1	HONORABLE FRED VAN SICKLE	
2	JAMES H. KAUFMAN WSBA 7836	
3	Sr. Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Spokane County Prosecuting Attorney's Office	
4	1115 West Broadway, 2 nd floor	
5	Spokane, WA 99260 Phone: (509) 477-5764	
6	FAX: (509) 477-3672	
7	Email: jkaufman@spokanecounty.org	
8	FRANK CONKLIN WSBA 4325 C.K. Powers P.S.	
9	818 West Riverside # 640 Spokane, WA 99201	
10	Phone: (509) 747-6877	
11	FAX: (509 747-6950 Email fjconklin@yahoo.com	
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
13	EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
14	SHAWN HUSS, a single man, and) others similarly situated)	Cause No. CV 05 180 FVS
15)	
16	Plaintiff)	ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT
17	Vs)	MINERALD COM EMIN
18	SPOKANE COUNTY, a municipal)	
19	Corporation	
20	Defendant)	
21		
22	**********	
23		
24	ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT Page 1 of 12	

ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

Page 2 of 12

COMES NOW Defendant Spokane County by and through James H. Kaufman, Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney and Frank Conklin and in response to the allegations contained in Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, admits, denies, and alleges as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION,

1.1 In answer to the allegations contained in paragraph 1.1 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County denies that its policy of collection jail intake fees is illegal or violates the due process clause of the XIV Amendment.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE:

2.1 In answer to the allegations contained in paragraphs 2.1 through 2.4 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County admits the same.

III. PARTIES

3.1 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 3.1 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations therefore denies the same.

ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT Page 3 of 12

3.2 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 3.1 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County admits it is a political subdivision but denies that it is a municipal corporation.

IV. FACTS

- 4.1 In answer the allegations contained in paragraphs 4.1 through 4.6 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County admits the same.
- 4.2 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 4.7 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County denies the same.
- 4.3 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 4.8 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County denies that the collection of a fee or tax constitutes a *conversion* of the property of the taxpayer.
- 4.4 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 4.9 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County admits that there is no "pre-deprivation" hearing before the fee is collected but denies the remainder of the allegations in that paragraph.
- 4.5 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 4.10 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County denies the allegations in this paragraph, in so far as that policy was modified before this litigation was commenced.

- 4.6 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 4.11 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County admits the same.
- 4.7 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 4.12 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County admits the Defendant was arrested but denies that the domestic violence complaint was frivolous.
- 4.8. In answer the allegations contained in paragraphs 4.13 and 4.14 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County admits the same and specifically admits that at the time he was incarcerated the funds he had upon his person were lawfully taken and applied to his obligation to pay the booking fee.
- 4.9 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 4.15 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County admits there was no formal explanation of return of the fee, but otherwise denies the remainder of the same.
- 4.10 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 4.16 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this averment and therefore denies the same.

- 4.11 In answer the allegations contained in paragraphs 4.17 and 4.18 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County admits the same.
- 4.12 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 4.19 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County admits the allegations of this paragraph with the caveat that unlike the vast majority of persons similarly situated, Mr. Huss did not promptly request that his money be returned when the charges were dropped, but waited nearly three (3) months to submit his request.
- 4.13 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 4.20 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this averment and therefore denies the same.
- 4.14 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 4.21 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County denies the same.
- 4.15 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 4.22 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County admits that as soon as it received a request from Mr. Huss, Spokane County promptly refunded his deposit.
- 4.16 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 4.23 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County admits it has not refunded "constructive trust", because the legislature has not required interest to be

paid on authorized refunds of booking fees. Spokane County admits it has not compensated Mr. Huss for being out of jail, and denies it has any obligation to do so.

4.17 In answer the allegations contained in paragraphs 4.24, 4.25 and 4.26 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County denies the same.

V. CLASS ALLEGATIONS

- 5.1 Defendant Spokane County realleges each and every previous answer as if fully set forth herein.
- 5.2 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 5.2 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this averment and therefore denies the same. Moreover, Spokane County denies that any funds were wrongfully converted.
- 5.3 In answer the allegations contained in paragraphs 5.3 through 5.8 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County denies the same.

VI. CAUSES OF ACTION

6.1 Defendant Spokane County realleges each and every previous answer as if fully set forth herein.

ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT Page 6 of 12

6.2 In answer the allegations contained in paragraphs 6.2 through 6.8 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County denies the same.

MUNICIPAL LIABILITY

- 6.3 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 6.9 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County realleges each and every previous answer as if fully set forth herein.
- 6.4 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 6.10 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County denies the same.
- 6.5 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 6.11 through 6.14 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County denies the same.

VII. DAMAGES

7.1 In answer the allegations contained in paragraph 7.1 of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Defendant Spokane County denies the same.

VII. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

Spokane County denies that Plaintiff is entitled to relief because his entire claim and other legal contentions therein are not warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law or the establishment of new law. Moreover, his fundamental allegations and other ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAIN

Page 7 of 12

factual contentions are entirely lacking in evidentiary support and this entire lawsuit is brought only to needlessly increase the cost of litigation and burden the taxpayers with the cost of responding to these frivolous contentions.

COUNTER STATEMENT OF THE CASE

RCW 70.48.390 Fee payable by person being booked provides:

A governing unit may require that each person who is booked at a city, county, or regional jail pay a fee based on the jail's actual booking costs or one hundred dollars, whichever is less, to the sheriff's department of the county or police chief of the city in which the jail is located. The fee is payable immediately from any money then possessed by the person being booked, or any money deposited with the sheriff's department or city jail administration on the person's behalf. If the person has no funds at the time of booking or during the period of incarceration, the sheriff or police chief may notify the court in the county or city where the charges related to the booking are pending, and may request the assessment of the fee. Unless the person is held on other criminal matters, if the person is not charged, is acquitted, or if all charges are dismissed, the sheriff or police chief shall return the fee to the person at the last known address listed in the booking records.

The following facts are not in dispute:

- Mr. Huss was booked into the Spokane County Jail on October 31,
 and released the following day, November 1, 2004.
- 2) At the time of his booking, the established booking fee for non-federal prisoners was \$89.12.
 - 3) Mr. Huss had \$39.30 taken from him at the time of his booking.

- 4) At the time Mr. Huss was booked, the procedure in place at the jail was to wait until the inmate requested any return of money taken from him to pay for booking fees.
- 5) This policy was changed prior to the filing of this litigation and the present policy is to automatically return any money taken to pay for booking fees if the person qualifies for the legislative refund.
- 6) As of January 6, 2005, those who are booked and released and have paid all or a portion of the \$89.12 fee but are not charged within 72 hours, automatically, and without request, have any sum they have paid for their booking fees returned.
- 7) The intake or booking fee is also automatically refunded to those found not guilty, or the charges dismissed and where prosecution is declined.
- 8) The Legislature does not require Spokane County to pay interest on any sums taken to pay for booking fees when and if the person qualifies for a refund.
- 9) After receiving a request from Mr. Huss in February, 2005, his funds were returned to him by check dated 2/23/005.
- 10) On September 11, 2001, the Spokane County Board of Commissioners, adopted a new procedure and designated Spokane County Risk

Manager or his/her designee as the agent appointed by Spokane County to receive any claims made against Spokane County.

Spokane County further alleges:

- 1) The booking fee is a financial exaction or tax, enacted pursuant to the comprehensive taxing power of the State, which becomes due and payable when any person is booked into jail.
- This fee is not a punishment, but an admissions tax enacted for the 2) sole purpose of compensating the County for the actual expense of booking persons into custody.
- 3) Under both Washington Law, and the United States Constitution, Spokane County has every legal right to retain any funds which legally come into the possession of Spokane County, to pay this admission fee when an inmate is booked into jail.
- The collection of this tax does not implicate the procedural due 4) process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Wherefore, Spokane County, having fully answered, requests this Court to dismiss Plaintiff's cause with prejudice and to award Spokane County attorney fees

23

1	in order to reimburse the public for the needless cost of this litigation.	
2	Respectfully submitted this 30 th day of December, 2005	
3		
4	JAMES H. KAUFMAN WSBA 7836	
5	Sr. Deputy Prosecuting Attorney	
6	Spokane County Prosecuting Attorney's Office 1115 West Broadway, 2 nd floor	
7	Spokane, WA 99260 Phone: (509) 477-5764	
8	FAX: (509) 477-3672	
9	Email: jkaufman@spokanecounty.org	
10	/s/ Frank Conklin	
11	FRANK CONKLIN WSBA 4325	
12	C.K. Powers P.S. 818 West Riverside # 640	
13	Spokane, WA 99201 Phone: (509) 747-6877	
14	FAX: (509) 747-6950	
15	Email fjconklin@yahoo.com	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		

ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT Page 11 of 12

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 30, 2005, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF System which will send notification to the following: Breean Lawrence Beggs and Frank Conklin.

/s/ James H. Kaufman

JAMES H. KAUFMAN, WSBA #7836 Sr. Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Spokane County Prosecutor's Office 1115 W. Broadway – 2nd Floor Spokane, WA 99201

Phone: (509) 477-5764 Facsimile: (509) 477-3672 jkaufman@spokanecounty.org

ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

Page 12 of 12