

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LIABILITY UNDER SECTION 1983

Karen M. Blum (kblum@suffolk.edu)
Suffolk University Law School
RESEARCH DATE: January 1, 2006

Author's Note

This outline is arranged under various topic headings that indicate problem areas likely to be encountered in the litigation of section 1983 cases. **The outline is not a substitute for the excellent treatises that exist on section 1983, but is intended as a useful research tool to keep informed of very recent case law and trends in this rapidly developing area.**

Please be advised that I do not use research assistants to prepare these outlines, so that any errors are my own. Each updated outline attempts to remove cases that may no longer be good law or to indicate any negative history of a case where important. **It is important that you KeyCite any case you intend to rely on, especially a district court opinion.** Obviously, you should not cite to this outline, but rather directly to cases contained herein.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT LIABILITY
UNDER SECTION 1983**

Karen M. Blum (kblum@suffolk.edu)
Suffolk University Law School
RESEARCH DATE: January 1, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PRELIMINARY PRINCIPLES	1
A. Direct v. Vicarious Liability	1
B. Individual Capacity v. Official Capacity Suits	9
C. Supervisory Liability v. Municipal Liability	15
D. No Qualified Immunity From Compensatory Damages for Local Entities; Absolute Immunity From Punitive Damages	30
E. No Eleventh Amendment Immunity for Local Entities /State Immunities Not Applicable	35
F. States Are Not "Persons" Under Section 1983	38
G. 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a): Supplemental Jurisdiction	41
H. No Heightened Pleading Requirement	43
I. Ethical Concerns for Government Attorneys	48
J. Heck v. Humphrey : The Intersection of Section 1983 and Habeas Corpus	53
 II. METHODS OF ESTABLISHING LOCAL GOVERNMENT LIABILITY AFTER <i>MONELL</i>	 68
A. Liability Based on Policy Statements, Ordinances, Regulations or Decisions Formally Adopted and Promulgated by Government Rulemakers	68
B. Liability Based on "Custom or Usage"	96
C. Liability Based on a Policy or Custom of Inadequate Training, Supervision, Discipline, Screening or Hiring	136
1. <i>City of Oklahoma City v. Tuttle</i>	136
2. <i>City of Springfield v. Kibbe</i>	138

3. <i>City of Canton v. Harris</i>	139
4. Illustrative Post- <i>Canton</i> Cases	152
a. "obviousness" cases	152
b. constructive notice cases	180
c. jail suicide cases	198
5. <i>Bryan County v. Brown</i>	210
6. Post- <i>Brown</i> Cases	214
7. Note on "Deliberate Indifference"	232
8. Note on "Shocks the Conscience"	256
9. Derivative Nature of Liability	292
10. Use of Public Reports to Establish Custom or Policy of Deliberate Indifference	318

D. Liability Based on Conduct of Policymaking Officials

Attributed to Governmental Entity	327
1. <i>Pembaur v. City of Cincinnati</i>	327
2. <i>City of St. Louis v. Praprotnik</i>	329
3. <i>Jett v. Dallas Independent School District</i>	346
4. Illustrative Lower Federal Court Cases	350
5. Note on <i>McMillian v. Monroe County</i>	365
6. Post <i>McMillian</i> Cases by Circuit	367

**III. GOVERNMENT LIABILITY FOR VIOLATIONS OF DUE PROCESS:
THE IMPACT OF *DESHANEY* ON SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS CLAIMS
AND *ZINERMON* ON PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS
CLAIMS**

A. Liability Based on Failure to Provide Protective Services	421
1. <i>DeShaney v. Winnebago County Dept. of Social Services</i> ..	421
2. "Getting Around" <i>DeShaney</i>	427
a. "special relationship" or custody cases	427
(i) public school	436
(ii) foster care	446
(iii) public housing/workplace	455
b. state-created-danger cases	464
c. entitlement cases	500
d. equal protection cases	505

B. Liability Based on Failure to Provide Procedural Due Process	. 511
1. <i>Parratt v. Taylor</i> 511
2. <i>Hudson v. Palmer</i> 511
3. <i>Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co.</i> 516
4. <i>Mathews v. Eldridge</i> 524
5. <i>Zinermon v. Burch</i> 525
6. Post- <i>Zinermon</i> Decisions 530
7. Conclusion 537
8. Note on <i>Sandin v. Conner</i> 549