1	Rivera&Associates
2	2180 Harvard Street, Suite 310 Sacramento, California 95815
3	Tel: 916-922-1200 Fax: 916 922-1303
4	Jesse M. Rivera, CSN 84259
5	Jonathan B. Paul, CSN 215884
6	Shanan L. Hewitt, CSN 200168 Kelly A. Yokley, CSN 192015
7	
8	Attorneys for Defendant, County of Sacramento
9	IN THE UNITED OF THE DISTRICT COURT
10	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11	IN AND FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12	CONNIE ARNOLD,) CASE NO. 2:12-cv-01998-LKK-EFB
13	Plaintiff, DEFENDANT COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO'S ANSWER TO
14) SACRAMENTO'S ANSWER TO) PLAINTIFF CONNIE ARNOLD'S FIRST
15	vs. AMENDED COMPLAINT and DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
16	COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.
17	Defendant.
18	
19	Defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO (hereinafter "defendant") in answering the
20	allegations of the First Amended Complaint (hereinafter "complaint") hereby admit, deny and
21	allege as follows:
22	I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>
23	1. In response to paragraph 1 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF
24	SACRAMENTO admits the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") was enacted in 1990.
25	Answering the remaining allegations contained in the paragraph 1, defendant COUNTY OF
26	SACRAMENTO contends the remaining allegations do not constitute averments of fact to which
27	an answer may be required, but insofar as an answer may be deemed required, this answering
28	defendant generally and specifically denies each and every remaining allegations contained in
	Defendant County of Sacramento's Answer to Plaintiff Connie Arnold's First Amended Complaint and Demand for Jury Trial

21 22

2. In response to paragraph 2, defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO admits that Sylvan Oaks Public Library is located near the corner of Auburn Boulevard and Van Maren Lane in the City of Citrus Heights. In response to the balance of this paragraph, defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO denies both generally and specifically, each and every allegation contained therein; too the extent the allegations are directed to the other defendants, defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO has no information or belief to enable it to answer said allegations, and for that reason and basing its denial on that ground, denies both generally and specifically, each and every allegation contained therein.

3. In response to paragraph 3, defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO generally and specifically denies each and every allegation contained therein and on that basis, denies paragraph 3 in its entirety.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. In response to paragraph 4 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO contends that said paragraph contain conclusions of law and not averments of fact to which an answer may be required, but insofar as an answer may be deemed required, this answering defendant generally and specifically denies each and every allegation contained in said paragraph, except to admit that this Court has jurisdiction over federal questions under 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
- 5. In response to paragraph 4 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO contends that said paragraph contain conclusions of law and not averments of fact to which an answer may be required, but insofar as an answer may be deemed required, this answering defendant generally and specifically denies each and every allegation contained in said paragraph, except to admit that venue is proper in the Eastern District of California.

III. PARTIES

6. In response to paragraph 6 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO is without sufficient information to answer the allegations in paragraph 6 and basing its denial on this ground, this answering defendant generally and specifically denies each

SACRAMENTO admits that it is a public entity. In response to the balance of the allegations in this paragraph, defendant contends that said paragraph contain conclusions of law and not averments of fact to which an answer may be required, but insofar as an answer may be deemed required, this answering defendant generally and specifically denies each and every remaining allegation contained in said paragraph.

8. In response to paragraph 8 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF

In response to paragraph 7 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF

- SACRAMENTO has no information or belief to enable it to answer said allegations and for that reason and basing its denial on that ground, denies both generally and specifically each and every, all and singular, the allegations contained therein.
- 9. In response to paragraph 9 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, admits that it has ownership of the Sylvan Oaks Library located at 6700 Auburn Boulevard, Citrus Heights, California 95621. In response to the balance of the allegations in this paragraph, defendant has no information or belief to enable it to answer said allegations and for that reason and basing its denial on that ground, denies both generally and specifically, each and every, all and singular, the allegations contained therein.
- 10. In response to paragraph 10 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO has no information or belief to enable it to answer said allegations, and for that reason and basing its denial on that ground, denies both generally and specifically, each and every, all and singular, the allegations contained therein.
- 11. In response to paragraph 11 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO has no information or belief to enable it to answer said allegations, and for that reason and basing its denial on that ground, denies both generally and specifically, each and every, all and singular, the allegations contained therein.
- 12. In response to paragraph 12 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO has no information or belief to enable it to answer said allegations, and for that reason and basing its denial on that ground, denies both generally and specifically, each and

every, all and singular, the allegations contained therein.

_ _

IV. GOVERNMENT CLAIM

- 13. In response to paragraph 13, of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO has no information or belief to enable it to answer said allegations, and for that reason and basing its denial on that ground, denies both generally and specifically, each and every, all and singular, the allegations contained therein.
- 14. In response to paragraph 14, of the complaint, defendant COUNTY

 OF SACRAMENTO has no information or belief to enable it to answer said allegations, and for that reason and basing its denial on that ground, denies both generally and specifically, each and every, all and singular, the allegations contained therein.
- 15. In response to paragraph 15 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY
 OF SACRAMENTO admits that plaintiff has waived all damages in this matter by not
 complying with the California Tort Claims Act. In response to the balance of the allegations
 contained in said paragraph, defendant has no information or belief to enable it to answer said
 allegations, and for that reason and basing its denial on that ground, denies both generally and
 specifically, each and every, all and singular, remaining allegations contained therein.

V. FACTS UPON WHICH ALL CLAIMS ARE BASED

- 16. In response to paragraph 16, defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO admits that Sylvan Oaks Public Library is located adjacent to Crosswoods Park. In response to the balance of the allegations contained in said paragraph, defendant has no information or belief to enable it to answer said allegations, and for that reason and basing its denial on that ground, denies both generally and specifically, each and every, all and singular, remaining allegations contained therein.
- 17. In response to paragraph 17, defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO has no information or belief to enable it to answer said allegations, and for that reason and basing its denial on that ground, denies both generally and specifically, each and every, all and singular, allegations contained therein.
 - 18. In response to paragraph 16, defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO has no

and Demand for Jury Trial

and on that basis, denies paragraph 25 in its entirety.

27

28

26.

1	SACRAMENTO generally and specifically denies each and every allegation contained therein
2	and on that basis, denies paragraph 26 in its entirety.
3	27. In response to paragraph 27 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF
4	SACRAMENTO has no information or belief to enable it to answer said allegations, and for that
5	reason and basing its denial on that ground, denies both generally and specifically, each and
6	every, all and singular, allegations contained therein.
7	28. In response to paragraph 28 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF
8	SACRAMENTO generally and specifically denies each and every allegation contained therein
9	and on that basis, denies paragraph 28 in its entirety.
10	29. In response to paragraph 29 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF
11	SACRAMENTO generally and specifically denies each and every allegation contained therein
12	and on that basis, denies paragraph 29 in its entirety.
13	30. In response to paragraph 30 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF
14	SACRAMENTO generally and specifically denies each and every allegation contained therein
15	and on that basis, denies paragraph 30 in its entirety.
16	VI. <u>NOTICE</u>
17	31. In response to paragraph 31 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF
18	SACRAMENTO has no information or belief to enable it to answer said allegations, and for that
19	reason and basing its denial on that ground, denies both generally and specifically, each and
20	every, all and singular, allegations contained therein.
21	VII. <u>CLAIMS FOR RELIEF</u>
22	FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE
23	AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT - TITLE II 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. and § 12131 et seq.
24	
25	32. In response to paragraph 32 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF
26	SACRAMENTO, incorporates by reference its responses to paragraphs 1 through 31 above, as
27	though fully restated herein.
28	33. In response to paragraph 33 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF

SACRAMENTO contends said paragraphs contain conclusion of law and not averments of fact

In response to paragraph 33 of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF

27

28

39.

SACRAMENTO generally and specifically denies each and every allegation contained therein

28

SACRAMENTO contends that said paragraph contains conclusions of law and not averments of

26

27

28

1	allegation contained in said paragraph.
2	54. In response to paragraph 54, of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF
3	SACRAMENTO generally and specifically denies each and every allegation contained therein
4	and on that basis, denies paragraph 54 in its entirety.
5	55. In response to paragraph 55, of the complaint, defendant COUNTY OF
6	SACRAMENTO generally and specifically denies each and every allegation contained therein
7	and on that basis, denies paragraph 55 in its entirety.
8	VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF
9	In response to the prayer for relief, set forth at page 18 of the complaint, defendant
10	COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO contends that no response is required; too the extent to which a
11	response is deemed required, defendant denies that plaintiff is entitled to any form of relief
12	whatsoever.
13	AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES
14	Defendant County of Sacramento alleges the following separate and distinct affirmative
15	defenses to plaintiff's complaint.
16	FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
17	As a first affirmative defense, defendant alleges that the complaint in its entirety, through
18	each separately stated Cause of Action, fails to state claims upon which relief can be granted.
19	SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
20	As a second affirmative defense, defendant alleges that Plaintiff's complaint does not
21	present a case or controversy.
22	THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
23	As a third affirmative defense, defendant alleges all its actions taken were undertaken in
24	good faith and with reasonable belief that said actions were valid, necessary and constitutionally
25	proper; thus, the answering defendant is entitled to qualified immunity.
26	FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
27	As a fourth affirmative defense, defendant alleges that this claim is barred by the
28	privileges, immunities and limitations set forth in Government Code §800, et seq., Government

1	Code §900, et seq. and C.C.P. §338, et seq.
2	FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
3	As a fifth affirmative defense, defendant alleges that defendant's acts were privileged
4	under applicable statutes and case law.
5	SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
6	As a sixth affirmative defense, defendant alleges that state law claims are subject to a 90-
7	day stay or proceedings under California Civil Code §§ 55.51-55.54.
8	SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
9	As a seventh affirmative defense, defendant alleges that plaintiff knew, or in the exercise
10	of ordinary care, should have known of the risks, hazards, illnesses and injuries involved in the
11	undertaking in which plaintiff was engaged; but nevertheless, and with full knowledge of these
12	things did fully and voluntarily consent to assume the risks, hazards, illnesses and injuries
13	involved in the undertaking.
14	EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
15	As an eighth affirmative defense, defendant alleges plaintiff failed to exercises ordinary
16	care for her own safety and well-being and that failure to exercise ordinary care proximately
17	caused and/or contributed to the alleged illness and injury plead in the complaint; consequently,
18	defendant is entitled to the full protection of the law.
19	NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
20	As a ninth affirmative defense, defendant alleges plaintiff faces no threat of future
21	irreparable harm; therefore, injunctive relief is not available.
22	TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
23	As a tenth affirmative defense, defendant alleges that this claim is barred by the equitable
24	doctrine of estoppel, waiver, unclean hands and laches.
25	ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
26	As an eleventh affirmative defense, defendant alleges that if plaintiff sustained the
27	damages alleged in the complaint, which defendant denies, plaintiff's damages were caused in
28	whole or in part by the conduct of third parties for whom defendant is not responsible, by forces

1	over which defendant has no control or through acts or omissions on the part of plaintiff and
2	therefore, an act or omission on the part of defendant was not the proximate cause and/or legal
3	cause of the plaintiff's alleged damages.
4	TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
5	As a twelfth affirmative defense, defendant alleges that the injuries and damages plaintiff
6	complains of, if any, resulted from the acts and or omissions of others and without any fault on
7	the part of this answering defendant.
8	THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
9	As a thirteenth affirmative defense, defendant alleges that the complaint is barred in that
10	the relief sought would place an undue financial and administrative burden on this answering
11	defendant.
12	FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
13	As a fourteenth affirmative defense, defendant alleges that the complaint is barred in that
14	the relief sought would require unreasonable modifications to programs and services.
15	FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
16	As a fifteenth affirmative defense, defendant alleges that plaintiff failed to exhaust his
17	administrative and other state remedies.
18	SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
19	As a sixteenth affirmative defense, defendant alleges that the complaint is barred because
20	defendant is not required to make structural changes in existing facilities where other methods
21	are or would be effective to achieve compliance with applicable law.
22	SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
23	As a seventeenth affirmative defense, defendant alleges that the complaint is barred in
24	that the relief sought would inappropriately mandate the manner in which defendant allocates
25	public funds in relation to existing programs and services.
26	EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As an eighteenth affirmative defense, defendant alleges that the complaint is barred

because plaintiff failed to request either reasonable accommodation or auxiliary aids as required

27

28

1	by law.
2	NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
3	As a nineteenth affirmative defense, defendant alleges that plaintiff's complaint fails to
4	state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against this answering defendant.
5	TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
6	As a twentieth affirmative defense, defendant alleges that plaintiff has failed to mitigate
7	her damages, and to the extend of this failure to mitigate, any damages awarded to plaintiff
8	should be reduced accordingly.
9	TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
0	As a twenty-first affirmative defense, defendant alleges that plaintiff's claim are barred
1	pursuant to the principles of res judicata and collateral estoppel.
2	TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
.3	As a twenty-second affirmative defense, defendant alleges that any alleged discrimination
4	was not arbitrary or intentional.
.5	TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
6	As a twenty-third affirmative defense, defendant asserts that its alleged refusal to allow
7	access was not discriminatory, but was caused by the structure of the facility and by the fact that
.8	plaintiff's special needs prevented her admission to the facility without construction, alteration or
9	modification that is not otherwise required by law under Civil Code section 51(d) and 52(g).
20	TWENTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
21	As a twenty-fourth affirmative defense, defendant alleges that plaintiff was not
22	discriminated against based solely on her disability.
23	TWENTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
24	As a twenty-fifth affirmative defense, defendant alleges that when viewed in its entirety,
25	the subject buildings and facilities are readily accessible to and useable by individuals with
26	disabilities.
27	TWENTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
28	As a twenty-sixth affirmative defense, defendant alleges that defendant is not required to

1	take any action that would result in a fundamental alteration in the nature of its services,
2	programs or activities, or in undue financial and administrative burdens.
3	TWENTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
4	As a twenty-seventh affirmative defense, defendant alleges that defendant did not receive
5	federal funding in association with programs, activities, services and benefits participated in by
6	plaintiff.
7	TWENTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
8	As a twenty-eighth affirmative defense, defendant alleges that defendant has insufficient
9	knowledge or information upon which to form a belief as to whether it may have additional, as
10	yet unstated, affirmative defenses. Defendant reserved the right to answer with additional
11	affirmative defenses in the event discovery indicates it would appropriate.
12	WHEREOF, Defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO prays for judgment as follows:
13	1. Plaintiff's action be dismissed;
14	2. Plaintiff's claim for injunctive relief be denied;
15	3. Plaintiff's take nothing by way of complaint;
16	4. Defendant be awarded its costs of suit, including attorney fees; and
17	5. For such other relief as the Court deems proper.
18	
19	Dated: October 24, 2012 Respectfully submitted,
20	RIVERA & ASSOCIATES
21	/s/ Jonathan B. Paul By:
22	JONATHAN B. PAUL Attorney for County of Sacramento
23	Theorney for County of Sucramento
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	///

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL Defendants, Defendant COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO demand a jury trial as provided for in Rule 38, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 201. Dated: October 24, 2012 Respectfully submitted, **RIVERA & ASSOCIATES** /s/ Jonathan B. Paul By:_ JONATHAN B. PAUL Attorney for County of Sacramento