AMENDED

Cross-Defendants.

1

12

10

13

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24

2526

27

28

Cross-defendants THE NATIONAL GRANGE OF THE ORDER OF PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY and EDWARD L. LUTTRELL hereby answer the unverified cross-complaint of ROBERT MCFARLAND as follows:

GENERAL DENIAL

Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 431.30, subdivision (d), Cross-defendants deny each and every allegation contained in the cross-complaint of Robert McFarland, including each of the causes of actions set forth therein, and deny that Robert McFarland has been damaged in any amount in either law or equity.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The cross-complaint of Robert McFarland, and each cause of action alleged therein, fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The cross-complaint of Robert McFarland, and each cause of action alleged therein, is uncertain under section 430.10, subdivision (f), of the Code of Civil Procedure.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The Superior Court of California lacks subject matter jurisdiction to determine the substantive issues of disagreement that should be decided internally through procedures established by the Constitution and Bylaws of the Order of the National Grange, of which the California State Grange is a constituent part, and Robert McFarland was elected its Master.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The cross-complaint, and each cause of action alleged therein, bars relief to Robert McFarland based upon the doctrine of waiver.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The cross-complaint, and each cause of action alleged therein, bars relief to Robert McFarland based upon the doctrine of consent, including to critique of his performance in office.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The cross-complaint, and each cause of action alleged therein, bars relief to Robert McFarland based upon the doctrine of estoppel.

9

7

12

10

15

22

28

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The cross-complaint, and each cause of action alleged therein, bars relief to Robert McFarland based upon the doctrine of laches.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The cross-complaint, and each cause of action alleged therein, bars equitable relief to Robert McFarland because he has failed to do equity and has unclean hands.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The cross-complaint, and each cause of action alleged therein, bars equitable relief to Robert McFarland because he has adequate legal remedies available and the balance of equities favor the National Grange and Edward L. Luttrell.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The cross-complaint, and each cause of action alleged therein, bars relief to Robert McFarland based upon his failure to mitigate its damages

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The cross-complaint, and each cause of action alleged therein, bars relief to Robert McFarland because provisions of the California Corporations Code, for which McFarland served as Master, allow a nonprofit California corporation to delegate its authority to a parent affiliate within the same organization and to be bound by a charitable trust as authorized by the bylaws.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The cross-complaint, and each cause of action alleged therein, bars damages relief to Robert McFarland based the doctrine of complete or partial set-off.

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The cross-complaint, and each cause of action alleged therein, bars relief to Robert McFarland because the statements made by the National Grange and Edward Luttrell were true and cannot be deemed defamatory.

FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The cross-complaint, and each cause of action alleged therein, bars relief to Robert McFarland because the statements made by the National Grange and Edward Luttrell were made without malice

j	
1	and are conditionally privileged as made on subjects of mutual interest under Civil Code section 47
2	subdivision (c).
3	FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
4	The cross-complaint, and each cause of action alleged therein, bars relief to Robert McFarland
5	because the statements made by the National Grange and Edward Luttrell were statements of opinion
6	rather than facts capable of being proved true or false.
7	SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
8	The cross-complaint, and each cause of action alleged therein, bars relief to Robert McFarland
9	because the statements made by the National Grange and Edward Luttrell did not violate his privacy
LO	and were justifiable critiques of his performance in office.
11	SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
12	The cross-complaint, and each cause of action alleged therein, bars relief to Robert McFarland
13	because the statements made by the National Grange and Edward Luttrell were intended to uphold the
14	discipline of the Order, not to gain competitive advantage or limit the economic opportunities o
15	McFarland.
16	PRAYER
17	WHEREFORE, Cross-defendants pray for judgment as follows:
18	1. Robert McFarland take nothing by way of its cross-complaint;
19	2. That the cross-complaint be dismissed;
20	3. For costs of suit;
21	4. For other proper relief.
22	Dated: May 23, 2013 PORTER SCOTT
23	A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
24	By Thoma & Revide
25	Martin N. Jensen
26	Thomas L. Riordan
27	

28

Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2012-00130439

3

1

2

4

5

6 7

8

10

11

13

15

14

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

ELLIS LAW GROUP

Sacramento, CA 95814

640 University Avenue, Suite 100

24

23

25

26 27

28

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I am a resident of the United States and of the County, of Sacramento, California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within above-entitled action. My business address is 350 University Avenue, Suite 200, Sacramento, California.

That on the date below, I served the following:

NATIONAL GRANGE AND EDWARD LUTTRELL'S ANSWER TO ROBERT MCFARLAND'S FIRST AMENDED CROSS-COMPLAINT

on all parties in the said action as addressed below by causing a true copy thereof to be:

BY MAIL. I am familiar with this Company's practice whereby the mail, after being placed in a designated area, is given the appropriate postage and is deposited in a U. S. mailbox in the City of Sacramento, California, after the close of the day's business.

BY PERSONAL SERVICE. I caused such document(s) to be delivered by hand to the office of the person(s) listed below

BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY. I caused the above-listed document(s) to be delivered by overnight delivery to the office of the person(s) listed below:

BY FACSIMILE. I caused the above-listed document(s) to be transmitted by facsimile transmission from (916) 927-3706 to the facsimile number listed below. The transmission was reported as completed and without error. A copy of the transmission report is attached. The transmission report was properly issued by the transmitting facsimile machine.

Attorneys for Robert McFarland
Attorneys for Defendants The California State Grange,
John Luvaas, Gerald Chernoff and Damian Parr
Mark Ellis

Robert D. Swanson
Daniel S. Stouder
BOUTIN JONES
555 Capitol Mall. Suite

555 Capitol Mall, Suite 1500 Sacramento, CA 95814

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at Sacramento, California, on 123, 2013.

Condy Cannon

5

RECEIVED IN DROP BOX

2013 MAY 23 PM 2: 43

GDUSC COURTHOUSE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO