

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CURRENT LAW	2
2014 REPORT SUMMARY	2
2017 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	3
COMPLIANCE FINDINGS	3
COMMON POLICY DEFICIENCIES	4
FAILURE TO MANDATE NOTIFICATION OF RIGHTS	4
FAILURE TO GRANT MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY	5
RELIANCE ON OUTDATED OR INACCURATE LEXIPOL MATERIAL.....	5
REFERENCE TO REPEALED OR IRRELEVANT STATUTES	5
RECOMMENDATIONS	6
PROVIDE TRANSLATED MATERIALS	6
EDUCATE MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS.....	6
MANDATE SUPERVISOR APPROVAL.....	6
MANDATE REPORTING	6
CONCLUSION	7
APPENDIX 1: TEXT OF CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE SECTION 3407	8
APPENDIX 2: TEXT OF TITLE 15, SECTION 1058.5. RESTRAINTS AND PREGNANT INMATES	9
APPENDIX 3: COMPLIANCE STATUS OF 36 COUNTIES INVESTIGATED.....	10
APPENDIX 4: COMPLIANCE STATUS OF ALL CALIFORNIA COUNTIES	11
APPENDIX 5: RECOMMENDED LANGUAGE ON MANDATING SUPERVISOR APPROVAL FOR USE OF RESTRAINTS (KINGS COUNTY)	12
APPENDIX 6: RECOMMENDED LANGUAGE ON MANDATING REPORTING AFTER USE OF RESTRAINTS (SAN LUIS OBISPO)	13

INTRODUCTION

Legal Services for Prisoners with Children (LSPC) believes in the human dignity of people in prison. As part of this mission, we have advocated for the rights of pregnant prisoners in California for nearly 40 years.

Pregnant people in correctional facilities face unique challenges. Pregnant prisoners are more likely to experience preeclampsia and pre-term birth than non-incarcerated people, and are more likely to have low birthweight babies.¹ Restraints that are routine in many correctional settings pose an additional threat for pregnant prisoners; a person who is restrained during pregnancy and birth faces increased risk of medical complications.² LSPC has been working to end the shackling of pregnant prisoners since 2005.³

In 2012, LSPC was proud to work with Assemblymember Toni Atkins (author) and Assemblymembers Nancy Skinner and Holly Mitchell (co-authors) to pass AB 2530, legislation to significantly restrict the shackling of pregnant prisoners in California. As a result, state law currently prohibits the most dangerous forms of restraint from being used on any incarcerated person known to be pregnant (Penal Code section 3407). In March of 2013, LSPC embarked on a project to determine whether all 58 California counties had written new policies on the shackling of pregnant prisoners to comply with section 3407.⁴ Our findings were disappointing: as of February 2014, only 23 out of 58 counties had policies fully compliant with the new law.

This report details LSPC's recent effort to update our investigation into the implementation of California's anti-shackling law. We focus specifically on the 36 counties determined to be non-compliant in 2014. In the following pages we explain the relevant legal authority, describe our research methodology, and outline the findings of our 8-month investigation.

As of September 2017, LSPC has determined that 26 out of the 36 counties investigated, and 48 California counties overall, are fully compliant with state anti-shackling laws. We hope this report continues to shed light on the dangerous use of restraints on pregnant prisoners, encourages the remaining 10 counties to come into full compliance with the law, and ultimately helps to ensure that incarcerated pregnant people are treated with the dignity, respect, and care they deserve.

¹ Marian Knight & Emma Plugge, *The Outcomes of Pregnancy Among Imprisoned Women: A Systematic Review*, 112 BJOG: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF OBSTETRICS & GYNECOLOGY 1467 (2005).

² Alison Smock, *Childbirth in Chains: A Report on the Cruel but not so Unusual Practice of Shackling Incarcerated Pregnant Females in the United States*, 3(2) TENNESSEE JOURNAL OF RACE, GENDER, & SOCIAL JUSTICE 111 (2014).

³ In 2005, LSPC worked with Assemblymember Sally Lieber to enact legislation that prohibited the shackling of pregnant prisoners in labor, during childbirth, and during recovery from childbirth. CAL. PENAL CODE §§ 5007.7, 6030(f).

⁴ There are no jail facilities in Alpine County. Jail services are primarily contracted to El Dorado County. For the purpose of this report, we evaluated its policies the same as El Dorado County policies.

CURRENT LAW

Enacted in 2012, California Penal Code section 3407 bans the most dangerous types of restraints (leg irons, waist chains and handcuffs behind the body) for pregnant prisoners under any circumstances. PC §3407 (a). The law also prohibits the routine restraint of pregnant prisoners in labor, during delivery, or in recovery after delivery by stating that in these circumstances, a pregnant prisoner *shall not* be restrained by the wrists, ankles or both unless deemed necessary for the safety and security of the prisoners, the staff, or the public. PC §3407 (b). In addition, the law grants medical professionals the authority to direct that restraints be removed from a pregnant prisoner at any time. PC §3407 (c). Finally, section 3407 (e) mandates that each California county inform pregnant prisoners of these rights.

These policies are also mandated by the Board of State and Community Corrections in *Title 15 Minimum Standards for Local Detention Facilities* Division 1, Chapter 1, Subchapter 4, section 1058.5. The full text of section 3407 and Title 15, section 1058.5 are attached in Appendix 1 and 2, respectively.

2014 REPORT SUMMARY

In February 2014, LSPC released our *No More Shackles* report detailing California counties' implementation of Penal Code section 3407. Starting in March of 2013, LSPC mailed Public Records Act (PRA) requests to all 58 California sheriffs. We enclosed the text of section 3407, outlined its mandates, and requested that each county send us a copy of its policies on the restraint of pregnant prisoners. We followed up repeatedly with non-responsive counties throughout the following months. By December of 2013, LSPC had received policies from 55 California counties.

We carefully compared each policy with Penal Code section 3407. All non-compliant counties received individualized letters with recommendations for updating their policies in order to come into full compliance with state law. We asked non-compliant counties to review and update their policies as soon as possible, and we provided approximately two months for revisions.

The following compliance findings were based on the 55 written policies received and compiled as of February 7, 2014:

- **21** counties were in *full compliance* with §3407
- **32** counties were in *partial compliance* with §3407
- **2** counties were *entirely non-compliant* with §3407
- **3** counties *did not provide policies* for review

After the publication of our 2014 report, Calaveras County provided an updated version of its policy and was determined to be in full compliance with section 3407.

2017 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This report details LSPC's efforts to determine the current compliance status of the 36 California counties which were not in full compliance in 2014. In February of 2017, LSPC mailed PRA requests to the sheriffs of these 36 counties. We again provided each county with the text of section 3407, outlined its mandates, and requested that each county send us a copy of its policies pertaining to the restraint of pregnant prisoners.

Each county's policy was then evaluated using a four-part compliance grading system. To be considered fully compliant, the relevant policy had to include all of the following components of section 3407:

1. Mandate that a prisoner known to be pregnant or in recovery after delivery **shall never be restrained by the use of leg irons, waist chains, or handcuffs from behind the body** (subsection a);
2. Statement that a pregnant prisoner in labor, during delivery, or in recovery after delivery, **shall not be restrained by the wrists, ankles, or both**, unless deemed necessary for the safety and security of the prisoner, the staff, or the public (subsection b);
3. Specification that **medical professionals' authority** to require the removal of all restraints from pregnant prisoners (subsection c);
4. Requirement that **pregnant prisoners be advised, orally or in writing**, of these standards and policies governing pregnant prisoners (subsection e).

Of the **36** counties that were sent PRA requests in February, **28** provided their policies in a timely manner. LSPC followed up repeatedly with the eight non-responsive counties, including a second PRA request in April and phone calls as necessary. In addition, LSPC sent individualized letters to non-compliant counties. We again explained the mandates of section 3407 and provided specific recommendations for modifying each county's policy in order to come into full compliance with California law.

By July, LSPC had received policies from **35** out of the **36** California counties investigated. Santa Cruz sent revised policies in September. The following findings are based on materials we have received as of September 2017.

COMPLIANCE FINDINGS

We carefully evaluated each county's policy regarding the restraint of pregnant prisoners. Based on the most recently provided policies of the 36 counties investigated, we found:

- **26 counties** are in **full compliance** with §3407
- **9 counties** are in **partial compliance** with §3407⁵
- **1 county did not provide policies** for review⁶

⁵ Amador, Colusa, Lassen, Madera, Monterey, Plumas, Sonoma, Tulare, and Yuba. Colusa and Sonoma counties are in the process of updating their policies to come into full compliance.

⁶ Del Norte County.

In addition to the 22 counties previously determined to be fully compliant, the 26 new counties in full compliance with section 3407 are the following: Contra Costa, Glenn, Imperial, Inyo, Kings, Lake, Mendocino, Merced, Modoc, Mono, Orange, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Sierra, Siskiyou, Solano, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity and Ventura.

Of the 10 counties that are non-compliant:

- **1 county is missing three out of four** components of PC §3407⁷
- **3 counties are missing two out of four** components of PC §3407⁸
- **4 counties are missing one out of four** components of PC §3407⁹
- **1 county did not provide policies** for review¹⁰

As of September 2017, 48 California counties are fully compliant with state anti-shackling laws. These findings demonstrate a significant increase in compliance since our 2014 report. Nonetheless, it is unacceptable that, five years after the passage of Assembly Bill 2530, 10 California counties have yet to sufficiently codify the rights of pregnant prisoners in their policies.

We are also extremely disappointed that, once again, Del Norte County has refused to comply with our PRA request to provide its policy on the restraint of pregnant prisoners.¹¹ Without the opportunity to evaluate its policy, LSPC must presume that Del Norte County is completely non-compliant with state law.

COMMON POLICY DEFICIENCIES

FAILURE TO MANDATE NOTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

Of the nine responding counties who are not fully compliant with Penal Code section 3407, eight counties failed to mandate that pregnant prisoners be informed of their rights.¹² This was by far the most common deficiency among non-compliant counties. Two of these counties provided the rights of pregnant prisoners on signs and in prisoner handbooks, but did not include the right to notification within their policies themselves.¹³ We strongly advise all counties to mandate prisoner notification within their policies, in addition to including pregnant prisoners' rights within prisoner materials. This guarantees compliance with section 3407 and ensures that jail staff, medical professionals, and prisoners are equally informed of the law.

⁷ Madera County.

⁸ Amador, Colusa, and Monterey.

⁹ Lassen, Plumas, Sonoma, Tulare, and Yuba.

¹⁰ Del Norte County.

¹¹ Del Norte County also refused to provide its policies on the restraint of pregnant prisoners during our 2013 investigation.

¹² Amador, Colusa, Lassen, Madera, Monterey, Plumas, Tulare, and Yuba.

¹³ Amador and Colusa.

FAILURE TO SPECIFY MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS' AUTHORITY

Two counties did not specify that medical professionals have the authority to remove prisoner restraints.¹⁴ Even though sections 3407 (a) and (b) allow for restraints in rare circumstances – if deemed necessary for the safety and security of the prisoner, the staff, or the public – a medical professional may nonetheless override this decision.

Counties that fail to include this provision in their policies are putting prisoners at risk of severe medical complications. A pregnant prisoner who is restrained faces increased medical risk. It is critical that correctional officers be informed of medical professionals' authority to remove restraints if and when they deem it necessary to do so.

RELIANCE ON OUTDATED OR INACCURATE LEXIPOL MATERIAL

Twelve counties obtained their anti-shackling policies from Lexipol, LLC, a for-profit provider of policy manuals for custody organizations.¹⁵ Over the course of our 2017 investigation, LSPC reviewed six different Lexipol policies pertaining to the restraint of pregnant prisoners. Four counties are currently relying on incorrect or outdated Lexipol policies that are not in compliance with state law.¹⁶

The use of incorrect Lexipol policies is particularly concerning considering that we previously noted this problem in our 2014 *No More Shackles* report.¹⁷ We advise all counties relying on Lexipol to ensure that their policies are updated and fully compliant with section 3407. We will also be reaching out to Lexipol directly to urge that it create and distribute a uniform, updated policy compliant with state law.

REFERENCE TO REPEALED OR IRRELEVANT STATUTES

In 2012, Assembly Bill 2530 repealed Penal Code section 5007.7, an outdated and less protective shackling ban. Nonetheless, we found that three counties continue to refer to section 5007.7 within their policies.¹⁸ This is especially problematic because Penal Code section 3407 (b) directly improves upon the language of section 5007.7 by removing the condition that shackling restrictions do not apply until a medical professional determines that a prisoner is in active labor. Current law was written specifically to ensure that prisoners in labor are not shackled before receiving medical attention (either at the correctional facility or in transport to the hospital). Counties that continue to reference repealed section 5007.7 are at risk of illegally and dangerously restraining prisoners in labor.

Several counties also cite Penal Code section 6030. However, the shackling restrictions that were previously in section 6030 have all been moved from that statute to section 3407. Similarly, one county cited Penal Code section 3423 in its policy, a statute that dictates procedures for community treatment programs, not local jails.¹⁹

¹⁴ Monterey and Madera.

¹⁵ Amador, Inyo, Lake, Lassen, Mono, Monterey, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, Sierra, Siskiyou, and Tulare.

¹⁶ Amador, Lassen, Monterey, and Tulare.

¹⁷ In 2014 LSPC determined that nine counties were relying on inaccurate Lexipol policy: Glenn, Lake, Modoc, Mono, San Joaquin, Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, and Trinity.

¹⁸ Colusa, Plumas, and Sonoma.

¹⁹ Colusa.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We strongly encourage the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC), and all California counties to:

- 1) Hold counties more accountable for having up-to-date policies with current legislation;
- 2) Provide translated versions of all materials distributed to female prisoners, especially those that outline their pregnancy rights; and
- 3) Educate medical professionals on their critical role in ensuring that restraints are removed from pregnant prisoners, as provided in section 3407 (c).

PROVIDE TRANSLATED MATERIALS

Forty percent of California households speak a language other than English in the home, and over one-third of California's adult female prison population identifies as Hispanic.^{20,21} In order to ensure that non-English speaking prisoners are aware of their rights, we advise California counties to provide relevant language translations of all pregnancy rights materials.

EDUCATE MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS

The fact that section 3407 (c) grants medical professionals the authority to have restraints removed from pregnant prisoners makes this policy directly relevant to all medical professionals who care for pregnant prisoners. We recommend that medical associations and the corrections community take steps to ensure that medical providers are fully informed of their role and responsibilities in caring for pregnant prisoners under section 3407. In addition, we strongly urge that the authority granted to medical professionals by this law be incorporated into medical facilities' policy manuals and relevant trainings.

MANDATE SUPERVISOR APPROVAL

Sixteen counties require that a jail supervisor, and not a line officer, make the decision to restrain a pregnant prisoner in labor in the event of a safety or security threat.²² While not explicitly mandated by section 3407, this requirement increases officer accountability and helps to ensure that the presence of a prisoner "threat" is not routinely used to justify restraint. To ensure that prisoners in labor are shackled only in truly exceptional circumstances, we recommend all counties adopt a similar requirement. Recommended language can be found in Appendix 5.

MANDATE REPORTING

Seventeen counties also mandate reporting in any circumstance that requires shackling during labor.²³ These counties require that officers provide written documentation in the event of an exceptional

²⁰U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Population and Housing Unit Estimates* (2016).

²¹Cal. Dep't of Corrections & Rehabilitation, *Prison Census Data* (2013).

²²Inyo, Kings, Lake, Lassen, Madera, Mono, Monterey, Sacramento, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tulare, Ventura, and Yuba.

²³Colusa, Inyo, Kings, Lake, Lassen, Mono, Orange, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Cruz, Siskiyou, Solano, Tulare, Ventura, and Yuba.

circumstance requiring restraint of a pregnant prisoner. While time frames vary, most counties require documentation to be filed within 10 days. Because such language similarly reduces the potential for unnecessary and harmful restraint, we recommend all counties adopt reporting requirements. Recommended language can be found in Appendix 6.

CONCLUSION

LSPC is pleased to have received policies from 35 of the 36 counties investigated in 2017. We are grateful to these counties, as well as those investigated in 2014, for taking the time to respond to our requests and policy recommendations. On the basis of our evaluation, LSPC can now verify that the policies of 48 out of 58 California counties (over 80%) are in total compliance with section 3407.

These findings demonstrate a significant increase in compliance since our 2014 report. Nonetheless, we were extremely disappointed to find that 10 California counties have yet to codify the rights of pregnant prisoners in their policies. It is unacceptable that five years after the passage of anti-shackling legislation, about 17 percent of California counties remain non-compliant with state law.

Penal Code section 3407 was enacted to protect pregnant people from experiencing dangerous medical complications while incarcerated. When legislation that pertains directly to the health and safety of prisoners takes effect, it is critical that California counties promptly update their policies to come into compliance with every component of that legislation. This report, in addition to LSPC's 2014 *No More Shackles* report, demonstrates that many California counties fail to write and update their policies in a timely, responsive manner. As a result, pregnant prisoners in California may continue to receive illegal, dangerous treatment and experience increased medical risk.

LSPC is proud of our history advocating on behalf of pregnant prisoners in California, and we will continue to advocate for prisoners' unconditional right to a dignified and healthy pregnancy, labor, and post-delivery. This report demonstrates that, while we have made significant progress in this effort, our work remains unfinished.

APPENDIX 1: Text of California Penal Code §3407

- a) A Prisoner known to be pregnant or in recovery after delivery shall not be restrained by the use of leg irons, waist chains, or handcuffs behind the body.
- b) A pregnant prisoner in labor, during delivery, or in recovery after delivery, shall not be restrained by the wrists, ankles, or both, unless deemed necessary for the safety and security of the prisoner the staff, or the public.
- c) Restraints shall be removed when a professional who is currently responsible for the medical care of a pregnant prisoner during a medical emergency, labor, delivery, or recovery after delivery determines that the removal of restraints is medically necessary.
- d) This section shall not be interpreted to require restraints in a case where restraints are not required pursuant to a statute, regulation, or correctional facility policy.
- e) Upon confirmation of a prisoner's pregnancy, she shall be advised, orally or in writing, of the standards and policies governing pregnant prisoners, including, but not limited to, the provisions of this chapter, the relevant regulations, and the correctional facility policies.
- f) For purposes of this section, "prisoner" means an adult or juvenile who is incarcerated in a state or local correctional facility.

APPENDIX 2: Text of BSCC Title 15, §1058.5. Restraints and Pregnant Inmates

The facility administrator, in cooperation with the responsible physician, shall develop written policies and procedures for the use of restraint devices on pregnant inmates. In accordance with Penal Code 3407 the policy shall include reference to the following:

- 1) An inmate known to be pregnant or in recovery after delivery shall not be restrained by the use of leg irons, waist chains, or handcuffs behind the body.
- 2) A pregnant inmate in labor, during delivery, or in recovery after delivery, shall not be restrained by the wrists, ankles, or both, unless deemed necessary for the safety and security of the inmate, the staff, or the public.
- 3) Restraints shall be removed when a professional who is currently responsible for the medical care of a pregnant inmate during a medical emergency, labor, delivery, or recovery after delivery determines that the removal of restraints is medically necessary.
- 4) Upon confirmation of an inmate's pregnancy, she shall be advised, orally or in writing, of the standards and policies governing pregnant inmates.

APPENDIX 3: Compliance status of 36 counties investigated

CA Counties	(1) Ban 3 Restraints	(2) No Restraints Unless Safety Issue	(3) Medical Professional Authority	(4) Notification of Rights
Amador	X		X	X
Colusa	X	X		
Contra Costa	X	X	X	X
Del Norte				
Glenn	X	X	X	X
Imperial	X	X	X	X
Inyo	X	X	X	X
Kings	X	X	X	X
Lake	X	X	X	X
Lassen	X	X	X	
Madera		X		
Mendocino	X	X	X	X
Merced	X	X	X	X
Modoc	X	X	X	X
Mono	X	X	X	X
Monterey	X	X		
Orange	X	X	X	X
Plumas	X	X	X	
Sacramento	X	X	X	X
San Francisco	X	X	X	X
San Joaquin	X	X	X	X
San Luis Obispo	X	X	X	X
San Mateo	X	X	X	X
Santa Barbara	X	X	X	X
Santa Clara	X	X	X	X
Santa Cruz	X	X	X	X
Sierra	X	X	X	X
Siskiyou	X	X	X	X
Solano	X	X	X	X
Sonoma	X		X	X
Sutter	X	X	X	X
Tehama	X	X	X	X
Trinity	X	X	X	X
Tulare	X	X	X	
Ventura	X	X	X	X
Yuba	X	X	X	

Key:

Total compliance	26
Not in compliance	9
No response	1

APPENDIX 4: Compliance Status of all California Counties

CA Counties	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Alameda	X	X	X	X
Alpine	X	X	X	X
Amador	X		X	X
Butte	X	X	X	X
Calaveras	X	X	X	X
Colusa	X	X		
Contra Costa	X	X	X	X
Del Norte				
El Dorado	X	X	X	X
Fresno	X	X	X	X
Glenn	X	X	X	X
Humboldt	X	X	X	X
Imperial	X	X	X	X
Inyo	X	X	X	X
Kern	X	X	X	X
Kings	X	X	X	X
Lake	X	X	X	X
Lassen	X	X	X	
Los Angeles	X	X	X	X
Madera		X		
Marin	X	X	X	X
Mariposa	X	X	X	X
Mendocino	X	X	X	X
Merced	X	X	X	X
Modoc	X	X	X	X
Mono	X	X	X	X
Monterey	X	X		
Napa	X	X	X	X
Nevada	X	X	X	X

CA Counties	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Orange	X	X	X	X
Placer	X	X	X	X
Plumas	X	X	X	
Riverside	X	X	X	X
Sacramento	X	X	X	X
San Benito	X	X	X	X
San Bernardino	X	X	X	X
San Diego	X	X	X	X
San Francisco	X	X	X	X
San Joaquin	X	X	X	X
San Luis Obispo	X	X	X	X
San Mateo	X	X	X	X
Santa Barbara	X	X	X	X
Santa Clara	X	X	X	X
Santa Cruz	X	X	X	X
Shasta	X	X	X	X
Sierra	X	X	X	X
Siskiyou	X	X	X	X
Solano	X	X	X	X
Sonoma	X		X	X
Stanislaus	X	X	X	X
Sutter	X	X	X	X
Tehama	X	X	X	X
Trinity	X	X	X	X
Tulare	X	X	X	
Tuolumne	X	X	X	X
Ventura	X	X	X	X
Yolo	X	X	X	X
Yuba	X	X	X	

Keys:

Total compliance	48
Not in compliance	9
No response	1

(1)	Ban 3 Restraints
(2)	No Restraints Unless Safety Issue
(3)	Medical Professional Authority
(4)	Notification of Rights

APPENDIX 5: Recommended Language on Mandating Supervisor Approval for Use of Restraints (Kings County)

514.8 PREGNANT INMATES

Restraints will not be used on inmates who are known to be pregnant unless based on an individualized determination that restraints are reasonably necessary for the legitimate safety and security needs of the inmate, the staff or the public. Should restraints be necessary, the restraints shall be the least restrictive available and the most reasonable under the circumstances.

In no event will an inmate who is known to be pregnant be restrained by the use of leg restraints/irons, waist restraints/chains, or handcuffs behind the body (Penal Code §3407).

514.8.1 INMATES IN LABOR

No inmate in labor, delivery or recovery shall be restrained by the use of leg restraints/irons, waist restraints/chains, or handcuffs behind the body (Penal Code §3407).

No inmate who is in labor, delivery or recovery from a birth shall be otherwise restrained except when all of the following exist (Penal Code §3407):

- a. There is substantial flight risk or some other extraordinary medical or security circumstance that dictates restraints be used to ensure the safety and security of the inmate, the staff of this or the medical facility, other inmates or the public.
- b. A supervisor has made an individualized determination that such restraints are necessary to prevent escape or injury.**
- c. There is no objection from the treating medical care provider.
- d. The restraints used are the least restrictive type and are used in the least restrictive manner.

Restraints shall be removed when medical staff responsible for the medical care of the pregnant inmate determines that the removal of restraints is medically necessary (Penal Code §3407).

The supervisor should, within 10 days, make written findings specifically describing the type of restraints used, the justification and the underlying extraordinary circumstances.

APPENDIX 6: Recommended Language on Mandating Reporting After Use of Restraints (San Luis Obispo)

523.10 PREGNANT INMATES

Restraints will not be used on inmates who are known to be pregnant unless based on an individualized determination that restraints are reasonably necessary for the legitimate safety and security needs of the inmate, the staff or the public. Should restraints be necessary, the restraints shall be the least restrictive available and the most reasonable under the circumstances.

In no event will an inmate who is known to be pregnant be restrained by the use of leg restraints/irons, waist restraints/chains, or handcuffs behind the body (Penal Code §3407).

523.10.1 INMATES IN LABOR

No inmate in labor, delivery or recovery shall be restrained by the use of leg restraints/irons, waist restraints/chains, or handcuffs behind the body (Penal Code §3407).

No inmate who is in labor, delivery or recovery from a birth shall be otherwise restrained except when all of the following exist (Penal Code §3407):

- a. There is substantial flight risk or some other extraordinary medical or security circumstance that dictates restraints be used to ensure the safety and security of the inmate, the staff of this or the medical facility, other inmates or the public.
- b. A supervisor has made an individualized determination that such restraints are necessary to prevent escape or injury.
- c. There is no objection from the treating medical care provider.
- d. The restraints used are the least restrictive type and are used in the least restrictive manner.

Restraints shall be removed when medical staff responsible for the medical care of the pregnant inmate determines that the removal of restraints is medically necessary (Penal Code §3407).

The supervisor should, within 10 days, make written findings specifically describing the type of restraints used, the justification and the underlying extraordinary circumstances.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the lead authors of AB 2530, Assemblymembers Toni Atkins, Nancy Skinner, and Holly Mitchell. We would also like to acknowledge our fellow co-sponsors, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, District IX (California) and the American Civil Liberties Union. We extend our thanks to LSPC staff and interns, with special gratitude to: Karen Shain for her legislative advocacy, Jesse Stout and Georgia Valentine, the principle contributors to LSPC's 2014 *No More Shackles* report, and former interns Rebecca DeWitt and Meghan Herbert for their time and research at the start of this project. Finally, we acknowledge the inspirational leadership of Dorsey Nunn, LSPC's Executive Director. Thank you for making this project possible.

Our Mission

LSPC organizes communities impacted by the criminal justice system and advocates to release incarcerated people, to restore human and civil rights and to reunify families and communities. We build public awareness of structural racism in policing, the courts and prison system and we advance racial and gender justice in all our work.

Our strategies include legal support, trainings, advocacy, public education, grassroots mobilization and developing community partnerships.

Legal Services for Prisoners with Children

1540 Market St., Suite 490

San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 255-7036

Fax: (415) 552-3150

info@prisonerswithchildren.org

www.prisonerswithchildren.org