

Case No. _____

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

PATRICIA McALLISTER,

Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

**LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
JOHN E. DEASY, Superintendent of the Los Angeles
Unified School District, and DOES 1 THROUGH 100, Inclusive**

Defendants and Respondents.

PETITION FOR REVIEW

Court of Appeal Case No. B244759 (2d App. Dist.);
Superior Court for the State of California,
County of Los Angeles, Case No. BC48467;

Julie A. Esposito, SBN 177722
424 Linwood Avenue, Unit B
Monrovia, CA 91016
Tel: (626) 358-9216
E-mail: julieesq2@gmail.com

Participating Attorney for
THE RUTHERFORD INSTITUTE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED	2
GROUND S AND NECESSITY FOR REVIEW	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	5
FACTS OF THE CASE.....	6
ARGUMENT.....	12
I. REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED BECAUSE THE COURT OF APPEAL’S DECISION THAT THE COMPLAINT DID NOT ALLEGE A PERSONAL-CAPACITY CLAIM UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1983 IS CONTRARY TO EXISTING PRECEDENT	12
1. “Official” and “Personal” Claims Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.....	13
2. The Court of Appeal’s Interpretation of the Complaint as Alleging Only an “Official-Capacity” Claim is Contrary to Established Precedent	16
II. REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED BECAUSE THE COURT OF APPEAL ERRED IN SUSTAINING THE DEMURRER WITHOUT GRANTING LEAVE TO AMEND THE COMPLAINT TO PLAINLY STATE A PERSONAL-CAPACITY CLAIM UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1983.....	25
III. REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED TO DETERMINE WHETHER A PRIVATE CAUSE OF ACTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF EXISTS UNDER THE GUARANTEE TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH CONTAINED IN ARTICLE I, § 2(A) OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION	32
CONCLUSION.....	36

CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT 38
PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL..... 39
ATTACHMENT A: DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEAL,
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT, JUNE 3, 2013

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Adelman v. Associated Intern. Ins. Co.</i> (2001), 90 Cal.App.4th 352.. 4, 24	
<i>Baker v. Chisom</i> (8th Cir. 2007), 501 F.3d 920	19
<i>Biggs v. Meadows</i> (4th Cir.1995), 66 F.3d 56.....	19, 22
<i>Blank v. Kirwan</i> (1985), 39 Cal.3d 311	23, 25
<i>Cerrato v. San Francisco Community College Dist.</i> (9th Cir. 1994), 26 F.3d 968, n.16.....	18
<i>Colony Cove Properties, LLC v. City of Carson</i> (9th Cir. 2011), 648 F.3d 948.....	31
<i>Cowan v. University of Louisville School of Medicine</i> (6th Cir. 1990), 900 F.2d 936.....	15
<i>Creighton v. City of Livingston</i> (E.D. Cal. 2009), 628 F.Supp.2d 1199	33
<i>Cuviello v. City and County of San Francisco</i> (N.D. Cal. 2013), 2013 WL 1615606.....	33
<i>Degrassi v. Cook</i> , (2002), 29 Cal.4th 333	32
<i>Franklin v. Leland Stanford Junior University</i> (1985), 172 Cal. App. 3d 322	34
<i>Hafer v. Melo</i> (1991), 502 U.S. 21	passim
<i>Hill v. Shelander</i> (7th Cir. 1991), 924 F.2d 1370.....	18
<i>Johnson v. Outboard Marine Corp.</i> (8th Cir. 1999), 172 F.3d 531 ...	19
<i>Katzberg v. Regents of the Univ. of Cal.</i> (2002), 29 Cal. 4th 300.....	33
<i>Kaye v. Bd. of Trustees of San Diego County Public Law Library</i> (2009), 179 Cal. App. 4th 48.....	34
<i>Kentucky v. Graham</i> (1985), 473 U.S. 159	12, 14, 21, 27
<i>McAllister v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist.</i> (2013), 216 Cal. App. 4th 1198.....	1
<i>Melo v. Hafer</i> (3d Cir. 1990), 912 F.2d 628.....	20
<i>Monroe v. Pape</i> (1961), 365 U.S. 167.....	16

<i>Moore v. City of Harriman</i> (6th Cir.2001), 272 F.3d 769.....	19
<i>Pena v. Gardner</i> (9th Cir. 1992), 976 F.2d 469	14
<i>Pitts v. County of Kern</i> (1998), 17 Cal. 4th 340.....	14
<i>Powell v. Alexander</i> (1st Cir. 2004), 391 F.3d 1	19, 20, 21, 23
<i>Price v. Akaka</i> (9th Cir. 1990), 928 F.2d 824.....	18, 23
<i>Pride v. Does</i> (10th Cir.1993), 997 F.2d 712	18
<i>Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guaranty Co.</i> (1998), 19 Cal.4th 26	25
<i>Romano v. Bible</i> (9th Cir. 1999), 169 F.3d 1182	17, 21
<i>Scheuer v. Rhodes</i> (1974), 416 U.S. 232.....	28
<i>Shoshone-Bannock Tribes v. Fish & Game Com'n, Idaho</i> (9th Cir. 1994), 42 F.3d 1278	21
<i>Will v. Mich. Dept. of State Police</i> (1989), 491 U.S. 58	passim

Statutes

42 U.S.C. § 1983.....	passim
Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 335.1	31
Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 473(a)(1).....	31
Cal. Const. Art. I, § 2(a)	passim
U.S. Const. amend. 1	5

Rules

Cal. Rules of Court 8.500(b)(1).....	1, 3, 4
--------------------------------------	---------

PETITION FOR REVIEW

TO THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE AND THE ASSOCIATE JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA:

Petitioner Patricia McAllister petitions this court for review of the decision and judgment of the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, filed in that court on June 3, 2013, affirming the judgment of the Superior Court, Los Angeles County, dismissing without leave to amend the First Amended Complaint of the Petitioner. A copy of the decision of the Court of Appeal is attached hereto as Attachment A (cited as “Att. A”). The decision, which was certified for publication and is reported as *McAllister v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist.* (2013) 216 Cal. App. 4th 1198, _____ Cal. Rptr. 3d _____, held that McAllister’s complaint could not be read as asserting a personal/individual-capacity claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and denied the Petitioner leave to amend the complaint. In doing so, the ruling below adopted a rule for construction and amendment of § 1983 complaints that is contrary to virtually all other decisions throughout the country, and this Court should grant the instant Petition in order to assure the uniformity of decision. Cal. Rules of Court 8.500(b)(1). In addition, the Petition should be granted in order to decide the

important question of law of what relief is available to citizens for claims based upon the right to freedom of speech guaranteed by Cal. Const. Art. I, § 2(a).

STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED

1. Did the courts below err in ruling that Petitioner’s claim against a public official under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 could not be construed as asserting the claim was against the official in his personal/individual capacity because the complaint alleged that the official acted within the course and scope of his office?

2. Did the courts below err in failing to grant the Petitioner leave to amend the complaint in order to assert that the claim for a deprivation of the Petitioner’s First Amendment right under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against a public official was against that official in his personal/individual capacity?

3. Does the guarantee that “every person may freely speak, write and publish his or her sentiments on all subjects” in Article I, § 2(a) of the California Constitution create a private cause of action for injunctive relief?

GROUND AND NECESSITY FOR REVIEW

In the case below, the Court of Appeal affirmed the Superior Court's order sustaining the demurrer filed by the Respondents without granting the Petitioner leave to amend. In doing so, the Court of Appeal relied on the Superior Court's erroneous reading of the amended complaint as alleging only a personal/official capacity claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Respondent Deasy, despite a clear intention to the contrary. The construction of the complaint employed by the courts below is contrary to existing precedent presuming that a public official is sued in his personal/individual capacity, even if the capacity is not explicitly stated. Moreover, the ruling below is contrary to controlling U.S. Supreme Court precedent that a § 1983 claim is not necessarily an official capacity claim where the complaint alleges the defendant official acted within the scope of his office; officials may be sued in their personal/individual capacities under § 1983 even where the challenged act is within the scope of his official duties. The Court of Appeal decision is at odds with existing law, and review is necessary in this case to settle an important question of law and to secure uniformity of decision. Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 8.500(b)(1).

Additionally, the Court of Appeal erred in affirming the Superior Court's sustaining of the demurrer without leave to amend. Existing law counsels that a demurrer should be overruled if the allegations of the complaint, reasonably considered, state a cause of action under *any* legal theory. *Adelman v. Associated Intern. Ins. Co.* (2001), 90 Cal.App.4th 352, 359-60. The Court of Appeal's failure to grant leave to amend in this case to allow a personal/individual capacity § 1983 claim to be explicitly alleged represents a departure from settled law, necessitating review.

Finally, the Court of Appeal's broad pronouncement that no private cause of action for injunctive relief exists for a violation of the freedom of speech provisions under Cal. Const. Art. I, § 2(a) prematurely decides an important constitutional question. The decision below leaves public school employees such as Petitioner without any remedy for adverse actions violating their constitutional right to freedom of speech, and review is necessary on this important question of state law. California Rules of Court 8.500(b)(1).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Petitioner, Patricia McAllister (hereafter “McAllister”), was employed as a substitute teacher by Respondent Los Angeles Unified School District (hereafter “LAUSD”) until she was discharged, allegedly on the order and at the direction of Respondent John E. Deasy (hereafter “Deasy”), Superintendent of LAUSD.¹ In her First Amended Complaint, McAllister asserted causes of action for, *inter alia*, (1) deprivation of rights under Cal. Const. Art. I, § 2(a), and (2) deprivation of rights under U.S. Const. amend. 1.

LAUSD and Deasy filed a demurrer to each cause of action (CT at 29), to which McAllister responded (CT at 43).² On October 3, 2012, the Superior Court entered a judgment sustaining the Defendants’ demurrer without leave to amend as to each of McAllister’s causes of action and ordering that McAllister take nothing on her First Amended Complaint against the Defendants (CT at 86).

¹ McAllister also included claims for wrongful termination, breach of contract, and negligent infliction of emotional distress. She also named as additional defendants unknown John Does 1-100.

² “CT” references are to pages of the Clerk’s Transcript filed in the Court of Appeal.

McAllister filed a timely appeal from the Superior Court judgment alleging, *inter alia*, that: (1) the Superior Court erred in granting the demurrer as to the Third Cause of Action against Deasy on the basis that only an official capacity claim was asserted against Deasy (Att. A at 9); (2) the Superior Court erred in failing to allow McAllister to amend the complaint to make it crystal clear that Deasy was being sued in his individual capacity (Att. A at 9); and (3) the Superior Court erred in granting Respondent's demurrer as to the Second Cause of Action, finding that the freedom of speech provisions in Art. I, § 2 of the California Constitution do not give rise to a private cause of action in this case (Att. A at 17). On June 3, 2013, the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District entered a judgment affirming the Superior Court's judgment as to all causes of action (Att. A at 1, 24). No petition for rehearing was filed with the Court of Appeal.

FACTS OF THE CASE

The relevant facts are set forth in Court of Appeal opinion (Att. A at 2-5). Beginning in April 2006, McAllister was employed as a substitute mathematics teacher in schools within the LAUSD. Under

this employment, McAllister was called on by LAUSD as needed to fill positions of regular LAUSD teachers who were absent from service. This employment was confirmed and continued on May 4, 2011, when LAUSD made an offer of employment to McAllister for the school year beginning in September 2011 and ending in June 2012 as an on-call substitute teacher (CT at 3, 20).

During the course of her employment as a substitute teacher for LAUSD, McAllister was never the subject of any significant disciplinary action and was a highly sought-after substitute teacher. As of approximately October 12, 2011, McAllister was scheduled to begin a substitute assignment at Ramon C. Cortines School of Visual and Performing Arts on November 4, 2011, and had been specifically requested for this substitute position by the administration at the school because of positive past experiences with McAllister (CT at 5-6).

On Wednesday, October 12, 2011, McAllister attended a public rally at Los Angeles City Hall. The rally was a part of the movement known as "Occupy Los Angeles," a grass-roots effort to protest the power exercised by corporations and the wealthiest one-percent of the population, and to seek to stop the deleterious effects of the influence

of wealth and corporate power on the political system in the United States. McAllister attended the rally because of her opposition to cuts in funding for public education (CT at 6).

During this rally, McAllister was approached by a news reporter for Reason.TV who asked for an interview, which the reporter recorded. McAllister was asked by the reporter for her name and affiliation. McAllister identified herself and stated she was there “representing herself,” although she did disclose that she worked for LAUSD. When explaining why she was at the rally, McAllister stated that “I think that the Zionist Jews who are running these big banks and our Federal Reserve, which are not run by the federal government, they need to be run out of this country.” (CT at 6).

A video of the interview of McAllister by Reason.TV was posted at the Reason.TV website. Although McAllister’s interview included statements by her in addition to those quoted above, the video posted and available at Reason.TV website was edited to include only the statements quoted above. The same edited video was also uploaded to, and available at, YouTube.com and was widely viewed (CT at 6).

Starting on the morning of Friday October 14, 2011, McAllister began receiving telephone calls from unidentified persons berating and condemning her for the statements. During the ensuing weekend, McAllister viewed the video over the internet and saw comments posted with the video statements urging persons to call LAUSD and demand that McAllister be fired and providing the telephone number for LAUSD (CT at 7).

On Tuesday, October 18, 2011, McAllister called the LAUSD “SubFinder” automated phone system to check on her scheduled teaching assignment for November 4, 2011, for the substitute assignment at Ramon C. Cortines School of Visual and Performing Arts that was to begin the following November. However, when she attempted to log in, the system rejected her request. The automated SubFinder system message said that her status was inactive, and that she should call her supervisor (CT at 7).

McAllister then called the Certificated Substitute Unit of LAUSD to inquire as to why her status was inactive. McAllister spoke with Marjorie Josaphat who told McAllister to call Dr. Ira Berman, LAUSD’s Director of Employee Relations. McAllister

called Dr. Berman's office and Dr. Berman told her to come to his office right away (CT at 7).

McAllister arrived at LAUSD's central offices at 1:00 p.m. on October 18, 2011, proceeded to Dr. Berman's office and was ushered inside. Present in the LAUSD office when McAllister entered it, were Dr. Berman and John Brasfield, Deputy Director of Human Relations for LAUSD. Dr. Berman then informed McAllister that her employment with LAUSD was terminated. McAllister asked Dr. Berman why she was being terminated. Dr. Berman did not give a reason, but told McAllister that she should see Deasy to inquire further. McAllister then left Dr. Berman's office (CT at 7).

Before she could speak to Deasy personally about the reason she was terminated, McAllister saw news reports of a statement that had been released to the press and media by Deasy as Superintendent of LAUSD. Deasy's statement read as follows:

As Superintendent of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), I want to emphasize that we condemn the remarks made recently by Patricia McAllister.

Her comments, made during non-work time at a recent protest rally, were her private opinions and were not made in the context of District services. At LAUSD, we recognize that the law is very protective of the freedom of speech rights of public employees when they are speaking as private citizens during non-working time.

I further emphasize to our students, who watch us and look to us for guidance, to be role models and to represent the ideals by which LAUSD lives, that we will never stand for behavior that is disrespectful, intolerant or discriminatory.

As a day-to-day substitute teacher, Ms. McAllister was an at-will employee. As of today, she is no longer an employee of the LAUSD.

(CT at 8).

On October 20, 2011, McAllister received by certified mail a letter dated October 18, 2011 from LAUSD signed by Vivian K. Ekchian. The letter read that “you are to be separated from employment with the Los Angeles Unified School District effective the date of this letter.” (CT at 8, 23).

McAllister alleged that the sole and exclusive cause for the termination of her employment with LAUSD on October 18, 2011, was the content of the statements made by McAllister at the Occupy Los Angeles Rally described in ¶ 11 of the First Amended Complaint (CT at 9-10). The First Amended Complaint further alleged that Deasy made the decision to terminate McAllister’s employment (CT at 10).

ARGUMENT

I. REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED BECAUSE THE COURT OF APPEAL’S DECISION THAT THE COMPLAINT DID NOT ALLEGE A PERSONAL-CAPACITY CLAIM UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1983 IS CONTRARY TO EXISTING PRECEDENT

In ruling that the demurrer to McAllister’s claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (hereafter also referred to as “§ 1983”) was properly sustained, the Court of Appeal determined that the complaint must be construed as alleging only an “official capacity” claim against Defendant Deasy and did not allege a “personal/individual capacity” claim (Att. at 11). Because “official capacity” claims under § 1983 are treated in all respects as claims against the government entity the official represents, *Kentucky v. Graham* (1985), 473 U.S. 159, 165-66, the Court of Appeal held that the supposed official capacity claim against Defendant Deasy was barred because LAUSD is not a “person” subject to a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Att. at 9).

The manner in which the Court of Appeal construed the complaint and law it applied respecting personal and official capacity claims under § 1983 conflicts with the law espoused by virtually every other court which has considered similar questions. Contrary to the Court of Appeal in this case, other courts, including the U.S. Court

of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, liberally construe § 1983 claims and will deem that an official is sued in his individual capacity and is a “person” subject to a claim for deprivation of constitutional rights under § 1983. Review is essential here to maintain uniformity of decision in this area of law and assure that the judicial consideration of valid civil rights claims is not cut off due to technical pleading rules.

1. “Official” and “Personal” Claims Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983

The Third Cause of Action set forth in the First Amended Complaint asserts a claim against Deasy under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which provides that “[e]very person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State . . ., subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law[.]”

Under § 1983, a defendant who is a natural person may be sued in either his “personal”/“individual” capacity or in his “official” capacity. “Personal-capacity suits seek to impose personal liability

upon a government official for actions he takes under color of state law. . . . Official-capacity suits, in contrast, ‘generally represent only another way of pleading an action against an entity of which an officer is an agent.’” *Kentucky v. Graham* (1985), 473 U.S. 159, 165-166 (citations omitted). *Accord Pitts v. County of Kern* (1998), 17 Cal. 4th 340, 350. Because an “official” capacity suit is no different than a suit against the entity, an official-capacity action is barred under the decision in *Will v. Mich. Dept. of State Police* (1989), 491 U.S. 58, if the named defendant is an officer of an entity that is deemed an “arm of the state” because states are not “persons” suable under § 1983. *Pena v. Gardner* (9th Cir. 1992), 976 F.2d 469, 472.

However, a personal-capacity suit is *not* barred by *Will* because such a claim is not considered one against a state entity. *Pena*, 976 F.2d at 472. “Personal-capacity suits, on the other hand, seek to impose individual liability upon a government officer for actions taken under color of state law. Thus, ‘[o]n the merits, to establish *personal* liability in a § 1983 action, it is enough to show that the official, acting under color of state law, caused the deprivation of a federal right.’” *Hafer v. Melo* (1991), 502 U.S. 21, 25 (quoting *Graham*, 473 U.S. at 166; emphasis in original). In order to succeed

in an individual capacity suit, a plaintiff can establish liability by proving that “[an] official, acting under color of state law, caused the deprivation of a federal right.” *Hafer*, 502 F.2d at 25.

Another crucial point, one which was lost on the Court of Appeal, is that the fact that an allegation that the defendant official was acting within the scope of his office and authority in causing the deprivation *does not make the claim an official-capacity claim*. In *Hafer v. Melo*, *supra*, the defendant, a state official, argued that because the alleged acts supporting the § 1983 claim were taken as part of her official duties, the claim against her was necessarily an “official capacity” suit that was barred under *Will*. The Supreme Court refused to accept this reasoning:

Hafer seeks to overcome the distinction between official- and personal-capacity suits by arguing that § 1983 liability turns not on the capacity in which state officials are sued, but on the capacity in which they acted when injuring the plaintiff. Under *Will*, she asserts, state officials may not be held liable in their personal capacity for actions they take in their official capacity. Although one Court of Appeals has endorsed this view, see *Cowan v. University of Louisville School of Medicine* (6th Cir. 1990), 900 F.2d 936, 942-943, we find it both unpersuasive as an interpretation of § 1983 and foreclosed by our prior decisions.

Through § 1983, Congress sought “to give a remedy to parties deprived of constitutional rights, privileges and immunities by an official’s abuse of his position.”

Monroe v. Pape (1961), 365 U.S. 167, 172. Accordingly, it authorized suits to redress deprivations of civil rights by persons acting “under color of any [state] statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage.” 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The requirement of action under color of state law means that Hafer may be liable for discharging respondents precisely because of her authority as auditor general. We cannot accept the novel proposition that this same official authority insulates Hafer from suit.

Hafer, 502 U.S. at 27-28. The Supreme Court went on to hold that “state officials, sued in their individual capacities, are ‘persons’ within the meaning of § 1983. The Eleventh Amendment does not bar such suits, nor are state officers absolutely immune from personal liability under § 1983 solely by virtue of the ‘official’ nature of their acts.”

Hafer, 502 U.S. at 31.

2. The Court of Appeal’s Interpretation of the Complaint as Alleging Only an “Official-Capacity” Claim is Contrary to Established Precedent

In reaching the conclusion that McAllister had only alleged an official-capacity suit against Deasy, the Court of Appeal employed an analysis and mode of construction of the complaint that essentially presumed that, because the complaint referred to Deasy as the Superintendent of LAUSD and asserted that he was engaged in his official duties in discharging McAllister, the § 1983 claim was an official-capacity claim. However, the analysis employed by the Court

of Appeal flies in the face of accepted § 1983 jurisprudence. Indeed, the Court of Appeal specifically rejected the controlling rules and standards of the highest federal court in California (Att. at 11).

Thus, in *Romano v. Bible* (9th Cir. 1999), 169 F.3d 1182, 1186, the Ninth Circuit established a liberal standard for construing § 1983 claims, holding that courts must “presume[] that officials necessarily are sued in their personal capacities where those officials are named in a complaint, even if the complaint does not explicitly mention the capacity in which they are sued.” In *Romano*, the plaintiffs alleged nothing more than “that, while acting under color of state law, the defendants deprived Mr. Romano of a protected property interest in violation of due process.” *Romano*, 169 F.3d at 1185. Citing *Hafer v. Melo*, *supra*, the Ninth Circuit determined that “[t]he Supreme Court has made it clear that a plaintiff can establish personal liability in a § 1983 action simply by showing that the official acted under color of state law in deprivation of a federal right” and that a plaintiff need allege nothing more in order to avoid Eleventh Amendment immunity. Under controlling Ninth Circuit precedent, “a section 1983 suit against state actors necessarily implies a suit against the defendants in their personal capacities” and is not barred by the ruling

in *Will* or the Eleventh Amendment. *Cerrato v. San Francisco Community College Dist.*, (9th Cir. 1994), 26 F.3d 968, n.16 (citing *Price v. Akaka* (9th Cir. 1990), 928 F.2d 824, 828, *cert. denied* (1991), 502 U.S. 967. *See also Hill v. Shelander* (7th Cir. 1991), 924 F.2d 1370, 1374 (“in a suit where the complaint alleges the tortious conduct of an individual acting under color of state law, an individual capacity suit plainly lies, even if the plaintiff failed to spell out the defendant’s capacity in the complaint.”))

In addition to the Ninth Circuit precedent, virtually all of the federal circuit courts have refused to adopt the kind of formalistic analysis of words employed by the Court of Appeal, ruling that the capacity in which the public official is sued in a § 1983 complaint should be based on a realistic examination of the course of the proceedings. As described by one federal court,

[u]nder the “course of proceedings” test, courts are not limited by the presence or absence of language identifying capacity to suit on the face of the complaint alone. Rather, courts may examine “the substance of the pleadings and the course of proceedings in order to determine whether the suit is for individual or official liability.” *Pride v. Does* (10th Cir.1993), 997 F.2d 712, 715. Factors relevant to this analysis include “the nature of the plaintiff’s claims, requests for compensatory or punitive damages, and the nature of any defenses raised in response to the complaint, particularly claims of qualified immunity.” *Moore v. City of Harriman* (6th

Cir.2001), 272 F.3d 769, 772 n. 1; *see also Biggs v. Meadows* (4th Cir.1995), 66 F.3d 56, 61. A court may also take into consideration “whether the parties are still in the early stages of litigation,” *Moore*, 272 F.3d at 772 n. 1, including whether amendment of the complaint may be appropriate. No single factor is dispositive in an assessment of the course of proceedings. “Throughout, the underlying inquiry remains whether the plaintiff’s intention to hold a defendant personally liable can be ascertained fairly.” *Biggs*, 66 F.3d at 61.

Powell v. Alexander (1st Cir. 2004), 391 F.3d 1, 22-23. As the *Powell* decision pointed out, the “course of proceedings” analysis, or the even more plaintiff-friendly test employed by the Ninth Circuit, is employed in every federal circuit that has considered the issue save one.³

The published decision of the Court of Appeal here is directly at odds with the decisions of the Ninth Circuit and other federal courts, adopting the “formalistic” approach that has been almost uniformly rejected. *Powell*, 391 F.3d at 22. Thus, the Court of Appeal focused on the caption of the complaint, stressing that it identified Deasy as “Superintendent of the Los Angeles Unified

³ Only the Eighth Circuit employs a test which, directly opposite to the Ninth Circuit’s approach, presumes that claims naming public officials are official-capacity claims. *Johnson v. Outboard Marine Corp.* (8th Cir. 1999), 172 F.3d 531, 535. However, the logic of the Eighth Circuit’s official-capacity presumption has been criticized both from without, *Biggs*, 66 F.3d at 59-60, and within. *Baker v. Chisom* (8th Cir. 2007), 501 F.3d 920, 926-27 (Gruender, J., dissenting).

School District” (Att. A at 10). However, courts following the majority approach uniformly reject the idea that identifying the position or office of the defendant makes the claim an official capacity one. *Powell*, 391 F.3d at 23-24.⁴ Then, after cavalierly discounting the fact that the substantive allegations of the complaint identified Deasy as an “individual”, the Court of Appeal focused on allegations concerning Deasy’s role in the formulation and execution of LAUSD policy, indicating that Deasy’s execution of policy would show an official capacity claim was asserted (Att. A at 10). But allegations concerning execution of policy should not have been taken as stating an official-capacity claim because it is established that a personal-capacity claim can be asserted against a public official even if the official was executing state policy in causing the deprivation of constitutional rights. *Melo v. Hafer* (3d Cir. 1990), 912 F.2d 628, 637, *aff’d* (1991), 502 U.S. 21.

The Court of Appeal’s decision ignored the “course of proceedings”, which should have led to the conclusion that the § 1983

⁴ Indeed, contrary to the statement in the Court of Appeal’s opinion (Att. A at 11), neither the caption nor any other part of the complaint indicates Deasy is being sued “in his capacity” as Superintendent. The reference to that office was simply an identification of Deasy’s position and served to support the required assertion that he acted under color of state law.

claim was against Deasy in his individual capacity. In particular, the fact that the complaint sought compensatory and punitive damages from Deasy for the § 1983 claim (CT at 13, 17) shows that an individual capacity claim was made here. *Powell*, 391 F.3d at 23; *see also Shoshone-Bannock Tribes v. Fish & Game Com'n, Idaho* (9th Cir. 1994), 42 F.3d 1278, 1284 (“Where state officials are named in a complaint which seeks damages under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, it is presumed that the officials are being sued in their individual capacities.”). Additionally, the fact that Deasy was named at all is a strong indication that the claim against him was in his individual capacity. Again, an “official capacity” claim is, as a matter of law, no different than and is treated as a suit against the entity. *Graham*, 473 U.S. at 165-66. Because LAUSD was otherwise named as a Defendant in the case, including Deasy would have been entirely superfluous and unnecessary if an official-capacity claim was intended. This is why the Ninth Circuit “presumes that officials necessarily are sued in their personal capacities where those officials are named in a complaint[.]” *Romano*, 169 F.3d at 1186. Indeed, by the Court of Appeal’s own logic, the very fact that McAllister named both Defendant Deasy *and* Defendants LAUSD must evince a clear

intent by McAllister to bring suit against both LAUSD and Defendant Deasy as a separate entity in his individual capacity.

Under the prevailing national test, the ultimate inquiry is “whether the plaintiff’s intention to hold the defendant personally liable can be ascertained fairly.” *Biggs*, 66 F.3d at 61. The fact that the complaint specifically named Deasy, never asserted he was being sued in his “official capacity,” and sought compensatory and punitive damages from him certainly support the conclusion that he was being sued in his personal capacity. Indeed, the personal capacity nature of the § 1983 claim was made crystal clear by the fact that the Third Cause of Action alleging a claim under § 1983 *does not* allege liability on the part of LAUSD, but asserts that “Defendant Deasy” is liable for the constitutional deprivation (CT at 13). The omission of LAUSD from the Third Cause of Action demonstrates that Deasy was sued in his personal capacity on the § 1983 claim⁵.

⁵ The Court of Appeal attempted to minimize the clear import of the omission of LAUSD from any mention in the Third Cause of Action by noting that the caption of this claim referred to “Defendants”, claiming this “suggests that [McAllister] was most certainly alleging liability on the part of LAUSD for this claim, since the only two named defendants were LAUSD and Deasy.” This not only wholly ignores the remaining text and operative allegations of the Third Cause of Action, every one of which (unlike every other Cause of Action) refers *only and specifically* to “Defendant Deasy,” but the

The Court of Appeal's published decision also has placed California jurisprudence in conflict with the rest of the nation when it held that the complaint asserted only an official-capacity claim because it alleged that Deasy's conduct was "within the course and scope of his employment at LAUSD[.]" (Att. A at 10-11). The Supreme Court made clear in *Hafer*, 502 U.S. at 3, that a claim is not transformed into an "official-capacity" claim subject to Eleventh Amendment immunity simply because of the "official nature" of the acts alleged. Thus, it is established that:

"[U]nder § 1983, a plaintiff may sue a [governmental] officer in [her] individual capacity for alleged wrongs committed by the officer in [her] official capacity." *Price v. Akaka*, 928 F.2d 824, 828 (9th Cir.1990). It simply "does not follow that every time a public official acts under color of state law, the suit must of necessity be one against the official in his or her official capacity."

Powell, 391 F.3d at 23-24. Nevertheless, the Court of Appeal here based its conclusion that the § 1983 claim was only an official-capacity claim largely on the basis of allegations in the complaint that Deasy was acting with the course and scope of his employment and duties as Superintendent.

restricted interpretation of the amended complaint does not give the complaint "a reasonable interpretation, read as a whole and its parts in their context." *Blank v. Kirwan* (1985), 39 Cal.3d 311, 318.

By relying on the official nature of the acts and failing to consider the complaint as a whole, the Court of Appeal decision creates a conflict between the jurisprudence of this state and that of the remainder of the nation. Indeed, the decision also conflicts with California decisions which hold that on review of an order sustaining a demurrer to a complaint, the reviewing court will “give the complaint a reasonable interpretation, reading it as a whole and its parts in their context. Irrespective of the labels attached by the pleader to any alleged cause of action, [the reviewing court will] examine the factual allegations of the complaint, ‘to determine whether they state a cause of action on **any available legal theory.**’” *Adelman v. Associated Int’l Ins. Co.* (2001), 90 Cal. App. 4th 352, 359 (citations omitted; emphasis added). In the interest of maintaining uniformity in the law governing § 1983 claims, this Court should grant the instant petition for review.

II. REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED BECAUSE THE COURT OF APPEAL ERRED IN SUSTAINING THE DEMURRER WITHOUT GRANTING LEAVE TO AMEND THE COMPLAINT TO PLAINLY STATE A PERSONAL-CAPACITY CLAIM UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1983

Although McAllister's complaint alleged a personal-capacity claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Defendant Deasy under the prevailing standards, even if this was not the case, the Court of Appeal erred in ruling that McAllister was not entitled to amend the complaint in order to make absolutely clear that a personal capacity claim was asserted against Deasy.⁶ In so ruling, it relied on two points: (1) McAllister had forfeited the right to amend by failing to provide an offer of proof of additional facts showing Deasy was acting in his individual capacity as suggested by the Superior Court (Att. A at 12; CT at 83); and (2) a simple allegation that Deasy was being sued in his personal capacity would not be sufficient because § 1983 does not allow claims against states "and individuals acting on behalf of states," and this intent may not be evaded by the "pleading

⁶ Under California precedent, a demurrer may be sustained without leave to amend only if there is no reasonable possibility that the defect can be cured by an amendment. *Blank v. Kirwan*, (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 311, 318. Additionally, "if a complaint does not state a cause of action, but there is a reasonable possibility that the defect can be cured by amendment, leave to amend must be granted." *Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guaranty Co.* (1998), 19 Cal.4th 26, 39.

device” of alleging a claim is against an individual in his “personal capacity.” (Att. A at 15).

Each of these points proceeds from the same flawed premise: that McAllister’s complaint needed to allege certain facts, apart from those already alleged in the complaint, showing that Deasy acted in his “personal”, as opposed to “official”, capacity. This premise is plainly contrary to the central holding in *Hafer*, 502 U.S. at 27-28, which explicitly rejected the idea that state officials are immune from § 1983 liability for actions taken in their “official capacity.” The ruling of the Court of Appeal conflicts with *Hafer* and, *a fortiori*, all § 1983 jurisprudence by holding that McAllister was required to allege something other than that Deasy acted in some manner outside of or beyond the duties and authorities of his position as Superintendent in order to maintain a personal capacity claim against Deasy.

With respect to the idea that McAllister “forfeited” the right to amend, this assumes that McAllister needed to offer additional proof in order to allege a personal capacity claim against Deasy. But *Hafer* establishes that “[o]n the merits, to establish *personal* liability in a § 1983 action, it is enough to show that the official, acting under color of state law, caused the deprivation of a federal right.” *Hafer*, 502

U.S. at 25 (quoting *Graham* 473 U.S. at 166; emphasis in original). McAllister’s complaint alleged these elements, and the suggestion of the Superior Court and Court of Appeal that some additional facts must be alleged to state a personal capacity claim ignores the plain holding in *Hafer*. Indeed, McAllister alleged all the facts within her knowledge and had no additional facts to allege since the case was at the pleading stage and no discovery had occurred.

As to the Court of Appeal’s second holding, that McAllister could not in any event amend the complaint to assert a personal capacity claim against Deasy, the Court’s justification is summed up in this passage from the opinion after summarizing *Hafer* and *Will v. Mich. Dept. of State Police*:

The Supreme Court thus made it clear that a “mere pleading device” should not be used to “circumvent congressional intent.” (*Will, supra*, 491 U.S. at p. 71.) The congressional intent to which the high court referred was the intent to *exclude* states, **and individuals acting on behalf of state**, from liability under section 1983. (*Id.* at p. 64.) Where such intent has been so clearly set forth, we decline to hold that a mere amendment changing the capacity in which Deasy is sued is all that is needed to circumvent the language and purpose of section 1983.

(Att. at 15; bold added). While *Will* certainly makes clear that states are not “persons” subject to a § 1983 claim, the Court of Appeal’s

additional pronouncement that “individuals acting on behalf of states” are not subject to § 1983 claims is patently wrong.

Indeed, *Hafer* rejected a state official’s claim that actions by her that were part of her official duties were actions of the state and could not be the basis for § 1983 liability under *Will*:

[Section 1983] authorized suits to redress deprivations of civil right by person acting “under color of any [state] statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage.” 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The requirement of action under color of state law means that *Hafer* may be liable for discharging respondents precisely because of her authority as auditor general. We cannot accept the novel proposition that this same official authority insulates *Hafer* from suit.

Hafer, 502 U.S. at 27-28. The Supreme Court went on to reject the state officer’s argument that actions within an officer’s authority and necessary to the performance of governmental functions, including employment decisions, should be considered acts of the state that may not be the basis for personal-capacity liability under § 1983. It wrote that the suggested distinction

ignores our holding that Congress enacted § 1983 “to enforce provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment against those who carry a badge of authority of a State and represent it in some capacity, *whether they act in accordance with their authority or misuse it.*” *Scheuer v. Rhodes* (1974), 416 U.S. 232, 243.

Hafer, 502 U.S. at 28 (emphasis added).

These passages from *Hafer* make clear that the Court of Appeal's published ruling that no curative amendment was possible here because Deasy was acting "on behalf of the state" and as such could not be held liable for discharging McAllister is simply wrong and a distortion of § 1983 law. Even if Deasy was acting for LAUSD, within the scope of his authority and pursuant to a policy or statute, he is still subject to a § 1983 personal-capacity claim. Allowing an amendment specifying that the claim against him was a personal-capacity claim would in no way violate or avoid the intent of Congress concerning the scope of § 1983 liability.

The Court of Appeal went to great lengths to distinguish *Hafer* from the instant case, but none of these supposed differences⁷ have any relevance to whether McAllister asserted a personal-capacity

⁷ In some respects, the Court of Appeal is simply wrong. For example, the decision indicates that *Hafer* is distinguishable because she was being held liable for actions, such as comments of her intent to discharge certain employees, that occurred before she took office (Att. A at 13). But *Hafer* could not have been liable for events occurring before she took office because she would not have then been acting "under color of state law" as required by § 1983. Additionally, the Court of Appeal referred to the plaintiffs' support of *Hafer's* election opponent as actions and events outside of the scope of *Hafer's* office which were the basis for liability. But these were actions of the *plaintiffs*, not *Hafer*, and so clearly were not a basis for *Hafer's* liability. Instead, *Hafer's* liability was based on her act of discharging the plaintiffs, which occurred in the course of her official duties.

claim or should be allowed to amend to make such a claim clear. Thus, the Court below wrote that some of Hafer's conduct could be described as "abuses of her position" rather than in furtherance of official policy (Att. A at 13). But, as discussed above, the *Hafer* decision makes clear that personal liability may attach to a state officer whether the actions are within or beyond the scope of the authority of the office. The Court also suggests that *Hafer* is distinguishable because some of the plaintiffs specifically alleged that the claim was against the defendant in her "individual capacity," indicating that the invocation of that phrase justified allowing the claim to go forward (Att. A at 13). Yet, this is precisely what McAllister requested the opportunity to do—to specifically assert that the claim is against Deasy in his personal capacity.

The Court of Appeal also indicated that an amendment to specifically allege that the claim against Deasy is in his personal capacity was inappropriate because it would effectively add a new party to the case (Att. A at 16). But the Court fails to explain why adding a new party would have been improper. Even to this day, the two-year statute of limitations on § 1983 claims applicable in California, *Colony Cove Properties, LLC v. City of Carson* (9th Cir.

2011), 648 F.3d 948, 956,⁸ has not run. Moreover, such an amendment is proper under California law. Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 473(a)(1). The Court of Appeal’s suggestion that amending to add a personal-capacity claim against Deasy was inappropriate because no “factual showing supporting [a] claim of personal liability on the part of Deasy” was offered exhibits the same misunderstanding of the law noted above: to establish Deasy’s personal liability under § 1983, all that needed to be alleged was that, acting under color of state law, he caused the deprivation of a federal right. *Hafer*, 502 U.S. at 25. McAllister’s complaint made the required allegations; nothing else needed to be shown, nor was Deasy’s personal liability affected by the fact that he was acting within the scope of his office and duties in causing the constitutional deprivation. *Id.* at 28.

⁸ Although earlier California decisions indicated that the limitations period on § 1983 claims was one year, the general personal injury limitations statute, which governs the limitations period for § 1983 claims, was amended in 2002 to increase the period to two years. Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 335.1.

III. REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED TO DETERMINE WHETHER A PRIVATE CAUSE OF ACTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF EXISTS UNDER THE GUARANTEE TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH CONTAINED IN ARTICLE I, § 2(A) OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION

The Court of Appeal also ruled that McAllister had no cause of action for injunctive relief under Cal. Const. Art. I, § 2(a) (Att. A at 20-21). Article I, § 2(a), protects the fundamental right of freedom of speech by providing that “[e]very person may freely speak, write and publish his or her sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of this right. A law may not restrain or abridge liberty of speech or press.” In *Degrassi v. Cook*, (2002), 29 Cal.4th 333, 344, this Court held, under the facts there presented, that a private cause of action for damages did not exist under Art. I, § 2. However, this Court also wrote that

the free speech clause of article I, section 2(a) “*is self-executing, and . . . even without any effectuating legislation, all branches of government are required to comply with its terms. Furthermore, it also is clear that, like many other constitutional provisions, this section supports an action, brought by a private plaintiff against a proper defendant, for declaratory relief or for injunction.*”

Degrassi, 29 Cal. 4th at 338 (emphasis in original, citation omitted).

This Court should grant the instant petition in order to decide the important question of whether an injunction may be issued to

remedy a violation of this State’s constitutional guarantee to free speech. In ruling as a matter of law that McAllister has no right to seek an injunction under Art. I, § 2(a), the Court of Appeal noted that no precedent was cited showing that such injunctive relief has ever, in fact, been granted under this provision[.]” But other courts, including this Court in *DeGrassi*, have found that Art. I § 2(a) may support a cause of action for injunctive relief. *See CuvIELLO v. City and County of San Francisco* (N.D. Cal. 2013), 2013 WL 1615606, at *26 (finding, explicitly, that “Article I, section 2(a) *does* support a cause of action for declaratory or injunctive relief,” and offering Plaintiff the opportunity to amend their complaint in order to state a request for declaratory or injunctive relief.) and *Creighton v. City of Livingston* (E.D. Cal. 2009), 628 F.Supp.2d 1199, 1216 (noting that “most constitutional provisions, including article I, §§ 2 and 3, support ‘an action, brought by a private plaintiff against a proper defendant, for declaratory relief or for injunction.’ ” (citing *Katzberg v. Regents of the Univ. of Cal.* (2002), 29 Cal. 4th 300)). Thus, the Court of Appeal’s implication that there is no support for allowing injunctive relief as a remedy for the State’s free speech provision is unconvincing.

Also unconvincing is its determination that an analysis of the text of Art. I, § 2(a) indicates that injunctive relief of the kind sought by McAllister, i.e., an order that she be rehired by LAUSD, is not proper. The lower court wrote that McAllister was not prevented from speaking and the Defendants had not passed a law or rule restricting speech. Because it is government actions which prevent speech that are covered by Art. I, § 2(a), the lower court reasoned that an injunction requiring McAllister be rehired was not a proper remedy under Art. I, § 2(a) (Att. A at 21).

But this holding, which is essentially that Art. I, § 2(a) protects *only* against direct government censorship of speech, is contrary to precedent establishing that the provision also is violated where the government retaliates against citizens because of the opinions they express. Thus, numerous cases recognize that Art. I, § 2(a), like the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, forbids a public employer from discharging an employee for engaging in protected speech. *See Kaye v. Bd. of Trustees of San Diego County Public Law Library* (2009), 179 Cal. App. 4th 48, 58-99 (citing numerous cases), and *Franklin v. Leland Stanford Junior University* (1985), 172 Cal. App. 3d 322, 336 (a public employee cannot be discharged or

disciplined for expressive conduct protected by the constitution). Plainly, Art. I, § 2(a) does protect an individual's right to employment if it is threatened because of her exercise of the right to expression protected by that provision.

Thus, the Court of Appeal erred in summarily deciding that injunctive relief may not be obtained to redress a violation of Art. I, § 2(a) that results in the loss of public employment. It is particularly important that this Court address this unsettled issue in the instant context. Relief under the California Constitution may be the only avenue available to public school employees such as McAllister who are discharged because of off-duty speech activities. Because school districts are protected by the Eleventh Amendment and are not "persons" for the purpose of 42 U.S.C. § 1983, no remedy is available under federal law. Moreover, to the extent the decision below is allowed to stand, a public school employee would have no claim against an individual responsible for a retaliatory discharge because the public official would be deemed to have acted in his or her "official capacity" and not subject to liability. Public school employees must have some legal vehicle for protecting and vindicating their fundamental constitutional rights when they are

violated by school districts. This Court should take up the important question of whether injunctive relief under the California Constitution is available by granting the instant Petition.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the decision of the Court of Appeal is a significant departure from precedent on the applicability and enforcement of federal rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. It is important that this Court take steps to resolve the conflict the decision below has created with virtually all other decisions on the scope of personal liability under § 1983. Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court grant the Petition for Review in order to ensure uniformity of decision and to resolve the important question of whether injunctive relief is available for a violation of the California Constitution's guarantee to freedom of speech.

Dated: July 12, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

Julie A. Esposito
424 Linwood Avenue, Unit B
Monrovia, CA 91016
Tel: (626) 358-9216
E-mail: julieesa2@gmail.com

Counsel for Petitioner

Participating Attorney for
THE RUTHERFORD INSTITUTE

CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT

Pursuant to California Rule of Court 8.504(d)(1), the undersigned Counsel for Petitioner does hereby certify that the foregoing Petition for Review contains 7,850 words, as shown by a computer program word count and excluding matters set forth in California Rules of Court 8.504(d)(3).

Los Angeles, CA 90012
(*Delivered for the attention of Hon. Rita Miller, Judge*)

Office of the Clerk
Court of Appeal of the State of California Second Appellate District
Ronald Reagan State Building
300 S. Spring Street
Second Floor, North Tower
Los Angeles, CA 90013

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of
California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on July 12, 2013, at Monrovia California.

Julie A. Esposito

ATTACHMENT A

Filed 6/3/13

CERTIFIED FOR PUBLICATION

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION TWO

PATRICIA MCALLISTER,

Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL
DISTRICT et al.,

Defendants and Respondents.

B244759

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. BC484767)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Rita Miller, Judge. Affirmed.

Julie A. Esposito for Plaintiff and Appellant.

Alexander A. Molina for Defendants and Respondents.

Patricia McAllister (appellant) appeals from a final judgment entered after the trial court sustained a demurrer to each of appellant's causes of action against respondents Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) and John E. Deasy (Deasy), superintendent of LAUSD (collectively "respondents"). We affirm the judgment.

CONTENTIONS

Appellant contends that the trial court erred in sustaining the demurrer to her third cause of action claiming a deprivation of rights under section 1983 of title 42 of the United States Code (hereafter section 1983). Although appellant concedes that the trial court properly sustained the demurrer as to LAUSD and Deasy in his official capacity, she argues that she should be permitted to amend her complaint to state this cause of action against Deasy in his individual capacity.

Appellant further contends that the trial court erred in sustaining a demurrer to her second cause of action alleging a private claim for relief under article I, section 2, subdivision (a) of the California Constitution (hereafter Constitution, section 2(a)). Appellant argues that the trial court's broad ruling that there is no private cause of action under section 2(a) is incorrect.

Next, appellant contends that the demurrer was not properly sustained as to her tort claims for wrongful discharge and infliction of emotional distress. Appellant argues that, contrary to the trial court's ruling, these causes of action are not impermissible under California Government Code section 815.

Finally, appellant contends that punitive damages are properly recoverable under section 1983 against an individual who is found to have acted with reckless or callous indifference in depriving appellant of her constitutional rights.

BACKGROUND

1. The complaint

Appellant filed her first amended complaint against respondents on May 22, 2012, alleging wrongful termination; deprivation of rights under the Constitution, section 2(a); violation of section 1983 for deprivation of rights under the First Amendment to the

United States Constitution; breach of implied contract; breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing; and negligent infliction of emotional distress.

Appellant is a credentialed teacher in mathematics and a permitted substitute teacher. LAUSD is an entity which controls and operates public elementary and secondary schools within the City and County of Los Angeles, California. Deasy is the duly appointed and acting superintendent of LAUSD and is responsible for overseeing all educational and administrative issues for LAUSD.

Beginning about April 14, 2006, appellant was employed by LAUSD as a substitute teacher for mathematics and general education subjects. On May 4, 2011, LAUSD made an offer of continued employment to appellant for the school year beginning September 2011 and ending June 2012 as an on-call substitute teacher.

As of October 12, 2011, appellant was scheduled to begin a substitute assignment at Ramon C. Cortines School of Visual and Performing Arts on November 4, 2011.

On Wednesday, October 12, 2011, appellant attended a public rally at Los Angeles City Hall. The rally was part of a movement known as "Occupy Los Angeles." Appellant attended because of her opposition to cuts in education. During the rally, appellant was approached by a reporter for Reason.TV who asked for an interview. Appellant identified herself and disclosed that she worked for LAUSD. She stated she was at the rally "representing herself." During the course of the interview, appellant made the following comment: "I think that the Zionist Jews who are running these big banks and our Federal Reserve, which are not run by the federal government, they need to be run out of this country."

A video of the interview was posted on the Reason.TV website. It was also uploaded to YouTube.com, and was widely viewed.

Beginning the morning of October 14, 2011, appellant began receiving telephone calls from unidentified people berating and condemning her for the statements which were repeated on the videos available on the internet. During this weekend, appellant viewed the internet video and saw comments posted urging people to call LAUSD and demand that appellant be fired.

On Tuesday, October 18, 2011, appellant called the LAUSD “Subfinder” automated telephone system to check on her scheduled teaching assignment for November 4, 2011, at Ramon C. Cortines School of Visual and Performing Arts. However, when she attempted to log in, the system rejected her request. The automated Subfinder system message said that her status was inactive, and that she should call her supervisor.

Appellant then called the Certificated Substitute Unit of LAUSD to inquire as to why her status was inactive. Appellant spoke with Marjorie Josaphat who told appellant to call Dr. Ira Berman, LAUSD’s director of employee relations. Appellant called Dr. Berman. He told her to come to his office right away.

Appellant arrived at LAUSD central offices at 1:00 p.m. on October 18, 2011, and proceeded to Dr. Berman’s office. Dr. Berman informed appellant that her employment with LAUSD was terminated. She was given no reason when she asked Dr. Berman why her employment was terminated, but was told that she should contact Deasy.

Before she could speak to Deasy, appellant saw a news report of a statement Deasy had released to the press and media. The statement read as follows:

“As Superintendent of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), I want to emphasize that we condemn the remarks made recently by Patricia McAllister. Her comments, made during non-work time at a recent protest rally, were her private opinions and were not made in the context of District services. At LAUSD, we recognize that the law is very protective of the freedom of speech rights of public employees when they are speaking as private citizens during non-working time.

“I further emphasize to our students, who watch us and look to us for guidance, to be role models and to represent the ideals by which LAUSD lives, that we will never stand for behavior that is disrespectful, intolerant or discriminatory.

“As a day-to-day substitute teacher, Ms. McAllister was an at-will employee. As of today, she is no longer an employee of the LAUSD.”

On October 20, 2011, appellant received by certified mail a letter dated October 18, 2011, from LAUSD signed by Vivian K. Ekchian. The letter read that ““you are to be

separated from employment with the Los Angeles Unified School District effective the date of this letter.””

On or about December 2, 2011, pursuant to the requirements of the California Tort Claims Act, as codified in Government Code section 910 et seq., appellant prepared a form outlining her claim against LAUSD. In the form, appellant asserted she had been fired as a result of an interview she gave at an “Occupy Los Angeles” rally. Appellant further asserted the termination was in violation of her First Amendment right to freedom of speech.

On December 13, 2011, appellant received notification from LAUSD that her claim had been rejected, and that she had six months to file a court action on the rejected claim.

Appellant alleges she has suffered and continues to suffer damages as a result of the termination of her employment. She further alleges that Deasy made the decision to terminate appellant’s employment, that he did so within the course and scope of his employment and duties as superintendent of LAUSD, and that he was acting pursuant to the policies, practices, directives and procedures of LAUSD.

2. The trial court proceedings

On June 22, 2012, respondents filed a demurrer to appellant’s first amended complaint. Respondents argued that appellant’s wrongful termination and negligent infliction of emotional distress claims failed as a matter of law because Government Code section 815, subdivision (a), abolished all common law or judicially declared liability for public entities. As to appellant’s cause of action under the Constitution, section 2(a), respondents argued that it should be dismissed because there is no private right of action under this provision. Respondents also argued that appellant could not state a prima facie case under section 1983 against LAUSD or its employees because it is well established that the state, and state officials sued in their official capacities, are not “persons” who may be liable under this statute. (*Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police* (1989) 491 U.S. 58 (*Will*)). In addition, respondents argued that they were immune pursuant to Government Code section 820.2, which provides that:

“Except as otherwise provided by statute, a public employee is not liable for an injury resulting from his act or omission where the act or omission was the result of the exercise of the discretion vested in him, whether or not such discretion be abused.”

Finally, respondents argued that LAUSD cannot be held liable for punitive damages under Government Code section 818, which provides that:

“Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a public entity is not liable for damages awarded under Section 3294 of the Civil Code or other damages imposed primarily for the sake of example and by way of punishing the defendant.”

Since no conduct was alleged on the part of Deasy that would support a claim of punitive damages, respondents argued that the claim should also fail as to Deasy.

Appellant opposed the demurrer. She argued that respondents are liable for the wrongful termination and negligent infliction of emotional distress tort claims under Government Code section 815.2, and that constitutional torts are not barred by the Government Claims Act. Appellant further argued that she has a private cause of action under the Constitution, section 2(a) because an analysis of the pertinent factors dictates in favor of the recognition of a cause of action. Appellant further argued that Deasy was liable under section 1983 as an individual, and that neither Deasy nor LAUSD was immune from suit under Government Code section 820.2.

Respondents filed a reply brief, and the matter was heard on September 10, 2012. The trial court’s detailed tentative decision reveals its reasoning. As to the wrongful termination and negligent infliction of emotional distress causes of action, the trial court agreed with respondents that such common law causes of action do not lie against a public entity such as LAUSD. (Gov. Code, § 815, subd. (a).) As to the claim under the Constitution, section 2(a), the trial court held that “the ‘freedom of speech’ provisions of the California constitution do not give rise to a private right of action,” citing *Katzberg v. Regents of University of California* (2002) 29 Cal.4th 300 (*Katzberg*) and *Degrassi v. Cook* (2002) 29 Cal.4th 333 (*Degrassi*).

Citing *Kirchmann v. Lake Elsinore Unified School Dist.* (2000) 83 Cal.App.4th 1098, 1115 (*Kirchmann*), the trial court held that LAUSD and Deasy, acting for LAUSD, should be considered state entities and therefore not subject to liability under section 1983. The trial court noted that appellant claimed she could state a prima facie case against Deasy under section 1983 for acts in his individual, rather than official, capacity. The court was inclined to allow appellant to make an offer of proof at the hearing, setting forth the facts which she believed supported her argument that Deasy was acting in his individual capacity. The court noted, “[o]f course, [appellant] may not contradict the judicial admissions in her complaint as to the allegations in the existing complaint that he was acting within the scope and course of his employment and pursuant to LAUSD policies.” The trial court found the issue of punitive damages to be moot in light of its decision to sustain the demurrer on all other causes of action.

Judgment in accordance with the tentative decision was filed on October 3, 2012. On October 23, 2012, appellant filed her notice of appeal.

DISCUSSION

I. Standard of review

“On appeal from a judgment dismissing an action after sustaining a demurrer without leave to amend, the standard of review is well settled. The reviewing court gives the complaint a reasonable interpretation, and treats the demurrer as admitting all material facts properly pleaded. [Citations.] The court does not, however, assume the truth of contentions, deductions or conclusions of law. [Citation.] The judgment must be affirmed ‘if any one of the several grounds of demurrer is well taken. [Citations.]’ [Citation.] However, it is error for a trial court to sustain a demurrer when the plaintiff has stated a cause of action under any possible legal theory. [Citation.] And it is an abuse of discretion to sustain a demurrer without leave to amend if the plaintiff shows there is a reasonable possibility any defect identified by the defendant can be cured by amendment. [Citation.]” (*Aubry v. Tri-City Hospital Dist.* (1992) 2 Cal.4th 962, 966-967.) The legal sufficiency of the complaint is reviewed de novo. (*Montclair Parkowners Assn. v. City of Montclair* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 784, 790.)

“When reviewing a demurrer on appeal, appellate courts generally assume that all facts pleaded in the complaint are true. [Citation.]” (*Cantu v. Resolution Trust Corp.* (1992) 4 Cal.App.4th 857, 877, fn. omitted.) While a plaintiff must be allowed to amend a complaint if there is a reasonable possibility that the plaintiff can rectify any defect, “[a] plaintiff may not avoid demurrer by pleading facts or positions in an amended complaint that contradict the facts pleaded in the original complaint or by suppressing facts which prove the pleaded facts false. [Citation.]” (*Ibid.*)

Bearing these standards in mind, we review the causes of action before us in this appeal.

II. Claim under section 1983

A. Applicable law

Section 1983 “creates a cause of action in favor of ‘the party injured’ against ‘[e]very person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State . . . , subjects, or causes to be subjected, any . . . person . . . to the deprivation of any rights . . . secured by the Constitution and laws’ (42 U.S.C. § 1983).” (*County of Los Angeles v. Superior Court* (1999) 21 Cal.4th 292, 297.)

Section 1983 is not itself a source of substantive rights, “‘but merely provides ‘a method for vindicating federal rights elsewhere conferred.’” [Citations.]” (*County of Los Angeles v. Superior Court, supra*, 21 Cal.4th at p. 297.) It allows actions against state or local officials for actions that have violated constitutional rights. (*Manta Management Corp. v. City of San Bernardino* (2008) 43 Cal.4th 400, 406.)

There are two essential elements of a claim under section 1983, (1) the conduct complained of was committed by a person acting under color of state law; and (2) the conduct deprived the plaintiff of a right, privilege or immunity secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States. (*Vergos v. McNeal* (2007) 146 Cal.App.4th 1387, 1402.)

However, a state, an entity acting as an “arm of the state,” or a state official sued in his official capacity may not be considered a “person” who may be liable under section 1983. (*Will, supra*, 491 U.S. at p. 71; see also *Kirchmann, supra*, 83 Cal.App.4th at p.

1115 [California school district as an “arm of the state” was not subject to liability under section 1983 claim]; *Belanger v. Madera Unified School Dist.* (9th Cir. 1992) 963 F.2d 248 [former principal’s claim that she was demoted to teacher in violation of section 1983 was properly dismissed because California school districts are agents of the state].)

“Suits against state officials in their official capacity . . . should be treated as suits against the State. [Citation.]” (*Hafer v. Melo* (1991) 502 U.S. 21, 25 (*Hafer*)). Thus, an official sued in his official capacity is not subject to liability under section 1983.

However, “officers sued in their personal capacity come to court as individuals. A government official in the role of personal-capacity defendant thus fits comfortably within the statutory term ‘person.’ [Citation.]” (*Hafer, supra*, at p. 27.) While a plaintiff may sue a state official in his individual capacity for acts undertaken under the guise of official authority (*ibid.*), we must also consider that a plaintiff may not “circumvent congressional intent by a mere pleading device.” (*Will, supra*, 491 U.S. at p. 71, fn. omitted.)

B. Appellant has failed to show that she should be permitted to amend her complaint to add a personal-capacity claim against Deasy

Appellant makes two arguments on appeal as to her section 1983 claim. First, appellant acknowledges that a section 1983 claim cannot lie against the state, an arm of the state, or a state employee in his official capacity. However, she contends that her first amended complaint, as written, alleges a section 1983 claim against Deasy in his personal capacity. Further, appellant argues that even if it is not clear that Deasy is being sued in his individual capacity, she should be granted leave to amend her complaint to specifically allege that Deasy is being sued in his individual capacity. For the reasons set forth below, we reject appellant’s arguments.

1. Appellant’s first amended complaint alleges an official-capacity suit against Deasy only

In determining whether a section 1983 claim may lie against a state official, we must analyze “the capacity in which the state officer is sued, not the capacity in which the officer inflicts the alleged injury.” (*Hafer, supra*, 502 U.S. 21, 26.) In order to determine

the capacity in which the officer is sued, we analyze the language of the complaint. (*Baughman v. State of California* (1995) 38 Cal.App.4th 182, 188.)

The operative complaint lists the defendants as “Los Angeles Unified School District; John E. Deasy, Superintendent of the Los Angeles Unified School District; and DOES 1 THROUGH 100, Inclusive.” Thus, the caption of the complaint gives no indication that Deasy was being sued as an individual. Instead, it shows the opposite intent: that Deasy was sued solely in his role as superintendent of schools.

The language of the complaint further confirms that appellant alleges an official-capacity claim only against Deasy. In her description of the parties, appellant describes Deasy as follows:

“Defendant John E. Deasy (hereinafter ‘Deasy’) is an individual and is the duly-appointed and acting Superintendent of LAUSD and is responsible for overseeing all educational and administrative issues for LAUSD and administers the overall educational activities of LAUSD’s schools and centers. Deasy is responsible for carrying out and enforcing the policies of LAUSD and, on information and belief, establishes LAUSD policy with respect to his actions and decisions. In all respects set forth herein, Defendant Deasy acted under color of the law of the State of California.”

While Deasy is identified as an “individual,” this brief reference in no way alters our analysis of the complaint. As set forth in *Will*: “Obviously, state officials literally are persons.” (*Will, supra*, 491 U.S. at p. 71.) The passing reference to Deasy as an individual person does not change the clear intent of the complaint to target Deasy in his official capacity. Of particular importance are appellant’s allegations that Deasy is responsible for carrying out and enforcing LAUSD policies. In an official-capacity lawsuit, as opposed to an individual-capacity lawsuit, “‘the entity’s ‘policy or custom’ must have played a part in the violation of federal law.’ [Citation.]” (*Hafer, supra*, 502 U.S. at p. 25.)

The nature of this action as an official-capacity claim against Deasy is emphasized further in the “facts” section of the complaint, where appellant explains that Deasy

carried out his allegedly wrongful act within the course and scope of his employment at LAUSD:

“Defendant Deasy made the decision to terminate Plaintiff’s employment and in doing so was acting within the scope and course of his employment and duties as Superintendent of Defendant LAUSD and was executing and acting pursuant to the policies, practices, directives and procedures of Defendant LAUSD.”

The language of the complaint leaves no question that Deasy was sued in his official capacity and not as an individual.

Appellant cites *Romano v. Bible* (9th Cir. 1999) 169 F.3d 1182, 1186 (*Romano*), for the proposition that a court should “presume[] that officials necessarily are sued in their personal capacities where those officials are named in a complaint, even if the complaint does not explicitly mention the capacity in which they are sued. [Citations.]”

First, we note that appellant has not cited any California state law setting forth the existence of this presumption when interpreting the sufficiency of a complaint on demurrer in California state court. However, we need not determine whether the presumption described under federal law should apply in this context.

The *Romano* court made it clear that the presumption exists where “the complaint does not explicitly mention the capacity in which [the state officials] are sued.” (*Romano, supra*, 169 F. 3d at p. 1186.) Here, as discussed in detail above, the complaint *was* explicit. Deasy was sued in his capacity as “Superintendent of the Los Angeles Unified School District” and in no other capacity. We therefore decline to apply the presumption described in *Romano*.¹

¹ Appellant also argues that “[t]he legal theory that Deasy is sued in his personal/individual capacity is patently stated by the First Amended Complaint, particularly because the Third Cause of Action *does not* allege liability on the part of LAUSD, but asserts that ‘Defendant Deasy’ is liable for the constitutional deprivation.” We reject this argument, which misstates the record. The third cause of action is alleged against “Defendants.” The use of the plural in this part of the pleading suggests that appellant was most certainly alleging liability on the part of LAUSD for this claim, since the only two named defendants were LAUSD and Deasy.

Based on the language and content of the complaint, we conclude that Deasy was sued in his official capacity as an officer of the state, and not as an individual.

2. Appellant has forfeited any argument that she should be permitted to amend her complaint to add a personal-capacity claim against Deasy

Appellant argues on appeal, as she did below, that she should be permitted to amend her complaint to name Deasy as an individual. Appellant argues that this pleading defect could have been cured by adding an express allegation that Deasy is being sued in his individual/personal capacity. Appellant claims that the trial court's decision to deny this request and sustain the demurrer without leave to amend was error.

We find that appellant has forfeited this argument by failing to provide a complete record on appeal. Included in the clerk's transcript is a copy of the trial court's tentative decision, dated September 10, 2012. In that tentative decision, the court stated:

“The court is inclined to allow Plaintiff to make an offer of proof at the hearing, setting what facts she can allege to support her current argument that Deasy was acting in his individual capacity. Of course, Plaintiff may not contradict the judicial admissions in her complaint as to the allegations in the existing complaint that he was acting within the scope and course of his employment and pursuant to LAUSD policies.

“The court cannot see how the complaint might be amended to state a viable claim against Deasy in light of the foregoing, but will entertain an offer of proof at the hearing before making a decision on whether to sustain the demurrer with or without leave to amend.”

Appellant has provided no further information regarding the court's suggestion she make an offer of proof at the hearing. In particular, appellant has not included in the record a reporter's transcript of the hearing. It is appellant's burden to show error by an adequate record. (*In re Kathy P.* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 91, 102.) Without a complete record showing whether an offer of proof was made, we are unable to assess any error, and we may presume that any offer of proof was insufficient to show a viable claim for individual liability against Deasy.

3. Appellant has failed to show that her proposed amendment is more than “a mere pleading device”

While appellant has failed to provide information regarding the trial court’s request that she provide an offer of proof regarding Deasy’s alleged personal liability, she takes the position that her current official-capacity lawsuit sufficiently alleges a section 1983 claim against Deasy in his personal capacity. Thus, appellant argues, a simple amendment, adding Deasy in his personal capacity, is all that is needed to state a claim against Deasy for personal liability.

Appellant has not convinced this court that she should be permitted to amend her complaint to add Deasy as a defendant in his personal capacity. In support of her position, appellant relies exclusively on *Hafer*. The *Hafer* court made it clear that state officers sued in their individual capacities are not “absolutely immune from personal liability under [section] 1983 solely by the ‘official’ nature of their acts.” (*Hafer, supra*, 502 U.S. at p. 31.)

However, *Hafer* is distinguishable from the matter at hand. It was a lawsuit brought by 18 employees who were dismissed by Barbara Hafer after she was elected to the post of auditor general of Pennsylvania. Notably, six of the plaintiffs who brought suit against Hafer expressly sued her in her *individual capacity*, and the remaining defendants, although not as explicit, signified a similar intent. (*Hafer, supra*, 502 U.S. at p. 24.) Personal liability on the part of Hafer was sufficiently pled in the allegations of the complaint, which described actions of Hafer *before* she was elected to the post of auditor general. Specifically, the plaintiffs alleged that during her campaign, Hafer publicly promised to fire several of the plaintiffs, who supposedly secured their jobs through payments to a former employee of the office. (*Id.* at p. 23.) Other plaintiffs alleged that Hafer discharged them because of their support for her opponent during the campaign. (*Ibid.*) Thus, Hafer’s alleged personal liability extended to and included actions and events occurring outside of her official public office. Hafer’s alleged actions taken pursuant to her official authority could more accurately be described as “‘abuse[s] of [her] position,’” rather than actions undertaken in furtherance of official policy.

Through section 1983, Congress sought to give individuals a remedy for such abuses of official authority. (*Id.* at p. 27.)²

The *Hafer* court acknowledged that “[s]tate officers sued for damages in their official capacity are not ‘persons’ for purposes of the suit because they assume the identity of the government that employs them. [Citation.]” (*Hafer, supra*, 502 U.S. at p. 27.) However, the *Hafer* court held that a government official in the role of a personal-capacity defendant fits comfortably into the statutory term “person.” (*Ibid.*) Significantly, when it came to a discussion of the precise difference between an official capacity lawsuit and a personal capacity lawsuit, the *Hafer* court deferred to *Will*, conceding that “*Will* itself makes clear that the distinction between official-capacity suits and personal-capacity suits is more than ‘a mere pleading device.’ [Citation.]” (*Hafer, supra*, at p. 27.)³

Will involved claims by petitioner Ray Will that he was denied a promotion with Michigan’s Department of State Police (Department) because his brother had been a student activist and the subject of a special file kept by respondent, the Department. Will filed suit alleging various violations of the United States and Michigan Constitutions as

² This distinction between *abusing official authority* and *carrying out official policy* adequately addresses the hypothetical set forth in appellant’s opening brief. Appellant worries that school district officials acting within the scope of their authority could, for example, discharge all Democrats without fear of liability because their official acts would endow them with the immunity that has been extended to the school district. But in discharging all Democrats, the hypothetical school official would not be carrying out official school policies, as Deasy was alleged to have done. Instead, that official would be abusing his or her position based on a personal agenda -- as *Hafer* allegedly did.

³ The *Hafer* court noted that the Third Circuit looked to the proceedings below to determine whether certain respondents brought their claims for damages against *Hafer* in her official capacity or her personal capacity. (*Hafer, supra*, 502 U.S. at p.24, fn. *.) Noting that some courts of appeal impose a rigid requirement, requiring specific allegations that the claim is brought against a state official in his or her individual capacity, the *Hafer* court advised “‘it is obviously preferable for the plaintiff to be specific in the first instance to avoid any ambiguity.’ [Citation.]” (*Ibid.*)

grounds for a claim under section 1983. Will named as defendants both the Department and the Director of State Police in his official capacity. (*Will, supra*, 491 U.S. at p. 60.)

The Michigan Supreme Court eventually ruled that the Department, as an arm of the state, is not a person under section 1983, and neither is a state official acting in his or her official capacity. (*Will, supra*, 491 U.S. at p. 61.) The United States Supreme Court agreed with this interpretation of section 1983. In response to the petitioner's argument that state officials should be considered "persons" when acting in their official capacities, the Supreme Court explained that "a suit against a state official in his or her official capacity is not a suit against the official but rather is a suit against the official's office. [Citation.]" (*Id.* at p. 71.) In *Will*, as here, the suit against the Director of State Police in his official capacity as an officer of the state was no different from a suit against the state itself. The high court commented: "We see no reason to adopt a different rule in the present context, particularly when such a rule would allow petitioner to circumvent congressional intent by a mere pleading device." (*Ibid.*, fn. omitted.)

The Supreme Court thus made it clear that a "mere pleading device" should not be used to "circumvent congressional intent." (*Will, supra*, 491 U.S. at p. 71.) The congressional intent to which the high court referred was the intent to *exclude* states, and individuals acting on behalf of states, from liability under section 1983. (*Id.* at p. 64.) Where such intent has been so clearly set forth, we decline to hold that a mere amendment changing the capacity in which Deasy is sued is all that is needed to circumvent the language and purpose of section 1983.

This result is also required under California state law rules governing amendments after the sustaining of a demurrer. In order to be permitted to amend her complaint to add Deasy as a defendant in his individual capacity, appellant was obligated to make a showing that such an amendment was appropriate. (See *Schifando v. City of Los Angeles* (2003) 31 Cal.4th 1074, 1081 [plaintiffs have "the burden of proving that an amendment would cure the defect[s]"]; *Cooper v. Leslie Salt Co.* (1969) 70 Cal.2d 627, 636 ["[p]laintiff must show in what manner he can amend his complaint and how that amendment will change the legal effect of his pleading".]) Appellant has failed to make

any such showing, other than suggesting that the defect can be cured by “simply adding an express allegation that Deasy is sued in his personal/individual capacity.” This change is not so “simple” as appellant suggests. She is, in effect, seeking to add an entirely new defendant to her lawsuit. (See *Will, supra*, 491 U.S. at p. 71 [a suit against a state official is “not a suit against the official but rather is a suit against the official’s office”].) The trial court did not err in requiring that appellant make a minimal factual showing that the addition of this new defendant was appropriate.⁴

Because appellant has completely failed to make any factual showing supporting her claim of personal liability on the part of Deasy, we need not determine the necessary parameters of any such showing. We simply hold that a request to amend a complaint to add a new defendant -- an individual, with liability separate from the state -- after a demurrer has been sustained, requires a minimal factual showing to satisfy the court that such an amendment is appropriate. Appellant has failed to make such a showing, therefore we decline to reverse the trial court’s ruling sustaining the demurrer to this cause of action without leave to amend.⁵

⁴ The court noted in its tentative decision that it would be difficult for appellant to make such a showing without contradicting “the judicial admissions in her complaint as to the allegations in the existing complaint that [Deasy] was acting within the scope and course of his employment and pursuant to LAUSD policies.” We agree that appellant may not expressly contradict her earlier allegations in order to survive demurrer. “A plaintiff may not avoid demurrer by pleading facts or positions in an amended complaint that contradict the facts pleaded in the original complaint or by suppressing facts which prove the pleaded facts false. [Citation.]” (*Cantu v. Resolution Trust Corp., supra*, 4 Cal.App.4th at p. 877.)

In addition, respondents point out that Deasy does not have the authority to hire or fire substitute teachers. Pursuant to Education Code sections 44953 and 45030, those employment decisions are made by the governing board of the school district. Thus, any allegation that Deasy carried out the act of terminating appellant’s employment in his individual capacity would be subject to demurrer on the ground that Deasy had no power to do so.

⁵ Because we have determined that Deasy was sued only in his official capacity, and that appellant has failed to make a showing that she should be permitted to amend her

III. Claim under the Constitution, section 2(a)

The trial court sustained respondents' demurrer to appellant's cause of action under the Constitution, section 2(a) on the ground that there is no private cause of action under that provision. The trial court cited *Katzberg*, and *Degrassi* in support of its ruling that the freedom of speech provisions of the California Constitution do not give rise to a private right of action.

Appellant argues that the trial court's broad ruling does not withstand analysis. Specifically, appellant argues that the *Degrassi* court, while denying a private cause of action for damages under the Constitution, section 2(a) under the facts before it, held that "This does not mean that the free speech clause, in general, never will support an action for money damages." (*Degrassi, supra*, 29 Cal.4th at p. 344.) Instead, appellant argues, each case must be separately evaluated under the factors set forth in *Katzberg, supra*, 29 Cal.4th at pages 324-329.

A. No private right of action exists under the Constitution, section 2(a) pursuant to Degrassi and Katzberg

The *Degrassi* court undertook a two-step procedure in concluding that the Constitution, section 2(a) did not create a private right of action for damages in that case. First, the court analyzed whether the language or legislative history of the provision disclosed an intent to include a damages remedy. (*Degrassi, supra*, 29 Cal.4th at pp. 338-342.) After undergoing this analysis, the high court concluded, "there is no indication in the language of article I, section 2(a), nor any evidence in the history of that provision, from which we may find, within that provision, an implied right to seek damages for a violation of the free speech right set out therein." (*Id.* at p. 342.)

However, this analysis did not end the inquiry. The high court then proceeded to consider "'whether a constitutional tort action for damages to remedy the asserted constitutional violation should be recognized.' [Citation.]" (*Degrassi, supra*, 29 Cal.4th at p. 342.) Applying the factors set forth in *Katzberg*, the court declined to recognize

complaint to add him as an individual defendant, we need not address the question of whether Deasy, in his individual capacity, is entitled to qualified immunity.

such a remedy for the asserted violation alleged in the case before it. (*Degrassi*, at p. 342.) The *Katzberg* factors are: (1) the adequacy of existing remedies; (2) the extent to which a constitutional tort action would change established tort law; (3) the nature of the provision and the significance of the purpose that it seeks to effectuate; and (4) whether the creation of a damages action might produce adverse policy consequences or practical problems of proof. (*Katzberg, supra*, 29 Cal.4th at pp. 324-329.)

We find that an analysis of these factors dictates against the recognition of a constitutional tort action in this case. As to the first factor, the parties disagree regarding whether appellant had alternative remedies available. Respondents assert that appellant did have remedies available, both under the Workers' Compensation Act (Lab. Code, § 3600 et seq.) and pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1085. Appellant asserts that neither remedy was available to her. As to the Workers' Compensation Act, appellant claims that this act compensates only for work-related injuries causing a disability or the need for medical treatment. (Lab. Code, § 3600, subd. (a); *Coca-Cola Bottling Co. v. Superior Court* (1991) 233 Cal.App.3d 1273, 1284.) Additionally, appellant claims, writs of mandate under Code of Civil Procedure section 1085 are only available to compel action that is required by statute.

While the first factor does not clearly dictate against recognition of a claim under the Constitution, section 2(a), the second factor militates strongly against it. As set forth in *Degrassi*, California tort law does not support recognition of a constitutional tort action for damages under this provision. (*Degrassi, supra*, 29 Cal.4th at p. 343.) Thus, recognition of a constitutional tort action would significantly change established tort law. Further, as set forth in *Motevalli v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist.* (2004) 122 Cal.App.4th 97 (*Motevalli*), the potential adverse policy consequences of the recognition of such a tort action is a critical consideration under the circumstances of this case. As explained by the *Motevalli* court, allowing a substitute teacher a constitutional damages action would create an inequitable situation:

“Untenured teachers have fewer rights than permanent teachers.
This difference is the product of an explicit legislative scheme. (See, e.g.,

[Ed. Code,] §§ 44911, 44915, 44929.21, 44932, 44948, 44953, 44954.) Recognition of a constitutional damages action here would result in the anomaly of [terminated] untenured teachers denied rehiring having *greater* rights than tenured teachers who have been discharged. A tenured teacher is required to exhaust his or her internal administrative remedies before going to court [citation], which decision would then be reviewed on administrative mandamus [citation], wherein the employer's liability would be determined by a court before the employee could bring an action for damages. [Citation.]”

(*Motevalli, supra*, 122 Cal.App.4th at p. 119.)

The *Motevalli* court further pointed out “if a probationary/provisional teacher . . . were allowed to proceed directly to court in a damages action . . . that teacher would be in a position superior to his or her tenured counterparts.” (*Motevalli, supra*, 122 Cal.App.4th at p. 119.) Thus, granting a constitutional action for damages would be “to provide protection the Legislature chose to withhold.” (*Ibid.*)

We agree with the reasoning of the *Motevalli* court, and find it applicable in the present matter. With this fourth *Katzberg* factor dictating so strongly against allowing a private cause of action in this matter, we decline to permit such a cause of action in this case. And while “the free speech clause reflects an important and fundamental interest,” “when the considerations mentioned above do not militate in favor of recognizing a constitutional tort action, the relative importance of the right, standing alone, is not a factor of great significance. [Citation.]” (*Degrassi, supra*, 29 Cal.4th at p. 343.)

We agree with appellant's assertion that the *Degrassi* court limited its holding to the specific case before it. However, *Degrassi* still provides controlling authority that a private right of action was *not* contemplated under the Constitution, section 2(a). Because the *Katzberg* factors do not unequivocally dictate in favor of allowing a private right of action in this case, we follow the *Degrassi* decision in finding that no such right should be recognized in the present action.

B. The injunctive relief that appellant seeks is not available under the Constitution, section 2(a)

Appellant emphasizes that her complaint not only seeks monetary relief, but requests injunctive relief requiring LAUSD to reemploy appellant at her former position with the same wages and benefits. Appellant argues that the *Degrassi* ruling was limited to an action for damages. (*Degrassi, supra*, 29 Cal.4th at p. 335.) Appellant points out that the *Degrassi* court explicitly acknowledged that an action for injunctive relief may be supported by the Constitution, section 2(a). (*Degrassi*, at p. 338 [“Furthermore, it also is clear that . . . this section supports an action, brought by a private plaintiff against a proper defendant, for declaratory relief or injunction”].) The *Degrassi* court did not address such a claim for injunctive relief, but limited its analysis to the question of “whether, assuming that the alleged facts demonstrate a violation of plaintiff’s free speech rights, plaintiff has stated an action for relief in damages.” (*Ibid.*) Appellant argues that, at the very least, she is entitled to maintain her claim under the Constitution, section 2(a) for an injunction requiring that she be rehired.

The *Degrassi* court did not elaborate on what sort of injunctive relief is available under the Constitution, section 2(a). Nor has appellant provided any precedent at all showing that such injunctive relief has ever, in fact, been granted under this provision. Appellant asks this court to create new law by finding that the Constitution, section 2(a) supports the imposition of an employment-related injunction.

We decline to do so. We begin by analyzing the constitutional provision at issue, which makes no mention of employment or an individual’s right to employment or rehiring. The provision at issue reads:

“Every person may freely speak, write and publish his or her sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of this right. A law may not restrain or abridge liberty of speech or press.”

(Const., § 2(a).)

Respondents did not literally curtail appellant’s free speech or prevent her from speaking freely. There is no suggestion that respondents told appellant what to say or

what not to say, or prevented her in any way from publishing her sentiments. Nor have respondents passed a law restraining or abridging speech. It is these types of activities which the language of the Constitution, section 2(a) targets, and thus it is these types of activities which would likely be candidates for injunctive relief under this provision.

The allegedly wrongful activity that respondents carried out was the termination of appellant's employment. The Constitution, section 2(a) cannot be read to support a cause of action for injunctive relief where an individual is seeking to be rehired by her employer. Without specific precedent that the Constitution, section 2(a) supports a cause of action for such an employment-related injunction, we decline to create authority for such an action.

IV. Tort claims for wrongful discharge and negligent infliction of emotional distress

The trial court sustained respondents' demurrers to appellant's tort causes of action for wrongful discharge and negligent infliction of emotional distress. The trial court cited *Miklosy v. Regents of University of California* (2008) 44 Cal.4th 876, 899 (*Miklosy*), which held:

“The Government Claims Act (§ 810 et seq.) establishes the limits of common law liability for public entities, stating: ‘Except as otherwise provided by statute: ¶ (a) A public entity is *not liable* for an injury, whether such injury arises out of an act or omission of the public entity or a public employee or any other person.’ (§ 815, subd. (a), italics added.) The Legislative Committee Comment to section 815 states: ‘This section *abolishes all common law or judicially declared forms of liability for public entities*, except for such liability as may be required by the state or federal constitution, e.g., inverse condemnation. . . .’ [Citation.]”

The trial court went on to note that both wrongful discharge and negligent infliction of emotional distress are common law claims. Thus, the trial court concluded, the defendants could not be sued under these causes of action.

Appellant points to Government Code section 815.2, which she describes as a “general authorization to assert tort claims against governmental entities.” Appellant argues that section 815.2 sets forth a general rule that an employee of a public entity is liable for his torts to the same extent as a private person, and the public entity is

vicariously liable. (*Barnhart v. Cabrillo Community College* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 818, 822.)⁶

Miklosy addressed this very same argument in the context of a wrongful discharge cause of action. The *Miklosy* appellants argued that irrespective of whether Government Code section 815 abolishes common law liability for public entities, the individual employees are subject to common law liability, and under section 815.2, the University, as their employer, bears that liability under the doctrine of respondeat superior. The *Miklosy* court rejected this argument, holding:

“Plaintiffs, however, overlook the fact that a *Tameny* action for wrongful discharge can only be asserted against *an employer*. An individual who is not an employer cannot commit the tort of wrongful discharge in violation of public policy; rather, he or she can only be the agent by which *an employer* commits that tort. This conclusion flows logically from our reasoning in *Tameny*.”

(*Miklosy, supra*, 44 Cal.4th at p. 900.)⁷

⁶ *Barnhart* involved a suit for personal injury claims arising out of a car accident. The *Barnhart* court noted that Government Code section 815.2 makes the doctrine of respondeat superior applicable to public employers. However, the court went on to affirm the trial court’s holding that the defendants were immune from liability under former California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 55450. The case thus does not support appellant’s claim that tort liability should be imposed under the circumstances before us.

⁷ The *Miklosy* court was referring to its previous decision in *Tameny v. Atlantic Richfield Co.* (1980) 27 Cal.3d 167, in which the high court held that, when “an employer’s discharge of an employee violates fundamental principles of public policy, the discharged employee may maintain a tort action and recover damages traditionally available in such actions.” (*Id.* at p. 170.) However, in *Palmer v. Regents of University of California* (2003) 107 Cal.App.4th 899, 909, the Court of Appeal specified that because the classic *Tameny* action is a judicially created tort, it is not properly asserted against a public entity. (See also *Miklosy, supra*, 44 Cal.4th at pp. 899-900 [“we agree with the *Palmer* court that [Government Code] section 815 bars *Tameny* actions against public entities”], fn. omitted.)

The same reasoning applies here. The tort of wrongful discharge, and the related infliction of emotional distress, may only be asserted against the employer. Under *Miklosy*, the demurrers to these causes of action were properly sustained.

Appellant asserts that *Miklosy* is distinguishable because here, unlike in *Miklosy*, the wrongful discharge was based upon a violation of appellant's constitutional rights. Appellant notes that the *Miklosy* court pointed out that Government Code section 815 “abolishes all common law or judicially declared forms of liability for public entities, except for such liability as may be required by the state or federal constitution, e.g., inverse condemnation. . . .” (*Miklosy, supra*, 44 Cal.4th at p. 899.) In *Miklosy*, the alleged wrongful termination was based on a violation of California's statutory whistleblower protections, whereas here, the alleged wrongful termination is based on a violation of appellant's free speech rights.

We find this distinction to be unpersuasive. *Miklosy* made it clear that a claim for wrongful discharge in violation of public policy may not be brought against a public entity. Thus, under *Miklosy*, liability for the tort of wrongful discharge in violation of public policy is not “required by the state or federal constitution.” (*Miklosy, supra*, 44 Cal.4th at p. 899, citing Legis. Com. com., 32 West's Ann. Gov. Code (1995) foll. [Gov. Code,] § 815, p. 167.) We decline to come to a different conclusion here.

Finally, appellant cites one federal lower court case, *Scott v. Solano County Health & Soc. Order Servs. Dep't* (E.D.Cal. 2006) 459 F.Supp.2d 959, 968, where the court considered a wrongful termination claim against a public entity and held that it was not barred by Government Code section 815. Because this case pre-dates *Miklosy*, we do not find it persuasive.

The alleged torts are barred under Government Code section 815 and *Miklosy*. The trial court did not err in sustaining respondents' demurrers to these causes of action.

V. Punitive damages claims

Appellant's final argument involves her claim for punitive damages. Appellant argues that because the trial court erroneously sustained the demurrers to the substantive

causes of action against respondents, it erroneously sustained the demurrer to her claim for punitive damages.

As set forth above, we have determined that the trial court properly sustained the demurrers to each of the challenged causes of action. Therefore, the demurrer to the punitive damages claim was also properly sustained.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed. Respondents are awarded their costs of appeal.

CERTIFIED FOR PUBLICATION

_____, J.
CHAVEZ

We concur:

_____, P. J.
BOREN

_____, J.
ASHMANN-GERST