1 2 3 4	DOUGLAS T. SLOAN, City Attorney CITY OF FRESNO By: Tina R. Griffin, Chief Assistant City Attorney (2600 Fresno Street Fresno, CA 93721-3602 Telephone: (559) 621-7500 Facsimile: (559) 488-1084	FRESNO Griffin, Chief Assistant City Attorney (SBN 210328) to Street A 93721-3602 : (559) 621-7500			
5 6 7 8 9 10	Jeffery L. Caufield, Esq. (SBN 166524) jeff@caufieldjames.com Matthew D. McMillan, Esq. (SBN 262394) mattm@caufieldjames.com CAUFIELD & JAMES, LLP 2851 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 410 San Diego, CA 92108-3843 Telephone: (619) 325-0441 Facsimile: (619) 325-0231 Attorneys for Defendant	E-FILED 4/12/2021 2:13 PM Superior Court of California County of Fresno By: R. Long, Deputy <i>Exempt from filing</i> <i>fee pursuant to</i> <i>Gov't Code § 6103</i>			
11	THE CÍTY OF FRESNO				
12	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF FRESNO				
13	COUNT	OF TRESNO			
14 15 16	KAREN MICHELI, <i>et al.</i> , Plaintiffs,	 Lead Case No.: 16CECG02937 Consolidated Case No.: 17CECG01724 Assigned for All Purposes to: Hon. Judge Rosemary McGuire, Dept. 502 			
 17 18 19 20 	v. THE CITY OF FRESNO, <i>et al.</i> Defendant. JACKIE FLANNERY, <i>et al.</i> ,	DEFENDANT CITY OF FRESNO'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' FIFTH AMENDED COMPLAINT Lead Action Filed: September 9, 2016 Consolidated Action Filed: May 17, 2017			
21	Plaintiffs,) Trial Date: Not Set			
 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 	v. THE CITY OF FRESNO, <i>et al.</i> Defendant.				
	DEFENDANT CITY OF FRESNO'S ANSWER T	O PLAINTIFFS' FIFTH AMENDED COMPLAINT			

1

2

Defendant THE CITY OF FRESNO (hereinafter, "Defendant"), for itself and for no other defendant, hereby answers the Consolidated Fifth Amended Class Action Complaint (hereinafter, "Complaint") of Plaintiffs KAREN MICHELI, individually and as Trustee of the Michael Micheli and Karen Micheli Trust, MICHAEL MICHELI, individually and as Trustee of the Michael Micheli and Karen Micheli Trust, FAITH NITSCHKE, individually and as Trustee of the Nitschke Family Trust of 2000, DAVID NITSCHKE, individually and as Trustee of the Nitschke Family Trust of 2000, DAVID NITSCHKE, individually and as Trustee of the Nitschke Family Trust of 2000, and JEANETTE GRIDER, and Plaintiffs in the consolidated action, JACKIE FLANNERY, GUADALUPE MEZA, RONDA RAFIDI, SHANN CONNER, MARIROSE LARKIN, PATRICIA WALLACE-RIXMAN aka PATTY WALLACE-RIXMAN, HARRY RIXMAN, and KELLY UNRUH, individually and as Trustee of the Kelly D. Unruh Living Trust, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated (collectively hereinafter, "Plaintiffs"), as follows:

GENERAL DENIAL

1. Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 431.30(d), Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in the Complaint, and the whole thereof, and each and every alleged cause of action thereof, and denies that Plaintiffs or the putative class members sustained any injury, loss or damage as alleged, or at all, by reason of any act, breach or omission on the part of this answering Defendant, and further denies any liability or fault whatsoever with respect to the matters complained of in the Complaint.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

2. Defendant asserts the following separate affirmative defenses to the Complaint, and reserves the right to assert additional affirmative defenses after further discovery or investigation. In asserting these affirmative defenses, Defendant does not, by stating the matters set forth in these defenses, allege or admit it has the burden of proof or persuasion with respect to any of these matters, and does not assume the burden of proof or persuasion as to any matters to which Plaintiffs, and each of them, have the burden of proof or persuasion.

- 6 ||///
- 7 ||///
- 28 ||///

1 <u>FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE</u> 2 (Failure to State a Cause of Action) 3 3. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, fails to state facts sufficient to 4 constitute claims upon which relief can be granted against this answering Defendant. SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 5 (Statute of Limitations) 6 7 4. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part, 8 by the applicable statutory and contractual periods of limitation, including, but not limited to, California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 335.1, 337, 338, 339, 342, and 343, and California Government Code §§ 9 10 911.2 and 945.6. 11 **THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE** 12 (Compliance with Statutory Authorities) 5. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part, 13 as Defendant is not liable for any acts or omissions undertaken by or at the direction or sufferance of any 14 15 local, state, or federal authority, including, without limitation, acts or omissions made in accordance 16 with any permit, license, statute, law, or regulation applicable at the time the acts or omissions occurred. 17 FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 18 (Preemption) 19 6. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part, 20 as Plaintiffs' claims for damages and those of putative class members are preempted by state and federal 21 statutes, laws, and regulations, including, but not limited to, the federal and California Safe Drinking 22 Water Acts and regulations promulgated under those Acts. 23 FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 24 (Comparative Fault) 25 7. Defendant is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the injuries and damages, if any, suffered by Plaintiffs and putative class members were proximately caused and 26 27 contributed to by the negligence of Plaintiffs and/or putative class members, and by reason thereof any 28

recovery obtained by Plaintiffs and/or putative class members against this answering Defendant should be barred or reduced according to the law of comparative negligence.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Duty Owed to Plaintiffs)

8. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part, because Defendant owed no mandatory duty to Plaintiffs and/or putative class members in regard to the matters alleged in the Complaint.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Causation)

9. The injuries and damages, if any, suffered by Plaintiffs and/or putative class members were directly, legally, and proximately caused and contributed to by an unforeseeable, independent, intervening and/or superseding event beyond the control of, and unrelated to any conduct of, this Defendant. This Defendant's alleged acts and omissions, if any, were inconsequential and indirect, in no way caused or contributed to Plaintiffs' or putative class members' alleged damages, injuries, or losses, if any, and were superseded by the negligence and wrongful conduct of others, including, but not limited to, Plaintiffs and putative class members, other defendants, and/or third parties.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Not a Substantial Factor)

10. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part, because the acts and omissions of Defendant alleged in the Complaint were not a substantial factor in bringing about the injuries and damages, if any, suffered by Plaintiffs and/or putative class members as alleged in the Complaint.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Intervening/Superseding Causes)

11. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part, because the injuries and damages, if any, of which Plaintiffs and/or putative class members complain were proximately caused or contributed to by the acts of other parties, Defendants, persons and/or other entities, and said acts were an unforeseeable, independent, intervening and/or superseding cause of the

1

injuries and damages, if any, of which Plaintiffs and/or putative class members complain, thus barring Plaintiffs and/or putative class members from any recovery from this answering Defendant.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Acts or Omissions of Third Parties)

12. This answering Defendant denies that Plaintiffs and/or putative class members were damaged as a proximate result of any conduct on the part of this answering Defendant. If Plaintiffs or putative class members suffered or sustained any loss or damage, the same was directly, legally, and proximately caused and contributed to by the independent acts or omissions of third parties or entities, whether or not parties to this action. Plaintiffs' and putative class members' recovery against this answering Defendant, if any, must therefore be reduced to the extent the damages, if any, were caused by the independent conduct of third parties.

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure to Mitigate Damages)

13. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part, because Plaintiffs and putative class members, by the exercise of diligence, could have mitigated against their claimed damages, if any; therefore, Plaintiffs' and putative class members' damages, if any, must be reduced, diminished or defeated by such amounts as should have been mitigated.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Lack of Damages)

14. Plaintiffs and putative class members have suffered no damages as a result of any act or omission of Defendant; therefore, Plaintiffs and putative class members are barred from asserting any cause of action against Defendant.

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Speculative Damages)

15. The injuries and damages, if any, suffered by Plaintiffs and/or putative class members are speculative, depend on the happening of events which are not reasonably certain to occur, may be mitigated by future events, and cannot be determined with the degree of certainty required by law.

1

DEFENDANT CITY OF FRESNO'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' FIFTH AMENDED COMPLAINT

1	FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
2	(Assumption of Risk)				
3	16. Defendant is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that at all times and places				
4	mentioned in the Complaint, Plaintiffs and putative class members had knowledge of, appreciated, and				
5	voluntarily assumed the risk of harm and consequence of any probable and likely damage, if any.				
6	FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
7	(Necessity)				
8	17. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part,				
9	as Defendant's conduct and practices were necessary and justified.				
10	SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
11	(Public Policy)				
12	18. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part,				
13	by public policy.				
14	SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
15	(Consent)				
16	19. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part,				
17	as Plaintiffs and putative class members consented to, approved, authorized, and/or ratified the alleged				
18	conduct of Defendant, thereby barring Plaintiffs and putative class members from recovering any				
19	damages or relief from this answering Defendant.				
20	EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
21	(Indispensable Parties)				
22	20. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part,				
23	because Plaintiffs failed to join all essential parties.				
24	NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
25	(Waiver)				
26	21. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part,				
27	because Plaintiffs and putative class members, and/or Plaintiffs' and putative class members'				
28	representatives and/or agents, have engaged in conduct and activities by reason of which said parties				
	5				

DEFENDANT CITY OF FRESNO'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' FIFTH AMENDED COMPLAINT

1	have knowingly and intentionally waived any and all claims against this answering Defendant, and				
2	Plaintiffs and putative class members are thereby barred and estopped from any recovery against this				
3	answering Defendant.				
4	TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
5	(Laches)				
6	22. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part,				
7	by the equitable doctrine of laches.				
8	TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
9	(Estoppel)				
10	23. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part,				
11	by the equitable doctrine of estoppel.				
12	TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
13	(Unclean Hands)				
14	24. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part,				
15	by the equitable doctrine of unclean hands.				
16	TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
17	(Lack of Standing)				
18	25. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part,				
19	as Plaintiffs and putative class members lack standing to sue for some or all of the conduct alleged in the				
20	Complaint.				
21	TWENTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE				
22	(Res Judicata and Collateral Estoppel)				
23	26. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part,				
24	by the doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel.				
25	111				
26	///				
27	111				
28	111				
	6 DEFENDANT CITY OF ERESNO'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIEES' FIFTH AMENDED COMPLAINT				

TWENTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Unjust Enrichment)

27. Defendant is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that any payment of money to Plaintiffs and/or putative class members for the loss and damages alleged in the Complaint would constitute unjust enrichment.

TWENTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Complete Performance)

28. Defendant is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant has fully and completely performed and has been discharged of any and all obligations and legal duties, if any, arising out of the matters alleged in the Complaint, except those obligations and legal duties this answering Defendant was prevented and/or excused from performing by the acts and/or omissions of Plaintiffs, other defendants, individuals, entities, and/or third parties whose identities are not now known to Defendant.

TWENTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure of Conditions Precedent)

29. Defendant is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Plaintiffs and putative class members have failed to satisfy one or more express or implied conditions precedent to any obligations allegedly owed by Defendant, such that the Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part.

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

TWENTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Consideration)

30. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part, due to lack of consideration.

TWENTY-NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Accord and Satisfaction)

31. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part, due to full accord and satisfaction.

28 ||///

1	THIRTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE			
2	(Statute of Frauds)			
3	32. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part,			
4	under the statute of frauds doctrine.			
5	THIRTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE			
6	(Excuse)			
7	33. Defendant is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Plaintiffs and putative			
8	class members were obligated to perform certain conditions in order to enforce any rights under any			
9	agreement or contract, oral or written, but failed to perform such conditions or otherwise breached the			
10	alleged agreement or contract, if any, with this answering Defendant. Therefore, this answering			
11	Defendant has been excused from the duties to perform any and all obligations set forth in the agreement			
12	or contract, if any exists.			
13	THIRTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE			
14	(Attorneys' Fees and Costs are Barred by Law)			
15	34. Plaintiffs and putative class members are precluded by law from recovering any			
16	attorneys' fees or costs of litigation from this answering Defendant.			
17	THIRTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE			
18	(Immunity)			
19	35. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part,			
20	because Defendant, a public entity, is immune from liability pursuant to California Government Code §			
21	810, <i>et seq</i> .			
22	THIRTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE			
23	(Spoliation of Evidence)			
24	36. Defendant is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Plaintiffs have			
25	intentionally or negligently spoliated evidence integrally necessary to properly and thoroughly litigate			
26	this action, resulting in irreparable injury and undue prejudice to Defendant and to Defendant's ability to			
27	defend itself in this matter, such that Plaintiffs are barred and estopped from any recovery against this			
28	answering Defendant.			

THIRTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure to Exhaust Administrative Remedies)

37. Defendant is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Plaintiffs' claims and those of the putative class members are barred, in whole or in part, by the failure to exhaust administrative remedies.

THIRTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Defendant's Discharge of Duty and Performance)

38. Without admitting to the existence of any duties or obligations as alleged in the Complaint, Defendant is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that it has fully and timely performed, satisfied, and/or discharged all of its duties and obligations under the federal and California Safe Drinking Water Acts and regulations promulgated under those Acts, or exercised reasonable diligence to discharge such duties and obligations. Therefore, Plaintiffs and putative class members are barred and estopped from any recovery against this answering Defendant.

THIRTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Not a Class Action)

39. Defendant is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that this action is not properly brought as a class action in that, among other things, Plaintiffs are not proper class representatives, common questions of fact and law do not predominate, Plaintiffs' claims are not typical of the claims of the purported class, the class is not so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable, and a class action is not superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy.

THIRTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Reasonableness and Good Faith)

40. Defendant and its agents acted reasonably and in good faith at all times material herein based on all relevant facts and circumstances known by them at the time they so acted. Accordingly, Plaintiffs and putative class members are barred from any recovery in this action.

7 ||///

28 ||///

THIRTY-NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(California Civil Code § 1431.2)

41. Defendant is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that there are other persons, parties, and/or defendants who are at fault and who proximately caused and contributed to Plaintiffs' and putative class members' alleged injuries and damages, if any. If Defendant is responsible to Plaintiffs and/or putative class members, which responsibility Defendant denies, Defendant is only liable for its proportionate share of non-economic damages, if any, as set forth in California Civil Code § 1431.2.

FORTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Balancing of Conveniences/Relative Hardship)

42. Defendant is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that in creating the condition alleged by Plaintiffs and putative class members to be a nuisance, Defendant acted innocently, reasonably, and in good faith, and an abatement of said alleged nuisance would impose a hardship on Defendant greatly disproportionate to that imposed on Plaintiffs and the putative class members by the continuance of the alleged nuisance requiring a balancing of conveniences to be undertaken by this Court, in accordance with California law.

FORTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Reasonable Exercise of Police Power)

43. The conduct of this answering Defendant, as alleged in the Complaint, was a reasonable exercise of the police power and undertaken pursuant to the express police powers delegated to this answering Defendant by the State of California and/or the United States of America.

FORTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Act of God)

44. The Complaint, and each purported cause of action therein, is barred, in whole or in part, because the alleged injuries, losses, and damages, if any, were the direct and proximate result of an unavoidable incident or condition and, as such, were an act of God, without fault or liability on the part of this answering Defendant.

8 ||///

1

1	FORTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
2	(Failure to Comply with Government Claims Act)					
3	45. Defendant is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Plaintiffs' claims and					
4	those of the p	those of the putative class members are barred, in whole or in part, by the failure to comply with the				
5	requirements of the Government Claims Act pursuant to California Government Code § 810, et seq.					
6	FORTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
7		(Incorporation of all Applicable Defenses)				
8	46.	Defendant asserts all applicable defenses pled by any other Defendant or party to this				
9	action, and hereby incorporates the same herein by reference.					
10	FORTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
11	(Reservation of Right to Assert Additional Defenses)					
12	47.	Defendant presently has insufficient knowledge or information upon which to form a				
13	belief as to whether it may have additional, as yet unstated, affirmative defenses. Therefore, Defendant					
14	reserves the right to assert additional affirmative defenses in the event discovery indicates to do so					
15	would be app	propriate.				
16		PRAYER				
17	WHEREFORE, this answering Defendant prays for judgment herein as follows:					
18	1.	That Plaintiffs take nothing by way of the Complaint;				
19	2.	That judgment be entered in favor of Defendant and against Plaintiffs on all causes of				
20		action;				
21	3.	3. For costs of suit incurred herein, including attorneys' fees and costs; and				
22	4.	For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.				
23	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL					
24	Defendant hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues upon which trial by jury may be had.					
25						
26	DATED: A	pril 12, 2021 CAUFIELD & JAMES, LLP				
27		Matthew D. McMillan, Esq.				
28		Attorneys for Defendant City of Fresno				
		11				

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF FRESNO Karen Micheli, et al. v. The City of Fresno, et al. (Lead Case) Jackie Flannery, et al. v. The City of Fresno, et al. (Consolidated Case)		FOR COURT USE ONLY
Jeffery L. Caufield (SBN 166524) Matthew D. McMillan (SBN 262394) CAUFIELD & JAMES, LLP 2851 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 410 San Diego, CA 92108	Tel: (619) 325-0441 Fax: (619) 325-0231	
Attorneys for: Defendant The City of Fresno	Date: Time: Courtroom: 502	Case Number: 16CECG02937 (Lead Case) 17CECG01724 (Consolidated Case)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, declare: I am employed in the County of San Diego, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to this action. My business address is 2851 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 410, San Diego, California 92108. I served a copy of the following document(s):

DEFENDANT CITY OF FRESNO'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' FIFTH AMENDED COMPLAINT

□ (BY MAIL) I caused each such envelope to be sealed and placed for collection and mailing from my business address. I am readily familiar with Caufield & James' practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing, said practice being that in the ordinary course of business mail is deposited with the postage thereon fully prepaid in the United States Postal Service the same day as it is placed for collection. I am aware that upon motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if the postal cancellation date or postage meter date on the envelope is more than one day after the date of deposit for mailing contained in this affidavit. Service by this method was sent to:

□ (BY OVERNIGHT MAIL) I am readily familiar with the practice of Caufield & James for the collection and processing of correspondence for overnight delivery and know that the document(s) described herein will be deposited in a box or other facility regularly maintained for overnight delivery. Service by this method was sent to:

(BY FACSIMILE) This document was transmitted by facsimile transmission from (619) 325-0231 and
he transmission was reported as complete and without error. I then caused the transmitting facsimile
nachine to properly issue a transmission report confirming the transmission.

 \Box (BY PERSONAL SERVICE) I caused each such envelope to be sealed and given to a courier for delivery on the same date. A proof of service signed by the authorized courier will be filed forthwith.

(BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION) This document was transmitted by electronic transmission from rebecca@caufieldjames.com and the transmission was reported as complete and without error. I then caused the transmitting e-mail account to properly issue a report confirming the electronic transmission.

SEE SERVICE LIST

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on April 12, 2021, at San Diego, California.

Rebecca Vargas Rebecca Vargas

SERVICE LIST

Raymond P. Boucher, Esq. Shehnaz M. Bhujwala, Esq. **BOUCHER LLP** 21600 Oxnard St., Suite 600 Woodland Hills, CA 91367 Tel: (818) 340-5400 Fax: (818) 340-5401 ray@boucher.la bhujwala@boucher.la Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Karen Micheli, et al.

Stuart R. Chandler, Esq. **STUART R. CHANDLER, APC**

761 E. Locust Ave., Suite 101 Fresno, CA 93720 Tel: (559) 431-7770 Fax: (559) 431-7778 <u>stuart@chandlerlaw.com</u> *Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Karen Micheli, et al.*

Gregory Owen, Esq. OWEN, PATTERSON & OWEN, LLP 23822 W. Valencia Blvd., Suite 303 Valencia, CA 91355 Tel: (661) 799-3899 Fax: (661) 799-2774 greg@owenpatterson.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Karen Micheli, et al.

Brian S. Kabateck, Esq. Christopher B. Noyes, Esq. **KABATECK BROWN KELLNER LLP** 633 W. Fifth Street., Suite 3200 Los Angeles, CA 90071 bsk@kbklawyers.com cn@kbklawyers.com Telephone: (213) 217-5000 Facsimile: (213) 217-5010 Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Jackie Flannery, et al. Frank M. Pitre, Esq. Julie L. Fieber, Esq. Donald J. Magilligan, Esq. **COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY LLP** 840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200 Burlingame, CA 94010 <u>fpitre@cpmlegal.com</u> <u>jfieber@cpmlegal.com</u> <u>dmagilligan@cpmlegal.com</u> Telephone: (650) 697-6000 Facsimile: (650) 697-0577 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Jackie Flannery, et al.*

Michael E. Gatto, Esq. LAW OFFICE OF MICHAEL E. GATTO PC

2540 Camino Diablo, Suite 200 Walnut Creek, CA 94597-3944 <u>mgatto@gattopc.com</u> Telephone: (925) 2781705 Facsimile: (925) 932-1961 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Jackie Flannery, et al.*

VIA EMAIL ONLY

Tina R. Griffin **City of Fresno** 2600 Fresno Street Fresno, CA 93721-3602 *Attorneys for Defendant, City of Fresno* <u>Tina.Griffin@fresno.gov</u>