

CASE NUMBER: CGC17559587

ANSWER TO COMPLAINT (TRANSACTION ID # 60936074 FILED BY DEFENDANT MCGINNIS, SEAN WILLIAM

Document prepared for:

CASE NAME

SAMANTHA BRIASCO-STEWART VS. SEAN WILLIAM MCGINNIS

ET AL

DOCUMENT FILED DATE

Aug. 3rd, 2017

CASE FILING DATE

June 16th, 2017

COUNTY

San francisco county, CA

JUDGE

CATEGORY

Teri L. Jackson

PERSONAL INJURY/PROPERTY DAMAGE - VEHICLE RELATED

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	PETER J. HIRSIG (State Bar No. 197993)
2	peter.hirsig@mcnamaralaw.com DENISE J. SERRA (State Bar No. 80602)
3	denise.serra@mcnamaralaw.com McNamara, Ney, Beatty, Slattery,
4	BORGES & AMBACHER LLP 639 Kentucky Street, First Floor
5	Fairfield, CA 94533 Telephone: (707) 427-3998 Facsimile: (707) 427-0268
6 7	Attorneys for Defendant SEAN WILLIAM MCGINNIS
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
9	CIVIL - UNLIN
10	
11	SAMANTHA BRIASCO-STEWART,
12	Plaintiff,
13	vs.
14	SEAN WILLIAM MCGINNIS and DOES
15	1-45, Defendants.
16	Defendants.
17	COMES NOW defendant, SEAN V
18	unverified complaint on file herein, admits, o
19	Answering the allegations of plaintif
20	denies each and every, all and singular, ge
	11

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco

08/03/2017 Clerk of the Court BY:RONNIE OTERO

Deputy Clerk

A, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO MITED JURISDICTION

Case No. CGC-17-559587

ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

Action Filed: 6/16/2017

VILLIAM MCGINNIS, and in answer to plaintiff's denies and alleges as follows:

's complaint on file herein, this answering defendant nerally and specifically, the allegations contained in said complaint, and each and every part thereof, and in this connection this defendant denies that plaintiff has been injured or damaged in any sum, or otherwise, or at all, by reason of any carelessness, negligence, act or omission of this answering defendant.

WHEREFORE, this answering defendant prays for judgment as hereinafter set forth.

AS AND FOR A FIRST, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE COMPLAINT, and each and every cause of action therein, this answering defendant alleges that the complaint fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against this answering defendant.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

AS AND FOR A SECOND, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE COMPLAINT, and each and every cause of action therein, this answering defendant alleges that plaintiff herself was guilty of carelessness, negligence and other wrongful conduct in and about the matters set forth in the complaint on file herein, and that said carelessness, negligence and other wrongful conduct on the part of said plaintiff proximately contributed in some degree to the alleged incident and to the damages and injuries, if any, alleged to have been sustained by said plaintiff and therefore said carelessness, negligence and wrongful conduct completely bars any recovery, or in the alternative, it reduces the right of recovery by that amount which contributed to this incident as set forth under the doctrine of comparative negligence.

AS AND FOR A THIRD, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE COMPLAINT, and each and every cause of action therein, this answering defendant alleges that others, including parties and unnamed individuals and entities, were careless and negligent in and about the matters alleged in the complaint on file herein, and that said carelessness and negligence on the part of said others proximately contributed to the happening of the incident, and to the injuries, loss and damages complained of, if any there were; should plaintiff recover damages against this answering defendant, said defendant is entitled to have the amount abated, reduced, or eliminated in proportion to the percentage of negligence of said others, including parties and unnamed individuals and entities, proximately causing plaintiffs injuries and damages, if any there were.

AS AND FOR A FOURTH, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE COMPLAINT, and each and every cause of action therein, this answering defendant alleges that plaintiff failed to mitigate her damages, if any, and accordingly, is not entitled to the relief sought in the complaint.

AS AND FOR A FIFTH, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE COMPLAINT, and each and every cause of action therein, this answering defendant alleges that plaintiff voluntarily and knowingly assumed any and all risks involved in the situation underlying the subject complaint.

///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

///

///

///

///

///

AS AND FOR A SIXTH, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE COMPLAINT, and each and every cause of action therein, this answering defendant alleges that plaintiff is barred by the applicable statutes of limitation (CCP §335.1).

AS AND FOR A SEVENTH, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE COMPLAINT, and each and every cause of action therein, this answering defendant alleges that some or all of the plaintiffs alleged damages and loss are barred by the provisions of Proposition 213 (Civil Code, Section 3333.4).

AS AND FOR A EIGHTH, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE COMPLAINT, and each and every cause of action therein, this answering defendant alleges the complaint is barred by collateral estoppel and res judicata.

AS AND FOR A NINTH, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, TO THE COMPLAINT, and each and every cause of action therein, plaintiff has incurred property damage that was paid by plaintiff's insurer. If plaintiff's insurer is subrogated by plaintiff's policy of insurance, plaintiff's has failed to join said insurer as a necessary party pursuant to Ferraro v. Lyle Construction of California (1980) 102 Cal.App.3d 33.

AS AND FOR A TENTH, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, TO THE COMPLAINT, and each and every cause of action therein, this answering defendant alleges that plaintiff's claim for, and right of, recovery is limited by the doctrine set forth in Witt v. Jackson (1961) 57 Cal.2d 57, 17 Cal. Rptr. 369, 360 P.2d 641. It is further alleged that plaintiff was in the course and scope of her employment with this answering defendant. Therefore, the Worker's Compensation statutes and/or laws and the Worker's Compensation Appeals Board have exclusive jurisdiction over and concerning plaintiff's claims and as a result the complaint is barred with this court having no jurisdiction.

McNAMARA, NEY, BEATTY, SLATTERY, BORGES & AMBACHER LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW 639 KENTUCKY STREET, FAIRFIELD, CA 94533-5530 TELEPHONE: (707) 427-3998

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

This answering defendant hereby demands that the matter be heard before a jury.

WHEREFORE, this answering defendant prays that plaintiff take nothing by way of her complaint on file herein, that defendant be hence dismissed with her costs of suit incurred, and for such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.

Dated: August 1, 2017

MCNAMARA, NEY, BEATTY, SLATTERY, BORGES & AMBACHER LLP

By

Peter J. Hirsig/ Denise J. Serra

Attorneys for Defendant

SEAN WILLIAM MCGINNIS

K:\SFIF\7940 Briasco\PLEADINGS\ANSWER.docx

ATTORNEYS AT LAW 639 KENTUCKY STREET, FAIRFIELD, CA 94533-5530 TELEPHONE: (707) 427-3998

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL (C.C.P. §§ 1013a, 2015.5)

I hereby declare that I am a citizen of the United States, am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action; my business address is 639 Kentucky Street, First Floor, Fairfield, California 94533-5530.

On this date I served the foregoing ANSWER TO COMPLAINT on the parties in said action, by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as listed below for mailing. I am readily familiar with this firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, it would be deposited with the United States Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States Post Office mail box at Fairfield, California, addressed as follows:

Attorneys For Plaintiff:

Craig A. Kroner LAW OFFICES OF CRAIG A. KRONER 1141 Ringwood Court, #10 San Jose, CA 95131-1757

Phone: 408-433-9893

E-Mail: locak@sbcglobal.net

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on August 3, 2017 at Fairfield, California.

me Woo