

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

Susan Doxtator, Arlie Doxtator, and
Sarah Wunderlich, as Special
Administrators of the Estate of Jonathon
C. Tubby,

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 19-CV-00137

v.

Erik O'Brien, Andrew Smith, Todd J.
Delain, Heidi Michel, City of Green
Bay, Brown County, Joseph P. Mleziva,
Nathan K. Winisterfer, Thomas Zeigle,
Bradley A. Dernbach, and John Does 1-
5,

Defendants.

**DEFENDANT BRADLEY A. DERNBACH'S ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE
DEFENSES TO PLAINTIFFS' AMENDED COMPLAINT (ECF NO. 22)**

NOW COMES the above-named Defendant, Bradley A. Dernbach (also referred to herein collectively as "Defendants" and/or "County Defendants," as referenced in ECF No. 38), by his attorneys, Crivello Carlson, S.C., and as and for his Answer and Affirmative Defenses to the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint dated March 5, 2019, hereby admits, denies, alleges, and shows to the Court as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Answering paragraph 1 of the Amended Complaint, deny Plaintiffs' description is either complete or correct; as further answer, Defendants deny any allegation of improper

conduct and affirmatively allege that Tubby's rights were not violated or infringed by the County Defendants.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. Answering paragraph 2 of the Amended Complaint, deny Plaintiffs' description is either complete or correct; as further answer, Defendants deny any allegation of improper conduct and affirmatively allege that Tubby's rights were not violated or infringed by the County Defendants.

3. Answering paragraph 3 of the Amended Complaint, admit.

4. Answering paragraph 4 of the Amended Complaint, admit.

PARTIES

5. Answering paragraph 5 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

6. Answering paragraph 6 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

7. Answering paragraph 7 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

8. Answering paragraph 8 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

9. Answering paragraph 9 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

10. Answering paragraph 10 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

11. Answering paragraph 11 of the Amended Complaint, admit that Todd J. Delain is Brown County's Sheriff and acts, and has acted, in the course and scope of his office and authority, consistent with the laws of the State of Wisconsin and the United States Constitution; as further answer, Defendants deny any allegation of improper conduct and affirmatively allege that Tubby's rights were not violated or infringed by the County Defendants; as further answer to any remaining allegations, deny Plaintiffs' description is either complete or correct.

12. Answering paragraph 12 of the Amended Complaint, admit that Heidi Michel is the Jail Administrator for the Brown County Jail and acts, and has acted, in the course and scope of her office and authority, consistent with the laws of the State of Wisconsin and the United States Constitution; as further answer, Defendants deny any allegation of improper conduct and affirmatively allege that Tubby's rights were not violated or infringed by the County Defendants; as further answer to any remaining allegations, deny Plaintiffs' description is either complete or correct.

13. Answering paragraph 13 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

14. Answering paragraph 14 of the Amended Complaint, admit that Brown County is a municipal entity in the State of Wisconsin and that Brown County maintains and operates the Brown County Sheriff's Department, which, in turn, maintains and operates the Brown County Jail; as further answer, Defendants deny any allegation of improper conduct and affirmatively allege that Tubby's rights were not violated or infringed by the County Defendants.

15. Answering paragraph 15 of the Amended Complaint, admit that Joseph P. Mleziva and Nathan K. Winisterfer are Deputy Brown County Sheriffs and act, and have acted, in the course and scope of their offices and authorities, consistent with the laws of the State of Wisconsin and the United States Constitution; as further answer, Defendants deny any allegation of improper conduct and affirmatively allege that Tubby's rights were not violated or infringed by the County Defendants; as further answer to any remaining allegations, deny Plaintiffs' description is either complete or correct.

16. Answering paragraph 16 of the Amended Complaint, admit that Thomas Zeigle is a Patrol Lieutenant with the Brown County Sheriff's Office and acts, and has acted, in the course and scope of his office and authority, consistent with the laws of the State of Wisconsin and the United States Constitution; as further answer, Defendants deny any allegation of improper conduct and affirmatively allege that Tubby's rights were not violated or infringed by the County Defendants; as further answer to any remaining allegations, deny Plaintiffs' description is either complete or correct.

17. Answering paragraph 17 of the Amended Complaint, deny. Affirmatively allege that Bradley A. Dernbach was a member of the Brown County Sheriff's Office at all times relevant to the Amended Complaint and that he acts, and has acted, in the course and scope of his office and authority, consistent with the laws of the State of Wisconsin and the United States

Constitution; as further answer, Defendants deny any allegation of improper conduct and affirmatively allege that Tubby's rights were not violated or infringed by the County Defendants; as further answer to any remaining allegations, deny Plaintiffs' description is either complete or correct.

18. Answering paragraph 18 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

19. Answering paragraph 19 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

20. Answering paragraph 20 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

21. Answering paragraph 21 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

22. Answering paragraph 22 of the Amended Complaint, admit that, upon arrival at the jail, Tubby refused to exit the police squad car; as further answer, admit that more than one police officer and sheriff's deputies responded to the "sally port" of the jail; as further answer, admit that, in general terms, the "sally port" is a secured entryway of the jail, where arrestees are transported from a squad car into the jail itself; as further answer to any remaining allegations, deny Plaintiffs' description is either complete or correct.

23. Answering paragraph 23 of the Amended Complaint, deny Plaintiffs' description is either complete or correct.

24. Answering paragraph 24 of the Amended Complaint, deny.

25. Answering paragraph 25 of the Amended Complaint, deny Plaintiffs' description is either complete or correct.

26. Answering paragraph 26 of the Amended Complaint, deny.

27. Answering paragraph 27 of the Amended Complaint, admit that, at all times relevant to the Amended Complaint, the County Defendants acted in the course and scope of their offices and authorities, consistent with the laws of the State of Wisconsin and the United States Constitution.

COUNT I—Unconstitutional Use of Deadly Force—42 U.S.C. § 1983
(Against Officer O'Brien)

28. Answering paragraph 28 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants state, reallege and incorporate by reference as though set forth fully herein their answers to paragraphs 1 through 27 above and the affirmative defenses herein.

29. Answering paragraph 29 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

30. Answering paragraph 30 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

31. Answering paragraph 31 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

32. Answering paragraph 32 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

33. Answering paragraph 33 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

34. Answering paragraph 34 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

COUNT II—Failure to Intervene—42 U.S.C. § 1983
(Against Mleziva, Winisterfer, Zeigle, Dernbach, and John Does 1-5)

35. Answering paragraph 35 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants state, reallege and incorporate by reference as though set forth fully herein their answers to paragraphs 1 through 34 above and the affirmative defenses herein.

36. Answering paragraph 36 of the Amended Complaint, deny Plaintiffs' description is either complete or correct.

37. Answering paragraph 37 of the Amended Complaint, deny.

38. Answering paragraph 38 of the Amended Complaint, deny.

39. Answering paragraph 39 of the Amended Complaint, deny.

40. Answering paragraph 40 of the Amended Complaint, deny.

41. Answering paragraph 41 of the Amended Complaint, admit that, at all times relevant to the Amended Complaint, the County Defendants acted in the course and scope of their offices and authorities, consistent with the laws of the State of Wisconsin and the United States Constitution; as further answer to any remaining allegations, deny.

42. Answering paragraph 42 of the Amended Complaint, deny.

43. Answering paragraph 43 of the Amended Complaint, deny.

44. Answering paragraph 44 of the Amended Complaint, deny.

COUNT III—Failure to Train—42 U.S.C. § 1983
(Against Defendants Smith, Delain, Michel, City of Green Bay, and Brown County)

45. Answering paragraph 45 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants state, reallege and incorporate by reference as though set forth fully herein their answers to paragraphs 1 through 44 above and the affirmative defenses herein.

46. Answering paragraph 46 of the Amended Complaint, deny.

47. Answering paragraph 47 of the Amended Complaint, deny Plaintiffs' description is either complete or correct.

48. Answering paragraph 48 of the Amended Complaint, deny Plaintiffs' description is either complete or correct.

49. Answering paragraph 49 of the Amended Complaint, deny.

50. Answering paragraph 50 of the Amended Complaint, deny.

COUNT IV—Failure to Supervise—42 U.S.C. § 1983
(Against Defendants Smith, Delain, Michel, City of Green Bay, and Brown County)

51. Answering paragraph 51 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants state, reallege and incorporate by reference as though set forth fully herein their answers to paragraphs 1 through 50 above and the affirmative defenses herein.

52. Answering paragraph 52 of the Amended Complaint, deny.

53. Answering paragraph 53 of the Amended Complaint, deny Plaintiffs' description is either complete or correct.

54. Answering paragraph 54 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these allegations and therefore deny them, putting Plaintiffs to their proof thereon.

55. Answering paragraph 55 of the Amended Complaint, deny Plaintiffs' description is either complete or correct.

56. Answering paragraph 56 of the Amended Complaint, deny.

57. Answering paragraph 57 of the Amended Complaint, deny.

58. Answering paragraph 58 of the Amended Complaint, deny.

COUNT V—Direct Action—Wis. Stat. § 895.46
(Against City of Green Bay)

59. Answering paragraph 59 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants state, reallege and incorporate by reference as though set forth fully herein their answers to paragraphs 1 through 58 above and the affirmative defenses herein.

60. Answering paragraph 60 of the Amended Complaint, these allegations are not directed to the County Defendants and therefore no answer is required.

COUNT VI—Direct Action—Wis. Stat. § 895.46
(Against Brown County)

61. Answering paragraph 61 of the Amended Complaint, Defendants state, reallege and incorporate by reference as though set forth fully herein their answers to paragraphs 1 through 60 above and the affirmative defenses herein.

62. Answering paragraph 62 of the Amended Complaint, admit.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

As and for affirmative defenses to Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Bradley A. Dernbach submits the following:

- a. The injuries and damages sustained by Plaintiffs were caused in whole or in part by the acts or omissions of Plaintiffs and/or Jonathon C. Tubby, and the failure to mitigate;
- b. The injuries and damages sustained by Plaintiffs were caused in whole or in part by the acts or omissions of persons other than the County Defendants;
- c. Plaintiffs cannot establish that any acts or non-acts of the County Defendants caused Tubby's constitutional deprivations, if any;
- d. The Amended Complaint contains allegations that fail to state claims upon which relief may be granted as against the County Defendants;
- e. The County Defendants are immune from suit by immunities including qualified immunity and discretionary immunity;
- f. Plaintiffs have failed to state claims for and are not legally entitled to compensatory damages;
- g. Plaintiffs have failed to state claims for and are not legally entitled to punitive damages;
- h. Plaintiffs have failed to state claims for and are not legally entitled to injunctive relief;
- i. Any injuries or damages sustained by Plaintiffs are the result of an intervening and/or superseding cause preventing Plaintiffs any rights of recovery against the County Defendants;

- j. Plaintiffs may have failed to exhaust administrative remedies before pursuing this action as required by statute or common law;
- k. Plaintiffs may have failed to name necessary and indispensable parties;
- l. To the extent Plaintiffs are intend to bring state law claims, those claims are and will be subject to limitations, requirements, caps and immunities in Wis. Stat. §§ 893. 80, 893.82;
- m. At all times relevant to matters alleged in Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, the County Defendants acted in good faith, in accordance with established laws and administrative rules;
- n. No individual Defendant can be found liable for the actions of any other individual defendant(s) under a theory of *respondeat superior*, or supervisory liability;
- o. All or portions of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint must be dismissed because one or more Defendants had no personal involvement whatsoever in the events leading to or surrounding the incident which is the basis of this lawsuit;
- p. Defendants reserve the right to name additional affirmative defenses, as they may become known through further discovery or other in this action.

WHEREFORE, Defendant, Bradley A. Dernbach, respectfully requests the following relief:

- 1. for a dismissal of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint upon its merits and with prejudice;
- 2. for the costs and disbursements of this action;
- 3. for reasonable actual attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988; and
- 4. for such other relief as this Court deems just and equitable.

DEFENDANTS HEREBY DEMAND A JURY OF 6

Dated this 5th day of April, 2019.

CRIVELLO CARLSON, S.C.

Attorneys for Defendants Todd J. Delain, Heidi Michel,
Brown County, Joseph P. Mleziva, Nathan K. Winisterfer,
Thomas Zeigle, and Bradley A. Dernbach

BY: s/ Benjamin A. Sparks

SAMUEL C. HALL, JR.

State Bar No. 1045476

BENJAMIN A. SPARKS

State Bar No. 1092405

PO ADDRESS:

710 N. Plankinton Avenue, Suite 500

Milwaukee, WI 53203

Phone: 414-271-7722

Fax: 414-271-4438

Email: shall@crivellocarlson.com

Email: bsparks@crivellocarlson.com

PROOF OF SERVICE – ELECTRONIC FILING

The undersigned hereby certifies that this document was filed electronically this 5th day of April, 2019. Notice of this filing will be sent to counsel of record at the email addresses registered by them with the Court by operation of the Court's electronic filing system. If not registered with the Court, a copy of this document will be sent via U.S. Mail and/or email this date.

s/Electronically signed by Linda M. Brent