

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

STEPHANIE GASCA, et al.,	)	
	)	
on behalf of themselves and all similarly	)	
situated individuals	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 17-cv-04149-SRB
	)	
ANNE PRECYTHE, Director of the Missouri,	)	
Department of Corrections, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Plaintiffs’ Motion for Summary Judgment. (Doc. #129). The motion is GRANTED.

This lawsuit challenges the parole revocation policies and procedures of the Missouri Department of Corrections and its Division of Probation and Parole. Plaintiffs argue there is no genuine dispute as to the material facts underlying Plaintiffs’ claim that Defendants’ revocation policies and procedures violate their rights “under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment . . . as articulated in *Gagnon v. Scarpelli*, 411 U.S. 778 (1973) and *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471 (1972).” (Doc. #113, p. 5). Plaintiffs seek prospective relief on behalf of a class of “all adult parolees in the state of Missouri who currently face, or who in the future will face, parole revocation proceedings.” (Doc. #113, p. 6). Defendants concede that “the policies that existed at the time Plaintiffs filed their Amended Class Action complaint did not satisfy [Due Process requirements]” and that Defendants have taken “substantial corrective measures to remedy these shortcomings.” (Doc. #140, p. 1).

The Court finds no genuine dispute of material fact and Plaintiffs are entitled to judgment as a matter of law. *See* Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(a). Accordingly, Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. #129) is **GRANTED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Stephen R. Bough  
JUDGE STEPHEN R. BOUGH  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DATED: February 27, 2019