

1 Brody A. McBride (CA SBN 270852)
2 2011 Palomar Airport Road, Suite 101
3 Carlsbad, CA 92011
4 (760) 253-1231
5 brody@brodymcbride.com

6 Trenton G. Lamere (CA SBN 272760)
7 122 Mascoutah Avenue
8 Belleville, IL 62220
9 (618) 539-2328
10 trenton@lamerelegal.com

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff Alba Marroquin de Portillo

12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
13 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

14 ALBA MARROQUIN DE PORTILLO,
15 individually and as successor in interest to
16 her deceased son, Lester Daniel Marroquin,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO and DOES 1-
20 20, inclusive,

21 Defendants.

Case No. '23CV0978 WQHWVG

COMPLAINT

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

I. INTRODUCTION 3

II. JURISDICTION, VENUE, AND CLAIMS 4

III. PARTIES 5

IV. FACTS 5

A. Jail Staff’s Reckless Indifference to Mr. Marroquin’s Serious Medical Needs 5

B. County’s Deliberate Indifference to Inmate Safety in County Jails 9

i. Disability Rights California’s Findings and Recommendations 9

ii. National Center on Institutions and Alternatives’ Findings and Recommendations 10

iii. California State Auditor’s Findings and Recommendations 12

iv. County’s Pattern and Practice of Failing to Keep Inmates Safe 13

C. Mr. Marroquin’s Wrongful Death 17

V. CAUSES OF ACTION 18

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION – 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Violation of Fourteenth Amendment – Deliberate Indifference to Serious Medical Needs 18

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION – 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Violation of Fourteenth Amendment – Interference with Familial Relations 19

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION – 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – *Monell* Liability 20

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Wrongful Death 22

VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF 22

VII. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL 23

I. INTRODUCTION

1
2 1. Lester Daniel Marroquin was a beloved son, nephew, cousin, and friend.
3 Those closest to him called him “Danny.” Inspired by his devotion to Christianity, Danny
4 was often a light in the lives of those around him, even when his struggles with mental
5 health made this difficult.

6 2. On May 30, 2021, Mr. Marroquin was a pretrial detainee in the San Diego
7 County Central Jail. On that day, jail staff knew Mr. Marroquin had a history of mental
8 illness and self-harming behavior, and was an ongoing danger to himself, in part because
9 voices in his head were telling him to continually drink water from the toilet.

10 3. As such, Mr. Marroquin should have been in Enhanced Observation Housing
11 (“EOH”), with safety checks conducted at least every fifteen minutes.

12 4. Instead, jail staff recklessly transferred Mr. Marroquin from a safety cell,
13 where he had been continuously monitored, to a minimally monitored cell in
14 Administrative Segregation (“Ad-Seg”) with the means for Mr. Marroquin to harm
15 himself—including a toilet with running water. Ad-Seg cells require checks only once
16 per hour.

17 5. Between checks, Mr. Marroquin predictably began drinking water from the
18 toilet, motivated by hallucinations and delusions. He believed he could somehow
19 communicate with his mom through these interactions with the toilet. And these beliefs
20 became more extreme as jail staff cut off contact between Mr. Marroquin and his mom.

21 6. When jail staff next checked on Mr. Marroquin, it was too late. Mr.
22 Marroquin had consumed so much water, he died from acute water intoxication.

23 7. Mr. Marroquin should have been admitted to an inpatient facility where he
24 could have received the psychiatric care he required. Instead, he was repeatedly
25 transferred in and out of the jail’s safety cells and EOH, never actually receiving the
26 treatment he needed.

27 8. Mr. Marroquin’s death was preventable. Had the Sheriff’s Department
28 implemented, for example, one of its own consultant’s recommendations—that Ad-Seg

1 safety checks be conducted every half hour, rather than every hour—it is more likely than
2 not that Mr. Marroquin would still be alive today.

3 9. Mr. Marroquin’s mother, Plaintiff Alba Marroquin de Portillo, now sues the
4 County of San Diego and Does 1-20, inclusive, for damages, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983
5 and California state law.

6 **II. JURISDICTION, VENUE, AND CLAIMS**

7 10. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28
8 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343, and 1367, as Plaintiff asserts causes of action arising under 42
9 U.S.C. § 1983, in addition to a California cause of action that arises from the same
10 controversy giving rise to Plaintiff’s federal claims.

11 11. The Court has personal jurisdiction over all Defendants in this action, as all
12 Defendants are and were, at all times relevant to this complaint, situated, regularly conduct
13 business, and/or are and were domiciled in the State of California.

14 12. Venue is proper in this district, as the events giving rise to this action occurred
15 in the County of San Diego, California, which is located within this judicial district.

16 13. Plaintiff has complied with the California Government Code requirements to
17 assert state-law causes of action and has, in particular, submitted a tort claim for damages
18 to the County, which the County denied by letter dated November 29, 2021. Within six
19 months, on May 24, 2022, Plaintiff filed a lawsuit (3:22-cv-00744-BAS-RBB), which was
20 subsequently dismissed without prejudice due to the incapacitating grief Plaintiff felt over
21 the death of her son, followed by a severe case of pneumonia that required Plaintiff to be
22 hospitalized from November 11, 2022, through January 18, 2023, and subsequently placed
23 in a rehabilitation facility. Once no longer incapacitated by grief or illness in February
24 2023, Plaintiff immediately resumed prosecution of her case. And from March 2023
25 through May 19, 2023, Plaintiff diligently arranged and participated in pre-litigation
26 mediation efforts. When those efforts were unsuccessful, Plaintiff filed this complaint.
27 Ms. Marroquin has, in short, pursued this lawsuit as diligently as humanly possible.

28 ///

1 **III. PARTIES**

2 14. Plaintiff Alba Marroquin de Portillo (“Plaintiff” or “Ms. Marroquin”) is and
3 was, at all times relevant to this complaint, an individual domiciled in California. Ms.
4 Marroquin was decedent Lester Daniel Marroquin’s mother. In addition to suing
5 individually for damages arising from Mr. Marroquin’s death, Ms. Marroquin sues as Mr.
6 Marroquin’s sole successor in interest to prosecute those claims which survived Mr.
7 Marroquin’s death. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 377.30.

8 15. Defendant County of San Diego (“County”) is and was, at all times relevant
9 to this complaint, a municipal entity duly organized under California law. The San Diego
10 County Sheriff’s Department (“Sheriff’s Department”) is the chief law enforcement
11 agency for the County. The Sheriff’s Department manages and operates the San Diego
12 Central Jail (“Central Jail”) and was, at all times relevant to this complaint, responsible
13 for the policies, procedures, practices, and customs of the Central Jail, as well as for the
14 hiring, training, supervision, discipline, actions, and inactions of the County’s agents
15 and/or employees working in the Central Jail.

16 16. Defendants Does 1 through 20, inclusive, are persons whose identities, titles,
17 and employment/agency relationships are currently unknown to Ms. Marroquin; that is,
18 she is currently ignorant of the true names of these persons. These defendants include jail
19 staff, detention officers, medical staff, medical providers, supervisors, employees, agents,
20 contractors, and final policymakers who substantially contributed to the acts and
21 omissions giving rise to the damages claimed herein. These defendants each acted under
22 color of state law, within the scope of their agency and/or employment, and with the full
23 knowledge and consent, either express or implied, of their principal and/or employer. Ms.
24 Marroquin will seek leave to substitute the true names of these defendants when she learns
25 their true identities.

26 **IV. FACTS**

27 **A. Jail Staff’s Reckless Indifference to Mr. Marroquin’s Serious Medical Needs**

28 17. From December 18, 2020, through May 30, 2021, Mr. Marroquin was a

1 pretrial detainee in the County’s custody at the Central Jail.

2 18. For the two years leading up to Mr. Marroquin’s incarceration, he struggled
3 with mental health issues. In particular, he had persistent delusions and hallucinations
4 that someone was going to hurt his mother. Unable to get the help he needed, Mr.
5 Marroquin’s mental health struggles led him directly into the criminal legal system. Mr.
6 Marroquin would be taken into custody, stabilized with medications, then released without
7 resources to maintain his stability, only to begin the cycle again.

8 19. Throughout all of this, Mr. Marroquin and his mom remained a constant
9 source of healing and comfort to one another. They maintained frequent contact—
10 particularly because Mr. Marroquin’s mental health depended so heavily on knowing his
11 mother was safe. Even when he was incarcerated, Ms. Marroquin and her son remained
12 as close as possible. They talked almost daily on the phone, and Ms. Marroquin would
13 make long trips to visit her son in person wherever he was located, even if only for an
14 hour. When they spent time together, they would listen to gospel music and talk about
15 their favorite Bible verses.

16 20. In fact, one of the reasons Mr. Marroquin’s mental health declined during his
17 final months in Central Jail was because jail staff increasingly cut off Mr. Marroquin’s
18 contact with his mom. This exacerbated Mr. Marroquin’s condition, as his mom was one
19 of the few people that could ease his mind. And on the other side of that coin, Mr.
20 Marroquin was one of the few people who could always light up his mom’s world.

21 21. Shortly after his booking in Central Jail, in December 2020, Mr. Marroquin
22 had an interaction with jail deputies where Mr. Marroquin was shot with a taser. After
23 ripping out one of the taser barbs and attempting to hurt himself, Mr. Marroquin was
24 placed into a safety cell.

25 22. A “safety cell” is the most restrictive type of cell in which an individual who
26 is a danger to themselves might be placed in Central Jail. The cells are small, windowless
27 rooms with rubberized walls. There is no sink, toilet, furniture, or bedding, leaving the
28 individual to sit or lie on the floor. A grate in the middle of the floor serves as a toilet.

1 Safety cells have a ceiling light that is illuminated 24/7, and a camera for remote
2 observation by custody staff. Individuals are given only a “safety smock” made from
3 heavy tear-free material fastened with straps or Velcro. Individuals are not allowed any
4 personal property while in a safety cell.

5 23. On or about January 9, 2021, Mr. Marroquin was placed in a safety cell after
6 injuring his head. He reported that auditory hallucinations were directing him to bang his
7 head on his cell wall.

8 24. On February 3, 2021, at the request of Mr. Marroquin’s public defender, the
9 state criminal court ordered Mr. Marroquin to undergo a psychiatric evaluation, to be
10 conducted on March 4, 2021. The Sheriff’s Department did not make Mr. Marroquin
11 available for this evaluation.

12 25. On or about March 13, 2021, Mr. Marroquin was again placed in a safety cell
13 due to self-harming behavior.

14 26. On March 18, 2021, Mr. Marroquin’s psychiatric evaluation still had not been
15 completed, so the state court continued the criminal proceedings to April 12, 2021.

16 27. On March 23, 2021, a court-appointed psychiatrist attempted to conduct a
17 remote video evaluation of Mr. Marroquin. Jail staff failed to produce Mr. Marroquin for
18 the evaluation.

19 28. On or about March 24, 2021, Mr. Marroquin was again placed in a safety cell
20 due to self-harming behavior. Jail staff had again discovered Mr. Marroquin banging his
21 head on his cell wall.

22 29. On April 5, 2021, the court-appointed psychiatrist again attempted to conduct
23 a remote video evaluation of Mr. Marroquin. Jail staff failed to produce Mr. Marroquin
24 for his evaluation.

25 30. On April 12, 2021, Mr. Marroquin’s psychiatric evaluation still had not been
26 completed, so the state criminal court ordered the Sheriff’s Department to produce Mr.
27 Marroquin for a psychiatric evaluation at the courthouse on April 30, 2021. The Sheriff’s
28 Department did not produce Mr. Marroquin for this evaluation.

1 31. On or about April 25, 2021, Mr. Marroquin was again placed in a safety cell
2 due to self-harming behavior. Specifically, jail staff had discovered Mr. Marroquin
3 attempting to strangle himself with a noose he had made from a shirt.

4 32. On or about April 29, 2021, Mr. Marroquin was again placed in a safety cell
5 due to self-harming behavior. He was trying to strangle himself with a towel.

6 33. Throughout this period, Mr. Marroquin was experiencing delusions and
7 auditory hallucinations that resulted in him putting his head in the toilet, including
8 uncontrollably drinking water from the toilet. These symptoms worsened as jail staff cut
9 off contact between Mr. Marroquin and his mom.

10 34. Jail staff repeatedly found Mr. Marroquin with his head in the toilet,
11 attempting to drown himself, and Mr. Marroquin was repeatedly transferred to safety cells
12 because of this self-harming behavior.

13 35. By May 21, 2021, Mr. Marroquin's psychiatric evaluation still had not been
14 completed, causing the state court to again continue his competency proceedings until
15 June 2021. (Remarkably, jail staff failed to produce Mr. Marroquin for this June hearing,
16 as well, apparently misrepresenting that Mr. Marroquin had refused to attend court, when
17 he had in fact died.)

18 36. On or about May 28, 2021, Mr. Marroquin was again placed in a safety cell
19 due to self-harming behavior.

20 37. On May 30, 2021, Defendants Does 1-20 made the decision to transfer, and
21 then transferred, Mr. Marroquin from the jail's psychiatric floor to an Ad-Seg cell.

22 38. The decision to transfer Mr. Marroquin was shocking for several reasons,
23 including the fact that he had been under near constant observation for weeks on the jail's
24 psychiatric floor; the fact that the transfer occurred on a Sunday when the staff who usually
25 treated Mr. Marroquin, and who cared about Mr. Marroquin, were off work; and the fact
26 that a clinician with little to no actual knowledge of Mr. Marroquin's condition approved
27 the transfer.

28 39. The Ad-Seg cell required only one-hour safety checks. More alarmingly, the

1 Ad-Seg cell was equipped with running water and a toilet.

2 40. Mr. Marroquin was, in short, transferred from the most protective cell in the
3 jail (a safety cell) to an Ad-Seg cell that was clearly, unequivocally, and obviously unsafe
4 for Mr. Marroquin. Several alternatives between these two extremes were available to
5 safeguard Mr. Marroquin’s life, including keeping him in EOH, where safety checks
6 would have been conducted at least every fifteen minutes.

7 41. During unchecked time in his Ad-Seg cell, Mr. Marroquin predictably stuck
8 his head into the toilet and began drinking, uncontrollably.

9 42. Deputies eventually found Mr. Marroquin down in his cell. He had died from
10 acute water intoxication.

11 43. In total, Mr. Marroquin had been placed in a safety cell at least eleven times,
12 and had been placed in EOH at least seventeen times, during his incarceration from
13 December 2020 through May 2021.

14 44. At no time during this incarceration by the County was Mr. Marroquin ever
15 taken to a hospital for inpatient psychiatric treatment. To the contrary, jail staff repeatedly
16 failed to produce Mr. Marroquin for court-ordered psychiatric evaluations and court dates.
17 Had Mr. Marroquin been properly evaluated, it is more likely than not he would have been
18 sent to a state mental health hospital for treatment and stabilization, prior to any
19 continuation of his underlying criminal proceedings.

20 45. The County took Mr. Marroquin into its custody then deliberately and
21 recklessly failed to ensure his safety.

22 **B. County’s Deliberate Indifference to Inmate Safety in County Jails**

23 **i. Disability Rights California’s Findings and Recommendations**

24 46. Disability Rights California (“DRC”) is a nonprofit agency and the largest
25 disability rights group in the nation. DRC is established under federal law to protect and
26 advocate for the rights of people with disabilities.

27 47. DRC opened an investigation into conditions at County jails in 2015.

28 48. In April 2018, DRC published its finding: “Suicides in San Diego County

1 Jail: A System Failing People with Mental Illness.”

2 49. DRC found “an extremely high number of jail inmates with significant
3 mental health treatment needs.”

4 50. DRC found “significant deficiencies in County’s suicide prevention
5 practices.”

6 51. DRC found the “County’s jail system subjects inmates with mental health
7 needs to a grave risk of psychological and other harms by failing to provide adequate
8 mental health treatment.”

9 52. DRC found “the existing systems of jail oversight have failed” to properly
10 monitor jail conditions, implement suicide-prevention practices, and provide adequate
11 mental health treatment practices.

12 53. DRC experts identified twenty-four “Key Deficiencies” and provided forty-
13 six recommendations to address deficiencies in the County’s suicide-prevention and
14 related mental health treatment delivery efforts.

15 54. DRC provided nine components necessary for a correctional suicide
16 prevention program to be effective, including, but not limited to: “Supervision of At-Risk
17 Inmates” and “Suicide Prevention Training.”

18 55. The County and its policymakers knew of and failed to implement the
19 foregoing recommendations prior to Mr. Marroquin’s death, thus substantially
20 contributing to his death.

21 **ii. National Center on Institutions and Alternatives’ Findings and**
22 **Recommendations**

23 56. Following the DRC Report, Lindsay Hayes, a project director with the
24 National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, assessed the suicide-prevention practices
25 within County jails. His report, “Report on Suicide Prevention Practices within the San
26 Diego County Jail System,” was released in June 2018.

27 57. Hayes’ Report focused on eight critical components of a suicide prevention
28 policy, which include: staff training, identification/screening, communication, housing,

1 levels of supervision/management, intervention, reporting, and follow-up/mortality-
2 morbidity review. Based on his on-site assessment, as well as a review of various Sheriff’s
3 Department policies and procedures related to suicide prevention, Hayes found several
4 policies inadequate to prevent suicide.

5 58. Hayes found “[t]he suicide prevention training requirements . . . are vague.”
6 Hayes found that, in 2017, only 31% of deputies and only 73% of medical personnel had
7 received annual suicide prevention training.

8 59. Hayes found “various suicide prevention policies provide limited guidance
9 regarding the observation of suicidal inmates, simply stating that custody personnel are
10 required to provide direct visual observation of suicidal inmates ‘at least twice in every
11 thirty (30) minute period.’” Hayes found there was “no option in any [Sheriff’s
12 Department] policy for constant and continuous observation of inmates at the highest risk
13 for suicide.”

14 60. Hayes’ report set forth thirty-two actionable recommendations.

15 61. Hayes “strongly recommended that the [suicide prevention] policy be revised
16 to include a more robust description of the requirements for both pre-service and annual
17 suicide prevention training, to include the duration of each workshop and an overview of
18 the required topics.”

19 62. Hayes “strongly recommended that possessions and privileges provided to
20 inmates on suicide precautions should be individualized and commensurate with their
21 level of risk.”

22 63. Hayes “strongly recommended that all . . . suicide prevention policies be
23 revised to include two levels of observation that specify descriptions of behavior
24 warranting each level of observation.” Additionally, “consistent with the standard of care,
25 an inmate identified as potentially suicidal (or placed on suicide precautions after hours
26 by non-mental health personnel) should be immediately referred to a mental health
27 clinician for completion of a suicide risk assessment.”

28 64. Hayes strongly recommended “officials conduct a comprehensive physical

1 plant review of all jail cells utilized for the housing of suicidal inmates to ensure that they
2 are reasonably suicide-resistant.”

3 65. The County and its policymakers knew of and failed to implement the
4 foregoing recommendations prior to Mr. Marroquin’s death, thus substantially
5 contributing to his death.

6 **iii. California State Auditor’s Findings and Recommendations**

7 66. Nearly a year after Mr. Marroquin’s death, the County still had not made
8 significant changes to address the record number of inmate deaths and injuries in its jails.

9 67. In February 2022, the California State Auditor published a report entitled,
10 “San Diego County Sheriff’s Department: It Has Failed to Adequately Prevent and
11 Respond to Deaths of Individuals in Its Custody.”

12 68. The audit concluded that, “Alarminglly, a total of 52 individuals in the San
13 Diego Sheriff’s Department’s jails died by suicide over the past 15 years, which is more
14 than twice the number in each of the comparable counties.”

15 69. The audit noted that, “in one case, an incarcerated individual who had
16 previously threatened suicide was released from a safety cell placement and enhanced
17 observation housing. . . . the Sheriff Department’s policy at that time did not specify time
18 frames for ongoing follow-up after such placement . . . [and] mental health staff followed
19 up only once with the individual after release from enhanced observation housing
20 Two weeks after the individual’s discharge from enhanced observation housing and about
21 12 days after the individual’s lone follow-up encounter with a mental health clinician, the
22 individual died by suicide.”

23 70. The audit report further noted, “the Sheriff’s Department’s records indicate
24 that a deputy did not perform a required safety check in a housing area, in part because of
25 poor communication between this deputy and the station deputy. One hour after the
26 deputy should have performed this check, sworn staff found an individual in this housing
27 area unresponsive after attempting suicide. A physician pronounced this individual
28 deceased at the scene after staff and paramedics were unsuccessful at saving the

1 individual's life.”

2 71. The audit report further outlined several policy changes that consultants and
3 reviewing agencies have recommended to address the number of suicides in County jails,
4 including increasing the frequency of safety checks in Ad-Seg units, using wristbands to
5 identify inmates with a history of self-harm, and giving individuals in EOH access to visits
6 and phone calls. As of the date of the state auditor's report, however, none of these
7 recommendations had been implemented by the County.

8 **iv. County's Pattern and Practice of Failing to Keep Inmates Safe**

9 72. Mr. Marroquin's death was a foreseeable result of a pattern among Sheriff's
10 Department personnel of failing to keep people safe while in County custody safe.

11 73. Inmate injuries and deaths are a foreseeable result of Sheriff's Department
12 personnel ignoring critical information and failing to protect people in the County's care
13 and custody:

- 14 a. On June 25, 2011, Daniel Sisson died from an acute asthma attack made
15 worse by drug withdrawal. He lay dead for several hours before a fellow
16 inmate found him. Due to lack of communication between jail staff, jail
17 staff had failed to monitor him. In a subsequent lawsuit, a jury awarded
18 \$3 million.
- 19 b. In September 2012, Bernard Victorienne suffered for five days from drug
20 overdose because jail staff ignored available (yet unshared) information
21 that he had ingested methamphetamine. Mr. Victorienne was placed in
22 Ad-Seg instead of in a medical unit. He was eventually found dead in his
23 cell from acute drug intoxication. The County settled this case for \$2.3
24 million.
- 25 c. In 2014, former U.S. Marine Kristopher NeSmith committed suicide. Last
26 seen alive about 10:00 p.m. one night, a guard noticed a bedsheet
27 fashioned into a rope. The deputy then failed to communicate this
28 information to other jail staff or to call for psychiatric intervention. No

1 other jail staff took any further action. Mr. NeSmith was later found dead,
2 having hung himself. The County settled this case for \$250,000.

- 3 d. In 2014, Ronnie Sandoval showed obvious symptoms of overdose, yet jail
4 staff did not summon help or treat him for overdose. Nor did jail staff
5 pass on information regarding Mr. Sandoval's condition during the shift
6 change. Mr. Sandoval died from drug intoxication.
- 7 e. In 2015, jail personal failed to input critical medical information into
8 JIMS (the jail information database) about Ruben Nunez, leading to Mr.
9 Nunez dying from water intoxication. One of the jail staff testified she
10 did not know how to use JIMS to add "alerts"—i.e., the most critical
11 information regarding an inmate. She testified she was never trained to
12 do this. The County settled this case for \$1 million.
- 13 f. In 2016, David Collins suffered traumatic brain injuries after falling twice
14 while suffering from a medical condition that caused difficulty walking.
15 Sheriff's Department personnel had just assumed he was drunk and failed
16 to provide any medical care to him. A jury awarded Collins more than
17 \$12 million.
- 18 g. In 2016, Heron Moriarty committed suicide after jail staff failed to
19 communicate among themselves about the twenty-eight telephone calls
20 his wife had placed to warn jail staff of Mr. Moriarty's suicidal intentions.
21 The County settled this case for \$3 million.
- 22 h. In 2018, Paul Silva was killed by Sheriff's Department personnel when
23 they were "extracting" him from a holding cell, where he had been kept
24 with the lights on, and without running water or a bed, for thirty-six hours.
25 Mr. Silva, who struggled with psychosis, died after he failed to
26 immediately comply with Sheriff's Department personnel instructions,
27 and was tased four to nine times while six members of a "tactical team"
28 held him down with a body shield and pressed down on his legs and torso.

1 The County settled this case for \$3.5 million.

2 i. In 2018, Frankie Greer, an army veteran, was put on a top bunk despite
3 Sheriff's Department personnel knowing he had a severe seizure disorder.
4 Mr. Greer had a seizure, fell from his bunk, and sustained traumatic brain
5 injuries. The County settled this case for \$7.75 million.

6 j. In 2018, Colleen Garot was booked into Las Colinas women's jail and,
7 despite patently obvious signs of head trauma, she was largely ignored by
8 Sheriff's Department personnel. After falling from a top bunk, being
9 attacked by another inmate, and being ignored while she had a seizure in
10 a safety cell, Ms. Garot had a debilitating stroke. The County settled this
11 case for \$9.5 million.

12 k. In March 2019, Ivan Ortiz died by suicide while on suicide precautions
13 on the jail's psychiatric floor. Mr. Ortiz suffocated himself with a plastic
14 lunch bag (which he should not have had while on suicide precautions).
15 The County settled this case for \$1 million.

16 l. In 2020, Tanya Suarez, suffering from drug-induced psychosis, was
17 allowed to pull out her own eyes while Sheriff's Department personnel
18 watched and failed to intervene. The County settled this case for \$4.35
19 million.

20 74. Inmate injuries and deaths are also a foreseeable result of Sheriff's
21 Department personnel failing to adequately monitor those in the County's care and
22 custody, including the following examples:

23 a. In the case of Mr. Sisson's death in 2011, jail staff failed to check on Mr.
24 Sisson for hours. Mr. Sisson died during drug withdrawal.

25 b. In 2012, as Mr. Victorienne lay on his cell floor, naked and unconscious,
26 none of the deputies conducted proper security check, soft counts, or hard
27 counts. One deputy was told by an inmate that Mr. Victorienne was not
28 breathing. This deputy kicked Mr. Victorienne, stated Mr. Victorienne

1 “twitched,” and left him to die in his cell.

- 2 c. In 2014, Christopher Carroll, who was severely mentally ill, was placed
3 in Ad-Seg. While unobserved, Mr. Carroll had smeared blood on the wall
4 of his cell, urinated on the floor, and threw food and feces on the ceiling
5 before hanging himself. Jail staff failed to conduct proper cell checks
6 despite knowing about Mr. Carroll’s condition.
- 7 d. In Mr. Nunez’s case, a deputy saw Mr. Nunez in his cell sitting in his own
8 vomit and urine. Despite seeing Mr. Nunez twice in this condition, this
9 deputy failed to summon help or take Mr. Nunez to medical services. The
10 deputy left Mr. Nunez in his cell to die.
- 11 e. In Mr. NeSmith’s case in 2014, a jail deputy saw Mr. NeSmith attempting
12 suicide, but took no action to stop Mr. NeSmith or to call for psychiatric
13 intervention.
- 14 f. In February of 2016, Richard Boulanger hung himself in his cell. His
15 cellmate pressed the emergency all button, but no deputy came to the cell
16 for approximately 20 minutes. A subsequent investigation revealed that
17 one of the deputies did not break stride or look into Mr. Boulanger’s cell
18 during a cell check. The investigation revealed that during cell checks,
19 the deputy peered into each cell for approximately once second in
20 violation of policy. The investigation further revealed a practice in which
21 the deputies were turning off the sound of the emergency call buttons,
22 lowering the volume, or muting the inmate intercom system so that no
23 sound could be heard. Call buttons in many of the housing units did not
24 function, which made no sound when pressed. The audio for the monitor
25 in the jail tower did not function well so that it was difficult to hear tones
26 and sounds from the monitor even when the volume was turned to the
27 maximum level.
- 28 g. In Mr. Ortiz’s case, he was supposed to be on fifteen-minute checks, but

1 jail staff failed to check on him for almost an hour at one point, allowing
2 him time to complete suicide.

3 75. Mr. Marroquin's death was, in summary, a foreseeable result of Sheriff's
4 Department personnel ignoring critical information, failing to protect people in the
5 County's care and custody, and failing to adequately monitor individuals in the County's
6 care and custody.

7 **C. Mr. Marroquin's Wrongful Death**

8 76. Does 1 through 20 were deliberately indifferent to, and recklessly
9 disregarded, Mr. Marroquin's health, safety, and welfare.

10 77. Does 1 through 20 failed to appropriately house and monitor Mr. Marroquin,
11 (an individual under their care and custody who they knew was suffering from psychosis
12 and was actively engaged in self-harming and suicidal behaviors) by failing to, among
13 other things, provide him with access to adequate psychiatric care, diligently monitor him,
14 and ensure he did not have access to the means to harm himself.

15 78. Does 1 through 20 had no reasonable justification, and in fact acted recklessly,
16 when they transferred Mr. Marroquin from a safety cell to an Ad-Seg cell with running
17 water and only one-hour safety checks. Defendants knowingly placed Mr. Marroquin in
18 a situation, knowing he faced a grave risk of death in that situation.

19 79. As an actual and proximate result of Defendants' deliberate and reckless
20 indifference to Mr. Marroquin's safety and wellbeing, Mr. Marroquin suffered damages
21 prior to his death, including those arising from his pre-death pain and suffering, in an
22 amount to be proven at trial. Ms. Marroquin, moreover, suffered damages arising from
23 Mr. Marroquin's wrongful death and the conscience-shocking deprivation of her parent-
24 child relationship with Mr. Marroquin, including economic damages in the form of funeral
25 expenses and non-economic damages including, including loss of love, companionship,
26 comfort, care, assistance, protection, affection, society, and moral support.

27 ///

28 ///

V. CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION – 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Violation of Fourteenth Amendment – Deliberate Indifference to Serious Medical Needs

(By Ms. Marroquin, As Mr. Marroquin’s Successor In Interest, Directly Against Does 1 Through 20)

80. All prior paragraphs are incorporated herein by this reference.

81. Ms. Marroquin asserts this cause of action as Mr. Marroquin’s successor in interest.

82. On May 30, 2021, Mr. Marroquin was a pretrial detainee in Defendants’ custody.

83. At all times relevant to this cause of action, Defendants were acting under color of state law.

84. On May 30, 2021, Defendants subjectively knew (or, objectively, should have known) that Mr. Marroquin faced serious medical risks and had serious medical needs, including mental health issues that made him a danger to himself.

85. Despite this knowledge, Defendants were deliberately indifferent to Mr. Marroquin’s serious medical risks and needs by, among other things, transferring Mr. Marroquin from a safety cell to an Ad-Seg cell; by failing to provide Mr. Marroquin access to adequate psychiatric care; by providing Mr. Marroquin with the means to self-harm and complete suicide (e.g., running water); and by leaving Mr. Marroquin unmonitored for unsafe periods of time thus allowing him to self-harm and ultimately complete suicide.

86. By being deliberately indifferent to Mr. Marroquin’s serious medical risks and needs, Defendants violated Mr. Marroquin’s Fourteenth Amendment right to be free from such deliberate indifference as a pretrial detainee.

87. As an actual and proximate cause of Defendants’ deliberate indifference to Mr. Marroquin’s serious medical risks and needs, Mr. Marroquin suffered damages prior to his death, including those arising from his pre-death pain and suffering, in an amount to be proven at trial.

1 88. Defendants, moreover, acted (or failed to act) in deliberate and reckless
2 disregard of Mr. Marroquin’s constitutionally protected rights. Plaintiff thus seeks an
3 award of exemplary damages against these defendants in an amount sufficient to punish
4 their conduct and to deter such conduct in the future.

5 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION – 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Violation of Fourteenth**
6 **Amendment – Interference with Familial Relations**

7 **(By Ms. Marroquin, Individually, Directly Against Does 1 Through 20)**

8 89. All prior paragraphs are incorporated herein by this reference.

9 90. On May 30, 2021, Defendants knew Mr. Marroquin had a recent and
10 extensive history of self-harming and suicidal behavior, and he was actively engaged in
11 self-harming behavior, including responding to command hallucinations to hurt himself.

12 91. Defendants were not, on this day, faced with rapidly evolving circumstances
13 on May 30, 2021, in the sense that they needed to make split-second decisions. Rather, it
14 was a routine Sunday. Mr. Marroquin was safely housed on the jail’s psychiatric floor,
15 either in a safety cell or in EOH. Defendants had time to deliberate and decide how they
16 were going to address Mr. Marroquin’s serious medical risks and needs.

17 92. Despites their knowledge of Mr. Marroquin’s serious medical risks and needs,
18 and the fact they had time to adequately address these risks and needs, Defendants
19 transferred Mr. Marroquin from near constant observation in a safety cell, to an Ad-Seg
20 cell equipped with running water and only one-hour safety checks. After weeks of Mr.
21 Marroquin being on the jail’s psychiatric floor, there was no legitimate correctional reason
22 for Defendants to—apparently out of the blue—transfer Mr. Marroquin to an Ad-Seg cell.
23 It was so obviously unsafe for Marroquin to be transferred to an Ad-Seg cell, that
24 Defendants’ decision to do so *shocks the conscience*.

25 93. Mr. Marroquin died as an actual and proximate result of Defendants’
26 conscience-shocking conduct.

27 94. As an actual and proximate result of Mr. Marroquin’s death, Ms. Marroquin
28 was deprived of her Fourteenth Amendment right as a parent to enjoy the familial

1 companionship and society of her son.

2 95. As a direct and foreseeable result of this denial of substantive due process,
3 Plaintiff suffered economic damages in the form of funeral expenses, and non-economic
4 damages, including loss of love, companionship, comfort, care, assistance, protection,
5 affection, society, and moral support—all in an amount to be determined at trial.

6 96. Defendants, moreover, acted (or failed to act) in deliberate and reckless
7 disregard of Plaintiff’s constitutionally protected rights. Plaintiff thus seeks an award of
8 exemplary damages against these defendants in an amount sufficient to punish their
9 conduct and to deter such conduct in the future.

10 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION – 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Monell Liability**

11 **(By Ms. Marroquin, Individually, And As Mr. Marroquin’s Successor In Interest,**
12 **Directly Against County)**

13 97. All prior paragraphs are incorporated herein by this reference.

14 98. Ms. Marroquin asserts this cause of action as Mr. Marroquin’s successor in
15 interest with regard to the violation of his constitutional rights under the Fourteenth
16 Amendment. Ms. Marroquin also asserts this claim individually with regard to the
17 violation of her own Fourteenth Amendment rights.

18 99. These constitutional violations were the actual and proximate result of certain
19 County “policies,” including:

- 20 a. a *de facto* policy, practice, and custom of ignoring and failing to
21 implement commonsense reforms, recommended by experts to remedy
22 the record-setting inmate deaths and injuries in County jails;
- 23 b. a *de facto* policy, practice, and custom of ignoring critical information and
24 failing to protect people in the County’s care and custody; and
- 25 c. a *de facto* policy, practice, and custom of failing to adequately monitor
26 people in the County’s care and custody.

27 100. For at least two years leading up to Mr. Marroquin’s death, the County’s final
28 policymakers were on notice of the foregoing “policies,” including the fact that these

1 “policies” were (and are) causing a disproportionate number of deaths and injuries to
2 people in County jails. By failing to implement any reasonable policy changes in response
3 to this crisis, the County has remained deliberately indifferent to the constitutional rights
4 of people in the County’s care and custody.

5 101. If the County is going to take into its custody individuals with serious health
6 issues, the County must provide them with adequate care. The County has, however,
7 consistently failed to provide adequate training, supervision, and resources for its jail staff.

8 102. Despite the frequency with which Sheriff’s Department personnel must work
9 with individuals suffering from mental health issues, for example, jail staff know little if
10 anything about mental healthcare. As such, jail staff frequently leave such individuals
11 unattended, unmonitored, and—even worse—in dangerous situations with obviously dire
12 consequences.

13 103. The County’s final policymakers failed, in summary, to provide adequate
14 training, supervision, and resources necessary for jail staff to perform their duties without
15 violating the constitutional rights of, not only the people in the County’s care and custody,
16 but these individuals’ spouses, children, and parents, as well.

17 104. Even after the County’s final policymakers were provided with official
18 reports from multiple oversight organizations, notifying them of the dangerous conditions
19 in County jails, policymakers failed to give jail staff the training, supervision, and
20 resources needed to address the problems raised by these oversight organizations.

21 105. Mr. Marroquin died as an actual and proximate result of the foregoing *de*
22 *facto* policies, practices, and customs; and as an actual and proximate result of the
23 County’s deliberate indifference to the training, supervision, and resource needs of its jail
24 staff.

25 106. As a result of Mr. Marroquin’s death, including the circumstances leading up
26 to and surrounding his death, Mr. Marroquin’s Fourteenth Amendment right to be free
27 from deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs and risks was violated. As a
28 result, Mr. Marroquin suffered damages prior to his death, including those arising from

1 his pre-death pain and suffering, in an amount to be proven at trial.

2 107. As a further result of Mr. Marroquin’s death, including the circumstances
3 leading up to and surrounding his death, Ms. Marroquin’s Fourteenth Amendment right
4 to familial relations was violated. As a result, Ms. Marroquin suffered economic damages
5 in the form of funeral expenses, and non-economic damages, including loss of love,
6 companionship, comfort, care, assistance, protection, affection, society, and moral
7 support—all in an amount to be determined at trial.

8 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Wrongful Death**

9 **(By Ms. Marroquin, Individually, Directly Against Does 1 Through 20 And**
10 **Vicariously Against County)**

11 108. All prior paragraphs are incorporated herein by this reference.

12 109. At the time of his death, Mr. Marroquin had no spouse or issue. Thus,
13 Plaintiff, as Mr. Marroquin’s parent, has standing to assert a cause of action for the
14 wrongful death of Mr. Marroquin. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 377.60.

15 110. As alleged herein, Mr. Marroquin died as a result of Defendants’ tortious
16 conduct, to wit, Defendants’ deliberate indifference to Mr. Marroquin’s serious medical
17 risks and needs. Mr. Marroquin’s death was, therefore, “wrongful” for purposes of a claim
18 for damages under California Code of Civil Procedure section 377.60. *See Estate of*
19 *Prasad v. County of Sutter*, 958 F. Supp. 2d 1101, 1118 (E.D. Cal. 2013).

20 111. As a direct and foreseeable result of Mr. Marroquin’s wrongful death, Ms.
21 Marroquin suffered economic damages in the form of funeral expenses, and non-economic
22 damages, including loss of love, companionship, comfort, care, assistance, protection,
23 affection, society, and moral support—all in an amount to be determined at trial.

24 112. Because Does 1 through 20 are directly liable for Mr. Marroquin’s wrongful
25 death, the County is vicariously liable for all damages arising from his wrongful death,
26 pursuant to California Government Code section 815.2.

27 **VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

28 113. Pursuant to the foregoing causes of action, Plaintiff prays for the following

1 relief:

- 2 a. on all causes of action, that judgment be rendered in favor of Plaintiff
3 and against Defendants;
- 4 b. on all causes of action, that compensatory damages (including economic
5 and noneconomic damages) be awarded as permitted by federal and state
6 law, in amounts to be determined at trial;
- 7 c. on the First and Second Causes of Action, that punitive damages be
8 awarded in an amount sufficient to deter and make examples out of these
9 individuals, to be determined at trial;
- 10 d. reasonable attorney fees, expenses, and costs of suit pursuant to 42
11 U.S.C. § 1988 and all other relevant statutory or case law; and
- 12 e. any and all other relief in law or equity to which Plaintiff may be entitled
13 and which this Court deems just and proper.

14 **VII. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

15 96. Pursuant to the Seventh Amendment and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38,
16 Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial on all causes of action asserted herein.

17
18 Dated: May 26, 2023

s/Trenton G. Lamere

19
20 Attorney for Plaintiff,

21 Alba Marroquin de Portillo
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS
See attachment.
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Los Angeles
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)
See attachment.

DEFENDANTS
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO; DOES 1-20
County of Residence of First Listed Defendant San Diego
NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.
Attorneys (If Known)
'23CV0978 WQHWVG

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
2 U.S. Government Defendant
3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)
PTF DEF
Citizen of This State 1 1
Citizen of Another State 2 2
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country 3 3
Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State 4 4
Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State 5 5
Foreign Nation 6 6

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

Table with columns: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, CIVIL RIGHTS, TORTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES. Includes various legal codes and descriptions.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)
1 Original Proceeding
2 Removed from State Court
3 Remanded from Appellate Court
4 Reinstated or Reopened
5 Transferred from Another District
6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer
8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION
Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):
42 U.S.C. s. 1983
Brief description of cause:
Deliberate indifference to pretrial detainee's serious medical needs in violation of Fourteenth Amendment; wrongful death

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:
CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.
DEMAND \$ Damages per proof.
CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:
JURY DEMAND: [X] Yes [] No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions):
JUDGE
DOCKET NUMBER 3:22-cv-00744-BAS-RBB

DATE May 26, 2023
SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD s/Trenton G. Lamere

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

CIVIL COVER SHEET – ATTACHMENT

Marroquin v. County of San Diego

Plaintiff:

ALBA MARROQUIN DE PORTILLO, individually and as successor in interest to her deceased son, Lester Daniel Marroquin

Plaintiff's Attorneys:

Brody A. McBride (CA SBN 270852)
2011 Palomar Airport Road, Suite 101
Carlsbad, CA 92011
(760) 253-1231
brody@brodymcbride.com

Trenton G. Lamere (CA SBN 272760)
122 Mascoutah Avenue
Belleville, IL 62220
(618) 539-2328
trenton@lamerelegal.com