Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo CSR: None ERM: None Deputy Sheriff: None

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff(s): No Appearances

For Defendant(s): No Appearances

Other Appearance Notes: Christopher Medeiros submits on behalf of Plaintiff(s)Andrew Baum

submits on behalf of Defendant(s)

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: Hearing on Motion to Enforce Settlement; Hearing on Motion to Seal or Redact Documents in Support of Motion to Enforce Stipulated Judgment

The Court's tentative ruling is provided to all sides via the Court's website.

Both sides submit to the Court's tentative ruling and stipulate to advance Hearing on Motion to Seal Motion to Seal or Redact Documents in Support of Reply to Opposition to Motion to Enforce Stipulated Judgment, scheduled for 05/23/2023.

The matters are called for hearing.

Pursuant to oral stipulation, the Hearing on Motion to Seal Motion to Seal or Redact Documents in Support of Reply to Opposition to Motion to Enforce Stipulated Judgment scheduled for 05/23/2023 is advanced to this date and heard.

The Court's tentative ruling is adopted as the Order of the Court as follows:

Case Number: 21STCV01309 Hearing Date: May 9, 2023 Dept: 34 SUBJECT: Motion to Enforce Stipulated Judgment

Moving Party: Plaintiff The People of the State of California, Ex Rel. Xavier Becerra, Attorney General of the State of California

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo CSR: None ERM: None Deputy Sheriff: None

Resp. Party: Defendant County of Los Angeles

The Motion to Enforce is GRANTED in part.

The Court finds that Defendant has not yet complied with Paragraphs 6, 15, 16(c), 19, 24(c), 25(b), 25(h), 26(e), 27(c), and 28(b) of the Stipulated Judgment.

Defendant is ORDERED to comply with Paragraphs 6, 15, 16(c), 19, 24(c), 25(b), 25(h), 26(e), 27(c), and 28(b) of the Stipulated Judgment.

The Parties and the Monitor are ORDERED to meet and confer regarding compliance deadlines for Paragraphs 6, 15, 16(c), 19, 24(c), 25(b), 25(h), 26(e), 27(c), and 28(b) of the Stipulated Judgment. The Parties and the Monitor shall have 30 days to meet and confer.

The Parties and the Monitor are ORDERED to appear before the Court on June 20, 2023 for a Status Conference.

If the Parties and the Monitor agree about the compliance deadlines, they may propose those deadlines to the Court at the upcoming Status Conference. If the Parties and the Monitor do not agree about the compliance deadlines, the Court will set a further hearing so that the Court may determine the appropriate compliance deadlines. Should the County not comply with those deadlines, the Court is inclined to issue an order to show cause why sanctions should not be

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo CSR: None ERM: None Deputy Sheriff: None

issued against Defendant for failure to comply with the Stipulated Judgment.

Plaintiff's Motion to Seal Motion to Enforce is GRANTED.

The hearing on the Motion to Seal Reply is ADVANCED to today's date of May 9, 2023. Plaintiff's Motion to Seal Reply is GRANTED.

BACKGROUND:

On January 13, 2021, Plaintiff The People of the State of California, Ex Rel. Xavier Becerra, Attorney General of the State of California filed its Complaint for Injunctive and Other Equitable Relief against Defendants Los Angeles County and Los Angeles County Office of Education.

On January 21, 2021, the Court entered: (1) Stipulated Judgment for Defendant County of Los Angeles; and (2) Stipulated Judgment for Defendant Los Angeles County Office of Education.

On April 12, 2023, Plaintiff filed its Motion to Enforce Stipulated Judgment ("Motion to Enforce"). In support of its Motion to Enforce, Plaintiff concurrently filed: (1) Memorandum of Points and Authorities; (2) Declaration of Christopher Medeiros; (3) Proposed Order; and (4) Declaration of Service by E-Mail.

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield	CSR: None
Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro	ERM: None
Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo	Deputy Sheriff: None

Also on April 12, 2023, Plaintiff filed its Motion to Seal or Redact Documents in Support of Motion to Enforce Stipulated Judgment ("Motion to Seal Motion to Enforce"). In support of its Motion to Seal Motion to Enforce, Plaintiff filed: (1) Declaration of Christopher Medeiros; (2) Proposed Order; and (3) Declaration of Service by E-Mail.

On April 26, 2023, Defendant Los Angeles County ("Defendant") filed its Opposition to the People's Motion to Enforce Stipulated Judgment ("Opposition to Motion to Enforce"). Defendant concurrently filed Declaration of Andrew Baum.

On May 2, 2023, Plaintiff filed its Reply to Opposition to Motion to Enforce Stipulated Judgment ("Reply re Motion to Enforce"). Plaintiff concurrently filed: (1) Declaration of Virginia Corrigan; and (2) Declaration of Service by E-Mail.

Also on May 2, 2023, Plaintiff filed its Motion to Seal or Redact Documents in Support of Reply to Opposition to Motion to Enforce Stipulated Judgment ("Motion to Seal Reply"). In support of its Motion to Seal Reply, Plaintiff filed: (1) Declaration of Christopher Medeiros; (2) Proposed Order; and (3) Declaration of Service by E-Mail.

ANALYSIS:

I. Preliminary Issues

The Motion to Seal Reply is currently scheduled to be heard on May 23, 2023. The Court

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield	CSR: None
Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro	ERM: None
Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo	Deputy Sheriff: None

assumes that no opposition will be filed to the Motion to Seal Reply. The Court therefore ADVANCES the hearing on the Motion to Seal Reply to May 9, 2023, which is the date of the hearing on the Motion to Enforce and the Motion to Seal Motion to Enforce. If Defendant indicates at the hearing on May 9, 2023 that it wishes to oppose the Motion to Seal Reply, the Court will continue the hearing on that motion to allow for normal briefing.

II. Motion to Enforce

A. Legal Standard

"If parties to pending litigation stipulate, in a writing signed by the parties outside of the presence of the court or orally before the court, for settlement of the case, or part thereof, the court, upon motion, may enter judgment pursuant to the terms of the settlement. If requested by the parties, the court may retain jurisdiction over the parties to enforce the settlement until performance in full of the terms of the settlement." (Code Civ. Proc., § 664.6, subd. (a).)

"Section 664.6 was enacted to provide a summary procedure for specifically enforcing a settlement contract without the need for a new lawsuit." (Weddington Prod., Inc. v. Flick (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 793, 809.) In deciding motions made under Section 664.6, judges "must determine whether the parties entered into a valid and binding settlement." (Kohn v. Jaymar-Ruby (1994) 23 Cal.App.4th 1530, 1533.)

B. Discussion

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield	CSR
Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro	ERM
Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo	Depu

CSR: None ERM: None Deputy Sheriff: None

1. Relevant Portions of the Stipulated Judgment

On January 21, 2021, the Court entered the Stipulated Judgment for Defendant County of Los Angeles ("Stipulated Judgment"). The Stipulated Judgment is 34 page long.

The following portions of the Stipulated Judgment are relevant to the Motion to Enforce.

a. Timely Transport of Youth to Class on a Daily Basis

"Within the timeframe set forth in the Detailed Plan, and as further described in the Detailed Plan: . . . The County will ensure that all youth are timely transported to and attending class on a daily basis, except when there is an immediate threat to the safety of youth or others, or unless LACOE authorizes an excused absence based on categories recognized by state law". (Stipulated Judgment, $\P 26(e)$.)

"Within the timeframe set forth in the Detailed Plan, and as further described in the Detailed Plan, the County will: . . . Provide and maintain sufficient staffing to ensure youth receive programming, recreation, exercise, outside activity, religious services, and visitation as required by California Code of Regulations, title 15, section 1321 and this Judgment; and are immediately available to LACOE for enrollment and evaluation, and timely transported to and attending class on a daily basis". (Stipulated Judgment, ¶ 28(b).)

b. Provision of Compensatory Education Services

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield	CSR: None
Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro	ERM: None
Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo	Deputy Sheriff: None

"Within the timeframe set forth in the Detailed Plan, and as further described in the Detailed Plan jointly developed by the County and LACOE: ... LACOE and the County will establish a process for gathering information from LACOE's Electronic System described at Section XII, Paragraph 26(c), to be included in a monthly report detailing enrollment, attendance, and daily educational minute information for youth placed in a Juvenile Hall for the prior month, including the reasons provided for any loss of education and an aggregation of educational minutes lost due to delays in enrollment, failure to have a teacher for the class, and/or failure to timely transport youth to school on a daily basis ('School Attendance and Enrollment Report'). The School Attendance and Enrollment Report will redact identifying information for youth and set forth proposed remedies and requests for immediate action to address any loss of education to youth, including the number of total minutes of education time lost for the month and any compensatory education services needed to make up for the loss, the cost of compensatory services, and a proposed provider. To the extent there is a dispute about whether LACOE or the County will fund the compensatory education services, the dispute and any supporting documentation will be submitted to the Education SME, who will make a determination, which will be final and binding upon the parties, within 10 business days". (Stipulated Judgment, ¶ 27(c).)

c. Provision of Time Outdoors for Youth

"The County is permanently enjoined from violating any law or regulation, including, but not limited to, Title 15 of the California Code of Regulations sections 1300 et seq., and the causes of action alleged in the People's Complaint, at the County's Juvenile Halls, and any successors and assigns of such Juvenile Halls, as defined in Paragraph 61 of this Judgment. During the compliance period of this Judgment, the County will carry out the terms of the following substantive provisions and provide sufficient resources and staffing necessary to fulfill the terms of the Judgment." (Stipulated Judgment, \P 6.)

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield	CSR: None
Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro	ERM: None
Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo	Deputy Sheriff: None

"Within the timeframe set forth in the Detailed Plan, and as further described in the Detailed Plan, the County will: . . . Review and revise current policies, procedures, and practices to: (i) ensure and maintain access to programming, recreation, exercise, outside activity, religious services, visitation, and phone calls, as required by law and regulation; (ii) prohibit the denial of programming, recreation, exercise, outside activity, religious services, visitation, or phone calls as a form of punishment, discipline or retaliation; (iii) prohibit Room Confinement on the basis of a youth's refusal to participate in programming, recreation, exercise, outside activity, religious services, or visitation; and (iv) document the provision or denial of programming, recreation, exercise, outside activity, religious services, visitation, and phone calls, and the reason(s) for any denials. Weekly reports regarding the aforementioned provision or denial will be signed and validated by the Unit supervisor and Juvenile Hall Superintendent or their designee and submitted to the OIG for review". (Stipulated Judgment, ¶ 24(c).)

"Within the timeframe set forth in the Detailed Plan, and as further described in the Detailed Plan, the County will: . . . Provide and maintain sufficient staffing to ensure youth receive programming, recreation, exercise, outside activity, religious services, and visitation as required by California Code of Regulations, title 15, section 1321 and this Judgment; and are immediately available to LACOE for enrollment and evaluation, and timely transported to and attending class on a daily basis". (Stipulated Judgment, ¶ 28(b).)

d. Timely and Accurate Documentation and Review of all Use-of-Force Incidents

"Within the timeframe set forth in the Detailed Plan, and as further described in the Detailed Plan, the County will ensure that all use of force incidents are accurately reported and documented, and that all uses of force not accepted by Internal Affairs for review are timely reviewed by FIRST for compliance with State law and Probation policy." (Stipulated Judgment, ¶ 15.)

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield	CSR: No
Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro	ERM: No
Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo	Deputy S

CSR: None ERM: None Deputy Sheriff: None

e. Installation of Video Cameras at Juvenile Halls

"Within the timeframe set forth in the Detailed Plan, and as further described in the Detailed Plan, the County will: . . . establish deadlines and a plan to install video cameras throughout the Juvenile Halls, with exceptions to preserve youth and staff privacy (e.g. bathrooms)". (Stipulated Judgment, \P 16(c).)

f. Creation and Implementation of a Positive Behavior Management Program

"Within the timeframe set forth in the Detailed Plan, and as further described in the Detailed Plan, the County will:

(a) "Review and evaluate the existing process to inform youth of the objectives and purposes of the positive behavior management program and the rewards involved, and make necessary improvements to effectively inform youth of the program;

(b) "Work in collaboration with LACOE to strengthen and integrate the County's and LACOE's positive behavior management programs and trauma-informed strategies to provide for a consistent and coordinated approach;

(c) "Maintain in County policies and directives the prohibition of:

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield	CSR: None
Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro	ERM: None
Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo	Deputy Sheriff: None

(1) group punishment as defined in California Code of Regulations, title 15, section 1302, and prohibited by California Code of Regulations, title 15, section 1390;

(2) denial of the basic rights listed in California Code of Regulations, title 15, section 1390, for punitive and disciplinary purposes; and

(3) use of Room Confinement for punishment, coercion, convenience, or retaliation as prohibited by Welfare and Institutions Code section 208.3, subdivision (b)(2), and California Code of Regulations, title 15, section 1354.5, subdivision (a)(2);

(d) "Enhance the plan to train all Juvenile Hall staff in the County's positive behavior management program; and

(e) "Enhance the plan to train Probation staff to respond to non-compliance in a proportionate, trauma-informed, and equitable way."

(Stipulated Judgment, $\P 19(a)$ –(e).)

g. Provision of Timely Medical Care

"Within the timeframe set forth in the Detailed Plan, and as described in the Detailed Plan, the County will: . . . Review and revise, as needed, its policies and practices to ensure that detained

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield	CSR: None
Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro	ERM: None
Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo	Deputy Sheriff: None

youth are provided with timely medical and mental health care and treatment planning that is compliant with law and regulations". (Stipulated Judgment, $\P 25(b)$.)

"Within the timeframe set forth in the Detailed Plan, and as described in the Detailed Plan, the County will: . . . Ensure DMH, DHS, and Probation collaborate to maintain and revise as needed a process to identify youth with severe mental health, developmental, or medical needs, and to ensure youth receive the appropriate level of care and timely transport for outside services". (Stipulated Judgment, $\P 25(h)$.)

2. The Parties' Arguments

Plaintiff moves the Court for an order that: (1) declares Defendant has not complied with the above-listed provisions of the Stipulated Judgment; (2) orders Defendant to comply with the above-listed provisions of the Stipulated Judgment and Detailed Plan requirements incorporated therein; (3) orders certain timelines for the Monitor and Defendant, including a 120-day compliance deadline that, if passed without Defendant coming into compliance, requires Defendant to come before the Court to show cause why the Court should not order sanctions; and (4) sets the scope of the order. (Motion to Enforce, p. 18:18–19; Proposed Order.)

Plaintiff argues that the requested relief is appropriate because: (1) the ongoing staffing crisis at the Juvenile Halls contributes to unsafe conditions; (2) Defendant is not complying with the Stipulated Judgment; (3) the Court has the authority to enter an order enforcing the Stipulated Judgment, (4) Defendant's failure to comply calls for an order enforcing the judgment; and (5) compliance issues include (a) failure to ensure youth are timely transported to and attending class on a daily basis, (b) failure to provide compensatory education services to youth who are entitled to them, (c) failure to ensure that youth receive outside activity, (d) failure to ensure that all use of force incidents are properly reported, documented, and reviewed, (e) failure to install cameras throughout Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall, (f) failure to implement a positive behavior

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield	CSR: None
Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro	ERM: None
Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo	Deputy Sheriff: None

management program, and (g) failure to ensure that youth receive timely medical care. (Memorandum, pp. 7:12–13, 9:10–11, 10:7–8, 10:13–14, 12:10–11, 13:3, 14:3–4, 15:13, 16:3–4, 17:14.)

Defendant does not dispute that it is not in compliance with the Stipulated Judgment. Nonetheless, Defendant opposes the Motion to Enforce, arguing: (1) that Defendant has undertaken efforts to urgently address problems with the Juvenile Halls, including (a) hiring, training, and recruiting staff, (b) creating fire safety and emergency operation plans, (c) implementing a modernized "safety check" system for youth housing, (d) implementing enhanced training, including regarding use of force and report writing, (e) working with agencies and community-based-providers to develop programs for youth, (f) completing a revised "Behavior Management Program" for incentivizing positive youth behavior, and (g) carriing out numerous facility upgrades; (2) that certain issues of non-compliance are due to delays outside of Defendant's control (i.e., regarding use of force, compensatory services obligations, delays installing cameras, a lack of staffing, and items that are the result of a lack of staffing); and (3) that Plaintiff's request for a 120-day compliance deadline is not warranted. (Opposition, pp. 4:17–19, 6:9–23, 7:18–19, 7:24–25, 8:23–24, 10:3–5, 11:7–8, 12:26, 13:25.)

Defendant proposes that the Parties meet and confer to establish workable deadlines for Defendant to come into compliance with the particular provisions at issue. (Opposition, p. 14:17–19.) Defendant states that "[a]chieving full compliance as quickly as it can remains, as it has always been, [Defendant's] goal, irrespective of the exact contours of [Defendant's] obligations with respect to timing under the Settlement." (Id. at 15:4–6.)

In its Reply, Plaintiff argues: (1) that Defendant's arguments and efforts have failed and current efforts are not sufficient to rectify the conditions at the Juvenile Halls; (2) that Defendant does not meaningfully dispute that it has long been out of compliance with the Stipulated Judgment; (3) that Defendant's explanations for non-compliance, which concede violations but offer no concrete plan for achieving compliance, underscore the need for Court intervention; (4) that Defendant provides insufficient detail about its efforts to implement a plan to provide

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield	CSR: None
Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro	ERM: None
Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo	Deputy Sheriff: None

compensatory education services; (5) that Defendant's defense of its backlog of unreviewed useof-force incidents misapprehends Defendant's obligations under the Stipulated Judgment; (6) that Defendant submission of the draft Positive Behavior Management Plan came two years after the Stipulated Judgment and after the Monitor excoriated Defendant's lack of progress; (7) that Defendant projects further delays in installing cameras; and (8) that the relief Plaintiff seeks is reasonable and necessary. (Reply, pp. 3:2–4, 6:6–10, 6:7:1–2, 7:23–24, 9:11–12, 10:3–4, 10:19– 20.)

3. Discussion

The Parties do not dispute that the conditions in Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall and Central Juvenile Hall do not meet the conditions set forth in the Stipulated Judgment. Nor do the Parties dispute that Defendant is behind schedule in complying with the above-listed aspects of the Stipulated Judgment. Instead, the County has offered various reasons for its failure to comply with the stipulated judgment. While some of these reasons may be legitimate, they are of small comfort to those children who are currently not receiving adequate care in our juvenile facilities.

C. Conclusion

The Motion to Enforce is GRANTED in part.

The Court finds that Defendant has not yet complied with Paragraphs 6, 15, 16(c), 19, 24(c), 25(b), 25(h), 26(e), 27(c), and 28(b) of the Stipulated Judgment.

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield	CSR: None
Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro	ERM: None
Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo	Deputy Sheriff: None

Defendant is ORDERED to comply with Paragraphs 6, 15, 16(c), 19, 24(c), 25(b), 25(h), 26(e), 27(c), and 28(b) of the Stipulated Judgment.

The Parties and the Monitor are ORDERED to meet and confer regarding compliance deadlines for Paragraphs 6, 15, 16(c), 19, 24(c), 25(b), 25(h), 26(e), 27(c), and 28(b) of the Stipulated Judgment. The Parties and the Monitor shall have 30 days to meet and confer.

The Parties and the Monitor are ORDERED to appear before the Court on June 20, 2023 for a Status Conference.

If the Parties and the Monitor agree about the compliance deadlines, they may propose those deadlines to the Court at the upcoming Status Conference. If the Parties and the Monitor do not agree about the compliance deadlines, the Court will set a further hearing so that the Court may determine the appropriate compliance deadlines. Should the County not comply with those deadlines, the Court is inclined to issue an order to show cause why sanctions should not be issued against Defendant for failure to comply with the Stipulated Judgment.

The parties are to file a Joint Status Conference Report 5 court days prior to the status conference hearing. At the next hearing, counsel are to appear in person; the Monitor may appear virtually.

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield	CSR: None
Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro	ERM: None
Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo	Deputy Sheriff: None

III. Motions to Seal Motion to Enforce and Motion to Seal Reply

A. Legal Standard

A party that requests that a record or portion of a record be filed under seal must file a motion or an application for an order sealing it. The motion must be accompanied by a supporting memorandum and a declaration containing facts sufficient to justify the sealing. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.551(b)(1);¿Savaglio v Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.¿(2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 588, 597-601.) All parties that have appeared in the case must be served with a copy of the motion or application. Unless the judge orders otherwise, a party that already possesses copies of the records to be sealed must be served with a complete, unredacted version of all papers as well as a redacted version. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.551(b)(2).)

i

The moving party must lodge the record with the court in a separate envelope when the motion or application is made, unless good cause exists for not lodging it or it has been lodged previously. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.551(b)(4) and (d).) The lodged record is conditionally under seal pending the judge's determination of the motion or application. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.551(b)(4).)

i

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 2.550(d), a judge may order that a record be filed under seal only if the judge expressly finds facts that establish all the following:

i

(1) There exists an overriding interest that overcomes the right of public access to the record.

(2) The overriding interest supports sealing the record.¿

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield	CSR: None
Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro	ERM: None
Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo	Deputy Sheriff: None

(3) A substantial probability exists that the overriding interest will be prejudiced if the record is not sealed.

(4) The proposed sealing is narrowly tailored, and;

(5) No less restrictive means exist to achieve the overriding interest. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.550(d).)

i

In ruling on a motion to seal, the court must weigh the competing interests and concerns. This process necessitates (1) identifying the specific information claimed to be entitled to protection from public disclosure, (2) identifying the nature of the harm threatened by disclosure, and (3) identifying and accounting for countervailing considerations. (H.B. Fuller Co. v. $Doe_{i}(2007)$ 151 Cal.App.4th 879, 894.) Therefore, to prevail on his or her motion, the moving party must present a specific enumeration of the facts sought to be withheld and the specific reasons for withholding them. (Id._i at p. 904.)

i

The California Supreme Court has held that the First Amendment provides "a right of access to ordinary civil trial and proceedings." (NBC Subsidiary (KNBC-TV), Inc. v. Superior Court¿(1999) 20 Cal.4th 1178, 1212.) The court further noted its belief that "the public has an interest, in all civil cases, in observing and assessing the performance of its public judicial system." (Id.,¿at 1210.) There is a presumption of openness in civil court proceedings. (Id., at 1217.) This presumption may apply to seemingly private proceedings. (Burkle v. Burkle (2006) 135 Cal. App.4th 1045, 1052 (divorce proceedings).) Therefore, it is up to this Court to determine if that presumption has been overcome.

i

Courts must find compelling reasons, prejudice absent sealing and the lack of less-restrictive means, before ordering filed documents sealed. (Hurvitz v. Hoefflin¿(2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 1232, 1246;¿NBC Subsidiary (KNBC-TV), Inc. v. Superior Court¿(1999) 20 Cal.4th 1178, 1208-1209 n. 25;¿Champion v. Superior Court¿(1988) 201 Cal.App.3d 777, 787.) A compelling reason could include to protect confidential trade secrets, which "have been recognized as a

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield	CSR: None
Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro	ERM: None
Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo	Deputy Sheriff: None

constitutionally protected intangible property interest." (DVD Copy Control Assn., Inc. v. Bunner, (2003) 31 Cal.4th 864, 878, internal citations omitted.)

i

A proposed sealing must be narrowly tailored to serve the overriding interest, such as by sealing portions of pleadings or redacting text. (In re Marriage of Burkle¿(2006) 135 Cal.App.4th 1045, 1052, 1070.) An application to seal must be accompanied by a declaration containing facts sufficient to justify sealing. (Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 2.551(b)(1).)

i

A "contractual obligation not to disclose can constitute an overriding interest" is sufficient to justify sealing the requested documents so long as the moving party establishes that disclosure of the information will result in substantial prejudice. (Universal City Studios, Inc. v. Superior Court¿(2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1273, 1283-1284.)

B. Discussion

Plaintiff requests that the Court seal: (1) portions of the Motion to Enforce; (2) portions of the Reply to the Motion to Enforce; and (3) Exhibits B, D, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, R, U, Y, and Z. (Motion to Seal Motion to Enforce; Decl. Medeiros re Motion to Seal Motion to Enforce, $\P\P$ 4–5; Motion to Seal Reply; Decl. Medeiros re Motion to Seal Reply, $\P\P$ 4–6.)

Regarding the items Plaintiff requests to be sealed, the Court finds: (1) that there exists an overriding interest that overcomes the right of public access to the record; (2) that the overriding interest supports sealing the record; (3) that a substantial probability exists that the overriding interest will be prejudiced if the record is not sealed; (4) that the proposed sealing is narrowly tailored, and (5) that no less restrictive means exist to achieve the overriding interest.

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 34

21STCV01309 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA vs LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.

May 9, 2023 8:30 AM

Judge: Honorable Michael P. Linfield Judicial Assistant: Reyna Navarro Courtroom Assistant: Vanessa Galindo CSR: None ERM: None Deputy Sheriff: None

The Court GRANTS Plaintiff's Motion to Seal Motion to Enforce.

The Court GRANTS Plaintiff's Motion to Seal Reply.

C. Conclusion

Plaintiff's Motion to Seal Motion to Enforce is GRANTED.

Plaintiff's Motion to Seal Reply is GRANTED.

Status Conference is scheduled for 06/20/2023 at 08:30 AM in Department 34 at Stanley Mosk Courthouse.

Clerk is to give notice.

Certificate of Mailing is attached.