1 2	Joseph Romano, In Pro Per 4723 Muirfield Court Santa Rosa, CA 95405 Telephone: (707) 542-2224		
3	Facsimile: (707) 542-2227		
4	Philip J. Terry, Esq. (SBN 148144) (Attorney for Plaintiff with limited scope) Samantha Pungprakearti, Esq. (SBN 264919)		
5	CARLE, MACKIE, POWER & ROSS, LLP 100 B Street, Suite 400		
6	Santa Rosa, California 95401 Telephone: (707) 526-4200		
7	Facsimile: (707) 526-4707		
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
9			
10	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA		
11	COUNTY OF SONOMA		
12	JOSEPH ROMANO, individually and as	Case No: SCV-262714	
13	trustee of the JOSEPH AND PIXIE ROMANO LIVING TRUST,	(Unlimited Civil)	
14	Plaintiff,	ANSWER TO CROSS-COMPLAINT	
15	v.	Action Filed: June 29, 2018 Trial date: August 23, 2019	
16 17	FAIRWAY VIEW ESTATES HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION; and DOES 1-20, inclusive,	Assigned Judge: Arthur A. Wick	
		Dept.: 17	
18	Defendants.		
19	AND RELATED CROSS-ACTION		
20			
21			
22	Plaintiff and Cross-Defendant JOSEPH ROMANO, individually and as trustee of the		
23	JOSEPH AND PIXIE ROMANO LIVING TRUST, (hereinafter "Cross-Defendant"), submits		
24	this Answer to Defendant and Cross-Complainant FAIRWAY VIEW ESTATES		
25	HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION's (hereinafter "Cross-Complainant") unverified Cross-		
26	Complaint.		
27	///		
28	111		
CARLE, MACKIE, POWER & ROSS LLP		1	
	ANSWER TO CROSS-COMPLAINT		

GENERAL DENIAL 1 Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 431.30, Cross-Defendant 2 generally denies each and every material allegation contained in Cross-Complainant's unverified 3 Cross-Complaint, and each and every cause of action thereof, and Cross-Defendant specifically 4 denies that Cross-Complainant has been injured or damaged in any sum, or at all by reason of an 5 act or omission on the part of Cross-Defendant. 7 AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES As separate affirmative defenses to the Cross-Complaint, Cross-Defendant further alleges 8 as follows: 10 FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 11 (Failure to State a Cause of Action) The Cross-Complaint and each cause of action therein fails to state facts sufficient to 12 constitute viable causes of action against Cross-Defendant. 13 SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 14 15 (Statute of Limitations) The Cross-Complaint and each cause of action and remedy sought therein is barred by the 16 applicable statute of limitations, including but not limited to, California Code of Civil Procedure 17 sections 336(b), 337, 338(a), 339(1), and 340. 18 THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 19 (Good Faith) 20 21 The Cross-Complaint and each cause of action and remedy sought therein is barred because Cross-Defendant acted in good faith and did not directly or indirectly intend to perform 22 any acts whatsoever which would constitute a violation of any local, state or federal laws, or 23 governing documents, including covenants or rules of Cross-Complainant. 24 FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 25 26 (Failure to Mitigate) Cross-Complainant, through the exercise of reasonable effort, could have mitigated its 27 damages, if any, and the resulting damages, if any, were directly and proximately caused by CARLE, MACKIE, POWER & ROSS LLP

ANSWER TO CROSS-COMPLAINT

1	Cross-Complainant's failure, neglect and refusal to exercise reasonable effort to mitigate its		
2	alleged damages. By way of example, Cross-Complainant knew or should have known that		
3	Cross-Defendant's improvements allegedly encroached on the common area many years ago, bu		
4	failed and refused to raise this claim previously.		
5	<u>FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE</u>		
6	(Laches)		
7	The Cross-Complaint, and each cause of action therein, is barred by the doctrine of		
8	laches. Cross-Complainants unreasonably, and without excuse, delayed in filing the claims		
9	alleged, and implicitly acquiesced to the alleged conduct, causing undue prejudice to Cross-		
10	Defendant.		
11	SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
12	(Unclean Hands)		
13	The Cross-Complaint and each cause of action and remedy sought therein is barred by the		
14	doctrine of unclean hands to the extent that it has knowingly violated the law, and governing		
15	documents, covenants and rules in an attempt to pressure Cross-Defendant into submission.		
16	SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
17	(Consent)		
18	The Cross-Complaint and each cause of action and remedy sought therein is barred		
19	because Cross-Complainant consented, either expressly or impliedly, to any such acts or conduct		
20	as may be shown on the part of Cross-Defendant. This includes, but is not limited to, Cross-		
21	Complainant's failure to raise the alleged issues of encroachment and failure to abide by rules for		
22	the last nine years.		
23	EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
24	(Estoppel)		
25	The Cross-Complaint and each cause of action and remedy sought therein is barred due to		
26	Cross-Complainant's conduct, including its failure to notify Cross-Defendant or any prior owner		
27	that the property allegedly encroaches on the common area, or that the property has alleged		
28	improvements that violate the governing documents was reasonably relied upon by Cross-		
e II			

CARLE, MACKIE, POWER & ROSS LLP

Defendant to his detriment. Therefore, Cross-Complainant must be estopped from asserting its 1 2 alleged claims. NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 3 (Waiver) 4 5 The Cross-Complaint and each cause of action therein is barred by the equitable doctrine of waiver. Cross-Complainant waived its right to enforce any alleged rights in the governing documents that are not alleged to have been violated, when it freely and knowingly chose not to 7 8 enforce those rules on Cross-Defendant and other residents during the past nine years. 9 TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 10 (Bad Faith) The Cross-Complaint and each cause of action therein is barred by the doctrine of bad 11 faith and/or selective enforcement. Cross-Complainant cannot enforce its governing documents in an arbitrary or capricious manner. The alleged violations asserted in the Cross-Complaint are 13 not enforced against other owners and do not pose a threat to the use or enjoyment of the other 14 15 properties in the community. ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 16 17 (Changed Circumstances) 18 The Cross-Complaint and each cause of action therein is barred by the equitable doctrine of changed circumstances. Cross-Complainant cannot enforce its governing documents when the 19 20 change in the surrounding circumstances substantially frustrates the purpose of the covenant. By way of example, the fact that Cross-Defendant's property has been merged between two parcels. 21 22 The alleged offending improvements are not near any other properties such that they would cause a threat to the use or enjoyment of the other residents. Plus, the Cross-Complainants have 23 permitted substantial improvements on most other residents' properties such that the community has operated without conforming to the strict requirements described in the governing 25 documents. 26 111 28

CARLE, MACKIE, POWER & ROSS LLP

1 2 3 4 5 6 8 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Balancing of Equities)

The Cross-Complaint and each cause of action therein is barred when balancing the equities. The alleged harm described in the Cross-Complaint is greatly outweighed by the hardship to the Cross-Defendant should equitable relief be granted.

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Reservation of All Defenses)

Because the Cross-Complaint is couched in conclusory terms, Cross-Defendant cannot fully anticipate all defenses that may be applicable to the within action. Accordingly, Cross-Defendant reserves the right to assert additional defenses, if and to the extent that such defenses are applicable.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Cross-Defendant, JOSEPH ROMANO, individually and as trustee of the JOSEPH AND PIXIE ROMANO LIVING TRUST, prays for judgment as follows:

- 1. That Cross-Complainant takes nothing by way of the Cross-Complaint;
- 2. That the Cross-Complaint and all causes of action thereunder be dismissed with prejudice;
- That the Court enter judgment for Cross-Defendant against Cross-Complainant on all alleged causes of action;
- 4. For attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and
- 5. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: May 16, 2019

CARLE, MACKIE, POWER & ROSS LLP

By:

Philip J. Terry, Esq. Samantha Pungprakearti, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiff/Cross-Complainant

28

27