Criminal Justice

Collection Actions

Details consumer defenses to debt buyer and creditor collection lawsuits on credit card, medical, and other consumer debts.

Subscribe Now!

The U.S. criminal justice system disproportionately burdens low-income individuals and people of color, as well as their families and communities. The National Consumer Law Center focuses on the intersection of criminal and consumer law, and their role in equitable criminal justice reform.

Criminal Background Checks

- Report: Broken Records Redux: How Errors by Criminal Background Check Companies Continue to Harm Consumers Seeking Jobs and Housing, Dec. 2019

Archive+

Criminal Justice Debt

Fact Sheets

- What States Can Do: Criminal Justice Debt, Sept. 2019

Reports & Press Releases

- Press Release: U.S. House Financial Services Committee Hearing on September 26 on Abusive Debt Collection with Testimony by National Consumer Law Center Attorney April Kuehnhoff, Sept. 25, 2019
- Report: Criminal Justice Debt in the South: A Primer for the Southern Partnership to Reduce Debt, Dec. 2018
A collaborative three-part initiative by the National Consumer Law Center and Harvard Law School’s Criminal Justice Policy Program.

Testimony

  Discusses the Debt Collection Practices Harmonization Act (H.R. 3948), which would ensure that individuals with criminal justice debts are protected from unfair and abusive debt collection practices by private companies.

- **Written Testimony of Brian Highsmith, NCLC’s Skadden Fellow, before the Judiciary Committee of the Connecticut General Assembly**, 2019 Regular Session, March 25, 2019

- **Written Testimony of Brian Highsmith, NCLC’s Skadden Fellow, before New York State’s Department of Financial Services, Division of Consumer Protection and Division of Criminal Justice Services**, Bail Bond Reform Listening Session, June 11, 2018

Letters

- **Coalition Letter in Support of the Martha Reed Wright Just and Reasonable Communications Act of 2019**, S.1764, June 11, 2019

Webinar Archive

- **Driving with Debt: What Attorneys and Organizers Can Do to Address the Problem of Driver’s License Suspensions for Court Debt**, January 31, 2019

- **Confronting Criminal Justice Debt Free Webinar Series (cosponsored by The National Consumer Law Center and the Criminal Justice Policy Program at Harvard Law School):**
  - [Confronting Criminal Justice Debt: Introduction and Impact on Communities of Color](#), Oct. 4, 2017
  - [The Advocacy Gap: Meeting the Urgent Need for Counsel to Represent Individuals in Criminal Debt Proceedings](#), Oct. 10, 2017
  - [Using Bankruptcy Law to Aid Criminal Justice Debtors](#), Oct. 17, 2017
  - [Introduction to Harvard’s Criminal Justice Policy Program’s 50-State Criminal Justice Debt Law Web Tool](#), March 1, 2018
  - [Ensuring that People Are Not Jailed Due to Poverty: Reforming Policies and Representing Clients in Criminal Justice Debt “Ability to Pay” Proceedings](#) (May 22, 2018)
  - [Affirmative Litigation of Criminal Justice Debt Abuses: Theory and Practice](#) (March 16, 2018)

Litigation

- **Crain & Serna v Accredited Surety and Casualty Co., et al., Case No RG1900-4509** [Complaint](#) and [Press Release](#)
  NCLC has filed a class-action lawsuit, with our partners at Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein LLP, Justice Catalyst Law, Public Counsel, and Towards Justice, in which we are challenging a scheme to inflate the price of bail premiums in the state of California. The lawsuit was filed in California state court on Jan 29, 2019, against the surety companies that underwrite bail bonds and the state and national trade associations representing the bail bond industry. Plaintiffs allege that an unlawful antitrust conspiracy has kept bail bond premiums
higher than they would be if the California bail-bonds market functioned competitively. This scheme, ongoing since at least 2004, has not only made bail bonds costlier for California consumers, but also resulted in more people spending time in jail while awaiting trial—separated from their families, jobs, and lives. The suit seeks damages for the hundreds of thousands of Californians who have overpaid for unlawfully inflated bail bond premiums and also injunctive relief to end the overcharges going forward.

- Pearson et al v Hodgson and Securus Technologies, Inc, Case No. 18-1360, [Complaint](#) and [Press Release](#)
- Egana v Blair’s Bail Bonds, Inc. Case No. 2:17-cv-5899 [First Amended Complaint](#)

Plaintiffs, an accused and others who agreed to indemnify the bail bond company in case of loss, filed this action on behalf of themselves and all individuals whose rights under federal and state law were violated when they contracted with Defendants for a bail bond to secure their own or their loved ones’ release from jail. The Amended Complaint describes the process through which Defendant bail bond company agreed to allow plaintiffs to finance the premium for the bond, but utilized contracts that violate the Truth in Lending Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq. by failing to make necessary disclosures, and state contract, conversion, and usury laws by requiring payment of amounts above what state law allows, including paying daily fees for ankle monitors supplied by another company. The FAC also alleges that Defendants violated the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1962 (RICO) and the Louisiana Racketeering Act, La. Stat. Ann. § 15:1351, by conspiring to employ or contract with bounty hunters to kidnap, detain, and threaten to jail principals unless they or their loved ones paid money that was distributed between Defendants. NCLC’s co-counsel are The Southern Poverty Law Center and the firm of Wilmer Hale

**Criminal Justice Archive**

Continuing updates and additional information concerning criminal justice debt will be available for subscribers to this legal treatise.
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