

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
MATTHEW MUMPHREY, *et al.*,  
  
Defendants.

Case No. [14-cr-00643-EMC-1](#)

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND  
DENYING IN PART DEFENDANTS’  
MOTION TO COMPEL**

Docket No. 119

In this collection of cases, a group of individuals, all of whom are African American and all who are being prosecuted for relatively low level drug trafficking in the Tenderloin under a program entitled Operation Safe Schools (“OSS”) (collectively, “Defendants”), contend their arrests and prosecution were based on racially selective actions taken by local and federal law enforcement. The issue currently before the Court is not whether racially selective actions were in fact taken, but whether Defendants are entitled to discovery to substantiate their claims of selective enforcement and prosecution.

After reviewing extensive briefing, the Court concludes that the record presented by the parties in connection with this motion contains substantial evidence suggestive of racially selective enforcement by the San Francisco Police Department (“SFPD”) and other federal law enforcement in connection with the conduct of OSS; that evidence is countered by a conspicuously meager rebuttal by the government. Accordingly, the Court concludes Defendants have made sufficient showing entitling them to discovery with respect to the claim of selective enforcement. However, the Court holds that, at least at this juncture, Defendants are not entitled to discovery with respect to their claim of selective prosecution. Defendants’ motion to compel discovery is thus **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part.

**I. BACKGROUND**

The above-referenced cases arise in the context of Operation Safe Schools (“OSS”). OSS was a program jointly undertaken by the U.S. Attorney’s Office (“USAO”), the Drug Enforcement Administration (“DEA”), and the San Francisco Police Department (“SFPD”).<sup>1</sup> *See United States v. Anthony*, No. CR-15-0005 EMC (Docket No. 11-2) (Phillips (FPD) Decl., Ex. C) (USAO press release, dated 12/9/2013) (USA Haag stating that she has “directed my office to work with the DEA and the [SFPD] to aggressively prosecute drug trafficking in areas around Tenderloin schools”). The purpose of OSS “was to aggressively prosecute drug dealers around schools and playgrounds in the Tenderloin district.” Docket No. 51-5 (Hasib (USAO) Decl. ¶ 3).

Two “sweeps” were done pursuant to OSS: one in late 2013 (August to November) and a second in late 2014 (October to December). *See* Defs.’ Ex. 3 (Cruz-Laucirica (FPD) Decl., Att. A) (spreadsheet of OSS cases). For the first sweep, 20 “buy/walk” operations were conducted. Fourteen out of the 20 individuals were prosecuted. *See* Docket No. 146-3 (Dorais (DEA) Decl. ¶ 4). For the second sweep, 23 operations were conducted, and all 23 individuals were prosecuted. *See* Docket No. 146-3 (Atakora (DEA) Decl. ¶ 1). Altogether (*i.e.*, for both sweeps), 37 individuals were prosecuted, more specifically, for violations of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841 and 860.<sup>2</sup> All 37 individuals are African American.

Currently pending before the Court is a joint motion filed by 12 of the individuals who

---

<sup>1</sup> According to Defendants, at least 46 law enforcement officers were involved in OSS, 34 being SFPD officers, 1 a Daly City officer, 10 DEA officers, and 1 a U.S. Marshal assigned to the DEA. *See* Mot. at 10. Defendants also claim that at least some of the SFPD officers were cross-designated as federal agents. *See* Mot. at 11. The government does not contest these claims. *See also United States v. Anthony*, No. CR-15-0005 EMC (Docket No. 11-1) (Sommerfeld (FPD) Decl., Att. A) (bar graph showing law enforcement officers involved and number of OSS cases each officer worked on); *United States v. Anthony*, No. CR-15-0005 EMC (Docket No. 42-1) (Nocetti (SFPD) Decl. ¶ 1) (testifying that he has been with the SFPD since 1991 and was assigned to serve as a Task Force Officer with DEA from 2000 until December 2013).

<sup>2</sup> *See* 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1) (providing that “it shall be unlawful for any person knowingly or intentionally – (1) to manufacture, distribute, or dispense, or possess with intent to manufacture, distribute, or dispense, a controlled substance”); *id.* § 860(a) (providing that “[a]ny person who violates [§ 841(a)(1)] by distributing, possessing with intent to distribute, or manufacturing a controlled substance in or on, or within one thousand feet of, the real property comprising a public or private elementary, vocational, or secondary school or a public or private college, junior college, or university, or a playground, or housing facility owned by a public housing authority, or within 100 feet of a public or private youth center, public swimming pool, or video arcade facility, is . . . subject to [certain enhanced punishment]”).

1 were targeted, arrested, and prosecuted pursuant to OSS. For convenience, these individuals shall  
 2 hereinafter be referred to collectively as “Defendants.” Defendants seek leave to serve discovery  
 3 related to two different, but related theories: (1) that law enforcement targeted persons for arrest  
 4 based on their race (*i.e.*, selective enforcement) and (2) that the prosecutors prosecuted the persons  
 5 based on their race (*i.e.*, selective prosecution). As indicated by the above, the Court hereby  
 6 **GRANTS** in part and **DENIES** in part Defendants’ motion to compel.

## 7 **II. ARMSTRONG**

8 The parties agree that *United States v. Armstrong*, 517 U.S. 456 (1996), provides the  
 9 governing standard for Defendants’ selective prosecution claim. As for the selective enforcement  
 10 claim, the parties also agree that *Armstrong* provides at least some general guidance, although  
 11 Defendants assert that *Armstrong* is not completely controlling given that some of its analysis was  
 12 specific to the role of a prosecutor which is distinct from the role of law enforcement. Given the  
 13 significance of *Armstrong*, the Court provides a brief synopsis as to the holding therein.

14 In *Armstrong*, the defendants were indicted on drug and firearm offenses. They alleged  
 15 that they were selected for prosecution because of their race (African American) and thus moved  
 16 for discovery or for dismissal of the indictment. *See id.* at 458-59.

17  
 18 In support of their motion, [the defendants] offered only an affidavit  
 19 by a “Paralegal Specialist,” employed by the Office of the Federal  
 20 Public Defender representing one of the [defendants]. The only  
 21 allegation in the affidavit was that, in every one of the 24 § 841 or §  
 22 846 [*i.e.*, drug] cases closed by the office during 1991 [*i.e.*, the year  
 before the defendants were indicted], the defendant was black.  
 Accompanying the affidavit was a “study” listing the 24 defendants,  
 their race, whether they were prosecuted for dealing cocaine as well  
 as crack, and the status of each case.

23 *Id.* at 459.

24 The district court ordered the government to provide discovery. Subsequently, the  
 25 government moved for reconsideration of the discovery order and submitted evidence for the  
 26 court’s consideration, including (1) affidavits from the federal and local agents participating in the  
 27 case, which stated that “race played no role in their investigation”; (2) an affidavit from an AUSA  
 28 who stated that the decision to prosecute met the general criteria for prosecution because, of, *e.g.*,

1 the amount of cocaine base involved, the criminal histories of the defendants, the strength of the  
2 evidence, etc.; and (3) sections of a DEA report which concluded that “‘large-scale, interstate  
3 tracking networks controlled by Jamaicans, Haitians, and Black street gangs dominate the  
4 manufacture and distribution of crack.’” *Id.* at 460.

5 In turn, the defendants provided additional information to the district court, including (1)  
6 an affidavit from one of defense counsel, stating that “an intake coordinator at a drug treatment  
7 center had told her that there are ‘an equal number of Caucasian users and dealers to minority  
8 users and dealers’”; (2) an affidavit from another criminal defense attorney, stating that “in his  
9 experience many nonblacks are prosecuted in state court for crack offenses”; and (3) a newspaper  
10 article “reporting that federal ‘crack criminals . . . are being punished far more severely than if  
11 they had been caught with powder cocaine, and almost every single one of them is black.’” *Id.* at  
12 460-61.

13 The district court denied the government’s motion for reconsideration and then, when the  
14 government stated it would not comply with the discovery order, dismissed the case.<sup>3</sup> *See id.* at  
15 461.

16 The specific issue as presented to the Supreme Court was what showing was necessary  
17 “for a defendant to be entitled to *discovery* on a claim that the prosecuting attorney singled him  
18 out for prosecution on the basis of his race.” *Id.* at 458 (emphasis added). However, before  
19 addressing this issue, the Supreme Court addressed the requirements for a selective prosecution  
20 claim. The Court explained first that there is a presumption that the prosecuting attorney has  
21 properly discharged his or her official duties and not violated equal protection. This presumption  
22 arises from the broad discretion a prosecutor is given in enforcing the criminal laws. *See id.* at  
23 464-65 (noting, *e.g.*, that, “[i]n the ordinary case, ‘so long as the prosecutor has probable cause to  
24 believe that the accused committed an offense defined by statute, the decision whether or not to  
25 prosecute, and what charge to file or bring before a grand jury, generally rests entirely in his  
26

---

27 <sup>3</sup> In a footnote, the Supreme Court noted that it had “never determined whether dismissal of the  
28 indictment, or some other sanction, is the proper remedy if a court determines that a defendant has  
been the victim of prosecution on the basis of his race.” *Armstrong*, 517 U.S. at 461 n.2.

1 discretion”). “[T]o dispel that presumption . . . , a criminal defendant must present ‘clear  
2 evidence to the contrary.’” *Id.* at 465. More specifically, the defendant must present clear  
3 evidence of discriminatory effect and discriminatory purpose. *See id.*

4 “Having reviewed the requirements to prove a selective-prosecution claim, [the Court]  
5 turn[ed] to the showing necessary to obtain discovery in support of such a claim.” *Id.* at 468.  
6 According to the Court, “[t]he justifications for a rigorous standard for the elements of a selective  
7 prosecution claim . . . require a correspondingly rigorous standard for discovery in aid of such a  
8 claim,” especially as discovery “will divert prosecutors’ resources” and “may disclose the  
9 Government’s prosecutorial strategy.” *Id.* It distilled the showing required for discovery as  
10 follows: there must be “‘*some evidence* tending to show the existence of the essential elements of  
11 the [selective prosecution] defense,’ discriminatory effect and discriminatory intent.” *Id.*  
12 (emphasis added).

13 For purposes of the case at hand, the Supreme Court only had to consider “what evidence  
14 constitutes ‘some evidence tending to show the existence’ of the discriminatory effect element.”  
15 *Id.* at 469. “The Court of Appeals [had] held that a defendant may establish a colorable basis for  
16 discriminatory effect without evidence that the Government has failed to prosecute others who are  
17 similarly situated to the defendant.” *Id.* The Supreme Court concluded that the appellate court  
18 was “mistaken in this view.” *Id.* It held that there must be “some evidence that similarly situated  
19 defendants of other races could have been prosecuted, but were not,” *i.e.*, “some evidence of  
20 differential treatment of similarly situated members of other races or protected classes.” *Id.* at 469-  
21 70.

22 The Supreme Court indicated that a similarly situated requirement was necessary in part  
23 because one could not assume, as the appellate court did below, that “‘people of *all* races commit  
24 *all* types of crimes” – *i.e.*, as opposed to “the premise that any type of crime is the exclusive  
25 province of any particular racial or ethnic group.”” *Id.* (emphasis added). The Court noted that  
26 not only was there no authority cited for the appellate court’s assumption but also that assumption  
27 “seems contradicted by the most recent statistics of the United States Sentencing Commission,”  
28 which showed, *e.g.*, that “[m]ore than 90% of the persons sentenced in 1994 for crack cocaine

1 trafficking were black, 93.4% of convicted LSD dealers were white, and 91% of those convicted  
2 for pornography or prostitution were white.” *Id.*<sup>4</sup>

3 In response to the concern that the similarly situated requirement would pose an  
4 evidentiary obstacle to a defendant, the Supreme Court stated as follows:

5  
6 In the present case, if the claim of selective prosecution were well  
7 founded, it should not have been an insuperable task to prove that  
8 persons of other races were being treated differently than  
9 respondents. For example, respondents could have investigated  
10 whether similarly situated persons of other races were prosecuted by  
11 the State of California and were known to federal law enforcement  
12 officers, but were not prosecuted in federal court.

13 *Id.* at 470.<sup>5</sup>

14 Ultimately, the Supreme Court held that, in the case under consideration, the defendants  
15 had not satisfied the requirement of “some evidence” of discriminatory effect. Defendants’  
16 “study” (*i.e.*, that, in every one of the 24 § 841 or § 846 cases closed by the FPD during 1991, the  
17 defendant was black)

18 failed to identify individuals who were not black and could have  
19 been prosecuted for the offenses for which responds were charged,  
20 but were not so prosecuted. . . . The newspaper article, which  
21 discussed the discriminatory effect of the federal drug sentencing  
22 laws, was not relevant to an allegation of discrimination in decisions  
23 to prosecute. [The] affidavits, which recounted one attorney’s  
24 conversation with a drug treatment center employee and the  
25 experience of another attorney defending drug prosecutions in state  
26 court, recounted hearsay and reported personal conclusions based on  
27 anecdotal evidence.

28  

---

29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

<sup>4</sup> The Court did not address the question-begging nature of these statistics; it is possible that these statistics on conviction and sentencing themselves reflect bias patterns of enforcement and prosecution, not simply the pattern of actual law violations. *See, e.g.,* Sonja B. Starr & M. Marit Rehavi, *Mandatory Sentencing & Racial Disparity: Assessing the Role of Prosecutors and the Effects of Booker*, 123 Yale L.J. 2 (2013).

<sup>5</sup> Even though the Supreme Court made reference to whether federal law enforcement *knew* of similarly situated persons being prosecuted in state court, that would seem to be more an issue with respect to discriminatory *intent* rather than discriminatory *effect*. *Cf. United States v. Tuitt*, 68 F. Supp. 2d 4, 10 (D. Mass. 1999) (noting that “the Supreme Court’s actual analysis of the evidence offered in *Armstrong* . . . in some ways appears to conflate the elements of effect and intent”).



1 *Id.*

2 After *Armstrong*, the Supreme Court issued another opinion on selective prosecution. *See*  
 3 *United States v. Bass*, 536 U.S. 862 (2002) (per curiam). The opinion – very brief – addressed a  
 4 contention made by a defendant that the government had decided to seek the death penalty against  
 5 him because of his race. The defendant sought dismissal based on this claim or, in the alternative,  
 6 discovery about the government’s capital charging practices. *See id.* at 862-63. The Supreme  
 7 Court concluded that the defendant had failed to “make a ‘credible showing’ that ‘similarly  
 8 situated individuals of a different race were not [charged],’” as required to demonstrate  
 9 discriminatory effect. *Id.* at 863.

10

11 The Sixth Circuit concluded that respondent had made such a  
 12 showing based on nationwide statistics demonstrating that “the  
 13 United States charges blacks with a death-eligible offense more than  
 14 twice as often as it charges white” and that the United States enters  
 15 into plea bargains more frequently with whites than it does with  
 blacks. Even assuming that the *Armstrong* requirement can be  
 satisfied by a nationwide showing (as opposed to a showing  
 regarding the record of the decisionmakers in respondent’s case),  
 raw statistics regarding overall charges say nothing about charges  
 brought against *similarly situated defendants*. . . .

16 *Id.* at 863-64 (emphasis added).<sup>6</sup>

17 In the instant case, both parties agree that *Armstrong* provides the general framework for  
 18 both selective prosecution and selective enforcement claims – *i.e.*, there must be both a  
 19 discriminatory effect and a discriminatory purpose. *See, e.g., United States v. Barlow*, 310 F.3d  
 20 1007, 1010 (7th Cir. 2002) (noting that defendant was “complain[ing] not of selective prosecution,  
 21 but of racial profiling [by the DEA], a selective law enforcement tactic[,] [b]ut the same analysis  
 22 governs both types of claims: a defendant seeking discovery on a selective enforcement claim  
 23 must meet the same ‘ordinary equal protection standards’ that *Armstrong* outlines for selective  
 24

---

25 <sup>6</sup> Although the *Armstrong* and *Bass* Courts focused on similarly situated as part of the  
 26 discriminatory effect analysis, evidence of differential treatment is also probative of  
 27 discriminatory intent. *See United States v. Smith*, 231 F.3d 800, 809 (11th Cir. 2000)  
 (“recogniz[ing] that the nature of the two prongs of a selective prosecution showing are such that  
 they will often overlap to some extent”); *cf. Pac. Shores Props., LLC v. City of Newport Beach*,  
 28 730 F.3d 1142, 1158 (9th Cir. 2013) (indicating that, in a civil case where discrimination is  
 alleged, preferential treatment of a similarly situated person can be evidence of discriminatory  
 intent).

1 prosecution claims”). Defendants, argue, however, that the specific discriminatory effect analysis  
2 in *Armstrong* applies only to selective prosecution claims, and not selective enforcement claims,  
3 because the analysis was targeted to the special role that a prosecutor has. Defendants point out  
4 that, in *United States v. Davis*, 793 F.3d 712 (7th Cir. 2015) (en banc), the Seventh Circuit, sitting  
5 en banc, acknowledged the distinction between selective enforcement and selective prosecution  
6 and found the rationale of *Armstrong* does not apply with full force where prosecutorial discretion  
7 is not involved.

8 In *Davis*, there were seven African American defendants who were charged “with several  
9 federal offenses arising from a plan to rob a stash house, where the defendants believed they  
10 would find drugs and money.” *Davis*, 793 F.3d at 714. The defendants argued that “the  
11 prosecutor, the FBI, and the ATF engaged in racial discrimination” by proceeding against them.  
12 *Id.* In support of their claim of discrimination, the defendants informed the district court that,  
13 “since 2006[,] the United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois has prosecuted 20  
14 stash-house stings, and that of the defendants in these cases 75 were black and 19 white.” *Id.* at  
15 715 (adding that “13 of the 19 white defendants were Hispanic”). The district court permitted  
16 discovery because “the overwhelming majority of the defendants named [were] individuals of  
17 color.” *Id.* at 719.

18 The Seventh Circuit disagreed with the district court, stating that its decision was

19  
20 inconsistent with *Armstrong*. The record in *Armstrong* showed that  
21 every defendant in every crack-cocaine prosecution filed by a  
22 particular United States Attorney’s office and assigned to the public  
23 defender was black. If, as the Supreme Court held, that evidence did  
24 not justify discovery into the way the prosecutor selected cases, then  
25 proof that in the Northern District of Illinois three-quarters of the  
26 defendants in stash-house cases have been black does not suffice.

27 *Id.* at 719-20.

28 But the Seventh Circuit then went on to note that the matter before it was not “that simple”  
because *Armstrong* was a pure selective prosecution case. *Id.* at 720.

The Supreme Court [noted] that federal prosecutors deserve a strong  
presumption of honest and constitutional behavior, which cannot be



1 overcome simply by a racial disproportion in the outcome, for  
 2 disparate impact differs from discriminatory intent. The Justices  
 3 also noted that there are good reasons why the Judicial Branch  
 4 should not attempt to supervise how the Executive Branch exercises  
 5 prosecutorial discretion. In order to give a measure of protection  
 6 (and confidentiality) to the Executive Branch's deliberative  
 7 processes, which are covered by strong privileges, the Court in  
 8 *Armstrong* insisted that the defendant produce evidence that persons  
 9 of a different race, but otherwise comparable in criminal behavior,  
 10 were presented to the United States Attorney for prosecution, but  
 11 that prosecution was declined.

12 *Id.*

13 The Seventh Circuit then noted that the case before it was not really a selective prosecution  
 14 case but rather a selective enforcement case – “the defendant’s principal targets are the ATF and  
 15 the FBI.” *Id.* But

16 [a]gents of the ATF and FBI are not protected by a powerful  
 17 privilege or covered by a presumption of constitutional behavior.  
 18 Unlike prosecutors, agents regularly testify in criminal cases, and  
 19 their credibility may be relentlessly attacked by defense counsel.  
 20 They also may have to testify in pretrial proceedings, such as  
 21 hearings on motions to suppress evidence, and again their honesty is  
 22 open to challenge. Statements that agents make in affidavits for  
 23 search or arrest warrants may be contested, and the court may need  
 24 their testimony to decide whether if shorn of untruthful statements  
 25 the affidavits would have established probable cause. Before  
 26 holding hearings (or civil trials) district judges regularly, and  
 27 properly, allow discovery into nonprivileged aspects of what agents  
 28 have said or done. In sum, the sort of considerations that led to the  
 outcome in *Armstrong* do not apply to a contention that agents of the  
 FBI or ATF engaged in racial discrimination when selecting targets  
 for sting operations, or when deciding which suspects to refer for  
 prosecution.

29 *Id.* at 720-21. *But see United States v. Alcaraz-Arellano*, 441 F.3d 1252, 1264 (10th Cir. 2006)  
 30 (stating that “[s]imilar caution is required in reviewing a claim of selective law enforcement”).

31 Although the Court agrees with the reasoning in *Davis*, it need not resolve this issue  
 32 whether *Armstrong* applies with full force to claims of selective enforcement. The Court finds  
 33 that, even assuming it does, Defendants have satisfied *Armstrong* in respect to their claim of  
 34 selective enforcement.

### 35 **III. RECORD EVIDENCE**

36 Both parties have provided evidence in conjunction with the pending motion. The primary

1 evidence is briefly outlined below.

2 A. Defendants' Evidence

- 3 • The fact that all 37 OSS defendants are African American.
- 4 • Charging data (between January 1, 2013, and February 28, 2015) from the San Francisco  
5 Superior Court, more specifically, with respect to drug-trafficking crimes in the  
6 Tenderloin. *See* Mot. at 20. The data reflected that 61.4% of those arrested and charged  
7 were African American, 24.7% were Latino, and 10.7% were white. *See* Mot. at 21; *see*  
8 *also* 2d Phillips (FPD) Decl., Ex. M (Beckett Rpt. at 7). Defendants' expert, Dr. Beckett,  
9 concluded that, based on a comparison of the charging data to the OSS results (where all  
10 persons charged were African American), there was a Z score of 4.75. A Z score of 4.75  
11 is highly significant. *See* Amram (FPD) Reply Decl., Att. A (Supp. Beckett Rpt. at Ex.  
12 05248-49). As Defendants explain, and the government does not dispute, a Z score is used  
13 to measure the statistical significance of an observed difference. "Z scores with an  
14 absolute value of 2 or more are considered statistically significant, meaning that the  
15 observed difference is very unlikely to be the result of chance." Mot. at 14 n.24.
- 16 • A survey administered to active drug users accessing services at the Tenderloin Needle  
17 Exchange site of the San Francisco AIDS Foundation's Needle Exchange Program. The  
18 survey commenced in August 2015, *see* Defs.' Ex. 41 (2d Phillips Decl., Ex. M) (Beckett  
19 Expert Report at 5), and was conducted on seven consecutive weeks.<sup>7</sup> *See* Mot. at 14. "In  
20 the survey, respondents were asked to recall up to six recent drug transactions that took  
21 place in the Tenderloin neighborhood and to identify the race/ethnicity of the person from  
22 whom they obtained the drugs." Mot. at 14. The data from the survey reflected as  
23 follows: 56% of the Tenderloin drug transactions involved African American drug sellers;  
24 20% involved Latino drug sellers; and 16.8% involved white drug sellers. *See* Mot. at 14.  
25 Similar to above Defendants' expert, Dr. Beckett, concluded that, based on a comparison  
26 of the survey results to the OSS results, there was a Z score of 5.23. *See* Amram (FPD)

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>7</sup> The government attempts to equate the survey with anecdotal evidence, *see* Opp'n at 21, but that is not a fair criticism given the way that the survey was designed and conducted.

1 Reply Decl., Att. A (Supp. Beckett Rpt. at Ex. 05248-49).

- 2 • Declarations from six persons who work in the Tenderloin. *See* Defs.’ Ex. 25 (Martinez  
3 Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 26 (Sandoval Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 27 (Brown Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 28 (Allen  
4 Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 32 (Harkin Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 36 (Leslie Decl.). The declarations  
5 generally indicate that there is a significant presence of non-African American drug dealers  
6 in the Tenderloin, particularly in certain locations within the Tenderloin. *See, e.g.*, Defs.’  
7 Ex. 32 (Harkin Decl. ¶ 6) (Program Manager for GLIDE Health Services HIV and  
8 Hepatitis C programs, stating that “I have found that drug dealers of the same ethnic group  
9 tend to work the same areas of the Tenderloin[;] [f]or example, most recently,  
10 Leavenworth has Honduran and Mexican drug dealers, Golden Gate Avenue has Whites  
11 and African Americans above Jones Street and just African Americans at Jones Street and  
12 below, and Hyde Street has Mexicans regularly dealing drugs there”).
- 13 • SFPD incident reports, some of which indicate SFPD “awareness of the presence,  
14 behavior, and specific geographic locations frequented by Hispanic/Latino dealers” in the  
15 Tenderloin. Mot. at 22 (giving six incident reports as examples). *See, e.g.*, Koeninger  
16 (FPD) Decl., Att. D at Ex. 00773 (SFPD incident report, dated April 2013 and authored by  
17 Officer G. Darcy) (stating that “I have participated in hundreds of buys busts and  
18 surveillance in this area” and that “I know that many of the drug dealers in the Hyde Street  
19 area are of Honduran descent”); Koeninger (FPD) Decl., Att. D at Ex. 00736 (SFPD  
20 incident report, dated April 2015 and authored by Officer D. Casey) (stating that, “[b]ased  
21 off prior arrests and contacts, I know that the corner of Eddy Street and Hyde Street is  
22 primarily controlled by Honduran national drug dealers”).
- 23 • Evidence related to approximately sixty non-African American drug dealers who  
24 Defendants claim are similarly situated to Defendants. *See* Mot. at 24 *et seq.* (identifying  
25 approximately forty such drug dealers); Reply at 14 *et seq.* (adding more comparators).  
26 Like Defendants, these sixty or so persons were arrested for committing drug-trafficking  
27 crimes in the Tenderloin within the OSS timeframe but, unlike Defendants, were not  
28 federally charged under OSS. Some of the OSS officers were involved with the arrests of

- 1 some of these individuals. *See* Reply at 37-38. *See, e.g.*, Koeninger (FPD) Decl., Att. A at  
 2 Ex. 226-3) (SFPD incident report for Doe 6) (reflecting that the following OSS officers  
 3 were involved in the arrest of Doe 6: Officers MacDonald (involved in 21 OSS cases), Lee  
 4 (involved in 21 OSS cases), Daggs (involved in 23 OSS cases), Solorzano (involved in 13  
 5 OSS cases), Payne (involved in 9 OSS cases), and Hagan (involved in 11 OSS cases)).
- 6 • Video from one of the OSS cases (*United States v. McNeal*, No. CR-15-0028 EMC)  
 7 showing that one officer says, “Fucking BMs” (*i.e.*, black males) and another officer says,  
 8 “Shh, hey, I’m rolling.” *See* Defs.’ Ex. 5 (1st Phillips (FPD) Decl. ¶¶ 3, 5). The officer  
 9 who made the first statement was involved in a total of 18 OSS cases; the officer who  
 10 made the second statement was involved in a total of 11 OSS cases.
  - 11 • Video from one of the OSS cases (now resolved) (*United States v. Roberts*, No. CR-13-  
 12 0760 CRB) where the undercover informant declines to buy drugs from an Asian woman  
 13 and waits to buy drugs from the defendant, an African American woman. *See* Mot. at 60-  
 14 61; *see also* *United States v. Anthony*, No. CR-15-0005 EMC (Docket No. 11-2) (Phillips  
 15 (FPD) Decl., Ex. G) (video in *Roberts* case).
  - 16 • The USAO’s knowledge of problems with racism within the SFPD, at least prior to the  
 17 second sweep in late 2014 (October to December). Defendants point to the fact that, in  
 18 early 2014, the USAO indicted three SFPD officers for, *inter alia*, civil rights violations  
 19 and, prior to trial in November 2014, racist texts were disclosed. (However, none of the  
 20 officers appears to have been involved with OSS.)
  - 21 • Declarations from approximately 20-25 OSS defendants (some of the defendants are  
 22 moving parties, some are not) who describe how SFPD officers have treated African  
 23 Americans, including but not limited to how they have paid more attention to African  
 24 Americans than to persons of other races.
    - 25 ○ Some of the OSS defendants talk about negative interactions with officers who  
 26 were specifically involved with OSS – *e.g.*, (1) Shaughn Ryan (2 OSS cases), *see*,  
 27 *e.g.*, Defs.’ Ex. 7 (Nash Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 9 (McNeal Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 10 (Jones  
 28 Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 14 (Rouse Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 18 (Williams Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 19

(Reed Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 20 (Adams Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 21 (Reddic Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 24 (Jules Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 29 (Johnson Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 30 (Cross Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 35 (Wallace Decl.); (2) Darren Nocetti (29 OSS cases), *see, e.g.*, Defs.’ Ex. 8 (Mathews Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 37 (Mackey Decl.); (3) Ryan Crosby (11 OSS cases), *see, e.g.*, Defs.’ Ex. 12 (Anthony Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 16 (White Decl.); (4) D. Goff (6 OSS cases), *see, e.g.*, Defs.’ Ex. 19 (Reed Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 34 (Jackson Decl.); Defs.’ Ex. 35 (Wallace Decl.); (5) Anthony Assaretto (8 OSS cases), *see, e.g.*, Defs.’ Ex. 34 (Jackson Decl. ¶ 2); (6) Micah Hope (6 OSS cases), *see, e.g.*, Defs.’ Ex. 20 (Adams Decl.); and (7) A. Scafani (14 OSS cases), *see, e.g.*, Defs.’ Ex. 35 (Wallace Decl.). Some of these interactions, while negative, do not clearly involve race.

- According to some of the defendants, some of the OSS officers (*e.g.*, Shaughn Ryan, Darren Nocetti, Anthony Assaretto, D. Goff, and A. Scafani) have expressly made racist statements or engaged in racist conduct. *See, e.g.*, Defs.’ Ex. 7 (Nash Decl. ¶ 5) (“On other occasions, Officer Ryan has referred to African-American females as ‘bitches’ and has made comments that women who are confidential informants for him are ‘bitches that work for me.’”); Defs. Ex. 9 (McNeal Decl. ¶ 5) (“Officer Ryan said a comment to me like, ‘I just got married and you better be glad . . . or I’ll take some black pussy.”); Defs.’ Ex. 21 (Reddic Decl. ¶ 4) (“On other occasions, Officer Ryan has referred to me as a ‘bitch’ or ‘little black girl.’”); Defs.’ Ex. 37 (Mackey Decl. ¶ 3) (“Shortly before my arrest in December, an SFPD officer I know as Darren yelled that I ‘better get [my] black ass off the block.”); Defs.’ Ex. 34 (Jackson Decl. ¶ 2) (“On one occasion, I heard Officer Assaretto call an Africa[n]-American man ‘nigger.’”); Defs.’ Ex. 35 (Wallace Decl. ¶ 7) (“In 2014, I witnessed Officers Goff, Scafani and another [SFPD] Officer harass a small group of African-American teenagers. One of the officers told the group, ‘Hands up, don’t shoot.’ The comment seemed to be intended to make fun of the Black Lives Matter movement.”).

- 1           ○       According to some of the female OSS defendants, some of the OSS officers have  
2 engaged in sexually inappropriate behavior with them. *See* Mot. at 63-67  
3 (identifying Shaughn Ryan as a particular problem but also pointing to D. Goff and  
4 Ryan Crosby). While the incidents are clearly gender based, they are not always  
5 clearly race based.

6 B.       Government's Evidence

7           In its opposition, the government provided declarations from several USAO attorneys and  
8 two DEA agents (both supervisors). In these declarations, the attorneys and supervisors deny they  
9 considered race or directed anyone to consider race in their management of the OSS. Below is a  
10 summary of the evidence the government submitted in support of its position. The declarations  
11 submitted by the government have been categorized by sweep.

12           For the **first OSS sweep**:

- 13       •       Katie Dorais, Special Agent of the DEA. *See* Pl.'s Ex. 3 (Dorais (DEA) Decl.). Ms.  
14 Dorais worked on the first sweep only. Her supervisor in the DEA assigned her as the lead  
15 investigator for OSS. According to Ms. Dorais, the investigation "focused on repeat  
16 offenders and/or known drug traffickers who were selling drugs near schools in the  
17 Tenderloin." Pl.'s Ex. 3 (Dorais (DEA) Decl. ¶ 2). Also according to Ms. Dorais, race  
18 was not a consideration: "At no time did I consider race during either phase of [OSS]. In  
19 addition, I was not instructed by an [AUSA] to consider race during the investigation [and]  
20 I did not direct any law enforcement officer to take race into consideration." Pl.'s Ex. 3  
21 (Dorais (DEA) Decl. ¶ 3). "Between August of 2013 and December of 2013 [the  
22 investigatory] team conducted twenty buy/walk Operations." Pl.'s Ex. 3 (Dorais (DEA)  
23 Decl. ¶ 4). Ms. Dorais does not explain whether she directly supervised each team  
24 member in the field when the arrests were made or whether she delegated the arrest  
25 decision to other law enforcement officers, *e.g.*, other DEA officers or SFPD officers.  
26 Fourteen out of the 20 persons were arrested and indicted. The remaining 6 were not  
27 prosecuted because she and the supervising ASUA (see below) concluded that the evidence  
28 was not sufficient for prosecution – *i.e.*, the evidence was not strong enough. *See* Pl.'s Ex.



1 3 (Dorais (DEA) Decl. ¶ 4). Ms. Dorais does not explain why the evidence was not strong  
 2 enough. In its brief, however, the government indicates that the evidence was not strong  
 3 enough because “the videotape did not show the drug deal with sufficient clarity.” Opp’n  
 4 at 17 n.10; *see also* Pl.’s Ex. 2 (Supp. Hasib (USAO) Decl. ¶ 4). The Court does not have  
 5 any information about the race of the 6 persons who were not prosecuted.

- 6 • Waqar Hasib, AUSA in the USAO. There are technically two declarations from Mr.  
 7 Hasib, one being submitted as a part of this motion and one that was submitted earlier in  
 8 the proceedings in conjunction with a different motion. *See* Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Hasib (USAO)  
 9 Decl.); Pl.’s Ex. 2 (Supp. Hasib (USAO) Decl.). OSS was Mr. Hasib’s idea. *See* Pl.’s Ex.  
 10 1 (Hasib (USAO) ¶ 3). According to Mr. Hasib, the purpose of OSS “was to aggressively  
 11 prosecute drug dealers around schools and playgrounds in the Tenderloin district.” Pl.’s  
 12 Ex. 1 (Hasib (USAO) Decl. ¶ 3). It appears that Ms. Hasib was the attorney who primarily  
 13 authorized prosecutions in the first sweep cases.<sup>8</sup> *See* Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Hasib (USAO) Decl. ¶  
 14 4). (The government did not submit any declarations from the line AUSAs who  
 15 recommended prosecution to Mr. Hasib.) Mr. Hasib authorized the prosecutions based on  
 16 the sufficiency of the evidence (each case included a videotaped drug deal) and did not  
 17 consider race. *See* Pl.’s Ex. 2 (Supp. Hasib (USAO) Decl. ¶ 2). “Indeed, in the large  
 18 majority of these cases, [he] was entirely unaware of any particular individual’s race when  
 19 [he] authorized presentation to the grand jury.” Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Hasib (USAO) Decl. ¶ 4). Mr.  
 20 Hasib did consider the individual’s criminal history prior to authorizing indictment because  
 21 OSS was intended to “target recidivist, repeat offenders who were selling drugs near  
 22 schools.” Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Hasib (USAO) Decl. ¶ 6). Mr. Hasib did decline to authorize  
 23 prosecution on some of the first sweep cases and typically did so “because the video  
 24 recording did not clearly identify the individual who sold drugs.” Pl.’s Ex. 2 (Supp. Hasib  
 25

---

26 <sup>8</sup> Another AUSA, Matthew McCarthy, seems to have authorized prosecution on a handful of OSS  
 27 cases. *See* Pl.’s Ex. 2 (McCarthy (USAO) Decl. ¶ 2). Like Mr. Hasib, Mr. McCarthy states that  
 28 race was not a consideration in his decision to commence prosecution. *See* Pl.’s Ex. 2 (McCarthy  
 (USAO) Decl. ¶ 3) (“AUSA Hasib’s prosecution memoranda did not mention the race of the  
 proposed defendants, and I did not review video or photographs of those defendants.”).

1 (USAO) Decl. ¶ 4).

2 For the **second sweep**:

- 3 • Charles Atakora, Special Agent of the DEA. Mr. Atakora appears to have worked on the  
4 second sweep cases only. He was assigned to OSS by his supervisor as the Case Agent.  
5 He “coordinated the investigations, collected evidence and presented twenty[-]three cases  
6 to the [USAO]. The [USAO] then presented the evidence to the grand jury which resulted  
7 in twenty[-]three indictments.” Pl.’s Ex. 3 (Atakora (DEA) Decl. ¶ 1). According to Mr.  
8 Atakora, the investigation focused on “repeat offenders, prior arrestees, and/or known  
9 narcotic dealers in the Tenderloin . . . that were conducting narcotic transactions near  
10 schools.” Pl.’s Ex. 3 (Atakora Decl. (DEA) Decl. ¶ 2). Also according to Mr. Atakora, he  
11 “did not consider race during the investigative process, and [he is] not aware of any  
12 investigator or prosecutor considering race during [OSS].” Pl.’s Ex. 3 (Atakora Decl.  
13 (DEA) Decl. ¶ 2). Like Ms. Dorais, Mr. Atakora does not explain whether he directly  
14 supervised each team member in the field when the arrests were made or whether he  
15 delegated the arrest decision to other law enforcement officers, *e.g.*, other DEA officers or  
16 SFPD officers.
- 17 • Sarah Hawkins, AUSA in the USAO. There are technically two declarations from Ms.  
18 Hawkins, one being submitted as a part of this motion and one that was submitted earlier in  
19 the proceedings in conjunction with a different motion. *See* Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Hawkins (USAO)  
20 Decl.); Pl.’s Ex. 2 (Supp. Hawkins (USAO) Decl.). Ms. Hawkins worked only on second  
21 sweep cases. More specifically, she worked on cases involving 12 out of the 23 persons  
22 implicated in the second sweep. *See* Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Hawkins (USAO) Decl. ¶¶ 2-3). Ms.  
23 Hawkins recommended prosecutions for these 12 people. (She did not have the authority  
24 to commence prosecutions.) *See* Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Hawkins (USAO) Decl. ¶¶ 1-3). For each of  
25 the cases, she was “provided an account of the individual’s conduct memorialized in a  
26 [DEA] Form 6, surveillance video of drug buys taken by the [SFPD], and the criminal  
27 history of the defendant.” Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Hawkins (USAO) Decl. ¶ 5); *see also* Pls.’ Ex. 2  
28 (Supp. Hawkins (USAO) Decl. ¶ 2). She recommended prosecutions based on the

1 sufficiency of the evidence and did not consider race. *See* Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Hawkins (USAO)  
2 Decl. ¶¶ 4-5). She worked on her OSS cases independent of the other line AUSA (*i.e.*, Mr.  
3 Farnham). *See* Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Hawkins (USAO) Decl. ¶ 10).

4 • Lloyd Farnham, AUSA in the USAO. There are technically two declarations from Mr.  
5 Farnham, one being submitted as a part of this motion and one that was submitted earlier in  
6 the proceedings in conjunction with a different motion. *See* Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Farnham (USAO)  
7 Decl.); Pl.’s Ex. 2 (Supp. Farnham (USAO) Decl.). Like Ms. Hawkins, Mr. Farnham  
8 worked only on second sweep cases. More specifically, he worked on cases involving 11  
9 out of the 23 persons implicated in the second sweep. *See* Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Farnham (USAO)  
10 Decl. ¶¶ 2-3). Mr. Farnham recommended prosecutions for these 11 people. (He did not  
11 have the authority to commence prosecutions.) *See* Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Farnham (USAO) Decl. ¶¶  
12 1-3). For each of the cases, he was “provided an account of the individual’s conduct  
13 memorialized in a [DEA] Form 6, surveillance video of drug buys taken by the [SFPD],  
14 and the criminal history of the defendant.” Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Farnham (USAO) Decl. ¶ 5); *see*  
15 *also* Pls.’ Ex. 2 (Supp. Farnham (USAO) Decl. ¶ 2). He recommended prosecutions based  
16 on the sufficiency of the evidence and did not consider race. *See* Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Farnham  
17 (USAO) Decl. ¶¶ 4-5). He worked on his OSS cases independent of the other line AUSA  
18 (*i.e.*, Ms. Hawkins). *See* Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Farnham (USAO) Decl. ¶ 10).

19 • Kevin Barry, AUSA in the USAO. There are technically two declarations from Mr. Barry,  
20 one being submitted as a part of this motion and one that was submitted earlier in the  
21 proceedings in conjunction with a different motion. *See* Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Barry (USAO) Decl.);  
22 Pl.’s Ex. 2 (Supp. Barry (USAO) Decl.). Mr. Barry worked only on second sweep cases.  
23 More specifically, Mr. Barry approved the recommendation of prosecution for 7 out of the  
24 23 people captured in the second sweep. *See* Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Barry (USAO) Decl. ¶¶ 2-3).  
25 Mr. Barry authorized the prosecutions based on the sufficiency of the evidence and did not  
26 consider race. In fact, he was “unaware of any individual’s race at the time [he] authorized  
27 prosecution to the grand jury, and [he] remained unaware of their race at the time the grand  
28 jury returned the indictments.” Pl.’s Ex. 1 (Barry (USAO) Decl. ¶ 5). Mr. Barry did

1 consider the individual's criminal history prior to authorizing an indictment because OSS  
2 was "targeted [at] persistent, recidivist, and repeat offenders selling drugs near schools in  
3 the Tenderloin." Pl.'s Ex. 1 (Barry (USAO) Decl. ¶ 7). Three of the 7 persons whom Mr.  
4 Barry authorized for prosecution were career offenders, and another 2 were likely  
5 classified as Category III. *See* Pl.'s Ex. 1 (Barry (USAO) Decl. ¶ 7).

- 6 • Daniel Kaleba, AUSA in the USAO. There are technically two declarations from Mr.  
7 Kaleba, one being submitted as a part of this motion and one that was submitted earlier in  
8 the proceedings in conjunction with a different motion. *See* Pl.'s Ex. 1 (Kaleba (ASAO)  
9 Decl.); Pl.'s Ex. 2 (Supp. Kaleba (USAO) Decl.). Mr. Kaleba worked only on second  
10 sweep cases. More specifically, Mr. Kaleba approved the recommendation of prosecution  
11 for 16 out of the 23 people captured in the second sweep. *See* Pl.'s Ex. 1 (Kaleba (USAO)  
12 Decl. ¶¶ 2-3). Mr. Kaleba authorized the prosecutions based on the sufficiency of the  
13 evidence and did not consider race. In fact, he was "unaware of any individual's race at  
14 the time [he] authorized prosecution to the grand jury, and [he] remained unaware at the  
15 time the grand jury returned its indictments." Pl.'s Ex. 1 (Kaleba (USAO) Decl. ¶ 5). Mr.  
16 Kaleba did consider the individual's criminal history prior to authorizing an indictment  
17 because OSS was "targeted [at] persistent, recidivist, and repeat offenders selling drugs  
18 near schools in the Tenderloin." Pl.'s Ex. 1 (Kaleba (USAO) Decl. ¶ 6). Nine of the 16  
19 persons whom Mr. Kaleba authorized for prosecution were career offenders. *See* Pl.'s Ex.  
20 1 (Kaleba (USAO) Decl. ¶ 6).

21 Surprisingly, the government has *not* provided *any* declarations from SFPD officers or any  
22 nonsupervisory DEA agents about the actual operation of OSS. *As a result, the Court has no*  
23 *information on the critical question as to how the targeting and arrests of the OSS defendants*  
24 *operated in the field.* While there is evidence that high-level supervisors did not direct officers in  
25 the field to target suspects on the basis of race, the government offers no explanation as to how the  
26 highly improbable outcome that all 37 suspects were African Americans occurred, even though it  
27 appears from the record that African Americans constitute roughly 60%, not 100%, of drug  
28 trafficking in the Tenderloin. The government presented no evidence of how suspects for OSS

1 “buys” were selected.

2 At the hearing, the government suggested for the first time that, as OSS operated in the  
3 Tenderloin, certain corners of the area were targeted first, which explained why all the OSS  
4 defendants are all African American – *i.e.*, those corners of the Tenderloin are dominated by  
5 African American drug dealers as opposed to, *e.g.*, Hispanic drug dealers. But the government  
6 never presented to the Court any *evidence* supporting this claim. Moreover, that representation,  
7 even if true, is problematic; it does not address who made the decision as to which corners should  
8 first be targeted and *why* only corners dominated by African American were targeted. Nor does  
9 the representation address Defendants’ evidence showing racial patterns are not so clear as the  
10 government contends. For instance, non-African Americans were, in fact, arrested for drug  
11 offenses (by the SFPD) all over the Tenderloin –even on corners that purportedly had  
12 predominantly African American drug dealers; yet, no non-African American drug dealers in  
13 those areas was ever arrested and prosecuted for a federal crime under OSS. *See* Sommerfeld  
14 (FPD) Decl. ¶ 9 & Att. C (map showing location of Tenderloin arrests with respect to San  
15 Francisco Superior Court charging data).

16 The fact that the government failed to present any evidence as to how OSS suspects were  
17 selected for “buys” and arrested for OSS prosecution – despite Defendants’ substantial evidence  
18 suggesting race-based enforcement – is puzzling. At the hearing, the government stated that the  
19 lack of any evidence from the SFPD was because the SFPD refused to cooperate or provide  
20 assistance. This is surprising given that SFPD officers appear routinely in federal prosecution for  
21 *e.g.*, drug offenses, including prosecution arising out of OSS specifically. Obtaining SFPD  
22 cooperation in prosecutions where the SFPD has been involved in investigations and arrests has  
23 never been a problem to this Court’s knowledge. It is also questionable why the government  
24 could have not compelled at least some of the SFPD officers to cooperate since some were also  
25 cross-designated as federal agents. Furthermore, the government failed to explain why it did not  
26 secure any declarations from nonsupervisory DEA agents who were familiar with the operation in  
27 the field. Although the government indicated, at the hearing, that one of the supervisory DEA  
28 agents did actually participate in the targeting and/or arrest of some of the OSS defendants, his

1 declaration is, notably, lacking in any detail about how the targeting and arrests actually operated  
2 in the field (*e.g.*, how were the targeting decisions made?).

3 As a consequence, Defendants' evidence of selective enforcement is left largely  
4 un rebutted.

#### 5 IV. SELECTIVE ENFORCEMENT

6 As stated above, Defendants seek discovery on two different theories: (1) selective  
7 enforcement and (2) selective prosecution. The Court addresses the selective enforcement theory  
8 first.

##### 9 A. Dismissal as a Remedy for Selective Enforcement

10 As an initial matter, the government argues that Defendants' motion to compel discovery  
11 on the selective enforcement theory should be denied outright because dismissal is not a remedy  
12 where a criminal defendant raises a claim of selective enforcement. The Court does not find the  
13 government's position persuasive.

14 First, the Court takes note that the government does not challenge dismissal as an available  
15 remedy for a selective prosecution claim – only as a remedy for a selective enforcement claim.<sup>9</sup>  
16 But racial discrimination in enforcement of criminal laws is constitutionally as injurious as racial  
17 discrimination in prosecution. It is difficult to discern why selective prosecution warrants  
18 dismissal, but selective enforcement (upon which prosecution is necessarily predicated) would not.

19  
20  
21 <sup>9</sup> As noted above, in *Armstrong*, the Supreme Court stated in a footnote that it had “never  
22 determined whether dismissal of the indictment, or some other sanction, is the proper remedy if a  
23 court determines that a defendant has been the victim of *prosecution* on the basis of his race.”  
24 *Armstrong*, 517 U.S. at 461 n.2 (emphasis added). Notwithstanding this statement, the  
25 government does not dispute that dismissal is in fact a remedy for a claim of selective prosecution.  
26 Indeed, that the remedy of dismissal is proper is supported by *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356  
27 (1886), which is discussed *infra*. Furthermore, circuit courts that have acknowledged that  
28 dismissal is a remedy for a selective prosecution claim, *see, e.g., In re Aiken County*, 725 F.3d  
255, 264 n.7 (D.C. Cir. 2013) (stating that, “[i]f the Executive selectively prosecutes based on  
impermissible considerations, the equal protection remedy is to dismiss the prosecution”); *United  
States v. Vasquez*, 145 F.3d 74, 82 n.6 (2d Cir. 1998) (stating that “[s]elective prosecution claims  
usually come up in litigation as affirmative defenses to prosecution, and the remedy is generally  
dismissal of the suit that was selectively prosecuted”); *Feder v. Village of Shiloh*, No. 97-1101,  
1997 U.S. App. LEXIS 19190, at \*5 n.3 (7th Cir. July 22, 1997) (acknowledging the *Armstrong*  
footnote but adding that the remedy of dismissal “seems to be implicit in other decisions of the  
Supreme Court, and this court implicitly has accepted that as the correct remedy”), and the  
government does not point to any authority to the contrary.



1 Racially selective action by law enforcement inflicts harm whether it is perpetrated by law  
2 enforcement in the streets or by a prosecutor in an office – both inflict substantial injury on the  
3 victim and society: in addition to violating the victim’s rights to equality and liberty, such  
4 discriminatory conduct impugns the integrity of the criminal justice system and compromises  
5 public confidence therein. As the Tenth Circuit explained in *Alcaraz-Arellano*, “[r]acially  
6 selective law enforcement violates this nation’s constitutional values at the most fundamental  
7 level; indeed, unequal application of criminal law to white and black persons was one of the  
8 central evils addressed by the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment.” *Id.* at 1263. The Seventh  
9 and Tenth Circuits have likewise held that dismissal of criminal proceedings is a proper remedy  
10 for selective enforcement. *See Davis*, 793 F.3d at 712 (en banc) (addressing a motion to dismiss  
11 based on selective enforcement); *Alcaraz-Arellano*, 441 F.3d at 1252 (same).

12 At the hearing, the government suggested that dismissal as a remedy for selective  
13 enforcement would be unfair to prosecutors who did not engage in discrimination. This argument  
14 is flawed. It ignores the fact that, in cases of selective enforcement, even if the prosecutors did not  
15 discriminate, law enforcement did, and thus there has still been a constitutional injury suffered by  
16 the victim of discrimination. The focus of the Fourteenth Amendment is not so much what is fair  
17 to prosecutors, but what is fair for the victims of discrimination.

18 Second, as amicus ACLU points out in its brief, in *Yick Wo*, the Supreme Court found  
19 dismissal an appropriate remedy for selective enforcement. In *Yick Wo*, the petitioners were  
20 Chinese persons who were arrested and ultimately imprisoned for violating local ordinances  
21 regarding laundry establishments. Each ordinance provided that it was unlawful for persons to  
22 operate laundry establishments in wooden buildings without first getting the consent of the board  
23 of supervisors. *See Yick Wo*, 118 U.S. at 368. The consent of the supervisors was not given to the  
24 petitioners and some 200 other Chinese persons while some 80 non-Chinese persons were  
25 “permitted to carry on the same business under similar conditions.” *Id.* at 374. The petitioners  
26 argued that their imprisonment was a violation of the Equal Protection Clause (*i.e.*, based on race).  
27 The Supreme Court agreed, holding that the administration of the ordinances was  
28

1 directed so exclusively against a particular class of persons [*i.e.*,  
 2 Chinese persons] as to warrant and require the conclusion, that,  
 3 whatever may have been the intent of the ordinances as adopted,  
 4 they are *applied by the public authorities charged with their*  
 5 *administration*, and thus representing the State itself, with a mind so  
 6 unequal and oppressive as to amount to a practical denial by the  
 7 State of that equal protection of the laws . . . . Though the law itself  
 be fair on its face and impartial in appearance, yet, if it is applied  
 and administered by public authority with an evil eye and an  
 unequal hand, so as to practically to make unjust and illegal  
 discriminations between persons in similar circumstances, material  
 to their rights, the denial of equal justice is still within the  
 prohibition of the Constitution.

8 *Id.* at 373-74 (emphasis added). The administration of the ordinances was within the province of  
 9 the board of supervisors, not the local prosecutor. *See id.* at 374 (stating that “[n]o reason  
 10 whatever, except the will of the supervisors, is assigned why [the petitioners] should not be  
 11 permitted to carry on, in the accustomed manner, their harmless and useful occupation, on which  
 12 they depend for a livelihood”). Thus, although the discrimination at issue in *Yick Wo* was a form  
 13 of selective enforcement rather than selective prosecution, the Supreme Court ordered that the  
 14 petitioners be discharged as a remedy for the equal protection violation – a remedy that is akin to a  
 15 dismissal.

16 Third, while the government argues that in, *United States v. Gomez-Lopez*, 62 F.3d 304  
 17 (9th Cir. 1995) (a pre-*Armstrong* case), the Ninth Circuit held that selective enforcement is not a  
 18 ground for dismissal (in the absence of a prosecutor’s knowledge of law enforcement officers’  
 19 targeting decisions), *see* Opp’n at 3-6, *Gomez-Lopez* is inapposite. In *Gomez-Lopez*, the defendant  
 20 brought a claim for selective prosecution, not selective enforcement. The main holding of the case  
 21 was that circuit-wide discovery was not permissible when all evidence pointed to decision-making  
 22 being made at the local level. *See, e.g.*, 306-07 (stating that “the question in this case is whether  
 23 the district court abused its discretion in ordering circuit-wide discovery without any indication  
 24 that decision-making occurred at the circuit level”; adding that “[t]here is no evidence that the  
 25 decision to prosecute [the defendant] was made by anyone other than the USAO for the Central  
 26 District”).

27 The government protests still that *Gomez-Lopez* weighs in its favor based on the following  
 28 language from the opinion:

1 We held in *United States v. Erne*, 576 F.3d 212 (9th Cir. 1979), that  
2 the proper focus in discriminatory prosecution cases is on the  
3 ultimate decision-maker. In *Erne*, we considered whether an  
4 evidentiary hearing was required on allegations that an Internal  
5 Revenue Service officer who referred Erne for prosecution  
6 impermissibly discriminated on the basis of Erne's exercise of his  
7 First Amendment rights. Because the revenue officer's  
8 recommendation for prosecution went through several internal  
9 reviews, and the United States Attorney ultimately decided whether  
10 to initiate criminal proceedings, we held that "even if [the revenue  
11 officer's] initial role in referring the matter for prosecution involved  
12 an improper discriminatory motive, it would be insufficient to taint  
13 the entire administrative process."

14 Likewise in *United States v. Greene*, 698 F.2d 1364 (9th Cir. 1983),  
15 the defendant pursued a claim of selective prosecution based on a  
16 showing that an IRS agent referred Greene for prosecution because  
17 of an impermissible motive. Again, we held that even if the agent's  
18 role in referring the matter for prosecution involved an improper  
19 discriminatory motive, it would be insufficient because "the ultimate  
20 decision to prosecute is several steps removed from the revenue  
21 officer."

22 *Gomez-Lopez*, 62 F.3d at 306. However, this language simply indicates that a selective  
23 prosecution claim should focus on the acts of the prosecutor. It does not foreclose a selective  
24 enforcement claim.

25 Finally, while there is authority to support the government's position – most notably, the  
26 Sixth Circuit's decision in *United States v. Nichols*, 512 F.3d 789 (6th Cir. 2008)<sup>10</sup> – that authority  
27 is distinguishable and in any event not binding precedent on this Court. In *Nichols*, the defendant  
28 claimed that a police officer's decision to run a warrant check on him was based on his race, thus  
violating the Equal Protection Clause. *See id.* It appears that the only remedy sought by the  
defendant was exclusion – *i.e.*, suppression of evidence found by the police during a subsequent  
search of a vehicle that he was inside. The Sixth Circuit held that exclusion was not a remedy  
available for an equal protection violation. The Sixth Circuit also held that, in lieu of exclusion as  
a remedy, a person whose rights were allegedly violated could bring a civil lawsuit. *See id.* at  
794-95. The relevant portion from *Nichols* is as follows:

<sup>10</sup> *See also United States v. Williams*, 431 F.3d 296, 299 (8th Cir. 2005) (stating that, even if there were a due process violation based on racial profiling, "it is uncertain that dismissal is an appropriate remedy").

1 While we, of course, agree with the general proposition that  
 2 selective enforcement of the law based on a suspect's race may  
 3 violate the Fourteenth Amendment, we do not agree that the proper  
 4 remedy for such violations is necessarily suppression of evidence  
 5 otherwise lawfully obtained. The exclusionary rule is typically  
 6 applied as a remedy for Fourth Amendment violations, which  
 7 Amendment does not apply to pre-contact investigatory steps like  
 8 that presented here (the decision to run a warrant check). *See Avery*,  
 9 137 F.3d at 353 (“[A]n officer's actions during the pre-contact stage  
 10 cannot give rise to Fourth Amendment constitutional concerns  
 11 because the citizen has not yet been ‘seized.’”). Even if the Fourth  
 12 Amendment were implicated, any challenge to a search or seizure  
 13 based on legitimate probable cause, but in which it is alleged the  
 14 officer's subjective motive was discriminatory, is doomed to fail.  
 15 *See Whren*, 517 U.S. at 813 (unanimously rejecting such a challenge  
 16 and holding that “[s]ubjective intentions play no role in ordinary,  
 17 probable-cause Fourth Amendment analysis”). Though the Court  
 18 left open the door to equal protection challenges in the same context,  
 19 it gave no hint as to what the appropriate remedy would be. *See*  
 20 *ibid.* Since we know from *Whren* that the evidence against Nichols  
 21 would not be suppressed under the Fourth Amendment (even if the  
 22 officers were improperly motivated by race), we are reluctant to  
 23 graft that Amendment's traditional remedy into the equal protection  
 24 context. Indeed, we are aware of no court that has ever applied the  
 25 exclusionary rule for a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment's  
 26 Equal Protection Clause and we decline Nichols's invitation to do so  
 27 here. Rather, we believe the proper remedy for any alleged violation  
 28 is a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against the offending officers. *See, e.g.,*  
*Farm Labor Org. Comm. v. Ohio State Highway Patrol*, 308 F.3d  
 523 (6th Cir. 2002) (rejecting officer's qualified immunity defense  
 and affirming partial summary judgment in favor of Hispanic  
 motorists who brought equal protection challenge under § 1983).

18 *Id.* at 794.

19 The Sixth Circuit's holding in *Nichols* is not persuasive. First, *Nichols* did not address the  
 20 remedy of dismissal; but to the extent one could infer from *Nichols* that dismissal of an  
 21 indictment, like exclusion, would not be an appropriate remedy for selective enforcement, such a  
 22 result cannot be squared with *Yick Wo*, where as noted above, the Supreme Court ordered the  
 23 remedy of discharge; notably, the fact that a § 1983 civil lawsuit was theoretically available was  
 24 not a factor.<sup>11</sup>

25 Furthermore, in *Nichols*, the Sixth Circuit's decision was based on its reluctance to graft  
 26 the remedy exclusion on to the Fourteenth Amendment because of that remedy's traditional

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
 28 <sup>11</sup> Section 1983 was enacted prior to *Yick Wo*. *See Filarsky v. Delia*, 132 S. Ct. 1657, 1658 (2012)  
 (noting that § 1983 was enacted in 1871).

1 association with the Fourth Amendment. Apart from the fact that the Fourteenth Amendment is a  
 2 different constitutional source providing for different protections than the Fourth Amendment,<sup>12</sup> in  
 3 *Nichols*, “there was no intrusion at all on Nichols’s personal liberties by the initial actions of the  
 4 officer [–] [t]here was no search, no seizure.” *Id.* at 795. Under those circumstances, the Court  
 5 appeared to view exclusion is an extreme remedy. Here, in contrast, Defendants were subject to  
 6 seizure and then referred to federal authority for prosecution for charges which entailed an  
 7 enhanced mandatory minimum sentence.<sup>13</sup> Unlike *Nichols*, the selective enforcement here did  
 8 operate to inflict a substantial intrusion upon Defendants’ personal liberties.

9 Moreover, while the Sixth Circuit grounded its analysis in terms of deterrence as the focus  
 10 of the exclusionary rule,<sup>14</sup> the remedy for a Fourteenth Amendment violation encompasses more  
 11 than deterrence. *Cf. Alcaraz-Arellano*, 441 F.3d at 1263 (stating that “[r]acially selective law  
 12 enforcement violates this nation’s constitutional values at the most fundamental level; indeed,  
 13 unequal application of criminal law to white and black persons was one of the central evils  
 14 addressed by the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment”). While dismissal of charges brought  
 15 about as a result of a constitutional violation may serve in part as a deterrent to race-based law  
 16 enforcement, it is also designed in part to redress that violation. *Cf. Davis v. United States*, 564  
 17 U.S. 229, 236-37 (2011) (stating that the exclusionary rule is a judicially created remedy the only  
 18 purpose of which “is to deter future Fourth Amendment violations”; exclusion is not even  
 19 “designed to ‘redress’ the injury occasioned by an unconstitutional search”) (emphasis added). It  
 20 puts the victim where he or she could have been but for racially selective conduct of law

21  
 22 \_\_\_\_\_  
 23 <sup>12</sup> It could also be argued that violation of the Fourteenth Amendment as a result of racially  
 24 selective law enforcement is by definition more likely to be a systemic practice than an unlawful  
 25 search.

26 <sup>13</sup> In most cases, the quantity of drugs charged was small, but because the sales occurred within  
 27 1,000 feet of a school, charges if proven carried an enhanced sentence under 21 U.S.C. § 860. *See*  
 28 21 U.S.C. § 860(a) (providing that a violator is “subject to (1) twice the maximum punishment  
 authorized by section 401(b) [21 U.S.C. § 841(b)], and (2) at least twice any term of supervised  
 release authorized by section 401(b) for a first offense”). This enhancement applied even if the  
 amount sold was only a fraction of a gram of crack cocaine, as occurred in OSS.

<sup>14</sup> *See Lingo v. City of Salem*, No. 14-35344, --- F.3d --- (9th Cir. June 27, 2016) (emphasizing  
 deterrence rationale for exclusionary rule).

1 enforcement.

2           *Nichols's* assumption that a Fourteenth Amendment violation can adequately be addressed  
3 through a civil lawsuit is questionable. It is not clear a civil remedy for selective enforcement  
4 leading to a prosecution is available, particularly if the defendant is convicted. *See Heck v.*  
5 *Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477, 487 (1994) (stating that, if “a judgment in favor of the plaintiff would  
6 necessarily imply the invalidity of his conviction or sentence the complaint must be dismissed  
7 unless the plaintiff can demonstrate that the conviction or sentence has already been invalidated”);  
8 *Young v. City of Peoria*, No. 12-cv-1086, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 153861, at \*10 n.5 (C.D. Cal.  
9 June 29, 2012) (noting that “Young may not be able to bring a § 1983 claim for damages from an  
10 unlawful state conviction without first having the conviction overturned in some manner [under  
11 *Heck*]” and that “Young’s selective prosecution claim, if successful, would necessarily mean that  
12 his conviction was unlawful”).

13           Accordingly, the Court concludes, consistent with the holdings of the Seventh and Tenth  
14 Circuits, that dismissal of an indictment is a proper remedy for a selective enforcement claim if  
15 proven. Having so held, the Court must next address whether there is some evidence of  
16 discriminatory effect and then some evidence of discriminatory intent sufficient to warrant  
17 discovery.

18 B.       Selective Enforcement – Discriminatory Effect

19       1.       Similarly Situated Evidence Requirement

20           As an initial matter, the Court addresses Defendants’ contention that discriminatory effect  
21 for selective enforcement purposes can be established based simply on the fact that all 37 OSS  
22 defendants are African American – *i.e.*, there is no need to do the *Armstrong* similarly situated  
23 analysis. This is the approach that the Seventh Circuit adopted in *Davis* (discussed above).

24           As noted above, *Davis* held that, as a general matter, in a selective enforcement case, a  
25 defendant need not necessarily provide some evidence as to preferential treatment of similarly  
26 situated persons outside the protected class in order to obtain discovery. Rather, the defendant can  
27 simply rely on statistics showing, *e.g.*, that a significant majority of persons targeted by law  
28



1 enforcement is made up of members of a protected class.<sup>15</sup> Under *Davis*, Defendants have  
 2 established some evidence of discriminatory effect because all 37 of those targeted and arrested  
 3 under the OSS program for whom the Court has information are all African American.<sup>16</sup>  
 4 Defendants have submitted undisputable evidence that these numbers are highly significant as a  
 5 statistical matter. The Court agrees with the approach in *Davis* and thus finds the statistical  
 6 showing made by Defendants herein establishes discriminatory effect of selective enforcement.

7       2.       Similarly Situated Evidence

8       Assuming, however, a statistical showing alone is not sufficient to show discriminatory  
 9 effect under *Armstrong*, and that the similarly situated requirement must be shown even in a  
 10 selective enforcement (as opposed to selective prosecution) case, Defendants have satisfied that  
 11 requirement. Defendants have shown some evidence that “similarly situated individuals of a  
 12 different race were not [targeted]” by law enforcement. *Armstrong*, 517 U.S. at 465.

13       To be sure, there is a threshold question of what the *Armstrong* Court meant by “similarly  
 14 situated.” In their motion, Defendants have provided examples of how various circuit courts have  
 15 defined the term. See Mot. at 72-75. See, e.g., *United States v. Lewis*, 517 F.3d 20, 25 (1st Cir.  
 16 2008) (stating that “[a] similarly situated offender is one outside the protected class who has  
 17 committed roughly the same crime under roughly the same circumstances but against whom the  
 18 law has not been enforced”); *United States v. Olvis*, 97 F.3d 739, 744 (4th Cir. 1996) (stating that  
 19 “defendants are similarly situated when their circumstances present no distinguishable legitimate  
 20 prosecutorial factors that might justify making different prosecutorial decisions with respect to  
 21 them”). The Ninth Circuit has not defined “similarly situated” since *Armstrong* was decided.  
 22 However, in a pre-*Armstrong* decision, the Ninth Circuit noted as follows:

23                               The goal of identifying a similarly situated class of law breakers is  
 24                               to isolate the factor allegedly subject to impermissible

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
 26 <sup>15</sup> At least one circuit court seems to have disagreed with the holding in *Davis* (although,  
 27 admittedly, the case was decided before *Davis*). See *Alcaraz-Arellano*, 441 F.3d at 1264 (stating  
 28 that “[s]imilar caution is required in reviewing a claim of selective law enforcement”).

<sup>16</sup> As noted above, 6 out of the 43 persons arrested under OSS were ultimately not prosecuted.  
 There is no evidence as to what the racial identities of those 6 persons are.

1 discrimination. The similarly situated group is the control group.  
 2 The control group and defendant are the same *in all relevant*  
 3 *respects*, except that defendant was, for instance, exercising his first  
 4 amendment rights. If all other things are equal, the prosecution of  
 only those persons exercising their constitutional rights gives rise to  
 an inference of discrimination. But where the comparison group has  
 less in common with defendant, then factors other than the protected  
 expression may very well play a part in the prosecution.

5 *United States v. Aguilar*, 883 F.2d 662, 706 (9th Cir. 1989) (emphasis added), *superseded by*  
 6 *statute on other grounds as stated in United States v. Gonzalez-Torres*, 273 F.3d 1181, 1187 (9th  
 7 Cir. 2001).

8 This approach makes sense and it consistent with how the term “similarly situated” is  
 9 understood in civil discrimination cases. *See United States v. Brantley*, 803 F.3d 1265, 1271-72  
 10 (11th Cir. 2015) (in a selective prosecution case, noting that, “[i]n a different context – when a  
 11 Title VII plaintiff complains she was treated differently than a similarly situated co-worker – we  
 12 have required the plaintiff and the employee to be similarly situated ‘in all relevant respects’” in  
 13 order “to prevent courts from second-guessing a reasonable decision by the employer”; “[t]he  
 14 same considerations apply in a challenge based upon selective prosecution” – *i.e.*, “a court is not  
 15 free to second-guess the prosecutor’s exercise of a charging discretion”).

16 But, importantly, there is no magic formula for determining who is similarly situated.  
 17 “Different factors will be relevant for different types of inquiries – it would be imprudent to turn a  
 18 common-sense inquiry into a complicated legal one.” *Chavez v. Ill. St. Police*, 251 F.3d 612, 635  
 19 (7th Cir. 2001) (§ 1983 selective enforcement case). A court should take “care[] not to define the  
 20 [similarly situated] requirement too narrowly.” *Id.* Here, similarly situated should include  
 21 consideration of the goals of the program. As discussed below, even under the government’s  
 22 purported criteria for prosecution under OSS (*e.g.*, history of drug dealing, strength of the  
 23 evidence), Defendants have demonstrated there were similarly situated non-African Americans  
 24 who were not arrested and subject to prosecution under OSS.

25 Defendants’ evidence on this point includes:

- 26 • 100% of the OSS defendants are African American, which contrasts with the San  
 27 Francisco Superior Court charging data obtained by Defendants (61.4% of those arrested  
 28 and charged for drug-trafficking crimes in the Tenderloin were African American, **24.7%**

1           **were Latino, and 10.7% were white)** and the survey information obtained by Defendants  
 2           (56% of the Tenderloin drug transactions involved African American drug sellers, **20%**  
 3           **involved Latino drug sellers, and 16.8% involved white drug sellers**). *See* Mot. at 14,  
 4           21, 76; *cf. Armstrong*, 517 U.S. at 470 (noting that “respondents could have investigated  
 5           whether similarly situated persons of other races were prosecuted by the State of California  
 6           and were known to federal law enforcement officers, but were not prosecuted in federal  
 7           court”).

- 8           • The San Francisco Superior Court charging data includes **hundreds of cases involving**  
 9           **non-African Americans** that could have been charged with a violation of § 860  
 10           specifically because “[a]lmost every area of the Tenderloin falls within 1,000 feet of a  
 11           playground or educational institutional.” Mot. at 76.
- 12           • Defendants have identified approximately **sixty specific instances in which non-African**  
 13           **American drug dealers** were arrested for committing drug-trafficking crimes in the  
 14           Tenderloin in recent years but were not federally charged under OSS.
- 15           • Video from one of the OSS cases (now resolved) (*United States v. Roberts*, No. CR-13-  
 16           0760 CRB) where the undercover informant **declines to buy drugs from an Asian**  
 17           **woman and waits to buy drugs from the defendant, an African American woman.**  
 18           *See* Mot. at 60-61; *see also United States v. Anthony*, No. CR-15-0005 EMC (Docket No.  
 19           11-2) (Phillips (FPD) Decl., Ex. G) (video in *Roberts* case).

20           The Court agrees with Defendants that this is enough to satisfy the similarly situated  
 21           evidence requirement for discovery purposes. The evidence shows there are substantial numbers  
 22           (and a substantial proportion) of drug dealers in the Tenderloin who are *not* African American; yet  
 23           they were not stopped or arrested under OSS. Defendants have proffered specific examples of  
 24           similar situated non-African Americans not arrested and charged in OSS.

25           In its papers, the government protests that nonetheless the similarly situated requirement  
 26           has not been met. For example, the government asserts that the OSS cases are different from the  
 27           comparator cases cited by Defendants because the OSS cases had strong evidence – *i.e.*, the drug  
 28           transactions were videotaped. *See* Opp’n at 17 (stating that “the defendants do not cite to a

1 videotaped drug sale in any of the 42 John and Jane Doe cases set forth in their motion for  
 2 discovery”). But as Defendants point out, that fact should have no impact on their selective  
 3 enforcement theory. The question for selective enforcement is whether law enforcement was  
 4 improperly targeting African Americans in the first place. That law enforcement, *after* making the  
 5 targeting decision, videotaped the transaction is irrelevant to the initial selection of the target. *See*  
 6 Mot. at 87. Videotape evidence simply begs the question of *whom* was targeted for an OSS “buy”  
 7 in the first place.

8 The government also challenges Defendants’ similarly situated evidence on the ground that  
 9 the examples cited by Defendants did not involve “the same basic crime” being committed “in  
 10 substantially the same manner.” Opp’n at 18-19 (quoting *Smith*, 231 F.3d at 810 (Eleventh  
 11 Circuit decision)).<sup>17</sup> But there should be no real dispute here that the same basic crime was  
 12 involved – drug trafficking in the Tenderloin and near a school.

13 The government’s real beef, therefore, seems to be about how the crimes were committed.  
 14 More specifically, for the non-OSS examples provided by Defendants, not all crimes involved  
 15 hand-to-hand drug deals. For example, some Does were investigated based on informant tips;  
 16 searches were executed in other Doe cases. *See* Opp’n at 18-20. But the government does not  
 17 seem to dispute at least some of the non-OSS cases did involve hand-to-hand drug deals. Indeed,  
 18 Defendants provided additional examples in their reply brief that involved such deals. One  
 19 similarly situated example is arguably all Defendants need to show discriminatory effect. *See*  
 20 *United States v. Alabi*, 597 Fed. Appx. 991, 996 (10th Cir. 2015) (stating that “[w]e have  
 21 recognized three possible methods of providing discriminatory effect in a selective-enforcement  
 22

---

23 <sup>17</sup> In *Smith*, the Eleventh Circuit stated:

24 [W]e define a “similarly situated” person for selective prosecution  
 25 purposes as one who engaged in the same type of conduct, which  
 26 means that the comparator committed the same basic crime in  
 27 substantially the same manner as the defendant – so that any  
 28 prosecution of that individual would have the same deterrence value  
 and would be related in the same way to the Government’s  
 enforcement priorities and enforcement plan – and against whom the  
 evidence was as strong or stronger than that against the defendant.

*Smith*, 231 F.3d at 810.

1 case: statistical evidence; *the identification of a similarly situated individual who could have been,*  
 2 *but was not, stopped or arrested;* and, in certain circumstances, anecdotal evidence establishing an  
 3 officer’s pattern of similarly discriminatory behavior”) (emphasis added). Moreover, even for the  
 4 non-OSS examples that did not involve hand-to-hand deals, the question is whether that difference  
 5 was material for the similarly situated analysis. Why did the manner of sales make a difference  
 6 from the viewpoint of the objective of the OSS program? *Cf. Lewis*, 517 F.3d at 25 (“The focus of  
 7 an inquiring court must be on factors that are at least arguably material to the decision as to  
 8 whether or not to prosecute. Material prosecutorial factors are those that are relevant – that is, that  
 9 have some meaningful relationship either to the charges at issue or to the accused – and that might  
 10 be considered by a reasonable prosecutor.”). The government has failed to provide an explanation  
 11 as to how those differences were material. Indeed, as Defendants argue, because the OSS  
 12 defendants were charged with violating § 841(a), *i.e.*, possession with mere intent to distribute, it  
 13 should not matter whether there was a hand-to-hand deal. *See Reply* at 39-41 (also arguing that  
 14 the government has improperly focused on how the officers investigated or discovered the crime).

15 Finally, the government suggests that any discriminatory effects are exaggerated because  
 16 Defendants are assuming that “[OSS] selected 37 individuals for prosecution on 37 independent  
 17 occasions,” but that was not in fact the case: “[T]he [OSS] arrests were concentrated in a relatively  
 18 small number of areas on a limited number of days. . . . [T]here was clear temporal and geographic  
 19 clustering, which undermines the assumption of independence across the 37 arrests.” *Opp’n* at 26.  
 20 But Defendants’ expert addresses this in her supplemental report.

21  
 22 In any given data set, some arrests are potentially “clustered” by  
 23 time and space. For example, arrests involving parties involved in  
 24 the same criminal event are not temporally or spatially independent  
 25 of each other. Yet this fact has not prevented well-respected, peer-  
 reviewed social science journals from publishing research that uses  
 the Z-score test to assess the likelihood that any racial disparities  
 between the arrested population and other benchmarks are the result  
 of chance.

26 Amram (FPD) Reply Decl., Att. A (Supp. Beckett Rpt. at Ex. 05248). The government did not  
 27 provide any expert report in support of its position.

28 Furthermore, the government’s claim of temporal and geographic clustering appears

1 overstated. For the first OSS sweep, 14 OSS defendants were arrested on 8 different days in 10  
 2 different locations; for the second OSS sweep, 23 defendants were arrested on 8 different days in  
 3 10 different locations. *See Cruz-Laucirica (FPD) Decl., Att. A* (chart providing, *inter alia*, dates  
 4 and locations of arrests). As reflected by maps prepared by Defendants, some of the locations are  
 5 in relatively close proximity to one another but a fair number of the locations are also dispersed in  
 6 different parts of the Tenderloin. *See Sommerfeld (FPD) Decl., Atts. E-F* (maps showing  
 7 locations of arrests). This is not a situation where, *e.g.*, a majority of the arrests took place in just  
 8 a few locations within the Tenderloin. In any event, the government failed to produce *any*  
 9 evidence as to how any clustering could have resulted in 37 out of 37 defendants being African  
 10 American.

11 Accordingly, even if there were a similarly situated requirement for discriminatory effect  
 12 in a selective enforcement case, the Court concludes that Defendants have made the required  
 13 showing of some evidence in support.

14 C. Selective Enforcement – Discriminatory Intent

15 Regarding discriminatory intent, the Ninth Circuit has noted that “[a]wareness of  
 16 consequences’ is not the same as intent to discriminate. The kind of intent to be proved is that the  
 17 government undertook a particular course of action ‘at least in part “because of,” not merely “in  
 18 spite of” its adverse effects upon an identifiable group.’” *United States v. Turner*, 104 F.3d 1180,  
 19 1184 (9th Cir. 1997); *see also Wayte v. United States*, 470 U.S. 598, 610 (1985) (stating that  
 20 “[d]iscriminatory purpose . . . implies more than . . . intent as awareness of consequences”)  
 21 (internal quotation marks omitted). Of course, discriminatory intent in the instant case is  
 22 somewhat of a complicated matter – both for purposes of selective enforcement and selective  
 23 prosecution – because the Court is being asked to consider the discriminatory intent of many  
 24 different individuals. But notwithstanding this difficulty, the Court concludes that Defendants  
 25 have adequately shown some evidence of discriminatory intent, in particular, within the SFPD.

26 As an initial matter, the fact that 100% of all the OSS defendants are African American is  
 27 probative of discriminatory intent, particularly when the relevant population is not 100% African  
 28 American. *See Mot. at 82* (arguing that “[t]he statistical disparity present here is so dramatic that



1 it alone should suffice for making a prima facie case of discriminatory intent”); *Belmontes v.*  
 2 *Brown*, 414 F.3d 1094, 1127 (9th Cir. 2005) (stating that habeas petitioner’s statistics “may  
 3 support a prima facie showing of unlawful charging discrimination” because they focused on the  
 4 decisionmaker at the local level), *rev’d on other grounds by Ayers v. Belmontes*, 549 U.S. 7  
 5 (2006); *Tuitt*, 68 F. Supp. 2d at 10 (in making an *Armstrong* evaluation, stating that “[a]  
 6 discriminatory effect which is severe enough can provide sufficient evidence of discriminatory  
 7 purpose”; citing, *inter alia*, *Yick Wo*). As Defendants argue, this is comparable to the “inexorable  
 8 zero” in the civil employment context. *See Woodson v. Pfizer*, 34 Fed. Appx. 490, 493 (7th Cir.  
 9 2002) (stating that, “[u]nder the ‘inexorable zero’ test, we held that when an employer with a  
 10 statistically large enough workforce employs no African Americans, we can infer that the  
 11 employer intentionally discriminates against African Americans in its hiring decisions”); *NAACP*  
 12 *v. Town of E. Haven*, 70 F.3d 219, 225 (2d Cir. 1995) (stating that “evidence that an employer in  
 13 an area with a sizeable black population has never hired a single black employee . . . , by itself,  
 14 supports an inference of discrimination”; *see also Int’l Bhd. of Teamsters v. United States*, 431  
 15 U.S. 324, 342 n.23 (1977) (stating that a “company’s inability to rebut the inference of  
 16 discrimination came not from a misuse of statistics but from ‘the inexorable zero’”). *But see*  
 17 *Chavez*, 251 F.3d at 647-48 (Seventh Circuit decision noting that “[o]nly in ‘rare cases [has] a  
 18 statistical pattern of discriminatory impact demonstrated a constitutional violation [e.g., jury  
 19 venire]”); also stating that, “in his context, statistics may not be the sole proof of a constitutional  
 20 violation and neither Chavez nor Lee have presented sufficient non-statistical evidence to  
 21 demonstrate discriminatory intent”); *cf. Olvis*, 97 F.3d at 745-46 (stating that, “in cases involving  
 22 discretionary judgments ‘essential to the criminal justice process,’ statistical evidence of racial  
 23 disparity is insufficient to infer that *prosecutors* in a particular case acted with a discriminatory  
 24 purpose”) (emphasis added).

25 Moreover, aside from the inexorable zero, Defendants have offered additional evidence of  
 26 discriminatory intent. For example:

- 27 • Evidence that the SFPD generally was “aware[] of the presence, behavior, and specific  
 28 geographic locations frequented by Hispanic/Latino dealers” in the Tenderloin, as reflected

1 in several SFPD incident reports. Mot. at 22 (giving six SFPD incident reports as  
2 examples).

- 3 • Evidence that some of the SFPD officers who were a part of OSS knew about the existence  
4 of non-African American drug dealers in the Tenderloin, as they were personally involved  
5 with the arrests of more than 30 non-African American comparators identified in  
6 Defendants' opening and reply briefs. *See* Reply at 37-38.

7 Evidence of such knowledge combined with the failure to arrest any non-African American drug  
8 dealers as part of OSS gives rise to an inference of discrimination.

9 Finally, there is further evidence of discriminatory intent based on (1) the OSS case where  
10 a SFPD officer made the "fucking BMs" comment; (2) the OSS case where an informant avoided  
11 a non-African American drug dealer and waited instead for an African American drug dealer; and  
12 (3) race-based comments or conduct by at least some of the SFPD officers who worked on OSS,  
13 albeit in non-OSS situations (with many of these officers working on multiple OSS cases).

14 The totality of the above evidence constitutes some evidence of discriminatory intent.

15 Contrary to what the government suggests, the declarations from the supervisory DEA  
16 agents and the federal prosecutors do not dispel the inference of discriminatory intent. Notably, as  
17 previously noted, the supervisory DEA agents do not describe how targeting decisions were  
18 actually made in the field, and there are no declarations from any "line" DEA agents or any SFPD  
19 officer. Furthermore, just because a supervisory DEA agent was not aware of any racism, *see*  
20 *Opp'n* at 12, is hardly enough to say that there was no race-based selectivity by officers in the  
21 field.

22 D. Summary

23 For the foregoing reasons, the Court concludes that dismissal is a remedy for a selective  
24 enforcement claim and that Defendants have submitted sufficient evidence of both discriminatory  
25 effect and discriminatory intent such that they are entitled to discovery in support of their selective  
26 enforcement claim.

27

28

1 **V. SELECTIVE PROSECUTION**

2 A. Selective Prosecution

3 While there is some evidence of discriminatory effect and discriminatory intent in selective  
4 enforcement, the evidence as to selective prosecution is more complicated.

5 The government points out that *Armstrong* assumed there has to be a selection in order for  
6 there to be a selective prosecution case. This position has merit. *See Armstrong*, 517 U.S. at 469  
7 (stating that “selective prosecution implies that a selection has taken place”) (internal quotation  
8 marks omitted). Thus, as to the claim of selective prosecution, the focus should be on whether the  
9 prosecutors who made the charging decisions (in contrast to police officers in the field) engaged in  
10 race-based selectivity in deciding whether to prosecute Defendants.

11 In this case, the record does not establish that federal prosecutors who made prosecutorial  
12 decisions were aware (either individually or collectively) of similarly situated non-African  
13 Americans that could have been presented for prosecution but were not. The only evidence on this  
14 point is the declarations of prosecutors that they had no such awareness. To be sure, this fact may  
15 inform discriminatory intent more so than discriminatory effect; the effect prong arguably should  
16 be measured by the pool of potential defendants known to all in the law enforcement chain, not  
17 just those presented to prosecutors.<sup>18</sup> *See Armstrong*, 517 U.S. at 470 (stating that “respondents  
18 could have investigated whether similarly situated persons of other races were prosecuted by the  
19 State of California *and were known to federal law enforcement officers*, but were not prosecuted in  
20 federal court”) (emphasis added). Regardless, the lack of knowledge and hence race-based  
21

---

22 <sup>18</sup> The government contends that the similarly situated evidence provided by Defendants is not a  
23 proper comparator because the OSS cases had strong evidence – *i.e.*, videotape – to support  
24 prosecution and there is no indication that the non-OSS cases had such videotape evidence.  
25 However, Defendants have made a fair case that the videotape evidence is not as strong as the  
26 government asserts. *See, e.g.*, Piper (FPD) Reply ¶ 3 (stating that, in 11 OSS cases, after viewing  
27 the body-camera video evidence, she was not able “to see any money and/or substance exchanged  
28 between a defendant and an alleged purchaser”; that, in 6 OSS cases, after viewing the  
rooftop/building surveillance video, she was not able “to see actual substance allegedly exchanged  
between individuals on the street”; and that, in 3 OSS cases, after viewing the rooftop/building  
surveillance video, she was not able “to clearly see the interaction due to blurred image, camera  
zoom, or lack of lighting”). Moreover, the government fails to address the fact that non-OSS  
cases often had strong evidence in other forms such as the sale of drugs to an undercover officer.  
*See Reply* at 35.

1 selection by prosecutors is critical to the equal protection claim of selective prosecution.

2 As to discriminatory intent, Defendants argue that at the very least, the prosecutors knew at  
 3 some point that all those prosecuted under the OSS were African American, and that this should  
 4 satisfy *Armstrong*. However, “[a]wareness of consequences’ is not the same as intent to  
 5 discriminate. The kind of intent to be proved is that the government undertook a particular course  
 6 of action ‘at least in part “because of,” not merely “in spite of” its adverse effects upon an  
 7 identifiable group.’” *Turner*, 104 F.3d at 1184; *see also Wayte*, 470 U.S. at 610 (stating that  
 8 “[d]iscriminatory purpose . . . implies more than . . . intent as awareness of consequences”)  
 9 (internal quotation marks omitted).

10 Defendants have offered several theories regarding discriminatory intent:

- 11 (1) Discriminatory intent can be inferred from the inexorable zero (*i.e.*, that none of the  
 12 defendants prosecuted pursuant to OSS are not African American);
- 13 (2) Discriminatory intent can be inferred because not all OSS defendants met the charging  
 14 criteria (*e.g.*, not all OSS defendants had a high-level criminal history);
- 15 (3) Discriminatory intent can be inferred because the prosecutors did not in place any policy to  
 16 ensure against SFPD discriminatory animus; and

17 But these theories are problematic, whether taken individually or collectively. For  
 18 example, the inexorable zero theory while viable in some contexts of discrimination jurisprudence,  
 19 has yet to be applied to selective prosecution claims. *See Olvis*, 97 F.3d at 745-46 (stating that,  
 20 “in cases involving discretionary judgments ‘essential to the criminal justice process,’ statistical  
 21 evidence of racial disparity is insufficient to infer that prosecutors in a particular case acted with a  
 22 discriminatory purpose”; adding that, “[b]y ruling that defendants can meet these demanding  
 23 burdens by presenting a study of the type they presented in this case [*i.e.*, that more than 90% of  
 24 those who had been tried since 1992 for crack cocaine offenses in certain divisions are black] and  
 25 thereby shifting to the government the onus of dispelling a presumption of discrimination would  
 26 open virtually every prosecution to a claim for selective prosecution”). At the very least, the Court  
 27 in *Armstrong* did not recognize its application in this context.

28 Defendants’ assertion that discriminatory intent can be inferred because not all OSS

1 defendants met the charging criteria (*e.g.*, not all OSS defendants were persistent, recidivist, and  
 2 repeat offenders) is problematic given that they have identified only about 1/4 of the OSS  
 3 defendants who did not meet the charging criteria.<sup>19</sup> *See* Mot. at 84-85 (identifying 9 OSS  
 4 defendants). This factual showing is not compelling evidence of discriminatory intent.

5 Defendants contend that discriminatory intent can be inferred because the prosecutors did  
 6 not put in place any policy to ensure against SFPD discriminatory animus. *See, e.g.*, Mot. at 90.  
 7 This fact perhaps establishes negligence in management or maybe even deliberate indifference to  
 8 the disparate consequences of its prosecutorial decisions.<sup>20</sup> But this would not establish the  
 9 requisite intentionality currently required under *Armstrong* to support a claim of selective  
 10 prosecution. Defendants cite *Wayte* to support their argument, but the language they cite is from  
 11 the *dissent*. *See* Reply at 41 n.27 (noting that opening brief failed to identify language from *Wayte*  
 12 as coming from the dissent). More specifically, Justice Marshall, in dissenting, stated that, to  
 13 make out a prima facie case of selective prosecution, a person must show (1) “that he is a member  
 14 of a recognizable, distinct class”; (2) “that a disproportionate number of this case was selected for  
 15 investigation and possible prosecution”; and (3) “*that this selection procedure was subject to*  
 16 *abuse or otherwise not neutral.*” *Wayte*, 470 U.S. at 626 (Marshall, J. dissenting) (emphasis  
 17 added). Justice Marshall, in turn, cited *Castaneda v. Partida*, 430 U.S. 482 (1977), for this  
 18 proposition, but *Castaneda* is arguably distinguishable because it was a case involving an equal  
 19 protection claim in a very specific context – *i.e.*, the grand jury context. *See id.* at 494; *see also*  
 20 *Batson v. Kentucky*, 476 U.S. 79, 95 (1986) (stating that, “[i]n cases involving the venire, this  
 21 Court has found a prima facie case [of discrimination] on proof that members of the defendant’s

22 \_\_\_\_\_  
 23 <sup>19</sup> The government quibbles that a person with high-level criminal history is not the same thing as  
 a repeat offender, *see* Opp’n at 32, but that seems to be elevating form over substance.

24 <sup>20</sup> Defendants have a fair argument for deliberate indifference, especially by the time of the 2014  
 25 sweep because, by that time, the prosecutors should have known because, “[o]nce the first  
 26 fourteen people were arrested and arraigned in the 2013 sweep, the government must have been  
 27 aware that they all appeared to be Black.” Mot. at 89. The statements of the individual  
 28 prosecutors that they were unaware of any pattern developing in the OSS prosecutions raises  
 troubling questions. One would hope and expect the U.S. Attorney’s Office would have a  
 systematic way of overseeing and discerning patterns of potential bias in respect to its  
 prosecutorial decisions, and not have to await a defense motion before becoming aware of such  
 pattern (as was represented at the hearing).

1 race were substantially underrepresented on the venire from which his jury was drawn, and that  
 2 the venire was selected under a practice providing ‘the opportunity for discrimination’; adding  
 3 that “[t]his combination of factors raises the necessary inference of purposeful discrimination  
 4 because the Court has declined to attribute to chance the absence of black citizens on a particular  
 5 jury array where the selection mechanism is subject to abuse”). No court, however, has applied  
 6 *Castaneda* or *Batson* to the specific context of *Armstrong*.

7 The Court therefore cannot say at this juncture that there is some evidence showing that the  
 8 prosecutors selected the OSS for defendants because of their race. This conclusion is consistent  
 9 with the Ninth Circuit’s decision in *Turner*, 104 F.3d at 1180.

10 In *Turner*, the defendants – five African American men – asserted that “they had been  
 11 selected for prosecution on crack cocaine charges on racial grounds.” *Id.* at 1181. The defendants  
 12 sought discovery on their selective prosecution claim. “In support of their motions, they  
 13 submitted an affidavit of a paralegal in the Federal Public Defender’s Office for the Central  
 14 District of California stating that an inspection of closed cases of crack cocaine prosecutions  
 15 defended by that public defender in 1991, 1992, and 1993 showed 47 African Americans, 5  
 16 Latino, and no white defendants had been charged with crack offenses.” *Id.* at 1182. The  
 17 defendants also submitted newspapers articles and a NPR report “commenting on ‘the racial  
 18 divide’ in crack cocaine prosecutions” and a study showing that “3% of 8,250 persons charged  
 19 with the sale of crack by the Los Angeles District Attorney to be Anglo, 53% to be African  
 20 American, 43% to be Latino, and 1% to be ‘other,’” while “[t]he comparable federal breakdown of  
 21 43 persons similarly charged was 0% Anglo, 83% African American, 16% Latino, and 0%  
 22 Other.”<sup>21</sup> *Id.*

23 In turn, the government submitted affidavits from both FBI agents and prosecutors. One of  
 24 the FBI agents explained, *inter alia*, that “much of the violent crime committed by street gangs . . .  
 25 was connected to illegal drug trafficking,” particularly with respect to cocaine base, with the

---

26  
 27 <sup>21</sup> The Ninth Circuit concluded that the defendants had failed to provide some evidence of  
 28 discriminatory effect because the study was “based on a statistically unimpressive number of  
 federal defendants” and failed to show that the small number of white persons who had been  
 prosecuted in state court were similarly situated. *Turner*, 104 F.3d at 1185.



1 Bloods and the Crips being the most notorious of those gangs. *Id.* at 1182-83. “[E]nforcement of  
 2 the federal laws regarding crack cocaine was one weapon in addressing the problem of gang-  
 3 related violent crimes . . . .” *Id.* at 1183. The prosecutors all stated that “race and ethnicity had  
 4 not influenced their decisions to prosecute.” *Id.* The government also provided a copy of the  
 5 USAO’s written prosecutive guidelines regarding drug offenses and an updated report of the  
 6 ethnic composition of its crack cocaine prosecutions in Los Angeles – out of 149 defendants, 109  
 7 were African American, 28 were Hispanic, 8 were Asian, 1 was white, and 3 were unclassified.  
 8 *See id.* at 1183-34.

9 With respect to the issue of discriminatory intent, the Ninth Circuit held that there was not  
 10 enough to show that the defendants had been targeted based on their race. The government had  
 11 provided a race neutral basis for the prosecution: Gangs were being targeted, not African  
 12 Americans, and “the distribution of cocaine by gang members inclined to violence makes the  
 13 distribution more heinous and more dangerous than the single sale of cocaine by individuals.” *Id.*  
 14 at 1185. The court added:

15  
 16 The [defendants] have offered no evidence whatsoever of a intent on  
 17 the part of the prosecutors to prosecute them on account of their  
 18 race, and the prosecutors and the FBI investigators have under oath  
 19 denied such motivation. No reason was given by the district court to  
 20 doubt the ‘background presumption] that United States Attorneys  
 21 are properly discharging their duties, no reason given to doubt the  
 22 integrity of prosecutors and investigators whose honesty, good faith,  
 23 and absence of racial bias are unimpaired by anything in evidence  
 24 before the court. The district court seems to have neither given  
 25 credence to the affidavits that the government placed before it nor  
 26 explained why the affidavits were not credible.

27 *Id.*

28 Here, as in *Turner*, Defendants have not presented reason to doubt the veracity of the  
 government’s declarations or the presumption of regularity that applies to prosecutors.<sup>22</sup> Should  
 such evidence arise, however, this issue may be revisited. At this juncture, the Court shall not

---

<sup>22</sup> As noted above, in the first OSS sweep, the U.S. Attorney’s Office decided not to prosecute 6 of  
 the 20 arrestees. At this juncture, there is no evidence, for instance, that all 6 (in contrast to the 14  
 who were prosecuted) were non-African Americans.

1 permit discovery on Defendants' selective prosecution claim.

2 In so ruling, the Court acknowledges Defendants' alternative theory that discriminatory  
3 intent can be inferred because the discriminatory intent of the law enforcement officers can be, in  
4 essence, attributed to the prosecutors because the prosecutors essentially delegated the  
5 decisionmaking to law enforcement officers. *See United States v. Monsoor*, 77 F.3d 1031, 1035  
6 (7th Cir. 1996) (in discussing vindictive prosecution claim, stating that, "to connect the animus of  
7 a referring agency to a federal prosecutor, a defendant must establish that the agency in some way  
8 prevailed upon the prosecutor in making the decision to seek an indictment"). While this may be a  
9 viable theory, in the instant case, there is insufficient evidence to support the theory. Notably, for  
10 the first sweep, 6 out of the 20 persons presented to prosecution by law enforcement were not  
11 prosecuted. This is strong evidence that independent prosecutorial judgment was exercised. For  
12 the second sweep, it is true that all 23 persons presented were actually prosecuted. But here the  
13 line AUSA declarations (from Ms. Hawkins and Mr. Farnham, who each worked independently  
14 from one another) indicate that independent prosecutorial judgment was exercised – *i.e.*, this was  
15 not just rubber stamping of law enforcement decisions. *Cf. Beck v. City of Upland*, 527 F.3d 853,  
16 862 (9th Cir. 2008) (noting that "[a] prosecutor's independent judgment may break the chain of  
17 causation between the unconstitutional actions of other officials and the harm suffered by a  
18 constitutional tort plaintiff[;] [p]ut in traditional tort terms, the prosecutor's independent decision  
19 can be a superseding or intervening cause of a constitutional tort plaintiff's injury, precluding suit  
20 against the officials who made an arrest or procured a prosecution").

21 The request for discovery into selective prosecution is therefore denied without prejudice  
22 to a further and future showing should additional evidence be revealed which meets the *Armstrong*  
23 standard.

## 24 VI. DISCOVERY

25 For the reasons stated above, the Court shall permit discovery on the selective enforcement  
26 theory, but not the selective prosecution theory. In so ruling, however, the Court does not  
27 automatically authorize the breadth of the discovery sought by Defendants. Rather, the Court  
28 directs the parties to meet and confer and agree upon a more measured, perhaps phased, approach.

1 *See, e.g., Davis*, 793 F.3d at 722-23.

2 The parties shall report within two (2) weeks from the date of this order to this Court by  
3 joint letter whether they can agree on a discovery plan. If not, the parties shall set forth their  
4 respective positions in said letter. A Status Conference shall be scheduled for 2:30 p.m., July 20,  
5 2016.

6 This order disposes of Docket No. 119.

7

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9

10 Dated: June 30, 2016



EDWARD M. CHEN  
United States District Judge

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28