

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION**

STANLEY LIGAS, et al.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	No. 05 C 4331
	)	
vs.	)	Judge Holderman
	)	
BARRY S. MARAM, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

---

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF JOINT MOTION FOR  
SETTLEMENT CLASS CERTIFICATION, PRELIMINARY APPROVAL  
OF CONSENT DECREE, AND APPROVAL OF NOTICE PLAN**

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
BACKGROUND .....	2
CLASS CERTIFICATION IS APPROPRIATE .....	6
A.    PLAINTIFFS MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF RULE 23(a).....	7
1.    Joinder Would Be Impracticable .....	9
2.    There Are Questions of Law and Fact Common to the Class.....	10
3.    The Named Plaintiffs’ Claims Are Typical of Those of the Class .....	13
4.    The Named Plaintiffs and their Counsel Will Fairly and Adequately Protect the Interests of the Class .....	14
a)    The Named Plaintiffs’ Interests are Not Antagonistic to Those of the Class.....	14
b)    Plaintiffs’ Counsel Are Qualified to Maintain This Action.....	16
5.    The Class Is Readily Identifiable.....	18
6.    Plaintiffs Are Members of the Class.....	18
B.    PLAINTIFFS MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF RULE 23(b)(2).....	19
THE COURT SHOULD PRELIMINARILY APPROVE THE CONSENT DECREE.....	20
A.    THE PRINCIPAL TERMS OF THE DECREE PROVIDE FAIR AND REASONABLE RELIEF THAT IS LIMITED TO INDIVIDUALS WHO WANT RELIEF.....	20
B.    THE PROPOSED CONSENT DECREE MERITS PRELIMINARY APPROVAL.....	24
1.    Strength of the Plaintiffs’ Case on the Merits Balanced Against the Terms of the Consent Decree.....	26
2.    Complexity, Length and Expense of Continued Litigation .....	27
3.    Opposition to the Settlement.....	28
4.    Lack of Collusion.....	30

5. Opinion of Competent Counsel as to the Reasonableness of the Settlement ..... 31

6. Stage of the Proceeding and Amount of Discovery Completed ..... 31

THE PROPOSED NOTICE PLAN SATISFIES THE REQUIREMENT OF RULE 23 AND DUE PROCESS. .... 32

CONCLUSION..... 34

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Alliance to End Repression v. Rochford</i> , 565 F.2d 975 (7th Cir. 1977) .....	8, 18
<i>Amchem Products, Inc., v. Windsor</i> , 521 U.S. 591 (1997).....	7, 19
<i>Arenson v. Whitehall Convalescent &amp; Nursing Home</i> , 164 F.R.D. 659 (N.D. Ill. 1996).....	9, 10
<i>Armstrong v. Board of School Directors of the City of Milwaukee</i> , 616 F.2d 305 (7th Cir. 1980) .....	25, 30, 31
<i>Baby Neal v. Casey</i> , 43 F.3d 48 (3d Cir. 1994) .....	10
<i>Benjamin H. v. Ohl</i> , No. 3:99-0338, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22454 (S.D.W.V. Oct. 8, 1999).....	20
<i>Biekert v. Maram</i> , 388 Ill. App. 3d 1114, 905 N.E.2d 357 (Ill. App. Ct. 2009).....	5
<i>Boulet v. Cellucci</i> , 107 F. Supp. 2d 61 (D. Mass. 2001).....	20
<i>Buckhannon Board and Care Home, Inc. v. West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources</i> , 532 U.S. 598 (2001).....	29
<i>Bzdawka v. Milwaukee County</i> , 238 F.R.D. 469 (E.D. Wis. 2006) .....	19
<i>Carson v. American Brands, Inc.</i> , 450 U.S. 79 (1981).....	26
<i>City of New York v. Maul</i> , 59 A.D. 3d 187 (N.Y. App. 1 <sup>st</sup> Dept. Feb. 10, 2009).....	13
<i>Colbert v. Blagojevich</i> , 2008 WL 4442597 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 29, 2008) .....	8
<i>De La Fuente v. Stokely-Van Camp</i> , 713 F.2d 225 (7th Cir. 1983) .....	13

*Donovan v. Estate of Fitzsimmons*,  
778 F.2d 298 (7th Cir. 1985) ..... 26

*Edmondson v. Simon*,  
86 F.R.D. 375 (N.D. Ill. 1980)..... 10

*EEOC v. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc.*,  
768 F.2d 884 (7th Cir. 1985) ..... 26

*Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacquelin*,  
417 U.S. 156 (1974)..... 7

*Fields v. Maram*,  
No. 04-C-0174, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16291 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 16, 2004) ..... passim

*Fontana v. Elrod*,  
826 F.2d 729 (7th Cir. 1987) ..... 32

*Fowler v. Birmingham News Co.*,  
608 F.2d 1055 (5th Cir. 1979) ..... 32

*Fresco v. Auto Data Direct, Inc.*,  
2007 WL 2330895 (S.D. Fla. May 14, 2007) ..... 33

*GE Capital Corp. v. Lease Resolution Corp.*,  
128 F.3d 1074 (7th Cir. 1997) ..... 26

*Gen. Tel. Co. v. Falcon*,  
457 U.S. 147 (1982)..... 7, 13

*Gomez v. Ill. State Bd. of Educ.*,  
117 F.R.D. 394 (N.D. Ill. 1987)..... 7, 8, 16

*Haldeman v. Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp.*,  
995 F. Supp. 534 (E.D. Pa. 1998) ..... 20

*Hawker v. Consovoy*,  
198 F.R.D. 619 (D.N.J. 2001)..... 33

*Hawkins v. Comm’r*,  
No. 99-143-JD, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 807, (D.N.H. Jan. 23, 2004)..... 20

*Hendrix v. Faulkner*,  
525 F. Supp. 435 (N.D. Ind. 1980) ..... 18

*Hispanics United v. Vill. of Addison*,  
160 F.R.D. 681 (N.D. Ill. 1995)..... 10, 12, 14

*Imasuen v. Moyer*,  
 No. 91-C-5425, 1992 WL 26705 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 7, 1992) ..... 15

*In re Asbestos Litigation*,  
 90 Fed.3d 35, Fed.R.Serv. 3d 1360 (5th Cir. 1996)..... 7

*Isby v. Bahy*,  
 75 F.3d 1191 (7th Cir. 1996) ..... 26

*Jackson v. Fort Stanton Hosp. & Training Sch.*,  
 757 F. Supp. 1243 (D.N.M. 1990),  
*rev'd in part on other grounds*, 964 F.2d 980 (10th Cir. 1992)..... 20

*Kaplan v. Chertoff*,  
 2008 WL 200108 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 24, 2008)..... 33

*Lanner v. Wimmer*,  
 662 F.2d 1349 (10th Cir. 1981) ..... 15

*Lightbourn v. County of El Paso*,  
 118 F.3d 421 (5th Cir. 1997) ..... 10

*Long v. Thornton Township High Sch.*,  
 82 F.R.D. 186 (N.D. Ill. 1979)..... 9

*M.A.C., et al. v. Betit*,  
 284 F. Supp. 2d 1298 (D. Utah 2003)..... 8, 12, 13, 19

*Maher v. Gagne*,  
 448 U.S. 122 (1980)..... 29

*Makin v. Hawaii*,  
 114 F. Supp. 2d 1017 (D. Haw. 1999)..... 18, 20

*Maley v. Del Global Techs. Corp.*,  
 186 F.Supp.2d 358 (S.D.N.Y. 2002) ..... 31

*Marisol A. v. Guiliani*,  
 126 F.3d 372 (2d Cir. 1997) ..... 10, 11

*Mars Steel v. Continental Ill. Nat'l Bank & Trust*,  
 834 F.2d 677 (7th Cir. 1987) ..... 30

*Martin v. Taft*,  
 222 F. Supp. 2d 940 (S.D. Ohio 2002) ..... 20

*Midwest Cmty. Council v. Chicago Park Dist.*,  
 87 F.R.D. 457 (N.D. Ill. 1980)..... 12

*Olmstead v. L.C.*,  
527 U.S. 591 (1999)..... 2, 26

*Patterson v. Gen. Motors Corp.*,  
631 F.2d 476 (7th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 451 U.S. 914 (1980)..... 11

*Rancourt v. Concannon*, 207 F.R.D. 14 (D. Me. 2002)..... 12

*Riordan v. Smith Barney*,  
113 F.R.D. 60 (N.D. Ill. 1986)..... 9, 14

*Robert E. v. Lane*,  
530 F. Supp. 930 (N.D. Ill. 1980)..... 7

*Rolland v. Cellucci*,  
52 F. Supp. 2d 231 (D. Mass. 1999)..... 20

*Rosario v. Livaditis*,  
963 F.2d 1013 (7th Cir. 1992) ..... 10, 11, 13, 14

*Sherman ex rel. Sherman v. Township High School Dist. 214*,  
540 F. Supp. 2d 985 (N.D. Ill. 2008)..... 15

*Small v. Sullivan*,  
820 F. Supp. 1098 (S.D. Ill. 1992)..... 9

*Swanson v. Am. Consumer Indus.*,  
415 F.2d 1326 (7th Cir. 1969) ..... 9

*Van Horn v. Trickey*,  
840 F.2d 604 (8th Cir. 1987) ..... 26

*Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc.*,  
396 F.3d 96 (2d Cir. 2005) ..... 31

*Walsh v. Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.*,  
726 F.2d 956 (3d Cir. 1983) ..... 32, 33

*Waters v. Berry*,  
711 F. Supp. 1125 (D.D.C. 1989)..... 15

*Wellman v. Faulkner*,  
715 F.2d 269 (7th Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 468 U.S. 1217 (1984)..... 18

*Wilder v. Bernstein*,  
499 F. Supp. 980 (S.D.N.Y. 1980) ..... 15

*Williams v. Blagojevich*,  
2006 WL 3332844 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 13, 2006) ..... 8, 19

*Wyatt v. Poundstone*,  
 169 F.R.D. 155 (M.D. Ala. 1995)..... 9, 11, 15, 20

**Statutes**

28 U.S.C. App., p 697..... 7  
 42 U.S.C. § 15043..... 16  
 59 Ill. Adm. Code §120.50..... 5  
 Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. § 794(a)..... 2, 11, 26  
 Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12132..... 2, 11, 26

**Other Authorities**

4 Robert Newberg, NEWBERG ON CLASS ACTIONS § 11:25 at 38 (4th ed. 2002)..... 25, 30  
 David F. Herr, MANUAL FOR COMPLEX LITIGATION, FOURTH (“MANUAL FOURTH”), § 30.41  
 (2005)..... 24, 25, 34

**Rules**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23..... 7, 32, 34  
 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) ..... passim  
 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2)..... 10  
 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3)..... 13  
 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b) ..... 7, 19  
 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2)..... 19, 32, 33  
 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3)..... 7  
 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)..... 32  
 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e) ..... 25  
 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(1)..... 32  
 Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(d) ..... 1

Plaintiffs Stanley Ligas, Jamie McElroy, David Cicarelli, Isaiah Fair, and Jennifer Wilson, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated (“Plaintiffs”), and Defendants Barry Maram and Carol Adams<sup>1</sup> (collectively, the “Parties”), submit this joint memorandum in support of their Motion for Settlement Class Certification, Preliminary Approval of Consent Decree, and Approval of Notice Plan (“Motion”). For the reasons explained below, certification of the very narrowly defined settlement class addressed by the Parties’ recently executed proposed Consent Decree (“Decree,” attached as Exhibit A) is appropriate. The proposed Decree is fair, reasonable, and provides substantial benefits to the entire class while removing the delay, risk, and expense inherent in the trial of a complex case such as this. This Court should certify the settlement class, grant preliminary approval of the Decree, adopt the Notice Plan and related proposed forms of notice (attached hereto as Exhibit B) and proceed to consider any objections to the Decree and final approval.

Plaintiffs brought this action almost five years ago to enjoin Defendants, state officials who administer Illinois’ programs of long-term care for adults with developmental disabilities, to provide community-based services and/or placement in community settings to those individuals who are eligible for and seek to receive such services. The Parties have reached a new agreement (in the form of the Decree) after many years of litigation, which will finally allow those individuals who affirmatively seek Community-Based Services and/or placement in a Community-Based Setting to receive the care they desire without placing *any* burden on

---

<sup>1</sup> Since this lawsuit was filed, Michelle R.B. Saddler has succeeded Dr. Adams as the Secretary of the Illinois Department of Human Services. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(d), Ms. Saddler, as the successor to Dr. Adams, is deemed “automatically substituted as a party.” The Parties respectfully request that this Court enter an Order consistent therewith.

individuals who are happy with the care they currently receive or have no interest in receiving such services.<sup>2</sup>

To that end, the class that the Parties now seek to certify, and the relief set forth in the Decree, are significantly narrower than that previously proposed. To be clear, consistent with Plaintiffs' currently operative Second Amended Complaint, the proposed class consists only of those individuals who affirmatively seek Community-Based Services and/or placement in a Community-Based Setting. The Decree affects only those individuals.

### **BACKGROUND**

This action, as originally filed on July 28, 2005, and as the Second Amended Complaint continued to set forth, seeks to provide the choice of community placement to adults with developmental disabilities currently living in private, larger facilities (known in Illinois as Intermediate Care Facilities for individuals with Developmental Disabilities ("ICF-DDs")), in compliance with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12132, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. § 794(a), Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1396-1396v, and the Supreme Court's integration mandate in *Olmstead v. L.C.*, 527 U.S. 591 (1999). Among other things, the *Olmstead* decision requires the State to develop a comprehensive, effectively working plan to offer individuals with developmental disabilities services in the most integrated setting appropriate to their needs. The named Plaintiffs are five adults with developmental disabilities who currently reside in ICF-DDs, or who are at risk for placement in such facilities, *and* who have affirmatively requested to receive Community-Based Services or placement in a Community-Based Setting. Defendants, named in their official capacities, run the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services ("HFS") and the

---

<sup>2</sup> The terms "Community-Based Services" and "Community-Based Setting" are defined in the Decree at page 4.

Illinois Department of Human Services (“DHS”). Those agencies are responsible for administering Illinois’ programs for providing services to persons with developmental disabilities.

The Class encompassed within the scope of the previously proposed consent decree agreed to by the Parties in their first attempt to settle this matter included all developmentally disabled adults who either reside in ICF-DDs with nine or more beds or are at risk of being placed in an ICF-DD. (CM/ECF Doc. Nos. 326, 327.) However, a large number of persons within that group -- who either had no interest in, or objected to, even being considered for Community-Based Services or a placement in a Community-Based Setting -- expressed concern about the potential impact of the broadly applicable provisions of that earlier proposed decree. Most particularly, their objections focused on a provision that the State individually evaluate all ICF-DD residents for the possibility and/or opportunity of living in the community. As a result, on July 7, 2009, the Court entered an Order denying approval of that decree and vacating its prior Order certifying the class. (CM/ECF Doc. No. 420.) In its decertification Order, the Court explained that “the class definition fails to restrict the class to developmentally disabled individuals that are eligible for, and desire, community placement.” (*Id.* at p. 2.) Those shortcomings have been rectified by the Decree now presented.

Following the Court’s July 7 Order, Plaintiffs filed their Second Amended Complaint on August 31, 2009, in which Plaintiffs sought relief for a significantly revised class -- specifically limited to those individuals who are expressly seeking Community-Based Services and/or placement in a Community-Based Setting. (CM/ECF Doc. No. 485). Since that time, the Parties have met on several additional occasions to negotiate and draft the terms of a proposed agreement. Those efforts were successfully concluded with the completion of a new, more

focused and limited Decree and a Notice Plan.<sup>3</sup> (A copy of the Decree is attached as Exhibit A. The Parties' proposed Notice Plan and proposed notices are attached as Exhibit B.) Indeed, both the class that the Parties now wish to certify and the proposed relief granted to that class are significantly revised and squarely address the concerns previously expressed by the Court and/or by many of those who objected to the earlier proposed decree.

First and foremost, with respect to the "desire" or "choice" of individuals with developmental disabilities: the class is expressly defined to include only those individuals who have actually "requested community placements." To that end, the Parties move this Court to certify a class consisting of individuals with developmental disabilities for whom Defendants have a record reflecting that the individual has affirmatively indicated that he or she seeks to receive services in a community setting. This proposed class is limited strictly to those individuals who have affirmatively requested Community-Based Services and/or placement in a Community-Based Setting. There can be no question that the class includes only those individuals who desire the relief provided in the Decree. That relief will not -- and cannot in any way -- impact the rights of individuals who wish to remain in an ICF-DD; who oppose community placement; who do not want to be considered for community placement; who do not want to be evaluated for community placement; or who do not want to be subjected to targeted efforts to even provide them with information about community placement and service options. By definition, such persons all are outside the class definition and the Decree. And lest there be any doubt, the Decree gives multiple opportunities to individuals, who -- for whatever reason --

---

<sup>3</sup> Additionally, the Parties met numerous times with Scott Mendel, one of the attorneys representing individuals who objected to the previously proposed decree and who agreed to act as an informal liaison to other objectors for purposes of discussing a proposed decree, as well as with Burton Brown and Barbara Reilly, who have filed a motion to intervene. The Decree incorporates many of the suggestions offered by those attorneys.

may believe they fall within the class definition, to clearly express that they do not want Community-Based Services or placement in a Community-Based Setting, and thus are outside the scope of the class.<sup>4</sup>

Second, with respect to “eligibility,” as a matter of law, all individuals who are “eligible” to receive services in an ICF-DD are “eligible” to be considered for community services because the eligibility criteria for community services under both Illinois and federal law are virtually identical to the criteria for placement in an ICF-DD. *Biekert v. Maram*, 388 Ill. App. 3d 1114, 1121, 905 N.E.2d 357, 364 (Ill. App. Ct. 2009) (“Pursuant to federal and state law and its own documentation, the [Home and Community-Based Services for the Developmentally Disabled] waiver program is available only to recipients who, in the absence of the waiver services, would require the Medicaid-covered level of care provided in an ICF/MR,<sup>5</sup> in that the waiver services are an alternative to an ICF/MR placement”); 59 Ill. Adm. Code §120.50 (“The target population to be served under [Illinois’ Waiver Program] is Medicaid-eligible Illinois adults with developmental disabilities who otherwise would require services in a State-operated developmental center or a community ICF/MR.”). Thus, the members of the proposed class -- those individuals who (i) currently live in ICF-DDs or who otherwise are eligible to live in ICF-DDs, and (ii) who have expressly requested Community-Based Services and/or placement in a Community-Based Setting -- are all indisputably “eligible” to be considered and evaluated for such services by the State of Illinois should they affirmatively request them.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Decree also gives those individuals who have rejected Community-Based Services or placement in a Community-Based Setting multiple opportunities to change their minds and affirmatively request such services, thus allowing them to join the class.

<sup>5</sup> ICF/MR is the federal term for the facilities that Illinois refers to as ICF-DDs.

**CLASS CERTIFICATION IS APPROPRIATE**

In connection with the Parties' agreement on the Decree, the parties have stipulated to certifying the following two sub-classes for purposes of settlement:

- 1) Adult individuals in Illinois:
  - (a) who have mental retardation and/or other developmental disabilities within the meaning of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12131(2) and the Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. § 794(a), and who qualify for Medicaid Waiver services;
  - (b) who reside in a private ICF-DD with nine or more residents; and
  - (c) for whom Defendants (including Defendants' agencies, employees, contractors and agents, and those acting in concert with them) have a Current Record reflecting that the individual has affirmatively requested to receive placement in a Community-Based Setting or Community-Based Services; or
- 2) Adult individuals in Illinois:
  - (a) who have mental retardation and/or other developmental disabilities within the meaning of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12131(2) and the Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. § 794(a), and who qualify for Medicaid Waiver services;
  - (b) who reside in a Family Home and are at risk of placement in a publicly or privately-owned long term care facility licensed by the Illinois Department of Public Health as an Intermediate Care Facility for the Developmentally Disabled, as defined at 77 Ill.Adm.Code §300.300; and
  - (b) for whom Defendants (including Defendants' agencies, employees, contractors and agents, and those acting in concert with them) have a Current Record reflecting that the individual has affirmatively requested to receive Community-

Based Services or placement in a Community-Based Setting.<sup>6</sup>

For the reasons discussed below, this class meets the requirements of both Rules 23(a) and (b).

**A. PLAINTIFFS MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF RULE 23(a)**

The overriding objective of class certification pursuant to Federal Rule 23 is to obtain “economies of time, effort and expense.” Advisory Committee’s Notes on Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(b)(3), 28 U.S.C. App., p 697. It is entirely proper for the Parties to negotiate a proposed settlement prior to certification. Although a court should consider the settlement agreement when deciding certification issues, *In re Asbestos Litigation*, 90 Fed.3d 35, Fed.R.Serv. 3d 1360 (5th Cir. 1996), it is settled that a class action must meet the requirements of Fed.R.Civ.P. 23 when certified for settlement purposes. *Amchem Products, Inc., v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 614 (1997).

When determining a class under Rule 23(a), the Court may not consider the merits of Plaintiffs’ claims and must take all factual allegations in the complaint as true. *Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacquelin*, 417 U.S. 156, 177 (1974); *Gomez v. Ill. State Bd. of Educ.*, 117 F.R.D. 394, 398 (N.D. Ill. 1987). Additionally, civil rights cases alleging discriminatory policies or practices are “by definition” class actions, provided they meet the other requirements of Rule 23(a). *Gen. Tel. Co. v. Falcon*, 457 U.S. 147, 157 (1982); *see also Amchem*, 521 U.S. at 614; *Robert E. v. Lane*, 530 F. Supp. 930, 944 (N.D. Ill. 1980) (a case alleging civil rights violations in an institutional setting represents a “prototypical candidate” for class certification). In particular, class certification is routinely allowed in civil rights cases alleging states’ violations of the community

---

<sup>6</sup> The terms “Current Record”, “Developmental Disabilities”, “ICF-DDs”, are defined in the Decree at pages 3-7.

integration mandates of the Americans with Disabilities Act. *See Colbert v. Blagojevich*, 2008 WL 4442597, \*10 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 29, 2008) (J. Lefkow) (certifying class consisting of “all Medicaid-eligible adults with disabilities in Cook County, Illinois, who are being, or may in the future be, unnecessarily confined to nursing facilities and who, with appropriate supports and services, may be able to live in a community setting”); *Williams v. Blagojevich*, 2006 WL 3332844, \*5 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 13, 2006) (J. Hart) (certifying class consisting of Illinois residents who “(a) have a mental illness; (b) are institutionalized in a privately owned Institution for Mental Diseases; and (c) with appropriate supports and services may be able to live in an integrated community setting”); *M.A.C., et al. v. Betit*, 284 F. Supp. 2d 1298, 1301-04 (D. Utah 2003) (certifying class of “all current and future Medicaid-eligible individuals residing in Utah who, because of their developmental disabilities or mental retardation have or will be determined to be eligible for, and are or will be on the waiting list to receive, services under the HCBS waiver by the Division of Services for People with Disabilities”).

Under Rule 23(a), courts may certify a class when 1) its members are so numerous that joinder of all claims is impracticable, 2) there are questions of law or fact common to the class, 3) the claims of the representative parties are typical of the class claims, and 4) the representative parties and their counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a); *Alliance to End Repression v. Rochford*, 565 F.2d 975, 977 (7th Cir. 1977); *Fields v. Maram*, No. 04-C-0174, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16291 at \*8-\*9 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 16, 2004). Additionally, courts have recognized two implied requirements under Rule 23(a): the class must be readily identifiable and the named plaintiffs must be part of the class. *Alliance to End Repression*, 565 F.2d at 977-78; *Gomez*, 117 F.R.D. at 397-98. As shown below, the proposed class here easily meets all of these requirements.

### 1. Joinder Would Be Impracticable

Although commonly referred to as the “numerosity” requirement, “the crux of the numerosity requirement is not the number of interested persons *per se*, but the practicality of their joinder into a single suit.” *Arenson v. Whitehall Convalescent & Nursing Home*, 164 F.R.D. 659, 663 (N.D. Ill. 1996) (quoting *Small v. Sullivan*, 820 F. Supp. 1098, 1109 (S.D. Ill. 1992)). While the number of class members is an important factor, others include “judicial economy, geographic diversity of class members, and the ability of individual class members to institute individual lawsuits ....” *Id.*; *see also Riordan v. Smith Barney*, 113 F.R.D. 60, 61 (N.D. Ill. 1986) (“[T]he test for impracticability of joinder is not simply a test for the number of class members”). Under these guidelines, this Court has certified classes with as few as 29 members. *Riordan*, 113 F.R.D. at 61; *see also Swanson v. Am. Consumer Indus.*, 415 F.2d 1326, 1333 (7th Cir. 1969) (40 members sufficient).

In this case, there is no question joinder is impracticable. Defendants have previously acknowledged that just through their Prioritization of Urgency of Need for Services (PUNS) database, at least 320 current ICF-DD residents and more than 4,000 individuals with developmental disabilities who live at home had requested placement in Community-Based Settings or Community-Based Services. *See* Second Am. Compl. ¶89. Based on these numbers alone, joinder is impracticable. *See Long v. Thornton Township High Sch.*, 82 F.R.D. 186, 189 (N.D. Ill. 1979) (plaintiff not required to specify exact size of class as long as good-faith estimate is provided); *Fields*, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16291 at \*13 (“[I]t is appropriate for the Court to make such common sense assumptions in determining whether the numerosity requirement is met”); *Wyatt v. Poundstone*, 169 F.R.D. 155, 164 (M.D. Ala. 1995) (in case on behalf of

institutionalized persons with mental retardation, numerosity was met because “[t]here are approximately 1,000 mentally retarded individuals in the defendants’ institutions ...”).

Other circumstances also point to impracticability of joinder. As Medicaid recipients, class members are located throughout the state and do not have the financial means to bring individual lawsuits. *Fields*, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16291 at \*18 (“Because the class members reside throughout the state, and because they are disabled and therefore are often of limited financial resources, joinder would be particularly difficult in this case.”); *Arenson*, 164 F.R.D. at 663 (“Class members who are residents of a nursing home may also lack the ability to pursue their claims individually.”). Finally, judicial economy plainly would be served by consolidating the actions of all similarly-situated persons rather than having them litigate individually. *Arenson*, 164 F.R.D. at 663.

## **2. There Are Questions of Law and Fact Common to the Class**

Rule 23(a) requires that there “need be only a single issue common to all members of the class.” *Edmondson v. Simon*, 86 F.R.D. 375, 380 (N.D. Ill. 1980); *Hispanics United v. Vill. of Addison*, 160 F.R.D. 681, 688 (N.D. Ill. 1995). “A common nucleus of operative fact is usually enough to satisfy the commonality requirement of Rule 23(a)(2).” *Rosario v. Livaditis*, 963 F.2d 1013, 1018 (7th Cir. 1992). *See also Lightbourn v. County of El Paso*, 118 F.3d 421, 425 (5th Cir. 1997) (“The commonality test is met when there is at least one issue, the resolution of which will affect all or a significant number of the putative class members.”) (citations omitted); *Baby Neal v. Casey*, 43 F.3d 48, 55 (3d Cir. 1994) (commonality met where “named plaintiffs share at least one question of fact or law with the grievances of the prospective class”); *Marisol A. v. Giuliani*, 126 F.3d 372, 375 (2d Cir. 1997) (class must “share a common question of law or fact”).

Even when the effect on each class member differs, an allegation that the defendant's discriminatory policy or practice affects the class as a whole will suffice to prove commonality of claims. *Rosario*, 963 F.2d at 1017 ("The fact that there is some factual variation among class grievances will not defeat a class action.") (citing *Patterson v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 631 F.2d 476, 481 (7th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 451 U.S. 914 (1980)). Thus, even if each class member's remedy differs, there is commonality if the injury flows from the same discriminatory acts or omissions. *See Marisol A.*, 126 F.3d at 376 (in class action involving foster children, "[t]he unique circumstances of each child do not compromise the common question of whether, as plaintiffs allege, defendants have failed to meet their federal and state law obligations").

In this action, Plaintiffs have challenged the systematic failure of Defendants to provide them with services in integrated community settings after they specifically requested such services. This is a "common nucleus of operative fact" that affects all members of the class. Indeed, unlike the previously certified class, this class consists solely of those individuals who specifically requested Community-Based Services. Additionally, the class members share overriding questions of law: whether Defendants' conduct violates the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12132, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. § 794(a), and Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1396-1396v. Class actions routinely are certified in civil rights cases presenting common questions of this nature. *See Wyatt*, 169 F.R.D. at 164-65 (commonality and typicality existed where "[t]he named plaintiffs share multiple interests and claims identical to the class members' claims"). As this Court has recognized, "[w]here 'broad discriminatory policies and practices constitute the gravamen of a class suit, common questions of law or fact are necessarily presumed.'" *Hispanics United*, 160 F.R.D. at

688 (quoting *Midwest Cmty. Council v. Chicago Park Dist.*, 87 F.R.D. 457, 460 (N.D. Ill. 1980)).

Moreover, courts have found commonality exists in classes of adults with developmental disabilities. In *Betit*, the court certified a class similar to the class proposed here, where the class consisted of individuals who had affirmatively requested community services. *Betit*, 284 F. Supp. 2d at 1303. The court, finding that commonality existed, noted that the facts shared by each class member, all of whom were adults with developmental disabilities, were nearly identical in that each proposed class member “is being denied a meaningful choice between the receipt of HCBS waiver services and institutionalization in violation of the Medicaid Act; and each is threatened with unnecessary institutionalization in violation of the ADA and § 504.” Similarly, in *Rancourt v. Concannon*, 207 F.R.D. 14 (D. Me. 2002)), the court found commonality existed in a class comprised of developmentally disabled individuals who were eligible for, but were not receiving Community-Based Services or placement, stating “[w]hile there is variation in the specifics of their individual medical circumstances, Plaintiffs do not allege that they have suffered isolated difficulties, but rather, that they face systemic barriers to receiving services” and that therefore “this common fact pattern gives rise to common legal issues, alleging violations of the Medicaid Act and its implementing regulations. *Id.* at 16; *see also Boulet v. Celluci*, 107 F. Supp.2d 61, 81 (D. Mass. 2000) (limiting class only to include adults with developmental disabilities who are eligible for and requested community services and finding that “the claims of the plaintiffs and the proposed class as amended share a common legal theory that adults eligible for waiver services are not being provided such services with reasonable promptness and, therefore, satisfy the commonality and typicality requirements of Rule 23(a)”). Thus, this Court should find that commonality exists here.

### 3. The Named Plaintiffs' Claims Are Typical of Those of the Class.

The “typicality” requirement is met when the named Plaintiffs’ claims “arise[] from the same event or practice or course of conduct that gives rise to the claims of other class members and ... are based on the same legal theory.” *De La Fuente v. Stokely-Van Camp*, 713 F.2d 225, 232 (7th Cir. 1983). This question is “closely related to the preceding question of commonality.” *Rosario*, 963 F.2d at 1018; *see also Falcon*, 457 U.S. at 157 n.13 (“the commonality and typicality requirements of Rule 23(a) tend to merge...”). As with commonality, typicality does not require that all class members suffer the same injury as the named plaintiffs. “Instead, we look to the defendant’s conduct and the plaintiffs’ legal theory to satisfy Rule 23(a)(3).” *Id.*; *see also De La Fuente*, 713 F.2d at 232 (typicality satisfied regardless of whether “there are factual distinctions between the claims of the named plaintiffs and those of other class members. Thus, similarity of legal theory may control even in the face of differences of fact.”); *M.A.C.*, 284 F. Supp. 2d at 1303 (finding typicality exists among class of individuals with developmental disabilities who had affirmatively requested community services); *City of New York v. Maul*, 59 A.D. 3d 187 (N.Y. App. 1<sup>st</sup> Dept. Feb. 10, 2009).

In *City of New York v. Maul*, defendants argued that a class of children with developmental disabilities lacked commonality because “to determine the appropriateness of a particular facility requires an individualized inquiry into that individual's needs”. *Id.* at 190. The court rejected this argument finding that “it ignores all of the other alleged harmful results of [defendants’] conduct which do not require specific factual inquiry.” *Id.*

Here, the named Plaintiffs have affirmatively requested and been refused community services by Defendants and as a result are, or are at risk of being, unnecessarily placed in an ICF-DD; therefore, their claims are identical to those of the putative class, which consists of other

persons with developmental disabilities who have also requested community services from Defendants and are also unnecessarily placed in an ICF-DD or at risk thereof. Moreover, unlike the prior class, all of the class members, by definition, have requested community services. Because the named Plaintiffs and the class share the same deprivations of federal rights, typicality is met here.

**4. The Named Plaintiffs and their Counsel Will Fairly and Adequately Protect the Interests of the Class**

The question of whether the named Plaintiffs will adequately protect the interests of the class is twofold. The first inquiry is the adequacy of the named Plaintiffs' representation of the interests of the class; the second is the adequacy of the named Plaintiffs' counsel. *Hispanics United*, 160 F.R.D. at 689. As shown below, those requirements are met here.

a) The Named Plaintiffs' Interests are Not Antagonistic to Those of the Class

The ability of the named Plaintiffs to represent the class goes to whether they have "sufficient interest in the outcome to ensure vigorous advocacy", *Rosario*, 963 F.2d at 1018, as well as any interests "antagonistic to the interests of the class." *Riordan*, 113 F.R.D. at 64. Courts may deny certification based on grounds of antagonism only if that antagonism "goes to the subject matter of the litigation." *Id.* Potential conflicts that are remote or speculative will not defeat class certification. *Hispanics United*, 160 F.R.D. at 689.

In this case, Plaintiffs' interests are entirely coextensive with those of the class. The named Plaintiffs who are currently residing in private ICF-DDs have requested placement in Community-Based Settings just like the rest of the class members residing in ICF-DDs who have made similar requests. Similarly, the named Plaintiffs who are currently residing at home and

are at risk of placement in an ICF-DD have requested Community-Based Services or placement in a Community-Based Setting just like the rest of the class members residing at home. They share the same claims as the class members as well as a strong interest in securing the declaratory and injunctive relief they seek. This relief will benefit all members of each of the two sub classes. There are no conflicts or antagonism, whether actual or apparent, between the named Plaintiffs and the class.

Notwithstanding the fact that the class proposed here includes only those individuals with developmental disabilities who have affirmatively requested Community-Based Services, this Court and numerous others have held, that even class members who are satisfied with discriminatory conduct are not entitled to stop other class members, who may not be so satisfied, from remedying systemic discrimination. *Imasuen v. Moyer*, No. 91-C-5425, 1992 WL 26705, \*2 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 7, 1992) (Holderman, J.) (“[T]he fact that some class members may be satisfied with an unconstitutional system and would prefer to leave violations of their rights unremedied is not dispositive under Rule 23(a)”); *Sherman ex rel. Sherman v. Township High School Dist. 214*, 540 F. Supp. 2d 985, 993-94 (N.D. Ill. 2008) (J. Gettleman) (“while it may be true that some plaintiff class members support the Act, such differences of opinion do not amount to ‘antagonistic’ interests sufficient to undermine class certification”); *Wyatt v. Poundstone*, 169 F.R.D. 155, 161 (M.D. Ala. 1995) (denying class certification where some institutional residents opposed community placement “would, in effect, preclude the use of the class action device in many of the very cases where it could be the most advantageous”); *Waters v. Berry*, 711 F. Supp. 1125, 1131-32 (D.D.C. 1989); *Lanner v. Wimmer*, 662 F.2d 1349, 1357 (10th Cir. 1981); *Wilder v. Bernstein*, 499 F. Supp. 980, 993 (S.D.N.Y. 1980).

b) Plaintiffs' Counsel Are Qualified to Maintain This Action

This Court has already determined Plaintiffs' counsel are qualified. (CM/ECF Doc. No. 86.) Nothing has happened that should lead to a different result here. Plaintiffs' counsel are personally experienced in disability civil rights and class action litigation and are well qualified to prosecute this action. The fact that counsel have been found adequate to represent classes of plaintiffs in the past constitutes "persuasive evidence" that they will serve as adequate counsel in this case. *Gomez*, 117 F.R.D. at 401.

Equip for Equality is the state-designated Protection and Advocacy agency for people with disabilities. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 15043. Experienced attorneys employed by it served as class counsel in *Access Living v. Chicago Transit Auth.*, No. 00-C-0070 (N.D. Ill.) (*see* 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6041 (N.D. Ill. May 9, 2001) and currently serve as class counsel in *Williams v. Quinn* (formerly *Blagojevich*), No. 05-C-4673 (N.D. Ill.) and *Colbert v. Quinn* (formerly *Blagojevich*), No. 07-C-4737 (N.D. Ill.). Its lawyers regularly litigate cases on behalf of individuals with disabilities. *See, e.g., Fisher v. Maram*, No. 06-C- 4405 (N.D. Ill.); *Craig v. Columbia College*, 09-C-07758 (N.D. Ill.); *Sidell v. Maram*, 05-C-1001 (C.D. Ill.); and *Rasho v. Walker*, 07-C-1298 (C.D. Ill.). Additionally, Kendra Hartman is a volunteer attorney with Equip for Equality who, in her former position as a partner at Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP, represented clients in numerous class action proceedings in state and federal courts throughout the country.

Benjamin Wolf of the American Civil Liberties Union of Illinois has over twenty-five years experience representing institutionalized children and people with disabilities. He has served as class counsel in the following civil rights cases: *B.H. v. McDonald*, No. 88-C-5599 (N.D. Ill.) (*see* 49 F.3d 294 (7th Cir. 1995) and 856 F. Supp. 1285 (N.D. Ill. 1994)); *K.L. v.*

*Edgar*, No. 92-C-5722 (N.D. Ill.) (*see* 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15404 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 6, 2000)); *A.N. v. Kiley*, No. 86-C-9486 (N.D. Ill.) (*see* 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13993 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 22, 1995)); *A.T. v. County of Cook*, No. 85-C-0325 (N.D. Ill.) (*see* 613 F. Supp. 775 (N.D. Ill. 1985)) and *Jimmy Doe v. Cook County*, No. 99 C 3945 (N.D. Ill.) (*see* 1999 WL 1069244 (N.D. Ill.)).

Access Living and its Managing Attorney for Community Integration, Edward Mullen, serve as class counsel in *Williams v. Quinn*, No. 05-C-4673 (N.D. Ill.). Previously, Access Living served as class counsel in *Access Living v. Chicago Transit Auth.*, and was certified as class counsel in *Fields v. Maram*, No. 04-C-0174 (N.D. Ill.) (*see* 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16291, at \*33 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 16, 2004)). Access Living regularly litigates civil rights cases on behalf of people with disabilities. Additionally, prior to joining Access Living, Ed Mullen regularly litigated class actions as defense counsel.

Finally, counsel from Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP, John Grossbart, Wendy Enerson, and Corey Shapiro, are experienced litigators who have represented clients in class action proceedings in more than 30 state and federal courts, including: *Schultz v. The Prudential Ins. Co. of America*, No. 09-cv-2387 (N.D. Ill.); *Daniels, et al. v. Bursey, et al.*, Case No. 03-CV-1550 (N.D. Ill.); *In re The Prudential Ins. Co. of Am. Sales Practices Litig.*, No. 95-4704 (*see* 962 F. Supp. 450 (D.N.J. 1997), *aff'd*, 148 F.3d 283 (3d Cir. 1998), *cert. denied*, 525 U.S. 1114 (1999)) (an MDL of several nationwide class actions); *Azar v. Prudential Ins. Co. of Am.*, 2003-NMCA-062 (N.M.); *In re VMS Sec. Litig.*, No. 89-C-9448 (N.D. Ill.); *West Washington Building LLC v. Body Wise Int'l, Inc.*, No. 03-CH-18809 (Ill. Cir. Ct.); *Fidel v. Farley*, No. 1:00v-48-M (W.D. Ky.); and *Reed, et al v. Advocate Health Care, et al.*, No. 06-C-3337 (N.D. Ill.).

### **5. The Class Is Readily Identifiable**

A class under Rule 23(a) must be “readily identifiable.” Specifically, “the description of the class must be sufficiently definite to permit ascertainment of the class members....” *Alliance to End Repression*, 565 F.2d at 977. A class description is sufficiently definite when its “scope is defined by the activities of the defendants.” *Id.* at 978.

Here, the proposed definition expressly identifies class members as adults with developmental disabilities who either reside in ICF-DDs, or are at risk of placement therein, notwithstanding their having expressly and affirmatively requested Community-Based Services or placement in a Community-Based Setting. This definition properly relies on objective, readily identifiable criteria. Moreover, the proposed class is significantly more identifiable than the previously certified class because here the individual must have affirmatively requested such services. Whether a person is a class member is dependent upon both a Plaintiff’s affirmative request and Defendants’ actions or inactions, and therefore the Court can feasibly determine whether an individual is a class member. *See Makin v. Hawaii*, 114 F. Supp. 2d 1017, 1020 (D. Haw. 1999) (in case under ADA integration mandate, court certified class of “mentally retarded people living at home who are on a wait list for services ...”); *Fields*, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16291 at \*40.

### **6. Plaintiffs Are Members of the Class**

Finally, the named Plaintiffs must show they are part of the class they seek to represent. *Hendrix v. Faulkner*, 525 F. Supp. 435, 442 (N.D. Ind. 1980), *aff’d in relevant part*, *Wellman v. Faulkner*, 715 F.2d 269 (7th Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 468 U.S. 1217 (1984). Here, each of the named Plaintiffs is an actual resident of an ICF-DD, or is at risk of placement in an ICF-DD, and

has affirmatively requested Community-Based Services and/or placement in a Community-Based Setting; therefore, they meet the criteria for class membership.

**B. PLAINTIFFS MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF RULE 23(b)(2)**

In addition to meeting the requirements of Rule 23(a), Plaintiffs must meet one of the requirements of Rule 23(b). Plaintiffs move here under Rule 23(b)(2), which allows courts to certify a class if the defendant “has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the class as a whole.” FED. R. CIV. P. 23(b)(2). Civil rights cases against parties charged with broad-based discrimination are “prime examples” of actions under Rule 23(b)(2). *Amchem Prods v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 613 (1997).

This case is exemplary of a Rule 23(b)(2) action because Defendants’ policies and practices affect all members of the proposed class as well as the named Plaintiffs, the remediation of which is well-suited for and requires declaratory and injunctive relief. Plaintiffs do not seek monetary damages for themselves or the class. Indeed, it is common place for class actions to proceed under Rule 23(b)(2) where people with disabilities seek to enforce their rights to community integration and services. *See Bzdawka v. Milwaukee County*, 238 F.R.D. 469, 476 (E.D. Wis. 2006) (class of elderly disabled persons in claim under ADA integration mandate); *Williams v. Blagojevich*, 2006 WL 3332844, \*5 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 13, 2006) (J. Hart) (certifying class consisting of Illinois residents who “(a) have a mental illness; (b) are institutionalized in a privately owned Institution for Mental Diseases; and (c) with appropriate supports and services may be able to live in an integrated community setting”); *M.A.C., et al. v. Betit*, 284 F. Supp. 2d 1298, 1301-04 (D. Utah 2003) (certifying class of “all current and future Medicaid-eligible individuals residing in Utah who, because of their developmental disabilities or mental

retardation have or will be determined to be eligible for, and are or will be on the waiting list to receive, services under the HCBS waiver by the Division of Services for People with Disabilities”); *Fields*, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16291, at \*39-\*42; *Hawkins v. Comm’r*, No. 99-143-JD, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 807, at \*11-\*12 (D.N.H. Jan. 23, 2004); *Boulet v. Cellucci*, 107 F. Supp. 2d 61, 81 (D. Mass. 2001); *Benjamin H. v. Ohl*, No. 3:99-0338, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22454, at \*11-\*12 (S.D.W.V. Oct. 8, 1999); *Makin*, 114 F. Supp. at 1020 (class of persons living at home certified in claim under ADA integration mandate); *Martin v. Taft*, 222 F. Supp. 2d 940, 947 (S.D. Ohio 2002); *Rolland v. Cellucci*, 52 F. Supp. 2d 231, 233 (D. Mass. 1999); *Haldeman v. Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp.*, 995 F. Supp. 534, 536 (E.D. Pa. 1998); *Wyatt*, 169 F.R.D. at 164-68 (certifying class of “all current and future mentally-retarded and mentally-ill residents of any facility, hospital, center, or home, public or private, to which they are assigned or transferred for residence by the Alabama Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation”); *Jackson v. Fort Stanton Hosp. & Training Sch.*, 757 F. Supp. 1243, 1257 (D.N.M. 1990) (court certified class of “all persons presently residing at” four state institutions, “all persons who became or will become residents of the institutions during the pendency of the action; and all persons who have been transferred ... to skilled nursing facilities, intermediate care facilities, homes for the aged and similar facilities, and whose services are funded in whole or in part by defendants”), *rev’d in part on other grounds*, 964 F.2d 980 (10th Cir. 1992).

**THE COURT SHOULD PRELIMINARILY APPROVE THE CONSENT DECREE**

**A. THE PRINCIPAL TERMS OF THE DECREE PROVIDE FAIR AND REASONABLE RELIEF THAT IS LIMITED TO INDIVIDUALS WHO WANT RELIEF**

The Decree fairly, reasonably and adequately affords relief to all class members. The essence of Plaintiffs’ Complaint is that all individuals with developmental disabilities who want

Community-Based Services must be afforded opportunities to make meaningful, informed choices regarding where they live, and that Defendants must ensure that supports and services are available, where appropriate, in Community-Based Settings. The relief afforded under the Decree fully addresses and achieves that goal and addresses the concerns of those individuals who previously objected to the terms of the earlier consent decree. A brief description of the key provisions and features of the Decree follows:

**1. Development of Community Capacity**

The Decree requires Defendants to ensure the availability of services, supports and other resources necessary to meet their obligations under the Decree, and, in particular, to increase the choices and opportunities for people with developmental disabilities who want Community-Based Services and/or placement in a Community-Based Setting.

**2. Relief Affects Private ICF-DD Residents Who Affirmatively Request Community-Based Services or Placement in A Community-Based Setting**

The Decree ensures that individuals currently residing in ICF-DDs who affirmatively request placement in a Community-Based Setting will receive such services in the most integrated setting appropriate to their needs. Defendants will develop a Transition Service Plan (as defined in the Decree) specific to each individual who requests such services. The Transition Service Plan will describe the services required; where and how such services will be developed and obtained; and a timetable for promptly completing that transition. The Transition Service Plan will be developed by a Qualified Professional (as defined in the Decree) in conjunction with the Class Member and, where one has been appointed, the Class Member's legal guardian, and, where appropriate, the Class Member's family members, friends and support staff who are familiar with the Class Member. For those individuals who have never requested Community-

Based Services or who inform Defendants that they no longer wish to receive Community-Based Services, Defendants obviously will not develop a Transition Service Plan as those individuals are not Class Members.

Within six years, all persons residing in ICF-DDs who have affirmatively requested placement in Community-Based Settings will transition to such Settings consistent with their Transition Service Plans and consistent with their ongoing desire for such placement. The Decree sets forth interim benchmarks as well, with not less than one-third of such persons transitioning within two and a half years, and not less than two-thirds transitioning within four and a half years of approval of the Decree. *The Decree does not require or force anyone to even receive a Transition Service Plan, much less move out of an ICF-DD. The Transition Service Plan process is for only those who have affirmatively indicated that they want placement in a Community-Based Setting. Individuals who do not make such an affirmative request are not members of the Class and their legal rights are unaffected by this Decree.*

### **3. Relief Afforded to Class Members Who Reside at Home**

The relief afforded by the Decree is not limited to private ICF-DD residents. Individuals with developmental disabilities who reside at home also benefit from the Decree. Under the Decree, Defendants must maintain a Statewide database in which all individuals with developmental disabilities who reside at home and have been identified as expressly having requested either Community-Based Services or placement in a Community-Based Setting are enrolled. These individuals will be placed on a waiting list for community services with selection prioritized by the individual's urgency of need for such services, the length of time that has passed since the individual enrolled, geographical considerations and other factors. As each individual is selected to receive community services, Defendants will develop a Transition

Service Plan (as defined in the Decree) specific to each person, and as described above. Within two years following approval of the Decree, Defendants shall provide such services to at least 1,000 individuals on the waiting list who are not in Crisis situations, and in each of the third, fourth, fifth and sixth years following approval of the Decree, defendants shall provide such services to at least 500 additional individuals each year.

The Decree provides that individuals in “Crisis” situations (as defined in the Decree) will receive necessary and appropriate Community-Based Services and/or placement in a Community-Based Setting expeditiously. The Decree places no limit to, or cap upon, the number of individuals in Crisis situations whom Defendants are obligated to serve.

#### **4. Monitoring and Compliance**

Under the Decree, the Court will appoint an independent and impartial Monitor who is knowledgeable concerning the management and oversight of programs serving individuals with developmental disabilities. The Monitor will be responsible for gauging Defendants’ compliance with the Decree, identifying actual and potential areas of non-compliance with the Decree, and recommending appropriate action by the Court in the event any issues cannot be resolved by discussion and negotiation among the Monitor and the Parties. The Monitor will file annual, publicly available reports with the Court to provide information sufficient for the Court to evaluate Defendants’ compliance or non-compliance with the Decree.

#### **5. Implementation Plan**

The Decree requires Defendants (with assistance from the Monitor, Plaintiffs, and class counsel) to develop an “Implementation Plan” to accomplish the obligations and objectives set forth in the Decree. The Implementation Plan will set forth specific tasks, timetables, and

protocols to ensure that Defendants fulfill the requirements of each provision of the Decree; describe the hiring, training and supervision of the personnel necessary to implement the Decree; describe necessary resource development activities; identify any services or supports required in Transition Service Plans that are not currently available; and identify any services and supports which, based on demographic or other data, are expected to be required to meet defendants' obligations under the Decree.

**6. Attorneys' Fees and Costs**

In full settlement of attorneys' fees incurred in connection with the litigation, defendants will pay \$1,990,000.00 to class counsel. This is the same amount that was set forth in the previously proposed decree. Additionally, Defendants will pay all costs and expenses incurred by class counsel through and including the approval of the Decree and any appeal thereof.

**7. Jurisdiction and Termination of Consent Decree**

Under the Decree, the Court shall retain exclusive jurisdiction to oversee, supervise, modify and enforce the terms of the Decree. The Court shall retain such jurisdiction for at least nine years following the approval of the Decree; after that time period, termination of jurisdiction can be accomplished through a specific procedure set forth in the Decree.

**B. THE PROPOSED CONSENT DECREE MERITS PRELIMINARY APPROVAL**

Preliminary approval of a proposed settlement or, as is the case here, a proposed consent decree, is the first in a two-step process required before a class action may be settled. David F. Herr, *MANUAL FOR COMPLEX LITIGATION, FOURTH* ("MANUAL FOURTH"), § 30.41 (2005). In considering preliminary approval, the court must first determine whether the proposed settlement is within the range of reasonableness that ultimately could be given final approval. *See*

*Armstrong v. Board of School Directors of the City of Milwaukee*, 616 F.2d 305, 312 (7th Cir. 1980). The court must review the settlement for fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness. *Id.* (“The courts of appeals have required that district court approval of a settlement pursuant to Rule 23(e) be given only where the district court finds the settlement fair, reasonable and adequate.”). If the court finds that a settlement is “within the range of possible approval,” it then proceeds to the second step in the review process, the fairness hearing. *Id.*; *see also* 4 Robert Newberg, *NEWBERG ON CLASS ACTIONS* § 11:25 at 38 (4th ed. 2002) (“NEWBERG”) (“If the preliminary evaluation of the proposed settlement does not disclose grounds to doubt its fairness or other obvious deficiencies ... and appears to fall within the range of possible approval, the court should direct that notice under Rule 23(e) be given to the class members of a formal fairness hearing...”). The purpose of the fairness hearing is to “provide class members an opportunity to present their views on the proposed settlement and to hear arguments and evidence for and against the terms.” *MANUAL FOURTH, supra*, § 21.633.

The Seventh Circuit has identified six factors for analyzing whether a class action settlement or consent decree should be given final approval. These factors are equally germane in deciding whether to grant preliminary approval:

1. the strength of the plaintiff’s case on the merits balanced against the settlement;
2. the complexity, length and expense of continued litigation;
3. the amount of opposition to the settlement;
4. the presence of collusion in gaining a settlement;
5. the opinion of competent counsel regarding the reasonableness of the settlement;

and

6. the stage of the proceedings and the amount of discovery completed.

*See GE Capital Corp. v. Lease Resolution Corp.*, 128 F.3d 1074, 1082 (7th Cir. 1997); *Donovan v. Estate of Fitzsimmons*, 778 F.2d 298, 308 (7th Cir. 1985). The district court should refrain from resolving the merits of the case or resolving unsettled legal questions. *Carson v. American Brands, Inc.*, 450 U.S. 79, 88 n.14 (1981); *see also EEOC v. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc.*, 768 F.2d 884, 889 (7th Cir. 1985). Because the object of settlement is to avoid, not confront, the determination of contested issues, the approval process should not be converted into an abbreviated trial on the merits. *Van Horn v. Trickey*, 840 F.2d 604,607 (8th Cir. 1987) (“the district court need not undertake the type of detailed investigation that trying the case would involve”). Instead, the court’s inquiry should be “limited to the consideration of whether the proposed settlement is lawful, fair, reasonable, and adequate.” *Isby v. Bahy*, 75 F.3d 1191, 1196 (7th Cir. 1996). As set forth in the following sections, application of these six factors in the context of this litigation merits preliminary approval of the Decree.

**1. Strength of the Plaintiffs’ Case on the Merits Balanced Against the Terms of the Consent Decree**

The terms of the Decree are fair, reasonable and adequate when balanced against the strength of the Plaintiffs’ case on the merits. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants have failed to comply with the integration mandates required by the ADA, Section 504 and Title XIX, and specifically allege that Illinois does not have “a comprehensive, effectively working plan for placing qualified persons with [ ] disabilities in less restrictive settings” as required by *Olmstead*, 527 U.S. at 605-06. Plaintiffs have developed the necessary proof to support these claims, including the retention of four experts who would testify, among other things, that Illinois does not have a comprehensive, effectively working plan; that Illinois ranks last or near last among the states in the percentage of people with developmental disabilities living in small Community-

Based Settings; that unnecessary institutionalization of persons with developmental disabilities causes a diminution in overall quality of life and that most people with disabilities, regardless of the severity of the disability or the degree to which they have behavior problems, benefit from community living; and that persons who currently reside in ICF-DDs and have made a record wanting placements in Community-Based Settings, are eligible for Community-Based Settings, and such placements would be the most integrated setting for their needs.

Despite the strengths of Plaintiffs' case, Plaintiffs are mindful of the hurdles to establish Defendants' liability and overcome any affirmative defenses. Plaintiffs also are mindful of the possibility of an adverse ruling on appeal if they prevail at trial. Importantly, however, because the Decree ensures that persons with developmental disabilities are offered the opportunity to make informed, meaningful choices as to whether or not their needs can best be met in Community-Based Settings or ICF-DDs, and ensures the availability of Community-Based options for those who choose them, the Decree fully implements the relief sought in Plaintiffs' Complaint, which Defendants acknowledge is appropriate for the persons who their agencies are intended to serve. In addition, without conceding the merits of the Plaintiffs' allegations, Defendants believe that the services and supports required by the Decree are consistent with their vision of the future direction of the developmental disabilities system in Illinois. Accordingly, all Parties jointly submit that the Decree is fair, reasonable and adequate.

## **2. Complexity, Length and Expense of Continued Litigation**

The Parties submit that if the Decree is not approved, expensive and protracted litigation will ensue. Any trial will be complex, contentious and cumbersome. Collectively, the Parties would likely call over thirty witnesses, including four expert witnesses who reside outside

Illinois, and numerous State employees who reside in Springfield, Illinois. The costs and expenses of preparing these witnesses, and for trial in general, would be enormous.

In addition, both Plaintiffs and Defendants submit that if they do not prevail at trial, they would likely appeal the matter to the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. An appeal would all but guarantee that this litigation would drag on for several more years without resolution or the implementation of any relief for class members. One of the primary benefits of the Decree is that it provides reasonably prompt relief to the class, many of whom have been waiting years for Community-Based Services, without these additional major expenditures of time and money. These factors strongly weigh in favor of preliminary and final approval of the Decree.

### **3. Opposition to the Settlement**

As this Court is aware, there was significant opposition by putative class members of the prior class given the scope of the prior consent decree proposed last year. But broadly speaking, those objectors are not class members under the much more limited Decree that is the subject of this Motion. Still, objections are anticipated and a motion to intervene is pending.

However, like Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint, the Decree recognizes the significant concerns of those who opposed the more broadly sweeping relief set forth in the Parties' earlier effort. *Importantly, the proposed Class consists of only those who have affirmatively requested Community-Based Services or placement in Community-Based Settings.* Unlike the prior class and earlier proposed decree, those individuals who do not seek any change in their care simply are not members of the Class. They will not be sought out, much less considered or evaluated for any services. Only those who expressly state a desire to be considered for Community-Based Settings and services are impacted. The class definition is narrowly defined to include only those individuals for whom the Defendants have some record

indicating that they wish to receive Community-Based Services. Obviously, individuals who objected to the previous decree on the grounds that they do not wish to receive Community-Based Services will not have such a current record of requesting such services. Their rights and legally protected interests are not affected at all.

The Parties also anticipate, based on prior objections, that there may be objections to the fees provision in the Decree. Such an objection has no basis in statute or case law. The fact that Plaintiffs are represented by attorneys from four non-profit legal organizations and a private law firm does not preclude Plaintiffs from seeking fees and costs under the relevant fee shifting statutes or otherwise preclude Plaintiffs from recovering fees as part of a negotiated settlement. Importantly, the amount in the Decree is substantively unchanged, notwithstanding the fact that Plaintiffs' counsel spent substantial time litigating this case since agreeing to the earlier proposed consent decree. Courts have specifically rejected arguments that attorneys who work on a *pro bono* basis – whether as part of a nonprofit legal organization or as private counsel that agrees to work *pro bono* – should be denied the opportunity to seek fees, even though they did not expect payment from the client.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, the attorneys' fees provided by the Decree are comparable to fees in similar cases. For instance, in *K.L. v. Edgar*, No. 92 C 5722, 2000 WL 1499445 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 6, 2004), the ACLU of Illinois and its *pro bono* counsel were awarded over \$1.9 million in attorneys' fees in a class action on behalf of people with mental illness residing in state-operated institutions. The court held that “there is no question that nonprofit legal organizations are entitled to seek fees under section 1988, even if they charge none to their clients.” *Id.* at \*9. The class size and makeup in *K.L.* is comparable to that of the case at bar. Furthermore, no law

---

<sup>7</sup> Settlement agreements enforced through a consent decree like the one proposed here may serve as the basis for an award of attorneys' fees. See *Buckhannon Board and Care Home, Inc. v. West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources*, 532 U.S. 598, 604 (2001) (citing *Maher v. Gagne*, 448 U.S. 122 (1980)).

firm or individual attorney will receive any portion of these attorneys' fees and costs. Rather, the entire amount will be paid to non-profit organizations, to defray the expense of future civil rights litigation, advocacy and other activities in the public interest (including the monitoring of this Decree).<sup>8</sup> In all events, the fee payment provisions of the Decree here certainly are reasonable and fair, and provide no ground on which to deny approval of the Decree.

#### **4. Lack of Collusion**

As a matter of law, a court should presume that negotiations were conducted in good faith and that the resulting agreement was reached without collusion in the absence of evidence to the contrary. *Mars Steel v. Continental Ill. Nat'l Bank & Trust*, 834 F.2d 677, 681-81 (7th Cir. 1987); *Armstrong*, 616 2d at 325; Newberg at § 11.41. Nothing supports a different result here. The Parties have vigorously advocated their respective positions throughout the pendency of the case. The Parties have engaged in extensive written and deposition discovery, several contested discovery motions, as well as Plaintiffs' motion for class certification, and an appeal to the Seventh Circuit. Although the objectors and intervenors have stated before and may contend again that the Parties colluded to reach an "overarching goal" of reducing ICF-DD capacity, (*see, e.g.*, Mot. to Intervene, CM/ECF Doc. No. 446 at 6-7), casting such aspersions ignores the fact that the true overarching goal of the litigation is to provide relief for those adults with developmental disabilities who want to receive Community-Based Services. The Parties negotiated a settlement that provides exactly that and nothing more. Indeed, objectors have yet to show any evidence -- and none exists -- to demonstrate any improper collusion.

---

<sup>8</sup> Lawyers from the private law firm Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP are lead trial counsel in this litigation, and have agreed to donate any fee award (net of out-of-pocket expenses), to Equip for Equality, a non-profit organization that is the federally mandated Protection and Advocacy agency for people with disabilities in Illinois.

In addition, the Decree took months to negotiate. Numerous in-person meetings and settlement conferences were conducted. Counsel for the Parties exchanged several drafts, advocating forcefully for language most advantageous to their clients. *See, e.g., Maley v. Del Global Techs. Corp.*, 186 F.Supp.2d 358, 366 (S.D.N.Y. 2002) (finding negotiations leading to class action settlement were arm's length in part because they had occurred over several months and had involved several in-person meetings). Thus, because the Decree resulted from arm's length negotiations between experienced counsel after significant discovery had occurred, and no evidence exists to the contrary, the Decree should be presumed to have been reached without collusion. *See, e.g., Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc.*, 396 F.3d 96, 116 (2d Cir. 2005) ("presumption of fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness may attach to a class settlement reached in arm's-length negotiations between experienced, capable counsel after meaningful discovery").

#### **5. Opinion of Competent Counsel as to the Reasonableness of the Settlement**

The court is "entitled to rely heavily on the opinion of competent counsel." *Armstrong*, 616 F.2d at 325. Counsel for the Parties, who are competent and experienced in class action and civil rights litigation, all recommend acceptance of the Decree. The Decree provides a fair, reasonable, and adequate disposition of the lawsuit. Indeed, the Decree embodies the single most important aspect of the relief sought by Plaintiffs – that all persons with developmental disabilities are provided opportunities to have the Defendants honor their requests to receive services in the most integrated setting appropriate to their needs.

#### **6. Stage of the Proceeding and Amount of Discovery Completed**

Another factor strongly supporting approval of the Decree is the extent of written, oral, fact and expert discovery and fact finding which had been completed in this case before settlement was reached. The Parties have thoroughly explored the factual and legal

underpinnings, as well as the merits, of this case. The parties initially reached agreement regarding a settlement on the eve of trial after having spent more than three years actively litigating the case. The Parties then renegotiated a settlement based on the revised and much narrower class definition set forth in the Second Amended Complaint.

The Parties have produced and reviewed hundreds of thousands of pages of documents, conducted over thirty depositions on the merits, and worked extensively with five experts in related fields. Considerable third-party discovery was conducted. All Parties also had spent considerable time getting the matter ready for the original trial date of October 20, 2008, all of which would have been used in a trial based on the allegations in the Second Amended Complaint. Thus, there was a complete factual record upon which experienced class counsel could evaluate what would be a fair resolution for Plaintiffs and the Class.

**THE PROPOSED NOTICE PLAN SATISFIES THE REQUIREMENT OF RULE 23 AND DUE PROCESS**

Rule 23(e)(1) requires the court to direct notice of a proposed settlement in a “reasonable manner to all class members who would be bound by the proposal.” Although notice is mandatory to satisfy due process considerations, the extent of the notice is discretionary, particularly with a Rule 23(b)(2) class with no right of opt-out. *See Walsh v. Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.*, 726 F.2d 956, 962 (3d Cir. 1983) (Rule 23(c)(2)’s requirement of “the best notice practicable” is inapplicable for notice of settlement of a Rule 23(b)(2) class); *Fontana v. Elrod*, 826 F.2d 729, 732 (7th Cir. 1987) (notice not required after certification of a Rule 23(b)(2) class). In a Rule 23(b)(2) class action, “mechanics of the notice process are left to the discretion of the court subject only to the broad ‘reasonableness standards imposed by due process.’” *Fowler v. Birmingham News Co.*, 608 F.2d 1055, 1059 (5th Cir. 1979).

In determining what type of notice is reasonable, courts consider whether the notice is sufficient to “bring the proposed settlement to the attention of representative class members who may alert the court to inadequacies in class representation, or conflicts among subclasses, which might bear upon fairness of settlement.” *Walsh*, 726 F.2d at 963-64 (upholding notice by publication and mail to representative members in Rule 23(b)(2) class). Courts have routinely approved notice plans in Rule 23(b)(2) cases, such as this one, where notice consisted of publication and/or other reasonable forms of direct or indirect notice. *Fresco v. Auto Data Direct, Inc.*, 2007 WL 2330895, at \*8 (S.D. Fla. May 14, 2007) (approving a notice plan that included a combination of publication and Internet notice but did not require individual notice); *Hawker v. Consovoy*, 198 F.R.D. 619, 621 (D.N.J. 2001) (publication notice in two newspapers as well as in all relevant prisons and jails was sufficient). For example, in *Kaplan v. Chertoff*, 2008 WL 200108, \*13 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 24, 2008), the court approved a notice plan where a Rule 23(b)(2) class of approximately 50,000 non-US citizens seeking injunctive relief from the government settled the case, and the proposed notice included posting the notice on the appropriate governmental websites, and providing notice to a network of community-based and non-profit immigration organizations. *Id.* at \*13. Of particular relevance here is the court’s finding that “the organizations that receive[d] the notice are well-positioned to spread information regarding the settlement to their clients by posting the notice in their facilities or on their websites.” *Id.*

The Parties submit that the proposed Notice Plan (Exhibit B) provides for the most reasonable notice under the circumstances. The Notice Plan includes: (1) publication notice in nine newspapers throughout Illinois with a collective circulation of over one million readers; (2) posting notice on the websites of the Illinois Department of Human Services, Division of

Developmental Disabilities and Equip for Equality, the not-for-profit corporation appointed by the State of Illinois to implement the federally-mandated Protection and Advocacy System in Illinois for persons with, among other things, developmental disabilities; (3) mailed notice to all eighteen preadmission screening (“PAS”) agencies throughout Illinois, which are responsible, by contract with the State of Illinois, for determining an individual’s eligibility for developmental disabilities services; (4) mailed notice to numerous disability rights-related organizations; (5) mailed notice to all adults with developmental disabilities (and their guardians) for whom defendants have a record of having an affirmative request for Community-Based Services or placement in a Community-Based Setting; and (6) mailed notice to all 240 private ICF-DDs in Illinois with nine beds or more. The cost of the Notice Plan will be fully borne by defendants. The Notice Plan is reasonable and clearly satisfies due process.

In conjunction with the proposed Notice Plan, the Parties request that the Court approve the form and content of the proposed Notices. (*See Exhibit B.*) The Notices are written in simple terminology and include (i) a description of the class; (ii) a description of the Decree; (iii) an explanation of the rights of class members; (iv) the names of class counsel; (v) the fairness hearing date; (vi) a statement regarding attorneys’ fees and expenses; (vii) a statement of the deadline for filing objections to the Decree; and (viii) instructions for obtaining further information. Those Notices satisfy the content requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* MANUAL FOURTH, *supra* § 21.633.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, and pursuant to Rule 23, the Parties respectfully request that the Court enter an Order (1) certifying the settlement class as described; (2) granting preliminary

approval of the Decree; (3) commanding notice in the form and method of the Parties' proposed Notice Plan; and (4) setting a date for a Fairness Hearing on the Decree.

Dated: January 25, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

<b>For Plaintiffs</b>	<b>For Defendants</b>
<b>By: <u> /s/ Corey M. Shapiro</u></b>	<b>By: <u> /s/ (with consent of) Brent D. Stratton</u></b>
John Grossbart Wendy Enerson Corey Shapiro Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP 233 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 7800 Chicago, Illinois 60606	Brent D. Stratton Thomas A. Ioppolo Kathleen Kreisel Flahaven Office of the Attorney General of the State of Illinois 100 W. Randolph Street, 12 <sup>th</sup> Floor Chicago, Illinois 60601
Barry C. Taylor Laura J. Miller John W. Whitcomb Barry G. Lowy Kendra K. Hartman Equip for Equality 20 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 300 Chicago, Illinois 60602	Karen Konieczny John E. Huston Christopher S. Gange Office of the Attorney General of the State of Illinois 160 North LaSalle Street, Suite N-1000 Chicago, Illinois 60601
Ed Mullen Access Living of Metropolitan Chicago 115 West Chicago Avenue Chicago, IL 60610	
Benjamin S. Wolf Roger Baldwin Foundation of ACLU, Inc. 180 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 2300 Chicago, Illinois 60601	

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned, an attorney for the Plaintiffs, certifies that on January 25, 2010, he electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the counsel of record.

s/ Corey M. Shapiro

14836350