

1 Daniel P. Struck, Bar No. 012377
 Rachel Love, Bar No. 019881
 2 Nicholas D. Acedo, Bar No. 021644
 Jacob B. Lee, Bar No. 030371
 3 STRUCK LOVE BOJANOWSKI & ACEDO, PLC
 3100 West Ray Road, Suite 300
 4 Chandler, Arizona 85226
 Telephone: (480) 420-1600
 5 dstruck@strucklove.com
rlove@strucklove.com
 6 nacedo@strucklove.com
jlee@strucklove.com

7 *Attorneys for Defendant-Respondent Kris Kline*

8 MICHAEL BAILEY
 9 United States Attorney
 District of Arizona
 10 WILLIAM C. STAES
 Assistant United States Attorney
 11 Illinois State Bar No. 6314835
 40 North Central Avenue, Suite 1800
 12 Phoenix, AZ 85004-4449
 Telephone: (602) 514-7500
 13 Fax: (602) 514-7693
William.Staes@usdoj.gov

14 *Attorneys for Defendants-Respondents*
 15 *David Gonzales, Donald Washington,*
 16 *and Michael Carvajal*

17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 18 **DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

19 Maria Guadalupe Lucero-Gonzalez, et al.,
 20 Plaintiffs-Petitioners,
 21 v.
 22 Kris Kline, et al.,
 23 Defendants-Respondents.

NO. CV-20-00901-PHX-DJH (DMF)
**DEFENDANTS-RESPONDENTS’
 RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS-
 PETITIONERS’ MOTION FOR
 RECONSIDERATION (Dkt. 35)**

24
 25 Defendants-Respondents Kris Kline, Warden of the Central Arizona Florence
 26 Correctional Complex (“CAFCC”); David Gonzales, U.S. Marshal for the District of
 27 Arizona; Donald W. Washington, Director of the U.S. Marshals Service (“USMS”); and
 28

1 Michael Carvajal, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”), through their
2 respective counsel, hereby respond to Plaintiffs-Petitioners’ Motion for Reconsideration.
3 Plaintiffs correctly note that the Supreme Court in *Monell v. Department of Social Services*,
4 436 U.S. 658, 690–95 (1978), addressed whether a municipality (or other local entity) is
5 considered a “person” for purposes of liability under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiffs are also
6 correct that their claims are not brought pursuant to § 1983; Defendants are federal officials
7 or private individuals acting under color of federal law and sued in their official capacity;
8 and Plaintiffs seek only injunctive relief.¹ (Dkt. 1, ¶¶ 17, 24–27 & Prayer for Relief.)

9 But the Court’s brief reference in its Order to *Monell* did not affect its subsequent
10 substantive analysis or its conclusion—that Plaintiffs “failed to demonstrate that they are
11 likely to succeed on the merits of their [constitutional] claim[s], and are thus not entitled to
12 preliminary injunctive relief.” (Dkt. 29 at 15, 18.) *See, e.g., Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S.
13 825, 829–30 (1994) (analyzing constitutionality of federal prison officials’ practices to
14 determine whether injunctive relief was available); *Simmat v. U.S. Bureau of Prisons*, 413
15 F.3d 1225, 1238 (10th Cir. 2005) (same); *Hallinan v. Scarantino*, No. 5:20-HC-2088-FL,
16 2020 WL 3105094, at *15 (E.D.N.C. June 11, 2020) (same). Indeed, Plaintiffs do not raise
17 any argument concerning, or otherwise take issue with, the ultimate result of the Court’s
18 Order; they do not request that the Court reconsider the result of its Order, nor do they
19 request the Court to vacate its ruling. (Dkt. 35 at 6.) In other words, although styled as a
20 Motion for Reconsideration, Plaintiffs’ motion—which asks the Court to do no more than
21

22 ¹ Defendants disagree with Plaintiffs’ contentions that their claims are cognizable in
23 an action for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and that release from detention
24 is an available remedy. (*See* Dkt. 16 at 18–21.) *See also, e.g., Ibarra-Perez v. Howard*, No.
25 CV-20-00739-PHX-DWL, 2020 WL 3440298, at *10 (D. Ariz. June 23, 2020) (“Were the
26 Court forced to answer the question, it would rule that Counts Two, Three, and Four of the
27 Petition are subject to dismissal because they are not cognizable in a § 2241 action. The
28 appropriate way to address complaints about health care deficiencies in a detention facility
is to order the facility (via injunctive relief) to fix the deficiencies, not to compel the facility
to release all of its detainees (or the subset of detainees who happened to file § 2241
petitions).”). While Plaintiffs’ Motion for Reconsideration does not require a robust
response, given its limited scope, Defendants expressly state, out of an abundance of
caution, that any and all arguments not raised herein are not waived for any purposes going
forward.

1 “clarify the record” as to *Monell*’s applicability “going forward”—is more akin to a
2 conspicuously narrow motion for clarification. (*Id.*) Defendants defer to the Court as to
3 whether further clarification is necessary.

4 DATED this 26th day of June 2020.

5 STRUCK LOVE BOJANOWSKI & ACEDO, PLC

6 By /s/ Nicholas D. Acedo

7 Daniel P. Struck
8 Rachel Love
9 Nicholas D. Acedo
10 Jacob B. Lee
11 3100 West Ray Road, Suite 300
12 Chandler, Arizona 85226

Attorneys for Defendant-Respondent Kris Kline

13 MICHAEL BAILEY
14 United States Attorney
15 District of Arizona

16 By /s/ Nicholas D. Acedo (with authority)

17 William Staes
18 Assistant United States Attorney

Attorneys for Defendants-Respondents David Gonzales, Donald W. Washington, and Michael Carvajal

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 26, 2020, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk’s Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following CM/ECF registrants:

Alejandro Agustin Ortiz	ortiza@aclu.org
Benjamin C. Calleros	bcalleros@perkinscoie.com
Emma A. Andersson	eandersson@aclu.org
Jean-Jacques Cabou	jcabou@perkinscoie.com
Margo R. Casselman	mcasselman@perkinscoie.com
Mathew R. Koerner	mkoerner@perkinscoie.com
Christine K. Wee	cwee@acluaz.org
Jared G. Keenan	jkeen@acluaz.org
William Charles Staes	William.Staes@usdoj.gov

/s/ Nicholas D. Acedo

3724390