

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

In re Flint Water Cases

Carthan v. Snyder
Case No: 5:16-cv-10444
(consolidated)

Honorable Judith E. Levy
United States District Judge

Magistrate Mona K. Majzoub

**DEFENDANT HOWARD D. CROFT'S
ANSWER, RELIANCE ON JURY DEMAND, AND AFFIRMATIVE
DEFENSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIFTH CONSOLIDATED AMENDED
CLASS COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF,
MONEY DAMAGES, AND JURY DEMAND [DKT. 1175-3]**

NOW COMES Defendant Howard D. Croft (“Mr. Croft”), by and through his attorney Alexander S. Rusek of White Law PLLC, and states that this Answer does not constitute a waiver of Mr. Croft’s Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment¹ rights under the United States Constitution nor his rights under Article 1, Section 17 of the Michigan Constitution in any way. Mr. Croft does not waive any rights in regards to this matter and he does not waive his rights in any other matters that are related in any way to these proceedings, including, but not limited to, Case No.: 16-TC2850-

¹ *Malloy v. Hogan*, 378 U.S. 1, 8; 84 S.Ct. 1389; 12 L.Ed.2d 653 (1964).

FY previously pending in the 67th District Court for the County of Genesee.

This Answer is filed pursuant to the Court's August 28, 2020 Order Regarding Matters Discussed at the August 26, 2020 Status Conference [Dkt. 1247]. Mr. Croft incorporates by reference all of his responses, except as set forth below, to the Plaintiffs' Fourth Consolidated Amended Class Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief, Money Damages, and Jury Demand [Dkt. 620-3] contained in his Answer, Reliance on Jury Demand, and Affirmative Defenses to Plaintiffs' Fourth Consolidated Amended Class Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief, Money Damages, and Jury Demand [Dkt. 1182]. Mr. Croft also incorporates by reference all previously asserted affirmative defenses and his reliance upon Plaintiffs' jury demand.

In recognition of the conditions and limitations set forth above, Mr. Croft states in Answer to Plaintiffs' Fifth Consolidated Amended Class Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief, Money Damages, and Jury Demand [Dkt. 1175-3] ("Complaint") as follows:

PARTIES

A. Plaintiffs

26. **Plaintiff Darnella Gaines**, on behalf of her minor child, K.C., is a 28 year old mother who resides in Flint, Michigan. Ms. Gaines' minor son, K.C., was born on July 26, 2011. From April 25, 2014 until approximately sometime in July

2015, Ms. Gaines and K.C. regularly used unfiltered water for drinking, cooking, bathing/showering, and clothes washing. After July 2015, Plaintiff continued to bathe, shower and wash clothes and dishes in unfiltered water. In addition to being exposed to high levels of lead during the timeframe that he consumed water, K.C. experienced hair loss and persistent skin rashes. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, K.C. has experienced serious physical injury due to his exposure to the toxic water, including, but not limited to, heightened levels of lead in his blood.

ANSWER: Mr. Croft lacks knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny the truth of the matters asserted in this paragraph. Mr. Croft denies that Plaintiff sustained the alleged injuries and damages described in this paragraph as a result of his conduct.

27. Plaintiffs Elnora Carthan, Rhonda Kelso, individually and on behalf of her minor child, K.E.K., Darnell and Barbara Davis, Michael Snyder, Marilyn Bryson, David Munoz, Tiantha Williams, individually and on behalf of her minor child, T.W., and Darnella Gaines, on behalf of her minor child, K.C., are referred to collectively herein as, "Individual Plaintiffs."

ANSWER: Mr. Croft admits that Plaintiffs have stylized their pleadings as set forth in this paragraph.

29. **Plaintiff 635 South Saginaw LLC (“South Saginaw LLC”)** is the owner of the restaurant “Cork on Saginaw,” which is located at 635 Saginaw Street in Flint Michigan. As the Flint Water crisis unfolded, Cork on Saginaw suffered a significant reduction in income due to the reluctance of restaurant patrons to purchase food and beverages at a restaurant located within the City of Flint that used Flint water. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ conduct described herein, South Saginaw LLC has suffered lost business income

ANSWER: Mr. Croft lacks knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny the truth of the matters asserted in this paragraph. Mr. Croft denies that Plaintiff sustained the alleged injuries and damages described in this paragraph as a result of his conduct.

31. Plaintiffs Frances Gilcreast, South Saginaw LLC, and Angelo’s Coney Island are referred to collectively herein as, “Business Plaintiffs.” The Business Plaintiffs and Individual Plaintiffs are referred to collectively as, “Plaintiffs.”

ANSWER: Mr. Croft admits that Plaintiffs have stylized their pleadings as set forth in this paragraph.

RESPONSE TO PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Mr. Croft requests that this Court enter judgment in his favor on all claims and award him an order for an award of reasonable attorney's fees and litigation expenses and denying an order for any other relief and deny Plaintiffs each and every element of relief requested in their Prayer for Relief, including but not limited to:

- a. Denying class certification under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 on all grounds and bases on which Plaintiffs' seek it;
- b. Denying any declaratory relief;
- c. Denying any injunctive relief;
- d. Denying appointment of a monitor;
- e. Denying an award of compensatory damages;
- f. Denying an order for an award of punitive damages;
- g. Denying an order for an award of exemplary damages;
- h. Denying an order for equitable relief;
- i. Denying an order for pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;
- j. Denying an order for an award of reasonable attorney's fees and litigation expenses; and
- k. Denying an order for any other relief.

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.