Suzanne Rabe William E. Morris SOUTHERN ARIZONA LEGAL AID, INC. 155 East Alameda Tucson, Arizona 85701 2 (602) 623-9461 3 James R. Bell Mark I. Soler 4 YOUTH LAW CENTER 1663 Mission Street, 5th Fl. 5 San Francisco, CA 94103 (415) 543-3379 6 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA 9 ANTHONY C., a minor, by and through 10 his Next Friend, GLORIA C.; JOHN P., by and through his Next Friend, NO. 11 CIV-82-501-TUC-ACM WILLIAM P.; MARK H., a minor, by and through his 12 AMENDED COMPLAINT Next Friend, ROSE ANN P.; JOY S., by and through her Next Friend, 13 (For Declaratory WILLIAM E. MORRIS; and Equitable MARIA R., by and through her Next 14 Relief, and Damages) Friend, WILLIAM E. MORRIS, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly 15 (CLASS ACTION) situated, 16 Plaintiffs, 17 vs. 18 PIMA COUNTY, a political subdivision; GILBERT VELIZ, Judge of the Superior 19 Court of Pima County, Juvenile Division, in his official capacity; RICHARD 20 WILSON, individually and in his official capacity as Director of Court Services 21 of the Pima County Juvenile Court Center; 22 ROBERT TUCKER, individually and in his official capacity as Deputy Director of Detention at the Pima County Juvenile 23 Detention Center; KATIE DUSENBERRY, CONRAD JOYNER, SAM LENA, E. S. (BUD) 24 WALKER and DAVID YETMAN, individually 25. and in their official capacities as members of the Pima County Board of 26 Supervisors,

Defendants.

I. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

- 1. This is a civil rights class action challenging:

 (1) the education, treatment, and conditions of confinement at the Pima County Juvenile Detention Center ("Detention Center")

 2225 E. Ajo Way, Tucson, Arizona; (2) the failure of the defendants to provide detention hearings within twenty-four (24) hours to juveniles detained at the Pima County Juvenile Detention Center; and (3) the detention of "status offenders" (juveniles who are charged with offenses which would not be crimes if committed by adults) for longer than twenty-four (24) hours at the Pima County Juvenile Detention Center.
- 2. Defendants, acting under color of state law, have caused plaintiffs to suffer and be subjected to cruel and unusual punishment, inhumane treatment, denial of due process and equal protection of law, as well as the deprivation of numerous other constitutional and statutory rights. Additionally, defendants have failed to provide a free, appropriate public education to juveniles detained at the Pima County Juvenile Detention Center who are handicapped and entitled to receive such education under Public Law 94-142 (Education For All Handicapped Children Act) (20 U.S.C. §1401, et seq.) and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. §794).

II. JURISDICTION AND RELATED MATTERS

3. This Court has jurisdiction of this action under 28 U.S.C. §1343(3), this being an action to redress the deprivation,

- 4. This Court also has jurisdiction of this action under 28 U.S.C. §1331(a), this being an action wherein the matter in controversy arises under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and under the laws of the United States.
- and 2202 and Rules 57 and 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to order the equitable relief requested herein, this being an action for a declaration of the rights of plaintiffs, and for injunctive and other equitable relief based upon that declaratory judgment, under 42 U.S.C. §§1983 and 1988, and other provisions of federal law.

Plaintiffs

- 6. Plaintiff ANTHONY C. is a juvenile, 17 years of age, and a citizen of the United States. At all times during the events described herein, plaintiff has resided in Pima County with his parents.
- 7. Plaintiff MARK H. is a juvenile, 17 years of age and a citizen of the United States. At all times during the events described herein, plaintiff has resided in Pima County.
 - 8. Plaintiff JOHN P. is a juvenile, 15 years of age, and

- 9. Plaintiff JOY S. is a juvenile, 17 years of age, and a citizen of the United States. At all times during the events described herein, plaintiff has resided in Pima County.
- 10. Plaintiff MARIA R. is a juvenile, 16 years of age, and a citizen of the United States. At all times during the events described herein, plaintiff has resided in Pima County with her parents.

Defendants

- 11. Defendant PIMA COUNTY is a political subdivision of the State of Arizona. As a local unit of government, it has implemented, executed, and adopted the policies, practices, acts and omissions complained of herein through formal adoption or pursuant to government custom.
- 12. Defendant GILBERT VELIZ is a Judge of the Superior Court of Pima County, Juvenile Division (Division Four). In this capacity, defendant VELIZ is responsible, pursuant to A.R.S. §8-203(a) and (b), for the detention, custody, care, placement and release of all persons brought before the Juvenile Court. Defendant VELIZ is also responsible for appointing a Director of Court Services for the Juvenile Court, who in turn recommends appointment of detention and receiving personnel. Defendant VELIZ is sued in his official capacity.
- 13. Defendant RICHARD WILSON is a Director of Court Services of the Pima County Juvenile Court Center. As such,

this defendant is responsible for the safety and welfare of all persons confined in the Detention Center. Defendant WILSON is sued individually and in his official capacity.

- 14. Defendant ROBERT TUCKER is the Deputy Director of Detention at the Pima County Juvenile Detention Center. As such, defendant is responsible for the safety and welfare of all persons confined at the Pima County Juvenile Detention Center. Defendant TUCKER is sued individually and in his official capacity.
- 15. Defendants KATIE DUSENBERRY, CONRAD JOYNER, SAM LENA, E. S. (BUD) WALKER, and DAVID YETMAN are members of the Pima County Board of Supervisors. As such, these defendants exercise their powers as a body politic and corporate and are responsible for directing, controlling, and maintaining, as well as making appropriations for, the Pima County Juvenile Detention Center. Said defendants are sued individually and in their official capacities.

III. CLASS ACTION

and all others similarly situated, pursuant to Rule 23(a), (b)(1) and (b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The class consists of all juveniles who are currently, have been during the year prior to the filing of this Complaint, and in the future will be confined in the Pima County Juvenile Detention Center, 2225 East Ajo Way, Tucson, Arizona.

2

3

4

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- The members of the class, consisting of several hundred persons, are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.
- There are questions of law and fact common to members of the plaintiff class, and the claims of the named plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the members of the plaintiff class.
- 19. Plaintiffs' attorneys have substantial experience in this type of litigation, and the named plaintiffs and their counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the class.
- 20. Since members of the plaintiff class are incarcerated in the Pima County Juvenile Detention Center for several days at a time, the injuries suffered by plaintiffs as a result of the policies and practices of defendants complained of herein are capable of repetition, yet may evade review, thereby making class relief appropriate.
- By their policies and practices, the defendants have acted and continue to act on grounds and in a manner generally applicable to the class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the class as a whole.
- 22. Questions of law or fact common to the class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, and a class action is superior to other methods available for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. Plaintiffs.

- 23. On Friday evening, October 9, 1981, plaintiff ANTHONY
 C., age 17, was arrested by City of Tucson police officers and
 detained in the Pima County Juvenile Detention Center
 ("Detention Center") in Tucson, Arizona until October 13, 1981.
- 24. Upon being detained, ANTHONY C. informed defendants that he was asthmatic and would need to see a doctor. However, despite several requests by ANTHONY C. and his parents, ANTHONY C. was never examined or attended by a doctor.
- 25. Despite repeated requests by plaintiff ANTHONY C.'s parents, the defendants failed and refused to release ANTHONY C. or to provide him a detention hearing prior to Tuesday afternoon, October 13, 1981.
- 26. During his confinement, ANTHONY C. was housed in a cell with up to four other juveniles.
- 27. Although ANTHONY C. did not cause any disturbances, violate any rules of the Detention Center or commit any disciplinary infractions during this detention, defendants held him in the secure confinement unit of the Detention Center. He was not allowed out of his cell during his confinement, except for approximately a 30-minute period each day, in which he was only allowed in the hallway.
 - 28. Defendants refused to allow ANTHONY C.'s parents to visit him during his detention except for one Sunday, October 11, 1981.

- 29. On Tuesday, October 13, 1981, ANTHONY C.'s detention hearing was held, resulting in his release to the custody of his parents. On November 19, 1981, at his adjudication hearing, ANTHONY C. was found not guilty.
- 30. Plaintiff MARK H. is a juvenile, 17 years of age, and a citizen of the United States. MARK H. has been detained in the Detention Center three times between October, 1981 and May, 1982. On at least two of these occasions, MARK H. was denied a prompt detention hearing within 24 hours of his arrest.
- 31. In or around October, 1981, defendants strapped MARK H. with handcuffs and leather straps to a steel bunk-bed for a period of time lasting more than 24 hours.
- 32. During the three periods of his confinement at the Detention Center between October, 1981 and May, 1981, MARK H. was subjected to the general conditions of confinement at the Detention Center set forth herein.
- 33. Plaintiff JOHN P. is a juvenile, 15 years of age, and a citizen of the United States.
- 34. Following plaintiff JOHN P.'s arrest and confinement early Saturday morning, July 17, 1982, the defendants failed to release JOHN P. or to provide him a detention hearing prior to Monday afternoon, July 19, 1982.
- 35. Despite plaintiff JOHN P.'s request on Saturday, July 17, 1982, to see a physician regarding extensive cuts and bruises, he did not receive such access to a physician until Monday, July 19, 1982.

26 //

//

- 36. Despite plaintiff JOHN P.'s requests to detention center staff to see a physician regarding a sore throat, plaintiff JOHN P. did not receive such access. He was able to see the physician only after personally approaching him and explaining the symptoms.
- 37. During the period of his confinement at the Detention Center, plaintiff JOHN P. was subject to the general conditions of confinement at the Detention Center set forth herein.
- 38. The defendants have denied plaintiff JOHN P. access to reasonable attorney visits from his undersigned attorneys.
- 39. Plaintiff JOY S. is a juvenile, 17 years of age, and a citizen of the United States. Plaintiff JOY S. is presently confined against her will in the Detention Center.
- 40. Plaintiff JOY S. has been confined in the Detention Center on three occasions since July 1, 1982.
- 41. Plaintiff JOY S., while charged only with status offenses, has been confined in the Detention Center for periods substantially in excess of 24 hours.
- 42. During her periods of confinement at the Detention Center, plaintiff JOY S. was and is subjected to the general conditions of confinement at the Detention Center set forth herein.
 - 43. The defendants have denied plaintiff JOY S. access to reasonable attorney visits from her undersigned attorneys.

- 44. In March of 1982, plaintiff MARIA R., age 16, was arrested by City of Tucson police officers as a status offender and taken to the Detention Center.
- 45. After MARIA R. entered the Detention Center she was denied medical and psychological care for two weeks.
- 46. The Detention Center psychologist, Doris Ford, saw Plaintiff MARIA R. only two times during the 30 days she stayed at the Detention Center. At one of these psychological examinations, Ms. Ford found MARIA R. to be pre-psychotic and schizophrenic as a result of paint sniffing.
- 47. Defendants stripped searched MARIA R. when she went through intake and every other day of her confinement. These strip searches were routinely conducted in the restroom in front of other young women in the Detention Center.
- 48. Defendants' overly restrictive visitation and telephone policies resulted in MARIA R. being denied reasonable visits and telephone calls to relatives.

B. Conditions in the Detention Center

- 49. The Detention Center, built in 1967, is a secure facility comprising part of the Juvenile Court Center, 2225 East Ajo Way, Tucson, Arizona.
- 50. The Detention Center houses and confines three categories of juveniles: 1) juveniles awaiting adjudication on delinquency charges; 2) juveniles awaiting placement following an adjudication of delinquency; 3) juveniles arrested for offenses which would not be crimes if committed by adults

(status offenders),

C. Living Units

- 51. The Detention Center contains two main living units with 18 beds each, and two secure confinement units with 6 cells each. The secure confinement units are in the same area as the main living units. All units house boys and girls separately.
- 52. Defendants routinely confine plaintiffs in secure confinement cells until a detention hearing is held. After a detention hearing is held, defendants routinely hold juveniles in the secure confinement cells for several days before moving them into the living unit.
- 53. The secure confinement cells measure approximately 7-1/2 feet by 11 feet, and contain one set of metal bunk-beds, one toilet, and one sink, but no shower. Each cell was designed to confine a maximum of two juveniles.
- 54. The secure confinement cells are constructed entirely of concrete except for one small window which admits very little natural light. The doors are steel except for one small window which looks out into an indoor hallway.
- 55. During October and November of 1981, defendants routinely confine as many as four persons in each of the secure confinement cells. When more than two children are confined in a secure confinement cell, the defendants provide a mattress on the floor for each additional individual. Because of the small size of the cell, children often must sleep with their feet and legs under the bottom bunk-bed.

- 56. Juveniles confined in the secure confinement unit are required to eat all their meals in their cells.
- 57. Defendants fail to provide juveniles in the secure confinement units with any educational program.
- 58. Plaintiffs confined in secure confinement cells are often not permitted to attend regular Sunday religious services conducted at the Detention Center.

D. Discipline

- 59. Disciplinary action is accomplished at the Detention Center by a system of "movements." Under this system of movements, defendants transfer children to the secure confinement cell area from the main living unit for minor disciplinary infractions. Defendants do not afford hearings prior to their transfer to the secure confinement unit pursuant to a disciplinary movement.
- 60. If a juvenile receives a total of four movements in a seven-day period, he/she is placed on discipline status. A minimum of 24 or a maximum of 48 hours must be spent in discipline status. In discipline status, the child remains in a locked secure confinement cell and: 1) is only allowed out of the cell to shower or to clean the cells; 2) may only visit with court employees in the locked secure confinement cell; 3) may not have family or other visitors.
- 61. A child may only move him or herself to the living unit area by: 1) waiting a predetermined period of time (often 48 hours or more) with good behavior; and 2) waiting for an open

space to become available in the living unit.

E. Restraints

62. The defendants routinely use leather restraints and handcuffs to punish juveniles for yelling, knocking on walls, or refusing to comply with directions. Defendants use both types of restraints to bind children's hands and feet and to secure them to the posts of the beds. Defendants do not give juveniles a hearing before punishing them.

F. Health, Safety and Personal Hygiene

- 63. Defendants do not adequately provide juveniles with clean mattresses, mattress cover sheets, laundered blankets or sheets. Defendants fail to provide juveniles with laundered clothes, routinely allowing them one change of clean clothing, including underwear, each week. This practice contributes to overall unsanitary conditions.
- 64. Defendants fail to provide juveniles with clothes to wear while their dirty clothes are being washed. These children must, therefore, remain naked in their cells, with only a sheet for cover, while their clothes are laundered.
- 65. Defendants fail to provide juveniles with adequate time in the shower each day.
- 66. Defendants fail to provide adequate ventilation in the Detention Center. Children confined therein do not have access to fresh air, and temperatures in the Detention Center are frequently extremely hot or cold. Poor ventilation and temperature control contribute to the deterioration of the

juveniles' physical and psychological health.

67. Defendants routinely operate the Detention Center with insufficient staff to ensure the safety of juveniles in the event of a fire or other emergency.

G. Education and Recreation

- 68. Defendants fail to provide classroom materials or instruction specifically designed to address the needs of those juveniles identified as special education students pursuant to Public Law 94-142 (the Education of All Handicapped Children Act), and \$504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, while in custody at the Detention Center.
- 69. Defendants do provide some instruction to juveniles in the main living unit. However, this instruction is extremely limited, and if a child misses one instructional session, defendants prohibit that child from attending any future classes. This is an overly restrictive and punitive denial of education.
- 70. Defendants fail to provide juveniles with any outdoor recreation during the entire period of their confinement. Also defendants fail to provide plaintiffs with adequate large muscle exercise during their confinement.
- 71. The defendants fail to provide a program of indoor recreation which includes sedentary games, books, periodicals and reading materials appropriate to the age, heritage and educational backgrounds of plaintiffs.

//

. 1

72. Defendants fail to screen juveniles for medical or mental problems after they are taken into custody. Defendants fail to provide adequate medical or mental health services to juveniles during their confinement in the Detention Center.

73. Defendants fail to provide adequate treatment for children suffering from severe emotional disturbances or other psychological impairments that substantially interfere with daily motor activities and require immediate treatment to prevent further deterioration while they remain in custody.

I. Visitation, Telephone, Mail Censorship and Searches

- 74. Defendants fail to provide juveniles with a private room or private area in which to visit their attorneys.
- 75. Defendants selectively enforce overly restrictive attorney visitation rules, having limited attorney visitors to only those attorneys representing detainees as attorneys of record in delinquency matters.
- 78. Defendants fail to provide juveniles access to a telephone for either incoming or outgoing calls. Similarly, defendants fail to provide juveniles with postage stamps for outgoing mail.
- 79. Defendants routinely subject juveniles to strip searches which are often conducted in full view of other children.
 - 80. Adult detainees at the Pima County Adult Detention

Detention Center receive postage stamps, substantial use of telephones, outdoor recreation, clean clothes, and access to visitors, as well as medical care far superior to that allowed children charged with lesser offenses but who are confined in the Juvenile Detention Center for comparable periods of time.

- 81. The defendant Supervisors are equally responsible for the overseeing and funding operation of those adult and juvenile detention centers.
 - J. Twenty-four Hour Detention Hearings
- 82. Rule 3(d) of the Arizona Rules of Procedure for the Juvenile Court provides:

No child shall be held in detention for more than 24 hours, excluding Saturdays, Sundays and holidays, unless a petition alleging his delinquent conduct has been filed; and no child shall be held longer than 24 hours, excluding Saturdays, Sundays and holidays, after the filing of said petition unless so ordered by the court after hearing.

- 83. Pursuant to Rule 3(d), defendants fail to hold detention hearings on weekends and holidays. If a juvenile is arrested and subsequently detained at the Detention Center after 3:00 p.m. on Friday, defendants fail to provide a hearing for him/her until Monday at 3:00 p.m. If Monday is a holiday, the defendants fail to provide a detention hearing for that juveniles until Tuesday at 3:00 p.m.
- 84. Pursuant to Rule 3(d), as applied by defendants, a juvenile detained on Friday, Saturday, Sunday or a holiday may not appear before a judge or referee for a probable cause determination or for a determination of release for up to 100

hours.

- 85. The detention or probation officers at the Detention Center are given the discretion by the defendants to release juveniles arrested on the weekend or holidays for certain specifically delineated, minor offenses. If the arrest is not for one of these specified offenses, the juvenile just remain in detention until the detention hearing.
- 86. The failure to provide detention hearings for juveniles on weekends and holidays results in overcrowded and inhumane conditions of confinement for children in the Detention Center because weekend and holidays are typically the periods of peak arrest activity in juvenile cases.
- 87. Crowding in the detention center increases the potential for violence among detainees by increasing the level of frustration, anxiety and tension they already experience while in confinement.
- 88. Defendants fail to provide a sufficient system for classifying inmates. As a result, serious offenders are often kept in the secure confinement unit with the juveniles who have never been detained before, or are only being detained for traffic offenses. This failure by defendants can and does lead to violence and physical abuse in the Detention Center.
- 89. Pursuant to Rule 4.1(c) of the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure, an adult detainee must be taken before a magistrate for an initial appearance within 24 hours after his/her arrest. If an adult arrestee is not brought before a

magistrate within that time, he/she must be immediately released.

90. Pursuant to Rule 4.1(c), the defendants PIMA COUNTY, KATIE DUSENBERRY, CONRAD JOYNER, SAM LENA, E. S. (BUD) WALKER and DAVID YETMAN must provide initial appearances within 24 hours for adults arrested and detained in Pima County.

K. Secure Detention of Status Offenders

- 91. The State of Arizona receives federal funds from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) which is part of the United States Department of Justice. Such funds have been granted to the State of Arizona for implementation of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (Juvenile Justice Act).
- 92. Section 223(12) of the Juvenile Justice Act, 42 U.S.C. \$5633(12), provides that, in order to receive funding under the Act, a state must comply with the requirements that juveniles who are charged with or who have committed offenses which would not be crimes if committed by an adult (status offenses) or offenses which do not constitute violations of valid court orders, and juvenile non-offenders such as dependent or neglected children, shall not be placed in secure juvenile detention or correctional facilities. Instead, a state must require that such juveniles be placed in settings representing the least restrictive alternatives appropriate to the needs of the child in the community, and provide "community-based" services, as defined in 42 U.S.C. \$5603(1).

93. The defendants regularly confine juveniles in the Detention Center who are charged with, or have committed offenses which would not be crimes if committed by an adult, where such offenses do not constitute violations of valid court orders.

V. LEGAL CLAIMS

94. For plaintiffs' claims, each enumerated below, they reallege subparagraphs 22 through 93 above, as if fully set forth herein, and in each and every statement of claim, and further allege:

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

95. The policies, practices, acts and omissions of defendants complained of herein regarding the conditions of confinement in the secure detention unit at the Detention Center subject plaintiffs to denial of due process of law, guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution; violate plaintiffs' right to privacy, guaranteed by the First, Fourth, Fifth, Ninth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, and violate plaintiffs' right to receive treatment in the least restrictive setting and under the least restrictive conditions, guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

96. Defendants' policies, practices, acts and omissions, complained of herein, specifically their imposition of discipline resulting in substantial loss of rights and privileges

without prior notice and an opportunity for evidentiary hearing, and their arbitrary use of prolonged punitive measures wholly disproprotionate to the seriousness of infractions or any need to protect legitimate institutional interests, violate plaintiffs' right to due process of law as guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

97. The policies, practices, acts and omissions of defendants complained of herein, specifically the use of leather restraints and handcuffs for prolonged periods of time, have violated and continue to violate plaintiffs' rights to freedom from cruel and unusual punishment, due process and equal protection of the laws guaranteed them by the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

98. Defendants' policies, practices, acts, and omissions complained of herein, specifically defendants' subjection of plaintiffs to insufficient staffing, unsanitary, unsafe, and illegal conditions of confinement in the Pima County Juvenile Detention Center violate the plaintiffs' right to due process of law, guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution; violate plaintiffs' right to privacy, guaranteed by the First, Fourth, Fifth, Ninth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution; and violate plaintiffs right to receive treatment in the least restrictive setting and under the least restrictive conditions, guaranteed by the Fourteenth

Amendment to the United States Constitution.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

99. The policies, practices, acts and omissions of defendants complained of herein have violated and continue to violate plaintiffs' right to an appropriate and adequate education while detained in the Pima County Juvenile Detention Center, as well as a right to an education under Public Law 94-142 (the Education for All Handicapped Children Act), and \$504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, (29 U.S.C. §794).

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

100. The policies, practices, acts and omissions of defendants complained of herein have violated and continue to violate plaintiffs' right to appropriate recreation as guaranteed by the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

101. Defendants' policies, practices, acts and omissions, complained of herein, and specifically the failure of defendants to provide adequate medical or mental health services to plaintiffs, violate their right to due process as guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, and violate plaintiffs' right to receive treatment in the least restrictive setting and under the least restrictive conditions, guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

26 //

EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

102. The policies, practices, acts and omissions of the defendants complained of herein, specifically the defendant's denial to plaintiffs of postage stamps and telephone calls, as well as defendants' overly restrictive policy regarding visitation, have violated and continue to violate plaintiffs' rights to freedom of speech and association, access to courts and counsel, due process of law and equal protection of the laws guaranteed them by the First, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

NINTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

103. The policies, practices, acts and omissions of defendants complained of herein, specifically the defendants' denial to plaintiffs of a private area for attorney visits, have violated and continue to violate plaintiff's rights to counsel, freedom of speech and association, privacy, due process and equal protection of the laws, guaranteed them by the First, Sixth, Ninth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

TENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

104. Defendants' policies, practices, acts and omissions complained of herein in routinely strip searching plaintiffs in full view of other juveniles, is violative of plaintiffs' rights to privacy, due process, and equal protection of the laws, guaranteed them by the First, Fourth, Sixth, Ninth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

ELEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

. 9

105. Defendants' policies, practices, acts and omissions complained of herein, specifically defendants' secure confinement in the Detention Center of status offenders and other juveniles presenting no danger to themselves or others, violate plaintiffs' rights under the Juvenile Justice Act, 42 U.S.C. \$5633(12); subject plaintiffs to cruel and unusual punishment, in violation of the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution; violate plaintiffs' right of privacy, guaranteed by the First, Fourth, Fifth, Ninth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution; and violate plaintiffs' right to receive treatment in the least restrictive setting and under the least restrictive conditions, guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

TWELFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

- 106. Defendants' policies, practices, acts and omissions complained of herein, specifically defendants' denial of prompt detention hearings on weekends and holidays in order to determine probable cause and conditions of release, is illegal and unconstitutional.
- 107. These acts violate plaintiffs' rights to due process and equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, and to access to counsel as guaranteed by the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

2

J

5

6 7

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs pray that this Court:

- Assume jurisdiction over this action;
- 2. Certify a class as defined herein, the named plaintiffs to serve as representatives thereof;
- 3. Issue a declaratory judgment, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§2201 and 2202, and Rule 57 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that the policies, practices, acts and omissions complained of herein:
 - a. Violate plaintiffs' rights under the Juvenile Justice Act, 42 U.S.C. §5601 et seq.;
 - b. Subject plaintiffs to denial of due process and equal protection of law guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution;
 - c. Subject plaintiffs to cruel and unusual punishment, in violation of the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution;
 - d. Violate plaintiffs' right to receive treatment in the least restrictive setting and under the least restrictive conditions, guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution;
 - e. Violate plaintiffs' right to privacy guaranteed by the First, Fourth, Fifth, Ninth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution;
 - f. Violate plaintiffs' right to counsel under the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States

Constitution;

- g. Violate plaintiffs' right to freedom of religion under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution;
- h. Violate plaintiffs' right to freedom of speech and expression under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution;
- i. Violate plaintiffs' rights under Public Law 94-142 (the Education of All Handicapped Children Act), 20 U.S.C. \$1401, et seq., and under \$504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. \$794;
- 4. Issue preliminary and permanent injunctive relief restraining, prohibiting and otherwise enjoining defendants, their agents, and employees from:
 - a. Detaining more than two juveniles in each secure confinement cell;
 - b. Failing to provide a bed to each juvenile confined in the Detention Center;
 - c. Requiring juveniles to eat meals in their cells;
 - d. Failing to provide a full and adequate recreation program, including outdoor and large muscle exercise, to all juveniles confined in the Detention Center;
 - e. Failing to provide special education and related services to all juveniles in the Detention Center who are eligible for special education;
 - f. Failing to provide plaintiffs with full and

adequate hearings before imposing any type of punishment;

- g. Restraining or binding plaintiffs with leather restraints, handcuffs or other mechanical restraints as a form of punishment or behavior control or for any other reason;
- h. Failing to provide plaintiffs with clean bedding while they are at the Detention Center;
- i. Failing to provide plaintiffs with an amount of clean clothing while they are at the Detention Center, adequate to ensure that they can be clothed at all times;
- j. Failing to provide plaintiffs with daily showers of reasonable duration while they are confined at the Detention Center;
- k. Failing to provide plaintiffs with adequate ventilation, heat and light while they are confined in the Detention Center.
- Failing to provide adequate staff to ensure the safety of plaintiffs in the event or an emergency;
- m. Failing to screen plaintiffs for medical or psychological problems on admission to the Detention Center;
- n. Failing to provide plaintiffs with adequate medical and psychiatric care while they are confined in the Detention Center;
- o. Failing to provide plaintiffs with a private room in which to confer with their attorneys while they are

confined in the Detention Center;

- p. Denying plaintiffs reasonable access to the courts and counsel;
- q. Failing to permit plaintiffs to visit with friends and family members other than parents or legal guardians while they are confined in the Detention Center;
- r. Failing to establish a flexible schedule of visiting hours adequate to ensure that plaintiffs are able to visit with friends and family members while they are confined to the Detention Center;
- s. Failing to provide plaintiffs with the opportunity to make outgoing and receive incoming telephone calls while at the Detention Center;
- t. Failing to provide plaintiffs with stamps to enable them to send outgoing mail while at the Detention Center;
- u. Strip searching plaintiffs without reasonable cause to believe that the plaintiff has concealed contraband on his/her person;
- v. Failing to provide plaintiffs with a detention hearing within 24 hours of their arrest and confinement;
- w. Confining juveniles who are charged with or who have committed offenses which would not be crimes if committed by adults, and which are not violations of valid court orders, in the Pima County Detention Center;

 5. Enter a judgment on behalf of the named plaintiffs

assessing general and special damages against defendants PIMA COUNTY, RICHARD WILSON, ROBERT TUCKER, KATIE DUSENBERRY, CONRAD JOYNER, SAM LENA, E. S. (BUD) WALKER, and DAVID YETMAN for injuries suffered by plaintiffs as a proximate result of the policies, practices, acts and omissions complained of herein, in the amount to be established by the proof;

- 6. Enter a judgment on behalf of the named plaintiffs assessing punitive damages against defendants RICHARD WILSON, ROBERT TUCKER, KATIE DUSENBERRGY, CONRAD JOYNER, SAM LENA, E. S. (BUD) WALKER, and DAVID YETMAN for the policies, practices, acts and omissions complained of herein, in the amount of \$100,000 against each said defendant;
- 7. Enter judgment on behalf of the named plaintiffs assessing punitive damages against defendants ROBERT TUCKER and RICHARD WILSON, individually, for intentionally interfering with the plaintiffs' right of access to the courts and counsel in connection with actions authorized by 42 U.S.C. §1983 and other civil matters.
- 8. Retain jurisidction over this action until defendants have fully complied with all orders and judgments entered by this Court;
- 9. Award plaintiffs reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1988;
 - 10. Grant plaintiffs their court costs herein; and

1		11.	Grant	such	other	and	further	relief	as	the	Court	deems
2	just	and	reason	able.								
3		DATE	ED:					_				
4		•										
5												
6							SUZANNE	RABE				
7								. - -		•		
8												
9							WILLIAM SOUTHER				AID,	INC.
10							155 East	t Alamed	la 💮			
11							(602) 63					
12							Janu	a P) 1	V//	10	
13							JAMES R		<u> </u>		\	
14							MARK I.	AW CENTI	ΞR			- .
15							1663 Mis San Fran	ncisco,	cree CA	9410	5th Fl. 03	•
16							(415) 54					
17							Attorne	ys for I	Plai	intif	fs	
18												
19												
20					٠							
21												
22												
23												
24												
25												
26												