

1 \*\*E-Filed 12/10/2010\*\*

2

3 DESIGNATED FOR PUBLICATION

4

5

6

7

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

9 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**

11

12 Michael Angelo MORALES  
and Albert Greenwood Brown,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 v.

15 Matthew CATE, Secretary of the California  
16 Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation,  
et al.,

17 Defendants.

Case Number 5-6-cv-219-JF-HRL  
Case Number 5-6-cv-926-JF-HRL

DEATH-PENALTY CASE

ORDER RE PARTIAL MOTION TO  
DISMISS

[Doc. No. 430]

18

19 Plaintiffs are condemned prisoners whom Defendants seek to execute pursuant to

20 California's operative lethal-injection protocol, California Code of Regulations, title 15, sections

21 3349 et seq. (2010), which took effect on August 29, 2010. (See Doc. No. 432-1.) On December

22 15, 2006, this Court found that an earlier version of the protocol, then officially designated as

23 San Quentin Operational Procedure No. 0-770, or OP 770, as actually applied in practice violated

24 the Eighth Amendment's prohibition against "cruel and unusual punishments," U.S. Const.

25 amend. VIII. *Morales v. Tilton (Morales 290)*, 465 F. Supp. 2d 972 (N.D. Cal. 2006). The

26 principal issue in the current proceedings is whether the new protocol is constitutional.

27 Like its several predecessors, the new protocol provides for "the injection of three drugs

28 into a person being executed: sodium thiopental, a barbiturate sedative, to induce

1 unconsciousness; pancuronium bromide, a neuromuscular blocking agent, to induce paralysis;  
2 and potassium chloride, to induce cardiac arrest.” *Id.* at 975; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15,  
3 §3349.4.5(g). Defendants have stipulated throughout these proceedings that “injection of the  
4 second and third drugs . . . without adequate anesthesia will cause an unconstitutional level of  
5 pain,” *Morales v. Cate* (*Morales 424*), No. 5-6-cv-219-JF-HRL, 2010 WL 3835655, at \*3 (N.D.  
6 Cal. Sept. 28, 2010); thus, the ultimate merit of Plaintiffs’ case turns, as it has from the outset, on  
7 a factual determination as to the degree of risk that a condemned inmate will not be or remain  
8 sufficiently anesthetized by the first drug when the second and third drugs are administered.

9 Pursuant to Court order, Plaintiffs recently have amended their complaint to “set[] forth  
10 their claims with respect to California’s new lethal-injection regulations.” (Doc. No. 425 at 1.)  
11 In response, and as permitted by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), Defendants now move  
12 to dismiss portions of Plaintiffs’ amended pleading, (Doc. No. 428), for failure to state a claim  
13 upon which relief can be granted:

14 (1) Plaintiffs’ facial challenge to the State of California’s written  
15 regulations governing the administration of the death penalty by  
16 use of lethal injection; and (2) Plaintiffs’ attempt to allege a claim  
17 that, under the standard for adopting an alternative execution  
18 protocol set forth in *Baze v. Rees*, 553 U.S. 35, 61 (2008), there  
19 exists a known and available alternative to California’s regulations  
20 as written which, in comparison to California’s regulations,  
21 significantly reduces a substantial risk of severe pain.<sup>1</sup>

22 (Doc. No. 430 at 7.) The Court has read the moving and responding briefs and has considered  
23 the oral arguments of counsel presented on December 2, 2010. For the reasons set forth herein,  
24 the partial motion to dismiss will be denied. At the same time, the Court will exercise its  
25 supervisory powers to limit the scope of the instant proceedings—and particularly the scope of  
26 discovery—so that the merits of Plaintiffs’ claims may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.<sup>2</sup>

---

27 <sup>1</sup> Defendants do not seek dismissal to the extent that Plaintiffs assert an as-applied challenge to  
28 the new protocol.

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiffs’ complaint contains only a single count of an alleged violation of the Constitution.  
(Doc. No. 428 at 49–56.) Although the instant motion parses this count into three separate claims, the  
Supreme Court recently has observed that “the distinction between facial and as-applied challenges is not  
so well defined . . . that it must always control the pleadings and disposition in every case involving a

1 I

2 A

3 As the Court has noted repeatedly throughout the instant litigation, neither the  
4 constitutionality of the death penalty, nor the constitutionality of lethal injection *per se* as a  
5 method of execution, is at issue in the present action. The action does not present the question of  
6 “whether the death penalty makes sense morally or as a matter of policy,” *Morales* 290 at 973, or  
7 of whether Plaintiffs’ convictions and death sentences are just and appropriate, *see, e.g., id.* at  
8 974. Both Plaintiffs have been convicted of and sentenced to death for truly heinous crimes.  
9 Their convictions and sentences have been affirmed on appeal and have survived literally  
10 decades of both state and federal collateral review. *Morales v. Woodford*, 388 F.3d 1159 (9th  
11 Cir. 2004); *Brown v. Ornoski*, 503 F.3d 1006 (9th Cir. 2007). The present action involves only  
12 the means by which Plaintiffs will be executed.

13 B

14 It also must be emphasized at the outset that the specific issue raised by a motion to  
15 dismiss is *not* whether a claim ultimately has merit. Rather, the only determination that the Court  
16 is permitted to make at this point is procedural: whether Defendants have shown beyond doubt  
17 that the Court could not grant any relief no matter what Plaintiffs are able to prove. *See Conley*  
18 *v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45–46 (1957); *Wool v. Tandem Computers, Inc.*, 818 F.2d 1433, 1439  
19 (9th Cir. 1987); *Rodriguez v. Cal. Hwy. Patrol*, 89 F. Supp. 2d 1131, 1134–35 (N.D. Cal. 2000).  
20 The Court may dismiss a claim for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted for

21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 constitutional challenge.” Although in some ways “[t]he distinction is both instructive and necessary,”  
23 this is because “it goes to the breadth of the remedy employed by the Court, not what must be pleaded in  
24 a complaint.” *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm’n*, 130 S. Ct. 876, 893 (2010). Even if the Court  
25 were to dismiss Plaintiffs’ facial challenge, “that would not prevent the Court from . . . addressing the  
26 facial validity,” *id.* at 892, of the lethal-injection protocol. Accordingly, the dismissal of a facial  
27 challenge while retaining an as-applied challenge would be a meaningless exercise. Similarly, as  
28 explained below, Plaintiffs’ argument regarding the availability of alternative lethal-injection procedures  
is not properly characterized as a separate claim. “Rather, it is—at most—a new argument to support  
what has been a consistent claim,” *id.* at 893 (internal quotation marks and brackets omitted), to wit, that  
California’s lethal-injection protocol violates Plaintiffs’ right “to be free from cruel and unusual  
punishment and to be free from arbitrary and capricious procedures,” (Doc. No. 428 at 49; *see id.* at 51,  
53).

1 only two reasons: (1) lack of a cognizable legal theory; or (2) failure to allege sufficient facts  
2 under a cognizable legal theory. *See Robertson v. Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc.*, 749 F.2d 530,  
3 533–34 (9th Cir. 1984). Moreover, even if the Court were to grant the instant motion, Plaintiffs’  
4 claim that the new regulations are unconstitutional as applied, the sufficiency of which is not  
5 challenged by Defendants, would proceed.

6 For present purposes, the Court is required to assume, without deciding, the truth of all of  
7 the factual allegations in Plaintiffs’ complaint, and to construe those allegations in the light most  
8 favorable to Plaintiffs. *See Jenkins v. McKeithen*, 395 U.S. 411, 421 (1969); *Sun Sav. & Loan*  
9 *Ass’n v. Dierdorff*, 825 F.2d 187, 191 (9th Cir. 1987). In particular, “[c]ivil rights complaints are  
10 to be liberally construed,” and need only comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a),  
11 *Buckey v. Cnty. of Los Angeles*, 968 F.2d 791, 794 (9th Cir. 1992), which provides that a  
12 complaint “must contain . . . a short and plain statement of the claim showing the pleader is  
13 entitled to relief,” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). “To survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must  
14 contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its  
15 face.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009) (internal quotation marks omitted)  
16 (construing Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)); *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 556, 570 (2007)  
17 (same). The Court need not accept as true conclusory allegations, unreasonable inferences, legal  
18 characterizations, or unwarranted deductions of fact contained in a complaint. *Clegg v. Cult*  
19 *Awareness Network*, 18 F.3d 752, 754–55 (9th Cir. 1994).

20 In light of this standard, motions to dismiss are viewed with disfavor and rarely are  
21 granted. *See Gilligan v. Jamco Dev. Corp.*, 108 F.3d 246, 249 (9th Cir. 1997). Moreover, when  
22 a claim is dismissed, leave to amend must be granted unless it is clear that amendment cannot  
23 cure the complaint’s deficiencies. *Lucas v. Dep’t of Corr.*, 66 F.3d 245, 248 (9th Cir. 1995).

## 24 II

### 25 A

26 Kevin Cooper was the first condemned prisoner to challenge the constitutionality of  
27 California’s lethal-injection protocol in this Court. *Cooper v. Rimmer*, No. 5-4-cv-436-JF, 2004  
28 WL 231325 (ND. Cal. Feb. 6), *aff’d*, 379 F.3d 1029 (9th Cir. 2004). Cooper filed his action a

1 mere eight days before he was scheduled to be executed, which left no time before his execution  
2 to develop a factual record with respect to the eight lethal-injection executions that California  
3 had conducted previously. The Court found that Cooper had “done no more than raise the  
4 possibility that California’s lethal-injection protocol unnecessarily risks an unconstitutional level  
5 of pain and suffering.” 2004 WL 231325, at \*4. Accordingly, the Court concluded that Cooper  
6 had “not met his burden of demonstrating” his entitlement to a stay of his execution. *Id.*, at \*3.

7 The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit affirmed, holding that Cooper  
8 had fallen “far short of showing that he is subject to an unnecessary risk of unconstitutional pain  
9 or suffering. . . .” 379 F.3d at 1033. Judge Browning concurred, noting that the circuit panel had  
10 determined “only that the district court did not abuse its discretion in applying the law to the  
11 factual record before it.” *Id.* at 1034 (Browning, J., concurring). Judge Browning observed that  
12 the ultimate outcome of the case might well be different were the case to proceed to trial, in part  
13 ““because the fully developed factual record may be materially different from that initially before  
14 the district court.”” *Id.* (quoting *Sports Form, Inc. v. United Press Int’l, Inc.*, 686 F.2d 750, 753  
15 (9th Cir. 1982)).<sup>3</sup>

16 The next prisoner scheduled for execution in California, Donald J. Beardslee, also filed a  
17 challenge to California’s lethal-injection protocol. *Beardslee v. Woodford*, No. 5-4-cv-5381-JF,  
18 2005 WL 40073 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 7), *aff’d*, 395 F.3d 1064 (9th Cir. 2005). Beardslee initiated his  
19 action thirty days before his scheduled execution. Although Beardslee had “been somewhat  
20 more diligent” than Cooper and had submitted additional evidence, the Court found once again  
21 that there was insufficient time to develop a complete factual record prior to the execution. 2005  
22 WL 40073, at \*2. It concluded that, like Cooper, Beardslee had “done no more than raise a  
23 concern that errors may be made during his execution that could expose him to a risk of  
24 unnecessary pain. Based upon the . . . record” then before it, the Court determined that “a  
25

---

26 <sup>3</sup> For reasons unrelated to his lethal-injection challenge, Cooper was not executed as scheduled,  
27 and the Court ultimately dismissed his complaint without prejudice for failure to exhaust administrative  
28 remedies. *Cooper v. Woodford*, No. 5-4-cv-436-JF (N.D. Cal. Oct. 14, 2004) (Doc. No. 33), *aff’d*, No.  
04-99001 (9th Cir. Aug. 11, 2005).

1 finding that there is a reasonable possibility that such errors will occur would not be supported by  
2 the evidence.” The Court concluded that Beardslee’s action thus was “materially  
3 indistinguishable from *Cooper*,” and it declined to issue a stay of execution. *Id.*, at \*3.

4 The Court of Appeals again affirmed, noting that “the question before us is not the  
5 ultimate resolution of the merits of this issue. That will have to await another day, based on a  
6 full record.” 395 F.3d at 1076. Although in the panel’s view the evidence submitted by  
7 Beardslee “raise[d] extremely troubling questions about the protocol,” *id.* at 1075, the  
8 determinative question was “whether, in this specific challenge, [Beardslee] has shown enough  
9 of a likelihood that he will be conscious during the administration of pancuronium bromide and  
10 potassium chloride to experience pain,” *id.* at 1076. The court concluded that, “[o]n this limited  
11 record, he has not made that showing,” *id.*, pointedly observing that it “express[ed] no opinion on  
12 the ultimate merits of the claims,” *id.* at 1077.<sup>4</sup>

13 Plaintiff Michael Angelo Morales initiated the present action, which is the third challenge  
14 to California’s lethal-injection protocol, on January 13, 2006,<sup>5</sup> shortly before the scheduling of  
15 his execution (which thereafter was scheduled for February 21, 2006), and accordingly there was  
16 sufficient time for at least some discovery.<sup>6</sup> For this reason, “the record in the present action  
17 [was] substantially more developed than the record in *Cooper* or *Beardslee*.” *Morales v.*  
18 *Hickman* (*Morales 62*), 415 F. Supp. 2d 1037, 1043 (N.D. Cal.), *aff’d*, 438 F.3d 926 (9th Cir.  
19 2006). The record evidence at the time of the hearing on Morales’s motion for a preliminary  
20 injunction supported a finding that “inmates’ breathing may not have ceased as expected in at  
21 least six [lethal-injection] executions.” As a result, and for the first time, the Court had “at least  
22 some doubt as to whether the protocol actually is functioning as intended.” 415 F. Supp. 2d at  
23 1045. However, though it found that Morales had “raised more substantial questions than his  
24

---

25 <sup>4</sup> Beardslee subsequently was executed as provided in OP 770. The next two prisoners executed,  
26 Stanley “Tookie” Williams and Clarence Ray Allen, did not file challenges to the protocol.

27 <sup>5</sup> The first document he filed was his original complaint. (Doc. No. 1.)

28 <sup>6</sup> Morales thereafter amended his complaint. (Doc. No. 51.)

1 counterparts in *Cooper* and *Beardslee*,” *id.* at 1046, the Court nonetheless denied Morales a stay  
2 of execution, on the condition that Defendants conduct the execution either using “only sodium  
3 thiopental or another barbiturate or combination of barbiturates” or with the involvement of an  
4 anesthetist or an anesthesiologist, *id.* at 1047.

5       Once again, the Court of Appeals affirmed. 438 F.3d 926. The court observed that  
6 “[u]nlike the earlier challenges to [OP] 770, in this case the district court had a more developed  
7 record, including evidence from executions subsequent to and including *Beardslee*’s.” *Id.* at 930.  
8 That record supported the finding that Morales, unlike *Cooper* and *Beardslee*, had “shown  
9 sufficient likelihood that the administration of the sodium thiopental will be improper in his  
10 case. . . .” *Id.* (quoting *Beardslee*, 395 F.3d at 1076) (internal brackets omitted).

11       As recounted in *Morales* 290, Morales was not executed, and a stay of execution issued.  
12 465 F. Supp. 2d at 976–77.<sup>7</sup> Shortly thereafter, Defendants revised OP 770.<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at 977. Over  
13 the next several months, the parties engaged in substantial fact discovery, and the Court  
14 “conducted five days of formal hearings, including a day at San Quentin State Prison that  
15 involved a detailed examination of the execution chamber and related facilities.” *Id.* at 974.  
16 These proceedings yielded “a mountain of documents, including hundreds of pages of legal  
17 briefs, expert declarations, and deposition testimony.” *Id.* This Court found that the factual  
18 record, “particularly as it has been developed through discovery and the evidentiary hearing,  
19 [was] replete with evidence that in actual practice OP 770 [did] not function as intended. The  
20 evidence show[ed] that the protocol and Defendants’ implementation of it suffer[ed] from a  
21 number of critical deficiencies,” *id.* at 979, several of which the Court discussed at some length,  
22 *id.* at 979–81. The Court found that there was a “pervasive lack of professionalism in the  
23 implementation of OP 770” as well as “systemic flaws in the implementation of the protocol.”

---

24  
25       <sup>7</sup> Defendants initially retained two anesthesiologists to be present at the execution. After the  
26 anesthesiologists declined to go forward at the eleventh hour, Defendants sought and obtained an order  
27 permitting them to execute Morales using only sodium thiopental, but they were unable or chose not to  
28 comply with certain terms of that order.

<sup>8</sup> Consequently, Mr. Morales filed his second amended complaint. (Doc. No. 131.)

1 *Id.* at 980. It noted that “[w]hatever the merits of the protocol in the abstract, there can be no real  
2 doubt that Defendants’ implementation of OP 770 has major flaws.” *Id.* at 981. The Court  
3 concluded that

4 Defendants’ implementation of California’s lethal-injection  
5 protocol lacks both reliability and transparency. In light of the  
6 substantial questions raised by the records of previous executions,  
7 Defendants’ actions and failures to act have resulted in an undue  
8 and unnecessary risk of an Eighth Amendment violation. This is  
9 intolerable under the Constitution.

10 *Id.*

11 At the same time, the Court found that “the deficiencies in the protocol appear to be  
12 correctable.” *Id.* at 982; *see also id.* at 974 (“Defendants’ implementation of lethal injection is  
13 broken, but it can be fixed.”). Rather than simply enter judgment for Plaintiffs, the Court  
14 therefore “respectfully . . . urge[d] the Governor’s Office to take this opportunity to address  
15 seriously now, rather than later, the significant problems with OP 770 and its implementation.”

16 The Governor’s Office accepted the Court’s invitation, and on May 15, 2007, Defendants  
17 issued a new version of OP 770.<sup>9</sup> (Docs. Nos. 317–18.) Discovery then resumed, and the Court  
18 scheduled an evidentiary hearing for December of that year. (*See* Doc. No. 319.) However, on  
19 October 31, 2007, a state trial court imposed a moratorium on executions in California “based on  
20 its conclusions that Defendants were required to and did not comply with California’s  
21 Administrative Procedures Act when they promulgated the protocol.” (Doc. No. 370 at 1 (citing  
22 *Morales v. Cal. Dep’t of Corr. & Rehab.*, No. CV061436 (Cal. Super. Ct. Marin Cnty. Oct 31,  
23 2007) (internal citation omitted)).) Because California no longer had an operative protocol for  
24 this Court to review, “all parties filed a statement with this Court whereby they jointly  
25 request[ed] that discovery be stayed and that the present case-management schedule be vacated.”  
26 (Doc. No. 370 at 1–2.) The Court responded that “[w]ithout making any findings or reaching any  
27 conclusions as to the appropriateness of or need for any changes to the schedule in this action, the  
28 Court will defer to the request made by the parties.” (*Id.* at 2.) The state-court litigation

---

<sup>9</sup> Morales filed his third amended complaint to reflect the new version of the protocol. (Doc. No. 323.)



1 ultimately led to the promulgation of the regulations now at issue. Active litigation in the present  
2 action then resumed.<sup>10</sup>

3 B

4 While the state-court moratorium on executions was in effect, the Supreme Court decided  
5 *Baze v. Rees*, 553 U.S. 35 (2008). *Baze* involved a constitutional challenge to Kentucky’s lethal-  
6 injection protocol, which uses the same three drugs used in California, *id.* at 44 (plurality op.),  
7 and the case clarified the standard that federal courts must apply to a constitutional challenge to  
8 an execution protocol. Prior to *Baze*, courts in the Ninth Circuit were required to determine  
9 whether an execution protocol subjected a prisoner to an “unnecessary risk of unconstitutional  
10 pain.” *Cooper*, 379 F.3d at 1033. This Court was obligated to apply that standard in *Morales*  
11 290 in determining whether Morales had carried his burden of proof. However, Chief Justice  
12 Roberts, writing for the plurality in *Baze*, explicitly rejected an “unnecessary risk” standard. 553  
13 U.S. at 51 (plurality op.). Plaintiffs now must establish that California’s lethal-injection protocol  
14 “creates a demonstrated risk of severe pain. [They] must show that the risk is substantial when  
15 compared to the known and available alternatives.” *Id.* at 61. The plurality also observed that “a  
16 lethal injection protocol substantially similar to the protocol we uphold today would not create a  
17 risk that meets this standard.” *Id.*

18 Although “[t]he trial court held extensive hearings and entered detailed” factual findings,  
19 *id.* at 41, the record in *Baze* included evidence only with respect to the one lethal-injection  
20 execution that Kentucky had conducted, in which there had been “no reported problems,” *id.* at  
21 46. As this Court has noted elsewhere, “the factual record before the Supreme Court [in *Baze*]  
22 was virtually nonexistent.” *Morales* 424, 2010 WL 3835655, at \*3. Indeed, that record plainly  
23 was *less* developed even than the records in *Cooper* and *Beardslee*. Like this Court in *Cooper*  
24 and *Beardslee*, the Supreme Court held that, on the facts before it, the prisoners had “not carried

---

25  
26 <sup>10</sup> This included Albert Greenwood Brown’s intervention in the present action and the  
27 conditional denial of a stay of his execution, *Morales v. Cate* (*Morales* 401), No. 5-6-cv-219-JF-HRL,  
28 2010 WL 3751757 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2010); the subsequent issuance of a stay of Brown’s execution,  
*Morales* 424, 2010 WL 3835655; and the filing of Plaintiffs’ fourth amended complaint to reflect the  
current version of the protocol, (Doc. No. 428).

1 their burden of showing that the risk of pain from maladministration of a conceded humane  
2 lethal injection protocol, and the failure to adopt untried and untested alternatives, constitute  
3 cruel and unusual punishment.” *Id.* at 41; *see also id.* at 53–54 (prisoners “have not shown” a  
4 substantial risk of serious problems).

5 The *Baze* plurality also commented explicitly on the difference that a developed record  
6 could make. It observed that, in a case with a slight record, “an isolated mishap alone does not  
7 give rise to an Eighth Amendment violation, precisely because such an event, while regrettable,  
8 does not suggest cruelty, or that the procedure at issue gives rise to a substantial risk of serious  
9 harm.” *Id.* at 50. But it also recognized that a pattern of serious problems during executions  
10 “—unlike an innocent misadventure—would demonstrate an objectively intolerable risk of harm  
11 that officials may not ignore.” *Id.*

12 Because the *Baze* petitioners could not identify even “an isolated mishap” during  
13 Kentucky’s only lethal-injection execution, it is not surprising that they were unable to “show[]  
14 that the risk of an inadequate dose of [sodium thiopental] is substantial.” *Id.* at 54. The plurality  
15 accepted the Kentucky trial court’s finding, based solely on expert testimony, that the risk of  
16 improper preparation of sodium thiopental was minimal, in part because such preparation is not  
17 particularly difficult. *Id.* at 54. Similarly, the plurality rejected concerns related to the  
18 intravenous lines used to administer the drugs in light of “several important safeguards to ensure  
19 that an adequate dose of sodium thiopental is delivered to the condemned prisoner.” These  
20 safeguards include requirements that members of the IV team have sufficient qualifications, *id.* at  
21 45, 55–56, and at least one year of relevant medical professional experience (the plurality  
22 described this as the “most significant” safeguard), *id.* at 45, 55; that the entire execution team  
23 participate in at least ten practice sessions per year, each encompassing “a complete walk-  
24 through of the execution procedures,” *id.*; that the IV team have ample time to establish primary  
25 and backup lines, and to prepare two sets of the drugs, *id.*; and that the warden and deputy  
26 warden be present in the execution chamber both to observe the prisoner and to watch for signs  
27 of the proper administration of the sodium thiopental along with any IV problems, *id.* at 45–46,  
28 56. The plurality concluded that “[i]n light of these safeguards, we cannot say that the risks

1 identified by [the petitioners] are so substantial or imminent as to amount to an Eighth  
2 Amendment violation.” *Id.* In short, the plurality assumed that the sodium thiopental would  
3 function as intended, as there was no evidence to the contrary.

4 The Kentucky trial court’s factual findings, based on this limited record, stand in sharp  
5 contrast to this Court’s factual findings in *Morales 290*, which were based on a voluminous  
6 record that included evidence with respect to eleven lethal-injection executions, the majority of  
7 which appeared to have had significant problems. Among other deficiencies in OP 770, the  
8 Court found, in large part on the basis of undisputed evidence, that the execution team  
9 improperly mixed, prepared, and administered sodium thiopental during executions, 465 F. Supp.  
10 2d at 980; that members of California’s execution team were insufficiently qualified, *id.* at 979;  
11 that the IV team members were “not adequately prepared to deal with any complications that may  
12 arise,” *id.*; that the walk-throughs in which the execution team participated were incomplete, and  
13 the team did not receive meaningful training, *id.*; that the IV team did not always prepare a  
14 backup line, *id.*; and that the physical conditions in which executions were carried out did not  
15 permit effective observation of the condemned inmate, *id.* at 980.

16 Accordingly, when it recently was directed by the Court of Appeals to apply the *Baze*  
17 standard to the record developed in *Morales 290*, the Court found that Morales had shown that  
18 California’s former lethal-injection protocol created a substantial risk of severe pain.

19 This finding [was] based on the entire record, *see Morales [290]*,  
20 465 F. Supp. 2d 972; on the largely undisputed evidence presented  
21 at the hearing; on Defendants’ stipulation that injection of the  
22 second and third drugs in the three-drug protocol (pancuronium  
23 bromide and potassium chloride) without adequate anesthesia will  
24 cause an unconstitutional level of pain; on the fact that data in  
25 Defendants’ execution logs indicate that sodium thiopental did not  
26 have its expected effect or function as expected in 64% of lethal-  
27 injection executions pursuant to the protocol; and in particular on  
28 the testimony of Defendants’ own medical expert, Dr. Singler, that  
in at least one execution the inmate likely was awake when the  
second and third drugs were injected, and that the only reason that  
the anesthesiologist could not render a definitive opinion was the  
apparent unreliability of Defendants’ records, *id.* at 980.

*Morales 424*, 2010 WL 3835655, at \*2.

1 III

2 A

3 Defendants' arguments with respect to Plaintiffs' facial challenge essentially are the same  
4 as they asserted in opposition to Brown's application for a stay of execution. *See Morales v.*  
5 *Cate (Morales 401)*, No. 5-6-cv-219-JF-HRL, 2010 WL 3751757, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 24,  
6 2010); *Morales 424*, 2010 WL 3835655, at \*3. Defendants contend that a facial challenge to the  
7 new regulations is not cognizable because the regulations "are substantially similar to or exceed  
8 comparable aspects of the Kentucky protocol upheld in *Baze*." (Doc. No. 430 at 18.) The bulk  
9 of Defendants' briefing is a side-by-side comparison of written provisions of the two protocols  
10 that demonstrates substantial similarity. (*Id.* at 4–14, 19–24.) Defendants argue that this  
11 comparison should be both the beginning and the end of the present inquiry in light of the  
12 statement by the *Baze* plurality that "a lethal injection protocol substantially similar" to  
13 Kentucky's "would not create" "a demonstrated risk of severe pain." 535 U.S. at 61 (plurality  
14 op.).

15 Indeed, standing alone, this statement would appear to obviate the need for any factual  
16 development with respect to a protocol that on paper is "substantially similar" to Kentucky's.  
17 However, the remainder of the plurality opinion does not support that reading. In its actual  
18 context, the statement simply stands for the unremarkable proposition that a protocol  
19 substantially similar to Kentucky's cannot in and of itself give rise to an Eighth Amendment  
20 claim. Nothing in *Baze* evidences the plurality's intent to foreclose all future facial challenges to  
21 protocols that appear substantially similar to Kentucky's, even if they are fact-based and even  
22 where as here there is substantial evidence that similar prior protocols have been deficient in  
23 actual practice.

24 Defendants also contend that the new protocol has remedied any deficiencies in OP 770  
25 by adding significant new safeguards. That well may be true, as Defendants have undertaken a  
26 major upgrade of their execution-related facilities and there are a number of important  
27 differences between the current and former versions of the protocol. (*See* Doc. No. 449 at 7–12  
28 (comparing and contrasting versions of the protocol).) But, as the Court previously has noted,

1 Plaintiffs have raised “substantial questions” of fact concerning the efficacy of these changes,  
2 *Morales* 424, 2010 WL 3835655, at \*4, and at the pleading stage Plaintiffs’ detailed factual  
3 allegations as to the various ways in which the new regulations allegedly have failed to remedy  
4 the deficiencies of OP 770, (*e.g.*, Doc. No. 428 at 38–46), cannot simply be dismissed as  
5 implausible. While Defendants very well may prevail on the merits, particularly given the high  
6 legal threshold for lethal-injection claims established by *Baze*, the Court must accept the  
7 allegations as true for purposes of a motion to dismiss.

8 B

9 Defendants also seek dismissal of Plaintiffs’ “claim that, under the standard for adopting  
10 an alternative execution protocol set forth in *Baze v. Rees*, 553 U.S. 35, 61 (2008), there exists a  
11 known and available alternative to California’s regulations as written which, in comparison to  
12 California’s regulations, significantly reduces a substantial risk of severe pain.” (Doc. No. 430 at  
13 7.) As Chief Justice Roberts wrote for the plurality,

14 [A] condemned prisoner cannot successfully challenge a State’s  
15 method of execution merely by showing a slightly or marginally  
16 safer alternative. . . . [¶] Instead, the proffered alternatives must  
17 effectively address a substantial risk of harm. To qualify, the  
18 alternative procedure must be feasible, readily implemented, and in  
19 fact significantly reduce a substantial risk of severe pain. If a State  
refuses to adopt such an alternative in the face of these documented  
advantages, without a legitimate penological justification for  
adhering to its current method of execution, then a State’s refusal  
to change its method can be viewed as cruel and unusual under the  
Eighth Amendment.

20 553 U.S. at 51–52 (plurality op.) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

21 The *Baze* petitioners claimed conclusorily that “Kentucky could switch from a three-drug  
22 protocol to a one-drug protocol by using a single dose of sodium thiopental or other barbiturate.”  
23 *Id.* at 56. However, this alternative was suggested for the first time in briefing before the  
24 Supreme Court, and thus the trial court made no factual findings regarding its effectiveness. *Id.*  
25 at 56–57. The plurality found it significant that “no other State has adopted the one-drug  
26 method<sup>11</sup> and [the prisoners] proffered no study showing that it is an equally effective manner of  
27

---

28 <sup>11</sup> Subsequent to *Baze*, both Ohio and Washington formally adopted a single-drug protocol.

1 imposing a death sentence.” *Id.* at 57. For these reasons, the plurality concluded that “the  
2 comparative efficacy of a one-drug method of execution is not so well established that  
3 Kentucky’s failure to adopt it constitutes a violation of the Eighth Amendment.” *Id.* The *Baze*  
4 petitioners also suggested various steps that could be taken to ensure proper delivery of the  
5 sodium thiopental prior to and during the administration of the other two drugs, including a  
6 consciousness check. *Id.* at 58–60. However, the plurality already had determined that the  
7 prisoners had “not shown that the risk of an inadequate dose of the first drug is substantial,” *id.* at  
8 54, and it held that “an inmate cannot succeed on an Eighth Amendment claim simply by  
9 showing one more step the State could take as a failsafe for other, independently adequate  
10 measures,” *id.* at 60–61.

11 Contrary to Defendants’ contentions, (Doc. No. 430 at 24–25), Plaintiffs’ amended  
12 complaint is sufficiently specific with respect to available alternative procedures to address the  
13 concerns articulated by the Chief Justice and thus to survive a motion to dismiss. In particular,  
14 Plaintiffs note that twice in the course of the instant proceedings Defendants themselves have  
15 agreed that a single-drug protocol using only sodium thiopental is feasible and readily  
16 implemented,<sup>12</sup> (Doc. No. 428 at 47); Plaintiffs also allege (and it is the case) that such a protocol  
17 has been successfully implemented in Ohio and Washington since *Baze* was decided, (*id.*). Such  
18 allegations are not merely “vague references” to alternative procedures. (Doc. No. 430 at 25.)  
19 Again, given the minimal showing Plaintiffs are required to make in opposition to a motion to  
20 dismiss, they are sufficient for present purposes.<sup>13</sup>

#### 21 IV

22 Good cause appearing therefor, Defendants’ requests for judicial notice are granted,  
23 Plaintiffs’ objections thereto are overruled, Defendants’ partial motion to dismiss is denied, and

---

24  
25 <sup>12</sup> Defendants agreed to use only sodium thiopental to execute both Morales, (Doc. No. 73), and  
Brown, (Docs. Nos. 394, 404).

26 <sup>13</sup> In *Morales 290*, the Court observed, inter alia, that a one-drug “lethal-injection protocol, with  
27 the execution accomplished solely by an anesthetic, such as sodium pentobarbital, would eliminate any  
28 constitutional concerns, subject only to the implementation of adequate, verifiable procedures to ensure  
that the inmate actually receives a fatal dose of the anesthetic.” 465 F. Supp. 2d at 983.

1 the stay of discovery previously entered is lifted. However, for the very reason that it concludes  
2 that Plaintiffs are entitled to pursue the two aspects of their claims that are the subject of the  
3 instant motion—the existence of an extensive, well-developed factual record—the Court intends  
4 to monitor closely the scope and pace of any additional discovery so that the merits of Plaintiffs’  
5 claims can be adjudicated promptly. The Court will hold a status conference for that purpose on  
6 December 17, 2010, at 10:30 a.m.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8  
9 DATED: December 10, 2010

10   
11 JEREMY FOGEL  
12 United States District Judge