

1 ROBERT J. CROTTY
2 TAMI J. WILCOX
3 BURKE D. JACKOWICH
4 LUKINS & ANNIS, P.S.
5 1600 Washington Trust Financial Center
6 717 W Sprague Ave.
7 Spokane, WA 99201-0466
8 (509) 455-9555

9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

FILED IN THE
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

MAY 23 2002

JAMES R. LARSEN, CLERK
DEPUTY
SPOKANE, WASHINGTON

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

12 [REDACTED] AND [REDACTED]
13 [REDACTED] father and mother,
14 individually and as guardians of their
15 minor child, [REDACTED]

16 Plaintiffs,

17 v.

18 ROYAL SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 160,
19 a political subdivision; STEVEN G.
20 DIAZ, individually; and PRESTON
21 "KENT" ANDERSEN, individually, and
22 the marital community composed thereof,

23 Defendants.

NO. CS-02-0185-FVS
COMPLAINT

COPY

24 COME NOW the plaintiffs, by and through their attorney of record, Lukins &
25 Annis, P.S., and allege the following:

26 **I. PARTIES**

1.1 Plaintiff [REDACTED] a minor, is a resident of Grant County,
Washington.

COMPLAINT: 1

LAW OFFICES
LUKINS & ANNIS
A PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CORPORATION
1600 WASHINGTON TRUST FINANCIAL CENTER
717 W SPRAGUE AVE.
SPOKANE, WA 99201-0466
(509) 455-9555

1 1.2 Plaintiffs [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are husband and wife
2 and the natural parents of plaintiff [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] are
3 residents of Grant County.

4 1.3 Defendant Royal School District No. 160 ("Royal") is a political
5 subdivision organized under the laws of the state of Washington. At all material times
6 relevant hereto, defendant Royal School District operated Royal Middle School in
7 Grant County, Washington.

8 1.4 Defendant Steven G. Diaz ("Diaz"), a former teacher in the Royal School
9 District, is believed to be a resident of Whitman County, Washington.

10 1.5 Defendant Preston Kent Andersen ("Andersen"), who is the principal of
11 Royal Middle School ("RMS") and the athletic director of Royal School District, was
12 acting at all times material hereto in both his official and individual capacities. All
13 acts or omissions of Andersen were performed for the benefit of the marital
14 community of Kent and Jane Doe Andersen. Defendant Andersen resides in Grant
15 County, Washington.

16 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

17 2.1 This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
18 § 1343(2), (3) and (4) and 20 U.S.C. § 1681, *et seq.* This Court has pendent
19 jurisdiction over the state law claims.

20 2.2 All jurisdiction prerequisites to filing suit have been met.

21 2.3 This Court has personal jurisdiction over all parties hereto.

22 2.4 Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

23
24
25
26
COMPLAINT: 2

1 **XII. EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION: LOSS OF CONSORTIUM**

2 12.1 Plaintiffs, as above named, reallege the preceding paragraphs and further
3 allege:

4 12.2 Plaintiffs [REDACTED] are the natural parents and guardians
5 of Leslie.

6 12.3 As a proximate cause of the aforementioned acts and omissions, plaintiffs
7 [REDACTED] have suffered a loss of consortium with their daughter,
8 [REDACTED] in an amount to be determined at the time of trial.

9
10 **XIII. JURY DEMAND**

11 A jury trial is requested.

12 **XIV. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

13 WHEREFORE, plaintiffs seek the following relief:

- 14 1. An injunction against defendant Royal School District ordering it to
15 adopt, in accordance with state and federal regulations, policies and procedures that
16 will prevent such harassment in the future;
- 17 2. An award of compensatory damages for past, present, and future medical
18 and health care-related expenses;
- 19 3. An award of compensatory damages for past, present, and future pain,
20 suffering, and other general and non-pecuniary damages;
- 21 4. An award of damages for past, present, and future loss of enjoyment of
22 life;
- 23 5. Punitive damages as allowed under 20 U.S.C. § 1681, *et seq.*;
- 24
25
26

COMPLAINT: 15

1 11.2 Defendants had a duty to refrain from intentionally or negligently
2 inflicting emotional distress upon [REDACTED]

3 11.3 Royal and Andersen breached this duty by intimidating [REDACTED] with
4 duplicitous threats, interrogating her by a male insurance official, helping to serve
5 subpoenas on behalf of Diaz, failing to provide counseling, failing to adopt
6 appropriate regulations and guidelines to safeguard the rights of students, and failing
7 to offer professional assistance to a thirteen-year-old student who was the subject of
8 sexual abuse by a school teacher on school grounds.
9

10 11.4 Diaz breached this duty by inflicting sexual abuse on [REDACTED] a thirteen-
11 year-old student of his.
12

13 11.5 Defendants knew or in the exercise of reasonable care should have
14 known that their acts would cause severe emotional distress to [REDACTED]

15 11.6 [REDACTED] has suffered severe emotional distress as a proximate cause of
16 defendants' breach.

17 11.7 Defendants' acts and omissions were so deplorable as to be considered
18 outrageous.
19

20 11.8 Defendants' acts were done intentionally or with reckless disregard to
21 [REDACTED] emotional wellbeing.

22 11.9 Defendants breached this duty negligently, as well as intentionally.

23 11.10 As a proximate cause of defendants' acts and omissions, [REDACTED] was
24 damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.
25
26

COMPLAINT: 14

1 9.3 Royal and Andersen negligently breached this duty by failing to properly
2 supervise their employee, Diaz.

3 9.4 Royal and Andersen knew or in the exercise of reasonable care should
4 have known that Diaz was engaging in illegal sexual conduct with [REDACTED].

5 9.5 As a proximate result of Royal and Andersen's acts and omissions,
6 plaintiffs were damaged in amounts to be proven at trial.

7
8 **X. SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION: NEGLIGENCE**

9 10.1 Plaintiffs, as above named, reallege the preceding paragraphs and further
10 allege:

11 10.2 Royal and Andersen had a duty to provide [REDACTED] with a safe school
12 environment free from sexual exploitation by a teacher and to comply with the laws
13 and regulations of the state of Washington including, but not limited to,
14 RCW 28A.230.080, RCW 28A.300.160, RCW 28A.600.010, RCW 28A.600.020,
15 RCW 28A.640.010, RCW 28A.640.020, RCW 26.44.030, and RCW 26.044.040, and
16 the regulations promulgated pursuant to these statutes and to RCW 28A.150.290.

17 10.3 Royal and Andersen were negligent in breaching this duty.

18 10.4 As a proximate cause of Royal's and Andersen's negligence acts and
19 omissions, plaintiffs were damaged in an amount to be proved at the time of trial.

20
21 **XI. SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION: INTENTIONAL AND NEGLIGENT**
22 **INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**

23 11.1 Plaintiffs, as above named, reallege the preceding paragraphs and further
24 allege:

25
26 COMPLAINT: 13

1 7.7 Royal and Andersen retaliated against [REDACTED] for her oppositional activity
2 by threatening her, failing to ensure her anonymity, and taking affirmative steps to
3 support the position of Diaz rather than protect [REDACTED], the student victim.

4 7.8 As a result of Royal and Andersen's willful violations of RCW 49.60,
5 [REDACTED] has been damaged in an amount to be proven at the time of trial.

6
7 **VIII. FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION: NEGLIGENT HIRING**

8 8.1 Plaintiffs, as above named, reallege the preceding paragraphs and further
9 allege:

10 8.2 Royal and Andersen owed a duty to its students and their parents to
11 properly investigate potential teachers before making hiring decisions.

12 8.3 Royal and Andersen negligently breached this duty by hiring Diaz as a
13 teacher for RMS and as a coach for RHS.

14 8.4 Royal and Andersen knew or in the exercise of ordinary care should have
15 known that Diaz posed a threat of becoming inappropriately involved with female
16 students during a particularly vulnerable time in their physical and emotional
17 development.
18

19 8.5 As a proximate cause of defendants' negligence, plaintiffs were damaged
20 in amounts to be proven at trial.

21
22 **IX. SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION: NEGLIGENT SUPERVISION**

23 9.1 Plaintiffs, as above named, reallege the preceding paragraphs and further
24 allege:

25 9.2 Royal and Andersen had a duty to properly supervise their employees.
26

COMPLAINT: 12

1 6.7 Royal and Andersen's acts and omissions were taken both in their official
2 capacities and individually.

3 6.8 As a direct and proximate cause of the acts and omissions of Royal and
4 Andersen, [REDACTED] has been damaged in amounts to be determined at trial.

5 6.9 Royal's and Andersen's acts and omissions were wanton, willful, or done
6 with reckless disregard for [REDACTED] rights, and therefore subject Royal and Andersen
7 to an award of punitive damages.

8
9 **VII. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATIONS OF THE WASHINGTON**
10 **LAW AGAINST DISCRIMINATION RCW 49.60**

11 7.1 Plaintiffs, as above named, reallege the preceding paragraphs and further
12 allege:

13 7.2 Royal and Andersen violated RCW 49.60, *et seq.*, by denying [REDACTED]
14 equal access to public services because of her sex and gender.

15 7.3 Royal and Andersen maintained a sexually hostile educational
16 environment.

17 7.4 Royal and Andersen knew or in the exercise of reasonable care should
18 have known of this sexually hostile educational environment.

19 7.5 Royal and Andersen failed to take any actions to protect plaintiff from
20 this sexually hostile educational environment.

21 7.6 [REDACTED] opposed this sexually hostile educational environment by reporting
22 it to her parents, who reported it to Royal.
23
24
25
26

COMPLAINT: 11

1 5.2 Royal and Andersen are directly liable to [REDACTED] under Title IX, 20 U.S.C.
2 § 1681, *et seq.*, and RCW 28A.640.010, *et seq.*, by subjecting [REDACTED] to discrimination
3 and sexual harassment.

4 5.3 Royal and Andersen had actual knowledge of Diaz's actions.

5 5.4 Royal and Andersen showed deliberate indifference to [REDACTED], in light of
6 their actual knowledge.
7

8 5.5 As a direct and proximate cause of this deliberate indifference, [REDACTED] has
9 been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial.

10 **VI. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATIONS OF PLAINTIFFS' EQUAL**
11 **PROTECTION RIGHTS UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1983**

12 6.1 Plaintiffs, as above named, reallege the preceding paragraphs and further
13 allege:

14 6.2 [REDACTED] has a right to equal access public education under the Fourteenth
15 Amendment to the United States Constitution.

16 6.3 [REDACTED] right to equal access to public education cannot be breached
17 because of her sex or gender.
18

19 6.4 Royal and Andersen had a special relationship with [REDACTED] that included
20 their responsibility to take affirmative action to ensure her equal access to public
21 education.

22 6.5 Royal and Andersen were deliberately indifferent to [REDACTED] rights to
23 equal access to public education.
24

25 6.6 Royal and Andersen, "under the cloak of state authority," violated
26 [REDACTED] equal protection rights due to her sex and gender.

COMPLAINT: 10

1 3.27 As a proximate cause of defendants' actions or inactions, [REDACTED] has
2 suffered serious damages including, but not limited to, mental anguish, anxiety,
3 humiliation, embarrassment, stigmatization, and loss of self-esteem, all of which are
4 ongoing and will likely continue into the future. As a proximate cause of the
5 defendants' actions or inactions, plaintiffs have incurred special damages for
6 psychological treatment that is ongoing and will continue into the future. As a
7 proximate cause of the defendants' actions or inactions, [REDACTED]
8 have suffered a loss of consortium with their daughter.

9
10 **IV. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: BATTERY**

11 4.1 Plaintiffs, as above named, reallege the preceding paragraphs and further
12 allege:

13 4.2 Diaz intentionally and willfully committed several batteries upon [REDACTED]
14 by engaging her in non-consensual sexual activities.

15 4.3 At the times of the above alleged batteries, [REDACTED] was thirteen years old
16 and not competent to give consent.

17 4.4 As a direct and proximate cause of the batteries committed against [REDACTED]
18 she has been damaged in amounts to be determined at trial.

19
20 **V. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF**
21 **SEX IN VIOLATION OF TITLE IX, 20 U.S.C. § 1681 AND RCW 28A.640.010**
22 **ET SEQ.**

23 5.1 Plaintiffs, as above named, reallege the preceding paragraphs and further
24 allege:

25
26
COMPLAINT: 9

1 carrier, and that insurance carrier conducted the investigation for Royal. It
2 interviewed [REDACTED] for two days in a row. The only people in the room with this
3 thirteen-year-old girl were the male investigator and Andersen. [REDACTED] was
4 intimidated and told that if she lied, she would be sent to jail and her parents would
5 lose their farm.

6
7 3.23 Diaz was charged with various crimes, including rape of a child in the
8 second degree and sexual misconduct with a minor in the first degree.

9 3.24 Shortly before the criminal trial, Diaz pled guilty to fourth degree assault
10 (with sexual motivation). He was ordered to surrender his teaching certificate and was
11 ordered not to be in direct contact with minor females at any time unless there is
12 immediate and continuous supervision by a responsible adult who is aware of the
13 sentencing restrictions and provisions.

14
15 3.25 The aforementioned acts and conduct by Diaz constituted sexual
16 harassment and discrimination about which Royal knew or should have known.
17 Royal's and Andersen's intentional indifference to the sexual acts of Diaz and to the
18 rights of [REDACTED] amounted to tacit approval and involvement by these defendants, who
19 were acting in their official capacities as agents and/or employees of Royal.

20
21 3.26 At all times material hereto, there existed a special relationship between
22 Royal and [REDACTED] whereby Royal had an affirmative duty, under federal and state law,
23 to take corrective actions to protect [REDACTED] from harm, including reasonable steps to
24 protect [REDACTED] from sex discrimination, sexual harassment, and sexual abuse, and to
25 ensure equal access to education.
26

COMPLAINT: 8

1 believed Diaz and [REDACTED] who denied being alone together. Andersen arbitrarily
2 decided the reporting students were lying and performed no further investigation.
3 During the following weeks, one of the reporting student's mothers telephoned
4 Andersen and stressed that her daughter was telling the truth and Andersen needed to
5 look further into the issue. Andersen ignored the mother's requests.
6

7 3.19 On March 30, 2001, Diaz forced [REDACTED] to have oral sex with him,
8 disregarding her wishes to stop. This incident made [REDACTED] very distraught and caused
9 her to question whether Diaz really loved her or was just using her.

10 3.20 In early April 2001, [REDACTED] confided in a middle school friend through an
11 e-mail that graphically described the sexual relationship with Diaz. It also described
12 [REDACTED] confusion over whether Diaz loved her or was taking advantage of her.
13 [REDACTED] confidante, who was troubled by the exploitative relationship between Diaz
14 and [REDACTED] gave a copy of the e-mail to her mother, who handed it over to Andersen.
15

16 3.21 During all times material hereto, Royal negligently and with intentional
17 indifference to the health and welfare of its students failed to maintain approved
18 sexual harassment policies and complaint procedures, in violation of both state and
19 federal laws.
20

21 3.22 After receiving the e-mail describing the sexual relationship between
22 Diaz and [REDACTED], Andersen failed to contact law enforcement officials, failed to
23 comply with appropriate federal and state guidelines for the handling of a sexual
24 abuse incident in a school, and failed to refer [REDACTED] to a qualified individual capable
25 of providing assistance to [REDACTED]. Instead, Andersen contacted Royal's insurance
26

COMPLAINT: 7

1 been "infatuated" with Diaz. Additionally, Andersen disregarded the concerns
2 expressed by parents and community members regarding rumors of Diaz's
3 inappropriate behavior with high school girls.

4
5 3.14 Despite the fact that Diaz had told defendant Andersen of his desire not
6 to have [REDACTED] in his class, [REDACTED] remained in his class and Diaz began to spend more
7 time alone with [REDACTED] after school and continued to groom her for his own sexual
8 purposes.

9
10 3.15 Diaz and [REDACTED] had inappropriate sexual relations on four separate
11 occasions, including oral sex, from February 12, 2001, through March 30, 2001, on
12 school grounds, in Diaz's classroom, with the door locked.

13
14 3.16 Diaz manipulated [REDACTED] into believing that he loved her and cared about
15 her. He took advantage of her romantic feelings so that she would keep the relation-
16 ship between them secret.

17
18 3.17 On or about February 23, 2001, two different students went to two
19 different teachers at RMS and informed the teachers of their concerns regarding an
20 inappropriate relationship between Diaz and [REDACTED]. Both teachers reported to
21 Andersen what the students had told them.

22
23 3.18 Andersen failed to notify proper authorities, failed to notify [REDACTED]
24 parents, failed to have the matter investigated by qualified individuals, and failed to
25 interview persons with knowledge about the relationship. Instead, Andersen, who
26 failed to appreciate the dynamics of an illicit teacher/student relationship and the
importance of secrecy to the preservation of this exploitative relationship, simply

COMPLAINT: 6

1 have known how important it is to hire middle school teachers with character and
2 integrity to serve as role models for their students during a critical time in their
3 physical, emotional, and sexual development.

4 3.11 During her eighth grade year (2000-2001) school year, [REDACTED] was
5 thirteen years old. She was an excellent student, [REDACTED]
6 [REDACTED] and had no record of behavioral problems in class. She was assigned
7 to Diaz's class.
8

9 3.12 Shortly after [REDACTED] began her eighth grade year (2000), Andersen
10 received a telephone call from an unidentified parent warning him that [REDACTED] was
11 "infatuated" with Diaz. Andersen informed Diaz that [REDACTED] was "infatuated" with
12 him and instructed Diaz not to be alone with [REDACTED]. However, Andersen failed to
13 investigate the nature of any relationship to determine what else needed to be
14 accomplished to protect RMS's student and its teacher. Andersen failed to inform
15 [REDACTED] parents that another parent had made a specific telephone call to express
16 concern about their daughter's infatuation with Diaz. Anderson also failed to monitor
17 the situation and thus did not discover that, despite Andersen's instructions, Diaz was
18 spending time alone with [REDACTED].
19
20

21 3.13 In November 2000, Diaz asked Andersen to remove [REDACTED] from his
22 class. Andersen not only again failed to contact [REDACTED] parents, he conducted no
23 investigation into Diaz's reason for making such a request, especially given the fact
24 that [REDACTED] was an excellent student with no history of behavioral problems in the
25 classroom. Andersen also disregarded the fact that [REDACTED] had been reported to have
26

COMPLAINT: 5

1 3.6 Several Royal parents and respected community members personally
2 cautioned Andersen about hiring Diaz as a teacher or as a coach.

3 3.7 Royal parents and community members, parents, and teachers at
4 Highland made Andersen aware of repeated rumors that Diaz had improper contact
5 with high school girls at Highland and also at Selah, where he had coached prior to
6 coaching at Highland. Andersen was also aware that Highland had refused to renew
7 Diaz's employment contract despite his apparent success as a coach.
8

9 3.8 Royal's investigation and hiring of Diaz as a teacher and as a coach was
10 biased, tainted, and conducted with deliberate indifference to the health and safety of
11 the students at Royal. Andersen failed to contact Highland's principal, who would
12 have told Andersen not to hire Diaz but instead to continue to search for other
13 candidates. Other respected members of the community who had knowledge of
14 rumors regarding Diaz's sordid background also told Andersen to continue to search
15 for other candidates. Andersen disregarded community members' advice to continue
16 searching for an individual whose background was not as questionable or
17 controversial as that of Diaz.
18

19 3.9 In summer 2000, Royal, relying upon the investigation of Andersen,
20 hired Diaz as a teacher in the middle school, and he began functioning as the head
21 coach of the high school basketball team.
22

23 3.10 Royal knew or should have known that middle school students are
24 generally vulnerable and impressionable because of their age and because they are
25 influenced by our modern sexualized culture. Royal and Andersen knew or should
26

COMPLAINT: 4

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

III. OPERATIVE FACTS

3.1 Plaintiffs, as named herein, reallege the preceding paragraphs and further allege:

3.2 During all times material hereto, Royal received federal assistance and state funding. Its acts and omissions, as alleged herein, were under color of statute, regulation, custom, or usage of the state.

3.3 Diaz (DOB 06/03/75) was the high school varsity basketball coach at Highland School District ("Highland") for the 1999/2000 school year. Despite having had a successful year, culminating in leading the boys' team to competition in the state championship tournament, Diaz was released from Highland immediately following the tournament. There had been rumors within the Highland community of inappropriate contact between Diaz and high school girls.

3.4 Following Diaz's release from Highland, Andersen, after receiving approval from the Royal School Board, fired the head coach of the boys' basketball team at Royal High School ("RHS").

3.5 During approximately June 2000, Andersen introduced Diaz to the RHS basketball team as its new head coach for the 2000/2001 basketball season, without having been interviewed or evaluated by the school board and approved for hire, which deviated from the customary practice involved in hiring a new coach. As Royal's Athletic Director, Andersen wanted a winning basketball team and was set on Diaz becoming the boys' head basketball coach at RHS.

COMPLAINT: 3

1 6. An award of attorney fees and costs as allowed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983
2 and RCW 49.60, *et seq.*; and

3 7. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and
4 equitable.

5 DATED this 2nd day of April, 2002.

7 LUKINS & ANNIS-, P.S.

8
9 By 

10 ROBERT J. CROTTY, WSBA #09113
11 TAMI J. WILCOX, WSBA #28367
12 BURKE D. JACKOWICH, WSBA# 31722
13 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
COMPLAINT: 16