# PlainSite

## Legal Document

Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco Case No. CGC 13 529410 Alba Ingram v. Country Market Et Al

Document 11



**View Document** 



**View Docket** 



### SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

### **Document Scanning Lead Sheet**

Aug-07-2013 11:42 am

Case Number: CGC-13-529410

Filing Date: Aug-07-2013 11:38

Filed by: RONNIE OTERO

Juke Box: 001 Image: 04155455

**ANSWER** 

ALBA INGRAM VS. COUNTRY MARKET et al

001C04155455

#### Instructions:

Please place this sheet on top of the document to be scanned.



IRENE TAKAHASHI, SB# 75112

E-Mail: irene.takahashi@lewisbrisbois.com

CHERIE J. EDSON, SB# 208598

E-Mail: cherie.edson@lewisbrisbois.com

333 Bush Street, Suite 1100

San Francisco, California 94104-2872

Telephone: 415.362.2580 Facsimile: 415.434.0882

Attorneys for Defendant CANYON MARKET



7

8

9

5

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO** 

10

11

12

13

14

ALBA INGRAM,

Plaintiff.

VS.

CANYON MARKET, and DOES 1-25,

15

16

**17** 

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

28

**BRISBOIS** &SMITH ШР

inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO. CGC-13-529410

#### ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Action Filed:

March 11, 2013

Trial Date:

None Set

Defendant CANYON MARKET ("defendant"), answering the First Amended Complaint of plaintiff ALBA INGRAM ("plaintiff"), denies generally and specifically, each and every, all and singular, the allegations of said Complaint, and each cause of action thereof, and further denies that plaintiff has been damaged in any sum or sums or at all.

WHEREFORE, defendant prays for judgment as hereinafter set forth.

#### FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Comparative Negligence)

Defendant alleges that plaintiff was partially, if not wholly, negligent or otherwise at fault on her own part and should be barred from recovery of that portion of the damages directly attributable to her proportionate share of the negligence or fault, pursuant to the doctrine of comparative negligence.

///

4837-8166-0437 1

#### SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Negligence of Third Parties)

Defendant alleges that the damages sustained by plaintiff, if any, were caused, in whole or in part, by the negligence or fault of third parties for which defendant is not liable or responsible.

#### THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Not Responsible for Acts of DOES)

Defendant is not responsible for the acts and/or omissions of those defendants named herein as Does 1 to 25.

#### FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Statute of Limitations - General)

Defendant alleges that plaintiff's First Amended Complaint and all causes of action therein are barred by the applicable statute of limitations, including but not limited to C.C.P. § 335.1.

#### FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure to State Sufficient Facts/Cause of Action)

Defendant alleges that the First Amended Complaint fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against defendant.

#### SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Several Liability of Non-Economic Damages)

The provisions of the "Fair Responsibility Act of 1986" (commonly known as Proposition 51, Civil Code Sections 1430, 1431, 1431.1, 1431.2, 1431.3, 1431.4, 1431.5 and 1432) are applicable to this action to the extent that plaintiff's injuries, if any, were legally caused or contributed to by the negligence or fault of persons or entities other than defendant. Based upon principles of comparative fault, the liability, if any, of defendant for non-economic damages shall be several only, and shall not be joint. Defendant, if liable at all, shall be liable only for the amount of non-economic damages allocated to defendant in direct proportion to defendant's percentage of fault, and a separate and several judgment shall be rendered against defendant for non-economic damages, if any.

28 || ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

26

}

4837-8166-0437.1

#### SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 2 (Failure to Join All Necessary Parties) 3 Defendant alleges that plaintiff failed to join all persons necessary for a full and just adjudication of the purported causes of action asserted in the First Amended Complaint. 4 5 EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (Superseding Causes) 6 7 Defendant alleges that plaintiff is barred from asserting any claims against defendant because her alleged damages were the result of one or more unforeseeable intervening and 9 superseding causes. 10 NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 11 (Estoppel) 12 Defendant alleges that by virtue of her own conduct, plaintiff is estopped from recovering 13 from defendant for the claims alleged in the First Amended Complaint. 14 TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 15 (Assumption of Risk) 16 Plaintiff conducted herself in such a manner at the time and place referred to in the First **17** Amended Complaint which implies that plaintiff reasonably assumed the risk of harm or injury 18 because plaintiff had actual knowledge of the particular dangers involved in such conduct, knew 19 and understood the degree of risk involved and thereafter, in spite of such knowledge, freely and 20 voluntarily chose to and did expose herself to that particular known danger which resulted in the injuries of which plaintiff now complains. 21 22 ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 23 (Not a Substantial Factor) 24 Defendant alleges that the First Amended Complaint and each cause of action therein is 25 barred on the grounds that the products, conduct, materials or premises of defendant as referred to 26 in plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, if any, were not a substantial factor in bringing about the 27 injuries and damages complained of by plaintiff and did not increase the risk that plaintiff would

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW

4837-8166-0437.I

suffer the injuries and damages complained of.

Ī	
1	TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
2	(Waiver)
3	Defendant alleges that plaintiff has waived any and all claims which she seeks to assert in
4	this action.
5	THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
6	(Contribution and Indemnification)
7	Defendant allege that it is entitled to a right of indemnification by apportionment and to a
8	right of contribution from any person or entity whose negligence proximately contributed to the
9	happening of the alleged injuries of plaintiff if plaintiff should receive a verdict against defendant.
10	FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
11	(Compliance with Law)
12	At all times relevant herein, the conduct of defendant alleged in the First Amended
13	Complaint conformed to all applicable statutes, governmental regulations and industry standards
14	applicable thereto.
15	FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
16	(Actual or Constructive Knowledge)
17	Defendant alleges that it lacked actual or constructive knowledge of a dangerous condition.
18	SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
19	(Dangerous Condition)
20	Defendant alleges that it did not create a dangerous condition and further alleges that no
21	dangerous condition existed.
22	SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
23	(Avoidable Consequences)
24	Defendant alleges that each and every cause of action set forth in plaintiff's First Amended
25	Complaint is barred, and plaintiff may not recover damages due to the failure of plaintiff to take
26	actions to avoid the injuries alleged and damages, if any, as set forth in the Complaint.
27	
28	<i>///</i>
- 1	

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW

4837-8166-0437.1

#### EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 1 2 (Laches and Unclean Hands) Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrine of laches and unclean hands. 3 NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 4 5 (Plaintiff Had Knowledge of Particular Dangers Involved.) Plaintiff conducted herself in such a manner at the time and place referred to in the 6 Complaint which implies that plaintiff reasonably assumed the risk of harm or injury because plaintiff had actual knowledge of the particular dangers involved in such conduct, knew and understood the degree of risk involved and thereafter, in spite of such knowledge, freely and voluntarily chose to and did expose herself to that particular known danger which resulted in the injuries of which plaintiff now complains. 11 12 TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 13 (Intervening Actions) 14 Defendant is informed and believes, and upon that basis alleges, that the losses, injuries or 15 damages, if any, incurred by plaintiff were the result of superseding intervening causes arising 16 from negligent or willful acts or omissions by parties defendant neither controlled nor had the 17 right to control, and thereby plaintiff's claims against defendant are barred. 18 TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (Unwarranted Claim) 19 20 Defendant is informed and believes, and upon that basis alleges, that the First Amended 21 Complaint filed by plaintiff was brought without reasonable cause and without a good faith belief 22 that there was a justifiable controversy under the facts or the law which warranted the filing of the 23 First Amended Complaint. Plaintiff should therefore be responsible for all of defendant's 24 necessary and reasonable defense costs, as more particularly set forth in the California Code of Civil Procedure. 25 TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 26 27 (Avoidance)

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LIP ATTORNE'S AT LAW

28

4837-8166-0437.1

Plaintiff failed to take precautions which would have avoided and/or diminished her

injuries and damages, if any. 1 TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (No Breach of Duty) 3 Defendant alleges that it did not breach any duty owed to plaintiff and that, at all relevant 4 times, defendant's conduct was reasonable. 5 TWENTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 6 7 (Complete Performance) Defendant has appropriately, completely and fully performed and discharged any and all 8 obligations and/or legal duties arising out of the matters alleged in plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. 10 TWENTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 11 (Insufficient Information or Knowledge/Unknown Defenses) 12 Defendant presently has insufficient knowledge or information with which to form a belief 13 as to whether defendant may have additional, and as of yet unstated, defenses available. 14 Defendant hereby reserves the right to assert additional defenses which become necessary based 15 upon information acquired during the course of discovery. 16 17 WHEREFORE, defendant prays for judgment as follows: That plaintiff take nothing by reason of the First Amended Complaint on file 18 (1)19 herein; 20 (2) For costs of suit herein; and For such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper. (3) 21 22 LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP DATED: August 7, 2013 23 24 25 By: Irene Takahashi 26 Cherie J. Edson 27 Attorneys for Defendant CANYON MARKET 28

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISCAARD & SMITH ILP

1837-8166-0437.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

**17** 

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

#### CALIFORNIA STATE COURT PROOF OF SERVICE

Ingram v. Canyon Market - San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-13-259410

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and not a party to the action. My business address is 333 Bush Street, Suite 1100, San Francisco, CA 94104-2872.

On August 7, 2013, I served the following document:

#### ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

I served the document on the following person at the following address (including fax number and e-mail address, if applicable):

Steven J. Brady, Esq. Brady Law Group

1015 Irwin Street San Rafael, CA 94901

Telephone: (415) 459-7300 Facsimile: (415) 459-7303

Email: mail@bradylawgroup.com Attorneys for Plaintiff ALBA INGRAM

The document was served by the following means:

X (BY U.S. MAIL) I enclosed the document in a sealed envelope addressed to the person at the address listed above and placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with the firm's practice for collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, on the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the U.S. Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with the postage fully prepaid.

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

Executed on August 7, 2013, at San Francisco, California.

aron Greens

RISCAARD & SIMTH LLP