## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

JOSE SANCHEZ, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES BORDER PATROL, et al.,

Defendants.

NO. CV12-5378-RJB

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

THIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT ("Agreement") in *Jose Sanchez, et al. v. United States Border Patrol, et al.*, Case No. CV12-5378-RJB (U.S.D.C. W.D. Wash.) is made and voluntarily and freely entered into by and between the plaintiffs, Jose Sanchez, Ismael Ramos Contreras, and Ernest Grimes (collectively, "Plaintiffs"), and the defendants, United States Border Patrol; United States Customs and Border Protection ("CBP"); Department of Homeland Security ("DHS"); John C. Bates, Chief Patrol Agent, Blaine Sector of the United States Border Patrol, in his official capacity; Janet Napolitano, Secretary, DHS, in her official capacity;

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT - 1 (Case No. CV12-5378-RJB)

Office of the United States Attorney 700 Stewart Street, Suite 5220 Seattle, WA 98101 (206) 553-7970

19

20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

\_\_\_

21

22

Thomas Winkowski, Acting Commissioner of CBP, in his official capacity; Michael J. Fisher, Chief of the United States Border Patrol, in his official capacity; and Jay Cumbow, Agent in Charge for the Port Angeles, Washington Station of the United States Border Patrol, in his official capacity (collectively, "Defendants"), by and through their undersigned counsel. Plaintiffs and Defendants are jointly referred to herein as the "Parties."

## **RECITALS**

- A. On April 26, 2012, Plaintiffs filed their Complaint in the above-referenced action, seeking for themselves and a class of persons similarly situated an injunction against the United States Border Patrol's conducting or participating in vehicle stops on the Olympic Peninsula without required reasonable suspicion that the occupants of the vehicles stopped are not legally in the United States. Defendants denied any wrongdoing.
- B. Although Plaintiff's Complaint was filed as a putative class action, this

  Agreement was reached prior to the filing of a motion for class certification, and
  no class has been certified.
- C. The Parties desire to settle fully and finally all differences between them related to this action.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual terms, conditions, promises and covenants set forth below, by this AGREEMENT, the Parties agree as follows:

1. <u>Letter to ACLU and NWIRP</u>. Within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this Agreement, CBP, via its component organization, the U.S. Border Patrol, specifically the Chief

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Pursuant to Rule 25(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Thomas Winkowski, the Acting Commissioner of CBP, has been substituted as defendant in place of his predecessor, David Aguilar.

of the Blaine Sector, will issue a letter to the American Civil Liberties Union of Washington ("ACLU") and the Northwest Immigrant Rights Project ("NWIRP") containing the language provided in Exhibit A attached hereto.

- Training. As soon as is practicable, but no later than one year from the effective 2. date of this Agreement, the Border Patrol will provide a single refresher training on the application of Fourth Amendment principles, including those relating to vehicle stops that must be based on reasonable suspicion, to all Border Patrol Agents assigned to the Port Angeles, Washington Station, on the date that the training is conducted. This training will also address when Border Patrol Agents should contact state law enforcement authorities for vehicle-related public safety concerns that they observe. As part of this training, agents in attendance will receive written materials on the topics covered. Both the content and the length of the training will be determined solely by CBP. Further, CBP's Office of Chief Counsel will be involved in the training's development and implementation. Notification that the foregoing training has been conducted will be provided via letter to the ACLU and the NWIRP no later than one year from the effective date of this Agreement.
- 3. Production of Field Contact Data Sheets. Every six months for a period of eighteen months from the effective date of this Agreement (i.e. three times), CBP will produce to Plaintiffs' counsel via appropriately redacted installments those Field Contact Data Sheets ("FCDS") that are issued by agents at the Port Angeles, Washington Station. Any produced FCDS will be redacted consistent with applicable laws, including FOIA, to protect information including, but not limited to, personally identifiable information, such as name, date of birth, place of birth, alias name(s), social security number; address(es); contact information; vehicle

information; and any information that may be confidential, sensitive, or as otherwise protected by law.

- 4. <u>Dismissal of Action</u>. Within seven (7) days of the execution of this Agreement, Plaintiffs will present the Court with a stipulated motion for an order of dismissal of this action with prejudice.
- 5. <u>Costs of Litigation</u>. The Parties agree that they will each bear their own costs and fees, including attorney's fees, related to this action.
- Release of Claims. Each of the Plaintiffs, on behalf of himself, his guardians, 6. heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns does hereby unconditionally release the United States of America, the Department of Homeland Security, United States Customs and Border Protection, and the United States Border Patrol, their sub-agencies, officers, agents, employees, and attorneys from any and all claims, demands, rights, and causes of action he has asserted in Sanchez, et al. v. U.S. Border Patrol, et al., No. 12-CV-5378 (W.D. Wash.), and from any claims arising from the same facts that formed the basis of the claims and causes of action therein, including without limitation any claim for attorneys' fees and costs, whether for personal injuries, damage to property, or economic losses, whether known or unknown, whether arising under common law, statute, or the U.S. Constitution, whether for monetary damages or injunctive relief, and whether, when directed against an individual, it is brought or stated against him/her in an official or personal capacity. Each of the Defendants agrees and acknowledges that this settlement, and specifically this Release and the dismissal with prejudice, shall not impact any of the Plaintiffs' ability to bring a claim arising from or related to any future actions by the United States Border Patrol, including Plaintiffs' standing to seek injunctive or declaratory relief.

23

18

19

20

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT - 5 (Case No. CV12-5378-RJB)

Each of the Plaintiffs agrees and acknowledges that he is currently represented by counsel who has advised him regarding this Release.

7. No Admission of Liability. The execution of this Agreement is not, is in no way intended to be, and should not be construed as an admission of liability or fault on the part of the United States of America, DHS, CBP, or the United States Border Patrol, or any of their agents, sub-agencies, contractors, servants, or employees, and Defendants specifically deny that they are liable to Plaintiffs. Furthermore, pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 408, this Agreement cannot be used as evidence of liability or fault on the part of the United States of America, DHS, CBP, or the United States Border Patrol, or any of their agents, sub-agencies, contractors, servants, or employees in any future proceeding. This Agreement is entered into by all Parties for the purpose of resolving disputed claims and/or to avoid the expenses and risks of further litigation.

## Miscellaneous Terms. 8.

- The persons signing this Agreement warrant and represent that they Α. possess full authority to bind the persons on whose behalf they are signing to the terms of the settlement.
- It is contemplated that this Agreement may be executed in several B. counterparts, with a separate signature page for each party. All such counterparts and signature pages, together, shall be deemed to be one document.
- By the execution of this Agreement the Parties acknowledge its receipt C. and sufficiency as a complete compromise of matters involving disputed issues of fact and law and fully assume the risk of any mistake of fact or law. The Parties acknowledge that this Agreement contains the entire understanding between the Parties, and that no promise or representation not contained in this Agreement has been made by any party hereto.

- D. The Parties represent that each has been represented by counsel of choice in connection with the review, approval, and execution of this Agreement; that each has shown this Agreement to his, her, or its respective attorney who has explained it and advised that it is a legally binding contract; that each party has read and understood this Agreement; and that each party intends to be bound by each provision of this Agreement.
- E. This Agreement cannot be modified or amended except by an instrument in writing, agreed to and signed by all of the Parties, nor shall any provision of this Agreement be waived other than by a written waiver signed by all of the Parties.
- F. The captions of paragraphs in this Agreement are for convenience only and shall not be deemed to limit, construe, affect, or alter the meaning of such paragraphs.
- G. The effective date of this Agreement shall be the date this Agreement is executed by the last of the Parties hereto to execute this Agreement.

By signing below, Plaintiffs Jose Sanchez, Ismael Ramos Contreras, and Ernest Grimes, and Defendants United States Border Patrol, CBP, DHS, John C. Bates, Janet Napolitano, Thomas Winkowski, Michael J. Fisher, and Jay Cumbow, hereby agree to, and are bound by, the terms of this Agreement.

9-20-2013

0-20-13 Jose Sanckez, Plaintiff

Date:

Ismael Ramos Contreras, Plaintiff

Date:

Ernest Gringes, Plaintiff

Date:

Office of the United States Attorney 700 Stewart Street, Suite 5220 Seattle, WA 98101 (206) 553-7970

i Belon Timothy Belsan Department of Justice, Office of Immigration Litigation Attorney for Defendants Date: 9-20-13 Rebecca Cohen Assistant United States Attorney Attorney for Defendants 9-20-2013 Date: 

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Exhibit A

"The U.S. Border Patrol is committed to abiding by the requirements of federal law. This commitment extends to the Border Patrol's initiation of vehicle stops on Washington State's Olympic Peninsula and is made with full awareness of the requirements in the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, including how the Fourth Amendment has been interpreted by both the U.S. Supreme Court and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

"Consistent with its commitment to abide by the requirements of federal law, the Border Patrol acknowledges that for vehicle stops made under the Fourth Amendment in non-border search situations—in other words, those brief, investigatory inquiries commonly referred to as 'Terry' stops (drawing their name from the seminal case of Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968) and its progeny) agents must have reasonable suspicion of a violation of law. To be reasonable, the suspicion must be based upon articulable facts which constitute objectively valid reasons for an agent to suspect that a particular individual may be involved in a violation of law. Moreover, the assessment of whether or not reasonable suspicion exists must be based upon all the facts and circumstances at issue, and these facts and circumstances must raise a suspicion that the particular individual being stopped may be engaged in wrongdoing.

"Because, as the U.S. Supreme Court has stated, 'Roads near the border carry not only aliens seeking to enter the country illegally, but a large volume of legitimate traffic as well,' the Border Patrol acknowledges that in many circumstances it will not be sufficient to establish reasonable suspicion to justify a vehicle stop under Terry simply that a vehicle is in an area near an international border. In addition, the Border Patrol acknowledges that it is subject to, and is committed to act in compliance with, applicable Department of Homeland Security guidance, including with respect to the use of race or ethnicity in law enforcement activities, and in particular, we call your attention to Secretary Ridge's June 1, 2004 guidance on this topic, a copy of which is attached to this letter for your ease of reference."