FILED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Alexandria D	2011 AUG - 3 A 9: 40
PEOPLE FOR THE ETHICAL TREATMENT OF ANIMALS, INC., a Virginia corporation,	CLERK US DISTRICT COURT ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA
Plaintiff,	ý
v.) Civil No. 1:11 0 809
UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE ROWAN GOULD, in his official capacity as Acting	
Director, United States Fish and Wildlife Service; ar	nd)
KEN SALAZAR, in his official capacity as Secretar	y,)
United States Department of the Interior,)
Defendants.)

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF

- Plaintiff challenges U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's ("FWS") decision to issue a
 Captive Bred Wildlife ("CBW") permit to Curtis and Berni Shepperson as violative of the
 Endangered Species Act ("ESA").
- 2. FWS's issuance of this permit allows activities that are expressly prohibited by Section 9 of the ESA, 16 U.S.C. § 1538. The agency approved the permit application in violation of the plain language of the ESA, which authorizes the FWS to permit otherwise prohibited activities only on a case-by-case basis, after public notice of each application, public access to each application, public opportunity to comment on each such application, and after the agency makes and publishes specific findings, including that the permit was "applied for in good faith," and that issuance of the permit will "not operate to the disadvantage of" the subject endangered species and "will be consistent with the purposes and policy set forth" in the ESA. 16 U.S.C. § 1539(a), (c), (d). The FWS's approval of the Sheppersons' permit application is not in

accordance with the ESA, arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, in excess of FWS's statutory authority, and without observance of procedure required by the ESA; accordingly, the approval violates the Administrative Procedure Act. 7 U.S.C. § 706(2)(a), (c), (d).

Jurisdiction and Venue

- 3. This Court has federal question jurisdiction over this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
- 4. This Court may grant the relief requested under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202 (declaratory and injunctive relief) and 5 U.S.C. §§ 701-706 (Administrative Procedure Act).
- 5. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because, on knowledge and belief, the unlawfully issued permit that is the subject of this lawsuit was issued from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Division of Management and Authority office in Arlington, Virginia, which lies within the Alexandria Division of the Eastern District of Virginia.

Parties

- 6. Plaintiff People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, Inc. ("PETA"), is a Virginia nonprofit corporation headquartered at 501 Front St., Norfolk, Virginia 23510.
- 7. PETA gathers information about captive animals, including captive endangered animals, and provides this information to its members through its website, magazine, action alerts, blog, and other materials that it disseminates. PETA also disseminates this information to the news media and uses it in preparing comments to legislative and administrative bodies.

 Because PETA is unable to obtain information through the Section 10 permitting process, PETA is hindered in its ability to provide its informational services.

- 8. The FWS's unlawful approval of the Sheppersons' CBW permit application injures PETA. By failing to comply with the process mandated by section 10 of the ESA, defendants have violated PETA's statutory right to obtain the information mandated for "each" application for a section 10 permit. As a result, PETA is unable to keep its members fully informed concerning the take of captive bred wildlife through its website, magazine, action alerts, blog, and other materials that it disseminates. PETA's injuries will be redressed if it prevails, because, as a result, the FWS will be required under section 10 of the ESA to publish notice of any application by the Sheppersons in the Federal Register, and PETA will receive such notice and will have access to all application materials as a matter of public record. FWS will further be required, if it decides to issue the Sheppersons a CBW permit, to publish findings in the Federal Register, and PETA will thereby have access to these findings.
- 9. Defendant ROWAN GOULD is sued in his official capacity as the Acting Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, the federal agency to which the Secretary of the Interior has delegated the responsibility of implementing the ESA and its regulations with respect to terrestrial species. Mr. Gould is charged with administering the ESA.
- 10. Defendant KEN SALAZAR is sued in his official capacity as the Secretary of the Interior ("Secretary"). The Secretary is the federal official who bears ultimate responsibility for implementation of the ESA.
- 11. Defendant UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICES is the federal agency to which the Secretary of the Interior has delegated the responsibility of implementing the ESA and its regulations with respect to terrestrial species.

Statutory Framework and Facts Giving Rise to Plaintiff's Claim for Relief

- A. Statutory and Regulatory Framework
- 12. Section 9 of the ESA prohibits the "taking" of any endangered species. 16 U.S.C. § 1538(a). The ESA defines the term "take" to include "harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct." *Id.* § 1532(19).
- 13. Section 9 further provides that it is unlawful to "possess, sell, deliver, carry, transport, or ship" any endangered species that is unlawfully taken. *Id.* § 1538(a). Section 9 also makes it unlawful to "deliver, receive, carry, transport, or ship in interstate commerce . . . in the course of a commercial activity" any endangered species. *Id.*
- 14. These prohibitions apply to endangered animals bred in captivity, as well as to those in the wild, unless a lawful section 10 permit has been issued by the FWS.
- 15. Section 10(a)(1)(A) of the ESA authorizes the FWS to issue a "permit" for any act that is otherwise prohibited by section 9, but only if such act is "for scientific purposes or to enhance the propagation or survival of the affected species." *Id.* § 1539(a)(1)(A).
- Register of each application for an exemption or permit which is made under [section 10]," *id.* § 1539(c), and requires that "[e]ach notice shall invite the submission from interested persons, within thirty days after the date of the notice, of written data, views or arguments with respect to the application" *Id.* Section 10 also mandates that "[i]nformation received by the [FWS] as a part of any application shall be available to the public as a matter of public record at every stage of the proceeding." *Id.*

- 17. The FWS may grant exceptions under section 10(a) "only if [it] finds and publishes . . . in the Federal Register that (1) such exceptions were applied for in good faith, (2) if granted and exercised will not operate to the disadvantage of such endangered species, and (3) will be consistent with the purposes and policy" of the Act. *Id.* § 1539(d).
 - B. Facts Giving Rise to Plaintiff's Claim
- 18. On information and belief, in or around February, 2010, the FWS's Arlington, Virginia-based Division of Management Authority issued a captive bred wildlife permit to Curtis and Berni Shepperson, authorizing them to take captive-bred endangered species. Prior to issuing this permit, FWS did not provide notice of the permit application in the Federal Register; did not invite the submission from interested parties of written data, views, or arguments with respect to the application; and did not publish findings in the Federal Register that the permit was applied for in good faith, would not operate to the disadvantage of the subject endangered species, and would be consistent with the purposes and policy set forth in the ESA. In addition, FWS has not made the information received as a part of this permit application available to the public as a matter of public record.

Plaintiff's Claim for Relief

Violations of the APA and Section 10 of the ESA

- 19. Each allegation set forth in the Complaint is incorporated herein by reference.
- 20. In approving the Sheppersons' application for a captive bred wildlife permit defendants have violated the procedural requirements of section 10(c) of the ESA that they "shall publish notice in the Federal Register of each application for an exemption or permit which is made under this section;" that "[e]ach notice shall invite the submission from interested parties, within thirty days after the date of the notice, of written data, views, or arguments with respect to

the application;" and that "[i]nformation received by the Secretary as a part of any application shall be available to the public as a matter of public record at every stage of the proceeding." 16 U.S.C. § 1539(c). Defendants also violated section 10(d) of the ESA by failing to find and publish findings "in the Federal Register that (1) such exceptions were applied for in good faith, (2) if granted and exercised will not operate to the disadvantage of such endangered species, and (3) will be consistent with the purposes and policy set forth in section 1531 of this title." *Id.* § 1539(d).

- 21. In so violating the mandates of section 10 of the Act, defendants have acted arbitrarily and capriciously, abused their discretion, acted contrary to law, acted in excess of their statutory authority, and acted without observance of procedure required by the ESA in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2).
- 22. This violation of law has caused and continues to cause, plaintiff's injuries as described in ¶¶ 6-8.

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiff requests that the Court issue an order:

- (1) declaring that defendants have violated the Endangered Species Act and the Administrative Procedure Act;
- (2) setting aside defendants' approval of the Sheppersons' CBW permit application and enjoining implementation of the permit;
- (3) enjoining defendants from allowing the Sheppersons to engage in any activities with respect to any captive bred endangered species that are prohibited by section 9 of the ESA to occur without first issuing a permit in accordance with all of the substantive and procedural requirements of section 10 of the ESA;

- (4) awarding plaintiff its costs and reasonable attorneys' fees; and
- (5) awarding plaintiff any other relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: August 3, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey S. Kerr

VA Bar No. 42122

Attorney for Plaintiff

PETA Foundation

1536 16th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036

(202) 540-2171

(202) 540-2208 (facsimile)

jeffk@petaf.org

%JS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

Case 1:11-cv-00809-CMH -IDD Document 1-1 Filed 08/03/11 Page 1 of 1 Page 1D#89 CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVIEWS OF THE FORM.)

		RSE OF THE FORM.)					Figure on the same	0.00		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, Inc. (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Norfolk, VA (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				DEFENDANT U.S. Fish and V as Acting Direct	Service; and	Ken S				
				in his official capacity as Secretary, U.S. Dep't of Interior. County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Arlington County, VA (INTERIOR EASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE						
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name leffrey S. Kerr, PETA Fou	e, Address, and Telephone Numb	er)		LAN Attorneys (If Known	nD INY	ALE	K US DISTRIC XANDRIA, VI	T COURT		
536 16th Street, N.W., W	ashington, DC 20036									
2 <u>02) 540-2171</u> II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF	F PRI	NCII	PAL PARTIES	/Place an "V" in	One Box 6	or Disintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	**		(For Diversity Cases Only on of This State		DEF		and One Box		
☑ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity	p of Parties in Item III)	Citizo	en of Another State	D 2	0		Principal Place	D 5	□ 5
-		Control to the state of the sta		en or Subject of a reign Country	3	0	3 Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box On		FC	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	vI	D.	NEDUDTOV	1 OTHER	CTATIE	FPC
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise ■ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Forcelosure	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	PERSONAL INJUR 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION 510 Motions to Vacat Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Otl 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	Y 61 62 62 62 62 62 62 62	0 Agriculture 0 Agriculture 10 Other Food & Drug 5 Drug Related Seizure 10 Froperty 21 USC 881 10 Liquor Laws 10 Liquor Laws 10 R. & Truck 10 Airline Regs. 10 Occupational 10 Safety/Health 10 Other 11 LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards 10 Act 10 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 10 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 10 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting 10 Empl. Relations 11 Empl. Ret. Inc. 12 Security Act 13 Habeas Corpus 14 Albeas Corpus 15 Other Immigration 16 Actions 17 Other Latine 18 Other Latine 19 Other Latine 10 Other Latine 11 Other Latine 12 Other Latine 13 Habeas Corpus 14 Other Latine 15 Other Immigration 16 Other Immigration 17 Other Immigration 18 Other Immigration	SI	422 Ap 423 Wi 28 PROP 820 Co 830 Pat 840 Tra SOCIA 861 HI. 862 Bla 863 DF 864 SS 865 RS FEDE 870 Tra or 871 IRS	ent	400 State F 410 Antitru	and Banking and Banking and Banking are credit Sat TV are Service ies/Comming are Challer C 3410 Statutory Altural Acts nic Stabilion of Information of Fee Det Equal Acceptation and the stability of Fee Det Equal Acceptation and Information of Fee Det Equal Acceptation and Information of Fee Det Equal Acceptation and Information of Information of Fee Det Equal Acceptation and Information of Fee Det Equal Acceptation and Information of In	ament ang acced and acced
N 1 Original □ 2 Re	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	Appellate Court tute under which you a	J 4 Rein Reop	ened ano	other d		Litigation	rict 7	Appeal to Judge fro Magistrat Judgment	m ie
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON 7 U.S.C. §§ 701- Brief description of ca	706					300	mit		-
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P.	IS A CLASS ACTION	N D	EMAND S			CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in	complai No	nt:
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE				DOCK	ET NUMBER			
DATE 08/03/2011	(SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY	OF RECORD						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # A	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	E		MAG. JUI	DGE		

MH -IDD Document 1-2 Filed 08/03/11

Court Name: United States District Court Division: 1 Receipt Number: 14683023252 Cashier ID: rbroaden Transaction Date: 08/03/2011

Payer Name: PEOPLE FOR ETHICAL TREAT

CIVIL FILING FEE
For: PEOPLE FOR ETHICAL TREAT
Amount: \$350.00

CASH Amt Tendered: \$350.00

Total Due: \$350.00 Total Tendered: \$350.00 Change Amt: \$0.00

FILING FEE 111CV809