

84-1160

Poulsen v. Amundson

1983 lease v. County for simple act later by prosecutor
Dep Sheriff in copies seek + serve on 2 Ees v. petu had
See more commands + appear B/+ Gf.

" " " arrest warrant

Plur refuses entry into inner pt v his office

Ss seek advice from arrest county judge

He says, ^{co attorney says} "go in + get him"

city cop, who was present, broke down air open

Ees v. found

1983 suit vs city, co, + officials

Dkt said + c/a

co a "person"

but no const depuote per co pol

co has no control pol a t sheriff

Cb + 'd for def reasons

"obv const vire"

S is a co officer + can act co pol

But no proof v co pol here

Simple deci re sheriff + act S was simple a gtal pol

But error + let + city off

tech to police used whatever force was nec

"a pol + t city joss, - > merely asking + S

but was petu's inj + result v t efes v to pol?

"revoke + make to later

84-1160

(2)

✓
County, range, etc.
is here

I → — (but Ct not +)

✓
All agree a council inviol.

For S & B struggled & kept to wa

Co co officer (last Co Atty or + Co Atty) giving order

he is a co official

he is elected

he can act & enforce - conceded

✓
In fact he is enforcing 1st row

Surely is a "1st bite" situation, or entitlement

can he in control + co? Yes

[seems suff here, or rem + dict to detail]

∴ ~~the~~ → remains [seem to be's action w + t city] for further purp.

✓
The measure is auth & act, in + # o times

✓
Acted w/in scope o auth by officials supposed to act
otherwise a free council violn

hope we do not go to a first bite situation

27 Nov 85

2 Dec 85
11
11

84-1160

7
15

✓ On this review, are we concerned only with County
Yes-only v

✓ What is the City? - content with + remains? - action on it?

Cl vs Whelan is it here?

✓ What is the def of this area under #3.

[Do + LA shareholders can bear on this one?]