

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE**

ADAM BRASEEL,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 1:22-cv-298
)	
GRUNDY COUNTY, TENNESSEE;)	JURY DEMAND (12)
ESTATE OF BRENT MYERS, Former Grundy)	
County Sheriff, in his individual capacity;)	
LONNIE CLEEK, Former Grundy County)	
Sheriff Chief Deputy, in his individual capacity;)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Grundy County, Tennessee, the Estate of Brent Myers, and Lonnie Cleek, (collectively referred to as “Defendants” unless otherwise specifically identified), by and through counsel, file with the Court their Answer to Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint as follows:

FIRST DEFENSE:

In response to the individual, numerical allegations of Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint, Defendants answer as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. In response to ¶ 1, the gravamen of Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint speaks for itself.
2. In response to ¶ 2, the gravamen of Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint speaks for itself. In further response and to the extent alleged in ¶ 2, Defendants deny they violated Plaintiff’s civil rights.
3. In response to ¶ 3, Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint speaks for itself.
4. In response to ¶ 4, Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint speaks for itself.

5. In response to ¶ 5, Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint speaks for itself.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. In response to ¶ 6, the gravamen of the Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint speaks for itself.

7. In response to ¶ 7, it is admitted that the Plaintiff has alleged claims under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments. It is further admitted that jurisdiction is proper in this Court.

8. In response to ¶ 8, it is admitted venue is proper in this Court.

PARTIES

9. The allegations in ¶ 9 are admitted.

10. The allegations of the first and second sentences of ¶ 10 are admitted. The remaining allegations of ¶ 10 are denied as alleged.

11. In response to the first sentence of ¶ 11, it is admitted that Brent Myers was, at the time of the events described in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, the sheriff of Grundy County. The allegations of the second sentence are denied as stated although it is admitted that Myers investigated the case against Plaintiff, identified evidence, and was responsible for supervising officers in the Grundy County Sheriff's Department.

12. The allegations of the first sentence in ¶ 12 are admitted. In further response, it is admitted that that Defendant Cleek participated in the investigation of the case against Plaintiff and identified evidence regarding the same.

13. The allegations in ¶ 13 are denied.

14. The allegations in ¶ 14 are admitted.

15. In response to ¶ 15, Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint speaks for itself.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

16. The allegations in ¶ 16 are denied.

17. The allegations in ¶ 17 are denied.

The Crimes

18. In response to ¶ 18, it is admitted that Mr. Burrows and Ms. Hill were attacked.

19. In response to ¶ 19, it is admitted that Mr. Burrows was beaten to death.

20. In response to ¶ 20, it is admitted that Ms. Hill was assaulted and Mr. Braden got into a fight with an individual at the residence.

21. In response to ¶ 21, it is admitted on information and belief that Mr. Braden called for help from a neighbor's house.

The Investigation

22. In response to ¶ 22, it is admitted that Officer Caldwell arrived at the scene and requested assistance for Ms. Hill. It is further admitted there was blood inside the house.

23. In response to ¶ 23, it is admitted that Officer West arrived and did speak with Mr. Braden. It is further admitted that Officer West prepared a report, which speaks for itself.

24. In response to ¶ 24, it is admitted that Sgt. Brown arrived on the scene.

25. The allegations of ¶ 25 are admitted.

26. In response to ¶ 26, it is admitted that officers went to the location of Mr. Burrow's car.

27. In response to ¶ 27, it is admitted that Sgt. Brown saw Mr. Burrow's body.

28. In response to ¶ 28, Defendants are not aware of a wallet being found as alleged.

29. In response to ¶ 29, Defendants are not aware of a report or photographs as alleged.

30. In response to ¶ 30, it is admitted that Defendant Cleek and former sheriff Myers were contacted and came to the scene.

31. In response to ¶ 31, it is admitted that the scenes where the crimes occurred were investigated and evidence was collected along with a search for fingerprints. It is further admitted that car was transported to the TBI as alleged.

32. The allegations of the first sentence of ¶ 32 are denied as alleged. In further response to ¶ 32, it is admitted that Sgt. Brown identified Plaintiff. Defendants lack information as to the remaining allegations of ¶ 32.

33. In response to ¶ 33, it is admitted on belief that Sgt. Brown advised of Plaintiff's identification and that such information was provided to TBI Agent Larry Davis.

34. In response to ¶ 34, it is admitted that Plaintiff's mother was located.

35. In response to ¶ 35, Defendants lack information of Sgt. Brown volunteering to testify and show that decisions relating to Sgt. Brown being called as a witness were not made by Defendants. Further, Sgt. Brown's participation in the investigation appears to have been concluded.

36. The allegations of ¶ 36 are denied as alleged. In further response, however, Defendants admit that TBI Agent Davis, Myers, and Cleek looked for Plaintiff.

37. In response to ¶ 37, Defendants admit that Plaintiff had been driving his mother's car and that the car was towed.

38. In response to ¶ 38, it is admitted that there was no DNA evidence (Plaintiff's DNA) within the vehicle. In further response, Defendants are not certain what Plaintiff refers to using the term "trademarks" and therefore lack information as to the second sentence of ¶ 38.

Plaintiff's Arrest

39. The allegations of ¶ 39 are admitted.

40. The allegations of ¶ 40 are admitted except that it appears the trial lasted more than two (2) days.

41. Defendants lack information or knowledge as to the allegations of ¶ 41 regarding the extent of the legal arguments and claims made except that Plaintiff appealed and his appeal was rejected. In further response, it is admitted that the record would speak for itself in this respect.

42. In response to ¶ 42, it is admitted that the record speaks for itself.

43. In response to ¶ 43, it is admitted that the record speaks for itself.

44. In response to ¶ 44, it is admitted that the record speaks for itself.

45. In response to ¶ 45, it is admitted that the record speaks for itself.

46. In response to ¶ 46, it is admitted that the record speaks for itself.

47. The allegations of ¶ 47 are admitted.

48. Defendants lack information as to the allegations of ¶ 48.

49. Defendants lack information as to the allegations of ¶ 49 except that on information and belief, Plaintiff was issued an exoneration.

50. Defendants lack information as to the allegations of ¶ 50.

Failure to Investigate the Real Killer of Malcolm Burrows and Real Assailant of Rebecca Hill – Kermit Bryson

51. The allegations of ¶ 51 are denied.

52. The allegations of the first sentence of ¶ 52 fail to make an allegation of fact but rather states an opinion. Defendants lack information as to the allegations of the second sentence of ¶ 52. The third sentence of ¶ 52 fails to make an allegation of fact but rather states an opinion.

53. The allegations of ¶ 53 are denied.

54. In response to ¶ 54, the referenced report and contents of the same speaks for itself.

55. In response to ¶ 55, Plaintiff fails to identify the witnesses referred to and, therefore, Defendants lack information to respond to the same.

56. In response to ¶ 56, the referenced statement speaks for itself. Defendants deny that the statement was ignored and show that Ms. White was a witness at Plaintiff's trial.

57. In response to ¶ 57, the referenced statement speaks for itself. Defendants deny the statement was ignored.

58. In response to ¶ 58, Plaintiff knew and was aware of all alibi witnesses and had the opportunity to call all alibi witnesses at trial.

59. The allegations of the first sentence of ¶ 59 are denied. Defendants lack information as to Mr. Bryson's car. Defendants lack information as to the specific design of the referenced vehicles.

60. The allegations of ¶ 60 are denied.

61. The allegations of ¶ 61 are denied.

62. The allegations of ¶ 62 are denied.

63. The allegations of ¶ 63 are denied.

64. In response to ¶ 64, it is admitted that Mr. Bryson had a criminal record.

65. Defendants lack information as to the allegations of ¶ 65 except that it is understood Mr. Bryson's fingerprint was found on the vehicle.

66. Defendants lack information as to the allegations of ¶ 66.

67. Defendants lack information as to the allegations of ¶ 67.

68. Defendants lack information as to the allegations of ¶ 68.

69. Defendants lack information as to the allegations of ¶ 69.

70. Defendants lack information as to the allegations of ¶ 70.

71. The allegations of ¶ 71 are denied.

72. On information and belief, in response to ¶ 72, it is admitted that testing by the TBI matched a fingerprint to Mr. Bryson.

73. The allegations of ¶ 73 are denied.

74. The allegations of the first sentence of ¶ 74 are denied. The allegations of the second sentence of ¶ 74 are admitted and it is further admitted that the analysis on Plaintiff's clothes, shoes, and the vehicle were obtained on a different day than the crime. The remaining allegations of ¶ 74 are denied.

75. The allegations of ¶ 75 are denied.

Fabrication of Evidence against Plaintiff

The Coerced "Identifications"

76. The allegations of ¶ 76 are denied.

77. The allegations of ¶ 77 are denied.

78. In response to ¶ 78, Mr. Braden's statements were known to Plaintiff and/or his counsel and his testimony speaks for itself. The remaining allegations of ¶ 78 are denied.

The "Missing" Wallet Fabrication

79. The allegations of ¶ 79 are denied.

80. Defendants lack information or knowledge of the allegations of the first sentence of ¶ 80, but the decision to call or not call Sgt. Brown to trial was not made nor directed by Defendants. Defendants lack information or knowledge as to the remaining allegations of ¶ 80.

81. In response to the first sentence of ¶ 81, it is admitted that Cleek and Myers were at the scene. It is denied that Cleek or Myers did anything with the wallet as may be alleged in ¶ 81 and further denied they suppressed anything.

82. In response to ¶ 82, Defendants deny suppressing evidence as alleged. Additionally, ¶ 82 includes Plaintiff's assumption, which is not an allegation that requires a response.

83. The allegations of ¶ 83 are denied.

84. In response to ¶ 84, the argument made by the State is reflected within the record and speaks for itself.

Conspiracy to Frame Plaintiff

85. In response to the first sentence of ¶ 85, Mr. Braden's statement speaks for itself as it relates to the description of the vehicle. The allegations of the second sentence are denied.

86. The allegations of the first sentence of ¶ 86 are denied. In response to the second and third sentences, Mr. Braden's statement speaks for itself.

87. In response to ¶ 87, it is admitted that Ms. White met with Sgt. Brown as alleged. In further response, Ms. White's statement speaks for itself.

88. The allegations of ¶ 88 are denied.

89. In response to ¶ 89, Ms. White's testimony speaks for itself.

The Fabrication and Alteration of Jay Douglas Description

90. In response to ¶ 90, any authenticated report regarding Mr. Douglas' interview speaks for itself.

91. In response to ¶ 91, any authenticated report speaks for itself. The remaining allegations of ¶ 91 are denied.

Fabrications about Kirk Braden that He Hit the Assailant

92. The allegations of ¶ 92 are admitted.

93. The allegations of ¶ 93 are denied.

94. The allegations of ¶ 94 are denied.

Suppression and Destruction of Evidence

95. The allegations of ¶ 95 are denied.

96. The allegations of ¶ 96 are denied.

97. Defendants lack information or knowledge of the allegations of ¶ 80; however, ¶ 80 includes allegations that are not appropriate and without proper foundation.

98. The allegations of ¶ 98 are denied.

PLAINTIFF ADAM BRASEEL'S INJURIES

99. In response to ¶ 99, Defendants deny they are liable or responsible for Plaintiff's claimed injuries and damages described in the same.

100. In response to ¶ 100, Defendants deny they are liable or responsible for Plaintiff's claimed injuries and damages described in the same.

101. Defendants lack information or knowledge as to ¶ 101.

102. In response to ¶ 102, Defendants deny they are liable or responsible for Plaintiff's claimed injuries and damages described in the same.

103. In response to ¶ 103, Defendants deny they are liable or responsible for Plaintiff's claimed injuries and damages described in the same.

104. In response to ¶ 104, Defendants deny they are liable or responsible for Plaintiff's claimed injuries and damages described in the same.

105. In response to ¶ 105, Defendants deny they are liable or responsible for Plaintiff's claimed injuries and damages described in the same.

106. Defendants lack information or knowledge as to the allegations of ¶ 106 but deny being liable or responsible for the same.

107. In response to ¶ 107, Defendants deny they are liable or responsible for Plaintiff's claimed injuries and damages described in the same.

108. In response to ¶ 108, Defendants deny they are liable or responsible for any of Plaintiff's claimed injuries.

COUNT I:

**VIOLATION OF THE FOURTH AND FOURTEENTH [AMENDMENTS]
TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION:
(AGAINST ALL INDIVIDUALLY NAMED DEFENDANTS)**

**MALICIOUS PROSEUTION
(42 U.S.C § 1983)**

109. In response to ¶ 109, Defendants incorporate by reference their answers to ¶ 1-108 above.

110. The allegations in ¶¶ 110 - ¶ 115 are denied.

111. In response to ¶ 116, Defendants deny they caused any unconstitutional deprivation of liberty.

112. The allegations in ¶ 117 call for a legal conclusion and the record in this respect speaks for itself.

113. The allegations in ¶¶ 118 and are denied.

COUNT II:

**VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS CLAUSE
OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT TO
THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION
-PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS:**

**UNLAWFUL SUPPRESSION OF EVIDENCE/*BRADY* VIOLATION
(AGAINST ALL INDIVIDUALLY NAMED DEFENDANTS)**

**MALICIOUS PROSEUTION
(42 U.S.C § 1983)**

114. In response to ¶ 120, Defendants incorporate by reference their answers to ¶ 1-119.

115. The allegations in ¶ 121 are denied.

116. In response to the first sentence of ¶ 122, Defendants lack information as to what Sgt. Brown claims. The remaining allegations of ¶ 122 are denied.

117. The allegations in ¶¶ 123 - 127 are denied.

COUNT III:

**VIOLATION OF THE DUE PROCESS
CLAUSE OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT
TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION:**

**FABRICATION OF EVIDENCE
(AGAINST ALL INDIVIDUALLY NAMED DEFENDANTS)**

**MALICIOUS PROSEUTION
(42 U.S.C § 1983)**

118. In response to ¶ 128, Defendants incorporate by reference their answers to ¶ 1-127 above.

119. The allegations in ¶¶ 129-134 are denied.

COUNT IV:

**VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS
CLAUSE OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT
TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION:**

**CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
(AGAINST ALL INDIVIDUALLY NAMED DEFENDANTS)
(42 U.S.C § 1983)**

120. In response to ¶ 135, Defendants incorporate by reference their answers to ¶ 1-134 above.

121. The allegations in ¶¶ 136 – 141 are denied.

COUNT V:

**FAILURE TO INTERVENE
(AGAINST ALL INDIVIDUALLY NAMED DEFENDANTS)
(42 U.S.C § 1983)**

122. In response to ¶ 142, Defendants incorporate by reference their answers to ¶ 1-141 above.

123. The allegations in ¶¶ 143 – 146 are denied.

COUNT VI:

**SUPERVISORY LIABILITY FAILURE TO INTERVENE
(AGAINST DEFENDANTS MYERS AND CLEEK)
(42 U.S.C § 1983)**

124. In response to ¶ 147, Defendants incorporate by reference their answers to ¶ 1-146 above.

125. The allegations in ¶¶ 148 – 152 are denied.

COUNT VII: [NOT INCLUDED IN PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED COMPLAINT]

COUNT VIII:

**MALICIOUS PROSECUTION
TENNESSEE LAW CLAIM**

126. In response to ¶ 153, Defendants incorporate by reference their answers to ¶ 1-152 above.

127. The allegations in ¶¶ 154 – 159 are denied.

COUNT IX:

CIVIL CONSPIRACY – TENNESSEE LAW CLAIM

128. In response to ¶ 160, Defendants incorporate by reference their answers to ¶ 1-159 above.

129. The allegations in ¶¶ 161-162 are denied.

130. In response to ¶ 163, Defendants Cleek and Myer admit they acted under color of law and within the scope of their employment at the times referred to in the Plaintiff' First Amended Complaint, but deny any claim or allegation of wrongdoing.

131. The allegations of ¶¶ 164-165 are denied.

COUNT X:

NEGLIGENCE – TENNESSEE LAW CLAIM

132. In response to ¶ 166, Defendants incorporate by reference their answers to ¶ 1-165 above.

133. ¶ 167 fails to make an allegation of fact but rather states a conclusion of law. In further response, Defendants deny any allegations of failure to disclose required information.

134. ¶ 168 fails to make an allegation of fact but rather states a claimed conclusion of law. In further response, Defendants admit to making a full and complete investigation.

135. The allegations of ¶¶ 169 to 172 are denied.

136. ¶ 173 fails to make an allegation of fact but rather states a conclusion of law. Further response, Defendant Grundy County denies any improper or unconstitutional policies.

137. The allegations of ¶¶ 174-175 are denied.

COUNT XI:

RESPONDEAT SUPERIOR - TENNESSEE LAW CLAIM

138. In response to ¶ 176, Defendants incorporate by reference their answers to ¶ 1-175 above.

139. The allegations of ¶ 177 are denied to the extent it is alleged that Defendants engaged in improper acts.

140. The allegations in ¶ 178-179 are denied.

COUNT XII:

IDEMNIFICATION - TENNESSEE LAW CLAIM

141. In response to ¶ 180, Defendants incorporate by reference their answers to ¶ 1-179 above.

142. ¶¶ 181-182 fail to make an allegation of fact but rather state a conclusion of law. In further response, Defendant Grundy County denies they are liable for any damages in this matter.

143. All further allegations set forth in Plaintiff's Complaint not specifically admitted, denied, or otherwise explained are hereby denied.

SECOND DEFENSE

Defendants plead and rely upon the defense of qualified immunity in all respects and as to all claims made in this case. Defendants were acting within their discretionary authority and their conduct did not violate clearly established rights of which a reasonable person would have known. Accordingly, Plaintiff is not entitled to the relief prayed for in his First Amended Complaint.

THIRD DEFENSE

All or portions of the claims set forth in Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint are barred by all other forms and versions of immunity including good faith immunity, common-law immunity, and sovereign immunity.

FOURTH DEFENSE

To the extent that Plaintiffs have relied upon vicarious liability for any causes of action based upon 42 U.S.C. § 1983 or other civil rights claims, vicarious liability, including *respondeat superior*, is not applicable to said civil rights causes of action, and any causes of action based upon any form of vicarious liability must be dismissed.

FIFTH DEFENSE

Defendants deny that their actions, inactions, policies or in any other way were the cause of Plaintiff's claimed damages or the events more fully set forth in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. Accordingly, Plaintiff is not entitled to the relief prayed for in his First Amended Complaint.

SIXTH DEFENSE

Defendants did not act with deliberate indifference as may be alleged in support of any claim set forth in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint in violation of Plaintiff's constitutional rights. Plaintiff is therefore not entitled to any recovery from Defendants.

SEVENTH DEFENSE

Defendants, individually or otherwise, did not violate Plaintiff's constitutional rights in any manner whatsoever and Plaintiff is not entitled to any recovery for the same.

EIGHTH DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint in that respect fails to set forth with specificity a policy or custom upon which they rely in support of their claim for recovery for alleged unconstitutional conduct. In that same respect, there is no policy, custom or otherwise in Grundy County, Tennessee that caused or led to the events more fully described in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint or caused or led to the injuries and/or damages claimed by Plaintiff. Defendants did not have or enforce any unconstitutional policies, customs, or practices or act with deliberate indifference related to the same. Plaintiff is therefore not entitled to the relief prayed for in his First Amended Complaint.

NINTH DEFENSE

Defendants are immune from some or all the claims asserted by Plaintiff in his First Amended Complaint. Defendants rely upon common law and statutory immunity provisions, including, but not limited to the immunity provisions of the Tennessee Governmental Tort Liability Act Tenn. Code Ann. § 29-20-201, including, without limitation, the applicable exceptions to removal of immunity under Tenn. Code Ann. § 29-20-205. In this respect, Defendants have and plead immunity for Plaintiff's state law causes of action. In addition, Plaintiff's state law claims are governed by and subject to the limitation of damages of the

Tennessee Governmental Tort Liability Act and Defendants specifically plead and rely upon such limitation.

TENTH DEFENSE

Plaintiff is not entitled to the recovery of punitive damages as Defendants did not act in a manner sufficient to give rise to the same. Punitive damages are not recoverable against a municipality for § 1983 claims. Defendants therefore aver that to the extent punitive damages are claimed in that respect, the same must be denied.

ELEVENTH DEFENSE

Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint makes claims and allegations against other parties for whom these Defendants are not liable or responsible to include but not necessarily be limited to actions taken during Plaintiff's criminal trial. Plaintiff can therefore have no recovery against these Defendants for the actions of such other parties to include all parties against whom Plaintiff previously filed litigation.

TWELFTH DEFENSE

Plaintiff was arrested and indicated based on probable cause as determined by a grand jury. Plaintiff can therefore have no recovery for alleged malicious prosecution. Additionally, Defendants did not act with malice or deliberate indifference as it relates to Plaintiff's prosecution. Defendants' actions were reasonable, taken in good faith, and for legitimate purposes and were based on the facts and information known and/or provided to them at the time.

THIRTEENTH DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint fails to state a claim or cause of action upon which relief can be granted and therefore must be dismissed.

FOURTEENTH DEFENSE

Plaintiff complains of procedural deficiencies and other problems with his criminal trial. Defendants did not control such trial and had limited participation in the same. Plaintiff was further represented throughout the criminal prosecution and trial referred to in his First Amended Complaint and had opportunity to challenge, investigate, interview witnesses, or take all other actions deemed necessary and/or appropriate regarding the same, including challenging the reliability of evidence through motion practice or otherwise. In this respect, Plaintiff has made multiple claims regarding ineffective assistance of counsel after his convictions as it relates to many of the issues and claims in his First Amended Complaint including claiming that he lacked proper representation and that such representation was constitutionally deficient. Plaintiff is therefore estopped and precluded from making complaint relating to his trial, defense actions and activities, and prosecution and further has waived complaints regarding the same.

FIFTEENTH DEFENSE

Defendants deny that they owed and/or breached a duty to Plaintiff or that they proximately caused Plaintiff's claimed damages and injuries as more fully set forth in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint.

SIXTEENTH DEFENSE

After his conviction for the criminal charges referred to in his First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff raised the issue of ineffective assistance of his counsel regarding his criminal trial and raised and asserted multiple complaints against his criminal defense attorneys, same being Floyd "Don" Davis and the law firm, Davis, Kessler, & Davis, and Robert Peters and his law firm, Swafford, Peters, Priest & Hall. Plaintiff asserted, *inter alia*, that his counsel failed to properly challenge the photo array that was used at the criminal trial in this matter and failed to properly represent him at trial. Plaintiff contended that the inadequacies of his defense counsel led to his

conviction. In the same respect, most, if not all, of the complaints made by Plaintiff in this litigation were known to Plaintiff and his defense counsel prior to the criminal trial that resulted in Plaintiff's conviction. Accordingly, in addition to the already raised defense of comparative fault by Plaintiff, Defendants raise the comparative fault and negligence of Plaintiff's criminal defense attorneys more fully set forth above and show that the actions and/or inactions of counsel were the approximate cause of Plaintiff's criminal conviction as opposed to any of the complaintive actions or inactions of any other party to this matter.

SEVENTEENTH DEFENSE

Some or all of Plaintiff's claims and causes of action set forth in his First Amended Complaint are barred by the applicable statute of limitations to the same.

WHEREFORE, having fully answered, the Defendants prays that Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint be dismissed. Defendants demand a trial by jury of twelve (12).

Respectfully submitted,

SPICER RUDSTROM, PLLC

By: /s/ B. Thomas Hickey, Jr.
B. Thomas Hickey, Jr., BPR #019105
Attorney for Defendants
537 Market Street – Suite 203
Chattanooga, TN 37402-1241
P: (423) 756-0262
F: (423) 756-8489
thickey@spicerfirm.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 20th day of March, 2024, I electronically filed this document along with any exhibits with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system which will automatically send e-mail notification of such filing to the following attorneys of record:

Kathleen T. Zellner
Douglas H. Johnson
Nicholas M. Curran
Kathleen T. Zellner & Associates, P.C.
4580 Weaver Parkway, Suite 204
Warrenville, IL 60555

Wesley Clark
Brazil Clark, PLLC
2901 Dobbs Avenue
Nashville, TN 37211

SPICER RUDSTROM, PLLC

By: /s/ B. Thomas Hickey, Jr.
B. Thomas Hickey, Jr.