

Table of Contents

Volume 1

CHAPTER 1. HISTORY, PURPOSES, FEDERAL JURISDICTION AND PROCEDURE AND STATE COURT ACTIONS

- § 1:1 Introduction
- § 1:2 Text of § 1983 and its jurisdictional counterpart
- § 1:3 History of § 1983
- § 1:4 Purposes of § 1983
- § 1:5 Policy considerations in § 1983 litigation
- § 1:6 —Federalism
- § 1:7 —Overdeterrence and overburdened federal courts
- § 1:8 —Cutting back the scope of the § 1983 remedy
- § 1:9 —Implications
- § 1:10 Who may be a § 1983 plaintiff
- § 1:11 —Citizens
- § 1:12 —Other persons
- § 1:13 —Local governments
- § 1:14 —States
- § 1:15 Who may be a § 1983 defendant
- § 1:16 —Local governments but not states
- § 1:17 —District of Columbia
- § 1:18 —Territories
- § 1:19 —Intergovernmental entities
- § 1:20 —United States
- § 1:21 —Indian tribes
- § 1:22 —Consulate officials
- § 1:23 Federal court jurisdiction over claims brought under § 1983 for constitutional and federal statutory violations
- § 1:24 —“Laws” actions: the prior law and the effect of the 1980 Jurisdictional Amendment Act
- § 1:25 —District of Columbia

- § 1:26 —Federal jurisdiction and state court judgments:
Rooker-Feldman, *Exxon Mobil* and *University of Maryland Medical System*
- § 1:27 —Federal jurisdiction and attorney discipline
- § 1:28 —Federal jurisdiction and bar admissions
- § 1:29 —Federal jurisdiction and domestic relations
- § 1:30 —Federal jurisdiction and other subjects
- § 1:31 Federal pendent claim jurisdiction
- § 1:32 —The Eleventh Amendment and pendent state
injunctive relief claims
- § 1:33 —The Judicial Improvements Act of 1990
- § 1:34 Federal pendent party jurisdiction
- § 1:35 —*Aldinger v. Howard*: limiting pendent party
jurisdiction
- § 1:36 —Uncertainty after *Monell*
- § 1:37 —The Judicial Improvements Act of 1990
- § 1:38 Removal
- § 1:39 —Removal and the Eleventh Amendment: the
Schacht and *Lapides* cases
- § 1:40 Federal venue
- § 1:41 Procedural rules, Rule 11, class actions, and
appeals
- § 1:42 —Pleading before *Leatherman*
- § 1:43 —*Leatherman v. Tarrant County*, *Ashcroft v.*
Iqbal and heightened pleading
- § 1:44 —Pleading after *Leatherman* and *Iqbal*
- § 1:45 —Summary judgment practice
- § 1:46 Pro se plaintiffs, including prisoners and
indigents; the Prison Litigation Reform Act of
1995
- § 1:47 Rules 11 and 26
- § 1:48 The Supreme Court's Rule 11 decisions
- § 1:49 Class actions
- § 1:50 Three-judge courts
- § 1:51 Final judgments and interlocutory appeals
- § 1:52 The right to a jury trial
- § 1:53 —Equitable relief actions
- § 1:54 —Combining damages and equitable relief actions
- § 1:55 —Demand for jury trial, waiver and withdrawal
- § 1:56 Section 1983 claims in state courts: jurisdiction
and the supremacy of federal law
- § 1:57 —*Howlett v. Rose* and *Haywood v. Drown*
- § 1:58 —Choosing between a federal and state forum

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 1:59 —Applicability of federal law to state court § 1983 actions: The Supremacy Clause, converse-*Erie*, and preemption; *Williams v. Reed* and exhaustion of administrative remedies
- § 1:60 —Applicability of federal law to state court § 1983 actions: the Supremacy Clause, converse-*Erie*, and preemption—Punitive damages in the states
- § 1:61 — —Challenges to state taxation in the states
- § 1:62 — —Interlocutory appeals in the states
- § 1:63 — —Justiciability in the states
- § 1:64 — —*Younger* in the states

CHAPTER 2. THE “DEPRIVATION [UNDER ‘COLOR OF’ LAW] OF ANY RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES, OR IMMUNITIES SECURED BY THE CONSTITUTION AND LAWS”

- § 2:1 Introduction
- § 2:2 Section 1983 and the Fourteenth Amendment:
Monroe v. Pape
- § 2:3 Fourteenth Amendment
- § 2:4 State action in the Supreme Court: an overview
- § 2:5 —State action and *Amtrak*
- § 2:6 Symbiotic relationship and governmental involvement approaches
- § 2:7 —Governmental involvement approach
- § 2:8 —Nexus
- § 2:9 —Private control over the public sector
- § 2:10 —State function approach
- § 2:11 Color of law and state action
- § 2:12 —Custom and joint activity
- § 2:13 Converse of the typical state action question:
police officers and state-employed professionals;
posting and blocking on social media
- § 2:14 Converse of the typical state action question:
police officers and state-employed
professionals—State-employed lawyers
- § 2:15 —State-employed doctors
- § 2:16 State action and color of law in the circuits
- § 2:17 State action, color of law, and conspiracy
- § 2:18 —Private co-conspirator liability
- § 2:19 —Immunity of private co-conspirators

- § 2:20 —*Noerr-Pennington*/§ 1983 immunity for private co-conspirators
- § 2:21 —Federal co-conspirators
- § 2:22 Conspiracy in general: governing principles
- § 2:23 —Pleading and conspiracy
- § 2:24 —Qualified immunity and conspiracy
- § 2:25 —Insufficient evidence of conspiracy
- § 2:26 —Sufficient evidence of conspiracy
- § 2:27 Section 1983 and federal statutory violations: “laws” actions
- § 2:28 —Background and prior law
- § 2:29 —*Thiboutot* and the Social Security Act: “laws” construed broadly
- § 2:30 —*National Sea Clammers* and water pollution legislation: “laws” limited
- § 2:31 —*Wright* and the 1937 Housing Act
- § 2:32 —*Golden State*, the National Labor Relations Act, and the Supremacy Clause
- § 2:33 —Significance of *Golden State*
- § 2:34 —*Wilder* and the Boren Amendment to the Medicaid Act
- § 2:35 —*Suter*, the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act and the implications for “laws” actions
- § 2:36 —*Livadas* and the National Labor Relations Act; the *Golden State* approach reaffirmed
- § 2:37 —*Blessing* and the Social Security Act’s “deadbeat dads” provisions
- § 2:38 —*Gonzaga University*, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and a more stringent requirement for enforceable rights in “laws” cases; *City of Rancho Palos Verdes*, the Telecommunications Act and Congressional intent to permit a § 1983 Remedy; *Health and Hospital Corporation of Marion County v. Talevski* and spending power legislation; *Medina v. Planned Parenthood South Atlantic* and the Medicaid Act’s any-qualified-provider provision
- § 2:39 —Section 1981 of Title 42 of the U.S. Code: governmental racial discrimination in the making of contracts and the Civil Rights Act of 1991
- § 2:40 —Federal statutes that preclude § 1983 constitutionally based claims: “laws” actions distinguished

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 2:41 “Laws” actions in the circuits
- § 2:42 —Interpreting *Golden State/Wilder* and *Suter*;
violations of federal regulations and interstate
compacts
- § 2:43 —The dormant Commerce Clause
- § 2:44 —Federal judicial remedial orders
- § 2:45 —Treaties with Indian tribes; treaties in general
- § 2:46 —Use of federal statutes to preclude § 1983
constitutional claims
- § 2:47 —Particular federal statutes and § 1983 “laws”
actions

CHAPTER 3. “[S]UBJECTS OR CAUSES TO BE SUBJECTED . . . TO THE DEPRIVATION”

- § 3:1 Introduction
- § 3:2 —Section 1983 and state-of-mind requirements
- § 3:3 —Due process and other constitutional
violations
- § 3:4 —Relevance of tort concepts
- § 3:5 —Tort concepts and *Heck v. Humphrey*
- § 3:6 State-of-mind requirements
- § 3:7 —Criticism of a § 1983 state-of-mind
requirement
- § 3:8 —*Parratt v. Taylor* and state-of-mind
requirements
- § 3:9 —*Daniels v. Williams*
- § 3:10 The First Amendment
- § 3:11 —Political discrimination in government
employment and public employee speech
- § 3:12 —Political discrimination in government
employment, public employee speech and
independent government contractors
- § 3:13 —Impermissible motivation and good faith;
retaliatory prosecutions and retaliatory arrests:
Hartman v. Moore, *Nieves v. Bartlett*, and
Gonzalez v. Trevino
- § 3:14 —Petition Clause
- § 3:15 —The religion clauses: establishment and free
exercise
- § 3:16 The Second Amendment
- § 3:17 The Fourth Amendment
- § 3:18 —Intent distinguished from subjective
motivation

- § 3:19 —Deadly force and Fourth Amendment seizures
- § 3:20 —*Brower v. County of Inyo*: roadblocks and Fourth Amendment seizures
- § 3:21 —*Graham v. Connor*: excessive use of force in making arrest governed by Fourth Amendment standards; *Barnes v. Felix* and the “totality of the circumstances” approach
- § 3:22 —Fourth Amendment seizures and possessory interests
- § 3:23 The circuits and the states
- § 3:24 Fifth Amendment
- § 3:25 —*Miranda* violations and the use-at-trial requirement: *Chavez v. Martinez* and *Vega v. Tekoh*
- § 3:26 Sixth Amendment
- § 3:27 —Custodial interrogations and the requirement of prejudice
- § 3:28 Eighth Amendment
- § 3:29 —*Estelle v. Gamble*, deliberate indifference and medical care
- § 3:30 —Prison attacks
- § 3:31 —Prison suicides
- § 3:32 —*Farmer v. Brennan* and the meaning of deliberate indifference
- § 3:33 —*Whitley v. Albers*, *Hudson v. McMillian* and prison security
- § 3:34 —*Wilson v. Seiter*, deliberate indifference and challenges to physical living conditions of prisons
- § 3:35 —Tobacco smoke
- § 3:36 —The Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995
- § 3:37 Due process before *Parratt v. Taylor* and *Daniels v. Williams*
- § 3:38 —Procedural due process
- § 3:39 —Substantive due process
- § 3:40 —Substantive due process and duty
- § 3:41 —*Baker v. McCollan* and wrongful confinement
- § 3:42 Due process
- § 3:43 —*Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co.*: deprivations by operation of law
- § 3:44 —*Hudson v. Palmer*: random and unauthorized intentional deprivations
- § 3:45 —*Daniels v. Williams* and *Davidson v. Cannon*: the abuse of governmental power standard

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 3:46	—Unanswered due process state-of-mind questions
§ 3:47	—Significance and potential impact of <i>Daniels</i>
§ 3:48	— <i>Zinnermon v. Burch</i> : deprivations of liberty and Parratt’s random and unauthorized conduct revisited
§ 3:49	— <i>Zinnermon</i> analyzed
§ 3:50	Due process and state-of-mind requirements
§ 3:51	—Procedural due process
§ 3:52	—Substantive due process and <i>Sacramento County v. Lewis</i>
§ 3:53	Proper scope of <i>Parratt</i>
§ 3:54	—Gradual movement of substantive due process toward <i>Parratt</i>
§ 3:55	—Relation between random and unauthorized conduct and the official policy or custom requirement for local government liability
§ 3:56	—Substantive due process and excessive use of force
§ 3:57	Substantive due process, wrongful confinement and danger creation
§ 3:58	—Danger creation claims of government employees and <i>Collins v. City of Harker Heights</i>
§ 3:59	Substantive due process, affirmative duties and <i>DeShaney v. Winnebago County Department of Social Services</i>
§ 3:60	— <i>DeShaney v. Winnebago County Department of Social Services</i>
§ 3:61	— <i>DeShaney</i> , special relationships and danger-creation
§ 3:62	—Distinguishing <i>DeShaney</i> from <i>City of Canton</i>
§ 3:63	Malicious prosecution, abuse of process, and the relevance of due process
§ 3:64	—Pre- <i>Albright</i> uncertainty in the circuits
§ 3:65	— <i>Albright v. Oliver</i> : a split Supreme Court finally confronts malicious prosecution
§ 3:66	— <i>Albright v. Oliver</i> , <i>Manuel v. City of Joliet</i> and the Fourth Amendment; <i>Thompson v. Clark</i> and favorable termination; <i>Chiaverini v. City of Napoleon, Ohio</i> and the “charge-specific” rule
§ 3:67	—Post- <i>Albright</i> and post- <i>Manuel</i> cases in the circuits and the states
§ 3:68	Substantive due process and taking law

- § 3:69 —Ripeness and challenges to land use decisions;
Knick v. Township of Scott
- § 3:70 —Temporary takings
- § 3:71 —Land use challenges in the circuits
- § 3:72 Due process and the adequacy of state
postdeprivation remedies
- § 3:73 —Adequacy in the Supreme Court
- § 3:74 —Findings of adequacy and inadequacy in the
circuits and states
- § 3:75 —Indigent plaintiffs
- § 3:76 —Adequacy and absolute immunity
- § 3:77 —Pleading and proving inadequacy
- § 3:78 Due process—Right of privacy
- § 3:79 Access to the courts
- § 3:80 —Due process
- § 3:81 —First Amendment
- § 3:82 —Requirement of interference with access to the
courts
- § 3:83 —Prisoner's right of access limited: *Lewis v.*
Casey
- § 3:84 —The right of access, *Harbury* and post-*Harbury*
decisions
- § 3:85 Equal protection: class based and class-of-one
claims
- § 3:86 Equal protection—Sex discrimination: the VMI
case
- § 3:87 —Sexual orientation discrimination: *Romer v.*
Evans
- § 3:88 —Proof of discriminatory purpose and
employment: *St Mary's Honor Center*
- § 3:89 —42 U.S.C. § 1981 and racial discrimination
cases involving state actors: *Jett v. Dallas*
Independent School District and the 1991 Civil
Rights Act
- § 3:90 The Commerce Clause
- § 3:91 —*Dennis v. Higgins*: dormant Commerce Clause
violations actionable under § 1983
- § 3:92 Respondeat superior
- § 3:93 —Current law: no respondeat superior liability
- § 3:94 —Distinguishing between respondeat superior
and § 1983 liability
- § 3:95 —Respondeat superior and private corporations
- § 3:96 Supervisory liability and duty; *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 3:97	Supervisory liability and duty—Fourteenth Amendment approach
§ 3:98	—Negligence/causation approach
§ 3:99	— <i>City of Canton v. Harris</i> : local government liability for failure to train and its implications for supervisory liability
§ 3:100	—In the circuits before and after <i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i>
§ 3:101	—Prison officials
§ 3:102	—Police officials
§ 3:103	—Other officials
§ 3:104	—Duties of subordinates and coequals to intervene
§ 3:105	Proximate cause
§ 3:106	—Proper role of tort concepts
§ 3:107	— <i>Martinez v. California</i> : privately caused harm and remoteness
§ 3:108	— <i>Malley v. Briggs</i> : inadequate police affidavits and proximate cause; <i>County of Los Angeles v. Mendez</i> : unlawful entry, deadly force and proximate cause
§ 3:109	—In the circuits
§ 3:110	Cause in fact
§ 3:111	—After-acquired evidence
§ 3:112	—Difficult cause in fact cases
§ 3:113	—Distinguishing cause in fact and duty
§ 3:114	—In the circuits

CHAPTER 4. “[S]HALL BE LIABLE TO THE PARTY INJURED IN AN ACTION AT LAW”: DAMAGES

§ 4:1	Introduction
§ 4:2	<i>Carey v. Phipus</i> , <i>Memphis Community Schools v. Stachura</i> , and presumed damages: analysis
§ 4:3	— <i>Carey v. Phipus</i> and procedural due process violations
§ 4:4	—Reach of <i>Carey</i> ’s no presumed damages rule and First Amendment violations
§ 4:5	— <i>Memphis Community Schools v. Stachura</i> and First Amendment violations
§ 4:6	Compensatory damages—General principles
§ 4:7	—Applicability of federal, not state, damages rules

- § 4:8 —Joint liability and contribution
- § 4:9 —Elements of damages
- § 4:10 —Cause in fact, damages, the *Mount Healthy* rule and *Texas v. Lesage*
- § 4:11 —Proximate cause and damages
- § 4:12 —Review for excessiveness
- § 4:13 —“Comparability” approach to review for excessiveness
- § 4:14 —Avoidable consequences and mitigation of damages
- § 4:15 —Double recovery
- § 4:16 —Class actions
- § 4:17 Unlawful searches, seizures, arrests, and confinement
- § 4:18 —Substantial special damages present
- § 4:19 —Substantial special damages not required
- § 4:20 —Limitations on substantial general damages awards
- § 4:21 —Confinement
- § 4:22 —Proximate cause
- § 4:23 Procedural due process
- § 4:24 —Deprivations of property and liberty interests and the *Mount Healthy* cause in fact rule
- § 4:25 —A short-lived equitable exception to *Mount Healthy*
- § 4:26 —General damages
- § 4:27 —Injury to reputation
- § 4:28 —Prison confinement cases
- § 4:29 First Amendment
- § 4:30 —Employment and general damages
- § 4:31 —Front pay
- § 4:32 —Prisons
- § 4:33 —Presumed damages
- § 4:34 Racial discrimination and other constitutional violations
- § 4:35 —Sex discrimination
- § 4:36 —Eighth Amendment violations
- § 4:37 —Presumed damages for certain Eighth Amendment violations
- § 4:38 —Other constitutional violations
- § 4:39 Punitive damages—*Smith v. Wade* and the *Kolstad* gloss
- § 4:40 —Defining recklessness or callous disregard

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 4:41	General principles
§ 4:42	—Relevant factors for punitive damages awards
§ 4:43	—Trial procedure and instructions
§ 4:44	— <i>Haslip</i> and due process review of judicial procedures for punitive damages awards
§ 4:45	—Review for excessiveness
§ 4:46	— —Independent appellate review for excessiveness: <i>BMW v. Gore</i> , <i>Cooper Industries</i> , and <i>State Farm</i>
§ 4:47	—Joint and several liability
§ 4:48	—Survival of punitive damages claims
§ 4:49	Unlawful searches, seizures, arrests, and confinement
§ 4:50	—The <i>BMW v. Gore</i> factors applied
§ 4:51	—Searches and seizures in prison
§ 4:52	—Supervisory liability for punitive damages
§ 4:53	Procedural due process
§ 4:54	—Employment
§ 4:55	—Attachment of property
§ 4:56	—Withholding entitlements
§ 4:57	First Amendment
§ 4:58	—Retaliatory conduct
§ 4:59	—Prisons
§ 4:60	Racial discrimination and other constitutional violations
§ 4:61	—Sex discrimination
§ 4:62	—Eighth Amendment and other violations
§ 4:63	—Conspiracy
§ 4:64	Survival of § 1983 damages actions
§ 4:65	— <i>Robertson v. Wegmann</i> : § 1988 and “inconsistency”
§ 4:66	—In the circuits
§ 4:67	Section 1983 wrongful death damages actions
§ 4:68	—Wrongful death and § 1983 policy
§ 4:69	—State law limitations on damages for wrongful death
§ 4:70	—State law enhancement of wrongful death damages

CHAPTER 5. “[S]UIT IN EQUITY OR OTHER PROPER PROCEEDING FOR REDRESS”: PROSPECTIVE RELIEF AND RELATED DEFENSES

§ 5:1	Introduction
-------	--------------

- § 5:2 Threshold formal requirements
- § 5:3 —Preliminary injunctions, temporary restraining orders and declaratory relief
- § 5:4 —Automatic substitution
- § 5:5 Statutory bars to § 1983 federal injunctive relief against state officials
- § 5:6 —The Johnson Act
- § 5:7 —The Tax Injunction Act, the *Fair Assessment* case and damages actions
- § 5:8 —The Tax Injunction Act and state court § 1983 actions: *National Private Truck Council*
- § 5:9 —The Tax Injunction Act in the circuits and the states
- § 5:10 Justiciability and declaratory and injunctive relief—an overview
- § 5:11 —The National Guard and justiciability
- § 5:12 Standing
- § 5:13 —*Warth v. Seldin* and the *Lujan* summary of standing requirements
- § 5:14 —*City of Los Angeles v. Lyons*
- § 5:15 —Standing and § 1983 in the circuits
- § 5:16 Ripeness
- § 5:17 Political questions and reviewability
- § 5:18 Federal declaratory and injunctive relief against state criminal proceedings—the rule of *Younger v. Harris*
- § 5:19 Current *Younger* Rule in the Supreme Court
- § 5:20 —Pending state civil proceedings
- § 5:21 —Pending state administrative proceedings
- § 5:22 —Section 1983 damages actions and the effect of *Heck v. Humphrey*
- § 5:23 —*Younger* and executive conduct
- § 5:24 The *Younger* “extraordinary circumstances” exceptions
- § 5:25 —Futility
- § 5:26 The *Younger* rule in the circuits
- § 5:27 —Requirement of a pending state proceeding
- § 5:28 —*Younger* exceptions
- § 5:29 —Interference with pending state proceedings
- § 5:30 —*Younger* and pending state civil and administrative proceedings

Volume 2

CHAPTER 6. “EVERY PERSON”: GOVERNMENTAL LIABILITY

- § 6:1 Introduction
- § 6:2 The law prior to *Monell*: the origin of § 1983 governmental immunity in *Monroe v. Pape*
- § 6:3 The law in the circuits prior to *Monell*: local government bodies and their agencies
- § 6:4 The law prior to *Monell*: suing individual officers who are persons
- § 6:5 *Monell v. Department of Social Services*: local government bodies are now persons
- § 6:6 *Monell*’s official policy or custom requirement for local government liability: a duty analysis
- § 6:7 Application of the official policy or custom requirement: an overview
- § 6:8 —Formal acts
- § 6:9 —Attribution of acts of high-ranking officials
- § 6:10 —Custom
- § 6:11 —Failure to train
- § 6:12 —Causation
- § 6:13 —Constitutional violation as condition precedent for local government liability: *City of Los Angeles v. Heller* and the *Fagan* issue
- § 6:14 —Official and individual capacity damages actions
- § 6:15 —Pleading and the *Leatherman* case
- § 6:16 —Appellate review and *Swint v. Chambers County Commission*
- § 6:17 —Ethical issues
- § 6:18 Formal acts of local government bodies
- § 6:19 Acts of high-ranking officials and their attribution to local governments: the prior law in the circuits
- § 6:20 —Fifth Circuit’s delegation of policymaking authority approach
- § 6:21 —Eighth Circuit’s final repository of power approach
- § 6:22 —Other circuit court attribution decisions
- § 6:23 Supreme Court case law on policymakers
- § 6:24 —*Pembaur v. City of Cincinnati*
- § 6:25 —*Pembaur* analyzed

- § 6:26 —*City of St. Louis v. Praprotnik*
- § 6:27 —*Praprotnik* analyzed: policymakers and ratification
- § 6:28 —*Jett v. Dallas Independent School District*
- § 6:29 —*Jett* analyzed
- § 6:30 —*Bryan County v. Brown* and single hiring decisions by policymakers
- § 6:31 —*McMillian v. Monroe County* and county sheriffs as county or state policymakers for particular purposes
- § 6:32 Current law in the circuits and the states
- § 6:33 Custom
- § 6:34 —Ways of showing custom
- § 6:35 —Causation and custom
- § 6:36 —Pleading a custom
- § 6:37 —Evidence of custom
- § 6:38 Liability for failure to train and supervise
- § 6:39 —*Tuttle* and single incidents
- § 6:40 —*Tuttle* and its implications analyzed
- § 6:41 —*City of Canton* and failure to train; *Connick v. Thompson*
- § 6:42 —*City of Canton* analyzed: failure to train deliberate indifference and its relation to Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference
- § 6:43 —*City of Canton* analyzed: the tension with *Parratt v. Taylor*
- § 6:44 In the circuits and the states: failure to train and supervise or properly hire; the relationship to qualified immunity and clearly settled law
- § 6:45 In the circuits and the states—Pleading, *City of Canton* and *Leatherman*
- § 6:46 —Sufficient evidence of failure to train and supervise or properly hire
- § 6:47 —Insufficient evidence of failure to train and supervise or properly hire
- § 6:48 —Instructions
- § 6:49 Must the local government violate the plaintiff's constitutional rights?
- § 6:50 —*City of Canton* analyzed
- § 6:51 —Relevance of the Third Circuit's *Fagan* decision
- § 6:52 Crucial distinction between official capacity and individual capacity damages actions
- § 6:53 —*Brandon, Graham, Will* and *Hafer*
- § 6:54 —Implications

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 6:55 —In the circuits and the states
- § 6:56 —Differences between official capacity *damages* actions and official capacity *prospective relief* actions
- § 6:57 Affirmative local government duties to act and the *DeShaney* case
- § 6:58 —*DeShaney v. Winnebago County Department of Social Services*
- § 6:59 Fourteenth Amendment damages actions
- § 6:60 Local government immunity after *Monell*
- § 6:61 No immunity from compensatory damages
- § 6:62 —Implications
- § 6:63 —In the circuits
- § 6:64 Absolute immunity from punitive damages
- § 6:65 —In the circuits
- § 6:66 State sovereign immunity rules and local government liability
- § 6:67 States are not persons
- § 6:68 —Prior law
- § 6:69 —*Will v. Michigan Department of State Police*
- § 6:70 —In the circuits and the states
- § 6:71 Territories are not persons

CHAPTER 7. “EVERY PERSON”: THE ABSOLUTE INDIVIDUAL IMMUNITY OF LEGISLATORS, JUDGES, PROSECUTORS, AND OTHERS

- § 7:1 Introduction
- § 7:2 —Functional approach
- § 7:3 Legislative immunity from liability for damages—*Tenney v. Brandhove*
- § 7:4 State legislators and protected legislative conduct
- § 7:5 —In the circuits
- § 7:6 State legislative employees
- § 7:7 Local and regional legislators: *Bogan v. Scott-Harris* and the functional approach of *Lake Country Estates*
- § 7:8 —Prior law
- § 7:9 —The *Lake Country Estates* case
- § 7:10 —Current law in the circuits
- § 7:11 Judicial immunity from liability for damages—*Pierson v. Ray*

- § 7:12 Scope of judicial immunity: *Bradley v. Fisher*,
Stump v. Sparkman, *Mireles v. Waco* and
Forrester v. White
- § 7:13 —*Bradley* and *Pierson* in the circuits
- § 7:14 —*Stump v. Sparkman*, *Mireles v. Waco* and the
judicial act test
- § 7:15 —*Forrester v. White* and administrative acts of
judges
- § 7:16 Scope of judicial immunity in the circuits
- § 7:17 —Judicial immunity inapplicable
- § 7:18 —Distinguishing between protected and
unprotected acts in the same case
- § 7:19 —Subject matter jurisdiction
- § 7:20 —Functional approach
- § 7:21 Relevance of prior agreements and personal
jurisdiction
- § 7:22 —Prior agreements
- § 7:23 —Personal jurisdiction
- § 7:24 Who is protected: the functional approach
- § 7:25 —*Butz v. Economou*: functionally broadening the
coverage of judicial immunity
- § 7:26 —Functionally narrowing the coverage of judicial
immunity
- § 7:27 —Court reporters not protected by absolute
judicial immunity
- § 7:28 —In the circuits and the states
- § 7:29 — —Court personnel
- § 7:30 — —Court-appointed persons
- § 7:31 — —Grand jurors
- § 7:32 — —Law enforcement officers and court orders
- § 7:33 — —Legislators
- § 7:34 — —Mayors, governors and heads of agencies
- § 7:35 — —Members of various boards and commissions
- § 7:36 — —Parole board officials
- § 7:37 — —Prison officials
- § 7:38 — —Social service personnel
- § 7:39 — —Zoning board officials
- § 7:40 Witnesses
- § 7:41 —In the circuits
- § 7:42 Prosecutorial immunity under *Imbler v.*
Pachtman, *Burns v. Reed*, *Buckley v.*
Fitzsimmons and *Van De Kamp v. Goldstein*
- § 7:43 Prosecutorial immunity—*Imbler v. Pachtman*: the

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	prosecutor as attorney for the state in a criminal trial
§ 7:44	— <i>Burns v. Reed</i> : the prosecutor as attorney for the state in a probable cause hearing and as legal advisor to the police
§ 7:45	— <i>Buckley v. Fitzsimmons</i> : fabricating evidence to create probable cause and statements at press conferences
§ 7:46	— <i>Kalina v. Fletcher</i> : initiating a criminal prosecution and swearing to facts in support of an arrest warrant
§ 7:47	In the circuits and the states: advocative, investigative, and trial-related conduct
§ 7:48	—The prosecutor as investigator
§ 7:49	—Distinguishing between investigative and advocative conduct
§ 7:50	—Trial-related conduct: pretrial
§ 7:51	—Trial-related conduct: posttrial
§ 7:52	In the circuits and the states: other prosecutorial functions
§ 7:53	—Communications to the media and to others
§ 7:54	—Giving legal advice
§ 7:55	—Involvement in civil proceedings
§ 7:56	—Cover-ups
§ 7:57	—The prosecutor as administrator
§ 7:58	—Nonprosecutorial and unauthorized conduct
§ 7:59	—Who else is protected: the functional approach
§ 7:60	—Injunctive relief distinguished
§ 7:61	Immunity of public defenders
§ 7:62	Injunctive relief: a limited exception to absolute immunity
§ 7:63	— <i>Supreme Court v. Consumers Union</i> : legislative and enforcement acts
§ 7:64	— <i>Pulliam v. Allen</i> and the Federal Courts Improvement Act of 1996: judicial acts
§ 7:65	—Implications

CHAPTER 8. QUALIFIED IMMUNITY FOR “PERSONS”: AN AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

§ 8:1	Introduction
§ 8:2	<i>Wood v. Strickland</i> : the leading case before <i>Harlow v. Fitzgerald</i>

- § 8:3 Qualified immunity test: the objective part and
Harlow v. Fitzgerald
- § 8:4 —*Harlow v. Fitzgerald*
- § 8:5 —A critical analysis
- § 8:6 —*Procunier v. Navarette*
- § 8:7 Relevance of state law; scope of discretionary
authority
- § 8:8 *Mitchell v. Forsyth*: interlocutory appeals
- § 8:9 —Interlocutory appeals: *Johnson v. Jones* and
the scope of review; *Ortiz v. Jordan* and *Dupree*
v. Younger contrasted
- § 8:10 —Interlocutory appeals: frequency
- § 8:11 *Anderson v. Creighton* and *Siegert v. Gilley*
- § 8:12 —*Anderson v. Creighton*: increased fact-
specificity, the *Lanier* gloss and *Hope v. Pelzer*
- § 8:13 —Flexibility in assuming constitutional
violations after *Pearson v. Callahan*; appellate
review after *Camreta v. Greene*
- § 8:14 Post-*Harlow* qualified immunity test in the
circuits and the states: applicable principles
(Part I)
- § 8:15 —State of mind and *Crawford-El*
- § 8:16 —Extraordinary circumstances exception
- § 8:17 Post-*Harlow* qualified immunity test in the
circuits and the states: applicable principles
(Part I)—Retroactivity
- § 8:18 Post-*Harlow* qualified immunity test in the
circuits and the states: applicable principles
(Part I)—What is clearly settled law?
- § 8:19 — —Clearly settled law and the police-media
cases: *Wilson v. Layne* and *Hanlon v. Berger*
- § 8:20 —Are certain constitutional rights more clearly
settled than others?
- § 8:21 Post-*Harlow* qualified immunity test in the
circuits and the states: applicable principles
(Part I)—Fourth Amendment Excessive Force
and Qualified Immunity: *Saucier v. Katz*
- § 8:22 —Whose decisions determine clearly settled law?
- § 8:23 Post-*Harlow* qualified immunity test in the
circuits and the states: applicable principles
(Part II)
- § 8:24 —Who decides the issue, judge or jury: *Hunter v.*
Bryant
- § 8:25 Post-*Harlow* qualified immunity test in the

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	circuits and the states: applicable principles (Part II)—Summary judgment practice and discovery
§ 8:26	—Raising qualified immunity through non- summary judgment procedures
§ 8:27	Post- <i>Harlow</i> qualified immunity test in the circuits and the states: applicable principles (Part II)—When can denial of summary judgment be appealed and by whom?
§ 8:28	—What is the scope of appellate review?
§ 8:29	Post- <i>Harlow</i> qualified immunity test in the circuits and the states: applicable principles (Part II)—Pleading requirements
§ 8:30	School officials
§ 8:31	—Students: due process
§ 8:32	—Students: First Amendment
§ 8:33	—Students: Fourth Amendment
§ 8:34	—Students: equal protection
§ 8:35	—Teachers, principals, and other employees: due process
§ 8:36	—Teachers, principals, and other employees: First Amendment
§ 8:37	—Teachers, principals, and other employees: equal protection
§ 8:38	—Teachers, principals and other employees: “laws” violations
§ 8:39	Mental health officials
§ 8:40	—In the circuits
§ 8:41	—Adequate care and treatment
§ 8:42	—Refusal of treatment
§ 8:43	—Least restrictive environment
§ 8:44	—Protection from harm
§ 8:45	Prison officials: <i>Procunier v. Navarette</i>
§ 8:46	Prison officials in the circuits
§ 8:47	—First Amendment: speech, association and religion
§ 8:48	—Fourth Amendment
§ 8:49	—Eighth Amendment: punishment and protection from harm
§ 8:50	—Access to the courts and law libraries
§ 8:51	—Procedural due process
§ 8:52	—Substantive due process
§ 8:53	—Privacy
§ 8:54	—Equal protection

- § 8:55 —Arrestees, pretrial detainees, parolees and visitors
- § 8:56 —Prison employees
- § 8:57 Law enforcement officers: *Pierson v. Ray*
- § 8:58 Law enforcement officers in the circuits
- § 8:59 —Fourth Amendment: *Malley v. Briggs* and warrants
- § 8:60 —Fourth Amendment: warrantless searches and investigative stops
- § 8:61 —Fourth Amendment: *Cameron v. Fogarty* and warrantless arrests
- § 8:62 —Warrantless arrests and seizures
- § 8:63 —Fourth Amendment: excessive force
- § 8:64 —Fifth Amendment
- § 8:65 —Due process: malicious prosecution
- § 8:66 —Due process: coerced confessions
- § 8:67 —Due process: the duty to protect and to prevent harm
- § 8:68 —Access to the courts
- § 8:69 —Privacy
- § 8:70 —Procedural due process
- § 8:71 —Equal protection
- § 8:72 —First Amendment
- § 8:73 Federal law enforcement officers
- § 8:74 State executives
- § 8:75 —*Scheuer v. Rhodes* and governors
- § 8:76 —Executive officials, knowledge of the law, and reliance on legal advice
- § 8:77 —Executives and the functional approach
- § 8:78 —First Amendment
- § 8:79 —Fourth Amendment
- § 8:80 —Procedural due process
- § 8:81 —Substantive due process
- § 8:82 —Due process: malicious prosecution and abuse of process
- § 8:83 —Equal protection
- § 8:84 —Dormant commerce clause violations
- § 8:85 —“Laws” violations
- § 8:86 Local government executives
- § 8:87 —First Amendment
- § 8:88 —Fourth Amendment
- § 8:89 —Substantive due process
- § 8:90 —Procedural due process

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 8:91	—Equal protection
§ 8:92	—Right of access to the courts
§ 8:93	—Functional approach
§ 8:94	Qualified immunity test: the subjective part before and after <i>Harlow</i>
§ 8:95	Burden of proof
§ 8:96	—Effect of <i>Harlow</i> and <i>Elder v. Holloway</i> : burden of proof
§ 8:97	—Effect of <i>Harlow</i> and <i>Leatherman</i> : burden of pleading
§ 8:98	Coverage of the qualified immunity test: government officials and private persons
§ 8:99	—Private persons, attachment statutes, court orders and government contracts and requests
§ 8:100	— <i>Wyatt v. Cole</i> and the private use of state attachment procedures; the good faith defense, post- <i>Wyatt</i> cases and post- <i>Janus</i> cases
§ 8:101	— <i>Richardson v. McKnight</i> , <i>Filarsky v. Delia</i> and private persons acting pursuant to government contract, government request or court order
§ 8:102	—Private co-conspirators
§ 8:103	Parole board and other officials

Volume 3

CHAPTER 9. “PROCEDURAL” DEFENSES NOT GOING TO THE MERITS

§ 9:1	Introduction
§ 9:2	Statutes of limitations—Choice
§ 9:3	—Choosing the proper limitations period
§ 9:4	— <i>Burnett v. Grattan</i> : a first step
§ 9:5	— <i>Wilson v. Garcia</i> : personal injury statutes of limitation
§ 9:6	— <i>Owens v. Okure</i> : which personal injury statute of limitations?
§ 9:7	—Retroactivity of <i>Wilson</i> : <i>Chevron Oil Co.</i> and <i>Harper</i>
§ 9:8	—Inconsistency with federal law
§ 9:9	— <i>Felder v. Casey</i> : notice of claim statutes inapplicable to state court § 1983 claims
§ 9:10	Accrual
§ 9:11	—Date of the challenged conduct

- § 9:12 —Date of discovery of injury
- § 9:13 Tolling
- § 9:14 —Individual actions
- § 9:15 —Class actions
- § 9:16 Statutes of limitations in the circuits and the states
- § 9:17 —Choosing the proper limitations period
- § 9:18 — —District of Columbia Circuit
- § 9:19 — —First Circuit
- § 9:20 — —Second Circuit
- § 9:21 — —Third Circuit
- § 9:22 — —Fourth Circuit
- § 9:23 — —Fifth Circuit
- § 9:24 — —Sixth Circuit
- § 9:25 — —Seventh Circuit
- § 9:26 — —Eighth Circuit
- § 9:27 — —Ninth Circuit
- § 9:28 — —Tenth Circuit
- § 9:29 — —Eleventh Circuit
- § 9:30 — —Accrual: the discovery rule, and *Heck v. Humphrey*, *Wallace v. Kato*, *McDonough v. Smith*, *Thompson v. Clark* and *Reed v. Goertz*
- § 9:31 —Continuing violation doctrine
- § 9:32 —Date of discharge and notification of future discharge
- § 9:33 —Conspiracy and cover-up
- § 9:34 —Tolling and saving statutes; equitable tolling
- § 9:35 —Relation back
- § 9:36 —Laches
- § 9:37 Res judicata and collateral estoppel
- § 9:38 Prior state criminal proceedings
- § 9:39 —Preclusive effect of guilty pleas
- § 9:40 —In the circuits and the states
- § 9:41 Prior state civil proceedings
- § 9:42 —Preclusive effect of prior judicial proceedings
- § 9:43 —Preclusive effect of judicially reviewed administrative proceedings
- § 9:44 —Preclusive effect of unreviewed arbitration awards
- § 9:45 —Preclusive effect of unreviewed administrative proceedings
- § 9:46 —In the circuits and the states
- § 9:47 Subsequent state judicial proceedings

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 9:48	Eleventh Amendment
§ 9:49	—Section 1983, the Eleventh Amendment, and the related “person” issue
§ 9:50	—Distinguishing states from local government entities
§ 9:51	—Distinguishing states from interstate compact planning agencies
§ 9:52	— <i>Pennhurst</i> and pendent state claims
§ 9:53	—Procedure
§ 9:54	Exhaustion of judicial remedies
§ 9:55	—The <i>Younger</i> qualification
§ 9:56	—The due process qualification
§ 9:57	—The habeas corpus qualification
§ 9:58	— <i>Heck v. Humphrey</i> : habeas and § 1983 damages actions; <i>Thompson v. Clark</i> and favorable termination; Olivier and purely prospective relief
§ 9:59	— <i>Heck v. Humphrey</i> : habeas and § 1983 damages actions— <i>Heck v. Humphrey</i> : analysis, implications and scope
§ 9:60	Exhaustion of administrative remedies
§ 9:61	— <i>Patsy v. Florida Board of Regents</i> ; exhaustion in the states: <i>Williams v. Washington</i>
§ 9:62	—Institutionalized persons: <i>Booth v. Churner</i> , <i>Porter v. Nussle</i> , <i>Woodford v. Ngo</i> and <i>Jones v. Bock</i>
§ 9:63	—The <i>Younger</i> qualification
§ 9:64	Exhaustion of remedies in the circuits
§ 9:65	—Administrative remedies: institutionalized persons and the Prison Litigation Reform Act; “laws” actions
§ 9:66	<i>Pullman</i> abstention
§ 9:67	—Scope and coverage of <i>Pullman</i>
§ 9:68	—Costs of <i>Pullman</i> abstention
§ 9:69	—In the circuits
§ 9:70	Release-dismissal agreements
§ 9:71	—Voluntariness
§ 9:72	—Questionable expansion of <i>Rumery</i> to waiver of § 1983 claims by the filing of a suit in a state court of claims

CHAPTER 10. ATTORNEY’S FEES

§ 10:1	Introduction
--------	--------------

- § 10:2 Prevailing party status and entitlement to fees
- § 10:3 —The double standard and special circumstances; *Fox v. Vice* and how to compute fees for prevailing defendants
- § 10:4 —Meaning of “prevailing”; pendent claims
- § 10:5 —Prevailing party status and nominal damages: *Farrar v. Hobby*
- § 10:6 —*Hanrahan v. Hampton*: prevailing party status and judicial relief on the merits
- § 10:7 —*Texas State Teachers Association v. Garland Independent School District*: prevailing party status and success on particular issues; *Sole v. Wyner*, *Lackey v. Holcomb* and preliminary injunctions
- § 10:8 —*Hewitt v. Helms*: prevailing party status and favorable judicial statements
- § 10:9 —*Rhodes v. Stewart*: prevailing party status and mootness
- § 10:10 —Prevailing party status and *Buckhannon*’s rejection of the catalyst theory
- § 10:11 —Prevailing party status and the dormant commerce clause
- § 10:12 —Timing of a request for fees
- § 10:13 —Proper forum for fees petitions
- § 10:14 —Hearings
- § 10:15 —Fees awards to prisoners
- § 10:16 Section 1983 “laws” claims
- § 10:17 —*Maher v. Gagne*
- § 10:18 State administrative and judicial proceedings
- § 10:19 —*Webb v. County Board of Education* and *North Carolina Department of Transportation v. Crest Street Community Council*: state administrative proceedings
- § 10:20 —State judicial proceedings
- § 10:21 Status of the parties
- § 10:22 Rule 68 offers of judgment, settlements, and ethical issues
- § 10:23 —*Marek v. Chesny*: Rule 68 “costs” include attorney’s fees
- § 10:24 —Interpreting settlement agreements
- § 10:25 —*Evans v. Jeff D*: ethical issues and settlements
- § 10:26 For and against whom fees may be awarded
- § 10:27 —*Hutto v. Finney*: fees awards against states
- § 10:28 —*Missouri v. Jenkins*: enhancement of fees

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	awards against states to compensate for delay in payment
§ 10:29	—Allocation of fees liability among losing parties
§ 10:30	—Distinguishing for fees purposes between individual and official capacity actions: the problems
§ 10:31	—Fees awards to pro se plaintiffs
§ 10:32	—Fees awards to prisoners
§ 10:33	— <i>Roadway Express v. Piper</i> : fees awards against attorneys
§ 10:34	—Fees awards for and against intervenors
§ 10:35	—Fees awards against the United States
§ 10:36	How fees are determined
§ 10:37	—“Reasonable” fees: the multifactor and lodestar approaches
§ 10:38	— <i>Norman v. Housing Authority</i> : the Eleventh Circuit’s articulation of the lodestar approach
§ 10:39	— <i>Hensley v. Eckerhart</i> : extent of plaintiff’s success
§ 10:40	— <i>Blum v. Stenson</i> : prevailing market rates and enhancement in general
§ 10:41	—The <i>Delaware Valley</i> cases: enhancing the lodestar, quality of representation, and contingency
§ 10:42	— <i>City of Riverside v. Rivera</i> : damages and fees awards
§ 10:43	—Fees awards to prisoners
§ 10:44	Contingent fee agreements
§ 10:45	—Prior split in the circuits
§ 10:46	— <i>Blanchard v. Bergeron</i> : the effect of contingent fee agreements on fees awards
§ 10:47	— <i>Venegas v. Mitchell</i> : the effect of a reasonable fees award on a contingent fee agreement
§ 10:48	Services performed
§ 10:49	—Paralegals, law clerks, and experts
§ 10:50	—Attorney’s records and appellate fatigue
§ 10:51	Costs
§ 10:52	—Attorney’s fees as sanctions

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Section 1983 Checklists

Appendix B. Forms

Table of Laws and Rules

Table of Cases

Index