

Memorandum

Date: October 17, 2018
To: All Sheriff's Personnel
From: Undersheriff Linver
Subject: Enforcement of Illegal Camping Ordinances



Sheriff's Bulletin: 18-13

This numbered bulletin is being distributed to clarify our department policies relating to the intersection between homelessness and the enforcement of county and city ordinances that prohibit camping and sleeping in public places. This information will be incorporated into our 2019 Lexipol policy update. Until then, this bulletin will serve to establish policy relating to this topic.

In a recent 9th Circuit Court of Appeals ruling, the court found that laws prohibiting homeless individuals from camping and sleeping in public violate the Eighth Amendment and are therefore unconstitutional, unless certain conditions are present/ met [Martin v. City of Boise (9th Cir. 2018) 902 F.3d 1031, 1048, 1049]. Those conditions are:

- There are a greater number of shelter beds available to house the homeless, than there are homeless within the community; **or**
(This is **not** the case in any of Santa Barbara County's communities. To the contrary, the City of Santa Barbara and County of Santa Barbara have issued declarations calling the lack of housing and shelter services a community crisis)
- Shelter services/ housing options were specifically made available to the individual homeless person and they chose not to avail themselves of the shelter services/ housing options that are readily available. This would/ will require that deputies document specific efforts made to provide housing options for the involved homeless individual and that individual's refusal to accept that assistance.
(In a footnote, the court acknowledged: "Naturally, our holding does not cover individuals who do have access to adequate temporary shelter, whether because they have the means to pay for it or because it is realistically available to them for free, but who choose not to use it.")

Sheriff's Office policy directive: Deputies should **not** cite or arrest homeless individuals for city or county ordinances prohibiting camping or sleeping in public places unless they are specifically able to prove that shelter services/ housing options were specifically made available to the homeless person they intend to arrest/ cite and that individual chose not to avail themselves of the shelter services/ housing options.

MEMORANDUM

To: All Sheriff's Personnel


Subject: Enforcement of Illegal Camping Ordinances

October 17, 2018

Page 2

Attachments/ background information:

- Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office: One Minute Brief, When does the Eighth Amendment bar enforcement of a statute or ordinance prohibiting homeless sitting, sleeping or lying on sidewalks or in other public places? [Martin v. City of Boise (9th Cir. 2018) 902 F.3d 1031, 1048, 1049]
- Law Offices of Jones & Mayer: Legal Update Vol. 33 No.27 The Eighth Amendment's prohibition on cruel and unusual punishment bars city from prosecuting individuals criminally for sleeping outside on public property when no shelter available



SOL LINVER
Undersheriff

News & Information

September 13, 2018

Vol. 33 No. 29 THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT’S PROHIBITION ON CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT BARS CITY FROM PROSECUTING INDIVIDUALS CRIMINALLY FOR SLEEPING OUTSIDE ON PUBLIC PROPERTY WHEN NO SHELTER AVAILABLE

In *Martin v. City of Boise*, 2018 U.S. App. LEXIS 25032 (9th Cir. Sept. 4, 2018), the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals held that a local ordinance violated the Eighth Amendment to the extent that it imposed criminal sanctions against homeless persons for sleeping outdoors, on public property, when they had no alternative shelter access available. The Court also held that two of the plaintiffs could be entitled to retrospective and prospective relief for the Eighth Amendment violation.

Background

The City of Boise (“City”) had two ordinances at issue. Boise City Code section 9-10-02 (the “Camping Ordinance”), declared that use of “any of the streets, sidewalks, parks, or public places as a camping place at any time” was a misdemeanor. This ordinance defined “camping” as “the use of public property as a temporary or permanent place of dwelling, lodging, or residence.” Boise City Code section 6-01-05 (the “Disorderly Conduct Ordinance”) banned “[o]ccupying, lodging, or sleeping in any building, structure, or public place, whether public or private . . . without the permission of the owner or person entitled to possession or in control thereof.”

Boise has a significant and increasing homeless population. According to the Point-in-Time Count (“PIT Count”) conducted by the Idaho Housing and Finance Association, there were 753 homeless individuals in Ada County — the county of which Boise is the seat — in January 2014, 46 of whom were “unsheltered,” or living in places unsuited to human habitation such as parks or sidewalks. In 2016, the last year for which data is available, there were 867 homeless individuals counted in Ada County, 125 of whom were unsheltered.

There were three homeless shelters in the City of Boise (“City”) for the City’s large and growing homeless population. Two of the three shelters were operated by BMR, a religious nonprofit organization, – one exclusively for men, and the other for women and children.

These two shelters maintained a religious environment, and, in some situations, denied shelter if certain expectations of religious conduct were not met. Other rules or practices denied stays for more secular reasons, such as limiting the stays to a certain number of days within a period.

The plaintiffs were six current or former residents of the City who are or were recently homeless. Each plaintiff alleged that, between 2007 and 2009, he or she was cited by Boise police for violating at least one of the two city ordinances. The plaintiffs filed action in federal court in the District of Idaho in October 2009. The plaintiffs alleged that their citations under the ordinances violated the Eighth Amendment’s Cruel and Unusual Punishments Clause and accordingly sought damages pursuant to 42 U.S.C. section 1983. Two of the plaintiffs also sought prospective declaratory and injunctive relief to prevent future enforcement of the ordinances because they expected to be cited under the ordinances again in the future.

After the lawsuit was initiated, the City police implemented the Special Order through a two-step procedure known as the “Shelter Protocol.” Under the Shelter Protocol, if any shelter in Boise reaches capacity on a given night, that shelter will so notify the police at roughly 11:00 pm. Each shelter has discretion to determine whether it is full, and Boise police themselves have no other mechanism or criteria for gauging whether a shelter is full. Since the Shelter Protocol was adopted, one of the three shelters has reported that it was full on almost 40% of

[News & Information \(/news/\)](/news/)

[General News \(/news/category/news/\)](/news/category/news/)

[Articles \(/news/category/articles/\)](/news/category/articles/)

[Client Alerts — Law Enforcement \(/news/category/client-alerts/\)](/news/category/client-alerts/)

[Municipal Law Updates \(/news/category/municipal-law-updates/\)](/news/category/municipal-law-updates/)

KEEP IN TOUCH



(<https://www.facebook.com/jonesmayer190242264473576>)



(<https://www.linkedin.com/company/jones-&-mayer>)



(<https://twitter.com/jonesmayer>)

NEED ADVICE?

[CONTACT US TODAY \(/contact-us/\)](/contact-us/)

nights. Although BRM agreed to the Shelter Protocol, its internal policy is never to turn any person away because of a lack of space, and neither BRM shelter has ever reported that it was full.

The District Court granted summary judgment to the City in July 2011, holding that the retrospective relief claims were barred and the prospective claims had become moot because the Boise Police Department had in January 2010 implemented procedures that prohibited enforcement of the two ordinances under certain conditions. The Ninth Circuit later reversed and remanded,[1] holding, among other things, that prospective relief claims were not moot and the January 2010 procedures were merely administrative policy and could be altered by the police department at any point. On remand, the District Court again granted summary judgment, holding that *Heck v. Humphrey*[2] barred all of the plaintiffs' claims for retrospective and prospective relief. Plaintiff again appealed.

Discussion

The Ninth Circuit considered on appeal whether the Eighth Amendment's prohibition on cruel and unusual punishment barred a city from criminally prosecuting individuals for sleeping outside on public property when they had no home or other shelter available.

Standing for Prospective Relief Claims

The Court first addressed whether the plaintiffs had standing to seek prospective relief. The Court explained initially that "on summary judgment, the plaintiffs 'need not establish that they in fact have standing, but only that there is a genuine issue of material fact as to the standing elements.'"

Observing that the City relied completely on the self-reporting by the shelters themselves about whether they were full, the Court observed that one shelter was completely full on up to 50% of the nights and had reported that it had to frequently turn away people seeking shelter.

The other two shelters, run by BRM, had a policy of refusing further nights' stays to those who had already stayed a certain number of days. A plaintiff testified that after being denied shelter for this reason in the past, he had been forced to sleep outdoors. Individuals who arrived at the BMR shelters after 8 p.m. were also denied shelter. The two shelters denied stays for other reasons as well.

The Court thus found that, even assuming on the veracity of the shelters' self-reporting, there remained a genuine issue of material fact as to whether homeless individuals in Boise faced a credible risk of being issued a citation on nights when shelters were full or when shelters denied entry for reasons other than shelter capacity – effectively a situation where no shelter was available for those homeless individuals. The Court thus concluded that plaintiffs had standing to pursue prospective relief.

Heck v. Humphrey

The Court next addressed the applicability of *Heck* "and its progeny" to the case. The Court explained that *Heck* held that a plaintiff in a Section 1983 action must demonstrate "a favorable termination of the criminal proceedings before seeking tort relief." Thus, *Heck* bars a Section 1983 claim if it is inconsistent with a prior criminal conviction or sentence arising out of the same facts, unless the conviction or sentence has been subsequently resolved in the plaintiff's favor.

Regarding retrospective relief claims here, the Ninth Circuit observed that *Heck* bars a Section 1983 action that would imply the invalidity of a prior conviction if the plaintiff could have sought invalidation of the underlying conviction via direct appeal or state post-conviction relief, but did not do so. The Ninth Circuit concluded that because none of the plaintiffs challenged their convictions on direct appeal (having expressly waived the right to do so as condition of their guilty pleas), most of their retrospective claims for injunctive relief were barred by *Heck*. Two plaintiffs, however, had also received citations that were dismissed, so, the Court held, *Heck* was not applicable to these claims and the District Court had erred in barring these particular claims.

The Ninth Circuit also concluded that the District Court erred in finding the plaintiffs' claims for prospective relief were barred by *Heck*. The Court understood *Wolff v. McDonnell*,[3] *Wilkinson v. Dotson*[4], and *Edwards* to have considered *Heck* to be focused on retrospective existing relief claims, not prospective injunctive claims for relief. The Court thus concluded that the *Heck* doctrine "serves to ensure the finality and validity of previous convictions, not to insulate future prosecutions from challenge."

Summarizing the Ninth Circuit's conclusions regarding *Heck*'s application to the claims here, the Court held that all but two of the plaintiffs' claims for retrospective relief were barred by *Heck*, but none of the claims for prospective injunctive relief were barred.

Eighth Amendment

The Eighth Amendment states: "Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted." U.S. Const., amend. VIII. One of the ways the Cruel and Unusual Punishments Clause limits the criminal process is by placing substantive limits on what the government may criminalize, though this limitation is to be "one to be applied sparingly." [5]

In the seminal Eighth Amendment case of *Robinson v. California*, [6] the Court stated, the United States Supreme Court held that the Cruel and Unusual Punishments Clause invalidated a California law that made the "status" of narcotic addiction a criminal offense.

The law, said the Supreme Court, punished the disease of narcotics addiction itself, and a law criminalizing a disease was an infliction of cruel and unusual punishment.

Powell v. Texas [7] interpreted *Robinson* as precluding only the criminalization of "status," not of "involuntary" conduct. But four dissenting Justices and concurring Justice White disagreed with the majority's view that *Robinson* left open the "question of whether certain conduct cannot constitutionally be punished because it is, in some sense, 'involuntary.'" Justice White noted that many chronic alcoholics were also homeless, for whom public drunkenness might be unavoidable as a practical matter. These people had "no place else to go and no place else to be" when they were engaged in the conduct of drinking, said Justice White. The four dissenting Justices similarly found that under *Robinson*, "criminal penalties may not be inflicted upon a person for being in a condition he is powerless to change," and that the defendant, "once intoxicated, . . . could not prevent himself from appearing in public places."

Thus, the Ninth Circuit explained describing *Powell*, five Justices "gleaned from *Robinson* the principle 'that the Eighth Amendment prohibits the state from punishing an involuntary act or condition if it is the unavoidable consequence of one's status or being.'" The Ninth Circuit said that this principle compelled the conclusion that "the Eighth Amendment prohibits the imposition of criminal penalties for sitting, sleeping, or lying outside on public property for homeless individuals who cannot obtain shelter."

Reinforcing the Ninth Circuit's view was its non-binding decision in *Jones v. City of Los Angeles*, [8] which said, "[w]hether sitting, lying, and sleeping are defined as acts or conditions, they are universal and unavoidable consequences of being human." *Jones*, 444 F.3d at 1136. Moreover, any 'conduct at issue here is involuntary and inseparable from status — they are one and the same, given that human beings are biologically compelled to rest, whether by sitting, lying, or sleeping.' *Id.* As a result, just as the state may not criminalize the state of being 'homeless in public places,' the state may not 'criminalize conduct that is an unavoidable consequence of being homeless — namely sitting, lying, or sleeping on the streets.' *Id.* at 1137."

The Ninth Circuit declared its holding to be narrow, saying that it did not require cities to provide enough shelter for the homeless or allow anyone to sit, lie, or sleep anywhere at any time in any place. Quoting *Jones*, the Court said it held only that "so long as there is a greater number of homeless individuals in [a jurisdiction] than the number of available beds [in shelters] the jurisdiction cannot prosecute homeless individuals for 'involuntarily sitting, lying, and sleeping in public.' [Citation] That is, as long as there is no option of sleeping indoors, the government cannot criminalize indigent, homeless people for sleeping outdoors, on public property, on the false premise they had a choice in the matter." [9]

The Court acknowledged in a footnote:

"Naturally, our holding does not cover individuals who do have access to adequate temporary shelter, whether because they have the means to pay for it or because it is realistically available to them for free, but who choose not to use it. Nor do we suggest that a jurisdiction with insufficient shelter can never criminalize the act of sleeping outside. Even where shelter is unavailable, an ordinance prohibiting sitting, lying, or sleeping outside at particular times or in particular locations might well be constitutionally permissible. [Citation]. So, too, might an ordinance barring the obstruction of public rights of way or the erection of certain structures. Whether some other ordinance is consistent with the Eighth Amendment will depend, as here, on whether it punishes a person for lacking the means to live out the 'universal and unavoidable consequences of being human' in the way the ordinance prescribes. [Citation]."

Here, the Ninth Circuit said the two City of Boise ordinances criminalized the act of sleeping outside on public property in violation of the Eighth Amendment when no shelter was available. Accordingly, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed and remanded regarding plaintiffs' claims for declaratory and injunctive prospective relief, and for the two retrospective claims pertaining to citations that were dismissed without conviction or sentence. The Court affirmed the plaintiffs' other retrospective relief claims.

HOW THIS AFFECTS YOUR AGENCY

This case may have a significant impact on cities with substantial homeless populations and inadequate or insufficient homeless facilities. The impact on a potential increase in homeless presence in public areas on the one hand may vie against the costs of additional homeless shelters on the other. Agencies should review their policies to stay in accord of this potentially impactful decision with regards to citations and protocols for issuance of such citations. The public in some cities, such as San Francisco, are already heavily impacted by the large and increasing number of homeless individuals in public places, and their accompanying consequences. This case will not diminish that momentum.

It should also be noted that in *Joel v. City of Orlando*, 232 F.3d 1353, 1362 (11th Cir. 2000), the Eleventh Circuit upheld an anti-camping ordinance similar to Boise's against an Eighth Amendment challenge. In *Joel*, however, the defendants presented unrefuted evidence that the homeless shelters in the City of Orlando had never reached capacity and that the plaintiffs had always enjoyed access to shelter space. *Id.* Those unrefuted facts were critical to the court's holding. *Id.*

As always, if you wish to discuss this matter in greater detail, please feel free to contact me at (714) 446-1400 or via email at jrt@jones-mayer.com (<mailto:jrt@jones-mayer.com>).

Information on www.jones-mayer.com (<http://www.jones-mayer.com/>) is for general use and is not legal advice. The mailing of this Client Alert Memorandum is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client-relationship.

[1] *Bell v. City of Boise*, 709 F.3d 890 (9th Cir. 2013).

[2] 512 U.S. 477 (1994).

[3] 418 U.S. 539 (1974).

[4] 544 U.S. 74 (2005).

[5] *Ingraham v. Wright*, 430 U.S. 651, 667 (1977).

[6] 370 U.S. 660 (1962).

[7] 392 U.S. 514 (1968).

[8] 444 F.3d 1118, 1138 (9th Cir. 2006), vacated, 505 F.3d 1006 (9th Cir. 2007).

[9] *Jones*, 444 F.3d at 1138.

[About Us \(/about-us/\)](#)

[Areas Of Practice \(/areas-of-practice/city-attorney-services/\)](#)

[Our Team \(/our-team/\)](#)


[Contact Us \(/contact-us/\)](#)


FULLERTON OFFICE

3777 North Harbor Blvd.
Fullerton, CA 92835

 Get Directions

(<https://www.google.com/maps/dir//3777+N+Harbor+Blvd,+Fullerton,+CA+92835/>)
4m16!1m7!3m6!
1s0x80dd2a99629fa2c3:0xe1d6734f9be6b36!
2s3777+N+Harbor+Blvd,+Fullerton,+CA+92835!
3b1!8m2!3d33.9139183!4d-117.9328317!4m7!
1m0!1m5!1m1!
1s0x80dd2a99629fa2c3:0xe1d6734f9be6b36!
2m2!1d-117.9328317!2d33.9139183)

 714-446-1400


 714-446-1448


ROSEVILLE OFFICE

8150 Sierra College Blvd., Suite 190
Roseville, CA 95661

 Get Directions

(<https://www.google.com/maps/dir//8150+Sierra+College+Blvd,+Suite+190,+Roseville,+CA+95661/>)
4m16!1m7!3m6!
1s0x809b1fd094ba3901:0x3f626b7fa834cbc7!
2s8150+Sierra+College+Blvd+%23190,+Roseville,+CA+95661
3b1!8m2!3d38.7462868!4d-121.2269026!4m7!
1m0!1m5!1m1!
1s0x809b1fd094ba3901:0x3f626b7fa834cbc7!
2m2!1d-121.2269026!2d38.7462868)

 916-771-0635

 916-771-0690

 receptionist@jones-mayer.com
(<mailto:receptionist@jones-mayer.com>)

Need help? Search our site.



Search



JACKIE LACEY
DISTRICT ATTORNEY

LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

ONE MINUTE BRIEF

COPYRIGHT © 2018 LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. MAY BE REPRODUCED FOR NON-COMMERCIAL PROSECUTORIAL, LAW ENFORCEMENT AND EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY. 1MB@da.lacounty.gov

NUMBER: 2018-18 **DATE:** 10-09-18 **BY:** Devallis Rutledge **TOPIC:** Criminalizing Public Sleeping

ISSUE: When does the Eighth Amendment bar enforcement of a statute or ordinance prohibiting homeless sitting, sleeping or lying on sidewalks or in other public places?

The Eighth Amendment prohibits excessive bail and fines, as well as the infliction of “**cruel and unusual punishments.**” The Supreme Court has held that the ban on cruel and unusual punishments “*imposes substantive limits on what can be made criminal and punished as such.*” *Ingraham v. Wright* (1977) 430 US 651, 667.

The Ninth Circuit has ruled that criminalizing the status of being “homeless,” or criminalizing the “unavoidable consequences” of that status—such as sitting, lying or sleeping on sidewalks and other public grounds—constitutes cruel and unusual punishment, in violation of the Eighth Amendment.

- Boise, Idaho, was sued by Robert Martin and other homeless plaintiffs. Some were cited for violating a “camping ordinance” that prohibited dwelling on the streets, sidewalks, public parks or spaces (similar to many city and county ordinances in other jurisdictions); some were cited for violating a “disorderly conduct ordinance” that prohibited “occupying or lodging” without permission (similar to PC § 647(e)). Evidence showed that Boise then had 867 homeless individuals and 446 beds. The Ninth Circuit ruled that in such circumstances, enforcement violates the Eighth Amendment:

*“[J]ust as the state may not criminalize the state of being homeless in public places, the state may not criminalize conduct that is an **unavoidable consequence** of being homeless—namely, sitting, lying, or sleeping [in public]. ... We hold ... that so long as there is a **greater number of homeless individuals** in a jurisdiction **than the number of available beds in shelters**, the jurisdiction cannot prosecute homeless individuals*

for involuntarily sitting, lying, or sleeping in public. ... [A] municipality cannot criminalize such behavior consistently with the Eighth Amendment when no sleeping space is practically available in any shelter.”

Martin v. City of Boise (9th Cir. 2018) 902 F.3d 1031, 1048, 1049 (Punctuation and citations omitted; emphases added.)

The court did acknowledge (but without suggesting examples) that “*Even where shelter is unavailable, an ordinance prohibiting sitting, lying, or sleeping outside **at particular times** or **in particular locations** might well be constitutionally permissible. So, too, might an ordinance barring the **obstruction of public rights of way** or the **erection of certain structures**.*” *Id.*, at 1048, fn. 8.

- Law enforcement officers seeking a prosecution for public sleeping should include in written reports the **relative numbers** of area **homeless** and area **shelter beds available** on the date of violation. Prosecutors initiating a prosecution for violation of a public-sleeping ordinance should confirm that this evidence is sufficient to support prosecution.

- Because the ruling in *Martin* is now “clearly-established law” within the Ninth Circuit, officers should seek and follow the advice of the AG, county counsel, city attorney or other civil legal advisor, as to the civil liability implications of this ruling.

BOTTOM LINE: The Eighth Amendment bars enforcement of a statute or ordinance prohibiting homeless sitting, sleeping or lying on sidewalks or in other public places whenever the number of homeless individuals in the jurisdiction exceeds the number of available shelter beds.

This information was current as of publication date. It is not intended as legal advice. It is recommended that readers check for subsequent developments, and consult legal advisors to ensure currency after publication. Local policies and procedures regarding application should be observed.
