UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

MATTHEW T. DIXON and ROSALYN HENDERSON-DIXON,)
Plaintiffs,)
v.) Civil Action No. 13-29
CITY OF WILMINGTON,)
CORPORAL BARNES,)
PATROLMAN FORD,	ý
PATROLMAN LYNCH and	,
OFFICER NOLAN,	

Defendants.

NOTICE OF A LAWSUIT AND REQUEST TO WAIVE SERVICE OF A SUMMONS

To: City of Wilmington c/o Mayor of Wilmington 800 North French Street Wilmington, DE 19801

Why are you getting this?

A lawsuit has been filed against you, or the entity you represent, in this court under the number shown above. A copy of the complaint is attached.

This is not a summons, or an official notice from the court. It is a request that, to avoid expenses, you waive formal service of a summons by signing and returning the enclosed waiver. To avoid these expenses, you must return the signed waiver within 30 days from the date shown below, which is the date this notice was sent. Two copies of the waiver form are enclosed, along with a stamped, self-addressed envelope or other prepaid means for returning one copy. You may keep the other copy.

What happens next?

If you return the signed waiver, I will file it with the court. The action will then proceed as if you had been served on the date the waiver is filed, but no summons will be served on you and you will have 60 days from the date this notice is sent (see the date below) to answer the complaint (or 90 days if this notice is sent to you outside any judicial district of the United States).

If you do not return the signed waiver within the time indicated, I will arrange to have the summons and complaint served on you. And I will ask the court to require you, or the entity you represent, to pay the expenses of making service.

Please read the enclosed statement about the duty to avoid unnecessary expenses.

I certify that this request is being sent to you on the date below.

Date: January 9, 2013

Richard H. Morse

American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of

Delaware

100 West 10th Street, Suite 603

Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Telephone: (302) 654-5326 ext. 103

rmorse@aclu-de.org

Attorney for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

MATTHEW T. DIXON and ROSALYN HENDERSON-DIXON,)
Plaintiffs,)
v.) Civil Action No. 13-29
CITY OF WILMINGTON, CORPORAL BARNES,)))
PATROLMAN FORD,	ý
PATROLMAN LYNCH and	•
OFFICER NOLAN,	

Defendants.

WAIVER OF THE SERVICE OF SUMMONS

To: Richard H. Morse
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
of Delaware
100 West 10th Street, Suite 603
Wilmington, DE 19801

I have received your request to waive service of a summons in this action along with a copy of the complaint, two copies of this waiver form, and a prepaid means of returning one signed copy of the form to you.

I, or the entity I represent, agree to save the expense of serving a summons and complaint in this case.

I understand that I, or the entity I represent, will keep all defenses or objections to the lawsuit, the court's jurisdiction, and the venue of the action, but that I waive any objections to the absence of a summons or of service.

I also understand that I, or the entity I represent, must file and serve an answer or a motion under Rule 12 within 60 days from January 9, 2013, the date when this request was sent (or 90 days if it was sent outside the United States). If I fail to do so, a default judgment will be entered against me or the entity I represent.

Date:	<signature attorney="" of="" or="" party="" the="" unrepresented=""></signature>
	Printed name:Address:
	E-mail address: Telephone number:

Duty to Avoid Unnecessary Expenses of Serving a Summons

Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires certain defendants to cooperate in saving unnecessary expenses of serving a summons and complaint. A defendant who is located in the United States and who fails to return a signed waiver of service requested by a plaintiff located in the United States will be required to pay the expenses of service, unless the defendant shows good cause for the failure.

"Good cause" does *not* include a belief that the lawsuit is groundless, or that it has been brought in an improper venue, or that the court has no jurisdiction over this matter or over the defendant or the defendant's property.

If the waiver is signed and returned, you can still make these and all other defenses and objections, but you cannot object to the absence of a summons or of service.

If you waive service, then you must, within the time specified on the waiver form, serve an answer or a motion under Rule 12 on the plaintiff and file a copy with the court. By signing and returning the waiver form, you are allowed more time to respond than if a summons had been served.

RECEIPT#_

____ AMOUNT_

APPLYING IFP

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			L CITY OF WILMIN	GTON, CORPORAL BA	ARNES, PATROLMAN
MATTHEW T. DIXON and	d ROSALYN HENDERSON-DIXON			MAN LYNCH, and OFFIC	
(b) County of Residenc	e of First Listed Plaintiff New Castle		County of Residence o	f First Listed Defendant	New Castle
(i	EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES	ONLY)
		-	•	O CONDEMNATION CASES, US NVOLVED.	SE THE LOCATION OF THE
(c) Attorney's (Firm Nam	ւշ, Address, and Telephone Number) can Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Del	_	Attorneys (If Known)		
	can Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Del 3, Wilmington, DE 19801, 302- 654-5326, e				
II. BASIS OF JURIS	DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
5 1 450	Maria de la compansión de		(For Diversity Cases Only)		and One Box for Defendant)
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☑ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citize	en of This State		
🗇 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity	Citize	en of Another State	2	
	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		en or Subject of a 💢 🗖		□ 6 □ 6
IV NATURE OF OU		For	reign Country		
IV. NATURE OF SU	IT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	⇒FC	DRFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJUR		0 Agriculture	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	☐ 400 State Reapportionment
120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Personal Injury		0 Other Food & Drug	☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 410 Antitrust
 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 	☐ 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpractic Liability ☐ 365 Personal Injury		5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	28 USC 157	☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	t 🗇 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability		O Liquor Laws	PROPERTY RIGHTS	☐ 460 Deportation
& Enforcement of Judgmen 151 Medicare Act			ORR, & Truck	☐ 820 Copyrights	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and
☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	330 Federal Employers' Injury Product Liability Liability		0 Airline Regs. 0 Occupational	☐ 830 Patent ☐ 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit
Student Loans	340 Marine PERSONAL PROPER		Safety/Health	C 010 Huddinain	490 Cable/Sat TV
(Excl. Veterans)	345 Marine Product 370 Other Fraud		0 Other	COOK I A ON OUR YOUR	☐ 810 Selective Service
I 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	t Liability		LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff)	850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage	e	Act	☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	☐ 875 Customer Challenge
190 Other Contract	Product Liability		0 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	12 USC 3410
 ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise 	360 Other Personal Product Liability	/ JU 731	0 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIO	NS □ 74	0 Railway Labor Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	892 Economic Stabilization Act
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vaca	ite 🔯 79	0 Other Labor Litigation	□ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	893 Environmental Matters
☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 442 Employment Sentence ☐ 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus:	II 79	I Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	or Defendant) 1 871 IRS—Third Party	☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act ☐ 895 Freedom of Information
240 Torts to Land	Accommodations D 530 General		Security Ace	26 USC 7609	Act Act
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 535 Death Penalty	18808	IMMIGRATION		900Appeal of Fee Determination
290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - ☐ 540 Mandamus & Ot Employment ☐ 550 Civil Rights		2 Naturalization Application 3 Habeas Corpus -		Under Equal Access to Justice
	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - ☐ 555 Prison Condition		Alien Detainee	•	950 Constitutionality of
	Other	☐ 46:	5 Other Immigration		State Statutes
		ļ	Actions		
				-0.00 (10)	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Ø11 Original ☐ 2 R			Stated Of Life Danatha	erred from	
Proceeding S	tate Court Appellate Court	Reop	(specif	v) Lingation	Judgment
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a	ire filing (I	Do not cite jurisdictions	i statutes unless diversity):	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	Brief description of cause:				
	Unreasonable seizure and excessive	<u>/e force</u> (claim against police.		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	N		EMAND S	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CAS	SE(S)				
IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE	SIGNATURE OF A	TORNEY (-
1/3//3	Lichal	2/	Morae		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	- (U U)		11000		
- TO SERVE SERVER					

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGE

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

MATTHEW T. DIXON and ROSALYN HENDERSON-DIXON)	
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	c. a. no. <u>13-29</u>
CITY OF WILMINGTON, CORPORAL BARNES, PATROLMAN FORD, PATROLMAN LYNCH, and OFFICER NOLAN,))))	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
Defendants.)))	

COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs Matthew T. Dixon ("Dixon") and Rosalyn Henderson-Dixon ("Henderson-Dixon") hereby allege as follows:

The Parties

- 1. Plaintiffs Dixon and Henderson-Dixon were at all times relevant hereto residents of the state of Delaware. They currently reside at 1806 West 5th Street, Wilmington, DE 19805.
- 2. At all times material hereto, Dixon and Henderson-Dixon have been husband and wife.
- 3. Defendant Officers Barnes, Ford, Lynch and Nolan (collectively, "Defendant Officers") were at all times relevant hereto police officers employed the City of Wilmington, acting under color of law, to wit, under color of the statutes, ordinances, regulations, policies, authority, customs and usages of the City of Wilmington.

- 4. Defendant City of Wilmington, Delaware ("Defendant Wilmington") is a municipal corporation and the public employer of the Defendant Officers.
- 5. At all times relevant hereto, Barnes held the rank of Corporal and carried badge number 008342; Ford held the rank of Patrolman and carried badge number 04110; Lynch held the rank of Patrolman and carried badge number 041292; and Nolan held the rank of Officer and carried badge number 055742.

Nature of the Action

- 6. This is an action for monetary damages and injunctive relief brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution, and Article 1 § 6 of the Delaware Constitution, and under the common law of the State of Delaware, against Barnes, Ford, Lynch and Nolan in their individual capacities and against the City of Wilmington.
- 7. As alleged hereinafter, Defendant Officers used unreasonable, excessive and unjustified force against Dixon, made an unreasonable seizure of the person of Dixon, and made an unreasonable search of Dixon's vehicle, violating his rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and Article I, §6 of the Delaware Constitution; failed to advise Dixon of his rights despite seizing him and questioning him about criminal activity; and assaulted and battered Dixon.
- 8. It is further alleged hereinafter that the foregoing violations and torts were a result of deficient training and a culture of non-accountability in the Wilmington Police Department.

Jurisdiction and Venue

- 9. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343(a) because this action arises under 42 U.S.C. §1983, and supplemental jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367, to entertain claims arising under state law.
- 10. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the defendants because the City of Wilmington is a municipality of the state of Delaware and Defendant Officers engaged in the conduct complained of herein within the state of Delaware. Venue lies in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c).

Facts

Officer Conduct

- 11. On or about January 25, 2011 at approximately 2:00 a.m., Dixon was driving home from a gas station located approximately seven-tenths of a mile from his home. Dixon had gone to the gas station to get oil for the car and had put the oil in the car while in the gas station parking lot.
 - 12. As Dixon drove home, Defendant Officers began following him.
- 13. After Dixon parked in front of his home and turned off his car's ignition, he was approached by two of defendant police officers, one on each side of his car. The officers told Dixon to place his hands outside the window of the car, and threatened to use the taser on Dixon if he did not comply. Dixon replied that he was complying, and asked them not to tase him. Dixon also said that he could not lower the window because it was electric and could not be operated when the car was off. Dixon was afraid that if he restarted the car he would be seen as attempting to flee or injure the officers.

- 14. Defendant Officers asked for Dixon's license and registration. They then questioned him about criminal activity. Despite having seized Dixon, they did not state his Miranda rights before engaging in this questioning.
- 15. Dixon was then instructed to place his hands behind his back, which he did.

 Defendant Officers threatened to taser Dixon, then dragged him from the car, twisting his body.

 Defendant Officers put Dixon against his car with his hands above his head and palms down on the roof. Dixon told the Defendant Officers that he had a bad back and that he was not resisting. The Defendant Officers nonetheless cuffed his hands behind his back, picked him up by his arms, and slammed him face down into the sidewalk.
- 16. Dixon was screaming in pain and calling his wife's name. In response,
 Henderson-Dixon and Plaintiffs' teenage daughters opened their front door, saw what was
 happening, and pleaded with Defendant Officers to stop hurting Dixon. Defendant Officers
 responded by pointing a taser at them, ordering them to go back inside, and threatening to arrest
 Henderson-Dixon's 16-year-old daughter.
- 17. When Dixon was on the ground, Defendant Officers beat him. They kicked and tasered him without cause, burning his skin through several layers of winter clothing, and causing injuries to the muscles and ligaments in his neck and back and chest pain.
- 18. Defendant Officers arrested Dixon, although they had neither a warrant nor probable cause to do so.
- 19. Defendant Officers searched Dixon's car, although Dixon did not consent and they had neither a warrant nor probable cause to do so.
- 20. At all times during the events describe above, the Defendants were engaged in a joint venture. The individual officers assisted each other in performing the various actions

described and lent their physical presence and support and the authority of their office to each other during the said events.

- 21. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing actions by Defendant Officers, Dixon:
 - a. was deprived of his physical liberty;
- b. suffered physical and mental injuries, which are or may be permanent in nature;
- c. has been required to undergo medical treatment and incur medical expenses.

Departmental Deficiencies

- 22. On or about July 7, 2010 attorneys representing Defendant Wilmington and Wilmington police officers in a wrongful death and civil rights law suit that ultimately resulted in a \$875,000 payment by Defendant Wilmington were advised that an expert in police practices found that deficient training and practices in the Wilmington Police Department had led to the use of excessive force causing death.
- 23. Although Defendant Wilmington paid \$875,000 to settle the lawsuit in which it received that expert opinion of the plaintiff's experts, it took no remedial action in response to the expert report or any other information it learned in the lawsuit. The risks to which the police department's deficiencies exposed the public remained unchanged after the lawsuit was settled.
- 24. The wrongful conduct by Defendant Officers and the injuries and losses suffered by plaintiffs were a foreseeable result of the departmental deficiencies.

COUNT I: 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Individual Defendants

- 25. Paragraphs 1 through 24 are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth.
- 26. The arrest and the beating violated Dixon's clearly established and well settled constitutional rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution to be free from an unreasonable search and seizure of his person, the unreasonable, excessive and unjustified use of force and the deprivation of liberty without due process of law.
- 27. Plaintiff Dixon is entitled to recover under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Defendants Barnes, Ford, Lynch and Nolan.

COUNT II: Battery and False Imprisonment against Individual Defendants

- 28. Paragraphs 1 through 24 are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth.
- 29. Defendants Barnes, Ford, Lynch and Nolan assaulted and battered Dixon, and falsely imprisoned him.
- 30. Plaintiff Dixon is entitled to damages under the law of Delaware for the injuries and losses resulting from the aforesaid assault and battery.

COUNT III: Loss of Consortium

- 31. Paragraphs 1 through 24 are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth.
- 32. At all times relevant hereto and continuing today, Dixon and Henderson-Dixon have been husband and wife.
- 33. On January 25, 2011, Dixon was injured when Defendant Officers pulled him out of his car and kicked and tasered him repeatedly.

- 34. As a direct and proximate result of Dixon's injuries, Henderson-Dixon has suffered loss of the care, companionship, support and consortium of her husband. Henderson-Dixon also was required to expend large amounts of time in caring for her husband, which obligated her to take time off from work.
 - 35. Plaintiff Henderson-Dixon claims damages for these losses against Defendants.

COUNT IV: 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and Common Law of Delaware against City of Wilmington

- 36. Paragraphs 1 through 35 are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth.
- 37. Upon information and belief, Defendant Wilmington did not train Defendant Officers that conduct of the type described herein was unacceptable for police officers.
- 38. Upon information and belief, conduct of the type described herein is acquiesced in by Defendant Wilmington such that the actions of Defendant Officers were executed pursuant to the customs and usages of Defendant Wilmington.
- 39. The conduct of the Defendant Officers described herein resulted, in part, from the departmental deficiencies of which Defendant Wilmington had knowledge and to which it acquiesced.
- 40. Defendant City of Wilmington is liable for Plaintiffs' damages caused by the conduct of Defendant Officers alleged above.

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

- 41. WHEREFORE, the plaintiffs request:
- a. An award of compensatory damages against Defendants, jointly and severally;
 - b. Injunctive relief requiring the adoption and implementation of

- i. Proper internal investigatory practices;
- ii. Proper training and supervision;
- iii. An enforcement mechanism that will enable the public to determine whether appropriate has taken appropriate remedial measures and complied with the orders of this court;
- c. Reasonable attorney's fees, pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, and the costs of this action;
 - d. Such other and further relief as this Court deems appropriate.

/s/ Richard H. Morse

Richard Morse (I.D. #531)
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Delaware 100 West 10th Street, Suite 603
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
Telephone: (302) 654-5326 ext. 103

rmorse@aclu-de.org

Attorney for Plaintiffs

DATED: January 3, 2013