1 2 3 4 5 6 7	SHANNON L. GUSTAFSON (SBN2288) sgustafson@lynberg.com AMY R. MARGOLIES (SBN283471) amargolies@lynberg.com LYNBERG & WATKINS A Professional Corporation 1100 W. Town & Country Road, Suite #1 Orange, California 92868 (714) 937-1010 Telephone (714) 937-1003 Facsimile Attorneys for Defendants, COUNTY OF Sand BREANA FITE	450
8		
9	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
10	CENTRAL DISTRIC	CT OF CALIFORNIA
11		
12	DEBORAH MOLLER, an individual	CASE NO. 5:22-CV-010306-DSF-MAR
13	and successor –in-interest of BRET BREUNIG, deceased,	Assigned for All Purposes to: Hon. Dale S. Fischer– Courtroom 7D
14	Plaintiffs,	Hon. Dale S. Fischer– Courtroom /D
15	VS.	DEFENDANTS' COUNTY OF SAN
16	COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, a	BERNARDINO AND BREANA FITE'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT
17	public entity; UNIDENTIFIED DEPUTIES, individuals; CITY OF REDLANDS, a public entity;	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
18	UNIDENTIFIED OFFICERS,	DEMAND FOR JUNI TRIAL
19	individuals; LOMA LIND UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER, a non-profit corporation;	Trial Date: 08/29/23
20	UNIDENTIFIED HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS, individuals; and	Complaint filed: 07/27/22 FAC filed: 09/19/22
21	KENNETH BREUNIG, a nominal Defendant	SAC filed: 12/08/22
22	Detendant	
23	Defendant.	
24		I
25	///	
26	///	
27	///	
28		

INTRODUCTION

1. Answering paragraph 1, this paragraph contains legal argument for which no response is required.

PARTIES

- 2. Answering paragraph 2, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph. For that reason, Defendants deny the allegations of this paragraph.
- 3. Answering paragraph 3, Defendants admit the factual allegations of this paragraph.
- 4. Answering paragraph 4, Defendants admit the factual allegations of this paragraph.
- 5. Answering paragraph 5, given the vague and broad wording of this request Defendants lack sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations as phrased. For that reason, Defendants deny the allegations of this paragraph.
- 6. Answering paragraph 6, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph. For that reason, Defendants deny the allegations of this paragraph.
- 7. Answering paragraph 7, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph. For that reason, Defendants deny the allegations of this paragraph.
- 8. Answering paragraph 8, Defendants deny San Bernardino County refused to properly identify any Doe deputies. Defendants lack sufficient information to admit or deny any allegations as they relate to the City of Redlands. Defendants lack sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations of this paragraph and deny those allegations for that reason.
- 9. Answering paragraph 9, Defendants admit San Bernardino County employed Breana Fite during the events identified in the Second Amended Complaint.

the allegations of this paragraph.

27

- 27. Answering paragraph 27, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this paragraph to the extent they relate to these responding Defendants. Defendants lack sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph to the extent they relate to other Defendants. For that reason, Defendants deny the allegations of this paragraph.
- 28. Answering paragraph 28, Defendants admit that when Breana Fite arrived at the Loma Linda Medical Center and contacted Decedent, he was not wearing any shoes and was wearing a hospital gown and blanket. Defendants further admit Decedent did not have any medical device such as crutches to help him ambulate. Defendants deny the remaining factual allegations of this paragraph.
- 29. Answering paragraph 29, the allegations in this paragraph are legal conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations, Defendants deny those allegations.
- 30. Answering paragraph 30, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this paragraph.
- 31. Answering paragraph 31, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this paragraph.
- 32. Answering paragraph 32, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this paragraph.
- 33. Answering paragraph 33, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this paragraph.
- 34. Answering paragraph 34, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph. For that reason, Defendants deny the allegations of this paragraph.
- 35. Answering paragraph 35, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this paragraph.

27 | /

1 36. Answering paragraph 36, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this 2 paragraph. 3 FACTS RELATED TO PLAINTIFF'S PUBLIC RECORDS ACT REQUEST 37. Answering paragraph 37, Defendants admit Plaintiff requested records from 4 5 San Bernardino County pertaining to Decedent's death and that County provided records in response. Defendants lack sufficient information or belief to admit or 6 7 deny the allegations of this paragraph as they relate to any party other than these 8 responding parties. Defendants deny the remaining factual allegations of this 9 paragraph. **10** 38. Answering paragraph 38, Defendants admit Plaintiff made a second inquiry 11 regarding the status of her request for documents. Defendants deny the remaining 12 factual allegations of this paragraph. 13 39. Answering paragraph 39, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this paragraph. 14 15 40. Answering paragraph 40, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this **16** paragraph. **17** 41. Answering paragraph 41, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph. For that reason, Defendants deny 18 19 the allegations of this paragraph. 20 FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF 21 Failure to Protect (42 U.S.C. § 1983) (Against FITE, Responding Deputies and Officers) 22 23 42. Answering paragraph 42, Defendants incorporate by this reference their responses to paragraphs 21 through 41. 24 43. Answering paragraph 43, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief to 25 **26** admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph. For that reason, Defendants deny the allegations of this paragraph. 27

NSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

1 THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF 2 **Due Process – State Created Danger (42 U.S.C. § 1983)** (Against FITE, Responding Deputies and Officers) 3 4 62. Answering paragraph 62, Defendants incorporate by this reference their 5 responses to paragraphs 21-41 and all subsequent paragraphs in this Answer. 63. Answering paragraph 63, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief to 6 7 admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph. For that reason, Defendants deny 8 the allegations of this paragraph. 9 64. Answering paragraph 64, the allegations in this paragraph are legal conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations, **10** Defendants deny those allegations. 11 65. Answering paragraph 65, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this 12 13 paragraph. 66. Answering paragraph 66, the allegations in this paragraph are legal 14 **15** conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations, 16 Defendants deny those allegations. **17** 67. Answering paragraph 67, the allegations in this paragraph are legal conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations, 18 19 Defendants deny those allegations. 68. Answering paragraph 68, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief to 20 admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph. For that reason, Defendants deny 21 22 the allegations of this paragraph. 69. Answering paragraph 69, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this 23 24 paragraph. 25 70. Answering paragraph 70, the allegations in this paragraph are legal **26** conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations, 27 Defendants deny those allegations. 28

1 **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF** 2 Due Process – Special Relationship (42 U.S.C. § 1983) (Against FITE, Responding Deputies and Officers) 3 4 71. Answering paragraph 71, Defendants incorporate by this reference their 5 responses to paragraphs 21-41 and all subsequent paragraphs in this Answer. 6 72. Answering paragraph 72, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief to 7 admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph. For that reason, Defendants deny 8 the allegations of this paragraph. 9 73. Answering paragraph 73, the allegations in this paragraph are legal conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations, **10** 11 Defendants deny those allegations. 12 74. Answering paragraph 74, the allegations in this paragraph are legal 13 conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations, Defendants deny those allegations. 14 15 75. Answering paragraph 75, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this **16** paragraph. **17** 76. Answering paragraph 76, the allegations in this paragraph are legal conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations, 18 19 Defendants deny those allegations. 20 77. Answering paragraph 77, the allegations in this paragraph are legal 21 conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations, 22 Defendants deny those allegations. 23 78. Answering paragraph 78, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief to 24 admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph. For that reason, Defendants deny 25 the allegations of this paragraph. 26 79. Answering paragraph 79, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this 27 paragraph. 28

1	80. Answering paragraph 80, the allegations in this paragraph are legal
2	conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations,
3	Defendants deny those allegations.
4	FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
5	Monell Claim (42 U.S.C. § 1983)
6	(Against Defendant County)
7	81. Answering paragraph 81, Defendants incorporate by this reference their
8	responses to paragraphs 21-41 and all subsequent paragraphs in this Answer.
9	82. Answering paragraph 82, Defendants admit San Bernardino County is an
10	incorporated public entity duly authorized and existing pursuant to the laws of the
11	State of California. Defendants deny the remaining factual allegations of this
12	paragraph.
13	83. Answering paragraph 83, Defendants admit that during the events alleged in
14	the Second Amended Complaint, Breana Fite was and still is a San Bernardino
15	County working in the Sheriff's Department. Defendants deny the remaining
16	factual allegations of this paragraph.
17	84. Answering paragraph 84, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this
18	paragraph.
19	85. Answering paragraph 85, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this
20	paragraph.
21	86. Answering paragraph 86, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this
22	paragraph.
23	87. Answering paragraph 87, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this
24	paragraph.
25	88. Answering paragraph 88, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this
26	paragraph.
27	
28	

89. Answering paragraph 89, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this

1

1	102. Answering paragraph 102, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this
2	paragraph.
3	103. Answering paragraph 103, the allegations in this paragraph are legal
4	conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations,
5	Defendants deny those allegations.
6	104. Answering paragraph 104, the allegations in this paragraph are legal
7	conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations,
8	Defendants deny those allegations.
9	SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
10	Violation of EMTALA (42 U.S.C. § 1395dd)
11	(Against Defendant LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER)
12	105. Paragraphs 105 through 115 are not made against these answering
13	Defendants and therefore no response is provided by these answering Defendants.
14	SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
15	California Health and Safety Code § 1317
16	(Against Defendant LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER)
17	116. Paragraphs 116 through 120 are not made against these answering Defendants
18	and therefore no response is provided by these answering Defendants.
19	EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
20	Negligence
21	(Against all Defendants)
22	121. Answering paragraph 121, Defendants incorporate by this reference their
23	responses to paragraphs 21-41 and all subsequent paragraphs in this Answer.
24	122. Answering paragraph 122, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this
25	paragraph.
26	123. Answering paragraph 123, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this
27	paragraph.
28	13
	DEFENDANTS COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO AND BREANA FITE'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT
	ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMILIANT

1	124. Answering paragraph 124, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this
2	paragraph.
3	125. Answering paragraph 125, the allegations in this paragraph are legal
4	conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations,
5	Defendants deny those allegations.
6	126. Answering paragraph 126, the allegations in this paragraph are legal
7	conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations,
8	Defendants deny those allegations.
9	127. Answering paragraph 127, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief to
10	admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph. For that reason, Defendants deny the
11	allegations of this paragraph.
12	128. Answering paragraph 128, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief to
13	admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph. For that reason, Defendants deny the
14	allegations of this paragraph.
15	129. Answering paragraph 129, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief to
16	admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph. For that reason, Defendants deny the
17	allegations of this paragraph.
18	NINTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
19	Bane Act Violation (Civil Code § 52.1)
20	(Against All Defendants)
21	130. Answering paragraph 130, Defendants incorporate by this reference their
22	responses to paragraphs 21-41 and all subsequent paragraphs in this Answer.
23	131. Answering paragraph 131, the allegations in this paragraph are legal
24	conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations,
25	Defendants deny those allegations.
26	
27	
28	14
	DEFENDANTS COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO AND BREANA FITE'S ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

1	132. Answering paragraph 132, the allegations in this paragraph are legal
2	conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations.
3	Defendants deny those allegations.
4	133. Answering paragraph 133, the allegations in this paragraph are legal
5	conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations.
6	Defendants deny those allegations.
7	134. Answering paragraph 134, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief to
8	admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph. For that reason, Defendants deny the
9	allegations of this paragraph.
10	135. Answering paragraph 135, the allegations in this paragraph are legal
11	conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations
12	Defendants deny those allegations.
13	136. Answering paragraph 136, the allegations in this paragraph are legal
14	conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations
15	Defendants deny those allegations.
16	TENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
17	Violation of California Public Records Act (Cal. Gov. Code §§ 6250, et seq.)
18	(Against Defendant COUNTY)
19	
	137. Answering paragraph 137, Defendants incorporate by this reference their
20	137. Answering paragraph 137, Defendants incorporate by this reference their responses to paragraphs 21-41 and all subsequent paragraphs in this Answer.
20 21	
	responses to paragraphs 21-41 and all subsequent paragraphs in this Answer.
21	responses to paragraphs 21-41 and all subsequent paragraphs in this Answer. 138. Answering paragraph 138, the allegations in this paragraph are legal
21 22	responses to paragraphs 21-41 and all subsequent paragraphs in this Answer. 138. Answering paragraph 138, the allegations in this paragraph are legal conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations
212223	responses to paragraphs 21-41 and all subsequent paragraphs in this Answer. 138. Answering paragraph 138, the allegations in this paragraph are legal conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations Defendants admit those allegations.
21222324	responses to paragraphs 21-41 and all subsequent paragraphs in this Answer. 138. Answering paragraph 138, the allegations in this paragraph are legal conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations Defendants admit those allegations. 139. Answering paragraph 139, the allegations in this paragraph are legal.
2122232425	responses to paragraphs 21-41 and all subsequent paragraphs in this Answer. 138. Answering paragraph 138, the allegations in this paragraph are legal conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations. Defendants admit those allegations. 139. Answering paragraph 139, the allegations in this paragraph are legal conclusions. To the extent this paragraph is construed to contain factual allegations.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Waiver, Estoppel, Unclean Hands)

3. Defendant alleges that Plaintiff's action is barred by reason of conduct, actions and inactions of Plaintiff/Decedent which amounts to and constitutes a waiver of any right Plaintiff may or might have had in reference to the matters and things alleged in the SAC, or that otherwise estop Plaintiff from recovery in this action, including but not limited to the doctrine of unclean hands.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure to Mitigate Damages)

4. Plaintiff's claims are barred or limited to the extent Plaintiff failed to mitigate plaintiff's injuries or damages, if there were any. Plaintiff has failed to mitigate the damages, if any, which Plaintiff has sustained, and to exercise reasonable care to avoid the consequences of harms, if any, in that, among other things, Plaintiff has failed to use reasonable diligence in caring for any injuries, failed to use reasonable means to prevent aggravation of any injuries and failed to take reasonable precautions to reduce any injuries and damages. She is therefore barred from recovery herein, or in the alternative, should have the damages reduced by the amount attributable to his failure to mitigate.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Contributory and/or Comparative Liability)

- 5. Plaintiff's claims are barred or limited by Plaintiff's and/or Decedent's contributory/comparative negligence or other conduct, acts, or omissions, and to the extent any Plaintiff suffered any injury or damages, it was the result of Plaintiff's own negligent or deliberate actions or omissions.
 - 6.
- 7. Plaintiff's recovery is barred because any injury or damage suffered by Plaintiff was caused solely by reason of the Plaintiff's and/or Decedent's wrongful

acts and conduct.

- 8. Plaintiff's damages, if any, were caused by the negligence and/or acts or omissions of parties other than the Defendants, whether or not parties to this action. Plaintiff's damages should therefore be reduced in proportion to the fault attributable to other parties, and to the extent necessary, Defendants may be entitled to partial indemnity from those other parties on a comparative fault basis.
- 9. Any injury or damages to Plaintiff herein were proximately caused by Decedent's negligence by his failure to exercise ordinary care under the circumstances. Plaintiff is therefore barred from recovery herein, or, if any state law liability is found on the part of the Defendants, then Plaintiff's recovery shall be reduced on the basis of Decedent's contributory comparative negligence.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Public Entity/Employee Immunity for Others' Torts)

- 10. Plaintiff's recovery is barred because public entities and employees are immune from liability for any injury caused by the act or omission of another person pursuant to Government Code §820.8.
- 11. The answering Defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that if Plaintiff sustained any injury or damages, such injury or damages was solely caused or contributed to by the wrongful conduct of other Defendants and/or entities or persons other than the answering Defendant. To the extent that Plaintiff's damages were so caused, any recovery by Plaintiff as against the answering Defendant should be subject to proportionately comparative equitable indemnity/contribution from such third parties.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Discretionary Immunity)

12. Defendants are immune from liability for Plaintiff's state law-based claims pursuant to Cal. <u>Gov. Code</u> §§ 815.2 and 820.2 because the acts or omissions

complained of in the Second Amended Complaint were the result of the exercise of discretion vested in public employees acting in the scope of their public employment.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Enforcement of Law)

13. Defendants are immune from liability pursuant to Cal. Gov. Code §§ 815.2 and 820.4 for Plaintiff's state law-based claims because the acts or omissions complained of in the Second Amended Complaint were the result of public employees exercising due care in the execution or enforcement of law.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Investigatory Immunity)

14. To the extent Plaintiff's state law claims are based on alleged injuries or damages Plaintiff contends she occasioned as a result of a County employee

14. To the extent Plaintiff's state law claims are based on alleged injuries or damages Plaintiff contends she occasioned as a result of a County employee instituting or prosecuting any judicial or administrative proceeding within the scope of their employment, Defendants are immune from liability pursuant to Cal. <u>Gov. Code</u> §§ 815.2 and 821.6.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Immunity for Failure to Provide Police)

15. To the extent Plaintiff's state law claims are based on alleged injuries or damages Plaintiff contends were occasioned as a result of a County employee failing to provide police protection service or failure to provide sufficient police protection services, Defendants are immune from liability pursuant to Cal. Gov. Code § 845.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Immunity for Failure to Arrest or Retain in Custody)

16. Plaintiff's state law-based claims are barred by <u>Gov. Code</u> § 846 because neither a public entity nor a public employee is liable for injury caused by the failure to make an arrest or by the failure to retain an arrested person in custody.

1 ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 2 (Respondent Superior) 3 17. Defendant may not be held liable on a respondeat superior theory for any 4 negligent or wrongful act or omission on the part of any subordinate. Monell v. 5 Department of Social Services of the City of New York (1978) 436 U.S. 658 (1978); 6 Larez v. City of Los Angeles, 946 F.2d 630, 645-646 (9th Cir. 1991); cf. City of 7 Canton v. Harris, 489 U.S. 378, 388-389 (1989); City of Los Angeles v. Heller, 475 8 U.S. 796 (1986). 9 TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE **10** (Immunity for Discharge of Mandatory Duties) 11 18. To the extent Plaintiff alleges her injuries and/or damages arise from Defendants' failure to perform a mandatory duty imposed by an enactment, Cal. 12 Gov. Code § 815.6 provides the County with immunity because the County's 13 employees exercised reasonable diligence in discharging those duties. 14 15 THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE **16** (Assumption of Risk) **17** 19. At the time and place referred to in the SAC, and before such event, 18 Decedent knew, appreciated, and understood each and every risk involved in placing 19 himself in the position which Decedent then assumed, and willingly, knowingly and 20 voluntarily assumed each of such risks, including, but not limited to, the risk of suffering personal bodily injury, lawful deprivation of right(s), or death. Because 21 22 Decedent assumed the risk of his own conduct, Plaintiff's derivative claims are 23 prevented. 24 FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 25 (Bad Faith) 20. The present action is not brought or maintained in good faith, are patently 26 27 meritless and frivolous and these Defendants consequently prays an award of all 28

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

reasonable defense costs, including attorney's fees pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 11 and 42 <u>U.S.C.</u> §1988. FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (Good Faith) 21. The answering Defendant acted in good faith and did not directly or indirectly perform any act whatsoever which would constitute a violation of any right possessed by Plaintiff, or any duties owed to Plaintiff. SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (Punitive Damages) 22. Plaintiff fails to state a cause of action against the Defendant for punitive damages in that punitive damages are not available against a public entity. SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (No Disregard of Rights or Deliberate Conduct) 23. The answering Defendant has never taken any action with a conscious disregard of Plaintiff's or Decedent's rights and has not engaged in any conduct with respect to Plaintiff or Decedent which would constitute deliberate or intentional conduct, nor has the answering Defendant ratified or approved any such act or acts of others. EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (Failure to State a Claim) 24. Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against the answering Defendant. <u>NINTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE</u> (Single Act Not Policy) 25. The requisite policy, practice, custom, or usage and/or failure to train to establish governmental liability under 42 <u>U.S.C.</u> § 1983 may not be proven through

1	reference to a single unconstitutional incident unless proof of that incident includes	
2	proof that it was caused by an existing unconstitutional policy.	
3	TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
4	(No Policy Maker)	
5	26. Plaintiff's claims are barred because the alleged constitutional violations	
6	were not ordered by a policy maker for the Defendant.	
7	TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
8	(Lack Of Personal Participation)	
9	27. Plaintiff's claims are barred by the principles expressed in <u>Jones v.</u>	
10	Williams, 297 F.3d 930, 935 (9th Cir. 2002), requiring personal participation for	
11	liability under 42 <u>U.S.C</u> . § 1983.	
12	TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
13	(Training Adequate)	
14	28. The County of San Bernardino's training was adequate to handle the usual	
15	and recurring situations facing its officers and employees and was therefore not	
16	deliberately indifferent to Plaintiff's constitutional rights.	
17	TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
18	(Statute of Limitations)	
19	29. Plaintiff's claims are untimely pursuant to Cal. <u>Code of Civ. Proc.</u> §§ 335.1,	
20	340, 342, and/or Gov. Code §§ 910, et seq., 945.4 and/or 945.6.	
21	TWENTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
22	(Variance from Tort Claim)	
23	30. The state law claims are barred for Plaintiff's failure to fairly include facts	
24	and theories supporting the state law claims in a government claim as required by	
25	Cal. Gov. Code § 905, et seq.	
26		
27		
28		

1 <u>TWENTY -FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE</u> 2 (Collateral Source) 3 31. Defendants request that in the event of a judgment in favor of Plaintiff, at a 4 post-trial hearing, the judgment be reduced against these public entity Defendants 5 for collateral course payments paid or obligated to be paid for services or benefits that were provided to or on behalf of Plaintiff prior to commencement of trial, as 6 7 provided in Cal. Gov. Code § 985. TWENTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 8 9 (Public Records Act) 10 32. Court is not the proper venue and lacks jurisdiction to decide Plaintiff's 11 Public Records Act claims. Calhoun v. Cruz, No. 2:20-CV-2209 DB P, 2022 WL 1527401, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 26, 2022). 12 13 TWENTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (Immunity Of Employee) 14 33. Defendant County is not liable for any act or omission where its employees 15 16 are immune from liability pursuant to Government Code §815.2 **17** TWENTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 18 (Immunity for Failure to Enforce Law) 19 34. Defendants are not liable for any injury caused by adopting or failing to adopt an enactment or by failing to enforce the law pursuant to Government Code **20** §§ 818.2, 821. 21 22 TWENTY-NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 23 (Failure to Diagnose Mental Illness) 24 35. Defendants are immune for their failure to diagnose or treat mental illness 25 pursuant to Government Code §§ 855.6 and 855.8 and for failure to admit a person **26** to a medical facility pursuant to Government Code §856.4. 27 28

NSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

THIRTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Unknown Claims)

36. Because Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint is couched in conclusory terms, the Answering Defendants cannot fully anticipate all the affirmative defenses that may be applicable to the within action. Accordingly, Defendants expressly reserves the right to assert additional affirmative defenses if and to the extent that such affirmative defenses become applicable.

WHEREFORE, Defendants prays that Plaintiff takes nothing by way of the Second Amended Complaint and that Defendants herein recover its attorney's fees, costs and such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

DATED: December 22, 2022

LYNBERG & WATKINS A Professional Corporation

By:

SHANNON L. GUSTAFSON

ornevs for Defendants.

OUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO and

19 **20**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

26

27