

Please print in ink or type
BEFORE THE STATE CLAIMS COMMISSION Of the State of Arkansas


COMPLAINT

## Jeremy Laymonce, \#163960 <br> 300 Corrections Dr, Newport, AR 72112



Sene agency huvoted: Department of Human Services Amour sought: 5,000,000
Monte, day, year nad place of thedenen or serve: 03-02-2017 at 806 Rhoden Road Judsonia Arkensss 72081 Explanation: On March 2 nd, 2017 , Caseworker Cassy Walker of the Department of Human Services came out to private residence located at 806 Rhaden Road Sudsoria Arkensss 72081 to engage in the wrongful removal and retention of a minor child (Claimants son) without legal authority. In other words, the Caseworker lacked probable cause and a warrant directing her to seize a named mince child and remove him from both of his natural parents in the middle of the night. Documentation andlor justification wassit given as the caseworker left with the child.

Asparts of this complaint, the claimant makes the statements, and answers the following questions, as indicated: (1) Has claim been presented to any same department on officer thereof?
 and Ccselurker Cosy Walker: and that the following action was taken thereon: No response
and that $\$ D_{1}^{60}$ was paid thereon: (2) Has any third person or corporation an interest in this claim? YeS
 and that thenaturethereof is as follows: Datheral mother houng right of custody to child removed andwas acquired on $03-02-2017$

## Same herenabove Explanation

$\qquad$

THE UNDERSIGNED states on oath that he or she is familiar with the matters and thing set forth in the above complaint, and that he or ale verily believes that they are true.
 (Pribt Claimaht/Representative Name)


SF1-R7:99

SWORN TO and subscribed before me




# BEFORE THE ARKANSAS STATE CLAIMS COMMISSION <br> JEREMY LAYMONCE (ADC 163960) <br> CLAIMANT 

v.

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

## RESPONDENT

## ORDER

Now before the Arkansas State Claims Commission (the "Claims Commission") is a motion filed by the Arkansas Department of Human Services (the "Respondent") to dismiss the claim of Jeremy Laymonce (the "Claimant"). Based upon a review of the motion, the Claimant's responses, the arguments made therein, and the law of Arkansas, the Claims Commission hereby finds as follows:

1. Claimant filed his claim on November 24, 2017, seeking $\$ 5,000,000.00$ in damages from Respondent for removing Claimant's child "without legal authority."
2. Respondent filed a motion to dismiss, arguing that dismissal is proper because (1) Claimant does not have custody and the juvenile and, thus, does not have standing to pursue this claim; (2) circuit courts have exclusive jurisdiction of proceedings in which a juvenile is alleged to be dependent-neglected; and (3) Arkansas law permits Respondent to take a juvenile into protective custody without a warrant.
3. Claimant filed a response stating that he is the parent of the juvenile and has a right to custody. Claimant also argues that Respondent's admission that it took the juvenile into custody amounts to an admission that Respondent violated Claimant's and the juvenile's constitutional rights. Claimant states that the facts did not warrant Respondent taking the juvenile into custody without a warrant.
4. Claimant then filed an additional response, titled "Motion for Supplemental Pleading," in which Claimant stated numerous cases for the proposition that Respondent's actions violated his and the juvenile's rights under the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Claimant also argued that Respondent did not satisfy its statutory requirements under Ark. Code Ann. §§ 9-27-313 and 12-18-1001. Claimant insists that he was the legal guardian of the juvenile on the day of the juvenile's removal.
5. The threshold question is whether Claimant has standing to bring this claim. See Farm Bureau Ins. Co. of Arkansas, Inc. v. Running M. Farms, Inc., 366 Ark. 480, 485, 237 S.W.3d 32,36(2006) ("Without standing, a party is not properly before the court to advance a cause of action").
6. Respondent has asserted that did not have legal custody of the juvenile. In response, Claimant appears to argue that he has a constitutional and statutory right to custody. However, Claimant does not dispute that Claimant did not have legal custody of the juvenile.
7. Without legal custody of the juvenile, the Claims Commission finds that Claimant does not have standing to contest the removal of the juvenile.
8. Given this finding, the Claims Commission need not reach Respondent's other bases for dismissal.
9. If Claimant believes that his constitutional rights were violated by the actions of Respondent, Claimant can pursue that claim elsewhere. Claims asserting constitutional violations are outside the jurisdiction of the Claims Commission because these claims can be filed in another court. See Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-204(b)(2)(A) ("The Commission shall have jurisdiction only over those claims which are barred by the doctrine of sovereign immunity from being litigated in a court of general jurisdiction.")
10. Respondent's motion is GRANTED, and Claimant's claim is DENIED and

## DISMISSED.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.



# ARKANSAS STATE CLAIMS COMMISSION 

Dexter Booth<br>Henry Kinslow, Co-Chair<br>Bill Lancaster<br>Sylvester Smith<br>Mica Strother, Co-Chair

DATE: March 2, 2018

## Notices) which may apply to your claim

(1) A party has forty (40) days from the date of this Order to file a Motion for Reconsideration or a Notice of Appeal with the Claims Commission. Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-211(b). If a Motion for Reconsideration is denied, that party then has twenty (20) days from the date of the denial of the Motion for Reconsideration to file a Notice of Appeal with the Claims Commission. Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-211(b)(3). A decision of the Claims Commission may only be appealed to the General Assembly. Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-211(a).
(2) If a Claimant is awarded less than $\$ 15,000.00$ by the Claims Commission at hearing, that claim is held forty (40) days from the date of disposition before payment will be processed. See Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-211(b). Note: This does not apply to agency admissions of liability and negotiated settlement agreements.
(3) Awards or negotiated settlement agreements of $\$ 15,000.00$ or more are referred to the General Assembly for approval and authorization to pay. Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-215(b).

# BEFORE THE ARKANSAS STATE CLAIMS COMMISSION JEREMY LAYMANCE (ADC 163960) <br> CLAIMANT 

## V. <br> ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

RESPONDENT

## ORDER

Now before the Arkansas State Claims Commission (the "Claims Commission") is a motion filed by Jeremy Laymance (the "Claimant") seeking reconsideration of the Claims Commission's March 2, 2018, order denying and dismissing his claim against the Arkansas Department of Human Services (the "Respondent"). Based upon a review of Claimant's motion, the arguments made therein, and the law of Arkansas, the Claims Commission hereby finds as follows:

1. Claimant filed his claim on November 24, 2017, seeking $\$ 5,000,000.00$ in damages from Respondent for removing Claimant's child "without legal authority."
2. Respondent filed a motion to dismiss, which was granted by the Claims Commission on March 2, 2018, based upon Claimant's lack of standing to bring a claim for removal of a child of whom he does not have custody.
3. Claimant then filed the instant motion for reconsideration, stating that he did have legal custody of his child on March 2, 2017. In support of his motion, Claimant attached a document titled "Citation" dated November 17, 2016, which was issued to Morgan Lynn Mosley; a pleading titled "Original Petition in Suit Affecting the Parent-Child Relationship (AOP)" filed November 15, 2016, regarding Claimant's child; and a transcript of a hearing held March 3, 2017,
in the district court of Anderson County, Texas, in which there was testimony from the caseworker with the Texas Department of Family and Protective Service regarding the following:

- Claimant's child tested positive for methamphetamines;
- The child's mother voluntarily placed the child with the mother's grandparents;
- Claimant was on felony parole during this time;
- Claimant was given permission by his parole officer to travel to Palestine, Texas to take care of some warrants;
- Claimant was never given permission to travel to Texas for the purpose of getting his child;
- Claimant unsuccessfully attempted to get his child in January and "committed an assault upon" the grandparents with whom the child had been placed;
- The child's mother was given visitation access to the child by her grandparents;
- There was a restraining order in place;
- The child's mother arrived at her grandparents' house on March 2, 2017, with Claimant hiding in the car;
- Claimant and the child's mother absconded with the child; and
- Claimant and the child's mother have a history of drug use and domestic violence.

Claimant also attached the first page of an order entered March 3, 2017, in the district court of Anderson County, Texas, although the substance of the order is not included; a docket sheet from the district court case describing the March 3, 2017, order as "extending TRO;" as well as citations dated March 14, 2017, demanding that Claimant and the child's mother appear to answer the petition.
4. In analyzing a motion for reconsideration, Rule 7.1 of the Claims Commission Rules and Regulations states that motions for reconsideration "will only be entertained if they set forth new or additional evidence which was not [previously] available . . . ."
5. Claimant does not include any information in his motion as to why this information was not previously available.
6. The Claims Commission finds that the motion does not set forth any new or additional evidence not previously available.
7. Even if Claimant could justify why these documents were not previously available to him, the documents attached to his motion for reconsideration show that there was a temporary restraining order in effect, which Claimant violated when he absconded with the child. The March 3, 2017, hearing extended the temporary restraining order and added a requirement that the Claimant and the child's mother could have no contact with the child. The documents contain no information confirming that Claimant had custody of his child on March 2, 2017.
8. As such, Claimant's motion for reconsideration is DENIED, and the March 2, 2018, Claims Commission order remains in effect.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


# ARKANSAS STATE CLAIMS COMMISSION 

Dexter Booth
Henry Kinslow, Co-Chair
Bill Lancaster
Sylvester Smith
Mica Strother, Co-Chair
DATE: April 17, 2018

## Notices) which may apply to your claim

(1) A party has forty (40) days from the date of this Order to file a Motion for Reconsideration or a Notice of Appeal with the Claims Commission. Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-211(b). If a Motion for Reconsideration is denied, that party then has twenty (20) days from the date of the denial of the Motion for Reconsideration to file a Notice of Appeal with the Claims Commission. Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-211(b)(3). A decision of the Claims Commission may only be appealed to the General Assembly. Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-211(a).
(2) If a Claimant is awarded less than $\$ 15,000.00$ by the Claims Commission at hearing, that claim is held forty (40) days from the date of disposition before payment will be processed. See Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-211(b). Note: This does not apply to agency admissions of liability and negotiated settlement agreements.
(3) Awards or negotiated settlement agreements of $\$ 15,000.00$ or more are referred to the General Assembly for approval and authorization to pay. Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-215(b).
jeremy latmuce
U.

CLAIMANT

Claim NO. 180463

RESPONDENT

Notice of Appeal

COMES NOW, Dereiny Leymince, the Claimant herein and fork .s pro ce notice seapleal hecelouy alleges and states:
1.) Respondents have misled the Arkansas state Clams Commission by asserting ciestody against Clamant to preclude his standing to pursue this claim, although, the fact is that the custociy covered in Cause No DCCVI7-070-364 shores custody, between non-pirents and claimant. ( $\sec$ Attamment 1)
ii. The Claims Commission weld that the "documents contain no :forfiliation confirming that Claimant mad Custidy io f his child on March And, 2017 " andolor got lost in the "substance" of the foreign tribunals order inegategy the argument bernie them Such as the complete Reporter's Record in (aux No Dc 0,7-070 369 whin Shows the transcripts if The ex porte hearing, that recites no service (page 4:21-5:11) on it respondents to further bind them and that non-pareat's were unsent fro the hearing due to traveling to Arkansas to get the child from. Respondent while the hearing was taking place (Somehow Respondents and nom-preres (1)
knew the outcome if the March Bod hearing so on March Inch, softer disregarding the parents and there childis rights as ierelevent, removed and retained the child).
3.) The ONLY issue Clamant is pursuing in this claim is that on March ind, 2017 , a child was weaggitully removed and retained by Respondents from both natural parents and grandparents ion Arkansas and released to a non-parent PRIUR to cony cunard of custody.
4.) On March and, 2017, the fact is that two separate lawsuits were pending in the interest Et the child (core by parents couseno.cce:16-13316 and another by non-purents-cuux ne. DCcvir-i゙TO-36r.) in Texas, yet, fondly the parents suit had personal service obtained so Respondents therefore lack authority or discretion, without curse or an Arkansas. state interest, to encroach into familial cifinirs and make placement decisions without providing the required provedse For the deprivation in their (DHS) cause.
5.) Respondents cannot reuscnably assume that the law's (Arkensas Code Annotated 5 9-27-306;9-27-312;9-27313; and 12-18-1001) |permit them to mudve themselves in a foreign tribunals cause anchor to be able to remove unidaren from the :e parents and release them to nor-parants who present only a foreign tribunals protection under obtained ex parte that hes nu defmite outcome, at the soneduled Hearing fouverng either party and that has no force ssifect in. this State orin onyfstate without service to. further brow the respondents listed within...
6.) Clament requests the Gueval Assembly to remand this claim.. for a proper relitigation Er the issues partrilly contaned hercinabeic.

WHEREFORE, Clamont prays unto the Goveral Assembly to grant any relief to which he may be int.Hed. Clament prays for geverod rel.es.

Date: Apr:\26t, 2018
Respectfrully subonited, fermy Layzm Jerenny Laymance 1200 E-st Lacy Street Pulestine, Texas 75801

CERIIFICATE OF SERUICE

I, beremy Laymance, Claimant heren, hereby certing that a upy of the Foreya.r. Notice if loperal was mailed by U.S Mail, poitroge paid, wh depositing the saime in the mail on the alcth day oi April 2018 to:

Attorrney sur Respondents
Michael Becentin
1700 Man Stricet
1P0.30×1437-51ot 5260 .
litthe Rock, Arkarsss 72203 3
Askansas State Clamis Commission
101 Esst Caprtol Averue, Suite 410
LiHle Rokk, Arkensas 72201-3823.

弦inytape Jeremy taymance

