UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

ANTHONY BANKS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 25-cv-10203

CITY OF CHICAGO, OFFICER
WALTER, OFFICER VENEGAS,
UNKNOWN CHICAGO TACTICAL
POLICE OFFICERS, UNKNOWN
SERGEANT, and LIEUTENANT NARO,
Defendants.

COMPLAINT

NOW COMES the PLAINTIFF, ANTHONY BANKS, by and through his attorney, Blake Horwitz, Esq., of The Blake Horwitz Law Firm, Ltd., and complaining of the DEFENDANTS, CITY OF CHICAGO, OFFICER WALTER, OFFICER VENEGAS, UNKNOWN CHICAGO TACTICAL POLICE OFFICERS, UNKNOWN SERGEANT, and LIEUTENANT NARO, states as follows:

I. JURISDICTION

1. The jurisdiction of the Court is invoked pursuant to the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1983; the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. §1331 and §1343(a); the Constitution of the United States; and this Court's supplementary jurisdiction powers.

II. PARTIES

2. PLAINTIFF ANTHONY BANKS ("PLAINTIFF") is a resident of the State of Illinois and was, at all times relevant, employed as a police officer with the Chicago Police Department ("CPD") and assigned to the 11th District.

- 3. DEFENDANT OFFICER WALTER (hereinafter, "DEFENDANT WALTER"), at all times relevant, was employed by and acting on behalf of the CPD and under the color of state law.
- 4. DEFENDANT OFFICER VENEGAS (hereinafter, "DEFENDANT WALTER"), at all times relevant, was employed by and acting on behalf of the CPD and under the color of state law.
- 5. DEFENDANT UNKNOWN SERGEANT (hereinafter, "DEFENDANT SERGEANT"), at all times relevant, was employed by and acting on behalf of the CPD and under the color of state law.
- 6. DEFENDANT LIEUTENANT NARO (hereinafter "DEFENDANT NARO"), at all times relevant, was employed by and acting on behalf of the CPD and under the color of state law.
- 7. DEFENDANTS UNKNOWN TACTICAL OFFICERS (collectively, "DEFENDANT UNKNOWN OFFICERS" and individually, "DEFENDANT UNKNOW OFFICER"), at all times relevant, were employed by and acting on behalf of the CPD and under the color of state law.
- 8. The DEFENDANT CITY OF CHICAGO (hereinafter, "DEFENDANT CITY") is a duly incorporated municipal corporation and is the employer and principal of the DEFENDANT OFFICERS. ¹ At all times material to this Complaint, the DEFENDANT OFFICERS were acting under the color of state law, ordinance, and/or regulation, statutes, custom, and usages of the DEFENDANT CITY.

2

¹ DEFENDANT WALTER, OFFICER VENEGAS, DEFENDANT SERGEANT, and DEFENDANT UNKNOWN TACTICAL OFFICERS are referred to collectively as "DEFENDANT OFFICERS."

9. At all relevant times, the DEFENDANT OFFICERS and DEFENDANT NARO were agents and/or employees of the DEFENDANT CITY.

III. <u>FACTS</u>

- 10. On or about March 17, 2025, PLAINTIFF responded to a scene while on duty in the 11th District.
- 11. At the scene, PLAINTIFF observed a heated exchange between a DEFENDANT UNKNOWN OFFICER and a visibly pregnant woman. PLAINTIFF observed the DEFENDANT UNKNOWN OFFICER bump into the woman, which escalated the confrontation.
- 12. PLAINTIFF attempted to de-escalate the situation by stepping between the DEFENDANT UNKNOWN OFFICER and the pregnant woman and asking the DEFENDANT UNKNOWN OFFICER to calm down.
- 13. Later that day, when PLAINTIFF returned to the police station, he was approached in the doorway by the same DEFENDANT UNKNOWN OFFICER, who aggressively questioned PLAINTIFF's conduct at the scene and accused PLAINTIFF of interfering with his team.
- 14. Several DEFENDANT OFFICERS then encircled PLAINTIFF, who is African-American.
- 15. After being surrounded by several DEFENDANT OFFICERS, PLAINTIFF was not free to leave.
- 16. One DEFENDANT UNKNOWN OFFICER told PLAINTIFF, "Go back where you came from."
- 17. Another DEFENDANT UNKNOWN OFFICER said, "Go back to the third district," which is known for having predominantly African-American officers.

- 18. Another DEFENDANT UNKNOWN OFFICER mumbled under his breath, "Nah n*gga," a racial slur directed at PLAINTIFF.
- 19. Two Chicago Police sergeants who witnessed the confrontation, intervened, and helped PLAINTIFF separate from the DEFENDANT OFFICERS.
- 20. PLAINTIFF reported the incident to his lieutenant, DEFENDANT NARO, who dismissed PLAINTIFF's concerns and instead informed PLAINTIFF that officers in the station were angry with him and instructed PLAINTIFF to leave early.
- 21. While enroute home, DEFENDANT NARO called PLAINTIFF and ordered him to return to the station to write a statement ("To/From"). This To/From was a sensitive, confidential internal document used to investigate wrongdoing.
- 22. On March 18, 2025, a fellow officer from PLAINTIFF's former district (District 3) informed PLAINTIFF that the To/From had been leaked online.
 - 23. The To/From statement was in fact, leaked online by a Chicago police officer.
- 24. That night, on March 18, 2025, PLAINTIFF received a graphic and threatening email containing a racist image on his department-issued phone. The image depicted a caricature of an African-American man with a gun in his mouth, reading: "When is a n*gger the most frustrated"? "When he tries to blow his own brains out." (Attached as Exhibit A).
- 25. This image was sent by one of the DEFENDANT OFFICERS who encircled PLAINTIFF, as alleged above.
 - 26. The image was sent to PLAINTIFF's work phone.
- 27. PLAINTIFF is now on medical leave due to emotional distress, trauma, and fear for his safety.

28. On July 31, 2025, Plaintiff received a right-to-sue letter from the EEOC regarding his EEOC Charge.

COUNT I §1983 Fourth Amendment Seizure (Against DEFENDANT OFFICERS)

- 29. PLAINTIFF realleges paragraphs 1-28 as though fully set forth herein.
- 30. On or around March 17, 2025, DEFENDANT OFFICERS surrounded PLAINTIFF, while on duty and in uniform, prevented PLAINTIFF from leaving, and detained PLAINTIFF without lawful authority or probable cause.
- 31. PLAINTIFF was not free to leave while surrounded by the DEFENDANT OFFICERS.
- 32. The actions of DEFENDANT OFFICERS directly and proximately caused PLAINTIFF to suffer, without limitation, pain and suffering, humiliation, emotional distress, and mental anguish.
- 33. The actions of DEFENDANT OFFICERS were the direct and proximate cause of the injuries that PLAINTIFF sustained as a result of DEFENDANT OFFICERS violating PLAINTIFF's constitutional rights, as alleged above.

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF respectfully requests that this Court award PLAINTIFF compensatory damages, punitive damages, costs, and attorneys' fees, as well as any other relief this Court deems just and equitable.

COUNT II False Imprisonment (Against DEFENDANT OFFICERS)

- 34. PLAINTIFF realleges paragraphs 1-28 as though fully set forth herein.
- 35. One or more of the DEFENDANT OFFICERS restricted PLAINTIFF's movement.

- 36. One or more DEFENDANT OFFICERS restricted PLAINTIFF's movement unreasonably and without probable cause.
- 37. PLAINTIFF's personal freedom was curtailed against his wishes by one or more of the DEFENDANT OFFICERS.
- 38. PLAINTIFF's detention by one or more of the DEFENDANT OFFICERS was unreasonable and unlawful.
- 39. As a result of one or more DEFENDANT OFFICERS' unlawful conduct, PLAINTIFF suffered and continues to suffer from emotional and psychological injuries, physical injuries, and other damages.

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF respectfully requests that this Court award PLAINTIFF compensatory damages, punitive damages, and costs, as well as any other relief this Court deems just and equitable.

COUNT III Violation of Civil Rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Equal Protection & Substantive Due Process) (Against DEFENDANT OFFICERS and DEFENDANT NARO)

- 40. PLAINTIFF realleges paragraphs 1-28 as though fully set forth herein.
- 41. DEFENDANT OFFICERS and DEFENDANT NARO, under color of law, subjected PLAINTIFF to racially motivated harassment, retaliation, and the unauthorized dissemination of confidential information, depriving PLAINTIFF of equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment
- 42. The DEFENDANT OFFICERS' and DEFENDANT NARO's conduct was outrageous, discriminatory, and inflicted intentional emotional harm on PLAINTIFF.

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF respectfully requests that this Court award PLAINTIFF compensatory damages, punitive damages, costs, and attorneys' fees, as well as any other

relief this Court deems just and equitable.

COUNT IV 42 U.S.C. § 1981 – Racial Discrimination in Employment (Against DEFENDANT OFFICERS)

- 43. PLAINTIFF realleges paragraphs 1-28 as though fully set forth herein.
- 44. PLAINTIFF, an African-American employee, was subjected to hostile and discriminatory treatment by DEFENDANT OFFICERS because of his race.
- 45. DEFENDANT OFFICERS' actions—including the use of racial slurs, exclusion, and physical intimidation—interfered with PLAINTIFF's conditions of employment in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1981.
- 46. DEFENDANT OFFICERS' conduct was intentional, malicious, and in reckless disregard of PLAINTIFF's rights.

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF respectfully requests that this Court award PLAINTIFF compensatory damages, punitive damages, costs, and attorneys' fees, as well as any other relief this Court deems just and equitable.

COUNT V Title VII – Racial Discrimination (Against DEFENDANT CITY)

- 47. PLAINTIFF realleges paragraphs 1 46 as though fully set forth herein.
- 48. PLAINTIFF was subjected to a racially hostile work environment, discrimination, and disparate treatment by CPD officers and supervisors.
- 49. Defendant CITY failed to prevent or correct the discrimination and was deliberately indifferent to the violations, in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act.
- 50. As a result, PLAINTIFF has suffered emotional distress, reputational harm, and career setbacks.

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF respectfully requests that this Court enter Judgment in his favor and against the DEFENDANT CITY and award compensatory damages, court costs, attorneys' fees, and such other relief that this Court deems just and equitable.

COUNT VI Respondent Superior (Against DEFENDANT CITY)

- 51. PLAINTIFF realleges paragraphs 1-46 as though fully set forth herein.
- 52. At all relevant times, DEFENDANT CITY was the employer and/or principal of INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS as their employer.
 - 53. At all relevant times, DEFENDANTS were employed by DEFENDANT CITY.
- 54. INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS' conduct described in this Complaint occurred within the scope of their employment with DEFENDANT CITY.
- 55. As the INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS' employer, DEFENDANT CITY is liable for their conduct committed within the scope of their employment.

WHEREFORE, should this Court find any INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS liable for any state-law claims described in this Complaint, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against DEFENDANT CITY as their principal and employer pursuant to the doctrine of *respondeat superior* and such other additional relief as this Honorable Court deems just and equitable.

COUNT VII Indemnification Pursuant to 745 ILCS 10/9-102 (AGAINST DEFENDANT CITY)

- 56. PLAINTIFF realleges paragraphs 1 55 as though fully set forth herein.
- 57. DEFENDANT CITY is the employer of the DEFENDANT OFFICERS.

Case: 1:25-cv-10203 Document #: 1 Filed: 08/26/25 Page 9 of 9 PageID #:9

58. In the event that the DEFENDANT OFFICERS are found liable for their actions

performed in the course of their employment, the DEFENDANT CITY must indemnify such

employee for this verdict pursuant to 745 ILCS 10/9-102.

59. Pursuant to the Illinois Tort Immunity Act, 745 ILCS 10/9-102, DEFENDANT

CITY is liable for any judgments for compensatory damages arising from DEFENDANT

OFFICERS' actions.

WHEREFORE, should the DEFENDANT OFFICERS in their individual capacities be

found liable for any of the alleged counts in this cause, PLAINTIFF demands that, pursuant to 745

ILCS 10/9-102, DEFENDANT CITY pay any judgment obtained against any of the

DEFENDANT OFFICERS.

JURY DEMAND

PLAINTIFF demands trial by a twelve-person jury.

Respectfully submitted,

s/Blake Horwitz

Plaintiff's Attorney

Blake Horwitz, Esq.

The Blake Horwitz Law Firm, Ltd.

216 S. Jefferson St., Ste. 101

Chicago, IL 60661

Phone: (312) 676-2100

bhorwitz@bhlfattorneys.com

9

ILND 44 (Rev. 08/23) Case: 1:25-cv-10203 Do CINCIA & QYER & US/25 Page 1 of 1 PageID #:10

The ILND 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				DEFENDANTS					
ANTHONY BANKS				CITY OF CHICAGO, et. al.					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (Except in U.S. plaintiff cases)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (In U.S. plaintiff cases only) Note: In land condemnation cases, use the location of the tract of land involved.					
(c) Attorneys (firm name, address, and telephone number)				Attorneys (If Known)					
The Blake Horwitz Law Firm, (312) 676-2100									
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	III. C	TITIZENSHIP (OF PR	INCIP	AL PARTIES	For Diversity Cases Onl	y.)		
□ 1 U.S. Government ■ 3 Federal Question			(C)	heck <u>one</u> box, only for pla	intiff and <u>c</u> PTF	<u>one</u> box for DEF	r defendant.)	PTF	DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government not a party.)		C	Citizen of This State			Incorporated or Princi Business in This State	ipal Place of	□ 4
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate citizenship of parties in Item III.)		C	Citizen of Another State	2	□ 2	Incorporated and Prin of Business in Anothe		□ 5
				Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	□3	□ 3	Foreign Nation	□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT									
CONTRACT	TOR	rs		PRISONER PETIT		710 E	LABOR	OTHER STATUT	TES
☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL IN	JURY	510 Motions to Vaca Sentence	ite		air Labor Standards	375 False Claims Ac	t
☐ 120 Marine	310 Airplane	365 Personal Inju		530 General		□ 720 I	abor/Management	376 Qui Tam (31 U	SC
☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander ☐ 330 Federal Employers'	☐ 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceuti	cal	535 Death Penalty			Relations	☐ 3729 (a)) ☐ 400 State Reapportion	onment
_ 150 Nimer rec	Liability	Personal Inju Product Liab	-	Other:		☐ 740 F	Railway Labor Act	☐ 410 Antitrust	
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	340 Marine	368 Asbestos Per	rsonal	□540 Mandamus & Otl	her	☐ 751 I	Family and Medical	430 Banks and Bank	ing
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	☐ 345 Marine Product Liability ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle	Injury Produ Liability		□550 Civil Rights □555 Prison Condition		□ 790 (Leave Act Other Labor Litigation	☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation	
☐ 151 Medicare Act	355 Motor Vehicle Product	Liability		560 Civil Detainee -		_	Employee Retirement	470 Racketeer Influ	enced
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	PERSONAL PROF	PERTY	Conditions			Income Security Act	and Corrupt	
Student Loan (Excludes Veterans)	☐ 360 Other Personal Injury ☐ 362 Personal Injury - Medical	☐ 370 Other Fraud		of Confinement				Organizations ☐ 480 Consumer Cred	it
153 Recovery of Veteran's Benefits	Malpractice	371 Truth in Len			ļ	PROI	PERTY RIGHTS Copyright	485 Telephone Cons	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits		380 Other Person	nal			□ 830 P	atent	Protection Act (TCPA)
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability		Property Da				_	atent - Abbreviated New Drug Application	☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 850 Securities/Comm	nodities/
☐ 196 Franchise		Product Lia	bility			☐ 880 I	rademark Defend Trade Secrets	Exchange 890 Other Statutory	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	BANKRUPTC	v	FORFEITURE/PE	NALTY		Act of 2016 (DTSA) IAL SECURITY	☐ 891 Agricultural Art ☐ 893 Environmental 1	
210 Land Condemnation	¥ 440 Other Civil Rights			☐ 625 Drug Related Se			IIA (1395ff)	895 Freedom of Info	
☐ 220 Foreclosure	441 Voting	423 Withdrawal		of Property 21 USC 881		☐ 862 1	Black Lung (923)	Act	
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	442 Employment	28 USC 15	7	690 Other		☐ 863 1	DIWC/DIWW	896 Arbitration	
☐ 240 Torts to Land	☐443 Housing/Accommodations						(405(g))	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure	
245 Tort Product Liability	445 Amer. w/ Disabilities-	IMMIGRATIO					SID Title XVI	Act/Review or A	
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	462 Naturalization Application				☐ 865 F	RSI (405(g))	Agency Decision ☐ 950 Constitutionality	
	Other	☐ 463 Habeas Corp	ous –		- [DERAL TAXES	State Statutes	
	448 Education	Alien Detain				870	Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff		
		(Prisoner Pe	_			□ 871 I	or Defendant RS—Third Party		
		Actions	8				26 USC 7609		
V. ORIGIN (Check one box,									
□ 1 Original □ 2 Removed from □ 3 Remanded from □ 4 Reinstated □ 5 Transferred □ 6 Multidistrict □ 8 Multidistrict □ From Another □ Litigation - □ District □ 1 District □ 1 District □ 1 District □ 2 District □ 3 Remanded from □ 4 Reinstated □ 5 Transferred □ 6 Multidistrict □ 8 Multidistrict □ 8 Multidistrict □ 1 District □ 1 District □ 2 District □ 3 Remanded from □ 4 Reinstated □ 5 Transferred □ 6 Multidistrict □ 8 Multidistrict □ 1 District □ 2 District □ 3 Remanded from □ 4 Reinstated □ 5 Transferred □ 6 Multidistrict □ 8 District □ 1 District □ 1 District □ 2 District □ 3 Distr									
(specify)									
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Enter U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of cause.) VII. PREVIOUS BANKRUPTCY MATTERS (For nature of suit 422 and 423, enter the case number and judge for any associated bankruptcy matter previously adjudicated by indee of this Court. He appropriate the above the property of the property o									
Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Racial Discrimina									
VIII. REQUESTED IN Check if this is a class action under Rule				Demand \$				nt:	
COMPLAINT:	F.R.CV.P.				Jury Demand: ■ Yes				
IX. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions): Judge Case Number									
X. Is this a previously dismissed or remanded case? Yes No If yes, Case # Name of Judge									
Date: August 26, 2025 Signature of Attorney of Record Signature of Attorney of Record									