

FILED 11-23-10 PM 3:23

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS COUNTY
DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION

JONATHAN JOHNSON, a disabled person, by his)
Co-Guardians, NORMAN JOHNSON and JANICE)
ELLA JOHNSON; NORMAN JOHNSON; JANICE)
JOHNSON; SHANE BEAUMONT, a minor by his)
mother and next friend SUMER MORIARITY;)
SUMER MORIARITY; ANGELA NUMKENA, a)
disabled person, by her Guardian and Conservator,)
ROBERT NUMKENA; HEATHER NUMKENA;)
ROBERT NUMKENA; CARLOS ORTIZ; GRACE)
ORTIZ; LUCIANO MARAZZO, a minor, by his)
father and next friend THOMAS ANTHONY)
(TONY) MARAZZO; THOMAS ANTHONY)
(TONY) MARAZZO; MARGARET MARAZZO;)
KAYLA MENSING, a minor, by her mother and)
next friend ANGELA MENSING; ANGELA)
MENSING; JAWAN BERT, a minor, by his)
mother and next friend ELIZABETH BERT;)
ELIZABETH BERT; LAWRENCE McKINLEY)
IV, a minor, by his Father and next friend)
LAWRENCE McKINLEY III; LAWRENCE)
McKINLEY III; DAWN McKINLEY; ANDREW)
RANALLO; CHRIS RANALLO; MELANIE)
RANALLO;)

No. 2010 L 7695

Plaintiffs,)

-vs.-)

MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS, INC., f/n/a
MOTOROLA, INCORPORATED,

Defendant.)

**ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES
OF DEFENDANT MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS, INC. F/K/A MOTOROLA, INC.**

Defendant Motorola Solutions, Inc. f/k/a Motorola, Inc. ("Motorola"), responds to the Complaint at Law filed by JONATHAN JOHNSON, a disabled person, by his Co-Guardians, NORMAN JOHNSON and JANICE ELLA JOHNSON; NORMAN JOHNSON; JANICE JOHNSON; SHANE BEAUMONT, a minor by his mother and

ANSWER 105. Motorola denies the allegations in Paragraph 105 of the Complaint. Motorola affirmatively states, however, that it is Motorola's policy to conduct all its operations in a responsible manner free from recognized hazards. Motorola further states that that it is Motorola's policy to respect the environment, health and safety of its employees, customers, suppliers, and community neighbors. Motorola further states that it is Motorola's policy to comply with all applicable environmental, health and safety and industrial hygiene laws and regulations of countries where it conducts operations.

106. Defendant, MOTOROLA, represented to its employees and the general public that it was proactively educating and informing its employees about any potential health hazards posed by exposure to toxic substances used in its semiconductor manufacturing processes.

ANSWER 106. Motorola denies the allegations in Paragraph 106 of the Complaint.

107. Defendant, MOTOROLA, represented to its employees and the general public that it was committed to removing from its manufacturing processes any and all chemicals which might potentially cause or contribute to adverse health effects, including adverse reproductive outcomes.

ANSWER 107. Motorola denies the allegations in Paragraph 107 of the Complaint.

108. Defendant, MOTOROLA, represented to its employees and the general public that by engaging in worker safety and education programs, its employees and their future

all of the aforesaid chemical products and substances;

- i. Failed to design, approve and/or implement reasonable and proper chemical handling and disposal policies, procedures and/or controls to protect semiconductor workers, including the EMPLOYEE PARENTS and their offspring from dangers associated with exposure to some or all of the aforesaid chemical products and substances;
- j. Failed to design, approve and/or install exhaust, ventilation and/or air circulation systems for the semiconductor wafer processing areas to reasonably protect employees, including the EMPLOYEE PARENTS, from exposure to some or all of the aforesaid chemical products and substances;
- k. Failed to provide proper and adequate personal protective equipment to employees, including the EMPLOYEE PARENTS;
- l. Provided inadequate training to employees, including the EMPLOYEE PARENTS, about the dangers to health posed by exposure to some or all of the aforesaid chemical products and substances;
- m. Failed to provide a safe place to work;
- n. Failed to honor or adhere to the misleading assurances they offered their employees, described above, that their reproductive health programs were adequate, that MOTOROLA's facilities were safe, and that working at MOTOROLA posed no hazard to the health of the workers or their future offspring.
- o. Was otherwise negligent.

ANSWER 134. Motorola denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 134 of the Complaint and subparagraphs 134(a) through 134(o) of the Complaint.

135. The alleged wrongful acts and omissions of Defendant, MOTOROLA, were motivated by a desire for unwarranted economic gain and profit.

ANSWER 135. Motorola denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 135 of the Complaint.