## Case 1:17-cv-01446-DAD-EPG Document 6 Filed 11/15/17 Page 1 of 11

1	DEANNE H. PETERSON, #147099		
2	County Counsel for the County of Tulare Kathleen A. Taylor, #131100		
3	Chief Deputy County Counsel		
4	Amy Terrible Myers, #269475 Deputy County Counsel		
5	2900 West Burrel Ave.		
6	Visalia, California 93291 Phone: (559) 636-4950		
7	Fax: (559) 737-4319		
8	E-mail: aterrible@co.tulare.ca.us		
9	Attorneys for Defendants County of Tulare and	Tulare County Sheriff	
10	UNITED STATES D	ISTRICT COLIDT	
11	EASTERN DISTRICT OF C		
12			
13	RAMIRO HUERTA,	Case Number: 1:17-cv-01446-DAD-	
14	Plaintiff,	EPG	
15		ANSWER OF DEFENDANTS	
16	VS.	COUNTY OF TULARE AND	
17	COUNTY OF TULARE, a governmental	TULARE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT	
18	entity; TULARE COUNTY SHERIFF, a governmental entity, Unknown TULARE		
19	COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPUTIES named	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	
20	herein, as Does 1-50; and ROES 1-50, inclusive,	Exempt from Filing Fees Pursuant to Government Code § 6103	
21	Defendants.		
22	Defendants.		
23	Defendants COUNTY OF TULARE ("Co	ounty"), and TULARE COUNTY SHERIF	
24		•	
25	("TCSO"), ("Defendants"), answering the Unver	rified Complaint alleging Assault; Battery;	
26	False Imprisonment; Violation of Civil Rights Under Color of Law (42 U.S.C. § 1983); and		
27	Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress.		
28			
nsel		Huerta v. County of Tulare et al.	

3 4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

22

24 25

26

27

28

Defendants hereby demand a trial by jury on all issues triable by a jury.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 

**ANSWER** 

- Defendants admit that Plaintiff was a resident of the County of Tulare at all times 1. relevant as set forth in paragraph 1 of the Complaint.
- 2. Defendants admit the County of Tulare is a governmental entity located in the County of Tulare, State of California as stated in paragraph 2 of the Complaint.
- Defendants deny that the Tulare County Sheriff (the Sheriff) is a governmental entity 3. as alleged in paragraph 3 of the Complaint; Tulare County Sheriff is a department contained within the entity of the County of Tulare.
- 4. Defendants admit the acts forming the basis of the Complaint took place within Tulare County and that the identities of the deputies responding to Plaintiff's home on the night in question are known to the Sheriff and County and said deputies responded to Plaintiff's location within the scope and course of their employment. Except as specifically admitted, the County and Sheriff deny each and every allegation contained in paragraph 4 of the Complaint.
- 5. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 5 of the Complaint.
- 6. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph 6 of the Complaint.
- Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph 7 of the Complaint. 7.
- 8. Defendants admit Plaintiff phoned the Porterville Police Department several times on the night of the incident and lack sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 8, therefore Defendants deny.

Visalia, California

\_.

9. Defendants admit that on April 25, 2017 Tulare County Sheriff's Deputies were dispatched to a residence located in the City of Strathmore at approximately 10:30 p.m. and that Plaintiff was located at that residence. Defendants further admit the deputies were wearing their department issued uniforms and standing outside the door to the residence. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 9 of the Complaint.

10. Defendants admit that Plaintiff was taken to the ground by a Sheriff's Deputy once he exited the residence and deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 10 of the Complaint.

- 11. Defendants admit that Plaintiff was placed in handcuffs and deny the remaining allegations set forth in paragraph 11 of the Complaint.
- 12. Defendants specifically deny that a "beating" took place. Defendants lack sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 12 of the Complaint, therefore Defendants deny.
- 13. Defendants admit that Plaintiff was transported to Sierra View District Hospital in Porterville where he was examined and medically cleared. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 13 of the Complaint.
- 14. Defendants admit that after Plaintiff was medically cleared he was transported from the Sierra View District Hospital to a Tulare County Detention Center where he was booked into custody and released on April 26, 2017. Defendants further admit that at the time the Complaint in this matter was filed criminal charges had not been filed against Plaintiff. Defendants lack sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations concerning Plaintiff's conduct after his release, and therefore deny those allegations. Except as specifically

admitted or denied as previously stated. Defendants deny each and every allegation

contained in paragraph 14 of the Complaint.

15.

9

7

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21

2223

2425

26

27

28

25.

contained in paragraph 15 of the Complaint.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(ASSAULT AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

denied, and that the instant lawsuit followed. Defendants deny the remaining allegations

Defendants admit that Plaintiff submitted a claim to Tulare County, that the claim was

- 16. The allegations contained in paragraph 16 of the Complaint are admitted or denied as set out above in response to the individual incorporated paragraphs.
- 17. Defendants lack sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 17 of the Complaint, therefore they are denied.
- 18. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 18 of the Complaint.
- 19. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 19 of the Complaint.
- 20. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 20 of the Complaint.
- 21. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 21 of the Complaint.
- 22. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 22 of the Complaint.

# SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (BATTERY AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 23. The allegations contained in paragraph 23 of the Complaint are admitted or denied as set out above in response to the individual incorporated paragraphs.
- 24. Defendants lack sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 24 of the Complaint, therefore they are denied.
- 25. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 25 of the Complaint.

#### Case 1:17-cv-01446-DAD-EPG Document 6 Filed 11/15/17 Page 5 of 11

- 26. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 26 of the Complaint.
- 27. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 27 of the Complaint.

# THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (FALSE IMPRISONMENT AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 28. The allegations contained in paragraph 28 of the Complaint are admitted or denied as set out above in response to the individual incorporated paragraphs.
- 29. Defendants lack sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 29 of the Complaint and therefore deny.
- 30. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 30 of the Complaint.
- 31. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 31 of the Complaint.
- 13 | 32. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 32 of the Complaint.

# **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION** (Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress)

- 33. The allegations contained in paragraph 33 of the Complaint are admitted or denied as set out above in response to the individual incorporated paragraphs.
- 34. Defendants deny that Plaintiff's constitutional rights were violated and lack sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 34 of the Complaint, therefore they are denied.
- 35. Defendants lack sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 35 of the Complaint, therefore they are denied.
- 36. Defendants admit that Plaintiff has the enumerated constitutional rights to the extent established by applicable law. Defendants deny each and every remaining allegation contained in paragraph 36 of the Complaint.

Huerta v. County of Tulare et al.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

### Case 1:17-cv-01446-DAD-EPG Document 6 Filed 11/15/17 Page 6 of 11

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	ĺ
23	ĺ
24	ĺ
25	l

- 37. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 37 of the Complaint.
- 38. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 38 of the Complaint.

# FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION (INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS)

- 39. The allegations contained in paragraph 39 of the Complaint are admitted or denied as set out above in response to the individual incorporated paragraphs.
- 40. Defendants lack sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 40 of the Complaint and on that basis deny.
- 41. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 41 of the Complaint.
- 42. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 42 of the Complaint.
- 43. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 43 (mistakenly numbered by Plaintiff as 32) of the Complaint.

#### FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

44. Defendants allege that the Complaint fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against these answering Defendants.

#### SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

45. Defendants allege that at the time of the incidents referred to in the Complaint,
Plaintiff was negligent or at fault and failed to use that degree of care and caution which a
reasonably prudent person would have used under the same or similar circumstances; that
Plaintiff's negligence or fault must be compared with the negligence or fault of the
Defendants, as well as that of any other persons or parties, and that any award to Plaintiff
must be reduced by the amount that the Plaintiff's negligence or fault contributed to
Plaintiff's injuries and damages if any there were.

Huerta v. County of Tulare et al.

26

27

28

\_.

County Counsel Tulare County Visalia, California

#### THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

46. Defendants allege that all events in connection with the incidents alleged in Plaintiff's Complaint and any resulting injuries or damages therefrom were contributed to and proximately caused by the negligence of the Plaintiff in that the Plaintiff failed to exercise ordinary care for his own safety under the circumstances, thereby barring the Plaintiff from any recovery.

#### FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

47. Defendants allege that they acted in good faith and did not directly or indirectly perform any acts whatsoever which would constitute a breach of any duty owed to the Plaintiff.

#### FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

48. Defendants allege that they acted in good faith and did not directly or indirectly perform any acts whatsoever which would constitute a violation of any state or federal constitutional right possessed by Plaintiff.

#### SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

49. Defendants allege that each of the Plaintiff's claims are barred by California Government Code sections 815, 815.2, 815.3, 818, 818.2, 820, 820.2, 820.4, 820.6, 820.8, 821, 845.6, 845.8, and 846.

#### SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

50. Defendants allege that they are entitled to recover reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees, from the Plaintiff and his counsel in that the Plaintiff's Complaint is frivolous and was brought and maintained in bad-faith and without reasonable cause, is

totally and completely without merit as to these Defendants, and was brought for the sole

purpose of harassing these Defendants. Cal. Code of Civil Procedure sections 128.5 and

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendants allege that they are entitled to recover reasonable expenses, including

attorney's fees, from the Plaintiff and his counsel in that they, at the time the Complaint was

filed and during its maintenance and to the extent that it includes causes of action filed under

the California Tort Claims Act, did not have a good faith belief that there was a justifiable

controversy under the facts and law which warranted the filing of the Complaint against

these Defendants, and therefore the Complaint was filed and maintained in bad-faith and

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

either expressly or impliedly, to any such acts or conduct as may be shown on the part of

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendants allege that at all times relevant to this litigation, the Plaintiff consented,

4

1021.7.

51.

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

52.

these Defendants.

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

53. Defendants allege that at all times relevant to this litigation, the Plaintiff engaged in provocative acts, conduct and/or words such that the conduct of Defendants relating to the

Plaintiff was reasonable, necessary and of a consequential nature.

without reasonable cause. Cal. Code of Civil Procedure section 1038.

### **ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

54. Defendants allege that at no time relevant to this litigation did the Plaintiff sustain any violation of his civil rights, pursuant to a governmental habit or custom thereby precluding

Huerta v. County of Tulare et al.

County Counsel Tulare County Visalia, California

### Case 1:17-cv-01446-DAD-EPG Document 6 Filed 11/15/17 Page 9 of 11

the Plaintiff from maintaining his causes of action for violation of his civil rights.

#### TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

55. Defendants allege that at all times relevant to this litigation, these Defendants acted in good faith and with probable cause and entertained an honest, reasonable belief that these Defendants' actions were reasonable and necessary thereby precluding the Plaintiff from maintaining any causes of action for violation of his civil rights.

#### THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

56. Defendants allege that at all times relevant to this litigation, the injuries and damages of which the Plaintiff complains amounted to nothing more than a tort which the State of California protects against by virtue of its tort laws thereby precluding the Plaintiff from maintaining any causes of action for violations of his civil rights.

#### FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

57. Defendants allege that at all times relevant to this litigation, these Defendants were performing discretionary functions, and their conduct did not violate any established statutory or constitutional rights of which a reasonable person would have an expectation of civil rights.

#### FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

58. Defendants allege that at all times relevant to this litigation, these Defendants acted in good faith and with probable cause and at no time did Defendants know or should have known that the action taken within the sphere of these Defendants' official responsibility would violate the constitutional rights of the Plaintiff, and the Plaintiff is thereby precluded from maintaining these causes of action for violations of his civil rights.

Huerta v. County of Tulare et al.

45

6

8

7

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

26

27

28

SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

59. Defendants allege that to the extent that Plaintiff's Complaint and causes of action for violations of his civil rights are based upon a theory of respondent superior against these Defendants, Defendants are immune from liability.

### SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

60. Defendants allege that the Plaintiff's claim for damages is barred in that Plaintiff could have avoided such damages, if any there were, with reasonable effort and failed to do so.

#### EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

61. Defendants allege that at the time and place of the incidents alleged in Plaintiff's Complaint, the Plaintiff knew of the danger and risk incident to his activity, but nevertheless freely and voluntarily exposed himself to all risks of harm and therefore assumed all risk of harm incidental thereto.

#### NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

62. Defendants allege that Plaintiff is estopped by his own conduct from asserting the allegations in the Complaint.

#### TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

63. Defendants allege that if the conduct of these Defendants is found to have been wrongful, which Defendants have denied and continue to deny, then Plaintiff's claim is barred by the doctrine of unclean hands.

///

///

## Case 1:17-cv-01446-DAD-EPG Document 6 Filed 11/15/17 Page 11 of 11

1	WHEREFORE, THESE ANSWERING DEFENDANTS PRAY that Plaintiff take		
2	nothing by way of his Complaint, and that the Defendants go hence with Defendants' costs		
3 4	of suit and attorney's fees incurred.		
5 6 7	Dated: November 15, 2017  DEANNE H. PETERSON Tulare County Counsel		
8 9 10	By/s/Amy Terrible MyersAMY TERRIBLE MYERS	_	
11 12			
13 14			
15 16			
17 18	KAM/11/6/2017/20171605		
19 20			
21   22			
23   24			
25 26	25		
27	27		
28 Insel	28   Huerta v. County of T	ılare et al.	

County Counsel Tulare County Visalia, California