

1 S. Edward Wicker (SBN 93057)
2 11440 W. Bernardo Court, Suite 300
3 San Diego, California 92127
4 Telephone: (760) 735-6100
5 edward@ewickerlaw.com

6 Gregory M. Garrison, Esq. (SBN 165215)
7 GREGORY M. GARRISON, APC
8 6886 Mimosa Drive
9 Carlsbad, California 92011
10 Telephone: (619) 708-1628
11 greg@garrisonapc.com

12 Alexander E. Papaefthimiou, Esq. (SBN 236930)
13 PAPAEFTHIMIOU APC
14 1601 Carmen Drive, Suite 212D
15 Camarillo, California 93010
16 Telephone: (805) 366-3909
17 alex@aplitigation.com

18 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

19 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
20 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

21 AGRO DYNAMICS, LLC a Wyoming Limited
22 Liability Company,

23 Plaintiff,

24 vs.

25 THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
26 DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION,
27 SAN DIEGO COUNTY, and SPECIAL
28 AGENTS PAUL GELLES, ERIC BALL,
KIERAN GRACIA, MARSHA DAWE, ROSS
VAN NOSTRAND, AND JEREMY FEUZ;
FRANK HASKELL, ANDREW AGUILAR,
JASON STEIN, TIMOTHY SMITH,
MICHAEL ASTORGA, CHRISTOPHER
MORRIS, SGT. STEVE BODINE, DET.
JUSTIN MOORE, DET. DWAYNE
PRICKETT, DET. CHRISTOPHER PEREZ,
AND DET. RICARDO ANDRADE; and DOES
1 to 50 inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO. **3:20-cv-02082-JAH-KSC**

**OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO
DISMISS BY DEFENDANTS
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, STEVE
BODINE, JUSTIN MOORE, DWAYNE
PRICKETT, CHRISTOPHER PEREZ,
AND RICARDO ANDRADE**

Date: January 27, 2021
Time: 10:30 a.m.
Dept.: 13B
Judge: Hon. John A. Houston

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. SUMMARY OF PERTINENT ALLEGATIONS AND INFERENCES..... 2

 A. Cultivation of Hemp is Legal under Federal and State Law.....2

 B. Defendant Issues Plaintiff a Registration to Grow Hemp.....2

 C. Defendants’ Unconstitutional “Marijuana” Seizure Warrant.....3

 D. Defendants Unconstitutionally Raid and Intentionally Destroy
 Plaintiff’s Legal and Registered Hemp Crop.....4

 E. Plaintiff Suffers Over \$3.4 Million in Losses.....5

III. GOVERNING STANDARDS.....6

IV. PLAINTIFF STATES A CLAIM UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1983
(FIRST COA).....7

V. PLAINTIFFS STATES A CLAIM UNDER CAL. CIV. CODE § 52.1
(SECOND COA)11

VI. PLAINTIFF STATES A CLAIM FOR VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA
CONSTITUTION (FOURTH COA)15

VII. PLAINTIFFS STATES CLAIMS FOR CONVERSION, TRESPASS AND
NEGLIGENCE (FIFTH, SIXTH AND SEVENTH COA).....17

VIII. DEFENDANTS ARE NOT “IMMUNE” FROM THEIR WILLFUL
VIOLATIONS OF LAW (ALL CAUSES OF ACTION).....17

 A. “Qualified Immunity” Does Not Apply (First and Third COA).....17

 B. Defendants are Not Immune Under Cal. Gov. Code § 821.6
 (Second, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Seventh COA)19

IX. PLAINTIFFS REQUEST LEAVE TO AMEND.....23

X. CONCLUSION.....23

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

United States Constitution

Fourth Amendment 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 17

Fifth Amendment7, 8, 17

Fourteenth Amendment..... 7, 8, 17

California Constitution

Article I, Section 1316

Article I, Section 1915

Statutes

7 U.S.C. 1639o-1639s 2, 16

42 U.S.C. § 19837-9

Cal. Civ. Code § 52.1 11, 17

Cal. Food & Agr. Code § 81006 2, 16

Cal. Gov. Code § 821.6 17, 19-21

Cal. Health & Safety Code § 11469..... 14

Cal. Health & Safety Code § 11479..... 10

Fed. Rul. Civ. Proc. 12 6, 18

Fed. Rul. Civ. Proc. 15(a)(1) 23

Cases

Allen v. Kumagi,
356 F. App’x 8 (9th Cir. 2009) 14

Armstrong v. Sexson,
2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 60023 (E.D. Cal. 2007) 15-16

Ashcroft v. Iqbal,
556 U.S. 662 (2009) 6

1 *Ass'n for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs v. Cnty. of Los Angeles,*
 2 648 F.3d 986 (9th Cir. 2011) 7

3 *Bagdasaryan v. City of Los Angeles,*
 4 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 224542 (C.D. Cal. 2018) 21-22

5 *Baughman v. State of California,*
 6 38 Cal. App. 4th 182 (1995) 21

7 *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*
 8 550 U.S. 544 (2006) 7

9 *Bd. Of the Cnty. Comm'rs v. Brown*
 10 520 U.S. 397 (1997) 9

11 *Bettin v. Maricopa Cty.,*
 12 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 42979 (D. Ariz. 2007) 13-14

13 *Blankenhorn v. City of Orange,*
 14 485 F.3d 463 (9th Cir. 2007) 22

15 *Camarillo v. City of Maywood,*
 16 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 85386 (C.D. Cal. 2008) 16-17

17 *City of Canton v. Harris,*
 18 489 U.S. 378 (1989) 9

19 *Clement v. City of Glendale,*
 20 518 F.3d 1090 (9th Cir. 2008) 15

21 *Cornell v. City & Cty. of San Francisco,*
 22 17 Cal. App. 5th 766 (2017) 11

23 *Cree, Inc. v. Tarr Inc.,*
 24 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 119008 (S.D. Cal. 2017) 6

25 *Cty. Inmate Tel. Serv. Cases,*
 26 48 Cal. App. 5th 354 (2020) 11

27 *Cty. of Los Angeles v. Superior Court,*
 28 181 Cal. App. 4th 218 (2009) 21

Customer Co. v. City of Sacramento,
 10 Cal. 4th 368 (1995) 16

DeSoto v. Yellow Freight Sys.,
 Inc., 957 F.2d 655 (9th Cir. 1992) 23

1 *Davis v. Fregoso*,
 2 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 137615 (S.D. Cal. 2012) 18-19

3 *Dougherty v. Bank of Am., N.A.*,
 4 177 F. Supp. 3d 1230 (E.D. Cal. 2016) 6

5 *Emeziem v. Cal. DOJ*,
 6 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 124481 (N.D. Cal. 2017) 22

7 *Estate of Silva v. City of San Diego*,
 8 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 221679 (S.D. Cal. 2020) 9

9 *Flores v. City of Pasadena*,
 10 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 177468 (C.D. Cal. 2019) 21-22

11 *Garmon v. County of Los Angeles*,
 12 828 F.3d 837 (9th Cir. 2016) 20-22

13 *Gillan v. City of San Marino*,
 14 147 Cal. App. 4th 103 (2007) 21

15 *Gillette v. Delmore*,
 16 979 F.2d 1342 (9th Cir. 1992) 9

17 *Gilligan v. Jamco Develop. Corp.*,
 18 108 F.3d 246 (9th Cir. 1997) 6

19 *Govind v. Felker*,
 20 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 68259 (C.D. Cal. 2011) 6

21 *Graham v. Connor*,
 22 490 U.S. 386 (1989) 7

23 *Gravelet-Blondin v. Shelton*,
 24 728 F.3d 1086 (9th Cir. 2013) 10

25 *Green v. Cty. of Yuba*,
 26 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27949 (E.D. Cal. 2019) 22

27 *Groten v. California*,
 28 251 F.3d 844 (9th Cir. 2001) 18

Harlow v. Fitzgerald,
 457 U.S. 800 (1982) 18

Holtz v. Superior Court,
 3 Cal. 3d 296 (1970) 16

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.