

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM SASSMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Governor
of California, and JEFFREY A. BEARD,
Secretary of the California Department
of Corrections and Rehabilitation, in
their official capacities, and DOES 1-
10,

Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-01679-MCE-KJN

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Plaintiff William Sassman (“Plaintiff”) initiated this action against Edmund G. Brown, Jr., Governor of California, and Jeffrey A. Beard, Secretary of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (“CDCR”), in their official capacities (collectively “Defendants”). Plaintiff claims Defendants’ exclusion of men from California’s Alternative Custody Program (“ACP”), as authorized by California Penal Code section 1170.05, violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Presently before the Court are the parties’ cross-motions for summary judgment and motions to exclude expert reports and testimony. ECF Nos. 50-51, 56, 60. For the following reasons, Defendants’ Motion for

1 Summary Judgment and the evidentiary motions are DENIED, and Plaintiff’s Motion for
2 Summary Judgment is GRANTED.¹

3
4 **BACKGROUND**

5
6 Senate Bill No. 1266, which added California Penal Code section 1170.05, was
7 signed into law on September 30, 2010. 2010 Cal. Stat., c. 644 (“SB 1266”). That bill
8 provided for the implementation of the ACP, authorizing the CDCR to “offer a program
9 under which female inmates, pregnant inmates, or inmates who, immediately prior to
10 incarceration, were primary caregivers of dependent children . . . who have been
11 committed to state prison may be allowed to participate in a voluntary alternative custody
12 program . . . in lieu of confinement in state prison.” SB 1266 § 2.² More specifically, the
13 ACP permits participants to be released from prison to live in a residential home,
14 transitional care facility, or residential drug treatment program for up to the last twenty-
15 four months of their prison sentences. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 15 §§ 3078.1(b), 3078.2(b).
16 Each ACP participant is monitored by a CDCR agent and is also subject to electronic
17 monitoring and searches. *Id.* § 3078.5.

18 As originally drafted, the ACP would have been open to all female prisoners, but
19 only to males who were “primary caregivers” of dependent children. SB 1266 § 2(c).
20 Legislative findings underlying the new law were as follows:

21 The incarceration rate for female offenders has doubled over
22 the last 20 years. As a result, California now has about
23 10,000 incarcerated women, which is more than any other
state.

24 _____
25 ¹ Because oral argument would not have been of material assistance, the Court ordered this
matter submitted on the briefs. E.D. Cal. Local R. 230(g).

26 ² An individual must also meet the following gender-neutral criteria, among others, to be eligible to
27 participate in the ACP: the person cannot have a current conviction for a violent or serious felony, the
28 person cannot have a current or prior conviction for an offense that requires them to register as a sex
offender, the person must be screened and determined not to pose a high risk to commit a violent offense,
and the person cannot have a history, within the last ten years, of escape from juvenile or adult custody.
Cal. Penal Code § 1170.05(d); Cal. Code Regs. tit. 15, §§ 3078.2, 3078.3.

1 Nearly 70 percent of female inmates are nonviolent
2 offenders. Two-thirds of female inmates were convicted of
property or drug-related crimes.

3 While over half of the men in prison were incarcerated for
4 violent crimes, only 30 percent of women were convicted of
violence.

5 Female inmates are more likely to be victims of violent crimes
6 than to be the perpetrators. Four in 10 female inmates were
physically or sexually abused before 18 years of age.

7 Over two-thirds of women are classified as low risk by the
8 prison classification system. However, women are often held
in more secure environments than their custody
9 classifications would warrant.

10 Approximately 67 percent of incarcerated women are
11 mothers, and many of them are single parents. Most of
California's incarcerated mothers are the primary caregivers
12 of dependent children and hope to return home to their
children. While the vast majority of children of incarcerated
13 men continue to live with their mothers, children of
incarcerated women are more likely to end up living with
other relatives or in foster care.

14 Separating parents from children has a substantial impact on
15 their futures. Children of inmates are much more likely than
16 their peers to become incarcerated. Research suggests that
17 mothers who are able to maintain a relationship with their
18 children are less likely to return to prison. Research also
19 demonstrates that a father's involvement in his child's life
20 greatly improves the child's chances for success. Helping
21 incarcerated fathers foster stronger connections with their
22 children, where appropriate, can have positive effects for
23 children. Strong family connections help to ensure that
24 fathers stay out of prison once they are released.

25 To break the cycle of incarceration, California must adopt
26 policies that facilitate parenting and family reunification.

27 SB 1266 § 1 (lettering removed) (emphasis added).³

28 ³ Additional excerpts from the legislative history also indicate that the Legislature had men in mind when it enacted the ACP. See, e.g., SB 1266 § 2 (“Willful failure of the program participant to return to the place of detention not later than the expiration of any period of time during which he or she is authorized to be away from the place of detention pursuant to this section, unauthorized departures from the place of detention, or tampering with or disabling, or attempting to tamper with or disable, an electronic monitoring device shall subject the participant to a return to custody”) (emphasis added); id. (“The participant shall remain within the interior premises of his or her residence during the hours designated by the secretary or his or her designee.”) (emphasis added); id. (“In addition, the participant shall admit any peace officer designated by the secretary or his or her designee into the participant’s residence at any time for purposes of verifying the participant’s compliance with the conditions of his or her detention.”)

1 A March 2013 CDCR Fact Sheet also indicated that the purpose of the ACP is “reuniting
2 low-level inmates with their families and reintegrating them back into their community.”
3 Decl. of Van Swearingen (“Swearingen Decl.”), ECF No. 50-4, Ex. F, at 1. In addition,
4 the Senate Committee on Public Safety made clear that “[t]he aim of [the ACP] [is] to
5 lower recidivism rates, encourage community and family involvement, hold fewer
6 children in Child Welfare System, and reduce the likelihood that an inmate’s children will
7 embark on a life of crime.” D’Agostino Decl., ECF No. 18-6, Ex. F, at 11.

8 Defendants contend, however, that the purpose of the ACP is more specific—
9 namely, to implement a gender-responsive program to “address women’s unique
10 pathways to criminality, and thereby, reduce recidivism.” Defs.’ Mot. Summ. J. (“Defs.’
11 Mot.”), ECF No. 51, at 1. According to Defendants’ retained expert, Dr. Nena Messina,⁴
12 “women offenders have been receiving services and programs developed primarily for
13 their male counterparts.” Messina Expert Report (“Messina Report”), ECF No. 48-1, at
14 4. However, “[a] large body of consistent and replicated literature has shown that
15 women offenders are low risk to public safety with complex needs that are better met in
16 community settings.” *Id.* at 5. As Dr. Messina explains: “Female crime rates, with few
17 exceptions, are much lower than male crime rates,” and “[w]omen’s participation [in
18 violent crime] is profoundly lower.” Messina Report at 6. In support of her conclusions,
19 Dr. Messina provides a number of other opinions with regard to the backgrounds and
20 needs of female inmates.

21 For example, according to Dr. Messina, “[i]ncarcerated women are . . . more likely
22 than incarcerated men to report extensive histories of trauma, including emotional,
23 physical, and sexual abuse as children, adolescents, and adults.” *Id.* at 3 (internal
24 citations omitted). “[W]omen report a higher degree of trauma and a higher impact of

25 (emphasis added); *id.* (“The secretary or his or her designee may immediately retake the participant into
26 custody to serve the balance of his or her sentence”) (emphasis added).

27 ⁴ Plaintiff moves to strike Dr. Messina’s testimony. ECF No. 60. Because the Court finds in favor
28 of Plaintiff even after considering that testimony, Plaintiff’s Motion is DENIED as moot. Similarly, because
the Court did not rely on Plaintiff’s expert in reaching its decisions, Defendants’ Motion to Exclude Expert
Report and Testimony (ECF No. 56) is DENIED as well.

1 that trauma on their current posttraumatic stress disorder compared to . . . men.”
2 D’Agostino Decl., Ex. B (“Messina Dep.”), ECF 52-2, 144:15-18. “Although a male
3 inmate can have all these problems, he is less likely to, and the problems tend to have a
4 differential impact on women: women who experience childhood abuse and trauma
5 become involved with crime significantly earlier than boys with similar histories, and girls
6 without such histories.” Defs.’ Mot. at 4-5 (citing Messina Report at 5-6). In sum,
7 according to Dr. Messina, women “are more likely to be dysfunctional” as a result of
8 childhood abuse, mental illness, and poverty. Messina Dep. at 176:8-177:4.

9 Dr. Messina also avers that “[w]omen are less likely to be employed before or
10 after incarceration, and are more likely to have primary caregiver responsibilities
11 compared to men in all states.” Defs.’ Mot. at 5 (citing Messina Dep. at 71:2-7;
12 D’Agostino Decl., Ex. A (“Messina Rebuttal”), ECF No. 52-1, at 1). “Reuniting with
13 children has been shown to reduce the risk of recidivism for women, but not for men.”
14 Id. (citing Messina Report at 10; Messina Dep. at 24:5-11). She also indicates that there
15 is purportedly a “very low likelihood that men will be primary caregivers of children and
16 reunify with their children when they leave prison.” Id. (citing Messina Dep. at 113:10-
17 114:12).

18 Dr. Messina thus opines that, “[a]lthough family reunification is a strong predictor
19 of success for female offenders, the same is not necessarily true for men: research
20 demonstrates that primary predictors of criminal behavior for men include criminally
21 active peers, extensive prior offending, and financial gain.” Id. (citing Messina Dep. at
22 127:18-128: 7; Messina Report at 6). Similarly, according to Dr. Messina, “research
23 shows that men of the same risk profiles as ACP-eligible women are still more likely to
24 recidivate,” and unlike men, “factors associated with women’s post-release success are
25 residing with children, strong family support, self-help participation, and specialized
26 programs with services for women and children.” Id. (citing Messina Dep. at 85:4-6,
27 86:2-88:2; Messina Report at 3). Finally, Dr. Messina testifies that “[w]omen have
28 multiple social service needs that are not well met in prison.” Id. at 5-6 (citing Messina

1 Dep. at 25:1-10). She thus concludes that a “[g]ender-responsive policy and practice
2 target women’s pathways to criminality by providing effective interventions that address
3 the intersecting issues of trauma, criminal behavior, substance abuse, mental health and
4 economic marginality, as well as specific services” is needed. Messina Report at 5.

5 Regardless of the Legislature’s precise intent, CDCR formally launched the ACP
6 on September 12, 2011. See Swearingen Decl., Ex. C. At that time it was decided that,
7 “[i]nitially, the program [would] be offered to qualifying female inmates. Participation may
8 be offered at a later date to male inmates, at the discretion of the Secretary of CDCR.”

9 Id.

10 However, on June 27, 2012, Governor Brown signed Senate Bill No. 1021, which
11 modified section 1170.05 to read: “[F]emale inmates sentenced to state prison for a
12 determinate term of imprisonment pursuant to Section 1170, and only those persons,
13 shall be eligible to participate in the alternative custody program authorized by this
14 section.” Cal. Penal Code § 1170.05(c) (emphasis added). Shortly thereafter, on
15 September 13, 2012, CDCR issued a notice of approval of emergency regulatory action
16 providing that “[t]o be eligible to participate in the Alternative Custody Program (ACP),
17 the inmate must volunteer and be female.” Cal. Code Regs. tit. 15 § 3078.2(a).⁵

18 Given the ACP’s difference in treatment of male and female inmates, CDCR
19 received a number of comments questioning whether the program impermissibly
20 discriminates against men. See Swearingen Decl., Ex. E. Most significantly, the
21 California Office of the Legislative Counsel issued statements warning the author of the
22 bill and the Governor that “[i]n so far as this bill would create a program that provides for
23 early release of women from prison custody to less restrictive confinement based on
24 gender, the bill may be construed as violating the constitutional requirement of equal
25 protection of law.” Id., Ex. M. The regulations nonetheless became effective and limited
26 ACP eligibility to female applicants. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 15, § 3078.2.

27
28 ⁵ This was the only relevant change in the eligibility criteria; none of the gender-neutral
exclusionary criteria were changed.

1 Even for female inmates otherwise satisfying the eligibility requirements, however,
2 acceptance into the ACP is not guaranteed. The CDCR screens ACP applicants to
3 evaluate whether a prisoner may participate in the Program. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 15
4 § 3078.4. A prisoner's predictive risk is assessed, and the CDCR prepares
5 Individualized Treatment and Rehabilitation Plans ("ITRP") for each participant. Id. The
6 goal in preparing the ITRP is to address the specific needs of each participant, with
7 various factors being considered, including: "(A) Housing; (B) Employment plans;
8 (C) Transportation; (D) Substance abuse treatment; (E) Parenting and life skills;
9 (F) Anger management and criminal thinking; (G) Career Technical Education programs
10 and educational needs; (H) Social services needs, e.g., Veteran's Affairs benefits,
11 general assistance, social security; [and] (I) Medical, dental, and mental health needs."
12 Id. The ITRPs themselves include goals such as: "receive [substance abuse]
13 treatment," "obtain counseling," "seek and complete vocational training," and "seek
14 employment." Swearingen Decl., Ex. Q. The ITRP is presented to an Institutional
15 Classification Committee, who considers the inmate for placement in the ACP. Cal.
16 Code Regs. tit. 15 § 3078.4.

17 Inmates chosen to participate in the ACP are supervised by a parole officer, who
18 also acts as a case manager. Id., § 3078.5. "A key component of the ACP . . . is
19 mandatory case management services," including at least one at-home inmate contact
20 per month. Decl. of Jill Brown ("Brown Decl."), ECF No. 53, Ex. A, at 51, 71-72.

21 Participating inmates are expected to comply with ITRP expectations and any special
22 requirements set by the parole-agent/case-manager. Id. at 49, 71-72. As inmates
23 progress through their plans, the case manager identifies further objectives. Id. at 50.

24 The CDCR also generates "Case Plans," which identify "goals, task and activities"
25 for ACP participants. Swearingen Decl., Ex. P. Those Case Plans direct that
26 participants should, for example, "address mental health needs," "stay clean and sober,"
27 "obtain an ID," "develop job skills," and "secure an income." Id. The Plans also identify

28 ///

1 programs and services available to ACP participants in their home communities,
2 programs and services that are generally available to both genders. Id.

3 As indicated above, ACP participants may apply to serve their sentences in
4 private homes, in private drug-treatment or transitional care facilities, or in a Female
5 Offender Treatment and Employment Program (“FOTEP”). Cal. Penal Code § 1170.05;
6 Messina Report at 4. Those offenders finishing out their sentences in their homes are
7 still expected to “be involved in programs, services and/or employment.” Brown Decl.,
8 Ex. A, at 52. The Case manager refers inmates living in private homes to services and
9 programs and monitors the inmate’s progress. Id. at 51-52, 71. Those participants
10 released to drug-treatment or transitional care facilities should, depending on the facility,
11 also have access to “gender-responsive specific groups and specific curricula for
12 women.” Messina Dep. at 24:12-21.

13 On June 3, 2013, Plaintiff applied to the ACP, requesting that he be allowed to
14 finish his sentence in his home community of Sacramento. Decl. of William Sassman
15 Decl. (“Sassman Decl.”), ECF No. 50-7, ¶ 8, Ex. A. Plaintiff contends that, exclusive of
16 his gender, he met and still meets all of the criteria required to be eligible to apply to the
17 ACP. Id. ¶ 7. On June 19, 2013, however, a CDCR correctional counselor denied
18 Plaintiff’s application solely because he was male. Id. ¶ 8, Ex. A. Plaintiff appealed the
19 denial of his ACP application through the third-level of review, and the CDCR denied the
20 last appeal in December 2013. Id. ¶¶ 9-14, Exs. B-E. His appeal was ultimately rejected
21 because “[s]tate law only allows female inmates to participate in the ACP.” Id. at Ex. E.
22 According to Defendants, male inmates may transition back into society via existing
23 transition hubs instead. Defs.’ Mot. at 8 (citing
24 <http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/rehabilitation/reentry-hubs.html>). Programs on substance abuse,
25 criminal thinking, anger management, and family relationships are offered” in these
26 hubs, and inmates may “obtain ID cards, academic degrees, and trade certifications.” Id.
27 Similar services are offered to parolees at Residential Multi-Service Centers. Id. at 9
28 (citing <http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/rehabilitation/residential-multi-service-center.html>).

1 In the meantime, as of October 2014, 422 women have participated in the ACP,
2 and there are currently 69 participants. Brown Decl. ¶ 3. “In 2014, the ACP had
3 received 1,058 applications,” but, “of those, only 118 inmates were accepted into the
4 program.” Decl. of Robin Harrington, ECF No. 65, ¶ 3. Of the approximately 117,805
5 male inmates in the California prison system, an estimated 3,149 male inmates could
6 potentially be eligible for the ACP and that 500 men could probably be admitted.
7 Swearingen Decl., ¶¶ 8-9, 22, Exs. G, H, U.

8 Upon denial of his appeal, on July 16, 2014, Plaintiff filed the instant action
9 challenging the exclusion from men from the ACP (ECF No. 1) and a motion for
10 preliminary injunctive relief (ECF No. 5). After considering Plaintiff’s request for
11 injunctive relief, the Court determined that Plaintiff had shown he was likely to succeed
12 on the merits of his claims but denied his request due to Plaintiff’s failure to show the
13 requisite likelihood of irreparable harm.⁶ ECF No. 38. The Court set a shortened
14 discovery and briefing schedule for the parties’ Cross Motions for Summary Judgment,
15 which are presently before the Court. Id.

17 STANDARD

18
19 The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure⁷ provide for summary judgment when “the
20 movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is
21 entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a); Celotex Corp. v. Catrett,
22 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986). “A party asserting that a fact cannot be or is genuinely
23 disputed must support the assertion by: (A) citing to particular parts of materials in the
24 record, including depositions, documents, electronically stored information, affidavits or
25 declarations, stipulations (including those made for purposes of the motion only),

26 ⁶ The Court also denied Plaintiff’s subsequent Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 35) to the
27 extent it asked the Court to reconsider its decision on the merits. ECF No. 38.

28 ⁷ All further references to “Rule” or “Rules” are to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure unless
otherwise noted.

1 admissions, interrogatory answers, or other materials; or (B) showing that the materials
2 cited do not establish the absence or presence of a genuine dispute, or that an adverse
3 party cannot produce admissible evidence to support the fact.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(1).
4 One of the principal purposes of Rule 56 is to dispose of factually unsupported claims or
5 defenses. Celotex, 477 U.S. at 323-24.

6 Rule 56 also allows a court to grant summary judgment on part of a claim or
7 defense, known as partial summary judgment. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a) (“A party may
8 move for summary judgment, identifying each claim or defense—or the part of each
9 claim or defense—on which summary judgment is sought.”); see also Allstate Ins. Co. v.
10 Madan, 889 F. Supp. 374, 378–79 (C.D. Cal. 1995). The standard that applies to a
11 motion for partial summary judgment is the same as that which applies to a motion for
12 summary judgment. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a); see also State of Cal., on Behalf of Cal.
13 Dep't of Toxic Substances Control v. Campbell, 138 F.3d 772, 780 (9th Cir.1998)
14 (applying summary judgment standard to motion for summary adjudication).

15 In a summary judgment motion, the moving party “always bears the initial
16 responsibility of informing the district court of the basis for its motion and identifying” the
17 portions in the record “which it believes demonstrate the absence of a genuine issue of
18 material fact.” Celotex, 477 U.S. at 323. If the moving party meets its initial
19 responsibility, the burden then shifts to the opposing party to establish that a genuine
20 issue as to any material fact actually does exist. Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith
21 Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 586–87 (1986); First Nat'l Bank of Ariz. v. Cities Serv. Co.,
22 391 U.S. 253, 288–89 (1968).

23 In attempting to establish the existence or non-existence of a genuine factual
24 dispute, the party must support its assertion by “citing to particular parts of materials in
25 the record, including depositions, documents, electronically stored information, affidavit
26 or declarations . . . or other materials; or showing that the materials cited do not establish
27 the absence or presence of a genuine dispute, or that an adverse party cannot produce
28 admissible evidence to support the fact.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(1). The opposing party

1 must demonstrate that the fact in contention is material, i.e., a fact that might affect the
2 outcome of the suit under the governing law. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S.
3 242, 248, 251–52 (1986); Owens v. Local No. 169, Ass’n of W. Pulp & Paper Workers,
4 971 F.2d 347, 355 (9th Cir. 1992). The opposing party must also demonstrate that the
5 dispute about a material fact “is ‘genuine,’ that is, if the evidence is such that a
6 reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party.” Anderson, 477 U.S. at
7 248. In other words, the judge needs to answer the preliminary question before the
8 evidence is left to the jury of “not whether there is literally no evidence, but whether there
9 is any upon which a jury could properly proceed to find a verdict for the party producing
10 it, upon whom the onus of proof is imposed.” Id. at 251 (quoting Improvement Co. v.
11 Munson, 81 U.S. 442, 448 (1871)). As the Supreme Court explained, “[w]hen the
12 moving party has carried its burden under Rule [56(a)], its opponent must do more than
13 simply show that there is some metaphysical doubt as to the material facts.” Matsushita,
14 475 U.S. at 586. Therefore, “[w]here the record taken as a whole could not lead a
15 rational trier of fact to find for the nonmoving party, there is no ‘genuine issue for trial.’”
16 Id. at 587 (quoting Cities Service, 391 U.S. at 289).

17 In resolving a summary judgment motion, the evidence of the opposing party is to
18 be believed, and all reasonable inferences that may be drawn from the facts placed
19 before the court must be drawn in favor of the opposing party. Anderson, 477 U.S. at
20 255. Nevertheless, inferences are not drawn out of the air, and it is the opposing party's
21 obligation to produce a factual predicate from which the inference may be drawn.
22 Richards v. Nielsen Freight Lines, 602 F. Supp. 1224, 1244–45 (E.D. Cal. 1985), aff'd,
23 810 F.2d 898 (9th Cir.1987).

24 25 ANALYSIS

26
27 Plaintiff contends that California’s refusal to permit male inmates to apply to the
28 ACP violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. In response,

1 Defendants counter that the ACP was properly enacted to provide gender responsive
2 programming only to women, who are an underserved subset of California's prison
3 population. The Court is confident that the California Legislature acted with the best of
4 intentions in establishing the ACP. However, by insisting that this is just a programming
5 case, Defendants utterly fail to acknowledge Plaintiff's primary point. This case is not
6 about programming. It is about freedom from incarceration. The line the State has
7 drawn separates male offenders, who must remain inside of prison walls, from female
8 offenders, who may apply to serve the last two years of their sentences in the
9 community. The result is that ACP-eligible male inmates must by definition serve two
10 additional years in a penal institution than they would potentially have to serve if they
11 were female. And families of ACP-eligible male offenders must wait two additional years
12 to start their reunification process than families of ACP-eligible females.

13 When the State draws a line between two classes of persons, and denies one of
14 those classes a right as fundamental as physical freedom, that action survives equal
15 protection review only if the State has a sufficient justification for the classification. Here,
16 the State does not.

17 **A. Prohibiting male inmates from applying to the ACP is**
18 **unconstitutional.**

19 The Equal Protection Clause "commands that no state shall 'deny to any person
20 within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws,' which is essentially a direction that
21 all persons similarly situated should be treated alike." City of Cleburne, Tex. v. Cleburne
22 Living Ctr., 473 U.S. 432, 439 (1985) (citing Pylar v. Doe, 457 U.S. 202, 216 (1982)).⁸
23 State policies that expressly discriminate among applicants on the basis of gender are
24 "subject to scrutiny under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment."
25 Miss. Univ. for Women v. Hogan, 458 U.S. 718, 723 (1982). Just because a statutory

26
27 ⁸ The Court has already determined that those male and female inmates who meet the gender-
28 neutral criteria set forth in the ACP are similarly situated. ECF No. 38. Nothing presented since the
Court's October 14, 2014, Order convinces the Court otherwise.

1 policy “discriminates against males rather than against females does not exempt it from
2 scrutiny or reduce the standard of review.” Id.

3 “[T]he party seeking to uphold a statute that classifies individuals on the basis of
4 their gender must carry the burden of showing an ‘exceedingly persuasive justification’
5 for the classification.” Id. at 724 (quoting Kirchberg v. Feenstra, 450 U.S. 455, 461
6 (1981)). “The burden is met only by showing at least that the classification serves
7 ‘important governmental objectives and that the discriminatory means employed’ are
8 ‘substantially related to the achievement of those objectives.’” Id. (quoting Wengler v.
9 Druggists Mutual Ins. Co., 446 U.S. 142, 150 (1980)).⁹ This test “must be applied free of
10 fixed notions concerning the roles and abilities of males and females. Care must be
11 taken in ascertaining whether the statutory objective itself reflects archaic and
12 stereotypic notions.” Id. at 724-25.

13 If a court finds that a State’s objective is legitimate and important, the next step is
14 to determine whether the discriminatory means are substantially related to the important
15 governmental interest. Id. “The purpose of requiring that close relationship is to assure
16 that the validity of a classification is determined through reasoned analysis rather than

17
18 ⁹ The Court declines Defendants’ invitation to apply the less-stringent standard of review set forth
19 in Turner v. Safley, 482 U.S. 78, 89 (1987). Under Turner, “when a prison regulation impinges on inmates’
20 constitutional rights, the regulation is valid if it is reasonably related to legitimate penological interests.” Id.
21 This Court has already rejected Defendants’ argument. See, generally, ECF No. 38. The Turner standard
22 is more appropriate to claims going to prison administration, not to Plaintiff’s claims regarding prisoner
23 release. Plaintiff’s challenge does not concern “institutional operations” or the “closed environment of the
24 correctional institution.” See Turner, 482 U.S. at 89-90. Rather, the crux of his complaint is that California
25 has selectively allowed only women to leave that closed environment. This case is thus more akin to
26 Johnson v. California, where the Court stated that “[t]he right not to be discriminated against based on
27 one’s race is not susceptible to the logic of Turner. It is not a right that need necessarily be compromised
28 for the sake of proper prison administration.” 543 U.S. 499, 510 (2005). Accordingly, “[i]n the absence of
controlling caselaw, the [C]ourt is compelled to find that the right to be free of gender discrimination is a
‘right that need [not] necessarily be compromised’” here as well. Greene v. Tilton, No. 2:09-cv-00793-
JAM-JFM, 2012 WL 691704, at *8 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 2, 2012), recommendation adopted by 2012 WL
1130602 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 29, 2012) (quoting Johnson, 543 U.S. at 510). Regardless, even if the Court
were to apply the less stringent Turner standard, Defendants’ exclusion of men from the ACP would still
fail for the reasons set forth in this Memorandum and Order because the State cannot show even a “valid,
rational connection” between the exclusion of men from the ACP and its purported objectives, there
appears to be no other avenue for male inmates to obtain early release, the State does not assert that the
allocation of prison resources will be detrimentally impacted by releasing men or that guards or other
inmates will be adversely affected, and there is an obvious, easy alternative to the discriminatory option,
which is simply to let men apply to the ACP as well. See Turner, 482 U.S. at 89-91.

1 through the mechanical application of traditional, often inaccurate, assumptions about
2 the proper roles of men and women.” Id. at 725-26.

3 According to Plaintiff, he is entitled to judgment as a matter of law because he is
4 similarly situated to female inmates that are eligible for the ACP, and the program’s
5 exclusion of men serves no important governmental objective. Pl.’s Mot. for Summ. J.
6 (“Pl.’s Mot.”), ECF No. 50-1. Defendants contend, however, that the ACP survives
7 constitutional scrutiny because it: “(1) serves the legitimate governmental objective of
8 reducing recidivism for female offenders and ameliorating the disproportionate burdens
9 they face in prison, particularly by treating the lasting effects of separation from their
10 children, and trauma, abuse, and addiction; and (2) is substantially related to that
11 objective because it provides gender-responsive programming tailored to female
12 offenders’ needs.” Defs.’ Mot. at 2. Defendants’ arguments prove too much.¹⁰

13 As a threshold matter, there is no reason for the State to rely on gender as a
14 proxy for need because the ACP already provides a highly individualized process to
15 determine individual inmate qualifications. In any event, the State has not shown that
16 gender is an accurate proxy here. Indeed, this case bears no similarity to those cases in
17 which gender distinctions have been upheld. Moreover, the State has offered no
18 persuasive explanation as to how excluding male offenders from the ACP furthers any of
19 its objectives. Finally, the ACP’s gender distinction fails for fundamental policy reasons

20
21 ¹⁰ The legislative history made clear that, contrary to Defendants’ current assertions, the State’s
22 interests in passing the ACP were family reunification and community reintegration, which this Court has
23 already determined are interests not served, and indeed undermined, by excluding men from the ACP.
24 ECF No. 38 at 12-13. That analysis is incorporated by reference in its entirety here. Id. In addition, the
25 Court previously determined that the State’s contention that the important governmental objectives behind
26 the ACP were “strengthening the bond between incarcerated women and their children and addressing the
27 holistic needs of incarcerated women” was “not borne out by the record.” Id. at 12 (citing ECF No. 15
28 at 15). More specifically, the Court found these to be “post hoc” explanations that contradicted the
express intent of the Legislature. Id. The arguments Defendants currently make are remarkably similar to
those previously presented to the Court in late 2014. Despite the fact that the Court still doubts whether
Defendants’ currently articulated objectives are anything other than post hoc attempts to justify an
irrational classification, the Court will nonetheless address those interests, which are no doubt important,
here. See Weinberger v. Wiesenfeld, 420 U.S. 636, 648 n.16 (1975) (“This Court need not in equal
protection cases accept at face value assertions of legislative purposes, when an examination of the
legislative scheme and its history demonstrates that the asserted purpose could not have been a goal of
the legislation.”).

1 as well. Accordingly, the refusal to permit male inmates to apply to the ACP is not
2 substantially related to any governmental interest, and the arbitrary line the State has
3 created between male and female inmates cannot stand.

4 **1. Sex is an unnecessary proxy for need given the ACP's highly**
5 **individualized application and case management system.**

6 The Court could conclude that the ACP fails to pass constitutional muster under
7 the case of Orr v. Orr alone. 440 U.S. 268 (1979). In Orr, the Court considered “the
8 constitutionality of [state] alimony statutes which provide[d] that husbands, but not wives,
9 may be required to pay alimony upon divorce.” Id. at 270. Several objectives potentially
10 motivated the Legislature to make that distinction. For example, the statutes could have
11 been “designed for the wife of a broken marriage who need[ed] financial assistance,”
12 which raised the possibility of two legislative objectives: “One [was] a legislative purpose
13 to provide help for needy spouses, using sex as a proxy for need. The other [was] a
14 goal of compensating women for past discrimination during marriage, which assertedly
15 ha[d] left them unprepared to fend for themselves in the working world following divorce.”
16 Id. at 280. The Court reasoned, of course, that “assisting needy spouses is a legitimate
17 and important governmental objective,” as is “[r]eduction of the disparity in economic
18 condition between men and women caused by the long history of discrimination against
19 women.” Id. (quoting Califano v. Webster, 430 U.S. 313, 317 (1977)). Nonetheless, the
20 problem presented in Orr, like that confronted by the Court here, was that the
21 classification did not “substantially relate[] to achievement of those objectives.” Id.
22 (internal citations and quotations marks omitted).

23 More specifically, the alimony statutes scrutinized in Orr already contemplated
24 “individualized hearings at which the parties’ relative financial circumstances [were]
25 considered.” Id. at 281. “There [was] no reason, therefore, to use sex as a proxy for
26 need.” Id. To the contrary, “[n]eedy males could be helped along with needy females
27 with little if any additional burden on the State.” Id. “Thus, the gender-based distinction
28 [was] gratuitous; without it, the statutory scheme would only provide benefits to those

1 men who [were] in fact similarly situated to the women the statute aids,' . . . and the
2 effort to help those women would not in any way be compromised." Id. (quoting
3 Weinberger, 420 U.S. at 653).

4 Exactly the same considerations apply here. Each individual applicant's eligibility
5 for the ACP and her programming needs are determined on a case-by-case basis when
6 she seeks admission to the Program. Since Defendants already look to the merits of
7 each application to determine whether an individual may benefit from participation, there
8 is no reason that applications from both males and females could not be reviewed.
9 Accordingly, in this case as in Orr, "males could be helped along with . . . females."

10 The importance of individualized inquiries can also be garnered from another
11 analogous case, Caban v. Mohammed, 441 U.S. 380 (1979), in which the Supreme
12 Court simultaneously emphasized the importance of both maternal and paternal
13 relationships. Caban involved a challenge to a state law that distinguished between
14 unwed mothers and unwed fathers with regard to their adoption rights. Id. at 381-82.
15 The New York adoption law at issue provided that consent to the adoption of minor
16 children had to be given by the parents of children born in wedlock or the mothers of
17 children born out of wedlock. Id. at 385. That is, in most circumstances, "an unwed
18 mother ha[d] the authority to block the adoption of her child simply by withholding
19 consent," but "[t]he unwed father ha[d] no similar control over the fate of his child, even
20 when his parental relationship [was] substantial," which was the case before the Court
21 there. Id. at 386-87. Instead, an unwed father was able to "prevent the termination of
22 his parental rights only by showing that the best interests of the child would not permit
23 the child's adoption by the petitioning couple." Id. at 387.

24 The appellees contended in Caban that "the distinction [was] justified by a
25 fundamental difference between maternal and paternal relations – that a natural mother,
26 absent special circumstances, bears a closer relationship with her child . . . than a father
27 does." Id. at 388 (internal citations and quotations omitted). That rationale is markedly
28 similar to California's justifications for a female only ACP in this case—that incarcerated

1 fathers are less likely to reunify with children than incarcerated mothers. The Supreme
2 Court rejected that argument for the obvious reason that “maternal and paternal roles
3 are not invariably different in importance.” Id. at 389.

4 The Court finds Caban especially on point because the adoption scheme
5 challenged there, like the statute in Orr, also provided for individualized hearings.
6 Indeed, the Caban parties were even represented by counsel during the adoption
7 proceedings before a hearing officer. Id. at 383. The fact that the parties had access to
8 hearings to present their cases as to the merits of an adoption petition seriously
9 undermined any need the State might offer for imposing a bright-line gender distinction.
10 Here too, the fact that the ACP is designed specifically to be an individualized program
11 that by definition determines both inmate qualifications and programming needs
12 undermines the State’s decision to use gender as a proxy as well.

13
14 **2. Even if the State needed to use gender as a proxy for need, its
evidence supporting the distinction is insufficient.**

15 **a. The State impermissibly relies on overly-broad
16 generalizations regarding the differences between men
and women.**

17 In attempting to nonetheless justify its bright gender line, the State primarily relies
18 on the report and testimony of its expert, Dr. Messina, in arguing that: (1) “[A] large body
19 of research and literature shows that female offenders are a low risk to public safety with
20 complex needs that are better met in the community”; (2) “[I]ncarcerated women are
21 more likely than incarcerated men to report extensive histories of trauma, including
22 emotional, physical, and sexual abuse as children, adolescents, and adults”;
23 (3) “[F]emale offenders report a higher degree of trauma and a higher impact of that
24 trauma when compared to men”; (4) “Although a male inmate can have all these
25 problems, he is less likely to, and these problems tend to have a differential impact on
26 women”; (5) “[W]omen are more likely to be dysfunctional as a result of childhood abuse,
27 mental illness, and poverty”; (6) “Women are less likely to be employed before or after
28 incarceration, and are more likely to have primary caregiver responsibilities compared to

1 men in all states”; (7) “[R]euniting with children has been shown to reduce the risk of
2 recidivism for women, but not for men”; (8) “[T]he legislature found that women are far
3 less violent than male offenders; (9) “[W]omen’s participation in violent crime is
4 “profoundly lower” than men’s”; (10) “There is . . . a very low likelihood that men will be
5 primary caregivers of children and will reunify with their children when they leave prison”;
6 and (11) “Although family reunification is a strong predictor of success for female
7 offenders, the same is not necessarily true for men.” Defs.’ Mot. at 4-5 (internal citations
8 and quotation marks omitted) (emphasis added). Cataloguing these arguments in this
9 way makes it glaringly obvious that the State impermissibly relies solely on “likelihoods”
10 and “tendencies” to support its legislation. In this regard, the instant case is similar to
11 United States v. Virginia, 518 U.S. 515 (1996).

12 In Virginia, female applicants sued the Commonwealth and its Virginia Military
13 Institute (“VMI”) arguing that VMI’s “exclusively male admissions policy violated the
14 Equal Protection Clause.” Id. at 523. Expert witness testimony indicated, however, that
15 “coeducation would materially affect at least . . . three aspects of VMI’s program –
16 physical training, the absence of privacy, and the adversative approach.” Id. at 540
17 (internal citations and quotations omitted). The district court agreed and rejected the
18 plaintiffs’ equal protection arguments after making “findings” on “gender-based
19 developmental differences.” Id. at 541 (citations omitted).

20 The Supreme Court reversed, in part because the district court’s findings simply
21 “restate[d] the opinions of Virginia’s expert witnesses, opinions about typically male or
22 typically female ‘tendencies.’” Id. (citations omitted). For example, the district court
23 determined that “[m]ales tend to need an atmosphere of adversativeness, while
24 [f]emales tend to thrive in a cooperative atmosphere.” Id. (citation and internal
25 quotations omitted). Such “[g]eneralizations and tendencies” are subject to a hard look,
26 however, because “[s]tate actors controlling gates to opportunity . . . may not exclude
27 qualified individuals based on ‘fixed notions concerning the roles and abilities of males
28 and females.’” Id. (citations omitted). This case is no different; given the highly

1 individualized nature of the ACP, there is simply no reason to resort to generalities rather
2 than to review the facts presented by each particular scenario.

3 Moreover, whether such generalized “findings” as to male or female “tendencies”
4 are accurate does not matter. Id. at 542. Here, although most men might not qualify for
5 the ACP, a conclusion to that effect nonetheless cannot be drawn by way of sweeping
6 generalization. Significantly, while the Supreme Court assumed in Virginia that most
7 women would not choose VMI’s “adversative method,”¹¹ such a determination was
8 nevertheless not a “one size fits all business.” Id. To the contrary, it was clear in
9 Virginia that “the VMI methodology could be used to educate women.” Id. (internal
10 citations and quotation marks omitted). “[S]ome women, at least would want to attend
11 [VMI] if they had the opportunity[,] . . . [would be] capable of all of the individual activities
12 required of VMI cadets.” Id. at 550 (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). “In
13 sum, . . . neither the goal of producing citizen soldiers . . . nor VMI’s implementing
14 methodology [was] inherently unsuitable to women.” Id. at 541 (internal citations and
15 quotations omitted). Ultimately, the issue in Virginia was not “whether ‘women—or men—
16 should be forced to attend VMI’; rather, the question [was] whether the Commonwealth
17 can constitutionally deny to women who have the will and capacity, the training and
18 attendant opportunities that VMI uniquely affords.” Id. (internal citations omitted).

19 The State does not deny here that, as in Virginia, some men may qualify and
20 benefit from the ACP. See Defs.’ Mot. at 15 (“Plaintiff has argued that some male
21 inmates could benefit from many of the programs offered under the ACP. Even if true,
22 that is of no moment.”). Indeed, Plaintiff himself has provided evidence demonstrating
23 that he has a significant relationship with his children such that he and his family would
24 benefit from the opportunity to reconnect and work on their relationships sooner rather
25 than later. The Court has been provided no reason to doubt that Plaintiff will actually
26 reunify with his family or to find that Plaintiff may recidivate even despite being given the

27
28 ¹¹ Nor, as the Supreme Court pointed out, would many men. Virginia, 518 U.S. at 542.

1 opportunity to do so. Accordingly, as in Virginia, the State’s generalizations are
2 insufficient to convince this Court it can deny all those who have the “will and capacity”
3 and would otherwise qualify, “the attendant opportunities that [the ACP] uniquely
4 affords.”

5 **b. Even if the State’s empirical evidence went beyond**
6 **generalizations, it is inapplicable here because**
7 **Defendants do not address the correct inmate**
8 **populations.**

8 Even if Defendants’ statistical evidence was more persuasive, it still fails to
9 support the distinction made regarding the ACP because it focuses on inmate
10 populations as a whole, not those inmates that are ACP-eligible. Defendants compare
11 all male offenders to all female offenders. But ACP applicants stand on a different
12 footing from other inmates since they must meet the gender-neutral exclusionary criteria
13 that eliminate most of the population from consideration.¹²

14 For example, to be eligible an applicant must not have sustained a conviction for
15 a violent or serious felony, and must not have been convicted of crimes that would
16 require them to register as a sex offender. They should also have been screened to
17 determine that they do not pose a high risk of committing a violent offense. The fact that
18 the ACP application process operates to screen out violent offenders makes any reliance
19 on the violent tendencies of the general prison population nonsensical. Furthermore,
20 nothing before the Court indicates the other generalizations made about inmate
21 populations are any more applicable to the ACP-eligible subclass.

22 To the contrary, it defies logic to think that the system-wide statistics on which
23 Defendants rely have any correlation to the relatively minute subset of men who may be
24 eligible for the ACP. Defendants’ own evidence indicates that, out of the thousands of

25 ¹² The closest the State comes to correcting this error is its argument that “research shows that
26 men of the same risk profiles as ACP-eligible women are still more likely to recidivate.” Defs.’ Mot. at 5
27 (citing Messina Dep. at 85:4-6, 86:2-88:2). Not only is this statement too broad to support any concrete
28 conclusions, it actually supports permitting male offenders to apply to the ACP. If the ACP is intended to
reduce recidivism, and men are more likely to recidivate, it follows that men may be in even greater need
of ACP programming than women.

1 male inmates in the California system, only approximately 3,149 are potentially eligible
2 for the ACP. Even more striking, only about 500 of that subset would likely be admitted
3 to the Program. Defendants offer no evidence that generalizations made with regard to
4 the entire California prison population are in any way indicative of the characteristics of
5 the small fraction of inmates who may actually be accepted to the ACP. See generally
6 Craig v. Boren, 429 U.S. 190, 199-204 (1976) (“[T]his merely illustrates that proving
7 broad sociological propositions by statistics is a dubious business, and one that
8 inevitably is in tension with the normative philosophy that underlies the Equal Protection
9 Clause.”). Defendants’ overly broad empirical evidence simply has no bearing on the
10 narrow question before the Court.

11 **3. Statistical problems aside, this case is fundamentally different**
12 **from those where the Supreme Court has approved using**
13 **gender as a proxy for need.**

14 Even if the Defendants’ statistical evidence was flawless, the ACP would still fail
15 constitutional review. Indeed, Defendants have not identified any case where gender
16 was permitted to act as a surrogate for need in situations such as this. To the contrary,
17 the cases on which Defendants rely are clearly distinguishable. For example, in
18 Schlesinger v. Ballard, 419 U.S. 498 (1975), and Rostker v. Goldberg, 453 U.S. 57
19 (1981), the Court upheld statutory distinctions put in place because all females were
20 categorically precluded from some types of military service, namely serving in combat
21 roles. Those cases were much different from this one because, as a matter of law, no
22 woman was similarly situated to any man. Here, there may be many male inmates who
23 are similarly situated to female inmates, despite the fact that female inmates may
24 nonetheless be “more likely” to qualify for the ACP.

25 More specifically, in Schlesinger, the Court rejected a challenge to differing
26 mandatory discharge rules for male and female naval officers. Female officers were not
27 subject to mandatory discharge until being passed over for promotion after thirteen years
28 of service. 419 U.S. at 505-06. Male officers, on the other hand, were subject to
mandatory discharge after failing to promote twice and having served less time as a

1 commissioned officer (i.e., nine years). 419 U.S. at 499, 503. The Court upheld that
2 distinction, explaining that “the different treatment of men and women naval
3 officers . . . reflects, not archaic and overbroad generalizations, but, instead, the
4 demonstrable fact that male and female line officers in the Navy are not similarly situated
5 with respect to opportunities for professional service.” Id. at 508. “Specifically women
6 [could] not be assigned to duty in aircraft that [were] engaged in combat missions nor
7 [could] they be assigned to duty on vessels of the Navy other than hospital ships and
8 transports.” Id. (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). Accordingly,
9 opportunities to acquire service records comparable to men were more limited for
10 women. Id. Congress could therefore rationally have concluded that a longer tenure
11 period for female officers would help provide “fair and equitable career advancement
12 programs.” Id. (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). Indeed, this made even
13 more sense when “underscored by the fact that in corps where male and female
14 lieutenants [were] similarly situated, Congress ha[d] not differentiated between them with
15 respect to tenure.” Id. at 509.

16 Similarly, in Rostker, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the
17 President’s power to require only males to register under the Military Selective Services
18 Act. 453 U.S. at 59, 83. The purpose of the registration requirement was to meet the
19 need for combat troops that would characterize any future draft. Id. at 76. As in
20 Schlesinger, however, women were categorically ineligible for combat. Id. Accordingly,
21 no purpose would have been served by requiring women to register alongside men. Id.
22 at 79. Again, “[m]en and women, because of the combat restrictions on women, [were]
23 simply not similarly situated for purposes of a draft or registration for a draft.” Id. at 78.¹³

24 ¹³ The Court also emphasized that Congress enacted the Military Selective Services Act pursuant to
25 its power “To raise and support Armies,” “To provide and maintain a Navy,” and “To make Rules for the
26 Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.” Rostker, 453 U.S. at 65 (citing U.S. Const.
27 art., I, § 8, cls. 12-14). Accordingly, Rostker was not “merely a case involving the customary deference
28 accorded congressional decision.” Id. at 64. “The case [arose] in the context of Congress’ authority over
national defense and military affairs, and perhaps in no other area has the Court accorded Congress
greater deference.” Id. at 64-65. “Not only is the scope of Congress’ constitutional power in this area
broad, but the lack of competence on the part of the courts is marked.” Id. at 65. Judicial deference was
thus at its apogee. Id. at 70-72.

1 Schlesinger and Rostker stand in stark contrast to the instant case. In those
2 cases, males and females stood on entirely different footing because females as a class
3 were precluded from serving in particular roles. There was no question that men and
4 women were not similarly situated. In this case, to the contrary, male and female ACP
5 applicants that meet the gender-neutral exclusionary criteria are similarly situated. Any
6 attempt to reach a different result by comparing male applicants to some hypothetical
7 female applicant with children and special social service needs is improper. Some men
8 may not have children. Neither may some women. Some men may not have histories of
9 trauma or abuse. Neither may some women. Accordingly, these cases provide
10 Defendants little support.¹⁴

11 The cases of Michael M. v. Superior Court of Sonoma County, 450 U.S. 464
12 (1981), and Nguyen v. I.N.S., 533 U.S. 53 (2001), are also not helpful to Defendants for
13 essentially the same reason. In Michael M., the question was whether California’s
14 statutory rape law, which made only men criminally liable, was constitutional. Id. at 466.
15 “The justification for the statute . . . [was] that the legislature sought to prevent
16 illegitimate teenage pregnancies.” Id. at 470. Accordingly, because “the risk of
17 pregnancy itself constitute[d] a substantial deterrence to young females,” the Court
18 reasoned that “[a] criminal sanction imposed solely on males thus serve[d] to roughly
19 ‘equalize’ the deterrents on the sexes.” Id. at 473. The Court’s decision therefore turned
20 on the fact that only women can bear children and thus only women run the risk of
21 pregnancy as a result of intercourse. See id. at 467-471.

22 Similarly, in Nguyen, the Court considered the constitutionality of a statute that
23 pertained to the citizenship of children born outside the United States to unmarried
24 couples where one parent is an American citizen and one parent is a non-citizen. Under
25 the statute, the citizenship of the child depended on whether the mother or the father
26

27 ¹⁴ Regardless, as the Court has previously emphasized, no showing must be made as to any of this in
28 order for a female to be accepted to the ACP. See ECF No. 38 at 9-10. The Court’s prior analysis on that
point is again incorporated here by reference.

1 was the United States citizen. 533 U.S. at 56-57. The Court found the distinction in
2 treatment was justified by two important governmental objectives: (1) “the importance of
3 assuring that a biological parent-child relationship exists”; and (2) “the determination to
4 ensure that the child and the citizen parent have some demonstrated opportunity or
5 potential to develop not just a relationship that is recognized, as a formal matter, by the
6 law, but one that consists of the real, everyday ties that provide a connection between
7 child and citizen parent and, in turn, the United States.” Id. at 62, 64-65.

8 As to the first interest, the difference in treatment was justified because the
9 biological relationship could be verified as to a mother by the event of birth itself since
10 the mother’s status “is documented in most instances by the birth certificate or hospital
11 records and the witnesses who attest to her having given birth.” Id. at 62. Verification of
12 the paternal relationship, on the other hand, required additional substantiation. Id. at
13 62-63.

14 The second justification also turned on child-bearing ability:

15 In the case of a citizen mother and a child born overseas, the
16 opportunity for a meaningful relationship between citizen
17 parent and child inheres in the very event of birth, an event
18 so often critical to our constitutional and statutory
19 understandings of citizenship. The mother knows that the
20 child is in being and is hers and has an initial point of contact
21 with him. There is at least an opportunity for mother and child
22 to develop a real, meaningful relationship.

23 The same opportunity does not result from the event of birth,
24 as a matter of biological inevitability, in the case of the unwed
25 father.

26 Id. at 65.

27 Accordingly, as with Schlesinger and Rostker, where all women were subject to
28 service limitations, Michael M. and Nguyen both turned on the fact that only women are
capable of bearing children. No male and female is similarly situated in that regard,
rendering the connection between the challenged statutes and the governmental
interests much closer. In this case, where female offenders are simply “more likely” to

///

1 qualify for or benefit from the ACP, the fit is insubstantial and falls far short of being
2 “exceedingly persuasive.”

3 Finally, Defendants’ reliance on Kahn v. Shevin, 416 U.S. 351 (1974), and
4 Califano v. Webster, 430 U.S. 313 (1977), is also misplaced. In Kahn, the Court upheld
5 a state law providing widows, but not widowers, with a \$500 tax exemption. 416 U.S. at
6 352. According to the Court, “[t]here can be no dispute that the financial difficulties
7 confronting the lone woman . . . exceed those facing the man.” Id. at 353. “Whether
8 from overt discrimination or from the socialization process of a male-dominated culture,
9 the job market is inhospitable to the woman seeking any but the lowest paid jobs.” Id.
10 When Kahn was decided, the median income for female workers was significantly lower
11 and “[w]hile the widower [could] usually continue in the occupation which preceded his
12 spouse’s death, in many cases the widow [would] find herself suddenly forced into a job
13 market with which she is unfamiliar, and in which, because of her former economic
14 dependency, she [would] have fewer skills to offer.” Id. at 354. The Court thus
15 concluded that “[t]here can be no doubt, therefore, that [the State’s] differing treatment of
16 widows and widowers ‘rest[ed] upon some ground of difference having a fair and
17 substantial relation to the object of the legislation.’” Id. at 355 (quoting Reed v. Reed,
18 404 U.S. 71, 76 (1971)).

19 Webster dealt with a similar challenge to a Social Security Act provision that
20 “result[ed] in a slightly higher ‘average monthly wage’ and a correspondingly higher level
21 of monthly old-age benefits for the retired female wage earner.” 430 U.S. at 316. The
22 Court explained: “Reduction of the disparity in economic condition between men and
23 women caused by the long history of discrimination against women has been recognized
24 as . . . an important governmental objective.” Id. at 317. That statute “operated directly
25 to compensate women for past economic discrimination.” Id. at 318. Accordingly,
26 “allowing women, who . . . have been unfairly hindered from earning as much as men, to
27 eliminate additional low-earning years from the calculation of their retirement benefits
28 work[ed] directly to remedy some part of the effect of past discrimination.” Id.

1 Kahn and Webster differ from the instant matter because in those cases the
2 Supreme Court recognized the historically arduous journey women had undergone to
3 gain traction as breadwinners in the workforce.¹⁵ This struggle to break into the
4 workplace likely affected all women, even if some did successfully enter the work force
5 and were able to advance. There was also no evidence in either case that any men had
6 suffered the same sort of discrimination as women. Accordingly, Kahn and Webster are
7 much more on par with the cases regarding service limitations and biological differences
8 than the instant case, where even the State appears to concede that some men could
9 benefit from the ACP.¹⁶

10 **4. Excluding men from the ACP is not substantially related to the**
11 **State's interests.**

12 On a fundamental basis, the most troubling aspect of the State's arguments is
13 that, even if the ACP is a superior method of approaching recidivism and social issues
14 for some women, and even though the State has offered ample justification for providing
15 the program to female offenders, the State still has not offered any rational explanation
16 for excluding men. For the State's action to survive equal protection review, there must
17 be some direct or indirect justification for excluding a particular class. None have been
18 shown here.

19 ///

20 ¹⁵ Kahn was also different from this case because it involved taxation. 416 U.S. at 352. The Court
21 itself has "long held that where taxation is concerned and no specific federal right, apart from equal
22 protection, is imperilled, the States have large leeway in making classifications and drawing lines which in
their judgment produce reasonable systems of taxation." Id. (citations and internal quotation marks
omitted).

23 ¹⁶ The Court notes that all of these latter cases are also distinguishable from Plaintiff's because
24 individualized hearings would not have been helpful. For example, in Schlesinger or Rostker, where all
25 women were precluded from serving in combat positions, the result of any hearing would have been to
26 reach the same conclusion: women were at a disadvantage. The same follows with regard to Michael M.
27 and Nguyen, where the legislation distinguished between men and women based on their ability to bear
28 children. Again, there can be only one result since men cannot give birth. Kahn and Webster present a
closer question because there could conceivably be some women who were not detrimentally affected by
the systemic workplace hostility identified by the Supreme Court. However, this Court can conceive of no
workable tax or social security scheme that would require each individual female applicant to prove
discrimination. Accordingly, gender was an appropriate proxy for need in part because an individualized
inquiry would either have been superfluous or unworkable.

1 First, nothing before the Court indicates that permitting men to apply to the ACP
2 will have any direct impact on female applicants. The State has not argued, for example,
3 that there is limited availability within the program such that admitting men will displace
4 women. See, e.g., Clark By & Through Clark v. Ariz. Interscholastic Ass'n, 886 F.2d
5 1191 (9th Cir. 1989) (goal of increasing athletic opportunities for women would be
6 undermined if males were permitted to displace females on female interscholastic
7 athletics teams). Certainly, Defendants have not shown that permitting men to apply to
8 the ACP will directly affect female applicants at all.

9 Nor have Defendants shown any indirect way that female offenders will be
10 impacted by admission of male offenders to the ACP. This type of showing is typically
11 made in cases where the government has legislated in an attempt to ameliorate the
12 effects of past discrimination or lack of equal opportunities. See, e.g., Schlesinger,
13 419 U.S. 498; Rostker, 453 U.S. 57; Kahn, 416 U.S. 351; Webster, 430 U.S. 313. In
14 every case where a gender distinction has been upheld, not only was there some reason
15 to treat one gender more favorably, but there was also a related reason to treat the other
16 gender unfavorably. Stated another way, the statutes were put in place because one
17 gender had historically enjoyed an advantage at the expense of the other such that there
18 was a valid compensatory justification for leveling the playing field. See Hogan,
19 458 U.S. at 730 (finding a “policy . . . invalid . . . because . . . the State ha[d] made no
20 showing that the gender-based classification [was] substantially and directly related to its
21 proposed compensatory objective.”). Given that compensatory objective, a gender-
22 neutral statute would have eviscerated the government’s objectives.

23 For example, in Schlesinger, female naval officers were subject to more lenient
24 mandatory discharge provisions to compensate them for the fact that male officers had
25 more advancement opportunities. 419 U.S. 508. The differential treatment was
26 intended to provide “fair and equitable career advancement programs.” Id. (citations
27 omitted). The very purpose of the scheme was to level the playing field for male and

28 ///

1 female officers, and permitting males to utilize the more preferential mandatory
2 discharge provisions as well would have undermined the distinction completely.

3 Similarly, in Kahn and Webster, the purpose of the tax and social security
4 preferences for females was to compensate them for disadvantages they had suffered
5 as a result of systemic hostility to women in the workplace. 416 U.S. at 353-55; 430 U.S.
6 at 318-20. Again, the legislative intent was to compensate females for the fact that
7 males historically had more career opportunities and higher wages than women. The
8 goal was to take steps to level the playing field, and permitting males to benefit from the
9 same preferences would have mooted that legislative objective.

10 This case is different because no showing has been made either that female
11 offenders have suffered some sort of systemic disadvantage with regard to timely
12 release or that male offenders somehow benefitted at their expense. In this regard, the
13 instant case is more like Hogan than the above cases on which Defendants rely. In
14 Hogan, the Court recognized that “[i]n limited circumstances, a gender-based
15 classification favoring one sex can be justified if it intentionally and directly assists
16 members of the sex that is disproportionately burdened.” 458 U.S. at 728 (citations
17 omitted). However, “a State can evoke a compensatory purpose to justify an otherwise
18 discriminatory classification only if members of the gender benefited by the classification
19 actually suffer a disadvantage related to the classification.” Id. In that case, male
20 applicants denied admission to a female-only nursing school were granted relief
21 because the State made no showing that “women lacked opportunities to obtain training
22 in the field of nursing or to attain positions of leadership in that field.” Id. at 729.
23 Accordingly, “although the State recited a ‘benign, compensatory purpose,’ it failed to
24 establish that the alleged objective is the actual purpose underlying the discriminatory
25 classification.” Id. at 730. The “policy [was] invalid . . . because . . . the State ha[d]
26 made no showing that the gender-based classification [was] substantially and directly
27 related to its proposed compensatory objective.” Id.

28 ///

1 Hogan is directly on point. Here, there has been no showing that male offenders
2 have previously been given opportunities for release or programming that female
3 offenders have not, such that some sort of compensatory system is needed to level the
4 playing field.¹⁷ Moreover, there has been no showing made that to “compensate” female
5 offenders, males must be excluded from the ACP. In the present case, on the other
6 hand, female offenders will fully reap the benefits of the ACP even if male inmates are
7 also permitted to apply. As in Hogan, where permitting men to attend classes had no
8 impact on the female students’ educational experience, here there is also no indication
9 in the record that female offenders will be at all affected by the presence of male inmates
10 in the ACP. In Hogan, the State was unable to show that permitting men to attend the
11 school would interfere with the State’s goal. Id. at 731. Similarly, here the State has
12 articulated no reason why permitting men to apply to the ACP will prevent the State from
13 continuing to address the programming needs and recidivism issues of female inmates.

14 Moreover, not only has the State failed to provide a sufficient justification for
15 excluding men, but the “use of a gender classification actually produces perverse results
16 in this case.” Orr, 440 U.S. at 282. In Orr, where husbands but not wives were required
17 to pay alimony, “[the state] statutes [gave] an advantage only to the financially secure
18 wife whose husband [was] in need.” Id. This is because, “[a]lthough such a wife might
19 have to pay alimony under a gender-neutral statute, the present statutes exempt[ed] her
20 from that obligation.” Id. “Thus, [t]he [wives] who benefitt[ed] from the disparate
21 treatment [were] those who were . . . nondependent on their husbands.” Id. (internal
22 citations omitted). “They are precisely those who are not needy spouses and who are
23 least likely to have been victims of . . . discrimination by the institution of marriage.” Id.
24 (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). “A gender-based classification which,

25
26 ¹⁷ The closest Defendants come to raising a successful argument on this theory is that “[t]he ACP
27 directly targets low-risk female inmates and is therefore substantially related to California legislature’s
28 intent to lessen the over-classification of women.” Defs.’ Mot. at 12. Defendants do not explain, however,
how releasing women ameliorates the over-classification problem or how excluding men furthers that
objective.

1 as compared to a gender-neutral one, generates additional benefits only for those it has
2 no reason to prefer cannot survive equal protection scrutiny.” Id. at 282-83.

3 Here, assuming the Legislature intended the ACP to ameliorate the undue
4 burdens female inmates have suffered from disproportionate histories of trauma and
5 parenting responsibilities, its disparate treatment of male and female offenders benefits
6 only “those it has no reason to prefer.” Because female applicants need not make any
7 showing that they are in fact caregivers or that they have suffered from any kind of
8 trauma, the individuals who unfairly benefit are the women who are not mothers or
9 caregivers and who have no history of any trauma or abuse.¹⁸ Accordingly, those
10 women, who may have little use for services, may still apply even though a male
11 offender who may be a caregiver or be able to demonstrate a great need of social
12 services cannot.

13 The disparate impact of the ACP’s gender distinction does not end there. Caban
14 serves to further demonstrate how far-reaching the harms from drawing such an arbitrary
15 line can be. In Caban, even if children of an unwed father had a substantial relationship
16 with him, they could be adopted by another man without their father’s consent. 441 U.S.
17 385-87. In short, children could have the only father they had known taken from them
18 over their objection and his.

19 The results here are just as harsh. Based solely on gender distinctions, children
20 of incarcerated mothers may have their mothers returned to them sooner. Children of
21 male offenders, and the mothers and step-mothers Defendants contend are caring for
22 these children while their fathers are incarcerated, must wait.¹⁹ Children of these men

23 ¹⁸ It is irrelevant whether a particular female offender fitting this classification has been specifically
24 identified. As indicated above, we know from the legislative history and from Defendants’ own evidence
25 that not all female inmates are mothers, and it appears not all inmates have suffered the trauma and
26 abuse Defendants contend warrant a sex-based distinction here. It is thus reasonable to infer from the
27 record that some women would be permitted to apply to the ACP despite having little need for services.

28 ¹⁹ The Court pauses to note that Defendants’ arguments seem to ignore the impact of same-sex
relationships on their statistics. All of the Defendants’ data seems to make gender distinctions based on
presumed heterosexual parenting relationships. Nothing in the record indicates, however, the number of
California’s inmates that may be in same-sex relationships such that, for example, a female inmate, like a
male inmate, may have left her children with a female partner or a male inmate may have left his children

1 must go two more years without a real chance to repair the parent-child relationship.
2 The children's caretakers, already shouldering the burden of raising children on their
3 own, must wait two additional years before their partner can reintegrate into their
4 children's lives and provide these caretakers with support.

5 The State offers no sufficient justification for its gender-based differential
6 treatment of children and their caretakers. Indeed, nothing before the Court is so
7 compelling that it can justify keeping fathers but not mothers from their children. To the
8 contrary, the legislative history makes clear that the well-being of children of inmates
9 was a primary concern.²⁰ Given the legislative findings, it seems incredibly counter-
10 productive to permit reunification for the children of female offenders and to ignore the
11 same needs of children of male offenders. Additionally, there is no reason that the Court
12 can see to shoulder the caretakers of the children of male prisoners with a greater
13 burden than is put on the caretakers caring for the children of female inmates.²¹

14 **5. The State's gender line also fails for fundamental policy**
15 **reasons.**

16 Finally, from this Court's perspective, the ACP's gender distinction and the State's
17 defense of that line seriously undermines some of the most basic precepts of our
18 criminal system; namely, that each defendant, regardless of gender, is a unique
19 individual responsible for his or her own actions. Treating inmates as homogenous

20 with a male partner. This distinction makes no difference to the Court for present purposes, but it does
21 seem to undermine the State's presumptions regarding how often fathers are not present such that female
22 offenders have to leave their children with some non-parental family member. To the contrary, it is entirely
23 possible that some female inmates may have left their children with another mother or step-mother, and
24 some men may have left children with a father or step-father.

25 ²⁰ See SB 1266 § 1(g) ("Separating parents from children has a substantial impact on their futures.
26 Children of inmates are much more likely than their peers to become incarcerated . . . Research also
27 demonstrates that a father's involvement in his child's life greatly improves the child's chances for
28 success. Helping incarcerated fathers foster stronger connections with their children, where appropriate,
can have positive effects for children. Strong family connections help to ensure that fathers stay out of
prison once they are released.")

²¹ Indeed, this seems to perpetuate the myth that fathers are incompetent and incapable of caring
for children without mothers, while saddling mothers with greater burdens than they necessarily need
carry. The Court is loath to go down this path.

1 based solely on their gender invidiously contributes to the misconception that inmates
2 lack intrinsic worth as individual human beings.

3 This Court is no stranger to criminal proceedings, having presided over both state
4 and federal criminal cases for nearly twenty years and managing a heavy criminal
5 caseload to this day. Every offender has his or her own story and is treated as an
6 individual based on his or her background and circumstances, his or her infractions, his
7 or her attitude and acceptance of responsibility, and his or her choices. This Court has
8 sentenced female offenders who stand in stark contrast to those described by
9 Defendants: women who were highly educated and professional, with no histories of
10 abuse, but who simply made poor decisions. So too, the Court has sentenced men who,
11 by all accounts, were doting and involved fathers, men who had been subjected to
12 horrendous abuse, and men who, with help, will likely never set foot in a criminal
13 courtroom again. It goes without saying that this Court would be breaching its sworn
14 duty to uphold the Constitution if it determined, without regard to any of those factors,
15 that its sentences for male offenders should be two years longer than the sentences it
16 would normally impose as for females.

17 More fundamentally, though, adopting Defendants' argument, would stigmatize,
18 although in different ways, every criminal defendant that appears before the Court. The
19 Court would have to treat female defendants as a class as victims, at least partly
20 powerless over their situations, patronizing them with more lenient sentences intended to
21 compensate them for their perceived inferiority with respect to their ability to overcome
22 their particular circumstances. It would have to categorically view male defendants as
23 dangerous and aggressive, with no real regard for their families, punishing them for their
24 perceived inferiority with respect to the potential for rehabilitation and family reunification.
25 In competing ways, members of each gender would be cast as innately inferior to the
26 other. Certainly there is no place for this type of stereotyping in criminal sentencings,
27 and the Court sees no principled reason why the State should be allowed to employ

28 ///

1 these stereotypes when evaluating offenders for release. The State cannot use gender
2 as a basis to grant or deny its citizens their freedom.

3 **B. The provision excluding men from applying to the ACP must be**
4 **stricken.**

5 Having determined the ACP's gender distinction is unconstitutional, the Court
6 must now determine the appropriate remedy. Defendants argue that "[i]f this Court
7 determines the ACP, as presently implemented, is unconstitutional, the Court cannot
8 simply remove the term 'female' from the statute." Defs.' Mot. at 16. According to
9 Defendants, such action would be contrary to the legislative intent because the
10 Legislature never meant to create an alternative custody program for all men. See id. In
11 addition, Defendants contend that even though the statute includes a severability clause,
12 the legislature did not consider that clause when it amended the statute to apply only to
13 female offenders and thus did not intend that the severability clause would apply to the
14 amended statute. Id. at 16-17 (citing Cal. Penal Code § 1170.05 ("If a phrase, clause,
15 sentence, or provision of this section or application thereof to a person or circumstance
16 is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect any other phrase, clause, sentence, or
17 provision or application of this section, which can be given effect without the invalid
18 phrase, clause, sentence, or provision or application and to this end the provisions of
19 this section are declared to be severable.")). Defendants' arguments are not well taken.

20 In equal protection cases, the Court has two choices: "[I]t may either declare [the
21 statute] a nullity and order that its benefits not extend to the class that the legislature
22 intended to benefit, or it may extend the coverage of the statute to include those who are
23 aggrieved by the exclusion." Welsh v. United States, 398 U.S. 333, 361 (1970) (Harlan,
24 J., concurring in the result). "Although the choice between extension and nullification is
25 within the constitutional competence of a federal district court, and ordinarily extension,
26 rather than nullification, is the proper course, the court should not, of course, use its
27 remedial powers to circumvent the intent of the Legislature and should therefore
28 measure the intensity of commitment to the residual policy and consider the degree of

1 potential disruption of the statutory scheme that would occur by extension as opposed to
2 abrogation.” Heckler v. Mathews, 465 U.S. 728, 739 n.5 (1984) (internal citations and
3 quotation marks omitted).

4 Expansion of the ACP is consistent with Senate Bill No. 1266’s findings that
5 support the reunification of fathers with children and of parenting and family reunification
6 more generally. See, e.g., § 1(g)-(h). This remedy is also consistent with section
7 1170.05’s severability clause, requiring that a severed, invalid provision “shall not affect”
8 application of the rest of the statute. See Cal. Penal Code § 1170.05(p). The Court has
9 no doubt that the California Legislature anticipated this decision, especially since it
10 chose to leave the statutory severance provision intact. Even more importantly,
11 however, is the fact that nullifying the ACP in its entirety would disrupt the reunification
12 process by removing all current female ACP participants from their families and
13 communities and returning them to prison. See Califano v. Westcott, 443 U.S. 76, 90
14 (1979) (finding that where district court chose extension of welfare benefits to previously
15 excluded class, “equitable considerations surely support its choice” given that “an
16 injunction suspending the program’s operation would impose hardship on beneficiaries
17 whom Congress plainly meant to protect”); Wauchope v. Dept. of State, 985 F.2d 1407,
18 1417 (9th Cir. 1993) (“No one has suggested here that [the defect] be remedied by
19 invalidating the statute, thereby stripping citizenship from the foreign-born offspring of
20 male citizens”). The appropriate solution here is to open the ACP to qualifying male
21 inmates rather than nullify its provisions altogether.

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **CONCLUSION**

2
3 California's decision to open an alternative custody program to female inmates
4 only and to permit them to apply for release up to two years prior to their earliest
5 possible release date violates the Equal Protection Clause of Fourteenth Amendment to
6 the United States Constitution. Accordingly, for all of the reasons stated above,
7 Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 51) is DENIED, and Plaintiff's
8 Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 50) is GRANTED. The Motions to Strike filed
9 by both sides (ECF Nos. 56, 60) are DENIED as well.

10 Defendants are hereby enjoined and prohibited from applying and/or enforcing
11 the female-only provisions of California Penal Code § 1170.05(a) and (c) in the
12 implementation and administration of the ACP. CDCR shall immediately cease denying
13 admission to the ACP on the basis that an applicant is male. Male prisoners shall be
14 accepted into the ACP if they are otherwise eligible under Penal Code section 1170.05
15 and the implementing regulations. Within thirty (30) calendar days of the electronic filing
16 of this Order, CDCR shall modify its website and any application forms, regulations, and
17 materials provided to prisoners and the public about the ACP to remove any reference to
18 the requirement that a prisoner must be female to apply or participate. This Order shall
19 apply to Defendants, their agents, employees, successors in office, and all persons with
20 knowledge of it. No person who has notice of this injunction shall fail to comply with it,
21 nor shall any person subvert the injunction by any sham, indirection, or other artifice.
22 The Court retains jurisdiction to enforce the terms of this injunction.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: September 8, 2015

25
26 
27 _____
28 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR., CHIEF JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT