1	Julie A. Marquis (SBN 178466)		
2	jmarquis@fmglaw.com Jasmyne Shaw (SBN 347914)		
3	Jasmyne.shaw@fmglaw.com FREEMAN MATHIS & GARY, LLP		
4	1010 B Street, Suite 400 San Rafael, California 94901		
5	Telephone: 415.394.9500 Facsimile: 833.317.0293		
6	Attorneys for Defendant		
7	REDWOOD EMPIRE FOOD BANK		
8			
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
10	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA		
11			
12	LISA CANNON,	Case No.: 24CV01482	
13	Plaintiff,	DEFENDANT DEDWOOD EMDIDE	
14	v.	DEFENDANT REDWOOD EMPIRE FOOD BANK'S ANSWER TO PLAINIFF'S COMPLAINT	
15	REDWOOD EMPIRE FOOD BANK; and DOES 1 to 5, Inclusive,	I LAINIFF S COMI LAINI	
16	DOES 1 to 3, metusive,	Complaint Filed: February 23, 2024	
17	Defendants.		
18			
19	Defendant REDWOOD EMPIRE FOOD BA	NK (hereinafter, "Defendant"), answers the	
20	Complaint filed by Plaintiff LISA CANNON (herein	nafter, "Plaintiff") as follows:	
21	GENERAL DENIAL		
22	Under the provisions of Section 432.20 of the California Code of Civil Procedure,		
23	Defendant denies, both generally and specifically, each and every cause of action in the		
24	Complaint and each and every allegation therein, including a denial that Plaintiff suffered		
25	damage in the sum or sums alleged or in any other sum or sums whatsoever.		
26	///		
27	///		
28			
	1		

DEFENDANT REDWOOD EMPIRE FOOD BANK'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT

Freeman Mathis & Gary, LLP Attorneys at Law

1	AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES	
2	FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
3	(Failure to State a Cause of Action)	
4	In answering Plaintiff's complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged	
5	therein, Defendant alleges the Complaint fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of	
6	action.	
7	SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
8	(Statute of Limitations)	
9	In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged	
10	therein, Defendant alleges that each cause of action is barred in whole or in part by the	
11	applicable statute(s) of limitations, including but not limited to Sections 335.1, 337, 338, 339,	
12	340, 343 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and Sections 12960 and 12965 of the	
13	California Government Code.	
14	THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
15	(No Causation)	
16	In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged	
17	therein, Defendant denies the injuries or damages complained of by Plaintiff, if any, were due to	
18	or caused by any act or omission by Defendant.	
19	FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
20	(Reasonable Interpretation of Applicable Law)	
21	In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged	
22	therein, Defendant alleges that it acted in good faith reliance upon a reasonable interpretation	
23	of applicable law.	
24	FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
25	(Legitimate Business Reasons)	
26	In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged	
27	therein, Defendant alleges any and all actions taken concerning Plaintiff were taken for lawful,	
28	non-discriminatory, non-retaliatory, legitimate business reasons.	

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Good Faith)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant alleges the relief prayed for in the Complaint is barred because to the extent the alleged conduct attributed to Defendant was in fact committed, Defendant acted in good faith and with innocent intent at all times and did not act willfully.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure to Exhaust Administrative Remedies)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant alleges Plaintiff's Complaint is barred in whole or in part by Plaintiff's failure to exhaust her administrative remedies.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Comparative Fault)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant alleges Plaintiff's Complaint is barred because Plaintiff contributed entirely, or at least in some degree, to her alleged damages.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Same Actor)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant alleges Plaintiff's claims are barred by application of the same actor defense.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Conduct Outside Course and Scope)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant asserts each cause of action cannot be maintained against Defendant because if Defendant's employees (including Plaintiff) took the actions alleged, such actions were committed outside the course and scope of such employees' employment, were not authorized, adopted or ratified by Defendant and/or Defendant neither knew nor should have known of such conduct.

Freeman Mathis & Gary, LLP Attorneys at Law 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

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Violation of Public Policy)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant alleges Plaintiff's Complaint is barred because Plaintiff's termination was not caused, in whole or in part, by any conduct of Defendant in violation of public policy.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Legitimate Business Activity)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant exercised reasonable care to prevent any and all alleged discriminatory and retaliatory behavior in that Defendant at all relevant times had written policies prohibiting discrimination, harassment, and retaliation that were communicated to all employees and strictly enforced.

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Reasonable Care)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant exercised reasonable care to prevent any and all alleged discriminatory and retaliatory behavior in that Defendant at all relevant times had written policies prohibiting discrimination, harassment, and retaliation that were communicated to all employees and strictly enforced.

FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure to Utilize Complaint Procedures)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant alleges Plaintiff's Complaint is barred because Plaintiff failed to take advantage of any preventive or corrective opportunities provided by Defendant, including but not limited to Plaintiff's failure to utilize Defendant's complaint procedures in a timely manner if at all.

27

28

///

///

19

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

& Gary, LLP

FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Violation)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, Defendant alleges it acted in good faith and with reasonable grounds to believe its actions did not violate California Government Code Sections 12940 et seq., or any other law.

SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Consent)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant alleges Plaintiff, at all relevant times, gave her consent, express or implied, to the alleged acts, omissions and conduct of the Defendant.

SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Complaint Barred by Labor Code)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant alleges Plaintiff's Complaint is barred in whole or in part by Sections 2854, 2856, 2858, and 2859 of the California Labor Code, respectively, because Plaintiff failed to: (1) use ordinary care and diligence in the performance of her duties, (2) comply substantially with the reasonable directions of her employer, (3) exercise a reasonable degree of skill in performing her duties, and (4) perform her job duties in a proper and skillful manner.

EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(At-Will Employee)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant alleges Plaintiff's Complaint is barred because Plaintiff was an at-will employee.

NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Avoidable Consequences)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant alleges Plaintiff's Complaint is barred by the application of the avoidable

Freeman Mathis & Gary, LLP Attorneys at Law

this P 28

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

1	consequences doctrine because Defendant implemented appropriate policies and procedures,	
2	which Plaintiff failed to follow.	
3	TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
4	(Failure to Mitigate)	
5	In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged	
6	therein, Defendant alleges that even if Plaintiff has suffered damages or injuries, all or some	
7	portion of said damages or injuries were caused or attributable to Plaintiff's failure to take	
8	reasonable action to mitigate said injuries or damages.	
9	TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
10	(Unclean Hands)	
11	In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged	
12	therein, Defendant alleges Plaintiff is barred from any relief by the equitable doctrine of unclean	
13	hands.	
14	TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
15	(Waiver)	
16	In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged	
17	therein, Defendant alleges by Plaintiff's conduct, Plaintiff waived any right to recover any relief	
18	pursuant to her Complaint, or any purported cause of action alleged therein.	
19	TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
20	(Estoppel)	
21	In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged	
22	therein, Defendant alleges Plaintiff is estopped by her conduct from recovering any relief	
23	pursuant to her Complaint, or any purported cause of action alleged therein.	
24	TWENTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
25	(Laches)	
26	In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged	
27	therein, Defendant alleges Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrine of laches.	
28		

1	TWENTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
2	(No Exemplary or Punitive Damages)	
3	In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged	
4	therein, Defendant alleges Plaintiff has failed to state facts sufficient to state a claim on which	
5	an award of punitive damages or exemplary damages may be granted.	
6	TWENTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
7	(No Attorney's Fees)	
8	In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged	
9	therein, Defendant alleges Plaintiff failed to state facts sufficient to state a claim for which she is	
10	entitled to recover attorneys' fees.	
11	TWENTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
12	(No Basis for Costs)	
13	In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every action alleged therein,	
14	Defendant alleges Plaintiff has failed to state facts sufficient to state a claim on which an award	
15	of costs may be granted.	
16	TWENTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
17	(Not Motivating Factor)	
18	In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged	
19	therein, Defendant alleges in the event of Plaintiff proves any wrongful acts by the answering	
20	Defendant, the adverse employment actions about which Plaintiff complains would have been	
21	taken even if the alleged wrongful motive played no role.	
22	TWENTY-NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
23	(No Severe or Pervasive Conduct)	
24	In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged	
25	therein, Defendant alleges the conduct of which Plaintiff complains was not severe or pervasive.	
26		
27		
28		

THIRTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (Lack of Harm)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged

3 4

1

2

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

///

& Gary, LLP

therein, Defendant denies Plaintiff was harmed or offended by this answering Defendants' alleged conduct. **THIRTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

(Privilege)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action, even assuming arguendo statements were published by the Defendant, the substance of those statements were privileged.

THIRTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Complaint is Frivolous)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant alleges a reasonable opportunity for investigation and discovery will reveal and, on that basis alleges, Plaintiff's Complaint is frivolous under Section 128.7 of the Code of Civil Procedure, and notice is hereby given Defendant will seek an order awarding its expenses including attorneys' fees incurred herein, at the conclusion of litigation.

THIRTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(In Pari Delicto)

Defendant alleges Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of in pari delicto due to the conduct of Plaintiff.

THIRTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(After-Acquired Evidence)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant alleges Plaintiff's claims are barred due to the application of the After Acquired Evidence Doctrine, or alternatively, the Doctrine of After-Acquired evidence limits and reduces Plaintiff's alleged damages.

THIRTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

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

(Workers' Compensation Exclusion)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant allege Plaintiff's alleged damages for physical or emotional distress are preempted by the exclusivity of workers' compensation law as provided under the California Labor Code.

THIRTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Penalties Violate Due Process)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant alleges an award of penalties against them under the circumstances of this case would constitute an excessive fine and otherwise be in violation of Defendants' due process and other rights under the United States and California Constitutions.

THIRTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Emotional Distress/Personal Injury Damages)

Plaintiff has failed to state facts sufficient to state a claim for which she is entitled to recover emotional distress and/or personal injury damages.

THIRTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Unknown Defenses)

In answering Plaintiff's Complaint, and as to each and every cause of action alleged therein, Defendant presently has insufficient knowledge or information upon which to form a belief as to whether it may have any additional affirmative defenses available. Accordingly, Defendant reserves the right to assert additional defenses to the Complaint in the event further discovery or inquiry indicates that they are appropriate.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Defendant prays as follows:

- 1. That Plaintiff takes nothing from Defendant by this Complaint, and that the Complaint be dismissed with prejudice:
 - 2. That judgment be entered in favor of Defendant and against Plaintiff; and

Freeman Mathis & Gary, LLP Attorneys at Law

1	3. That Defendant be awarded costs of suit and reasonable attorneys' fees incurred herein.	
2		
3	Dated: April 18, 2024	FREEMAN MATHIS & GARY, LLP
4		
5		By: Inlie A Marquis
6		Julie A Marquis Jasmyne Shaw
7		Attorneys for Defendant REDWOOD EMPIRE FOOD BANK
8		RED WOOD ENHINE FOOD BINNE
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14 15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
I	11	

10
DEFENDANT REDWOOD EMPIRE FOOD BANK'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT

Freeman Mathis & Gary, LLP Attorneys at Law

1 2 3 4 5 6 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF MARIN

I am employed in the County of Marin, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 1010 B Street, Suite 400, San Rafael, CA 94901 and my electronic service address is Kimberly.basileu@fmglaw.com.

On April 18, 2024, I served the foregoing document(s) entitled:

DEFENDANT REDWOOD EMPIRE FOOD BANK'S ANSWER TO PLAINIFF'S COMPLAINT

on interested parties in this action by placing a true and correct copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:

Candice Clipner, Esq. 740 4th Street, 2nd Floor Santa Rosa, CA 95404 candice@clipnerlaw.com

Attorney for Plaintiff LISA CANNON

- (BY MAIL) I deposited such envelope(s) in the mail at San Rafael, California. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed as set forth above. I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at San Rafael, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.
- (BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE): Based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept electronic service, by transmitting a true and correct copy of the foregoing document(s) to be sent to the persons at the electronic service addresses set forth above.
- (BY ELECTRONIC MAIL) (COURTESY COPY): By Transmitting a true and correct copy of the foregoing document(s) to the e-mail address(es) set forth above.
- (State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on April 18, 2024, at San Rafael, California.

Kim Basileu

Freeman Mathis & Gary, LLP Attorneys at Law

28

22

23

24

25

26