

General Questions, 14

Pending Lawsuits

1. Kenneth Barnes v. District of Columbia, Superior Court of the District of Columbia
2. Tyrone Bryant v. District of Columbia, Superior Court of the District of Columbia
3. John Dowdy v. District of Columbia, D.C. Court of Appeals
4. Carla Doe v. District of Columbia, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia
5. Jerry M. v. District of Columbia, Superior Court of the District of Columbia

Plaintiffs filed suit in D.C. Superior Court in 1985 on behalf of all youth currently, or will be, in the custody of the District's juvenile justice agency and residing in District-run facilities for delinquent youth alleging systemic violations of various D.C. statutes and the Fifth and Eighth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution. The matter was settled in 1986 when the parties entered into a consent decree. In 2007, in order to expedite progress in the case and to avoid the appointment of a receiver, the parties entered into a comprehensive work plan intended to provide concrete guidelines for resolution of the lawsuit and oversight by a court-appointed Special Arbitrator.

Following a lengthy period of stalled progress, in 2012, the District launched a plan to end this lawsuit which consisted of a concerted effort on DYRS' part to meet the requirements of the work plan coupled with an aggressive litigation strategy requiring plaintiffs to demonstrate that DYRS was still failing to satisfy constitutional minimums. This two-pronged attack allowed the District to get to a point where it could file a motion to dismiss the lawsuit on the basis of the Prison Litigation Reform Act ("PLRA"). After crafting the motion, in September 2014, OAG reached out to plaintiffs to inform them of the District's intent to file. As Plaintiffs and the Special Arbitrator realized that the District had a substantial chance of success on the merits, they offered to enter into settlement talks rather than engaging in protracted litigation. After several months of negotiations, the Parties signed a partial settlement on December 15, 2014.

On December 19, 2014, the parties filed a joint motion for preliminary approval of a Settlement Agreement which was negotiated and agreed to by the parties

- If approved, the Settlement Agreement will vacate a number of Work Plan provisions, some of which will still be subject to reporting requirements, including: Room Confinement, Intake and Housing Assignment, Planning and Delivery of Services, Related Services at the YSC, Grievances and Training
 - The following Work Plan provisions will remain under court supervision per the Agreement: population, staffing and deployment, medical and behavioral health care, and fire safety
6. K.G. v. District of Columbia, Superior Court of the District of Columbia
 7. Patricia Grimes v. District of Columbia, in U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia
 8. Jacqueline Hurst v. District of Columbia, United States District Court for the District of Maryland

9. Jacqueline Hurst v. District of Columbia, Superior Court of the District of Columbia
10. Steve Little v. District of Columbia, No. 14 CA 1069 in Superior Court of the District of Columbia
11. Jamie Thomas v. District of Columbia, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia

