	l i		
1	JOEL H. SIEGAL, ESQ. [SBN: 117044] Attorney at Law	ENDORSED FILED Superior Court of California Country of San Francisco	
2	703 Market Street, Suite 801 San Francisco, CA 94103		
3	Telephone: (415) 777-5547	JUN - 3 2011	
4	Facsimile: (415) 777-5247 Email: joelsiegal@yahoo.com	CLERK OF THE COURT WARY A. MORAN	
5		Deputy Clerk	
6	Attorney For Plaintiffs MAHEEN CHANI TASEER AND SHA	AHBAZ ALI TASEER	
7		•	
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
9	SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY—UNLIMITED JURISDICTION		
10	MAHEEN GHANI TASEER AND	Case No. CGG-11-508779	
11	SHAHBAZ ALI TASEER,	FIRST AMENDED	
12	Plaintiffs,	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES	
13	AMERICANI AIRI BIES, CITY AND	1) Violations of Civil Code Sections 51, 51.5, 51.7, 52, 52.1;	
14	AMERICAN AIRLINES; CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; SAN FRANCISCO POLICE	2) Violation of California Constitution Article 1, Sections 2, 4, 7;	
15	DEPARTMENT; SAN FRANCISCO	Violation of California Government Code Section:11135;	
16	CHIEF OF POLICE GREG SUHR, OFFICER CUNNINGHAM (Badge	4) Negligence 5) Assault	
17	#236); OFFICER LEE (Badge #81); and DOES 1-100, inclusive,	6) Battery 7) False Imprisonment/False Arrest	
18	Defendants.	8) Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress 9) Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress	
19		10) 42 USC Sections 1983 and 1985	
20			
21	Plaintiffs MAHEEN GHANI TASEER AND SHAHBAZ ALI TASEER allege as		
22	follows:		
23	1. This is an action for mone	etary relief. It arises from a common set of factual	
24	issues regarding the racial profiling by American Airlines, the City and County of San		
25	Francisco, and the San Francisco Police Department of Plaintiffs Maheen Ghani Taseer and		
26	Shahbaz Ali Taseer, prominent and respectful citizens of Pakistan, when they were on board an		
27	American Airlines flight at San Francisco International Airport. As a result of Defendant's		
28			
	FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES	-1- FirstAndComplaint_Taseer_060211[1] Case No. CGG-1]-508779	

 unjust actions, Plaintiffs have suffered physical harm, extreme humiliation and embarrassment, harm to their reputations and a fear of travel.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. This Court is proper because injuries to the plaintiffs occurred within the jurisdictional boundaries of this Court, and because Defendants, and each of them, operate within the jurisdictional boundaries of this Court.
 - 3. Plaintiffs hereby request a jury trial on all claims.

THE PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff, MAHEEN GHANI TASEER, is a citizen of Pakistan, and is of Middle Eastern heritage and descent, and is a Muslim.
- 5. Plaintiff, SHAHBAZ ALI TASEER, is a citizen of Pakistan, and is of Middle Eastern heritage and descent, and is a Muslim. He is the son of Salman Taseer, the prominent and well respected recently assassinated Governor of the Punjab Province of Pakistan.
- 6. Defendant, AMERICAN AIRLINES, is a commercial air carrier, and a corporation doing business in the state of California and operating an airline at San Francisco International Airport in San Francisco, California.
- 7. Defendants CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO and the SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT were acting under the authority of Defendant City and County of San Francisco. Defendants SAN FRANCISCO CHIEF OF POLICE GREG SUHR, OFFICER CUNNINGHAM (Badge #236), and OFFICER LEE (Badge #81), acted within their authority.
- 8. Plaintiffs do not know the true names of defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, and therefore sue them by those fictitious names. In addition, plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that each of those defendants was in some manner negligently and proximately responsible for the events and happenings alleged in this Complaint and for plaintiffs' damages.

-2-

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

FirstAntdComplaint_Tisseer_060211[1]
Case No. CGG-11-508779

9. Pursuant to Government Code §§900, et seq., Plaintiffs are required to file a notice of claim against certain public entities. Plaintiffs did file such claim. Plaintiffs timely filed this action upon rejection of said claim.

FACTS

- vacation. They looked forward to spending a few weeks traveling in the United States.

 Plaintiffs were young, successful and recently married. Plaintiff Shahbaz Ali Taseer is the son of the recently assassinated Governor of the Punjab Province of Pakistan. Governor Taseer was a close ally of the United States Government, and the Plaintiffs herein had no history of militant, subversive, or terrorist activity. In fact they, like there father, were allies, friends and admirers of the United States and our system of government and law. They spent a week in New York, New York before heading to California where they spent a week in Los Angeles, and then flew to San Francisco where they spent the remaining 10 days of their vacation.
- 11. On August 19, 2010, Plaintiffs were passengers who held valid tickets for passage aboard American Airlines Flight 24 from San Francisco, California to John F. Kennedy Airport in New York. After a brief layover in New York, Plaintiffs were scheduled to board a Pakistan International Airlines flight to travel home to Lahore, Pakistan. Flight 24, scheduled to depart San Francisco at 7:30 a.m. was delayed until 9:30 a.m.
- 12. Plaintiffs passed through airport security in the San Francisco International Airport without problem. At no time did they exhibit suspicious behavior and they were not singled out for additional searches or questioning. They passed TSA screening without question or concern.
- 13. Plaintiffs boarded American Airlines flight 24 at or about 9:00 a.m. Plaintiffs stowed their carry-on luggage and took their assigned seats in the back of the plane. They settled in and drifted off to sleep.
- 14. At 10:00 a.m., after taxiing, the pilot stopped the plane and announced that there was a delay. The plane remained on the tarmac. Plaintiffs, thinking it would just be a short

-3-

7

8

11

12

13 14 15

19 20 21

17

18

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

delay, continued to sleep. An hour later the pilot said the delay was indefinite and that the plane would return to the gate.

- 15. Over the intercom the pilot assured the passengers that any connecting flights would be rebooked and told them they were free to use their cellular phones, computers and personal listening devices. At 11:30 a.m. Plaintiff Mr. Taseer used his cellular phone to call a friend in the San Francisco area to ask him to come pick Plaintiffs up from the airport as it looked like they might not be able to get on another flight inunediately.
- 16. The pilot came over the intercom again and announced that there was a small security issue and that police officers would be boarding the plane to escort the passengers off, two at a time. Plaintiff has no reason to know or understand why they were singled out by Defendant San Francisco Police Department, handcuffed and arrested. On information and belief, American Airlines Captain Tom Rice, later told San Francisco Police Officers that Plaintiffs, who were seated in row 41h appeared to look "agitated" during the delay. On information and belief Defendant American Airlines suggested to, or conspired with, the other Defendants to point an accusatory finger at Plaintiffs, that they were involved in some illegal activity, simply because of their national origin and religion. That assumption proved false, and is vile and racist. At 12:45 p.m. officers boarded the back of the plane, near Plaintiffs seats, and approached them. An officer asked Plaintiff if his name was "Basheer." Plaintiff replied, "No, my name is Shahbaz Ali Taseer." Plaintiffs were asked to identify their carry on luggage and told they would be handcuffed as part of "normal security protocol." Plaintiffs were then handcuffed in full view of the other passengers. No other passengers were handcuffed. Plaintiffs had no idea what was happening and were embarrassed, shocked and humiliated because they had been singled out.
- 17. Plaintiffs were escorted off of the plane and led to separate police cars, located just below the wings of the plane. The cars were situated so that Plaintiffs were unable to see each other. Plaintiffs were still not told why they had been arrested.
- 18. On information and belief, the Bomb Squad arrived and boarded the plane.

 Because Plaintiffs were handcuffed directly beneath the plane, and confined in the patrol cars.

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

FirstAmdComplaint_Timscer_060211[1]
Case No. CGQ-11-508779

they feared for their lives. Plaintiff Mr. Taseer, whose father was the pro-American high profile Governor of Punjab, feared that he was being framed for political purposes. With no information regarding the status of a supposed bomb aboard the plane, Plaintiffs sat in fear for their lives during the entire hour that the Bomb Squad searched the plane. Had a bomb exploded while they were in handcuffs beneath the plane, Plaintiffs would have been in grave danger. During the hour that they waited, all the while handcuffed, they had never been so scared in their lives.

- 19. After the plane was emptied and searched, Plaintiffs were driven to a new location in the airport. They were then taken into separate rooms and handed over to the FBI. Plaintiff Mr. Taseer was only then read his Miranda rights. He gave the officers permission to search his bag and answered all of their questions. The officers told him that there had been a call stating that two Pakistanis were going to bomb/hijack the plane. Plaintiff asked if he had been personally identified and the officers admitted that he had not.
- 20. In another room, FBI agents questioned Plaintiff Mrs. Taseer. They told her that she had been randomly selected and other passengers were also being questioned. This was a not true; Plaintiffs were the only passengers to be questioned. Plaintiff Mrs. Taseer informed the officers that she was newly married and on vacation with her husband. She answered all of their questions. She had never been so frightened in her life. In addition, due to back problems that were aggravated by wearing the handcuffs, Plaintiff Mrs. Taseer was in extreme pain during the entire interrogation.
- 21. After several hours, Plaintiffs were released. They were told to sign a Certificate of Release that stated that they had been subject to a detention and not an arrest. Anxious to leave, Plaintiffs signed the forms. When Plaintiffs returned to the American Airlines counter to see about boarding another flight home, the area was crawling with media, there to investigate the "terrorist" threat. The media crowded around Plaintiffs who had never felt so humiliated and embarrassed in their lives Plaintiffs were unable to book an immediate flight and their return home was delayed by 3 days.

-5-

 \mathbf{I}

Plaintiff Mrs. Taseer has a history of neck, shoulder and back pain which has gotten substantially worse after this incident. Her pain was aggravated by the prolonged time in handcuffs with her body hunched over in the back of the police car. Her doctor has prescribed muscle relaxers and physical therapy, but she has only had a mild improvement. She has difficulty sleeping as the pain keeps her up at night.

- Due to Defendants' unlawful treatment, Plaintiffs are afraid to travel. After the incident there was extensive media coverage and Plaintiffs were humiliated because they had been labeled as terrorists. This experience has left Plaintiffs anxious, humiliated, embarrassed and confused. Plaintiff Mrs. Taseer's physical injuries affect her quality of life and serve as a constant reminder of the painful and humiliating experience she suffered at the hands of Defendants.
- 24. As reported in the press following the incident there was no credible evidence linking these plaintiffs to any illegal activity. They were singled out, and treated differently, only because of their name and national origin, and religion. In fact, Plaintiffs' father/father-in-law was a respected governor of the State of Punjab, a strong ally of the United States. He was recently assassinated by fundamentalists in his country in and effort to stifle free speech and democracy. It is ironic that Plaintiffs' father and father-in-law were assassinated in Pakistan by radicals, simply for espousing a belief in freedom and liberty, the very qualities that were denied to Plaintiffs in the United States.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of California Civil Code §§ 51, et seq.—Civil Rights Act (Against all Defendants)

- 25. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege paragraphs 1-24, as though set forth fully herein.
- 26. By defendants' aforesaid allowance of hostile action, defendants have violated plaintiffs' right to be free from discrimination and retaliation as guaranteed by Civ. Code §§ 51, et seq.

-6-

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

FirstAmdComplain(_Taseer_060211[1] Case No CGG-11-508779

- As a direct and proximate result of conduct of defendants, and each of them, plaintiffs have suffered and will continue to suffer physical injuries, humiliation, and mental anguish.
- 28. Defendants' violation of plaintiffs' civil rights as guaranteed by Civ. Code §§
 51, et seq., entitles plaintiffs to receive compensatory damages, reasonable attorney's fees, and injunctive relief, all of which are provided for in Civ. Code § 52 and are prayed for below.
- In doing the acts alleged in this Complaint, defendants knew or should have known that their actions and inactions were likely to cause harm to Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that defendants intended to cause injury to plaintiffs and acted with a willful and conscious disregard of plaintiffs' rights as secured by Civ. Code §§ 51, et seq., thereby entitling plaintiffs to recover treble damages, or a minimum of \$4,000, pursuant to Civ. Code § 52, subd. (a).
- 30. Additionally, as to Defendant American Airlines, Federal statute, 49 U.S.C. §40127, et elia, prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color and national origin in air transportation. Defendant American Airlines discriminated against Plaintiffs, citizens of Pakistan, on the basis of race, color or national origin; Defendant's actions in violation of the law caused Plaintiffs damages in the form of: embarrassment, humiliation and mortification, physical injury, and severe mental anguish and emotional distress.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Assault

(Against San Francisco Police Department and the City and County of San Francisco)

- 31. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege paragraphs 1-30, as though set forth fully herein.
- 32. Defendants intended to cause or place Plaintiffs in apprehension of an immediate harmful or offensive contact.
- 33. As a result of the acts alleged above, Plaintiffs were in fact placed in great apprehension of harmful or offensive contact with Defendant San Francisco Police Department.
- 34. As a direct and proximate result of the acts of Defendants as alleged above, Plaintiff Mrs. Taseer was burt and injured, sustaining injuries to her body in the form of an

-7

FirstAmdComplaint_Tescer_060211[1]
Case No. CGG-11-508779

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

27

28

aggravated back, neck and shoulder injury, all of which caused, and continue to cause Plaintiff great mental and physical pain and suffering.

- 35. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiffs have sustained damages, all to their injury, detriment and damage in amounts not fully ascertained, but within the jurisdiction of this Court.
- 36. Defendant San Francisco Police Department's conduct as alleged herein was authorized by Defendant City and County of San Francisco. Defendant City and County of San Francisco is liable to Plaintiffs under the doctrine of respondent superior.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Battery

(Against San Francisco Police Department and the City and County of San Francisco)

- 37. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege paragraphs 1-36, as though set forth fully herein.
- 38. Defendants acted intentionally which resulted in harmful and offensive contact with Plaintiffs.
- 39. The harmful and offensive contact caused injury, harm, damage or loss to Plaintiffs.
- 40. As a direct and proximate result of the acts of Defendants as alleged above, Plaintiff Mrs. Taseer was hurt and injured, sustaining injuries to her body in the form of an aggravated back, neck and shoulder injury, all of which caused, and continue to cause Plaintiff great mental and physical pain and suffering.
- 41. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiffs have sustained damages, all to their injury, detriment and damage in amounts not fully ascertained, but within the jurisdiction of this Court.
- 42. Defendant San Francisco Police Department's conduct as alleged herein was authorized by Defendant City and County of San Francisco. Defendant City and County of San Francisco is liable to Plaintiffs under the doctrine of respondent superior.

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

FirstAmdComplaint_Tascer_060211[1]
Case No. CGG-11-508779

1	İ
۱	

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

28

.....

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

False Arrest/False Imprisonment

(Against All Defendants)

- 43. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege paragraphs 1-42, as though set forth fully herein.
- 44. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendants caused the Plaintiffs to be arrested and imprisoned without reasonable or probable cause to believe that they committed any crimes as alleged in this Complaint.
- 45. Defendant's action of confining Plaintiffs to a bounded area in a police car, and later in an interrogation room was without Plaintiffs' consent.
- 46. As a result of the false arrest and/or false imprisonment by Defendants,
 Plaintiffs suffered the damages and injuries as alleged heretofore in this Complaint.
- 47. The acts of Defendants as alleged herein, were done within the course and scope of their employment for Defendant City and County of San Francisco. Defendant City and County of San Francisco is therefore liable for said false arrest and/or false imprisonment as respondent superior.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligence

(Against All Defendants)

- 48. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege paragraphs 1-47, as though set forth fully herein.
- 49. Defendants and each of them owed a duty of care; said duty was breached proximately harming plaintiffs in an amount to be proven at trial.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress

(Against all Defendants)

- 50. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege paragraphs 1-49, as though set forth fully herein.
- 51. Defendants' conduct as alleged herein was intentional, outrageous and malicious, exceeding all bounds usually tolerated by a decent society, and was especially calculated to cause, and did cause plaintiffs to suffer severe and enduring emotional distress.

- 52. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of defendants' acts as alleged herein, plaintiffs have suffered and continue to suffer shock, humiliation, embarrassment, fright, nervousness, anxiety, mortification, indignity and extreme and enduring emotional distress, all to their damage in an amount to be determined according to proof at trial.
- 53. Defendants committed the acts herein alleged despicably and oppressively, with the wrongful intention of injuring plaintiffs and acted with an improper and evil motive amounting to malice in conscious disregard to plaintiffs' mental well-being.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress

(Against all Defendants)

- 54. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege paragraphs 1-53, as though set forth fully herein.
- 55. Defendant American Airlines conduct described above constituted a breach of defendant's fiduciary duty as a common carrier and Defendant's duty of care to Plaintiffs to ensure that Defendant did not cause unnecessary or unjustified harm to Plaintiff. It was reasonably foreseeable that a breach of that duty by Defendant would cause emotional distress to Plaintiffs.
- 56. Defendant San Francisco Police Department's and Defendant City and County of San Francisco's conduct constituted a breach of Defendants' duty of care not to subject others to emotional distress which would foreseeably cause them physical injury through physical impact or threat of impact.
- 57. Defendants knew or should have known that their failure to exercise due care would cause a great injustice to Plaintiffs and cause them extreme emotional trauma.
- 58. Defendants' conduct caused Plaintiffs extreme embarrassment, humiliation and mortification. Plaintiffs are afraid to travel because of the extreme injustice they suffered at the hands of Defendants.

27

28

-10-

FirstAmdComplaint_Tasccr_060211[1]
Case No. CGG-11-508779

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of Cal. Const. art. I, § 4

(Against all Defendants)

- 59. The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1-58 inclusive are incorporated into this cause of action by reference as if set forth in full.
- 60. Defendants' actions as described above interfered with plaintiff's free exercise of religion in violation of Cal. Const. art. I, § 4, in that plaintiff is unable to freely assert their views.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of California Government Code Section 11135

(Against all Defendants)

- 61. The allegations set forth in paragraphs, 1-60 inclusive are incorporated into this cause of action by reference as if set forth in full.
- 62. Defendants' actions as described above interfered with Plaintiffs' free exercise of religion in violation of Government Code Section 11135 in that Plaintiffs were unable to freely assert their views.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of Federally Protected Rights under 42 U.S.C. Section 1983 (Against Defendants Individually)

- 63. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege paragraphs 1-62, as though set forth fully herein.
- 64. Defendants, while acting under the color of state law, deprived Plaintiffs of their rights protected by Federal law.
- 65. Defendants' actions were intentional, and were based on a clearly expressed, official policy of Defendants.
- 66. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' actions, Plaintiffs have suffered extreme embarrassment and humiliation, and emotional distress, accompanied by various physical symptoms, including but not limited to sleeplessness, nervousness, and extreme anxiety, as well as physical injury. Plaintiffs have also suffered damages in excess of the

EC.

FirstAmdComplaint_Tuscer_060211[1]
Case No. CGC-11-508779

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	minimum established for this court. Plaintiffs' damages are uncertain at this time, and		
2	Plaintiffs will amend this Complaint to state their damages with particularity once they are		
3	known.		
4	WHEREFORE, plaintiffs pray for judgment against defendants as follows:		
5	PRAYER		
6	1. For general damages according to proof;		
7	2. For special damages according to proof;		
8	3. For treble damages pursuant to Civ. Code § 52, subd. (a);		
9	4. For reasonable attorney's fees, according to proof, pursuant to Civ. Code § 52,		
10	subd. (a);		
11	5. For costs of suit herein.		
12	6. For such other and further relief as the Court finds proper.		
13	1014		
14	Dated: June 3, 2011 JOBC H. SIEGAL		
15	Attorney for Plaintiffs		
16	Maheen Ghani Taseer and Shahbaz Ali Taseer		
17			
18	REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL		
19	Plaintiffs hereby request a trial by jury on all claims for relief.		
20	Respectfully submitted,		
21	0 11 8		
23	Dated: June 3, 2011		
24	DEL H. SIEGAL Attorney for Plaintiffs		
25	Maheen Ghani Taseer and Shahbaz Ali Taseer		
26	. •		
27			
28			
	-12- First Amd Complaint_Tascer_0602 t [1] FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES Case No. CGG-11-508779		