

11. The present action eviscerates the role of community input and may not constitute an actual case or controversy before the court in the absence of the Coalition Against Police Brutality as a party intervenor.

12. In seeking an expedited judicial sanction to the proposed agreements, the parties are seeking to avoid the required input of public stakeholders whose interests are significantly impacted and potentially impaired by the proposed Consent Judgments. At the time of filing the Complaint, the Judgments represented a proposed agreement between the parties. Local law requires that all such contracts and settlements of lawsuits require the approval of Detroit City Council before they become binding against the City. This mechanism of democratic government allows the opportunity for the public to be heard during legislative consideration of the matter.

13. Community input and outreach have been required and integrated into the consent decrees and agreements entered into by the DOJ with police departments in other jurisdictions. If judicially sanctioned, Detroit would virtually stand alone as a jurisdiction where the community of effected persons was completely bypassed by the DOJ in seeking an agreement or judgment to terminate the use of illegal and unconstitutional excessive and deadly force by a police department.

14. The Petitioner respectfully suggests that it would be unwise of this Court to judicially sanction the proposed agreements between the parties without consideration and input from impacted stakeholders such as the Coalition of Police Brutality.

16. Because the Coalition Against Police Brutality has an interest in the proposed Consent Judgments and their interests may be impaired by the present litigation and they are not adequately represented, the Coalition moves for party status as an