

1 Sterling E. Norris, Esq. (SBN 040993)
2 JUDICIAL WATCH, INC.
3 2540 Huntington Drive, Suite 201
4 San Marino, CA 91108
5 Tel.: (626) 287-4540
6 Fax: (626) 237-2003

7 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

2010 JAN 27 PM 2:15
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FILED

8 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10
11 LESLIE DUTTON and AMERICAN
12 ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN, INC.,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 v.

15 LOS ANGELES COUNTY
16 SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT and
17 LEROY D. BACA, in his official
18 capacity as Sheriff of Los Angeles
19 County,

20 Defendants.

CV10 0595

Case No.

VDF

(EX)

**COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

21 Plaintiffs LESLIE DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
22 WOMEN, INC. hereby sue Defendants LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S
23 DEPARTMENT and LEROY D. BACA for violation of the First and Fourteenth
24 Amendments to the Constitution of the United States and allege as follows:
25
26
27
28

Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief;
Demand for Jury Trial

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief is asserted by Plaintiffs LESLIE DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN, INC. pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343(3), and 2201.

2. Venue in this Court is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim at issue occurred in this judicial district and Defendants reside within this judicial district.

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff LESLIE DUTTON (“DUTTON”) is the President of Plaintiff AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN, INC. Plaintiff DUTTON also is the producer and host of the public affairs television program known as Full Disclosure Network.

4. Plaintiff AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN, INC. (“AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN”) is a corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of California. Plaintiff AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN operates as a not-for-profit, educational organization under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Plaintiff AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN disseminates the public affairs television program known as Full Disclosure Network.

5. Defendant LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT is, and at all relevant times herein was, a law enforcement agency organized and existing under the Los Angeles County Code, the charter of the County of Los Angeles and the laws of the State of California.

1 6. Defendant LEROY D. BACA (“BACA”) is, and at all relevant times
2 herein was, the Sheriff of Los Angeles County and an officer, agent, and/or
3 employee of Defendant LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT.
4 Defendant BACA is being sued in his official capacity only.

5 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

6 7. Full Disclosure Network is an Emmy Award winning public affairs
7 television program available on public access cable television channels and
8 streamed over the Internet via the program’s website, www.FullDiscloure.net. Full
9 Disclosure Network features videotaped interviews with government officials,
10 community leaders, experts, and other persons of interest, as well as commentary
11 by Plaintiff DUTTON. It also features video news blogs that are made available to
12 the public on Full Disclosure Network’s website.

13 8. Plaintiff LESLIE DUTTON is the producer and host of Full
14 Disclosure Network’s programs and video blogs.

15 9. Full Disclosure Network’s programs and video news blogs cover a
16 wide variety of subjects, including national issues, such as border security and
17 terrorism, as well as state and local issues such as California Assembly
18 proceedings, recall elections, local police practices, public corruption, gangs, and
19 education.
20

21 10. In 2009, Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
22 WOMEN began a new, multi-episode series of programs for Full Disclosure
23 Network concerning certain benefits paid by the County of Los Angeles to state
24 superior court judges serving in the County of Los Angeles. These benefits are
25 above and beyond the salary and benefits the superior court judges receive as
26 compensation from the State of California for serving as state judicial officials.
27
28

1 The new series has been featured prominently on the Full Disclosure Network
2 website and has been the subject of numerous press releases and email updates
3 issued by Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN.

4 11. In this new series, entitled "Judicial Benefits and Court Corruption,"
5 Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN have been
6 very critical of the County of Los Angeles for paying supplemental benefits to the
7 state superior court judges serving in the County of Los Angeles.

8 12. Since approximately April 2009, Plaintiffs DUTTON and
9 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN have been attempting to interview Mr.
10 Richard I. Fine, a controversial, disbarred California attorney, for Full Disclosure
11 Network's "Judicial Benefits and Court Corruption" series. Mr. Fine, who
12 describes himself in court pleadings as being "known for fighting government
13 corruption and misappropriation of funds by state, county and municipal
14 governments" and claims to have been "active in fighting judicial corruption" over
15 the last ten years, has been and continues to be a longstanding and outspoken critic
16 of the county-provided judicial benefits.
17

18 13. Since on or about March 4, 2009, Mr. Fine has been incarcerated
19 indefinitely in the Men's Central Jail of Defendant LOS ANGELES COUNTY
20 SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT pursuant to a civil contempt order entered by the
21 state superior court. Mr. Fine's continuing, indefinite incarceration is related, at
22 least in part, to various legal arguments he has asserted with respect to the county-
23 provided benefits. Mr. Fine has initiated a host of legal actions challenging his
24 continuing, indefinite incarceration and the county-provided benefits. At a
25 minimum, Mr. Fine's legal claims and activities and his continuing, indefinite
26
27
28

1 incarceration for civil contempt make him newsworthy and a person of public
2 interest.

3 14. On information and belief, Mr. Fine has not been charged with or
4 convicted of any crime and would be released if he cured himself of the civil
5 contempt found by the superior court.

6 15. Also on information and belief, Mr. Fine, who is seventy (70) years
7 old and is in failing health, does not present a disciplinary problem or security risk
8 to Defendant LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT or the
9 Men's Central Jail.

10 16. In addition to reporting on the county-provided judicial benefits,
11 Plaintiff DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN also have
12 chronicled the continuing, indefinite incarceration of Mr. Fine as part of their
13 "Judicial Benefits and Court Corruption" series and accompanying video news
14 blogs. Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN also
15 have produced a related series of video news blogs regarding Mr. Fine entitled
16 "Fight for Freedom & Judicial Benefits." Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN
17 ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN have been highly critical of the continuing,
18 indefinite incarceration of Mr. Fine.
19

20 17. On information and belief, Defendants LOS ANGELES COUNTY
21 SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT and BACA are aware of Plaintiffs DUTTON's and
22 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN's "Judicial Benefits and Court
23 Corruption" series and accompanying video news blogs on Full Disclosure
24 Network and their criticism of the county-provided judicial benefits. On
25 information and belief, Defendants LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S
26 DEPARTMENT and BACA also are aware of Plaintiffs DUTTON's and
27
28

1 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN's coverage and criticism of Mr. Fine's
2 continuing, indefinite incarceration for civil contempt.

3 18. Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN
4 have repeatedly requested permission from Defendants LOS ANGELES COUNTY
5 SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT and BACA to interview Mr. Fine at the Men's
6 Central Jail for Full Disclosure Network's "Judicial Benefits and Court
7 Corruption" series and related video blogs. Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN
8 ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN seek to interview Mr. Fine to discuss his various
9 legal claims and his continuing, indefinite confinement, as well as to observe Mr.
10 Fine's physical condition and the conditions of his confinement.

11 19. In addition, Mr. Fine wishes to be interviewed by Plaintiffs DUTTON
12 and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN.

13 20. Defendants LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
14 and BACA have repeatedly denied Plaintiff DUTTON's and AMERICAN
15 ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN's requests to interview Mr. Fine at the Men's
16 Central Jail. Defendant LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT's
17 and BACA's denials of Plaintiff DUTTON'S and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
18 OF WOMEN's requests to interview Mr. Fine at the Men's Central Jail have been
19 arbitrary and capricious, and, on information and belief, also have been unlawfully
20 based, at least in part, on Plaintiff DUTTON'S and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
21 OF WOMEN's coverage and criticism of Mr. Fine's continuing, indefinite
22 incarceration for civil contempt.
23

24 21. Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN
25 were first denied permission to interview Mr. Fine in April 2009. At that time,
26 Defendant LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT Deputy
27
28

1 Johnnie Jones informed Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
2 WOMEN that the request was denied because “the judge said so,” although
3 Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN were not
4 provided with a copy of any order prohibiting interviews of Mr. Fine, and Plaintiffs
5 DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN have not been able to
6 identify any such ruling in the court record.

7 22. On or about September 11, 2009, Plaintiffs DUTTON and
8 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN made a second request to interview
9 Mr. Fine at the Men’s Central Jail. In response, Defendant LOS ANGELES
10 COUNTY SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT Spokesperson Steve Whitmore told
11 Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN that the
12 request was denied because it was the policy of Defendant BACA not to allow
13 interviews of Mr. Fine.

14 23. On or about September 12, 2009, Plaintiffs DUTTON and
15 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN received an email from Mr. Whitmore
16 stating, “The Sheriff has respectfully declined your request to interview Mr. Fine at
17 this time. Thank you for your interest. And I’m sure we will talk soon.” The email
18 indicated that it also had been sent to Defendant BACA and Defendant BACA’s
19 Executive Assistant, Thomas M. Laing.

20 24. On or about September 14, 2009, Plaintiffs DUTTON and
21 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN made a third request to interview Mr.
22 Fine via an intermediary. The request was denied.

23 25. On or about September 17, 2009, Plaintiffs DUTTON and
24 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN made a fourth request to interview Mr.
25 Fine at the Men’s Central Jail by contacting Defendant BACA’s Executive
26
27
28

1 Assistant, Mr. Laing, by telephone. Mr. Laing advised Plaintiffs DUTTON and
2 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN that he would speak to Defendant
3 BACA about the request.

4 26. When Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
5 WOMEN did not receive a response to their September 17, 2009 request to Mr.
6 Laing, they left a voice mail message for Defendant LOS ANGELES COUNTY
7 SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT Spokesperson Whitmore on or about September 23,
8 2009, in which they made a fifth request to interview Mr. Fine.

9 27. On or about September 24, 2009, Defendant LOS ANGELES
10 COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT Spokesperson Whitmore left the following
11 voice mail message for Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
12 WOMEN:

13 Hi, Leslie. This is Steve Whitmore. I am unfortunately the bearer of
14 bad news. The Sheriff has repeatedly told me that that will not
15 happen, and so your request has been denied. And . . . I just talked to
16 him yesterday about this and he said again, he said, "No, that's not
17 going to happen." So it's not going to happen, Leslie. And I'm sorry
18 to have to deliver that to you but that is what the Sheriff's decision is
19 and it's his discretion. And I know that it's bad news, and I'm sorry
20 for that, but that is a final decision. Thank you and stay well. Bye.

21 28. On October 26, 2009, Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN
22 ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN sent a letter to Defendant BACA regarding the
23 repeated denials of their requests to interview Mr. Fine.

24 29. On November 6, 2009, Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN
25 ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN sent a follow-up letter to Defendant BACA
26 regarding the repeated denials of their requests to interview of Mr. Fine.

27 30. Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN
28 received no response from either Defendant LOS ANGELES COUNTY

1 SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT or Defendant BACA to their letters of October 26,
2 2009 and November 6, 2009.

3 31. In contrast to the repeated denials of the requests of Plaintiffs
4 DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN to interview Mr. Fine
5 at the Men's Central Jail, a reporter for the *Los Angeles Times*, Victoria Kim, was
6 allowed to interview Mr. Fine at the Men's Central Jail on or about May 22, 2009.

7 32. On June 7, 2009, the *Los Angeles Times* published an account of Ms.
8 Kim's interview of Mr. Fine at the Men's Central Jail. See Victoria Kim, "Lawyer
9 Takes a Stand From His Cell; Jailed for contempt because he won't discuss his
10 personal finances, he alleges judicial bias," *Los Angeles Times*, June 7, 2009 at
11 A31. The *Los Angeles Times* has not reported on the continued, indefinite
12 incarceration of Mr. Fine as frequently or as critically as have Plaintiffs DUTTON
13 and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN.

14 33. When Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
15 WOMEN reported on the Full Disclosure Network that the *Los Angeles Times*
16 reporter "apparently sneaked into" the Men's Central Jail to interview Mr. Fine,
17 Defendant LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT Spokesperson
18 Whitmore sent Plaintiff DUTTON an email on or about September 30, 2009
19 strongly denying the report and asserting that Ms. Kim "got lucky":
20

21 Leslie:

22 You need to know upon checking, Ms. Kim did not sneak in. She just
23 apparently got lucky. Your reporting is wrong and I would have told
24 you this if you had bothered to check back with me.

25 34. According to records subsequently produced by Defendant LOS
26 ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT in response to a California
27 Public Records Act request, when Ms. Kim went to the Men's Central Jail to
28

1 interview Mr. Fine, she filled out a Men's Central Jail visitor's pass identifying
2 herself as a representative of the media and an employee of the *Los Angeles Times*.
3 On information and belief, Ms. Kim also wore press credentials during the
4 interview, and deputies of Defendant LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S
5 DEPARTMENT were aware of Ms. Kim's presence.

6 35. On information and belief, Defendants LOS ANGELES COUNTY
7 SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT and BACA also have allowed members of the media
8 to videotape interviews of prisoners incarcerated in the Men's Central Jail. On
9 information and belief, Defendants LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S
10 DEPARTMENT and BACA allowed ABC's 20/20 producer Terri Whitcraft to
11 videotape an interview of an inmate at the Men's Central Jail in September 2009.

12 36. The refusal of Defendants LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S
13 DEPARTMENT and BACA to allow Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN
14 ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN to interview Mr. Fine at the Men's Central Jail has
15 harmed and is harming the ability of Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN
16 ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN to obtain and disseminate information to the public
17 about Mr. Fine's various legal claims; his continuing, indefinite confinement; his
18 physical condition; and the conditions of his confinement. It also has harmed and
19 is harming the ability of Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
20 WOMEN to report on and provide commentary about Mr. Fine's claims,
21 confinement, and condition, and to otherwise carry out their public interest
22 mission.
23

24 37. There is no reasonably adequate, alternative way for Plaintiffs
25 DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN to interview Mr. Fine
26
27
28

1 for Full Disclosure Network's programs and video news blogs other than to
2 interview him at the Men's Central Jail.

3 **COUNT I**

4 **(Violation of the First Amendment - 42 U.S.C. § 1983)**

5 38 Plaintiffs hereby reallege Paragraphs 1 through 37 as if fully stated
6 herein.

7 39. Plaintiff DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN
8 enjoy the rights of Freedom of Speech and Freedom of the Press, as guaranteed by
9 the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

10 40. Defendant BACA, acting within the course and scope of his authority
11 and under color of state law, has deprived and is continuing to deprive Plaintiffs
12 DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN of their rights under the
13 U.S. Constitution by denying their requests to interview Mr. Fine at the Men's
14 Central Prison.
15

16 41. As the Sheriff of Los Angeles County, Defendant BACA has final
17 policymaking authority with respect to the requests of Plaintiffs DUTTON and
18 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN to interview Mr. Fine at the Men's
19 Central Prison, and Defendant BACA's denial of Plaintiffs DUTTON's and
20 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN's requests constitutes official policy
21 of Defendant LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE.

22 42. Defendant LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE's policy
23 of denying Plaintiffs DUTTON's and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
24 WOMEN's requests to interview Mr. Fine at the Men's Central Prison amounts to
25 deliberate indifference to Plaintiffs DUTTON'S and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
26 OF WOMEN's rights under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S.
27
28

1 Constitution and is the cause of the violations of Plaintiffs DUTTON's and
2 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN's rights alleged herein.

3 43. Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN
4 are being irreparably and substantially injured as a direct and proximate result of
5 Defendants LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT's and
6 BACA's unlawful deprivation of Plaintiffs DUTTON's and AMERICAN
7 ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN's constitutional rights.

8 44. Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN
9 have no adequate remedy at law.


10 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court: (1) declare the
11 refusal of Defendants LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
12 and BACA to allow Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
13 WOMEN to interview Mr. Fine at the Men's Central Jail to be unlawful; (2) enjoin
14 Defendants LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT and BACA
15 from continuing to deny Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
16 OF WOMEN requests to interview Mr. Fine at the Men's Central Jail; (3) award
17 Plaintiffs DUTTON and AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN reasonable
18 attorney's fees and costs; and (4) grant such other relief as the Court may deem just
19 and proper.
20

21 ///
22 ///
23 ///
24 ///
25 ///
26 ///
27 ///

1 **PLAINTIFF DEMANDS A TRIAL BY JURY.**

2 Dated: January 27, 2010

3 Respectfully submitted,
4 JUDICIAL WATCH, INC.

5
6 By: 
Sterling E. Norris

7
8 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28