## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTAE

## **ORDER**

This case is before the Court on Plaintiffs' motion to extend the consent decre impose a corrective-action plan or, in the alternative, hold Defendant Hinds County, in contempt. Pls.' Mot. [131] at 1. For the following reasons, prospective relief remandances are some of the decree will be extended under a corrective-action plan.

Plaintiffs originally filed this case in 2011 against Hinds County, Mississippi, unconstitutional conditions at the Henley-Young Youth Detention Center. On March the Court signed a negotiated consent decree [33]. It named a court-appointed monit established 71 provisions for which Hinds County was expected to reach substantial by March 28, 2014. On March 25, 2014, the Court extended that period to March 28 because Hinds County had reached substantial compliance as to only three of the 71 *See* Apr. 25, 2014 Order [50]. The Court also held the County in contempt. *Id.* 

After that, the County dedicated more resources to the facility, and things important the progress did not result in substantial compliance as to all provisions, so on March the parties submitted, and the Court signed, an Amended Consent Decree [64]. That eliminated a few provisions for which the County reached substantial compliance and the decree for two more years until March 2018. When that deadline arrived, the parties submitted a Second Amended Consent Decree [120] extending prospective relief through the provisions of the county reached substantial compliance and the decree for two more years until March 2018.

Again, some progress was made, but more work remained. So on November 14, 2018, Plaintiffs filed the present motion seeking another extension, a corrective-action plan, or alternatively a contempt order. Pls.' Mot. [131] at 1.

should hire a full-time PhD-level clinical psychologist. *See, e.g.*, Monitor's Report [140] at 9. Yet no one has demonstrated to the Court that the Constitution requires a full-time PhD-level clinical psychologist.

These are just two examples; there are many more. And while the County spends time

Case 3:11-cv-00327-DPJ-FKB Document 144 Filed 04/03/19 Page 4 of 4

Having reviewed the Third Amended Consent Decree, the Court is convinced that it is a

step in the right direction. It removes unnecessary yet time-consuming objectives and will give

the County clear and obtainable guideposts to achieve substantial compliance and remedy the

remaining constitutional issues. While "prospective relief remains necessary to correct a current

and ongoing violation of the Federal right," the parties' proposed plan "extends no further than

necessary to correct" those violations, "is narrowly drawn," and reflects the "least intrusive

means to correct the violation." 18 U.S.C. § 3626(b)(1)(3). The Court will therefore approve

the Third Amended Consent Decree and extend this matter until March 28, 2021. Because the

Court grants the corrective-action plan reflected in the Third Amended Consent Decree, it

declines to address the Plaintiffs' alternative request for an order of contempt.

**SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** this the 3rd day of April, 2019.

s/ Daniel P. Jordan III

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

4