

Executive Summary of Lawsuit Filed on September 3, 2025

The lawsuit filed today provides a detailed summary of the facts and legal theories supporting Plaintiffs' claims against the United States arising out of the Army's failure to act in response to numerous warning signs that Army Reservist, Robert Card, posed an imminent risk of violence to the community of Lewiston, Maine. The legal theories included in the lawsuit arise out of the following categories of Army misconduct:

The Army's knowledge of service member mass violence made the risks posed by Robert Card entirely foreseeable.

With a long history of mass violence committed by current and former service members, the United States military was aware of the unique risks posed by service members with mental illness. In response to past mass tragedies, the military enacted policies and systems designed to protect fellow service members and the public from these risks. In this case, the Army was aware that Army Reservist Robert Card suffered mental illness, was a risk for violence, had access to military grade weapons and had threatened to commit a mass shooting.

The Army knew of the effects on the brain from repeat exposure to blast forces, increasing the risks posed by Card's erratic behavior and threats of violence.

From years of experience and internal studies, the Army knew that Card's exposure to blast forces from his Army duties likely caused or contributed to his precipitous onset of mental illness, increasing the risk that Card would decline without treatment and continue to pose an unacceptably high danger to himself and the community.

The Army promised the Card family, local law enforcement and Card's medical providers that it would act to protect the community and separate Card from his firearms. The Army broke those promises.

In the months leading to the mass shooting, the Army ensured members of the Card family, local law enforcement, and Card's treating medical providers that it would act to protect the community from Card's mental illness, threats of violence, and access to weapons by monitoring him closely, providing him with medical evaluation and treatment, and separating him from his firearms. The Army broke its promises.

The Army violated its own orders, policies, and regulations by failing to take mandatory actions to respond to the threat of imminent harm posed by Card.

After months of erratic, threatening and violent conduct by Card, and assessments of medical providers who found Card unfit for military duty and unable to possess firearms safely, the Army knew that Card posed an unacceptable risk to the community. Army policies—and orders issued specifically in this case—required the Army to take mandatory actions including: (1) to communicate the warnings up the chain to the highest levels of Army Reserve command; (2) to exercise ongoing jurisdiction over Card until it had formally adjudicated Card’s mental and physical status; (3) to engage available reporting structures and legal processes to ensure that Card did not have access to firearms; and (4) to communicate all material information about Card to law enforcement. The Army breached each of these obligations.