for the

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

INMATES OF OCCOQUAN, et al.,	)
Plaintiffs, v.	) ) Civil Action No.
MARION S. BARRY, JR., et al.,	) 86-2128 (JLG) )
Defendants.	) )

## CONSENT MOTION TO CONVENE THREE-JUDGE COURT

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3626(a)(3)(C), the parties hereby request that the Court convene a three-judge court, in accordance with the procedures set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 2284, to obtain approval of the "Population Consent Order" attached hereto.

The Special Officer's Report on Defendants' Compliance with the Orders Related to Personal Safety, dated September 29, 1997, the exhibits thereto, and the stipulations set forth in the Population Consent Order provide the factual predicate for the imposition of the Population Consent Order.

Consented to by:

JOHN M. FERREN
Corporation Counsel, D.C.
WILLIAM J. EARLE
Acting Deputy Corporation Counsel, D.C.
Special Litigation Division



Inmates of Occoquan v. Barry

Consent Motion

Page\_2

RICHARD S. LOVE (#340455)
Acting Assistant Deputy
Corporation Counsel
Special Litigation Division
441 Fourth Street, NW
6th Floor South
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 727-6295

Attorney for Defendants

Dated: November 20, 1997

AYR3HA N. KHAN (#4268B6) ACLU National Prison Project

1875 Connecticut Ave., NW

Suite 410

Washington, DC 20009

(202) 234-4830

Attorney for Plaintiffs

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

INMATES OF OCCOQUAN, et al.,	)
Plaintiffs, v.	) ) Civil Action No. ) 86-2128 (JLG) )
MARION S. BARRY, JR., et al.,	
Defendants.	) )

## POPULATION CONSENT ORDER

As required by 18 U.S.C. § 3626(a)(3), this three-judge Court was convened, upon the request of the parties, by the District Judge in this case pursuant to the procedures set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 2284.

Based upon the Plaintiffs' Motion for the Appointment of a Receiver and Imposition of Fines Regarding Personal Safety, Defendants' Opposition thereto, the findings of the Special Officer contained in her September 29, 1997 Report on Defendants' Compliance with the Orders Related to Personal Safety, which were adopted by the District Judge, the exhibits appended thereto, which were admitted into evidence by the District Judge, and the record herein, the parties stipulate and the Court finds as follows:

The District Court has previously entered orders in this case that have failed to remedy the deprivation of plaintiffs'

Inmates of Occoquan v. Barry
Population Consent Order
Page 2

constitutional rights that are remedied with this Order.

Defendants have had a reasonable amount of time to comply with the previous court orders entered in this case. Thus, the prerequisites for convening a three-judge court, as set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3626(a)(3)(A), have been satisfied.

It has been demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that crowding is a primary cause of the high level of violence described in the Special Officer's Report and that the violence constitutes a violation of the plaintiffs' federal constitutional rights. It has also been demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that no relief other than that set forth herein will remedy this violation. Thus, the factual predicate for imposition of a prisoner release order, as set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3626(a)(3)(E), has been established.

Furthermore, the relief set forth herein is narrowly drawn, extends no further than necessary to correct the constitutional violation, and is the least intrusive means necessary to correct the violation. Thus, the requirements of 18 U.S.C. § 3626(a)(1) for imposition of relief in a civil action regarding prison conditions are satisfied.

Accordingly, it is hereby ordered that Defendants shall maintain the population at the Occoquan Facility at or below

1400 inmates and shall further reduce the population to 1200 inmates or below by March 31, 1998. This population ceiling can be exceeded only if the Director of the D.C. Department of Corrections files with the Court a written declaration that (1) there has been an unusual and significant increase in the number of inmates committed to the D.C. Department of Corrections; (2) the Department is unable to safely house these additional inmates in other institutions; and (3) these inmates can be safely housed at Occoquan during the proposed time period. If defendants seek to exceed the ceiling for a period of greater than 14 days, they shall file a motion with the Court within the 14-day-period seeking the Court's approval to temporarily exceed the limit for a specified additional period. Such approval shall be granted by the Court only if the defendants demonstrate that the above three factors are satisfied. In no event shall the facility house more than 1673 inmates.

This Order shall remain in force until such time as the Occoquan Facility ceases to be used by defendants to house inmates.

Inmates of Occoquan v. Barry
Population Consent Order
Page 4

United States Circuit Judge

Dated:

Consented to by:

JOHN M. FERREN

Corporation Counsel, D.C.

WILLIAM J. EARLE

Acting Deputy Corporation Counsel, D.C.

Special Litigation Division

RICHARD S. LOVE (#340455)

Acting Assistant Deputy

Corporation Counsel

Special Litigation Division

441 Fourth Street, NW

6th Floor South

Washington, DC 20001

(202) 727-6295

Attorney for Defendants

Dated: November 20, 1997

AYESHA N. KHAN (#426836)

ACLU National Prison Project

1875 Connecticut Ave., NW

Suite 410

Washington, DC 20009

(202) 234-4830

Attorney for Plaintiffs