## Case5:15-cv-03454-PSG Document1 Filed07/27/15 Page1 of 9

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Paul B. Justi (SBN124727) LAW OFFICES OF PAUL B. JUSTI 1981 North Broadway, Suite 250 Walnut Creek, CA 94596 T: 925.256.7900 F: 925.256.9204 pbjusti@comcast.net  Attorneys for Plaintiffs EMMANUEL STEPHENS; JASMINE WHITLEY; DAVIAN GEORGE; and EMANI STEPHENS  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
9						
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
11	SAN JOSE DIVISION					
12	EMMANUEL STEPHENS; JASMINE ) CASE NO.					
13	WHITLEY; DAVIAN GEORGE; and  EMANI STEPHENS;  COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES					
14	) Plaintiffs ) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED					
15	)					
16	v. )					
17 18	CITY OF SAN JOSE; SAN JOSE ) POLICE DEPARTMENT; and DOES 1- ) 25, inclusive, )					
19	) Defendants					
20						
21	Plaintiffs allege:					
22	1. Plaintiff EMMANUEL STEPHENS is a resident of the City of San Jose,					
23	County of Santa Clara.					
24						
25	2. Plaintiff JASMINE WHITLEY is a resident of the City of San Jose,					
26	County of Santa Clara.					
27	3. Plaintiff DAVIAN GEORGE, age 14, is a resident of the City of San Jose,					
28	County of Santa Clara and the minor child of plaintiffs Stephens and Whitley.					

- 4. Plaintiff EMANI STEPHENS, age 7, is a resident of the City of San Jose, County of Santa Clara and the minor child of plaintiffs Stephens and Whitley.
- 5. Defendant CITY OF SAN JOSE is a municipal entity, which includes the administration of and responsibility for defendant SAN JOSE POLICE DEPARTMENT.
- 6. Defendant SAN JOSE POLICE DEPARTMENT is a law enforcement agency in and for defendant San Jose.
- 7. Plaintiffs are ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants Does 1-25, inclusive, and sues such defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs will amend this complaint to include the true names and capacities of such fictitiously named defendants if and when such true names and capacities are ascertained.
- 8. At all times alleged herein, each defendant and each police officer identified below was acting as the agent, employee, servant and/or representative of each other defendant and each other police officer identified below and in committing the acts and omissions alleged herein, each defendant and each police officer identified below was acting in the course and scope of such agency, employment, servitude and/or representation, such that each defendant is jointly and severally liable for each other defendant and each police officer identified below is jointly and severally liable for each other police officer identified below.

#### **JURISDICTION**

9. This Court has jurisdiction because the First Cause of Action arises under 42 U.S.C. §1983 and the Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the Second and Third Causes of Action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.

#### **VENUE**

10. Venue is proper in the San Jose Division of the Northern District of California because the acts and omissions alleged herein arose in the City of San Jose, CA, County of Santa Clara.

### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

- his business and went to pick up his daughters, plaintiff Emani, age 7, and plaintiff Davian, age 14, from school. Plaintiff Stephens picked his daughters up and stopped to get snacks on their way home, with plaintiff Stephens remaining in his car while his two daughters, age 7 and 14, went in and got snacks. At the time that plaintiff Stephens and his minor daughters stopped for snacks, a police officer employed by defendant SJPD, Officer Alexander Keller, began following plaintiff Stephens and his two minor daughters, although neither plaintiff Stephens, plaintiff Emani or plaintiff Davian were engaged in any unlawful or suspicious behavior. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that the only reason that Officer Keller began following them in his patrol car is because plaintiffs Stephens, Davian and Emani are African-American and that Officer Keller was racially-profiling them and engaged in prohibited race-based law enforcement activities.
- 12. Plaintiffs Stephens, Davian and Emani arrived at their home in the City of San Jose, at which point plaintiff Emani exited the vehicle to get the mail and plaintiff Davian came out of the house to open the garage door. Officer Keller jumped out of his patrol car with his weapon drawn and yelled at plaintiff Stephens to "put your hands up! Get back, get back." When plaintiff Stephens asked "what's going on?", Officer Keller then responded "Shut up before I tase you," despite the fact that plaintiff Stephens did not present any indication of

aggressive intent or pose or appear to pose any threat to anyone. Neither plaintiff Stephens,
Davian nor Emani were engaged in any unlawful or suspicious behavior and posed no threat to
public safety to warrant Officer Keller drawing his gun and aiming it at plaintiffs Stephens,
Davian and Emani and threatening to tase plaintiff Stephens. Plaintiffs are informed and believe
and thereon allege that the only reason that Officer Keller drew his gun, pointed it at plaintiffs
Stephens, Davian and Emani and threatened to tase plaintiff Stephens is because plaintiffs
Stephens, Davian and Emani are African-American and that Officer Keller was racially-profiling
them and engaged in prohibited race-based law enforcement activities.

- plaintiff Emani burst into tears and ran into the house to inform her mother, plaintiff Whitley, that "the police have a gun and they're going to take daddy to jail!" Plaintiff Whitley came outside and observed Officer Keller shoving plaintiff Stephens into the patrol car and ignoring plaintiff Stephens reasonable requests as to why he was being detained. Plaintiff Whitley also inquired of the police officer why her husband was being detained and in response to such inquiries, Officer Keller yelled at plaintiff Whitley, "Get on the curb and shut up!"
- 14. In light of Officer Keller's unlawful behavior, plaintiff Whitley then instructed her daughter to go inside their home to get plaintiff Whitley's cell phone so that plaintiff Whitley could document Officer Keller's unlawful behavior. Officer Keller then told plaintiff Whitley's daughter, "If you leave, then I'm arresting you too and taking you to juvenile hall." Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that the only reason that Officer Keller told plaintiff Whitley to "shut up" and threatened to arrest plaintiff Whitley's daughter without any probable cause and despite the fact that plaintiff's daughter had not engaged in any wrong-doing was because plaintiffs Stephens, Whitley, Davian and Emani are African-American

4

5

7

9

10

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

2728

and Officer Keller was racially-profiling them and engaged in prohibited race-based law enforcement activities, including seeking to prevent plaintiff Whitley's daughter from recording Officer Keller's racial profiling and race-based law enforcement activities.

- 15. Officer Keller handcuffed plaintiff Stephens and detained him in the back of the patrol car. Officer Keller detained the family for approximately 20 minutes, at which point additional police officers arrived on the scene, Officer Kevin Cassidy and Sgt. Damian Bortolotti. Sgt. Damian Bortolotti had authority over and was present to supervise the actions of Officer Keller. Plaintiff Whitley asked Officer Cassidy why her husband was being detained and Officer Cassidy responded that they had gotten a call about a suspicious black man with a purple backpack. Plaintiff Whitley informed the officer that her husband plaintiff Stephens did not have a purple backpack and had never been out of the car for the arresting officer to have even been able to see a purple backpack. Plaintiff Whitley also asked the two responding officers where the (allegedly) suspicious black person had been seen and what (allegedly) made him suspicious and the officers refused to respond to these inquiries. Officer Cassidy stated that "we get calls about once a week about suspicious black people and have to check it out to see what's going on. This happens a lot with black people over here." These comments demonstrated that the only reason plaintiff Stephens was followed, held at gunpoint, threatened with being tased, detained, handcuffed, arrested and his wife and daughters threatened and verbally abused was because they were African-American living in an area that defendant SJPD does not believe African Americans belong as a result of racial profiling and race-based law enforcement activities.
- 16. In an effort to cover up his racial-profiling and race-based law enforcement activities, Officer Keller began to search plaintiff Stephens vehicle, including the engine compartment, without probable cause or any exigent circumstances. When plaintiff

Whitley asked Sgt. Bortolotti what Officer Keller was doing and why, the responding officer said "I don't know what he's doing" and was unable to explain Officer Keller's actions, confirming that the arresting officer's actions had no legitimate law enforcement purpose and further demonstrating Officer Keller's racial profiling and race-based law enforcement activities. By failing to properly supervise Officer Keller's actions, Sgt. Bortolotti failed in his own duties and ratified the wrongful conduct of Officer Keller.

- plaintiff Whitley's name on it. Sgt. Boroloti asked plaintiff Whitley if she had proof that the prescription medical marijuana was lawfully hers, whereupon plaintiff Whitley showed Sgt. Bortolotti her driver's license and medical marijuana card. Despite such proof, Officer Keller seized the prescription medical marijuana and cited plaintiff Stephens for possession of marijuana. When plaintiff Whitley asked Sgt. Bortolotti why the arresting officer was citing her husband, plaintiff Stephens, when she, plaintiff Whitley, had just proven that the prescription medical marijuana was hers, Sgt. Bortolotti was again unable to explain the arresting officer's action, stating "it's his stop," once again demonstrating that Officer Keller's actions served no legitimate law enforcement purpose and further demonstrating Officer Keller's racial profiling and race-based law enforcement activities. By failing to properly supervise Officer Keller's actions, Sgt. Bortolotti failed in his own duties and ratified the wrongful conduct of Officer Keller.
- 18. As a proximate result of the above-described acts and omissions, plaintiffs suffered violations of their Constitutional rights, were unlawfully detained in their personal freedom, subject to illegal search and seizure and suffered extreme emotional distress, fear and anxiety in an amount to be proven at trial and in excess of the jurisdictional limits of this Court.

- 19. Plaintiffs filed a complaint with the City of San Jose Office of the Independent Auditor and have been provided with no information regarding the results of any purported investigation of their complaint.
- 20. Plaintiffs timely submitted claims against the City of San Jose and the San Jose Police Department pursuant to the Tort Claims Act, Government Code §910 *et seq.*, which claims were rejected by the City of San Jose.

# FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. §1983

(All Plaintiffs as to Defendants SAN JOSE and SJPD)

- 19. Plaintiffs incorporate by this reference paragraphs 1 through 18, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 20. 42 U.S.C. §1983 prohibits the violation of Constitutional rights under color of state law.
- 21. The above-described acts and omissions constituted an unlawful seizure of plaintiffs' persons under color of state law and unlawful search, thereby violating plaintiffs' rights guaranteed under the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the United States Constitution.
- 22. As a proximate result of the above-described violation of their rights protected under the United States Constitution under color of state law, plaintiffs suffered extreme emotional distress, fear and anxiety in an amount to be proven at trial and in excess of the jurisdictional limits of this Court.

# SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

(All Plaintiffs as to Defendants SAN JOSE and SJPD)

23. Plaintiffs incorporate by this reference paragraphs 1 through 22, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.

- 24. The above-described acts and omissions were extreme and outrageous and exceed the bounds of all civilized society. Such acts and omissions were intended to, and substantially certain to, cause severe emotional distress and did in fact cause plaintiffs severe emotional distress.
- 25. As a proximate result of the above-described acts and omissions, plaintiffs each suffered extreme emotional distress, fear and anxiety in an amount to be proven at trial and in excess of the jurisdictional limits of this Court.

# THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION NEGLIGENCE

(All Plaintiffs as to Defendants SAN JOSE and SJPD)

- 26. Plaintiffs incorporate by this reference paragraphs 1 through 25, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 27. Defendants each owed a duty of care to plaintiffs, including, without limitation, in the execution of their law enforcement duties.
- 28. Defendants breached their duty of care owed to plaintiffs as described above.
- 29. As a proximate result of the above-described breaches of their duties of care owed to plaintiffs, plaintiffs each suffered extreme emotional distress, fear and anxiety in an amount to be proven at trial and in excess of the jurisdictional limits of this Court.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs each pray for relief as follows:

- 1. For general damages in an amount according to proof at trial;
- 2. For special damages in an amount according to proof at trial;
- 3. For costs and attorneys fees as provided by law; and

### Case5:15-cv-03454-PSG Document1 Filed07/27/15 Page9 of 9

1 For such other and further relief as the Court deems fair and just. 4. 2 Dated: July 27, 2015 LAW OFFICES OF PAUL B. JUSTI 3 4 5 Paul B. Justi 6 Attorneys for plaintiffs EMMANUEL 7 STEPHENS; JASMINE WHITLEY: DAVIAN GEORGE; and EMANI 8 **STEPHENS** 9 10 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 11 Plaintiffs each hereby demand trial by jury. 12 Dated: July 27, 2015 LAW OFFICES OF PAUL B. JUSTI 13 14 15 Paul B. Justi 16 Attorneys for plaintiffs EMMANUEL 17 STEPHENS; JASMINE WHITLEY; 18 DAVIAN GEORGE; and EMANI **STEPHENS** 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

### **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS EMMANUEL STEPHEN AND EMANI STEPHENS	e;	DEFENDANTS CITY OF SAN JOSE; SAN JOSE POLICE DEPARTMENT; AND DOES 1-25 INCLUSIVE							
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff SANTA CLARA  (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)					
				NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT	ONDEMNATI T OF LAND IN	ON CASES, USÉ T IVOLVED.	HE LOCATION	OF	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, PAUL B. JUSTI; LAW OI BROADWAY, SUITE 250	FFICES OF PAUL B	JÚSTI, 1981 N.	.7900	Attorneys (If Known)	1				
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in (	One Box Only)	III. CI	L TIZENSHIP OF P	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in	One Box f	or Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government	Not a Party)	(	(For Diversity Cases Only) <b>P</b>	TF DEF	Incorporated or Pri	and One Box for an and One Box for an and One Box for an		
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizens)	nip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	12 🗇 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A		<b>□</b> 5	□ 5
			8	n or Subject of a 🔲 reign Country	3 🗇 3	Foreign Nation		<b>1</b> 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT					·				
CONTRACT		ORTS		REETURE/PENALTY	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER	STATUTI	ES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane  315 Airplane Product Liability	PERSONAL INJUR  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  367 Health Care/		5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other	423 Withd 28 US	SC 157	☐ 375 False C☐ 400 State R☐ 410 Antitrus☐ 430 Banks a	eapportion st and Bankin	
& Enforcement of Judgment  151 Medicare Act  152 Recovery of Defaulted	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability	Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal			■ PROPER ■ 820 Copyr ■ 830 Patent ■ 840 Trade	;	☐ 450 Comme ☐ 460 Deporta ☐ 470 Rackete Corrupt	ation	
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)  153 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability	Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER	TY 🗇 710	LABOR Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL  3 861 HIA (	SECURITY 1395ff)	☐ 480 Consun ☐ 490 Cable/S ☐ 850 Securiti	ner Credit at TV	
of Veteran's Benefits  160 Stockholders' Suits  190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury	☐ 370 Other Fraud ☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage ☐ 385 Property Damage	☐ 720 ☐ 740	Act ) Labor/Management Relations ) Railway Labor Act Family and Medical	☐ 862 Black	Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI	Exchan  890 Other S  891 Agricul  893 Environ  895 Freedon	ige tatutory Ac tural Acts imental Ma	ctions atters
	☐ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	Product Liability	<b>7</b> 90	Leave Act Other Labor Litigation			Act  B 896 Arbitrat		iation
REAL PROPERTY  210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS  3 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITION	S 🗇 791	Employee Retirement		L TAX SUITS	🗖 899 Admini:	strative Pro	
☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations	Habeas Corpus:  ☐ 463 Alien Detainee  ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence  ☐ 530 General		Income Security Act	or De:	(U.S. Plaintiff fendant) Third Party C 7609			-
290 All Other Real Property	□ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other □ 448 Education	535 Death Penalty Other:		IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application Other Immigration Actions					
TY OBJOIN		Confinement							
	noved from 3	Remanded from  Appellate Court	I 4 Reinst Reope		rred from r District	□ 6 Multidistric Litigation	et		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	N Brief description of ca	use:		o not cite jurisdictional statu		,			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION	DE	UNDER COLOR O MAND \$ ,000,000.00	CH	_AVV IECK YES only it RY DEMAND:	f demanded in	complaint	t:
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE				NUMBER	<u>,                                    </u>	. 110	
PATE 7/27/15	San Bh.	SUNATURE OF ATTO	ORNEY OF	RECORD					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY  RECEIPT # AM	OUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUDO	3E		
1111				JUDGE		MAG. JUD	ندر		

Date:

UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT for the
	District of
Plaintiff(s) $V.$ $Defendant(s)$	) ) ) ) Civil Action No. ) ) )
	IN A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address)	
are the United States or a United States agency, or an o P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an	on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of notion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will You also must file your answer or motion with the coun	be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.

CLERK OF COURT

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

### PROOF OF SERVICE

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

	This summons for (na.	me of individual and title, if an	ny)						
was rec	ceived by me on (date)		·						
	☐ I personally served	I the summons on the ind	ividual at (place)						
			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 resid	des there,							
	on (date), and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or								
	☐ I served the summer	ons on (name of individual)		, who is					
	designated by law to	accept service of process	s on behalf of (name of organization)						
		on (date)	; or						
	☐ I returned the sum	e	; or						
	☐ Other (specify):								
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$						
	I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.								
Date:									
		_	Server's signature						
		_	Printed name and title						
		_	Server's address						

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc: