

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF GRUNDY COUNTY  
THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT  
STATE OF MISSOURI**

AARON M. MALIN, )  
Plaintiff, )  
vs. )

NORTHWEST INTERAGENCY TEAM RESPONSE )  
OPERATION (NITRO Task Force); RODNEY )  
HERRING, in his official capacity as a member )  
of the NITRO Task Force’s Executive Board; )  
RICK BASHOR, in his official capacity as a )  
member of the NITRO Task Force’s Executive )  
Board; KEITH WOOD, in his official capacity as )  
a member of the NITRO Task Force’s )  
Executive Board; BEN BECERRA, in his official )  
capacity as a member of the NITRO Task )  
Force’s Executive Board; PORTER HENSON, in )  
his official capacity as a member of the )  
NITRO Task Force’s Executive Board; ROGER )  
DURANT, in his official capacity as a member )  
of the NITRO Task Force’s Executive Board; )  
TOMMY WRIGHT, in his official capacity as a )  
member of the NITRO Task Force’s Executive )  
Board; DENNIS MARTIN, in his official capacity )  
as a member of the NITRO Task Force’s )  
Executive Board; JOHN ECKERSON, in his )  
official capacity as a member of the NITRO )  
Task Force’s Executive Board; STEVE COX, in )  
his official capacity as a member of the )  
NITRO Task Force’s Executive Board; )  
GREGORY GANT, in his official capacity as a )  
member of the NITRO Task Force’s Executive )  
Board; J. BRET JOHNSON, in his official )  
capacity as a member of the NITRO Task )  
Force’s Executive Board; and the MISSOURI )  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY, )  
Defendants. )

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

Division \_\_\_\_\_

**PETITION**

1. Plaintiff Aaron Malin (“Malin”) brings this action against the Defendants to seek redress for violations of the Missouri Sunshine Law (§§ 610.010 to 610.035, RSMo.) and the Intergovernmental Drug Laws Enforcement Act (§§ 195.501 to 195.511, RSMo.).

1 2. Malin asks this Court to issue an order (1) declaring that Defendant Northwest  
2 Interagency Team Response Operation (“NITRO” or “the Task Force”) and its officers or agents  
3 are subject to the Missouri Sunshine Law, (2) declaring that the Task Force and its officers or  
4 agents have violated various requirements under the Sunshine Law, (3) enjoining the Task Force  
5 and its officers or agents from future violations of the Sunshine Law, and (4) awarding Malin  
6 litigation costs, attorney’s fees, and an appropriate civil penalty as authorized by the Sunshine  
7 Law.  
8

9 3. Malin also asks this Court to issue an order (1) declaring that the Intergovernmental Drug  
10 Laws Enforcement Act conditions a task force’s eligibility for state grants on meeting certain  
11 requirements, (2) declaring that the Task Force does not satisfy the requirements the  
12 Intergovernmental Drug Laws Enforcement Act imposes on eligibility for state grants, (3)  
13 declaring that the Task Force has not been and is not now eligible to receive state grants, (4)  
14 declaring that Defendant Missouri Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) has violated the law by  
15 authorizing direct expenditures of taxpayer funds to the Task Force, and (5) enjoining DPS from  
16 determining and/or certifying to the auditor or any other public official that the Task Force is  
17 eligible to receive state grants unless and until the Task Force satisfies the legal requirements to  
18 be eligible for state grants.  
19  
20

21  
22 **Venue and Jurisdiction**

23 4. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Missouri’s Injunction Act, §  
24 526.030, RSMo., the Missouri Declaratory Judgment Act, § 527.010, RSMo., and the Missouri  
25 Sunshine Act, §§ 610.027 and 610.030, RSMo.  
26

27 5. Venue for this action is proper in this Court because Defendant NITRO’s principal place  
28 of business is in Grundy County and Defendant Rodney Herring lives in Grundy County.

1  
2 **Parties**

3 6. Plaintiff Aaron Malin is a resident and taxpayer of Chesterfield, Missouri; taxes he pays  
4 to his city and county provide public funding to the St. Louis County Multi-Jurisdictional Task  
5 Force and his state taxes provide public funding to all multijurisdictional enforcement groups  
6 that receive state grants.  
7

8 7. Malin is pursuing this case not only to defend his own rights under the Sunshine Law, but  
9 also on behalf of all state and local taxpayers with the goal of ending the use of taxpayer funds in  
10 ways that violate the Intergovernmental Drug Laws Enforcement Act.  
11

12 8. Defendant Northwest Interagency Team Response Organization, also known as the  
13 NITRO Task Force (“the Task Force”), is a multi-jurisdictional enforcement group purportedly  
14 formed pursuant to § 195.505.1, RSMo.  
15

16 9. Defendant Rodney Herring is the Sheriff of Grundy County, the Project Director for the  
17 Task Force, and a member of the Northwestern Interagency Team Response Organization’s  
18 Executive Board (“the Task Force’s Executive Board”); he is sued in his official capacity.  
19

20 10. Defendant Rick Bashor is the Chief of Police for the Cameron Police Department and a  
21 member of the Task Force’s Executive Board; he is sued in his official capacity.  
22

23 11. Defendant Keith Wood, is the Director of the Maryville Department of Public Safety and  
24 is a member of the Task Force’s Executive Board; he is sued in his official capacity.  
25

26 12. Defendant Ben Brecerra is the Sheriff of Daviess County and a member of the Task  
27 Force’s Executive Board; he is sued in his official capacity.  
28

13. Defendant Porter Henson is the Sheriff of Clinton County and a member of the Task  
Force’s Executive Board; he is sued in his official capacity.

1 14. Defendant Roger Durant is a civilian resident of Cameron, Missouri, appointed to serve  
2 as a member of the Task Force's Executive Board; he is sued in his official capacity.

3 15. Defendant Tommy Wright is the Chief of Police for the Trenton Police Department and a  
4 member of the Task Force's Executive Board; he is sued in his official capacity.

5 16. Defendant Dennis Martin is the Sheriff of Atchison County and a member of the Task  
6 Force's Executive Board; he is sued in his official capacity.

7 17. Defendant Josh Eckerson is the Sheriff of Harrison County and a member of the Task  
8 Force's Executive Board; he is sued in his official capacity.

9 18. Defendant Steve Cox is the Sheriff of Livingston County and a member of the Task  
10 Force's Executive Board; he is sued in his official capacity.

11 19. Defendant J. Bret Johnson is the Colonel of the Missouri Highway Patrol and, upon  
12 information and belief, is a member of the Task Force's Executive Board; he is sued in his  
13 official capacity.

14 20. Defendant Gregory Gant is the Special Agent in charge of the Kansas City Field Division  
15 of the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives ("ATF") and a member of  
16 the Task Force's Executive Board; he is sued in his official capacity.

17 21. Defendants Herring, Bashor, Wood, Brecerra, Henson, Durant, Wright, Martin, Eckerson,  
18 Cox, Johnson, and Gant will be referred to collectively as "the Task Force's Executive Board."

19 22. Defendant Missouri Department of Public Safety ("DPS") is the government agency  
20 responsible for monitoring the operations of multi-jurisdictional enforcement groups to ensure  
21 that groups receiving state grants authorized by the General Assembly meet the eligibility  
22 requirements for those grants; § 195.509.3 requires DPS to monitor the operations of multi-  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 jurisdictional enforcement group units and to “determine and certify to the auditor the amount of  
2 [state grants] to be made to each designated MEG financial officer.”

### 3 4 **The Intergovernmental Drug Laws Enforcement Act**

5 23. Section 195.503(4) defines “Multijurisdictional Enforcement Group”, or “MEG,” as “*a*  
6 *combination of political subdivisions established under sections 573.500 and 573.503, section*  
7 *178.653, and section 311.329*, to investigate and enforce computer, Internet-based, narcotics,  
8 and drug violations.” [emphasis added]

9  
10 24. The definition of “Multijurisdictional Enforcement Group” in § 195.503(4) does not  
11 contemplate the formation of task forces that would include government entities other than  
12 political subdivisions of the state of Missouri or, in limited cases, political subdivisions of states  
13 bordering Missouri counties.

14  
15 25. Section 195.505 authorizes and governs the formation of task forces, providing:

16 *Any two or more political subdivisions or the state highway patrol and any one*  
17 *or more political subdivisions* may by order or ordinance agree to cooperate with  
18 one another in the formation of a multijurisdictional enforcement group  
19 [(“MEG”)] for the purpose of intensive professional investigation of computer,  
internet-based, narcotics and drug law violations. [emphasis added]

20 26. Section 195.505.1, only contemplates task forces being formed through agreements  
21 among political subdivisions of the state of Missouri and/or the Missouri State Highway Patrol.

22 27. Section 195.507, RSMo., provides a limited exception to the general rules regarding the  
23 formation of task forces, allowing certain Missouri counties that border other states to form task  
24 forces through agreements with political subdivisions of the states that border those counties.  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 28. Nothing in § 195.507 or any other part of the Intergovernmental Drug Laws Enforcement  
2 Act authorizes political subdivisions of the state of Missouri to form task forces through  
3 agreements, partnerships, or memoranda of understanding entered into with federal agencies.

4 29. Section 195.509.1, RSMo., states: “A multijurisdictional enforcement group *which meets*  
5 *the minimum criteria established in this section* is eligible to receive state grants to help defray  
6 the costs of operation.” [emphasis added]

7  
8 30. Section 195.509.2, RSMo., states:

9 To be eligible for state grants, a MEG shall:

10 (1) Be established and operating pursuant to intergovernmental contracts  
11 *written and executed in conformity by law*, and involve two or more units of  
12 local government;

13 (2) Establish a MEG policy board *composed of an elected official, or his*  
14 *designee, and the chief law enforcement officer from each participating unit of*  
15 *local government* and a *representative of a hazardous materials response team*  
16 or, if such team is not formed, then *a representative of the local fire response*  
17 *agency*, to oversee the operations of the MEG and make such reports to the  
18 department of public safety as the department may require;

19 (3) Designate a single appropriate official of a participating unit of local  
20 government to act as the financial officer of the MEG for all participating units of  
21 the local government and to receive funds for the operation of the MEG;

22 (4) *Limit its target operation to enforcement of drug laws*;

23 (5) Cooperate with the department of public safety in order to assure  
24 compliance with sections 195.501 to 195.511 and to enable the department to  
25 fulfill its duties under sections 195.501 to 195.511 and supply the department with  
26 all information the department deems necessary therefor;

27 (6) Cooperate with the local hazardous material response team to establish a  
28 local emergency response strategy. [emphasis added]

31. Section 195.509.3, RSMo., states:

23 The department of public safety shall monitor the operations of all MEG units  
24 which receive state grants. *From the moneys appropriated annually*, if funds are  
25 made available *by the general assembly* for this purpose, *the director shall*  
26 *determine and certify to the auditor the amount of the grant to be made to each*  
27 *designated MEG financial officer*. No provision of this section shall prohibit  
28 funding of multijurisdictional enforcement groups by sources other than those  
provided by the general assembly, if such funding is in accordance with and in  
such a manner as provided by law. [emphasis added]

1 32. An organization that does not match the definition of § 195.503(4) cannot be considered  
2 a MEG for the purposes of the Intergovernmental Drug Law Enforcement Act and, therefore,  
3 cannot be eligible for state grants pursuant to that Act.

4 33. By the plain terms of §§ 195.509.1 and 195.509.2, RSMo., a MEG that does not satisfy  
5 “the minimum criteria established in” § 195.509.2, RSMo., the multijurisdictional enforcement  
6 group is not “eligible to receive state grants.”  
7

8 34. In Missouri a MEG is frequently referred to as a “task force;” for the purposes of this  
9 lawsuit the generic term “task force” is intended to be synonymous with a MEG authorized  
10 under Chapter 195, RSMo.  
11

### 12 The Sunshine Law

13 35. Chapter 610, RSMo., contains statutes requiring — with a few specified limitations —  
14 that the meetings, records, and votes of all public bodies must be open to the public; this set of  
15 statutes is commonly referred to as the “Sunshine Law.”  
16

17 36. Section 610.011, RSMo., declares:

18 1. It is the public policy of this state that meetings, records, votes, actions,  
19 and deliberations of public governmental bodies be open to the public unless  
20 otherwise provided by law. **Sections 610.010 to 610.200 shall be liberally**  
21 **construed** and **their exceptions strictly construed** to promote this public policy.  
[emphasis added]

22 2. Except as otherwise provided by law, all public meetings of public  
23 governmental bodies shall be open to the public as set forth in section 610.020, all  
24 public records of public governmental bodies shall be open to the public for  
25 inspection and copying as set forth in sections 610.023 to 610.026, and all public  
votes of public governmental bodies shall be recorded as set forth in section  
610.015.

26 37. Section 610.010(4), RSMo., in relevant part, defines “Public governmental body” as:

27 [A]ny legislative, administrative, or governmental entity created ... by order or  
28 ordinance of any political subdivision or district... including...:

1 (c) Any department or division of the state, of any political subdivision of the  
2 state, of any county or of any municipal government[;]...

3 (e) Any committee appointed by or at the direction of any of the entities and  
4 which is authorized to report to any of the above-named entities, any advisory  
5 committee appointed by or at the direction of any of the named entities for the  
6 specific purpose of recommending, directly to the public governmental body's  
governing board or its chief administrative officer, policy or policy revisions or  
expenditures of public funds[.]

7 38. Section 610.010(3), RSMo., defines "Public business" as "all matters which relate in any  
8 way to the performance of the public governmental body's functions or the conduct of its  
9 business[.]"  
10

11 39. Section 610.010(5), RSMo., defines "Public meeting" as:

12 [A]ny meeting of a public governmental body subject to sections 610.010 to  
13 610.030 at which any public business is discussed, decided, or public policy  
14 formulated, whether such meeting is conducted in person or by means of  
15 communication equipment, including, but not limited to, conference call, video  
16 conference, internet chat, or internet message board. The term "public meeting"  
17 shall not include an informal gathering of members of a public governmental  
18 body for ministerial or social purposes when there is no intent to avoid the  
19 purposes of this chapter, but the term shall include a public vote of all or a  
majority of the members of a public governmental body, by electronic  
communication or any other means, conducted in lieu of holding a public meeting  
with the members of the public governmental body gathered at one location in  
order to conduct public business.

20 40. Section 610.010(6), RSMo., defines "Public record" as:

21 [A]ny record, whether written or electronically stored, retained by or of any  
22 public governmental body including any report, survey, memorandum, or other  
23 document or study prepared for the public governmental body by a consultant or  
24 other professional service paid for in whole or in part by public funds, including  
25 records created or maintained by private contractors under an agreement with a  
26 public governmental body or on behalf of a public governmental body; provided,  
27 however, that personally identifiable student records maintained by public  
28 educational institutions shall be open for inspection by the parents, guardian or  
other custodian of students under the age of eighteen years and by the parents,  
guardian or other custodian and the student if the student is over the age of  
eighteen years. The term "public record" shall not include any internal  
memorandum or letter received or prepared by or on behalf of a member of a



1 public governmental body consisting of advice, opinions and recommendations in  
2 connection with the deliberative decision-making process of said body, unless  
3 such records are retained by the public governmental body or presented at a  
4 public meeting. Any document or study prepared for a public governmental body  
5 by a consultant or other professional service as described in this subdivision shall  
6 be retained by the public governmental body in the same manner as any other  
7 public record[.]

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
41. Section 610.020., RSMo., states in relevant part:

1. All public governmental bodies shall give notice of the time, date, and  
place of each meeting, and its tentative agenda, in a manner reasonably  
calculated to advise the public of the matters to be considered[.]

2. Notice conforming with all of the requirements of subsection 1 shall be  
given at least twenty-four hours, exclusive of weekends and holidays  
when the facility is closed, prior to the commencement of any meeting of a  
governmental body unless for good cause such notice is impossible or  
impractical, in which case as much notice as is reasonably possible shall  
be given. Each meeting shall be held at a place reasonably accessible to  
the public and of sufficient size to accommodate the anticipated  
attendance by members of the public, and at a time reasonably convenient  
to the public, unless for good cause such a place or time is impossible or  
impractical....

3. A public body shall allow for the recording by audiotape, videotape, or  
other electronic means of any open meeting. A public body may establish  
guidelines regarding the manner in which such recording is conducted so  
as to minimize disruption to the meeting....

7. A journal or minutes of open and closed meetings shall be taken and  
retained by the public governmental body, including, but not limited to, a  
record of any votes taken at such meeting. The minutes shall include the  
date, time, place, members present, members absent and a record of votes  
taken. When a roll call vote is taken, the minutes shall attribute each  
“yea” and “nay” vote or abstinence if not voting to the name of the  
individual member of the public governmental body.

42. Section 610.023.1, RSMo., requires each public governmental body “to appoint a  
custodian who is to be responsible for the maintenance of that body’s records.”

43. Section 610.023 also states that “[t]he identity and location of a public governmental  
body’s custodian is to be made available upon request.”

1 44. Section 610.027.1, RSMo., states that “[a]ny aggrieved person, taxpayer to, or citizen of,  
2 this state... may seek judicial enforcement of the requirements of sections 610.010 to 610.026.”

3 45. Section 610.027.2, RSMo., states that once a party bringing suit under the Sunshine Law  
4 has demonstrated to the court “that the body in question is subject to the requirements of sections  
5 610.010 to 610.026 and has held a closed meeting, record, or vote, the burden of persuasion will  
6 be on **the body and its members** to demonstrate compliance” with the Sunshine Law. [emphasis  
7 added]  
8

9 46. Section 610.027.3, RSMo., states:

10 Upon a finding by a preponderance of the evidence that a public governmental  
11 body or a member of a public governmental body has knowingly violated sections  
12 610.010 to 610.026, the public governmental body or the member shall be subject  
13 to a civil penalty in an amount of up to one thousand dollars. If the court finds that  
14 there is a knowing violation of sections 610.010 to 610.026, the court may order  
15 the payment by such body or member of all costs and reasonable attorney fees to  
16 any party successfully establishing a violation. The court shall determine the  
17 amount of the penalty by taking into account the size of the jurisdiction, the  
18 seriousness of the offense, and whether the public governmental body or member  
19 of a public governmental body has violated sections 610.010 to 610.026  
20 previously.

21 47. Section 610.027.4, RSMo., states:

22 Upon a finding by a preponderance of the evidence that a public governmental  
23 body or a member of a public governmental body has purposely violated sections  
24 610.010 to 610.026, the public governmental body or the member shall be subject  
25 to a civil penalty in an amount up to five thousand dollars. If the court finds that  
26 there was a purposeful violation of sections 610.010 to 610.026, then the court  
27 shall order the payment by such body or member of all costs and reasonable  
28 attorney fees to any party successfully establishing such a violation. The court  
shall determine the amount of the penalty by taking into account the size of the  
jurisdiction, the seriousness of the offense, and whether the public governmental  
body or member of a public governmental body has violated sections 610.010 to  
610.026 previously.

48. Section 610.028.2, RSMo., requires all public governmental bodies to:

[P]rovide a reasonable written policy in compliance with sections 610.010 to  
610.030, open to public inspection, regarding the release of information on any

1 meeting, record or vote and any member or employee of the public governmental  
2 body who complies with the written policy is not guilty of a violation of the  
3 provisions of sections 610.010 to 610.030 or subject to civil liability for any act  
4 arising out of his adherence to the written policy of the agency.

5 49. Put more simply, transparency is the rule for public entities in Missouri. Courts are not at  
6 liberty to infer exceptions to this rule; the only permissible exceptions are those established by  
7 statute and courts are instructed to construe those exceptions strictly in order to preserve the rule  
8 of transparency.

### 9 About the Task Force

10 50. The Task Force receives direct expenditures of public funds generated through federal,  
11 state, and local taxation.

12 51. Upon information and belief, each political subdivision of the state of Missouri  
13 participating in the Task Force's operation adopted orders or ordinances intended to facilitate the  
14 formation of the Task Force under § 195.505.1.

15 52. If those orders and ordinances formed a lawful entity at all, that entity is a public  
16 governmental body within the definition of § 610.010(4), and it is therefore subject to the  
17 requirements of the Sunshine Law.  
18

19 53. Upon information and belief, the political subdivisions of the state participating in the  
20 Task Force's operation have also entered into a Memorandum of Understanding ("the MOU")  
21 with the ATF and/or the United States Attorney for the Western District of Missouri that  
22 establishes guidelines for how the Task Force will function. A copy of the MOU is attached as  
23 Plaintiff Exhibit 1.  
24

25 54. The MOU requires Task Force officers to be "assigned to the ATF Kansas City, Group II  
26 Field Office[.]"  
27  
28

1           55. The MOU assigns “the ATF Special Agent in Charge or his/her designee... operational  
2 control over all operations related to the NITRO TASK FORCE.”

3           56. The MOU gives the “ATF Group II Supervisor” sole authority to designate “the Task  
4 Force Coordinator who will oversee the day-to-day operations of the Task Force.”

5           57. The MOU reserves to ATF “final authority as to the suitability of TFOs for inclusion on  
6 the Task Force.”

7           58. The MOU gives ATF authority over “designated oversight for investigative and  
8 personnel matters related to the Task Force.”

9           59. The MOU assigns the ATF Special Agent in Charge (not the Missouri law enforcement  
10 officers directly accountable to the citizens) the power to decide what “level of prosecution will  
11 best serve the interests of justice and the greatest overall benefit to the public.”

12           60. Upon information and belief, no single political subdivision of the state of Missouri has  
13 the authority to direct the actions or operations of the Task Force.

14           61. Upon information and belief, no political subdivision of the state of Missouri has the  
15 authority to issue orders to the Task Force’s commanding officer.

16           62. Upon information and belief, some of the Task Force’s officers are employed and paid by  
17 state or local law enforcement agencies using state and/or local taxpayer funds.

18           63. The Task Force has appointed a financial officer who receives funds for the operation of  
19 the Task Force.

20           64. Upon information and belief, the Task Force maintains a funding account that is not  
21 directly controlled by either the ATF or any one of the individual police departments or sheriff’s  
22 departments that participate in the Task Force’s operations.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 65. Upon information and belief, the Task Force receives direct expenditures of state and/or  
2 local taxpayer funds to facilitate its operation.

3 66. If, contrary to ¶ 52 above, the attempted inclusion of the ATF and/or the United States  
4 Attorney for the Western District of Missouri prevented the formation of a lawful entity under  
5 the Intergovernmental Drug Law Enforcement Act, the Task Force would not qualify for state  
6 grants under the Intergovernmental Drug Law Enforcement Act.  
7

8  
9 **DPS Has Certified the Task Force to Receive State Grants**

10 67. Upon information and belief, more than once since January 1, 2010, the Task Force has  
11 submitted an application for state grants, asserting that it meets the qualifications established  
12 under § 195.509.2.

13 68. Upon information and belief, more than once since January 1, 2010, DPS has purported  
14 to monitor the Task Force's operations to determine if the Task Force was in compliance with  
15 sections 195.501 to 195.511.  
16

17 69. Upon information and belief, more than once since January 1, 2010, DPS has determined  
18 and certified to one or more public officials that the Task Force was eligible to receive state  
19 grants under section 195.509.2.  
20

21 70. Upon information and belief, more than once since January 1, 2010, DPS has  
22 recommended, certified, or otherwise authorized that a specified amount of state grants should be  
23 distributed to the Task Force.

24 71. Upon information and belief, since January 1, 2010, DPS has recommended, certified, or  
25 otherwise authorized that more than \$150,000 worth of state grants should be distributed to the  
26 Task Force.  
27  
28

1 72. Upon information and belief, for at least part of the time since January 1, 2010, state  
2 grants that DPS has recommended, certified, or otherwise authorized to be distributed to the Task  
3 Force have been used to pay part or all of the salary for a Task Force administrator who is not  
4 currently employed by any police department or sheriff's department of a political subdivision of  
5 the state of Missouri and a Task Force commander who is not currently employed by any police  
6 department or sheriff's department of a political subdivision of the state of Missouri.  
7

8 73. Upon information and belief, as of the filing of this Petition on July 14, 2015, DPS is  
9 engaged in a contract with the Task Force pursuant to which or in connection with which funding  
10 is distributed from the state to the Task Force.  
11

12 74. Upon information and belief, as of the filing of this Petition on July 14, 2015, Heather  
13 Haslag is a DPS employee tasked with monitoring the Task Force for the purpose of verifying  
14 that the Task Force is properly accounting for public funds that have been distributed to the Task  
15 Force.  
16

17 75. Upon information and belief, Heather Haslag and/or other DPS employees regularly  
18 communicate with one or more persons affiliated with the Task Force for the purpose of  
19 verifying how the Task Force is using state grants.  
20

21 76. Upon information and belief, the Task Force is currently subject to the oversight of an  
22 Executive Board whose membership consists of one representative from each law enforcement  
23 agency that has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding related to the Task Force, a  
24 citizen at large appointed by an elected official to serve on the Executive Board, a representative  
25 of the Missouri State Highway Patrol, and a representative from the ATF.  
26

27 77. Upon information and belief, the Task Force's Executive Board currently lacks a member  
28 of a hazardous materials response team or a representative of a local fire response agency.

## **The Task Force Refuses to Produce Open Public Records**

1  
2 78. In 2013, Plaintiff Malin began researching the way that Missouri's multi-jurisdictional  
3 drug task forces operate; his goal was to share with the general public the information he would  
4 gather.

5 79. Malin believes that the so-called drug war is a failed policy that has led to disastrous  
6 intrusions into individual citizens' privacy and liberty, and he believes that if the public truly  
7 understood how these task forces were using the enormous power and quantities of taxpayer  
8 money that are being given to multi-jurisdictional drug task forces, the public would demand for  
9 significant changes be made to state policy regarding multi-jurisdictional task forces.  
10

11 80. Malin believes this to be especially true, given the way that these multi-jurisdictional task  
12 forces have attempted to avoid transparency and accountability to the citizens of Missouri for the  
13 way that they use the power and taxpayer money that the state has given them.  
14

15 81. Malin has been using Missouri's Sunshine Law as his primary tool for obtaining public  
16 records that he can use to further his own and the public's understanding of how multi-  
17 jurisdictional task forces have been using the power and taxpayer money they have been given.  
18

19 82. In 2013 Malin saw that the NITRO Task Force was listed on a map posted on the  
20 Missouri State Highway Patrol's website, so he began attempting to learn more about the Task  
21 Force. A copy of the map as it existed at that time is attached as Plaintiff's Exhibit 2.  
22

23 83. In late 2013, as Malin was preparing to send open public records requests to the Task  
24 Force, he called the phone number listed as belonging to "NITRO DTF" on the Missouri State  
25 Highway Patrol map, hoping to make sure he had the correct information for submitting an open  
26 records request.  
27  
28

1 84. The person who answered the phone that day gave Malin another phone number for the  
2 Task Force and told Malin that he needed to contact Eric McAllister, who, upon information and  
3 belief, was a Task Force Officer at that time.

4 85. When Malin spoke to McAllister, McAllister told Malin to fax his open public records  
5 request to (816) 632-5376.  
6

7 86. Malin followed McAllister's instructions, faxing an open public records request directed  
8 to the attention of the NITRO Task Force Custodian of Records, but Malin's request was not  
9 acknowledged and he did not receive any records in response to this effort.

10 87. In mid-January 2014, Malin once again called the number he had been given to reach  
11 McAllister to make sure he had the right instructions for filing a Sunshine Law request.  
12

13 88. An unknown male answered Malin's phone call ("Answerer #1"), but when Malin asked  
14 if he had reached "the NITRO drug task force," Answerer #1 said, "Nope, this isn't it."

15 89. One minute later, when Malin pressed Answerer #1 to identify himself, Answerer #1  
16 responded, "This... this is the Task Force, but I'm not gonna give you my name."  
17

18 90. Malin stated that he was a citizen attempting to file a request for open public records and  
19 he wanted to reach the Task Force's custodian of records; Answerer #1 instructed Malin to  
20 contact Mark Curzydlo, an attorney with ATF.

21 91. Upon information and belief, Curzydlo is not now and never has been designated as the  
22 custodian of records for the Task Force.  
23

24 92. After confirming that he had, in fact, called the correct phone number, Malin called back  
25 seeking an explanation as to why Answerer #1 had initially tried to mislead him and why Malin's  
26 Sunshine Law request was being referred to a federal agency.  
27  
28



1 93. Malin’s second phone call was answered by a different unknown male (“Answerer #2”)  
2 who asserted that NITRO was neither a Missouri state entity *nor* a federal entity, although he  
3 stated that the task force’s agents “basically work for” the ATF.

4 94. Malin also asked Answerer #2 to identify the custodian of records for NITRO, and  
5 Answerer #2 claimed that the ATF was the custodian of records.  
6

7 95. Malin sent additional open public records requests to the Kansas City Field Office for the  
8 ATF, only to get a letter in response claiming that his “request for documents and information  
9 [could not] be processed by this office.”

10 96. Defendant Gant sent Malin a letter stating that if Malin wanted records or information  
11 related to the Task Force Malin would have to file a federal Freedom of Information Act Request  
12 with the ATF’s Disclosure Division in Washington, DC.  
13

14 97. Although he was perplexed as to why a Missouri law enforcement agency insisted that he  
15 treat it as part of the ATF, Malin attempted to contact the ATF’s Disclosure Division – but  
16 beyond acknowledging that it had received his request, Malin never heard more from the ATF’s  
17 Disclosure Division.  
18

19 98. Malin also tried to contact John Ham, a Public Information Officer with the ATF’s  
20 Kansas City Field Office to try to figure out how to obtain public records, but after a brief initial  
21 exchange of information, Malin never heard from Ham again.  
22

23 99. After months of trying and failing to identify the proper custodian of records to receive  
24 an open records request pursuant to Missouri’s Sunshine Law and pursuing every direction in  
25 which he had been pointed, on July 14, 2014, Malin tried sending a request to Greg Coon, whom  
26 Malin knew to be the Task Force administrator responsible for corresponding with DPS regarding  
27 NITRO’s eligibility for state grants.  
28

1           100.       Coon responded that Malin’s request had been forwarded to the legal department  
2 and that the legal department was informed that Malin had “been advised how to obtain our  
3 records.”

4           101.       At this point, on July 14, 2014, Malin notified Defendant Coon that he considered  
5 NITRO’s responses to demonstrate “clear defiance towards open records laws” and added that  
6 Malin would consider legal action to require NITRO’s compliance with the Sunshine Law. A  
7 copy of this email is attached as Plaintiff’s Exhibit 3.

8           102.       On October 11, 2014, Malin sent an open public records request to the attention of  
9 “Custodian of Records for NITRO,” care of Defendant Herring, NITRO’s Project Director.  
10

11           103.       On October 15, 2014, Herring responded that he had received Malin’s request, but  
12 insisted that he was not the Custodian of Records and that “[t]he Custodian of Records for  
13 NITRO is the [ATF]; their address is Bureau of ATF – KC Division, 2600 Grand Street Kansas  
14 City, Missouri 64108.” A copy of Herring’s Letter of October 14, 2014 is attached as Plaintiff’s  
15 Exhibit 4.  
16

17           104.       On December 29, 2015, Malin sent an open public records request by certified  
18 mail, return receipt requested, marked for the attention of “NITRO Task Force Custodian of  
19 Records” and addressed to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives at 2600  
20 Grand Boulevard, Kansas City, Missouri 64108.  
21

22           105.       On January 6, 2015, Malin sent an open public records request by certified mail,  
23 return receipt requested, marked for the attention of “NITRO Task Force Custodian of Records”  
24 and addressed to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives at 2600 Grand  
25 Boulevard, Kansas City, Missouri 64108; the envelope was returned to Malin marked “Return to  
26 Sender.”  
27  
28



1 political subdivisions of the state of Missouri, including, but not limited to, the Cameron Police  
2 Department, the Trenton Police Department, the Maryville Department of Public Safety, the  
3 Atchison County Sheriff's Office, the Clinton County Sheriff's Office, the Daviess County  
4 Sheriff's Office, the Grundy County Sheriff's Office, the Harrison County Sheriff's Office, the  
5 Livingston County Sheriff's Office, and the Missouri State Highway Patrol.

6  
7 112. The Task Force's Executive Board is subject to the provisions of the Missouri  
8 Sunshine Law because it is a governmental entity at least one member of which was appointed at  
9 the direction of political subdivision of the state, in accordance with § 195.509.2(2), RSMo.

10 113. The Task Force's Executive Board is subject to the provisions of the Sunshine  
11 Law because § 195.509.2(2), RSMo., authorizes the Task Force's Executive Board to report to  
12 the Missouri Department of Public Safety, which is itself a political subdivision of the state and a  
13 public governmental entity for the purposes of the Sunshine Law. *See* § 610.010(4), RSMo.  
14  
15

16 **The Task Force Failed to Appoint or Identify a Proper Custodian of Records**

17 114. Section 610.023.1 requires each public governmental body to appoint a custodian  
18 to be responsible for the maintenance of that body's records and to disclose the identity of the  
19 custodian upon request.  
20

21 115. Failing to appoint or otherwise identify a custodian of records is a serious  
22 violation of the Sunshine Law because, in the absence of such a custodian, it is not only unclear  
23 to whom members of the public should direct their Sunshine Law requests, but there is the  
24 additional concern that the public governmental body's records will be mishandled, misplaced or  
25 destroyed because their legal significance is not recognized. The absence of a designated  
26 custodian may also drastically increase the cost to citizens of obtaining public records due to the  
27  
28

1 additional time an impromptu custodian will have to spend in their effort to locate requested  
2 records, relative to an official custodian familiar with the process.

3 116. In order to comply with the requirement for appointing a custodian of records, the  
4 public governmental body must formally designate a specific person or officer; this requirement  
5 is not satisfied by a broad statement that another agency is responsible for a public governmental  
6 body's records.  
7

8 117. In order to comply with the requirement for appointing a custodian of records, the  
9 public governmental body must designate a specific person or officer who is personally subject  
10 to the jurisdiction of Missouri courts, because otherwise a public governmental body could avoid  
11 the transparency required by the Missouri Sunshine Law simply by designating a custodian of  
12 records outside of the state.  
13

14 118. As of the filing of this Petition on July 14, 2015, the Task Force and its Executive  
15 Board have not designated or appointed any specific person or officer to be their custodian of  
16 records.  
17

18 119. The Task Force and its Executive Board have violated § 610.023.1, RSMo., by  
19 failing to properly designate or appoint a custodian of records for the Task Force or its Board.

20 120. On several occasions Malin asked persons associated with the Task Force to make  
21 available the identity and location of the Task Force's custodian of records so he could submit  
22 Sunshine Law requests for the Task Force's public records.  
23

24 121. The Task Force and its Executive Board have violated § 610.023.1 by failing to  
25 properly reveal the identity and location of their custodian of records when Malin asked them to  
26 do so.  
27  
28

**The Task Force Disobeys Public Meetings Requirements**

1  
2       122.       Section 610.020.7, RSMo., requires public governmental bodies such as the Task  
3 Force’s Executive Board to take and retain “a journal or minutes of open and closed meetings...  
4 [and] [t]he minutes shall include the date, time, place, members present, members absent and a  
5 record of any votes taken.”

6  
7       123.       Over the past year and a half, Malin has used the Sunshine Law to seek minutes  
8 of the meetings of MEG oversight boards for every task force in this state; he has received in  
9 response documents indicating that nearly every other MEG oversight board conducts regular,  
10 formal meetings and keeps minutes of those meetings.

11  
12       124.       Upon information and belief, the Task Force’s Executive Board has held at least  
13 one meeting within the definition of § 610.010(5), RSMo.

14       125.       Upon information and belief, the topic of one or more of these meetings included  
15 discussion of the use of state grants the distribution of which have been authorized,  
16 recommended, and/or approved by DPS, or that the Task Force’s Executive Board expected to be  
17 authorized, recommended, and/or approved by DPS.

18  
19       126.       Upon information and belief, the Task Force’s Executive Board has violated §  
20 610.020.7, RSMo., by failing to take and retain “a journal or minutes” of any public meeting it  
21 has held at which “public business” was discussed.

22       127.       Section 610.020.1, RSMo., requires public governmental bodies to give public  
23 notice of their meetings, including a tentative agenda of matters to be considered at the meeting.  
24

25       128.       Upon information and belief, the Task Force’s Executive Board has not given  
26 public notice of any meetings it has held and has not made available to the public agendas of  
27 matters to be discussed in those meetings.  
28

1           129.       The Sunshine Law’s requirement that meetings of public government bodies and  
2 their committees, as well as the mandatory records that must be made of those meetings, must be  
3 open to the public is crucial to ensuring that citizens of Missouri have an opportunity to educate  
4 themselves regarding the public policies to be implemented by these bodies and the uses to  
5 which these bodies are applying public funds.

6  
7           130.       If public government bodies such as the Task Force’s Executive Board are  
8 permitted to elude public scrutiny by discussing public business without providing the  
9 transparency required by the Sunshine Law, it would be come easy for public government bodies  
10 to circumvent the central purpose of the Sunshine Law as expressed in § 610.011, RSMo.

11  
12           **NITRO’s Board Members Knowingly and/or Purposefully Violated the Sunshine Law**

13  
14           131.       As most of the Task Force’s Executive Board members are the top law  
15 enforcement officials for their political subdivisions, a majority of the Task Force’s Executive  
16 Board members are aware of the Missouri Sunshine Law and their responsibility to abide by its  
17 terms.

18           132.       The Task Force’s officers and Executive Board members are aware that the Task  
19 Force is an agency formed under and subject to Missouri law.

20  
21           133.       The Task Force’s officers and Executive Board members are aware that the Task  
22 Force is obligated to comply with the requirements of Missouri law.

23           134.       Additionally, in an email dated December 3, 2013, DPS employee Heather Haslag  
24 and Jason Grellner (a commanding officer of another multi-jurisdictional task force) indicated  
25 plans to “informally” spread legal advice via “MSHP-coordinated task forces” as to how to  
26 respond to Sunshine Law requests that were being made by Aaron Malin. A copy of that email  
27 is attached as Plaintiff’s Exhibit 6.  
28

1           135.       Upon information and belief, one or more of the Task Force’s Executive Board  
2 members were notified, either formally or informally, that Missouri’s multi-jurisdictional task  
3 forces are subject to the Sunshine Law and must respond to Sunshine Law requests.

4           136.       To the extent that Task Force officers or Executive Board members have told  
5 Malin that the only way for him to obtain public records relating to the Task Force is to file a  
6 Freedom of Information Act request with a federal agency, these instructions constituted a  
7 knowing and/or purposeful refusal to comply with the terms of Missouri’s Sunshine Law.  
8

9           137.       Upon information and belief, the Task Force and its Executive Board have failed  
10 to adopt any written policy as required by § 610.028.2.  
11

12           138.       In the absence of a written policy in compliance with § 610.028.2, none of the  
13 Task Force’s Executive Board members may claim to be sheltered from guilt or civil liability as  
14 a result of compliance with such a policy.  
15

16 **WHEREFORE** Malin prays that this Court enter judgment in his favor and against the Task  
17 Force and the Task Force’s Executive Board, entering an order and/or judgment that:  
18

- 19           A. Declares the Task Force to be a public governmental body as defined by the Missouri  
20 Sunshine Law;  
21           B. Declares that the Task Force and the Task Force’s Executive Board are subject to the  
22 Missouri Sunshine Law’s requirements;  
23           C. Finds that the Task Force and the Task Force’s Executive Board has failed to appoint  
24 a custodian of records as required by § 610.023.1;  
25  
26  
27  
28



- 1 D. Finds that the Task Force and the Task Force’s Executive Board has failed to make  
2 available the identity and location of a custodian of public records when Malin  
3 requested that they do so, as required by § 610.023.1;
- 4 E. Finds that the Task Force and the Task Force’s Executive Board have conducted at  
5 least one public meeting within the definition of § 610.010(5), RSMo.;
- 6 F. Finds that the Task Force and the Task Force’s Executive Board failed to keep a  
7 journal of minutes of its public meetings as required by § 610.020.7;
- 8 G. Finds that the Task Force and/or individual members of the Task Force’s Executive  
9 Board were aware that the Task Force is subject to the requirements of the Missouri  
10 Sunshine Law;
- 11 H. Finds that the Task Force and the Task Force’s Executive Board, knowingly and/or  
12 purposely violated the Sunshine Law by failing to appoint a custodian of records, by  
13 failing to provide public notice of their meeting(s), by failing to keep a journal of  
14 minutes of their meeting(s);
- 15 I. Orders the Task Force and the Task Force’s Executive Board to pay Malin all costs  
16 and reasonable attorneys fees related to this litigation, plus a civil penalty in the  
17 amount of up to \$5,000 per violation; and
- 18 J. Grants to Malin such other and further relief as is just and proper.  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 **COUNT TWO**  
24 **Violations of the Intergovernmental Drug Laws Enforcement Act**  
25 **(All Defendants)**

26 139. Malin incorporates and realleges the allegations contained in the foregoing  
27 paragraphs of this Petition as if set forth fully herein.  
28

1 140. For the purpose of Count II, Malin is challenging the lawfulness of DPS’s actions  
2 determining that the Task Force has been/is eligible to receive state grants and also its  
3 certification that the Task Force should receive any amount of state grants.  
4

5 **NITRO Does Not Meet the Definition of a Multi-Jurisdictional Enforcement Group**

6 141. The inclusion of ATF and the U.S. Attorney’s Office as parts of the Task Force  
7 removes the Task Force from the definition of “multi-jurisdictional enforcement group” under §  
8 195.503(4) and the remainder of the Intergovernmental Drug Laws Enforcement Act.  
9

10 142. Neither the ATF nor the U.S. Attorney’s Office is a political subdivision of the  
11 state of Missouri or of any other state that borders Missouri.

12 143. Nothing in the Intergovernmental Drug Laws Enforcement Act authorizes a  
13 Missouri multi-jurisdictional drug task force to enter into agreements with the ATF or the U.S.  
14 Attorney’s Office.  
15

16 144. Because the Task Force has purported to enter into an agreement with the ATF  
17 and the U.S. Attorney’s Office, the Task Force does not exist within the definition established in  
18 the Intergovernmental Drug Laws Enforcement Act and cannot qualify for state grants.  
19

20 **NITRO Does not Meet the Minimum Criteria to Be Eligible for State Grants**

21 145. Section 195.509.2(4) requires a task force to “limit its target operation to  
22 enforcement of drug laws”; if a task force does not do this, it is not eligible for state grants.  
23

24 146. The MOU states that “[o]ffenses investigated and enforced pursuant to this MOU  
25 are those falling within ATF’s jurisdiction ... [s]pecifically, but not limited to, *the Gun Control*  
26 *Act of 1968*, 18 U.S.C. § 921 et. seq. and *the National Firearms Act*, 26 U.S.C. §§ 5861 et. seq.”  
27  
28

1 147. On the first page of the MOU there is a “Purpose” section stating that the Task  
2 Force’s goals include:

- 3 a. Investigating *firearms trafficking*.  
4 b. Investigating *firearms related violent crime*.  
5 c. Gathering and reporting intelligence data relating to *trafficking in firearms*.  
6

7 148. In the “Measurement of Success” section of the MOU, it states that in addition to  
8 focusing on “drug traffickers” and “armed drug traffickers,” the Task Force will focus on  
9 “*armed career criminals*” and “*felons in possession of firearms*.”

10 149. The MOU states that the Task Force’s “Strategic Priority High Priority  
11 Performance Goals” to include: (1) Armed Drug Trafficking Organizations, (2) *Firearms*  
12 *Criminal Possession and Use*, (3) *Firearms Trafficking*, (4) Criminal Groups and Gangs, (5)  
13 *Explosives, Bombs, and Bombings*, (6) *Fire and Arson*, and (7) Workforce, which specifies a  
14 focus on “execut[ing] *the ATF mission*.”  
15

16 150. Upon information and belief, the Task Force does not limit its target operation to  
17 the enforcement of drug laws, as is required for a task force to be eligible for state funds under  
18 the Intergovernmental Drug Laws Enforcement Act; rather, the Task Force is involved in the  
19 enforcement of firearms laws – and potentially other laws – whether or not they directly relate to  
20 the enforcement of drug laws.  
21

22 151. Additionally, § 195.509.2(2) states that the required oversight board for a task  
23 force must comprise “an elected official, or his designee, and the chief law enforcement officer  
24 from each participating unit of local government *and* a representative of a hazardous materials  
25 response team or, if such team is not formed, then a representative of the local fire response  
26 agency.”  
27  
28

1           152.       Upon information and belief, the Task Force’s Executive Board does not include  
2 “a representative of a hazardous materials response team” or “a representative of the local fire  
3 response agency.”

4           153.       The Task Force’s Executive Board does, however, include persons *not* authorized  
5 to sit on an oversight board – namely, the person or persons representing the ATF.

6           154.       Because the statute makes a properly-composed oversight board a prerequisite for  
7 eligibility to receive state grants, the fact that the Task Force’s board is lacking essential  
8 members and including unauthorized members renders the Task Force ineligible to receive state  
9 grants.  
10

11  
12                   **DPS is Unlawfully Certifying the Task Force to Receive State Grants**

13           155.       Under the plain terms of § 195.509, a task force that does not meet the minimum  
14 criteria established in that section is not eligible to receive state grants.

15           156.       Whenever the General Assembly makes funds available for distribution to multi-  
16 jurisdictional enforcement groups such as the Task Force, § 195.509.3, RSMo., makes DPS  
17 responsible for determining and certifying to the auditor (1) which of those multi-jurisdictional  
18 groups will receive state grants and (2) the amount of the state grants to be made to those multi-  
19 jurisdictional enforcement groups.  
20

21           157.       DPS makes these evaluations on an annual basis, and § 195.511, RSMo., requires  
22 the director of DPS to make an annual report to the governor and the General Assembly  
23 regarding the operations of MEGs, “including a breakdown of the appropriation for the current  
24 fiscal year indicating the amount of the state grant each MEG received or will receive.”  
25

26           158.       Upon information and belief, the Task Force applied for and received state grants  
27 in 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015 because DPS determined and certified to the auditor or  
28

1 some other public official (1) that the Task Force was eligible to receive state grants and (2) that  
2 a certain amount of state grants should be allocated to the Task Force.

3 159. By determining and/or certifying that the Task Force is authorized to receive state  
4 grants, DPS has permitted and is still permitting direct expenditures of public funds generated  
5 through taxation that were and are unauthorized under Missouri law.  
6

7 160. Upon information and belief, the Task Force continues to submit requests for state  
8 grants that require DPS to evaluate whether the Task Force meets statutory prerequisites to be  
9 eligible for state grants.

10 161. Upon information and belief, the Task Force is currently operating under a  
11 contract administered by DPS that results in the distribution of state grants to the Task Force,  
12 and/or the Task Force is in the process of applying to DPS in hopes that in the future DPS will  
13 certify that the Task Force is eligible to receive state grants.  
14

15 162. This Court has the authority to declare that DPS's past certifications that the Task  
16 Force was eligible to receive state grants were unlawful.  
17

18 163. This Court has the authority to enjoin DPS from unlawfully certifying the Task  
19 Force's eligibility to receive state grants in the future.

20 164. Enjoining DPS from violating § 195.509.2, RSMo., would prevent the unlawful  
21 direct expenditures of public funds raised through taxation harm that have been causing injury to  
22 taxpayers such as Malin.  
23

24 165. If Malin's requested injunction is not granted, it is likely that DPS will continue to  
25 take actions that permit unlawful direct expenditures of public funds generated through taxation.  
26  
27  
28

1 **WHEREFORE** Malin prays for this Court to enter judgment in his favor and against Defendants  
2 NITRO, Herring, Bashor, Wood, Brecerra, Henson, Durant, Wright, Martin, Eckerson, Cox,  
3 Johnson, and Gant and the Missouri Department of Public Safety, entering an order and/or  
4 judgment that:

- 5       A. Declares that the inclusion of ATF and the U.S. Attorney’s Office as members of the  
6       Task Force removes the Task Force from the definition of “multi-jurisdictional  
7       enforcement group” under § 195.503(4) and, thus, from eligibility for state grants  
8       under the Intergovernmental Drug Laws Enforcement Act;  
9  
10       B. Declares that the Task Force has not been and is not now eligible to receive state  
11       grants because the composition of the Task Force’s Executive Board is contrary to §  
12       195.509.2(2);  
13  
14       C. Declares that the Task Force has not been and is not now eligible to receive state  
15       grants because it does not limit its target operation to the enforcement of drug laws;  
16  
17       D. Declares that DPS has violated § 195.509.3 by erroneously determining that the Task  
18       Force was eligible for state grants despite its failure to comply with the eligibility  
19       requirements of § 195.509.2, and by certifying to the auditor or some other public  
20       official that state grants should be issued to the Task Force;  
21  
22       E. Enjoins DPS from continuing to determine and/or certify to the auditor or any other  
23       public official that the Task Force is eligible to receive state grants until such time as  
24       the Task Force complies with the requirements of the Intergovernmental Drug Law  
25       Enforcement Act; and  
26       F. Grants to Malin such other and further relief as is just and proper  
27  
28

Respectfully submitted,



---

David E. Roland      Mo. Bar #60548  
14779 Audrain Road 815  
Mexico, MO 65265  
Phone:(314) 604-6621  
Fax: (314) 720-0989  
Email: libertyandjustice@gmail.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

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  
26  
27  
28