

1 G. Dana Scruggs, SBN 96152
2 CARTWRIGHT, SCRUGG, FULTON & WALTHER
3 716 Ocean Street, Suite 100
4 Santa Cruz, CA 95060
5 Telephone: (831) 457-1700
6 Facsimile: (831) 457-3788

7 John Burton, SBN 86029
8 THE LAW OFFICES OF JOHN BURTON
9 128 North Fair Oaks Avenue
10 Pasadena, California 91103
11 Telephone: (626) 449-8300
12 Facsimile: (626) 449-4417

13 Attorneys for K.D., a Minor by and through her Guardian ad Litem,
14 James De La Pena, Individually and as the Successor in Interest
15 to Krista DeLuca, deceased

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
17 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
18 SAN JOSE DIVISION

19 K.D., a Minor by and through her Guardian
20 ad Litem, JAMES DE LA PENA, and as
21 Successor in Interest to KRISTA DeLUCA,
22 Deceased,

23 Plaintiff,

24 vs.

25 COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ, SANTA CRUZ
26 SHERIFF'S OFFICE, SHERIFF-
27 CORONER JIM HART, UNDERSHERIFF
28 JEREMY VERINSKY, CHIEF DEPUTY
JEFF MARCH, LIEUTENANT KELLY
KENT, CALIFORNIA FORENSIC MEDICAL
GROUP, INC., and DOES 1 to 25,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:16-cv-03226

**COMPLAINT FOR WRONGFUL DEATH
AND DAMAGES BASED ON:**

1. **42 U.S.C. § 1983, Wrongful Death;**
2. **42 U.S.C. § 1983, Survival; and**
3. **Negligence**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

JURISDICTION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1. This action arises under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Jurisdiction is conferred upon this Court by 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343. This Court also has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state-law cause of action under 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

2. Venue is proper in the Northern District of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because the unlawful acts and practices alleged herein occurred in the County of Santa Cruz, California, which is within this judicial district.

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff K.D., is the minor child of the Decedent, KRISTA DeLUCA. She is represented in her individual capacity by her Guardian ad Litem, JAMES DE LA PENA. Plaintiff is a citizen of the United States residing in the County of Santa Cruz, California. As the sole heir, K.D. is the successor-in-interest to DeLUCA, and is represented in her capacity as the successor in interest by her Guardian ad Litem DE LA PENA.

4. Defendant COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ ("COUNTY") is a local governmental entity duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, and is responsible for the actions, omissions, policies, procedures, practices and customs of its various agents and agencies, including Defendant SANTA CRUZ SHERIFF'S OFFICE ("SCSO"). The COUNTY and the SCSO operate the Santa Cruz County Main Jail ("Jail"), located at 259 Water Street, Santa Cruz. Defendant JIM HART is the COUNTY's Sheriff-Coroner, Defendant JEREMY VERINSKY is the SCSO's Undersheriff, Defendant JEFF MARCH is the SCSO's Chief Deputy and head of its Corrections Bureau, and Defendant KELLY KENT is an SCSO lieutenant assigned to supervise the day-to-day operations of the Jail. Each is sued in his individual capacity as a supervisor who either directed his subordinates, set in motion a series of acts by his subordinates, or knew or reasonably should have known and failed to stop acts by his subordinates that deprived the Plaintiff or the Decedent of a constitutional right, as alleged herein.

5. Defendant CALIFORNIA FORENSIC MEDICAL GROUP, INC. ("CFMG") is a private, for-profit, medical services corporation qualified to do business in California. As

1 alleged herein, as a cost-cutting measure on September 17, 2012, the COUNTY and the
2 SCSO contracted with CFMG, purportedly to provide medical services to the Jail's
3 inmates. In doing the acts alleged herein CFMG, and its agents and employees, acted
4 under color of state law as the agent of the COUNTY and SCSO.

5 6. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of Defendant DOES 1
6 through 25, and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is
7 informed and believes and thereon alleges that each DOE so named was employed by
8 Defendant COUNTY, the SCSO or CFMG at the time of the conduct alleged herein and
9 acted within the course and scope of that employment and under color of state law. On
10 information and belief, each Defendant DOE was responsible for the training, supervision
11 and/or conduct of the Jail employees and/or agents alleged herein and was either
12 negligent, recklessly indifferent to, or deliberately indifferent to the medical condition of the
13 Decedent, and is therefore responsible for and caused the acts and injuries alleged
14 herein. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to state the names and capacities of Defendants
15 sued herein as DOES 1 through 25 when they have been ascertained.

16 7. Each Defendant proximately caused and is otherwise responsible for the
17 unlawful conduct and resulting harm by, among other things, personally participating in the
18 conduct, or acting jointly and in concert with others who did so, by authorizing,
19 acquiescing, condoning, acting, omitting or failing to take action to prevent the unlawful
20 conduct, by promulgating or failing to promulgate policies and procedures pursuant to
21 which the unlawful conduct occurred, by failing and refusing to initiate and maintain proper
22 and adequate policies, procedures and protocols, and by ratifying and condoning the
23 unlawful conduct performed by agents and officers, deputies, medical providers and
24 employees under their direction and control.

25 8. Whenever and wherever reference is made in this Complaint to any act by
26 Defendants, each Defendant was the agent of the others, was acting within the course
27 and scope of this agency, and all acts alleged to have been committed by any one of them

1 shall also be deemed to mean the acts and failures to act of each named Defendant and
2 DOE Defendant individually, jointly or severally, and as failing to intervene to prevent the
3 wrongful conduct of another and the resulting injury to Plaintiff or the Decedent.

4 **EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES**

5 9. Plaintiff has complied with all applicable requirements for the state-law
6 causes of action. Through her guardian ad litem, without counsel, Plaintiff filed the
7 required claim pursuant to Cal. Gov't Code § 910 timely, which was denied on December
8 17, 2015, making this lawsuit timely. Subsequently, Plaintiff filed an amended claim
9 through her guardian ad litem, with counsel, prior to the expiration of the six-month
10 statutory period. That claim, which is the operative claim for the purposes of this litigation,
11 has not been acted upon. As more than 45 days have passed since the filing of the
12 amended claim, this lawsuit is therefore both ripe and timely under each tort claim.

13 **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

14 **The COUNTY and the SCSO Contract Inmate Health Care to CFMG**

15 10. As a cost-cutting measure, on or about September 17, 2012, the COUNTY,
16 through its policymakers including the County Board of Supervisors, upon
17 recommendation by then Sheriff-Coroner Phillip Wowak, contracted with CFMG to replace
18 the Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency (SCCHSA) as the provider of inmate
19 medical services at the Jail. The approximately \$3,000,000 yearly contract was projected
20 to save the COUNTY approximately \$1,500,000 per year in inmate medical services.

21 11. The COUNTY hired CFMG to provide these services with objective and
22 subjective deliberate indifference to CFMG's extensive history of allegations and lawsuits
23 over inadequate medical care. If not already known to the COUNTY, the SCSO and its
24 policy makers, minimal due diligence would have exposed this history. After CFMG took
25 over medical services at the Jail, inmates died at a shocking and unprecedented rate and
26 generated a public outcry.

1 12. According to state Department of Justice records, at least 72 persons
2 committed suicide in the last decade while held in a jail served by CFMG. CFMG's
3 population-adjusted rate for suicide and drug overdose deaths is approximately 50 percent
4 higher than in other county jails. Most persons who died in such cases were, like DeLUCA,
5 pretrial detainees. At least three other county's grand juries have criticized the company's
6 role in inmate deaths. A company spokesperson has admitted that the company has
7 settled six lawsuits in five years. Several more are pending, including a lawsuit in CFMG's
8 home town of Monterey where the plaintiffs recently obtained a far reaching preliminary
9 injunction enjoining CFMG's unconstitutional practices. See Hernandez v. County of
10 Monterey, N.D. Cal. Case No. 5:13-cv-02354-PSG, Order, April 15, 2015.

11 13. KRISTA DeLUCA's death was not an isolated incident. Over recent years,
12 Defendants have allowed conditions at the Jail to deteriorate, causing an environment
13 where standards for health care are deliberately ignored and protocols for inmate safety
14 disregarded. After an unprecedented five deaths at the Jail during an eleven-month period
15 from August 2012 to July 2013 (there have been two more since that date) a Santa Cruz
16 County Grand Jury formally investigated the Jail's policies and practices. In May 2014, the
17 Grand Jury released its report, finding, among other facts, that overcrowded conditions in
18 the main jail housing units made difficult for correctional officers to follow policies and
19 monitor inmate safety, that there was a lack of consistent enforcement of rules and
20 regulations by correctional officers, that record keeping requirements were lax and many
21 procedures went undocumented, that the COUNTY provided inadequate counseling time
22 with inmates, and that inmate safety was at risk because the COUNTY failed to have a
23 comprehensive protocol manual or individualized inmate treatment plans at the Jail. The
24 Grand Jury released a follow up report on "Medical Services at the Jails" in 2015, and a
25 third report on this death on June 8, 2016.

26 14. The Grand Jury investigations found lax standards and shocking
27 indifference. Six of the seven Jail deaths investigated by the Grand Jury took place after
28

1 CFMG assumed responsibility for Jail medical care in September 2012, and resulted from
2 CFMG's deliberate indifference to coordinating inmate health care with THE COUNTY and
3 the SCCHSA.

4 15. Most of the Grand Jury's recommendations, including "The Sheriff-Coroner
5 should designate qualified personnel to oversee the medical services contract provisions
6 and compliance with standards," and "The Sheriff-Coroner should obtain independent
7 oversight of its jail medical services by medically qualified personnel," were rejected by the
8 COUNTY and the SCSO.

9 16. Defendants had, and have a mandatory duty of care to properly and
10 adequately hire, train, retain, supervise, and discipline its officer and medical employees
11 so as to avoid unreasonable risk of harm to inmates. Defendants, each and all of them,
12 failed to take necessary, proper, or adequate measures in order to prevent the violation of
13 Decedent's and Plaintiff's rights, the suffering and death of Decedent, and injuries and
14 damages to Plaintiff. Defendants breached their duty of care to citizens in that they failed
15 to adequately train, supervise and discipline their medical personnel employees, in the
16 exercise of professional standards of care of withdrawing patients; deputy sheriffs and
17 officers, DOES 1-25, inclusive, in the proper detention and supervision of inmates
18 undergoing withdrawals at the Jail. This lack of adequate supervisory training
19 demonstrates the existence of a custom, practice and policy of promoting, tolerating,
20 and/or ratifying with objective and subjective deliberate indifference ongoing failures in
21 monitoring inmates, including DeLUCA.

22 17. Defendants COUNTY and CFMG failed to promulgate appropriate policies,
23 guidelines and procedures and have failed to rectify improper practices and customs with
24 regard to the monitoring and treatment and/or health and safety of Jail inmates
25 undergoing withdrawals. The failures include, but are not limited to, a failure to meet legal,
26 national/professional and medical standards relating to the medical care of inmates by
27 transporting them to appropriate hospitals for evaluations by licensed physicians and other
28

1 appropriate medical providers, a failure to ensure that medical professionals'
2 recommendations regarding proper treatment setting are followed, a failure to ensure that
3 the staff engage in proper and required welfare checks of inmates, a failure to ensure
4 adequate medical treatment and measures are taken; a failure to maintain adequate
5 medical staff for the Jail, and a deliberate failure to maintain adequate custodial staff for
6 the Jail.

7 18. The Jail's "Chemically Dependent Inmate Policy," for example did not meet
8 the requirements of the Title 15, Section 1213, in that it failed to specify what symptoms
9 necessitate immediate transfer to a hospital, failed to address how chemically dependent
10 inmates are identified other than self report or staff report, and did not incorporate any
11 objective opiate withdrawal screening tool such as the Clinical Opiate Withdrawal Scale
12 (COWS), a simple 11 item questionnaire that provides an objective measurement of the
13 stage and severity of an inmate's opiate withdrawal to direct treatment decision making,
14 and lacks other necessary provisions such as specifying procedures for transferring
15 withdrawing inmates to a hospital.

16 19. The contract between the COUNTY and CFMG deliberately and foreseeably
17 creates a conflict of interest by building in a significant financial disincentive that
18 compromises sound medical judgment. The provision, found at page 217, provides that
19 "CFMG will pay all hospital emergency/catastrophic medical care costs up to \$15,000 per
20 inmate for each medical/surgical inpatient episode."

21 20. Defendants knew the substantial risk of harm caused by inadequate medical
22 evaluation, treatment, and monitoring policies and practices in the Jail, and consciously
23 disregarded that danger by deliberately choosing to take steps to prevent, or even
24 diminish, the harmful effects of these unlawful policies and practices. Defendants were
25 thus objectively and subjectively deliberately indifferent to the risk of harm to Decedent
26 DeLUCA created by their documented failure to operate a constitutionally adequate
27 protocol for monitoring opiate withdrawal symptoms of inmates.

1 Following the booking process Defendants placed DeLUCA into general population, Unit
2 G, rather than into a medical ward. Shortly thereafter DeLUCA began experiencing
3 withdrawal symptoms including vomiting, sweats, chills, headaches and general misery.
4 Callously, Defendants did not place DeLUCA on even their minimal opiate detoxification
5 protocol until the following evening, September 26, 2015, when she was already suffering
6 from severe withdrawal symptoms.

7 25. The next day, September 27, 2015, DeLUCA informed the correctional
8 officers that she was having shortness of breath and could not stop vomiting. A CFMG
9 nurse examined her. DeLUCA pleaded to be taken to the hospital for evaluation by a
10 doctor, where she could receive proper treatment. Instead, Defendants moved DeLUCA
11 into an observation cell located in the booking area of the jail and gave her some
12 Gatorade and breathing exercises, as if she was a reality television actor at yoga class.

13 26. DeLUCA's condition continued to deteriorate. Early the next afternoon,
14 September 28, 2015, a CFMG physician's assistant (PA) was notified concerning the
15 uncontrollable vomiting. Rather than examine the patient, however the PA prescribed an
16 injection and left her in the Jail.

17 27. Later that day, Defendants moved DeLUCA to 0 Unit, which is a medical
18 observation housing area of the jail, but is not an infirmary. DeLUCA needed IV hydration,
19 but received nothing other than water and more Gatorade. DeLUCA's cell was located
20 within an area that could be monitored by non-recorded video surveillance, viewable by
21 the assigned correctional officer. Safety checks performed by the correctional officers
22 were required only every 30 minutes. During these checks DeLUCA was observed to be
23 getting even sicker, with uncontrolled vomiting. At 5:00 a.m., a CFMG nurse gave
24 DeLUCA a suppository to control her vomiting, but did not even bother charting her vital
25 signs, and again -- having been instructed not to transport inmates to the hospital on
26 CFMG's dime -- left DeLUCA in her vomit covered cell.

27

28

1 28. On September 29, 2015, shortly before 7:00 a.m., Defendant Correction
2 Officer Ballinger, who was assigned to supervise inmates in 0 Unit, found DeLUCA
3 unresponsive. Jail staff called 911 for medical assistance. Santa Cruz Fire Department
4 and American Medical Response arrived at the scene, and Paramedic Daniel O'Brien
5 declared DeLUCA dead in her cell at 7:28 a.m.

6 29. The COUNTY's Medical Examiner, Stephany Fiore, M.D., determined the
7 cause of DeLUCA's death to be "acute aspiration pneumonia, dehydration, and probable
8 electrolyte imbalance due to protracted vomiting associated with opiate withdrawal." In
9 other words, Defendants allowed this young mother to puke herself to death in a jail cell
10 without getting her any meaningful medical attention, much less a life-saving trip to the
11 hospital. At least CFMG saved the \$15,000 hospital charge.

12 30. Defendants' objective and subjective deliberate and reckless indifference to
13 withdrawing inmates generally and to DeLUCA's medical condition in particular was the
14 actual and proximate cause of her death. Had DeLUCA been transported to Dominican
15 Hospital as she repeatedly requested, she would not have died in the Jail. Staff at the Jail
16 who interacted with her knew she was at serious risk of death or great bodily harm due to
17 opiate withdrawal and failed to take the most basic steps to protect her. Instead, they
18 placed her in an ordinary cell, leaving her isolated and alone with only a non-recorded,
19 video monitoring system, and was checked, at best, only every 30 minutes by the jail
20 attendant.

21 31. DELUCA's death was the proximate result of Defendants' failure to
22 reasonably supervise and care for her and refusing to transport her to Dominican Hospital
23 where she would have gotten the care she needed, especially having been on notice of
24 her history of opiate use and heroin addiction, including while in custody.

25 32. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants COUNTY, SCSO and CFMG
26 maintained policies or de facto unconstitutional customs and practices of permitting,
27 ignoring and condoning: (1) failure of Jail personnel to provide adequate medical
28

1 evaluation and treatment for the protection of the health or safety of Jail inmates; (2)
2 failure to properly monitor and treat inmates, which includes inadequate intake, screening,
3 evaluation, diagnosis, referral to medical providers, including physicians, treatment plans,
4 administration of medications, medical record keeping, staffing, communication between
5 medical, mental health and custodial staff, housing, supervision, and access to medical
6 health care; and (3) failure to supervise or at minimum unconstitutionally "lax supervision,"
7 failure to report, investigate, and reprimand Jail personnel for their wrongful conduct.

8 33. Each policy, custom or practice of Defendants COUNTY, SCSO and CFMG
9 posed a substantial risk of serious harm to DeLUCA, and Defendants COUNTY, SCSO
10 and CFMG, through their policymakers knew their policies, practices and customs posed
11 this risk, given that the risk was obvious and longstanding.

12 34. As a result of the objective and subjective deliberate indifference, reckless
13 and/or conscious disregard of the misconduct by Defendants COUNTY, SCSO and
14 CFMG, through their policymakers, and/or each of them, allowed Jail personnel to
15 continue their custom and practice of deliberate indifference unchecked, resulting in the
16 violation of the Plaintiff's and Decedent's rights as alleged herein.

17 35. The acts, omissions and deliberate indifference of COUNTY decision
18 makers, including high ranking SCSO officials, DEFENDANTS Sheriff-Coroner JIM HART,
19 Undersheriff JEREMY VERINSKY, Chief Deputy JEFF MARCH, and Lieutenant KELLY
20 KENT them resulted in the deprivation of Plaintiff's and the Decedent's constitutional
21 rights. These customs, practices or policies were the legal cause of the Decedent's death
22 and Plaintiff's injuries, and each individual Defendant acting in accord with this custom,
23 policy or practice acted with deliberate indifference to the needs of persons such as
24 DeLUCA, who was in the custody and care of Defendants.

25 **DAMAGES**

26 36. As a result of the Defendants' conduct alleged herein, Plaintiff K.D. in her
27 individual capacity has lost the support, love and companionship of her mother. Plaintiff
28

1 was physically, mentally, emotionally and financially injured and damaged as a proximate
2 result of DeLUCA's wrongful death, including, but not limited to, the loss of decedent's
3 familial relationships, comfort, protection, companionship, love, affection, solace, and
4 moral support.

5 37. Plaintiff has been deprived of DeLUCA's financial support. In addition to
6 these damages, Plaintiff is entitled to recover for the reasonable value of funeral and
7 burial expenses.

8 38. As a result of the Defendants' objective and subjective deliberate and
9 reckless indifference to the Decedent's federal constitutional rights, as alleged herein, the
10 Decedent sustained pre-death pain and suffering and lost the enjoyment of life, general
11 damages that survive her death under federal civil-rights law and are recoverable by
12 Plaintiff under her 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims in her capacity as DeLUCA's successor in
13 interest.

14 39. Each individual DEFENDANT and CFMG acted recklessly or with callous
15 indifference to DeLUCA's life threatening physical and medical condition and to the
16 Decedent's and Plaintiff's constitutional rights. Plaintiff, as Decedent's successor in
17 interest, is therefore entitled to an award of punitive damages against each individual
18 Defendant and against CFMG in particular.

19 40. Plaintiff found it necessary to engage the services of private counsel to
20 vindicate their rights, and the rights of Decedent, under the law. Plaintiff is therefore
21 entitled to recover all attorneys' fees incurred in relation to this action pursuant to
22 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **(Fourth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments, 42 U.S.C. § 1983)**

25 **(PLAINTIFF INDIVIDUALLY AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

26 41. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding
27 paragraphs of this Complaint.

28

1 42. As set forth above, the Decedent and Plaintiff were subjected to deprivation
2 of rights by all Defendants acting under color of law of the State of California and of the
3 County of Santa Cruz, which rights include, but are not limited to, the Fourth, Eighth and
4 Fourteenth Amendment rights to appropriate and reasonable medical care while in
5 custody as a Jail inmate.

6 43. By reason of the aforementioned acts, these Defendants, and each of them,
7 due to their objective and subjective deliberate indifference to Jail inmates and drug
8 addicts generally, and to DeLUCA in particular, have violated the constitutional rights and
9 liberty interests of Decedent DeLUCA, including those provided in the Fourth, Eighth and
10 Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, giving Plaintiff the right to recover
11 compensatory damages for the wrongful death of her mother, the Decedent.

12 44. Because Defendants' wrongful conduct served no legitimate law
13 enforcement purpose and shocks the conscience, Defendants deprived Plaintiff of her
14 rights under the Fourteenth Amendment to familial relationships without due process of
15 law, entitling her to the special, general and punitive damages alleged above.

16 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **(Survival action: Violation of Decedent's Civil Rights**

18 **Under the Fourth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment, 42 U.S.C. § 1983)**

19 **(PLAINTIFF AS SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

20 45. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference herein all preceding
21 paragraphs of this Complaint.

22 46. The foregoing claim for relief arose in Decedent's favor, and Decedent would
23 have been the Plaintiff with respect to this claim if she had lived.

24 47. As alleged above, the Decedent was subjected to deprivation of rights by all
25 Defendants acting under color of law of the State of California and of the County of Santa
26 Cruz, which rights include, but are not limited to, privileges and immunities secured to
27

28

1 Decedent by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the right to
2 reasonable and appropriate medical care while in custody as a jail inmate.

3 48. By reason of the aforementioned acts, these Defendants, and each of them,
4 due to their deliberate indifference to the health and welfare of Jail inmates generally and
5 to that of DeLUCA in particular, have violated the constitutional rights and liberty interests
6 of Decedent DeLUCA, including those provided in the Fourth, Eighth and Fourteenth
7 Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, causing the Decedent to experience pain and
8 suffering and to lose the enjoyment of life, damages recoverable under the Federal Civil
9 Rights Act against all Defendants, and entitling Plaintiff to recover punitive damages
10 against the individual Defendants and CFMG.

11 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **(Negligence)**

13 **(PLAINTIFF INDIVIDUALLY AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

14 49. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference herein all preceding
15 paragraphs of this Complaint.

16 50. Defendants, and each of them, failed to exercise ordinary care in the medical
17 evaluation, treatment and care of the Decedent, proximately causing her death in the Jail.

18 51. Defendants, and their agents and employees, knew or had reason to know
19 that DeLUCA was in need of immediate medical care and failed to take reasonable action
20 to summon such medical care in a timely manner.

21 52. As a direct and proximate cause of the aforementioned acts of Defendants,
22 Plaintiff lost the support, love, comfort and society of her mother, the Decedent, as
23 hereinabove alleged.

24 **PRAYER**

25 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for relief, as follows:

- 26 1. For general damages in a sum according to proof;
27 2. For special damages in a sum according to proof;

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 3. For punitive damages in a sum according to proof;
- 4. For leave to amend or supplement the Complaint as the identity of the Doe defendants is discovered and new evidence is uncovered;
- 5. For reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988;
- 6. For cost of suit herein incurred; and
- 7. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: June 10, 2016

CARTWRIGHT, SCRUGGS, FULTON & WALTHER
THE LAW OFFICES OF JOHN BURTON

/s/ G. Dana Scruggs, Esq.
G. Dana Scruggs, Attorneys for Plaintiff

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial in this action.

Dated: June 10, 2016

CARTWRIGHT, SCRUGGS, FULTON & WALTHER
THE LAW OFFICES OF JOHN BURTON

/s/G. Dana Scruggs, Esq.
G. Dana Scruggs, Attorneys for Plaintiff