UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA JACKSONVILLE DIVISION

TERRANCE JONES, RICKEY ADAMS,
FELTER BLAKE, CHARLES BROWN,
JOHNNIE BUCHANAN, KETHON COLBERT,
JAMES EDWARDS, TRACY ELLISON,
JAMES FIELDS, JOSEPH FULLER,
JASON GRACE, RICKIE GRACE, JR.,
MILTON HANNON, RICKY HICKS,
KEVIN HILL, MARCUS HOLLIDAY,
PRELLA HOLLIE, JOSHUA JORDAN,
GARRETT JORDAN, TERRY MCCLAIN,
JAMES MCKINNEY, TIMOTHY NORRIS,
JEROME PATTERSON, WARREN POWELL,
RUFUS SMITH, HOWARD SMOTHERS, JR.,
RODERICK SPANN, JAMAL WELLS,
MARCEL WHITE, ALPHONSO JENKINS-YOUNG,

Plaintiffs,

v. Case No.:

CITY OF JACKSONVILLE.

Defendant.

COMPLAINT & DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs TERRANCE JONES, RICKEY ADAMS, FELTER BLAKE, CHARLES BROWN, JOHNNIE BUCHANAN, KETHON COLBERT, JAMES EDWARDS, TRACY ELLISON, JAMES FIELDS, JOSEPH FULLER, JASON GRACE, RICKIE GRACE, JR., MILTON HANNON, RICKY HICKS, KEVIN HILL, MARCUS HOLLIDAY, PRELLA HOLLIE, JOSHUA JORDAN, GARRETT JORDAN, TERRY MCCLAIN, JAMES MCKINNEY, TIMOTHY NORRIS, JEROME PATTERSON, WARREN POWELL, RUFUS SMITH, HOWARD SMOTHERS, JR.,

RODERICK SPANN, JAMAL WELLS, MARCEL WHITE, ALPHONSO JENKINS-YOUNG, ("Plaintiffs"), by and through undersigned counsel, hereby file this Complaint against Defendant CITY OF JACKSONVILLE, ("Defendant"), and states as follows:

INTRODUCTION

- 1. This is an action to remedy discrimination based on disability, race and color, pursuant to the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act, as amended, ("ADAAA"), 42 U.S.C. §12101, et seq., Title VII, Civil Rights Act of 1866, 42 U.S.C. §1981, as amended by the Civil Rights Act of 1991 ("Section 1981") and the for the violation of their rights to be free from racial and disability discrimination and to recover front pay, back pay, an equal amount as liquidated damages, reinstatement, lost benefits, compensatory damages, emotional distress damages, pain and suffering, injunctive relief, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs and any other relief to which the Plaintiffs are entitled including but not limited to equitable relief.
- 2. Plaintiffs also complain pursuant to the Florida Civil Rights Act of 1992, Fla. Stat. §760.01 *et seq.* ("FCRA"), based upon diversity and supplemental jurisdiction of this Court, seeking relief and damages to redress the injuries Plaintiffs have suffered as a result of being discriminated against by their employer on the basis of disability, color, and race.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. Jurisdiction of this matter arises pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331 with federal questions involving Title VII, Section 1981 and the ADAAA, 28 U.S.C. § 1367. An express grant of federal court jurisdiction over this federal claims is found in Title VII at

- 42 U.S.C. §2000e-5(f)(3). Jurisdiction over state law claims also arise under the Court's supplemental jurisdiction, 28 U.S.C. § 1367
- 4. This Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' claims because at all times material to this Complaint, Plaintiffs worked for Defendant in Duval County, Florida.
- 5. The illegal conduct complained of and the resultant injury occurred within the judicial district in and for Duval County, Florida.
- 6. Plaintiffs filed their Charges of Discrimination timely with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"). The EEOC issued its right-to-sue letter therefore this Complaint is being filed within 90 days of Plaintiffs receiving their right-to-sue letter.

PARTIES

- 7. Plaintiffs are adult individuals who reside in Jacksonville, Duval County, Florida.
- 8. Defendant CITY OF JACKSONVILLE is and was, at all relevant times, operating in Duval County, Florida and is within the jurisdiction of this Court. Therefore, venue is proper in this Court.
- 9. The City of Jacksonville is responsible for the Fire Department of the City of Jacksonville, an agency it maintains, operates, and governs.
 - 10. Plaintiffs are employed as firefighters by the City of Jacksonville.
 - 11. Plaintiffs are African American males.
- 12. Defendant was an employer as defined by the laws under which this action is brought and employs greater than 15 employees.

- 13. At all times material to this action, Plaintiffs were "employees" of Defendant within the meaning of the ADA.
- 14. At all times material to this action, Defendant was, and continues to be an "employer" within the meaning of the ADA.
- 15. At all relevant times, the City acted through its agency, to commit the acts alleged in this Complaint and was responsible for such acts.

TITLE VII / FCRA STATUTORY PREREQUISITES

- 16. Plaintiffs are African American male individuals who suffered discrimination based on their race and medical condition. As such, they are members of a class of individuals protected by Title VII and the FCRA.
 - 17. Plaintiffs were qualified for their position of employment as firefighters.
- 18. The Defendant meets the statutory criteria for coverage as an "employer" under Title VII and the FCRA.
- 19. Plaintiffs meet the statutory criteria for coverage as an "employee" under Title VII, and the FCRA.
- 20. Plaintiff filed their Charge of Discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"). The EEOC issued its right-to-sue letter on the Charge of Discrimination. Therefore this complaint is being filed within 90 days of Plaintiff receiving their right-to-sue letter.
- 21. Accordingly, Plaintiffs have complied with all other Title VII, and FCRA requirements and all other prerequisites prior to bringing this lawsuit.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 22. At all times material, Defendant acted with malice and with reckless disregard for Plaintiffs' federally protected rights.
- 23. Plaintiffs have retained the law firm of MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A. to represent them in the litigation and have agreed to pay the firm a reasonable fee for its services.
- 24. Plaintiffs are all African American firefighters who suffer from Pseudofolliculitis Barbae, a disabling or "perceived" disability" condition under the ADAA that affects approximately 45-85% of Black men.
- 25. Pseudofolliculitis Barbae is a medical condition that causes significant pain, severe bumps, scarring, and deformities on the skin of afflicted individuals if they shave with a razor in order to be completely clean shaven.
- 26. Plaintiffs were employed by Defendant as a Firefighters/Paramedics or Firefighters/EMTs ("firefighters") during all relevant times.
- 27. Plaintiffs bring this claim for disability discrimination against Defendant for its unlawful discrimination of Plaintiffs based upon their disability or "perceived disability," in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.* ("ADA"). Plaintiffs are seeking damages including lost wages, compensatory damages, punitive damages, and their attorneys' fees and costs.
- 28. Plaintiffs' bring a claim for discrimination against Defendant, who subjected Plaintiffs to workplace discrimination and retaliation because of their medical condition.

FACTS

29. Plaintiffs are African American males.

- 30. Plaintiffs all suffer from the medical condition of Pseudofolliculitis Barbae.
- 31. This condition affects primarily African American men, and precludes them from shaving with a razor.
- 32. The Jacksonville Fire Department maintains a policy whereby every active duty firefighters is required to be clean shaven.
- 33. "Clean shaven" is defined as having no facial hair whatsoever, and the policy requires active duty firefighters to use a razor to meet that standard.
- 34. As Black men with Pseudofolliculitis Barbae, Plaintiffs cannot shave with a razor. Moreover, this policy disproportionality affects Black firefighters.
- 35. Beginning in April 2015, Plaintiffs all received an accommodation due to their medical condition that permitted them to have close cropped facial hair that was barely noticeable, as long as they passed what is called the "fit test."
- 36. The "fit test" refers to a test that the department administers to gauge the fit of the positive pressure self-contained breathing apparatus ("SCBA") masks on the face of a firefighter.
- 37. If the mask fits properly, then oxygen would not escape from the mask and the fit test would be passed.
 - 38. Each Plaintiff took and passed a fit test on numerous occasions.
- 39. By the Departments own metric, the Plaintiffs could all perform their job functions with the simple accommodation that they were afforded, i.e., being permitted to be close shaven but not clean shaven.

6

- 40. Plaintiffs aptly performed their job functions with the accommodation provided regarding the clean shave policy.
- 41. Each day Plaintiffs worked, they were subject to visual inspections by their supervisors, who observed that the barely noticeable facial hair worn by Plaintiffs conformed to the accommodation granted to them.
- 42. However, on January 12, 2016, Plaintiffs each received a Memorandum from Kelli O'Leary, Director, Employee Services, for the City of Jacksonville Fire and Rescue Department, stating that effective immediately, the accommodation granted in April 2015, is now being denied.
- 43. As a consequence of Defendant's actions, Plaintiffs' accommodations were unilaterally revoked and Plaintiffs were expected to be clean shaven with a razor's shave.
- 44. Defendant declared that there would be no exception to the clean shave policy for any reason as having any amount of facial hair would impact the fit of an SCBA mask.
- 45. Defendant based its decision on alleged OHSA violations. This reason was false. Every Plaintiff passed a fit text, passed daily visual inspections at the firehouse, was able to perform their job functions.
- 46. When the Plaintiffs objected to this treatment, they were informed that they would be placed on light duty, which preventing them from working as firefighters. Additionally, Plaintiffs would be prohibited from taking promotional test until they were clean shaven. More importantly, Plaintiffs' would have their pay reduced while on light

7

duty.

- 47. The position taken by the Department is a farce, and aimed at discriminating against Plaintiffs and coercing them by taking away their ability to earn a living.
- 48. There was no analysis of any of the Plaintiffs' accommodation before they were unilaterally revoked.
- 49. This newfound stance on the shave policy was not grounded in any legitimate workplace need, but rather a desire to discriminate against Plaintiffs.
- 50. Indeed, should the affected firefighters be placed on light duty, they would represent a significant portion of the African American membership at the Jacksonville Fire Department.
- 51. Plaintiffs were told that they would no longer be accommodated and were required to be clean shaven as defined by using a razor to shave.
- 52. Plaintiffs were forced to choose between working as career firefighters and earning a living, and shaving, which results in significant pain, skin irritation, and lasting damage to their skin.
- 53. Plaintiffs were all afforded a medical accommodation to the shave policy due to their medical condition and were permitted to maintain very slight and barely noticeable facial hair.
- 54. Plaintiffs' trimmed their facial hair to the point where it was at best stubble.
 - 55. With the accommodation, Plaintiffs were able to perform all of their job

functions without any hardship to the Defendant.

- 56. Each Plaintiff successfully passed a fit test that certified each Plaintiff could wear an oxygen mask with the slight facial hair without any leakage of air.
- 57. Despite the fact that Plaintiffs performed their job function with the accommodation without any hardship to Defendant, Defendant without any notice, legitimate reason, or rational basis, unilaterally canceled the accommodation.
- 58. Defendant did not engage in any analysis, consideration, or review of the accommodation.
- 59. Plaintiffs were told that, all of a sudden, there were no exceptions to the shave policy and that the Plaintiffs were in direct violation of the policy.
- 60. Defendant's actions were aimed at discriminating against African American firefighters as their policy affected predominately African American firefighters within the Jacksonville Fire Department.
- 61. The Defendant's conduct had a disparate impact upon African American firefighters as nearly every African American firefighter was targeted by this sudden and unlawful change in policy.
- 62. The result of Defendant's actions is that a disproportionate number of black firefighters were adversely affected by the policy, reassigned, and forced to choose between their livelihood and serving the City they love.
- 63. Plaintiffs and other African American firefighters now have to shave with a razor and endure painful bumps on their skin, irritated skin conditions, and scarring on their skin as a result of the department's unlawful policies.

9

COUNT I – RACE DISCRIMINATION UNDER TITLE VII

- 64. Plaintiffs reincorporate and adopt all allegations contained within paragraphs 1 through 63, above.
- 65. Defendant City of Jacksonville, by and through the Jacksonville Fire Department, discriminated against Plaintiffs on the account of their race.
- 66. Defendant engaged in unlawful employment practices prohibited by Title VII by discriminating against Plaintiffs as set forth herein.
- 67. Defendant's employment practices have the effect of disproportionately targeting Black firefighters so that they would be reassigned and eventually terminated.
- 68. Approximately 45%-85% of African American males experience pain, scarring, bumps, and deformity if they use a razor to shave.
- 69. Defendant knew or should have known of the discrimination unlawfully targets African Americans and those with disabilities.
- 70. The above discrimination was done by Defendant with a reckless disregard for Plaintiffs' rights under federal law. As a direct and proximate result of the discrimination described above, Plaintiffs have suffered and continues to suffer loss of employment, loss of income, loss of other employment benefits and has suffered and continues to suffer mental anguish, distress, humiliation, great expense and loss of enjoyment of life.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for a trial by jury and all legal and equitable relief allowed by law including:

a. Back pay and benefits;

- b. Interest on back pay and benefits;
- c. Front pay and benefits;
- d. Compensatory damages for emotional pain and suffering;
- e. Injunctive relief;
- f. Prejudgment interest;
- g. Costs and attorney's fees; and
- h. Such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT II – RACE DISCRIMINATION UNDER SECTION 1981

- 71. Plaintiffs reincorporate and adopt all allegations contained within paragraph 1 through 63, above.
- 72. Plaintiffs are members of a protected class under Section 1981 due to their race.
- 73. By the conduct described above, Defendant engaged in unlawful employment practices and discriminated against Plaintiffs on the basis of their race in violation of Section 1981.
 - 74. Defendant knew or should have known of the discrimination.
- 75. The above discrimination was done by Defendant with a reckless disregard for Plaintiffs' rights under federal law. As a direct and proximate result of the discrimination described above, Plaintiffs suffered and continues to suffer mental anguish, distress, humiliation and loss of enjoyment of life.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for a trial by jury and all legal and equitable relief allowed by law including:

- a. Back pay and benefits;
- b. Interest on back pay and benefits;
- c. Front pay and benefits;
- d. Compensatory damages for emotional pain and suffering;
- e. Injunctive relief;
- f. Prejudgment interest;
- g. Costs and attorney's fees; and
- h. Such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT III – RACE DISCRIMINATION UNDER THE FCRA

- 76. Plaintiffs reincorporate and adopt all allegations contained within paragraphs 1 through 63, above.
 - 77. Plaintiffs are members of protected class due to their race.
- 78. By the conduct described above, Defendant engaged in unlawful employment practices and discriminated against plaintiffs on the basis of their race in violation of the FCRA.
 - 79. Defendant knew or should have known of the discrimination.
- 80. The above discrimination was done by Defendant with a reckless disregard for Plaintiff's rights under state law. As a direct and proximate result of the discrimination described above, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer loss of employment, loss of income, loss of other employment benefits and has suffered and continues to suffer mental anguish, distress, humiliation, great expense and loss of enjoyment of life.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for a trial by jury and all legal and equitable relief allowed by law including:

- A. Back pay and benefits;
- B. Interest on back pay and benefits;
- C. Front pay and benefits;
- D. Compensatory damages for emotional pain and suffering;
- E. Injunctive relief;
- F. Prejudgment interest;
- G. Costs and attorney's fees; and
- H. Such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT IV - DISCRIMINATION UNDER THE ADAAA

- 81. Plaintiffs reincorporate and adopt all allegations contained within paragraphs 1 through 63, above.
- 82. Plaintiffs have a bona fide disability that affects a major life function, namely the ability to shave, skin condition, and skin deformity.
- 83. Plaintiffs have been discriminated against by the Defendant due to their bona fide disability in violation of Federal law.
- 84. Moreover, Defendant regarded Plaintiffs as having a disability when they denied them an accommodation and/or when Defendants unilaterally reassigned Plaintiffs from the firehouse to light duty due to their disability and/or having regarded the Plaintiffs as disabled.
 - 85. Plaintiffs are protected by the ADA:

- a. Plaintiffs were disabled or "perceived as disabled" employees who suffered discrimination because of their disability or "perceived disability" by Defendant; and
- b. Plaintiffs suffered an adverse employment action as a result of their disability or "perceived disability."
- 86. Defendant was at all material times an "employer" as envisioned and defined by the ADA.
- 87. Plaintiffs' medical condition is a protected disability under the ADA, as amended. See 42 U.S.C. § 12102.
- 88. Defendant's actions unquestionably constitute disability discrimination in violation of the ADA, as amended.
- 89. By reason of the foregoing, Defendant's actions, and non-actions, affected the "terms, conditions or privileges" of Plaintiffs' employment as envisioned by the ADA.
- 90. Alternatively, Defendant perceived Plaintiffs as being "disabled," and therefore, unable to perform the essential functions of their positions, despite the fact that Plaintiffs could perform same with a reasonable accommodation.
- 91. Pleading in the alternative, Plaintiffs' impairment did not substantially limit a major life activity, but was treated by Defendant as if it did.
- 92. Pleading in the alternative, Plaintiffs' medical condition constituted an impairment that limited a major life activity only because of Defendant's attitude toward the impairment.
 - 93. Defendant does not have a non-discriminatory rationale for denying

Plaintiffs' accommodation request.

- 94. Plaintiffs were disabled individuals, or otherwise perceived as disabled by Defendant, during their employment. Therefore, they are members of protected classes as envisioned by the ADA.
- 95. Plaintiffs suffered sufficiently severe and pervasive treatment because of their disability and/or "perceived disability," and request for accommodation regarding same.
- 96. The acts of Defendant, by and through its agents and employees, violated Plaintiffs' rights against disability discrimination under the ADA.
- 97. The discrimination to which Plaintiffs were subjected was based on their disability and/or "perceived disability."
- 98. The conduct of Defendant, its agents, and employees proximately, directly, and foreseeably injured Plaintiffs, including, but not limited to, lost wages and benefits, future pecuniary losses, emotional pain and suffering, humiliation, inconvenience, mental anguish, loss of enjoyment of life, and other non-pecuniary losses.
- 99. The conduct of Defendant was so willful and wanton, and in such reckless disregard of the statutory rights of Plaintiffs, as to entitle them to an award of punitive damages against Defendant to deter it, and others, from such conduct in the future.
- 100. Plaintiffs are entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and litigation expenses pursuant to the ADA.
- 101. Plaintiffs' have retained the law firm of MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A. to represent Plaintiffs in the litigation and have agreed to pay the firm a reasonable fee for its

services.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for a trial by jury and all legal and equitable relief allowed by law including:

- a. Back pay and benefits;
- b. Interest on back pay and benefits;
- c. Front pay and benefits;
- d. Compensatory damages for emotional pain and suffering;
- e. Injunctive relief;
- f. Prejudgment interest;
- g. Costs and attorney's fees; and
- h. Such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT V DISCRIMINATION BASED ON DISABILITY IN VIOLATION OF THE FCRA

- 102. Plaintiffs reincorporate and adopt all allegations contained within Paragraphs 1 through 63, above.
- 103. Plaintiffs are members of a protected class due to their disability/handicap or perceived disability/handicap.
- 104. By the conduct described above, Defendant engaged in unlawful employment practices and discriminated against Plaintiffs on the basis of their disability/handicap or perceived disability/handicap in violation of the FCRA.
 - 105. Defendant knew or should have known of the discrimination.

106. The above discrimination was done by Defendant with a reckless disregard for Plaintiffs' rights under state law. As a direct and proximate result of the discrimination described above, Plaintiffs have suffered and continues to suffer mental anguish, distress, humiliation, great expense and loss of enjoyment of life.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for a trial by jury and all legal and equitable relief allowed by law including:

- a. Back pay and benefits;
- b. Interest on back pay and benefits;
- c. Front pay and benefits;
- d. Compensatory damages for emotional pain and suffering;
- e. Injunctive relief;
- f. Prejudgment interest;
- g. Costs and attorney's fees; and
- h. Such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Plaintiffs specifically reserves the right to amend their Complaint to seek punitive damages against Defendant

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 38(b), Plaintiffs hereby demand a trial by jury.

Dated this 23^{rd} day of November, 2020.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ ANTHONY J. HALL

Anthony J. Hall, Esq.

Florida Bar No.: 40924 Morgan & Morgan, P.A. 20 N. Orange Ave., 16th Floor Orlando, FL 32801

MAILING: P.O. Box: 530244 Atlanta, GA 30353-0244 Direct Tel.: (407) 418-2079 Facsimile: (407) 245-3390

ahall@forthepeople.com Email:

Counsel for Plaintiffs

JS 44 (Rev. 09/19)

Case 3:20-cv-01330 Document 1-1 Filed 11/23/20 Page 1 of 1 PageID 19 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 d	ocket sneet. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF T		0			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS			
TERRANCE JONES, et	al		CITY OF JACKS	CITY OF JACKSONVILLE			
(b) County of Residence of (E.	of First Listed Plaintiff **XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	(SES)	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)				
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Anthony J. Hall, Esq., Mo 1600, Orlando, Florida 3 ahall@forthepeople.com	organ & Morgan, 20 N 2801, Tel: (407) 418-2	Orange Avenue, Suite					
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)			(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintig		
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	nt S 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			PTF DEF □ 1 □ 1 Incorporated or Pr of Business In 1			
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Citizen of Another State	□ 2 □ 2 Incorporated and I of Business In A			
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	□ 3 □ 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			FORFEITHRE/PENALTY		of Suit Code Descriptions.		
CONTRACT ☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment ☐ 8 Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS X440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	FORFEITURE/PENALTY 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 690 Other 710 Fair Labor Standards	28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	OTHER STATUTES ☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC ☐ 3729(a)) ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and ☐ Corrupt Organizations ☐ 480 Consumer Credit ☐ (15 USC 1681 or 1692) ☐ 485 Telephone Consumer ☐ Protection Act ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts ☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act ☐ 896 Arbitration ☐ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
Proceeding Sta	moved from 3 tte Court Cite the U.S. Civil Sta 42 U.S.C. \$12107	Appellate Court	Reinstated or	her District Litigation fy) Transfer			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of ca						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.			DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: N Yes No			
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER			
DATE 11/23/2020	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/ Anthony J. Hall						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	(OVD)T				a dr		
RECEIPT # AN	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUI)GE		

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Middle District of Florida

	Middle Distric	et of Florida				
TERRANCE JONES, ef	t al)					
DI: ::(//)))					
Plaintiff(s))	Civil Action No.				
V.		CIVII ACIOII IVO.				
CITY OF JACKSONVILLE						
)					
Defendant(s))					
Defendant(s))					
SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION						
117 W Suite	fice of General Counse /. Duval Street	ı				
A lawsuit has been filed against you.						
Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are: Anthony J. Hall, Esquire Morgan & Morgan, P.A. 20 N Orange Avenue, Suite 1600 Orlando, Florida 32801 Tel: (407) 418-2079 Email: ahall@forthepeople.com						
If you fail to respond, judgme You also must file your answer or more		tered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.				
		CLERK OF COURT				
Date:						
		Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk				

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (1))

		ne of individual and title, if any)						
was re	ceived by me on (date)	·						
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual a	at (place)					
			on (date)	; or				
	☐ I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with (name)							
	, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there, on (date), and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or I served the summons on (name of individual), wh							
	designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of (name of organization)							
			on (date)	; or				
	☐ I returned the summ	I returned the summons unexecuted because						
	☐ Other (specify):							
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00				
	I declare under penalty							
Date:								
			Server's signature					
			Printed name and title					
			Server's address					

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc: