

1 **WO**

2
3
4
5
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**
8

9 Victor Antonio Parsons, et al.,

10 Plaintiffs,

11 v.

12 Charles L Ryan, et al.,

13 Defendants.
14

No. CV-12-00601-PHX-ROS

ORDER

15 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Enforce. (Doc. 2520) In
16 compliance with the Court's previous Orders interpreting substantial non-compliance, the
17 Court finds as follows. (Doc. 2644)

18 The following PM/locations are not substantially non-compliant:

- 19
- PM 19 at Perryville
 - 20 • PM 19 at Phoenix
 - 21 • PM 19 at Tucson
 - 22 • PM 67 at Florence
 - 23 • PM 67 at Perryville
 - 24 • PM 73 at Tucson

25 The following PM/locations meet the Stipulation's definition of non-compliant but
26 are recently compliant and so the Court will not order a remediation plan:

- 27
- PM 44 at Winslow
 - 28 • PM 48 at Tucson

- PM 95 at Tucson
- PM 96 at Tucson
- PM 98 at Tucson

The following PM/locations are non-compliant and the Court will require Defendants to provide a remediation plan:

- PM 19 at Eyman
- PM 19 at Lewis
- PM 52 at Phoenix
- PM 67 at Tucson

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED granting in part Plaintiffs' Motion to Enforce (Doc. 2520).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that PM 48 at Tucson, PM 95 at Tucson, and PM 96 at Tucson are substantially non-compliant.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that PM 19 at Eyman, PM 19 at Lewis, PM 52 at Phoenix, and PM 67 at Tucson are substantially non-compliant. Defendants shall file a remedial plan tailored to each of these PM/locations no later than October 22, 2018.

Dated this 28th day of September, 2018.



Honorable Roslyn O. Silver
Senior United States District Judge