- 1		
1	GAY CROSTHWAIT GRUNFELD – 121944 VAN SWEARINGEN – 259809	1
2	PRIYAH KAUL – 307956	
3	ERIC MONEK ANDERSON – 320934 HANNAH M. CHARTOFF – 324529	n
4	ROSEN BIEN GALVAN & GRUNFELD LL 101 Mission Street, Sixth Floor	AP
5	San Francisco, California 94105-1738 Telephone: (415) 433-6830	
6	Facsimile: (415) 433-7104 Email: ggrunfeld@rbgg.com	
7	vswearingen@rbgg.com pkaul@rbgg.com	
8	eanderson@rbgg.com hchartoff@rbgg.com	
9	AARON J. FISCHER – 247391	
10	LAW OFFICE OF AARON J. FISCHER	
11	2001 Addison Street, Suite 300 Berkeley, California 94704-1165	
12	Telephone: (510) 806-7366 Facsimile: (510) 694-6314	
13	Email: ajf@aaronfischerlaw.com	
14	(additional counsel on following page)	
15	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
16	UNITED STATES DIS	STRICT COURT
17	SOUTHERN DISTRICT	
18	DARRYL DUNSMORE, ERNEST	Case No. 3:20-cv-00406-AJB-WVG
19	ARCHULETA, ANTHONY EDWARDS, REANNA LEVY, JOSUE LOPEZ,	DECLARATION OF JOSUE
20	CHRISTOPHER NELSON, CHRISTOPHER NORWOOD, and	LOPEZ IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTIONS FOR
21	LAURA ZOERNER, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,	PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AND PROVISIONAL CLASS
22	Plaintiffs,	CERTIFICATION
23	V.	Judge: Hon. Anthony J. Battaglia
23 24	SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, COUNTY OF SAN	Trial Date: None Set
	DIEGO, CORRECTIONAL HEALTHCARE PARTNERS, INC.,	
25	LIBERTY HEALTHCARE, INC., MID- AMERICA HEALTH, INC., LOGAN	
26	HAAK, M.D., INC., ŚAN DIEGO COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT,	
27	and DOES 1 to 20, inclusive,	
28	Defendants.	Case No. 3:20-cv-00406-AJB-WVG

[3903205.1] DECLARATION OF JOSUE LOPEZ IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTIONS FOR

(counsel continued from preceding page) 1 CHRISTOPHER M. YOUNG – 163319 ISABELLA NEAL – 328323 OLIVER KIEFER – 332830 DLA PIPER LLP (US) 401 B Street, Suite 1700 San Diego, California 92101-4297 Telephone: (619) 699-2700 4 5 Facsimile: (619) 699-2701 christopher.young@dlapiper.comisabella.neal@dlapiper.com Email: 6 7 oliver.kiefer@dlapiper.com BARDIS VAKILI – 247783 JONATHAN MARKOVITZ – 301767 ACLU FOUNDATION OF SAN DIEGO & IMPERIAL COUNTIES 2760 Fifth Avenue, Suite 300 10 San Diego, California 92103-6330 Telephone: (619) 232-2121 11 bvakili@aclusandiego.org Email: 12 imarkovitz@aclusandiego.org 13 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

[3903205.1]

DECLARATION OF JOSUE LOPEZ

I, Josue Lopez, declare:

- 1. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein, and if called as a witness, I could and would competently so testify.
- 2. I was incarcerated in the San Diego County Jail (the "Jail") from October 8, 2019 until May 12, 2021. During that time, I was awaiting trial. I was released on bail on May 12, 2021.
- 3. From my experiences, the Jail is a very unsafe and inaccessible place for incarcerated people with disabilities. I am deaf and my primary method of communication is American Sign Language ("ASL"). I can rely on written notes in the absence of a sign language interpreter. I am not fluent in lip-reading in English, but I am able to understand some information. The Jail consistently refused to accommodate my hearing disability while I was incarcerated.
- 4. I was booked into Vista Detention Facility ("Vista") on or around October 8, 2019. Shortly after my arrival, I attended an initial mental health appointment during which custodial staff kept me handcuffed to a bar in the room which made it impossible for me to use my hands to sign effectively with the inperson interpreter about my mental health.
- 5. At Vista, I could not keep in regular contact with my wife or attorney because the facility did not have any interpreting services or Video Relay services, and its Telecommunication Device for the Deaf ("TTY") machine was not in working order. The Jail had a sign that said deaf people can access the TTY to communicate, but when I asked correctional staff about it, no one knew how to operate it. I tried to use it a few days after arriving at the Jail, but it did not work. Several times I complained to staff about its non-working condition as well as the lack of access to communication devices, but they ignored my repeated requests for help fixing the machine. Because of the lack of communication options, I

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

sometimes asked fellow incarcerated people to make phone calls for me in order to relay important messages.

- 6. I transferred to George Bailey Detention Center ("George Bailey") on or around December 12, 2019. During the first few months of my time at the facility, the most effective point of contact I had with my wife was through short, inperson visits. But because the facilities were overcrowded, it was difficult to schedule visits. There was a TTY at George Bailey, but staff did not know how to operate it. When I tried to ask staff to use the TTY, they often refused to allow me to use it. Staff never once offered me access to the TTY. There was also a thirtyminute video conferencing method called Securus. During my time in the Jail, these video conferencing calls were expensive for me and my family. It was around \$100 a month to participate in frequent calls with my loved ones. These calls also had poor network connectivity, so it was hard to use this method. When the COVID-19 pandemic began in March 2020, George Bailey suspended all in-person social visiting. They suspended in-person social visits from March 2020 until July 2020, and then again in November 2020 until May 2021. In December 2020, they suspended all video visits as well.
- 7. When the Jail suspended social visits, I had to rely on just the TTY to communicate with my family. The TTY is a special device, similar to a typewriter, that allows speech-to-text communication. The TTY was not effective for communication; there was usually a poor signal which stopped all communication, and even when the signal worked, words often became garbled when two people spoke at the same time, messing up the translation. My conversations over the TTY took much longer than normal voice phone calls.
- 8. Many deputies at George Bailey became visibly frustrated with me when I asked to use the TTY. Deputies frequently denied me access to the TTY when I requested it. They said they were "too busy" or "short-staffed" to take me to use it. They also delayed my request by stating they would help me "later" or they

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

"needed to ask the team" if I was allowed to use the TTY. When I finally did get to use the TTY, and it was slow to operate because of poor network connection, the deputies rushed me to end my call and did not allow me to finish my conversations with my loved ones or attorneys. To take one example, on March 16, 2021, I requested to use the TTY several times. I waited hours, and was not allowed to use the TTY to call my wife until 11:45 pm. I was unable to reach my wife because she was most likely asleep by the time I called her. I asked to use the TTY the next day and explained that I could not reach my wife due to the late hour that I called the night before. Staff originally accepted my request, but later came back and told me the TTY had been moved to a different area of the Jail, without my knowledge. Deputies did not escort me to the TTY's new location and I was unable to call my wife for a second time.

9. I tried to raise the issues of TTY access with staff on several occasions. For example, on October 3, 2020, I spoke with Sergeant Cortes-Garcia about the issue and he said he would help resolve it. For a few days after my conversation with the Sergeant, it was easier to access the TTY when I requested it from staff. However, after those few days, custodial staff went back to refusing or delaying my access. Deputies continued to be dismissive or outright rude to me when I asked to use the TTY, denying me contact with my family, friends, and legal counsel. I estimate that staff refused me access to the TTY at least 100 times, maybe more. Wait times varied each day, but I estimate the average amount of time I waited to use the TTY was two to three hours. It was hard to predict how long I would have to wait. The longest time I had to wait to use the TTY was three days. That happened at least four or five times. People who did not have hearing disabilities never had to wait as long as I did when they requested to use the phone. Sometimes my hearing friends told me that they would overhear the deputies talking badly of me when they discussed the phone schedule. My neighbors would say that the deputies complained about how much I asked to use the TTY.

10. There were also long delays to set up confidential videoconferencing calls with my defense attorney. For a significant period of time, George Bailey only had two laptops to use for court and attorney-client meetings, making it very difficult to schedule a call with my attorney.

- 11. Throughout my time at Vista and George Bailey, I had problems securing a video call with my attorney that was confidential. Sometimes, deputies stood in the same room while I communicated with my attorney and a sign language interpreter over video. This was especially bad during court appointments. When I needed to have short but important confidential appointments with my attorney before a court hearing, deputies remained in the same room. When my attorney asked if deputies could leave the room, they said they could not. They also failed to accommodate my disability during many of these calls. Some deputies kept me handcuffed, which prevented me from signing and communicating effectively to the interpreter.
- The Jail has also failed to accommodate my disability in other ways. The Jail did not provide a sign language interpreter during interactions with nursing and medical staff, despite my requests. When I left the Jail to attend medical appointments at an outside hospital, I received an interpreter. But the Jail never provided me with an interpreter for routine medical contacts inside the facility. Instead, I had to rely on written notes to understand the complex medical issues and advice that the provider was trying to discuss with me. For the majority of these appointments, I did not understand what medical staff tried to communicated to me. Sometimes, the doctors did not write any information down for me. I could not read their lips because the majority of interactions occurred while staff wore masks. If a new nurse was assigned to me, they often failed to communicate effectively with me because they did not know, and apparently had no way of knowing, that I am deaf.
- 13. Many of the deputies also did not know that I am deaf and rely on written notes and lip-reading in the absence of a sign language interpreter. As a

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

result, many of the deputies tried to communicate with me while wearing their masks. Whenever staff did communicate with me via written notes, the notes would be short and cryptic. Staff always seemed rushed and acted like they did not want to take the time to explain things to me.

- 14. Custody staff usually involved other incarcerated people when there was reason to communicate with me. Custody staff would have other incarcerated people write down staff's questions and responses for me to read. Custody staff often told another incarcerated person what to communicate to me and then the staff member would leave before I had an opportunity to respond. This process was ineffective because I often had follow-up questions I wanted to ask the deputy. This practice also placed me at a substantial risk of harm because other incarcerated people learned confidential information about me whenever I needed to communicate with Jail staff. I also could not trust that these people would write down accurate information. I was especially vulnerable to other people incarcerated in the Jail because of the nature of my charges, and was constantly fearful that having them participate in my communications with deputies put me at an extreme risk of being harmed. I had no ability to control whether the other incarcerated people who learned my confidential information from Jail staff would pass that information on to other incarcerated persons at the Jail.
- 15. I have also experienced issues with the medical care treatment at the Jail, which put my life at a substantial risk of harm. Before I was arrested, I received a kidney transplant in November 2001. I take the following medications every day to ensure that my body does not reject the transplant: cyclosporine, mycophenolate and prednisone. When I first arrived at Vista in October 2019, the Jail failed to give me my medication for around four to five days. I also had issues with receiving my medication on a daily basis. I was supposed to take my medication in the mornings, but due to staffing shortages, I would sometimes receive my meds in the afternoon or evening. The Jail occasionally dealt with

inventory shortages; they did not have my medications in stock and there would be a delay in ordering them. This meant I sometimes went three days without taking my medications. Throughout the month of April 2020, I was in and out of the hospital because I had lost around fifteen to twenty pounds and I had a low sodium count. My body was shutting down and I was very sick. I was physically weak and thirsty all the time. I believe the decline in my health, including my weight loss, was due in part to the Jail's failure to provide me with my life-sustaining medications in a timely manner.

- 16. Medical staff at the Jail also ordered me to drink two liters of water per day. When I went to the outside hospital in April 2020, a kidney specialist at the hospital told me that I needed to be drinking even more water. When I returned to the Jail and told medical that I needed to drink more water, they denied me access to more water. I do not know why they limited me to two liters and ignored the specialist's advice. I began to drink more water secretly, so that I could stay hydrated.
- 17. On June 9, 2020 and April 26, 2021, my defense attorney argued in court about the Jail's failure to provide adequate medical care treatment for my kidney transplant. The court transcripts are attached hereto as **Exhibits A** and **B**. The judge ordered that the Sheriff's Department address my medication issues by ensuring they have a stockpile of medications on-site so that I receive them in a timely manner.
- 18. There were other conditions that placed my safety and survival at risk in the Jail. For example, on February 13, 2021, myself and others in my housing unit asked for grievance forms. A deputy threatened us that something bad would happen if we filed grievances, saying, "whoever you want to write up, don't."

27 || / / .

///

28 | / /

19. I want to help improve conditions for people with disabilities and severe medical conditions who are incarcerated within the San Diego County Jail system. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration is executed 10/19/2021 at San Diego, California on DocuSigned by: Josue Lopez

[3737812.7]

EXHIBIT A

1	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
3	DEPARTMENT 25 BEFORE HON. HARRY M. ELIAS, JUDGE
4	
5	THE PEOPLE,) CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT
6	PLAINTIFF, CASE NO. CN405969
7	VS.
8	JOSUE LOPEZ,)
9	DEFENDANT.)
10	
11	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
12	JUNE 9, 2020
13	PAGES 1 THROUGH 11
14	APPEARANCES:
15	
16	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: SUMMER STEPHAN DISTRICT ATTORNEY
17	BY: JENNIFER REISCHL DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
18 .	325 S. MELROSE DRIVE, SUITE 5000 VISTA, CALIFORNIA 92081
19	
20	FOR THE DEFENDANT: HERBERT WESTON & TANYA WESTON BY: HERBERT WESTON
21	378 VISTA VILLAGE DRIVE VISTA, CALIFORNIA 92083
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	ı
27	
28	DULCEMARIA DUARTE, CSR 13968 OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

VISTA, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, JUNE 9, 2020; 11:02 A.M. 1 2 (THE FOLLOWING HEARING WAS REPORTED VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE PER EMERGENCY RULE OF COURT 3(A).) 3 - 000 -4 THE COURT: Okay. This is CN405969. The People 5 6 vs. Josue Lopez. Mr. Lopez is appearing by way of video 7 remote as are both counsel to a semi-closed courtroom 8 pursuant to California Emergency Rule of Court 3 and 5. 9 There's no member of the public present. The public can 10 listen in on YouTube. Mr. Lopez is being assisted by a 11 certified American Sign Language interpreter. 12 THE INTERPRETER: Certified American Sign Language interpreter, Nancie Alcock. Qualified by 16 years in the 13 14 court, oath on file. 15 THE CLERK: The interpreter's identification has 16 been verified by the Court. 17 THE COURT: She has an oath on file and certified. 18 Mr. Weston, would you like to state your appearance, please. 19 MR. WESTON: Yes. Herbert Weston appearing on 20 behalf of Mr. Lopez. I'm appearing by video from my office. THE COURT: And Ms. Reischl on behalf of the 21 22 People. 23 MS. REISCHL: Yes, Your Honor. Jennifer Reischl 24 appearing on behalf of the People. 25 THE COURT: And Mr. Lopez, are you able to see the 26 American Sign Language interpreter and understand what we're

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I can, Your Honor.

27

28

doing?

3

my other clients we've been able to sort of jerry-rig a --

the ability to communicate either by phone or by video. The

27

28

4

We had the same type of a conference; we just had

28

1 for a period of time so I can at least explain to him what's 2 going on. I do find it amazing that my client is able to 3 talk to his -- his -- his family sometimes but not to me, 4 and I don't understand why that is. You know, I've been 5 told a few times that it's because the jail phones for 6 attorneys is not there. I haven't the slightest idea what 7 they're doing with that, but I think that this Court is 8 mandated to do something to prevent this continuing on and 9 on and we have a prelim date set, and I'm not able to do a 10 prelim because I can't effectively represent him because we 11 haven't been able to talk about his case, just mere 12 communications. I -- he also has a medical condition. 13 That's one of the other issues that we addressed the last time. He has 14 15 a -- a -- he has a kidney transplant, meaning that he has a transplanted kidney. He is at high risk. The Court was 16 17 concerned about the medical conditions and we addressed those the last time. He has been getting treatment, but 18 19 again, he tells me that he has this medicine that he has to 20 take every day. Unfortunately, sometimes the medicine doesn't get to the jail. So he wasn't been able to take his 21 22 medicine yesterday for the pills that keep him alive. 23 THE COURT: Who has the responsibility of getting the medication to the jail? 24 25 MR. WESTON: The jail does. They won't take --26 they will not take any -- any private things. We've asked 27 that the jail -- that he could bring his stuff -- that they 28 won't accept anything but their medicine. He's been

6

1 best we can is basically -- it's denying him his right to 2 have an effective attorney because as many times as I tried 3 and attempted to have that communication, it hasn't happened 4 and I don't think that that should happen in this day in age when we could put him under house arrest and make sure he 5 6 isn't able to leave his house. From my experience with the 7 electronic bracelet, whatever way we set it up, they're 8 pretty accurate. They get almost immediate notice if you 9 were to leave that particular area and it's a GPS thing and 10 they would follow him. 11 And so I'm asking the Court to allow him to be 12 released so at some point in time he be able to communicate 13 and have effective communication. Even if he's out of 14 custody we can do Zoom meetings like we're doing right now, which the jail doesn't allow. They're just incapable of 15 16 doing that and I can't blame the jail for that because I don't know -- we were able to come up with this or have this 17 idea of what we needed to do. 18 19 THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Reischl? 20 MS. REISCHL: Yes, Your Honor. I'm opposed to any reduction in bail. I understand Mr. Weston's concerns, but 21 22 this is a very serious case with life talk allegations, and 23 I know Your Honor heard the bail arguments on April 23rd and left bail at a million dollars. And I believe this Court is 24 25 already familiar with the facts of this case, but the 26 defendant is a public safety -- a major public safety 27 In this case he had intercourse multiple times 28 with a victim who was five years old. There was oral

1 copulation. He apologized on video when confronted about 2 the charges. There's also a potential additional 1108 3 victim, and when his phone was searched there was child porn 4 found on his phone. So this is a very serious case. 5 not think a reduction in bail is the solution here. I don't know what relief the Court can offer, but I think the 6 7 solution needs to be finding a way he can communication with 8 his attorney while remaining in custody. If the Court wants 9 any additional facts about the fact --10 THE COURT: I want to know what you can do to 11 facilitate to -- yeah, you work with the Chief law 12 enforcement in the County of San Diego. Your -- your Chief Officer can probably direct or have directly with the 13 sheriff -- the sheriff an ability to make this work. 14 15 what can you do to make it work because otherwise you've got 16 an appeal right at the outset before you've even gotten a 17 prelim? 18 MS. REISCHL: Does the Court have suggestions? 19 I don't know what the Court would suggest, but --20 THE COURT: I'm asking you what you can do. I'm 21 not suggesting anything yet. MS. REISCHL: I don't know what we can do to make 22 23 the sheriff's department do anything. 24 THE COURT: How about ask --25 MS. REISCHL: Yeah, we can ask --26 THE COURT: Has anybody asked -- has anybody 27 asked --

MS. REISCHL: In past issues I've seen defense file

28

9

skids. If it has to go all the way up to the DA, fine. Do

28

```
1
      something. If I'm in a position come the 11th that nothing
 2
      has been done, I will take the only action I feel I can take
 3
      to preserve the constitutional integrity of this case.
 4
      Anybody have any doubts as to what we're talking about?
 5
               MR. WESTON: No, Your Honor.
 6
               MS. REISCHL: No.
 7
               THE COURT: Okay. All you guys have got work to do
 8
      the 11th at 1:30.
 9
               MR. WESTON: Thank you, Your Honor.
10
               THE COURT: Ms. Reischl, you'll notify the sheriff
11
      he's adept of the OSC?
12
               MS. REISCHL:
                             Yes.
13
               THE COURT: Thank you.
                            Thank you, Your Honor.
14
               MR. WESTON:
15
               (The proceedings adjourned at 11:16 a.m.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```

1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2	: SS. COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO)
3	COUNTY OF SAM DIEGO)
4	
5	
6	I, DULCEMARIA DUARTE, Official Reporter for the
7	Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the
8	County of San Diego, do hereby certify:
9	That as such reporter, I reported in machine
10	shorthand the proceedings held in the foregoing case;
11	That my notes were transcribed into computer format
12	under my direction, and the proceedings held on June 9,
13	2020, contained within Pages 1 through 11 are a true and
14	correct transcription.
15	Dated this 16th day of April, 2021.
16	
17	- Hylamana Hyatte
18	Dulcemaria Duarte, CSR 13968
19	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

EXHIBIT B

Superior Court of the State of California For the County of San Diego Department 25 Hon. Harry M. Elias, Judge

The People,

Certified Transcript

Case No. CN405969

ν.

JOSUE LOPEZ,

Defendant.

Plaintiff,

OSC Hearing

Reporter's Transcript

June 11, 2020

Pages 1 through 26

Appearances:

For Plaintiff:

Summer Stephan District Attorney By: Justine L. Santiago Deputy District Attorney

325 South Melrose Drive, Suite 5000

Vista, California 92081-6691

For Defendant:

Weston Criminal Lawyers

By: Herbert Weston 378 Vista Village Drive Vista, California 92083

Stephanie Whitehead, RDR, CRR, CSR# 10093 Official Court Reporter

Vista, California; Thursday, June 11, 2020; 3:42 p.m. 1 -000-2 3 All right. So this is CN405969. The THE COURT: 4 People v. Josue Lopez. 5 Mr. Lopez is appearing by way of video remote to a 6 semi-closed courtroom pursuant to California Emergency Rule 7 of Court 3 and 5. It's semi-closed in that the public are 8 not physically present; they are able to listen in by way of 9 YouTube. 10 Mr. Lopez is being assisted by a certified American 11 sign language interpreter who is? 12 Certified American Sign Language THE INTERPRETER: 13 Interpreter Nancy Alcock. Oath on file. 14 The interpreter's identification has THE CLERK: 15 been verified by the Court. 16 We're here at a hearing set by the THE COURT: 17 Court because we were in court two days ago. One, I want to 18 thank Mr. Toyen for responding so quickly and being 19 available. 20 Present currently on the stream are Sanford Toyen, 21 the legal adviser to the Sheriff, Herb Weston, counsel for 22 Mr. Lopez, and Justine Santiago, counsel for the People. I 23 know there are other people available. We'll get to that in 24 a minute. 25 Mr. Toyen, let me give you a brief run-up to where 26

we're at and why I asked you to be present today. I'm going

to give you a brief overview, and then I am going to let

27

28

Mr. Weston give you more detail. There are two issues of some concern as it relates to me, which is why I asked for this hearing.

The more important one to me is the fact that Mr. Weston advised me Mr. Lopez has certain medical issues, in particular he's a kidney transplant recipient. And, therefore, as I understand most transplant patients require significant medications, antirejection medications, other medications so their transplant remains successful. That's my primary concern.

The second, though, was Mr. Weston has indicated to me an inability to be able to communicate with his client in terms of preparation for the preliminary hearing. I mean, we hear that on a number of occasions, but I think it's sort of borne out here in the sense that it's clear Mr. Lopez needs an American Sign Language interpreter. So, one, we have to accommodate the interpreter's schedule to make that work, and obviously the schedule of the facility, and the ability so that Mr. Lopez can see the interpreter while Mr. Weston is trying to communicate with her.

We've been able to accommodate that twice here in court in that we've set up in a separate room a laptop so that Mr. Weston can Microsoft Teams into the laptop, as can the jail facility, and then Ms. Alcock has been here on both occasions so she can serve as the link between Mr. Weston and his client for those communications.

continue or to do that other than when we're in the courtroom setting to make that work. And in light of the fact that this is a multi-count life-top case, that's sort of the third branch, if you will, in terms of the weigh down on this issue.

So, Mr. Weston, I would ask for you, if you could, to advise Mr. Toyen in more detail as it relates to, first, the medication issue and then, second, the ability to communicate with your client issue.

MR. WESTON: Yes, your Honor. During the pendency of this particular case, since I got on, there's always been a concern regarding the medical condition of my client. And I know that the Sheriff tries as best as they can -- I'm not trying to think that they don't try at all on behalf of Mr. Lopez. However, I do get called quite a few times regarding the fact that there's some medicine that he has been on that he would miss on kind of a regular basis. It seems like it's a special medicine.

They have problems with either getting it or having it in enough of a supply that he can't get his daily dose.

Like the other day, when he went to court he told me that he had missed, I believe, a day or two where they had missed it out. Today they were -- they're supposed to give it in the morning, and they gave it to him in the afternoon, right about 1:30 today.

There's a concern about that. It has been better, his medical care, since they transferred him from a regular jail cell to the medical facility. It's better care there because -- and not because the other -- (technical difficulties with live stream) -- are not watching, but this

is an individual who needs extra care because of his medical condition and that it would be severe health issues.

He has been going to the hospital. He has a lower -- and I thought it was salt, but I might not have gotten to remember the exact one, but a lower reading which causes a big concern. Also the fact that he's been losing weight because of the medical conditions that he has, that that in fact has prevented him -- and when he was going to the hospital they were trying to control that medical condition, and, therefore, he was going back and forth to the hospital.

My understanding that he's been back and forth to the hospital a few times since our last court date on April the 23rd where we went through and I addressed or was concerned about the fact that there's this medical condition that he has that doesn't seem to be being taken care of.

So I have a concern regarding his medical condition. I do get a call from his relatives. That's how I hear it because, of course, he can't communicate with me. He does communicate with his relatives. The other problem is just that, the lack of communication.

When he was -- when the coronavirus wasn't present I could take my American Sign interpreter and go down and visit him, which we did. But since that time we've been -- and again, I don't want to say this as if they're picking on me in particular, but they basically have shut down the jail from having visits that we are able to go. And --

MR. TOYEN: Mr. Weston?

MR. WESTON: Yes.

MR. TOYEN: I'm sorry. I don't want to interrupt you, but I think we might be able to shortcut some of this. I don't mean to dispute your experience, but I can tell you that, you know, I've got the acting lieutenant of the Bailey facility here as well as THE sergeant who's in charge of supplementary services. And if you can come down to the Bailey with your interpreter, you're not going to be -- you're not -- you'll be able to have your contact visit.

MR. WESTON: Well, I mean --

MR. TOYEN: I can tell you that right now.

MR. WESTON: Well, I mean, the difficulty of that is I have to make a decision that my -- that I'm putting my -- I know the room that we go to. That room is not -- does not socially distance the three individuals who are going to be in that room. I've been in that room numerous times. I mean, they're physically not being able to do that. Also the fact that during this time period we're not supposed to be doing that type of contact. Whether I do it is something that I decide, but I can't decide for my interpreter. The fact of the matter is --

MR. TOYEN: So are you -- is your claim that the room isn't big enough? Because I thought it had to do with you not -- a claim that you didn't have -- that you weren't being allowed down at the facility to have a contact visit with a sign language interpreter.

MR. WESTON: Well, when we went to the jail to try to accomplish that, we were told that there are no contact

visits. There's no visits -- visiting. Now, I mean, all's I can do is -- they tell me that the jail was shut down for visits of that type. There is a way that we can do through -- at least now or started to do -- (technical difficulties with live stream) -- there was -- the Securus has allowed us to do video visits with certain people at George Bailey. They do it at George Bailey and they do it at Vista. They don't do it at South Bay and downtown.

When my client got to George Bailey, I tried to avail myself of the video visits that way, and I kept getting denied of the video visits; that he wasn't available for -- to visit. The procedure is I go in at midnight, because there's a two-day span which I can ask for a visit. On midnight, about three times a week, I go onto the Securus website and I try to book a visit with my client within those two days because that's the only two days that they will allow me to have.

And every time -- I did -- was able to get two times or, I believe, one time on this particular client that I was able to get a visit, but then it wasn't -- he wasn't brought there to be visited. It isn't that we're not trying.

MR. TOYEN: This was at midnight?

MR. WESTON: No, no, no. This is where I have to go on Securus. You have to go on the form and demand a time. So you go on the form, they give you two days to request a visit. So if I'm on midnight, I've got that day and the next day. And those are the only two days that I

can make a visit for. If there's no visiting available then they tell me, "no visits available." There's never a visit within the first day. Sometimes, for some people, there's a visit on the next day.

On Mr. Lopez's matter, there was never a visit. I've been on that website numerous times trying to get to see him because I know I have to organize a visit. And I'm able to then, after I make an appointment, try to have an interpreter ready to go so that I can then see him at least through the phone, even though the phone screen, at least from my experience, is not that -- at least it appears for me, not that big. But we might have some problems. But that's the problem is that every time I've attempted to try to see my client, I've been told that we can't do that.

MR. TOYEN: You're talking -- well, I just want to make clear because there's a lot of things you're throwing -- you're kind off putting up here.

Is the issue with in-person visit or the video visits?

MR. WESTON: I was told you can't do an in-person visit. Period.

MR. TOYEN: You can. You can. We may not allow that for -- we may not allow that for everybody, but, you know, you clearly -- your client clearly has a situation that's different, and we need to accommodate that and we will. You can come down for an in-person visit if that's what you want.

THE COURT: And Mr. Toyen, do you believe that were

that to occur you have a locale or a location where the visit can occur where both his client, Mr. Weston, and the interpreter could be sufficiently distant in terms of meeting the Department of Public Health's requirements?

MR. TOYEN: Yes. So let me about put that -- I've got the administrative lieutenant there -- here. She can confirm that.

MS. FARRIS: Hi, this is Lieutenant Jill Farris, and we are happy to accommodate any visit any time you need. So we switched our professional visits to the social visit room so that there would be the glass. And if using an interpreter, Mr. Lopez would be on one side of the glass, you could be on the other side of the glass, and the interpreter could be on that side of the glass, and that way you'd be spread out if you need to be. And the interpretations can happen through the glass.

We can also do in-person contact visits like you did back in February when you were down here. So we can do it that way. If you're not comfortable doing an in-person, then we could do it through the glass in the social visit room as well. I'm happy to accommodate whatever makes everyone feel comfortable. We really don't have a lot of visits happening, so the space is really not an issue down here.

THE COURT: So Mr. Weston, let me ask you: Between the option of trying to do it on Securus with a video setup or doing an in-person in a larger room that would allow all three parties to be present socially distanced, consistent

with the requirements of the Department of Public Health, which would you prefer to do?

MR. WESTON: Well, first I'd have to figure out what my interpreter would want. I mean, it's not just me. If it was just me, I'd probably go down to the room and do it, but it's not just me. So I'd have to make a determination of what he -- he feels comfortable in doing when I take him with me because there's three of us, me, him and my --

THE COURT: So you haven't inquired of that person yet?

MR. WESTON: Well, I did inquire. When I asked him if he would feel comfortable going down to a jail, and he said no, I mean, I did inquire that way. There isn't that -- but I would tell the Court that was a couple weeks ago. I mean, there seems to be a more opening of our society. So I don't know what his -- what his experience has been. And I do notice that -- and I will tell the Court since we last talked on, I believe, three days ago, they have opened up Microsoft Teams to be able to do some visits at the -- at the George Bailey facility similar to what we have here.

We are having some difficulty though in the George Bailey facility because it's not a confidential communication, being that the -- my understanding is that George Bailey's Microsoft system isn't tied down to a table. So, like, I've done visits now at South Bay. They put the -- they turn the computer on. It's either tied down and

then all of the Sheriffs go out of the room, and so I feel comfortable that my client has a confidential communication with me.

We tried that at George Bailey, and it appears -and I don't know if it's just one room -- that in that
particular facility, the Microsoft Teams or the computer
that they have to leave a Sheriff within the room after -even after they turn it off as opposed to whereas you can -they can leave the room in other facilities.

I'm okay with Microsoft Teams because that's safe.

I just want to make sure it's a confidential communication
between me and my client and being able to have a room where
he's not there with a Sheriff. Because I think if a
Sheriff's in the room, that that violates -- it's no longer
confidential.

THE COURT: So Mr. Toyen, what can you tell me about what, if anything, you know about the accessibility of a Microsoft Teams interview or client contact similar to the process we have here; one, if that can be done, and two, the ability to keep it confidential so that the deputy need not be in the room at the time they're communicating?

MR. TOYEN: I'd have to -- I'd defer to Justine on that because she's, you know, at the facility. I don't know is that -- it sounds to me like that's primarily for social visits.

Justine, am I -- am I close?

MS. SANTIAGO: And I think -- are you trying to get information from Jill or myself?

MR. TOYEN: Oh, sorry.

THE COURT: You mean, Lieutenant Farris?

MR. TOYEN: Yes, Lieutenant Farris.

MS. SANTIAGO: Thank you.

MS. FARRIS: Yes. So it's my understanding there are computers throughout the facility that we're doing attorney-client meetings. If the deputies are leaving the door propped open or they're standing in there because there's computer equipment and they don't want to leave the inmate with the computer equipment unmonitored, then that is an issue I can address on my end. Obviously, our inmate can be patted down, searched, before he goes in the room, after he leaves the room so if there's an issue of computer tampering we can address that.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. FARRIS: So if that's what you're seeing here at Bailey, is that the deputy is staying in the room, it may be to monitor the computer equipment, and I can fix that.

That's no problem. I can ask the deputies to secure the door so there is no deputy monitoring your -- your meeting with your client.

THE COURT: So what I'm hearing -- and any one of you feel free to correct me if I'm wrong. What I'm hearing is the Sheriff can accommodate a Microsoft Teams client -- attorney-client interview, maintain confidentiality, and with the use of Microsoft Teams, have it also accessible to a sign language interpreter so that Mr. Weston can communicate with his client.

MS. FARRIS: Mr. Weston would have to provide the -- I don't have a sign language interpreter at George Bailey.

THE COURT: No, no, no. That's him.

MS. FARRIS: Okay.

THE COURT: It's basically a three-party meeting. The sign-language interpreter is to facilitate Mr. Weston's ability to communicate with Mr. Lopez, Mr. Lopez's ability to communicate back. And when that meeting is ongoing, Mr. Lopez will be in the room by himself, the deputy would have had the ability to pat him down before, if they feel appropriate, handcuff him to the chair so he at least can't damage the computer, and then when it's done, he goes back to his -- his room or his cell or his mod, and Mr. Weston goes on with his.

Mr. Weston, will that meet your ability to have a confidential client interview?

MR. WESTON: It would, your Honor. I do tell the Court that it appears that the way we're doing that -- and again, I apologize. We just started it yesterday the 11th.

I had eight interviews with my clients that I've been doing over -- that I haven't been communicating with except over the phone. So I've done eight of those.

Now, one of the issues is for Mr. Lopez's idea is the slots are regulated by the public defender because I believe they're the ones that set it up.

THE COURT: I would think, based on what I'm hearing, that if you had a direct communication with

Lieutenant Farris or any designee of hers, they could facilitate that to expedite your ability to communicate with your client.

MR. WESTON: Thank you. That was my other thing that the slots are limited to 20 minutes. So I was hoping that I would be able to communicate with someone directly so that we can set that up to have -- because of the sign interpreter it takes longer, I believe, to communicate, as opposed to the other times if they only give you 20-minute slots which is okay; we just make more of them. But if they're available for us to make those arrangements or I have someone to make the arrangements I'm happy to do it that way.

THE COURT: All right. So let me now then go to

MR. TOYEN: Lieutenant, is that something we can do?

MS. FARRIS: Yes, I will get a hold of Ridgehaven.

They simply provide us with the schedule and make sure that

we -- after I know a good time for you and for the

interpreter and then we'll get that time slot saved for you.

MR. WESTON: And if you could -- I'm happy to give you my e-mail address so we can communicate e-mail or however --

MS. FARRIS: Absolutely, yeah. Absolutely.

THE COURT: All right. So let me go back.

Mr. Toyen, I wonder if you could then go back and address what you know or how you think we can help facilitate the

continued medical care and/or providing of medication to Mr. Lopez. It sounds like there's already been an improvement because he's been moved to a medical room or a medical ward, if you will.

MR. TOYEN: Yeah, and we -- Dr. Montgomery is here just to back me up. We did a -- we looked at his medication that he's supposed to be receiving, and I think -- I'm probably going to mangle this. But Prednisone, cyclosporin, and mycophenolate. It shows that he's regularly receiving those. Those are -- those are the kidney medications. We discovered, though, that, you know, because we've gone to a new provider, pharmaceutical provider that basically just does everything outside and ships it to us, my understanding is in, you know, prepackaged dosages --

THE COURT: Right. Like being in a nursing care home.

MR. TOYEN: Very similar to that is my understanding. And we discovered that we didn't -- there have been gaps where, you know, the shipment has taken longer to arrive than we thought it was going to be -- than we thought it was going to take. And that, I think, accounts for the vast majority of the times when he didn't appear to be getting his medicine -- his medication.

Now that we know that that's the issue, we're working you know to make sure that happens including, you know, keeping a stocked supply of certain medications available. So if a shipment is late, you know, we've got a replacement stockpile.

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

So Mr. Weston, Prednisone, THE COURT: cyclosporin -- I forget the name of the third one. Are those the three you're aware of, or are there more, or something else you think that has not or is not being provided? I believe that those are the ones that MR. WESTON: my client was being -- was talking about. The kidney medication was the ones that they were concerned. And I believe what -- what he just described was exactly what my client was saying. They were telling him well, we're out of it. We'll get it to you as soon as we get another supply of it, which is a concern is that they shouldn't run out of it because it's real important. I understand we're all human. I'm not trying to say there's some nefarious thing here. I'm just worried about the effect of lack of medication my client is --If I hear Mr. Toyen correctly, the THE COURT: Sheriff's trying to remedy the situation by creating sort of a stockpile so that they will have some available --That's my understanding. MR. TOYEN: -- of regular. THE COURT: Dr. Montgomery, if you want to jump in. MR. TOYEN: DR. MONTGOMERY: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Toyen. Your Honor, Jon Montgomery, Medical Officer. Thank you for allowing me to join you today. Just to clarify, Mr. Lopez is currently on three separate medications, that's Prednisone, cyclosporine and

mycophenolate. These medications are associated with the

chronic immunosuppression needed for the maintenance of his transplant.

The issue has been with, as Mr. Toyen mentioned, we have relatively recently moved to an outsourced pharmaceutical service, and the two main medications, the cyclosporin and mycophenolate, have been essentially just in time, if you will, shipped in, as you were alluding to, similar to a group home construct, in 30-day pill packages. And they've been ordered for months at a time.

However, because of the logistical considerations, sometimes it takes upwards of about three to five days for some of the medications to arrive. And it does appear that there has been several instances, unfortunately, that we have run out by a day or so. Again, our primary reason for being is for the appropriate medical care and treatment of our patients.

So yes, we are taking direct action. We are getting a stockpile of medications which is called our stock or profile medications for all three of those. The intent is if and when the patient-specific medications for whatever reason are not readily available, we would shift over to the stock medications to provide the buffer until the resupply from Diamond comes into play.

THE COURT: All right. So it sounds to me like the Sheriff is making, one, the inability to deliver it is not either intentional on their part or even a result of their lack of effort; it's the inability of the pharmaceutical company or the pharmaceutical provider to ship with a

consistent enough basis so it's always there on time.

I think any of us who have ever switched from one health plan to another health plan or one Rx provider -- prescription provider to another runs into some of this.

But it sounds to me like they're making every effort in creating the stockpile that if there's any further delay, it will not affect him receiving his meds.

So then I guess my next then question is we currently have a preliminary hearing date set for June 17.

And I want to hear from you, Mr. Weston. Are you comfortable proceeding then, or would you like additional time so you can work out these Microsoft Teams meetings to communicate with your client, or what would you like?

MR. WESTON: No, your Honor. It's always been our intent to not have a prelim on the 17th. This is the type of case that we need to do a live prelim on, and so it's never been our intention to go forward unless we had the ability to do a live prelim. Either way, I wouldn't be ready to perform a prelim because of the lack of preparation.

But I want to make sure that the record is clear that our intention was, even before I couldn't communicate with my client, that I don't believe having a video prelim is proper in this type of case. Especially with the communication problems, being in another room is -- for him would just be terrible in trying to figure out how to communicate during a prelim.

So I'm going to waive time and set the matter over

to a time when we're at least going to have -- or have a 1 potential of having a live hearing, which I think is 2 sometime July or August. 3 The longer we go the likelihood is THE COURT: 4 greater than we'll have something live in court. If I had a 5 firm date when I knew we'd start, I'd tell you. 6 No, I understand that, your Honor. MR. WESTON: 7 But I don't know yet. THE COURT: 8 So Mr. Lopez, what I'd like to ask you is under the 9 law you have a right to a speedy preliminary hearing, under 10 the new emergency rules, within 30 days of when you are 11 arraigned and no later than 60 days from when you are 12 arraigned. 13 If you wish, you may give up your right to a speedy 14 preliminary hearing and agree to one at a later date. 15 Mr. Weston is trying to accommodate or find a date 16 when everyone could actually appear here in court. But I 17 want to be very candid with you: I can't guarantee that the 18 date we set would necessarily accomplish that. 19 Are you willing at this time, sir, to waive time to 20 a new date picked by Mr. Weston? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Yes, that would be fine. 22 Thank you. THE COURT: 23 Thank you, your Honor. THE DEFENDANT: 24 Mr. Weston, you're in charge. THE COURT: 25 MR. WESTON: Yes, your Honor. I would suggest 26 maybe we can do the 26th of August which is like a 27 Wednesday. That gives us enough time -- again, it might not 28

be a solid date, but I think that might be enough. 1 All right. Ms. Santiago, is that date THE COURT: 2 okay with the People? 3 Yes, your Honor, thank you. MS. SANTIAGO: 4 All right. We'll set the matter for THE COURT: 5 preliminary hearing on August 26, 8:45 a.m. in Department 5 6 or whatever courtroom 5 sends it to. As we get closer it 7 that August date, we'll know more as to whether we're having 8 live hearings or not. Again, I want to thank Mr. Toyen on 9 behalf of the Sheriff's Department, Lieutenant Farris and 10 Dr. Montgomery for participating in this and helping us try 11 to reach some ability to assist both in Mr. Lopez's health 12 and also his ability to communicate with his client. 13 Your Honor, I was wondering if -- I MR. WESTON: 14 don't want to give Lieutenant Farris's e-mail or contact --15 THE COURT: No, no. We can go offline and I'll let 16 Ms. Santiago or Mr. Toyen, either one, be the link so that 17 you and Lieutenant Farris can be in touch. 18 MR. WESTON: Okay. 19 MR. TOYEN: I will act as the clearinghouse. I 20 will send all the e-mails to Ms. Santiago. 21 Thank you very much, Mr. Toyen. THE COURT: 22 Okay. That would be perfect. MR. WESTON: 23 Thank you everybody. THE COURT: 24 MR. WESTON: Your Honor, maybe we could set a 25 back-up readiness date with the idea that maybe that 26 would -- we can have a better idea whether or not the courts 27

are going to be open or not.

28

Okay. THE COURT: 1 And we could do a 977 waiver because MR. WESTON: 2 then that way least if we don't need Mr. Lopez and we're 3 only going to set new dates that we can take care of it. 4 THE COURT: Do you want to take a 977 waiver from 5 Mr. Lopez at this time? 6 Yes, your Honor. May I go forward? MR. WESTON: 7 THE COURT: Yes. 8 Okay. Mr. Lopez, we're going to be MR. WESTON: 9 setting an intervening court date. We're asking that you 10 waive your right to come to court just to set new dates in 11 case the courts aren't open yet. 12 Is that okay for you to be -- basically allow me to 13 appear for you for the purposes of just setting dates? Is 14 that all right? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, yes. That would be fine. 16 Yes, that would be fine. 17 All right. Again, thank you everybody. THE COURT: 18 I appreciate the time you put in and waiting to hear this so 19 late in the afternoon so I could clear up the appropriate 20 room and get everybody involved. 21 MR. TOYEN: You're welcome, your Honor. Your 22 Honor, just on a personal matter would you be able to either 23 call me or contact me on Teams after you're done with your 24 calendar for the day? 25 Yeah. THE COURT: 26 This has nothing to do with this case. MR. TOYEN: 27 Yeah. Sure. Why don't you stay -- can THE COURT: 28

1	he stay there and we lose everybody else?	
2	THE BAILIFF: I can do that.	
3	THE CLERK: What's the readiness date?	
4	THE COURT: Herb, what date do you want for that	
5	readiness?	
6	MR. WESTON: Right. I was just going to say, can	
7	we have July 23rd? That's a Thursday. Is that okay,	
8	Ms. Santiago?	
9	MS. SANTIAGO: That's fine. Thank you.	
10	THE COURT: Okay. Good. Thanks.	
11	MR. WESTON: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you,	
12	everyone.	
13	THE COURT: Everybody bail out except Mr. Toyen.	
14	(Proceedings concluded at 4:15 p.m.)	
15	000	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

State of California) : SS. County of San Diego) I, Stephanie Whitehead, RDR, CRR, CSR #10093, an Official Court Reporter for the Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the County of San Diego, do hereby certify and declare: I reported the proceedings held in the foregoing case by creating notes utilizing my stenographic machine; That my notes were transcribed with proprietary computer and formatted under my direction; And the preceding hearing heard on June 11, 2020, contained within pages 1 through 23, is a true and accurate transcription. Dated this 26th day of April 2021. Stephanie Whitehead, RDR, CRR, CSR #10093 Official Court Reporter