

**AMY CONEY BARRETT SIDED  
WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT IN NEARLY  
NINE OUT OF EVERY TEN CASES**

**ACCOUNTABLE** 

# LAW ENFORCEMENT: Amy Coney Barrett Sided With Law Enforcement 86% Of The Time When Police Actions Were At Issue In the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit.

**Amy Coney Barrett Sided With Law Enforcement 86% Of The Time, When Cases Before Her Questioned Police Actions, Including In Multiple Officer-Involved Shootings.**

**Of 29 Law Enforcement-Centric Cases That Came Before Barrett's Court, She Sided With Police Interests 86 Percent Of The Time.**

*NOTE: Red in the chart below denotes a decision siding with police. Blue denotes siding with individuals. White is a neutral.*

DATE	CASE TITLE	CASE NO.	HOW DID BARRETT RULE?	BRIEF DESCRIPTION
3/8/18	<a href="#">Dwane Sanzone, representative of Keith R. Koster, deceased v. James Gray</a>	17-2103	Barrett voted to "reverse the district court's decision and remand with instructions to enter judgment" in favor of police.	Officer Gray fatally shot Keith R. Koster after "Koster threatened to fire a 'warning shot' and then pointed his gun at police officers gathered in the doorway of his apartment." Koster's sister sued claiming that Gray used excessive force and violated the Fourth Amendment. "The district court denied Gray's motion for summary judgment based on qualified immunity. "
1/7/19	<a href="#">Johnnie Lee Savory v. William Cannon, Sr. as special representative for Charles Cannon, et. al.</a>	17-3543	Barrett voted to reverse the district court's ruling and remand for further proceedings.	Savory spent 30 years in prison on a double murder charge and has proclaimed his innocence even after his release. The governor of Illinois has since pardoned him. Almost two years after the pardon, Savory filed a civil rights suit against the City of Peoria and several Peoria police officers, alleging they framed him. The district court dismissed the suit as untimely.
7/31/20	<a href="#">Estate of Joseph Biegert v. Thomas Molitor</a>	19-2837	Barrett wrote the opinion affirming the district court's ruling in favor of police.	Biegert's mother called the police concerned that her son was going to die by suicide. Though he was initially compliant, Biegert began to resist and officers tried to "subdue Biegert with fists, Tasers, and a baton." Biegert eventually "began to stab one of the officers, they shot him, and he died at the scene." Biegert's mother argued the officers used excessive force and the district court disagreed.
6/9/20	<a href="#">Harry O'Neal v. James Reilly</a>	19-2981	Barrett wrote the opinion affirming the District Court's ruling in favor of the police.	Harry O'Neal filed civil rights charges against the police officers who arrested him for aggravated battery during a traffic stop. O'Neal's civil rights claim was barred pending his battery conviction, but it was able to proceed after the conviction was

				overturned. However, O'Neal's motions to initiate the civil rights claims had procedural flaws, and the district court held that he waived his rights by not invoking the right rule.
2/5/20	<a href="#">Ronald Crosby v. City of Chicago</a>	18-3693 & 19-1439	Barrett wrote the opinion affirming the District Court's ruling in favor of police.	In 2015, Ronald Crosby won a settlement against Eduardo Gonzalez, a police officer, for allegedly shoving him out of a third-story window. Crosby went to court dispute whether the terms of the settlement barred a new lawsuit claiming the City and other police officers covered up Gonzalez's misconduct by falsely claiming he had a gun at the time of the incident.
1/28/20	<a href="#">Urija Elston v. County of Kane</a>	19-1746	Barrett wrote this opinion affirming the lower court's decision in favor of the County	An off-duty Kane County sheriff's deputy got into a verbal and physical skirmish with Urija Elston in a park, resulting in the officer grabbing him by the neck, climbing on top of him, and pulling his arms behind his back. Urija successfully sued Demeter, but lost a court case against Kane County, with the court ruling the officer was not acting in his official capacity.
8/2/19	<a href="#">Marcus Torry v. City of Chicago</a> <a href="#">City of Chicago</a>	18-1935	Barrett wrote this opinion affirming the district court's decision that the scope of the stop was lawful, and that the officers were entitled to qualified immunity regardless.	Three black men in a grey sedan were stopped by Chicago police officers in 2014, on suspicion of a shooting that had happened three hours earlier. The men filed suit, alleging they lacked reasonable suspicion to initiate the stop (this followed some other charges being dropped).
1/15/19	<a href="#">William Rainsberger v. Charles Benner</a>	17-2521	Barrett wrote the opinion affirming that Benner could not claim qualified immunity to defend himself from accusations that he violated the Rainsberger's 4th amendment rights by filing a false affidavit.	Charles Benner was a detective who filed a false affidavit indicating that William Rainsberger had murdered his own mother. The case was eventually dismissed due to evidentiary problems and Rainsberger sued Detective Benner. Benner moved to end the case claiming qualified immunity, but the District Court said Benner did not have qualified immunity in this case because he made materially false statements in the affidavit.
2/1/19	<a href="#">Mack A. Sims v. William Hyatte</a>	18-1573	Barrett wrote a *DISSENT* arguing that the majority did not give deference to the Indiana Court of Appeals in granting relief to Sims.	Mack Sims alleged the state violated his due process rights by withholding evidence favorable to his case. Sims was convicted of a 1993 attempted murder and later found in 2012 that the only witness in his case had been hypnotized before trial to "enhance his recollection of the shooting." After Sims's habeas petitions in state courts failed, he filed a habeas petition in district court, which was denied. Sims appealed.
2/7/19	<a href="#">USA v. Travis S. Vaccarro</a>	18-1753	Barrett wrote this opinion affirming the district court ruling in favor of the police.	Travis Vaccarro, who entered a conditional guilty plea to possessing a firearm as a felon, contested a pat-down search and search of his vehicle that led to charges.
5/9/19	<a href="#">Lopez-Aguilar v. Marion Cnty. Sheriff's Dep't</a>	18-1050	Barrett voted to "reverse the judgment of the district court and remand the	The State of Indiana attempted to intervene after Lopez-Aguilar alleged that when he was detained for transfer into ICE custody,

			case for proceedings consistent with this opinion," in favor of police.	officers violated his Fourth Amendment rights and the parties agreed on a judgment and order for relief.
3/1/19	<a href="#">United States v. Street</a>	18-1209	Barrett voted to affirm the district court's ruling in favor of police.	Street was stopped and questioned by officers law enforcement officers that were "searching for two African-American men who moments before had committed an armed robbery." Street was not arrested then, but provided information during the stop that helped lead to his later arrest. "Street contends that the stop violated his Fourth Amendment rights because he was stopped based on just a hunch and his race and sex. "
7/13/20	<a href="#">Gysan v. Francisko</a>	19-1471	Barrett voted to affirm the District Court ruling in favor of police.	Officers Francisko and Kuehl attempted to stop Cataline for a welfare stop and Cataline did not comply with officers' demands to turn off his car and "hand over his keys." Instead, Cataline turned his car around, hit one of the police cars, and allegedly pinned one of the officers behind a car door. Francisko shot and killed Cataline. Cataline's mother in this suit contends the police violated the Fourth Amendment in shooting him. The district court granted summary judgment to both defendants and rejected the argument after concluding that Francisko is entitled to qualified immunity.
3/31/20	<a href="#">King v. Hendricks County Commissioners</a>	19-2119	Barrett voted to affirm the District Court ruling in favor of police.	After arriving for a welfare check, an officer shot King, who suffered from paranoid schizophrenia. Officers allege that King charged at them with a knife, which prompted the shooting. King's father alleges the officers violated King's fourth amendment rights but the district court found there was no violation.
1/10/20	<a href="#">Day v. Wooten</a>	19-1930	Barrett voted to reverse the district court's ruling, the outcome that favored the police.	Wooten died in police custody "after he complained of difficulty breathing" following a chase and the position in which he was hand cuffed. The district court ruled "the officers were not entitled to qualified immunity because 'reasonable officers would know they were violating an established right by leaving Day's hands cuffed behind his back after he complained of difficulty breathing.'"
12/17/19	<a href="#">Johnson v. Rogers</a>	19-1366	Barrett voted to affirm the District Court ruling in favor of police.	An officer used a leg sweep, effectively to trip, Johnson into a sitting position as he kept attempting to stand while in custody. The fall resulted in a compound fracture in one leg that he contends "resulted from a kick designed to punish him rather than to return him to a sitting position." The district court ruled that the officer was entitled the qualified immunity.
8/22/19	<a href="#">United States v. Kelerchian</a>	18-1320	Barrett voted to affirm Kelerchian's conviction.	Kelerchian colluded with police officers to defraud weapons manufacturers and avoid restrictions on selling certain weapons

				to private individuals. "Kelerchian went to trial and was convicted on four counts of conspiracy and four counts of making false writings. On appeal, Kelerchian raises numerous issues."
8/21/19	<a href="#">United States v. Simon</a>	18-2442	Barrett voted to affirm the District Court's ruling in favor of police.	Simon was found to be a felon in possession of a gun and pleaded guilty. Simon raised a "litany of issues on appeal," including allegations that officers lacked probable cause to initiate a traffic stop and that they inappropriately prolonged the stop to allow for a dog sniff.
7/26/19	<a href="#">Ruiz-Cortez v. City of Chicago</a>	18-1078	Barrett voted to affirm the District Court ruling dismissing the City of Chicago, but overturned the jury trial that found in favor of the dirty cop.	After a dirty cop's false testimony led to his imprisonment, Ruiz-Cortez sued the City of Chicago and the dirty police officer for violating his constitutional rights. "The district court dismissed the claim against the City at summary judgment, concluding that there was no evidence of municipal liability." A jury trial found for the dirty cop after he invoked his 5 <sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights.
7/9/19	<a href="#">United States v. Sawyer</a>	18-2923	Barrett voted to affirm the District Court ruling in favor of police.	Sawyer pleaded guilty to possessing a firearm as a felon. In appeal, Sawyer contests the search of his backpack, in which police found guns. The district court denied the motion to suppress and concluded "that Sawyer, as a trespasser, had no legitimate expectation of privacy in the house and therefore none in the unattended backpack."
4/6/20	<a href="#">Conner v. Vacek</a>	19-1160	Barrett voted to affirm the District Court ruling in favor of police.	Conner was arrested by Vacek and was found guilty of domestic abuse charges. Conner is suing Vacek and a fire sergeant involved in the initial response, alleging they violated his fourth amendment right "when they entered his apartment and arrested him without a warrant." The district court entered summary judgment for the defendants.
5/21/20	<a href="#">Stingley v. Chisholm</a>	19-2364	Barrett voted to affirm the District Court ruling in favor of prosecutors.	Craig Stingley sued Wisconsin prosecutors, "alleging that they unlawfully failed to investigate and charge those responsible for his son's murder. The district court correctly dismissed the complaint because the prosecutors are absolutely immune for these alleged acts."
8/27/19	<a href="#">Perkins v. Milwaukee County</a>	18-3710	Barrett voted to affirm the District Court ruling in favor of Milwaukee Transit Services.	Perkins protested "after a Milwaukee police officer killed his brother" and later applied for a job with Milwaukee Transit Services, Inc. (MTS) and he was not hired. He sued Milwaukee County and alleges his first amendment rights were violated because "he learned that a hiring manager had said that MTS would not hire him because of his family's protests."
6/24/19	<a href="#">Royal v. Norris</a>	18-3039	Barrett voted to reverse the lower ruling, the order claiming there was no law that "would have put the officers on	Royal ingested cocaine just before he was arrested and then died in police custody. His estate sued the officers involved, "alleging that they violated Royal's constitutional right to medical

			notice that their conduct violated the Fourth Amendment," therefore ruling in favor of police.	treatment by not sending him immediately to the hospital." The magistrate judge denied the officers' motion for summary judgment and concluded that they were not entitled to qualified immunity.
8/27/19	<a href="#">United States v. Bean</a>	18-2195	Barrett voted to affirm the District Court ruling in favor of police.	"Devon Bean challenges the denial of his motion to suppress a gun and marijuana found during a traffic stop. The district court denied Bean's motion on the ground that police officers, in blocking his car and then smelling marijuana in it, had probable cause to search him and the car."
5/17/19	<a href="#">Bogan v. German</a>	18-2927	Barrett voted to affirm the District Court ruling in favor of police.	Bogan, a parolee, sued several officers for searching his apartment without a warrant and for seizing and searching his vehicle. The district court granted a summary judgement for the defendants and denied Bogan's cross motion on the basis that as a parolee, he did not have a "reasonable expectation of privacy."
3/21/19	<a href="#">McNett v. Robertson</a>	18-1508	Barrett voted to affirm the District Court ruling in favor of police.	McNett, an Illinois inmate, challenged the dismissal of his complaint that alleged two officers detained him in violation of the Fourth Amendment, and that the Village of Palatine "has a policy or practice of arresting people without probable cause." The district court dismissed the complaint.
8/15/18	<a href="#">Miller v. Gonzales</a>	17-2386	Barrett voted to affirm the District Court ruling in favor of police.	In the midst of a chase and jumping over a fence, an officer landed on Miller and broke Miller's jaw, Miller alleges it was intentional and an excessive use of force. A jury disagreed and ruled in favor of the officer.
6/25/18	<a href="#">Hoeft v. Joanis</a>	17-2701	Barrett voted to affirm the District Court ruling in favor of police.	Hoeft alleges that two police officers violated his rights under the Fourth and Fifth Amendments when they held, interrogated, and threatened him until he falsely confessed to burglaries. He later pleaded no contest to the burglary and served his sentence. Upon release he sued the officers involved, but the District court dismissed it as untimely.

**Methodology:** *Accountable.US reviewed all cases Amy Coney Barrett heard during her time on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit and analyzed her position on any case in which law enforcement was named a party. Once each relevant opinion was catalogued, Accountable.US calculated the percentage of cases in which Barrett ruled for law enforcement.*

## **Amy Coney Barrett Ruled That Police Officers Who Let A Black Teenager In Their Custody Die – After He Told Them He Couldn't Breathe – Had Qualified Immunity From A Civil Suit.**

Case At Issue: [Shanika Day et al v. Franklin Wooten](#) (Case No. 19-1930)

### **January 2020: Barrett's Ruling In A Qualified Immunity Case Was Described As A "Radical Departure" From Previous Court Decisions That Put The "Burden On The Person Who's Dying" Instead Of Police.**

2020: Barrett Granted Qualified Immunity To Police In The 2015 Death Of A Black Teen Accused Of Shoplifting Who Told Officers He Couldn't Breathe.

**January 10, 2020: Barrett Ruled In Favor Of Giving Qualified Immunity To Two Police Officers Involved In The Death Of A Black Teenager Accused Of Shoplifting, Overturning The Lower Court's Decision.** [United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, *Day v. Wooten*, [1/10/20](#)]

**Indianapolis Star HEADLINE: "Teen Told Police He Couldn't Breathe. Officers Aren't Liable For His Death, Court Says."** [Indianapolis Star, [1/28/20](#)]

- **2015: Eighteen-Year-Old Terrell Day Fled After A Security Guard Accused Him Of Shoplifting A Watch.** "Day died after police held him in connection with a shoplifting incident at Burlington Coat Factory on the afternoon of Sept. 26, 2015. A loss-prevention officer confronted Day after the teen allegedly tried to take a watch from the store. A security officer then saw a gun in Day's pocket, according to court documents. Day fled on foot." [Indianapolis Star, [1/28/20](#)]
- **Police Handcuffed Day As He Lay Collapsed On The Ground And Told An Officer He Was Having Trouble Breathing.** "By the time police caught up to Day, he'd collapsed onto a patch of grass behind a nearby gas station. The gun was not found on Day, but was found near him at the scene. Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Officer Randall Denny arrived at the scene and handcuffed Day. He noticed that Day was 'overweight, sweating and breathing heavily,' the court said. Day told police he was having trouble breathing." [Indianapolis Star, [1/28/20](#)]
- **Video Shows Day, Still Handcuffed, Surrounded By Officers And Having Trouble Standing; He Collapses, Officers Lay Him On His Back "And That's Where He Remains Until He Dies."** "Video taken by a bystander shows several officers trying to stand Day up while he's still handcuffed. Day stands for a few seconds, but his legs appear to go out and his body then tilts toward the ground, with officers still appearing to hold him up. Surveillance video captures some of the incident from further away. 'They stood him up to try and have the ambulance examine him, but his legs go out,' Alvarez said. 'And then they just place him lying on his back. And that's where he remains until he dies.'" [Indianapolis Star, [1/28/20](#)]
- **Day Died Of "Sudden Cardiac Death" With His "Hands Being Cuffed Behind His Back" Listed As A "Contributing Cause."** "Day's death was caused by "sudden cardiac death," according to an autopsy filed in the case. Listed as a contributing cause, court documents said, was Day's hands being cuffed behind his back." [Indianapolis Star, [1/28/20](#)]
- **The 7th Circuit Opinion: "This Case Arose From An Unfortunate Tragedy. However, The Officers Did Not Violate Any Clearly Established Right. Accordingly, The District Court's Judgment Denying Officer Denny And Sergeant Wooten's Qualified Immunity Defense Is REVERSED."** [United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, *Day v. Wooten*, [1/10/20](#)]

*The Family's Attorney Said The Ruling Was A "Radical Departure" From Previous Decisions And Put The "Burden On The Person Who's Dying" Instead Of Police.*

**"Attorneys For Day's Mother, Shanika, Believe The Decision Could Set A 'Dangerous' Precedent For Future Civil Cases Alleging Police Misconduct."** [Indianapolis Star, [1/28/20](#)]

- **One Of The Family's Attorney Said The Ruling Was A "Radical Departure" From Its Prior Decisions.** "They plan to ask the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit to reconsider the court's ruling, which attorney Nathaniel Lee calls a 'radical departure' from its prior decisions." [Indianapolis Star, [1/28/20](#)]
- **"Now, Burden Is On The Person Who's Dying. It's No Longer On The Police To Be Trained."** [Indianapolis Star, [1/28/20](#)]

## **Amy Coney Barrett Ruled That Police Officers Who Killed A Suicidal Man – After Being Called To The Scene By The Man's Mother – Did Not Commit Any Constitutional Violations.**

Case At Issue: [Estate of Joseph Biegert v. Thomas Molitor](#) (Case No. 19-2837)

### **A Mother Called The Police To Help Her Suicidal Son And The Police Officers Ended Up Shooting Him To Death; Still, Barrett Ruled That No Constitutional Violation Had Occurred.**

*July 2020: Barrett Wrote The Opinion Declaring That "Officers Might Have Made Mistakes" But They "Did Not Violate The Fourth Amendment By Shooting" A Man With Mental Illness Whose Mother Called To Help Him Through A Suicidal Episode.*

**The Mother Of A Man Who Was Fatally Shot By Police Sued After Her Welfare Check For His Suicidal Episode Ended In His Killing.** "Joseph Biegert's mother called the police for help because she was concerned that her son was attempting to kill himself. Officers went to Biegert's apartment to check on him, and when they arrived, Biegert initially cooperated. He began resisting, though, when the officers tried to pat him down. A scuffle ensued, and the officers tried 2 No. 19-2837 to subdue Biegert with fists, Tasers, and a baton. All of these efforts to restrain Biegert failed, and Biegert armed himself with a kitchen knife. When he began to stab one of the officers, they shot him, and he died at the scene. Biegert's mother, on behalf of his estate, argues that the officers used excessive force both by restraining Biegert during a pat down and by shooting him." [United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit Court, No. 19-2837, *Estate of Joseph Biegert v. Thomas Molitor*, [7/31/20](#)]

- **"Biegert's Mother Called The Police For Help Because She Was Concerned That Her Son Was Attempting To Kill Himself."** [United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit Court, No. 19-2837, *Estate of Joseph Biegert v. Thomas Molitor*, [7/31/20](#)]
- **Biegert's Mother Disclosed Her Son's History Of Depression, Suicide Attempts, That He Was Alone, And Had "Neither Weapons Not Vehicles."** "On February 24, 2015, Joseph Biegert texted his mother that he had taken a number of pills in an apparent suicide attempt. His mother, concerned for his safety, called the Green Bay, Wisconsin, police and requested a welfare check. She told the dispatcher that Biegert was depressed, had a history of suicide attempts, was alone, and had access to neither weapons nor vehicles." [United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit Court, No. 19-2837, *Estate of Joseph Biegert v. Thomas Molitor*, [7/31/20](#)]

- **When Officers Arrived “Biegert Initially Cooperated” But “Began Resisting” When Officers Restrained Him During Pat Down.** “Officers went to Biegert’s apartment to check on him, and when they arrived, Biegert initially cooperated. He began resisting, though, when the officers tried to pat him down. [...] Biegert’s mother, on behalf of his estate, argues that the officers used excessive force both by restraining Biegert during a pat down and by shooting him.” [United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit Court, No. 19-2837, *Estate of Joseph Biegert v. Thomas Molitor*, [7/31/20](#)]
- **“Officers Tried To Subdue Biegert With Fists, Tasers, And A Baton.”** [United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit Court, No. 19-2837, *Estate of Joseph Biegert v. Thomas Molitor*, [7/31/20](#)]
- **Officers Shot And Killed Biegert After He Armed Himself With A Knife In Defense Of Their Restraint Methods.** “As he patted him down, Dunn held two of Biegert’s fingers with one hand in a way that Dunn concedes may have been painful. While Dunn searched Biegert, Krueger advised the rescue team that they could approach the apartment. Biegert recoiled when Dunn’s pat down neared Biegert’s belt, and Biegert pulled his right hand out of Dunn’s grasp. Krueger then grabbed Biegert’s left hand while Dunn sought to regain control of Biegert’s right hand. Biegert pulled away, dragging the officers toward the kitchen. Krueger told Biegert ‘[d]on’t do anything stupid’ and tried to put Biegert in a secure hold so that he could place him in handcuffs. Dunn attempted to block Biegert with his leg, and both Biegert and Dunn fell to the floor. Biegert rose again, pulled the officers into the kitchen and all three men fell to the floor while Biegert continued to thrash against the officers. Krueger drew his Taser and attempted to use it on Biegert, but it did not fire. When Krueger then tried to put the Taser directly against Biegert, Biegert squeezed Krueger’s genitals and reached for the Taser. Krueger knocked the Taser out of Biegert’s hand and began punching Biegert in the face, apparently with no effect. Dunn then drew his Taser, and although he tried to aim at Biegert, he hit Krueger instead. Once Krueger recovered from the shock, he expanded his baton and prepared to continue striking Biegert. At this point, Biegert managed to grab a knife from the kitchen counter, and he stood over Dunn with the knife in his right hand.” [United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit Court, No. 19-2837, *Estate of Joseph Biegert v. Thomas Molitor*, [7/31/20](#)]
- **The Estate Contended There Was A Pause Where Officers “Stopped Shooting When Biegert Ceased To Pose A Threat And Then Resumed After He Had Collapsed To The Ground.”** “The estate also contends that there was a pause in the shooting—that the officers stopped shooting when Biegert ceased to pose a threat and then resumed after he had collapsed to the ground.” [United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, No. 19-2837, *Estate of Joseph Biegert v. Thomas Molitor*, [7/31/20](#)]
  - **OPINION: Dash Cameras Offered “Gargled Audio” And Could Not Confirm The Pause.** “The estate’s best evidence for this theory is the audio captured by one of the officers’ dash cameras. But the garbled audio, in which the officers can barely be heard over the background noise, contains no clearly audible pause.” [United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, No. 19-2837, *Estate of Joseph Biegert v. Thomas Molitor*, [7/31/20](#)]

**Barrett Wrote The Opinion Affirming The Lower Court’s Decision In Favor Of The Officers Involved In Biegert’s Death.** [United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, No. 19-2837, *Estate of Joseph Biegert v. Thomas Molitor*, [7/31/20](#)]

- **“The Officers Might Have Made Mistakes, And Those Mistakes Might Have Provoked Biegert’s Violent Resistance. Even If So, However, It Does Not Follow That Their Actions Violated The Fourth Amendment.”** [United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, No. 19-2837, *Estate of Joseph Biegert v. Thomas Molitor*, [7/31/20](#)]
- **“The Estate Also Emphasizes That The Officers Violated Police Department Regulations And That These Violations Bear On The Officers’ Reasonableness. But The District Court Was Correct To Give No Weight To These Arguments.”** [United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, No. 19-2837, *Estate of Joseph Biegert v. Thomas Molitor*, [7/31/20](#)]

- **“Policies And Procedures Do Not Shed Light On The Reasonableness Of An Officer’s Behavior.”** [United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, No. 19-2837, *Estate of Joseph Biegert v. Thomas Molitor*, [7/31/20](#)]
- **“The Officers Did Not Violate The Fourth Amendment By Shooting Biegert. Not Did Their Actions Preceding The Shooting Render Their Use Of Force Unreasonable. Because We Conclude That No Constitutional Violation Occurred, We Need Not Determine Whether The Officers Are Entitled To Qualified Immunity. The District Court’s Decision is AFFIRMED.”** [United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, No. 19-2837, *Estate of Joseph Biegert v. Thomas Molitor*, [7/31/20](#)]

**March 2020: Barrett Ruled Police Were Justified In Killing A Paranoid Schizophrenic Man Who Called Them For Help, Despite Circumstantial Evidence That Undermined The Officers’ Account Of What Happened.**

Case At Issue: [King v. Hendricks County Commissioners](#) (Case No. 19-2119)

**In 2020 A Man Called Police Asking For Help And Two Officers Went To His House To Perform A Welfare Check.**

November 29, 2016: Police Fatally Shot Bradley King, “A 29-Year-Old Resident Of Hendricks County, Indiana, Who Suffered From Paranoid Schizophrenia ... During An Encounter At His Home.” [Justia, United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, No. 19-2119, *Matthew King v. Hendricks County Commissioners*, [3/31/20](#)]

- **“Two Hendricks County Reserve Deputies Went To The King’s Family Home To Perform A ‘Welfare Check’ After Bradley Called 9-1-1 And Requested Help.”** [Justia, United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, No. 19-2119, *Matthew King v. Hendricks County Commissioners*, [3/31/20](#)]

**The Police Officers Claim That After They Arrived, The Man Charged Them, Unprovoked, With A Knife, Though The Victim’s Father Says He “Was Never Violent, Even When Suffering A Psychotic Episode.”**

*The Victim Was Right Handed, But Police Claim He Held The Knife In His Left Hand.*

Once The Officers Arrived Matters “Spun Horribly Out Of Control, Though What Precisely Happened Is Disputed, Aside From The Fact That Bradley Wound Up Dead.” [Justia, United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, No. 19-2119, *Matthew King v. Hendricks County Commissioners*, [3/31/20](#)]

- **“The Only Living Eyewitnesses Are The Officers Involved.”** [Justia, United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, No. 19-2119, *Matthew King v. Hendricks County Commissioners*, [3/31/20](#)]
- **Officers Contended That King Charged At Them, Unprovoked, With A Knife.** “The evidence developed for purposes of the defendants’ motion for summary judgment was as follows. The deputies, Jason Hays and Jeremy Thomas, testified that upon their arrival, Bradley came out of the house, walked toward them, and pulled a ten-inch knife out of his shorts pocket. Hays and Thomas backpedaled, drew their service firearms, and yelled at Bradley to stop and drop the knife. Bradley disregarded their commands and kept moving forward. Then, with the knife in his left hand, left arm raised in front of him so that the blade was pointing toward the officers, he started running at Hays. When Bradley was approximately eight feet away, Hays fired one shot. It proved to be fatal.” [Justia, United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, No. 19-2119, *Matthew King v. Hendricks County Commissioners*, [3/31/20](#)]