1	HARMEET K. DHILLON							
2	Assistant Attorney General Civil Rights Division							
3	JESUS A. OSETE							
3	Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General R. JONAS GEISSLER							
4	Deputy Assistant Attorney General ANDREW M. DARLINGTON (FL No.	1018895)						
5	Senior Counsel	1010073)						
6	GREGORY DOLIN (DC No. 497455) Senior Counsel							
	United States Department of Justice							
7	950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, D.C. 20530 Telephone: (202) 550-5305							
8	Telephone: (202) 550-5305							
9	E-Mail: andrew.darlington@usdo	oj.gov						
0	Attorneys for Plaintiff							
	Attorneys for Plaintiff UNITED STATES OF AMERICA							
1	ADJUTED OF A TELE DISTRICT COLUMN							
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT							
13	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA							
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	Case No. ^^^^^						
15	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT						
16	V.							
17	THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, CHIEF OF POLICE PAMELA							
	CHIEF OF POLICE PAMELA SMITH in her official capacity as							
18	SMITH, in her official capacity as Chief of the Metropolitan Police							
19	Department of the District of Columbia the METROPOLITAN							
20	Columbia, the METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT OF THE							
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.							
21	Defendants.							
22								
23	Plaintiff, the United States of America, by and through its undersigned counsel							
24	hereby brings this action against defendants the District of Columbia, Chief of Police							
25	Pamela Smith ("Chief Smith"), in her official capacity as Chief of the Metropolitan Police							
1		Department of the District of Columbia, and the Metropolitan Police Department of the						
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	, and the Metropolitan Police Department of the						
26 27	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	•						

INTRODUCTION

- 1. On February 10, 2003, Dick Heller, an active-duty special policeman, sued the local government of our Nation's capital because the D.C. Code did not trust him to possess a firearm in his home for self-defense. Five years later, the U.S. Supreme Court found in favor of Mr. Heller and recognized that law-abiding citizens have the right to possess arms protected under the Second Amendment inside the home for lawful purposes such as self-defense. As the Court explained, the Second Amendment protects the right to "keep and bear" those arms that are "in common use today." *See New York State Rifle & Pistol Ass'n, Inc. v. Bruen*, 597 U.S. 1, 47 (2022); *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 554 U.S. 570, 627 (2003).
- 2. Less than a year later, the Council of the District of Columbia ("Council"), the governing body of our Nation's capital, amended its broad gun possession registration requirement to carve out—in response to *Heller*—a requirement that someone who is not a registered gun owner may *only* possess a registered gun owner's gun if that person would otherwise qualify to register the gun, and *only if* that person reasonably believes that such possession is necessary to prevent their imminent death or great bodily injury. *See* D.C. Code § 7-2502.01(b)(4) (2023).
- 3. Over the years since *Heller*, the Council continued its efforts to infringe the Second Amendment-protected "right of the people to keep and bear arms" through limiting law-abiding citizens' ability to register commonly used firearms and criminalizing the possession of firearms that it refuses to register.
- 4. Specifically, the District denies law-abiding citizens the ability to register a wide variety of commonly used semi-automatic firearms, such as the Colt AR-15 series rifles, which is among the most popular of firearms in America, and a variety of other semi-automatic rifles and pistols that are in common use. *See* D.C. Code § 7–2501.01.
- 5. Indeed, D.C's current semi-automatic firearms prohibition that bans many commonly used pistols, rifles or shotguns is based on little more than cosmetics, appearance, or the ability to attach accessories, and fails to take into account whether the

- prohibited weapon is "in common use today" or that law-abiding citizens may use these weapons for lawful purposes protected by the Second Amendment. *See Heller*, 554 U.S. at 47. Therefore, the District's restrictions lack legal basis.
- 6. Acting pursuant to the authority granted them by the D.C. Code governing Washington, D.C., Chief Smith and the MPD enforce the provisions of the District of Columbia Code. These provisions include the power to approve or deny certificates of registration for firearms. Their decisions to deny certificates of registration for commonly possessed semiautomatic firearms run afoul of binding Supreme Court precedent and therefore trample the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens.
- 7. This case concerns much more than dormant, bad law. It concerns the very real requirement that the DC Defendants have acted and are continuing to act in blatant disregard to our Constitution and the rulings of our Nation's highest court.
- 8. The United States of America brings this lawsuit to protect the rights that have been guaranteed for 234 years and which the Supreme Court has explicitly reaffirmed several times over the last two decades.

PARTIES

- 9. Plaintiff is the United States of America.
- 10. Defendant Washington, D.C. is a governmental entity within the meaning of 34 U.S.C. § 12601, is responsible for funding Defendants Chief Smith and MPD, and is responsible for its acts or omissions.
- 11. Defendant Chief Smith is the current Chief of Police for the MPD. In that capacity, Chief Smith has the authority and obligation to enforce the laws of D.C. See D.C. Code § 5-105.01. Additionally, the Chief or her designee promulgate rules or regulations and implement gun registration and licensing within D.C. See D.C. Mun. Regs. tit. 24, § 2305.1.
- 12. Defendant MPD is the law enforcement agency that enforces the laws within Washington, D.C. See D.C. Code § 5–105.05. MPD serves as the gun registration and licensing office for all applicants within Washington, D.C. See D.C. Mun. Regs. Tit. 24,

6 7

5

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27 28 § 2305. Additionally, MPD has and exercises authority to arrest individuals committing a violation of criminal law in their presence, including when in the home of a law-abiding citizen who possesses an unregistered firearm, irrespective of whether the possession of such a firearm is constitutionally protected under *Heller* and progeny. See D.C. Code § 23-581.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- This Court has jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 13. 1343(a)(3), and 1345.
- The United States is authorized to initiate this action against all DC 14. Defendants and seek equitable and declaratory relief under the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, 34 U.S.C. § 12601(b).
- Venue is proper in the Federal District of Columbia pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 15. §§ 1391(b)(1)-(2) because all DC Defendants carry out their duties and operations within the District of Columbia, and the events, duties, obligations, or omissions giving rise to this claim, including the continued authority and duty to fine or arrest law-abiding citizens in violation of their Second Amendment rights, occurred and continue to occur within the Federal District of Columbia.

BACKGROUND

- Law-abiding citizens have a constitutional right to possess a "firearm in the 16. home operable for the purpose of immediate self-defense." Heller, 554 U.S. at 635. This right extends to those arms that are "in common use today." Bruen, 597 U.S. at 47.
- District of Columbia criminalizes possession of firearms not registered with 17. the MPD. D.C. See D.C. Code § 7-2502.01(a) ("No person or organization in the District shall possess or control any firearm, unless the person or organization holds a valid registration certificate for the firearm."); D.C. Code § 2507.06.
- 18. Certain categories of firearms may never be registered in D.C., which means they may never be legally possessed inside the home by law-abiding citizens for

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

self-defense, public defense, target shooting, or other lawful purposes. See D.C. Code § 7-2502.02(a).

- 19. The registration prohibition extends to an array of weapons currently in common use in America, including semi-automatic rifles like the AR-15 and numerous other pistols and shotguns. See D.C. Code \S 7-2501.01(3A)(A)¹.
- Other semi-automatic weapons defined as a prohibited "assault weapon" 20. include, for example: a) "semiautomatic pistol[s] that ha[ve] the capacity to accept a detachable magazine and . . . a threaded barrel"; and b) "[a] semiautomatic shotgun that has . . . a pistol grip that protrudes conspicuously beneath the action of the weapon." *Id*. The term "pistol grip" is not defined. *Id*.
- 21. If a law-abiding citizen possesses a Second Amendment-protected firearm that is not registerable in D.C. in the home for the lawful purpose of self-defense, that individual faces anything from an administrative fine to a criminal misdemeanor conviction punishable by up to one year in jail and a \$2,500 fine. See D.C. Code §§ 7-2507.06(a), (b)(1) (allowing for an administrative disposition of certain offenses at the prosecution's discretion); 22-3571.01(b)(5).
- 22. Chief Smith and MPD routinely arrest law-abiding citizens for possessing firearms that are protected under the Second Amendment but not registerable in D.C. See D.C. Code § 23-581. Upon information and belief, DC Defendants will continue to execute their duties as prescribed by law.

5

¹ The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in *Heller v. D.C.*, 670 F.3d 1244 (D.C. Cir. 2011), upheld the registration prohibitions at issue in the present litigation, but that court utilized "intermediate scrutiny." Subsequently, the U.S. Supreme Court in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Ass 'n, Inc. v. Bruen*, 597 U.S. 1, (2022), expressly repudiated application of intermediate scrutiny to its current two-prong test requiring plaintiffs to show the conduct is protected by the Second Amendment, then shifting the burden to the defendants to show the regulation or enforcement action is within the Nation's historical tradition. Accordingly, the Circuit court's assessment does not bar the current claim and is not binding precedent. Moreover, then-Judge Kavanaugh reached the opposite conclusion employing the text, history, and tradition test ultimately adopted by Bruen.

- 23. The Attorney General for the District of Columbia and the Office of Attorney General for the District of Columbia have the authority to prosecute all misdemeanor firearm offenses and seek enforcement of related fines. *See* D.C. Code § 23-101(a).
- 24. As a result of conduct by all DC Defendants, which District of Columbia's law mandates, law-abiding citizens who own firearms protected under the Second Amendment are prevented from registering and, therefore, legally possessing within the meaning of local ordinance such firearms within our Nation's capital. *See* Def. Mot. Dismiss, *Yzaguirre v. District of Columbia*, No. 1:24-cv-01828 (D.D.C. Jan. 15, 2025), Dkt. No. 26.
- 25. As a result of conduct by all DC Defendants, which District of Columbia's law mandates, law-abiding citizens possessing firearms protected under the Second Amendment face arrest, fines, prosecution, and forfeiture of their property.
- 26. Unless and until this Court enjoins DC Defendants and enters the declaratory relief that the United States is seeking, DC Defendants will continue enforcing the unconstitutional provisions of D.C. law.

COUNT I

(Violation of 34 U.S.C. § 12601 – Unconstitutional Pattern or Practice of Preventing Possession of Firearms Protected under the Second Amendment by Law-Abiding Citizens for Lawful Purposes)

- 27. The United States re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1-[[##]] above.
- 28. The United States is authorized under 34 U.S.C. § 12601(b) to seek declaratory and equitable relief to eliminate a pattern or practice of law enforcement officer conduct that deprives persons of rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States.
- 29. The Second Amendment of the United States Constitution generally protects the right of law-abiding individuals to keep and bear arms in common use for lawful purposes such as self-defense while in the home. *See generally Heller*, 554 U.S. 570.

- 30. D.C. Code currently prohibits the registration of the AR-15 and other semi-automatic rifles, which makes it illegal for law-abiding citizens to possess these firearms in the home for lawful purposes. D.C. Code § 7-2501.01(3A)(A)(i)(I)(ee).
- 31. The AR-15 is a firearm in common use for lawful purposes.² Other semi-automatic rifles that D.C. code bans are also in common use by law-abiding citizens for lawful purposes.
- 32. Handguns "are the most popular weapon chosen by Americans for self-defense in the home . . . " *Heller*, 554 U.S. at 629.
- 33. Shotguns not otherwise barred by Federal law and protected under the Second Amendment are not only commonly used for lawful purposes, but they also provide an important means of self-defense. *See McDonald v. City of Chicago, Ill.*, 561 U.S. 742, 857-8 (2010) (Thomas, J., concurring).
- 34. There is no exception in the D.C. Code to the registration prohibition of firearms currently banned under the D.C. Code yet otherwise protected under the Second Amendment for law-abiding citizens seeking to possess them for lawful purposes.
- 35. There is no historically analogous prohibition of the broad ban of firearms that are in common use by law-abiding citizens for lawful purposes, such as self-defense inside the home.
- 36. There is no historically analogous justification for the prohibition of the broad ban of commonly used firearms by law-abiding citizens for lawful purposes, such as self-defense inside the home.
- 37. Chief Smith and the MPD are law enforcement authorities subject to the prohibition in 34 U.S.C. § 12601(a), and the officers in their employ are law enforcement officers who act on DC Defendants' behalf in the discharge of their duties, including the duty to process and approve applications for firearm registration within D.C.

² Smith & Wesson Brands, Inc. v. Estados Unidos Mexicanos, 605 U.S. 280, 297 (2025) (unanimous opinion) (noting that "[t]he AR-15 is the most popular rifle in the country").

- 38. The District of Columbia is a governmental entity within the meaning of 34 U.S.C. § 12601(a) and funds Defendants Chief Smith and the MPD to carry out its duties as required by the D.C. Code.
- 39. The denial and prohibition of registrations as alleged in *Yzaguirre*, et al. v. D.C., et al., 1:24-cv-1828 (D. D.C.) are not isolated, peculiar, or accidental incidents.
- 40. Indeed, unconstitutional law and official policy obligates all DC Defendants to deny registration of Second Amendment-protected firearms that law-abiding citizens possess for lawful use within D.C. and to arrest such individuals for conduct the Second Amendment protects.
- 41. Accordingly, DC Defendants have engaged, and continue to engage, in a pattern or practice of conduct by law enforcement officers that deprives people of rights secured and protected by the Constitution, in violation of 34 U.S.C. § 12601(a).
- 42. Unless this Court enjoins DC Defendants and grants the declaratory relief the United States is seeking, all DC Defendants will continue to engage in the pattern or practice of the conduct described above, which deprives law-abiding individuals of their Second Amendment rights to possess firearms protected under the Second Amendment for lawful purposes, such as self-defense in the home.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

- 43. WHEREFORE, the United States hereby prays that the Court grant the following relief:
- a. A declaration that DC Defendants are engaged in a pattern or practice of conduct by law enforcement officers that deprives persons of rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States in violation of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, 34 U.S.C. § 12601(b), including, but not limited to:
- i. A declaration that the pattern and practice by DC Defendants of prohibiting registration of the AR-15 by law-abiding citizens violates the Second Amendment; and

1	ii. A declaration	on that the pattern and practice by DC Defendants of					
2	prohibiting registration of all other firearms without an automatic firing mechanism and						
3	otherwise protected under the Second Amendment that law-abiding citizens possess						
4	violates the Second Amendment;						
5	b. A permanent injunction prohibiting all DC Defendants from arresting and						
6	levying fines against otherwise law-abiding citizens for possessing the AR-15 and all other						
7	firearms protected by the Second Amendment and being possessed or used for lawful						
8	purposes;						
9	c. A permanent injunction	requiring all DC Defendants within a reasonable					
10	period of time to enable and allow the registration of firearms protected under the Second						
11	Amendment by law-abiding citizens; and						
12	d. An award of all such ado	ditional relief as the interests of justice may require.					
13							
14	DATED: December 22, 2025.	Respectfully submitted:					
15 16		HARMEET K. DHILLON Assistant Attorney General Civil Rights Division					
17		JESUS A. OSETE Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General					
1819		R. JONAS GEISSLER Deputy Assistant Attorney General					
20		/s/ Andrew M. Darlington					
21		ANDREW M. DARLINGTON Senior Counsel					
22		GREGORY DOLIN					
23		Senior Counsel					
2425		WILLIAM J. HANRAHAN AUSTIN FULK Trial Attorneys, Second Amendment Section					
26		Attorneys for Plaintiff					
27		UNITED STATES OF AMERICA					
28							

CIVIL COVER SHEET

JS-44 (Rev. 10/2020 DC)				. ,		-						
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				- 1	EFENDA							
United States of America				her Dis	THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, CHIEF OF POLICE PAMELA SMITH, in her official capacity as Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, the METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.							
(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE (EXC		STED PLAINTIFFLAINTIFF CASES)		_			(IN U.S	. PLAINTI	ED DEFENDANT FF CASES ONLY) IELOCATION OF THE TRACTOR	E LAND INIVOLV		
(c) ATTORNEYS (FIRM NA	ME ADDRESS	, AND TELEPHONE NUMBER)		AT	TORNEYS			CASES, USE II	ELOCATION OF THE TRACTO	LAND INVOLV	ED	
1 ` ′	*	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		- 1	orney G	`	,	Schwall	1			
Andrew M. Darlington; Civil Rights Division U.S. Department of Justice; 950 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20530; Tel.: (202) 550-5305; Andrew.Darlington@usdoj.gov					orriey C	cilciai	Dilair	ochwali	,			
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (PLACE AN x IN ONE BOX ONLY)			III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (PLACE AN X IN ONE BOX FOR PLAINTIFF AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT) FOR DIVERSITY CASES ONLY!									
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff				Citizen of this State PTF O 1 O 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in This State							O 4	
2 U.S. Government Defendant		versity ndicate Citizenship of	Citizen	of Ano	ther State	O 2	O 2	Incorpo	rated and Principal Plac	e O 5	O 5	
-	Parties in item III)		Citizen or Sub Foreign Coun			O 3	O 3	of Busin Foreign	ess in Another State Nation	O 6	O 6	
(Dlage on V	·	IV. CASE ASSIG							- 1: Notano of C	<u>:</u> 4\		
		ory, A-N, that best repres										
○ A. Antitrust	A. Antitrust O B. Personal Injury/ Malpractice			© C. Administrative Agency Review				v	O D. Temporary Restraining Order/Preliminary			
410 Antitrust	1	irplane	151 Medicare Act Social Security				Injunctio)n				
	1	irplane Product Liability					Any nature of suit					
	1	ssault, Libel & Slander ederal Employers Liability	861 HIA (1395ff)					may be selected for this category of case assignment.				
	340 M			862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI					_	case assignment.		
		arine Product Liability	1						*(If Antitrust, then A governs)*			
	350 Motor Vehicle			965 DSI (405(c))								
	l <u> </u>	otor Vehicle Product Liabil ther Personal Injury	Other Statutes 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 890 Other Statutory Actions (If Administrative Agency is									
		ledical Malpractice										
		roduct Liability										
		ealth Care/Pharmaceutical										
		ersonal Injury Product Liab sbestos Product Liability										
© E. General Civ	il (Other)	OR		0	F. Pro			ivil				
Real Property 210 Land Condemn	nation	Bankruptcy 422 Appeal 27 USC 1	158		Federal Tax Suits 870 Taxes (US plaintiff or			tiff or	462 Naturaliz Applicati			
220 Foreclosure					defendant)			465 Other Immigration				
	230 Rent, Lease & Ejectment			871 IRS-Third Party 26 US			y 26 USC	Actions				
	240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability Prisoner Petitions 535 Death Penalty					7609			470 Racketee			
290 All Other Real Property 540 Mandamus & Otl					Forfeiture/Penalty 625 Drug Related Seizure of				& Corrupt Organization 480 Consumer Credit			
									490 Cable/Satellite TV 850 Securities/Commodities/			
Personal Property	Personal Property 555 Prison Condition 370 Other Fraud 560 Civil Detainee –				Property 21 USC 881							
	371 Truth in Lending of Confinement								Exchange			
□ 380 Other Personal Property Damage □ 385 Property Damage Product Liability □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 835 Patent – Abbrevi Drug Application □ 840 Trademark □ 880 Defend Trade Se 2016 (DTSA)					Other Statutes				896 Arbitrati		ooduro	
					375 False Claims Act 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) 400 State Reapportionment 430 Banks & Banking 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc.			899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision				
			iated Nev	w				950 Constitutionality of State Statutes 890 Other Statutory Actions (if not administrative agency				
			n									
				4 . 6								
			zerets Act 01		460 Deportation			review or Privacy Act)				

☐ G. Habeas Corpus/ 2255 ☐ 530 Habeas Corpus – General ☐ 510 Motion/Vacate Sentence ☐ 463 Habeas Corpus – Alien Detainee	O H. Employment Discrimination 442 Civil Rights – Employment (criteria: race, gender/sex, national origin, discrimination, disability, age, religion, retaliation)	○ I. FOIA/Privacy Act ■ 895 Freedom of Information Act ■ 890 Other Statutory Actions (if Privacy Act)	J. Student Loan 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (excluding veterans)				
	(If pro se, select this deck)	*(If pro se, select this deck)*					
O K. Labor/ERISA (non-employment) 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgnt. Relations 740 Labor Railway Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	■ L. Other Civil Rights (non-employment) 441 Voting (if not Voting Rights Act) 443 Housing/Accommodations 440 Other Civil Rights 445 Americans w/Disabilities – Employment 446 Americans w/Disabilities – Other 448 Education	M. Contract 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholder's Suits 190 Other Contracts 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	N. Three-Judge Court 441 Civil Rights – Voting (if Voting Rights Act)				
V. ORIGIN							
© 1 Original Proceeding From State Court C							
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (CITE THE U.S. CIVIL STATUTE UNDER WHICH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE A BRIEF STATEMENT OF CAUSE.)							
34 USC 12601; Defendants conduct a pattern or practice of infringing against Second Amendment rights.							
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 DEMAND \$ JURY DEMAND: Check YES only if demanded in complaint YES NO X							
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY	(See instruction) YES	NO If yes, p	lease complete related case form				
DATE: 12/22/2025	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RE	CORD Andrew M. D.	arlington				

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET JS-44 Authority for Civil Cover Sheet

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and services of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. Listed below are tips for completing the civil cover sheet. These tips coincide with the Roman Numerals on the cover sheet.

- I. COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF/DEFENDANT (b) County of residence: Use 1 100 1 to indicate plaintiff ir resident of Washington, DC, 88888 if plaintiff is resident of United States but not Washington, DC, and 99999 if plaintiff is outside the United States.
- III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES: This section is completed <u>only</u> if diversity of citizenship was selected as the Basis of Jurisdiction under Section II.
- IV. CASE ASSIGNMENT AND NATURE OF SUIT: The assignment of a judge to your case will depend on the category you select that best represents the <u>primary</u> cause of action found in your complaint. You may select only <u>one</u> category. You <u>must</u> also select <u>one</u> corresponding nature of suit found under the category of the case.
- VI. CAUSE OF ACTION: Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a briefstatement of the primary cause.
- VIII. RELATED CASE(S), IF ANY: If you indicated that there is a related case, you must complete a related case form, which may be obtained from the Clerk's Office.

Because of the need for accurate and complete information, you should ensure the accuracy of the information provided prior to signing the form.