CLERKS OFFICE U.S. DIST. COURT AT CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA FILED 08/12/2019

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

JULIA C. DUDLEY, CLERK BY: /s/ J. JONES DEPUTY CLERK

JASON KESSLER

Case No.: 3:19-cv-00044

Judge Norman K. Moon

and

DAVID MATTHEW PARROTT

COMPLAINT WITH JURY DEMAND

Plaintiffs,

v

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, TARRON J. RICHARDSON, in his official capacity, AL S. THOMAS in his individual capacity, BECKY CRANNIS-CURL in her individual capacity, MAURICE JONES in his individual capacity.

Defendants.

This action was previously filed and was assigned case #3:18-cv-00107

PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff Jason Kessler is a resident of the state of Maryland
- 2. Plaintiff David Matthew Parrott is a resident of the state of Indiana.
- 3. Defendant City of Charlottesville is a municipality located in the Commonwealth of Virginia. It is sued via a Monell claim due to the misconduct of its City Manager. As a matter of Virginia law, Charlottesville's City Manager is its final policy maker.
- 4. Defendant Tarron J. Richardson is the current City manager of Charlottesville VA. He is sued in his official capacity due to the misconduct of his predecessor in office, Defendant Maurice Jones.
 - 5. Defendant Al Thomas was the Chief of Police of Charlottesville VA,

during all relevant times. He is sued in his individual capacity.

- 6. Defendant Becky Crannis-Curl is a Virginia State Trooper ("VSP") holding the rank of Lieutenant at all relevant times. She is sued in her individual capacity.
- 7. Defendant Maurice Jones was the City Manager of Charlottesville VA during all relevant times. He is sued in his individual capacity.

NATURE OF ACTION

- 8. This action is filed by Plaintiffs Jason Kessler and David Matthew Parrott against Defendants for violation of their First Amendment rights by means of engaging in and/or acquiescing in a hecklers veto during the "Unite the Right" rally in Charlottesville VA on August 12, 2017.
- 9. Mr. Kessler wished to speak, hear others speak, and engage in expressive political activity in opposition to a proposal by Charlottesville City Council to remove the statue of Confederate General Robert E. Lee from the former Lee Park in Charlottesville and planned to do so in Charlottesville August 12, 2017.
- 10. Mr. Parrott wished to engage in expressive political activity in support of Mr. Kessler and to hear persons scheduled to speak at the event make their presentations and planned to do so on August 12, 2017.
 - 11. The Plaintiffs political message is generally referred to as "Alt-Right".
- 12. Many consider Alt-Right political messaging to be offensive due to its liberal use of racially and religiously offensive language.
- 13. A small portion of those who dislike Alt-Right political messaging are known as "Alt-Left" or Antifa. So disturbed are the Antifa about Alt-Right politics that Antifa makes it it's explicit mission to deny Alt-Right persons the ability to speak in public places.
 - 14. Antifa is explicit in its willingness to use violence to deny Alt-Right persons

the right to speak in public.

- 15. Antifa uses phrases such as "by any means necessary" and "punch a Nazi" to communicate their intention to use, and approval of the use of, physical violence to impede or prevent Alt-Right persons from engaging in speech on public property.
- 16. Defendants knew, and intended, that Antifa groups would come

 Charlottesville on August 12, 2017 and, "by any means necessary", stop or attempt to stop the

 Plaintiffs from exercising their free speech rights.
- 17. Defendants planned to, and did, use the expected and foreseeable confrontations between Antifa and Alt-Right to declare the Unite the Right rally to be an "unlawful assembly" or to declare a "state of emergency". Defendants did this purely due to their objection to the content of Plaintiffs speech.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 18. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C § 1331, 1343, and 42 U.S.C. §1983.
 - 19. Venue is proper in the Western District of Virginia, pursuant to 28 §U.S.C. 1391 because a substantial part of the events giving rise to these claims occurred in this District.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 20. On information and belief, Plaintiffs make the following factual allegations.
- 21. Antifa is a well-known and violent group of people with similar beliefs who consistently and predictably engage in violent actions to suppress the free speech rights of anyone Antifa deems unworthy of a public platform.
- 22. Antifa uses violent rhetoric to rally its members and other sympathetic persons to the cause of "smashing the patriarchy." Antifa uses language such as "punch a

¹ To Antifa/Alt-Left members, any Alt-Right person is considered a Nazi.

Nazi", "no platform for hate", "by any means necessary" and other similar phrases to indicate its intentions.

- 23. Antifa has repeatedly put its violent rhetoric into practice at Alt-Right or even ordinary conservative political rallies and events.
- 24. On January 20th, 2017, during the presidential inauguration, Antifa members rioted in downtown Washington D.C., leading to the arrest of at least 217 people. Six police officers were injured in the riots. According to CNN, "... black-clad "Antifascist" protesters smashed storefronts and bus stops, hammered out the windows of a limousine and eventually launched rocks at a phalanx of police lined up in an eastbound crosswalk." Antifa "attempted to shut down entrances" to inaugural festivities²
- 25. On February 1st, 2017 prior to a planned speech by an Alt-Right speaker at the University of California at Berkeley, Antifa members devastated the campus, causing approximately \$100,000 in damages. Black-clad protesters wearing masks threw fireworks and rocks at police. Some even hurled Molotov cocktails that ignited fires. They also smashed windows of the student union center on the Berkeley campus where political speech was to be held. At least six people were injured. The violent protesters tore down metal barriers, set fires near the campus bookstore and damaged the construction site of a new dorm. One woman wearing a red Trump hat was pepper sprayed in the face while being interviewed by CNN affiliate KGO.³
- 26. On March 4th, 2017 in Berkeley, California, a pro-Trump march was violently disrupted by Antifa rioters. Berkeley Police Officer Byron White said 10 arrests were made: one for resisting arrest, four for assault with a deadly weapon, including a dagger, and five for battery. Other items, such as bricks and baseball bats, were confiscated as well.⁴

⁴ https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-nation/wp/2017/03/05/pro-trump-rally-in-berkeley-turns-

² https://www.cnn.com/2017/01/19/politics/trump-inauguration-protests-womens-march/index.html

³ https://www.cnn.com/2017/02/01/us/milo-yiannopoulos-berkeley/index.html

- 27. Antifa showed up to and violently disrupted other events they deemed unworthy of public space prior to August 12, 2017 including, but not limited to, May 1, 2017 in Portland OR⁵, and July 8, 2017 in Charlottesville VA.⁶ More than twenty Antifa were arrested in Charlottesville, four on felony charges. Charlottesville police Lt. Durrette reported that Antifa threw tomatoes and water bottles, and spit on police officers.⁷
- 28. Lt. Durrette also observed "Thank God we parked (the people being assaulted by Antifa) in the (parking) garage or else we probably would have had to shoot someone" to get the non-Antifa persons out safely. 8
- 29. After the July 8, 2017 event in Charlottesville defendant Al Thomas stated he was not going to protect rally participants from Antifa on August 12, 2017.9
 - 30. Defendants were aware of Antifa's violent history and tactics.
- 31. Defendants were aware numerous known Antifa groups would be in Charlottesville for the specific purpose of imposing a heckler's veto on the Plaintiff's on August 12, 2017.¹⁰
- 32. Defendant Al Thomas shared news of what Antifa could be expected to do in Charlottesville on August 12, 2017 with then City Manager defendant Maurice Jones.¹¹
- 33. In the months prior to August 12, 2017, Antifa internet threats reached a fever pitch.
- 34. Video was posted to YouTube of Antifa members firing live ammunition at targets painted with Alt-Right symbols.¹²

 $violent-as-protesters-clash-with-the-presidents-supporters/?utm_term = .7547bc18d0bd$

⁵ http://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2017/05/02/526532023/portland-police-arrest-25-saying-a-may-day-rally-devolved-into-riot

⁶ https://www.nbc29.com/story/35847760/4-facing-felony-charge-following-kkk-groups-justice-park-rally

⁷ Independent Review of the 2017 Protest Events in Charlottesville VA ("Heaphy Report") at p. 57.

⁸ Id. at p. 54.

⁹ Id. at p. 64. Defendant Thomas stated "I'm not going to get them (Alt-Right persons) in and out again" in specific reference to Plaintiffs August 12, 2017 Unite the Right Rally.

¹⁰ McAuliffe, <u>Beyond Charlottesville</u>; p. 64-65; Kindle Desktop version (2019).

¹¹ August 7, 2017 email from Al Thomas to Maurice Jones with link to article of how Antifa attacked Alt-Right persons in Portland OR in August 2017.

- 35. Antifa group "Redneck Revolt" posted a "Call to Arms" to the internet. In it they called for Antifa groups to come to the Unite the Right rally and "dust off the guns of 1921", referring to an incident in 1921 where armed Communists murdered military and law enforcement personnel.¹³
- 36. Antifa group "South Side ARA" encouraged their members to punch Alt Right presenter and scheduled speaker Richard Spencer.¹⁴
- 37. The Philly Antifa (AKA Philly ARA) website called for "direct confrontation" and advised their supporters that offensive violence is "completely legal" because "the best defense is a good offense". They called for Plaintiff's rally and other similar rallies to be shut down and their political opponents to be "completely neutralized on the streets".¹⁵
- 38. Referencing, among others, Plaintiff Jason Kessler, Showing Up for Racial Justice Charlottesville urged their supporters to, ""Know a Nazi, see a Nazi, punch a Nazi." ¹⁶
- 39. Antifa of the Seven Hills published an image with the names of Alt-Right speakers Jason Kessler, Richard Spencer, Matthew Heimbach and Nathan Damigo with an incitement to "Destroy white supremecy (sic) and its actors."¹⁷
- 40. Other Antifa violent rhetoric threatening Plaintiffs rally includes, but is not limited to, "take up their space and disrupt their rally" break Richard Spencer's arm , "Punch a Nazi" and "Kill your local Nazi scum", "Trump supporters will get that ass whipped", and "Gulag all Trump supporters". 22

¹² https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CywFbSdMVx0

¹³https://www.redneckrevolt.org/single-post/CALL-TO-ARMS-FOR-CHARLOTTESVILLE

¹⁴ https://twitter.com/Chicago_ARA/status/866140378575011841

 $^{^{15}\} https://web.archive.org/web/20170817041157/https://phillyantifa.org/frequently-asked-questions-suggested-readingsvideos-start-here/$

¹⁶ https://web.archive.org/web/20190501185721/https://twitter.com/SURJ_Cville/status/864527150375993346

¹⁷ https://twitter.com/ash_Antifa/status/895661737793519616

¹⁸ https://www.facebook.com/al.shiflett/posts/10155019884633155

¹⁹ https://www.facebook.com/RefuseFascism/posts/1731016153859060

²⁰https://www.instagram.com/p/BbqYfXQjFT0/

²¹ https://web.archive.org/web/20190502230059/https:/twitter.com/corey_lemley/status/736358087368400897

²² https://web.archive.org/web/20190502230728/https://twitter.com/corey_lemley/status/911649260629786624

- 41. Prior to August 12, 2017 Defendants were briefed by regional law enforcement on what Antifa groups were expected to show up in Charlottesville on August 12, 2017. At least six known Antifa organizations were identified by law enforcement as planning to be in Charlottesville on August 12, 2017. At least two of the groups were headquartered in or geographically affiliated with Charlottesville.
- 42. Prior to August 12, 2017 Defendants had received intelligence that Antifa would be in attendance and planning to engage in violence by throwing soda cans filled with concrete.²³
- 43. At the actual "Unite the Right" ("UTR") event on August 12, 2017 Chief Thomas and Lt. Crannis-Curl were present in a supervisory capacity. Chief Thomas supervised all Charlottesville police officers on scene and Lt. Crannis-Curl supervised all VSP present.
- 44. Chief Thomas ordered Charlottesville police not to intervene at the Unite the Right Rally and to allow Antifa to impose a heckler's veto on Plaintiffs political speech.
- 45. On July 8, 2017 the Charlottesville police had done their jobs and separated political speakers from violent Antifa. On July 8, 2017 Charlottesville police did their jobs and prevented a heckler's veto. They were thanked by being assaulted and spit on by Antifa.
 - 46. After July 8, 2017, Chief Thomas made it very clear his police would not be permitted to do their jobs and prevent Antifa from imposing a heckler's veto on August 12, 2017.
- 47. After July 8, 2017 Chief Thomas told his subordinates ""I'm not going to get [Alt-Right] in and out" during the UTR rally. Chief Thomas' meaning was clear. He would not permit his police officers to prevent Antifa from violently imposing a heckler's

²³ Heaphy Report p.187

veto again.

- 48. A third-party report commissioned by the City after August 12 found that "Rather than engage the crowd and prevent fights, the [Charlottesville police department] plan was to declare the event unlawful and disperse the crowd."²⁴
- 49. Charlottesville police officers received the orders implementing Defendants unlawful scheme loud and clear.
- 50. Charlottesville Officers told third party investigators that they had been ordered not to engage over "every little thing"; not to "go in and break up fights"; not to interrupt "mutual combat"; and officers were not to be sent out among the crowd where they might get hurt.²⁵
- 51. During the August 12, 2017 event, Chief Thomas stuck with the unlawful plan to permit a heckler's veto. Upon being advised that violence had broken out the Chief stated "Let them fight, it will make it easier to declare an unlawful assembly." ²⁶
- 52. Charlottesville police did indeed, and pursuant to Defendants unlawful orders, "let them fight".
- 53. Tom Keenan of Antifa group Philly ARA sprayed mace at Alt-Right protesters.²⁷ Tom Massey of Philly ARA indiscriminately sprayed mace into a crowd of Alt-Right protesters²⁸ and beat Alt-Right demonstrators with canes on several different occasions.²⁹
- 54. Keenan and Massey later distinguished themselves by assaulting Hispanic Marines in Philadelphia while calling the Marines "spic" and "wetback". 30 They currently face

²⁵ Heaphy Report p. 98

²⁴ Heaphy Report p.98

²⁶ Heaphy Report p. 133

²⁷ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xsHWU-hCEDI

²⁸ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MtpVu-UBc5Y

²⁹ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k1L974le73k; https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7xxKh7I_PGA

³⁰ https://www.phillymag.com/news/2018/12/13/marines-assaulted-philadelphia-keenan-massey-antifa/

felony charges in Pennsylvania.

- 55. Don Gathers, co-founder of Black Lives Matter Charlottesville, bludgeoned an Alt-Right demonstrator using a stick,³¹ Daryle Lamont Jenkins slapped an Alt-Right demonstrator,³² Corey Lemley attacked a man with an Antifa themed baseball bat,³³ and Alexandra Shiflett threw bricks and bottles at demonstrators.³⁴
- 56. Antifa group Refuse Fascism demonstrators used picket signs to hit Alt Right attendees on Market Street outside Emancipation Park.³⁵ Brent Betterly of Antifa group South Side ARA released mace into a crowd of people and later hit an Alt-Right demonstrator with a metal pipe.³⁶
- 57. In one incident, captured on video, a citizen was knocked to the ground with a sucker punch by Brian Bozicek of Philly ARA. Once on the ground he was smothered and punched by Kristopher Goad from Antifa of the Seven Hills, kicked in the head by Tom Massey of Philly ARA and clubbed in the head with an expandable asp baton by Lindsey Moers, also Philly ARA.³⁷
- 58. Luis Oyola of Antifa group Anarchist People of Color stated "(Antifa) were successful in drawing (Alt-Right demonstrators) away from the park. And, um, make them more vulnerable. As that happened many people were in the line of fire of projectiles, of people spray, of tear gas, and a lot of people were hurt and beaten on both sides."
- 59. At one point a citizen begged police to do something while fighting broke out directly in front of Charlottesville police officers. The fighting had started when Antifa

³¹ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sP8KO9ZsZpA

³² https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vj9BWu6Qdps

³³ https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=1419096424792391

³⁴ https://youtu.be/3-KOUxTIdUE

³⁵ https://youtu.be/77AuzljnQB4

³⁶ Betterly images attached

³⁷ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j6iQGoE2ynE

³⁸ https://web.archive.org/web/20190718075500/https://crimethinc.com/podcasts/the-exworker/episodes/56/transcript

crowded around a park entrance and refused Alt-Right attendees' access to the rally location.

The officers simply stood in silence staring at the results of this in progress heckler's veto.

- 60. After the August 12th events, Charlottesville police stated they feared "retaliation" from Chief Thomas if they provided truthful information about August 12.³⁹
- 61. Defendant Maurice Jones was the City Manager for Charlottesville VA at all relevant times and as such was Charlottesville's final policy maker. Maurice Jones communicated with Al Thomas, specifically about Antifa, prior to August 12, 2017. Maurice Jones knew of and approved of Al Thomas' orders that his police not prevent Antifa from violently imposing a heckler's veto on the Alt-Right on August 12, 2017.
- 62. Maurice Jones was present in the government "command center" together with Chief Thomas and several others on August 12. Maurice Jones heard Al Thomas say "let them fight it will make it easier to declare an unlawful assembly."
- 63. Maurice Jones did not order Chief Thomas to abandon his unlawful scheme and prevent Antifa from violently imposing a heckler's veto. Maurice Jones did not fire Al Thomas so real police officers could do their jobs. Maurice Jones agreed with and authorized Al Thomas' plan to permit the heckler's veto and did so both before and during August 12th. Maurice Jones acquiesced in Al Thomas's plan to permit the heckler's veto before and during August 12, 2017.
- 64. Defendant Becky Crannis-Curl allowed the heckler's veto as soon as people began arriving for the UTR event. She advised fellow law enforcement that she was going "off-plan" and refused to send Virginia State Police ("VSP") "arrest teams" into the street.⁴⁰
- 65. Lt. Crannis-Curl effectively communicated this order to all VSP under her command.

-

³⁹ Heaphy Report p. 14.

⁴⁰ Heaphy Report p.121.

- 66. Other VSP troopers advised Charlottesville police that they would not send VSP troopers to engage the crowd "if safety was compromised." Still other VSP officers advised either citizens or City police they were "under orders" not to intervene or "not to break up fights."
- 67. So strictly did VSP adhere to this non-intervention order that even when citizens directly begged for help the VSP refused stating they were "not available" to help.⁴²
- 68. Both Charlottesville and VSP officers were under similar, if not identical, orders to permit the Antifa to violently impose a heckler's veto upon the Plaintiffs.
- 69. On August 12. While Antifa was actively and violently imposing a heckler's veto upon the Plaintiffs, a woman approached a police barricade and got Charlottesville Officer Ernest Johnston's attention. She asked, "Are you going to engage the crowd at all?" "Not unless I get a command to," Officer Johnson responded. "Even if there are people physically hurting one another?" she asked. "If I'm given the command to act, yes ma'am, I will." She repeated her question, and he gave the same answer: he would engage if and when he was commanded to do so.⁴³
- 70. A man who witnessed the heckler's veto in progress asked VSP troopers why they weren't doing anything to restore order. The trooper replied, "Our policy today is that we cannot get involved in every skirmish, and we are here to protect the public's safety." The man was incredulous that VSP would allow the fights to go on, but the trooper reiterated, "That is our policy."
- 71. On August 12, 2017 Antifa assembled on Market Street between 1st and 2d Streets in Charlottesville. Market Street were the only entrances to the park not blocked by law enforcement.

⁴² Heaphy Report p. 122

⁴¹ Heaphy Report p.122

⁴³ Heaphy Report p. 132

⁴⁴ Heaphy Report p. 132.

- 72. Plaintiff Jason Kessler attempted to enter from the so-called backside of the park at Jefferson and 2nd Street. He believed that is where he was supposed to enter pursuant to instructions from police. He was prevented from doing so by VSP barricades which the troopers refused to move. Mr. Kessler advised the troopers he was the event organizer and permit holder, but they still did not let him enter the park. Rather, he was told he had to enter by walking past Antifa on Market Street.
- 73. Mr. Kessler walked toward Market Street and saw the skirmishes between Alt-Right trying to enter the park and Antifa trying to impose a heckler's veto.
- 74. Mr. Kessler was able to negotiate his way through the crowd and enter the park.
- 75. Once in the park Mr. Kessler approached the speaker's area of the park which was also blockaded by VSP. VSP advised he could not enter the speaker's area to prepare for his rally until Charlottesville police said he could. No Charlottesville police were available in that area to consult.
- 76. Shortly thereafter law enforcement declared an "unlawful assembly" and all persons were ordered to leave the park. Mr. Kessler protested that he had a permit and should be allowed to stay. Plaintiff Kessler was again ordered out of the park. He complied, told as many Alt-Right supporters as he could to leave the park and proceed to a nearby location, and left without incident.
- 77. Plaintiff David Matthew Parrott walked up Market Street with a group of alts-right event supporters. Mr. Parrott attempted to communicate with several officers after entering the park regarding the Antifa violence. None were cooperative. Mr. Parrott, was entirely surrounded by violent antifa and the Charlottesville Police Department would not cooperate to halt or attempt to halt the ongoing Antifa violent heckler's veto. Mr. Parrott focused on medical aid to the dozens of injured Alt-Right attendees while in the park,

encouraged people to refrain from violence and maintain a secure perimeter around the event. When the "unlawful assembly" was declared, Mr. Parrott walked up to the Confederate statue on the hill to achieve a better vantage point for planning his group's exit from the park. While attempting to do so, Mr. Parrott was arrested, detained, and transported to the jail, which was located adjacent to his parking garage.

- 78. Plaintiff Jason Kessler had a lawful permit to hold the Unite the Right Rally at the former Lee Park in Charlottesville on August 12, 2017. Plaintiffs First Amendment right to free speech was violated by a violent Antifa led heckler's veto. Plaintiff Kessler was prevented from speaking, hearing other speakers, and demonstrating in support of his political opinions. Defendants knew Antifa would appear and attempt to shut down the Unite the Right rally. Defendants illegally permitted the heckler's veto and then used the chaos caused by Antifa to shut down Plaintiffs rally. Defendants engaged in the misconduct listed above due to public hostility to the content of Plaintiffs speech.
 - 79. Plaintiff David Matthew Parrott had a legal right to attend and participate in the Unite the Right Rally at the former Lee Park in Charlottesville on August 12, 2017. Plaintiffs First Amendment right to free speech was violated by a violent Antifa led heckler's veto. Plaintiff Parrott was prevented from speaking, hearing other speakers, and demonstrating in support of his political opinions. Defendants knew Antifa would appear and attempt to shut down the Unite the Right rally. Defendants illegally permitted the heckler's veto and then used the chaos caused by Antifa to shut down Plaintiffs rally. Defendants engaged in the misconduct listed above due to public hostility to the content of Plaintiffs speech.
- 80. After the unlawful assembly declaration South Side ARA took to social media to celebrate spraying a Unite the Right speaker with mace and bragged about "the

beating we dealt them with our bare hands in the street."45

- 81. Antifa protestor Corey Lemley posted a picture of a Unite the Right demonstrator being punched in the face along with the violent commentary, "Open those eyes when you catch these hands." 46
- 82. At a symposium on the Unite the Right rally, Black Lives Matter

 Charlottesville co-founder Jalane Schmidt bragged, "Well we're trying to chase those folks

 out. That's what we're about."⁴⁷
- 83. Redneck Revolt leader Dwayne Dixon boasted about his role on August 12th as, "...physically fighting: kicking, striking, bloodying, cracking heads. I mean bloody, ugly things that I would never wish but we need people with this moral clarity and determination."

COUNT I

First Amendment – Heckler's Veto (Against Al S. Thomas)

- 84. The preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference.
- 85. Defendant Thomas ordered Charlottesville police officers to allow Antifa to impose a heckler's veto upon the Plaintiff.
 - 86. Defendant Thomas's misconduct was taken under color of state law and was willful, wanton, malicious, and/or deliberately indifferent to the constitutional rights of the Plaintiffs.
 - 87. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of the Plaintiff's First Amendment rights, Plaintiffs have suffered irreparable harm, including the loss of their

⁴⁵https://web.archive.org/web/20190423193625/https:/twitter.com/Chicago_ARA/status/896902376791191553

⁴⁶ https://www.facebook.com/corey.lemley1012/posts/133884094369020

⁴⁷ https://www.soundcloud.com/user-458357165/faith-in-the-struggle-a-panel-on-christianity-and-white-supremacy-in-charlottesville

⁴⁸ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U0dgg9dXLm0&feature=player_embedded

fundamental constitutional rights to First Amendment freedom of speech and expression and right to be free of a heckler's veto.

88. Defendant Thomas is liable to the Plaintiffs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

COUNT II First Amendment – Heckler's Veto (Against Becky Crannis-Curl)

- 89. The preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference.
- 90. Defendant Crannis-Curl ordered Virginia State Troopers to allow Antifa to impose a heckler's veto upon the Plaintiff.
 - 91. Defendant Crannis-Curl's misconduct was taken under color of state law and was willful, wanton, malicious, and/or deliberately indifferent to the constitutional rights of the plaintiffs.
 - 92. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of the Plaintiff's First Amendment rights, Plaintiffs have suffered irreparable harm, including the loss of their fundamental constitutional rights to First Amendment freedom of speech and expression and right to be free of a heckler's veto.
 - 93. Defendant Crannis-Curl is liable to the Plaintiffs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

COUNT III

First Amendment – Heckler's Veto (Against Maurice Jones)

- 94. The preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference.
- 95. Defendant Jones ordered and/or acquiesced in and/or approved Defendant Al Thomas's plan to allow Antifa to impose a heckler's veto on the Plaintiffs Unite the Right

rally and then use the resulting chaos as an excuse to declare an unlawful assembly.

- 96. Defendant Jones's misconduct was taken under color of state law and was willful, wanton, malicious, and/or deliberately indifferent to the constitutional rights of the plaintiffs.
- 97. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of the Plaintiff's First Amendment rights, Plaintiffs have suffered irreparable harm, including the loss of their fundamental constitutional rights to First Amendment freedom of speech and expression and right to be free of a heckler's veto.
 - 98. Defendant Jones is liable to the Plaintiffs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

COUNT IV Monell Claim (Against City of Charlottesville)

- 99. The preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference.
- 100. Defendant Maurice Jones was the City Manager of Charlottesville, VA at all relevant times.
- 101. As a matter of state law Maurice Jones was the final policymaker for Charlottesville VA at all relevant times and set policy for the Charlottesville regarding the relevant events.
- 102. The City of Charlottesville VA is therefore liable for Maurice Jones's misconduct as described above.
 - 103. Defendant Jones's misconduct was taken under color of state law and was willful, wanton, malicious, and/or deliberately indifferent to the constitutional rights of the plaintiffs.
 - 104. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of the Plaintiff's First Amendment rights, Plaintiffs have suffered irreparable harm, including the loss of their fundamental constitutional rights to First Amendment freedom of speech and expression and

right to be free of a heckler's veto.

105. The City of Charlottesville is liable to the Plaintiffs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and Monell v. Department of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658 (1978).

COUNT V Supervisory Liability (Against Al S. Thomas)

- 106. The preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference.
- 107. Defendant Thomas was supervising all Charlottesville police officers at all relevant times.
 - 108. Defendant Thomas affirmatively caused the Charlottesville police to fail in their duty to not participate in, cause, or acquiesce in Antifa's heckler's veto of the Plaintiffs.
- 109. Defendant Thomas omitted to perform his duty of not allowing Antifa to impose a heckler's veto on the Plaintiff's event.
 - 110. Defendant Thomas's misconduct was taken under color of state law and was willful, wanton, malicious, and/or deliberately indifferent to the constitutional rights of the plaintiffs.
 - 111. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of the Plaintiff's First Amendment rights, Plaintiffs have suffered irreparable harm, including the loss of their fundamental constitutional rights to First Amendment freedom of speech and expression and right to be free of a heckler's veto.
 - 112. Defendant Thomas is liable to the Plaintiffs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

<u>COUNT VI</u> Supervisory Liability

(Against Becky Crannis-Curl)

- 113. The preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference.
- 114. Defendant Crannis-Curl was supervising all Virginia State Troopers at all relevant times.
- 115. Defendant Crannis-Curl affirmatively caused the Virginia State Troopers to fail in their duty to not participate in, cause, or acquiesce in Antifa's heckler's veto of the Plaintiffs.
- 116. Defendant Crannis-Curl omitted to perform her duty of not allowing Antifa to impose a heckler's veto on the Plaintiff's event.
- 117. Defendant Crannis-Curl's misconduct was taken under color of state law and Was willful, wanton, malicious, and/or deliberately indifferent to the constitutional rights of the plaintiffs.
 - 118. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of the Plaintiff's First Amendment rights, Plaintiffs have suffered irreparable harm, including the loss of their fundamental constitutional rights to First Amendment freedom of speech and expression and right to be free of a heckler's veto.
 - 119. Defendant Crannis-Curl is liable to the Plaintiffs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs demand judgment against the Defendants as follows:

- A. To award Plaintiffs compensatory damages in an amount to be shown at trial against all defendants;
- B. Punitive damages against all individual capacity defendants;
- C. Costs incurred in this action;
- D. Reasonable attorney fees;

- E. Prejudgment interest;
- F. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully Submitted,

s/ Elmer Woodard

Elmer Woodard
Attorney at Law
5661 US Hwy 29
Blairs VA 24527
434-878-3422
VSB 27734
isuecrooks@comcast.net
Trial Attorney for Plaintiffs

s/

JAMES E. KOLENICH (0077084) Kolenich Law Office 9435 Waterstone Blvd. #140 Cincinnati, OH 45249 (513) 444-2150 (513) 297-6065 (fax) JEK318@gmail.com PHV Pending

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				DEFENDANTS			
Jason Kessler				City of Charlottesville			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Prince George County (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Elmer Woodard 5661 US HWY 29 Blairs VA 434-878-3422				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Albemarle (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)			
II DACICOE HIDICOI	CTION OF WAR O	D 01)	шсі	TIZENSHID OF D	DINCIDAL DADTIES	OI WYY O D C DI C	
				II. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant)			
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	✓ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		Citize	en of This State			
☐ 2 U.S. Government ☐ 4 Diversity Defendant		ip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	2		
			Citizen or Subject of a 3 5 Foreign Nation 6 6 6 Foreign Country				
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		ly) RTS	FC	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	Click here for: Nature BANKRUPTCY	of Suit Code Descriptions. 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 & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS □ 440 Other Civil Rights □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other □ 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal 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 & Othe 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	TY	LABOR O Fair Labor Standards Act O Labor/Management Relations O Railway Labor Act I Family and Medical Leave Act O Other Labor Litigation Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application Other Immigration Other Immigration Other Immigration Other Immigration Other Immigration Other Immigration Actions	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC	
	cite the U.S. Civil Star 42 USC 1983	Appellate Court tute under which you are		1 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	brief description of ca	use: lonell; supervisory li	iabilitv				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.				DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: ▼ Yes □ No			
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY See instructions): JUDGE Moon DOCKET NUMBER 3:17cv72; 3:18cv107							
DATE 08/12/2019		signature of att s/ Elmer Wooda		DF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY							

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 there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven 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 Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407
 - Multidistrict Litigation Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.

 PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statue.
- 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.