

Leonard R. Berman, OSB # 96040
4711 SW Huber St., Suite E-3
Portland, OR 97219
(503) 473-8787
Easyrabbi@yahoo.com

BONNETT, FAIRBOURN, FRIEDMAN
& BALINT, P.C.

Tonna K. Farrar, OSB #120072
2325 East Camelback Road, Suite 300
Phoenix, Arizona 85016
Telephone: (503) 487-6352 – Oregon
(602) 274-1100 – Phoenix
Facsimile: (602) 274-1199
tfarrar@bffb.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Portland Division

**WILLIAM DILLON, SCOTT GRAUE,
DAVID HODGES, ALBERT LOVE AND
JAYSON SAYLOR** individually, and on behalf
of a class of others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

**CLACKAMAS COUNTY AND CRAIG
ROBERTS**, both individually and in his official
capacity as Sheriff,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:14-CV-820

**CLASS ACTION SECOND AMENDED
COMPLAINT**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

INTRODUCTION

This is a class action brought to redress the deprivation by Defendants of rights secured to the Plaintiffs William Dillon, Scott Graue, David Hodges, Albert Love, Jayson Saylor (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Plaintiffs”) and the proposed Class Members by the laws of the United States of America including the Fourth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments.

Plaintiffs individually, and on behalf of the proposed class, by and through counsel, hereby complain as follows:

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

1. For at least the past two years, Clackamas County (hereinafter, “CC”) has an unconstitutional policy, custom and practice of strip-searching pre-trial detainees and convicted inmates in public and group settings in view of closed circuit cameras in violation of minimal penal standards and codes of conduct as exemplified by ABA Standard 23-7.9 [Searches of prisoners’ bodies] and OAR 291-041-0020 [Inmates (infra)] for random searches, after court hearings, and during routine searches as well as one mass search of 160 inmates on or about October 10, 2012. For purposes of this Complaint, strip and visual cavity searches are collectively referred to as “strip searches.”

2. No pat-downs occur. Other corrections facilities do pat-down searches and only conduct strip searches when reasonable suspicion arises from a pat-down and on a private, individual basis.

3. The complained-of group and public strip searches have been conducted in the hallways and open areas in the Clackamas County Jail (hereinafter “CCJ”) on a daily basis since May 21, 2012.

4. On or about October 10, 2012, several dozen inmates (believed to be up to 160 or more) were pulled out of their cells in pairs by deputies in camouflage commando gear and publicly strip searched on a mass basis.

5. Upon information and belief, this afore-described strip search custom, practice and policy derived from the custom, practices and/or written policies of the aforementioned

County Departments, and was promulgated by senior Department officials including Defendant Sheriff Craig Roberts.

6. Defendants have instituted a written *policy*, custom or practice of strip searching all individuals in public and group settings in the custody of CC (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 in a public setting in front of fellow inmates and other deputies) and are later allowed to dress back into jail clothing. These written policies include but are not limited to the following:

- 25.47.4 C Searches are done on a “routine and random basis.”**
- 25.47.4 2D (2)(b) Unclothed Searches, are to be viewed by:**
- 1. staff members conducting search**
 - 2. staff members working in the area**
 - 3. other inmates being searched at the same time.**

7. The policies, customs and practices of the Defendants as described herein are clearly unconstitutional, in that these entities and individuals are directing/conducting the strip searches of all individuals in public and group settings in CC custody and/or without any particularized suspicion that the individuals in question have either contraband or weapons, and the searches are unconstitutional in their scope, manner and duration in violation of the United States Constitution.

8. Upon information and belief, this policy is currently in place at the CCJ, with new and/or prospective members of the Class being subjected to the harms that have already been inflicted upon the named Plaintiff(s).

9. The continuing policy, practice and custom of strip searching individuals in group and public settings will cause irreparable harm to the new and/or prospective members of the Class, an adequate remedy for which does not exist at law.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

10. This Court has jurisdiction over this action under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 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. § 1983. This Court additionally has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claim(s) asserted herein under 28 U.S.C. §1367.

11. 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

12. Plaintiffs Graue, Dillon and Hodges reside in jail custody in Oregon.

13. Plaintiff Saylor lives in Clackamas County out of jail custody.

14. Plaintiff Love lives in Multnomah County out of jail custody.

15. The proposed class members currently reside either in jail custody in Clackamas County, Oregon and in other counties, or out of jail custody.

16. Defendant CC is a county government organized and existing under the laws of the State of Oregon. At all times relevant hereto, CC, acting through its Corrections Department, 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 Department personnel. In addition, at all relevant times, CC was responsible for

enforcing the rules of the CCJ, and for ensuring the personnel employed in the CCJ followed the Constitution and laws of the United States and of the State of Oregon.

17. Defendant Craig Roberts is the Sheriff and final decision-maker and policy makers with respect to the treatment of pre-trial and other detainees over which the CC exercises custodial or other control.

18. From time to time, individuals (including certain named Plaintiffs and/or proposed class members) residing in jail custody in Oregon are transferred from one county jail to another, including CCJ.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

19. Plaintiff bring 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 strip searched in public and group settings in the CCJ.

20. The three classes that Plaintiffs seek to represent are defined as follows:

CLASS ONE – UNLAWFUL GROUP STRIP SEARCHES COMPENSATORY DAMAGES CLASS¹

All persons (including pre-trial detainees and convicted inmates) who were or currently are in the custody of the CCJ regardless of charges, who have been or will be searched while unclothed in a group and public setting in open areas involving one or more deputy who:

- A. Inspects the individual from top to bottom;
- B. Inspects his hair, ears, mouth, hands, armpits, feet, between toes, nostrils;
- C. Inspects a woman's breasts or tells a man to separate his penis and testicles;
- D. Inspects beneath the foreskin of an uncircumcised male;
- E. Requires the individual to bend and spread buttocks;

¹ All named Plaintiffs are proposed Class Representatives for Class One.

- F. Requires the individual to face a wall so staff can inspect the back of the body;

The class period commences on September 25, 2012 and extends to May 4, 2015. Specifically excluded from the class are Defendants and any and all of their respective affiliates, legal representatives, heirs, successors, employees or assignees.

**CLASS TWO – OCTOBER 10, 2012 STRIP SEARCH
COMPENSATORY DAMAGES CLASS²**

All persons (including pre-trial detainees and convicted inmates) who were or currently are in the custody of the CCJ regardless of charges, who were searched while unclothed in a group and public setting in open areas involving one or more deputy who:

- A. Inspects the individual from top to bottom;
- B. Inspects his hair, ears, mouth, hands, armpits, feet, between toes, nostrils;
- C. Inspects a woman's breasts or tells a man to separate his penis and testicles;
- D. Inspects beneath the foreskin of an uncircumcised male;
- E. Requires the individual to bend and spread buttocks;
- F. Requires the individual to face a wall so staff can inspect the back of the body;

The class period pertains to a one-time public search of at least 160 inmates on or about October 10, 2012. Specifically excluded from the class are Defendants and any and all of their respective affiliates, legal representatives, heirs, successors, employees or assignees.

**CLASS THREE – UNLAWFUL GROUP STRIP SEARCHES
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF CLASS³**

All persons (including pre-trial detainees and convicted inmates) who are or will be placed into the custody of the CCJ regardless of charges, who have been or will be searched while unclothed in a group and public setting in open areas involving one or more deputy who:

- A. Inspects the individual from top to bottom;

² All named Plaintiffs are proposed Class Representatives for Class Two.

³ Plaintiffs Graue, Dillon and Hodges are proposed Class Representatives for Class Three.

- B. Inspects his hair, ears, mouth, hands, armpits, feet, between toes, nostrils;
- C. Inspects a woman's breasts or tells a man to separate his penis and testicles;
- D. Inspects beneath the foreskin of an uncircumcised male;
- E. Requires the individual to bend and spread buttocks;
- F. Requires the individual to face a wall so staff can inspect the back of the body;

The class period commences on September 25, 2012 and extends to the date on which CC is either enjoined from its policy, practice and custom of unlawful strip searches or ceases to conduct its policy, practice and custom of unlawful strip searches. Specifically excluded from the class are Defendants and any and all of their respective affiliates, legal representatives, heirs, successors, employees or assignees.

21. 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).

22. The members of the class are so numerous as to render joinder impracticable. Upon information and belief, there are hundreds, if not thousands, of people arrested who are placed into the custody of CC 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.

23. 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 the 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.

24. 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 in an unreasonable fashion. All members of the class were placed into the custody of their CCJ facilities, and all were illegally strip searched in violation of the clearly established law in this judicial circuit.

25. Plaintiffs' 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.

26. The representative Plaintiff (s) have the requisite personal interest in the outcome of this action and will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiffs have no interests that are adverse to the interests of the members of the Class.

27. Plaintiffs have retained counsel who have substantial experience and success in the prosecution of civil rights litigation and class action litigation.

28. Counsel for Plaintiffs know of no conflicts among members of the class, or between counsel and members of the class.

29. This action, in part, seeks declaratory and injunctive relief. As such, the Plaintiffs seek 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 placed into the custody of CC. In short, the aforementioned County Departments, the Policy Making Defendants and County Corrections Officers acted on grounds generally applicable to all class members.

30. In addition to certification under Rule 23(b)(2), and in the alternative, Plaintiff (s) seek certification under Rule 23(b)(3).

31. 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 in an unreasonable fashion, all individuals committed to the CCJ 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.

32. 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.

33. 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.

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

FACTS

Facts Applicable to the Class Generally

35. The Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution, by means of the substantive due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, prohibits state and county officials, such as the Defendants in this action and the Corrections Officers they employ and supervise, from performing strip searches in an unreasonable fashion on pre-trial detainees in a random and/or routine fashion.

36. The Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution, by means of the substantive due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, prohibits state and county officials, such as the Defendants in this action and the Corrections Officers they employ supervise, from performing strip searches in an unreasonable fashion on sentenced inmates, in a random and/or routine fashion, as an example of cruel and unusual punishment.

37. Defendants know that they may not institute, enforce or permit enforcement of a policy or practice of conducting strip searches unreasonably or in violation of the Constitution.

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

39. Upon information and belief, Defendants have promulgated, implemented, enforced, and/or failed to rectify a written and/or *de facto* policy, practice or custom of public, mass strip-searching all in the custody of CCJ in an unreasonable fashion.

40. Pursuant to this written and/or *de facto* policy, each member of the Classes, including the named Plaintiffs, were the victims of routine group and public strip searches.

41. This policy, custom or practices of group strip searches blatantly violate the Constitution and the minimal penal standards and codes as exemplified by ABA Standard 23-7.9 Searches of prisoners' bodies and OAR 291-041-0020 Inmates to wit:

ABA Standard 23-7.9

(a) In conducting a search of a prisoner's body, correctional authorities should strive to preserve the privacy and dignity of the prisoner. Correctional authorities should use the least intrusive appropriate means to search a prisoner. Searches of prisoners' bodies should follow a written protocol that implements this Standard.

(b) Except in exigent situations, a search of a prisoner's body, including a pat-down search or a visual search of the prisoner's private bodily areas, should be conducted by correctional staff of the same gender as the prisoner.

...

(d) Visual searches of a prisoner's private bodily areas, whether or not inspection includes the prisoner's body cavities, should:

(i) **be conducted only by trained personnel in a private place out of the sight of other prisoners and of staff not involved in the search**, (emphasis added) except that a prisoner should be permitted to request that more than one staff member be present....

The relevant OAR states in part:

291-041-0010 Definitions

(c) Skin: A search procedure wherein the person being searched removes all of his/her clothing and is visually examined and clothing removed is carefully inspected before return and redressing, for the purpose of detecting contraband.

291-041-0020 Inmates

(7) Skin Searches: Skin searches conducted by DOC staff will be of the same gender as the inmate, unless there is an emergency. Except in emergencies, inmates undergoing skin searches will be removed to a private area for the search. (Emphasis added)

42. As a direct and proximate result of the unlawful strip searches 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(s) – have suffered or will suffer psychological pain,

humiliation, suffering and mental anguish and in the alternative, are also entitled to nominal compensatory damages.

Facts Applicable to the Plaintiff Scott Graue

43. Graue's experiences are representative of the class at large. On a daily basis, seven days a week from on or about May 19, 2012 until the present CC searched inmates randomly, after hearings and on a routine schedule. Graue and others sustained multiple public strip searches while housed at CCJ, and on October 10, 2012 Graue sustained a mass public strip search in open areas of the CCJ likely exceeding 160 inmates when deputies strip searched him and others in a group and public fashion.

44. As Corrections Officers watched, Graue and others removed all of their clothing, including underpants.

45. A Corrections Officer inspected Graue from top to bottom while naked. The deputy then instructed him to bend over and spread his buttocks, lift and separate the penis and testicles.

46. As a direct and proximate result of the unlawful strip searches conducted pursuant to CC policy, practice and custom, he has suffered and continues to suffer damages.

47. A tort claim notice from Graue including twenty-three other inmates (including Saylor, Hodges and Love) timely issued on January 21, 2013.

Facts Applicable to the Plaintiff David Hodges

48. Hodges' experiences are representative of the class at large. On a daily basis, seven days a week from on or about May 19, 2012 until the present, CC searched inmates randomly, after hearings and on a routine schedule, and Hodges and others sustained multiple public strip searches. On October 10, 2012, Hodges sustained a mass public strip search in open

areas of the CCJ likely exceeding 160 inmates when deputies strip searched him and others in a group and public fashion.

49. As Corrections Officers watched, Hodges and others removed all of their clothing, including underpants.

50. A Corrections Officer inspected Hodges from top to bottom while naked. The deputy then instructed him to bend over and spread his buttocks, lift and separate the penis and testicles.

51. As a direct and proximate result of the unlawful strip searches conducted pursuant to CC policy, practice and custom, he has suffered and continues to suffer damages.

52. A tort claim notice from Graue including twenty-three other inmates (including Saylor, Hodges and Love) timely issued on January 21, 2013.

Facts Applicable to the Plaintiff William Dillon

53. Dillon's experiences are representative of the class at large. Dillon suffered group strip searches on multiple occasions in 2013 at CCJ including but not limited to on or about February 15, 2013 and February 19, 2013, after court dates.

54. As Corrections Officers watched, Dillon and others removed all of their clothing, including underpants.

55. A Corrections Officer inspected Dillon from top to bottom while naked. The deputy then instructed him to bend over and spread his buttocks, lift and separate the penis and testicles.

56. As a direct and proximate result of the unlawful strip searches conducted pursuant to CC policy, practice and custom, he has suffered and continues to suffer damages.

Facts Applicable to the Plaintiff Albert Love

57. Love's experiences are representative of the class at large. Love suffered group strip searches on multiple occasions in 2012 including but not limited to one or about October 10, 2012 and after court hearings September 25, 2012 and sentencing October 10, 2012, in a group and public setting in the “dressing room” with up to sixteen other detainees.

58. Love and others sustained multiple public strip searches, and on October 10, 2012 Love sustained a mass public strip search in open areas of the CCJ likely exceeding 160 inmates when deputies strip searched him and others in a group and public fashion.

59. As Corrections Officers watched, Love and others removed all of their clothing, including underpants.

60. A Corrections Officer inspected Love from top to bottom while naked. The deputy then instructed him to bend over and spread his buttocks, lift and separate the penis and testicles.

61. As a direct and proximate result of the unlawful strip searches conducted pursuant to CC policy, practice and custom, he has suffered and continues to suffer damages.

62. A tort claim notice from Graue including twenty-three other inmates (including Saylor, Hodges and Love) timely issued on January 21, 2013.

Facts Applicable to the Plaintiff Jayson Saylor

63. Saylor's experiences are representative of the class at large. Saylor suffered group strip searches on multiple occasions in 2012 including but not limited to one or about October 10, 2012 and after court hearings September 27 and 28th, 2012, and after sentencing November 16, 2012, in a group and public setting in the “dressing room” with up to sixteen other detainees.

64. Saylor and others sustained multiple public strip searches, and on October 10, 2012 Saylor sustained a mass public strip search in open areas of the CCJ likely exceeding 160 inmates when deputies strip searched him and others in a group and public fashion.

65. As Corrections Officers watched, Saylor and others removed all of their clothing, including underpants.

66. A Corrections Officer inspected Saylor from top to bottom while naked. The deputy then instructed him to bend over and spread his buttocks, lift and separate the penis and testicles.

67. As a direct and proximate result of the unlawful strip searches conducted pursuant to CC policy, practice and custom, he has suffered and continues to suffer damages.

68. A tort claim notice from Graue including twenty-three other inmates (including Saylor, Hodges and Love) timely issued on January 21, 2013.

COUNTS

COUNT I

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

69. Plaintiff(s) incorporate by reference and realleges each and every allegation stated in paragraphs 1 through 68.

70. The Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution, by means of the substantive due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, prohibits state and county officials, such as the Defendants in this action and the Corrections Officers they employ and supervise, from performing strip searches in an unreasonable fashion on pre-trial detainees in a random and/or routine fashion.

71. The Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution, by means of the substantive due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, prohibits state and county officials, such as the Defendants in this action and the Corrections Officers they employ and supervise, from performing strip searches in an unreasonable fashion on sentenced inmates, in a random and/or routine fashion, as an example of cruel and unusual punishment.

72. The actions of Defendants detailed above violated Plaintiffs' rights under the United States Constitution. Simply put, it was not objectively reasonable for CC Officers to strip search Plaintiff (s) and class members absent probable cause and in a public and group setting. It was also not objectively reasonable for the Defendants to order/direct County Corrections Officers to conduct such searches.

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

74. Upon information and belief, the aforementioned Sheriff Roberts is responsible for establishing the policies, customs, practices, and procedures to be utilized in the operation of their facilities, and is responsible for the implementation of the strip search policy questioned in this lawsuit and/or ratified the policy. As such, each named individual is individually responsible for the damages of the named Plaintiff(s) and members of the Class.

75. Defendants knew that the strip search policy was illegal, and acted willfully, knowingly, and with specific intent to deprive Plaintiffs and members of the Class of their Constitutional rights.

76. 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.

COUNT II
Violation of State Law Rights Under Oregon Tort Claims Act – Invasion of Personal Privacy

77. Plaintiff(s) incorporate by reference and realleges each and every allegation stated in paragraphs 1 through 76.

78. In violation of ORS §30.865, Defendants knowingly made or recorded a photograph(s), motion picture(s), videotape(s) or other visual recording(s) of Plaintiffs and the Class in a state of nudity during the group and public strip searches without the consent of Plaintiffs or the Class, and at the time the visual recording was made or recorded the plaintiff was in a place and circumstances where the plaintiff had a reasonable expectation of personal privacy.

79. Plaintiffs and the Class had a reasonable expectation of personal privacy in not being subjected to unlawful group and public strip searches open to public view of other inmates and/or CC employees.

80. Plaintiffs and the Class suffered damages as a result of Defendants' invasion of their personal privacy and are therefore entitled to compensatory damages and reasonable attorneys fees.

81. As more fully described above, Defendants were provided with requisite and timely notice under the Oregon Tort Claims Act pursuant to ORS § 30.275.

DEMAND FOR PUNITIVE DAMAGES

82. Plaintiff(s) incorporate by reference and realleges each and every allegation stated in paragraphs 1 through 81.

83. Sheriff Roberts continues to propagate an illegal strip search policy, custom and practice with complete indifference to the Plaintiffs' and Class Members' rights even though he knows for a fact that his actions are unconstitutional.

84. Sheriff Roberts' development and propagation of an illegal strip search policy, custom and practice is oppressive because it violates the rights of Plaintiffs and the Class Members with unnecessary harshness or severity.

85. It is clear that Sheriff Roberts has 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 Sheriff Roberts, and to send a message to him that the requirements of the United States Constitution also apply to government officials in all named counties.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

86. The Plaintiff(s) hereby demand trial by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs William Dillon, Scott Graue, David Hodges, Jayson Saylor, Albert Love individually and on behalf of a class of others similarly situated, request that this Honorable Court grant them 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, 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 Sheriff Roberts in his individual capacity for no less than \$1,000,000.00 in punitive damages.

- D. A declaratory judgment against all Defendants under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §2201 that the strip search policies, practices and customs of the County and the County Departments are unconstitutional.
- E. A preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining Defendants from continuing to strip and visual cavity search pre-trial detainees and convicted inmates in group and public fashion without adequate privacy.
- F. A preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining Defendants from continuing to strip and visual cavity search pre-trial detainees and convicted inmates absent particularized, reasonable suspicion that the arrestee subjected to the search is concealing weapons or other contraband.
- G. A monetary award for attorney's fees and the costs of this action, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988 and ORS §30.865.

Dated: May 4, 2015.

BONNETT, FAIRBOURN, FRIEDMAN
& BALINT, P.C.

By: s/Tonna K. Farrar

Tonna K. Farrar, OSB No. 120072
2325 East Camelback Road, Suite 300
Phoenix, Arizona 85016
Telephone: (503) 487-6352 – Oregon
(602) 274-1100 – Phoenix
tfarrar@bffb.com

Leonard R. Berman
4711 SW Huber St., Suite E-3
Portland, OR 97219
(503) 473-8787
OSB # 96040
Easyrabbi@yahoo.com
Attorneys for Plaintiffs