

1 ARTHUR I. WILLNER, State Bar No. 118480  
2 [awillner@leaderberkon.com](mailto:awillner@leaderberkon.com)  
3 LEADER BERKON COLAO & SILVERSTEIN LLP  
4 550 S. Hope Street, Suite 1850  
5 Los Angeles, CA 90071  
6 Telephone: (213) 234-1750  
7 Facsimile: (213) 234-1747

8 **ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS**  
9 MATTHEW GARRETT, Ph.D. and PROFESSOR ERIN  
10 MILLER

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
12 **FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13 MATTHEW GARRETT, PH.D., an  
14 individual, and PROFESSOR ERIN  
15 MILLER, an individual,

16 Plaintiffs,

17 vs.

18 CHRISTOPHER W. HINE, General  
19 Counsel of the Kern Community College  
20 District, individually and in his official  
21 capacity; THOMAS J. BURKE, former  
22 Chancellor of the Kern Community  
23 College District, individually and in his  
24 official capacity; BILLIE JO RICE, Vice  
25 President of Bakersfield College,  
26 individually and in her official capacity;  
27 SONYA CHRISTIAN, Chancellor of the  
28 Kern Community College District,  
individually and in her official capacity;  
and DOES 1 THROUGH 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:21-cv-00845-DAD-BAK

**PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED  
COMPLAINT;**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Complaint Filed: May 25, 2021

Leader Berkon Colao & Silverstein LLP  
Attorneys at Law

1 Plaintiffs Matthew Garrett, Ph.D. and Professor Erin Miller, by and through  
2 their counsel of record, and for their First Amended Complaint against Defendants  
3 Christopher W. Hine, Thomas J. Burke, Billie Jo Rice, Sonya Christian, and DOES  
4 1 through 50, hereby state as follows:

5  
6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. A public college or community college district has no business  
8 investigating, much less disciplining, a faculty member for publicly criticizing how  
9 the college or district chooses to spend its money, which is indisputably a matter of  
10 public concern. Yet that is precisely what Defendants did when, operating under  
11 color of state law, they investigated, disciplined, and retaliated against Dr. Matthew  
12 Garrett and Professor Erin Miller following Plaintiffs' presentation on censorship to  
13 a Bakersfield College campus audience on September 12, 2019 in which Dr. Garrett  
14 criticized what he regarded as political bias in the District's expenditure of college  
15 funds. To make matters worse, basing their action upon a demonstrably false  
16 pretext, Defendants knowingly violated Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights in order  
17 to assuage the feelings of and bow to pressure brought by other faculty members  
18 and administrators who disagreed with Plaintiffs' political viewpoints.  
19 Furthermore, Defendants have since engaged in an ongoing pattern and practice of  
20 retaliation against Plaintiffs in violation of their First Amendment rights. Contrary  
21 to the apparent view of Defendants, a faculty member's constitutional rights cannot  
22 be bargained away in order to satisfy the interests of competing groups on campus.  
23 Plaintiffs bring this action to hold Defendants accountable for the violations of their  
24 rights to free speech and academic freedom and to help bring about the changes  
25 needed to end the threat to freedom of expression at the Kern Community College  
26 District and on the Bakersfield College campus.

1           2.     This incident is but one example of what has become a dangerous  
2 assault on First Amendment rights on college campuses nationwide by  
3 administrators and officials, often egged on by certain faculty members and  
4 students, to suppress the speech of anyone with whom they disagree. Once  
5 regarded as the “marketplace of ideas,” *Keyishian v. Board of Regents*, 364 U.S.  
6 479, 487 (1967), college campuses in recent years have increasingly devolved into  
7 environments where only acceptable viewpoints may be publicly expressed while  
8 differing views are subject to investigation and even punishment. The clear  
9 purpose of this illiberal movement is not merely to investigate and discipline those,  
10 like Plaintiffs, who have expressed disagreeable ideas, but to chill the speech of and  
11 serve as a warning to other faculty members that the better course of action is to  
12 self-censor rather than risk suffering adverse employment consequences.

13           3.     Defendants’ actions ignore the fundamental principle that neither  
14 students nor faculty “shed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech or  
15 expression at the schoolhouse gate.” *Tinker v. Des Moines Indpt. Comm. Sch. Dist.*,  
16 393 U.S. 503, 506 (1969). Moreover, the Supreme Court has made it crystal clear  
17 that teachers may not be compelled “to relinquish the First Amendment rights they  
18 would otherwise enjoy as citizens to comment on matters of public interest in  
19 connection with the operation of the public schools in which they work.” *Pickering*  
20 *v. Bd. of Education*, 391 U.S. 563, 568 (1968). A teacher’s criticism of the  
21 allocation of school funds and calls for more transparency on how those funds are  
22 spent fall squarely within this principle.

23           4.     By investigating, disciplining, and retaliating against Plaintiffs for  
24 speaking on matters of public concern, Defendants have violated the First  
25 Amendment. Plaintiffs now file this First Amended Complaint to vindicate their  
26 First Amendment rights.

Leader Berkon Colao & Silverstein LLP  
Attorneys at Law

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5. This Court has original jurisdiction over these federal claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343, as Plaintiffs bring claims under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, and under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

6. This Court has authority to award the requested declaratory relief under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202 and Rule 57 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; the requested injunctive relief under 28 U.S.C. § 1343(a) and pursuant to Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; the requested damages under 28 U.S.C. § 1343(a); and attorneys’ fees under 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

7. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the Defendants because, upon information and belief, each of the Defendants either resides in the Eastern District of California or has sufficient contacts with the Eastern District of California due to their current or former employment with the Kern Community College District to establish this Court’s jurisdiction over them.

8. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 in the Eastern District of California because a substantial part of the acts or omissions giving rise to this case occurred within the Eastern District and at least one Defendant resides in the Eastern District.

**THE PARTIES**

9. At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiff Matthew Garrett, Ph.D. is and was a resident of Bakersfield, California, an employee of Kern Community College District, and a full-time tenured professor in the History Department at Bakersfield College.

10. At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiff Erin Miller is and was a resident of Bakersfield, California, an employee of Kern Community College District, and a full-time tenured professor in the History Department at Bakersfield College.

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

1           11. Defendant Christopher W. Hine was and is, at all times relevant to this  
2 Complaint, employed as the General Counsel of Kern Community College District.  
3 Hine acted under color of state law when he violated Plaintiffs' rights under the  
4 First and Fourteenth Amendments when he ordered the investigation into Plaintiffs'  
5 speech and when he issued an Administrative Determination disciplining Plaintiffs  
6 and warning them of the potential of further negative repercussions to their  
7 employment with the District arising out of their speech, which lies clearly within  
8 the First Amendment's protection of freedom of expression and academic freedom.  
9 Furthermore, Defendant Hine knew or should have known that he was violating  
10 long-established principles of constitutional law with respect to his conduct. In  
11 addition, Hine has continued to retaliate against Plaintiffs regarding their exercise  
12 of their First Amendment rights by, among other things, interfering with Plaintiffs'  
13 requests for public records concerning the expenditure and allocation of grant funds  
14 and regarding the complaints against them. Defendant Hine is sued in his official  
15 and individual capacities.

16           12. Defendant Thomas J. Burke was, at all times relevant to this  
17 Complaint, employed as Chancellor of Kern Community College District. As such,  
18 he is the District's chief executive officer, responsible for its administration and  
19 policymaking, including the conduct alleged herein. Acting under color of state  
20 law, Defendant Burke authorized, acquiesced in, sanctioned, and supported the  
21 actions of Defendant Hine. Furthermore, Defendant Burke knew or should have  
22 known that he was violating long-established principles of constitutional law with  
23 respect to his conduct. Defendant Burke is sued in his official and individual  
24 capacities.

25           13. Defendant Billie Jo Rice was and is, at all times relevant to this  
26 Complaint, employed as Vice President of Bakersfield College. Rice retaliated  
27 against Plaintiffs regarding their exercise of their First Amendment rights by,  
28

1 among other things, deliberately mishandling Dr. Garrett’s personal and  
2 confidential information and interfering with Dr. Garrett’s application for  
3 equivalency to teach in the fields of Interdisciplinary Studies and Ethnic Studies.  
4 Defendant Rice’s actions were in violation of Plaintiff Garrett’s First Amendment  
5 rights and in retaliation of their exercise of those rights. Defendant Rice is sued in  
6 her official and individual capacities.

7 14. Defendant Sonya Christian is the Chancellor of the Kern Community  
8 College District and has held that position since it was vacated by Defendant Burke.  
9 As such, she is the District’s chief executive officer, responsible for its  
10 administration and policymaking, including the conduct alleged herein. Before  
11 becoming Chancellor, she was the President of Bakersfield College. As such, she  
12 was the College’s chief executive officer, responsible for its administration and  
13 policymaking, including the conduct alleged herein. While in these positions, she  
14 oversaw and directed, among others, defendants Rice and Hine and was complicit  
15 in and/or failed to act to prevent their violation of Plaintiffs’ rights and as retaliation  
16 for Plaintiffs’ exercise of their First Amendment rights as alleged herein. She  
17 acted under color of state law and is sued in her official and individual capacities.

18 15. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that DOES 1 through 50 are other  
19 officials and administrators employed by KCCD and Bakersfield College who are  
20 responsible for the improper actions against Plaintiff detailed below, or are  
21 necessary parties, and Plaintiff will amend this Complaint when their true identities  
22 are known.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26

27

28

**FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

1  
2           16. In addition to their roles as faculty members, Dr. Garrett was the  
3 founder, and Professor Miller on the advisory board, of the Liberty Institute<sup>1</sup> – a  
4 sanctioned campus organization that aims to promote and preserve freedom of  
5 thought and intellectual literacy through the open discourse of diverse political  
6 ideas with an emphasis on American ideals and western historical values.  
7 Censorship is anathema to the Liberty Institute.

8           17. In April of 2019, controversial stickers were anonymously posted  
9 around the Bakersfield College campus, some of which stated such things as  
10 “smash cultural Marxism” and as well as other right-of-center viewpoints. The  
11 stickers were removed by campus authorities. This prompted a public debate, in  
12 part through op-ed articles in the local press. Certain faculty members and students  
13 associated with the campus Social Justice Institute decried the stickers as “racist”  
14 and “vandalism” and “hate crimes.” Dr. Garrett, on the other hand, publicly  
15 questioned whether the stickers might actually be a protest of sorts against the use  
16 of taxpayer funds to advance a one-sided partisan political agenda on campus.  
17 Certain faculty members and students associated with the Social Justice Institute  
18 responded to Dr. Garrett’s comments by publicly accusing both him and Professor  
19 Miller of advocating and enabling white supremacy.

20           18. As this controversy progressed, and in lieu of ongoing salvos in the  
21 local press, other faculty members sought to arrange a formal public debate  
22 between Dr. Garrett on the one hand, and faculty associated with the Social Justice  
23 Institute on the other including Professors Andrew Bond and Oliver Rosales. Since  
24 such a debate is precisely the sort of free exchange of ideas that he stands for, Dr.  
25 Garrett readily agreed. Bond and Rosales, however, refused to participate.

26  
27 \_\_\_\_\_

28 <sup>1</sup> The Liberty Institute has since been renamed The Renegade Institute for Liberty.

1           19. On September 12, 2019, with his counterparts having refused to  
2 participate, Plaintiff Garrett gave a public lecture on the Bakersfield College  
3 campus entitled, “The Tale of Two Protests: Free Speech and the Intellectual  
4 Origins of BC Campus Censorship.” The lecture discussed the intellectual  
5 justifications and strategies of censorship while drawing parallels to behavior at the  
6 college. Plaintiff Miller delivered the introduction to Dr. Garrett’s lecture.

7           20. The event took place on campus and was well-attended by members of  
8 the college community and the public. Professor Miller’s introduction lasted  
9 approximately ten minutes. Dr. Garrett’s speech lasted approximately one hour and  
10 was followed by a vigorous audience question and answer period that lasted about  
11 forty-five minutes.

12           21. During his lecture, Dr. Garrett discussed issues such as Marxism, free  
13 speech, and campus censorship. A few minutes of his lecture also addressed what  
14 in his view was the expenditure of grant funds to the college to promote a partisan  
15 political agenda. He identified certain Bakersfield College faculty including,  
16 among others, Bond and Rosales as the recipients of grant funds that were being  
17 directed to further partisan social justice agendas. He called for an investigation  
18 into the expenditure of these funds at Bakersfield College. Neither Dr. Garrett in  
19 his speech nor Professor Miller in her introduction at any time accused Bond or  
20 Rosales or anyone else at Bakersfield College of misappropriating these funds or  
21 fiscal improprieties or personally enriching themselves or of any illegal conduct.

22           22. Criticism of the manner in which a public college or university  
23 prioritizes the expenditure of its funds is core speech protected by the First  
24 Amendment.

25           23. Although differences of opinion were raised and discussed during the  
26 course of the event, at all times the exchange of ideas was civil and respectful. The  
27  
28



1 September 12, 2019 lecture was an example of precisely the sort of “marketplace of  
2 ideas” that American college campuses are intended to exemplify.

3 ***Bond and Rosales File Formal Complaints with Bakersfield College HR***  
4 ***Regarding Plaintiffs’ Speech from the September 12, 2019 Lecture.***

5 24. In October 2019, Professor Miller filed a public records request  
6 regarding various grants.

7 25. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that, on October 11 and 19, 2019,  
8 respectively, Professors Bond and Rosales filed HR complaints against Dr. Garrett  
9 and Professor Miller arising out of the September 12, 2019 lecture.

10 26. On December 3, 2019, Dr. Garrett gave a 30-minute radio interview in  
11 which he discussed the collapse of critical thinking in the academy and again  
12 criticized the way Bakersfield College faculty were directing grant funds. Dr.  
13 Garrett’s comments during the radio interview were made as a private citizen on a  
14 matter of public concern.

15 27. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that, on or about January 6, 2020,  
16 Professor Bond and Rosales filed addendums to their complaints.

17 28. To this day, Defendants have improperly refused to permit Dr. Garrett  
18 and Professor Miller to see the complaints that were made against them based on  
19 the spurious assertion that showing Plaintiffs the charges would somehow violate  
20 the privacy rights of the complainants.

21 ***Defendant Hine, with the Designation, Direction, Knowledge and Acquiescence***  
22 ***of Defendant Burke, Orders an Investigation into Plaintiffs’ September 12, 2019***  
23 ***Speech. Following the Investigation, Hine Punishes and Retaliates Against***  
24 ***Plaintiffs Based Solely on the Exercise of Their First Amendment Rights.***

25 29. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that, in early  
26 August 2020, Defendant Christopher W. Hine, with the designation, direction,  
27 knowledge and acquiescence of Defendant Burke and perhaps other officials of  
28

1 KCCD and Bakersfield College who will be identified as DOE Defendants, referred  
2 Professors Bond and Rosales’ formal complaints against Dr. Garrett and Professor  
3 Miller for investigation as to whether some of their comments at the September 12,  
4 2019 event constituted “unprofessional” conduct in violation of certain KCCD  
5 Board and Administrative Policies.

6 30. On or about October 8, 2020, Hine issued a KCCD Administrative  
7 Determination containing the following statements and findings:

8 (a) Professor Miller, in her introduction to Dr. Garrett’s speech,  
9 made a number of statements implying that both Dr. Oliver Rosales and Professor  
10 Andrew Bond “were improperly misusing grant funds and BC resources to finance  
11 various ‘social justice’ platforms.”

12 (b) Dr. Garrett, during his speech, repeated the above allegations “in  
13 greater detail” (i.e., that Rosales and Bond were improperly misusing grant funds).

14 (c) Dr. Garrett’s and Professor Miller’s comments constituted  
15 allegations of “financial impropriety” and of misappropriation of grant funds by  
16 Rosales and Bond.

17 (d) Dr. Garrett and Professor Miller’s purported accusations that  
18 Rosales and Bond had engaged in “financial improprieties” constituted  
19 unprofessional conduct.

20 (e) Dr. Garrett and Professor Miller made these accusations against  
21 Rosales and Bond “without giving them a reasonable chance to explain the grants in  
22 question or defend themselves.”

23 (f) Dr. Garrett “made the situation worse by repeating the  
24 allegations on a radio station after Dr. Rosales and Professor Bond properly  
25 complained.”

26 31. Based upon the above statements and findings, Defendant Hine made  
27 the determination that Dr. Garrett and Professor Miller “engaged in unprofessional  
28

1 conduct, as defined in Section A.3 of Article Four of the CCA collective bargaining  
2 agreement, in their statements and allegations regarding misuse and  
3 misappropriation of grant funds by Dr. Rosales and Professor Bond.” Hine’s  
4 conduct was based solely on Plaintiffs’ statements on matters of public concern at  
5 the September 12, 2019 speech and in Dr. Garrett’s radio interview, all of which  
6 constituted protected speech under the First Amendment.

7 32. Having made the aforementioned “determination,” Defendant Hine  
8 threatened that “the District will investigate any further complaints of policy and  
9 procedure violations and, if applicable, will take appropriate remedial action,  
10 including but not limited to any discipline determined to be appropriate. It is  
11 recommended that any videos of the September 12, 2019 presentation by Dr.  
12 Garrett with introduction by Professor Miller be removed from all district websites  
13 until all inaccurate or misleading allegations have redacted or deleted.”

14 33. Notwithstanding his threat of further discipline, Defendant Hine has  
15 never identified what statements of fact in Plaintiffs’ presentation were inaccurate  
16 or misleading. This is because Hine was and remains fully aware that Plaintiffs’  
17 statements were not inaccurate or misleading and that they were statements on  
18 matters of public concern protected by the First Amendment. Indeed, for example,  
19 Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Hine was clearly aware  
20 that Dr. Garrett’s statements regarding the allocation of funds to Kern Sol News  
21 since he negotiated the contract that allowed for the allocation of those funds.  
22 Moreover, Plaintiffs deny that any of their statements were inaccurate or  
23 misleading.

24 34. Defendant Hine’s Administrative Determination also invoked the  
25 threat of termination of Dr. Garrett’s and Professor Miller’s employment by  
26 referencing California Education Code § 87667, which provides that “A contract or  
27 regular employee may be dismissed or penalized for one or more of the grounds set  
28

1 forth in Section 87732.” One of the grounds set forth in Section 87732 is  
2 unprofessional conduct, which was precisely the determination found by Defendant  
3 Hine against Dr. Garrett and Professor Miller.

4 35. In addition, Defendant Hine stated that the Administrative  
5 Determination and the Investigator’s report will be referred to the President of  
6 Bakersfield College “to determine what disciplinary actions and remedial actions  
7 are necessary based upon the findings.”

8 36. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendant  
9 Burke was aware that Dr. Garrett’s statements concerning the expenditure of grant  
10 funds were correct and that Bond and Rosales had been given the opportunity to  
11 participate in the program. Despite his knowledge that some or all of the findings  
12 were false, Burke acquiesced in the Administrative Determination, did nothing to  
13 correct the record, and nonetheless allowed the adverse consequences to Plaintiffs  
14 to proceed.

15 37. Moreover, Defendant Hine further stated in the Administrative  
16 Determination that Rosales’ and Bond’s complaints were whistleblower complaints  
17 as provided in BP 7F, and that there are no appeal rights provided under BP 7F or  
18 AP 7F.

19 38. In short, Defendant Hine reached findings and determinations that  
20 were pretextual and false and carried with them the threat of further discipline up to  
21 and including termination. In addition, by classifying Bond and Rosales as so-  
22 called “whistleblowers” (defining “whistleblower” in a manner utterly foreign to  
23 both federal and California law), Defendant Hine left Dr. Garrett and Professor  
24 Miller exposed to charges of retaliation and termination in the event they tried to  
25 publicly defend themselves.

1           39. Defendant Hine has since used the threat against Plaintiffs of being  
2 charged with retaliation and the sanctions that accompany a finding of retaliation to  
3 prevent or significantly limit Plaintiffs' right to public records requests.

4           40. Thus, at the same time that Defendant Hine has withheld the  
5 complaints from Plaintiffs and has failed to identify the purported inaccuracies in  
6 Plaintiffs' speech, Hine has threatened Plaintiffs with further discipline should they  
7 continue to request production of the very records that support their statements  
8 regarding KCCD's and Bakersfield College's grant expenditures.

9           41. Defendant Hine's actions were meant to, and in fact did, punish and  
10 retaliate against Dr. Garrett and Professor Miller for the exercise of their First  
11 Amendment rights and chill them from continuing to engage in speech on matters  
12 of public concern.

13           ***Defendants' Administrative Determination Contained Demonstrably False***  
14           ***Assertions of Fact and Findings.***

15           42. Each of the statements and findings of the Administrative  
16 Determination was demonstrably false.

17           43. Neither Dr. Garrett nor Professor Miller, during their presentation of  
18 September 12, 2019 (or during Dr. Garrett's radio interview) ever accused Rosales  
19 or Bond of improperly misusing grant funds other than his disagreement with their  
20 expenditure for partisan political purposes.

21           44. Neither Dr. Garrett nor Professor Miller, during their presentation of  
22 September 12, 2019 (or during Dr. Garrett's radio interview), ever accused Rosales  
23 or Bond of financial improprieties or the misappropriation of grant funds.

24           45. Neither Rosales nor Bond was denied a reasonable chance to explain  
25 the grants in question or defend themselves. On the contrary, both Rosales and  
26 Bond were aware that the grant funding would be a topic at the presentation and  
27 were invited and encouraged to attend the September 12, 2019 event; yet both  
28

1 refused to participate. Bond and Rosales expressly told other faculty that they  
2 chose not to participate in an effort to delegitimize Dr. Garrett's presentation.

3 46. Notably, the Administrative Determination makes clear that the  
4 majority of Rosales' and Bond's complaints arising out of the September 12, 2019  
5 presentation involved speech by Dr. Garrett and Professor Miller that even  
6 Defendant Hine had to conclude was protected under the First Amendment.

7 47. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereby allege that Defendants  
8 have deliberately taken the position, as a false pretext for the violation of Plaintiffs'  
9 rights of free speech and academic freedom, that Dr. Garrett's and Professor  
10 Miller's speech regarding the expenditure of grant funds during the September 12,  
11 2019 event constitutes defamation as to Rosales and Bond and is therefore not  
12 protected under the First Amendment.

13 48. Defendants' assertion that Dr. Garrett's and Professor Miller's speech  
14 is unprotected defamation is demonstrably wrong inasmuch as Plaintiff plainly did  
15 not accuse Rosales and Bond of financial improprieties or the misappropriation of  
16 grant funds and because, to the extent that Plaintiffs discussed the expenditure of  
17 grant funds, their comments were both truthful and expressions of their opinions on  
18 a subject of significant public interest.

19 49. Indeed, Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that  
20 Defendants know to this day that Plaintiffs' comments regarding the expenditure of  
21 grant funds were true inasmuch as Defendants Burke and Christian and Vice  
22 President Zav Dadabhoy<sup>2</sup> had written letters of support for a grant directing funds  
23 to the Kern Sol News, and that in or about November 2019 Rosales openly  
24 admitted that he funded the Kern Sol News and intended to continue doing so.  
25 Furthermore, Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendant Hine drafted or

26 \_\_\_\_\_

27 <sup>2</sup> With the promotion of Sonya Christian to KCCD Chancellor, Zav Dadabhoy has since been  
28 named Interim President of Bakersfield College.

1 prepared the contract facilitating that funding. In short, despite knowing that Dr.  
2 Garrett's comments were true, Hine nonetheless issued an Administrative  
3 Determination that completely mischaracterized Plaintiffs' statements, and  
4 censored, disciplined, and threatened them with further discipline thereby punishing  
5 them and chilling them from continuing to engage in speech on matters of public  
6 concern.

7 50. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereby allege that Defendants,  
8 in particular Defendant Hine who is an attorney and the KCCD General Counsel,  
9 were and are fully aware that Dr. Garrett's and Professor Miller's speech on  
10 September 12, 2019 and Dr. Garrett's statements during the radio interview were  
11 fully protected under the First Amendment. Defendant Hine nonetheless  
12 deliberately mischaracterized Plaintiffs' speech in violation of their First  
13 Amendment rights in order to placate or "throw a bone" to Rosales and Bond so  
14 that they wouldn't feel their complaints had been effectively dismissed in their  
15 entirety as they should have been.

16 51. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereby allege that Defendants,  
17 in particular Defendant Hine as an attorney and KCCD General Counsel, have  
18 deliberately misclassified Rosales and Bond as "whistleblowers" under KCCD  
19 Board Policy 7F in order to further placate them and enhance their status as  
20 complainants and to retaliate against Plaintiffs over the exercise of their right to free  
21 speech and academic freedom.

22 52. Defendant Hine's deliberate violation of Plaintiffs' First Amendment  
23 rights emboldened Bond to respond by sending a mass email to the campus  
24 community declaring victory over Dr. Garrett and Professor Miller by announcing  
25 KCCD's institutional support further censoring Plaintiffs, declaring Plaintiffs'  
26 demonstrably true statements as lies, and implicitly reinforcing Bond's damning  
27  
28

1 and false allegations on campus that Plaintiffs were supporters of white  
2 supremacism.

3 ***Defendants' Acts of Retaliation in Response to Plaintiffs' Exercise of Their First***  
4 ***Amendment Rights Have Continued Unabated.***

5 53. In addition to the above violations of Plaintiffs' First Amendment  
6 rights and retaliation for exercising those rights, Defendants' acts of retaliation  
7 against Plaintiffs in response to their exercise of their First Amendment rights  
8 continue to this day including, among other things, the following flagrant examples.

9 54. In February 2021, despite knowing that the complaints against  
10 Plaintiffs were untrue, Defendant Hine blocked Plaintiff Miller's public records  
11 requests related to the complaints, investigation, and Administrative Determination.  
12 Indeed, in blocking these requests, Hine warned Plaintiffs that further requests for  
13 records could increase the likelihood that they would be charged with retaliation by  
14 the complainants.

15 55. In March 2021, Dr. Garrett applied for equivalency to teach in the  
16 fields of Interdisciplinary Studies and Ethnic Studies. Defendant Rice (as well as  
17 certain DOE administrators to be named later) carelessly, negligently, and  
18 deliberately mishandled and disseminated Dr. Garrett's confidential information  
19 related to that application, including his personal transcripts and Social Security  
20 Number, to individuals having no duties pertaining to his application and no right to  
21 see such information.

22 56. Furthermore, in response to efforts by Bond and Rosales and others to  
23 derail Dr. Garrett's application on grounds that his protected viewpoints and  
24 personal background were inconsistent with Ethnic Studies, Rice retaliated against  
25 Dr. Garrett by attempting in various ways to obstruct his application to teach Ethnic  
26 Studies by, among other things, misrepresenting in bad faith the institutional need  
27 and requirements for teaching Ethnic Studies.



1           57. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendant  
2 Christian enjoys the final say in the manner in which Bakersfield College campus  
3 events are conducted in light of the Covid pandemic. Christian has demonstrated  
4 her willingness to approve, personally and/or through the administrators who she  
5 supervises (i.e., DOE Defendants to be named when identified later) large-scale in-  
6 person events when they involve her political allies and the potential for financial  
7 benefit for the District while applying more restrictive Covid protocols to an event  
8 sponsored by Dr. Garrett.

9           58. For example, in October 2021, the campus community was encouraged  
10 to attend in person the football homecoming game as well as pregame tailgating.  
11 Similarly, in September 2021, the Bakersfield College Performing Arts Department  
12 hosted a jazz festival attended by campus and influential community members  
13 including Dolores Huerta. Furthermore, Bakersfield College hosted an in-person  
14 event involving a speech by Democratic Assemblyman Rudy Salas to which  
15 students and administrators were encouraged to attend. In addition, Plaintiffs are  
16 informed and believe that Defendant Christian permitted its Athletics Hall of Fame  
17 dinner to go forward off campus without masks or social distancing or other Covid  
18 measures.

19           59. In stark contrast, when Dr. Garrett invited a black conservative  
20 speaker, Kevin McGary, for an in-person on campus event in September 2021, he  
21 was not permitted to host the event in-person. As a result, Dr. Garrett's funding for  
22 the event was damaged and the last minute notice of the change of venue was  
23 embarrassing and damaging as to the community relationships he was building.  
24 This is yet another example of the viewpoint discrimination and retaliation directed  
25 at Plaintiffs as a consequence of their September 12, 2019 speech.

26           60. Defendants continue to retaliate against Plaintiffs by having failed to  
27 this day to withdraw the Administrative Determination despite their ability to do so  
28

1 and despite their longstanding and ongoing knowledge that its accusations against  
2 Plaintiffs are false and pretextual and in violation of their First Amendment rights.

3 ***Plaintiffs Enjoy the Right to Academic and Personal Freedom Pursuant to their***  
4 ***Collective Bargaining Agreement with KCCD and the KCCD Board Policies and***  
5 ***Administrative Policies.***

6 61. KCCD Administrative Policy 7D2A provides, in relevant part, as  
7 follows: “Academic Freedom

8 No provision of this Administrative Procedure shall be interpreted to prohibit  
9 conduct that is legitimately related to the course content, teaching methods,  
10 scholarship, or public commentary of an individual faculty member or the  
11 educational, political, artistic, or literary expression of students in classrooms and  
12 public forums. Freedom of speech and academic freedom are, however, not  
13 limitless and this procedure will not protect speech or expressive conduct that  
14 violates federal or California antidiscrimination laws.”

15 62. The Administrative Determination expressly concedes that none of the  
16 allegations by Rosales and Bond, if true, would state a violation of state or federal  
17 antidiscrimination laws.

18 63. Plaintiffs’ collective bargaining agreement with KCCD provides, in  
19 relevant part, as follows:

20  
21 “ARTICLE FOUR – PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATION

22 A. Academic Freedom: The District, the Colleges and unit members will adhere  
23 to the following in regard to academic freedom:

- 24 1. Education in a democracy depends upon earnest and unceasing pursuit of  
25 truth and upon free and unrestricted communication of truth...
- 26 4. The District recognizes the fundamental right of the faculty member to be  
27 free from any censorship or restraint which might interfere with the  
28

1 faculty member's obligation to pursue truth and maintain his/her  
2 intellectual integrity in the performance of his/her teaching functions.

3 B. Personal Freedom

4 2. A faculty member shall be entitled to the full rights of citizenship and no  
5 religious or political activities, or lack thereof, of any unite member shall  
6 be used for purposes of disciplinary action.

7 ***Defendants' Actions Have Caused a Deprivation of Rights, and Economic and***  
8 ***Emotional Damage to Dr. Garrett and Professor Miller.***

9 64. Each of Defendants' actions described above relating to the  
10 investigation and discipline, the threat of further discipline, and other acts of  
11 retaliation, were substantial and were motivated in whole or in part by Plaintiffs'  
12 constitutionally protected speech and expressive conduct.

13 65. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' acts, Plaintiffs have  
14 suffered irreparable injury, including being deprived of their constitutional rights to  
15 free expression. Defendants' actions were meant to, and in fact did, punish Dr.  
16 Garrett and Professor Miller and chill them from continuing to engage in speech on  
17 matters of public concern.

18 66. Defendants have acted recklessly and with callous disregard for  
19 Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights by retaliating against them for speaking on  
20 matters of public concern.

21 67. Defendants' actions damaged Plaintiffs' reputation, caused them stress  
22 and emotional injuries, including suffering from physical manifestations of stress  
23 and anxiety, consumed hours of time during which they have tried to defend  
24 themselves, and irreparably injured their constitutional rights to free speech and  
25 academic freedom. Plaintiffs' ability to defend themselves, however, has been  
26 limited by the explicit and implicit threat of the Administrative Determination and  
27 the response to Plaintiffs' document requests that any attempts at defending  
28

1 themselves could be construed as retaliation against the purported “whistleblowers”  
2 thereby subjecting them to further punishment.

3 68. As a result of Defendants’ actions, Plaintiffs’ names are now linked on  
4 the Bakersfield College campus with the false accusations that they engaged in  
5 unprofessional conduct and the false accusations that they accused Rosales and  
6 Bond of financial improprieties and financial misappropriation and that they are  
7 associated with white supremacist ideology.

8 69. Plaintiffs have also been irreparably damaged in their profession as  
9 college professors. At a time when college campuses are rife with “cancel culture”  
10 and knee-jerk reactions to anything perceived as insensitivity toward so-called  
11 marginalized faculty and students, Defendants’ actions toward Plaintiffs will likely  
12 limit their opportunities should they choose to seek future employment at other  
13 colleges or universities.

14 70. Each of Defendants’ actions, and taken together, constitutes an adverse  
15 employment action based on Plaintiffs’ exercise of protected speech under the First  
16 Amendment.

17 71. Plaintiffs have diligently attempted to mitigate their damages by  
18 consistently defending themselves against Defendants’ actions, all to no avail.

19 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **Violation of Plaintiffs’ First Amendment Right to Freedom of Speech through**  
21 **Retaliation**

22 **(42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Against Defendants in Their Individual Capacities)**

23 72. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each of the allegations contained in  
24 paragraphs 1-71 of this First Amended Complaint, as if set forth fully herein.

25 73. By subjecting Plaintiffs, and each of them, to an investigation, an  
26 Administrative Determination containing demonstrably and pretextual false  
27 statements and findings, disciplinary action, and the threat of further disciplinary  
28

1 action including potential termination, Defendants, by policy and practice, and  
2 acting under color of state law, have retaliated against Plaintiffs substantially  
3 because of their exercise of their freedom of expression and have deprived them of  
4 their ability to freely express their ideas on issues of public concern at Bakersfield  
5 College. In so doing, Defendants unconstitutionally have taken adverse  
6 employment actions against Plaintiffs in retaliation for their protected speech on  
7 matters of public concern.

8 74. Despite (a) knowing that the First Amendment protected Plaintiffs’  
9 speech and (b) having no justifiable interest in regulating or punishing Plaintiffs’  
10 speech on matters of public concern or an interest that outweighs Plaintiffs’  
11 exercise of their First Amendment rights, Defendants discriminated against  
12 Plaintiffs for exercising their clearly established right to free speech on issues of  
13 public concern and the right to academic freedom as secured by the First and  
14 Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

15 75. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ actions described  
16 above, Plaintiffs have been deprived of their constitutional rights. They have  
17 suffered, and continue to suffer, emotional distress and economic injury. They are,  
18 therefore, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, entitled to an award of  
19 compensatory damages, punitive damages, and the reasonable costs of this lawsuit,  
20 including reasonable attorneys’ fees.

21 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **Violation of Plaintiffs’ First Amendment Right to Freedom of Speech through**  
23 **Retaliation**

24 **(42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Against Defendants in Their Official Capacities)**

25 76. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each of the allegations contained in  
26 paragraphs 1-75 of this Complaint, as if set forth fully herein.

27  
28

1           77. By subjecting Plaintiffs, and each of them, to an investigation, an  
2 Administrative Determination containing demonstrably and pretextual false  
3 statements and findings, disciplinary action, and the threat of further disciplinary  
4 action including potential termination, Defendants, by policy and practice, and  
5 acting under color of state law, have retaliated against Plaintiffs substantially  
6 because of their exercise of their freedom of expression and have deprived them of  
7 their ability to freely express their ideas on issues of public concern at Bakersfield  
8 College. In so doing, Defendants unconstitutionally have taken adverse  
9 employment actions against Plaintiffs in retaliation for their protected speech on  
10 matters of public concern.

11           78. Despite (a) knowing that the First Amendment protected Plaintiffs’  
12 speech and (b) having no justifiable interest in regulating or punishing Plaintiffs’  
13 speech on matters of public concern or an interest that outweighs Plaintiffs’  
14 exercise of their First Amendment rights, Defendants discriminated against  
15 Plaintiffs for exercising their clearly established right to free speech on issues of  
16 public concern and the right to academic freedom as secured by the First and  
17 Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

18           79. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ adverse employment  
19 actions, Plaintiffs have suffered irreparable injury, including being deprived of their  
20 constitutional rights to free expression.

21           80. Plaintiffs have no adequate legal, administrative, or other remedy by  
22 which to prevent or minimize the continuing irreparable harm to their First  
23 Amendment rights.

24           81. As a legal consequence of Defendants’ violation of Plaintiffs’ First  
25 Amendment rights, which are irreparable *per se*, Plaintiffs are entitled to injunctive  
26 relief including, but not limited to, mandating that Defendants publicly rescind the  
27 Administrative Determination and its findings, remove from Plaintiffs employment  
28

1 files and from the records of KCCD and Bakersfield College all records pertaining  
2 to the Administrative Determination, requiring Defendants to rescind their  
3 “recommendation” to remove the unedited video of their September 12, 2019  
4 speech from all District websites, to withdraw the referral of the Administrative  
5 Determination to the President of Bakersfield College for further disciplinary  
6 action, and to cease obstruction of Plaintiffs’ public records requests.

7 82. Defendants’ actions described above have created a present an  
8 ongoing injury to Plaintiffs through a pattern of retaliation as well as damage to  
9 their reputation that will likely impact their career prospects. They are, therefore,  
10 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, entitled to the injunctive relief requested  
11 above, and the reasonable costs of this lawsuit, including reasonable attorneys’ fees.

12 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **(Declaratory Judgment - 28 U.S.C. § 2201, *et seq.*)**

14 83. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each of the allegations contained in  
15 paragraphs 1-82 of this Complaint, as if set forth fully herein.

16 84. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between Plaintiffs and  
17 Defendants concerning whether Plaintiffs’ speech described above constituted  
18 protected speech under the First Amendment and whether Defendants’ retaliatory  
19 actions violate the Constitution. A judicial declaration is, therefore, necessary and  
20 appropriate at this time.

21 85. Plaintiffs desire a judicial determination of their rights against  
22 Defendants as they pertain to Plaintiffs’ right to speak without being subjected to  
23 the threat of further investigation, retaliation, and discipline based on pretextual  
24 grounds.

25 86. To prevent further violation of Plaintiffs’ constitutional rights by  
26 Defendants, it is appropriate and proper that a declaratory judgment issue, pursuant  
27  
28

1 to 28 U.S.C. § 2201 and Fed.R.Civ.P. 57, declaring that Defendants’ conduct  
2 described above is unconstitutional.

3  
4 **REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

5 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs Dr. Matthew Garrett and Professor Erin Miller  
6 respectfully request that the Court enter judgment against Defendants and provide  
7 Plaintiffs with the following relief:

8 1. A declaratory judgment stating the Individual Defendants’ actions  
9 described herein violated Plaintiff’s right to free speech as guaranteed by the First  
10 and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution;

11 2. A permanent injunction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1343(a) requiring  
12 those Defendants with the authority to do so to publicly rescind the Administrative  
13 Determination, remove from Plaintiffs’ employment files and from the records of  
14 KCCD and Bakersfield College all records pertaining to the Administrative  
15 Determination, require Defendants to rescind the “recommendation” to remove the  
16 unedited video of their September 12, 2019 speech from all District websites, to  
17 withdraw the referral of the Administrative Determination to the President of  
18 Bakersfield College for further disciplinary action, and to cease all further  
19 retaliatory actions arising out of Plaintiffs’ exercise of their First Amendment  
20 rights.

21 3. Compensatory damages against Defendants in their individual  
22 capacities, in an amount to be proven at trial to compensate Plaintiffs for the  
23 Defendants’ unconstitutional violation of their free speech rights and the retaliation  
24 they have suffered;

25 4. Punitive damages against Defendants in their individual capacities to  
26 sanction their deliberate misconduct, and to deter Defendants and others from  
27 denying free speech rights to others similarly situated in the future;



1           5. Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988,  
2 costs of suit and reasonable expenses;

3           6. Pre and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate allowable by law;  
4 and

5           7. Any other relief which this Court may deem just and proper.

6  
7 Dated: June 28, 2022

LEADER BERKON COLAO &  
SILVERSTEIN LLP

8  
9 By: /s/ Arthur I. Willner  
10 Arthur I. Willner, SBN 118480  
11 Attorneys for Plaintiffs DR.  
12 MATTHEW GARRETT and  
13 PROFESSOR ERIN MILLER  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Leader Berkon Colao & Silverstein LLP  
Attorneys at Law

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury on all claims triable by jury in this cause of action.

Dated: June 28, 2022

LEADER BERKON COLAO &  
SILVERSTEIN LLP

By: /s/ Arthur I. Willner

Arthur I. Willner  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs DR. MATTHEW  
GARRETT and PROFESSOR ERIN  
MILLER

Leader Berkon Colao & Silverstein LLP  
Attorneys at Law

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