### **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 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, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS  (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff  (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)  (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)				DEFENDANTS					
				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant  (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.  Attorneys (If Known)					
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in C	One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF	PRINCIPA	AL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for	Plaintif	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant)  PTF DEF  Citizen of This State $\Box$ 1 $\Box$ 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State $\Box$ 4 $\Box$ 4						
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citize	n of Another State	<b>1</b> 2 <b>1</b> 2	Incorporated and F of Business In A		<b>5</b>	
W. NAWIDE OF GUY				n or Subject of a eign Country	<b>3 3</b>	Foreign Nation	□ 6 □	<b>1</b> 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		nly) DRTS	FO	RFEITURE/PENALTY	BAN	NKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES		
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 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	PERSONAL INJURY  □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJUR    365 Personal Injury - Product Liability   Product Liability   Pharmaceutical   Personal Injury   Product Liability   Product Liability   Personal Injury   Product Liability   PERSONAL PROPER   370 Other Fraud   371 Truth in Lending   380 Other Personal   Property Damage   385 Property Damage   385 Property Damage   Product Liability   PRISONER PETITION   Habeas Corpus:   463 Alien Detainee   510 Motions to Vacate   Sentence   530 General   535 Death Penalty   Other:   540 Mandamus & Oth   550 Civil Rights   555 Prison Conditions of   Confinement	TY	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other  LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 1 Employee Retirement Income Security Act  IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions	422 Appe   423 With 28 U   PROPE    820 Copy   830 Pater   840 Trad   861 HIA   862 Blac   863 DIW   864 SSIE   865 RSI   870 Taxe   871 IRS-26 U   871 IR	eal 28 USC 158 Idrawal JSC 157  RTY RIGHTS  yrights Int emark  JSECURITY  (1395ff) (1395ff) (1495ff) (1595ff) (	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 400 State Reapportionne □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influence □ Corrupt Organization □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodi □ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Acti □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matt □ 895 Freedom of Informa Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Proc Act/Review or Appe Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	ent  ed and ens  ities/ ions  ters tion	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION VII. REQUESTED IN	moved from 3 te Court  Cite the U.S. Civil Sta  Brief description of ca  CHECK IF THIS	Appellate Court atute under which you at ause:  IS A CLASS ACTION		ened Anotl (specif	her District fy) tatutes unless di	CHECK YES only	if demanded in complaint:		
COMPLAINT: VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	UNDER RULE 2  E(S)  (See instructions):					URY DEMAND:	Yes 🗆 No		
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY C	F RECORD	DOCKE	ET NUMBER			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	40UNT	ADDI VINC IED		ШОСЕ		MAC IIII	DOE.		

#### INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- **I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
  - (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
  - (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)** 

- **III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- **IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- **V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

  Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction. Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

**Date and Attorney Signature.** Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF OREGON PORTLAND DIVISION

Matthew John Helmut Klug, Plaintiff,

VS.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

City of Portland, Charles Andrew Hales, Peter Helzer (41782), Bradley Nutting (45920), Tony Passadore (33482), Jennifer Thompson (43484), Eric Weber (32070), Multnomah County Sheriff's Office, Multnomah County Fire & Emergency,

Defendants

Case No.: 3:2015-CV-413-ST

**COMPLAINT** 

Civil Rights Violations False Arrest **Malicious Prosecution** Abuse of a Vulnerable Person (42 U.S.C. § 1983) Jury Trial Demanded

Dated this 13<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2015

Pro se P.O. Box 2246 Portland, Oregon 97208

28

# United States District Court District of Oregon

Plaintiff Matthew John Helmut Klug hereby alleges that:

### **NATURE OF ACTION**

7 8

1.

This is a civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, ORS 124.100, and ORS 30.265 by Matthew John Helmut Klug (Plaintiff). Defendants arrested and unlawfully assaulted Plaintiff, subsequently detaining Plaintiff in jail without probable cause that Plaintiff committed any crime. Defendants have given Judges and Prosecutors false and misleading information which caused Plaintiff to be prosecuted without probable cause. The acts and omissions of Defendants violated Plaintiff's rights under the Fourth, Fifth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. As a result of Defendants' acts and omissions, Plaintiff suffered economic and noneconomic damages. Plaintiff is entitled to damages and an award of attorney's fees and costs.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2.

This court has subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims of violation of federal constitutional rights pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331(a) and 1343 because the causes of action arise under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This court has jurisdiction over Plaintiff's pendant state law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

3.

Venue is proper in the District of Oregon pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because a substantial part of the acts or omissions giving rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred in the District of Oregon and because Defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in the District of Oregon.

### TORT CLAIM NOTICE

4.

Prior to the institution of this action, Plaintiff provided notice of this claim to all necessary parties pursuant to ORS 30.275.

### **PARTIES**

5.

At all material times, Plaintiff was a resident of Portland, Oregon.

At all material times, Peter Helzer was employed as a law enforcement officer for the Portland Police Bureau, an entity of the City of Portland, Oregon, and was working under color of state law. He is sued in his individual capacity.

7.

At all material times, Tony Passadore was employed as a law enforcement officer for the Portland Police Bureau, an entity of the City of Portland, Oregon, and was working under color of state law. He is sued in his individual capacity.

8.

At all material times, Bradley Nutting was employed as a law enforcement officer for the Portland Police Bureau, an entity of the City of Portland, Oregon, and was working under color of state law. He is sued in his individual capacity.

9.

At all material times, Eric Weber was employed as a law enforcement officer for the Portland Police Bureau, an entity of the City of Portland, Oregon, and was working under color of state law. He is sued in his individual capacity.

10.

At all material times, Jennifer Thompson was employed as a law enforcement officer for the Portland Police Bureau, an entity of the City of Portland, Oregon, and was working under color of state law. She is sued in her individual capacity.

28

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

At all material times, Charles Andrew Hales was employed as the Police Bureau Commissioner for the City of Portland, Oregon, and was working under color of state law. He is sued in his individual capacity.

12.

At all material times the City of Portland was a political subdivision of the State of Oregon. As a local government entity, the City of Portland is a suable person under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. At all material times, the City of Portland employed Defendants Helzer, Passadore, Nutting, Weber, Thompson, and Hales. At all material times, defendants Helzer, Passadore, Nutting, Weber, Thompson, and Hales were acting pursuant to City of Portland's laws, customs, and/or policies.

13.

At all material times Multnomah County Sheriff's Office was an entity of Multnomah County, a political subdivision of the State of Oregon. As a local government entity, Multnomah County is a suable person under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. At all material times, Multnomah County Sheriff's Office employed unknown medical personnel. Defendant Multnomah County Sheriff's Office was acting pursuant to Multnomah County Sheriff's Office laws, customs, and/or policies.

14.

At all material times Multnomah County Fire & Emergency was an entity of Multnomah County, a political subdivision of the State of Oregon. As a local government entity, Multnomah County is a suable person under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. At all material times, Multnomah County Fire & Emergency employed unknown medical personnel. Defendant Multnomah County Fire & Emergency was acting pursuant to Multnomah County Fire & Emergency laws, customs, and/or policies.

### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

15.

On September 17, 2014, Plaintiff was riding a bicycle and was stopped by the Portland Police Bureau. Portland Police deployed Electronic Control Weapons (E.C.W.) upon Plaintiff without probable cause that Plaintiff committed any crime. Officer Defendants used excessive force and excessive numbers of taser cycle rounds from the Electronic Control Weapons upon Plaintiff. <a href="www.klug.pw">www.klug.pw</a>

Plaintiff is a disabled person diagnosed with mental illness. Plaintiff is also diagnosed with epilepsy, and is prescribed medication to control epileptic seizures. Plaintiff requires medication twice daily to prevent the seizures.

17.

Plaintiff received cuts, abrasions, and a wound to the knee which bled and certainly required medical attention. Two dart taser probes were removed from Plaintiff's back by Multnomah County Fire & Emergency, and those probes were placed into evidence with the Portland Police Bureau.

18.

Plaintiff was not provided any medical treatment or attention while in the care of the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office. No required medicine was given to Plaintiff as prescribed. Plaintiff did contract Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) from the Multnomah County Detention Center.

19.

Plaintiff was held by the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office for more than a day's time, and Plaintiff received no medical care, attention, treatment, or prescribed medicine. Plaintiff sustained thrust taser wounds also left untreated.

20.

Plaintiff was released from the custody of the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office the evening of September 18, 2015, and was not charged with any crime.

4 5

3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

28

27

Plaintiff did not consent to a search of the bicycle, papers, effects, and the saddle-bag which was attached. Plaintiff was not read Miranda rights. The search of the bicycle bag did take place, but the search revealed no instrumentalities of any suspected crime. The only fruits of the search were the discovery of a current version of the Oregon Driver's Manual, a bicycle lock, and some fruit leather snack food.

### FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

### (Excessive Use of Force - Violation of the Fourth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments)

22.

Each individual officer Defendant's acts and omissions caused Plaintiff to be arrested and assaulted without probable cause in violation of the Fourth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

23.

Defendant City of Portland's training program and curriculum was inadequate for the tasks that the individual Defendants performed; this inadequacy of training is a result of the Defendant City of Portland's deliberate indifference; and the inadequacy in training the officers caused the Plaintiff's harm by depriving Plaintiff rights, privileges or immunities secured by the Constitution.

#### SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

### (Malicious Prosecution - Violation of the Fourth and Fourteenth **Amendments**)

24.

Defendant City of Portland's acts and omissions mislead the prosecuting attorney as to the existence of probable cause, which left Plaintiff to be jailed and prosecuted without probable cause in violation of the Forth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution.

Defendant City of Portland's training program and curriculum was inadequate for the tasks that Defendant City of Portland performed; this inadequacy of training is a result of the Defendant City of Portland's deliberate indifference; and the inadequacy in training caused the Plaintiff's harm by depriving Plaintiff rights, privileges or immunities secured by the Constitution. Defendant City of Portland performed pursuant to City of Portland's laws, customs, and/or policies.

### THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

### (False Arrest – Oregon State Law Claim)

26.

Each individual officer Defendant's individual acts did intentionally confine the Plaintiff unlawfully, which caused Plaintiff to be aware of the confinement. The conduct interfered with the basic principles and concepts of Plaintiff's personal freedom, health and safety.

27.

Defendant City of Portland's training program and curriculum was inadequate for the tasks that the individual Defendants performed; this inadequacy of training is a result of the Defendant City of Portland's deliberate indifference; and the inadequacy in training the officers caused the Plaintiff's harm by depriving Plaintiff rights, privileges or immunities secured by the Constitution.

### FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

### (Malicious Prosecution - Oregon State Law Claim)

28.

Defendant City of Portland's individual acts and omissions initiated, caused, and have had an active roll in bringing criminal proceedings without probable cause against Plaintiff. The Plaintiff has sustained damage and continues to suffer damage because of the repeated, and ongoing prosecution.

2 3 4

Defendant City of Portland's training program and curriculum was inadequate for the tasks that Defendant City of Portland performed; this inadequacy of training is a result of the Defendant City of Portland's deliberate indifference; and the inadequacy in training caused the Plaintiff's harm by depriving Plaintiff rights, privileges or immunities secured by the Constitution. Defendant City of Portland performed pursuant to City of Portland's laws, customs, and/or policies.

### FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Cruel and Unusual Punishment - Violation of the Eighth Amendment) 30.

Defendant Multnomah County Sheriff's Office individual acts and omissions actively ignored the necessary prescription medication Plaintiff requires, created conflict, and caused the violation of the Eighth Amendment to the Constitution.

31.

Defendant Multnomah County Sheriff's Office training program and curriculum was inadequate for the tasks that the individual Defendants performed; this inadequacy of training is a result of the Defendant Multnomah County Sheriff's Office deliberate indifference; and the inadequacy in training the officers caused the Plaintiff's harm by depriving Plaintiff rights, privileges or immunities secured by the Constitution.

### SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Abuse of a Vulnerable Person – Oregon State Law Claim)

32.

Defendant Multnomah County Fire & Emergency's individual acts and omissions actively ignored the requirement to independently determine the appropriate disposition of a vulnerable person following an abuse accusation. Plaintiff expected to receive medical attention and was withheld treatment and medicine by "mandatory abuse reporters" E.M.T. personnel following the abuse.

3

4

5 6

7

8

9 10

11 12

14 15

13

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

Defendant Multnomah County Fire & Emergency's training program and curriculum was inadequate for the tasks that the individual Defendants performed; this inadequacy of training is a result of the Defendant Multnomah County Fire & Emergency's deliberate indifference; and the inadequacy in appropriate education and training of the medics caused the Plaintiff's harm by depriving Plaintiff rights, privileges or immunities secured by the Constitution.

### **DAMAGES**

34.

As a direct an proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants, Plaintiff has sustained severe psychiatric injury and emotional distress, including, but not limited to depression, loss of sleep, loss of self-esteem, a fear of those in authority or positions of power, fear of law enforcement, severe isolation from family and friends, personal humiliation and embarrassment as well as a loss of opportunity for future employment and economic earning capacity due to an extensive list of pending criminal charges surrounding this unfortunate event. Due to the assault and detention Plaintiff experiences anxiety, sleeplessness, and has experienced severe damage to personal, professional, and family relationships. These damages are permanent, other physical damages such as Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA), and the taser wounds, have lasted nearly six months in duration thus far. Plaintiff seeks \$5,000,000. in noneconomic damages and prays for relief.

35.

As a direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff will expect to incur attorney fees and medical expenses for ongoing representation, treatment and care. The Plaintiff is expected to require continued legal help and medical care into the future. Plaintiff seeks economic damages in an amount to be determined at trial. These expenses are continuing.

### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff respectfully prays that this Court will enter a Judgement in Plaintiff's favor, and against Defendants as follows:

- A. Grant Plaintiff's compensatory damages against Defendants in an amount to be determined at trial;
- B. Award Plaintiff reasonable costs, expenses, and attorney's fees;
- C. Grant Plaintiff such further relief as this Court deems just and equitable under the circumstances.

### **JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial.

**DATED** this 13<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2015

By: /s Matthew Klug

Matthew Klug, Pro se P.O. Box 2246 Portland, Oregon 97208 (503) 383-9655