

1 DONALD SPECTER (SBN 83925)  
dspecter@prisonlaw.com  
2 THOMAS M. NOSEWICZ (SBN 317849)  
tom@prisonlaw.com  
3 PRISON LAW OFFICE  
1917 Fifth Street  
4 Berkeley, California 94710  
Telephone: (510) 280-2621  
5 Facsimile: (510) 280-2704

6 JESSICA VALENZUELA  
SANTAMARIA (SBN 220934)  
jsantamaria@cooley.com  
7 ADDISON M. LITTON (SBN 305374)  
aliton@cooley.com  
8 MARK A. ZAMBARDA (SBN 314808)  
mzambarda@cooley.com  
9 COOLEY LLP  
3175 Hanover Street  
10 Palo Alto, CA 94304  
11 Telephone: (650) 843-5000

12 KENDALL DAWSON WASLEY  
(SBN 252294)  
kendall@dawsonwasleylaw.com  
13 PMB 233, 1520 E. Covell Blvd.  
14 Davis, CA 95615  
Telephone: (408) 827-5024

15 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
19 EUREKA DIVISION

20 BRIAN CHAVEZ and BRANDON  
21 BRACAMONTE, on behalf of  
themselves and all others similarly  
22 situated,

23 *Plaintiffs,*

24 v.

25 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA,

26 *Defendant.*

JAMES R. WILLIAMS, County  
Counsel (SBN 271253)  
DOUGLAS M. PRESS, Assistant  
County Counsel (SBN 168740)  
ARYN PAIGE HARRIS, Deputy  
County Counsel (SBN 208590)  
LING YANG LEW, Deputy County  
Counsel (SBN 271200)  
OFFICE OF THE COUNTY  
COUNSEL  
70 West Hedding Street  
East Wing, Ninth Floor  
San Jose, California 95110-1770  
Telephone: (408) 299-5900  
Facsimile: (408) 292-7240

*Attorneys for Defendant*  
Santa Clara County

Case No. 1:15-cv-05277-RMI

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF  
CONSENT DECREE AND NOTICE TO  
THE CLASS**

Date: November 27, 2018  
Time: 10:00 AM

Magistrate Judge Robert M. Illman

1 Plaintiffs in this action, Brian Chavez, Brandon Bracamonte, and a class of all  
2 people who are now, or in the future will be, incarcerated in the Santa Clara County  
3 jails, and a subclass of all people who are now, or in the future will be, incarcerated in  
4 the Santa Clara County jails and who have a psychiatric and/or intellectual disability,  
5 as defined under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.,  
6 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. § 794, allege that conditions in the  
7 Jails violate the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution  
8 and the Americans with Disabilities Act. Plaintiffs claim that they are entitled to  
9 injunctive relief to address their claims.

10 The parties have entered into a Consent Decree that was filed with their Joint  
11 Motion for Preliminary Approval of Consent Decree and Notice to the Class, which  
12 would settle all claims in this case. The parties have submitted a proposed notice to the  
13 class, as well as a proposed order regarding the distribution of the notice to the plaintiff  
14 class. This Court has presided over the proceedings in the above-captioned action and  
15 has reviewed all of the pleadings, records, and papers on file. The Court has reviewed  
16 the Joint Motion for Preliminary Approval of Consent Decree and Notice to the Class  
17 along with the Consent Decree and supporting documents, and has considered the  
18 parties' arguments concerning the proposed settlement of this class action. The Court  
19 has determined that inquiry should be made regarding the fairness and adequacy of this  
20 proposed settlement.

21 Accordingly, good cause appearing, IT IS ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

22 1. A court should preliminarily approve a class action settlement if it “appears  
23 to be the product of serious, informed, non-collusive negotiations, has no obvious  
24 deficiencies, does not improperly grant preferential treatment to class representatives or  
25 segments of the class, and falls within the range of possible approval.” *In re Tableware*  
26 *Antitrust Litig.*, 484 F. Supp. 2d 1078, 1079 (N.D. Cal. 2007) (quotation marks and  
27 citations omitted). The Court finds that this standard is met in this case, as the proposed  
28 settlement is the product of arms-length, serious, informed, and non-collusive

1 negotiations between experienced and knowledgeable counsel who have actively  
2 prosecuted and defended this litigation.

3 2. The Court finds that the requirements of Rule 23(b)(2) are met because this  
4 action seeks declaratory and injunctive relief against policies and practices that risk  
5 harm and discriminatory treatment to the class.

6 3. The Court finds that the Consent Decree meets the requirements of 18  
7 U.S.C. § 3626(a)(1). The Consent Decree attached hereto is granted preliminary  
8 approval and incorporated by reference herein, subject to the right of class members to  
9 challenge the fairness, reasonableness, or adequacy of the Consent Decree.

10 4. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e)(1), the Court approves the  
11 substance, form and manner of the Notice of Proposed Class Action Settlement (the  
12 “Notice”) filed by the parties, and finds that the proposed method of disseminating the  
13 Notice meets all due process and other legal requirements and is the best notice  
14 practicable under the circumstances.

15 5. By December 18, 2018, the County is directed to post the Notice in  
16 English, Spanish, and Vietnamese in all housing units in such a manner as to make the  
17 notice visible to all inmates. The County shall hand deliver a copy of the Notice to each  
18 inmate in administrative management. The Notice shall be posted and delivered for  
19 thirty days.

20 6. The County is also directed to provide a copy of this Order, the full  
21 Consent Decree, the Remedial Plan and Plaintiffs’ motion for attorneys’ fees to inmates  
22 who complete an inmate request form and request the documents. Defendant must file  
23 and serve on Plaintiffs’ counsel a declaration affirming that notice was published as  
24 required in this order.

25 7. A fairness hearing shall take place at 10:00 a.m. on February 27, 2019 in  
26 Courtroom 14, United States Courthouse, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco,  
27 California, to determine whether the proposed settlement of this action on the terms and  
28 conditions provided for in the Consent Decree is fair, reasonable, and adequate and

1 should be finally approved by the Court. The hearing may be continued from time to  
2 time without further notice to the class. Any further briefing from the parties in advance  
3 of the hearing shall be filed no later than February 13, 2018.


4 8. Any member of the class may enter an appearance on his or her own behalf  
5 in this action through that class member's own attorney (at their own expense), but need  
6 not do so. Class members who do not enter an appearance through their own attorneys  
7 will be represented by class counsel. Alternatively, any member of the class may write  
8 to the Court about whether the settlement is fair.

9 9. The Court will consider written communications when deciding whether to  
10 approve the settlement. Comments regarding the fairness of the settlement must include  
11 at the top of the first page the case name (*Chavez v. County of Santa Clara*) and the case  
12 number (N.D. Cal. No. 1:15-cv-05277-RMI). A written comment must contain the  
13 author's full name and must include all objections and the reasons for them, must  
14 include any and all supporting papers (including, without limitation, all briefs, written  
15 evidence, and declarations), and must be signed by the class member. A class member  
16 who desires to comment but who fails to comply with the above objection procedure  
17 and timeline shall be deemed to have not objected and the objection shall not be heard  
18 or considered at the hearing. Comments must be postmarked by January 17, 2019, and  
19 must be sent to the following address:

20 Clerk of the Court  
21 United States District Court  
22 450 Golden Gate Avenue  
23 San Francisco, CA 94102

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25 Dated: November 27, 2018

26   
27 The Honorable Robert M. Illman  
28 United States Magistrate Judge

188894774 v2