3	Andrew L. Wright, Esq. (SBN: 147184) Wright & McGurk, LLP 17500 Red Hill Avenue, Suite 100 Irvine, California 92614 Telephone: (949) 988-7100 Facsimile: (949) 234-6251 Attorneys for PAT SOLEY parent of, and guardian ad litem for BENJAMIN NEIL SOLEY, a minor	JAN 04 2013 John A. Clarke Executive Officer/Clerk By SHAUNYA-WESLEY
. 8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9	COUNTY OF LOS ANGE	LES, CENTRAL DISTRICT
10	,	
11	LEE CAPLIN, guardian ad litem for MINOR CHILD; GITA CAPLIN, an individual; LEE	CASE NO.: BC332406
12	CAPLIN, an individual,	Judge: Honorable Ernest M. Hiroshige Department: 54
13	Plaintiffs,	Hearing Date January 24, 2ஓ1ஆ் ஓ ஐ _ ட റ
14	vs.	Time: ±18:30 a.m. ECC FA/DE FA
15 16	TERRY AND PAT SOLEY, parents of, and guardian ad litem for BENJAMIN NEIL SOLEY, a minor, et al	Judge: Honorable Ernest M. Hiroshige Department: 54 Hearing Date: January 24, 2813 PRE LEADER SITE OF DEFENDANTS TERRY AND PAT SOLEY parents of, and ghardian ad glitem for BENDAMIN NEIL SOLEY, a minority
17	2 2 2 1 ,	
18	Defendants.	<u> </u>
19		[1] his
20		F7 PM 310 \$0.00 \$0.00 \$0.00
21	TO PLAINTIFFS LEE CAPLIN, guard	lian ad litem for MINOR CHILD, GITA CAPLIN,
22	an individual, LEE CAPLIN, an individual, A	ND TO THEIR ATTORNEY OF RECORD:
23	DEFENDANT PAT SOLEY, as parent of, and guardian ad litem for BE開場開閉	
24	SOLEY, a minor ("DEFENDANTS"), and as successor in interest to the estate of TERRY	
25	SOLEY, deceased, in answer to the Complaint of PLAINTIFFS on file neglin, decises and	
26	alleges as follows:	0.00
27	1. Under and pursuant to the prov	vision of the <u>California Code of Civil Procedure</u> ,
28	specifically section 431.30 thereof, this answ	vering DEFENDANTS generally deny each and
ł	ANSWER T	1

二年十二年 日本でまる

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28

every allegation of said unverified Complaint and all of them, and the whole thereof, and each and every allegation of each cause of action alleged therein, and further expressly denies that as a direct or proximate result of any acts or omission on the part of these answering DEFENDANTS have PLAINTIFFS herein sustained or suffered injury or damage in the amount alleged in the Complaint, or in any amount or at all, or that PLAINTIFFS have suffered injury or damages for any reason in the sums alleged in the Complaint, or in other sum or sums, or at all.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

2. These answering DEFENDANTS allege that the PLAINTIFFS were careless and negligent in and about the matters referred to in said Complaint and that such negligence and carelessness on the part of said PLAINTIFFS proximately contributed to the cause of injury and/or damages allegedly suffered by PLAINTIFFS if any there was.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

3. These answering DEFENDANTS allege that any and all alleged acts or omissions, which allegedly created the condition at the time and place of the alleged damages which are the subject of this action, were caused by PLAINTIFFS and/or third parties, and therefore, these DEFENDANTS is/are not liable to PLAINTIFFS for any of the alleged damages.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

4. These answering DEFENDANTS allege by the exercise of reasonable effort PLAINTIFFS could have mitigated the amount of damages PLAINTIFFS suffered, if any there were, by taking reasonable and diligent steps to mitigate damages, but PLAINTIFFS failed to mitigate their damages.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

These answering DEFENDANTS allege that PLAINTIFFS herein failed to comply with the applicable Statute of Limitations concerning filing of the lawsuit.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

6. These answering DEFENDANTS allege that PLAINTIFF'S Complaint contains

insufficient factual allegations to state a cause of action against these responding DEFENDANTS.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

7. These answering DEFENDANTS allege that if PLAINTIFFS sustained injury, loss or damage in this action, PLAINTIFF'S right to recover as against these DEFENDANTS is barred by the application of the doctrine of Unclean Hands.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

8. These answering DEFENDANTS allege that if PLAINTIFF sustained injury, loss or damage in this action, PLAINTIFF' right to recover as against these DEFENDANTS is barred by the application of the doctrine of Laches.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

9. The allegedly false and disparaging statements which form the subject matter of the COMPLAINT concern a matter of general and public interest. The statements are therefore privileged under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the Unitied States Constitution and Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution of the State of California, and were published, if at all, in the good faith and reasonable belief that they were true, without any knowledge of falsity and without reckless disregard and any falsity. The recovery prayed for by the PLAINTIFF'S would violate the constitutional rights of these answering DEFENDANTS.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The statements which form the subject matter of the COMPLAINT were published, if at all, without malice and in good faith and were made in the reasonable belief that the statements were to persons also interested therein, and are therefore privileged under California Civil Code Section 47.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

11. The statements which form the subject matter of the COMPLAINT were published, if at all, without malice and in good faith and were made in the reasonable belief that the statements were to persons also interested therein, who stood in such relation to

ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

は こうない かんない

25

26

27

28

and proximately caused and contributed to by their own negligence, acts, and/or omissions. PLAINTIFF'S recovery herein, if any, should be diminished to the extent that their alleged

24. The injures and damages of which PLAINTIFFS complains, if any, were directly

PROOF OF SERVICE

1	PROOF OF SERVICE	
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)	
3) ss. COUNTY OF ORANGE)	
4	·	
5	I am employed in the County of Irvine, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is: 17500 Red Hill Avenue, Suite 100.	
6	Irvine, California 92614.	
7	On January, 2013, I served the foregoing documents described as DEFENDANT'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT on all parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed as follows.	
9	·	
10	[SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST]	
11		
12	(X) BY MAIL. I deposited such envelope(s) in the mail at Irvine, California. The envelopes were mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid. I am "readily familiar" with	
13	the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that	
į	practice it would be deposited with U.S. Postal Service on the same day in the ordinary course of business. I am aware on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid	
14 15	if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after the date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.	
16 17	() BY PERSONAL SERVICE. I caused such envelope(s) to be delivered by hand to the offices of the addressee(s).	
18 19	() BY ELECTRONIC TRANSFER. I caused all of the pages of the above entitled document to be sent to the recipients noted on the attached service list via electronic transfer (FAX) at the respective FAX numbers.	
20	() BY COURIER SERVICE	
21	Executed on January, 2013 at Irvine, California.	
22	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above	
23	is true and correct.	
24	By: Lean Hegedus	
25		
26		
27		
28		
l	I	

PROOF OF SERVICE MAILING LIST

Joseph A. Pertel, Esq. Law Office of Joseph A. Pertel 1717 Fourth Street, Suite 300 Santa Monica, California 90401