26

27

28

Whereas, this Court has presided over the proceedings in the above-captioned action (the "Class Action") and has reviewed all of the pleadings, records, and papers on the file herein;

Whereas, the parties have entered into a Stipulated Order for Permanent Injunctive Relief, which was lodged with the Court on November 18, 2003;

Whereas, the Court has reviewed the Stipulated Order for Permanent Injunctive Relief together with the Exhibits thereto, and has heard the attorneys for the parties with respect to the proposed settlement of this action;

Whereas, the Court has determined that inquiry should be made as to the fairness and adequacy of this proposed settlement; and

Whereas, the Court has conducted a hearing respecting the reasonableness of proceeding with this proposed settlement, and good cause appearing therefore, now finds and orders as follows:

#### **FINDINGS**

- 1. The Court finds that the proposed settlement falls within the range of possible approval and is sufficiently fair to warrant the dissemination of notice to the proposed class members apprising them of the settlement, and finds that the proposed class, as defined in Paragraph 5, below is proper.
- 2. The proposed settlement is the product of arm's-length, serious, informed and non-collusive negotiations between experienced and knowledgeable counsel who have actively prosecuted and defended this litigation.
- 3. The Settlement Agreement is granted preliminary approval and incorporated herein by this reference, and has the full force and effect of an order of this Court.
- 4. A hearing is appropriate to consider whether this Court should grant final approval to this settlement, and to allow adequate time for members of the class, or their counsel, to support or oppose this settlement.

### GOOD CAUSE APPEARING THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

5. This action is determined to be properly maintained as a class action pursuant to

Rule 23(b)(2), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, with a class consisting of: 1) California parolees who are at large (all California parolees who are not in custody); 2) California parolees in custody as alleged parole violators, and who are awaiting revocation of their state parole; and 3) California parolees who are in custody, having been found in violation of parole and sentenced to prison custody.

- 6. A short and long written notice attached hereto shall be disseminated to the class.
- 7. Within **28** days after the Court orders Preliminary Approval, or as soon thereafter as practicable, the Notice shall be disseminated to the Class, substantially in the forms attached hereto by the following means:
  - (1) For the portion of the class consisting of California parolees who are at large (all California parolees who are not in custody), the short written notice shall be posted in all parole field offices. Copies of the long written notice, the Stipulated Order for Permanent Injunctive Relief, and large print and audio copies of the short and long written notices shall be available in all parole field offices. Parolees who are not required to report to the parole office during the notice period, shall receive the short written notice by first class mail, or shall be provided with the short notice in person by their parole agent, and may come to the field office to read the long notice and the Stipulated Order for Permanent Injunctive Relief.
  - (2) For members of the class who are California parolees in custody as alleged parole violators, the short written notice shall be (a) posted in all California prisons, reception centers, jails and other facilities where Defendants require parolees to be held in such a manner as to make the notice visible to all parolees in custody; (b) posted in each room where revocation serves and hearings take place; (c) served on parolees who are being served with revocation charges and/or screening offers during the notice period as part of their revocation documents; and (d) served on parolees who appear for parole revocation hearings. Copies of the, long notice, the Stipulated Order for Permanent Injunctive Relief, and large print and audio copies of the short and long written notice shall be made available in each facility, in locations such as prison and jail libraries, where Defendants require parolees to be held.

- (3) For the portion of the class who are California parolees in custody, having been found in violation of parole and sentenced to prison custody, the short written notice shall be posted in all California prisons and reception centers in such a manner as to make the notice visible to all parolees in custody. Copies of the long notice, the Stipulated Order for Permanent Injunctive Relief, and large print and audio copies of the long and short written notice shall be made available in each facility, in locations such as prison and jail libraries, where Defendants require parolees to be held.
- 8. The expense of giving notice to the class members shall be paid by the Defendants. Dissemination of the Notice as provided above is hereby authorized and approved, and satisfies the notice requirement of Rule 23(e), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Constitution of the United States, due process and any other applicable rule(s) of this Court.
- 9. No later than **December 29, 2003**, Defendants must file and serve on Plaintiffs' counsel an affidavit affirming that they published notice as required in this order.
- 10. Any member of the class may enter an appearance on their own behalf in this action through that class member's own attorney (at their own expense), but need not do so. Class members who do not enter an appearance through their own attorneys will be represented by the Plaintiffs as class representatives and their counsel. Alternatively, any member of the class may write to the federal court about whether the settlement is fair. The federal court will consider written communications when deciding whether to approve the settlement.

  Comments regarding the fairness of the settlement MUST include at the top of the first page the case name (Valdivia v. Schwarzenegger) and case number (S-94-0671 LKK/GGH).

  Comments must be postmarked by February 9, 2004 and must be sent to the following address:

Clerk of the Court United States District Court Eastern District of California 501 "I' Street Sacramento, CA 95814

- 11. A final approval hearing pursuant to Rule 23(e), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, will be in the Courtroom of the undersigned on **March 8, 2004**, at 10:00 a.m. in the United States District for the Eastern District of California, Sacramento Division, to determine whether the proposed settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate, and whether it should be finally approved by the Court. The hearing may be continued from time to time without further notice.
  - 12. Briefs in support of final approval shall be filed on or before February 19, 2004.
- 13. Plaintiffs' motion for reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses shall be filed and served no later than **April 2**, **2004**. Defendants' response to the fees motion shall be filed and serve no later than **April 30**, **2004**. Plaintiffs' reply shall be filed and served no later than **May 28**, **2004**. A hearing on the motion for attorneys' fees and expenses shall be held on **June 7**, **2004**.
- 14. A status conference is set for **March 1, 2004** at 2:30 p.m. for the parties to report to the Court on the two unresolved issues regarding administrative appeals and revocation extensions.

IT IS SO ORDERED

Dated: December, 2003

AWRENCE K. KARLTON United States District Judge

### SETSELEPANDOTO FICKLESS ACCUTION 821P AFRO LIFOR BY ORDATION

Valdivia v. Schwarz ...egger, E.D. Cal. No. Civ. S->--0671 LKK/GGH Deadline for Comments On Fairness of Settlement: \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2004

<u>Valdivia v. Schwarzenegger</u> is a statewide class action challenging the California parole revocation system under the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. This notice explains the proposed settlement, how you can read it, and how you can tell the court about whether you think it is fair. If you are a California parolee, you are part of the <u>Valdivia</u> class, whether you are out on parole, being held on revocation charges, or serving a revocation term. The <u>Valdivia</u> lawsuit seeks federal court orders to change the parole revocation system. No money damages were asked for, and none will be awarded in this class action case. The settlement does not affect your ability to sue for money damages or to petition for a writ of habeas corpus.

You can read about the changes in parole revocations in a longer version of this notice and in the <u>Valdivia</u> "Stipulated Order for Permanent Injunctive Relief." You can find this document in the prison law library, jail library, or parole office.

Under the agreement, by early 2004, some parolees will be sent to community-based programs, instead of prison. Starting between July 2004 and January 2005, all parolees will be appointed counsel for screening offers and revocation hearings. Parolees will receive faster notice of the charges against them. Parolees in some circumstances will receive expedited hearings on probable cause. Final revocation hearings must be held within 35 calendar days of the arrest. Parolees' attorneys will have better access to witnesses and evidence.

By July 2005, parolees held on revocation charges will receive probable-cause hearings within 10 business days after notice of the charges

The court will keep jurisdiction to enforce the requirements of the settlement. The court will hold a hearing on the fairness of the settlement on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 2004, \_\_\_\_\_\_ a.m./p.m., at the United States Courthouse in Sacramento, Courtroom 4.

The attorneys who brought the class action will ask the Court to have defendants pay for their attorneys' fees and expenses. The Court will decide the amount of these fees.

Parolees can write to the federal court about whether the settlement is fair and whether they object to the award of attorneys' fees. Comments MUST include at the top of the first page the case name, <u>Valdivia v. Schwarzenegger</u>.

Comments must be postmarked no later than

, and sent to the address at right.

Clerk of the Court United States District Court Eastern District of California 501 "I" Street Sacramento, CA 95814

For more information, you may contact the attorneys for the class:

Rosen, Bien & Asaro, LLP	Prison Law Office	Bingham McCutchen
155 Montgomery St., 8th Flr.	General Delivery	Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94104 Tel: (415) 433-6830	San Quentin, CA 94964.	San Francisco, CA 94111

# **IMPORTANT NOTICE**

## SETTLEMENT OF CLASS ACTION - PAROLE REVOCATION

<u>Valdivia v. Schwarzenegger</u>, E.D. Cal. No. Civ. S-94-0671 LKK/GGH

Deadline for Comments On Fairness of Settlement:
Hearing on Fairness of Settlement:
, 2004,a.m./p.m.
United States Courthouse in Sacramento, Courtroom 4.

<u>Valdivia v. Schwarzenegger</u> is a statewide class-action lawsuit that seeks to change the way California treats persons who are arrested on parole violations. A proposed settlement has been reached. The federal court must now decide if the settlement is fair. This notice explains the settlement, how you can read it, and how you can write to the court about whether you think it is fair.

The <u>Valdivia v. Schwarzenegger</u> class action was filed in 1994. If you are a California parolee, you are a member of the <u>Valdivia</u> class, whether you are out on parole, being held in jail or prison on revocation charges, or serving a revocation term. The lawyers for the parolees are Bingham & McCutchen; Prison Law Office; Stephen J. Perrello, Jr.; Alex Landon; and Rosen Bien & Asaro, 155 Montgomery Street, Suite 800, San Francisco, CA, 94104.

The individual defendants in this case are: Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor of the State of California and Chief Executive of the state government; Roderick Q. Hickman, the Secretary of the California Youth and Adult Correctional Agency; Edward S. Alameida. Jr., Director of the California Department of Corrections; Richard Rimmer, Deputy Director of the California Department of Corrections, Parole and Community Services Division ("P&CSD"); Carol A. Daly, Commissioner and Chair of the Board of Prison Term ("BPT"); Alfred R. Angele, Sharon Lawin, Booker T. Welch, Jones M. Moore, and Kenneth L. Risen, BPT Commissioners; and Kenneth E. Cater, Chief Deputy Commissioner of the BPT.

The defendants include state officials in charge of the Board of Prison Terms ("BPT") and the California Department of Corrections ("CDC"). The BPT and CDC officials are represented by Thomas Patterson, Deputy Attorney General, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000, San Francisco, CA 94102.

The <u>Valdivia</u> lawsuit challenges violations of parolees' rights under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution. The lawsuit asked the federal court to order the BPT and CDC to change parole revocation procedures to comply with the Constitution. No money damages were asked for, and none will be awarded in this class action case.

The <u>Valdivia</u> lawsuit claims that the BPT and CDC violated the Constitution in the following specific ways:

- The BPT and CDC arrest and hold parolees for weeks without any hearings to find out whether there is probable cause to hold them.
- The BPT and CDC do not tell parolees the charges against them or their rights before making parolees decide whether to accept a "screening offer." The BPT and CDC do not give parolees enough notice of the charges against them before the revocation or "Morrissey" hearing.
- The BPT and CDC use forms in parole revocation that are too hard to read.
- The BPT and CDC do not provide attorneys to represent parolees who should get attorneys under the Due Process Clause. When the BPT and CDC do provide attorneys, the attorneys do not get enough time to represent the parolee, and do not get enough information from the BPT and CDC.
- The BPT and CDC do not provide enough help for parolees with mental illness or other problems that make it hard for them to decide on screening offers or participate in revocation hearings.
- The BPT and CDC sometimes do not allow parolees to present witnesses and evidence needed to defend themselves at revocation hearings.
- The BPT and CDC sometimes do not allow parolees to cross-examine persons who provide evidence against them.

• The BPT's system for parole revocation appeals is unfair.

In June 2002, the federal court ruled on a pre-trial motion (motion for summary judgment) that the BPT and CDC violate parolees' constitutional rights by holding parolees for weeks, and sometimes months, without any hearings to find out whether there is enough evidence ("probable cause") to arrest the parolee. This order was published. You can find it in the law library at 206 F. Supp. 2d 1068, or Page 1068 of Volume 206 of the Federal Supplement. All of the other issues in the case have not yet been decided. The settlement means that these issues will not go to trial, except for two issues (BPT appeals and revocation extension hearings) that are not part of the settlement, and that may go to trial.

On November 18, 2003, the attorneys for both sides gave the federal court a negotiated plan in the form of a "Permanent Injunction," which would settle the lawsuit, and require the BPT and CDC to change the parole revocation procedures to fix the problems listed above. If approved by the court, the Permanent Injunction will require many changes in the revocation system. Here are some of the most important changes.

- The BPT and CDC will use alternatives to parole revocation, such as treatment in the community, for some parolees who would otherwise be arrested on parole violation charges.
- The BPT and CDC must give the parolees notice of the charges within 3 business days of the placement of a parole hold.
- All parolees will receive attorneys in the revocation process. Attorneys will help the parolees decide on any screening offers, and will represent parolees at any hearings.
- The BPT and CDC must provide attorneys with all non-confidential information they intend to use against the parolee. Due process limits what information the BPT and CDC can call confidential.
- Parolees' attorneys will be able to review parolees' field files.
- Attorneys will be provided with training on how to represent parolees effectively.

- If the attorney can show that there is no basis to continue holding the parolee, the BPT and CDC must provide an expedited (faster) hearing, six to eight business days after the parolee receives notice of the charges.
- Final revocation hearings must be held on or before the 35th calendar day after placement of the parole hold.
- Parolees' attorneys will be able to subpoena and present witnesses and documents for final revocation hearings, under the same way that the state can subpoena and present witnesses.
- Beginning July 1, 2005, the BPT and CDC must provide a preliminary hearing within 10 business days after the parolee has received notice of the charges, to find out if there is probable cause to hold the parolee. Parolees' attorneys will still be able to get a faster, expedited hearing, if they can show that there is no basis to hold the parolee.
- At the preliminary probable cause hearing, parolees will be allowed to
  present evidence to defend against the charges, or to show that revocation is
  not appropriate. The parolee and parolee's attorney will be allowed to
  present such evidence through the parolee's testimony, or through written
  documents.
- The BPT and CDC will not be permitted to use hearsay evidence against a parolee in a manner that violates the parolees' right to confront his or her accusers.
- The federal court will keep jurisdiction to enforce these requirements, and plaintiffs' counsel in <u>Valdivia</u> will monitor how the BPT and CDC comply.
- The settlement does not cover claims involving BPT appeals, and involving parole revocation extension hearings. These claims may still go to trial.

The settlement does not affect parolees' ability to sue the BPT and CDC for money damages regarding parole revocation, or to petition for a writ of habeas corpus. However, in any case asking for class or systemic relief, BPT and CDC officials may argue that the lawsuit should be dismissed because of the <u>Valdivia</u> settlement.

As part of this settlement, the attorneys for the parolees will ask the Court to have defendants' pay for attorneys' fees and expenses. The amount of these fees will be decided by the Court.

The <u>Valdivia v. Schwarzenegger</u> proposed settlement is set forth in a "Stipulated Order for Permanent Injunctive Relief." You can read this document at the prison law library, jail library, or parole office.

|--|

Parolees can write to the federal court about whether the settlement is fair and whether they object to attorneys' fees. The federal court will consider written comments when deciding whether to approve the settlement. Comments about the fairness of the settlement MUST include at the top of the first page the case name, Valdivia v. Schwarzenegger.

Comments must be received by \_\_\_\_\_\_, and must be sent to the following address:

Clerk of the Court
United States District Court
Eastern District of California
501 "I" Street
Sacramento, California 95814

The Court has scheduled a hearing on the fairness of the settlement for \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 2004, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ a.m./p.m. at the United States Courthouse in Sacramento, at the above address, in Courtroom 4.

For more information regarding this settlement, you may contact the parolees' lawyers at the following address and phone number:

Rosen, Bien & Asaro, LLP 155 Montgomery St., Eighth Floor San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: (415) 433-6830 Prison Law Office General Delivery San Quentin, CA 94964

Bingham McCutchen 3 Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111

Large print and audio tape versions of this document are available in the prison law library, jail library and parole office.

1 PROOF OF SERVICE 2 I, the undersigned, certify and declare that I am over the 3 age of 18 years, employed in the City and County of San 4 Francisco, California, and not a party to the within action. 5 My business address is 155 Montgomery Street, 8th floor, 6 San Francisco, California 94104. On the date specified below, I 7 served a true copy of the following document(s): 8 9 [PLAINTIFFS' PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND SCHEDULING HEARING ON 10 FINAL SETTLEMENT APPROVAL 11 on the parties in said action by causing same to be 12 delivered in the manner listed below: 13 14 BY U.S. MAIL Thomas S. Patterson 15 Deputy Attorney General 16 Office of the California Attorney General 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000 17 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004 18 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is 19 true and correct. Executed this 1st day of December, 2003, at 20 San Francisco, California. 21 22 23 James I. 24 25 26 27

28

United States District Court for the Eastern District of California December 3, 2003

\* \* CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE \* \*

2:94-cv-00671

Valdivias

v.

Wilson et al

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California.

That on December 3, 2003, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office, or, pursuant to prior authorization by counsel, via facsimile.

William Vernon Cashdollar Attorney General's Office 1300 I Street, Suite 125 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 AR/LKK

Stephen J Perrello Jr Law Office of Stephen J Perrello P O Box 880738 San Diego, CA 92168

Alexander L Landon Law Offices of Alex Landon 2442 Fourth Avenue San Diego, CA 92101

Laurel M Nelson NOT ED-CA ADMITTED Law Offices of Laurel M Nelson P O Box 462075 Escondido, CA 92046

Karen Kennard Bingham McCutchen LLP Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1800 San Francisco, CA 94111 Michael W Bien RSSR 2946V2067AJJK GGH Document 821 Filed 12/03/03 Page 17 of 17 155 Montgomery Street, Eighth Floor San Francisco, CA 94104

Donald Specter Prison Law Office General Delivery San Quentin, CA 94964

Thomas Stuart Patterson California Attorney General's Office 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004

John T Philipsborn Law Offices of John T Philipsborn 507 Polk Street, Suite 250 San Francisco, CA 94102

Kristen A Palumbo Bingham McCutchen LLP Three Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111-4067

Peter D Nussbaum Altshuler Berzon Nussbaum Rubin and Demain 177 Post Street, Suite 300 San Francisco, CA 94108

Jack L. Wagner, Clerk

Deputy Clerk