UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SOUTHERN DIVISION

BEFORE: HON. GEORGE B. HARRIS, JUDGE

ROBERT CHARLES JORDAN, JR.,

Plaintiff and Petitioner,

VS.

c. J. FITZHARRIS, et al,

Defendants and Respondents.

No. 44309 and 44786

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT EVIDENTIARY HEARING

August 17, 1966

Reported by: MERILYN SEYBERT

7

14 15

16 17

18

19

21

20

22

20

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 17 1966, MORNING SESSION- 10:30 A.M.

THE CLERK: Civil Action 44309 and 44786, Robert Charles Jordan, Jr. vs. C. J. Fitzharris, et al, for further evidentiary hearing.

MR. COHLER: Ready for the plaintiff and petitioner, your Honor.

MR. GRANUCCI: Ready, Your Honor.

May it please the Court, at this time the defendants are ready to proceed to call Officer Caldwell, please.

THE CLERK: Officer Caldwell.

TERRY H. CALDWELL,

called as a witness on behalf of the defendants, being duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Will you state your full name and occupation to the Court.

THE WITNESS: Terry H. Caldwell, Correctional Officer, Correctional Training Facility.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. OAKES:

- Q. Officer Cladwell, you stated that you are currently employed as a correctional officer at Soledad State Prison.

 Is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. How long have you been so employed?
 - A. Three years.

- 1
- 3
- 4
- 6
- 7 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15

- 17
- 18
- 20

19

- 21
- 23
- 24
- 25

- Where have you been employed or assigned? Q.
- Generally completely throughout the institution, A. facets of officers' work.
- During the course of your employment, have you ever been assigned as an officer to the first floor of O-wing?
 - I have. A.
 - Q. How long were you assigned to this wing?
 - Approximately nine months. A.
 - During what watch was that? Q.
 - The first watch. A.
 - Q. What nine months period was that, please?
- Between approximately June of '65 until March of A. 166.
 - What days of the week did you work? Q.
 - Tuesday through Sunday.
- During this period that you were assigned as an Q. officer to O-wing on the first watch--Withdraw that, please.

What hours of the day consist of the first watch?

- Between 12:00 midnight and 8:00 a.m. A.
- During the period when you were an officer in Owing during the first watch, how many officers were on duty in O-wing?
- Myself on the first floor, and another officer on the second floor.

- Q. Did the other officer also have control of the third floor?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Was there a sergeant on duty at that time?
 - A. No.
- Q. Would you describe briefly your duties during this watch.
- A. We make count approximately every two hours, we filled in isolation logs, made callings on the half hour.
- MR. COHLER: Excuse me. I didn't hear the witness. You did what?

THE WITNESS: We made telephone calls to the control room every half hour.

--control and custody of the inmates.

- MR. OAKES: Q. Would you describe your duties during this period as primarily custodial in nature?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You were there primarily to keep control and were there in case something would happen?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Did you ever go back into the cell area other than to make a count?
 - A. Yes sir.
 - Q. For what purposes?
 - A. Security checks, any type of a problem with an

inmate that --

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

17

16

18

19 20

21

22

24

23

A. Yes.

THE COURT: Could you speak just a little louder.

I say, any time we had a problem with an THE WITNESS: inmate, I would have to go back.

You will have to speak a little louder and THE COURT: a little slower. The stenographic reporter has to get all this.

MR. OAKES: Q. How many times on an average would you be back in the cell areas, other than the times you were making a count?

- I would say three, four times.
- Q. A night?
- Yes sir. A.
- That includes the so-called quiet cell area? Q.
- Yes sir. A.
- How long did it take you to make a count? Q.
- Of the entire wing? Or of the one section? Α.
- Q. ' Of the one section.
- A. Two, three minutes.
- Q. What are you required to see when you make a count?
- Α. Human flesh.
- Do you attempt to be thorough in making this count? Q.
- As thorough as possible in the length of time. A.
- You also attempted to be fairly rapid? Q.

- 2
- 5
- 6
- 7 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 21

20-

- 22 23
- 24
- 25

- Why is this, please? Q.
- Well, the longer you are back there, the more noise vou are going to make. And this is an essential thing on the first watch, is to be as quiet as possible. less time you are back there, naturally the less noise you are going to make.
- Did you have a specific time that you were required to provide water or flush the commodes?
 - A. No.
 - Did you normally flush the commodes? Q.
 - No. A.
 - Why not? Q.
 - Because of the disturbance. Α.
- Would you provide an inmate water during this shift Q. if he requested it?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. How much?
 - As much as he would take.
 - Did you ever limit him to one cup? Q.
 - Α. No.
- If a man had more than one cup in his cell, would Q. you fill up all his cups?
 - A. Definitely.
- On the average, do you recall whether most men do Q. Or more than one cup? have one cup only?

4 5

6

8

9

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

22

21

24

23

25

- A. Usually two or three.
- Q. Would you generally leave a cup?
- A. Yes.
- Q. During the period that you worked in the Adjustment Center or O-wing, would you say that the flaps in the quiet cells were more often closed? Or more often open?

MR. COHLER: Excuse me. Would you state the period of time, counsel? Are you covering the whole period?

MR. OAKES: I said during the period he worked in the Adjustment Center. The whole period.

MR. COHLER: The whole period. Thank you.

MR. OAKES: Q. You may answer.

- A. Generally they were closed.
- Q. This is true at the time in July of last year?
- A. Yes sir.
- Q. Were they sometimes open?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Were they always closed?
- A. No.
- Q. If a man requested his flaps to be open, would you open them?
- A. Using my own judgment, if the man had been causing a disturbance no, I would not open them. But if he remained quiet for a length of time, I would open them.
 - Q. If a man asked his flaps to be closed, would you

close them?

- A. Definitely.
- Q. Did that often happen?
- A. Yes, it did.
- Q. Were the doors open during that period, or were they more often closed?
 - A. More often closed.
- Q. When the flaps were closed, could you still hear a person held in a quiet cell if he called out to gain your attention?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Have you ever experienced difficulty in hearing a man?
- A. No sir. Excuse me. Other than unless there was a disturbance going on some place else in the wing.
- Q. When you were making the count and checking the cells during the count, did you check the quiet cells more carefully than the regular isolation cells?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Why?
- A. Well, because of the type of inmates that we have back there. We are always anticipating something to be wrong, destroying what facilities he has or attempting to mutilate himself or destruct himself.
 - Q. In making this check, would you be apt to detect

2 3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

3

5

6

7

9

.0

.1

.2

3

4

5

В

7

8

(

2

3

4

an unusal state of uncleanliness?

- A. I think so g yes:
- Q. Officer Caldwell, would you consider a cell which had excrement on the floor and on the walls to be unusually unclean?
 - A. Yes, I would.
 - Q. Is the existence of such a condition quite unusual?
 - A. Yes, it is, very.
 - Q. What is the prevalent odor present in O-wing?
 - MR. COHLER: Counsel, you are asking the whole wing?
 - MR. OAKES: Yes.
 - MR. COHLER: I just want to be clear.

THE WITNESS: Wherever you have a large number of people living together, you are going to have human odors, body odors. I remember when I was in the service, the dormitories that we lived in had an odor that I was not familiar with. But it is about the same odor that you would get in a school gym, something like that.

- MR. OAKES: Q. Or perhaps an Army barracks?
- A. Yes.
- Q. This same odor is perhaps prevalent throughout any wing?
 - A. Throughout the entire institution.
 - Q. Is the same odor prevalent in the quiet cell area?
 - A. Yes.

- 1
- 5
- 6
- 7 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21 22
- 23
- 24
- 25 BY MR. COHLER:

- Perhaps a little stronger? Or about the same? Q.
- Well, because of the fact that these people are not allowed to take a shower every day and clean themselves as you or I would, it is a little stronger, yes.
 - Do you recognize the plaintiff, Mr. Jordan? Q.
 - Yes. A.
- Do you recall that Mr. Jordan was housed in a quiet Q. cell during the month of July of last year?
 - Yes, I do. Α.
- Do you recall seeing excrement on the floor and on the walls of Mr. Jordan's cell?
 - . A. No, I don't.
 - Do you recall smelling such a condition? Q.
 - Α. No.
- If you had smelled such a condition, do you think you would recall it now?
 - Definitely. Α.
- Do you recall seeing or smelling vomit in Mr. Jordan's cell?
 - No, I don't. A.
- If you had smelled such a condition, do you think you would remember it now?
 - A. I think so, yes.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

- Q. Officer Caldwell, how old are you?
- A. Twenty-four.

- Q. Would you state again, please, how long you have worked on the first floor of O-wing as a correctional officer.
 - A. How long I did work there?
 - Q. You are not working there now?
 - A. No. I am not.
 - Q. How long did you work there?
 - A. Approximately nine months.
 - Q. From what time to what time?
- A. Between approximately June of 1965 until March of
- Q. You said you never experienced difficulty in hearing an inmate make a request from a quiet cell. Is that correct?
- A. I said unless there was noise elsewhere, I could hear him.
- Q. How does one tell whether or not he has heard something if he hasn't heard it? How does he know he hasn't heard it?
- A. Well, you don't know. You just assume that if there is noise and the man is back there and he is hollering you are not going to hear him. You don't know whether he is hollering or not.

- Q. How do you make the judgment that the man is not hollering any more in order to open up the flaps?
- A. Well, to my best recollection, the people in the strip cells were naturally the most apt to be noisy. This is the reason they are back there. It was generally the rule that these were the only people making the noise.

However, if we continue to let him make the noise, the rest of the section became usually involved. But generally speaking, these were the only people that were in that section making the noise.

- Q. Was there generally noise from that section?
- A. I wouldn't say generally. Quite a bit of the time, there was.
- Q. You say there was noise more of the time? Or not noise more of the time?
 - A. Not more of the time, no.
 - Q. Then why were the flaps closed more of the time?
- A. Because of the fact that there was always the possibility of the noise starting. In other words, if the flaps remained open, if a man started causing a disturbance, which has happened several times, it takes some time to get back there, and as has been the case several times, before the officer could get back there he had agitated other inmates into going along with him and causing a general disturbance.

- 7
- 10
- 11

- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23

- Then in order to prevent the recurrence of the disturbance, you leave the flaps closed, is that right?
 - A. Yes.
- You said you sometimes exercise your discretion and you open the flaps.
 - That is right.
- Why do you do that if there is cause for recurrence of the disturbance?
- Well, if a person has shown himself capable of being quiet, I will open the flaps &
- How long does he have to be quiet in order to satisfy Q. you in your duties?
 - For a day, two days, three days.
 - It could be as long as three days?
 - It could be, yes.
- You mention that inmates in quiet cells sometimes destroy the facilities there. What facilities do they destroy?
 - Their clothing, their bedding.
- You stated that your primary purpose in making a check was to see "human flesh," is that correct?
 - This is true A.
- In other words, the purpose is to tell whether or not the inmate is still there?
 - Right. This is the purpose of the count. A.

- Q. How about a security check, is that the same thing?
- A. No, it isn't.
- Q. What is the purpose of the security check, if it differs?
- A. A security check is to make sure that the wing is secured, that all locks are locked, all doors are closed, also to check for any unusual occurrences, such as a possible attempted suicide or self mutilation, possible escape.
- Q. A security check, as the name implies to me, is to maintain security, to make sure the man is still there and is not hurting himself or cutting his bars or something of that nature.
 - A. That is true.
- Q. About how long does it take to make a security check?
- Well, let me start at the beginning. How many cells do you check in making a security check?
- A. There are 24 cells on each side in each section.

 Like I say, we go back there maybe three, four times a

 night, other than the counts to make these checks. So it

 could vary. There is no set time.
 - Q. Do you check all 48 cells yourself?
 - A. Yes, I do.
 - Q. Do you check each cell on each security check?

9

12

11

13 14

15

18 17

18 19

20

22

23 24

- A. No, I don't.
- Q. Do you have a planned method of rotating the cells you check?
- A. This is something that we have been instructed not to do, is to form a pattern.
- Q. Do you have a means for keeping track for yourself which cells you have checked and which you haven't
 - A. No. I don't.
- Q. You try to keep track in your memory, "Last time I saw this one and that one, and I will see this one this time," or maybe you double up sometimes?
 - A. Possibly.
- Q. It is a possibility you wouldn't see every cell in the course of the night, is that correct?
 - A. No, it isn't.
- Q. What do you do to keep yourself from missing a cell out of 48? Do you keep track of them all in your memory?
- A. I have worked in wings where I kept track of 131 cells.
 - Q. You don't write this down or anything?
 - A. No, I don't.
- Q. About how long does it take to make an average security check?
- A. Well, I will put it this way: I mentioned before that you had to make a call in every half hour. So the

longest I would be back there would be a half an hour.

- Q. You have other duties as well, don't you?
- A. I do.

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

30

22

23

- Q. Can you estimate the average length of time to make a security check?
 - A. Ten, twenty minutes.
- Q. While you are making the security check, you are keeping track in your own memory as to which cells you have seen and which cells you haven't seen, and really all you are looking for is to see whether or not bars are cut or people are out of their cells or things of that nature. Is that right?
 - A. Basically, yes.
- Q. You have testified about a general odor in O-wing as being gymnasium-like or barracks-like.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. How did the odor strike you on the first floor of 0-wing when you first began working there in June of 1965?
 - A. I don't recall.
 - Q. Would you say the whole place stunk, to you?
- A. The whole institution stunk the first day I went to work there.
 - Q. How about the first floor in O-wing?
- A. I didn't notice anything particularly strong about the odor.

- 2
- 3
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 10
- 11
- Ļ
- !3
- 1**4**
- .в
- .7
- ,8
- .9
- 11
- 12
- !3
- 4

.4 odo

- Q. Would you say that when the flaps are closed on the strip cell or quiet cells and if the doors are closed that this may restrict the emanation of odor from the cell?
 - A. No, it would not.
 - Q. It would not?
 - A. It would not.
 - Q. Would you explain that, please.
- A. The cells have a ventilating system, both incoming and outgoing air, to my knowledge.
- Q. I am concerned about how the odor might get out of that cell, whatever odor it is, so that you would observe it up in front in the officers' area. If the flaps are closed and the door is closed, doesn't this restrict the odor coming out of the cell?
 - A. I would like to explain.
 - Q. Please.
- A. The ventilating system that we have in there, for some reason, I don't know why, but any strong odor such as gas, human defecation invariably comes through the vents in the officers' area. We don't have the—in the officers' area, we don't have any windows and the door is locked all the time. The only ventilation that we have is what comes—it seems to me, comes from the cells, because whenever a person has been—they have used tear gas back there or there has been defecation in the tiers, we get it.

 Q. Now, tear gas has a way of spreading in many directions, does it not?

MR. OAKES: Pardon me. What kind of tear gas?

MR. COHLER: It is my understanding the institution uses only one type.

MR. OAKES: There are three types.

MR. COHLER: There are three types of containers. But $c_{\rm N}$ was the only type Mr. Donnelly testified to.

MR. GRANUCCI: There was also testimony about Mace, which is a new type of tear gas.

MR. COHLER: Yes. I am wrong.

- Q. Excluding Mace, which is a new type of tear gas--
- A. We have one type. But this comes in two different-one is a powder and one is a liquid, as Mr. Donnelly already stated-one is a vapor, rather.

The powder, to my best recollection, does not spread itself too much. It is the vapor that--

- Q. Let's limit our attention to the vapor tear gas. When vapor tear gas is used, for whatever reason, isn't the presence of that vapor tear gas noticeable from many directions and in a fairly large area?
 - A. Yes, I would say so.
- Q. On the first floor of O-wing, the west corridor, there are no solid doors from the quiet cell area up to the officers' area, are there?

A. No.

5

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23 â

- Q. And if you noticed tear gas in the officers' area, might you not notice that as well coming through the corridor as it may be possibly coming through the ventilation system?
- A. I seem to notice it more in the officers' area and in the area that it was used rather than in the corridor. Whether this is something unusual to me, I don't know.
- Q. The question is how it might get there. It may come down the corridor and be trapped in the officers' area, might it not, since you say you have no doors and windows in the officers' area?
 - A. This is true.
- Q. And there are no closings on the windows in the corridor, they are open, holes, six above each window space?
 - A. To my best recollection, yes.
- Q. So you really don't know whether or not the odor of tear gas came through any ventilation system or came down the corridor and hung in the officers' area, do you?
- A. I do know that quite a large amount came through the ventilation system.
 - Q. How do you know that, sir?
- A. Well, in the summer months it gets pretty warm in there because of the fact we have no windows. And this one ventilating--this one vent that we have in the center of

the officers' area, when we were--worked up a sweat or something, we would stand under this and cool off. We would drape a towel over it so it would force the air downward, and I would try to remain in there for awhile. And I always noticed whenever there was tear gas used back there, that odor came from the vents.

- Q. When you said "back there," you mean somewhere in the first floor of O-wing?
 - A. Yes.

в

- Q. Officer Caldwell, July was the second month of nine that you had worked on the first floor of O-wing, is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Is your recollection of your experience in O-wing more fresh with regard to those times nearer the present time? Or do you have a better recollection of the further back times?
 - A. I couldn't honestly say for sure.
 - Q. All sort of jumbled together, your whole experience?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You can't separate out July 1965 in your recollection, can you?
 - A. There was nothing outstanding about the month, no.
- Q. Can you separate out July 1965 in your recollection, Officer?

2

3

Б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

23

24

- Q. Other than the fact that you may have reviewed certain records to determine that plaintiff Jordan was in a quiet cell in July 1965, do you have any recollection of his being there?
- A. Inmate Jordan was in the quiet cells quite often. I remember a time in January. I remember a time in July.
 - Q. January 1966?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you actually specifically remember Mr. Jordan's presence in the quiet cell? Or haven't you refreshed your recollection with certain records?
 - A. I would say a little bit of both.
- Q. Who else was in the quiet cell when Mr. Jordan was in there in July 1965?
 - A. During the time that Mr. Jordan was in that cell?
- Q. Right. Can you tell us the names of the other inmates that were in the quiet cells during that time?
 - A. Several others moved in and out.
 - Q. Do you recall their names?
 - A. Well, Esparza.
 - Q. In July 1965?
 - A. I believe so, yes, to my best recollection.
 - Q. Go ahead. What were their names?
 - A. Wells and Esparza.

- 2
- 3.
- 4

- 6
- 7
- 9
- 10 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17 18
- 19
- 50
- 21
- 22
- 23 24
- 64 95

- Q. Can you recall any others?
- A. Not offhand, no.
- MR. COHLER: Mr. Grace, may I have Plaintiff's Exhibit 13, please. Excuse me. I meant Plaintiff's Exhibit 12.
 - Q. How certain is your recollection, Officer?
 - A. Oh, I wouldn't say it is completely certain, no.
 - Q. How certain is it?
- A. Well, I will say I remember these three people being in the strip cell during the time that I worked there and--
 - Q. At the same time? In July 1965?
 - A. I believe so. I can't say I am absolutely positive.
- Q. Officer, I would like you to look carefully through Plaintiff's Exhibit 12.
- First, let me ask you whether or not you recognize these copies of an isolation log, two pages; one being official visitations, and one being movements of inmates. Do you so recognize?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. You are accustomed to working with those documents in the course of your duties?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Those documents are intended to reflect the names of all inmates in this area, aren't they?
 - A. This reflects the names of people on isolation.

- Q. Yes. And if Mr. Wells or Mr. Esparza were in the quiet cell or strip cell at this time, their names should be in there, shouldn't they?
 - A. No, not necessarily.
 - Q. All right. Would you explain that, please.
- A. If a person was moved for creating a disturbance and placed in a strip cell, he does not necessarily—there are times when he is not put on isolation. He may come out in two days or three days. This is not—isolation is a classification, and these people are sometimes put in the quiet cells for one or two days and then taken out. So his name would not have to be on this.
- Q. Would you look through there and see whether or not these gentlemen were on isolation status that you have mentioned.
- MR. OAKES: We will stipulate their names do not appear.

 THE WITNESS: From what I have gone through so far, I

 do not see their names.
- MR. COHLER: Q. Do you recall who was on duty with you July 9th through July 20th 1965?
- A. Yes. There were two men that were usually on with me; Mr. Cecil, who was the regular second tier officer, and Mr. Hendricks who worked the relief positions, two days upstairs and two days downstairs.
 - Q. Do you ever have any conversations with inmates

8

6

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

24

while they are in the wuiet cells or strip cells during your watch?

- Many times. A.
- Who did you have conversations with July 9th through July 20th in the quiet cells or strip cells?
 - I can't remember. Α.
- When the flaps are closed on the quiet cells or Q. strip cells, are they all closed? Or some open and some closed?
- A. · They are not all closed. Sometimes one cell might be left open and the other cell closed.
- Can you recall which cells had the flaps open from Q. July 9th through July 20th, and which cells had flaps closed from July 9th to July 20th?
 - Α. No.
- Isn't it true, Officer, that you really have no recollection of July 9th through July 20th other than your general impression of what was supposed to be done during the whole period you were on duty?
 - A. Basically, yes.
- MR. GRANUCCI: Object to the form of the question as overly argumentative. If counsel would rephrase it to eliminate the phrase about what was "supposed" to be done, and substitute in what he generally did, I think the question might be more acceptable. As it is, I think it is

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

19

20 21

22

23

24

A. Yes.

BY MR. OAKES:

confusing and a bit unfair.

MR. COHLER: I would like to be able to ask both questions if I have to, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. GRANUCCI: With that understanding, I will withdraw the objection.

MR. COHLER: I believe the witness stated an answer.

Did the reporter get an answer?

THE REPORTER: Yes.

MR. COHLER: What was it?

THE REPORTER: The answer: "Basically, yes."

MR. COHLER: Q. And the same is true, is it not, that you have no independent recollection of July 9th through July 20th; it is melted in with all your experiences throughout the time you worked on the first floor of O-wing?

- A. There was nothing that set it out from any other times. It was a normal period.
 - Q. Would you answer the question, please.
 - A. No. It does not stand out in my mind.

MR. COHLER: Thank you.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

Q. Officer Caldwell, you did work during the period of July 9th through July 20th 1965?

в

- Q. Mr. Jordan was in the strip cell area during that time, was he not?
 - A. Yes, he was.
- Q. Aside from your independent recollection, would you have recalled whether or not the cells would have been in an unclean condition at that time?
 - A. I would have known, yes.
 - Q. Would you recall that now?
- A. If there was anything outstandingly filthy about the cells, such as human defecation, I would notice it because these things do stand out in my mind. There have been times when this odor has been in the wing, and you just can't miss it.
- Q. Fine. Thank you. Now, when you check the wings, what do you do?
 - A. When I--
 - Q. Or check the cells, pardon me.
- A. As I stated before, I try to--not to stand around them too long to arouse the inmates. But I shine my light around the fixtures, the plumbing devices, the bars of the cell, shine it on the inmate, keeping it out of his face as much as possible, possibly take a glance on the bed. It varies. Like I say, there is no set pattern, so you--
- Q. Now, in checking a quiet cell, do you have to open up either the door or the flap if they happen to be closed?

- A. Generally we open the door.
- Q. Generally you open the door?
- A. Yes.

3

5

8

8

9

.1

.2

3

4

5

7

8

9

0

- Q. You, therefore, go inside?
- A. Might step inside, yes.
- Q. So in order to detect, perhaps a nauseous odor, you would not have to stand outside the cell?
 - A. No.
- Q. During the course of the evening, will you not detect this because you had been into the cell itself?
 - A. Definitely. If it was there, you would pick it out.
- Q. You stated on direct examination that there are two men on duty in O-wing.
 - A. Right.
- Q. When you go back in the cell area, what procedures are followed?
- A. If I have to go back into the cell area, I call the officer upstairs. He comes down. I give him my keys and he opens the doors for me and I go back. I never go into the cell area on my own. There is always the officer there.
 - Q. That means he has to leave his post?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. And vice versa. If he goes back, you must leave your post?
 - A. Yes.

- 1 2
- 3
- 5
- 6
- 7 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 21

- 24
- A. No, I do not.
- Q. Never?

Therefore, if a disturbance were to be created during this shift, he would have to come downstairs, open the cell, let you inside--

- A. Open the--
- I am sorry. Open the grille gate? Q.
- Right. A_{\circ}
- And his floor would be left unguarded? Q.
- Right. Yes sir. A_{\circ}
- Q. If a disturbance were to spread, you would have to obviously call for more help, is that correct?
 - ' A. Definitely.
- How heavily staffed is the institution during your shift?
- As I remember, on the first watch we have 14 A. officers taking care of 10 wings, plus four towers, plus we have an outside sergeant, a control sergeant, and a watch lieutenant and a watch sergeant.
 - MR. OAKES: I have no further questions.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. COHLER:

- Officer Caldwell, in making a security check or head count, do you ever open the window flaps on the door rather than opening the door?

- 1
- 2
- 4
- 5

- 8
- 10 11
- 12
- 13 14
- 15
- 17
- ļ

30

- 11
- ?3

22

¥

Q. Please. Be very careful.

A. Let me back up.

- A. I would never open the window flap because of the fact I can't hardly lift it.
- Q. I don't mean the big one. There is a little flap on the door itself, isn't there?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. That is the one I am referring to. Do you ever open that to make a head count or a security check?
- A. No, because of the fact it is a little taller--I am not very tall, and I can't see into the cell.
- Q. You mentioned on some occasions there had been an odor in the wing, noticeable to you. Isn't it true that on some occasions a number of inmates will throw things out into the corridors which would create a large mess, which would include a large odor?
- A. During a disturbance I have never noticed a complete difference in the change of the smell, unless, of course, they had been burning. This has been the only time that the odor has changed to any significance.

Usually what is thrown out on the tier, which is always, every day, thrown out on the tier--there is paper, sand-wiches, orange peelings, just general debris.

Q. There has been some testimony that on some occasions inmates will throw human defecation out on the

1

3

в

7

5

8

10

11

13

15

14

16

17 18

19

20 21

> 22 23

24

officers or out into the tier, or throwing it generally. Has this ever happened in your experience?

A. I have never had it thrown at me. However, on two occasions—I can't remember the dates—there has been defecation thrown on the tier itself, I believe to get me to step in it or something like this. But it has been there, and you can't miss it.

- O. Has there been a noticeable odor then?
- A. Well, this is how I found it.
- Q. Was there a noticeable odor?
- A. Yes, definitely.
- Q. You can't remember those dates, though?
- A. No, I can't remember the dates.

Excuse me. I might add that these--both times were on eastside.

the "Max" side, the D side. I have never had it, while I have been working there, on the west side or the isolation side.

MR. COHLER: Thank you.

MR. OAKES: I have no further questions at this time, Your Honor.

(Witness excused.)

MR. GRANUCCI: At this time defendant would like to

RAUL MATA,

called as a witness on behalf of defendant, being duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: State your full name and occupation to the Court.

THE WITNESS: My name is Raul Mata. I am a correctional officer.

MR. COHLER: Your Honor, if the Clerk, will hand the Court the file, including the list of witnesses, it will appear that this gentleman's name is not included. I understand there is a limited purpose for which defendants call officer Mata. I would like it to be clear on the record by motion, and if it is as limited as it should be, I will not resist; if it is not, I will resist strenuously.

MR. OAKES: Your Honor, the issues of this case have gone broader than what occurred in July, the issues created originally by the plaintiff's complaint, we have heard a lot of testimony about witnesses who were present and about occurrences to them on occasions other than July last year. I think it is fair that this man testify about his experiences, which go beyond the time of July 9th to July 20th 1965.

MR. COHLER: Your Honor, I understand that Officer Mata may have some testimony very relevant to the so-called tear gas incident previous to Thanksgiving. Testimony has been heard from inmate Esparza and inmate Wells regarding that incident. I have no objections to examination regarding that incident.

prised by any testimony by Officer Mata going beyond that.

There was considerable pretrial difficulty involving this very question which was obviated through the courtesy of defendants! counsel, and that was very shortly before trial. On that occasion, Officer Mata was not brought into the picture and no opportunity for preparation regarding officer Mata has been available.

I am willing to forego any objection which may lie only insofar as it involves the tear gas incident. I don't testimonist think I should have to face at this time about Officer mata's general experience ranging the whole period of time he may have been at the institution.

MR. OAKES: Your Honor, as I said previously, there has been testimony about periods other than the period in question.

THE COURT: Let's proceed and see what we eventuate.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. OAKES:

- Q. Officer Mata, how are you employed, sir?
- A. How am I employed?
- Q. Yes.
- A. I work at the Correctional Training Facility at Soledad.
 - Q. Dor how long?

What is your current assignment, please?

I worked there for approximately eight and a half

I am assigned to the isolation section in the Ad-

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

vears.

Q.

Q.

Q.

A۰

Q. That would be beginning approximately November of

last year, 1965?

- A. Yes sir.
- Q. Do you know inmates Esparza and Wells?

During what shift is that, please?

For approximately ten months.

I work the second watch, 7:30 to 4:00.

How long have you been assigned to this?

A. Yes sir, I do.

justment Center, O-wing.

- MR. COHLER: Excuse me, counsel. Just so the record is clear, Mr. Wells is no longer an inmate.
- MR. OAKES: Q. Do you know a Mr. Esparza and a Mr. Wells?
 - A. Yes sir, I do.
- Q. Do you recall their being in the quiet cells in November of last year, 1965?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Calling your attention to the period around Thanksgiving of last year, do you recall an incident in which there was a use of tear gas involving Mr. Esparza?

A. Yes.

Q. Would you like to relate your version of what occurred at that time?

A. Yes sir. It was approximately November 23rd or 24th, and the Adjustment Center Disciplinary Committee was hearing Esparza's and Wells' disciplinaries in front of their cells.

At that time Esparza "exploded" and climbed on the bars and started rattling and shouting obscenities and attempting to create a general disturbance. It was impossible to continue the hearing, and he was instructed by Mr. Johnston and Sergeant Friedrick and myself to cease that kind of behavior, and he, of course, did not comply, and the disturbance was beginning to spread. I heard other people shouting and yelling and rattling bars in the isolation section. I heard bars rattling upstairs.

And Mr. Johnston and Mr. Friedrick conferred and decided to use tear gas. And, of course, the equipment was received and Mr. Friedrick--

- Q. Let me interrupt for a moment. Was there first any request to remove Mr. Esparza's clothing, or that he pass out his clothing?
 - A. Yes. Yes.
 - Q. Please continue.
 - Q. And he, of course, Esparza, refused to pass out his

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

17

6

18

[9

10 11

3

Ä

clothing and equipment. Mr. Friedrick instructed Esparza numerous times, two or three times. The first time Esparza went into a fighting stance and told him, "Fuck you, punk. come in and get them."

Mr. Friedrick again instructed him to pass out the equipment, and each time was met with a defiance and a challenge. As a last resort Mr. Friedrick told him that if he didn't, tear gas would be applied.

Esparza told him, "Fuck you. It ain't no big thing. Go ahead."

At this time, Mr. Friedrick instructed me to release a short burst of tear gas. I put on a gas mask and stepped into the small section right outside the bars and squatted and released one short spray.

Esparza was approximately three-quarters of the way from the bars, and he had a blanket over him.

I released a short spray onto the floor. He dropped the blanket. He ran over. He grabbed me by the gas mask. I jerked away from him, bumped my head against the wall, and then I released another short spray approximately knee-He immediately said, "I give up. Here is my clothes. And he took them off and passed them out.

- Am I correct in stating then that you did not spray Q. tear gas about the upper portion--
 - No sir, I didn't. A.

. 9

10

11

12

13.

15

14

18

19

18

21

50

23

22

24

- Q. As I recall, was it two or three bursts?
- A. It was two bursts.
- Q. Did you empty the canister into that cell?
- A. No sir.
- Q. Was inmate Wells housed next to this man?
- A. Yes sir.
- Q. Did you spray any gas into Mr. Wells' cell?
- A. No sir.
- Q. None at all?
- A. No.
- Q. Were the flaps on Mr. Esparza's cell closed or open when you left?
 - A. They were open.
- MR. OAKES: At this time I would like to go into his general duties, Your Honor, if I may.

MR. COHLER: Your Honor, I am hesitating to go into this, but I feel that I have to object strenuously. Plaintiff, counsel submitted interrogatories propounded to the Superintendent of the institution. Those interrogatories have been discussed previously.

As Your Honor will recall from the testimony, in large part the answers were "No information is available."

What inferences may be drawn from that is not the subject of my present discussion. There was a difficulty in the understanding of the interrogatories apprently, and the

б

answers to them, which was brought out in discussion between Mr. Granucci and myself on at least two occasions, the last of those occasions was very shortly before trial was set.

I felt that I would be surprised by the presence of eye witnesses having once been told--and I am not implying any bad faith--having once been told that there was no information available.

To obviate that problem, the courtesy was extended to me to go with Mr. Oakes to the institution to interview all people who were thought to have eye witness accounts. This was tape recorded and transcribed. Officer Mata was not one of those persons.

A good deal of the testimony before the Court to date has been more succinct than would otherwise have been without these informal depositions. My preparation has been enhanced greatly in terms of time.

I do not feel it is even necessary or proper for this witness to go into his general experience when I have had no opportunity to examine the man before in any way and have relied upon the fact that he wouldn't be called. I just feel it is not necessary to defendants' case, and I am being unduly surprised. I don't feel it is proper.

MR. OAKES: Your Honor, the interrogatories raised, as
I recall it--and you may correct me if I am wrong, counselthe officers that were on duty at the time. This man was

not on duty in July.

Frankly, we did not decide to use this man until last Tuesday at the institution when we heard how the case was going, what witnesses counsel was going to call, and particularly as far as the incident and also the fact that we visited the cell, and Your Honor was in there.

We have heard a great deal of testimony about changes, about how the system is being conducted now. This whole thing is in fact an issue, and I think the man should be willing to meet such issues that have been raised at this time.

THE COURT: Well, with respect to any of the issues, that is, the incident of the tear gas, any changeovers that have been made, I will hear testimony. But relating to his experience as wholesale over a period of years, I can't see that--

MR. OAKES: I was referring to the time--

THE COURT: We will go along. If you have any objections, you may reserve them.

MR. COHLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. OAKES: Q. You are presently an officer in the isolation side?

- A. Yes sir.
- Q. Will you describe your duties as the second watch, second duty officer.

1

5

7

6

8

10 11

12

13

15

18

17

[8

30

?1 ?2

23

- A. The security and custody of the inmates is my responsibility, their welfare, the general cleanliness of the section, the feeding, the changing of the clothing, escorting inmates frequently throughout the day for various committees. That is about the generalization of my duties.
 - Q. Your duties keep you fairly busy?
 - A. Very busy.
- Q. Regarding the period prior to the time the automatic flushing devices were installed, how often during this shift would you flush the commodes in the quiet cells?
 - A. A minimum of twice a shift.
 - Q. What times?
 - A. The morning and in the afternoon.
 - Q. Would you flush them oftener if requested?
 - A. Yes. It was requested frequently.
 - Q. Were you quite regular about flushing?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. As a general policy, are the flaps during your shift left open or closed?
 - A. They were open.
 - Q. Has this been true since last November?
 - A. Yes sir.
 - Q. When might they be left closed?
 - A. When an inmate is creating a disturbance.
 - Q. How often do you clean the cell area on the isolation

and strip cell side?

в

10

11

13

15

16

9.

Ю

1

2

MR. COHLER: Counsel, I am going to ask you to be careful about time now. Since November?

MR. OAKES: Well, the whole thing is limited to that. He wasn't there before then.

THE WITNESS: On Saturdays they are GI'd thoroughly, and during the regular working week I take a trash can and a broom and it is issued to the occupied cells and the inmates in them sweep out the cells. And if there is any spilled food or milk or coffee, I issue a mop. And if they desire to use a mop more frequently, why, it is available; and also a commode brush and soap, et cetera, cleaning material.

- Q. On your general GI that you mentioned, this includes the quiet cells?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. What procedures are involved when you clean the quiet cell area? How do you go about this?
- A. We have a hose that we use. I open all of the empty cells and spray soap, and we use scrub brushes and squeegees and mops and they are hosed down and washed thoroughly.

The occupied cells, if the inmate wants to use the hose, it is available and he can roll up his equipment and set it up on top of the toilet and he can proceed to clean his

]

3

5

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

20

19

21

23

2

cell with the hose and soap and all of the available equipment.

If he refuses, then he is asked if he wants to use the mop and the other material, commode brushes and soap.

- Q. Would you furnish a man housed in a quiet cell cleaning material at other periods than on Saturday if he requested it?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. You have had occasion to place men in quiet cells?
 - A. Pardon me?
- Q. You have had occasion to place men in the quiet cells, haven't you?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Have you ever placed a man in a dirty cell?
 - A. No.
- Q. By the way, Officer, a week ago yesterday, I believe it was, when His Honor, Mr. Cohler, Mr. Granucci and myself visited the quiet cell area, I noticed you appeared to be scrubbing. Can you explain why you were scrubbing on that day?
- A. That was a Tuesday, I believe. And the reason for that is I was not able to GI the quiet cell section on Saturday because we had been having difficulties. We had a disturbance and we were very busy and we were anticipating from Saturday up to Tuesday, anticipating more difficulty.

ő

9

7

25

However, Tuesday was kind of quiet so I proceeded to change into coveralls and proceed with the cleaning of the section.

- Q. You had not cleaned from the Saturday before?
- A. Not from Saturday, no.
- Q. Are you familiar with what might be called the "inmate grapevine?"
 - A. Pardon?
- Q. Are you familiar with what might be called the "inmate grapevine"?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. The ability of inmates to get information from one another throughout the institution, even though they are not face to face?
 - A. The rumors?
 - Q. Yes.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Is it your opinion, based on your experience, that even an inmate held on O-wing could get information to another?
 - A. It is very easy.
- Q. Would it be fair to say that you spend a good deal of time in the cell area?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Probably more so than officers on the other watch?
 - A. Yes.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- Б
- а
- 1
- 8
- (
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 50
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

- Q. This includes the quiet cells?
- A. Yes.
- Q. You have a lot of contact with the inmates?
- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. As a general statement, how would you describe your approach when dealing with an inmate?
 - A. It is an easy, soft approach.
 - Q. Why?
- A. Because we certainly don't want to create any problems by being harsh with them. We have people that are very excitable.

MR. OAKES: That is all I have.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. COHLER:

- Q. Officer Mata, do the inmates, generally speaking, who are in quiet cells or strip cells require particular custodial care?
 - A. What, sir?
 - Q. Particular custodial care?
 - A. Are they allowed -- I don't understand your question.
 - Q. I will start over. I am sorry.
- With regard, generally speaking, to inmates who are housed in quiet or strip cells, is a particular degree of care required in terms of custody and security?
 - A. Yes sir.

- б

- · 6

- Q. These are thought to be, generally speaking, the more dangerous, hostile, volatile inmates; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You are more careful about what you give them in the way of potential weapons than you are of other inmates, is that correct?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. You are careful that when you are in the cell area, the strip cell area, there must be high security in terms of opening the cell doors, aren't you?
 - A. Yes sir.
 - Q. In fact, there always must be two officers present?
 - A. Not all the time.
 - Q. Would you explain that, please.
- A. If a person has been emotionally disturbed, has had sufficient time to calm down, quiet down, and after establishing a friendly relation with him, it is up to the individual's judgment at the time, if another officer is not available, immediately available, if it is necessary to bring this man out, if he in his judgment feels that nothere will be no violence of incidents involved, he might bring the inmate out by himself. But it is not customary.
- Q. All right. For instance, and turning to bodily cleanliness, for one, in order for an inmate to have a shower, he must be escorted if he is coming from a quiet

cell, or strip cell, is that right?

- A. That is right.
- Q. When he is passing from a quiet cell or strip cell to the shower area, he has no tools or equipment or portential weapons with him, does he?
 - A. No sir.

Б

в

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. At least he is not supposed to. I understand, and there has been testimony, I believe, that something as simple as a toothbrush can be made into a very dangerous weapon with other matter, is that correct?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. What do you think about the potential dangerous weapon use of a broom?
 - A. It can be used as a weapon.
 - Q. Or a mop?
 - A. They also can be used as weapons.
- Q. Or parts of a bucket? All those things can be used as weapons?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. In fact, you don't even have to do very much to a broom or a mop to use it as a weapon, do you?
 - A. No.
- Q. What security precautions are taken in giving brooms or mops to inmates in quiet or strip cells?
 - A. The officer is present during the time they are

в

using this equipment, and he is accountable for it after they finish.

- Q. That latter portion of your statement is in terms of making sure they aren't left behind, is that right?
- A. That is right, to make sure the inmate returns it to you.
- Q. Is there but one officer present while the inmate is actually using the equipment?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. About how long would it take a man in a quiet cell or a strip cell to use this equipment to clean out his cell?
- A. It varies, depends on whether he is going to use the hose or if he is just going to sweep it out and mop it.

 Ten, fifteen minutes, approximately.
- Q. During that time the officer, and yourself if you were the officer, would be standing directly outside his cell?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. You have stated that you are very busy. Is it ever possible that you don't get to every cell in all of the area of your responsibility for cleaning every Saturday?
- A. No sir. It is a difficult -- it is very difficult to do it, but it is done. The officer -- my partner that I work with holds the keys and he sits in an area where he can observe me, and I take the time to go back there and

clean them thoroughly.

- Q. You do it yourself personally?
- A. I take an inmate porter with me, and I participate.
- Q. You both do it?
- A. Yes sir.
- Q. Do you find any difficulty, Officer, in having an inmate porter clean another man's cell?
 - A. Yes sir.
 - Q. What is that difficulty?
 - A. They just don't like to do it.
 - Q. But you have them do it?
 - A. Yes sir. They do it reluctantly.
- Q. Do you feel the cleanliness of the cell is more important than the problem that may be created by asking an inmate porter to clean another man's cell?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Officer, please direct your attention to the period before Thanksgiving, the so-called tear gas incident with Mr. Esparza. I would like to see if we can straighten out the timing of this as closely as possible. If you can't recall, please say so.

Do you recall about what time there began to be a disturbance from Mr. Esparza's cell?

- A. Approximately 3:30.
- Q. 3:30?

3

4

6

7

8

LO

11

12

.3

.

.ê

.7 .8

.9

<u>}</u>0

)]

12

?3

4

- 1
- 2
- 3
- ¥
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- .
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 18
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- brought in from the window, into the isolation section, and
- up into the vicinity of Esparza's cell. So I proceeded to search approximately three or four cells.
 - con approximately three or four cells.
 - Esparza's cell was the last one. As I was searching

I had to--I had observed some contraband that was

- A. Approximately.
- Q. Is that afternoon?
- A. Yes sir.
- Q. About how long did that disturbance last before an officer went back to the cell-- Excuse me. There was a committee that day, wasn't there?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. I am sorry. Was the Committee examining Mr. Esparza or Mr. Wells?
 - A. I believe they were hearing Wells' disciplinary.
- Q. You said before that the Committee was hearing both Esparza and Wells on disciplinary. Was that an error?
 - A. No sir, that was correct.
 - Q. They were hearing both--
- A. No, not at the same time. They were going to hear both of them at this time.
- Q. , Do you recall what the incidents were leading up to their examining both Wells and Esparza?
 - A. Yes sir, I do.
 - Q. Please relate that.

his cell, I found tobacco, which is not allowed in the section, and I confiscated it. Esparza at this time "exploded." He thought it wasn't fair that I should search his cell like I did the rest of the other inmates, and he went into a rage and shouted curses, obscenities, and I decided that since he was creating a disturbance that the best thing that could be done was to segregate him from the section, to a quiet cell.

As Esparza was acting out his hostility in the corridor, the exercise corridor, Mr. Friedrick and Officer Foncannon arrived on the scene, and we had to order Esparza two or three times to proceed to the quiet cell. He finally did so.

While this was occurring, Wells participated. He also became unruly and shouted obscenities, and there was a lot of unrest in the section. Other inmates were beginning to shout.

So after we celled Esparza, we moved Wells also.

Esparza and Wells had a close relationship, and it is my opinion that whenever one got into trouble, the other one had to participate, to back him up or to save face.

And on their way back to the quiet cells, Esparza-- I mean, Wells was arguing, and he stopped two or three times. The last time he stopped abruptly, he had his hands clenched, and he stopped abruptly and he started to turn around. He is a pretty big man. He is a weight lifter.

so the officer behind him, thinking that Esparza was going to start fighting, put an arm lock on him. And I grabbed one leg and Mr. Friedrick grabbed the other.

wells started struggling violently. We were having a very difficult time. It was necessary for another officer to enter the section and take him around the waist, and we carried him back to the guiet cell.

- Q. When you say "waist," are you using that somewhat figuratively?
 - A. Yes sir. Around the waist, like this (indicating)
 - Q. The waist.

- A. Well, around his back, let's put it that way.
- Q. Not between his legs?
- A. No sir.
- Q. This was a bit of a conflagration, and you were interested on holding onto a leg, weren't you?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. Were you looking around to see where the other officers were--
 - A. I was trying to hold onto the leg.
- Q. You weren't very concerned about where the other officers were grabbing Mr. Wells?
- A. I remember seeing Mr. Friedrick holding onto the other one, and the other officer had an armlock while Wells was struggling.

- Q. In the middle of this struggling, you were exerting as much force as you could to carry out your duty properly and hold onto that leg?
- A. I was trying to hold onto him, let's put it that way.
- Q. You remember precisely where all of the other officers were holding him?
 - A. Yes sir, I do.
- Q. Let's turn back to 3:30 when Mr. Esparza began making a lot of noise, rattling on the bars, climbing up the bars, during the meeting. What was the next thing that happened? And how long afterward?
- A. The next thing that occurred, Mr. Friedrick instructed him to stop and he didn't. Mr. Johnston instructed
 him to stop and he didn't. I instructed him, and he would
 not comply with the instructions.
- Q. Did you close the flaps to try and keep him quiet, to try to keep this agitation from spreading?
 - A. I do not remember.
- Q. You don't remember whether the flaps were closed or open, is that right?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. Go ahead, please. How long did he continue making noise and disobeying the orders to stop?
 - A. For approximately -- I can't estimate the time.

3

5

η

8

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

50

21 22

23

24

- Q. A matter of minutes?
- A. At the time the other sections were becoming unruly.
- Q. Wouldn't it have been normal procedure to close the flaps?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. That is their purpose, to stop this type of agitation?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. But you can't remember whether or not they were open or closed?
 - A. No sir.
- Q. Was Mr. Esparza making all this noise and disobeying orders to be quiet for a minute? A half hour? An
 hour? A couple of hours? Three hours? Have you any recollection?
 - A. No, he just kept on rattling bars and shouting.
 - Q. Then what happened?
- A. Thereafter the--while he was instructed various times to cease, and he didn't and the rest of the sections were becoming unsettled, so he was instructed to pass out his clothes, and he--he was instructed to pass out his clothes, and he refused.
- Q. At the time he was instructed to pass out his clothes and he refused, who was present, as you recall?
 - A. Mr. Johnston, Mr. Friedrick, myself, and I believe

Mr. DeCarli.

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. Was Mr. Kiepura there?
- A. I do not remember if he was there.
- Q. After he refused to pass out his clothes, what happened?
- A. Mr. Friedrick and then Mr. Johnston conferred, and I believe they decided to obtain gas.
 - Q. Were you in on that conference?
 - A. No sir.
 - Q. Go ahead, please.
- A. So we went up to the officers area and waited for the gas.
 - Q. "We," being all the people?
- A. All of the group, and of course, this disturbance was going on at the time, and after it arrived, why, we went back and Mr. Friedrick instructed--
- Q. All right. I want you to back up a little bit, please. You say you all went out into the officers' area. That is out in the front part? It opens into the east and west corridor?
 - A. Yes sir.
 - Q. About how long did it take before the gas arrived?
 - A. I don't remember. Ten, fifteen minutes, or more.
- Q. During that ten or fifteen minutes, was there general agitation throughout O-wing?

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

20

21 22

- Yes sir. There were people fattling upstairs and there were people rattling bars downstairs.
- Q. Was there anybody dispatched to take care of the rattling upstairs?
- Yes sir. I believe the officers were attempting to cope with it.
 - There were other officers upstairs at the time? Q.
 - Yes sir. A.
- But the same group, Johnston, Friedrick, yourself, and DeCarli, were waiting out in the officers' area; is that correct?
 - A. Yes sir.
- During this ten or fifteen minutes, about how loud was the general bar rattling in the O-wing section itself?
- It was loud. It would stop momentarily, and it Α. would start again.
 - You considered it a fairly major disturbance?
- No sir. It wasn't a major disturbance, but there Α. were people participating.
- You had called for tear gas to stop something which wasn't a major disturbance?
 - No sir. We called for gas to make Esparza stop. Α.
- Was it just to make Esparza stop? Or was it to stop Esparza because of the spread of this agitation?
 - It was stop stop Esparza. A.

To your knowledge, there was no consideration given

б

 MR. GRANUCCI: Objection, Your Honor. I think that question is argumentative.

THE COURT: Sustained.

- MR. COHLER: Q. Was the noise throughout O-wing about at ordinary level for bar rattling noise? Or was it soft? Or was it particularly loud?
- A. Esparza would start it. He would rattle, and then somebody else would rattle. He would stop and they would stop.
- Q. Could you estimate how many cells were rattling their bars, how many inmates in their cells were rattling their bars?
 - A. No sir, I couldn't.
- Q. After approximately fifteen minutes, when the tear gas arrived, would you go very slowly and tell us what happened, please. Try to remember every detail.
- A. We returned to Esparza's cell. He was instructed to remove his clothing. He went to a fighting stance. He told Sergeant Friedrick, "Fuck you. You come in here and get them." Mr. Friedrick instructed him two or three times. He still refused. He was defiant and challenging.

Finally, Mr. Friedrick told him that if he didn't he would have to use gas. Esparza told him, "Well, that ain!

no big thing," and cussed him out. Mr. Friedrick instructed me to go ahead and release one short spray.

- Q. I think you have forgotten something. You put a gas mask on, didn't you?
 - A. Before I entered the cell, yes.
- Q. Mr. Friedrick instructed you to put the gas mask on before you went into the cell?
 - A. Yes sir.

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

17

18

19

30

21

32

23

4

ð

Q. Let's stop right there.

Officer Mata, what instructions have you had and what training have you had, if any, in the use of tear gas?

- A. We are trained how to use the different equipment.
- Q. Is that when you first come to work? Or when?
- A. This is general in service training for all personnel.
- Q. When did you receive your training in the use of tear gas?
- A. This training is received around July of every year.
 - Q. Every year? There is annual in-service training?
- A. Yes sir, along with firearms and different types of weapons.
- Q. What are the instructions you receive in the use of tear gas, Officer Mata?
 - A. We had an instructor there that gave us the name

2 3

5

4

6

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

22

24

- of the equipment and how it is used.
- Q. Can you be more specific? Doesn't he tell you more about-- What does he do? What is the real training here?
- A. He shows you the different weapons, like the gas cylinders, the gas guns.
 - Q. The gas guns.
 - A. The different shells or different makeup of the gas.
- Q. What does he explain to you about the dangerous quality, if any, of tear gas?
- A. He stated it was harmless. It was irritating, but harmless.
 - Q. That it could never cause great bodily harm?
 - A. That is right.
 - Q. And it could never kill anybody?
 - A. No sir.
- Q. When you say "no sir," you mean that is what he told you?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Does he give you instructions on where to direct a spray or a shot of tear gas?
 - A. No sir, he doesn't.
- Q. Have you ever had any instructions in where to spray or direct a charge of tear gas?
- A. Yes sir. Mr. Friedrick has instructed us on how to use it.

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

A. I believe it was after.

- Q. What were those instructions?
- A. He stated not to fire directly into a man's face, to fire--release the gas down low.
 - Q. When did you receive those instructions?
- A. I do not recall. It wasn't at this time. He told me--he instructed me not to release gas high.
 - Q. Did he say why?
 - A. No sir.
- Q. How often had you used tear gas, Officer Mata, personally been the one to turn the knob?
- A. About three, approximately three or four times. I do not recall.
- Q. How often of those three or four times did you use it in a cell itself, as opposed to out in a corridor or a general gathering of inmates?
 - A. How many times?
 - Q. Yes.
 - A. About three or four times.
- Q. Each time you have personally used it, it has been directed into a cell itself?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. Were those three or four times, some of them or all of them, before or after this Thanksgiving incident with Mr. Esparza?

б

3

10

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

21

20

23 24

- Q. This was the first time you had used tear gas?
- A. No sir.
- Q. I am a little confused. How many times before this time had you used tear gas?
 - A. Before Esparza?
 - Q. Yes.
 - A. Approximately three or four times.
 - Q. I misunderstood you. Thank you.

THE COURT: We will take a recess for ten minutes.

(A short recess was taken.)

THE CLERK: 44309 and 44786.

MR. COHLER: Ready for plaintiff and petitioner, Your Honor. Mr. Mata will take the stand again, please.

Q. Officer Mata, you were relating the incident involving the use of tear gas prior to Thanksgiving. You had stated the nature of your training and experience in the use of tear gas.

Now, would you slowly describe for the Court, after Sergeant Friedrick, among others, had ordered Esparza to throw out his clothes, and when the tear gas was brought and you put your mask on, what happened?

A. I stepped inside the outer section of the cell, and I squatted, and I released a short spray of tear gas.

Esparza, at that time, threw his blanket down, ran over, grabbed my gas mask, I pulled away from him and bumped my

3

5 6

7

9

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

90

21 22

23

24

head against the wall, and I released another short spray low.

- Q. Did this all happen very quickly?
- A. Yes sir.
- Q. Condensed into a matter of about a minute?
- A. Seconds.
- Q. You said "a short spray." Would you mind going "pssst" for the length of time that you sprayed the first time?
- A. It was a very short spray, just "pssst" and I shut it off.
- Q. How does this work? There is a canister you hold in your left hand?
 - A. Yes sir.
 - Q. And you turn a knob--
- A. It has a valve on top with a small spout, and I believe you turn left. And I just barely turned it, and I released a short spray, and I shut it off.
- Q. I am trying to find out what "short" means to you, is all I am trying to do, Officer.
 - A. Well, I will demonstrate.
 - Q. Please.
- A. "Pssst," and that is it, and then Esparza ran over and he grabbed me by the gas mask, I jerked away, bumped my head. Then I released another one, "pssst," and that

3

2

6

٥

10

,1

l2

,3

.4

.6

.7

8

,9

10

22

11

!3

A 5

was enough, he gave up and passed out all of the equipment.

- Q. You say this was all condensed into a few seconds. How quickly does tear gas permeate an area?
- A. I don't think I am--I don't think I can answer that. It spreads.
- Q. Let me ask you this: If a man had a blanket over him and you were shooting it towards the floor, would it be just a matter of seconds before it got inside under the blanket, and he threw the blanket down and came rushing at you?
 - A. I don't understand that question.
- Q. Well, I have never had tear gas shot at me. I would like the record to be clear as to how quickly it takes, in your recollection, for the tear gas to be shot out at the floor, rise up under a blanket, get a man to a point where he feels the effects, throws down the blanket and comes rushing at you.
 - A. I don't know.
 - Q. Half a minute?
 - A. I don't know.
- Q. You couldn't say then that that was just a matter of seconds?
- A. I am talking about the actual incident itself when the gassing was taking place.
 - Q. How long did it take for the short burst fired at

3

6

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

18

19

20

22

23 24

25

the floor to rise up under the blanket, have an effect upon the inmate, have him throw down his blanket and come rushing at you?

A. I don't know. As soon as I--

MR. GRANUCCI: Objection. I don't know that it did affect him. It may have persuaded him psychologically that he ought not continue resistance. It may have had a physical effect on him. The question, to that extent, is vague.

MR. COHLER: I will go back a little further.

- Q. When you released the short burst, as you described it, did Mr. Esparza thereafter throw down the blanket?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Did he say anything, that you recall, as he threw down the blanket?
- A. No. I don't remember him saying anything. He just rushed over.
 - Q. Did he say anything like, "I give up"?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Did he cough?
 - A. No.
- Q. He was about three-quarters of the distance of the cell, is that right?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Away from the bars?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Did he spring at the bars?
- A. He rushed over.
- Q. He ran?
- A. Yes.

5

10

1

2

3

4

.5

8

7

18

19

30

)]

22

23

4

ð

- Q. Now, you were standing in between the bars and the wall.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. How close to the bars were you standing?
- A. Close enough to where as I could aim the spout of the gas cylinder.
 - Q. How close do you have to--
 - A. Between the bars.
- Q. You had to be close enough to get the spout to fit between the bars, is that the idea?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. He rushed at you. Did he actually grab your gas mask?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Did he pull it off?
 - A. He was trying to.
 - Q. Did it come off at all?
 - A. No. I jerked away.
 - Q. You fell backwards, is that it?
 - A. I didn't fall back. I jerked away and I hit my

head against the wall behind me.

- Q. As you jerked away and hit your head on the wall behind you, did you release the second burst?
- A. No. After my head bounced off the wall, then I released another short spray.
 - Q. Did your head hurt from hitting the wall?
 - A. Yes.

2

3

Б

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Did you blink?
- A. I think I did.
- Q. Are you as certain as to where the gas was aimed for the second burst as you are as to where it was aimed for the first burst?
 - A. Yes sir. It was low.
- Q. And you are just as sure of the second burst after you hit your head as you are of the first burst when you stood up close and aimed it between the bars, is that right?
 - A. I didn't stand up.
 - Q. Excuse me. I didn't mean to imply that.

You are just as sure of the aim of the second burst after you hit your head against the wall and blinked--

- A. Yes sir.
- Q. --as you were the first when you crouched and actually held it between the bars?
 - A. Yes sir.
 - Q. Why were you so careful about holding it right

22 23

 between the bars on the first time, and you felt you could just spray immediately the second time after you bounced back and hit your head?

- A. Because I didn't want to release a high spray.
- Q. I understand what you didn't want to do, Officer.

You felt it was necessary in releasing the first burst to squat and actually get the nozzle or whatever it is, between the bars so you could control, direct it. Is that right?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And the second time you released it immediately after you bounced back and hit your head. Is that correct?
 - A. Right.
- Q. Was there a good deal of confusion during this incident?
 - A. I wouldn't say confusion.
- Q. Is it normal to have that many men back at the strip cell area?
- A. No sir, it isn't. But they were having a disciplinary hearing. The Committee itself was there.
- Q. But there were more men there in what might be considered a small area than there ordinarily are. Is that correct?
- A. There is always a group of people in a disciplinary committee.

- 2
- 3.
- 4
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13.
- 14
- 15
- 16 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

- Q. Was there anyone besides yourself standing in the space between the bars and the wall of the strip cell area?
 - A. No sir.
- Q. You couldn't recall whether or not the flaps were open or closed?
- A. I know they were open when the disciplinary hearing was taking place.
 - Q. A few minutes ago you couldn't recall.
 - A. You confused me.
 - Q. I am not trying to.
 - A. I know that, but you still confuse me.
 - Q. We will let it drop.
- You stated that yourself, as well as Sergeant Friedrick had ordered Esparza to take his clothes off. Is that correct?
- A. No. I didn't instruct Esparza to take his clothes off.
 - Q. The sergeant did, Sergeant Friedrick?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. Did Sergeant Friedrick tell Mr. Esparza why he wanted his clothing passed out?
 - A. That's right.
 - Q. What did he say?
- A. Well, first of all, when Esparza "exploded" and was making all this noise, he was instructed to be quiet

. 9

10

12 13.

14

15

17

16

18

19

20 21

23 24

22

25

and quit, and he didn't. And, of course, after the equipment was obtained, he was instructed to remove them. He
was told that he would get them back as soon as he quit
disturbing the section. I do not recall the exact words
Mr. Friedrick used.

- Q. The removal of clothing then, as you understood it at the time, was an instrument of punishment and hopeful deterrence as to the noise-making. Is that correct?
 - A. No sir.
- MR. GRANUCCI: Objection to the question as argumentative.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. COHLER: That is all, Officer. Thank you.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. OAKES:

- Q. Officer Mata, last Tuesday did you have any idea that the Court was going to view the area?
 - A. No sir.
- Q. There was some mention about weapons, and reference was made to brooms and mops during cleaning and the fact that these might be used as a weapon. Now, isn't a broom or a mop quite a bit larger than the normal weapons found in the institution?
 - A. Yes sir.
 - Q. When brooms and mops are being used by an inmate in

.

2

4

5

6

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

.

the quiet cell, is he not inside the cell?

- A. Yes, he in the cell, and I pass the equipment in-
 - Q. You are on the outside?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Discussing this Disciplinary Committee hearing that was in process in front of Mr. Esparza's cell and Mr. wells' cell, if the flaps had been closed, would that adequately have closed down the noise?
- A. No sir. You can-- If a person is creating a disturbance in the quiet cell with the falps up, you could still hear him.
- Q. Could this still disturb the rest of the inmates in the wing?
 - A. Yes sir.
 - Q. How much do you weigh?
 - A. Approximately 200 pounds.
 - Q. How tall are you?
 - A. Five-nine.
 - Q. Would you say rather stocky?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. How much room is between the steel front of the quiet cell and the metal bars, vertical bars?
 - A. Approximately two or three feet.
 - Q. When you stooped down--

- 1
- 2
- 3
- .
- 5
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- .
- 11
- 12 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17 18
- 19
- 20
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

- A. I squatted.
- Q. --squat down, do you pretty much fill up the whole space?
 - A. There isn't much space left.
- Q. So if you were to fall backward, would you have very far to fall?
 - A. No sir.
- Q. So you would not strike your head, probably, to such a state that you would lose consciousness?
 - A. No sir.
 - MR. OAKES: That is all I have.
 - MR. COHLER: That is all. Thank you, Officer.
- MR. OAKES: Just a minute. If the Court has any questions--

THE COURT: No questions.

(Witness excused.)

- MR. OAKES: I'd like to recall John Nash.
- THE CLERK: You may resume the stand.

JOHN L. NASH,

- recalled as a witness on behalf of the defendants, having been previously duly sworn, resumed the stand and testified further as follows:
- THE CLERK: Will you restate your name for the record, please.
 - THE WITNESS: My name is John Lewis Nash.

J

5 6

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

30

31

23

24

Ж

BY MR. OAKES:

Q. Mr. Nash, you have previously testified at some length in this matter. First of all, I would like to thank you for your patience.

I should like to review, if I might, just briefly what has been stated. Counsel will correct me if I misstate anything, and I wish you would also, please.

I believe you testified that you are 34 years old, you work the third watch in the isolation side, the quiet cell side, and your duties also include the "Max" side or the "Max" security side in O-wing; that your duties are basically that you make security checks during this watch, you make counts, you pass out equipment, including shaving equipment, supplies; you counsel inmates; you service the cells, which include the strip cells; and things of this nature. Is that correct?

- A. Correct.
- Q. I believe you testified also that you know inmate Jordan.
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. I would like to call your attention to--I believe it is Plaintiff's Exhibit 13, the isolation segregation record.
 - MR. COHLER: 1.3, counsel?

MR. OAKES: Yes.

- Q. I call your attention to the second entry for 7/9/65. I believe that states, "We seized, searched, and celled, I/C moved," initials "JM." Are your initials?
 - A. Yes sir.

2

3

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

.3

4

15

16

17

18

Ø

11

22

- \mathbb{Q} . Does that indicate you were on duty the evening Mr. Jordan was moved to a quiet cell?
 - A. Yes sir.
 - Q. Do you recall the occasion?
 - A. I recall it vividly.
 - Q Specifically? Or do you recall it fairly well?
 - A. Fairly well, I would say.
- Q. What procedures are generally employed when you receive a man in the watch, he is to be placed in a quiet cell?
- A. The man usually, if he is in the Adjustment Center, is searched before he brought down. And when he comes down to me, I go back and search his cell and I inspect his cell, look for contraband, check for the cleanliness of the cell.
- Q. You indicated that you searched the cell. Did you search the cell on this evening?
 - A. Right. I did.
 - Q. How do you conduct this search?
- A. At this time, I used my flashlight. I usually started at the door, look around the commod area and the

3

б

7

6

9

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25 bars and the ventilator. I look--it is pretty well detailed when I search.

- Q. Do you also check the walls, perhaps?
- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. During the course of such a search, would you notice if there was excrement on the walls?
 - A. I would.
- Q. Would you notice if the cell is in an otherwise unclean condition?
 - A. I would.
 - Q. What would you consider to be an unclean condition?
- A. Well, if it have foreign matter, food particles, excrement or anything that shouldn't be in the cell, I would call it in an unclean condition.
- Q. Officer Nash, have you ever placed a man in an unclean cell?
- A. I have. But I have given him stuff to clean it out with. I tell him, "If you want to clean it out," or give him a broom, something to clean it out.
- Q. What dictates? Why have you placed a man in an unclean cell?
- A. Mainly because I didn't have another one to put him in.
- Q. Would this be, perhaps, during a disturbance or something going on when you needed to use the cell?

- A. No, not necessarily.
- Q. In other words, there were no other cells available?
- A. No other cells available.
- Q. Did you place Mr. Jordan in an unclean cell?
- A. No sir.

2

3

4

5

в

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. The conduct of your duties includes checking on your inmates during the course of the evening, does it not?
 - A. Yes, it does.
- Q. Do you recall that inmate Jordan was housed in a quiet cell during the month of July 1965?
- A. Well, about the only way I can recall is by the record.
 - Q. You have reviewed the record?
 - A. Right.
- Q. You refreshed your recollection to the extent that you know he was there?
 - A. Right.
 - Q. Do you recall talking to Mr. Jordan?
 - A. I recall talking to him.
- Q. In talking to him, did you have to be in quite close proximity to his cell?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Would you probably enter in past the steel door?
 - A. Yes, I would.
 - Q. Furthermore, I believe you testified that you

serviced the cell every night.

A. Yes.

2

3

4

Б

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. Would this not require you to go inside the cell?
- A. It does.
- Q. Pardon me. Inside the steel door area.
- A. Yes.
- Q. Mr. Nash, did you ever at any time notice the odor of human excrement emanating from Mr. Jordan's cell?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Would you have noticed such an odor?
 - A. I am quite sure I would.
 - Q. Would you remember it now?
 - A. I think I would. I am quite sure I would.
- Q. Did you at any time notice the odor of vomit emanating from Mr. Jordan's cell?
 - A. No sir.
 - Q. Would you have noticed it?
 - A. I would.
 - Q. Do you think you would recall it now?
 - A. I think I would.
- Q. Officer Nash, during the course of his testimony, Mr. Jordan referred to you as a "fish bull." Do you know what that term means?
 - A. I have heard it used more or less for new officers.
 - Q. You do know what it means?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- Б
- В
- 7
- 8
- 9
- . 10
- 11
- 12
- :3
- 4
- .5
- 16
- .7
- .8
- .9
- 11

- 12
- ?3
- 4
- 5

- A. Yes.
- Q. Does the term concern you?
- A. Not too much, I don't think.
- Q. Why not?
- A. Well, I think I have the same approach to inmates at this time as I did at that time.
 - Q. What is that approach?
- A. Well, I use a moderate approach to them. I don't try to make them afraid of me or anything. I just try to be friendly.
 - MR. OAKES: I have no further questions at this time.

 CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. COHLER:

- Q. Officer Nash, how long, once again, have you worked as first floor O-wing officer?
 - A. Oh, I'd say approximately 14, 15 months.
 - Q. Since June of 1965?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. You are presently working there as well?
 - A. Yes, I am.
- Q. Officer Nash, can you separate out in your recollection any particular period of time during those 12 or 14 months, as opposed to your recollection of your general experience?
 - A. Yes sir. We have had some disturbances there.

[]

- Q. Short of a disturbance, which would be a particular instance, can you separate out in your recollection a particular period of time, such as July 9th through July 20 1965, as opposed to your general experience over the past 12 or 14 months?
 - A. Yes. But not where Jordan is concerned, no.
- MR. COHLER: Miss Reporter, would you read the answer, please.

(The answer was read.)

- MR. COHLER: Q. You stated that you refreshed your recollection through examining various documents; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Before you refreshed your recollection, did you have any memory of that period of time, July 9th through July 20 1965?
 - A. No.
- Q. What you are able to testify to today is only what you learned from the documents you reviewed; is that correct?
- A. Yes. I have a vivid memory, but I wouldn't say it would be concrete that Mr. Jordan was in the cell that--I couldn't say I moved him on the 9th until I did look at the documents.
 - Q. You had known that Jordan had been in a quiet cell

at some time.

2

3

4

5

•

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

A. Sure.

- Q. You could separate out which period of time in your memory.
 - A. No.
- Q. Indeed, isn't your memory of more recent experiences in the quiet or strip cell area more fresh than your memory of previous times?
 - A. Sure.
- Q. Particularly going back as far as the second month you had been on duty, is that correct?
 - A. Sure.
- Q. For instance, can you remember what other inmates were in quiet cells or strip cells at the same time Mr. Jordan was in July 1965?
 - A. No, I cannot.
- Q. Or whether or not window flaps or doors were open or closed on various cells during that period?
 - A. No, I can't.
 - Q. Or whether or not--
- A. I can't distinguish which cells the flaps was open and which cells the flaps was closed at the time.
- Q. Or even whether during that period was one of the occasions when a man was in a dirty cell and refused to clean it up?

- 2
- 3
- 5
- 6
- 8
- 9
- 10 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 22

- 23
- 24
- 25

- A. I don't remember any incident of that nature at all.
- Q. You couldn't tell the Court whether an incident of that nature happened during this period of time or some other period of time?
- A. Well, I don't remember any time--at any time that a man was in the quiet cell and refused to clean it up.
- Q. Oh, I am sorry. I misunderstood your testimony.
 I didn't mean to ask you that way.

You looked at Plaintiff's exhibit and read part of an entry including "I/C moved." Do you have that before you, for July 9th?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Is that your handwriting, "I/C moved"?
- A. I don't think that is my handwriting.
- Q. The "We seized, searched and celled," is your hand-writing?
 - A. I am sure that is mine.
- Q. That was the entry with respect to which you put your initials "JN," is that correct?
 - A. Right.
- Q. After that entry, there appears "I/C moved," is that correct?
 - A. Right.
 - MR. COHLER: Thank you. No further questions.
 - THE COURT: We will take the noon recess at this time

and resume at a quarter past 2:00.

(Whereupon the luncheon recess was taken until 2:15 o'clock p.m.)

--000--

[4

3

8

б

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

18

17 18

19

30

1

2 23

4

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 17 1966 AFTERNOON SESSION - 2:15 P.M.

MR. OAKES: I don't know whether Mr. Nash was dismissed. But in any event, I would like to recall him.

Officer Nash? THE CLERK:

JOHN L. NASH,

resumed the stand, having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. OAKES:

- Q Officer Nash, during the course of your testimony, you stated that you had put a man in an unclean cell.
 - Α. Yes.
 - Is that correct?
 - Α. Yes sir.
 - Was that a quiet cell? Q.
 - No sir, it wasn't. Α. No.
- What was the state of the uncleanliness of that Q. cell?
- Well, it had some tooth powder on the floor and a couple of pieces of paper. That is all.
- Was the man provided an opportunity to clean up the Q. cell?
- I told him-- Let me relate it to you as it Yes. were.
 - I had some old cells--I had another cell that didn't

4

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

19

18

20 21

22 23

24 25 have a light, any light fixture. The light fixture was broken. And I told him, which cell he would prefer, "This one? Or the one that had the toothpaste in it?" And he took the one that had the light. I told him I would give him a broom to sweep it up.

- Q. Have you ever put a man in an unclean quiet cell?
- A. No sir.
- MR. OAKES: I have no further questions.
- MR. COHLER: No questions, Your Honor.

Thank you, Officer.

(Witness excused.)

MR. OAKES: Call Mr. Johnston, please.

THE CLERK: Mr. Johnston?

GEORGE F. JOHNSTON,

called as a witness on behalf of the defendants, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: State your name and occupation to the Court.

THE COURT: George F. Johnston, Program Administrator at the Correctional Training Facility at Soledad.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GRANUCCI:

- Q. Mr. Johnston, what are the duties of a program administrator?
- A. Well, in my own case I have the supervision of unit

 3, which includes the supervision of the general orderlines

4

в

7

5

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

22

23

24

of the unit, the cleanliness, the feeding in those wings that we feed in the wings, the programs that take place in the unit, the classification and disciplinary committees are under my supervision.

- Q. The wings over which you are in charge include the Isolation Row, do they not?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. And some cells known as strip or quiet cells?
 - A. Right.
 - Q. Do your duties ever bring you into O-wing?
- A. Many times. In fact, my office is attached to O-wing.
 - Q. Do you ever visit the Isolation Row?
 - A. I do.
 - Q. The quiet cell area?
 - A. I do.
 - Q. Could you tell us how often?
- A. Well, this is difficult to state exactly. However, I go in there when the occasion demands. It could be maybe twice in the same day, or it could be maybe once or twice a week.
- Q. Are you responsible for the state of cleaniliness of that section?
 - A. I am.
 - Q. How do you effectuate, how do you carry out your

responsibilities as to cleanliness?

- A. Well, we make inspections periodically. I make them whenever I am not--my attention isn't demanded elsewhere. My sergeant or my lieutenant makes them regularly, at least once a week.
- Q. If you saw something that wasn't up to your standard of cleanliness, what would you do?
- A. Well, I would give an order to the lieutenant or the sergeant to take care of it.
 - Q. You have authority to do that?
 - A. Yes sir.

2

3

в

8

0.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

0

1

2

3

4

- Q. You are one of the defendants in this lawsuit, are you not?
 - A. I am.
 - Q. Do you have any laice against the plaintiff Jordan?
 - A. No, I don't.
- Q. Did you ever conspire with the other defendants to subject him to cruel and unusual punishment?

MR. COHLER: For the record, Your Honor, I wish to object to the question as calling for the witness' conclusion on an issue which must be decided by the Court.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: I have not ever conspired with anybody about any nefarious activity.

MR. GRANUCCI: Q. And that includes activity directed

6

23 24

25

against the plaintiff, is that correct?

- Correct.
- Now, do you remember an incident involving the use of tear gas on the day before Thanksgiving of 1965, with respect to an inmate named Esparza?
- I don't recall the date specifically, but I do recall the incident where we used tear gas to control inmate Esparza.
- Could you tell us about that incident, such as you remember?
- Well, we went back to the quiet cell area as a disciplinary committee --
 - Q. Who was that?
- Mr. Kiepura and myself and the sergeant and Mr. DeCarli.
 - Q. Who was the sergeant?
 - Sergeant Friedrick.

We heard the disciplinary on Esparza and moved on then to the cell of Wells, who was next door, and began to hear his disciplinary.

At this time Esparza set up a terrific din in his cell that was almost deafening, so that we couldn't make ourselves heard in talking to Wells.

So we had to stop our disciplinary hearing with Wells. Then we retired to the officers' area to discuss among

5

7

9

8

11

12

10

13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24

ourselves what steps we should take to control the situa-We did decide that we would like to control him with tear gas and that we would take his clothing from him.

- Why would you take his clothing from him?
- Well, I suspect that this is a little bit punitive, but punitive with the thought in mind of gaining control and restoring order.
- Was the clothing to be taken from Esparza for a definite period of time?
- A. I don't think we had stated any definite period of time, no.
- Was the purpose of attempting to get Esparza's clothing to bring him under control at the present time? Or to punish him for conduct which had occurred and had been completed in the past?
 - It probably was a little of both. Α.
- All right. I wonder if you could take up the narrative. As I recall, you had gone back into the officers' area to await the arrival of the tear gas. Then what?
- Well, first I had to get permission to use the I can't recall whether I called the Associate tear gas. Superintendent or called Mr. Donnelly, the Deputy Superintendent. But I did get permission from one of these people.

So then we called control and had them send the gas down to us. And it was then that we went back into the area with the gas and that the gas was administered to Esparza in the course of getting his clothing.

- Q. How much gas did you use?
- A. Two short bursts.
- Q. What happened then?
- A. I was standing actually observing the operation outside the cell itself--not outside Esparza's cell, but outside of Wells' cell, over by the outside wall of the building. It was at that time that Wells threw what he claims to have been water out in our direction. Some of it hit me in the face, and it burned my eye. So I questioned whether it was actually water or not.
 - Q. What do you think it was?
 - A. I feel that it was urine, myself.
 - Q. Was any gas directed at Mr. Wells?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Do you know why not?
- A. Well, I don't think we felt that it was necessary to utilize gas on Wells, that he was more or less going along with Esparza because of their rather close relationship and that once we had controlled Esparza that Wells probably would cease any disturbance that he was making.
 - Q. Now, directing your attention to July of 1965,

3

5

6

7

9

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

23

during that period of time, quiet cells were not equipped with waterbasins, were they?

- A. No, they were not.
- Q. Are they now?
- A. They are now.
- Q. Mr. Johnston, I am going to show you an article made out of plastic. I wonder if you could tell me what that is, please.
- A. This is one of the waterbasins that we have placed in the quiet cells.
- Q. But Mr. Johnston, there is something wrong with that waterbasin, isn't there?
- A. Yes. This one has been damaged by an inmate in the quiet cell.

MR. GRANUCCI: Mr. Clerk, will you mark this exhibit.

THE COURT: It may be marked.

THE CLERK: Defendants Exhibit H.

(A plastic waterbasin was marked for identification as Defendants Exhibit H.)

- MR. GRANUCCI: Q. In July of 1965, Mr. Johnston, were there water pitchers in the quiet cells?
 - A. There were not.
 - Q. Are there any now?
 - A. Yes, there are.
 - Q. I show you an item made out of plastic and ask you

в

8

18

20

22

10 11

to tell the Court what that is.

- This is one of the water pitchers that we have placed in the quiet cells.
- Q. But Mr. Johnston, there is something wrong with that water pitcher, isn't there?
 - It has been damaged by an inmate.
 - Q. A quiet cell inmate?
 - Yes. A.
 - MR. GRANUCCI: Mr. Clerk.
 - THE COURT: It may be marked.
 - THE CLERKS Defendants, Exhibit I for identification.

(A plastic water pitcher was marked for identification as Efendants' Exhibit I.)

Your Honor, may these exhibits now MR. GRANUCCI: marked for identification be introduced into evidence?

THE COURT: They may.

In evidence. THE CLERK:

> (The plastic water basin and plastic pitcher previously marked for identification as Defendants' Exhibits H and I were received in evidence.)

- MR. GRANUCCI: Q. Mr. Johnston, how many water pitchers and how many waterbasins were ordered?
 - A. We placed an order for a dozen.
 - How many did you receive?

1

- 3
- 4
- 7
- 8
- . 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 20

- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24

- Q. How many sets of waterbasins and pitchers do you have left?
 - A. Three.
 - Q. That is, in an undamaged condition?
 - A. Yes, that are in use.
- Q. Now, Mr. Johnston, I want to show you a rather heavy and somewhat cumbersome item which is made out of canvas. I wonder if you would tell me what that is, please.
- A. This is one of the strong blankets that we use in the quiet cell.
- Q. You are familiar with the strong blankets, are you not?
 - A. Yes. I have seen quite a few of them.
- Q. What is the condition of the particular strong blanket now before you?
 - A. This is a new, unused strong blanket.
 - Q. Where are those made, Mr. Johnston?
 - A. At the Dual Vocational Institution.
 - Q. Are they in standard size?
- A. I have never actually measured them myself, and out of my observations I would say yes, that this is a standard size.
- Q. Mr. Johnston, would you step down from the witness stand and help me unravel this strong blanket so we can illustrate to the Court the size of it.

б

7

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

- A. ·Yes.
- Mr. Johnston, how tall are you?
- About six feet four and a half. A
- MR. GRANUCCI: And may the record show that I am six feet and one-half an inch.
 - Q. This is typical of a new strong blanket --
 - Yes, it is. A.
- --that would be issued to an inmate who is placed Q. in a quiet cell?
- A. Well, we don't always issue new ones, but we do when the need arises.
- I wonder if you would place that on the floor, fold it up, roll it over a second time, fold it up, and fold it up again.
- MR. COHLER: May the record show that the strong blanket was folded upon the creases in which it arrived.
 - MR. GRANUCCI: The record may so indicate.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK: Defendants' Exhibit J.

(A strong blanket was marked for identification as Defendants' Exhibit J.)

Your Honor, I move the admission of MR. GRANUCCI: Defendants' Exhibit J into evidence.

THE COURT: It may be marked.

Ą

.

(A strong blanket previously marked for identification as Defendants' Exhibit J was received in evidence.)

MR. GRANUCCI: Q. Mr. Johnston, how long have you been in corrections work?

- A. It will be 30 years next May.
- Q. I wonder if you could recount for the Court your background.
- A. Well, I started work at San Quentin in 1937 and worked there as an officer, correctional officer until 1942 when I enlisted in the Navy. I returned to work at San Quentin as an officer in, I believe, December 1945. And in March of 1947, after having passed a promotional examination, I became a parole officer.

I worked in paroles in both the Fresno and San Francisco offices until, I believe it was, January 1951, when I was recalled to active duty with the Navy in the Korean War.

I returned to work at the Correctional Training

Facility in March of 1952 as a grade II institutional

parole officer. That classification has since been changed

to correctional counselor.

I stayed at the training facility for about 18 months, when I transferred back to San Francisco in the parole office as a grade II professional officer, and about four months later transferred to San Quentin as a grade II

institutional parole officer and remained there for five years.

In March, I believe it was March of 1959 I--well, I guess I will have to say that through a reclassification of our series and expansion of our series, I again found myself at grade I and had to go through promotional examinations again, and I again passed the examination and became a correctional counselor, grade II, at the Correctional Training Facility in March of 1959.

Since that time I have taken further promotional examinations, and I became a correctional counselor, grade III, and my working title at that time was the classification and parole representative. I had charge of all of the counselors in the institution, as well as the function of the Adult Authority visits and hearings of the institution.

I took further examination and became a program administrator in December of 1964, and I have since completed one more promotional examination and am on the promotional list for associate superintendent.

- Q. Then it is fair to say, Mr. Johnston, that you have had a great deal of experience in working in the prison system in California in general, and the Correctional Training Facility in particular.
 - A. I would say that would be true.

 Q. I am going to take a plastic envelope and show you certain items. As I pull these out and hand them to you, what I want you to do for the record, if you will, is describe them so that the reporter will be able to take down your description.

A. All right.

- Q. Mr. Johnston, I am going to take out the first item.
 Will you tell me what that is, please.
- A. Well, this is a toothbrush handle that has been melted and a dirk-type piece of wire--I am not just sure what the wire comes from, but it looks like it might be some kind of a dentist's--it has a name stamped on the side, it might be made from some kind of a dentist's instrument. It is a rather stiff piece of wire, and it could be certainly used as a dirk-type weapon.
 - Q. Do you know how such a weapon could be made?
- A. Probably with the use of matches or by burning paper in the cell, an inmate could make this if he has the material.
- Q. All right, Mr. Johnston. Leave that there. I am going to take out another item, and I will ask you, just as you did with the last one, to describe it to the Court.
- A. This, I believe, is a handle of a hairbrush that has been melted, with a piece of a nail clipper appended to it by the same method as in the previous weapon. This

3.

4 5

в

8

9

10 11

12

14

13

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

24

25

23

one doesn't appear to have been quite completed, because the edges are not sharpened. However, it still could be a damaging sort of weapon.

- Mr. Johnston, I will take another item out of the envelope and ask you to describe this.
- Well, again we have a toothbrush handle that has A. been fashioned into a weapon by wrapping string around the handle and also appending to it a small piece of metal in the sahpe of about an inch and a half blade. It, too, could be an effective weapon.
- And finally, Mr. Johnston, would you describe this weapon for the Court.
- A. Again we have a toothbrush that has been melted, and a razor blade, a double-edged razor blade inserted through it. Here you would have -- probably not the type of weapon with which you could kill, but you would disfigure badly by slashing a person.
 - Now, Mr. Johnston--
- MR. COHLER: Are you going to leave the subject area of these items?
- I am going to continue with those MR. GRANUCCI: No. items, counsel.
- MR. COHLER: For the record, I want to object. going to move to strike unless there is some connecting up between these items and some period of time or people

involved in this lawsuit. I will wait.

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

4

15

.6

.7

.8

.9

10

1

3;

4

5

MR. GRANUCCI: Your Honor, what I intend to do--I will make the following offer of proof. I am going to elicit from this witness that these items are thoroughly illustrative of the types of weapons that have been found in searches of the institution in general, and the adjustment center in particular. I make no claim that the plaintiff has ever been in the possession of such a weapon.

However, there is an issue in this case concerning the reasonableness of the conditions that attended petitioner's confinement in the quiet cell in July of 1965. One of those conditions of which he now makes complaint involves the lack of a toothbrush.

I think that we are entitled to bring what evidence we can to bear upon the reasonableness of that condition. I think the availability or the amenability of toothbrushes to be converted into deadly, vicious weapons like Your Honor has seen, bears upon the reasonableness of the restriction there involved, particularly when we heard evidence from the lips of the plaintiff himself about how easy it is to get contraband into a quiet cell.

MR. COHLER: If it please the Court, for the purposes that I understand the offer to be made, which are that there can be danger arising from the availability of certain items such as toothbrushes, I will have no objection.

Counsel has offered to say that he will not claim that the plaintiff has had such weapons in his possession. I don't think that goes far enough. This could be prejudicial. I ask that it be stipulated that the plaintiff has not had such weapons, has not been accused of having such weapons, and the failure to think he has such weaponspardon me. I will restate that.)

And that there was no thought that the possibility of his having such weapons entered into his confinement in the quiet cell.

MR. GRANUCCI: Well, I can go partway, counsel. I can stipulate that the fact that he--that there was no suspicion that he had such a weapon which resulted in his confinement in the quiet cell in July of 1965--

THE COURT: They may be marked for identification presently. I will hear you out later.

MR. COHLER: Thank you.

THE CLERK: Defendants' Exhibits K, L, M, N for identification.

(Four items were marked for identification as Defendants' Exhibits K, L, M, and N.)

MR. GRANUCCI: At this moment, Your Honor, in order to complete my record, I will move the admission of those exhibits into evidence.

THE COURT: I will sustain the objection.

14

MR. GRANUCCI: Your Honor, may the sustaining of the objection be without prejudice to leave to renew my motion?

THE COURT: It may be renewed if there be some correlation or some link with respect to the evidentiary aspect. Just a generalization wouldn't mean much to the court.

MR. GRANUCCI: Your Honor, I would like leave to elicit from the witness that these weapons have been found in the institution and are typical of such weapons that are found in the institution. That is as far as I intend to go with this matter.

MR. COHLER: Let's take it question by question, Your Honor. Is that satisfactory?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. COHLER: Thank you.

MR. GRANUCCI: Q. Mr. Johnston, are the weapons that you have just described illustrative of weapons found in searches of the institution?

- A. Yes, they are.
- Q. Are they illustrative of weapons that have been found within the Adjustment Center?
 - A. They are.
 - Q. From time to time?
 - A. They are.
 - MR. GRANUCCI: That is as far as I intend to go.

Your witness, counsel.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. COHLER:

- Q. Mr. Johnston, turning your attention to the tear gas incident involving Mr. Esparza during November, prior to Thanksgiving, 1965, what was the conversation which took place involving the obtaining the authority to use tear gas, if you know?
- A. Well, I don't recall the specific words that were used. I know that we discussed it, and we did get the permission, and we did use it.
- Q. Were you personally the gentleman who called for permission?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you know what kind of description you gave of the circumstances, in asking for permission to use the tear gas?
 - A. Again, I can't recall the words. But--
 - Q. Can you recall the substance?
 - A. I would only have to assume that I--
 - Q. Well, we had better not have assumptions.
 - A. All right then.
- Q. Based upon your experience, Mr. Johnston, what factors do you consider relevant in a determination whether or not to request permission to use tear gas?

- A. Well, there are many factors, depending upon the particular incident that is taking place. In one incident, you would consider one set of factors; another incident, you would consider another set of factors. But I think one of the primary things that we are concerned with is maintaining control and order.
- Q. You stated, I believe, on direct examination that the tear gas contained was obtained from control.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. I don't think we have had a description of control. Would you describe that for the Court, please.
- A. Control is a kind of nerve center, you might say,
 of the institution. This is where we keep our master counts
 or the master files for the daily institutional head counts.
 Our PBX board is there, and we also keep certain emer-

gency equipment there that we can call on and obtain readily without having to go outside to the armory.

- Q. Are all types of tear gas containers which were available in November 1965 available from Control?
 - A. I couldn't say.
- Q. Did you specify which type of container you wanted to have authority to use, if you recall?
 - A. I don't recall.
- Q. How many times have you personally been involved in the use of tear gas at Soledad?

- A. By "personally involved," do you mean the supervision of the use of tear gas?
- Q. Either present at its use, or asked to request authority, or using it yourself, involved at least to the extent that you were on this occasion.
- A. Oh, probably in the order of half a dozen times.

 I can't be too specific here.
 - Q. Don't guess. Just your best recollection.

Would you say that the tear gas which was used in the incident involving Mr. Esparza spread to some extent beyond Mr. Esparza's cell itself?

- A. Yes, it usually does when you use tear gas in a unit like that. It spreads almost throughout the unit.
 - Q. It didn't all stay in Mr. Esparza's cell, did it?
 - A. No, it definitely didn't.
 - Q. Some of it was around yourself, was it not?
 - A. It was.
- Q. Mr. Johnston, on the six occasions that you had been involved in the use of tear gas, and particularly on this occasion, what is the sensation of having tear gas near your face, particularly your eyes?
 - A. It causes them to water.
 - Q. To sting a little bit?
- A. I have never really had them burn much. There is a little-probably a little sensation to it, stinging

sensation.

Q. Mr. Johnston, I understand, and I am asking you if you agree, that when you have tear gas around your face, and particularly your eyes, and when it is burning a little bit, that if you put water in your eyes it becomes very stinging. Do you know that?

A. Not out of my own experience, because I have never put water in my eyes when I have had tear gas in them.

- Q. At the time that some liquid was thrown on Your or spilled on you or whatever by Mr. Wells, did you know whether or not water in combination with tear gas could cause a stinging sensation?
 - A. No.
- Q. In other words, you assumed it was urine because of the stinging?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. On the basis of that assumption, a man was given 29 days disciplinary isolation, is that right?
 - A. I don't recall what our disposition was.
- Q. But the disposition resulted from the incident of the throwing of the liquid, is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.

THE COURT: Throwing of what?

MR & COHLER: Liquid.

THE WITNESS: Well, now, wait a minute. I'm not quite

3

2

5

b

8

9

10

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

sure of that even.

1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

30

31

22

23

MR. COHLER: Q. Please explain.

- A. Yes. I don't remember whether we--
- Q. The 115 would show it, wouldn't it?
- A. We had-- I don't recall that we wrote a 115 on the throwing of the liquid. The disciplinary that we were hearing was over an incident in the past.
 - Q. Perhaps there is an error there.
 - A. Prior to that time.
- Q. Mr. Johnston, you stated that you make inspections periodically. During the course of those inspections, there is always an examination of the cleanliness by yourself in all areas, including the quiet or strip cell area?
 - A. That is right.
- Q. About how often do your yourself personally make such inspections?
- A. Well, weekly if I can. But I can't always do it weekly. So, as I said, I have sometimes delegated it to the lieutenant and the sergeant.
- Q. The most often, depending upon your schedule, would be weekly?
 - A. That would be the most often.
- Q. Do you have any recollection of how often you made inspections in June, July and August 1965?
 - A. No, I don't.

- 2
- 4
- D
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18 19
- 20
- 22
- 23
- 24
- AP
- 25

- Q. You also stated that if you observed a state of uncleanliness, you followed up by ordering your sergeant or lieutenant to do something about it; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. After you ordered them to do something about it, what do you do to follow up beyond that?
- A. Well, I check with them now and then, sometimes look myself.
- Q. You became a program administrator in December 1964, is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Have you been program administrator in Unit 3 since that time?
 - A. No, I haven't.
- Q. How long have you been program administrator of unit 3?
 - A. Since the latter part of April of last year.
 - Q. That includes O-wing, does it not?
 - A. It does.
- Q. You described several items that generally could be called weapons.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Can you tell the Court when, in fact, those particular items which were shown to the Court were found?
 - A. No, I couldn't. I obtained these examples from

our S-squad, which is a search and security squad.

- Q. They are kept by the S-squad over a period of time?
- A. Yes. They have quite a collection of these items.
- Q. Several of the items you described involved the use of toothbrush handles, is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Toothbrushes are now available in the quiet or strip cells area, are they not?
 - A. Yes, they are.
- Q. In deciding to make them available, do you know whether or not-- Withdraw that. Excuse me.

You have also described, and there have been marked and entered in evidence as Defendants' exhibits, a plastic washbasin and plastic water pitcher. You stated that there was one dozen ordered, and three sets now remain. Is that correct?

- A. That is correct.
- Q. When these were ordered, was there any expectation that they might be destroyed or damaged by inmates?
 - A. I don't know whether there was or not.
- Q. Wouldn't you say generally the inmates in the quiet cell or strip cell were hostile and a destructive group?
 - A. Yes, I would say that.
- Q. In fact, generally that is why they are supposed to be there.

A. Correct.

5

6

7

8

9

.0

1

3

5

8

0

1

2

- Q. Wasn't there an expectation when the items were put in the cell that they may be damaged?
 - A. I don't know.
- Q. The inmates were put in the quiet or strip cell because, at least in part, they damaged--
- A. Maybe I misunderstand you. But if you are saying, did we talk about them damaging the things before we put them in there, no, we did not. If we had something up in the backs of our heads somewhere that they might destroy them, this might be true. I don't know.
- Q. Isn't it fair to say that the people who are put in the strip cells or quiet cells are more or less a destructive lot, and it didn't even need to be said, it was more or less expected that some of these would be damaged.
 - A. That is what you are saying, not me.
- MR. GRANUCCI: Object to the question as argumentative, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

- MR. COHLER: Q. When one dozer were ordered, one dozen sets, did you yourself have any estimate as to how long that dozen might last?
 - A. No, I have no idea how long.
- Q. To your knowledge have any more plastic pitchers and plastic waterbasins been ordered?

Ä

A. Yes. I have recently replaced an order for another dozen.

MR. COHLER: Thank you, Mr. Johnston.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GRANUCCI:

- Q. Mr. Johnston, without sounding facetious, I want to ask you whether you know the difference between water and urine.
 - A. I think I do, yes.
- Q. Are you sure that the liquid that Wells threw on you was not water?
- A. I couldn't really say this, no. I assumed that it was urine because it burned my eyes.
 - Q. Did it have any smell?
 - A. I can't say whether it did or not.
 - Q. You can't recall?
 - A. I can't recall.
- MR. GRANUCCI: Your Honor, I have no further questions of this witness. Perhaps the Court would have some.

THE COURT: I have no questions.

MR. GRANUCCI: May he be excused?

THE COURT: Yes.

(Witness excused.)

MR. GRANUCCI: Call Mr. DeCarli, please.

THE CLERK: Mr. DeCarli.

A. ALFRED DE CARLI,

called as a witness on behalf of the defendants, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: State your name and occupation for the court.

THE WITNESS: A. Alfred DeCarli, Correctional Counselor, Correctional Training Facility.

THE COURT: D-e-C-a-r-l-i?

THE WITNESS: Yes sir.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GRANUCCI:

5

6

7

8

9

.0

.1

2

3

5

в

- Q. Mr. DeCarli, what grade of correctional counselor are you?
 - A. Grade I.
- Q. What are the duties of a correctional counselor in grade I?
- A. Well, there is many. I sit on--in on classification disciplinary hearings, censor problem mail, case work, Board reports, other duties, searching for lost items of clothing or personal property.
 - Q. To what section of the prison are you assigned?
 - A. Adjustment Center. O-wing, in particular.
 - Q. Your duties cause you to be in O-wing?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. What percentage of your time do you spend in O-wing

- 2
- 3
- 4

- 6
- 7
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 9E

- A. I am assigned full time. There is times when I am elsewhere, records, mail room, or areas like that. I would say 90 percent of the time in the wing itself.
 - Q. Are you in the isolation section of O-wing?
 - A. My duties take me there.
- Q. Your duties take you there. Do your duties ever take you to the area of the quiet cells?
 - A. Yes, they do.
- Q. Mr. DeCarli, were you employed at the institution in July of 1965 from the 9th to the 20th?
- A. I was employed there, but not in the Adjustment Center.
 - Q. Where were you employed?
 - A. I was at the North Facility.
 - Q. What were your duties there?
 - A. ' I was the training officer.
- Q. Did you have anything to do with the placement of plaintiff Jordan in a quiet cell from July 9th through July 20th 1965?
 - A. I did not.
- Q. Does the performance of your duties take you into the area of the quiet cells?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. Have you had an opportunity to observe the condition of cleanliness of those quiet cells?

Α.

Yes.

2

3

4

5

7

ç

q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

)E

- Q. I wonder if you would tell the Court your description of those conditions.
- A. The first thing that I would be affected by might be the smell, body, a musky odor. And after spending a few minutes there, maybe a half hour, I don't notice it any more. The condition otherwise, of cleanliness, I couldn't tell. I would notice that there might be coffee stains on the bars from cups. Aside from that, I don't know. If there were filth--if there was filth in there I didn't notice it.
 - Q. How about fecal matter spread on the walls?
 - A. I never seen any.
 - Q. Vomit on the walls?
 - A. None.
 - Q. Urine?
 - A. No.
- Q. When you go back to a quiest cell area, how often do you spend back there?
- A. In some cases I have spent an hour and a half there with one person.

THE COURT: That would be approximating the cell? Or in the cell? Or where?

- MR. GRANUCCI: I am going into that, Your Honor.
- Q. When you are back there, where do you stand in

3

5 6

7

9

10

12

13

15

14

16

17 18

19

20

22

23 24

25

relation to the cell?

- A. I stand on the inside, not on the inside of the bars, but just across from him on the inside.
- Q. Is that in the little ante room between the outside wall and the bar gate?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You say you spent an hour and a half in a quiet cell with a particular individual -- Withdraw that.

You say you spent an hour and a half visiting with an individual in front of a quiet cell.

- A. Yes.
- Q. Do you recall the name of that individual?
- A. This was Esparza.
- Q. Do you recall when you made that visit?
- A. I'm not positive. This happened shortly after the gassing incident that we have been talking about. If that was the day before Thanksgiving, it wasn't the next day because I was off. But very possibly on Friday.
 - Q. How long did you spend with Esparza?
 - A. I estimate about an hour and a half.
- Q. Without going into what Mr. Esparza told you, did he make any complaint to you about having been tear-gassed?
 - A. He did not.
 - Q. Did you notice the effects of the tear gas?
 - A. There was slight irritation to my eyes, and that

was about it.

- Q. Was it such that it was uncomfortable?
- A. Slightly, but it didn't make me leave.
- Q. Didn't make you leave. Is there anything in your mind now that would cause you to recall the condition of the cleanliness in Esparza's cell at that time you visited him?
 - A. No, I don't.
- Q. Was it any better then than the conditions that ordinarily prevail in the isolation section as you observed them?
- MR. COHLER: Your Honor, the witness has already said he doesn't recall the conditions. I don't think this leading should be permitted.

MR. GRANUCCI: All right.

- Q. Could you tell us why you spent an hour and a half with Esparza at that time?
- A. Well, Esparza, as a rule, is a person who needs a lot of attention, and when he gets going--I think we have observed this--he just goes on and on and on. There wasn't much I was doing. I was doing a lot of listening, and he was telling me about his past, his problems at other institutions, and family, and future. He just went--he could go on for hours.
 - Q. It was part of your duties to listen to the inmates

and talk to them?

Yes.

Α.

11 12

Q. What is the purpose of that?

A. Well, possibly to draw out some of the hostility and—he has got to talk to someone, and I was familiar with his past to some extent, through the files.

At this time I felt that he had been upset pretty badly a few days before. I wasn't going to do any counseling. I was just going to listen to him and let him-he had settled; he was pretty, I would say, responsible at that time, and he could talk without getting upset. He just talked at length.

- Q. I want to jump back a little bit to two days before.
 Were you present at a Disciplinary Committee hearing before
 the cells of Wells and Esparza when the tear gas was used?
 - A. Yes, I was.
- Q. Would you narrate to us your recollection of that incident?
- A. Well, we had--the group that was mentioned earlier had gone back to hear Esparza's case--and I don't recall the disposition, but he wasn't happy with it. So we heard it, and the disposition was given, and then we left his area to go next door to Wells' cell. He also had a disciplinary.

As we attempted to hear the case on Wells, we were

unable to complete it because Esparza had started clamoring the bars and had set up such a commotion that it was impossible to hear what Wells was talking about. So we had to leave the area. We were not able to continue.

And we left the area, went out to the officers' area.

And to my best recollection, I would say that from the time we left that area to the time that Esparza was gassed, I would estimate it was probably eight to ten minutes in which the noise I don't believe ever let up. It just built up to a tremendous crescendo and state there. You could hear noises from upstairs and on the "Ma" side, so other people were getting irritated by then and made some attempts to join in. At that time he was gassed.

- Q. Do you know how much tear gas was used?
- A. Two bursts, short bursts.
- Q. They were short bursts?
- A. Yes sir.

10

11

12

13

4

15

16

17

18

19

50

31

22

23

- Q. Getting back to Esparza, have you had occasion to counsel with him since November of 1965?
 - A. Numerous times.
 - Q. Have you noticed any improvement in Esparza?
- A. There has been a great improvement. As a matter of fact, he is being recommended for minimum institution at the present time.
 - Q. Is it institutional policy, as you understand it,

when an inmate is confined in a quiet cell to just let him sit and rot?

- A. No, this is not the policy.
- Q. What is the policy?
- A. This is part of my job, to visit him whenever I get in the area-- First of all, I generally go down there when someone has asked for me, either from the officers'-- at the officers' request, at the inmates' request through the officers, or a note. And when I go in to see one person. I see whoever wants to see me. This is the way it is throughout the wing.
- Q. It is your duty to counsel with these inmates; and what is the purpose of that counseling?
- A. Well, I think my reports have some bearing on maybe the Adult Authority. I have to present as clear a picture as possible to the Adult Authority, and if I know the man I think I can do a better job than if I just read the records and reported on that. So I get to know these people quite well.
 - Q. Do you attempt to draw them out?
- A. Yes, their families, their background, their future, problems that they have been confronted with either before coming to the institution or problems that have--they have been confronted with on the main line.
 - Q. Mr. DeCarli, in your opinion, is the improvement

б

~ =

that has been noted in Esparza, at least in part, related to the counseling and other services furnished to him by the institution?

- A. I believe so, yes.
- Q. Now, do you know the plaintiff?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Have you had occasion to counsel him?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What is the nature of the contacts that you have had with the plaintiff?
 - A. Primarily in processing writs.
 - Q. What does that involve?
- A. Well, there is quite a lengthy process. The written rough draft is picked up by myself, delivered to the education department for typing, when it has been typed it is returned to me and I return it to the person who wanted it. He reviews it. If it is satisfactory, he will ask me to provide envelopes, whatever it takes to get it mailed. Also, I furnish legal paper, writing paper.
- Q. The inmate has to pay for those legal supplies, doesn't he?
- A. Since I have been there, the inmates do not. This is, I imagine, part of the procedure. But it is not very expensive to provide it, it saves a lot of time, so we just go ahead and provide it.

4

5

__

0

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

22.

21

23

24

1

- Q. Do you now or have you ever had any malice towards the plaintiff Jordan?
 - A. No.
- Q. Did you conspire with the other defendants to deprive him of his constitutional rights?

MR. COHLER: For the record, Your Honor, I object to the question as eliciting a response bearing upon something the Court must decide.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: No.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. COHLER:

- Q. Mr. DeCarli, do you have an opinion as to whether or not the plaintiff has improved over the past six months?
 - A. I think he is well controlled.
- Q. Thank you. Mr. DeCarli, during the so-called gas incident involving Mr. Esparza, where were you standing when the gas was turned on?
 - A. I was just outside of the cell.
- Q. More precisely, where? Near a window flap? A door? Where?
- A. No. I was in line with some of the activity at the time. I was outside the cell, approximately four or five feet outside of the outer door, in the area, but outside the outer door.

10 11

12 13

14

15

18

17 18

19

30 11

32

?3 4

- Was there anyone standing between you and the outer door?
- I couldn't say. There was activity there. were four or five around. I couldn't say at all times. At times, I was in direct line.
 - Q. At the time the gas was turned on.
 - A. Yes, I was able to observe this.
 - Q. You actually saw the gas being turned on or off?
 - A. Yes.
 - You saw the officer's hand turning the knob? Q.
- No. But I observed the officer holding the con-A. tainer. I did not see the movement of his hand. He had his back to me.
 - Q. There was still this noise going on?
 - A. Yes.
- Mr. DeCarli, you have related your recollection of Q. your observation as to the state of cleanliness during the time that you have been in O-wing. When did you first come to O-wing?
 - Α. About the middle of August.
 - Q. 1965?
 - A. 1965.
- Q. In your present capacity, Mr. DeCarli, are you responsible, or at least a part of your responsibilities, for the state of cleanliness and the location of inmates

in O-wing?

- A. I don't believe I am responsible.
- Q. Are you partly responsible?
- A. If I see a condition that is a hazard, I believe I would call it to my superior's attention.
- Q. Mr. DeCarli, you say that you spoke with Mr. Esparza for about an hour and a half.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. About two days after the gassing, is that right?
 - A. Two or three days, I am not sure.
- Q. And two or three days after the gas incident, there was still enough gas around to irritate your eyes? Is that right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Incidentally, Mr. DeCarli, Mr. Esparza was a stamp collector, wasn't he?
 - A. Not at the time.
 - Q. Not at the time of the gassing.
 - A. Right.
 - Q. But in the time that you had known him?
 - A. This has been in several months past.
 - MR. COHLER: Thank you.
- MR. GRANUCCI: I have no further questions of this witness. Perhaps the Court does?

THE COURT: He may be excused.

5

2

3

4

7

в

8

LO

.1

.2

.3

,5 .6

.7

.8

30 31

32

23

3

б

6

4

7

9

8

1

2

3

5

7

)

3

MR. GRANUCCI: Your Honor, would this be an appropriate time for a recess?

THE COURT: Yes.

(A short recess was taken.)

MR. GRANUCCI: Call Mr. Swagerty, please.

THE CLERK: Mr. Swagerty.

CLEMETT L. SWAGERTY,

called as a witness on behalf of the defendants, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: State your name and occupation.

THE WITNESS: Clemett Swagerty, Associate Superintendent, Correctional Training Facility, Soledad.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GRANUCCI:

- Q. Mr. Swagerty, how long have you been Associate Superintendent of the Correctional Training Facility?
 - A. Since November 28 1965.
 - Q. What did you do before then?
- A. I was Program Administrator at the California Men's College in San Luis Obispo.
 - Q. What are the duties of an associate superintendent?
- A. At the Correctional Training Facility, I am in charge of three program units and Central services.
 - Q. What are the three program units?
 - A. Unit 1, Unit 2 and Unit 3. These comprise the

16

17 18

<u>L9</u>

30 31

2:2

13

- housing in the total institution.
- Q. Do your duties also relate to the classification of inmates?
- A. Yes. Each program unit has its classification committee.
 - Q. Do you know the plaintiff Robert Jordan?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Did you have anything to do with the incident that brought about his confinement in a quiet cell in July 1965?
 - A. No, I did not.
- Q. Were you in any way connected with that confinement?
 - A. No, I was not.
 - Q. Or with the conditions of that confinement?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Do you have any malice toward the plaintiff?
 - A. No, I do not.
- Q. Did you conspire with the other defendants to deprive him of his constitutional rights?
 - A. No, I did not.
 - MR. GRANUCCI: Your witness, counsel.
- MR. COHLER: Excuse me, Your Honor. For the record, the same objection.
 - THE COURT: Overruled.
- MR. COHLER: I have no questions of this witness, Your Honor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. GRANUCCI: May Mr. Swagerty be excused?

THE COURT: Yes.

· (Witness excused.)

MR. GRANUCCI: Call Mr. Kiepura, please.

THE CLERK: Mr. Kiepura.

WILLIAM T. KIEPURA,

called as a witness on behalf of the defendants, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: State your name and occupation to the Court.

THE WITNESS: William T. Kiepura, Correctional Counselor, Correctional Training Facility, Soledad.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GRANUCCI:

- Q. Mr. Kiepura, what grade of correctional counselor are you?
 - A. Grade II.
- Q. What are the duties of the correctional counselor, garde II?
- A. Administrative to a great degree, supervising the grade I counselors, sitting on classification committees and disciplinary committees.
 - Q. Where are you assigned as a correctional counselor?
 - A. Unit 3.
 - Q. Does that include the Adjustment Center?

A.

 A_{\circ}

A.

2

3

4 Б

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

I have.

A.

- Q. What are those conditions?
- Satisfactory, in my opinion. A.

Does that include O-wing?

- Q. Does that include the Isolation Row?
- Q. Do your duties take you into 0-wing frequently?
- They do. A۰
- Q. Do they take you into the isolation section?
- \mathbf{A}_{\circ} Occasionally.

It does.

It does.

It does.

- Q. Occasionally?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Could you estimate how often, say, in the period of a week, you go into the isolation section?
- It varies, sometimes I may go in there daily for two or three days in a row, again it might be once a week.
- Q. Have you had an opportunity to observe the conditions of cleanliness in the isolation section?
 - A. I have.
- How long have you been making visits to the isola-Q. tion section?
 - A. Two years, a little over two years.
 - And you have observed the conditions of cleanliness? Q.

- 1 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21 22
- 23
- 24

- Does that include the strip cells? Q.
- That includes the quiet cells, yes.
- Q. Do you remember the Esparza incident involving the use of tear gas in connection with inmate Esparza?
 - A. Some details, yes.
 - Q. Could you narrate to the Court what you remember.
- Well, we were back at the cell hearing inmate Esparza's disciplinary. When we finished we proceeded to inmate Wells, who I believe was in the next cell, and inmate Esparza apparently became somewhat distressed at our decision and began to make considerable noise, so much so that we were unable to hear inmate Wells and complete his disciplinary hearing at that particular time.

We left to go back into the back end of the unit in the officers' section and Mr. Johnston obtained permission to When the gas came, we went back and Mr. Mata then proceeded to use the gas when inmate Esparza refused to follow the instructions.

- Q. Do you know how much gas was used?
- Α. As far as I can remember, only two bursts.
- Q. Were they long bursts? Or short bursts?
- Very short bursts. A.
- MR. GRANUCCI: May I have plaintiff's Exhibit No. 3, please.
 - Now, Mr. Kiepura, directing your attention to July Q.

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

13 1965, did you participate in a disciplinary committee proceeding Mr. Jordan?

- A. According to the record, I did.
- Q. Did you have any independent recollection of that committee proceeding?
 - A. None.
- Q. In fact, your sole memory is what is on the record there?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Were you the person who wrote the disposition finding on that, on that CDC Form 115?
- MR. COHLER: Your Honor, in view of the witness' statement that he has no recollection, I think the only proper question is whether he recognizes his handwriting.

THE COURT: He may, by examination, refresh his recollection of events.

THE WITNESS: This is my handwriting.

- MR. GRANUCCI: Q. Would you read what you wrote there.
- A. *Denies bar rattling, but did spit on officer. If not treated right, will spit on him again and again. Will slap him in the face if he gets a chance. Vulgar and disrespectful towards committee. Disposition: LST-1, 29 days isolation."
- Q. Now, was plaintiff confined in a quiet cell at that time?

- 1
- 2
- 4
- Б
- 6
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- --
- 25

- A. I couldn't say.
- Q. That disciplinary form and the disposition have nothing on it about the confinement of inmate Jordan in a quiet cell as part of the punishment, does it?
 - A. No, it does not.
 - Q. Would there be a reason for that?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. What is the reason?
 - A. I forgot to write it.
- Q. Ordinarily, as a matter of practice, when an inmate ib rought out of a quiet cell for a disciplinary committee hearing and the matter is heard and determined, is there a discussion as to whether he should be returned to the quiet cell or not, or whether his housing status should be changed?
 - A. There is a discussion.
- Q. Based on your general practice, do you believe that such a discussion occurred in this case? And I am referring to general practice, not your memory.
 - A. I would assume so.
 - Q. You would assume so.
- Now, Mr. Kiepura, do you have any malice toward the plaintiff?
 - A. None.
 - Q. Did you conspire with the other defendants to

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

Mr. Kiepura, you testified that you MR. COHLER: Q. forgot to write "quiet cell," or something of that nature

deprive him of his federally protected constitutional rights?

MR. COHLER: Same objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: I did not.

MR. GRANUCCI: Your witness, counsel.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. COHLER:

- Q. Mr. Kiepura, if I understand your testimony correctly, you have no recollection of the disciplinary hearing other than what you read from the form 115, which you Seen shown have shown us, is that correct?
 - That is correct.
- Q. Even looking at that form it doesn't refresh your recollection? It is only what is on the form that you know!?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Mr. Kiepura, how do you remember that you forgot something you didn't even remember to do at the time you were filling out the form, when you have no independent recollection at all?

MR. GRANUCCI: Your Honor, objection as to the form of the question as highly compound and confusing.

THE COURT: Sustained.

in the disposition on the form 115 which you were shown. Would you explain to the Court, please, how you are presently able to testify that you forgot to do that.

- A. Because, if I remember correctly, this information is on the 114 form, and knowing Sergeant Friedrick and our practices, I know he will not write anything down unless we are decided in the committee. He wrote it down that that was the decision and therefore I must have forgotten it in this case.
- Q. In other words, it is no recollection of what you did or didn't do; it is a statement you are making based upon what is your understanding of the general practice.
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Regardless of the reasons for there being no indication of "quiet cell" on the disposition which was written, there was approval, was there not, on the form 115 itself, other than those who were in attendance at the hearing?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Can you identify what appears to be the initials RHD?
 - A. Mr. Donnelly.
 - Q. Was Mr. Donnelly present at the hearing?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Can you identify what appears to be Mr. Forden's

signature as his?

- A. No, I cannot.
- Q. Does it look to you like it says Forden?
- A. It says Forden, yes, but I don't know it well enough to identify that as his signature.
 - Q. Was Mr. Forden at the meeting?
 - A. No.

3

Б

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

17

18

19

30

21

22

23

- Q. No one was there except yourself and Sergeant Friedrick, Mr. Jordan, and an escort Officer Spoon. Is that correct?
 - A. I would assume so.
- MR. GRANUCCI: Objection, Your Honor. There is no testimony, at least from this witness, as to identity of the escort officer.
- MR. COHLER: Q. Mr. Kiepura, you say you were present at the so-called gas incident involving Mr. Esparza. Can you recall where you were standing when the gas was being used?
 - A. I believe I was quite close to his cell.
 - Q. Can you recall where you were?
 - A. Not within a foot or two, no.
- Q. Do you recall whether or not you saw Officer Mata turning the control device on the gas cylinder?
 - A. No, I do not.
 - MR. COHLER: Thank you.

3

4

б

в

7

ń

10

13

14

15

17

18

19

30

22

21

24

MR. GRANUCCI: No further questions of this witness, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. GRANUCCI: May he be excused?

THE COURT: Yes sir.

(Witness excused.)

MR. OAKES: Call Mr. Robert Hoagland, please.

THE CLERK: Mr. Hoagland.

ROBERT R. HOAGLAND,

called as a witness on behalf of the defendants, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: State your name and occupation to the Court.

THE WITNESS: Robert R. Hoagland. I am a Correctional Program Supervisor I at Sierra Conservation Center, Jamestown, California, formerly of CTF, Soledad.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. OAKES:

- Q. What is a correctional program supervisor?
- A. Well, in essence it is a correctional officer with case work, case work duties; that is, he is assigned a case load of 16 inmates, and he is their case worker and responsible for reports and communications, group counseling with this 16.
- Q. Were you a correctional program supervisor while you were at Soledad?

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

30 31

32

23

- A. They do not have that status there.
- Q. When did you transfer to Sierra Conservation Center?
- A. I reported September 1 of '65.
- Q. Prior to that time you were an officer at the California Training Facility at Soledad?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. How long were you an officer at the Training Facility?
 - A. Approximately nine years.
- Q. During your assignment to Soledad, were you assigned to the O-wing?
 - A. Yes sir.
 - Q. How long were you in O-wing?
 - A. Approximately seven years.
 - Q. What watch did you work?
 - A. First and second.
- Q. During the period of July 1965, were you assigned in O-wing?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. What watch were you then working?
- A. I worked first floor, isolation officer, second watch.
 - Q. Do you know Mr. Jordan?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Do you recall Mr. Jordan being in a wuiet cell or

6

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

strip cell during July of last year?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Do you have any specific recollections about that period?
 - A. By date? By date?
 - Q. Yes.
 - No, not necessarily by date. \mathbf{A}_{\circ}
 - Q. You have some recollections of that period?
 - A. Yes.
- Would you describe your duties while you were assigned to O-wing much the same as what Mr. Mata described this morning?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Were you required to provide water during your watch?
 - A. Yes.
 - How much water would you provide? Q.
- Well, the supply wasn't limited. It was to meet the demand of the inmate.
 - Q. How often would you bring water?
- Regularly scheduled, twice a day, in the morning A_{\circ} and the afternoon.
 - Would you provide water more often?
 - More often? A. .
 - Yes.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- в
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- . .
- 15
- 16
- 17 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

- Q. Did you provide water more often?
- A. Yes, I have provided water.
- Q. Would you ever restrict an inmate to one cup?
- A. No.

Yes.

A.

- Q. Do the inmates often have more than one cup?
- A. One cup of water? Or one cup?
- Q. No. Do the inmates have more than one cup available to them to hold water?
 - A. Yes, they have more.
 - Q. You allowed them to keep more than one?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. If an inmate had two cups in his cell and you gave him water, would you fill up both of his cups?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Would you fill up his cups, let him drink it down, and leave water in the cups when you left?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Would that reduce the number of trips you were required to make back to the quiet cell area, perhaps?
 - A. It could, yes.
- Q. Have you ever noticed inmates washing their hands with the water in these cups?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Do you also supply toilet paper to the cells?

Did they use the toilet paper to clean their hands?

They could have. I don't recall seeing any inmate

You were required to clean the cell block during

- 1
- 2
- 3
- Δ.
- Ē
- в
- 7
- 8
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24

your watch, were you?

A. That is correct.

do that.

Α..

Yes.

- Q. What procedures did you follow when you cleaned the cell block?
- A. I had a policy of -- in the strip cell areas on Saturday was our scrub day, and we would take back the mops and the scrub brushes and there is a hose back there. And we would have soap powder and cleanser. And I had a friend in the culinary department that would supply me with a bleach, quite strong bleach, you had to take a teaspoonful to a gallon of water or something like this, and we used all of these articles in cleaning. And there was a toilet brush.
 - Q. Did you use the bleach to clean the stools?
 - A. Yes, the whole cell with it.
- Q. Was the equipment made available to the inmates to clean their cells, particularly having in mind those inmates in the quiet cells? Was equipment made available to the inmates to clean their cells at times other than the weekly cleaning?

A. Every day. Every day I had a cell broom that I

just left in the tunnel area where--well, it wasn't always

in the tunnel area either--but it was available to me and

Are the quiet cells cleaned at any other times?

the inmates would ask if they could sweep their cell, or

I would ask them. The broom was available every day.

Are they cleaned any other times?

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q. Yes.

Q.

A.

- A. Other than on Saturdays?
- Q. Yes.
- A. Well, they are cleaned when the inmate leaves the cell.
- Q. Is he required to clean the cell before he leaves it?
 - A. He was when I had the section, yes.
- Q. He may be held over if he does not clean the cell, is that correct?
 - A. Yes. Well-- Yes, that is correct.
- Q. You also fed the inmates during this watch, did you not?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. What were your policies concerning the flaps during the period of July 1965?

MR. COHLER: Excuse me. I didn't hear the question.

MR. OAKES: Q. What were the policies concerning the

3

б

7

8

9

10 11

13

14

12

15 16

17

18

20 21

23

22

24

flaps on the cell doors during July 1965?

MR. COHLER: Your Honor, I think there ought to be a foundation of whether or not any policy which existed was followed before the policy is stated.

THE COURT: You may lay the foundation.

MR. OAKES: Q. Was there a policy concerning the flaps?

- A. Yes, there was.
- Q. Did you follow the policy?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What was the policy, please?
- A. The policy was that if a man was not making a disturbance and wasn't causing a problem that might disrupt the rest of the unit, the flaps would be left down. This wasn't followed necessarily all the time; but at any time it wasn't followed it was at the request of the inmate in his cell. He would rather have his flaps up than down. This has happened.
 - Q. Does this happen fairly often?
 - A. Right.
 - Q. Do you usually leave the doors open?
- A. I left them open only during the feedings or when we were scrubbing down or something like that, or unless the cell was empty. If the cell was empty, the door and the flaps were all down.
 - Q. When you went off duty around, I believe, 3:45 in

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

30

31

12

)

A. Approximately.

- Q. When you went off duty, would you normally secure the strip cell area?
 - A. Yes.

the afternoon-

- Q. What would this include?
- A. Well, it wasn't just the strip cell area. The whole unit was secured, or that section. It consisted of looking at every cell to see that the cell was on double-up, and that included the strip cell area. The strip cell doors were closed and the flaps were up.
 - Q. The flaps were up when you left?
- A. Yes, the flaps were up-- Yes, when I left a unit and turned the unit over to the relieving officer, the third watch officer, the unit was secured. This was the policy.
- Q. Was it your policy to leave the control of the flaps up to the next shift?
- A. Yes. Well, they had an Adjustment Center sergeant and an officer, and it was their watch, and they handled it.

Now, I would like to say here, too, that there were times when I didn't--or the flaps were opened when I left.

But normally these were specific reasons for it; for example, after I had come back and serviced the strip cells as far as the water and the toilet paper and so forth, then

I would go flush the toilets. A lot of times orange peels and et cetera were dropped down into the toilet itself, and when I flushed it, it flooded the cell. So that meant I had to get all of the equipment out, go back to the cell and clean it up, and in a lot of cases I left the doors and so forth open to facilitate the drying and so forth of the cell. But the officer that was relieving me would be made aware of why this was left open.

Q. Do you have any specific recollections about any incidents concerning the doors or flaps of Mr. Jordan's cell during this period?

A. All I can say is I remember the policy and not-no, I can't.

Q. Do you remember any requests being made of you from Mr. Jordan?

A. I remember one time Jordan--I was securing the cells in the evening, the afternoon, and Jordan asked me I would leave the door open for a minute. He wanted to finish something he was writing. He was writing--well, I don't know what he was writing, but he said he had a few more lines to finish and would I leave it open for a few minutes. So I went in and secured the rest of the cells, and he--when I came back to his cell, he said, "I got a few more things to do, a few more things to write," and I waited momentarily while he finished, and he thanked me,

and I secured his cell.

- Q. Do you think you had a fairly good relationship with Mr. Jordan?
- A. Oh, yes, I have known Jordan for what, for four years, five years, something like that.
- Q. During the course of your duties you spent quite a bit of time in the wuiet cell area?
 - A. Oh, yes.
- Q. You spent quite a bit of time inside the cells themselves, in the ante room of the cells?
- A. Yes. It was the best policy if you wanted to talk to a man that was housed in a strip cell, to go in to him and talk, because if he had something to say, it wasn't necessarily for the entire inmate population. So you would go into him inside the room and talk with him.
- Q. A cell that contains excrement and vomit would smell quite badly, would it not?
 - A. Yes indeed.
 - Q. Would it bother you to work in such conditions?
 - A. Yes indeed.
 - Q. Would you do something about such conditions?
 - A. I would.
- Q. Do you recall such a condition existing in Mr. Jordan's cell?
 - A. No, I do not.

2

4 5

6 7

8

10

11

12

L4 L5

16

17 18

50

21

22

- 3

- 9
- 10 11
- 12
- 13
- 14 15
- 16
- 17
- 18

- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24

- Would you recall such a condition?
- I think so, because this wasn't a common thing. If the condition like that existed and -- of course, this is my opinion--but if a condition like this existed in a strip cell, it was caused by the man within the cell, and then this showed us that we had other problems than just his-than just his disciplinary, and time spent, and so forth. It would mean that Dr. Hack would have to be advised or consulted.
- Q. You stated, I believe, that you worked in the Adjustment Center for about seven years.
 - A. Seven years, yes.
 - That is quite a period of time, is it not?
 - Yes, it is. A.
- Do you remember various changes that were made in the Adjustment Center over the period of years?
- Many changes, physical, as well as programming. Actually, I started before it was an adjustment center. It was just called 0-wing.
- Do you ever recall mattresses being in the Adjust-Q. ment Center?
 - You mean the regulation mattresses? A.
 - `Q. Yes.
 - In the strip cells?
 - Yes

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

- Q. Did that create a problem?
- A. It did one night I will never forget.
- Q. What was that?
- There was a gentleman in one of the strip cells. I can't recall which one. Somehow he got ahold of some matches. He had the regulation -- the thick mattresses. I think he had a blanket also. He had proceeded in tearing up the mattress, taking all of the cotton out of it and tearing the light canvas that encircles, makes up the mattress. He tore this in shreds. All this he had piled up in between his bars and the outside door. He lit this. My father and I were on duty at the time. This was at And we observed smoke coming out from underneath, and it must have been burning fairly well, because if you have been there at night, you know that the night light, it isn't too much light. But we did see smoke--or we smelled it first, and we went back there, opened the door. And when the oxygen hit the already smoldering, it blew up real good. The man was unconscious on the floor. to be taken to the hospital. My father went to the hospital for oxygen. All and all, it was a real good mess.
 - Q. Your father was a correctional officer?
 - A. He still is, yes.
 - Q. Officer Hoagland, calling your attention to the

period between July 9 and July 20 of 1965, do you recall taking Mr. Jordan out for a shower?

A. Yes, I do.

б

- Q. Are you sure of that?
- A. I am positive.
- Q. Why are you sure of that?
- A. For several things, reasons.

One is-- You see, you work in an adjustment center where there is maximum control, maximum custody. Everything you do, you have to think about the security involved.

Now, Jordan was in a strip cell, and as I remember it he needed a shave. He asked me if, "I could have a shower-if he could have a shower. I didn't answer him then, as I recall, and when I left the unit--I told him I would check and see. I left the unit, left the area. I don't recallif I talked to Sergeant Friedrick or I just checked his 114 to see how many days he had back there. I think Jordan knows the rules in regards to running the place better than anybody else.

In any case, subsequently I did get him out for a shower on the understanding that he would shave, which he agreed to.

We came down for the shower, I escorted him down to the grille gate where the shower is located, and I told him, "I will get you a razor and a mirror," so he could shave in

the shower. And he said that he-that he had changed his mind, that he didn't think he wanted a shave. I said, "Well, I have changed my mind. I don't think I want to give you a shower, because that was the deal. No shave, no shower."

Now, the position it put me in, as I started to say originally, is that getting a man out of a strip cell is not a problem. You have been down there, and Mr. Cohler. If you have an opportunity to leave a strip cell, you will normally do so. In most cases, the man would come out of the strip cell, and he would have other housing or he would—or whatever arrangements you have made for him. But I had to take Jordan back to the strip cell, and I was quite concerned about this. And it wasn't a good idea on my part. I put myself in a bad position, and I don't normally do this.

MR. OAKES: I have no further questions at this time.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. COHLER:

- Q. I am not quite sure I understand, Officer Hoagland, what you meant when you said you put yourself in a bad position. Would you explain that a little bit more, please.
- A. Well, Jordan, and I don't think any of the inmates, like to be housed in the strip cell, which is understandable.

- Now, Jordan was out and he had a shower and so forth: And I personally--I had a few quick moments, because I had to take Jordan back to the strip cell. I was in there by myself. This was the explanation I meant to get across.
- Q. You said you wouldn't ordinarily do that. What does that mean?
 - A. I wouldn't ordinarily do what?
- Q. You said when you were testifying just at the tail end of direct examination that you put yourself in a bad position and you wouldn't ordinarily do that. What wouldn't you ordinarily do?
- A. I wouldn't ordinarily get him out alone; I mean, by myself.
 - Q. You would have another officer on duty?
- A. That is right. Now, there was another officer on duty.
- Q. In other words, it is a bit of a problem to take a man out for a shower from a strip cell, is that right?
- A. It poses a problem. Not in all cases. Not getting a man out of a strip cell, there is no problem at all, normally.
- Q. You also related, Mr. Hoagland, that you looked at the form 114 to see how long Mr. Jordan had been in the quiet or strip cell.
 - A. I may have looked at the blackboard. Or I may not

 have done either. What I am saying is, I either talked with Sergeant Friedrick, or I looked at the board, one of the two, or the 114.

- Q. Do you consider the forms 114 accurate?
- A. In regards to how many days a man had been in the Adjustment Center.
- Q. You say you were concerned about having Mr. Jordan out for a shower on this occasion because you were by yourself. Is that correct?
 - A. Well, I was there to take him back by myself.
- Q. Was there no other officer or sergeant around at that time?
- A. The sergeant had been in and had gone--he had comeSergeant Friedrick came in, in fact Jordan talked with
 Sergeant Friedrick when he was either preparing or had
 started to take a shower. But he left, the sergeant had
 left the unit, the downstairs unit, as I remember, and there
 was just the other officer and myself.
- Q. What did Mr. Jordan and Sergeant Friedrick talk about, do you recall?
- A. I think he asked him for legal material, his legal property.
- Q. You think Mr. Jordan asked Sergeant Friedrick for legal material?
 - A. Well, he has legal property, or legal material in

5

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

23

24

which he subsequently got, I might add.

his property, and this is what I think he asked him for,

- Q. While he was in the quiet cell?
- While he was in the quiet cell.
- You said you checked a blackboard or a form 114 or Q. something. Do you recall how long Mr. Jordan had been in the quiet or strip cell at the time you say you took him out for a shower?
- He had been in at least five days, because I wouldn't have gotten him out for a shower hadn't he been. But the exact number, I can't say, no.
 - Q. Could it have been as long as two weeks?
 - Two weeks? A.
 - Q. Yes.
 - I couldn't say. I don't know. A.
- Now, the blackboard, does that show whether people Q. are in isolation? Whether they are in a quiet cell? Or what does it show?
- In Jordan's case it showed he was in the quiet A. cell, that his name and number -- Now, mind you, it has been a year--his name and number, the date he came in, and if he was on isolation, his release date. I think that is all.
 - Q. It shows the cell number he is in?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. How many inmates have you given showers to in the quiet cells or strip cells in the last two years on the first floor of O-wing, approximately?
- A. Well, seeing as how I haven't been down--I wasn't down there a full two years, let's try, maybe, eight or nine months. I think I had the "Max" section, and I moved over to isolation and had it between eight to ten months prior to transfer to SCC.
 - Q. Approximately the beginning of 1965?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. From, let's say, January 1965 until September 1965, about how many showers did you give inmates from the quiet cells or the strip cells?
 - A. It would be only a guess, but--
 - Q. Estimate for us if you can.
- A. Perhaps five, maybe, five or six. That is about-five or six, that I could say.
- Q. About how often do you make available a shower to an inmate who is in a quiet cell or a strip cell? I am asking you for your recollection, not the policy.
 - A. I am sorry, Mr. Cohler. I lost that.
 - Q. I will start over.

During the period from January 1965 until the beginning of September 1965, you were on the second watch on the first floor, weren't you? Is that right?

A. Yes.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Wouldn't that be the normal time, if any, when an inmate housed in a quiet or strip cell would have a chance to take a shower?
 - A. No-- I am sorry, I am missing.
- Q. You were on the second watch. Now, as I understand-and I want your testimony, not my understanding--the third
 watch doesn't give showers to people and the first watch
 doesn't give showers to people, is that right?
 - A. You are not right.
 - Q. Correct me now.
- A. People who are going out to court will be showered on the third watch.
- Q. All right. Let's exclude that then. Except for the group going out to court, does the first watch or the third watch generally offer showers to people in strip cells or quiet cells?
 - A. No.
 - Q. It is generally done in the second watch, is it?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You were on duty during the second watch from January 1965 until the beginning of September 1965, weren't you?
 - A. That is right.
 - Q. You say you afforded only five or six showers during

that whole nine-month period?

- A. That I can remember, that I can pinpoint, that is all I can say.
- Q. Are you telling the Court -- I just want to understand what you mean -- Are you telling the Court that you only remember five or six particular incidents? Or that your best estimate is that you only gave five or six showers?
 - A. That I can remember only five or six.
- Q. How many showers would you estimate you afforded inmates during that period?
- A. Well, after a man had been there for five days, he was afforded--if he was to remain back there longer, he was afforded a shower if his actions--if we didn't feel we had to wrestle with him or it would cause a hassel.
- Q. Say an inmate was in the quiet cell or strip cell for nine days. How would you know whether or not he had been afforded an opportunity to take a shower at some time within those nine days?
- A. Normally it would be indicated on the 114 if someone had showered him.
 - Q. You would have to rely on the 114, is that correct?
- A. Yes, or the officer--as the release are run there, the officer that is assigned in Max, let's say, is working during the time that the isolation officer would be off.

- Information is relayed back and forth this way also.
- Q. It is supposed to be relayed on a form 114, is it not?
 - A. Right.
- Q. Mr. Jordan was in the quiet cell on July 9 through July 20, and you have related one time when you say you took him for a shower.
 - A. And a shave.
- Q. And a shave. Ought he not, according to the policy, have received more than just one shower during that period of time, if he received one even?
 - A. How many days?
- Q. July 9th through July 20th. Perhaps we could have some help.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 13, I believe it is, the form 114.

I show you Plaintiff's Exhibit 13 in this case, Mr. Hoagland, and refresh your recollection if you will look at the entry starting July 9th through July 20th when Mr. Jordan was in the quiet or strip cell. I ask you whether it is not true, if the policy had been followed, he would have received at least two showers during that period?

A. Let's see, 7/20 is when he moved, wasn't it. Moved 12:05.

Not necessarily, no. From the 9th to the 20th? Right?

Q. Let's count on our fingers. 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th,

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th. I gét about 12 days.

- A. You are right, counsel.
- Q. Is it true that if policy were followed, he ought to have received at least two showers?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. You say you recall one shower. Do you find any indication of the shower noted on the record?
 - A. It is not on here, no.
 - Q. It ought to have been noted, shouldn't it?
- A. Right. I can tell you when it wasn't, to a degree.
 But I can't tell you when it was.

He came in on Friday, which would be the 9th; it wasn't Friday. Saturday I worked; it wasn't Saturday, as I recall. Sunday and Monday I am off. And that week, Tuesday I didn't work. So it would be from Wednesday on.

- Q. The first Wednesday on?
- A. Right. But that is as far as I can go in regards to specifying a certain day.
- Q. If an officer who is your relief officer were on duty during this period on the second watch, looking at that record he would not know that Mr. Jordan had been afforded an opportunity for a shower, would he?
 - A. Not unless the other officer told him.
 - Q. You stated on direct examination that you didn't

recall this period of time.

. A. Not by date.

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Q. By date. Correct.

You also stated, I believe, that you didn't recall the period of time, except for leaving the door open for Mr.

Jordan so he could write a little bit further; is that true?

- A. Then; and the shower, I remember that.
- MR. OAKES: I don't think that is quite what he stated.
- MR. COHLER: We will let the record speak for itself.
- Q. You have told the Court that you recall a shower, a conversation during the shower, a conversation with Mr. Jordan and Sergeant Friedrick at the time of the shower, which days you were on and which days you were off, looking at a blackboard, looking at a cell number.

Have you done anything to refresh your recollection before testifying, Mr. Hoagland?

- A. Not by reading any documents, I haven't, no.
- Q. Except for and excluding counsel and anyone from the Attorney General's office, have you spoken to anyone before testifying about this period of time?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. With whom?
- A. I have spoken with some of the people who have appeared as witnesses for the State.
 - Q. Including Sergeant Friedrick?

- Q. Did you talk about this shower incident with
- A. That is correct.

Sergeant Friedrick?

That is correct.

- Q. His recollection was about just what you have testified, was it not?
 - A. No. I told him.
- Q. You told him. Did you tell him everything you told the Court?
 - A. Perhaps. Perhaps I did.
- Q. Is there anything in particular you can recall now that you haven't told the Court?
- A. Well, we were talking just today in regards to the shower, and they were telling me, actually, that I would no doubt be under quite extensive cross-examination because it wasn't documented. But the reason--and another thing that tells me this is what I have done, over and above that I remember the incident, is that if Jordan needed a shave and he was in a regular isolation cell out in front of the screen, I would have shaved him in his cell and then brought him to the shower.
- Q What if he were in a regular isolation cell--well, let me back up a little bit.

You said that any time from the first Wednesday on, that you took him for a shower. If he did not have another

shower, which wasn't also recorded after that, by the time he got to an isolation cell, he may have been in need of a shower. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

3

4

5

в

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. You may have afforded an opportunity for a shave and shower for an isolation cell inmate, would you not, to a man who needed it?
- A. But if I was to do that, I wouldn't have let him come to the shower and shower and shave.
- Q. Perhaps you asked him to shave in his cell and then took him out for a shower and that was the deal.
 - A. Perhaps I did what?
- Q. You asked him to shave in his cell before you took him out for a shower, and that was the deal.
 - MR. GRANUCCI: Is that a question?
 - MR. COHLER: I meant it to be a question.
 - THE WITNESS: I don't follow you, counsel.
- MR. COHLER: Q. You say there was some problem about Mr. Jordan not shaving, and you didn't want to let him have a shower unless he shaved.
 - A. Right.
- Q. Is it possible, thinking back over a year now, particularly thinking back to the institution at which you no longer work, that the deal was that he shave in his cell and then you would let him have a shower?

- 9 10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

2

22

21

23

24

- A. No, that isn't, because if I--if I had made that type of a deal, then I wouldn't have escorted him. I would put the man on--I would take the cell off the double lock and then when he was ready I would roll the bar off front, and he would come to the shower that way.
- Q. When did you speak to Sergeant Friedrick about this?
 Have you spoken to him more than once?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. When was the first time?
 - A. You mean about the whole case itself?
- Q. No. Let's talk about the shower. That is all that matters right now.
- A. Well, I can't--I said something to him about the shower--or the-- what I just said, in regard to moving the man out of his cell if he was isolation, or escorting him if he was strip cell. This was said--I told Sergeant Friedrick today.
- Q. When was the first time, if you recall, that you discussed this shower incident with Sergeant Friedrick?

 Very roughly, Mr. Hoagland. Was it in the month of August?

 Or earlier?
 - A. I think it possibly was earlier.
 - Q. Was it before or after the 4th of July holiday?
 - A. I can't remember just when it was. I know I--I still had family living in--let's see. I am trying to think

I had a vacation, and during my vacation I went to Soledad to see my parents and visited with Friedrick at that time. I think it was probably late July, I guess.

- Q. Could you be sure that it wasn't into the month of August?
 - A. No, I couldn't. But I don't think it was.
- Q. The first time you spoke to Sergeant Friedrick about the shower incident, Mr. Hoagland, did he recall anything about it at all in your conversation?

MR. GRANUCCI: Objection, hearsay.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. COHLER: Do you have the question, sir?

- A. Yes. It was--he said something about he remembered something about talking with Jordan when Jordan was taking a shower.
- Q. When Jordan was taking? Or preparing to take a shower?
- A. Well, it was one way or another. He was either going into the shower, or he had taken the shower and was coming out.
 - Oh, and there is one thing else I would like to add.
 - Q. Please.
- A. When Jordan--when I brought Jordan out of the strip cell, he had his clothes on, because we exchanged clothes for him. He put his clothes there on the bars, as you may

3

5

6

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

25

- have seen them do. They take their clothes and stick them on the bars right by the shower.
- Q. That may help us to fix the time a little bit. please continue to tell us what Mr. Friedrick said when you spoke to him in July.
- A. He said that he remembered talking with Jordan, and he was preparing or had finished taking a shower.
 - Q. Did he remember anything about it beyond that?
- A. And I refreshed his memory by saying, "Well, when I took him out of the strip cell you talked to him and you asked him for his legal papers.".
 - Q. "He asked you for his legal papers."
 - A. He asked Mr. Friedrick.
- Q. Was there anything else Sergeant Friedrick could remember after you had refreshed his recollection?
 - A. No, not that I can think of.
- Q. I ask you to look at the entry 7/24, the second page of Plaintiff's 13.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Do you recognize the initials?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Are those yours?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. This was the fourth day after Mr. Jordan was removed from the quiet or strip cell, is that correct?

]

A.

- 2
- 3

- ļ

- í
- ţ 1

- 3 3

- What is the entry there, Mr. Hoagland?
- "C/EX, shower." A.

Yes.

- You took Mr. Jordan out for a shower on that day, did you not?
 - Yes, he had a shower that day.
- I believe you testified on direct examination, Mr. Hoagland, that upon occasion you have observed inmates having more than one cup of water in their cell at a time; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
- In trying to service inmates with water, you try Q. to make the rounds to as many cells in as short a time as possible, do you not?
 - Well, there are only six. A.
 - To all of the six cells then. Q. All right.
 - And that is they are full.
- No matter how many cells there are, do you try to Q. service the water as efficiently as possible?
 - Yes, that is right.
- Do you stop to see what the inmate does with the Q. water after his stomach is full?
- No, it is just left there on the bars. In fact, I might add, upon servicing the strip cells in the afternoon, on many occasions I have observed that the water I had left

3

5

6

7

8

.9

10

11 12

13.

14 15

16

17

18

19

21

20

23

22

24

Q. You said that you fed the inmates. I am not trying to say that you fed anything incorrect. But to be a

- ing to say that you fed anything incorrect. But to be a little more accurate, you and the inmate-porter would feed the inmates, is that correct?
 - A. Right.
- And the inmate porter would do the actual handling of the tray? Or would you do it?
 - A. I would.
- Q. You handled the food, and the porter pushed the cart?
 - A. Right.
- Q. You made reference, Mr. Hoagland, to scrubdown, I think you called it, which was performed at least once every Saturday while you were on duty.
 - A. Right.
- Q. Would you describe very fully what is involved in these scrubdowns, please.
- A. Yes. If a cell is empty, the cell is opened up.

 There is, in the tunnel--well, not the tunnel, really-there is a door at the back right-hand wall past cell 1224,
 and this leads into--actually, it joins to Max, Max section
 In the middle of this area is the tunnel area, which you
 are probably familiar with.

At this entrance, just inside the entrance to the door is the hose, the water hose. With the equipment that I had, that I spoke of earlier, and the hose, we would sweep out the cells. And I normally handled the hose myself, put the water on the floor, the soap and the bleach, and if there was the inmate in the cell, I would take his mattress out, he would generally take his socks off, roll up his coveralls, and would be issued the scrub brush which he would use, the toilet brush. And after he had a nice soapy lather in there, we would again put the water in, rinse it out, and the squeegee for him to use. And then after the water had all been--or as much as can be taken out with the squeegee, he would then dry-mop the cell. And all the doors and flaps were left open.

Normally I would take his mattress and put it over the door of the cell when it was convenient. When the cell dried out he was given back his mattress.

The cells that were empty, on occasions I would take a porter with me. But I hesitated to do this, because I didn't trust the porters that much. This was a good time for them to take things into their friends, and I was interested in cleaning the cells rather than worrying about this guy running around. So a lot of the times I would-in fact, I would say in most cases I had my hight-top rubber irrigator boots on and would be scrubbing the cells

out myself for another reason also, is because I had to work back there and the porter didn't. I had observed porters on other occasions and they didn't do the job that I felt should be done back there. So I would go in myself and scrub with the scrub brush the floors, the walls, the toilet and the whole area to my satisfaction.

- Q. Anything else?
- A. Not that I can think of.
- Q. Sure?

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Mr. Hoagland, I was told by Sergeant Friedrick that you liked to fish--

- A. Fish?
- Q. Fish. And you liked your new assignment out at the Sierra Conservation Center, is that right?
 - A. That is right.
 - Q. It has been challenging to you?
- A. Well, not as much as I would like, because I found the job assignment up there was a little more demanding-that my free time isn't like it was at Soledad.
 - Q. You have been busy?
- A. Yes. Well, as a CPS-1, you haven't--well, maybe.
 I shouldn't go into this.
 - Q. I don't want to go into it far.
- A. Anyway, what is involved is, there is additional case work that is done on my time.

- Q. And some of the things you are doing now are different from the things you did at Soledad?
 - A. Well, I am working with different people.
- Q. Aside from the identity of the people, are you doing different kinds of things? There is a certain adjustment involved in changing jobs, is there not?
- A. Well, coming from the Adjustment Center to this job, it is a real vacation.
- Q. It is true that there are certain procedures, new things to learn?
 - A. Oh, yes, sure.
- Q. Would you say you recall things that have happened more recently better than you recall things happening in the past?
- A. Who is to say what we retain? I couldn't really answer that and give the whole truth, I don't believe.
- Q. I won't ask you to do anything you can't answer truthfully.
 - A. I remember incidents that happened many years ago.
- Q. For instance, you remember the burning mattress very vividly?
- A. Oh, yes. That is quite an experience I don't think anyone would forget. I also recall an experience with Jordan, when we had to--I was involved in forcibly moving him from--it was a verbal attack on another inmate that he

. 3

4

5

7

^

10

11

12

13

14

16

15

17

18

19

01

22

23

24

felt, as he said, snitched on him. But this is something else I would remember.

THE COURT: Have you about finished your examination? We are running into a late hour.

MR. COHLER: That is all. Thank you.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. OAKES:

Q. Calling your attention to the entry for 7-24 on that log--I think it is Plaintiff's 12--

MR. COHLER: 13, I think.

MR. OAKES: Q. --the entry is "C/EX, shower," as I understand it.

- A. Yes.
- Q. What does that stand for?
- A. It stands for corridor, corridor exercise and shower.
- Q. Was Mr. Jordan at this time in an isolation cell?
 Or a strip cell?
 - A. He was in an isolation cell.
- Q. If Mr. Jordan had been in an isolation cell, would you escort him to a shower?
 - A. No.
- Q. Is the normal procedure to be outside of the grille gate, the front grille gate, when a man is on corridor exercise?

Q

- A. Oh, yes.
- Q. So in this instance, you would have more than likely have been outside, while he was in the isolation cell?
- A. For this exercise and shower, was I outside the grille gate?
 - Q. Yes.
- A. Yes. This is a matter of rolling the bar, you roll the locking device, and the man can open his door.
 - MR. OAKES: I believe I have no further questions.

 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COHLER:

- Q. An inmate who takes a shower from the isolation section and an inmate who takes a shower from a strip cell or quiet cells takes a shower in precisely the same shower room, does he not?
 - A. Yes.
 - MR. COHLER: Thank you.
 - THE COURT: How many additional witnesses have you?
- MR. GRANUCCI: Your Honor, we have four more additional witnesses. We have another correctional officer whose examination will be about the same length, perhaps a little longer, than Officer Hoagland's. Then we have the building engineer, who will testify as to the ventilation system.

 I don't anticipate that will be lengthy. We have Mr.

4

6

5

9

.0

,2

,1

,3

,5

.4

.6

18

17

30

21

L9

22

23

24

ponnelly to come back for--and I mean this--about two or three minutes of questioning and testimony. Then Mr. Fitzharris for what I think will be a very short examination.

MR. COHLER: Your Honor, I would like to advise both counsel, as I have informally, and Your Honor that there is a possibility there will be one rebuttal witness.

THE COURT: Do you think we could conclude the testimony tomorrow morning?

MR. GRANUCCI: We think we could, but then again, Your Honor, we might now.

MR. OAKES: May I interrupt? The testimony of my witness will not be too long, perhaps ten minutes.

MR. GRANUCCI: Well then, I believe we will probably conclude tomorrow morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do we have a calendar?

THE CLERK: Yes sir. I understand from Mrs. Blair it may run 45 minutes or so.

(A discussion was had between the Court and the Clerk not within hearing of the Reporter.)

MR. GRANUCCI: A possible suggestion is that we could come in and go for a half hour, and then adjourn and let the Court conduct the calendar.

THE COURT: Let us start at 9:30, and then we can recess at 10:15 so I can go ahead with the regular calendar.

I will have to adjourn tomorrow at about 12:00 o'clock-I have other matters during the course of the day, I have
an accumulation of matters, as it might appear--we will
see how we get along tomorrow.

I think we can cover all of this testimony tomorrow by 12:00 o'clock.

MR. GRANUCCI: Your Honor, at least speaking for the defendants, we will want some time to argue the case.

THE COURT: You can argue it Friday.

MR. GRANUCCI: That is fine with us.

MR. COHLER: I was going to ask about that, Your Honor.

Do you want closing argument before receipt of the

transcript or afterwards?

THE COURT: I have ordered the transcript, but I am still without it. I ammonot sure it will be in time. I am going to move along on this matter. Next week I have an extremely heavy week.

MR. COHLER: The plaintiff would like to move as quickly as possible.

THE COURT: All right.

Miss Reporter, will you ask them to get as much of the transcript as is available.

9:30 in the morning.

(Whereupon the hearing was adjourned until 9:30 a.m. Thursday, August 18 1966.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SOUTHERN DIVISION

BEFORE: HON. GEORGE B. HARRIS, JUDGE

ROBERT CHARLES JORDAN, JR.,

Plaintiff and Petitioner,

No. 44309 and 44786

.vs.

C. J. FITZHARRIS, et al,

Defendants and Respondents.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
EVIDENTIARY HEARING

AUGUST 18 1966 AUGUST 19 1966

Reported by: MERILYN SEYBERT

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

THURSDAY, AUGUST 18 1966 - MORNING SESSION - 9:30 A.M.

THE CLERK: 44309 and 44786, Robert Jordan, Jr. vs.

C. J. Fitzharris, further evidentiary hearing.

MR. COHLER: Ready for the plaintiff and petitioner.

MR. GRANUCCI: Ready for the defendants, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You may proceed.

MR. OAKES: I would like at this moment to call Officer Hoagland.

ROBERT . HOAGLAND ,

recalled as a witness on behalf of the defendants, having been previously duly sworn, resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

THE CLERK: Would the witness restate his name for the record.

Robert Hoagland. THE WITNESS:

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. OAKES:

- Yesterday afternoon, during the course of your testimony you indicated that Mr. Jordan had been in his quiet cell for a period of, I believe, 11 days.
 - That is correct.
- It was indicated at that time that he should have Q. probably had two showers during that period.
 - A. That is right.
 - Q. Have you since decided that that statement was

4

5

В

7

9

8

10 11

12

13

4 15

1.6

.7

.8 .9

30

31

12

!3

14

5

one. shower?

incorrect, and that he was probably only eligible for only

- A_{\circ} Yes, I have.
- Could you explain that, please.
- The normal policy was that a man would shower every A. five days, but he had to complete the fifth day, which would mean--I will use my hands again--from the 9th to the 13th would be five days, but he would have to complete the fifth day, which is midnight of that day.

Since his showering was handled by the second watch, he would be eligible for a shower on the 14th, which was actually the sixth day.

Then his five days would start again with the 15th, so it would be the 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th and the 19th would be his fifth day. But he would have to complete that fifth day to midnight, which would be the 20th. And the 20th is the day that he came out and was housed in regular isolation housing, and would be eligible for the routine exercise-shower that he would fall into in that section.

I have no further questions. MR. OAKES: I see. FURTHER RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. COHLER:

Let me go through this finger exercise with you Q. once again.

He came in the night of the 9th, is that correct?

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

19

18

20

22

23

24

25

- A. That is correct.
- Q. When would be the end of his first day? The midnight of the 9th? Or the midnight of the 10th?
 - A. Midnight of the 9th.
 - Q. That is one day?
 - A. Right.
 - Q. The 10th is two days.
 - A. Right.
 - Q. The 11th is three days.
 - A. Right.
 - Q. The 12th is four days. The 13th is five days.
 - A. Right.
 - Q. So on the 14th he gets a shower.
 - A. Right.
- Q. Then the night of the 14th is the end of another day, right?
- A. No. The 15th starts his next five days, because he had the shower the 14th.
- Q. I want to see how you count the days. Then the 15th, by midnight of the 15th, he would have completed one day?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. The 16th, two; the 17th, three; the 18th, four; the 19th, five.
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. So on the 20th he is eligible for another shower.

8

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

21

That is right. A.

- He didn't have a shower on the 20th, did he?
- No.
- Since we have you back again, Mr. Hoagland, do you Q. remember, particularly toward the end of this period, July 9th through July 20th, that there was a riot or a lot of trouble of some sort up at North, and several people were moved down into the isolation and quiet cell or strip cell area?
- No, I can t-- they were having trouble over there with the Moslem and Nazi groups, but I can't say if this was during this period.
- Without trying to characterize it, wasn't there some sort of racial trouble, and a lot of people were brought down into the quiet or strip cell area and the isolation area about this period of time?
 - It could have been. A.
- You have been able to remember quite a few things Q. Do you recall whether or not Jordan was moved out of the quiet cell or the strip cell into regular isolation because there was a need for more quiet or strip cells?
 - No, I do not remember that. Α.
- Without tying you down to this particular period of Q. time, do you remember that some time around July, perhaps after or before, let's just start with generally, there had

been difficulty, a lot of people had been moved, I believe from North into the quiet cell area, into the isolation area? Do you recall that much, without pinning it down to time yet?

- A. It could be, yes.
- Q. Yes?

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

[4

15

.6

7

8.

.9

30

11

2

?3

%

15

- A. This could have been the case. I can't--
- Q. Do you recall that that happened some time?
- A. Some time, yes.
- Q. In fact, there was a fairly unusual amount of heavy custody and heavy guarding when this group of people from North was moved down into the isolation area, whenever it was? Do you recall that?
 - A. Heavy guarding?
- Q. Well, let's be specific. At this time, wasn't there thought to be so much trouble that even inmates in isolation cells were escorted when they left their cells?
- A. Well, inmates in isolation cells were normally escorted anyway, wherever they went, other than for a normal exercise period.
- Q. Let's be careful. I think you said yesterday that an inmate going from an isolation cell to his shower would normally not be escorted. There would be the roll lock, or whatever it is.
 - A. Well, I did say "other than exercise." Just now.

6

8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19 20

> 21 22

24

25

23

- Q. Right. I am not trying to get you confused.
- If a man was to come out under normal exercise, \mathbf{A}_{\circ} No. then he wouldn't be escorted. He would be keyed and rolled.
 - Q. That would be the occasion for a shower?
 - A. Right.
- Q. Wasn't there a period after this rioting or whatever it was, where they brought a lot of these people down from North, where there was escort even for normal exercise and shower, from the isolation showers?
- I don't remember, Mr. Cohler. It could have hap-But I don't remember doing that myself. pened after I left.
- You don't remember escorting people from normal isolation cells? Let me see if I can refresh your memory a little bit better.

In fact, there was so much trouble that the escort officers were carrying billy clubs.

- I can remember that -- or I know that in an emergency situation like this, that the events you are describing do take place. But I can't recall whether it was during the period that is in the question right now. And I am sorry I can't.
- All right. Don't recall any more than you can. Let's just establish what has happened at some time, even though you can't fix the time right now. At some time there was sufficient disturbance and there was sufficent

THE COURT: Is it hot or cold?

THE WITNESS: I don't think it is heated. It is not-

need, in the opinion of the personnel at the institution, that even inmates in isolation cells would be escorted when they left the cells for normal exercise and showers?

- A. This I don't remember. I can't remember doing this.
- Q. Do you remember that that has ever happened?
- A. Oh, yes.

MR. COHLER: I think that is the best recollection you have. Let's see what other people can remember. Thank you.

MR. OAKES: I have no further questions of this witness at this time. If the Court has any questions--

THE COURT: I have one question that may have been covered earlier--I doubt that it has -- and that is: When is an inmate placed on restricted diet, according to your judgment and opinion?

THE WITNESS: When I--since I was in isolation section, I never--there was n, t a man in there that was on this diet.

THE COURT: That covers what period of time?

THE WITNESS: That covers eight months, from September back.

THE COURT: What is that diet, specifically?

THE WITNESS: Well, it is a loaf, like a meatloaf, and it is a-- I have tasted it. It is tasteless. It doesn't have much flavor.

I don't think it is heated.

2

3

4

Б

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

30

31

32

23

34

35

THE COURT: What portion is given, what amount is given to an inmate? Once a day? Or twice a day?

THE WITNESS: Twice a day.

THE COURT: Is it like a hard sausage?

THE WITNESS: It is like a meatloaf.

THE COURT: Is it hard or soft?

THE WITNESS: It is not hard like an apple. I think it is --it is not mushy soft, but it has a consistency. It can be sliced or--

THE COURT: Would you have to have an order before you place a man on that type of ration?

THE WITNESS: Oh, yes. The medical department has to O.K. it.

THE COURT: Without a medical O.K., you would not serve a man that?

THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: I have no further questions.

MR. GRANUCCI: Your Honor, could I ask a question?

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GRANUCCI:

- Q. You were an officer during your time in the isolation section, weren't you?
 - A. Yes sir.
 - Q. As an officer, you had no power to order anybody

5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

25

24

on an isolation diet, did you?

- A. No, I did not.
- That would be for the Disciplinary Committee, would it not?
- The Adjustment Center Committee or the Disciplinary A. Committee, yes.

(Witness excused.)

MR. OAKES: I would like at this time to recall Sergeant Friedrick.

WILLIAM T. FRIEDRICK,

recalled as a witness on behalf of the defendants, having been previously duly sworn, resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

THE CLERK: Restate your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: William Thomas Friedrick.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. OAKES:

Sergeant, you have already testified at length in this matter. I thank you for your patience.

You have stated, I believe, that you were the second watch sergeant in O-wing and assigned to O-wing since June 1965, is that correct?

- A. That is correct.
- I believe you have also recounted your duties and responsibilities as the Adjustment Center officer during

the second watch.

- A. That is correct.
- Q. Sergeant Friedrick, have you been present in the courtroom during the past few days?
 - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. Have you heard the testimony of several defense witnesses concerning an incident where tear gas was used to control Mr. Esparza?
 - A. Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Do I understand the witness to say he has been threatened in the courtroom?

MR. OAKES: I asked if he was present, Your Honor. I am sorry.

THE COURT: What are the implications of this question, counsel?

MR. OAKES: I was attempting to be brief, your Honor, and ask if he had heard statements made by other defense witnesses telling about the incident where tear gas was used in the incident with Mr. Esparza, and whether his recollection agreed with that of the other witnesses.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

MR. OAKES: I am sorry if I was not clear.

THE COURT: Would you speak up a little louder.

MR. OAKES: I am sorry, Your Honor.

I will state the question again:

- Q. Have you heard the testimony of several defense witnesses concerning an incident where tear gas was used to control Mr. Esparza?
 - A. Yes, I have.
- Would you agree with the facts as related by those witnesses?
 - A. Yes sir.

- Q. Have you also heard the testimony relating to an incident concerning Mr. Wells?
 - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. This is an incident where Mr. Wells was forcibly removed to another cell?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Would you like to recount your version of that incident, please?
- A. As best as I can recollect, yes. I was in the office of the Program Administrator. I don't remember the date. But an officer called me in there and told me Officer Mata was on the tier with inmate Esparz, who was reacting in an aggressive manner, and assistance was required.

I proceeded from the officer to the first floor of O-wing. Officer Foncannon came down the stairwell, and I asked him to accompany me to the first floor.

We both entered, and inmate Esparza had--was standing

with his back near the wall. He had his fist clenched; and Officer Mata was trying to persuade him to go to a quiet cell.

There was a lot of verbal ado, a lot of abusive language on the part of the inmate. He was quite angry and upset. I didn't immediately know why he was being removed. Obviously, at this time, I felt the officer felt it was his judgment that he had to move him at that time. He wasn't in the cell. He was out on the tier.

As I entered the section, Mr. Wells, who was the person in the second cell, and he was agitating the situation by his behavior. He was making remarks toward the officer and encouraging inmate Esparza.

I entered the area and I ordere Esparza two or three times to move on, and he did. After two or three orders, I believe, from what I can remember, he did. He proceeded and went into the quiet cell.

Because of inmate Wells'--now Mr. Wells, formerly inmate Wells--because of his behavior that he exhibited there, it could have been a potential dangerous situation. The inmate could have struck the officer because of inmate Wells' agitation and encouragement. There were a few other inmates who were making remarks. Inmate Esparza was in view of several inmates in the unit.

It was a matter of judgment. I felt that inmate Wells

should also be removed to a quiet cell. They were quite close friends at this time, and I felt the necessity of maintaining control of the particular section.

1

2

3

4

б

6

7

8

9

10

1

12

.3

.4

.5

,6

.7

.8

.9

10

1

12

!3

4

5

So I opened the cell personally, and I explained to Mr. Wells why I was moving him. He started arguing, but he did come out of the cell. And he agreed by his actions, by coming out, that he would go.

However, from the first or second cell to the quiet cell is a long walk, and he stopped a few times. I don't remember exactly how many. But he did stop and proceeded to argue, and he was loud and boisterous. I would order him, and each time he would go. Finally, the last time he stopped he attempted to make a stand and had his back against the cell front, and he was acting aggressively.

These things happened so fast, and it happened quite awhile ago, so I may be wrong; but I believe he had his arms rather loose as if he might strike out. I don't remember exactly, but to the best of my knowledge, he was acting aggressively.

He is a large, strong youth. What it amounted to, Mr. Foncannon and Mr. Mata and I were in there at that time. I believe Mr. Foncannon grabbed Mr. Wells from behind and around the neck, you might say it was a shoulder-hold or a neck-lock, I am not familiar with the terminology. At this time I immediately grabbed his left leg and Mr. Mata

grabbed his right leg.

8.

.7

I recall having ahold of him around the thigh, I believe my left hand was underneath the knee, the hollow of the knee; and my right hand I had on his upper thigh and I was holding him. In fact, I was holding on quite dearly. He was kicking violently and struggling. We had him in the air.

Mr. Johnston was controlling the keys for the unit, and he observed we were having considerable difficulty, and he ordered Office Nance to enter the area and assist us.

Officer Nance came in and between the officers, three officers and myself, we carried Mr. Wells and place him in a quiet cell.

- Q. Did you at that time grab Mr. Wells by the testicles?
- A. No sir. At no time did I strike him or grab him or anything like this. I did hold him. I was holding him by the left leg in the area of the thigh. Now, it is possible—he was kicking and I was trying to maintain my balance—I had him like this (indicating), he was going in this direction, and I was standing sideways holding him like this (indicating). Now, it is possible that in the struggle that possibly my arm or my elbow might have hit him in the area of the crotch. But at no time did I de—liberately or maliciously grab in the area of the testicles, or strike him or anything like this, no sir.

- Q. I call your attention to plaintiff's Exhibit 13_{ij} the segregation record. I have a copy here. Is there an entry there for 7/13?
- A. Yes sir. The last line here, the top line there, yes sir.
- Q. Would you read that last line on the first page, please.
 - A. "29 days isolation and then assigned, LTS-1."
 - Q. Are those initials?
 - A. Those are my initials there, yes.
- Q. Does that indicate that you conducted a disciplinary hearing on that date?
 - A. Yes.

3

Б

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Did you conduct a disciplinary hearing on that date
- A. Yes.
- Q. Was Mr. Jordan present at that hearing?
- A. Yes, he was.
- Q. Did Mr. Jordan have clothes on at that disciplinary hearing?
 - A. Yes, he did.
- Q. Do you recall the period now of July 9th through July 20 1965?
 - A. Yes. I recall some of it, yes.
- Q. Do you recall an incident in which it is your opinion Mr. Jordan was preparing to take a shower?

Α.

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

- Would you like to recount your remembrance of that occasion?
- I entered the unit one morning. I don't remember what day it was. But as I entered the first floor, inmate Jordan was standing by the front grille gate, which is next to the shower area. He was undressing, and he hung his coveralls on the bars.

I didn't see him take a shower, but to the best of my recollection he was preparing to take a shower at that time.

- I draw your attention to a very crude drawing I have made on the board, or this piece of paper. Does this somewhat reflect the layout of the first part of the isolation side of 0-wing in the officers area?
- The front door would be directly in front of that sally port there.
 - Q. Right in here (indicating)?
 - A. That is where I entered, yes.
 - Q. The grille would be right here?
 - Yes. A.
 - Q. There is a door on the grille gate?
 - Yes sir. A.
 - Is there a sally port or closed caged area here? Q.
 - That is right. A.

Yes, I do.

There is another door at this point, is there not?

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Right. A.
 - Are there also vertical bars along this side?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Is the shower located at this spot--
 - Yes, it is. A.
 - Q. --or this cell here (indicating)?
 - It is not a cell, but if it was a cell, that would be the first cell, yes.
 - Q. The place that you saw Mr. Jordan standing, was it in this area right here (indicating)?
 - A. It was right near where the two X's are.
 - Q. Right here (indicating)?
 - Α. Yes.
 - And his clothes were hanging here? Or here? Q.
 - A. They were hanging on the front. Right in there, yes. He was standing right near the bars.
 - Sergeant Friedrick, would there be any reason for a Q. man to be in that area other than to take a shower--
 - No sir. Not that I know of. A.
 - --with his clothes off, undressing?
 - Not undressing. He might walk up to that area if he was exercising. He might walk up to that area and ask a question, ask the officer, inquire about something; but not while he was undressing. He would have to be preparing for a shower.

- Q. To the best of your recollection, did this occur during the time Mr. Jordan was in the quiet cell?
 - A. Yes. To the best of my knowledge, yes.
- Q. We heard some testimony yesterday by Mr. Hoagland to the effect that he talked to you about this.
 - A. Yes sir.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Was that in preparation for this case?
- A. Yes sir.
- Q. Would you like to recount what you were doing at that time?
- MR. COHLER: Your Honor, I would like the time to be fixed first.
- MR. OAKES: Q. Do you recall talking to Mr. Hoagland about this case in July of this year?
 - A. I don't remember whether it was July.
 - Q. I am sorry. It would be June of this year.
- A. It was a month or two months ago. I don't recall the date. But I did talk to him.
- MR. COHLER: Could it be clear, Your Honor, that it was not August?
 - Could you put that question, please.
 - MR. OAKES: It was not August. August 1966, counsel?
 - MR. COHLER: Correct.
- THE WITNESS: I don't believe so, although it's possible.

 It might have been June, July or August, let's put it that

way. I don't remember exactly when I first talked to Mr.
Hoagland, but it could have been anywhere from one, two,
three--

MR. OAKES: Q. Well, let's put it this way. Do you recall having a discussion when Mr. Cohler and myself were present?

A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Do you recall that that was in July?
- MR. COHLER: As a matter of fact, it wasn't.
- MR. OAKES: It wasn't?
- MR. COHLER: It was early August.
- MR. OAKES: Q. Do you recall the discussion that you had with Mr. Hoagland was prior to the discussion that you had with us?
- A. Would you rephrase the question? I am sorry. I am confused now with this.
- Q. Do you recall that the discussion you had with Mr. Hoagland was prior to the discussion you had with--
 - A. Oh, yes. Yes.
 - Q. Fine. Now, where was this discussion had?
 - A. In my home.
 - Q. How was it effected? How did you get ahold of--
- A. As I recall, members of the Attorney General's office and possibly the Superintendent asked me to contact

 Mr. Hoagland who was transferred to Sonora, and when I

g

arrived home after work I called Mr. Hoagland's father who resides in Salinas. The senior Hoagland told me that his son was on vacation at that time, and that he would tell him to return my call. Shortly thereafter, that evening, Mr. Hoagland appeared at my home.

- Q. Do you recall during that conversation Mr. Hoagland indicating to you that you had been present while the shower was taking place?
- A. He told me I was present. I don't recall this, but he told me about it.
 - Q. Do you recall Mr. Hoagland being present?
 - A. No, I don't.
- Q. Do you recall any officer? And if so, which officer?
- A. No, I don't recall any officer, which officer. I mean, there was an officer there, to the best of my recollection, but I don't remember which officer.
 - Q. Do you recall Mr. Jordan being there?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Again directing your attention to the period July 9 through July 20 1965, do you recall any other occasion when you might have talked to Mr. Jordan?
- A. Yes. I had occasion to talk to him one morning.

 I believe in the quiet cell area.
 - Q. It was during this period?

- ნ გ

- A. During the period that he was confined in the quiet cell.
- Q. When you talked to him in the quiet cell area, were you required to unlock the door to enter his cell?
- A. No. I unlocked the door to the grille gate that leads to the quiet cell area itself. But, no, the door was open when I talked to him.
 - Q. Do you recall what the discussion was about?
- A. It was either about—I was in the area. I didn't go back there specifically to see anyone in particular. In fact, I don't recall why I went back there. But I was back there, and inmate Jordan called to me and asked me about either writing paper or legal material. I don't remember which. And I was over there a few minutes, and this is all I remember that he asked me about. I told him I would talk with the officer and see that he got what he needed. I may have talked to another inmate or so, I don't recall. I then returned and passed through the isolation section into the other area.
- Q. Do you recall any overwhelming odors coming out of there?
 - A. No sir, I don't.
- Q. Do you recall that the cell was in an unclean condition?
 - A. No, not to my knowledge. It was clean, as far as

I could tell. I didn't inspect the walls or anything like this. I don't have any recollection of doing this. But I didn't detect any odor coming from any particular cell, including inmate Jordan's.

- Q. Sergeant Friedrick, are you familiar with what might be called the inmate grapevine?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Is it your opinion, based on your experience, that this is a fairly effective means of communication?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Is it your opinion, based on your experience, that inmates, even though held in an isolation cell or in the O-wing, could get information from one to another?
 - A. Yes, very readily.
 - Q. Perhaps you might explain how some of this occurs.
- A. Well, they communicate in various ways. They communicate through the ventilating system, many of them will communicate through the plumbing system. I have often seen inmates kneeling down in front of the toilet bowl hollering. They communicate in this manner.

They pass notes out the window via fish lines that they drop out the window, it goes down the building, down to the various floors, and they are retrieved by whoever might be exercising, and the note is addressed to a certain individual and the inmate is obligated to deliver the message

There are various means. There are contacts. We serve the other units within the complex; there are many inmates who bring in word from the outside, and whatever. Our food, our clothing, our supplies come from outside the Adjustment Center itself.

We search as well as we possibly can for contraband and possible weapons and so forth. But there are letters, notes that can be rolled up and they are quite small. There are so many hiding places. They have ways of communicating. It is done, let's put it this way.

MR. OAKES: I have no further questions at this time.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GRANUCCI:

в

- Q. Sergeant Friedrick, during your duty as a sergeant in the Adjustment Center, you have seen a great many weapons made by inmates, have you not?
 - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. Have you ever seen any weapons made out of toothbrushes?
 - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. Could you describe the type of weapons that you have seen?
- MR. COHLER: Your Honor, we have had considerable testimony describing these weapons. In the interest of time, perhaps counsel could not pursue this with this witness.

MR. GRANUCCI: Well, at the present procedural posture of the case, we offered into evidence three sample tooth-brushes that have been converted into weapons as illustrative of the type of thing that can be done with a tooth-brush. Your Honor sustained that objection, but granted me leave to renew my offer of the evidence.

I thought that in the interest of protecting the record and also in getting further available evidence before the Court which might obviate the necessity of a further offer of proof, I might eliciti similar testimony from this witness.

MR. COHLER: I have no objection to an attempt to lay a foundation for the offer of the evidence.

THE COURT: Proceed, please.

MR. GRANUCCI: Q. Have you ever mean weapons made out of toothbrushes?

A. Yes, I have.

- Q. Could you describe such weapons, please.
- A. Yes. Sometimes the toothbrush handle itself is sharpened. I imagine the--I have never apprehended an inmate in the act of making a weapon. This is supposition on my part. I imagine he might break a portion of it off or might get a match and burn and melt a portion of it off to a point and sharpen it on the concrete floor.

By the same token, he may secure a razor blade or some

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

ι1

12

13

L4 L5

L6

۱7

18

50

21

23

22

24

25

other hardened piece of wire, and through the use of matches he will make a connection through this wire and attache an appendix to it to make the handle itself.

I imagine there are many ways. I am not an expert. I don't make weapons.

- Q. But you have found such weapons?
- A. I haven't found them personally as a sergeant. As an officer, I have. As a sergeant, I have had some of my officers find them and show them to me. I don't recall whether--it is certainly not during the incident in question.
 - Q. No. No. We are not relating--
- A. I believe possibly I have seen one or two toothbrush type weapons, but I am not certain, during my prison tour.
 - Q. During your prison tour?
 - A. Yes.
- MR. COHLER: Your Honor, counsel just said they are not relating it to something.

MR. GRANUCCI: We are not relating it to the plaintiff.

THE COURT: When you spoke to the incident in question, what do you mean by the incident in question?

THE WITNESS: Well, what I am trying to say is that I never saw any of these toothbrush weapons during the--during the dates in question.

THE COURT: During the dates in question?

THE WITNESS: Yes, during July 9th to July--

THE COURT: When in point of time were toothbrushes supplied to the inmates in your particular section?

THE WITNESS: I honestly don't remember. I could estimate, Your Honor. I believe it may have been either last fall around Christmastime, or possibly January or February.

Now, I don't remember.

THE COURT: Were you familiar with an inquiry made by Mr. McGee concerning the conditions in the facilities?

THE WITNESS: No sir. The first time I had knowledge about that was when it was brought out this week.

THE COURT: So you did not relate your period of time to that event at all?

THE WITNESS: No sir.

THE COURT: You haven't any independent recollection with respect to the time the toothbrushes were supplied to the inmates in your particular section?

THE WITNESS: No.

MR. GRANUCCI: I wonder if I could ask the witness something to clarify that, Your Honor.

- Q. Sergeant Friedrick, have toothbrushes always been available to inmates in isolation cells as distinguished from quiet cells?
 - A. Yes.

THE COURT: We are only concerned with quiet cells,

aren't we?

MR. GRANUCCI: That is right, Your Honor. I think one of the Court's questions mentioned isolation cells.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. COHLER: Your Honor, I understand that the calendar is to be heard, at least in part, this morning. My examination may be lengthy.

THE COURT: Are there any other questions of this gentleman?

MR. COHLER: I have cross-examination.

THE COURT: I suggest we pursue it. Then he might go back to his occupation.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. COHLER:

- Q. Sergeant Friedrick, turning your attention to the so-called shower incident, please, your best recollection is that although you can't remember who the officer was, there was an escort officer; is that correct?
 - A. I don't remember the officer on duty.
 - Q. But there was an escort officer?
 - A. Yes. To the best of my knowledge, yes sir.
- Q. Sergeant, perhaps you heard me ask Mr. Hoagland about his recollection regarding a riotous incident of some sort, I believe, up in North, which brought several

people into the quiet cell or strip cell area. Do you remember such an incident?

A. I vaguely remember a riot having occurred at the North Facility. It was during the time the supervisor of inmates classification was in O-wing, hearing special cases. The supervisor of inmates classification for the Department ordinarily comes around every four months or so to Soledad.

Now, I don't remember what date that was. I know he was there. I was in the room when hearing some of these cases, participating in the hearing of some of these cases. But I don't remember what day it was. I do remember that it was around noon, because the hearings were discontinued, and all available personnel were dispatched to the North Facility.

To the best of my recollection, most of the inmates were involved, and there was a large amount of inmates, I don't remember how many, were scattered between X and O-wing.

The great majority, I believe, were placed in X-wing because of the type cells they have in X-wing, the closed door

- Q. I don't want to take you too far into that incident.
 What I want to find out is whether you can recall various
 inmates being brought down into the quiet or strip cell
 area as a result of that situation.
 - A. No I honestly don't remember how many were brought
 - Q. Let's try it this way: Do you remember that Mr.

Jordan was removed from the quiet or strip cell on or about July 20 1965, because there was a need for further strip cells?

A. No sir, not to my knowledge.

May I interject something here?

Q. Please.

A. To the best of my knowledge, inmate Jordan was placed in the quiet cell on Friday night. Normally, the inmates are not removed from a quiet cell until after the disciplinary hearings. When inmate Jordan appeared before the hearing, because of his behavior at the time, it was felt that he should remain in the quiet cell a little longer until his behavior changed.

We do, with but a few exceptions, we do try to get inmates out of a quiet cell as soon as we possibly can. I
believe it was Tuesday or Wednesday, the 13th, according to
the record, it may have been Tuesday or Wednesday, when
Mr. Jordan was remanded back to the quiet cell.

Ordinarily on Fridays I try to get people out of the quiet cells before I go home for the weekend. I am certain sincerely, in my own mind, that whoever else was in the quiet cells in addition to inmate Jordan, if I could possibly have moved him or anybody else, I would have.

Now, I am certain we were--I am very certain in my mind that we were crowded at that time, and it could have been

because of this riot at North Facility. I don't really know. I don't remember.

But in any event, I could not move inmate Jordan out of the quiet cell on Friday. I am off Saturday and Sunday. Possibly the overcrowdedness continued over the weekend.

I know Monday we are often overcrowded because of the weekend. And Monday all of these various committees from the various facilities and the other units do come in, and often it is late Monday afternoon and possibly Tuesday before we can move a man out.

I am trying to recollect and testify to what I can remember, to the best of my knowledge.

Q. Of course.

Sergeant, you have recalled the shower incident after a discussion with Mr Hoagland, and you have recalled that this took place some time during the time Mr. Jordan was in the quiet or strip cell as you remember it. What do you rely upon to fix in mind the fact that it took place while Mr. Jordan was in the quiet or strip cell, during that period of time?

A. I just remember, when I walked in, I saw him there, Mr. Cohler. To the best of my knowledge, it was during the time he was in a quiet cell. In all fairness, I must admit that I possibly was influenced by Mr. Hoagland having told me that I was the man, possibly because I have read

the records; but to the best of my knowledge. I did see him standing there.

Б

Q. Didn't you rely to a great extent on the fact that Mr. Jordan had an escort officer, which would generally have been the case if he had come from the quiet or strip cell?

A. Well, I believe there was an officer standing there as an escort officer. I do know that the regular isolation inmates, the officer will take the cell off double lock and he will return to the officers' area and place the lock or bar mechanism in the open position and he will not be standing there while the inmate is showering.

There are many things that lead me to believe that to the best of my knowledge I am right, that he did take a shower there. There is always the possibility I am wrong. But I do not believe so.

Q. Would you answer the queston, please, whether or not a primary factor in your mind in recalling that it was during the period of time he was in the quiet or strip cell was that he had an escort officer?

MR. GRANUCCI: Objection, Your Honor. It has been asked and answered.

MR. COHLER: It has been asked, but not answered.

THE COURT: He may answer.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I could have been influenced by that,

Mr. Cohler. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. COHLER: Thank you.

THE COURT: This witness is excused. Thank you.

(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: We will take up the calendar.

(The Master Calender was heard.)

(A short recess was taken.)

MR. GRANUCCI: At this time I request permission to approach the Bench with opposing counsel.

(A discussion was had at the Bench, not within hearing of the Reporter.)

MR. GRANUCCI: Mr. Clerk, would you call Mr. Lovett, please.

THE CLERK: Mr. Lovett.

ROLAND LOVETT,

first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Will you state your name and occupation to the Court.

THE WITNESS: Roland Lovett, Chief Engineer, Correctional Training Facility, Soledad.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GRANUCCI:

Q. Mr. Lovett, what are your duties as Chief Engineer at the Correctional Training Facility?

- 2 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 1
- .2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- .8
- .9
- :1
- 2
- !3
- 15

- A. To supervise maintenance and operation of all mechanical facilities, boiler rooms, sewage plant, water systems.
 - Q. Does that also relate to the heating system?
 - A. That includes all heating and ventilating systems.
- Q. Mr. Lovett, in laymen's terms, would you please give us a description of the heating system in O-wing.
 - A. Is it permissible to read?
 - Q. You may read from notes.
 - MR. COHLER: That is satisfactory.

THE WITNESS: Each and every cell in O-wing and the officers' area is heated and ventilated by a forced air system. Each cell has a supply duct entering in one upper rear corner of the cell. An exhaust duct removes air from officers' corner and the cell.

One large fan supplies air to the entire building, including the officers' section. This air is heated, if necessary, by a set of coils which are heated by hot water. The temperature of this water is controlled by sub-master controls, which in turn are controlled by an outside thermostat, which senses the ambient air temperature and raises or lowers the water temperature accordingly.

This system was designed by the California State Department of Architecture and was installed originally when the building was constructed.

The air is exhausted from the building through ducts extending to all cells and the officers' area by one large exhaust fan which is sized to prevent a negative pressure in the building.

MR. GRANUCCI: Q. Mr. Lovettt, I am going to show you a photograph which I have already shown counsel and ask you to describe what that depicts.

MR. COHLER: What photograph, counsel?

MR. GRANUCCI: The first one.

of the Administration Building at Central Training Facility.

MR. GRANUCCI: Now I will show you another photograph and ask you what that depicts.

A. This is two master thermostats operated by air, which senses the outside air temperature at all times and controls the heating not only in O-wing, but all of the other Central Facility buildings at Soledad.

- Q. I show you a third picture and ask you what that depicts.
- A. This is the picture of the inside of one of the quiet cells showing specifically the intake or supply air duct louvers and the exhaust air louvers.
- Q. Mr. Lovett, how often is the air changed in the quiet cells?

MR. COHLER: Excuse me, counsel. I would object, unless

q

the question is phrased: How often is the air supposed to be changed if the system is working as described?

MR. GRANUCCI: All right. That is the question.

- Q. How often is the air changed when the system is working as described?
 - A. Once every six minutes.
 - MR. GRANUCCI: I offer these three photographs.
 - THE COURT: They may be marked for identification.
 - THE CLERK: Defendants' Exhibits O, P and Q.

(Three photographs were marked for identification as Defendants' Exhibits O, P and Q.)

MR. GRANUCCI: Q. Mr. Lovett, does that system work automatically? Or is it operated by a member of the staff?

A. The system operates as preset continually 24 hours a day, and the only thing required is preventative maintenance or perhaps repairs are required on occasion if something breaks down. In other words, there is no setting it manually every day for a certain temperature. It goes up and down with the outside air.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KOHLER:

- Q. Mr. Lovett, you stated that the air change, if the system is working as described, in the quiet cell area every six minutes, is that right?
 - A. Yes.

Q. Would that not be affected whether or not-- Let me go back, if I may.

Have you ever seen a quiet cell or a strip cell yourself?

- A. Many times.
- Q. You are familiar with the flap arrangement on the doors and windows?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. Would the change of air as you have described it every six minutes be affected in any way by whether the flaps are closed or open?
- A. It would work just as effectively if the flaps were closed.
- Q. Would it work just as effectively if the flaps were open?
 - A. It would.
- Q. I will have to ask you to explain that a little bit.

 It seems to me, as a layman, if there is a closed room or an open room, it makes a difference.
- A. Well, you are going into something pretty deep here. To give a sensible explanation, I have large blueprints to show you the entire system, how the entire system is-building is ventilated through many ducts; which in turn are broken down into many areas, and those cells, approximately 590 cubic feet, have about 100 cubic feet a minute

coming in through one of the ducts which is in the picture, or one of the grilles, and circulates around and back out another one.

The building is pressurized by having the supply fan put more air into the building that the exhaust air is moving. So if you have it open, there would be a small balance of air that would move on out into the corridor, out the open windows and so forth. If it was closed, just what it was sized for.

Q. Would you--

.22

- A. If the flaps were closed.
- Q. Excuse me. Would you say that based upon your experience as an engineer, and particularly your experience in this institution with this system, that the flow of air is such that it could be noticed by holding your hands up to the vents?
 - A. It is not.
 - Q. It is not.
 - A. That is not good engineering.
 - MR. COHLER: Thank you.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GRANUCCI:

- Q. Do you know whether the ventilating system was working during July 1965?
 - A. I have searched all records, and I find no record

of that system being down for repairs at any time during July 1965.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. COHLER:

В

- Q. Mr. Lovett, did you inspect the system, that you recall, in July 1965?
- A. I don't recall any particular than of the many inspections I have made of the system. As Chief Engineer—we have a statonary engineer that operates the heating and ventilating system, and I merely check with him occasionally if he requests assistance or I want to see how he is doing on his job. On occasions, I will go through and look at the system myself.
- Q. I notice in the picture which you described as reflecting the inside of the quiet cell, that the vents are high on the wall. Is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. The change of air would be for the whole cell?

 Or just for that air which happened to be up? Is there any circulation system built in, in terms of up and down?
- A. The natural humidity of air coming through the vents, such as this room here, you keep your flow of air above the occupants. As it comes in, naturally it is moving around and is on its way back out. In other words, it doesn't make a circle from one vent to the other.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

- Q. Even in a square cell, or a rectangular cell?
- A. No, it wouldn't do that.
- MR. COHLER: Thank you.
- MR. GRANUCCI: May the witness be excused?
- THE COURT: Yes.

(Witness excused.)

- MR. GRANUCCI: Call Mr. Donnelly.
- THE CLERK: Mr. Donnelly.

ROBERT H. DONNELLY,

- recalled as a witness on behalf of the defendants, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified further as follows:
 - THE CLERK: Restate your name for the record.
 - THE WITNESS: Robert H. Donnelly.

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GRANUCCI:

- Q. Were you in the courtroom this morning during the session which commenced at 9:30?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. Did you hear certain questions posed by opposing counsel respecting certain trouble at North Facility during the summer of 1965?
 - A. I did.
 - Q. What did you do after you heard those questions?
 - A. I went to out a phone and contacted Deputy

Superintendent Black presently in charge of the institution and asked him to search the North Facility records to find out if a racial disturbance had occurred on July 19th or 20th or thereabouts.

- Q. What did Mr. Black tell you?
- A. Mr. Black told me over the phone that a racial disturbance had occurred at North Facility on June 29 1965, and that they have no record of any major disturbance at North Facility during the month of July 1965.
- Q. Now, Mr. Donnelly, I forgot to ask you the last time on the stand, do you have any malice toward the plaintiff?
 - A. I do not, sir.
- Q. Did you ever conspire with the other defendants to deprive him of his constitutional rights?
- MR. COHLER: For the record, Your Honor, the same objection as previously stated.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: I have not conspired.

- MR. GRANUCCI: Q. Now, Mr. Donnelly, do you have any responsibilities as regard to transfer of inmates or recommending the transfer of an inmate between various institutions?
- A. As a member of the classification committees and also as Deputy Superintendent, being Chairman of the

- Q. Do you have present intention regarding the transfer of the plaintiff to another institution at the conclusion of this case?
 - A. I do, sir.

Classification Committee, I do.

- Q. Would you please state that intention?
- A. It is my intention to request that Mr. Jordan be transferred from the institution at Soledad at the end of these hearings.
 - Q. May I ask your reason for such transfer?
 - A. There are two.
 - Q. What are they?
- A. One reason is that, because of the publicity which this trial has received, I believe Mr. Jordan would be a cause celebre, a focal point to form a leadership against-not that he would necessarily be looking for this, but that this would tend to form naturally around him.
- Q. You think that this is something that might be thrust upon him, is that correct?
- A. It is possible. I also believe that if Mr. Jordan were to get into any disciplinary difficulties at the institution following these proceedings, that there would be always the question: Were we taking retribution, taking revenge on Mr. Jordan because of anything that might come out of these hearings.

- r#

- THE COURT: All right.
- MR. GRANUCCI: Your witness, counsel.

- Q. The purpose of the transfer then is to alleviate those difficulties?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. Is the purpose of the transfer to in any way restrict the power of the federal court to act in this case?
 - A. No sir.
 - Q. Not to your knowledge?
 - A. Not to my knowledge.

THE COURT: Will you stipulate, counsel, that any decree that this Court might enter, that might be entered notwithstanding the presence or absence of the petitioner Jordan from the Soledad Facility?

MR. GRANUCCI: Your Honor, could I reserve judgment on that point? We do have some tricky jurisdictional problems here.

THE COURT: I am used to tricky jurisdictional problems.

MR. GRANUCCI: It is a matter that I would like to consult with my clients about, and I think it is also a matter I would like to consult with my superiors about.

THE COURT: Until you do, we will hold the petitioner in the custody of the Marshal here.

MR. GRANUCCI: I would be prepared to give Your Honor an answer by tomorrow morning.

BY MR. COHLER:

- Q. Mr. Donnelly, would it be possible for you to state on the record that there is no punishment element whatso-ever contemplated at this time in any form in any move which may be made of Mr. Jordan?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. And that his conduct, particularly during the past six months, as it may be viewed by the authorities at the institution, will be passed along to any transferee institution?
 - A. That is our intention, yes sir.
 - MR. COHLER: Thank you, Mr. Donnelly.

THE COURT: Mr. Donnelly, do you have any jurisdictional right or authority over the so-called Youth Authority in-mates; that is, with respect to the transfer of Youth Authority inmates to your Facility, sir?

THE WITNESS: No sir. The transfer of Youth Authority inmates is reserved to the Youth Authority. All transfers of Youth Authority wards between institutions is done by the Youth Authority itself, and not by the institution.

THE COURT: Then the order of the Youth Authority-Let us take the illustration of the young man who testified.

19 years of age, who admittedly was in some difficulty-you have to accept that transfer, do you?

THE WITNESS: Yes sir. According to the law of the

State of California, as I understand it, the Youth

Authority may place any of their wards in any of the institutions of the State, whether the Department of Mental
Hygiene, well, whatever it is.

THE COURT: And the wisdom, or lack of wisdom of the transfer in question would not be for your discretion at all?

THE WITNESS: Except if a transfer might appear unwise to me, I might make recommendation to the Youth Authority.

But I have no authority to change their action.

THE COURT: How long has that practice been engaged in in the transfer of the Youth Authority inmates to your facility?

THE WITNESS: Well, actually, the Youth Authority, I believe, has been placing wards in the Department of Corrections institutions for quite some time, Your Honor. The situation at Soledad, we have worked very closely with the Youth Authority because North Facility has been for some time almost, not quite, but almost half Youth Authority wards. The numbers of wards at North Facility has been gradually diminishing. I believe right at the moment it might be somewhere in the nature of 225. When I was at North Facility, we have had as high as 550 wards at North Facility, out of a total population of about 1,200, approximately half of the population.

Now, when the Youth Authority wards at North Facility got into difficulty, the Youth Authority did give the North Facility the authority to transfer the men to the Adjustment Center for holding purposes.

THE COURT: Do you know of any reason why Soledad is selected as a facility to house that type of inmate, as distinguished from any other facility that might be available?

THE WITNESS: I believe it has been the question of population pressures on the Youth Authority.

THE COURT: Population pressures?

THE WITNESS: Yes. The numbers of wards as opposed to the number of beds that are available. They are presently opening an institution at Stockton, and I believe this accounts, in part, for the gradually diminishing number of Youth Authority wards that are at North Facility.

THE COURT: No further questions.

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. OAKES:

- Q. Mr. Donnelly, would the Youth Authority determination to transfer a ward to CTF have to do with the fact of the type of inmates, primarily the age group of inamates normally housed at CTF?
- A. Yes, I believe it is a combination of those things. When it would come down to a question of needing bed space,

I believe they would operate on the principle that the more acting out inmate would come to North Facility, and the less acting out inmate or more amenable inmate to the Youth Authority.

- Q. They would prefer to send them to CTF rather than San Quentin?
 - A. Yes sir.
 - Q. Because of the age factor?
 - A. Yes.

в

- Q. Would also the fact that the Training Facility is a training facility? I know you can't speak for the Youth Authority, but do you believe this to be the case?
- A. I believe that the Youth Authority is concerned about the atmosphere in which the youth is being housed, and I believe North Facility, despite some training opportunities, does have the reputation of being a place in which the wards may be better able to conduct themselves.

FURTHER RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. COHLER:

- Q. Mr. Donnelly, you have referred to the North Facility several times. Now, when the ward of the Youth Authority is transferred to Soledad, is that a transfer to North Facility? Or precisely what is it a transfer to?
- A. The Youth Authority may transfer and has transferred wards to both North Facility, or they might refer the ward

to Central Facility.

- Q. Do they specify which?
- A. Yes, they do.
- Q. Has it ever happened, to your knowledge, that a ward transferred to Correctional Training Facility North has been placed in the Adjustment Center, which is in the Central Facility?
 - A. Yes sir.
- Q. Would you tell the Court, please, in what manner that is jurisdictionally proper, from your point of view, when the assignment was originally to North, and he is then placed in the Central Facility?
- A. I was present in North Facility when this question arose. I became concerned over wards being placed in the Adjustment Center, and we received permission, because of the necessity of trying to operate North Facility, we received the authority to move wards temporarily from North Facility to the Adjustment Center, the fact being then, I think at the next appearance, which would be the following month, of the Youth Authority at Soledad, the case of the ward could be brought up to the Youth Authority for determination as to whether or not he should be returned to North Facility, transferred to, perhaps, another institution, or released, or kept in the Adjustment Center, whatever the disposition of the Youth Authority might be.

including the Adjustment Center, was contemplated as a

temporary population problem relieving transfer?

Is it fair to say that the transfer to Central,

1 2

3

4

5

7

6

8

.0

.1

.3

.4

.5 .6

.7

.8

30

31

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Yes.

A. No sir. Transfers from North to the Adjustment Center?
Q. Yes.

- A. No sir. To the best of my knowledge it--
- Q. As far as the authority from the Youth Authority
 Board to do so, did they contemplate that you have open
 access to moving them to the Adjustment Center whenever you
 felt proper in your own discretion? Or was this to relieve
 you of a particular problem at North?
- A. This was simply to provide us with a method of controlling inmates who might have been acting up.
- Q. Including confinement not only in the Adjustment. Center, but in the quiet or strip cell area if you felt necessary?
- A. I believe that was the understanding. The Adjustment Center has been visited by members of the Youth Authority.
- MR. GRANUCCI: No further questions of this witness.

 May he be excused?

(Witness excused.)

MR. GRANUCCI: Your Honor, I had planned at this time

to recall Superintendent Fitzharris. I would ask leave not to do so. His testimony would be short. I would ask leave instead to call him tomorrow morning for short testimony.

Without going into too many of the details, the reason for my delay relates to the Court's request for correspondence between the office of Mr. McGee and the office of Mr. Fitzharris. I ask now that these proceedings be continued until tomorrow morning, at which time we would ask leave to recall Mr. Fitzharris.

MR. COHLER: May I say two things, if it please the Court?

First, I think it was inadvertent, counsel, but it was not only the office of Mr. McGee, but that would include the office of Mr. Dunbar and anyone--

MR. GRANUCCI: Yes. Sacramento.

MR. COHLER: Secondly, Your Honor, I would like to be advised, if it is possible, if we may move directly into argument following the conclusion of the testimony tomorrow morning, or what the Court may contemplate in that line?

THE COURT: How much testimony do you intend to have?

MR. GRANUCCI: Five minutes, or less, of direct, and
then as much cross as counsel feels is appropriate.

MR. COHLER: And I am going to ask that the Court for leave to recall Mr. Jordan for two questions.

THE COURT: I think, under the circumstances, you could

advance into the arguments, if you desire to do so.

MR. GRANUCCI: At the present time, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Or have the matter stand over. I understand the transcripts are not available, counsel.

MR. COHLER: Your Honor, I am prepared to go into argument following the conclusion of testimony tomorrow morning with, of course, the understanding that recollection of testimony may not be as accurate as it would be with the use of a transcript. There has been only one of me taking notes. Perhaps other counsel, with two, would have better notes.

MR. GRANUCCI: Your Honor, ordinarily I would say I would be prepared to start now. However, the testimony is not complete, and we are the defendants in this case, and I think we should have the opportunity to answer the plaintiff's argument before we start.

THE COURT: When would you prefer to go forward, counsel?

MR. GRANUCCI: As soon as counsel finishes his argument.

MR. COHLER: That is satisfactory.

THE COURT: Under the circumstances, if it be agreeable to counsel, we will go forward with the arguments tomorrow.

MR. GRANUCCI: That is fine, Your Honor.

MR. COHLER: Satisfactory.

1 ...

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

9

10

11

13

L4 L5

16

17

19

20

22

23 24

25

MR. GRANUCCI: Your Honor, about how much time would Your Honor want to limit the arguments to?

THE COURT: I have said this before, but I guess it bears repetition.

I never try to place limits on argument. It is pretty much within the bounds of counsels! own demands and the demands of the case.

Do you think you can conclude the arguments tomorrow?

MR. GRANUCCI: I think I could, Your Honor. My own
experience has been primarily in the Appellate Court of
the State and in this Circuit where they do rather stringently
limit time.

MR. COHLER: Your Honor, I have no experience in any court prior to this, but I feel that in the absence of the transcript I will be able to be as succinct as possible and contemplate within an hour, with responses, also, to questions from the Bench if the Court so desires.

THE COURT: We will proceed on that basis, and if the demands of the arguments run over, or if the matters require additional attention, we will continue over until Tuesday of the following week.

MR. GRANUCCI: I don't think that will be necessary.

But is quite agreeable.

MR. COHLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: On this memorandum submitted to the Court,

I should like an opportunity to go over it, and we will discuss it later.

MR. GRANUCCI: I will not mention that memorandum further, Your Honor, until Your Honor has let us have his opinion on it.

THE COURT: We will resume the calendar tomorrow at 9:30.

(A discussion was had between the Court and the Clerk Not within the hearing of the Reporter.)

THE COURT: I would suggest renewing the matters at hand in this case of Jordan at 10:30 tomorrow.

MR. COHLER: Shall we commence argument immediately following evidence?

THE COURT: As soon as Mr. Fitzharris is excused from the stand.

MR. COHLER: And the two questions of the plaintiff. Thank you, Your Honor.

(Whereupon the hearing was recessed until 10:30 a.m. Friday, August 19 1966.)

--000--

FRIDAY, AUGUST 19 1966 - MORNING SESSION - 10:30 A.M.

THE CLERK: 44309 and 44786.

MR. COHLER: Ready for the plaintiff and petitioner, Your Honor.

MR. GRANUCCI: Ready for the defendant, Your Honor.

May it please the Court, counsel have conferred and agreed that the following statement should be read into the record, with Your Honor's approval, of course, regarding the inquiry addressed by telegram to the Court from the father of Philip Millette, deceased.

"All records presently available within the Department of Corrections relating to Philipe Millette, deceased, when made available, the original documents to the Court and Xerox copies to opposing counsel.

In chambers opposing counsel related the views of an independent psychiatrist, known by reputation to the Court, and I related the views of Dr. Hack, consulting psychiatrist.

"After discussion, it was the judgment of all counsel. and the Court that the matter of the apprent suicide of Philip Millette bore no relevance to the instant litigation."

THE COURT: That is a correct statement.

MR. GRANUCCI: Thank you, Your Honor.

I also want to thank the Court for the opportunity to read this statement into the record.

THE COURT: Very well, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

В

7

8

9

LO.

11

:2

.3

.4

.5

.6

.7

8.

.9

10

11

22

23

14

15

MR. GRANUCCI: Call Mr. Fitzharris, please.

THE CLERK: Mr. Fitzharris.

CLETUS J. FITZHARRIS,

recalled as a witness on behalf of the defendants, having been previously duly sworn, resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

THE CLERK: Will the witness please restate his name for the record.

THÉ WITNESS: Cletus J. Fitzharris.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GRANUCCI: Q. Mr. Fitzharris, I believe that during your previous testimony you testified that certain changes were inaugurated in Adjustment Center procedure following discussions between yourself and your staff.

- A. That's right.
- Q. Would you please tell the Court whether you have attempted to refresh your recollection concerning this matter during the interval?
 - A. On the changes that were--
 - Q. On the changes that were inaugurated?
- A. Well, this relates back to the testimony of Mr. Donnelly--

Is this what you have reference to?

Q. That is right, Mr. Fitzharris.

- A. Mr. Donnelly's testimony was to the effect that Mr. McGee had made some representations to me or to the institution, which was not true--not--I represented to him. I told him that Mr. McGee had made inquiry. May I relate to the--
 - Q. Please relate the circumstances of that inquiry.
- A. I can't relate the time, but at a meeting of all of the wardens and superintendents of the Department of Corrections, plus other staff people, Mr. McGee, as he usually does at one of these meetings, takes a little time to brief us on many things that are happening in the legislative end of things, the research and various things that are going on of which he is aware and wants to bring us aboard.

As a part of this discussion, he mentioned that he had had conversations with one of the Supreme Court Justices-- I don't know which one--concerning a writ that had been filed.

- Q. Mr. Fitzharris, to interrupt you, did he say what inmate had filed the writ?
- A. He did not state any inmate, nor did he say what institution. I have no certain knowledge where that writ came from.
 - Q. Proceed.
 - A. His caution was that in these days when the Courts

are taking a more searching look at human rights, that all caution should be observed in dealing with the inmates in disciplinary matters. That is as far as I can recall what was said at that particular point.

Now, whether at that meeting or the subsequent meeting of the wardens and superintendents, I am not sure, but Mr. Dunbar again made the same point, again referring to all wardens and superintendents, making no reference to any particular case or no specific institution, but again cautioning all of us as to the need to keep an eye out for the rights of the individual.

- Q. Mr. Fitzharris, if these comments had been directed to conditions at Soledad, do you think your memory would be clearer?
- A. I am positive. One doesn't like to be embarrassed in front of his peers.
 - Q. Or his superiors, either, I take it.

Now, following these two--following these meetings or consultations with Mr. McGee and Mr. Dunbar, did you receive a memorandum from Mr. Stutsman?

- A. That is right.
- Q. Have you examined this copy of the memorandum?
- A. I have.

- Q. Is that copy substantially accurate?
- A. I think so.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. GRANUCCI: I am not prepared to vouch for the

MR. GRANUCCI: Your Honor, I would like to interject here. Your Honor asked for a search of the files for a correspondence between, generally speaking, the Sacramento office of the Department of Corrections and Mr. Fitzharris' office. A search was made at Soledad.

- Q. Is that correct, Mr. Fitzharris?
- A. That is true.
- Q. Were these documents found there?

A. No. If I may, I might explain that my secretary is on vacation and the substitute was unable to find any file that bore this. But I do recall that particular--

MR. GRANUCCI: However, Your Honor, I will represent to the Court that a search was requested in Sacramento.

The documents were found. They were read over the phone to my secretary, who transcribed them from the telephone conversation.

THE COURT: I will accept the documents through your office.

MR. COHLER: Yes, Your Honor. This is the best available evidence, and there is no objection.

MR. GRANUCCI: Of course, on the other hand, we reserve any other objections. But certainly this is the best available evidence.

THE CLERK

THE COURT: So ordered.

THE CLERK: Defendants R for identification.

actual verbatim accuracy of these transcriptions. I-will vouch for their substantial accuracy.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. GRANUCCI: Q. Now, was the first item of correspondence a memorandum dated February 1 1966, from Mr. Stutsman, Chief Deputy Director of the Department of Corrections, to all wardens, subject inmage discipline?

MR. COHLER: Excuse me.

THE COURT: One moment, counsel.

Have you had an opportunity to examine these?

MR. COHLER: Yes, Your Honor, I have copies.

With respect to counsel's pending question--

Are you asking, counsel, whether this is the first such document as found? Or are you asking for the witness, recollection? I think we ought to be careful there.

MR. GRANUCCI: I am representing that these three are all copies -- are what was found of the correspondence. Now, I am asking the witness about his recollection.

THE WITNESS: Aside from the date, I think the information therein and the signature thereon, it is substantially --it is. I don't remember the date offhand.

MR. GRANUCCI: I offer this as defendants next for identification.

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

to All Wardens and Superintendents, was marked Defendants Exhibit R for identification.)

in reply to that memorandum

(A letter dated February 1 1966

MR. GRANUCCI: Q. Now, in reply to that memorandum addressed to all wardens, did you in turn send a reply, addressed to Director Dunbar?

- A. I did.
- Q. Is it dated April 13 1966?
- A. That is true.
- Q. Is this a copy or a transcription of that?
- A. Insofar as I can tell, it seems to be, and the logic of the whole--this is a cover letter.
 - Q. That is a cover letter.

Defendants next for identification.

THE CLERK: Defendants' Exhibit S for identification.

(Copy of a letter dated April 13 1966, Mr. Fitzharris to Mr. Dunbar, was marked for identification as Defendants' Exhibit S.)

MR. GRANUCCI: Q. With the cover letter, was there included a memorandum to yourself from R. H. Donnelly, subject, inmate discipline, dated April 12 1966?

A. That is true.

MR. GRANUCCI: Defendants' next in order for identi-

THE CLERK: Defendants T for identification.

(A copy of a letter dated April 12 1966, Mr. Donnelly to Mr. Fitzharris, was marked for identification as Defendants Exhibit T.)

MR. GRANUCCI: Q. Directing your attention to the memo of February 1 1966-- Incidentally, Mr. Fitzharris, do you have a copy of that?

A. In my briefcase in the back there. It is in the second or third row.

Which one are we talking about now?

Q. The one dated February 1 1966, the third sentence of the third paragraph.

To the best of your understanding, what were the questionable practices referred to in that sentence?

MR. COHLER: Counsel, are you asking what the --

MR. GRANUCCI: What the witness' understanding of that was.

MR. COHLER: Of that was at the time he received the letter?

.MR. GRANUCCI: That is correct.

THE WITNESS: I didn't know.

MR. GRANUCCI: Q. You didn't know?

A. As I recall, there had been no items brought to anybody's attention in any of these meetings, there was nothing specified in this memorandum. I took this to mean that "whoever is doing something wrong, stop it."

- Q. Have you or did you subsequently, pursuant to that memorandum, undertake a review of Adjustment Center procedures? Or had that been undertaken previously, if you can remember?
- A. I can't exactly place it, but I am sure, from my usual method of procedure, that when I come home from one of these meetings and something has been emphasized by the Director or the Administrator or some other member of the staff, that seems to me to bear some looking into or need some action, I usually get set on doing it right away.
 - Q. Fine.
- A. So I presume that we had some discussions prior to receiving this. But I have no positive recollection.
- Q. Now, there is a letter dated--the next exhibit, dated April 13 1966, from yourself to Mr. Dunbar, the second paragraph dealing with the installation of an automatic flushing device for the Oriental toilets in the strip cells, would you read the next sentence, please.
- A. "This eliminates the possibility of staff becoming involved in other matters and not flushing the toilets with regularity."
 - Q. What did you mean by that sentence?
- MR. COHLER: Your Honor, I think the document speaks for itself.
 - MR. GRANUCCI: I think the document does not speak for

itself.

1

2

3

5

В

7

В

9

)

3

5

j

3

}

)

3

5

5

THE COURT: He may explain.

MR. GRANUCCI: The witness is entitled to explain.

THE COURT: He may explain.

THE WITNESS: My point was simply this, that if the Adjustment Center is in the state of fiege and in the state of riot and we are adding additional personnel to try to bring the thing under control, as we do frequently, we can't always depend on an officer's thinking at that time that, "This is now the time to flush the toilets." Besides, it is a time-consuming thing to unlock, go down in the tunnel, flush the toilets, come back and lock the tunnel.

So in the conservation of staff time in an urgent situation, and the fact that the human element enters this thing, always will and always would, this is what I had in mind.

- Q. The next sentence refers to the availability of water and personal hygiene materials to inmates in strip cells so that hygiene may be maintained. Would you please explain to the Court your point in that sentence.
- A. Well, I think we had reviewed this matter of the supplying of washbasins and the pitchers for the water, and at that point we had already installed them.
- Q. Now, the memorandum from Mr. Donnelly to yourself dated April 12 1966; second page, paragraph B, that paragraph

21.

makes reference to an apparent deviation from strict adherence to the Director's rules. Mr. Fitzharris, what was that deviation?

A. The only one that I can think of, and I haven't had a chance to spend too much time thinking and certainly haven't had a chance to review the records, but the only one I recall at the moment, was that it was the custom and practice in the past, and contrary to the Director's rules, that if an inmate persisted in boisterous, obscene, obnoxious behavior, verbal or otherwise, and continued to do this in spite of repeated warnings, the step prior to having to take him back to the quiet cell was to recommend a five-day, what they call cell exercise, which means he is not turned out into the corridor to pace up and down the long corridor, but rather is encouraged to use isometric exercises. At least, he is assigned to his cell without his daily exercise.

Now, at that point we found that the officers were recommending this to the sergeant and the sergeant was approving it, and while it wasn't a great deviation, because regulations provide that the program administrator could approve it, nevertheless, we went one step further and made it so that the disciplinary committee would have to approve it.

This is the only deviation from any regulations that I

can think of.

MR. GRANUCCI: Very good, Mr. Fitzharris. Now, to sum up: To the best of your knowledge, were the changes in the Adjustment Center procedure occasioned or motivated by this lawsuit?

A. I am positive, in my own mind, that they were not. There was a discussion had in file of last year concerning the deprivation of inmates in quiet cells of their clothing, and I was told by the staff that one of the serious reasons—one of the serious reasons—was that we had had a suicide by the use of the coveralls; and, two, there had been frequently burning of the clothing and mattresses and so forth.

In September -- and this we didn't remember the other day--but in September of last year, certainly long before this suit was involved, we sent out I have forgotten how many coveralls and how many blankets to be fireproofed so they could be issued to people we thought would be inclined to burn their furnishings.

- Q. Fine. Thank you, Mr. Fitzharris.
- A. May I continue to say that in my sincere feeling, none of these so-called improvements were occasioned by this lawsuit. They would have happened if this lawsuit had not been filed.
- Q. Mr. Fitzharris, yesterday you heard the testimony of Mr. Donnelly, that Mr. Jordan would probably be moved

at the conclusion of this lawsuit.

Yes.

2 A.

Q. Now, are there plans to move him while the case is under submission?

A. There are no plans at all at the moment. This is

Mr. Donnelly's recommendation, and this has to be acted

upon by a classification committee and it has to be approved

by a representative of the Director's office. This has not

been done, nor has it been requested.

- Q. What will be done with the plaintiff while the case is before the Judge for his decision and before he decides it?
- A. I would hope that plaintiff could be remanded to the custody of the Marshal. However, if not, we will return him back to Soledad and he can continue to live in his same cell.
- Q. Now, Mr. Fitzharris, did you ever conspire with any of the other defendants to bring about a deprivation of the plaintiff's constitutional rights?

MR. COHLER: Same objection, Your Honor.

THE WITNESS: Never.

MR. GRANUCCI: Q. Do you have any malice toward the plaintiff?

A. None at all. Only disappointment.

MR. GRANUCCI: Your witness, counsel.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BY MR. COHLER:

- Mr. Fitzharris, in addition to the meetings of the wardens and superintendents, which I think you said took place on two occasions --
 - A. I didn't say two occasions.
 - Q. I misunderstood. Once. Is that correct?
 - A. I wasn't sure.
 - All right. One or two occasions.

Outside of the actual meetings themselves, and so as to avoid the embarrassment before your peers and superiors which you related, was there any private conversation with you at all from anyone in the Sacramento office regarding the subject matter you have testified to?

- Yes, informally the Director, Director Dunbar talked to me, I think maybe during a coffee break or some time informally, at least, and indicated that people, inmates being put in the quiet cells without clothing should be watched very carefully. At that time I recall telling him that we had already provided for the fireproofing of coveralls, and this would probably alleviate a good deal of the problem.
- Outside of the meetings themselves, there was conversation relating to the same general subject matter, directed at you as Superintendent -- not "at you" excuse me.

- 1 2
- 3
- 5
- в
- 7
- 8 9
- LO
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 4
- 15 .ც
- .7
- 18
- 19
- 30 31
- 32
- 23
- 34
- 35

- --conversation with you as Superintendent of the Correctional Training Facility. Is that correct?
 - Only on this one issue, one topic.
- Mr. Fitzharris, reference has been made to a memorandum which is Defendants! Exhibit T for identification, from Mr. Donnelly to yourself. I believe you have a copy before you. April 12th is the date on the transcript copy.

I believe you testified that that memorandum was in the works before the memorandum from Mr. Stutsman to all wardens, which is Defendants' --

MR. GRANUCCI: Objection. He is misstating the testi-There was no testimony that this memorandum was in the works before the memorandum of February 1st. It was his testimony that there were changes for review or under investigation.

MR. COHLER: All right. I am sorry. I will start over.

- I believe you testified, Mr. Fitzharris, that review was under consideration before Mr. Stutsman's memorandum to all wardens, Defendants' R for identification, had been received. Is that correct?
 - A. Right.
- Mr. Donnelly's memorandum bearing the date April Q. 12th, Defendants' T for identification, starts off in the

A.

8

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

following manner, does it not?

"The following is in reply to Mr. Stutsman's letter of February 1, 1966, subject as above." Yes.

MR. COHLER: Those are all of the questions I have. However, defendants have not moved the admission in evidence of their exhibits for identification R. S and T. would like to have these marked as Plaintiff's Exhibits, if they are not going to move them in evidence, so they may come in.

MR. GRANUCCI: It is our position, Your Honor, that any evidence of change in this case is irrelevant and immaterial. We have maintained this position throughout the proceedings. We have marked these exhibits for identification pursuant to the direction of the Court.

Now, I will not stipulate to the admission of them into evidence. In fact, I think the Court should not even consider them, because I think that they relate to matters of change, and those matters of change themselves are irrelevant in this proceeding.

MR. COHLER: Your Honor, these are documents which have both served to refresh the memory of this witness, which were thought to possibly exist by Mr. Donnelly, and which appear, by Mr. Donnelly's testimony, to have been generated at least in part from inquiry of the California Supreme

Court or a Justice thereof on some informal basis.

.2

:1

The present witness has stated that there was discussion at a meeting of wardens and superintendents regarding the Court's view of human rights. These documents appear to have been generated, at least in part, related to such discussion.

The changes are very much in admission, or at least support the inference of an admission as to whether or not human rights were properly protected previously. That is the very heart of this case.

As far as relevancy goes, I see no foundation for an objection.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled. They may be marked.

Do you propose to mark them as Plaintiff's exhibits?

MR. COHLER: I would be happy to have them as Plaintiff's exhibits, unless the defendants want to keep the same letters and have them--

MR. GRANUCCI: I have no objection to them carrying the same letters. But I do not want to waive my subsequent--

MR. COHLER: I will stipulate that counsel's record is protected.

THE COURT: Perhaps they could be marked on behalf of the Court.

MR. GRANUCCI: That is agreeable.

1 MR. COHLER: I will be happy to have them as Plaintiff's exhibits. 2 3 THE COURT: Very well. THE CLERK: 4 Plaintiff's Exhibits 14, 15 and 16. 5 MR. COHLER: Corresponding to Defendants' for identification, R, S and T. 6 7 THE COURT: They may be marked. 8 (Copies of three letters previously marked for identifica-9 tion as Defendants' Exhibits R, S and T, were marked for identi 10 fication as Plaintiff's Exhibits 14, 15 and 16.) 11 12 MR. COHLER: I move their admission in evidence. 13 THE COURT: They may be marked. 14 THE CLERK: In evidence. 15 (Copies of three letters previously marked as Plaintiff's 16 Exhibits 14, 15 and 16 for identification, were received in 17 evidence.) 18 MR. GRANUCCI: I have no further questions of this 19 witness, Your Honor. May he be excused? 20 THE COURT: Yes. (Witness excused.) 21 Your Honor, that concludes the presenta-22 MR. GRANUCCI: tion of defendants; witnesses. I do have some motions. 23 24 MR. COHLER: Excuse me. Do you want to move after your

25

case?

5

6

4

7 8

10

9

12

11

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

25

24

MR. GRANUCCI: I want to move before I submit my case. Do you have any rebuttal at all, counsel? MR. COHLER: Your Honor, I am going to move admission

of documents which have been produced by the defendants and ask two questions of the plaintiff.

MR. GRANUCCI: This is the Wells disciplinary file. It was subpoenaed from the California Youth Authority.

May I see it? This is as to Wells? THE COURT:

MR. GRANUCCI: This is as to Wells. Your Honor, Youth Authority records, being confidential, are not readily available, and we had to obtain a subpoena to get them. Having obtained the subpoena and having received the file, we copied the documents. We introduce those into evidence for the same purpose that the other disciplinary records were introduced.

MR. COHLER: Limited to showing bias?

MR. GRANUCCI: Limited to showing bias.

MR. COHLER: Your Honor, so the record may be clear, I have not reviewed the documents. However, I would not object to the offer for the same purpose.

I would like the record to be clear that I do not represent Mr. Wells, and make no representation as to whether or not he would want his documents, which the Youth Authority Board considers private, to be entered into evidence.

MR. GRANUCCI: Now, my second motion is to expand the consideration by this Court of the disciplinary records presently before it on the plaintiff's inmate and X inmate records. Those records were introduced to the Court to show bias. I now move that the Court expand its consideration of those records inasmuch as those records constitute information which was before the defendants and could lead them to draw conclusions about the propriety of Adjustment Center and for quiet cell confinement.

MR. COHLER: Your Honor, I shall object rather strenuously to this for several reasons.

First, the reports themselves are clear hearsay, an objection which was not raised as to the limited offer.

Secondly, this would mean that the reports came in on that basis after the opportunity for plaintiff and petitioner to present any answering side of stories or things of that matter, not as to what the incident reported was, but as to what happened in the hearing committee.

As I understand it, the offer is designed to show what information the committee acted on. That is pure hearsay in those documents. Inmates who are spoken of in those reports may have a very different version of what was told the committee. The opportunity for that testimony is--

THE COURT: In view of the original ruling and the limited nature thereof, my ruling will remain as it is.

4 5

MR. COHLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The documents are limited in purpose and scope.

MR. COHLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. GRANUCCI: My next motion, Your Honor, is to introduce the exhibits -- I do not recall the specific numbers -- the toothbrush weapons.

PTHE CLERK: I will give you the numbers on those.

Defendants Exhibits for identification K, L, M and N.

MR. COHLER: Your Honor, I object on the following grounds: The testimony which was elicited regarding the weapons amply demonstrates that weapons are found, weapons are dangerous, and this is the common occurrence. The weapons themselves have been shown affirmatively to have absolutely no relevance at all to the time period or the people involved in this lawsuit.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. GRANUCCI: My next motion, which I make before I submit to the Court, but I ask the right to reserve argument on the motion in the course of my argument is this:

To dismiss this case as against the defendants the State of California and the Correctional Training Facility at Soledad. I made the motion previously during the pretrial proceedings. It was denied, but the Court allowed me leave to renew the motion. I herein renew it, and will present

. .

BY MR. COHLER:

argument upon this point at the time of argument of the case.

THE COURT: I will reserve my ruling.

MR. COHLER: In addition to reserving your ruling, Your Honor, I think the record should be clear and we should be careful here as to when, if this motion be granted, it is effective. We are going to have some rebuttal testimony and there is going to be final argument, and I don't want to have a risk of a new trial.

THE COURT: I reserve the ruling.

MR. COHLER: Thank you.

MR. GRANUCCI: Having presented our motion, we conclude our case.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. COHLER: Your Honor, with leave of Court, I willack
Mr. Jordan to resume the stand. Mr. Jordan?

ROBERT CHARLES JORDAN, JR., oulisown behalf called as a witness in rebuttal by the plaintiff, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Restate your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Robert Charles Jordan, Jr.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

Q. Mr. Jordan, if you will please direct your attention

to July 20 1965, when you were removed from the strip cell through at least July 24th, a Saturday, and tell the Court whether or not at that time inmates in isolation, not the strip cell area, were under escort when they left the cell for exercise or for a shower.

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

в

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COHLER: That is all, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Will you read the question and answer, please.

(The record was read.)

THE COURT: They were escorted, were they, the inmates?

THE WITNESS: Yes, all of them were.

THE COURT: By whom?

THE WITNESS: By officer -- if I can explain it?

THE COURT: Yes.

THE WITNESS: The night before I was released from the strip cell, they had what they call a noise riot in the whole building, and the officers--the program administrator and everybody else showed up, and they stripped everyone in isolation. They stripped--

THE COURT: Including the six cells, they stripped the whole isolation area?

THE WITNESS: Yes. They took the mattresses, the blankets, the sheets, the clothes, and every article in the house used to make noise or anything like this.

MERILYN SEYBERT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
P. O. BOX 36052 ROOM 19445
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102
TELEPHONE 621-5797

They they had--these guys were over there for some type of riot or some noise. All of them were YA's.

THE COURT: All of them were Youth Authorities?

THE WITNESS: Yes, YA's. And they were talking about if the cells were open they were going to fight and do this and they were calling the officers out. So every time some one in that section, they let them shower, they let them exercise. And the officer would come with a club and open the man's cell, and they said, "All right, you shower," and he'd go shower, and the officer would stand right there and he'd even walk for five minutes against the wall. He couldn't come against the cell. He had to stay on the wall side.

MR. COHLER: Q. Just so it will be perfectly clear, that applied to inmates in the isolation as opposed to the strip cell area as well, did it not?

A. Yes, that was isolation.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. GRANUCCI:

- Q. Mr. Jordan, you are sure this happened--
- A. Oh, yes, I am sure.
- Q. I hadn't finished the question.

Are you sure this happened around the 20th of July or just before you got out of the quiet cell?

A. It happened before I got out of the quiet cell,

.25

and everybody was stripped when I came out. In fact, when I was up front they brought two of us up to the strip cell, and they took us up front and they gave us mattresses and they gave us our clothes, and we were the only guys in there so we had to put up with a lot of mouth from these guys about, "How come they can have theirs and we can't have ours? They must be snitchers or something." You remember this.

MR. GRANUCCI: O.K., Mr. Jordan. No further questions.

MR. COHLER: No questions, Your Honor. Thank you, Mr.

Jordan.

(Witness excused.)

MR. COHLER: Mr. Grace, I ask to be marked next in order for identification what purports to be copies, 21 pages in total stapled together, represented to me by opposing counsel to be the totality of documents found relating to psychiatric examinations, interviews, reports, bearing on the plaintiff.

MR. GRANUCCI: No objection to their admission into evidence if plaintiff offers them.

THE COURT: This is a compilation of the psychiatric examinations?

MR. COHLER: Yes, and the purpose of my making the offer, Your Honor, is that Dr. Hack read portions thereof.

I think the record ought to be complete. The plaintiff and

petitioner have advised me that his waiver of privilege applies equally to these documents. He has no personal objection if there be any privilege.

THE COURT: Is that correct, Mr. Jordan?

MR. JORDAN: Yes sir.

. 7

MR. COHLER: I would like the record to be complete, rather than just excerpts from various reports as read on the stand by Dr. Hack. I offer them in evidence.

MR. GRANUCCI: No objection.

THE COURT: What is Mr. Jordan's age at the present time?

MR. COHLER: 27, Your Honor.

MR. GRANUCCI: That is correct, Your Honor.

MR. COHLER: I may state to the Court --

THE COURT: I notice some of these are signed by another gentleman.

MR. COHLER: That is correct. I am advised by counsel that some of these reports came from other institutions, other places where Mr. Jordan has been.

THE COURT: This is the compilation, counsel?

MR. GRANUCCI: That is the compilation, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well.

THE CLERK: Plaintiff's 17 in evidence.

(A compilation of psychiatric reports on Mr. Jordan were marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit 17 and received in evidence.)

MR. GRANUCCI: Your Honor, we have some surrebuttal, very short.

MR. OAKES: Call Mr. Hoagland, please.

THE CLERK: Mr. Hoagland.

ROBERT R. HOAGLAND,

called as a witness in surrebuttal by the defendants, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Will the witness restate his name.

THE WITNESS: Robert Hoagland.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. OAKES.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Mr. Hoagland, did you just hear the testimony of the plaintiff on the stand?
 - A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. Do you have any idea, sir, what he is talking about?
- A. No, and I mentioned this yesterday. I have no knowledge of this incident he is talking about.
- Q. Do you recall any incidents during this period when you would be escorting men out of the isolation cells when they were out of the isolation cells?
 - A. No, I don't remember.
 - MR. OAKES: I have no further questions.
 - MR. COHLER: No questions, Your Honor.
 - THE COURT: Thank you.

(Witness excused.)

...

MR. COHLER: The plaintiff has no further evidence to offer.

THE COURT: Is the matter submitted on the evidence?

MR. COHLER: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. GRANUCCI: Submitted for the defendants, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We will take a five-minute recess and then go into the arguments.

(A short recess was taken.)

MR. COHLER: I hope to be as brief as possible.

THE COURT: No restrictions on argument.

MR. COHLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

I think the evidence which we have heard and the events which have been described through various witnesses is of the type which sticks in the mind. I think the memories of some of the inmates and the former inmates who have testified are indelibly impressed with these scenes. And some of these scenes are things most of us would normally expect to have passed from the scene a long time ago in our history.

There are two actions consolidated before the Court; a petition for habeas corpus and an action under the so-called Civil Rights Act.

As appointed counel, I do not wish to abandon the petition for habeas corpus. I feel the Court should consider the disposition available under that petition and the issuance of the writ if the Court feels in its

evils we have had described, to other remedy can adequately protect the plaintiff's rights.

The civil rights action, so-called, is founded on jurisdiction under 28 USC Sections 1343 and 1331, and I think the jurisdiction is clear.

The statutes themselves are designed generally to protect civil rights under the United States Constitution.

Section 1983 deals with individual or unilateral action which violates a person's rights. In this case, the contention is that the plaintiff's rights have been violated.

Section 1985 refers to conspiratorial behavior toward the same end.

THE COURT: Pardon me, counsel. May I interrupt you just a moment?

MR. COHLER: Please.

THE COURT: Do you regard this as a class action?

MR. COHLER: Your Honor, the complaint was not framed as a class action. Consideration was given to that at the time, and subsequently. My understanding of the new rules of Federal Civil Procedure, and I have not reviewed them closely, but my understanding is that the requisite of representation has been somewhat increased in some respects For a single individual to have brought class action in this instance was not in my discretion at the time and my

judgment at the time appropriate, I did not do so, nor am
I moving the Court to amend the complaint to conform to the
evidence in that regard.

Cognizant, however, that rulings which may affect the plaintiff's incarceration may also affect others, and likewise cognizant that we have heard from inmates on a which the Court may infer, represents what we would hear from a great many other inmates, dounsel has not attempted to search out those inmates who had the worst possible situation. The inmates and former inmates heard by the Court as witnesses were taken from a list submitted in answers to interrogatories propounded by the plaintiff to Superintendent Fitzharris. From that list, only those available at the Correctional Training Facility were interviewed, and affidavits from all of those persons were submitted. For various reasons, not all of those persons testified, nor were they called by the defense.

I do not consider it a true class action, a hybrid class action, a spurious class action in the formal sense. I think the evidence is indicative of what happens to a large group of people.

Plaintiff need only prove that his rights were deprived he was deprived of his constitutional rights and that that happened under the color of State law.

I refer the Court to Marshall v. Sawyer found at

301 F.2d 639, a Ninth Circuit case decided in 1962, and further to Antelope v. George, 211 F.Supp 657, from the District Court in Idaho, also in 1962.

Б

Your Honor, the constitutional rights at issue in this case are found under the 14th Amendment to the Federal Constitution, particularly the due process clause. It has been held, and in fact, the defendants conceded in motions for summary judgment and to dismiss, that the standards of cruel and unusual punishment as stated in the 8th Amendment are considered under this due process clause. As cited by the defendants in that memorandum, the authority for that proposition is Robinson v. California, 370 U.S. 660, a 1962 Supreme Court case.

In accord, very recently in the Fourth Circuit, Driver v. Hinnant.

THE COURT: What is the citation?

MR. COHLER: I beg your pardon. 356 F.2d, 761, the Fourth Circuit, early this year 1966.

The language of the 8th Amendment, which is dealt with through or incorporated in, however the phrase may be used, the due process clause of the 14th Amendment, refers to cruel and unusual punishment. There is no testimony as to the usual or unusual nature of the conditions which have been described, except that they seem to prevail at this institution, or so the evidence has shown.

4

6

10

12

L3

L4

15

16

.7

.9

30

31

)2 |3

:5

14

But I do not feel that the Court ought to be concerned about the strict language of the "and unusual."

For instance, in the Robinson v. California case just cited to the Court, the Supreme Court of the United States held that a law in California, a statute, convicting for addiction to narcotics constituted cruel and unusual punishment. Clearly, that was not unusual. It was a statute being enforced until the decision.

Likewise, the Driver v. Hinnant case, just cited to the Court, went off on the same rationale involving chronic alcoholism, clearly again there was no requisite of "and unusual." The sense of the constitutional prohibition is that this isn't right, it is a breach of human dignity, it is going too far.

The language of "cruel and unusual punishment" in connection with the 14th Amendment due process clause has come inside the prison walls before this Court may rule in this case, in Talley v. Stephens found at 247 F. Supp 683.

In November of 1965 the Eastern District of Arkansas District Court, a Federal Court, held with respect to a State prison that an inmate could not be put to hard labor where he was not physically capable of hard labor; this was cruel and unusual punishment.

I think it is fair to say that the law in this area, as far as rationale goes, a doctrine goes, is not too

difficult, as always the application of the law may not be as easy.

I would like to clear a little more underbrush here, if I may, particularly with respect to the responsibility of superiors.

The defendants in this case are, by and large, superiors, down a chain of command as described by Superintendent Fitzharris. The defendants in this case, many of them, have not had personal knowledge of the events described by plaintiff's witnesses.

There has been talk of policy, procedure, what ought to be done, rules, et cetera. That does not relieve the defendants of responsibility.

As stated by the Court in Talley v. Stephens, just cited, the Eastern District of Arkansas case in November of last year, and I quote as found at page 692:

"It is also true that the record does not disclose that respondent" --

There the warden, Your Honor, a superior official, in a position of superiority--

"authorized or had personal knowledge of some of the events mentioned herein. However, it must not be overlooked that respondent is in charge of the Penitentiary and is responsible for the acts of his subordinates, including trusty

guards. He is not relieved of that responsibility by personal ignorance of abuses practiced in fields and barracks.**

Although the facts are different in this case than that, the principle is the same.

In addition --

THE COURT: Wasn't that case concerned with a number of lashes to be administered to inmates?

MR. COHLER: There were three petitioners or plaintiffs in that case, as I recall it, Your Honor. Different circumstances were involved with respect to each inmate. The holding, as I recall, was more closely with respect to the hard labor situation rather than corporal punishment. I may be mistaken in my recollection.

THE COURT: I remember integrated in the case was a matter of corporal punishment.

MR. COHLER: Yes, that was discussed.

This is clearly, I would say, enough under Section 1983, which deals with unilateral action of a defendant or any person.

Section 1985 refers to a conspiracy. A conspiracy was described by Dr. Kunkel as ganging up. Dr. Kunkel is not an attorney and is not expected to state the law and I do not believe that is a statement of the law. Conspiracy is collobration.

more in the nature of corroboration, group action, working

toward the same goal. Corroboration is a term which Mr. Fitzharris himself used to describe a team approach, which the Director of Corrections had emphasized in a speech Mr. Fitzharris related. This is group action. You don't have to have a written agreement for conspiracy. This has been settled for a long time.

In this case the group action was intended to effect certain programs, was intended to permit certain types of incarceration, was intended to permit certain types of removal of privileges.

Those who propose, promulgate and supervise the programs working together take the responsibility for seeing that it is not abused and that the practice follows the proper procedure. I think that this is sufficient group activity toward that goal to constitute conspiracy.

I want to state at this time, Your Honor, that Mr. DeCarli defendant and Mr. Swagerty defendant were not at the institution and in this area at the time of July 1965. In the event damages are awarded, I do not think they should be held for damages. In the event injunctive relief of any sort is awarded, they are clearly in positions of responsibility held by others before them, and ought to be the subject of injunctive relief as well as the other defendants.

I think it is clear on the evidence in this case the

policy which is supposed to be followed has not been in many cases. And in other cases, even the policy is not up to minimum constitutional standards.

The defendants' evidence consists almost throughout of simple statement that, "We do what we are supposed to"; "We follow policy"; "It was always that way"; "I would have noticed anything unusual."

I think it is fair to say that the defendants who work at the institution cannot be expected to remember these events as well as those who were subjected to them. The defendants see these things every day. They might not be able to sort out the time very well. But the man who is put in that cell will remember it. And he will remember the specifics, as the testimony shows.

It would have been asking something almost inhuman for the guards, correctional officers, sergeants who heard Mr. Fitzharris say that he relied upon his subordinates, to come forward and admit that they didn't do what they were supposed to do. That was the nature of most of the questions: "Was there a policy? Did you follow it? Did you do what you were supposed to do?" I don't think any witness can come forward and say, "I didn't do what I was supposed to do." I don't think there is much weight to that testimony.

That testimony must be balanced against specific recollection and close narration by several inmates and former

inmates, and I will turn to that in a moment, if the Court please.

There is also uncontradicted evidence that the policy, so-called, was not followed in practice. Your Honor will recall the forms 114, plaintiff's Exhibit 13 in this case, the sign-in sheets, the movement sheets down in the isolation section. Where the inmates are moved from cell to cell, they are supposed to be marked down they were moved. Cell exercises indicated. Showers are indicated. Shaves are indicated.

There has been a problem of a shower in this case, and I will come to that at a later point in time. But the defendants themselves say in trying to explain away the shower situation as to whether or not Mr. Jordan had a shower when he was in the quiet cell or strip cell, that they don't keep the records that well.

Well, those records are vital. If it means anything to these people to have a man take a shower, the only way they can tell whether or not he had one within the past five days, according to their policy, is to look at that or happen to hear it from someone in passing.

Those records are not incidental, technical records which are kept to be sent off somewhere where they are not used. They are used daily. Each officer so testified, that he used that in the normal course of business.

There has been a lot of testimony that the men working down there are very busy, and I think that may have a good deal of bearing on just how much they do of what they are supposed to do. It may be that in being so busy, they don't sign in as well.

THE COURT: Is it not virtually conceded, counsel, that they were undermanned?

MR. COHLER: Your Honor, it is conceded that they were understaffed, underfinanced, and under pressure, and had a very tough job to do.

There are problems in this case of two different nature. The defendants have very real problems. We have heard very candid testimony, particularly from the upper administrative defendants. There are very real problems at this institution which they are trying to work out, and I think they are trying in good faith to work them out and have so demonstrated to the Court.

But there is a second kind of problem. The defendants' problems, understaffed, underfinanced, with a tough job to do, cannot be reason for letting a man have his constitutional rights be deprived. Whether or not Mr. Jordan's rights were taken from him, that is a question for this courtroom.

It is not up to the Court to decide the best way to run a prison. But it is up to the Court to decide that if men

are to be incarcerated in special punishment cells called "strip cells" or "quiet cells," that there has to be enough staff, there has to be enough resources available to see to it that a man's rights are not taken away from him. That is the concern of the Court.

In addition to the isolation log movement sheet which wasn't filled out, and where men were busy, and where there was understaffing, there is a disciplinary called the CDC ll5. Several are in evidence for a limited purpose, to show bias.

Here is an area where the institution itself recognizes the importance of a hearing, the importance of an inmate telling his story, the importance of discipline which is meted out fairly; or if it isn't, resentment and hostility may be built up, as seems to be the case in many instances, according to the testimony.

The CDC 115, the disciplinary report, is not a quick sign-in type piece of paper. It is very important, and it is acknowledged to be important.

The disposition on the form 115 is written by someone present at the hearing. There is approval given by superiors who were not at the hearing, based upon what is written.

Mr. Donnelly, the Deputy Superintendent, said that there were other files available to see where a man might

4 5

be at the moment. He didn't look at those in Mr. Jordan's case, and it didn't appear that he did so generally.

It is what is on that piece of paper which is important. The disposition in this case, which happens to be before the Court, of Mr. Jordan-and I don't think that Mr. Jordan brought this case knowing that his 115 hadn't been filled out correctly. He brought it for other reasons.

In this case, which happened to come up for other reasons, the 115 report itself did not show the disposition which was made. Sergeant Friedrick, acting unilaterally, made an entry that the plaintiff was to be placed in a quiet or strip cell "until behavior warrants change."

It is my understanding that these quiet cells or strip cells are something special. There are only six of them. They have to be reserved for particularly difficult cases, some of which are incorrigible, as Dr. Hack has said. Care must be taken in putting a man in a quiet cell or strip cell. It is supposed to be the last thing you do to him. You want to reserve those.

But no superior had a chance to pass upon the wisdom of assigning Mr. Jordan to the quiet cell or the strip cell.

I think that bears in two ways. First of all, it is not supposed to be done that way, by their own rules. An error of that nature, I don't think is an inadvertent mistake. Perhaps it is.

3 4 5

6

8

7

9 10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 . 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

Mr. Kiepura testified that he didn't remember anything at all about the hearing; he only knew what was in the docu-For some reason, he was able to remember what he had forgotten at the hearing itself to write down, that Mr. Jordan was supposed to go to the quiet cell.

Whether or not Mr. Jordan's going to the quiet cell was actually discussed between Mr. Kiepura and Sergeant Friedrick at the meeting, no superior knew of the disposition, and the superior approved the form as written.

There were also supposed to be three people at the meeting. There were only two. This also may be attributed to understaffing. It is a rule which is considered important by the Superintendent, and it wasn't followed.

Sergeant Friedrick emphasized that a man's clothing couldn't be taken away by himself alone, that this required approval. With regard to Mr. Esparza and the so-called tear gas incident, Officer Mata said that Sergeant Friedrick ordered Esparza to take off his clothes. Sergeant Friedrick said that he had requested authority for the use of tear gas and to remove his clothes. But I think if anything is clear about that incident, it is clear that the tear gas was ordered because Esparza wouldn't take his clothes off. So there was an order to take off clothes before there was a request for the authority. And it was to follow up on that order, made without a request for

authority that the extraordinary measure of tear gas was used.

THE COURT: Wasn't it a blanket used as sort of a shroud over his head rather than clothing?

MR. COHLER: It was both, Your Honor. There was a blanket that was used as a shroud over his head, as I recall the testimony, and he was ordered to throw out all his clothes except, as Sergeant Friedrick said, his shorts, I believe; perhaps his socks as well.

Sergeant Friedrick testified he wouldn't have been left in the cell with just his shorts before that. He was told to roll out his blanket, step out of his clothes, as I recall it.

The flaps are supposed to be open except when there is a disturbance. It is clear from all sides that the flaps were closed most of the time.

However, there is also a lot of testimony here that the flaps were only closed when there was a disturbance. Maybe this all fits together.

Officer Caldwell said you have to leave the flaps closed until you are sure the man won't start agitating again. He says that is two or three days. And, of course, everyone says they move the man out of the quiet cell or strip cell as quickly as they can.

So, isn't it quite possible that the flaps are closed

while the man is in the quiet cell or strip cell, because for two or three days they have to be closed because he might agitate and as soon as he stops agitating they move him out. The result, as Officer Nash testified to directly, is that the flaps were closed most of the time.

That is also true of the testimony from the inmates and former inmates with respect to their various occasions in the quiet or strip cell.

It is interesting to note with respect to the flaps that Officer Nash, and I believe other officers, testified that if an inmate wanted more water he could get it on request, and that in fact the request for water could be heard up at the officers' area, even though the flaps were closed.

Now, these are the flaps used and designed and justified to stop noise. Whether or not any noise could be heard from that cell with the flaps closed, it seems probable that the noise would sound more like agitation than a legitimate request for water.

With respect to clothing, Your Honor, and what an inmate might be permitted to wear inside the quiet or strip cell, the rule as read by Mr. Fitzharris is that clothing may be removed only temporarily, only for a suicide watch, and only with a note to the psychiatrist or the officer of the day.

18:

Plaintiff's testimony that he was without clothing for eight days is uncontradicted. There are people who say it doesn't work that way. And there are people who say, "Well I don't remember one way or the other." But no one said that during those eight days they remember seeing Mr. Jordan with his clothes on.

There is a lot of general recollection about what is supposed to happen and what might have happened. But that testimony is virtually uncontradicted, and I submit that even if it is contradicted, it must prevail.

The man didn't say he didn't have clothes at all. He said he didn't have them for eight of these 12 days. I believe Mr. Jordan would recall that.

No one has had the audacity to come forward and say that Mr. Jordan was on suicide watch. He did have a history of what appears to be an attempted suicide at Vacaville. He was permitted his glasses, certainly a dangerous weapon for mutilating himself. He was permitted a pencil, which he had to steal to write to the Court; certainly a dangerous weapon. And his flaps were closed, which would pretty much preclude a suicide watch type of observation. Here again, the policy was not followed. Procedure was not followed.

I don't think the clothing is a trivial mistake. Somebody has to take your clothes. They just don't forget, they aren't forgotten to be written down, logged somewhere.

In fact, Mr. Fitzharris just told us a few moments ago there was a very real problem about inmates having clothing in the quiet or strip cells, that there was a fire problem. I think it is a fair inference from what Mr. Fitzharris said that to his knowledge that until they could arrange to have these things fireproofed, there were many occasions when inmates in quiet cells weren't permitted their clothes. The plaintiff has testified his was one such instance.

There have been a lot of abstractions about control and punishment. There has been various discussion from various witnesses on this subject.

Mr. Donnelly said, Deputy Superintendent Donnelly, that a punishment must have a certain maximum time, the time must be certain as to the maximum amount of punishment. In the plaintiff's own case, Sergeant Friedrick put him in a quiet or strip cell until his behavior warranted change. It is true his isolation sentence was 29 days, but there is a marked difference between isolation and quiet cell.

Reference has been made to the hearing, to the number of people present, to what was written down on the 115 disposition regarding Mr. Jordan. I would like to touch briefly on what might be called the procedural due process aspect of this case.

It is the plaintiff's major contention that under the conditions as testified to by plaintiff's witnesses no man

L7 L8

?3

can be incarcertated in these cells. As a part of that contention, there are certain aspects which I shall point out to the Court in a moment, which even if they were as the defendants say they are, no man can be put in that cell.

There are certain limited functions which can be justified for a strip cell. It is, in the very strict sense, a control measure to prevent a man from destroying himself, destroying State property, and arousing the inmate population. I will avoid the term "agitation," if possible, because it seems to be almost all encompassing.

If this most severe type of confinement, and I don't mean severe in a colored sense, but it is severe; it is a stripped cell, with no furnishings and no facilities. At least, it wasn't until recently.

If a man should be put in that situation, there must be a good deal of care taken that he is not abused, intentionally, unintentionally, by understaffing or whatever, that while he is down there right near the rock bottom of having the necessities for survival, that he doesn't lose them.

To put a man in that situation should take a good deal of thought by people who are accustomed to thinking in larger terms than, "Where do we move this man today?" and "Who do we go with tomorrow?"

One man, at the second highest level, just above

1

3

5 6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

correctional officer, one man ought not have the discretion to put a person, as in this case the plaintiff, in this most severe cell, regardless of the conditions in that cell "until behavior warrants change."

Any person, even within the prison walls, is entitled to a little bit more of a hearing. Now, there are no rules of evidence in these hearings, there aren't judgments --

THE COURT: Aren't there areas as contended for by the respondents or defendants that could center around emergency aspects?

MR. COHLER: Exactly, Your Honor, and I was just about to exclude that situation. There may be emergencies of many natures. There may be a real riot. There may be a particular inmate causing a problem. There may be a fire. There may be a stabbing. There could be any number of things easily imagined. There is no reason that the quiet cell or strip cell could not be used on that occasion.

But when it comes time to making a disposition, and it appears to take some time sometimes to get to this hearing committee, but whenever it is deemed proper to have a hearing at some point, somebody besides one person at the second highest level in the institution ought to decide whether the man remains there and ought to decide more than "until behavior warrants change."

I am not trying to interfere with the discretions to

handle, and plaintiff does not submit discretion should be interfered with to handle anything of an emergency nature. But of course emergencies expire, and the matter should receive attention. "Emergency" is a word that can be abused as well.

Now, aside from the statements of policy offered by defendants, policy which is shown by their own testimony not to be fulfilled in some very important areas, on the other side, the plaintiff's witnesses, those who are and were inmates, have told their story. And I might say it appeared to me to be much a telling of stories, rather than a neatly packaged examination which might have been rehearsed in some nature. I certainly discussed this case with all of those men. I assure the Court nothing was rehearsed. Stories were told, questions were asked from the Bench, and there was what I would call a rather thorough cross-examination.

These stories were also told at Soledad in the presence of the very highest personnel at the institution, and in the presence of guards. I believe it is fair to say that if the inmates who were testifying knew they were telling lies, they would know that their keepers knew they were telling lies, and there would be room for reprisals—and I am not accusing anyone of trying to make reprisals—but there would be room for reprisals, at least from the

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

imagination of the man on the stand.

MR. GRANUCCI: Your Honor, I must object to this line of argument. Plaintiff's attorney is actually testifying now to things that happened when he secured the affidavits from the plaintiff's witnesses.

MR. COHLER: I will strike all of that.

MR. GRANUCCI: There was no evidence of that in the record. He must restrict his argument to evidence.

MR. COHLER: I am sorry, Your Honor. I will be happy to have it from the record. I mentioned it in passing. It may be stricken upon stipulation.

MR. GRANUCCI: So stipulated.

Your Honor, the men who testified in the MR. COHLER: room, whether it was real or imagined, may well have thought that if they weren't telling the truth and it would be known to those who kept them in custody, that they would have reprisals against them through one means or another. And I am not accusing anyone of attempting reprisals.

THE COURT: Are you undertaking to represent to this Court that -- that factor would enter the mind of the ordinary man under those circumstances?

MR. COHLER: Correct.

There is no charge that any reprisal has THE COURT: been made or would be made.

MR. COHLER: Absolutely.

THE COURT: All right. We might take a recess now, counsel, until 2:00 o'clock.

MR. COHLER: Thank you, Your Honor. (The noon recess was taken.)

--000--

3 4

FRIDAY, AUGUST 19 1966 - AFTERNOON SESSION - 2:00 P.M.

MR. COHLER: May it please the Court:

Your Honor, before recess I had discussed, at least in part, the testimony offered by the defendants as to general policy, and following it some of the problems that arose in that testimony.

The witnesses for the plaintiff who are and were inmates testified to their own recollection of their own personal experience, which hopefully are unique experiences and might well be remembered.

For instance, we have heard quite a bit of testimony from both sides regarding the so-called Esparza tear gas incident.

In part, there is a conflict among the defendants witnesses, perhaps not significant, but perhaps noteworthy.

Sergeant Friedrick said that he himself called for authorization for the tear gas, as I recall it. Mr. Johnston testified that he was the one that called. Of course, it is possible that they both called or that it was just a poor recollection.

Mr. Esparza says that he got shot right in the face or sprayed, whatever the proper term is, with the tear gas.

Officer Mata, admittedly the officer who did the tear gas working using, testified to two short bursts. However short the bursts were, they clearly had their effect. The tear gas

was present not only in the cell. It was also present in the corridor. And it was also present two or three days later when Mr. DeCarli felt the tears in his eyes during an hour and a half interview with Mr. Esparza.

Now, before shooting the second burst Mr. Mata had his gas mask grabbed at by Mr. Esparza and his head knocked against the wall. Apparently he didn't fall down, according to his testimony.

It seems to me a very fair inference, and a very natural inference, that when his gas mask was grabbed at and he hit his head against the wall, in that small space, that he would have released a shot of tear gas. He didn't take the same careful aim as he did when he crouched down and aimed between the bars, as he felt was necessary for the first burst. It seems to me an entirely natural, unintentional reaction to let fly with that nozzle the second time. I am not saying it was aimed at Mr. Esparza's face. But I think it is very easy to believe and the Court ought to conclude as a matter of fact that that is where it went.

As to the duration of these bursts, how long they actually lasted, I don't think is significant. They had their effect. As a matter of fact, no other witness said that he saw the handle turned. There was testimony from defendants' witnesses present at the scene that there was a great deal of noise, which was still continuing, which

was at least in part the cause of the use of the tear gas.

I doubt that anyone heard the noise. In fact, there was
testimony that the noise was not heard.

It would seem unlikely that those without gas masks would be standing right up in that little galleyway between the outer wall and the bars of the cell where Officer Matawas operating.

There is some confusion in the record about what Mr. Esparza had said leading up to this incident. There is testimony about "I'll cut your heart out."

As I recall it, Mr. Esparza himself was a little confusing in his testimony on this point, as to what language it was in. I think the testimony will bear out the possibility that he said it twice, in Spanish and in English. It seems quite plausible that he would say it in Spanish to an officer who was Spanish-speaking and would say it in English for the benefit of other inmates as part of the agitation of which the defendants have spoken so often, the saving face, the leading of the gang that has been referred to.

In any event, Mr. Wells said he heard it in English or Spanish, and I am not even sure now. But it was different from one of the statements that Mr. Esparza made. And I believe that is the only conflict that even comes close among the testimony of the plaintiff's witnesses to having

any significance. And that is a very small part of a fairly collateral incident itself.

Now, tear gas, Your Honor, is something that ought to be treated with respect. In the course of examination, I made reference to a case Titcomb v. New York, the citation of which is 222 N.Y.State 2d 596, the case arising in the Court of Claims in New York in 1961. In that case \$20,000 damages were awarded for conscious pain and suffering before death, the death resulting from the use of tear gas in a closed room which, as related in the report of that case, was about the same size the testimony shows the strip cell to have been.

Another citation I wish to refer to the Court is Chaudoin v. Fuller, 192 P2d 243. This case was in the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

THE COURT: 192 PM 2d?

MR. COHLER: Yes, Your Honor, at page 243.

In that case, the Supreme Court of Arizona sustained a holding of the lower court that the sheriff's conduct in firing tear gas into the face of a prisoner was a wanton and reckless assault; \$10,000 damages was awarded in an action against the deputy sheriff's superior.

There has also been a good deal of testimony about the further portion of this so-called tear gas incident which involved Mr. Wells, housed next door in another strip cell

Mr. Wells testified under oath that he was positive that it was water he threw at the officers. Mr. Johnston felt the sting and assumed it was urine. Mr. Johnston didn't smell the odor of urine. Of course, it is possible that in those surroundings no one would notice the difference, the smell of the urine on him/or from the general conditions as testified to.

This case in particular is a case about the plaintiff and the time that he spent in a strip cell, so-called. The case, Your Honor, has come a long ways from the time that Mr. Jordan was in that very cell during this very period of time and with a smuggled pencil and smuggled paper he wrote a letter to the outside world. We are past the point where statements of general policy can provide the answer. We are past the point where this action can be called sham and frivolous. We are past the point where the Court can be told that it has no jurisdiction over subject matter of this type.

I would like to pause for a moment and comment about the term "strip cell." On its face, one would think this would be a rather innocent usage. Professionally there has been testimony that it means "stripped," stripped of physical facilities; stripped for a good purpose in its intent, to eliminate self destruction, destruction of State property, and to control and inmate.

 A cell as barren as that must be used with caution, it is true.

Now, Sergeant Friedrick thought he picked up the term from the inmates. It seems plausible inference to me, Your Honor, that the inmates used the term "stripped" to indicated what happens to them; they are stripped, like they are kept quiet, as opposed to the facilities in the cell.

Even so, standing alone, I would not think this of particular significance. But there has been a somewhat curious defensive attitude about the use of the term.

Someone substituted the term "quiet cell" for "strip cell" in a quotation in a sworn answer to interrogatories.

MR. GRANUCCI: Your Honor, I object to counsel relying on that matter in argument, because an objection to the very question was sustained.

MR. COHLER: It was sustained as argumentative, Your Honor. This is argument.

THE COURT: You may proceed.

MR. COHLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

My purpose in noting that is not to imply bad faith in answer to our interrogatories, but I think it is indicative of a defensive attitude, for some reason, about the term "strip cell." Perhaps that in itself is indicative of the fact that people don't always have clothing in these cells.

Now, control, one of the so-called legitimate functions

.1.

of the strip or quiet cell is thought by Mr. Donnelly to mean a graduated system of rewards and punishments; control is imposed with the hope the inmate will think it is punishment, so the inmate will be deterred.

Admittedly control and punishment are abstractions which overlap. The testimony of all has been to that effect

But control as a legitimate rationale for a cell barren of all normal facilities must be taken very narrowly to serve its legitimate purpose. When it gets to be used in a punitive manner, it gets to be abused, and other privileges are taken away when the punishment aspect of the strip cell begins to fail its purpose.

I asked the witnesses several times, you may recall, and
I again pose the question to you: Where is the dividing
line between the preventative aspects and the punitive
measures? Where is that line?

May I suggest the following to the Court:

In trying to control an inmate from hurting himself or destroying State property or hurting other inmates or affecting the general prison population, he must, one, be isolated, and siolation cells serve that purpose; and he must, two, be put in surroundings where he has nothing around to use on himself or to destroy which belongs to the State.

Control in this sense would mean putting a man in a

strip cell with furnishings which are indestructible or thought to be as harmless as possible without depriving the man of ordinary essentials for survival.

Now, when it gets to a point where flaps are left closed longer than the noise which apparently causes them to be closed is existent, when it gets to the point where there is no facility for a man to keep himself clean, to wash himself before he eats, we have moved over into the punishment area, I suggest, Your Honor, and punishment of a cruel and unusual nature, because there is no need to control a man by keeping his hands dirty when he eats a sandwich, there is no need to control a man by keeping him from light and air, there is no need to control a man by keeping him in filth, even if it is self-made filth.

If the defendants take the position that a man must be put in a cell without the normal facilities for washing and in a cell where there is no light to enable him to properly see to use the facilities, and if the man be psychotic, perhaps, such that he would mess up his own cell intentionally with bodily waste, putting a man in a cell of that nature must carry the concomitant responsibility to see that he isn't left in his own filth, to see that he can wash before he eats, and that he does get air, except where the flaps must be used to keep down the noise, which apparently is their purpose.

1

5

8 9

6

7

10 11

12

14

15

13

16

18

17

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

I would characterize that as punishment, Your Honor, in those circumstances, because the control of the man is no longer effected by those means, except by means of punishment as a deterrent. That kind of punishment, we submit, is unconstitutional.

There has been discussion in the same line regarding food and a restricted diet. Dr. Kunkel has testified that the restricted diet contains adequate calories for human needs.

THE COURT: 2,000.

MR. COHLER: I think he said 2,600, I am not sure.

THE COURT: I thought it was 2,000.

Even if the caloric count is sufficient MR. COHLER: in that meatloaf type cold restricted diet loaf, it apparently is unpalatable, at least so some witnesses have testified.

Now, it may be that when it leaves the kitchen it is palatable. But it may be that it is unpalatable in the surroundings in which it must be eaten. Indeed, some witnesses testified that they didn't even eat normal food in these circumstances because of the filth and the odor and the stench and the nauseaous nature of the cell.

Use of a restricted diet is denial of another privilege which could be called control, or, I suggest, should be called punishment. I am not prepared to argue the use of

a restricted diet alone is unconstitutional. But use of restricted diet for punitive purposes in the arena where all other conditions as alleged are present, is part of the totality of the unconstitutional confinement.

It was interesting for me to hear Sergeant Friedrick make the statement that it is sometimes necessary to deprive inmates of the ordinary essentials for survival.

whether an opening statement would be called for. I drafted a very brief one. In that statement I had written, "I shall not burden the record with elaborate statements of what we expect the evidence to show. The plaintiff will show generally that he was confined by the defendants in what is known here as a strip cell, and that he was deprived of the ordinary essentials for survival."

Sergeant Friedrick had not made that statement in our so-called informal interview.

I suggest that in laymen's language nothing comes closer to what the law knows as cruel and unusual punishment than depriving a man of the ordinary essentials for survival.

In addition to the failure of specific testimony on the part of the defendants and some contradictions and a general absence of recollection of this specific period, the Court has before it the specific testimony from

L5

L9

?1 ?2

?3

5

plaintiff's witnesses, and plaintiff himself has testified that during the precise period in time in which he was confined he was confined for 12 days. The cell was dirty when he entered, and each of the plaintiff's witnesses has testified that the cell was dirty when he entered, except Mr. Porte. Mr. Porte testified that there was dirt. He said on testimony here that there was not human bodily waste.

According to the answers to interrogatories, Mr. Porte was in the cell the plaintiff was later confined in in the middle of May, almost two months before plaintiff's confinement.

If the Court should find that Mr. Porte was in the cell without human bodily waste, he was the only inmate who so testified, and he would have been in that cell about two months before the plaintiff himself was placed there.

The plaintiff has testified that the cell in which he was placed had the flaps closed almost all the time, except when he persuaded Officer Nash to leave them open. And I think perhaps Mr. Hoagland said that he left the door open. I am not sure I have the officers correct.

But for those few minutes, the flaps and the door were closed the whole time.

For the first eight days, the plaintiff testified that he had no clothing at all--none--in the cell which he said was filled with human excrement and in which he said he

himself vomited and he said was general nauseous.

.0

.1

.2

.3

Plaintiff, as with the other inmates, and as was admitted during this period of time, had no opportunity to wash before his meals.

The plaintiff requested medical treatment by two letters, and a third. The first two were not responded to by Dr. Kunkel.

As the plaintiff himself said, and of course it was speculation, they may have miscarried. Dr. Kunkel had no record of it either. It is not very adequate medical treatment if the request for treatment miscarries. There is no opportunity to even begin treatment, much less than see whether the treatment is adequate.

Finally, on February 14th the plaintiff was seen by Dr. Kunkel. That was three days after the appointment of counsel in this case. At that time the plaintiff complained of stomach difficulties, among others, and his testimony was—and this is uncontradicted by the doctor—that he received no blood test and no urine sampling.

I am not a doctor, and I don't know what is proper for a physical when a man is complaining of a stomach ailment.

But I have always had-- Well, I better not say that.

Excuse me.

Now, there has been some question about a shower allegedly taken by the plaintiff during the time he was

I think it is abundantly clear on the record, that the testimony of Officer Hoagland and Sergeant Friedrick is nothing but a mistaken recollection.

The isolation log which was supposed to show the movement of Mr. Jordan if he were to take a shower, reflected no shower during the period in question, July 9 through July 20, and it did show a shower on Saturday, July 24th.

Mr. Fitzharris' answer to interrogatories states specifically with reference to Mr. Jordan and with respect to this period of time that plaintiff had no opportunity to exercise. Sergeant Friedrick testified that you can't take a shower without having an opportunity to exercise.

Mr. Hoagland said that part of his recollection of Mr. Jordan taking a shower at this time is based upon a conversation he remembers overhearing between Sergeant Friedrick and Mr. Jordan regarding the plaintiff's legal papers. Sergeant Friedrick, on the other hand, said, yes, there was such a conversation, but it took place back at the quiet cell or the strip cell. Now, that can't be any part of Sergeant Hoagland's proper recollection if Sergeant Friedrick's testimony is from good memory.

I think the testimony shows clearly that the basic factor relied upon to indicate to these gentlemen in their testimony that it was during the time the plaintiff was in

the strip cell is that he was escreted at the shower. The plaintiff testified, the last testimony that was heard by the Court, was that there were special circumstances through Saturday, July 24th when all inmates from the isolation, as well as the quiet or strip cells, were escorted, a practice which is not generally prevalent, according to Mr. Hoagland himself. It is very true that the plaintiff, according to the records themselves, had a shower on that Saturday. According to the plaintiff's testimony he must have had been escorted.

I suggest that is the basis for the misunderstanding, and that there was no shower at all for the plaintiff during the 12 days he was in the quiet cell or strip cell. Even if there was a shower, it would have been only on the sixth day, as I count it, or after five days, as they count it. That is not very often to wash either, when there is no other way to wash.

Officer Hoagland, incidentally, on surrebuttal, didn't have recollection of this period. He couldn't recall whether or not what Mr. Jordan testified to was accurate. On the other hand, he seemed to recall the shower very vividly the other day.

Your Honor, we suggest that the plaintiff's case has been proven easily by a preponderance of the evidence. It is a long way from a close question in my view. There is

L9

SO

an abundance of evidence with a very credible line running through it and very few contradictions among those people who I doubt are accustomed to testimony in court and who were cross-examined skillfully.

There is corroboration from inconsistencies among the defendants' testimony itself. There is corroboration from the records which are supposed to be kept accurately, according to State law. There is corroboration from the answers to interrogatories. And there is corroboration by way of admissions with respect to the changes which we heard most fully about this morning for the first time.

It is true and we may take it as true, it seems from the testimony, that it was not this case which triggered a reexamination of the conditions of the institution. It was an inquiry, according to Mr. Donnelly, triggered by another court and passed through the highest part of the Department of Corrections to take a look, to see what was happening. According to Mr. Donnelly, they took a look, saw what was happening, decided they had better make some changes. According to Mr. Fitzharris, that is because the court was beginning to—

THE COURT: Is it or is it not true that this case was before the Supreme Court of California at one juncture?

MR. COHLER: Your Honor, the questions were put in terms of "this case." I think they may have been understood

- 3

by the witnesses to mean this case, No. 44786, in this court, before Your Honor, with these defendants. Perhaps the record ought to have been made more clear in that respect.

THE COURT: Well, is it or is it not true that the petitioner undertook to exhaust his remedies in the State of California?

MR. COHLER: That is true, Your Honor. The Court may take judicial notice--

THE COURT: Wasn't that a condition preceding coming to this Courthouse?

MR. COHLER: Yes, Your Honor. The Court may take judicial notice of the files of the Supreme Court of California to establish that, if necessary.

I don't think more need be said about the changes, Your Honor. It seems there was a good deal of resistance to making these changes. There were many problems in employing these changes. We have heard quite a bit of testimony about how hard it is to have water thrown at you, how the defendants' exhibits, the pitcher, the bowl, were ripped up. They lost many, they had to buy more. It doesn't seem they are really enjoying these water pitchers down there, and these waterbasins. It wasn't a change which they thought was, at first, to be such a good idea. Mr. Fitzharris isn't sure that they are going to keep it.

LO

L

.3

.4

.5

But they made it. And it seems to be abundantly clear that it was made in response to someone higher up in the system, and to an inquiry from a court. The admission is just as strong whether it is this Court or another Court or the Director of Corrections. It is an admission that they looked around, found out it wasn't up to snuff, and decided they had better make some changes, which they did.

As I see it, Your Honor, the defense in this case is that it just didn't happen the way the plaintiff's witnesses have stated. I suggest to the Court that the upper administrative personnel, the defendants in this case, are not all that aware of what happens in their own institution. Mr. Fitzharris directed the work of men for 245 hours to find out what happened. This was after an inquiry had been received from his own superiors to find out what had happened. This was after the Court's intention to look into the matter was clear. This was not a casual look-around. This was, I am sure, an attempt to find out what was happening.

The answers were generally, "The policy is," and "No information is available as to specifics."

Understaffed and underfinanced as they may be, the defendants are obliged to see that constitutional rights are not deprived if they place a man in a special cell, to see that that cell, and the use of that cell, is not

abused.

The statements of general cleanliness and general ventilation and, "nothing went wrong or I would have remembered it," and the six-minute change of air in the cell, even if the flaps were open or closed, according to the engineer, and the fact that the air couldn't be felt by the hand of someone holding it up to the vent.

Mr. Caldwell, the officer, said that he used to stand in front of this vent to feel the air, that it was warm back there. Their ventilation system wasn't as good in the officers' area. He felt the air coming through the ventilation shaft.

None of the inmate witnesses felt any air coming through their part of the ventilation system.

Mr. DeCarli's eyes stung two or three days after the tear gas incident. That wasn't moved out by the ventilation system.

Sergeant Friedrick says there is a grapevine, and I'm sure there is; and that the ventilation system is a good deal a part of the grapevine, and I'm sure it is; and that the men are in the strip cells because they are agitators, and I'm sure many of them are. Maybe something is clogging up that ventilation system back in the strip cell to cut off the grapevine.

Mr. Hoagland gave the most specific testimony as to

cleanliness. Mr. Hoagland got down on his hands and knees, with a wash bucket, brooms, mops, the rags, the cleanser, and he even got a special bleach, apparently from the dispensary, apparently not normally supplied. These cells must have been pretty dirty to require that special bleach.

Officer Caldwell said the whole place stunk when he came to work, but not particularly in this area. Now, I suggest that even with the automatic flusher, and particularly before that when it was flushed even twice a watch, as it was supposed to be, and twice a day, as the testimony has been, that there was bound to have been some odor emanating from the cells from commodes which were flushed that less frequently; just the law of averages. There must have been odor back there, Your Honor, and I don't find that the statement that there was no odor very convincing as to the state of cleanliness.

I would like to turn for a moment to the question of relief, if the Court please. Perhaps it is not out of order to relate an incident that happened to myself riding in a cab this morning. The cab driver who was driving me related that he had been in an accident awhile back, sustained some \$3,500 out-of-pocket expenses, had a lawsuit for \$25,000, and that he would be delighted with \$10,000.

The Courts, in negligent actions, award for pain and suffering every day, a good deal; tort actions.

The plaintiff has proven, we submit, that he was deprived of constitutional rights, fundamental human dignity. If damages are awarded for pain and suffering when you break a rib or twist a neck, what kind of damages repair a man's memory? How whole can a man be made?

I don't think that this is just an emotional argument. I think this is a very real argument. This man ought to be made whole, Your Honor. I don't think the \$25,000 claim and prayer for compensatory damages compared coincidentally with what the cab driver is claiming when he suffered \$3,000 out-of-pocket, is at all unrealistic.

This even happens within the prison walls. I read in the paper that Mickey Cohen got \$100,000 for being hit over the head in prison under the Civil Rights Act because he wasn't protected well enough by the guards.

It must be sure, and the Court must make sure, that the plaintiff is not subjected to this treatment again, and injunctive relief must be framed to that end. The enforcement of injunctive relief is not an easy matter in a case of this sort. Enforcement of injunctive relief depends upon showing a violation of the injunction, in essence, a trial de novo, putting a burden upon counsel for both sides, a member of the private Bar and the very

busy Attorney General's office, to insure proper adherence to any injunction which this Court may issue.

Even more so, it takes the courage of an inmate to come forward as Mr. Jordan did. Your Honor heard testimony of inmates who seemed inured to these conditions. Some of them didn't even seem to mind going down there. This was taken as a part of their life. Very few men would come forward in those circumstances, aside from any fear of reprisals.

The Court will remember Mr. Allison who, real or imagined, said that he was afraid to testify. He even said he was afraid to tell the Court that he was afraid.

The plaintiff, as stated by Dr. Hack, is a man who knows his rights. And he has come to this Court to have those rights vindicated and has sought reasonable relief, which we submit should be offered and ordered in full.

In awarding the plaintiff in this action, both injunctively and by way of damage award, the Court does more.
The collateral effects are not to be overlooked.

I am not even speaking particularly of the institution or the prison system. There is a good deal of talk these days about the absence of respect for law and order. And there is a lot of talk about people taking the law into their own hands. Inmates in institutions may be particularly suspect to that type of approach. They may feel that

they can't buck the system. An order from this Court will prove to these men that you can get relief the right way, through the channels of the law. When those men hit the streets again, all of society must be rewarded.

Your Honor, the plaintiff submits that his prayers be granted in full. Thank you.

MR. GRANUCCI: May it please the Court:

We have been through a rather long two weeks; long for the plaintiff's very learned counsel, long for ourselves, long for the defendants, long for the Court as well. I do not intend to unduly extend these proceedings by lengthy or prolix oral argument. But there are some basic points I have to make, and I want to make them clearly and if possible, succinctly.

First off, I want to renew our motion to dismiss on the part of the State of California and the Correctional Training Facility, a political subdivision of that State. If there is any certainty at all in this rather unsettled area of civil rights litigation, it is this: That neither the State nor a political subdivision thereof is a proper party defendant under the Civil Rights Act. The Court of Appeals for this Circuit has definitively so ruled in the Williford case, a case cited by the defendants in their motion to dismiss.

Moreover, the State is not a proper party in a habeas

corpus proceeding. This is clear in the case Bohm v.

Alaska, Roseborough v. California, Morehead v. California,

all cases in the Court of Appeals for this Circuit.

Consequently, this case doesn't involve abstract political institutions, abstract State body, abstract concepts; it involves flesh and blood people on both sides. The defendants are as flesh and blood as the plaintiff and his supporting witnesses, and any judgment the Court enters runs not against the State; it runs against them.

Now, the law, briefly: We must keep in mind that we are dealing with a quite narrow and yet at the same time quite elusive question of law. The plaintiff, in order to obtain any relief at all against the defendants, must show by a preponderance of the evidence that he has been subjected to cruel and unusual punishment, a violation of the 8th Amendment to the Constitution, which 8th Amendment is applied against the States by the 14th Amendment and which is in turn effectuated against the State officers by the Federal Civil Rights Act, which is only co-extensive with constitutional rights.

We also should keep in mind this: That in the wisdom distilled of generations the law has developed that matters of prison discipline and internal procedures are, absent constitutional questions, of course, reserved to the management of the States.

1 2

I need not belabor the point. Suffice it to say that plaintiff's argument to the contrary, procedural due process is entirely out of order in the prison setting.

So we get down to the facts. But before we get to the facts, I would remind the Court again that we are not dealing with what is penologically the most advanced concept, we are not arguing about what is the most desirable concept, whether they are undesirable; but whether the conditions of the plaintiff's incarceration were so extreme as to constitute cruel and unusual punishment. This concept of cruel and unusual punishment is a limited one.

Arguments have raged back and forth about the desirability of the death penalty. I am using this argument as an illustration solely. However, no court has ever held that capital punishment is itself cruel and unusual. It may be undesirable, a point much debated, but not cruel and unusual, at least in the eyes of the law, at least as applied to the 8th Amendment.

We get down to the bare bones of the case: What were the conditions of plaintiff's confinement from the 9th day of July 1965 up until the 20th day of July 1965? And do those conditions amount to cruel and unusual punishment?

I suggest, Your Honor, that in determining whether those conditions did constitute cruel and unusual punishment, the rule of reason carries a great part. Most of the

decisions that discuss cruel and unusual punishment discuss them in terms of being excessive or disproportionate. When you refine it out, the decisions, I think, talk in the terms of whether the conditions imposed or the penalty imposed is reasonable in the light of the offense.

So, what were the conditions of plaintiff's confinement, were they reasonable? That is the issue here.

On the 9th day of July, plaintiff was placed in a quiet cell in O-wing at Soledad Correctional Training Facility.

We have said, and we have proven, that he was put in a clean quiet cell. Officer Nash specifically so testified. He was in that cell, he serviced it, he found it was clean.

Officer Hoagland testified to the practice that prevailed of keeping it clean. I noted with a sense of frustrated amusement, if you will, counsel's argument that Mr. Hoagland was there with the scrub brushes and the bleach and the mops and the brooms so the cells must have been pretty dirty. Well, I think, as I will allude to later, this is an example of "You're damned if you do and you're damned if you don't." You are condemned by and criticized if you leave the cells dirty; you are criticized if you clean up the cells.

But regardless of what plaintiff thinks about it, the

A second point: He was furnished a strong blanket

L3

L5

instead of a conventional mattress. It looks like a barely adequate, if that, means of sleeping. But it can be folded over, contrary to what plaintiff said in his complaint. It is made of canvas. It has a blanket in it. It has some wamrth. And there is a reason why that type of facility is furnished instead of a mattress.

Remember Officer Hoagland's testimony about the sad experience of his father, the inmate that tore his mattress apart, set it afire in a quiet cell and caused injury to himself and to the senior Hoagland.

This is a point to keep in mind with regard to the mattresses and everything else. I think the plaintiff demonstrated it more than anybody else, more clearly. It is easy to get contraband into those quiet cells, very easy indeed.

You saw the plaintiff so adroitly throwing out the fish line. I stood over here, right about here (indicating), asked plaintiff to throw the line, and he hit me right in the face, just as I am sure he intended to do.

Now, with the possibility of getting in contraband that easily, is it any wonder that a strong blanket would be furnished instead of a mattress?

Now, flaps, getting to the testimony of flaps: The policy is that we leave the flaps down. Some of plaintiff's witnesses testified that the flaps were up. Officer Nash

testified that when he came on duty most of the time, the flaps were up. Officer Caldwell testified that in the mornings, the midnight-8:00 o'clock shift, the flaps were sometimes up, sometimes down. Officer Nash at first felt a little hesitant about moving the flaps because of his inexperience. He was, in that peculiar jargon of the plaintiff, a "fish bull."

But in any event, the flaps were there. Sometimes they were up. And we say sometimes they were down. And I think we can believe Officer Hoagland, and we can believe Sergeant Friedrick about that.

Is it unreasonable to have a cell with flaps? Isn't there a compelling need to prevent riots, to prevent agitation from spreading? Shouldn't officers be very careful? And I think they were careful about the flaps, and I think that as far as the flaps goes, it shows an exercise of judgment according to the circumstances that were present to the officers.

Now, the toilet: Our testimony was that the toilet was flushed twice per shift, six times a day. Now, that doesn't sound like the sort of thing, the sort of facility that any one of us would like to have in our homes. But it is a necessity in a prison setting, as are so many other things. Inmates flood their cells. It is easy to flood a cell, from the testimony. All you do is you take some

4 5

material, perhaps clothing, put it in the toilet, press the button and away we go. And you have the beginnings of a disturbance which could turn into a riot.

So very properly, then, those toilets are not subject to the inmate's own control. They weren't then, they aren't now, and they are never going to be.

Water: Again, the plaintiff testified that he got water three times a day, as much as he wanted. The guards testified that there was always a little water left over, left over in the cells so the man could drink it later or wash his hands with it.

Efforts to increase the availability of water have not been entirely successful. This is not disputed.

Only three sets of water pitchers and basins remain out of a dozen that were originally ordered. Apparently the occupants of quiet cells don't particularly agree or support efforts to ameliorate the conditions of quiet cell confinement.

The fact remains that plaintiff, using some water from his cup and a little toilet paper could have at least washed his hands. He never said that he didn't have enough toilet paper.

Now, he lacked a toothbrush, too. I would like to talk about this a little bit, because this does seem, when you first look at it as a free man, that it would be a bit

extreme not to give a man a toothbrush.

Б

There was testimony, however, that those toothbrushes could be converted into weapons, and again we thought the ease with which the contraband can be smuggled into a quiet cell.

Now, the fact that toothbrushes are being furnished now doesn't mean that it was unconstitutional not to furnish them last July. States, after all, are afforded a great latitude of available choices. The question is not whether it is better to furnish a toothbrush than not to furnish, but was it entirely devoid of reason, entirely unjustifiable for the defendants not to have furnished the plaintiff a toothbrush in July of 1965.

There was testimony from Sergeant Friedrick that he had seen weapons made out of toothbrush handles. I submit this was the reason that the toothbrushes were not furnished.

Clothing: Again, policy is to grant clothing. Usually quiet cell occupants are granted clothing. However, as was elicited from the witness stand, there had been a suicide accomplished sometime previously by the use of coveralls. Defendants were confronted with that situation. Perhaps bearing on the side of safety, they were more anxious to take clothing—or were more cautious to take clothing away from the inmates than—

THE COURT: Were there any suicidal tendencies noted

7 .

in connection with petitioner Jordan?

MR. GRANUCCI: I believe there was, Your Honor.

THE COURT: May I ask you to enumerate them, if any.

MR. GRANUCCI: Mr. Clerk, may I have Plaintiff's Exhibit 3, the answers to interrogatories.

These answers to interrogatories were admitted into evidence at the motion of plaintiff. In his disciplinary file, which is appended thereto, six pages back, it is noted that on Sunday February 14, 1965, plaintiff at least made an attempt to hang himself.

Now, I am in no position to argue that this was either a legitimate suicide attempt, or what I might want to call an exhibitionist type of attempt. But the record is in the file, and it was introduced by the plaintiff.

THE COURT: That was February?

MR. GRANUCCI: February of '65.

Also, the taking of clothing has been used and justified as a control measure. I will get to that presently.

The shower: I think there was a shower. I am convinced of it. Of course, these are just my views of the evidence and my views of the evidence are not evidence themselves.

But Sergeant Friedrick and Officer Hoagland both testified to a shower.

I think that plaintiff's attempt to discredit their

testimony is a bit contrived. Officer Hoagland, it will be remembered, testified that he would have no reason to be in this area (indicating) if a man were on regular corrîdor exercise.

Now, the plaintiff attempted to contradict that testimony by stating that there was a great disturbance around
the time in question, people were brought in from North
Facility, if I remember his testimony this morning correctly.

Of course, we have Mr. Donnelly's testimony that he checked the records and he found that the only record of a major disturbance at North Facility was June 29 1965, two weeks before plaintiff was put in that quiet cell.

Now, I approach the next subject rather gingerly because I am not before the Court attempting to disparage or blacken anyone's character. Suffice it to say that the plaintiff is one of a class of inmates that is extraordinarily difficult to control.

I think Dr. Hack put it very succinctly when he described the plaintiff as a five-ton steel ball without handles. Perhaps plaintiff, by the process of involving himself in this litigation, by the process of cooperating with counsel, by the process of helping prepare the lawsuit, maybe he has given himself a handle. If he has, I think we are all happy to that extent. If he has, then this suit has served at least one purpose.

Б

But the fact is that he is an extraordinarily or has been an extraordinarily difficult inmate.

What do you do with a man like that?

I was rather taken with the ease, the almost superficial ease, with which counsel articulated his theories of punishment and control. In a sense it was articulate, but it was inconsistent. First, quiet cells were unconstitutional, then quiet cells may be all right but you have to use them carefully; you can use them for a control measure but not for a punishment measure; you can take away clothing for a control measure but not for a punishment measure. All so easy, all so straight-forward. I suppose we all tend to think that way.

Defense counsel, too, were used to finely drawn jurisdictional questions, used to precise questions of law; in the case of learned counsel, used to precise business documents; in the case of defense counsel, used to the precision of the rules on appeal and the rules regarding the rule of criminal judgment.

But when you get down inside the Adjustment Center, it just doesn't work that way. And if there is any voice that should be listened to, it is the voice of Sergeant Friedrick. He said, "I have trouble drawing the line between control and punishment. It has got to be done on the basis of individual judgment, the facts of the individual

situation, and as you see it then."

_

the memoranda that was received this morning?

MR. GRANUCCI: The memoranda --

Now, in this same connection, much cross-examination was directed to whether a specific set of conditions would occasion a specific response on the part of the correctional officers who testified.

Is it possible, given the complexities of human nature, given the difficulty, the compound difficulties that confront the defendants and their staff, given also the inexperience of the defense witnesses in testifying, is it possible for them to sit on this witness stand and spell out with fine precision what they would do in a given situation? It is a matter of judgment.

Now, I want to say a word about a collateral matter, the Esparza gas incident. It shouldn't have been in the case at all. It was objected to, the objection was overruled. I mean no criticism, but as the result of that ruling we produced evidence of our own.

Counsel dismisses it as incredible, unworthy of belief, as he has dismissed most of the defense case. The fact remains that two short bursts were fired. That is all. As little gas was used as would be necessary to control the man.

THE COURT: Is there any reference to gas mentioned in

THE COURT: The three exhibits. My recollection is that there was a specific reference to the use of qas.

MR. GRANUCCI: There was a reference to that. It was a reference to the fact that for at least a year previous to the date of that memorandum, it has been the policy to require permission, supervision, and a prompt medical examination afterwards. All of those conditions were carried out in the Esparza matter.

I put it up to Your Honor: Is it more human to use gas? Or is it more human to go in and wrestle with a man?

It is time, in approaching this very question, that we put aside the horror story of World War I and look at the realities. If you want to encourage physical wrestling, the possibility of assault, the possibility of permanent injury, the best way to do it is to prohibit the use of gas. These defendants were careful with that tear gas. There is no doubt about that at all.

There was talk by plaintiff that he was denied medical treatment, his letter to Dr. Kunkel was ignored. I don't believe that was Dr. Kunkel's testimony. Dr. Kunkel testified he answered the letters by visiting the plaintiff. He observed nothing other than that the plaintiff was in good health, a condition which his examination of February 4 1966 confirmed.

Much has been made in argument about the fact that the

9:

disciplinary form on the report that was made out during plaintiff's confinement in the quiet cell did not reflect the fact that he was to remain in the cell "until behavior warrants change."

From this, plaintiff has spun out the theory that his confinement in the quiet cell was without possibility of review by Mr. Donnelly or persons at that level.

Yet Mr. Donnelly!s testimony was that when he reviewed the 115 forms for his signature, he always had before him, or at least available to him, the inmate's cell status, the record which is promptly kept and promptly noticed of where the defendant was housed, the form 103B.

Now there is something else that plaintiff attempts to make out. He doesn't say it, but the inference is that Sergeant Friedrick added to the form 114, the segregation record, the fact that plaintiff was to remain in the quiet cell until his behavior warranted change. From that, he infers that the sergeant did that without permission of Mr. Kiepura, and from that he infers that his constitutional rights were denied.

Two answers to that: Mr. Kiepura, I believe, and I am stating my recollection of the testimony, Your Honor, testified that ordinarily as a matter of practice the cell housing or quiet cell housing was discussed with Sergeant Friedrick who made the notation. Mr. Kiepura, frankly,

16.

candidly admitted he forgot to write it down on the 114.

I think that is an example of a harmless error, to borrow a term from the judicial setting.

I think it is inappropriate because the cases hold that procedural due process doesn't apply in the prison setting.

In any event, plaintiff seeks to argue that he was improperly kept in the quiet cell an undue length of time. However, when he was brought out after a few days, the record notes that he was still vulgar and disrespectful before the committee, and it was quite reasonable then to return him to a quiet cell until behavior warranted change.

Sergeant Friedrick said that on the weekends before he went off he tried to get as many people out of the quiet cells as possible. It is an obvious conclusion that plaintiff's release was considered and was not carried out because it was still premature.

Something else about that disciplinary committee hearing: Counsel argues that plaintiff's testimony is uncontradicted, that he was without clothes for eight days.

Sergeant Friedrick testified from the stand that when the plaintiff came out for that disciplinary hearing, he had his clothes on.

Now, let's talk about the evidence of changes: We have objected to that coming in, except insofar as limited to injunctive relief. I think to that extent it is proper,

because the Court, if it is to intelligently frame an injunction, which I don't think it should, should know what the present conditions are.

But to use the changes as admissions of guilt, really puts the defendants in an untenable position. If there is any validity at all or any merit at all, or any legitimate purpose at all to be served by suits brought by inmates challenging, trying to collect damages from their warden and guardians, it is that by allowing such suits an improvement of prison conditions will be effectuated.

Now this proposition is a debatable one. My authority for that is Justice Duniway's language in Willow v. Dixon, which I have cited in the memorandum.

In any event, if the purpose of the Civil Rights Act is to encourage change, then using evidence of change as an admission of guilt really defeats the purpose of the Act. It is self-defeating. Again you are liable if you change and you are liable if you don't change. If you change you admit you are guilty in the past; if you don't change you are stubborn, inccorigible, adhering in brutal, sadistic ways.

Really, Your Honor, what is the solution to this dilemma? Well, I think I have the solution. The fact is that change is a false issue in this case.

THE COURT: Counsel, how could change be a false issue

in this case when we find it, or find the causative relationship centered in and around the several pieces of writing that the Court received this morning? How could it be immaterial?

MR. GRANUCCI: Very easy, Your Honor, because what we have is ultimately a problem of law.

THE COURT: These changes were not spontaneous.

MR. GRANUCCI: They were not spontaneous, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You agree on that?

MR. GRANUCCI: I wholeheartedly agree.

THE COURT: And a causative relationship or the causation, if you please, must be found some place.

MR. GRANUCCI: Quite so.

THE COURT: Where, in your opinion, counsel, do we find the cause and causation for the changes?

MR. GRANUCCI: The inquiry from the State Supreme Court Justice to Mr. McGee's office.

THE COURT: And if that inquiry, in turn, from the Supreme Court Justice had centered around a petition for writ of habeas corpus, and if in turn that petition for habeas corpus had as the plaintiff therein the present plaintiff before the Court, then the cause and causation would be the instant suit, would it not?

MR. GRANUCCI: Yes, it would. But it would still be a false issue.

THE COURT: We will take a short recess.

(A short recess was taken.)

MR. GRANUCCI: May it please the Court, before we took our recess the Court posed a question to me about why the issue of change is a false issue, even conceding for argument that a Supreme Court Justice of the California Supreme Court was interested in the case, that such interest was conveyed to the Department of Corrections in Sacramento and eventually filtered its way down to this institution.

How can I call that a false issue? I insist that it is, for this reason. What are we litigating here? Are we litigating whether the conditions of plaintiff's confinement in July 1965 was the most desirable penology, the most advanced, the most practical, the most reasonable? No.

Not at all. We are litigating their constitutionality.

That is what this case is all about.

Now, those conditions in July of 1965 must, as far as constitutionality is concerned, stand or fall on their own merits. No amount of subsequent change could make an unconstitutional condition constitutional. And I respectfully submit to this Court that no amount of change could make a constitutional condition unconstitutional.

Efforts to improve, I don't think are relevant in the constitutional setting of this case. However, the evidence of change does have another interesting aspect, and it is

this:

Advocates of federal intervention by way of habeas corpus and the Civil Rights Act have often argued that as much as the federal courts dislike intervening in State affairs, it is necessary when the States fail to do their duty.

Here we have evidence that before this case even came into a federal court there was State action involved, that it had generated an inquiry into conditions generally, an effort to change, an effort which I regretfully state to the Court has not been entirely successful. One of the important things, the water pitchers and the water jugs apparently are not working out too well.

That is why I say the evidence of change is a false issue. Why, you know what it is? It is like a layman commenting on a matter of law. Remember, I asked the defendants on the stand whether they conspired against the plaintiff, whether they had malice, and counsel very diligently objected on the grounds that this was a lay conclusion on an issue of law. Well, it is the same thing. It is the same thing.

Now, a word about conspiracy. The plaintiff says the defendants conspired to deprive him of his constitutional rights. Plaintiff, now, with considerable adroitness attempts to convert the conspiracy theory into a rather

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

refined concept of respondeat superior. I don't think it I don't think it will work at all. There was will work. no conspiracy here, nothing intentional, nothing malicious. The respondent superior argument, I submit, is quite inappropriate.

Now, I want to talk about the defendants a minute, not just the defendant officials, but the quards and custodial people themselves, because it is they who are really on trial before this Court just as much as the officials are. It is their performance of their duties that has been called into guestion.

Plaintiff says again that the defendant officials didn't know what was going on. Well, we heard what was going on. We heard it from the lips of the custodial officers. well intentioned attempt to substantially comply with policies in a very difficult situation.

Again it is somewhat ironic that plaintiff will commend the defendants for trying to do a very, very difficult job and -- if I don't misquote him -- actually trying to do their best, and yet at the same time dismiss their testimony as unworthy of credit.

I am not going to comment on credibility of anybody, I think the Court can judge that for itself. Your Honor.

The officers testified fully and frankly what was favorable, what was not so favorable. The defendant

officials did the same; what was favorable what was not so favorable.

I remember in a pretrial proceeding a remark from the Bench that the State of California should welcome an inquiry into prison conditions in order that the truth may be known and they may be vindicated from the charges, if that be appropriate.

I wouldn't go so far as to say we welcomed this trial.

It has been a great strain on everybody. But we did and
we have put everything in that could possibly bear on the
case.

Now, as the Court takes the case under advisement, under submission, I implore Your Honor to consider the position of these defendants and the custodial officers as well.

It is very true that they are charged with one of the most difficult jobs that could be given to any human being, controlling the almost uncontrollable, volatile, explosive types of inmates.

Now, suppose this Court grants damages. Do you realize what effect that will have? Why, what it will mean is this It will mean that every inmate confined in the Adjustment Center will realize that if he can provoke an incident, if he can somehow provoke the use of force, or if he can get himself placed in a quiet cell, he has a good chance of collecting money from his custodial officers. Is this a

L

Injunctive relief: Another very difficult matter. How

desirable situation? Is this what this Court wants to do?

I don't think so.

On the other hand, consider the position of the defendants. To award damages here not only undermines the prison discipline, but it has this other effect, it makes the prison administrators, it makes custodial officers leery about imposing discipline, leery about controlling volatile and violent inmates.

Counsel just mentioned the Mickey Cohen decision in which Mickey Cohen was awarded \$100,000 or so damages—and I don't know that it was under the Civil Rights Act; I think it was under the Federal Tort Claims Act, because ironically enough the Civil Rights Act does not apply to the Federal Government—but in any event, Mickey Cohen was assaulted by a violent inmate and he collected damages on the theory that the prison officials did not control the inmate.

So again, condemned if you do control, condemned if you don't.

Please consider the position of these defendants when Your Honor takes under advisement the question of damages.

Remember, it is not an abstract entity, the State of California. It is damages against flesh and blood individuals.

can we sit back, either counsel or myself, and with all due respect the Court, too, and anticipate the almost infinite variety of difficult emergency situations which will be confronted by the defendants and their staff in the performance of their duties? It is easy for learned counsel to brush aside emergencies, but it is the man on the spot who has to make a judgment of what is an emergency and what isn't and how much he can do without violating the Court's order and how much he can't do, and again on the other side the possibility that conforming convicts may be injured or killed if they guess wrong.

Now, much has been made about the fact that the recordkeeping during this period in question was not all that it should have been, at least in the opinion of the plaintiff. And perhaps it was not as complete as I would have liked it either.

Keep in mind, however, that there is no constitutional mandate on the defendants to keep full records.

Counsel narrated a personal experience. I narrate one, too.

I was in the hospital a couple of years ago. One of the things that impressed itself upon me was the myriad of records that were kept, all sorts of records. I wondered. This didn't seem to be necessary. This was going beyond what I thought was even adequate practice. All sorts of

charts, all sorts of checks, all sorts of records. Then
I realized, this is done to provide a record in case there
is a malpractice case, in case anything is ever questioned
they will have a lot of evidence.

As a matter of law, it makes good sense. But let's put that situation in prison context and see where it takes us.

If Your Honor holds errors in record-keeping against us, what I think it will mean is this; is that considerable attention will be directed in the future to keeping of records, just papers for the sake of paper, forms for the sake of forms. The record will doubtless be more accurate than the records we have here.

But don't think think the time could be more productively spent working and counseling with inmates, personal contact, personal counseling?

You know, I was struck by Mr. DeCarli's testimony here that he spent an hour and a half counseling with inmate Esparza. And he had spent much time other than that. But one of the things that disappointed me, on the other hand, was the fact that Esparza said that his improvement, which is admitted, had nothing to do with the institution; it was all to do with a lady on the outside.

Be that as it may, the time of the staff should be spent as much as possible in working with people, and not

working with forms. Consider the effect of any judgment or decree on that.

Finally, we get back to where we started, the question of whether plaintiff's conditions of confinement in July 1965 were cruel and unusual.

I think that persuasive authority might be found in support of our case from the Manual of Correctional Standards. That manual is before the Court. Copies of what I thought was the appropriate part were furnished to counsel.

Now, that manual was written largely by California people, it is true. However, the Association of Correctional Standards has on its governing Board members of federal prison systems, members of prison systems from other States and other countries. It sets out the standards to which Mr. Fitzharris said the institution tries to conform.

Quiet cells are specifically provided in that manual.

Restricted diet is specifically provided in that manual as a proper disciplinary device.

So the conditions of confinement, the fact of the quiet cells, the fact of the flaps, that is not unusual.

In fact, it is standard practice. Even the Oriental toilets without outside controls, that is considered standard penological practice.

So, insofar as there has been an attempt on the part of these defendants and the officers and the staff as well to conform to good penological practice, there cannot be said to have been cruel and unusual punishment. They have been attmpting to conform to good practice, not deviate from it.

Your Honor, I suppose when I sit down I will think of about half a dozen other things that I should have said, but I feel now I have presented in argument all of the salient features, all of the important points that the Court should remember in taking this case under submission. We have done our best to satisfy the Court as to the factual conditions as they existed. We have tried to show the necessity and the reasonableness for these conditions.

We submit this case with satisfaction at the showing that we have made. We also submit it with confidence in the Court to reach a just decision, a decision that will take into account the need of these defendants, the difficulties of these defendants, the good intentions of these defendants, the dedication of these defendants, the skills of these defendants.

Wouldn't it be a wonderful world if there weren't any prisons? Wouldn't it be a wonderful world even if there wasn't any need for an adjustment center in any prison? Wouldn't it be a wonderful world if there was no need to

control anybody because there was no such thing as uncontrollable violence?

Well, we are never going to see such a world, not in this life. When this case is over, the defendants job is going to be just as difficult tomorrow as it is today and it was in July of 1965.

But we respectfully submit this case and we confidently submit this case and we know that the Court will issue a just decision.

Thank you very much, Your Honor.

MR. COHLER: If it please the Court, I had full intention of making no response to counsel's argument. But I would like to note a few factors as rapidly as possible.

First, with respect to the changes, a matter which I don't think bears more argument. But I would like to note some factors in this regard.

Mr. Fitzharris said this was a response to a probe regarding human rights, not mere improvement.

It is suggested here I think perhaps, at least by implication, that if the Court admits evidence of that nature, there is a damned if you do and damned if you don't.

I suggest to the contrary. If the Court didn't have a full hearing involving evidence of all nature, there wouldn't have been any change at all, improvements or human rights, whatever. It was inquiry, triggered in some manner

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

18

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

from a court, the highest court in the State of California, and then we had changes.

The California Supreme Court Justices or the single Justice is not a layman such as a witness stating what is a conspiracy and what isn't.

Reference was made to a major disturbance in North Facility at the end of June, not the end of July 1965, in connection with a shower problem. The plaintiff did not testify that there was a major disturbance of such a nature that it might be kept in special records. There was hearsay as to what the record showed through the telephone There was no objection to the hearsay, but the weight of what the record showed, what was looked for.

All the plaintiff said was that there were people who had to be under escort from isolation cells, not quiet cells, through Saturday, July 24th, to take a shower. therein / like the escort and the basic factor which Mr. Friedrick and Mr. Hoagland thought led to a shower in their recollection during the quiet cell period, and we contend was just nothing but a mistake.

Counsel has unintentionally, I am sure, misconstrued my argument to the Court with respect to control and punishment. I do not suggest that the line of constitutionality be couched in terms of control or punishment.

The Court addressed a question regarding suicidal

tendencies of the plaintiff. The record is, as counsel read to the Court and suggested to the Court, that there was an attempt of some sort by the plaintiff upon his own life the previous February.

That, however, is shown conclusively to have nothing at all to do with the nature of the plaintiff's confinement in July 1965.

His clothing was taken for eight days, says the plaintiff, and was given back to him. Why given back if this was a suicide problem? There was no testimony about a suicide watch. There was testimony that the flaps were closed. That would preclude a suicide watch. The plaintif had his glasses, clearly weapons or potential weapons for self mutilation. The plaintiff was permitted to keep a pencil, equally useful to hurt himself if that was a problem.

Nor has there ever been any evidence in this case, that I can mecall, that the plaintiff went around breaking up his cell or anything of that nature. And not even that rationale was available for the quiet cell confinement.

In closing counsel made rererence to opening the floodgates to the claims of prisoners and, again, it was a damned if you do and damned if you don't type of argument.

Your Honor, the floodgates are open and should be open for full compensation for any man whose constitutional

rights have been deprived.

~=

25.

THE COURT: Is the matter submitted on the arguments?

MR. COHLER: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

MR. GRANUCCI: The matter is submitted for the defendants, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I think in closing I should say a word to counsel representing the plaintiff as well as counsel representing the defendants.

I have participated in these courts now for close on to 21 years. I think apart from the gravity of the situation confronting the Court, that I have never had a more refreshing experience than I have had in connection with the presentation of this cause.

The Court, consistent with our policy and having passed the threshold on the motion for summary judgment, and after recognition had been given to the fact that we had to take testimony in view of the issues delineated in the pleadings the Court undertook to appoint counsel.

In doing so, we invited Mr. Cohler to undertake the very arduous and expensive, at least to himself, representation of the plaintiff Mr. Jordan.

I have one recollection of the zeal and devotion of counsel in this case that compares with this early recollection. It was many, many years ago. It was the case of United States of America v. Grady Webb. It involved a

bank robber. I appointed a Mr. O'Connor, the partner of Harold Faulknor. We tried the case for about three weeks. That case left a lasting impression upon me with respect to the sacrifices that lawyers make in preserving the fine traditions and the background and vitality that lawyers should have, particularly the trial advocate.

I understand that Mr. Cohler has concluded the presentation of his first case in court. His attitude and his demeanor, his general regard for colleagues on the other side of the controversy, his respectful demeanor of witnesses, and in singular the totality of his conduct, brought to me again the realization that the art of advocacy is still present. We should, in turn, note for the record that this young man has given unstintingly of his talents.)

The comments that I have to make for Mr. Cohler are no more or less applicable to defense counsel. Mr. Granucci and Mr. Oakes both have undertaken to provide the Court with every bit of evidence that might aid the Court in the final solution of this problem. The case is not without difficulty, and I am deeply appreciative of the services they rendered to the Court. In like manner, the general decorum, the general attitude of these men has been a source of great comfort to this Court.

I close the chapter in this case with the thought that

the problem now rests with me, and you gentlemen have given me everything possible to solve that problem.

Thank you.

(Whereupon the matter was submitted.)

--000--

i. Muchin Leghest Official Reporter.

Certify that the foregoing pages 384thoughts a true and accreet transcript of the matter therein contained as reported by me and thereafter reduced to typewriting to the best of my ability.