

ROMANUCCI & BLANDIN, LLC

1 321 North Clark Street, Suite 900

2 Chicago, IL 60654

3 Telephone: +1 (312) 253-1000

4 Email: aromanucci@rblaw.net5 bberkman@rblaw.net6 jlevin@rblaw.net

7 Antonio Romanucci, IL State Bar No.: 6190290

8 Benjamin Berkman, IL State Bar No.: 6329445

9 Joshua Levin, IL State Bar No. 6320993

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**10 Arliss Siebeck, individually, and as
11 Personal Representative of the Estate of
12 Dillon Siebeck, and on behalf of all Statutory
13 Beneficiaries of Dillon Siebeck; and
14 Helen Domme, individually and on
behalf of all Statutory Beneficiaries of
Dillon Siebeck;

15 Plaintiffs,

16 v.

17 Juan Gonzales; Joshua Anderkin; and City of
18 Glendale, a municipal corporation,

19 Defendants.

20 Case No.

21 **COMPLAINT**22 **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**23 Plaintiffs Arliss Siebeck, individually, and as Personal Representative of the Estate of
24 Dillon Siebeck, and on behalf of all Statutory Beneficiaries of Dillon Siebeck, and Helen
25 Domme, individually and on behalf of all Statutory Beneficiaries of Dillon Siebeck, complain of
Defendants Juan Gonzales, Joshua Anderkin (Gonzales and Anderkin collectively, “Individual
Defendants”) and the City of Glendale (all defendants collectively, “Defendants”) as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This case concerns the unlawful and unjustified killing of Dillon Siebeck, an
2 unarmed 46-year-old man, by Officer Juan Gonzales of the Glendale Police Department on
3 January 8, 2025.

4. On that day, Mr. Siebeck was sitting in Horizon Park in Glendale, Arizona. Mr.
5 Siebeck was unarmed and peaceful and was not engaged in any unlawful activity. While
6 searching for another individual—whose physical description did not match Mr. Siebeck—
7 officers of the Glendale Police Department spotted Mr. Siebeck at a picnic table in Horizon Park.
8 From approximately 300 feet away from Mr. Siebeck, officers commanded Mr. Siebeck to walk
9 toward them. Mr. Siebeck did not display any weapon, and he made no verbal or physical threats
10 to any individual. Notwithstanding the absence of any threat, or of any credible reason to believe
11 that Mr. Siebeck was the suspect Glendale Police was looking for, Officer Juan Gonzales shot
12 twice at Mr. Siebeck. After an instruction given simultaneous to Officer Gonzales firing the
13 initial volley of shots, no Glendale Police Department officer gave any further instruction to Mr.
14 Siebeck. Fourteen seconds later, Officer Gonzales fired two additional shots at Mr. Siebeck, at
15 least one of which struck him. When Mr. Siebeck was shot by Officer Gonzales, he could not
16 have been non-compliant with any commands, because he had not been given any after the first
17 round of shots.

18. Sergeant Joshua Anderkin was leading the operation in Horizon Park that day.
19 Sergeant Anderkin failed to intervene or offer any supervision to Officer Gonzales, even after
20 Officer Gonzales fired two wholly unjustified shots at Mr. Siebeck from hundreds of feet away.
21 Worse yet, Sergeant Anderkin refused to allow officers of the Glendale Police Department to
22 render aid to Mr. Siebeck for more than 15 minutes after Mr. Siebeck had been shot. Mr.
23 Siebeck died from the gunshot wounds inflicted on him by Officer Gonzales.

24. Plaintiff Arliss Siebeck is Dillon Siebeck's brother and the personal representative
25 of Mr. Siebeck's estate. Plaintiff Helen Domme is Dillon Siebeck's mother. They now seek
26 some measure of justice on behalf of Mr. Siebeck, who was unlawfully and unjustifiably killed
27 by an officer of the Glendale Police Department who was entrusted to protect the public.

1 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2 5. This Court has federal-question jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
3 § 1331 because some of Plaintiffs' claims arise under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a federal statute.

4 6. The Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' state law claims under 28
5 U.S.C. § 1337, as they arise from the same events giving rise to Plaintiffs' federal claims.

6 7. Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b) because all incidents,
7 events, and occurrences giving rise to this action occurred in Glendale, Arizona, which is in the
8 United States District Court for the District of Arizona.

9 PARTIES

10 8. Plaintiff Arliss Siebeck is Dillon Siebeck's brother and the personal representative
11 of Mr. Siebeck's estate.

12 9. Plaintiff Helen Domme is Dillon Siebeck's mother.

13 10. Defendant Juan Gonzales is an officer of the Glendale Police Department. At all
14 times relevant to this action, Juan Gonzales acted in the scope of his employment for the City of
15 Glendale as an officer of the Glendale Police Department. Officer Gonzales is a resident of
16 Maricopa County, Arizona.

17 11. Defendant Joshua Anderkin is a sergeant of the Glendale Police Department. At
18 all times relevant to this action, Joshua Anderkin acted in the scope of his employment for the
19 City of Glendale as a sergeant of the Glendale Police Department. Sergeant Anderkin is a
20 resident of Maricopa County, Arizona.

21 12. The City of Glendale is a municipal corporation located in Maricopa County,
22 Arizona. At all times relevant to this action, defendants Gonzales and Anderkin acted within the
23 scope of their employment with the City of Glendale. The City of Glendale operates and controls
24 the Glendale Police Department, which is an agency and subsidiary unit of the City.

25 FACTS

26 13. On or about January 8, 2025 at 7:00 PM, Glendale Police Department ("GPD")
27 officers were investigating a domestic violence incident involving 23-year-old Angelo Diaz
("Diaz"). GPD officers were attempting to locate and apprehend Diaz.

14. GPD officers located a white pickup truck matching Diaz's vehicle's description
1 parked near Horizon Park in Glendale, Arizona.

15. GPD officers made this vehicle the target of their tactical operation aimed at
2 apprehending Diaz.

16. It was communicated over the GPD radio that Diaz was wearing a hooded
5 sweatshirt and shorts, and had a shaved head.

17. Around 7:10 PM, GPD officers suspected movement inside Diaz's vehicle, but
7 could not confirm the vehicle's occupancy due to the vehicle's tinted windows.

18. GPD officers instructed the occupant to exit the vehicle with his hands raised, but
9 at this point took no action to confirm the vehicle's occupancy.

19. No one exited the vehicle, and GPD officers noted that the occupant could be
10 crouched in the vehicle.

20. Without determining whether the person in the vehicle that matched Diaz's truck
12 was in fact Diaz, GPD officers inexplicably shifted their attention to a man sitting on picnic
13 tables in the park.

21. Dillon Siebeck ("Dillon") was the man sitting on the picnic tables.

22. Dillon had no affiliation whatsoever with Diaz and did not resemble him. Unlike
16 GPD's suspect, Dillon was 46-years-old—twice the age of the man they were looking for. Unlike
17 GPD's suspect, Dillon was not Hispanic.

23. Given his lack of physical resemblance to the suspect, Officer Gonzales and
19 Sergeant Anderkin had no reasonable basis to believe that Dillon was Angelo Diaz.

24. When officers turned their attention to Dillon, they were standing behind police
20 vehicles approximately 300 feet from Dillon. The officers were located near Diana Avenue in
21 Horizon Park, while Dillon was at the picnic tables under an overhang on the opposite side of the
22 park.

23. Officer Juan Gonzales was among the officers who set up to confront Dillon. The
24 team confronting Dillon was led by Sergeant Joshua Anderkin.

25. Despite the lack of physical similarity to their suspect, Officer Gonzales—who
26 was set up laying on the ground in front of a police vehicle—pointed an assault rifle at Dillon.
27 Several other GPD officers also took cover behind police vehicles and pointed firearms at Dillon.

1 At all relevant times, Officer Gonzales and the other GPD officers who drew their firearms on
2 Dillon were positioned approximately 300 feet away from Dillon.

3 27. Sergeant Anderkin, utilizing a PA system, instructed “Angelo” to put his hands up
4 and walk towards the officers.

5 28. Dillon began complying with Anderkin’s instructions and Anderkin said “good
6 man, good man” over the PA.

7 29. Dillon was unarmed. Dillon at no point displayed or possessed any weapon.
8 Dillon made no verbal or physical threats to anyone or any property at any time. Dillon was at
9 all times a more-than-considerable distance—approximately 300 feet—away from any GPD
10 officer, on the other side of the park. There was no other person in Dillon’s vicinity; the closest
11 people to him were the GPD officers taking cover behind police vehicles hundreds of feet away.

12 30. As Anderkin instructed “Angelo” over the PA to keep his hands on his head,
13 Officer Gonzales shot at Dillon twice with his assault rifle. Neither Officer Gonzales nor any
14 other GPD officer gave Dillon a warning that they would shoot prior to Officer Gonzales firing
15 at Dillon.

16 31. Officer Gonzales had no justification for shooting at Dillon, who posed no threat
17 to any person or property. Officer Gonzales could not have reasonably perceived that Dillon was
18 a threat to any person or property at the time he fired, as Dillon was hundreds of feet away, was
19 unarmed, was not displaying or in possession of any weapon, and made no physical or verbal
20 threats to any officer or any other person.

21 32. Neither Sergeant Anderkin nor any other GPD officer intervened after Officer
22 Gonzales fired two shots at Dillon without justification. Neither Sergeant Anderkin nor any
23 other GPD officer took any steps to stop or disarm Officer Gonzales, or to discourage him from
24 shooting at Dillon again.

25 33. As Officer Gonzales fired his first volley of shots at Dillon, Sergeant Anderkin
26 was completing an instruction to “Angelo” to put his hands on his head. After the shots and that
27 instruction, there is a 14 second pause in which no further instructions are given by any GPD
28 officer.

34. Fourteen seconds after Officer Gonzales’s first volley of shots, although Dillon
35 remained unarmed and unthreatening, Officer Gonzales shot at Dillon twice more, shooting at

1 Dillon a total of four times. At least one of the second volley of bullets fired by Officer Gonzales
2 struck Dillon. It was this second volley of shots that killed Dillon.

3 35. Dillon had been given no instructions or directions with which to comply at the
4 time Officer Gonzales shot him, as there had not been any instruction given over the PA or by
5 any GPD officer since Sergeant Anderkin's instruction simultaneous to the first volley of shots.
6 There was 14 seconds of no instruction or direction whatsoever prior to Officer Gonzales firing
7 the second volley of shots, so Dillon could not possibly have been refusing to comply with a
police command at the time Officer Gonzales shot him.

8 36. Although multiple GPD officers were present at the scene, Officer Gonzales was
9 the only GPD officer to shoot at Dillon. No GPD officer used any less-lethal weapons or any
10 other force on Dillon. Officer Gonzales had no justification for firing any of his four shots at
Dillon.

11 37. Dillon was not armed, nor did he imply that he was armed during this encounter.

12 38. Dillon did not make any verbal or physical threats to any person during this
13 encounter.

14 39. Dillon did not make any threatening or aggressive movement towards any person
15 during this encounter. At all times prior to being shot, Dillon was hundreds of feet away from
16 GPD officers and was being given instructions directed at someone else, who Dillon did not
17 know and who did not even resemble Dillon. Officer Gonzales could not have reasonably
18 perceived that Dillon posed a threat to anyone, let alone an imminent threat of deadly or serious
19 force.

20 40. Once Dillon was spotted in the park, no GPD officer took any step to confirm that
Dillon was the person GPD was searching for. Officers, including Gonzales and Anderkin,
21 simply assumed—without any reasonable basis—that Dillon was the person they were looking
22 for. This false and baseless assumption appears to have been premised on nothing other than that
Dillon happened to be present in the park—some 300 feet away from the vehicle matching the
23 suspect's truck.

24 41. Dillon had no connection to GPD's investigation of Angelo Diaz, other than his
mere presence in Horizon Park.

25 42. Following Gonzales' four shots, Anderkin confirmed that Dillon was down and
26 was not moving.

1 43. Anderkin then stated “Suspect down. We’re going to need the dog to get this
2 guy.”

3 44. As a result of being shot by Gonzales, Dillon was immediately in serious medical
4 distress, which would have been obvious to any officer in Anderkin’s or Gonzales’s position.

5 45. Anderkin and Gonzales knew or should have known that Dillon required
6 immediate medical care and that without such care he was likely to die.

7 46. Despite this knowledge, Anderkin did not provide medical attention or instruct
8 any officer to provide medical attention to Dillon until more than 15 minutes after Dillon had
9 been shot.

10 47. Anderkin did not radio for medical attention or instruct any officer to radio for
11 medical attention for Dillon until more than 15 minutes after Dillon had been shot.

12 48. To the contrary, Anderkin instructed officers to “hold” and not approach Dillon
13 until the K9 unit arrived.

14 49. There was no security or public safety risk that warranted delaying medical care
15 to Dillon for any period of time, let alone more than 15 minutes.

16 50. Officers did not begin to approach Dillon until 19 minutes after he was shot by
17 Officer Gonzales. Dillon was so far away from where the officers were positioned at the time
18 Officer Gonzales shot Dillon that, from the time they started to approach him, it took them a full
19 75 seconds to arrive in the vicinity of Dillon’s body.

20 51. Dillon died in Horizon Park as a result of being shot by Officer Gonzales, for
21 which he received no timely medical aid.

22 52. Rather than providing or requesting medical attention – while awaiting a K9 unit
23 to apprehend a downed suspect – Anderkin instructed GPD officers to turn their attention back to
24 Diaz’s white pickup truck.

25 53. All GPD officers present at the scene complied with Anderkin’s instruction, and
26 as a result, no GPD officer or medical personnel rendered or secured aid for Dillon for over 19
27 minutes.

28 54. GPD officers eventually approached and entered Diaz’s vehicle, where they found
him dead from what police determined to be a self-inflicted gunshot wound.

55. Upon information and belief, Diaz shot himself before GPD officers arrived on scene, and no gun – other than Gonzales’ police rifle – was fired while GPD officers were on scene.

56. Had GPD officers, including Officer Gonzales and Sergeant Anderkin, cleared their suspect's vehicle before turning their attention to Dillon, they would have found Diaz incapacitated.

57. Had GPD officers, including Officer Gonzales and Sergeant Anderkin, compared Dillon to their suspect's physical description, they would have found that Dillon was not their suspect.

58. Officer Gonzales' decision to shoot at Dillon 4 times constituted deadly, excessive force, unjustified by any threat posed by Dillon or any threat reasonably perceived by Officer Gonzales.

History of Excessive Force by GPD

59. The deadly, excessive force used against Dillon Siebeck on January 8, 2025 was not an isolated incident. It is part of a documented pattern and practice of excessive force by Glendale Police Department officers. The following is a non-exhaustive sampling of incidents involving GPD's use of excessive force.

60. On February 23, 2015, Anthony Baker was shot in the leg by GPD Officer Baldomero Dumla without justification after raising his hands.

61. In 2016, a GPD officer used fired multiple gunshots into a vehicle during a planned “vehicle containment,” striking Stephen Ross 15 times and killing him instead of his twin brother. On information and belief, this use of force was excessive and unjustified.

62. On July 27, 2017, GPD Officer Matthew Schneider dragged Johnny Wheatcroft – the passenger of a car alleged to have improperly used its turn signal – from the car, tasing Wheatcroft ten times in the process.

63. After Wheatcroft was handcuffed, lying face down on hot asphalt with another GPD Officer kneeling on his back, Officer Schneider kicked Wheatcroft in the groin.

64. Officer Schneider proceeded to tase Wheatcroft in his testicles without justification.

65. Prior to this incident, Officer Schneider had been disciplined by the City of Glendale at least six times yet was permitted to retain his police powers, thereby exposing

1 residents to an officer the City knew or should have known posed a high risk of causing harm
2 and violating individuals' rights.

3 66. Officer Schneider was later criminally charged with three counts of aggravated
4 assault and pled guilty to disorderly conduct for his excessive force against Wheatcroft.

5 67. The excessive force used against Wheatcroft prompted an FBI probe into the
6 Glendale Police Department.

7 68. Wheatcroft filed a civil suit against the City of Glendale for the excessive force
8 incident; the lawsuit settled in 2022.

9 69. On March 6, 2018, GPD Officers without justification slammed Robert Greer into
10 a golf cart, kneeled on his back, and pepper sprayed him while Greer was exercising his First
11 Amendment right to record an encounter between the officers and his son outside of a Glendale
12 restaurant.

13 70. Greer did not interfere with the officers and was never charged for obstruction;
14 Greer was escorted off of the restaurant property and was cited for trespassing.

15 71. Greer filed a civil suit against the City of Glendale for the GPD officers' violation
16 of his rights; the GPD officers and Greer settled in 2019.

17 72. On July 1, 2017, GPD Officer Elkhannoussi shot Patrick Sanchez three times in
18 the back of the head while two other GPD Officers restrained him. On information and belief,
19 this use of force was excessive and unjustified.

20 73. On or about December 2018, James Hurst, another bicyclist, was stopped by two
21 GPD Officers. Hurst immediately dismounted from his bicycle and put his hands in the air.

22 74. After Hurst put his hands in the air, GPD Sergeant Aaron Aldridge tased Hurst in
23 the chest without justification.

24 75. On or about March 2019, Glendale Police Officer Matthew Salyers was
25 suspended for thirty hours after repeatedly striking an unnamed man in the face during a traffic
26 stop without justification.

27 76. On June 13, 2019, Glendale Police Officer Joshua Carroll approached David
28 Dulaney, who was apparently asleep in his car. Dulaney, told Officer Carroll that he had a
disability.

77. Officer Carroll preceded to drag Dulaney from the car, shoved his face into the hot pavement, and repeatedly struck Dulaney in the back of the head with his taser, all without justification.

78. Dulaney did not resist arrest.

79. After beating and handcuffing Dulaney, Carroll unnecessarily and without justification dragged or threw Dulaney while he was on the ground.

80. On December 6, 2022, Khadrah Wazwaz was stopped by Glendale Police Officers for suspected shoplifting, a misdemeanor. Wazwaz made no threatening gestures towards the officers, and there was no indication that she was armed.

81. Glendale police officers preceded to take Wazwaz to the ground.

82. Wazwaz alerted the officers that she experienced seizures.

83. Despite this warning, the officers “stunned” Wazwaz fourteen times over a four-minute period. On information and belief, this use of force was excessive and unjustified.

84. In a press conference about the incident, a Glendale Police Department spokesperson said that “force is not in reference to misdemeanor or felony cases, it’s in reference to an individual’s resistance.”

COUNT I

42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Excessive Force

*Arliss Siebeck, as personal representative of the estate of Dillon Siebeck, against Defendant
Gonzales*

85. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the allegations of all paragraphs set forth above into this Count, as if fully set forth herein.

86. At all relevant times, Defendant Gonzales acted under the color of law as a police officer employed by Defendant City of Glendale.

87. Defendant Gonzales intentionally utilized deadly force when he shot at Dillon four times with an assault rifle.

88. Defendant Gonzales' use of deadly force was excessive because Dillon had not committed a crime, nor was he suspected of any crime at the time he was shot. No probable

1 cause existed to establish a reasonable probability that Dillon had committed or would commit a
 2 crime.

3 89. Defendant Gonzales' use of deadly force was excessive because Dillon did not
 4 pose any safety threat to GPD officers or any individual in Horizon Park.

5 90. Defendant Gonzales' use of deadly force was excessive because Officer Gonzales
 6 could not have reasonably perceived Dillon to pose any threat, let alone a serious or immediate
 7 one, at the time he fired all four shots at Dillon.

8 91. Defendant Gonzales' use of deadly force was excessive because Dillon was not
 9 attempting to evade arrest or flee from officers.

10 92. Defendant Gonzales' misconduct was objectively unreasonable and violated
 11 Dillon's clearly established federal constitutional rights. No reasonable officer in Defendant
 12 Gonzales' position would have believed that use of deadly force against Dillon was justified.

13 93. Dillon died as the direct and proximate result of Defendant Gonzales' intentional
 14 and unjustified use of deadly force. Defendant Gonzales' use of deadly force caused Dillon's
 15 loss of life and loss of enjoyment of life, as well as conscious pain, suffering, emotional distress,
 16 and other damages prior to his death.

17 **COUNT II**

18 **42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Unlawful Seizure**

19 *Arliss Siebeck, as personal representative of the estate of Dillon Siebeck, against Defendant*
 20 *Gonzales*

21 94. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the allegations of all paragraphs set forth
 22 above into this Count, as if fully set forth herein.

23 95. At all relevant times, Defendant Gonzales acted under the color of law as a police
 24 officer employed by Defendant City of Glendale.

25 96. Defendant Gonzales seized Dillon when Defendant Gonzales intentionally shot at
 26 Dillon four times, striking his person and thereby terminating his freedom of movement.

27 97. Defendant Gonzales' seizure of Dillon was unlawful because no probable cause
 28 existed to establish a reasonable probability that Dillon had committed or would commit a crime.

1 Defendant Gonzales likewise had no reasonable basis to believe that Dillon posed a threat of
 2 harm to any person when he fired four shots at Dillon.

3 98. Even if Defendant Gonzales subjectively believed that Dillon may have been
 4 Angelo Diaz, that incorrect belief was objectively unreasonable given Dillon's age, race,
 5 physical characteristics, and the approximately 300-foot distance that separated Defendant
 6 Gonzales from Dillon.

7 99. Defendant Gonzales had no reasonable basis to believe that Dillon was Angelo
 8 Diaz; mere presence in a public park 300 feet from where Diaz's car was located is not a
 9 reasonable basis to conclude that Dillon was Angelo Diaz, especially when Dillon did not fit
 10 Diaz's physical description and no other facts connected Dillon to Diaz.

11 100. Any mistaken belief that Dillon was Angelo Diaz therefore did not provide
 12 Defendant Gonzales with the probable cause necessary to lawfully seize Dillon.

13 101. Defendant Gonzales' misconduct was objectively unreasonable and violated
 14 Dillon's clearly established federal constitutional rights. No reasonable officer in Defendant
 15 Gonzales' position would have believed that seizing Dillon through the use of deadly force was
 16 justified.

17 102. Dillon died as the direct and proximate result of Defendant Gonzales' unlawful
 18 seizure, which was an intentional use of unjustified deadly force. Defendant Gonzales' use of
 19 deadly force and unlawful seizure caused Dillon's loss of life and loss of enjoyment of life, as
 20 well as conscious pain, suffering, emotional distress, and other damages prior to his death.

21 **COUNT III**

22 **42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Failure to Render Aid**

23 *Arliss Siebeck, as personal representative of the estate of Dillon Siebeck, against Individual
 24 Defendants*

25 103. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the allegations of all paragraphs set forth
 26 above into this Count, as if fully set forth herein.

27 104. At all relevant times, the Individual Defendants acted under the color of law as
 28 police officers employed by Defendant City of Glendale.

1 105. Defendant Gonzales critically injured Dillon during the course of his unlawful
2 seizure and unlawful use of deadly force by shooting at Dillon four times with an assault rifle.

3 106. As police officers, the Individual Defendants had a duty to render aid or secure
4 medical care for individuals who they know have sustained injury during the course of a seizure
5 or police use of force.

6 107. Dillon was incapable of verbalizing his need for immediate medical attention due
7 to the critical nature of his injuries.

8 108. Despite the lack of request, Individual Defendants knew that Dillon had been
9 injured in the course of Defendant Gonzales's seizure and use of force, and the need for
10 immediate medical attention was apparent, as evidenced by the fact that Sergeant Anderkin
11 communicated over the police radio that Dillon was "down" and was not moving.

12 109. Individual Defendants failed to render aid or secure medical care for Dillon,
13 choosing instead to let Dillon bleed out on the ground while the Individual Defendants waited
14 more than 15 minutes for a K9 unit to arrive.

15 110. Individual Defendants' decision to wait more than 15 minutes before rendering
16 aid or securing medical care for Dillon was unreasonable because there were sufficient officers
17 on scene to attend to both Dillon's critical condition and secure Diaz's vehicle.

18 111. Individual Defendants' decision to call for a K9 unit to apprehend Dillon after he
19 was shot and showed no movement or threat, rather than call for medical care or provide medical
20 care themselves, was unreasonable because it obfuscated the critical nature of Dillon's injuries
21 and fatally delayed life-saving care.

22 112. Individual Defendants' failure to render aid to Dillon, and Sergeant Anderkin's
23 instruction to officers to not render aid, evinced a deliberate indifference to Dillon's life and
24 constitutional rights.

25 113. Individual Defendants' misconduct was objectively unreasonable and violated
26 Dillon's clearly established federal constitutional rights. No reasonable officer in Individual
27 Defendants' position would have believed that their failure to render aid or secure medical care
28 was justified.

114. Dillon died as the direct and proximate result of the Individual Defendants' failure to render aid or secure medical care following Defendant Gonzales' intentional use of deadly force. Individual Defendants' failure to render aid or secure medical care caused Dillon's loss of life and loss of enjoyment of life, as well as conscious pain, suffering, emotional distress, and other damages prior to his death.

COUNT IV

42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Failure to Intervene

*Arliss Siebeck, as personal representative of the estate of Dillon Siebeck, against Defendant
Anderkin*

115. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the allegations of all paragraphs set forth above into this Count, as if fully set forth herein.

116. Sergeant Anderkin owed a constitutional duty to intervene in Officer Gonzales's unlawful seizure and use of excessive force.

117. Sergeant Anderkin had an opportunity to intervene in Officer Gonzales's unlawful seizure and use of excessive force on Dillon. After Officer Gonzales initially fired two shots at Dillon, roughly 14 seconds passed before Officer Gonzales fired two additional shots.

118. Though Sergeant Anderkin was observing Dillon and thus could not have reasonably believed that Dillon posed a serious threat or that the use of deadly force against Dillon would be justified, Sergeant Anderkin said nothing to Officer Gonzales after Officer Gonzales initially fired two wholly unjustified shots at Dillon. Sergeant Anderkin took no steps to prevent or stop Officer Gonzales from firing additional shots at Dillon. Without any intervention from Sergeant Anderkin, Officer Gonzales fired two additional shots at Dillon with no reasonable justification.

119. Sergeant Anderkin's failure to intervene in Officer Gonzales's obviously unconstitutional conduct evinced a deliberate indifference to Dillon's life and constitutional rights.

120. Sergeant Anderkin's misconduct was objectively unreasonable and violated Dillon's clearly established federal constitutional rights. No reasonable officer in Sergeant Anderkin's position would have believed that his failure to intervene was justified.

121. Dillon died as a direct and proximate result of Sergeant Anderkin's failure to intervene. Sergeant Anderkin's failure to intervene caused Dillon's loss of life and loss of enjoyment of life, as well as conscious pain, suffering, emotional distress, and other damages prior to his death.

COUNT V

42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Failure to Supervise

*Arliss Siebeck, as personal representative of the estate of Dillon Siebeck, against Defendant
Anderkin*

122. Plaintiffs realleges and incorporates the allegations of all paragraphs set forth above into this Count, as if fully set forth herein.

123. Sergeant Anderkin owed a constitutional duty to supervise Officer Gonzales.

124. Sergeant Anderkin had an opportunity to intervene in Officer Gonzales's unlawful use of seizure and use of excessive force on Dillon. After Officer Gonzales initially fired two shots at Dillon, roughly 14 seconds passed before Officer Gonzales fired two additional shots.

125. Though Sergeant Anderkin was observing Dillon and thus could not have reasonably believed that Dillon posed a serious threat or that the use of deadly force against Dillon would be justified, Sergeant Anderkin said nothing to Officer Gonzales after Officer Gonzales initially fired two wholly unjustified shots at Dillon. Sergeant Anderkin took no steps to prevent or stop Officer Gonzales from firing additional shots at Dillon. Without any intervention from Sergeant Anderkin, Officer Gonzales fired two additional shots at Dillon with no reasonable justification.

126. Sergeant Anderkin knew that Officer Gonzales was violating Dillon's constitutional rights after Officer Gonzales fired his first two shots at Dillon. Sergeant Anderkin nonetheless did not use his supervisory authority to take any action to stop Officer Gonzales from continuing his unconstitutional use of force.

127. Sergeant Anderkin's failure to supervise Officer Gonzales during Officer
 2 Gonzales's obviously unconstitutional conduct evinced a deliberate indifference to Dillon's life
 3 and constitutional rights.

128. Sergeant Anderkin's misconduct was objectively unreasonable and violated
 5 Dillon's clearly established federal constitutional rights. No reasonable officer in Sergeant
 6 Anderkin's position would have believed that his failure to supervise Officer Gonzales during
 7 Officer Gonzales's obviously unconstitutional conduct was justified.

129. Dillon died as a direct and proximate result of Sergeant Anderkin's failure to
 9 supervise. Sergeant Anderkin's failure to intervene caused Dillon's loss of life and loss of
 10 enjoyment of life, as well as conscious pain, suffering, emotional distress, and other damages
 11 prior to his death.

12 **COUNT VI**

13 **42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Interference with Familial Relationship**

14 *Domme & Arliss Siebeck, individually, against Individual Defendants*

15 130. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the allegations of all paragraphs set forth
 16 above into this Count, as if fully set forth herein.

17 131. At all relevant times, the Individual Defendants acted under the color of law as
 18 police officers employed by Defendant City of Glendale.

19 132. Plaintiff Arliss Siebeck is Dillon's brother, and they maintained a relationship
 20 until the time of Dillon's death. Dillon texted Arliss's wife Kelli on the day that Dillon died.
 21 Arliss expected that Dillon would come live near Arliss in Wyoming and work with Arliss on his
 22 electrical business at the time of Dillon's death. Plaintiff Domme is Dillon's mother, and she
 23 would have received familial support from Dillon but for Dillon's untimely and unlawful killing.

24 133. Defendant Gonzales interfered with Plaintiffs Siebeck and Domme's fundamental
 25 interest in their familial relationship with Dillon by intentionally and fatally shooting him
 26 without justification, probable cause, or any modicum of due process.

27 134. Defendant Gonzales' decision to shoot at Dillon four times shocks the conscience.
 28 He intentionally shot Dillon when Dillon was unarmed, posed no threat to any individual, and

1 was very evidently not the individual sought by GPD. Sergeant Anderkin's decision not to
 2 intervene or supervise Officer Gonzales after Gonzales's initial volley of wholly unjustified shots
 3 also shocks the conscience as it enabled Gonzales to fire additional, unjustifiable shots at Dillon,
 4 and represents a total abdication of his role as a supervising officer.

5 135. The Individual Defendants interfered with Plaintiffs Siebeck and Domme's
 6 fundamental interest in their familial relationship with Dillon by consciously disregarding their
 7 duty to render or secure medical aid to Dillon, who they knew was critically injured by
 8 Defendant Gonzales' gunfire while he was being seized.

9 136. The Individual Defendants' decision to forego their known duty to render or
 10 secure medical aid shocks the conscious because they had a reasonable opportunity spanning the
 11 course of more than 15 minutes to seek or provide medical care for Dillon.

12 137. Individual Defendants' misconduct was objectively unreasonable and violated
 13 Plaintiffs' clearly established federal constitutional rights. No reasonable officer in Individual
 14 Defendants' position would have believed that their interference with Plaintiffs' fundamental
 15 interest in their familial relationship with Dillon was justified.

16 138. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant Gonzales' intentional act of
 17 shooting Dillon four times constituting excessive force and an unreasonable seizure, Sergeant
 18 Anderkin's failure to intervene, and the Individual Defendants' failure to render aid, Dillon died
 19 and his association, companionship, and society with Plaintiffs Siebeck and Domme was
 20 permanently lost for Dillon and Plaintiffs.

21 **COUNT VII**

22 **42 U.S.C. § 1983 – *Monell***

23 *Arliss Siebeck, individually and as personal representative of the Estate of Dillon Siebeck, and*
 24 *Helen Domme, individually, against Defendant City of Glendale*

25 139. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the allegations of all paragraphs set forth
 26 above into this Count, as if fully set forth herein.

27 140. At all relevant times, the Individual Defendants acted under the color of law as
 28 police officers employed by Defendant City of Glendale.

1 141. The City of Glendale bears responsibility for Individual Defendants' violations of
2 Dillon's and Plaintiffs' constitutional rights. This is so for at least four reasons: First, the City
3 has an unofficial custom or practice of GPD officers excessively deploying serious and even
4 deadly force on members of the public when the use of such force is not justified by any threat
5 posed by the subject. Second, the City was deliberately indifferent to Dillon's and Plaintiffs'
6 constitutional rights when it failed to adequately supervise and discipline Officer Gonzales,
7 whose record shows a high number of "response to resistance" events. The resulting culture of
8 impunity at GPD resulted in Officer Gonzales unlawfully shooting and killing Dillon. Third, the
9 City of Glendale has failed to adequately train officers with respect to the use of deadly force,
10 resulting in Officer Gonzales shooting an unarmed man who had no apparent relationship with
11 the subject of GPD's investigation. Fourth, the total failure of any of the numerous GPD officers
12 on the scene that night—including around half a dozen GPD officers standing near Officer
13 Gonzales as he fired obviously unjustified shots and countless other GPD officers in Horizon
14 Park—to intervene in Officer Gonzales's obviously unconstitutional conduct evinces a
15 widespread practice of failing to intervene when other officers violate individual's constitutional
16 rights. Further, such failure to intervene by so many GPD officers under circumstances in which
17 intervention should have been obvious to any well-trained, well-supervised, and well-disciplined
18 officer corps evinces the City failed to adequately train, supervise, or discipline GPD officers on
19 officers' duty to intervene.

20 142. As discussed in the section labeled History of Excessive Force by GPD above,
21 which present a non-exhaustive list of examples, GPD has a continuing, widespread, and
22 persistent pattern of using serious and even lethal force without justification against members of
23 the public.

24 143. Officer Gonzales represents an archetype of, and a predictable consequence of,
25 the City's failure to act in the face of a continuing, widespread, and persistent pattern of misuse
26 of force. Officer Gonzales' record includes an abnormally high number of "responsive to
27 resistance" events—e.g., uses of force—yet GPD does not appear to have ever meaningfully
28 disciplined officer Gonzales. Indeed, Officer Gonzales's record indicates that GPD sustained

1 allegations against him for a May 2022 event in which Officer Gonzales discharged his firearm.
2 Although the department sustained a violation of GPD policies regarding Handling, Display, and
3 Use of Firearms for the incident in which Gonzales fired his firearm, he faced no suspension for
4 the violation.

5 144. The City's failure to meaningfully hold officers accountable in the face of a
6 widespread, persistent pattern of excessive force amounts to deliberate indifference to the
7 Constitutional rights of members of the public. It further amounts to a failure to adequately
8 supervise and discipline its officers, who, in unjustifiably using serious and lethal force, have
9 repeatedly misused the enormous power with which they are vested.

10 145. The City has knowingly failed to train its officers adequately on the appropriate
11 use of lethal force and proper assessments of the risk posed by members of the public. As a
12 matter of policy, practice, and custom, the City has knowingly failed to provide adequate training
13 to its officers notwithstanding the City's pattern of excessive force.

14 146. Finally, the uniform conduct by countless officers of the Glendale Police
15 Department on January 8, 2025 evinces a widespread practice of failing to intervene when
16 officers engage in obvious unconstitutional conduct. While only Officer Gonzales fired shots
17 that night, around half a dozen other officers were standing in his immediate vicinity at the time
18 he fired. Numerous other officers were in Horizon Park at the time. None of those officers fired
19 a single shot or used any less-lethal force on Dillon. This is because Dillon could not have
20 reasonably been perceived to be a threat to anyone at the moments Officer Gonzales fired. And
21 yet, not a single officer intervened to prevent Officer Gonzales from continuing to shoot at
22 Dillon. This indicates a widespread, persistent culture and practice across the Department of
23 failing to intervene when officers engage in excessive force in obvious violation of individuals'
24 constitutional rights.

25 147. Such failure to intervene by so many GPD officers also indicates the City failed to
26 adequately train, supervise, or discipline GPD officers on officers' duty to intervene.

27 148. The City's deliberate indifference to a sustained pattern and practice of excessive
28 use of serious and lethal force, its widespread practice of failing to intervene, and its failure to

1 adequately discipline, supervise, and train GPD officers (including Officer Gonzales and Officer
2 Anderkin), as described above, was the moving force behind the immense injuries suffered by
3 Dillon and Plaintiffs. Individual Defendant' actions are precisely what one would expect from a
4 department where the unjustified use of lethal force is tolerated. By failing to adequately
5 investigate, intervene in, punish, and discipline prior instances of similar conduct, and failing to
6 meaningfully train officers in the appropriate use of force, the City encouraged future uses of
7 excessive and deadly force by Officer Gonzales and others, as officers are led to believe their
8 actions will not be meaningfully scrutinized or subject to discipline.

9 149. As a result of these inappropriate policies, practices, and customs, the City
10 encourages police officers, like Officer Gonzales, to wantonly escalate uses of force, injuring and
11 killing people like Dillon in the process.

12 150. The shooting, unlawful seizure, and killing of Dillon by Defendant Gonzales was
13 a direct and proximate result of the City's unconstitutional custom or practice.

14 151. As a result, Dillon died and suffered conscious pain, suffering, emotional distress,
15 and other damages prior to his death. In addition, Plaintiffs and Dillon permanently lost their
16 companionship, association, and society.

17 COUNT VIII

18 A.R.S. § 12-611 – Wrongful Death

19 *Arliss Siebeck, as Personal Representative of the Estate of Dillon Siebeck and on behalf of all
20 Statutory Beneficiaries of Dillon Siebeck, and Domme, on behalf of all Statutory Beneficiaries of
21 Dillon Siebeck, against All Defendants*

22 152. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the allegations of all paragraphs set forth
23 above into this Count, as if fully set forth herein.

24 153. Plaintiff Arliss Siebeck, as Personal Representative of the Estate of Dillon
25 Siebeck, may file an action arising out of Dillon's wrongful death under Arizona law, A.R.S.
26 § 12-612(A).

27 154. Plaintiff Domme, as Dillon's mother, may file an action arising out of Dillon's
28 wrongful death under Arizona law, A.R.S. § 12-612(A).

1 155. Plaintiffs have complied with the requirements of A.R.S. §§ 12-821 and 12-
2 821.01, having served an appropriate Notice of Claim in accordance with the requirements of
3 Arizona law. The parties on whom the Notice of Claim was served did not respond to the Notice
4 of Claim, and have not offered to resolve the Plaintiffs' claims in any way.

5 156. The shooting and killing of Dillon Siebeck constitutes a wrongful act, neglect, or
6 default for which Defendants are jointly and severally liable.

7 157. Defendants owed duties of due care to Dillon and the Plaintiffs. Such duties
8 included, without limitation, the duty to protect Dillon and the Plaintiffs from harm that might be
9 caused by the use of unnecessary, unreasonable, or excessive force against Dillon.

10 158. Defendants' duties of care emanated from their role as a public police agency and
11 its officers charged with preserving life and not employing unnecessary, unreasonable, or
12 excessive force in the conduct of their official activities. Defendants therefore had a duty to
13 protect Dillon from physical harm or death, and a duty to protect his family from the foreseeable
14 harms and losses that would result from his death.

15 159. Defendant Anderkin, as a supervising police official and the commanding officer
16 at the scene of Dillon's killing, owed a duty to Dillon and the Plaintiffs to properly and
17 proactively supervise those officers under his authority so that they would not use excessive,
18 unreasonable, unnecessary, or inappropriate force when interacting with Dillon.

19 160. The treatment of Dillon by the GPD officers, including the killing of Dillon,
20 violated duties of care Defendants had to Dillon and to the Plaintiffs, including without
21 limitation their duties to train, supervise, and discipline officers in implementing policies
22 concerning appropriate tactics, techniques, and use of force.

23 161. Defendants' treatment of Dillon also violated duties of care Defendants had to
24 Dillon and to the Plaintiffs to properly supervise the work of the GPD officers at the scene of
25 Dillon's killing and to prevent them from using any inappropriate, unnecessary, unreasonable or
26 excessive tactics or force.

1 162. Defendant Gonzales committed a battery against Dillon by intentionally firing at
2 Dillon without any justification. At least one of Defendant Gonzales's shots struck and killed
3 Dillon.

4 163. Defendant Gonzales' wrongful actions and/or failures to act alleged herein
5 directly and proximately caused Dillon's death.

6 164. Defendant Gonzales' wrongful actions and/or failures to act alleged herein
7 directly and proximately caused the Statutory Beneficiaries injuries and loss, including the loss
8 of Dillon's life.

9 165. With gross negligence and deliberate indifference toward Dillon's life, Sergeant
10 Anderkin failed to intervene and supervise Officer Gonzales to stop him from continuing his
11 gross, intentional use of excessive force on Dillon despite having the opportunity to stop Officer
12 Gonzales prior to Officer Gonzales firing the second, fatal volley of shots.

13 166. Sergeant Anderkin's wrongful actions or failures to act alleged herein directly and
14 proximately caused Dillon's death.

15 167. Sergeant Anderkin's wrongful actions or failures to act alleged herein directly and
16 proximately caused the Statutory Beneficiaries injuries and loss, including the loss of Dillon's
17 life.

18 168. The losses suffered by the Plaintiffs as a result of the Individual Defendants'
19 wrongful actions and failures to act as alleged herein include Plaintiff Domme's loss of her son
20 Dillon and her loss of Dillon's love, affection, companionship, care, protection, guidance, both
21 since his death and in the future.

22 169. Plaintiffs are entitled to recover from the Defendants for all their losses and harms
23 resulting from Dillon's wrongful death and from Defendants' wrongful actions and failures to act
24 as alleged herein.

25 170. Defendants' actions constitute intentional wrongful conduct and deliberate
26 indifference to the rights of Dillon and his surviving family.

27 171. In addition to the intentional wrongful conduct and deliberate indifference, the
28 actions and failures to act alleged herein reflect that Defendants engaged in extreme and

1 excessive cruelty to Dillon and the Plaintiffs, which constitutes reckless indifference to the rights
2 and safety of Dillon and the Plaintiffs that Defendants knew or ought to have known.

3 172. In addition to the intentional wrongful conduct and deliberate indifference, the
4 actions of Defendants as alleged herein also constituted unnecessary and wanton infliction of
5 pain and suffering and created an unreasonable risk of harm to Dillon and the Plaintiffs with the
6 highly probable result that the harm would occur.

7 173. As a direct and proximate result of the actions and failures to act of Defendants as
8 alleged herein, the Plaintiffs suffered grave and devastating injuries and loss, including the loss
9 of Dillon's life.

10 174. On information and belief, Defendants' wrongful actions and failures to act as
11 alleged herein were malicious and undertaken with reckless disregard for the rights and the
12 substantial risk of harm to Dillon and his family. Plaintiffs' claims qualify, therefore, for the
13 imposition of punitive or exemplary damages in an amount sufficient to punish Defendants and
14 to deter other similarly situated persons from like conduct.

15 175. Plaintiffs are entitled to recovery of taxable costs, including per the terms of
16 A.R.S. § 12-341

17 176. The City of Glendale is vicariously liable for the conduct of the Individual
18 Defendants, who at all relevant times were acting within the scope of their duties as employees
19 of the City of Glendale.

20 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

21 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiffs Arliss Siebeck, individually, as Personal Representative of the
22 Estate of Dillon Siebeck, and on behalf of all Statutory Beneficiaries of Dillon Siebeck, and
23 Helen Domme, individually and on behalf of all Statutory Beneficiaries of Dillon Siebeck,
24 respectfully request that this Court enter a judgment in their favor against Defendants City of
25 Glendale, Juan Gonzales, and Joshua Anderkin, and award compensatory damages, punitive
26 damages, all damages available under A.R.S. § 12-613, attorneys' fees, costs, and any other
27 relief the Court deems just and appropriate with respect to all Defendants.

JURY DEMAND

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b), Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Dated: December 31, 2025

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Benjamin Berkman

ROMANUCCI & BLANDIN, LLC

Antonio Romanucci
Benjamin Berkman
Joshua Levin
ROMANUCCI & BLANDIN, LLC
321 N. Clark St.
Suite 900
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 458-1000

Attorneys for Plaintiff