

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
WESTERN DIVISION

STEVELAND L. YOUNG,)	
Kansas City, Jackson County, Missouri,)	
)	
and)	
)	
WINIFRED L. JAMIESON,)	
Kansas City, Jackson County, Missouri,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 4:25-cv-456
)	
OFFICER B. DOUGHERTY #4751,)	JURY TRIAL DEMAND
c/o Kansas City, Missouri Police Department,)	
)	
and)	
)	
OFFICER J. COMFORT # 5921,)	
c/o Kansas City, Missouri Police Department,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

COMPLAINT

COME NOW Steveland L. Young and Winifred L. Jamieson, Plaintiffs, by and through their attorney, Arthur A. Benson II of the Law Office of Arthur A. Benson II, and for their complaint against Defendants Officer B. Dougherty and Officer J. Comfort, state and allege as follows:

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs demand a jury trial on all issues raised herein.

NATURE OF ACTION

1. Plaintiffs Steveland L. Young (hereinafter “Young”) and Winifred Jamieson (hereinafter “Jamieson”) bring this action against Defendant Officers B. Dougherty (hereinafter “Dougherty”) and J. Comfort (hereinafter “Comfort”) seeking damages arising out of an incident that occurred at a comedy show featuring Hasan Minhaj held at the Music Hall in Kansas City, Missouri on March 22, 2022. In Count I (invoking 42 U.S.C. § 1983), Young, who is Black, and his partner Jamieson, who is white, allege that without the arresting officers conducting even a minimal investigation of what had transpired and in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution which prohibits selective enforcement of the law, they were wrongfully and unlawfully arrested for disorderly conduct while a similarly situated white female was not.

In Count II, also invoking 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Young and Jamieson further allege that Dougherty and Comfort caused them to be charged, confined, and prosecuted in violation of the Fourth Amendment because the officers did not conduct a reasonably thorough investigation, let alone a minimal investigation that would have exonerated Young and Jamieson and, thus, their arrests were without probable cause. And in Count III, Young and Jamieson invoke 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to allege that acting without probable cause and behaving either intentionally or recklessly, Dougherty and Comfort caused the confinement and malicious prosecution of Young and Jamieson in violation of the Fourth Amendment.

Finally, in Count IV, Young and Jamieson allege that their arrest and subsequent prosecution interfered with the anticipated benefit of their contract in buying tickets to the show, *i.e.*, that they would be allowed to watch Minhaj’s show in its entirety, in violation of

42 U.S.C. § 1981.

PARTIES

2. Plaintiff Steveland L. Young is a natural person and is a citizen and a resident of Kansas City, Jackson County, Missouri. He is Black.

3. Plaintiff Winifred L. Jamieson is a natural person and is a citizen and a resident of Kansas City, Jackson County, Missouri. She is white.

4. Defendant Officer B. Dougherty #4751, at all times relevant hereto was an Officer with the Kansas City, Missouri Police Department. He is white.

5. Defendant Officer J. Comfort #5921 (hereinafter, “Comfort”), at all times relevant hereto was an Officer with the Kansas City, Missouri Police Department. He is white.

STATE ACTION

6. The acts and omissions of Defendants Dougherty and Comfort herein which give rise to Plaintiffs’ claims were committed by them while acting under color of state law and the regulations, policies, procedures, practices, customs, and usages of the Kansas City, Missouri Police Department.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343.

8. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because the unlawful acts alleged in this Complaint were committed in Kansas City, Jackson County, Missouri, which as provided in 28 U.S.C. § 105(b), lies within the Western District of Missouri.

9. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because the events, acts or omissions giving rise to Plaintiff’s claims occurred in Kansas City, Jackson County,

Missouri which as provided in 28 U.S.C. § 105(b), lies within the Western Division of the Western District of Missouri.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL CLAIMS

Laughing While Black.

10. Sometime prior to March 22, 2022, Jamieson purchased two tickets to the Hasan Minhaj comedy show to be held at the Kansas City Music Hall on that date so that she and Young, who are a couple, could attend the show and enjoy a night out together.

11. Prior to the commencement of the show that evening, Young and Jamieson took their designated seats. Seated in front of Young and Jamieson was a white woman.

12. Along with the other members of the audience, Young and Jamieson were enjoying the show. There was loud laughter, clapping, and some shouted comments of approval of Minhaj's performance.

13. Soon, the woman in front of Young and Jamieson turned around to tell Young to be quiet, to make less noise approving or reacting to the show, to tone down his laughing and enjoyment of the comedy.

14. Although other patrons were similarly enthusiastically enjoying the show, the woman's irritation was focused on Young. At one point, she even stood up, turned around toward Young, and berated him for his joyful expressions.

15. Young told the woman to stop harassing him, but she did not stop her complaining.

16. The woman repeatedly disturbed the peace of Young and Jamieson.

17. Other members of the audience seated nearby were also disturbed by the actions

of the woman and offered words of support to Young and Jamieson.

18. Young's and Jamieson's actions and the sounds they made were not rude or offensive and they were no louder than many comments appreciating the comedy that were made or even shouted by other patrons in that area of the audience.

19. Somehow, the woman or her companions got the attention of Crowd Systems, Inc. (hereinafter, "CSI") employees who were providing security at the event.

Consequences of Laughing While Black? Arrest, Prosecution, and Damages.

20. CSI employees then summoned police. Officer Dougherty was first to respond and he was soon joined by Officer Comfort, and perhaps additional officers who were not identified in Dougherty's narrative report.

21. After a brief exchange in the auditorium of the Music Hall between Young and Jamieson and Dougherty, during which Minhaj left the stage, informing the audience that he would return after the situation was resolved, Dougherty and the other responding officers took Young and Jamieson into custody and escorted them from the building.

22. Young and Jamieson were arrested for and charged with disorderly conduct.

23. Officer Littleton responded and transported Young and Jamieson to the East Patrol Division detention for booking on the charge.

24. At no time had there been any disorderly conduct by Young and Jamieson and they were not disruptive, or disturbing the peace of anyone.

25. To the extent there was any disturbance, it was caused by the woman seated in front of Young and Jamieson.

26. Neither Dougherty nor any of the other officers who responded conducted an

investigation to determine whether or not an ordinance violation had even occurred.

Although there was exculpatory evidence reasonably available at hand – Young, Jamieson, and other patrons seated nearby who were witnesses to what had transpired could have been interviewed before Young and Jamieson were arrested – Dougherty and the other officers arrested Young and Jamieson – solely on the basis of inherently unreliable hearsay not attributable to other law enforcement officers – without doing even that minimal investigation.

27. Had Dougherty and the other officers conducted such a minimal investigation, they would have determined that it was the woman seated in front of Young and Jamieson who was being disorderly and had caused a disturbance, not Young and Jamieson.

28. Had Dougherty and the other officers conducted such a minimal investigation and had they determined that it was the woman seated in front of Young and Jamieson who was the disorderly party who had caused the disturbance, Young and Jamieson would not have been arrested, charged, and prosecuted.

29. Ultimately, on September 20, 2024, the disorderly conduct charges against Young and Jamieson were dismissed.

30. Young and Jamieson were damaged by their unconstitutional and unlawful arrest. Not only were they denied the opportunity to watch Minhaj's entire performance and were thereby denied the benefit of their purchase of their tickets, they were obliged to obtain defense counsel at a cost of several thousand dollars, they also suffered mental distress, anxiety, and agitation as well as emotional pain and suffering, humiliation, embarrassment, insult, and inconvenience.

31. But for the wrongful arrest of Young and Jamieson, they would not have suffered the damages identified, *supra* at ¶ 30.

32. Dougherty's and Comfort's acts and conduct were willful, wanton, reckless, and malicious, and further, showed a complete and deliberate indifference to, and conscious disregard for, the constitutional and statutory rights of Young and Jamieson. Therefore, Young and Jamieson are entitled to an award of punitive or exemplary damages in an amount sufficient to punish Dougherty and Comfort or to deter Dougherty, Comfort, and others from like conduct in the future.

COUNT I
UNLAWFUL ARREST RESULTING FROM SELECTIVE ENFORCEMENT
IN VIOLATION OF THE EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE
OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT
42 U.S.C. § 1983

33. Young and Jamieson hereby reallege and incorporate each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 - 32 of this Complaint as if fully set forth here.

34. Dougherty exercised his discretion to enforce the law and arrest and charge Young and Jamieson with disorderly conduct on account of Young's race and Jamieson's association and/or affiliation with him but did not arrest, charge, or prosecute the Caucasian woman seated in front of them whose conduct was arguably the same as Young's and Jamieson's.

35. Dougherty's exercise of his discretion to enforce the law and arrest and charge Young and Jamieson on account of Young's race and Jamieson's association and/or affiliation with him had a discriminatory effect and discriminatory purpose in that a similarly situated individual, *i.e.*, the white woman seated in front of them who was arguably at least as

disorderly as Young and Jamieson, was not investigated, arrested, or charged.

36. Young's race – Black – and Jamieson's association and/or affiliation with him was a motivating factor in Dougherty's decision to arrest them; there was a discriminatory purpose to their arrest.

37. On information and belief, Dougherty has intentionally and purposefully targeted, arrested, and charged a disproportionate number of Blacks and their associates, affiliates, or advocates, thereby disproportionately applying neutral laws to a specific class of people, *i.e.*, Blacks and their associates, affiliates, or advocates.

38. That Dougherty may also have been motivated by other factors does not justify or diminish his ethnic animus which was the central and dominant motivation for his discriminatory conduct.

39. The arrest, charging, and prosecution of Young and Jamieson on the basis of Young's race and Jamieson's association and/or affiliation with him in violation of their Fourteenth Amendment right to equal protection caused Young and Jamieson to sustain damage as set forth, *supra* at ¶ 30, in that they were arrested; transported to the East Patrol Division detention facility and booked; they were obliged to obtain defense counsel at a cost of several thousand dollars; suffered mental distress, anxiety, and agitation as well as emotional pain and suffering, humiliation, embarrassment, insult, and inconvenience. In addition, they were denied the opportunity to watch Minhaj's entire performance and were thereby denied the benefit of their purchase of their tickets.

40. Dougherty's and Comfort's acts and conduct were willful, wanton, reckless, and malicious, and further, showed a complete and deliberate indifference to, and conscious

disregard for, the constitutional rights of Young and Jamieson. Therefore, Young and Jamieson are entitled to an award of punitive or exemplary damages in an amount sufficient to punish Dougherty and Comfort or to deter Dougherty, Comfort, and others from like conduct in the future.

41. Young and Jamieson are entitled to recover from Dougherty and Comfort their reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses incurred in this cause as provided by 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

COUNT II
UNLAWFUL ARREST WITHOUT PROBABLE CAUSE RESULTING FROM THE
FAILURE TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION IN VIOLATION OF THE
FOURTH AMENDMENT AS APPLIED TO THE STATES BY THE
FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT
42 U.S.C. § 1983

42. Young and Jamieson hereby reallege and incorporate each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 - 41 of this Complaint as if fully set forth here.

43. Dougherty and Comfort knew or should have known that under the United States Constitution, there is a clearly established prohibition against an arrest and detention without probable cause and that the arrest and detention of Young and Jamieson without probable cause violated their constitutional rights.

44. Reasonable and prudent officers would know or should have known that when contemplating an arrest he or she is not free to disregard plainly exculpatory evidence, even if substantial inculpatory evidence (standing by itself) suggests that probable cause exists.

45. Reasonable and prudent officers would know or should have known that he or she does not have probable cause when a minimal further investigation would have exonerated the suspect(s) and that he or she may not close his or her eyes to facts that would help clarify

the circumstances.

46. Reasonable and prudent officers would known or should have known that he or she has a duty to conduct a reasonably thorough investigation prior to arresting the suspect(s), at least in the absence of exigent circumstances and so long as law enforcement would not be unduly hampered if the officers wait to obtain more facts before seeking to arrest.

47. Reasonable and prudent officers would not believe that Young and Jamieson had committed or were committing an offense and would not believe that there was probable cause to arrest them had they interviewed witnesses who were immediately at hand before taking them into custody and transporting them to detention because no exigent circumstances prevented them from conducting such interviews because Minhaj had left the stage promising to return and complete the show once the situation was resolved.

48. The arrest, charging, and prosecution of Young and Jamieson without probable cause in violation of their Fourth Amendment rights caused Young and Jamieson to sustain damage as set forth, *supra* at ¶¶ 30, 39, in that they were arrested; transported to the East Patrol Division detention facility and booked; they were obliged to obtain defense counsel at a cost of several thousand dollars; suffered mental distress, anxiety, and agitation as well as emotional pain and suffering, humiliation, embarrassment, insult, and inconvenience. In addition, they were denied the opportunity to watch Minhaj's entire performance and were thereby denied the benefit of their purchase of their tickets.

49. Dougherty's and Comfort's acts and conduct were willful, wanton, reckless, and malicious, and further, showed a complete and deliberate indifference to, and conscious

disregard for, the constitutional rights of Young and Jamieson. Therefore, Young and Jamieson are entitled to an award of punitive or exemplary damages in an amount sufficient to punish Dougherty and Comfort or to deter Dougherty, Comfort, and others from like conduct in the future.

50. Young and Jamieson are entitled to recover from Dougherty and Comfort their reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses incurred in this cause as provided by 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

COUNT III
MALICIOUS PROSECUTION IN VIOLATION OF THE FOURTH AMENDMENT
AS APPLIED TO THE STATES BY THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT
42 U.S.C. § 1983

51. Young and Jamieson reallege and incorporate each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 - 50 of this Complaint as if fully set forth here.

52. As set forth above, *supra* at ¶¶ 43-47 (Count II), Dougherty and Comfort caused Young's and Jamison's confinement and prosecution by arresting them without probable cause (given that they failed to conduct either a minimal or reasonably thorough investigation, ignoring possibly exculpatory evidence immediately at hand via witness interviews).

53. The prosecutions of Young and Jamieson terminated in their favor when the charges against them were dismissed by the prosecutor on September 20, 2024.

54. No probable cause supported the arrest, confinement, or prosecution of Young and Jamieson.

55. And, as stated, *supra* at ¶¶ 30, 39, and 48, Young and Jamieson sustained damages.

56. Because Dougherty and Comfort caused the prosecution without probable cause and because they behaved either intentionally or recklessly, malice is inferable.

57. As alleged, *supra* at ¶¶ 32, 40, and 49, Dougherty's and Comfort's acts and conducts were willful, wanton, reckless, and malicious, and further, showed a complete and deliberate indifference to, and conscious disregard for the constitutional rights of Young and Jamieson. Therefore, Young and Jamieson are entitled to an award of punitive or exemplary damages in an amount sufficient to punish Dougherty and Comfort or to deter them and others from like conduct in the future.

58. Young and Jamieson are entitled to recover from Dougherty and Comfort their reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses incurred in this cause as provided by 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

COUNT IV
VIOLATION OF THE MAKE AND ENFORCE CONTRACTS, THE
FULL AND EQUAL BENEFITS OF THE LAWS AND PROCEEDINGS, AND THE
LIKE PUNISHMENT, PAINS, AND PENALTIES CLAUSES OF
42 U.S.C. § 1981

59. Young and Jamieson reallege and incorporate each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 - 58 of this Complaint as if fully set forth here.

60. In relevant part, 42 U.S.C. § 1981(a) provides:

All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory to *make and enforce contracts*, to sue, be parties, give evidence, *and to the full and equal benefit* of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, *and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties*, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, and to no other.

Emphasis added.

61. The statute further explains that "the term 'make and enforce contracts' includes

includes the making, performance, modification, and termination of contracts, and the enjoyment of all benefits, privileges, terms, and conditions of the contractual relationship.” 42 U.S.C. § 1981(b). Subsection (c) plainly states that the rights protected in 42 U.S.C. § 1981 are protected against impairment under color of state law.

62. As alleged, *supra* at ¶ 10, some time prior to March 22, 2022, Jamieson purchased two tickets to the Hasan Minhaj comedy show to be held at the Kansas City Music Hall on that date so that she and Young, who are a couple, could attend the show and enjoy a night out together.

63. The purchase of those tickets constituted a contract between Young and Jamieson and the entity that sold them the tickets – be it Minhaj or a promoter or several parties that would profit from the sale of those tickets – that, in turn, afforded them the contractual benefit of being able to attend the show.

64. That enjoyment of the contractual benefit was enforceable by 42 U.S.C. § 1981.

65. The arrest of Young and Jamieson by state actors Dougherty and Comfort on the basis of race interfered with the enforcement of the contract and with their anticipated benefit of the purchase contract, *i.e.*, that they would be allowed to watch the show in its entirety.

66. Additionally, because of their arrest – state action – by Dougherty and Comfort on the basis of race, Young and Jamieson were also deprived of the full and equal benefit of all laws for the security of persons that were enjoyed by the white woman in the row in front of them in that she complained about their behavior and the police intervened on her behalf and not on behalf of Young and Jamieson. And Young and Jamieson were subjected to punishment and penalties that she was not in that they were arrested and prosecuted for the

same behavior she exhibited that did not result in her arrest and prosecution.

67. Young and Jamieson were damaged by their unconstitutional and unlawful arrest. Not only were they denied the opportunity to watch Minhaj's entire performance and were thereby denied the benefit of their purchase of their tickets, and were denied the full and equal benefit of the laws and were subjected to punishment and penalties that the white woman was not, they were obliged to obtain defense counsel at a cost of several thousand dollars, they also suffered mental distress, anxiety, and agitation as well as emotional pain and suffering, humiliation, embarrassment, insult, and inconvenience.

68. Dougherty's and Comfort's acts and conduct were willful, wanton, reckless, and malicious, and further, showed a complete and deliberate indifference to, and conscious disregard for, the constitutional and statutory rights of Young and Jamieson. Therefore, Young and Jamieson are entitled to an award of punitive or exemplary damages in an amount sufficient to punish Dougherty and Comfort or to deter Dougherty, Comfort, and others from like conduct in the future.

69. Young and Jamieson are entitled to recover from Dougherty and Comfort their reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses incurred in this cause as provided by 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs Young and Jamieson request that the Court, after a trial by jury of their claims, enter judgment for Plaintiffs and against Defendant Dougherty and Comfort for their actual, compensatory, nominal damages and punitive damages as are proven at trial and are fair and reasonable, for their costs herein, including their reasonable

attorney fees and expenses as provided by 42 U.S.C. § 1988, and for any other such legal or equitable relief as the Court deems appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

LAW OFFICE OF ARTHUR A. BENSON II

By s/ Arthur A. Benson II
Arthur A. Benson II D.Kan. #70134
4006 Central Avenue
Kansas City, Missouri 64111
(816) 531-6565
abenson@bensonlaw.com

Attorney for Plaintiffs

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 THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Steveland L. Young and Winifred Jamieson

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Jackson County, Missouri
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Arthur A. Benson II, Law Offices of Arthur A. Benson II,
4006 Central, Kansas City, Missouri 64111 816-531-6565 ext 100

DEFENDANTS

Officer B. Dougherty and Officer J. Comfort

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant unknown
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE
LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant
- ☒ 3 Federal Question
(U.S. Government Not a Party)
- ☐ 4 Diversity
(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- | | PTF | DEF | | PTF | DEF |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Citizen of This State | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Incorporated <i>or</i> Principal Place of Business In This State | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Citizen of Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | Incorporated <i>and</i> Principal Place of Business In Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | Foreign Nation | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury	PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	<input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 810 Selective Service <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 892 Economic Stabilization Act <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 894 Energy Allocation Act <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
REAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	CIVIL RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 444 Welfare <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITIONS <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition	LABOR <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION <input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 463 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions	

V. ORIGIN

(Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☒ 1 Original Proceeding
☐ 2 Removed from State Court
☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court
☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened
☐ 5 Transferred from another district (specify)
☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation
☐ 7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (**Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity**):
42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Counts I - III); 42 U.S.C. § 1981 (Count IV)

Brief description of cause: Selective Enforcement in violation of Equal Protection Clause of 14th Amendment; Unlawful Arrest without Probable Cause in violation of Fourth Amendment; Malicious Prosecution in Violation of Fourth Amendment; Violations of 42 U.S.C. § 1981

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23
DEMAND \$ _____
JURY DEMAND: ☒ Yes ☐ No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions):

JUDGE _____

DOCKET NUMBER _____

DATE

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

June 18, 2025

s/ Arthur A. Benson II

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # _____

AMOUNT _____

APPLYING IFP _____

JUDGE _____

MAG. JUDGE _____

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading 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. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

I. (a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.

(b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)

(c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".

II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.C.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)

III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.

IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerks in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.

V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment. (7) Check this box for an appeal from a magistrate judge's decision.

VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553
Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service

VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

Demand. In this space enter the dollar amount (in thousands of dollars) being demanded or indicate other demand such as a preliminary injunction.

Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.

VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.