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 THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	eranamen et stad for en grante dem a met kleim anterim an met de anterim production et en anterim andere des d E		DEFENDANTS		
		ĺ			
(b) County of Residence of First L (EXCEPT IN	Lebanon U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		NOTE: IN LAN	of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) ID CONDEMNATION CASES, U	
			LAND	INVOLVED.	
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address,	•	. 1	Attorneys (If Known)		
rochniak Weisberg, Matthew Iorton, PA 19070, 610-690-08		on Ave.,			
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTIO	N (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CI		PRINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government ☐ 3 Flaintiff	Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			TF DEF 1 1 Incorporated or Pr of Business In Thi	
☐ 2 U.S. Government ☐ 4 ☐ Defendant	Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizer	of Another State	1 2	
*	(moreate Cruzensin) of Fantes in Rent In)		or Subject of a	3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place a					
CONTRACT 110 Insurance PERSO	TORTS ONALINIUS PEDSONALINIUS	***************************************	Agriculture	BANKRUPTCY 7 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES 7 400 State Reapportionment
□ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	irplane Product ability 365 Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 370 Other Fraud ability 371 Truth in Lendin (otor Vehicle oduct Liability 371 Truth in Lendin Property Dama Product Liability 385 Property	Section Geometric Geomet	Agriculture Other Food & Drug Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 Liquor Laws R.R. & Truck Airline Regs. Occupational Safety/Health Other LABOR Fair Labor Standards Act Labor/Mgmt. Relations Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act Railway Labor Act Other Labor Litigation Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee Other Immigration Actions	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 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	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
ORIGIN Original Proceeding (Place an "X" in O 2 Removed fro State Court	om 3 Remanded from Appellate Court	☐ 4 Reinst Reope	ned anoth	ferred from	
JI CALISE OF ACTION -	the U.S. Civil Statute under which you 331 re: 1983	are filing (D	o not cite jurisdiction	al statutes unless diversity):	
Bne	of description of cause: vil Rights Violation of 2nd Am	nendment	Right to Carry a	Firearm	
-	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTIO UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	ON DE 1,000,00	MAND \$ 0.00	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: ✓ Yes □ No
/III. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY	See instructions): JUDGE		. ,	DOCKET NUMBER	
ATE	SIGNATURE OF A	ATTORNEY O	F RECORD		
11/24/2008 AW (MM					
OR OFFICE USE ONLY		_	JUDGE	мад. дл	

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Middle District of Pennsylvania

)

Civil Action No.

Waiver of the Ser	rvice of Summons
To:	
(Name of the plaintiff's attorney or unrepresented plaintiff)	
I have received your request to waive service of a su two copies of this waiver form, and a prepaid means of retur	ammons in this action along with a copy of the complaint, rning one signed copy of the form to you.
I, or the entity I represent, agree to save the expense	of serving a summons and complaint in this case.
I understand that I, or the entity I represent, will jurisdiction, and the venue of the action, but that I waive any	keep all defenses or objections to the lawsuit, the court's objections to the absence of a summons or of service.
	st file and serve an answer or a motion under Rule 12 within on this request was sent (or 90 days if it was sent outside the entered against me or the entity I represent.
Date 11/24/08	Ant um
	Signature of the attorney or unrepresented party
	Motthew Weisberg Printed name
	Printed name
	7 S. morton Ave., morton 9A 19070 Address
	Mweisterga ppwlaw. com

Duty to Avoid Unnecessary Expenses of Serving a Summons

Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires certain defendants to cooperate in saving unnecessary expenses of serving a summons and complaint. A defendant who is located in the United States and who fails to return a signed waiver of service requested by a plaintiff located in the United States will be required to pay the expenses of service, unless the defendant shows good cause for the failure.

"Good cause" does *not* include a belief that the lawsuit is groundless, or that it has been brought in an improper venue, or that the court has no jurisdiction over this matter or over the defendant or the defendant's property.

If the waiver is signed and returned, you can still make these and all other defenses and objections, but you cannot object to the absence of a summons or of service.

If you waive service, then you must, within the time specified on the waiver form, serve an answer or a motion under Rule 12 on the plaintiff and file a copy with the court. By signing and returning the waiver form, you are allowed more time to respond than if a summons had been served.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Meleanie & Scott Hain	‡
Individually & as Husband & Wife	:
	:
	:
Plaintiffs	: CIVIL ACTION NO.:
V.	į.
	: JURY OF TWELVE (12) JURORS DEMANDED
Michael J. DeLeo	1
Individually & in his official capacity	1
400 S. 8 th St.	!
Lebanon, PA 17042	
	Ĭ
And	1
	1
Office of the Lebanon County Sheriff	;
400 S. 8 th St.	:
Lebanon, PA 17042	:
	:
And	1
	1
Lebanon County]
400 S. 8 th St.	1
Lebanon, PA 17042	:
	1
And	1
	1
John Does 1-10	:

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

Defendants:

I. Preliminary Statement

- 1. This is an action for an award of attorney's fees and costs, compensatory, statutory, and punitive damages, also seeking equitable, injunctive and other relief, for Defendants' Civil Rights violations arising from Plaintiff, Meleanie Hain's open carrying a firearm.
- 2. Individually, jointly or severally, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for, but not limited to, the below causes of action and aforesaid remedies, for the reasons stated, which reasons are averred upon information and belief, or will become known in discovery or at trial.
- 3. Plaintiff reserves the right to rely on the "Discovery Rule" and the Doctrine(s) of Equitable Tolling/Fraudulent Concealment, respectively.

II. Jurisdiction and Venue

- 4. Jurisdiction in this Honorable Court is based on federal question conferred by 28 U.S.C. §1331; supplemental jurisdiction over state law claims is granted by 28 U.S.C. §1367.
- 5. Venue lies in this District in that the events giving rise to this claim occurred here, at least one (1) Defendant resides, maintains a principal place of business, is incorporated or does business here, or the subject of this action is situated within this district.

III. Parties

- 6. Plaintiffs, Meleanie ("Plaintiff") and Scott Hain, are adult individuals, and husband and wife, citizens currently residing at the above-captioned address.
- 7. Defendant, Michael J. DeLeo ("DeLeo" or "Sheriff"), was at all times material the Sheriff of Lebanon County ("County") and at all times relevant hereto was the primary legal official responsible for any policy and other decisions governing actions relevant to this matter, and he was operating in his official capacity as an employee, worker, or agent of Defendants,

County and Sheriff's Office (see below), at the above-captioned address, and he is being sued individually and in his official capacity, having acted under color of state law.

- 8. Defendant, Office of the Sheriff of Lebanon County ("Sheriff's Office"), along with Defendant, County, at all times material granted Defendant, DeLeo, the legal authority for official responsibility for any policy and other decisions governing actions relevant to this matter, and was operating as an agency of Defendant, County, at the above-captioned address, having acted under color of state law.
- 9. Defendant, Lebanon County ("County"), is a municipality, registered to transact business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with agents authorized to receive service of process at the above-listed address, and owns, operates, manages, directs and controls Defendant, Sheriff's Office, which Defendants, County and Sheriff's Office, employs Defendant, DeLeo.
- 10. Defendants, John Does 1-10, are individuals or entities affiliated with, associated with, doing business as, employed by, servants of or work-persons of Defendants, and have liability and responsibility hereunder.

IV. Operative Facts

- 11. On or about September 11, 2008, Plaintiff was lawfully upon the premises of Optimist Park ("Park") in Lebanon County, a public park within the jurisdiction and geographic limits of Defendant, County, for the purpose of Plaintiff's daughter's soccer game through Lebanon Recreational Youth Soccer ("LRYS").
- 13. At all times material, Plaintiff was granted the right, by the Second Amendment of the United States Constitution and state law, to openly carry a firearm.
- 14. At all times material, Plaintiff was licensed by Defendants and municipal authority to carry a concealed firearm.

- 15. At the time, Plaintiff was, as permitted by all applicable laws and the Constitution of the United States and the Second Amendment thereto, openly carrying a legally possessed and displayed handgun, which was safely and properly secured in a holster.
- 16. While at the soccer game, Plaintiff was approached by the opposing team's coach, Charlie Jones (non-party) ("Jones"), Defendant, County's Public Defender, who advised Plaintiff about other parents' concerns about Plaintiff's then openly carrying a firearm.
- 17. Although Plaintiff was not doing anything improper, illegal or suspicious, Plaintiff moved to another part of the field after the above conversation.
- 18. After the game, Plaintiff approached Jones in an attempt to explain her rights, provide an explanatory pamphlet, explain why she carries a firearm, and to otherwise calm any potential fears Jones or others may have had or harbored.
- 19. Jones barely let Plaintiff speak, instead Jones made wild, false accusations re questioning Plaintiff's intentions of violence none of which were based on fact but seemingly arose out of Jones' unprovoked fears.
- 20. Following the soccer game, Plaintiff received an email from Nigel Foundling (non-party) ("Foundling"), the director of LRYS, which was believed prompted by Jones.
- 21. Without any basis, Foundling stated that Plaintiff would no longer be allowed to carry a firearm to any LRYS game and that any further "incidents" would be referred to the Lebanon City Police Department.
- 22. Plaintiff responded to Foundling by requesting additional information about the complaint(s) made, the formal written rules of LRYS, and LRYS and Foundling's reasons for anticipating police involvement.
- 23. Plaintiff did not receive a response from Foundling.

- 24. On the following Monday, September 15, 2008, Plaintiff and her daughter arrived for the previously scheduled soccer practice only to find that no one else attended-it had been cancelled.
- 25. Plaintiff was never contacted about the cancelled practice, which practice was conducted by Colleen Foundling (non-party), Foundling's wife.
- 26. On or about September 20, 2008, Plaintiff received a notice ("notice") dated September 17, 2007, authored by Defendant, DeLeo, that DeLeo, with implicit authority of co-Defendants, there revoked Plaintiff's License to Carry Firearms ("LTCF").
- 27. Prior to receiving the notice, Plaintiff was not provided a hearing, any judicial process, or even given an opportunity to speak with Defendant, Sheriff, or her accusers, defend her actions, or otherwise offer any rebuttal evidence prior to Defendants' unilateral revocation. After receiving the notice pursuant to Plaintiff's "Right to Know" request vis-à-vis the circumstances underlying the revocation, Defendant, Sheriff and Sheriff's Office, refused to respond to that request.
- 28. The notice merely references Plaintiff's presence in the Park advising Plaintiff that some unidentified individuals in the Park were upset by Plaintiff's open carry.
- 29. At no point in the notice did DeLeo specifically reference any misconduct by Plaintiff, only that Plaintiff was observed carrying a weapon openly in a belt holster.
- 30. On or about September 19, 2008, a deputy ("deputy") in Defendant, Sheriff's Office, informed Plaintiff that her LTCF would be reinstated if Plaintiff agreed to conceal her firearm in the future.
- 31. Rejecting deputy's offer, on or about September 22, 2008, Plaintiff filed a formal appeal of Defendants' revocation of Plaintiff's LTCF.

- 32. On or about October 14, 2008, a hearing ("hearing") was held at which time Defendant, County, argued in favor of the revocation of Plaintiff's LTCF.
- 33. At the hearing, Plaintiff's LTCF was reinstated by Judge Eby (non-party), that court confirming Plaintiff's good standing and Defendants' failure of meritorious prosecution or legal foundation.

V. Causes of Action

CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATION- 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th & 14th Plaintiff v. Defendants

- 34. Paragraphs above are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth at length herein and below.
- 35. At the time Defendant, Sheriff, revoked Plaintiff's LTCF, Plaintiff had not committed any infraction to justify the revocation.
- 36. Defendant, Sheriff, had no cause to revoke Plaintiff's LTCF.
- 37. At the hearing, Defendant, County, failed to articulate any even alleged infraction to justify the revocation.
- 38. Defendant, County, had no cause to revoke Plaintiff's LTCF and to oppose Plaintiff's appeal, as was confirmed by the court.
- 39. Defendants' actions deprived Plaintiff of her LTCF and separate rights guaranteed by the Second Amendment and state law, without due process of law.
- 40. The above acts or omissions of Defendants were carried out with an intentional, conscious or reckless disregard of the rights of Plaintiff:
 - (a) to be granted an LTCF and separate, independent right to carry a firearm, to be shielded from revocation, except upon process of law;

- (b) to be protected in her person and property from unfounded, unilateral governmental prosecution, interference, seizure and intrusion;
- (c) to be protected from intentional, abusive, and malicious infringement of her Civil Rights; and
- (d) to be protected from other and further misconduct of Defendants herein discussed or as will become known during discovery or at trial.
- 41. Defendants actions stated above, *inter alia*, were committed under color of state law and were violations of Plaintiff's clearly establish and well settled Constitutional and other legal rights.
- 42. As a result, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer harm, including financial (wage loss, attorneys fees related to appeal representation, and loss of earning capacity) and emotional distress, *inter alia*, in violation of her rights under the laws and Constitution of the United States of America, in particular the First, Second, Fourth, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments thereto, and Title 42 U.S.C. §1983, and its corollary under the Pennsylvania Constitution which includes Article I §§8 and 21.

COUNT II CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATION-MONELL

Plaintiff v. County and Sheriff's Office

- 43. Paragraphs above are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth at length herein and below.
- 44. Prior to the events described herein, Defendants', County and Sheriff's Office, developed and maintained policies, practices and customs exhibiting deliberate indifference to the constitutional right of persons within the geographic and jurisdictional limits of Lebanon County, which caused violations of Plaintiff's constitutional and other rights.

- 45. Specifically, Defendants', County and Sheriff's Office, failed to adequately and properly supervise and train its Sheriff in various aspects of law enforcement procedure and substance, including, but not limited to, the nature and existence of good cause, evaluation of character, the constitutional limitations on seizures, and the laws of the United States, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and otherwise relating to the ownership and possession of firearms.
- 46. The above described acts or omissions by Defendants, County and Sheriff's Office, demonstrated a deliberate indifference to the rights of citizens of Lebanon County, such as Plaintiff, and were the cause of the violations of Plaintiff's rights as set forth herein.

<u>COUNT III</u> CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATION-<u>CONSPIRACY</u>

Plaintiff v. Defendants

- 47. Paragraphs above are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth at length herein and below.
- 48. The Civil Rights Act of 1866, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§1985-1986, prohibits conspiracies to interfere with civil rights.
- 49. Defendants violated 42 U.S.C. §1985 in that they conspired for the purpose of impeding, hindering, obstructing and defeating the due course of justice with the intent to deny Plaintiff the protection of the laws and to injure her and her property.
- 50. Defendants have each done and have caused to be done acts in furtherance of this conspiracy whereby Plaintiff has been injured and has been deprived of her rights and privileges as a citizen of the United States.
- 51. Defendants had actual knowledge of the conspiracies to deprive Plaintiff of her rights, and had the power and opportunity to prevent the violations from occurring and continuing and failed to do so.

52. As a direct and proximate result of the above, Defendants caused Plaintiff to suffer significant indignities and financial and other damages and deprived Plaintiff of her rights and privileges as a citizen of the United States.

COUNT IV

Wrongful Use ('Dragonetti')/Abuse & Misuse of Process/Malicious Prosecution

Plaintiff v. Defendants

- 53. Paragraphs above are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth at length herein and below.
- 54. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants commenced, continued and prosecuted the revocation primarily for a purpose other than that of rightful or adjudication of the claim in which the proceedings were based.
- 55. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant acted intentionally or in a grossly negligent manner in commencing, continuing and or prosecuting the revocation for the purpose of suppressing Plaintiff's known or should have been known rights to open carry a firearm.
- 56. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants acted maliciously and for the primary purpose of harassing Plaintiff by the commencement, continuation and prosecution of the revocation.
- 57. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants intentionally and implicitly misrepresented the material facts underlying the revocation.
- 58. Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for her losses, expenses and damages pursuant to 42 Pa.C.S.A. 8351 et seq., titled Wrongful Use of Civil Proceedings, for Abuse and Misuse of Process, and Malicious Prosecution

COUNT V-LOSS OF CONSORTIUM

Scott Hain v. Defendants

59. Paragraphs above are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth at length herein and below.

60. Plaintiff, Scott Hain, husband of Plaintiff, Meleanie Hain, as a result of the aforesaid intentional, negligent, careless and reckless conduct of Defendants has lost the companionship, consortium, society and services of wife-Plaintiff, Meleanie Hain, to his great personal detriment and loss.

VI. Prayer for Relief

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request this Honorable Court enter judgment in their favor and against Defendants, individually, jointly and severally, in an amount in excess of \$1,000,000.00 (\$1 Million), plus such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems necessary and just, and to Order the following relief:

- a. Injunctive relief including but not limited to monitoring and education;
- b. Statutory damages;
- c. Compensatory damages, including; and
 - i. Actual damages for financial injury (including but not limited to wage loss and loss of earning capacity, and attorneys fees related to the revocation appeal) and emotional distress;
 - ii. Attorneys fees and expenses, and costs of suit; and
 - iii. Loss of Consortium.
- d. Punitive damages.

PROCHNIAK WEISBERG, P.C.

/s/ Matthew B. Weisberg, Esquire MATTHEW B. WEISBERG, ESQUIRE Attorney for Plaintiffs