1	BRAD D. BRIAN (SBN 79001) brad.brian@mto.com	
2	ROHIT K. SINGLA (SBN 213057) rohit.singla@mto.com	Superior Court of College
3	VICTORIA A. DEGTYAREVA (SBN 284199) Victoria.Degtyareva@mto.com	Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles
4	MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP 350 South Grand Avenue, Fiftieth Floor	NOV 14 2022
5	Los Angeles, California 90071-3426 Telephone: (213) 683-9100	Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court  By
6	Facsimile: (213) 687-3702	Cristina Grijalva Deputy
7	ALEC KARAKATSANIS*	
8	alec@civilrightscorps.org SHIRLEY LAVARCO*	
9	shirley@civilrightscorps.org CIVIL RIGHTS CORPS	
10	1601 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 800 Washington, D.C. 20009	
11	Telephone: (202) 844-4975 Facsimile: (202) 609-8030	
12	DAN STORMER (SBN 101967)	LESLIE A. BAILEY (SBN 232690)
13	dstormer@hadsellstormer.com BRIAN OLNEY (SBN 298089)	lbailey@publicjustice.net BRIAN HARDINGHAM (SBN 288773)
14	bolney@hadsellstormer.com HADSELL STORMER RENICK & DAI LLP	bhardingham@publicjustice.net
15	128 N. Fair Oaks Avenue Pasadena, California 91103	PUB_IC JUSTICE 475 14 <sup>th</sup> St., Ste. 610
16	Telephone: (626) 585-9600	Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: (510) 622-8150
17	Facsimile: (626) 577-7079	
18	[Additional Counsel Listed on Last Page]	
19	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
20	*Pro Hac Vice applications forthcoming	
21	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
22	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT Phillip Urquidi, Daniel Martinez, Susana Case No. Case No.	
23	Phillip Urquidi, Daniel Martinez, Susana Perez, Terilyn Goldson, Gerardo Campos, and	·
24	Arthur Lopez, on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated, and Clergy and Laity	DECLARATION OF MEREDITH GALLEN
25	United for Economic Justice ("CLUE"), Reverend Jennifer Gutierrez, Reverend Gary	
26	Williams, and Rabbi Aryeh Cohen, individually,	
27	Plaintiffs,	
28	vs.	

DECLARATION OF MEREDITH GALLEN

City of Los Angeles Los Angeles County, Los Angeles County Sherriff's Department, Sheriff Alex Villanueva, Los Angeles Police Department, and Chief Michel R. Moore, Defendants. DECLARATION OF MEREDITH GALLEN

## **DECLARATION OF MEREDITH GALLEN**

- 1. I make this declaration based on my own personal knowledge. If called to testify I would be able to attest to the following.
- 2. I am an attorney-at-law, duly licensed to practice in the State of California. I am employed by the Los Angeles County Public Defender's Office and am a board member of the Los Angeles County Public Defenders Union Local 148.
- 3. I have been employed by the Los Angeles County Public Defender's Office since April of 2017.
- 4. I currently work in a felony trial assignment at the Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal

  Justice Center in downtown Los Angeles. In this assignment I represent indigent clients
  charged with a wide range of felony offenses. I have previously worked in misdemeanor
  trial assignments at Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center, the Compton

  Courthouse, and the Metropolitan Courthouse.
- 5. Throughout my five years as a public defender, I have worked in multiple arraignment courts and have personally represented hundreds if not thousands of clients at arraignment. I have repeatedly witnessed the ways in which the bail determination made at the time of an arraignment can drastically impact the course of a case.
- 6. Public defenders in Los Angeles County meet their clients for the first time at arraignment. We do the best we can to make thorough arguments that our clients should be released from custody without cash bail or on a bail amount that they can reasonably

- afford. However, our advocacy is severely limited by the circumstances surrounding arraignment.
- 7. Arraignments generally occur in high-volume courts. In those courts, there is a tremendous amount of pressure to make sure that all cases are heard quickly. There is no real remedy for a delayed arraignment. Clients whose cases are not heard on the date of their scheduled arraignment will remain in custody until the next court day. Consequently, public defenders work hard to ensure that all cases scheduled for arraignment on a particular date are heard on that date to avoid having a client who would otherwise be released remain in jail simply because there was not enough time to call their case. In addition to the high volume of cases handled in arraignment court, this creates pressure to move quickly.
- 8. Arraignment interviews take place under difficult physical conditions. Public defenders are often compelled to speak to clients while they are confined in crowded holding tanks alongside many other people in custody. We try to have important conversations about a client's background, current health conditions, charges, and constitutional rights but must do so by shouting in-between bars or through glass. At the time of arraignment our clients are often hungry and dehydrated, struggling because they have not been provided with prescribed medications, or experiencing symptoms of withdrawal. They may also be handcuffed. Public defenders' ability to gather the information that would assist in making a fulsome bail argument is limited by these conditions.
- 9. A bail argument is only as strong as the information we can garner to support it. Clients in custody do not have access to their property or their cells phone. The only phone numbers they can provide for loved ones, employers, social workers, case managers, etc.

- are the numbers they have memorized. They are unable to access any documentation of employment, mental health conditions, program participation, etc.
- 10. When it is time for us to make a bail argument in a case at arraignment, we endeavor to provide as much information as possible to demonstrate that a client is not a danger to public safety and will return to future court dates. This is a hard task because of the issues outlined above the high volume of cases, the conditions in which arraignments occur, and the lack of access to vital information that could impact the case.
- 11. When a case is called for arraignment, a client is typically held in a glass or metal holding cell within the courtroom itself, typically with many other people who are incarcerated.
- 12. Bench officers at arraignment often ask us for specific documentation to support our arguments (e.g., proof of employment, documentation of enrollment in a substance abuse program, letters of support) or other information that is not readily available given the constraints described in paragraphs 7-9. It is common, in those scenarios, for judges to indicate that if they had more information or documentation, they may consider releasing a client without bail or with a nominal bail amount but are unwilling to do in the moment of initial arraignment. It is routine for the bench officers to then cite the nature of charges, reference the bail schedule, and set a cash bail amount for the case.
- 13. When cash bail is set at arraignment in a case, many clients who had hoped to fight their charges decide to enter a change in plea from "guilty" to "no contest" and accept offers that will allow them to be released from custody on the date of arraignment. In so doing, they abandon the pursuit of viable defenses and their constitutional rights because ongoing incarceration is too great a risk to their well-being.

- 14. In my experience, the bail amount set at arraignment profoundly impacts the way in which future bench officers assess issues related to bail in a case. Bench officers who hear a case post-arraignment often indicate that they believe there must have been a clear reason to justify the imposition of a certain bail amount at the time of arraignment. It often requires a tremendous amount of work to induce a post-arraignment bench officer to consider deviating from the bail decision made by the arraignment judge.
- 15. Because the bail schedule influences the arraignment judge's determination of bail, and the arraignment judge's decision impacts any bench officer's subsequent assessment of the case, in practice the bail schedule has a significant effect on whether a person will be held in custody for the duration of their case.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed November 11, 2022 in Los Angeles, California.

Meredith Gallen

## Additional Plaintiffs' Counsel: 1 2 ROWLEY J. RICE (SBN 313737) SALIL H. DUDANI (SBN 330244) 3 Rowley.Rice@mto.com salil@civilrightscorps.org TIANA S. BAHERI (SBN 330835) 9861 Irvine Center Dr, 4 Tia.Baheri@mto.ccm Irvine, CA 92618 **BRIANNE HOLLAND-STERGAR\* CIVIL RIGHTS CORPS** 5 Brianne.Holland-Stergar@mto.com Telephone: (202) 844-4975 Facsimile: MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP (202) 609-8030 6 350 South Grand Avenue, Fiftieth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-3426 7 Telephone: (213) 683-9100 Facsimile: (213) 687-3702 8 PAUL L. HOFFMAN (SBN 71244) 9 hoffpaul@aol.com JOHN C. WASHINGTON (SBN 315991) 10 jwashington@sshhzlaw.com SCHONBRUN, SEPLOW, HARRIS, 11 HOFFMAN & ZELDES, LLP 200 Pier Ave., Suite 226 12 Hermosa Beach, CA 90254 Telephone: (424) 297-0114 13 (310) 399-7040 Facsimile: 14 \*Pro Hac Vice app!ications forthcoming 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28