Court’s Continued Authority 10

 (7) Dispute Resolution 10

I. RECITALS

(A) Parties: The parties to this Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") are:

(1) The plaintiff class (hereinafter "plaintiffs" or "class members"), as defined below at (I)(B); and

(2) The defendant officials and employees of the Executive Office for Immigration Review ("EOIR"); John Ashcroft, Attorney General of the United States in his official capacity; Michael Creppy, Chief Immigration Judge in his official capacity; Lori Scialabba, Chair of the Board of Immigration Appeals in her official capacity.

(B) Definition of the Class: The Class shall be defined as follows:

"all persons who have had (or would have had) suspension of deportation hearings conducted before April 1, 1997, within the jurisdiction of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and who were served an Order to Show Cause within seven years after entering the United States, where:

(a) the immigration judge reserved or withheld granting suspension of deportation on the basis of the February 13, 1997 directive from Defendant Chief Immigration Judge Michael Creppy; or

(b) the suspension of deportation hearing was concluded prior to April 1, 1997, the INS has appealed or will appeal, at any time, on a basis that includes the applicability of either section 309(c)(5) or 309(c)(7) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act, Pub. L. No. 104-208, 110 Stat. 3009 (Sept. 30, 1996), amended Pub. L. No. 104-302, 110 Stat. 3656 (Oct. 11, 1996) ("IIRIRA"), and the case was affected by the February 13, 1997 directive from Defendant Chief Immigration Judge Michael Creppy or the February 13, 1997 directive from Defendant Board Chairman Paul W. Schmidt; or

(c) the Board of Immigration Appeals ("the Board") has or had jurisdiction but withheld granting suspension of deportation (or reopening or remanding a case for consideration of an application for suspension of deportation) before April 1, 1997 on the basis of the February 13, 1997 directive from Defendant Board Chairman Paul W. Schmidt."

(C) Jurisdiction: The Court refers to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. The parties do not dispute that the Court has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this action, and that it may appropriately enter an order approving this Agreement. The parties agree that the Court will not retain continuing jurisdiction to supervise this settlement Agreement, or to enforce its terms, except to resolve claims raised in accordance with the dispute resolution mechanism set forth in section (II)(C)(6) below.

(D) Intention of the Parties: The parties desire to resolve this litigation by entering into this Agreement, thereby avoiding the time and expense of further litigation of claims made by the plaintiffs. This Agreement is intended to dispose of all claims that were raised by Plaintiffs against Defendants in their official and individual capacities in this lawsuit. The parties acknowledge that this Agreement is fully binding upon them, and on each of their successors

during the life of the Agreement. By entering into this Agreement, defendants do not admit to any violations of, or failure to comply with, the Constitution, laws or regulations. The parties agree that the Agreement is fully dispositive of all issues in this case.

(E) Effective Date: The “effective date” of this agreement shall be 30 days after the date of the final Court approval of this agreement.

II. NEW CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION (“RENEWED SUSPENSION”)

The Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) will provide the following relief to “eligible class members”, as defined below.

(A) Definition of “Eligible class members”

The following class members are eligible for the relief provided below by this agreement:

(1) individuals for whom the Immigration Judge either reserved a decision, or scheduled a merits hearing on a suspension application under Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) § 244 (as such section existed in 1996, before amendment by IIRIRA), between February 13, 1997 and April 1, 1997, and the hearing was continued until after April 1, 1997 (other than where all three of the following are present: the continuance was at the request of the alien, the alien was represented by an attorney, and the transcript of the hearing was prepared following an appeal, and makes clear which party requested the continuance¹), and for which either

- (i) no decision has been issued, or
- (ii) a decision was issued denying or pretermittting suspension based on IIRIRA § 309(c)(5), and no appeal was filed, or
- (iii) a decision was issued denying or pretermittting suspension based on IIRIRA § 309(c)(5), and an appeal was filed and the case is pending with the BIA, or
- (iv) a decision was issued denying or pretermittting suspension based on IIRIRA § 309(c)(5), the appeal was filed, and the BIA denied the appeal based on IIRIRA § 309(c)(5) (irrespective of whether further relief was pursued in federal court, or whether a motion to reopen was subsequently filed with the BIA), or
- (v) the Immigration Judge granted suspension after April 1, 1997, and the

¹ The individual shall have the opportunity to contest a finding by the EOIR that all three of the factors listed in the parenthetical are present by invoking the dispute resolution process as provided in section (II)(C)(7).

INS filed a notice of appeal, motion to reconsider, or motion to reopen challenging the individual's eligibility for suspension based on IIRIRA § 309(c)(5), such that but for this settlement agreement, the Immigration Judge or the BIA would deny suspension based on IIRIRA § 309(c)(5);

(2) individuals whose cases were pending at the Board of Immigration Appeals (either on direct appeal from the Immigration Judge decision, or on a motion to reopen) between February 13, 1997 and April 1, 1997, where the notice of appeal (or the motion to reopen) was filed on or before October 1, 1996, and which were, or would be (but for this settlement agreement), denied on the basis of IIRIRA § 309(c)(5), whether or not the decision of the BIA denying suspension solely on the basis of IIRIRA § 309(c)(5) has already been issued²;

(3) individuals whose cases were taken under submission following a merits hearing before February 13, 1997, where no decision was issued until after April 1, 1997;

(4) individuals for whom the Immigration Judge denied or pretermitted suspension between October 1, 1996 and March 31, 1997, on the basis of IIRIRA § 309(c)(5), and the individual filed a notice of appeal with the BIA; and

(5) individuals for whom the Immigration Judge granted suspension of deportation before April 1, 1997 and the INS appealed based only on IIRIRA § 309(c)(5) or IIRIRA § 309(c)(7);

(6) notwithstanding any of the foregoing categories, the term "eligible class members" shall not include those individuals who have obtained adjustment of status to permanent residence by way of the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act (NACARA) or any other means, or who have obtained (or will obtain) an administrative adjudication or re-adjudication of their claims for suspension of deportation without regard to Section 309(c)(5) of IIRIRA, following a remand from the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit or the BIA or following an order by the BIA or an immigration judge reopening their cases.

² The fact that an individual whose case is under the jurisdiction of either the Immigration Court or the BIA may be eligible for "repapering" under proposed 8 C.F.R. § 240.80 et seq. or any other similar procedure implementing IIRIRA §§ 309(c)(2) or (3) will not preclude an individual from relief under the terms of the settlement. In addition, cases administratively closed (for any reason) are considered pending before EOIR for purposes of this settlement.

(B) Relief provided to eligible class members:

Renewed Suspension: All eligible class members (as defined above) who are not already lawful permanent residents, shall be eligible to apply for and be granted “renewed suspension” which shall mean suspension of deportation, as that provision existed under INA § 244 on September 29, 1996, before amendment by IIRIRA, or any subsequent statute. All such eligible class members shall be eligible to apply for and be granted such relief as described below:

(1) **Relief for All Eligible Class Members:** No Immigration Judge and no member or panel of the Board of Immigration Appeals shall issue a decision in the case of any eligible class member after the effective date, except for a decision as provided by and consistent with the provisions for relief as discussed herein;

(2) **If Immigration Court Has Jurisdiction Over Case:** For all eligible class members whose cases are pending before the Immigration Judge (whether on calendar, administratively closed, or in a timely filed motion to reconsider or reopen) as of the effective date, such individual shall be notified in writing by the EOIR of his or her eligibility for relief under this agreement (if not already granted suspension by the Immigration Judge), by use of the form attached hereto as Exhibit B, before the scheduling of the merits hearing described below, and shall have the opportunity to apply for renewed suspension in one (or, if applicable, more) of the following ways:

(a) if the case is on the Immigration Court calendar (or under submission with no future hearing date), then the Immigration Judge shall schedule a hearing on the eligible class member’s application for renewed suspension of deportation, and permit the individual to supplement the record of the application for suspension;

(b) if the case is administratively closed, then upon recalendaring, the individual shall be scheduled for a hearing on the eligible class member’s application for renewed suspension of deportation, and permit the individual to supplement the record of the application for suspension;

(c) if a motion to reopen or reconsider is pending following a grant of suspension to an eligible class member, where the motion is based on IIRIRA § 309(c)(5) or § 309(c)(7), then the Immigration Judge shall deny the motion on that basis, and the BIA shall deny any INS appeal based on § 309(c)(5) or § 309(c)(7);

(d) if a timely filed motion to reopen or reconsider is pending following the denial or pretermission of suspension for an eligible class member then the motion shall be granted, and the individual shall be scheduled for a regular hearing on the merits of the eligible class member’s application for renewed suspension of deportation, and the Immigration Court shall permit the individual to supplement the record of the application for suspension;

(3) **If BIA Has Jurisdiction Over the Case:** For any eligible class member whose case is pending at the Board of Immigration Appeals on the effective date, either on direct

appeal, or with a pending and timely filed motion to reopen, such eligible class member shall have the opportunity to apply for renewed suspension in one (or, if applicable, more) of the following ways:

(a) If the eligible class member was granted suspension by the Immigration Judge, and the notice of appeal was filed by the INS, then the BIA shall affirm the decision of the Immigration Judge, and the BIA will not entertain a motion to reopen or reconsider based on IIRIRA § 309(c)(5) or § 309(c)(7);

(b) If the eligible class member was granted suspension by the Board of Immigration Appeals (or the BIA affirmed the Immigration Judge's grant of suspension) and the INS filed a motion to reopen or reconsider based on IIRIRA § 309(c)(5) or § 309(c)(7) which is pending, then that motion shall be denied;

(c) If the eligible class member's suspension application was denied or pretermitted by the Immigration Judge based solely on Section 309(c)(5), and the case is pending at the BIA, then the BIA shall remand the case to the Immigration Judge (attaching form Exhibit D informing the class member of this settlement, attached hereto), who shall schedule a regular hearing so that the eligible class member can apply for renewed suspension, and permit the eligible class member to supplement the record of the application for suspension;

(d) If the eligible class member's motion to reopen or reconsider to apply for suspension is pending before the BIA (whether or not the individual's suspension application previously was denied or pretermitted by the Board of Immigration Appeals based solely on Section 309(c)(5)), then the BIA shall grant the motion, and remand the case to the Immigration Judge (attaching form Exhibit D informing the class member of this settlement, attached hereto), who shall schedule a regular hearing so that the eligible class member can apply for renewed suspension, and permit the eligible class member to supplement the record of the application for suspension;

(4) **If Motion to Reopen/Reconsider Already Denied:** For any eligible class member whose motion to reopen or reconsider before the BIA or the Immigration Judge has been denied as of the effective date based solely on Section 309(c)(5), such individual shall be eligible to file an additional motion, not subject to the time or numerical limitations in 8 C.F.R. § 3.2 or 8 C.F.R. § 3.23, and with no filing fee required, within the "motion to reopen period" (which is defined as follows: the "motion to reopen" period shall consist of the 18 month period following the publication of this settlement in the federal register, except that during the final six months of that 18 month period, if any eligible class member files a motion to reopen with the EOIR, then the motion to reopen period shall continue for an additional six months, for a total of 24 months, and if during the final six months of that 18 month period, no eligible class member files a motion to reopen with the EOIR, then the motion to reopen period shall consist of only 18 months)³ as follows:

³ Nothing in this agreement shall prevent the EOIR from sua sponte reopening the case of

(a) For any eligible class member whose motion to reopen or reconsider before the BIA has already been adjudicated and denied based solely on Section 309(c)(5), such individual shall be eligible to file an additional motion to reopen or reconsider, requesting that the BIA reopen or reconsider the prior motion, and the BIA shall reopen the case, and remand the case to the Immigration Judge, who shall schedule a regular hearing so that the individual can apply for renewed suspension, and permit the individual to supplement the record of the application for suspension;

(b) For any eligible class member whose motion to reopen or reconsider before the Immigration Judge has already been adjudicated and denied based solely on Section 309(c)(5), if no appeal to the BIA has been filed, then such individual shall be eligible to file an additional motion to reopen or reconsider, requesting that the Immigration Judge reopen or reconsider the prior motion, and the Immigration Judge shall reopen the case, and schedule a regular hearing so that the individual can apply for renewed suspension, and permit the individual to supplement the record of the application for suspension;

(c) For any eligible class member whose motion to reopen or reconsider before the Immigration Judge has already been adjudicated and denied based solely on Section 309(c)(5), if an appeal to the BIA has been filed, and is pending, then the appeal shall be granted by the BIA, and the BIA shall order the Immigration Judge to reopen the case (attaching form Exhibit D informing the class member of this settlement, attached hereto), and schedule a regular calendar hearing so that the individual can apply for renewed suspension, and permit the individual to supplement the record of the application for suspension;

(d) For any eligible class member whose motion to reopen or reconsider before the Immigration Judge has already been adjudicated and denied based solely on Section 309(c)(5), if an appeal to the BIA has been filed and denied based solely on Section 309(c)(5), then such individual shall be eligible to file an additional motion to reopen or reconsider, requesting that the BIA reopen or reconsider the prior decision, and the BIA shall reopen the case, and remand the case to the Immigration Judge, who shall schedule a regular hearing so that the individual can apply for renewed suspension, and permit the individual to supplement the record of the application for suspension;

(5) **Sua Sponte Reopening If EOIR Already Decided Case:** For eligible class members whose applications for suspension have already been denied or pretermitted by the BIA or by the Immigration Judge based solely on Section 309(c)(5), where no appeal has been filed as of the effective date of the settlement agreement, the EOIR shall identify such individuals as provided below, and shall sua sponte reopen such cases once identified, and remand such cases to the Immigration Judge where necessary (attaching form Exhibit D informing the class member of

an eligible class member after the termination of the motion to reopen period.

this settlement, attached hereto), who shall schedule a regular hearing so that the individual can apply for renewed suspension, and permit the individual to supplement the record of the application for suspension, as follows:

(a) **EOIR Identification and reopening**: the EOIR shall accomplish such identification of class members and reopening of their cases within six (6) months of the effective date of this settlement agreement,

(b) **Procedure following remand**: following the sua sponte reopening and remand of a case:

(i) **Notice of Hearing and Administrative Closure**: notice of the scheduled hearing shall be sent by certified mail to the last known address of the Respondent contained in the administrative record and the attorney of record, if any, and if the individual fails to appear for the scheduled hearing, absent evidence that the hearing notice sent by certified mail was actually received by Respondent (and not just the attorney of record) and no other individual, the case shall be administratively closed, following which, should the Respondent come forward, the hearing shall be recalendared; and

(ii) **Recalendaring and Administrative Closure**: should the Immigration Court or the INS learn of an address believed to be that of Respondent, then the case may be recalendared, and if so, notice of the scheduled hearing shall be sent by certified mail to that address, and if the individual fails to appear again for the scheduled hearing, absent evidence that the hearing notice sent by certified mail was actually received by Respondent and no other individual, the case shall again be administratively closed, as described above; and

(iii) **Appropriate Resolution**: after the conclusion of the latter of (1) the motion to reopen period defined in Section (II)(B)(4) above and (2) the final administrative adjudication by the EOIR of all class members cases other than those administratively closed under this paragraph, any cases that remain administrative closed can be adjudicated as the Immigration Judge decides is appropriate for the particular case, including, but not limited to, keeping the case administratively closed, or recalendaring and entering the appropriate order; however any case previously administratively closed under Section (II)(B)(5)(b) in which an in absentia order is subsequently entered may be reopened through a motion to reopen based on lack of notice under former INA § 242B(c)(3)(B) (before amendment by IIRIRA), 8 U.S.C. 1252b(c)(3)(B), and the failure of the Respondent to inform the Court of his or her address subsequent to the original final administrative EOIR decision denying suspension shall not be a basis to deny the motion to reopen, and any eligible class member whose case is so reopened shall be eligible to apply for renewed suspension under this agreement;

(c) **Motions to Reopen Permitted**: where the EOIR has not sua sponte reopened an eligible class member's case, such individual shall be eligible to file a motion to reopen, not subject to the time or numerical limitations in 8 C.F.R. § 3.2 or 8 C.F.R. § 3.23, with no filing fee required, within the motion to reopen period as defined above in Section (II)(B)(4), requesting that the EOIR reopen the case, and the EOIR shall reopen the case, and remand the

case to the Immigration Judge, who shall schedule a regular hearing so that the individual can apply for renewed suspension, and permit the individual to supplement the record of the application for suspension;

(6) **Limitation on Appeals:** In no case where the eligible class member is granted renewed suspension shall the BIA entertain an appeal or a motion to reconsider or reopen filed by the INS based on IIRIRA § 309(c)(5) or § 309(c)(7);

(7) **Notification by EOIR of Determinations of Ineligibility:** Any eligible class member who is determined by EOIR not to be eligible for relief under this settlement agreement because such individual is determined by EOIR not to fall under Section (II)(A)(1) due to presence of the following three events: the continuance was at the request of the alien, the alien was represented by an attorney, and the transcript of the hearing was prepared following an appeal and makes clear which party requested the continuance, shall be so notified by EOIR within 60 days of that determination. Copies of that determination shall be sent to the last attorney of record and to class counsel. The reasons for the asserted non-eligibility shall be stated in the notice, and attached shall be a form, attached hereto as Exhibit C, which shall inform the class member of the stay of deportation, the dispute resolution provisions, and the 90 day period to contest this determination in district court, as specified in section (II)(C)(7), below;

(C) **Other Considerations**

(1) **Stay of Deportation and Dissolution of Injunction**

(a) As of the date the settlement is finally approved by the court, the injunction against deportation granted by the court in its order of March 28, 1997, is dissolved as to any class members ineligible for a remedy under this settlement agreement and is dissolved for any eligible class member who is not the subject of a final order, and shall expire upon reopening of any eligible class member's case under the terms of this agreement. The stay is also dissolved 30 days after any individual determined by EOIR not to be eligible for relief under this agreement (as described in Section (II)(B)(7)) is notified by EOIR of such ineligibility, unless such individual notifies EOIR within that 30-day period that he/she is invoking the dispute resolution mechanism under Section (II)(C)(7). In the latter case, the stay shall be dissolved at the conclusion of the dispute resolution process (including review in the Court if no resolution is achieved by the parties through dispute resolution).

(b) An eligible class member who files a motion to reopen under section (II)(B)(4) or (II)(B)(5)(c) may also request of stay of deportation from EOIR, and to eliminate the need to fashion such request as an emergency motion where deportation is imminent, the filing of such a stay request shall cause such individual to be presumed to be an eligible class member for purposes of the stay of deportation; however such presumption and stay can be dissolved by order of the EOIR in not less than seven (7) days after the filing of the motion of the reopen if the individual has not filed prima facie evidence of being an eligible class member as forth in section II(A) of this agreement by that time;

(c) any individual who is an eligible class member and who is not ineligible for suspension of deportation due to deportability under INA § 241(a)(2), (3) or (4) (before amendment by IIRIRA) is eligible to be granted bond by the Immigration Court if taken into INS custody;

(2) **Publication and Notice** The EOIR will mount a public information campaign designed to afford notice to eligible class members whose cases are no longer pending before the EOIR of their rights and obligations under this Agreement. The EOIR will initiate its public information campaign within 30 days from the effective date. The public information campaign will include, but not be limited to:

(a) Placement of an Advisory Statement (attached hereto as Exhibit A) describing the rights and obligations of class members under this Agreement on the EOIR Internet web site, and the INS Internet web site;

(b) Distribution of the Advisory Statement referenced in subparagraph (a) above to the Community Relations Office located within each INS District Office, and posted prominently at each EOIR Immigration Court;

(c) Distribution of the Advisory Statement referenced in subparagraph (a) above to all news organizations in the United States listed on the INS media distribution list;

(d) Distribution of the Advisory Statement referenced in subparagraph (a) above to all immigration assistance providers listed on the Roster of Recognized Organizations and Accredited Representatives maintained by the Executive Office for Immigration Review pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 292;

(e) Distribution of the Advisory Statement referenced in subparagraph (a) above to appropriate international organizations and community outreach networks; and

(f) Publication of the Advisory Statement referenced in subparagraph (a) above in the Federal Register within 30 days of the effective date;

(3) **Monitoring:** Within 30 days of final court approval, EOIR will provide to plaintiff's counsel a list of all identified class members, including class member's names, alien number, address, telephone number, and if represented, the attorney of record's name, address and telephone number, with an indication by the EOIR whether the class member is eligible for relief under this settlement agreement. The EOIR will provide plaintiffs' counsel with status reports every six months on the status of eligible class members cases pending at the BIA which have either been granted suspension, renewed suspension or remanded to the Immigration Court, the status of eligible class members whose cases were reopened (and whether such reopening was sua sponte or in response to a motion filed by the individual), the status of any denials of motions to reopen of persons who claim eligibility for renewed suspension under this agreement, and a

list of any additional class members determined to be ineligible for relief under this settlement agreement. The first status report will be provided to plaintiffs' counsel approximately 210 days from the effective date. The report shall include any changes or updates to the class member's names, alien number, address, telephone number, and if represented, the attorney of record's name, address and telephone number.

(4) **Attorneys' Fees**: The EOIR will pay plaintiffs attorney's fees of \$395,000, plus \$3,935.01 in costs, as specified in 28 U.S.C. §§ 1920, 2412, and 2671, and 5 U.S.C. § 504, within thirty (30) days from the date this Agreement becomes effective pursuant to paragraph II(C)(5) below. If payment is not made within the 30 day period, interest will accrue at the federal civil post judgment rate, as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 1961. Any future application for attorneys' fees based on any action to enforce the provisions of this Agreement shall be treated as a newly filed action for EAJA purposes and no attorneys' fees for enforcement of this Agreement may be predicated upon any acts of the defendants or findings of this Court that occurred prior to the effective date of this Agreement.

(5) **Dismissal of Complaint**: Upon final approval of this Agreement, the parties will jointly move the Court to enter an order dismissing all issues, claims, and causes of action arising from plaintiffs' Complaint, other than otherwise provided for in this Agreement. This Agreement will not become effective until the Court signs such an order.

(6) **Court's Continued Authority**: Upon final approval of this Agreement, and until the latter of

(1) ninety (90) days following the final administrative adjudication of all class members' cases (other than those cases which are administratively closed pursuant to Section II(B)(5)(b)), and

(2) the termination of the motion to reopen period defined in Section II(B)(4), the Court shall have authority under this agreement to resolve claims by any party hereto that any other party has repudiated or committed a breach of any term of this Agreement (which may include a violation of the Agreement as to an individual class member). Except where irreparable harm would occur (for example, an imminent deportation), in exercising such retained authority, the Court shall not act on any matter until the complaining party has initiated the dispute resolution mechanism under paragraph (7) below, the time for response has expired, and the negotiations have proved fruitless; nor shall the Court modify or expand in any way the undertakings of the parties hereunder without the consent of all parties. Ninety (90) days after all class members' cases (other than those cases which are administratively closed pursuant to Section II(B)(5)(b)) are finally adjudicated consistent with this agreement, the parties will jointly advise the court that one of the two conditions above has been met and that the Court can dismiss the case;

(7) **Dispute Resolution**. A significant purpose of this Agreement is to eliminate or reduce the need for further complex litigation in Court. In order to effectuate this purpose the parties agree to the following dispute resolution mechanism:

(a) Upon learning of any fact or facts that constitute the basis for asserting that a party has repudiated or committed a breach of any term of this Agreement (which may include a violation of the Agreement as to an individual class member), the aggrieved party (including any individual class member) shall notify the parties pursuant to section (d) below of that fact or facts and request a report on what remedial action has been taken with respect to such alleged facts prior to invoking the enforcement provisions of this Agreement.

(b) Within thirty (30) days after receipt of such notice, the party alleged to have repudiated or committed a breach of the agreement shall provide notice pursuant to section (d) below and to the aggrieved party of the results of its investigation of the facts and any remedial action it has taken or intends to take in connection therewith.

(c) Thereafter the parties shall negotiate in good faith in an effort to resolve any disputes remaining after the undertaking set forth in subparagraphs (a) and (b) above have been completed.

(d) All notices required under the provisions for dispute resolution shall be served upon the respective parties as follows:

Plaintiffs:

Linton Joaquin
National Immigration Law Center
3435 Wilshire Blvd. Suite 2850
Los Angeles, CA 90010

Defendants:

David McConnell
Office of Immigration Litigation
Department of Justice/Civil Division
P.O. Box 878, Ben Franklin Station
Washington, DC 20044

(e) If, after such good faith negotiation, there are remaining issues that have not been resolved, either party, including any class member who continues to believe that the EOIR has violated the terms of this agreement in its determination that such individual is not an eligible class member, or in the implementation of the relief provided (other than a discretionary determination on the suspension application), will have ninety (90) days from the repudiation, breach or notice of the EOIR decision (referred to in section (b) above) to file a motion with the Court seeking review of such repudiation, breach or EOIR determination.

Counsel for Plaintiffs: _____ Dated: _____
Marc Van Der Hout

Counsel for Defendants: _____ Dated: _____
David McConnell