

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

MICHAEL WILDEY JR.,
Plaintiff,

v.

SGT. NICOLAS SALAMONE, in his
official and individual capacities, CPL.
BRADLEY ELLMANN, in his official and
individual capacities, and CHESTER
TOWNSHIP, NEW JERSEY,
Defendants.

Civil Action No. _____

VERIFIED COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

This is a Civil Action brought by Plaintiff, Michael Wildey Jr., against Defendants, Sgt. Nicolas Salamone, in his official and individual capacities, Cpl. Bradley Ellmann, in his official and individual capacities, and Chester Township, New Jersey. Mr. Wildey brings a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for Defendants’ violation of his First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendment rights to the U.S. Constitution, along with Defendants’ violation of his rights guaranteed by the New Jersey State Constitution, alleging as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff, Michael Wildey Jr., is and was at all relevant times, a citizen of the United States and resides in Chester Township, New Jersey.

2. Defendant, Sgt. Nicolas Salamone, is an individual who, at all relevant times, is and was a duly appointed and acting police officer for Chester Township, New Jersey, and is and was acting in such a capacity as an agent, servant, and/or employee of Chester Township, New Jersey, and/or is and was acting under the color of law.

3. Defendant, Cpl. Bradley Ellmann, is an individual who, at all relevant times, is and was a duly appointed and acting police officer for Chester Township, New Jersey, and is and was

RANDAZZA | LEGAL GROUP

acting in such a capacity as an agent, servant, and/or employee of Chester Township, New Jersey, and/or is and was acting under the color of law.

4. Defendant, Chester Township, New Jersey, is a duly delegated municipal corporation and/or entity pursuant to the laws of the State of New Jersey.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this civil action per 28 U.S.C. § 1331 as this is a civil action arising under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the First and Fourth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over all Defendants as they are all citizens or organs of the State of New Jersey, and the Defendants committed the acts complained of within the said State.

7. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) & (2) as all defendants reside in this District and all events giving rise to the claim occurred in this District.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

8. On or about August 31, 2025, a motor vehicle accident took place on a public roadway located in Chester Township, New Jersey.

9. After the accident (and after the injured had been removed), Plaintiff legally parked his vehicle near the scene of the accident, to observe the post-accident investigation and take photographs of the scene.

10. Plaintiff remained in a public area at all relevant times while observing and photographing without interfering in any post-accident investigation being conducted by the Chester Township Police Department.

11. Despite remaining in a public space and not interfering in the post-accident investigation, the Defendants Salamone and Ellmann, in the course of their employment as police

officers for Chester Township, New Jersey, engaged in activity in violation of Plaintiff's Constitutional rights.

12. The Defendants' activity was recorded as audiovisual footage from the bodycams worn by Defendants Salamone and Ellmann; and the footage reveals numerous violations of Plaintiff's Constitutional rights. See **Exhibit A** (Ellmann Bodycam Footage), and **Exhibit B** (Salamone Bodycam Footage).

13. Specifically, Defendants Salamone and Ellmann approached Plaintiff asking him if he had taken photographs of the accident scene.

14. When he admitted that he had, Ellmann said, "Give me your phone. It's going to be seized for evidence." Exh. A at 00:00:29; Exh. B at 00:00:40.

15. When Plaintiff objected to the seizure of his phone, Ellmann said Plaintiff could keep his phone if "you delete them right now." Exh. A at 00:00:39; Exh. B at 00:00:50.

16. Defendants stood in close proximity to Plaintiff forcing him to delete any photos he took of the accident site, and to ensure the photos were permanently deleted, Ellmann even stood over him and demanded Plaintiff delete them from his cellphone's "recently deleted" folder. Exh. A at 00:00:53; Exh. B at 00:01:04.

17. Once Plaintiff complied with these unconstitutional demands, Ellmann stated "Alright. He can leave." Exh. A at 00:01:15; Exh. B at 00:01:27.

18. Plaintiff only complied because he felt that he was not free to go, and that he would be arrested and put in jail for the weekend if he did not comply.

19. Any person of ordinary firmness would have believed that he was detained and that avoiding arrest or other repercussions was only possible if he deleted the photographs.

20. Immediately after the Plaintiff's photographs were deleted, Defendant Salamone walks away and states to several other police officers on the scene, "Make sure this guy doesn't take his phone out again because he was taking pictures of everything." Exh. B at 00:01:59.

21. Defendants accordingly not only unconstitutionally detained Plaintiff and forced Plaintiff to delete his footage, but also acted to prevent him taking any additional footage.

22. Defendant Salamone is then heard joking with other Chester Township police officers whether Plaintiff is parked legally or not so as to issue him a ticket; stating, "I gotta look up the ordinance..." Exh. B at 00:02:05.

23. Nevertheless, Defendant Salamone made his true intentions known when he advises the other police officers: "We'll get him out of here." Exh. B at 00:02:13.

24. Defendant Salamone then instructs Plaintiff to leave the area despite his constitutional right to be in a public place. Exh. B at 00:02:36.

25. On December 7, 2021, the Acting Attorney General for the State of New Jersey, the Hon. Andrew J. Bruck, issued Attorney General Law Enforcement Directive No. 2021-11 to all local and county law enforcement offices entitled, "**First Amendment Right to Observe, Object to, and Record Police Activity**" which provides a list of actions prohibited by police officers when a member of the public seeks to publicly record them. *See Exhibit C*.

26. The New Jersey Attorney General's Directive clearly states an "officer shall not:"

- Tell the bystander that the recording of police officers, police activity, or persons who are the subject of a police action is not allowed.
- Tell a bystander that recording police activity requires a permit or officer consent.
- Threaten, intimidate, order to cease, or otherwise discourage a bystander from remaining in the proximity of, recording, or verbally commenting on officer conduct directed at the officer's official activities.
- Demand that the bystander state a reason why the bystander is recording.

- Detain, arrest, or threaten to arrest a bystander based on activity protected by the First Amendment, including but not limited to the bystander’s verbal criticism, questioning of police actions, lawful recording of the officers, or gestures.

27. The bodycam footage reveals that rather than follow the mandates of the New Jersey Attorney General, the Defendants committed every single unconstitutional act on this list.

CAUSES OF ACTION

Count I

**Unlawful and Retaliatory Seizure/False Arrest
(42 U.S.C. § 1983 – First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments)**

28. Plaintiff hereby repeats and realleges each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.

29. Observing and recording on-duty police activity in a public forum, without interfering with those duties, is a legitimate means of gathering information and is conduct protected by the First Amendment.

30. This is clearly established law or in the alternative, so obviously the law that no reasonable law enforcement officer would have conducted themselves as the Defendants did.

31. On August 31, 2025, Plaintiff was engaged in constitutionally protected expressive activity—namely, observing and recording on-duty officers from Chester Township performing their duties in public.

32. As a result of this activity, and in retaliation for the activity, Defendants Salamone and Ellmann detained and arrested Plaintiff, seized his cellphone, and forced him to delete photographs legally taken in a public place, before they released him from his improper detention.

33. Defendants Salamone and Ellmann unlawfully detained Plaintiff for lawfully engaging in constitutionally protected expressive activity: observing and recording police activity.

34. Defendants' actions were unreasonable, unlawful, and deprived Plaintiff of his right to be free from unreasonable seizure of his person in violation of the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution and his right not to be retaliated against for exercising his First Amendment rights.

35. As a direct result of the Defendants' conduct described above, Plaintiff suffered damages through the loss of liberty.

36. Furthermore, Plaintiff now reasonably fears future interference with his right to record police, and retaliatory or unlawful arrest for recording police activity.

37. Defendants' actions described herein were either negligent, intentional, and/or exhibited a reckless indifference to Plaintiff's clearly established constitutional rights.

Count II
Unlawful and Retaliatory Search/Seizure
(42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Fourth Amendment)

38. Plaintiff hereby repeats and realleges each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.

39. Plaintiff has a right under the Fourth Amendment to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures.

40. As stated above, Defendants Salamone and Ellmann seized Plaintiff's cellphone under the false pretext that the photographs that Plaintiff took were evidence relating to the motor vehicle accident.

41. Then, Defendants abandoned that pretext and demanded that Plaintiff delete any photographs he took in order for him to be allowed to leave the scene.

42. Defendants then stood in close proximity to Plaintiff forcing him to delete any photos he took of the accident site.

43. Only after Plaintiff complied with Defendants' unlawful demands, was Plaintiff told he was free to leave.

44. As a direct result of the Defendants' conduct described above, Plaintiff suffered damages through the loss of liberty.

45. Furthermore, Plaintiff now reasonably fears future interference with his right to record police, and retaliatory or unlawful arrest for recording police activity.

46. Defendants' actions described herein were either negligent, intentional, and/or exhibited a reckless indifference to Plaintiff's clearly established constitutional rights.

47. Defendants' actions violated clearly established law or in the alternative, were so obviously unconstitutional law that no reasonable law enforcement officer would have conducted themselves as the Defendants did.

Count III
***Monell*¹ Claims**
(42 U.S.C. § 1983 – First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments)

48. Plaintiff hereby repeats and realleges each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.

49. Defendant, Chester Township, New Jersey, maintains, condones, and is deliberately indifferent to unconstitutional policies, customs and practices of the Defendants, Salamone, Ellmann, and other members of the police force, including but not limited to falsely arresting people and/or seizing their property for observing and/or filming police activity in public, in violation of the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments.

50. These customs and practices are so pervasive that they constitute de facto policies of Chester Township, New Jersey.

¹ *Monell v. Dept. of Soc. Svcs.*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978).

51. In addition, by its actions, Chester Township, New Jersey has ratified the unlawful conduct of the Individual Defendants herein.

52. The aforementioned policies, customs and practices directly caused and were the moving force behind Plaintiff's constitutional deprivations and resulting injuries alleged herein, including but not limited to the loss of liberty.

53. Plaintiff fears future constitutional deprivations and resulting injuries should he continue to exercise his First Amendment rights to observe and/or record public police activity.

Count IV
Violations of the New Jersey Constitution and New Jersey Civil Rights Act
(N.J. Const., N.J.S.A. 10:6-1 to 10:6-2)

54. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the paragraphs previously set forth.

55. The actions of all Defendants acting under color of state law and/or in their individual capacities as set forth at length above, deprived Plaintiff of his rights secured by the Constitution of the State of New Jersey and in violation the N.J.S.A. 10:6-1, *et. seq.* ("The New Jersey Civil Rights Act").

56. As a direct result of the Defendants' conduct described above, Plaintiff suffered damages through the loss of liberty.

57. Furthermore, Plaintiff now reasonably fears future interference with his right to record police, and retaliatory or unlawful arrest for recording police activity.

58. Defendants' actions described herein were either negligent, intentional, and/or exhibited a reckless indifference to Plaintiff's clearly established constitutional rights.

JURY DEMAND

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 38(b), Plaintiff Michael Wildey Jr. demands a trial by jury of all issues presented in this Complaint which are triable by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff asks this Court to issue and award:

- A. Enter Judgment in Favor of Plaintiff against Defendants;
- B. Enter a Temporary Injunctive Order preventing Defendants from retaliating against Plaintiff for exercising his constitutional right to observe and film public police activity;
- C. Enter a Permanent Injunctive Order preventing Defendants from retaliating against Plaintiff for exercising his constitutional right to observe and film public police activity;
- D. Award Compensatory and Punitive Damages against Defendants;
- E. Award Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988 and any other applicable provisions of law;
- F. Any such other and further relief the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: February 19, 2026.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Vincent S. Verdiramo
Vincent S. Verdiramo, 024691986
vincent@verdiramolaw.com
Verdiramo & Verdiramo Esqs. PA
3163 Kennedy Boulevard
Jersey City, New Jersey 07306
Tel: 201-798-7082

Marc J. Randazza (*PHV Forthcoming*)
ecf@randazza.com
Alan R. Levy, 032071999
arl@randazza.com
RANDAZZA LEGAL GROUP, PLLC
30 Western Avenue
Gloucester, MA 01930
(978) 801-1776

Counsel for Plaintiff, Michael Wildey Jr.

VERIFICATION OF COMPLAINT

I, Michael Wildey Jr., am the Plaintiff in the above-captioned matter. I have reviewed the foregoing allegations in this Verified Complaint, and I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing allegations are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and understanding.

Dated: 02 / 19 / 2026



Michael Wildey Jr.

RANDAZZA | LEGAL GROUP

Exhibit A

Video Exhibit
Ellmann Bodycam Footage

**To be filed conventionally
with the Clerk's Office.**

Exhibit B

Video Exhibit
Salamone Bodycam Footage

**To be filed conventionally
with the Clerk's Office.**

Exhibit C

New Jersey Attorney General Law
Enforcement Directive No. 2021-11



State of New Jersey

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF LAW AND PUBLIC SAFETY
DIVISION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
PO Box 085
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0085
TELEPHONE: (609) 984-6500

PHILIP D. MURPHY
Governor

SHEILA Y. OLIVER
Lt. Governor

ANDREW J. BRUCK
Acting Attorney General

LYNDSAY RUOTOLO
Director

ATTORNEY GENERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT DIRECTIVE NO. 2021-11

TO: All Law Enforcement Chief Executives and County Prosecutors

FROM: Andrew J. Bruck, Acting Attorney General

DATE: December 7, 2021

SUBJECT: **First Amendment Right to Observe, Object to, and Record Police Activity**

Freedom of speech is a foundational American principle. Fidelity to this right—embodied in the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and in the New Jersey Constitution—has distinguished our country throughout its history. Free speech protections have always intersected with many aspects of everyday life, including the role of law enforcement, but increasingly so with modern advances in communication technology.

In particular, given widespread ownership of smartphones over the past decade, civilian recordings of police activity are now routine. The First Amendment’s protection of an individual’s right to record “police officers conducting their official duties in public” is well-recognized. Fields v. City of Philadelphia, 862 F.3d 353, 355 (3d Cir. 2017). In order to continue building better relationships between communities and police, this Directive is necessary to ensure that the First Amendment’s bounds are as clear as possible—to both civilians and law enforcement alike—with respect to the right to observe, object to, and record police activity.

Pursuant to the authority granted to me under the New Jersey Constitution and the Criminal Justice Act of 1970, N.J.S.A. 52:17B-97 to -117, which provides for the general supervision of criminal justice by the Attorney General as chief law enforcement officer of the state in order to secure the benefits of a uniform and efficient enforcement of the criminal law and the administration of criminal justice throughout the State, I hereby direct all law enforcement and prosecuting agencies operating under the authority of the laws of the state of New Jersey to comply with the following policies and procedures.



I. Scope of the First Amendment Right

A. *The right to record an officer's conduct.* A member of the public who is present but not taking part in a situation or event, i.e., a “bystander,” has the right to witness, observe, photograph, audio and video record, comment on, or complain about law enforcement officers conducting official duties in public or in private places where the person has a right to be present.¹

1. A bystander has the same right to make recordings as a member of the press, as long as the bystander has a legal right to be present where they are, (a) in public settings including but not limited to parks, sidewalks, streets, locations of public protests, common areas of public facilities and buildings, and (b) in private places where the bystander has the right to be present, including but not limited to common areas of private facilities and buildings, and a bystander's home or business.
2. As long as the recording takes place in a setting in which the bystander has a legal right to be present and does not interfere with an officer's safety or lawful duties, the officer shall not:
 - i. Tell the bystander that the recording of police officers, police activity, or persons who are the subject of a police action is not allowed.
 - ii. Tell a bystander that recording police activity requires a permit or officer consent.
 - iii. Threaten, intimidate, order to cease, or otherwise discourage a bystander from remaining in the proximity of, recording, or verbally commenting on officer conduct directed at the officer's official activities.
 - iv. Perform an investigatory stop or arrest of the bystander solely on the basis that the bystander is recording police conduct.
 - v. Demand the bystander's identification.
 - vi. Demand that the bystander state a reason why the bystander is recording.
 - vii. Detain, arrest, or threaten to arrest a bystander based on activity protected by the First Amendment, including but not limited to the bystander's verbal criticism, questioning of police actions, lawful recording of the officers, or gestures.

¹ The use of the term “bystander” is not to the exclusion of the First Amendment rights of other civilians under the law.

- viii. Intentionally block or obstruct recording devices. Officers are not required to position themselves in a manner that gives individuals better angles or views while recording, but may not deliberately obstruct actions taken in public from the view of people who are recording.²

B. *Limitations on the right to record an officer's conduct.*

1. Nothing in this Directive prohibits officers from questioning or detaining for a reasonable period of time any individual they reasonably suspect has committed, is committing, or is about to commit a crime or incite others to violate the law.
2. The fact that a bystander has a recording device does not entitle the bystander to cross a police line, to enter an area that is closed to the public, or to enter any area designated as a crime scene.
 - i. Credentialed media personnel may be granted closer access to incident scenes or be allowed to cross police lines with relevant law enforcement agency approvals. This right does not extend to anyone who has not received such approval.
3. If a bystander is recording police activity from a position that materially impedes or interferes with the safety of officers or their ability to perform their duties, or that threatens the safety of members of the public, an officer may direct the bystander to move to a position that will not interfere. However, the officer shall not order the bystander to stop recording.
 - i. N.J.S.A. 2C:29-1 continues to prohibit conduct whereby a person purposely (a) “obstructs impairs or perverts the administration of law or other government function,” or (b) “prevents or attempts to prevent a public servant from lawfully performing an official function by means of flight, intimidation, force, violence, or physical interference or obstacle, or by means of any independently unlawful act.”

- C. *The right to complain about or criticize an officer's conduct.*** Law enforcement officers shall not use or threaten to use force or their arrest authority—or take any other action described in Section I.A.2 above—in response to mere criticism or gestures so long as that expression neither gives rise to an objectively reasonable fear of harm to the officer(s) or others, violates the law, or incites others to violate the law.

² This provision is not intended (1) to prohibit law enforcement officers from protecting the privacy of people seeking medical assistance or experiencing a mental health crisis, or of the deceased, or (2) to prevent officers from establishing an appropriately sized crime scene perimeter for the purposes of evidence preservation.

II. Limitations on Seizing and Searching Recording Devices

A. *Seizures and searches.* Law enforcement must obtain a warrant in order to seize and search a recording device, except in the following narrowly defined circumstances:

1. Seizing a recording device during a search incident to lawful arrest of the bystander. However, mere seizure does not allow for a search of the device itself without obtaining a warrant.
2. Where the officer has probable cause to believe that a bystander's recording device contains a recording that is evidence of a crime:
 - i. The officer may request the bystander voluntarily transmit the recording to law enforcement. If electronic transmission is not possible, the officer may request that the bystander consent to voluntarily provide the recording device or its memory chip to law enforcement for the purpose of a search of the contents.
 - ii. If the bystander refuses, the officer may seize the recording device only under exigent circumstances, defined as (1) probable cause to believe that a violent crime resulting in serious bodily injury or death has been committed; (2) a good-faith belief that there is evidence of that crime on the recording device; and (3) a good-faith belief that the evidence will be lost or destroyed absent seizure. Mere seizure does not allow for a search without a warrant, unless necessary to prevent imminent death or serious bodily harm.

B. *Seizure of recording devices from journalists is generally prohibited.* Law enforcement should never seize a press member's recording device, except in the exceedingly rare case where it is necessary for public safety or the result of a search incident to a lawful arrest of the journalist. In addition, officers must never delete material from a journalist's recording device, and should obtain warrants to search such devices only after obtaining approval from the County Prosecutor or the Attorney General.

C. *Return of seized devices.* If a recording device is seized, due care must be exercised in its safekeeping and preservation, pursuant to established agency evidence retention protocols. No recording device should be seized without providing information to the bystander concerning where, when, and how to recover the property. Seized devices should be returned as soon as practicable.

III. Other Provisions

A. *Non-enforceability by third parties.* This Directive is issued pursuant to the Attorney General's authority to ensure the uniform and efficient enforcement of the laws and administration of criminal justice throughout the State. This Directive imposes limitations

on law enforcement agencies and officials that may be more restrictive than the limitations imposed under the United States and New Jersey Constitutions, and federal and state statutes and regulations. Nothing in this Directive shall be construed in any way to create any substantive right that may be enforced by any third party.

- B. **Severability.** The provisions of both this Directive shall be severable. If any phrase, clause, sentence or provision of this Directive is declared by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, the validity of the remainder of the document shall not be affected.
- C. **Questions.** Any questions concerning the interpretation or implementation of this Directive shall be addressed to the Director of the Division of Criminal Justice, or their designee.
- D. **Effective date.** This Directive shall take effect immediately and shall remain in force and effect unless and until it is repealed, amended, or superseded by Order of the Attorney General.



Andrew J. Bruck
Acting Attorney General

ATTEST:



Lyndsay Ruotolo
Director
Division of Criminal Justice

Dated: December 7, 2021

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS
MICHAEL WILDEY JR.
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)
Verdiramo & Verdiramo Esqs. PA, 3163 Kennedy Blvd., Jersey City, NJ 07306 - (201) 798-7082

DEFENDANTS
SGT. NICHOLAS SALAMONE, et al.
County of Residence of First Listed Defendant
NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.
Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
2 U.S. Government Defendant
3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)
CITIZENSHIP: 1 Citizen of This State, 2 Citizen of Another State, 3 Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country
CORPORATION: PTF DEF 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State, 2 Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State, 3 Foreign Nation

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

Table with 5 columns: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES. Includes codes like 110 Insurance, 210 Land Condemnation, 310 Airplane, 440 Other Civil Rights, 625 Drug Related Seizure, etc.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)
1 Original Proceeding, 2 Removed from State Court, 3 Remanded from Appellate Court, 4 Reinstated or Reopened, 5 Transferred from Another District, 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer, 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION
Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 42 U.S.C. § 1983
Brief description of cause: Defendants' violation of Plaintiffs First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendment rights to the U.S. Constitution.

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

DATE February 19, 2026 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/ Vincent S. Verdiramo

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE