1 2	GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP GREGORY F. HURLEY (SBN 126791) STACEY L. HERTER (SBN 185366)	
3	650 Town Center Drive, Suite 1700 Costa Mesa, CA 92626	
4	Telephone: (714) 708-6500 Facsimile: (714) 708-6501	
5	Email: hurleyg@gtlaw.com	
6	herters@gtlaw.com	
7	Attorneys for Defendant CHIPOTLE MEXICAN GRILL, INC.	
8		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	MAURIZIO ANTONINETTI, JEAN	CASE NO.: 06CV-2671-LAB (POR)
12	RIKER, JAMES PERKINS, KAREN FRIEDMAN and MICHAEL	CLASS ACTION - Related to
13	RIFKIN, on behalf of themselves and	USDC No. 05 CV1660 J (WMc)
14	all other similarly situated,	
15	Plaintiffs,	CHIPOTLE MEXICAN GRILL INC.'S ANSWER AND
16	VS.	AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES
17	CHIPOTLE MEXICAN GRILL,	[DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL]
18	INC., a Colorado Corporation and DOES 1-10, Inclusive,	
19	Defendants.	
20		
21   22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

Defendant Chipotle Mexican Grill, Inc. answers the Complaint ("Complaint") in this action and admits, denies and alleges as follows:

- 1. Responding to Paragraph 1 of the Complaint, Chipotle asserts that the allegations in this paragraph constitute argument and legal conclusions to which no response is necessary, and on that basis Chipotle denies each and every allegation in this paragraph.
- 2. Responding to Paragraph 2 of the Complaint, Chipotle lacks the information and knowledge necessary to form a belief as to Plaintiffs' allegations, and on that basis denies the allegations.
- 3. Responding to Paragraph 3 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 4. Responding to Paragraph 4 of the Complaint, the Complaint speaks for itself. To the extent Plaintiffs' characterization of the Complaint is inconsistent with the Complaint, Chipotle denies the characterization.
- 5. Responding to Paragraph 5 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 6. Responding to Paragraph 6 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 7. Responding to Paragraph 7 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 8. Responding to Paragraph 8 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 9. Responding to Paragraph 9 of the Complaint, Chipotle admits that original jurisdiction in this Court appears to be appropriate pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1334.
- 10. Responding to Paragraph 10 of the Complaint, Chipotle admits only that venue appears to be appropriate in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c).

27

- 11. Responding to Paragraph 11 of the Complaint, Chipotle lacks the information and knowledge necessary to form a belief as to Plaintiffs' allegations, and on that basis denies the allegations.
- 12. Responding to Paragraph 12 of the Complaint, Chipotle lacks the information and knowledge necessary to form a belief as to Plaintiffs' allegations, and on that basis denies the allegations.
- 13. Responding to Paragraph 13 of the Complaint, Chipotle admits only that it is a Colorado corporation authorized to do business in California, but denies all remaining allegations.
- 14. Responding to Paragraph 14 of the Complaint, Chipotle lacks the information and knowledge necessary to form a belief as to Plaintiffs' allegations, and on that basis denies the allegations.
- 15. Chipotle incorporates its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 14 of the Complaint by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 16. Responding to Paragraph 16 of the Complaint, Chipotle lacks the information and knowledge necessary to form a belief as to Plaintiffs' allegations, and on that basis denies the allegations.
- 17. Responding to Paragraph 17 of the Complaint, Chipotle lacks the information and knowledge necessary to form a belief as to Plaintiffs' allegations, and on that basis denies the allegations.
- 18. Responding to Paragraph 18 of the Complaint, Chipotle lacks the information and knowledge necessary to form a belief as to Plaintiffs' allegations, and on that basis denies the allegations.
- 19. Responding to Paragraph 19 of the Complaint, Chipotle lacks the information and knowledge necessary to form a belief as to Plaintiffs' allegations, and on that basis denies the allegations.

- 20. Responding to Paragraph 20 of the Complaint, Chipotle lacks the information and knowledge necessary to form a belief as to Plaintiffs' allegations, and on that basis denies the allegations.
- 21. Responding to Paragraph 21 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 22. Responding to Paragraph 22 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 23. Responding to Paragraph 23 of the Complaint, Chipotle admits that Plaintiffs "seek" certain relief, but denies that they are entitled to any such relief and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph.
- 24. Responding to Paragraph 24 of the Complaint, Chipotle lacks the information and knowledge necessary to form a belief as to Plaintiffs' allegations, and on that basis denies the allegations.
- 25. Responding to Paragraph 25 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 26. Responding to Paragraph 26 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 27. Responding to Paragraph 27 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 28. Responding to Paragraph 28 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 29. Responding to Paragraph 29 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 30. Responding to Paragraph 30 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 31. Responding to Paragraph 31 of the Complaint, Chipotle lacks the information and knowledge necessary to form a belief as to Plaintiffs' allegations, and on that basis denies the allegations.

12

1314

15 16

17

18 19

2021

2223

2425

2627

- 32. Chipotle incorporates its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 31 of the Complaint by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 33. Responding to Paragraph 33 of the Complaint, the Americans With Disabilities Act speaks for itself. Chipotle denies Plaintiffs' characterization of the Act to the extent such characterization is inconsistent with the provisions of the Act.
- 34. Responding to Paragraph 34 of the Complaint, the Americans With Disabilities Act speaks for itself. Chipotle denies Plaintiffs' characterization of the Act to the extent such characterization is inconsistent with the provisions of the Act.
- 35. Responding to Paragraph 35 of the Complaint, the Americans With Disabilities Act speaks for itself. Chipotle denies Plaintiffs' characterization of the Act to the extent such characterization is inconsistent with the provisions of the Act.
- 36. Responding to Paragraph 36 of the Complaint, the Americans With Disabilities Act speaks for itself. Chipotle denies Plaintiffs' characterization of the Act to the extent such characterization is inconsistent with the provisions of the Act.
- 37. Responding to Paragraph 37 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 38. Responding to Paragraph 38 of the Complaint, Chipotle admits only that it is a public accommodation.
- 39. Responding to Paragraph 39 of the Complaint, Chipotle lacks the information and knowledge necessary to form a belief as to Plaintiffs' allegations, and on that basis denies the allegations.
- 40. Responding to Paragraph 40 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 41. Responding to Paragraph 41 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 42. Chipotle incorporates its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 41 of the Complaint by reference as though fully set forth herein.

1213

1415

1617

18 19

2021

2324

22

25

2627

- 43. Responding to Paragraph 43 of the Complaint, the Unruh Civil Rights Act speaks for itself. Chipotle denies Plaintiffs' characterization of the Act to the extent such characterization is inconsistent with the provisions of the Act.
- 44. Responding to Paragraph 44 of the Complaint, the Unruh Civil Rights Act speaks for itself. Chipotle denies Plaintiffs' characterization of the Act to the extent such characterization is inconsistent with the provisions of the Act.
- 45. Responding to Paragraph 45 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 46. Responding to Paragraph 46 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 47. Responding to Paragraph 47 of the Complaint, Chipotle lacks the information and knowledge necessary to form a belief as to Plaintiffs' allegations, and on that basis denies the allegations.
- 48. Responding to Paragraph 48 of the Complaint, Chipotle admits only that it is a business establishment.
- 49. Responding to Paragraph 49 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 50. Responding to Paragraph 50 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 51. Responding to Paragraph 51 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 52. Chipotle incorporates its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 51 of the Complaint by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 53. Responding to Paragraph 53 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 54. Responding to Paragraph 54 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.

10

12

13

16

15

17 18

19

21

22

20

23 24

25 26

27

- 55. Responding to Paragraph 55 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 56. Responding to Paragraph 56 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- Chipotle incorporates its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 56 of the 57. Complaint by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 58. Responding to Paragraph 58 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 59. Responding to Paragraph 59 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 60. Responding to Paragraph 60 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 61. Responding to Paragraph 61 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 62. Responding to Paragraph 62 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 63. Chipotle incorporates its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 62 of the Complaint by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- Responding to Paragraph 64 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all 64. allegations therein.
- 65. Responding to Paragraph 65 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 66. Responding to Paragraph 66 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.
- 67. Chipotle incorporates its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 66 of the Complaint by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- Responding to Paragraph 68 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all 68. allegations therein.

13

14 15

1617

18

19 20

21

2223

24

25

2627

 $_{28}$ 

69. Responding to Paragraph 69 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.

70. Responding to Paragraph 70 of the Complaint, Chipotle denies all allegations therein.

#### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

For a further answer to Plaintiffs' Complaint and by way of affirmative defenses, Chipotle alleges as follows:

# **FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

As a First Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that the Complaint and said causes of action fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

#### SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a Second Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that Plaintiffs failed subsequent to the occurrence described in the Complaint to properly mitigate their damages, if any, and thereby are precluded from recovering those damages which could have reasonably been avoided by the exercise of due care on their part.

## THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a Third Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that Plaintiffs voluntarily and with full knowledge of the matters referred to in the Complaint assumed any and all of the risk, hazards, and perils of the circumstances referred to in the Complaint and, therefore, assumed the risk of any injuries or damages sustained by said Plaintiffs, if any at all.

## **FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

As a Fourth Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that this incident was caused by the negligence and/or fault of other persons, corporations, and entities, whether named or not named in the Complaint, and that Chipotle's liability, if any, should be reduced accordingly.

# FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a Fifth Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that said Complaint is barred by the Statute of Limitations; including but not limited to, §§ 335.1, 337.1, 338, 339, 340, and 343 of the California Code of Civil Procedure.

#### SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a Sixth Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that if any injuries or damages were sustained by Plaintiffs, those injuries and damages were proximately caused and contributed to by Plaintiffs themselves. Any recovery to which Plaintiffs are entitled, if any, should be reduced by the amount proportionate to the amount by which Plaintiffs' fault contributed to the damages Plaintiffs allege they sustained.

### **SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

As a Seventh Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that in the event Chipotle prevails in this action, Chipotle shall be entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees for the defense of this matter under the provisions of the ADA and California Civil Code Sections 51, 52 and 54.

# EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As an Eighth Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that Chipotle's conduct was privileged because it was undertaken pursuant to the terms of the applicable laws, regulations, orders, and approvals relating to building construction and/or fire safety and public safety.

## **NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

As a Ninth Affirmative Defense, it is alleged that Plaintiff's Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, is barred by reason of the issuance by local building authorities of appropriate building permits and Certificates of Occupancy for said facilities.

234

5

6

7

9

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

2526

27

28

#### TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a Tenth Affirmative Defense, it is alleged that any and all injuries or damages, if any, suffered by Plaintiffs were caused, in whole or in part, by other persons or entities for whose acts or omissions Chipotle has no responsibility.

#### **ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

As an Eleventh Affirmative Defense, it is alleged that the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, is barred by reason of Chipotle's good faith reliance upon the advice of governmental agencies with respect to said facilities.

#### TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a Twelfth Affirmative Defense, it is alleged that the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein is barred because the relief demanded in Plaintiffs' Complaint would, if granted result in a fundamental alteration of Chipotle's services.

## THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a Thirteenth Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, because of their failure to name indispensable parties pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 19.

## FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a Fourteenth Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the equitable doctrine of waiver.

## FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a Fifteenth Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of equitable estoppel.

234

5

6

7 8

9

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

23

24

25

2627

28

### SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a Sixteenth Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of judicial estoppel.

### SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a Seventeenth Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of laches.

#### EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As an Eighteenth Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, because Chipotle was justified in acting as it did, in that Chipotle acted in good faith and in the lawful exercise of its legitimate rights in connection with all matters alleged in the Complaint.

## NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a Nineteenth Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, because the laws and regulations that Plaintiffs seek to enforce are unconstitutionally vague and/or unconstitutionally overbroad.

## TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a Twentieth Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, because Chipotle relied in good faith on the law as it existed at the time of the construction of the facilities at issue.

## TWENTY FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a Twenty First Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part by the doctrine of unclean hands.

3

45

6

8 9

10

11

12

13

1516

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

24

25

26

27

28

#### TWENTY SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a Twenty Second Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action, it is alleged that Plaintiffs' claims are barred as a matter of law because Plaintiffs lack standing to seek the relief they request.

#### TWENTY THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a Twenty Third Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, it is alleged that Plaintiffs' claims are barred as a matter of law because Plaintiffs failed to provide any notice to Chipotle regarding the relief demanded prior to filing this lawsuit.

#### TWENTY FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As a Twenty Fourth Affirmative Defense to the Complaint and each cause of action alleged therein, Chipotle reserves the right to amend this Answer to assert additional affirmative defenses as such additional defenses are discovered during the course of this case.

## WHEREFORE, Chipotle prays:

- 1. That the Complaint be dismissed with prejudice;
- 2. That Plaintiffs take nothing by way of their Complaint;
- 3. That Chipotle recovers its costs of suit, including attorneys' fees; and,
- 4. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

By s/Gregory F. Hurley

Gregory F. Hurley, Esq. Stacey L. Herter, Esq.

Attorneys for Defendant, CHIPOTLE MEXICAN GRILL, INC.

E-Mail: hurleyg@gtlaw.com

DATED: December 28, 2006

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** Chipotle hereby demands a trial by jury. DATED: December 28, 2006 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP By: s/Gregory F. Hurley
Gregory F. Hurley Stacey L. Herter Attorneys for CHIPOTLE MEXICAN GRILL, INC. E-Mail: hurleyg@gtlaw.com 

1 PROOF OF SERVICE 2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE COUNTY 3 I am employed in the aforesaid county, State of California; I am over the age of 18 4 years and not a party to the within action; my business address is 650 Town Center Drive, Suite 650, Costa Mesa, CA 92626. On the below date, I electronically filed the CHIPOTLE MEXICAN GRILL 6 INC.'S ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES with the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, using the CM/ECF System. The Court's CM/ECF System will send an email notification of the foregoing filing to the following parties and counsel of record who are registered with the Court's CM/ECF System: 9 10 Amy B. Vandeveld 11 Law Offices of Amy B. Vandeveld 1850 Fifth Avenue, Suite 22 San Diego, CA 92101 T: (619) 231-8883 13 F: (619) 231-8329 14 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 15 16 (BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE VIA CM/ECF SYSTEM) 17 In accordance with the electronic filing procedures of this Court, service has been effected on the aforesaid party(s) above, whose counsel of record is a registered 18 participant of CM/ECF, via electronic service through the CM/ECF system. 19 (FEDERAL) 20 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct, and that I am employed at the office of a member of the bar of this Court and at whose 21 direction the service was made. 22 23 Executed on December 28, 2006, at Costa Mesa, California. 24 25 26 27 28