1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ROB BONTA Attorney General of California MARK T. CUMBA Supervising Deputy Attorney General JOHN B. GREENE Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 227751 300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 269-6497 Fax: (916) 731-2120 E-mail: John.Greene@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Defendants State of California, acting by and through the California Highway Patrol, and David Agredano			
9	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
10	FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
11	WESTERN DIVISION			
12 13				
14	JOHN SEARS,	2:21-cv-03165		
15	Plaintiff,	DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO		
16	v.	DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO COMPLAINT; DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL		
17 18 19 20 21	CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL, a State Agency; DAVID AGREDANO, an officer with the California Highway Patrol; and DOES 1-40, inclusvie,, Defendants.			
22 23 24 25 26 27 28	COMES NOW Defendants State of California, acting by and through the California Highway Patrol, and David Agredano, and in response to the complaint on file herein admit, deny, and allege as follows: 1. Answering paragraph 1 of the complaint, answering Defendants admit that on January 23, 2020, Plaintiff was traveling on Nacimiento Lake Drive, in San Luis Obispo County, leading two mules when he was approached by Defendant			

David Agredano. Answering Defendants further admit that Defendant David
Agredano requested and later ordered that Plaintiff keep his mules out of the traffic
lane. Answering Defendants deny that Defendant David Agredano's order and
Plaintiff's subsequent arrest was in violation of Plaintiff's rights. Defendants have
no information or belief upon the remaining facts alleged in said paragraph
sufficient to enable Defendants to answer the allegations and, on that ground, deny
each and every remaining allegation of said paragraph of the complaint.

- 2. Answering paragraph 2 of the complaint, answering Defendants admit that Nacimiento Lake Drive is part of the Juan Bautista de Anza Trail and is a two-lane country road that twists though hills in San Luis Obispo County. Answering Defendants deny each and every remaining allegation of said paragraph of the complaint.
- 3. Answering paragraph 3 of the complaint, answering Defendants admit the allegations in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 4. Answering paragraph 4 of the complaint, answering Defendants admit that a number of drivers had called CHP dispatchers claiming that Plaintiff's mules posed a safety hazard. Answering Defendants further admit that Plaintiff was arrested at the intersection of Nacimiento Lake Drive and San Marcos Drive which is approximately 5.2 miles outside of Paso Robles. Answering Defendants deny each and every remaining allegation of said paragraph of the complaint.
- 5. Answering paragraph 5 of the complaint, answering Defendants admit that Plaintiff was arrested for violation of California Vehicle Code sections 2800(a) and 21954(a). Answering Defendants further admit that Plaintiff's mules and personal property were impounded and released upon payment of a \$266 fee. Defendants have no information or belief upon the remaining facts alleged in said paragraph sufficient to enable Defendants to answer the allegations and, on that ground, deny each and every remaining allegation of said paragraph of the complaint.

- 6. Answering paragraph 6 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 7. Answering paragraph 7 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 8. Answering paragraph 8 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 9. Answering paragraph 9 of the complaint, the allegations of said paragraph contain conclusions of law which do not require an answer. To the extent that said allegations may be deemed to require an answer, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of said paragraph.
- 10. Answering paragraph 10 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 11. Answering paragraph 11 of the complaint, Defendants have no information or belief upon the facts alleged in said paragraph sufficient to enable Defendants to answer the allegations and, on that ground, deny each and every allegation of said paragraph of the complaint.
- 12. Answering paragraph 12 of the complaint, Defendants have no information or belief upon the facts alleged in said paragraph sufficient to enable Defendants to answer the allegations and, on that ground, deny each and every allegation of said paragraph of the complaint.
- 13. Answering paragraph 13 of the complaint, Defendants have no information or belief upon the facts alleged in said paragraph sufficient to enable Defendants to answer the allegations and, on that ground, deny each and every allegation of said paragraph of the complaint.
- 14. Answering paragraph 14 of the complaint, the allegations of said paragraph contain conclusions of law which do not require an answer. To the extent that said allegations may be deemed to require an answer, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of said paragraph.

- 15. Answering paragraph 15 of the complaint, the allegations of said paragraph contain conclusions of law which do not require an answer. To the extent that said allegations may be deemed to require an answer, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of said paragraph.
- 16. Answering paragraph 16 of the complaint, the allegations of said paragraph contain conclusions of law which do not require an answer. To the extent that said allegations may be deemed to require an answer, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of said paragraph.
- 17. Answering paragraph 17 of the complaint, the allegations of said paragraph contain conclusions of law which do not require an answer. To the extent that said allegations may be deemed to require an answer, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of said paragraph.
- 18. Answering paragraph 18 of the complaint, the allegations of said paragraph contain conclusions of law which do not require an answer. To the extent that said allegations may be deemed to require an answer, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of said paragraph.
- 19. Answering paragraph 19 of the complaint, the allegations of said paragraph contain conclusions of law which do not require an answer. To the extent that said allegations may be deemed to require an answer, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of said paragraph.
- 20. Answering paragraph 20 of the complaint, the allegations of said paragraph contain conclusions of law which do not require an answer. To the extent that said allegations may be deemed to require an answer, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of said paragraph.
- 21. Answering paragraph 21 of the complaint, the allegations of said paragraph contain conclusions of law which do not require an answer. To the extent that said allegations may be deemed to require an answer, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of said paragraph.

- 22. Answering paragraph 22 of the complaint, answering Defendants admit that the incidents alleged in Plaintiff's complaint occurred in San Luis Obispo County. Answering Defendants deny each and every remaining allegation of said paragraph of the complaint.
- 23. Answering paragraph 23 of the complaint, the allegations of said paragraph contain conclusions of law which do not require an answer. To the extent that said allegations may be deemed to require an answer, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of said paragraph.
- 24. Answering paragraph 24 of the complaint, answering Defendants admit that Plaintiff is an individual. Defendants have no information or belief upon the remaining facts alleged in said paragraph sufficient to enable Defendants to answer the allegations and, on that ground, deny each and every remaining allegation of said paragraph of the complaint.
- 25. Answering paragraph 25 of the complaint, answering Defendants admit the allegations in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 26. Answering paragraph 26 of the complaint, answering Defendants admit the allegations in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 27. Answering paragraph 27 of the complaint, Defendants have no information or belief upon the facts alleged in said paragraph sufficient to enable Defendants to answer the allegations and, on that ground, deny each and every allegation of said paragraph of the complaint.
- 28. Answering paragraph 28 of the complaint, the allegations of said paragraph contain conclusions of law which do not require an answer. To the extent that said allegations may be deemed to require an answer, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of said paragraph.
- 29. Answering paragraph 29 of the complaint, the allegations of said paragraph contain conclusions of law which do not require an answer. To the

extent that said allegations may be deemed to require an answer, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of said paragraph.

- 30. Answering paragraph 31 of the complaint, the allegations of said paragraph contain conclusions of law which do not require an answer. To the extent that said allegations may be deemed to require an answer, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of said paragraph.
- 31. Answering paragraph 32 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 32. Answering paragraph 33 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 33. Answering paragraph 34 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 34. Answering paragraph 35 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 35. Answering paragraph 36 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 36. Answering paragraph 37 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 37. Answering paragraph 38 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny that Plaintiff's arrest was unlawful. Defendants have no information or belief upon the remaining facts alleged in said paragraph sufficient to enable Defendants to answer the allegations and, on that ground, deny each and every remaining allegation of said paragraph of the complaint.
- 38. Answering paragraph 39 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 39. Answering paragraph 40 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.

- 40. Answering paragraph 41 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 41. Answering paragraph 43 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 42. Answering paragraph 44 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 43. Answering paragraph 45 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 44. Answering paragraph 46 of the complaint, answering Defendants admit that Defendant David Agredano arrested Plaintiff on January 23, 2020. Answering Defendants deny each and every remaining allegation of said paragraph of the complaint.
- 45. Answering paragraph 47 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 46. Answering paragraph 48 of the complaint, answering Defendants admit that Plaintiff did not resist arrest. Defendants further admit that Plaintiff verbally objected to his arrest and expressed his alleged legal rights to travel on the subject road. Defendants have no information or belief upon the remaining facts alleged in said paragraph sufficient to enable Defendants to answer the allegations and, on that ground, deny each and every remaining allegation of said paragraph of the complaint.
- 47. Answering paragraph 49 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 48. Answering paragraph 50 of the complaint, answering Defendants admit that Plaintiff's mules and personal belongings were impounded due to his arrest. Answering Defendants deny each and every remaining allegation of said paragraph of the complaint.

- 49. Answering paragraph 51 of the complaint, answering Defendants admit that Defendant David Agredano checked the box on the Arrest-Investigation Report indicating that "if released immediately, would jeopardize the prosecution of the offense or offenses for which arrested or the prosecution of any other offenses." Answering Defendants deny each and every remaining allegation of said paragraph of the complaint.
- 50. Answering paragraph 52 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 51. Answering paragraph 53 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 52. Answering paragraph 55 of the complaint, the allegations of said paragraph contain conclusions of law which do not require an answer. To the extent that said allegations may be deemed to require an answer, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of said paragraph.
- 53. Answering paragraph 56 of the complaint, the allegations of said paragraph contain conclusions of law which do not require an answer. To the extent that said allegations may be deemed to require an answer, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of said paragraph.
- 54. Answering paragraph 57 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 55. Answering paragraph 58 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 56. Answering paragraph 59 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 57. Answering paragraph 60 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 58. Answering paragraph 61 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.

- 59. Answering paragraph 62 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 60. Answering paragraph 63 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 61. Answering paragraph 65 of the complaint, Defendants have no information or belief upon the facts alleged in said paragraph sufficient to enable Defendants to answer the allegations and, on that ground, deny each and every allegation of said paragraph of the complaint.
- 62. Answering paragraph 66 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 63. Answering paragraph 67 of the complaint, answering Defendants admit the allegations in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 64. Answering paragraph 68 of the complaint, answering Defendants admit the allegations in said paragraph of the complaint.
- 65. Answering paragraph 69 of the complaint, the allegations of said paragraph contain conclusions of law which do not require an answer. To the extent that said allegations may be deemed to require an answer, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of said paragraph.
- 66. Answering paragraph 70 of the complaint, the allegations of said paragraph contain conclusions of law which do not require an answer. To the extent that said allegations may be deemed to require an answer, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of said paragraph.
- 67. Answering paragraph 71 of the complaint, answering Defendants admit that when Plaintiff is walking with his mules, Plaintiff is a pedestrian and must comply with the laws applicable to pedestrians.
- 68. Answering paragraph 72 of the complaint, answering Defendants deny each and every allegation of Plaintiff in said paragraph of the complaint.

statute of limitations of Code of Civil Procedure section 335.1 [relating to assault;

battery; injury or death caused by wrongful act or neglect].

The complaint and each cause of action therein are barred by the two-year

26

27

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 4: 1 2 Plaintiff herein willingly, voluntarily and knowingly assumed each, every and 3 all the risks and hazards involved in the activities alleged in the complaint. 4 AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 5: 5 Any and all alleged happenings and events, damages and injuries, if any there 6 were, were proximately caused and contributed to by the negligence of plaintiff and 7 others, each and all of whom failed to exercise ordinary care at the times and places 8 alleged in the complaint. 9 AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 6: 10 This action against a public entity is barred by the failure to precede the action 11 with a claim as required by Gov. Code sections 905.2, 905.7, 911.2, 945.2 and 12 950.2. 13 AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 7: 14 Plaintiff's own conduct estops plaintiff from claiming the damages alleged in 15 the complaint. 16 AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 8: 17 At all relevant times, plaintiff failed to mitigate injury and damages. 18 AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 9: 19 Because the complaint is couched in conclusory terms, all affirmative defenses 20 that may be applicable to the within action cannot be fully anticipated. Accordingly, the right to assert additional affirmative defenses, if and to the extent 21 22 that such affirmative defenses are applicable, is reserved. 23 AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 10: The instant action is barred by the doctrine of unclean hands. 24 25 AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 11: 26 Plaintiff has waived any right to relief for the causes of action alleged in the 27 complaint. 28

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 12:

If and to the extent that the allegations of the complaint attempt to enlarge upon the facts and contentions set forth in the California Government Claims Program claim, if any there was, said complaint fails to state a cause of action and is barred by Government Code sections 905.2, 911.2 and 950.2.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 13:

If and to the extent that any claim was presented to the California Government Claims Program, this lawsuit is untimely because it was filed more than six-months after a written notice of rejection of claim was personally delivered or deposited in the mail. (Gov. Code Section 945.6.)

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 14

The detention or arrest, if any there was, alleged in the complaint was regular and lawful and made in good faith by a peace officer or peace officers acting within the course and scope of authority and with reasonable cause to believe at the time that such action was lawful.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 15:

There was reasonable cause to make the detention or arrest, if any there was, alleged in the complaint.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 16:

At the time and place alleged in the complaint, defendants were peace officers in the course and scope of employment. At all relevant times, defendant(s) had reasonable cause to believe that plaintiff had committed a public offense in an officer's presence, to wit, a violation of the law of the State of California, and so believing, exercised the power, and discharged the duty, of lawful arrest.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 17:

Answering defendants will be entitled to reasonable attorney fees and costs of suit upon prevailing within the meaning of 42 United States Code section 1988.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 18:

At all relevant times, defendants exercised due care and acted only in the execution or enforcement of the law.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 19:

The complaint fails to state a cause of action for violation of civil rights, as any deprivation of civil rights alleged in the complaint was not without due process of law.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 20:

Answering defendants have not deprived any person of any right, privilege or immunity guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States. There has been no deprivation of any right, privilege or immunity guaranteed by the laws or Constitution of the United States.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 21:

All acts of defendants, if any there were, occurred in the proper exercise of police powers without malice or intent to deprive any person of any right arising under the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to do any person any other injury.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 22:

Answering defendants are entitled to qualified and official and quasi-judicial immunity. Defendant(s) acted at all times herein relevant in good faith, with due care, within the scope of discretion, and pursuant to laws, regulations, rules, and practices reasonably believed to be in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the United States. There is no liability pursuant to the Federal Civil Rights Act where one acts in good faith and entertains an honest, reasonable belief that one's actions are in accord with the clearly-established law. (*Harlow v. Fitzgerald* (1982) 457 U.S. 800, 818 [73 L.Ed.2d 396, 102 S.Ct. 2727].)

///

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 23:

There is no liability for any injury or damages, if any there were, resulting from an exercise of discretion vested in a public employee, whether or not such discretion be abused. (Gov. Code, §§ 815.2, 820.2.)

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 24:

The complaint herein fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against answering defendants because there can be no recovery for a federal civil rights violation against one who enjoys absolute prosecutorial immunity from suit pursuant to *Imbler v. Pachtman* (1976) 424 U.S. 409 at 431, 47 L.Ed.2d 128, 96 S.Ct. 984.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 25:

The answering public entity is immune from suit pursuant to Government Code section 815 to the extent that the complaint and each cause of action therein attempt to state a cause of action not provided by statute against a public entity.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE NO. 26:

To the extent that the complaint herein seeks recovery on any common law tort theory, any liability for common law tort must be diminished in proportion to the amount of fault attributable to plaintiff and others.

19 ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

1	WHEREFORE, Defendants pray that:		
2	1. Judgment be rendered in favor of Defendants and against Plaintiff; and		
3	2. Plaintiff take nothing by the Complaint; and		
4	3. Defendants be awarded costs of suit incurred herein; and		
5	4. Defendants be awarded such other and further relief as the Court may deem		
6	necessary and proper.		
7			
8	Dated: May 20, 2021 Re	espectfully submitted,	
9	Ro	OB BONTA	
10	M Sı	ttorney General of California [ARK T. CUMBA [Appervising Deputy Attorney General]	
11		John B. Greene	
12	, <i>S</i> ,		
13			
14	JC De	OHN B. GREENE eputy Attorney General	
15	At Co	eputy Attorney General ttorneys for Defendants State of alifornia, acting by and through the alifornia Highway Patrol, and avid Agredano	
16 17		alifornia Highway Patrol, and avid Agredano	
18	LA2021600655		
19	64210838.docx		
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

1	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	
2	Defendants hereby demand a trial by jury.	
3		
4	D-4-1 M- 20 2021	Danie 40 11 . 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.
5	Dated: May 20, 2021	Respectfully submitted,
6		Rob Bonta Attorney General of California Mark T. Cumba
7		Supervising Deputy Attorney General
8		/s/ John B. Greene
9		
10		JOHN B. GREENE
11		Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Defendants State of California, acting by and through the California Highway Patrol, and David Agredano
12		California, acting by and through the
13		David Agredano
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY E-MAIL

Case Name: Sears v. CHP et al. No.: 2:21-cv-03165

I declare:

I am employed in the Office of the Attorney General, which is the office of a member of the California State Bar, at which member's direction this service is made. I am 18 years of age or older and not a party to this matter. I am familiar with the business practice at the Office of the Attorney General for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. In accordance with that practice, correspondence placed in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General is deposited with the United States Postal Service with postage thereon fully prepaid that same day in the ordinary course of business.

On May 20, 2021, I served the attached **DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO COMPLAINT**; **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** by transmitting a true copy via electronic mail.

Todd T. Cardiff Law Office of Todd T. Cardiff

E-mail Address: todd@tcardifflaw.com

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States of America the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on May 20, 2021, at Los Angeles, California.

Yamillet Dominguez	
Declarant	Signature

LA2021600655 64232850.docx