

1 OFFICE OF COUNTY COUNSEL  
2 Dawyn Harrison (173855)  
3 County Counsel  
4 *dharrison@counsel.lacounty.gov*  
5 Dylan Ford (228699)  
6 Deputy County Counsel  
7 *dford@counsel.lacounty.gov*  
8 500 West Temple St., Floor 6  
9 Los Angeles, California 90012  
10 Telephone: (213) 974-1807/(213) 974-1811  
11 Facsimile: (213) 687-8822  
12

13 KENDALL BRILL & KELLY LLP  
14 Robert E. Dugdale (167258)  
15 *rdugdale@kbkfirm.com*  
16 Michael J. McCarthy (334829)  
17 *mmccarthy@kbkfirm.com*  
18 10100 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 2500  
19 Los Angeles, California 90067  
20 Telephone: (310) 272-7904  
21 Facsimile: (310) 556-2705  
22

23 *Attorneys for Defendants Los Angeles*  
24 *County Sheriff Robert Luna, in his Official*  
25 *Capacity, and the County of Los Angeles*

26  
27  
28

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**WESTERN DIVISION**

DENNIS RUTHERFORD, et al.,

21 Plaintiffs,

22 v.

23 ROBERT LUNA, Sheriff of Los  
24 Angeles County, in his official capacity,  
and the COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,

25 Defendants.

Case No. 75-cv-04111-DDP

**DEFENDANTS' SEVENTH  
QUARTERLY REPORT  
PURSUANT TO ORDER  
GRANTING JOINT STIPULATION  
[DKT. NO. 402]**

Hon. Dean D. Pregerson  
Courtroom 9C

1 **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

		<u>Page</u>
1	I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	A. Background .....	2
3	B. The Stipulated Order.....	3
4	III. PUTTING ASIDE VIOLATIONS OF THE STIPULATED ORDER 5 THAT OCCURRED ON NEW YEAR'S DAY 2025—AND WHICH 6 HAVE NOT REOCCURRED IN THE THREE MONTHS SINCE— 7 DEFENDANTS ACHIEVED SUBSTANTIAL COMPLIANCE WITH 8 THE STIPULATED ORDER IN EACH MONTH COVERED BY 9 THIS REPORT .....	5
10	A. Defendants Provided Plaintiffs with Monthly Reports of LASD's 11 Performance .....	5
12	B. Defendants Implemented the Remedial Actions .....	6
13	C. Defendants Were in Substantial Compliance With All But One 14 Paragraph During Each Month of This Past Quarter.....	6
15	IV. THE COUNTY'S BED INVENTORY RAMP-UP GOALS .....	9
16	V. CONCLUSION .....	11
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

I.

## INTRODUCTION

3       Nearly two years into the implementation of the Stipulated Order and  
4 Defendants' use of the Shared Intake Monitoring System ("SIMS") to track inmate  
5 processing through the Inmate Reception Center (the "IRC"), Defendants have  
6 generally only encountered two circumstances that impact Defendants' ability to  
7 substantially comply with all aspects of the Stipulated Order governing inmate  
8 movement and conditions in the IRC. The first is when a rise in inmate arrivals in  
9 the aftermath of a holiday or on a holiday slows inmate processing and creates  
10 backlogs in the IRC. The second (and more common) is when a SIMS outage  
11 occurs and IRC staff are forced to manually track the movement of inmates, which  
12 occasionally leads to mistakes. Both situations occurred during the quarter covered  
13 by this report and were at the root of every single violation of the Stipulated Order  
14 that occurred during the period: (1) a wave of inmate arrivals that occurred on New  
15 Year's Day and severely affected IRC processing, leading to 30 instances when  
16 individuals were held for short amounts of time in the IRC beyond the Stipulated  
17 Order's 24-hour limit; and (2) two brief SIMS outages that occurred during the  
18 quarter that resulted in a handful of violations when deputies were forced to  
19 manually track inmate movement in the IRC.

20        Although the violations that occurred on New Year's Day caused the County  
21 to fall out of substantial compliance with the Stipulated Order's requirements during  
22 the month of January, the lessons learned from that event have resulted in the  
23 County avoiding a recurrence of that situation on subsequent holidays during the  
24 quarter; and the track record the County has established over the past 21 months  
25 confirms that the violations that occurred in the IRC as a result of the New Year's  
26 Day surge appear to be an aberration the County has avoided in the past and can  
27 avoid in the future. (Indeed, on January 1, 2025, Defendants experienced more  
28 violations of the Stipulated Order on that single day than they have experienced for

1 all other days combined since August 2023.) And putting this single day aside, the  
2 County continued its remarkable run in achieving sustained compliance with the  
3 Stipulated Order’s requirements during the quarter covered by this Report,  
4 sustaining only a few violations otherwise and achieving substantial compliance  
5 with the Stipulated Order in both February 2025 and March 2025. Thus, while  
6 Defendants cannot report substantial compliance across the board during each  
7 month of this past quarter, they are nonetheless proud of their continued success in  
8 providing improved services in the IRC that in no way resemble the issues that led  
9 to the imposition of the Stipulated Order.

10 **II.**

11 **RELEVANT FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

12 **A. Background**

13 During the Summer of 2022, Defendants encountered a massive influx of  
14 inmates into the IRC when the COVID-related Emergency Bail Schedule was lifted  
15 at the end of June 2022; and months later, in February 2023, Correctional Health  
16 Services (“CHS”) faced a momentary staffing crisis in the IRC. Both these  
17 challenges caused acute backlogs in processing inmates through the IRC and, for a  
18 time, impacted the general sanitary conditions and the timely provision of medical  
19 and mental health services in the IRC. (Dkt. Nos. 413, 415).

20 On September 27, 2022, this Court granted Plaintiffs’ unopposed Motion for a  
21 Temporary Restraining Order and Motion for an Order to Show Cause Why a  
22 Preliminary Injunction Should Not Issue. (Dkt. No. 351). As Defendants worked to  
23 meet the requirements of the preliminary injunction entered by the Court, the  
24 February 2023 CHS staffing shortage referenced above significantly hampered those  
25 efforts, prompting Plaintiffs’ Motion for an Order to Show Cause Re: Contempt (the  
26 “Contempt Motion”), filed on February 27, 2023. (Dkt. No. 375). Over the next  
27 four months, Defendants redoubled their efforts to improve conditions in the IRC,  
28 initiated a plan to implement corrective actions to realize those improvements, and

1 developed SIMS to provide IRC personnel with real-time data that tracks the  
2 location and overall flow of inmates into and out of the IRC, including data tracking  
3 the following areas central to the Court’s injunctive relief: (1) the overall length of  
4 time an inmate spends in the IRC; (2) the length of time an inmate is tethered to the  
5 IRC Front Bench; and (3) the length of time an inmate is in a locked cell or cage in  
6 the IRC.

7 **B. The Stipulated Order**

8 Prior to the evidentiary hearing on the Contempt Motion scheduled for  
9 June 27, 2023, counsel for Plaintiffs and counsel for Defendants met and conferred  
10 and reached a joint stipulation, which the Court granted in the form of an order  
11 issued on June 22, 2023 (“Stipulated Order”). (Dkt. No. 402).

12 The Stipulated Order permanently restrains and enjoins Defendants from  
13 violating Paragraphs 1-6 of the Stipulated Order and memorializes Defendants’  
14 plans for remedial efforts to address overcrowding, delays in processing, the need to  
15 move inmates into permanent housing, the provision of adequate medical and  
16 mental health care, and general living conditions in the IRC (the “Remedial  
17 Actions”).<sup>1</sup> In this regard, Paragraphs 1-6 of the Stipulated Order set forth the  
18 following limitations and conditions for the processing of inmates through the IRC  
19 and requires Defendants to self-report violations of these limitations and conditions:

- 20 1. Holding an incarcerated person in the IRC for more than 24 hours.
- 21 2. Holding an incarcerated person on the IRC Clinic Front Bench,  
22 handcuffed, chained, or tethered to a chair or any other object, for more  
than four hours.
- 23 3. Holding an incarcerated person in an IRC holding cell for more than  
24 12 hours total, or holding more people in a holding cell than its rated  
25 capacity by the Board of State and Community Corrections.

---

27 <sup>1</sup> A complete description of these Remedial Actions is included in Paragraph  
28 8 of the Stipulated Order. (Dkt. No. 402 at 7-10).

- 1 4. Holding an incarcerated person in the IRC Clinic cage, when locked,  
2 for more than eight (8) hours total.
- 3 5. Holding an incarcerated person in the IRC Clinic area, cage, or any cell  
4 in the IRC when that location is not in a clean and sanitary condition,  
5 with access to functioning toilets, potable drinking water, clean water  
6 to wash, and sufficient garbage receptacles.
- 7 6. Holding an incarcerated person in the IRC clinic area, cage, or any cell  
8 in the IRC without providing ongoing access to adequate medical and  
9 mental health care, including but not limited to regular pill call.

10 (Id. ¶¶ 1-6).

11 The Stipulated Order further requires Defendants to document and provide  
12 monthly status reports to Plaintiffs and file a quarterly status report with the Court.

13 (Id. ¶ 14). Paragraph 10 of the Stipulated Order defined the parameters that  
14 Defendants must meet each month to be considered in substantial compliance with  
15 their obligations under this agreement. In this regard, Defendants only achieve  
16 substantial compliance with the Stipulated Order's requirements if:

- 17 (a) fewer than 25 persons who are processed through the IRC in a  
18 calendar month are held in the IRC for more than 24 hours in  
19 violation of Paragraph 1 (and no person is held in the IRC in a  
20 calendar month for more than 36 hours);
- 21 (b) there are no more than four (4) days in a calendar month where  
22 more than five (5) people are held for more than 24 hours in  
23 violation of Paragraph 1;
- 24 (c) no more than five (5) people in a calendar month are handcuffed,  
25 chained, or otherwise tethered to the IRC Clinic Front Bench for  
26 more than four (4) hours in violation of Paragraph 2 (and no  
27 person is tethered to the IRC Clinic Front Bench for more than  
28 six (6) hours); and
- 29 (d) no more than fifteen (15) persons are kept in an IRC holding cell  
30 or the IRC cage in a calendar month in violation of paragraphs 3  
31 and/or 4 (and no person is kept in an IRC holding cell for more  
32 than 18 hours or in the IRC cage for more than 12 hours).

33 (Id. ¶ 10).

1 Pursuant to the Stipulated Order, the County is also required, by no later than  
2 the 10th of each calendar month, to notify Plaintiffs if it believes Defendants  
3 achieved substantial compliance during the previous calendar month. Thereafter,  
4 within ten days of when the County provides Plaintiffs with this monthly  
5 assessment, Plaintiffs must notify Defendants if they dispute the County's account  
6 of Defendants' compliance with the Stipulated Order's requirements. (*Id.* ¶ 11).

7 The Quarterly Report, which covers the three months prior to its filing,  
8 requires the County to detail:

- 9 (a) the status of implementing the Remedial Actions;
- 10 (b) whether Defendants believe they are in substantial compliance with  
11 paragraphs 1-6 [], including data showing performance with paragraphs  
12 1-4 as set forth in Paragraph 10;
- 13 (c) the County's progress in bringing on-line new non-carceral beds  
14 pursuant to the County's Diversion Efforts, as well as its status in  
15 funding additional non-carceral beds scheduled to be added to the  
16 inventories of ODR and DMH after June 30, 2025, pursuant to the  
17 County's Diversion Efforts; and
- 18 (d) the impact the County's progress in adding non-carceral beds to the  
19 inventories of ODR and DMH is having on eliminating backlogs in the  
20 IRC.

21 (*Id.* ¶ 14).

### 22 III.

## 23 **PUTTING ASIDE VIOLATIONS OF THE STIPULATED ORDER THAT 24 OCCURRED ON NEW YEAR'S DAY 2025—AND WHICH HAVE NOT 25 REOCCURRED IN THE THREE MONTHS SINCE—DEFENDANTS 26 ACHIEVED SUBSTANTIAL COMPLIANCE WITH THE STIPULATED 27 ORDER IN EACH MONTH COVERED BY THIS REPORT**

### 28 **A. Defendants Provided Plaintiffs with Monthly Reports of LASD's 29 Performance**

30 As required by Paragraph 11 of the Stipulated Order, Defendants transmitted  
31 monthly reports detailing their compliance with Paragraphs 1-4. On February 10,

1 2025, March 10, 2025<sup>2</sup>, and April 10, 2025, Defendants described the violations that  
2 occurred in the preceding months in e-mail correspondence with counsel for  
3 Plaintiffs and stated their position that they had achieved substantial compliance for  
4 each month, with the exception of one day which placed Defendants out of  
5 substantial compliance with Paragraph 1 during January 2025.<sup>3</sup>

6 **B. Defendants Implemented the Remedial Actions**

7 As required by the Stipulated Order, Defendants implemented the Remedial  
8 Actions described in Paragraph 8 of the Stipulated Order within 30 days of the Court  
9 entering the Stipulated Order on June 22, 2023. Defendants reported the successful  
10 implementation of the Remedial Actions in their First Quarterly Report (Dkt. No.  
11 413 at 9-11) and continue to maintain them, including, but not limited to,  
12 continuously training new IRC staff on the Stipulated Order's requirements,  
13 maintaining the regular cleaning schedule in the IRC, and tracking potential  
14 violations of the Stipulated Order in real time via SIMS.

15 **C. Defendants Were in Substantial Compliance With All But One  
16 Paragraph During Each Month of This Past Quarter**

17 Data from SIMS confirms that Defendants achieved substantial compliance  
18 with Paragraphs 2-4 of the Stipulated Order during the most recent quarter and  
19

---

20 <sup>2</sup> On March 13, 2025, counsel for Defendants transmitted a supplemental  
21 monthly report to account for additional, previously unreported violations as well.

22 <sup>3</sup> Importantly, this correspondence is not the only confirmation of substantial  
23 compliance that counsel for Plaintiffs receive from Defendants. LASD directly  
24 transmits the daily SIMS report for the preceding day (or in the case of weekends, a  
25 report covering the previous three to four days is sent at the beginning of the  
26 following week), as well as a monthly report at the start of the month. These reports  
27 provide detailed information concerning the duration and explanation for any  
28 purported violation's cause. LASD has also proactively provided further  
explanation of violations' underlying circumstances and in response to additional  
inquiries from counsel for Plaintiffs.

1 achieved the same with the exception of one day, New Year's Day 2025, for  
2 Paragraph 1.

3       In January 2025, there were **31** reported violations of the 24-hour limitation  
4 (one reported erroneously), **one** reported violation of the IRC Front Bench 4-hour  
5 limitation, and **one** (erroneously) reported violation of the 12-hour cell limitation.

6       The 31 substantiated violations of the Stipulated Order all occurred on New  
7 Year's Day 2025, when the morning shift inmate arrivals in the IRC were 200+%

8 greater when compared to the same shift and day of the previous year. The increase  
9 was due, in significant part, to the transfer of a significant number of inmates from  
10 LASD station jails to the IRC at nearly the same point in time on New Year's Day,  
11 and above-average screening time that was needed for many of the individuals who  
12 arrived that day to clear the IRC. This combination of circumstances led to  
13 bottlenecks in the IRC, which were unprecedented since the launch of SIMS and  
14 resulted in reverberations that eventually required the brief closure of the IRC.

15       Thirty of the 31 violations that occurred in the IRC on January 1, 2025,  
16 resulted because the Defendants failed to clear an inmate from the IRC within the  
17 Stipulated Order's 24-hour limitation; and that number of violations resulted in  
18 Defendants falling out of substantial compliance with the Stipulated Order's  
19 requirements for the month of January. (See Paragraph 10(a) (requiring that fewer  
20 than 25 inmates be processed through the IRC in less than 24 hours during a month  
21 for Defendants to achieve substantial compliance with the Stipulated Order for the  
22 month.) Although Defendants are disappointed that such a significant violation of  
23 the Stipulated Order occurred on the first day of the quarter, it is notable that no  
24 single violation of the Stipulated Order that occurred that day was of a long enough  
25 duration to have violated any other substantial compliance benchmark in Paragraph  
26 10(a). For instance, no single violation of the Stipulated Order involved a failure to  
27 process an inmate through the IRC within 36 hours, which is another way to violate  
28 the Stipulated Order: Seven of the violations that occurred on January 1, 2025 were

1 less than one hour in length; 11 were less than two hours; six were less than three  
2 hours; and six were less than four hours. This spectrum of violations, where none  
3 was more than four hours, reflects that the cause of the violations was a dramatic  
4 increase in incoming inmates that unexpectantly slowed the IRC's otherwise capable  
5 processing abilities.

6 The lone four-hour IRC Front Bench violation that occurred in January 2025  
7 lasted approximately 38 minutes.

8 The IRC Cage was not utilized at any point in January 2025, nor in February  
9 2025 and March 2025.

10 In the wake of the events of New Year's Day, Defendants have developed  
11 greater notice and communications networks between the station jails and the IRC in  
12 order to be better prepared for any threat that a flood of new inmates might overrun  
13 the IRC. And notably, since January 1, 2025, the IRC has only had one other  
14 violation of the Stipulated Order's 24-hour limitation.

15 In February 2025, there were **four** reported violations of the 24-hour  
16 limitation (although one was determined to be erroneous and Defendants contend  
17 two others did not constitute actual violations of the Stipulated Order), **one** reported  
18 violation of the IRC Front Bench four-hour limitation, and **zero** reported violations  
19 of the 12-hour cell limitation.

20 Two reported violations of the 24-hour limitation occurred on February 13,  
21 2025 and February 26, 2025. On each of these occasions, both inmates were in  
22 urgent care with access to a bed. Defendants have long maintained that these  
23 circumstances do not constitute a violation because the IRC is not defined in the  
24 Stipulated Order to include Urgent Care (and both inmates had access to a bed). A  
25 third violation was later determined to be erroneous, as the inmate had been moved  
26 to Module 231 prior to the expiration of permitted time under Paragraph 1.  
27 However, a substantiated violation of the 24-hour limitation occurred on February  
28 27, 2025, and lasted approximately one hour and 32 minutes. The violation was the

1 result of a SIMS outage when deputies were attempting to manually track all  
2 inmates' movement.

3 The single violation of the four-hour IRC Front Bench limitation set forth in  
4 the Stipulated Order occurred on February 26, 2025 during a SIMS outage. On this  
5 occasion, LASD staff responsible for manually tracking movement of the front  
6 bench did not follow procedures, leading to one violation of one hour and three  
7 minutes.

8 In March 2025, there were **zero** reported violations of the 24-hour limitation,  
9 **zero** reported violations of the IRC Front Bench four-hour limitation, and **one**  
10 reported violation of the 12-hour cell limitation (lasting approximately two  
11 minutes). The lone violation occurred during a SIMS outage when the LASD was  
12 forced to track inmate movement in the IRC manually.

13 **IV.**

14 **THE COUNTY'S BED INVENTORY RAMP-UP GOALS**

15 For Fiscal Year 2024-25, Defendants set a goal<sup>4</sup> of achieving a total of 4,668  
16 slots across ODR's three programs—ODR Housing, ODR MIST, and ODR FIST—  
17 by June 30, 2025. For DMH, the goal is a total of 164 new DMH beds added in  
18 FY2023-2024 and FY2024-2025. This goal contemplates adding 80 more DMH  
19 beds beyond the 84 that came online in FY2023-2024. Defendants continue to make  
20 progress towards those goals.

21  
22

---

23  
24 <sup>4</sup> The Stipulated Order does not require that Defendants meet any quota in  
25 bringing a particular number of community beds on-line that can be used to  
26 eliminate overcrowding in the LACJ, or even that Defendants achieve their stated  
27 ramp-up plan. Nor does the Stipulated Order permit Plaintiffs to file an enforcement  
28 action predicated solely on the County's failure to implement these diversion efforts,  
unless those failures contribute to a failure to meet substantial compliance with the  
requirements of Paragraphs 1-6 in the Stipulated Order. (Dkt. No. 402 ¶ 13).

1 ODR has reached 4,388 total beds or slots across the three programs  
2 discussed above and is on track to meet its overall bed goal.<sup>5</sup> In this past quarter,  
3 the 22 beds DMH contracted for last quarter came online, and DMH is finalizing  
4 contracts for an additional 34 beds. DMH also added eight beds in the Second  
5 Quarter of 2024 that were inadvertently not reported in Defendants' Fifth Quarterly  
6 Report, bringing the year one and two total to 156 new beds. As a result of these  
7 additions, DMH is now on track to reach its two-year goal of 164 new beds.

8 Finally, in the first quarter of the fiscal year, 620 patients were released from  
9 jail to ODR Housing, ODR MIST, or ODR FIST. Of those, 482 were evaluated to  
10 be P3 or P4 at the time of assessment.<sup>6</sup> Additional information regarding releases  
11 by ODR program and P-level follows in the table (*Figure 1*), below.

12 *Figure 1*

ODR P-Level Release Data, October 1, 2024 – December 31, 2024				
	ODR Housing	ODR MIST	ODR FIST	Total
Assessment P-Level				
P0	0	1	0	1
P1	2	3	3	8
P2	81	17	31	129
P3	225	49	122	396
P4	23	17	46	86
Total	331	87	202	620

21  
22 <sup>5</sup> ODR may move beds between these programs as program needs change  
23 from month to month, and DMH may also change from time to time the mix of bed  
24 types allocated to justice-involved individuals.

25 <sup>6</sup> The ODR Housing program currently focuses on inmates classified as P3 or  
26 P4 for initial admission to their treatment program, but if an ODR participant is  
27 detained again in jail after a relapse or set-back, then that person is evaluated by  
28 ODR for return to the program regardless of their P level at the time of re-arrest. In  
addition, ODR also considers referrals for P2 inmates housed in Enhanced Mental  
Health Moderate Observation Housing dorms.

	ODR Housing	ODR MIST	ODR FIST	Total
Release P-Level				
P0	0	1	0	1
P1	9	3	5	17
P2	198	32	75	305
P3	123	50	117	290
P4	1	2	5	7
Total	331	87	202	620

## CONCLUSION

The County is pleased to report that its adherence with the Stipulated Order's requirements continues to be laudable. Although the IRC occasionally experiences SIMS outages or other acute (but temporally short) events that impact its ability to achieve substantial compliance across the board, as was the case of New Year's Day 2025, those events are a demonstrable rarity, and the County remains committed to developing processes that will eliminate these aberrational instances of non-compliance with the Stipulated Order altogether.

DATED: April 15, 2025

## KENDALL BRILL & KELLY LLP

By: /s/ Robert E. Dugdale  
Robert E. Dugdale

*Attorneys for Defendants Los Angeles  
County Sheriff Robert Luna, in his Official  
Capacity, and the County of Los Angeles*