

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA
CENTRAL DIVISION

FILED
DES MOINES, IOWA
SEP 30 1999 AM 9:14
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA

JUDGMENT IN CIVIL CASE
CASE NO.: 4-90-cv-50365

GEORGE GOFF

Plaintiff

v

CHARLES HARPER, et al.,
Defendant

X **DECISION BY COURT.** This action came to consideration before the Court.
The issues have been considered and a decision has been rendered.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED: The defendants plan four, as modified by the Court, is accepted as an appropriate plan to correct the constitutional violations as to prisoner care found by the Court to be present at Fort Madison Penitentiary. The penitentiary officials shall forthwith implement and carry out the directions of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that judgment shall be entered for plaintiffs. No monetary judgment was sought and none is given.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the plaintiffs are awarded costs as provided by law.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the matter of attorney fees will be held in abeyance until after the appeal process is completed.

See attached Judgment Background

OCT - 1 1999

Date

James R. Roenbaum
Clerk

Debbie Shepherd
(By) Deputy Clerk

Goff v. Harper



PC-IA-001-008

372

05 280-45

Judgement Background

In its order of June 5, 1997 (Docket # 72), this Court directed the defendants to formulate a plan to remedy the four constitutional violations set out in detail in that order which are: 1. The violation of substantive due process resulting from the extraordinary long lockup sentences; 2 the violation of the Eighth Amendment resulting from the inadequate mental health treatment received by mentally ill and mentally disordered inmates; 3 the violation of the Eighth Amendment resulting from the deprivation of exercise for inmates in lockup during the winter months, 4 the violation of the Eighth Amendment resulting from the pandemonium and bedlam the mentally stable inmates must suffer because they are intermingled with the mentally ill inmates who either cannot or do not control their behavior. The Court sets out eight specific matters to be considered. On August 6, 1999 this Court entered an order accepting defendant's plan number four (docket # 294) with some modifications. The specifics of the modification are set out on pages 46, 47, and 48 of said order.

Thereafter the defendants requested the Court to stay part of the Court's ruling in the June 6, 1999 order. The plaintiffs requested the Court to amend its order. Each of the motions has been denied. The Court also denied defendants' motion to dismiss.