

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

NICHOLAS A. PALMIGIANO, et al.,

V.

C.A. No. 74-172

J. JOSEPH GARRAHY, et al.

THOMAS R. ROSS, et al.,

V.

C.A. No. 75-032

J. JOSEPH GARRAHY, et al.

## ORDER

On November 19, 1984, the Court entered an order which interalia set forth certain further compliance requirements and reporting and compliance deadlines with respect to the Court's remedial decree of August 10, 1977. The defendants have continued their compliance efforts since November 19, 1984 and have periodically reported on same to the Court and to the plaintiffs.

On June 24, 1985, the Court reactivated the Special Master to conduct an assessment of the defendants' success in meeting the terms of the November 19, 1984 Order. On July 22, 1985, the Special Master filed his Findings And Recommendations which interalia found that the defendants had not complied with certain important provisions of the November 19, 1984 Order and that although they had the plans and resource to comply with some of those provisions, they clearly were unable to do so under the current compliance deadlines.

On September 17, 1985, a status conference was held in chambers and appearing there with the Court were the Special Master, the defendant John Moran and certain of his subordinates,



Assistant Attorney General David Prior, counsel for the defendants, and Alvin J. Bronstein, counsel for the plaintiffs. At this status conference, the defendants reported on recent compliance efforts and also made oral motions to amend existing C.A. Par 14-112 compliance requirements and compliance and reporting deadlines, TOTAL OF GATABALL GAT BUT which motions were not opposed by the plaintiffs. Counsel for \*\*\*\* the plaintiffs advised the Court that plaintiffs agreed that the C.A. COL. 75-1991 defendants would be in compliance with the Court's orders with G. JORBER GRARAFT をひむ。 respect to housing and all environmental health and safety issues at the Maximum Security Facility by November 1, 1985 and, in light of the substantial compliance made by the defendants in eligi om de light de de grand de de those areas, the Court will grant those motions.

reportable and complaints weatherman alve respect to the west a At the September 17, 1985 status conference, the Court also remedial decree of august 10, 2007. The appendance have community considered the July 22, 1985 Findings and Recommendations of the i es la company Special Master and heard from the parties with respect to the current state of overcrowding and idleness at the Medium Security On June 24, 30%0, the Court resources the special Mauren to facility and the Intake Service Center and the impact of said overcrowding and idleness on the basic housing, health, environmental and safety standards which the defendants are required to meet under the prior orders of the Court. The Court determined that an evidentiary hearing was necessary at the I Republication of the Santa Charles of the Thirty Control of the Contro earliest possible time to examine these issues and to determine whether further remedial relief is required to protect the constitutional rights of the plaintiffs as set forth in the earlier decrees of this Court.

It is therefore the order, judgement and decree of this Court that:

- 1. The defendants' motion to permit the use of the infirmary isolation cells at the Maximum Security Facility for short term disciplinary purposes, that is for no more than thirty (30) days, is granted provided, however, that the defendants within sixty (60) days from the date of this Order submit to the Court and to the plaintiffs a written description of their plan for the use of these cells and a description of steps taken to ensure that the abuse which characterized their earlier use will not recur.
- 2. The defendants' motion to extend their time to complete the renovations at the Old Maximum Security facility to November 1,:1985 and to thereafter continue to use the facility for the housing of prisoners indefinitely so long as they maintain that facility in compliance with the minimum standards set forth in the August 10, 1977 order is granted. A report detailing the status of these renovations shall be filed with the Court and plaintiffs by November 15, 1985.
- 3. By November 30, 1985, the defendants shall provide the Court and plaintiffs with a formal report which details all plans, either in place or prospective, together with funding sources and timetables, for providing meaningful vocational and industrial programming in each facility of the Adult Correctional Institutions.
- 4. This matter be set for an evidentiary hearing commencing Monday, December 16 1985 at 9:30 a.m. The Court will take

मिन एक नोजानमानम्क होत् नमन्त्र । द्वार नकार्य । हुन्। evidence on the current state of overcrowding and idleness at the Medium Security Facility, including its protective custody population, and the Intake Service Center and the impact of said conditions on the basic housing, health, environmental and safety Signification of the sound in the second in standards which the defendants are required to meet under the acquested which one descinance are required to meet and and sections as 5. The Co

Court and to six purification Court is willing to consider a reasonable modification of the dates in this Order provided an application for modification is submitted to the Court within one week of 

By Order,

2. 3952 and to theresteen control Clerk and to Characters. · 在中央的 中国 医生物 如此,这一种的 "这种"的 "这种"的 "这种"的 "这种"的 "这种"。

September 30, 1985

pendunting and out offer with a section and His control in the control of the control

plans, alther in these on a companion resource this foreing

Product to the second of the s

A special of marginet recoefficients age