10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

Exempt From Filing Fee Government Code § 6103

FAGEN FRIEDMAN & FULFROST, LLP Roy A. Combs, SBN 123507 rcombs@f3law.com L. Carlos Villegas, SBN 242251 cvillegas@f3law.com Jen Michael-Stevens, SBN 286646 imichael-stevens@f3law.com 6300 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1700 Los Angeles, California 90048 Phone: 323-330-6300 Fax: 323-330-6311 6 7 Attorneys for Respondent, Regents of the University of California 8

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT

DAVID ABRAMS,

Petitioner,

VS.

REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

Respondent.

CASE NO. 19STCP03648

REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S ANSWER TO PETITION FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE

Action Filed:

08/22/19 None Set

Trial Date:

Pursuant to Sections 431.10, et seq., of the California Code of Civil Procedure, Respondent 19 REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ("Respondent") answers the Petition of

Petitioner DAVID ABRAMS ("Petitioner"). Respondent answers the Petition as follows and

denies that Petitioner is entitled to any relief whatsoever.

111 23

24 111

25 111

111 26

27 111

28 111

REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S ANSWER TO PETITION FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

28

I. RESPONSES TO ALLEGATIONS¹

- Respondent denies the allegations in the section preceding "Jurisdiction & Venue" 1. and paragraph 1 in the Petition. Respondent admits that the above-captioned court has iurisdiction.
 - 2. Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 2 of the Petition.
- 3. Respondent is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 3 of the Petition, and on this basis denies said allegations.
 - Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 4 of the Petition.
- 5. Respondent is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 5 (section I. paragraph 1)² of the Petition, and on this basis denies said allegations.
- Respondent is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations 6. contained in Paragraph 6 (section I. paragraph 2) of the Petition, and on this basis denies said allegations.
- Respondent is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations 7. contained in Paragraph 7 (section I. paragraph 3) of the Petition, and on this basis denies said allegations.
- Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 8 (section I. paragraph 4) 8. of the Petition.
- Answering Paragraph 9 (section I. paragraph 5), Respondent neither admits nor 9. denies the allegation in question on the grounds that they purport to characterize a document that speaks for itself.
- Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 10 (section I. paragraph 10. 6) of the Petition.

¹ To the extent that Respondent's contemporaneously filed Motion to Strike results in any portion of the Petition being stricken, Respondent requests that any answer to stricken material be disregarded.

² The Petition resets numbering paragraphs beginning with the "Factual Allegations" section. Answer will continue to reference the actual paragraph number as opposed to the number in the Petition in order to avoid confusion. E.g. this paragraph is responding to "Factual Allegations" paragraph 1.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Respondent is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations 11. contained in Paragraph 11 (section I. paragraph 7) of the Petition, and on this basis denies said allegations.
- Respondent is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations 12. contained in Paragraph 12 (section I. paragraph 8) of the Petition, and on this basis denies said allegations.
- Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 13 (section I. paragraph 9) of the 13. Petition.
- Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 14 (section II. paragraph 14. 10) of the Petition.
- 15. Respondent asserts that the Exhibit speaks for itself and denies any other allegations in Paragraph 15 (section II. paragraph 11) of the Petition.
- Respondent is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations 16. contained in Paragraph 16 (section II. paragraph 12) of the Petition, and on this basis denies said allegations.
- Respondent denies the allegations of delay in Paragraph 17 (section II. paragraph 17. 13) and asserts that the Exhibit speaks for itself.
- Respondent is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations 18. contained in Paragraph 18 (section II. paragraph 14) of the Petition, and on this basis denies said allegations.
- Respondent is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations 19. contained in Paragraph 19 (section II. paragraph 15) of the Petition, and on this basis denies said allegations.
- Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 20 (section II. paragraph 16) of the 20. Petition.
- Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 21 (section II. paragraph 16) of the 21. Petition.

	22.	Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 22 (section II. paragraph 17) of the
Petitio	n	

- 23. Answering paragraph 23 (Claims for Relief, paragraph 18) of the Petition,
 Respondent incorporates by reference its responses to the allegations of the preceing paragraphs as
 if set forth in fuill.
- 24. Respondent alleges that Paragraph 24 (Claims for Relief, paragraph 19) of the Petition contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent that it makes allegations, the Respondent denies those allegations.
- 25. Respondent alleges that Paragraph 25 (Claims for Relief, paragraph 20) of the Petition contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent that it makes allegations, the Respondent denies those allegations.
- 26. Respondent alleges that Paragraph 26 (Claims for Relief, paragraph 21) of the Petition contains a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent that it makes allegations, the Respondent denies those allegations.
- 27. Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 27 (Claims for Relief, paragraph22) of the Petition.
- 28. Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 28 (Claims for Relief, paragraph23) of the Petition.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

Respondent pleads the following separate defenses. Respondent reserves the right to assert additional affirmative defenses that discovery indicates are proper.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Acts of Government Officials in Conformance with Law)

29. As a separate and first affirmative defense to the Petition and each purported cause of action contained therein, Respondent alleges that the acts and conduct of Respondent, who were at all times herein government officials performing discretionary functions, did not violate clearly established statutory or constitutional rights of Petitioner of which a reasonable person would have known. Furthermore, Respondent reasonably believed in good faith that its acts and conduct were

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

28

constitutional. (See Harlow v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800, 812 (1982); Smiddy v. Varney, 665 F.2d 261, 266 (9th. Cir. 1981).

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Compliance with the Law)

30 As a separate and second affirmative defense to the Petition and each purported cause of action contained therein, Respondent alleges that the actions taken by Respondent were in full compliance with the law.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Respondent Acted in Accordance with Constitution)

31. As a separate and third affirmative defense to the Petition and each purported cause of action contained therein, Respondent alleges that Respondent acted at all times within the scope of discretion, in good faith, with due care, and pursuant to applicable rules, regulations, and practices reasonably and in good faith believed to be in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the United States and/or the State of California and Respondent is therefore not liable.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure to Exhaust Administrative Remedies)

32. As a separate and fourth affirmative defense to the Petition and each purported cause of action contained therein, Respondent alleges that Petitioner's claims are barred because Petitioner failed to exhaust his administrative remedies.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Good Faith – Reasonable Belief that Actions were Necessary)

As a separate and fifth affirmative defense to the Petition and each purported cause 33. of action contained therein, Respondent alleges that Respondent is immune from liability pursuant to the Federal Civil Rights Act where it acts in good faith and entertains an honest, reasonable belief that its actions were necessary. Harlow v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800, 102 S. Ct. 2727 (1982).

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Justification/Excuse)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28

34. As a separate and sixth affirmative defense to the Petition and each purported cause of action contained therein, Respondent alleges that by virtue of the acts of the Petitioner, and/or the persons and/or entities acting on his behalf, Petitioner is barred from prosecuting the purported causes of action set forth in the Petition because the acts and/or omissions alleged in the Petition were justified and/or excused.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Ongoing Investigation)

As a separate and seventh affirmative defense to the Petition and each purported 35. cause of action contained therein, Respondent alleges that it has not yet completed a thorough investigation or study or completed the discovery of all the facts and circumstances of the subject matter of the Petition and, accordingly, reserves the right to amend, modify, revise or supplement its answer and to plead such other defenses and take such other further actions as it may deem proper and necessary in its defense upon completion of said investigation and/or study.

WHEREFORE, Respondent prays for relief as follows:

- That the Petition be dismissed, with prejudice and in its entirety; 1.
- 2. That Petitioner take nothing by reason of this Petition and that judgment be entered against Petitioner and in favor of Respondent;
- That Respondent be awarded its attorneys fees and costs incurred in defending this 3. action;
- That Respondent be granted such other and further relief as the Court may deem 4. just and proper.

DATED: October 10, 2019

FAGEN FRIEDMAN & FULFROST, LLP

Jen Michael-Stevens

L. Carlos Villegas

Attorneys for Regents of the University of California

801-108/4572579.1 27

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and not a party to this action. I am employed in the County of Alameda, State of California. My business address is 70 Washington Street, Suite 205, Oakland, CA 94607.

On October 10, 2019, I served true copies of the following document(s) described as **REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S ANSWER TO PETITION FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE** on the interested parties in this action as follows:

David Abrams 305 Broadway, Suite 601 New York, NY 10007

BY MAIL: I enclosed the document(s) in a sealed envelope or package addressed to the persons at the addresses listed in the Service List and placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with Fagen Friedman & Fulfrost, LLP's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope was placed in the mail at Oakland, California.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on October 10, 2019, at Oakland, California.

Maribel Mejia-Moran