

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. LA CV02-05662 JAK (SHx)

Date July 31, 2014

Title Katie A, et al. v. Diana Bonta, et al.

Present: The Honorable JOHN A. KRONSTADT, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Melissa Kunig

Alex Joko

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Robert D. Newman
Patrick Gardiner
Kimberly Lewis

Also Present:

Special Master, Richard Saletta;
Brandon Nichols, Los Angeles County Counsel
Philip Browning, Director, Los Angeles County
DCFS

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

Ernest Martinez; Carmen D. Snuggs;
Douglas Press; Susan Diedrich; John Krause;
Dina Kokkos-Gonzalez; Gregory Rose;
Heather Cotto (via teleconference);
Christine Hoerl (via teleconference);
Caroline Caton (via teleconference);
Connie Hamilton (via teleconference);
Cheryl Treadwell (via teleconference);
Teresa Castillo (via teleconference);
Julia Rojas (via teleconference);
Julie Inderkum (via teleconference);
Troy Konarski (via teleconference);
Kathleen Nishimura (via teleconference);
Francine Bremer; (via teleconference)

Proceedings: STATUS CONFERENCE

The status conference is held. The Court makes introductory comments about the parties' progress toward agreement on the appropriate next steps in the implementation process, the significant efforts made by Defendants toward reaching the goals and requirements of the settlement agreement, and the dedicated and thorough work of the Special Master. The Court notes that all involved are dedicated to the well-being of the children on whose behalf the litigation was brought.

The Court then notes that the parties and the Special Master have not previously conferred as to disputed issues on their respective proposals for recommendations for the Court to adopt. The Court then inquires whether all parties and the Special Master believe that it would be productive for them to confer at this time and prior to further proceedings with the Court. All agree that this would be a productive means of seeking to narrow, if not resolve, disputed issues. The Court approves such discussions and recesses the proceedings for that purpose.

The parties and the Special Master confer in various groups and sub-groups for approximately 90

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.	LA CV02-05662 JAK (SHx)	Date	July 31, 2014
Title	Katie A, et al. v. Diana Bonta, et al.		

minutes. All of these discussions are off the record; the Court is not present for any of them.

The Court resumes the proceedings. Counsel for Plaintiffs and for certain Defendants as well as the Special Master address the Court. With respect to the 11 recommendations that have been made by the Special Master, the parties and the Special Master report substantial agreement as to 3-8 and 9, and note that recommendation 10 concerns a scheduling matter that is within the Court’s complete discretion; it is not disputed by the parties. The parties and the Special Master also discuss their progress toward potential agreement as to recommendations 2 and 7. Finally, the parties and Special Master acknowledge that the greatest areas of disagreement presently concern recommendations 1 and 11.

The Court confers with all parties and the Special Master as to the areas of agreement and dispute. The Court expresses optimism that agreement may be reached as to some, if not all, of the remaining issues through further discussions between and among the parties and the Special Master. In the interest of judicial and party economy, as well as to serve the need to take steps that will ensure the timely compliance with the terms of the settlement agreement, the Court concludes that the next steps in the process will be as follows:

1. The parties and the Special Master shall meet and confer forthwith as to the language in any remaining disputed recommendations. On or before **August 15, 2014**, the parties and Special Master shall submit a then up-to-date version(s) of the recommendations. The submission shall use a red-line format to illustrate any remaining disputes as to language between or among the parties and the Special Master.
2. At the same time that the parties and Special Counsel submit the aforementioned document, each of the three – Plaintiffs, Defendants, and the Special Master – shall submit a brief, not to exceed 10 pages, setting forth their respective or collective positions as to why the disputed language and resulting approach that each recommends is both appropriate and consistent with the requirements of the settlement agreement. The Court notes that a reiteration of what is in the parties’ briefs that preceded this hearing would not be particularly useful because that information is already before the Court. Instead, the parties should add to that information by focusing on the practical issues that relate to a successful and timely implementation of the terms of the settlement agreement so that the affected minors will receive the needed services in accordance with the schedule anticipated by the settlement agreement. Descriptions of meaningful, proposed timelines will also be helpful.
3. The Court sets a further status conference for **August 28, 2014 at 11:00 a.m.** to discuss and seek to resolve any remaining disputes as to the recommendations, and to set any further appropriate deadlines and hearings in this matter. The Court sets a meeting with the Special Master in advance of the hearing on **August 28, 2014 at 10:00 a.m.** The Special Master shall email the Clerk with a list of parties who will be appearing by telephone and in person on or before **August 21, 2014**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

1 : 13

 Initials of Preparer mku
