

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

DR. CHAD COFFMAN,	)	CASE NO.: 1:16-CV-02159
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	JUDGE: DAN POLSTER
	)	
vs.	)	<b><u>ANSWER OF DEFENDANTS PARMA</u></b>
	)	<b><u>CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF</u></b>
PARMA CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	)	<b><u>EDUCATION, CARL H. HILLING,</u></b>
BOARD OF EDUCATION, et al.,	)	<b><u>CASANDRA JOHNSON, KATHLEEN A.</u></b>
	)	<b><u>PETRO, LYNN HALLORAN, KAREN S.</u></b>
Defendants	)	<b><u>DENDORFER, ROSEMARY GULICK</u></b>
	)	<b><u>AND JOHN TENEROWICZ'S ANSWER</u></b>
	)	<b><u>TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT</u></b>
	)	
	)	
	)	<b><u>(Jury Demand Endorsed Hereon)</u></b>

Now come Defendants, Parma City School District Board of Education, Carl H. Hilling, Cassandra Johnson, Kathleen A. Petro, Lynn Halloran, Karen S. Dendorfer, Rosemary C. Gulick and John Tenerowicz, by and through counsel Mazanec, Raskin & Ryder Co., L.P.A., and for their answer to Plaintiff's Complaint state as follows:

1. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman's last known address was 3529 Delmar Drive, Rocky River, Ohio 44116 and was the principal at Parma Senior High School but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 1.
2. Defendants admit the allegations contained in Paragraph 2 of Plaintiff's Complaint.
3. Defendants admit Paragraph 3 of Plaintiff's Complaint to the extent that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is currently employed by the Board under a contract but deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 3 of Plaintiff's Complaint.
4. Defendants admit Paragraph 4 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

5. Defendants admit that Defendant Hilling is the male superintendent of the District, admit that Plaintiff has named him in his official and individual capacity, deny he was superintendent at all relevant times, but is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the statement regarding his residence as alleged in Paragraph 5 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

6. Defendants admit that Defendant Johnson is a black female who is the Human Resources Director for the Board and that Plaintiff has named her in her official and individual capacities but is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding her residence as alleged in Paragraph 6 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

7. Defendants deny whether or not Defendant Petro held the position at all relevant times and admit the remaining allegations in Paragraph 7 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

8. Defendants deny whether or not Defendant Halloran held the position at all relevant times and admit the remaining allegations in Paragraph 8 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

9. Defendants deny whether or not Defendant Dendorfer held the position at all relevant times admit the remaining allegations in Paragraph 9 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

10. Defendants deny whether or not Defendant Gulick held the position at all relevant times and admit the remaining allegations in Paragraph 10 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

11. Defendants admit Defendant Tenerowicz is a male member of the Board but state they are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 11 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

12. Defendants acknowledge that Plaintiff has referred to the Superintendent and the Board Members collectively as Defendants but state that the remaining statements in Paragraph 12 of Plaintiff's Complaint do not require a responsive answer from the Defendants.

13. Defendants admit that Defendant Matthew LaHue was an Assistant Principal at Parma High School but deny whether or not he held this position at all relevant times as alleged in Paragraph 13 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

14. Defendants admit that Defendant Yolanda Rodriguez Pettigrew was an Assistant Principal at Parma High School but deny whether or not she held this position at all relevant times as alleged in Paragraph 14 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

15. Defendants state they are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 15 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

16. Defendants admit that Richard Vanik was employed at Parma High School but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 16 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

17. Defendants state they are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 17 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

18. Defendants admit Paragraph 18 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

19. Defendants incorporate by reference all of the above answers contained in Paragraphs 1 through 18 in response to Paragraph 19 of Plaintiff's Complaint

20. Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraphs 20, 21, 22 and 23 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

21. Defendants incorporate by reference all of the above answers contained in Paragraphs 1 through 20 in response to Plaintiff's allegations in Paragraph 24.

22. Defendants admit that the Board entered into a contract of employment with Chad Coffman as a high school principal previous to his current contract but state they are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the specific dates as alleged in Paragraph 25 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

23. Defendants admit that the Board and Plaintiff Chad Coffman entered into a second contract of employment but state they are without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the specific dates as alleged in Paragraph 26 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

24. Defendants admit that Chad Coffman and the Board entered into a three (3) year contract of employment for high school principal but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 27 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

25. Defendants admit that the Board approved Coffman to serve as Interim Superintendent for a short period of time but state they are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the dates as alleged in Paragraph 28 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

26. Defendants state they are without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 29 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

27. Defendants admit that Hilling became Superintendent of the District but are without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the date alleged in Paragraph 30 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

28. Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 31 and 32 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

29. Defendants admit that the Board and the District renewed Coffman's Employment Agreement as a high school principal but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 33 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

30. Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 34 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

31. Defendants admit that Director Johnson took the position as Human Resources Director for the Board but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 35 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

32. Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraphs 36 and 37 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

33. Defendants admit that a grandmother for a student contacted Parma High School to say that her granddaughter was being bullied in the lunchroom by other Parma High School students but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 38 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

34. Defendants state they are without sufficient knowledge and information as to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 39 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

35. Defendants admit that someone spoke with the student and was told that mean things were being said to the student and that the student did not want anyone to know but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 39 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

36. Defendants admit that someone from Parma High School looked at a video of the lunchroom but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 40 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

37. Defendants admit that the grandmother came to school again and indicated that her granddaughter was still being harassed and that she knew the names of the students but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 41 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

38. Defendants admit that someone from Parma High School called in two students with a school counselor and explained that if there was any more contact that there would be serious consequences but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 42 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

39. Defendants admit that two students stated that an adult female made contact with them after school but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 43 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

40. Defendants admit that a school administrator received a call that students had been jumped but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 44 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

41. Defendants admit that a school administrator called Plaintiff Chad Coffman on his cell phone and apprised him of the situation after school but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 45 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

42. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman suggested that the administrator contact Rick Vanik and Dale Hillman to let them know the situation because it was after school hours but are without sufficient knowledge and information as to the title of their positions as alleged in Paragraph 46 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

43. Defendants admit that an administrator sent an e-mail to both individuals explaining the incident with the information available at the time but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 47 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

44. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 48 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

45. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman was made aware of two statements written by students that they had been jumped by a person and two adults and had been taken to the hospital after school but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 49 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

46. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 50 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

47. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman was called by Pettigrew to her office because a student, her mother and grandmother were present but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 51 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

48. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman was told that there was an incident after school but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 52 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

49. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman requested the mother and grandmother to take the student home for the day in order to review the police report but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 53 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

50. Defendants admit that the mother and grandmother inquired as to why the student had to go home and the other students were permitted to stay but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 54 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

51. Defendants admit Paragraph 55 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

52. Defendants deny Paragraph 56 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

53. Defendants admit that the grandmother stated she was going to see the Superintendent so Plaintiff Chad Coffman called Superintendent Hilling and shared the information he had gathered so far with him on the phone but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 57 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

54. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 58 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

55. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman received a police report indicating that two students were assaulted and that the police report included witness statements but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 59 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

56. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman met with Assistant Principal Pettigrew and shared the information regarding what had taken place and had instructed her to hold three suspension hearings for the three girls as alleged in Paragraph 60 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

57. Defendants admit that two of the hearings were for bullying and insubordination which would be a three-day suspension and one was for fighting which would be a ten-day suspension but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 60 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

58. Defendants are without sufficient and information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 61 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

59. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 62 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

60. Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 63 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

61. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 64 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

62. Defendants admit that a student came into the office and spoke with Assistant Principal Pettigrew and indicated that a number of her friends were posting things on social media about the fight and making fun of her for getting jumped and getting "her ass beat" but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 65 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

63. Defendants admit that a student indicated that someone had posted a video and that the student forwarded the video to Assistant Principal Pettigrew and stated that she did not know who posted the video but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 66 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

64. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 67 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

65. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman brought the complaint to Assistant Principal Pettigrew but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 68 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

66. Defendants state that are without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 69 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

67. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraphs 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, and 76 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

68. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 77 that the January 12, 2016 Administrative Leave of Absence letter included a statement that an investigation was being



performed and that Coffman was restricted to communications only with his District Supervisor and admit the remaining allegations in Paragraph 77 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

69. Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of allegations of Paragraph 78 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

70. Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 79 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

71. Defendants admit that the January 21, 2016 e-mail from Director Johnson indicated that the meeting in part concerned whether Plaintiff Chad Coffman had fulfilled his obligations thoroughly and appropriately document and investigate concerns in connection with a recent United States Department of Education Ohio for Civil Rights Region 15 investigation but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 80 of Plaintiff's Complaint that this was the sole issue for the meeting.

72. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman attended the investigative meeting in the Superintendent's office with the presence of Superintendent Hilling and Director Johnson and state they are without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 81 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

73. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 82 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

74. Defendants state they are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 83 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

75. Defendants state they are without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraphs 84, 85, 86, and 87 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

76. Defendants admit the allegations contained in Paragraph 88 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

77. Defendants state that the Board has provided substantial records and denies the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 89 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

78. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 90 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

79. Defendants admit that a meeting has not been scheduled with regard to Coffman's administrative leave, deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 91 of Plaintiff's Complaint and state that the Court has issued a stay of proceedings pursuant to an order issued on September 9, 2016.

80. Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 92 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

81. Defendants admit that Section 3139 of the Board Policies contains a Section concerning staff discipline but state the language included in Paragraph 93 is only a portion of the language contained in Section 3139 as alleged in Paragraph 93 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

82. Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraphs 94, 95 and 96 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

83. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman secured new counsel to represent him but deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 97 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

84. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge and information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraphs 98, 99 and 100 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

85. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraphs 101 and 102 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

86. Defendants incorporate all of the above Paragraphs 1 through 85 in response to Paragraph 103 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

87. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is attempting to bring a breach of contract action against the Board as alleged in Paragraph 104 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

88. Defendants admit that an employment contract exists between Plaintiff Chad Coffman and the Parma School Board but deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 105 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

89. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraphs 106 and 107 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

90. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 108 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

91. Defendants state they are without sufficient knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 109 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

92. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraphs 110 and 111 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

93. Defendants admit that on January 13, 2016 Plaintiff Chad Coffman sent an e-mail containing the quoted language in Paragraph 112 of Plaintiff's Complaint, but deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 112 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

94. Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraphs 113, 114, 115 and 116 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

95. Defendants admit the allegations contained in Paragraph 117 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

96. Defendants state that Ohio Revised Code §3319.02 speaks for itself and denies the allegations in Paragraph 118 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

97. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 119 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

98. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman's 2016 evaluation has not been completed but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 120 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

99. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraphs 121 and 122 in Plaintiff's Complaint.

100. Defendants incorporate all of the above Paragraphs 1 through 99 in response to Paragraph 123 of Plaintiff's Complaint as though fully rewritten herein. .

101. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is attempting to bring a cause of action pursuant to Chapter 2721 of the Ohio Revised Code as well as declaratory relief under federal law and federal civil procedure but state that these statements do not require a responsive answer from Defendants but deny Coffman is entitled to declaratory relief as alleged in Paragraph 124 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

102. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is attempting to bring an action against the Board as alleged in Paragraph 125 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

103. Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraphs 126, 127, 128 and 129 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

104. Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 130 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

105. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 131 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

106. Defendants incorporate all of the above Paragraphs 1 through 105 in response to Paragraph 132 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

107. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is attempting to bring a Section 1983 action and 1988 actions for violations of the United States Constitution but that these statements

do not require a responsive answer from Defendants as alleged in Paragraph 133 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

108. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is attempting to bring a claim against all Defendants jointly and severally but state that these statements do not require a responsive answer from Defendants as alleged in Paragraph 134 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

109. Defendants admit Paragraph 135 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

110. Defendants deny Paragraphs 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144 and 145 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

111. Defendants incorporate all of the above Paragraphs 1 through 110 in response to Paragraph 146 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

112. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is attempting to bring a claim pursuant to 42 U.S. §1985 Subsection 3 but that this statement does not require a responsive answer from Defendants as alleged in Paragraph 147 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

113. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is attempting to bring a claim against all Defendants jointly and severally but that this statement does not require a responsive answer from Defendants as alleged in Paragraph 148 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

114. Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraphs 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154 and 155 of Plaintiff's Complaint,

115. Defendants incorporate all of the above Paragraphs 1 through 114 in response to Paragraph 156 of Plaintiff's Complaint as though fully rewritten herein.

116. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 157 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

117. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is attempting to bring a claim against all Defendants jointly and severally but that this statement does not require a responsive answer from Defendants as alleged in Paragraph 158 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

118. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraphs 159, 160 and 161 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

119. Defendants state they are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 162 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

120. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraphs 163, 164 and 165 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

121. Defendants incorporate all of the above Paragraphs 1 through 120 in response to Paragraph 166 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

122. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 167 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

123. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is attempting to bring a claim against all Defendants jointly and severally but that this statement does not require a responsive answer from Defendants as alleged in Paragraph 168 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

124. Defendants deny Paragraphs 169, 170, 171, 172, 173 and 174 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

125. Defendants incorporate all of the above Paragraphs 1 through 124 in response to Paragraph 175 of Plaintiff's Complaint as though fully rewritten herein.

126. Defendants deny Paragraph 176 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

127. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is attempting to bring a claim against all Defendants jointly and severally but that this statement does not require a responsive answer from Defendants as alleged in Paragraph 177 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

128. Defendants admit that there is a contract between Plaintiff Chad Coffman and the Board but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 178 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

129. Defendants state they are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 179 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

130. Defendants deny Paragraphs 180, 182 and 183 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

131. Defendants incorporate all of the above Paragraphs 1 through 130 in response to Paragraph 184 of Plaintiff's Complaint as though fully rewritten herein.

132. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 185 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

133. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is attempting to bring a claim against all Defendants jointly and severally but that this statement does not require a responsive answer from Defendants as alleged in Paragraph 186 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

134. Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 187 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

135. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraphs 188, 189 and 190 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

136. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is at least 40 years but deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 191 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

137. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraphs 192, 193, 194, 195, 196 and 197 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

138. Defendants incorporate all of the above Paragraphs 1 through 137 in response to Paragraph 198 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

139. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is attempting to bring his claim pursuant to the Age Discrimination and Employment Act but that this statement does not require a responsive answer from Defendants as alleged in Paragraphs 199 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

140. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is attempting to bring this claim against the Board but that this statement does not require a responsive answer from Defendants as alleged in Paragraph 200 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

141. Defendant admits that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is at least 40 years old but deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 201 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

142. Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraphs 202, 203, 204 and 205 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

143. Defendants incorporate all of the above Paragraphs 1 through 143 in response to Paragraph 206 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

144. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is attempting to bring a claim against all Defendants jointly and severally but that this statement does not require a responsive answer from Defendants as alleged in Paragraphs 207 and 208 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

145. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is at least 40 years old but deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 209 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

146. Defendants deny Paragraphs 210, 212 and 213 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

147. Defendants incorporate all of the above Paragraphs 1 through 146 as though fully rewritten herein in response to Paragraph 214 of Plaintiff's Complaint.



148. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is attempting to bring a claim under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 but state that this statement does not require a responsive answer by Defendants as alleged in Paragraph 215 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

149. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman is attempting to bring his claim against the Board but that this statement does not require a responsive answer by Defendants as alleged in Paragraph 216 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

150. Defendants deny Paragraphs 217, 218, 219, 220, 221 and 222 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

151. Defendants incorporate all of the above Paragraphs 1 through 150 as though fully rewritten herein in response to Paragraph 223 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

152. Defendants admit that Plaintiff Chad Coffman made public records requests as alleged in Paragraph 224 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

153. Defendants deny Paragraphs 225, 226 and 227 of Plaintiff's Complaint.

### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

#### **FIRST DEFENSE**

154. Plaintiff fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted against these answering Defendants.

#### **SECOND DEFENSE**

155. Any actions taken by the Board and/or Defendants collectively or individually were justified and taken in good faith.

#### **THIRD DEFENSE**

156. No punitive damages can be awarded against the Board.

#### **FOURTH DEFENSE**

157. Defendants' actions at all times were based on reasonable factors other than age.

**FIFTH DEFENSE**

158. All actions taken by the Board or the individual Defendants were based on legitimate, non-discriminatory reasons.

**SIXTH DEFENSE**

159. The statute of limitations precludes all or some of Plaintiff's complaints or causes of actions.

**SEVENTH DEFENSE**

160. Plaintiff's state law claims for age discrimination are completely barred by the election of remedies doctrine.

**EIGHTH DEFENSE**

161. Plaintiff has failed to exhaust his administrative remedies and has available alternative remedies.

**NINTH DEFENSE**

162. Some or all of Plaintiff's claims are not ripe for adjudication.

**TENTH DEFENSE**

163. Defendants are not subject to any Section 1985(3) conspiracy claim because the claim is barred by the intracorporate conspiracy doctrine.

**ELEVENTH DEFENSE**

164. Defendants invoke the privileges, immunities and benefits provided to them in Ohio Revised Code Section 2744.

**TWELFTH DEFENSE**

165. Individual Defendants are entitled to qualified good faith immunity.

**THIRTEENTH DEFENSE**

166. Plaintiff Chad Coffman has not suffered an adverse employment action.

**FOURTEENTH DEFENSE**

167. Plaintiff Chad Coffman has no property right in continued employment.

**FIFTEENTH DEFENSE**

168. Plaintiff Chad Coffman has failed to elect his remedies for age discrimination under Chapter 4112 of the Ohio Revised Code.

**SIXTEENTH DEFENSE**

169. Defendants state that Plaintiff has no independent cause of action for age discrimination under 42 U.S.C. Section 1983.

**SEVENTEENTH DEFENSE**

170. Defendants reserve the right to amend this answer with additional defenses as further information is available through discovery.

WHEREFORE, having fully answered, Defendants pray that Plaintiff's Complaint be dismissed, and that they go hence without cost or delay.

Respectfully submitted,

MAZANEC, RASKIN & RYDER CO., L.P.A.

*s/Patricia A. Rubright*

\_\_\_\_\_  
TODD M. RASKIN (0003625)

PATRICIA A. RUBRIGHT (0009435)

100 Franklin's Row

34305 Solon Road

Cleveland, OH 44139

(440) 248-7906

(440) 248-8861 – Fax

Email: [traskin@mrrlaw.com](mailto:traskin@mrrlaw.com)

[prubright@mrrlaw.com](mailto:prubright@mrrlaw.com)

Counsel for Defendant s Parma City School District  
Board of Education, Carl H. Hilling, Cassandra  
Johnson, Kathleen A. Petro, Lynn Halloran, Karen  
S. Dendorfer, Rosemary C. Gulick and John  
Tenerowicz

**JURY DEMAND**

A trial by jury composed of the maximum number of jurors permitted under the law is hereby demanded.

*s/Patricia A. Rubright*

\_\_\_\_\_  
TODD M. RASKIN (0003625)

PATRICIA A. RUBRIGHT (0009435)

Counsel for Defendants Parma City School District Board of Education, Carl H. Hilling, Cassandra Johnson, Kathleen A. Petro, Lynn Halloran, Karen S. Dendorfer, Rosemary C. Gulick and John Tenerowicz

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on October 6, 2016, a copy of the foregoing Answer of Defendants Parma City School District Board of Education, Carl H. Hilling, Casandra Johnson, Kathleen A. Petro, Lynn Halloran, Karen S. Dendorfer, Rosemary Gulick and John Tenerowicz's Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint was filed electronically. Notice of this filing will be sent to all registered parties by operation of the Court's electronic filing system. Parties may access this filing through the Court's system.

*s/Patricia A. Rubright*

\_\_\_\_\_  
TODD M. RASKIN (0003625)

PATRICIA A. RUBRIGHT (0009435)

Counsel for Defendant s Parma City School District Board of Education, Carl H. Hilling, Cassandra Johnson, Kathleen A. Petro, Lynn Halloran, Karen S. Dendorfer, Rosemary C. Gulick and John Tenerowicz