EXHIBIT G

STATE OF NEW YORK
SUPREME COURT : COUNTY OF ORLEANS

③

_____

AB 524 DOE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Index No.: 21/47386

**LYNDONVILLE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT;
LYNDONVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**.

Defendants.

_____

DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO
PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT

Defendants, Lyndonville Central School District and Lyndonville
Elementary School, by and through their attorneys, Webster Szanyi LLP, as and for its
Answer to the Plaintiff's Complaint state as follows:

1.   The allegations contained in paragraph 1 of Plaintiff's Complaint
call for a legal conclusion that does not require an admission or denial, to the extent any
response is required, the Defendants deny knowledge or information sufficient to form a
belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore denies
the same.

2.   Deny knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
truth or falsity of the allegations contained in paragraph 2 of Plaintiff's Complaint and
therefore denies same.

3.   The allegations contained in paragraph 3 of Plaintiff's Complaint
call for a legal conclusion that does not require an admission or denial, to the extent any
response is required, the Defendants deny knowledge or information sufficient to form a

belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore denies the same.

4.   Admit the allegations contained in paragraph 4 of Plaintiff's Complaint insofar as Lyndonville Central School District is a public-school district located in the County of Orleans and State of New York and otherwise deny knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations insofar as the allegations are vague and ambiguous as to what times are considered material.

5.   Admit the allegations contained in paragraph 5 of Plaintiff's Complaint insofar as Lyndonville Elementary School is part of the Lyndonville Central School District and otherwise deny knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations insofar as the allegations call for a legal conclusion and are vague and ambiguous as to what times are considered material.

6.   Admit the allegations contained in paragraph 6 of Plaintiff's Complaint insofar as Terry E. Houseman was an employee of the Lyndonville Central School District for a period of time and otherwise deny knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations insofar as the allegations are vague and ambiguous as to what times are considered material.

7.   The allegations contained in paragraph 7 of Plaintiff's Complaint call for a legal conclusion that does not require an admission or denial, to the extent any response is required, the Defendants deny knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore denies the same.

8. The allegations contained in paragraph 8 of Plaintiff's Complaint call for a legal conclusion that does not require an admission or denial.

9. The allegations contained in paragraph 9 of Plaintiff's Complaint call for a legal conclusion that does not require an admission or denial, to the extent any response is required, the Defendants deny knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore denies the same.

10. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 10 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

11. Admit the allegations contained in paragraph 11 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

12. Deny knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in paragraph 12 of Plaintiff's Complaint and therefore denies same.

13. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 13 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

14. Deny knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in paragraph 14 of Plaintiff's Complaint and therefore denies same.

15. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 15 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

16. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 16 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

17. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 17 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

18. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 18 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

19. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 19 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

20. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 20 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

21. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 21 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

22. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 22 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

23. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 23 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

24. Deny the allegations contained in paragraph 24 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

25. Deny knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in paragraph 25 of Plaintiff's Complaint and therefore denies same.

26. Admit or deny the allegation set forth in paragraphs numbered 1 through 25 as previously admitted or denied.

27. The allegations contained in paragraph 27 of Plaintiff's Complaint call for a legal conclusion that does not require an admission or denial, to the extent any

DOCKET ALARM

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.