

1 DAVID J. BERGER, State Bar No. 147645
2 CATHERINE E. MORENO, State Bar No. 264517
3 THOMAS J. MARTIN, State Bar No. 150039
4 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
5 Professional Corporation
6 650 Page Mill Road
7 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050
8 Telephone: (650) 493-9300
9 Facsimile: (650) 565-5100
10 Email: tmartin@wsgr.com

11 PAUL CHAVEZ, State Bar No. 241576
12 ROBIN GOLDFADEN, State Bar No. 208055
13 LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS
14 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA
15 131 Steuart Street, Suite 400
16 San Francisco, CA 94105
17 Telephone: (415) 543-9444
18 Facsimile: (415) 543-0296
19 Email: pchavez@lccr.com

20 JULIA HARUMI MASS, State Bar No. 189649
21 JINGNI (JENNY) ZHAO, State Bar No. 284684
22 ALAN L. SCHLOSSER, State Bar No. 49957
23 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION
24 OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, INC.
25 39 Drumm Street
26 San Francisco, CA 94111
27 Telephone: (415) 621-2493
28 Facsimile: (415) 255-8437
Email: jmass@aclunc.org

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

21 UELIAN DE ABADIA-PEIXOTO, *et al.*,)
22 Plaintiffs,)
23 v.)
24 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF)
25 HOMELAND SECURITY, *et al.*,)
26 Defendants.)
27)
28)

Case No.: 3:11-cv-4001 RS

CLASS ACTION

**PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED
NOTICE OF MOTION, MOTION,
AND MEMORANDUM OF POINTS
AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT
OF FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Date: April 10, 2014
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Judge: Honorable Richard Seeborg
Ctrm: 3, 17th Floor

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION

TO THE CLERK OF THE COURT AND ALL COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on April 10, 2014, at 1:30 p.m., before the Honorable Richard Seeborg of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Courtroom 3, 17th Floor, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California, named plaintiffs and class representatives Uelian De Abadia-Peixoto, Esmar Cifuentes, Pedro Nolasco Jose and Mi Lian Wei (“Plaintiffs”) will and hereby do make, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e), an unopposed motion for final approval of settlement in the above-captioned class action (the “Motion”) set forth in the parties’ settlement agreement (“Agreement”), dated December 18, 2013, filed herewith. Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court enter the proposed Final Order and Stipulated Dismissal, filed in final form herewith. Plaintiffs also move for approval of attorneys’ fees and costs provision of the Agreement under Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(2).

This Motion is made on grounds that the proposed Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and should therefore be approved. The Court granted preliminary approval of the Agreement on January 23, 2014. Notice to the class was thereafter provided as detailed below. To date, counsel has received no objections to the proposed settlement.

The Motion is based upon this Motion, the supporting Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Agreement and its exhibits, the Declarations of Catherine E. Moreno, Julia Harumi Mass, Paul Chavez, Robin Goldfaden, Angie Young Kim, Jeff Rosenblum, and Eddie Robinson, any argument of counsel, and all papers and records on file in this matter.

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

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND.....	2
III.	SUMMARY OF THE AGREEMENT.....	5
IV.	CLASS NOTICE AND RESPONSE TO PROPOSED SETTLEMENT.....	9
V.	ARGUMENT	11
A.	The Court Should Grant Final Approval of the Settlement Agreement.....	11
1.	Legal Standard.....	11
2.	The Proposed Settlement Merits Final Approval.....	12
a.	The Settlement Provides Substantial Relief for Settlement Class Members	12
b.	The Strength of Plaintiffs’ Claims Balanced Against the Risk, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation Favors Approval of the Settlement.....	13
c.	The Stage of Proceedings and Discovery Thus Far Has Enabled Sufficient Evaluation of the Merits of the Claims.....	13
d.	The Recommendation of Experienced Counsel Favors Approval.....	15
e.	The Presence of a Governmental Participant Favors Approval.....	15
f.	The Class Members’ Reaction Favors Approval	15
g.	The Risk of Maintaining Class Action Status Throughout the Trial Is a Neutral Factor	16
B.	Certification of the Settlement Class Is Appropriate	16
C.	The Attorneys’ Fees Provision of the Agreement Is Reasonable.....	17
VI.	CONCLUSION	18

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)

CASES

Adoma v. University of Phoenix, 913 F. Supp. 2d 964 (E.D. Cal. 2012)..... 15

Barbosa v. Cargill Meat Solutions Corp., No. 1:11-cv-00275, 2013 WL 3340939
(E.D. Cal. July 2, 2013)..... 16

Boyd v. Bechtel Corp., 485 F. Supp. 610 (N.D. Cal. 1979) 15, 16

Churchill Vill., L.L.C. v. Gen. Elec., 361 F.3d 566 (9th Cir. 2004) 11

Ellis v. Naval Air Rework Facility, 87 F.R.D. 15 (N.D. Cal. 1980), *aff'd*, 661 F.2d
939 (9th Cir. 1981) 15

Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp., 150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1998)..... 11, 16, 17, 18

Murillo v. Pac. Gas & Elec. Co., No. CIV. 2:08-1974, 2010 WL 2889728 (E.D.
Cal. July 21, 2010) 16

Nat’l Rural Teecomms. Coop. v. DIRECTV, Inc., 221 F.R.D. 523 (C.D. Cal. 2004) 14, 15, 16

Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm’n of City and County of San Francisco,
688 F.2d 615 (9th Cir. 1982)..... 11, 12

Van Bronkhorst v. Safeco Corp., 529 F.2d 943 (9th Cir. 1976)..... 11

West v. Circle K Stores, Inc., No. Civ. S-04-0438, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 76558
(E.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2006)..... 15

RULES

Civil L. R. 7-4(a)(3) 1

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 16, 17

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)..... 16

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)..... 16

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)..... 2, 11

Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6)..... 3

Fed. R. Civ. P. 34 5

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 This class action settlement is a success for the Settlement Class. Uelian De Abadia-
3 Peixoto, Esmar Cifuentes, Pedro Nolasco Jose and Mi Lian Wei (“Named Plaintiffs” or
4 “Plaintiffs”), on behalf of the class certified in this action, respectfully submit this memorandum
5 in support of their unopposed motion for final approval of the proposed settlement of this action.
6 Plaintiffs and Defendants have reached settlement of Plaintiffs’ action pursuant to the terms and
7 conditions contained in the settlement agreement (“Agreement”), dated December 18, 2013, and
8 filed herewith.¹ See Moreno Decl., Ex. 1. Pursuant to Civil L. R. 7-4(a)(3), the issue to be
9 decided is whether the Court should grant final approval the Agreement.

10 Plaintiffs’ complaint sought declaratory and injunctive relief on behalf of a class certified
11 as all current and future adult immigration detainees who have or will have proceedings in
12 Immigration Court in San Francisco. The complaint challenged as unconstitutional Defendants’
13 then-extant policy and practice of shackling all civil immigration detainees appearing in San
14 Francisco Immigration Court at their wrists, waists, and ankles during their Master Calendar,
15 Bond, and Merits Hearings without an individualized determination of the need for restraints.
16 The parties actively litigated this action for over two years before reaching the proposed
17 settlement, with the substantial assistance of Magistrate Judge Laurel Beeler.

18 As discussed in detail herein, pursuant to the Agreement, Defendants will change their
19 practice such that members of the Settlement Class will no longer be restrained during their
20 Bond and Merits Hearings absent narrowly-defined emergency situations. While Defendants
21 may continue to restrain Settlement Class members during Master Calendar Hearings, involving
22 simultaneous appearance of multiple respondents, Settlement Class members will be able to
23 request a modification of such restraints where a physical, psychological, or medical condition
24

25
26 ¹ All capitalized terms not defined herein are defined in the Agreement, submitted as
27 Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Catherine E. Moreno (“Moreno Decl.”). The Settlement Class is
28 defined in the parties’ Agreement as all current and future adult immigration detainees who have
or will have proceedings in Immigration Court in San Francisco during the period from
December 23, 2011 (the date of this Court’s class certification order) to three years from the
Effective Date of the Agreement (*i.e.*, the full term of the Agreement). See *id.* at § I.11.

1 would prevent the application of restraints in a safe and humane manner. Defendants have also
2 agreed not to chain detainees to one another under any circumstances. In addition, Defendants
3 have agreed to arrangements that will facilitate confidential attorney-client communications
4 before and during Master Calendar Hearings.

5 Following the Court's preliminary approval of the Agreement on January 23, 2014, the
6 parties implemented the comprehensive notice plan approved by the Court. The plan included
7 posting notices in all facilities holding Settlement Class members, sending notices to all
8 organizations on the list of low-fee and free legal services provided to Settlement Class
9 members, sending notice via email to the Northern California chapter of the American
10 Immigration Lawyers Association and the Northern California chapter of the National Lawyers'
11 Guild, and posting notice on the websites of the Executive Office for Immigration Review
12 ("EOIR"), United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE"), the American Civil
13 Liberties Union Foundation ("ACLU") of Northern California, and the Lawyers' Committee for
14 Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area. The parties provided notices in English, Spanish,
15 Chinese, and Punjabi. To date, counsel has not received a single objection.

16 The Court should grant final approval to the settlement because it is fair, adequate, and
17 reasonable. As discussed below, the settlement easily satisfies the Ninth Circuit's standards for
18 final approval. Given the complexities of this constitutional class action and the continued risks
19 if the parties were to proceed, the Agreement provides substantial relief for the Settlement Class
20 members and eliminates the risk that the Settlement Class might obtain less or nothing at all.
21 The recommendation of experienced counsel also weighs in favor of approval, especially
22 following extensive discovery and months of arm's-length settlement negotiations with the
23 governmental defendants and their counsel. Accordingly, Plaintiffs move the Court under Fed.
24 R. Civ. P. 23(e) for entry of the [Proposed] Final Order and Stipulated Dismissal, submitted
25 herewith.

26 **II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

27 On August 15, 2011, Plaintiffs filed their class action civil rights complaint for injunctive
28 and declaratory relief against Defendants. Dkt. No. 1. Plaintiffs argued that the Due Process

1 Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution prohibited Defendants' then-
2 extant policy and practice of shackling all immigration detainees during all of their Immigration
3 Court proceedings. *Id.* Two days later, Plaintiffs moved for class certification and appointment
4 of class counsel. Dkt. No. 5. On September 8, 2011, Defendants filed a motion seeking
5 enlargement of time to file their opposition to Plaintiffs' motion for class certification (Dkt.
6 No. 23), which Plaintiffs opposed (Dkt. No. 27) and the Court denied on September 12, 2011
7 (Dkt. No. 29). On October 11 and October 14, 2011, Defendants moved to dismiss Plaintiffs'
8 action (Dkt. No. 33) and opposed Plaintiffs' motion for class certification (Dkt. No. 34),
9 respectively. After further briefing from Plaintiffs (Dkt. Nos. 35, 40) and Defendants (Dkt.
10 No. 45) and a hearing on these motions (Dkt. No. 46), the Court on December 23, 2011, denied
11 Defendants' motion to dismiss and certified Plaintiffs' class of "all current and future adult
12 immigration detainees who have or will have proceedings in immigration court in San
13 Francisco" (Dkt. No. 52).

14 Following the Court's Order, Plaintiffs began extensive discovery into Defendants'
15 shackling policies and practices and related matters. Between January 24, 2012 and April 12,
16 2013, Plaintiffs served Defendants with four sets of document requests, four sets of
17 interrogatories, and one set of requests for admission. Defendants served two sets of document
18 requests, one set of interrogatories and one set of requests for admission on the Named Plaintiffs
19 and/or members of the Plaintiff class between September 28, 2012 and April 26, 2013. Plaintiffs
20 also noticed Rule 30(b)(6) depositions of Defendants ICE (on July 2, 2012, re-noticed
21 January 25, 2013, and May 3, 2013) and EOIR (on July 2, 2012) and depositions of Supervisory
22 Detention and Deportation Officers ("SDDOs") Yakov Grinberg (on October 17, 2012) and
23 Johnny J. Bailey (on April 26, 2013), Assistant Chief Immigration Judge Print Maggard, Field
24 Office Director Timothy S. Aitken, Assistant Field Office Director Jason M. McClay, and
25 Deputy Field Office Director David W. Jennings (also noticed on April 26, 2013). Defendants
26 noticed the depositions of Named Plaintiffs Esmar Cifuentes (on February 16, 2012), Uelian De
27 Abadia-Peixoto, and Pedro Nolasco Jose (on July 25, 2012, re-noticed July 27, 2012, October 12,
28 2012, and October 25, 2012), and Mi Lian Wei (on July 25, 2012, re-noticed July 27, 2012).

1 Defendants deposed Named Plaintiff Cifuentes on February 16, 2012, prior to his deportation to
2 Guatemala, Named Plaintiffs Abadia-Peixoto and Nolasco Jose on November 15, 2012, and
3 Named Plaintiff Wei on November 30, 2012. Plaintiffs deposed SDDO Grinberg on
4 November 16, 2012.

5 During this time, the parties engaged in numerous rounds of discovery motion practice
6 and hearings before Magistrate Judge Kandis Westmore. These efforts are partially summarized
7 below. On August 31, 2012, Plaintiffs sought to move to compel the production of various
8 categories of documents withheld by Defendants. Dkt. Nos. 81, 82. On the same day,
9 Defendants moved for a protective order limiting the scope of Plaintiffs' discovery. Dkt. No. 83.
10 Per Magistrate Judge Westmore's Standing Order, the parties met and conferred regarding the
11 issues contained in Plaintiffs' motion to compel and submitted a joint discovery letter outlining
12 their remaining disputes on October 22, 2012. Dkt. Nos. 91, 99. Separately, Plaintiffs opposed
13 Defendants' motion for protective order. Dkt. No. 89. Defendants' motion was heard on
14 November 1, 2012. Dkt. No. 91. Magistrate Judge Westmore denied Defendants' motion on
15 November 13, 2012. Dkt. No. 109. Three days later, Magistrate Judge Westmore issued her
16 Order regarding the parties' October 22, 2012 joint discovery letter, ordering Defendants to
17 produce significant additional documents. Dkt. No. 110. The parties updated Magistrate Judge
18 Westmore with a joint discovery status letter on November 19, 2012 (Dkt. No. 111), and the
19 Court issued an order on the status letter on November 30, 2012 (Dkt. No. 114).

20 Following *in camera* review of Defendants' documents pursuant to her November 16,
21 2012 Order, Magistrate Judge Westmore ordered Defendants to produce additional documents in
22 four consecutive orders based on the Court's *in camera* review – on January 7, 2013 (Dkt.
23 No. 116), February 1, 2013 (Dkt. No. 122), February 27, 2013 (Dkt. No. 128), and March 27,
24 2013 (Dkt. No. 132). Defendants moved for leave to file a motion for reconsideration of
25 Magistrate Judge Westmore's March 27, 2013 order on April 2, 2013 (Dkt. No. 133), which
26 Magistrate Judge Westmore granted in part and denied in part on April 9, 2013 (Dkt. No. 134).
27 Defendants moved this Court for relief from the nondispositive order of the Magistrate Judge on
28 April 23, 2013 (Dkt. No. 135), which Plaintiffs opposed (Dkt. No. 142).

1 On April 24, 2013, the parties submitted their third and final joint discovery letter,
2 regarding Plaintiffs' efforts to obtain Rule 34 inspection of the Immigration Court building in
3 San Francisco. Dkt. No. 138. Magistrate Judge Westmore ruled on the joint letter on July 12,
4 2013, generally ordering Defendants to make various portions of the building housing the
5 Immigration Court available for Plaintiffs' inspection. Dkt. No. 157. Plaintiffs also sought
6 discovery from the detention facilities that house immigration detainees who appear in
7 Immigration Court in San Francisco, subpoenaing the West County Detention Facility,
8 Sacramento County Sheriff's Department, and Yuba County Jail on January 28, 2013. After
9 considerable discussion with representatives of these facilities (including the assistance of
10 Defendants), Plaintiffs received production on May 2, 2013 (Sacramento), June 14, and
11 August 15-16, 2013 (Yuba County) and November 8, 2013 (West County). Ultimately,
12 Plaintiffs received and reviewed more than twenty thousand pages of documents from
13 Defendants and the detention facilities.

14 While Plaintiffs continued to aggressively seek thorough discovery into Defendants'
15 shackling policies and practices, the parties moved to stay discovery several times based on their
16 progress toward settlement (as well as the government shutdown, which occurred in the midst of
17 the parties' settlement efforts). The Court referred the case to Magistrate Judge Beeler on
18 March 20, 2012, for the purpose of completing a settlement conference. Dkt. No. 66. The
19 parties met with Magistrate Judge Beeler for their first settlement conference, which lasted more
20 than nine hours, on June 13, 2012. Dkt. No. 76. Thereafter, the parties met with Magistrate
21 Judge Beeler by telephone and/or in person on November 28, 2012 (Dkt. No. 113), February 20
22 and 25 (Dkt. Nos. 125, 127), March 6, 11, and 15 (Dkt. Nos. 129, 130, 131), June 25 and 28
23 (Dkt. Nos. 155, 156), July 24 (Dkt. No. 161), September 25 (Dkt. No. 176), and November 6, 15,
24 18 and 19, 2013 (Dkt. Nos. 190, 195, 197, 200). These discussions culminated in the parties'
25 December 18, 2013 Agreement. *See* Moreno Decl., Ex. 1.

26 **III. SUMMARY OF THE AGREEMENT**

27 The Agreement resolves the above-captioned class action as to all Defendants. *Id.* at 1.
28 Its term will extend three years from the Effective Date. *Id.* at § I.3.

1 **The Settlement Class.** The parties have agreed that the Settlement Class will consist of
2 all current and future adult immigration detainees who have or will have proceedings in
3 Immigration Court in San Francisco during the period from December 23, 2011 (the date of this
4 Court’s class certification order) to three years from the Effective Date of the Agreement (*i.e.*,
5 the full term of the Agreement). *Id.* at § I.11.

6 **Bond and Merits Hearings.** Pursuant to the Agreement, during two of the three types of
7 Immigration Court proceedings in San Francisco – Bond and Merits Hearings – detainees will
8 not be restrained, except in emergency situations. *Id.* at § III.3. Specifically, officers will be
9 allowed to restrain detainees in emergency situations to protect the safety of the detainee, other
10 detainees, the public, and ICE or EOIR personnel, or to prevent escape. *Id.* at § III.4. For
11 example, if a detainee becomes combative, disruptive, violent, or threatening, an officer may
12 decide to apply restraints or keep them applied during the hearing. *Id.* An SDDO will document
13 all emergency situations that led to the use of restraints on a detainee during a hearing in the
14 Comments screen of ICE’s Enforce Alien Removal Module (“EARM”) database. *Id.* A detainee
15 who is restrained due to his or her behavior will be restrained in all future hearings, unless he or
16 she requests that ICE modify or eliminate the use of restraints based on medical, physical, or
17 psychological grounds that prevent the application of restraints in a safe and humane manner. *Id.*
18 An SDDO will consider the request and any undue hardship imposed on the detainee from the
19 application of full restraints, and, as soon as practicable, either grant the request, deny the
20 request, reduce the level of restraints, or consider additional available alternatives. *Id.* This
21 decision will be documented in the Comments screen of EARM and communicated to the
22 detainee and/or his or her attorney verbally or in writing, and will include the basis for the
23 decision (to the extent that it does not reveal specific information that would compromise law
24 enforcement sensitive information). *Id.*

25 **Master Calendar Hearings.** In the remaining type of Immigration Court proceeding –
26 Master Calendar Hearings – detainees will appear in full restraints unless an SDDO modifies the
27 level of restraints either due to exigent circumstances or pursuant to a detainee’s request based
28 on a physical, psychological, or medical condition that would prevent application of restraints in

1 a safe and humane manner, where application of full restraints would impose undue hardship on
2 a detainee (which determination will include a consideration of whether the application of
3 restraints would aggravate an existing injury or disability, and, if necessary, involve guidance
4 from the Immigration Health Services Corps). *Id.* at § III.2. If necessary, the SDDO may
5 mitigate any security threat posed by allowing a detainee to appear without restraints by
6 assigning additional officers to the court or making arrangements with the Immigration Court for
7 a separate appearance by the detainee. *Id.* Again, any request to modify the level of restraints
8 and the SDDO's decision with respect to each request will be documented in the Comments
9 screen of EARM and communicated to the detainee and/or his or her attorney verbally or in
10 writing, and will include the basis for the decision, to the extent that it does not reveal specific
11 information that would compromise law enforcement sensitive information. *Id.* Regardless of
12 the level of restraints imposed, detainees will not be attached to each other during hearings. *Id.*

13 Defendants have also agreed to facilitate confidential attorney-client consultations related
14 to Master Calendar Hearings by allowing Settlement Class members to engage in such
15 consultations in ICE's visiting rooms prior to the hearings. *Id.* at § V. ICE will maintain two
16 visiting rooms, one of which will generally be made available for consultations from 7:00 a.m. to
17 11:00 a.m. (prior to and during Master Calendar Hearings), and Defendants will generally make
18 best efforts to keep one pew in the courtroom free for brief attorney-client consultations during
19 Master Calendar Hearings. *Id.* Defendants will also ensure that each Respondent has a copy of
20 his or her Notice to Appear during these periods. *Id.* ICE will also post in English, Spanish,
21 Chinese, and Punjabi the written notice attached as Exhibit A to the Agreement in the detention
22 facilities where Detained Respondents are housed and in the holding areas of the building
23 housing the Immigration Court in San Francisco. *Id.* at § IV. ICE will also provide a copy of
24 this written notice in all four languages to Settlement Class members during ICE's intake
25 process. *Id.* In addition, within 90 days of the Effective Date, the immigration judges presiding
26 over Master Calendar Hearings will make a statement at the commencement of each hearing
27 summarizing ICE's restraints practices at Master Calendar Hearings and informing detainees that
28 they may request a change to the use of restraints for their respective circumstances. *Id.*

1 **Monitoring and Data Collection.** Beginning ninety (90) days from the Agreement's
 2 Effective Date, Defendants will periodically monitor contract officers and collect certain data
 3 regarding the new restraints policy. *Id.* at §§ VII-VIII.² Defendants also will monitor and assess
 4 G4S contract officers to ensure their compliance with and implementation of the new restraints
 5 policy, and ICE will document the monitoring process and maintain records of its assessments of
 6 G4S's performance. *Id.* at § VII. San Francisco ICE ERO will also maintain the EARM
 7 Comments screens referenced above reflecting (i) the application of restraints and reasons for
 8 applying restraints to any Settlement Class members in Bond and Merits Hearings (*i.e.*, based on
 9 emergency situations), and (ii) requests by Respondents to be accommodated with a lower level
 10 or removal of restraints for Master Calendar Hearings and the dispositions of such requests. *Id.*
 11 at § VIII. San Francisco ICE ERO will, on a bi-annual basis, provide Plaintiffs' counsel copies
 12 of the EARM Comment screens for any detainee who was restrained for a Bond or Merits
 13 Hearing or whose request for removal or lessening of restraints for a Master Calendar Hearing
 14 was denied. *Id.* Defendants' obligation to provide EARM Comment screens will extend either
 15 three years if Plaintiffs invoke the Agreement's Dispute Resolution Process or two years if
 16 Plaintiffs do not do so. *Id.*

17 **Attorneys' Fees.** Defendants have agreed to pay Plaintiffs' reasonable attorneys fees and
 18 costs in the amount of three hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$350,000.00), which shall
 19 constitute the full and final satisfaction of Plaintiffs' claims for attorneys' fees, costs, and
 20 litigation expenses that could have been brought in the above-captioned matter, and is inclusive
 21 of any interest. *Id.* at § XIII.

22 **Notice Provisions.** The Agreement states that the parties are to provide direct notice to
 23 the Settlement Class by (i) sending notice via U.S. mail and/or email to all organizations
 24 included on the list of low-fee and free legal services provided to respondents in removal
 25 proceedings before the San Francisco Immigration Court; (ii) sending notice via email to the list-

26
 27
 28 ² Defendants will also provide training to Impacted ICE ERO Personnel and Immigration
 Judges concerning the new policies and procedures. *Id.* at § VI.

1 servs for the Northern California chapter of the American Immigration Lawyers Association
2 (“AILA”) and the Northern California chapter of the National Lawyers’ Guild; (iii) posting
3 notice in areas visible to immigration detainees in all facilities holding respondents appearing
4 before the San Francisco Immigration Court; and (iv) posting notice on the websites of EOIR,
5 ICE, ACLU of Northern California, and Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights of the San
6 Francisco Bay Area. *Id.* at § IX. The Agreement provides that all postings be in English,
7 Spanish, Chinese, and Punjabi, and all parties provide alternate format copies of the notice upon
8 request. It further provides that notice be posted/distributed by the parties within seven (7)
9 working days of the date of entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, and remain posted for no
10 less than thirty (30) days. *Id.*

11 Settlement Class members were able to object to the proposed Agreement by submitting
12 Objections to Class Counsel in writing, via regular or electronic mail, or by leaving a message
13 with the Objection via telephone. Settlement Class members were also informed of their right to
14 appear at the final approval hearing, provided they comply with the process for submitting
15 Objections.

16 **Release.** Pursuant to the Agreement, Plaintiffs will release Defendants from all claims
17 asserted in this lawsuit or that could have been asserted on behalf of the Settlement Class arising
18 from the facts and circumstances alleged in the Complaint, including all claims for injunctive or
19 declaratory relief. The Agreement and its waiver and release will not impact the ability of any
20 individual class member (other than the Named Plaintiffs) (i) to bring a claim for monetary
21 damages in his or her individual capacity arising from or related to injury suffered as a result of
22 Defendants’ application of restraints to such class member, or (ii) to argue that the application of
23 restraints adversely affected such individual class member’s ability to defend or present his or
24 her case to the Immigration Court in San Francisco. *Id.* at § XIV.

25 **IV. CLASS NOTICE AND RESPONSE TO PROPOSED SETTLEMENT**

26 Pursuant to the Court’s January 23, 2014 Preliminary Approval Order, the parties:

- 27 (i) sent notice in English, Spanish, Chinese, and Punjabi via U.S. mail to all
28 organizations included on the list of low-fee and free legal services provided to

1 respondents in removal proceedings before the San Francisco Immigration Court
2 on January 30, 2014. Declaration of Angie Young Kim (“Kim Decl.”) ¶ 2.

3 (ii) sent notice in English, Spanish, Chinese, and Punjabi via email to the list-servs for
4 the Northern California chapter of AILA and the Northern California chapter of
5 the National Lawyers’ Guild on January 30, 2014. Declaration of Robin
6 Goldfaden (“Goldfaden Decl.”) ¶ 2.

7 (iii) posted notice in English, Spanish, Chinese, and Punjabi for at least thirty (30)
8 days in areas visible to immigration detainees in all facilities holding respondents
9 appearing before the San Francisco Immigration Court beginning January 30,
10 2014, except that the Punjabi translation was posted at the Yuba County Jail
11 beginning on February 3, 2014. Declaration of Eddie Robinson (“Robinson
12 Decl.”) ¶ 3.³

13 (iv) posted notice for at least thirty (30) days on the websites of ICE and EOIR in
14 English, Spanish, and Chinese, beginning on January 30, 2014, and in Punjabi
15 beginning on January 31, 2014. *Id.* ¶ 6; Declaration of Jeff Rosenblum
16 (“Rosenblum Decl.”) ¶¶ 3-4, 7.⁴

17 (v) posted notice in English, Spanish, Chinese, and Punjabi for at least thirty (30)
18 days on the websites of the ACLU of Northern California, and Lawyers’
19 Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area, beginning on
20 January 30, 2014. Goldfaden Decl. ¶ 3; Declaration of Julia Harumi Mass (“Mass
21 Decl.”) ¶ 9.

22
23 ³ The delay in posting the Punjabi translation of the notice at Yuba County Jail was due to
24 delay in receipt of the Punjabi translation and technical difficulties at Yuba County Jail. *Id.* at
25 ¶¶ 4-5. The Punjabi translation remains posted, so that it has been available for at least the full
26 thirty (30) days called for by the Preliminary Approval Order. *Id.* at ¶¶ 3-5.

27 ⁴ The delay in posting the Punjabi translation of the notice to the websites of ICE and EOIR
28 was due to what Defendants viewed as translation deficiencies in the Punjabi translation initially
provided by Plaintiffs and the time needed to modify the translation and provide Plaintiffs time
to review those changes. Robinson Decl. at ¶¶ 4, 6; Rosenblum Decl. at ¶¶ 4-5. The Punjabi
translation remains posted, so that it has been available for at least the full thirty (30) days called
for by the Preliminary Approval Order. Robinson Decl. at ¶ 6; Rosenblum Decl. at ¶¶ 3-4, 7.

1 The deadline for receipt of Settlement Class members' objections to the final approval of
 2 the Agreement is March 20, 2014. To date, Plaintiffs' counsel have not received any objections
 3 in writing, via regular or electronic mail, or by telephone or voicemail. Goldfaden Decl. ¶ 4;
 4 Mass Decl. ¶ 10; Kim Decl. ¶ 5. Nor have the parties received any requests for copies of the
 5 notice in any alternate format. Goldfaden Decl. ¶ 4; Mass Decl. ¶ 10; Kim Decl. ¶ 5; Robinson
 6 Decl. at ¶ 7; Rosenblum Decl. at ¶ 6. Should any objections be received prior to the final
 7 approval hearing, the parties will promptly inform the Court.

8 V. ARGUMENT

9 A. The Court Should Grant Final Approval of the Settlement Agreement

10 1. Legal Standard

11 It is well established in the Ninth Circuit that "voluntary conciliation and settlement are
 12 the preferred means of dispute resolution. This is especially true in complex class action
 13 litigation[.]" *Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm'n of City and County of San Francisco*,
 14 688 F.2d 615, 625 (9th Cir. 1982); see *Van Bronkhorst v. Safeco Corp.*, 529 F.2d 943, 950 (9th
 15 Cir. 1976) ("[T]here is an overriding public interest in settling and quieting litigation. This is
 16 particularly true in class action suits which are now an ever increasing burden to so many federal
 17 courts and which frequently present serious problems of management and expense.").

18 In approving a proposed settlement of a class action under Federal Rule of Civil
 19 Procedure 23(e), a court must find that the proposed settlement is "fair, adequate and
 20 reasonable." *Officers for Justice*, 688 F.2d at 625. To determine whether a settlement is fair,
 21 adequate, and reasonable, courts in the Ninth Circuit typically evaluate it based upon the
 22 following non-exclusive list of factors:

23 (1) the strength of the plaintiffs' case; (2) the risk, expense, complexity, and likely
 24 duration of further litigation; (3) the risk of maintaining class action status throughout
 25 the trial; (4) the amount offered in settlement; (5) the extent of discovery completed
 26 and the stage of the proceedings; (6) the experience and views of counsel; (7) the
 presence of a governmental participant; and (8) the reaction of the class members to
 the proposed settlement.

27 *Churchill Vill., L.L.C. v. Gen. Elec.*, 361 F.3d 566, 575 (9th Cir. 2004) (citing *Hanlon v.*
 28 *Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011, 1026 (9th Cir. 1998)). No one factor controls, and the

1 “importance to be attached to any particular factor will depend upon and be dictated by the
2 nature of the claim(s) advanced, the type(s) of relief sought, and the unique facts and
3 circumstances presented by each individual case.” *Officers for Justice*, 688 F.2d at 625.

4 **2. The Proposed Settlement Merits Final Approval**

5 The parties respectfully request that the Court grant final approval of the Agreement
6 because it is well within the requisite range of fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness.

7 **a. The Settlement Provides Substantial Relief for Settlement 8 Class Members**

9 In assessing the consideration obtained by class members in a class action settlement,
10 “[i]t is the complete package taken as a whole, rather than the individual component parts, that
11 must be examined for overall fairness.” *Officers for Justice*, 688 F.2d at 628. The Agreement
12 unquestionably benefits the Settlement Class by ending Defendants’ policy and practice of
13 shackling all detainees at Bond and Merits Hearings. Under the Agreement, Defendants may not
14 restrain Settlement Class members in Bond and Merits Hearings except in emergency situations
15 (*i.e.*, where a detainee becomes combative, disruptive, violent, or threatening). This represents a
16 sea change from Defendants’ challenged policy and practice, under which all detainees were
17 fully shackled during the entirety of their Bond and Merits Hearings – which in some instances
18 involve several different days of proceedings and often include the taking of testimony from the
19 respondents themselves – despite what Plaintiffs alleged to be shackles’ painful interference with
20 detainees’ ability to participate in their own proceedings.

21 Further, while Defendants may continue to restrain Settlement Class members during
22 Master Calendar Hearings, which typically involve several individuals appearing at the same
23 time, Defendants may no longer shackle detainees to one another (“daisy-chaining”), will set
24 aside spaces for private attorney-client consultations, and must allow detainees to request
25 removal or modification of restraints prior to and/or at the hearing itself based on physical,
26 psychological, or medical condition(s). Again, this change is significant and indisputably
27 benefits the Settlement Class. Eliminating “daisy-chaining” and setting aside spaces outside and,
28 when possible, within the courtroom will enable private attorney-client consultations otherwise

1 not possible under Defendants' challenged policy and practice. Additionally, to the extent that
2 shackles affect detainees' mental state and/or physical condition, the Agreement will allow
3 Settlement Class members to request and obtain modification and/or removal of restraints even
4 in Master Calendar Hearings.

5 **b. The Strength of Plaintiffs' Claims Balanced Against the Risk,**
6 **Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further**
7 **Litigation Favors Approval of the Settlement**

8 Given Plaintiffs' aggressive prosecution of this action both before and after filing suit,
9 Plaintiffs' counsel understood the strengths and weaknesses of their claims, both factually and
10 legally, throughout the action – including during the parties' settlement discussions (which began
11 on June 13, 2012) – and were able to effectively engage in rigorous negotiations with Defendants
12 (*See* Dkt. No. 76). Entering into settlement negotiations, Plaintiffs and their counsel were
13 confident in the strength of their case, but also pragmatic in their awareness of the risks inherent
14 in litigation. For example, Plaintiffs would face the risk of dismissal at the summary judgment
15 stage. Resolution of such a dispositive motion would turn on the adjudication of matters such as
16 the required showing of prejudice to the Class as a result of Defendants' restraints practices
17 relative to Defendants' asserted interests.

18 Plaintiffs could certainly not have counted on injunctive relief as beneficial to the Class
19 as the terms of the Agreement had the case proceeded to trial, and success on the merits was by
20 no means guaranteed. Defendants were expected to adduce expert testimony and evidence
21 concerning their restraints practices, leading to a "battle of the experts" that inherently carries
22 some risk. Even if Plaintiffs did prevail through motion practice and at trial, relief to the Class
23 could be delayed for years by an appeal. Moreover, such relief, if it were attained, might be
24 narrower in scope and effect than that obtained as a result of this settlement. Given the
25 complexities of this constitutional class action and the continued risks if the parties were to
26 proceed, the Agreement represents a favorable resolution and eliminates the risk that the
27 Settlement Class might recover less or nothing at all.

28 **c. The Stage of Proceedings and Discovery Thus Far Has**
Enabled Sufficient Evaluation of the Merits of the Claims

1 The extent of discovery completed and the stage of proceedings at the time of settlement
2 are relevant “in determining the adequacy of the parties’ knowledge of the case.” *Nat’l Rural*
3 *Telecomms. Coop. v. DIRECTV, Inc.*, 221 F.R.D. 523, 527 (C.D. Cal. 2004). These
4 considerations also weigh in favor of approval.

5 Prior to filing the Complaint on August 15, 2011, Plaintiffs conducted an extensive
6 investigation into the claims asserted therein. Plaintiffs’ counsel observed over one hundred
7 bond and master calendar hearings in Immigration Court in San Francisco, interviewed dozens of
8 adult immigrant detainees, and consulted with numerous legal practitioners and experts in the
9 fields of mental health and courtroom security. Dkt. No. 6 (Pls.’ Mem. in Supp. of Class Cert.)
10 at 15. Plaintiffs’ investigation continued after filing suit and successfully opposing Defendants’
11 motion to dismiss (Dkt. Nos. 27, 29) and obtaining class certification on behalf of “all current
12 and future adult immigration detainees who have or will have proceedings in immigration court
13 in San Francisco” (Dkt. No. 52).

14 Plaintiffs (and Defendants) engaged in extensive discovery, including numerous rounds
15 of discovery requests, several rounds of briefing and two discovery hearings before Magistrate
16 Judge Kandis Westmore aimed at expanding the scope of Defendants’ production, challenging
17 the applicability of asserted privileges, and/or compelling production of specific responsive
18 documents. In total, Plaintiffs reviewed over twenty thousand pages of documents obtained from
19 Defendants ICE and EOIR and third parties West County Detention Facility, Sacramento County
20 Sheriff’s Department, and Yuba County Jail. Plaintiffs also conducted outreach to the Class via
21 letter, procured a telephone line through which detainees could (and did) contact Plaintiffs’
22 counsel, and personally interviewed more than twenty detainees regarding their experiences with
23 restraints in Immigration Court in San Francisco. Defendants, for their part, sought documents
24 and testimony from the Named Plaintiffs and members of the Plaintiff class. Plaintiffs and
25 Defendants each noticed numerous depositions, and the parties respectively took and/or defended
26 several depositions before agreeing to stay discovery based on promising settlement discussions
27 before Magistrate Judge Beeler (as well as the intervening government shutdown).
28

1 **d. The Recommendation of Experienced Counsel Favors**
 2 **Approval**

3 “[T]he fact that experienced counsel involved in the case approved the settlement after
 4 hard-fought negotiations is entitled to considerable weight.” *Ellis v. Naval Air Rework Facility*,
 5 87 F.R.D. 15, 18 (N.D. Cal. 1980), *aff’d*, 661 F.2d 939 (9th Cir. 1981); *see Boyd v. Bechtel*
 6 *Corp.*, 485 F. Supp. 610, 622 (N.D. Cal. 1979) (“The recommendations of plaintiffs’ counsel
 7 should be given a presumption of reasonableness.”).

8 Class Counsel is experienced in the litigation, certification, trial, and settlement of
 9 complex claims, including class actions. Moreno Decl. at ¶¶ 3-8; Mass Decl. at ¶¶ 2-4;
 10 Declaration of Paul Chavez (“Chavez Decl.”) at ¶¶ 2-3. Class Counsel has determined that the
 11 Settlement is in the best interest of the Class, especially because it provides substantial relief and
 12 eliminates the risk that the Settlement Class might obtain less or nothing at all if the litigation
 13 proceeds.

14 **e. The Presence of a Governmental Participant Favors Approval**

15 All the defendants in this case are governmental entities or actors. Defendants include the
 16 United States Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”); Rand Beers, Acting Secretary of DHS;
 17 ICE; John Sandweg, Acting Director of ICE; Timothy Aitken, Field Office Director of the San
 18 Francisco District of ICE; Eric H. Holder, Jr., United States Attorney General; EOIR; and Juan P.
 19 Osuna, Director of EOIR (collectively, “DOJ Defendants”). The DOJ Defendants’ presence in
 20 this litigation and endorsement of the settlement weigh in favor of approval. *See Adoma v.*
 21 *University of Phoenix*, 913 F. Supp. 2d 964, 977 (E.D. Cal. 2012) (presence of governmental
 22 participant weighed in favor of approving settlement).

23 **f. The Class Members’ Reaction Favors Approval**

24 “The lack of objections to the settlement is perhaps the most significant factor weighing
 25 in favor of settlement.” *West v. Circle K Stores, Inc.*, No. Civ. S-04-0438, 2006 U.S. Dist.
 26 LEXIS 76558, at *19-*20 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2006); *accord Nat’l Rural*, 221 F.R.D. at 529
 27 (“The absence of a single objection to the Proposed Settlement provides further support for final
 28 approval of the Proposed Settlement.”).

1 To date, Class Counsel has not received a single objection to the settlement despite
2 widespread notice of the settlement in four languages informing class members – and many of
3 the attorneys who represent class members in their immigration proceedings – that they may
4 object in writing, via regular or electronic mail, or by leaving a message with the Objection via
5 telephone. This further supports approval of the settlement.

6 Moreover, in the event any objections are received, it is “established that the absence of a
7 large number of objections to a proposed class action settlement raises a strong presumption that
8 the terms of a proposed class action settlement are favorable to the class members.” *Nat’l Rural*
9 *Telecomms.*, 221 F.R.D. at 529; *see Boyd*, 485 F. Supp. at 624 (approving settlement where 16
10 percent of class filed some opposition to settlement).

11 **g. The Risk of Maintaining Class Action Status Throughout the**
12 **Trial Is a Neutral Factor**

13 The Court has already certified a class nearly identical to the Settlement Class proposed
14 by the parties. Plaintiffs are unaware of any specific difficulty in maintaining class-action status
15 in this case, and thus this factor is neutral. *See Barbosa v. Cargill Meat Solutions Corp.*,
16 No. 1:11-cv-00275, 2013 WL 3340939, at *13 (E.D. Cal. July 2, 2013) (“Because the Court is
17 not aware of any risks to maintaining class-action status throughout trial, this factor is neutral.”);
18 *Murillo v. Pac. Gas & Elec. Co.*, No. CIV. 2:08-1974, 2010 WL 2889728, at *7 (E.D. Cal.
19 July 21, 2010) (where court was unaware of any specific difficulty in maintaining class-action
20 status through trial, court did not consider this factor for settlement purposes).

21 **B. Certification of the Settlement Class Is Appropriate**

22 A court may certify a settlement class if a plaintiff demonstrates that all of the
23 prerequisites of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a) have been met, and that at least one of the
24 requirements of Rule 23(b) have been met. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23; Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1022.
25 Here, the Court has already certified a class nearly identical to the Settlement Class proposed by
26 the parties. Indeed, if anything, the Settlement Class is narrower in that it is time-bound by the
27 term of the Agreement.
28

1 Because the Court has already found that a class consisting of “all current and future
2 adult immigration detainees who have or will have proceedings in immigration court in San
3 Francisco” meets the requirements of Rule 23, the parties respectfully propose that certification
4 of the Settlement Class (*i.e.*, “all current and future adult immigration detainees who have or will
5 have proceedings in immigration court in San Francisco between December 23, 2011, to three
6 years from the Effective Date of the Agreement”) is likewise appropriate in connection with final
7 approval of the settlement.

8 **C. The Attorneys’ Fees Provision of the Agreement Is Reasonable**

9 The attorneys’ fees and costs provision should be approved as part of the Agreement
10 because it: (1) was not the result of collusion or a sacrifice of the interests of the class; and
11 (2) represents a discount to the lodestar for the hours and rates Plaintiffs’ counsel have recorded
12 in connection with their prosecution of this action.

13 This Agreement was the product of extensive, months-long negotiations conducted with
14 the substantial guidance and assistance of Magistrate Judge Beeler. Indeed, the parties
15 participated in at least fifteen separate in-person or telephonic settlement conferences involving
16 Magistrate Judge Beeler, in addition to conducting numerous informal settlement talks by
17 telephone over the course of eighteen months. During the course of these negotiations, the
18 parties engaged in extensive discovery, including contentious related motion practice. The
19 parties did not negotiate attorneys’ fees until after there was an agreement in principle on all the
20 substantive aspects of the Agreement. Moreno Decl. at ¶ 12; Mass Decl. at ¶ 8; Chavez Decl. at
21 ¶ 7. Under such circumstances, it is clear that the Agreement is the product of vigorous, arm’s-
22 length bargaining and that “the fee was not the result of collusion or a sacrifice of the interests of
23 the class[.]” *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1029.

24 “In employment, civil rights, and other injunctive relief class actions, courts often use a
25 lodestar calculation because there is no way to gauge the net value of the settlement or any
26 percentage thereof.” *Id.* The lodestar calculation “begins with the multiplication of the number
27 of hours reasonably expended by a reasonable hourly rate.” *Id.*

1 Here, Defendants have agreed to pay Plaintiffs' reasonable attorneys fees and costs in the
 2 amount of three hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$350,000.00), which shall constitute the full
 3 and final satisfaction of Plaintiffs' claims for attorneys' fees, costs, and litigation expenses that
 4 could have been brought in the above-captioned matter, and is inclusive of any interest. Moreno
 5 Decl. Ex. 1 at § XIII. The amount of attorneys' fees to be paid is a figure negotiated with the
 6 assistance of Magistrate Judge Beeler. Moreno Decl. at ¶ 12; Mass Decl. at ¶ 8; Chavez Decl. at
 7 ¶ 7. It represents a discount to the lodestar for the hours and rates Plaintiffs' counsel have
 8 recorded in connection with their prosecution of this action. Moreno Decl. at ¶¶ 9-10 (noting
 9 that lodestar for Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati attorney timekeepers for 2011-2013,
 10 applying Equal Access to Justice Act rates, amounts to over \$935,685 – a figure that does not
 11 include costs or significant time devoted to this matter by staff); *see also* Mass Decl. at ¶¶ 5-6;
 12 Chavez Decl. at ¶¶ 4-5. Moreover, the amount of attorneys' fees was disclosed in the notice to
 13 the Settlement Class (*see, e.g.*, Kim Decl. Ex. 2), and no objections have been received to date.
 14 Goldfaden Decl. ¶ 4; Mass Decl. ¶ 10; Kim Decl. ¶ 5.

15 VI. CONCLUSION

16 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court grant final
 17 approval of the settlement.

18 Dated: March 6, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

19 By: /s/ Catherine E. Moreno
 20 Catherine E. Moreno

21 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
 22 *Professional Corporation*
 23 David J. Berger
 24 Thomas J. Martin
 25 Angie Young Kim
 26 Savith S. Iyengar
 27 Briza Sanchez
 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

LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL
RIGHTS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY
AREA
Paul Chavez
Robin Goldfaden

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
FOUNDATION OF NORTHERN
CALIFORNIA, INC.
Julia Harumi Mass
Jingni (Jenny) Zhao
Alan L. Schlosser

Attorneys for Plaintiffs