

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DELPHINE ALLEN, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,
Defendants.

MASTER CASE FILE
NO. C00-4599 TEH

ORDER REQUIRING UPDATED
LISTS OF PERSONS
RESPONSIBLE

Beginning in August 2010, Defendants were obligated to file and keep current a list of persons responsible for various tasks. The Court eliminated that requirement following the appointment of the Compliance Director, whose monthly reports included such information. However, the Court has now changed the reporting requirements of the Compliance Director, and his reports no longer detail persons responsible for each task.

Accordingly, with good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants shall resume filing updated lists of persons responsible with the Court. Defendants must designate individuals responsible for all tasks in the Negotiated Settlement Agreement, as well as the four areas identified in paragraph C.2 of the Court’s December 12, 2012 Order.¹ Defendants’ filings shall include any updates to changes in the line of authority above the Chief of Police, as such individuals may also be held ultimately responsible for any of Defendants’ shortcomings. Updated lists of persons responsible shall be filed within seven days of any changes.

As the Court has repeatedly stated, filing a list of persons responsible will encourage Defendants’ own sense of accountability, which is critical to the success of sustainable

¹The Court’s prior orders only required Defendants to identify persons responsible for tasks under active monitoring. However, the Monitor also periodically assesses compliance with inactive tasks to ensure sustainability, and it is therefore important for Defendants to designate a responsible person or persons for all tasks in the NSA.


1 reforms. The Court hopes that this case continues on an upward trajectory, but having a list
2 of persons responsible will also allow the Court, if it becomes necessary, to enter an order to
3 show cause against appropriate individuals as to why sanctions, including a possible finding
4 of contempt, should not issue.²

5

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7

8 Dated: 05/29/14



THELTON E. HENDERSON, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

²In addition to holding designated leaders responsible, the Court may also issue an order to show cause against any individual officer or employee who is suspected of interfering with or undermining this Court's orders. *See* May 18, 2011 Second Order re: Accountability (noting that "all parties and the [Oakland Police Officers' Association] now acknowledge that this Court has the legal authority to enter sanctions against any member or employee of the Oakland Police Department who interferes with compliance efforts in this case").