1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Garo Mardirossian, Esq., #101812 garo@garolaw.com Rowena J. Dizon, Esq., #171365 rdizon@garolaw.com MARDIROSSIAN & ASSOCIATES, INC A Professional Law Corporation 6311 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90048-5001 Telephone (323) 653-6311 Facsimile (323) 651-5511  Thomas E. Beck, Esq., #81557 becklaw@earthlink.net THE BECK LAW FIRM 10377 Los Alamitos Boulevard Los Alamitos, CA 90720 Telephone (562) 795-5835 Facsimile (562) 795-5821  Attorneys for Plaintiff ANDREW TREVOR	PM 2: 20	
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
13	CENTRAL DISTRIC	SACVIZ 37355 (TPFX)	
14		JACKEC 20.202 (11.2)	
15	ANDREW TREVOR CLARKE,	Case No.:	
16	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES	
17	vs.	1. Violation of Civil Rights (42 U.S.C. § 1983)	
18	CITY OF FULLERTON; MICHAEL SELLERS, Chief of Police individually and as a peace officer; CARY TONG #1341,	(42 0.5.0. § 1903) ) 2. <i>Monell</i> Claim	
19	as a peace officer; CARY TONG #1341,	(42 U.S.C. § 1983)	
20	individually and as a peace officer; SAM CONTINO # 774, individually and as a peace officer; KENTON HAMPTON #	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	
21	1337, individually and as a peace officer;	)	
22	individually and as a peace officer; DOE		
23	individually and as a peace officer; DOE SALAZAR # UNKNOWN, individually and as a peace officer; DOE WORLEY # UNKNOWN, individually and as a peace officer; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,		
24	officer; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,		
25	Defendants.		
26			
27			
28			

2

4 5

6 7

8

1011

12

1314

16

17

15

18

1920

2122

23

2425

2627

28

#### **JURISDICTION**

1. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343, (1), (2), (3) and (4). This action at law for money damages arises under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the United States Constitution, the laws of the State of California and common law principles to redress a deprivation under color of state law of rights, privileges and immunities secured to Plaintiff by said statutes, and by the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution.

#### **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

- 2. At all times herein mentioned, Plaintiff ANDREW TREVOR CLARKE is a resident of the County of Orange, City of Anaheim, and a United States citizen.
- At all times herein mentioned, Defendants MICHAEL SELLERS, Chief of 3. Police individually and as a peace officer, CARY TONG #1341, individually and as a peace officer, SAM CONTINO # 774, individually and as a peace officer, KENTON HAMPTON # 1337, individually and as a peace officer, DOE BOLDEN # UNKNOWN, individually and as a peace officer, DOE SALAZAR # UNKNOWN, individually and as a peace officer, DOE WORLEY # UNKNOWN, individually and as a peace officer, and DOES 1-10, inclusive and each of them, were employees of the City of Fullerton and the Fullerton Police Department. Defendant SELLERS was at all relevant times, the highestranking law enforcement policymaker for the City of Fullerton. Defendants DOES 6-10 were each duly appointed qualified and acting ranking officers, officials and employees of the Fullerton Police Department and Defendant CITY, also charged by law with the supervision, management, control, operation and administration of the Fullerton Police Department and with the responsibility, control, supervision, training, employment, assignment, discipline and removal of peace officers of the Fullerton Police Department and CITY. Each said Defendant was acting within the course and cope of their said employment and under the color of state law, and as the employee, agent and representative of each other Defendant.

- 4. Defendant CITY OF FULLERTON (hereinafter referred to as "CITY") is and at all times herein mentioned has been a public entity and an incorporated county duly authorized and existing as such in and under the laws of the State of California; and at all times herein mentioned, Defendant CITY has possessed the power and authority to adopt policies and prescribe rules, regulations and practices affecting the operation of the Fullerton Police Department, and particularly said Department's Patrol, Internal Investigations and Training and Personnel Divisions and other operations and subdivisions presently unidentified to Plaintiff, and their tactics, methods, practices, customs and usages related to internal investigations, personnel supervision and records maintenance, the use and deployment of dangerous weapons, the use of force, and powers of arrest by its rank and file.
- 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the Defendants designated as a DOE is intentionally and negligently responsible in some manner for the events and happenings herein referred to, and thereby proximately caused injuries and damages as herein alleged. The true names and capacities of DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, and each of them, are not now known to Plaintiff who therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this complaint to show their true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.
- 6. Defendants, and each of them, did the acts and omissions hereinafter alleged in bad faith and with knowledge that their conduct violated well established and settled law.
- 7. The incidents complained of occurred outside Heroes Bar & Grill, at or near the vicinity of 125 W. Santa Fe Ave., in the City of Fullerton. On March 17, 2010, at approximately 10:00 p.m., Plaintiff CLARKE was outside Heroes Bar & Grill smoking a cigarette when some individuals started harassing him and tried to pick a fight. All of a sudden, several police officers including Defendants CONTINO, HAMPTON, BOLDEN and TONG converged on Plaintiff, took him face down to the ground onto his stomach, beat him with blunt objects and punched him several times while accusing him of

"resisting arrest." Plaintiff CLARKE, however, was not resisting. While taking Plaintiff into custody, DEFENDANT TONG crushed and twisted Plaintiff's fingers, to the point of fracturing the pinky finger in Plaintiff's left hand. One of the officers used his boot to step on Plaintiff's face. Plaintiff was not informed why he was being accosted and was not told he was being arrested. DEFENDANT TONG or HAMPTON slammed Plaintiff's head onto the side of the police vehicle while telling him to "watch his head." Thereafter, Defendant TONG transported Plaintiff to the jail and during the ride, Defendant TONG repeatedly drove the police vehicle at high speeds and then maliciously subjected plaintiff to "screen tests" by braking suddenly and unnecessarily causing the unbelted Plaintiff to fly forward and slam his face against the grate separating the rear and front of the patrol car. Upon arrival at the jail, Plaintiff overheard an officer say to a jailer, "take special care of this one, he thinks he's smart."

While Plaintiff was detained in violation of California Penal Code section 853.6 at the Fullerton jail, Defendants SALAZAR and WORLEY and each of them, ordered Plaintiff to strip to his underwear for photographs; kept Plaintiff wet and cold inside his jail cell and repeatedly taunted Plaintiff when Plaintiff complained that he was shivering and cold and when he asked for a blanket or a hot beverage; inflicted unnecessary pain by beating Plaintiff about the head "where no marks would show"; and intentionally twisted Plaintiff's already broken pinky finger, while Plaintiff screamed in pain. Defendants SALAZAR and WORLEY repeatedly refused to respond to Plaintiff's repeated demands to tell him why he was arrested, and repeatedly denied Plaintiff's requests for a phone call. Defendants detained Plaintiff in the jail for approximately 8 hours, who was released when the shift changed. Upon his release, Plaintiff discovered that \$140.56 of his money was missing and unaccounted for, as only \$34.00 was returned to him. Plaintiff had \$174.56 in his possession at the time Defendants arrested him. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants wrongfully took \$140.56 of Plaintiff's money.

28 | \\\

///

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

#### (VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS - 42 U.S.C. § 1983)

(By Plaintiff Against Defendants TONG, CONTINO, HAMPTON, BOLDEN, SALAZAR, WORLEY and DOES 1-5, inclusive.)

- 8. Plaintiff refers to and re-pleads each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 7 of this complaint, and by this reference incorporates the same herein and makes each a part hereof.
- 9. This action at law for money damages arises under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the United States Constitution, the laws of the State of California and common law principles to redress a deprivation under color of state law of rights, privileges and immunities secured to Plaintiff CLARKE by said statutes, and by the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution.
- or justification, and acting under color of law, Defendants TONG, CONTINO, HAMPTON, BOLDEN, and DOES 1-5 and each of them, intentionally and maliciously deprived Plaintiff CLARKE of rights secured to him by the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution in that Defendants and each of them, subjected Plaintiff to unreasonable, unnecessary and excessive force during his arrest, and engaged in a conspiracy to cover up the excessive use of force. Defendants, and each of them intentionally and maliciously deprived Plaintiff of rights secured to him by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution in that these Defendants, and each of them, intentionally violated California Penal Code sections 841, 851.5 and 853.6 thereby depriving Plaintiff of due process rights guaranteed to him by the Fourteenth Amendment.
- 11. While Plaintiff CLARKE was in their custody, Defendants, and each of them, intentionally and maliciously deprived Plaintiff of rights secured to him by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution in that these Defendants, and each of them, used unreasonable, unnecessary and excessive force, in a manner that was

wanton and sadistic and not in a good faith effort to restore discipline, and was done solely for the purpose of inflicting unnecessary pain and suffering, and to harm and embarrass Plaintiff.

- 12. Defendants SALAZAR and WORLEY intentionally and maliciously deprived Plaintiff CLARKE of rights secured to him by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution in that these Defendants, and each of them, removed Plaintiff's clothing without legal justification, and for several hours subjected Plaintiff to freezing conditions in his cell, refusing his requests for a blanket or a hot beverage, and instead taunting him as Plaintiff shivered in the cold, in a manner that was wanton and sadistic and was done solely for the purpose of inflicting unnecessary pain and suffering, and to harm and embarrass Plaintiff.
- 13. Defendants SALAZAR and WORLEY intentionally and maliciously deprived Plaintiff of rights secured to him by the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution in that these Defendants, and each of them, refused Plaintiff's repeated requests for a phone call, in violation of California <u>Penal Code</u> section 851.5 (a), and in violation of his right to communicate and his right to procedural due process.
- 14. As a proximate result of the aforesaid acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff sustained great physical and mental pain and shock to his nervous system, fear, anxiety, torment, degradation and emotional distress.
- 15. As a proximate result of the aforesaid acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff was deprived of his liberty, without warrant or justification.
- 16. As a proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff was compelled to expend money all to his damage according to proof.
- 17. As a proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered damage to his reputation and embarrassment in the community.
- 18. By reason of the aforementioned acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff incurred medical and therapeutic expenses in an amount as proved.

- 19. In addition, by reason of the aforementioned acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff was kept from attending to his usual occupations, and has suffered loss and impairment of earnings and employment opportunities all to his damage in an amount as proved.
- 20. By reason of the aforementioned acts of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff was compelled to secure the services of an attorney at law to redress the wrongs hereinbefore mentioned and by virtue thereof, Plaintiff is indebted and liable for attorney's fees.
- 21. The aforementioned acts and omissions of Defendants were committed by each of them knowingly, willfully and maliciously, with the intent to harm, injure, vex, harass and oppress Plaintiff with a conscious disregard of Plaintiff's constitutional rights and by reason thereof, Plaintiff seeks punitive and exemplary damages from Defendants, and each of them, (except Defendant CITY) in an amount as proved.

# SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

# (UNLAWFUL CUSTOM AND PRACTICE UNDER 42 U.S.C § 1983)

(By Plaintiff Against Defendants CITY, SELLERS and DOES 6-10, inclusive.)

- 22. Plaintiff refers to and re-pleads each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 21 of this complaint, and by this reference incorporates the same herein and makes each a part hereof.
- 23. Defendant CITY is and at all times herein mentioned, has been a public entity and an incorporated municipality duly authorized and existing as such in and under the laws of the State of California; and at all times herein mentioned, Defendant CITY possessed the power and authority to adopt policies and prescribe rules, regulations and practices affecting the operation of the Fullerton Police Department and its tactics, methods, practices, customs and usages related to internal investigations, personnel supervision and records maintenance, and the proper uses of force by its rank and file, generally.

- 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that on March 17, 2010, and for some time prior thereto, Defendants CITY, SELLERS and DOES 6-10 inclusive, had in place, and had ratified policies, procedures, customs and practices which permitted and encouraged their police officers to unjustifiably, unreasonably and in violation of the First, Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments, unlawfully use excessive and unreasonable force on persons they detain and arrest.
- 25. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants SELLERS and Does 6-10, and each of them, were employees acting under the CITY's direction and control, who knowingly and intentionally promulgated, maintained, applied, enforced and suffered the continuation of policies, customs, practices and usages in violation of the First, Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments respectively to the United States Constitution, which customs, policies, practices and usages at all times herein mentioned required and encouraged the employment, deployment and retention of persons as peace officers who have demonstrated their brutality, dishonesty, and numerous other serious abuses of their powers as peace officers in the employment of the CITY.
- 26. Defendant CITY knowingly maintains and permits official *sub-rosa* policies or customs of permitting the occurrence of the kinds of wrongs set forth above, by deliberate indifference to widespread police abuses, failing and refusing to impartially investigate personnel complaints, failing to discipline or prosecute peace officers who commit acts of felonious dishonesty and crimes of violence, each ratified and approved by CITY, SELLERS and DOES 6-10, inclusive.
- 27. The unconstitutional policies, practices or customs promulgated, sanctioned or tolerated by Defendants CITY, SELLERS and DOES 6-10 include, but are not limited to:
- (a) Defendants CITY, SELLERS and DOES 6-10 had knowledge, prior to and since this incident, of repeated allegations of abuse and assaultive misconduct toward detainees and arrestees. Specifically, CITY, SELLERS and DOES 6-10 knew Defendants had in the past committed acts of police abuse, dishonesty and prevarication;

- (c) Defendants CITY, SELLERS and DOES 6-10 refused to adequately discipline individual officers and employees found to have committed similar acts of abuse and misconduct;
- (d) Defendants CITY, SELLERS and DOES 6-10 refused to competently and impartially investigate allegations of abuse and misconduct alleged to have been committed by Fullerton Police Department officers;
- (e) Defendants CITY and SELLERS reprimanded, threatened, intimidated, demoted and fired officers who reported acts of abuse by other officers;
- (f) Defendants CITY and SELLERS covered up acts of misconduct and abuse by Fullerton Police Department officers and thereby sanctioned a code of silence by and among officers;
- (g) Defendants CITY and SELLERS rewarded officers who displayed aggressive and abusive behavior towards detainees and arrestees;
- (h) Defendants CITY and SELLERS failed to adequately train and educate officers in the use of reasonable and proper force and failed to enforce the department's written regulations with respect to uses of force;
- (i) Defendant CITY and SELLERS failed to adequately supervise the actions of officers under their control and guidance;
- (j) Defendants CITY and SELLERS condoned and encouraged a conspiracy of silence among their employees for the purpose of concealing and furthering wrongful and illegal conduct by their employees;
- (k) Defendants CITY and SELLERS fostered and encouraged an atmosphere of lawlessness, abuse and unconstitutional misconduct, as to encourage their police officers to believe that improper arrest of residents of the City of Fullerton or

persons present therein, the excessive and improper use of force, the submission of false police reports, and the commission of perjury was permissible and to believe that unlawful acts of falsification of evidence and perjury would be overlooked without discipline or other official ramifications. By March 2010 and thereafter, these represented the unconstitutional policies, practices and customs of the CITY.

- 28. Said policies, procedures, customs and practices also called for the CITY and its Police Department not to discipline, prosecute, or objectively and/or independently investigate or in any way deal with or respond to known incidents and complaints of excessive and improper use of force, falsification of evidence, the preparation of false police reports to justify wrongful conduct and to cover-up and conceal such wrongful conduct by officers of the Fullerton Police Department. Said policies, procedures, customs and practices also called for the CITY to fail to objectively and/or independently investigate or in any way deal with or respond to the related claims and lawsuits made as a result of excessive force and related misconduct.
- 29. Said policies, procedures, customs and practices called for and led to the refusal by Defendants, and each of them, to investigate complaints of previous incidents of excessive and improper use of force, the filing of false police reports to conceal such misconduct, the falsification of evidence and perjury and instead, officially claim that such incidents were justified and proper.
- 30. Said policies, procedures, customs and practices of Defendants, and each of them, evidenced a deliberate indifference to the violations of the constitutional rights of Plaintiff. This indifference was manifested by the failure to change, correct, revoke or rescind said policies, procedures, customs and practices in light of prior knowledge by Defendants, and each of them, and their subordinate policymakers, of indistinguishably similar incidents of excessive and improper use of force, falsification of evidence, submission of false police reports and perjury.
- 31. Defendants, and each of them, demonstrated their deliberate indifference to the civil rights of minority groups and other victims of the Fullerton Police Department's

unlawful arrests, falsified evidence, false and misleading police reports and false and perjurious testimony by ignoring the history and pattern of prior civil lawsuits alleging civil rights violations arising from such misconduct and the related payment of damages to such individuals.

- 32. Defendants, and each of them, demonstrated their deliberate indifference by an absence of or by maintenance of an inadequate system of tort claims tracking, use-of-force tracking, and maintenance of an inadequate system of officer discipline and independent and objective investigation by the CITY and its Police Department which failed to identify and investigate instances of false and unlawful arrests, falsification of evidence, submission of false police reports and perjury.
- 33. Defendants, and each of them, demonstrated their deliberate indifference to the civil rights of minority groups and other victims of the Fullerton Police Department's unlawful arrests, improper uses of force, and falsified evidence, by their failure to adequately train and more closely supervise or re-train officers and/or discipline or recommend prosecution of those officers who in fact improperly used such force, falsified evidence, submitted false and misleading police reports, and/or committed perjury.
- 34. Other systemic deficiencies which indicated and continue to indicate, a deliberate indifference to civil rights violations by officers of the Fullerton Police Department include:
- a. preparation of investigative reports designed to vindicate and/or justify excessive and improper use of force;
- b. preparation of investigative reports which uncritically rely solely on the word of Fullerton police officers involved in unlawful arrests or improper use of force and which systematically fail to credit testimony by non-officer witnesses;
- c. preparation of investigative reports which omit factual information and physical evidence which contradicts the accounts of the officers involved;

10

11

15

23 24 25

27 28

- failure to maintain centralized department-wide systems for the d. tracking and monitoring of tort claims and lawsuits alleging false arrests, excessive and improper use of force, planting of evidence, perjury, abuse of authority, and other similar misconduct by individual officers so as to identify those officers who engage in a pattern of abuse of police authority and police misconduct.
- Defendants, and each of them, also maintained a system of grossly 35. inadequate training pertaining to lawful arrests, reasonable use of force, police ethics, the law pertaining to searches and seizures, testifying in trial and perjury, the collection of evidence, and the preparation of police reports.
- Defendants, and each of them, demonstrated their deliberate indifference the victims of its Police Department's unlawful arrests, excessive and improper uses of force, and perjury by failing to implement an officer discipline system which would conduct meaningful and independent investigations of citizen complaints of excessive and improper use of force, falsified evidence, evidence tampering, authoring and filing of false and misleading police reports, and the presentation of false testimony at trial.
- Defendants, and each of them, demonstrated their deliberate indifference to 37. the victims of its Police Department's excessive and improper uses of force, falsified evidence, false and misleading police reports and false and perjurious testimony by their implementation of a practice and custom within the Fullerton Police Department of permitting their officers to engage in unlawful activities while on duty such as assaults, batteries, and other crimes of moral turpitude.
- The foregoing acts, omissions, and systemic deficiencies are policies and 38. customs of Defendants, and each of them, which caused, permitted and/or allowed under official sanction Defendant Defendants TONG, CONTINO, HAMPTON, BOLDEN, SALAZAR, WORLEY and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive to believe that excessive and improper uses of force, evidence falsification, filing of false and misleading police reports, and the commission of perjury would not be objectively, thoroughly and/or properly investigated, all with the foreseeable result that defendants' officers would

improperly use force, falsify evidence, abuse and improperly punish post-arrest detainees, submit false and misleading police reports, and commit perjury, and thereby violate the civil rights of the citizens of this State with whom said officers would come into contact.

- 39. By reason of the aforesaid policies, customs, practices and usages, Plaintiff was deprived of his rights under the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.
- 40. By reason of the aforementioned acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff suffered severe mental anguish, emotional distress, and financial losses as alleged in the First Cause of Action, all to Plaintiff's damage in a sum according to proof.

#### **PRAYER**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays judgment against Defendants and each of them, as follows:

## AS TO EACH CAUSE OF ACTION AS APPLICABLE

- 1. For General damages according to proof;
- 2. For Special damages according to proof;
- 3. For Punitive damages as provided by law, in an amount to be proved against each individual Defendant;
  - 4. For attorney's fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C § 1988;
  - 5. For Costs of suit;
  - 6. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

Dated: March 12, 2012

MARDIROSSIAN & ASSOCIATES, INC.

By:

Garo Mardirossian, Esq.

Rowena [./Dizon, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiff ANDREW TREVOR

CLARKE

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 

Plaintiff ANDREW TREVOR CLARKE hereby demands a trial by jury.

Dated: March 12, 2012

MARDIROSSIAN & ASSOCIATES, INC.

By:

Garo Mardirossian, Esq.

Rowena J. Dizon, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff ANDREW TREVOR

**CLARKE** 

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

#### NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Josephine Tucker and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Jean P. Rosenbluth.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

SACV12- 373 JST (JPRx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge
NOTICE TO COUNSEL
A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is

[X] Southern Division

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

**Western Division** 

312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8

Los Angeles, CA 90012

411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053

Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516

Eastern Division

Riverside, CA 92501

3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Central District of California

ANDREW TREVOR CLARKE	)		
Plaintiff	)	SACVIZ	373T9(JPK)
v.	)	Civil Action No.	
CITY OF FULLERTON (See Attachment)	)		
Defendant	)		

#### SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) CITY OF FULLERTON, 303 West Commonwealth, Fullerton, CA 92832

MICHAEL SELLERS, CARY TONG #1341, SAM CONTINO #774, KENTON HAMPTON #1337, DOE BOLDEN #UNKNOWN, DOE SALAZAR #UNKNOWN, DOE WORLEY #UNKNOWN, 237 West Commonwealth, Fullerton, CA 92832

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Garo Mardirossian, Esq., MARDIROSSIAN & ASSOCIATES, INC.
6311 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90048-5001

Thomas E. Beck, Esq., THE BECK LAW FIRM 10377 Los Alamitos Boulevard, Los Alamitos, CA 90720

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

MAR 1 2 2012  Date:	JULIE PRADO

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Civil Action No.

#### PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (1))

	This summons for <i>(nan</i>	ne of individual and title, if any)				
was re	ceived by me on (date)					
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual a				
			on (date)	- ; or		
	☐ I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with (name)					
	, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,					
	on (date) , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or					
	☐ I served the summo	ons on (name of individual)		, who is		
	designated by law to a	accept service of process on beha				
			on (date)	; or		
	☐ I returned the summ	nons unexecuted because		- ; or		
				,		
	☐ Other ( <i>specify</i> ):					
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00		
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this information	is true.			
Date:						
			Server's signature			
		**************************************				
			Printed name and title			

#### **ATTACHMENT TO SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION**

MICHAEL SELLERS, Chief of Police individually and as a peace officer; CARY TONG #1341, individually and as a peace officer; SAM CONTINO #774, individually and as a peace officer; KENTON HAMPTON #1337, individually and as a peace officer; DOE BOLDEN #UNKNOWN, individually and as a peace officer; DOE SALAZAR #UNKNOWN, individually and as a peace officer; DOE WORLEY #UNKNOWN, individually and as a peace officer; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,

Defendants.

# Case 8:12-cv-00373-JST-JPR Document 1 Filed 03/12/12 Page 19 of 21 Page ID #:32 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself □) ANDREW TREVOR CLARKE	DEFENDANTS CITY OF FULLERTON (See Attachment)			
(Place an	Attorneys (If Known)  SHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES - For Diversity Cases Only X in one box for plaintiff and one for defendant.)			
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff  2 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)  Citizen of This  ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant  ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	of Business in this State			
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country 3 3 5 Foreign Nation 6 6 6  IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in one box only.)  17 Original 2 Removed from 3 Remanded from 4 Reinstated or 5 Transferred from another district (specify): 6 Multi-7 Appeal to District				
Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened District Judge from Magistrate Judge  V. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: JURY DEMAND: Ves No (Check 'Yes' only if demanded in complaint.)  CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.P. 23: Yes No MONEY DEMANDED IN COMPLAINT: S According to proof  VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.)				
42 U.S.C. §1986 police misconduct and Monell claim.  VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one box only.)				
OTHER STATUTES	PROPERTY			

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

CV-71 (05/08)

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Ha If yes, list case number(s):	s this action been pr	reviously filed in this court an	d dismissed, remanded or closed? ♥No □ Yes	
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have If yes, list case number(s):	e any cases been pro	eviously filed in this court that	t are related to the present case? ☑ No □ Yes	
□ C.	Arise from the sam Call for determinate For other reasons w	e or closely related transaction ion of the same or substantiall rould entail substantial duplica	ns, happenings, or events; or y related or similar questions of law and fact; or ation of labor if heard by different judges; or and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.	
IX. VENUE: (When completing the	-			
(a) List the County in this District;  Check here if the government, in	California County of ts agencies or emplo	outside of this District; State if oyees is a named plaintiff. If i	f other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. this box is checked, go to item (b).	
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country	
Orange County				
			f other than California; or Foreign Country, in which <b>EACH</b> named defendant resides. f this box is checked, go to item (c).	
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country	
Orange County				
(c) List the County in this District; Note: In land condemnation ca		· ·	other than California; or Foreign Country, in which <b>EACH</b> claim arose.	
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country	
Orange County				
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernar Note: In land condemnation cases, us	dino, Riverside, V	entura Santa Barbara, or S tract of land involved	an Luis Obispo Counties	
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (	OR PRO PER):	An 3n	Date March 9,2012	
Notice to Counsel/Parties: The or other papers as required by law	e CV-71 (JS-44) C v. This form, approv	ed by the Judicial Conference	mation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed ing the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)	
Key to Statistical codes relating to So	•			
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of	Cause of Action	
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))		
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)		
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))		
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))		
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.		
865	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. U.S.C. (g))			

CV-71 (05/08) CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 2 of 2

#### **ATTACHMENT TO CIVIL COVER SHEET**

MICHAEL SELLERS, Chief of Police individually and as a peace officer; CARY TONG #1341, individually and as a peace officer; SAM CONTINO #774, individually and as a peace officer; KENTON HAMPTON #1337, individually and as a peace officer; DOE BOLDEN #UNKNOWN, individually and as a peace officer; DOE SALAZAR #UNKNOWN, individually and as a peace officer; DOE WORLEY #UNKNOWN, individually and as a peace officer; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,

Defendants.