## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA ATLANTA DIVISION

GEORGIACARRY.ORG, INC., et. al.	)	
	)	CIVIL ACTION FILE NO.
V.	)	
	)	1:09-CV-594-TWT
METROPOLITAN ATLANTA	)	
RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY, et. al.	)	
	)	
Defendants	)	

## PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

#### **Summary**

Plaintiffs brought this action against Defendants for violations of the federal Privacy Act and other state and federal laws. Before the Court currently is Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Doc. 21]. In their Motion, Defendants claim that Section 7 of the Privacy Act does not apply to them because they assert that MARTA is not a "state or local government agency" as that term is used in the Privacy Act. Defendants also assert that Plaintiffs' Privacy Act claims are moot. Because Defendants have argued (successfully) in earlier cases that MARTA is a "local government agency," and because case law indicates that the Privacy Act should be applied to MARTA, and because Defendants have done nothing to remedy the harm they caused Plaintiffs, Defendants' Motion must be denied.

### **Background**

#### Admitted Facts

Defendants admit that MARTA police officers stopped Plaintiff Raissi and, in the course of their encounter, the officers asked Raissi for his social security number ("SSN"). Defendants' Statement of Material Facts, ¶ 5. Defendants' further admit that the officers did not advise Raissi 1) whether disclosure was optional or mandatory, 2) by what statutory or other authority his SSN was requested, and 3) what uses would be made of his SSN. *Id.*, ¶ 6.

#### Additional Facts

In previous litigation, MARTA represented to the Court of Appeals of Georgia that:

MARTA is an agency of local governments which performs an essential governmental function.

Certified Copy of MARTA's "Brief of Appellee," [Doc. 30-2, p. 2]. MARTA stated in the same brief:

[MARTA] is plainly a public agency, and an agency of local government, just as the General Assembly has said.

*Id.*, pp. 3-4.

In response to Plaintiffs' First Discovery Requests, Defendants MARTA, Dorsey and Dunham provided Plaintiffs with several documents bearing Raissi's social security number, including 1) a hand-written report by Defendant Nicholas entitled "MARTA Police Department Incident Report;" 2) a type-written report by Defendant Nicholas entitled "Incident Report;" 3) Dispatcher "remarks" on the incident; and 4) an audio recording of the radio traffic of the incident (in which the officers broadcast Raissi's SSN over the public airwaves). June 11, 2009 Letter from Defense Counsel to Plaintiffs' Counsel, with produced documents [Doc. 16-2, pp. 5, 12, and 13; Doc. 31-2, p. 3].<sup>1</sup>

#### <u>Argument</u>

Defendants' Brief [Doc. 21-2] in the instant Motion is nearly identical to Defendants' Response [Doc. 19] to Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Doc. 17]. Rather than burden the Court with duplicate material, therefore, Plaintiffs incorporate by reference their arguments contained in their Reply in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. 30-1].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The audio recording cannot be cited at this writing. Plaintiffs requested on July 29, 2009 that Defendants file the audio recording [Doc. 22]. As of this writing, Defendants have not complied with this request.

JOHN R. MONROE,

/s/ John R. Monroe\_\_\_\_\_

John R. Monroe Attorney at Law 9640 Coleman Road Roswell, GA 30075 Telephone: (678) 362-7650 Facsimile: (770) 552-9318 john.monroe1@earthlink.net

# ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFFS

# Local Rule 7.1D Certification

The undersigned counsel certifies that the foregoing was prepared using Times New Roman 14 point, a font and point selection approved in LR 5.1B.

> /s/ John R. Monroe\_\_\_\_\_ John R. Monroe

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on August 12, 2009, I filed the foregoing using the ECF system, which automatically will email a coy to:

Ms. Paula M. Nash pmnash@itsmarta.com

/s/ John R. Monroe

John R. Monroe