



The motion to expand the class definition will be denied without prejudice to plaintiffs' right to submit an amended proposed definition of "minor offenses" following the depositions taken in January. The motion to postpone the class exclusion date will be granted pending the resolution of the potential amendment of the class definition. Plaintiffs are directed to be prepared to promptly send the Class Notices following the resolution of the request to amend the definition of "minor offenses." Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That plaintiffs' Motion to Amend Protective Order, Doc. 66, is granted and paragraph 2 of the protective order filed on May 22, 2001, Doc. 24, is amended to provide as follows: That any confidential information related to juvenile detainees that is released to Plaintiff's counsel pursuant to any court order shall not be disclosed to the Plaintiff, her parents, or to any other person, with the exception of persons regularly employed or associated with Plaintiff's counsel whose assistance is required by Plaintiff's counsel in the preparation of this case, employees of document copying services and court reporting services utilized for purposes of this litigation, and employees of other third-party companies essential for the administration of class notice.
2. That plaintiffs' Motion to Expand Class Definition and to Postpone Class Exclusion Date, Doc. 67, is granted in part and denied in part as follows: (a) the motion to expand the class definition is denied without prejudice to plaintiffs' right to submit an amended proposed definition of "minor offenses" on or before **January 24, 2003**; and (b) the motion to postpone the class exclusion date is granted and a new date will be established after the issue of amending the proposed class definition is resolved by the Court.

Dated this 14<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2003.

BY THE COURT:

  
Lawrence L. Piersol  
Chief Judge

ATTEST:

JOSEPH HAAS, CLERK

BY: Charon Forto  
(SEAL) DEPUTY