

1 Peter Neufeld\*  
 (New York Bar No. 1020841)  
 2 Nick Brustin\*  
 (New York Bar No. 2844405)  
 3 Anna Benvenuti Hoffmann\*  
 (New York Bar No. 4412011)  
 4 Katie McCarthy\*  
 5 (New York Bar No. 5583141)  
 Kate Fetrow\*  
 6 (New York Bar No. 955937)  
 7 \* *Pro Hac Vice Applications Pending*  
 Neufeld Scheck & Brustin, LLP  
 8 99 Hudson Street, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
 9 New York, NY 10013  
 10 212-965-9081 Phone • 212-965-9084 Fax  
 peter@nsbcivilrights.com  
 11 nick@nsbcivilrights.com  
 12 anna@nsbcivilrights.com  
 13 katie@nsbcivilrights.com  
 katef@nsbcivilrights.com  
 John Thomas  
 14 (Idaho Bar No. 6727)  
 15 166 Martinsburg Lane  
 Idaho Falls, LD 83404  
 16 jthomas@co.bonneville.id.us

17 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 18  
 19 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO**

20	_____ )	
21	Christopher Tapp, an individual, )	
22	Plaintiff, )	Case No.
23	v. )	<b>COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR</b>
24	The City of Idaho Falls, Jared Fuhriman, )	<b>JURY TRIAL</b>
25	Steven G. Finn, Ken Brown, Curtis Stacey, )	
26	Phillip Grimes, Kent Livsey, and Steve Roos )	
27	Defendants. )	
28	_____ )	

**COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND**

1  
2 Plaintiff Christopher Tapp, by and through his attorneys, the law firm Neufeld Scheck &  
3 Brustin, LLP, and John Thomas, alleges as follows:

4  
5 **INTRODUCTION**

- 6 1. Christopher Tapp spent an unimaginable 20 years, 1 month, and 22 days wrongfully  
7 imprisoned, and 21 years and 2 months wrongfully convicted, for the 1996 rape and murder  
8 of Angie Dodge—a crime he did not commit and had absolutely nothing to do with.  
9
- 10 2. Angie Dodge was actually raped and murdered by Brian Dripps, who lived across the street  
11 from her and acted alone. Recent DNA testing has confirmed that Dripps was the source of  
12 the semen and hair found on Dodge’s body. When brought in for questioning, Dripps  
13 confessed to raping and murdering Dodge. He also acknowledged that he had acted alone and  
14 that he did not know Tapp. Dripps has been charged with the rape and murder of Angie  
15 Dodge and is currently awaiting trial.  
16
- 17 3. Tapp’s wrongful imprisonment was the direct result of egregious misconduct by Defendant  
18 officers of the Idaho Falls Police Department (“IFPD”) and the City of Idaho Falls.  
19 Defendants knew or should have known that Tapp had nothing to do with the crime, because  
20 the objective evidence from the crime scene indicated that there was a single perpetrator,  
21 pretrial DNA evidence excluded Tapp as a potential source of the semen found on the  
22 victim’s body, and absolutely no physical evidence connected him to the crime.  
23
- 24 4. But despite Tapp’s innocence, Defendants engaged in a coordinated campaign to wrongfully  
25 convict Tapp for Dodge’s murder.  
26
- 27 5. In particular, Defendants coercively and abusively interrogated Tapp for about sixty hours,  
28 repeatedly threatening him with death, lying to him, and falsely promising him leniency if he

1 told them what they wanted to hear. Defendants also continuously used coercive and  
2 manipulative sham polygraphs on Tapp—not to get to the truth—but in order to coerce Tapp  
3 into giving five distinct, false and fabricated confessions.

- 4 6. When Tapp first spoke to the police, he told the truth: that he knew nothing about the crime  
5 and indeed had never even been to Dodge’s apartment. Tapp only falsely confessed under  
6 Defendants’ unrelenting and constant pressure and manipulation, including their use of  
7 multiple sham polygraphs, false promises of leniency, death threats, lies, and manipulation.  
8
- 9 7. Each of the five false confessions that Defendants coerced Tapp into giving precisely fit  
10 Defendants’ theory of the murder at the time they were given. And, as Defendants learned  
11 new information and their theory of the crime changed, rather than acknowledge the truth—  
12 that Tapp is innocent—Defendants coerced new confessions from Tapp that fit their evolving  
13 theory.  
14
- 15 8. Moreover, because he is innocent, Tapp had no information about the crime. And so, for each  
16 of the five false confessions that Defendants coerced from Tapp, Defendants broke the rules  
17 and fed Tapp key non-public details about Dodge’s murder, and then falsely reported that  
18 those details had come from Tapp, and that those details corroborated Tapp’s confessions.  
19
- 20 9. When Defendants first spoke to Tapp, he truthfully denied any knowledge of the crime. But  
21 Defendants, months into a high-profile investigation without a suspect, were unsatisfied with  
22 the truth. So, Defendants coerced Tapp into falsely stating that Defendants’ suspect at the  
23 time—a young man named Benjamin Hobbs, who was friends with Tapp—had confessed to  
24 Tapp that he killed Dodge.  
25
- 26 10. But Defendants were still unsatisfied with Tapp’s confession. And so they coerced Tapp into  
27 falsely confessing to a second story: that Tapp had been at Dodge’s apartment the night of  
28

1 the murder, had seen Hobbs attack Dodge with a knife, and then, frightened, had run away  
2 only to return later to see Dodge’s body.

3 11. But, shortly after Defendants had wrung this false confession from Tapp, Defendants learned  
4 that DNA evidence excluded both Tapp and Hobbs as the source of the semen found on  
5 Dodge’s body—meaning the fabricated confessions that Defendants had wrung from Tapp  
6 were demonstrably false.  
7

8 12. Rather than acknowledge the truth—that Tapp was not at all involved in Dodge’s murder—  
9 Defendants instead wrung a third confession from him, this time feeding Tapp another name:  
10 Jeremy Sargis. In this false confession, Defendants coerced Tapp into saying that Tapp,  
11 Hobbs, and Sargis had entered Dodge’s apartment and then Hobbs and Sargis had attacked  
12 Dodge.  
13

14 13. But, yet again, the evidence quickly demonstrated that the story Defendants coerced from  
15 Tapp was false: Additional DNA testing revealed that Sargis was not the source for the  
16 semen at the scene, either.  
17

18 14. Defendants then forced Tapp into a fourth false confession. In this version of the story,  
19 Sargis was not at the scene, but rather Tapp, Hobbs, and a third man had purportedly entered  
20 Dodge’s apartment. Because Defendants did not have a name to feed Tapp for this unknown  
21 third man, this time, Tapp was unable to name the third “perpetrator,” Defendants also forced  
22 Tapp to falsely confess, in this version of events, that Tapp held down Dodge’s arms while  
23 Hobbs and the third man had sexually assaulted her.  
24

25 15. Defendants were still unsatisfied with Tapp’s four false confessions. And so they coerced a  
26 fifth final, false confession from Tapp to pin the blame on Tapp himself. In the fifth and final  
27  
28

1 version of events, Hobbs had threatened Tapp into participating in the crime, and Tapp had  
2 then cut Dodge across the breast.

3 16. To shore up this false confession, Defendants also coerced a vulnerable teenaged girl,  
4 Destiny Osborne, into falsely reporting that she heard Tapp confess to the crime. After  
5 Tapp's conviction, she admitted that her story was completely fabricated, had been fed to her  
6 by Defendants, and that she had only repeated Defendants' false story because Defendants  
7 had threatened and coerced her.  
8

9 17. Absolutely no physical or forensic evidence tied Tapp to this crime; the key evidence offered  
10 against him at trial was the false confession that Defendants had extracted from Tapp, the  
11 "corroborating" facts that Defendants had fed to Tapp and then falsely reported came from  
12 him, and Osborne's coerced false statement.  
13

14 18. By 2009, the existence of exculpatory DNA evidence and other evidence proving Tapp's  
15 innocence was obvious and widely available. Indeed, even the victim's mother recognized  
16 his innocence and actively advocated for Tapp's release. However, the IFPD actively  
17 suppressed or otherwise wrongfully failed to act on newly discovered information that would  
18 have resulted in Tapp's immediate release. In 2009, the IFPD was given the opportunity to  
19 perform Y-STR DNA testing to identify the perpetrator's paternal line and thus identify the  
20 perpetrator—which would have cleared Tapp's name and secured his release a decade  
21 early—but the IFPD declined. Instead of fulfilling their legal and constitutional obligations to  
22 help secure the release of an obviously innocent man, the IFPD buried or wrongfully  
23 represented the evidence and the circumstances of the investigation in refusing to perform the  
24 additional testing and search.  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 19. On July 17, 2019, more than twenty-two years after Tapp was wrongfully arrested for a  
2 murder he did not commit, the Seventh Judicial District of Idaho Falls, County of Bonneville  
3 held a hearing in which Judge Alan Stephens announced he was going to vacate and dismiss  
4 the charges against Tapp. “As far as this court is concerned,” Judge Stephens explained to  
5 Tapp, “you are innocent of the convictions you have been living under for the past 20-plus  
6 years. I don’t think any of us could imagine what it would be like to experience  
7 imprisonment for something we didn’t do . . . I’m just glad it could be corrected at this time.”  
8 Shortly thereafter all convictions were vacated and charges dismissed on the basis of Tapp’s  
9 actual innocence. Tapp’s wrongful conviction and continued wrongful imprisonment was not  
10 the work of rogue, low-level officers at the IFPD. Rather, it occurred in one of the most high-  
11 profile investigations ever conducted by the IFPD, with direct involvement by supervisors  
12 and senior officials at the Department, including the Chiefs of Police Kent Livsey and Steve  
13 Roos.  
14

15  
16 20. Alternatively, Tapp’s wrongful imprisonment was the result of an investigation and post-  
17 conviction misconduct so grossly negligent, negligent, reckless, or deliberately indifferent to  
18 Tapp’s liberty interests so as to amount to a constitutional deprivation of his civil rights.  
19

20 21. Tapp’s actual innocence is widely recognized by leading national experts, courts, and even  
21 the victim’s mother. Post-conviction DNA testing has repeatedly confirmed that there was  
22 only one perpetrator, Brian Dripps, and excluded Tapp as the source of any the perpetrator  
23 DNA evidence found at the crime scene.  
24

25 22. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ actions and omissions, Tapp sustained  
26 injuries and damages, including loss of his freedom for more than twenty years, loss of the  
27 most productive years of his adult life, pain and suffering, mental anguish, emotional  
28

1 distress, indignities, degradation, permanent loss of natural psychological development, and  
2 restrictions on all forms of personal freedom including but not limited to diet, sleep, personal  
3 contact, educational opportunity, vocational opportunity, athletic opportunity, personal  
4 fulfillment, sexual activity, family relations, reading, television, movies, travel, enjoyment,  
5 and freedom of speech and expression.  
6

7 23. Moreover, Tapp sustained discrete, traumatic personal and bodily injuries, some life-  
8 threatening, that were actually and proximately caused by the Defendants' actions, errors, or  
9 omissions—including not only their initial investigatory misconduct but their constitutional  
10 failures in post-conviction years leading to Tapp's continued wrongful imprisonment.  
11

12 24. Even if the City of Idaho Falls and/or individual Defendants may not have expected or  
13 intended to continue to imprison an innocent man or cause these grave injuries, defendants  
14 are nonetheless legally responsible under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 because these injuries are the  
15 foreseeable result of the defendants' recklessness, negligence, or deliberate indifference to  
16 Mr. Tapp's rights, their policies and procedures, and their failure to train and supervise their  
17 employees.  
18

19 25. Mr. Tapp—now free and finally exonerated—brings this lawsuit to hold those who illegally  
20 caused his wrongful conviction and over two decades of wrongful imprisonment accountable.  
21

### 22 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

23 26. This action is brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to redress the deprivation under color of  
24 law of Tapp's rights as secured by the United States Constitution.

25 27. This Court has federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343.

26 28. Supplemental jurisdiction over Tapp's state law claims exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C.  
27 § 1367(a).  
28

1 29. Venue is properly laid in the District of Idaho under U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that this is the  
2 District in which the claim arose.

3 30. Tapp respectfully demands a trial by jury on all issues and claims set forth in this Complaint,  
4 pursuant to the Seventh Amendment of the United States Constitution and Federal Rule of  
5 Civil Procedure 38(b).

6 31. Tapp has complied with the requirements of Idaho Tort Claims Act § 6-901 et seq., and  
7 served Defendant the City of Idaho Falls with a Notice of Claim on December 20, 2019, and  
8 an Amended Notice of Claim on January 17, 2020.

9  
10 **PARTIES**

11 32. Plaintiff **Christopher Tapp** was wrongfully arrested, indicted, prosecuted, tried, convicted,  
12 and imprisoned by the acts of Defendants in this Complaint. He is, and at all times relevant  
13 herein was, an individual residing in the State of Idaho.

14 33. Defendant **City of Idaho Falls** is a municipality incorporated in the State of Idaho. At all  
15 times relevant to this action, the Idaho City Falls Police Department is and was a part, and  
16 under the responsibility, of the City of Idaho Falls.

17 34. Defendant **Jared Fuhriman**, at all times relevant herein, was employed by the IFPD, acting  
18 under color of law and in his individual capacity within the scope of employment pursuant to  
19 the statutes, ordinances, regulations, policies, customs, and usage of the City of Idaho Falls.  
20 Fuhriman went on to serve two terms as the mayor of Idaho Falls. He is sued in his  
21 individual capacity.

22 35. Defendant **Steven G. Finn**, at all times relevant herein, was employed as a Detective by the  
23 IFPD, acting under color of law and in his individual capacity within the scope of  
24



1 employment pursuant to the statutes, ordinances, regulations, policies, customs, and usage of  
2 the City of Idaho Falls. He is sued in his individual capacity.

3 36. Defendant **Ken Brown**, at all times relevant herein, was employed as a Detective by the  
4 IFPD, acting under color of law and in his individual capacity within the scope of  
5 employment pursuant to the statutes, ordinances, regulations, policies, customs, and usage of  
6 the City of Idaho Falls. He is sued in his individual capacity.

8 37. Defendant **Curtis Stacey** was employed as a Sergeant by IFPD, acting under color of law  
9 and in his individual capacity within the scope of employment pursuant to the statutes,  
10 ordinances, regulations, policies, customs, and usage of the City of Idaho Falls. He is sued in  
11 his individual capacity.

13 38. Defendant **Phillip Grimes** was employed as a Detective by the IFPD, acting under color of  
14 law and in his individual capacity within the scope of employment pursuant to the statutes,  
15 ordinances, regulations, policies, customs, and usage of the City of Idaho Falls. He is sued in  
16 his individual capacity.

18 39. Defendant **Kent Livsey**, at all times relevant herein, was the duly appointed and acting Chief  
19 of the IFPD, acting under color of law and in his individual capacity within the scope of  
20 employment pursuant to the statutes, ordinances, regulations, policies, customs, and usage of  
21 the City of Idaho Falls. He is sued in his individual capacity.

23 40. Defendant **Steve Roos**, at all times relevant herein, was the duly appointed and acting Chief  
24 of the IFPD, acting under color of law and in his individual capacity within the scope of  
25 employment pursuant to the statutes, ordinances, regulations, policies, customs, and usage of  
26 the City of Idaho Falls. He is sued in his individual capacity.

**FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

***Brian Dripps rapes and murders Angie Dodge***

1  
2  
3 41. In the early hours of June 13, 1996, Brian Dripps, who was in his thirties, broke into the  
4 apartment of his neighbor, eighteen-year-old Angie Dodge, raped her, and murdered her with  
5 a knife.

6  
7 42. Dripps, who was known to be violent, lived across the street from Dodge at the time of the  
8 crime but had no social contact with her. He was more than a decade older than Dodge.

9 43. Dripps acted alone. Chris Tapp, who was nineteen years old at the time, did not know Dripps  
10 and did not have anything to do with this crime.

11 44. Chris Tapp is completely innocent of the Dodge rape and murder.  
12

13 ***Defendants investigate the murder for months but fail to arrest real killer***

14 45. Responding to a 911 call, IFPD officers arrived at the apartment the next morning and began  
15 their investigation. Defendants Sergeant Curtis Stacey and Detective Ken Brown were among  
16 the first officers at the scene.  
17

18 46. Defendants found Dodge's body lying in the bedroom next to the bed with her throat slashed.  
19 She also had multiple wounds to her chest and hands. Her blue sweatpants were pulled down  
20 and her purple t-shirt was pulled up. There were blood splatters on the wall near the body.

21 47. Confronted with the extensive crime scene, Defendants took only a few dozen photographs,  
22 rather than hundreds of photographs as would have been standard for police investigations of  
23 homicides at the time. In addition, the few photographs Defendants did take were haphazard;  
24 they lacked a ruler and identifying placard, which would have been essential to permit a  
25 viewer to understand the scale and relevance of the photographs, and which was the standard  
26 practice for police investigations of homicides at the time.  
27  
28

1 48. Defendants knew from the evidence at the scene that the crime had a single perpetrator. They  
2 also collected or supervised the collection of samples for a rape kit from Dodge's body and  
3 collected samples of bodily fluids from the scene.

4 49. Defendants interviewed Dodge's neighbors and friends. They learned Dodge had last been  
5 seen alive around 12:20 a.m. on June 13 when friends who had been visiting with her left her  
6 apartment.

7  
8 50. The case quickly grew into one of the highest-profile cases that IFPD had ever worked. The  
9 Chief of Police, Kent Livsey, quickly became directly involved in supervising the  
10 investigation, including providing multiple statements about the progress of the investigation  
11 to the press.  
12

13 51. Within days of the murder, as part of their investigation, IFPD officers questioned the true  
14 perpetrator, Brian Dripps. Dripps, who lived in a basement apartment across the street from  
15 Dodge, admitted to the police that he was out until 3:00 am the night Dodge was raped and  
16 murdered—the very window of time that the crime occurred—and claimed to be too drunk to  
17 remember anyone he would have seen. Despite this suspicious statement, Dripps's proximity  
18 to Dodge, and his violent reputation, Defendants either failed to investigate Dripps further or  
19 failed to report the results of any investigation they did conduct. Although the IFPD took  
20 blood samples for DNA testing from at least *sixty-five* other men during their investigation,  
21 Defendants did not take a sample from Dripps. If Defendants had done so, they would have  
22 correctly solved the murder and spared Tapp.  
23  
24

25 52. Moreover, on information and belief, two police officers on bicycles were covering that  
26 neighborhood in the early morning hours of June 13, 1996—the night of the crime, and at a  
27 time Dripps had told the police he was out on the street. However, these officers either failed  
28

1 to document their interactions that night, or thereafter destroyed any documentation of those  
2 interactions.

3 53. Instead, Defendants learned that Dodge was part of a group of friends that spent time along  
4 the Snake River, which runs through the center of Idaho Falls and is accessible at various  
5 points to the public.

6  
7 54. Defendants interviewed multiple members of that group of friends, including Chris Tapp.

8 55. Tapp, then nineteen years old, was a lifelong resident of Idaho Falls.

9 56. Tapp gave a voluntary statement to Defendant Phillip Grimes in November, answering  
10 questions about who Dodge had interacted with at the Snake River. Tapp truthfully told  
11 Grimes that he had never been to Dodge's apartment. Along with dozens of other teenaged  
12 boys and young men, Tapp also voluntarily gave a blood sample in late 1996.

13  
14 57. Consistent with the objective evidence at the crime scene and Defendants' theory at this point  
15 in the investigation that the crime had been committed by a single perpetrator, once these  
16 young men were excluded as the source of the semen at the scene, Defendants no longer  
17 pursued them as suspects.

18  
19 ***Defendants focus their investigation on Benjamin Hobbs after learning Hobbs had been***  
20 ***arrested on unrelated charges in Nevada***

21 58. After nearly six months of investigation into the murder, Defendants had failed to follow up  
22 on their interviews with the true perpetrator, Dripps, and their investigation was faltering.  
23 Then, on January 6, 1997, Defendants learned that a young man named Benjamin Hobbs—  
24 who was one of the teenagers that hung out at the Snake River—had been arrested on an  
25 unrelated rape charge in Ely, Nevada. Hobbs had been an acquaintance of Dodge and was a  
26 friend of Tapp.  
27  
28

1 59. Facing mounting pressure to solve this high-profile crime, Defendants, out of desperation,  
2 decided to focus their investigation on Hobbs (and his friends to the extent they might  
3 provide evidence incriminating Hobbs), despite the fact that absolutely no evidence linked  
4 Hobbs or any of his friends, including Tapp, to the crime.

5 60. The very next day, Defendants Jared Fuhriman and Grimes drove Tapp to the police station  
6 to question him.

7  
8 ***Defendants subject Tapp to nearly sixty hours of coercive and manipulative interrogations and***  
9 ***sham polygraphs to wring multiple false confessions from him***

10 61. Defendants first interviewed Tapp on January 7, 1997. Tapp was cooperative and truthfully  
11 denied any knowledge of or involvement in the crime.

12 62. Fuhriman, along with Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and Finn, set out on a continuous course of  
13 coercion, manipulation, threats, and false promises to secure a false confession from Tapp.  
14 At this point, Defendants' theory was that Hobbs was the sole perpetrator. Their aim in  
15 questioning Tapp was to pressure Tapp into providing evidence against Hobbs.

16  
17 63. To pressure Tapp into implicating Hobbs, right from the start, Fuhriman lied to Tapp, telling  
18 him it looked like Tapp had been involved in Dodge's murder—despite Tapp's actual  
19 innocence, the lack of any evidence whatsoever connecting him to the crime, and the fact that  
20 Defendants' goal in this interrogation was to pressure Tapp into providing evidence against  
21 Hobbs. Fuhriman also, from the beginning, threatened to "fry" Tapp when Tapp said,  
22 truthfully, that he knew nothing about the crime.

23  
24 64. Throughout this campaign of coercion, Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, and Stacey acted  
25 either at Chief Livsey's direction or with his knowledge and consent.

26  
27 65. Fuhriman, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and Finn conducted this campaign of coercion under  
28 Livsey's supervision. When Tapp's mother tried to put a stop to the interrogations, Livsey

1 even personally intervened to try to convince Tapp’s mother to let the interrogations  
2 continue.

3 66. Over the course of the next three weeks—between January 7, 1997, and February 1, 1997—  
4 Fuhriman, Brown, Stacey, Grimes, and Finn subjected Tapp to a total of nine interrogations  
5 and seven sham polygraph examinations, in sum about sixty hours. These interrogations  
6 lasted for hours at a time, and even during “breaks” Fuhriman, Brown, Stacey, Grimes, and  
7 Finn continued to coerce, manipulate, question, and pressure Tapp. Defendants also  
8 threatened Tapp with death multiple times, lied to him, and refused his requests for real  
9 breaks, even when the exhausted and often sobbing Tapp repeatedly begged for them.  
10

11 67. Despite the absence of any evidence against him, Fuhriman arrested Tapp on January 11,  
12 1997, on the charge that Tapp was an accessory to Dodge’s murder.  
13

14 68. Through the course of these interrogations, Defendants coerced, pressured, and manipulated  
15 Tapp into falsely confessing to this crime. Defendants’ coercion included conducting seven  
16 polygraph examinations in which they repeatedly lied to Tapp and told him he had failed the  
17 polygraphs. Defendants’ abuse of these sham polygraphs was not in the service of  
18 ascertaining the truth, but rather to overbear Tapp’s will in order to coerce him into making  
19 several false confessions. Defendants also coerced Tapp by threatening him multiple times  
20 with death by electric chair and gas chamber.  
21

22 69. Defendants conducted this campaign of coercion and manipulation despite learning of  
23 exculpatory DNA evidence that any reasonable officer would have realized proved Tapp’s  
24 innocence. Yet, each and every time—rather than accept Tapp’s innocence—Defendants  
25 instead, unreasonably, changed their theory of the case and manipulated Tapp into confessing  
26 to a new version of the story that fit whatever Defendants’ current theory of the case was.  
27  
28

1 70. Defendants learned on January 17, 1997, that Tapp's and Hobbs's DNA did not match the  
2 semen found at the scene. Because the objective evidence at the scene indicated it was a  
3 single-perpetrator crime, any reasonable officer would have known that this DNA evidence  
4 conclusively excluded Tapp as the perpetrator of this crime. Nor could Tapp be Hobbs's  
5 accomplice when Hobbs was likewise conclusively excluded as the source of the semen left  
6 by the perpetrator.  
7

8 71. But despite this conclusive evidence of Tapp's innocence, Defendants continued their  
9 campaign of coercion and manipulation to force Tapp to falsely confess to multiple versions  
10 of the crime that fit Defendants' evolving evidence and theory of the case.  
11

12 72. Throughout the three-week gauntlet which Defendants put Tapp through, Defendants caused  
13 Tapp to falsely confess not once, but nearly half a dozen times to different versions of the  
14 crime. As Defendants learned new facts about the case, they coerced new confessions from  
15 Tapp to match their shifting theory of the case.  
16

17 73. Defendants first coerced Tapp into saying, falsely, that though he had not been at Dodge's  
18 apartment the night of the murder, Hobbs had killed Dodge and then confessed to Tapp.

19 74. Defendants then forced Tapp to change this story a second time, perhaps realizing it would  
20 be better to have him as a witness to the crime itself: in this version, Defendants coerced  
21 Tapp to falsely state he had been with Hobbs at Dodge's apartment, that Hobbs had argued  
22 with Dodge, and that he witnessed Hobbs attack Dodge with a knife. In this version of  
23 Defendants' story, Tapp ran out of the building and hid before later re-entering the apartment  
24 and seeing Dodge's body.  
25

26 75. This false and coerced confession did not match the evidence from the crime scene, as  
27 Defendants well knew. For example, Dodge's apartment door locked from the outside, and so  
28

1 there was no way that Tapp could have left the apartment and then reentered without a key.

2 But rather than acknowledge that the confessions that they had wrung from Tapp were false  
3 and that Tapp was completely innocent, Defendants pushed to have Tapp charged with the  
4 murder.

5 76. Yet shortly after Defendants coerced Tapp into making the second false confession,  
6

7 Defendants learned that neither Tapp nor Hobbs matched the DNA from the semen found on  
8 the victim, meaning that the most recent account of events Defendants coerced from Tapp  
9 did not match the actual evidence in the case: Neither Tapp nor Hobbs was the perpetrator.

10 77. And so Defendants pressured Tapp into “confessing” to yet another version of events.  
11

12 Defendants first fed Tapp the name of a third young man, Jeremy Sargis, just as they had fed  
13 Tapp Hobbs’ name earlier. Defendants then coerced Tapp into falsely confessing that Tapp,  
14 Hobbs, and Sargis had entered Dodge’s apartment, that Tapp saw Hobbs and Sargis sexually  
15 assault Dodge, and that Hobbs and Sargis then stabbed her. But DNA testing results a week  
16 later excluded Sargis as the source of the DNA at the scene, too.  
17

18 78. Defendants then coerced and pressured Tapp into making a fourth “confession.” But this  
19

20 time, Defendants did not have a name to feed Tapp. And so, this time, when Defendants  
21 coerced Tapp into saying that the third man was not Sargis, but another man who was with  
22 Tapp and Hobbs in Dodge’s apartment, Tapp could only “confess” that he did not remember  
23 the third man’s name. In this version of events, Defendants also coerced Tapp into  
24 “confessing” to having held down Dodge during the attack.

25 79. A few days later, Defendants coerced Tapp into making a fifth and final false “confession”—  
26

27 that Hobbs had threatened Tapp and forced Tapp to participate in the crime, and so Tapp had  
28 cut Dodge across the chest.



1 80. On February 3, 1997, a warrant of arrest was issued for Tapp and he was indicted by criminal  
2 complaint with murder in the first degree, in violation of Idaho Code §§ 18-4001, 18-4002,  
3 and 18-4003(a), and rape, in violation of Idaho Code §§ 18-6101(3), (4).

4 ***Defendants feed Tapp secret facts about the crime to fabricate a false confession from Tapp***

5 81. As none of the DNA at the scene matched Tapp, Hobbs, or Sargis, Defendants knew or  
6 should have known that the stories they had coerced Tapp into “confessing” to were false. So  
7 Defendants took steps to falsely bolster the appearance of reliability of Tapp’s coerced  
8 confessions.  
9

10 82. Because Tapp had nothing to do with the crime and therefore knew nothing about it, to make  
11 Tapp’s “confessions” appear reliable, for every one of Tapp’s coerced false confessions,  
12 Defendants Fuhriman, Brown, Stacey, Grimes, and Finn fed Tapp non-public details of the  
13 crime known only to the IFPD and the real perpetrator, Dripps.  
14

15 83. During smoke breaks and other pauses in the interrogations, Defendants told Tapp the story  
16 they wanted him to tell and fed him non-public facts about the crime to weave into that story.  
17 They then falsely reported that those stories and facts originated with Tapp. Defendants also  
18 took Tapp to Dodge’s apartment, where they threatened him with rape and death, and  
19 provided him with yet more non-public details about the crime.  
20

21 84. For example, and without limitation:

- 22 a. Defendants knew that Dodge had a long cut on her right breast from the autopsy  
23 and from viewing the crime scene and photographs of it. Defendants, including  
24 but not limited to Fuhriman, Grimes, Brown, and Finn, provided this fact to Tapp  
25 and then, when Tapp repeated that fact back to them, falsely reported that Tapp  
26 had volunteered that non-public fact. Defendants then misrepresented that the  
27  
28

1 only way that Tapp could have known that Dodge had a cut on her breast was if  
2 he had committed the crime. Fuhriman also falsely stated in his report that Tapp  
3 had volunteered that he had cut Angie across the right breast.

4 b. Defendants knew that Dodge had been hit in the face from the autopsy.

5 Defendants, including but not limited to Fuhriman, Grimes, Brown, and Finn,  
6 provided this fact to Tapp and then falsely reported that Tapp had volunteered that  
7 non-public fact. They then misrepresented that the only way that Tapp could have  
8 known that fact was if he had committed the crime.

9 c. Defendants knew the layout of Dodge's apartment, including which entryway and  
10 porch led to that apartment. Defendants, including but not limited to Fuhriman  
11 and Finn, provided that information to Tapp and then falsely reported that Tapp  
12 had volunteered this non-public information. Defendants then misrepresented that  
13 the only way that Tapp could have known this was if he had been in Dodge's  
14 apartment before, and thus that his supposed knowledge of the apartment  
15 corroborated his confession.

16 d. Defendants knew that Dodge was found wearing sweatpants and a t-shirt, and that  
17 the sweatpants were found pulled halfway down Dodge's legs. Defendants,  
18 including but not limited to Fuhriman and Finn, provided this information to Tapp  
19 and then falsely represented that Tapp had volunteered this non-public fact. They  
20 then misrepresented that the only way that Tapp could have known that fact was if  
21 he had committed the crime.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 85. Despite Defendants' lies that Tapp provided multiple inculpatory non-public facts to them  
2 over the course of their interrogations and polygraphs, in reality, and as Defendants knew,  
3 Tapp only knew these facts because Defendants had provided them to him.

4 ***Defendants fabricate additional inculpatory evidence against Tapp***

5 86. Not content with their coerced confessions and lies about the source of the nonpublic facts  
6 included in those confessions, Defendants, including but not limited to Fuhriman, also  
7 fabricated from whole cloth inculpatory evidence against Tapp.  
8

9 87. For example, and without limitation, Fuhriman asked Tapp where semen would be found on  
10 Dodge's body. Defendants knew that semen had been found on Dodge's leg.  
11

12 88. But Tapp, who is totally innocent of this crime and therefore had no idea where semen was  
13 found on Dodge's body, guessed wrong: He guessed that semen was found on her stomach.

14 89. Defendants, including Fuhriman, knew that the real perpetrator would know that semen  
15 would have been found on Dodge's leg, not her stomach. And so Defendants, including  
16 Fuhriman, fabricated that, although Tapp had said that semen might be located on Dodge's  
17 upper body, above her waist, Tapp had motioned to indicate that the semen would have been  
18 on her thighs.  
19

20 ***Defendants shore up their false and fabricated confession by coercing a vulnerable young***  
21 ***woman into falsely stating that Tapp had confessed to her***

22 90. Defendants knew that the evidence against Tapp was extraordinarily weak: a coerced and  
23 false confession only produced through hours of abusive and coercive polygraphs and  
24 interrogations and based solely on facts fed to Tapp by Defendants. And so Defendants set  
25 out to shore up their coerced confession by coercing a fabricated statement against Tapp from  
26 a vulnerable young woman named Destiny Osborne, whom Defendants could threaten and  
27 manipulate.  
28

1 91. Osborne was just a teenager when Defendants decided to coerce a fabricated statement from  
2 her. At the time, Osborne was so heavily addicted to methamphetamine that, from 1996 to  
3 1998, she spent time in a residential behavior health center for that addiction. Osborne did  
4 not know Hobbs and knew Tapp only as an acquaintance.

5 92. When Osborne first spoke to Defendants in February 1997, she told police that she had last  
6 seen Dodge the day before her murder, but had little other evidence to offer.  
7

8 93. Undeterred by the truth, Defendants, including Fuhriman, Brown, Stacey, and Grimes  
9 decided to coerce and fabricate a false story from Osborne to corroborate the false and  
10 fabricated confession they had coerced from Tapp.

11 94. Osborne initially told Fuhriman, Brown, and Grimes honestly that she knew nothing about  
12 the crime and did not even know Hobbs.  
13

14 95. But as with Tapp, Fuhriman, Brown, Grimes, and Stacey were unsatisfied with Osborne's  
15 truthful answer that she knew nothing about the crime. Instead, Fuhriman, Brown, Grimes,  
16 and Stacey repeatedly told Osborne that she had blocked out or suppressed the memory.  
17

18 96. Fuhriman, Brown, Grimes, and Stacey also threatened to arrest Osborne unless she told them  
19 what they wanted to hear.

20 97. Finally, after Defendants' repeated interrogation and threats, Osborne agreed to falsely report  
21 that she had heard Tapp confess.  
22

23 98. Fuhriman, Brown, Grimes, and Stacey then fed Osborne exactly the story they wanted her to  
24 tell. When she got something "wrong", they would "correct" her by telling her again what  
25 they wanted her to say.

26 99. Defendants thus coerced Osborne into falsely stating that she had been at a party after  
27 Dodge's murder and had overheard Tapp and Hobbs confess to the crime.  
28

1 100. Brown then fabricated a report of Defendants’ conversation with Osborne. That report stated  
2 that he had received a call from someone who worked at the residential treatment facility  
3 where Osborne was housed. Brown went on to report that he and Stacey had gone to speak  
4 with Osborne, who was “very nervous” and told them that she had overheard Tapp and  
5 Hobbs talking at a party about having murdered Dodge.  
6

7 101. Brown’s report was totally fabricated: Osborne did not know Hobbs; there was no such  
8 party; and Osborne never heard Tapp and Hobbs—who are totally innocent of this crime—  
9 confess.  
10

11 102. Brown’s report also completely omitted that he, Fuhrman, Grimes, and Stacey had  
12 spoken to Osborne multiple times, and that they had pressured, coerced, and threatened  
13 Osborne for hours before she finally made inculpatory false statements against Tapp. And  
14 Brown further omitted from his report that Defendants had fed Osborne the story they wanted  
15 her to tell. Instead, they falsely reported, just as they had done with Tapp, that the story came  
16 unprompted from Osborne.  
17

18 103. Fuhrman, Brown, Grimes, and Stacey also failed to record or destroyed any recordings of  
19 their multiple conversations with Osborne.  
20

21 104. On information and belief, given the high-profile nature of the investigation and Livsey’s  
22 involvement in the interrogations of Tapp, Livsey knew or should have known that Fuhrman,  
23 Brown, Grimes, and Stacey had coerced and fabricated this false inculpatory report.  
24

25 ***Based on Defendants’ false and fabricated evidence, Tapp is tried, convicted, and sentenced to***  
26 ***life in prison***  
27

28 105. Defendants knew or should have known that Tapp’s confession and Osborne’s statement  
were false, fabricated, and the result of Defendants’ own suggestion, threats, and coercion.

1 106. Defendants withheld from both the prosecutor and Tapp's defense attorneys that they had  
2 fed Tapp facts about the crime and then falsely claimed that those facts came from Tapp, that  
3 they had fabricated inculpatory evidence against Tapp, and that they had coerced and  
4 threatened Osborne into offering inculpatory false evidence against Tapp.

5 107. Prior to trial, Tapp moved to suppress his confession on the grounds that he had been  
6 denied the right to counsel and that the interrogations were coercive. Fuhriman, Brown, and  
7 Stacey all testified at his suppression hearing. Fuhriman and Brown testified falsely,  
8 consistent with their earlier reports, that Tapp had volunteered non-public facts. Based on  
9 Defendants' false evidence, Tapp's motion was denied in substantial part.

10 108. Tapp stood trial beginning May 12, 1998, on charges of murder in the first degree, rape,  
11 and deadly weapon enhancements in the commission of a felony. Prosecutors sought the  
12 death penalty.  
13

14 109. At trial, based on the false and fabricated evidence reported by Defendants, the  
15 prosecution argued that Tapp, with Hobbs, had raped and murdered Dodge.  
16

17 110. The jury was told that Tapp had confessed to participating in the rape and murder of  
18 Dodge, and that his confession was corroborated by the fact that he had provided multiple  
19 non-public facts, including that Dodge had been cut across the right breast, the location and  
20 layout of Dodge's apartment, that Dodge had been found wearing sweatpants pulled partway  
21 down her legs, and that semen had been found on Dodge's leg.  
22

23 111. But, because Defendants concealed their egregious misconduct from the prosecution and  
24 defense, the jury never learned that each and every one of the non-public facts—which the  
25 prosecution identified as evidence that Tapp had knowledge of the crime that only the real  
26 perpetrator could have known—had actually been fed to Tapp by Defendants.  
27  
28

1 112. Osborne’s testimony was also offered against Tapp. Based on Defendants’ continued  
2 threats and coercion, Osborne gave the story that Defendants had fed her: that she had  
3 overheard Tapp and Hobbs confess at a party to murdering Dodge.

4 113. Just as with Tapp’s coerced false confession, because Defendants concealed their  
5 egregious misconduct from the prosecution and defense, the jury never learned that  
6 Osborne’s testimony was false, fabricated, and fed to Osborne by Defendants.  
7

8 114. On May 28, 1998, based on Defendants’ false and fabricated evidence, and after thirteen  
9 hours of deliberation, the jury returned guilty verdicts against Tapp on all counts.

10 115. Following a sentencing hearing on December 10, 1998, at which the prosecutor pressed  
11 for a death sentence, the judge sentenced Tapp on December 11 to serve a sentence of life in  
12 prison plus 15 years and a fixed term of 30 years on the murder conviction and a term of 20  
13 years with a fixed term of 10 years on the rape conviction.  
14

15 116. Although Tapp was prosecuted on a theory he had committed the crime with Hobbs,  
16 Hobbs was not prosecuted.  
17

18 ***Tapp’s wrongful conviction was the result of unconstitutional policies and practices of the***  
19 ***Idaho Falls Police Department***

20 117. Tapp’s wrongful conviction was also the direct result of the IFPD’s unconstitutional  
21 investigative policies, practices, customs, and failure to supervise. First, the Chief of Police,  
22 Kent Livsey, was directly involved in supervising this high-profile investigation. On  
23 information and belief, Livsey was aware of the rampant misconduct in the Dodge  
24 investigation and at least tacitly endorsed it.  
25

26 118. The widespread and extraordinary misconduct in the Dodge investigation was also part of  
27 a broader pattern of IFPD investigative misconduct. No later than the early 1990s, the IFPD  
28 had a pattern, practice, and/or custom of unconstitutional conduct during criminal

1 investigations, including coercing or suggesting confessions, fabricating evidence, and  
2 systematically failing to supervise and discipline officers, including but not limited to  
3 Fuhriman, enabling such misconduct to persist. On information and belief, the City of Idaho  
4 Falls, through its policymakers, had prior notice of this pattern of unconstitutional  
5 misconduct, based on the open and notorious nature of the misconduct, including the  
6 acquiescence and participation of IFPD supervisors.  
7

8 119. This policy, practice, or custom involved the use of various techniques to coerce or  
9 fabricate confessions and/or incriminatory statements, including without limitation: the use  
10 of threats, false promises of leniency, psychological manipulation, sham polygraphs,  
11 leveraging or exploiting vulnerabilities of witnesses or suspects, including mental  
12 vulnerabilities, threatening criminal penalties, and perjury and false statements in police and  
13 court documents and proceedings.  
14

15 120. This policy, practice, or custom also involved the use of various techniques to make false  
16 statements appear true and reliable, including, without limitation: providing a witness or  
17 suspect with details about the crime that only the real perpetrator or police could know,  
18 whether through leading questions or more direct communication; taking misleading steps to  
19 make coerced statements appear as if they originated from the suspect following a lawful  
20 interrogation; and misrepresenting that a suspect's formal statement was a verbatim  
21 statement in the suspect's own words.  
22

23  
24 121. On information and belief, this policy, practice, or custom was either promulgated of the  
25 Idaho Falls Police Department's policymaker, or allowed to develop and continue, unabated,  
26 with his explicit knowledge and consent. That policymaker also failed to discipline the  
27  
28



1 multiple officers who engaged in this misconduct, further allowing these unconstitutional  
2 practices to continue.

3 122. The Dodge murder investigation is itself a striking example of the IFPD's systemic  
4 failure to supervise, train, and discipline its officers and detectives. In this investigation  
5 alone, seven IFPD officers and detectives coordinated to coerce multiple false and fabricated  
6 confessions from a suspect and to coerce a false and fabricated witness statement. Moreover,  
7 this misconduct happened under the direct supervision of Livesey, the IFPD Chief of Police  
8 himself. If the IFPD had had a constitutionally adequate training and supervision structure,  
9 such widespread misconduct would not have occurred.

10  
11 123. Nor was Tapp's case an isolated incident. For example, in 1991, on information and  
12 belief, Fuhriman coerced a woman named Sylvia Canido into testifying that her ex-husband,  
13 Michael Whiteley, had raped and kidnapped her. Fuhriman, a church bishop in the Church of  
14 the Latter-Day Saints, threatened Canido with excommunication if she did not lie. On the  
15 basis of the false testimony that Fuhriman coerced from Canido, Whiteley was tried and  
16 convicted of rape and kidnapping and sentenced to life in prison.

17  
18 124. The City of Idaho Falls also had in force and effect a policy, practice, or custom of failing  
19 to adequately supervise and discipline IFPD officers in the exercise of their constitutional  
20 obligations, including their obligations not to fabricate evidence, commit perjury, or hide  
21 exculpatory evidence. This failure by policymakers to properly train, supervise or discipline  
22 their subordinates amounted to deliberate indifference to the rights of those who came into  
23 contact with IFPD officers.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 ***Tapp continues to fight to demonstrate his innocence with the help of his defense attorney,***  
2 ***leading experts, the Innocence Project, and even the victim's mother***

3 125. Even after his conviction, Tapp did not stop fighting to demonstrate his innocence. In the  
4 decades after his conviction Tapp filed an appeal and multiple unsuccessful petitions for  
5 post-conviction relief.

6 126. By the mid-2000s, Tapp had found an unlikely ally in his fight to prove his innocence:  
7 Angie Dodge's mother, Carol Dodge.

8 127. Years after her daughter's murder, Carol Dodge had decided to watch the tapes of Tapp's  
9 polygraphs and interrogations. And despite her belief at the time of Tapp's trial—based on  
10 misrepresentations by Defendants—that Tapp was guilty, watching those tapes in their  
11 entirety, combined with the exculpatory results of DNA testing, convinced her of Tapp's  
12 innocence. Carol Dodge then became one of Tapp's fiercest advocates.

13 128. Carol Dodge, in coordination with Tapp's criminal defense attorney, John Thomas,  
14 reached out to experts in false confessions and polygraphs about Tapp's case.

15 129. In 2012, Carol Dodge began to correspond with Retired Judge Michael Heavey of Judges  
16 for Justice.

17 130. Judge Heavey investigated the case and enlisted the help of leading experts with long and  
18 distinguished careers at the FBI in crime scene investigation, proper interrogation practices,  
19 and the science and application of polygraphs.

20 131. Together, Tapp, Carol Dodge, Judge Heavey fought to demonstrate Tapp's innocence.

21 ***Defendants refuse to conduct additional investigation that would***  
22 ***have exonerated Tapp years earlier***

23 132. In 2001, post-conviction DNA testing of the semen found on Dodge's left leg had  
24 identified a partial profile of the then-unknown man who raped and murdered Dodge. That  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 profile was entered into the FBI's Combined DNA Index System ("CODIS") system, but  
2 returned no match.

3 133. In 2008, after years of urging by Tapp's attorneys, including the Idaho Innocence Project,  
4 and the victim's mother, additional DNA testing on the hairs found at the crime scene  
5 determined that the hairs were consistent with the profile developed in 2001. That new, more  
6 complete profile was again entered into the CODIS system, but again returned no match.  
7

8 134. In 2009, the Idaho Innocence Project sent a letter to Defendant Steve Roos, the then-  
9 IFPD Chief of Police, explaining that a new technique called Familial, or low stringency,  
10 searching permitted law enforcement to compare DNA profiles to databases and identify  
11 possible relatives of a perpetrator. Because this technique could identify not only the exact  
12 match, but also the family members of a match, it was more comprehensive than the FBI's  
13 CODIS system.  
14

15 135. The Idaho Innocence Project's letter also explained that, while Idaho did not yet use this  
16 technique, the Innocence Project had contacted Colorado and California, and that those states  
17 were happy to help the IFPD run the samples taken from the crime scene and attempt to  
18 locate the as-yet unidentified source of the semen and hair found on Dodge's body, so long  
19 as the IFPD made the request. That letter even included a template email for Defendants to  
20 send, contact information for the appropriate people and entities in California and Colorado,  
21 a form with mailing instructions for the laboratory, and a list of the requirements for the use  
22 of California's database.  
23  
24

25 136. Despite being handed this easy, straightforward, and obvious investigative step on a  
26 silver platter, Defendants, including but not limited to Roos, Fuhriman, Finn, Brown, Stacey,  
27 and/or Grimes, failed to act. On information and belief, based on Defendants' false  
28

1 representations about the evidence, the Idaho State Police denied the request to compare the  
2 samples taken from the crime scene to the California and Colorado databases.

3 137. The true murderer, Brian Dripps, lived in California after murdering Dodge, and had  
4 multiple children there.

5 138. On information and belief, had Defendants, including Roos, sent the samples to the  
6 California and Colorado databases for low stringency testing, the true perpetrator, Dripps,  
7 would have been identified and Tapp would have been exonerated nearly a decade earlier. As  
8 a result of their refusal to conduct this simple investigatory act, Tapp continued to languish in  
9 prison for nearly another decade for a crime he did not commit.  
10

11 ***New evidence confirms Tapp's innocence—and Defendants do nothing to free him***  
12

13 139. In September 2012, IFPD sent samples taken from Dodge's shirt and pants and a teddy  
14 bear from the crime scene to a DNA testing laboratory for additional, more advanced, DNA  
15 testing. In early 2013, Defendants received the report from that additional DNA testing. That  
16 testing compared those samples to Tapp and Hobbs' DNA and excluded both men as the  
17 source of the DNA found on the shirt, pants, and teddy bear. In other words, the results of the  
18 2013 testing again conclusively excluded Tapp and Hobbs as the perpetrators.  
19

20 140. But, as part of that 2012–2013 testing, Defendants refused to conduct Y-STR testing on  
21 the original semen samples taken from Dodge's body, and so prevented the laboratory from  
22 creating a full Y paternal "profile" of the true perpetrator.  
23

24 141. Defendants' theory by the time of Tapp's final false confession, and the theory presented  
25 at trial, was that Tapp's role in the crime was assisting Hobbs as Hobbs raped Dodge. As a  
26 result, when the 2013 testing concluded that Hobbs and Tapp were excluded as the source of  
27  
28

1 any and all DNA found at the scene, Defendants knew or should have known that their  
2 theory of the case was wrong, and that Tapp was actually innocent.

3 142. But, yet again, rather than acknowledge Tapp's innocence, Defendants, including but not  
4 limited to, on information and belief, Fuhriman, Finn, Brown, Stacey, Grimes, Livsey, and/or  
5 Roos, instead worked to keep Tapp wrongfully convicted and incarcerated.  
6

7 143. In 2013, Judge Heavey, together with Carol Dodge and John Thomas, enlisted the help of  
8 Steven Drizin, a professor at Northwestern University and one of the nation's leading experts  
9 in false confessions, to review the tapes and offer an opinion. Dr. Drizin produced a report on  
10 Defendants' interrogations of Tapp. That report examined at length the extraordinarily  
11 coercive behavior of the police and concluded that there was absolutely no evidence that  
12 Tapp was at the crime scene or that he participated in in the murder. Indeed, Dr. Drizin  
13 concluded: "The one certainty that emerges from the police investigation is that the rapist and  
14 murderer of Angie Dodge is still on the loose."  
15

16 144. Heavey, Carol Dodge, and Thomas also enlisted the help of a leading FBI expert in  
17 police practices, Gregg O. McCrary, who produced a report which determined that  
18 Defendants had "manipulated Mr. Tapp through a series of explicit threats and promises,  
19 used false evidence ploys, asked a host of leading questions and continually contaminated the  
20 interrogation by disclosing nonpublic details of the crime and crime scene." He concluded  
21 that "[t]his is a false confession."  
22

23 145. On May 1, 2013, Tapp's second Petition for Post-Conviction Relief was dismissed.  
24 Because of Defendants' determination to ignore evidence of Tapp's innocence and refusal to  
25 pursue evidence that might lead to the identification of the true murderer, Tapp remained  
26 wrongfully imprisoned for a crime he did not commit.  
27  
28

***While Tapp is fighting to prove his innocence, Defendants smear Tapp in the press***

1  
2 146. Even after multiple rounds of DNA testing had excluded Tapp as the perpetrator and  
3 numerous experts had determined that Tapp’s confessions were false, Defendants continued  
4 to publicly and falsely claim that Tapp was guilty.

5  
6 147. In 2012, Fuhriman—then the Mayor of Idaho Falls—gave an interview to NBC Dateline,  
7 in which he lied and said that Tapp had provided non-public information that was “absolutely  
8 ... not fed,” and that there were “no doubts” in Fuhriman’s mind that “Tapp is part of the  
9 homicide itself.”

10  
11 148. In 2016, the Idaho Falls Police Department again falsely indicated to the press that Tapp  
12 was guilty.

13 ***New advanced testing identifies the DNA profile of the true perpetrator***  
14 ***and again conclusively excludes Tapp***

15 149. In 2014, a profile obtained from some, but not all, the semen taken from the crime scene  
16 was at last compared against a database operated by the Sorenson Molecular Genealogy  
17 Foundation and Ancestry.com. That testing identified the family tree of the true perpetrator.

18 150. Over the next two years, Idaho Falls investigators attempted to trace this family line of  
19 the true perpetrator, but were unable to identify him.

20  
21 151. In 2016, Idaho Falls investigators finally allowed the Sorenson Molecular Genealogy  
22 Foundation to conduct Y testing of the DNA taken from the semen samples from Dodge’s  
23 body and clothes, thus allowing for a complete Y DNA profile of all the perpetrator DNA  
24 found at the crime scene. This testing once again identified the profile of a single  
25 perpetrator—and conclusively excluded Tapp.  
26  
27  
28

1 152. This result yet again confirmed what Defendants knew or should have known all along:  
2 Only one person was responsible for the rape and murder of Angie Dodge, and that person  
3 was not Chris Tapp.

4 ***The State finally agrees to release Tapp from prison—but refuses to exonerate him***

5 153. In 2017, faced with the totality of the evidence that Tapp and his defense attorneys had  
6 assembled since his conviction demonstrating that Tapp was not the perpetrator, the State  
7 finally agreed to release Tapp from prison.  
8

9 154. But despite the evidence of Tapp’s innocence—Tapp’s DNA did not match the DNA  
10 profile of the perpetrator and multiple experts had determined that Tapp’s confession was  
11 coerced and false—the City refused to exonerate Tapp.  
12

13 155. Instead, the City offered Tapp a Hobson’s choice: it offered to dismiss and vacate Tapp’s  
14 rape conviction and consent to release Tapp from prison, but leave Tapp’s wrongful murder  
15 conviction standing.  
16

17 156. Faced with such a choice, after having spent decades wrongfully imprisoned, Tapp  
18 agreed. On March 22, 2017, the court entered an order amending Tapp’s conviction,  
19 dismissing his rape charge, and ordering Tapp released from prison.

20 ***New DNA testing identifies the true perpetrator as Brian Dripps***

21 157. In the spring of 2017, Idaho Falls investigators submitted a portion of the semen sample  
22 for genetic genealogy testing. Once the expansive DNA profile was revealed, a genealogy  
23 laboratory used an ancestry database to identify third cousins of the unidentified source of the  
24 semen sample. The genealogist constructed a family tree from the third cousins and  
25 eventually identified the most likely source of the semen: Brian Dripps. Investigators realized  
26 that Dripps had resided across the street from Angie Dodge at the time of the murder.  
27  
28

1 158. Investigators surreptitiously collected a cigarette butt that Dripps discarded and tested  
2 that cigarette for DNA. The profile from the cigarette matched the DNA from the semen and  
3 hair found on Dodge's body.

4 159. On May 15, 2019, Dripps was brought in for questioning about Dodge's murder. He  
5 admitted his guilt, explained that he had acted alone, and acknowledged that he did not know  
6 Tapp.  
7

8 160. On May 16, 2019, the IFPD held a press conference in which they announced that they  
9 had identified Dripps as the source of all the suspect DNA, including the semen, found at the  
10 murder of Angie Dodge and that Dripps was being charged with the rape and murder of  
11 Dodge.  
12

13 161. The IFPD spent the next eight weeks investigating and successfully verifying Dripps's  
14 admission that he acted alone. Dripps is currently awaiting trial for the rape and murder.  
15

16 162. Because of Defendants' misconduct, not only did Tapp spend more than two decades  
17 wrongfully convicted, but the true murderer remained free to commit other crimes for over  
18 twenty years. Nor has there been, on information and belief, any serious attempt to determine  
19 whether Dripps committed other violent felonies since he raped and murdered Dodge in  
20 1996.  
21

22 ***Destiny Osborne admits that her testimony against Tapp was false and the result of  
23 Defendants' coercion and misconduct***

24 163. While Tapp continued to struggle to demonstrate his innocence from prison, Destiny  
25 Osborne, the teenager whom Defendants had coerced into testifying against Tapp, finally  
26 admitted the truth.  
27  
28



1 164. In 2017, Osborne admitted to Carol Dodge that her trial testimony against Tapp had been  
2 false. She admitted that the story was entirely fabricated by Defendants and that she had only  
3 testified against Tapp because of Defendants' coercion.

4 165. Later, Osborne confirmed this story in an interview with the *Idaho Falls Post Register*,  
5 telling the newspaper that she was "manipulated and coerced and fed a huge story and  
6 threatened 23 years ago . . . to falsely testify against Chris Tapp." She told the *Post Register*  
7 that she was "literally . . . fed what [she] did say."  
8

9 ***Tapp is at last exonerated***

10 166. Only *after* the true perpetrator, Dripps, had been arrested and confessed to raping and  
11 murdering Angie Dodge did the authorities agree to vacate and dismiss Tapp's wrongful  
12 murder conviction.  
13

14 167. On July 17, 2019, more than twenty-two years after Tapp was wrongfully arrested for a  
15 murder he did not commit, the Seventh Judicial District of Idaho Falls, County of Bonneville  
16 vacated and dismissed the remaining charges against Tapp. Upon doing so, Judge Alan  
17 Stephens stated, "[a]s far as this court is concerned, you are innocent of the convictions you  
18 have been living under for the past 20-plus years. I don't think any of us could imagine what  
19 it would be like to experience imprisonment for something we didn't do . . . I'm just glad it  
20 could be corrected at this time."  
21

22 **DAMAGES**

23  
24 168. Christopher Tapp spent more than twenty years incarcerated and twenty-two years  
25 wrongfully convicted for a horrific crime he did not commit. He must now attempt to make a  
26 life for himself without the benefit of those life experiences and resources that normally  
27 equip adults for that task.  
28

1 169. As a direct result of Defendants’ intentional, bad faith, willful, wanton, reckless, grossly  
2 negligent, negligent, and/or deliberately indifferent acts and omissions, Tapp sustained  
3 injuries and damages including: loss of freedom for more than twenty years; physical pain  
4 and suffering; severe mental anguish; emotional distress; loss of family relationships; severe  
5 psychological damage; loss of property; legal expenses; loss of income and career  
6 opportunities; humiliation, indignities, and embarrassment; degradation; permanent loss of  
7 natural psychological development; and restrictions on all forms of personal freedom  
8 including but not limited to diet, sleep, personal contact, educational opportunity, vocational  
9 opportunity, athletic opportunity, personal fulfillment, sexual activity, family relations,  
10 reading and other entertainment, travel, enjoyment, and expression, for which he is entitled to  
11 monetary relief.  
12  
13

14 170. Additionally, the emotional pain and suffering caused by losing those years has been  
15 substantial. During his incarceration, Tapp was stripped of the various pleasures of basic  
16 human experience, from the simplest to the most important, which all free people enjoy as a  
17 matter of right. Tapp missed out on the ability to share holidays, births, funerals, and other  
18 life events with loved ones, opportunities to fall in love, to marry, to have a family, and the  
19 fundamental freedom to live one’s life as an autonomous human being.  
20

21 171. Losing his liberty just as he was finishing his teens, Tapp was deprived of some of the  
22 most significant and meaningful parts of life: the opportunity to raise a family and to pursue a  
23 career.  
24

25 172. Tapp also suffered uniquely from his lengthy wrongful incarceration and imprisonment.  
26 From the very first days of his incarceration, Tapp faced unusual, and serious, harms and  
27 injuries. Because Tapp was unjustly and falsely labeled as a “sex offender,” he faced serious  
28

1 threats in prison. In the spring or summer of 1997, Tapp was physically attacked by another  
2 inmate and suffered injuries and bruising, including to his face. This was not an isolated  
3 incident; numerous times throughout his over twenty years of wrongful imprisonment—  
4 indeed, nearly every year—Tapp suffered physical assaults.

5  
6 173. The injuries that Tapp suffered in prison did not stop at beatings. In 1998, he contracted  
7 tuberculosis as a result of exposure to prison conditions. But despite that diagnosis, Tapp was  
8 denied treatment for years. Although Tapp continued to suffer from tuberculosis throughout  
9 the entirety of his wrongful incarceration, he only received treatment for that illness once, in  
10 2001, despite testing positive for tuberculosis repeatedly.

11  
12 174. In 2006, Tapp seriously injured his knee while doing work at the prison due to inadequate  
13 safety precautions. That injury causes Tapp to limp, and affects his quality of life, to this day.

14 175. In 2006, Tapp suffered another sustained injury when a block of bleach exploded near  
15 him, melting his shoe and seriously burning his foot.

16  
17 176. In 2006, Tapp contracted pneumonia due to exposure from prison conditions. For over  
18 two weeks, Tapp suffered and grew sicker until he was too weak to get up or eat. Only after  
19 fifteen days, when Tapp could barely move, did prison officials finally provide Tapp with  
20 any treatment. This discrete injury has left Tapp with residual damage to his lungs.

21  
22 177. As a result of substandard dental care in prison, Tapp developed severe periodontitis and  
23 lost numerous teeth. Instead of providing proper treatment, the prison dentist simply  
24 extracted Tapp's teeth, including in 2002, 2005, 2007, and 2009. The prison refused to give  
25 him implants or dentures. As a result of missing teeth, Tapp cannot eat many regular foods.  
26 The loss of teeth has also caused him to be ashamed of his appearance and has had a dramatic  
27 negative affect on his social life.  
28

1 178. Beginning in about 2010, Tapp also suffered hearing loss as a result of the constant,  
2 heightened noise he experienced in prison.

3 179. Tapp also suffered from severe mental health illnesses as a result of his wrongful  
4 imprisonment. In 2015, he was diagnosed with major depressive disorder diagnosis.

5 180. While in prison, his father passed away. Tapp was unable to attend his funeral. Tapp's  
6 mother was forced to remortgage the family home to pay for her son's legal fees.

7 181. Tapp continues to suffer as a direct result of his wrongful conviction and incarceration.

8 182. Even if the City of Idaho falls and/or individual Defendants may not have expected or  
9 intended to wrongfully imprison an innocent man or cause these grave injuries, Defendants  
10 are nonetheless legally responsible under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 because these injuries are the  
11 foreseeable result of the Defendants' recklessness, negligence, or deliberate indifference to  
12 Tapp's rights; their policies and procedures; and their failure to train and supervise their  
13 employees.  
14  
15

16 **FEDERAL CLAIMS**

17  
18 **COUNT I**

19 **42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim for Deprivation of Liberty Without Due Process of Law and**  
20 **Violation of Right to a Fair Trial, Under the Fourteenth Amendment, based on the**  
21 **fabrication of false evidence, including false confessions**

22 ***Against Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, and Stacey***

23 183. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the allegations of this Complaint as if fully set forth  
24 herein, and further alleges as follows:

25 184. Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, and Stacey fabricated false evidence of  
26 Tapp's guilt, thereby violating Tapp's right to a fair trial and causing him to be deprived of  
27 his liberty without due process of law.  
28

1 185. As described in greater detail above, Defendants fabricated evidence in a number of ways  
2 prior to trial, and they did so knowingly or in reckless disregard for the truth. That fabricated  
3 evidence was used to arrest Tapp, to prosecute him, and was the basis for the jury's guilty  
4 verdict.

5 186. Defendants, individually and in concert, falsely reported that Tapp had volunteered non-  
6 public information only the true perpetrator would know, when in fact Defendants had fed  
7 that information to Tapp.  
8

9 187. Defendants, individually and in concert, used investigative techniques that were so  
10 coercive and abusive that they knew or should have known that those techniques would yield  
11 false information. For example, and without limitation, Defendants used manipulative  
12 polygraph examinations, threats, lies, and false promises in order to coerce five false  
13 confessions from Tapp.  
14

15 188. Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and Livsey, while acting under  
16 color of law, ignored evidence pointing to the true perpetrator, Brian Dripps, and/or failed to  
17 follow up on such evidence, thereby conducting a constitutionally inadequate investigation in  
18 violation of Tapp's Fourteenth Amendment Due Process right to a fair trial.  
19

20 189. Defendants, individually and in concert, deliberately fabricated the witness statement of  
21 Osborne through coercion, manipulation, and threats.  
22

23 190. Defendants, individually and in concert, continued their investigation of Tapp despite the  
24 fact that they knew or should have known that he was innocent based on the evidence  
25 collected from the crime scene.

26 191. Evidence of Defendants' misconduct could have been used to undermine key evidence  
27 relied on by Defendants in this investigation. Had it been disclosed, it could have been used  
28

1 at trial to impeach Defendants and witnesses at trial as well as the quality of the entire  
2 investigation.

3 192. Defendants' actions, individually and cumulatively, played a direct and decisive role in  
4 the jury's guilty verdict and were highly prejudicial to Tapp's defense. Had Defendants not  
5 engaged in such misconduct or had their misconduct been disclosed, the evidence would  
6 have tended to prove Tapp's innocence, cast doubt on the entire police investigation and  
7 prosecution, and most likely would have created a different result at trial.

8  
9 193. The foregoing acts and omissions were deliberate, reckless, wanton, cruel, motivated by  
10 evil motive or intent, done in bad faith, and/or involved callous indifference to Tapp's  
11 federally protected rights. These acts were perpetrated while Defendants were acting under  
12 color of state law and in their capacities as employees or agents of the City of Idaho Falls.

13  
14 194. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions, Tapp was wrongly arrested,  
15 detained, charged with murder, prosecuted, convicted, sentenced to life in prison,  
16 incarcerated for over twenty years, wrongfully convicted for over twenty-one years, and  
17 suffered the other grievous injuries and damages set forth above.  
18

19 **COUNT II**

20 **42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim for Deprivation of Liberty Without Due Process of Law and**  
21 **Violation of Right to a Fair Trial, Under the Fourteenth Amendment, based on withholding**  
22 **exculpatory evidence from the prosecution and defense**

23 ***Against Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and Livsey***

24 195. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the allegations of this Complaint as if fully set forth  
25 herein, and further alleges as follows:

26 196. Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and Livsey withheld exculpatory  
27 evidence from the prosecution and defense, thereby violating the Constitution and *Brady v.*  
28 *Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), and its progeny.

1 197. Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and Livsey, individually and in  
2 concert, in an effort to secure Tapp's conviction without regard to his actual innocence,  
3 deliberately and in bad faith deprived Tapp of his Due Process rights.

4 198. Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and Livsey, individually and in  
5 concert, in an effort to secure Tapp's conviction without regard to his actual innocence,  
6 intentionally suppressed material, exculpatory and impeachment information from Tapp, his  
7 defense counsel, and the prosecution in violation of the Constitution and *Brady v. Maryland*,  
8 including without limitation failing to disclose the true circumstances of Destiny Osborne's  
9 statements, and failing to disclose information pointing to other suspects, including true  
10 perpetrator Dripps.  
11

12 199. Evidence of Defendants' misconduct could have been used to undermine key evidence  
13 relied on by Defendants in this investigation. Had it been disclosed, it could have been used  
14 at trial to impeach Defendants and witnesses as well as the quality of the entire investigation.  
15

16 200. Defendants' actions, individually and cumulatively, played a direct and decisive role in  
17 the jury's guilty verdict and were highly prejudicial to Tapp's defense. Had Defendants not  
18 engaged in such misconduct or had their misconduct been disclosed, the evidence would  
19 have tended to prove Tapp's innocence, cast doubt on the entire police investigation and  
20 prosecution, and most likely would have created a different result at trial.  
21

22 201. The foregoing acts and omissions were deliberate, reckless, wanton, cruel, motivated by  
23 evil motive or intent, done in bad faith, and/or involved callous indifference to Tapp's  
24 federally protected rights. These acts were perpetrated while Defendants were acting under  
25 color of state law and in their capacities as employees or agents of the City of Idaho Falls.  
26  
27  
28

1 202. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions, Tapp was wrongly arrested,  
2 detained, charged with murder, prosecuted, convicted, sentenced to life in prison,  
3 incarcerated for over twenty years, wrongfully convicted for over twenty-one years, and  
4 suffered the other grievous injuries and damages set forth above.

5  
6 **COUNT III**

7 **42 U.S.C. § 1983 Claim for Post-Trial Deprivation of Liberty Without Due Process of Law**  
8 **Under the Fourteenth Amendment**  
9 ***Against Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, Livsey, and Roos***

10 203. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the allegations of this Complaint as if fully set forth  
11 herein, and further alleges as follows:

12 204. Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, Livsey, and Roos, individually and  
13 in concert, in an effort to preserve Tapp's conviction without regard to his actual innocence,  
14 intentionally or with deliberate indifference and in bad faith refused to take steps that they  
15 knew or should have known could have produced evidence of Tapp's innocence, in violation  
16 of the Constitution. For example, and without limitation, Defendants knew as of no later than  
17 2009 that comparing the DNA profiles obtained from testing done from materials taken from  
18 the crime scene could have identified the true perpetrator.

19  
20 205. Had Defendants run this profile through the familial search databases of California and  
21 Colorado, on information and belief, the true perpetrator would have been identified over a  
22 decade earlier, and Tapp would have been released up to eight years earlier.

23  
24 206. Tapp had a liberty interest in proving his innocence, including through newly discovered  
25 exculpatory evidence.

26 207. The foregoing acts and omissions were deliberate, reckless, wanton, cruel, motivated by  
27 evil motive or intent, done in bad faith, and/or involved callous indifference to Tapp's  
28



1 federally protected rights. These acts were perpetrated while Defendants were acting under  
2 color of state law and in their capacities as employees or agents of the IFPD.

3 208. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' misconduct, Tapp's incarceration was  
4 wrongfully extended, and Tapp continued to suffer all of the grievous injuries and damages  
5 set forth above.

6  
7 **COUNT IV**

8 **42 U.S.C. § 1983 Claim for Malicious Prosecution and Violation of the Fourth and**  
9 **Fourteenth Amendments**

10 *Against Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and Livsey*

11 209. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the allegations of this Complaint as if fully set forth  
12 herein, and further alleges as follows:

13 210. Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and Livsey caused criminal  
14 proceedings to be brought against Tapp without probable cause and without any reasonable  
15 belief in guilt. Tapp is completely innocent of the rape and murder of Angie Dodge. As  
16 Defendants knew, the sole basis for the criminal action against Tapp was the false evidence  
17 that Defendants fabricated, while forensic evidence (including DNA) exculpated him. No  
18 reasonable officer in 1996 would have believed that fabricated evidence provided probable  
19 cause to arrest, and no reasonable officer in 1996 would have believed that an arrest and  
20 prosecution without probable cause was justified.

21  
22 211. Defendants also continued the prosecution against Tapp on the basis of this false and  
23 fabricated inculpatory evidence and suppressed material exculpatory evidence, thereby  
24 subjecting Tapp to ongoing seizure in violation of the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments.

25  
26 212. The criminal proceedings against Tapp were initiated with malice. Defendants Fuhriman,  
27 Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and Livsey caused the charges against Tapp to be filed by  
28

1 knowingly providing the prosecution misinformation, concealing exculpatory evidence, and  
2 otherwise engaging in wrongful and bad faith conduct that caused the initiation of the legal  
3 proceedings against Tapp when they knew there was no probable cause.

4 213. Defendants initiated the action against Tapp for the purpose of denying Tapp's  
5 constitutional rights, including his right to be free from unreasonable seizure, and his right to  
6 not be deprived of liberty without due process of law.  
7

8 214. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey,  
9 and Livsey's actions, Tapp was wrongly arrested, detained, charged with rape and murder,  
10 prosecuted, convicted, sentenced to life in prison plus fifteen years and a fixed term of thirty  
11 years on the murder conviction and a term of twenty years with a fixed term of ten years on  
12 the rape conviction and suffered the other grievous injuries and damages set forth above.  
13

14 215. The criminal proceedings against Tapp terminated in his favor.

15 216. On March 22, 2017, the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District of the State of  
16 Idaho entered an order amending Tapp's conviction, dismissing his rape charge, and vacating  
17 his sentence for that charge. This Order left Tapp's first-degree murder conviction in effect.  
18

19 217. After a hearing on July 17, 2019, the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District of the  
20 State of Idaho, In and For the County of Bonneville, issued an Order on July 25, 2019,  
21 vacating and dismissing Tapp's murder conviction based on actual innocence. On August 12,  
22 2019, Tapp's criminal case, CR-1997-481, was dismissed pursuant to the ruling dismissing  
23 Tapp's murder conviction based on actual innocence.  
24

25 **COUNT V**

26 **42 U.S.C. § 1983 Claim for Violation of the Right Against Self-Incrimination in Violation of**  
27 **the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment**

28 *Against Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, and Stacey*

1 218. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the allegations of this Complaint as if fully set forth  
2 herein, and further alleges as follows:

3 219. Although Tapp had nothing to do with Dodge's murder, Defendants repeatedly  
4 threatened, manipulated, and lied to Tapp in order to coerce five false and fabricated  
5 confessions from him in violation of his Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment rights.  
6

7 220. In particular, as described in detail above, the circumstances of Tapp's interrogation were  
8 highly coercive, including but not limited to the following:

9 a. Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, and Stacey, individually and in  
10 concert, threatened Tapp, who was susceptible to suggestion, including with the  
11 death penalty.  
12

13 b. Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, and Stacey, individually and in  
14 concert, falsely promised that Tapp would be released without charges and  
15 granted leniency if he gave the false confessions that Defendants wanted him to  
16 give.  
17

18 c. Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, and Stacey, individually and in  
19 concert, repeatedly used polygraphs to attempt to convince Tapp that his  
20 memories were wrong and that he had been involved in the crime.  
21

22 221. These coercive interrogation techniques shock the conscience and violate the decencies  
23 of civilized conduct. By interrogating Tapp in this manner and doing nothing subsequent to  
24 stop the violation, Defendants set in motion a series of acts by others which they knew or  
25 reasonably should have known would cause these statements to be used against Tapp at trial,  
26 thereby inflicting constitutional injury.  
27  
28

1 222. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions, Tapp was wrongly arrested,  
2 detained, charged with murder, prosecuted, convicted, and sentenced to life in prison plus 15  
3 years and a fixed term of 30 years on the murder conviction and a term of 20 years with a  
4 fixed term of 10 years on the rape conviction.

5  
6 **COUNT VI**

7 **42 U.S.C. § 1983 Civil Rights Conspiracy Claim**

8 ***Against Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and Livsey***

9 223. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the allegations of this Complaint as if fully set forth  
10 herein, and further alleges as follows:

11 224. Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and Livsey, and others yet  
12 unknown, including without limitation individuals outside of the IFPD, agreed among  
13 themselves to act in concert to deprive Tapp of his clearly established constitutional rights as  
14 protected by the Fourth, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments, including his right not to be  
15 deprived of liberty without due process of law and be free from illegal seizure.  
16

17 225. As described in detail above, in furtherance of the conspiracy, Defendants engaged in and  
18 facilitated numerous overt acts in furtherance of the conspiracy, including but not limited to  
19 the following:  
20

- 21 a. Acting in concert to suggest, coerce, and fabricate Tapp's five false confessions;
  - 22 b. Acting in concert to conceal that Tapp's confessions were false, fabricated, and  
23 otherwise tainted;
  - 24 c. Acting in concert to suggest, coerce, and/or fabricate inculpatory statements from  
25 Destiny Osborne; and  
26
- 27  
28

- d. Acting in concert to conceal that Osborne’s statement was false, fabricated, and otherwise tainted;
- e. Prior and subsequent to Tapp’s arrest, charging, and indictment, deliberately ignoring and/or recklessly failing to investigate evidence of Tapp’s innocence.

226. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ overt acts, Tapp was deprived of his constitutional rights; wrongly prosecuted, detained, and incarcerated for over twenty years; and subjected to other grievous injuries and damages as set forth above.

**COUNT VII**

**42 U.S.C. § 1983 Supervisory Liability Claim**

***Against Defendants Livsey and Roos***

227. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the allegations of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein, and further alleges as follows:

228. Tapp’s wrongful arrest, confinement, prosecution, trial, conviction, and incarceration was caused by the unconstitutional action and inaction of Defendant Livsey acting in his individual capacity and under color of law.

229. Upon information and belief, Defendant Livsey directly participated in the misconduct that resulted in Tapp’s wrongful conviction, including but not limited to directing or permitting Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, and Stacey to coerce false and fabricated statements from Tapp.

230. Upon information and belief, Defendant Livsey was personally aware of the misconduct engaged in by his subordinate officers, who were under his direct supervision and given the small size of the IFPD and the high-profile nature of the investigation into the murder of Angie Dodge. Defendant Livsey’s misconduct included but was not limited to the following:

- 1 a. Defendant Livsey knowingly refused to come forward with information that  
2 would have terminated the wrongful prosecution of Tapp, which, upon  
3 information and belief, he knew or should have known had been initiated based  
4 on the coerced, fabricated confession of Tapp and the coerced and fabricated  
5 statement of Osborne, as well as in spite of suppressed exculpatory information.  
6 As a result, Livsey knew or reasonably should have known that Tapp's  
7 constitutional rights to be free from unreasonable seizure and not to be deprived  
8 of liberty without due process of law would be violated.
- 9
- 10 b. Defendant Livsey culpably failed to adequately train, supervise, and/or control his  
11 subordinates, who obtained coerced, fabricated, or suggested identifications, and  
12 suppressed exculpatory information.
- 13
- 14 c. Defendant Livsey violated Tapp's constitutional rights by acquiescing in the  
15 deprivation of Tapp's constitutional rights by his subordinates, and by generally  
16 showing a reckless or callous indifference to Tapp's rights, including but not  
17 limited to Tapp's rights to be free of unconstitutional interrogation methods.
- 18
- 19 d. Defendant Livsey's failure to train, supervise, and/or control his subordinates, his  
20 indifference to the actions of his subordinates, and his indifference to Tapp's  
21 rights, encouraged and permitted his subordinates to fabricate evidence and to fail  
22 to document and disclose exculpatory evidence.
- 23

24 231. Upon information and belief, Defendant Roos was personally aware of the misconduct  
25 engaged in by his subordinate officers, who were under his direct supervision and given the  
26 small size of the IFPD and the high-profile nature of the investigation into the murder of  
27 Angie Dodge. Defendant Roos's misconduct included but was not limited to the following:  
28

- 1 a. Upon information and belief, Defendant Roos was aware of and/or participated in  
2 the decisions to deny and delay post-conviction DNA testing and analysis that  
3 would have identified the true perpetrator, and thus led to Tapp's exoneration,  
4 years earlier.
- 5 b. Upon information and belief, Defendant Roos violated Tapp's constitutional  
6 rights by acquiescing in the deprivation of Tapp's constitutional rights by his  
7 subordinates, and by generally showing a reckless or callous indifference to  
8 Tapp's rights, including but not limited to Tapp's rights to receive post-conviction  
9 exculpatory evidence.

10 232. The actions and omissions of Defendants Livsey and Roos, in their individual capacities,  
11 caused Tapp to suffer the constitutional deprivations and grievous personal injuries and  
12 damages described above.  
13  
14

15 **COUNT VIII**

16 **42 U.S.C. § 1983 Failure to Intervene**

17 ***Against Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and Livsey***

18  
19 233. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the allegations of this Complaint as if fully set forth  
20 herein, and further alleges as follows:

21 234. By their conduct and under color of state law, Defendants, acting within the scope of  
22 their employment, had opportunities to intervene on behalf of Tapp to prevent his malicious  
23 prosecution and deprivation of liberty without due process of law, but with deliberate  
24 indifference declined to do so. No reasonable officer in 1996 would have believed this  
25 conduct was lawful. Defendants' failures included but are not limited to:  
26  
27  
28

- 1 a. Failing to intervene to prevent or stop the pressure, threats, manipulation, and
- 2 coercion of false and fabricated confessions by Tapp;
- 3 b. Failing to intervene to prevent or stop the pressure, threats, manipulation, and
- 4 coercion of a false and fabricated witness statement by Osborne;
- 5 c. Failing to intervene to inform the prosecution, court, and defense that other
- 6 officers were presenting fabricated evidence in Tapp's prosecution; and
- 7
- 8 d. Failing to intervene to prevent the withholding or concealing of exculpatory
- 9 evidence from the prosecution and defense.

10 235. Defendants' failures to intervene violated Tapp's clearly established constitutional right  
11 not to be deprived of liberty without due process of law as guaranteed by the Fourth and  
12 Fourteenth Amendments. No reasonable police officer in 1996 would have believed that  
13 failing to intervene to prevent Defendants from fabricating inculpatory evidence, concealing  
14 and withholding exculpatory evidence, or causing Tapp to be arrested and prosecuted without  
15 probable cause, were lawful.  
16

17 236. Defendants' acts and omissions, as described in the preceding paragraphs, were the direct  
18 and proximate cause of Tapp's injuries. Defendants knew, or should have known, that their  
19 conduct would result in Tapp's wrongful arrest, prosecution, conviction, and incarceration.  
20

21 237. The actions and omissions of Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and  
22 Livsey, in their individual capacities, caused Tapp to be wrongly arrested, detained, charged  
23 with rape and murder, prosecuted, convicted, sentenced, and incarcerated for over twenty  
24 years. As a result, Tapp suffered the constitutional deprivations and grievous personal  
25 injuries and damages described above.  
26  
27  
28



**Count IX**

**42 U.S.C. § 1983 *Monell* Claim for Direct Involvement of Policymakers**

***Against Defendant the City of Idaho Falls***

1  
2  
3  
4 238. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the allegations of this Complaint as if fully set forth  
5 herein, and further alleges as follows:

6  
7 239. Defendant the City of Idaho Falls was at all times relevant to this Complaint responsible  
8 for the policies, practices, and customs of the Idaho Falls Police Department.

9 240. Defendant the City of Idaho Falls created and maintained a custom, policy and/or practice  
10 of unconstitutional misconduct in homicide investigations, including but not limited to the  
11 encouragement and use of, and reliance on, suggestive and/or coercive techniques during  
12 interviews and interrogations to obtain false statements and confessions, and/or witness  
13 statements that law enforcement knew or should have known were false, the fabrication of  
14 inculpatory evidence, the suppression of exculpatory and/or impeachment evidence, and the  
15 intentional failure to conduct adequate investigations of crimes.  
16  
17

18 241. Upon information and belief, Defendant Livsey, as the chief policymaker for the City of  
19 Idaho Falls and the Idaho Falls Police Department, was personally aware of the misconduct  
20 engaged in by his subordinate officers, who were under his direct supervision, given the  
21 small size of the IFPD and the high-profile nature of the investigation into the murder of  
22 Angie Dodge.  
23

24 242. On information and belief, Defendant Livsey, the Chief of Police and relevant  
25 policymaker for the Idaho Falls Police Department and the City of Idaho Falls, was directly  
26 aware of and/or participated in that misconduct and failed to train, discipline, or supervise his  
27 subordinate to prevent or ameliorate that misconduct.  
28

1 243. In addition, the City of Idaho Falls created and maintained a custom, policy and/or  
2 practice of unconstitutional misconduct of failing to take basic investigatory steps post-  
3 conviction when doing so would be likely to yield evidence that a person had been  
4 wrongfully convicted.

5 244. On information and belief, Defendant Roos, as Chief of Police, and Defendant Fuhriman,  
6 as mayor of Idaho Falls, as the chief policymakers for the City of Idaho Falls and the Idaho  
7 Falls Police Department, were directly aware of and/or participated in that misconduct and  
8 failed to train, discipline, or supervise his subordinate to prevent or ameliorate that  
9 misconduct.  
10

11 245. Tapp's wrongful arrest, confinement, prosecution, trial, conviction, incarceration, and  
12 other injuries as set forth above were caused by the unconstitutional policies, practices, and  
13 customs of the City of Idaho Falls.  
14

15 **COUNT X**

16 **42 U.S.C. § 1983 *Monell* Claim Failure to Train, Supervise, or Discipline in**  
17 **Constitutionally Adequate Investigation Techniques, Interrogation Procedures, or *Brady***  
18 ***duties***  
***Against Defendant the City of Idaho Falls***

19 246. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the allegations of this Complaint as if fully set forth  
20 herein, and further alleges as follows:

21 247. Defendant the City of Idaho Falls was at all times relevant to this Complaint responsible  
22 for the policies, practices, and customs of the Idaho Falls Police Department.  
23

24 248. Defendant the City of Idaho Falls created and maintained a custom, policy and/or practice  
25 of unconstitutional misconduct in homicide investigations, including but not limited to the  
26 encouragement and use of, and reliance on, suggestive and/or coercive techniques during  
27 interviews and interrogations to obtain false confessions and statements, and/or witness  
28

1 statements that law enforcement knew or should have known were false, the fabrication of  
2 inculpatory evidence, the suppression of exculpatory and/or impeachment evidence, and the  
3 intentional failure to conduct adequate investigations of crimes.

4 249. The City of Idaho Falls, by and through its policymakers, created and maintained a  
5 custom, policy, or practice of failing to train, supervise, or discipline its employees and  
6 agents, including Defendants, regarding constitutionally proper investigation procedures,  
7 including but not limited to interrogation procedures.

8  
9 250. The City of Idaho Falls, by and through its policymakers, created and maintained a  
10 custom, policy, or practice of failing to train, supervise, or discipline its employees and  
11 agents, including Defendants, regarding their obligations to document and disclose  
12 exculpatory evidence pursuant to their *Brady* obligations.

13  
14 251. The unconstitutional customs, policies, patterns, and practices of the City of Idaho Falls  
15 have caused other individuals, other than Tapp himself, to be prosecuted or convicted on the  
16 basis of false and fabricated evidence, including but not limited to Michael Whiteley.

17  
18 252. These unconstitutional customs, policies, and practices of the City of Idaho Falls  
19 proximately and directly caused Tapp's physical and constitutional injuries, including his  
20 false arrest, illegal confinement, unfair trial, wrongful conviction, and other damages  
21 described above.

22 **IDAHO STATE LAW CLAIMS**

23  
24 **COUNT XI**

25 **State Law Claim for Malicious Prosecution**

26 ***Against Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and Livsey***

1 253. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the allegations of this Complaint as if fully set forth  
2 herein, and further alleges as follows:

3 254. Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and Livsey caused criminal  
4 proceedings to be brought against Tapp without probable cause and without any reasonable  
5 belief in guilt. Tapp is completely innocent of the rape and murder of Angie Dodge. As  
6 Defendants knew, the sole basis for the criminal action against Tapp was the false evidence  
7 that Defendants fabricated, while forensic evidence (including DNA) exculpated him. No  
8 reasonable officer in 1996 would have believed that fabricated evidence provided probable  
9 cause to arrest, and no reasonable officer in 1996 would have believed that an arrest and  
10 prosecution without probable cause was justified.  
11

12  
13 255. Defendants also continued the prosecution against Tapp on the basis of this false and  
14 fabricated inculpatory evidence and suppressed material exculpatory evidence, thereby  
15 subjecting Tapp to ongoing seizure.  
16

17 256. The criminal proceedings against Tapp were initiated with malice. Defendants Fuhriman,  
18 Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and Livsey caused the charges against Tapp to be filed by  
19 knowingly providing the prosecution misinformation, concealing exculpatory evidence, and  
20 otherwise engaging in wrongful and bad faith conduct that caused the initiation of the legal  
21 proceedings against Tapp when they knew there was no probable cause.  
22

23 257. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey,  
24 and Livsey's actions, Tapp was wrongly arrested, detained, charged with rape and murder,  
25 prosecuted, convicted, sentenced to life in prison plus fifteen years and a fixed term of thirty  
26 years on the murder conviction and a term of twenty years with a fixed term of ten years on  
27 the rape conviction and suffered the other grievous injuries and damages set forth above.  
28

1 258. The criminal proceedings against Tapp terminated in his favor.

2 259. On March 22, 2017, the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District of the State of  
3 Idaho entered an order amending Tapp's conviction, dismissing his rape charge, and vacating  
4 his sentence for that charge. This Order left Tapp's first-degree murder conviction in effect.

5 260. After a hearing on July 17, 2019, the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District of the  
6 State of Idaho, In and For the County of Bonneville, issued an Order on July 25, 2019,  
7 vacating and dismissing Tapp's murder conviction based on actual innocence. On August 12,  
8 2019, Tapp's criminal case, CR-1997-481, was dismissed pursuant to the ruling dismissing  
9 Tapp's murder conviction based on actual innocence.  
10

11 **COUNT XII**

12 **State Law Claim for False Imprisonment**

13 ***Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, and Livsey***

14 261. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the allegations of this Complaint as if fully set forth  
15 herein, and further alleges as follows:  
16

17 262. The conduct of the above-named Defendants directly resulted in the false imprisonment  
18 of Tapp while acting in the scope of their employment for the Idaho Falls Police Department  
19 and the City of Idaho Falls.

20 263. Tapp's liberty of movement and freedom to remain in the place of his own lawful choice  
21 was violated by his wrongful conviction causing him to be restrained against his will.  
22

23 264. The restraint of Tapp against his will was caused by Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes,  
24 Brown, Stacey, and Livsey's intentional conduct in fabricating evidence, coercing false  
25 confessions, and concealing exculpatory evidence.  
26

27 265. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions, Tapp suffered the grievous  
28 injuries and damages set forth above.

**COUNT XIII**

**State Law Claim for Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress**

***Against Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, Livsey, and Roos***

1  
2  
3  
4 266. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the allegations of this Complaint as if fully set forth  
5 herein, and further alleges as follows:

6 267. Tapp has suffered serious and severe emotional distress as a direct and proximate result  
7 of Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, Livsey, and Roos's extreme,  
8 outrageous, and intentional acts in both unlawfully obtaining his wrongful conviction and by  
9 failing to turn over evidence directly proving his innocence.  
10

11 268. Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, Livsey, and Roos committed this  
12 misconduct intentionally while acting in the scope of their employment for the Idaho Falls  
13 Police Department and the City of Idaho Falls.  
14

15 269. Tapp's serious and severe emotional distress was a reasonably foreseeable consequence  
16 of Defendants' actions.

17 270. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions, Tapp has suffered and continues  
18 to suffer emotional distress which has been accompanied by physical manifestations,  
19 including anxiety, depression, extreme stress, and other ailments.  
20

**COUNT XIV**

**State Law Claim for Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress**

***Against Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, Livsey, and Roos***

21  
22  
23 271. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the allegations of this Complaint as if fully set forth  
24 herein, and further alleges as follows:  
25

26 272. Tapp has suffered and continues to suffer serious and severe emotional distress as a direct  
27 and proximate result of Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, Livsey, and  
28

1 Roos's negligent acts in both unlawfully obtaining his wrongful conviction and by failing to  
2 take steps that would have led to his exoneration years earlier.

3 273. Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, Livsey, and Roos committed this  
4 misconduct while acting in the scope of their employment for the Idaho Falls Police  
5 Department and the City of Idaho Falls.  
6

7 274. Tapp's serious and severe emotional distress was a reasonably foreseeable consequence  
8 of Defendants' actions.

9 275. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions, Tapp has suffered emotional  
10 distress which has been accompanied by physical manifestations, including anxiety,  
11 depression, extreme stress, and other ailments.  
12

13 **Count XV**

14 **State Law Claim for Invasion of Privacy**

15 ***Against Defendant Fuhriman***

16 276. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the allegations of this Complaint as if fully set forth  
17 herein, and further alleges as follows:

18 277. Fuhriman placed Tapp in a false light in the public eye by making false and injurious  
19 public statements to the press, that Tapp was guilty of the murder of Angie Dodge. Fuhriman  
20 made these statements even though he knew or should have known that Tapp was innocent.  
21

22 278. Fuhriman committed this misconduct while acting in the scope of their employment for  
23 the Idaho Falls Police Department and the City of Idaho Falls.  
24

25 279. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's actions, Tapp has suffered the grievous  
26 harms and injuries set out more fully above.  
27  
28

**COUNT XVI**

**State Law Claim for Vicarious Liability**

***Against Defendant the City of Idaho Falls***

280. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the allegations of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein, and further alleges as follows:

281. At all times relevant herein, the City of Idaho Falls was the employer of Defendants Fuhriman, Finn, Grimes, Brown, Stacey, Livsey, and Roos. As such, all acts or omissions by these defendants, as an agent for the City of Idaho Falls, were the acts and omissions of their principle, City of Idaho Falls.

282. As an employer, the City of Idaho Falls is liable for all damages caused by its agents, as described herein, while acting within the scope of their employment.

283. As an employer, the City of Idaho Falls is responsible for all its employees' actions that were in furtherance of or incidental to the employment.

**JURY DEMAND**

284. Pursuant to the Seventh Amendment of the United States Constitution, Tapp requests a jury trial on all issues and claims set forth in this Complaint.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Tapp demands judgment jointly and severally against Defendants as follows:

A. That the Court award compensatory damages to him and against the Defendants, jointly and severally, in an amount to be determined at trial but that exceeds the jurisdictional limits of all lower courts that would otherwise have jurisdiction over this action;



1 B. That the Court award punitive damages to him, and against all individual Defendants,  
2 in an amount to be determined at trial, that will deter such conduct by Defendants in the future;

3 C. For a trial by jury;

4 D. For pre-judgment and post-judgment interest and recovery of his costs, including  
5 reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988 for all 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims; and

6 E. For any and all other relief to which he may be entitled.  
7

8  
9 Respectfully submitted,

10 Dated: October 8, 2020

11  
12 By: /s/Peter Neufeld  
13 Peter Neufeld  
14 Nick Brustin  
15 Anna Benvenuti Hoffmann  
16 Katie McCarthy  
17 Kate Fetrow  
18 Neufeld Scheck & Brustin, LLP  
19 99 Hudson Street, 8th Floor  
20 New York, NY 10013

21 /s/John Thomas  
22 John Thomas  
23 166 Martinsburg Lane  
24 Idaho Falls, ID 83404

25 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Christopher Tapp*  
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

Christopher Tapp

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Bonneville County (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) John Thomas, 166 Martinsburg Lane, Idaho Falls, ID 83404, 208-529-1350; Neufeld Scheck & Brustin, LLP, 99 Hudson Street, 8th Floor, New York, NY 10013, (212) 965-9081.

DEFENDANTS

The City of Idaho Falls, Jared Fuhriman, Steven G. Finn, Ken Brown, Curtis Stacey, Phillip Grimes, Kent Livsey, and Steve Roos

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Bonneville County (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

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)

Table with columns for Plaintiff (PTF) and Defendant (DEF) citizenship: Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State, Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State, Foreign Nation.

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Large table with categories: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, CIVIL RIGHTS, TORTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES.

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 (specify), 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. § 1983

Brief description of cause: Redress the deprivation under color of law of Tapp's rights as secured by the United States Constitution

VII. REQUESTED IN 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: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

DATE 10/08/2020 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/John Thomas

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

### Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading 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. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.  
 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.  
 United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.  
 Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.  
 Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions](#).
- V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.  
 Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.  
 Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441.  
 Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.  
 Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.  
 Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.  
 Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.  
 Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.  
**PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.
- VI. Cause of Action.** Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint.** Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.  
 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.  
 Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

**Date and Attorney Signature.** Date and sign the civil cover sheet.