# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

\* \* \* \* \*

JONATHAN CHAN and KARLA FORD,	)
Plaintiffs,	)
V.	)
BOARD OF REGENTS OF TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY dba Texas Southern University Thurgood Marshall School of Law; SHELLEY SMITH, ndividually and as Professor of Law, Thurgood Marshall School of Law; DOES I-XX, inclusive,	) ) ) )
Defendants.	)

COMPLAINT (Jury Demanded)

COME NOW, Plaintiffs, JONATHAN CHAN and KARLA FORD (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiffs"), by and through their attorney of record, JASON J. BACH, ESQ. of THE BACH LAW GROUP, PLLC, and hereby complain and allege against the above-named Defendants, and each of them, based upon knowledge, information and a reasonable belief derived therefrom, as follows:

#### INTRODUCTION

This is a Complaint for Damages and injunctive relief brought by students of Texas Southern University Thurgood Marshall School of Law. The claims, against the University and faculty of this public university, are based upon 42 U.S.C. Section 1983 and the Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution, alleging infringement of Plaintiffs' right to substantive and procedural due process. Plaintiffs also rely on the University's School of Law Student Rules and Regulations and alleges a pendent breach of contract claim. Plaintiffs have also asserted a claim against University Defendant for negligent hiring, training, and supervision, and all Defendants for intentional and negligent infliction of emotional distress, defamation, slander, libel, and injunctive and declaratory relief.

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

#### PARTIES & JURISDICTION

- This Court has jurisdiction over the claims set forth in this action pursuant to 28 1. U.S.C. Section 1331 (federal question) and 28 U.S.C. Section 1343 (civil rights).
- 2. Supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' pendent state law claims is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1367, as the claim arises out of the same transaction and occurrence as Plaintiffs' federal claim.
- 3. Venue is proper in the Southern District of Texas pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1391(b) in that the claims arose in this district, and Plaintiffs and Defendants are located in this district.
- Costs, expert witness fees, and attorney's fees are sought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. Section 1988.
- Plaintiff, JONATHAN CHAN, is currently a resident of the State of Texas, and at all 5. relevant times, was a student at Texas Southern University.
- 6. Plaintiff, KARLA FORD, is currently a resident of the State of Texas, and at all relevant times, was a student at Texas Southern University.
- 7. Defendant, BOARD OF REGENTS OF TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY (hereinafter referred to as "TSU"), operates TSU, a public educational institution of higher learning, located in Houston, Harris County Texas.
- 8. Defendant SHELLEY SMITH, at all times relevant was a visiting Professor of Law in the Thurgood Marshall School of Law at TSU. She is named in this case both individually and in her official capacity as Professor of Law in the Thurgood Marshall School of Law at TSU.
- 9. That the true names or capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise, of Defendants DOES I through XX are unknown to Plaintiffs, who therefore, sue said Defendants by such fictitious names.
- 10. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that each of the Defendants designated herein as DOES are responsible in some manner for the events and happenings referred to in this action and proximately caused damages to Plaintiffs as herein alleged, and that Plaintiffs will ask leave of this Court to amend this Complaint, to insert the true names and capacities of said Defendants, and when the same have been ascertained to join such Defendants in this action.

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

- 11. At all times herein, the individual Defendants and the Defendant TSU, have been acting under color of law.
- 12. At all times relevant hereto, and in all their actions described herein, Defendants' actions took place in the State of Texas, County of Harris.
- Defendants, and each of them, did the acts and omissions hereinafter alleged in bad 13. faith and with knowledge that their conduct violated well established and settled law.

## GENERAL FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 14. Plaintiff Jonathan Chan was a first year law student at the TSU, Thurgood Marshall School of Law from the Fall 2010 semester through the Spring 2011 semester. In May, 2011, Chan was dismissed from the School of Law after receiving a "D-" grade in his Contracts II course from his professor, Defendant Shelley Smith.
- 15. Plaintiff Karla Ford was a first year law student at the TSU, Thurgood Marshall School of Law from the Fall 2010 semester through the Spring 2011 semester. In May, 2011, Ford was dismissed from the School of Law after receiving a "D" grade in her Contracts II course from her professor, Defendant Shelley Smith.
- 16. Both Chan and Ford timely appealed their final grades on the basis that professor Smith arbitrarily issued them a low grade, which was not based upon their performance on the examinations, but in order to "curve them out" of the law school and/or a deliberate indifference to correct the known error of issuing the incorrect grades.
- 17. During the semester, Plaintiffs attended exam review sessions for their previous three Contracts II examinations with Defendant Smith. Yet at the review, Defendant Smith refused to show Plaintiffs how she arrived at their grades, or where points were taken off and where the points were awarded on the examinations.
- 18. Plaintiffs were not even given an opportunity to review their final Contracts II examination for accuracy or to determine whether their grades on that examination were given arbitrarily.
- 19. That the University and professor Smith deliberately withheld all information from Plaintiffs regarding the basis for the grades they received, including where points were awarded and

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

where points were taken away on the examination.

- That despite Plaintiffs' requests for copies of their examinations, model answers, and an explanation for the basis on which their grades were based, the University refused to provide the requested information.
- 21. Instead, the University terminated professor Smith in order to prevent Plaintiffs from gathering the necessary information to appeal their grades through the University's grade change process.
- 22. On September 2, 2011, several months after Plaintiffs filed their petitions for grade change, the law school's Academic Standards Committee conducted a meeting with Plaintiffs present that lasted under five minutes. At the meeting the Committee informed Plaintiffs that "the professor has emailed us and said there was no computation error or discrimination involved in the grading."
- 23. At the September 2, 2011 meeting, the University did not present any additional information or evidence or provide Plaintiffs with any of the information they requested that would show the arbitrary or discriminatory grading on the part of professor Smith.
- 24. On September 6, 2011, the Academic Standards Committee issued letters to Plaintiffs denying their petitions for a grade change. The Committee's stated basis for denial of the petitions was "insufficient evidence" to support their petitions.
- 25. The decisions made by Defendants TSU to remove Plaintiffs from the law school are arbitrary and capricious in nature, are in violation of the law school's Student Rules and Regulations, and in violation of Plaintiffs' U.S. Constitutional Rights.
- 26. As a result of Defendant TSU and Smith's arbitrary, capricious, and unlawful actions, Plaintiffs have been prevented from attending classes at TSU, thus halting and destroying their ability to attend law school or to ever enter the legal profession.
- 27. As a result of the above, Defendants, and each of them, have wrongly caused Plaintiffs to be sanctioned and removed from the University and for the above-noted sanctions to be wrongly placed on their record, all in violation of their U.S. Constitutional Rights, depriving them of the opportunity to obtain an education and further their careers, and inflicting emotional distress

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

and physical injury, all damaging them in an amount in excess of SEVENTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$75,000.00).

### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

## CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATION, DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

- 28. Paragraphs 1 through 27, inclusive are incorporated by reference.
- 29. The actions of Defendants resulted from, and were taken, pursuant to a de facto policy of Defendant TSU, to arbitrarily "curve out" students from the law school, which is implemented by Deans, professors, and other employees of the said Defendants, all acting under the color of law, who chose to violate Plaintiffs' constitutional rights, without rightful authority of law, and who continue to violate Plaintiffs' constitutional rights on an on-going basis by preventing them from returning to school, and effectively preventing them from being admitted to another institution of higher learning.
- 30. Supervisory and policy making officers and officials of said Defendants have known the existence of the *de facto* policy described above for a substantial period of time.
- 31. Despite their knowledge of the said illegal policy and practices, supervisory and policy-making officers and officials of the said Defendants have not taken steps to determine said practices, have not disciplined or otherwise properly supervised the individual employees who engaged in the said practices, have not effectively trained Deans and other employees with regard to the proper constitutional and statutory limits on the exercise of their authority, and have instead sanctioned the policy and the practices described herein and have takes steps to cover up the existence of said policy and practices.
- 32. That the above actions by Defendants have resulted in both the substantive and procedural due process denial of rights, all in violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.
- 33. That by reason of the aforesaid actions, Defendants' actions exhibit deliberate indifference to and/or reckless disregard for the constitutional rights of Plaintiffs and other similarly

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

situated students, all in violation of the Plaintiffs' constitutional rights, and as a direct and proximate result thereof, the Plaintiffs sustained severe damages in an amount in excess of SEVENTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$75,000.00).

- 34. The acts, conduct and behavior of each of the Individual Defendants were performed knowingly, intentionally, oppressively, and maliciously, by reason of which Plaintiffs are entitled to punitive damages in a sum in excess of SEVENTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$75,000.00).
- 35. It has been necessary for the Plaintiffs to obtain the services of an attorney to prosecute this action and Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of attorney's fees and costs of suit incurred herein.

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

#### BREACH OF CONTRACT

- 36. Paragraphs 1 through 35, inclusive are incorporated by reference.
- 37. Plaintiffs has an express and implied contract with Defendants in connection with rights explicitly guaranteed by TSU pursuant to the University's Thurgood Marshall School of Law Student Rules and Regulations.
  - 38. The actions of Defendants constitute a breach of the express and implied contract.
- 39. As a result of the breach committed against the Plaintiffs, they have been damaged in an amount in excess of SEVENTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$75,000.00).
- It has been necessary for the Plaintiffs to obtain the services of an attorney to 40. prosecute this action, and Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of attorney's fees and costs of suit incurred herein.

### **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### NEGLIGENT HIRING, TRAINING, & SUPERVISION

- 41. Paragraphs 1 through 38, inclusive, are incorporated by reference.
- 42. At all times material and relevant herein, the Defendants had a duty to not violate the Constitutional rights of their students.
  - 43. At all times relevant herein, Defendant TSU had a duty not to hire individuals with

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

a propensity towards committing unlawful acts against those who lawfully go about their business. and to adequately train and supervise their agents, officers, and employees.

- 44. At all times relevant herein, the Defendant TSU had a duty to protect the public, such as Plaintiffs, from the illegal actions of their own agents, officers, employees and others. In addition, Defendant TSU had a duty not to hire individuals with a propensity towards committing unlawful acts against the public, and to adequately train and supervise their employees.
- 45. Defendants, and each of them, breached their respective duties, and are therefore negligent and liable to the Plaintiffs, who have suffered serious economic loss, loss of reputation, loss of daily and future income, and to incur severe financial obligations in order to retain attorneys, as well as other painful injuries, deprivation of his liberty, invasion of his privacy, grievous mental suffering, all to her damage in an amount in excess of SEVENTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$75,000.00).
- 46. It has been necessary for the Plaintiffs to obtain the services of an attorney to prosecute this action, and Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of attorney's fees and costs of suit incurred herein.

#### FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

## INTENTIONAL AND NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF SEVERE MENTAL DISTRESS

- 47. Paragraphs 1 through 46, inclusive, are incorporated by reference.
- 48. As a result of Defendants' intentional and negligent conduct and omissions, Plaintiffs suffered and continue to suffer great mental and emotional harm, anguish, insecurity, self-revulsion, damage to their self-esteem, and self-worth, shame and humiliation, including but not limited to: severe and clinical depression, anxiety, loss of sleep, and change of appetite.
- 49. Plaintiffs required medical and psychological care as result of the malfeasance and nonfeasance of Defendants. This has caused Plaintiffs to incur expenses for medical care, treatment, and expenses incidental thereto. The total amount of Plaintiffs' damages cannot yet be fully ascertained, and as such we respectfully ask leave of this Court to amend Plaintiff's Complaint to insert the full amount when such have been fully ascertained.

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

50. As a result of the mental distress described above, Plaintiffs have suffered serious psychological injury, loss of community reputation, medical expenses, and to incur severe financial obligations in order to retain attorneys to seek redress against the unlawful conduct of the Defendants, as well as deprivation of their liberty, invasion of privacy, and grievous mental suffering, all to damages in an amount in excess of SEVENTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$75,000.00).

- 51. The acts, conduct and behavior of the Defendants were performed willfully, intentionally, oppressively, fraudulently and maliciously, by reason of which Plaintiffs are entitled to punitive damages in a sum in excess of SEVENTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$75,000.00).
- 52. It has been necessary for Plaintiffs to obtain the services of an attorney to prosecute this action, and Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of attorney's fees and costs of suit incurred herein.

# **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

### INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF

- 53. Paragraphs 1 through 52 inclusive are incorporated by reference.
- 54. Defendants' actions of preventing Plaintiffs from attending class and continuing in the law school at TSU and the placing of notations of any accusations, findings, or sanctions against them, in Plaintiffs' student files or upon their transcripts, is unjust and illegal.
- 55. The harm caused by Defendants is irreparable and can only be mitigated by the reinstatement of Plaintiffs in the law school and omission of any notations. For that reason, Plaintiffs are entitled to an order requiring Defendants to immediately allowing them to return to the law school, remove any notations of any accusations, findings or sanctions, and prohibiting Defendants from further interfering with Plaintiffs' educational future.
- 56. Plaintiffs seek a judicial determination that the acts, practices and policies described in this complaint are in violation of Plaintiffs' Constitutional due process rights.
- 57. As a result of the acts committed against Plaintiffs, they have been damaged all in an amount in excess of SEVENTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$75,000.00).
  - 58. As a result of Defendants' intentional conduct, they have caused Plaintiffs to incur

attorney's fees in an amount in excess of SEVENTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$75,000.00) and thus Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of attorney's fees.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Honorable Court: Enter judgment in Plaintiffs' favor, and against the Defendants, and each of them: (a) for compensatory damages in an amount in excess of SEVENTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$75,000.00); (b) for punitive damages each in an amount in excess of SEVENTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$75,000.00); (c) for injunctive and declaratory relief; and (d) together with the costs and disbursements of this action and such other attorney's fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1988, and further relief as justice requires.

DATED this 02<sup>nd</sup> day of February, 2012.

## THE BACH LAW GROUP, PLLC

By:/s/ Jason J. Bach
JASON J. BACH, ESQ.
State Bar No. 24071556
Southern District of Texas No. 1331975
2802 Flintrock Trace, Suite 255
Austin, Texas 78738
Tel: (512) 879-3901
Fax: (702) 925-8788

Attorney in Charge for Plaintiffs