

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
AND THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

No. CIV S-90-0520 LKK JFM P (E.D. Cal.)

v.

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER,
et al.,

Defendants.

MARCIANO PLATA, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

No. C 01-1351 TEH (N.D. Cal.)

v.

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER,
et al.,

Defendants.

CARLOS PEREZ, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

No. C 05-5241 JSW (N.D. Cal.)

v.

MATTHEW CATE, et al.,

Defendants.

1 JOHN ARMSTRONG, et al.,

2 Plaintiffs,

No. C 94-2307 CW (N.D. Cal.)

3 v.

4 ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER,
5 et al.,

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

6 Defendants.
7 _____/

8 The Receiver in Plata, the Special Master in Coleman, and the Court Representatives in
9 Perez and Armstrong have presented to the judges in the above-captioned cases an agreement
10 that they have reached during the coordination meetings that they have held to date. The
11 agreement, which is attached to this order, is presented to the undersigned for review and
12 approval.

13 Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties in the above-
14 captioned cases are granted until January 30, 2009, to show cause why the attached agreement
15 should not be adopted as an order of the court. Any response to this order to show cause shall be
16 filed in each of the above-captioned cases and served on all of the parties to all of the cases and
17 on the Receiver, the Special Master, and the Court Representatives. Thereafter, the request for
18 approval of the agreement will be taken under submission for individual and joint consideration
19 by the undersigned.

20
21 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

22
23 Dated: 01/15/09



24 LAWRENCE K. KARLTON
25 SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

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

Dated: 01/15/09




THELTON E. HENDERSON
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Dated: 01/15/09



JEFFREY S. WHITE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Dated: 01/15/09



CLAUDIA WILKEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1 Transcription and Dictation Coordination Agreement

2 Transcription and Dictation process is defined as the management of the staff who
3 perform the tasks of transcribing and correcting medical dictation including, but not limited to,
4 management and creation of positions, hiring of staff, and procurement and management of
5 everything required to effectively operate a centralized transcription and dictation office,
6 including transcription and dictation equipment and technologies.

7 The Office of the Receiver needs to work in coordination with the California Department
8 of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) and the Division of Correctional Health Care Services
9 (DCHCS), which is responsible for the mental health, dental, and the Americans with
10 Disabilities Act remedial infrastructure, to achieve the respective visions, missions, and goals of
11 the *Armstrong, Coleman, Perez, and Plata* class actions. Based upon previously approved
12 coordination agreements, the Receiver is responsible for Information Technology, Telemedicine,
13 Construction (including new health care facility construction and upgrade construction), Space
14 Coordination, the Pilot Program for Chief Executive Officer, CIM-GACH, Contracts,
15 Credentialing, Hiring, and Pharmacy. A coordinated transcription and dictation agreement would
16 ensure that required transcription and dictation services will be available to support the execution
17 of these agreements.

18 Currently, the transcription and dictation process is managed separately by the Receiver
19 or by DCHCS, depending on which program area the established positions serve. Management
20 and handling of this process by a single unit would be more practical and efficient. The Court
21 representatives in the *Armstrong, Coleman, Perez, and Plata* class actions propose that the
22 Receiver assume responsibility, in coordination with DCHCS and subject to the oversight of the
23 Court representatives in *Armstrong, Coleman, Perez, and Plata* cases, for all statewide
24 operations of transcription and dictation for medical, mental health, and dental programs. Placing
25 this responsibility and the resources, including all filled and vacant positions for transcription
26 and dictation, under a single unit would support the Receiver's objectives and the requirements
of the mental health and dental programs in a cost efficient manner.