

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
URBANA DIVISION

BENJAMIN MANN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 14-2200
)	
CITY OF CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS,)	
et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ANSWER

NOW COMES the Defendant, POLICE OFFICER KRISTINA HAUGEN, in her individual capacity only, by her attorney, David E. Krchak of Thomas, Mamer & Haughey, LLP and in answer to the complaint in this matter, states as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. Defendant Haugen admits the allegations contained in paragraph 1 of Plaintiff's complaint.
2. Defendant Haugen admits the allegations contained in paragraph 2 of the complaint.

PARTIES

3. Defendant Haugen admits the allegations contained in paragraph 3.
4. Defendant KRISTINA HAUGEN admits the allegations contained in paragraph 4 as they relate to her.
5. Defendant Haugen admits the allegations contained in paragraph 5.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

6. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 6 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegation.

7. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 7 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegation.

8. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 8 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegation.

9. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 9 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegation.

10. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 10 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegation.

11. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 11 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegation.

12. Defendant Haugen admits that Officer Henry and Officer Rush were first to arrive at the scene, and neither admits nor denies the remainder of the allegations contained in paragraph 12 as she lacks sufficient knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

13. Defendant Haugen denies the allegations of paragraph 13.

14. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 14 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

15. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 15 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

16. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 16 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

17. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 17 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

18. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 18 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

19. Defendant Haugen denies that Plaintiff was never resisting, and denies that there is now or ever has been a conspiracy to cover up misconduct and further denies that the City of Champaign had any policy regarding failure to provide meaningful discipline or credible oversight of its officers. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies any remaining allegations contained in paragraph 19 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

20. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 20 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

21. Defendant Haugen admits that OC spray was administered to assist in subduing the aggressive Plaintiff. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the remainder of the allegations contained in paragraph 21 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

22. Defendant Haugen denies that there is or ever has been an attempt to cover-up any alleged misconduct as a result of this incident and neither admits nor denies the remainder of the allegations contained in paragraph 22 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

23. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 23 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

24. Defendant Haugen admits she arrived at the incident location at approximately 2:21 AM on March 16, 2014 and denies the remainder of the allegations of paragraph 24.

25. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies any allegations contained in paragraph 25 as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

26. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 26 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

27. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 27 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

28. Defendant Haugen denies the allegations of paragraph 28.

29. Defendant Haugen denies the allegations of paragraph 29.

30. Defendant Haugen denies that any officers intentionally omitted any pertinent information from any reports and neither admits nor denies any remaining allegations contained in paragraph 30 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

31. Defendant Haugen denies the allegations of paragraph 31.

32. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 32 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

33. Defendant Haugen denies the allegations of paragraph 33.

34. Defendant Haugen admits that one video shows Plaintiff being assisted by other officers to the police car and denies any remaining allegations of paragraph 34.

35. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 35 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

36. Defendant Haugen admits that Officer Epling transported Plaintiff to Carle Hospital emergency room prior to taking him to jail and denies any remaining allegations of paragraph 36.

37. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 37 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

38. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 38 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

39. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in paragraph 39 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

40. Defendant Haugen denies the allegations of paragraph 40.

41. Defendant Haugen neither admits nor denies the allegations about Plaintiff's stay in jail, his arraignment or bail as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations. Defendant Haugen denies all remaining allegation of paragraph 41.

42. Defendant Haugen denies the allegations of paragraph 42.

43. Defendant Haugen admits the case was dismissed by the state's attorney's office, and neither admits nor denies the remainder of the allegations contained in paragraph 43 of the complaint as she lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

COUNT I – 42 U.S.C. §1983: EXCESSIVE FORCE

44. Defendant Haugen provides the same responses to the above paragraphs re-alleged in Paragraph 44.

45. Defendant Haugen admits Plaintiff was seized during the early morning hours of March 16, 2014.

46. Defendant Haugen denies the allegations of paragraph 46.

47. WHEREFORE, Defendant KRISTINA HAUGEN prays that Count I of Plaintiff's complaint be dismissed with costs awarded.

COUNT II – FALSE ARREST

48. Defendant Haugen provides the same responses to the above paragraphs now realleged in paragraph 48.

49. Defendant Haugen denies each and every allegation contained in paragraph 49.

50. Defendant Haugen denies the allegations of paragraph 50.

51. Defendant Haugen denies the allegations of paragraph 51.

52. WHEREFORE, Defendant KRISTINA HAUGEN prays that Count II of the complaint be dismissed with costs.

COUNT III – FAILURE TO INTERVENE

Count III is subject to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

COUNT IV – 42 U.S.C. §1983: MUNICIPAL POLICY CLAIM

Count IV of Plaintiff's complaint does not make any allegations against Defendant Haugen and, hence, no response is provided.

COUNT V – MALICIOUS PROSECUTION
State Law Claim

Count V is subject to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

COUNT VI – INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS
State Law Claim

Count VI is subject to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

COUNT VII – CONSPIRACY
State Law Claim

Count VII is subject to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

COUNT VIII – RESPONDEAT SUPERIOR

Count VIII of Plaintiff's complaint does not make any allegations against Defendant Haugen and, hence, no response is provided.

COUNT IX – STATUTORY INDEMNIFICATION

Count IV of Plaintiff's complaint does not make any allegations against Defendant Haugen and, hence, no response is provided.

Respectfully submitted,

POLICE OFFICER KRISTINA HAUGEN

BY: THOMAS, MAMER & HAUGHEY, LLP

BY: _____

David E. Krchak, Bar No. 3127316
THOMAS, MAMER & HAUGHEY, LLP
30 Main St., Suite 500
P.O. Box 560
Champaign, IL 61824-0560
Phone: (217) 351-1500
Fax: (217) 351-2169

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

Defendant, POLICE OFFICER CHRISTOPHER HAUGEN, hereby asserts the following Affirmative Defenses to the allegations contained in the complaint:

1. This Defendant is entitled to qualified immunity and any action taken by her during the process of arresting Plaintiff as alleged in the complaint was objectively reasonable in light of the facts in front of her and, therefore, this Defendant is not liable.

2. In the exercise of her duties, the Defendant has immunity from prosecution under Section 2-202 of the Tort Immunity Act. 45 ILCS 10/2-202. These immunities protect her from the common law actions alleged in Plaintiff's complaint.

Respectfully submitted,

POLICE OFFICER KRISTINA HAUGEN

BY: THOMAS, MAMER & HAUGHEY, LLP
s/ David E. Krchak

BY: _____
David E. Krchak, Bar No. 3127316
THOMAS, MAMER & HAUGHEY, LLP
30 Main St., Suite 500
P.O. Box 560
Champaign, IL 61824-0560
Phone: (217) 351-1500
Fax: (217) 351-2169
krchak@tmh-law.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on November 7, 2014, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to Shneur Nathan.

s/ David E. Krchak

David E. Krchak, Bar No. 3127316
THOMAS, MAMER & HAUGHEY, LLP
30 Main St., Suite 500
P.O. Box 560
Champaign, IL 61824-0560
Phone: (217) 351-1500
Fax: (217) 351-2169
krchak@tmh-law.com