

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

RECEIVED

APR 22 2026

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

MARCUS RUSHING,

Plaintiff,

v.

ANOKA COUNTY

And

DAKOTA COUNTY,

And

WASHINGTON COUNTY,

And

CITY OF WEST ST. PAUL

And

OFFICER TODD



Defendant(s)

And

JEFFERY SMITH

And

CHRIST TEMPLE APOSTOLIC
CHURCH

JOHN/JANE DOES 1-20

Case No.

COMPLAINT: Trial by Jury

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

(42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985; First Amendment Retaliation; and Supplemental State Law Claims)

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This action arises from a coordinated course of conduct in retaliation for Plaintiff's protected federal litigation activity against institutional defendants, including McGaw Medical Center of Northwestern University, HealthPartners, Unity Point, and Wood Health.
 2. After Plaintiff engaged in protected activity, Defendants initiated and participated in a pattern of interference that extended across multiple states and into Plaintiff's personal, professional, and familial life.
 3. This interference included:
 - Defamation and false allegations of domestic violence
 - Manipulation of law enforcement and judicial processes
 - Interference with employment and housing opportunities
 - Unauthorized access to and destruction of Plaintiff's communications and evidence
 - Coordinated actions depriving Plaintiff of access to his children
 4. Defendants acted individually and in concert, including through misuse of state processes and influence over state actors, to retaliate against Plaintiff and obstruct his legal claims.
-

II. JURISDICTION, VENUE AND PARTIES

A. Jurisdiction

4. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff's federal claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this action arises under the Constitution and laws of the United States, including claims brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for violations of Plaintiff's rights under the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments.
 5. This Court also has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1343(a)(3) and (4) because Plaintiff seeks redress for the deprivation, under color of state law, of rights, privileges, and immunities secured by the United States Constitution, and for injuries caused by conspiracies to interfere with civil rights.
 6. Plaintiff further brings claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2) and § 1985(3) for conspiracies to interfere with federal judicial proceedings, obstruct justice, and deprive Plaintiff of equal protection and equal privileges under the law.
 7. The Court has supplemental jurisdiction over related state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) because those claims arise from a common nucleus of operative facts, including alleged acts of defamation, abuse of process, malicious prosecution, intentional infliction of emotional distress, tortious interference with contractual and prospective economic relations, and related Minnesota common law claims.
-

B. Venue

8. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred within the State of Minnesota, including in Dakota County and other Minnesota jurisdictions where Defendants' actions were carried out, directed, or had foreseeable effects.

9. These events include, among other things, alleged acts involving law enforcement conduct, judicial proceedings, employment and housing impacts, interference with access to courts, and communications and coordinated actions occurring within this District.

10. Venue is also proper because Defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in this District for the conduct alleged herein, which includes actions taken within Minnesota and actions directed toward Plaintiff within Minnesota that caused harm in this District.

C. Parties

11. Plaintiff is an individual residing in Minnesota who brings this action pro se for violations of his constitutional, statutory, and common law rights arising from the conduct described herein.



13. Defendant Pastor Jeffery Smith is affiliated with Christ Temple Apostolic Church and Christ Temple Apostolic Church is a religious organization in Minnesota.

14. Defendant Dakota County is a political subdivision of the State of Minnesota responsible for the actions of its employees, agents, departments, and officers acting within the scope of their employment.

15. Defendant Washington County (if applicable) is a political subdivision of the State of Minnesota responsible for similar actions as alleged herein.

16. Individual Defendants include law enforcement officers, county employees, and other state actors who participated in or contributed to the deprivation of Plaintiff's rights under color of state law.

17. Plaintiff further alleges that certain private actors acted jointly with state actors, or in concert with them, in a manner sufficient to state claims under **42 U.S.C. § 1983** and **§ 1985**, including through participation in, facilitation of, or ratification of actions taken under color of law.

18. Plaintiff does not assert claims against non-parties for liability in this action, but references certain non-party conduct solely to establish context, motive, and the existence of coordinated retaliatory conduct affecting the named Defendants' actions.

D. General Allegations Regarding Concerted Conduct

19. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' conduct, taken collectively, reflects a pattern of coordinated and interrelated actions affecting Plaintiff's access to courts, employment opportunities, housing stability, parental rights, and access to evidence in ongoing legal proceedings.

20. These actions include alleged misuse of legal process, dissemination of false statements to third parties, interference with administrative processes, and participation in or facilitation of state action impacting Plaintiff's constitutional rights.

III. PREFATORY MATTERS, BACKGROUND & TIMELINE OF RELEVANT EVENTS

21. The Plaintiff and Defendant Partner moved from Ohio back to MN in January of 2025.
22. The Plaintiff moved from Ohio to MN while he was engaged in ongoing federal litigation against Defendant McGaw Medical Center of Northwestern University and Wood Health, et al.
23. At that time, the Plaintiff was self-employed and had a contract with Signify Health.
24. In January of 2025, the Plaintiff and Defendant Partner began to attend Christ Temple Apostolic Church in Roseville, MN and became members around February of 2025.
25. Defendants in ongoing federal litigation discovered that the Plaintiff had moved from Ohio to MN.
26. In March of 2025, Defendant(s) interfered with his medical licensure which affected his ability to earn a living while self-employed in MN.
27. In April of 2025, the Plaintiff met with Defendant Pastor Jeffery Smith to ask for assistance with regard to employment and transitioning to MN in the context of ongoing federal litigation that had affected his ability to work as a physician. Around that time, Defendant Smith verbally stated that he would help.
28. Defendant Smith inquired about details of the ongoing federal litigation.
29. Defendant Smith then scheduled several meetings for the Plaintiff to meet with other religious leaders to discuss the case and how he might help.
30. Around this same time, the Plaintiff enrolls in the MN Safe-at-Home program due to threats received from the McGaw Medical Center of Northwestern University and ongoing harassment.
31. One such threatening communication stated:

“I know that a big part of your [Plaintiff's] character is seeking truth, and it may feel disingenuous to endorse anything that you disagree with. But it will bite you in the ass if you don't learn to concede to the group, even if they are wrong. You can be completely right, and it won't matter if people have already turned against you. **It is a dangerous world for a Black man, and you can't afford to make it more dangerous for yourself by being unable to let things go**”

32. Between April and May of 2025, several meetings are scheduled, but Defendant Smith never shows up to any of these meetings.

33. Defendant Smith then asks the Plaintiff to explain the federal case with the Grant Funder for Christ Temple Apostolic Faith, Mr. Babbington.

34. Plaintiff agrees and calls Mr. Babbington and explains the federal litigation and Mr. Babbington begins to laugh on the phone call.

35. Plaintiff then ended the call and declined further assistance from Mr. Babbington.

36. The Plaintiff relayed his concerns back to Defendant Smith and declined further assistance from Mr. Babbington.

37. Defendant Smith stated that Mr. Babbington was one of the most powerful men in Minnesota, but Plaintiff declined further assistance from Mr. Babbington.

38. Shortly thereafter, Def. Smith informs the congregation that they would be acquiring a new church facility in Fridley, MN.

39. Sometime after August of 2025, Defendant Smith acquires a new facility in Fridley, MN.

40. Around this time, the Plaintiff and Defendant Partner experience significant financial hardship.

41. The Plaintiff and Defendant Partner had minor children together and enroll to receive public assistance in Washington County, MN.

42. In October of 2025, Plaintiff requests emergency assistance in Case # 25-CV-2001. Upon receipt of a motion for temporary relief, Case #25-CV-2001 is dismissed with a request to refile with an IFP application, and this correspondence was then backdated to a date prior to the relief being requested.

43. Case #25-CV-2001 was refiled and given a new case number of Case #25-CV-3894.

44. Around October of 2025, the Plaintiff seeks relief from the MN NAACP in St. Paul.

45. The Plaintiff meets with and communicates his concern to executives of the NAACP and also to an attorney from the NAACP.

46. The executive of the NAACP informs the Plaintiff that he believed that the Plaintiff's life was in danger.

47. The Plaintiff communicated this concern to the Defendant Partner and informed Defendant Partner that we should leave, but Def. Partner insisted that we stay.

48. The Plaintiff then prepares an emergency preparation kit for Defendant Partner, which includes his passwords, case details and evidence in the ongoing federal litigation.

49. The Plaintiff had begun documenting what had occurred on three personal websites and their corresponding Facebook profiles between May and October of 2025:

www.marcusrushingmd.com
www.Dad-Beats.com
www.EqualRight2Dream.com

50. The Def. Partner had created the Plaintiff's Facebook profile and the corresponding Facebook Profiles for the aforementioned websites.

51. One of the last posts that the Def. created was an article on Dad-Beats.com that explained how the Plaintiff was separated from his prior marital children, after McGaw began to interfere with a previous divorce tribunal in Illinois (Case #2019D8356).

52. However, by the end of October, the Plaintiff decided to deactivate his Facebook profile.

53. On Nov 6, 2025, the Plaintiff and Def. Partner receive an eviction notice from their Washington County, MN residence and would later move to Dakota County, MN.

54. At this point in time, each of the federal cases involving McGaw (25CV1957, 25CV3894, and 25CV3909) are listed as open and active.

55. Around this time, the Plaintiff again reaches out to Def. Smith and Christ Temple Apostolic Church for assistance.

56. Def. Smith verbally represents that he would assist Plaintiff in securing employment, but instead he assists Def. Partner in securing employment near his residence in Washington County, MN. Def. Smith would later ask the Plaintiff how his wife liked her new job.

57. Around this same time, Def. Smith instructs two members of Christ Temple Apostolic Church to visit the marital home, Sandy and Ta'jesha Shaviss.

58. The Plaintiff objects to these individuals coming to the marital home, but Def. Partner insists that they come to the marital home above the Plaintiff's objections.

59. On one such visit, Sandy and Ta'jesha Shaviss provide an external hard drive to Def. Partner.

60. When Plaintiff questioned Def. Partner on why the hard drive had been provided, Defendant Partner did not provide a clear explanation.

61. Plaintiff reasonably believed that the device could contain information related to the ongoing disputes or litigation.

62. Around this same time, Def. Smith appoints Def. Partner to the Praise Team at Christ Temple Apostolic Church.

63. Around this same time, Def. Partner begins to remain at church allegedly for Praise Team rehearsal that coincided with Def. Smith's presence.

64. Around this same time, Def. Partner is then appointed by Def. Smith to center stage-praise team for Sunday Service.

65. Around this time, Def. Partner began to instigate a false allegation of domestic violence on her social media page.

66. Around this time, Def. Partner began to communicate a false allegation of domestic violence to several members at Christ Temple Apostolic Church.

67. Around this time, Def. Partner began to communicate a false allegation of domestic violence to several mutual contacts in MN and family in IL.

68. Around this time, Def. Partner began to instigate and incite arguments with Plaintiff.

69. During these confrontations, Def. Partner would verbally insult Plaintiff and, at times, physically strike him in an effort to provoke a response to create grounds for false allegations.

70. On or around January 2, 2026, upon going through Def. Partner's phone and personal computer, he learned that:

- (a) Def. Partner was having an affair with Def. Smith
- (b) Def. Partner had been communicating false allegations of domestic violence in paragraphs 45-49 above to several mutual contacts at Christ Temple Apostolic Church.
- (c) Content suggestive that Def. Partner had been having multiple affairs

71. Upon discovery of the aforementioned, Def. Partner called the West St. Paul police and alleged domestic violence against the Partner.

72. The Plaintiff videorecorded the altercation beginning with observation of the contents on the Plaintiff's phone and ending with Def. Partner self-inflicting a wound on her right leg.

73. When the West St. Paul Police arrived at the marital residence, this footage was shown and rendered to the officers and no arrest was made.

74. One of the officers, Officer Lalor, stated that though no domestic violence occurred that Def. Partner had the right to leave.

75. Officer Lalor, upon information and belief, then allows the Def. Partner to leave with the marital children in the Plaintiff's personal vehicle.

76. On or around January 3, Def. Partner requested that the Plaintiff leave her CashApp card and SNAP Card with a member of Defendant church, who was also an employee of Dakota County, MN. The CashApp and SNAP Card were the only funds that the Plaintiff had access to.

77. Def. Partner leaves with the marital children and the Plaintiff is not reconnected with the marital children until they are returned to him during a church service on January 4, 2026.

78. During this service, Def. Smith preaches a sermon where he uses a story of the Samaritan Woman at the well to suggest to the congregation the conditions by which a woman should leave her husband.

79. After the service, Def. Smith and Def. Partner coordinate the removal of the marital children from the Plaintiff without court order or emergency.

80. Specifically, at the end of service, but prior to everyone being dismissed, church members removed my eldest and youngest daughter away from the Plaintiff without Plaintiff's consent or permission and when there was no emergency.

81. The Plaintiff's 3-year-old son, who was holding onto Plaintiff at the time his siblings were removed, was then physically separated from Plaintiff by a church member.

82. The child was visibly distressed and resisted the separation, including kicking and crying.

83. The incident was observed by multiple members of the congregation.

84 Plaintiff did not physically resist or interfere with the removal of his three children.

85. The separation occurred in the absence of any emergency circumstances or court order authorizing removal of the child from Plaintiff's care.

86. Immediately after this several members began to questioned Plaintiff regarding what he had "done" to his wife and why his wife was in "hiding".

87. Plaintiff was publicly humiliated and treated as an abuser.

88. At the end of the service, Def. Smith informs the Plaintiff that he had received information pertinent to his marriage to Def. Partner from Sandy Shaviss.

89. Immediately following the January 4, 2026 church service incident, Defendant Partner asked the Plaintiff whether the children could accompany Plaintiff back to the marital residence.

90. Defendant Partner later returned to the residence with the children, remained briefly to shower, and then departed to an undisclosed location.

91. The Plaintiff communicated the aforementioned to the West St. Paul Police.

92. On the morning of January 5, 2026, while Plaintiff was caring for the children at the residence, Plaintiff was served with notice of restraining order.

93. Upon being served with the Order of Protection, Plaintiff was separated from the marital children. The separation included very young children – the youngest being only 5 months old at the time (now 7 months old), a 3-year old, and a 5-year old – whom Plaintiff had been involved with every single day of their lives. This separation occurred during their formative developmental years, creating harm that cannot be regained, particularly with the youngest child, and caused severe emotional distress to Plaintiff and the marital children.

94. The plaintiff was only provided 15 minutes to leave the marital residence. The plaintiff did not have a chance to pack his medications, additional clothing, and evidence to ongoing federal litigation. Specifically, correspondence from the U.S. District Court showing that cases 25CV2001, 25CV3894, and 25CV3909 were not in fact closed on Nov 6, 2026, but were open; Plaintiff's backup hard drives and personal computer with extensive evidence pertinent to the aforementioned federal cases as well as Case 25CV1957 and finally the physical evidence related to the aforementioned cases.

95. Upon being served with the Order of Protection, the Plaintiff became homeless.

96. Between Jan 6, 2026 and Feb 28, 2026, the Plaintiff begins to receive rejection correspondence from several jobs applied to in Dakota County, MN that the Plaintiff was reasonably qualified for. During this same time period, the Dakota County Workforce attempts to close a workforce application that was initiated back in November of 2025.

97. Between Jan 6, 2026 and March 6, 2026, the Plaintiff applies for housing assistance in both Dakota County and Washington County, but receives no correspondence regarding application.

98. On or around Jan 6, 2026 the Def. Partner removes the Plaintiff from the Washington County public assistance application.

(a) When the Plaintiff is informed that he was removed as a beneficiary, he appealed this decision based on failure of notification, but this appeal was never placed on a schedule.

(b) The Plaintiff then went to Washington County DHS on or around Feb 4, 2026 to inquire about the appeal and status of benefits.

(c) A case manager informed the Plaintiff that he needed to apply for benefits in Dakota County, MN even though both parties up until that point in time were receiving benefits in Washington County, MN.

(d) The Plaintiff explained to the associate that he was homeless, and the associate stated that the Plaintiff was not eligible for benefits.

(e) The Plaintiff had not in fact applied for benefits during the phone call with the case manager; rather, he had only been discussing the appeal and verification of benefits.

(f) The case manager then informed the Plaintiff that she would directly reach out to the appellate officer assigned to the case to cancel the Plaintiff's appeal.

(g) The Plaintiff reported concerns regarding this conversation to the case manager's supervisor, explaining that he felt that he was being denied benefits due to homelessness.

(h) The case manager's supervisor then instructed the Plaintiff that he could apply for benefits. The Plaintiff then applied for benefits via an in-person paper application.

- (i) The application was approved and benefits were rendered on Feb 6, 2026.
- (j) However, the same case manager over SNAP, interfered with the Plaintiff's General assistance benefits and denied the application, indicating that we had not completed the phone application.
- (k) However, no phone application had been rendered.
- (l) The same case manager then initiated de novo an appeal of the canceled phone application and assigned this to an appellate hearing.
- (m) The Plaintiff then reached out to the appeals court and requested that the appeal be withdrawn as he was already receiving benefits.

99. On or around January 6, 2026, while the Plaintiff was homeless and had no ability to respond, the McGaw Medical Center of Northwestern University moved to dismiss Case #2024L004444 in Cook County, IL.

100. The Plaintiff reached out to the Dakota County Legal Aid for assistance in vacating the restraining order for Case No. 19WS-FA26-6 and for representation in Case#19WS-FA26-35, but despite leaving several messages receive no correspondence. Later correspondence from the Dakota County Legal Aid stated that the Plaintiff was denied for Legal Aid service, without any explanation. A judicial officer in case #19WS-FA26-35 would later inform the Plaintiff that he was indeed eligible to receive legal services from Dakota County Legal Aid. The Plaintiff would later file a Motion to Vacate the restraining order and a hearing was scheduled for 4.24.26 at 10am. However, this hearing as well as the entire case for 19WS-FA26-6 would be completely removed from the docket and from the MN Public Court record system.

101. On or around January 8, 2026, the Plaintiff filed for divorce (Case #19WS-FA26-35, Dakota County, MN).

102. Between January 12th and 14th, 2026, Def. Partner is served with Divorce Papers.

103. On or around January 13, 2026, Def. Partner communicates to the Plaintiff that she intended to "lift" the restraining order.

104. Def. Partner attempts to withdraw the restraining order and informs the Plaintiff that she is awaiting a call from the Dakota County Courthouse on January 14, 2026 regarding withdrawal of the restraining order.

105. Around this same time, Def. Partner communicates to the Plaintiff that she needed to communicate with Def. Smith on how to proceed with the restraining order.

106. On Jan 15 Def. Partner states via text message, "I was also advised to not have you stay at the house. It was my decision to put my comfort to the side for a few days so you can spend time with them [the kids]."

107. Between Jan 4 and Jan 23, the Plaintiff and Def. Smith have additional text correspondence.

108. Specifically, Defendant Pastor asked Plaintiff whether he knew who his wife was dating.

109. Defendant Pastor stated that if Defendant Partner was dating someone outside the church, he had “no jurisdiction.”

110. Defendant Pastor stated that if she was dating someone within the church, he would want to meet with them.

111. Defendant Pastor had previously refused to meet jointly with Plaintiff and Defendant Partner while they were married.

112. Defendant Partner falsely communicates to several mutual contacts that Plaintiff lived with a relative in Illinois, however, the Plaintiff had in fact remained homeless in MN, and communicated the same to Def. Partner.

113. On or around Jan 15, 2026, Def. Partner, recognizing that Plaintiff is homeless and without funds, agrees to provide the Plaintiff with cash and to help the Plaintiff secure a place of his own.

114. On Jan 15, 2026 Def. Partner then sends Plaintiff a number of Facebook housing listings via text message.

115. The Plaintiff informs Def. Partner that he deactivated his account in November of 2025 and that he no longer had access to Facebook.

116. Def. Partner explained to the Plaintiff that there was “no such thing” as inability to access a deactivated Facebook. Because of this correspondence, the Plaintiff logged on and regained access to his Facebook account around that time.

117. On or around this time, the Plaintiff regained access to his Facebook account to examine the Facebook listings that Def. Partner had sent him, and he noticed that his Facebook profile had been significantly altered. Specifically,

(a) all posts that highlighted the relationship between the Plaintiff and Def. Partner had been removed, including:

(i) Plaintiff and Defendant’s wedding anniversary photos from June 30, 2025 that occurred in Minnesota.

(ii) A poem that Plaintiff had written for Def. Partner in or around June 30, 2025.

(iii) Posts of Plaintiff and Defendant Partner jointly performing advocacy for www.Dad-Beats.com

(iv) Posts of Plaintiff and Defendant Partner jointly performing advocacy for www.EqualRight2Dream.com, including advocacy performed at a local musical/fair in the Twin Cities area.

(v) Photos of Plaintiff and Defendant partner enjoying themselves at the Minnesota State Fair in August of 2025.

(vi) Video footage of Plaintiff and Def. Partner at an Open Mic event in St. Paul, MN where the Plaintiff is reading a poem from www.EqualRight2Dream.com entitled the “Waltz of Power”.

(b) DM messages pertinent to Plaintiff and Defendant Partner’s actual relationship, including:

- (i) correspondence between sibling of Def. Partner and Plaintiff where he states “I love the way you love and take care of my sister”
- (ii) routine correspondence between Plaintiff and Defendant Partner that accurately depicted their routine communication.

118. Additionally, the Plaintiff noticed that Def. Partner’s Facebook profile had also changed significantly.

- (a) The same mutual posts that accurately portrayed our relationship over the past 6 years had been removed.
- (b) Posts regarding indirect allegations of abuse and domestic violence had been occurring from around Nov of 2025 to January of 2026.
- (c) Posts of photos of our family had been deleted.
- (d) A post from around January 22 of 2026, where Defendant Partner falsely alleged on Facebook that Plaintiff committed domestic violence against her (See Exhibit).
- (e) A post from around the same time where Def. Partner posted a comment in support of Defendant Pastor stating “that’s my Pastor”.

119. Upon seeing the defamatory content on Def. Partner’s Facebook profile, the Plaintiff makes a post on his own wall stating the following:

“To my wife and my best friend, I love you with all of my heart and I have always loved you, and I always will – this will never change. You can never do any wrong in my eyes, because my eyes only see you for who you are. I see what others cannot. You will always have my support. I have never cared about what has happened, because Love covert a multitude. There is no path traveled too far where grace cannot restore. There is a light and an open door that will always remain open for you. Do not look at the outward appearance. I know what it looks like, but it’s not what it looks like. I will always try to protect you and my protection is this: Our Father, which art in heaven, protect my family from dangers seen and unseen in the Mighty Name of Jesus. Be offense around my wife and our children when I cannot see and cannot be there. Protect them Lord in the Name of Jesus. Not my will Lord, but thine will be done.”

120. To which, Def. Partner responded with a heart emoji and comments “1 Corinthians 13:4-7”.

121. On the same day, at around 1:28pm, Def. Partner restores a DM conversation from 6/30/25 the poem that I wrote for her, that is referenced in paragraph 107 above.

122. Def. Partner had the pin for Plaintiff’s FB account because she created the FB account for the Plaintiff.

123. Def. Partner had access to Plaintiff’s FB account, as he provided her with all passwords after discussing the threat from McGaw with the MN NAACP.

124. Def. Partner had access to Plaintiff’s FB account as he had never logged off of his personal computer which remained present in Def. Partner’s custody at the marital residence.

125. Between January 22 and the present, April of 2026, several mutual contacts attempt to reach out to me via Facebook Direct Message, but each and every message was deleted, though

notifications indicating their presence were still showing. Facebook notifications informed the Plaintiff that there were at least 6 devices that were logged in to the Plaintiff's Facebook profile during this time period. A subpoena to META, Inc seeking clarification of this was ignored.

126.. On or around January 24, 2026, Defendant Partner deactivated one or more Facebook accounts of which Defendant was aware.

127. On or around January 24, 2026, Defendant Partner deactivated his cell phone service from our family plan, effectively leaving Plaintiff with no means to communicate with marital children, housing needs, bills, or other needs.

128. On or around January 24, 2026, Defendant Partner cancelled Plaintiff's cloud storage, effectively deleting stored text message communications with the Plaintiff.

129. On or around January 24, 2026, Defendant Partner had correspondence with the West St. Paul Police.

130. Police Officer Todd records on his body camera (1/24/26 at 8:59:05) the following phone conversation between the "Officer Todd" and Def. Partner.

(a) During this phone call, Def. Partner sends Officer Todd screenshots of Plaintiff's private Facebook DM messages, where she is logged into Plaintiff's account and intercepts private messages between the Plaintiff and third parties.

(b) During this phone call, Def. Partner communicates to Officer Todd that she felt threatened and communicated that Plaintiff had been harassing and stalking and re-blocking her number, when in fact Def. Partner is the one that had initiated contact with him on Facebook and had been continuously corresponding with Plaintiff even after the phone call with Officer Todd. One of the text messages that was sent to the Officers as evidence of harassment stated in part as follows:

"I'm not sure of all that's going on right now, but despite all of it, just know that I still love you. Honestly, I probably always will love you. Thanks for giving me 3 beautiful children. I'm rooting for you and you'll always have me in your corner no matter what. You take care of yourself. Take care of our family. Until we meet again, keep God first place, keep on praying, continue to seek Him above all else, surround yourself with good genuine friends. You're a very intelligent woman that can do anything she puts her mind too. Thanks for the memories that we did share together – they were truly some of my best days. I appreciate all of who you are, even the parts I may not have understood. I wish you good success for yourself and for our kids.

(c) During this phone call, Def. Partner communicates to Officer Todd that "I do believe that last week he was sitting outside the house", when the Plaintiff had been nowhere near the marital residence since the enactment of the restraining order on Jan 5, 2026.

(d) During this phone call, Def. Partner falsely alleges that Plaintiff had been antagonizing and cursing her out, when the only phone calls had been FaceTime messages with the Plaintiff and the marital children, until Def. Partner deactivated his phone service, which effectively eliminated contact between the Plaintiff and his marital children.

(e) Officer Todd, then asks if at any point in time did you ask to cease communication with the Plaintiff, and Def. Partner falsely states “yes”.

Four days after this call on Jan 29, 2026, Def. Partner would reactivate the line stating “I turned it on so you can have access to the kids...You can call whenever. The call will be unsupervised. You can ft [facetime] them if you would like or you can do a regular call.”

Additionally, Def. Partner writes “Also, while I have you. Can you call the car note people and see if they can delay one payment and add it to the end of the loan? They can do this and will a couple times usually if asked. This would allow me to be able to catch up on everything. Please let me know if this is something you are willing to do.” - to which the Plaintiff responded “Of Course”. Def. Partner then responded “was gonna call today and try to pay something on it”

(f) Def. Partner states to Officer Todd that Plaintiff “sent me all the bills”, when Def. Partner had requested of the Plaintiff to be sent the bills pertinent to the marital household.

(g) Def. Partner falsely alleges to Officer Todd that the Plaintiff “tried to intimidate me to drop the order of protection” when Def. Partner communicated on her own volition that she planned to drop the order of protection:

On Jan 13th at 3:53pm, Def. Partner texts Plaintiff the following “Call me please re: lifting the OOP”

On Jan 14th, Def. Partner texts “The OOP will be lifted. I have to wait for a call confirming it was approved or if it will require a hearing. I should receive that call tomorrow. I didn’t get there early enough today...I hope this doesn’t affect you coming to see them. Maybe you can stay til Tuesday maybe Thursday, and we can make a plan?”

(h) Def. Partner falsely communicates to Officer Todd that Plaintiff had been harassing Def. Partner since being removed from the home. However, our communications were mostly centered on the marital children and marital finances.

(a) For example, on Jan 23 at 2:47pm, Def. Partner writes “Eden is pretending to talk to you on his phone. Do [you want] to talk to them?”

(b) For example, on Jan 15, Def. Partner writes that she would be able to give Plaintiff \$400 to help with homelessness stating “I promise I’ll help how I can”...“Would you rather me give you cash when you see the kids or walmart to Walmart? I could probably give 100 for now. Could do more next week. Don’t forget to text so we can do a ft [facetime] when you get back.”...”K. I’m doing hw. Text when you’re ready for the kids”

(i) Def. Partner falsely alleges to Officer Todd that Plaintiff “only activated his Facebook to harass me”, when Def. Partner had knowledge that the Plaintiff only activated his Facebook to be able to view the Facebook apartment posts that the Def. Partner had sent to the Plaintiff on January 15, 2026.

(j) Def. Partner falsely alleges to Officer Todd that the Plaintiff’s Facebook and been “deactivated for almost a year”, and that Plaintiff had blocked Def. Partner, deactivated and reactivated her account, when Def. Partner had knowledge that the Plaintiff had only deactivated his account once in Nov of 2025, and reactivated the account only once in January of 2026, and when the Plaintiff had never in fact blocked Def. Partner on Facebook

(k) Def. Partner communicated to Officer Todd that he had deactivated the Plaintiff’s phone on Jan 24, 2026 but could re-activate the call to facilitate charging him.

(l) Officer Todd, having knowledge of the deactivation, calls the deactivated line and states “If I can get him to admit to that [the aforementioned], I can submit it for charging”

131. Sometime thereafter January 24, but before January 30, Def. Partner would later reactivate the phone service, but upon reactivation, the Plaintiff notices that stored text messages were deleted.

132. Specifically, the following conversations were deleted:

- (a) conversations between the Plaintiff and members of Christ Temple Apostolic Church
- (b) conversations between the Plaintiff and Def. Smith
- (c) conversations between the Plaintiff and West St. Paul Police
- (d) text message evidence in ongoing federal litigation
- (e) all text message communication between the Plaintiff and Def. Partner from the past 6 years of their relationship, including:
 - i. routine day to day communication that showed the true dynamic of our relationship
 - ii. text message correspondence between Def. Partner and Plaintiff where Def. Partner apologizes for striking the Plaintiff in December of 2025.

133. On January 29, 2026, Def. Partner reactivates the Plaintiff’s phone service.

134. On the same date, Def Partner informs the Plaintiff that he could retrieve belongings from the marital home and requests that “an officer come with you to pick up your things so there are no issues. Thank you. Ttyl”. The Plaintiff had previously explained to Def. Partner via text message that “I don’t want to go to jail. I’m homeless.” To which Def Partner responded, “Send you to jail “Why? What??.”

135. On the same date, the Plaintiff requested emergency relief and modification of restraining order in (Case #19WS-FA26-35, Dakota County, MN).

136. On January 30, 2026, the Plaintiff sent a demand letter to Def. Smith and CTAC requesting amicable resolution of the defamatory allegations regarding domestic violence with a response deadline of Feb 6, 2026.

137. On January 31, 2026, Def. Partner acknowledges via text message that she deleted the Plaintiff’s messages as well as a shared iCloud family storage.

138. Thereafter on the same date, Def. Partner then deactivates the Plaintiff’s phone for a final time on January 31, 2026 and **since this time the Plaintiff has had no e-mail, text or Facebook contact with the Def. Partner** – save for correspondence in legal proceedings. **However, sometime after March 16, 2026, the Plaintiff would notice two additional warrants against him for an alleged violation of the restraining order.**

139. On Feb 4, 2026 the Plaintiff mailed correspondence via UPS regarding an update to his Safe-At-Home address pursuant to correspondence from the Safe-at-Home program on or around 1/22/2026. Though mailed locally via UPS with an expected delivery of two days on Feb 6, 2026, was re-routed by UPS to USPS and given the following Tracking # 9405550899562027838863,

which showed that this package was not delivered to the Safe-At-Home program until 2/9/26 at 9:14am.

140. On the evening of Feb 4, 2026, the Plaintiff phones the West St. Paul Police and speaks to an Officer Isabelle Lalor regarding a civil assist to retrieve personal belongings at the marital home.

141. Officer Lalor informs the Plaintiff to wait before arriving. The Plaintiff concedes to this and arrives at the marital home. Upon arrival, Officer Lalor states that the Plaintiff is under arrest for domestic abuse.

142. Officer Lalor asks the Plaintiff if he remembers her.

143. Office Lalor then confiscates his belongings.

144. I explain to Officer Lalor that there is modification of the restraining order pending in the divorce Case (Case #19WS-FA26-35).

145. The Def. Partner is present at the marital home with our eldest daughter watching the arrest at the front door.

146. The Plaintiff is then transferred to a separate vehicle and transported to Hastings County Jail.

147. The West St. Paul Police then reaches out to my emergency contact regarding CashApp payment for Bail, and communicated false terms of release to the Emergency Contact.

148. The West St. Paul Police then collected CashApp payments allegedly for Bail without judicial order.

149. Upon information and Belief, the West St. Paul Police then communicated false terms of release to Def. Partner.

150. Def. Partner then communicated that Plaintiff was arrested as well as false terms of release to several mutual contacts.

151. While incarcerated, and during a hearing for the alleged violation of the restraining order the presiding judge escalates the charges to a DANCO and sets a hearing for **April 29, 2026.**

152. The Plaintiff is released from custody the following day on Feb 5, 2026 with an Order that allows entry into marital residence with police assistance.

153. On the same date, the Dakota County Jail called to verify if the Plaintiff was still active with the Safe-At-Home Program. The Dakota County Jail reached out to the communicated to the Safe-At-Home Program without court authorization that the Plaintiff was released from custody.

154. Per MGMA response received by the Safe-At-Home program, after correspondence between the Dakota County Jail and the Safe-At-Home program, the Safe-At-Home program then calls the Plaintiff at the number that was deactivated by Def. Partner. The Safe-At-Home program then

calls Def. Partner and Def. Partner allegedly purports to be a “Group Home” where Plaintiff “no longer resides”.

155. Because of the aforementioned, the Plaintiff is terminated from the Safe-at-Home program which provided protections from the McGaw medical center of Northwestern University during ongoing litigation.

156. On Feb 6, 2026, because Plaintiff had not received correspondence from Def. Smith or Christ Temple Apostolic Church, the Plaintiff filed Case # 2CV261141 in Anoka County, MN.

157. Prior to incarceration there was no decision on the Plaintiff's emergency relief and modification of restraining order for Case #19WS-FA26-35, Dakota County, MN. However, upon checking the docket upon being released, the Plaintiff noticed that the docket now showed an Order with a partial response that mischaracterized the Plaintiff's request as an attempt to divest Def. Partner of a vehicle that was the exclusive property of the Plaintiff and did not address any of the other aspects of the emergency relief.

158. On or around 2/9/26, the Plaintiff's vehicle was repossessed while in possession by Def. Partner. The Def. Partner communicates to several third parties and mutual contacts that the Plaintiff had the vehicle towed. The Def. Partner had previously communicated to the Plaintiff on Jan 15, 2026, that she would resume payments of the vehicle and even uses cash to make alterations to the Plaintiff's vehicle on around the same date.

159. On or around 2/16/26, Def. Partner purchases a new vehicle.

160. On or around 2/17/26, the Plaintiff requests subpoenas in Anoka County Case#02-CV-26-1141, but the subpoenas are delayed for almost two weeks and never processed.

161. The Plaintiff communicates his concern to the Anoka County Clerk responsible for processing the subpoenas and she informs me that the Judge is aware of the subpoena requests. The Plaintiff then requests to speak with her Supervisor. The Supervisor asks the Plaintiff who the subpoenas would be addressed to, but the Plaintiff states that this is confidential.

162. ON or around 2.25.26, the Plaintiff files a Motion for Preservation of Evidence, Forensic Inspection, and Sanctions for Spoliation of Evidence.

163. On 2/26/26, the Plaintiff files an Emergency Motion for Ex Parte Subpoenas under Seal, to protect the identity of requested subpoena. Though filed under seal, the court makes this subpoena request publicly available in the docket, so that any one could see the intended subpoena recipients.

164. The Plaintiff immediately calls the Anoka County Clerk responsible for processing the subpoenas and also communicate this to the supervisor of the Office of the Clerk, who then seals the document.

165. The Subpoena was to Defendant phone carriers, Apple/iCloud, Meta, and Law enforcement.

166. Around this time, Apple reaches out and responds that they would not be honoring a preservation of evidence request.

167. The following day, Defendant Partner independently files an answer signed on Feb 27, 2026 into the Case, but this answer is not reflected in the docket.

168. Because the Anoka County Court had never processed and mailed the subpoenas and because the Emergency Motion for Ex Parte Subpoenas remained unaddressed, on or around March 2, 2026, the Plaintiff obtained subpoenas directly from the Office of the Clerk in Anoka. The Plaintiff tendered those subpoenas to the intended recipients and approximately 3 days later, on around March 5, 2026, the presiding judicial officer dismisses the complaint on a technical error while the subpoenas and emergency relief was still at play. Of note, on Feb 12, 2026, the judicial officer had initially screened the complaint as non-frivolous. At the time of dismissal on March 5, 2026 only the Def. Partner had filed an answer that was not filed into the case.

169. One day later on 3.6.26, a revised Defendant Answer, that upon information and belief was submitted on her behalf by a legal representative referenced the McGaw Medical Center of Northwestern. Specifically, Def Partner stated:

(a) "I, the defendant would like to add that Defendant [REDACTED] is employed as a [REDACTED] and Plaintiff, Dr. Marcus D Rushing is a physician and is unemployed due to several frivolous litigations plaintiff has filed against McGaw Medical Center of Northwestern College in Illinois, HealthPartners in Minnesota, and Wood Health in Ohio. The defendant would like to make the court aware that these allegations and retaliative litigations are habitual to the plaintiff, Doctor Marcus Rushing. Please also review Marcus Rushing vs [REDACTED] Divorce proceedings to further prove the plaintiff's patterns of abuse and malicious use of the court system. Dr. Rushing is known to avoid accepting any decent employment"

Additionally, Def. Partner's answer stated that:

(b) "Defendant [REDACTED] and Jeffery had no direct contact before this litigation."

(c) "Defendant [REDACTED] would like to make it known to court that the plaintiff is currently on 24hr monitoring due to an arrest for a warrant for repetitive OOP violations.

(i) Of note, at no point in time has the Defendant ever been placed on 24 hr monitoring.

(d) "Plaintiff is enrolled in Minnesota's Safe at Home Program, but Defendant does not have enough information to confirm the validity of the need for the protection.

(e) "Defendant has never filed an OOP on anyone in the past"

(i) Of note, filed into the case were two restraining orders that were filed by Def. Partner against a Past Partner who is currently incarcerated, and that were subsequently dismissed.

(f) And finally, the Defendant's answer requested that "litigation...be transferred to Dakota county".

170. The Plaintiff filed an Amended complaint on March 6, 2026 and a motion to vacate the March 5, 2026 dismissal. On March 9, 2026, the judicial officer cited the same technical error, that had already been addressed without providing any recommendation to cure the amended

complaint. To avoid a dismissal with prejudice, the Plaintiff appealed the matter to the district court.

171. Dakota County Case #19WS-FA26-35, though filed on Jan 8, 2026, scheduled an ICMC hearing for March 2, 2026 – extending resolution of parenting matters and retrieval of personal belongings by **some 53 days**. This case was stricken the preceding workday however, when the judicial officer commented that Plaintiff had failed to serve Def. Partner. Plaintiff had in fact served Partner, but Dakota County Sheriff had failed to tender Affidavit of Service to Plaintiff. However, on March 2, 2026 that same judicial officer had ex parte communication with the Def. Partner at the ICMC conference that was determined to be stricken. At that conference the judicial officer allows Def. Partner to submit an unsigned Answer to the court. Def. Partner would later communicate to a different judicial officer during a March 16, ICMC hearing that the Plaintiff had failed to appear at the March 2, 2026 meeting.

172. On or around March 2, 2026, the Plaintiff appeared at the marital residence accompanied by Law Enforcement pursuant to a Feb 5, 2026 Court Order from Dakota County Case – 19WS-CR-26-969. Defendant Partner again refused entry despite the Order. The West St. Paul Police documented the incident under Incident Report No. 260302-0004609. On or around March 3, 2026, the Plaintiff would file a Motion for Emergency Hearing on Contempt and Immediate Enforcement of Property Retrieval Order in Dakota County Case No 19WS-CR-26-969. This Motion was not granted a hearing date. Of note, during a prior attempt to retrieve property coordinated through the Dakota County Sheriff's Office, the Sheriff relayed that Def. Partner stated that “the items you are asking for are no longer at the house.”

173. On the March 16, ICMC conference, the Judicial Officer hosts the Plaintiff and the Def. Partner last, when no other parties were present. Of note, this is the same pattern that occurred during Case 2019D8356, when the McGaw Medical Center of Northwestern University began to interfere in the aforementioned case. This pattern was also observed in Case 2024L004444, in Cook County, IL. At each of the ICMC conferences prior to our meeting, the judicial officer allowed the parties to select mediation and the ICMC was not used to grant orders, save for scheduling orders. During the ICMC, the Judicial Officer and the Def. Partner began correspondence that took up the most of the ICMC conference – and the subject was infidelity, allegations regarding the previous case 2019D8356 in Cook County IL, and more allegations of restraining order violations. When the Plaintiff was finally granted permission to speak, he verbally petitioned the court for the following agenda items for consideration at the ICMC conference:

- (a) Maintain appropriate communication with three minor children who are too young to independently facilitate contact, as Def. Partner had been communicating the allegations of domestic violence to the minor marital children as well as to the children's Daycare.
- (b) Establish a practical parenting plan protecting safety and privacy while preserving parental rights.
- (c) Determine interim parenting arrangements considering my temporary housing and safety concerns.
- (d) Clarify household composition for safety and parenting logistics.
- (e) Authorize retrieval of essential personal belongings (mail, documents, clothing, electronics, tax records, educational materials, business equipment).
- (f) Ensure preservation of documents and evidence related to ongoing legal matters.

- (g) Clarify disputed property ownership for accurate accounting, including a vehicle with contested registration.
- (h) Protect children from exposure to adult legal allegations during proceedings.
- (i) Pursue alternative dispute resolution options such as facilitated discussions, mediation, or early neutral evaluation.

174. The Judicial Officer's Order rendered thereafter, did not include a single item that the Plaintiff had petitioned the court and only included the items that Def. Partner had petitioned the court.

175. The Plaintiff filed a Combined Motion for Leave and to Reconsider the Order, but this was never addressed.

176. Between March 17 and the present, the Plaintiff requested several subpoenas in Dakota County Case #19WS-FA26-35. The subpoenas were purported to be mailed but never received. Subpoenas that were rendered and served were never responded to.

177. Specifically, the subpoenas were sent to Def. Partner's employer and CashApp to verify income in the context of a divorce and receiving state benefits – but the subpoena responses, though properly served were never rendered to the Plaintiff.

178. Of note, a subpoena to Def. Partner's phone carrier, that requested phone and text records highlighting the false allegations of domestic abuse, between Def. Partner and Def. Pastor, Def. Partner and members of Def. Church, between Def. Partner and employees of Dakota County, as well as correspondence between Def. Partner and Officer Lalor, were instead provided directly to the Dakota County Court, and not to the Plaintiff that requested this info. Upon information and belief, the Defendants coordinated the misdirection of the subpoena response to conceal evidence of misconduct.

179. Additionally, during this same time period, the Plaintiff requested MGMA data from. Upon information and belief, the Defendants reached out to subpoena recipients. An MGMA request sent via mail to the Safe-At-Home program is never delivered and withheld for almost a month. However, an e-mailed MGMA request is rendered and responses provided in this time period.

180. Def. Partner as well as Plaintiff had been receiving benefits in Washington County, MN. However, Def. Partner represented to the court that she was enrolled to receive benefits in Dakota County, MN. An MGMA request rendered during this time did not confirm enrollment in Dakota County, MN. However, the same MGMA request did confirm that unbeknownst to Plaintiff, that his Medical Care had been transferred from Washington County, MN to Dakota County, MN on or around Feb 12, 2026 without his knowledge or consent. The Plaintiff received no response when requesting why the care was transferred.

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

A. Protected Activity and Initial Retaliation

181. Plaintiff engaged in protected federal litigation activity against McGaw Medical Center of Northwestern University, UnityPoint, HealthPartners and Wood Health/Wood County Hospital.

182. Following this activity, the aforementioned Defendants became aware of Plaintiff's relocation to Minnesota.

183. Shortly thereafter, interference began with Plaintiff's medical licensure and employment opportunities.

B. Expansion Into Personal and Religious Context

184. Plaintiff sought assistance from Christ Temple Apostolic Church and Defendant Smith.

185. Defendant Smith obtained information regarding Plaintiff's litigation and subsequently failed to provide assistance.

186. Defendant Smith introduced Plaintiff to third parties who responded in a dismissive and hostile manner.

187. Defendant Smith later engaged in conduct favoring Defendant Partner and excluding Plaintiff.

C. Defamation and False Allegations

188. Defendant Partner began making false allegations of domestic violence to:

- Church members
- Social media
- Law enforcement
- Mutual contacts

189. Defendant Partner communicated false narratives of domestic violence to Dakota County employees, and Law Enforcement encouraging them to take adverse actions against Plaintiff.

190. These statements were false and made with knowledge of their falsity.

191. Defendant Smith and church members amplified these allegations within the congregation.

D. Interference With Parental Rights

192. Church members, acting at the direction or encouragement of Defendant Smith and Defendant Partner, physically removed Plaintiff's children without court order.

193. This occurred in a public setting and caused humiliation and distress.

E. Interference With Safe-at-Home Protections

194. During Plaintiff's wrongful arrest and detention, Defendants and Spouse interfered with his Safe-at-Home protections, access to evidence, and communications:

195. Safe-at-Home calls were misdirected to spouse's number, which Spouse falsely represented as a group home, obstructing program communications.

196. Spouse's actions materially contributed to spoliation of evidence and interference with Plaintiff's federal claims, state law claims, and ongoing divorce proceedings.

197. The Dakota County Jail called Safe-at-Home contacts to verify Plaintiff's disenrollment after his arrest, despite no judicial order authorizing such disclosure.

F. Law Enforcement Involvement

198. Defendant Partner made false reports to law enforcement.

199. Officers acted on these reports, resulting in:

- Arrest of Plaintiff
- Seizure of property
- Continued legal proceedings

200. Officers ignored exculpatory evidence and relied on false statements.

G. Evidence Destruction and Account Access

201. Defendant Partner accessed Plaintiff's accounts and communications.

202. Defendant Partner:

- Deleted text messages
- Deactivated phone service
- Altered social media accounts
- Intercepted communications

203. This conduct resulted in loss of evidence relevant to ongoing litigation.

H. Government Interference and Administrative Failures

204. County actors:

- Failed to process appeals
- Interfered with benefits
- Mishandled subpoenas
- Disclosed protected information

205. Safe-at-Home protections were compromised through unauthorized disclosures and misrepresentations.

I. Interference With Litigation

206. McGaw and associated actors interfered with Plaintiff's ongoing litigation by:

- Filing actions affecting related proceedings
- Influencing outcomes through indirect coordination
- Exploiting Plaintiff's homelessness and lack of access to evidence

207. This interference extended into Minnesota proceedings and Plaintiff's family law matters.

J. Retaliatory and Administrative Failures

208. Dakota County failed to honor lawful subpoenas and requests for documents, including those submitted by MGMA, delaying or denying Plaintiff's ability to collect evidence for ongoing federal litigation.

209. Spouse's interference and Dakota County's administrative failures together created a material risk of spoliation, obstruction of justice, and deprivation of Plaintiff's legal rights.

210. Plaintiff applied for employment and workforce positions with **Dakota County**, for which he was qualified.

211. Following his homelessness caused by wrongful arrest, Safe-at-Home disenrollment, and related abuses, **Dakota County** denied Plaintiff's employment applications, withdrew consideration, and moved to cancel his workforce applications without lawful justification.

212. The timing of these actions directly correlates to the retaliatory interference and administrative failures following Plaintiff's federal litigation activity, constituting **adverse employment actions** and denial of equal opportunity.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS ESTABLISHING PLAUSIBLE CONSPIRACY AND JOINT ACTION

A. Governing Standard

213. Plaintiff alleges that the conduct described herein reflects coordinated action among private and state actors sufficient to state plausible claims under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1985.

214. At the pleading stage, Plaintiff is not required to prove an express agreement but must allege facts permitting a reasonable inference of concerted action, parallel conduct, and shared objectives.

B. Parallel Conduct Across Actors

215. Following Plaintiff's protected federal litigation activity, multiple actors—including private individuals, institutional actors, and state actors—engaged in temporally aligned conduct affecting:

- Plaintiff's access to courts and legal process;
- Plaintiff's employment and housing opportunities;
- Plaintiff's parental and custodial rights; and
- Plaintiff's access to evidence relevant to ongoing litigation.

216. The timing, similarity, and escalation of these actions support a plausible inference that the conduct was not isolated or independent.

C. Interlocking Acts Across Private and State Actors

217. Plaintiff alleges that:

- Private actors disseminated allegations of criminal or abusive conduct to third parties, including law enforcement and community institutions;
- State actors relied upon or acted in response to those allegations in initiating enforcement actions;
- Institutional actors facilitated or amplified reputational harm impacting employment and housing determinations; and
- Administrative actors interfered with subpoenas, benefits, and evidentiary preservation.

218. These actions, taken together, demonstrate interlocking conduct that plausibly supports joint action under §1983 and conspiracy under §1985.

D. Shared Objective Inference

219. The coordinated effect of Defendants' conduct was to:

- impair Plaintiff's ability to pursue pending litigation;
- restrict Plaintiff's custody and parental access;
- destabilize Plaintiff's housing and employment; and

- interfere with Plaintiff's access to legal process and evidence.

220. These outcomes support a reasonable inference of shared objectives among Defendants, regardless of formal agreement.

E. Role of Non-Party Actors (Context Only)

221. Plaintiff references McGaw Medical Center of Northwestern University solely as a non-party background actor relevant to:

- Plaintiff's initial protected litigation activity; and
- the broader context of alleged retaliatory motive.

222. Plaintiff does not assert direct claims against McGaw in this action, but alleges that its prior litigation relationship provides context for the retaliatory environment in which the named Defendants acted.

F. Conclusion of Conspiracy Allegations

223. Taken as a whole, the allegations plausibly support:

- concerted action among Defendants;
 - deprivation of constitutional rights under color of state law; and
 - interference with judicial proceedings under §1985.
-

V. CAUSES OF ACTIONS

A. Federal Claims

COUNT I – FIRST AMENDMENT RETALIATION (42 U.S.C. §1983)

(Against All Defendants)

224. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

Protected Activity

225. Plaintiff engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment, including:

- (a) filing and prosecuting federal litigation against institutional defendants, including McGaw Medical Center of Northwestern University, U.S. Bank, HealthPartners, Unity Point, and WoodHealth/Wood County Hospital
- (b) communicating about matters of public concern, including alleged misconduct in healthcare and legal systems; and
- (c) publishing content and advocacy through online platforms and social media.

Adverse Actions

226. Defendants, acting under color of state law, subjected Plaintiff to adverse actions that would deter a person of ordinary firmness from continuing to engage in protected activity, including:

- (a) arresting Plaintiff and initiating criminal enforcement actions based on knowingly false or misleading allegations;
- (b) restricting Plaintiff's access to his children through misuse of legal processes and coordinated actions;
- (c) interfering with Plaintiff's employment opportunities and workforce applications;
- (d) interfering with Plaintiff's access to public benefits and housing assistance;
- (e) obstructing Plaintiff's access to evidence and communications necessary for ongoing litigation; and
- (f) disseminating false allegations that damaged Plaintiff's credibility in legal and professional contexts.

Causal Connection

227. The adverse actions were motivated, at least in part, by Plaintiff's protected activity.

228. The retaliatory motive is evidenced by:

- (a) the temporal proximity between Plaintiff's litigation activity and the onset of adverse actions;
- (b) Defendants' knowledge of Plaintiff's litigation and advocacy efforts;
- (c) references to Plaintiff's litigation in statements made by Defendants; and
- (d) a pattern of escalating actions following Plaintiff's continued pursuit of legal claims.

State Action and Joint Participation

229. Defendants Officer Lalor, Officer Todd, and the municipal Defendants acted under color of state law at all relevant times.

230. Private Defendants, including Jessica Rushing, Pastor Jeffery Smith, and Christ Temple Apostolic Church, acted under color of state law by willfully participating in joint activity with state actors.

231. This joint activity included:

- (a) providing information to law enforcement that was knowingly false or misleading, with the expectation that it would be relied upon to take official action;
- (b) coordinating communications and actions that led to Plaintiff's arrest and continued legal restrictions;
- (c) engaging in ongoing interactions with law enforcement to sustain adverse actions against Plaintiff; and
- (d) participating in a shared course of conduct in which state actors relied on private actors' statements without independent verification.

232. The relationship between private and state actors went beyond mere reporting and constituted joint participation in the challenged conduct.

Conspiracy to Retaliate

233. Defendants reached an agreement to retaliate against Plaintiff for his protected activity.

234. The existence of this agreement is supported by:

- (a) coordinated and repeated reliance on the same false allegations across multiple actors;
- (b) sequential and reinforcing actions by private and state actors;
- (c) continued adverse actions despite the availability of exculpatory evidence; and
- (d) the use of legal processes in a manner that advanced shared objectives.

235. In furtherance of the conspiracy, Defendants committed overt acts, including those described in paragraphs 70 and 75.

Chilling Effect and Harm

236. Defendants' actions would chill a person of ordinary firmness from continuing to engage in protected activity.

237. As a direct and proximate result, Plaintiff suffered:

- (a) deprivation of liberty;
- (b) interference with familial relationships;
- (c) economic harm;
- (d) reputational damage; and
- (e) emotional distress.

Municipal Liability (Monell)

238. Defendant municipalities are liable because the constitutional violations were caused by:

- (a) policies or customs permitting reliance on unverified allegations in initiating enforcement actions;
- (b) failure to train officers in evaluating credibility and exculpatory evidence; and
- (c) practices that allowed retaliatory enforcement actions to occur.

COUNT II – DENIAL OF ACCESS TO COURTS (42 U.S.C. §1983)

(Against All Defendants)

239. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

Protected Right of Access

240. Plaintiff has a constitutional right of meaningful access to the courts under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

241. This right includes the ability to pursue nonfrivolous legal claims, to access evidence, and to participate meaningfully in judicial proceedings.

Underlying Nonfrivolous Claims

242. Plaintiff was actively pursuing nonfrivolous legal claims, including:

- (a) federal litigation against institutional defendants, including McGaw Medical Center of Northwestern University;
- (b) state and federal claims related to employment, civil rights, and contractual relationships; and
- (c) family law proceedings involving custody, parenting time, and property rights in Minnesota.

243. These claims had arguable legal and factual merit and were actively pending or being prepared at the time of Defendants' conduct.

Obstructive Conduct

244. Defendants, acting under color of state law and/or in joint participation with state actors, engaged in conduct that obstructed Plaintiff's access to the courts, including:

(a) **Destruction and deletion of evidence:**

Defendant Jessica Rushing deleted text messages, cloud-stored data, and communications spanning multiple years, including materials relevant to Plaintiff's legal claims;

(b) **Interference with communications:**

Defendant Jessica Rushing deactivated Plaintiff's phone service, preventing communication with counsel, courts, and third parties;

(c) **Unauthorized access and interception:**

Defendants accessed and interfered with Plaintiff's electronic accounts and communications, including social media and messaging platforms;

(d) **Interference with subpoenas and evidence collection:**

County Defendants failed to process, delayed, or misdirected subpoenas and document requests, including directing subpoena responses away from Plaintiff;

(e) **Compromise of Safe-at-Home protections:**

Government Defendants disclosed or misdirected protected information, resulting in Plaintiff's removal from the Safe-at-Home program and exposure of protected contact channels;

(f) **Wrongful arrest and resulting incapacity:**

Law enforcement Defendants arrested Plaintiff at a time when he was actively attempting to comply with legal process and retrieve essential materials, resulting in loss of access to documents and inability to participate in ongoing proceedings;

(g) **Denial and obstruction of benefits and resources:**

County Defendants interfered with Plaintiff's access to benefits, housing, and workforce assistance, impairing his ability to sustain litigation;

(h) **Coordination with private actors:**

Private Defendants acted in concert with state actors to create conditions that prevented Plaintiff from effectively pursuing his claims.

State Action and Joint Participation

245. Defendants Officer Lalor, Officer Todd, and municipal entities acted under color of state law.

246. Private Defendants acted under color of state law by willfully participating in joint activity with state actors, including coordinated conduct that resulted in the deprivation of Plaintiff's legal rights.

Actual Injury

247. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff suffered actual injury, including:

- (a) loss and destruction of critical evidence necessary to support his claims;
- (b) inability to timely respond to motions and court actions in ongoing litigation;
- (c) dismissal or adverse impact on claims due to lack of access to evidence and resources;
- (d) inability to effectively prosecute family law matters involving custody and property; and
- (e) substantial delay and prejudice in multiple legal proceedings.

248. Defendants' actions rendered Plaintiff's access to the courts ineffective and meaningless.

Causation

249. Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff's inability to pursue his legal claims and resulted in concrete and particularized harm.

Specific Injury to Underlying Proceedings

250. Defendants' obstructive acts caused concrete injury to specific legal proceedings, including:

(A) Federal Litigation Against McGaw and Related Defendants

251. Plaintiff was actively engaged in federal litigation involving claims against institutional defendants, including McGaw Medical Center of Northwestern University.

252. Defendants' conduct caused the following harm to those proceedings:

(a) Deletion of Communications and Digital Evidence:

Defendant ██████████ deleted text messages, cloud-stored communications, and electronic data containing evidence relevant to Plaintiff's claims, impairing Plaintiff's ability to present factual support and respond to dispositive motions;

(b) Deactivation of Phone and Communication Channels:

Plaintiff's phone service was terminated during critical periods, preventing timely communication with courts, opposing parties, and potential counsel;

(c) Wrongful Arrest and Homelessness:

Plaintiff's arrest and resulting homelessness deprived him of access to physical evidence, including hard drives, court correspondence, and litigation materials necessary to prosecute his claims;

(d) Interference During Critical Motion Periods:

Defendants' actions coincided with and contributed to Plaintiff's inability to respond to filings, including dispositive motions filed during periods of incapacity;

(e) Subpoena Interference:

Delays, failures to process, and misdirection of subpoenas prevented Plaintiff from obtaining third-party evidence necessary to support his claims.

(B) Minnesota Family Court Proceedings (Custody, Divorce, and Protective Orders)

253. Plaintiff was engaged in family court proceedings involving custody, parenting time, and property rights.

254. Defendants' conduct caused the following harm:

(a) False Allegations Affecting Judicial Decision-Making:

Defamatory statements of domestic abuse were relied upon in proceedings affecting custody and protective orders, impairing Plaintiff's ability to obtain fair consideration;

(b) Destruction of Exculpatory Evidence:

Deletion of communications and records prevented Plaintiff from presenting evidence rebutting allegations of abuse;

(c) Interference with Court-Ordered Property Retrieval:

Despite court authorization, Defendants obstructed Plaintiff's ability to retrieve personal property and legal materials necessary for participation in proceedings;

(d) Ex Parte and Procedural Irregularities:

Proceedings occurred in Plaintiff's absence or without meaningful participation due to Defendants' actions, including misrepresentations regarding service and Plaintiff's availability;

(e) Loss of Access to Children:

Actions taken by Defendants, including coordinated removal and reliance on false allegations, impaired Plaintiff's ability to assert custodial rights.

(C) State Court Civil Litigation (Anoka County Case)

Plaintiff initiated civil litigation in Minnesota seeking relief related to the conduct described herein.

255. Defendants' conduct caused the following harm:

(a) **Delay and Failure to Process Subpoenas:**

Court personnel failed to process subpoenas in a timely manner, preventing Plaintiff from obtaining evidence prior to dismissal;

(b) **Public Disclosure of Sealed Filings:**

A motion filed under seal was improperly made public, exposing Plaintiff's litigation strategy and intended subpoena targets;

(c) **Dismissal Without Access to Evidence:**

The case was dismissed while Plaintiff's subpoenas and emergency motions were pending, depriving Plaintiff of a meaningful opportunity to develop the record;

(d) **Interference with Evidence Preservation:**

Defendants' conduct contributed to the loss and unavailability of evidence central to Plaintiff's claims.

(D) Administrative and Benefits Proceedings

256. Plaintiff sought public assistance, workforce support, and housing assistance in Minnesota.

257. Defendants' conduct caused the following harm:

(a) **Interference with Appeals Process:**

Plaintiff's appeal regarding benefits was improperly handled, including attempts to cancel or redirect the appeal without proper process;

(b) **Denial and Delay of Benefits:**

Administrative actions delayed or denied benefits, impairing Plaintiff's ability to secure housing and maintain stability necessary to pursue litigation;

(c) **Transfer and Mismanagement of Benefits:**

Benefits were transferred or altered without Plaintiff's knowledge or consent, creating additional barriers;

(d) **Workforce Application Interference:**

Attempts to close or interfere with Plaintiff's workforce applications reduced his ability to obtain employment necessary to support ongoing legal action.

(E) Safe-at-Home Program Protections

258. Plaintiff was enrolled in Minnesota's Safe-at-Home program for protection during ongoing litigation.

259. Defendants' conduct caused the following harm:

(a) **Unauthorized Disclosure and Misdirection:**

Government actors disclosed or misdirected protected communications;

(b) **False Representation by Private Defendant:**

Defendant Jessica Rushing misrepresented Plaintiff's status, causing confusion in program administration;

(c) **Termination from Program:**

Plaintiff was removed from the program, exposing him to risk and eliminating protections critical to safely pursuing litigation.

Cumulative Effect

260. The cumulative effect of Defendants' actions was to systematically impair Plaintiff's ability to investigate, prepare, and present his claims across multiple forums.

261. As a result, Plaintiff's access to the courts was not merely delayed, but effectively obstructed.

Municipal Liability (Monell)

262. Defendant municipalities are liable because the violations were caused by:

- (a) policies or customs permitting interference with legal processes and subpoena handling;
- (b) failure to train employees regarding preservation of evidence and access to courts; and
- (c) practices that allowed disclosure of protected information and obstruction of legal rights.

Relief

263. Plaintiff seeks damages and equitable relief to remedy the denial of his constitutional right of access to the courts.

COUNT III– EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION

(42 U.S.C. §§ 1981, 1983, 2000d et seq. (Title VI), Fair Housing Act, Minn. Stat. § 363A)
Against County Defendants, Municipal Defendants, and Individual Actors Acting Under Color
of State Law

Incorporation of Facts

264. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

Protected Status and Activities

265. Plaintiff is a Black male and a physician engaged in protected civil rights activity, including:

- (a) participation in federal litigation against institutional defendants;
- (b) complaints regarding civil rights violations in employment and healthcare settings; and
- (c) invocation of legal protections in state and federal courts.

Adverse Employment Actions

266. Plaintiff applied for employment and workforce opportunities with Dakota County and related agencies for which he was qualified.

267. Defendants took adverse employment actions against Plaintiff, including:

- (a) denial of employment applications;
- (b) withdrawal or closure of workforce applications;
- (c) failure to process or deliberate obstruction of employment eligibility determinations; and
- (d) discouragement or exclusion from consideration following Plaintiff's protected litigation activity and housing instability.

Housing Discrimination and Deprivation of Equal Access

268. Plaintiff applied for housing assistance and related benefits in Dakota County and Washington County.

269. Defendants interfered with Plaintiff's housing access by:

- (a) denying or delaying housing assistance applications;
- (b) misdirecting or failing to process applications;
- (c) removing Plaintiff from eligibility determinations without due process; and
- (d) conditioning or impairing access to housing assistance on inaccurate or retaliatory information.

Retaliation for Protected Activity

270. Defendants' adverse actions were taken in retaliation for Plaintiff's:

- (a) initiation and prosecution of federal civil rights litigation;
- (b) complaints regarding institutional misconduct; and
- (c) invocation of legal protections in state court proceedings.

271. Defendants were aware of Plaintiff's protected activity and took adverse actions shortly thereafter, establishing causal connection.

Discriminatory Intent and Impact

272. Defendants' conduct was motivated by discriminatory animus and retaliatory intent, and had a disparate impact on Plaintiff as a Black male litigant experiencing housing insecurity and legal vulnerability.

274. Defendants treated Plaintiff less favorably than similarly situated individuals not engaged in protected activity and not subject to similar litigation history.

State Action

275. County and municipal Defendants acted under color of state law in administering employment and housing programs.

276. Private actors acted jointly with state actors or induced state action through coordinated conduct, thereby rendering their conduct actionable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Injury

277. As a direct result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff suffered:

- (a) loss of employment opportunities;
- (b) loss of housing stability;
- (c) increased homelessness;
- (d) disruption of access to legal proceedings; and
- (e) emotional distress and reputational harm.

Relief

278. Plaintiff seeks compensatory damages, punitive damages, declaratory relief, and injunctive relief prohibiting ongoing discrimination and retaliation.

**COUNT IV – 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2) – CONSPIRACY TO INTERFERE WITH
JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS**
(Against All Defendants)

Incorporation of Facts

279. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs.

Conspiracy

280. Defendants knowingly conspired to deter, obstruct, or intimidate Plaintiff in federal and state judicial proceedings.

Interference with Federal Proceedings

281. Defendants engaged in acts intended to:

- impair Plaintiff's ability to prosecute federal litigation against McGaw Medical Center of Northwestern University;
- obstruct access to evidence and witnesses;
- interfere with filing, discovery, and motion practice.

Overt Acts

282. Overt acts included:

- destruction and deletion of electronic evidence;
- interference with subpoenas and discovery requests;
- dissemination of false statements intended to influence legal proceedings;

- coordination with state actors to cause arrest and displacement of Plaintiff.

Injury

283. Plaintiff suffered actual injury including loss of evidence, dismissal prejudice, and impairment of litigation rights.

State Court / Witness Intimidation Component

284. Defendants further conspired to deter witnesses and parties in state court proceedings through intimidation, false allegations, and reputational harm.

Relief

285. Plaintiff seeks damages, equitable relief, and attorneys' fees under 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

**COUNT V – 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3) – CLASS-BASED CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE
EQUAL PROTECTION**
(Against All Defendants)

Incorporation of Facts

286. Plaintiff re-alleges all preceding paragraphs.

Conspiracy

287. Defendants conspired for the purpose of depriving Plaintiff of equal protection of the laws.

Class-Based Discriminatory Animus

288. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants acted with discriminatory and retaliatory animus against Plaintiff as:

- a Black male; and
- an individual engaged in protected civil rights litigation.

Overt Acts

289. Defendants committed overt acts including:

- false criminal allegations and reputational destruction;
- interference with employment and housing opportunities;
- manipulation of legal processes to deprive Plaintiff of custody and property rights;
- coordination with state actors to impose adverse legal consequences.

Injury

290. Plaintiff suffered deprivation of:

- equal access to judicial proceedings;
- equal access to housing and employment opportunities;
- parental and custodial rights; and
- constitutional protections under law.

Relief

291. Plaintiff seeks compensatory and punitive damages.

A. State Law Claims

292. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

Count I – Abuse of Process (Minnesota Common Law)

██████████, City of West. St. Paul)

293. Defendant caused legal process to be issued against Plaintiff, including:

- (a) an Order for Protection (“OOP”) obtained based on allegations of domestic abuse;
- (b) criminal enforcement actions and arrest procedures arising from alleged violations of the OOP; and
- (c) law enforcement–assisted exclusion of Plaintiff from the marital residence.

294. These processes are intended under Minnesota law to protect individuals from actual abuse and to ensure lawful enforcement of court orders.

Ulterior Purpose

295. Defendants ██████████ initiated and used these processes for improper collateral purposes unrelated to their lawful function, including:

- (a) concealment of an affair with Def. Smith
- (b) removing Plaintiff from the marital residence to obtain exclusive control of property and finances;
- (c) depriving Plaintiff of access to his minor children outside of lawful custody proceedings;
- (d) creating leverage in anticipated and pending family court litigation;
- (e) damaging Plaintiff’s professional reputation through allegations of domestic violence; and
- (f) interfering with Plaintiff’s ability to prosecute ongoing federal and state litigation.

296. Defendant’s actions were not undertaken to secure legitimate protection from abuse, but to achieve these collateral objectives.

Willful Acts in Improper Use of Process

297. After the issuance of process, Defendants committed willful acts not proper in the regular course of proceedings, including:

(a) **Knowingly false and continuing allegations:**

Defendant [REDACTED] continued to provide false statements to law enforcement, church members, and third parties after initiation of the OOP, despite knowledge that no domestic violence had occurred.

(b) **Manipulation of law enforcement action:**

Defendants provided misleading and incomplete information to Officers Lalor and Todd, including allegations contradicted by video evidence, to procure enforcement action and arrest.

(c) **Use of process to secure arrest and exclusion:**

On or about February 4, 2026, Plaintiff was arrested despite attempting to comply with law enforcement instructions and while seeking lawful retrieval of personal property, resulting in continued deprivation of liberty and property.

(d) **Interference with access to children and property:**

Defendants used the existence of the OOP and related enforcement actions to prevent Plaintiff from accessing his children and retrieving essential belongings, even where court orders permitted such access.

(e) **Continuation of process for coercive leverage:**

Defendant Jessica Rushing referenced legal restrictions and coordinated with others to maintain Plaintiff's exclusion from the home while simultaneously requesting financial assistance and communication from Plaintiff.

(f) **Use of process to influence third parties:**

Defendants communicated the existence of the OOP and related allegations to church members, law enforcement, and others to reinforce a narrative of abuse and isolate Plaintiff socially and economically.

Lack of Proper Purpose

298. The above acts demonstrate that Defendants used legal process not to achieve its intended protective function, but to coerce, harass, and gain advantage over Plaintiff in personal and legal matters.

Municipal Liability

299. Defendant City of West St. Paul is liable because the conduct of its officers was undertaken pursuant to:

- (a) policies or customs permitting reliance on uncorroborated allegations despite available exculpatory evidence;
- (b) failure to adequately train officers in evaluating credibility and evidence in domestic abuse allegations; and
- (c) tolerance of misuse of legal process resulting in wrongful arrest and deprivation of rights.

Damages

300. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' abuse of process, Plaintiff suffered:

- (a) wrongful arrest and deprivation of liberty;
- (b) loss of housing and personal property;
- (c) loss of access to his minor children;
- (d) reputational harm;
- (e) emotional distress; and
- (f) economic damages.

Causation

301. Defendants' improper use of legal process was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff's injuries, and such injuries were a foreseeable result of the misuse of process.


Count II – Defamation (Minnesota Common Law)

, Jeffery Smith, Christ Temple Apostolic Church)

302. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.


False Statements of Fact

303. Defendants made and/or republished false statements of fact concerning Plaintiff, including but not limited to allegations that Plaintiff:

- (a) committed acts of domestic violence against Defendant ;
- (b) engaged in abusive, threatening, or dangerous behavior toward his spouse and family; and
- (c) posed a danger warranting intervention by law enforcement or separation from his children.

304. These statements were statements of fact, not opinion, and were capable of being proven true or false.

Publication to Third Parties

304. Defendant  published these false statements to multiple third parties, including:

- (a) members of Christ Temple Apostolic Church;
- (b) mutual friends, family members, and acquaintances;
- (c) law enforcement officers; and
- (d) the general public via social media postings, including Facebook.

305. Defendant  further published written statements on social media in or around January 2026 accusing Plaintiff of domestic abuse.

306. Defendant Pastor Jeffery Smith and members of Christ Temple Apostolic Church republished and/or ratified these statements within the congregation, including:


- (a) repeating or endorsing allegations of abuse;

- (b) questioning Plaintiff in a manner that assumed the truth of the allegations; and
- (c) communicating to others that Plaintiff had engaged in wrongful or abusive conduct.

307. As a direct result, the statements were widely disseminated within Plaintiff's personal, religious, and professional communities.

Falsity

308. The statements described above were false.


309. Plaintiff did not commit acts of domestic violence against Defendant 

310. At least one law enforcement response resulted in no arrest after officers reviewed video evidence contradicting the allegations.

Fault

311. Defendant  made these statements with actual malice, in that she:

- (a) knew the statements were false; or
- (b) acted with reckless disregard for their truth or falsity.

312. Defendant  had direct knowledge of the underlying events and knowingly fabricated or distorted those events.

313. Defendant Pastor Jeffery Smith and Christ Temple Apostolic Church acted at least negligently, and in some instances with reckless disregard for the truth, by:

- (a) repeating or endorsing allegations without reasonable investigation;
- (b) relying solely on one-sided accusations; and
- (c) amplifying the statements in a manner that increased their reach and harm.

Defamation Per Se

314. The statements constitute defamation per se under Minnesota law because they falsely impute:

- (a) criminal conduct (domestic violence); and
- (b) conduct incompatible with Plaintiff's profession as a physician.

315. As a result, damages are presumed.

Privilege and Abuse of Privilege

316. To the extent any statements to law enforcement or other parties are alleged to be privileged, such privilege is defeated because:

- (a) the statements were made with actual malice;

- (b) the statements were knowingly false;
- (c) Defendants acted with reckless disregard for the truth; and
- (d) the statements were excessively published beyond any legitimate purpose, including to social, religious, and public audiences.

317. Defendants abused any conditional privilege by using such communications not to report legitimate concerns, but to further a campaign to harm Plaintiff's reputation and standing.

Relationship to Conspiracy

318. The publication and repetition of defamatory statements as described herein were undertaken in coordination with other Defendants as part of a broader pattern of conduct, as further alleged in Count II (Civil Conspiracy).

Actual Damages

319. In addition, Plaintiff suffered actual damages, including:
- (a) harm to his personal and professional reputation;
 - (b) loss of employment opportunities;
 - (c) social isolation and humiliation within his religious community;
 - (d) emotional distress; and
 - (e) damage to his standing in ongoing legal proceedings.

Causation

320. Defendants' false statements were a direct and proximate cause of Plaintiff's damages.

Vicarious Liability

321. Christ Temple Apostolic Church is liable for the acts of its agents, including Defendant Pastor Jeffery Smith, acting within the scope of their roles in communicating with and directing members of the congregation.

COUNT III – Civil Conspiracy (Minnesota Common Law) (Against All Defendants)

322. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

Agreement

323. Defendants reached an agreement, whether express or tacit, to engage in a course of conduct that included:
- (a) publishing and amplifying false allegations of domestic violence;

- (b) using those allegations to influence law enforcement and third parties; and
- (c) interfering with Plaintiff's personal, professional, and legal interests.

324. The existence of this agreement is evidenced by coordinated actions, including:

- (a) repeated and consistent false statements across multiple individuals and settings;
- (b) reliance by multiple Defendants on the same narrative despite contradictory evidence; and
- (c) timing and sequencing of actions that reinforced and escalated the allegations.

Overt Acts

325. In furtherance of the agreement, Defendants committed overt acts, including:

- (a) Defendant [REDACTED] making and disseminating false allegations;
- (b) Defendant Pastor Jeffery Smith and church members repeating and endorsing those allegations;
- (c) communications with law enforcement that resulted in adverse action against Plaintiff; and
- (d) continued reliance on the allegations to justify exclusion, arrest, and reputational harm.

Underlying Tort

326. The acts described constitute underlying torts, including defamation as alleged in Count I.

Intent

327. Defendants intended to accomplish unlawful objectives, including harming Plaintiff's reputation, isolating him from his community, and gaining advantage in personal and legal matters.

Damages

328. As a direct and proximate result of the conspiracy, Plaintiff suffered the damages described in Count I and elsewhere in this Complaint.

COUNT IV – MALICIOUS PROSECUTION (Minnesota Law and §1983 Analog)

(Against Defendant [REDACTED], City of West St. Paul, Officer Todd, John/Jane Does)

329. Defendants initiated or continued criminal proceedings against Plaintiff, including:

- Alleged domestic violence claims
- Alleged violations of an Order for Protection

330. These proceedings were initiated **without probable cause**, as:

- Plaintiff provided exculpatory video evidence
- Allegations were fabricated or knowingly false
- Defendants ignored contradictory evidence

331. Defendants acted with **malice**, including:

- Intent to harm Plaintiff's reputation
- Intent to gain advantage in custody and marital disputes
- Retaliatory motive tied to Plaintiff's protected activity

332. The proceedings terminated in Plaintiff's favor, including:

- No arrest at initial incident after police review
- Lack of substantiated domestic violence findings
- Dismissal or invalidation of allegations (to the extent established)

333. Alternatively, to the extent proceedings remain ongoing, Defendants' conduct supports a federal claim for **unlawful seizure pursuant to legal process** under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

334. The City of West St. Paul is liable for policies or customs that caused the prosecution without probable cause.

335. As a result, Plaintiff suffered:

- Deprivation of liberty
- Criminal charges and reputational harm
- Emotional distress
- Financial damages

COUNT V – INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS (IIED)

(Minnesota Common Law)

Against All Defendants

Incorporation of Facts

336. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

Extreme and Outrageous Conduct

337. Defendants engaged in extreme and outrageous conduct that went far beyond all possible bounds of decency, including:

- coordinated false allegations of domestic abuse and criminal conduct;
- separation of Plaintiff from minor children without lawful basis;
- destruction of personal and legal records;
- interference with housing, employment, and public benefits;
- misuse of law enforcement processes to effectuate removal and arrest; and
- dissemination of defamatory statements to employers, community members, and legal actors.

Intent or Recklessness

338. Defendants acted intentionally or with reckless disregard of the probability of causing severe emotional distress to Plaintiff.

Severe Emotional Distress

339. Plaintiff suffered severe emotional distress, including:

- psychological trauma from separation from minor children;
- distress resulting from homelessness and loss of financial stability;
- distress from reputational destruction and public allegations of abuse;
- ongoing emotional harm resulting from litigation interference and isolation.

Causation

340. Defendants' conduct was a direct and proximate cause of Plaintiff's emotional distress.

Damages

341. Plaintiff is entitled to compensatory and punitive damages.

COUNT VI – FALSE LIGHT / PUBLICITY PLACED IN FALSE LIGHT (MINNESOTA)

(Against Defendant ██████████ and Other Disseminating Defendants)

Incorporation of Facts

342. Plaintiff re-alleges all preceding paragraphs.

Publicity

343. Defendants publicly disseminated information concerning Plaintiff to third parties, including:

- social media postings;
- communications to law enforcement;
- communications to church members and community contacts;
- statements to employers and governmental actors.

False Light

344. These communications placed Plaintiff in a false light that would be highly offensive to a reasonable person, including:

- false allegations of domestic abuse;
 - implication of criminal or violent conduct;
 - misrepresentation of Plaintiff's conduct in family and custody matters.
-

Knowledge or Reckless Disregard

345. Defendants knew or acted with reckless disregard for the falsity of the statements.

Actual Harm

346. Plaintiff suffered reputational injury, loss of custody access, employment harm, and community ostracization.

Relief

347. Plaintiff seeks compensatory and punitive damages.

COUNT VII – TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE WITH PROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC ADVANTAGE

(Against All Defendants)

Incorporation of Facts

348. Plaintiff re-alleges all preceding paragraphs.

Valid Economic Expectancies

349. Plaintiff had valid prospective economic relationships, including:

- employment opportunities with Dakota County and related entities;
- housing assistance and rental opportunities;
- workforce development and professional employment prospects.

350. Defendants knew of Plaintiff's economic expectancies.

Intentional Interference

351. Defendants intentionally interfered by:

- disseminating false allegations affecting employment and housing decisions;
- interfering with administrative benefit systems;
- causing wrongful arrest and homelessness;
- obstructing access to communications necessary for employment and housing applications.

Causation

352. Defendants' conduct directly resulted in denial, delay, or termination of Plaintiff's economic opportunities.

Damages

353. Plaintiff suffered loss of income, housing instability, and diminished employment prospects.

VI. Damages

354. As a direct result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff suffered:

- Loss of employment and economic opportunities;
 - Loss of Safe-at-Home protections;
 - Interference with legal and federal claims;
 - Emotional distress, reputational harm, and financial losses.
-

VII. Prayer for Relief

Plaintiff requests:

1. Declaratory relief recognizing violations of federal and state rights;
2. Compensatory and punitive damages;
3. Injunctive relief to prevent further interference or spoliation;
4. Preservation of all evidence;
5. Attorney's fees and costs;
6. Any other relief deemed just and proper;
7. Trial by jury.

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all claims so triable

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Marcus Rushing

Marcus Rushing, Pro Se

Address: Confidential