

Pro Per

Index

	Section	Page
1		
2		
3	Introduction	1
4	Jurisdiction and Venue	2
5	Parties	2
6	Factual Allegations	3
7	Federal Causes of Action	4
8	State Law Claims	5
9	Prayer for Relief	6
10	Table of Authorities	7
11		

Jurisdiction and Venue

This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 for federal questions arising under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, per *Bell v. Hood*, 327 U.S. 678, 681-82 (1946), and 28 U.S.C. § 1343(a)(3) for civil rights deprivations, per *Monroe v. Pape*, 365 U.S. 167, 184 (1961). Supplemental jurisdiction over state law claims is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a), as they share a common nucleus of operative facts, per *United Mine Workers v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715, 725 (1966), and *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Allapattah Services, Inc.*, 545 U.S. 546, 559 (2005). Venue is appropriate in the Western District of Texas under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2), as all events occurred in Uvalde County, satisfying the fairness and convenience factors of *Gulf Oil Corp. v. Gilbert*, 330 U.S. 501, 508 (1947).

Parties

Plaintiff Tyler M. Cox, a 28-year-old resident of Uvalde County, Texas, and a UPS delivery driver, has Article III standing under *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61

Pro Per

1 (1992), having suffered concrete injuries traceable to Defendants' conduct, redressable by
2 judicial relief. Defendant William R. Mitchell, acting in his official capacity as County Judge
3 under Tex. Gov't Code § 26.001, exercised policymaking authority, rendering him liable under
4 *Monell v. Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658, 690 (1978), and *Pembaur v. City of*
5 *Cincinnati*, 475 U.S. 469, 481 (1986). Uvalde County, a municipal corporation, is accountable
6 for its policies and customs causing constitutional harm, per *Owen v. City of Independence*, 445
7 U.S. 622, 645 (1980).

8 Factual Allegations

9
10 On March 27, 2025, Plaintiff, authorized by courthouse staff to place packages in the first-floor
11 hallway due to elevator maintenance, was confronted by Defendant Mitchell. Despite Plaintiff's
12 lawful presence, Mitchell publicly humiliated him, shouting derogatory remarks and violently
13 seizing his delivery dolly, scattering packages and committing assault under Tex. Penal Code §
14 22.01. When Plaintiff offered to relocate the packages, Mitchell, without probable cause or
15 reasonable suspicion, ordered Deputy Rodriguez to "place him under arrest and cuff him."
16 Rodriguez handcuffed Plaintiff excessively tightly, causing injury, and detained him for over five
17 minutes without *Miranda* warnings, during which Mitchell demanded Plaintiff's name, violating
18 the Fifth Amendment. Mitchell seized Plaintiff's cellular phone for nine minutes without
19 consent, constituting conversion under Tex. Penal Code § 31.03 and a Fourth Amendment
20 violation per *Riley v. California*, 573 U.S. 373, 401-02 (2014). Post-incident, Mitchell falsely
21 claimed to the *Uvalde Leader-News* that Plaintiff called him an "asshole," a defamatory
22 statement contradicted by witnesses, damaging Plaintiff's reputation. Uvalde County's refusal to
23 release surveillance footage, controlled by Mitchell, obstructed justice under 18 U.S.C. § 1519
24 and Tex. Gov't Code § 552.021. These actions reflect a custom of deliberate indifference,
25 enabled by the County's failure to train or supervise Mitchell, despite prior complaints in 2024,
actionable under *City of Canton v. Harris*, 489 U.S. 378, 388 (1989).

1 Federal Causes of Action

2 First Cause of Action: Fourth Amendment Violation (Unreasonable Seizure)

3 Defendants violated Plaintiff's Fourth Amendment right against unreasonable seizures by
4 detaining him without probable cause or reasonable suspicion, failing the objective
5 reasonableness standard of *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1, 16 (1968), and *Graham v. Connor*, 490
6 U.S. 386, 395 (1989), per *Deville v. Marcantel*, 567 F.3d 156, 164 (5th Cir. 2009).

8 Second Cause of Action: Fifth Amendment Violation (Self-Incrimination)

9 Defendants violated Plaintiff's Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination through
10 custodial interrogation without *Miranda* warnings, per *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, 444
11 (1966), and *Berkemer v. McCarty*, 468 U.S. 420, 442 (1984), per *Chavez v. Martinez*, 538 U.S.
12 760, 773 (2003).

14 Third Cause of Action: Fourteenth Amendment Violation (Equal Protection)

15 Defendants' discriminatory enforcement violated Plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment equal
16 protection rights by targeting him as a "class of one" among delivery personnel, without rational
17 basis, per *Village of Willowbrook v. Olech*, 528 U.S. 562, 564 (2000), and *Lindquist v. City of*
18 *Pasadena*, 669 F.3d 225, 235 (5th Cir. 2012).

20 Fourth Cause of Action: Fourteenth Amendment Violation (Substantive Due Process)

21 Defendants' conscience-shocking conduct, including assault and arbitrary detention, violated
22 Plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment substantive due process rights, per *County of Sacramento v.*
23 *Lewis*, 523 U.S. 833, 846 (1998), and *Whitley v. Hanna*, 726 F.3d 631, 638 (5th Cir. 2013).

Pro Per

1 Fifth Cause of Action: Fourteenth Amendment Violation (Procedural Due Process)

2 Defendants deprived Plaintiff of procedural due process by seizing his phone without notice or
3 hearing, violating *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 335 (1976), and *Cleveland Board of*
4 *Education v. Loudermill*, 470 U.S. 532, 542 (1985).

6 Sixth Cause of Action: Municipal Liability (Monell)

7 Uvalde County is liable under *Monell* for policies and customs, including unchecked authority to
8 Mitchell and failure to train, that were the moving force behind these violations, per *Pineda v.*
9 *City of Houston*, 291 F.3d 325, 328 (5th Cir. 2002), and *Connick v. Thompson*, 563 U.S. 51, 61
10 (2011).

12 State Law Claims

13 First Claim: Violation of Texas Constitution (Due Process and Equal Protection)

14 Defendants violated Plaintiff's due process and equal protection rights under Tex. Const. art. I, §
15 19, per *University of Texas Medical School at Houston v. Than*, 901 S.W.2d 926, 929 (Tex.
16 1995).

18 Second Claim: Kidnapping

19 The unlawful detention constitutes kidnapping under Tex. Penal Code § 20.03, per *Lugo v. State*,
20 923 S.W.2d 598, 600 (Tex. Crim. App. 1995).

22 Third Claim: Assault

23 Mitchell's physical contact with Plaintiff's dolly constitutes assault under Tex. Penal Code §
24 22.01, per *Fisher v. Carrousel Motor Hotel, Inc.*, 424 S.W.2d 627, 629 (Tex. 1967).

Pro Per

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Fourth Claim: Conversion

The phone seizure constitutes conversion under Tex. Penal Code § 31.03, per *Waisath v. Lack's Stores, Inc.*, 474 S.W.2d 444, 446 (Tex. 1971).

Fifth Claim: Defamation

Mitchell's false statement to the newspaper constitutes defamation under Texas common law, per *WFAA-TV, Inc. v. McLemore*, 978 S.W.2d 568, 571 (Tex. 1998), and *Bentley v. Bunton*, 94 S.W.3d 561, 579 (Tex. 2002).

Prayer for Relief

Plaintiff seeks \$5,000,000 in compensatory damages (\$150,000 economic; \$4,850,000 non-economic), trebled to \$15,000,000 under *Smith v. Wade*, 461 U.S. 30, 56 (1983). Injunctive relief includes release of surveillance footage, civil rights training per TAC § 215.9, an ombudsman, and compliance policies, per *Brown v. Board of Education*, 349 U.S. 294, 301 (1955). Plaintiff requests DOJ referral under 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242, 1519, and attorney fees under 42 U.S.C. § 1988(b), per *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 433 (1983). Plaintiff prays for: (A) declaratory relief; (B) \$15,000,000 in damages and fees; (C) injunctive relief; and (D) criminal referral, apology, and equitable relief.

Respectfully submitted,

 July 7, 2025
Tyler M. Cox, Pro per
416 Mulberry St., Uvalde, TX 78801
830-275-3123

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Table of Authorities
U.S. Supreme Court Cases

- *Bell v. Hood*, 327 U.S. 678 (1946)
- *Boyd v. United States*, 116 U.S. 616 (1886)
- *Brown v. Board of Education*, 349 U.S. 294 (1955)
- *Chavez v. Martinez*, 538 U.S. 760 (2003)
- *Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe*, 401 U.S. 402 (1971)
- *City of Canton v. Harris*, 489 U.S. 378 (1989)
- *Cleveland Board of Education v. Loudermill*, 470 U.S. 532 (1985)
- *Connick v. Thompson*, 563 U.S. 51 (2011)
- *County of Sacramento v. Lewis*, 523 U.S. 833 (1998)
- *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Allapattah Services, Inc.*, 545 U.S. 546 (2005)
- *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386 (1989)
- *Gulf Oil Corp. v. Gilbert*, 330 U.S. 501 (1947)
- *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424 (1983)
- *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555 (1992)
- *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976)
- *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966)
- *Monell v. Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978)
- *Monroe v. Pape*, 365 U.S. 167 (1961)
- *Owen v. City of Independence*, 445 U.S. 622 (1980)
- *Pembaur v. City of Cincinnati*, 475 U.S. 469 (1986)
- *Riley v. California*, 573 U.S. 373 (2014)
- *Smith v. Wade*, 461 U.S. 30 (1983)
- *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1 (1968)
- *United Mine Workers v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715 (1966)
- *Village of Willowbrook v. Olech*, 528 U.S. 562 (2000)
- *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356 (1886)

Fifth Circuit Cases

- *Deville v. Marcantel*, 567 F.3d 156 (5th Cir. 2009)
- *Lindquist v. City of Pasadena*, 669 F.3d 225 (5th Cir. 2012)
- *Pineda v. City of Houston*, 291 F.3d 325 (5th Cir. 2002)
- *United States v. Benavides*, 864 F.3d 688 (5th Cir. 2017)
- *United States v. Reese*, 2 F.3d 870 (5th Cir. 1993)
- *Whitley v. Hanna*, 726 F.3d 631 (5th Cir. 2013)

Texas Cases

- *Bentley v. Bunton*, 94 S.W.3d 561 (Tex. 2002)
- *Fisher v. Carrousel Motor Hotel, Inc.*, 424 S.W.2d 627 (Tex. 1967)
- *Heitman v. State*, 815 S.W.2d 681 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991)
- *In re Davila*, 425 S.W.3d 656 (Tex. 2014)

- *Lugo v. State*, 923 S.W.2d 598 (Tex. Crim. App. 1995)
- *University of Texas Medical School at Houston v. Than*, 901 S.W.2d 926 (Tex. 1995)
- *Waisath v. Lack's Stores, Inc.*, 474 S.W.2d 444 (Tex. 1971)
- *WFAA-TV, Inc. v. McLemore*, 978 S.W.2d 568 (Tex. 1998)

Common Law Cases

- *Dr. Bonham's Case*, 8 Co. Rep. 113b (1610)
- *Entick v. Carrington*, 2 Wils. 275 (1765)

Federal Statutes

- 5 U.S.C. § 706
- 5 U.S.C. § 2635
- 18 U.S.C. § 241
- 18 U.S.C. § 242
- 18 U.S.C. § 1519
- 28 U.S.C. § 1331
- 28 U.S.C. § 1343
- 28 U.S.C. § 1367
- 28 U.S.C. § 1391
- 42 U.S.C. § 1983
- 42 U.S.C. § 1988

Texas Statutes and Administrative Codes

- Tex. Gov't Code § 26.001
- Tex. Gov't Code § 552.021
- Tex. Penal Code § 20.03
- Tex. Penal Code § 22.01
- Tex. Penal Code § 31.03
- TAC § 40.1
- TAC § 215.9

Constitutional Provisions

- U.S. Const. amend. IV
- U.S. Const. amend. V
- U.S. Const. amend. XIV
- Tex. Const. art. I, § 19
- Tex. Const. art. V, § 1-a(6)(A)

PRESS FIRMLY TO SEAL



PRESS FIRMLY TO SEAL

Retail



78840

U.S. POSTAGE PAID
PM
CLEARLAKE, WA 98235
JUL 10, 2025

\$14.95

S2324M503727-03

RDC 03



CERTIFIED MAIL



SEP 10 2025

WESTERN DISTRICT COURTHOUSE
BY WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DEPUTY CLERK

FROM:

Tyler Cox
416 Mulberry St
Wualde TX 78801

- Expected delivery date specified
- Domestic shipments include \$10
- USPS Tracking® service included
- Limited international insurance.**
- When used internationally, a customs declaration form is required.

*Insurance does not cover certain items. For details regarding claims exclusions see the Domestic Mail Manual at <http://pe.usps.com>.

** See International Mail Manual at <http://pe.usps.com> for availability and limitations of coverage.

FLAT RATE ENVELOPE
ONE RATE ANY WEIGHT

To schedule free Package Pickup,
scan the QR code.



USPS.COM/PICKUP

TRACKED ■ INSURED



PS00001000014

EP14F October 2023
OD: 12 1/2 x 9 1/2



TO:
Clerk, US District Court
Western Dist. of TX Del Rio Division
111 East Broadway Rm L100
Del Rio TX 78840

This package is made from post-consumer waste. Please recycle - again.

This packaging is the property of the U.S. Postal Service and is provided solely for use in sending Priority Mail and Priority Mail International shipments. Misuse may be a violation of federal law. This package is not for resale. EP14F © U.S. Postal Service, October 2023. All rights reserved.