1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		ATES DISTRICT COURT
17	FOR THE WESTERN D	ISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
18 19	LEONARD PELTIER, CHAUNCEY) NO.
20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·) NO.) COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF
21) CIVIL RIGHTS, 1ST AMENDMENT
22) 5 TH AMENDMENT (DUE PROCESS)
23	•) 14 TH AMENDMENT (DUE PROCESS,
24		AND EQUAL PROTECTION
25		ARTICLE I-Washington State
26) Constitution, DEFAMATION, TORTIOUS
27	•	INTERFERENCE WITH CONTRACT
28	WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT	
29	of LABOR AND INDUSTRIES;	<u>) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED</u>
30	TIMOTHY CHURCH, individually and) \
31 32	in his capacity as PUBLIC AFFAIRS MANAGER of the WASHINGTON	<i>)</i> \
33	STATE DEPARTMENT of LABOR and	<i>)</i> }
34	INDUSTRIES; JAY INSLEE,	,)
35	Individually and in his capacity as)
36	GOVERNOR of the STATE of)
37	WASHINGTON; EDWARD P. WOODS)
38	LARRY LANGBERG; DOES 1-200,)
39)
40 41	Defendants.	
41 42)
12		

1

PELTIER v. SACKS, et al. - COMPLAINT

LAWRENCE A. HILDES (WSBA # 35035) P.O. Box 5405, Bellingham, WA 98227 Tel: (360) 715-9788

Email: Ihildes@earthlink.net

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

LEONARD PELTIER AND CHAUNCEY PELTIER, the PLAINTIFFS herein, by
and through their attorney, allege as follows:

I. JURISDICTION

- 1. This court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to
 Title 28, United States Code Sections 1331, 1332, 1343, and 1367, and venue is
 properly set in the Western District Federal Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1391.
 - 2. The claims upon which this suit is based occurred in this judicial district.
 - 3. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of the named DEFENDANTS reside in this judicial district.

12 <u>II. PARTIES</u>

4

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.1 Plaintiff LEONARD PELTIER is an American Indian Activist convicted under highly questionable circumstances of the disputed deaths of two FBI agents in 1974. The government case involved lying to Candia authorities and providing false witness testimony to persuade Canada to extradite this Plaintiff, witness coercion, falsifying, misrepresenting, and deliberately concealing material evidence, deliberately selecting a favorable venue, falsely representing to the trial judge that his own safety was in jeopardy and other acts deliberately calculated to ensure conviction. Plaintiff Leonard Peltier has been a Federal Prisoner, as a result for 40 years. His case has been the subject of great dispute and controversy. He is also an extremely accomplished artist.

PELTIER v. SACKS, et al. - COMPLAINT

- 1 He is currently housed in FCI Coleman in Coleman, Florida in the CENTRAL
- 2 DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.
- 3 2.2 Plaintiff CHAUNCEY PELTIER is a single man residing in Portland Oregon
- 4 in the DISTRICT OF OREGON. CHAUNCEY PELTIER is the SON of LEONARD
- 5 PELTIER, runs a gallery on behalf of Leonard and is the agent for sale, lending, and
- 6 distributing LEONARD PELTIER's paintings. PLAINTIFF CHAUNCEY PELTIER was
- 7 responsible for selecting and making available the paintings that were exhibited as is
- 8 at controversy herein.
- 9 2.3 Defendant JOEL SACKS, is and was at the time of the incidents that are the
- basis for this Complaint, the DIRECTOR of the WASHINGTON STATE
- 11 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES. By information and belief,
- 12 DEFENDANT JOEL SACKS is a resident of THURSTON COUNTY, WA in the
- 13 WESTERN DISTRICT of WASHINGTON, whose office is in LACEY, WA in
- 14 THURSTON COUNTY. By information and belief, Defendant SACKS personally, along
- with Defendants INSLEE and CHURCH made the decision to remove certain paintings
- 16 by PLAINTIFF LEONARD PELTIER from the public exhibition hereinafter described
- solely due to the identity and controversy surrounding the artist causing the harm to
- 18 Plaintiffs detailed herein.
- 19 2.4 Defendant TIMOTHY CHURCH is, and was at the time of the incidents that
- 20 are the basis for this complaint, the PUBLIC AFFAIRS MANAGER for the
- 21 WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT of LABOR and INDUSTRIES. By information

- and belief, DEFENDANT JOEL SACKS is a resident of THURSTON COUNTY, WA in
- the WESTERN DISTRICT of WASHINGTON, whose office is in LACEY, WA in
- 3 THURSTON COUNTY. By information and belief, Defendant CHURCH personally,
- 4 along with Defendants INSLEE and SACKS made the decision to remove certain
- 5 paintings by PLAINTIFF LEONARD PELTIER from the public exhibition hereinafter
- 6 described solely due to the identity and controversy surrounding the artist causing the
- 7 harm to Plaintiffs detailed herein.
- 8 2.5 Defendant JAY INSLEE is and was at the time of these incidents, THE
- 9 governor of the STATE of WASHINGTON. DFENDANT INSLEE is, and must be, a
- 10 resident of THURSTON COUNTY in the WESTERN DISTRICT of WASHINGTON. By
- information and belief, Defendant INSLEE personally, along with Defendants SACKS
- and CHURCH made the decision to remove certain paintings by PLAINTIFF
- 13 LEONARD PELTIER from the public exhibition hereinafter described solely due to the
- identity and controversy surrounding the artist causing the harm to Plaintiffs detailed
- 15 herein.
- 2.6 Defendant EDWARD P. WOODS is, and was at the time of these incidents
- a retired FBI AGENT, whose sole focus, and obsession, since his retirement, first
- under paid contract with the FBI, and since, by belief unpaid, has been to discredit,
- isolate, and harass, defame, and otherwise attack PLAINTIFF LEONARD PELTIER,
- and attempt to prevent PLAINTIFF from ever been released from prison.. As part of
- 21 that vendetta, DEFENDANT WOODS contacted Defendants INSLEE and SACKS and

organized others to do so all demanding that PLAINTIFF LEONARD PELTIER'S

2 paintings be removed from the public exhibition in question and, to do so made

3 knowingly false statements to those officials to induce them to remove LEONARD

4 PELTIER"S artwork and expression from the exhibition, resulting in that harm. By

5 INFORMATION and BELIEF DEFENDANT EDWARD P. WOODS is a resident of

Cincinnati, OH, in the SOUTHERN DISTRICT of OHIO.

7 2.7 DEFENDANT LARRY LANGBERG is a retired FBI agent, the former

President of the FBI Agents Association and the Current Director of the Society of

former special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. While an active agent,

10 Defendant LANGBERG made disparaging comments about the "over-promotion" of

agents of color and was investigating for improperly lobbying a member of Congress

12 for pay increases. DEFENDANT LANGBERG, in order to induce Defendants SACKS

and INSLEE to order Plaintiff Leonard Peltier's paintings removed from the exhibition,

wrote a letter to Defendant SACKS that was full of knowingly false statements and

slurs. By INFORMATION and BELIEF, DEFENDANT LARRY LANGBERG is a

resident of DUNFRIES, VA in the EASTERN DISTRICT of VIRGINIA.

17 2.8 Other employees of the DEPARTMENT of LABOR and INDUSTRIES, the

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE, and other agencies participated in the decision to deprive

PLAINTIFFS of their means of FIRST AMENDMENT expression and are designated

20 as Does 1-198.

6

8

9

11

13

14

15

16

18

1	2.9 Other retired FBI AGENTS, and others identities unknown to Plaintiffs also
2	engaged in defamatory communications to coerce and induce the above state officials
3	to deprive PLAINTFFS of their First Amendment Expression as described herein.
4	They are designated in this complaint as Does 199-200.
5	2.10 This action is brought pursuant to FIRST and FOURTEENTH
6	Amendments to the United States Constitution, and Article 1, Section 5 and
7	Washington State common law prohibiting tortious interference with a contract,
8	Intentional infliction of emotional distress, and Washington common law negligence.
9	2.11 On March 25, 2016 PLAINTIFFS electronically filed a tort claim for
10	damages to the State Department of Risk Management. On April 16, 2016, the
11	Washington State Attorney General's Office acknowledged the claims in a letter.
12	Plaintiffs never heard from them or anyone else with the State again. This action
13	follows
14	III. FACTS
15	3. 1 PLAINTIFF LEONARD PELTIER is AN American Indian Movement
16	Activist who is now one of the longest held political prisoners in the world.
17	3.2 PLAINTIFF' LEONARD PELTIER was convicted of supposedly
18	murdering two FBI agents in a trial broadly conceded to have been full of irregularities.
19	The government case involved lying to Candia authorities and providing false witness
20	testimony to persuade Canada to extradite this Plaintiff, witness coercion, falsifying,
21	misrepresenting, and deliberately concealing material evidence, deliberately selecting

- a favorable venue, falsely representing to the trial judge that his own safety was in
- 2 jeopardy and other acts deliberately calculated to ensure conviction.
- 3.3 In addition, the FBI was later forced to admit that the gun did not match the
- 4 results of the ballistics tests on the bullets that killed the FBI agents, and the case
- 5 deteriorated to the point that the FBI and US Attorney's argument was that LEONARD
- 6 PELTIER was there and involved, and therefore deserved to be convicted.
- 7 3.4 For this LEONARD PELTIER has been locked up in Federal Prisons for the
- 8 past 40 years.
- 9 3.5 His conviction is highly suspected and his cause has been taken up by
- millions of people around the world, including members of National Parliaments
- leaders in the legal, political, academic, entertainment, media, and sports world, and a
- 12 sizeable percentage of American Indians.
- 3.6 LEONARD PELTIER is now in extremely poor health and there is a serious
- 14 question as to how much longer he will live.
- 15 3.7 Each Time PLAINTIFF LEONARD PELTIER petitions for release or has a
- parole review date, a gaggle of retired FBI agents including Defendants WOODS and
- 17 LANGBERG sends a barrage of correspondence insisting that PELTIER not be
- released full of falsehood, slurs, and innuendo.
- 19 3.8. While in prison, LEONARD PELTIER has become an extremely
- 20 accomplished painter, mostly of Native Americans and Native American themes, but
- other subjects as well, and his art is highly valued and widely exhibited.

1	3.9 Since he is imprisoned and unable to give speeches and attend public
2	events, his painting is his principal means of public expression.
3	3.10 PLAINTIFF CHAUNCEY PELTIER is in frequent phone, letter, and e-mail
4	contact with his father and runs a gallery in Portland Oregon of his father's art
5	3.11 CHAUNCEY PELTIER has been designated by his father and the
6	PELTIER FAMILY as the official agent for his father's art.
7	3.12 This is a particularly crucial time for PELTIER to have visibility as his
8	petition for clemency has been submitted to President Obama to review and act on
9	before he leaves office, and, as mentioned, is in very poor health and faces death in
10	prison if he is not released.
11	3.13 In preparation for a planned art display to Celebrate Native American
12	Heritage month (November, 2015) in the lobby of its Headquarters building in
13	Tumwater, employees of the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries
14	solicited loans of art by Native Americans to be up for the entire month.
15	3.14 An employee of L& I, the agency that deals with labor and workplace
16	issues for the State offered to, and was given approval to arrange for the loan of four
17	paintings by LEONARD PELTIER.
18	3.15 With his father's and the family's approval, CHAUNCEY PELTIER
19	selected four appropriate paintings and arranged for them to be conveyed from his

Portland, OR gallery to Tumwater.

1	3.16	The paintings were then examined, approved an installed as part of the
2	exhibit.	

- 3 3.17 They were seen there by thousands of people of have business with L &I, 4 come for forms, and others who just came to see the exhibit.
- 3:18 The paintings allowed the public to see a side of LEONARD PELTIER not
 generally reported in the media or other sources.
 - 3.19 The paintings themselves were not of a particularly controversial nature, but were a major part of LEONARD PELTIER'S public expression on American Indian and related themes, and a crucial part of his petitioning the government for redress of grievances.
 - 3.20 By means unknown to Plaintiffs, Defendants WOODS and LANGBERG became aware of the inclusion of LEONARD PELTIER's work in the exhibit, and wrote the previously referred to vicious and libelous letters demanding the removal of the art work.
 - 3.21 Despite the fact that, by their own admission, State Officials received no more than four negative comments about including the paintings and hundreds, if not thousands in support of their inclusion, Defendants SACKS, INSLEE, and CHURCH made the decision, without any public process, to remove LEONARD PELTIER's paintings, by their own admission, solely because PELTIER himself was controversial and because he had painted them.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

1	3.22 On November 15, 2015, SACKS and CHURCH directed an employee
2	(identity unknown) to simply remove the four paintings and replace them with other
3	Native American art Sacks found unobjectionable.
4	3.23 Despite many pleas for the restoration of the paintings, and explanations
5	as to the illegality of the removal, SACKS, INSLEE, and CHURCH refused to put the
6	paintings back up, sending form e-mails and letters explaining that LEONARD
7	PELTIER was too controversial and that having his art up, and the controversy around
8	it, "detracted from the message of the exhibit" which was unspecified
9	3.24 None of the decision-makers was themselves Native American
10	3.25 The paintings were returned to CHAUNCEY PELTIER who was able to
11	find a far less visible and smaller private venue at a local food co-op, as a way to
12	mitigate damages, but there mostly reached an audience that knew who LEONARD
13	PELTIER was and what he had to say.
14	3.26 This action follows.
15	
16	IV. STATEMENT OF DAMAGES
17 18	4.1 As a direct and proximate result of the intentional and/or negligent acts of
19	DEFENDANTS, PLAINTIFFS sustained deprivation of their First and Fourteenth
20	Amendment Rights, right to be free of race discrimination, right to be not be subjected
21	to a hostile, discriminatory environment, right to be free of government censorship

1	based on the personal political controversy surrounding them, and right to be free of
2	censorship by the government to reward the "Heckler's veto.".
3	4.2 As a further direct and proximate result of the intentional and negligent acts
4	of the DEFENDANTS, PLAINTIFFS were deprived of legitimate public expression for
5	no justified reason at a critical time for LEONARD PELTIER's public visibility and
6	attempts to petition the g9overnment for redress of grievances and to use his art to
7	influence public policy
8	4.3 As a further direct and proximate result of the intentional and/or negligent
9	acts of DEFENDANTS, PLAINTIFFS had to retain legal counsel to protect and
10	vindicate their rights in court at an amount to be established at trial and for which they
11	are entitled to be reimbursed.
12	4.4 As a further direct and proximate result of the intentional and negligent acts
13	of the DEFENDANTS, PLAINTIFFS is entitled to compensation for costs associated
14	with seeking redress for these specific harms.
15	4.5 PLAINTIFS are entitled to compensation for the Constitutional and persona
16	harms DEFENDANTS inflicted on them.
17	
18	V. CAUSES OF ACTION:
19 20	VIOLATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS (42 USC 1983)
21	(As to Doe DEFENDANTS, and DEFENDANTS SACKS, INSLEE, AND CHURCH)

1	5.1 PLAINTIFFS re-allege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations
2	set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 4.5 of this complaint.

- 5.2 By deliberately removing and censoring Plaintiff LEONARD PELTIER'S paintings due solely to the identity of the artist and controversy surround ding him and his case, Defendants engaged in First Amendment violative conduct to the harm of Plaintiffs. See <u>Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission</u>, 558 U.S. 310 (2010), 5.3 By allowing the objecting voices of Woods, Langberg, and potentially two others to induce them to remove the paintings in question from the exhibit, Defendants allowed a heckler's veto to determine whose speech would be allowed in direct violation of Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights as defined by <u>Terminello v. City of</u>
- 5.4 By removing Plaintiff' LEONARD PELTIER's art from an important public exhibition without any hearing or public process, or due consideration, Defendants deprived Plaintiffs of an important property right, contracted opportunity, and opportunity to display his art to potential purchasers and politically motivated viewers in violation of Plaintiffs' Substantive and procedural Due Process rights under the 14th Amendment.
- 5.5 This censorship and removal caused considerable pain, emotional distress, potential economic loss, deprivation of an already established public forum, and other harm to PLAINTIFFS in an amount to be proved in trial.

Chicago 337 U.S. 1(1949).

1	5.6 The conduct of DEFENDANTS was willful, malicious, oppressive and/or
2	reckless, and was of such a nature that punitive damages should be imposed in an
3	amount commensurate with the wrongful acts herein alleged.
4	WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFFS prays for relief as hereinafter set forth.
5	
6 7 8 9 10	COUNT TWO VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS BY DECISION-MAKERS (42 USC 1983) (As To Defendants SACKS and INSLEE)
12	5.7 PLAINTIFFS reallege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations
13	set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 5.6 of this complaint.
14	5.8 Defendants Sacks is the highest decision-maker at his agency, the
15	Department of Labor and Industries.
16	5.9 Defendant Inslee, as Governor is the highest decision-maker in the State.
17	5.10 In acting to remove and censor Plaintiffs' artwork based on who he is and
18	the controversy surrounding his case, these Defendants acted to set policy as the only
19	ones who can do so for their agency and the State respectively.
20	5.11 The decision was made not because of any clear and present danger,
21	nor because the art itself was likely to result in any harm, but solely because a few
22	people of alleged influence were offended.

1	5.12 The conduct of DEFENDANTS was willful, malicious, oppressive, and/or
2	reckless, and was of such a nature that punitive damages should be imposed in an
3	amount commensurate with the wrongful acts alleged herein.
4	WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFFS pray for relief as hereinafter set forth.
5	
6 7 8 9	COUNT THREE VIOLATIONS OF WASHINGTON CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE I, §§ 3, 4 AND 5) (AS TO DEFENDANTS SACKS, INSLEE, AND CHURCH, AND DOES 1-100)
10	5.13 PLAINTIFFS reallege and incorporates herein by reference the
11	allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 5.12 of this complaint.
12	5.14 Defendants in planning and ordering Plaintiffs' paintings removed as
13	described above for the reasons described above violated Plaintiffs' rights to Free
14	Expression, to Peaceably Petition the Government for Redress, and the Right to Due
15	Process (Sections 5, 4, and 3 respectively)
16	5.15 As a direct and proximate result of the violation of their rights by
17	DEFENDANTS, PLAINTIFFS suffered general and special damages as alleged in this
18	complaint.
19	5.16 The conduct of DEFENDANTS was willful, malicious, oppressive, and/or
20	reckless, and was of such a nature that punitive damages should be imposed in an
21	amount commensurate with the wrongful acts alleged herein.
22	WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for relief as hereinafter set forth.
23	

1	
2 3 4 5 6	COUNT FOUR DEFAMATION (AS TO DEFENDANTS EDWARD P. WOODS, LARRY LANGBERG, AND DOES 199-200
7	5.17 PLAINTIFFS reallege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations
8	set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 5.16 of this complaint.
9	5.18 In demanding that Washington L & I and the State itself remove the
10	paintings by Plaintiff LEONARD PELTIER, these Defendants used and relied on
11	kno0wingly untrue statements, libelous characterizations of LEONARD PELITIER,
12	staggering hyperbole, and recitations of "facts" that they reasonably knew or should
13	have known were untrue for the sole purpose of silencing LEONARD PELTIER and
14	causing emotional harm to Plaintiffs.
15	5.19 They, in e-mails and letters published these defamatory statements to
16	Defendants CHURCH, SACKS, and INSLEE, and those statements resulted in the
17	harm suffered by Plaintiffs, as admitted by all Defendants.
18	5.20 These statements and actions were part of a longstanding pattern of
19	statements and actions by WOODS and LANGBERG and the manifestation of their
20	single-minded obsession with ensuring that LEONARD PELTIER dies in 0prison and is
21	silenced at every opportunity and are taken out of, pure malice and hatred
22	

15

1 2 3		INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS (As to All DEFENDANTS)
4 5	5.21	PLAINTIFFS reallege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations
6	set forth in F	Paragraphs 1 through 5.20 of this complaint.
7	5.22	In carrying out the pattern of Constitutionally prohibited and wrongful
8	conducts all	eged throughout this complaint, DEFENDANTS, and each of them sought
9	to cause em	otional distress and trauma to PLAINTIFFS, and PLAINTIFFS did suffer
10	such emotio	nal distress with accompanying physical symptoms.
11	5.23	As a direct and proximate result of the violation of their Constitutional
12	rights by DE	FENDANTS, PLAINTIFFS suffered general and special damages as
13	alleged in th	is complaint.
14	5.24	The acts and omissions of DEFENDANTS were extreme and
15	outrageous,	and would be so seen and would shock the conscience of a reasonable
16	person.	
17	5.25	The conduct of DEFENDANTS was willful, malicious, oppressive,
18	extreme and	outrageous and/or reckless, and was of such a nature that punitive
19	damages sh	ould be imposed in an amount commensurate with the wrongful acts
20	alleged here	in.
21	WHE	REFORE, PLAINTIFFS pray for relief as hereinafter set forth.
22		

COLINIT CIV

2 3 4	NEGLIGENCE (As to All Defendants)
5	5.26 Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations set
6	forth in Paragraphs 1 through 5.25 of this complaint.
7	5.27 Defendants, and each of them, owed Plaintiffs a duty to use due care and
8	Act in accordance with law and the State and Federal Constitutions.
9	5.28 In committing the aforementioned acts and/or omissions, Defendants, all
10	of whom were in a position to know better, and each of them, negligently breached
11	said duty, directly and proximately resulting in the injuries and damages to the
12	Plaintiffs as alleged herein.
13	WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for relief as hereinafter set forth.
14	
15	
16	
17	VI. JURY TRIAL DEMAND
18	6.0 PLAINTIFFS hereby demand a jury trial in this matter.
19	
20	VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF
21	WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFFS prays for judgment against the DEFENDANTS as
22	follows:

PELTIER v. SACKS, et al. - COMPLAINT

1	 For general damages including pain and suffering and, together with specia 	
2	damages for PLAINTIFF'S economic losses and reasonable and necessary legal	
3	expenses, the exact amount of which will be established at the time of trial;	
4	2. For punitive damages in an amount to be proven at trial pursuant to Federa	
5	and State law;	
6	3. For actual attorney's fees and litigation costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1988.	
7	4. For a new exhibition, in the same or a more public State owned location in	
8	Olympia of PLAINTIFFS" paintings for a period to be agreed to, of no less than two	
9	weeks.	
10	5. For a policy not to make decisions to exclude or remove artwork due to	
11	controversy surrounding the artist, and such other educational and injunctive relief as	
12	the court may deem appropriate.	
13	6. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		

1 DATED: July 13, 2016

2	<u>/S/LAWRENCE A. HILDES</u>
3	LAWRENCE A. HILDES, WSBA #35035,
4	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
5	Law Offices of Lawrence A. Hildes
6	P.O. Box 5405, Bellingham, WA 98227
7	Tel: (360) 715-9788, Ihildes@earthlink.net
8	Attorney for PLAINTIFFS LEONARD AND
9	CHAUNCEY PELTIER
10	
11	