

1 LAUREN HANSEN (SBN 268417)  
PATTI PRUNHUBER (SBN 277439)  
2 MICHAEL RAWSON (SBN 95868)  
THE PUBLIC INTEREST LAW PROJECT  
3 449 15<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 301  
Oakland, CA 94612  
4 Telephone: (510) 891-9794  
Fax: (510) 891-9727  
5 Email: lhansen@pilpca.org

6 STEPHANIE HAFFNER (SBN 194192)  
ROBERT D. NEWMAN (SBN 86534)  
7 WESTERN CENTER ON LAW & POVERTY  
449 15<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 301  
8 Oakland, CA 94612  
Telephone: (213) 235-2617  
9 Fax: (510) 251-0600  
Email: shaffner@wclp.org

10 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
11 THOMAS V. LORAN III (SBN 95255)  
ELAINE LEE (SBN 293452)  
12 STACIE O. KINSER (SBN 300529)  
PHILIP SHECTER (SBN 300661)  
13 Four Embarcadero Center, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
14 Telephone: (415) 983-1000  
Fax: (415) 983-1200  
15 Email: thomas.loran@pillsburylaw.com

16 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Plaintiff Class

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

19 DONALD RAY LILLEY, JARVIS  
20 JOHNSON, and DANIEL  
MALLORY, individually and on  
21 behalf of all others similarly situated,  
22 Plaintiffs,

23 vs.

24 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA; BOARD  
OF SUPERVISORS OF ALAMEDA  
25 COUNTY; ALAMEDA COUNTY  
SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY; and  
26 LORI COX, in her official capacity as  
Director of the Alameda County  
Social Services Agency,

27 Defendants.  
28

Case No.:  
**CLASS ACTION**  
**COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND**  
**DECLARATORY RELIEF**  
**(Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2))**

INTRODUCTION

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

1. Plaintiffs Donald Ray Lilley, Jarvis Johnson, and Daniel Mallory bring this action individually and on behalf of a class of persons (the “Class” or the “Plaintiff Class”) consisting of all current and future applicants for regular and expedited CalFresh (Food Stamp) benefits from defendant Alameda County (“Alameda County” or the “County”). This suit challenges Alameda County’s widespread failure to timely determine eligibility for CalFresh (Food Stamp) benefits. The ongoing and persistent failure and/or refusal of the named Defendants to ensure, on a county-wide basis, the processing of CalFresh applications within the time limits mandated by federal and state law has resulted and continues to result in substantial delays in providing CalFresh benefits to thousands of low-income households in Alameda County critically in need of this assistance to help them feed themselves and their families and provide them with adequate food and nutrition. Indeed, the County’s failure to comply with federal and state mandated timelines has resulted in a backlog of 10,657 pending applications as of July 2015. As a result, needy Alameda County residents are facing undernutrition and hunger, homelessness, and serious health risks.

2. CalFresh applications must be processed, and benefits issued to those eligible, as soon as possible, but no later than 30 days after the date a person submits an application. 7 U.S.C. § 2020(e)(3); 7 C.F.R. § 273.2(a), (g)(1), (3); Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code § 18911(a). Applicants in emergency situations with very low-income and few resources may qualify for expedited food stamps. 7 U.S.C. § 2020(e)(9); 7 C.F.R. § 273.2(i); MPP § 63-301.51.<sup>1</sup> The County must issue these benefits to eligible persons within three calendar days. Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code § 18914(b) (implementing 7 C.F.R. § 273.2(i)); MPP § 63-301.531(a)).

---

27 <sup>1</sup> “MPP” refers to the California Department of Social Services’ Manual of Policies  
28 and Procedures containing the CalFresh regulations. The MPP or Manual is found at:  
<http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/ord/PG303.htm> (last visited September 24, 2015).

1           3.       In violation of these mandates, Alameda County is processing regular and  
2 emergency applications well beyond the respective 30-day and three-day time limits. In  
3 July 2015, the most recent month for which data are publicly available, 24.7% of all regular  
4 (30-day) CalFresh applications were decided late due to County delay. Meanwhile,  
5 applications for emergency assistance are processed late at least 13% of the time and  
6 County policies ensure that the actual rate of late payment of emergency benefits is far  
7 greater.

8           4.       Plaintiff Donald Ray Lilley has been waiting for 52 days for the County to  
9 process his application and without the CalFresh benefits, is not getting enough food to eat.  
10 In desperate need of food, on September 21, 2015, Plaintiff Jarvis Johnson filed a request  
11 for expedited service on his CalFresh application. Eight calendar days later, the County has  
12 not yet issued a decision or benefits. This delay is five days longer than the California- and  
13 federal-mandated timeframe. Plaintiff Daniel Mallory's application for expedited food  
14 stamps has been lingering unprocessed for 25 days and the County still has not issued him  
15 benefits. All three Plaintiffs are eligible for food stamps, and in all three circumstances, the  
16 County unlawfully delayed the processing of their applications and issuance of benefits.

17           5.       The County has a longstanding policy, pattern, practice, and custom of  
18 failing and refusing to timely process CalFresh applications. Plaintiffs therefore seek  
19 declaratory and preliminary and permanent injunctive relief on behalf of themselves and, in  
20 accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and 23(b)(2), on behalf of the Class of similarly  
21 situated CalFresh applicants, to remedy Defendants' violations of their rights under federal  
22 and state law and to enjoin Defendants' failure and/or refusal to process CalFresh  
23 applications, and to provide CalFresh benefits to eligible applicants, on a timely basis.

24

25

#### JURISDICTION

26           6.       This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to  
27 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1367. Plaintiffs' action for declaratory and injunctive relief is  
28 authorized by 28 U.S.C. §§ 1343, 2201, and 2202 and by Fed. R. Civ. P. 57 and 65.

1           7.       Plaintiffs' claim for violations of California state law concerns the same  
2 actions and omissions that form the basis of Plaintiffs' claim under federal law such that the  
3 California state law claim is part of the same case or controversy. This Court therefore has  
4 supplemental jurisdiction over the California state law claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

5  
6

VENUE AND INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

7           8.       Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because a substantial part  
8 of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims herein occurred in this District, and  
9 because all Defendants named herein reside in, maintain offices in, or are responsible for  
10 enforcing the laws relevant to this litigation in this District.

11          9.       In accord with Local Rule 3-2 and Local Rule 3-5, this civil action should be  
12 assigned to the San Francisco Division or to the Oakland Division of this Court because a  
13 substantial part of the events or omissions which give rise to the claims herein have  
14 occurred and are occurring in Alameda County.

15  
16

RIGHT OF ACTION

17          10.      Title 42 of the United States Code, § 1983 confers a right of action to  
18 enforce the federal statutes cited herein. California Code of Civil Procedure § 1085 confers  
19 a right of action to enforce the California state statutes cited herein.

20  
21

PARTIES

22          11.      Plaintiff Donald Ray Lilley is a resident of the City of Livermore, in the  
23 County of Alameda and brings this action both individually and on behalf of the Plaintiff  
24 Class.

25          12.      Plaintiff Jarvis Johnson is a resident of the City of Oakland, in the County of  
26 Alameda and brings this action both individually and on behalf of the Plaintiff Class.

27          13.      Plaintiff Daniel Mallory is a resident of the City of Berkeley, in the County  
28 of Alameda and brings this action both individually and on behalf of the Plaintiff Class.

1           14. Alameda County is a political body of the State of California and, pursuant  
2 to federal and state law, is required to oversee and monitor the Social Services Agency.

3           15. Defendant Board of Supervisors of Alameda County (the “Board of  
4 Supervisors”) is the legislative body charged by law with managing the County  
5 government.

6           16. Defendant Alameda County Social Services Agency (the “Agency”) is the  
7 local public agency responsible for administering Alameda County’s CalFresh program  
8 within the County, including ensuring timely processing of CalFresh applications.

9           17. Defendant Lori Cox is the Director of the Agency. Plaintiffs sue Ms. Cox in  
10 her official capacity only. Ms. Cox is responsible for the enforcement, operation, and  
11 execution of laws pertaining to the Agency’s administration of the CalFresh program,  
12 including the timely processing of CalFresh applications.

13           18. At all relevant times, all four of the named Defendants were, are, and have  
14 been acting in concert with respect to the administration of the CalFresh program such that  
15 each such Defendant is, was, and has been at all relevant times acting as the agent of each  
16 of the other Defendants with reference to the matters alleged herein. To obtain complete  
17 relief and to avoid the need for the filing of a multiplicity of legal actions, Plaintiffs and the  
18 Class have sued all four of the named Defendants herein for declaratory and injunctive  
19 relief.

20

21

FACTS PERTAINING TO EACH NAMED PLAINTIFF

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

19. Plaintiff Donald Ray Lilley is disabled and has a current application pending  
for Supplemental Security Income (SSI). He currently receives General Assistance  
benefits. After paying rent, he does not have enough money left to pay for food with his  
meager public assistance grant. While waiting for food stamps, there have been days when  
he does not have enough to eat and he has experienced health problems due to poor  
nutrition. Mr. Lilley applied for CalFresh benefits on August 7, 2015. The County sent

1 him just one notice, informing him that his caseworker has changed. As of the date of  
2 filing of this complaint, the County has not issued him the benefits to which he is entitled.

3 20. Plaintiff Jarvis Johnson is a 53-year old man with disabilities. He receives  
4 General Assistance benefits of \$336 per month. After paying for rent and utilities, he has  
5 \$10 to survive on per month. Desperately needing additional assistance, he applied for  
6 CalFresh benefits on September 10, 2015. After learning he was eligible for expedited  
7 benefits, Mr. Johnson requested expedited Food Stamps from the County on September 21,  
8 2015. More than one week later, the County still has not issued Mr. Johnson benefits.

9 21. Plaintiff Daniel Mallory is unemployed, after losing a job for which he is  
10 owed unpaid wages. Without any income to pay for food, he applied for expedited  
11 CalFresh with the County on September 3, 2015. Despite providing identification and  
12 indicating that his housing costs exceed his income and resources combined, the County has  
13 not issued him expedited food stamps. Twenty-five days later, he is still waiting for  
14 expedited CalFresh assistance.

15  
16 CLASS DEFINITION AND CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

17 22. Plaintiffs Donald Ray Lilley, Jarvis Johnson, and Daniel Mallory seek to  
18 represent the Class consisting of current and future applicants for CalFresh (Food Stamp)  
19 benefits from Alameda County. As such, this action is maintainable as a class action  
20 pursuant to Rule 23(a) and 23(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

21 23. The requirements of Rule 23(a)(1) are met in that the Class is so numerous  
22 that joinder of all members is impracticable. According to data reported by the County to  
23 the California Department of Social Services (“CDSS”), the number of new applicants for  
24 CalFresh benefits has exceeded 3,900 in each month of 2015. The County’s most recent  
25 reported data show that as of the end of July 2015, 10,657 applications are pending with no  
26 decision rendered. The Class is also fluctuating, in that as they apply for benefits, new  
27 people regularly will qualify to be members of the Class.

28

1           24. In accordance with the requirements of paragraph (2) of Fed. R. Civ. P.  
2 23(a), members of the Class share common issues of law and fact, including whether  
3 Alameda County has a policy, pattern, practice, and custom of failing and/or refusing to  
4 process regular and expedited CalFresh (Food Stamp) applications within statutorily  
5 mandated time periods and whether any such policy, pattern, practice, or custom violates  
6 federal or state law.

7           25. The claims of the named Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the class they  
8 represent (within the meaning of paragraph (3) of Rule 23(a)). Plaintiff Donald Ray Lilley  
9 applied for food stamps and has experienced a lengthy and unlawful delay by the County in  
10 the processing of his application and issuance of benefits. Plaintiffs Jarvis Johnson and  
11 Daniel Mallory applied for and are eligible for expedited food stamps, and both have  
12 experienced the County's failure to timely process their applications, going without the  
13 prompt emergency assistance to which they are entitled.

14           26. In accordance with paragraph (4) of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a), Plaintiffs will  
15 fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiffs know of no conflict of  
16 interest between any of themselves and the Class or any Class members and are likewise  
17 unaware of any conflict of interest between or among any of the Class members.

18           27. Plaintiffs are represented by experienced counsel who will adequately  
19 represent the interests of the Class.

20           28. Defendants have acted, and continue to do so, on grounds generally  
21 applicable to the Class that Plaintiffs represent, thereby rendering appropriate injunctive  
22 and declaratory relief for the Class as a whole in accordance with paragraph (2) of Fed. R.  
23 Civ. P. 23(b).

24

25                                   STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BACKGROUND

26           29. The federal Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program ("SNAP"), formerly  
27 known as the Food Stamp Program, was initiated in 1964 pursuant to the Food Stamp Act

28

1 (the Act).<sup>2</sup> The express purpose of SNAP is to “safeguard the health and well-being of the  
2 Nation’s population by raising levels of nutrition among low-income households.”  
3 7 U.S.C. § 2011. SNAP provides federally-funded benefits to eligible low-income  
4 households to help them purchase food. *Id.* § 2011 *et seq.*

5 30. SNAP is administered nationally by the United States Department of  
6 Agriculture (“USDA”), which is responsible for issuing regulations consistent with the Act.  
7 *Id.* § 2013(a), (c). States that participate in the program designate a state agency to  
8 administer the program at the state level. *Id.* § 2012(t). State agencies must administer the  
9 program in compliance with the Act and its implementing regulations. *Id.* § 2020(e).

10 31. In California, CDSS is the designated state agency responsible for  
11 administering SNAP. California has delegated the operation of its food stamp program to  
12 county governments, and each county welfare department must administer the Food Stamp  
13 program, in accordance with CDSS rules and regulations. Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code  
14 §§ 10604-10605, 18902. California has named its SNAP program “CalFresh.”

15 32. To be financially eligible for CalFresh, a household, defined as a group of  
16 people who purchase and prepare food together, must have income below 100% of the federal  
17 poverty level after deductions that account for housing, dependent care, and medical expenses,  
18 among other exclusions and deductions. 7 U.S.C. § 2014(c)(1). As of 2015, that figure for a  
19 family of three is \$20,090 per year or \$1,675 per month. *Id.*; 80 Fed.Reg. 3236-37 (Jan. 22,  
20 2015). Eligible households that do not have a member who is over age 60 or who is  
21 considered disabled must also have income, prior to deductions, less than 200% of the federal  
22 poverty level. 7 U.S.C. §§ 2014(a), (c)(2); 7 C.F.R. § 273.2(j)(2)(C); Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code  
23 §18901.5; All County Letter (ACL) 14-56 (August 22, 2014) at page 2. This amount is  
24 currently \$40,180 per year or \$3,349 monthly for a family of three. *See* 80 Fed. Reg.  
25 3236-37.

26

27

28 <sup>2</sup> On June 18, 2008, Congress amended the Food Stamp Act by renaming the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008. Pub. L. No. 110-246, § 4001.



1 33. Pursuant to federal law, counties must process food stamp applications and  
2 issue benefits to those eligible no later than 30 days after the date of application. 7 U.S.C.  
3 § 2020(e)(3); 7 C.F.R. § 273.2(a), (g)(1), (3).

4 34. Under federal law, expedited food stamps benefits must be provided no later  
5 than seven days following the date of application when eligible applicants have extremely  
6 low income and resources or cannot meet their monthly housing expense. 7 U.S.C. §  
7 2020(e)(9); 7 C.F.R. § 273.2(i)(1), (i)(3)(i). Federal law permits a state to adopt a shorter  
8 time frame, and California has done so—benefits must be issued to households eligible for  
9 expedited service within three calendar days of application. Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §  
10 18914(b); California Department of Social Services Manual of Policies and Procedures  
11 (MPP) § 63-300.1.

12 35. State law further mandates that aid to the “needy and distressed” must be  
13 provided “promptly and humanely.” Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code § 10000.

14

15

STATEMENT OF FACTS

16

County Non-Compliance with Regular CalFresh Processing Timeframes

17

18 36. CDSS requires each county in the State of California to report its CalFresh  
19 application statistics on a monthly basis. According to data reported by Alameda County,  
20 on average 19.4% of its applications were processed late due to County delay in the past  
21 year. In the most recent month for which data is available, July 2015, of the applications  
22 approved, approximately 21.5% were approved late due to County delay. Of those  
23 applications denied, approximately 30.5% were denied after the 30 day deadline due to  
County delay.

24

25 37. The following table shows the degree of late processing over the most recent  
twelve months for which data is available:

26 ///

27 ///

28

Table 1

CDSS DFA 296 – Alameda Data for Regular Processing of CalFresh Applications<sup>3</sup>

Month	Number of Processed Applications <sup>4</sup>	Number of Late Approved Applications <sup>5</sup>	Number of Late Denied Applications <sup>6</sup>	Percentage of Total Late Applications <sup>7</sup>
August 2014	3,739	293	286	15.5%
September 2014	3,738	293	358	17.4%
October 2014	4,061	329	392	17.8%
November 2014	3,026	264	263	17.4%
December 2014	3,246	292	263	17.1%
January 2015	3,385	317	309	18.5%
February 2015	3,134	327	276	19.2%
March 2015	3,944	443	380	20.9%
April 2015	3,788	411	286	18.4%
May 2015	3,806	438	446	23.2%
June 2015	4,310	561	327	22.9%
July 2015	4,722	653	518	24.7%
<b>12 Month Average<sup>8</sup></b>	<b>3,742</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>19.4%<sup>9</sup></b>

///

///

<sup>3</sup> All tables and charts are created using the Alameda County data from the CDSS Monthly DFA 296 Report (DFA 296): <http://www.cdss.ca.gov/research/PG353.htm>

<sup>4</sup> “Number of Total Applications” is calculated by adding “Applications approved” (Column 7), “PACF Applications denied” (Column 10), and “NACF Applications denied” (Column 11).

<sup>5</sup> “Number of Late Approved Applications” is calculated by adding “PACF Applications approved in over 30 days (CWD caused)” (Column 8) and “NACF Applications approved in over 30 days (CWD caused)” (Column 9).

<sup>6</sup> “Number of Late Denied Applications” is calculated by adding “PACF Applications denied in over 30 days (CWD caused)” (Column 12) and “NACF Applications denied in over 30 days (CWD caused)” (Column 13).

<sup>7</sup> “Percentage of Total Late Applications” is calculated by adding “Number of Late Approved Applications” and “Number of Late Denied Applications” and dividing the total by “Number of Total Applications.”

<sup>8</sup> “12 Month Average” is the average of each total over the last 12 months.

<sup>9</sup> See footnote 5, *supra*.

1 38. Alameda County ranked worst of the 58 counties in the State, in timely  
2 processing both approved and denied applications, according to a CDSS report of average  
3 application processing times from August 2014 to July 2015.<sup>10</sup>

4 County Non-Compliance with Expedited CalFresh Processing Timeframes

5 39. For expedited service benefits, counties report data to CDSS on a quarterly  
6 basis. Data reported by Alameda County show that for April through June 2015, 10.4% of  
7 applications for expedited CalFresh (emergency food stamps) were paid late due to County  
8 delay, and for the period from January through March 2015, 14.6% of emergency  
9 applications were processed late due to County delay.<sup>11</sup>

10 40. The County has a Food Stamp Handbook that provides guidance to Agency staff.  
11 Handbook Section 63-03.02 states, “The 3-day timeframe shall begin the day the ET [Eligibility  
12 Technician] identifies that the household meets the criteria for ES [Expedited Service] and not on  
13 the date the application was filed.” This proviso directly violates the requirements in Cal. Welf.  
14 & Inst. Code § 18914(b) and MPP §§ 63-301.531(a) & 63-301.522, which provide that the  
15 three-day processing time for expedited benefits begins on the date the application is submitted  
16 (*i.e.*, filed).

17 41. According to this same Handbook Section, the County’s data-keeping system is  
18 “not programmed correctly to report statistics of late [expedited service] determinations. Until  
19 further instructions are provided...issue the benefits as soon as administratively possible.”  
20 Therefore, on information and belief, the extent of the problem with untimely processing of  
21 expedited CalFresh (Food Stamp) benefit applications is even worse than the data reported by the  
22 County to the State.

23  
24  
25 <sup>10</sup> These statistics are from a comparison of counties’ 12 month averages for the period  
26 August 2014 to July 2015, at  
<http://www.cdsscounties.ca.gov/foodstamps/res/pdf/Regular.pdf>.

27 <sup>11</sup> This number was calculated by adding column 4a2 on p. 6 of the DFA 296X to  
28 column 4a3 on p. 6 of the DFA 296X, and then dividing by the total number of expedited  
services applications approved, at column 4a, on p. 5 of the DFA 296X.

1                   The Problem Has Resulted in a Serious Backlog of Applications

2           42.       Meanwhile, Alameda County data show the number of pending applications as  
3 of its May, June, and July 2015 reports was 11,837, 11,541, and 10,657, respectively. The  
4 backlog continues to exceed over *two times* the average number of applications received each  
5 month.

6  
7                   COMMON ALLEGATIONS REGARDING INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY

8                                   RELIEF

9           43.       By reason of the foregoing, an actual and present controversy has arisen and  
10 now exists between Plaintiffs and the Class, on the one hand, and Defendants, on the other  
11 hand. With respect to such controversy, Plaintiffs and the Class contend that Defendants  
12 are violating their respective rights under the laws of the United States and the State of  
13 California by failing and/or refusing timely to process CalFresh applications and by failing  
14 and/or refusing timely to provide CalFresh benefits to eligible households within 30 days of  
15 the date of the application or within three days of the date of the application for those  
16 eligible households entitled to expedited services, while Plaintiffs and the Class are  
17 informed and believe and on that basis allege that each of Defendants disputes and denies  
18 each of the foregoing contentions.

19           44.       A declaration by this Court that Defendants have engaged in a pattern and  
20 practice of violating Plaintiffs' and the Class's rights under federal and state law to the  
21 timely processing of their CalFresh applications and to the timely receipt of their CalFresh  
22 benefits is therefore necessary and appropriate at this time.

23           45.       Defendants' failure and refusal to comply with the time requirements of  
24 federal and state law for processing CalFresh (Food Stamp) benefit applications and for  
25 providing such benefits to eligible applicants has proximately resulted and, unless  
26 restrained and enjoined, will continue to result in imminent and irreparable harm to  
27 Plaintiffs and members of the Plaintiff Class. By continuing to fail and/or refuse to make  
28 timely application decisions, Defendants' are delaying needed food assistance to Plaintiffs

1 and Class members, forcing Plaintiffs and Class members to choose between meeting their  
2 nutritional needs or other basic needs. The problem has grown for over two years and  
3 threatens to continue to grow, causing harm to Plaintiffs and Class members absent  
4 injunctive relief.

5 46. Plaintiffs and members of the Class have no plain, adequate, or complete  
6 remedy at law to address the failure to timely process applications described herein.  
7 Plaintiffs and the Plaintiff Class therefore seek injunctive relief restraining Defendants from  
8 engaging in the unlawful acts described herein.

9

10

**FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

11

**(Violation of federal law by failing to provide timely CalFresh benefits)**

12

13

47. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation  
contained in paragraphs 1 through 46.

14

15

16

17

18

19

48. While acting under color of law, Defendants have developed and maintained  
a policy, pattern, practice, and custom of failing and/or refusing to determine CalFresh  
(Food Stamp) eligibility and issue CalFresh (Food Stamp) benefits within thirty days of  
application and within three calendar days of application for expedited benefits, thereby  
depriving Plaintiffs and members of the Class of their respective rights under 7 U.S.C.  
§§ 2020(e)(3) and (e)(9); 7 C.F.R. §§ 273.2(a)(2), (g)(1), and (i)(3)(i).

20

21

**SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

22

**(Violation of state law by failing to provide timely CalFresh benefits)**

23

24

49. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation  
contained in paragraphs 1 through 46.

25

26

27

28

50. Defendant's policy, pattern, practice, and custom of failing and/or refusing  
to determine eligibility for CalFresh (Food Stamp) benefits within thirty days of application  
and within three calendar days of application for expedited benefits violate the rights of

1 Plaintiffs and members of the Plaintiff Class under Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 10000,  
2 18914(b); and MPP §§ 63-300.1, 63-301.531(a) & 63-301.522.

3

4

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

5

6

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs and the Plaintiff Class respectfully request that this Court enter judgment in their favor and against Defendants, and each of them, as follows:

7

(a) Assert jurisdiction over this action;

8

9

10

11

(b) Certify this action as a class action on behalf of all current and future applicants for regular and expedited CalFresh (Food Stamp) benefits from Alameda County, pursuant to Rule 23(a) and Rule 23(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;

12

13

14

15

16

17

(c) Grant a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction *pendente lite* and a permanent injunction thereafter restraining and enjoining Defendants, and each of them and all persons acting in concert with any of them, from failing and/or refusing to process applications of, and from failing and/or refusing to issue CalFresh benefits to, Plaintiffs and the Class within federal- and state-mandated time frames;

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

(d) Declare that Defendants' policy, pattern, practice, and custom of failing and/or refusing to determine regular CalFresh applications within 30 days of the date of application and expedited CalFresh applications within three days of the date of application violate the rights of Plaintiffs and the Class under federal and state law and further declare that Defendants' further policy, pattern, practice, and custom of failing and/or refusing timely to provide CalFresh benefits to eligible impoverished households in Alameda County within the time mandated under federal and state law likewise violate the rights of Plaintiffs and the Class thereunder;

1 (e) Award reasonable costs and expenses incurred in the prosecution of this  
2 action, including reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1988  
3 and 1920 and Cal. Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

4 (f) Grant any and such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and  
5 proper.

6

7 Dated: September 29, 2015.

8

Respectfully Submitted:

9

THE PUBLIC INTEREST LAW PROJECT

10

WESTERN CENTER ON LAW & POVERTY

11

12

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

13



14

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Lauren Hansen

15

16

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28