1 2 3 4	RICHARD M. MARTINEZ, SBA No. 7763 307 South Convent Avenue Tucson, Arizona 85701 (520) 327-4797 phone (520) 320-9090 fax richard@richardmartinezlaw.com Counsel for Plaintiff						
5	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT						
6	FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA						
7	MARTIN H. ESCOBAR						
8	Plaintiff, No.						
9 10	V. COMPLAINT						
10	JAN BREWER, Governor of () the State of Arizona, in her () Official and Individual ()						
	Capacity, TERRY GODDARD,						
12	Capacity, TERRY GODDARD, the Attorney General of the the State of Arizona, in his Official and Individual Capacity, the City of Tucson, a						
13	the City of Tucson, a)						
1415	municipal corporation, and) Barbara LaWall, County) Attorney, Pima County)						
16	Defendants.						
17 18	Plaintiff alleges:						
	I. JURISDICTION						
19	1. Jurisdiction is conferred on this Court by 28 U.S.C. § 1331and 1343(a)(4).						
20	II. VENUE						
21	Venue is proper in this Court because Defendants' unlawful conduct has						
22	been initiated and will occur within in the State of Arizona, including Pima County.						
23	III. PARTIES						
24	3. Plaintiff is a naturalized citizen of the United States and a resident of the						
25							
26	State of Arizona living in Pima County within the geographic boundaries of the City o Tucson. 4. Defendant Jan Brewer is the Governor of the State of Arizona, and as such						
27							
28							

the highest ranking state constitutional officer whose powers as the chief executive include the approval of legislation passed by the Arizona State Legislature,,

- 5. Defendant Terry Goddard is the Attorney General for the State of Arizona, and as such is the highest ranking law enforcement official for the State, has the authority to prosecute alleged violations of the enacted criminal statutes of the State of Arizona.
- 6. The City of Tucson is a municipal corporation, which exists pursuant statutory authority provided by the Legislature of the State of Arizona.
 - 7. Barbara LaWall is the County Attorney in Pima County.

IV. GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 8. Plaintiff is Hispanic.
- 9. Plaintiff is employed as a permanent Police Officer with the City of Tucson for the Tucson Police Department.
- 10. The Tucson Police Department was established and is operated by the City of Tucson.
- 11. Plaintiff's employment as a Police Officer requires as a condition of employment that he is certified as a Law Enforcement Official by the Arizona Peace Officer Standard and Training Board (AzPOST"), and maintain in good standing AZPOST Law Enforcement Certification.
- 12. The Tucson Police Department operates as a law enforcement agency for a community with a significant Hispanic population, approximately 36%, that reside within and travel throughout the incorporated area of the City which is also the jurisdictional area of all official responsibilities of plaintiff as a law enforcement official.
- 13. The City of Tucson is located within the geographic boundaries of Pima County; the County's Hispanic population in the 2000 Census was reported to be 247,578 and comprise 29.34% of the general population.
- 14. Plaintiff is currently assigned to uniform patrol in Operations Division South an area of the City of Tucson in which Hispanic represent well over 50% of the

residents, Spanish is commonly spoken and frequented by visitors from Mexico.

- 15. The City of Tucson is geographically located approximately 60 miles south of the international border between the United States of America and Mexico.
- 16. The State of Arizona shares a geographic border with the State of Sonora, Mexico that spans the entire length of the State of State of Arizona's southern border.
- 17. In the December 2008 publication prepared by the University of Arizona Eller College of Management for the Arizona Office of Tourism, Mexican Visitors to Arizona: Visitor Characteristics and Economic Impacts, 2007-08, it was reported that over 24 million lawful Mexican alien crossings occurred from Mexico to Arizona from July 2007 to June 2008 and that the City of Tucson is a major destination point for Mexican visitors.
- 18. The City of Tucson is connected to the border cities of Nogales, Sonora Mexico and Nogales Arizona by Interstate 19, an established part the United States Interstate Freeway system; Interstate 19 is a major corridor of travel between citizens of Mexico and United States who utilize this roadway on a 24/7 basis and number in the hundreds of thousands. Additionally, the I-19 corridor is utilized as a significant commercial corridor for international trade and goods in the hundreds of millions of dollars on an annual basis.
- 19. In plaintiff's experience as a Law Enforcement Officer, proximity to the Mexican border does not provide any race neutral criteria or basis to suspect or identify who is lawfully in the United States.
- 20. In plaintiff's experience as a Law Enforcement Officer, neither the racial and linguistic characteristics of Operations Division South or the Mexican national visitors thereto provide any race neutral criteria or basis to suspect or identify who is lawfully in the United States.
- 21. During the performance of plaintiff's duties as a Law Enforcement Officer he has daily contact with numerous Hispanics, a number of whom have a skin color and/or physical features that are commonly attributed to Hispanics; In plaintiff's

experience as a Law Enforcement Officer, skin color and/or physical features does not provide any race neutral criteria or basis to suspect or identify who is lawfully in the United States.

- 22. During the performance of plaintiff's duties as a Law Enforcement Officer he has daily contact with numerous Hispanics, a number of whom dress in a manner that is commonly and/or stereotypical in attribution to Hispanics; In plaintiff's experience as a Law Enforcement Officer, the clothing worn by any person does not provide any race neutral criteria or basis to suspect or identify who is lawfully in the United States.
- 23. During the performance of plaintiff's duties as a Law Enforcement Officer, he has daily contact with numerous Hispanics, a number of whom are Spanish-speaking, some monolingual Spanish-speakers, some Spanish dominant and some who speak English with an accent; In plaintiff's experience as a Law Enforcement Officer, a person's linguistic capabilities in Spanish and/or English do not provide any race neutral criteria or basis to suspect or identify who is lawfully in the United States.
- 24. During the performance of plaintiff's duties as a Law Enforcement Officer, he has daily contact with numerous Hispanics, a number of whom listen to Spanish-language radio, television and music; In his experience as a Law Enforcement Officer, listening to Spanish-language radio, watching Spanish-language television or playing Spanish-language music does not provide any race neutral criteria or basis to suspect or identify who is lawfully in the United States.
- 25. During the performance of plaintiff's duties as a Law Enforcement Officer, he has daily contact with numerous Hispanics, a number of whom are in vehicles that are common and/or stereotypical in attribution to Hispanics; In plaintiff's experience as a Law Enforcement Officer, the vehicle a person is in person does not provide any race neutral criteria or basis to suspect or identify who is lawfully in the United States.
- 26. During the performance of plaintiff's duties as a Law Enforcement Officer, he has daily contact with numerous Hispanics, a number of whom use public

transportation, commuter vans or commercial carriers; In plaintiff's experience as a Law Enforcement Officer, the use of public transportation, commuter vans or commercial carriers does not provide any race neutral criteria or basis to suspect or identify who is lawfully in the United States.

- 27. During the performance of plaintiff's duties as a Law Enforcement Officer, he has daily contact with numerous Hispanics, a number of whom are in vehicles with out of state and Mexican automobile license plates; In plaintiff's experience as a Law Enforcement Officer, the license plate on a vehicle does not provide any race neutral criteria or basis to suspect or identify who is lawfully in the United States.
- 28. During the performance of plaintiff's duties as a Law Enforcement Officer, he has daily contact with numerous Hispanics, a number of whom live or are inside a residence that is common and/or stereotypical in attribution to Hispanics to Hispanics;
- 29. During the performance of plaintiff's duties as a Law Enforcement Officer he has daily contact with numerous Hispanics, some of whom are elementary, middle and high school age and at times occur on school grounds or in close proximity thereto.
- 30. In plaintiff's experience as a Law Enforcement Officer, contact with K-12 school age Hispanic children that includes any inquiry into the student's or parents status in the United States is not premised on race neutral criteria or basis to suspect or identify who is lawfully in the United States and does not occur without invading the student's privacy, right to due process or equal protection.
- 31. In plaintiff's experience as a Law Enforcement Officer, there are no race neutral criteria or basis to suspect or identify who is lawfully in the United States; requiring such, the mandate of SB 1070, compels under threat of lawsuit, discipline and loss of required certification every Law Enforcement Officer in the State of Arizona to actively engage in racial profiling to detain, question and require every Hispanic found within the limits of the City of Tucson to prove their legal status in the United

States of America irrespective of county of origin, citizenship, immigrant status based solely on immutable and mutable characteristics common or stereotypical in attribution to Hispanics.

- 32. During the performance of plaintiff's duties as a Law Enforcement Officer he has daily contact with Hispanics during the investigation into potential criminal activity, an investigation that is often dependent on the cooperation, information and trust of Hispanic witnesses and victims; In plaintiff's experience as a Law Enforcement Officer, requiring law enforcement to routinely question Hispanics about their immigrant status in the United States and require production of actual proof of their lawful presence in the United States would seriously impede law enforcement investigations and facilitate the successful commission of crimes in the United States.
- 33. Defendant Brewer signed Senate Bill 1070 into law on Friday, April 23rd, 2010 and on the same date issued Executive Order 2010-09 requiring AzPOST to prescribe a minimum training course for law enforcement officers in the state and all political subdivisions to implement SB 1070 while allowing for use of race, color and national origin as permissible factors to consider in establishing reasonable suspicion that a person is an undocumented alien.
- 34. SB 1070 compels plaintiff as a AzPOST certified Law Enforcement Officer for the City of Tucson to determine the immigration status of Hispanics, detain, arrest and criminally cite undocumented persons and lawful residents of the United States who fail to complete or carry an alien registration document.
- 35. SB 1070 amends A.R.S. § 13-1509, and provides for the criminal prosecution as a class 1 misdemeanor and as a felony persons who fail to complete or carry an alien registration document.
- 36. The City of Tucson has established and maintains as a part of the City Attorney's Office, a criminal prosecution entity that routinely prosecutes criminal matters within the jurisdiction of the Tucson Municipal City Court.
 - 37. Barbara LaWall, as the County Attorney for Pima County has the

responsibility and duty to prosecute alleged violations of the criminal laws enacted in Arizona by charging such alleged offenses in the Pima County Justice Court or the Superior Court of the State of Arizona in Pima County.

- 38. At all times relevant to this complaint, Defendants have announced and made clear their intent to implement and enforce SB 1070, enacted legislation of the State of Arizona, a session law that places every Hispanic within the State of Arizona at substantial risk of the immediate loss of rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution, including unlawful detention, denial of due process, equal protection based solely on their race, Hispanic.
- 39. SB 1070 was enacted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona and signed into law by Defendant Brewer as a result of racial bias and anti-Hispanic beliefs and sentiments.
- 40. Plaintiff believes that SB 1070 is the product of racial bias aimed specifically at Hispanics, is unlawful, results in impermissible deprivations of rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution, has voiced his opinions of such in the work place and been confronted by Law Enforcement Officer's for expressing such beliefs.
- 41. The City of Tucson, including the Tucson Police Department has no agreement or authorization as provided for and required by 8 U.S.C. § 1357, Subsection 287(g)(1) and (5) to allow, instruct or order any City of Tucson employee, including and of its 1,100 plus authorized Law Enforcement Officers to make any inquiry of any individual concerning the person's immigration status or require proof of lawful presence in the United States.

COUNT ONE

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT: DUE PROCESS

(42 U.S.C. § 1983)

42. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates all allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 41 as if fully set forth herein.

1	has suffered injury.				
2	COUNT FIVE				
3	FOURTH AMENDMENT				
4	54. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates all allegations contained in				
5	paragraphs 1 through 53 as if fully set forth herein.				
6	55. Defendants' actions against Plaintiff constitute a violation of the Fourth				
7	Amendment to the United States Constitution.				
8	56. As a direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendants', Plaintif				
9	has suffered injury.				
10	COUNT SIX				
11	FEDERAL PREEMPTION & UNAUTHORIZED OR SUPERVISED FEDERAL				
12	IMMIGRATION CONDUCT				
13	(8 U.S.C. § 1357)				
14	57. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates all allegations contained in				
15	paragraphs 1 through 56 as if fully set forth herein.				
16	58. Defendants' actions against Plaintiff constitute a violation of 8 U.S.C. §				
17	1357, Subsection 287(g)(1) and (5) as the City of Tucson has no authorization or				
18	agreement with the United States to perform any immigration inquiries of any				
19	persons present in the United States.				
20	59. As a direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff				
21	has suffered injury.				
22	DECLARATORY JUDGMENT				
23	(28 U.S.C. § 2201)				
24	60. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates all allegations contained in				
25	paragraphs 1 through 59 as if fully set forth herein.				
26	61. Plain seeks a declaratory judgment as provided in 28 U.S.C. § 2201				
27	et.seq.				
28	//				

V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays:

- 1. That this court declare the actions complained of herein to be in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the First, Fourth, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.
- 2. That Defendants' be ordered to take appropriate injunctive and affirmative acts to insure that the actions complained of herein are not engaged in again by them or any of its agents.
- 3. That Defendants', including the officers, director, agents, employees and successors be permanently enjoined from engaging any immigration stops, questioning, detention, citing or any law enforcement activity reserved to the federal government.
 - 4. That Plaintiff be awarded his attorneys' fees;
 - 5. That Plaintiff be awarded his costs; and
- 6. That Plaintiff be awarded all other relief that this court deems just and proper under the circumstances.

DATED this 28th day of April 2009.

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

<u>s/Richard M. Martinez, Esq.</u> Richard M. Martinez, Esq. Counsel for Plaintiff

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

Case 4:10-cv-00249-PCBIID PCOVER 15HEEilard 04/29/10 Page 1 of 2

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	STRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE PORM.)	DEFEN	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)		
	of First Listed Plaintiff XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) Address, and Telephone Number)	NOT			
II. BASIS OF JURISD	DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSI	HIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTI	ES(Place an "Y" in One Roy for Plaintiff	
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	(For Diversity Citizen of This State	Cases Only) PTF DEF	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF or Principal Place	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another S Citizen or Subject or Foreign Country	of Business	and Principal Place 5 5 5 5 S In Another State 5 6 6 6 6	
	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)				
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 380 Other Personal Property Dama Property Dama	y - George Control of Property 2 George Control of Propert	\$\frac{1}{2} \text{ Appeal 28 USC 158}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 423 Withdrawal} \text{ 28 USC 157}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 420 Copyrights} \text{ 360 Copyrights}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 830 Patent}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 840 Trademark}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 840 Trademark}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 861 HIA (1395ff)}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 862 Black Lung (923)}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405())}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 865 RSI (405(g))}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 871 IRS—Third Party}\$ \$\frac{2}{2} \text{ USC 7609}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 470 USC 7609}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 423 Withdrawal}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 423 Withdrawal}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 420 Copyrights}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 840 Trademark}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 840 Trademark}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 862 Black Lung (923)}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405())}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 865 RSI (405(g))}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 865 RSI (405(g))}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)}\$ \$\frac{1}{2} \text{ 871 IRS—Third Party}\$ \$\frac{2}{2} \text{ USC 7609}\$	890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act	
□ 1 Original □ 2 Re	an "X" in One Box Only) emoved from	☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened	(specify) Litiga	ntion Judgment	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you	are filing (Do not cite j	urisdictional statutes unless diversit	ty):	
vii chest of heli	Brief description of cause:				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	ON DEMAND \$	CHECK YES o JURY DEMA	only if demanded in complaint: ND: ☐ Yes ☐ No	
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE	SIGNATURE OF	ATTORNEY OF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY					
RECEIPT # A	MOUNT APPLYING IFP	·	JUDGE MAG	S. 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.