

1 Steven J. Serbalik, Bar No. 028191  
2 **STEVEN J. SERBALIK, P.L.C.**  
3 4925 E. Desert Cove Ave Unit 116  
4 Scottsdale, Arizona 85254  
5 Telephone: (480) 269-1529  
6 [steveserbalik@gmail.com](mailto:steveserbalik@gmail.com)  
7 *Attorney for Plaintiffs Aaron Cross and the*  
8 *Arizona Conference of Police and Sheriffs, Inc.*

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Aaron Cross, individually and the Arizona  
Conference of Police and Sheriffs, an Arizona  
nonprofit corporation,  
  
Plaintiffs,

v.

Chris Nanos, in his official capacity as Sheriff  
of the Pima County Sheriff’s Department; Juan  
Carlos Navarro, in his official capacity as a  
Captain of the Pima County Sheriff’s  
Department.

Defendants.

NO.

**VERIFIED COMPLAINT AND  
PETITION FOR A PRELIMINARY  
INJUNCTION**

Plaintiff’s Aaron Cross and the Arizona Conference of Police and Sheriffs  
 (“AZCOPS”) (collectively where appropriate the “Plaintiffs”) for their Complaint against  
 Chris Nanos and Juan Carlos Navarro (collectively where appropriate the “Defendants”)   
 allege as follows:

**JURISDICTIONAL ALLEGATIONS**

1. Jurisdiction is appropriate pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331 because Plaintiffs bring  
 this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983 and the First and Fourteenth Amendments of the  
 United States Constitution. This Court also has supplemental and/or pendent jurisdiction

1 over state constitutional, common law and statutory claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.

2 2. This Court has jurisdiction of Plaintiffs' federal law claims pursuant to 28  
3 U.S.C. §1331 and 42 U.S.C. §1988. Plaintiffs seek injunctive relief.

4 3. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to A.R.S. §12-401 and 28 U.S.C. §1391  
5 as the parties are residents and entities of Pima County and the events underlying this  
6 lawsuit occurred in Pima County, an area wholly within the District of Arizona. All parties  
7 are residents of and/or are doing business in Arizona.

8 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

9 4. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate, by this reference, their claims, facts and  
10 allegations in the paragraphs above as if set forth fully therein.

11 5. Defendant Chris Nanos is the duly-elected Sheriff of Pima County, with the  
12 ultimate authority and responsibility to establish policy, practices, customs, procedures,  
13 protocols and training for the Pima County Sheriff's Department ("PCSD") as an official  
14 policymaker. As the elected Sheriff, Nanos has official, vicarious, direct and supervisory  
15 liability of the PCSD's officers, agents and employees.

16 6. Defendant Juan Carlos Navarro is a Captain with PCSD, and in that role he  
17 transmits reports and recommendations to Sheriff Nanos and other officials in Pima  
18 County, who rely upon his actions and recommendations in deciding on disciplinary  
19 actions and policy interpretations.

20 7. Plaintiff AZCOPS is a statewide organization dedicated to fair representation of  
21 law enforcement officers located around the State of Arizona. Plaintiff Cross is an  
22 AZCOPS member, and AZCOPS therefore provides Plaintiff Cross with legal  
23 representation and incurs costs and fees associated with this representation.

24 **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS**

25 **Aaron Cross's Employment with the Pima County Sheriff's Department**

26 8. Plaintiff Aaron Cross is a Pima County Sergeant and state-certified peace  
27 officer.

28 9. In April 2024, Defendant Nanos initiated an internal investigation and his

1 his employees “admonished” Plaintiff Cross due to comments he made during an off-duty  
2 interview — only to have the “investigation” closed after he filed a federal lawsuit. The  
3 parties agreed to dismiss the case with prejudice, but only after the case was mooted by  
4 the Sheriff by ceasing the chilling conduct.

5 10. This case represents a further chilling effect on Plaintiffs’ First Amendment  
6 rights after the prior lawsuit was dismissed.

7 11. On October 12, 2024, Plaintiff Cross - while off duty - participated in a  
8 political event by holding a sign on a public sidewalk which stated "Deputies don't want  
9 Nanos.”

10 12. During the October 12th political event, Plaintiff Cross was wearing personally  
11 owned clothing which, while similar in style and color to those of on-duty deputies, did  
12 not bear any insignia or badging associated with the PCSD. He was not wearing any  
13 department issued equipment. He had his personally-owned gun, handcuffs, and handcuff  
14 holder on his belt.

15 13. No policies of PCSD or Pima County govern what deputies can wear off duty.

16 14. During the political event, Plaintiff Cross was with another similarly dressed  
17 individual who was not an active member of the PCSD. No one present wore any County  
18 or PCSD insignia, and to the best of Plaintiff Cross’ knowledge, no one wore any county  
19 or PCSD issued equipment.

20 15. Shortly after the event, Plaintiff Cross received a call from Captain Navarro, a  
21 supervisor within PCSD, who claimed there had been "complaints" that on-duty PCSD  
22 employees were engaged in a protest against Sheriff Nanos while in uniform.

23 16. Plaintiff Cross confirmed to Captain Navarro that he was not on duty at the  
24 time of the event, and that he was not in uniform - everything he was wearing was  
25 personally owned and purchased.

26 17. Captain Navarro gave Plaintiff Cross an order that if he participated in future  
27 political events, he could not wear anything which deputies wore while "on duty.”

28 18. Plaintiff Cross asked for the policy which was associated with this order, but it

1 was not provided. Plaintiff Cross asked for this order to be provided in writing, and this  
2 request was also denied.

3 19. On October 14, 2024, Plaintiff Cross again participated in a political event  
4 while off duty, holding the same sign as on October 12th.

5 20. In compliance with Captain Navarro's verbal order, Plaintiff Cross was dressed  
6 in a gray "Under Armor" shirt and khaki "BDU" style pants - an outfit that to the best of  
7 Plaintiff Cross' knowledge - no one is issued or wears while on-duty for PCSD.

8 21. During the October 14th political event, Plaintiff Cross received a phone call  
9 and was ordered to appear in his supervisor's office in 30 minutes.

10 22. When Plaintiff Cross arrived at the supervisor's office, he was placed on paid  
11 administrative leave for an unspecified reason while pending an unspecified investigation.  
12 Plaintiff Cross was admonished from communicating to others that he was on  
13 administrative leave.

14 23. Plaintiff Cross is the head of the Pima County Deputies Organization - a labor  
15 organization that has the largest number of sworn deputies in Pima County.

16 24. Plaintiff Cross' admonishment - which does not even allow him to speak about  
17 the fact that he is on administrative leave - has a direct impact on his ability to  
18 communicate matters of public concern to members of his labor organization and to the  
19 public.

20 25. On the morning of October 15, 2024, Counsel for Plaintiff Cross sent a letter to  
21 Sean Holguin, the legal advisor for PCSD, informing him of the events and requesting -  
22 based on the fact that Plaintiff Cross was engaging in protected Free Speech activities and  
23 was not in PCSD uniform - that PCSD remove Plaintiff Cross from administrative leave  
24 and release him from the admonishment by 1500 hours [See Attachment A].

25 26. PCSD did not respond to Counsel's letter, remove Plaintiff Cross from  
26 administrative leave or release him from admonishment.

27 27. In the afternoon hours of October 15th, PCSD provided a media release related  
28 to the PCSD IA investigation into Plaintiff Cross [See Exhibit B].

1           28. In their PCSD media release, Defendants falsely claims that “[a]lthough  
2 Sergeant Cross was off duty, he was dressed in department issued attire.”

3           29. Defendants knew the claim that Plaintiff Cross was dressed in department  
4 issued attire was false when PCSO issued the media release because, based on Plaintiff  
5 Cross' communication with the supervisor after the first political event, they were aware  
6 that everything Plaintiff Cross was wearing was personally owned and purchased.

7           30. Prior to the false press release, the Arizona Star’s website ([tucson.com](http://tucson.com)) had  
8 released a picture of the attire of members of the protest - and noted in their caption that  
9 no PCSD insignia were present on the protestors [See Exhibit C].

10           31. The PCSD media release falsely claims that Plaintiff Cross’ attire at the  
11 October 13th event was a “direct violation of his Commander's orders, by appearing  
12 equipped like a law enforcement officer who is associated with official duties," while  
13 ignoring the fact that Plaintiff Cross' attire was different in color and style than any of the  
14 approved clothing for on-duty deputies.

15           32. The PCSD media release mischaracterizes Plaintiff Cross’ actions, falsely  
16 suggesting that they raised concerns related to specific regulations within the Sheriff's  
17 Office, Pima County and State and Federal Law which prohibit campaigning while  
18 representing oneself as a department member under the color of authority.

19           33. The Defendants’ actions - placing Plaintiff Cross on administrative leave and  
20 issuing an untruthful media release - create a chilling effect on Plaintiff Cross’ and  
21 AZCOPS members’ First Amendment rights. Plaintiff Cross was also admonished from  
22 communicating to unauthorized persons that he was on administrative leave, further  
23 impacting Plaintiff Cross’s First Amendment rights.

24           34. Without this Court’s intervention, Defendants will continue to keep Plaintiff  
25 Cross on administrative leave and uphold its admonishment in retaliation for his speaking  
26 off-duty on a matter of public concern, further damaging and chilling Plaintiff Cross’ First  
27 Amendment rights.

28           35. Because the majority of PCSD sworn Deputies are members of Plaintiff

1 AZCOPS, Plaintiff Cross' administrative leave would have a further chilling effect on the  
2 ability of AZCOPS members to exercise their First Amendment rights to comment on  
3 matters of public concern.

#### 4 **Damages to Plaintiffs**

5 36. Plaintiff Cross suffered and continues to suffer chilling effects on his right to  
6 speak regarding matters of public concern.

7 37. Plaintiff AZCOPS will have thousands of dollars in legal costs and fees to  
8 represent Plaintiff Cross in fighting Defendants' actions, which do not respect the Federal  
9 and Arizona Constitutional rights of its members.

10 38. Plaintiffs' fear that, without this Court's intervention, Defendants will continue  
11 to inflict harm upon them by prohibiting Plaintiff Cross from speaking on matters of  
12 public concern, and by wrongfully disciplining Plaintiff Cross without respecting his  
13 constitutional rights to speak on matters of public concern.

#### 14 **COUNT I**

#### 15 **42 U.S.C. §1983 - Violation of Federal Constitutional Rights**

16 39. Plaintiffs reallege each and every allegation set forth in the paragraphs above  
17 and incorporate each allegation by this reference.

18 40. Plaintiff Cross has the constitutional right to be free from a deprivation of a  
19 protected interest (his right to speak on matters of public concern) without due process of  
20 law.

21 41. Unless otherwise specified, Defendants were at all material times acting under  
22 the color of law and in their capacity as officials and agents of their respective government  
23 agencies.

24 42. Defendant Nanos intentionally or recklessly allowed an employment action  
25 against Plaintiff Cross that deprived Plaintiff Cross of the ability to contribute to  
26 conversations related to matters of public concern, and failed to consider or understand the  
27 First Amendment right to freedom of speech on matters of public concern.

28 43. Defendant Navarro intentionally or recklessly engaged in an employment

1 action against Plaintiff Cross that deprived Plaintiff Cross of the ability to contribute to  
2 conversations related to matters of public concern, and failed to consider or understand the  
3 First Amendment right to freedom of speech on matters of public concern.

4 44. Plaintiff Cross and AZCOPS will face further damages and chilling effects if  
5 Defendants are allowed to keep Plaintiff Cross on administrative leave and under  
6 admonishment while proceeding with their investigation.

7 45. The lack of a meaningful consideration of the Federal constitutional concerns  
8 will cause actual damages to Plaintiffs in the form of time and money that will be  
9 expended to defend against Defendants unlawful actions.

10 46. Defendants wrongful conduct as referenced in this Complaint constitute  
11 violations of the United States Constitution, including, but not limited to, Amendments I  
12 and XIV, in that Plaintiffs were deprived of privileges and immunities guaranteed to all  
13 citizens of the United States by being categorically deprived of their ability to participate  
14 in speech related to matters of public concern, without proper cause, with an  
15 unconstitutional motive and malice, without equal protection and without substantive and  
16 procedural due process.

17 47. Defendants' wrongful conduct both actually and proximately caused damage to  
18 Plaintiff in the form of attorneys fees in an amount to be determined by the Court.

19 **COUNT II**

20 **Arizona Constitution Art. 2, §6 - Violation of State Constitutional Rights**

21 48. Plaintiffs reallege each and every allegation set forth in the paragraphs above  
22 and incorporate each allegation by this reference.

23 49. Unless otherwise specified, Defendants were at all material times acting under  
24 the color of law and in their capacity as officials and agents of their respective government  
25 agencies.

26 50. Defendants initiated and took part in Plaintiff Cross' orders, administrative  
27 leave, and admonishment.

28 51. The actions against Plaintiff Cross failed to consider his right to participate in

1 speech related to matters of public concern, and the protections contemplated in the  
2 Arizona Constitution - particularly Art. 2 §6 - which states - “Every person may freely  
3 speak, write, and publish on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of that right.”

4 52. Defendants’ wrongful conduct both actually and proximately caused damages  
5 to Plaintiffs in the form of attorneys fees in an amount to be determined by the Court.

6 **COUNT III**

7 **Negligence and Gross Negligence**

8 53. Plaintiffs reallege each and every allegation set forth in the paragraphs above  
9 and incorporate each allegation by this reference.

10 54. Unless otherwise specified, Defendants were at all material times acting under  
11 the color of law and in their capacity as officials and agents of their respective government  
12 agencies.

13 55. Defendants owed a duty to Plaintiff Cross to use care to avoid or prevent harm  
14 caused by improperly disciplining an employee.

15 56. Defendants owed a duty to Plaintiff Cross to ensure that his rights to  
16 participate in speech in his capacity as a private citizen on matters of public concern were  
17 protected before issuing an unlawful directive and improperly placing him on  
18 administrative leave.

19 57. Defendants owed a duty to Plaintiff Cross to not knowingly or recklessly make  
20 false or misleading statements about Plaintiff Cross in the media.

21 58. Defendants breached their duties by incompetently and illegally issuing a  
22 directive to Plaintiff Cross regarding how he must engage in his constitutionally protected  
23 speech.

24 59. Defendants breached their duties by incompetently and illegally placing  
25 Plaintiff Cross on administrative leave for engaging in constitutionally protected speech.

26 60. Defendants breached their duties by continuing to keep Plaintiff Cross on  
27 administrative leave after they were advised, in writing, through their legal  
28 representatives, that this action had a chilling effect on Plaintiff Cross’ rights to speak on



1 matters of public concern.

2 61. Defendants breached their duties by issuing a PCSD media release that  
3 intentionally or recklessly included claims that Defendants knew or should have known  
4 were false and/or misleading.

5 62. Defendants' breach both actually and proximately caused damage to Plaintiffs  
6 in the form of attorneys fees in an amount to be determined by the Court.

7 **PETITION FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

8 63. Plaintiffs reallege each and every allegation set forth in the paragraphs above  
9 and incorporate each allegation by this reference.

10 64. Upon information and belief, Defendants intend to keep Plaintiff on  
11 administrative leave and under admonishment while they proceed with an unspecified  
12 internal investigation into Plaintiff Cross.

13 65. Without preliminary relief, Plaintiffs would incur substantial hardship,  
14 including additional costs, the exposure of legal strategies, and a deficient appeal process  
15 that would materially harm their protected interests.

16 52. For these reasons, as well as those set forth in the accompanying Motion,  
17 Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court enjoin Defendants from taking any further  
18 adverse actions against Plaintiff Cross or any member of Plaintiff AZCOPS until the Court  
19 can address the procedural and substantive concerns raised in this Complaint.

20 53. Although legal service of this Complaint and Petition is pending,  
21 Defendants were provided through their legal representation with actual electronic copies  
22 of the Complaint and Motion for a Preliminary Injunction via email immediately after this  
23 document was filed with the Court.

24 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

25 Plaintiffs pray for judgment against the Defendants as follows:

- 26 (a) For attorneys fees arising from Procedural Due Process violations in an  
27 amount to be determined by the Court;
- 28 (b) For attorneys fees arising from Substantive Due Process violations in an

1 amount to be determined by the Court;

2 (c) For attorneys fees arising from Negligence in an amount to be determined  
3 by the Court;

4 (d) General damages in an amount to be proved at trial, including but not  
5 limited to damages to reputation, emotional distress, lost profits, deprivation  
6 of constitutional rights, humiliation, and attorney's fees;

7 (e) Cost and attorneys' fees as may be allowed by law and 42 U.S.C. §1988;

8 (f) Interim and permanent injunctive relief to remedy past violations and to  
9 prevent further violations of Plaintiffs' rights; and

10 (g) Such other and further relief which is just and reasonable.

11 **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

12 Plaintiffs request a jury trial as appropriate.

13 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 17th day of October, 2024.

14 **STEVEN J SERBALIK, P.L.C.**

15  
16 By: /s/Steven J. Serbalik  
17 Steven J. Serbalik  
18 4925 E. Desert Cove Ave #116  
19 Scottsdale, Arizona 85254  
Attorney for Plaintiffs Aaron Cross and the  
Arizona Conference of Police and Sheriffs, Inc.

20 **Verification of Aaron Cross**

21 I, Aaron Cross, under penalty of perjury, have read this Verified Complaint, and I avow  
22 that the items listed herein for which I have personal knowledge are true and accurate to  
23 the best of my knowledge.

24   
25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 Aaron Cross  
27  
28