

1 G. SCOTT EMBLIDGE, State Bar No. 121613  
2 ERIN H. REDING, State Bar No. 252691  
3 JODIE A. SMITH, State Bar No. 299225  
4 MOSCONE EMBLIDGE & OTIS LLP  
5 220 Montgomery Street, Suite 2100  
6 San Francisco, CA 94104  
7 Telephone: (415) 362-3599  
8 Facsimile: (415) 362-2006  
9 Email: emblidge@mosconelaw.com  
10 reding@mosconelaw.com

11 Attorneys for Defendants County of Alameda,  
12 the Alameda County Board of Supervisors,  
13 the Alameda County Social Services Agency,  
14 and Lori Cox in her capacity as Director of the  
15 Alameda County Social Services Agency

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
18 SAN FRANCISCO COURTHOUSE

19 DONALD RAY LILLEY; JARVIS  
20 JOHNSON; and DANIEL MALLORY,

Case No. 3:15-cv-004475-JD

21 Plaintiffs,

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]  
ORDER TO DISSOLVE PERMANENT  
INJUNCTION**

22 vs.

23 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA; BOARD OF  
24 SUPERVISORS OF ALAMEDA COUNTY;  
25 ALAMEDA COUNTY SOCIAL SERVICES  
26 AGENCY; and LORI COX, in her official  
27 capacity as Director of the Alameda County  
28 Social Services Agency;

Defendants.

STIPULATION

Defendants County of Alameda, Board of Supervisors of Alameda County, Alameda County Social Services, and Lori Cox (“Defendants), by and through their attorney Erin H. Reding of Moscone Emblidge & Otis LLP, on the one hand, and Plaintiffs Donald Ray Lilley, Jarvis Johnson, and Daniel Mallory, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated (“Plaintiffs”), by and through their attorney Lauren Hansen of the Public Interest Law Project, on the other hand, do and hereby AGREE and STIPULATE as follows:

WHEREAS, on March 7, 2016, the Court entered a stipulated Permanent Injunction and Order in this case;

WHEREAS, the Permanent Injunction and Order, *inter alia*, enjoins Defendants “to comply fully within a margin of human error with the legally mandated times for processing expedited and regular CalFresh applications” – to wit, applicants for regular CalFresh benefits must receive a determination of eligibility and the issuance of benefits for approved applications within thirty (30) days from the date of application and qualified applicants for expedited service CalFresh benefits must receive such benefits within three (3) calendar days from the date of application;

WHEREAS, the Permanent Injunction and Order also provides that the injunction shall remain in effect for a minimum of one year and until Defendants have complied for six consecutive months with the above-mentioned time frames and presented evidence that they “will continue to comply with these time frames for the foreseeable future”;

WHEREAS, Defendants complied with the time frames for the timely processing of regular and expedited CalFresh applications for the following percentages of applications from March 2016 through February 2017: March 2016 – 95.3% (regular applications) and 91.7% (expedited applications); April 2016 – 94.7% (regular applications) and 94.1% (expedited applications); May 2016 – 95.4% (regular applications) and 92.5% (expedited applications); June 2016 – 96.6% (regular applications) and 96.3% (expedited applications); July 2016 – 98% (regular applications) and 96.3% (expedited applications); August 2016 – 98.3% (regular applications) and 96.2% (expedited applications); September 2016 – 98.7% (regular

1 applications) and 97.3% (expedited applications); October 2016 – 99.1% (regular applications)  
2 and 98.7% (expedited applications); November 2016 – 99.1% (regular applications) and 97.5%  
3 (expedited applications); December 2016 – 99.4% (regular applications) and 99.7% (expedited  
4 applications); January 2017 – 98.8% (regular applications) and 98.83% (expedited applications);  
5 and February 2017 – 99.2% (regular applications) and 99.1% (expedited applications);

6 WHEREAS, at the March 9, 2017 hearing on Defendants’ Motion to Dissolve the  
7 Permanent Injunction, the Court requested that the County demonstrate one additional month of  
8 compliance with the Permanent Injunction before dissolving the Injunction;

9 WHEREAS, at the March 9, 2017 hearing on Defendants’ Motion to Dissolve, the Court  
10 requested the parties file a stipulation and proposed order dissolving the Permanent Injunction,  
11 upon one additional month of compliance by Defendants;

12 WHEREAS, as of April 10, 2017, Defendants have demonstrated one additional month  
13 of compliance with the Permanent Injunction in that 99.4% of regular CalFresh applications and  
14 98.9% of expedited CalFresh applications were processed in a timely manner in March 2017;

15 WHEREAS, Defendants have also given assurances that they will continue to comply for  
16 the foreseeable future with the above-mentioned time frames for the processing of regular and  
17 expedited CalFresh applications; and

18 WHERAS, as of April 10, 2017, Defendants have satisfied all terms of the Permanent  
19 Injunction.

20 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY STIPUALTED by and between Defendants and  
21 Plaintiffs as follows:

- 22 (1) Defendants have satisfied the terms of the Permanent Injunction;
- 23 (2) The Permanent Injunction is hereby dissolved pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil  
24 Procedure 60(b)(5); and

(3) This case is hereby closed.

SO STIPULATED.

Dated: April 25, 2017

Erin H. Reding

Counsel for Defendants

Dated: April 25, 2017

Lauren Hansen

Counsel for Plaintiffs

**[PROPOSED] ORDER**

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- (1) Defendants have satisfied all the terms of the Permanent Injunction;
- (2) The Permanent Injunction is hereby dissolved pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(5); and
- (3) This case is hereby closed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: "O c{"6, 2017

