

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

_____	:	
PHYLLIS A. MITCHELL,	:	
both individually and on behalf of a class of	:	
others similarly situated,	:	
	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	Civil Action Number
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
THE COUNTY OF CLINTON,	:	
DAVID FAVRO,	:	
both individually and in his	:	
official capacity as Sheriff of the County of	:	
Clinton, JERRY MAGGY, both	:	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
individually and as Undersheriff of the	:	
County of Clinton, and MICHAEL	:	
SMITH, both individually and as	:	
Major in the Clinton County Sheriff's	:	
Department,	:	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
	:	
Defendants.	:	
_____	:	

INTRODUCTION

This is a class action brought to redress the deprivation by Defendants of rights secured to the Plaintiffs and proposed Class by the United States Constitution and the laws of the United States of America. For at least the past several years, the Clinton County Sheriff's Department has had a policy of strip-searching all individuals who enter the Clinton County Jail and are placed in jail clothing, regardless of the crime upon which they are charged. Upon information and belief, this policy is, in part, derived from the written procedures of the Clinton County Sheriff's Department, and was promulgated by senior Department officials; specifically, Defendants David Favro, Jerry Maggy and Michael Smith.

It has been well established in this judicial circuit for many years that individuals charged with misdemeanors or violations cannot be strip-searched absent particularized suspicion that they possess weapons or contraband. In fact, several judges in this Judicial District, as well as the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, have recently held that blanket strip search policies/practices like those in dispute in this case are unconstitutional. In short, the policy of Clinton County and the Clinton County Sheriff's Department to forcing those charged with minor crimes to undergo the indignities of a strip search upon entry into the Clinton County Jail is not only clearly illegal, but is degrading, insensitive and unnecessary.

Phyllis Mitchell brings this action on behalf of herself, and on behalf of a class of thousands of others who were strip searched after being charged with petty crimes, to vindicate the clear and unnecessary violation of her civil rights and those of the class members she proposes to represent. Ms. Mitchell was charged with several unclassified Agricultural & Markets Law misdemeanors for not feeding her dogs, and was subjected to a strip search, in violation of their right against unreasonable searches under the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution. She seeks monetary damages for herself and each member of the proposed class, a declaration that the Sheriff's Department's policies/practices are unconstitutional, and an injunction precluding Clinton County and the Clinton County Sheriff's Department from continuing to violate the rights of those placed into their custody. With this as a background, Plaintiff Phyllis Mitchell, through counsel, hereby complains as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This Court has jurisdiction over this action under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1341 & 1343 because it is filed to obtain compensatory damages, punitive damages, and injunctive relief for the deprivation, under color of state law, of the rights of citizens of the United States secured by the Constitution and federal law pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981 & 1983. This Court also has jurisdiction over this action under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 2201, as it is filed to obtain declaratory relief relative to the Constitutionality of the policies of a local government.

2. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e)(2) because the events giving rise to Plaintiffs' claims and those of proposed class members occurred in this judicial district.

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff Phyllis A. Mitchell ("Mitchell") is 47 years old and resides in Clinton County, New York. On or about March 27, 2003, Mitchell was arrested and placed in the Clinton County Jail on charges of Abandonment of Animals, Failure to Provide Proper Sustenance (two counts), and Failure to Provide Proper Food and Drink, all misdemeanors under New York's Agricultural and Markets Law. Ms. Mitchell was also charged with the violation of having an unlicensed dog.

4. Defendant County of Clinton (the "County") is a county government organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York. At all times relevant hereto, the County, acting through its Sheriff's Department, was responsible for the policies, practices, supervision, implementation and conduct of all matters pertaining to

the Clinton County Jail and was responsible for the appointment, training, supervision and conduct of all Sheriff's Department personnel, including those working in the Clinton County Jail. In addition, at all relevant times, the County was responsible for enforcing the rules of the Clinton County Jail, and for ensuring that Sheriff's Department personnel employed in the Jail obey the Constitution and laws of the United States and of the State of New York.

5. The Clinton County Sheriff's Department (the "Sheriff's Department") is a County Sheriff's Department organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York. Although not a legal entity for the purposes of litigation, the Department is listed as a party for the purposes of identification. At all times relevant hereto, the Sheriff's Department was responsible for operating, organizing, overseeing and administering the Clinton County Jail ("CCJ"). At all times relevant hereto, Defendant Sheriff's Department, together with the County of Clinton, was responsible for the policies, practices, supervision, implementation and conduct of all matters pertaining to the CCJ, and was responsible for the appointment, training, supervision and conduct of all Sheriff's Department personnel, including those working in the CCJ. In addition, at all times relevant hereto, Defendant Sheriff's Department, together with the County of Clinton, was responsible for enforcing the rules of the Clinton County Jail, and for ensuring that Sheriff's Department personnel employed in the CCJ obeyed the Constitution and laws of the United States and of the State of New York.

6. Defendant David Favro ("Sheriff Favro") is the duly elected Sheriff of Clinton County, and, as such, is a policy maker with respect to the treatment of pre-trial and other detainees over which the CCJ exercises custodial or other control. Sheriff Favro's

principal place of business is 25 McCarthy Drive, Plattsburgh, NY 12901. Sheriff Favro is made a Defendant in this action in both his individual and official capacities.

7. Defendant Jerry Maggy (“Undersheriff Maggy”) is the duly appointed Undersheriff of Clinton County and, as such, is a policy maker with respect to the treatment of pre-trial and other detainees over which the CCJ exercises custodial or other control. Undersheriff Maggy’s principal place of business is 25 McCarthy Drive, Plattsburgh, NY 12901. Undersheriff Maggy is made a Defendant in this action in both his individual and official capacities.

8. Defendant Michael Smith (“Major Smith”) is the duly appointed Major of the Clinton County Sheriff’s Department and is the officer in charge of the operation of the Clinton County Jail. As such, Major Smith is a policy maker with respect to the treatment of pre-trial and other detainees over which the CCJ exercises custodial or other control. Major Smith’s principal place of business is 25 McCarthy Drive, Plattsburgh, NY 12901. Major Smith is made a Defendant in this action in both his individual and official capacities.

9. Collectively, Sheriff Favro, Undersheriff Maggy, and Major Smith will be referred to as the “Policy Making Defendants.”

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

10. Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to Rules 23(b)(1), 23(b)(2) and 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of themselves and a class of similarly situated individuals who were charged with misdemeanors or minor crimes and were strip searched upon their entry into the Clinton County Jail.

11. The class that Plaintiff seeks to represent is defined as follows:

All persons who have been or will be placed into the custody of the Clinton County Jail after being charged with misdemeanors, violations, violations of probation or parole, traffic infractions, civil commitments or other minor crimes and were or will be strip searched upon their entry into the Clinton County Jail pursuant to the policy, custom and practice of the Clinton County Sheriff's Department and the County of Clinton. The class period commences on February 28, 2003 and extends to the date on which the Clinton County Sheriff's Department and/or the County of Clinton are enjoined from, or otherwise cease, enforcing their unconstitutional policy, practice and custom of conducting strip searches absent reasonable suspicion. Specifically excluded from the class are Defendants and any and all of their respective affiliates, legal representatives, heirs, successors, employees or assignees.

12. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action under Federal law and satisfies the numerosity, commonality, typicality and adequacy requirements for maintaining a class action under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a).

13. The members of the class are so numerous as to render joinder impracticable. Upon information and belief, there are hundreds of people arrested for misdemeanors and violations who are placed into the custody of the Clinton County Jail every month – all of whom are members of the proposed class. Upon information and belief, the size of the proposed class totals at least 2,000 individuals, some of whom have had their civil rights violated on multiple occasions.

14. Upon information and belief, joinder of all of these individuals is impracticable because of the large number of class members and the fact that class members are likely dispersed over a large geographical area, with some members presently residing outside of Clinton County and this Judicial District. Furthermore, upon information and belief, many members of the class are low-income persons, may not speak English, and likely would have great difficulty in pursuing their rights individually.

15. Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Class, in that they all had their right to be free from unreasonable searches violated by Defendants' conducting strip searches absent particularized suspicion. All members of the class were charged with misdemeanors or violations when placed into the custody of the Clinton County Jail, and all were illegally strip searched in violation of the clearly established law in this judicial circuit.

16. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class. Plaintiff and all members of the class sustained damages arising out of Defendants' course of conduct. The harms suffered by the Plaintiff are typical of the harms suffered by the class members.

17. The representative Plaintiff has the requisite personal interest in the outcome of this action and will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiff has no interests that are adverse to the interests of the members of the Class.

18. Plaintiff has retained counsel who has substantial experience and success in the prosecution of class action and civil rights litigation. The named Plaintiff is being represented by Elmer Robert Keach, III; Bruce Menken and Jason Rozger of Berenbaum

Menken & Ben-Asher, LLP; Gary E. Mason and Charles Schneider of The Mason Law Firm, PLLC; and Jonathan Cuneo and Charles LaDuca of Cuneo Gilbert & LaDuca, LLP. Mr. Keach is an experienced civil rights and class action attorney who has litigated a wide variety of civil rights actions before this Court, and has litigated class action lawsuits in state and federal courts in five states. Mr. Keach has successfully litigated a series of strip search class actions before this Court, including cases against Rensselaer, Schenectady and Montgomery County.

19. Bruce Menken and Jason Rozger are both experienced civil rights attorneys from New York City, having litigated scores of civil rights cases against a number of Defendants, including one prison brutality case presently pending in this District. Mr. Menken and Mr. Rozger have successfully represented many victims of illegal strip searches, including several who opted out of the recent class action litigation against the City of New York. Mr. Menken and Mr. Rozger were also co-counsel in the Rensselaer, Schenectady, Montgomery and Schoharie County class actions.

20. Gary E. Mason is one of this country's premier class action attorneys, with offices in Washington, DC. Mr. Mason has successfully litigated class actions against Fortune 500 companies in both state and federal court in over a dozen jurisdictions, including gaining a settlement for a class of purchasers of defective polybutylene pipe of \$ 950 million dollars. Mr. Mason has served as lead or co-counsel in numerous high profile class actions, including In Re The Exxon Valdez, In Re Diet Drugs Product Liability Litigation and In Re Synthetic Stucco (EIFS) Product Liability Litigation. In addition to his extensive experience as a class action and environmental lawyer, Charles Schneider is a former trial attorney with the U.S. Department of Justice's Civil Rights

Division and has successfully litigated a series of cases involving corrections misconduct. Mr. Mason and Mr. Schneider were also co-counsel in the Rensselaer, Schenectady and Montgomery County class actions.

21. Jonathan Cuneo and Charles LaDuca of Cuneo Waldman & Gilbert, have extensive experience in state and federal trial and appellate courts, before law enforcement authorities and in proceedings before the United States Congress. Cuneo and LaDuca have successfully prosecuted several complex class actions, including cases involving securities fraud, antitrust violations, consumer protection and products liability in state and federal courts throughout the United States. Mr. Cuneo and Mr. LaDuca were also co-counsel in the Schenectady County class action.

22. In short, Plaintiff's counsel has the resources, expertise and experience to successfully prosecute this action against Clinton County, the Clinton County Sheriff's Department and the Policy Making Defendants. Counsel for Plaintiff knows of no conflicts among members of the class, or between counsel and members of the class.

23. This action, in part, seeks declaratory and injunctive relief. As such, the Plaintiff seeks class certification under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2), in that all class members were subject to the same policy requiring the illegal strip searches of individuals charged with misdemeanor or minor crimes and placed into the custody of the Clinton County Jail. In short, the County of Clinton, the Clinton County Sheriff's Department, the Policy Making Defendants and Clinton County Corrections Officers acted on grounds generally applicable to all class members.

24. In addition to certification under Rule 23(b)(2), and in the alternative, Plaintiff seeks certification under Rule 23(b)(3).

25. Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Class, and predominate over any questions that affect only individual members of the Class. These common questions of law and fact include, without limitation, the common and predominate question of whether the Defendants' written and/or *de facto* policy/practice of strip searching all individuals charged with misdemeanors or minor crimes and committed to the Clinton County Jail is a violation of the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, and whether such a written and/or *de facto* policy existed during the class period.

26. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy, since joinder of all of the individual members of the class is impracticable given the large number of class members and the fact that they are dispersed over a large geographical area. Furthermore, the expense and burden of individual litigation would make it difficult or impossible for individual members of the class to redress the wrongs done to them. The cost to the federal court system of adjudicating thousands of individual cases would be enormous. Individualized litigation would also magnify the delay and expense to all parties and the court system. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action in this District presents far fewer management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and the court system, and protects the rights of each member of the Class.

27. Upon information and belief, there are no other actions pending to address the Defendants' flagrant violation of the civil rights of thousands of individuals, even though the Defendants have maintained their illegal strip search regimen for the past several years.

28. In the alternative to certification under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3), Plaintiff also seeks partial certification under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(4).

FACTS

Facts Applicable to the Class Generally

29. The Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution prohibits state officials, such as the Policy Making Defendants in this action and the Corrections Officers they supervise, from performing strip searches of arrestees who have been charged with misdemeanors or other minor crimes unless the officer has reasonable suspicion to believe that the arrestee is concealing a weapon or contraband.

30. Upon information and belief, the County of Clinton, the Clinton County Sheriff's Department and the Policy Making Defendants have instituted a written and/or *de facto* policy, custom or practice of strip searching all individuals who enter the custody of the Clinton County Jail (by forcing them to remove their clothing for a visual inspection of their bodies and/or forcing them to submit to a visual inspection of their body cavities) and are placed into jail clothing, regardless of the nature of their charged crime and without the presence of reasonable suspicion to believe that the individual was concealing a weapon or contraband. For purposes of this Complaint, strip and visual cavity searches are collectively referred to as "strip searches."

31. The County of Clinton, the Clinton County Sheriff's Department, and the Policy Making Defendants know that they may not institute, enforce or permit enforcement of a policy or practice of conducting strip searches without particularized, reasonable suspicion. This judicial circuit has stated repeatedly that state officials may not strip search individuals charged with misdemeanors or violations absent particularized, reasonable suspicion, with this principle being clearly established in 1986 by *Weber v. Dell*, 804 F.2d 796 (2d Cir. 1986) and recently affirmed by *Shain v. Ellison*,

273 F.3d 56 (2d Cir. 2001), *cert. denied sub. nom, Nassau Co. v. Shain*, 537 U.S. 1083 (2002).

32. The Defendants' written and/or *de facto* policy, practice and custom mandating wholesale strip searches of all misdemeanor and violation arrestees has been promulgated, effectuated and/or enforced in bad faith and contrary to clearly established law.

33. Reasonable suspicion to conduct a strip search may only emanate from the particular circumstances antecedent to the search, such as the nature of the crime charged, the particular characteristics of the arrestees, and/or the circumstances of the arrest.

34. Upon information and belief, the County of Clinton, the Clinton County Sheriff's Department and Policy Making Defendants have promulgated, implemented, enforced, and/or failed to rectify a written and/or *de facto* policy, practice or custom of strip searching all individuals placed into the custody of the Clinton County Jail and placed into jail clothing without any requirement of reasonable suspicion, or indeed suspicion of any sort. This written and/or *de facto* policy made the strip searching of pre-trial detainees routine; neither the nature of the offense charged, the characteristics of the arrestee, nor the circumstances of a particular arrest were relevant to the enforcement of the policy, practice and custom of routine strip searches.

35. Pursuant to this written and/or *de facto* policy, each member of the Class, including the named Plaintiff, was the victim of a routine strip search upon their entry into the Clinton County Jail. These searches were conducted without inquiry into or establishment of reasonable suspicion, and in fact were not supported by reasonable

suspicion. Strip searches are conducted for individuals arrested for, among other innocuous offenses, Driving While Intoxicated, Harassment and Trespassing.

36. As a direct and proximate result of the unlawful strip search conducted pursuant to this written and/or *de facto* policy, the victims of the unlawful strip searches – each member of the class, including the named Plaintiff – has suffered or will suffer psychological pain, humiliation, suffering and mental anguish.

Facts Applicable to the Named Plaintiff

37. Phyllis Mitchell's experience is representative of the class at large. On or about March 27, 2003, Ms. Mitchell was arrested and placed in the Clinton County Jail on charges of Abandonment of Animals, Failure to Provide Proper Sustenance (two counts), and Failure to Provide Proper Food and Drink (to animals), all misdemeanors under New York's Agricultural and Markets Law. Ms. Mitchell subsequently spent one night in the Clinton County Jail before posting \$7,000.00 bail, and was released from the Clinton County Jail on March 28, 2003. Ms. Mitchell is presently 47 years old, and has no prior criminal history. She was taken into custody by the New York State Police. The circumstances of her criminal charges are that she is alleged to have failed to feed several animals at her former home in Ellenberg, New York. Upon information and belief, these charges were eventually resolved with Ms. Mitchell agreeing to an Adjournment in Contemplation of Dismissal.

38. At approximately 7:00 PM on or about March 27, 2003, Ms. Mitchell was transported to the Clinton County Jail on \$7,000.00 bail. Approximately thirty minutes later, Ms. Mitchell was moved into a room with lockers on the wall in the booking area of

the Clinton County Jail and was forced to remove her clothing. As a Corrections Officer watched, Ms. Mitchell removed all of her clothing, including her underpants and brassiere.

39. A Corrections Officer then instructed Ms. Mitchell to lift her breasts, and then to squat and cough. Ms. Mitchell complied, with the Corrections Officer conducting a visual inspection of Ms. Mitchell's vaginal and rectal area. Mitchell was then provided with a jail uniform.

40. On this particular occasion, there was no reasonable suspicion to believe that Ms. Mitchell was concealing a weapon or other contraband. Indeed, no inquiry was made of Ms. Mitchell that could have given rise to the requisite reasonable suspicion.

41. As a direct and proximate result of the unlawful strip search conducted pursuant to County and Sheriff's Department policy, practice and custom, Ms. Mitchell has suffered and continues to suffer psychological pain, humiliation, suffering and mental anguish.

CAUSES OF ACTION

AS AND FOR A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

Violation of Constitutional Rights Under Color of State Law

-- Unreasonable Search and Failure to Implement Municipal Policies to Avoid Constitutional Deprivations Under of Color of State Law --

42. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation stated in paragraphs 1 through 41.

43. The Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution protects citizens from unreasonable searches by law enforcement officers, and prohibits officers from conducting strip searches of individuals arrested for misdemeanors or violations absent some particularized suspicion that the individual in question has either contraband or weapons.

44. The actions of Defendants detailed above violated Plaintiff's rights under the United States Constitution. Simply put, it was not objectively reasonable for Clinton County Corrections Officers to strip search Plaintiff and class members based on their arrests for misdemeanor/violation charges. It was also not objectively reasonable for the Policy Making Defendants to order/direct Clinton County Corrections Officers to conduct such searches.

45. These strip searches were conducted pursuant to the policy, custom or practice of the County of Clinton and the Clinton County Sheriff's Department. As such, the County of Clinton is directly liable for the damages of the named Plaintiff and members of the Class.

46. Upon information and belief, Sheriff Favro, Undersheriff Maggy and Major Smith are responsible for establishing the policies and procedures to be utilized in the

operation of the Clinton County Jail, and are responsible for the implementation of the strip search policy questioned in this lawsuit. As such, Favro, Maggy and Smith are each individually responsible for the damages of the named Plaintiff and members of the Class.

47. Sheriff Favro, Undersheriff Maggy and Major Smith knew that the CCJ's strip search policy was illegal, and acted willfully, knowingly, and with specific intent to deprive Plaintiff and members of the Class of their Constitutional rights.

48. This conduct on the part of all Defendants represents a violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983, given that their actions were undertaken under color of state law.

49. As a direct and proximate result of the unconstitutional acts described above, Plaintiff and members of the proposed class have been irreparably injured.

AS AND FOR A SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

-- Demand for Declaratory Judgment --

50. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation stated in paragraphs 1 through 49.

51. The policy, custom and practice of the Clinton County Sheriff's Department, the County of Clinton and the Policy Making Defendants is clearly unconstitutional, in that these entities and individuals are directing/conducting the strip searches of all individuals placed into the Clinton County Jail without any particularized suspicion that the individuals in question have either contraband or weapons.

52. Plaintiff and members of the Class request that this Court issue a declaratory judgment, and that it declare the strip search policy of the County of Clinton and the Clinton County Sheriff's Department to be unconstitutional.

AS AND FOR A THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

-- Demand for Preliminary and Permanent Injunction --

53. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation stated in paragraphs 1 through 52.

54. The policy, custom and practice of the Clinton County Sheriff's Department, the County of Clinton and the Policy Making Defendants is clearly unconstitutional, in that these entities and individuals are directing/conducting the strip searches of all individuals placed into the Clinton County Jail without any particularized suspicion that the individuals in question have either contraband or weapons.

55. Upon information and belief, this policy is currently in place at the Clinton County Jail, with new and/or prospective members of the Class being subjected to the harms that have already been inflicted upon the named Plaintiff.

56. The continuing pattern of strip searching individuals charged with minor crimes will cause irreparable harm to the new and/or prospective members of the Class, an adequate remedy for which does not exist at law.

57. Plaintiff demands that the County of Clinton, the Clinton County Sheriff's Department, the Policy Making Defendants and Clinton County Corrections Officers immediately desist from strip searching individuals placed into the custody of the Clinton County Jail absent any particularized suspicion that the individuals in question have either contraband or weapons, and seek both a preliminary and permanent injunction from this Court ordering as much.

DEMAND FOR PUNITIVE DAMAGES

58. The actions of the Individual Defendants detailed herein are outrageous, in that they continue to propagate an illegal strip search policy even though they know for a fact that their actions are unconstitutional.

59. It is clear that the Policy Making Defendants, the County of Clinton and the Clinton County Sheriff's Department have no respect for the civil rights of individual citizens or for the rule of law. Consequently, an award of punitive damages is necessary to punish the Policy Making Defendants, and to send a message to them that the requirements of the United States Constitution also apply to government officials in Clinton County.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

60. The Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Phyllis Mitchell, on behalf of herself and on behalf of a class of others similarly situated, request that this Honorable Court grant her the following relief:

- A. An order certifying this action as a class action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23.
- B. A judgment against all Defendants, jointly and severally on Plaintiff's First Cause of Action detailed herein, awarding Compensatory Damages to each named Plaintiff and each member of the proposed class in an amount to be determined by a Jury and/or the Court on both an individual and a class wide basis.

C. A judgment against Defendant David Favro on Plaintiff's First Cause of Action for \$1,000,000.00 in punitive damages.

D. A judgment against Defendant Jerry Maggy on Plaintiff's First Cause of Action for \$1,000,000.00 in punitive damages.

E. A judgment against Defendant Michael Smith on Plaintiff's First Cause of Action for \$1,000,000.00 in punitive damages.

F. A declaratory judgment against all Defendants declaring the County of Clinton and the Clinton County Sheriff's Department's policy, practice and custom of strip and visual cavity searching all detainees entering the Clinton County Jail, regardless of the crime charged or suspicion of contraband, to be unconstitutional and improper.

G. A preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining Defendants from continuing to strip and visual cavity search individuals charged with misdemeanors or minor crimes absent particularized, reasonable suspicion that the arrestee subjected to the search is concealing weapons or other contraband.

H. A monetary award for attorney's fees and the costs of this action, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 23;

Respectfully submitted by:

/s Elmer Robert Keach, III

Dated: February 27, 2006
Amsterdam, NY

Elmer Robert Keach, III, Esquire
USDC, NDNY Bar Roll Number 601537
LAW OFFICES OF ELMER ROBERT
KEACH, III, PC
1040 Riverfront Center
Post Office Box 70
Amsterdam, NY 12010
Telephone: 518.434.1718
Telecopier: 518.770.1558
Electronic Mail:
bobkeach@keachlawfirm.com

Bruce E. Menken, Esquire
USDC, NDNY Bar Roll Number 104942
Jason J. Rozger, Esquire
BERANBAUM, MENKEN, &
BEN-ASHER, LLP
80 Pine Street, 32nd Floor
New York, NY 10004
Telephone: 212.509.1616
Telecopier: 212.509.8088
Electronic Mail: jrozger@bmbf.com

Gary E. Mason, Esquire
Charles Schneider, Esquire
THE MASON LAW FIRM, PLLC
1225 19th Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: 202.429.2290
Telecopier: 202.429.2294
Electronic Mail: gmason@masonlawdc.com

Jonathan W. Cuneo, Esquire
USDC, NDNY Bar Roll Number 511605
Charles LaDuca, Esquire
USDC, NDNY Bar Roll Number 511604
CUNEO GILBERT & LaDUCA, LLP
317 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002
Telephone: 202.789.3960
Telecopier: 202.789.1813
Electronic Mail: CharlesL@cuneolaw.com

**ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF AND
THE PROPOSED CLASS**