

2. Third-Party Defendant is the City of New Orleans, which is a political subdivision of the State of Louisiana, organized and operating pursuant to a duly adopted Home Rule Charter.

OTHER PARTIES AND THEIR CLAIMS

3. Original Plaintiffs Lashawn Jones, et al., are present or former inmates of jail facilities operated by Sheriff Gusman. In their Complaint (Doc. 1), they allege that the conditions of confinement therein violate the United States Constitution. They seek declaratory and injunctive relief to remedy such alleged violations, and also seek certification of a class of present and future inmates in the custody of the Orleans Parish Sheriff. Their Complaint the subject of a separate Third-Party Complaint tendered by the Sheriff for contemporaneously herewith.

4. The United States of America has been granted leave by this Court to file a Complaint in Intervention in this action (Doc. 70). The allegations of its Complaint are similar to those made by original plaintiffs Lashawn Jones, et al., but also include alleged violations of 42 U.S.C., Title VI. The United States seeks declaratory and injunctive relief to remedy such alleged violations. A copy of its Complaint in Intervention is attached hereto as Exhibit "A".

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. Jurisdiction of the causes of action in the Complaint in Intervention is asserted pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1345.

6. As the Complaint in Intervention asserts claims within this Court's federal question jurisdiction, this Court also has jurisdiction of the claims asserted in this Third Party Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

7. Venue is proper in this District because all of the events or omissions recited herein

arose in this District. 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

8. The City of New Orleans is responsible for funding jail facilities of the Orleans Parish Sheriff's Office pursuant to various provisions of Louisiana law. The City of New Orleans has acknowledged its funding obligations and has provided funding with respect to the Sheriff's jail facilities in the numerous consent decrees or settlement agreements executed and filed into the record in Hamilton, et al. v. Morial, et al., Case No. 69-2443, Section "A"(5).

9. To the extent that the Court should conclude that the Sheriff must provide prospective relief in the form of additional staffing, training, care, treatment or other services to Orleans Parish inmates which will necessitate funding over and above that currently provided by the City of New Orleans, judgment should also be entered in favor of the Sheriff ordering the City of New Orleans to pay the Sheriff the full cost, as determined by the Court, of providing such prospective relief.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Third-party plaintiff, Marlin N. Gusman, the Sheriff of Orleans Parish, prays that:

1) Third-party defendant, the City of New Orleans, be required to appear and answer, all and singular, the allegations of this Third-Party Complaint;

2) After due proceedings had, should judgment be rendered granting any prospective relief against third-party plaintiff in favor of the United States of America on its Complaint in Intervention, then, in that event, third-party plaintiff be awarded judgment herein against third-party defendant, ordering the City of New Orleans to pay the Orleans Parish Sheriff the full cost, as determined by the Court, of providing any prospective relief ordered by this Court pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3626; and

3) For all other general and equitable relief to which third-party plaintiff may be entitled under the law.

Respectfully submitted,

USRY, WEEKS & MATTHEWS


By: 

T. Allen Usry, (LSBN 12988)
Freeman R. Matthews, (LSBN 9050)
Timothy R. Richardson, (LSBN 27625)
Blake J. Arcuri, (LSBN 32322)
1615 Poydras Street, Suite 1250
New Orleans, LA 70112
Tel: (504) 592-4600; Fax: (504) 592-4641

**COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT AND
THIRD PARTY PLAINTIFF**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that on this 28th day of September, 2012, a copy of the foregoing was filed electronically with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system. Notice of this filing will be sent by operation of the court's electronic filing system.


T. Allen Usry

Amendment rights and (2) discrimination against OPP Latino prisoners in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d.

2. The United States alleges the following, based on information and belief:

I. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. The United States is authorized to bring this action pursuant to the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1997c, and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d ("Title VI").

4. The Attorney General certifies that all pre-filing requirements specified by 42 U.S.C. § 1997c have been met. The Attorney General's certificate is attached to, and incorporated in, this Complaint in Intervention.

5. This Court has jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 & 1345. This Court may grant the relief sought in this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 & 2202.

6. Venue is proper in this district. The acts and omissions giving rise to this action occurred in the Eastern District of Louisiana. 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

II. DEFENDANT

7. Defendant ORLEANS PARISH SHERIFF operates OPP, and is responsible for the safety, care, custody, and control of prisoners incarcerated in OPP, as well as the actions of OPP staff. The Sheriff, Marlin N. Gusman, is sued only in his official capacity as ORLEANS PARISH SHERIFF.

8. Defendant ORLEANS PARISH SHERIFF receives federal financial assistance, including from the United States Department of Justice ("United States"). As a recipient of federal funds, the ORLEANS PARISH SHERIFF is responsible for ensuring that OPP will comply with Title VI and its implementing regulations.

9. Defendant is legally responsible for the operation, maintenance, and conditions of OPP, and for the safety and health of prisoners incarcerated at OPP.

10. At all relevant times, Defendant has acted or failed to act, as alleged herein, under color of state law.

III. BACKGROUND

11. OPP is an institution within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. § 1997.

12. OPP currently houses approximately 2500 to 2900 prisoners consisting of a large number of pre-trial detainees and prisoners serving short misdemeanor sentences. OPP operates seven jail buildings and employs a staff of approximately 450 security officers. OPP houses prisoners in six of the buildings, namely the Temporary Detention Center ("TDC"), original Orleans Parish Prison Jail, Templeman V, Conchetta, the Broad Street work-release facility, and eight windowless tents constructed with FEMA financial assistance ("the Tents"). OPP also operates a seventh building, the Intake Processing Center ("IPC"), which does not house prisoners.

13. The United States sent Defendant a findings letter on September 11, 2009, and an update to its findings letter on April 23, 2012. These letters detailed the unconstitutional conditions at OPP, including those alleged in this Complaint. The United States' September 11, 2009 letter also notified Defendant of the minimal measures necessary to remedy the unconstitutional conditions at OPP. The United States' April 23, 2012 letter further advised Defendant that OPP's limited English proficiency ("LEP") services violate Title VI and its implementing regulations. Defendant has failed to take basic steps to correct, and remains deliberately indifferent to, the known unlawful deficiencies described in the United States' letters and elsewhere.

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. OPP Fails to Protect Prisoners from Harm

14. The Constitution requires Defendant to protect prisoners from violence inflicted by OPP staff and other prisoners. Defendant has failed to take minimum reasonable measures to protect prisoners from harm, and is deliberately indifferent to the obvious and substantial risk of harm to prisoners, caused by OPP staff and other prisoners.

15. OPP prisoners suffer serious harm and risk of serious harm from OPP's failure to take reasonable measures to protect prisoners from excessive use of force and sexual misconduct by OPP staff. These failures have resulted in the following instances of harm to prisoners, as shown by Defendant's own documentation:

- a. In September 2011, an OPP deputy forced a prisoner to perform oral sex. The inmate was placed in handcuffs, removed from his cell, and taken into a closet, where he was forced to perform oral sex.
- b. In July 2011, correctional officers beat a prisoner in the Tents, as shown on OPSO video. Officers involved in the beating then attempted to cover up the beating by failing to accurately report the facts surrounding the incident.
- c. In August 2010, a prisoner committed suicide one day after an officer beat him. Officers pepper sprayed the prisoner inside his cell multiple times, opened his cell door, and physically assaulted him.

16. OPP prisoners suffer serious harm and risk of serious harm from Defendant's failure to take reasonable measures to protect prisoners from physical and sexual violence by other prisoners. As a result, OPP prisoners suffer high rates of serious prisoner-on-prisoner violence and sexual assaults. In 2011, OPP reported over 65 incidents of prisoner-on-prisoner

assaults. In many of these incidents, OPP staff ignored requests for help or protections from prisoners.

17. OPP's failure to provide reasonably safe conditions have resulted in the following instances of serious injury and harm to prisoners, as shown by OPP's own documentation:

- a. In March 2010, a 22-year-old prisoner died after he was attacked and stabbed by another prisoner at OPP;
- b. In June 2010, a prisoner suffered injuries to his back, lungs, and kidneys after he was stabbed 18 times at OPP; and
- c. In July 2010, a prisoner was taken to the emergency room after he was attacked and stabbed multiple times at OPP.

~~18. Defendant is subjectively aware of the ongoing serious harm and risk of serious~~
harm from the United States' September 11, 2009 findings letter and April 23, 2012 update letter, yet fails to correct the known deficiencies.

19. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to the known harm and risk of harm by, *inter alia*, failing to maintain adequate security policies and procedures, deficient staffing and prisoner supervision, failing to classify and house prisoners based on objective risk of violence and victimization, inappropriate reliance on prisoners to provide security supervision, inadequate staff training, and failed systems of accountability.

20. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to inadequate staffing levels at OPP, which cause prisoners serious harm. Defendant fails to staff adequately densely populated housing pods and violence-prone buildings. As a result, rampant prisoner-on-prisoner violence goes unnoticed and unaddressed.

21. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to prisoners' safety by failing to implement a prisoner classification system that properly determines with whom each prisoner may be housed and the degree of supervision required for each prisoner. This failure causes poor supervision of violent prisoners, and the inappropriate commingling of violent prisoners with non-violent prisoners. Prisoner-on-prisoner physical and sexual assaults result.

22. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to prisoners' safety by relying on certain prisoners to perform security functions, giving prisoners inappropriate power and control over other prisoners and compromising safety.

23. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to prisoners' safety by failing to train staff adequately to prevent prisoner-on-prisoner violence and to use only reasonable force on prisoners.

24. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to prisoners' safety by failing to correct broken accountability measures. Defendant's substandard accountability measures at OPP, such as his use of force policies, investigation practices, and prisoner grievance system, fail to prevent, detect, or correct OPP staff's use of unconstitutionally excessive force.

B. OPP Fails to Provide Constitutional Suicide Protection and Mental Health Care

25. The Constitution requires Defendant to protect prisoners from suicide and self-harm and to provide adequate care for prisoners' serious medical and mental health care needs. Defendant has exhibited deliberate indifference to prisoners' serious medical and mental health care needs and to the obvious and substantial ongoing risk of prisoner suicide, self-harm, and untreated mental illness.

26. OPP prisoners suffer serious harm from Defendant's deliberate indifference to prisoners' serious mental health needs and to the ongoing risk of suicide and self-harm, as shown by Defendant's own documentation:

- a. In April 2010, a prisoner committed suicide after being placed in an isolation cell for erratic behavior. Less than one hour after being placed in the cell, the prisoner tied his shirt to the bars in the cell door and hanged himself;
- b. In August 2011, an OPP prisoner committed suicide by asphyxiation while on constant observation; and
- c. In August 2011, a prisoner with known mental illness and suicidal thoughts was inappropriately placed in general population. He was then moved to suicide watch and committed suicide one week later.

27. Defendant is subjectively aware of the ongoing serious harm and risk of serious harm from the United States' September 11, 2009 findings letter and April 23, 2012 update letter, yet fails to correct the known deficiencies.

i. Inadequate Suicide Prevention

28. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to the known harm and risk of harm by, *inter alia*, failing to implement adequate policies and procedures to treat and supervise prisoners with suicidal and self harm tendencies, failing to hire adequate staff to implement such policies and procedures, continuing to house suicidal prisoners in cells with obvious suicide hazards, and failing to train staff adequately to monitor and supervise suicidal prisoners.

29. Defendant is deliberately indifferent by failing to provide comprehensive, basic training to correctional staff to identify and respond to prisoners who are at risk of suicide, self-harm, or untreated mental illness.

30. Defendant is deliberately indifferent by housing suicidal prisoners in suicide watch cells that exacerbate mental illness and contain suicide hazards. These hazards include protrusions that prisoners can use as tie-off points to commit suicide.

31. Defendant is deliberately indifferent by failing to timely or adequately evaluate prisoners for level of suicide risk and, based on risk, provide the appropriate supervision, or transfer to an outpatient mental health facility.

32. Defendant is deliberately indifferent by failing to adequately monitor, and provide meaningful treatment to, prisoners on suicide watch. This failure allows prisoners to commit suicide or engage in self-harm.

33. Defendant is deliberately indifferent by failing to employ adequate numbers of trained correctional staff to monitor prisoners on suicide watch.

34. Defendant is deliberately indifferent by failing to adequately evaluate prisoners before removing them from suicide watch and failing to implement any step-down program for prisoners being removed from suicide watch.

ii. Inadequate Mental Health Care

35. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to prisoners' serious mental health needs by, *inter alia*, continuing to use deficient: (1) screening and evaluation practices; (2) staffing; (3) assessment and treatment practices; and (4) quality assurance measures. Defendant is aware that these conditions exist and are causing harm to prisoners and fails to correct these conditions despite this knowledge. These deficient OPP practices cause prisoners serious harm and create an unreasonable risk of harm.

36. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to prisoners' serious mental health needs by failing to implement initial mental health screening and evaluation. OPP inappropriately relies

on untrained licensed practical nurses ("LPNs") to perform duties outside the scope of their training and expertise, including mental health screenings and initial evaluations. Untrained LPNs fail to identify and refer prisoners with mental illness to the psychiatrist for treatment, causing harm to prisoners.

37. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to prisoners' serious mental health needs by understaffing OPP's mental health care services, and consequentially failing to provide minimal treatment for prisoners' mental illnesses. OPP's understaffing limits the psychiatrist primarily to writing prescriptions and occasionally providing reactive crisis care. The psychiatrist's heavy workload prevents the psychiatrist from treating all prisoners with serious mental illness.

38. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to prisoners' serious mental health needs by rarely ensuring adequate mental health assessments. This results in OPP not identifying and providing treatment to prisoners with mental illness. For those prisoners OPP does identify as having serious mental illness, OPP provides inadequate treatment that consists only of medications and reactions to crises.

39. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to prisoners' serious mental health needs by failing to evaluate prisoners properly before prescribing prescription medications and failing to monitor properly these medications' effects.

40. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to prisoners' serious mental health needs by failing to formulate, document and implement treatment plans for prisoners with mental illnesses.

41. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to prisoners' serious mental health needs by failing to employ a quality assurance system that monitors high-risk, high-volume, and problem-prone aspects of mental health care.

42. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to prisoners' serious mental health needs by failing to follow, measure, and document the quality and timeliness of critical mental health processes such as assessments, suicide prevention evaluations, suicide management, medication management, and treatment services.

C. OPP Provides Unconstitutional Medical Care

43. The Constitution requires Defendant to provide prisoners with adequate care for their serious medical needs. Defendant has exhibited deliberate indifference to OPP prisoners' serious medical needs. OPP prisoners suffer serious harm from Defendant's failure to provide treatment for their serious medical needs.

44. Defendant is subjectively aware of the ongoing serious harm and risk of serious harm from the United States' September 11, 2009 findings letter and April 23, 2012 update letter, yet fails to correct the known deficiencies.

45. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to prisoners' serious medical needs by failing to implement an adequate sick call process or medication administration system.

46. OPP's sick call process fails to adequately collect, process, and track prisoners' sick call requests. This failure causes prisoners harm from unnecessary delays before treatment, and unanswered sick call requests that result in no treatment for the prisoner's serious medical need.

47. Defendant's medication administration process inappropriately allows prisoners to self-administer many of their own medications.

48. The inappropriate medication practice causes harm and risk of harm to prisoners from under and over medication, including from powerful psychotropic drugs.

D. OPP Subjects Prisoners to Unconstitutional Physical Plant Conditions

49. The Constitution requires Defendant to provide prisoners with a minimal civilized measure of life's necessities, including protection from environmental and fire safety hazards. Defendant has failed to take minimum reasonable measures to protect prisoners from environmental and fire safety hazards, and is deliberately indifferent to the resulting harm and risk of harm to prisoners.

50. OPP prisoners suffer harm and risk of harm from OPP's substandard environmental health and sanitation conditions.

51. Defendant is subjectively aware of the ongoing serious harm and risk of serious harm from the United States' September 11, 2009 findings letter and April 23, 2012 update letter, yet fails to correct the known deficiencies.

52. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to prisoners' safety by maintaining OPP in a state of disrepair, causing illness and injury to prisoners. Broken floor tiles, toilets, sinks, showers, water leaks, mold, and electrical hazards exist throughout OPP. Poor ventilation exacerbates harm from OPP's elevated prisoner cell temperatures.

53. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to prisoners' safety by serving prisoners unsanitary food. Prisoners serve food, with bacteria-prone temperatures, prepared in unsanitary food service areas. This food service practice subjects prisoners to food-borne illnesses. Defendant is deliberately indifferent to prisoners' health and safety by housing prisoners in units without operational smoke or alarm systems and without implementation of appropriate fire watches.

E. OPP Unlawfully Discriminates Against Latino Limited English Proficient Prisoners

i. Unlawful Discrimination

54. Defendant is aware of OPP prisoners who are LEP and of what is necessary to provide meaningful LEP assistance and services in the correctional context.

55. Defendant is aware of the discriminatory treatment of Latino LEP prisoners at OPP, yet it allows OPP to continue to operate in a discriminatory manner and fails to take basic measures to address and correct this discrimination.

56. Defendant's failure to provide language assistance at OPP denies Latino LEP prisoners the services, programs, and activities that OPP makes available to non-LEP prisoners.

57. For example, Defendant's failure to provide LEP assistance prevents Latino LEP prisoners from meaningful access to the intake, processing, housing, and medical services, at each of the OPP facilities.

58. Defendant lacks a sufficient number of LEP competent Spanish speaking staff at OPP.

59. Defendant conducts OPP's intake process almost exclusively in English, leaving Latino LEP prisoners uninformed about the intake and classification process, and OPP's general rules.

60. Defendant fails to translate important OPP documents, including documents regarding prisoner rights and access to services, into Spanish for Latino LEP prisoners. OPP staff members regularly ask Latino LEP prisoners to sign important forms written in English without the aid of appropriate language assistance.

67. Through an April 23, 2012, letter and other means, the United States advised Defendant that OPP's LEP services violate Title VI and its implementing regulations.

68. Since the April 23, 2012, letter, the United States has made concerted efforts to secure Defendant's voluntary compliance with Title VI and its implementing regulations.

69. The United States has determined that Defendant's compliance with Title VI and its implementing regulations cannot be secured by voluntary means without court ordered remedies.

V. VIOLATIONS

FIRST CLAIM:

DEFENDANT'S PATTERN AND PRACTICE OF VIOLATING PRISONERS' CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

70. The United States re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1-533, above.

71. The Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1997, authorizes the United States to seek equitable and declaratory relief to remedy a pattern or practice of Defendant depriving prisoners confined to OPP of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution.

72. Defendant is, has been, or should have been aware of the deficiencies alleged in paragraphs 1-533, but has failed to take effective measures to remedy these deficiencies. These failures amount to deliberate indifference to the safety and health of OPP prisoners, in violations of the rights, privileges, and immunities of those prisoners that the Constitution secures and protects. *See* U.S. Const. Amend. VIII & XIV. This deliberate indifference caused and continues to cause the violations of constitutional rights alleged.

79. This treatment of Latino LEP prisoners by Defendant or Defendant's agents is unjustified and has an adverse disparate impact/discriminatory effect on Latinos.

80. Defendant's discrimination against LEP prisoners violates Title VI and the DOJ's Title VI implementing regulations.

VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

81. WHEREFORE, the United States prays that the Court will:

82. Declare that Defendant's acts and omissions constitute a pattern or practice of conduct that deprives OPP prisoners of rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution;

83. Enjoin Defendant and Defendant's agents from continuing these acts and omissions, and order Defendant to take such remedial actions as will ensure lawful conditions of confinement at OPP;

84. Declare that Defendant has excluded persons from participation in, denied persons the benefits of, or subjected persons to discrimination under programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance, on the basis of race, color, or national origin, in violation of Title VI;

85. Enjoin Defendant and Defendant's agents from engaging in any of the discriminatory acts forming the Title VI violation, and order Defendant to take such remedial action as will eliminate such discrimination; and

86. Order such other relief as the interests of justice may require.

Respectfully submitted this 23rd day of September, 2012.




ERIC H. HOLDER, JR.
Attorney General of the United States

JAMES B. LETTEN (LA 8517)
United States Attorney
District of New Orleans

THOMAS E. PEREZ
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division

ROY L. AUSTIN, JR. (DC 211491)
Deputy Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division



JONATHAN M. SMITH (DC 396578)
Chief

LAURA COON
Special Counsel

COREY SANDERS (DC 490940)

KERRY DEAN (DC 474260)

Trial Attorneys

United States Department of Justice

Civil Rights Division

Special Litigation Section

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530

Tel.: (202) 514-6255

Email: corey.sanders@usdoj.gov