

1 DONALD SPECTER – 083925  
STEVEN FAMA – 099641  
2 ALISON HARDY – 135966  
SARA NORMAN – 189536  
3 REBEKAH EVENSON – 207825  
PRISON LAW OFFICE  
1917 Fifth Street  
4 Berkeley, California 94710-1916  
Telephone: (510) 280-2621

5 MICHAEL W. BIEN – 096891  
JANE E. KAHN – 112239  
6 ERNEST GALVAN – 196065  
ROSEN BIEN GALVAN & GRUNFELD LLP  
7 315 Montgomery Street, Tenth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94104-1823  
8 Telephone: (415) 433-6830

9 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
AND NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT COMPOSED OF THREE JUDGES  
PURSUANT TO SECTION 2284, TITLE 28 UNITED STATES CODE

RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. Civ S 90-0520 KJM DAD PC  
**THREE JUDGE COURT**

MARCIANO PLATA, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. C01-1351 TEH  
**THREE JUDGE COURT**  
**MOTION FOR FURTHER ENFORCEMENT ORDER**

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 On February 10, 2014, this Court issued an order granting Defendants an extra two years to  
3 reduce the prison population. The Order sets new population benchmarks and it requires  
4 Defendants to take certain measures “immediately” in order to ensure Defendants comply with the  
5 crowding cap at the end of two years. Order at 3. The Court issued an Opinion explaining the  
6 basis for its decision to grant the extra time – that Defendants had “belatedly” shown that they are  
7 “prepared to take the necessary steps toward achieving a durable solution without additional costly  
8 and wasteful litigation and delay,” and that the measures that Defendants had agreed to take would  
9 resolve conditions in the *long run*:

10 We recognize that these measures should have been adopted much earlier, that  
11 plaintiffs’ lawyers have made unceasing efforts to obtain immediate relief on behalf  
12 of their clients, and that California prisoners deserve far better treatment than they  
13 have received from defendants over the past four and a half years. Similarly,  
14 California’s citizens have incurred far greater costs, both financial and otherwise,  
15 as a result of defendants’ heretofore unyielding resistance to compliance with this  
16 Court’s orders. Finally, we recognize that this Court must also accept part of the  
17 blame for not acting more forcefully with regard to defendants’ obduracy in the  
18 face of its continuing constitutional violations. Nevertheless, resolving the  
19 conditions in California prisons for the long run, and not merely for the next few  
20 months, is of paramount importance to this Court as well as to the people of this  
21 State.

22 Opinion re: Order Granting in Part and Denying In Part Defs’ Request For Extension of  
23 December 31, 2013 Deadline, Feb. 10, 2014 at 3, 4.

24 The order was also based in part on Defendants’ assurances that they would not “appeal or  
25 support the appeal of any subsequent order necessary to implement the extension order or any of  
26 its provisions.” *Id.* at 3.

27 Just seven months have elapsed from the issuance of the extension, and Defendants have  
28 now yet again demonstrated an unwillingness to comply with the population reduction measures in  
their own plan and ordered by the Court. Although Defendants have achieved the first population  
reduction benchmark, they are far from full compliance, and the measures ordered by the Court  
were meant to resolve the issues in a “durable” manner for the “long run.” This Court should  
issue an order requiring Defendants to comply with its February 10, 2014 Order.

1  
2  
3 **II. THE COURT SHOULD ENFORCE ITS ORDER REQUIRING DEFENDANTS**  
4 **TO MAKE MINIMUM CUSTODY INMATES ELIGIBLE TO EARN 2-FOR-1**  
5 **GOOD TIME CREDITS.**

6 This Court's February 10, 2014, Order requires that Defendants "immediately" implement  
7 "[i]ncreased credits for ... for minimum custody inmates": "Minimum custody inmates will be  
8 eligible to earn 2-for-1 good time credits to the extent such credits do not deplete participation in  
9 fire camps where inmates also earn 2-for-1 good time credits." Order at 3.

10 There are many minimum custody inmates who are ineligible for fire camps, and for whom  
11 granting credits could never "deplete participation in fire camps." For example, prisoners with  
12 significant disabilities are not sent to fire camps, nor are those with serious medical or mental  
13 health conditions, or those with less than a year to serve. Preventing such prisoners from earning  
14 2-for-1 good time credits would have *no* impact on participation in fire camps. Nonetheless,  
15 Defendants have not implemented increased credits for such prisoners.

16 Plaintiffs attempted to resolve this matter informally with Defendants, but Defendants  
17 informed Plaintiffs' counsel they did not intend to grant 2-for-1 credits, *even for those* Plaintiffs  
18 who were minimum custody and ineligible to participate in fire camps.

19 Yesterday, Defendants stated that "extending two-for-one credit earnings to minimum  
20 custody inmates would adversely affect fire camp rates." Sept. 15, 2014, Status Report, Exh. B. at  
21 2 (ECF Nos. 2811-2/5218-2). But they do not explain how changing the credit earning for  
22 ineligible inmates would deplete fire camp participation rates.

23 Seven months have now passed since Defendants were ordered to take "immediate" action  
24 on these credits. Plaintiffs should have to wait no longer for the relief to be implemented.

25 **III. THE COURT SHOULD ENFORCE ITS ORDER REQUIRING DEFENDANTS**  
26 **TO INCREASE CREDITS FOR NON-VIOLENT SECOND STRIKE**  
27 **OFFENDERS**

28 This Court's February 10, 2014, Order requires that Defendants "immediately" implement  
"[i]ncreased credits for ... non-violent second strike offenders": "Non-violent second-strikers will  
be eligible to earn good time credits at 33.3% and will be eligible to earn milestone credits for

1 completing rehabilitative programs.” Order at 3.

2 Defendants have implemented this measure, but not for all non-violent second strikers.  
3 Instead, they made all non-violent second strikers eligible for credits *except* those who have a prior  
4 conviction for a sex offense. Sept. 15, 2014, Status Report, Exh. B. at 2 (ECF Nos. 2811-2/5218-  
5 2).

6 Defendants make no justification for deviating from the Court’s order requiring the credits  
7 be granted to “non-violent second strikers.” Defendants should not be permitted to unilaterally  
8 exclude some categories of non-violent offenders from the credits ordered by this Court.

9 **IV. THE COURT SHOULD ENFORCE ITS ORDER REQUIRING DEFENDANTS**  
10 **TO CREATE AND IMPLEMENT NEW PAROLE PROCEDURES**

11 Although this Court ordered Defendants to “immediately” create and implement new  
12 parole processes, seven months later Defendants have still not finalized, much less implemented,  
13 new parole processes for non-violent second offenders or persons who are 60-years old and who  
14 have served at least 25 years. Sept. 15, 2014, Status Report, Exh. B. at 2-3 (ECF Nos. 2811-  
15 2/5218-2).

16 Plaintiffs should have to wait no longer for the relief to be implemented. The Court should  
17 require the necessary policies to be finalized immediately, and should set a deadline of January 1,  
18 2015, to begin holding hearings for both categories of parole.

19 **V. CONCLUSION**

20 Permitting Defendants to change the credit reforms and delay the parole reforms that they  
21 had promised to implement in exchange for an extension of time not only violates the Court’s  
22 order, it also conflicts with the reasons that the Court granted the order in the first place: to create  
23 a “durable” solution that remedies crowding in the “long run.” Opinion re: Order, Feb. 10, 2014 at  
24 3, 4. The Court should enter a further enforcement order requiring Defendants to implement two-  
25 for-one credits for minimum custody inmates ineligible for fire camps, requiring Defendants to  
26 grant 33% credits to all non-violent second strikers, and setting a hard deadline for Defendants to  
27 implement new parole procedures required by the February 10, 2014, Order.  
28

