IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

*യന്തയന്തയന്തയന്തയാ* 

PLAINTIFFS/COUNTER-DEFENDANTS' ORIGINAL ANSWER
TO COUNTER-PLAINTIFF'S COUNTERCLAIM

Flowbee Haircutter Limited Partnership ("Flowbee LP") (collectively "Flowbee") file this,

their Original Answer to the Counterclaim brought by Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff

Google, Inc. ("Google"). Unless specifically admitted, Flowbee denies each of the

NATURE OF THE CASE

contract. Flowbee denies that Google's Counterclaim is meritorious.

Flowbee admits that Google purports to state claims based on breach of

Plaintiffs/Counter-Defendants Flowbee International, Inc. ("Flowbee Intl.") and

No. C 10-00668-WHA

JURY TRIAL REQUESTED

(415) 217-7011 Telecopier

FLOWBEE HAIRCUTTER LIMITED PARTNERSHIP,

Plaintiffs,

Defendant.

GOOGLE, INC.,

1.

FLOWBEE INTERNATIONAL, INC. and

allegations of Google's Counterclaim.

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 2. Flowbee denies the allegations in the first sentence of paragraph 2, as the subject contract does not pertain to the claims brought by Flowbee in the underlying suit. Flowbee admits the remaining allegations in paragraph 2.
- 3. Flowbee denies that it breached the subject contract and therefore denies that Google was forced to expend money and resources to seek transfer of this suit. Flowbee admits that Google is seeking recovery of damages that it alleges to have suffered.

## **PARTIES**

- 4. Flowbee admits the allegations of paragraph 4.
- 5. Flowbee admits the allegations of paragraph 5.
- 6. Flowbee lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of paragraph 6, and therefore denies the same.

# JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. While Google purports to bring a claim against Flowbee under the laws of the State of California, Flowbee denies that the action is meritorious or that it is properly brought as a counterclaim in this action. Flowbee admits that the Court has jurisdiction over this matter.
  - 8. Flowbee admits the allegations of paragraph 8.
- 9. Flowbee admits that venue of Google's unmeritorious counterclaim is proper in this district.

## **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

10. Flowbee admits the allegations contained in the first sentence of paragraph 10. Flowbee lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations of paragraph 10, and therefore denies the same.

28

# **FURTHER ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

By way of further answer and as affirmative defense, Flowbee denies that it is liable to Google on any of the counterclaims alleged and denies that Google is entitled to damages, attorneys' fees, costs, pre-judgment interest or to any relief whatsoever.

# **PRAYER**

WHEREFORE, Flowbee prays for Judgment on Google's Counterclaim as follows:

- 1. That Google take nothing by way of its Counterclaim;
- 2. That the Counterclaim, and each and every purported claim for relief therein, be dismissed with prejudice;
- 3. That Flowbee be awarded its costs of suit incurred herein, including attorneys' fees and expenses; and
- 4. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

David T. Bright Watts Law Firm, L.L.P. 500 North Water Street, Suite 1200 Corpus Christi, Texas 78401 (361) 887-0500 Telephone (361) 887-0055 Telecopier

By: /s/ David T. Bright
David T. Bright (pro hac vice granted)

Attorney at Law State Bar No. 02991490 Federal Bar No. 8628

### and

Damien P. Lillis State Bar No. 191258 SMITH LILLIS PITHA LLP 400 Montgomery Street, Suite 501 San Francisco, California 94104 (415) 814-0411 Telephone (415) 217-7011 Telecopier

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

#### TORTHER ANSWER AND ATTIMITATIVE DELENGES

1

2728

26

| 1       | DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL  |
|---------|--|
| 2       | Flowbee hereby demands a jury trial on all issues which can be heard by a jury.  |
| 3       | Respectfully submitted,  |
| 4       | David T. Bright Watts Law Firm, L.L.P. 500 North Water Street, Suite 1200 Corpus Christi, Texas 78401 (361) 887-0500 Telephone (361) 887-0055 Telecopier   |
| 5       |  |
| 6       |  |
| 7       |  |
| 8       | By: /s/ David T. Bright  David T. Bright (pro hac vice granted)  |
| 9<br>10 | Attorney at Law State Bar No. 02991490 Federal Bar No. 8628  |
| 11      | and  |
| 12      | Damien P. Lillis   |
| 13      | State Bar No. 191258<br>SMITH LILLIS PITHA LLP<br>400 Montgomery Street, Suite 501<br>San Francisco, California 94104<br>(415) 814-0411 Telephone<br>(415) 217-7011 Telecopier   |
| 14      |  |
| 15      |  |
| 16      | ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF  |
| 17      | CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE   |
| 18      | I hereby certify that on the 17 <sup>th</sup> day of June, 2010, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court for the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, using the CM/ECF system of the court, which will send notification of such filing to the to individuals who have consented in writing to accept notification as service of this document by electronic means.    S   David T. Bright   David T. B |
| 19      |  |
| 20      |  |
| 21      |  |
| 22      |  |
| 23      |  |
| 24      |  |
| 25      |  |
| 26      |  |
| 27      |  |
| 28      |  |