

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JENNY LISETTE FLORES., *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney  
General of the United States, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. CV 85-4544-DMG (AGR<sub>x</sub>)

**ORDER GRANTING FINAL  
APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT  
AGREEMENT [1161][1284]**

1 UPON CONSIDERATION of Plaintiffs’ Unopposed Motion for Final Approval  
2 of Settlement [Doc. # 1284], the Court APPROVES the parties’ settlement agreement  
3 [Doc. # 1256-1] (“Agreement”).

4 As detailed in the Agreement, the parties have agreed to resolve Plaintiffs’  
5 August 9, 2021 Motion to Enforce [Doc. # 1161] regarding Class Members detained at  
6 Emergency Intake Sites (“EISes”).

7 The Agreement provides, in part, that EISes shall provide suitable living  
8 accommodations, access to daily outdoor activity, private phone calls at least twice a  
9 week for at least ten minutes in length, family reunification services, appropriate mental  
10 health interventions, educational services, legal services information, and structured  
11 leisure time activities. The Agreement generally prohibits the placement of particularly  
12 vulnerable children in EISes, absent extraordinary circumstances. Additionally, the  
13 Agreement requires specific case management services such as an initial assessment by  
14 a case manager within 24 hours of a minor’s admission to the facility and weekly  
15 meetings with case managers.

16 On June 30, 2022, the Court preliminarily approved the parties’ Agreement and  
17 approved the notice of the proposed Agreement to *Flores* Class Members (“Notice”) in  
18 accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e). [Doc. # 1258.] The Court set  
19 a schedule for notice and final approval. *Id.*

20 The Agreement is a compromise reached by the parties as a result of arm’s length  
21 negotiations. The Agreement benefits the Class and was not the result of collusion  
22 between the parties. The parties have complied with the schedule established by the  
23 Court and provided notice to the Class Members as ordered. The notice provided  
24 complied with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e)(1) and was  
25 the best notice practicable under the circumstances. No Class Member has objected to  
26 the Agreement.

27 The Court held a final fairness hearing on September 23, 2022 at 10:00 a.m. After  
28 considering the requirements of Rule 23(e), the Court finds that the Agreement is fair,  
reasonable, and adequate. Plaintiffs’ Unopposed Motion for Final Approval of


1 Settlement is **GRANTED** and the Agreement is **APPROVED**. IT IS FURTHER  
2 ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Motion to Enforce is **DENIED** as moot.

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4

5 DATED: September 23, 2022

6

  
DOLLY M. GEE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28