

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

William Felix Bossie,  
*Plaintiff,*

v.

Michael J. Houle,  
*Defendant.*

Civil No. 3:10cv879 (JBA)

September 23, 2011

RULING ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

On September 2, 2010, Plaintiff William Felix Bossie filed a Seconded Amended Complaint [Doc. # 25] against Defendant Connecticut State Trooper Michael J. Houle alleging that Houle violated 42 U.S.C. § 1983 during his investigation of a automobile collision involving Bossie "by denying [him] the benefits of both a procedurally fair and accurate investigation into the facts and/or causes of the Collision on account of [his] race and/or national origin as a Hispanic male." Defendant now moves [Doc. # 31] for summary judgment. For the reasons stated below, Defendant's motion for summary judgment will be granted.

I. Material Facts

On April 20, 2010 at approximately 6:00 a.m., while driving westbound on Interstate 84 in Waterbury, Connecticut, Mr. Bossie lost control of his car and collided with a vehicle driven by Paul Yankowski. (Accident Report, Ex. C to Def.'s Loc. R. 56(a)1 Stmt. at 2.) Mr. Bossie's car came to rest on the left side of the highway. (*Id.*) Trooper Houle was dispatched to the scene of the accident and wrote in his ensuing Accident Report that when he arrived he approached Mr. Bossie's car and spoke with Mr. Bossie. (Houle Aff. ¶ 3-4, Ex. A to Def.'s 56(a)1 Stmt.) He stated in the Accident Report and in his affidavit that Mr. Bossie claimed

that Mr. Yankowski's car collided with his after he attempted to change lanes into the left lane and Mr. Yankowski would not allow him to. (*Id.* ¶ 5; Accident Report at 2.) Mr. Bossie claims that "[t]he only words that . . . Houle stated to me at the accident scene were to ask me if I had any injuries, and to stay in my car. He refused to listen to or take my factual version of how the motor vehicle accident happened." (Bossie Aff. ¶ 2; *see also* Bossie Dep., Ex. D to Def.'s 56(a)1 Stmt. at 73:12–23.) Mr. Yankowski told Trooper Houle that after entering the highway, Mr. Bossie quickly moved into the left lane without signaling and that he was unable to avoid striking Mr. Bossie's car. (Accident Report at 2–3; Yankowski Aff., Ex. B to Def.'s 56(a)1 Stmt. ¶¶ 3–4.)

Mr. Bossie claims that Trooper Houle's Accident Report is "Ninety Five (95) percent factually false as written in its narrative form." (*Id.*) In addition to denying that Trooper Houle listened to his version of how the collision happened, Mr. Bossie alleges that while he was on an ambulance stretcher following the accident he saw Trooper Houle, while speaking to Mr. Yankowski, "visibly laughing at me, smiling at me, joking about me, and pointing his finger at me all while doing so." (*Id.* ¶ 3; Bossie Dep. at 73:12–23, 127:5–128:9.) Mr. Bossie also alleges that after he asked Trooper Houle to retrieve his cell phone from his car, he saw Trooper Houle "forcibly tear a Puerto Rican flag off of my motor vehicle." (Bossie Aff. ¶ 3.) He testified during his deposition that Trooper Houle "pulled my Puerto Rican flag that I had on my car back on the speaker . . . and took it and threw it . . . down." (Bossie Dep. at 74:15–25.) He similarly stated at a later point in the deposition that Trooper Houle "[w]ent in the back. Grabbed my flag. Threw it on the floor, and from right there he got up. He go out of my car. Close the door. Told the tow truck, 'Get it out of here.'" (*Id.* at 89:12–90:1.)

Mr. Bossie also testified that when he went to pick up his car after it was towed, his flag “was on the floor with a boot footprint on it and broke—with the stick broke.” (*Id.* at 78:11–14.)

Although Mr. Bossie did not originally claim that he saw Trooper Houle break the flag’s stick, only that Houle threw it on the floor, he later stated during his deposition that he recalled seeing Houle break the stick before throwing the flag. (*Id.* at 100:20–102:15.)

Mr. Bossie did not hear Trooper Houle say anything about his Puerto Rican heritage at the accident scene. (Bossie Dep. at 91:5–92:5.)

Mr. Bossie states in his affidavit:

The Defendant Michael J. Houle did not legitimately investigate the motor vehicle accident which is a subject of this case. . . . He falsified all the narrative parts of the Police Report. I also saw him throw parts of my car around the roadway, and kick parts of my car in the roadway. I also saw him forcibly tear, brake[sic], and remove a Puerto Rican flag that I had legally adhered to rear part of my motor vehicle.

(Bossie Aff. ¶ 4.)

Trooper Houle avers that at no point during the investigation did he “laugh or point at Mr. Bossie . . . , say or do anything that reflect on Mr. Bossie’s race or ethnic status . . . , [or] consider the race or ethnic status of any of the parties in discharging my responsibilities.” (Houle Aff. ¶¶ 13–14.) He concluded based on his investigation that Mr. Bossie violated Conn. Gen. Stat. § 14-236, failure to drive in an established lane, and cited Mr. Bossie for the violation. (*Id.* ¶ 12; Accident Report at 3.) Mr. Bossie entered a plea of *nolo contendere* to that charge. (Bossie Aff. ¶ 5.)

## II. Discussion<sup>1</sup>

Although it is unclear from Mr. Bossie's second amended complaint or his memorandum in opposition<sup>2</sup> to Defendant's motion to dismiss under what substantive constitutional or statutory law Mr. Bossie seeks relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, his counsel clarified at oral argument that he claims Defendant violated Section 601 of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d, and the First Amendment.

### A. Title VI

Section 601 of Title VI provides: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." 42 U.S.C. § 2000d.

Mr. Bossie's Title VI claim against Trooper Houle necessarily fails as a matter of law because Title VI does not provide for individual liability, only liability against entities that receive federal financial assistance. *Chance v. Reed*, 538 F. Supp. 2d 500, 511 (D. Conn. 2008) (citing *Albra v. Advan, Inc.*, 490 F.3d 826, 831 (11th Cir. 2007); *Kelly v. Rice*, 375 F. Supp. 2d

---

<sup>1</sup> "Summary judgment is appropriate where, construing all evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party," *Pabon v. Wright*, 459 F.3d 241, 247 (2d Cir. 2006), "the pleadings, the discovery and disclosure materials on file, and any affidavits show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law," Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(2). An issue of fact is "material" if it "might affect the outcome of the suit under the governing law," and is "genuine" if "a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party" based on it. *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986). "Unsupported allegations do not create a material issue of fact." *Weinstock v. Columbia Univ.*, 224 F.3d 33, 41 (2d Cir. 2000).

<sup>2</sup> On February 22, 2011, Mr. Bossie's counsel filed only a Local Rule 56(a)2 Statement and Affidavit in response to Defendant's motion for summary judgment, but after being granted leave by the Court, filed his memorandum in opposition on September 7, 2011.

203, 208 (S.D.N.Y. 2005); *Jackson v. Univ. of New Haven*, 228 F. Supp. 2d 156, 158 n.4 (D. Conn. 2002)). Additionally, by its terms, Section 601 refers to exclusion from, denial of the benefits of, or discrimination under a federally-funded program. In order to successfully maintain a claim under Title VI, Plaintiff must be able to demonstrate a nexus between the federal funds provided to the program at issue and the particular activity of the program about which he complains. *See Assoc. Against Discrimination in Emp't, Inc. v. City of Bridgeport*, 647 F.2d 256, 276 (2d Cir. 1981) (“[F]or a claimant to recover under Title VI against an employer for discriminatory employment practices, a threshold requirement is that the employer be the recipient of federal funds aimed primarily at providing employment.”). Mr. Bossie alleges that Trooper Houle discriminated against him in the performance of his motor-vehicle accident investigation duties as a state trooper and his counsel stated at oral argument that he assumes that the Department of Public Safety receives some form of federal aid. However, he offers no evidence that any federal funds that may be provided to the Department of Public Safety are aimed at or concern Trooper Houle’s actions in this case, i.e. the investigation and reporting of traffic accidents.

Accordingly, because Mr. Bossie brings this case against Trooper Houle and not a program that receives federal financial assistance, Defendant is entitled to summary judgment in his favor on Mr. Bossie’s Title VI claim.

B. First Amendment

Mr. Bossie claims that by removing the Puerto Rican flag from the back speaker of his car, breaking its stick, and throwing it to the ground, Trooper Houle violated his First Amendment right to free speech in the expression of pride in his Puerto Rican heritage.

# 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.