

The United States has a particular interest in this litigation because it involves issues virtually indistinguishable from those the United States just addressed in its amicus brief filed with the Fifth Circuit in the appeal of *Garner v. Livingston*, No. C-06-218 2011 WL 2038581 (S.D. Tex. May 19, 2011), in which the District Court for the Southern District of Texas found that Texas's prohibition on quarter-inch beards violated RLUIPA.² Here, the Texas Department of Criminal Justice ("TDCJ" or "Defendant") likewise denied prisoner David Ali's request to grow a half-inch beard, which Mr. Ali contends is a core aspect of his religious practice. Mr. Ali is an observant Muslim who believes he has a religious obligation to "embrace known Islamic customs and emulate the prophets," including by wearing a half-inch beard. Ali's Opp. to Def's Mot. for Summ. J. ("Opp."), Dkt. No. 154, at 2. TDCJ does not contest the sincerity of Mr. Ali's beliefs or that the no-beard policy substantially burdens his religious exercise. Def's Mot. for Summ. J. ("Def's Mot."), Dkt. No. 147, at 4. Thus, TDCJ's no-beard policy contravenes RLUIPA unless the restriction furthers a compelling government interest and is the least restrictive means for furthering that interest. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 2000cc-2(b). The principal arguments TDCJ raises here in an attempt to satisfy this burden were found unpersuasive by the District Court in *Garner*, and the United States' amicus brief urges the Fifth Circuit to likewise reject them.

Based on the undisputed facts in this litigation, the United States believes that TDCJ's blanket prohibition on religious beards is not narrowly tailored to the generalized budgetary and security interests it asserts. As the *Garner* court recognized and the United States described more fully in its amicus brief, TDCJ already permits approximately 7,000 inmates to wear

² The amicus brief filed by the United States in *Garner* (the "*Garner* Brief") is attached here as Exhibit A.

understood and enforced. For that reason, and those explained in the attached briefing, the United States respectfully asks this Court to deny TDCJ's motion for summary judgment.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS E. PEREZ
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division

JONATHAN M. SMITH
Chief
Special Litigation Section

TIMOTHY D. MYGATT
Special Counsel
Special Litigation Section

Michael J. Songer
T. Jack Morse
Trial Attorneys
United States Department of Justice
Civil Rights Division
Special Litigation Section
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 514-6255
michael.songer@usdoj.gov

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES:	PAGE
<i>Ali v. Quarterman</i> , 434 F. App'x 322 (5th Cir. 2011) (per curiam) (unpublished)	17
<i>Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union</i> , 542 U.S. 656 (2004)	10, 12
<i>Baranowski v. Hart</i> , 486 F.3d 112 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 552 U.S. 1062 (2007).....	26
<i>Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah</i> , 508 U.S. 520 (1993).....	15
<i>Cinel v. Connick</i> , 15 F.3d 1338 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 513 U.S. 868 (1994).....	22
<i>Cutter v. Wilkinson</i> , 544 U.S. 709 (2005)	<i>passim</i>
<i>DeMoss v. Crain</i> , 636 F.3d 145 (5th Cir. 2011).....	16-17
<i>Diaz v. Collins</i> , 114 F.3d 69 (5th Cir. 1997)	16
<i>Employment Div. v. Smith</i> , 494 U.S. 872 (1990).....	10
<i>Fegans v. Norris</i> , 537 F.3d 897 (8th Cir. 2008)	24
<i>Fowler v. Crawford</i> , 534 F.3d 931 (8th Cir. 2008), cert. denied, 129 S. Ct. 1585 (2009).....	24
<i>Fraternal Order of Police v. City of Newark</i> , 170 F.3d 359 (3d Cir.), cert. denied, 528 U.S. 817 (1999).....	22-23
<i>Freeman v. Texas Dep't of Criminal Justice</i> , 369 F.3d 854 (5th Cir. 2004)	9
<i>Gooden v. Crain</i> , 353 F. App'x 885 (5th Cir. 2009) (per curiam) (unpublished)	16-17

CASES (continued):	PAGE
<i>Green v. Polunsky</i> , 229 F.3d 486 (5th Cir. 2000).....	22
<i>Guru Nanak Sikh Society v. County of Sutter</i> , 456 F.3d 978 (9th Cir. 2006)	2
<i>Hamilton v. Schriro</i> , 74 F.3d 1545 (8th Cir.), cert. denied, 519 U.S. 874 (1996).....	11
<i>Khatib v. County of Orange</i> , 639 F.3d 898 (9th Cir. 2011) (en banc), cert. denied, 132 S. Ct. 115 (2011).....	2
<i>Kuperman v. Wrenn</i> , 645 F.3d 69 (1st Cir. 2011)	24
<i>Longoria v. Dretke</i> , 507 F.3d 898 (5th Cir. 2007) (per curiam).....	16
<i>Lovelace v. Lee</i> , 472 F.3d 174 (4th Cir. 2006)	23
<i>Mayweathers v. Terhune</i> , 328 F. Supp. 2d 1086 (E.D. Cal. 2004)	24
<i>Murphy v. Missouri Dep’t of Corr.</i> , 372 F.3d 979 (8th Cir.), cert. denied, 543 U.S. 991 (2004).....	11-12, 16, 26
<i>Nelson v. Miller</i> , 570 F.3d 868 (7th Cir. 2009)	2
<i>Pugh v. Goord</i> , 571 F. Supp. 2d 477 (S.D.N.Y. 2008)	10
<i>S.E.C. v. Gann</i> , 565 F.3d 932 (5th Cir. 2009)	19
<i>Shakur v. Schriro</i> , 514 F.3d 878 (9th Cir. 2008).....	30
<i>Sherbert v. Verner</i> , 374 U.S. 398 (1963).....	10
<i>Spratt v. Rhode Island Dep’t Of Corr.</i> , 482 F.3d 33 (1st Cir. 2007).....	25
<i>Thunderhorse v. Pierce</i> , No. 09-1353, cert. denied, 131 S. Ct. 896 (2011).....	2
<i>United States v. Hardman</i> , 297 F.3d 1116 (10th Cir. 2002)	11

CASES (continued):	PAGE
<i>United States v. Wilgus</i> , 638 F.3d 1274 (10th Cir. 2011).....	12
<i>Warsoldier v. Woodford</i> , 418 F.3d 989 (9th Cir. 2005)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Washington v. Klem</i> , 497 F.3d 272 (3d Cir. 2007).....	11, 15, 23
<i>World Outreach Conference Ctr. v. City of Chicago</i> , 591 F.3d 531 (7th Cir. 2009)	10

STATUTES:

Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA)	
42 U.S.C. 2000cc-1(a) (Section 3)	1, 5-6, 9
42 U.S.C. 2000cc-2(b)	7, 9-10
42 U.S.C. 2000cc-2(f).....	2
42 U.S.C. 2000cc-3(c)	25, 30
42 U.S.C. 2000cc-3(g)	23, 30
42 U.S.C. 2000cc-5(2).....	7, 10
42 U.S.C. 1983	4

REGULATIONS:

28 C.F.R. 551.2	20
Cal. Code Regs. tit. 15, § 3062(h) (2011), available at http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Regulations/Adult_Operations/index.html	20
Colo. Admin. Reg. 850-11(IV.A.3), available at http://www.doc.state.co.us/sites/default/files/ar/0850_11_0.pdf	20
N.H. Dep’t of Corr. Policy and Procedure Directive 7.17(IV.D), available at http://www.nh.gov/nhdoc/documents/7-17.pdf	20-21
Or. Admin. R. 291-123-0015(2)(a), available at http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_200/oar_291/291_123.html	20

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY: PAGE

146 Cong. Rec. 16,699 (2000)
 (joint statement of Sen. Hatch and Sen. Kennedy on RLUIPA).....13, 15, 18

S. Rep. No. 111, 103d Cong., 1st Sess. (1993).....13, 15, 18

RULES:

Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)2

MISCELLANEOUS:

Black’s Law Dictionary 100 (7th ed. 1999)14

Texas Department of Criminal Justice Offender Orientation Handbook,
available at
http://www.tdcj.state.tx.us/documents/Offender_Orientation_Handbook_English.pdf.....3, 21

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-40653

WILLIE LEE GARNER,
also known as WILLI FREE I GAR'NER,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

EILEEN KENNEDY, in her official capacity as Director,
Region IV, Texas Department of Criminal Justice, *et al.*,

Defendants-Appellants

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES AS *AMICUS CURIAE*
SUPPORTING APPELLEE AND URGING AFFIRMANCE

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

The United States will address the following issue:

Whether the Texas Department of Criminal Justice's policy prohibiting prison inmates from growing beards is the least restrictive means of advancing compelling governmental interests under Section 3 of the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA), 42 U.S.C. 2000cc-1(a).

INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES

This case concerns the interpretation of RLUIPA's requirement that a State's imposition of a substantial burden on the religious exercise of one of its prisoners must be the "least restrictive means" of furthering a compelling governmental interest. The Department of Justice is charged with enforcing RLUIPA, see 42 U.S.C. 2000cc-2(f), and is involved in several pending RLUIPA investigations and litigations that concern beard-length issues. The Department, therefore, has an interest in how courts construe the statute. At the request of the Supreme Court, the United States recently filed an amicus brief on petition for writ of certiorari in *Thunderhorse v. Pierce*, No. 09-1353, cert. denied, 131 S. Ct. 896 (2011), addressing a court of appeals' application of the "least restrictive means" test in the prison context.

The United States also has filed amicus briefs in appeals that addressed the interpretation of RLUIPA in the prison context more generally, and the interpretation of the "substantial burden" provision in the land-use context. See *Khatib v. County of Orange*, 639 F.3d 898 (9th Cir. 2011) (en banc) (prison), cert. denied, 132 S. Ct. 115 (2011), *Nelson v. Miller*, 570 F.3d 868 (7th Cir. 2009) (prison), and *Guru Nanak Sikh Society v. County of Sutter*, 456 F.3d 978 (9th Cir. 2006) (land use). The United States files this brief pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29(a).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. *Factual Background*

Plaintiff Willie Lee Garner is a prisoner in the custody of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ), assigned to the McConnell Unit in Beeville, Texas. SR 2230.¹ The TDCJ's grooming policy requires all male inmates to be clean shaven; it bars mustaches, beards, or hair under the lip. Texas Department of Criminal Justice Offender Orientation Handbook, at 10, available at http://www.tdcj.state.tx.us/documents/Offender_Orientation_Handbook_English.pdf (last visited Dec. 23, 2011). Inmates with the objectively verifiable medical condition pseudofolliculitis barbae (razor bumps) are excepted from this prohibition. They may wear a beard of up to a quarter-inch in length. SR 2290-2291, 2293, 2366. These inmates are issued a "clipper-shave pass" to report to the prison barbershop regularly to trim their beard with electric clippers. SR 2281, 2292-2293. Approximately 7,000 inmates of the 155,000 inmates in the TDCJ possess clipper-shave passes. SR 2271, 2292.

Garner identifies himself as a Muslim and contends that his Islamic faith requires him to wear a beard. SR 2230-2231. Garner violated the TDCJ's grooming policy by not shaving, and was disciplined several times as a result. SR

¹ This brief uses the following abbreviations: "R ____" for the Record on Appeal; "SR ____" for the Supplemental Record on Appeal; and "Br. ____" for defendants' opening brief filed with this Court.

2232, 2260. According to Garner, his punishment included loss of commissary and recreation privileges, solitary confinement, and negative treatment during the review of his parole application. SR 2232-2233. While Garner asserts that his religion prescribes a “fist-length” beard (closer to four inches than a quarter-inch), he insists only on the right to wear the same quarter-inch beard prisoners with pseudofolliculitis barbae may wear. SR 2235-2236, 2240-2241, 2243-2244.

2. *Proceedings Below*

In 2006, Garner filed a pro se complaint in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1983 and RLUIPA, alleging violations of his federal constitutional and statutory rights. R 12-53. In September 2007, the district court granted the prison summary judgment. R 724-726. On appeal, the Fifth Circuit affirmed the judgment with respect to Garner’s constitutional claims, but reversed and remanded Garner’s RLUIPA claims for trial. SR 40-49. On remand, counsel was appointed to represent Garner and the case was reassigned to a different district judge for trial. SR 50-52.

After holding a bench trial, the district court issued a memorandum opinion and order granting in part and denying in part Garner’s RLUPA claims.² SR 2095-

² Garner also contended that his faith required him to wear a head covering known as a Kufi, and that the TDCJ’s ban on wearing a Kufi while in transit from one location to another violated RLUIPA’s substantial burden provision. SR 2095-2096, 2234. The district court denied this claim. SR 2101-2102. Garner did not

(continued...)

2103. Garner brought his claim pursuant to Section 3 of RLUIPA, which prohibits a State from imposing a “substantial burden” on a religious exercise of one of its prisoners unless the State demonstrates that the imposition of the burden furthers a compelling governmental interest, and does so by the least restrictive means. 42 U.S.C. 2000cc-1(a). The district court held (a) that it is undisputed that Garner’s wearing of a beard is a religious exercise, (b) that defendants did not challenge the contention that the TDCJ policies at issue impose a substantial burden on this religious exercise, and (c) that the State of Texas has compelling governmental interests in the safety and reasonably economical operations of its prison system. SR 2097-2098.

The district court then held that defendants failed to show that prohibiting all beards is the least restrictive means of satisfying its compelling interests. The district court stated that there is a lack of consensus among penologists as to whether allowing prisoners to grow beards has any significant relationship to the issue of safety. SR 2099. The district court then rejected defendants’ contention that the TDCJ’s ability to identify prisoners would be hindered by allowing the quarter-inch beard Garner sought to wear, holding that Muslim prisoners could be shown wearing beards in their identification photos. SR 2099-2100. Next, the

(...continued)

cross-appeal this issue, and the United States takes no position on the merits of this claim.

district court dismissed defendants' concern that a quarter-inch beard could be a hiding place for weapons or contraband. SR 2100. The district court also rejected defendants' objection that a prisoner with a beard could change his appearance by shaving his beard, finding that a beardless prisoner could just as easily change his appearance by growing a beard. SR 2100. Finally, the district court rejected defendants' economic justifications, finding that the evidence failed to show a significant cost increase for the TDCJ if Muslim inmates were allowed to grow short beards. SR 2100-2101.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The TDCJ's grooming policy violates RLUIPA. RLUIPA establishes that First Amendment protections of an individual's exercise of his or her religious freedoms apply to inmates. Section 3 of RLUIPA, accordingly, prohibits state and local governments from imposing "a substantial burden on the religious exercise of a person residing in or confined to an institution," unless the government shows that the burden furthers "a compelling governmental interest" and does so by "the least restrictive means." 42 U.S.C. 2000cc-1(a). The TDCJ's grooming policy bans all inmates, other than those with an objectively verifiable dermatological condition, from wearing beards, and punishes inmates who violate this prohibition with disciplinary sanctions. Defendants do not dispute that this ban imposed a substantial burden on Garner's religious exercise.

The burden thus shifted to defendants to show that their prohibition is the least restrictive means of advancing compelling governmental interests. See 42 U.S.C. 2000cc-2(b), 2000cc-5(2). To satisfy this burden, defendants must produce record evidence showing that their regulation is the least restrictive means of advancing compelling governmental interests, and that none of the proffered alternative schemes would be less restrictive while still satisfactorily advancing those interests. The pronouncements of Congress in enacting Section 3 and the Supreme Court in interpreting Section 3 establish that in order to be the least restrictive means of advancing compelling governmental interests, a prison policy that substantially burdens religious exercise must be well founded in protecting prison security, inmate health, or a similarly compelling penological interest.

The district court correctly held that defendants failed to satisfy their burden. With regard to protecting prison security, the record does not support defendants' contention that the TDCJ's ban on beards is the least restrictive means of advancing that compelling governmental interest. The record lacks any documentation of security problems that trim beards would cause, and includes evidence that many prisons in other States, and the Federal Bureau of Prisons, allow trim beards similar to the one Garner is seeking. Defendants provide no valid reason why a religious exemption for trim beards threatens the TDCJ's interest in inmate identification while a medical exemption does not, and provide

no sound basis for their assertion that an inmate will be able to alter his appearance significantly by shaving a quarter-inch beard.

Defendants' economic arguments also do not satisfy this standard. The record lacks any study on how feasible and costly it would be to accommodate a religious exemption for a quarter-inch beard; rather, the evidence indicates that accommodating a religious exemption will impose only the possible marginal costs of expanding the barbering services to accommodate Muslims and of taking new photographs for identification cards. Defendants' contention that the religious exemption is distinguishable because Muslim inmates like Garner will require more frequent trips to the barbershop to maintain a beard of exactly one-quarter-inch finds no support in the record. Rather, Garner has consistently requested the same treatment afforded to inmates with the medical exemption. No more persuasive is defendants' assertion that allowing a religious exemption will lead to "opportunistic conversion" and excessive costs for the TDCJ. The Supreme Court has empowered a prison to question the sincerity of an inmate's faith, thereby lowering the rate of opportunistic conversions. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that a religious exemption from the no-beard policy leads to a significant number of legitimate inmate requests for the right to wear a quarter-inch beard, defendants' claim fails because they have not shown that the costs will be so excessive as to

prevent the State from achieving other compelling interests such as security or inmate health.

ARGUMENT

THE TDCJ'S BAN ON BEARDS VIOLATES RLUIPA BECAUSE IT IS NOT THE LEAST RESTRICTIVE MEANS OF ADVANCING COMPELLING GOVERNMENTAL INTERESTS

Section 3 of RLUIPA prohibits state and local governments from imposing “a substantial burden on the religious exercise of a person residing in or confined to an institution,” unless the government shows that the burden furthers “a compelling governmental interest” and does so by “the least restrictive means.” 42 U.S.C. 2000cc-1(a). Section 3 thus “protects institutionalized persons who are unable freely to attend to their religious needs and are therefore dependent on the government’s permission and accommodation for exercise of their religion.” *Cutter v. Wilkinson*, 544 U.S. 709, 721 (2005). This Court has recognized that this substantial burden “standard poses a far greater challenge than does [traditional free exercise analysis] to prison regulations that impinge on inmates’ free exercise of religion.” *Freeman v. Texas Dep’t of Criminal Justice*, 369 F.3d 854, 858 n.1 (5th Cir. 2004).

1. Under RLUIPA, Garner bore the initial burden to show that the TDCJ’s policy prohibiting him from wearing a quarter-inch beard substantially burdens his religious exercise. See 42 U.S.C. 2000cc-2(b). Defendants do not dispute (Br. 15)

that Garner satisfied this burden. Accordingly, the burden of proof shifted to the prison to show that its policy not only furthers a compelling governmental interest, but does so by the least restrictive means. See 42 U.S.C. 2000cc-2(b), 2000cc-5(2).

Defendants assert (Br. 15) that the TDCJ's grooming policy furthers compelling governmental interests. The district court found that the State of Texas has compelling governmental interests in the safety and reasonably economical operations of its prison system, and this finding is not being challenged on appeal.

2. In this case, defendants failed to show that their compelling governmental interests are furthered in the least restrictive means. See 42 U.S.C. 2000cc-2(b), 2000cc-5(2). While RLUIPA does not define the phrase "least restrictive means," other First Amendment case law provides a definition. Under the compelling interest standard,³ the prison here must "demonstrate that no alternative forms of regulation would [accomplish the governmental interest] without infringing First Amendment rights." *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398, 407 (1963); see also *Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union*, 542 U.S. 656, 666 (2004) (least

³ Several courts have observed that in RLUIPA, Congress sought to restore the compelling interest standard that the Supreme Court set forth in *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398 (1963), but later abandoned in *Employment Division v. Smith*, 494 U.S. 872 (1990). See, e.g., *World Outreach Conference Ctr. v. City of Chicago*, 591 F.3d 531, 534 (7th Cir. 2009); *Pugh v. Goord*, 571 F. Supp. 2d 477, 504 n.11 (S.D.N.Y. 2008).

restrictive means test in free speech context requires court to compare challenged regulation to available, effective alternatives); *United States v. Hardman*, 297 F.3d 1116, 1145 (10th Cir. 2002) (Hartz, J., concurring) (“[L]east restrictive means,’ as one would naturally interpret the phrase, signifies that the imposition by the government on religious worship must be the minimal imposition to accomplish the government’s compelling ends.”).

This standard does not require prison officials to refute “every conceivable option in order to satisfy the least restrictive means prong of” RLUIPA. *Hamilton v. Schriro*, 74 F.3d 1545, 1556 (8th Cir.) (interpreting least restrictive means prong of RLUIPA’s predecessor, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act), cert. denied, 519 U.S. 874 (1996). Instead, where there is evidence that less restrictive alternatives exist, the prison officials must at least show that they have “actually considered and rejected the efficacy of” those alternatives for good reason. *Warsoldier v. Woodford*, 418 F.3d 989, 999 (9th Cir. 2005); see, e.g., *Washington v. Klem*, 497 F.3d 272, 284 (3d Cir. 2007) (prison “must consider and reject other means before it can conclude that the policy chosen is the least restrictive means”); *Murphy v. Missouri Dep’t of Corr.*, 372 F.3d 979, 988 (8th Cir.) (remanding for further proceedings where it was “not clear that [the defendant] seriously considered any other alternatives, nor were any explored before the district court”), cert. denied, 543 U.S. 991 (2004).

In determining whether prison officials have satisfied their burden, a court “ha[s] an obligation to ensure that the record supports the conclusion that the government’s chosen method of regulation is least restrictive and that none of the proffered alternative schemes would be less restrictive while still satisfactorily advancing the compelling governmental interests.” *United States v. Wilgus*, 638 F.3d 1274, 1289 (10th Cir. 2011) (interpreting RFRA); see also *Ashcroft*, 542 U.S. at 669 (“The Government’s burden is not merely to show that a proposed less restrictive alternative has some flaws; its burden is to show that it is less effective.”). In rejecting alternatives, prison officials must rely on sound evidence, and not assumptions and stereotypes. The government’s record evidence must consist of more than conclusory statements that a prison policy is the least restrictive means to further compelling governmental interests. See *Warsoldier*, 418 F.3d at 998-999; *Murphy*, 372 F.3d at 988-989. A prison’s claim that a specific restriction on religious exercise is the least restrictive means of advancing compelling governmental interests is significantly undermined by evidence that many other prisons, with the same compelling interests, allow the practice at issue. See *Warsoldier*, 418 F.3d at 1000 (“[T]he failure of a defendant to explain why another institution with the same compelling interests was able to accommodate the same religious practices may constitute a failure to establish that the defendant was using the least restrictive means.”).

3. RLUIPA's legislative history, and the Supreme Court's decision in *Cutter*, provide guidance on how courts should test the State's policy and evidence while avoiding judicial micro-management of state prisons. After stating that courts applying Section 3 should defer appropriately to the policies prison officials institute to maintain order and security, the joint statement of the lawmakers sponsoring RLUIPA also recognized that "inadequately formulated prison regulations and policies grounded on mere speculation, exaggerated fears, or post-hoc rationalizations will not suffice to meet [RLUIPA's] requirements." 146 Cong. Rec. 16,699 (2000) (joint statement of Sen. Hatch and Sen. Kennedy on RLUIPA) (quoting S. Rep. No. 111, 103d Cong., 1st Sess. 10 (1993)). Along these lines, the Supreme Court in *Cutter* observed that Congress enacted Section 3 to eliminate "'frivolous or arbitrary' barriers [that] impeded institutionalized persons' religious exercise," such as state prisons that served Kosher food to Jewish inmates but refused to serve Halal food to Muslim inmates; prisons that refused to provide sack lunches to Jewish inmates to allow them to break fasts after nightfall; and prisons that refused to allow Chanukah candles while allowing smoking and votive candles. *Cutter*, 544 U.S. at 716 & 717 n.5. The Court then stated that Congress addressed these types of unnecessary barriers to religious exercise by instituting the "compelling governmental interest" and "least restrictive means" standards into prison life. *Id.* at 717 (citation omitted).

The pronouncements of Congress and the Supreme Court regarding Section 3 suggest the following guiding principles for a court to follow in determining whether a prison policy that imposes a substantial burden on religious exercise is the least restrictive means to further compelling governmental interests. First, in accordance with *Cutter*, a prison policy cannot be arbitrary, which is defined generally as “[d]epending on individual discretion” or “founded on prejudice or preference rather than on reason or fact.” Black’s Law Dictionary 100 (7th ed. 1999). This requirement prohibits a prison from allowing one activity and disallowing another if both would have the same effect, or lack of effect, on the State’s compelling interests. In *Warsoldier*, for example, the Ninth Circuit held that the California Department of Corrections’ (CDC) hair-length restriction was not the least restrictive means of achieving compelling governmental interests in inmate health and prison security in part because the restriction applied only to male inmates, while the CDC’s interests in inmate health and prison security obviously applied equally to offenders of both genders. 418 F.3d at 1000. Along similar lines, in *Washington* the Third Circuit held that the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections’ policy limiting a prisoner to 10 books in his cell “arbitrarily limit[ed]” the property an inmate may possess, and was not the least restrictive means of achieving the prison’s valid interests in safety and health because it allowed that inmate to keep four storage boxes of personal property and

and jail operations, testified that he recommended to TDCJ officials, based upon his personal experience and discussions with other prison systems, that the TDCJ keep its no-beard policy to further its interests in security. SR 2257, 2283-2285, 2362-2364. Stephens acknowledged, however, that he is not aware of any studies or reports indicating that prison systems that allow inmates to wear short beards have experienced increased security problems as a result. SR 2282-2283. Both Stephens and John Moriarty, the TDCJ Inspector General, raised the possibility of an inmate shaving his short beard to create identification problems, but admitted they lacked knowledge of *any* incidents in the TDCJ, or even in other prison systems, in which an inmate shaved his beard or made any non-clothing-related changes of appearance to hinder identification. SR 2271, 2283-2284, 2381, 2392-2393, 2396. In light of the lack of documentation of security problems that trim beards would cause, the district court acted well within its discretion in finding that defendants' evidence did not adequately support the TDCJ's policy. See *S.E.C. v. Gann*, 565 F.3d 932, 939 (5th Cir. 2009).

The record evidence showed instead that Garner's proposed religious exemption for a quarter-inch beard would be less restrictive than a total ban, while still protecting compelling governmental interests. The Federal Bureau of Prisons, and more than 40 out of the 50 States, allow their inmates to wear trim beards similar to the one Garner is requesting either as a matter of course or pursuant to a

religious exemption. See, e.g., 28 C.F.R. 551.2 (“An inmate [in the federal prison system] may wear a mustache or beard or both.”); Cal. Code Regs. tit. 15, § 3062(h) (2011) (permitting facial hair for male inmates that is no longer than one-half inch),⁵ available at http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Regulations/Adult_Operations/index.html (follow “DEPARTMENT RULES” hyperlink) (last visited Dec. 23, 2011); Colo. Admin. Reg. 850-11(IV.A.3) (allowing inmates “freedom in personal grooming,” including beards that “are kept neat and clean”), available at http://www.doc.state.co.us/sites/default/files/ar/0850_11_0.pdf (last visited Dec. 23, 2011); Or. Admin. R. 291-123-0015(2)(a) (requiring only that “facial hair * * * be maintained daily in a clean and neat manner”), available at http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_200/oar_291/291_123.html (last visited Dec. 23, 2011); N.H. Dep’t of Corr. Policy and Procedure Directive 7.17(IV.D) (providing shaving waiver allowing quarter-inch beard for “[i]nmates declaring membership in recognized faith groups, and demonstrating a sincerely held religious belief in which the growing of facial hair is of religious significance”), available at <http://www.nh.gov/nhdoc/documents/7-17.pdf> (last

⁵ California is in the process of amending section 3062(h) to allow facial hair of any length, consistent with the Federal Bureau of Prison’s policy. See Settlement Agreement, *Basra v. Cate*, No. CV11-01676 SVW (C.D. Cal. June 5, 2011) (attached as an addendum to this brief).

visited Dec. 23, 2011). Stephens conceded that the experience of prisons that allow facial hair is relevant to the issue of whether the TDCJ could adopt a religious exemption without compromising security or identification. SR 2281. Because institutions from other jurisdictions have the same compelling interest in prison security as the TDCJ, their allowance of beards firmly supports Garner's position that the TDCJ's grooming policy is not the least restrictive means of advancing this interest. See *Warsoldier*, 418 F.3d at 998-1001.

In addition, the TDCJ's grooming policy imposes no similar limitations on inmates' hairstyles, providing further evidence that a ban on beards is not the least restrictive means of furthering the compelling governmental interest in prison security. The TDCJ allows inmates to shave their heads, which both Stephens and his supervisor, TDCJ Correctional Institutions Division Director Richard Thaler, acknowledged interferes with identification at least as much as the possibility of an inmate shaving a quarter-inch beard. SR 2275-2276, 2465-2466. The grooming policy further provides that "[m]ale offenders must keep their hair trimmed up the back of their neck and head," that "[h]air must be neatly cut," and that "[h]air must be cut around the ears." Texas Department of Criminal Justice Offender Orientation Handbook, at 10, available at [http://www.tdcj.state.tx.us/documents/Offender_Orientation_Handbook_English.p](http://www.tdcj.state.tx.us/documents/Offender_Orientation_Handbook_English.pdf)df (last visited Dec. 23, 2011). Defendants provided no evidence that trim one-

quarter-inch beards provide any greater impediment to identification than trim haircuts. In fact, because hair need only be neat and trim under the grooming policy, Stephens acknowledged that inmates may grow hair to such an extent that, unlike a quarter-inch beard, it completely hides the contours of the head. SR 2277.

The security concerns defendants raise in their opening brief do not justify the TDCJ's grooming policy. First, the TDCJ's grooming policy allows inmates with pseudofolliculitis barbae to wear a quarter-inch beard for medical reasons. Defendants' ostensible concern (Br. 24) that a beard will hinder identification of inmates within the prison is just as applicable to the inmates they allow to wear beards for medical reasons as to inmates who would do so for legitimate religious reasons.⁶ As the district court observed (SR 2099-2100), defendants suggested no reason why Muslim inmates could not be shown wearing beards in their identification photos as well. Cf. *Fraternal Order of Police v. City of Newark*, 170 F.3d 359, 366-367 (3d Cir.) (under standard of heightened scrutiny, police department violated free exercise clause of First Amendment when it refused

⁶ In their opening brief, defendants appear to have abandoned the security argument pressed below that a quarter-inch beard will allow inmates to hide weapons or contraband. See *Cinel v. Connick*, 15 F.3d 1338, 1345 (5th Cir.) (appellant abandons issues not raised and argued in initial brief on appeal), cert. denied, 513 U.S. 868 (1994). This Court has observed that "contraband or weapons could hardly be hidden in a beard of such a short length." *Green v. Polunsky*, 229 F.3d 486, 490 (5th Cir. 2000). Indeed, Stephens conceded this point at trial. SR 2270.

religious exemptions from its prohibition against officers wearing beards, while allowing medical exemptions from same prohibition), cert. denied, 528 U.S. 817 (1999).

Defendants concede (Br. 25) there is no reason why a religious exemption threatens their interest in inmate identification but a medical exemption does not. See *Washington*, 497 F.3d at 285; *Warsoldier*, 418 F.3d at 1000. They distinguish (Br. 25) the medical exemption on the ground that issuing a clipper-shave pass to an inmate with pseudofolliculitis barbae advances other compelling governmental interests – avoiding inmate infections and minimizing the accompanying costs of medical treatment. These interests hardly justify the distinction defendants draw, however, as RLUIPA establishes that protection of religious exercise is a compelling governmental interest as well. See 42 U.S.C. 2000cc-3(g) (“This chapter shall be construed in favor of a broad protection of religious exercise, to the maximum extent permitted by the terms of this chapter and the Constitution.”); *Lovelace v. Lee*, 472 F.3d 174, 186 (4th Cir. 2006) (“Congress * * * intended to provide as much protection as possible to prisoners’ religious rights without overly encumbering prison operations.”) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Defendants’ argument (Br. 24-25) that an inmate could shave his beard to change his appearance within the prison or in order to escape is also baseless, even with appropriate judicial deference to prison officials. As noted above, TDCJ

officials could not name a single incident in which an inmate shaved his beard, or made any non-clothing-related changes of appearance, to hinder identification. See p. 19, *supra*. Indeed, several federal courts have observed the contrary; they held that shaving a beard of a quarter-inch length, or even one slightly longer, does not provide an escaped inmate with a sufficiently changed appearance to avoid capture. See *Fegans v. Norris*, 537 F.3d 897, 907 (8th Cir. 2008) (“An uncut beard creates a better disguise for an escapee than a quarter-inch beard, because it conceals the contours of an inmate’s face.”); *Mayweathers v. Terhune*, 328 F. Supp. 2d 1086, 1095 (E.D. Cal. 2004) (shaving a half-inch beard is unlikely to assist an escapee in eluding capture); cf. *Kuperman v. Wrenn*, 645 F.3d 69, 74-75 (1st Cir. 2011) (prison officials submitted an affidavit stating that grooming policy limiting inmates to quarter-inch beard prevents escaped inmate from quickly changing appearance). Accordingly, this justification is based upon “mere speculation” or “exaggerated fears.”

Finally, defendants’ contention (Br. 26 (citing *Fowler v. Crawford*, 534 F.3d 931, 941 (8th Cir. 2008), cert. denied, 129 S. Ct. 1585 (2009))) that “evidence of policies at one prison is not conclusive proof that the same policies would work at another institution” fails to undermine the record evidence. Defendants do not point to any evidence showing that Texas prisons are any different from those in States that allow beards. Of particular relevance are the Federal Bureau of Prisons

and the State of California, which are comparable to Texas in size and for years have permitted their inmates to grow beards even longer than the one Garner is requesting. The Federal Bureau of Prisons “has managed the largest correctional system in the Nation under the same heightened scrutiny standard as RLUIPA without compromising prison security, public safety, or the constitutional rights of other prisoners,” *Cutter*, 544 U.S. at 725 (quoting Brief for the United States at 24, No. 03-9877), suggesting that beards likewise would not compromise security in the TDCJ; defendants present no argument in their brief of significant differences between the two prison systems that would make the allowance of beards unworkable in Texas. Cf. *Spratt v. Rhode Island Dep’t Of Corr.*, 482 F.3d 33, 42 (1st Cir. 2007) (Federal Bureau of Prisons policy allowing inmate preaching suggests such activity would not compromise prison security absent explanation by prison officials of significant differences between state unit and a federal prison that would render the federal policy unworkable).

Neither do defendants’ economic concerns justify the TDCJ’s grooming policy. RLUIPA “may require a government to incur expenses in its own operations to avoid imposing a substantial burden,” 42 U.S.C. 2000cc-3(c). Therefore, the prison must show that the additional cost of accommodating Garner’s religious exercise is so excessive that it prevents the State from achieving other compelling interests such as security or inmate health. See *Baranowski v.*

Hart, 486 F.3d 112, 125-126 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 552 U.S. 1062 (2007); cf. *Cutter*, 544 U.S. at 726 (“Should inmate requests for religious accommodations become excessive, impose unjustified burdens on other institutionalized persons, or jeopardize the effective functioning of an institution, the facility would be free to resist the imposition.”).

Based upon the record here, the district court correctly held that defendants failed to prove that their ban on beards is in any way necessary to satisfy their interest in effective prison security. The TDCJ has not offered any evidence on the adverse effect that allowing beards would have on security or inmate health. Instead, Stephens acknowledged that the TDCJ has not conducted a specific study on how feasible and costly it would to accommodate a religious exemption for a quarter-inch beard, and that he does not know of any significant cost problems beards cause for the prison systems that allow them. SR 2287-2289. Stephens’ testimony that he “know[s] one guy that’s really worried [about costs], and that’s [himself]” (SR 2289) and that barbershop equipment “would get used significantly more” if a religious exemption were allowed (SR 2368), contains precisely the type of conclusory statements that are insufficient to meet the government’s burden of proof. See *Warsoldier*, 418 F.3d at 998-999; *Murphy*, 372 F.3d at 988-989.

The uncontroverted record evidence further establishes that the costs of a religious exemption would not be excessive. The McConnell Unit already has

barbering services for inmates allowed to wear beards by virtue of their medical condition, and some of the expense of taking new photographs for prisoner identification cards would be covered by fees paid by the prisoners themselves. SR 2280, 2287. The record evidence further provides that the TDCJ Muslim population is approximately 7,100 inmates, which is about the same number of inmates who currently have clipper-shave passes. SR 2292, 2432. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that granting Garner the right to wear a quarter-inch beard will lead to a significant percentage of Muslim inmates requesting the same, accommodating this wish will impose upon the TDCJ only the possible marginal costs of expanding the barbering services to accommodate Muslims and of taking new photographs for identification cards, hardly a significant increase in costs.

On appeal, defendants argue (Br. 19-21) that granting Garner's request to wear a beard will significantly increase costs associated with allowing beards because (1) Muslim inmates must maintain a beard of a quarter-inch in length, thus requiring more barbershop visits than inmates with pseudofolliculitis barbae, who receive a beard trimming approximating a clean shave; and (2) inmates will proclaim membership in religious groups that receive an exception from the no-beard policy, and the size of this group – unlike the group of inmates with a dermatological condition – is not constrained by objective criteria. These arguments either fail to provide a rational distinction between the medical and

religious exemptions or lack a sound basis. They therefore do not establish a ban on beards as the least restrictive means of advancing the TDCJ's compelling interests in effective and economical prison security.

The record evidence does not bear out defendants' first concern. Defendants base this argument upon Garner's statement on cross-examination that his faith does not allow him to be clean shaven. SR 2243. In light of Garner's understanding that the medical exemption requires an inmate's beard to be trimmed but does not leave him clean shaven (SR 2242-2243), Garner's response is at best ambiguous as to whether he objects to the clean shave of a razor or the approximation of a clean shave afforded by a clipper. His response is clarified by his subsequent testimony that the TDCJ "said they would have no problem with the medical exempt with wearing a quarter-of-an-inch beard. So, if I am allowed to wear a beard, that's – that's what I seek to wear, a quarter of an inch." SR 2243. This statement indicates, as the district court concluded, that Garner is seeking relief no greater than the medical exception from the no-beard policy the TDCJ provides for inmates with pseudofolliculitis barbae.⁷ See also SR 530, 2050 (stating in district court pleadings that the TDCJ failed to consider "changing its grooming policy to permit all inmates to wear a closely trimmed beard, with a

⁷ The United States takes no position on the application of RLUIPA to other circumstances.

requirement that each inmate report for a clipper shave and haircut on a regular schedule similar to the schedules currently followed for inmate haircuts”).

Defendants thus are mistaken in their belief that inmates with a religious exception from the no-beard policy will require more frequent trips to the prison barbershop.

Defendants’ second concern – that other inmates will opportunistically convert to a religion that has a faith exception from the no-beard policy, leading to excessive costs for the TDCJ – is equally unavailing. Defendants cite (Br. 21) the TDCJ’s prior experience of opportunistic conversion when it extended accommodations to inmates to eat a pork-free diet and participate in peace pipe ceremonies, and inmates’ ongoing requests for religious exemptions from the grooming policy. Defendants assert, therefore, that “there is good reason to suspect that many inmates would express a faith preference – whether Muslim or otherwise – in an attempt to secure an exception from the grooming code.” Br. 21. Contrary to defendants’ apparent belief that they must unquestioningly accept an inmate’s profession of faith, *Cutter* empowers them to challenge the sincerity of an inmate’s religious beliefs, thereby reducing the rate of opportunistic conversion. See *Cutter*, 544 U.S. at 725 n.13. This option does not disappear merely because defendants choose not to exercise it.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that a religious exemption from the no-beard policy leads to a significant number of legitimate inmate requests for the right to

wear a quarter-inch beard, defendants' claim fails because they have not shown that the requests, or costs, will be so excessive that they will prevent the State from achieving other compelling interests such as security or inmate health. See pp. 26-27, *supra*. The McConnell Unit already contains a barbershop that trims the beards of inmates with pseudofolliculitis barbae. Defendants cannot legitimately deny a religious accommodation based solely on the *possibility* that the additional marginal costs to the prison of the accommodation will be overwhelming. Such an interpretation of RLUIPA's substantial burden provision contravenes RLUIPA's mandate that a prison may have to "incur expenses in its own operations to avoid imposing a substantial burden," and that RLUIPA be interpreted "in favor of a broad protection of religious exercise." 42 U.S.C. 2000cc-3(c), 2000cc-3(g). Accordingly, speculative assertion of increased costs is unavailing.⁸ Cf. *Shakur v. Schriro*, 514 F.3d 878, 887-890 (9th Cir. 2008) (dismissing prison's assertion of

⁸ Defendants also argue (Br. 22-23) that a religious exemption to the no-beard policy will create administrative burdens in the form of enforcing the quarter-inch limit and coordinating the movements of more inmates through the barbershop. For the reasons set forth above, this argument is unavailing. The burden of enforcing the quarter-inch limit is as applicable to inmates with a medical exemption from the grooming policy as it would be to inmates with a religious exemption. See pp. 22-23, *supra*. And defendants fail to quantify the burden of moving additional inmates through the barbershop, much less show that it is so excessive that it would prevent the State from achieving its compelling budgetary interests. See pp. 26-27, 29-31, *supra*.

annual cost to provide Halal or Kosher meals to Muslim inmates, which was not based upon personal knowledge).

CONCLUSION

This Court should affirm the district court's ruling that the TDCJ's ban on beards violates RLUIPA's substantial burden provision.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS E. PEREZ
Assistant Attorney General

s/ Christopher C. Wang
MARK L. GROSS
CHRISTOPHER C. WANG
Attorneys
Department of Justice
Civil Rights Division
Appellate Section
Ben Franklin Station
P.O. Box 14403
Washington, DC 20044-4403
(202) 514-9115

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 27, 2011, I electronically filed the foregoing Brief for the United States as Amicus Curiae Supporting Appellee and Urging Affirmance with the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit by using the CM/ECF system. All participants in this case are registered CM/ECF users, and service will be accomplished by the appellate CM/ECF system.

s/ Christopher C. Wang
CHRISTOPHER C. WANG
Attorney

**CERTIFICATE REGARDING PRIVACY REDACTIONS
AND VIRUS SCANNING**

I certify (1) that all required privacy redactions have been made in this brief, in compliance with 5th Cir. Rule 25.2.13; (2) that the electronic submission is an exact copy of the paper document, in compliance with 5th Cir. R. 25.2.1; and (3) that the document has been scanned for viruses with the most recent version of a commercial virus scanning program and is free of viruses.

s/ Christopher C. Wang
CHRISTOPHER C. WANG
Attorney

Date: December 27, 2011

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

1. This brief complies with the type-volume limitations of Fed. R. App. P.

32(a)(7)(B), because:

This brief contains 6980 words, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(7)(B)(iii).

2. This brief complies with the typeface requirements of Fed. R. App. P.

32(a)(5), and the type style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6), because:

This brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Word 2007 in 14-point Times New Roman font.

s/ Christopher C. Wang
CHRISTOPHER C. WANG
Attorney

Date: December 27, 2011

ADDENDUM

1 4. California Code of Regulations Title 15, Section 3062(h) (“Section
2 3062(h)”) prohibits inmates from wearing facial hair that extends more than one-
3 half inch in length from the face. Plaintiff contends that Section 3062(h) imposes a
4 substantial burden on Mr. Basra’s religious exercise. Plaintiff further contends
5 Defendants have disciplined Mr. Basra and he continues to face possible discipline
6 in accordance with prison regulations for violating Section 3062(h). All of the
7 allegations of wrongdoing made by Plaintiff in this lawsuit are denied by any and
8 all Defendants who are or ever were parties to this lawsuit.

9 5. Plaintiff and Defendants (“the Parties”) now desire and intend by this
10 Settlement Agreement to compromise and settle all disputes between them arising
11 out of or relating to the claims in this lawsuit, including any rights to appeal.

12 6. Therefore, in consideration of the covenants set forth in this
13 Settlement Agreement, the Parties agree to effect a compromise of their disputes
14 on the terms and conditions set forth below:

15 **II. Terms and Conditions**

16 7. The “Effective Date” of this Settlement Agreement shall mean the
17 date that the Court grants the stipulated stay of all proceedings in this matter (see
18 paragraph 15). Each term and condition is material to this Settlement Agreement,
19 and the absence of approval of the entirety of this Settlement Agreement, including
20 without limitation the provision contained in paragraph 15, below, or the failure of
21 the Court to enter the stipulated order of dismissal with every term agreed to by the
22 parties included, shall render this Settlement Agreement null and void, and the
23 Parties agree that any order approving anything other than the entirety of this
24 Settlement Agreement shall be unenforceable.

25 8. Beginning with the Effective Date of this Settlement Agreement,
26 Defendants agree that they will not discipline Mr. Basra for violations of Section
27 3062(h).

28 9. Within 30 days of the Effective Date of this Settlement Agreement,
CDCR shall issue a memorandum to all its prisons instructing prison staff that the
facial hair length restrictions set forth in Section 3062(h) will no longer be

1 enforced. This memorandum shall remain in effect until Section 3062(h) is
2 amended or repealed to remove the facial hair length restrictions.

3 10. Within 90 days of the Effective Date of this Settlement Agreement,
4 Defendants shall begin the process of initiating a change to Section 3062(h) in
5 accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act to eliminate the facial hair
6 length restrictions. The Parties acknowledge that compliance with the
7 Administrative Procedures Act can be a lengthy process, which typically takes
8 more than a year. Defendants will act in good faith in accordance with the
9 Administrative Procedures Act to change Section 3062(h) to eliminate the facial
10 hair length restrictions. Nothing in this Agreement shall prevent Defendants from
11 requiring that inmates maintain their facial hair in a neat and clean manner. Until
12 Defendants amend Section 3062(h), Defendants shall not discipline any inmate for
13 the length of his facial hair.

14 11. The provisions of this Settlement Agreement shall apply to Mr. Basra
15 while he is incarcerated under the jurisdiction of CDCR, whether in a prison in the
16 State of California or an out-of-state prison that contracts with CDCR.

17 12. CDCR shall expunge Mr. Basra's record of any reference to
18 violations of Section 3062(h).

19 13. CDCR shall permit Mr. Basra to wear a grey or white patka, not to
20 exceed 24" by 24," which he may acquire from an approved vendor, subject to the
21 same limitations CDCR or the specific institution where Mr. Basra is housed
22 places on other inmates permitted to wear religious headwear or coverings.

23 14. The State shall pay \$42,000 as complete resolution of all claims of
24 Mr. Basra to his counsel, the ACLU Foundation, Alston & Bird LLP and/or the
25 Sikh Coalition for attorneys' fees and costs arising from this litigation. No interest
26 shall accrue on this amount and no other monetary sum shall be paid to Plaintiffs.
27 Any amounts other than attorneys' fees or costs paid to Mr. Basra shall be subject
28 to his restitution obligations under California Penal Code Section 2085.5.

1 15. The Parties agree to a stay of all proceedings in this action until the
2 enactment of changes to Section 3062(h) to eliminate the facial hair length
3 restrictions and will file a stipulation to stay the matter subject to the Court's
4 approval. This agreement shall be contingent upon the Court's agreement to stay
5 proceedings as requested by the Parties. Following the enactment of changes to
6 Section 3062(h) to eliminate the facial hair length restrictions, the Parties shall file
7 a stipulation of dismissal with prejudice of all claims against Defendants in the
8 case of *Basra v. Cate*, Case No. CV11-01676 SVW(FMOx) (C.D. Cal.).

9 16. By signing this Settlement Agreement, the Plaintiff agrees that it will
10 releases Defendants, and each of them, and Defendants will release Plaintiff from
11 all claims, past, present and future, known or unknown, arising from or potentially
12 arising from the facts alleged in the Complaint or Complaint in Intervention as
13 soon as Defendants have notified Plaintiff's counsel that the enactment of changes
14 to Section 3062(h) to eliminate the facial hair length restrictions have been
15 completed, but not before. It is the Parties' intention, in executing this Settlement
16 Agreement and in receiving and accepting the consideration referred to, that this
17 Settlement Agreement shall be effective as a full and final accord and satisfaction
18 and release of all claims Plaintiff may have against Defendants or Defendants may
19 have against Plaintiff in this lawsuit. In furtherance of this intention, Plaintiff and
20 Defendants acknowledge that they are familiar with, and expressly waive, the
21 provisions of California Civil Code section 1542, which provides as follows:

22 **A general release does not extend to claims which the creditor does**
23 **not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of**
24 **executing the release which if known by him or her must have**
25 **materially affected his or her settlement with the debtor.**

26 **III. Representations and Warranties**

27 17. This Settlement Agreement is the compromise of various disputed
28 claims and shall not be treated as an admission of liability by any of the Parties for
any purpose. The signature of or on behalf of the respective Parties does not

1 indicate or acknowledge the validity or merits of any claim or demand of the other
2 Party.

3 18. This Settlement Agreement is binding on the Parties and their
4 agencies, departments, successors, or independent contractors including agents
5 and/or assigns that have responsibility for implementation of the requirements of
6 this Settlement Agreement either currently or in the future.

7 19. This Settlement Agreement is not intended to impair or expand the
8 right of any person or organization to seek relief against the State, CDCR or its
9 officials, employees, or agents for their conduct or the conduct of CDCR
10 employees for issues not specifically enumerated in this settlement agreement.

11 20. If any Party believes that another Party has failed to fulfill any
12 obligation under this Settlement Agreement, the Party shall, prior to initiating any
13 court proceeding to remedy such failure, give written notice of the failure to the
14 lead counsel of record for the other Party and attempt in good faith to resolve any
15 such failure. If the Parties are unable to resolve their differences within sixty days
16 of the written notice, then any Party may request the Court to enforce compliance
17 with this Settlement Agreement. Each Party shall be responsible for his own
18 attorneys fees incurred under this paragraph except that should a motion to enforce
19 the Settlement Agreement be necessary, the prevailing party in that proceeding
20 shall be entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees associated with drafting and filing
21 any such motion or opposition to such motion.

23 21. The undersigned signatories represent that they have full authority
24 from their respective clients to execute this settlement agreement.

25 22. This Settlement Agreement may be executed by the Parties in
26 counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original executed document
27 and all of which, together, shall constitute one and the same agreement.
28

1 23. This Settlement Agreement expresses the entire agreement of the
2 Parties. No recitals, covenants, agreements, representations, or warranties of any
3 kind have been made or have been relied upon by any Party, except as specifically
4 set forth in the Settlement Agreement. Nothing other than this Settlement
5 Agreement shall be relevant or admissible to supplement or vary any of its terms
6 and provisions. All prior discussions, agreements, and negotiations are superseded
7 by and merged and incorporated into this Settlement Agreement. This is an
8 integrated document.

9
10 **FOR SUKHJINDER S. BASRA**

11 June ____, 2011
12
13

14 _____
15 CASSANDRA E. HOOKS
16 JONATHAN M. GORDON
17 LEIB MITCHELL LERNER
18 Alston & Bird LLP

19 June ____, 2011
20

21 _____
22 PETER J. ELIASBERG
23 ACLU Foundation of Southern California


24 June ____, 2011
25

26 _____
27 DANIEL MACH
28 American Civil Liberties Union
Program on Freedom of Religion and Belief

1 23. This Settlement Agreement expresses the entire agreement of the
2 Parties. No recitals, covenants, agreements, representations, or warranties of any
3 kind have been made or have been relied upon by any Party, except as specifically
4 set forth in the Settlement Agreement. Nothing other than this Settlement
5 Agreement shall be relevant or admissible to supplement or vary any of its terms
6 and provisions. All prior discussions, agreements, and negotiations are superseded
7 by and merged and incorporated into this Settlement Agreement. This is an
8 integrated document.
9
10

11 FOR SUKHJINDER S. BASRA

12 June 3, 2011

13
14 

15 CASSANDRA E. HOOKS
16 JONATHAN M. GORDON
17 LEIB MITCHELL LERNER
18 Alston & Bird LLP

19 June 3, 2011

20
21 

22 PETER J. ELIASBERG
23 ACLU Foundation of Southern California

24 June 4, 2011

25
26 

27 DANIEL MACH
28 American Civil Liberties Union
Program on Freedom of Religion and Belief

From: Holiday Inn

972 403 7330 #6796

06/04/2011 16:15

#140 P.001/001

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


June 4th, 2011

Harsimran Kaur Dang
HARSIMRAN KAUR DANG
The Sikh Coalition

1 **FOR DEFENDANTS**

2 June 3, 2011

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


MICHELLE DES JARDINS
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
LUFKIN DIVISION**

DAVID RASHEED ALI,)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>)	
)	
<i>v.</i>)	Civil Action No. 9:09-cv-52
)	
RICK THALER, DIRECTOR)	
TDCJ-CID JUSTICE)	
<i>Defendant.</i>)	

STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES

EXHIBIT B

1 THOMAS E. PEREZ
Assistant Attorney General
2 SAMUEL R. BAGENSTOS
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General
3 JONATHAN M. SMITH (DC Bar # 396578)
Chief, Special Litigation Section
4 TIMOTHY D. MYGATT (PA Bar # 90403)
timothy.mygatt@usdoj.gov
5 Special Counsel, Special Litigation Section
EMILY A. GUNSTON (SBN # 218035)
6 emily.gunston@usdoj.gov
Samantha K. Trepel (DC Bar # 992377)
7 samantha.trepel@usdoj.gov
Trial Attorneys
8 United States Department of Justice
Civil Rights Division
9 Special Litigation Section
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
10 Washington, D.C. 20530
Telephone: (202) 514-6225
11 Facsimile: (202) 514-4883

12 ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR.
United States Attorney
13 LEON W. WEIDMAN
Assistant United States Attorney
14 Chief, Civil Division
ROBYN-MARIE LYON MONTELEONE
15 Chief, Civil Rights Unit
ERIKA JOHNSON-BROOKS (SBN 210908)
16 erika.johnson@usdoj.gov
Assistant United States Attorney
17 Federal Building, Suite 7516
300 North Los Angeles Street
18 Los Angeles, CA 90012
Telephone: (213) 894-0474
19 Facsimile: (213) 894-7819

20 Attorneys for the United States of America

21
22 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
23 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION**

24 SUKHJINDER S. BASRA AND)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA) No. CV11-01676 SVW (FMOx)
25)
26 Plaintiffs,) **UNITED STATES' BRIEF IN**
) **SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF**
27 v.) **SUKHJINDER S. BASRA'S**
28) **MOTION FOR A**

1 MATTHEW CATE, *et al.*,

2 Defendants.

) **PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

) Honorable Stephen V. Wilson

) Hearing Date: June 6, 2011

) Time: 1:30 p.m.

) Courtroom: 6

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

Table of Contents

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

I. INTRODUCTION5

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....5

III. APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARDS7

 A. Standard for Issuing a Preliminary Injunction7

 B. RLUIPA Prohibits the Government From Imposing a Substantial Burden on a Prisoner’s Religious Exercise Unless the Government’s Justification for Imposing the Burden Can Withstand Strict Scrutiny.....8

IV. ANALYSIS.....8

 A. Mr. Basra Is Likely To Succeed on the Merits Because the Substantial Burden Placed on His Exercise of Religion Is Not the Least Restrictive Means of Achieving a Compelling Governmental Interest.8

 1. Defendants Have Placed a Substantial Burden on Mr. Basra’s Exercise of Religion.9

 2. Defendants Cannot Establish a Compelling Governmental Interest or Least Restrictive Means9

 B. The Public Interests Animating RLUIPA Favor Issuance of a Preliminary Injunction.....15

 C. Failure To Grant an Injunction Will Result in Irreparable Harm to Mr. Basra15

 D. The Balance of Equities Sharply Favor Granting Issuance of a Preliminary Injunction.....16

V. CONCLUSION.....17

Table of Authorities

Cases

Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell, 632 F.3d 1127, 1131 (9th Cir. 2011)10

Benning v. Georgia, 391 F.3d 1299, 1310 (11th Cir. 2004).....21

Ch. of Scientology v. United States, 920 F.2d 1481, 1488 (9th Cir. 1990)22

Charles v. Verhagen, 348 F.3d 601, 607 (7th Cir. 2003)21

Cutter v. Wilkinson, 544 U.S. 709, 713 (2005).....20

Edmisten v. Werholtz, 287 F. App’x 728, 735 (10th Cir. 2008).....20

Guru Nanak Sikh Soc’y v. Cnty of Sutter, 326 F. Supp. 2d 1140, 1161 (E.D. Cal. 2003)22

Jova v. Smith, 582 F.3d 410, 415 (2d Cir. 2009)16

May v. Baldwin, 109 F.3d 557, 563 (9th Cir. 1997)12

Mayweathers v. Newland, 314 F.3d 1062, 1067 (9th Cir. 2002).....7

Mayweathers v. Terhune, 328 F. Supp. 2d 1086, 1095-96 (E.D.Ca. 2004) 19, 22

Murphy v. Mo. Dep’t of Corr., 372 F.3d 979, 988-89 (8th Cir. 2004)17

Murphy v. Zoning Comm’n of the Town of New Milford, 148 F. Supp. 2d. 173, 181 (D. Conn. 2001) 21, 22

River of Life Kingdom Ministries v. Vill. of Hazel Crest, 611 F.3d 367, 380 (7th Cir. 2010)20

Sefeldeen v. Alameida, 238 F. App’x 204, 205-06 (9th Cir. 2007)12

Shakur v. Schriro, 514 F.3d 878, 881 (9th Cir. 2008)12

Warsoldier v. Woodford, 418 F.3d 989, 993-94 (9th Cir. 2005) passim

Washington v. Klem, 497 F.3d 272, 283 (3d Cir. 2007)16

Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, 555 U.S. 7, ___, 129 S. Ct. 365, 374 (2008).....10

Statutes

Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15, §3062 (h) 8, 21

Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Person Act (“RLUIPA”), 42 U.S.C. § 2000cc *et seq.* (2000) passim

1 THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, by its undersigned attorneys,
2 hereby files this brief in support of Plaintiff Sukhjinder S. Basra’s Motion for a
3 Preliminary Injunction.

4 **I. INTRODUCTION**

5 Plaintiff Sukhjinder S. Basra, an inmate at the California Men’s Colony
6 Correctional Facility (“CMC”) in San Luis Obispo, California, is a lifelong
7 practitioner of the Sikh faith. As an observant Sikh, he is religiously mandated to
8 maintain unshorn hair, including facial hair. This fundamental requirement of his
9 religion signifies his respect for the will of God. Adherents to the Sikh faith
10 believe that cutting one’s hair is a grievous sin. Pursuant to these beliefs, Mr.
11 Basra always has maintained his hair and beard uncut and unshaved, including
12 during his incarceration.

13 California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (“CDCR”) policy
14 prohibits facial hair longer than one-half inch, without providing any exception for
15 those whose religious practices forbid cutting facial or other bodily hair
16 (“Grooming Policy”). This rule was not enforced against Mr. Basra until after his
17 transfer from Pleasant Valley State Prison (“PVSR”), a more restrictive, higher
18 security CDCR facility, to the minimum security facility in CMC. Once at CMC,
19 Defendants began enforcing this Grooming Policy against Mr. Basra, subjecting
20 him to progressively more severe disciplinary sanctions for practicing his religion.

21 Mr. Basra is now compelled either to cut his beard and violate a central tenet
22 of his religion, or suffer increasingly severe penalties, including the deprivation of
23 privileges and the risk of longer confinement in prison, in violation of his rights
24 under the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Person Act (“RLUIPA”), 42
25 U.S.C. § 2000cc *et seq.* (2000). Defendants contend that the Grooming Policy is
26 justified by their interest in the security of California’s prison facilities, but the
27 security interests they assert do not justify perpetuating the substantial burden
28 imposed on Mr. Basra’s religious liberty, one of our society’s most fundamental

1 rights. *See Mayweathers v. Newland*, 314 F.3d 1062, 1067 (9th Cir. 2002)
2 (RLUIPA is designed to “guard against unfair bias and infringement on
3 fundamental freedoms”). As President Clinton said in signing RLUIPA,
4 “[r]eligious liberty is a constitutional value of the highest order, and the Framers of
5 the Constitution included protection for the free exercise of religion in the very
6 first Amendment. This Act recognizes the importance the free exercise of religion
7 plays in our democratic society.” *See* Statement by President William J. Clinton
8 Upon Signing S. 2869, 2000 U.S.C.C.A.N. 662 (September 22, 2000). Indeed,
9 Congress enacted RLUIPA to combat “egregious and unnecessary” restrictions on
10 religious exercise, “[w]hether from indifference, ignorance, bigotry, or lack of
11 resources.” 146 Cong. Rec. 16698-99 (2000).

12 Defendants’ Grooming Policy is precisely the type of unnecessary restriction
13 targeted by RLUIPA. The United States urges this Court to grant Mr. Basra’s
14 Motion for a Preliminary Injunction.

15 **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

16 Mr. Basra is an observant Sikh who is religiously mandated to maintain
17 unshorn hair, including facial hair. Decl. of Professor Gurinder Singh Mann in
18 Supp. of Pl. Sukhjinder S. Basra’s Mot. for Prelim. Inj., ¶ 7, ECF No. 7-4
19 (hereinafter “Mann Decl.”). His unshorn beard is approximately six inches in
20 length. Members of the Sikh religion have five articles of faith which are worn at
21 all times. One of these five articles is the *kesh*, or unshorn hair. Adherents to the
22 Sikh faith believe that cutting one’s hair is a grievous sin and that uncut hair is
23 required for a Sikh to be classified as pure. Basra Decl. in Supp. of Mot. for
24 Prelim. Inj. ¶ 5, Jan. 26, 2011, ECF No. 7-2 (hereinafter “Basra Decl.”).

25 Mr. Basra currently is incarcerated in a minimum security facility within
26 CMC. He is kept in an unlocked, 90-person dormitory room. *Id.* ¶ 7. He initially
27 was incarcerated at PVSP, where he lived in a locked, two-man cell. *Id.* After one
28

1 year of discipline-free incarceration at PVSP, CDCR transferred Mr. Basra to
2 CMC on or about February 26, 2010. *Id.*

3 According to CDCR regulations, “facial hair, including short beards,
4 mustaches, and sideburns are permitted for male inmates and shall not extend more
5 than one-half inch in length outward from the face.” Cal. Code Regs. tit. 15,
6 § 3062(h) (2010). The regulations contain no provision for religious exemption.
7 Moreover, they apply system-wide, regardless of the level of security at an
8 individual facility.

9 When Mr. Basra was incarcerated in a more restrictive setting at PVSP, he
10 kept his beard unshorn but suffered no disciplinary action during his incarceration
11 there. Basra Decl. ¶ 9. While at PVSP, and during the initial portion of his
12 confinement at CMC, CDCR never warned Mr. Basra his beard violated any law or
13 policy, and never disciplined Mr. Basra for having his beard longer than one-half
14 inch. *Id.* When Mr. Basra first entered the state system through the inmate
15 reception center, he was asked to run his fingers through his beard in front of the
16 guards. Since then, however, no CMC employee has ever searched Mr. Basra’s
17 beard or asked him to run his fingers through his beard in front of them. Mr. Basra
18 has never been accused of hiding any contraband in his beard. No correctional
19 officer has ever physically manipulated Mr. Basra’s beard, run a metal detection
20 wand over it, or asked Mr. Basra to part his beard or run his fingers through it in
21 front of them, for any reason. *Id.* ¶ 10.

22 Beginning in March 2010, however, CDCR began disciplining Mr. Basra for
23 maintaining his beard at longer than one-half inch in length. *Id.* ¶ 11. Since then,
24 CDCR has subjected Mr. Basra to progressively more severe disciplinary action
25 for failing to comply with the Grooming Policy. On April 3, April 30, and June
26 28, 2010, Mr. Basra was issued administrative Rules Violation Reports (“RVR”)
27 for violating Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15, §3062 (h), “Grooming Standards,” for having
28 a beard longer than one-half inch. Basra Decl. ¶¶ 12-14. At the administrative

1 hearings on each of these violations, Mr. Basra pled not guilty and informed the
2 hearing official that he is unable comply with the grooming standard due to his
3 religious beliefs. Nevertheless, after each hearing, Mr. Basra was found guilty of
4 violating the Grooming Policy. *Id.* For these violations, Mr. Basra received
5 various punishments, including over 40 hours of extra duty, loss of good time
6 credits, and 10 days confinement to quarters. *Id.* During the confinement to
7 quarters period, Mr. Basra was required to stay in his cell and was permitted to
8 leave only to eat, use the rest room, and receive medical attention. He also lost his
9 rights to visitation, phone calls, yard access, day room, canteen, quarterly
10 packages, and accrual of excused time off. *Id.* ¶ 14, fn 1. Mr. Basra appealed each
11 of these charge through all three levels of administrative review, arguing that the
12 disciplinary action substantially burdened his religious exercise. *Id.* ¶¶ 12-14.

13 On July 19, 2010, Mr. Basra submitted to Defendant Gonzalez a request that
14 he be exempted from the Grooming Policy and allowed to maintain his beard
15 untrimmed. *Id.* ¶17. In this request, he informed the warden that maintaining
16 unshorn facial hair is part of his religious belief and practice. In a letter dated July
17 28, 2010, CDCR denied Mr. Basra's request, stating in pertinent part:

18 [Y]ou are not being discriminated against, as you allude to in your
19 letter You are being treated the same as the other inmates at
20 CMC You may have a beard, but you must keep it trimmed to no
21 more than one-half inch in length. There is no provision in the CCR,
22 Title 15 for the Warden to exempt the grooming standards.

23 *Id.* ¶ 14.

24 Other than disciplinary procedures for violations of the grooming code,
25 Mr. Basra has a positive disciplinary record. *Id.* ¶ 16. The penalties for the
26 practice of his religion are becoming more severe, and he is in danger of having his
27 security classification changed. *Id.* ¶8. As a result of the Grooming Policy, Mr.
28 Basra has suffered and likely will continue to suffer disciplinary sanctions,

1 including but not limited to the following: (1) loss of visitation rights; (2) extra
2 duties; (3) loss of assignment to particular duties; (4) extra restrictions or
3 confinement; and (5) loss of Work Time Credit or risk of loss of credits in the
4 future.

5 **III. APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARDS**

6 **A. Standard for Issuing a Preliminary Injunction**

7 The Supreme Court has held that a “plaintiff seeking a preliminary
8 injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely
9 to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of
10 equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest.” *Winter v.*
11 *Natural Res. Def. Council*, 555 U.S. 7, ___, 129 S. Ct. 365, 374 (2008). Prior to
12 the Supreme Court’s decision in *Winter*, a number of circuits had employed a
13 sliding scale approach in determining whether to issue a preliminary injunction.
14 Under this approach, the elements of the preliminary injunction test are balanced,
15 so that a stronger showing of one element may offset a weaker showing of
16 another. *Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127, 1131 (9th Cir.
17 2011). The Ninth Circuit had adopted a version of this sliding scale approach
18 under which a preliminary injunction could issue where the likelihood of success
19 is such that “serious questions going to the merits were raised and the balance of
20 hardships tips sharply in [plaintiff’s] favor.” *Id.* (quoting *Clear Channel Outdoor,*
21 *Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*, 340 F.3d 810, 813 (9th Cir. 2003)). In *Cottrell*, the
22 court held that this approach survived the Supreme Court’s decision in *Winter*.
23 Under the Ninth Circuit test, then, “serious questions going to the merits’ and a
24 hardship balance that tips sharply toward the plaintiff can support issuance of an
25 injunction, assuming the other two elements of the *Winter* test are also met.” *Id.*
26 at 1132.

27 Accordingly, to obtain a preliminary injunction, Mr. Basra “must show
28 either (1) a likelihood of success on the merits and the possibility of irreparable

1 injury or (2) the existence of serious questions going to the merits and the balance
2 of hardships tipping in [his] favor.” *Warsoldier v. Woodford*, 418 F.3d 989, 993-
3 94 (9th Cir. 2005) (quoting *Nike, Inc. v. McCarthy*, 379 F.3d. 576, 580 (9th Cir.
4 2004)). Mr. Basra has met the standards of both of these tests. Accordingly, his
5 motion should be granted.

6 **B. RLUIPA Prohibits the Government From Imposing a Substantial**
7 **Burden on a Prisoner’s Religious Exercise Unless the Government’s**
8 **Justification for Imposing the Burden Can Withstand Strict**
9 **Scrutiny.**

10 RLUIPA provides that no state or locally-owned institution, including
11 correctional facilities, “shall impose a substantial burden on the religious exercise
12 of a [prisoner].” 42 U.S.C. § 2000cc-1(a). “Religious exercise” includes “any
13 exercise of religion, whether or not compelled by, or central to, a system of
14 religious belief.” 42 U.S.C. § 2000cc-5(7)(A).

15 In order to overcome this prohibition on burdening religious exercise, a
16 government must demonstrate that imposition of the burden is: (1) “in furtherance
17 of a compelling governmental interest;” and (2) “the least restrictive means of
18 furthering that compelling governmental interest.” 42 U.S.C. § 2000cc-1(a).
19 Under RLUIPA, Mr. Basra bears the initial “burden of going forward with
20 evidence to demonstrate a prima facie claim that [the Grooming Policy] and its
21 punitive sanctions designed to coerce him to comply with that policy constitute a
22 substantial burden on the exercise of his religious beliefs.” *Warsoldier*, 418 F.3d.
23 at 994. Once he has done so, Defendants must show that the substantial burden
24 placed on Mr. Basra is the least restrictive means of furthering a compelling
25 governmental interest. *Id.* at 995.

26 **IV. ANALYSIS**

27 The Grooming Policy substantially burdens Mr. Basra’s religious exercise,
28 and Defendants do not contest this point in the Opposition. Defendants attempt to
justify the substantial burden by claiming that it serves a compelling governmental

1 interest—the need to quickly identify inmates and to prevent the introduction, use
2 and distribution of weapons, drugs, and other contraband – and that the Grooming
3 Policy is the least restrictive means of achieving those ends. Defendants’ argument
4 fails in light of the Ninth Circuit’s decision in *Warsoldier*, 418 F.3d 989, in which
5 the plaintiff challenged CDCR’s Grooming Policy prohibiting long hair. Under
6 almost identical facts, the Ninth Circuit rejected these arguments and held that the
7 plaintiff had demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits of his claim that
8 California’s grooming policy prohibiting long hair violated RLUIPA, 42 U.S.C. §
9 2000cc-1. *Id.*

10 **A. Mr. Basra Is Likely To Succeed on the Merits Because the Substantial**
11 **Burden Placed on His Exercise of Religion Is Not the Least Restrictive**
12 **Means of Achieving a Compelling Governmental Interest.**

13 **1. Defendants Have Placed a Substantial Burden on Mr. Basra’s**
14 **Exercise of Religion.**

15 A State places a substantial burden on religious exercise when it places
16 “substantial pressure on an adherent to modify his behavior and to violate his
17 beliefs.” *Warsoldier*, 418 F.3d at 995 (quoting *Thomas v. Review Bd. of the Ind.*
18 *Emp’t Sec. Div.*, 450 U.S. 707, 717-18 (1981)) (internal quotation marks omitted)
19 (holding that grooming policies requiring inmates to cut their hair intentionally
20 impose a substantial burden); *see also Shakur v. Schriro*, 514 F.3d 878, 881 (9th
21 Cir. 2008); *May v. Baldwin*, 109 F.3d 557, 563 (9th Cir. 1997) (finding substantial
22 burden where important benefits were conditioned on conduct proscribed by a
23 religious faith, a Rastafarian inmate undoing his dreadlocks). The Ninth Circuit
24 has found a substantial burden when the action is “oppressive to a significantly
25 great extent, such that it renders religious exercise effectively impracticable.”
26 *Sefeldeen v. Alameida*, 238 F. App’x 204, 205-06 (9th Cir. 2007) (quotation marks
27 omitted) (quoting *San Jose Christian Coll. v. City of Morgan Hill*, 360 F.3d 1024,
28 1034-35 (9th Cir. 2004)).

1 In *Warsoldier*, the Court held that imposing discipline such as that imposed
2 upon Mr. Basra for failing to comply with CDCR’s grooming regulations is a
3 substantial burden on religious exercise. *Warsoldier*, 418 F.3d at 996. Like the
4 plaintiff in *Warsoldier*, Mr. Basra is not being physically forced to comply with the
5 grooming standard, but he is being forced to choose between abandoning a core
6 tenant of his religion and being subjected to a variety of increasing punishments.
7 The court found such a Hobson’s choice to be a substantial burden on religious
8 exercise, noting that imposing such a dilemma “flies in the face of Supreme Court
9 and Ninth Circuit precedent that clearly hold that punishments to coerce a religious
10 adherent to forgo his . . . religious beliefs is an infringement on religious exercise.”
11 *Id.* The policy at issue here imposes a substantial burden on Mr. Basra’s religious
12 exercise, and Defendants do not contest that this prong of RLUIPA has been met.

13 **2. Defendants Cannot Establish a Compelling Governmental**
14 **Interest or Least Restrictive Means**

15 Because imposition of the Grooming Policy on Mr. Basra amounts to a
16 substantial burden on his religious exercise, CDCR must show that the imposition
17 of the substantial burden on Mr. Basra serves a compelling governmental interest,
18 and that the policy is the least restrictive means of advancing that interest. *See* 42
19 U.S.C. §§ 2000cc-1(a), 2000cc-2(b). Here, Defendants cite to prison safety and
20 security to justify depriving Mr. Basra of his fundamental right to exercise his
21 religion. In spite of evidence from other jurisdictions, and the holding in
22 *Warsoldier*, Defendants claim, as they did in *Warsoldier*, that the Grooming Policy
23 is the least restrictive means of achieving those goals. It is not, and the Ninth
24 Circuit has previously rejected these same arguments.

25 In *Warsoldier*, Defendants argued that their policy prohibiting long hair
26 allowed for the quick and accurate identification of inmates; prevented inmates
27 from hiding contraband or weapons in their hair or on their bodies; and prevented
28 prisoners from disguising their identity by cutting their hair upon escape.

1 *Warsoldier*, 418 F.3d at 997. They make the same arguments here. Defendants’
2 Opp. to Mot. for Prelim. Inj., 3-9, ECF No. 32 (hereinafter “Opposition” or
3 “Opp.”). While prison safety and security are compelling interests, CDCR could
4 achieve those goals through less restrictive means.

5 a. The Grooming Policy Is Not Necessary for Prisoner Identification and
6 Prevention of Escape

7 The prohibition on long beards does not aid in the prevention of escapes or
8 the capture of escapees because CDCR already must employ mechanisms to
9 address the changing appearance of prisoners. In response to the Ninth Circuit’s
10 decision in *Warsoldier*, CDCR changed its grooming policy in 2006 to allow hair
11 of any length. Decl. of Randolph Grounds in Supp. of Opp. to Mot. for Prelim.
12 Inj., ¶ 2, ECF No. 32-1 (hereinafter “Grounds Decl.”). In *Warsoldier*, the
13 defendants had argued that removing the hair length prohibition would help
14 prisoners escape and elude capture. *Warsoldier*, 418 F.3d at 997. Yet, Defendants
15 have not cited to a single instance since the regulation changed where a prisoner
16 escaped, attempted to escape, or eluded capture by changing his hair length.
17 Indeed, the last instance of escape involving a change of hair length defendants cite
18 to occurred almost fourteen years ago. Opp. Ex. 2, at 2, ECF No. 32-3. These
19 fears either proved to be unfounded, or defendants have found other, less
20 restrictive means, of addressing these dangers.¹

21 _____
22 ¹ Defendants cite heavily to an incident in 1997 in which an inmate escaped by
23 shaving his beard, cutting his hair, fashioning an apparently realistic identification
24 card, donning civilian clothing, and leaving through the front gates of the prison.
25 One assumes that CDCR addressed this situation by resorting to the obvious less
26 restrictive alternatives of preventing inmates from accessing printers, cameras,
27 laminating machines, and civilian clothing, and restricting access to employee
28 identification cards.

1 Because CDCR already effectively manages prisoners' changes in
2 appearance, the beard length restriction is unnecessary. Changing hair length is
3 just one of a number of ways in which prisoners may change their appearance.
4 During a period of incarceration, prisoners may age, gain and/or lose weight, incur
5 facial scars, get tattoos, lose teeth, and suffer receding hairlines. Decl. of John
6 Clark ¶ 22 (hereinafter "Clark Decl."). Professional correctional management
7 requires any facility to maintain safety and security in spite of these changes. *Id.*
8 ¶ 24. One way to accomplish this task is to require a new photograph and inmate
9 identification whenever these changes occur, and retention of all past inmate
10 photos so the facility has a series of pictures of each inmate in every state of
11 appearance. The Federal Bureau of Prisons ("BOP") manages to administer this
12 practice while incarcerating 215,000 prisoners and facing severe budgetary
13 limitations. *Id.* ¶¶ 10, 22, 27. CDCR likely already has policies and practices in
14 place to maintain security in spite of these inevitable appearance changes,
15 accounting for the lack of a single escape by an inmate who altered his appearance
16 in the last fourteen years. If it does not, than it cannot credibly cite to appearance
17 change as a compelling concern.

18 Moreover, Defendants' general citations to cost concerns in administering
19 less restrictive alternatives are unpersuasive. Congress underlined the importance
20 of eradicating burdens on religious exercise by explicitly providing that
21 compliance with RLUIPA "may require a government to incur expenses in its own
22 operations to avoid imposing a substantial burden on religious exercise."
23 42 U.S.C. § 2000cc-3(c).

24 b. The Grooming Policy Is Not the Least Restrictive Means of Preventing
25 Prisoners From the Concealing Contraband.

26 Defendants cite to the fear that prisoners will conceal contraband in a long
27 beard. They cite to "numerous occasions" in which prisoners have concealed
28 contraband "within beards and long hair," without offering any temporal or

1 quantitative specifics. They do not cite a single specific example of an inmate
2 concealing contraband in a beard. Opp. at 4. Moreover, Defendants raised the
3 same concern in *Warsoldier*, 418 F.3d at 997, but, since changing the regulation,
4 CDCR has addressed this concern by searching prisoners' hair. Grounds Decl.
5 ¶ 14. To the extent that concealment of contraband in beards also is a concern,
6 CDCR may employ the same remedy. Any additional administrative burden
7 would be minor, and that burden is outweighed by the interest in protecting a
8 fundamental right. The BOP addresses this concern by regularly searching
9 prisoners to prevent them from concealing contraband on their person. Clark Decl.
10 ¶ 26. The search consists of requiring the prisoner to run his hands vigorously
11 through his hair and through his beard, and then inserting his fingers in his mouth
12 and pulling his cheeks back. Prisoners also are subjected to a handheld metal
13 detection wand. The entire process takes only a few seconds. *Id.*

14 c. The Grooming Policy Is Overly Restrictive Because It Applies to All
15 Inmates, Regardless of Security Risk.

16 CDCR has enforced the Grooming Policy against Mr. Basra despite its
17 determination, evidenced by his transfer to a minimum security prison, that
18 he poses a lower security risk. Defendants have the burden of showing that
19 security, their asserted compelling interest, is actually furthered by banning
20 this specific Plaintiff from having an unshorn beard. 42 U.S.C. § 2000cc-
21 1(a) (prohibiting government imposition of a substantial burden on “religious
22 exercise of a person” unless “the government demonstrates that imposition of
23 the burden on *that person*” furthers a compelling government interest)
24 (emphasis added); *see, e.g., Jova v. Smith*, 582 F.3d 410, 415 (2d Cir. 2009)
25 (“[T]he state may not merely reference an interest in security or institutional
26 order in order to justify its actions.”); *Washington v. Klem*, 497 F.3d 272, 283
27 (3d Cir. 2007) (“Even in light of the substantial deference given to prison
28 authorities, the mere assertion of security or health reasons is not, by itself,

1 enough for the Government to satisfy the compelling governmental interest
2 requirement. Rather, the particular policy must further this interest.”);
3 *Murphy v. Mo. Dep’t of Corr.*, 372 F.3d 979, 988-89 (8th Cir. 2004) (“[Officials]
4 must do more than offer conclusory statements and offer post hoc
5 rationalizations.”) (citations omitted).

6 Defendants have not demonstrated how security is actually furthered by
7 prohibiting Mr. Basra from keeping his beard unshorn. When Mr. Basra was
8 housed in a medium security facility, Defendants did not require him to shorten his
9 beard, nor did Defendants punish him for maintaining a long beard. Basra Decl.
10 ¶ 9. Mr. Basra has since been transferred to a minimum security facility, where he
11 has maintained a clean disciplinary record, other than discipline he has received for
12 maintaining an unshorn beard in accordance with his religious beliefs. *Id.* ¶¶ 7, 16.
13 Furthermore, Defendants have not pointed to any evidence in their Opposition that
14 Mr. Basra is an escape risk or that he has attempted to conceal contraband in his
15 beard. In *Warsoldier*, the Ninth Circuit found that CDCR’s grooming policy
16 prohibiting long hair likely was not the least restrictive means of furthering the
17 proffered security interest, in part because Mr. Warsoldier, like Mr. Basra, was
18 housed in a minimum security facility. The *Warsoldier* court found that the
19 lowered security pressures at minimum security facilities may require policies that
20 are correspondingly less restrictive, and criticized CDCR for failing to address this
21 difference in its policies. 418 F.3d at 999. That same principle applies here.
22 Defendants have made no showing that the burden imposed on Mr. Basra by the
23 Grooming Policy furthers the asserted compelling government interest in security,
24 and therefore have failed to meet their burden under RLUIPA.

1 d. Because the Federal Bureau of Prisons Is Able To Maintain Safety and
2 Security Without Restricting Beard Length, CDCR's Policy Cannot Be
3 the Least Restrictive Means.

4 The Federal Bureau of Prisons has a population of approximately 215,000
5 prisoners, Clark Decl. ¶ 10, in contrast to California's 160,000. Grounds Decl.
6 ¶ 18. It incarcerates organized crime figures, gang leaders, international terrorists,
7 and other violent offenders. Clark Decl. ¶ 10. It must deal with gang rivalries, as
8 well as regional rivalries. *Id.* The BOP also must deal with constant budgetary
9 limitations and shortfalls in the face of an ever-increasing prison population. *Id.*
10 ¶ 27. The BOP does not tolerate escapes or the possession of contraband by
11 prisoners. *Id.* ¶ 11.

12 The BOP does not place any restriction on the length of prisoners' beards or
13 hair. *Id.* ¶ 9. To guard against the concealment of contraband, BOP staff search
14 prisoners by running a metal detection wand over the prisoners' bodies, and/or by
15 requiring prisoners to vigorously manipulate their hair, beards, and their mouths in
16 the presence of staff. This procedure is not an undue administrative burden. It
17 takes a matter of seconds, and much of it would need to be done even if BOP
18 restricted beard length. *Id.* ¶ 26.

19 Despite incarcerating some of the most inventive and escape prone prisoners
20 in American history, BOP has not found it necessary to restrict beard length to
21 maintain security. Clark Decl. ¶¶ 18, 25. BOP must manage change of inmates'
22 appearance regardless of any grooming policies, since a prisoner's appearance may
23 change drastically and quickly over the course of an incarceration – they may age,
24 gain or lose weight, get tattoos, receive scars, grow their hair, or lose their hair. *Id.*
25 ¶ 22. The existence or length of one's beard is just one factor in this inevitable
26 appearance change, and BOP must monitor this to ensure safety and security.
27 Instituting a beard length restriction would not alleviate this burden. *Id.* ¶ 17.

1 In *Warsoldier*, the Ninth Circuit criticized CDCR for failing to consider less
2 restrictive grooming policies when other institutions with the same penological
3 goals were able to accommodate the same religious practices. See *Warsoldier*, 418
4 F.3d at 999-1000. It held that failure of an institution to distinguish itself from
5 these analogous institutions “may constitute a failure to establish that the defendant
6 was using the least restrictive means.” *Id.* at 1000. The court also noted that
7 prison systems such as those run by Oregon, Colorado, Nevada and the BOP have
8 all satisfied their penological interests with much broader policies or with religious
9 exemptions. *Id.* at 999-1000. Here, Defendants have failed to distinguish
10 themselves from the BOP.

11 Defendants’ reliance on *Mayweathers v. Terhune*, 328 F. Supp. 2d 1086
12 (E.D. Cal. 2004), is misplaced. There, a group of Muslim state prisoners filed suit
13 under RLUIPA challenging CDCR’s grooming policy which, at that time,
14 prohibited beards of any length. *Mayweathers*, 328 F. Supp. 2d at 1090-91. The
15 plaintiffs asked for an injunction to allow them to wear half-inch beards, alleging
16 that wearing this short beard was an exercise of their religion. *Id.* The court found
17 CDCR’s grooming standard violated RLUIPA, *id.* at 1096, because allowing
18 inmates to wear one-half inch beards was a less restrictive alternative. *Id.* at 1102.
19 The court did not find that allowing one-half inch beards was the least restrictive
20 alternative, because that question was not before it, and the court received no
21 evidence on that point. Defendants’ assertion that the court made such a finding is
22 incorrect.

23 The Ninth Circuit has made clear that grooming policies such as the one at
24 issue here violate RLUIPA because there are less restrictive and equally effective
25 alternatives to accomplish the goal of maintaining safety and security. Defendants
26 cite to no contrary Ninth Circuit authority on this point, nor could they. The
27 experience of the Federal Bureau of Prisons establishes that CDCR’s approach is
28

1 overly restrictive and needlessly deprives California prisoners of a fundamental
2 right.

3 **B. The Public Interests Animating RLUIPA Favor Issuance of a**
4 **Preliminary Injunction**

5 As explained above, elimination of the Grooming Policy will not imperil
6 public safety, contrary to Defendants' assertions. Moreover, it is well-settled that
7 "the public has an interest in protecting the civil rights of all persons." *Edmisten v.*
8 *Werholtz*, 287 F. App'x 728, 735 (10th Cir. 2008) (reversing denial of preliminary
9 injunctive relief). The federal government's interest in protecting individual rights
10 is particularly salient in the context of the religious protections afforded by
11 RLUIPA, "the latest of long-running congressional efforts to accord religious
12 exercise heightened protection from government-imposed burdens" *Cutter v.*
13 *Wilkinson*, 544 U.S. 709, 713 (2005). RLUIPA passed both houses of Congress
14 unanimously and was supported by more than seventy religious and civil rights
15 groups representing a diversity of religious and ideological viewpoints. *See* 146
16 Cong. Rec. S7777-78. Its enactment followed a three year congressional
17 investigation into free exercise violations involving the religious practices of
18 institutionalized persons. *River of Life Kingdom Ministries v. Vill. of Hazel Crest*,
19 611 F.3d 367, 380 (7th Cir. 2010). As set forth in a joint statement by RLUIPA
20 co-sponsors Orrin Hatch and Edward Kennedy, Congress found that "[w]hether
21 from indifference, ignorance, bigotry, or lack of resources, some institutions
22 restrict religious liberty in egregious and unnecessary ways." *See* 146 Cong. Rec.
23 16698-99 (2000).

24 Moreover, facilitating the religious exercise of incarcerated persons serves
25 the important societal interest in rehabilitation of inmates. This interest in
26 rehabilitation was one of the motivations for Congress's passage of RLUIPA.
27 When introducing the bill that would become RLUIPA, Senator Kennedy
28 specifically noted that restrictions on the practice of religion in the prison context

1 could be counter-productive: “[s]incere faith and worship can be an indispensable
2 part of rehabilitation.” *See* 146 Cong. Rec. S6689. Further, this interest has been
3 repeatedly recognized by federal courts. In a decision affirming a district court’s
4 finding that a prison violated RLUIPA by denying prayer oils to a Muslim inmate,
5 the Seventh Circuit explained that “RLUIPA’s attempt to protect prisoners’
6 religious rights and to promote the rehabilitation of prisoners falls squarely within
7 Congress’ pursuit of the general welfare” *Charles v. Verhagen*, 348 F.3d 601,
8 607 (7th Cir. 2003); *see also, e.g., Benning v. Georgia*, 391 F.3d 1299, 1310 (11th
9 Cir. 2004) (“rehabilitation of prisoners is also a . . . purpose underlying RLUIPA”).

10 **C. Failure To Grant an Injunction Will Result in Irreparable Harm to**
11 **Mr. Basra**

12 Mr. Basra has been subjected to discipline for adhering to his religious
13 beliefs. Basra Decl. ¶ 18. Because Defendants have denied his religious
14 exemption, he continues to be in violation of the Grooming Policy. He is in
15 immediate danger of being deemed a program failure. 15 Cal. Code Regs. tit. 15,
16 § 3062(m). He already has received a referral to program review to determine if he
17 should be deemed a program failure. Basra Decl. ¶ 14. This kind of “chilling
18 effect” on the exercise of religion constitutes irreparable injury. *See Murphy v.*
19 *Zoning Comm’n of the Town of New Milford*, 148 F. Supp. 2d. 173, 181 (D. Conn.
20 2001) (holding that a chilling effect on religious practice was enough to satisfy the
21 irreparable harm requirement).

22 When evaluating irreparable injury in the context of RLUIPA, courts have
23 determined that the concerns are the same as those in the First Amendment
24 context. Indeed, Congress’ expressed intent to protect the free exercise of religion
25 led the court in *Murphy* to conclude the following:

26 Since the statute [“RLUIPA”] was enacted for the express purpose of
27 protecting the First Amendment rights of individuals, the allegation that
28 defendants have violated this statute also triggers the same concerns that led

1 the courts to hold that these violations result in a presumption of irreparable
2 harm.

3 *Murphy*, 148 F. Supp. 2d at 180-81.

4 The ““loss of First Amendment freedoms, for even minimal periods of time,
5 unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury.” *Ch. of Scientology v. United*
6 *States*, 920 F.2d 1481, 1488 (9th Cir. 1990) (quoting *Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347
7 (1976)); *see Guru Nanak Sikh Soc’y v. Cnty of Sutter*, 326 F. Supp. 2d 1140, 1161
8 (E.D. Cal. 2003). Furthermore, Congress enacted RLUIPA to “protect the free
9 exercise of religion from unnecessary government interference.” *Murphy*, 148 F.
10 Supp. 2d at 180 (citation omitted).

11 Under similar facts, the Ninth Circuit found a burden like the one being
12 placed upon Mr. Basra constituted irreparable injury. *Warsoldier*, 418 F.3d at
13 1001-02 (“We have previously held that putting substantial pressure on an adherent
14 to modify his behavior and to violate his belief infringes on the free exercise of
15 religion Because Warsoldier has, at a minimum, raised a colorable claim that
16 the exercise of his religious beliefs has been infringed, he has sufficiently
17 established that he will suffer an irreparable injury absent an injunction barring
18 enforcement of the grooming policy against him.”) (internal quotation marks and
19 citations omitted). Therefore, a preliminary injunction is necessary to ensure that
20 Mr. Basra is not threatened with irreparable injury.

21 **D. The Balance of Equities Sharply Favor Granting Issuance of a**
22 **Preliminary Injunction.**

23 Mr. Basra is being punished for practicing his religion. He is being deprived
24 of a fundamental right. These facts alone merit the issuance of a preliminary
25 injunction.

26 The interests asserted by Defendants do not alter this balance. Defendants
27 assert that the deprivation of Mr. Basra’s fundamental right is necessary to prevent
28 inmate escape and the concealment of contraband, but enjoining Defendants from

1 enforcing this policy against Mr. Basra would place no burden upon them. For the
2 initial period of Mr. Basra’s incarceration – when he was at a more secure facility
3 – Defendants did not feel compelled to enforce the Grooming Policy against him.
4 To date, Defendants have not felt it necessary to search Mr. Basra’s beard for
5 contraband and, in fact, have housed him in minimum security facility where he
6 sleeps in an unlocked dormitory. Defendants’ past actions confirm they would not
7 be burdened by an injunction against enforcing the Grooming Policy against Mr.
8 Basra.

9 Mr. Basra has demonstrated he is likely to prevail on his claims. He has also
10 demonstrated that irreparable injury would occur, and that the balance of hardships
11 is sharply in his favor. Public safety will not be imperiled. Rather, the public
12 interest will be served by such an injunction. Accordingly, the United States urges
13 this Court to grant his Motion for a Preliminary Injunction.

14
15 **V. CONCLUSION**

16 The United States respectfully urges that this Court to grant Mr. Basra’s
17 Motion for a Preliminary Injunction.

18
19 Respectfully submitted,

20
21 ANDRÉ BIROTTE, JR.
22 United States Attorney
23 Central District of California

THOMAS E. PEREZ
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division

24
25 LEON W. WEIDMAN
26 Assistant United States Attorney
27 Chief, Civil Division

SAMUEL R. BAGENSTOS
Principal Deputy Assistant
Attorney General
Civil Rights Division

1 /s/ Erika Johnson-Brooks

2 ROBYN-MARIE LYON MONTELEONE

JONATHAN M. SMITH

3 Chief, Civil Rights Unit

Chief

4 ERIKA JOHNSON-BROOKS

Special Litigation Section

5 Assistant United States Attorney

6 United States Attorney

TIMOTHY D. MYGATT

7 Central District of California

Special Counsel

8 312 North Spring Street

Special Litigation Section

9 Los Angeles, CA 90012

10 /s/ Samantha K. Trepel

11 EMILY A. GUNSTON

12 SAMANTHA K. TREPEL

13 Trial Attorneys

14 U.S. Department of Justice

15 Civil Rights Division

16 Special Litigation Section

17 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

18 Washington, D.C. 20530

19 (202) 514-6255

1 THOMAS E. PEREZ
Assistant Attorney General
2 SAMUEL R. BAGENSTOS
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General
3 JONATHAN M. SMITH (DC Bar # 396578)
Chief, Special Litigation Section
4 TIMOTHY D. MYGATT (PA Bar # 90403)
timothy.mygatt@usdoj.gov
5 Special Counsel, Special Litigation Section
EMILY A. GUNSTON (SBN # 218035)
6 emily.gunston@usdoj.gov
Samantha K. Trepel (DC Bar # 992377)
7 samantha.trepel@usdoj.gov
Trial Attorneys
8 United States Department of Justice
Civil Rights Division
9 Special Litigation Section
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
10 Washington, D.C. 20530
Telephone: (202) 514-6225
11 Facsimile: (202) 514-4883

12 ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR.
United States Attorney
13 LEON W. WEIDMAN
Assistant United States Attorney
14 Chief, Civil Division
ROBYN-MARIE LYON MONTELEONE
15 Chief, Civil Rights Unit
ERIKA JOHNSON-BROOKS (SBN 210908)
16 erika.johnson@usdoj.gov
Assistant United States Attorney
17 Federal Building, Suite 7516
300 North Los Angeles Street
18 Los Angeles, CA 90012
Telephone: (213) 894-0474
19 Facsimile: (213) 894-7819

20 Attorneys for the United States of America
21

22 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
23 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION**

24 SUKHJINDER S. BASRA AND)
25 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA) No. CV11-01676 SVW (FMOx)
26)
27 Plaintiffs,) **DECLARATION OF JOHN**
) **CLARK IN SUPPORT OF BRIEF**
28) **IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF**

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

v.
MATTHEW CATE, *et al.*,
Defendants.

**SUKHJINDER S. BASRA'S
MOTION FOR A
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Honorable Stephen V. Wilson
Hearing Date: June 6, 2011
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Courtroom: 6

JOHN L. CLARK, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, makes the following declaration under penalty of perjury:

1. My name is John L. Clark. I am a corrections professional with particular expertise in the operation of a large, complex correctional system.
2. I have agreed to work with the United States in this matter to assess policies and practices of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (“CDCR”) that restrict the length of prisoners’ facial hair.
3. I have been involved in corrections for over 35 years, including 25 years at the Federal Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”). From 1991-1997, I served as Assistant Director of BOP. As Assistant Director, I was a member of BOP’s Executive Staff, BOP’s central decision making body on policy and personnel matters. I oversaw agency policy on all detention-related issues and operations, including the coordination of the operations of all federal pretrial facilities. I regularly visited each federal detention center to review and assess operations.
4. Within BOP, I have worked in seven different facilities, including serving as Warden at both the Metropolitan Correctional Center in Miami, Florida

1 (“MCC Miami”) and the United States Penitentiary at Marion, Illinois
2 (“USP Marion”), the nation’s first “supermax” facility.

3 5. At the conclusion of my time serving as Assistant Director at BOP, Attorney
4 General Janet Reno appointed me to manage a congressionally established
5 agency tasked with closing the Lorton correctional facility in Washington,
6 DC and transferring its 7,000 inmates to federal custody. The transfer was
7 completed in 2002 and the agency was closed.

8 6. After the completion of the Lorton transfer, I worked from 2002-2009 as a
9 management consultant for several federal agencies, including the U.S.
10 Marshals Service and the Office of the Federal Detention Trustee within the
11 U.S. Department of Justice, where I helped coordinate oversight of local
12 detention facilities used by the Marshals Service for detaining federal
13 pretrial prisoners. During the course of these duties, I became generally
14 familiar with the operations of hundreds of local facilities with contracts to
15 detain federal pretrial prisoners. I also visited a number of local detention
16 facilities.

17 **Importance of Religious Exercise in the Corrections Environment**

18 7. Corrections professionals widely recognize that allowing prisoners to
19 exercise their religion is an essential part of good corrections management.
20 The closed environment of penal institutions inherently breeds boredom,
21 frustration, and tensions among inmates that may result in aggressive or
22 disruptive behavior. For this reason, providing the comfort of one’s religion
23 is an important tool of good corrections management. Encouraging religious
24 exercise can often reduce management problems in correctional settings by
25 occupying prisoners with mental stimulation, providing structured activity
26 on a routine basis, and offering tools for overcoming anger or frustration
27 with the idle existence of life inside prison.
28

1 8. In addition, religious exercise can be an important component of prisoners'
2 and detainees' rehabilitation.

3 **Federal Bureau of Prisons**

4 9. BOP recognizes the integral role played by religious exercise in managing
5 prisoners in a correctional setting. BOP does not place any restrictions on
6 the length of federal prisoners' hair or beards.

7 10. BOP applies these policies to a diverse population of prisoners and pre-trial
8 detainees. Indeed, BOP incarcerates approximately 215,000 prisoners in
9 115 correctional facilities, encompassing a wide range of security levels and
10 presenting an array of sophisticated threats to maintaining security and good
11 order. BOP incarcerates gang members, gang leaders, international
12 terrorists, and other violent offenders. It also must manage the risk of
13 violence associated with gang and regional rivalries.

14 11. BOP's policies reflect a lack of tolerance for prisoner escapes and the
15 concealment of contraband.

16 12. BOP policies, along with those of many other correctional facilities in the
17 United States, reflect the fundamental importance of allowing prisoners to
18 freely exercise their religion. BOP policies were not written in a vacuum;
19 rather, they have been developed and refined based on many years of
20 experience with the real world problems associated with the daily
21 management of a wide variety of correctional facilities.

22 13. I have applied BOP's grooming policies as Warden of two high profile
23 federal facilities: MCC Miami and the USP Marion "supermax" facility.

24 ***(i) Metropolitan Correctional Center in Miami, FL***

25 14. I served as Warden of MCC Miami for two years, from 1988-1989. At that
26 time, the facility housed 800-1,100 detainees in a space designed to
27 accommodate only 400.
28

1 15. Each of these detainees was charged with a federal felony. Occupants of
2 MCC Miami included many very violent offenders, dangerous drug dealers
3 and organized crime figures, a terrorist accused of bombing an airliner, and
4 other notorious criminals. Former Panamanian dictator Manuel Noriega was
5 sent to the facility to await prosecution after his seizure by the U.S. military
6 in 1990. After he was convicted, he served a number of years of his
7 sentence there under highly secure conditions.

8 16. Ensuring detainees' freedom of religious exercise has long been an
9 important component of corrections management at MCC Miami. During
10 my tenure there, the facility did not place any restrictions on the length of
11 prisoners' hair or facial hair. That policy remains unchanged.

12 ***(ii) U.S. Penitentiary, Marion, IL***

13 17. I left MCC Miami in 1989 to become Warden of USP Marion – then the
14 highest security federal prison in the United States. Marion opened in 1968
15 as an administrative maximum security penitentiary to replace Alcatraz and
16 house the nation's most dangerous federal criminals. USP Marion continued
17 to carry out this critical mission until 1993 when the construction of a new
18 administrative maximum security facility in Florence, Colorado was
19 completed and the prisoner population was transferred. At that time, Marion
20 took on the function of a high security federal penitentiary.

21 18. Marion has incarcerated some of the most inventive, escape prone and
22 violent criminals in American history, including mob bosses John Gotti and
23 Demeco Scarfo.

24 19. During my tenure at USP Marion, USP Marion did not place any restrictions
25 on the length of inmates' hair or facial hair. It remains the policy of USP
26 Marion to not place any restrictions on the length of inmates' hair or facial
27 hair.

1 **Analysis of CDCR's Grooming Policy**

2 20. I have reviewed court filings in this litigation, incidents reports produced by
3 Defendants, and the declarations of Toni Bair and Chief Deputy Warden
4 Grounds.

5 21. I understand that CDCR currently allows prisoners to wear hair of any
6 length, but restricts the length of prisoners' beards to one-half inch.

7 22. BOP must contend with the constant and sudden change of the appearances
8 of a large number of inmates. Each of the 215,000 inmates may change his
9 or her appearance dramatically and quickly over the course of an
10 incarceration. An inmate may: cut his hair, grow his hair long, change his
11 hair style, lose his hair, gain weight, lose weight, get tattoos, receive scars,
12 lose teeth, and age.

13 23. To aid quick identification of inmates, BOP requires that a new photo be
14 taken and a new identification be issued at regular intervals, and whenever
15 staff notice an inmate's appearance is changing. BOP retains past
16 photographs of each inmate, such that it possesses a series of photographs of
17 each inmate in various states of appearance.

18 24. Professional correctional management requires any facility to maintain
19 safety and security in spite of prisoners' constantly changing appearance.
20 BOP has instituted a variety of security measures that do not depend on
21 personal knowledge and quick identification of inmates to prevent their
22 escape.

23 25. Based on extensive knowledge and experience of managing the day to day
24 operations of a large correctional system, BOP has not found it necessary to
25 restrict beard length in order to maintain security.


26 26. Concealment of contraband is a serious issue in all correctional facilities,
27 and the BOP is vigilant in preventing it. BOP prisoners are searched
28 regularly, randomly, and before and after participating in certain activities,

1 such as visits. Searches are conducted by running a hand-held metal
2 detection wand over a prisoner's person and/or by requiring the prisoner to
3 run his fingers vigorously through hair and beard and to insert his own
4 fingers in his mouth and pull cheeks back. These searches are conducted
5 quickly and can be completed in a matter of seconds.

6 27. BOP is subject to severe budgetary limitations, shortfalls, and cuts while
7 incarcerating an increasingly large population of inmates. These budgetary
8 restrictions have not prevented the BOP from administering the security
9 measures described above. Professional correctional management requires
10 that these measures be taken in any correctional facility.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

2
3 DATED May 23 2011


4 John L. Clark

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