IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

TIAWANDA MOORE,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF CHICAGO, Chicago Police Officers JASON WILSON, RICHARD PLOTKE and LUIS ALEJO,

Defendants.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, TIAWANDA MOORE, through her attorneys, Smith, Johnson & Antholt LLC,

brings the following complaint against Defendants CITY OF CHICAGO and Chicago Police

Officers JASON WILSON, RICHARD PLOTKE and LUIS ALEJO:

1. This action is brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. Section 1983 to redress the

deprivation under color of law of Plaintiff's rights as secured by the United States Constitution.

JURISDICTION & VENUE

- 2. This Court has jurisdiction of the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1367.
- 3. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). All parties reside in this judicial

district, and the events giving rise to the claims occurred within this district.

PARTIES

4. Plaintiff Tiawanda Moore is a twenty-one-year-old resident of Decatur, Georgia and at the time of the incident was a resident of Chicago, Illinois.

Case: 1:12-cv-00238 Document #: 1 Filed: 01/12/12 Page 2 of 6 PageID #:2

5. At all relevant times, Officer Jason Wilson, Sgt. Richard Plotke and Officer Luis Alejo (referred to collectively as "Defendant Officers" were sworn members of the Chicago Police Department, employed by Defendant City and acting under color of law and within the scope of their employment.

6. Defendant City is a municipal corporation, duly incorporated under the laws of the State of Illinois, and the employer and principal of Defendant Officers at all relevant times.

FACTS

7. On approximately July 6, 2010, the police were called to Plaintiff's home in response to a previously reported domestic dispute.

8. Defendant Officer Jason Wilson and his partner responded to the call.

9. Ms. Moore's then-boyfriend allowed the officers into the home and Officer Wilson went upstairs to the bedroom where Ms. Moore was located to interview Ms. Moore.

10. During his interview, Officer Wilson physically groped Ms. Moore's breasts and buttocks.

11. Before leaving the bedroom, Officer Wilson wrote his home phone number on a piece of paper and told Ms. Moore to call him because they should "hook-up".

12. Ms. Moore called the Chicago Police Department to report Officer Wilson's misconduct.

13. At Chicago Police Department headquarters, Ms. Moore met with Lt. Richard Plotke and Officer Luis Alejo from the Internal Affairs Division ("IAD").

14. Instead of investigating Ms. Moore's complaint and arresting Officer Wilson,IAD investigators worked to discourage Ms. Moore from filing the complaint.

Case: 1:12-cv-00238 Document #: 1 Filed: 01/12/12 Page 3 of 6 PageID #:3

15. After Ms. Moore described the assault and inappropriate conduct by Officer Wilson, Defendants Plotke and Alejo sought to prevent Ms. Moore from proceeding with an official complaint against Officer Wilson.

16. Ms. Moore asked that two new officers be assigned to help her file her complaint,Lt. Plotke refused to reassign new personnel.

17. When Ms. Moore got up to leave the interview room, Lt. Plotke closed the door and told her to sit down and that she was not going anywhere.

18. While under a reasonable suspicion that the officers had committed a crime, were about to commit a crime and were committing a crime against her, Ms. Moore recorded the conversation with Defendant Officers on her Blackberry telephone.

19. During several minutes of recording, Defendants Plotke and Alejo attempted to convince Ms. Moore to the drop the complaint.

20. When Defendants Plotke and Alejo suspected that Ms. Moore's Blackberry, which was sitting on the table between them, was recording their conversation they stopped the conversation and arrested her.

21. Defendants Plotke and Alejo wrongfully arrested Ms. Moore and charged her with violating the Illinois Eavesdropping Statute. The statute, however, specifically exempts persons who record "under reasonable suspicion that another party to the conversation is committing, is about to commit ... a criminal offense against the person ... and there is reason to believe that evidence of the criminal offense may be obtained by the recording." 720 ILCS § 5/14-3.

22. Defendants Plotke and Alejo knew that by stopping Ms. Moore from leaving the interview room and attempting to prevent her from filing a complaint against Officer Wilson

Case: 1:12-cv-00238 Document #: 1 Filed: 01/12/12 Page 4 of 6 PageID #:4

they were committing the crimes of unlawful restraint, official misconduct and were attempting to commit the crime of obstruction of justice.

23. As a result of the arrest, Ms. Moore spent over two weeks in Cook County Jail and was forced to spend a year fighting the baseless criminal charge.

24. On August 25, 2011, a jury in the Cook County Circuit Court found Ms. Moore not guilty.

COUNT I: Fourth Amendment – Unreasonable Seizure

25. Each of the foregoing Paragraphs is incorporated as if restated fully herein.

26. As described in the preceding paragraphs, Defendant Wilson unreasonably seized Plaintiff in violation of the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

27. The misconduct described in this Count was objectively unreasonable and was undertaken intentionally with willful indifference to Plaintiff's Constitutional rights.

28. As a result of Defendant's misconduct, Plaintiff suffered injuries including emotional distress.

COUNT II: Fourth Amendment – False Arrest

29. Each of the foregoing Paragraphs is incorporated as if restated fully herein.

30. As more fully described above, the Defendant Plotke and Alejo arrested Plaintiff without a probable cause in violation of the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

31. The misconduct described in this Count was objectively unreasonable and was undertaken intentionally with willful indifference to Plaintiff's Constitutional rights.

Case: 1:12-cv-00238 Document #: 1 Filed: 01/12/12 Page 5 of 6 PageID #:5

32. As a result of Defendants' misconduct, Plaintiff suffered injuries including emotional distress.

COUNT III: Illinois Malicious Prosecution

33. Each of the foregoing Paragraphs is incorporated as if restated fully herein.

34. Defendant Officers Plotke and Alejo caused criminal proceedings against Plaintiff to be commenced and continued without probable cause for the crime charged.

35. Defendant Officers Plotke and Alejo acted with malice and with willful and wanton disregard for the truth.

36. Plaintiff was acquitted of the charge in a manner indicative of Plaintiff's innocence, which fully and finally terminated the case in Plaintiff's favor.

37. As a result of Defendants' misconduct, Plaintiff suffered injuries including emotional distress.

38. Illinois law provides that public entities, such as Defendant City, are directed to pay any compensatory damages on a tort judgment against an employee who was acting within the scope of his or her employment.

39. At all relevant times, Defendant Officers were agents of Defendant City, and acting within the scope of their employment as a Chicago Police Officers. Defendant City, therefore, is liable as principal for all torts committed by Defendant Officers.

Case: 1:12-cv-00238 Document #: 1 Filed: 01/12/12 Page 6 of 6 PageID #:6

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in her favor

and against Defendants, awarding compensatory damages for the injuries that she has suffered,

costs and reasonable attorneys' fees, and punitive damages against the Defendant Officers and all

such other relief as this Court finds just and equitable.

PLAINTIFF DEMANDS TRIAL BY JURY.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

/s/ Robert W. Johnson Attorneys for Plaintiff

Robert W. Johnson Amanda Antholt Christopher R. Smith James Baranyk Smith, Johnson & Antholt, LLC 112 S. Sangamon Street, 3rd Floor Chicago, IL 60607 (312) 432-0400

Case: 1:12-cv-00238

The civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form isrequired for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

(a) PLAINTIFFS Tiawanda Moore			DEFENDANTS CITY OF CHICAGO, Chicago Police Officers JASON WILSO	DN.	
			RICHARD PLOTKE and LUIS ALEJO,	514,	
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff DeKalb County, GA (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant <u>Cook County</u> (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)			Attorneys (If Known)		
Robert Johnson, Smith, Johnson, & Antholt, LLC, 112 S. Sangamon, Third Floor, Chicago, Il, 60607, 312.432.0400					
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)			ITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff or Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant)		
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citizen	en of This State PTF DEF DEF PTF 4 of Business In This State	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen	en of Another State 2 2 Incorporated <i>and</i> Principal Place 5 of Business In Another State	5	
			en or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign Nation 6 reign Country	6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)					
	TORTS PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJU		SPEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATU1 510 Agriculture 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 400 State Reapportionn		
120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (excl. vet.) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	310 Airplane 362 Personal Injury-Med. Malpractic 135 Airplane Product 365 Personal Injury-Med. Malpractic 130 Airplane Product 365 Personal Injury 130 Airplane Product 365 Personal Injury 130 Airplane Product 368 Asbestos Personal 130 Airplane 368 Asbestos Personal 130 Federal Employers' Liability 1340 Marine 9ERSONAL PROPE 340 Marine 370 Other Fraud 1355 Motor Vehicle 370 Other Personal Product Liability 380 Other Personal 1356 Other Personal Inj. Product Liability 1360 Other Personal Inj. Stato Exerce 1441 Voting 510 Motions to Vac. 1442 Employment 535 Death Penalty <td>- - 62/ y - 63/ y - 64/ - - 65/ g - - g - - ge - 71/ y - 72/ TONS - 73/ ate - 74/ 1000 - 74/ 1000 - 74/</td> <td>520 Other Food & Drug 410 Antitrust 525 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 410 Antitrust 530 Liquor Laws 28 USC 157 540 R.R. & Truck PROPERTY RIGHTS 560 Occupational 820 Copyrights 560 Occupational 830 Patent 560 Octup 840 Trademark 590 Other 840 Trademark 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 861 HIA (1395ff) 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 864 SSID Title XVI 864 SSID Title XVI 893 Environmental Ma 850 Freedom of Inform & Disclosure Act FEDERAL TAX SUITS 790 Other Labor Litigation 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609</td> <td>g ttes/etc. ed and ons ty/Exch. ge ation Act tters Act tation Act ler stice f tions</td>	- - 62/ y - 63/ y - 64/ - - 65/ g - - g - - ge - 71/ y - 72/ TONS - 73/ ate - 74/ 1000 - 74/ 1000 - 74/	520 Other Food & Drug 410 Antitrust 525 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 410 Antitrust 530 Liquor Laws 28 USC 157 540 R.R. & Truck PROPERTY RIGHTS 560 Occupational 820 Copyrights 560 Occupational 830 Patent 560 Octup 840 Trademark 590 Other 840 Trademark 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 861 HIA (1395ff) 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 864 SSID Title XVI 864 SSID Title XVI 893 Environmental Ma 850 Freedom of Inform & Disclosure Act FEDERAL TAX SUITS 790 Other Labor Litigation 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	g ttes/etc. ed and ons ty/Exch. ge ation Act tters Act tation Act ler stice f tions	
V. ORIGIN (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY) Transferred from Appeal to District I Original Proceeding 2 Removed from State Court 3 Remanded from Appellate Court 4 Reinstated or Reopened 5 Transferred from another district (specify) 6 Multidistrict Litigation 7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgement					
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Enter U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of cause.)VII. PREVIOUS BANKRUPTCY MATTERS (For nature of suit 422 and 423, enter the case number and judge for any associated bankruptcy matter perviously adjudicated by a judge of this Court. Use a separate attachment if necessary)					
VIII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:					
COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 JURY DEMAND: Yes					
IX. This case is not a refiling of a previously dismissed action.					
^{DATE} 1/12/2012 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s Robert W. Johnson					
L					