

1 Terry W. Bird – Bar No. 49038  
 2 tbird@birdmarella.com  
 3 Dorothy Wolpert – Bar No. 73213  
 4 dwolpert@birdmarella.com  
 5 Shoshana E. Bannett – Bar No. 241977  
 6 sbannett@birdmarella.com  
 7 Kate S. Shin – Bar No. 279867  
 8 kshin@birdmarella.com  
 9 Oliver Rocos – Bar No. 319059  
 10 orocos@birdmarella.com  
 11 Christopher J. Lee – Bar No. 322140  
 12 clee@birdmarella.com  
 13 BIRD, MARELLA, BOXER, WOLPERT,  
 14 NESSIM, DROOKS, LINCENBERG &  
 15 RHOW, P.C.  
 16 1875 Century Park East, 23<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
 17 Los Angeles, California 90067-2561  
 18 Telephone: (310) 201-2100  
 19 Facsimile: (310) 201-2110  
 20  
 21 Naeun Rim – Bar No. 263558  
 22 nrim@manatt.com  
 23 MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP  
 24 2049 Century Park East, Suite 1700  
 25 Los Angeles, California 90067  
 26 Telephone: (310) 312-4000  
 27 Facsimile: (310) 312-4224  
 28  
 Attorneys for Plaintiff-Petitioners Yonnedit  
 Carror Torres, Vincent Reed, Felix Samuel  
 Garcia, Andre Brown, and Shawn L. Fears

Donald Specter – Bar No. 83925  
 dspecter@prisonlaw.com  
 Sara Norman – Bar No. 189536  
 snorman@prisonlaw.com  
 Sophie Hart – Bar No. 321663  
 sophieh@prisonlaw.com  
 Patrick Booth – Bar No. 328783  
 patrick@prisonlaw.com  
 PRISON LAW OFFICE  
 1917 Fifth Street  
 Berkeley, California 94710  
 Telephone: (510) 280-2621  
 Facsimile: (510) 280-2704  
 Peter J. Eliasberg – Bar No. 189110  
 peliasberg@aclusocal.org  
 Peter Bibring – Bar No. 223981  
 pbibring@aclusocal.org  
 ACLU FOUNDATION OF  
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
 1313 West 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
 Los Angeles, CA 90017  
 Telephone: (213) 977-9500  
 Facsimile: (213) 977-5297

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION**

YONNEDIL CARROR TORRES,  
 et al.,  
 Plaintiff-Petitioners,  
 vs.  
 LOUIS MILUSNIC, in his capacity as  
 Warden of Lompoc, et al.,  
 Defendant-Respondents.

CASE NO. 2:20-cv-04450-CBM-PVCx  
**PETITIONERS' OPPOSITION TO  
 RESPONDENTS' MOTION TO  
 DISSOLVE PRELIMINARY  
 INJUNCTION**  
 Hearing Date: June 29, 2021  
 Time: 10:00 a.m.  
 Courtroom: 8B  
 Honorable Consuelo B. Marshall

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Page**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND ..... 2

    A. Procedural History ..... 2

    B. Home Confinement Guidance..... 5

    C. Inmates Remain At Serious Risk Of Harm From COVID-19 ..... 6

III. LEGAL STANDARD ..... 6

IV. THE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION SHOULD REMAIN IN PLACE..... 7

    A. The Preliminary Injunction Is Necessary To Protect Inmates  
    From The Unconstitutional Risk Of Harm At Lompoc ..... 7

    B. Home Confinement Remains A Critical Part Of The BOP’s  
    Response To The COVID-19 Pandemic..... 8

    C. Respondents’ Motion Is Simply Another Effort To Circumvent  
    Its Home Confinement Obligations ..... 9

V. CONCLUSION ..... 10

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

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Federal Cases**

*Bellevue Manor Associates v. United States*,  
165 F.3d 1249 (9th Cir.1999)..... 6

*Helling v. McKinney*,  
509 U.S. 25 (1993) ..... 1

*Karnoski v. Trump*,  
926 F.3d 1180 (9th Cir. 2019)..... 6

*Orantes-Hernandez v. Gonzales*,  
504 F. Supp. 2d 825 (C.D. Cal. 2007), *aff’d sub nom. Orantes-  
Hernandez v. Holder*, 321 F. App’x 625 (9th Cir. 2009)..... 7

*United States v. Austin*,  
2021 WL 1137987 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 25, 2021)..... 8

*United States v. Figueroa*,  
2021 WL 1122590 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 24, 2021)..... 8

*United States v. Jackson*,  
2021 WL 806366 (D. Minn. Mar. 3, 2021)..... 8

**Federal Statutes**

18 U.S.C.  
§ 3624(c)(2) ..... 5

CARES Act, Pub. L. No. 116-136  
§ 12003(b)(2)..... 5

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Nowhere is Respondents’ resistance to judicial oversight clearer than in its  
3 consistent opposition to the preliminary injunction entered in this action on July  
4 2020 (the “Preliminary Injunction”). Respondents have repeatedly tested its limits,  
5 denying home confinement to as many inmates as possible and delaying transfer to  
6 those approved. This Court and Magistrate Castillo have found that in doing so,  
7 Respondents have breached it in a multitude of ways. (Dkt. Nos. 105, 229.) Despite  
8 *never* having been in compliance with the Preliminary Injunction, Respondents now  
9 seek to dissolve it. There is no basis for doing so.

10 As is set out in Petitioners’ contemporaneous opposition to Respondents’  
11 Motion for Summary Judgment, inmates at Lompoc remain in substantial danger of  
12 harm from COVID-19 a full year after a huge outbreak that infected over 1,000  
13 inmates and claimed at least four lives. (Dkt. No. 257.) Respondents have failed to  
14 enact basic testing programs, maintain a “grossly inadequate system of health care,”  
15 and have enacted a woefully deficient vaccination program that fails to provide the  
16 minimal information inmates need to make an informed decision as to whether to  
17 get vaccinated. (*See id.* at 7-12.) Lompoc still houses a “pool of extremely high-  
18 risk, unvaccinated patients,” who remain at increased risk in a setting where social  
19 distancing is impossible. (*Id.* at 15.) Respondents’ refusal to comply with the  
20 Preliminary Injunction and to reduce the risk to the incarcerated population  
21 demonstrates that the ongoing threat is the result of their own deliberate  
22 indifference. (*Id.* at 21-24.) While there are no longer hundreds of cases of  
23 COVID-19 at Lompoc, the constitution requires Respondents to take reasonable  
24 measures to *prevent* future outbreaks. *Helling v. McKinney*, 509 U.S. 25, 33 (1993)  
25 (“It would be odd to deny an injunction to inmates who plainly proved an unsafe,  
26 life threatening condition in their prison on the ground that nothing yet had  
27 happened to them.”). Given that hundreds of those incarcerated remain unvaccinated  
28 and the continued uncertainty regarding the duration of immunity and protection

1 from variants, there is no significant change in circumstances that would warrant the  
2 dissolution of the Preliminary Injunction.

3 The BOP’s own guidance supports the necessity of the Preliminary Injunction  
4 to ensure home confinement continues. As recently as April 13, 2021, the BOP  
5 stated that “*it is imperative to continue reviewing at-risk inmates for placement on*  
6 *home confinement in accordance with the CARES Act and guidance from the*  
7 *Attorney General.*” Declaration of Oliver Rocos (“Rocos Decl.”) Ex. 1 at 1. As  
8 this Court is aware, the Attorney General’s guidance was that the BOP “maximize  
9 appropriate transfers to home confinement of all appropriate inmates.” *Id.*, Ex. 2 at  
10 1. Since the BOP is clear that home confinement remains a cornerstone of its  
11 response to the pandemic, Respondents’ assertion that judicial oversight of its home  
12 confinement process is no longer required should be disregarded.

13 Respondents’ motion is simply the culmination of their ongoing efforts to  
14 thwart the Court’s order that they fulfill their obligations to protect the inmates in  
15 their care. Having consistently violated the Preliminary Injunction, Respondents  
16 hope through this motion to avoid ever having to comply with it. That attempt at an  
17 end run around their violations should be denied.

18 **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND<sup>1</sup>**

19 **A. Procedural History**

20 On July 14, 2020, the Court granted Petitioners’ motion for a preliminary  
21 injunction to require Respondents to make “full and speedy use of their authority  
22 under the CARES Act and evaluate each class member’s eligibility for home  
23 confinement which gives substantial weight to the inmate’s risk factors for severe  
24 illness and death from COVID-19 based on age (over 50) or Underlying Health  
25  
26

---

27 <sup>1</sup> Although the Court is familiar with the background, Petitioners repeat the  
28 essential facts for ease of reference and refer to further facts as necessary below.

1 Conditions.”<sup>2</sup> (Dkt. No. 45 at 49 (the “Preliminary Injunction”).) The Court also  
2 provisionally certified a class of individuals comprising “all current and future  
3 people in post-conviction custody at FCI Lompoc and USP Lompoc over the age of  
4 50, and all current and future people in post-conviction custody at FCI Lompoc and  
5 USP Lompoc of any age” with certain underlying health conditions. (*Id.* at 48.)

6 Following the Preliminary Injunction, Respondents began identifying class  
7 members using SENTRY records and reviewing class members for home  
8 confinement. (*See generally* Dkt. Nos. 50-51.) The decisions regarding home  
9 confinement with respect to each class member are documented in review  
10 worksheets (the “Review Worksheets”) that Respondents filed for each class  
11 member denied home confinement. (*See, e.g.*, Dkt. No. 78 at Exs. A-B.)

12 On September 10, 2020, Petitioners filed a motion to enforce compliance with  
13 the preliminary injunction, including on the basis Respondents were not promptly  
14 transferring those granted home confinement. (Dkt. No. 93.) The Court granted  
15 that motion on October 8, 2020. (Dkt. No. 105.) Nevertheless, the parties continued  
16 to dispute additional issues regarding Respondents’ compliance with the Preliminary  
17 Injunction. On December 29, 2020, following the November 24, 2020 Status  
18 Conference, the Court referred the parties’ disputes to the Honorable Pedro V.  
19 Castillo, the assigned magistrate judge on the matter. (Dkt. No. 151).

20 The parties briefed the matter and a hearing was held on March 19, 2021,  
21 following which the parties were ordered to submit supplemental briefing. (Dkt.  
22 Nos. 163, 174, 180, 188.) The parties submitted that supplemental briefing by April  
23 5, 2021. (Dkt. Nos. 188, 201-202, 205-207.)

24 In support of Petitioners’ supplemental briefing, Petitioners submitted under  
25 seal a series of excel spreadsheets that summarized the Review Worksheets for 285  
26

---

27 <sup>2</sup> Petitioners’ *Ex Parte* Application for a Temporary Restraining Order was  
28 converted into an expedited motion for a preliminary injunction. (Dkt. Nos. 41, 42.)

1 inmates denied home confinement, together with citations to the respective Review  
 2 Worksheets. (Dkt. No. 202.)<sup>3</sup> Among many other issues, the evidence showed that  
 3 Respondents were failing to comply with the Preliminary Injunction by denying  
 4 home confinement on the basis inmates had not served “enough” time or had spent  
 5 convictions for violent crimes committed decades ago. (Dkt. No. 201 at 1-2.) Even  
 6 more concerning was the fact that class members were being denied home  
 7 confinement in whole or in part on the basis they were not old enough or did not  
 8 have enough “COVID Risk Factors” or “No Underlying Health Conditions” even  
 9 though, by virtue of being members of the provisional class, *this Court already had*  
 10 *found them to be at risk of severe harm or death from COVID-19.*<sup>4</sup> (Dkt. No. 201 at  
 11 3-4.) One inmate was denied solely on the basis Respondents contend he has “No  
 12 COVID Risk Factors” (Dkt. No. 201 at 4), notwithstanding that this Court already  
 13 determined that his age, 51, means that he is vulnerable to suffering a severe illness  
 14 or even death from COVID-19. (Dkt. No. 45 at 48.)

15 On April 29, 2021, Magistrate Judge Castillo issued a Report and  
 16 Recommendation (the “Recommendation”). (Dkt. No. 229.) Magistrate Judge  
 17 Castillo determined that Respondents were not complying with the Preliminary  
 18 Injunction and recommended this Court issue a further order requiring Respondents  
 19 to take specific steps in order to bring their home confinement process into  
 20 alignment with the applicable guidance—something they should have been doing all  
 21 along. (*Id.*) Respondents objected to the Recommendation and Petitioners opposed  
 22 that objection, seeking that it be entered in full. (Dkt. Nos. 245, 253.) The

23 \_\_\_\_\_  
 24 <sup>3</sup> Petitioners identified the 285 individuals in their filings out of the many  
 25 hundreds denied home confinement because they did not have any demerits in the  
 26 majority of categories of information in the Review Worksheets. (Dkt. No. 201 at  
 27 1.) They are identified for illustrative purposes only, and do not reflect the full  
 28 range of issues identified in Respondents’ home confinement review process. (*Id.*)

<sup>4</sup> The full range of Respondents’ violations are identified in Petitioners’ briefing  
 regarding the motion to enforce. (*See* Dkt. Nos. 169, 180, and 201-202.)

1 Recommendation remains pending.

2 **B. Home Confinement Guidance**

3 As this Court is aware, home confinement was recognized at the outset of the  
 4 pandemic as a valuable tool in protecting the health and lives of inmates. As early  
 5 as March 26, 2020, then Attorney General William Barr issued a memorandum (the  
 6 “March 26 Memo”) directing the BOP to prioritize the use of “various statutory  
 7 authorities to grant home confinement for prisoners seeking transfer in connection  
 8 with the COVID-19 pandemic.” Rocos Decl., Ex. 3 at 1. Congress passed the  
 9 CARES Act the following day, and in so doing authorized the Attorney General to  
 10 lengthen the maximum amount of time a prisoner may be placed on home  
 11 confinement pursuant to § 3624(c)(2) upon finding “emergency conditions will  
 12 materially affect the functioning of the [BOP].” CARES Act, Pub. L. No. 116-136,  
 13 § 12003(b)(2).

14 In an April 3, 2020 memorandum (the “April 3 Memo”), then Attorney  
 15 General Barr exercised his power under the CARES Act and declared that  
 16 “emergency conditions are materially affecting the functioning of the BOP.” Rocos  
 17 Decl., Ex. 2. That memorandum further directed the BOP to continue processing  
 18 inmates eligible for home confinement under pre-CARES Act standards, to “expand  
 19 the cohort of inmates who can be considered for home release . . . to the most  
 20 vulnerable inmates at the most affected facilities,” and to “immediately review all  
 21 inmates who have COVID-19 risk factors, as established by the CDC.” *Id.* at 1.  
 22 The BOP was ordered to “*immediately maximize appropriate transfers to home*  
 23 *confinement of all appropriate inmates*”. *Id.* (emphasis added).

24 Various guidance has been issued since that date regarding the criteria the  
 25 BOP should consider when conducting home confinement reviews, including  
 26 memoranda on April 22, 2020, May 8, 2020, and November 16, 2020. (Dkt. No.  
 27 169-1, Exs. 4-6.) Crucially, however, the Attorney General’s April 3 Memo has  
 28 never been withdrawn and home confinement continues to be a critical tool the BOP



1 must use to protect inmates.

2 As recently as April 13, 2021, the BOP reaffirmed that COVID-19 presents a  
 3 life-threatening risk to vulnerable inmates in prison and restated that as a part of its  
 4 “*ongoing effort to protect the health and safety of staff and inmates during the*  
 5 *COVID-19 pandemic, it is imperative to continue reviewing at-risk inmates for*  
 6 *placement on home confinement in accordance with the CARES Act and*  
 7 *guidance from the Attorney General*” (the “April 13 Memo”). Rocos Decl., Ex. 1  
 8 at 1 (emphasis added). That guidance identified factors the BOP should consider for  
 9 home confinement. *Id.* It does not, however, refer to vaccinations at all, much less  
 10 state that inmates who have been vaccinated or offered the vaccine are not eligible  
 11 for home confinement. *Id.*

### 12 C. Inmates Remain At Serious Risk Of Harm From COVID-19

13 As set out in the contemporaneously filed Opposition to Respondents’ Motion  
 14 for Summary Judgment, while COVID-19 cases at Lompoc have remained low for  
 15 some time inmates remain at a substantial risk of severe illness or death from a  
 16 further outbreak in the facility and widespread additional harm. (*See generally* Dkt.  
 17 No. 257.) Since the outset of the pandemic more than a year ago, Respondents have  
 18 failed to take the basic steps necessary to prevent the spread of COVID-19 and there  
 19 is every chance that another severe and deadly outbreak could occur at any time.

### 20 III. LEGAL STANDARD

21 A party seeking to modify or dissolve a preliminary injunction bears the  
 22 burden of establishing “a significant change in facts” justifying that relief. *Karnoski*  
 23 *v. Trump*, 926 F.3d 1180, 1198 (9th Cir. 2019). District courts must “take all the  
 24 circumstances into account in determining whether to modify or vacate a prior  
 25 injunction or consent decree.” *Bellevue Manor Associates v. United States*, 165  
 26 F.3d 1249, 1256 (9th Cir.1999). In particular, courts must determine “whether the .  
 27 . . . injunction has outlived its purpose and usefulness—in other words, whether  
 28 evolving circumstances have resolved the underlying problems, thereby rendering

1 the injunction unnecessary.” *Orantes-Hernandez v. Gonzales*, 504 F. Supp. 2d 825,  
2 830–31 (C.D. Cal. 2007), *aff’d sub nom. Orantes-Hernandez v. Holder*, 321 F.  
3 App’x 625 (9th Cir. 2009).

4 **IV. THE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION SHOULD REMAIN IN PLACE**

5 **A. The Preliminary Injunction Is Necessary To Protect Inmates From**  
6 **The Unconstitutional Risk Of Harm At Lompoc**

7 As set forth in detail in Petitioners’ contemporary Opposition to Respondents’  
8 Motion for Summary Judgment, inmates at Lompoc remain at serious risk of harm  
9 from COVID-19. (Dkt. No. 257.) Even now, after more than 1,000 inmates  
10 contracted COVID-19 and at least four died from it, Lompoc’s testing, medical care,  
11 and hygiene processes all remain far below the minimum necessary to provide a safe  
12 environment. (*Id.* at 7-12.) Respondents’ deliberate indifference is manifest not  
13 only from their repeated failures to comply with the Preliminary Injunction, but  
14 from their refusal to implement those necessary changes. (*Id.* at 21-24.)

15 In particular, while Respondents tout their vaccination program, 41.4% of  
16 inmates remain unvaccinated and Respondents have failed to provide a vaccination  
17 program that offers the minimum necessary vaccine education. (*Id.* at 15-19.)  
18 Many of those who are unvaccinated are vaccine hesitant due to their serious  
19 underlying conditions—the exact same conditions that put them at a high risk of  
20 severe illness or death from COVID-19. Yet, Respondents have refused to offer  
21 them the education and medical assurance they need in order to make an informed  
22 decision. (*Id.*) Dr. Venters, the Court-appointed expert, has concluded that  
23 Respondents’ vaccination program has resulted in a “pool of extremely high-risk,  
24 unvaccinated patients,” who remain at a very substantial risk of severe harm from  
25 COVID-19. (*Id.* at 15.)

26 Respondents’ citations to cases concerning the denial of compassionate  
27 release to inmates who received or were offered the vaccine are inapposite and serve  
28 merely to highlight the flaws in their vaccination program. Mot. at 5-6. Petitioners

1 are not seeking compassionate release, merely relief that would ensure their  
2 confinement is constitutional. Even so, not one of the authorities Respondents cite  
3 state that an individual can be denied home confinement where they refuse a vaccine  
4 *even when they have not been provided with sufficient information to make an*  
5 *informed vaccination decision. See United States v. Jackson*, 2021 WL 806366, at  
6 \*1 (D. Minn. Mar. 3, 2021) (“The record does not bear out Jackson’s claim that he  
7 was not provided with sufficient information about the vaccine”); *United States v.*  
8 *Figueroa*, 2021 WL 1122590 at \*4-5 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 24, 2021) (noting defendant  
9 had failed to show how the advice he did receive justified his refusal to accept the  
10 vaccine); *United States v. Austin*, 2021 WL 1137987, at \*2 & n.1 (E.D. Mich. Mar.  
11 25, 2021) (noting defendant refused the vaccine without justification without stating  
12 what information he received).

13 The Preliminary Injunction was imposed precisely because Respondents were  
14 failing to take steps to protect those who were most at risk of harm from COVID-19.  
15 Since the evidence is clear that Respondents are still failing to protect those  
16 individuals who remain at risk, there is no “significant change in facts” that would  
17 justify the dissolution of the Preliminary Injunction.

18 **B. Home Confinement Remains A Critical Part Of The BOP’s**  
19 **Response To The COVID-19 Pandemic**

20 Further supporting the ongoing necessity of the Preliminary Injunction is the  
21 fact that despite a year having passed since the pandemic began, the BOP’s April 13  
22 Memo is clear that home confinement remains a cornerstone of the BOP’s response.  
23 Far from home confinement being obsolete in light of developing facts, the BOP  
24 states that “*it is imperative to continue reviewing at-risk inmates for placement on*  
25 *home confinement in accordance with the CARES Act and guidance from the*  
26 *Attorney General.*” Rocos Decl., Ex. 1 at 1. The Attorney General’s exhortation to  
27 the BOP that it “maximize appropriate transfers to home confinement of all  
28 appropriate inmates” remains controlling guidance. *Id.*, Ex. 2 at 1. According to the

1 BOP itself, home confinement is just as crucial to protecting inmates from COVID-  
2 19 as it ever was. Respondents are under a clear obligation to continue to review at  
3 risk inmates for home confinement and to grant it where appropriate. In the absence  
4 of any change in that fact, the Preliminary Injunction should be maintained.

5 **C. Respondents’ Motion Is Simply Another Effort To Circumvent Its**  
6 **Home Confinement Obligations**

7 Finally, the fact that Respondents filed this motion to dissolve the Preliminary  
8 Injunction without having actually complied with it demonstrates their contempt for  
9 it and home confinement as a whole and their determination to deny this life-saving  
10 measure to as many inmates as possible.

11 As set forth in Petitioners’ multiple motions to enforce the Preliminary  
12 Injunction, Respondents have so far denied home confinement on a broad range of  
13 apparently baseless reasons, including that inmates: have not served enough time;  
14 have stale, prior convictions for violent crimes; have a PATTERN score above  
15 minimum; are not old enough; do not have enough underlying conditions; have a  
16 “serious” current offense, albeit not violent or sexual in nature; have an alleged gang  
17 affiliation; or any other basis they can identify such as a concern it would “diminish  
18 the seriousness of the offense” or because the inmate “had close ties to Mexico.”<sup>5</sup>  
19 (*See* Dkt. No. 201.) Even when Respondents have granted home confinement, they  
20 have repeatedly delayed inmates’ transfer for months. (*See, e.g.*, Dkt. No. 159, Ex.  
21 A (noting inmate was still incarcerated at Lompoc despite having been granted  
22 home confinement five months earlier).) Respondents’ tactics in minimizing home  
23 confinement, rather than “maximizing” it as they are required to do, have been  
24 highly effective. Although 2,083 medically vulnerable inmates have been reviewed  
25 for home confinement, only 141—less than 7%—were granted it. Mot. at 3.

26  
27 <sup>5</sup> Full details of those improper bases for denying home confinement are contained  
28 in Petitioners’ prior filings. (Dkt. Nos. 93, 169, 180, 201-202, 253.)

1 This Court has found that Respondents violated the Preliminary Injunction in  
2 delaying transfer of inmates, (Dkt. No. 105), yet that tactic still continues today.  
3 (*See* Dkt. No. 243 ¶ 12 (home confinement reviews for two inmates are “paused”  
4 while they await “relocation approval”).) Magistrate Judge Castillo also found *just*  
5 *weeks ago* that Respondents have violated the Preliminary Injunction in multiple  
6 ways by improperly considering irrelevant factors and information. (Dkt. No. 229.)

7 Properly understood, Respondents’ motion is simply yet another attempt to  
8 evade the requirements of the Preliminary Injunction by reading into it an exception  
9 for inmates who have been vaccinated or who have even been offered the  
10 vaccination. *But there is no basis for that argument.* Respondents do not point to a  
11 single piece of guidance anywhere that says vaccinations are even relevant to home  
12 confinement decisions, let alone any guidance sufficient to counteract the clear  
13 mandate of the Attorney General and the BOP itself that home confinement must be  
14 ongoing. No such guidance exists.

15 In sum, dissolving the Preliminary Injunction now would merely allow  
16 Respondents to escape their repeated, widespread violations of the Preliminary  
17 Injunction and to continue to flout their obligation to consider home confinement for  
18 suitable individuals. Respondents should not be permitted to make an end run  
19 around this Court’s orders.

20 **V. CONCLUSION**

21 For the above reasons, Petitioners respectfully request the Court deny  
22 Respondents’ motion.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 DATED: June 8, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

2

Terry W. Bird

3

Dorothy Wolpert

4

Shoshana E. Bannett

5

Kate S. Shin

6

Oliver Rocos

7

Christopher J. Lee

8

Bird, Marella, Boxer, Wolpert, Nessim,

9

Drooks, Lincenberg & Rhow, P.C.

10

By:           /s/ Oliver Rocos          

Oliver Rocos

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Petitioners

11

12 DATED: June 8, 2021

Donald Specter

13

Sara Norman

14

Sophie Hart

15

Patrick Booth

16

Prison Law Office

17

By:           /s/ Sara Norman          

Sara Norman

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Petitioners

18

19 DATED: June 8, 2021

Naeun Rim

20

Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP

21

By:           /s/ Naeun Rim          

Naeun Rim

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Petitioners

22

23

24

25

26

27

28