

PRO BONO PANEL PERIODICAL

WELCOME BACK! - THE SPRING 2022 PANEL PERIODICAL

As directed in General Order 2022-4: Court Operations During the COVID-19 – Pandemic: “It is further ORDERED that public and bar-related functions may be scheduled in person subject to availability of space.” Therefore, welcome back to the U.S. District Court, for public and bar-related functions.

In this issue of the Spring 2021 Panel Periodical, highlights include a “Featured Attorney Insight” from attorney Kevin Homiak, Kate Bailey, and Athul Archaya about his co-counsel’s experiences in reaching a favorable outcome for a client in a Panel case. Also featured is an outline by WilmerHale attorneys Nora Passamaneck and Aretha Frazier of recent and interesting 10th Circuit cases that could impact common issues for Civil Pro Bono Panel lawyers. Also, court staff provide informative summaries about the Civil Pro Bono Panel appointment process, how the court’s disciplinary process operates, a recap of the limited representation (unbundling) rule, and what and who perform the court’s *Initial Review* process.

Colorado’s Succession to Service Pro Bono Pipeline

The Civil Pro Bono Panel is now a participant in the online service “[Paladin](#),” a connection portal that allows pro bono law firms and lawyers nation-wide to express their interest in Civil Pro Bono Panels. Please let your local and national pro bono coordinators know that this is another way to find pro bono opportunities, and not just the U.S. District Court’s.

Paladin Search... Filter

SUCCESSION TO SERVICE Colorado's Pro Bono Pipeline

Looking for legal assistance? Click here.

[Express Interest](#)

[Share This Opportunity](#)

Who should volunteer

- Lawyers
- Law Students

Type of engagement

- Litigation

Time commitment

Varies - Limited representation could take 20 hrs. Investment. General representation of an entire case could take hundreds of hours.

Training and support

Annual In-Service Training Seminars through the Faculty of Federal Advocates (<https://www.facultyfederaladvocates.org/>).

- Training is provided
- CLE credit for training

Acquired skills

Case management | Drafting or writing | Client communication | Motion practice | Courtroom or trial experience | Negotiation

USDC Colo. Pro Bono Panel Ongoing Opportunities

The U.S. District Court, District of Colorado has continuous civil pro bono representation opportunities, through the court's Civil Pro Bono Panel program. The Panel is a program consisting of volunteer attorneys willing to represent individuals of limited financial means (not strictly limited to the "indigent") in civil matters whenever requested by the court and without compensation. Pro Bono Panel volunteers (individuals or law firms) are free to decline cases when contacted by court staff, without a penalty. Volunteers inform the court about the types of cases they are willing to consider, and court staff will send them only those types of cases to review. Malpractice insurance is covered under the program, as well as reimbursement of costs (potentially up to \$13,000, including expert fees), mentoring advice, CLE credit, and training programs through the court's partner in the program, the Faculty of Federal Advocates (<https://www.facultyfederaladvocates.org/>). Volunteers are also allowed to enter into contingency fee agreements OR attorney fee agreements with clients.

COVID-19 | **Formerly Incarcerated** | **People with Disabilities** | **Pre-Incarcerated & Incarcerated**

- Workers & Unemployed
- Civil Rights
- Employment
- Health
- Housing

Why work with U.S. District Court - District of Colorado

Pro bono representation opportunities of pro se parties – both general and limited scope – in Federal civil cases. Non-prisoner and prisoner (civil rights) cases. Mentoring by experienced lawyers, costs reimbursed, malpractice coverage, manuals vs. pro bono representation and federal litigation, and CLE credits are all provided.

Featured ATTORNEY INSIGHT

*The Panel Periodical offers the opportunity for a Panel Attorney(s) to share his or her experiences working on a Panel case. The following is presented as a guest column authored by attorneys **Kevin Homiak of Homiak Law, LLC, Kate Bailey of Messner Reeves LLP, and Athul Acharya of Public Accountability.** (The views of the attorneys do not represent the views of the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado.)*

Successful Resolution of an Excessive Force Case

Last November, a team from Homiak Law, Messner Reeves, and Public Accountability secured a \$750,000 settlement for a pro bono client who brought claims against El Paso County for excessive force and denial of timely medical care.

The client was a pre-trial detainee at the El Paso County Criminal Justice Center (“CJC”) in April 2015, when he suffered an orbital bone fracture and concussion after being violently taken to the ground by five El Paso County Sheriff’s deputies with his hands handcuffed behind his back. Video of the incident from inside the CJC cell also revealed that, although the client had visible symptoms of a concussion—vomiting, difficulty standing while interacting with deputies, and a swollen and bloody knot on his forehead—deputies did not seek medical attention for him for nearly ninety minutes.

The client filed suit in Colorado federal court in 2016. He represented himself for four years until the Court granted his motion to appoint counsel and sent the case to the Pro Bono Panel. We took the case in June 2020 and deposed over a dozen Sheriff’s deputies and their supervisors and learned that the El Paso County Sheriff’s Office had a widespread informal custom and practice of deputies unnecessarily taking pre-trial detainees at CJC to the ground without warning or justification—a practice which led to several deaths and serious injuries. One EPCSO lieutenant estimated in his deposition that nearly 100-200 similar violent takedowns occurred at CJC between 2005 and 2015, and that half of these takedowns involved inmates whose hands were handcuffed behind their back—making it impossible for them to protect their head or face. He explained that, at CJC, “detainees [were] always being taken to the floor unnecessarily” by deputies, were “regularly being taken to the floor as a first resort” by deputies, and that takedowns became “the norm so much that [they were] always used.”

After obtaining this testimony, the Court permitted us to amend the complaint to add a municipal liability claim against El Paso County and an Eighth Amendment denial of timely medical care claim against two EPCSO deputies. We reopened discovery, obtained thousands of pages of incident reports, and received hundreds of hours of surveillance footage from CJC depicting similar takedowns and detainee injuries. We also obtained key concessions in the deposition of the Sheriff of El Paso County, disclosed a fantastic use of force expert who previously served as the Sheriff of Pueblo County, and successfully opposed the defendants’ motion for summary judgment on qualified immunity grounds.

Featured ATTORNEY INSIGHT (continued)

Shortly before trial, Kate Bailey of Messner Reeves joined the case as trial counsel, and Athul Acharya of Public Accountability joined the case as appellate counsel. Ms. Bailey successfully convinced the Court to permit the late disclosure of a radiology expert to establish medical causation and obtained crucial deposition testimony from the client's treating physician (the medical director at CJC) that the deputies' takedown caused our client's facial fracture, and that he did not receive timely medical attention.

Mr. Acharya's assistance was equally invaluable. After the Court denied the defendants' motion for summary judgment, the individual defendants filed an interlocutory appeal with the Tenth Circuit, and El Paso County simultaneously moved to stay the trial on the remaining *Monell* claim just three weeks before it was set to begin. The defendants were confident that the case would not be tried on the scheduled date. But through his oral argument, Mr. Acharya successfully convinced the Court to certify the individual defendants' interlocutory appeal as frivolous, deny the County's motion to stay trial, and allow trial to proceed as scheduled.

After the final pretrial conference and on the Friday afternoon before trial, the defendants agreed to a monetary settlement of \$750,000 and to institute additional training and procedural safeguards at CJC, including recording all inmate and detainee disciplinary hearings, to resolve our client's claims. The defendants also agreed to refer the sixteen most egregious takedowns at CJC for further investigation. The victory represents the highest settlement amount in an excessive force case against El Paso County, and one of the highest excessive force settlements in Colorado not involving permanent injury.

“We recognized long ago that mere access to the courthouse doors does not, by itself, assure a proper functioning of the adversary process.”

– Justice Thurgood Marshall, Ake v. Oklahoma, 470 U.S. 68 (1986).

***Need to Access to “Live Shot Studio, Live Streaming, Virtual Events”
and other Video Productions?***

Linda Petrie Bunch, owner/operator of MFG Studios, LLC, contacted the clerk’s office after a Civil Pro Bono Panel member used her company’s services for an unrelated legal matter. Ms. Bunch, impressed by the work of the court’s program and Panel lawyers, is willing to volunteer time and services to Pro Bono Panel law firms and lawyers of the video production services if necessary and useful for a Civil Pro Bono Panel case. For more information, you may contact:

Linda Petrie Bunch | MFG Studios, LLC | accounting@mfgstudios.com
LPB Cell: 303.517.2165 | MFG: 303.349.3044 | ALT: 720.296.6850
320 Santa Fe Drive | Denver, CO 80223 | mfgstudios.com

Be on the Lookout for the USDC Civil Pro Bono Panel’s Annual Report

A publication of the court’s Standing Committee on Pro Se Litigation, the Civil Pro Bono Panel’s Annual Report presents information on the number of orders of appointment of pro bono counsel entered in 2021, the number of cases successfully placed with pro bono counsel, what types of cases were available, and will list an “Honor Roll” of the pro bono volunteers.

Article: Recent Tenth Circuit Cases

By Nora Passamaneck and Aretha Frazier (WilmerHale LLP)

(The views of the attorneys do not represent the views of the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado.)

The following is a summary of some recent Tenth Circuit decisions that may be of interest to the Panel:

Inmate Civil Rights / Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) / Rehabilitation Act
Crane v. Utah Dep’t of Corr., 15 F.4th 1296 (10th Cir. 2021)

The Court affirmed dismissal of claims for violations of the Eighth Amendment, the ADA, and the Rehabilitation Act brought by the estate of a mentally ill and intellectually disabled inmate who committed suicide while in Utah Department of Corrections custody. On the Eighth Amendment claims, the Court held that the named prison officials were shielded by qualified immunity because neither the “general use of punitive isolation to discipline prisoners who happen to be mentally ill” nor “subjecting a suicidal and intellectually disabled individual to . . . unusually harsh solitary confinement conditions” violated clearly established law. 15 F.4th at 1307. On the ADA and Rehabilitation Act claims, the Court clarified that “the ADA merely requires the plaintiff’s disability be a but-for cause (i.e., ‘by reason of’) of the discrimination, rather than—as the Rehabilitation Act requires—its sole cause (i.e., ‘solely by reason of’).” *Id.* at 1313. Dismissing the claims, the Court held that the estate had not alleged plausible facts for either claim.

First Amendment - Freedom of Speech
Thompson v. Ragland, 23 F.4th 1252 (10th Cir. 2022)

The Court reversed dismissal of a Metropolitan State University student’s claim for violation of her First Amendment right to free speech. The student had emailed her classmates encouraging them to leave “honest” reviews for a professor of a class she had dropped. That communication—according to the Associate Director for Student Conduct—violated the Student Code of Conduct, and as a result the student was instructed to cease further discussing that professor with any students. The student then filed suit for damages. The district court dismissed the complaint on the basis that the defendant (the Associate Director for Student Conduct) had not violated clearly established law and was therefore entitled to qualified immunity. Reversing and remanding for further proceedings, the Court explained that at the time of the events and as alleged in the complaint, “the law was clear that discipline cannot be imposed on student speech without good reason. And when, as here, that discipline takes the form of a prior restraint on student speech, the law is especially clear: such prospective, content-based restrictions ‘carr[y] a presumption of unconstitutionality.’” 23 F.4th at 1260 (citation omitted).

Article: Recent Tenth Circuit Cases (continued)

Race Discrimination – Title VI and Equal Protection

Sturdivant v. Fine, 22 F.4th 930 (10th Cir. 2022)

The Court affirmed the denial of defendant dance coach's motion for summary judgment on Title VI and equal protection claims brought by an African American high school student. The student asserted that the dance coach had instructed team members to exclude the student from activities after the coach lost her job for using a racial slur in text messages regarding the student. The Court first declined to address the coach's argument that she did not act under state law where she was terminated at the time of the conduct in question, explaining that action under state law is an element of § 1983 and not part of the qualified immunity defense (the issue on appeal). Addressing the facts, the Court held that a reasonable factfinder could infer that the coach had violated the student's right to equal protection and that the student's right to equal protection was clearly established at the time. "Given the long-standing recognition of an African-American student's right to equal treatment, [the coach] had fair notice that the Equal Protection Clause would prohibit her orchestration of a racially motivated boycott against [the student]." 22 F.4th at 938.

Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA")

Stroup v. United Airlines, Inc., 26 F.4th 1147 (10th Cir. 2022)

The Court affirmed the denial of defendant airline's motion for judgment as a matter of law and for a new trial after a jury returned a verdict in favor of plaintiff-flight attendants on their claims for wrongful termination in violation of the ADEA. The Court explained that trial hinged on whether there was pretext for termination, and that the jury's handling of this issue is dispositive unless the evidence is "lopsided." It held that there was sufficient evidence in the record. The Court further upheld the finding of willfulness, explaining the evidence of pretext supported willfulness where the plaintiffs had undermined the credibility of the defendant's witnesses. The Court further recognized that "pretext showings will not always turn so heavily on witness credibility," and that "we do not hold that the willfulness standard will be satisfied in every instance where plaintiffs are able to establish pretext and that the employer's decision-makers were trained on and aware of the legal prohibition against age discrimination." 26 F.4th at 1166.

Title VII – Sex Discrimination

Tudor v. Se. Oklahoma State Univ., 13 F.4th 1019 (10th Cir. 2021)

Title VII claims based on denial tenure and ultimate termination, on which she prevailed before a jury. The professor presented as a cis-man when she began teaching at the university in 2004; after her transition she was twice denied tenure despite recommendations. After the jury found in favor of the plaintiff and awarded her damages, the district court reduced the award, denied reinstatement, and awarded front pay. On cross-appeals, the Court held, among other things, that the district court abused

Article: Recent Tenth Circuit Cases (continued)

its discretion in denying the plaintiff's motion for reinstatement with tenure. Reinstatement is the preferred remedy, the university failed to show the necessary extreme hostility between the parties, and tenure would make the plaintiff whole in light of the jury verdict finding that she would have been granted tenure absent discrimination.

Title VII – Retaliation

Reznik v. inContact, Inc., 18 F.4th 1257 (10th Cir. 2021)

The Court reversed the dismissal of a Title VII retaliation claim brought by a former call-center employee who was terminated after reporting instances of racial harassment against two Filipino employees located in Manila, Philippines. Because Title VII protections do not extend to aliens, at issue was whether the plaintiff's belief that she was engaging in protected opposition to discrimination was objectively reasonable. Adopting "an objective reasonableness inquiry that considers the law against what a reasonable employee would believe, not 'what a reasonable labor and employment attorney would believe,'" the Court determined that it was reasonable for the plaintiff to think that the harassment she reported would violate Title VII. A dissenting opinion was filed and asserted that objective reasonableness of an employee's belief that her employer has engaged in an unlawful behavior should be measured against existing substantive law.

ADA – Employment

Edmonds-Radford v. Sw. Airlines Co., 17 F.4th 975 (10th Cir. 2021)

The Court affirmed the grant of summary judgment in favor of defendant airline on a former employee's ADA and Rehabilitation Act claims because the former employee's termination was based on not meeting the aptitude requirements for her position. The Court affirmed that the Rehabilitation Act does not apply because the plaintiff failed to establish the airline received federal financial assistance. The Supreme Court has already rejected the argument that federal grants to airports bring airlines within the purview of the Rehabilitation Act. Further, that the airline's predecessor received federal loans did not render the defendant the intended beneficiary or recipient of the funds. On the ADA disparate-treatment claim, the Court affirmed that the plaintiff failed to raise a factual issue that (1) she was terminated because of her disability where the decision-makers were unaware of her disability, or (2) the reason for termination was pretextual. The Court further affirmed summary judgment on the plaintiff's ADA failure to accommodate claim, holding that the plaintiff failed to establish that she requested accommodations in connection with her disability and that the airline failed to provide each requested accommodation.

What You Need to Know about U.S.D.C. Disciplinary Matters – and Good News, No Complaints in Panel Cases –

- Mark Fredrickson, Legal Specialist, U.S. District Court -

D.C.COLO.LAttyR 6(a) authorizes the Court's Chief Judge to appoint three Judicial officers that constitute the Court's Disciplinary Panel. The Disciplinary Panel has jurisdiction over disbarment, suspension, censure, or any other attorney discipline. The active District Court judges appoint twelve volunteer lawyers who constitute the court's Committee on Conduct and also appoint the Committee's Chair and Vice Chair. The Committee Chair in turn appoints all twelve members to one of four three-member subcommittees and appoints a chair for each subcommittee. The Committee Chair assigns to the subcommittees complaints against members of the Court's bar (about 3-5 a year), criminal convictions that must be evaluated to determine if disciplinary action is warranted (one or two a year), applications for reinstatement or readmission (about 5-8 a year), applications for relief from the rule of good standing (rarely sought and even more rarely granted), and allegations that a member of the bar is incapable of practicing law due to a disability (extremely rare, mostly reciprocally imposed when another court places an attorney on "disability/inactive" status). Except for the dismissal of a complaint against an attorney or if a complaint results in the Disciplinary Panel ordering charges filed, the Committee in most instances offers recommendations to the Disciplinary Panel on most matters that come before it. Should a complaint proceed to hearing before the Disciplinary Panel (extremely rare), the assigned subcommittee acts as prosecutor in the hearing. Federal Rules of Evidence and Procedure apply. Such proceedings are deemed as quasi-criminal with the due process rights of the accused strictly observed.

Please note that no disciplinary complaint has yet been filed against any attorney on the Pro Bono Panel since the Panel's inception, which speaks to the professionalism of Pro Bono Panel lawyers.

Almost all discipline is reciprocal from state or other federal disciplinary bodies and results not in identical discipline with a disbarment or suspension in another court resulting in a disbarment or suspension in our court, but a downgrading of the attorney's bar status by the Clerk of Court to "Not in Good Standing" by the imposition of the Rule of Good Standing. In good standing is defined as "not suspended or disbarred by any court for any reason." D.C.COLO.LAttyR 3(c). A Petitioner can obtain relief from the Rule of Good Standing if by clear and convincing evidence the attorney can show a denial of due process, a resulting grave injustice, or the misconduct giving rise to the discipline would warrant less severe discipline by our court. Relief from the Rule of Good Standing has recently been extended to applications for admission to the bar. Most often such relief is sought because an attorney has failed to pay fees or failed to comply with CLE requirements in a jurisdiction in which the attorney no longer practices. There is no committee on admissions, judicial or otherwise, and objective criteria, active in at least one jurisdiction and in good standing in all jurisdictions whenever or wherever admitted, are the only criteria used to determine

eligibility for admission to the bar. The Rule of Good Standing is strictly enforced. **Please note that no disciplinary complaint has yet been filed against any attorney on the Pro Bono Panel since the Panel's inception, which speaks to the professionalism of Pro Bono Panel lawyers.**

Limited Representation in Civil Cases – Local Rules, Instructions, Forms, and Frequently Asked Questions regarding Entering and Withdrawing an Appearance on a Limited Representation Basis

The U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado permits Limited Representation of all unrepresented parties -- non-prisoners and prisoners -- in civil actions. Effective December 1, 2016 this District broadened the scope of limited representation to allow such representation for ALL unrepresented parties. The Court continues *generally* to not permit the Colorado state court practice of limited representation unless counsel follow the Court's particular procedural requirements for limited representation. This District requires counsel to follow three procedural steps to successfully enter into, practice in, and withdraw from a case when acting as counsel on a limited representation basis. Generally, counsel must do the following:

- 1) File a Motion for Leave to Provide Limited Representation that sets forth a clearly-defined scope of representation, with "reasonable particularity."
- 2) Once the motion is granted, counsel should file an Entry of Appearance to Provide Limited Representation document in the case to officially demarcate the commencement of representation in the case.
- 3) Once the task, appearance, or service is completed, the attorney must file a Motion to Withdraw from the case, showing "good cause" for withdrawal -- i.e., describing the completion of the discrete task.

For more information, sample forms, rules FAQs, see [Limited Representation Guide](#).

Pro Se Division for the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado

– Frequently Asked Questions –

- Shawn Helgeson, Staff Attorney U.S. District Court -

What does the Pro Se Division do? The Pro Se Division assists the Court in handling specific actions as provided by Local Rule 8.1 and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915, 1915A. The Division conducts an initial review of the following:

- All cases filed by prisoners (without regard to whether the prisoner is represented by counsel or the filing fee is prepaid);
- All cases filed by nonprisoners who request to proceed in forma pauperis (without prepayment of the filing fee);

- All habeas corpus cases (except for death penalty cases or counseled and prepaid federal immigration actions) under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241, 2254, or 2255; and
- All requests to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal.

The Pro Se Division reviews prisoner and nonprisoner cases for claims that are frivolous or malicious, seek damages against an immune defendant, or do not comply with applicable procedural rules. Initial review can include entries of orders to cure designated deficiencies, orders to amend pleadings, and orders to show cause. Initial review often requires resolving motions such as motions for preliminary injunctive relief, to stay proceedings, or requesting discovery. Cases that do not survive initial review are dismissed. Cognizable claims are drawn for assignment to a presiding judge. If a case is drawn in whole or part, a memorandum summarizing the claims, applicable law, and any pending motions is provided contemporaneously to the assigned judge via the Clerk's Office.

In habeas corpus cases, the Pro Se Division resolves preliminary matters including timeliness, exhaustion of available administrative or state court remedies, and determining whether the claims are improperly second or successive. Many habeas cases are dismissed in their entirety as part of initial review. If a habeas case cannot be dismissed in its entirety as part of initial review, the case is drawn for assignment to a presiding judge, and the Pro Se Law Clerk assigned to the case during initial review will remain assigned to the case. If appropriate, the Pro Se Law Clerk will provide a draft order to the assigned judge dismissing some claims based on untimeliness or exhaustion and ordering that the remaining claims be addressed on their merits. Whether claims are dismissed in part or drawn in full, the assigned Pro Se Law Clerk retains responsibility to prepare a draft order on the merits for the assigned judge after briefing is completed. The District's policy for § 2255 motions is that the Pro Se Division conducts an initial review and, if the motion is not denied, the sentencing judge handles the merits.

How many cases does the Pro Se Division handle? In 2021, the Pro Se Division reviewed approximately **32%** of the civil cases filed in this District (**1,137 out of 3,507**). The Division's statistics for 2021 are as follows (statistics include resolution of cases assigned in prior years):

- Prisoner cases (nonhabeas): **616** assigned; **467** dismissed; **137** drawn
- Nonprisoner IFP cases: **277** assigned; **207** dismissed; **89** drawn
- Habeas corpus – initial review: **244** assigned; **205** dismissed; **49** drawn
- Habeas corpus actions resolved on the merits: **56**

Who is in the Pro Se Division and how can Court/Chambers staff contact you? Senior Judge Lewis T. Babcock and Magistrate Judge Gordon P. Gallagher supervise the Pro Se Division and sign orders. There are eight lawyers in the Pro Se Division.

Reminder – Stay in Touch with Civil Pro Bono Panel Documents, News, and Events on the U.S. District Court’s Civil Pro Bono Panel [Webpage](#):

Civil Pro Bono Panel - Details, and Available Cases

PERMANENT PROGRAM FOR COURT APPOINTMENT OF PRO BONO COUNSEL

ANNOUNCEMENT – THE FEDERAL COURT PRISON LITIGATION HANDBOOK IS NOW AVAILABLE FOR ALL ATTORNEYS INTERESTED IN REPRESENTING INCARCERATED LITIGANTS

Application for Attorneys to Join the Civil Pro Bono Panel and Sample Motions:

- [Download Civil Pro Bono Application](#)
- [Download Local Rule LAttyR 15 - Civil Pro Bono Representation](#)
- [Download Civil Pro Bono Panel Description](#)
- [Download Attorney Motion for Panel Appointment](#)
- [Link to Other Civil Pro Bono Panel Attorney Forms](#)

Handbooks, Instructions, and Guides:

- [Download Federal Court Prison Litigation Handbook for Attorneys](#)
- [Download Limited Representation Guide](#)

"Panel Periodical" Newsletters:

- [Download Spring 2019 Civil Pro Bono Panel "Panel Periodical" Newsletter](#)
- [Download Winter 2019 Civil Pro Bono Panel "Panel Periodical" Newsletter](#)
- [Download Spring 2020 Civil Pro Bono Panel "Panel Periodical" Newsletter](#)
- [Download Fall 2020 Civil Pro Bono Panel "Panel Periodical" Newsletter](#)
- [Download Winter 2020 Civil Pro Bono Panel "Panel Periodical" Newsletter](#)
- [Download Spring 2021 Civil Pro Bono Panel "Panel Periodical" Newsletter](#)
- [Download Fall 2021 Civil Pro Bono Panel "Panel Periodical" Newsletter](#)

Pro Bono Panel Annual Reports and Recognition of Volunteer Attorneys:

- [Download 2017 Annual Report of the Civil Pro Bono Panel](#)
- [Download 2018-2019 Annual Report of the Civil Pro Bono Panel](#)
- [Download 2019-2020 Annual Report of the Civil Pro Bono Panel](#)
- [Download 2021 Court-FFA Dec. 7, 2021 Recognition of Volunteer Attorneys](#)

Cases Available TO ALL ATTORNEYS for Pro Bono Representation

[Per LAttyR 15(f), at least four Civil Pro Bono Panel attorneys have reviewed each of these cases and opted not to accept representation]:

Case Number	Case Name	Cause of Action	Plaintiff/Defendant	Complaint
18-cv-00320-WJM-STV	Samuel O.P. Yeiser v. DG Retail, LLC, et al.	Cause: 42:1983 Prisoner Civil Rights (Complaint alleges racial discrimination in violation of 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981 and 1982,	Plaintiff	Complaint