	Case5:15-cv-03113-HRL	Document1	Filed07/0	6/15	Page:				
	Cases:10 ov oct10 till	Affine)	0/10	r age.				
1	Cindy C. Miller	. 0							
. 2	P.O. Box 3094 San Ramon, CA 94583 Telephone: (925) 381-3092	HI			10				
3	Email: corvz513@yahoo.com			JUL	-62				
4	Plaintiff In Pro Se		į	RICHARI XLERK, U.S	D W. WI				
5	Attorney In Fact for Plaintiff SHANE D. MILLER		NOR	THERN DIS	STRICT OF AN JOSE				
6					(
7	UN	ITED STATES	S DISTRICT	r cou	RT				
8	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA								
9									
10	CINDY C. MILLER, Individua SHANE D. MILLER, by and the	illy, and	Case No.						
11	Attorney In Fact, Cindy C. Mil	ler,	M 87	4 E	? (
12	Plaintiffs,	V	U V COMPLAIN	L O) (
13	vs.		CONITLAII	11					
14	COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA CLARA COUNTY SHERIFF'	A; SANTA S	DEMAND F	OR JU	J RY T I				

DEPARTMENT; SANTA CLARA

COUNTY JAIL; SANTA CLARA VALLEY MEDICAL CENTER; DR.

ALEX CHYORNY in his individual and official capacity as Adult Custody Health

STEVENS in her individual and official capacity as county counsel; SHERIFF

LÂURIE SMITH in her individual and official capacity of Sheriff of the County

DEPUTY/OFFICERS J. CHACON, TEJEDA, ANTHONY DIAZ, T.

of Santa Clara; SERGENTS MATTHEW TRACY, J. JÉNSEN and DURAN in

their individual and official capacity of jail personnel at the Santa Clara County Jail;

GONZALES, EUGENE TOBOLA, VASQUEZ, TEMPRA, PEARCE, CHETCUTI, DIAS and MADRIZ in their

individual and official capacity of jail

and DOES 1-100, INCLUSIVE,

personnel at the Santa Clara County Jail;

Defendants.

Services Physician; SANTA CLARA COUNTY COUNSEL CHERYL A.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

15 3113

Filed

RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN JOSE

HPL

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMPLAINT

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. This action seeks monetary damages and injunctive relief for violations of the civil rights, privileges and immunities guaranteed under the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America and Title 42 U.S.C. §1983. In addition, Plaintiffs bring this action under the Americans with Disability Act, 42 U.S.C. §12101, et seq. ("ADA"), Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, at 29 U.S.C. §794 and the Unruh Civil Rights Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§51, et seq. and 52, et seq.
- 2. Jurisdiction is founded on 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1343(1), (2), (3), (4) and the aforementioned statutory and constitutional provisions. Plaintiffs further invoke the pendent jurisdiction of this Court to consider claims arising under state law under 28 U.S.C. §1367.
- 3. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) because the event giving rise to this Complaint occurred in this district.

PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiffs CINDY C. MILLER and SHANE D. MILLER are citizens of the United States of America and citizens and residents of the State of California. CINDY C. MILLER is SHANE D. MILLER's mother and has been granted power of attorney for all matters by SHANE D. MILLER.
- 5. Defendant COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA is a municipal corporation and is a political subdivision of the State of California.
- 6. Defendants SANTA CLARA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT and SANTA CLARA COUNTY JAIL are agencies and part of the COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA, and at all times relevant hereto was run by policy approved by the Defendant SHERIFF LAURIE SMITH.
- 7. Defendant SANTA CLARA VALLEY MEDICAL CENTER is an agency and part of the COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA and at all times relevant hereto was run by policy approved by the COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA.
- Defendant DR. ALEX CHYORNY is and was at all times relevant to this
 Complaint an Adult Custody Health Services Physician, providing medical services to prisoners

of the SANTA CLARA COUNTY JAIL at Defendant SANTA CLARA VALLEY MEDICAL CENTER by policy approved by the Defendant COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA and under the direction of Defendant SHERIFF LAURIE SMITH. He is responsible for medical care and treatment to prisoners at defendant SANTA CLARA COUNTY JAIL. He is sued individually and in his official capacity.

- 9. Defendant SHERIFF LAURIE SMITH is and was at all times relevant to this Complaint Sheriff of Santa Clara County, California. As such, she was the commanding officer and was responsible for the training, supervision, and conduct of the officers and employees of Defendants SANTA CLARA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT and SANTA CLARA COUNTY JAIL. She was and is also responsible by law for enforcing the regulations of Defendants SANTA CLARA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT and SANTA CLARA COUNTY JAIL and for insuring that Jail Correctional Officers and employees and agents obey the laws of the State of California and the United States. She is sued individually and in her official capacity.
- 10. Defendant COUNTY COUNSEL CHERYL A. STEVENS is and was at all times relevant to this Complaint a county counsel of Santa Clara County, California. As such, she was and is responsible by law for enforcing the laws and regulations of Defendant SANTA CLARA COUNTY and the laws of the State of California and the United States.
- 11. Defendants SGT. MATTHEW TRACY, SGT. J. JENSEN, SGT. DURAN, DEPUTY/OFFICERS J. CHACON, TEJEDA, ANTHONY DIAZ, T. GONZALES, EUGENE TOBOLA, VASQUEZ, TEMPRA, PEARCE, CHETCUTI, DIAS and MADRIZ were, at all relevant times, Jail Correctional Deputies or Officers of Defendant SANTA CLARA COUNTY JAIL, responsible by law to obey the regulations of Defendants SANTA CLARA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT and SANTA CLARA COUNTY JAIL and the laws of the State of California and the United States. These Defendants are sued individually and in their official capacity.
- 12. At all times relevant hereto and in all their actions described herein, all of the Defendants were acting under color of law and pursuant to their respective authorities as sheriff,

9 10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

county counsel, deputies, correctional officers and jail medical personnel.

The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise of the Defendants herein designated as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiffs who, therefore, sue said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs allege that each named Defendant herein designated as DOE is negligently, intentionally, recklessly wantonly, contractually or otherwise legally responsible for the events and happenings herein referred to and proximately caused injury and damages thereby to Plaintiffs, as herein alleged. Plaintiffs will ask leave of the Court to amend this Complaint to insert the true names and capacities of such Defendants when same have been ascertained and will further ask leave to join said Defendants in these proceedings.

14. Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 15. Plaintiff SHANE D. MILLER ("MILLER") has grand-mal, tonic-clonic epilepsy which is a serious neurological disorder recognized as a disability under the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA"). MILLER was diagnosed with grand-mal, tonic-clonic epilepsy by neurologist Dr. Lawrence Grace of St. Johns Hospital in Oxnard, California on February 13, 1978. MILLER has been awaiting trial in the SANTA CLARA COUNTY JAIL since September 22, 2013.
- On March 26, 2014 and while incarcerated in SANTA CLARA COUNTY JAIL, 16. MILLER suffered a tonic-clonic seizure. He awakened to find himself on the floor of his cell with a contusion on his head and an injury to his forearm.
- On March 28, 2014, MILLER was transported to SANTA CLARA VALLEY 17. MEDICAL CENTER where a limited neurological exam revealed MILLER was confused and lacked sensation, including to pain, at his lower left extremity. A CT of MILLER's head revealed a moderate sized right parietal subgaleal hematoma and midoccipital subgaleal hematoma. In spite of these findings, DR. ALEX CHYORNY, a general practitioner internist, opined that MILLER was "malingering". There is no evidence that DR. CHYORNY consulted with a neurologist or that he considered MILLER's epilepsy in making this diagnosis.

- 18. MILLER was returned to SANTA CLARA COUNTY JAIL where he continued to suffer dizziness, nausea, headaches, back pain and numbness in his lower extremities as a result of his grand mal seizure. He was unable to bear his weight or raise himself up to lay on his bed. MILLER's condition rendered him unable to lift himself from the floor to the toilet so he could not use the toilet and was forced to foul himself and then lay in his own waste.
- 19. SANTA CLARA COUNTY JAIL personnel failed to provide MILLER with a wheelchair or diapers in spite of MILLER's requests and the obvious and apparent need for them. As a result of Defendants' deliberate indifference to MILLER's medical condition and failure to provide even minimally adequate care for same, MILLER's condition worsened such that he has lost approximately 100 pounds of body weight while incarcerated in the SANTA CLARA COUNTY JAIL.
- 20. MILLER was repeatedly ordered to stand even though his medical condition rendered him unable to do so. As a result, MILLER has been cited for infractions, handcuffed with his hands behind his back connected to chains securing his feet and then dragged out of his cell with his arms lifted high behind his back.
- 21. On June 26, 2014, MILLER continued to suffer from weakness in his lower extremities such that he was unable to stand, walk or even raise himself onto the toilet. Although jail personnel were aware of MILLER's condition, Deputy Officers PEARCE, CHETCUTI, DIAS and MADRIZ ordered MILLER, who was prone on the cell floor, to stand and gather his belongs so he could be moved to another cell. When MILLER failed to rise because he was unable to do so, Officers PEARCE and DIAS applied twist locks on his hands and arms and raised him up and into a wheelchair, causing MILLER to scream in pain.
- 22. MILLER was subsequently taken to a new cell in a wheelchair by Officers PEARCE, CHETCUTI, DIAS and MADRIZ. Although restrained with waist chains and leg shackles, MILLER was again ordered to stand and walk. The jail personnel were aware of MILLER's inability to stand and walk. When MILLER failed to stand and walk as ordered, MILLER was again lifted by his chained arms and placed face down on the floor of his cell.
 - 23. Because MILLER could not walk and SANTA CLARA COUNTY JAIL personnel

refused to provide a wheelchair to transport him for meetings with counsel, MILLER was prevented from access to counsel. In addition to MILLER's requests that his medical condition be accommodated through the provision of a wheelchair, diapers and other appropriate medical intervention, his counsel, J. Hector Moreno, Jr. made similar requests and offered to provide a wheelchair or, alternately, meet with MILLER in his cell. SANTA CLARA COUNTY JAIL personnel continued to disregard MILLER's requests for accommodation, denying him access to a wheelchair or to meet with counsel in his cell - effectively denying him access to counsel.

- 24. On the afternoon of July 17, 2014, MILLER's counsel sent a letter via email transmission to SANTA CLARA COUNTY COUNSEL CHERYL A. STEVENS requesting MILLER be provided with wheelchair assistance to access counsel and attend hearings. An hour later and in apparent retaliation for counsel's letter, MILLER was again restrained and pepper sprayed for failing to obey Officer J. CHACON's order to stand against the wall with his hands behind his back to allow officers to conduct a window and bar check. At the time of this incident, MILLER was found lying on the cell floor in his own urine and feces because he was unable to raise himself up to use the toilet. Again, MILLER told jail personnel he was unable to stand. When MILLER failed to stand as ordered, he was sprayed two times in the face with pepper spray.
- 25. MILLER was handcuffed with his hands behind his back connected to chains securing his feet and placed on a restraint chair by his arms lifted high behind his back. MILLER was subsequently taken to the sun deck, doused with water, and left to dry. In addition to SANTA CLARA COUNTY JAIL personnel, SGT. DURAN, Deputy Officers J. CHACON, VASQUEZ, and TEMPRA, the abuse of MILLER was witnessed and implicitly ratified by COUNTY COUNSEL CHERYL A. STEVENS. Instead of any acknowledgement and accommodation for his medical condition, MILLER was cited by Deputy Officer J. CHACON for disobeying a verbal order, failure to follow sanitation regulations, and failure to wear an identification band.
- 26. On August 4, 2014, MILLER had a medical appointment. When MILLER was unable to stand as ordered for transport, Officers T. GONZALES, ANTHONY DIAZ, and E.

TOBOLA, under the direction of SGT. JENSEN, again shackled MILLER's hands behind his back and lifted him by his arms into a wheelchair.

27. On January 3, 2015, MILLER was sleeping on the floor of his cell when Officer TEJEDA entered the cell for a "welfare" check. Officer TEJEDA kicked MILLER on his back near his kidneys with sufficient force to cause MILLER's head to slam against the concrete wall. Subsequently, MILLER informed medical personnel at the JAIL that he saw blood in his urine as a result of TEJEDA's kick to his kidneys. MILLER's urine tested positive for blood twice, indicating the injury to his kidneys was so substantial as to require further evaluation, but MILLER was not taken to a medical facility where it could be determined if his kidneys were lacerated.

Plaintiffs have complied with the notice requirements of the Tort Claims Act.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(42 U.S.C. 1983)

(Violations of the Fourteenth, Eighth, and Sixth Amendments to the United States Constitution)

- 28. Plaintiffs plead and incorporate the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1-27 of the Complaint as if specifically set forth therein.
- 29. Following his tonic-clonic seizure on March 26, 2014, MILLER directly and repeatedly informed Defendant correctional and medical personnel that he suffered from epilepsy; that he experienced a seizure; and, that he was unable to walk, stand, or raise himself up onto his bed or to use the toilet. Defendants knew, or should have known, that MILLER's epilepsy and his obvious weakened condition following his seizure, required medical accommodations.
- 30. By their actions described herein, Defendants, under color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage, subjected MILLER to the deprivation of rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution, federal, state and county laws and regulations.
- 31. Specifically, Defendants knew MILLER faced a substantial risk of serious harm and, in fact experienced serious harm, as a result of his medical condition following his seizure. Defendants recklessly, wantonly and maliciously denied MILLER access to necessary medical

evaluation, treatment, and assistive devices as well as denied him reasonable accommodation for his medical condition.

- 32. Defendants denied MILLER the right to be free from unwarranted, unjustified and excessive use of force by inflicting physical punishment upon him when he failed to obey orders to stand and walk or to obey sanitation regulations when he was physically unable to do so because of his epilepsy. By this same conduct, Defendants effectively denied MILLER assistance of counsel by refusing to allow him access to a wheelchair to transport him to meetings with counsel and refusing to allow counsel to visit MILLER in his cell.
- 33. Defendants repeatedly and knowingly failed to enforce the laws of the State of California and the regulations of the COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA and the SANTA CLARA COUNTY JAIL. Defendants were, or should have been, aware of such unlawful acts, policies, and practices, prior to and during the course of MILLER's incarceration.
- 34. Defendants COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA, SANTA CLARA SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT and SHERIFF LAURIE SMITH are directly liable and responsible for the acts of the agents and employees of Defendants because they repeatedly and knowingly failed to enforce the laws of the State of California, laws of the United States, and the regulations of the COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA and the SANTA CLARA COUNTY JAIL pertaining to provision of medical care to inmates, reasonable accommodation for disabilities, inmates right to access to counsel, and the use of force against inmates.
- 35. Defendants' conduct was intentional and was done with the aim of causing MILLER extreme and outrageous physical and mental distress, or with the reckless disregard of such result. As a result, MILLER sustained injuries and damages as hereinbefore and hereinafter set forth.
- 36. As a direct and legal result of the acts and omissions of Defendants MILLER has suffered damages, including, without limitation, past, present and future serious and permanent personal injuries, mental suffering, loss of earnings and earnings capacity, loss of enjoyment of life, pain and suffering, emotional distress, medical care and expenses, attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and other pecuniary losses not yet ascertained. MILLER has suffered damages in an amount

in excess of Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000.00).

37. Plaintiffs claim attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Negligent Hiring, Retention, Training, and Supervision)
Against Defendants SANTA CLARA VALLEY MEDICAL CENTER, SANTA CLARA
COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

- 38. Plaintiffs plead and incorporate each and every allegation in paragraphs 1-37.
- 39. Defendants COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA, SANTA CLARA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, and SANTA CLARA VALLEY MEDICAL CENTER had a duty to Plaintiffs to exercise due care in the hiring, selection, training, supervision, oversight, direction, retention and control of employees and agents retained by them as medical personnel and correctional officers, including to insure their compliance with California Government Code § 845.6, and § 815.2.
- 40. Defendants COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA, SANTA CLARA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, and SANTA CLARA VALLEY MEDICAL CENTER had a duty to Plaintiffs to properly train and/or supervise its agents and employees in furnishing or obtaining medical care for MILLER when they knew, or had reason to know, that Plaintiff was in need of immediate medical care and accommodation of his disabling epilepsy and they are also individually responsible pursuant to Government Code §855.8 and § 856.
- 41. Defendants breached their duties to the Plaintiffs through their negligent, grossly negligent, reckless and/or intentional conduct in violation of Plaintiffs' rights, including California Government Code § 845.6, for negligence in failing properly train, supervise, furnish and/or obtain medical care and accommodation for MILLER when Defendants knew, or had reason to know, that MILLER was in need of immediate medical care and accommodation for his disabling epilepsy.
- 42. Defendants had knowledge, or should have had knowledge, and had actual, implied or constructive notice of the tortious nonfeasance leading up to acts of Defendant Adult Custody Health Services Physician, DR. ALEX CHYORNY, SHERIFF LAURIE SMITH, and

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Assault)

- 49. Plaintiffs plead and incorporate each and every allegation in paragraphs 1-48.
- 50. Defendants' willful and intentional conduct described herein, including, but not limited to, inflicting physical punishment upon MILLER during "welfare" checks and when he failed to obey orders to stand and walk or to obey sanitation regulations when he was physically unable to do so because of his epilepsy created a reasonable apprehension by MILLER of an immediate, offensive, contact with his person.
- 51. As a direct result of Defendants' conduct as described herein, MILLER sustained actual damages including injuries to his person, pain, severe and grievous mental and emotional suffering, humiliation, shame, embarrassment, worry, fear, anguish, shock, nervousness, and anxiety in an amount to be ascertained according to proof at trial.
- 52. Said conduct by Defendants was malicious, deliberate, intentional and done with the knowledge of, or conscious disregard of, the harm that would be and was inflicted on MILLER. As a result of said intentional conduct, MILLER is entitled to punitive damages.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Battery)

- 53. Plaintiffs plead and incorporate each and every allegation in paragraphs 1-52.
- 54. Defendants' willful and intentional conduct described herein, including, but not limited to, inflicting physical punishment upon MILLER during "welfare" checks and when he failed to obey orders to stand and walk or to obey sanitation regulations when he was physically unable to do so because of his epilepsy constitutes harmful and offensive contact with MILLER's person.
- 55. As a direct result of Defendants' conduct as described herein, MILLER sustained actual damages including injuries to his person, pain, severe and grievous mental and emotional suffering, humiliation, shame, embarrassment, worry, fear, anguish, shock, nervousness, and anxiety in an amount to be ascertained according to proof at trial.

COMPLAINT

56. Said conduct by Defendants was malicious, deliberate, intentional and done with the knowledge of, or conscious disregard of, the harm that would be and was inflicted on MILLER. As a result of said intentional conduct, MILLER is entitled to punitive damages.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Negligence)

- 57. Plaintiffs plead and incorporate each and every allegation in paragraphs 1-56.
- 58. Defendants had a duty to Plaintiffs to prevent foreseeable risks to foreseeable people, including the Plaintiffs. Defendants failed to provide reasonable medical care pursuant to California Government Code § 845.6 for prisoners and further negligent violations of §815.2 regarding injuries by an employee within the scope of employment which acts were not discretionary and against individual Defendants in violation of California Government Codes § 855.8 and § 856.
- 59. Defendants having personal knowledge and reason to know that MILLER required immediate medical care and reasonable accommodation for his disability had a duty to MILLER pursuant to California Government Code § 845.6 to provide immediate medical care and reasonable accommodation for his disability to MILLER.
 - 60. Defendants breached their duty.
- 61. Defendants' conduct as described above is also in violation of California
 Government Code § 845.6, for depriving MILLER of immediate medical care and reasonable
 accommodation for his disability despite Defendants' having personal knowledge and reason to
 know MILLER required immediate medical care and reasonable accommodation. Defendants'
 failure to reasonably provide said care and accommodation resulted in MILLER's serious and
 permanent physical injuries and Plaintiffs' emotional distress.
- 62. As a direct and proximate result of the acts and omissions of the Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiffs has suffered damages, including, without limitation, past, present and future serious and permanent personal injuries, mental suffering, loss of earnings and earnings capacity, loss of enjoyment of life, pain and suffering, emotional distress, medical care and expenses, attorneys' fees, costs of suit, the loss of the love, affection, society and companionship

of family and friends, other pecuniary losses not yet ascertained, and Plaintiff has suffered 1 damages in an amount in excess of Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000.00). 2 3 SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress) 4 Plaintiffs plead and incorporate each and every allegation in paragraphs 1-62. 5 Defendants' conduct as described herein was extreme and outrageous such as to 6 shock the conscience and to exceed that usually tolerated in a civilized community. 7 65. Defendants intended to cause Plaintiffs severe emotional distress or acted with 8 reckless disregard of the probability that Plaintiffs would suffer severe emotional distress. 9 66. Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiffs severe emotional 10 distress. 11 12 PRAYER WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs demand Judgment in their favor against the Defendants, 13 jointly and severally, as follows: 14 Compensatory damages in a sum in excess of \$75,000.00; 1.. 15 2. Costs and disbursements of this action, including attorney's fees; 16 17 3. Special damages according to proof and in excess of the sum of \$75,000.00; 18 4. Punitive damages according to proof; and For such other and further relief as to the Court may seem just and equitable 19 5. 20 Dated: July 6, 2015 21 22 Cinduc miller 23 24 Plaintiff In Pro Se Attorney In Fact for intiff SHANE D. MILLER 25 26 27 28 13 COMPLAINT

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12) Cand rev (1/15/13)

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 purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	ocket sneet. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAC	GE OF TH	DEFENDANTS	1974, is required for the use of	and clerk of court for the		
SHANE D. MILLER and CINDY C. MILLER				COUNTY OF	COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA (See attachment for list of all Defendants.)			
·	of First Listed Plaintiff Se	A Clark	,					
(E	YCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF C.	4SES)	<i></i>	NOTE:	of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES (IN LAND CONDEMNATION (THE TRACT OF LAND INVO)	Santa Clara ONLY) CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF LVED.		
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Cindy C. Miller, Plain Miller P.O. Box 3094, San R	Address, and Telephone Number tiff in Pro Se and Attorney	In Factor Plaintiff	Shane D	استعما		v.		
				UV I	5 311	3 HAL		
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION Rlace an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. C	TTIZENSHIP OF PR		ace an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff		
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	x 3 Federal Operation (U.S. Government Not a Party)			(Fur Diversity Cases Only)	TF DEF 1 1 Incorporated or Pr of Business In 1	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF incipal Place \[\backslash 4 \] \[\backslash 4 \]		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)			Citizen of Another State	2 Incorporated and l of Business In A	Principal Place		
				Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 G 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	' (Place an "X" in One Box (Inly)			•			
☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJ			OF THE LANGE OF THE STREET			
☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander ☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability ☐ 340 Marine	☐ 365 Personal Injum Product Liabi x 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutica Personal Injum Product Liabi ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injumy Product	ry - ility al y lity sonal	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ <u>6</u> 90 Other	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal	460 Deportation		
(Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	□ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability x 360 Other Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice	Liability PERSONAL PROI 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lend 380 Other Persona Property Dam 385 Property Dam Product Liabil	PERTY	TABON 1710 Fair Labor Standards Act Act 720 Labor/Management Relations 740 Railway Labor Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act 790 Other Labor Litigation	361 HIA (1395ff)			
□ 210 Land Condemnation □ 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 Detaine 510 Motions to Va Sentence 1530 General 1535 Death Penalty Other: 1540 Mandamus & 1550 Civil Rights 1550 Civil Rights 1557 Prison Conditi		791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act Admica a graph of the security Act 462 Naturalization Application 465 Other Immigration Actions	□ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	■ 896 Arbitration ■ 399 Administrative Procedure ■ Act/Review or Appeal of ■ Agency Decision ■ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
V. ORIGIN (Place) an "X" in x 1 Original 2 Rem	oyed from 📙 3 Rema	560 Civil Detainee Conditions of Confinement anded from		Leinstated or 5 Trans	ferred from 6 Multidis	l l		
Proceeding State	Court Appe	ellate Court	R	leopened Anot]	ner District Litigation			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	es unless diversity):							
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 23, 1	A CLASS ACTION	V	DEMAND \$ In excess of \$	575,000 CHECK YES only i	f demanded in complaint:		
VIII. RELATED CASE(IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER				
IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIC			AN FD	ANCISCO/OAKLAN				
DATE:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			N PRO SE AND ATTORNEY IN		() EUREKA		

July 6,0015

Cindy C. Miller