1	Lee Gelernt*	
2	Andre Segura* AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION	
3	FOUNDATION IMMIGRANTS' RIGHTS PROJECT 125 Broad St., 18 th Floor	Luis F. Parra (Bar No. 21570)
4	New York, NY 10004	PARRA LAW OFFICES 571 North Grand Avenue
5	T: (212) 549-2660 lgelernt@aclu.org	Nogales, AZ 85621 T: (520) 281-9369
6	asegura@aclu.org	F: (520) 281-1396 lfparra@azmxlaw.com
7	Daniel J. Pochoda (Bar No. 021979) James Duff Lyall (Bar No. 330045)** ACLU FOUNDATION OF ARIZONA	
8	3707 North 7th Street, Suite 235 Phoenix, AZ 85014	Roberto C. Montiel (Bar No. 003198) ROBERTO MONTIEL LAW OFFICES
9	T: (602) 650-1854 F: (602) 650-1376	571 North Grand Avenue Nogales, AZ 85621
10	dpochoda@acluaz.org jlyall@acluaz.org	T: (520) 281-2923 lawrobertomontiel@hotmail.com
11		
12	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
13	3 (Additional Counsel on Subsequent Pages)	
14	(Auditional Counsel on Subsequent Fages)	
1 -		
15	IN THE UNITED STA'	TES DISTRICT COURT
16		FES DISTRICT COURT ICT OF ARIZONA
	FOR THE DISTR	ICT OF ARIZONA
16	FOR THE DISTR ARACELI RODRIGUEZ, individually and as the surviving mother and personal	ICT OF ARIZONA CASE NO. 4:14-CV-02251-TUC-RCC
16 17	FOR THE DISTR ARACELI RODRIGUEZ, individually and as the surviving mother and personal representative of the ESTATE OF J.A.,	ICT OF ARIZONA
16 17 18	FOR THE DISTR ARACELI RODRIGUEZ, individually and as the surviving mother and personal representative of the ESTATE OF J.A., Deceased, <i>Plaintiff</i> ,	ICT OF ARIZONA CASE NO. 4:14-CV-02251-TUC-RCC FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT AND
16 17 18 19	FOR THE DISTR ARACELI RODRIGUEZ, individually and as the surviving mother and personal representative of the ESTATE OF J.A., Deceased,	ICT OF ARIZONA CASE NO. 4:14-CV-02251-TUC-RCC FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT AND
16 17 18 19 20	FOR THE DISTR ARACELI RODRIGUEZ, individually and as the surviving mother and personal representative of the ESTATE OF J.A., Deceased, <i>Plaintiff</i> , V.	ICT OF ARIZONA CASE NO. 4:14-CV-02251-TUC-RCC FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT AND
16 17 18 19 20 21	FOR THE DISTR ARACELI RODRIGUEZ, individually and as the surviving mother and personal representative of the ESTATE OF J.A., Deceased, <i>Plaintiff</i> , v. , Agent of U.S. Border Patrol,	ICT OF ARIZONA CASE NO. 4:14-CV-02251-TUC-RCC FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT AND
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	FOR THE DISTR ARACELI RODRIGUEZ, individually and as the surviving mother and personal representative of the ESTATE OF J.A., Deceased, <i>Plaintiff</i> , V.	ICT OF ARIZONA CASE NO. 4:14-CV-02251-TUC-RCC FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT AND
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	FOR THE DISTR ARACELI RODRIGUEZ, individually and as the surviving mother and personal representative of the ESTATE OF J.A., Deceased, <i>Plaintiff</i> , v. , Agent of U.S. Border Patrol,	ICT OF ARIZONA CASE NO. 4:14-CV-02251-TUC-RCC FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT AND
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	FOR THE DISTR ARACELI RODRIGUEZ, individually and as the surviving mother and personal representative of the ESTATE OF J.A., Deceased, <i>Plaintiff</i> , v. , Agent of U.S. Border Patrol,	ICT OF ARIZONA CASE NO. 4:14-CV-02251-TUC-RCC FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT AND
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 	FOR THE DISTR ARACELI RODRIGUEZ, individually and as the surviving mother and personal representative of the ESTATE OF J.A., Deceased, <i>Plaintiff</i> , v. , Agent of U.S. Border Patrol,	ICT OF ARIZONA CASE NO. 4:14-CV-02251-TUC-RCC FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT AND
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 	FOR THE DISTR ARACELI RODRIGUEZ, individually and as the surviving mother and personal representative of the ESTATE OF J.A., Deceased, <i>Plaintiff</i> , v. <i>Plaintiff</i> , v. <i>Agent of U.S.</i> Border Patrol, <i>Defendant</i> .	ICT OF ARIZONA CASE NO. 4:14-CV-02251-TUC-RCC FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT AND

1	Additional Counsel		
1			
2	Cecillia D. Wang* AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES	Arturo J. Gonzalez* Hector Suarez*	
3	UNION FOUNDATION	Hector Suarez* MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP	
4	IMMIGRANTS' RIGHTS PROJECT	425 Market Street	
5	39 Drumm Street San Francisco, CA 94111	San Francisco, CA 94105 T: (415) 268-7000	
	T: (415) 343-0770	F: (415) 268-7522	
6	F: (415) 268-7522	agonzalez@mofo.com	
7	cwang@aclu.org	hsuarez@mofo.com	
8	Mitra Ebadolahi*		
9	ACLU FOUNDATION OF SAN DIEGO		
10	AND IMPERIAL COUNTIES P.O. Box 92138		
11	San Diego, CA 92138-7131		
	T: (619) 232-2121 F: (619) 232-0036		
12	mebadolahi@aclusandiego.org		
13	* A locité d'anna la sa cois a		
14	* Admitted pro hac vice ** Admitted pursuant to Ariz. Sup. Ct.		
15	R. 38(f)		
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		ii	

2

1

3 4

5

7

8

9

Plaintiff Araceli Rodriguez, through counsel, hereby complains and alleges the following:

INTRODUCTION

1. This civil rights case involves the brazen and lawless killing of a sixteenyear-old boy, J.A., by , agent of the United States Border Patrol. The 6 fatal shooting of J.A. is not an isolated incident by the Border Patrol. United States Border Patrol agents have been responsible for multiple unjustified deadly shootings and physical abuses along the U.S.-Mexico border over the past several years. J.A.'s killing is one of the latest and most egregious of these incidents.

10 2. On the night of October 10, 2012, J.A., a Mexican national, was 11 peacefully walking along a street in his hometown of Nogales, Sonora, Mexico. The 12 street on which he was walking, Calle Internacional, runs parallel to the border fence. 13 At approximately 11:30 pm, Defendant , who was standing on the U.S. side of 14 the fence, opened fire. An autopsy report shows that J.A. was fatally hit with ten 15 bullets. At the time of the shooting, no Border Patrol agent or officer of the United 16 States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) was under threat by J.A. or anyone else 17 standing near him — much less in immediate danger of deadly or serious bodily harm. 18 J.A.'s death was senseless and unjustified.

19 3. J.A.'s mother, Araceli Rodriguez, brings this lawsuit for monetary 20 damages for the killing of her youngest son, alleging claims under the Fourth and Fifth 21 Amendments to the United States Constitution.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This case is brought pursuant to *Bivens* and the Fourth and Fifth Amendments to the United States Constitution. See Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). The Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question jurisdiction).

27 28

22

23

24

25

1	5. Venue is proper in the District of Arizona because a substantial part of	
2	the events complained of and giving rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred in this District.	
3	See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), 1391(e), 1402(b).	
4	PARTIES	
5	6. Plaintiff ARACELI RODRIGUEZ is a Mexican national currently	
6	residing in Nogales, Sonora, Mexico. She is the mother of the deceased, J.A., who was	
7	also a Mexican national. J.A. resided in Nogales, Sonora, Mexico at the time of his	
8	death. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit individually and as the surviving mother and	
9	personal representative of J.A.'s estate.	
10	7. Defendant is the U.S. Border Patrol agent who shot	
11	and killed J.A. Defendant was acting under color of law. The Border Patrol is	
12	an agency within CBP, which itself is located within the Department of Homeland	
13	Security.	
14	JURY DEMAND	
15	8. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury in this action on each of her claims	
16	triable by jury.	
17	FACTS	
18	J.A.'s Death	
19 20	9. On the night of October 10, 2012, after playing basketball in his	
20	neighborhood with his girlfriend and friends, J.A. was walking by himself down the	
21	sidewalk on Calle Internacional, a street that runs alongside the border fence on the	
22	Mexican side of the border between the United States and Mexico. Because Calle	
23 24	Internacional is a main thoroughfare, with commercial and residential buildings,	
24 25	residents of the town frequently walk down that street.	
25 26	10. According to an eyewitness who was walking behind J.A. on Calle	
26 27	Internacional on that night, at approximately 11:30 pm, at least one U.S. agent,	
27	stationed on the U.S. side of the fence, opened fire. According to various reports,	
-0		

anywhere from 14 to 30 shots were fired. Upon information and belief, no agents or officers issued any verbal warnings before opening fire.

11. Defendant hit J.A. and he collapsed where he was shot, in front of a medical office on the corner of Calle Internacional and Calle Ingenieros. He was found moments later lying in a pool of his own blood.

12. J.A. was shot approximately ten times and virtually all of those shots entered his body from behind.

8

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

13. Upon information and belief, no one else was shot.

9 14. Just prior to the shooting, J.A. was visible and not hiding; an observer
10 could see that he did not pose a threat. He was doing nothing but peacefully walking
11 down the street by himself when he was gunned down. He was not committing a crime,
12 nor was he throwing rocks, using a weapon, or in any way threatening U.S. Border
13 Patrol agents or anyone else. Furthermore, no one near J.A. at the time of the shooting
14 was throwing rocks or threatening U.S. Border Patrol agents in any manner (or
15 threatening anyone else).

16 15. At the moment he was shot, J.A. was walking on the southern side of 17 Calle Internacional, directly across the street from a sheer cliff face that rises 18 approximately 25 feet from street level. The cliff is approximately 30 feet from where 19 J.A. was standing when shot. The border fence, which is approximately 20–25 feet tall, 20 runs along the top of the cliff. Thus, at the location where J.A. was shot, the top of the 21 fence towers approximately 50 feet above street level on the Mexican side. The fence 22 itself is made of steel beams that are 6.5 inches in diameter. Each beam is 23 approximately 3.5 inches apart. Defendant fired from the U.S. side of the fence. 24 (A photograph from Google Maps of the border fence and the corner where J.A. was 25 killed is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit A.)

26 16. According to an emergency police dispatch, a Border Patrol agent phoned
27 authorities in Mexico approximately five minutes after shots were fired. The agent

informed Mexican authorities that there were shots fired on the borderline and that someone was wounded on the Mexican side, but the agent did not identify the shooters.

At the time of the shooting, J.A. lived in Nogales, Sonora, Mexico, 17. approximately four blocks from where he was shot. Because J.A.'s mother was away for work, his grandmother was often with him in Nogales, Mexico to care for him. His 6 grandmother and grandfather live in Arizona and were lawful permanent residents of the United States at the time of the shooting. They are now U.S. citizens. Upon information and belief, Defendant did not know whether J.A. was a U.S. citizen or whether he had significant contacts with the United States.

10 18. Defendant's actions in killing J.A. were unreasonable and excessive, and 11 were unnecessary to defend against bodily injury or deadly force. Defendant acted 12 intentionally with the specific purpose of causing serious harm and/or death to J.A., 13 without legal justification.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

19. Defendant acted under color of law.

Systemic Problems of Abuse at the Border by U.S. Agents

20. J.A.'s killing is unfortunately not a unique event, but part of a larger problem of abuse by Border Patrol agents in Nogales and elsewhere.

21. The U.S.-Mexico border area in Mexico is unlike other areas of Mexico. U.S. Border Patrol agents not only control the U.S. side of the fence, but through the use of force and assertion of authority, they also exert control over the immediate area on the Mexican side, including where J.A. was shot.

22. U.S. control of the Mexican side of the border fence in Nogales and other areas along the Southern border is apparent and longstanding, and recognized by persons living in the area.

23. Border Patrol agents use guns, non-lethal devices and other weapons, as well as military equipment and surveillance devices to target persons on the Mexican side of the border. For example, U.S. surveillance cameras are mounted along the border fence, monitoring activity on the Mexico side of the fence. One such camera,

4

- 25 26
- 27

1 with a clear line of sight over Calle Internacional, is mounted approximately 150 feet 2 from the location where J.A. was shot. Additionally, Border Patrol agents have opened 3 fire into Nogales from the U.S. side on prior occasions and are known to launch non-4 lethal devices such as pepper spray canisters into Nogales neighborhoods from the U.S. 5 side of the border fence. By shooting at individuals on the Mexican side, and using 6 weapons and devices with a range extending to the Mexican side of the border area, the 7 United States, through the Border Patrol, controls the area immediately adjacent to the 8 international border fence on the Mexican side. This control extended to the street, 9 Calle Internacional, where J.A. was killed.

10 24. U.S. Border Patrol agents, with force, exercise control over areas on the 11 Mexican side adjacent to the international border fence. U.S. Border Patrol agents 12 make seizures on the Mexican side of the fence. CBP officials are authorized to be on 13 Mexican soil to conduct pre-inspection of those seeking admission to the United States. 14 U.S. Border Patrol helicopters fly in Mexican airspace near the border and swoop down 15 on individuals, inundating those individuals with dust and debris. Thus, as the Chief of 16 the U.S. Border Patrol has acknowledged, U.S. border security policy "extends [the 17 nation's] zone of security outward, ensuring that our physical border is not the first or 18 last line of defense, but one of many." Securing Our Borders-Operational Control 19 and the Path Forward: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Border and Maritime 20 Security of the H. Comm. on Homeland Security, 112th Cong. 8 (2011) (prepared 21 statement of Michael J. Fisher, Chief of U.S. Border Patrol).

- 22
- 23 24
- 25

26

27

28

25. In recent years, physical abuse of persons near the border by U.S. Border Patrol agents has been rampant in Nogales and elsewhere. The Border Patrol consistently denies public access to basic information about its operations, including whether agents responsible for abuse are disciplined in any way, thus shielding the agency and individual agents from public accountability for abusive policies and practices. Even after many fatal shooting incidents involving Border Patrol agents, the agency has refused to release the names of those involved.

26. Based on an extensive investigation, the Arizona Republic found that between 2010 and 2012, the year J.A. was killed, there were 487 "use of force incidents" in the Border Patrol's Tucson Sector, 233 of which occurred in the Nogales area. *See* Bob Ortega and Rob O'Dell, *Force at the Border: Tucson Sector*, ARIZ. REPUBLIC (Dec. 16, 2013).

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

27. Reports also found that nationwide there were 15 deaths caused by Border Patrol agents in 2011–2012 alone, five of which occurred in the Tucson Sector. Thirteen of these deaths were caused by shootings. Another source found that CBP agents have killed 28 people since 2010. From 2005 to 2014, Border Patrol agents caused 46 deaths nationwide, according to media reports and data provided by the government.

12 28. A report by the American Immigration Council in May 2014 reviewed 13 809 complaints of alleged abuse by Border Patrol agents between 2009 and 2012 and 14 found that "CBP officials rarely take action against the alleged perpetrators of abuse." 15 AMERICAN IMMIGRATION COUNCIL, NO ACTION TAKEN: LACK OF CBP 16 ACCOUNTABILITY IN RESPONDING TO COMPLAINTS OF ABUSE 3 (2014). The report 17 noted that it was impossible to determine which cases had merit based on the data 18 provided by the government, but concluded that it was "astonishing that, among those 19 cases in which a formal decision was issued, 97 percent resulted in 'No Action Taken.'" 20 *Id.* at 1.

21 29. A former high ranking official at CBP has publicly stated: "With very
22 serious misconduct—borderline criminal activity—senior management often gave
23 Border Patrol agents a slap on the wrist or did nothing at all." Andrew Becker,
24 *Removal of Border Agency's Internal Affairs Chief Raises Alarms*, HUFFINGTON POST
25 (June 12, 2014).

30. In response to continuing public interest and controversy surrounding
CBP's use of force policies and practices, and in particular to a letter sent by 16
members of Congress seeking information about CBP's use of force policies, CBP

1	commissioned an external, independent review of its use of force policies and practices		
2	from the Police Executive Research Forum ("PERF"), a non-profit research		
3	organization comprised of experts on police practices. See POLICE EXEC. RESEARCH		
4	FORUM, U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION USE OF FORCE REVIEW: CASES AND		
5	POLICIES (2013). PERF reviewed all deadly force events from January 2010 through		
6	October 2012, including 67 case files related to CBP officers' use of deadly force.		
7	PERF subsequently provided CBP with a report and recommendations, detailing		
8	significant shortcomings in CBP use of force policies and practices, including the		
9	following:		
10	a) "It is not clear that CBP consistently and thoroughly reviews all use of deadly		
11	force incidents." (Report at 4);		
12	b) Too many cases [involving shootings at rock throwers] do not appear to meet		
13	the test of objective reasonableness with regard to the use of deadly force."		
14	(Report at 7);		
15	c) Of the 25 case files PERF reviewed involving shots fired by Border Patrol		
16	agents who responded to alleged rock throwing, "[s]ome cases seemed to be a		
17	clear cut self-defense reaction to close and serious rock threats or assaults, while		
18	other shootings were of more questionable justification. The more questionable		
19	cases generally involved shootings that took place through the IBF [International		
20	Border Fence] at subjects who were throwing rocks at agents from Mexico."		
21	(Report at 8).		
22	31. In September 2013, a report by the Department of Homeland Security		
23	Office of Inspector General noted that "many agents and officers do not understand use		
24	of force and the extent to which they may or may not use force." Department of		
25	Homeland Security, Office of Inspector General, CBP Use of Force Training and		
26	Actions to Address Use of Force Incidents (Redacted) 17 (2013).		
27	32. Upon information and belief, Defendant is still employed by CBP.		
28			

1	Harm Suffered by Plaintiff Because of Defendant's Actions		
2	33. There is a real and actual controversy between Plaintiff and Defendant,		
3	and Defendant's actions were the proximate cause of the death of Plaintiff's son.		
4	34. Plaintiff and her son have suffered significant damages, in an amount to		
5	be proven at trial.		
6	CAUSES OF ACTION		
7	COUNT ONE		
8	VIOLATION OF THE FOURTH AMENDMENT		
9	35. The foregoing allegations are re-alleged and incorporated herein by		
10	reference.		
11	36. At the time J.A. was fatally shot, Defendant was not in danger of fatal or		
12	bodily harm from J.A. or anyone else.		
13	37. In fatally shooting J.A., Defendant acted intentionally and used		
14	unreasonable and excessive force with the purpose of causing harm to J.A. without		
15	legal justification.		
16	38. Defendant's actions violated the Fourth Amendment's prohibition against		
17	seizures with excessive and unreasonable force.		
18	<u>COUNT TWO</u>		
19	VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT		
20	39. The foregoing allegations are re-alleged and incorporated herein by		
21	reference.		
22	40. At the time J.A. was fatally shot, Defendant was not in danger of fatal or		
23	bodily harm from J.A. or anyone else.		
24	41. In fatally shooting J.A., Defendant acted intentionally, maliciously, and		
25	used unreasonable and excessive force, with the purpose to cause harm to J.A. without		
26	legal justification. Defendant's actions were unnecessary to achieve any legitimate law		
27	enforcement objective.		
28			
	Q		

1	42.	Defendant's actions were grossly excessive and deliberately indifferent,	
2	and shocked the conscience, in violation of the substantive due process component o		
3	the Fifth Amendment.		
4		RELIEF	
5	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests relief as follows:		
6	43.	A declaration that Defendant's actions violated the Constitution.	
7	44.	Trial by jury.	
8	45.	Damages, including punitive damages, in an amount to be proven at trial.	
9	46.	Costs and reasonable attorney fees.	
10	47.	Such other relief as the Court deems just and equitable.	
11	48.	Demand for jury trial.	
12			
13	DATED: Se	eptember 8, 2014	
14		<u>/s/Lee Gelernt</u>	
15		ACLU FOUNDATION IMMIGRANTS' RIGHTS PROJECT	
16		/s/Luis F. Parra	
17		PARRA LAW OFFICES	
18		/s/Roberto C. Montiel	
19		ROBERTO MONTIEL LAW OFFICES	
20		/s/ Daniel J. Pochoda	
21		ACLU FOUNDATION OF ARIZONA	
22		Counsel for Plaintiff	
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		9	