

1 CAIR LEGAL DEFENSE FUND  
 2 Lena F. Masri (DC # 1000019) (*pro hac* pending)  
 3 lmasri@cair.com  
 4 Carolyn M. Homer (CA # 286441)  
 5 chomer@cair.com  
 6 453 New Jersey Ave., SE  
 7 Washington, DC 20003  
 8 Phone: (202) 742-6420  
 9 Fax: (202) 379-3317

10 COUNCIL ON AMERICAN-ISLAMIC  
 11 RELATIONS, CALIFORNIA  
 12 Patricia Shnell (CA # 316183)  
 13 pshnell@cair.com  
 14 Amr Shabaik (CA # 288109)  
 15 ashabaik@cair.com  
 16 Greater Los Angeles Area Office  
 17 2180 W. Crescent Ave., Suite F  
 18 Anaheim, CA 92801  
 19 Phone: (714) 776-1177  
 20 Fax: (714) 776-8310

21 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 22 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

23 **JOE ALFRED TAYLOR, III**, Inmate #  
 24 4755117;

25 **MIGUEL ARCINIEGA**, Inmate # 4363112;  
 26 and,

27 **HUGO CORTEZ**, Inmate # 5257488;

28 Plaintiffs,

v.

**ALEX VILLANUEVA**, Sheriff, Los Angeles  
 County Sheriff's Department, in his official  
 and individual capacities;

**JIM MCDONNEL**, Former Sheriff, Los  
 Angeles County Sheriff's Department, in his

Case No. 2:19-cv-04398-SJO (ASx)

**AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR  
 DECLARATORY AND  
 INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND  
 FOR DAMAGES**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

Hon. S. James Otero  
 Mag. Alka Sagar

1 individual capacity, only;

2 **ALEX SALDAÑA**, Deputy Sheriff, Los  
3 Angeles County Sheriff's Department, in his  
4 individual capacity, only;

5 **R. OLMSTED**, Assistant Sheriff of Custody  
6 Operations, Los Angeles County Sheriff's  
7 Department, in his official and individual  
8 capacities;

9 **J. DEMPSEY**, Chief, Specialized Programs  
10 Custody Services Division, Custody  
11 Operations, Los Angeles County Sheriff's  
12 Department, in his individual capacity, only;

13 **H. MACIAS**, Captain, Inmate Services  
14 Bureau/Education Based Incarceration,  
15 Specialized Programs Custody Services  
16 Division, Custody Operations, Los Angeles  
17 County Sheriff's Department, in his individual  
18 capacity, only;

19 **JUAN D. MARTINEZ**, Sergeant of  
20 Religious and Volunteer Services, Men's  
21 Central Jail, Los Angeles County Sheriff's  
22 Department, in his individual capacity, only;

23 **PRESTON SMITH**, Officer/Religious and  
24 Volunteer Services Liaison, Men's Central Jail,  
25 Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, in  
26 his individual capacity, only;

27 **MARTIN WILSON**, Chaplain, Men's  
28 Central Jail, Los Angeles County Sheriff's  
Department, in his individual capacity, only;

**NOCHEZ MINJAREZ**, Custody Assistant,  
Men's Central Jail, Los Angeles County  
Sheriff's Department, in her individual  
capacity, only;

1 **MERCHAIN**, Sergeant, Men’s Central Jail,  
2 Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, in  
3 his individual capacity, only;

4 **KARAPETYAN**, Custody Assistant, Men’s  
5 Central Jail, Los Angeles County Sheriff’s  
6 Department, in her individual capacity, only;  
7 and,

8 **HOPKINS**, Custody Assistant, Men’s Central  
9 Jail, Los Angeles County Sheriff’s  
10 Department, in his individual capacity, only;

11 **STEINERT**, Sergeant, Men’s Central Jail,  
12 Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, in  
13 his individual capacity, only; and,

14 **BROWN**, Sergeant, Men’s Central Jail, Los  
15 Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, in his  
16 individual capacity, only;

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
Defendants.



1 rights of all inmates to adequate, effective and meaningful access to the courts by forcing  
2 them to strip to their underwear to obtain access to the law library. For Muslim inmates,  
3 this also places a substantial burden on their right to free exercise of religion as it is their  
4 sincerely held religious belief to maintain modesty, particularly because they are  
5 oftentimes monitored by correctional employees of the opposite gender.

6 5. Defendants' policies and procedures substantially burden Plaintiffs' religious  
7 exercise, discriminate against Plaintiffs on the basis of religious denomination, and treat  
8 Plaintiffs on less than equal terms with other religious and non-religious similarly situated  
9 persons.

10 6. Defendants have not identified a compelling government interest for either  
11 failing to provide or placing onerous hurdles upon Muslim inmates before they could be  
12 provided with access to religious accommodations, services, programming and materials  
13 while simultaneously dedicating space, time and resources to ensure the same religious  
14 needs of other inmates are met.

15 7. Nor have Defendants identified a compelling government interest for  
16 unlawfully imposing policies and procedures that substantially burden the rights of  
17 Plaintiffs to the free exercise of religion by means that are not the least restrictive means  
18 available to correctional facilities to protect their asserted government interests.

19 8. These actions are not the result of ignorance or ineptitude but a part of the  
20 Defendants' deliberate plan to prefer other faiths over Islam. Indeed, Defendants have  
21 created a systematic preference against Islam and their Muslim inmates.

### 22 **Jurisdiction and Venue**

23 9. This Court has federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331  
24 and 28 U.S.C. § 1343 over Plaintiffs' claims of violations of the First and Fourteenth  
25 Amendments to the United States Constitution, the Religious Land Use and  
26 Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000 ("RLUIPA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000cc et seq., and 42  
27 U.S.C. § 1983.

28 10. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367 over

1 Plaintiffs' claims of violations of the California Constitution, art. I, § 4.

2 11. Plaintiffs' claims for declaratory and injunctive relief are sought under 28  
3 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202, 28 U.S.C. § 1343, Rules 57 and 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil  
4 Procedure, and by the general, legal, and equitable powers of this Court.

5 12. Plaintiffs' claims for attorneys' fees and costs are predicated upon 42 U.S.C.  
6 §§ 1988 and 2000cc-2(d), which authorize the award of attorneys' fees and costs to  
7 prevailing parties, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and RLUIPA.

8 13. Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Men's Central Jail, where  
9 Plaintiffs are incarcerated, is an "institution" within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. § 2000cc-  
10 1(a) and 42 U.S.C. § 1997.

11 14. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants  
12 reside and conduct business in the State of California.

13 15. Venue is proper under 42 U.S.C. § 1391 as to all Defendants because  
14 Defendants operate within the geographical boundaries of the State of California, and the  
15 substantial part of the acts described herein occurred within this District.

16 **Plaintiffs**

17 16. Plaintiff Joe Alfred Taylor, III, is an individual, a male, a Muslim and an  
18 inmate at Los Angeles Sheriff's Department's Men's Central Jail (Inmate No. 4755117).  
19 He was at all relevant times considered a "person confined to an institution" as the term  
20 is defined in 42 U.S.C. § 2000cc *et seq.*

21 17. Plaintiff Miguel Arciniega is an individual, a male, a Muslim and an inmate  
22 at Los Angeles Sheriff's Department's Men's Central Jail (Inmate No. 4363112). He was  
23 at all relevant times considered a "person confined to an institution" as the term is defined  
24 in 42 U.S.C. § 2000cc *et seq.*

25 18. Plaintiff Hugo Cortez is an individual, a male, a Muslim and an inmate at  
26 Los Angeles Sheriff's Department's Men's Central Jail (Inmate No. 5257488). He was at  
27 all relevant times considered a "person confined to an institution" as the term is defined  
28 in 42 U.S.C. § 2000cc *et seq.*

1                    **Defendants Sued in Both Official and Individual Capacities**

2            19. Defendant Alex Villanueva is the Sheriff of Los Angeles County Sheriff's  
3 Department ("LASD"). Defendant Villanueva is a decision-maker and possesses  
4 authority to formulate, establish and approve all policies, programs and procedures  
5 concerning Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, including the Men's Central Jail.  
6 Defendant Villanueva is being sued in both his official and individual capacities.

7            20. Defendant R. Olmsted is the Assistant Sheriff of Custody Operations of the  
8 Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. Defendant Olmsted is a decision-maker and  
9 possesses authority to formulate, establish and approve all policies, programs and  
10 procedures concerning custody operations of Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department,  
11 including the Men's Central Jail. Defendant Olmsted personally engaged in  
12 discriminatory behavior against the Plaintiffs. Defendant Olmsted is being sued in both  
13 his official and individual capacities.

14                    **Defendants Sued in Individual Capacity, Only**

15            21. Defendant Jim McDonnel is the Former Sheriff of the Los Angeles County  
16 Sheriff's Department. Defendant McDonnel was a decision-maker and possessed  
17 authority to formulate, establish and approve all policies, programs and procedures  
18 concerning custody operations of Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, including  
19 the Men's Central Jail. Defendant McDonnel personally engaged in discriminatory  
20 behavior against the Plaintiffs. Defendant McDonnel is being sued in his individual  
21 capacity, only.

22            22. Defendant Saldaña is the Deputy Sheriff of Los Angeles County Sheriff's  
23 Department. Defendant Saldaña is a decision-maker and possesses authority to  
24 formulate, establish and approve all policies, programs and procedures concerning  
25 custody operations of Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, including the Men's  
26 Central Jail. Defendant Saldaña personally engaged in discriminatory behavior against  
27 Plaintiffs. Defendant Saldaña is being sued in his individual capacity, only.

28            23. Defendant J. Dempsey is the Chief of the Specialized Programs Custody

1 Services Division of Custody Operations of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's  
2 Department. Defendant Dempsey is a decision-maker and possesses authority to  
3 formulate, establish and approve all policies, programs and procedures concerning  
4 specialized custody operations of Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, including  
5 the Men's Central Jail. Defendant Dempsey personally engaged in discriminatory  
6 behavior against the Plaintiffs. Defendant Dempsey is being sued in his individual  
7 capacity, only.

8 24. Defendant H. Macias is the Captain of the Inmate Services  
9 Bureau/Education Based Incarceration Unit ("EBI") of Specialized Programs Custody  
10 Services Division of Custody Operations of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's  
11 Department. Defendant Macias is a decision-maker and possesses authority to  
12 formulate, establish and approve all policies, programs and procedures concerning  
13 inmate services and education-based programs in connection with specialized custody  
14 operations of Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, including the Men's Central  
15 Jail. Defendant Macias is also responsible for coordinating all chaplain and religious  
16 services for inmates. Defendant Macias personally engaged in discriminatory behavior  
17 against the Plaintiffs. Defendant Macias is being sued in his individual capacity, only.

18 25. Defendant Juan D. Martinez is the Sergeant of Religious and Volunteer  
19 Services at Men's Central Jail, a Los Angeles Sheriff's Department correctional facility.  
20 Defendant Juan Martinez personally engaged in discriminatory behavior against the  
21 Plaintiffs. Defendant Martinez is being sued in his individual capacity, only.

22 26. Defendant Preston Smith is an Officer and the Religious and Volunteer  
23 Services Liaison at Men's Central Jail, a Los Angeles Sheriff's Department correctional  
24 facility. Defendant Smith personally engaged in discriminatory behavior against the  
25 Plaintiffs. Defendant Smith is being sued in his individual capacity, only.

26 27. Defendant Chaplain Wilson at Men's Central Jail, a Los Angeles County  
27 Sheriff's Department correctional facility. Defendant Wilson is being sued in his  
28 individual capacity, only.



1           34. Plaintiffs have sincere religious beliefs that prohibit the consumption of  
2 certain foods, including pork. In accordance with their sincerely held religious beliefs,  
3 they must refrain from eating pork products and are permitted to only eat meat that is  
4 halal<sup>1</sup>, each of the Plaintiffs submitted requests to be added to the halal diet.

5           35. However, each of the Plaintiffs were subjected to onerous hurdles and  
6 unreasonable delays in violation of their rights to free exercise and to be free from  
7 disparate and discriminatory treatment on the basis of their faith in violation of RLUIPA  
8 and the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

9           36. On May 5, 2017, Plaintiff Taylor first submitted a request for a halal diet and  
10 a grievance stating that he is Muslim and requires a halal diet in accordance with his  
11 sincerely-held religious beliefs. He says that Defendant Smith questioned him and  
12 subsequently “told me I was not a Muslim and would make sure I never got a Halal diet  
13 because he approves the diets.” Defendants refused to process this request and did not  
14 assign it a reference number.

15           37. On February 23, 2017 and April 16, 2017, Plaintiff Taylor submitted two  
16 more grievances that he still had not received a halal diet. Defendants did not process  
17 either of these requests and did not assign them reference numbers.

18           38. On July 5, 2017, Plaintiff Taylor submitted an emergency grievance on the  
19 basis that he should be given a halal diet due to his faith, that he lost a significant amount  
20 of weight due to his refusal of the majority of meals being given to him, and that  
21 Defendant Smith “expressed to me he will personally prevent a special diet for me.”  
22 Defendants refused to process this grievance or assign it a reference number.

23           39. On July 15, 2017, Plaintiff Taylor filed an emergency grievance stating that,  
24 “I have put in numerous unanswered emergency grievance in regards to a halal diet.  
25 Today marks a documented (83) days/(120) meals refused for religious reasons. Plus  
26 food I can eat from the store is restricted without explanation.”

27  
28

---

<sup>1</sup> A halal diet consists of a diet that is prepared in accordance with Islamic law.

1           40. Due to Defendants' refusal to give him halal meals, Plaintiff Taylor went on  
2 a hunger strike from July 23 – July 28, 2017. Because of his hunger strike, Defendants  
3 added Plaintiff Taylor to the vegetarian list. But Defendants refused to add him to the  
4 halal list, which contains meat Plaintiff Taylor could eat in accordance with his sincerely-  
5 held religious beliefs.

6           41. On August 10, 2017, Chaplain Wilson subjected Plaintiff Taylor to a  
7 rigorous and unlawful testing of his knowledge of the Islamic faith. Wilson asked  
8 questions from a standardized list of 17 questions and compared Taylor's answers to a  
9 master key. Plaintiff Taylor recalls being asked who the prophet of Islam is, what the five  
10 pillars of Islam are, where Mecca is located, and what type of Muslim he is, among other  
11 things. At the conclusion of the test, Chaplain Wilson approved Plaintiff Taylor's request  
12 for a halal diet and Plaintiff Taylor signed an agreement to receive his diet.

13           42. On August 20, 2017, Plaintiff Taylor submitted two requests to kitchen staff  
14 and the food coordinator stating that he signed his halal questionnaire agreement on  
15 August 10, 2017 with Chaplain Wilson who had approved his halal diet; however, he still  
16 had not received it.

17           43. Two days later, Plaintiff Taylor submitted another emergency grievance  
18 stating that his halal diet was approved; however, he was informed by Deputy Herndon  
19 that he had to clear it with Defendant Smith first. "Smith is keeping me from getting my  
20 approved diet." In a second emergency grievance filed that same day, Plaintiff Taylor  
21 wrote, "Hunger strike due to being refused 'halal'. CA Smith upset I refused to answer  
22 questions... I signed halal agreement 8-10-17. How is this man still harassing me?"

23           44. On September 6, 2017, Plaintiff Taylor submitted another emergency  
24 grievance on the basis that Defendant Smith was continuing to harass him and prevent  
25 him from receiving his approved halal diet. In a second grievance filed that day, Plaintiff  
26 Taylor wrote that he is suffering spiritually and losing weight from hunger strikes as a  
27 result of being denied his halal diet.

28           45. On September 28, 2017, Sergeant D. McDaniel wrote an email to Defendant

1 Saldaña on behalf of Plaintiff Taylor raising concerns regarding the unconstitutional  
2 practice of denying a religious diet based upon unlawful questioning regarding the  
3 sufficiency of religious beliefs and denying a religious diet based upon the responses to  
4 the questions:

5 I am writing to inquire and request a Halal religious special  
6 Diet for I/M Taylor, Joe. # 4755117. He has requested this  
7 special Diet via numerous request forms... He has been very  
8 patient... However, he has still not received this Special  
9 Religious Diet. His claims are that someone may be  
10 questioning his religious beliefs when they questioned him at  
11 an earlier date. However, I don't believe any of us can deny  
12 his religious diet on the grounds that we don't believe him to  
13 be a devout Muslim. It is like if I didn't bring my bible in to  
work, would someone say I'm not a Christian, or if I didn't  
know everything in the bible, then can someone say I'm not a  
Christian. I don't think we can Deny him because we don't  
think he is Muslim enough...

14 46. On October 13, 2017, Plaintiff Taylor filed another grievance, this time  
15 stating that Defendant Martinez asked him to sign documents that waive his rights to  
16 bring a claim against Defendants before he could be provided a halal diet. Plaintiff Taylor  
17 refused to sign and was denied his halal diet as a result.

18 47. The following day, Plaintiff filed another request where he described a  
19 conversation he had with Defendant Martinez that day, whereby Defendant Martinez  
20 informed him that Defendant Smith overrode the approval of Plaintiff Taylor's halal diet  
21 and Defendant Martinez approved the override.

22 48. Defendants refused to process each of these grievances and did not assign  
23 reference numbers to any of them.

24 49. During the fall of 2017, Plaintiff Taylor briefly received halal meals, only to  
25 have the authorization revoked.

26 50. The ACLU Jails Project ("ACLU Jails Project"), the court-ordered monitor  
27 of conditions of confinement within all Los Angeles County jail facilities, sent a complaint  
28 on Plaintiff Taylor's behalf on November 3, 2017 to Defendants. The complaint stated

1 that he is being denied a religious halal diet in response to a complaint he submitted on  
2 August 31, 2017.

3 51. Defendants responded that “Inmate Taylor was interviewed upon his  
4 request for a halal diet. Inmate was not able to meet the criteria per the religious liaison  
5 officer and was denied. On 11/15/17, Sr. Calderon contacted Taylor. He stated he is  
6 now getting Halal diet. 5800-2017-1113-262.” Upon information and belief, the religious  
7 liaison officer is Defendant Smith.

8 52. On December 5, 2017, the ACLU Jails Project submitted another complaint  
9 on Plaintiff Taylor’s behalf regarding receiving a halal diet in connection with a complaint  
10 he submitted on September 7, 2017.

11 53. On December 6, 2017, Plaintiff Taylor submitted another grievance on the  
12 basis that he has submitted numerous grievances against Defendant Smith and that he  
13 has yet to receive a Notification of Disposition. He went on to say that “CA Smith is bias  
14 and prejudice against Muslim inmates. He personally ‘overrode’ the approval of my Halal  
15 diet. (With Sgt. Juan Martinez’s approval).”

16 54. On December 20, 2017, Defendants responded to the December 5, 2017  
17 complaint submitted by the ACLU Jails Project, stating “Food Services advised that there  
18 is no special diet order for Inmate Taylor. Advised Inmate Taylor to submit a request for  
19 a religious/special diet that will be submitted for review by Chaplain’s Services. Religious  
20 Services/Chaplain Services were contacted on 12/20/2017. Stated I/M Taylor’s request  
21 will be re=applied [sic] for special diet. 5800-2017-1212-285.”

22 55. On February 7, 2018, the ACLU Jails Project submitted another complaint  
23 on Plaintiff Taylor’s behalf in connection with a complaint he submitted on January 16,  
24 2018 regarding his halal diet still not being approved.

25 56. On October 16, 2018, the ACLU Jails Project submitted another complaint  
26 on Plaintiff Taylor’s behalf in connection with a complaint he submitted on September  
27 20, 2018 that his halal diet was revoked.

28 57. Upon information and belief, Defendants did not respond to either the

1 February 7, 2018 or the October 16, 2018 complaints submitted by the ACLU Jails  
2 Project.

3 58. Plaintiff Taylor was finally approved to receive a halal diet at the end of  
4 2018.

5 59. Plaintiff Arciniega was subjected to similar treatment before his halal diet  
6 was finally approved.

7 60. On November 25, 2018, days after converting to Islam, Plaintiff Arciniega  
8 submitted an Inmate Request Form stating that “I am a Muslim and would like to get put  
9 on a Halal diet.”

10 61. After having heard nothing from Defendants, on December 13, 2018,  
11 Plaintiff Arciniega submitted a second request again stating, “I am a Muslim and need to  
12 be put in a Halal diet. Thank you.”

13 62. Still having heard nothing, on December 20, 2018, Plaintiff Arciniega  
14 submitted yet another request stating once again, “I am a Muslim who is and has been  
15 requesting my Halal diet approval. My brothers in Islam are witness to my faith. Please  
16 assist me in receiving my religious diet. I do not wish to HUNGER STRIKE but will.”  
17 (Caps in original).

18 63. Plaintiff Taylor added a signed statement of support on the same request,  
19 “I, Joe Alfred Taylor III (4755117) am witness to this young brother... having firm belief  
20 in Islam. He meets the requirement and follows the tenets of Islamic faith. Please provide  
21 him with agreement and questionnaire to begin the process for his Halal diet.”

22 64. That same day, Plaintiff Arciniega filed a grievance stating that he submitted  
23 numerous requests and a lot of grievances<sup>2</sup>, and that he has not yet received “an agreement  
24

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 <sup>2</sup> As is made clear in the allegations, as a matter of practice, Defendants refuse to process or respond to  
27 the vast majority of grievances filed and do not assign them reference numbers. In many of these  
28 instances, a copy of the original grievance is not given to the Plaintiffs, or other inmates. Due to this  
practice, Plaintiffs have copies of many but not all grievances that they have filed. The grievances in  
Plaintiffs’ possession are described in this Amended Complaint. However, Plaintiffs assert that they  
have exhausted their administrative remedies with respect to all grievances they filed.

1 or questionnaire.” He reiterated that he does not wish to strike.

2 65. For the first time since his first request, Defendants finally responded to his  
3 grievances by issuing a Notification of Disposition<sup>3</sup> that stated simply that “[i]nmate  
4 stating he submitted multiple requests for halal diet, but no avail.” The Notification of  
5 Disposition was reviewed and issued by Defendants Merchain and Karapetyan. No  
6 further action was taken by Defendants.

7 66. On or about December 31, 2018, Plaintiff Arciniega submitted another  
8 grievance requesting a halal diet and asked, “I would like to know what is being done to  
9 provide a resolution.”

10 67. That same day, Defendant Smith subjected Plaintiff Arciniega to an intrusive  
11 and unlawful religious inquiry in order to determine whether or not he is a Muslim.  
12 Plaintiff Arciniega recalls being asked the names of the Prophet Muhammad’s wives, why  
13 he converted to Islam, where Mecca is, among several other questions that tested his  
14 Islamic knowledge. Upon completion of the test, Defendant Smith made an unlawful  
15 determination that Plaintiff Arciniega is not a Muslim and denied his requests for a halal  
16 diet for failure to meet the criteria.

17 68. On January 1, 2019, Plaintiff Arciniega submitted another request for a halal  
18 diet.

19 69. On January 4, 2019, Plaintiff Arciniega submitted another grievance, this  
20 time explaining that he had recently converted to Islam but Defendant Smith had refused  
21 to acknowledge his conversion and denied him access to the halal diet.

22 70. That same day, Plaintiff Taylor also submitted a grievance in support of  
23 Plaintiff Arciniega’s requests and grievances stating that “I observed CA Preston Smith  
24 asking vague non-descriptive, confrontational questions to Muslim brother Miguel  
25 Arciniega #4363112 and told Bro. Miguel since he’s ‘only’ been a Muslim approx. 6 weeks  
26

---

27 <sup>3</sup> The Notification of Disposition is undated; however, it states the Date of Collection was December  
28 24, 2018. Reference No. 5100-2018-1230-292, with a reference to a duplicate grievance assigned  
Reference No. 5100-2018-0104-304.

1 (took Shahada in custody) he doesn't meet HALAL diet criteria.” (Caps in original)

2 71. On January 7, 2019, Plaintiff Arciniega submitted another request for a halal  
3 diet.

4 72. Defendants issued another Notification of Disposition<sup>4</sup> that stated again  
5 that “[i]nmate [is] stating he submitted several requests to receive halal diet with no avail.”  
6 The Notification of Disposition was again reviewed and issued by Defendants Merchain  
7 and Karapetyan. No further action was taken by Defendants.

8 73. Plaintiff Arciniega received and appealed this Notification of Disposition on  
9 January 9, 2019. He stated in his appeal that he began a hunger strike on January 4, 2019  
10 due to being prevented from receiving a halal diet and because Defendant “Smith falsely  
11 denied my Halal.”

12 74. On January 11, 2019, Plaintiff Arciniega submitted another request and the  
13 following day submitted another grievance regarding receiving a halal diet.

14 75. Defendants issued another Notification of Disposition<sup>5</sup> stating that  
15 “[i]nmate was previously interviewed and denied Halal Diet meals. He is not Muslim and  
16 was not practicing any of the tenets of Islam. He was subsequently offered Vegetarian  
17 Diet meals and is currently receiving them.” The Notification of Disposition was  
18 reviewed and issued by Defendant Hopkins.

19 76. Plaintiff Arciniega submitted an appeal that same day stating that he was  
20 “not” questioned according to the ‘17’ approved questions from the Chaplain meeting.”  
21 He further wrote that he was denied a halal diet on January 4, 2019 by Defendant Smith  
22 and again denied by Senior Muslim Chaplain Khani on January 24, 2019. An undated  
23 denial of the appeal was issued by Defendant Karapetyan.

24 77. Plaintiff Arciniega continued his hunger strike in an attempt to enforce his  
25

26 <sup>4</sup> The Notification of Disposition is undated; although it states the Date of Collection was January 1,  
27 2019). Reference No. 5100-2018-0104-304 (the same Reference Number referred to as a duplicate in  
the first Notification of Disposition).

28 <sup>5</sup> The Notification of Disposition is undated; although it states the Date of Collection was January 12,  
2019). Reference No. 5100-2019-0207-318.

1 rights to receive a diet in accordance with his sincerely held Islamic beliefs. In March of  
2 2019, Plaintiffs Taylor and Cortez joined him in his hunger strike to help add pressure on  
3 Defendants to approve Plaintiff Arciniega's request for a halal diet.

4 78. Four days later, Defendants added Plaintiff Arciniega to the vegetarian diet.

5 79. On March 11, 2019, Defendant Smith subjected Plaintiff Arciniega to a  
6 second intrusive and unlawful inquiry whereby he questioned Plaintiff Arciniega about  
7 the sufficiency of his knowledge of Islam. Plaintiff Arciniega recalls being asked where  
8 the Qur'an came from and where the Prophet Muhammad came from. This time, Muslim  
9 Chaplain Khani was present. Defendant Smith approved Plaintiff Arciniega's diet on that  
10 day, after making the determination that he was in fact Muslim. Plaintiff Arciniega began  
11 receiving halal meals approximately a week and a half later.

12 80. Plaintiff Cortez was similarly subjected to an intrusive and unlawful inquiry  
13 for the purpose of determining whether or not he is Muslim before his halal diet request  
14 could be approved.

15 81. Plaintiff Cortez recalls being questioned by Defendant Brown, who asked  
16 him 17 questions from a standardized list of questions and compared his answers to a  
17 master key that contained answers to the questions. He recalls being asked: (1) what are  
18 the five pillars of Islam; (2) which way do Muslims face when they pray (upon answering  
19 this question with "East", Sergeant Brown responded by asking what way Muslims prayed  
20 before they began facing East); (3) where is the Ka'bah; (4) where was the Prophet  
21 Muhammad born; (5) where did the Prophet Muhammad migrate; (6) what is the name  
22 of the Muslim holy book; (7) what are the six articles of faith; (8) what is the name of the  
23 Prophet Muhammad's daughter; (9) what is the name of the Prophet Muhammad's  
24 cousin; (10) what is the name of Prophet Abraham's first born child; and, (11) whether  
25 he converted to Islam.

26 82. Based upon his answers, Defendant Brown approved Plaintiff Cortez's  
27 request for a halal diet, and he began receiving halal meals the following day.

28 83. Despite having already been deemed a Muslim for the purposes of receiving

1 his halal diet by Defendant Brown, approximately two to three months later, Defendant  
2 Smith brought Plaintiff Cortez to “test” him once again about his knowledge of Islam  
3 because, as Defendant Smith explained, Plaintiff Cortez is Mexican and Mexicans are not  
4 Muslim. Defendant Smith asked Plaintiff Cortez the exact same questions that Defendant  
5 Brown asked him the first time.

6 84. At first, Plaintiff Cortez answered the questions with the correct Arabic  
7 terminology. Defendant Smith responded that he needed to provide the answers again in  
8 English because “we’re in America and we don’t speak Arabic here.”

9 85. Defendant Smith approved Plaintiff Cortez’s halal diet request based upon  
10 his answers to the questions that day.

11 86. Defendants have unlawfully subjected Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates  
12 to onerous hurdles, unreasonable delays and rigorous, intrusive and unlawful scrutiny of  
13 their religious adherence as a condition of eligibility to receive a halal diet in violation of,  
14 among other laws, their rights to free exercise of religion, to be free from disparate and  
15 discriminatory treatment on the basis of their Islamic faith, and to be free from excessive  
16 government entanglement as secured by RLUIPA and the First and Fourteenth  
17 Amendments to the United States Constitution.

18 87. The substantial burden that Defendants have placed upon Plaintiffs and  
19 other Muslim inmates similarly situated is not necessary, or the least restrictive means, to  
20 achieve any compelling state interest.

21 **Denying Muslim Inmates Access**  
22 **to Friday Religious Services and Islamic Religious Classes**

23 88. Just as other religious faith backgrounds, including Christianity and Judaism,  
24 command their adherents to observe an end-of-the-week holy day through congregational  
25 prayer and spirituality (known in Christianity and Judaism as the Sabbath), Muslims are  
26 commanded to observe Fridays through congregational prayer and spirituality known as  
27  
28

1 *Jumu'ah*<sup>6</sup> prayer.

2 89. Defendants have unlawfully prevented Plaintiffs and similarly situated  
3 Muslim inmates from performing *Jumu'ah* prayers in accordance with their sincerely-held  
4 religious beliefs.

5 90. Meanwhile, Defendants have ensured that religious services are available to  
6 inmates of other faiths to attend. For example, Defendants schedule religious services  
7 and/or meditation sessions at least once per week for Christian, Jehovah's Witness and  
8 Buddhist inmates to attend.

9 91. Section 5-13/100.00 of the LASD Custody Division Manual states in  
10 pertinent part that each facility "shall [c]reate a Master Schedule for the purpose of  
11 religious programs to all inmates who wish to participate."

12 92. Further, each facility shall "[a]rrange a scheduled time period to permit  
13 inmates to worship or meditate that does not conflict with general facility operations" and  
14 "[p]rovide access to appropriate facilities for worship or meditation."

15 93. Defendants' Custody Services Division issued a "Muslim Religious  
16 Services" Bulletin (Bulletin # 2014-03) (the "Muslim Religious Services Bulletin") that  
17 outlines policies and procedures regarding *Jumu'ah* prayer pursuant to Section 5-13/100.00  
18 of the LASD Custody Division Manual. The Bulletin states:

19 Muslim services will be scheduled on Fridays between 1200  
20 and 1400 hours. Muslim services will be facilitated by a volunteer  
21 Imam Chaplain. Custody Services Division currently has eight (8)  
22 Imam Chaplains who will help facilitate services at all custody  
facilities.

23 In the event that an Imam Chaplain is not available, a Chaplain  
24 or religious volunteer of any faith may facilitate an inmate led prayer  
service.

25 94. However, Defendants have not included *Jumu'ah* prayer on the Master  
26

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>6</sup> *Jumu'ah* prayer is a congregational prayer followed by a sermon, called a *khutbah*, performed by Muslims on Fridays just after noon.

1 Schedule, nor have Defendants permitted Plaintiffs or other similarly situated Muslim  
2 inmates to participate in or lead *Jumu'ah* prayer in accordance with established policy.

3 95. Nor have Defendants scheduled Islamic study classes (also known as *ta'leem*)  
4 for Muslim inmates to attend.

5 96. However, Defendants have scheduled religious study classes that are  
6 available to inmates of other faiths to attend. For example, Bible study classes are offered  
7 at least once per week for Christian inmates to attend.

8 97. Defendants also permit inmates to regularly attend gatherings for  
9 nonreligious purposes, including academic, vocational, life-skills and other learning  
10 opportunities, among other things.

11 98. Plaintiff Taylor submitted multiple requests to perform *Jumu'ah* prayers;  
12 however, Defendants have refused to honor his requests.

13 99. Plaintiff Taylor followed up with multiple complaints and grievances  
14 regarding both *Jumu'ah* prayers and *ta'leem* classes, all of which Defendants either refused  
15 to process or denied. Among the complaints and grievances are the following:

- 16 a. On March 3, 2018, Plaintiff Taylor submitted a grievance that “[c]ustody are  
17 not providing me with the opportunity to participate in *Jumu'ah* services.  
18 *Jumu'ah* is ‘obligatory’ in congregation and cannot be made up. So custody  
19 is violating my right to exercise my faith.”
- 20 b. On March 9, 2018, he submitted an emergency grievance asking, “[w]hy  
21 does this floor not provide Muslim services. Why am I not being allowed  
22 to fully exercise my Islamic faith...”
- 23 c. On March 16, 2018, he submitted an emergency grievance stating, “I am  
24 housed in a ‘protective custody’ module and custody refuse to provide me  
25 access to *Jumu'ah* services that are held on this floor. Custody cannot  
26 provide me with an answer to why Muslims are the only ones not allowed  
27 religious services.”
- 28 d. Defendants refused to process these grievances or assign them a reference

1 number.

2 e. On May 31, 2018, Plaintiff Taylor contacted ACLU SoCal’s Jails Project.  
3 On June 13, 2018, ACLU Jails Project sent a complaint to LASD that  
4 “inmate reports that he is denied access to religious services. Please  
5 investigate into this matter.” LASD responded on July 10, 2018 that  
6 “Islamic chaplain will be notified.” No further action was taken by  
7 Defendants.

8 f. On May 15, 2019 – approximately one year later – he filed another grievance  
9 stating in part that “[o]ther ‘religious’ services are held on various days. Why  
10 are Muslims denied services such as Jumu’ah and Tahlim services.”

11 g. On October 11, 2018, Plaintiff Taylor submitted another emergency  
12 grievance regarding other inmates being allowed to perform religious  
13 services; however, Muslims are not permitted.

14 h. On August 13, 2019, Plaintiff Taylor received a Notification of Disposition<sup>7</sup>.  
15 The Notification of Disposition was reviewed and issued by Defendants  
16 Smith and Minjarez and stated “[p]er Religious Services Unit, Jumu’ah  
17 services are being looked at by the Islamic chaplains and the Jail Liaison  
18 Unit. This service is currently pending approval.”

19 i. That same day, Plaintiff Taylor filed an appeal; however, he never received  
20 a response to his appeal.

21 100. Defendants have taken no further action to address these grievances or to  
22 add *Jumu’ah* prayers to the Master Schedule.

23 101. By denying and/or refusing to process Plaintiff Taylor’s requests and  
24 grievances, and by refusing to provide Muslim inmates access to *Jumu’ah* prayers and  
25 *ta’leem* classes, Defendants have imposed a substantial burden upon the rights of Plaintiff  
26 Taylor and other similarly situated Muslim inmates to the free exercise of religion. This  
27

28 <sup>7</sup> The Notification of Disposition is undated. Reference No.: 5100-2019-0807-233.

1 discriminates, and continues to discriminate, against Plaintiff Taylor and other similarly  
2 situated Muslim inmates on the basis of religion or religious denomination in violation of,  
3 among other laws, RLUIPA and the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United  
4 States Constitution.

5 102. Defendants have further subjected Plaintiff Taylor and other Muslim  
6 inmates similarly situated to disparate treatment by denying them the right to perform  
7 *Jumu'ah* prayer and to attend *ta'leem* classes.

8 103. On June 4, 2019, Plaintiff Arciniega also grieved the lack of *ta'leem* classes,  
9 even though Christians received Bible studies. Defendants did not respond to that  
10 grievance.

11 104. Defendants are capable of permitting Plaintiff Taylor and other Muslim  
12 inmates similarly situated to perform *Jumu'ah* prayers and to attend *ta'leem* classes because  
13 they permit inmates of other faith backgrounds to perform religious services and attend  
14 religious study classes. Moreover, Defendants have designed a multipurpose recreational  
15 room (known as the "day room") for religious and nonreligious congregational inmate  
16 gatherings.

17 105. The substantial burden that Defendants have placed upon Plaintiff Taylor  
18 and other Muslim inmates similarly situated is not necessary, or the least restrictive means,  
19 to achieve any compelling state interest.

20 **Facilitating Religious Holiday Feasts for Inmates of Other Faiths**  
21 **While Refusing to Provide Muslim Inmates the Same Benefit**

22 106. Muslims worldwide celebrate two religious holidays – *Eid al-Fitr*, which  
23 marks the end of Ramadan, and *Eid al-Adha*, which marks the culmination of the annual  
24 pilgrimage to Mecca. Both are celebrated by congregational prayers, feasts and festivals.  
25 This year, *Eid al-Fitr* was celebrated on June 3, 2019 and *Eid al-Adha* was celebrated on  
26 August 10, 2019.

27 107. Defendants regularly facilitate religious feasts for inmates of different faiths  
28 to participate in. Defendants provide, for example, Jewish inmates with Passover feasts

1 and Christian inmates with Christmas feasts in celebration of their religious holidays.

2 108. However, Defendants have refused to provide Plaintiffs and other Muslims  
3 similarly with the same religious holidays feasts for either of the two Islamic religious  
4 holidays.

5 109. Plaintiffs Taylor and Arciniega expected this year to be no different.  
6 Accordingly, they filed grievances well in advance of *Eid al-Fitr* based upon their  
7 differential treatment in prior years in an attempt to seek assurances that this year they  
8 would be treated the same as Christian and Jewish inmates:

9 a. Plaintiff Taylor filed a grievance on April 2, 2019 requesting “to obtain Eid  
10 al Fitr Halal food for one of my two Islamic Festive Holidays.”

11 b. The following day, Plaintiff Arciniega filed a similar grievance. However,  
12 Defendants never processed this grievance.

13 c. Defendant Hopkins issued a Notification of Disposition in connection with  
14 Plaintiff Taylor’s grievance, stating that it was granted. He further  
15 commented, “[y]es in accordance with LASD Volunteer Imam Chaplains.”<sup>8</sup>

16 d. Still having heard nothing in response to his April 3, 2019 grievance, Plaintiff  
17 Arciniega filed a second grievance on May 2, 2019 stating, “I have observed  
18 Christians receive their religious holiday meals and Jewish inmates received  
19 their Passover meals ‘Holiday’ religious meals. Last year Muslims were not  
20 provided ‘Eid Ul Fitr’ meals. Are Muslims going to be treated ‘equally’ this  
21 year and given ‘Eid Ul Fitr’ meals?” Again, Defendants never processed this  
22 grievance.

23 110. *Eid al-Fitr* came and went and – as expected – Muslim inmates, including  
24 Plaintiffs, did not receive their religious feasts as promised.

25 111. In response, Plaintiff Taylor appealed the Notification of Disposition –  
26 twice. On June 5, 2019, he wrote, “[a]s I expected, Muslims were treated with deliberate

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>8</sup> The Notification of Disposition is undated; although it states the Date of Collection is April 30, 2019. Reference No. 5100-2019-0506-224.

1 indifference and ‘not’ provided the equal protection of Jewish inmates... Provide Muslims  
2 with late ‘Eid-ul-Fitr’ meals as ‘again’ we did not receive them.” Two days later, he wrote  
3 in a second appeal, “LASD did not provide to the Muslims equal treatment as the Jewish  
4 inmates on their religious holiday of Passover. A budget is set aside for religious  
5 observances including meals. Muslims are treated with deliberate indifference in LASD  
6 custody.”

7 112. Both of Plaintiff Taylor’s appeals were denied by Defendant Karapetyan.

8 113. Plaintiff Taylor and Plaintiff Arciniega have exhausted their administrative  
9 remedies.

10 114. By refusing to provide Muslim inmates with the same benefits of a religious  
11 feast that they provide to inmates of other faiths during their holidays, Defendants have  
12 subjected Plaintiffs Taylor and Arciniega and Muslim inmates similarly situated to  
13 disparate treatment and have discriminated against, and continue to discriminate against  
14 Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates similarly situated on the basis of religion or religious  
15 denomination in violation of, among other laws, RLUIPA and the First and Fourteenth  
16 Amendments to the United States Constitution.

17 115. Defendants are capable of providing Plaintiffs Taylor and Arciniega and  
18 other Muslim inmates similarly situated with *Eid* feasts because they provide inmates of  
19 other faiths – including Christian and Jewish inmates – with religious holiday feasts.  
20 Additionally, Defendants have set aside a budget for religious holiday feasts.

21 116. The substantial burden that Defendants have placed upon Plaintiff Taylor  
22 and other Muslim inmates similarly situated is not necessary, or the least restrictive means,  
23 to achieve any compelling state interest.

24 **Restricting Muslim Inmates’ Rights**  
25 **to Personal Religious Texts, Items and Clothing**

26 117. The Qur’an, *kufis*, prayer rugs and *dhikr*<sup>9</sup> prayer beads are all listed in the  
27

---

28 <sup>9</sup> *Dhikr* prayer beads are similar to prayer beads used by other faiths, including Christianity, Hinduism,

1 Religious Personal Property Matrix, which was developed for the purpose of  
 2 standardizing inmate personal property throughout the State of California. *See* 15 CCR §  
 3 3190.<sup>10</sup>

4 118. However, Defendants have restricted their Muslim inmates to having a  
 5 Qur'an, a *kefi* and a prayer rug only during *Jumu'ah* prayer – an accommodation  
 6 Defendants are denying them access to in the first place. Defendants do not place such  
 7 restrictions on other faith groups. For example, Jewish inmates do not have restrictions  
 8 on when or where they can wear a *yarmulke*<sup>11</sup>.

9 119. Defendants' Muslim Religious Services Bulletin outlines policies and  
 10 procedures regarding *kefis*<sup>12</sup> that it purports to be in accordance with Section 5-13/100.00  
 11 of the LASD Custody Division Manual. The Bulletin states in pertinent part that, “[t]he  
 12 Muslim religion requires the use of prayer rugs and Kufi caps during the [Friday] service.  
 13 In an effort to accommodate these requirements, Custody Services Division has approved  
 14 the use of the following items during religious services...” The Bulletin goes on to  
 15 describe the specific prayer rugs and *kefis* that have been approved.

16 120. However, Section 5-13/100.00 of the LASD Custody Division Manual does  
 17 not actually discuss *kefis*, prayer rugs or any other type of religious attire or religious item.

18 121. An LASD Office Correspondence issued on May 23, 2016 regarding  
 19 “Preparation and Implementation of Ramadan Fast” is even more restrictive. It refers to  
 20 the Muslim Religious Services Bulletin as having granted approval to Muslim inmates to  
 21 use prayer rugs and *kefis* only during *Jumu'ah* prayer; however, it also falsely states that the  
 22 Bulletin also restricts possession of the Qur'an to be during *Jumu'ah* prayer.

23  
 24 \_\_\_\_\_  
 25 Buddhism, Sikhism and Baha'i. They are used by Muslims to mark the repetitions of prayers or  
 26 utterances of short sentences glorifying God.

27 <sup>10</sup> The Religious Personal Property Matrix, incorporated by reference into 15 CCR § 3190, is available at:  
 28 [https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/regulations/wp-content/uploads/sites/171/2019/08/RELIGIOUS-  
 PERSONAL-PROPERTY-MATRIX-12-9-13.pdf](https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/regulations/wp-content/uploads/sites/171/2019/08/RELIGIOUS-PERSONAL-PROPERTY-MATRIX-12-9-13.pdf)

<sup>11</sup> A *yarmulkei* is a skullcap worn in public by Orthodox Jewish men or during prayer by other Jewish men.

<sup>12</sup> A *kefi* is a brimless, short, and rounded cap worn by Muslim men.

1           122. Inmates of other faiths, however, are not restricted as to when or where they  
2 may possess or use their religious texts.

3           123. Moreover, with regards to Plaintiff Taylor, he was forced to submit  
4 numerous requests and grievances before he was finally approved to obtain a Qur'an, kufi,  
5 prayer mat and *dhikr* beads.

6           124. Plaintiffs Taylor, Arciniega and Cortez each filed grievances regarding  
7 Defendants' restrictions on their use of religious texts, items and clothing. Among them  
8 are the following:

- 9           a. On February 23, 2017, Plaintiff Taylor filed a request for a copy of the  
10 Qur'an and a prayer mat. That same day, he filed another request stating  
11 "[c]ould you please come to speak to me in regards to halal diet, prayer mat,  
12 Qur'an and a kufi. I have put in numerous requests for the above."
- 13           b. On March 15, 2017, Plaintiff Taylor filed a grievance stating "I have been  
14 requesting a Qur'an/Koran for several months. I asked a Deputy for one  
15 yesterday was told 'we don't supply that Muslim bullshit here! I'll get you a  
16 Bible you can have but we don't do Qur'ans.' I am being denied my right to  
17 religious material."
- 18           c. On March 1, 2018, Plaintiff Taylor filed a grievance that he was prevented  
19 access to the visiting room because he was in possession of his Qur'an: "A  
20 female deputy forced me to leave my Qur'an because Qur'ans are not  
21 authorized in the visiting area." On another request he filed the same day,  
22 he wrote that he was also told by the deputy that it is a misdemeanor to go  
23 to the visiting area with a Qur'an.
- 24           d. On June 21, 2018, Plaintiff Taylor filed a grievance that Deputy Domin and  
25 another officer grabbed him inside his cell by his *dhikr* beads and the officer  
26 cut them off. His appeal of that grievance was denied by Defendant  
27 Karapetyan and states simply "[u]nder review at court services." No further  
28

- 1 action was taken by Defendants to address this grievance.<sup>13</sup>
- 2 e. On September 9, 2018, Plaintiff Taylor filed a grievance that Defendant
- 3 Martinez is “not upholding equal protection for Muslims and our religious
- 4 prayer beads, but he ensures Catholics have rosaries.”
- 5 f. On September 20, 2018, Plaintiff Taylor filed a complaint with the ACLU
- 6 Jails Project regarding Defendants’ refusal to provide him with *dhikr* prayer
- 7 beads.
- 8 g. On August 3, 2018, Plaintiff Taylor submitted a request stating that he has
- 9 “requested prayer beads as Catholics have their rosaries,” and that
- 10 Defendant Martinez has prohibited the replacement of the beads that were
- 11 cut off from around his neck.
- 12 h. On November 10, 2018, Plaintiff Taylor filed a request that described a Unit
- 13 Order that was posted on a wall that authorizes possession of the Bible and
- 14 that does not mention the Qur’an as an authorized religious item. He
- 15 reiterated his request for a Qur’an and a prayer mat.
- 16 i. On November 11, 2018, Plaintiff Taylor filed a grievance that he still has
- 17 not received a Qur’an or any of the other religious materials he requested.
- 18 Defendants refused to process any of these grievances.
- 19 j. Defendants did not provide Plaintiff Taylor with a Qur’an until more than
- 20 three months after his requests, and did not provide him a kufi until more
- 21 than a year later.
- 22 k. On May 2, 2019, Plaintiff Arciniega filed a grievance stating “Sheriff
- 23 Villanueva, every week your deputies tell me I cannot wear my kufi to
- 24 recreation due to LASD-Bulletin 2014-03. I am harassed by your deputies
- 25 on a weekly basis...you have a policy that restricts me from wearing religious
- 26 material.” Defendants refused to process this grievance and took no action
- 27

28 <sup>13</sup> Reference No. 5100-2018-0626-398.

1 to address it.

2 l. On or before May 3, 2019, Plaintiff Cortez filed another grievance that every  
3 week he is told by deputies he cannot wear his *kufi* to recreation. A  
4 Notification of Disposition<sup>14</sup> was issued by Defendant Steinert that stated:  
5 “A KUFU may only be worn during religious services or inside a housing  
6 location. The deputies are correct when they say a KUFU cannot be worn  
7 while going to recreation. This has been confirmed to be correct by the  
8 Religious Services [Liaison] and by bulletin, Custody Support Services  
9 Bulletin #2014-03.”

10 m. Plaintiff Cortez filed an appeal stating that “LASD has a ‘policy’ that restricts  
11 an authorized kufi and the locations within the facility it can be worn. Jewish  
12 inmates do not have to remove their yarmulke in violation of equal  
13 protection...” Defendant Karapetyan denied his appeal because “[p]er  
14 policy, A KUFU may only be worn during religious services or inside a  
15 housing location.”

16 n. On May 10, 2019, Plaintiff Taylor wrote in a grievance “[t]hroughout the  
17 month of Ramadan (Muslim Monthly Observance) I am forced by LASD  
18 personnel to remove my kufi or be denied access to the roof (recreation  
19 area), visiting passes, medical passes or to Court. This procedure is  
20 racial/Muslim discrimination.” Defendants refused to process this grievance  
21 and took no action to address it.

22 125. By refusing to allow Muslim inmates with the same access to religious texts,  
23 items and clothing that they provide to inmates of other faiths, Defendants have subjected  
24 Plaintiffs Taylor and Arciniega and Muslim inmates similarly situated to disparate  
25 treatment and have discriminated against, and continue to discriminate against Plaintiffs  
26 and other Muslim inmates similarly situated on the basis of religion or religious  
27

---

28 <sup>14</sup>The Notification of Disposition is undated. Reference No. 5100-2019-0511-243.

1 denomination in violation of, among other laws, RLUIPA and the First and Fourteenth  
2 Amendments to the United States Constitution.

3 126. Defendants are capable of providing Plaintiffs Taylor and Arciniega and  
4 other Muslim inmates similarly situated with religious items and clothing because they  
5 provide inmates of other faiths – including Christian and Jewish inmates – with religious  
6 items and clothing.

7 127. The substantial burden that Defendants have placed upon Plaintiff Taylor  
8 and other Muslim inmates similarly situated is not necessary, or the least restrictive means,  
9 to achieve any compelling state interest.

10 **LASD Policies and Practices**  
11 **That Chill the Rights of All Special Custody Inmates**

12 **Forcing Special Custody Inmates to Undergo a Cavity Search and Strip to their**  
13 **Underwear to Access the Law Library and Day Room**

14 128. In accordance with their Islamic faith, Muslims are required to dress  
15 modestly, particularly in front of the opposite gender.

16 129. Defendants have imposed a policy, practice and/or procedure that requires  
17 all special custody inmates, including Plaintiffs, to undergo a cavity search and strip to  
18 their underwear in order to access the law library and day room.

19 130. Defendants' policy, practice and/or procedure chills the rights of all special  
20 custody inmates to adequate, effective and meaningful access to the Courts in violation  
21 of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States  
22 Constitution.

23 131. Further, Defendants' policy, practice and/or procedure places an added,  
24 particularized and substantial burden on Plaintiffs and Muslim inmates similarly situated  
25 because it forces them to violate their sincerely-held religious beliefs that require them to  
26 maintain modesty, particularly because female correctional staff monitor them as they use  
27 the law library and day room, in violation of RLUIPA and the First and Fourteenth  
28 Amendments to the United States Constitution.

1 132. On June 1, 2019, Plaintiff Taylor filed a grievance stating that, “LASD-MCJ-  
2 1750/1700 Module has begun a process of forcing all inmate to leave the cell to dayroom;  
3 law library, without county issued pants. Only permitting underwears and tshirts to be  
4 worn. This practice is against Islamic beliefs.” Defendants refused to process this  
5 grievance and have taken no corrective action.

6 133. Plaintiff Taylor filed another grievance, which he appealed on September 2,  
7 2018, that Sergeant Moreno violated his religious modesty rights by filming him while he  
8 was naked in the shower.<sup>15</sup> Defendants did not respond to his appeal and have taken no  
9 corrective action.

10 134. Plaintiff Taylor has exhausted his administrative remedies.

11 135. The substantial burden that Defendants have placed upon Plaintiff Taylor  
12 and other Muslim inmates similarly situated is not necessary, or the least restrictive means,  
13 to achieve any compelling state interest.

14 136. To the extent that Defendants assert a security concern as a compelling state  
15 interest – such an assertion is nonsensical because Defendants allow special custody  
16 inmates to wear county-issued clothing throughout other areas within the facility.

17 **COUNT I**

18 **Violation of the First and Fourteenth Amendments**  
19 **to the United States Constitution**  
20 **(Establishment Clause)**

21 137. Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference the foregoing  
22 paragraphs of this Amended Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

23 138. The Establishment Clause of the First Amendment of the Constitution of  
24 the United States provides, “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of  
25 religion.” The Establishment Clause applies with full force and effect to the acts of state  
26 and local government entities and officials pursuant to the Due Process Clause of the  
27

28 <sup>15</sup> Reference No. 5100-2018-0628-320.

1 Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

2 139. Defendants unlawfully engaged and continue to engage in excessive  
3 government entanglement by subjecting Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates similarly  
4 situated to rigorous and intrusive inquiry that tests the adequacy of the knowledge of their  
5 Islamic faith in order to prove they are devout Muslims in the eyes of Defendants before  
6 they can become eligible to obtain a religious halal diet, in violation of the Establishment  
7 Clause of First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

8 140. The U.S. Supreme Court has held that, “[i]t is not only the conclusions that  
9 may be reached by the [Government] which may impinge on rights guaranteed by the  
10 Religion Clauses, but also the very process of inquiry leading to findings and conclusions.”  
11 *N.L.R.B. v. Catholic Bishop of Chicago*, 440 U.S. 490, 502 (1979). A Supreme Court plurality  
12 later recognized that government action which requires “inquiry into the recipient’s  
13 religious views” including details of how “sectarian” those views are “is not only  
14 unnecessary but also offensive. It is well established, in numerous other contexts, that  
15 courts should refrain from trolling through a person’s or institution’s religious beliefs.”  
16 *Mitchell v. Helms*, 530 U.S. 793, 828 (2000). As the Supreme Court explained in *Thomas v.*  
17 *Review Bd. Of Ind.*, 450 U.S. 707, 715-16 (1981): “[T]he guarantee of free exercise is not  
18 limited to beliefs which are shared by all of the members of a religious sect. Particularly  
19 in this sensitive area, it is not within the judicial function and judicial competence to  
20 inquire whether the petitioner or his fellow worker more correctly perceived the  
21 commands of their common faith. Courts are not arbiters of scriptural interpretation.”  
22 The same restrictions which apply to judicial evaluation of faith tenets also restrict  
23 executive, administrative, or prison official’s evaluations, such as the test imposed by  
24 Defendants.

25 141. Defendants’ failure to provide religious services and programming for  
26 Muslim inmates while simultaneously providing religious services and programming to  
27 inmates of other faiths – including Christians, Jehovah’s Witnesses and Buddhists –  
28 reflects their preference against Islam and their overall discriminatory approach, in

1 violation of the Establishment Clause of the First and Fourteenth Amendments of the  
2 United States Constitution.

3 142. Defendants' sponsorship and support of religious services, programming  
4 and feasts for inmates that are not Muslim – including Christians, Jews, Jehovah's  
5 Witnesses and Buddhists – has the primary effect of advancing those religions and  
6 disfavoring Islam, in violation of the Establishment Clause of the First and Fourteenth  
7 Amendments to the United States Constitution.

8 143. By imposing onerous hurdles and unreasonable delays upon Muslim inmates  
9 and not inmates of other faiths before they could obtain access to religious texts, items  
10 and clothing and by imposing restrictions upon Muslim inmates and not inmates of other  
11 faiths as to where and when they may possess and use their religious texts, items and  
12 clothing, Defendants' actions have the primary effect of advancing all other faiths and  
13 disfavoring Islam, in violation of the Establishment Clause of the First and Fourteenth  
14 Amendments to the United States Constitution.

15 144. Defendants' sponsorship and support of religious accommodations for  
16 inmates of faiths that are not Muslim conveys to reasonable observers a message of  
17 endorsement of those faiths and a message of disfavor and condemnation towards Islam,  
18 in violation of the Establishment Clause of the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the  
19 United States Constitution.

20 145. By violating the Establishment Clause as set forth above, Defendants have,  
21 under color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, and/or usage, deprived Plaintiffs of  
22 rights secured by the First and Fourteenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution, entitling  
23 Plaintiffs to relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

24 146. Defendants lack any compelling government interest in conducting a  
25 religious test as a condition of eligibility for halal meals.

26 147. Defendants lack any compelling government in providing religious services,  
27 programming and feasts for inmates of faiths that are not Muslim and denying those same  
28 benefits to Muslims.

1 148. Defendants lack any compelling government in imposing onerous hurdles,  
2 unreasonable delays and restrictions upon Muslim inmates' use of religious texts, items  
3 and clothing and not imposing similar hurdles, unreasonable delays and restrictions upon  
4 inmates of other faiths.

5 149. Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that the above-described policies are a  
6 violation of the Establishment Clause to the First and Fourteenth Amendments of the  
7 United States Constitution.

8 150. Defendants' unlawful actions caused Plaintiffs harm and Plaintiffs are  
9 entitled to injunctive and declaratory relief, compensatory and punitive damages, in  
10 addition to all such other relief this Court deems just and proper including costs and  
11 attorneys' fees in this action.

12 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request this Honorable Court grant declaratory relief  
13 and injunctive relief in the form requested in the Prayer for Relief below. Further,  
14 Plaintiffs request compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendants sued in  
15 their individual capacity, only, plus all such other relief this Court deems just and proper  
16 including costs and attorneys' fees incurred in this action.

17 **COUNT II**

18 **Violation of the First and Fourteenth Amendments**  
19 **to the United States Constitution**  
20 **(Free Exercise of Religion)**

21 151. Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference the foregoing  
22 paragraphs of this Amended Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

23 152. The Free Exercise Clause of the United States Constitution provides:  
24 "Congress shall make no law ... prohibiting the free exercise [of religion]." The Free  
25 Exercise Clause applies with full force and effect to the acts of state and local government  
26 entities and officials pursuant to the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment  
27 to the United States Constitution.

28 153. Each of the RLUIPA claims (Counts IV-V) are also actionable under the

1 Free Exercise Clause, because Defendants’ actions reflect imposition of substantial  
2 religious burdens, as well as official policies and practices of non-neutrality, upon  
3 Plaintiffs and similarly situated Muslim inmates.

4 154. Defendants imposed and continue to impose a substantial burden on the  
5 rights to free exercise of religion upon Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates similarly  
6 situated by requiring them to rigorous and intrusive inquiry that tests the adequacy of the  
7 knowledge of their Islamic faith in order to prove they are devout Muslims in the eyes of  
8 Defendants before they can become eligible to obtain a religious halal diet, in violation of  
9 the Free Exercise Clause of the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States  
10 Constitution.

11 155. Defendants imposed and continue to impose a substantial burden on the  
12 rights to free exercise of religion upon Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates similarly  
13 situated by failing to provide religious services, programming and feasts for Muslim  
14 inmates while simultaneously providing religious services, programming and feasts to  
15 inmates of other faiths – including Christians, Jehovah’s Witnesses and Buddhists, in  
16 violation of the Free Exercise Clause of the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the  
17 United States Constitution.

18 156. Defendants imposed and continue to impose a substantial burden on the  
19 rights to free exercise of religion upon Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates similarly  
20 situated by placing onerous hurdles and unreasonable delays upon Muslim inmates and  
21 not inmates of other faiths before they could obtain access to religious texts, items and  
22 clothing and by imposing restrictions upon Muslim inmates and not inmates of other  
23 faiths as to where and when they may possess and use their religious texts, items and  
24 clothing, in violation of the Free Exercise Clause of the First and Fourteenth  
25 Amendments to the United States Constitution.

26 157. Defendants imposed and continue to impose a substantial burden on the  
27 rights of Plaintiffs and other special custody inmates similarly situated by forcing them to  
28 undergo a cavity search and strip to their underwear to access the law library and day

1 room.

2 158. Defendants' actions identified above chill and impose a substantial burden  
3 upon rights of Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Muslim inmates to the free exercise  
4 of religion.

5 159. Imposition of such burdens are not in furtherance of a compelling  
6 government interest and are not the least restrictive means of furthering any governmental  
7 interest, compelling or otherwise.

8 160. Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that the above-described policies are a  
9 substantial burden to the free exercise of Plaintiffs' religion and the religion of Muslim  
10 inmates similarly situated, are not justified by a compelling government interest, and are  
11 in violation of their First and Fourteenth Amendment rights to their free exercise of  
12 religion.

13 161. Defendants' unlawful actions caused Plaintiffs harm and Plaintiffs are  
14 entitled to injunctive and declaratory relief, compensatory and punitive damages, in  
15 addition to all such other relief this Court deems just and proper including costs and  
16 attorneys' fees in this action.

17 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request this Honorable Court grant declaratory relief  
18 and injunctive relief in the form requested in the Prayer for Relief below. Further,  
19 Plaintiffs request compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendants sued in  
20 their individual capacity, only, plus all such other relief this Court deems just and proper  
21 including costs and attorneys' fees incurred in this action.

22 **COUNT III**

23 **Violation of the First and Fourteenth Amendments**  
24 **to the United States Constitution**  
25 **(Equal Protection)**

26 162. Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference the foregoing  
27 paragraphs of this Amended Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

28 163. The Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause provides that "No

1 state shall ... deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”  
2 Equal protection asks whether Government action adversely affects a “suspect class,”  
3 such as by drawing distinctions based on race, ethnicity, national origin, or religion. *See,*  
4 *e.g., Harbin–Bey v. Rutter*, 420 F.3d 571, 576 (6th Cir. 2005). Religious distinctions are  
5 “inherently suspect.” *City of New Orleans v. Dukes*, 166 427 U.S. 297, 303 (1976).

6 164. Defendants have discriminated and continue to discriminate against  
7 Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates similarly situated on the basis of their Islamic faith  
8 by requiring them to rigorous and intrusive inquiry that tests the adequacy of the  
9 knowledge of their Islamic faith in order to prove they are devout Muslims in the eyes of  
10 Defendants before they can become eligible to obtain a religious halal diet, in violation of  
11 the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States  
12 Constitution.

13 165. Defendants have discriminated and continue to discriminate against  
14 Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates similarly situated on the basis of their Islamic faith  
15 by failing to provide religious services, programming and feasts for Muslim inmates while  
16 simultaneously providing religious services, programming and feasts to inmates of other  
17 faiths – including Christians, Jehovah’s Witnesses and Buddhists, in violation of the Equal  
18 Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

19 166. Defendants have discriminated and continue to discriminate against  
20 Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates similarly situated on the basis of their Islamic faith  
21 by placing onerous hurdles and unreasonable delays upon Muslim inmates and not  
22 inmates of other faiths before they could obtain access to religious texts, items and  
23 clothing and by imposing restrictions upon Muslim inmates and not inmates of other  
24 faiths as to where and when they may possess and use their religious texts, items and  
25 clothing, in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to  
26 the United States Constitution.

27 167. Defendants have discriminated and continue to discriminate against  
28 Plaintiffs and other inmates similarly situated by forcing them to undergo a cavity search

1 and strip to their underwear to access the law library and day room.

2 168. Defendants’ discriminatory policies identified above are not in furtherance  
3 of a compelling government interest and are not the least restrictive means of furthering  
4 any governmental interest, compelling or otherwise.

5 169. Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that the above-described policies  
6 discriminate against Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates similarly situated, are not justified  
7 by a compelling government interest, and are in violation of the Equal Protection Clause  
8 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

9 170. Defendants’ unlawful actions caused Plaintiffs harm and Plaintiffs are  
10 entitled to injunctive and declaratory relief, compensatory and punitive damages, in  
11 addition to all such other relief this Court deems just and proper including costs and  
12 attorneys’ fees in this action.

13 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request this Honorable Court grant declaratory relief  
14 and injunctive relief in the form requested in the Prayer for Relief below. Further,  
15 Plaintiffs request compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendants sued in  
16 their individual capacity, only, plus all such other relief this Court deems just and proper  
17 including costs and attorneys’ fees incurred in this action.

18 **COUNT IV**

19 **Violation of the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act**  
20 **(Religious Exercise)**

21 171. Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference the foregoing  
22 paragraphs of this Amended Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

23 172. The Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (“RLUIPA”)  
24 limits the ability of state prisons to impose substantial burdens on the religious exercise  
25 of inmates. 42 U.S.C. § 2000cc-1. Congress enacted RLUIPA ... in order to provide very  
26 broad protection for religious liberty” to prisoners. *Holt v. Hobbs*, 135 S. Ct. 853, 859  
27 (2015).

28 173. Defendants imposed and continue to impose a substantial burden on the

1 religious exercise of Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates similarly situated by requiring  
2 them to undergo rigorous and intrusive inquiry that tests the adequacy of the knowledge  
3 of their Islamic faith in order to prove they are devout Muslims in the eyes of Defendants  
4 before they can become eligible to obtain a religious halal diet.

5 174. Defendants imposed and continue to impose a substantial burden on the  
6 religious exercise of Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates similarly situated by failing to  
7 provide religious services, programming and feasts for Muslim inmates while  
8 simultaneously providing religious services, programming and feasts to inmates of other  
9 faiths – including Christians, Jehovah’s Witnesses and Buddhists, in violation of RLUIPA.

10 175. Defendants imposed and continue to impose a substantial burden on the  
11 religious exercise of Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates similarly situated by placing  
12 onerous hurdles and unreasonable delays upon Muslim inmates and not inmates of other  
13 faiths before they could obtain access to religious texts, items and clothing and by  
14 imposing restrictions upon Muslim inmates and not inmates of other faiths as to where  
15 and when they may possess and use their religious texts, items and clothing, in violation  
16 of RLUIPA.

17 176. Defendants imposed and continue to impose a substantial burden on the  
18 religious exercise of Plaintiffs and Muslim inmates similarly situated by forcing them to  
19 undergo a cavity search and strip to their underwear to access the law library and day  
20 room.

21 177. Defendants’ actions have deprived and continue to deprive Plaintiffs and  
22 other Muslim inmates similarly situated of their right to be free from a government-  
23 imposed substantial burden on their religious exercise as secured by RLUIPA.

24 178. Imposition of such burdens are not in furtherance of a compelling  
25 government interest and are not the least restrictive means of furthering any governmental  
26 interest, compelling or otherwise.

27 179. Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that the above-described policies are a  
28 substantial burden to the religious exercise of Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates

1 similarly situated in violation of RLUIPA.

2 180. Defendants' unlawful actions caused Plaintiffs harm and Plaintiffs are  
3 entitled to injunctive and declaratory relief, compensatory and punitive damages, in  
4 addition to all such other relief this Court deems just and proper including costs and  
5 attorneys' fees in this action.

6 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request this Honorable Court grant declaratory relief  
7 and injunctive relief in the form requested in the Prayer for Relief below. Plaintiffs further  
8 request all such other relief this Court deems just and proper including costs and  
9 attorneys' fees incurred in this action.

10 **COUNT V**

11 **Violation of the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act**  
12 **(Equal Terms)**

13 181. Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference the foregoing  
14 paragraphs of this Amended Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

15 182. Defendants have treated Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates similarly  
16 situated on less than equal terms than inmates of other faiths by requiring them to  
17 undergo rigorous and intrusive inquiry that tests the adequacy of the knowledge of their  
18 Islamic faith in order to prove they are devout Muslims in the eyes of Defendants before  
19 they can become eligible to obtain a religious halal diet.

20 183. Defendants have treated Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates similarly  
21 situated on less than equal terms than inmates of other faiths by failing to provide religious  
22 services, programming and feasts for Muslim inmates while simultaneously providing  
23 religious services, programming and feasts to inmates of other faiths – including  
24 Christians, Jehovah's Witnesses and Buddhists.

25 184. Defendants have treated Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates similarly  
26 situated on less than equal terms than inmates of other faiths by placing onerous hurdles  
27 and unreasonable delays upon Muslim inmates and not inmates of other faiths before they  
28 could obtain access to religious texts, items and clothing and by imposing restrictions

1 upon Muslim inmates and not inmates of other faiths as to where and when they may  
2 possess and use their religious texts, items and clothing.

3 185. Defendants' discriminatory policies identified above are not in furtherance  
4 of a compelling government interest and are not the least restrictive means of furthering  
5 any governmental interest, compelling or otherwise.

6 186. Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that the above-described policies  
7 discriminate against Plaintiffs and other Muslim inmates similarly situated, are not justified  
8 by a compelling government interest, and are in violation of RLUIPA.

9 187. Defendants' unlawful actions caused Plaintiffs harm and Plaintiffs are  
10 entitled to injunctive and declaratory relief in addition to all such other relief this Court  
11 deems just and proper including costs and attorneys' fees in this action.

12 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request this Honorable Court grant declaratory relief  
13 and injunctive relief in the form requested in the Prayer for Relief below. Further,  
14 Plaintiffs request all such other relief this Court deems just and proper including costs  
15 and attorneys' fees incurred in this action.

16 **COUNT VI**

17 **Violation of the Fourteenth Amendment**  
18 **to the United States Constitution**

19 **(Due Process – Adequate, Effective and Meaningful Access to the Courts)**

20 188. Plaintiffs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference the foregoing  
21 paragraphs of this Amended Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

22 189. The Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment guarantees state  
23 inmates the right to adequate, effective and meaningful access to the courts. *Bounds v.*  
24 *Smith*, 430 U.S. 817, 822 (1997). This right is grounded not just in the Due Process Clause  
25 but also is an aspect of the First Amendment right to petition the Government for  
26 redress of grievances." *Bill Johnson's Restaurants, Inc. v. N.L.R.B.*, 461 U.S. 731, 741  
27 (1983), as well as the Privileges and Immunities Clause, *Chambers v. Baltimore & O.R.*  
28 *Co.*, 207 U.S. 142, 148 (1907).



1 without discrimination or preference are guaranteed....The Legislature shall make no law  
2 respecting an establishment of religion.” This provision is interpreted comparably to the  
3 First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. *See generally Hewitt v. Joyner*, 940 F.2d 1561 (9th  
4 Cir. 1991).

5 196. Defendants actions violate the California Constitution for the same reasons  
6 they violate the Establishment Clause (Count I) and Free Exercise (Count II) claims  
7 referenced above.

8 197. Defendants’ unlawful actions caused Plaintiffs harm and Plaintiffs are  
9 entitled to injunctive and declaratory relief, compensatory and punitive damages, in  
10 addition to all such other relief this Court deems just and proper including costs and  
11 attorneys’ fees in this action.

12 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request this Honorable Court grant declaratory relief  
13 and injunctive relief in the form requested in the Prayer for Relief below. Further,  
14 Plaintiffs request compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendants sued in  
15 their individual capacity, only, plus all such other relief this Court deems just and proper  
16 including costs and attorneys’ fees incurred in this action.

17 **Prayer for Relief**

18 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request that this Honorable Court enter judgment in  
19 their favor and against Defendants on each and every count in this complaint, and grant  
20 the following relief:

21 1. A declaratory judgment that Defendants’ policies, practices, and customs  
22 violate the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States,  
23 RLUIPA, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and Article I § 4 of the California Constitution;

24 2. An injunction that:

25 a. Requires Defendants to cease using a religious questionnaire before  
26 approving religious diets;

27 b. Requires Defendants to promptly provide halal meals to Muslim  
28 inmates upon request;

- 1 c. Requires Defendants to facilitate *Jumu'ab* prayers each Friday;
- 2 d. Requires Defendants to facilitate *ta'leem* religious study classes;
- 3 e. Requires Defendants to hold *Eid* feasts;
- 4 f. Requires Defendants to provide access to Qur'ans, kufis, prayer rugs,
- 5 and prayer beads;
- 6 g. Requires Defendants to lift restrictions on inmate's possession and
- 7 use of Qur'ans, kufis, prayer rugs and prayer beads that substantially
- 8 burden Muslim inmate's religious exercise;
- 9 h. Requires Defendants to cease body cavity and strip searches as a
- 10 condition of access to the law library and day room;
- 11 i. Requires Defendants to treat Islam on equal terms with all other
- 12 faiths.

13 3. An award of compensatory and punitive damages against the individual  
14 capacity defendants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

15 4. An award of attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses of litigation, pursuant to 42  
16 U.S.C. § 1988; and,

17 5. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

18 **JURY DEMAND**

19 NOW COME Plaintiffs, by and through their undersigned counsel, and hereby  
20 demand a jury trial of the above-referenced causes of action so triable.

21  
22 Dated: August 26, 2019

Respectfully submitted,  
CAIR LEGAL DEFENSE FUND  
Lena F. Masri (DC # 1000019) β  
lmasri@cair.com  
Carolyn M. Homer (CA # 286441) §  
chomer@cair.com  
453 New Jersey Ave., SE  
Washington, DC 20003  
Phone: (202) 742-6420  
Fax: (202) 379-3317

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

COUNCIL ON AMERICAN-ISLAMIC  
RELATIONS, CALIFORNIA

By: /s/ Patricia Shnell

Patricia Shnell (CA # 316183) §  
pshnell@cair.com

Amr Shabaik (CA # 288109) §  
ashabaik@cair.com

Greater Los Angeles Area Office

2180 W. Crescent Ave., Suite F

Anaheim, CA 92801

Phone: (714) 776-1177

Fax: (714) 776-8340

β *Pro hac vice pending*

§ *Admitted to practice in this court*