

**THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE**

Joseph Gay\*  
jgay@ij.org  
Robert Frommer\*  
rfrommer@ij.org  
901 N. Glebe Rd. Suite 900  
Arlington, VA 22203  
Tel. (703) 682-9320

Robert E. Johnson\*  
rjohnson@ij.org  
16781 Chagrin Blvd. Suite 256  
Shaker Heights, OH 44120  
Tel. (703) 682-9320

\* Applications for admission *pro hac vice* forthcoming

**THE VORA LAW FIRM, P.C.**

Lou Egerton-Wiley (SBN 323482)  
lou@voralaw.com  
Nilay U. Vora (SBN 268339)  
nvora@voralaw.com  
Jeffrey Atteberry (SBN 266728)  
jatteberry@voralaw.com  
201 Santa Monica Blvd., Ste. 300  
Santa Monica, California 90401  
Tel. (424) 258-5190

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
WESTERN DIVISION

**JENI PEARSONS and MICHAEL  
STORC,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;  
Federal Bureau of Investigation  
Special Agent LYNNE ZELLHART,  
in her individual capacity; and DOES  
1 through 5, Federal Bureau of  
Investigation agents in their  
individual capacities,**

Defendants.

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

**COMPLAINT**

**INTRODUCTION**

1  
2 1. When the government takes someone’s personal property, it should be  
3 responsible for keeping it safe. Yet all too often, government officials take people’s  
4 property—to forfeit, to use as evidence, or simply because they can—and when the  
5 government’s asserted need for the property ends, the government fails to return the  
6 property, in whole or in part.

7 2. That’s what happened to Plaintiffs Jeni Pearsons and Michael Storc.  
8 The government broke into Jeni and Michael’s safe-deposit box at U.S. Private  
9 Vaults (USPV) in Beverly Hills, California, which they used to store \$2,000 in cash  
10 and about \$20,000 in silver they had purchased as a retirement nest egg. Without  
11 any evidence that Jeni and Michael had done anything wrong, the government tried  
12 to administratively forfeit the silver. The government eventually abandoned its  
13 unjustified forfeiture attempt and tried to return the property. But by that time, the  
14 \$2,000 in cash in Jeni and Michael’s box had disappeared.

15 3. Jeni and Michael’s problems began on March 22, 2021, when the FBI  
16 raided USPV’s business premises based on suspicion that the business itself had  
17 committed various crimes. The FBI’s warrant application stated that by seizing  
18 USPV’s property, the FBI would end up with custody of the individual safe-deposit  
19 boxes, too. And to address the obvious constitutional concerns that presented, the  
20 FBI promised the magistrate judge in its warrant application that the FBI would  
21 “preserve the property for safekeeping” and return the property to the rightful  
22 owners.

23 4. But the FBI also had a separate plan—concealed from the magistrate  
24 judge who approved the warrant—to administratively forfeit all boxes containing  
25 property worth at least \$5,000 (the FBI’s minimum threshold for profitability), and  
26 to conduct investigatory searches of the boxes for evidence to support the  
27 forfeitures. These investigatory searches demanded significant time and effort—for  
28 instance, running all cash by drug-sniffing dogs and documenting agents’ notes and

1 observations to use in later forfeiture proceedings. The resulting time crunch left  
2 agents scrambling to search each box as quickly as possible so they could move on  
3 to the next one.

4 5. This left little time for complying with the government's promises to  
5 safeguard the boxes and return the contents to the owners. The point of opening the  
6 boxes was to create "inventories" of the contents that would protect them against  
7 loss or theft. But in the dash to process each box as quickly as possible, the agents  
8 often didn't even take the time to carefully check for and protect all the valuable  
9 property in the box, once they confirmed that the contents were worth more than  
10 \$5,000 and therefore subject to forfeiture. And the resulting "inventories" they  
11 created were all but useless, describing property worth anywhere from a few dollars  
12 to a million dollars with vague terms like "miscellaneous coins." In the rush to  
13 finish, it was inevitable that valuable property would go missing, never to be  
14 returned to the rightful owners.

15 6. After the FBI abandoned its efforts to forfeit Jeni and Michael's  
16 property, it returned their silver. But it never returned the \$2,000 in cash it took  
17 from their box. Jeni and Michael therefore filed an administrative claim with the  
18 FBI, showing that they had placed \$2,000 in their box shortly before the USPV raid  
19 and that the FBI had not returned the \$2,000. Adding insult to injury, however, the  
20 FBI denied any responsibility, disingenuously stating that there was "no evidence  
21 of negligence or wrongful acts on the part of any FBI employee."

22 7. That's wrong. Jeni and Michael's cash was completely secure until  
23 FBI agents broke open the safe-deposit box looking for property that could be  
24 forfeited. Its disappearance can only be explained by the acts or omissions of the  
25 FBI agents who broke into the box and rummaged through it. The FBI never should  
26 have broken into the safe-deposit boxes in the first place but, once it did, it became  
27 responsible for returning everything it had custody of, unless it had a lawful reason  
28 to keep it.



1 Clause, the Tucker Act, and the Little Tucker Act. References to conduct by the  
2 United States include acts taken by its agents and employees.

3 14. Defendant Lynne Zellhart is a special agent with the Federal Bureau of  
4 Investigation who is responsible for the acts, violations, and injuries alleged in this  
5 action. She spearheaded the government's secret plan to break into the USPV safe-  
6 deposit boxes. Among other conduct, she made representations to the magistrate  
7 judge and to boxholders about safeguarding the property so it could be returned to  
8 the rightful owners; led the development of the secret plan to seize and forfeit boxes  
9 containing property worth more than \$5,000 and to conduct investigatory searches  
10 for evidence to support the forfeitures; created specialized procedures to conduct  
11 the investigatory searches of the boxes at the expense of safeguarding their  
12 contents; and directly supervised the process of breaking into the USPV boxes,  
13 conducting investigatory searches of the contents, seizing the contents for  
14 forfeiture, and eventually returning (or failing to return) the contents to the  
15 boxholders.

16 15. Defendants Does 1–5 (the “Doe Defendants”) are agents of the Federal  
17 Bureau of Investigation who, along with Defendant Zellhart, are responsible for the  
18 acts, violations, and injuries alleged in this action. Among other conduct, they  
19 searched or assisted in the search of Plaintiffs’ USPV safe-deposit box and, in that  
20 role, were entrusted with safeguarding the contents, including the \$2,000 in cash  
21 stored in the box, so that it could be safely returned to Plaintiffs. Their identities  
22 and their number are currently unknown to Plaintiffs but can be determined by the  
23 government based on its internal records. They will be added as named Defendants  
24 when their identities are disclosed. They are sued in their individual capacities  
25 under the Constitution, *Bivens*, the Westfall Act (28 U.S.C. § 2679(b)(2)(A)), and  
26 California statutory and common law. The acts, violations, and injuries for which  
27 they are responsible in this action also form the basis for liability of the United  
28 States of America under the Federal Tort Claims Act.



1 not have room to install a safe, and they thought it would be better and safer to keep  
2 their property in a secure facility outside of their home. They also liked that USP  
3 was close to their home.

4 25. Jeni and Michael trusted and expected USP to safeguard their  
5 property. They had every impression that USP was a trustworthy, legitimate  
6 business.

7 26. Jeni and Michael used their box to store silver that they purchased as a  
8 retirement nest egg, extra cash, and copies of personal documents.

9 27. They acquired the cash and silver over several years, using Jeni's  
10 income working at a non-profit theater company and Michael's income as a  
11 transportation coordinator in the film industry.

12 28. Consistent with USP's recommendation, Jeni and Michael also  
13 placed a letter containing their contact information, as well as information  
14 identifying their beneficiaries, on top of the interior sleeve of their box. The  
15 remaining contents of their box were contained within that interior sleeve.

16 29. Jeni and Michael renewed their safe-deposit-box lease with USP in  
17 November 2020.

18 30. When they visited their safe-deposit box at USP, Jeni and Michael  
19 would also occasionally photograph the contents of their box.

20 31. The following photograph from February 2, 2021, accurately depicts  
21 the portion of Jeni and Michael's USP box where they were storing their cash at  
22 the bottom of a small, black cardboard box inside of their box, before the  
23 government raided USP:

24  
25  
26  
27  
28



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



32. As of March 22, 2021, Jeni and Michael’s USPV safe-deposit box contained \$2,000 in cash, about \$20,000 worth of silver, and personal documents, such as receipts for the silver purchases.

**The Government And Defendant Zellhart Obtain A Warrant To Seize USPV’s Nest Of Safe-Deposit Boxes By Promising To Safeguard The Contents**

33. On March 9, 2021, the United States indicted USPV, the company, for money laundering and drug trafficking.

34. On March 17, 2021, the government applied to a magistrate judge for a warrant to search USPV’s business premises and to seize certain business property owned by USPV. Defendant Zellhart had been in charge of drafting the affidavit for the warrant application and ultimately swore under oath that it was true.

35. In the application, Defendant Zellhart made representations under oath to the magistrate judge about how the government would conduct the search.



1           36. One item the warrant application requested permission to seize was the  
2 “nests of safety deposit boxes,” that is, the relatively worthless structure that houses  
3 all the individual safe-deposit boxes.

4           37. The application explained that the government sought to seize “the  
5 nests of boxes themselves, not their contents.” But by seizing the nests, the  
6 government would “end up with custody of what is inside those boxes.”

7           38. To alleviate the obvious concerns arising from the government taking  
8 the property of so many innocent third parties, the warrant application promised to  
9 safeguard the contents of the safe-deposit boxes so that they could be returned to  
10 their rightful owners.

11           39. The warrant application assured the magistrate judge that agents would  
12 follow their written inventory policies to “protect their agencies from claims of  
13 theft or damage to the contents of the boxes.”

14           40. The warrant application also represented that agents would seek to  
15 “identify the owner and preserve the property for safekeeping.”

16           41. Relying on these statements that the government would safeguard the  
17 contents of the boxes and reunite them with the rightful owners, the magistrate  
18 judge issued the warrant to search USPV’s business premises and to seize the nest  
19 of safe-deposit boxes.

20           42. The warrant, however, specifically did not authorize a “criminal search  
21 or seizure of the contents of the safety deposit boxes.”

22           43. Instead, the warrant instructed agents to conduct an “inventory” of the  
23 boxes “to protect their agencies and the contents of the boxes.”

24           44. The warrant also directed agents to inspect the boxes in order to  
25 identify ownership, so that the property could be safely returned to the rightful  
26 owners.

27  
28

1                    **The Government and Defendant Zellhart Separately Plan To Forfeit**  
2                    **Everything Over \$5,000 And To Search The Boxes For Evidence Of Crimes**

3                    45. But in contrast to the statements in its warrant application, the  
4 government had also formulated a separate plan for the USPV boxes that it did not  
5 disclose to the magistrate judge.

6                    46. Defendant Zellhart testified about this plan during depositions in an  
7 earlier lawsuit. According to her testimony as the government’s 30(b)(6)  
8 representative, the government decided to move forward with indicting USPV and  
9 raiding its business in the summer or fall of 2020.

10                  47. Defendant Zellhart also testified that from the beginning, she and the  
11 government planned to seize the nest of safe deposit boxes in the USPV raid.  
12 Defendant Zellhart also confirmed that the government did not want the nest for its  
13 evidentiary value, but instead to bring USPV’s business to a “screeching halt.”

14                  48. Defendant Zellhart also testified that by about this time, she and the  
15 government were already planning to use civil forfeiture against some or all the  
16 property at USPV.

17                  49. As part of this planning, the FBI agent in charge of the Los Angeles  
18 Field Office criminal division spoke with the head of the asset forfeiture unit for the  
19 office in summer 2020. He asked whether the unit could handle the anticipated  
20 forfeiture of hundreds of USPV boxholders’ property. The forfeiture head  
21 confirmed that the office could process that volume.

22                  50. As planning for the raid progressed, and before applying for the  
23 warrant, the forfeiture head of the FBI’s Los Angeles Field Office “made a  
24 determination that there was probable cause to proceed [with civil forfeiture] on  
25 assets seized in the investigation from U.S. Private Vaults,” including “the contents  
26 of the boxes.” That is, even before applying for the warrant, the government “had  
27 already determined that there was probable cause to move forward” with forfeiture  
28 actions against the box contents. The only factor determining whether the

1 government tried to forfeit the box contents was whether it “met the minimum  
2 monetary threshold” of \$5,000, because below that, “the cost [to forfeit] would be  
3 more than the value of the asset.”

4 51. To carry out this large-scale forfeiture, Defendant Zellhart created  
5 specialized one-time search procedures for the USPV boxes. These procedures were  
6 admittedly designed to identify evidence to support the forfeitures. As Agent  
7 Zellhart confirmed in her 30(b)(6) deposition, she “wanted agents to gather  
8 information concerning, for instance, whether the money smelled like drugs, or if it  
9 was banded -- packaged in an unusual manner.” The specialized search procedures  
10 included, for example, running currency by drug sniffing dogs, documenting  
11 agents’ “cash observations,” and providing copies of all paperwork to the asset  
12 forfeiture unit.

13 **In The Rush To Search For Evidence To Support The Forfeitures, Defendants**  
14 **Fail To Safeguard The Contents Of The Boxes Like They Promised**

15 52. On March 22, 2021, the government executed its search and seizure  
16 warrant at USPV’s business premises, seized the “nest” of safe-deposit boxes, and,  
17 in so doing, “end[ed] up with custody of what [was] inside those boxes.”

18 53. Having obtained custody of the contents of the boxes, the government  
19 assumed the role and accompanying duties of bailee of the contents previously held  
20 by USPV.

21 54. Having obtained custody of the contents of the boxes, the government  
22 assumed responsibility for safeguarding the property and returning the contents to  
23 the rightful owners, as the government represented it would do in its warrant  
24 application.

25 55. When the government obtained custody of the USPV safe-deposit  
26 boxes and the contents of the boxes, the contents were safe and secure because they  
27 were in locked boxes that could only be accessed by those boxes’ owners using  
28 their keys.

1           56. Instead of honoring its promises to safeguard the safe-deposit boxes  
2 and return the contents to the rightful owners, the government instead spent the  
3 week of March 22, 2021, breaking into the safe-deposit boxes to look for property  
4 to forfeit and searching for evidence to support the forfeitures (such as running cash  
5 by drug-sniffing dogs, describing the condition of cash, and looking inside sealed  
6 envelopes).

7           57. The resulting search was hectic. Searching nearly 1,400 boxes for  
8 evidence to support the forfeitures took days longer than anticipated. This led to  
9 time constraints that required Defendants to cut corners in their efforts to safeguard  
10 boxholders' property. (They did not, of course, cut corners in their efforts to search  
11 for evidence to support the forfeitures.)

12           58. For example, one way to safeguard the contents of the boxes was to  
13 videotape the process of opening the boxes. But as Defendant Zellhart confirmed in  
14 her deposition, "reality got in the way," and Defendants did not videotape about  
15 half of the boxes they opened.

16           59. Another way to safeguard the contents of the boxes would have been  
17 to create meaningful inventories describing the valuable property taken from the  
18 boxes. But in the chaos following the raid and the rush to search for evidence to  
19 support their forfeiture plans, Defendants failed to create meaningful inventories.  
20 As one agent involved in the searches testified in an earlier deposition, the agents  
21 were trying to be "speedy" with each box so they could "move on to the next one."  
22 And as the searches dragged on, adjoining businesses became frustrated by the  
23 government's lingering presence, further pressuring Defendants to "move as  
24 quickly as [they] could," and putting a "premium" on "processing boxes quickly."

25           60. This rushed, slapdash process created inventories that were essentially  
26 useless for their ostensible purpose of safeguarding the contents of the boxes.  
27 Instead, the inventories described the contents in vague, general terms, like  
28 "miscellaneous coins" or "assorted jewelry" or "miscellaneous general items."

1 These descriptions could cover anything from novelty items worth a couple bucks  
2 to rare and valuable coins and jewelry worth millions.

3 61. Another way of safeguarding the contents of the boxes against theft,  
4 damage, or loss would have been to leave the safe-deposit boxes locked. But that  
5 would not have accomplished the government's purpose of finding boxes with  
6 property that could be forfeited. To achieve that purpose, the government broke into  
7 the boxes and deliberately exposed those contents to theft, damage, and loss.

8 62. The foreseeable and probable result of breaking open the boxes was  
9 that valuable property would be stolen, damaged, misplaced, or lost. The locked  
10 boxes were safe, so opening them inevitably created a risk of loss. And trying to  
11 process so many boxes in such a short period of time would inevitably lead to some  
12 property going missing, even in the best of circumstances. And these were not the  
13 best of circumstances, with agents searching for evidence to support the forfeitures  
14 at the expense of being careful to safeguard the property.

15 63. Valuable property stored in the USPV safe-deposit boxes was in fact  
16 stolen, damaged, misplaced, or lost after the government broke into them.

17 64. For example, one safe-deposit box held the retirement savings of an  
18 80-year-old, semi-retired doctor, who later filed suit under the name Dr. Linda R.  
19 The agents searching her box created a written inventory that listed "misc. coins"  
20 and a video inventory that only vaguely depicted envelopes containing coins,  
21 without quantifying the number, type, or value of coins they contained. Dr. R. filed  
22 a lawsuit and a motion for the return of her property under Federal Rule of Criminal  
23 Procedure 41(g) after discovering the government had lost dozens of gold coins that  
24 were worth more than \$75,000. The government successfully moved to dismiss that  
25 lawsuit for lack of jurisdiction on the ground that Rule 41(g) does not provide a  
26 remedy for lost property.

27 65. In another case, the government initially lost 110 gold coins worth  
28 about \$220,000 belonging to a retired civil servant for the City of Los Angeles, who

1 also used the box to store his retirement savings. After he filed a lawsuit over the  
2 missing coins, the government “found” 47 of the coins. But the remaining 63 gold  
3 coins worth about \$123,000 were never returned. The plaintiff in that case  
4 dismissed his case after the government moved to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction  
5 under Rule 41(g). (He is now represented by the same counsel as Jeni and Michael  
6 and is filing a lawsuit at the same time as this one challenging the government’s  
7 loss of his gold coins.)

8 **Defendants Take Jeni And Michael’s Property**

9 66. As with the other USPV safe-deposit boxes, the government also took  
10 custody of Jeni and Michael’s box on or about March 22, 2021.

11 67. Sometime during the week of March 22, 2021, the Doe Defendants  
12 broke into Jeni and Michael’s box.

13 68. According to the government’s representations to the magistrate judge  
14 and restrictions contained in the warrant, the Doe Defendants broke into Jeni and  
15 Michael’s box to safeguard the property in the government’s custody until it could  
16 be safely returned to Jeni and Michael.

17 69. Consistent with those representations, the Doe Defendants had a duty  
18 to safeguard the contents of Jeni and Michael’s box so that the property could be  
19 returned to Jeni and Michael.

20 70. But instead of safeguarding Jeni and Michael’s property, the Doe  
21 Defendants broke into Jeni and Michael’s box to look for property to forfeit, and to  
22 search for evidence to support the forfeiture.

23 71. When the Doe Defendants estimated that the contents of Jeni and  
24 Michael’s box were worth more than \$5,000, they seized those contents for the  
25 purpose of subjecting them to administrative forfeiture.

26 72. The Doe Defendants also prepared the inventory forms for Jeni and  
27 Michael’s box.

28

1           73. On information and belief, those forms do not refer to the \$2,000 in  
2 cash stored in Jeni and Michael’s box.

3           74. Jeni and Michael first learned about the FBI’s USPV raid in April  
4 2021, when Jeni went to visit their USPV box. When Jeni arrived, she discovered  
5 that USPV was shuttered, with a notice from the FBI posted on the door.

6           75. The FBI notice posted at USPV directed boxholders to go to a  
7 “uspvclaims” webpage on the FBI website “to initiate a claim for your US Private  
8 Vaults box.” The link directed users to a “U.S. Private Vaults Claim Form,” which  
9 instructed users to provide certain information “[t]o make a claim for property  
10 stored at U.S. Private Vaults in Beverly Hills, California.”

11           76. Jeni submitted a claim to the FBI on April 19, 2021. She then received  
12 an email from the FBI explaining that “all property seized is in a secure FBI  
13 facility. FBI agents and staff are working diligently, in a methodical and systematic  
14 way, to process all claims and address each safe deposit box that is in our custody.”  
15 The email further stated that “it is important to us that we ensure property is  
16 returned to the lawful owner,” and that the FBI would either “make arrangements to  
17 return your property” or “request additional information.”

18                           **After Attempting To Forfeit Their Property, The**  
19                           **Government Returns Jeni And Michael’s Silver, But Not Their \$2,000**

20           77. As the government had planned to do before the raid, it “initiated civil  
21 administrative forfeiture against all of the boxes that met the minimum monetary  
22 threshold.” The property in Jeni and Michael’s box was worth more than \$5,000, so  
23 the government initiated administrative forfeiture proceedings against their box,  
24 despite no evidence that the property was properly subject to forfeiture.

25           78. In May 2021, Jeni and Michael each received a “Notice of Seizure of  
26 Property and Initiation of Administrative Forfeiture Proceedings.” The notices were  
27 dated May 21, 2021, and stated that the government was initiating administrative  
28 forfeiture proceedings with respect to the silver the government had taken from Jeni



1 and Michael’s safe-deposit box. The notice did not refer to the cash that Jeni and  
2 Michael stored in their box. (Jeni and Michael are plaintiffs in a separate lawsuit  
3 that successfully challenged the administrative forfeiture notices on due process  
4 grounds, and that, on behalf of a certified class, continues to litigate whether the  
5 searches of the USPV boxes violated the Fourth Amendment.)

6 79. On May 20, 2021, the government also issued an omnibus notice of  
7 seizure directed to USPV. The omnibus notice stated that the government was  
8 initiating administrative forfeiture proceedings with respect to the contents of  
9 several hundred USPV safe-deposit boxes, including the silver that Jeni and  
10 Michael stored in their box. The omnibus notice did not reflect the cash that Jeni  
11 and Michael stored in their box.

12 80. On August 16, 2021, the government stated that it was abandoning its  
13 efforts to forfeit Jeni and Michael’s property and that it would instead return the  
14 property it had taken from their USPV safe-deposit box.

15 81. On October 1, 2021, the government returned Jeni and Michael’s  
16 silver. To the best of their recollection, Jeni and Michael believe that the FBI  
17 returned all their silver. But the FBI never gave them a detailed inventory of the  
18 silver it took from their box, so they cannot be certain.

19 82. The government did not return their \$2,000 in cash, and still has not  
20 returned it.

21 83. On March 9, 2023, Jeni and Michael submitted administrative claims  
22 to the FBI under the FTCA, seeking compensation for the \$2,000 that the  
23 government never returned.

24 84. On March 27, 2023, the FBI denied their claim, asserting that there  
25 was “no evidence of negligence or wrongful acts on the part of any FBI employee.”

26 85. But Jeni and Michael’s cash was safe and secure in their safe-deposit  
27 box on March 22, 2021. It was only when the FBI took custody of their box and  
28 then broke into it that the cash went missing. Whatever happened to it, the only

1 explanation is that it was lost due to either negligence or a wrongful act by an FBI  
2 employee.

3 86. Additionally, regardless of whether any specific FBI employee did  
4 something wrong or was negligent, once the government took custody of Jeni and  
5 Michael's property, it was responsible for either returning the cash to them or  
6 compensating them for what it took.

### 7 **INJURY TO PLAINTIFFS**

8 87. If the government had never taken custody of Jeni and Michael's safe-  
9 deposit box at USPV, Jeni and Michael would still have access to their box and to  
10 the \$2,000 they stored in their box.

11 88. The government's failure to abide by the representations in its warrant  
12 application, the restrictions the judge imposed in the warrant, and its representations  
13 to boxholders in its claims materials resulted in the loss of the \$2,000 that Jeni and  
14 Michael stored in their USPV box.

15 89. The government's failure to fulfill its duty to safeguard the contents of  
16 Jeni and Michael's box, to exercise reasonable care to ensure the contents were not  
17 lost, stolen, or misplaced, and ultimately to return the contents to the rightful  
18 owners, resulted in Jeni and Michael's loss of the \$2,000 in cash they had stored in  
19 their USPV box.

20 90. The government's abdication of its responsibilities to safeguard the  
21 contents of Jeni and Michael's box to instead pursue profitable forfeitures resulted  
22 in the loss of the \$2,000 that Jeni and Michael had stored in their USPV box.

23 91. The government's conduct of deliberately taking Jeni and Michael's  
24 property to further its law enforcement objectives relating to USPV (bringing it to a  
25 "screeching halt" and finding forfeitable property), and then permanently depriving  
26 Jeni and Michael of the use and possession of the cash in their box, has injured  
27 them in the amount of \$2,000.

28

1 92. Because the \$2,000 in cash they had stored in their box was never  
2 returned to them, Jeni and Michael can no longer use it as a source of retirement  
3 savings, a rainy-day fund, or as a source of cash in case of emergencies.

4 93. To redress these injuries, Jeni and Michael therefore assert the  
5 following various theories of liability, all of which seek the same relief: \$2,000 in  
6 damages for the cash that Defendants took custody of but never returned.

7 **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

8 **COUNT I: Conversion and Trespass to Chattels**

9 **Against Defendant United States of America**

10 **Under the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(b)(1), 2671–80)**

11 94. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every  
12 allegation set forth in ¶¶ 1 through 93 above.

13 95. Under the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA), Defendant United States  
14 of America is liable for injury or loss of property caused by the negligent or  
15 wrongful acts or omissions of its employees acting within the scope of their office  
16 or employment.

17 96. Defendant United States of America is liable for the tortious acts and  
18 injuries caused by the Individual Defendants and other agents working on its behalf  
19 because they committed those tortious acts and caused those injuries while acting  
20 on behalf of the FBI.

21 97. Jeni and Michael timely and properly exhausted the FTCA’s  
22 administrative claims process.

23 98. Jeni and Michael together owned and had the right to possess the  
24 \$2,000 they stored in their USPV safe-deposit box.

25 99. The Individual Defendants, while acting on behalf of the FBI,  
26 exercised dominion over the contents of Jeni and Michael’s USPV safe-deposit box  
27 when they took custody of the box and searched it on or about the week of March  
28

1 22, 2021, and in doing so, the Individual Defendants engaged in a wrongful act or  
2 otherwise disposed of Jeni and Michael’s property rights in the cash.

3 100. Defendant Zellhart engaged in a wrongful act that interfered with Jeni  
4 and Michael’s property rights when she instructed the Doe Defendants to break into  
5 Jeni and Michael’s box, seize the contents for forfeiture, and search for evidence to  
6 support the forfeiture.

7 101. The Doe Defendants engaged in a wrongful act that interfered with  
8 Jeni and Michael’s property rights when they broke into Jeni and Michael’s box,  
9 seized the contents for forfeiture, and searched for evidence to support the  
10 forfeiture.

11 102. The Doe Defendants engaged in a wrongful act that interfered with  
12 Jeni and Michael’s property rights to the extent they stole Jeni and Michael’s cash  
13 or allowed it to be stolen by others. In the absence of any explanation for the  
14 missing cash, its disappearance can only be explained by the wrongful acts of the  
15 Doe Defendants.

16 103. Even assuming they acquired initial possession of the money lawfully,  
17 Defendants also wrongfully interfered with Jeni and Michael’s property rights when  
18 Defendants refused to return the money upon request.

19 104. As a result of Defendants’ unwarranted interference with Jeni and  
20 Michael’s property and possessory rights, Jeni and Michael have incurred damages  
21 in the amount of \$2,000.

22 105. The United States is therefore liable under the FTCA for the torts of  
23 conversion and trespass to chattels.

24 **COUNT II: Breach of Bailment**

25 **Against Defendant United States of America**

26 **Under the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(b)(1), 2671–80)**

27 106. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every  
28 allegation set forth in ¶¶ 1 through 93 above.

1           107. Under the FTCA, Defendant United States of America is liable for  
2 injury or loss of property caused by the negligent or wrongful acts or omissions of  
3 its employees acting within the scope of their office or employment.

4           108. Defendant United States of America is liable for the tortious acts and  
5 injuries caused by the Doe Defendants and other agents working on its behalf  
6 because they committed those tortious acts and caused those injuries while acting  
7 on behalf of the FBI.

8           109. Jeni and Michael timely and properly exhausted the FTCA's  
9 administrative claims process.

10           110. USPV held the contents of the safe-deposit boxes as bailee, and  
11 Defendants took on the obligations of a bailee when they transferred custody of the  
12 contents of Jeni and Michael's box from USPV to themselves.

13           111. The contents of the USPV safe-deposit boxes were delivered into the  
14 custody of Defendants for the purpose of safeguarding the contents until they could  
15 be returned to the rightful owners.

16           112. Defendants made statements, both to the magistrate judge and directly  
17 to boxholders, that they were taking delivery of the contents of the USPV boxes for  
18 the purpose of caring for the property until the rightful owners could request  
19 redelivery.

20           113. The contents of the USPV safe-deposit boxes were also delivered into  
21 Defendants' custody to benefit Defendants by helping them to shut down USPV's  
22 business and search for property that could be forfeited.

23           114. As bailees, Defendants received delivery of the contents of Jeni and  
24 Michael's box, including the \$2,000.

25           115. Jeni and Michael have demanded the return of their property, including  
26 their \$2,000.

27           116. Defendants failed to return all the property, specifically the \$2,000,  
28 when Jeni and Michael demanded redelivery.

1 117. Defendants have not offered any justification for their failure to re-  
2 deliver Jeni and Michael’s property, nor is there any possible explanation other than  
3 the wrongful or negligent acts of Defendants.

4 118. Defendant United States of America is therefore liable for breaching  
5 its bailment obligations in the amount of \$2,000.

6 **COUNT III: Negligence**

7 **Against Defendant United States of America**

8 **Under the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(b)(1), 2671–80)**

9 119. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every  
10 allegation set forth in ¶¶ 1 through 93 above.

11 120. Under the FTCA, Defendant United States of America is liable for  
12 injury or loss of property caused by the negligent or wrongful acts or omissions of  
13 its employees acting within the scope of their office or employment.

14 121. Defendant United States of America is liable for the tortious acts and  
15 injuries caused by the Doe Defendants and other agents working on its behalf  
16 because they committed those tortious acts and caused those injuries while acting  
17 on behalf of the FBI.

18 122. Jeni and Michael timely and properly exhausted the FTCA’s  
19 administrative claims process.

20 123. Defendants had a duty, pursuant to the representations in the warrant  
21 application, the limitations in the warrant, their representations to boxholders, and  
22 from their own conduct in taking custody of the boxes, to safeguard the contents of  
23 the boxes in their custody, to ensure that those contents were not lost, stolen, or  
24 destroyed, and ultimately to return the contents of the USPV boxes to their rightful  
25 owners.

26 124. Defendants breached this duty when they lost or stole Jeni and  
27 Michael’s \$2,000 in cash.  
28

1           125. The government and Defendant Zellhart breached this duty when they  
2 failed to take reasonable care to prevent Jeni and Michael’s cash from being lost or  
3 stolen. They instructed the agents searching the boxes to search for evidence to  
4 support the forfeitures instead of safeguarding the contents of the boxes, created  
5 instructions for searching the boxes that were calculated to uncover evidence to  
6 support the forfeitures at the expense of safeguarding the contents, and directly  
7 created the frenzied environment that required agents to search the boxes as quickly  
8 as possible.

9           126. The Doe Defendants also breached this duty when they failed to take  
10 reasonable care to prevent Jeni and Michael’s cash from being lost or stolen. They  
11 failed to take the time to secure the contents against theft or loss, instead processing  
12 the box as quickly as they could so they could move on to the next one. The Doe  
13 Defendants also failed to create a meaningful inventory of the valuable property  
14 inside Jeni and Michael’s box. Finally, under the circumstances, the disappearance  
15 of the cash can only be explained by the Doe Defendants’ failure to take reasonable  
16 care to guard the contents of Jeni and Michael’s box.

17           127. Jeni and Michael’s cash was secure in their box before Defendants  
18 broke into it. In the absence of any explanation or evidence from the government  
19 about how the cash disappeared, the only explanation under the circumstances is  
20 that Defendants were negligent or worse.

21           128. As a proximate result of Defendants’ breach of that duty, Jeni and  
22 Michael have been damaged in the amount of \$2,000.

23           129. The United States is therefore liable under the FTCA for the tort of  
24 negligence.  
25  
26  
27  
28



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**COUNT IV: Breach Of Bailment Contract**  
**Against Defendant United States of America**

**Under the Little Tucker Act (28 U.S.C. § 1346(a)(2))**

130. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation set forth in ¶¶ 1 through 93 above.

131. Under the Little Tucker Act, the United States is liable for breaches of express or implied contracts, and the district courts have jurisdiction over such claims so long as they do not exceed \$10,000.

132. USPV held the contents of the safe-deposit boxes as bailee, and Defendants took on the obligations of a bailee when they transferred custody of the contents of Jeni and Michael’s box from USPV to themselves.

133. The contents of the USPV safe-deposit boxes were delivered into the custody of Defendants for the purpose of safeguarding the contents until they could be returned to the rightful owners.

134. Defendants made statements, both to the magistrate judge and directly to boxholders, that they were taking delivery of the contents of the USPV boxes for the purpose of caring for the property until the rightful owners could request redelivery.

135. The contents of the USPV safe-deposit boxes were also delivered into Defendants’ custody to benefit Defendants by helping them to shut down USPV’s business and search for property that could be forfeited.

136. As bailees, Defendants received delivery of the contents of Jeni and Michael’s box, including the \$2,000.

137. Jeni and Michael have demanded the return of their property, including their \$2,000.

138. Defendants failed to return all the property, specifically the \$2,000, when Jeni and Michael demanded redelivery.

1 139. Defendants have not offered any justification for their failure to re-  
2 deliver Jeni and Michael’s property.

3 140. Defendant United States of America is therefore liable for breaching  
4 its bailment obligations in the amount of \$2,000.

5 **COUNT V: Unconstitutional Taking Without Just Compensation**

6 **Against Defendant United States of America**

7 **Under the Little Tucker Act (28 U.S.C. § 1346(a)(2)) and the Fifth Amendment**

8 141. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every  
9 allegation set forth in ¶¶ 1 through 93 above.

10 142. The Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution  
11 states, “nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just  
12 compensation.”

13 143. The Little Tucker Act provides district courts with jurisdiction over  
14 claims “founded ... upon the Constitution,” such as claims under the Fifth  
15 Amendment, that do not exceed \$10,000.

16 144. Jeni and Michael possessed protectable property interests in the \$2,000  
17 in cash they stored in their USPV box. They were the sole owners of the cash, and  
18 they shared the sole right to access, possess, use, and dispose of the cash.

19 145. Defendants intentionally invaded that property interest. Even if it was  
20 not wrongful to do so and benefited the public, they purposefully took Jeni and  
21 Michael’s property in connection with their efforts to shut down USPV’s business  
22 operations and search for forfeitable property. Defendants’ refusal to return the  
23 property, whatever their reason for not returning it, has permanently divested Jeni  
24 and Michael of the entirety of their property rights in the \$2,000 in cash.

25 146. Even if it was not wrongful to do so and benefited the public, the  
26 direct, natural, or probable result of breaking into hundreds of safe-deposit boxes at  
27 USPV is that some of that property would be lost, stolen, or misplaced. Defendants  
28 decided to do so anyways because they judged that the government objectives they

1 were pursuing (shutting down USPV and discovering property that could be  
2 forfeited) were worth those losses. And as a direct result of that decision, Jeni and  
3 Michael have lost all ability to possess and use their \$2,000.

4 147. Even if it was not wrongful to do so and benefited the public, the  
5 direct, natural, or probable result of sacrificing the creation of meaningful  
6 inventories to instead search for forfeitable property and evidence to support  
7 forfeitures, is that some of that property would be lost, stolen, or misplaced.  
8 Defendants decided to do so anyways because they judged that the government  
9 objectives they were pursuing (shutting down USPV and discovering property that  
10 could be forfeited) were worth those losses. And as a direct result of that decision,  
11 Jeni and Michael have lost all ability to possess and use their \$2,000.

12 **COUNT VI: Conversion and Trespass to Chattels**

13 **Against Individual Defendants**

14 **Under California Law**

15 148. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every  
16 allegation set forth in ¶¶ 1 through 93 above.

17 149. Jeni and Michael together owned and had the right to possess the  
18 \$2,000 they stored in their USPV safe-deposit box.

19 150. The Individual Defendants exercised dominion over the contents of  
20 Jeni and Michael's USPV safe-deposit box when they took custody of the box and  
21 searched it on or about the week of March 22, 2021, and in doing so, the Individual  
22 Defendants engaged in a wrongful act or otherwise disposed of Jeni and Michael's  
23 property rights in the cash.

24 151. Defendant Zellhart engaged in a wrongful act that interfered with Jeni  
25 and Michael's property rights when she instructed the Doe Defendants to break into  
26 Jeni and Michael's box, seize the contents for forfeiture, and search for evidence to  
27 support the forfeiture.  
28

1           152. The Doe Defendants engaged in a wrongful act that interfered with  
2 Jeni and Michael’s property rights when they broke into Jeni and Michael’s box,  
3 seized the contents for forfeiture, and searched for evidence to support the  
4 forfeiture.

5           153. The Doe Defendants engaged in a wrongful act that interfered with  
6 Jeni and Michael’s property rights to the extent they stole Jeni and Michael’s cash  
7 or allowed it to be stolen by others. In the absence of any explanation for the  
8 missing cash, its disappearance can only be explained by the wrongful acts of the  
9 Doe Defendants.

10           154. Even assuming they acquired initial possession of the money lawfully,  
11 the Individual Defendants also wrongfully interfered with Jeni and Michael’s  
12 property rights when they refused to return the money upon request.

13           155. As a result of the Individual Defendants’ unwarranted interference  
14 with Jeni and Michael’s property and possessory rights, Jeni and Michael have  
15 incurred damages in the amount of \$2,000.

16           156. The tortious conduct by the Individual Defendants also violated the  
17 Constitution, including the Fourth Amendment.

18           157. As a result of the tortious and unconstitutional conduct of the  
19 Individual Defendants, Jeni and Michael have incurred damages in the amount of  
20 \$2,000.

21           158. Individual Defendants’ tortious conduct also violated the Constitution  
22 and therefore falls under the Westfall Act exception for claims “brought for a  
23 violation of the Constitution of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. § 2679(b)(2). To the  
24 extent the claim remains barred by 28 U.S.C. § 2679(b)(1) under current precedent,  
25 Jeni and Michael preserve the issue.

26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**COUNT VII: Breach of Bailment**  
**Against Individual Defendants**  
**Under California Law**

159. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation set forth in ¶¶ 1 through 93 above.

160. USPV held the contents of the safe-deposit boxes as bailee, and the Individual Defendants took on the obligations of a bailee when they transferred custody of the contents of Jeni and Michael’s box from USPV to themselves.

161. The contents of Jeni and Michael’s USPV safe-deposit box were delivered into the custody of the Individual Defendants for the purpose of safeguarding the contents until they could be returned to the rightful owners.

162. Defendants made statements, both to the magistrate judge and directly to boxholders, indicating that the Individual Defendants were taking delivery of the contents of the USPV boxes for the purpose of caring for the property until the rightful owners could request redelivery.

163. The contents of the USPV safe-deposit boxes were also delivered into the Individual Defendants’ custody to benefit the Individual Defendants by helping them to accomplish their objectives of shutting down USPV’s business and searching for property that could be forfeited.

164. As bailees, the Individual Defendants received delivery of the contents of Jeni and Michael’s box, including the \$2,000.

165. Jeni and Michael have demanded the return of their property, including their \$2,000.

166. The Individual Defendants failed to return all the property, specifically the \$2,000, when Jeni and Michael demanded redelivery.

167. The Individual Defendants have not offered any justification for their failure to re-deliver Jeni and Michael’s property, nor is there any possible explanation other than the wrongful or negligent acts of the Individual Defendants

1 168. The conduct by the Individual Defendants, which was both tortious  
2 and breached the bailment contract, also violated the Constitution, including the  
3 Fourth Amendment.

4 169. As a result of the tortious conduct, breach of contract, and  
5 unconstitutional conduct of the Individual Defendants, Jeni and Michael have  
6 incurred damages in the amount of \$2,000.

7 170. Individual Defendants' tortious conduct also violated the Constitution  
8 and therefore falls under the Westfall Act exception for claims "brought for a  
9 violation of the Constitution of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2679(b)(2). To the  
10 extent the claim remains barred by 28 U.S.C. § 2679(b)(1) under current precedent,  
11 Jeni and Michael preserve the issue.

12 **COUNT VIII: Negligence**  
13 **Against Individual Defendants**  
14 **Under California Law**

15 171. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every  
16 allegation set forth in ¶¶ 1 through 93 above.

17 172. The Individual Defendants had a duty pursuant to the representations  
18 in the warrant application, the limitations in the warrant, the representations to  
19 boxholders, and from their own conduct in taking custody of the boxes, to  
20 safeguard the contents, to ensure the contents were not lost, stolen, or destroyed,  
21 and ultimately to return the contents of the USPV boxes to their rightful owners.

22 173. The Individual Defendants breached this duty when they lost or stole  
23 Jeni and Michael's \$2,000 in cash.

24 174. Defendant Zellhart breached this duty when she failed to take  
25 reasonable care to prevent Jeni and Michael's cash from being lost or stolen. She  
26 instructed the agents searching the boxes to search for evidence to support the  
27 forfeitures instead of safeguarding the contents of the boxes, created instructions for  
28 searching the boxes that were calculated to uncover evidence to support the

1 forfeitures at the expense of safeguarding the contents, and directly created the  
2 frenzied environment that required agents to search the boxes as quickly as  
3 possible.

4 175. The Doe Defendants also breached this duty when they failed to take  
5 reasonable care to prevent Jeni and Michael’s cash from being lost or stolen. They  
6 failed to take the time to secure the contents against theft or loss, instead processing  
7 the box as quickly as they could so they could move on to the next one. The Doe  
8 Defendants also failed to create a meaningful inventory of the valuable property  
9 inside Jeni and Michael’s box. Finally, under the circumstances, the disappearance  
10 of the cash can only be explained by the Doe Defendants’ failure to take reasonable  
11 care to guard the contents of Jeni and Michael’s box.

12 176. Jeni and Michael’s cash was secure in their box before the Doe  
13 Defendants broke into it. The mere fact of its disappearance necessarily implies  
14 negligence by the Individual Defendants.

15 177. As a proximate result of the Individual Defendants’ breach of that  
16 duty, Jeni and Michael have been damaged in the amount of \$2,000.

17 178. The tortious conduct by the Individual Defendants also violated the  
18 Constitution, including the Fourth Amendment.

19 179. As a result of the tortious and unconstitutional conduct of the  
20 Individual Defendants, Jeni and Michael have incurred damages in the amount of  
21 \$2,000.

22 180. Individual Defendants’ tortious conduct also violated the Constitution  
23 and therefore falls under the Westfall Act exception for claims “brought for a  
24 violation of the Constitution of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. § 2679(b)(2). To the  
25 extent the claim remains barred by 28 U.S.C. § 2679(b)(1) under current precedent,  
26 Jeni and Michael preserve the issue.

27  
28





1 and Michael’s box for forfeitable property and for evidence to support the  
2 forfeiture.

3 186. To the extent the USPV warrant permitted the Individual Defendants  
4 to break into Jeni and Michael’s boxes to conduct an inventory, the search was still  
5 unreasonable. The warrant expressly stated that it did “not authorize a criminal  
6 search or seizure of the contents of the safety deposit boxes,” yet the inventory  
7 search here was a mere pretext to search Jeni and Michael’s box for forfeitable  
8 property and evidence to support the forfeitures.

9 187. To the extent the USPV warrant permitted the Individual Defendants  
10 to break into Jeni and Michael’s boxes to conduct an inventory, the search was still  
11 unreasonable, because the warrant only authorized the inventory searches because  
12 Defendant Zellhart misrepresented the true scope of the searches Defendants  
13 intended to conduct and failed to disclose the plan to search the boxes for  
14 forfeitable property and for evidence to support the forfeitures.

15 188. It is clearly established, and every reasonable FBI agent has fair  
16 warning, that agents may not search safe-deposit boxes without a warrant or an  
17 exception to the warrant requirement.

18 189. It is clearly established, and every reasonable FBI agent has fair  
19 warning, that the inventory exception does not permit searches that are a pretext  
20 for investigatory searches.

21 190. It is clearly established, and every reasonable FBI agent has fair  
22 warning, that the inventory exception applies to specific situations like taking  
23 custody of an automobile or booking people into jail, not to breaking into hundreds  
24 of safe-deposit boxes.

25 191. It is clearly established, and every reasonable FBI agent has fair  
26 warning, that the inventory exception applies to searches under standardized  
27 procedures, not specialized, one-time procedures created for that specific search.  
28

1           192. It is clearly established, and every reasonable FBI agent has fair  
2 warning, that searches pursuant to a warrant may not exceed the express  
3 limitations of the warrant.

4           193. It is clearly established, and every reasonable FBI agent has fair  
5 warning, that warrants may not be obtained by misstating the scope of the intended  
6 search and omitting material facts about the intended search.

7           194. Despite these clearly delineated rights, the Individual Defendants  
8 deliberately acted in a manner calculated to deprive Jeni and Michael of their  
9 rights.

10           195. Jeni and Michael are therefore entitled to damages in the amount of  
11 \$2,000 for the unreasonable search of their USPS safe-deposit box.

12           196. Jeni and Michael are entitled to these damages of \$2,000 directly  
13 under the Fourth Amendment, which contains clear, prohibitory, enforceable  
14 language that binds the government and each of its officers, including the  
15 Individual Defendants.

16           197. Jeni and Michael are alternatively entitled to damages of \$2,000  
17 pursuant to *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*,  
18 403 U.S. 388 (1971), which provides a cause of action against agents who violate  
19 the Fourth Amendment. Additionally, Jeni and Michael have no alternative  
20 remedies for their injuries caused by Defendants, and Jeni and Michael's claims do  
21 not implicate separation of powers, national security considerations, or any other  
22 special factors counseling hesitation against a damages remedy for their injuries.

23           198. Jeni and Michael are alternatively entitled to damages of \$2,000  
24 pursuant to the Westfall Act, which provides that its bar on actions against federal  
25 employees "does not extend or apply to a civil action against an employee of the  
26 Government ... which is brought for a violation of the Constitution of the United  
27 States." 28 U.S.C. § 2679(b)(2)(A).

28



1           204. It is clearly established, and every reasonable FBI agent has fair  
2 warning, that when seizing personal property like cash, agents may not take the  
3 property for their own use or allow others to take the property for their own use.

4           205. It is clearly established, and every reasonable FBI agent has fair  
5 warning, that when seizing personal property like cash, agents must conduct the  
6 seizure in a manner that does not unreasonably infringe possessory interests,  
7 including by acting reasonably to ensure the property is not stolen, lost, or  
8 destroyed.

9           206. It is clearly established, and every reasonable FBI agent has fair  
10 warning, that the continuing seizure of personal property like cash requires an  
11 ongoing justification, and that having stolen, lost, or destroyed the property is not a  
12 valid justification.

13           207. Despite these clearly delineated rights, the Individual Defendants  
14 deliberately acted in a manner calculated to deprive Jeni and Michael of their rights.

15           208. Jeni and Michael are therefore entitled to damages in the amount of  
16 \$2,000 for the unreasonable manner of the seizure and unjustified continuing  
17 seizure of their personal property.

18           209. Jeni and Michael are entitled to these damages of \$2,000 directly  
19 under the Fourth Amendment, which contains clear, prohibitory, enforceable  
20 language that binds the government and each of its officers, including the  
21 Individual Defendants.

22           210. Jeni and Michael are alternatively entitled to damages of \$2,000  
23 pursuant to *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*,  
24 403 U.S. 388 (1971), which provides a cause of action against agents who violate  
25 the Fourth Amendment. Additionally, Jeni and Michael have no alternative  
26 remedies for their injuries caused by Defendants, and Jeni and Michael's claims do  
27 not implicate separation of powers, national security considerations, or any other  
28 special factors counseling hesitation against a damages remedy for their injuries.







1 Dated: September 22, 2023

Respectfully Submitted,

3 /s/ Lou Egerton-Wiley

4 **INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE**

5 Joseph Gay\*  
6 jgay@ij.org  
7 Robert Frommer\*  
8 rfrommer@ij.org  
9 901 N. Glebe Rd. Suite 900  
10 Arlington, VA 22203  
11 Tel. (703) 682-9320

12 Robert E. Johnson\*  
13 16781 Chagrin Blvd. Suite 256  
14 rjohnson@ij.org  
15 Shaker Heights, OH 44120  
16 Tel. (703) 682-9320

17 \* Applications for admission  
18 *pro hac vice* forthcoming.

19 **THE VORA LAW FIRM, P.C.**

20 Lou Egerton-Wiley (SBN 323482)  
21 lou@voralaw.com  
22 Nilay U. Vora (SBN 268339)  
23 nvora@voralaw.com  
24 Jeffrey Atteberry (SBN 266728)  
25 jatteberry@voralaw.com  
26 201 Santa Monica Blvd., Ste. 300  
27 Santa Monica, California 90401  
28 Tel. (424) 258-5190

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*