

1 James M. Finberg (State Bar No. 114850)
Joy A. Kruse (State Bar No. 142799)
2 LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
Embarcadero Center West
3 275 Battery Street, 30th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
4 Telephone: (415) 956-1000
Facsimile: (415) 956-1008

5 Charles F.A. Carbone (State Bar No. 206536)
6 CALIFORNIA PRISON FOCUS
2940 16th Street, Suite 307
7 San Francisco, CA 94103
Telephone: (415) 252-9211
8 Facsimile: (415) 252-9311

9 Counsel for Plaintiff STEVE M. CASTILLO

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12
13 STEVE M. CASTILLO,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 EDWARD S. ALAMEIDA, JR., et al.,

17 Defendants.

Case No. C-94-2847-MJJ-JCS

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

18
19 Plaintiff STEVEN M. CASTILLO (“Plaintiff”) and Defendants EDWARD S.
20 ALAMEIDA, JR, et al.(“Defendants”) have agreed to resolve the claims alleged in the above-
21 captioned action on the terms set forth in this Settlement Agreement.

22 **I. INTRODUCTION**

23 1. This action was originally filed on August 9, 1994. Plaintiff filed five
24 subsequent amended complaints. Plaintiff challenged the constitutionality of the gang validation
25 procedures; the evidence used in his individual validation; and whether or not his validation was
26 the result of retaliation by prison officials for his jailhouse lawyering and peace proposal
27 activities. Using the overbreadth doctrine that applies in the context of First Amendment
28 challenges to regulations, Plaintiff challenged not only his own validation, but also gang

1 validation policies and procedures as applied to other prisoners. Plaintiff also challenged some of
2 the physical conditions in the Segregated Housing Unit (“SHU”) at Pelican Bay State Prison
3 (“PBSP”), as well as the psychological effects of long-term SHU confinement.

4 2. The Defendants are Edward S. Alameida, Jr., Joseph L. McGrath, Jr., Alan
5 Addison, Judy Olson, E.S. Rodriguez, Larry Williams, C. Sheppard, and J. Bridle, all of whom
6 were sued in his or her official capacity. Defendants deny any and all allegations raised by
7 Plaintiff in this action.

8 3. On June 19, 2002, the Court granted Defendants’ summary judgment
9 motion as to Plaintiff’s Eighth Amendment claim regarding physical conditions in the SHU.
10 Summary judgment as to Plaintiff’s First Amendment claims, retaliation claim, and Eighth
11 Amendment claim (regarding the psychological effects of SHU confinement) were denied.

12 4. On January 5, 2004, this Court partially granted Defendants’ summary
13 judgment motion finding there was no due process violation, except to the extent Mr. Castillo
14 alleges he was denied notice and an opportunity to be heard during the course of his initial
15 validation. The Court also found that there was “some evidence” to support Mr. Castillo’s
16 validation. The Court granted Defendants’ summary judgment motion as to Plaintiff’s Eighth
17 Amendment claim finding that there were no psychological effects of prolonged SHU
18 confinement. Summary judgment as to Mr. Castillo’s retaliation and First Amendment claims
19 was denied.

20 **II. PARTIES**

21 5. The Plaintiff is Steve M. Castillo, a prisoner at Pelican Bay State Prison.

22 6. The Defendants are Edward S. Alameida, Jr., the former Director of the
23 California Department of Corrections, Joseph L. McGrath, Jr., the Warden at PBSP, Alan
24 Addison, a retired Senior Special Agent in the former Special Services Unit, Judy Olson, a retired
25 Associate Government Program Analyst in the Law Enforcement and Investigations Unit, E.S.
26 Rodriguez, a former CDC Lieutenant at PBSP, Larry Williams, a retired CDC Lieutenant at
27 PBSP, C. Sheppard, a former Acting Warden at PBSP, and J. Bridle, a former CDC Lieutenant
28 at PBSP.

1 **III. DEFINITIONS**

2 7. The following terms when used in this Agreement shall have the meanings
3 specified below:

4 (a) “Inactive review” shall mean the review of an inmate’s prison gang
5 status governed by the process described in Title 15 § 3341.5(c)(5).

6 (b) “Articulate basis” shall mean a written record of specific,
7 articulable facts along with the rational inferences drawn from those facts.

8 (c) “Current, active determination” shall mean a written record and
9 finding as defined in paragraph 24 of this Settlement Agreement.

10 (d) “Defendants” shall mean Edward S. Alameida, Jr., Joseph L.
11 McGrath, Jr., Alan Addison, Judy Olson, E.S. Rodriguez, Larry Williams, C. Sheppard, and
12 J. Briddle.

13 (e) “Execution of settlement” or “Effective Date” shall mean the date
14 by which the final party shall have signed the agreement.

15 (f) “Gang activity” and “gang content” are defined in this agreement
16 consistent with the definition in Title 15 §§ 3000 & 3023.

17 (g) “Parties” shall mean Plaintiff Castillo and the Defendants
18 enumerated *supra* in ¶ 7(d).

19 (h) “Released Claims” shall mean any and all claims or causes of
20 action contained in Plaintiff’s original Complaint, First Amended Complaint, Second Amended
21 Complaint, Third Amended Complaint, Fourth Amended Complaint, and Fifth Amended
22 Complaint. “Released claims” shall also include Plaintiff’s gang validation and conditions of
23 confinement at Pelican Bay State Prison existing from the date of the original Complaint,
24 August 9, 1994, through the date of the execution of this Agreement. “Released claims” does not
25 refer to any claims regarding the review of Mr. Castillo’s validation as set forth in paragraph 29
26 of this Agreement or to any future inactive reviews of Mr. Castillo’s status on behalf of the
27 Classification Committee.

28 (i) “Released Parties” shall mean Edward J. Alameida, Jr.; Joseph L.

1 McGrath, Jr.; Alan Addison; Judy Olson; E.S. Rodriguez; Larry Williams; C. Sheppard, and
2 J. Briddle, all of whom are released in his/her individual and official capacities.

3 (j) "Validation" shall mean the process codified in Title 15 § 3378
4 whereby an inmate is identified as a prison gang member or gang associate.

5 **IV. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

6 8. For all policy and procedure changes described in this agreement, the
7 Department of Corrections agrees to propose to codify the changes in either Title 15 of the
8 California Code of Regulations and/or the Department Operations Manual ("DOM"). The parties
9 estimate it will take approximately 90 days from the date of the execution of the settlement
10 agreement for the Law Enforcement Investigations Unit ("LEIU") to finalize the proposed Title
11 15 and/or DOM changes. The proposed changes, whether to Title 15 or to the DOM, will then be
12 forwarded to the Department of Corrections' Regulation and Policy Management Branch, which
13 may take approximately nine months to finalize the changes. The Regulation and Policy
14 Management Branch will assist in determining whether Title 15 and/or the DOM is the
15 appropriate place to codify the policies and procedures recited herein. The Department shall
16 conclude its internal finalization of the proposed changes to both Title 15 and/or the DOM no
17 later than one year from the date of the execution of this Agreement. Plaintiff understands that
18 following internal finalization of the proposed changes to Title 15 by the Department of
19 Corrections, the Department of Corrections must forward the proposed changes to Title 15 to the
20 California Office of Administrative Law and/or any other interested body for final codification.
21 A written copy of any codification of these policies and procedures in either Title 15 or the DOM
22 shall be provided to Plaintiff's counsel within 30 calendar days of their codification.

23 9. Due Process in Validations and Inactive Reviews. Defendants shall
24 provide notice and opportunity to be heard to each and every prisoner at the pre-validation and
25 inactive review stage. Defendants agree to provide 24-hour advance notice to each prisoner of
26 the source items considered prior to the validation packet being sent to Law Enforcement and
27 Investigations Unit ("LEIU") for approval or rejection of an initial validation. Defendants also
28 agree to record the prisoner's opinion on each of the source items and to forward in written form

1 such opinions to LEIU. A copy of the written record of the prisoner's opinion shall be given to
2 the prisoner, prior to the time the record is forwarded to LEIU.

3 10. Defendants shall provide notice and opportunity to be heard for inactive
4 reviews. Notice shall be given to the prisoner at least 24 hours in advance of a consideration of
5 inactive review. Similarly, each prisoner shall be given an opportunity to record his opinions on
6 the new source items as part of the inactive review. The recorded views of the inmate shall be
7 forwarded to the decision-makers over the inactive reviews prior to the rendering of a decision. A
8 copy of the written record of the prisoner's opinions shall be given to the prisoner within fourteen
9 calendar days of the inactive review. Defendants agree that when new source items are raised,
10 beyond those used in the initial validation, each inmate shall be given notice and opportunity to
11 be heard during the inactive review.

12 11. The policies and procedures discussed in paragraphs 12 through 21 *infra*
13 correspond to the "independent source items" discussed in Title 15 § 3378(c)(8).

14 12. Photographs. (Title 15 § 3378(c)(8)(D)). Defendants shall reasonably
15 ascertain the date of any photograph used in any validation. Defendants agree that no photograph
16 used in any validation shall be older than six years. Defendants agree that at the time the
17 photograph is taken, at least one person in the photograph shall have been validated, or be
18 validated no more than six months after the date the photograph was taken. Defendants agree that
19 staff shall record this information and provide it on a written form given to the inmate.

20 13. Talking in the Law Library. (*see* Title 15 § 3378(c)(8)(E)). Defendants
21 agree that a prisoner's talking in a SHU law library to a validated gang member or associate shall
22 not be relied upon as a source item unless IGI or staff has an articulable basis for determining that
23 the communication was related to gang activity. Defendants agree that staff shall record this
24 information and provide it on a written form given to the inmate.

25 14. Tattoos and symbols. (Title 15 § 3378(c)(8)(B)). Defendants agree that
26 any tattoo or symbol relied upon as a source item must include an articulation by staff as to why
27 the tattoo or symbol has a specific association with a particular prison gang. Defendants agree
28 that staff shall record this information and provide it on a written form given to the inmate.

1 15. Written Material/Communications. (Title 15 § 3378(c)(8)(C) & (L)).
2 Staff must have an articulable basis for why a written material or communication is reliable
3 evidence of gang association or membership. Defendants agree that staff must articulate and
4 record why a written material or communication is evidence of gang association/membership
5 based on either the explicit, or coded, content of the communication. With respect to greeting
6 cards, such as a birthday card or get well card, staff must record an articulable basis for why the
7 communication is evidence of gang membership or association.

8 16. Staff Information. (Title 15 § 3378(c)(8)(E).) Defendants agree that staff
9 must have an articulable basis for determining that gang content or conduct at issue is gang-
10 related. Defendants agree that staff shall record this information and provide it on a written form
11 given to the inmate.

12 17. Offenses. (Title 15 § 3378(c)(8)(I)). Defendants agree that if a
13 disciplinary offense is considered a potential source item for validation, IGI or staff shall have an
14 articulable basis for why the offense is gang-related. Defendants agree that staff shall record this
15 information and provide it on a written form given to the inmate.

16 18. Legal Documents. (Title 15 § 3378(c)(8)(J)). Defendants agree that staff
17 shall have an articulable basis for why legal correspondence is a source item. Staff shall
18 articulate and record why a legal document is evidence of gang association or membership based
19 on either the explicit or coded content of the document. This information shall be recorded by
20 staff and provided on a written form given to the inmate.

21 19. Address Books. (*see* Title 15 § 3378(c)(8)(L)). Defendants agree that
22 staff shall have an articulable basis for why the contents of address books are evidence of gang
23 association. This information shall be recorded by staff and provided on a written form given to
24 the inmate.

25 20. Visitors. (Title 15 § 3378(c)(8)(K)). Defendants agree that staff must
26 have an articulable basis for determining that the visitor and inmate discussed gang content or
27 conduct. Defendants must have an articulable basis for identifying the visitor as associated with
28 the prison gang, and Defendants agree that the gang identification of a visitor may be rebutted via

1 a prisoner’s opportunity to present his views. This information shall be recorded by staff and
2 provided on a written form given to the inmate.

3 21. Confidential Sources. (Title 15 § 3378(c)(8)(H)). Defendants agree that
4 “laundry lists” – that is, when confidential sources, including debriefers, identify a prisoner as an
5 associate or member by listing names of inmate(s) without reference to gang-related acts
6 performed by the inmate(s) – shall not be relied upon as a source item. Defendants agree that the
7 confidential source must identify specific gang activity or conduct performed by the alleged
8 associate or member before such information can be considered as a source item. This
9 information shall be recorded by staff and provided on a written form given to the inmate.

10 22. Single Source Rule. Defendants agree that a single, gang-related incident
11 or conduct described or documented by multiple sources, confidential or otherwise, shall
12 constitute one source item only.

13 23. Hearsay. Defendants also agree that exclusive reliance on hearsay from a
14 confidential source will not be used as a source item for validation.

15 24. Current, Active Determination. Defendants agree that a prisoner will not
16 receive an indeterminate SHU term as a validated gang member or associate without first being
17 found to be a current, active gang member or associate consistent with the procedural safeguards
18 established in this Agreement. Each ICC and/or UCC review of an indeterminate SHU term will
19 review the inmate’s current gang status and indicate that status on the 128G chrono. The inmate
20 will receive a copy of the chrono unless otherwise requested. “Currently active” gang status is
21 defined as any documented gang activity within the past six years consistent with CCR
22 3341.5(c)(5). Defendants agree that these requirements will be reflected in Title 15 and/or the
23 DOM, to the extent they do not already appear there.

24 25. The provisions set forth in paragraphs 11 to 24 shall be applied on a
25 prospective basis only, and shall apply throughout the Department of Corrections.

26 26. Training. Defendants agree that the above policy changes shall be
27 reflected in Institutional Gang Investigator (“IGI”) training materials and gang educational
28 materials considered and applied by LEIU, and shall be reflected in Title 15 and/or the

1 Department of Operations Manual. Defendants agree that all relevant staff, including but not
2 limited to IGI and LEIU, will receive training and instruction on the terms of the settlement
3 agreement no later than 180 days after execution of the settlement where appropriate and as
4 reflected in Paragraph 8.

5 27. Administrative Bulletin or Memorandum. Defendants shall issue a
6 memorandum or an administrative bulletin to notify general staff of the terms of the settlement
7 agreement no later than 180 days after execution of the settlement. A copy of the memorandum
8 or administrative bulletin shall be provided to Plaintiff's counsel within 30 calendar days of its
9 issuance.

10 28. Gang Diversion Video. Defendants will seek permission from the Director
11 of the CDC to show a gang diversion video to the general and SHU populations. A copy of the
12 gang diversion video shall be provided to plaintiff's counsel within thirty calendar days of its first
13 broadcast, if any.

14 29. Gang Validation of Plaintiff Castillo. Defendants agree that after executing
15 the settlement, Defendants will within 90 days review the validation of the Plaintiff in accordance
16 with the modifications adopted pursuant to the settlement. Defendants also agree that no source
17 items learned of through Plaintiff's deposition testimony in this litigation shall be considered
18 against Mr. Castillo in any subsequent review of his gang validation.

19 **V. ENFORCEMENT**

20 30. The Court, specifically the Honorable Martin J. Jenkins, shall retain
21 jurisdiction to enforce the terms of this Agreement. The Court shall have the power to enforce
22 the terms of this Agreement through specific performance and all other remedies permitted by
23 law or equity.

24 31. While the parties agree that there is no ongoing monitoring of the
25 Settlement Agreement,

26 (a) If Plaintiff's counsel believes that Defendants are not complying
27 with the specific provisions of this Settlement Agreement to make policy changes, they shall
28 notify Defendants' counsel in writing via the U.S. Postal Service of the facts supporting their

1 belief. Defendants shall investigate the allegations and respond in writing within 45 days. If
2 Plaintiff's counsel are not satisfied with Defendants' response, the parties shall meet and confer to
3 resolve the issue(s). If the parties are unable to resolve the issue(s) satisfactorily, Plaintiff may
4 request relief in the U .S. District Court, Northern District of California, before Judge Martin J.
5 Jenkins. This process will cease to be available once the proposed changes to the policies
6 described in this Settlement Agreement are internally finalized. This occurs when the California
7 Department of Corrections' Regulatory and Policy Management Branch provides the proposed
8 changes to the Office of Administrative Law and/or other interested bodies, where approvals are
9 outside the California Department of Corrections' control.

10 (b) Following final codification of the proposed changes by the Office
11 of Administrative Law and/or any other interested bodies, the California Department of
12 Corrections will implement the codified changes. For six months following the start date of the
13 implementation of the codified policy changes, if Plaintiff's counsel believes that Defendants are
14 not complying with the implementation of the codified policy changes, they shall notify
15 Defendants' counsel in writing via the U.S. Postal Service of the facts supporting their belief.
16 Defendants shall investigate the allegations and respond in writing within 45 days. If Plaintiff's
17 counsel are not satisfied with Defendants' response, the parties shall meet and confer to resolve
18 the issues(s). If the parties are unable to resolve the issue(s) satisfactorily, Plaintiff may request
19 relief in the U .S. District Court, Northern District of California, before Judge Martin J. Jenkins.
20 This process will cease to be available once the six-month time frame elapses from the
21 implementation start date described above.

22 (c) There can be no individual inmate relief regarding an inmate's gang
23 validation granted through the above-described process; individual inmate concerns regarding
24 his/her own gang validation can only be raised as exemplars by Plaintiff's counsel of alleged
25 noncompliance. Individual inmate concerns must be raised through the California Department of
26 Corrections inmate appeals process (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 15, §§ 3084 *et seq.*) and separate suit.

27 **VI. ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS**

28 32. Defendants shall pay Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, LLP \$240,000

1 within 90 calendar days of the execution of this agreement. That sum shall be divided among
2 plaintiff's counsel, future litigation efforts, and plaintiff as shall be decided by plaintiff's counsel
3 and plaintiff. Lief, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, LLP shall complete a Payee Data Record
4 form and shall return that Payee Data Record form to Defendants' counsel upon execution of this
5 agreement.

6 33. At the time that Plaintiff and his counsel signs this settlement agreement,
7 Plaintiff's counsel shall also sign and return to counsel for Defendants an executed Stipulation
8 and [Proposed] Order of Dismissal With Prejudice. Plaintiff's counsel authorizes counsel for
9 Defendants to file the dismissal with prejudice with the court once the settlement check has been
10 delivered to Plaintiff's counsel.

11 **VII. RESOLUTION OF CLAIMS**

12 34. Plaintiff fully and forever releases and discharges all served and unserved
13 Defendants, including Defendants Edward S. Alameida, Jr., Joseph L. McGrath, Jr., Alan
14 Addison, Judy Olson, E.S. Rodriguez, Larry Williams, C. Sheppard, and J. Bridle, and all others
15 who have ever been named as Defendants in this action, in both their individual and official
16 capacities, from all claims, demands, actions, and causes of action including claims for attorneys'
17 fees, court costs, and other costs of suit, arising out of an alleged injury or claims incurred by
18 Plaintiff as alleged in this action. Plaintiff also fully and forever releases and discharges the State
19 of California, the California Department of Corrections and its employees, agents (including, but
20 not limited to the Pelican Bay State Prison in Crescent City, California and its employees and
21 agents), servants, and other representatives, past or present, from all claims, demands, actions,
22 and causes of action, including claims for attorneys' fees, court costs, and other costs of suit,
23 arising out of any alleged injury or claims incurred by Plaintiff as alleged in this action. Plaintiff
24 specifically, but without limitation, releases the Releasees for all claims that were brought or that
25 could have been brought. Plaintiff does not release any claims regarding the review of his
26 validation as set forth in paragraph 29 of this Agreement nor any claims regarding any future
27 inactive reviews of his status on behalf of the Classification Committee.

28 35. Plaintiff acknowledges and agrees that this release and discharge is a

1 general release. Plaintiff expressly waives and assumes the risk of any and all claims identified in
2 Paragraph 7(h) which exist as of this date, but which he does not know or suspect to exist,
3 whether through ignorance, oversight, error, negligence, or otherwise, and which, if known,
4 would materially affect his decision to enter into this settlement agreement. Plaintiff has read
5 the contents of Section 1542 of the Civil Code of the State of California, and he expressly waives
6 the benefits of this section. Section 1542 reads as follows:

7 Section 1542. (General Release - Claims Extinguished)
8 A general release does not extend to claims which the creditor does
9 not know or suspect to exist in his favor at the time of executing the
10 release, which if known by him must have materially affected his
11 settlement with the debtor.

12 Plaintiff assumes the risk that the facts or law may be other than he believes.

13 36. Upon the execution of the settlement agreement, Defendants shall be
14 deemed to and shall have released Plaintiff Castillo from any and all claims relating to the
15 original Complaint and the Second Amended Complaint, Third Amended Complaint, Fourth
16 Amended Complaint, and Fifth Amended Complaint.

17 **VIII. PARTIES' AUTHORITY**

18 37. The signatories hereby represent that they are fully authorized to enter into
19 this agreement and bind the parties hereto to the terms and conditions hereof.

20 38. All of the Parties acknowledge that they have been represented by
21 competent, experienced counsel throughout all negotiations which preceded execution of this
22 agreement, and this agreement is made with the consent and advice of counsel.

23 **IX. MUTUAL FULL COOPERATION**

24 39. The Parties agree to use their best efforts and to fully cooperate with each
25 other to accomplish the terms of this agreement, including but not limited to, execution of such
26 documents and to take such other action as may reasonably be necessary to implement and
27 effectuate the terms of this agreement.

28 **X. MODIFICATION**

40. This agreement may not be changed, altered, or modified, except in writing
and signed by the parties hereto, and approved by the Court.

1 **XI. ENTIRE AGREEMENT**

2 41. This agreement constitutes the entire agreement between the Parties
3 concerning the subject matter hereof. No extrinsic oral or written representations or terms shall
4 modify, vary or contradict the terms of this agreement. In the event of any conflict between this
5 agreement and any other settlement-related document, the parties intend that this agreement shall
6 be controlling.

7 **XII. CHOICE OF LAW/JURISDICTION**

8 42. This agreement shall be subject to, governed by, construed, enforced, and
9 administered in accordance with the laws of the State of California, both in its procedural and
10 substantive aspects, and shall be subject to the continuing jurisdiction of the United States District
11 Court for the Northern District of California. According to Magistrate Judge Edward M. Chen at
12 the May 28, 2004 Settlement Conference, “[u]nder the terms of the settlement agreement, the
13 District Court will retain jurisdiction to supervise the enforcement, should that be necessary.”
14 This agreement shall be construed as a whole according to its fair meaning and intent, and not
15 strictly for or against any party, regardless of who drafted or who was principally responsible for
16 drafting this agreement or any specific term or condition thereof.

17 **XIII. COUNTERPARTS**

18 43. This agreement may be executed in counterparts, and when each party has
19 signed and delivered at least one such counterpart, each counterpart shall be deemed an original,
20 and, when taken together with other signed counterparts, shall constitute one agreement, which
21 shall be binding upon and effective as to all Parties.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Dated: September __, 2004

LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP

2

3

By: _____
Joy A. Kruse

4

5

James M. Finberg (State Bar No. 114850)
Joy A. Kruse (State Bar No. 142799)
Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, LLP
Embarcadero Center West
275 Battery Street, 30th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
Telephone: (415) 956-1000
Facsimile: (415) 956-1008

6

7

8

9

Counsel for Plaintiff STEVE M. CASTILLO

10 Dated: September __, 2004

CALIFORNIA PRISON FOCUS

11

12

By: _____
Charles F.A. Carbone

13

14

Charles F.A. Carbone (State Bar No. 206536)
2940 16th Street, Suite 307
San Francisco, CA 94103
Telephone: (415) 252-9211
Facsimile: (415) 252-9311

15

16

Counsel for Plaintiff STEVE M. CASTILLO

17

18 Dated: September __, 2004

LAW OFFICES OF GRAHAM NOYES

19

20

By: _____
Graham Noyes

21

James Graham Noyes (State Bar No. 157395)
228 Commercial Street, #219
Nevada City, CA 95959
Telephone: (530) 478-9196
Facsimile: (530) 478-9197

22

23

24

Counsel for Plaintiff STEVE M. CASTILLO

25

26

27

28

1 Dated: September __, 2004

BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General of the State of
California
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

2

3

4

By: _____
Jonathan L. Wolff

5

6

Jonathan L. Wolff
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
Telephone: (415) 703-1113
Facsimile: (415) 703-5843

7

8

9

Attorneys for Defendants Alameida, McGrath, Addison,
Olson, Rodriguez, Williams, Sheppard, and Briddle

10

11

Dated: September __, 2004

STEVE M. CASTILLO

12

13

14

By : _____
Steve M. Castillo

15

16

Steve M. Castillo
P.O. Box 7500
Pelican Bay State Prison
Crescent City, CA 95531

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28