2004 JA116 PM 3:49	DEBRA W. YANG United States Attorney LEON W. WEIDMAN Assistant U.S. Attorney Chief, Civil Division ROBERT I. LESTER (Bar No. 116429) Room 7516 Federal Building 300 North Los Angeles Street Los Angeles, California 9001 Telephone: (213) 894-2464 Fax: (213) 894-7819 Attorneys for defendants (additional co	unsel listed on continuous listed on continuous listed on continuous library listed on continuous listed on contin	CENTRAL DISTRIBY nuation page) AL LAW	FILED DISTRICT COURT I 7 2001 GT OF CALIFORNIA DEPUTY Priority Send Enter Closed JS-5/JS-6 JS-2/JS-3 ORTGINAL CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT FEB 8 2004	
	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		T COURT	ENTRA DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA DEPUTY	
	FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
	FELICITY MARY NEWMAN, et al.,)) CIV.)) CIV. NO. 87-4757-WDK(CWx)) ORDER APPROVING SETTLEMENT OF CLASS ACTION		
	Plaintiffs,				
	v.))	1000 01		
	UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES, et al.,) Hear	ing: None : None		
	Defendants.)			

THIS CONSTITUTES NOTICE OF ENTRY

AS REQUIRED BY FRCP, RULE 77(d).

¹ Pursuant to Rule 25 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure United States Citizenship and Immigration Services ("CIS") is substituted for the former Immigration and Naturalization Service, and Eduardo Aguirre, Jr., Acting Director, in his official capacity, is substituted for former Commissioner Doris Meissner.

-	PETER D. NESSLER
2	Assistant Attorney General
_	Civil Division
3	DAVID J. KLINE
4	TERRI J. SCADRON
-	ANTHONY W. NORWOOD
5	Attorneys
6	Office of Immigration Litigation Civil Division
U	U.S. Department of Justice
7	P.O. Box 878, Ben Franklin Station
o	Washington, D.C. 20044
8	Telephone: (202) 616-4883
9	Fax: (202) 616-9366
10	Additional attorneys for defendants
10	
11	
12	ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN LEGAL CENTER Stewart Kwoh
12	1145 Wilshire Blvd. 2nd Floor
13	Los Angeles, CA 90017
14	
14	ASIAN LAW CAUCUS, INC.
15	Joannie C. Chang 939 Market Street, Suite 201
	San Francisco, CA 94103
16	
17	NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD
	Marc Van Der Hout
18	Van Der Hout & Brigagliano 180 Sutter Street, Fifth Floor
19	San Francisco, CA 94104
•	·
20	Additional attorneys for plaintiffs
21	111
22	
23	
1	
24	
25	
Ì	
26	
27	
İ	
70 I	

l

This matter is before the Court pursuant to the parties' Joint Motion to Approve Settlement Agreement. The Court has read and considered the parties' motion, the comments and objection of putative class members to the proposed settlement, and the parties' joint response to those objections. The Court finds that the proposed settlement fully and fairly resolves the claims of class members herein and that it should accordingly be approved.

Rule 23(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires the Court to approve a settlement in a class action. Rule 23(e) provides:

A class action shall not be dismissed or compromised without the approval of the court, and notice of the proposed dismissal or compromise shall be given to all members of the class in such manner as the court directs.

Under Rule 23(e), a class settlement will be approved so long as the "proposed settlement . . . is fundamentally fair, adequate, and reasonable." Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle, 955 F.2d 1268, 1276 (9th Cir. 1992). It is the settlement taken as a whole, rather than the individual component parts, that must be examined for overall fairness. Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm'n of San Francisco, 688 F.2d 615, 628 (9th Cir. 1982). There is a "strong judicial policy that favors settlements, particularly where complex class action litigation is concerned." Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle, supra, at 1276.

For the reasons set out in the parties' joint motion to approve the settlement and their joint response to the objections and comments of putative class members, the Court finds that the settlement is fundamentally fair, adequate and reasonable. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the proposed settlement is approved

Dated January 16

, 2004.

William full

United States District Judge

Presented M

I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

15

Anthony W. Norwood U.S. Department of Justice

Office of Immigration Litigation

Civil Division

P.O. Box 878, Ben Franklin Station

Washington, D.C. 20044 Counsel for Defendants

[per telephonic authorization]

Peter A Schey

Carlos R. Holguin

Center for Human Rights

and Constitutional Law

256 S. Occidental Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90057

20 Counsel for Plaintiffs

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

	DEBRA W. YANG United States Attorney LEON W. WEIDMAN						
3							
4							
5	300 North Los Angeles Street Los Angeles, California 90012						
6	Telephone: (213) 894-2464 Fax: (213) 894-7819						
7 8	Page)						
_	CENTER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND CONSTITUTIONAL LAW Peter A. Schey Carlos R. Holguin Center For Human Rights and Constitutional Law 256 S. Occidental Blvd.						
9							
10							
12	- ·	onal Counsel listed on Continuation					
13	Page)						
14		STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
15	FELICITY MARY NEWMAN,)						
16	et al.,	CIV. NO. 87-4757-WDK(CWx)					
17	}						
18	Plaintiffs,	JOINT STIPULATION					
19	v. (OF SETTLEMENT					
	BUREAU OF CITIZENSHIP AND						
20	IMMIGRATION SERVICES, 1/et al.,)	Hearing: Time:					
21	Defendants.)						
22)						
23	•						
24							
25							
26							
27		Federal Rules of Civil Procedure the					
8	Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services ("BCIS") is substituted for the former Immigration and Naturalization Service, and Eduardo						
	Aguirre, Jr., Acting Director, in his official capacity, is substituted for former Commissioner Doris Meissner.						

1	ROBERT D. McCALLUM, JR.
2	Assistant Attorney General Civil Division
3	DAVID J. KLINE TERRI J. SCADRON
4	ii a caracteristic caracterist
5	Office of Immigration Litigation Civil Division
6	U.S. Department of Justice
7	P.O. Box 878, Ben Franklin Station Washington, D.C. 20044 Telephone: (202) 616-4883
8	Fax: (202) 616-9366
9	Additional Attorneys for Defendants
10	
11	ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN LEGAL CENTER Stewart Kwoh
12	l145 Wilshire Blvd. 2nd Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017
:13	ASIAN LAW CAUCUS, INC.
14	Joannie C. Chang 939 Market Street, Suite 201 San Francisco, CA 94103
15	
16	NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD Marc Van Der Hout
17	Van Der Hout & Brigagliano 180 Sutter Street, Fifth Floor
18	San Francisco, CA 94104
19	Additional Attorneys for Plaintiffs
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

- 2 -

Plaintiffs and defendants, by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby agree and stipulate as follows:

1. Class Definition

The following subclasses are entitled to relief pursuant to this Settlement Agreement:

- A. All persons who are otherwise prima facie eligible for legalization under Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA") who attempted to file a completed application and application fee with a representative of the Immigration and Naturalization Service ("INS") including a Qualified Designated Entity ("QDE"), during the period from May 5, 1987, to May 4, 1988, but had the application and fee refused by that representative because they had traveled outside of the United States and returned with a visitor's visa, student visa, or any other type of visa or travel document.
- B. All persons who filed for class membership under Newman et al. v. INS et al., 87-4757-WDK(CWx)(C.D. Cal.), and who are otherwise prima facie eligible for legalization under Section 245A of the INA, who were informed by an INS officer or QDE employee during the period May 5, 1987, to May 4, 1988, that they were ineligible for legalization because they had traveled outside of the United States and returned with a visitor's visa, student visa, or any other type of visa or travel document, or were refused by the INS or its QDEs legalization forms on account of that travel and the facially valid visa rule, and for whom such information, or inability to obtain the required application forms, was a substantial cause of their failure to timely file or complete a written application.

For purposes of the subclass definition, the phrase "filed for class membership" shall be determined in accordance with 8 C.F.R.

§ 245a.10.

2. Notice to Defendants' Employees

Commencing within fourteen (14) days of the date on which this Settlement Agreement is approved by the district court, or a separate settlement agreement is approved by the district court in Catholic Social Services, Inc. v. Reno, CIV No. S-86~1343 LKK (E.D. Cal.), ("CSS") whichever is later, defendants shall use good faith and reasonable efforts to distribute this Settlement Agreement or a summary attached as Exhibit 1 to all of their officers, agents and employees responsible for processing class membership claims or who may in the course of their duties supervise officers who detain or remove putative class members. Defendants shall use good faith and reasonable efforts to serve Class Counsel with copies of all supplemental instructions or guidelines issued to their officers, agents or employees regarding implementation of this Settlement Agreement.

3. Notice to Subclass Members

In the event that this agreement is approved by the district court, defendants shall, within sixty (60) days from the date of the court's approval, or the approval of a separate settlement agreement by the district court in <u>CSS</u>, whichever is later, issue a press release and a Class Notice in English and Spanish (attached as Exhibit 2) announcing this Settlement Agreement. The press release, Class Notice, and Newman Class Membership Applications (attached as Exhibit 3) shall be distributed to the media and community-based organizations according to the BCIS's normal procedure for doing so, and defendants shall provide a copy of the distribution list to class counsel. The press release, Class Notice and Newman Class Membership Applications

shall be posted on defendants' web site until the end of the application period referenced in paragraph 4 below. The press release, Class Notice and Newman Class Membership Applications shall also be made available at defendants' district offices until the end of the application period referenced in paragraph 4 below. Within 60 days of this Settlement Agreement and during the remainder of the application period specified in paragraph 4, defendants shall make available to all persons, upon request, a copy of Form I-687, Newman Class Member Applications and instructions, and Form I-765.

4. Application Period.

In the event that this agreement is approved by the district court, defendants shall, within thirty (30) to sixty (60) days after the issuance of Notices required in Paragraph 3 above, commence accepting Newman Class Membership Applications, and Form I-687 Application for Status as a Temporary Resident with fee, and supporting documentation, from subclass member applicants. Defendants shall continue to accept such applications for subclass membership and temporary permanent residence for a period of one year thereafter, and no longer. Applications shall be deemed filed on the date postmarked in accordance with the provisions at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(a).

5. Filing of Applications.

Individuals asserting a claim for relief under this Settlement Agreement shall file a Newman Class Membership Application, and a Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident, with fee, and supporting documentation.

⁻13

1.8

The fee for filing a Form I-687 shall be the fee applicable by regulation or Federal Register Notice at the time of filing the application(s). (The fee for filing a Form I-687, which has not changed since 1986, is currently \$185 per person with a family cap of \$420, but may be changed to reflect the current cost of adjudication). The fee for fingerprinting is currently \$50 and the fee for filing Form I-765, Application for Employment Authorization, is currently \$100. Except as provided for in Paragraph 10 below, applicants must file a Form I-765 with fee if they wish to receive an employment authorization document.

As to persons who previously filed for class membership, as that term is defined in paragraph 1 above, Defendants shall refund the fee for filing the Form I-687 if such person's application for class membership is denied pursuant to paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 below.

As to those individuals who did not previously file for class membership, as that term is defined in paragraph 1 above, there shall be no refund of the fee for filing the Form I-687 if such person's application for class membership is denied pursuant to paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 below.

6. Adjudication of Applications for Class Membership

Newman Class Membership Applications should be granted if, based on responses to questions asked on the applications, it appears more probable than not that the applicant meets the subclass definition. A determination that an applicant is a subclass member is not binding in any manner on defendants for the purposes of an adjudication on the merits of the application for temporary residence which shall be conducted de novo. Newman Class Membership Applications shall not be denied solely because applicants do not possess documentary evidence

.

 establishing class membership. Defendants shall treat information and materials submitted in connection with a Newman Class Member Application as confidential in accordance with 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(c)(5).

7. Intended Denials of Class Membership

Before denying an application for class membership, defendants shall forward the applicant or his or her representative a notice of intended denial explaining the perceived deficiency in the applicant's Newman Class Membership Application and providing the applicant thirty (30) days to submit additional written evidence or information to remedy the perceived deficiency.

8. Denial of Applications for Class Membership.

Defendants shall send a written notice of the decision to deny an application for class membership to the applicant and his or her attorney of record, with a copy to Class Counsel. The notice shall explain the reason for the denial of the application, and notify the applicant of his or her right to seek review of such denial by a Special Master, on the document attached as Exhibit 4. On review, neither defendants nor the applicant shall be permitted to submit new evidence to the Special Master.

- 9. Review by Special Master.
- A. Selection of the Special Masters. These will be the same Special Masters selected in <u>CSS</u>, and any appeals will be assigned in the same random manner as in that case.
- B. Review of Decisions Involving Determination of Class
 Membership. Any decision by defendants denying an application for
 subclass membership may be appealed to a Special Master. Any such
 appeal must be post-marked within 30 days of the date of mailing of
 the notice denying the application for class membership. The Special

Master's review shall be based on the documents and other evidence submitted by the applicant, and any documentary evidence relied upon by defendants in reaching the decision to deny the application for class membership.

The Special Master shall be paid a fee of \$125 for adjudicating each appeal under subparagraphs (i) and (ii) below. Payment of this fee shall be bourne by the parties as follows:

- (i) If the appeal involves a denial of class membership based on criminal or security-related grounds, the applicant is responsible for paying the entire fee; and
- (ii) If the appeal involves a denial of class membership on other than criminal or security-related grounds, the fee shall be bourne equally by defendants and the applicant. The applicant's portion of the fee must accompany his or her notice of appeal. Defendants must submit their portion of the fee within 30 days of being notified by the Special Master that an appeal has been duly filed.
- C. Review of Other Decisions. An applicant who believes that defendants have violated his or her individual rights pursuant to paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, or 13 of this Settlement Agreement may file a claim with the Special Master. However, prior to filing any such claim, the applicant must advise defendants by certified mail, or other documented delivery service to an address specified by defendants, that he or she believes that Defendants have violated his or her rights under Paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, or 13. Defendants shall have forty-five (45) days from the date they are notified of the applicant's intent to file a claim under this paragraph in which to investigate and, if appropriate, rectify any deficiency. If fifty (50) days after notifying defendants of his or her intent to file a

claim, the applicant does not receive notice that defendants have sustained the applicant's challenge, then the applicant may file his or her appeal to the Special Master. Any such appeal must be postmarked within eighty (80) days of the date the applicant advised Defendants of the alleged violation.

The Special Master shall be paid a fee of \$65 for adjudicating each appeal under this subparagraph C. The applicant must pay the entire fee at the time he or she files the notice of appeal. If the applicant prevails on the merits of his or her appeal, Defendants must reimburse the applicant the entire fee within a reasonable time after being notified that the applicant prevailed on appeal.

10. Renewal of Employment Authorization Documents

*-*13

Defendants shall, without fee, reissue or renew for a period of one year employment authorization to applicants in the subclass defined herein who were previously issued such employment authorization pursuant to interim relief orders in Newman et al. v. INS, No. 87-4757 (C.D. Cal.). An applicant shall be entitled to have his or her employment authorization renewed only during the application period and only one time under this provision.

11. Adjudication of Applications for Temporary Residence.

Defendants shall adjudicate each application for temporary residence filed on Form I-687 in accordance with the provisions of Section 245A of the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a, regulations, and administrative and judicial precedents the INS followed in adjudicating I-687 applications timely filed during the IRCA application period. In adjudicating I-687s pursuant to this agreement, defendants shall utilize the standards set forth in 8 CFR § 245a.18(c), or 8 CFR § 245a.2(k)(4), which ever is more favorable to

the applicant. Failure to provide evidence other than affidavits shall not be the sole basis for finding an alien failed to meet the continuous residence requirement. For purposes of establishing residence and presence in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b), the term "until the date of filing" shall mean until the date the alien attempted to file a completed application and fee or was caused not to timely file, consistent with the Subclass Definitions. In evaluating the sufficiency of applicant's proof of residence, defendants shall take into account the passage of time and attendant difficulties in obtaining corroborative documentation of unlawful residence.

- 12. Time for Determining Class Membership and Legalization Applications.
- A. Defendants shall use good faith and reasonable efforts either to approve applications for class membership or issue notices of intended denials within ninety (90) days. If a notice of intended denial is issued, defendants shall endeavor to issue a final decision on the application for class membership within ninety (90) days after receipt of an applicant's supplemental evidence or explanation, if any.
- B. Defendants shall use good faith and reasonable efforts to adjudicate subclass members' I-687 Forms within one hundred and eighty (180) days of approval of their application for class membership.
- C. If the aggregate volume of Form I-687 applications received under this Settlement Agreement and the Settlement Agreement reached in <u>CSS</u> exceeds two hundred forty thousand it is anticipated that the approximate processing times referenced in subparagraphs A and B above will double.

13. Removal of Class Applicants from the United States.

Defendants shall not remove from the United States or detain any putative class members who appear to be prima facie eligible for class membership under this Settlement Agreement and for legalization under Section 245A of the INA. This paragraph shall not apply to any alien who is subject to detention or removal despite his or her having been previously determined to be eligible for class membership. For example, if, after having been deemed a class member, it is found that the alien has been convicted of a crime(s) that render(s) him or her ineligible for legalization, the alien may nevertheless be detained and removed from the United States.

14. Reporting on Implementation of This Agreement.

Commencing four months after the beginning of the filing period, defendants shall prepare quarterly reports setting forth the number of Newman Class Membership Applications, Forms I-687, and Forms I-765, that were received, approved, denied and pending. Copies of such report shall be provided to Class Counsel. In the event defendants believe good cause exists to extend the time periods set forth in paragraphs 12, defendants shall provide Class Counsel with a written explanation of such cause and proposed alternative target periods.

15. Costs and Attorneys Fees.

8.

Defendants will pay plaintiffs attorneys' fees and costs, as determined by a separate agreement.

16. Duration of Agreement.

The parties agree that this agreement will become effective on the date it is approved by the Court. The agreement will remain in effect for one year after defendants adjudicate the last application for class membership. Defendants agree to promptly notify Class

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

⁻ 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Counsel of the date they adjudicate the last application for class membership.

Dismissal of Complaint, Dissolution of Injunctive Orders and Other Decisions.

In the event the district court approves this Settlement Agreement, plaintiffs agree to promptly move the court for dismissal with prejudice of each and every claim of the complaint, as amended, and the dissolution of any injunctive order(s) and other decisions entered by the district court.

18. Continuing Jurisdiction.

The parties agree that notwithstanding the filing and granting of any motion pursuant to paragraph No. 17, the district court will retain jurisdiction in this action over only the matters described immediately below.

- Claims by plaintiffs that the Defendants have engaged in a pattern and practice of refusing to implement any of the relief set forth in this Agreement.
- Claims by plaintiffs that the Defendants have expressly В. repudiated this Agreement.
- At least sixty (60) days prior to bringing any action C. pursuant to this provision, the parties shall meet and confer in a good faith effort to resolve any of their differences.
- Any action under this provision must be brought within one D. year after the Defendants adjudicate the last application for class membership.
- Class Counsel. 19.

Class Counsel for the purposes of this Settlement Agreement are

5

б

7

3

Peter Schey and Carlos R. Holguin, Center for Human Rights and Constitutional Law, 256 5. Occidental Slvd., Los Angeles, CA 90057, telephone (213) 188-8693, facsimile (213) 386-9494, email ammestycoordinator@centerforhumanriants.org.

- 20. This agreement is conditioned upon approval by the Secretary of the Department of Momeland Security, and the Deputy Actorney Seneral, United States Department of Justice.
- 21. This agreement is subject to approval by the United States Dietrica Court pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.

Carlos R. Holguin

(213) 388-8693

Center for Human Aights

256 S. Occidental Blvd.

Los Angeles, CA 90057

Counsel for Plaintiffs

Dated: Fine 17, 2003

and Constitutional Law

9 10 11

pochzow 12 U.S. Department of Justice P.O. Box 878, Ben Franklin 13

Station

Washington, DC 20044

202-615-4283

Counsel for Defendance

Dated:

Robert R. Rhyndrid Associate Gereral Counsel 18 Buleau of Cidizenship and

Immigration Services

U.S. Department of Homeland

Security 20

Dated: 0-16-03 21

22

16

17

19

June 15, 2003 23

24

25

25

27

2 €

- 13 -

---<u>-</u> - - -