#### IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE CITY, MARYLAND

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF MARYLAND

3600 Clipper Mill Road – Suite 350 Baltimore, MD 21211

Plaintiff,

VS.

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF OF CALVERT COUNTY, MD

30 Church Street Prince Frederick, MD 20678

-and-

MIKE EVANS in his official capacity as Sheriff of Calvert County, MD 30 Church Street Prince Frederick, MD 20678

Defendants.

Case No.

CIVIL BIVISION

2022 MAR -2 AM (0: 05

### COMPLAINT - CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff, the American Civil Liberties Union of Maryland, Inc. (the "ACLU"), by and through its undersigned attorneys, hereby sues Defendants, the Office of the Sheriff of Calvert County, Maryland (the "Sheriff's Office") and Mike Evans, in his official capacity as the Calvert County Sheriff, upon the following causes of action and averments of fact.

### NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. In July 2021, the ACLU requested documents from Defendants under the Maryland Public Information Act ("MPIA"), Maryland Code, General Provisions Article ("G.P.") § 4-101 et seq., relating to the use of three police searching techniques by the Sheriff's Office. The ACLU

also requested a waiver of fees associated with that request. In their response, Defendants stated that the Sheriff's Office possesses documents that are responsive to the ACLU's request, but denied the ACLU's request for a fee waiver, citing only the ACLU's ability to pay and the resources required to produce the requested documents. Defendants withheld the requested documents until the ACLU paid the requested fees and continues to withhold the documents. The ACLU now brings this action against Defendants to challenge Defendants' denial of the ACLU's request for a fee waiver and to seek an order requiring Defendants to produce the responsive documents.

#### **PARTIES**

#### **Plaintiff**

- 2. Plaintiff, the American Civil Liberties Union of Maryland is a Maryland non-profit membership organization with its principal place of business at 3600 Clipper Mill Rd., Suite 350, Baltimore, Maryland. The American Civil Liberties Union of Maryland is the Maryland affiliate of the national organization the American Civil Liberties Union.
- 3. The ACLU "exists to empower Marylanders to exercise their rights so that the law values and uplifts their humanity."
- 4. To further its mission, the ACLU gathers information and authors reports about issues important to the lives of Marylanders. Examples of the ACLU's reporting efforts include:
  - a. An August 2016 report entitled "Detained Without Process: The Excessive Use of Mandatory Detention Against Maryland's Immigrants";
  - b. More recently, an October 2021 report entitled "Chasing Justice Addressing Police Violence and Corruption in Maryland."
- 5. The ACLU publishes these reports on its website (<a href="https://www.aclu-md.org/en/publications">https://www.aclu-md.org/en/publications</a>) along with summaries of their contents.

- 6. The ACLU also publishes shorter form news stories and blog posts on its website (<a href="https://www.aclu-md.org/en/news">https://www.aclu-md.org/en/news</a>).
- 7. To protect the civil rights of all Marylanders, the ACLU also engages in legal advocacy and litigation to protect the rights of Marylanders.
- 8. The ACLU uses information gathered through requests under the MPIA to research and create its public reports and to help guide its legal advocacy efforts.
- The ACLU routinely requests fee waivers when it makes document requests under the MPIA and those requests are routinely granted. Some of the Maryland agencies that have waived fees in response to document requests by the ACLU are the Baltimore City Police Department, the Baltimore County Police Department, the Frederick City Police Department, the Montgomery County Police Department, the Office of the Sheriff of Frederick County, the Prince George's County Police Department, and the Office of the Sheriff of Wicomico County.

#### **Defendants**

- 10. The Office of the Sheriff of Calvert County, Maryland, is an agency of the Calvert County government and the custodian of the records sought in this case, as defined by the MPIA, Md. Code, G.P. § 4-101(d). It has its headquarters at 30 Church Street, Prince Frederick, Maryland.
  - 11. Mike Evans is the current Calvert County Sheriff.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

12. This Court has jurisdiction over this action under Maryland Code Ann., Cts. & Jud. Proc. § 1-501. Venue is proper in Baltimore City under Md. Code, G.P. § 4-362(a)(3)(i).

#### **FACTS**

13. In a letter dated July 22, 2021 (the "July 22 request"), the ACLU requested from Defendants documents related to the use of three types of police searches by the Sheriff's Office

and requested that Defendants waive all fees associated with the request. A copy of the July 22 request is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

- 14. The July 22 request sought three categories of documents:
  - a. "Any records showing the number of body searches, strip searches, and manual body cavity searches conducted each year from 2017 to present";
  - b. "Any video and/or audio recordings, including dashboard camera footage and/or body camera footage for all strip searches and manual body cavity searches performed from 2017 to present"; and
  - c. "Any field observation reports, uniform criminal citation reports (DC/CR 45), criminal investigation/case reports, arrest reports, statements of charges (DC/CR 2), probable cause continuation sheets (DC/CR 4), and/or Traffic Stop Data Collection forms that relate to or arise out of any strip search or manual body cavity search performed from 2017 to present."
- 15. In the July 22 request, the ACLU requested that "all fees related to this request be waived" pursuant to Md. Code, G.P. § 4-206(e).
- 16. In the July 22 request, the ACLU clarified that it was "request[ing] this information to carry out [its] charitable mission."
- 17. The ACLU explained in the July 22 request that disclosure of the documents was "in the public interest" because: "(1) the information sought would significantly contribute to the public understanding of the sheriff's office operations and activities; (2) there is a strong public interest in having the requested information available as there is a genuine public concern regarding policing; and (3) the waiver would primarily benefit the public, not a narrow personal or commercial interest."

- 18. In the July 22 request, the ACLU also advised Defendants that "the [ACLU] has a limited ability to pay for the copying and other charges associated with [the] MPIA requests."
- 19. On or about July 23, 2021, the ACLU sent the July 22 request by electronic mail to Captain David Payne, who was designated by the Sheriff's Office on its website as the appropriate recipient for MPIA requests.
- 20. Notwithstanding this designation, Captain Payne disputed being the proper recipient for MPIA requests and insisted that the ACLU re-send the July 22 request to Assistant Sheriff, Lieutenant Colonel P. D. McDowell.
- 21. The ACLU then sent the July 22 request to Lt. Col. McDowell, also on or about July 23, and received an email from Captain Payne confirming that the Sheriff's Office had received the request.
- 22. On or about the same day, the ACLU sent a hard copy of the July 22 request by certified mail to the Sheriff's Office, addressed to Captain Payne.
- 23. After hearing nothing from Defendants, on or about September 7, Gina Elleby, Legal Advocacy Manager for the ACLU, called the Sheriff's Office to inquire about the status of the request. Lt. Col. McDowell returned Ms. Elleby's call and conveyed that he was conferring with the Attorney General to ensure the requested records were disclosable.
- 24. Over the following two months, the parties engaged in correspondence and a series of phone calls clarifying and narrowing the scope of the July 22 request.
- 25. Defendant formally responded to the July 22 request in a letter dated November 8, 2021 (the "November 8 response"). A copy of the November 8 response is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

- 26. In the November 8 response, Defendants explained that "[t]he Sheriff's Office does not have in its custody any 'records showing the number of body searches, strip searches, and manual body cavity searches conducted each year from 2017 to the present."
  - 27. Regarding the ACLU's second and third requests, Defendants explained that:
    - a. "The Criminal Investigations Bureau has approximately 240 cases where responsive records <u>may</u> exist." (Emphasis added.) Defendants indicated that production of these records would take approximately 240 hours of personnel time.
    - b. "The Detention Center likely possesses video and/or audio recordings of strip searches performed from 2017 to the present at the detention center." Defendants indicated that production of these records would take approximately 126 hours of personnel time.
    - c. "The Patrol Bureau had one known report of an incident where a suspect was found to have CDS in his body cavity." Defendants produced this responsive record. See Attachment to Exhibit B (Case Report Supplement dated Feb. 10, 2021).
- 28. Defendants indicated, however, that it would require the ACLU to pay \$12,271.50 for Defendant to produce the remaining responsive records.
- 29. Ignoring the public interest apparent from the face of the ACLU's July 22 request, Defendants denied the ACLU's request for a waiver of fees because the ACLU "has the ability to pay and there is no apparent public interest served by [the July 22 request]."
- 30. In a five-page letter dated December 21, 2021 (the "December 21 reply"), the ACLU, by its undersigned counsel, explained why a waiver of fees associated with the July 22 request was in the public interest, and requested that Defendants reconsider and reverse their denial

of the ACLU's request for a fee waiver. A copy of the December 21 reply is attached hereto as **Exhibit C**.

- 31. Defendants reiterated their decision to deny the waiver in a letter dated January 6, 2021 (the "January 6 denial"). A copy of the January 6 denial is attached hereto as **Exhibit D**.
- 32. The January 6 denial states simply: "Given the Sheriff's Office resources needed to satisfy the request, your request for a waiver of fees is denied."

## **COUNT I: IMPROPER DENIAL OF WAIVER OF FEES**

- 33. The ACLU incorporates preceding paragraphs 1–32 by reference as if each were fully restated herein.
- 34. Under Md. Code, G.P. § 4-206(e), a custodian of records must waive the fees associated with a records request if the requestor asks for a waiver and the custodian determines that a waiver would be in the public interest.
- 35. A waiver of fees associated with the July 22 request is in the public interest and Defendants' denial of the fee waiver was arbitrary and capricious.
- 36. Defendants violated the MPIA by denying the ACLU's request for a waiver of the fees associated with the July 22 request.

### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff ACLU respectfully requests that this Court:

- (1) Enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff ACLU declaring that Defendants have violated the MPIA;
- (2) Order Defendants to waive all fees associated with the July 22 request;
- (3) Order Defendants to produce all documents associated with the July 22 request; and

(4) Award Plaintiff ACLU its costs, including attorneys' fees, it has incurred in maintaining this action, as authorized by Md. Code., G.P. § 4-362(f).

March 2, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

Adam B. Abelson (CPF # 1012140004)
ZUCKERMAN SPAEDER LLP
100 East Pratt Street, Suite 2440
Baltimore, MD 21202-1031
(410) 949-1148
aabelson@zuckerman.com

Deborah A. Jeon (CPF # 9006280125) AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION OF MARYLAND 3600 Clipper Mill Road - Suite 350 Baltimore, MD 21211 (410) 889-8550 x120 jeon@aclu-md.org

Attorneys for Plaintiff, American Civil Liberties Union of Maryland



July 22, 2021

Public Information Officer Major Dave McDowell, Assistant Sheriff Calvert County Sheriff's Office 30 Church Street Prince Frederick, Maryland 20678

VIA ELECTRONIC AND CERTIFIED MAIL, RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED,

Re: Maryland Public Information Act Request

Dear Major McDowell or Custodian of Records:

This is a request under the Maryland Public Information Act (MPIA), Md. Code, Gen. Prov., §§ 4-101 et seq. On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union of Maryland, we wish to inspect and copy all records in your custody and control pertaining to the following:

 Any records showing the number of body searches, strip searches, and manual body cavity searches conducted each year from 2017 to the present;

 Any video and/or audio recordings, including any dashboard camera footage and/or body camera footage for all strip searches and manual body cavity searches performed from 2017 to present; and

c. Any field observation reports, uniform criminal citation reports (DC/CR 45), criminal investigation/case reports, arrest reports, statements of charges (DC/CR 2), probable cause continuation sheets (DC/CR 4), and/or Traffic Stop Data Collection forms that relate to or arise out of any strip search or manual body cavity search performed from 2017 to present.

We anticipate that we will want copies of some or all of the records sought. Pursuant to Gen. Prov. § 4-206(e), we request that all fees related to this request be waived. The American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Maryland is a non-profit 501(c)(3), receives its funding from charitable donations, and does not charge for its legal services. Our non-profit, tax-exempt organization is dedicated to protecting the civil liberties of all Marylanders and visitors to Maryland.

We request this information to carry out our charitable mission. This request meets the criteria for a fee waiver under the MPIA, and fees associated with similar requests are regularly waived. The fee waiver would be in the public interest as: (1) the information sought would significantly contribute to the public understanding of the sheriff's office operations and activities; (2) there is a strong public interest in having the requested information available as there is a genuine public concern regarding policing; and (3) the waiver would primarily benefit the public, not a narrow personal or commercial interest. In addition, please note that the ACLU of Maryland has a limited ability to pay for the

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF MARYLAND

3600 CLIPPER MILL ROAD SUITE 350 BALTIMORE, MD 21211 T/410-889-6555 F/410-366-7838

WWW.ACLU-MD.ORG

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS JOHN HENDERSON PRESIDENT

DANA VICKERS SHELLEY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

ANDREW FREEMAN GENERAL COUNSEL



copying and other charges associated with MPIA requests. See generally Office of the Attorney General, Maryland Public Information Act Manual 7-5-7-9 (15th ed. 2020) (discussing criteria for waiver of fees under the MPIA). If the request for a waiver of fee is denied, please advise us in writing of the reason(s) for the denial and of the cost, if any, for obtaining a copy of the requested records.

If you determine that some portions of the requested records are exempt from disclosure, I will expect, as the Act provides in § 4-203(c)(1)(ii), that you provide me with any portion of the records that is subject to inspection. If all or any part of this request is denied, please provide me (1) the reasons for the denial, (2) the legal authority for the denial, (3) a brief description of the record that will enable me to assess the applicability of the legal authority for the denial, and (4) notice of the available remedies. Md. Code, Gen. Prov.,§ 4-203(c)(1)(i). The Act also requires in § 4-203(c)(1)(i)(2) that you may not decline to allow inspection of the full record on the grounds that part of the record is not subject to inspection, when redaction would resolve the issue. If no redaction is possible, an explanation must be provided describing why the redacted record cannot be provided.

It is essential that this request be fulfilled within 30 days, as required by Gen. Prov. § 4-203(a). Further, if you anticipate a delay, I expect a response within 10 days addressing (1) the amount of time that you estimate records production will take, (2) an estimate of the range of fees that may be charged to comply with the request, and (3) the reason for the delay. Md. Code Gen. Prov. § 4-203(b)(2). If I do not receive notice within the required time period, I will treat your failure to respond as a denial and seek appropriate relief.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter, and I look forward to receiving your response. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Gina Elleby Legal Advocacy Manager

ACLU of Maryland elleby@aclu-md.org



Major S. R. Jones Special Operations & Homeland Security Bureau

Capt. K. Cross Detention Center Administrator

Capt. T. M. Ireland Office of Professional Standards

# OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF CALVERT COUNTY

MIKE EVANS SHERIFF

Lt. Col. P. D. McDowell ASSISTANT SHERIFF

Major T. D. Reece Detention Center Administrator



Capt. R. V. Naughton Patrol Bureau

Capt. T. K. Fridman Investigations Bureau

Capt. W. B. Parrott Administrative & Judicial Services Bureau

November 8, 2021

Dear Ms. Elleby:

This letter responds to your letter dated July 22, 2021, in which you request records from the Calvert County Sheriff under the Maryland Public Information Act ("PIA"), General Provisions Article("GP") §§4-101 et seq. In your letter you requested the following:

- Any records showing the number of body searches, strip searches, and manual body cavity searches conducted each year from 2017 to the present;
- Any video and/or audio recordings, including any dashboard camera footage and/or body camera footage for all strip searches and manual body cavity searches performed from 2017 to present; and
- c. Any field observation reports, uniform criminal citation reports (DC/CR 45), criminal investigation/case reports, arrest reports, statements of charges (DC/CR 2), probable cause continuation sheets (DC/CR 4), and/or Traffic Stop Data Collection forms that relate to or arise out of any strip search or manual body cavity search performed from 2017 to present.

Since receiving your request, I reached out to you to discuss the difficulties and burdens associated with the Sheriff's Office search for responsive records and asked that if you seek records of some specific incident to please specify the incident so that responsive records can be located and produced. You declined this request. Having declined this request, I have made inquiries with all relevant command staff personnel to determine whether responsive records exist and what Sheriff's Office resources are necessary to satisfy your request. Based on this investigation, the Sheriff responds to your request as follows:

The Sheriff's Office does not have in its custody any "records showing the number of body searches, strip searches, and manual body cavity searches conducted each year from 2017 to the present." With respect to parts b and c of your request:

The Criminal Investigations Bureau has approximately 240 cases where responsive records <u>may</u> exist. We have determined that the locating, review, and production of any responsive records will take approximately 240 hours / 30 plus business days of Bureau personnel time.

The Detention Center likely possesses video and/or audio recordings of strip searches performed from 2017 to present at the detention center. We have determined that the locating, review, and production of any responsive records will take approximately 126 hours / 15 plus days of detention center and Information Technology Services personnel time.

The Patrol Bureau had one known report of an incident where a suspect was found to have had CDS in his body cavity. That report will be disclosed.

Given the Sheriff's Office resources needed to satisfy the request, the Sheriff's Office must charge a fee of \$12,271.50 to satisfy the request. Because your organization has the ability to pay and there is no apparent public interest served by your request, your request for a waiver of fees is denied. The Sheriff's Office will not begin the search and review of these records until receipt of this fee. See Glass v. Anne Arundel County, 453 Md. 201 (2017).

Pursuant to GP § 4-362, your client is entitled to seek judicial review of this decision. Your client also has the option to file a complaint with the Public Information Act Compliance Board concerning the amount of the fee charged, see GP § 4-1A-01 et seq., and may also refer any concerns about this decision to the Public Access Ombudsman pursuant to GP § 4-1B-01 et seq.

If you have any questions about this letter, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Lieutenant Colonel Dave mcDowell

	CA.	30 Chur CASE	COUNTY ch St., Prince Fre REPORT SU	аепск∸ мто	20076	JITI		CASEIV	0.2021	-00007137
TE REPORTED	TIME	INCIDENT TYPE								
)2/10/2021	12:01	LOCATION OF OCCU	AFERCE							
CORRED BETWEEN	1									
vo ,	TME	REPORTING OFFICE	R (MANE AND ID #)					STATUS / DATE		
	1	Buckler, 604	12							
			COMMIT/ATTEMPT	DESCRIPTION	N OF STATUTE	CROHANC				
STATUTE/ORDINAL	ICE #		COMMINATION							
				-						
2							_			
3										
_										
				_						
5										
SOBJECT CODE		NAME (LAS) , FI	ASI, MIDDLE)							
						PR	марурно	NE.	OTHER PH	ONE
ADDRESS (STREE	I MODRESS, CH	Y.SIAIC.ZIF				- 1				
1										
				逐》	HEIGHT	WEIGHT.	HAR COL	98	-	ere color
000	#GE	act								HEAD INJURY
000 NJBY 1795	APPARENT	ARCE BROKEN BONES	Dioss of TEETH	ļ	POSSIBLE II	ITERNAL INJ		□unconscious □unconscious	exess 🗆	
	µ0.E	F BROKEN BONES	LOSS OF TEETH MAJOR INJURY DEURNS		□ POSSIBLE II	ITERNAL INJ		□unconscious	exess 🗆	HEAD INJURY
INJURY 179E	APPARENT	PRACE BROKEN BONES DURY	MAJOR INJURY		POSSELE II	ITERNAL INJ		□unconscious	exess 🗆	HEAD INJURY
	APPARENT	PRACE BROKEN BONES DURY	MAJOR INJURY		POSSELE II	NTERNAL INJ CERATION JUNY	URIES	□unconscious □none	exess D	MEAD INJURY OTHER
INJURY 179E	APPARENT	TEROKEN BONES DURY UNDS	MAJOR INJURY		POSSELE II	NTERNAL INJ CERATION JUNY		□unconscious □none	exess 🗆	MEAD INJURY OTHER
NURY 1995	APPARENT	TEROKEN BONES DURY UNDS	MAJOR INJURY		POSSELE II	NTERNAL INJ CERATION JUNY	URIES	□unconscious □none	exess D	MEAD INJURY OTHER
NUBRY 1 YES	APPARENT MINOR IN. STAB WOOL	TEROKEN BONES DURY UNDS	MAJOR INJURY		POSSELE II	NTERNAL INJ CERATION JUNY	URIES	□UNCONSCIQUE □NONE □NONE	exess D	MEAD INJURY OTHER
NURV199E	APPARENT	TEROKEN BONES  JUNE 1  NAME (LAST, F	MAJOR INJURY		POSSILE III SEVERE LA SERIOUS IN	METOHT	URIES RIMARY PHO	□UNCONSCIOUS □NONE  DNE	OTHER P	MEAD INJURY OTHER
NUBRY 1 YES	APPARENT MINOR IN. STABWOOD TAODRESS, CO	PROKEN BONES  INAME (LAST, F)  ITY, STATE UP)  RACE  IT BROKEN BONES	□ MAJOR INJURY □ BURNS □ BURN		POSSIDLE IN SEVERE LA SERIOUS IN	METONITERNAL INJ	URIES RIMARY PHO	□UNCONSCIQUE □NONE □NONE	OTHER P	HEAD INJURY OTHER HONE
SUBJECT CODE  ADDRESS GIRE	APPARENT MINOR IN. STABOVOS  TADDRESS, CI  FOE  APPARENT MINOR IN.	PROKEN BONES  NAME (LAST, F)  IT STATE UP)  IT BROKEN BONES  LURY	■MAJOR INJURY ■EURNS IRST, MODUE)		POSSILE III SEVERE LA SERIOUS IN	WEIGHT INTERNAL IN	URIES RIMARY PHO	□UNCONSCIOUS □NONE  PINE  OR □UNCONSCIOUS	OTHER P	HEAD INJURY OTHER HONE EYE COLON
NURVIYEE  SUBJECT CODE  ADDRESS GIRE  DOU	APPARENT MINOR IN. STABWOS  TACORESS, CI ACORESS, CI APPAREN  APPAREN  MINOR IN STABWOS	PROKEN BONES  NAME (LAST, F)  RACE  IT BROKEN BONES  LURY  AUROS	MAJOR INJURY SEURNS IRST, MODGLE)  LOSS OF TEETH MAJOR INJURY BURNS		POSSIDLE IN SEVERE LA SERIOUS IN INEIGHT POSSIBLE SEVERE LA	WEIGHT INTERNAL IN	URIES RIMARY PHO	□UNCONSCIOUS □NONE  PINE  OR □UNCONSCIOUS	OTHER P	HEAD INJURY OTHER HONE EYE COLON
NURVIVE  SUBJECT CODE  ADDRESS GIRE  DOB  WAIRVIVE  SUBJECT CODE	APPARENT MINOR IN. STABWOS  TACORESS, CI ACORESS, CI APPAREN  APPAREN  MINOR IN STABWOS	PROKEN BONES  NAME (LAST, F)  RACE  IT BROKEN BONES  LURY  AUROS	MAJOR INJURY SEURNS IRST, MODULE)  LOSS OF TEETH MAJOR INJURY		POSSIDLE IN SEVERE LA SERIOUS IN INEIGHT POSSIBLE SEVERE LA	METOHT  NTERNAL IN  WETOHT  NTERNAL IN  WERATION  NAIRY	HAR COL	□UNCONSCIOUS □NONE  OR □NONE	OTHER P	HEAD INJURY OTHER HONE EYE COLOH HEAD INJURY OTHER
NURY 179E  SUBJECT CODE  ADDRESS GIRE  DOB  INAURY 179E	APPARENT  MINOR IN.  STABWOO  FOR  APPARENT  APPARENT  MINOR IN.  STABWOO	PROKEN BONES  NAME (LAST, F)  RACE  IT BROKEN BONES  LURY  AUROS	MAJOR INJURY SEURNS IRST, MODGLE)  LOSS OF TEETH MAJOR INJURY BURNS		POSSIDLE IN SEVERE LA SERIOUS IN INEIGHT POSSIBLE SEVERE LA	METOHT  NTERNAL IN  WETOHT  NTERNAL IN  WERATION  NAIRY	URIES RIMARY PHO	□UNCONSCIOUS □NONE  OR □NONE	OTHER P	HEAD INJURY OTHER HONE EYE COLOH HEAD INJURY OTHER
NURVIVE  SUBJECT CODE  ADDRESS GIRE  SUBJECT CODE  ADDRESS GIRE	APPARENT  MINOR IN.  STABWOO  FOR  APPARENT  APPARENT  MINOR IN.  STABWOO	PARCE  RAME (LAST, F  BROKEN BONES  RAME (LAST, F  BROKEN BONES  LURY  HAME (LAST, F)	MAJOR INJURY SEURNS IRST, MODGLE)  LOSS OF TEETH MAJOR INJURY BURNS		POSSIDLE IN SEVERE LA SERIOUS IN INEIGHT POSSIBLE SEVERE LA	METOHT  NTERNAL IN  WETOHT  NTERNAL IN  WERATION  NAIRY	URIES RIMARY PHO JURIES RIMARY PH	□UNCONSCIOUS  NONE  ONE  ONE  ONE	OTHER P	HEAD INJURY OTHER HONE EYE COLON HEAD INJURY OTHER
NURVIVE  SUBJECT CODE  ADDRESS GIRE  SUBJECT CODE  NAJRYTYPE  SUBJECT CODE  ADDRESS GIRE	APPARENT  MINOR IN.  STABWOO  FOR  APPARENT  APPARENT  MINOR IN.  STABWOO	PARCE  RAME (LAST, F  BROKEN BONES  RAME (LAST, F  BROKEN BONES  LURY  HAME (LAST, F)	MAJOR INJURY SEURNS IRST, MODGLE)  LOSS OF TEETH MAJOR INJURY BURNS		POSSIDLE IN SEVERE LA SERIOUS IN INEIGHT POSSIBLE SEVERE LA	METOHT  NTERNAL IN  WETOHT  NTERNAL IN  WERATION  NAIRY	URIES RIMARY PHO JURIES RIMARY PH	□UNCONSCIOUS  NONE  ONE  ONE  ONE	OTHER P	HEAD INJURY OTHER HONE EYE COLOH HEAD INJURY OTHER
NURVIVE  SUBJECT CODE  ADDRESS GIRE  SUBJECT CODE  NAJRYTYPE  SUBJECT CODE  ADDRESS GIRE	APPARENT MINOR IN. STABWOS  FOR APPARENT MINOR IN STABWOS  STABWOS  APPARENT MINOR IN STABWOS  STABWOS  ET ADDRESS, S	PROKEN BONES  INFO STATE LPS  TRACE  IT BROKEN BONES  LURY  HAME (LAST, FI  TRACE  IT BROKEN BONES  LURY  HAME (LAST, FI  TRACE  TO BROKEN BONES  LURY  HAME (LAST, FI  TO BRO	MAJOR INJURY SEURNS IRST, MODGLE)  LOSS OF TEETH MAJOR INJURY BURNS	SEX.	HEIGHT  SEMIOUS IN  HEIGHT  SEMIOUS IN  HEIGHT  SEMIOUS I	WEIGHT WEIGHT	HAR COL	UNCONSCIOUS NONE ONE ONE ONE	OTHER P	HEAD INJURY OTHER HONE EYE COLON HEAD INJURY OTHER
NURVIVE  SUBJECT CODE  ADDRESS GIRE  SUBJECT CODE  NAJRYTYPE  SUBJECT CODE  ADDRESS GIRE	APPARENT  APPARENT  MINOR IN  STABWOOD  TACORESS, CO  APPARENT  MINOR IN  STAB WO  ASE 1 ADDRESS, CO	PROKEN BONES  NAME (LAST, F)  PRACE  IT BROKEN BONES  JURY  HAME (LAST, F)  HAME (LAST, F)  PRACE  INTEROKEN BONES  NUMBER  INTEROKEN BONES	MAJOR INJURY SEURNIS  IRST, MODULE)  LOSS OF TEETH MAJOR INJURY BURNIS  FIRST, MODULE)	SEX.	POSSIBLE IN   SEVERE LA   SEVERE LA   SEPHIQUS IN   SEPHIQUS IN   SEPHIQUS IN   SEVERE LA   SEVERE LA   SEVERE LA   SEVERE LA   SEPHIQUS IN   SE	MEIGHT INTERNAL INTER	HAR COL	□UNCONSCIOUS  NONE  ONE  ONE  ONE	OTHER P	HEAD INJURY OTHER  RONE  EYE COLON  HEAD INJURY  JOTHER  PHONE
SUB-ECI CODE  SUB-ECI CODE  SUB-ECI CODE  SUB-ECI CODE  SUB-ECI CODE  SUB-ECI CODE	APPARENT  MINOR IN.  STABWOS  TACORESS, CO  APPARENT  MINOR IN.  STABWOS  ASE  APPARENT  ASE  MINOR IN.  ASE  APPARENT  MINOR IN.  ASE  MINOR IN.	PROKEN BONES  NAME (LAST, F)  IN AME (LAST, F)	MAJOR INJURY SEURNIS  IRST, MODULE)  LOSS OF TEETH MAJOR INJURY BURNIS  FARST, MODULE)	SEX.	HEIGHT  SEMIOUS IN  HEIGHT  SEMIOUS IN  HEIGHT  SEMIOUS I	MEIGHT INTERNAL IN LORATION NAIRY INTERNAL IN LORATION NAIRY	HAR COL	UNCONSCIOUS  NONE  OR  UNCONSCIOUS  ONE  ONE	OTHER P	HEAD INJURY  OTHER  RONE  EYE COLON  HEAD INJURY  OTHER  PHONE  EYE COLON
SUB-ECI CODE  SUB-ECI CODE  SUB-ECI CODE  SUB-ECI CODE  SUB-ECI CODE  SUB-ECI CODE	APPARENT  APPARENT  MINOR IN  STABWOOD  TACORESS, CO  APPARENT  MINOR IN  STAB WO  ASE 1 ADDRESS, CO	PROKEN BONES  NAME (LAST, F)  IN AME (LAST, F)	MAJOR INJURY SEURNIS  IRST, MODULE)  LOSS OF TEETH MAJOR INJURY BURNIS  FIRST, MODULE)	SEX.	INEIGHT  POSSIBLE IN  SEPHIQUS IN  INEIGHT  POSSIBLE  POSSIBLE  SEPHIQUS IN  INEIGHT  POSSIBLE  SEPHIQUS IN  SEPHIQUS IN  INEIGHT  INEIGHT  SEPHIQUS IN  SEPHIQUS	MEIGHT INTERNAL IN LORATION NAIRY INTERNAL IN LORATION NAIRY	HAR COL	UNCONSCIOUS  NONE  OR  UNCONSCIOUS  ONE  ONE	OTHER P	HEAD INJURY  OTHER  RONE  EYE COLON  HEAD INJURY  OTHER  PHONE  EYE COLON
SUB-ECI CODE  SUB-ECI CODE  SUB-ECI CODE  SUB-ECI CODE  SUB-ECI CODE  SUB-ECI CODE	APPARENT   MINOR IN.   STABWOS   APPARENT   APPARENT   APPARENT   STABWOS   STABWOS   APPARENT   STABWOS   STABWOS	PROKEN BONES  NAME (LAST, F)  RACE  IT BROKEN BONES  JUNDS  HAME (LAST, F)  RACE  IT BROKEN BONES  JUNDS  RACE  NT BROKEN BONES  NAME (LAST, F)	MAJOR INJURY SEURNIS  IRST, MODULE)  LOSS OF TEETH MAJOR INJURY BURNIS  FARST, MODULE)	SEX.	INEIGHT  POSSIBLE IN  SEPHIQUS IN  INEIGHT  POSSIBLE  POSSIBLE  SEPHIQUS IN  INEIGHT  POSSIBLE  SEPHIQUS IN  SEPHIQUS IN  INEIGHT  INEIGHT  SEPHIQUS IN  SEPHIQUS	MEIGHT INTERNAL IN LORATION NAIRY INTERNAL IN LORATION NAIRY	HAR COL	UNCONSCIOUS  NONE  OR  UNCONSCIOUS  ONE  ONE	OTHER P	HEAD INJURY  OTHER  RONE  EYE COLON  HEAD INJURY  OTHER  PHONE  EYE COLON

# CALVERT COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE CASE REPORT SUPPLEMENT

CASE NO. 2021-00007137

 -	-	-	А	т	19.7	-

					S 0 900 3	
On 02/10/2021 I was as: located at the Calvert C 20678. While observing something out of his und substances. Detectives said he did not swallow was concealing controlle bathroom and I conduct numerous smaller plastic cocaine a schedule II co Calvert County Detention Academy's entry level of collected the suspected	ounty Sherif on a derwear and went into the anything, he ed dangerou ed a strip se c bags that o ontrolled dan on Center as	recorded system placed it into a interview row was getting as substances arch on gerous substance a Correction aring program	on his person. De During the strict powdery sub ance. Before become Sofficer. I attendim.	reaching is a known us hat was nouth. Other detep, J. Murphy aip search I locat stance. The stance of the Southern ining I was train	derick, Calve into his under er of controll attempting to lectives and nd I took ed a plastic told me the sofficer I was a Maryland C	ed dangerous o swallow. I believed into the oag that contained substance was employed by the friminal Justice
			2			
I certify (as declare) under penalty of perj	ury under the laws of	the state of Maryland	that the foregoing is true and o	rorrect		
REPORTING OFFICER	PERSONNEL P	DATE	SUPERVISOR APPROVAL		Personiter F	VALE
Buckler, 6042		02/10/2021				



Adam Abelson Zuckerman Spaeder LLP 410.949.1148 aabelson@zuckerman.com

December 21, 2021

### VIA E-MAIL & FEDERAL EXPRESS

Lt. Col. P. D. McDowell Calvert County Sheriff's Office 30 Church St. Prince Frederick, MD 20678 Dave.Mcdowell@calvertcountymd.gov

> Request for Reconsideration of Fee Waiver Denial. Re:

Dear Lt. Col. McDowell:

I represent the American Civil Liberties Union of Maryland (the "ACLU"), and write in response to your correspondence dated November 8, 2021, informing the ACLU that the Office of the Sheriff of Calvert County (the "Sheriff's Office") will not honor the ACLU's request for a waiver of fees associated with its request, dated July 22, 2021, seeking records related to the use of body searches, strip searches, and manual body cavity searches by members of your department (the "July 22 request"). As detailed below, your denial of a waiver for fees associated with the July 22 request is arbitrary and capricious, because under the statute and applicable case law, the ACLU and the July 22 request fall squarely within the Maryland Public Information Act's ("MPIA's") public interest exception. Accordingly, we request that you reverse that decision.

### Applicable Law

Under the MPIA, although a custodian of records may charge a "reasonable fee" for costs incurred in the search for and production of requested records, a requester is entitled to have any such fees waived if such waiver "would be in the public interest." Md. Code, General Provisions Art. § 4-206(a) & (e). Courts have routinely reversed denials of public interest fee waiver requests based on findings that the custodian's denial was arbitrary and capricious, particularly where, as here, a nonprofit organization has requested records related to the conduct of government actors. See, e.g., Baltimore Action Legal Team v. Office of the State's Attorney of Baltimore City, No. 1251, 2021 WL 4786936, at \*14-18 (Md. App. 2021)1; Action Comm. for Transit, Inc. v. Town of Chevy Chase, 145 A.3d 640, 654 (Md. App. 2016); Mayor and City Council of Baltimore v. Burke, 506 A.2d 683, 688 (Md. App. 1986).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Baltimore Action Legal Team opinion was published December 17, 2021.

LT. COL. P. D. MCDGWELL DECEMBER 21, 2021 PAGE 2

To determine whether a fee waiver is "in the public interest," Maryland courts look to guidance from the Maryland Attorney General, including the Maryland Public Information Act Manual ("MPIA Manual")<sup>2</sup> and Opinions of the Attorney General.<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., Baltimore Action, 2021 WL 4786936, at \*14-18 (applying factors identified in the MPIA Manual and Opinions of the Attorney General to reverse denial of fee request); Chevy Chase, 145 A.3d at 649 (same). The Attorney General instructs that custodians should waive fees "when a requestor seeks information for a public purpose, rather than a narrow personal or commercial interest, because a public purpose justifies the expenditure of public funds to comply with the request." MPIA Manual at 7-5. Custodians should also waive fees where disclosure "will shed light on 'a public controversy about official actions,' or on 'an agency's performance of its public duties." Id. at 7-6 (quoting Chevy Chase, 145 A.3d at 650). The Attorney General specifically instructs that it is improper for agencies that receive a waiver request to consider only "the ability of the applicant to pay" when deciding whether to grant a fee waiver; custodians "must consider . . . other relevant factors," including whether the requester has only a "personal or commercial interest" and whether disclosure will shed light on "an agency's performance of its public duties." MPIA Manual at 7-5 & 7-6 (emphasis added). See also Burke, 506 A.2d at 688 (denial of fee waiver was arbitrary and capricious where custodian failed to consider public interest factors).

The Maryland Attorney General also instructs custodians to "look at case law interpreting the comparable [Freedom of Information Act ('FOIA')] provision, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)," when determining whether to grant a public interest waiver under the MPIA. MPIA Manual at 7-6. See also Chevy Chase, 145 A.3d at 649 (identifying relevant factors under FOIA). A waiver must be granted under FOIA where disclosure will: "(1) shed light on 'the operations or activities of the government'; (2) be 'likely to contribute significantly to public understanding' of those operations or activities; and (3) not be 'primarily in the commercial interest of the requester." Cause of Action v. FTC, 799 F.3d 1108, 1115 (D.C. Cir. 2015). Maryland courts have distilled several relevant considerations from cases applying this FOIA standard, including "the potential that the requested disclosure would contribute to public understanding and the significance of that understanding" and "whether the material sought pertains to 'a matter of genuine public concern." Chevy Chase, 145 A.3d at 650.

These fundamental protections reflect not only the General Assembly's determination that records sought for public interest purposes must be disclosed, and that agencies are prohibited from charging fees for such disclosure: These protections also ensure that government agencies do not deter the expression of activity protected by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Indeed, Maryland courts have recognized that the right of open access to government information "is a cornerstone of democratic government." *Chevy Chase*, 145 A.3d at 648. The MPIA plays a

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Maryland Public Information Act Manual (16th ed. 2021), available at https://www.marylandattorneygeneral.gov/Pages/OpenGov/piamanual.aspx.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Available at https://www.marylandattorneygeneral.gov/Pages/Opinions/index.aspx.

LT. COL. P. D. MCDOWELL DECEMBER 21, 2021 PAGE 3

key role in guaranteeing that "a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people" remains "open to the people." Id. (quoting MPIA Manual at Preface) (emphasis in original). As the Court of Special Appeals has explained, "the First Amendment's guarantee of free expression of speech protects persons from the imposition of financial burdens based upon the content of their speech. . . . A decision based upon such unconstitutional considerations is clearly arbitrary and capricious." Id. at 653–54 (internal citations omitted). "[I]mposing a fee for information . . . might have a chilling effect" on the ability of organizations like the ACLU to disseminate information about government activities and thereby to advance public understanding of the conduct of government agencies. Burke, 506 A.2d at 688.

## The Sheriff's Office's Denial of the Fee Waiver Is Arbitrary and Capricious

Under these standards, the ACLU's fee waiver request must be granted. Your denial of the fee waiver requests constitutes an abuse of discretion for five independent reasons and will be reversed if we are constrained to seek judicial review.

First, the ACLU seeks the identified records for a public purpose rather than to serve a personal or commercial interest. See MPIA Manual at 7-5 (requiring waiver "when a requestor seeks information for a public purpose, rather than a narrow personal or commercial interest"). The ACLU relies on MPIA requests to gather information necessary for it to defend the civil rights and liberties of all Marylanders, to promote public accountability, to uncover and address unlawful practices by government agencies, and to educate the public about Maryland programs and policies. In keeping with this mission, the records identified in the July 22 request would contribute to public understanding of the activities of Maryland's law enforcement agencies by revealing the circumstances surrounding the use of the types of searches that are the subject of our request. There is no "personal or commercial interest" served by the requests. Indeed, state and local agencies in Maryland recognize the public purpose served by the ACLU's MPIA requests and routinely grant the ACLU's accompanying requests for fee waivers — so much so that the ACLU has seldom had to litigate the denial of a waiver in this state. For this reason, even standing alone, the denial is arbitrary and capricious.

Second, the requested records "will shed light . . . on 'an agency's performance of its public duties." Id. at 7-6 (quoting Chevy Chase, 145 A.3d at 650). The public has an interest in reviewing the performance of the government actors who serve their communities. See, e.g., Chevy Chase, 145 A.3d at 643 (reversing denial of waiver where requested documents related to retention of four firms "to represent the Town's interests in lobbying both the federal and state governments to deny funding" for construction of a new light rail line); Burke, 506 A.3d at 688 (recognizing "the importance of public exposure of the delayed and extremely costly improvements to" a waste water treatment plant that might be facilitated by disclosure of requested documents). See also Physician's Comm. for Responsible Med. v. Dep't of Health and Hum. Servs., 480 F. Supp. 2d 119, 123 (D.D.C. 2007) (holding that the disclosure of records of the closed meetings of an

LT, COL. P. D. MCDOWELL DECEMBER 21, 2021 PAGE 4

interagency committee "would make a significant contribution to public understanding of any lack of progress by [the committee]"). That interest is particularly acute when it comes to records of police interactions with members of the public, including the records of the use of police searches identified in the July 22 request.

Third, the requested records "will shed light on 'a public controversy about official actions' ...." MPIA Manual at 7-6 (quoting Chevy Chase, 145 A.3d at 650). See also Baltimore Action, 2021 WL 4786936, at \*17 (finding this factor "particularly germane" to a request for records of police misconduct). The request for records goes directly to an issue of substantial public controversy: the use of searches by police officers, particularly the types of searches of individuals that are the subject of our request. The General Assembly recently acknowledged the overwhelming public interest served by disclosure of police records, including personnel records, by amending the MPIA to expand the accessibility of those records. The amendment, a provision of the Maryland Police Accountability Act of 2021 known as "Anton's Law," was enacted in response to the death of Anton Black, a 19-year-old Eastern Shore man who died during an encounter with a police officer whose long record of police abuse had been suppressed by officials. See Senate Bill 178 ("Anton's Law"), 2021 Md. Laws, ch. 62. See also Hannah Gaskill, After Years of Legislating, Anton's Law Goes into Effect, Maryland Matters (Oct. 1, 2021), https://www.marylandmatters.org/2021/10/01/after-years-of-legislating-antons-law-goes-intoeffect/ (discussing the years-long fight to reform the MPIA through Anton's Law). Senate Sponsor Jill P. Carter summarized the purpose of Anton's Law in public comments:

My hope is that with the passage of Anton's Law, we will no longer allow the patterns and practices of unconstitutional policing . . . and, most importantly, we will save lives by preventing other heinous, brutal, extrajudicial killings such as that of Anton Black.

Gaskill, *supra*. Disclosure of the records of searches requested by the ACLU will serve the public's interest in increased accountability by exposing police officers to greater scrutiny, in part in the hope of identifying problem officers and removing them from positions of power. That interest outweighs any cost to the government in complying with the ACLU's July 22 request.

Fourth, your Office has not identified any proper basis for denial of the fee waiver request. You justified your denial of the ACLU's request for a fee waiver only "[b]ecause [the ACLU] has the ability to pay and there is no public interest served by [the ACLU's] request . . . ." Letter from P. D. McDowell, Lt. Col., Office of the Sheriff of Calvert County, to Gina Elleby, Legal Advocacy Manager, ACLU of Maryland (Nov. 8, 2021). But a custodian may not deny a request based solely on "the expense to the [custodian] of locating and duplicating the documents . . . and the perceived ability of the [requestor] to pay" without also considering the public interest. Burke, 506 A.2d at 688. Your conclusory statement that "there is no public interest served" by the July 22 request comes nowhere close to "identify[ing] what relevant factors" you considered so that a reviewing

LT. COL. P. D. MCDOWELL DECEMBER 21, 2021 PAGE 5

court may determine whether "the actual decision-making process" leading to your denial of a fee waiver here was arbitrary and capricious. *Chevy Chase*, 145 A.3d at 653.

Fifth, even if the ACLU did not qualify for a full waiver of fees in light of the overwhelming public interest in disclosure of the requested documents, it nonetheless qualifies for a waiver of all fees not associated solely with duplicating the requested records because it is a representative of the news media. Under FOIA and applicable case law, to which Maryland courts representative of the news media. Under FOIA and applicable case law, to which Maryland courts for commercial use and the request is made by ... a representative of the news media." Cause of Action, 799 F.2ds at 1111 (quoting 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II)) (emphasis in original). "[A] representative of the news media' means any person or entity that gathers information of potential interest to a segment of the public, uses its editorial skills to turn the raw materials into a distinct work, and distributes that work to an audience." Id. at 1120 (quoting 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)). The ACLU regularly gathers information of potential interest to the public and turns raw data and materials into digestible reports, articles, and other widely disseminated "distinct work[s]." Id. at 1121 ("[T]he news-media waiver ... focuses on the nature of the requestor, not its request."). The ACLU will use the records identified in its July 22 request to contribute to such reports, articles, and other distinct works about the use of police searches.

For these reasons, the ACLU urges you to reverse your decision denying a waiver of fees associated with the processing of the July 22 request. I look forward to your prompt response, no later than January 14, 2022. With the Sheriff's Office holding the requested documents pending resolution of the fee waiver, it is imperative that we know the Sheriff's Office's position so we can move forward with litigation if your Office intends to stand by the fee waiver denial. I can be reached via any of the means listed above.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Adam B. Abelson

cc: Deborah A. Jeon (via email: jeon@aclu-md.org)
Gina Elleby (via email: elleby@aclu-md.org)

Justin Lewis (via email: ilewis@zuckerman.com)



Major S. R. Jones Special Operations & Homeland Security Bureau

Capt. K. Cross Detention Center Administrator

Capt. B. Parrott Office of Professional Standards

# OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF CALVERT COUNTY

MIKE EVANS SHERIFF

Lt. Col. P. D. McDowell ASSISTANT SHERIFF

Major T. D. Reece
Detention Center Administrator

EXHIBIT D

Capt. R. Jones Patrol Bureau

Capt. T. K. Fridman Investigations Bureau

Capt. R. V. Naughton Administrative & Judicial Services Bureau

January 6, 2022

Mr. Adam Abelson

This letter responds to your letter dated December 21, 2021, in which you request a reconsideration of fees associated with the ACLU's request, dated July 22, 2021, for records relating to the use of body searches, strip searches, and manual body cavity searches by members of our agency.

Given the Sheriff's Office resources needed to satisfy the request, your request for a waiver of fees is denied.

If you have any questions about this letter, please feel free to contact me.

Sincarely

Lieutenant Colonel Dave McDowell

				*
ity	OF	Cou	ntv	١
				۳

## CIVIL - NON-DOMESTIC CASE INFORMATION REPORT

CIVIL -	ON-DOMESTIC CIT			
	DIRECT	FIONS	1 CT. 1idb dbo	
Plaintiff: This Information	<b>Plaintiff:</b> This Information Report must be completed and attached to the complaint filed with the lerk of Court unless your case is exempted from the requirement by the Chief Judge of the Court of			
lark of Court unless vour	case is exempted from the	requirement by the Chief Ju	idge of the Court of	
1 to Dula 2	111(a)		(II)	
	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	is required by Rule 2-323(h)		
Defendant: You must fil	CONATION DEPORT	CANNOT BE ACCEPTED	AS A PLEADING	
THIS INF	DEPENDENCE OF THE PERSON AND AND	T CASE NUMBER		
ORM FILED BY: ZPLA	INTIFF UDEFENDAN	vs. Office of the She	(Clerk to insert)	
CASE NAME: ACLU of M	[arvland]	vs. Office of the She	riff Calvert County MD	
CASE NAME: 1020 01	Plaintiff		Defendant	
ARTY'S NAME: America	n Civil Liberties Union of	Maryland PHON	E.	
ARTY'S ADDRESS: 3600	Clipper Mill Road - Suit	e 350, Baltimore, MD 2121	1	
ARTIS ADDRESS. Soot				
ARTY'S E-MAIL:				
If represented by an attor	ney:	PHON	E. 410-949-1148	
ARTY'S ATTORNEY'S N	VAME: Adam B. Adeison	PHUN	Sto 2440 Baltimore 2120	
THE PROPERTY OF A TEMPORAL PROPERTY OF A TEMP	DIDLECT HERCHHAII SU	actici EEI; 100 E.		
ADTVIC ATTODNEVICE	-MAIL: aabelson@zucke	rman.com		
AKII S AII UKNEI SL	/ MA			
IURY DEMAND? □Yes	MINU	Case #(s) if known		
RELATED CASE PENDI	ING? Lives wind it yes,	, Case #(s), if known:	***************************************	
ANTICIPATED LENGT	H OF TRIAL?:ho	urs <u>L</u> days		
	PLEADIN	NG TYPE		
New Case: Soriginal		ve Appeal		
New Case: Moriginal	ament Amendment	T I		
Existing Case: Post-Jud	ginein - Amendment	gory section - go to Relief sect	on.	
If filing in an existing case, s	CA CE CA TECODY	SUBCATEGORY (Check	one box.)	
	SE: CASE CATEGORY	SUBCATEGORT (CRECK	Constructive Trust	
	Government	PUBLIC LAW	Contempt	
Asbestos	☐ Insurance ☐ Product Liability	☐ Attorney Grievance ☐ Bond Forfeiture Remission	Denosition Notice	
Business and Commercial	DD ODEDTY	Civil Dighte	1 Dist Ct Mtn Appeal	
Conspiracy	Adverse Possession	County/Mncpl Code/Ord	☐ Financial	
Conversion	Breach of Lease			
Defamation	☐ Detinue	Eminent Domain/Condemn	□ Miscellaneous	
False Arrest/Imprisonment	Distress/Distrain	☐ Environment	Perpetuate restilliony Evidence	
T Frand	Fiectment	Error Coram Nobis	Prod. of Documents Req.	
Lead Paint - DOB of Youngest Plt:	Forcible Entry/Detainer	☐ Habeas Corpus	Receivership Sentence Transfer	
Youngest Plt:	☐ Foreclosure☐ Commercial	☐ Mandamus	☐ Set Aside Deed	
LI Loss of Consortium	Residential	☐ Prisoner Rights	Special Adm Atty	
Malicious Prosecution	Currency or Vehicle	☑ Public Info. Act Records	Special Adm Atty Subpoena Issue/Quash	
Malpractice-Medical	Deed of Trust	Quarantine/Isolation	Trust Established	
Malpractice-Professional	Land Installments	☐ Writ of Certiorari	Trustee Substitution/Removal	
Misrepresentation	Lien	<b>EMPLOYMENT</b>	Witness Appearance-Compel	
☐ Motor Tort ☐ Negligence	☐ Mortgage	□ ADA	PEACE ORDER	
Nuicance	☐Right of Redemption	☐ Conspiracy	☐ Peace Order	
☐ Premises Liability	Statement Condo	☐ EEO/HR	EQUITY	
☐ Product Liability	Forfeiture of Property / Personal Item	□ FLSA	Declaratory Judgment	
Specific Performance	Fraudulent Conveyance	□FMLA	☐ Equitable Relief ☐ Injunctive Relief	
Trespass	☐ Landlord-Tenant	☐ Workers' Compensation	☐ Mandamus	
☐ Premises Liability ☐ Product Liability ☐ Specific Performance ☐ Toxic Tort ☐ Trespass ☐ Wrongful Death	Lis Pendens	☐ Wrongful Termination		
CONTRACT	Mechanic's Lien	INDEPENDENT	OTHER	
Asbestos	Ownership	PROCEEDINGS	Accounting	
Rreach	Partition/Ŝale in Lieu		Friendly Suit	
Business and Commercial Confessed Judgment	Quiet Title Rent Escrow	Assumption of Jurisdictio	☐ Maryland Insurance Administr	
	Return of Seized Proper	ty Authorized Sale	☐ Miscellaneous	
(Cont'd)	Right of Redemption	Attorney Appointment  Body Attachment Issuanc	e Specific Transaction	
☐ Construction ☐ Debt	Tenant Holding Over	Body Attachment Issuance	Structured Settlements	
Fraud	-	LI COMMISSION ISSUANCE	— <del>Managara Z</del> 2000	
∟ Fraud				

	THEODING CASE. D	ELIEF (Check All that	Apply)	
	☐ Earnings Withholding	☐ Judgment-Interest	Return of Property	
Administrative Action Appointment of Receiver Arbitration Asset Determination Attachment b/f Judgment Cease & Desist Order Condemn Bldg Contempt Court Costs/Fees Damages-Compensatory Damages-Punitive	☐ Enrollment ☐ Expungement ☐ Findings of Fact ☐ Foreclosure ☐ Injunction ☐ Judgment-Affidavit ☑ Judgment-Confessed ☐ Judgment-Consent ☑ Judgment-Declaratory ☐ Judgment-Default	☐ Judgment-Summary ☐ Liability ☐ Oral Examination ☐ Order ☐ Ownership of Property ☐ Partition of Property es☐ Peace Order ☐ Possession ☑ Production of Records ☐ Quarantine/Isolation O ☐ Reinstatement of Empl	oyment	
If you indicated Liability ab may not be used for any pur □Liability is conceded. □Lia				
Liability is conceded. Library		Attaments Foos Interest	or Court Costs)	
MONETARY DAM	1AGES (Do not include	Attorney's Fees, Interest,		
☑ Under \$10,000 □	\$10,000 - \$30,000	<b>3 φ30,000 · φ100,000</b>	Over \$100,000	
☐ Medical Bills \$	🗆 Wage Loss \$_		Damages \$	
ALTEI	RNATIVE DISPUTE RE	ESOLUTION INFORMAT	IION	
Is this case appropriate for A. Mediation	referral to an ADR proce ĎNo ⊠No	SS under Md. Rule 17-101?  C. Settlement Confe  D. Neutral Evaluation		
	SPECIAL REC	QUIREMENTS		
☐ If a Spoken Language In	nterpreter is needed, chec	k here and attach form Co	C-DC-041	
☐ If you require an accome here and attach form	modation for a disability	under the Americans with I	Disabilities Act, <b>check</b>	
	TOTAL ATED I F	NGTH OF TRIAL	. LIENCTH OF	
With the exception of Balt	timore County and Baltin	nore City, please fill in the	estimatea LENGIII OI	
TRIAL.	(Case will be trac	eked accoraingly)		
□ 1/2 day	y of trial or less	☐ 3 days of trial time		
□ 1 day	of trial time	☐ More than 3 days of	f trial time	
- I	s of trial time			
BUSINESS AND TECHNOLOGY CASE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM				
500 St. 1920/1920 1000 1000	· d Tachnology tr	ack designation under Md. nt and check one of the trac	Rule 16-308 is requested, ks below.	
☐ Expedited-	- Trial within 7 months of fendant's response	Standard - Trial		
	EMERGENCY R	ELIEF REQUESTED		

# COMPLEX SCIENCE AND/OR TECHNOLOGICAL CASE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (ASTAR) FOR PURPOSES OF POSSIBLE SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT TO ASTAR RESOURCES JUDGES under Md. Rule 16-302, attach a duplicate copy of complaint and check whether assignment to an ASTAR is requested.

Md.	Md. Rule 16-302, attach a aupticate copy of complaint and electronic and electron			
	Defe	Trial within 7 months of ndant's response	☐ Standard - Trial within 18 months of Defendant's response	
IF Y	OU ARE FILING YO	UR COMPLAINT IN BAL	TIMORE CITY, OR BALTIMORE COUNTY,	
PLE.	ASE FILL OUT THE	APPROPRIATE BOX BE	RE CITY (CHECK ONLY ONE)	
	CIRCUIT CO			
$\mathbf{X}$	Expedited	Trial 60 to 120 days fi	om notice. Non-jury matters.	
	Civil-Short	Trial 210 days from fi	rst answer.	
	Civil-Standard	Trial 360 days from fi		
	Custom	Scheduling order ente	red by individual judge.	
	Asbestos	Special scheduling or		
	Lead Paint	Fill in: Birth Date of y	oungest plaintiff	
	Tax Sale Foreclosure	s Special scheduling or	ler.	
	Mortgage Foreclosur	es No scheduling order.		
	CII	OCUIT COURT FOR R	ALTIMORE COUNTY	
	CII	RCUIT COURT FOR B		
	Expedited Frial Date-90 days)	Attachment Before Judgme Administrative Appeals, D Guardianship, Injunction,	ent, Declaratory Judgment (Simple), istrict Court Appeals and Jury Trial Prayers, Mandamus.	
(T	Standard rial Date-240 days)	Related Cases, Fraud and	Judgments (Vacated), Contract, Employment Misrepresentation, International Tort, Motor Tort, rkers' Compensation Cases.	
	Extended Standard Frial Date-345 days)	Danconal Injury Cases (me	, Professional Malpractice, Serious Motor Tort or dical expenses and wage loss of \$100,000, expert (parties), and trial of five or more days), State	
	Complex Frial Date-450 days)	Class Actions, Designated Product Liabilities, Other	Toxic Tort, Major Construction Contracts, Major Complex Cases.	
Marc	ch 2, 2022		Signature of Counsel / Party	
	Date 100 East Pratt Stree	et - Suite 2440	Adam B. Abelson (CPF # 1012140004)	
	Address Printed Name			

March 2, 2022		CC and Booth
	Date	Signature of Counsel / Party
100 East Pra	att Street - Suite 2440	Adam B. Abelson (CPF # 1012140004)
	Address	Printed Name
Baltimore	MD 21202	

Zip Code

State

City