I

1	
1	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	
10	L.H., A.Z., D.K., and D.R., on behalf of themselves and
11	all other similarly situated juvenile parolees
12	in California, NO. CIV. S-06-2042 LKK/GGH
13	Plaintiffs,
14	v. <u>ORDER</u>
15 16	EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Governor, State of California, et al,
17	Defendants.
18	/
19	The court HEREBY FINDS that defendants have demonstrated
20	substantial compliance with the following requirements:
21	• Timely appointment of counsel;
22	• At the time of attorney appointment, provision of a copy of
23	all the evidence on which the State intends to rely or which
24	may be exculpatory; evidence not provided with at least two
25	days' notice shall be excluded unless the state shows good
26	cause;

1

- Attorney will be informed of Return to Custody Assessment by
 the tenth business day after the hold;
- Adequate time for representation; reasonable access to
 clients and files; confidential phone calls and space in
 which to meet; observing staff cannot participate in
 proceedings;
- Not accepting waivers of hearing rights or the right to
 counsel made prior to the juvenile parolee meeting with
 counsel; waivers of hearings and requests for continuance
 must be made in writing in the presence of counsel;
- Not in custody hearings within 60 days after service and with
 all due process and ADA protections; and
- Revocation may be extended only after a revocation extension
 hearing (no time-adds or DDMS time extensions).

These requirements will therefore no longer be a primary focus of Plaintiffs' or the Special Master's monitoring unless and until it comes to the parties' or the Special Master's attention that there has been a significant decline in compliance.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

19

DATED: February 9, 2011.

LÀWRENCE K. KARLTON SENIOR JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT