1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		the Northern District of California Jose Division Case No.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Plaintiff, vs. The City of San Jose and The City of San Jose Police Department, a municipal corporation; Officer Jorge Garibay # 4218; a sworn San Jose police officer and as an individual; Sgt. D. Tran Badge # 3269, a San Jose police officer and as an individual; and DOES 1 Through 40 Inclusive. Defendants Defendants	Complaint For Special And General Damages (Including Statutory Damages, Punitive Damages And Attorney Fees) Arising From Racial Discrimination, Malicious Prosecution And Excess Force In Violation Of 42 USC 1981, 1983; 1985 and Violation Of Civi Rights As Protected By The California Constitution And The Constitution Of The United States And All Relevant Applicable California and United States Statutes Protecting Individual Rights And Safety And Enforceable Under California Civil Code §51 et.seq. And § 52 & § 52.1 et. seq. and 42 U.S. 1981 et. seq; Common Law Torts of Battery and Conspiracy. Jury Trial Requested: Filed April 15, 2014 Hearing: Time: Court: Courtroom
	Complaint for Damages	Page 1

Alemayehu v Garibay et.ai.

Nature of Action

1. This action is brought to redress unlawful violation of the Plaintiff's civil rights under 42 U.S.C § 1981,1983 and 1985 as amended and under California Civil Code § 51 & 52.1 et.seq., and for associated State tort actions arising from a common set of operative facts.

Jurisdiction and Venue

- 2. This Court has Jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1981, 1983, 1985; 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343, 1345 and 1367[a] and under California State Law and Statute.
- 3. Venue is proper in this Court and in this district in that the events and conduct alleged in this complaint occurred in this county and involved parties who reside or work in Santa Clara County.

Parties

- 4. Plaintiff Dawit Alemayehu, an individual, is and was at all times relevant to this action within the City of San Jose, County of Santa Clara, State of California and a citizen of the United States.
- 5. Defendant City of San Jose is an incorporated municipality in Santa Clara County, State of California.
- 6. Defendant Jorge Garibay is and was at all time relevant to this action an employee of the City of San Jose, working as a police officer acting under color of authority for the San Jose Police Department. He is named in both his individual and official capacity.
- 7. Defendant Sgt. Tran is and was at all time relevant to this action an employee of the City of San Jose, working as a police officer acting under color of authority for the San Jose Police Department. He is named in both his individual and official capacity.
- 8. Plaintiff does not know the true names and or capacities of defendants named in this complaint as Does I through Does 40 inclusive and therefore sues them under such fictitious names pursuant to CCP § 474. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to state the true names and capacities of these fictitiously named defendants when they are ascertained.
- 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that these fictitiously named individuals are legally responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions set forth below and therefore are liable to Plaintiff for the relief requested.
- 10. At all times relevant and mentioned herein, unless otherwise stated, each defendant was the agent and/or employer of every other defendant, and in doing the things, acts and omissions alleged

27

28

below, was acting within the scope and authority of its agency and/or employment. All actions of each defendant alleged herein were ratified and approved by the officers, supervisors managing agents of each of the other defendants.

Allegations Common To All Claims

- II. All actions complained of, or alleged herein, occurred in the City of San Jose, County of Santa Clara, State of California on April I and April 2, 2013.
- 12. Plaintiff filed tort claims with the City of San Jose as required on September 23, 2013, within the six months mandated by Gov. Code § 911.2.
- 13. The City of San Jose failed to accept or reject the claim and it was deemed rejected as a matter of law fourth-five days after submission.
- 14. Plaintiff filed this action within the time allowed by statute, and within two years of the violation of his civil rights and other tortuous acts complained of herein.
- 15. Plaintiff was placed under arrest for 647(f) Drunk in Public at about 0230 hours on April 1, 2013, by officer Bligh of the Campbell police department.
- 16. Once arrested, Plaintiff was handcuffed and placed in a Campbell police vehicle by officer Bligh.
 - 17. Plaintiff was then driven to the Santa Clara County Sheriff's Department (SCCSD) jail.
 - 18. When Plaintiff arrived at the jail, he was admittedly under the influence of intoxicants.
- 19. On or about April 1, 2013, at approximately 0300 hours, Plaintiff was in the custody of the Campbell Police Department and in the "sally port" of the Santa Clara County Jail.
 - 20. Bligh then removed Plaintiff from the car.
 - 21. At that time Plaintiff was in handcuffs with his arms behind his back.
- 22. Plaintiff's pants had fallen off his hips and Bligh was attempting to pull them up so that Plaintiff could walk through the door without falling down.
 - 23. At the same time Bligh was in the process of removing Plaintiff's belt.
 - 24. Plaintiff was born in North Eastern Africa, and only recently relocated to the United States.
 - 25. In his country of origin, prisoner rape is not uncommon.

- 26. Plaintiff did not understand why the officer was trying to remove his belt, and due to his intoxicated state was not fully cognizant of the process and procedures that are concomitant with being booked into a jail.
 - 27. Plaintiff was trying to turn to face the officer and to find out what was happening.
- 28. Bligh had Plaintiff bent over his patrol car and was controlling Plaintiff's movements, but was having difficulty removing Plaintiff's belt and emptying his pockets.
- 29. Without being asked for assistance by Bligh, or observing Bligh being in any danger, defendant Garibay approached Bligh and asked if Bligh wanted any help. Bligh said sure.
 - 30. Garibay then asked if they should take Plaintiff to the ground.
- 31. Bligh, believed that the two officers would simply lower the hand-cuffed Plaintiff to the ground.
- 32. Bligh saw no reason for the use of any leg sweep or other force beyond lowering the Plaintiff to the ground.
- 33. Bligh described the Plaintiff's actions when he was handcuffed and bent over the car as: "Alemayehu began yelling at me, saying he didn't want me to remove his belt. Alemayehu pulled away from me, making it difficult to hold onto him and preventing me from pulling his pants up. I pushed Alemayehu up against the trunk of the vehicle and held him in place with my forearm. I repeatedly told Alemayehu to relax and hold still. SJPD Officer Garibay #4218 heard (S) Alemayehu yelling and assisted me. I informed Officer Garibay that I was trying to remove Alemayehu's belt so I could get him inside. Officer Garibay placed (S) Alemayehu in a rear wrist lock and used his body weight to push (S) Alemayehu against the trunk of the vehicle. I continued to attempt to remove (S) Alemayehu's belt and pull his pants up. I saw one of Alemayehu's feet come up and hit my leg, but I couldn't tell if he was trying to kick me."
- 34. Bligh did not think defendant Garibay was going to be forcibly taking Alemayehu to the ground because he was handcuffed.
- 35. Bligh thought that he and Garibay would guide him to the ground, get his pants pulled up and belt removed, and then walk him into jail.
 - 36. Bligh told defendant Garibay that he did not think Garibay was going to take him down.
 - 37. Defendant Garibay asserts in part that the Plaintiff was kicking him.

- 38. There were no marks or other indications on defendant Garibay's legs or body that would show that he had been kicked or that Plaintiff had in anyway made forceful contact with defendant.
- 39. Defendant, in a hand written supplemental report, stated that because the Plaintiff was struggling, and he felt the Plaintiff reach for the side of defendant's knife, he performed a leg sweep take down to avoid any injury to himself.
- 40. In his official report Garibay asserts that he took the Plaintiff to the ground because he feared, based on his experience and training, that Plaintiff might have a weapon in his belt, including a belt buckle knife. Defendant Garibay then reports that he told officer Bligh that he was going to take the Plaintiff to the ground and performed a leg sweep.
- 41. Defendant then issued a citation to the Plaintiff for resisting arrest, and battery on a police officer. All charges were dismissed.
- 42. Defendant Garibay then contacted his superior, defendant Tran. Defendant Garibay noted in his report that the Plaintiff started to lift his legs and began to move them backward.
- 43. Defendant Tran was given a copy of a video tape that shows the incident. At no time did any report of document produced by defendant Tran refer to the video tape or verify any of defendant Garibay's assertions.
- 44. Plaintiff suffered internal injury to his head and had inter-cranial bleeding, damage to his eye and cheek and long term vision impairment. Plaintiff was forced to seek additional medical attention from experts at Stanford Hospital and has incurred significant medical bills.

First Cause Of Action Battery of D. Alemayehu by Defendant Garibay

- 45. Plaintiff Alemayehu, incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, paragraphs I through paragraph 44.
- 46. On April 1, 2013, Defendant Garibay, acting in concert with Tran and Doe1, did make unwanted physical contact with Plaintiff and did use force to take the handcuffed Plaintiff to the ground through a violent leg sweep. Defendants did so without any reason to believe that the Plaintiff was an imminent danger to the officers, and upon information and belief assert that the use of unnecessary force was based in part on his African American heritage.

47. During the course of that physical contact Defendant Garibay acting under the color of authority and as ratified by Defendant Tran subjected Plaintiff to being thrown face first to the ground after being handcuffed. Said conduct was unwanted and unnecessary and offensive.

Second Cause Of Action Excess Force Against of D. Alemayehu By Defendant Garibay As Ratified By Defendant Tran

- 48. Plaintiff D. Alemayehu incorporates by reference as if fully set forth herein paragraphs I through paragraph 47.
- 49. Defendant Garibay's only knowledge of the Plaintiff was that Plaintiff was handcuffed, in the sallie port of the County Jail and pushed over the back of a police patrol car where he was being searched, and his pants pulled up, on his own volition, and without request, assisted the officer searching Plaintiff and then used leg sweep to throw Plaintiff to the ground face first. Plaintiff alleges based on information and belief, that a salient and significant factor in the use of unnecessary force was his African American heritage.
- 50. Defendant Garibay knew of no facts that would justify such a violent physical assault on the Plaintiff. The officer who took Plaintiff in custody did not belief that any action, other than lowering the Plaintiff to the ground, was necessary.
- 51. Defendant Garibay was not subject to physical injury and stated that the Plaintiff began to raise his leg. Plaintiff made no threat to injure any officer, nor did he in fact injure any office.
- 52. Defendants Garibay, violated both San Jose Police Departmental policies on the use of force and state law. Defendant Tran and Does 1 ratified that violation, thus creating a practice of using excess force.
- 53. As a direct and proximate cause of the use of excess force Mr. Alemayehu was denied his rights under the 4^{th} Amendment to the United States Constitution.

Third Cause Of Action – Count 1 Violation of Civil Rights of D. Alemayehu Under Art 1 § 13 of The Constitution of California and, The 4th Amendment of The United States Constitution; 42 U.S.C.§ 1981, 1983 and 1985 As Applied To The States By The 14th Amendment

54. Plaintiff Alemayehu incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, paragraphs 1 through paragraph 53.

- 55. Defendant Garibay, in combination with defendant Tran, did conspire to cover up the use of excess force against Plaintiff on April 2, 2012 and did seek to maliciously prosecute the Plaintiff for crimes he did not commit. To wit, P.C 148 and P.C. 243.
- 56. At the time of the use of excess force and the malicious prosecution of the Plaintiff, and during the "investigation" of the use of force, both Garibay and Tran were acting under color of authority and were fully armed as a police officer.
- 57. Said use of excess force was not reasonable and was a violation of the Plaintiff's civil rights as provided by the 4th amendment to the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of California. Plaintiff alleges based on information and belief, that a salient and significant factor to the use of unnecessary force was his African American heritage.
- 58. Defendant Garibay had no reasonable facts upon which to base his taking down, with a leg sweep, of the handcuffed Plaintiff other than the Plaintiff was/is an African-American.
- 59. Defendant Garibay used unnecessary force on the Plaintiff and then filed a false police report alleging that Plaintiff resisted or obstructed him and committed a battery on a police officer. The charges and the police report, as well as defendant Tran's investigation, were intended to obfuscate the real facts and to absolve Garibay from any claim of excessive force or civil right violation.
- 60. The un-necessary use of force, the filing of unsupported charges to justify the use of excess force and the faux investigation of Garibay's actions all violated the Plaintiff's civil rights as provided by the Constitution of the State of California.
- 61. Plaintiff requests compensatory damages to be proven at trial, injunctive relief, and attorneys' fees as allowed by statute 42 USC 1988. Defendants, and each of them, acted maliciously and oppressively, engaging in despicable conduct with a willful and conscious disregard of the rights and safety of Plaintiff. In addition Defendants, and each of them, engaged in despicable conduct that subjected Plaintiff to cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's civil rights. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to exemplary damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

Third Cause Of Action – Count 2 Violation of Civil Rights of D. Alemayehu Art 1 § 13 of The Constitution of California and The 4th Amendment of The United States Constitution; As Applied To The States By The 14th Amendment and as Protected By California Civil Code Section 51 et.seq & Section 52 et.seq.

- 62. Plaintiff incorporates by reference as if fully set forth herein paragraphs 1 through paragraph 61.
- 63. Defendants Garibay, Tran and Doe1, through the use of force, intimidation threat, and coercion did deny the Plaintiff his civil rights as provided by both the Constitutions of the United States, and California, in that they conspired to use excessive force and or covered up or ratified the use of excess force without reasonable or articulable facts. Their malicious prosecution was an attempt to intimidate, threaten, and coerce Plaintiff from bringing legal action against them.
- 64. Plaintiff alleges, based on information and belief, that a salient and significant factor in the use of unnecessary force. The cover-up and the malicious prosecution was Plaintiff's African American heritage.
- 65. Plaintiff requests statutory penalties of \$25,000 per violation per violator against Garibay and Tran for the violation of his civil rights, compensatory damages to be proven at trial, injunctive relief, attorneys fees as allowed by statute Civil Code §52 et.seq. Defendants, and each of them, acted maliciously and oppressively, engaging in despicable conduct with a willful and conscious disregard of the rights and safety of Plaintiff. In addition defendants and each of them engaged in despicable conduct that subjected Plaintiff to cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's civil rights. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to exemplary damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

Plaintiff reserves his rights to amend this action to bring a Monel claim upon discovery of relevant and supporting facts. Plaintiff request a Jury Trial.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff's demand judgment from the Defendants for:

- 1. General damages according to proof;
- Special damages according to proof;
- Exemplary damages according to proof;
- 4. Statutory damages as allowed by law;
- 5. Attorney fees as allowed by statute;

Case 5:14-cv-01738-EJD Document 1 Filed 04/15/14 Page 9 of 9

Costs of Suit; and 6. Such other damages and equitable relief as this court may deem just and proper. 7. The Law Firm of KALLI & Associates p.c. Dated: January 14, 2014 M. Jeffery Kallis Attorney for the Plaintiff Dated: January 14, 2014 Bustamante and Gagliasso P.C. Attorney for the Plaintiff

Case 5:14-cv-01738-EJD Document 1-1 Filed 04/15/14 Page 1 of 1

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 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 Dawit Alemayehu			DEFENDANTS The City of San Jose and The City of San Jose Police Department, Officer Jorge Garibay, Sgt. D. Tran, and Does 1 through 40					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Santa Clara (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Santa Clara (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.				
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A M. Jeffery Kallis 408-9 The Law Firm of Kallis & 333 W San Carlos St., St	71-4655 / Steven Associates / Bustan	M. Berki 408-977-1 nante & Gagliasso	911	Attorneys (If Known)				
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)			RINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	•			(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State		Incorporated or Proof Business In		
■ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi	p of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	2 🗖 2	Incorporated and of Business In		
			Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 5 Foreign Nation 6 6 6 Foreign Country					
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			154	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	RAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers' Liability	□ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability □ 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability □ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERT' □ 370 Other Fraud □ 371 Truth in Lending □ 380 Other Personal Property Damage Property Damage Product Liability	□ 62	25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 90 Other	☐ 422 Appe ☐ 423 With 28 U	al 28 USC 158 drawal SC 157 RTY RIGHTS rights	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ☐ 480 Consumer Credit	
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	□ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice		0 72 0 74 0 75	LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 40 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 20 Other Labor Litigation	SOCIAL SECURITY 861 JHA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g))		□ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS	D 79	91 Employee Retirement		AL TAX SUITS	899 Administrative Procedure	
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - ☐ Employment ☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - ☐ Other ☐ 448 Education ☐	Habeas Corpus: ☐ 463 Alien Detainee ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence ☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penalty Other: ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of		Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 62 Naturalization Application 65 Other Immigration Actions	26 USC 7609		Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
	moved from	Appellate Court	Reo	pened Anothe (specify)		□ 6 Multidist Litigation		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON 42 USC 1981, 19 Brief description of ca	83, and 1985		Do not cite jurisdictional state and the cite jurisdictional state and the cite jurisdiction and the cite jurisdictional state and the cite and	tutes unless di	versity):		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION		DEMAND \$ in exce ss < 75,000.00	•	CHECK YES only URY DEMAND	y if demanded in complaint: D: 🗶 Yes 🗆 No	
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	ET NUMBER		
DATE 04/15/2014	1/4	SIGNATURE OF ATTO	ORNEX	OF RECORD				
IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMEN (Place an "X" in One Box Only		SAN FRANCISCO/OAK	LAND	SAN JOSE E	UREKA			