Mou v. City of San Jose et al

Doc. 19

1

7 8

6

10 11

9

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

11111

28

A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF EVENTS UNDERLYING THIS ACTION

This action alleges violation of the Federal Civil Rights Act (42 U.S.C. § 1983), arising from the suspension of Plaintiff Mou's library privileges for a period of six months within the City of San Jose Library system. Plaintiff Mou believes that her constitutional rights have been violated by Defendant City of San Jose in taking such action in suspending her library privileges.

Plaintiff further alleges that she has "suffered severe mental distress and was injured in her health as a direct result of the action taken by Defendants."

Neither parties dispute the fact that the City of San Jose Library Department had a policy and procedure in place for suspensions of library privileges and available procedure for a hearing to review the grounds for the suspension. Ms. Mou availed herself of the hearing process and attended a Suspension Review Hearing with her attorney before the Assistant Library Director for the City of San Jose Public Library.

Ms. Mou's initial suspension from the San Jose Public Library was from November 1, 2006 to May 1, 2007. After Ms. Mou's Appeal Hearing which was held on January 4, 2007 the suspension was reduced to four months which therefore resulted in a condition that she could return on March 1, 2007. There were a number of conditions in which she was allowed to regain her library privileges which were outlined in a correspondence of January 18, 2007.

2. THE PRINCIPAL FACTUAL ISSUES WHICH THE PARTIES DISPUTE

The underlying facts and circumstances existing at the time for the basis of Plaintiff Mou's suspension are in dispute.

3. THE PRINCIPAL LEGAL ISSUES WHICH THE PARTIES DISPUTE

The first issue in dispute is whether or not there is a liberty interest within the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment within Plaintiff's ability to freely use the public library when she was suspended from such privileges.

1	A second area of legal dispute would be the determination of the amount of
2	process which is due before the Defendants can act to suspend a person such as Plaintiff
3	Mou from access to the library.
4	4. OTHER FACTUAL ISSUES WHICH REMAIN UNRESOLVED FOR THE REASONS STATED BELOW AND HOW THE PARTIES PROPOSE TO RESOLVE
5	THOSE ISSUES
6	None.
7	5. THE PARTIES WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN SERVED AND THE REASONS
8	None.
9	6. THE ADDITIONAL PARTIES WHICH TO THE BELOW SPECIFIED PARTIES INTEND TO JOIN IN THE INTENDED TIME FRAME FOR SUCH JOINDER
0	INTEND TO JOIN IN THE INTENDED TIME FRANCE FOR SUCH JOINDER
11	None currently known.
12	7. THE FOLLOWING PARTIES CONSENT TO A ASSIGNMENT OF THIS CASE TO A U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR JURY TRIAL
13	A U. S. WAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR JUNT TRIAL
14	Defendant City of San Jose consents to assignment of this case to a United States
15	Magistrate Judge for jury trial.
16	<u>DISCLOSURES</u>
17	The parties have agreed to make Rule 26 Initial Disclosures on or before the date
18	for the Case Management Conference in this matter.
19	DISCOVERY
20	The parties have no reason to believe that discovery in this matter will exceed those
21	outlined in the Federal Rules.
22	
23	
24	
25	11111
26	11111
27	11111
28	3
	DEFENDANT'S JOINT CMC STATEMENT Case Number: C07-05740 RS

481369.doc

1	TRIAL SCHEDULE
2	Defendant believes that post discovery motions will be necessary and therefore
3	request that a Subsequent Case Management Conference be scheduled in approximately
4	120 days.
5	Both Plaintiff and Defendants demand a jury trial.
6	
7	Dated: May <u>/3</u> , 2008 RICHARD DOYLE, City Attorney
8	
9	By: Anni I Dune
10	ROBERT BURCHELEL Sr. Deputy City Attorney
11	Attorneys for Defendant,
12	CITY OF SAN JOSE
13	
14	CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER
15	The Case Management Statement and [Proposed] Order is hereby adopted by the
16	Court as the Case Management Order for the case and the parties are ordered to comply
17	with this Order. In addition, the Court orders:
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Dated:
25	United States District Court Judge
26	
27	
28	4

Case Number: C07-05740 RS

481369.doc

DEFENDANT'S JOINT CMC STATEMENT

- 1	
2	CASE NAME: Mou v. CSJ, et al.
3	CASE NO.: C07-05740 RS
4	I, the undersigned declare as follows:
5	I am a citizen of the United States, over 18 years of age, employed in Santa Clara County, and not a party to the within action. My business address is 200 East Santa Clara Street, San Jose, California 95113-1905, and is located in the county where the service described below occurred.
7	On May 5, 2008, I caused to be served the within:
8	
9	DEFENDANT'S CMC STATEMENT AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
10	by MAIL, with a copy of this declaration, by depositing them into a sealed envelope, with postage fully prepaid, and causing the envelope to be deposited for collection and mailing on the date indicated above.
12	I further declare that I am readily familiar with the business' practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. Said correspondence would be deposited with the United States Postal
13	Service that same day in the ordinary course of business.
14	
15	Addressed as follows:
16	Ms. Chin-Li Mou
17.	4141 Boneso Circle
18	San Jose, CA 95134 Phone Number: (408) 954-8085
	E-Mail: cmou@hotmail.com
19	In Propria Persona
20	
21	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on May, 2008, at San Jose, California.
22	
23	alle
24	Cecilia McDaniel
25	
26	

PROOF OF SERVICE

27

28