APR.03.2009 12:14

#6639 P.013 /014

ARTHUR A. HARTINGER (SBN 121521) ahartinger@meyersnave.com GEOFFREY SPELLBERG (SBN 121079) gspellberg@meyersnave.com KIMBERLY M. DRAKE (SBN 209090) kdrake@meyersnave.com REICHI LEE (SBN 228578) rlee@meversnave.com MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON 555 12th Street, Suite 1500 Oakland California 94607 Telephone: (510) 808-2000 Facsimile: (510) 444-1108 8 Attorneys for Defendant CHRISTOPHER DOLAN (SBN 165358) chris@cbdlaw.com RACHEL PUSEY (SBN 224880) rachel@cbdlaw.com The Dolan Law Firm 11 1438 Market Street San Francisco, CA 94102 Telephone: 415-421-2800 Facsimile: 415-421-2830 14 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 15 16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 18 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 19 20 JAMES JENKINS, SHAWN PICKETT, CASE NO. C 08-03401 MHP AND ARNOLD THREETS, 21 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER Plaintiffs. PERMITTING DEFENDANT TO FILE 22 FIRST AMENDED ANSWER ٧. 23 CITY OF RICHMOND, a California 24 Governmental Entity, 25 Defendant. 26 27 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED, by and between the parties hereto, that Defendant in this 28 C 08-03401 MHP STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER PERMITTING DEFENDANT TO FILE FIRST AMENDED **ANSWER** 1218080

1	action may file the First Amended Answer to First Amended Complaint, a copy of which is
2	attached hereto.
3	IT IS SO STIPULATED.
4	. 11-
5	DATED: April 17 2009 MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON
6	Page 1
7	By: Multiple Arthur A. Hartinger
8	Geoffrey Spellberg Reiche Lee
9	Attorneys for Defendant CITY OF RICHMOND
10	1218080.1 THE DOLAN LAW FIRM
11	
12	By: Chsey
13	Christopher Dolan Rachel Pusey
14	Attorneys for Plaintiffs JAMES JENKINS, SHAWN PICKETT and
15	ARNOLD THREETS
16	
17	ORDER
18	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION BETWEEN THE PARTIES, the Court hereby grants
19	Defendant leave to file its First Amended Answer to First Amended Complaint for Damages.
20	IT IS SO ORDERED.
21	IT IS SO ORDERED.
22	
23	Dated:4/15/2009
24	
25	Carrier H. Patel
26	Judge Marilyn H. Patel
27	2 C 08-03401 MHP
28	STIPULATION AND (PROPOSED) ORDER PERMITTING DEFENDANT TO FILE AIRST AMENDED ANSWER 1218080

1 2 3	ARTHUR A. HARTINGER (SBN 121521) ahartinger@meyersnave.com GEOFFREY SPELLBERG (SBN 121079) gspellberg@meyersnave.com KIMBERLY M. DRAKE (SBN 209090)	
4	kdrake@meyersnave.com REICHI LEE (SBN 228578)	
5	rlee@meyersnave.com MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSO	ON
6	555 12th Street, Suite 1500 Oakland, California 94607	
7	Telephone: (510) 808-2000 Facsimile: (510) 444-1108	
8	Attorneys for Defendant CITY OF RICHMOND	
9		
10	TIMITED COLUMNS	DICTRICT COLUMN
11		DISTRICT COURT ICT OF CALIFORNIA
13		SCO DIVISION
14	SAN FRANCIS	SCO DIVISION
15	JAMES JENKINS, SHAWN PICKETT, AND	CASE NO. C 08-03401 MHP
16	ARNOLD THREETS,	DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED
17	Plaintiffs,	ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
18		Discrimination Based Upon Race in
19	V.	Violation Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as Amended § 701 et seq.,
20	CITY OF RICHMOND, a California	42 U.S.C. 2000(e) <i>et seq</i> . 2. Retaliation in Violation of Title VII of
21	Governmental Entity; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,	the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as Amended, § 701 et seq., 42 U.S.C.
22	Defendant,	2000(e) et seq.Discrimination Based Upon Race in
23		Violation of Civil Rights Act of 1991, 42 U.S.C. § 1981 et seq.
24		4. Retaliation in Violation of Civil Rights Act of 1991, 42 U.S.C. § 1981 <i>et seq</i> .
25		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
26	Defendant CITY OF RICHMOND (herei	nafter "Defendant") hereby answers and responds
27	to the First Amended Complaint filed by JAMES	JENKINS, SHAWN PICKETT, ARNOLD
28	THREETS AND CLEVELAND BROWN (herei	
		C 08-03401 MHP
	DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANS	WER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

•	2	4 7	*	1
	3.	Δdi	nitte	
1	J.	Aui	1111111	·u.

- 14. Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 15. Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 16. Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.

Venue

- 17. Defendant admits that Plaintiffs allege that the claims arose in the Northern District.
- 18. Defendant admits that African Americans can be deemed members of a protected class, but deny any liability to Plaintiffs.
- 19. Defendant admits that Title VII can be applicable to public authorities, but denies liability here.
- 20. Defendant admits that 42 U.S.C. § 1981 can be applicable to public entities, but denies liability here.
- 21. Defendant admits that it is a governmental entity subject to suit under the Civil Rights Act. Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis denies those allegations and denies liability.
- 22. Defendant admits that certain Plaintiffs filed charges with the EEOC but is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis denies those allegations.
- 23. Defendant admits that Plaintiff Brown filed charges with the EEOC but is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations

DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

C 08-03401 MHP

1	54.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
2	55.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
3	56.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
4	57.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
5	58.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
6		Second Cause of Action
7		Retaliation in Violation of Title VII (42 U.S.C.A. § 2000e)
8		(Against Defendant RICHMOND and/or Does 1-50)
9	59.	Defendant incorporates by reference each and every response to Paragraphs 1
10	through 58 a	bove.
11	60.	Defendant admits that Plaintiffs have the right to be free from discrimination and
12	harassment,	but deny the remaining allegations.
13	61.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
14	62.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
15	63.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
16	64.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
17	65.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
18		Third Cause of Action
19		Discrimination Based on Race (42 U.S.C.A. § 1981)
20		(Against Defendant RICHMOND and/or Does 1-50)
21	66.	Defendant incorporates by reference each and every response to Paragraphs 1
22	through 65 a	bove.
23	67.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
24	68.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
25	69.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
26	70.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
27	71.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
28	72.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
]	6 C 08-03401 MH DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

ł		
1		Fourth Cause of Action
2		Retaliation Based on Race (42 U.S.C.A. § 1981)
3		(Against Defendant RICHMOND and/or Does 1-50)
4	73.	Defendant incorporates by reference each and every response to Paragraphs 1
5	through 72 ab	pove.
6	74.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
7	75.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
8	76.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
9	77.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
10	78.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
11	79.	Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
12		AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES
13		I.
14	AS A	ND FOR A FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Defendant alleges that the First
15	Amended Co	mplaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.
16		II.
17	AS A	ND FOR A SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Defendant alleges that the
18	injuries and d	amages of which Plaintiffs complain, if any, resulted from the acts and/or omissions
19	of plaintiffs tl	hemselves or of others, and without any fault on the part of defendant.
20		III.
21	AS A	ND FOR A THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Defendant alleges that it is immune
22	from liability	by operation of California and/or federal laws in that City employees and/or agents
23	acted in good	faith and in the proper exercise of their discretionary authority.
24		IV.
25	AS A	ND FOR A FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Defendant alleges that it is
26	entitled to the	other privileges, immunities and protections afforded under applicable California
27	law, including	g but not limited to, Government Code Sections 815 et seq.
28		

7 C 08-03401 MHP
DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

AS AND FOR A FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Defendant alleges that all actions taken by City employees and/or agents were undertaken in good faith and with the reasonable belief that said actions were valid, necessary and constitutionally proper.

V.

VI.

AS AND FOR A SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Defendant alleges that City employees and/or agents used only the means necessary to implement legitimate City business decisions, and to exercise the City's lawful rights.

VII.

AS AND FOR A SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Defendant alleges that Plaintiffs themselves were careless and/or negligent, and did not exercise ordinary care, caution and/or prudence to avoid the alleged events of which they complain, and further assumed the risks of the events or incidents, and that said conduct was the proximate cause of the injuries and damages alleged.

VIII.

AS AND FOR AN EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Defendant alleges that Plaintiffs' claims and the resulting injuries and damages they allege herein are barred to the extent that the claims exceed the scope of the administrative complaints they filed with the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing and/or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

IX.

AS AND FOR A NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Defendant alleges that Plaintiffs' claims for damages are barred to the extent that they failed to mitigate them.

X.

AS AND FOR A TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Defendant alleges that it is entitled to absolute or qualified immunity and/or privilege to the extent that the conduct of its employees or agents was mandated, authorized and/or directed by agency, municipal, and state laws.

1	XI.
2	AS TO THE ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Defendant alleges that Plaintiffs'
3	complaint herein and each of their claims is vague and set forth in conclusory terms and as such,
4	this answering Defendant cannot fully anticipate all affirmative defenses that may be applicable.
5	XII.
6	AS AND FOR AN TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Defendant alleges that it is
7	entitled to qualified immunity under applicable federal law.
8	WHEREFORE, Defendant prays that:
9	1. Plaintiffs take nothing by their First Amended Complaint;
10	2. Defendant has judgment against Plaintiffs;
11	3. Defendant be awarded its costs of suit; and
12	4. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.
13	XIII.
14	AS AND FOR A THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Plaintiffs' claims are barred
15	by their failure to exhaust administrative and/or contractual remedies.
16	VX.
17	AS AND FOR A FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Plaintiffs' claims are
18	barred by the equitable doctrines of laches, unclean hands, res judicata and/or estoppel.
19	XV.
20	AS AND FOR A FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Plaintiffs' claims are barred
21	by the applicable statute of limitations.
22	XVI.
23	AS AND FOR A SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Plaintiffs' claims are barred
24	by the doctrines of waiver, estoppel and consent.
25	XVII.
26	AS AND FOR A SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, Plaintiffs' claims, to the
27	extent they seek damages for physical, mental and emotional distress, are barred by California
28	Labor Code sections 3600 et. seq, which provides that Workers' Compensation is Plaintiffs'
	9. C 08-03401 MHP
ł	DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

1	exclusive remedy.
2	XVIII.
3	AS AND FOR A THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, if Plaintiffs are entitled to
4	damages for any loss suffered or sustained, which is denied, then the total amount of damage to
5	which Plaintiffs would otherwise be entitled shall be limited in whole or in part by the doctrine of
6	after acquired evidence.
7	Dated: April 14, 2009 MEYERS NAVE RIBACK SILVER & WILSON
8	
9	By: /s/ Geoffrey Spellberg Geoffrey Spellberg
10	Attorneys for Defendant CITY OF RICHMOND
11	
12	1218002.1
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT