| SUREKHA PESSIS, Deputy City Attorn 200 North Main Street, Room 916 Los Angeles, California 90012 | ney (State Bar No. 193206) |
|--|--|
| Attorneys for Defendant CITY OF LOS | ANGELES |
| UNITED STATES | DISTRICT COURT |
| CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| CARL MITCHELL, MICHEAL ESCOBEDO, SALVADOR ROQUE, JUDY COLEMAN, as individuals; LOS ANGELES CATHOLIC WORKER, CANGRESS, as organizations, PLAINTIFFS, v. CITY OF LOS ANGELES, a municipal entity; LT. ANDREW MATHIS, SGT. HAMER and SGT. RICHTER, in their individual and official capacities, DEFENDANTS. | CASE NO. CV16-01750 SJO (JPRx) [Assigned to the Honorable S. James Otero, Courtroom 1] [proposed] ORDER GRANTING CITY OF LOS ANGELES' MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF ORDER Date: June 27, 2016 Time: 10 a.m. Place: Courtroom 1 |
| The Court, having considered the marguments of counsel, hereby rules as follows: The motion to clarify its order of Aprinjunction issued in favor of the Plaintiffs, | oving and opposing papers and the ows: oril 13, 2016, concerning the preliminary is GRANTED. |
| | Los Angeles, California 90012 Telephone: 213.473.6877; Facsimile: 213 Eric.Brown@lacity.org Attorneys for Defendant CITY OF LOS UNITED STATES: CENTRAL DISTRIC CARL MITCHELL, MICHEAL ESCOBEDO, SALVADOR ROQUE, JUDY COLEMAN, as individuals; LOS ANGELES CATHOLIC WORKER, CANGRESS, as organizations, PLAINTIFFS, v. CITY OF LOS ANGELES, a municipal entity; LT. ANDREW MATHIS, SGT. HAMER and SGT. RICHTER, in their individual and official capacities, DEFENDANTS. TO ALL PARTIES AND TO THEIR A The Court, having considered the m arguments of counsel, hereby rules as follows. |

PROPOSED ORDER ON MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION

| 1 | The City may understand the phrase "Skid Row or its surrounding areas" to | |
|----|---|--|
| 2 | mean "the area bordered by Second Street to the north, Eighth Street to the south, | |
| 3 | Alameda Street to the east, and Spring Street to the west." | |
| 4 | The Court did not intend for the City to leave non-essential property of | |
| 5 | homeless arrestees on the street pursuant to Enjoined Action No. 1. The Court | |
| 6 | understands that the City may exercise its community caretaking functions to | |
| 7 | impound property incident to arrest, as appropriate under the specific factual | |
| 8 | circumstances of a given situation. | |
| 9 | The City's confiscation of property left on the street after 24-hours' notice, as | |
| 10 | contemplated in Enjoined Action No. 7, is not a per se violation of Enjoined Action | |
| 11 | No. 1. | |
| 12 | The preliminary injunction does not preclude the City from removing couches. | |
| 13 | appliances, sheds, and other bulky items from City sidewalks and streets. | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | DATED: May 11, 2016 By: | |
| 16 | The Honorable S. James Otero District Judge | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| | | |