RECEIVED CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS CHRISTOPHER BRIZZOLARA (SBN 130304) 1 2013 SEP 11 P 5: 09 1528 16th Street 2 CITY CLERK'S OFFICE Santa Monica, California 90404 Telephone: (310) 394-6447 3 Telecopier: (310) 656-7701 4 5 Attorneys for Claimant Brian Weir 6 7 IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM OF **CLAIM FOR DAMAGES AND OTHER** CLAIMANT BRIAN WEIR **RELIEF** 9 Claimant, 10 VS. 11 CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS, CITY OF 12 BEVERLY HILLS POLICE DEPARTMENT, CHIEF OF POLICE 13 DAVID SNOWDEN, CAPTAIN TONY LEE,) LIEUTENANT TERRY NUTALL, AND 14 DOES 1 - 100. 15 16 Please be advised that claimant Brian Weir ("claimant") hereby submits a 17 Governmental Claim pursuant to Government Code Sections 905 and 910, et seq. and 18 other authorities. 19 20 NAME AND ADDRESS OF CLAIMANT: Brian Weir, c/o Christopher Brizzolara, 21 1528 16th Street, Santa Monica, California 90404, Telephone: (310) 394-6447, 22 Telecopier: (310) 656-7701. 23 ADDRESS TO SEND ALL CLAIMS AND OTHER NOTICES: Christopher В. 24 25 Brizzolara, 1528 16th Street, Santa Monica, California 90404, Telephone: (310) 394-26 6447, Telecopier: (310) 656-7701. 27 C. THE DATE, PLACE AND OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE OCCURRENCE 28 OR TRANSACTIONS WHICH GIVE RISE TO THE CLAIMS ASSERTED:

Date: In or around April/May, 2013, and continuing.

Place: Beverly Hills Police Department, 464 North Rexford Drive, Beverly Hills,

California 90210 and other locations.

Facts: Claimant was assigned as a sergeant to the SWAT and K-9 Units of the Beverly Hills Police Department (hereafter the Department"), which are and have been considered to be a coveted positions in the Department. On or about February 11, 2012, claimant, as the senior patrol sergeant in the Department on duty, responded to the scene of the death of Whitney Houston ("decedent") at the Beverly Hilton Hotel in Beverly Hills, California. Claimant attempted to secure and preserve the scene of the death and the evidence thereat in order to attempt to assure a competent and thorough inguiry and investigation could be performed into the facts, events, and circumstances surrounding the death of the decedent. At that time, in order to prevent contamination of potential DNA and other potential evidence on the body of the decedent, and to attempt to preserve the dignity of the remains of the decedent, the decedent's body was covered with a sheet and/or other covering. Thereafter, Beverly Hills Police Department Detective Sergeant (now Lieutenant) Terry Nutall ("Nutall'), who at the time was assigned and responsible for overseeing Court Liaison duties and criminal investigations involving fraud/forgery, auto burglaries, arrived at the scene of the death of the decedent. Detective Sergeant Nutall, for no legitimate law enforcement inquiry, investigative, or other proper and legal purpose, knelt beside and leaned over the decedent, removed the sheet and/or other covering from the body of the decedent to an area below the pubic region of the decedent's body, and came in close proximity to

touching the body of the decedent while making inappropriate comments to the effect and substance that the decedent "looked attractive for a woman of her age and current state" and "Damn, she's still looking good, huh?"

Upon information and belief, Nutall's actions violated state or federal statutes or were in noncompliance with state or federal rules or regulations including disturbing and/or moving the body of the decedent from the position of death without permission of the coroner or the coroner's appointed deputy, and caused potential and/or actual contamination of potential DNA and/or other potential evidence on the body of the decedent. Further, upon information and belief, Nutall, in a manner not authorized by law, treated the dead body of the decedent in a way that Nutall knew would outrage ordinary family sensibilities, as defined by and in violation of *Model Penal Code* 250.10. Additionally, upon information and belief, Nutall's actions violated various provisions of the Department's manual, including, *inter alia*, sections 4/238, et seq.

From in or around February 11, 2012 and continuing at other times, claimant disclosed to the City of Beverly Hills and/or the Beverly Hills Police Department, government and/or law enforcement agencies, information which claimant had reasonable cause to believe disclosed violations of state or federal statutes, or violation or noncompliance with state or federal rules or regulations, by agent(s) and/or employee(s) of the City of Beverly Hills and/or the Beverly Hills Police Department, including but not limited to, disturbing and/or moving the body of the decedent from the position of death without permission of the coroner or the coroner's appointed deputy, treating the dead body of the decedent in a way that would outrage ordinary family sensibilities, potentially and/or actually contaminating potential DNA and/or other

potential evidence on the body of the decedent, harming the integrity of the scene of the death of the decedent, attempting to impede and/or obstruct, and/or impeding and/or obstructing inquiry and/or investigation into the facts, events, and circumstances surrounding the death of the decedent, making and/or attempting to make false statements in report(s) regarding the investigation of potentially criminal circumstances, events, and/or other activities, attempting to willfully destroy and/or wilfully destroying matters or things to be produced in evidence in regard to inquiry(s) or investigation(s) authorized by law, harassing and/or discriminatory remarks and/or other conduct in violation of FEHA, Title 7, the California and United States Constitutions, and other statutes, and other violations of state or federal statutes, or violation or noncompliance with state or federal rules or regulations.

After complaining to his superiors and others in the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, and others, regarding the above, claimant was subjected to removal from his position with the SWAT and K-9 Units of the Beverly Hills Police Department, denial of promotion to other positions, removal of employment supervisory duties and responsibilities, removal of duties and responsibilities, denial of special pay, loss of overtime compensation, denial of training, harassment and ostracizing, receiving inappropriate and harassing comments and/or documents, subjected to conduct undermining his authority as a supervisor, disparaging comments concerning responding party, and other substantial and material adverse employment actions.

Claimant disclosed information to the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, government and/or law enforcement agencies, which

claimant had reasonable cause to believe disclosed violations of state or federal statutes, or violation or noncompliance with state or federal rules or regulations, by other employees of the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department.

The City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department made, adopted, and/or enforced rules, regulations, and/or policies designed to prevent claimant and other employees from disclosing information to a government or law enforcement agencies, which claimant and other employees had reasonable cause to believe disclosed violations of state or federal statutes.

The City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department and others retaliated against claimant for disclosing information to the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, law enforcement and/or government agencies, which the claimant had reasonable cause to believe disclosed violations of state or federal statutes, or violations or noncompliance with state or federal rules or regulations, including but not limited to: 1) denying claimant coveted and/or favorable job positions and assignments; 2) subjecting claimant and subordinates of claimant to ostracism and harassment; 3) removing from claimant job responsibilities which would further claimant's career; 4) denying claimant other employment benefits; 5) knowingly making false, misleading or malicious statements regarding claimant which were and are reasonably calculated to harm or destroy the reputation, authority or official standing of the claimant; 6) refusing to promote plaintiff; 7) receiving inappropriate and harassing comments and documents; 8) disparaging comments concerning responding party; 9) denial of special pay; 10) loss of overtime compensation; 11) removal from

the SWAT and K-9 Units of the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department; and 12) other actions having a substantial and material adverse effect on claimant's employment.

A motivating reason and/or contributing cause for the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department engaging in the foregoing adverse employment actions against claimant was to retaliate for the claimant engaging in the protected activities of disclosing information to the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, government and/or law enforcement agencies, which the claimant had reasonable cause to believe disclosed violations of state or federal statutes, or violations or noncompliance with state or federal rules or regulations, in violation of *Labor Code* Section 1102.5, et seq.

The City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department further retaliated against claimant for refusing to participate in activities that would result in a violation of state or federal statutes, or a violation or noncompliance with a state or federal rules or regulations.

Further, claimant made the written and other provision of evidence regarding an abuse of authority pertaining to the conduct of the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department.

Chief of Police David Snowden, Captain Tony Lee, Lieutenant Terry Nutall, and/or other agents and/or employees of the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, acting within the course and scope of their employment with the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, took reprisal actions, including acts of intimidation, restraint, coercion,

discrimination, punitive, and/or disciplinary action against claimant, including but not limited to: 1) denying claimant coveted and/or favorable job positions and assignments; 2) subjecting claimant and subordinates of claimant to ostracism and harassment; 3) removing from claimant job responsibilities which would further claimant's career; 4) denying claimant other employment benefits; 5) knowingly making false, misleading or malicious statements regarding claimant which were and are reasonably calculated to harm or destroy the reputation, authority or official standing of the claimant; 6) refusing to promote plaintiff; 7) receiving inappropriate and harassing comments and documents; 8) disparaging comments concerning responding party; 9) denial of special pay; 10) loss of overtime compensation; 11) removal from the SWAT and K-9 Units of the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department; and 12) other actions having a substantial and material adverse effect on claimant's employment.

A motivating reason and/or a concurrent cause for the engaging in the foregoing reprisal actions and/or adverse employment actions against claimant was to retaliate against claimant for having made the written and other provision of evidence regarding an abuse of authority pertaining to the conduct of City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, and their supervisors, managers, managing agents, agents, and/or employees, in violation of *Government Code* Section 53298, et seq.

Further, claimant, as sworn California peace officer, was at all times pertinent hereto entitled to the protections of the Peace Officers Bill of Rights ("POBR")

(Government Code Section 3300, et seq.)

From in or around May, 2013 to present and continuing, the City of Beverly Hills

and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department maliciously violated with the intent to injure the claimant, the POBR, including but not limited to:

- a. failing to make a copy of and/or keep available for inspection claimant's personnel file and/or other files used for personnel purposes by defendant City, in violation of *Government Code* Sections 3305, 3306, and 3306.5;
- b. subjecting claimant to punitive action, denying claimant coveted position(s) and/or promotions, and/or threatening claimant with such treatment, because of the lawful exercise of the rights granted under the POBR, and/or the exercise of any rights under existing administrative grievance procedures, in violation of *Government Code* Sections 3304;
- c. subjecting claimant to punitive action and/or denying claimant coveted positions(s) and/or promotion on grounds other than merit, without providing claimant with an opportunity for administrative appeal, in violation of *Government Code* Sections 3304:
- other violations of the POBR.

Further, *Labor Code* Section 1102.5, *Government Code* Sections 3300, et seq., and 53298, et seq. set forth fundamental public policies which protect employees in the State of California from being subjected to reprisals and adverse employment actions based upon the protected classes, activities, and conduct set forth therein. During the term of claimant's employment, claimant was subjected to the reprisals, retaliation, and denial of employment benefits based upon claimant's activities and conduct protected by *Labor Code* Section 1102.5, Government Code Section 3300, et seq., and 53298, et seq. Said reprisals and adverse decisions and employment actions of the City of

Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, and/or agents and/or employees of the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department acting within the course and/or scope of their employment with the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department claimant injury, damage, loss, or harm.

The conduct of the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police

Department, and/or agents and/or employees of the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City
of Beverly Hills Police Department, acting within the course and scope of their
employment with the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police

Department, in violating *Labor Code* Section 1102.5, *Government Code* Sections 3300,
et seq. and 53298, et seq., and/or other misconduct was outrageous.

The conduct of the agents and/or employees of the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, acting within the course and scope of their employment with the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, was intended to cause claimant economic and non-economic damages, including emotional distress and damage to claimant's reputation, and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, and/or agents and/or employees of the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, acting within the course and/or scope of their employment with the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, acted with reckless disregard of the probability that claimant would suffer economic and non-economic damages, including emotional distress and damage to claimant's reputation. The conduct of the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department,

and/or agents and/or employees of the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, acting within the course and scope of their employment with the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, caused claimant to suffer economic and non-economic damages, including emotional distress and damage to claimant's reputation, and other injury, damage, loss, or harm.

Claimant alleges that each of the entities and individuals named above, and each of them, are the agents, servants and/or employees of each other entity and individual named above, and at all relevant times were acting within the course and scope of said agency, service and/or employment. Claimant alleges that he was subjected to retaliatory conduct and reprisals by each of the entities and individuals named above for his complaints and engaging in other protected activities as outlined above.

Claimant alleges that the conduct described herein was and is a violation of Labor Code Sections 1102.5, Government Code Sections 3300, et seq., and 53298, et seq., and other state and federal statutes, codes, and regulations, and that such violations were a substantial factor and an actual, legal, and proximate cause of claimant suffering the injuries, damages, loss, and/or harm set forth below. Claimant also claims attorneys fees and costs under all applicable provisions.

Claimant has timely filed government claim(s) within six months of the injury, damage, loss, and/or harm caused by the acts, omissions, and other misconduct of the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, and their supervisors, managers, managing agents, agents, and/or employees set forth above.

D. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE INJURY, DAMAGE, OR

LOSS INCURRED:

Claimant has sustained and will continue to sustain economic and non-economic damages, including emotional distress and damage to claimant's reputation, and other injury, damage, loss, or harm. Claimant was required, and/or in the future may be required, to engage the services of health care providers, and incurred expenses for medicines, health care appliances, modalities, and/or other related expenses in a sum to be ascertained according to proof. Claimant was and/or will be hindered, prevented, and/or precluded from performing claimant's usual activities, training, schooling, education, and occupation, and denied claimant additional background, training, and experience as a law enforcement officer, causing the claimant to sustain damages for past and future loss of income, wages, earning, and earning capacity, and other economic damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof. Claimant suffered incidental, consequential, and/or special damages, in an amount according to proof. Claimant has and will continue to incur attorneys fees and costs in an amount according to proof, and is entitled to recover same, as well as statutory and other penalties, under the Labor Code, C.C.P. 1021.5, Government Code Sections 3309.5 and 53298.5, and/or other applicable authorities. Claimant has and/or will sustain health care expenses, loss of past, present and future earnings, income, benefits, and services, loss of household services and physical assistance in the operation of the household, loss of academic, social, vocational, and recreational opportunities, activities, abilities, and capacities, pre-judgment interest, and other damages. Claimant will also seek exemplary and punitive damages against the individuals causing injury, damage, or loss to claimant in a sum appropriate to punish said individuals, and to

deter such conduct in the future, and to set an example for others.

E. NAMES OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES CAUSING THE INJURY, DAMAGE OR LOSS TO CLAIMANT INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO THE FOLLOWING:

Chief of Police David Snowden, Captain Tony Lee, Lieutenant Terry Nutall, and/or other agents and/or employees of the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, acting within the course and scope of their employment with the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, in regard to the above-described matters

F. OTHER WITNESS INFORMATION:

Lt. Joseph Chirillo, Detective Sergeant Michael Publicker, Sergeant Sean Smollen, Sergeant Sean Dexter, Detective Chris Coulter, Officer Finn McClafferty, Officer Eric Olsen, and/or other agents and/or employees of the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, acting within the course and scope of their employment with the City of Beverly Hills and/or the City of Beverly Hills Police Department, and others.

G. JURISDICTION OF THIS MATTER WILL BE PROPER IN THE STATE SUPERIOR OR OTHER COURT OF UNLIMITED JURISDICTION.

Claimant has sustained and will continue to sustain economic and non-economic damages, including emotional distress and damage to claimant's reputation, and other injury, damage, loss, or harm. Claimant was required, and/or in the future may be required, to engage the services of health care providers, and incurred expenses for medicines, health care appliances, modalities, and/or other related expenses in a sum to be ascertained according to proof. Claimant was and/or will be hindered, prevented,

and/or precluded from performing claimant's usual activities, training, schooling, education, and occupation, and denied claimant additional background, training, and experience as a law enforcement officer, causing the claimant to sustain damages for past and future loss of income, wages, earning, and earning capacity, and other economic damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof. Claimant suffered incidental, consequential, and/or special damages, in an amount according to proof. Claimant has and will continue to incur attorneys fees and costs in an amount according to proof, and is entitled to recover same, as well as statutory and other penalties, under the Labor Code, C.C.P. 1021.5, Government Code Sections 3309.5 and 53298.5, and/or other applicable authorities. Claimant has and/or will sustain health care expenses, loss of past, present and future earnings, income, benefits, and services, loss of household services and physical assistance in the operation of the household, loss of academic, social, vocational, and recreational opportunities, activities, abilities, and capacities, pre-judgment interest, and other damages. Claimant will also seek exemplary and punitive damages against the individuals causing injury, damage, or loss to claimant in a sum appropriate to punish said individuals, and to deter such conduct in the future, and to set an example for others. Pursuant to Government Code Section 910(f), the amount of damages claimed exceeds \$10,000 and will also necessarily lie within the unlimited jurisdiction of the Superior Court. Claimant also claims attorney's fees and costs as provided by law, including the Labor Code, C.C.P. 1021.5, Government Code Sections 3309.5 and 53298.5. and other applicable authorities.

DATED: 9/10/13

Ву:

Christopher Brizzolara

Attorney for Claimant Brian Weir