

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
SUMMIT COUNTY, OHIO

MEMBER WILLIAMS,  Plaintiff,  vs.  KISLING, NESTICO & REDICK, LLC, <i>et al.</i> ,  Defendants.	Case No. CV-2016-09-3928  Judge Alison Breaux
<b>PLAINTIFFS' ANSWER TO DEFENDANTS' AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM</b>	

Plaintiffs Member Williams, Naomi Wright, and Matthew Johnson (“Plaintiffs”) answer the Amended Counterclaim of Defendants Kisling, Nestico & Redick, LLC (“KNR”), Alberto Nestico, and Robert Redick as follows:

1. Admit.
2. Admit.
3. Admit.
4. Admit.
5. Plaintiffs admit Wright and Johnson are residents of Summit County and former clients of KNR. Plaintiffs admit that Wright and Johnson terminated KNR’s representation. Plaintiffs deny all other allegations in Paragraph 5.
6. This paragraph incorporates previous paragraphs by reference and does not require additional response from Plaintiffs.

7. Plaintiffs admit KNR hired Robert Horton on or around February 20, 2012. Plaintiffs and that his responsibilities included providing legal services to KNR clients while complying with ethical rules generally applicable to all attorneys in the state of Ohio. Plaintiffs are otherwise without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 7.
8. Plaintiffs admit that Williams called KNR in or around September of 2013, spoke with Mr. Horton about her accident, and that KNR eventually agreed to represent her. Plaintiff is without sufficient information to otherwise admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 8.
9. Answering Paragraph 7 of Defendants' Counterclaim, Plaintiff admits that a KNR attorney explained to her that KNR would charge her expenses only if recovery was made on her behalf. Plaintiff denies that she agreed to participate in any "meeting" with any so-called "investigator." Plaintiffs are otherwise without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 9.
10. Plaintiff admits that Horton's employment with KNR ceased somewhere in or around 2015. Plaintiff is without sufficient information to otherwise admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 10.
11. Plaintiffs admit that Williams agreed to settle her personal injury claim, that she was provided with an itemized printout of all expenses, fees and payments that listed the so-called "investigator's charge" as the first expense item, and that she reviewed and signed the disbursement sheet, release and settlement check at KNR. Williams denies that she did so with informed consent as to the case expenses that KNR charged her, including the so-called "investigator's charge." Plaintiffs further state that Williams did ask questions and express objections as to her settlement and as to how KNR treated her and handled her case, but she does not recall whether she was asked if she asked such questions or expressed such

objections on the same occasion that she signed the settlement documents and are without sufficient information to otherwise admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 11.

12. Admit.

13. Plaintiffs admit that Williams and her attorneys knew that KNR's principal place of business was in Summit County, Ohio and that Williams filed her complaint in Cuyahoga County. Plaintiffs deny that Williams or her attorneys knew that all of the conduct giving rise to her claim arose in Summit and/or Medina County.

14. Deny.

15. Plaintiff admits that the Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas transferred venue to Summit County. Plaintiff is without sufficient information to otherwise admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 15 of Defendants' Counterclaim, as the Cuyahoga County Court did not state its reasons for transferring venue.

16. Plaintiffs admit that their attorneys posted a request on social media for assistance in finding more information about their claims, and further state that their request contained information that was entirely truthful and not "prejudicial" in any unlawful sense. Plaintiffs deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 16.

17. Plaintiffs admit that KNR and Nestico sent Williams' attorneys a letter falsely alleging defamation and requesting that Williams and her attorneys cease and desist and remove the posts about KNR from social media. Plaintiffs deny that the posts were defamatory or unlawful in any way, denies that they could "refuse" to cease and desist from defaming Defendants when they never defamed them in the first place, or that they could "refuse" to "remove defamatory posts" from social media when no defamatory posts were ever made in the first place. Plaintiffs further state that, in response to threats of litigation from Defendants' attorneys, their attorneys removed their post about KNR from Facebook and

Twitter to avoid pointless and frivolous litigation. Plaintiffs otherwise deny the allegations of Paragraph 17.

18. Deny.

#### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

19. This paragraph incorporates previous paragraphs by reference and does not require additional response from Plaintiffs.

20. The decisions cited in this Paragraph speak for themselves.

21. Deny.

22. Deny.

23. Deny

#### **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

24. This paragraph incorporates previous paragraphs by reference and does not require additional response from Plaintiffs.

25. Plaintiffs are without sufficient information to admit or deny Paragraph 25.

26. Plaintiffs admit that their Claims in this action were brought “in the proper forum and with probable cause” to redress damages incurred by the Plaintiffs and members of each Putative Class, and admit that Defendants deny the allegations in the Second Amended Complaint. Plaintiffs otherwise deny the allegations of Paragraph 26.

27. Deny.

28. Plaintiffs admit that their and their attorneys’ conduct in this lawsuit has been intentional in filing this lawsuit and pursuing the claims stated herein against Defendants. Plaintiffs otherwise deny the allegations of Paragraph 28.

29. Plaintiffs deny that they or their attorneys have engaged in any misconduct or that they have otherwise ratified any misconduct.

30. Deny.

31. Deny.

### **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

32. This paragraph incorporates previous paragraphs by reference and does not require additional response from Plaintiffs.

33. Plaintiffs lack sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 33.

34. Plaintiff denies that she or her attorneys have comprehensive knowledge of Defendants' business relationships (constructive or otherwise), but admits that she and her attorneys know that KNR and Nestico have business relationships and that businesses generally intend to maintain a good reputation to obtain new clients.

35. Deny.

36. Deny.

37. Plaintiffs deny that they or their attorneys have engaged in any misconduct or that they have otherwise ratified any misconduct.

38. Deny.

39. Deny.

40. Deny.

### **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

41. This paragraph incorporates previous paragraphs by reference and does not require additional response from Plaintiffs.

42. Deny.

43. Plaintiffs deny that they or their attorneys have engaged in any misconduct or that they have otherwise ratified any misconduct.

44. Deny.

45. Answering Paragraph 45 of Defendants' Counterclaim, Plaintiff denies that she or her attorneys have made any false and misleading statements, and denies that any statements made by herself or her attorneys have harmed or will harm the general public. Plaintiff admits that the public has an interest in being free from mistake and deception. Plaintiff is without sufficient information to otherwise admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 45.

46. Deny.

47. Deny.

48. Deny.

49. Deny.

50. Deny.

51. Deny.

52. Deny.

#### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

1. Counterclaimants fail to state claims for which relief can be granted.
2. Counterclaimants claims are barred by the doctrines of laches, waiver, estoppel, equitable estoppel, fraud or illegality, unclean hands, accord and satisfaction, and release.
3. Any alleged injury claimed by Counterclaimants was due to their own acts or omissions, their own breach of thier duties to their clients, and caused by persons other than Plaintiffs.

Dated: August 3, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

THE CHANDRA LAW FIRM, LLC

/s/ Peter Pattakos

Subodh Chandra (0069233)

Donald Screen (00440770)

Peter Pattakos (0082884)

1265 W. 6<sup>th</sup> St., Suite 400

Cleveland, OH 44113-1326

216.578.1700 Phone

216.578.1800 Fax

Subodh.Chandra@ChandraLaw.com

Donald.Screen@ChandraLaw.com

Peter.Pattakos@ChandraLaw.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Member Williams*

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The foregoing document was served on all necessary parties by operation of the Court's e-filing system on August 3, 2017.

/s/ Peter Pattakos

*One of the Attorneys for Plaintiff*