UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI NORTHERN DIVISION

MARCUS MAYS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 2:12-CV-6
)	
DOUG HOWELL and)	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
CITY OF LAGRANGE, MISSOURI,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT

COMES NOW Plaintiff Marcus Mays (hereinafter "Plaintiff"), by and through his attorney, and for his Complaint against Defendant Doug Howell (hereinafter "Defendant Howell") and Defendant City of LaGrange, Missouri (hereinafter "Defendant LaGrange") and respectfully states to this Honorable Court the following:

- 1. This is a civil action arising under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and common law avenues of recovery for deprivations of Plaintiff's rights against both Defendants.
 - 2. Plaintiff sues Defendant Doug Howell in his individual capacity.

JURISDICTION

3. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1341.

VENUE

- 4. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).
- 5. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff resided and was a citizen of LaGrange, Missouri.
- 6. Defendant City of LaGrange, Missouri is a political subdivision of the State of Missouri acting under color of State law, and is a person for purposes of a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action

of damages.

7. Defendant Howell, at all times relevant herein, was a police officer employed by the City of LaGrange, Missouri.

COLOR OF STATE LAW

- 8. At all times relevant herein, Defendant Howell acted under color of state law.
- 9. Particularly, Defendant Howell acted under color of the laws, statutes, ordinances, regulations, policies, customs and usages of the State of Missouri, and its political subdivisions.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 10. On March 31, 2010, Plaintiff owned a dog named "Cammie", a female American Bulldog.
 - 11. On March 31, 2010, Cammie was approximately 1 ½ years old.
- 12. On information and belief, Cammie was in heat and broke free from her chain at Plaintiff's residence.
 - 13. At all times relevant herein, Cammie had a dog collar around her neck.
- 14. A neighbor of Plaintiff's, Mary Coleman saw Cammie and called the LaGrange Police Department.
 - 15. Defendant Howell put a noose around Cammie's neck with a Snare pole.
- 16. Prior to Defendant Howell putting a noose around Cammie's neck with a Snare pole, someone had chained Cammie to a vehicle near Mary Coleman's residence.
- 17. After the noose being put around Cammie's neck, Cammie tried to run away, but Defendant Howell pulled the end of the Snare pole forcing Cammie to turn in a circular motion.
- 18. Cammie came to a stop and Defendant Howell un-holstered his pistol and fired one round into Cammie's chest while she was standing there with the noose around her neck.

- 19. Cammie dropped on her side immediately after being shot.
- 20. Defendant Howell re-holstered his weapon.
- 21. Cammie began to wag her tale while lying on her side and after about 35 seconds, Defendant Howell un-holstered his weapon again and shot Cammie in the head, killing her.
- 22. The shooting of Cammie was videotaped by Defendant Howell or his partner's car camera. (See Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 attached hereto).

COUNT I VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS 42 U.S.C. § 1983 AND FOURTH AMENDMENT AGAINST DEFENDANT HOWELL FOR COMPENSATORY DAMAGES, PUNITIVE DAMAGES AND ATTORNEY'S FEES

- 23. Plaintiff re-alleges all of the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
- 24. Defendant Howell's shooting and killing Plaintiff's dog constituted a seizure under the Fourth Amendment¹.
 - 25. The right to possess a dog is clearly established².
- 26. Defendant Howell's shooting and killing Plaintiff's dog was objectively unreasonable in that Plaintiff's dog was standing still with a noose around from the Snare pole being held by Defendant Howell when Defendant Howell un-holstered his firearm and shot Plaintiff's dog and Defendant Howell was not in any immediate danger, which called for the use of deadly force³.

Compensatory Damages

27. Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Plaintiff is entitled to an award of compensatory damages against Defendant Howell in his individual capacity.

Punitive Damages

28. Defendant Howell's actions were:

¹ <u>Lesher v. Reed</u>, 12 F.3d 148, 150-51 (8th Cir.1994).

³ Fuller v. Vines, 36 F.3d 65 (9th Cir. 1994)

- a. Reckless;
- b. Showed callous indifference toward the rights of Plaintiff; and
- c. Were taken in the face of a perceived risk that the actions would violate federal law.
- 29. Plaintiff is entitled to an award of punitive damages against Defendant Howell in his individual capacity, in order to punish him and to deter others.

Attorney's Fees

30. Under 42 U.S.C. § 1988 if Plaintiff is the prevailing party in this litigation, then he will be entitled to receive an award of reasonable attorney's fees, non-taxable expenses and costs.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 1988 against Defendant Howell in his individual capacity, for compensatory damages in a fair and reasonable amount, for punitive damages, for reasonable attorney's fees, for and non-taxable expenses, for costs, and Plaintiff prays for such other relief as may be just under the circumstances and consistent with the purpose of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

COUNT II VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS 42 U.S.C. § 1983 AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT AGAINST DEFENDANT CITY OF LAGRANGE, MISSOURI FOR COMPENSATORY DAMAGES AND ATTORNEY'S FEES

31. Plaintiff re-alleges all of the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.

Compensatory Damages

1st Alternative Basis of Municipal Liability

Delegation to Defendant Howell

32. As the first alternate basis for liability against Defendant City of LaGrange, the policy maker for Defendant City of LaGrange is an aldermanic board, the mayor, or someone else, and that person delegated full authority and/or empowered Defendant Howell to make

policy.

33. That delegation of authority by the actual policy maker of Defendant LaGrange placed Defendant Howell in a policy making position, and the acts of Defendant Howell may fairly be said to be those of the municipality⁴.

34. Those acts therefore subject Defendant LaGrange to liability for the constitutional violations of Defendant Howell⁵.

2nd Alternative Basis of Municipal Liability – Failure to Train, Supervise, Control

- 35. As the second alternative basis for liability against Defendant LaGrange, Defendant LaGrange failed to properly hire, train, supervise, control and/or discipline Defendant Howell. Defendant LaGrange was thus deliberately indifferent to the rights of others in adopting its hiring and training practices, and in failing to supervise, control and/or discipline Defendant Howell such that those failures reflected a deliberate or conscious choice by Defendant LaGrange⁶.
 - 36. Those deficiencies caused Plaintiff damages⁷.
- 37. In light of the fact that it was Defendant Howell who engaged in the constitutional violations, the need to correct the deficiencies is so obvious, and the inadequacy so likely to result in the violation of constitutional rights, that the policymakers of Defendant LaGrange can reasonably be said to have been deliberately indifferent to the need⁸.
- 38. If Defendant LaGrange had properly hired, trained, supervised, controlled and/or disciplined Defendant Howell, the constitutional violations committed by Defendant Howell would not have occurred.
- 39. These failures by Defendant LaGrange to hire, train, supervise, control and/or discipline Defendant Howell subject Defendant LaGrange to liability for the constitutional

⁴ Id. at 483, and Kujawski v. Board of Com'rs of Bartholomew County, Ind., 183 F.3d 734, 737 (7th Cir. 1999).

⁵ Id. at 483; Kujawski v. Board of Com'rs of Bartholomew County, Ind., 183 F.3d 734, 737 (7th Cir. 1999).

⁶ City of Canton v. Harris, 489 U.S. 378, 389 (1989).

⁷ <u>Larson By Larson v. Miller</u>, 76 F.3d 1446, 1454 (8th Cir. 1996).

⁸ Andrews v. Fowler, 98 F.3d 1069, 1076 (8th Cir. 1996).

violations committed by Defendant Howell.

Waiver of Sovereign Immunity

- 40. Upon information and belief, at the relevant time, Defendant LaGrange had purchased and had in effect a policy of insurance to insure itself against claims or causes of action for damages caused by city employees engaged in government functions, including torts as described herein.
- 41. The purchase of that insurance constitutes a waiver of sovereign immunity by Defendant LaGrange⁹.

Compensatory Damages

42. Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of compensatory damages against Defendant LaGrange.

Attorney's Fees

43. Under 42 U.S.C. § 1988 if Plaintiff is the prevailing party in this litigation, then he will be entitled to receive an award of reasonable attorney's fees, non-taxable expenses and costs.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 1988 against Defendant LaGrange for compensatory damages in a fair and reasonable amount, for reasonable attorney's fees, and non-taxable expenses, for costs and such other relief as may be just under the circumstances and consistent with the purpose of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

COUNT III VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS 42 U.S.C. § 1983, RESPONDEAT SUPERIOR AGAINST DEFENDANT CITY OF LAGRANGE, MISSOURI FOR COMPENSATORY DAMAGES AND ATTORNEY'S FEES

- 44. Plaintiff re-alleges all of the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
- 45. At all relevant times Defendant Howell was:

⁹ RSMo. 71.180 and/or 537.610.

- a. Serving as an employee of Defendant LaGrange as a police officer;
- b. Engaging in a government function; and
- c. Acting within the course and scope of that employment.
- 46. Defendant LaGrange is liable under a theory of respondeat superior¹⁰.
- 47. The actions of Defendant Howell caused Plaintiff to suffer the damages outlined herein.

Compensatory Damages

48. Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of compensatory damages against Defendant LaGrange.

Attorney's Fees

49. Under 42 U.S.C. § 1988 if Plaintiff is the prevailing party in this litigation, then he will be entitled to receive an award of reasonable attorney's fees, non-taxable expenses and costs.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 1988 against Defendant LaGrange for compensatory damages in a fair and reasonable amount, for reasonable attorney's fees, and non-taxable expenses, for costs and such other relief as may be just under the circumstances and consistent with the purpose of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

¹⁰ Plaintiff makes this claim based on the dissent of Justice Breyer in <u>Board of County Com'rs of Bryan County</u>, <u>Okl. v. Brown</u>, 520 U.S. 397, 416 (1997).

Respectfully submitted,

SCHOTTEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

BY: s/James W. Schottel, Jr.

James W. Schottel, Jr. #51285MO 906 Olive St., PH St. Louis, MO 63101 (314) 421-0350 (314) 421-4060 Facsimile jwsj@schotteljustice.com

Attorney for Plaintiff Marcus Mays

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI NORTHERN DIVISION

MARCUS MAYS,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) Case No. 2:12-CV-
DOUG HOWELL and))
CITY OF LAGRANGE, MISSOURI,)
Defendants.)

NOTICE OF EXHIBIT FILING

Exhibit 1 to Plaintiff's Complaint will be filed with the Clerk's Office in DVD format.

I certify that within 24 hours of the filing of this Notice, I will file and serve a DVD copy of the item identified above.

Dated: January 19, 2012 Respectfully submitted,

SCHOTTEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

BY: s/James W. Schottel, Jr.

James W. Schottel, Jr. #51285MO 906 Olive St., PH St. Louis, MO 63101 (314) 421-0350 (314) 421-4060 facsimile jwsj@schotteljustice.com

Attorney for Plaintiff Marcus Mays SJS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

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				DEFENDAN'	TS	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
MARCUS MAYS				DOUG HOWEL	L and C	ITY OF LAGRANO	GE, MISSOURI
(b) County of Residence (E)	of First Listed Plaintiff L CCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	ewis County SES)			J NI)	J.S. PLAINTIFF CASES DEMNATION CASES, U	Lewis County ONLY) ISE THE LOCATION OF THE
(c) Attorney's (Birm Name	Address, and Telephone Number	۸		Attorneys (If Know		illo,	
Schottel & Associate Louis, MO 63101; (3)	es, P.C., 906 Oli	•		Anoneys (II Ano	wii)		
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)				IPAL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
J 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government	Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Or en of This State	PTF D	EF Incorporated or P of Business In Th	
U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	O 2 C	3 2 Incorporated <i>and</i> of Business In	
	(,		en or Subject of a reign Country	O 3 C	3 Foreign Nation	06 06
IV. NATURE OF SUIT							
☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	VIS PERSONAL INJUR		VER CREATENAMY 10 Agriculture		Appeal 28 USC 158	400 State Reapportionment
120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. 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	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 441 Voting	□ 362 Personal Injury- Med. Malpractice □ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability □ 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER □ 370 Other Fraud □ 371 Truth in Lending □ 380 Other Personal Property Damage □ 385 Property Damage	C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	20 Other Food & Drug 225 Drug Related Seizun of Property 21 USC: 30 Liquor Laws 40 R.R. & Truck 50 Airtine Regs. 60 Occupational Safety/Health 90 Other LABOR 1010 Fair Labor Standard Act 20 Labor/Mgmt. Relati 30 Labor/Mgmt. Report & Disclosure Act 40 Railway Labor Act 90 Other Labor Litigati	P8	Withdrawal 28 USC 157 Copyrights Patent Trademark HIA (1395ff) Black Lung (923) DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) SSID Title XVI RSI (405(g)) Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 350 Securities/Commodities/Exchange 375 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters
220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	□ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 444 Welfare □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other ■ 440 Other Civil Rights	Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Od 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	ther	91 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	☐ 871	or Defendant) IRS — Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 894 Energy Allocation Act □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
☑1 Original ☐2 R	tate Court	Remanded from Appellate Court atute under which you a	Reo	stated or 5 a	ransferred f mother distri specify)	ct Multidis Litigatio	n Judgment
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	N 42 U.S.C. § 3	1983					
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P	IS A CLASS ACTION 23	N D	EMAND\$		CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	y if demanded in complaint: D: ☑ Yes ☐ No
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DC	CKET NUMBER	
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TTORNEY	OF RECORD	0		
01/19/2012 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		gru W		1 Helle	\langle / \rangle	7	
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDG	ie	MAG. JU	DXTE

	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
MARCUS MAYS Plaintiff, v. DOUG HOWELL and CITY OF LAGRANGE, MISSOURI Defendant)))) Case No. 2:12-CV-6)))
	ORIGINAL FILING FORM
THIS FORM MUST BE COMPLE WHEN INITIATING A NEW CAS	ED AND VERIFIED BY THE FILING PARTY
PREVIOUSLY FILED IN THIS COL AND ASSIGNED TO THE HONOR THIS CAUSE IS RELATED PREVIOUSLY FILED COMPLAINT	SUBSTANTIALLY EQUIVALENT COMPLAINT, WAS RT AS CASE NUMBER BLE JUDGE BUT IS NOT SUBSTANTIALLY EQUIVALENT TO ANY THE RELATED CASE NUMBER IS AND HE HONORABLE THIS CASE MAY, PRIGINAL PROCEEDING.
I	SE, NOR A SUBSTANTIALLY EQUIVALENT SLY FILED IN THIS COURT, AND THEREFORE L PROCEEDING.
The undersigned affirms that the in	ormation provided above is true and correct.

Date: 01/19/2012

Case: 2:12-cv-00006-JCH Doc. #: 1-4 Filed: 01/19/12 Page: 1 of 2 PageID #: 12



United States District Court

EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI NOTICE OF LAWSUIT AND REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS

* * Plaintiff to Complete Gray Area * *

TO: Doug Howell; 200 W Washington St, LaGrange, MO 63448			
(Name of defendant)			
(as of			
(Title) (Name of business)			
A lawsuit has been commenced against you (or the entity on whose behalf you are addressed). A copy of the complaint is attached to this notice. It has been filed in the United States District Court for the Eastern District			
of Missouri and has been assigned docket number 2:12-CV-6			
This is not a formal summons or notification from the court, but rather my request that you sign and return the enclosed waiver of service in order to save the cost of serving you with a judicial summons and an additional copy of the complaint. The cost of service will be avoided if I receive a signed copy of the waiver within30 days after the date designated below as the date on which this Notice and Request is sent. I enclose a stamped and addressed envelope (or other means of cost-free return) for your use. An extra copy of the waiver is also attached for your records.			
If you comply with this request and return the signed waiver to the undersigned, it will be filed with the court and no summons will be served on you. The action will then proceed as if you had been served on the date the waiver is filed, except you will not be obligated to answer the complaint before 60 days from the date designated below as the date on which this notice is sent (or before 90 days from that date if your address is not in any judicial district of the United States).			
If you do not return the signed waiver within the time indicated, I will take appropriate steps to effect formal service in a manner authorized by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and will then, to the extent authorized by those Rules, ask the court to require you (or the party on whose behalf you are addressed) to pay the full costs of such service. In that connection, please read the statement concerning the duty of parties to waive the service of the summons, which is set forth on the foot of the waiver form.			
I affirm that this request is being sent to you on behalf of the plaintiff, this day of January, 20 12. Signature of Plaintiff's Attorney or			
Unrepresented Plaintiff			

DUTY TO AVOID UNNECESSARY COSTS OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS

Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires certain parties to cooperate insaving unnecessary costs of service of the summons and complaint. 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 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

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 unproper 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 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 plaintiffs attorney (or unrepresented plaintiff) a response to the complaint and must also 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 actually served, when the request for waiver of service was received.

Case: 2:12-cv-00006-JCH Doc. #: 1-4 Filed: 01/19/12 Page: 2 of 2 PageID #: 13



United States District Court

EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

WAIVER OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS

* * Plaintiff	To Complete	NOTICE TO DEFENDANT(S) Gray Area * *
	mes W. Scho	ottel, Jr. ff's attorney or unrepresented plaintiff)
I acknowled	dge receipt of	your request that I waive service of a summons in the action of:
Cas	se Caption:	Mays vs. Howell and City of LaGrange
Cas	se Number:	2:12-CV-6
in the United instrument,	States District C and a means	Court for the Eastern District of Missouri. I have also received a copy of the complaint in this action, two copies of this s by which I can return the signed waiver to you without cost to me.
lagree to save behalf I am	e the cost of sen acting) be se	vice of a summons and an additional copy of the complaint in this lawsuit by not requiring that I (or the entity on whose erved with judicial process in the manner provided by Rule 4.
I (or the entity objections b	on whose beha pased on a de	alf I am acting) will retain all defenses or objections to the lawsuit or to the jurisdiction or venue of the court except for efect in the summons or in the service of the summons.
l understand thupon you wi	natajudgmentn ithin 60 days	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 after
or within 90	days after da	(Date Waiver sent) ate if the request was sent outside the United States.

DEFENDANT'S ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF WAIVER OF SERVICE

		THE TANK OF SERVICE
_	Date	Print name
		Signature
as	(Officer or Agent)	of (Corporation or Association)
		Address
		City, State, Zip Code

Case: 2:12-cv-00006-JCH Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 01/19/12 Page: 1 of 2 PageID #: 14



United States District Court

EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI NOTICE OF LAWSUIT AND REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS

* * Plaintiff to Complete Gray Area * *

TO:	Ronnie Powers; 118 S. Main St., LaGrange	MO 63448		
	(Name of defendant)			
		range, Missouri		
	(Title) (Name of	f business)		
A lawsuit been fil	suit has been commenced against you (or the entity on whose beha filed in the United States District Court for the Eastern	If you are addressed). A copy of the complaint is attached to this notice. It has a District		
of Misso	ssouri and has been assigned docket number $\frac{2:12-C}{C}$	V-6		
of the wait envelop	vaiverwithin30days after the date designated below as the date ope (or other means of cost-free return) for your use.	equest that you sign and return the enclosed waiver of service in order to save if the complaint. The cost of service will be avoided if I receive a signed copy on which this Notice and Request is sent. I enclose a stamped and addressed An extra copy of the waiver is also attached for your records.		
datether	ne waiver is filed, except you will not be obligated to answer the core	ou. The action will then proceed as if you had been served on the applaint before 60 days from the date designated below as the date on which address is not in any judicial district of the United States).		
If you do not return the signed waiver within the time indicated, I will take appropriate steps to effect formal service in a manner authorized by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and will then, to the extent authorized by those Rules, ask the court to require you (or the party on whose behalf you are addressed) to pay the full costs of such service. In that connection, please read the statement concerning the duty of parties to waive the service of the summons, which is set forth on the foot of the waiver form.				
l affirm t		plaintiff, this day of anual , 20 12,		

DUTY TO AVOID UNNECESSARY COSTS OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS

Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires certain parties to cooperate insaving unnecessary costs of service of the summons and complaint. 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 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

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 unproper 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 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 must also file a signed copy of the response with when the request for waiver of service was received.

By waiving service, a defendant is allowed more time to answer, than if the summons had actually served,

Case: 2:12-cv-00006-JCH Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 01/19/12 Page: 2 of 2 PageID #: 15



United States District Court

EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

WAIVER OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS

* * Plaintiff To Complete Gray Area * *
To: James W. Schottel, Jr. (Name of plaintiff's attorney or unrepresented plaintiff)
I acknowledge receipt of your request that I waive service of a summons in the action of:
Case Caption: Mays vs. Howell and City of LaGrange
Case Number: 2:12-CV-6
in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri. I have also received a copy of the complaint in this 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 Rule 4.
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.
l 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 60 days afterJanuary 20, 2012
or within 90 days after date if the request was sent outside the United States.
DEFENDANT'S ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF WAIVER OF SERVICE

DEFEN	NDANT'S ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF WAIVER OF SERVICE	
Date	Print name	_
as(Officer or Agent)	Signature of(Corporation or Association)	_
	Address	-
	City, State, Zip Code	-