BY FAX

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF SHAWNEE COUNTY, KANSAS CRIMINAL COURT DEPARTMENT

JOHN DOE,)	•
Plaintiff,)	
vs.))	Case No. 12 C 168 Div. No. 6
KIRK THOMPSON, DIRECTOR,	į	— • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
et al.,)	
Defendants.)	

DEFENDANTS' JOINT ANSWER

Defendants Kirk Thompson, Director of the Kansas Bureau of Investigation, and Frank Denning, Sheriff of Johnson County, Kansas, provide the following admissions, denials and responses to Plaintiff's *Petition for Declaratory Judgment*.

- 1. Defendants are without sufficient information to form an opinion or belief as to the truth of the factual allegations contained in Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 13, 21 and 22 of Plaintiff's *Petition for Declaratory Judgment*, and therefore deny the same.
- 2. Paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 23 and 25 of Plaintiff's *Petition for Declaratory Judgment* consist of legal argument and conclusions to which a response is not required.
- 3. Paragraph 9, of Plaintiff's Petition for Declaratory Judgment consists, in part, of legal argument and conclusions to which a response is not required. To the extent it contains factual allegations pertaining to Plaintiff Doe and supporting a recognized cause of action,

Defendants are without sufficient information to form an opinion or belief as to their truth and therefore deny the same.

- 4. In response to Paragraphs 10 and 11, of Plaintiff's Petition for Declaratory Judgment, Defendants admit that statutory requirements for registration exist under prior and current law. To the extent Paragraphs 10 and 11 contain factual allegations pertaining to Kansas Offender Registration Act (KORA) registration requirements, the statutory text speaks for itself and Defendant admits the requirements of that text as enacted and as amended. The balance of Plaintiff's Paragraph 10 and 11 consists of legal argument and conclusions to which a response is not required.
- 5. Defendants admit the statements and allegations contained in Paragraphs 14 and 15 of Plaintiff's *Petition for Declaratory Judgment*.
- 6. In response to Paragraph 16 of Plaintiff's *Petition for Declaratory Judgment*, Defendants admit the Court has authority to enter declaratory relief within its respective jurisdiction, as provided by the text of K.S.A. § 60-1701.
- 7. Defendants deny the statements and allegations contained in Paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 of Plaintiff's *Petition for Declaratory Judgment*. The balance of these paragraphs consists of legal argument and conclusions to which a response is not required.
- 8. In response to Paragraph 20 of Plaintiff's *Petition for Declaratory Judgment*, Defendants incorporate herein by reference their admissions, denials and responses to Paragraphs 1 through 19 above.
- 9. Paragraph 24 of Plaintiff's *Petition for Declaratory Judgment* is a prayer for relief to which no responsive pleading is required.

- 10. Paragraphs 26 and 27 of Plaintiff's *Petition for Declaratory Judgment* consist of prayers for relief or legal argument and conclusions to which no responsive pleading is required.
- 11. Paragraph 28 consists of legal argument and conclusions to which no responsive pleading is required.
- 12. Defendants deny each and every statement and allegation contained in Paragraphs

 1 through 28 of Plaintiff's *Petition for Declaratory Judgment* not specifically admitted herein above.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

First Defense

The relief Plaintiff seeks is expressly barred by K.S.A. § 22-4908.

Second Defense

The Kansas Offender Registration Act is remedial in nature. Plaintiff is therefore obligated to comply with valid, subsequent legislative changes in the registration requirements of which he now complains.

Third Defense

By use of pseudonym, Defendants are uncertain as to whether Plaintiff is currently registered. If Plaintiff registered after June 30, 2011, under the current statutory enactment of KSORA, he or she has knowingly waived any rights or standing to contest future registration obligations.

Fourth Defense

Plaintiff's factual allegations, even if true, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted against Defendants.

Additional Affirmative Defenses

Defendants have insufficient knowledge and information upon which to form an opinion or belief as to whether they may have additional affirmative defenses available at this time. Defendants therefore reserve the right to assert additional affirmative defenses in the event discovery or further investigation indicates they would be appropriate.

WHEREFORE, having fully answered Plaintiff's *Petition for Declaratory Judgment*, Defendants respectfully request that Plaintiff take naught by his petition, that Defendants be awarded their costs of this action and for such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

Date: March 16, 2012

Respectfully submitted by:

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL DEREK SCHMIDT

Kimberly M.J. Lynch, KS No. 24225

Assistant Attorney General

120 SW 10th Avenue Topeka, Kansas 66612

(p) (785) 296-6244 / (f) (785) 291-3767

kim.lynch@ksag.org

Attorney for Defendant Kirk Thompson Director of Kansas Bureau of Investigation

FERREE, BUNN, O'GRADY & RUNDBERG, CHTD.

Kirk T. Ridgway

KS. No. 17172

Ferree, Bunn, O'Grady & Rundberg, Chtd.

9300 Metcalf Avenue, Suite 300

Overland Park, Kansas 66212-6319

(p) (913) 381-8180 / (f) (913) 381-8836 <u>kridgway@fbolaw.com</u> Attorneys for Defendant Frank Denning, Sheriff of Johnson County, Kansas

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing Answer was sent via U.S. mail, postage prepaid, this 16th day of March, 2012 to:

Christopher M. Joseph Bonnie Boryca 1508 S.W. Topeka Blvd. Topeka, Kansas 66612 (785) 234-3272 (785) 234-3610 – Fax cjoseph@josephhollander.com bonnie@joshephhollander.com ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

Kirk T. Ridgway