

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
WESTERN DIVISION**

<b>HAROLD STANLEY,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>vs.</b>	)	<b>Case No.: 06-0752-CV-W-GAF</b>
	)	
<b>HON. JACK GRATE et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

**ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIM OF MARCIA STANLEY**

COMES NOW, the Defendant, Marcia E. Stanley, and for her Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint states and alleges as follows:

1. As to Plaintiff's preamble set out prior to the numbered paragraphs, Defendant Stanley admits that Jack Grate is a judge in the Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri at Independence, that Lester Wight is an attorney who has represented Defendant Stanley, and that Defendant Stanley is employed by the Lee's Summit R-7 School District. Defendant Stanley denies all other allegations contained in such preamble. Defendant Stanley admits the allegations contained in paragraph 1 of Section II of the Complaint.
  
2. Paragraph 2 of Section II of the Complaint sets out a legal conclusion based on a court decree, and Defendant Stanley admits that the decree speaks for itself. Defendant Stanley denies all other allegations, conclusions, or implications contained in paragraph 2 of Section II of the Complaint.

- 3.** Paragraph 3 of Section II of the Complaint sets out a legal conclusion based on a court decree, and Defendant Stanley admits that the decree speaks for itself. Defendant Stanley denies all other allegations, conclusions, or implications contained in paragraph 3 of Section II of the Complaint.
- 4.** Paragraph 4 of Section II of the Complaint sets out a legal conclusion based on a court decree, and Defendant Stanley admits that the decree speaks for itself. Defendant Stanley denies all other allegations, conclusions, or implications contained in paragraph 4 of Section II of the Complaint.
- 5.** Paragraph 5 of Section II of the Complaint sets out a legal conclusion based on a court decree, and Defendant Stanley admits that the decree speaks for itself and that Plaintiff has made some payments pursuant to the decree. Defendant Stanley denies all other allegations, conclusions, or implications contained in paragraph 5 of Section II of the Complaint.
- 6.** Defendant Stanley is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in paragraph 6 of Section II of the Complaint.
- 7.** Defendant Stanley is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in paragraph 7 of Section II of the Complaint.
- 8.** Defendant Stanley is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in paragraph 8 of Section II of the Complaint.
- 9.** Defendant Stanley is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in paragraph 9 of Section II of the Complaint.
- 10.** Defendant Stanley admits that Plaintiff filed a document purporting to remove a state court action to federal court in approximately March 2005. Defendant Stanley denies

that Plaintiff's action actually had the effect of removing any state court case to federal court. Defendant Stanley denies all other allegations contained in paragraph 10 of Section II of the Complaint.

- 11.** Defendant Stanley is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in paragraph 11 of Section II of the Complaint.
- 12.** Defendant Stanley is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in paragraph 12 of Section II of the Complaint. However, Defendant Stanley specifically denies that the state circuit court lacked jurisdiction in the referenced matter.
- 13.** Defendant Stanley admits the allegations contained in paragraph 13 of Section II of the Complaint.
- 14.** Defendant admits the allegations contained in paragraph 14 of Section II of the Complaint, but denies the implication that any remand to state court was necessary.
- 15.** Defendant Stanley denies the allegations contained in paragraph 15 of Section II of the Complaint.
- 16.** Defendant Stanley is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in paragraph 16 of Section II of the Complaint. However, Defendant specifically denies the allegation that the state circuit court lacked jurisdiction over the referenced matter,
- 17.** Defendant Stanley denies the allegations contained in paragraph 17 of Section II of the Complaint.

- 18.** Defendant Stanley admits that Judge Grate issued an Order to Show Cause on or about January 5, 2006. Defendant Stanley denies all other allegations contained in paragraph 18 of Section II of the Complaint.
- 19.** Defendant Stanley denies the allegations contained in paragraph 19 of Section II of the Complaint.
- 20.** Defendant Stanley denies the allegations contained in paragraph 20 of Section II of the Complaint.
- 21.** Defendant Stanley incorporates and restates her answer to paragraphs 1-21 of the Complaint, as set out above.
- 22.** Defendant Stanley admits that Plaintiff enjoys the rights of a citizen of the United States. Defendant Stanley denies all other allegations, conclusions, or implications contained in paragraph 22 of Section II of the Complaint.
- 23.** Defendant Stanley incorporates and restates her answer to paragraphs 1-20 of the Complaint, as set out above.
- 24.** Defendant Stanley admits that Plaintiff enjoys the rights of a citizen of the United States. Defendant Stanley denies all other allegations, conclusions, or implications contained in paragraph 24 of Section II of the Complaint.
- 25.** Defendant Stanley denies the allegations contained in paragraph 25 of Section II of the Complaint.
- 26.** Defendant Stanley denies the allegations contained in paragraph 26 of Section II of the Complaint.
- 27.** Defendant Stanley denies the allegations contained in paragraph 27 of Section II of the Complaint.