OPIGINAL

	Humberto M. Guizar, Esq., (SBN 125769) GUIZAR, HENDERSON & CARRAZCO, I 18301 Irvine Blvd. Tustin, CA 92780 Tel: (714) 541-8600 Fax: (714) 541-8601 E-mail: herito@aol.com	MAR 2 3 2016
5	Attorney for Plaintiffs' HERIBERTA CENTENO, JOSE CENTENO	SUPERIOR COURT OF FRESINO BY
7	Cristobal Galindo SBN: 277670 Law Offices of Cristobal M. Galindo, P.C. 4151 Southwest Freeway, Suite 602	
8	4151 Southwest Freeway, Suite 602 Houston, Texas 77027 Phone) 713-228-3030 Fax) 713-228-3003 E-mail: cmg@galindolaw.com	0,14
10 11	Attorney for Plaintiff, CHANNEL CENTENO,	00084
12 13	SUPERIOR COURT	OF CALIFORNIA
14	COUNTY OF	FRESNO 16 CE CG DO 8 9 7
	CHANNEL CENTENO) HERIBERTA CENTENO,) JOSE CENTENO, individually)	CASE NO: COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES:
17	Plaintiffs,	1. Wrongful Death
18	v.	2. Unreasonable Search and Selzure-Excessive Force (42 U.S.C. § 1983)
20	CITY OF FRESNO, ZEBULON PRICE, S FELIPE MIGUEL LUCERO, S and DOES I THROUGH 10,	3. Substantive Due Process-(42 U.S.C. § 1983)
21	Inclusive,	
22	Defendants.	4. Municipal Liability for Unconstitutional Custom, Practice, or Policy-(42
23)	U.S.C. § 1983)
24 25		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
26		
27	PLAINTIPF'S COMPLA	UNT FOR DARLICES
		MINI FORDANIAGEA

16CECG00897 CFL Civil Complaint filed 242328



COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

CHANNEL CENTENO, individually and as successor in interest to FREDDY MARTIN CENTENO, decedent. HERIBERTA CENTENO, and, JOSE CENTENO individually, for their Complaint against Defendants CITY OF FRESNO, ZEBULON PRICE, and FELIPE MIGUEL LUCERO and DOES 1-10, inclusive, allege as follows:

INTRODUCTION

- 1. This state tort and Federal civil rights action seeks compensatory and punitive damages from Defendants for violating various rights under state law and the United States Constitution in connection with the fatal police shooting of FREDDY CENTENO, (hereinafter also referred to as, "DECEDENT"). on September 3, 2015.
- Defendants ZEBULON PRICE, FELIPE MIGUEL LUCERO, proximately caused DECEDENT's and Plaintiffs' injuries by firing the shots that killed DECEDENT, by integrally participating or failing to intervene in the shooting, and by engaging in other acts and/ or omissions around the time of the shooting that resulted in his death.
- Defendants CITY OF FRESNO (Hereinafter also referred to as "CITY") and DOES 6-10 also proximately caused DECEDENT's and Plaintiffs' injuries and are liable under state law and under principles set forth in Monell v. Department of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658 (1978).
 - 4. The policies and customs behind shootings of civilians such as FREDDY CENTENO are fundamentally unconstitutional and constitute a menace of major proportions to the public. Accordingly, insofar as Plaintiffs herein seek by means of this civil rights action to hold accountable those responsible for the killing of FREDDY CENTENO and to challenge the CITY's unconstitutional policies and practices, this civil rights action is firmly in the public interest.

26

20

3

67

27

PARTIES

5. At all relevant times, decedent FREDDY CENTENO was an individual residing in the CITY OF FRESNO, California.

2

3

4

6

10

- 6. Plaintiff CHANNEL CENTENO, hereinafter also referred to as 'CHANNEL CENTENO, is an adult individual residing in the CITY OF FRESNO, California and is the natural born child of DECEDENT. CHANNEL CENTENO sues both in her individual capacity as the child of DECEDENT and in a representative capacity as a successor-in-interest to DECEDENT pursuant to California Civil Code § 377,32. CC seeks both survival and wrongful death damages under federal and state law.
- Plaintiff JOSE CENTENO is the natural father of DECEDENT, FREDDY CENTENO, and he hereby sues in his individual capacity as the father of DECEDENT.
- Plaintiff HERIBERTA CENTENO is an individual residing in the CITY OF FRESNO, California and is the mother of DECEDENT, and she hereby sues in her individual capacity as the mother of DECEDENT.
- 9. Defendants, ZEBULON PRICE, (hereinafter also referred to as "PRICE") and FELIPE MIGUEL LUCERO, (hereinafter referred to as "LUCERO") are Police OFFICERS for the CITY of FRESNO Police Department, (hereinafter referred to as "CITY"), and were acting under color of law within the course and scope of their duties as Police OFFICERS for the CITY. Said defendants were acting with the complete authority and ratification of their principal, Defendant CITY.
- 10. Defendants DOBS 1-5 are supervisorial officers for the CITY who were acting under color of law within the course and scope of their duties as Police OFFICERS for the CITY. DOES 6-8 were acting with the complete authority and ratification of their principal, Defendant CITY.
- 25 11. Defendants DOES 9-10 are managerial, supervisorial, and policymaking 26 employees of the CITY, who were acting under color of law within the course and 27 scope of their duties as managerial, supervisorial, and policymaking employees for the

was unarmed and he posed no threat to any of the individual defendants, or any other 2 person.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Wrongful Death.

As Against Defendants CITY OF FRESNO, ZEBULON PRICE, FELIPE MIGUEL LUCERO and DOES 1 THROUGH 10.

- Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate the foregoing paragraphs as if set forth herein. 7 29.
 - This cause of action arises under the general laws and Constitution of the State 30. of California, including sections 815.2 and 820 of the Government Code.
- Defendants PRICE, LUCERO and DOES 1 through 10, while working as Police officers for the CITY OF FRESNO POLICE DEPARTMENT, and acting within the course and scope of their duties, employed negligent tactics and intentionally and/or without due care shot decedent FREDDY CENTENO. The shooting resulted from said Defendants' unsafe and negligent pre-shooting tactics as well as their careless, wrongful and excessive use of force under the circumstances that they encountered at the time of the shooting. As a result of these intentional acts and/or negligence, decedent FREDDY CENTENO suffered serious injuries and lost his life. Defendants PRICB, LUCERO and DOES I through 10, had no legal or reasonable justification for their actions or subjective belief that such force was lawful.
- As a direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendants PRICE, LUCERO and DOES 1 through 10, as alleged above, FREDDY CENTENO suffered serious injuries and lost his life. Plaintiffs have been deprived of the life-long comfort, society, support and care of FREDDY CENTENO, and will continue to be so deprived for the remainder of their natural lives. Plaintiffs were further forced to pay funeral and burial expenses as a result of the conduct of Defendants.
- 33. Defendant CITY is vicariously liable for the wrongful acts of Defendants PRICE, LUCERO and DOES 1 through 10, pursuant to California Government Code § 815.2,

PLAINTIPP'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

26

24

25

3

5

6

8

10

11

13

15

17

81 19

which provides that a public entity is liable for the injuries caused by its employees
within the scope of the employment if the employee's act would subject him to liability.

34. Defendants PRICE, LUCERO and DOES 1 through 10 received inadequate training from the CITY in the proper use of firearms and tactics, including the proper and safe tactics for dealing with suspects that are mentally or emotionally unstable, emotionally distraught and otherwise psychologically incapacitated, as well as suspects that are under the influence of alcohol. As a direct and proximate result of this failure to provide such adequate firearms and tactics training to Defendants PRICE, LUCERO and DOES 1 through 10, the shooting of FREDDY CENTENO occurred, causing the present Plaintiffs the losses and injuries herein complained of.

12

13

16

- At no time, either prior to the employment of Defendants PRICE, LUCERO and DOES I through 10, or to the assignment of these Defendants to duties whereby it was foresecable that said Defendants would be required to use their firearm, did Defendant CITY take reasonable steps to ascertain whether Defendants PRICE, LUCERO and DOES 1 through 10 were psychologically capable of performing such duties and whether they had a propensity towards violence or toward over-reaction in typical encounters with the public. To the contrary, Defendant CITY was aware of various instances where Defendants PRICE, LUCERO and DOES 1 through 10 unnecessarily and recklessly drew their firearms. Despite knowledge of such propensity, the Defendant CITY failed to take action to discipline or train these Defendants to correct this propensity. Instead, Defendant CITY carelessly allowed Defendants PRICE, LUCERO and DOES 1 through 10 to continue to encounter members of the public in the course of their duties. As a direct and proximate result of this failure to use due caution and care in the selection, training, and retention of Defendants PRICE, LUCERO and DOES 1 through 10, FREDDY CENTENO lost his life, causing the present Plaintiffs the losses and injuries complained of herein.
- 27 36. Defendant CITY, and DOES 6 through 10, also negligently retained Defendants

I PRICE, LUCERO and DOES I through 5, when it was known or should have been known by the CITY, and DOES 6 through 10, that said Defendants had on prior 3 occasions created violent confrontations leading to serious injury or death. 37. At the time of the death of FREDDY CENTENO, Defendants CITY, and DOES 4 6 through 10, negligently and carelessly had in place, and had ratified customs and practices which permitted their police officers while on duty and while off duty to shoot persons unjustifiably, unreasonably and in violation of civil rights. Said policies, procedures, customs and practices also called for Defendants 38. 8 CITY, and DOES 6 through 10, not to meaningfully discipline, prosecute or in any way 10 deal with or respond to known incidents, complaints, and instances of the deliberate and 11 reckless creation of violent confrontations by police officers of CITY. Other systemic deficiencies which indicated, and continue to indicate, a careless 12 and negligent disregard by Defendants CITY, and DOES 6 through 10, to the violations 13 of the civil rights by the police officers of the CFPD, include: 14 preparation of investigative reports designed to vindicate the use of 15 a. 16 firearms, regardless of whether such acts were justified. 17

- preparation of investigative reports which uncritically rely solely on the b. word of police officers involved in the aforementioned confrontations and which systematically fall to credit testimony by non-sheriff witnesses,

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

- preparation of investigative reports which omit factual information and physical evidence which contradicts the accounts of the involved police officers,
- issuance of public statements exonerating deputies and other personnel involved in such incidents prior to the completion of investigations of such incidents, and,
- e. failing to enact and implement training as to the safe handling of suspects who are mentally or emotionally unstable, emotionally distraught and otherwise psychologically incapacitated.

1	39. Said negligent customs and practices of Defendants CITY, and DOES 6 through
2	10, evidenced a deliberate indifference to the unnecessary shooting of persons such as
3	FREDDY CENTENO by the failure to cliange, correct, revoke, or rescind said customs
4	and practices, and tactic and weapons training in light of prior knowledge by said
5	Defendants of indistinguishably similar incidents of contact with persons who are
6	mentally or emotionally unstable, emotionally distraught and otherwise psychologically
7	incapacitated where tactics and firearm use caused death or serious bodily injury to such
8	persons.
9	40. The foregoing acts, omissions, and systemic deficiencies are practices and
10	customs of Defendants CITY, and DOES 6 through 10 caused Defendants PRICE, and
11	LUCERO, to be unaware of the rules and laws governing permissible use of firearms
12	while on duty and off duty and to believe that firearm discharges are entirely within the
13	discretion of the officer and that improper discharges would not be honestly and

As a result of the aforementioned negligent and intentional acts, omissions, systematic deficiencies, customs and practices of Defendants CITY, and DOBS 6 through 10, Defendants PRICE, and LUCERO shot FREDDY CENTENO without justification, thereby killing him.

properly investigated, all with the foreseeable result that Defendants' deputies would use

15 deadly force in situations where such force is neither necessary, reasonable nor legal,

16 thereby violating the civil rights of the citizens of this state.

42. As a further result of the aforementioned negligent and intentional acts. omissions, systematic deficiencies, customs and practices of Defendants CITY, the present Plaintiffs have lost the love, affection, society, support and moral support of FREDDY CENTENO.

25

23

26

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Unreasonable Se	arch and Seizur	e-Excessive Fo	rce (42 U.S.C	, § 1983)
Olli cushimpio io			THE PARTY OF THE	TUCTOO
nainst Defendants	ZEBULON PR	CE, and FELI	LE MICORI	POCINO

- 43. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 42 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.
- delivered Plaintiffs have lost the love, affection, society, support and moral support of decedent FREDDY CENTENO of his right to be secure in his person against unreasonable searches and seizures as guaranteed to Decedent under the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution and applied to state actors by the Fourteenth Amendment.
- 45. As a result, FREDDY CENTENO suffered extreme pain and suffering and eventually suffered a loss of life and of earning capacity. Plaintiffs have also been deprived of the life-long love, companionship, comfort, support, society, care, and sustenance of Decedent, and will continue to be so deprived for the remainder of their natural lives. Plaintiffs claim funeral and burial expenses and a loss of financial support.
- 17 46. The shooting was excessive and unreasonable, especially because FREDDY 18 CENTENO had not threatened to cause physical injury to PRICE, LUCERO, or any other person.
- 20 47. Defendants PRICE, and LUCERO's discharge of their firearms and lethal use of deadly force violated their training, was willful, wanton, malicious, and done with reckless disregard for the rights and safety of Decedent, and therefore warrants the imposition of exemplary and punitive damages as to individual Defendants PRICE, and LUCERO.

25 /// 26 ///

2

4

27 //

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEI

Substantive Due Process (42 U.S.C. § 1983

(Against Defendants PRICE, LUCERO

and DOES 1 Through 5)

5	48. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through
6	47 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.
	49. Plaintiff CHANNEL CENTENO had a cognizable interest under the Due
8	Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution to be
	free from state actions that deprive her of life, liberty, or property in such a manner as
	to shock the conscience, including but not limited to unwarranted state interference in
	Plaintiffs familial relationship with her father, Decedent.
10	50 TORE CENTENIO ALTERNATION

- 12 SE CENTENO and HERIBERTA CENTENO as the parents of FREDDY CENTENO had a cognizable interest under the Due Process Clause of the 14 Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution to be free from state actions 15 that deprive them of life, liberty, or property in such a manner as to shock the conscience, including but not limited to unwarranted state interference in Plaintiffs familial relationship with their son, Decedent.
- Decedent had a cognizable interest under the Due Process Clause of the 18 Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution to be free from state actions that deprive him of his right to life, liberty, or property in such a manner as to shock the conscience.
- The aforementioned actions of PRICE, and LUCERO shocks the conscience, in that they acted with deliberate indifference to the constitutional rights of Decedent and Plaintiffs, and with purpose to harm unrelated to any legitimate law enforcement objective. 25
- Defendants PRICE, and LUCERO thus violated the substantive due process 53. 26 rights of Plaintiffs to be free from unwarranted interference with their familial

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

1	relationship with Decedent.
2	54. As a direct and proximate cause of the acts of PRICE, and LUCERO, FREDDY
3	CENTENO experienced severe pain and suffering for 23 days and lost his life and
4	carning capacity. Plaintiffs suffered extreme and severe mental anguish and pain and
5	have been injured in mind and body. Plaintiffs have also been deprived of the life-long
6	love, companionship, comfort, support, society, care, and sustenance of Decedent,
7	FREDDY CENTENO, and will continue to be so deprived for the remainder of their
8	natural lives. Plaintiffs are also claiming funeral and burial expenses and a loss of
9	financial support.
10	55. The conduct of PRICE, and LUCERO was willful, wanton, malicious, and done
11	with reckless disregard for the rights and safety of FREDDY CENTENO and Plaintiffs
12	and therefore warrants the imposition of exemplary and punitive damages as to
13	Defendants PRICE, and LUCERO only.
14	56. Plaintiffs CHANNEL CENTENO, JOSE CENTENO, and HERIBERTA
15	CENTENO, bring this claim in each case individually, and in each case seek death
16	damages for the violation of their constitutional rights to a familiar relationship with
17	DECEDENT. Plaintiffs also seek attorney fees under this claim.
18	FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
19	Municipal Liability for Unconstitutional Custom or Policy
20	(42 U.S.C. § 1983) (Against Defendants CITY and DOES 6-10)
21	57. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through
22	56 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.
23	58. On information and belief, Defendants PRICE, and LUCERO's unjustified
24	shooting of FREDDY CENTENO was found to be within CFPD policy.
25	59. On information and belief, Defendants PRICE, and LUCERO's unjustified
- 1	shooting of FREDDY CENTENO was ratified by CFPD supervisorial officers.
27	60. On information and belief, Defendants PRICE, and LUCERO were not

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES -13.

- On and for some time prior to September 3, 2015 (and continuing to the present date), Defendants CITY and DOES 6-10, acting with gross negligence and with reckless and deliberate indifference to the rights and liberties of the public in general, and of Plaintiffs and DECEDENT, and of persons in their class, situation and comparable position in particular, knowingly maintained, enforced and applied an official recognized custom, policy, and practice of:
 - (a) Employing and retaining as police officers and other personnel, including defendant's PRICE, and LUCERO, whom Defendants CITY and DOES 6-10 at all times material herein knew or reasonably should have known had dangerous propensities for abusing their authority and for mistreating citizens by failing to follow written CFPD policies, including the use of excessive force;
 - (b) Of inadequately supervising, training, controlling, assigning, and disciplining CITY Police OFFICERS and other personnel, including defendants PRICE, and LUCERO, whom Defendants CITY and DOES 6-10 knew or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known had the aforementioned propensities and character traits, including the propensity for violence and the use of excessive force;
 - (c) By maintaining grossly inadequate procedures for reporting, supervising, investigating, reviewing, disciplining and controlling the intentional misconduct of Defendants PRICE, and LUCERO, who are Police OFFICERS and/or agents of CITY;
 - (d) By failing to discipline CITY Police OFFICERS' and/or agents' conduct, including but not limited to, unlawful detention and excessive force;
 - (e) By ratifying the intentional misconduct of PRICE, LUCERO, and other Police OFFICERS and/or agents, who are Police OFFICERS and/or agents of CITY;

5

6

7

8

12

13

19

26

By having and maintaining an unconstitutional policy, custom, and practice of detaining and arresting individuals without probable cause or reasonable suspicion, and using excessive force, including deadly force, which also is demonstrated by inadequate training regarding these subjects, policies, customs, and practices of Defendants CITY and DOES 6-10 were maintained with a deliberate indifference to individuals' safety and rights; and

By failing to properly investigate claims of unlawful detention and (g) excessive force by CITY Police OFFICERS,

9 62. By reason of the aforementioned policies and practices of Defendants CITY and DOES 6-10, DECEDENT was severely injured and subjected to pain and suffering and 10 lost his life. 11

63. Defendants CITY and DOES 6-10, together with various other officials, whether named or unnamed, had either actual or constructive knowledge of the deficient policies, practices and customs alleged in the paragraphs above. Despite having knowledge as stated above, these defendants condoned, tolerated and through actions and inactions thereby ratified such policies. Said defendants also acted with deliberate indifference to the foreseeable effects and consequences of these policies with respect to the constitutional rights of FREDDY CENTENO, Plaintiffs, and other individuals similarly situated.

20 64. By perpetrating, sanctioning, tolerating and ratifying the outrageous conduct and other wrongful acts, Defendants DOBS 6-10 acted with intentional, reckless, and callous disregard for the life of FREDDY CENTENO and for FREDDY CENTENO 23 and Plaintiffs' constitutional rights. Furthermore, the policies, practices, and customs 24 implemented, maintained, and still tolerated by Defendants CITY and DOES 6-10 were affirmatively linked to and were a significantly influential force behind the injuries of FREDDY CENTENO and Plaintiffs.

65. 27 The actions of each of Defendants DOES 6-10 were willful, wanton, oppressive,

	N.	
	1	malicious, fraudulent, and extremely offensive and unconscionable to any person of
	2	normal sensibilities, and therefore warrants the imposition of exemplary and punitive
2. 26	3	damages as to Defendants DOES 6-10.
	. 4	66. By reason of the aforementioned acts and omissions of Defendants CITY and
	5	DOES 6-10, Plaintiffs were caused to incur funeral and related burial expenses, and
	6	loss of financial support.
	7	67. By reason of the aforementioned acts and omissions of Defendants CITY and
(8)	8	DOES 6-10, Plaintiffs have suffered loss of love, companionship, affection, comfort,
	9	care, society, and future support.
	10	68. Accordingly, Defendants CITY and DOBS 6-10 each are liable to Plaintiffs for
	11	compensatory damages under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
	12	69. Plaintiffs seek both wrongful death damages and survival damages under this
	13	claim. Plaintiffs also seek attorney fees under this claim.
	14	
	15	PRAYER FOR RELIEF
	16	WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request entry of judgment in their favor and against
	17	Defendants the CITY OF FRESNO, City of Fresno Police officers, PRICE, LUCERO,
	18	and Does I-10, inclusive, as follows:
	19	A. For compensatory damages, including both survival damages and wrongful death
	20	damages under federal and state law, in the amount to be proven at trial;
	21.	B. For funeral and burial expenses, and loss of financial support;
*	22	C. For punitive damages against the individual defendants in an amount to be
	23	proven at trial;
	24	D. For interest;
	25	E. For reasonable costs of this suit and attorneys' fees; and,
*		F. For such further other relief as the Court may deem just, proper, and appropriate.
	27	and appropriate.
		PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
×		-16-

· ·

. .

.

. ..

			8
		DATED: March 17, 2016	GUIZAR, HEMPERSON & CARRAZCO, L.L.P.
	2		
	3	•	By All HUPD
	4		HUMBINITATIONEAR Esq., Atternetification in the control of the con
ŧ	5		HENBARY CINTENO, JOSE VEN WINO
	6	DAMON, March 17 2016	LAW OFFICES OF CRISTOBAL GALINDO, P.C.
	. 7	DATED: March 17, 2016	LAW OFFICE OF CRISTOBAL GALLINDO, F.C.
	8		Bu
	9		CRISTOBAL GALINDO Esq., Attorneys For Plaintiff CHANNEL CENTENO,
	10		CHANNEL CENTENO,
ā	11	(
	12		
	13		
	14		
	15		
	16	·	
	17		
	18		
	19		
	20		
(* (***) *) .	21.	man man and an agree of the same comments and the same states and the same states are same states and the same states are same states and the same states are	And the second s
	23		
	24		
	25		
	26		
	27		
		PLAIN	TIPP'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
			TIPP'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES. - 17 -

.

20	4				
1	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL				
2	Plaintiffs hereby demand a tr	rial by jury.			
.3					
4	DATED: March 17, 2016	GUIZAR, HENDE	RSON & CARRAZCO, L.L.P.		
5					
6		B	AR Bag.,		
7		Attoney For Plan	iffs, TENO		
8		JOSE CENTERO			
9					
10	DATED: March 17, 2016	LAW OFFICES OF	CRISTOBAL GALINDO, P.C.		
11		7	λ		
12		By (
13		CRISTOBALGAL Attorneys For Plain	NDO Esq.,		
14	9	CHANNEL CENTI	3NO		
15					
16					
17					
18 19		W.	\$4		
20					
21			e se		
22	and the second the second that the the	اور د وهوه المحمد المحمد المراب المحمد المراب المحمد المحمد المحمد المحمد المحمد المحمد المحمد المحمد المحمد ا	a dalar may yayata ayada ayada ayada a dalar ayada a dalar a d Talar a dalar a		
23					
24					
25					
26		•	ar X		
27					
- 1	11		* 0*:		

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES