IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS EASTERN DIVISION

DAVID WATLINGTON and LINDSEY HOLLAWAY, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated

PLAINTIFFS

v.

No. 2:17-cv-2-DPM

CITY OF McCRORY, ARKANSAS and PAUL HATCH, in his Official Capacity as the Police Chief of McCrory, Arkansas

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

- 1. The City of McCrory and Chief Hatch move again to dismiss Watlington and Hollaway's case. They say the case is moot—the complained-of city ordinance no longer exists. And they say the complaint fails to state a claim—the ordinance was never enforced against Watlington and Hollaway, so it didn't deprive them of any constitutional right.
- **2.** Although Watlington and Hollaway's request for injunctive relief is moot, they also seek some damages. № 25 at 15–16, 20. This claim saves their case from mootness. *E.g., Forbes v. Arkansas Educational Television Communication Network Foundation*, 982 F.2d 289, 290 (8th Cir. 1992) (per curiam); № 22 at 2–3.

3. The Court already concluded that Chief Hatch's warning was the

beginning of enforcement. № 22 at 2. Watlington and Hollaway say he told

them they'd have to move after the holidays because of a recently enacted

ordinance. № 25 at ¶¶ 34–35. And now they allege particularized facts about

damages caused by this enforcement of an allegedly unconstitutional

ordinance. That's enough.

Watlington and Hollaway didn't file a verified complaint or attach

affidavits as directed, № 22 at 3, but they did allege they lost \$200 in wages

and more than \$600 in transportation expenses looking for a new home. № 25

at ¶¶ 113, 115–18. Watlington and Hollaway have sufficiently stated a claim

for approximately \$800 in damages caused by Hatch's beginning to enforce

the ordinance against them. That claim, and only that claim, is what the rest

of the case is about.

Motion, № 26, denied.

So Ordered.

D.P. Marshall Jr.

United States District Judge

3 August 2017

-2-