

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF \_\_\_\_\_**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**PLAINTIFF**

**CAUSE NO.** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
**DEFENDANT**

**COMPLAINT**

**DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW (42 USC §1983)**

1. The Plaintiff is a resident of \_\_\_\_\_

2. The Defendant is a resident of \_\_\_\_\_, who was acting in the official capacity of/as a(n) \_\_\_\_\_ at all times complained of herein.

3. The Court has the authority to hear this Complaint pursuant to 42 USC §1983 and 28 USC §1331.

4. On or about \_\_\_\_\_, the Plaintiff was circulating a ballot petition, at \_\_\_\_\_, held on public property and generally accessible to the public for no entry fee, for the purpose of placing candidates on the ballot, on a form prescribed by the Secretary of State and so required by law. This constituted an act of freedom of speech and assembly.

5. No access to the public location where the Plaintiff was circulating the petition was blocked or impeded, nor was any crime or disruption being committed. The entire interaction with the public and those who chose to sign or not sign was happy, pleasant and otherwise the part of an ordinary day at a publicly accessible location.

6. The Defendant caused to have the Plaintiff removed from \_\_\_\_\_. The Defendant also violated the Plaintiff's civil rights by

---

---

---

---

---

7. The Plaintiff suffered damages in the following ways:

---

---

---

---

---

8. The Plaintiff had a right to circulate a ballot petition as protected by the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

9. The Defendant's unlawful acts, made with the implied threat of physical and deadly force, caused the Plaintiff to leave public property and chilled the expression of his rights as protected by the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

10. Public places historically associated with the free exercise of expressive activities, such as streets, sidewalks and parks, are public forums, and the Defendant's unlawful acts to restrict the content of the Plaintiff's exercise of his freedom of speech and assembly. The unlawful act had no basis in city ordinance, statute or otherwise codified local or state authority. In short, the unlawful order was arbitrary, capricious, oppressive and designed to thwart the Plaintiff's and others' attempts to place candidates on the statewide ballot for which every elector may choose to vote or not vote for.

THE PLAINTIFF,

---

---

---

---