

1 **WO**

2

3

4

5

6

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

7

8

9

Jesse Dupris, et al.)

NO. 08-8132-PCT-PGR
08-8133-PCT-PGR
(CONSOLIDATED)

10

Plaintiffs)

11

v.)

AMENDED ORDER

12

Selanhongva McDonald, et al.,)

13

Defendants.)

14

15

Before the Court are the following motions: Individual Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 169) and Defendant United States’ Motion for Summary Judgment as to Plaintiffs’ FTCA Claim (Doc. 168), both of which are joined in part by Defendants Massey and Anderson (Docs. 183, 184), and Plaintiffs’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Re: Federal Employee Status of Tribal Officer Defendants (Doc. 170).

20

For the reasons set forth below, the Court will grant summary judgment for the Individual Defendants and the United States. The Court will deny Plaintiffs’ motion for partial summary judgment.¹

23

INTRODUCTION

24

Plaintiffs Jesse Dupris and Jeremy Reed filed suit against tribal police officers of the White Mountain Apache Tribe and agents of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (“BIA”) in their

26

27

¹ Plaintiffs’ requests for oral argument (Docs. 192, 196) will be denied because the parties have fully briefed the issues and oral argument will not aid in the Court’s decision. See *Partridge v. Reich*, 141 F.3d 920, 926 (9th Cir. 1998).

28

1 individual capacities, alleging civil rights violations under *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named*
2 *Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), and against the United States
3 under the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA), 28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(b)(1) and 2671, et seq.
4 Plaintiffs claim that their Fourth and Fifth Amendment rights were violated when they were
5 unreasonably seized, wrongfully arrested, and maliciously prosecuted. Plaintiffs contend that
6 the actions taken by the Individual Defendants constituted those violations.

7
8 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

9 In early September 2006, the BIA created the “Operation Mountain Line” Task Force
10 to investigate a series of sexual assaults occurring on the White Mountain Apache Indian
11 Reservation in Whiteriver, Arizona. The crimes were committed by a man or men who posed
12 as police or security officers. The majority of the fifteen victims were minor females
13 assaulted at night on a trail near an abandoned house.

14 BIA Agents Molly Hernandez, Tino Lopez, Perry Proctor, Michael McCoy, Duston
15 Whiting, and Warren Youngman were assigned to the Task Force. McCoy was the Incident
16 Commander, Youngman the Assistant Incident Commander, and Whiting the case agent.
17 Perphelia Massey and Joshua Anderson, officers from the White Mountain Apache Police
18 Force, were also assigned to the Task Force.

19 As discussed in more detail below, and described in a previous order (Doc. 48), the
20 Task Force investigation included interviews with victims and witnesses, some of whom
21 identified Plaintiffs as their attackers.

22 On October 20, 2006, McCoy and Youngman met with tribal prosecutor Paula King
23 to see whether the Tribe wanted to pursue tribal charges against Plaintiffs. King agreed to
24 charge and prosecute Plaintiffs and gave permission to McCoy and Youngman to have
25 Plaintiffs arrested on tribal charges.

26 That same day, Officer Anderson arrested Reed at his home on the Reservation.
27 Officer Massey arrested Durpis at the Hon-Dah police substation on the Reservation.

1 Individual Defendant Hernandez was present at Reed’s arrest in a back-up capacity, but did
2 not participate because Reed did not resist arrest.

3 On October 24, 2006, King modified the tribal charges against Reed and signed the
4 complaint. On October 25, 2006, at the arraignment, King tried to modify the tribal charges
5 against Dupris but the Tribal Court denied her request and determined that Plaintiffs should
6 continue to be held in tribal jail.

7 On November 1, 2006, Reed was released on bond by the Tribal Court. Dupris was
8 released on November 12.

9 On November 16, 2006, King moved to dismiss the charges against Reed “without
10 prejudice” in case additional evidence was provided. On February 20, 2007, King moved to
11 dismiss the charges against Dupris “with prejudice.” On April 27, 2007, King’s request to
12 change Reed’s dismissal of charges to “with prejudice” was granted.

13 **SUMMARY JUDGMENT STANDARD**

14 A court “shall grant summary judgment if the movant shows that there is no genuine
15 dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.”
16 Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(a); *see also Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 322–23 (1986). The
17 moving party bears the initial responsibility of presenting the basis for its motion and
18 identifying those portions of the record that demonstrate the absence of a genuine issue of
19 material fact. *Id.* at 323.

20
21 If the moving party meets its initial responsibility, the burden then shifts to the
22 opposing party, who must demonstrate the existence of a factual dispute and that the fact in
23 contention is material. *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248–50 (1986); *see*
24 *Triton Energy Corp. v. Square D. Co.*, 68 F.3d 1216, 1221 (9th Cir. 1995). The opposing
25 party need not establish a material issue of fact conclusively in its favor; it is sufficient that
26 “the claimed factual dispute be shown to require a jury or judge to resolve the parties’
27 differing versions of the truth at trial.” *First Nat’l Bank of Arizona v. Cities Serv. Co.*, 391
28

1 U.S. 253, 288–89 (1968).

2 When considering a summary judgment motion, the court examines the pleadings,
3 depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with the affidavits
4 or declarations, if any. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c). The judge’s function is not to weigh the
5 evidence and determine the truth but to decide whether there is a genuine issue for trial.
6 *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 249. The evidence of the non-movant is “to be believed, and all
7 justifiable inferences are to be drawn in his favor.” *Id.* at 255. However, if the evidence of
8 the non-moving party is merely colorable or is not significantly probative, summary
9 judgment may be granted. *Id.* at 248–49.

10 **INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS’ MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

11 Individual Defendants Hernandez, Lopez, and Proctor, joined by Massey and
12 Anderson, move for summary judgment on Plaintiffs’ *Bivens* claims.² (Docs. 169, 183.) The
13 Individual Defendants argue that they are entitled to qualified immunity because they were
14 not personally involved in the alleged violation of Plaintiffs’ constitutional rights. They also
15 contend, along with Massey and Anderson, that no constitutional violation occurred because
16 the arrests were supported by probable cause and because the existence of probable cause
17 defeats the malicious prosecution claim. Plaintiffs filed a response opposing the motion.
18 (Doc. 191.)

19 **I. Qualified Immunity Doctrine**

20 Qualified immunity is an affirmative defense. The defendant asserting qualified
21 immunity bears the burden of both pleading and proving the defense. *Gomez v. Toledo*, 446
22 U.S. 635, 640 (1980). In the context of a motion for summary judgment in a § 1983 action,
23

24
25 ² The *Bivens* claims against BIA Agent McDonald were dismissed January 26,
26 2011 (Doc. 121); the claims against Agents McCoy and Youngman were dismissed on June
27 27, 2011 (Doc. 158). Plaintiffs concede that the claims against Individual Defendant Daniel
28 Hawkins should also be dismissed. (Doc. 191 at 5 n.1.)

1 the defendant bears the burden of establishing that there is no genuine issue of material fact
2 to be resolved regarding his immunity. *See Moreno v. Baca*, 431 F.3d 633, 638 (9th Cir.
3 2005).

4 The determination of whether a law enforcement officer is entitled to qualified
5 immunity from a plaintiff's § 1983 claims involves a tiered analysis. *Saucier v. Katz*, 533
6 U.S. 194, 201 (2001); *Moreno*, 431 F.3d at 638. The first step requires the court to determine
7 if any of the plaintiff's constitutional rights were violated, viewing the facts in the light most
8 favorable to the plaintiff. *Id.*; *Moreno*, 431 F.3d at 638; *Johnson v. County of Los Angeles*,
9 340 F.3d 787, 792 (9th Cir. 2003). If no constitutional right was violated, there is no
10 necessity for further inquiry. *Saucier*, 533 U.S. at 201.

11 The second step requires the court to determine if the violated right was clearly
12 established at the time of the violation. *Moreno*, 431 F.3d at 638. The contours of the violated
13 right must have been clear enough that a reasonable law enforcement officer would have
14 understood that what he was doing violated the individual's constitutional rights. *Anderson*
15 *v. Creighton*, 483 U.S. 635, 640 (1987); *Moreno*, 431 F.3d at 638.

16 The court must consider the "objective legal reasonableness" of the officer's conduct,
17 rather than his subjective motivation, when determining if the officer is entitled to qualified
18 immunity. *Harlow v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 800, 819 (1982); *Brittain v. Hansen*, 451 F.3d 982,
19 988 (9th Cir. 2006); *Butler v. Elle*, 281 F.3d 1014, 1031 (9th Cir. 2002). "A defendant's good
20 faith or bad faith is irrelevant to the qualified immunity inquiry." *Burk v. Beene*, 948 F.2d
21 489, 494 (8th Cir. 1991).

22 The plaintiff bears the burden of establishing that the actions complained of
23 constituted a violation of his constitutional rights. *Hydrick v. Hunter*, 466 F.3d 676, 705–06
24 (9th Cir. 2006). He also bears the burden of establishing that the contour of the underlying
25 constitutional right was clearly established at the time of the alleged misconduct. *Id.*; *Galvin*
26 *v. Hay*, 374 F.3d 739, 745 (9th Cir. 2004).

1 **II. Analysis**

2 **A. Personal Involvement**

3 In a prior order, the Court dismissed the *Bivens*' claims set forth in Plaintiffs' First
4 Amended Complaint, finding that Plaintiffs "failed to adequately allege that the Individual
5 Defendants, through their own actions, . . . violated Plaintiffs' constitutional rights." (Doc.
6 48 at 10.) The Court explained that actions undertaken by the Individual
7 Defendants—interviewing witnesses and victims and showing them photographic line-
8 ups—did not amount to a constitutional violation and that Plaintiffs' remaining assertions
9 were directed only at the conduct of the "defendants' as a group." (*Id.* at 9.)

10 The allegations in the Fourth Amended Complaint fail for the same reasons. Plaintiffs
11 do not allege that Hernandez, Lopez, or Proctor, as individuals, played any role in the
12 decisions to arrest and prosecute Plaintiffs. None of the Individual Defendants was present
13 for the arrest of Plaintiff Dupris, and only Hernandez was present, in a back-up role, at
14 Reed's arrest. (*See* Doc. 167, Ex. 4.)

15 Plaintiffs argue that the false arrest and malicious prosecution were group efforts and
16 therefore the Individual Defendants are liable under the "integral participant" theory. (Doc.
17 191 at 5.) According to this principle, liability may attach to anyone who "set[s] in motion
18 a series of acts by others which the actor knows or reasonably should know would cause
19 others to inflict the constitutional injury." *Johnson v. Duffy*, 588 F.2d 740, 743–44 (9th Cir.
20 1978). Plaintiffs argue that the decisions to arrest and prosecute them were made "as a
21 group" by the Task Force. (Doc. 191 at 6.) Therefore, according to Plaintiffs, the Individual
22 Defendants, as members of the Task Force, are liable as integral participants in the arrest and
23 prosecution. (*Id.*)

24
25 The Individual Defendants' membership in the Task Force, which was headed by
26 Incident Commanders McCoy and Youngman, is insufficient to show personal involvement.
27 To overcome qualified immunity, a plaintiff "must allege facts, not simply conclusions, that
28

1 show that an individual was personally involved in the deprivation of his civil rights.” *Barren*
2 *v. Harrington*, 152 F.3d 1193, 1194 (9th Cir. 1998); *see Jones v. Williams*, 297 F.3d 930, 937
3 (9th Cir. 2002) (“we require individual participation, not simply being present or being a
4 member of a team”); *Blankenhorn v. City of Orange*, 485 F.3d 463, 481 n.12 (9th Cir. 2007)
5 (liability under the integral participation doctrine requires “some fundamental involvement
6 in the conduct that allegedly caused the violation”). Plaintiffs have advanced no facts
7 showing that the Individual Defendant’s personally participated in the alleged constitutional
8 violations.

9 The cases relied on by Plaintiffs, *Beck v. City of Upland*, 527 F.3d 853 (9th Cir. 2008),
10 and *Boyd v. Benton County*, 374 F.3d 773 (9th Cir. 2004), do not support Plaintiffs’
11 interpretation of the integral participant doctrine. In *Beck*, a false arrest case, the court ruled
12 that a police chief was not entitled to qualified immunity despite the fact that he “did not sign
13 or prepare the police report, the criminal complaint, or the declaration submitted to secure
14 the warrant.” *Id.* at 871. In finding the chief liable, the court explained that despite the clear
15 absence of probable cause, the chief “failed to do anything to stop the process that led to the
16 arrest, but instead abetted it and threatened [others] when they attempted to get involved.”
17 *Id.* at 872. In fact, the chief not only initiated the investigation and had the matter referred
18 to the prosecutor, he was also one of “purported victims” of the plaintiff’s threatening
19 speech. *Id.*

20
21 *Boyd* was an excessive force case. The court held that every officer who provided
22 armed backup for another officer who unconstitutionally deployed a flash-bang device to
23 gain entry to a suspect’s home could be held liable because “every officer participated in
24 some meaningful way” in the arrest and “every officer was aware of the decision to use the
25 flash-bang, did not object to it, and participated in the search operation knowing the
26 flashbang was to be deployed.” *Boyd*, 374 F.3d at 780.

27 None of the circumstances characterizing the police chief’s personal involvement in
28

1 *Beck* or the officers' actions in *Boyd* are present with respect to the roles played by
2 Hernandez, Lopez, and Proctor in Plaintiffs' arrest and prosecution. The record is clear that
3 they did not supervise the Task Force, make the probable cause determinations, or initiate
4 the arrest or prosecution; those decisions were made by Incident Commanders McCoy and
5 Youngman. (See Doc. 167, ¶¶ 68, 77, 82–83; Doc. 193 at 79, 92–93; *id.*, Exs. 4, 5, and 8.)
6 The Individual Defendants simply carried out routine investigative duties and were present
7 at Task Force briefings. Neither this activity, nor Hernandez's presence at Reed's arrest,
8 amounts to "fundamental involvement" in the conduct that resulted in the alleged
9 constitutional violation. *Blankenhorn*, 485 F.3d at 481 n.12. Therefore, Plaintiffs' conclusory
10 assertions of wrongdoing on the part of the Task Force are insufficient to demonstrate that
11 Proctor, Hernandez, and Lopez personally violated any of their constitutional rights.

12 Unlike the Individual Defendants, Massey and Anderson, however, did personally
13 participate in the arrests. Nevertheless, as discussed next, they are entitled to qualified
14 immunity if the arrests were supported by probable cause.

15 **B. Probable Cause**

16 The Individual Defendants, along with Massey and Anderson, contend that no
17 constitutional violation occurred, and therefore they are entitled to qualified immunity,
18 because the arrests were supported by probable cause. (Doc. 169 at 7.) "The test for whether
19 probable cause exists is whether 'at the moment of arrest the facts and circumstances within
20 the knowledge of the arresting officers and of which they had reasonably trustworthy
21 information were sufficient to warrant a prudent [person] in believing that the petitioner had
22 committed or was committing an offense.'" *Blankenhorn*, 485 F.3d at 471 (quoting *United*
23 *States v. Jensen*, 425 F.3d 698, 704 (9th Cir. 2005)); *Peng v. Mei Chin Penghu*, 335 F.3d
24 970, 976 (9th Cir. 2003) ("Probable cause exists when, under the totality of the circumstances
25 known to the arresting officers, a prudent person would have concluded that there was a fair
26 probability that [the suspect] had committed a crime.") (quoting *United States v. Buckner*,

1 179 F.3d 834, 837 (9th Cir. 1999)).

2 Because qualified immunity protects all “but the plainly incompetent or those who
3 knowingly violate the law,” a law enforcement officer will be immune to claims based on an
4 arrest without probable cause unless “it is obvious that no reasonably competent officer”
5 would have believed that there was probable cause to arrest. *Malley v. Briggs*, 475 U.S. 335,
6 341 (1986); *see Crowe v. County of San Diego*, 608 F.3d 406, 433–34 (9th Cir. 2010). Thus,
7 qualified immunity applies not only to officers who correctly determine that probable cause
8 exists, but also to officers who reasonably but mistakenly conclude that it does. *Hunter v.*
9 *Bryant*, 502 U.S. 224, 227 (1991).

10 “The existence of probable cause turns on the information known to the officers at the
11 moment the arrest is made, not on subsequently-received information.” *Spiegel v. Cortese*,
12 196 F.3d 717, 725 (7th Cir. 1999). The fact that charges are ultimately dismissed does not
13 mean the arrest was not supported by probable cause. *See Freeman v. City of Santa Ana*, 68
14 F.3d 1180, 1189 (9th Cir. 1995).

15 Here, the Court concludes that the Individual Defendants, and tribal officers Massey
16 and Anderson, could have reasonably believed that probable cause existed to arrest Plaintiffs.

17
18 At the time they made the probable cause determination to arrest Dupris, Agents
19 McCoy and Youngman were aware of various information suggesting Dupris’ involvement
20 in the attacks. (*See* Doc. 167, Exs. 7, 10.) Dupris had recently been a security guard for the
21 White Mountain Apache Housing Authority (“WMAHA”), and in that capacity he had access
22 to the locations and equipment used by the attacker, including handcuffs. (*Id.*) Dupris lived
23 in the “Ben Gay” housing area, near the trail where the assaults occurred. (Doc. 167, Exs. 4,
24 7, 10.) Michelle Young, a former tribal police officer, had observed Dupris on patrol one
25 night around the time of one of the attacks. (Doc. 167, Exs. 6, 7, 10.) Wearing a shirt with
26 the word “security” on it, he was running from a trail to his vehicle. (*Id.*) Young then saw
27 Dupris change back into his WMAHA shirt. (*Id.*) Two victims, L.T. and L.B., identified
28

1 Dupris from a photo lineup (*id.*, Exs. 6, 7, 8, 10), as did M.M., an eyewitness to another
2 assault. (*Id.*, Exs. 7, 10.) Other victims provided physical details of their attacker that
3 matched those of Dupris. (*Id.*, Exs. 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10.) Dupris had lied about his residence, and
4 his polygraph answers were deemed “deceptive” by an FBI examiner. (*Id.*, Exs. 7, 10.)
5 Victim C.D. stated that her attacker did not have the accent of an Apache man, had a “light
6 complexion,” and was not Apache. (*Id.*) Dupris is Irish and Sioux, not Apache, and had lived
7 off of the Reservation for several years. (*Id.*) Dupris’ supervisor believed that he had once
8 gotten into trouble when he worked for WMAHA for “having a young woman in his work
9 vehicle.” (*Id.*)

10 When they made the decision to arrest Reed, McCoy and Youngman were aware of
11 the following information. When shown a photo lineup, victim B.L. identified Reed as her
12 attacker. (Doc. 167, Exs. 6, 7, 10.) Reed matched the height and weight descriptions provided
13 by several victims and witnesses, and matched descriptions that the suspect had “hairy” or
14 “bushy” eyebrows. (*Id.*, Exs. 4, 6, 7, 10.) Like Dupris, he lived in the “Ben Gay” housing
15 area and had worked as a WMAHA security guard. (*Id.*, Exs. 7, 10.) He was evasive and
16 refused to speak with the Task Force or come in for an interview. (*Id.*) Dupris identified Reed
17 as a possible suspect based on the similarity of their appearance. (*Id.*) Reed’s supervisor said
18 he was the only security guard who had a flashlight with a blue light, which matched the type
19 of flashlight used by the suspect. (*Id.*) Reed admitted he had been accused “of picking up
20 girls in different areas, and having two way radios.” (*Id.*) Reed is an Apache who has lived
21 on the Reservation his entire life, and victim B.L., who identified Reed from the photo
22 lineup, stated that her attacker had a “rez boy” voice. (*Id.*)

23 Finally, prior to the arrests, the United States District Court had authorized a search
24 of Dupris’ vehicle and residence, and the tribal prosecutor, after being briefed by McCoy and
25 Youngman, authorized the arrest of Dupris and Reed on tribal charges. (*Id.*)

26 Plaintiffs note inconsistencies in the accounts offered by the victims and witnesses,
27
28

1 and challenge the reliability of their identifications.³ While some of Plaintiffs' concerns are
2 well taken, they are not sufficient to show that Task Force agents were incompetent or
3 knowingly violated the law when they determined that probable cause existed to arrest
4 Plaintiffs. "Nothing suggests that a victim's report must be unfailingly consistent to provide
5 probable cause. The credibility of a putative victim or witness is a question, not for police
6 officers in the discharge of their considerable duties, but for the jury in a criminal trial."
7 *Spiegel*, 196 F.3d at 725; *see Torchinsky v. Siwinski*, 942 F.2d 257, 262 (4th Cir. 1991) ("It
8 is surely reasonable for a police officer to base his belief in probable cause on a victim's
9 reliable identification of his attacker."); *Ahlers v. Schebil*, 188 F.3d 365, 370 (6th Cir. 1999)
10 ("An eyewitness identification will constitute sufficient probable cause unless, at the time
11 of the arrest, there is an apparent reason for the officer to believe that the eyewitness was
12 lying, did not accurately describe what he had seen, or was in some fashion mistaken
13 regarding his recollection of the confrontation.") (interior quotations omitted); *Curley v.*
14 *Village of Suffern*, 268 F.3d 65, 70 (2d Cir. 2001) (information provided by a victim is
15 sufficient to establish probable cause even where the suspect and victim provide different
16 versions of events, "unless the circumstances raise doubt as to the person's veracity").

17
18 The Task Force had no reason to believe the witnesses were lying or mistaken in their
19 identifications and descriptions of the suspects. Once probable cause to arrest Plaintiffs was
20 established through this information, the Task Force was under "no constitutional obligation
21 to conduct any further investigation in the hopes of uncovering potentially exculpatory
22 evidence." *Spiegel*, 196 F.3d at 723.

23 Moreover, the eyewitness identifications in this case did not stand alone but were

24
25 ³ These inconsistencies principally relate to the witnesses' descriptions of the
26 suspects' height and build. While both Dupris and Reed are six feet, four inches tall, several
27 witnesses described their attacker as being under six feet. (*See, e.g.*, Doc. 193 at 8–14.)
28 However, one of these witnesses, victim L.B., positively identified Plaintiff Dupris. (*See id.*
at 15.) Plaintiffs also note that victim L.T. and witness M.M., both of whom identified
Dupris, had been drinking at the time of the incidents, as had victim B.L., who identified
Plaintiff Reed as her attacker. (*See id.* at 10–11.)

1 supported by corroborating circumstantial evidence, including the fact that Plaintiffs were
2 employed as security guards, were familiar with the area where the assaults took place, and
3 were evasive or deceptive during their interactions with the agents; in addition, Dupris was
4 seen running from a trail at night and then changing his clothes. The information gathered
5 by the Task Force persuaded the tribal prosecutor to approve the arrest and initiate the
6 prosecution of Dupris and Reed. The Court therefore concludes that the totality of the
7 evidence before the Task Force was sufficient to support a reasonable belief that probable
8 cause existed to arrest Plaintiffs. The Task Force agents were not required to delay the arrests
9 “until after they have resolved each and every inconsistency or contradiction in a victim’s
10 account.” *Spiegel*, 196 F.3d at 725.

11 **C. Malicious Prosecution**

12 The existence of probable cause also defeats Plaintiffs’ s malicious prosecution claim.
13 There is a presumption that a prosecutor filing a criminal complaint exercised independent
14 judgment in determining that probable cause existed to arrest the accused, thereby breaking
15 the chain of causation between arrest and prosecution and immunizing the investigating
16 officers from damages suffered after complaint was filed. *Beck*, 527 F.3d at 862; *see Newman*
17 *v. County of Orange*, 457 F.3d 991, 993 (9th Cir. 2006) (“[f]iling a criminal complaint
18 immunizes investigating officers . . . from damages suffered thereafter because it is presumed
19 that the prosecutor filing the complaint exercised independent judgment in determining that
20 probable cause for an accused’s arrest exists at that time”) (quoting *Smiddy v. Varney*, 665
21 F.2d 261, 266 (9th Cir. 1981)). Rebutting the presumption of independent prosecutorial
22 judgment requires that “the plaintiff prove the absence of probable cause.” *Id.* at 864.
23

24 The Court has found that McCoy and Youngman, who commanded the Task Force,
25 reasonably determined that probable cause existed to arrest Plaintiffs. Based on this finding,
26 the Court concludes that Plaintiffs have failed to rebut the presumption that the tribal
27 prosecutor’s judgment to prosecute was independent. The prosecutor herself has attested that
28

1 her decision prosecute Plaintiffs was made independently and in good faith, based on the
2 information she received from the Task Force. Her independence is further demonstrated by
3 that fact that she came to believe Plaintiffs were “overcharged” and moved to modify the
4 charges before arraignment. (Doc. 167, Ex. 5.)

5 The Individual Defendants have satisfied their burden of establishing that there is no
6 genuine issue of material fact to be resolved regarding their immunity or the existence of
7 probable cause. *See Moreno*, 431 F.3d at 638. Therefore, their summary judgment motion
8 will be granted.

9 **DEFENDANT UNITED STATES’ MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AS**
10 **TO PLAINTIFFS’ FTCA CLAIM**

11 In their FTCA claim, Plaintiffs allege that the negligent and/or grossly negligent acts
12 and omissions of the Individual Defendants constituted false arrest, malicious prosecution,
13 abuse of process, and aiding and abetting the tortious conduct of others. (Doc. 126 at 30.)
14 The United States moves for summary judgment on the grounds that Plaintiffs’ FTCA claims
15 are barred by the discretionary function exception, by the immunity provision of Arizona’s
16 mandatory reporting statute, A.R.S. § 13-3620, and by the existence of probable cause at the
17 time of the arrests.⁴ (Doc. 168.)

18 **I. Discretionary Function Doctrine**

19 The United States can be sued only to the extent that it has waived its sovereign
20 immunity. *Reed v. United States Dep’t of Interior*, 231 F.3d 501, 504 (9th Cir. 2000). The
21 FTCA grants such a waiver and authorizes suits against the United States
22

23 for injury or loss of property, or personal injury or death caused by the
24 negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government
25 while acting within the scope of his office or employment, under
26 circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable to
the claimant in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission
occurred.

27 ⁴ Based on its analysis of these issues and its findings with respect to probable
28 cause, the Court will not address Defendants’ additional arguments.

1 28 U.S.C. § 1346(b)(1).

2 However, there are exceptions to this broad waiver of sovereign immunity, one of
3 which is the discretionary function exception, which maintains the United States' immunity
4 for "[a]ny claim . . . based upon the exercise or performance or the failure to exercise or
5 perform a discretionary function or duty on the part of a federal agency or an employee of
6 the Government, whether or not the discretion involved is abused." 28 U.S.C. § 2680(a).
7 "The discretionary function exception marks the boundary between Congress' willingness
8 to impose tort liability on the United States and the desire to protect certain decision-making
9 from judicial second-guessing." *Conrad v. United States*, 447 F.3d 760, 764 (9th Cir. 2006)
10 (citing *Berkovitz v. United States*, 486 U.S. 531, 536–37 (1988)).

11 In assessing whether the discretionary function exception applies to a particular case,
12 courts look to "the nature of the conduct, rather than the status of the actor," and assess the
13 conduct in two ways. *Berkovitz*, 486 U.S. at 536 (quoting *United States v. Varig Airlines*, 467
14 U.S. 797, 813 (1984)). The first issue is whether the action taken by the government
15 employee is a matter of judgment. *Id.* ("conduct cannot be discretionary unless it involves
16 an element of judgment or choice"). The discretionary function exception will not apply if
17 there is a statute, regulation, or policy mandating particular conduct by a government
18 employee which does not allow for the exercise of discretion in fulfilling that mandate. *Id.*

19 Once it has been determined that the challenged conduct involves an element of
20 discretion, the question is whether the discretion involves the type of decision-making that
21 the discretionary function exception was designed to protect. *Id.* The purpose of the
22 discretionary function exception is "to prevent judicial second-guessing of legislative and
23 administrative decisions grounded in social, economic, and political policy through the
24 medium of an action in tort." *Id.* at 536-37 (quoting *Varig Airlines*, 467 U.S. at 814).
25 Therefore, the exception applies if the discretionary decision is a permissible exercise of
26 policy judgment. *Id.*

1 Another exception to the FTCA’s waiver of sovereign immunity is for intentional
2 torts, including malicious prosecution and false arrest. 28 U.S.C. § 2680(h). However, this
3 exception does not apply to intentional torts committed by federal “investigative or law
4 enforcement officers.” *Id.* The Ninth Circuit and other courts have interpreted § 2680(h) as
5 being subject to the discretionary function proviso of § 2680(a). *See Gasho v. United States*,
6 39 F.3d 1420, 1433 (9th Cir. 1994); *Medina v. United States*, 259 F.3d 220, 225, 229 (4th
7 Cir. 2001); *Pooler v. United States*, 787 F.2d 868, 872–73 (3d Cir. 1986); *Gray v. Bell*, 712
8 F.2d 490, 507–08 (D.C.Cir. 1983). Thus, “to maintain an FTCA claim for an intentional tort,
9 a plaintiff must first clear the ‘discretionary function’ hurdle.” *Gasho*, 39 F.3d at 1433. “If
10 a defendant can show that the tortious conduct involves a ‘discretionary function,’ a plaintiff
11 cannot maintain an FTCA claim, even if the discretionary act constitutes an intentional tort
12 under section 2680(h).” *Id.* at 1435.

13 The government bears the burden of proving that the discretionary function exception
14 applies. *Myers v. United States*, 652 F.3d 1021, 1028 (9th Cir. 2011). As set forth below, the
15 Court finds that the United States has satisfied that burden.

16 **II. Analysis**

17 **A. Application of discretionary function exception**

18 As the Ninth Circuit has explained, “investigations by federal officers clearly involve
19 the type of policy judgment protected by the discretionary-function exception.” *Alfrey v.*
20 *United States*, 276 F.3d 557, 566 (9th Cir. 2002) (citing *Sabow v. United States*, 93 F.3d
21 1445, 1452 (9th Cir. 1996)); *see Sloan v. United States Dep’t of Housing and Urban Dev.*,
22 236 F.3d 756, 760 (D.C. Cir. 2001) (“The decision to initiate a prosecution has long been
23 regarded as a classic discretionary function.”); *Horta v. Sullivan*, 4 F.3d 2, 21 (1st Cir. 1993)
24 (“although law enforcement agents have a mandatory duty to enforce the law, decisions as
25 to how best to fulfill that duty are protected by the discretionary function exception to the
26 FTCA”); *Pooler*, 787 F.2d at 871 (3d Cir. 1986) (“Decision making as to investigation and
27
28

1 enforcement, particularly when there are different types of enforcement action available, are
2 discretionary judgments.”) (interior quotation omitted). The BIA Task Force, in pursuing its
3 investigation of the rapes on the Reservation, was exercising the type of policy judgments
4 protected by the discretionary function exception. *See Sabow*, 93 F.3d at 1453
5 (“Investigations by federal law enforcement officials . . . clearly require investigative officers
6 to consider relevant political and social circumstances in making decisions about the nature
7 and scope of a criminal investigation” and are the types of “social and political judgments
8 that Congress meant to shield from FTCA challenges”).

9 Plaintiffs contend, however, that the discretionary function exception is inapplicable
10 in this case because “Defendants did not have discretion to declare that probable cause
11 existed when their discretionary decisions resulted in no reasonable belief that either Reed
12 or Dupris committed the offenses for which they were charged.” (Doc. 192 at 6.) In support
13 of this allegation, Plaintiffs assert that the investigation was “shabby” and that the BIA
14 rushed to solve the case so that it could pay out reward bonuses and gain leverage in its
15 attempt to shut down the tribal police force. (*Id.* at 2, 12.) These arguments are unsupported
16 and unpersuasive.

17 First, a review of the relevant cases demonstrates that decisions to arrest and prosecute
18 Reed and Dupris were the product of discretionary functions, and thus protected under §
19 2680(a), notwithstanding Plaintiffs’ criticisms of the quality of the investigation. “Congress
20 did not intend to provide for judicial review of the quality of investigative efforts.” *Pooler*,
21 787 F.2d at 871; *see Vickers v. United States*, 228 F.3d 944, 950 (9th Cir. 2000) (“Under the
22 FTCA, negligence in performing discretionary functions” is not actionable.”); *Sabow*, 93
23 F.3d at 1452 n. 6, 1453-54; *Kerns v. United States*, No. CV-04-1937-PHX-NVW, 2007 WL
24 552227, at *21 (D. Ariz. Feb. 21, 2007), *rev’d on other grounds*, 2009 WL 226207 (9th Cir.
25 Jan. 28, 2009) (“The discretionary function exception has been applied to shield review of
26 the negligent investigation and arrest of a person later determined to be innocent of the
27

1 charged offense.”). Courts have applied the exception despite investigative deficiencies,
2 including mishandling, altering, and failing to obtain and preserve physical evidence,
3 irregularities in the autopsy and interviewing procedures, and failure to consider all the
4 evidence, *Sabow*, 93 F.3d at 1452–54; failing to “verify, corroborate or surveil” the drug
5 transactions that led to the plaintiffs’ arrest and prosecution, *Pooler*, 787 F.2d at 869; failing
6 to interview a certain witness, conduct a line-up or show the witness a photo-array, or
7 otherwise further investigate a claim of mistaken identity, *Valdez v. United States*, 08 Civ.
8 4424(RPP), 2009 WL 2365549 (S.D.N.Y. July 31, 2009); conducting a “haphazard”
9 investigation to quickly solve a “high visibility” case and showing witnesses photos of the
10 plaintiff that were 15 to 20 years old, *Rourke v. United States*, 744 F.Supp. 100, 102 (E.D.Pa.
11 1990).

12 The Court rejects the argument that the Task Force investigation was deficient in a
13 manner that separates it from these cases and necessitates a finding that discretionary
14 function immunity does not apply. Plaintiffs’ allegations that the investigation was not only
15 shabby but pursued in bad faith are neither supported by the record nor relevant, given the
16 Court’s conclusion, set forth above, that probable cause existed to arrest and prosecute
17 Dupris and Reed.

18 This is not a case where officers “act[ed] entirely outside the bounds of the policy
19 considerations supporting application of the discretionary function exception.” *Casillas v.*
20 *United States*, CV 07-395-DCB (HCE), 2009 WL 735193, at *15 (D.Ariz February 11, 2009)
21 The Task Force agents did not “depart[] from the duties of an investigator.” *Sutton v. United*
22 *States*, 819 F.2d 1289, 1293 (5th Cir. 1987). To the contrary, it was through the performance
23 of their investigative duties that they reached their probable cause determination.
24

25 There is a clear contrast between the investigation undertaken by the Task Force and
26 cases where courts have found that the government forfeited the protections of the
27 discretionary function exception. For example, in *Reynolds v. United States*, 549 F.3d 1108,
28

1 1112–14 (7th Cir. 2008), the court ruled that the discretionary function exception did not
2 apply to protect two federal government investigators from suit in an action alleging that the
3 agents submitted a knowingly false affidavit to the state prosecutor, resulting in the plaintiff’s
4 prosecution and subsequent loss of her job. In *Limone v. United States*, 497 F.Supp.2d 143
5 (D. Mass. 2007), the court found that the discretionary function exception did not preclude
6 liability where FBI agents suborned perjured testimony, resulting in wrongful murder
7 convictions, and where the FBI concealed information that would have exposed the agents’
8 activities. Finally, in *Patel v. United States*, 806 F.Supp. 873, 876 (N.D. Cal. 1992), the court
9 found that the discretionary function exception did not apply to the officers’ decision to burn
10 down a structure while executing a search warrant because the decision was “not based on
11 considerations rooted in social, economic or political policy.”

12 Plaintiffs’ criticisms of the Task Force investigation, to the extent they are supported
13 by the record, allege nothing more than the kind of negligence that is subject to protection
14 under the discretionary function doctrine.

15 The decisions made by the BIA Task Force in its investigation were discretionary and
16 grounded in policy considerations. Therefore, Plaintiffs’ FTCA claims are barred by the
17 discretionary function exception. Moreover, the arrest and prosecution of Dupris and Reed
18 were supported by probable cause. No genuine issues of material fact exist regarding these
19 issues. Accordingly, the Court will grant the United States’ motion for summary judgment.

20
21 **B. A.R.S. § 13-3620(J)**

22 Under 28 U.S.C. § 1336(b), FTCA actions are governed by “the law of the place
23 where the act or omission causing the injury occurred.” *Mundt v. United States*, 611 F.2d
24 1257, 1259 (9th Cir. 1980). The government is only liable to the same extent as a private
25 person would be under state law. 28 U.S.C. § 1346(b)(1); *Conrad*, 447 F.3d at 767; *see* 28
26 U.S.C. § 2674 (the United States is liable “in the same manner and to the same extent as a
27 private individual in like circumstances”). “Even if the conduct entails uniquely
28

1 governmental functions, the court is to examine the liability of private persons in analogous
2 situations.” *Tekle v. United States*, 511 F.3d 839, 852 (9th Cir. 2007) (citing *United States*
3 *v. Olson*, 546 U.S. 43, 45–46 (2005)). Therefore, Arizona law is used to determine the United
4 States’ tort liability in this matter. This includes applying the same immunities Arizona
5 affords a private person. *Id.*; see *Dalrymple v. United States*, 460 F.3d 1318 (11th Cir. 2006);
6 *Barnes v. United States*, 448 F.3d 1065 (8th Cir. 2006); *In re Fema Trailer Formaldehyde*
7 *Products Liability Litigation*, 719 F.Supp.2d 677, 684 (E.D.La. 2010).

8 Pursuant to A.R.S. § 13-3620(A), (J), any person, including a police officer,
9 investigating allegations of sexual assault of a minor, is immune from civil liability arising
10 from the investigation unless they acted with malice.⁵ See *Crawford v. City of Phoenix*, CV
11 05-2444-PHX-JAT, 2007 WL 1140396, at *2 (D. Ariz. Apr. 16, 2007). Malice is defined as
12 “a wish to vex, annoy or injure another person, or an intent to do a wrongful act, established
13 either by proof or presumption of law.” A.R.S. § 1-215(2).

14 There is no dispute that the BIA Task Force was investigating sexual assaults
15 committed against minors. Therefore, absent a showing of malice, the United States would
16 be entitled to immunity under § 13-3620(J).

17 Plaintiffs contend that genuine issues of material fact exist as to whether the United
18 States acted with malice. (Doc. 192 at 7–15.) However, Plaintiffs’ specific allegations of
19 malice, which ascribe to Task Force investigators various ulterior motives, such as time
20 constraints and financial incentives (see Doc. 192 at 11–15), are conclusory, speculative, and
21 unsupported in the record. Therefore, they are insufficient to raise a genuine issue of material
22 fact. See *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 257; *Jeffers v. Gomez*, 267 F.3d 895, 908 (9th Cir. 2001).

23 Moreover, as discussed above, the arrests were supported by probable cause, which
24

25
26 ⁵ Plaintiffs contend that A.R.S. § 13-3620 is unconstitutional under the state
27 constitution’s anti-abrogation clause. (Doc. 192 at 8–11.) However, because no court has
28 found § 13-3620 unconstitutional, its immunity provisions applied to the United States under
28 U.S.C. § 2674.

1 undermines any contention that they were undertaken with a “wish to vex, annoy or injure
2 another person, or an intent to do a wrongful act.”

3 For the same reasons, tribal officers Massey and Anderson, who joined this aspect of
4 the United States’ motion for summary judgment, are also entitled to immunity under A.R.S.
5 § 13-3620(J).

6 **PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT RE:**
7 **FEDERAL EMPLOYEE STATUS OF TRIBAL OFFICER DEFENDANTS**

8 Plaintiffs allege that Perphelia Massey and Joshua Anderson were “federal
9 employees” for purposes of the FTCA and *Bivens*, and seek summary judgment on the issue.
10 (Doc. 170.) In response, the Federal Defendants contend that the motion should be denied
11 as moot because they do not contest the federal employee status of Massey and Anderson for
12 purposes of the FTCA. (Doc. 185 at 2.) In the alternative, the Federal Defendants argue that
13 the motion should be denied and the FTCA claims dismissed “because the actions by the
14 Defendants do not meet the requirements of the proviso to the intentional tort exception of
15 the FTCA.” (*Id.*) The Federal Defendants take no position on whether Massey and Anderson
16 are subject to liability under *Bivens*.⁶ (*Id.*, n.2.)

17 **I. 28 U.S.C. § 2680(h) and *Bivens***

18 As noted above, 28 U.S.C. § 2680(h), which establishes immunity for claims based
19 on intentional torts such as false arrest and malicious prosecution, contains a proviso waiving
20 immunity for intentional torts committed by any “investigative or law enforcement officer,”
21 defined as “any officer of the United States who is empowered by law to execute searches,
22 to seize evidence, or to make arrests for violations of Federal law.” The parties do not dispute
23 that “[a]bsent the power to enforce federal law, tribal officers are not federal investigative
24 or law enforcement officers.” *Trujillo v. United States*, 313 F.Supp.2d 1146, 1150 (D.N.M.

26 ⁶ The Federal Defendants are represented by the United States Department of
27 Justice, which does not represent Massey or Anderson in their individual capacities. (Doc.
28 185 at 2, n.2.)

1 2003) (citing *Dry v. United States*, 235 F.3d 1249 (10th Cir. 2000)); see *Russell v. United*
2 *States*, No. CV-08-8111-PCT-MHM, 2009 WL 2929426, at *1 (D.Ariz. Sept. 10, 2009).

3 In *Bivens*, 403 U.S. 388, the Supreme Court “recognized for the first time an implied
4 private action for damages against federal officers alleged to have violated a citizen’s
5 constitutional rights.” *Correctional Services Corp. v. Malesko*, 534 U.S. 61, 66 (2001). “It
6 is widely accepted that *Bivens* provides a cause of action only against an official ‘acting
7 under color of federal law.’” *Pollard v. Geo Group, Inc.*, 607 F.3d 583, 588 (9th Cir. 2010)
8 (citing *Bivens*, 403 U.S. at 389); see *Boney v. Valline*, 597 F.Supp.2d 1167, 1172 (D.Nev.
9 2009) (under *Bivens* plaintiff must show that the constitutional violation was “committed by
10 a federal actor”).

11 **II. Analysis**

12 Massey and Anderson were tribal police officers assigned to the Task Force. Massey
13 arrested Dupris, and Anderson arrested Reed. Plaintiffs assert that Massey and Anderson, by
14 virtue of their participation with the BIA Task Force, were federal law enforcement officers
15 for purposes of § 2680(h). Plaintiffs’ arguments in support of this proposition are not
16 supported by the record or relevant legal authority.

17 First, the record shows that Massey and Anderson were not given Special Law
18 Enforcement Commissions (“SLEC”) from the BIA, deputized by the BIA, or otherwise
19 authorized to make arrests under federal law. (Doc.186, Exs. 1, 2.) In addition, contrary to
20 Plaintiffs’ assertion, the fact that a 93-638⁷ contract existed between the BIA and the Tribe
21 for the provision of law enforcement services does not “automatically confers federal law
22 enforcement authority upon the officers in tribal police departments.” *Trujillo*, 313 F.Supp.2d
23 at 1150; see *Buxton v. United States*, No. CIV. 09-5057-JLV, 2011 WL 4528329 (D.S.D.
24 Sept. 28, 2011) (explaining that a “separate process exists for conferring federal law
25

26
27 ⁷ The Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, Publ.L. No. 93-
28 638, authorizes the BIA to provide law enforcement services on reservations.

1 enforcement authority on tribal police officers”); *Bob v. United States*, No. Civ. 07-5068,
2 2008 WL 818499, at *2 (D.S.D. March 26, 2008) (holding that even though tribal defendants
3 may be considered federal employees under the FTCA, they were not federal “investigative
4 or law enforcement officers” in light of government’s affidavit stating that none of the tribal
5 officers involved in the disputed incident held an SLEC from the BIA); *Locke v. United*
6 *States*, 215 F. Supp.2d 1033, 1038–39 (D.S.D. 2002).

7 As further evidence that Massey and Anderson were federal officers, Plaintiffs cite
8 the fact that they assisted in the execution of federal search warrants. This level of
9 participation is insufficient to establish their status as federal law enforcement officers or
10 investigators under § 2680(h). In *Locke*, for instance, the court found that neither the
11 existence of a 638 contract nor the allegation that “in practice” tribal officers assisted in
12 executing federal warrants or making arrests on federal violations suggested that the officer
13 was “anything other than a Tribal police officer.” 215 F. Supp.2d at 1038–39.

14 Based on these factors, the Court also finds that Massey and Anderson, when they
15 arrested Plaintiffs, were not acting under the color of federal law for purposes of liability
16 under *Bivens*. See *Boney*, 597 F.Supp.2d at 1186; *Romero v. Peterson*, 930 F.2d 1502, 1507
17 (10th Cir. 1991) (to be federal officers entitled to qualified immunity from liability in *Bivens*
18 action, defendants must have been acting as employees or agents of federal government or
19 using their federal badges or other indicia of authority in furtherance of business of another
20 entity or person). Massey and Anderson were tribal officers who arrested Plaintiffs on tribal
21 charges. As noted, the record indicates that they were not authorized to arrest suspects on
22 federal charges. (Doc.186, Exs. 1, 2.)

23
24 Plaintiffs are not entitled to summary judgment on the issue of the federal employee
25 status of Massey and Anderson.
26
27
28

1 **CONCLUSION**

2 In their motions for summary judgment, the Individual Defendants and the United
3 States have shown that there are no genuine disputes as to any material facts and they are
4 entitled to judgment as a matter of law under Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). Plaintiffs have failed to
5 make such a showing in their partial motion for summary judgment.

6 Accordingly,

7 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** granting the Individual Defendants' Motion for
8 Summary Judgment (Doc. 169).

9 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** granting the United States' Motion for Summary
10 Judgment as to Plaintiffs' FTCA Claim (Doc. 168).


11 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** denying Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary
12 Judgement (Doc. 170).

13 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** dismissing the Fourth Amended Complaint (Doc.
14 126).

15 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** denying as moot Defendant's Motion in Limine to
16 Exclude the Expert Testimony of Mr. Robertson, Dr. Lyman, and Dr. Davis (Doc. 162).

17 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment
18 accordingly.

19 DATED this 24th day of January, 2012.
20

21 
22 _____
23 Paul G. Rosenblatt
24 United States District Judge
25
26
27
28