

BROWN COUNTY

31001 – Small claims
Claim under dollar limit

2. In violation of §§ 802.05(2)(c) and(d), Defendant's Answer To Amended Complaint, Paragraph 4, alleging that Defendant lacks information or knowledge sufficient to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 8 of the Amended Complaint does not have and is not likely to have evidentiary support, and is not warranted and is not reasonably based on lack of information, as Defendant's Answer To Amended Complaint, Paragraph 3, specifically admits the allegations of Paragraph 8 of the Amended Complaint.

3. In violation of § 802.05(2)(d), Defendant's Answer To Amended Complaint, Paragraph 2, alleging that Defendant lacks information or knowledge sufficient to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 6 of the Amended Complaint is not warranted and is not reasonably based on lack of information, as the allegation contained in Paragraph 6 of the Amended Complaint relates specifically to the Defendant's actions.

4. In violation of §§ 802.05(2)(c) and (d), Defendant's Answer To Amended Complaint, Paragraph 2, alleging that Defendant lacks information or knowledge sufficient to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 7 of the Amended Complaint does not have and is not likely to have evidentiary support, and is not warranted and is not reasonably based on lack of information, as Defendant's Counterclaim, Paragraphs 9-11 confirm for the record Defendant's participation in the Agreement and knowledge of the specific allegations that are the subject of Paragraph 7 of the Amended Complaint.

5. In violation of §§ 802.05(2)(c) and(d), Defendant's Answer To Amended Complaint, Paragraph 4, alleging that Defendant lacks information or knowledge sufficient to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraphs 9, 10, 13 and 14 of the Amended Complaint does not have and is not likely to have evidentiary support, and is not warranted and is not reasonably based on lack of information, as Defendant's Counterclaim, Paragraphs 9-11, confirm for the record Defendant's participation in the Agreement and knowledge of the specific allegations that are the subject of Paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Amended Complaint.

6. In violation of § 802.05(2)(d), Defendant's Answer To Amended Complaint, Paragraph 4, alleging that Defendant lacks information or knowledge sufficient to admit or

deny the allegations contained in Paragraphs 16 and 18 of the Amended Complaint is not warranted and is not reasonably based on lack of information, as the allegation contained in Paragraphs 16 and 18 of the Amended Complaint relates specifically to the Defendant's actions.

7. In violation of § 802.05(2)(b), Defendant's Affirmative Defenses, Paragraph 3, alleging that Plaintiff's Amended Complaint is barred by the statute of limitations is not warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law.

Wherefore, Plaintiff Eunice Rodriguez respectfully requests the court enter an order imposing sanctions as the court deems appropriate, and an award of reasonable attorneys fees and costs.

Dated this 20th day of June, 2008.

Kevin W. Davidson
Attorney for Eunice Rodriguez
Wis. State Bar. No 1045344

DIRECT INQUIRIES TO:

Kevin W. Davidson
Davidson Law Office LLP
900 Laurel Lane
Kaukauna, WI 54130
(920) 750-1925
(920) 243-1638 facsimile

davidson@law-wi.us