	Case 2:17-cv-03200-GMS Docume	nt 8 Filed 09/20/17 Page 1 of 3
1	JELLISON LAW OFFICES, PLLC	
2	2020 North Central Avenue Suite 670	
3	Phoenix, Arizona 85004 Telephone: (602) 772-5520	
4	Facsimile: (602) 772-5509 E-mail: jim@jellisonlaw.com	
5	JAMES M. JELLISON, ESQ. #012763 Attorney for Defendants	
6	IN THE UNITED STAT	TES DISTRICT COURT
7	FOR THE DISTR	ICT OF ARIZONA
8		
9	MARIA ADAME, in her individual capacity; CLARISA ABARCA, as parent of minor	Case No.: CV-2017-3200-PHX-GMS
10	child; C.A., in her individual capacity, and the ESTATE OF DEREK ADAME, as statutory	
11	beneficiaries of the claim for wrongful death of Derek Adame, deceased,	NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF ACTION FROM STATE COURT
12		FROM STATE COURT
13	Plaintiffs,	
14	V.	
15	CITY OF SURPRISE, SURPRISE POLICE DEPARTMENT, OFFICER JOSEPH	
16	GRUVER and OFFICER SHAUN MCGONIGLE,	
17	Defendants.	
18		
10	To the Clerk of the above entitled Court:	
20	PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that pursuar	tt to 28 U.S.C. §§1331, 1441 and 1446 and U.S.
21	District Court Local Rule 3.6, Defendants t	he City of Surprise, City of Surprise Police
22	Department and City of Summiss Police Offi	care Crower and McConigla haraby notice the
23	Department, and City of Surprise Police Off	cers Gruver and McGonigle hereby notice the
24	removal of the above-captioned case from the	Arizona Superior Court, County of Maricopa, to
25	this Court and in support thereof respectfully she	ow:
26		

1. Defendant City of Surprise received the Complaint in the state court action on or about August 22, 2017. On September 7-8, 2017, undersigned counsel waived service for the remainder of the City of Surprise Defendants. Copies of such are attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by reference.

2. This Notice of Removal is being filed within thirty days after receipt of the Complaint, which states federal claims for the first time in the underlying state court action, and is timely filed under 28 U.S.C. §1446(b).

3. The time for Defendants to answer or move with respect to the Complaint has not expired; Defendants have not answered or otherwise responded to the Complaint.

4. Upon information and belief, Plaintiffs are residents of the State of Arizona.

5. A copy of the Notice has been filed with the Clerk of the Superior Court for Maricopa County.

6. This is a civil action in which Plaintiffs appear to allege causes of action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983, Count I: Excessive Force, Count II: Supervisory Liability, Count III: Failure to Intervene, Count IV: Municipal Liability, and Count V: Wrongful Death.

WHEREFORE, City of Surprise Defendants request the above-entitled action now pending in the Superior Court of the State of Arizona, in and for the County of Maricopa, be removed to this Court and that all further proceedings in this action be conducted in this Court as provided by law, and as a Phoenix Precinct matter pursuant to LRCiv. 77.1.

	Case 2:17-cv-03200-GMS Document 8 Filed 09/20/17 Page 3 of 3
1	DATED this 20 <sup>th</sup> day of September, 2017.
2	JELLISON LAW OFFICES, PLLC
3	By: s/James M. Jellison
4	James M. Jellison Attorney for Defendants
5	I hereby certify that on September 20, 2017
6	I hereby certify that on September 20, 2017 I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing.
7 8	Copy mailed to:
8 9	MY AZ LAWYERS Anthony Ramirez
10	1731 West Baseline Road, Suite 101 Mesa, AZ 85202
11	Attorney for Plaintiffs
12	
13	s/Kasey M. Rivera
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	3

# **EXHIBIT A**

•.

•	Case 2:17-cv-03200-GMS Document	Date: 8-22-2017 Time: 10:11412
1 2 3	MY AZ LAWYERS Anthony J. Ramirez #033119 1731 W. Baseline Road, Suite 101 Mesa, Arizona 85202	Served by: <u>Andrew Sinder</u> Badge No.: <u>MC - 80.37</u> Accepted by: <u>M20001</u> LIT/NOC No.: 17-07
4 5 6	Telephone: (480) 263-1699 Facsimile: (480) 478-0714 anthony@myazlawyers.com Attorney for Plaintiffs	
7 8	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT O	
9	IN AND FOR THE COU	
10		CV2017-095167
11 12	MARIA ADAME, in her individual capacity, CLARISA ABARCA, as parent of minor child C. <sup>Redacted</sup> A. <sup>Redacted</sup> , in her individual capacity,	NO. SUMMONS
13 14	and the ESTATE OF DEREK ADAME, as statutory beneficiaries of the claim for	(TORT – NON-MOTOR VEHICLE)
15	wrongful death of Derek Adame, deceased, Plaintiffs,	ASSIGNED TO:
16 17 18	v.	If you would like legal advice from a lawyer, Contact the Lawyer Referral Service at 602-257-4434
19 20 21	CITY OF SURPRISE, SURPRISE POLICE DEPARTMENT, OFFICER JOSEPH GRUVER and OFFICER SHAUN MCGONIGLE	or <u>www.maricopalawyers.org</u> Sponsored by the Maricopa County Bar Association
22 23	Defendants.	
24 25	STATE OF ARIZONA TO THE DEFENDA	NTS:
26 27 28	CITY OF SURPRISE - 16000 N. CIVIC CENTER PLAZA SURPRISE, AZ 85374	
	1	

۰ ،

I

.

	Case 2:17-cv-03200-GMS Document 8-1 Filed 09/20/17 Page 3 of 31
1	
2	SURPRISE CITY PROSECUTOR 16000 N. CIVIC CENTER PLAZA
3	SURPRISE, AZ 85374
4	
5	CITY OF SURPRISE POLICE DEPARTMENT 14250 WEST STATLER PLAZA
6	SUITE 103
7	SURPRISE, AZ 85374
8	OFFICER JOSEPH GRUVER
9	CITY OF SURPRISE POLICE DEPARTMENT
10 11	14250 WEST STATLER PLAZA SUITE 103
12	SURPRISE, AZ 85374
13	OFFICER SHAUN MCGONIGLE
14	CITY OF SURPRISE POLICE DEPARTMENT
15	14250 WEST STATLER PLAZA SUITE 103
16	SURPRISE, AZ 85374
17	
18	A lawsuit has been filed against you.
19	YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED and required to appear and defend, within
20	100 ARE THREE I SOMMORED and required to appear and detend, whilm
21	the time applicable, in this action in this Court. If served within Arizona, you shall appear
22	and defend within 20 days after the service of the Summons and Complaint upon you,
23	
24	exclusive of the day of service. If served out of the State of Arizona, whether by direct
25 26	service, by registered or certified mail, or by publication, you shall appear and defend
20 27	within 30 days after the service of the Summons and Complaint upon you in complete,
28	mant so days allor ale service of the Summons and Complaint upon you in complete,
	exclusive of the day of service. Where process is served upon the Arizona Director of

Insurance as an insurer's attorney to receive service of legal process against it in this state, the insurer shall not be required to appear, answer or plead until the expiration of 40 days after day of such service upon the Director. Service by registered or certified mail without the State of Arizona is complete 30 days after the date of filing the receipt and affidavit of service with the Court. Service by publication is complete 30 days after the date of first publication. Direct service is complete when made. Service upon the Arizona Motor Vehicle Superintendent is complete 30 days after filing the Affidavit of Compliance and return receipt of Officer's Return. RCP 4; Arizona Revised Statutes, Section 20-222, 28-502, 28-503.

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that in case of your failure to appear and defend within the time applicable, judgment by default may be rendered against you for the relief demanded in the Complaint.

YOU ARE CAUTIONED that in order to appear and defend, you must file an Answer or proper response in writing with the Clerk of this Court, accompanied by the necessary filing fee, within the time required and you are required to serve a copy of any Answer or response upon the Plaintiffs attorney; RCP 10(d); Arizona Revised Statutes, Section 12-311; RCP 5.

The name and address of the Plaintiffs' attorney is:

Anthony J. Ramirez, Esq. 1731 West Baseline Road, Suite 101 Mesa, AZ 85202

•.	Case 2:17-cv-03200-GMS Document 8-1 Filed 09/20/17 Page 5 of 31
1	P. 480-833-8000, F. 602-478-0714
2	
3	REQUESTS FOR REASONABLE accommodation for persons with disabilities
5	must be made to the court by parties at least 3 working days in advance of a scheduled
6 7	proceeding.
8	SIGNED AND SEALED THIS DATE:
9	
10	By:
11	Deputy Clerk
12	AUG 09 2017
13	STAL STAL
14 15	DEPUTY CLERK
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24 25	
26	
27	
28	
	4

٢.

	Case 2:17-cv-03200-GMS Document	8-1 Filed 09/20/17 Page 6 of 31
1		
2	MY AZ LAWYERS Anthony J. Ramirez #033119	COPY
3	1731 W. Baseline Road, Suite 101 Mesa, Arizona 85202	AUG 09 2017
4	Telephone: (480) 263-1699	SCOURT MICHAEL K. JEANES, CLERK
5	Facsimile: (480) 478-0714 anthony@myazlawyers.com	DEPUTY OLERK
6	Attorney for Plaintiffs	
7		
8	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT O	
9	IN AND FOR THE COL	JNTY OF MARICOPA
10	MARIA ADAME, in her individual capacity,	Case No.
11 12	CLARISA ABARCA, as parent of minor child	$\mathbb{C} \mathbb{V} 2017 = 0.05$
12	C. <sup>Redacted</sup> A <sup>Redacted</sup> , in her individual capacity, and the ESTATE OF DEREK ADAME, as	095167
14	statutory beneficiaries of the claim for	
15	wrongful death of Derek Adame, deceased,	COMPLAINT FOR WRONGFUL DEATH
16	Plaintiffs,	
17	v.	(TORT – NON-MOTORVEHICLE)
18	CITY OF SURPRISE, SURPRISE POLICE	
19	DEPARTMENT, OFFICER JOSEPH	
20	GRUVER and OFFICER SHAUN MCGONIGLE	
21	Defendants.	
22 23		
24	COMES NOW Plaintiffs, MARIA AD	AME, surviving mother of decedent DEREK
25	ADAME; and CLARISA ABARCA, parent o	f minor child, C <sup>Redacted</sup> A surviving
26	minor daughter of decedent DEREK ADAM	
27		
28	ADAME, by and through undersigned counsel,	nereby state the following in support of their
	Petition for Wrongful Death against the above-n	amed Defendants:

#### **INTRODUCTION**

This action arises from the unjustified fatal shooting of Derek Adame ("Adame") by Surprise Police Officer Joseph Gruver ("Defendant Gruver"). This is a civil action filed pursuant to sections 12-611 and 12-612 of the Arizona Revised Statues, which is commonly referred to as the state of Arizona's Wrongful Death Statutes. It is also brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to redress the deprivation under the color of law of Adame's rights as secured by the United States Constitution. Without any warning or legal justification, Defendant Gruver jumped into Adame's vehicle, shot him twice, and killed him on November 26, 2016. Adame had no weapon in his hand or on his person and had been sleeping in his vehicle. Defendant Gruver's willful, excessive, and unreasonable force resulted in Adame sustaining fatal gunshot wounds to his right forearm, torso, and right shoulder which are the causes of in his premature death. Officer McGonigle (McGonigle) was staying updated on the suspicious vehicle call, was present during the shooting, and did nothing to intervene. Present during the shooting Defendant Gruver was employed by the City of Surprise, Arizona ("Defendant City" or "SPD") at the time he shot and killed Adame.

Acting under the color of law, Defendant Gruver deprived Adame of his well-established civil rights protected both by the United States Constitution and the state of Arizona Constitution. Plaintiffs, Marie Adame, surviving mother of decedent Adame; and Clarisa Abarca, parent of minor child,  $C_{i}^{\text{Redacted}} A^{\text{Redacted}}$  surviving minor daughter of decedent Adame ("Plaintiffs"), seek compensatory and punitive damages, in addition to any other relief this Honorable Court deems just and proper under the circumstances.

# JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Action arises under the Constitution and laws of the United States and therefore this Court has jurisdiction pursuant to Title 28, Sections 1331 of the United States Code and directly under the United States Constitution.

2. The events and omissions giving rise to this Action occurred in this judicial district, and therefore venue is proper in this Court pursuant to Title 28, Section 1391(b) of the United States Code.

# JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiffs demands a trial by jury pursuant to Arizona Rule of Civil Procedure
 38(b) on all issues so triable.

# PARTIES

4. Derek Adame was a twenty (20) year-old resident of Surprise, Arizona when Defendant Gruver shot and killed him on November 26, 2016.

5. Plaintiff Marie Adamc is the surviving mother of decedent Derek Adame.

6. Plaintiff Clarisa Abarca is the parent of minor child,  $C_i^{\text{Redacted}} A_i^{\text{Redacted}}$  who is the surviving minor daughter of decedent Derek Adame.

7. Under Arizona Law, Marie Adame and C.<sup>Redacted</sup> A.<sup>Redacted</sup> through her mother Clarisa Abarca have standing to assert claims for the wrongful death of Derek Adame. Accordingly, they also have standing to assert 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims on behalf of Derek Adame.

8. Defendant Gruver is and was at all times relevant herein duly appointed and acting officer, servants, employees and agents of the Surprise Police Department, a municipal

agency of Defendant City of Surprise. At all times relevant herein, Defendant Gruver was acting under the color of laws, statutes, ordinances, regulations, policies, customs and/or usage of the State of Arizona and the Surprise Police Department, in the course and scope of his duties and functions as an officer, agent, servant, and employee of Defendant City of Surprise, was acting for, and on behalf of, and with the power and authority vested in him by the City of Surprise and the Surprise Police Department, and was otherwise performing and engaging in conduct incidental to the performance of his lawful functions in the course of his duties.

9. Defendant City is and was at all times relevant herein a municipal entity created and authorized under the laws of the state of Arizona. It is authorized by law to maintain a police department which acts as its agent in the area of law enforcement and for which it is ultimately responsible. Defendant City assumes the risks incidental to the maintenance of a police force and the employment of police officers. Defendant City was at all times relevant herein the public employer of Defendant's Gruver and McGonigle, identified more fully *infra*, including at the time Defendant Gruver shot and killed Adame.

10. By the conduct, acts, and omissions complained of herein, Defendant's Gruver and McGonigle violated clearly established constitutional standards under the United States Constitution of which a reasonable police officer under the circumstances would have known.

## **NOTICE OF CLAIM**

11. Plaintiff timely filed a Notice of Claim with the City Clerk of the City of Surprise, setting forth the facts underlying Plaintiff's claim against the City of Surprise, pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-821, et. seq., and Arizona Rule of Civil Procedure 4.1(1).

# STATEMENT OF FACTS

12. On November 26, 2016, at approximately 12:48 a.m., Adame was sleeping in his vehicle located on North 177th Avenue.

13. Simultaneously, Defendant Gruver was driving toward the area of a suspicious vehicle call. He noticed and began to follow a vehicle that he felt was suspicious. As he was following a suspicious vehicle, he passed Adame's vehicle.

14. After Defendant Gruver determined the vehicle was no longer suspicious to him, he asked for the suspicious vehicle call to be assigned to him.

15. Upon reaching Adame's vehicle, Defendant Gruver ran the vehicle's license plate in his mobile data computer. The computer returned an "ACIC stolen tag."

16. Defendant Gruver turned on his "takedown" lights, proceeded to exit his vehicle, and called the license plate over the radio to reconfirm if it was stolen.

17. Defendant Gruver proceeded to walk behind his vehicle and, before approaching Adame's vehicle, removed his firearm from its holster.

18. As Defendant Gruver got to the front of his vehicle, his firearm was in his hand.

19. Upon confirmation from dispatch, Defendant Gruver continued to walk toward Adame's vehicle. He knocked on the passenger window while pointing his firearm in the direction of the vehicle. With no answer, Defendant Gruver opened the passenger door and proceeded to point his firearm at Adame. Defendant Gruver identified himself as Surprise Police and told Adame to raise his hands and do not move. He then proceeded to tell Adame to place his hands on the steering wheel, which Adame complied.

20. Defendant Gruver continued to shout at Adamc and ordered him to keep his

hands up. Adame replied, "I'm not doing anything wrong." Defendant Gruver continued to shout at Adame and began to move toward the vehicle, his firearm inside the vehicle and pointed at Adame.

21. Defendant Gruver proceeded to jump into the vehicle with both knees on the passenger seat with his firearm pointed at Adame. The vehicle began to slowly pull forward when Defendant Gruver yelled, "I will...", and shot his firearm twice into Adame. Defendant Gruver then fell out of the vehicle. The vehicle accelerates down 177th Avenue and crashes into a dark gray, full-sized Dodge Ram truck.

22. Without any warning or legal justification, Defendant Gruver used willful, excessive, and unreasonable force when he shot and killed Adame.

23. Defendant Gruver's negligent handling of his firearm resulted in Adame sustaining fatal gunshot wounds to his right forearm, torso, and right shoulder, which subsequently resulted in Adame's premature death.

24. At no time during the course of this incident did Adame have a firearm or dangerous weapon of any kind in his hand or on his person.

25. At the time of the shooting, Defendant Gruver and an additional officer did not witness Adame holding a firearm or dangerous weapon in his hand.

26. Defendant Gruver shooting throughout the incident was a violation of Adame's constitutionally guaranteed rights to be free from the use of excessive force, the right to life, due process under the law, and equal protection under the law.

27. Prior to his death, Adame endured a substantial amount of conscious pain and suffering from the moment Defendant Gruver shot him until his body ultimately succumbed to

death.

28. During the SPD investigation, Officer McGonigle stated he did not advise Defendant Gruver that the plate was stolen because he did not want to "freak him out." He stated "he had a weird feeling that something might go down," so he started heading to the direction of the call although he did not assign himself to the call.

29. During the SPD investigation, Officer McGonigle stated that when he initially approached as backup and Adame had both of his hands on the steering wheel.

30. During the SPD investigation, Defendant Gruver attempted to justify and rationalize the unlawful killing of twenty (20) year-old Adame by stating that there were a lot of unknowns, he was by himself, and that Adame was moving his hands.

# COUNT I: EXCESSIVE FORCE (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

31. Plaintiffs incorporate the allegations stated in each Paragraph of this Complaint as if restated fully herein.

32. As described in the preceding paragraphs, the conduct of Defendant Gruver constituted excessive force against Derek Adame in violation of the United States Constitution.

33. The conduct and actions of Defendant Gruver, acting in concert and under color of law, in authorizing, directing, and/or shooting a firearm in Adame's right forearm, torso, and right shoulder causing his premature death, was excessive and unreasonable, was done intentionally, willfully, with a deliberate indifference and/or with reckless disregard for the natural and probable consequences of his actions, was done without lawful justification or reason, and was designed to and did cause specific and serious physical pain and suffering in violation of Plaintiff's rights as guaranteed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, including the right to be free from the use of excessive, unreasonable, and unjustified force.

34. The actions of Defendant Gruver as described above violated and deprived Adame of his clearly established and well-settled civil rights to be free from the use of excessive and deadly force, as well as the deprivation of liberty without due process of law and equal protection of the law.

35. The death of Adame was directly and proximately caused by the aforementioned violations and deprivation of his constitutional rights by Defendant Gruver, as Defendant Gruver unlawfully used deadly force against Adame when it was blatantly unwarranted and unjustified to do so.

36. On November 26, 2016, Defendant Gruver used unnecessary and excessive force on Adame of life, liberty, and due process of law. Defendant Gruver jumped into Adame's vehicle while his firearm was drawn and pointed at Adame, and shot him twice.

37. As a direct and proximate result of said Defendant City's and Defendant Gruver's acts, omissions, and excessive force, Adame was deprived of his rights to due process of law, equal protection, and the right to life guaranteed to him by the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution.

38. The conduct described in this Count was undertaken by Defendant Gruver within the scope of his employment and under the color of law such that his employer, Defendant City, is liable for his actions.

39. The conduct described in this Count was objectively unreasonable and was undertaken intentionally with willful indifference to Adame's constitutional rights and to the resulting harm to Adame and Plaintiffs.

40. As a result of the conduct described in this Court, Plaintiffs suffered damages.

# COUNT II: SUPERVISORY LIABILITY (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

41. Plaintiff incorporate the allegations stated in each of the Paragraphs of this Complaint as if restated fully herein.

42. Defendant City has a duty to provide reasonable and effective operations of its police department.

43. Defendant City also has a duty to establish proper policies, customs, and regulations of the police department.

44. The wrongful death of Adame was directly and proximately caused by the failure, negligence, and carelessness of the Defendant City because it failed to properly hire, train, and supervise the police officers it employs.

45. The conduct described in this Count was undertaken by Defendant Gruver within the scope of his employment and under the color of law such that his employer, Defendant City, is liable for his actions.

46. As a result of the conduct described in this Court, Plaintiffs suffered damages.

# COUNT III: FAILURE TO INTERVENE (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

47. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate all above paragraphs as through fully set forth herein.

48. Pleading in the alternative, Defendant McGonigle had a reasonable opportunity to prevent the violations of Adame's constitutional rights as described in this Complaint had they been so inclined, but failed to do so.

49. Defendant McGonigle's actions were undertaken intentionally and with reckless

indifference to Adame's rights.

50. As a direct and proximate result of the misconduct described in this Count, Adame's constitutional rights were violated, and Adame and Plaintiffs suffered damages.

# COUNT IV: MUNICIPAL LIABILITY (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

51. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate all above paragraphs as through fully set forth herein.

52. Defendant City have a duty to provide reasonable and effective operations of its police department.

53. Defendant City also have a duty to establish proper policies, customs, and regulations of the police department.

54. Defendant City directly caused the constitutional violations suffered by Adame, and is liable for the damages suffered by Adame and Plaintiffs as a result of the conduct of the defendant officers. The conduct of Defendant and the surrounding officers was a direct consequence of policies and practices of Defendant City.

55. At all times relevant to this complaint, Defendant City, acting through the Surprise Police Department, had in effect policies, practices, and customs that condoned and fostered the unconstitutional conduct of the individual defendants, and were a direct and proximate cause of damages and injures complained of herein.

56. The wrongful policies, practices, customs and/or usages complained of herein, demonstrated a deliberate indifference on the part of policymakers of the Defendant City to the constitutional rights of persons within the city, and were the direct and proximate cause of the violations of Adames' rights alleged herein.

### **COUNT V: WRONGFUL DEATH**

57. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate all above paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

58. As described in the preceding Paragraphs of this Complaint, Defendant Gruver committed a wrongful act that caused Adame's premature death.

59. Defendant Gruver intentionally, negligently and outside of Police Department policy, jumped into Adame's vehicle with his firearm withdrawn and fired his firearm at Adame, causing a harmful or offensive contact with Adame to occur. This harmful or offensive contact caused Adame's death.

60. Defendant Gruver fired his firearm with reckless indifference to the result or the rights or safety of others. In doing so, Defendant Gruver breached his duty to refrain from such conduct.

61. The conduct described in this Count was undertaken by Defendant Gruver within the scope of his employment and under the color of law such that his employer, Defendant City, is liable for his actions.

62. As a result of the conduct as described in this Court, Adame's death occurred and Plaintiffs occurred and Plaintiffs suffered damages.

### **DAMAGES**

63. As a direct and proximate result of the violations and deprivation of Adame's rights, he suffered severe, painful, and fatal injuries.

64. As a direct and proximate result of these actions, Plaintiffs lost the love, care, companionship, comfort, guidance, services, and support of Adame.

//

65. As a direct and proximate result of these actions, Plaintiffs have experienced pain, grief, sorrow, anguish, stress, shock, and mental suffering presently and is reasonably probable to experience in the future.

66. As a direct and proximate result of these actions, Plaintiffs have lost income and services as a result of the death, and is reasonably probable to be lost in the future.

67. As a direct and proximate result of the injuries to Adame, Plaintiffs have become obligated for necessary medical care and service for the injury that resulted in the untimely death.

68. As a direct and proximate result of the injuries to Adame, Plaintiffs have become obligated for necessary funeral and burial expenses.

WHEREFORE, for all of the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs, MARIE ADAME and C.<sup>Redacted</sup> A<sup>Redacted</sup> through her mother CLARISA ABARCA, respectfully request that the Court enter judgement in their favor and against Defendants, CITY OF SURPRISE and JOSEPH GRUVER and SHAUN MCGONIGLE awarding compensatory damages, punitive damages, and any other relief this Court deems just and appropriate.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this  $S^{T4}$  day of August, 2017.

Ramirez, Esq. Anthony J Altorney for Plaintiffs

**ORIGINAL** and one copy of the foregoing of the foregoing filed this \_\_\_\_\_ day of August, 2017 with:

Clerk of the Court Maricopa County Superior Court

COPY of the foregoing mailed/delivered this \_\_\_\_\_ day of August, 2017 to:

<sup>7</sup> Surprise City Prosecutor
8 16000 North Civic Center Plaza
9 Surprise, AZ 85374

10 City of Surprise
11 Office of the City Clerk
16000 North Civic Center Plaza

12 Surprise, AZ 85374

14 By: \_\_\_\_\_\_ 

	Case 2:17-cv-03200-GMS Document 8	-1 Filed 09/20/17 Page 19 of 31
*		
1	MY AZ LAWYERS	COPY
2	Anthony J. Ramirez #033119	
3	1731 W. Baseline Road, Suite 101 Mesa, Arizona 85202	AUG 0 9 2017
4	Telephone: (480) 263-1699	MACHAEL K. JEANES, CLERK
5	Facsimile: (480) 478-0714 anthony@myazlawyers.com	DEPUTY CLERK
6	Attorney for Plaintiffs	
7		
8	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF	F THE STATE OF ARIZONA
9	IN AND FOR THE COU	NTY OF MARICOPA
10		
11	MARIA ADAME, in her individual capacity, CLARISA ABARCA, as parent of minor child	CV0017 0054 48
12	C <sup>Redacted</sup> A <sup>Redacted</sup> , in her individual capacity,	CV2017-095167 NO.
13	and the ESTATE OF DEREK ADAME, as statutory beneficiaries of the claim for	
14	wrongful death of Derek Adame, deceased,	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL (TORT – NON-MOTOR VEHICLE)
15	Plaintiffs,	,
16 17		
18	v.	ASSIGNED TO:
19	CITY OF SURPRISE, SURPRISE POLICE DEPARTMENT, OFFICER JOSEPH	
20	GRUVER and OFFICER SHAUN	
21	MCGONIGLE	
22	Defendants.	
23		
24	Plaintiffs, by and through undersigne	d counsel, pursuant to Rule 38, Arizona
25	Rules of Civil Procedure, hereby request trial	by jury in the event this matter is not set
26	for compulsory arbitration or an appeal is tak	en from arbitration.
27	W	
28	W	
	W	
	1	
1		

DATED this  $\mathcal{S}^{Ta}$  day of August, 2017.

MY ARIZONA LAWYERS, PLLC.

By

Anthony I. Ramirez, Esq. 1731 West Baseline Road, Suite 101 Mesa, AZ 85202 P. 480-833-8000 Attorney for Plaintiffs

	Case 2:17-cv-03200-GMS Document 8-	1 Filed 09/20/17 Page 21 of 31
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	MY AZ LAWYERS Anthony J. Ramirez #033119 1731 W. Baseline Road, Suite 101 Mesa, Arizona 85202 Telephone: (480) 263-1699 Facsimile: (480) 478-0714 anthony@myazlawyers.com Attorney for Plaintiffs	AUG 0 9 2017
8	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF	F THE STATE OF ARIZONA
9	IN AND FOR THE COU	NTY OF MARICOPA
10		
11 12	MARIA ADAME, in her individual capacity, CLARISA ABARCA, as parent of minor child $C_{\rm Redacted}^{\rm Redacted}$ in her individual capacity,	CV2017-095167 CASE NO.
13 14	and the ESTATE OF DEREK ADAME, as statutory beneficiaries of the claim for	CERTIFICATE OF COMPULSORY ARBITRATION
15	wrongful death of Derek Adame, deceased, Plaintiffs,	(TORT – NON-MOTOR VEHICLE)
16 17		
18	v.	ASSIGNED TO:
19	CITY OF SURPRISE, SURPRISE POLICE DEPARTMENT, OFFICER JOSEPH	
20	GRUVER and OFFICER SHAUN MCGONIGLE	
21		
22	Defendants.	
23 24		
25		
26	The undersigned certifies that the large	gest award sought by Plaintiffs, including
27	punitive damages, but excluding interest, att	orneys' fees, and costs exceeds the limits
28	set by Local Rule for compulsory arbitration	This same is not subject to the Arizon

Rules of Civil Procedure governing compulsory arbitration.

l

.

set by Local Rule for compulsory arbitration. This case is not subject to the Arizona

.

DATED this  $8^{-4}$  day of August, 2017.

MY ARIZONA LAWYERS, PLLC.

By Anthony J. Ramirez, Esq.

1731 West Baseline Road, Suite 101 Mesa, AZ 85202 P. 480-833-8000 Attorney for Plaintiffs

	Case 2:17-cv-03200-GMS Document 8-1	Filed 09/20/17 Page 23 of 31
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	MY AZ LAWYERS Anthony J. Ramirez #033119 1731 W. Baseline Road, Suite 101 Mesa, Arizona 85202 Telephone: (480) 263-1699 Facsimile: (480) 478-0714 anthony@myazlawyers.com Attorney for Plaintiffs	
8	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF	THE STATE OF ARIZONA
9	IN AND FOR THE COU	NTY OF MARICOPA
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MARIA ADAME, in her individual capacity, CLARISA ABARCA, as parent of minor child C. <sup>Redacted</sup> A <sup>Redacted</sup> in her individual capacity, and the ESTATE OF DEREK ADAME, as statutory beneficiaries of the claim for wrongful death of Derek Adame, deceased, Plaintiffs, v. CITY OF SURPRISE, SURPRISE POLICE DEPARTMENT, OFFICER JOSEPH GRUVER and OFFICER SHAUN MCGONIGLE Defendants.	NO. CV2017-095167 WAIVER OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS RE: CITY OF SURPRISE POLICE DEPARTMENT
23		
24	TO: Anthony Ramirez, Plaintiffs' atto	mey:
25 26		f your request that I waive service of the
27	summons in the above captioned action, which	ch is case number CV2017-095167, in the

Superior Court of the State of Arizona in and for the County of Maricopa. I have also

received a copy of the complaint in the action, two copies of this instrument, and a means by which I can return the signed waiver to you without cost to me.

I agree to save the cost of service of a summons and an additional copy of the complaint in this lawsuit by not requiring that I (or the entity on whose behalf I am acting) be served with judicial process in the manner provided by the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure.

I (or the entity on whose behalf I am acting) will retain all defenses or objections to the lawsuit or to the jurisdiction or venue of the court except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the service of the summons.

I understand that a judgment may be entered against me (or the party on whose behalf I am acting) if an answer or motion under Rule 12 is not served upon you within sixty (60) days after the Request for Waiver of Service of Summons was sent, or within ninety (90) days after that date if the request was sent outside the United States.

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ SEPTEMBER, 2017. Jim Jellison, Esq.

# **DUTY TO AVOID UNNECESSARY COSTS OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS**

Rule 4.1 and Rule 4.2 of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure require certain parties to cooperate in saving unnecessary costs of service of the summons and the pleading. A defendant located in the United States who, after being notified of an action and asked by a plaintiff located in the United States to waive service of a summons, fails to do so will be required to bear the cost of such service unless good cause be shown for its failure to sign and return the waiver.

It is not good cause for a failure to waive service that a party believes that the complaint is unfounded, or that the action has been brought in an improper place or in a court that lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action or over its person or property. A party who waives service of the summons retains all defenses and objections (except any relating to the summons or to the service of the summons), and may later object to the jurisdiction of the court or to the place where the action has been brought.

A defendant who waives service must, within the time specified on the waiver form, serve on the plaintiff's attorney (or unrepresented plaintiff) a response to the complaint and also must file a signed copy of the response with the court. If the answer or motion is not served within this time, a default judgment may be taken against that defendant. By waiving service, a defendant is allowed more time to answer than if the summons had been actually served when the request for waiver of service was received.

	Case 2:17-cv-03200-GMS Document 8-1	. Filed 09/20/17 Page 26 of 31
1	MY AZ LAWYERS	
2	Anthony J. Ramirez #033119	
3	1731 W. Baseline Road, Suite 101 Mesa, Arizona 85202	
4	Telephone: (480) 263-1699	
5	Facsimile: (480) 478-0714 anthony@myazlawyers.com	
6	Attorney for Plaintiffs	
7		
8	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF	THE STATE OF ARIZONA
9	IN AND FOR THE COU	NTY OF MARICOPA
10		
11	MARIA ADAME, in her individual capacity,	NO. CV2017-095167
12	CLARISA ABARCA, as parent of minor child $C^{\text{Redacted}}$ A <sup>Redacted</sup> in her individual capacity,	WAIVER OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS
13	and the ESTATE OF DEREK ADAME, as	RE:
14	statutory beneficiaries of the claim for wrongful death of Derek Adame, deceased,	OFFICER JOSEPH GRUVER
15		
16	Plaintiffs,	
17	<b>v</b> .	
18	CITY OF SURPRISE, SURPRISE POLICE	
19	DEPARTMENT, OFFICER JOSEPH	
20	GRUVER and OFFICER SHAUN MCGONIGLE	
21		
22	Defendants.	
23		
24	TO: Anthony Ramirez, Plaintiffs' attor	mey:
25	I, Jim Jellison, acknowledge receipt o	f your request that I waive service of the
26		
27	summons in the above captioned action, which	ch is case number CV2017-095167, in the
28	Sumarian Count of the State of Animone in an	I for the County of Mariana I have also

Superior Court of the State of Arizona in and for the County of Maricopa. I have also

received a copy of the complaint in the action, two copies of this instrument, and a means by which I can return the signed waiver to you without cost to me.

I agree to save the cost of service of a summons and an additional copy of the complaint in this lawsuit by not requiring that I (or the entity on whose behalf I am acting) be served with judicial process in the manner provided by the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure.

I (or the entity on whose behalf I am acting) will retain all defenses or objections to the lawsuit or to the jurisdiction or venue of the court except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the service of the summons.

I understand that a judgment may be entered against me (or the party on whose behalf I am acting) if an answer or motion under Rule 12 is not served upon you within sixty (60) days after the Request for Waiver of Service of Summons was sent, or within ninety (90) days after that date if the request was sent outside the United States.

DATED this 715\_ day of \_ SEPTEMBER\_ 2017. Jim Jellison, Esq.

# DUTY TO AVOID UNNECESSARY COSTS OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS

Rule 4.1 and Rule 4.2 of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure require certain parties to cooperate in saving unnecessary costs of service of the summons and the pleading. A defendant located in the United States who, after being notified of an action and asked by a plaintiff located in the United States to waive service of a summons, fails to do so will be required to bear the cost of such service unless good cause be shown for its failure to sign and return the waiver.

It is not good cause for a failure to waive service that a party believes that the complaint is unfounded, or that the action has been brought in an improper place or in a court that lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action or over its person or property. A party who waives service of the summons retains all defenses and objections (except any relating to the summons or to the service of the summons), and may later object to the jurisdiction of the court or to the place where the action has been brought.

A defendant who waives service must, within the time specified on the waiver form, serve on the plaintiff's attorney (or unrepresented plaintiff) a response to the complaint and also must file a signed copy of the response with the court. If the answer or motion is not served within this time, a default judgment may be taken against that defendant. By waiving service, a defendant is allowed more time to answer than if the summons had been actually served when the request for waiver of service was received.

1       MY AZ LAWYERS         2       Anthony J. Ramirez #033119         1731 W. Baseline Road, Suite 101         3       Mesa, Arizona 85202         4       Telephone: (480) 263-1699         5       Facsimile: (480) 478-0714         5       anthony@myazlawyers.com         6       Attorney for Plaintiffs         7       IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF         9       IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF         9       IN AND FOR THE COURT         10       MARIA ADAME, in her individual capacity,         11       MARIA ADAME, in her individual capacity,         12       CLARISA ABARCA, as parent of minor child         14       CLARISA ABARCA, as parent of minor child         15       Redacted         14       MARIA ADAME, in her individual capacity,         15       In her individual capacity,         16       Plaintiffs,         17       v.         18       CITY OF SURPRISE, SURPRISE POLICE         19       DEPARTMENT, OFFICER JOSEPH         10       GRUVER and OFFICER SHAUN         12       Defendants.	
TO: Anthony Ramirez, Plaintiffs' attor I, Jim Jellison, acknowledge receipt o summons in the above captioned action, whic Superior Court of the State of Arizona in and	of your request that I waive service of the ch is case number CV2017-095167, in the

Ц

received a copy of the complaint in the action, two copies of this instrument, and a means by which I can return the signed waiver to you without cost to me.

I agree to save the cost of service of a summons and an additional copy of the complaint in this lawsuit by not requiring that I (or the entity on whose behalf I am acting) be served with judicial process in the manner provided by the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure.

I (or the entity on whose behalf I am acting) will retain all defenses or objections to the lawsuit or to the jurisdiction or venue of the court except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the service of the summons.

I understand that a judgment may be entered against me (or the party on whose behalf I am acting) if an answer or motion under Rule 12 is not served upon you within sixty (60) days after the Request for Waiver of Service of Summons was sent, or within ninety (90) days after that date if the request was sent outside the United States.

8th day of SEPTEMBER, 2017. DATED this Jim Jellison, Esq.

# **DUTY TO AVOID UNNECESSARY COSTS OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS**

Rule 4.1 and Rule 4.2 of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure require certain parties to cooperate in saving unnecessary costs of service of the summons and the pleading. A defendant located in the United States who, after being notified of an action and asked by a plaintiff located in the United States to waive service of a summons, fails to do so will be required to bear the cost of such service unless good cause be shown for its failure to sign and return the waiver.

It is not good cause for a failure to waive service that a party believes that the complaint is unfounded, or that the action has been brought in an improper place or in a court that lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action or over its person or property. A party who waives service of the summons retains all defenses and objections (except any relating to the summons or to the service of the summons), and may later object to the jurisdiction of the court or to the place where the action has been brought.

A defendant who waives service must, within the time specified on the waiver form, serve on the plaintiff's attorney (or unrepresented plaintiff) a response to the complaint and also must file a signed copy of the response with the court. If the answer or motion is not served within this time, a default judgment may be taken against that defendant. By waiving service, a defendant is allowed more time to answer than if the summons had been actually served when the request for waiver of service was received.

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

# **Civil Cover Sheet**

This automated JS-44 conforms generally to the manual JS-44 approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974. The data is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. The information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law. This form is authorized for use <u>only</u> in the District of Arizona.

# The completed cover sheet must be printed directly to PDF and filed as an attachment to the Complaint or Notice of Removal.

Plaintiff Maria Adame ; Clarisa Abarca ; , (s): C.A., minor	, City of Surprise; , Surprise Police Defendant Department; Joseph Gruver , (s): Police Officer; Shaun McGonigle , Police Officer
County of Residence: Maricopa	County of Residence: Maricopa
County Where Claim For Relief Arose: Maricopa	
Plaintiff's Atty(s):	Defendant's Atty(s):
Anthony Ramirez , Attorney (Maria Adame ; Clarisa Abarca ; , C.A., minor) MY AZ LAWYERS 1731 West Baseline, suite 101 Mesa, Arizona 85202 480-263-1699	James M. Jellison , Attorney (, City of Surprise; , Surprise Police Department; Joseph Gruver , Police Officer; Shaun McGonigle , Police Officer) Jellison Law Offices 2020 N. Central, suite 670 Phoenix, Arizona 85004 602-772-5520

# REMOVAL FROM MARICOPA COUNTY, CASE #CV 2017-095167

II. Basis of Jurisdiction:

**3. Federal Question (U.S. not a party)** 

III. Citizenship of Principal Parties (Diversity Cases Only) Plaintiff:- N/A Defendant:- N/A

IV. Origin :

2. Removed From State Court

V. Nature of Suit:

440 Other Civil Rights

http://www.azd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/generate civil js44.pl

VI.Cause of Action: 42 U.S.C. section 1983

VII. Requested in Complaint Class Action: **No** Dollar Demand: Jury Demand: **Yes** 

VIII. This case is not related to another case.

Signature: <u>s/James M. Jellison</u>

Date: <u>9/20/2017</u>

If any of this information is incorrect, please go back to the Civil Cover Sheet Input form using the *Back* button in your browser and change it. Once correct, save this form as a PDF and include it as an attachment to your case opening documents.

Revised: 01/2014

#### Case 2:17-cv-03200-GMS Document 8-3 Filed 09/20/17 Page 1 of 2 SUPPLEMENTAL CIVIL COVER SHEET FOR CASES REMOVED FROM ANOTHER JURISDICTION

This form must be attached to the Civil Cover Sheet at the time the case is filed in the United States District Clerk's Office

Additional sheets may be used as necessary.

### 1. Style of the Case:

Please include all Plaintiff(s), Defendant(s), Intervenor(s), Counterclaimant(s), Crossclaimant(s) and Third Party Claimant(s) still remaining in the case and indicate their party type. Also, please list the attorney(s) of record for each party named and include their bar number, firm name, correct mailing address, and phone number (including area code).

Party	Party Type	Attorney(s)
Maria Adame, in her individual capacity Clarisa Abarca, as parent of minor child; C.A. in her individual capactiy, and the Estate of Derek Adame	Plaintiffs	Anthony J. Ramirez (state bar no. 033119) MY AZ LAWYERS 1731 West Baseline Road, Suite 101 Mesa, AZ 85202 (480) 263- 1699
City of Surprise City of Surprise Police Department City of Surprise Officer Gruver City of Surprise Officer McGonigle	Defendants	James M. Jellison (state bar no. 012763) for Defendants Jellison Law Offices, PLLC 2020 North Central Avenue, Suite 670 Phoenix, AZ 85004 (602) 772-5520

### 2. Jury Demand:

Was a Jury Demand made in another jurisdiction? If "Yes," by which party and on what date?	Yes 💽	No 🔘	

Yes

In the Maricopa County Superior Court by Plaintiff on August 9, 2017.

### 3. Answer:

Was an Answer made in another jurisdiction? If "Yes," by which party and on what date?

No (•)

# Case 2:17-cv-03200-GMS Document 8-3 Filed 09/20/17 Page 2 of 2 Served Parties:

The following parties have been served at the time this case was removed:

Party	Date Served	Method of Service
Defendant City of Surprise	08/22/2017	process server
City of Surprise Police Department	09/07/2017	waiver of service
City of Surprise officers Gruver and McGonigle	09/07/2017	waiver of service

#### 5. Unserved Parties:

4.

The following parties have not been served at the time this case was removed:

Party	Reason Not Served

### 6. Nonsuited, Dismissed or Terminated Parties:

Please indicate changes from the style of the papers from another jurisdiction and the reason for the change:

Party	Reason for Change

### 7. Claims of the Parties:

The filing party submits the following summary of the remaining claims of each party in this litigation:

Party	Claims
Plaintiff	alleges violations to 42 U.S.C section 1983; excessive force, supervisory liability, failure to intervene, municipal liability, and wrongful death.

# Pursuant to 28 USC § 1446(a) a copy of all process, pleadings, and orders served in another jurisdiction (State Court) shall be filed with this removal.