



PN-CA-003-001

HUGH R. MANES--Lead Counsel
CAROL A. WATSON
MANES & WATSON
3600 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1710
Los Angeles, CA 90010
(213) 381-7793

JULIUS L. CHAMBERS
CLYDE E. MURPHY
MARINA HISEH
ALAN JENKINS
NAACP LEGAL DEFENSE &
EDUCATIONAL FUND, INC.

99 Hudson Street, Ste. 1600
New York, NY 10013
(212) 219-1900

BILL LANN LEE
PATRICK O. PATTERSON
CONSTANCE L. RICE
KEVIN S. REED
NAACP LEGAL DEFENSE &
EDUCATIONAL FUND, INC.
315 W. 9th Street, Ste. 208
Los Angeles, CA 90015
(213) 624-2405

ROBERT GARCIA
UCLA SCHOOL OF LAW
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024
(310) 925-4487

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

JOHN C. BURTON
JAMES S. MULLER
BURTON & NORRIS
301 N. Lake Street, Ste. 800
Pasadena, CA 91101
(818) 449-3300

GARY S. CASSELMAN
11340 W. Olympic, Ste. 250
Los Angeles, CA 90064
(310) 478-8388

ROBERT MANN
DONALD W. COOK
MANN & COOK
3600 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1710
Los Angeles, CA 90010
(213) 252-9444

ART GOLDBERG
SANDOR C. FUCHS
GOLDBERG & FUCHS
1467 Echo Park Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90026
(213) 250-5500

RICHARD EIDEN
2110 S. Hill Street, Ste. O
Occanside, CA 92054
(619) 967-9101

JAMES FOSTER
4929 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 915
Los Angeles, CA 90010
(213) 936-2110

JORGE GONZALEZ
2614 1/2 North Broadway Street
Los Angeles, CA 90031
(213) 225-2247

TED T. YAMAMOTO
1200 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 206
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 482-2248

MARK E. GLASSER
2210 Wilshire Blvd., #313
Santa Monica, CA 90403
(310) 319-3777

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DARREN THOMAS; MICHAEL
STERLING; KEVIN MARSHALL;
WILLIAM SCOTT; JESUS AVILA;
ERNESTO AVILA; TRACY BATTS;
AARON BREITIGAM; ANTONIO
CABALLERO; RUBEN CALDERON,
individually and as guardian ad litem for
CHRISTIANA CALDERON, a minor; and
DAVID CALDERON, a minor; CAROLINA
CALDERON; LINDA CALDERON;
JORGE CALDERON; DEMETRIO
CARRILLO; ELZIE COLEMAN;
DOLORES DALTON as guardian ad litem
for RON DALTON, a minor; MARIAN
ENGLISH individually, and as parent and
heir of LAWRENCE JOHNSON, deceased;
SERGIO GALINDO; RAUL GONZALES;
MARCELO GONZALEZ; RICHARD
HERNANDEZ; JEFFERY HOLLIMAN;
SOCORRO HUERTA as guardian ad litem

Case No. CV 90-5217

**FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT FOR
DAMAGES,
INJUNCTIVE AND
DECLARATORY
RELIEF AND
RECEIVERSHIP
(42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985)**

CLASS ACTION

**DEMAND FOR JURY
TRIAL**

1 for FERNANDO MARTINEZ, a minor;)
2 ERIC JONES; SANDRA LEONARD and)
3 CANDI LEONARD, each as heirs of)
4 WILLIAM LEONARD, deceased;)
5 YLDEFONZA LORENZANA; ALFREDO)
6 MAYA, individually and as guardian ad)
7 litem for IRENE MAYA; RAUL MAYA,)
8 individually and as guardian ad litem for)
9 RAUL MAYA, JR., a minor; CARLOS)
10 MAYA; MARGUERITA MAYA; RUBEN)
11 MAYA; LUPE MAYA; GILBERT MAYA;)
12 NATALIE MELENDREZ as guardian ad)
13 litem for JESSIE MELENDREZ, a minor;)
14 GREGORIA MENDIBLES; ESTELLA)
15 MONTOYA, individually and as guardian)
16 ad litem for REBECCA MONTOYA, a)
17 minor, MONIQUE TREVIÑO, a minor, and)
18 CRYSTAL TREVIÑO, a minor; RAPHAEL)
19 OCHOA; JOSE ORTEGA; DELIA OSITA;)
20 PATSY PEREZ as guardian ad litem for)
21 ADOLPHO ALEJADE, a minor, and)
22 BRIAN ALEJADE, a minor; JULIA POLK,)
23 Administrator for Estate of LLOYD POLK;)
24 RITA PRECIADO as guardian ad litem for)
25 SALVADOR PRECIADO, a minor;)
26 TERESA RODRIGUEZ, individually and as)
27 guardian ad litem for ALICE OREJEL, a)
28 minor and MARIA OREJEL, a minor;)
ESTELA SANCHEZ; SERGIO SANCHEZ;)
ALFONSO SANCHEZ; JOSE SANCHEZ;)
ALFREDO SANCHEZ; CHARLES SCOTT;)
FRANCISCO TOVAR, individually and as)
guardian ad litem for the following minors:)
FRANCISCO TOVAR Jr., a minor,)
YESENIA TOVAR, a minor; MARCELA)
TOVAR, a minor, JAIME TOVAR, a minor,)
JESUS TOVAR, a minor, and HERMAN)
TOVAR, a minor; ELSA TOVAR; MARTA)
VELEZ; ALVIN WASHINGTON; and)
DANNY WILLIAMS, on behalf of)
themselves and all other persons similarly)
situated,)

Plaintiffs,

vs.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, a public)
entity; LOS ANGELES COUNTY)
SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, a public entity;)
CITY OF LYNWOOD, a public entity and a)
municipal corporation; SHERMAN BLOCK,)
individually, and as Sheriff of the County of)
Los Angeles; ROBERT EDMONDS,)
individually, and as Undersheriff of the)
County of Los Angeles; JERRY HARPER,)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Pages:</i>
INTRODUCTION	1
JURISDICTION	2
VENUE	3
PARTIES	3
Plaintiffs	3
Defendants	5
CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS	8
INCORPORATION	9
CHARGING ALLEGATIONS	9
First Cause of Action (All Plaintiffs)	9
① Violence and Excessive Force	10
② Unreasonable Searches and Seizures	10
③ Racial Discrimination and Harassment	11
④ Retaliation, Cover Charges and Discouragement of Complaints	12
⑤ Deficient Personnel Practices	12
⑥ Inadequate Investigatory Practices and Covering Up Misconduct	13
Second Cause of Action (All Plaintiffs)	16
Third Cause of Action (All Plaintiffs)	16
Fourth Cause of Action (Darren Thomas, Kevin Marshall, Michael Sterling, William Scott)	17
Fifth Cause of Action (Sandra Leonard and Candi Leonard)	20
Sixth Cause of Action (Estate of Lloyd Polk)	21
Seventh Cause of Action (Fernando Martinez)	22
Eighth Cause of Action (Jose Ortega)	23

1 individually, and as Assistant Sheriff of the)
County of Los Angeles; RICHARD)
2 FOREMAN, individually, and as Assistant)
Sheriff of the County of Los Angeles;)
3 BERT J. CUEVA, individually, and as)
Commander of the Los Angeles County)
4 Sheriff's Lynwood Station; JUAN)
ALVARADO; SGT. ANDERSON)
5 (#160080); PAUL ARCHAMBAULT)
(#213669); CHARLES BARTON;)
6 TIMOTHY E. BENSON (#246380); GARY)
BLACKWELL; STEVE BLAIR (#236778);)
7 ROBERT BLUME (#273451);)
BRANDENBURG (#209523); LT. C.)
8 BRANTLEY; TIMOTHY BROAD;)
KATHERINE BROWN-VOYER (#258489);)
9 T. BROWNELL; RICHARD CALZADA;)
ANTHONY CAMPBELL (#013405);)
10 SCOTT CARTER (#150582); LT.)
RICHARD L. CASTRO; JOHN CHAPMAN)
11 (#220837); JAVIER CLIFT; JOHN)
CORINA (#213435); DANIEL COOPER;)
12 DANIELLE CORMIER; JAMES)
CORRIGAN (#213671); COSTLEIGH)
13 (#173151); ROBERT DELGADILLO)
(#230237); FRUSTINO DELVALLE; SGT.)
14 DEVINE; ROBERT DILLARD; CRAIG)
DITSCH; STEPHEN DOWNEY (#219137);)
15 RAYMOND ESQUERRA (#137451);)
LANCE FRALICK; MICHAEL J. GARCIA)
16 (#207136); RONALD E. GILBERT)
(#207131); KELLY (GILL) MCMICHAEL)
17 (#260309); GIRON (#033144); DOUGLAS)
GILLIES (#244674); NEILS GITTISARN)
18 (#236616); TIMOTHY GLOVER; CURTIS)
GOLDEN; FRANK GONZALES; KEVIN)
19 GORAN (#222021); CAPTAIN RAYMOND)
GOTT; RUBEN GRACIA (#213459);)
20 ALBERT GROTEFEND (#034657);)
JOSEPH GUZMAN; ALLEN HARRIS;)
21 SGT. TOMMY HARRIS; T.J. HARVEY)
(#038535); LT. A. HERRERA;)
22 HOLBROOK (#209619); JOSEPH)
HOLMES (#041885); ERIC HUBNER)
23 (#37190); DALE HUITMAN (#265013);)
KEVIN J. KIFF (#235151); J. LESLIE)
24 (#223389); LOY LUNA (#201663); JASON)
MANN (#196175); ALLYN LAWRENCE)
25 MARTIN (#223374); GUY MATO)
(#188894); SCOTT LEE McCORMICK)
26 (#248043); ABEL A. MORENO (#195912);)
JOHN MOSSOTTI (#232692); JACK)
27 NEIHOUSE; NELSON (#220245);)
EDWARD M. NORDSKOG (#241276);)
28 NUNEZ (#067434); RODOLFO O'DELL;)
O'HARA (#183119); RICHARD OROSCO)

(#068734); JAMES PACINA; ANDRE PINESETT (#260171); MICHAEL PIPPIN (#116212); LT. RADELEFF; DAN RAIMO (#207220); JACK RAMIREZ (#211246); JEROLD REEVES (#208423); R.A. REED (#236792); MICHAEL REYNOLDS; RIFKIN (#207195); ALLEN RIPIEY; MARTIN RODRIGUEZ; WILLIAM ROMAN (#077668); THOMAS A. ROSAS (#111632); T. RUNNING; MICHAEL SALVATORE (#044852); MICHAEL SCHNEIDER (#244092); J. SHEEHY (#207157); LARRY SHULTZ; SAMUEL SILVA; ELIZABETH SMITH (#222075); LT. M. SPARKS; BRIAN STEINWAND (#218524); JACK TARASIUK (#244912); GREGORY THOMPSON (#196144); GERALD RICHARD THOMPSON (#238853); GREG THURMAN; PATRICK VALDEZ; MICHAEL VOGEL (#186761); BYRON G. WAINIE (#222015); K. WALL (#238868); TODD LAWRENCE WALLACE (#248150); JOHN A. WEST (#248032); JAMES WHITTEN; MICHAEL WILBER; ROBERT WINDRIM; CHRIS JAMES YOUNG (#248084); each of whom is sued individually in his or her official capacity as an agent or employee of the County of Los Angeles; City of Compton Police Officer THOMAS ZAMPIELLO (#128), who is sued individually and in his official capacity; and DOES 1 through 414, each of whom is sued individually and in his or her official capacity as an agent or employee of the County of Los Angeles, or the City of Lynwood,

Defendants.

Defendants.

1	Ninth Cause of Action (Aaron Breitigam)	24
2	Tenth Cause of Action (Alvin Washington, Jeffrey Holliman, Danny Williams and Charles Scott)	24
3	Twelfth Cause of Action (Maya Household)	25
4	Thirteenth Cause of Action (Rodriguez Household)	26
5	Fourteenth Cause of Action (Montoya Household)	27
6	Fifteenth Cause of Action (Calderon Household)	28
7	Sixteenth Cause of Action (Tovar Household)	30
8	Seventeenth Cause of Action (Sergio Galindo)	31
9	Eighteenth Cause of Action (Sanchez Family)	31
10	Nineteenth Cause of Action (Richard Hernandez)	32
11	Twentieth Cause of Action (Raul Gonzales)	33
12	Twenty-First Cause of Action (Jesse Melendrez)	33
13	Twenty-Second Cause of Action (Salvador Preciado and Raphael Ochoa)	34
14	Twenty-Third Cause of Action (Marrienne English)	34
15	Twenty-Fourth Cause of Action (Ron Dalton, Eric Jones and Marcelo Gonzalez)	35
16	Twenty-Fifth Cause of Action (Demetrio Carillo)	36
17	Twenty-Sixth Cause of Action (Tracy Batts)	36
18	Twenty-Seventh Cause of Action (Elsie Coleman)	37
19	DAMAGES	38
20	INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	40
21	PRAYER FOR RELIEF	40
22	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	46
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 Plaintiffs allege:

2 **INTRODUCTION**

3 1. This is a civil rights action brought under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1985 against the
4 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES; THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT,
5 [hereinafter "LASD"]; THE CITY OF LYNWOOD; SHERMAN BLOCK, Sheriff; ROBERT
6 EDMONDS, UnderSheriff; JERRY HARPER, Assistant Sheriff; RICHARD FOREMAN,
7 Assistant Sheriff; BERT J. CUEVA, Commander of the LASD's Lynwood Station [hereinafter
8 "Lynwood Station"]; numerous Los Angeles County deputy sheriffs; and one City of Compton
9 police officer. All individuals are sued individually and in their official capacities. Plaintiffs
10 seek compensatory and punitive damages, as well as equitable relief, including preliminary and
11 permanent injunctions, declaratory relief and an order for receivership of the Lynwood Station.

12 2. Defendant deputies, with the tacit authorization of the defendant policy-makers,
13 have engaged in a pattern of constitutional violations directed against plaintiffs and other
14 members of the class who have been or may be subject to unnecessary or excessive force,
15 illegal searches and seizures or racial discrimination in the law enforcement jurisdiction of the
16 Lynwood Station. The abusive acts include warrantless, harassing arrests and detentions,
17 incidents of excessive force and unwarranted physical abuse against handcuffed and otherwise
18 defenseless detainees (beating, kicking, pushing, striking with flashlights, choking, slamming
19 doors on legs, slapping, shooting to maim); ransacking homes and businesses; incidents of
20 outright torture (interrogation with stun guns, beating victims into unconsciousness, holding a
21 gun in a victim's mouth and pulling the trigger on an empty chamber, pushing a victim's head
22 through a squad car window); quick-stop driving to bang a victim's head against the squad car
23 screen; and uninhibited expressions of racial animus by deputies, including use of epithets such
24 as "niggers" and "wetbacks." The defendant deputies, with the tacit authorization of the
25 defendant policy makers, have engaged in a pattern of using violence and excessive force,
26 making illegal arrests and detentions, conducting unreasonable searches and seizures, and
27 discriminating on the bases of race, ethnicity, color, national origin, age or economic class
28 against the plaintiffs and the members of the class in the law enforcement jurisdiction of the

1 Lynwood, California, and involves Los Angeles County Deputy Sheriffs assigned to or
2 stationed at the Lynwood Station.

3
4 **PARTIES**

5 **Plaintiffs**

6 6. Plaintiffs DARREN THOMAS, KEVIN MARSHALL, MICHAEL STERLING,
7 WILLIAM SCOTT, ALVIN WASHINGTON, JEFFERY HOLLIMAN, TRACY BATTS, ELZIE
8 COLEMAN, CHARLES SCOTT and DANNY WILLIAMS are African-American males who,
9 at the relevant times hereto, were victims of abuse inflicted upon them at least in part because
10 of their race or color by one or more Los Angeles County Deputy Sheriffs assigned to or
11 stationed at the Lynwood Station, pursuant to the policies and practices referred to in paragraph
12 25, *infra*.

13 7. Plaintiff MARIAN ENGLISH is the mother and heir at law of LAWRENCE
14 JOHNSON, deceased, a fifteen year old African-American youth, killed at least in part because
15 of his race or color by one or more deputy sheriffs assigned or stationed at to the Lynwood
16 Station, pursuant to the policies and practices referred to in paragraph 25 *infra*.

17 8. Plaintiff JULIA POLK is the administrator of the Estate of LLOYD POLK, deceased,
18 who was a Latino man who was the victim of abuse inflicted upon him by one or more of the
19 deputies assigned to the Lynwood Station, pursuant to the policies and practices referred to in
20 paragraph 25, *infra*.

21 9. Plaintiffs MARCELO GONZALEZ; SOCORRO HUERTA as guardian ad litem for
22 FERNANDO MARTINEZ, a minor; JOSE ORTEGA; RICHARD HERNANDEZ;
23 MARGUERITA MAYA; GILBERT MAYA; CARLOS MAYA; LUPE MAYA; RAUL MAYA;
24 RAUL MAYA, JR.; RUBEN MAYA; ALFREDO MAYA, individually and as guardian ad
25 litem for IRENE MAYA, a minor; DELIA OSITA; TERESA RODRIGUEZ, individually and
26 as guardian ad litem for MARIA OREJEL, a minor, and ALICE OREJEL, a minor; GEORGIA
27 MENDIBLES; PATSY PEREZ as guardian ad litem for ADOLPHO ALEJADE, a minor, and
28 BRIAN ALEJADE, a minor; ANTONIO CABALLERO; ERNESTO AVILA; JESUS AVILA;

1 ESTELA MONTOYA, individually and as guardian ad litem for REBECCA MONTOYA, a
2 minor, CRYSTAL TREVIÑO, a minor, and MONIQUE TREVIÑO, a minor; JORGE
3 CALDERON; CAROLINA CALDERON; LINDA CALDERON; RUBEN CALDERON,
4 individually and as guardian ad litem for CHRISTIANA CALDERON, a minor; and DAVID
5 CALDERON, a minor; ELSA TOVAR; FRANCISCO TOVAR, individually and as guardian
6 ad litem for FRANCISCO TOVAR Jr., a minor, YESENIA TOVAR, a minor, MARCELA
7 TOVAR, a minor, JAIME TOVAR, a minor, JESUS TOVAR, a minor, and HERMAN TOVAR,
8 a minor; SERGIO GALINDO; SERGIO SANCHEZ; ALFREDO SANCHEZ; ALFONSO
9 SANCHEZ; JOSE SANCHEZ; YLDEFONZA LORENZANA; MARTA VELEZ; ESTELA
10 SANCHEZ; RAUL GONZALES; NATALIE MELENDREZ as guardian ad litem for JESSIE
11 MELENDREZ, a minor; RITA PRECIADO as guardian ad litem for SALVADOR PRECIADO,
12 a minor; RAPHAEL OCHOA; ERIC JONES; DOLORES DALTON as guardian ad litem for
13 RON DALTON, a minor; and DEMETRIO CARRILLO, are Latino men and women who were
14 victims of abuse inflicted upon them at least in part because of their race, color, or national
15 origin by one or more Los Angeles County Deputy Sheriffs assigned to or stationed at the
16 Lynwood Station, pursuant to the policies and practices referred to in paragraph 25, *infra*.

17 10. Plaintiffs SANDRA LEONARD and CANDI LEONARD are each the natural
18 daughters and heirs at law of WILLIAM LEONARD, a white man who was killed at least in
19 part because of his economic class, or because of the race, color, or national origin of persons
20 with whom he associated, by one or more deputy sheriffs assigned to or stationed at the
21 Lynwood Station, pursuant to the policies and practices referred to in paragraph 25, *infra*.

22 11. Plaintiff AARON BREITIGAM is a white young man who was a victim of abuse
23 inflicted upon him at least in part because of his economic class, or because of the race, color,
24 or national origin of persons with whom he associated, by one or more deputy sheriffs assigned
25 to or stationed at the Lynwood Station, pursuant to the policies and practices referred to in
26 paragraph 25 *infra*.

27 **Defendants**

28 12. At all times herein mentioned defendant CITY OF LYNWOOD was and is a legal

1 Lynwood Station, in violation of their rights under the First, Fourth, Fifth, Eighth, Ninth,
2 Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America.
3 As a result of the terrorist-type tactics of the defendant deputies, and the policy makers'
4 tolerance of such tactics, plaintiffs and other members of the class are being irreparably injured,
5 both physically and mentally, and their civil rights are being violated.

6 3. The pattern of official misconduct is attributable to illegal and unconstitutional
7 policies, rules, regulations, practices, customs, or usages [hereinafter "policies and practices"]
8 of the LASD. Policy makers for the COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, the LASD and the CITY
9 OF LYNWOOD, including the defendants BLOCK, EDMONDS, HARPER, FOREMAN, and
10 CUEVA, were aware of, acquiesced in, tolerated, and tacitly authorized and encouraged, failed
11 to prevent and caused the illegal and unconstitutional terrorist tactics by the defendant deputies.
12 Defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LASD, CITY OF LYNWOOD, BLOCK,
13 EDMONDS, HARPER, FOREMAN, and CUEVA have failed to control or discipline deputy
14 sheriffs who use violence, excessive force and unreasonable searches and seizures; have
15 fostered a culture of violence, discriminatory treatment and official misconduct against members
16 of racial and other minority groups; have avoided or minimized the consequences of official
17 misconduct by defendant deputy sheriffs; have discouraged the filing and investigation of
18 civilian complaints; and have otherwise failed to adopt adequate personnel practices to protect
19 the legal and constitutional rights of the plaintiffs and the members of the class. The defendants
20 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LASD, CITY OF LYNWOOD, BLOCK, EDMONDS,
21 HARPER, FOREMAN, and CUEVA have thereby exhibited deliberate indifference to the
22 constitutional rights of the plaintiffs and the members of the class.

23 **JURISDICTION**

24 4. Jurisdiction is conferred upon this Court by 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343. Plaintiffs
25 seek declaratory relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

27 **VENUE**

28 5. Each claim herein arises out of an incident which occurred in or near the City of

1 and political entity and municipality duly organized and existing as such under the laws of and
2 within the State of California, and the County of Los Angeles.

3 13. At all times herein mentioned defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES was and is
4 a legal and political entity established under the laws of the State of California and the Charter
5 of the County of Los Angeles, with all the powers specified and necessarily implied by the
6 Constitution and laws of the State of California and exercised by a duly elected Board of
7 Supervisors or its agents and officers. At all times mentioned herein the LOS ANGELES
8 COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT was and is a public entity under California law.

9 14. At all times herein mentioned defendant SHERMAN BLOCK was and is the duly
10 elected Sheriff of Los Angeles County, and in such capacity was and is the manager and chief
11 administrator of the LASD. BLOCK is responsible for, among other things, the employment,
12 discharge, training, supervision, control, assignment and discipline of all sworn and civilian
13 personnel of the LASD, and the formulation, promulgation, adoption, application,
14 implementation, administration, enforcement and revocation of the policies and practices of
15 LASD.

16 15. At all times herein mentioned defendant ROBERT EDMONDS was and is the
17 Undersheriff of LASD, and as such, is second in command of LASD, assisting and aiding the
18 Sheriff in the performance of his duties.

19 16. At all times herein mentioned defendants JERRY HARPER and RICHARD
20 FOREMAN were and are the Assistant Sheriffs of LASD, who assist and aid the Sheriff in the
21 performance of his duties, and in particular, they, together with Undersheriff EDMONDS, are
22 responsible for the administration of disciplinary policies and procedures within LASD, subject
23 to the Sheriff's overall responsibility therefor.

24 17. At all times herein mentioned Captain BERT J. CUEVA was the commanding
25 officer of the Lynwood Station, which is located at 11330 Bullis Road, in Lynwood, California,
26 and which has law enforcement jurisdiction over all of the City of Lynwood and the
27 surrounding unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County, including Willowbrook and East
28 Compton. Captain CUEVA creates or implements policies and practices of the LASD at the

1 Lynwood Station.

2 18. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that defendants JUAN
3 ALVARADO; SGT. ANDERSON (#160080); PAUL ARCHAMBAULT (#213669); CHARLES
4 BARTON; TIMOTHY E. BENSON (#246380); GARY BLACKWELL; STEVE BLAIR
5 (#236778); ROBERT BLUME (#273451); BRANDENBURG (#209523); LT. C. BRANTLEY;
6 TIMOTHY BROAD; KATHERINE BROWN-VOYER (#258489); T. BROWNELL; RICHARD
7 CALZADA; ANTHONY CAMPBELL (#013405); SCOTT CARTER (#150582); LT.
8 RICHARD L. CASTRO; JOHN CHAPMAN (#220837); JAVIER CLIFT; JOHN CORINA
9 (#213435); DANIEL COOPER; DANIELLE CORMIER; JAMES CORRIGAN (#213671);
10 COSTLEIGH (#173151); ROBERT DELGADILLO (#230237); FRUSTINODELVALLE; SGT.
11 DEVINE; ROBERT DILLARD; CRAIG DITSCH; STEPHEN DOWNEY (#219137);
12 RAYMOND ESQUERRA (#137451); LANCE FRALICK; MICHAEL J. GARCIA (#207136);
13 GIRON (#033144); RONALD E. GILBERT (#207131); KELLY (GILL) MCMICHAEL
14 (#260309); DOUGLAS GILLIES (#244674); NEILS GITTISARN (#236616); TIMOTHY
15 GLOVER; CURTIS GOLDEN; FRANK GONZALES; KEVIN GORAN (#222021); CAPT.
16 RAYMOND GOTT; RUBEN GRACIA (#213459); ALBERT GROTEFEND (#034657);
17 JOSEPH GUZMAN; ALLEN HARRIS; SGT. TOMMY HARRIS; T.J. HARVEY (#038535);
18 LT. A. HERRERA; HOLBROOK (209619); JOSEPH HOLMES (#041885); ERIC HUBNER
19 (#37190); DALE HUFFMAN (#265013); KEVIN J. KIFF (#235151); J. LESLIE (#223389);
20 LOY LUNA (#201663); JASON MANN (#196175); ALLYN LAWRENCE MARTIN
21 (#223374); GUY MATO (#188894); SCOTT LEE McCORMICK (#248043); ABEL A.
22 MORENO (#195912); JOHN MOSSOTTI (#232692); JACK NEIHOUSE; NELSON (#220245);
23 EDWARD M. NORDSKOG (#241276); NUNEZ (#067434); RODOLFO O'DELL; O'HARA
24 (#183119); RICHARD OROSCO (#068734); JAMES PACINA; ANDRE PINESETT (#260171);
25 MICHAEL PIPPIN (#116212); LT. RADELEFF; DAN RAIMO (#207220); JACK RAMIREZ
26 (#211246); JEROLD REEVES (#208423); R.A. REED (#236792); MICHAEL REYNOLDS;
27 RIFKIN (#207195); ALLEN RIPLEY; MARTIN RODRIGUEZ; WILLIAM ROMAN
28 (#077668); THOMAS A. ROSAS (#111632); T. RUNNING; MICHAEL SALVATORE

(#044852); MICHAEL SCHNEIDER (#244092); J. SHEEHY (#207157); LARRY SHULTZ; SAMUEL SILVA; ELIZABETH SMITH (#222075); LT. M. SPARKS; BRIAN STEINWAND (#218524); JACK TARASIUK (#244912); GREGORY THOMPSON (#196144); GERALD RICHARD THOMPSON (#238853); GREG THURMAN; PATRICK VALDEZ; MICHAEL VOGEL (#186761); BYRON G. WAINIE (#222015); K. WALL (#238868); TODD LAWRENCE WALLACE (#248150); JOHN A. WEST (#248032); JAMES WHITTEN; MICHAEL WILBER; ROBERT WINDRIM; CHRIS JAMES YOUNG (#248084) are individual Los Angeles County Deputy Sheriffs, assigned to or working out of the Lynwood Station at the time of the acts hereinafter complained of.

19. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that defendant T. ZAMPIELLO (#128) was and is at all times material hereto a police officer for the City of Compton.

20. The true names of defendants DOES 1 through 414 are presently unknown to plaintiffs, who therefore sue each of these defendants by such fictitious name; but upon ascertaining the true identity of a defendant DOE, plaintiffs will amend this Complaint or seek leave to do so by inserting the true name in lieu of the fictitious name. Plaintiffs are each informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that each defendant DOE herein is in some manner responsible for the injuries and damages herein complained of.

21. At all times herein mentioned LASD provided law enforcement services to defendant CITY OF LYNWOOD pursuant to a written or oral agreement between defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES or LASD and defendant CITY OF LYNWOOD. Pursuant to Cal. Govt. Code §815.2(a), defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and LASD are vicariously liable under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1985 for injuries proximately caused by acts or omissions of their employees within the scope of their employment.

22. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that, according to the 1990 census, the CITY OF LYNWOOD had a population of approximately 61,945, of which 70 percent were Latinos, 21 percent were African-Americans and 6 percent were white; that Lynwood's unemployment was about 12.5 percent as compared to an overall County average

1 of 7.4 percent; and that the taxable income per capita was about \$7,260 compared to the Los
2 Angeles County per capita average of \$16,149.

3 4 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

5 23. With respect to their claims for injunctive and declaratory relief only, plaintiffs
6 bring this action on their own behalf and on behalf of a class of all other persons similarly
7 situated pursuant to Rule 23, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The class is defined as

8 All residents of or visitors to the geographic area within the law enforcement
9 jurisdiction of the Lynwood station of the Sheriff's Department of the County of Los
10 Angeles who have been or may be subject to policies and practices of unnecessary or
11 excessive force, illegal searches and seizures, or racial discrimination by deputy sheriffs.

12
13 a. In accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. Rule 23(a), the class is so numerous
14 that joinder of all members is impracticable; there are questions of law or fact
15 common to the class; the claims of the representative parties are typical of the
16 claims of the class; and the representative parties will fairly and adequately
17 protect the interests of the class.

18 b. In accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. Rule 23(b)(2), the parties opposing
19 the class have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the
20 class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief or corresponding
21 declaratory relief with respect to the class as a whole.

22 c. In accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. Rule 23(c)(4)(A), the action may be
23 brought or maintained as a class action with respect to plaintiffs' claims for
24 injunctive and declaratory relief only.

25 26 **INCORPORATION**

27 24. Paragraphs 1 through 23 above are hereby repeated, realleged and incorporated by
28 this reference in paragraphs 25 through 93 of this Complaint.

CHARGING ALLEGATIONS

First Cause of Action

(42 U.S.C. § 1983, by all plaintiffs against defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LASD, CITY OF LYNWOOD, BLOCK, EDMONDS, HARPER, FOREMAN and CUEVA)

25. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that, at all times herein mentioned, defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LASD, CITY OF LYNWOOD, BLOCK, EDMONDS, HARPER, FOREMAN, and CUEVA, as a matter of policy and practice, were aware of, acquiesced in, tolerated, tacitly authorized and encouraged, failed to prevent and caused the illegal and unconstitutional misconduct by the defendant deputies. Defendants have thereby exhibited deliberate indifference, gross negligence or reckless disregard for the safety, security and federal constitutional and legal rights of plaintiffs and all persons similarly situated. There is a direct link between the policies and practices of the LASD, the defendant deputies' violent and unconstitutional misconduct, and the injuries suffered by plaintiffs and the members of the class. The unconstitutional policies, practices and misconduct include:

Violence and Excessive Force

- W*
- a. Deputies subject people to unreasonable, unnecessary, and excessive force, including deadly force.
 - b. Deputies improperly use firearms to terrorize, maim and kill members of the public, including plaintiffs in this action. Deputies enter homes and other premises with their weapons drawn and give armed orders to men, women, and young children without regard to whether their captives pose any threat to deputies or others. Deputies use their firearms to terrorize people during beatings and to kill or maim unarmed persons.
 - c. Deputies use unjustified blows with impact weapons, including metal flashlights, batons, and saps, to the head and other vital parts of the body that are susceptible to serious or fatal injury.
 - d. Deputies use dogs to bite, punish, torture, injure, maim, and disfigure persons, and to inflict excessive and unreasonable force and violence on persons,

1 where the use of such force is not justified.

2 c. Deputies inflict "curbside justice" and "attitude adjustments"--in other words,
3 the unreasonable and unnecessary use of violence and excessive force--to punish
4 summarily members of the public whose words, attitude, or behavior is deemed
5 offensive by such deputies.

6 f. Deputies inflict summary punishment on persons who temporarily elude or
7 seek to flee from deputies.

8 **Unreasonable Searches and Seizures**

9 g. Deputies detain and arrest people without reasonable suspicion or probable
10 cause. Deputies commonly undertake such detentions and arrests for purposes
11 of harassment and oppression of persons because of their race, ethnicity, national
12 origin, color, age or class.

13 h. Deputies execute searches, with or without a warrant, in an unreasonable and
14 violent manner, including the wanton and unnecessary destruction of property.
15 Deputies commonly undertake such searches for purposes of harassment and
16 oppression. Deputies frequently target minority persons for this harassment and
17 oppression. In searches of homes and businesses, Lynwood deputies storm in
18 during the early morning hours without giving notice of their identity or time for
19 the occupants to answer the door; they destroy property; they throw property on
20 the floor or from room to room; they terrorize the occupants by brandishing
21 weapons; they force whole families to stand or kneel, nearly naked, in the cold
22 night air for long periods of time; they improperly confiscate property not
23 identified in search warrants; they shove or needlessly move the frail and ill; and
24 they leave people terrified and suffering psychologically and physically from the
25 experience.

26 **Racial Discrimination and Harassment**

27 i. Deputies engage in racist conduct and racially motivated attacks against
28 African-American and Latino members of the community, use racist speech

1 when speaking with minority members of the community and denigrate the race,
2 ethnicity and nationality of African-Americans and Latinos members of the
3 community. Racial slurs frequently accompany beatings and other abuse
4 administered by Lynwood deputies. Lynwood deputies intimidate and ridicule
5 African-Americans and Latinos.

6 j. A group of Lynwood deputies are members of or associate with a neo-nazi,
7 white supremacist gang called the "Vikings," which exists with the knowledge
8 and tolerance of defendant departmental policy makers. Lynwood deputies
9 affiliated with the Vikings gang engage in racially motivated, anti-black, white-
10 supremacist hate crime activities, use racist speech, and glorify and celebrate the
11 use of excessive force and other official misconduct by deputies.

12 k. An official policy of targeting suspected gangs in the Lynwood area for
13 special attention results in racially motivated harassment. In addition, African-
14 Americans and Latinos, particularly those who are thought to be connected with
15 gangs, are the focus of repeated instances of police brutality, harassment and
16 other abuse.

17 **Retaliation, Cover Charges and Discouragement of Complaints**

18 l. Deputies engage in retaliation and intimidation directed at persons who assert
19 their rights or otherwise question the authority of Lynwood deputies, including
20 confrontations with and retaliatory conduct against plaintiffs in an attempt to
21 convince them to dismiss this action. Particularly when African-Americans or
22 Latinos claim that their rights are being violated and question a deputy's
23 authority, they are likely to be abused.

24 m. Deputies follow an unwritten policy and practice of charging persons injured
25 in the course of routine stops in order to protect deputies from accusations of
26 brutality, harassment and other misconduct.

27 n. Witnesses who attempt to file misconduct reports regarding incidents of
28 brutality and other misconduct by Lynwood deputies are discouraged from doing

1 so by deputies and their superiors.

2 **Deficient Personnel Practices**

3 o. Defendants select, hire, retain, assign, and promote deputies with
4 demonstrable propensities for excessive force, violence, racial prejudice or other
5 misconduct to duties that enable such deputies to engage in such misconduct.

6 p. Defendants fail adequately to train, supervise and control deputies with
7 regard to the use of firearms and force, the investigation and apprehension of
8 suspects, cultural awareness and the need to be free of racial and ethnic bias.

9 q. Defendants fail adequately to discipline deputies involved in the improper use
10 of firearms or the use of excessive force, violence, racism and bias, dishonesty
11 or other misconduct.

12 r. Defendants fail to test psychologically and counsel deputies whose use of
13 unreasonable and excessive force and racial and ethnic bias has been brought to
14 the attention of their superiors by multiple citizen complaints or other evidence
15 of such misconduct.

16 s. Defendants condone and encourage deputies in the belief that they can violate
17 the federally secured rights of persons such as the plaintiffs and members of the
18 class with impunity, and that such conduct will not adversely affect their
19 opportunities for promotion and other employment benefits.

20 **Inadequate Investigatory Practices and Covering Up Misconduct**

21 t. Defendants fail adequately to investigate incidents involving the use of
22 firearms or the use of force, violence, racial and ethnic bias or other misconduct
23 by deputies.

24 u. Defendants fail adequately to investigate civilian complaints, tort claims and
25 lawsuits filed against deputies arising out of incidents of alleged misconduct, and
26 fail even to maintain files in a manner that would allow defendants to track such
27 complaints, claims, and lawsuits and to monitor misconduct by deputies.

28 v. Defendants and other supervisory personnel conduct investigations in such

1 a manner as to fail to reveal or to conceal the misconduct of deputies, including
2 but not limited to using investigative techniques and procedures reasonably
3 known to have such effects.

4 w. Deputies fabricate evidence following incidents involving the improper use
5 of firearms or the use of excessive force, violence, racial and ethnic bias or other
6 misconduct. These practices include but are not limited to using so-called
7 "creative report writing," i.e., filing materially false police reports, and making
8 false statements to prosecution authorities to obtain the filing of false charges
9 and the institution of false and malicious prosecutions against victims of the
10 deputies' misconduct.

11 x. Deputies remove or cover-up their name tags and conceal their identity in
12 incidents involving the improper use of firearms or the use of excessive force,
13 violence or racial and ethnic bias by deputies.

14 y. Deputies adhere to an unwritten "code of silence" which consists of one
15 simple rule: a deputy does not provide adverse information against a fellow
16 deputy. Deputy misconduct is allowed to continue even though witnessed by
17 other deputies. The code of silence, which influences the behavior of many
18 deputies in a variety of ways, violates a deputy's public responsibility to ensure
19 compliance with the law.

20 z. Defendants fail to punish deputies who abide by the code of silence, and fail
21 to protect deputies who break the code of silence from harassment or retaliation
22 by other deputies. Deputies therefore believe that if they fail or refuse to
23 participate in the "code of silence" or fail to cover up or conceal the misconduct
24 of other deputies, that such failures will cause them to be ostracized by other
25 deputies, will adversely affect their ability to get support from other deputies in
26 the field, and will adversely affect their opportunities for promotion and other
27 employment benefits.

28 aa. Defendants have failed adequately to use a number of tools to prevent

1 excessive force, abusive searches and racial and ethnic bias by deputies,
2 including such tools as training, promotions and pay upgrades, monitoring and
3 counselling of deputies, discipline, reassignment of deputies, civil litigation
4 against deputies, and criminal prosecution of deputies. Such failures convey the
5 message that excessive force, abusive searches, and racial and ethnic bias are in
6 practice condoned by the policy-making defendants.

7 26. Said defendants and each of them, acting under color of state law, have deprived
8 and continue to deprive plaintiffs and the members of the class of rights, privileges, and
9 immunities secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States, in particular by the First,
10 Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, Ninth, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States
11 Constitution, by, inter alia, ordering, authorizing, maintaining, enforcing, tolerating, ratifying,
12 permitting, acquiescing in, or applying the policies and practices set forth in paragraph 25
13 above. As a direct and proximate result of those policies and practices, plaintiffs have
14 sustained injury and damage as described hereinafter.

15 27. Plaintiffs and the members of the class have a reasonable fear that they will
16 continue to be subjected to defendants' unlawful and unconstitutional actions, policies, and
17 practices set forth above and in paragraph 25, and that plaintiffs and the members of the class
18 will continue to suffer injury and damage as a result thereof. Plaintiffs are informed and
19 believe and thereon allege that, based upon the conduct of the defendants and each of them as
20 set forth hereinabove, and because of the race, class, color, age, or national origin of plaintiffs
21 and the members of the class, they are likely to be the victims of future incidents similar to
22 those set forth above, and that there is a real and immediate threat that defendants will inflict
23 further injury and damage on them.

24 28. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that defendants COUNTY
25 OF LOS ANGELES, LASD, CITY OF LYNWOOD, BLOCK, EDMONDS, HARPER,
26 FOREMAN, and CUEVA ordered, authorized, maintained, enforced, acquiesced in, tolerated,
27 ratified, or permitted other defendants herein to apply or to engage in the unlawful and
28 unconstitutional actions, policies, and practices set forth above in paragraph 25. Defendants'

1 conduct alleged herein constitutes a pattern of intimidation, illicit law enforcement behavior,
2 and statutory and constitutional violations based either on a deliberate plan by defendants or
3 on defendants' deliberate indifference, gross negligence, or reckless disregard to the safety,
4 security and federal constitutional and statutory rights of plaintiffs and the members of the
5 class.

6
7 **Second Cause of Action**

8 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by all plaintiffs against all defendants)

9 29. Defendants and each of them, acting under color of state law, have conspired and
10 agreed to deprive plaintiffs of due process of law, the equal protection of the laws, or rights,
11 privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States, in
12 particular by the First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, Ninth, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth
13 Amendments to the United States Constitution, by, inter alia, ordering, authorizing, maintaining,
14 enforcing, tolerating, ratifying, permitting, acquiescing in, or applying the policies and practices
15 set forth in paragraph 25 above. In furtherance of this conspiracy, one or more of the
16 defendants committed one or more of the overt acts set forth in paragraphs 29 through 86 of
17 this Complaint, which did, in fact, deprive plaintiffs of due process of law, the equal protection
18 of the laws, or their rights, privileges or immunities. As a direct and proximate result of
19 defendants' conspiracy and their overt acts in furtherance thereof, plaintiffs sustained injury and
20 damage as set forth hereinafter.

21
22 **Third Cause of Action**

23 (42 U.S.C. § 1985, by all plaintiffs against all defendants)

24 30. Defendants and each of them have conspired and agreed to deprive plaintiffs and
25 the members of the class of the equal protection of the laws or equal rights, privileges, or
26 immunities secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States, in particular by the First,
27 Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, Ninth, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States
28 Constitution, by, inter alia, ordering, authorizing, maintaining, enforcing, tolerating, ratifying,

1 permitting, acquiescing in, or applying the policies and practices set forth in paragraph 25
2 above. Defendants' conspiracy was and is motivated by animus directed against plaintiffs
3 because of their race, color or national origin, or by the race, color, or national origin of
4 persons with whom they associated, or by other class-based, invidiously discriminatory animus
5 directed against plaintiffs. In furtherance of this conspiracy, one or more of the defendants
6 committed one or more of the overt acts set forth in paragraphs 31 through 86 of this
7 Complaint, which did, in fact, deprive plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws or of equal
8 rights, privileges or immunities. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' conspiracy and
9 their overt acts in furtherance thereof, plaintiffs sustained injury and damage as set forth
10 hereinafter.

11
12 **Fourth Cause of Action**

13 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiffs DARREN THOMAS, MICHAEL STERLING, KEVIN
14 MARSHALL AND WILLIAM SCOTT against defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ,
15 LASD, ROSAS, MATO, DELGADILLO, GRACIA, CORRIGAN, CORMIER, RIPLEY, and
16 DOES 1 through 8)

17 31. On or about April 28, 1990, at about 11:30 P.M., at or near 11152 Popc Avencue
18 in or near the City of Lynwood, California, defendants THOMAS A. ROSAS (#111632), GUY
19 MATO (#188894), DANIEL J. E. CORMIER, ALLEN RIPLEY, and DOES 1 through 4, while
20 acting under color of state law, each wilfully detained, arrested and imprisoned these plaintiffs
21 without a warrant, lawful process or probable cause, reasonable suspicion or lawful process;
22 and these defendants wilfully and without necessity or lawful justification pushed, shoved,
23 struck, kicked and used other unreasonable force upon these plaintiffs.

24 32. While these plaintiffs were in the defendants' custody within police vehicles, en
25 route to Lynwood Station, defendants deliberately drove recklessly, stopping their vehicles
26 suddenly, with the purpose and effect of hurling the plaintiffs forward against the metal dividers
27 and other hard surfaces within the police vehicles.

28 33. While these plaintiffs were in warrantless custody in the "gang trailer" at Lynwood

1 Station, defendants MATO, ROSAS, GRACIA, RIPLEY, CORMIER, CORRIGAN,
2 DELGADILLO and DOES 1 through 4, each wilfully and knowingly struck and beat plaintiff
3 DARREN THOMAS, kicked him in the face, choked him into unconsciousness twice,
4 electrocuted him with a taser, and otherwise used unreasonable force upon Mr. THOMAS, all
5 without necessity or legal justification.

6 34. During this beating and use of excessive force, one or more of the defendants
7 stated to plaintiff THOMAS:

8 "Yeah nigger, you ain't got no rights. We are going to make sure you don't ask
9 any more questions!"

10 35. These defendants repeatedly referred to these plaintiffs as "niggers"; and one of
11 these defendants, without necessity or legal justification, held a shotgun to the head of plaintiff
12 MARSHALL while he was in custody in said "gang trailer" following his arrest.

13 36. On or about April 28, 1990, and at various times thereafter, defendants GUY
14 MATO, THOMAS ROSAS (#111632), RUBEN GRACIA (#213459), JAMES CORRIGAN
15 (#213671), ROBERT DELGADILLO (#230237), ALLEN RIPLEY, DANIELLE CORMIER,
16 EUGENE LESLIE and DOES 1 through 8 deprived plaintiff THOMAS of rights secured to him
17 by the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution by covering up
18 and concealing their violation of California Penal Code §§ 147, 149, 241, 243 (a) and 245 (a),
19 which violations were committed during the defendants' aforescribed physical abuse of
20 plaintiff THOMAS. Each said defendant knowingly, intentionally and maliciously, and while
21 acting under color of state law, on or about and at various times after April 28, 1990, prepared,
22 contributed to, approved, submitted and caused and permitted to be prepared, approved and
23 submitted to the District Attorney's office, written and oral reports, accounts, testimony and
24 statements concerning plaintiff THOMAS' alleged conduct which each defendant knew or in
25 the exercise of reasonable care should have known was false, distorted, contrived, and
26 inaccurate, and which contained omissions of material fact relating to and supporting plaintiff's
27 innocence, including the following:

28 a) false allegations that plaintiff THOMAS was drinking an alcoholic

1 beverage on a public street;

2 b) false allegations that drinking an alcoholic beverage on private property
3 in public view was a violation of a Lynwood ordinance, when, as said defendants each knew
4 or reasonably should have known, it was not;

5 c) false allegations that plaintiff THOMAS was verbally abusive toward said
6 defendants, or toward any of them;

7 d) false allegations that plaintiff THOMAS struck and attempted to strike
8 said defendants, or any of them;

9 e) false allegations that plaintiff THOMAS resisted and attempted to resist,
10 obstruct and delay his arrest and the performance of their respective duties by said defendants;

11 f) knowing and deliberate omission of the fact that said defendants fired and
12 caused to be fired a taser into plaintiff THOMAS' body twice, all without necessity or legal
13 justification; and

14 g) knowing and deliberate omission from said reports that said defendants
15 knowingly and wilfully used unreasonable and unnecessary force on plaintiff THOMAS without
16 necessity or legal justification, and while he was in their custody and control.

17 37. These defendants each knowingly, intentionally and maliciously, and in reckless
18 disregard of plaintiff's civil rights and liberty, and for the aforescribed reasons, purposes and
19 objectives, prepared and submitted these false reports and caused same to be prepared and
20 submitted to the Los Angeles County District Attorney's office in order to induce that office
21 to prosecute plaintiff THOMAS for criminal violation of Penal Code §§ 243(b), 148, and 69
22 and Lynwood Ordinance 3.2, which offenses said defendants each knew or reasonably should
23 have known at all times material herein that plaintiff THOMAS had not committed and of
24 which offenses he was innocent.

25 38. By reason of the aforescribed intentions, acts and omissions of said defendants,
26 the Los Angeles County District Attorney's office, without knowledge of the falsity of said
27 reports or of the information contained therein and omitted therefrom, and acting in the belief
28 that they were each accurate and truthful, filed a criminal complaint, No. 90M05630, in the

1 Municipal Court of the Compton Judicial District, on May 7, 1990, charging plaintiff DARREN
2 THOMAS with violating on April 28, 1990 Penal Code §243(b) (battery on an officer), §§ 69
3 and 148, resisting, delaying, and obstructing a police officer in the discharge of a duty of his
4 office) and Lynwood Municipal Ordinance §3.2 (drinking alcohol on a public street), which
5 accusation each defendant at all times herein mentioned knew, or in the exercise of reasonable
6 care should have known, was false and untrue.

7 39. By reason of the defendants' above-described actions, criminal charges were made,
8 procured and caused to be made, procured, instituted and prosecuted by said defendants and
9 each of them against plaintiff THOMAS maliciously and without probable or reasonable cause
10 and in reckless disregard of his civil and constitutional rights, security, and liberty; and by
11 reason thereof, plaintiff was prosecuted in a jury trial commencing about February 27, 1991,
12 through March 14, 1991, on which latter date, a mistrial was declared by the court, and all of
13 said criminal charges were dismissed by the Court with prejudice.

14 40. By reason of the aforescribed acts and omissions of said defendants and each of
15 them, plaintiff THOMAS was compelled to retain an attorney to represent him through said
16 criminal proceedings, and thereby incurred legal fees and expenses in a sum not yet fully
17 known, but which sum is in excess of \$25,000.

18
19 **Fifth Cause of Action**

20 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiff SANDRA LEONARD AND CANDI LEONARD against
21 defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LASD, MARTIN, WALLACE, THOMPSON,
22 YOUNG, BENSON, McCORMICK, GILBERT, MORENO, WAINIE, BLUME, BLAIR, WEST,
23 DOWNEY, GITTISARN, DOES 9 through 14)

24 41. On or about February 10, 1990, at or near Brenton Street in the City of Lynwood,
25 California, defendants ALLYN L. MARTIN (#223374), TODD L. WALLACE (#248150),
26 GERALD R. THOMPSON (#238853), CHRIS J. YOUNG (#248084), TIMOTHY E. BENSON
27 (#246380), SCOTT L. McCORMICK (#248043), RONALD E. GILBERT (#207131), ABEL
28 A. MORENO (#195912), BYRON G. WAINIE (#222015), ROBERT BLUME (#273451),

1 STEVE BLAIR (#236778), JOHN A. WEST (#248032), STEPHEN DOWNEY (#219137),
2 NEILS GITTISARN (#236616), and DOES 9 through 14, without necessity or lawful
3 justification, did each knowingly and wilfully shoot and kill WILLIAM LEONARD, the father
4 of plaintiffs SANDRA LEONARD and CANDI LEONARD.

5
6 **Sixth Cause of Action**

7 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiff JULIA POLK, Administrator of the Estate of LLOYD
8 POLK, against defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LASD, MANN, NORDSKOG,
9 CHAPMAN, BLACKWELL, WILBER, FRALICK, ALVARADO, TARASIUK, THURMAN,
10 REYNOLDS and DOES 15 through 30)

11 42. On or about February 11, 1990, at or near 11162 Virginia in the City of Lynwood,
12 defendants JASON MANN (#196175), EDWARD M. NORDSKOG (#241276), JOHN
13 CHAPMAN (#220837), GARY BLACKWELL, MICHAEL WILBER, LANCE FRALICK,
14 JUAN ALVARADO, and DOES 15 through 25, and each of them, without necessity or lawful
15 justification, and without a warrant, seized, arrested and imprisoned LLOYD POLK for over
16 17 days, and did each knowingly and wilfully kick and beat him repeatedly with billy clubs
17 about the head and body. Defendants filed false and misleading police reports which resulted
18 in Mr. POLK's unwarranted criminal prosecution. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
19 alleges that defendants through false statements and material omissions in their reports,
20 prevented prosecutors from exercising independent judgement in determining whether to
21 prosecute Mr. POLK. Criminal charges against Mr. POLK were dismissed at the conclusion of
22 a preliminary hearing at which the court determined that the prosecutor lacked sufficient cause
23 to bind Mr. POLK over to Los Angeles Superior Court.

24 43. In addition to the damages listed below, plaintiff has incurred legal fees and
25 expenses as a result of Mr. POLK's criminal prosecution.

26 44. On April 15, 1990, Easter Sunday, to intimidate, harass and oppress LLOYD
27 POLK, defendants MICHAEL REYNOLDS, JACK TARASIUK (#244912), and GREG
28 THURMAN arrested and imprisoned Mr. POLK on a spurious charge of attempted murder and

1 assault on a police officer and kept him incarcerated for approximately 72 hours, all without
2 a warrant, lawful process or probable cause. At the end of 72 hours, defendants released Mr.
3 POLK without filing any charges.

4 45. On or about April 22, 1990, to intimidate, harass and oppress Mr. POLK,
5 defendants JASON MANN (#196175), EDWARD M. NORDSKOG (#241276), and DOES 26
6 through 30, and each of them, arrested and imprisoned him for in excess of 12 hours upon a
7 charge of drinking an alcoholic beverage in public, all without a warrant, lawful process or
8 probable cause.

9
10 **Seventh Cause of Action**

11 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiff FERNANDO MARTINEZ against defendants COUNTY OF
12 LOS ANGELES, LASD, HARRIS, DELGADILLO, SGT. DEVINE and DOES 31 through 42)

13 46. On or about February 11, 1990, at or near the 5100 block of Beechwood in
14 Lynwood, California, defendants DOES 31 through 37, and each of them, stopped, detained and
15 arrested Mr. MARTINEZ without a warrant or lawful process. These defendants shoved Mr.
16 MARTINEZ'S head into the side window of the deputies' police unit, cracking the window and
17 thereby injuring Mr. Martinez. The defendant deputies with deliberate indifference, gross
18 negligence or reckless disregard of the need for medical attention, failed and refused thereafter
19 to take Mr. MARTINEZ to a doctor and to provide or arrange for medical care or treatment,
20 notwithstanding plaintiff's obvious and immediate need therefor.

21 47. On April 15, 1990, Easter Sunday, in Ham Park, in Lynwood, California, defendant
22 SGT. DEVINE, ALLEN HARRIS, ROBERT DELGADILLO and DOES 38 through 42, and
23 each of them, arrested and imprisoned Mr. MARTINEZ, without a warrant or lawful process,
24 and in the course thereof, this plaintiff was struck in the jaw by one of defendants DOES 38
25 through 42 without necessity or lawful justification.

26 Thereafter, while plaintiff was seated in the back seat of the patrol car with his wrists
27 handcuffed behind his back, one of these defendants drove the patrol car in a reckless and
28 dangerous manner, braking and accelerating suddenly, so as to cause Mr. MARTINEZ' face and

1 head to smash into the metal partition separating the front and back seats of the vehicle.

2 48. At the Lynwood Station, defendants DOES 38 through 42, without necessity or
3 lawful justification, wilfully beat, choked and kicked Mr. MARTINEZ.

4
5 **Eighth Cause of Action**

6 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiff JOSE ORTEGA against defendants
7 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LASD, MANN, NORDSKOG, CHAPMAN, BLACKWELL,
8 WILBER, FRALICK, ALVARADO, and DOES 43 through 47)

9 49. On or about February 11, 1990, defendants JASON MANN (#196175), EDWARD
10 M. NORDSKOG (#241276), JOHN CHAPMAN (#220837), GARY BLACKWELL, MICHAEL
11 WILBER, LANCE FRALICK, JUAN ALVARADO, and DOES 43 through 47 seized Mr.
12 ORTEGA without a warrant, dragged him off the front porch of a friend's home at 11144
13 Virginia Avenue in the City of Lynwood, and then wilfully and knowingly struck him in the
14 back with a metal flashlight, all without necessity or lawful justification. Mr. ORTEGA was
15 thereafter released at the scene without any charges being filed, and the deputy sheriffs left the
16 scene.

17 50. After a witness to the beating telephoned a complaint about the beating to the
18 Lynwood Station, deputy sheriffs DOES 43 through 47 returned to the scene and, at the
19 direction of their sergeant (Sgt. Yarborough), transported Mr. ORTEGA to St. Francis Hospital
20 for x-rays and treatment for his injury. At the hospital Mr. ORTEGA was met by defendants
21 MANN and NORDSKOG, who thereupon arrested him, without probable cause, for interfering
22 with a police investigation in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 148 and thereupon took him into
23 custody and denied Mr. ORTEGA medical treatment.

24 51. Defendants then filed false and misleading police reports which resulted in
25 plaintiff's unwarranted criminal prosecution. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
26 alleges that defendants, through false statements and material omissions in their reports,
27 prevented prosecutors from exercising independent judgement in determining whether to
28 prosecute plaintiff.

1 52. In addition to the damages listed below, plaintiff has incurred legal fees and
2 expenses as a result of his criminal prosecution.

3
4 **Ninth Cause of Action**

5 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiff AARON BREITIGAM against defendants COUNTY OF LOS
6 ANGELES, LASD, MANN, NORDSKOG, CHAPMAN, BLACKWELL, WILBER, FRALICK,
7 ALVARADO, and DOES 43 THROUGH 47)

8 53. On or about February 11, 1990, at 11144 Virginia Avenue in the City of Lynwood,
9 defendants JASON MANN (#196175), EDWARD M. NORDSKOG (# 241276), JOHN
10 CHAPMAN (#220837), GARY BLACKWELL, MICHAEL WILBER, LANCE FRALICK,
11 JUAN ALVARADO and DOES 43 through 47 seized Mr. BREITIGAM without a warrant,
12 lawful process or reasonable cause and dragged him off the porch and down the driveway
13 (along with plaintiff JOSE ORTEGA), thereby injuring his back, all without necessity or lawful
14 justification, after which plaintiff was released without charges.

15
16 **Tenth Cause of Action**

17 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiffs ALVIN WASHINGTON, JEFFERY HOLLIMAN, DANNY
18 WILLIAMS and CHARLES SCOTT against defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LASD,
19 RAIMO, BENSON, GORAN, STEINWAND, CORINA, WALL, NELSON, HOLMES, and
20 DOES 48 through 50)

21 54. On or about February 15, 1990, while plaintiffs WASHINGTON, HOLLIMAN and
22 SCOTT were at plaintiff WASHINGTON'S auto repair shop (here and after "shop") in the City
23 of Lynwood, defendants DAN RAIMO (#207220) TIMOTHY E. BENSON (#246380), KEVIN
24 GORAN (#222021), BRIAN STEINWAND (#218524), JOHN CORINA (#213435), JOSEPH
25 HOLMES (#041885), K. WALL (#238868), and NELSON (#220245) and DOES 48 through
26 50 entered into and upon the shop and adjoining property which was then leased or occupied
27 by plaintiff WASHINGTON. Defendants thereafter proceeded to destroy and ransack the shop
28 and plaintiffs' personal property and effects then inside the dwelling, including but not limited

1 to, the destruction of plaintiff WASHINGTON's safe and auto diagnostic computer, the
2 overturning and ransacking of tools, equipment and files, all of which aforescribed acts were
3 wanton, malicious and exceeded the scope of the search warrant under which these defendant
4 deputies were presumably operating.

5 55. During the raid, defendants, and each of them, and DOES 48 through 50, placed
6 the muzzles of their guns to the heads of Mr. HOLLIMAN and Mr. WILLIAMS, kicked Mr.
7 WILLIAMS in the stomach and ribs, ground Mr. HOLLIMAN's face into the ground and
8 stomped on his hand causing the dislocation of his thumb.

9 **Eleventh Cause of Action**

10 (Intentionally Omitted)

11 **Twelfth Cause of Action**

12 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiffs MARGUERITA MAYA, GILBERT MAYA, CARLOS MAYA,
13 LUPE MAYA, RAUL MAYA, RAUL MAYA, JR., RUBEN MAYA, ALFREDO MAYA, and
14 IRENE MAYA against defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LASD, WHITTEN,
15 CALZADA, COOPER, WINDRIM, PACINA, CORRIGAN, GLOVER, LT. HERRERA,
16 DELVALLE, CHAPMAN, C. BRANTLEY, SPARKS, GOTT, HOLMES, and DOES 51
17 through 66)

18 56. On or about March 1, 1990, defendants JAMES WHITTEN, RICHARD
19 CALZADA, DANIEL COOPER, ROBERT WINDRIM, JAMES PACINA, JAMES CORRIGAN
20 (#213671), TIMOTHY GLOVER, FRUSTINO DELVALLE, JOHN CHAPMAN (#220837), LT.
21 A. HERRERA and DOES 51 through 66 served a search warrant on the residence of these
22 plaintiffs, located at 5160 Cortland Street, in Lynwood, California. The deputies who entered
23 the plaintiffs' home acted under color of a search warrant obtained by defendant JOHN
24 CHAPMAN (#220937) in violation of the Fourth Amendment; and the execution of the warrant
25 was overseen by CAPTAIN RAYMOND GOTT, LT. A. HERRERA, LT. C. BRANTLEY, LT.
26 M. SPARKS, and SGT. JOE HOLMES. The search warrant purporting to authorize the search
27 was facially overbroad in violation of the Fourth Amendment and based upon an affidavit
28 containing known misstatements of material fact. Such warrant was based on underlying facts

1 so lacking in probable cause that any reasonable officer should have known that the warrant
2 was deficient and did not provide sufficient authority to carry out the search. Notwithstanding,
3 the defendants entered the plaintiffs' home, terrorized and humiliated them at gunpoint,
4 ransacked their home and seized items without lawful justification. Defendants detained and
5 questioned plaintiffs without a warrant, lawful process or probable cause.

6 57. Plaintiff CARLOS MAYA was taken into custody during the search of plaintiffs'
7 residence. Upon his release from custody and while he was still at the station deputy defendant
8 DOES 61 through 66 beat plaintiff CARLOS MAYA.

9
10 **Thirteenth Cause of Action**

11 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiffs DELIA OSITA, TERESA RODRIGUEZ, ALICE OREJEL,
12 MARIA OREJEL, GREGORIA MENDIBLES, ADOLPHO ALEJADE, BRIAN ALEJADE and
13 ANTONIO CABALLERO against defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LASD, DITSCH,
14 GONZALES, GORAN, GUZMAN, O'DELL, RAIMO, RODRIGUEZ, CHAPMAN, HOLMES,
15 HERRERA, BRANTLEY, SPARKS, GOTT and DOES 51 through 66)

16 58. On or about March 1, 1990, defendants CRAIG DITSCH, FRANK GONZALES,
17 KEVIN GORAN (#222021), JOSEPH GUZMAN, RODOLFO O'DELL, DANIEL RAIMO
18 (#207220), MARTIN RODRIGUEZ, and DOES 51 through 66 forcibly entered the residence
19 of these plaintiffs, located at 5174 Sanborn Street, in Lynwood, California, in order to conduct
20 a search pursuant to a search warrant. The deputies who entered the plaintiffs' home acted
21 under color of a search warrant obtained by defendant JOHN CHAPMAN (#220937) in
22 violation of the Fourth Amendment; and the execution of the warrant was overseen by LT. A.
23 HERRERA, LT. C. BRANTLEY, LT. M. SPARKS, CAPT. RAYMOND GOTT and SGT. JOE
24 HOLMES. The search warrant purporting to authorize the search was facially overbroad in
25 violation of the Fourth Amendment and based upon an affidavit containing known
26 misstatements of material fact. Such warrant was based on underlying facts so lacking in
27 probable cause that any reasonable officer should have known that the warrant was deficient
28 and did not provide sufficient authority to carry out the search. Notwithstanding, the

1 defendants entered the plaintiffs' home, terrorized and humiliated them at gunpoint, ransacked
2 the residence, and removed money and other items which were not the subject of the search.
3 Furthermore, defendants detained and questioned plaintiffs without a warrant, lawful process
4 or probable cause. During the search Plaintiff GREGORIA MENDIBLES was bedridden
5 following recent surgery, and, in spite of protests, she was lifted up by the Defendants and
6 forcibly moved within the home against her will.

7
8 **Fourteenth Cause of Action**

9 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiffs ERNESTO AVILA, JESUS AVILA, ESTELLA MONTOYA,
10 REBECCA MONTOYA, MONIQUE TREVIÑO and CRYSTAL TREVIÑO against defendants
11 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LASD, CITY OF LYNWOOD, THOMPSON, STEINWAND,
12 NEIHOUSE, LUNA, HARRIS, CLIFT, CORINA, CHAPMAN, HOLMES, HERRERA,
13 BRANTLEY, SPARKS, GOTT and DOES 51 through 66)

14 59. On or about March 1, 1990, defendants GREGORY THOMPSON (#196144);
15 BRIAN STEINWAND (#218524); JACK NEIHOUSE; SGT. TOMMY HARRIS; JAVIER
16 CLIFT; JOHN CORINA (#213435); and DOES 51 through 66 forcibly entered the residence
17 of these plaintiffs, located at 11121 Popc Street, in Lynwood, California, in order to conduct
18 a search pursuant to a search warrant. The deputies who entered the plaintiffs' home acted
19 under color of a search warrant obtained by defendant JOHN CHAPMAN (#220937) in
20 violation of the Fourth Amendment; and the execution of the warrant was overseen by SGT.
21 JOE HOLMES, LT. A. HERRERA, LT. C. BRANTLEY, LT. M. SPARKS and CAPT.
22 RAYMOND GOTT. The search warrant purporting to authorize the search was facially
23 overbroad in violation of the Fourth Amendment and based upon an affidavit containing known
24 misstatements of material fact. Such warrant was based on underlying facts so lacking in
25 probable cause that any reasonable officer should have known that the warrant was deficient
26 and did not provide sufficient authority to carry out the search. Notwithstanding, the
27 defendants entered the plaintiffs' home, terrorized and humiliated them at gunpoint, and
28 ransacked their home. Defendants detained and questioned plaintiffs without a warrant, lawful

1 process, probable cause, or any lawful basis. Defendants' entry into the premises was
2 unreasonable under the Fourth Amendment and did not comply with the requirements of Penal
3 Code Section 1531.

4
5 **Fifteenth Cause of Action**

6 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiffs JORGE CALDERON, CAROLINA CALDERON, LINDA
7 CALDERON, RUBEN CALDERON, DAVID CALDERON, and CHRISTIANA CALDERON
8 against defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LASD, GROTEFEND, CARTER,
9 ESQUERRA, ROMAN, OROSCO, RAMIREZ, SALVATORE, GRACIA, GOLDEN,
10 CORMIER, RIPLEY, (GILL) McMICHAEL, GILLIES, WAINIE, RADELEFF, CASTRO,
11 CHAPMAN, HOLMES, HERRERA, BRANTLEY, SPARKS, GOTT and DOES 51 through 76)

12 60. On or about March 1, 1990, defendants ALBERT GROTEFEND (#034657),
13 SCOTT CARTER (#150582), ESQUERRA (#137451), WILLIAM ROMAN (#077668),
14 RICHARD OROSCO (#068734), JACK RAMIREZ (#211246), MICHAEL SALVATORE
15 (#044852), RUBEN GRACIA (#213459), and DOES 51 through 66 entered the residence of
16 these plaintiffs, located at 11125 Pope Street, in Lynwood, California, in order to conduct a
17 search. The deputies who entered the plaintiffs' home acted under color of a search warrant
18 obtained by defendant JOHN CHAPMAN (#220937) in violation of the Fourth Amendment;
19 and the execution of the warrant was overseen by SGT. JOE HOLMES, I.T. A. HERRERA,
20 LT. C. BRANTLEY, LT. M. SPARKS and CAPT. RAYMOND GOTT. The search warrant
21 purporting to authorize the search was facially overbroad in violation of the Fourth Amendment
22 and based upon an affidavit containing known misstatements of material fact. Such warrant
23 was based on underlying facts so lacking in probable cause that any reasonable officer should
24 have known that the warrant was deficient and did not provide sufficient authority to carry out
25 the search. Notwithstanding, the defendants entered the plaintiffs' home, terrorized and
26 humiliated them at gunpoint, and ransacked their home. Defendants detained and questioned
27 plaintiffs without a warrant, lawful process, probable cause, or any lawful basis. Defendants'
28 entry into the premises was unreasonable under the Fourth Amendment and did not comply

1 with the requirements of Penal Code Section 1531. Defendants unlawfully and unreasonably
2 seized plaintiff JORGE CALDERON'S .22 caliber rifle, which rifle they later returned in a
3 damaged and inoperable condition.

4 61. On or about April 6, 1990, in the City of Lynwood, defendants CURTIS GOLDEN,
5 DANIELLE CORMIER, ALLEN RIPLEY, (KELLY GILL) McMICHAEL (#260309),
6 DOUGLAS GILLIES (#244674), BYRON G. WAINIE (#222015), LT. RADELEFF, LT.
7 RICHARD L. CASTRO, and DOES 67 through 76 stopped, detained, arrested or questioned
8 Mr. RUBEN CALDERON without a warrant, lawful process or probable cause. Furthermore,
9 these defendants choked RUBEN CALDERON with a flashlight, slammed a car door on his
10 legs and, while he was jailed at the Lynwood Station, beat him wilfully and without necessity
11 or lawful justification. After RUBEN CALDERON's mother called to complain about this ill
12 treatment, defendants responded by threatening and physically mistreating him causing further
13 injury, pain, suffering, humiliation, and fear.

14
15 **Sixteenth Cause of Action**

16 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiffs ELSA TOVAR, FRANCISCO TOVAR, FRANCISCO TOVAR
17 JR., YESENIA TOVAR, MARCELA TOVAR, JAIME TOVAR, JESUS TOVAR and
18 HERMAN TOVAR against defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LASD, GROTEFEND,
19 ESQUERRA, SALVATORE, RAMIREZ, GRACIA, ROMAN, CARTER, OROSCO,
20 CHAPMAN, HOLMES, HERRERA, BRANTLEY, SPARKS, GOTT and DOES 51 through 66)

21 62. On or about March 1, 1990, defendants GROTEFEND, ESQUERRA,
22 SALVATORE, RAMIREZ, GRACIA, ROMAN, CARTER, OROSCO and DOES 51 through
23 66 entered the residence of these plaintiffs, located at 11125½ Pope Street, in Lynwood,
24 California, to conduct a search of the home. However, defendants did not have a search warrant
25 authorizing them to search this location, nor did they have any other lawful justification for the
26 search without a warrant. The search warrant the defendants possessed that morning did not
27 authorize entry into the home in which the TOVARs resided. The deputies who entered the
28 plaintiffs' home purported to act under color of a search warrant obtained by defendant JOHN

1 CHAPMAN (#220937) in violation of the Fourth Amendment; and the execution of the warrant
2 was overseen by SGT. JOE HOLMES, LT. A. HERRERA, LT. C. BRANTLEY, LT. M.
3 SPARKS and CAPT. RAYMOND GOTT. The search warrant relied upon by the defendants
4 was facially overbroad in violation of the Fourth Amendment and based upon an affidavit
5 containing known misstatements of material fact. Such warrant was based on underlying facts
6 so lacking in probable cause that any reasonable officer should have known that the warrant
7 was deficient and did not provide sufficient authority to carry out the search. Notwithstanding,
8 the defendants forcibly entered the plaintiffs' home and terrorized and humiliated them at
9 gunpoint, and ransacked their home. Defendants detained and questioned plaintiffs without a
10 warrant, lawful process or probable cause.

11
12 **Seventeenth Cause of Action**

13 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiff SERGIO GALINDO against defendants COUNTY OF LOS
14 ANGELES, LASD, SGT. ANDERSON, GIRON, RIFKIN, HOLBROOK, NUNEZ,
15 BRANDENBURG, COSTLEIGH, O'HARA, CHAPMAN, HERRERA, HOLMES, BRANTLEY,
16 SPARKS and GOTT and DOES 51 through 66)

17 63. On or about March 1, 1990, defendants SGT. ANDERSON (#160080), GIRON
18 (#033144), RIFKIN (#207195), HOLBROOK (#209619), NUNEZ (#067434),
19 BRANDENBURG (#209523), COSTLEIGH (#173151), O'HARA (#183119), and DOES 51
20 through 66 entered the residence of this plaintiff, located at 11209 Duncan Avenue, in
21 Lynwood, California, in order to conduct a search pursuant to a search warrant. The deputies
22 who entered the plaintiffs' home acted under color of a search warrant obtained by defendant
23 JOHN CHAPMAN (#220937) in violation of the Fourth Amendment; and the execution of the
24 warrant was overseen by Lt. A. HERRERA and SGT. JOE HOLMES. The search warrant
25 purporting to authorize the search was facially overbroad in violation of the Fourth Amendment
26 and based upon an affidavit containing known misstatements of material fact. Such warrant
27 was based on underlying facts so lacking in probable cause that any reasonable officer should
28 have known that the warrant was deficient and did not provide sufficient authority to carry out

1 the search. Notwithstanding, the defendants entered the plaintiff's home, terrorized and
2 humiliated him at gunpoint, and ransacked his home. Defendants detained and questioned
3 plaintiff without a warrant, lawful process or probable cause.

4
5 **Eighteenth Cause of Action**

6 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiffs SERGIO SANCHEZ, ALFREDO SANCHEZ, ALFONSO
7 SANCHEZ, JOSE SANCHEZ, MARTA VELEZ, ESTELA SANCHEZ and YLDEFONZA
8 LORENZANA against defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LASD, GILLIES, KIFF,
9 (GILL) McMICHAEL, BROWN-VOYER, VOGUE, MOSSOTTI, TARASIUK, LUNA,
10 HARVEY, REED, and DOES 77 through 92)

11 64. On or about March 24, 1990, in the City of Lynwood, defendants DOUGLAS
12 GILLIES (#244674), KEVIN J. KIFF (#235151), KELLY (GILL) McMICHAEL (#260309),
13 KATHERINE BROWN-VOYER (#258489), MICHAEL VOGUE (#186761), JOHN MOSSOTTI
14 (#232692), JACK TARASIUK (#244912), LOY LUNA (#201663), T.J. HARVEY (#038535),
15 R.A. REED (#236792), and DOES 77 through 92 stopped, detained, arrested and questioned
16 these plaintiffs without a warrant, lawful process or probable cause. Furthermore, these
17 defendants struck and beat plaintiffs SERGIO SANCHEZ, ALFREDO SANCHEZ, ALFONSO
18 SANCHEZ, and JOSE SANCHEZ, with batons and flashlights willfully and without necessity
19 or lawful justification, thereby causing serious injury to each of them.

20 65. Furthermore, these defendants physically assaulted plaintiffs MARTA VELEZ and
21 ESTELA SANCHEZ willfully and without necessity or lawful justification. MARTA VELEZ,
22 who was eight months pregnant at the time of the assault, was pushed in the breasts by one of
23 these defendants.

24 66. Plaintiff YLDEFONZA LORENZANA, an 82 year-old great-grandmother, was held
25 for the duration of the illegal detention at the point of a shotgun while she lay in her bed.

26
27 **Nineteenth Cause of Action**

28 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiff RICHARD HERNANDEZ against defendants COUNTY OF

1 LOS ANGELES, LASD, RUNNING, BROWNELL, BENSON, KIFF, and DOES 93 through
2 98)

3 67. On or about March 24, 1990, in the City of Lynwood, defendants T. RUNNING
4 (#223235), T. BROWNELL (#223432), TIMOTHY E. BENSON (#246380), KEVIN J. KIFF
5 (#235151), and DOES 93 through 98 stopped, detained, arrested and questioned this plaintiff
6 without a warrant, lawful process or probable cause. Further, these defendants kicked and beat
7 Mr. Hernandez with their flashlights and fists, wilfully and without necessity or lawful
8 justification.

9
10 **Twentieth Cause of Action**

11 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiff RAUL GONZALES against defendants WAINIE, PINESETT,
12 BLAIR, GRACIA, THOMPSON, PIPPIN, CORRIGAN, MORENO, DILLARD, BARTON,
13 RAIMO, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, and LASD, and DOES)

14 68. On or about April 13, 1990, in the City of Lynwood, BYRON G. WAINIE
15 (#222015), ANDRE PINESETT (#260171), STEVE BLAIR (#236778), RUBEN GRACIA
16 (#213459), GREGORY THOMPSON (#196144), MICHAEL PIPPIN (#116212), JAMES
17 CORRIGAN (#213671), ABEL A. MORENO (#195912), ROBERT DILLARD, CHARLES
18 BARTON, and DAN RAIMO (#207220) falsely and maliciously arrested Mr. GONZALES on
19 a charge of attempted robbery. After removing Mr. GONZALES from the sight and presence
20 of family members defendants beat plaintiff about the head and body, willfully and without
21 necessity or lawful justification, thereby causing serious injuries to his head and body. These
22 defendants thereafter caused Mr. GONZALES to be falsely imprisoned in the Los Angeles
23 County Jail for a period in excess of 10 days.

24
25 **Twenty-First Cause of Action**

26 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiff JESSE MELENDREZ against defendants COUNTY OF LOS
27 ANGELES, LASD, LUNA and DOES 99 through 107)

28 69. On or about April 14, 1990, at or near 11501 Duncan Avenue, Lynwood,

1 defendants LOY LUNA (#210663) and DOES 99 through 107 stopped, detained, arrested and
2 questioned Mr. MELENDREZ without a warrant, lawful process or probable cause. These
3 defendants unlawfully and without probable cause detained and arrested Mr. MELENDREZ,
4 and, in the course of transporting Mr. MELENDREZ to the Lynwood Station, struck and beat
5 Mr. MELENDREZ while he was helplessly handcuffed in the rear seat of these deputies' patrol
6 car. These defendants thereafter handcuffed Mr. MELENDREZ to a swivel chair in the trailer
7 of the station and continued to slap, beat and strike said plaintiff, all without necessity or
8 justification.

9
10 **Twenty-Second Cause of Action**

11 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiffs SALVADOR PRECIADO and RAPHAEL OCHOA against
12 defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LASD, CITY OF LYNWOOD, HUBNER,
13 REEVES, HUFFMAN, CORINA, HOLMES, and DOES 108 through 122)

14 70. On or about April 17, 1990, in the City of Lynwood, defendants ERIC HUBNER
15 (#37190), JEROLD REEVES (#208423), DALE HUFFMAN (#265013), JOHN CORINA
16 (#213435), and JOSEPH HOLMES (#041885), and DOES 108 through 112 stopped, detained,
17 arrested and questioned plaintiffs without a warrant, lawful process or probable cause. These
18 defendants struck these plaintiffs in the face wilfully and without necessity or lawful
19 justification. Further, one of these defendants shoved a loaded revolver into plaintiff
20 RAPHAEL OCHOA'S mouth for approximately thirty seconds and told him, "Every time you
21 see us we are going to fuck with you."

22 71. On or about April 20, 1990, at or near 11345 Wright Road, Lynwood, defendants
23 DOES 113 through 122 stopped, detained, arrested and questioned these plaintiffs without a
24 warrant, lawful process or probable cause. These defendants beat plaintiff SALVADOR
25 PRECIADO while he was kept in a darkened cell and slammed him into metal lockers wilfully
26 and without necessity or lawful justification.

27 72. On or about April 20, 1990, defendants DOES 113 though 122 entered and
28 searched plaintiff RAPHAEL OCHOA'S residence at 11345 Wright Road, without a warrant

1 or probable cause.

2
3 **Twenty-Third Cause of Action**

4 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiff MARIAN ENGLISH against defendants COUNTY OF LOS
5 ANGELES, LASD, NORDSKOG, KIFF and DOES 123 through 140)

6 73. On or about May 5, 1990, in the City of Lynwood, defendants EDWARD M.
7 NORDSKOG (#241276), KEVIN J. KIFF (#235151), and DOES 123 through 140 without legal
8 cause or justification, and with an intent to kill, shot and killed LAWRENCE JOHNSON, a 15
9 year old youth, the son of plaintiff MARIAN ENGLISH.

10
11 **Twenty-Fourth Cause of Action**

12 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiffs RON DALTON, ERIC JONES and MARCELO GONZALEZ
13 against defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LASD, NORDSKOG, KIFF, MOSSOTTI,
14 REEVES, VALDEZ, CORMIER, MANN, SCHNEIDER and DOES 141 through 142)

15 74. On or about May 20, 1990 in the City of Lynwood, defendants EDWARD M.
16 NORDSKOG (#241276), KEVIN J. KIFF (#235151), JOHN MOSSOTTI (#232692), JEROLD
17 REEVES (#208423), PATRICK VALDEZ, DANIELLE CORMIER, JASON MANN (#196175),
18 MICHAEL SCHNEIDER (#244092), and DOES 141 through 142 stopped, detained, arrested
19 and questioned plaintiffs, without a warrant, lawful process or probable cause. Further, these
20 defendants beat and struck Mr. DALTON with blunt objects, and kicked him, all done wilfully
21 and without necessity or lawful justification. Furthermore, one of these defendants shoved a
22 loaded revolver into Mr. DALTON's mouth threatening to blow his head off. During this
23 incident, plaintiffs Mr. JONES and Mr. GONZALEZ, were also beaten by these defendants
24 without necessity or lawful justification. One of these defendants put a gun to the head of Mr.
25 GONZALEZ and pulled the trigger, but the gun did not fire.

26 75. Defendants then filed false and misleading police reports which they knew would
27 result in the unwarranted criminal prosecution of plaintiffs DALTON and JONES. Plaintiffs
28 are informed and believe and thereon allege that defendants through false statements and

1 material omission in their report, prevented prosecutors from exercising independent judgement
2 in determining whether to prosecute plaintiff. All criminal charges against Mr. DALTON were
3 dismissed by the court on November 21, 1991, and against Mr. JONES on January 15, 1992.
4 Mr. GONZALEZ pleaded no contest to a criminal charge on January 15, 1992. In addition to
5 the damages listed below, plaintiffs incurred legal fees and expenses as a result of their criminal
6 prosecution.

7
8 **Twenty-Fifth Cause of Action**

9 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiff DEMETRIO CARRILLO against defendants COUNTY OF LOS
10 ANGELES, LASD, SMITH, and CAMPBELL)

11 76. On or about October 16, 1989, Mr. CARRILLO, after speaking briefly to a woman
12 receiving a citation from a deputy sheriff, was accosted and verbally and physically abused by
13 defendants ELIZABETH SMITH (#222075) and ANTHONY CAMPBELL (#013405).
14 Defendants used vulgar language and ethnic slurs. Mr. CARRILLO was beaten about the body
15 by defendants without necessity or lawful justification, resulting in injuries. Plaintiff was
16 wrongfully arrested by defendants SMITH and CAMPBELL without a warrant, probable cause
17 or other lawful justification. Defendants maliciously prepared and submitted false reports about
18 Mr. CARRILLO, which the District Attorney relied upon in filing a charge against Mr.
19 CARRILLO of violating Cal. Penal Code § 148, thereby requiring Mr. CARRILLO to go to
20 trial where he was subsequently acquitted.

21
22 **Twenty-Sixth Cause of Action**

23 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiff TRACY BATTS against defendants COUNTY OF LOS
24 ANGELES, LASD, STEINWAND, RAIMO, THOMPSON, PIPPIN, LESLIE, SHEEHY,
25 ZAMPIELLO and DOES 143 through 151)

26 77. On or about May 17, 1990, on or near Atlantic Drive in the unincorporated area
27 known as East Compton, defendants BRIAN STEINWAND, DAN RAIMO (#207220), opened
28 fire with a handgun and a shotgun and attempted to kill unarmed Mr. TRACY BATTS without

1 necessity or lawful justification. Defendants STEINWAND and RAIMO then created mortal
2 danger for Mr. BATTS by saying verbally and in their written report that Mr. BATTS had been
3 armed with a handgun, which was not true.

4 78. On or about May 25, 1990, at and near Washington Street and Greenleaf Avenue
5 in the unincorporated area known as East Compton, defendants DAN RAIMO, GREGORY
6 THOMPSON (#196144), M. PIPPIN (#116212), and DOES 143 through 151 (deputies assigned
7 to the Lynwood Substation), and J. LESLIE (#223389) and J. SHEEHY (#207157), (deputies
8 assigned to the Firestone Station) opened fire on and attempted to kill Mr. BATTS without
9 necessity or lawful justification. Again, defendants RAIMO and THOMPSON created mortal
10 danger for Mr. BATTS by telling other deputies that Mr. BATTS was armed with a hand gun,
11 which was not true. After an hour or two of searching by deputies, Defendant MICHAEL
12 PIPPIN found Mr. BATTS and shot him in the right leg, without necessity or lawful
13 justification. Furthermore, after Mr. BATTS was shot and as he lay helpless on the ground, at
14 the direction and request of defendant LESLIE, defendant Compton Police Officer
15 ZAMPIELLO unleashed his attack canine and sicced it on Mr. BATTS, whose leg was then
16 mauled by the dog.

17 18 **Twenty-Seventh Cause of Action**

19 (42 U.S.C. § 1983, by plaintiff ELZIE COLEMAN against defendants COUNTY OF LOS
20 ANGELES, LASD, ARCHAMBAULT, BLOCK and defendants DOES 152 through 181)

21 79. On or about May 26, 1990 at or about 11:15 p.m., at or near 11844 South Antwerp
22 Street, Lynwood, defendant PAUL ARCHAMBAULT (#213669), without necessity or lawful
23 justification, and with an intent to kill him, shot at and hit plaintiff ELZIE COLEMAN
24 numerous times, seriously wounding him, including while he lay face down bleeding helplessly.

25 80. Defendant ARCHAMBAULT falsely arrested the unarmed, seriously injured MR.
26 COLEMAN, falsely claiming that MR. COLEMAN feloniously possessed and brandished a
27 handgun.

28 81. In furtherance of the aforementioned conspiracy and with the assistance and

1 connivance of Sheriff SHERMAN BLOCK, the COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and the LASD,
2 defendant ARCHAMBAULT fabricated evidence and a false police report to justify the
3 unlawful and excessive use of deadly force upon plaintiff COLEMAN and to promote their
4 effort to prosecute him upon fabricated evidence.

5 82. Defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and LASD recklessly or intentionally
6 conducted its investigation of the incident so as to permit and facilitate the fabrications of
7 defendant ARCHAMBAULT to be furthered with the result that the unjustified use of excessive
8 and deadly force by defendant ARCHAMBAULT was tolerated and approved.

9 83. During the course of the purported investigation, defendants COUNTY OF LOS
10 ANGELES and LASD, by and through their deputy sheriffs, falsely arrested eyewitness to the
11 illegal and improper shooting by defendant ARCHAMBAULT, removing them from the scene
12 of the shooting in an effort to cover up the true facts of the shooting.

13 84. Plaintiff COLEMAN was prosecuted based upon the knowing fabrications of
14 defendant ARCHAMBAULT.

15 85. Defendants ARCHAMBAULT, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, AND LASD
16 attempted to and did present materially false testimony at the felony preliminary hearing and
17 criminal trial of plaintiff COLEMAN in Compton Superior Court Case Number TA 69002. The
18 defendants knew or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known that the information
19 and testimony they presented during the preliminary hearing and criminal trial was false,
20 distorted, contrived, and inaccurate.

21 86. Plaintiff COLEMAN was fully acquitted on October 23, 1991 of all criminal
22 charges following an extended trial.

23 87. Plaintiff COLEMAN incurred the expense and obligation to pay attorney's fees
24 and costs in defense of the false criminal charges.

25 **DAMAGES**

26 88. By reason of the aforementioned acts of defendants, and each of them, plaintiffs
27 were injured in their health, strength and activity, sustained great mental pain, suffering and
28 shock to their nervous system, torment, anxiety, anguish, humiliation, and severe emotional

1 distress, all to their damage in an amount according to proof at trial.

2 89. As a proximate result of the foregoing wrongful acts of defendants, and each of
3 them, property belonging to plaintiffs was damaged and destroyed in an amount according to
4 proof at trial.

5 90. By reason of the aforementioned acts of defendants and each of them, plaintiffs
6 were or will in the future be required to receive hospital, medical, doctor, nursing, dental and
7 psychological care and treatment, and by reason thereof, will incur expenses related thereto in
8 an amount according to proof at trial.

9 91. By reason of the aforementioned defendants and each of them, plaintiffs were
10 unable to work, and sustained and will in the future sustain a loss and impairment of earnings
11 in an amount according to proof at trial.

12 92. Defendants' acts were done and committed by each defendant knowingly,
13 deliberately and maliciously, with the intent to oppress, injure and harass plaintiffs, and with
14 reckless indifference to the civil rights, personal security and safety of these plaintiffs; and by
15 reason thereof, plaintiffs pray for punitive and exemplary damages from and against defendants
16 and each of them, in an amount according to proof at trial.

17 93. In addition, plaintiffs SANDRA LEONARD and CANDI LEONARD, as the
18 daughters and heirs of decedent WILLIAM LEONARD, have each suffered and will continue
19 to each suffer loss of his financial and moral support, love, comfort, companionship, affection,
20 society and solace, all to these plaintiffs' general damage in an amount according to proof at
21 trial.

22 94. By reason of the aforementioned acts of defendants, and each of them, plaintiffs
23 SANDRA LEONARD and CANDI LEONARD have each incurred funeral and burial expense
24 for the cortege, last rites, services and interment of their father's body, in an amount according
25 to proof at trial.

26 95. In addition, plaintiff MARIAN ENGLISH, as the parent and heir of decedent
27 LAWRENCE JOHNSON, has suffered and will continue to suffer loss of his financial and
28 moral support, love, comfort, companionship, affection, society and solace, all to her general

1 damage in an amount according to proof at trial.

2 96. By reason of the aforementioned acts of defendants, and each of them, plaintiff
3 MARIAN ENGLISH has incurred funeral and burial expense for the cortege, last rites, services
4 and interment of her son's body, in an amount according to proof at trial.

5
6 **INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

7 97. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that, unless enjoined,
8 defendants will continue to engage in the unlawful acts and in the policies and practices
9 described above, in violation of the legal and constitutional rights of the plaintiffs and the
10 members of the class. Plaintiffs and the members of the class face the real and immediate threat
11 of repeated and irreparable injury and continuing, present adverse effects as a result of the
12 unlawful misconduct, policies and practices of the defendants. Plaintiffs and the members of
13 the class have no adequate and complete remedy at law.

14
15 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

16 WHEREFORE, plaintiffs seek judgment as follows:

17 1. Declaring, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202 that the acts, policies, rules,
18 regulations, practices, customs, and usages that the defendants engaged in as set forth in
19 paragraphs 25-29 above violate the legal and constitutional rights of the plaintiffs and the
20 members of the class.

21 2. Permanently enjoining defendants and their agents, employees, and successors, and
22 all persons in active concert or participation with defendants, from engaging in the unlawful
23 and unconstitutional acts, policies, rules, regulations, practices, customs, and usages set forth
24 in paragraph 25 above.

25 3. Placing the Lynwood Station under the direct supervision and control of a receiver
26 or special master to be appointed by the Court; directing the receiver or special master to
27 review all existing written and unwritten policies and procedures of defendants with respect to
28 the acts, policies, rules, regulations, practices, customs, and usages set forth in paragraph 25

1 above; directing the receiver or special master to modify, amend, or revoke, or to confirm and
2 enforce, existing policies and procedures and to establish such new or additional written
3 policies and procedures as may be necessary and proper; and directing the receiver or special
4 master to implement and enforce appropriate written policies and procedures with respect to the
5 following subjects, among others:

6 a. Ensuring compliance with constitutional standards governing the use
7 of firearms, the use of force the conduct of searches, and the use of deadly force.

8 b. Providing adequate training, certification, and periodic recertification
9 of all deputies in the lawful use of force, including firearms and other deadly
10 force.

11 c. Specifying departmentally approved weaponless control techniques,
12 and providing for adequate training, certification, and periodic recertification of
13 all deputies in the use of such techniques.

14 d. Ensuring that members of the public injured by deputies receive
15 prompt and appropriate medical care, and that their injuries are catalogued and
16 recorded in police reports and by photographs of all such injuries.

17 e. Requiring that all persons in custody be transported to a hospital for
18 examination and treatment by a medical doctor whenever:

19 (1) the person sustains a head injury, strikes his or her
20 head on a hard object, or sustains a blow to the head, regardless
21 of how minor any such injury may appear;

22 (2) the person is choked or is subjected to any control
23 hold involving the neck, regardless of whether or not the person
24 is rendered unconscious;

25 (3) the person has any injuries that appear to require
26 medical attention;

27 (4) the person requests medical treatment, regardless of
28 whether or not the person has any apparent injuries.

1 f. Prohibiting the use of saps in any circumstances, and prohibiting the
2 use of head strikes and strikes to other vital areas of the body by batons or
3 flashlights, except in cases where there is legal justification for the use of deadly
4 force.

5 g. Prohibiting the improper use of police dogs to attack, bite, or maul
6 persons.

7 h. Requiring that searches be conducted in a manner which inflicts the
8 least amount of damage necessary in order to conduct an adequate search; that
9 deputies be required to photograph or videotape the premises before and after
10 each and every search; that deputies return to their original location and
11 condition all items displaced in any search; and that the Los Angeles County
12 Sheriff's Department pay for the repair or replacement of any property
13 unnecessarily damaged or destroyed in the course of any search.

14 i. Recording in writing each instance in which a deputy is involved in
15 the use of force in arresting a suspect or in detaining any person, regardless of
16 whether an arrest is made.

17 j. Requiring that any deputy who participates in or witnesses any
18 incident involving the use of force by a deputy or deputies shall prepare and
19 submit a departmental report containing detailed information regarding the
20 incident, including:

21 (1) A full description of the actions of the suspect or
22 member of the public which made the use of force necessary;

23 (2) A full description of the specific force used or
24 observed by the deputy;

25 (3) A full description of any injuries or complaints of
26 injuries sustained by the suspect or member of the public,
27 including photographs or videotapes of the suspect or member of
28 the public;

1 (4) A full description of any medical treatment received
2 by and any refusal of such treatment by the suspect or member
3 of the public.

4 k. Establishing a system that allows an immediate on-duty supervisor to
5 readily access a historical record of any deputy who has used force in a period
6 of at least the last 5 years, including the identity of the deputy(ies) involved in
7 the use of force, the file number(s) (URN) of the report(s) in which the use of
8 force is reported, and a description of the nature of the force used (e.g.,
9 "intentional head strike with baton"; "accidental head strike with flashlight");
10 requiring periodic review of such records for patterns of unjustified use of force
11 by deputies and institution of disciplinary proceedings where appropriate;
12 requiring review of such records whenever a supervisor prepares a departmental
13 performance evaluation of any deputy; and requiring that performance
14 evaluations include documentation of any patterns concerning the unjustified use
15 of force.

16 1. Providing that, in any situation in which deadly force has been used
17 by a deputy and death or serious injury has resulted, there shall be an
18 administrative review of the use of force to determine whether it was in
19 compliance with departmental policy and constitutional standards, and whether
20 departmental policy should be modified in view of the circumstances
21 surrounding the use of such force.

22 m. Requiring that, in departmental investigations of officer-involved
23 shootings, other use of deadly force by deputies, or complaints of deputy
24 misconduct:

25 (1) all percipient witnesses (including deputies) be
26 segregated from each other as soon as practicable after the
27 incident;

28 (2) such witnesses not be permitted to discuss the

1 incident with any other witness until after all witnesses have been
2 interviewed by departmental investigators;

3 (3) such witnesses not be informed of the contents or
4 substance of the statements of other witnesses until after all
5 witnesses have been interviewed by departmental investigators;
6 and

7 (4) all witness interviews, including interviews of
8 involved deputies, be fully and completely tape-recorded.

9 n. Indexing by individual deputy and maintaining files of complaints by
10 members of the public, Cal. Govt. Code § 910 claims, and lawsuits concerning
11 deputy misconduct; adequately investigating such complaints, claims, and
12 lawsuits; and using such files to monitor the conduct of deputies.

13 o. Requiring psychological testing and counseling of deputies with a
14 record of using unreasonable or excessive force, making false arrests, filing false
15 charges, engaging in related acts of dishonesty, or engaging in racially
16 motivated misconduct.

17 p. Maintaining a promotional system which penalizes deputies for
18 instances of unjustified use of firearms or unjustified use of force, violence,
19 dishonesty, racial or ethnic bias, or other misconduct.

20 q. Requiring dismissal of deputies repeatedly involved in instances of
21 unjustified use of firearms or unjustified use of force, violence, dishonesty, racial
22 or ethnic bias, or other misconduct.

23 r. Requiring that, where an investigation discloses any improper use of
24 force by a deputy, particularly improper use of force which causes serious bodily
25 injury as defined in Cal. Penal Code § 243, that matter should be referred to the
26 District Attorney's Office for consideration of filing a criminal complaint.

27 s. Requiring that, whenever any deputy has been judicially determined
28 to have engaged in a violation of constitutional or civil rights, whenever a

1 monetary settlement has been made or a judgment has been rendered based on
2 the use of excessive force by a deputy, or whenever any arrest has been made
3 as to which a deputy claims to be the victim of a crime:

4 (1) a departmental investigation be conducted, regardless
5 of any earlier investigation or the findings thereof;

6 (2) the investigators review all evidence introduced at
7 trial or provided to them by any person, and that they interview
8 all known witnesses including plaintiff's trial experts, and
9 interview plaintiff's counsel in any lawsuit alleging deputy
10 misconduct;

11 (3) a full report be made to the Sheriff and to the receiver
12 or special master with recommendations for or against
13 disciplinary or criminal sanctions against the deputy.

14 t. Directing that the defendants seek tangible ways (for example,
15 through disciplinary measures) to establish the principle that racial and ethnic
16 bias will not be tolerated within the LASD, and that the defendants establish an
17 adequate program of cultural awareness training and periodic retraining to
18 eliminate racial or ethnic stereotypes for all deputies.

19 4. Directing defendants to establish a civilian review board, separate from and
20 independent of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, to review complaints against
21 deputies by members of the public, Cal. Govt. Code § 910 claims, and lawsuits concerning the
22 use of firearms, the use of force, unreasonable searches and seizures, false arrest, filing of false
23 charges, related dishonesty by deputies, and racial or ethnic bias by deputies; and empowering
24 said body to recommend discipline to the Sheriff and, when appropriate, criminal prosecution
25 to the District Attorney.

26 5. Entering judgment for compensatory general and special damages in an amount in
27 accordance with proof.

28 6. Entering judgment for exemplary damages against each of the individual defendants

1 in an amount sufficient to punish and to make an example of said defendants, and to deter said
2 defendants and others from engaging in similar conduct.

3 7. Awarding reasonable attorney's fees, expenses, and costs of suit.

4 8. Granting such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

5
6 DATED: October , 1992.

7
8
9

HUGH MANES
Lead Counsel

10 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

11 All plaintiffs demand a jury trial.

12 DATED: October , 1992

13
14
15

HUGH MANES
Lead Counsel

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is: 315 West Ninth Street, Suite 208, Los Angeles, California 90015.

On October __, 1992, I served the foregoing document described as FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT, on all interested parties in this action by placing true copies thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed as follows:

F. JAMES FEFFER
COTKIN & COLLINS
201 N. Figueroa, Ste. 1100
Los Angeles, Ca 90012

PATRICK T. MEYERS
Principal Deputy County Counsel
DE WITT W. CLINTON, County Counsel
648 Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

STEVEN MANNING
CAROL ANN HUMISTON
MORRIS, POLICH & PURDY
1055 West Seventh Street
24th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017-2503

JOHN GEZELIUS
THOMAS OVERLANDER
OVERLANDER, AHERNE & LEWIS
801 N. Brand Blvd., Ste. 640
Glendale, CA 91203

I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in the affidavit. Executed on October __, 1992, at Los Angeles, California.

I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.
