

19<sup>th</sup> JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT  
PARISH OF EAST BATON ROUGE  
STATE OF LOUISIANA

NO. 651,069

SECTION 22

JAMES J. DONELON, COMMISSION  
OF INSURANCE FOR THE STATE OF  
LOUISIANA, IN HIS CAPACITY AS  
REHABILITATOR OF LOUISIANA  
HEALTH COOPERATIVE, INC.

VERSUS

TERRY S. SHILLING, et al

**ANSWER TO FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL, AMENDING AND RESTATED PETITION FOR  
DAMAGES AND REQUEST FOR TRIAL BY JURY ON BEHALF OF GROUP  
RESOURCES INCORPORATED**

NOW INTO COURT, through undersigned counsel, comes Defendant, Group  
Resources Incorporated ("GRI"), which responds to Plaintiff's First Supplemental, Amending  
and Restated Petition for Damages as follows:

**AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

GRI asserts the following Affirmative Defenses to the allegations in the Petition.

**FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

The Petition and each and every alleged cause of action therein fail to state a  
claim or cause of action against GRI.

**SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

At all material times, GRI acted in accordance with the documents, agreements,  
and understandings with respect to the relationship between it and Louisiana Health Cooperative  
("LAHC").

**THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

Plaintiff is estopped from making the claims asserted due to its own actions and  
inactions and course and pattern of conduct over many years.

**FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

The claims asserted are barred by laches, waiver, unclean hands, ratification, and  
any applicable period of prescription.

**FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

The company documents of each of the referenced companies and the contracts agreements, and understandings of the parties are the best evidence thereof.

**SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

GRI affirmatively pleads all conditions precedent, conditions subsequent, indemnities, and limitations set forth in its contracts and/or subcontracts relevant to these proceedings as a defense to Plaintiff's claims.

**SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

Granting the relief sought herein would result in unjust enrichment.

**EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

GRI affirmatively alleges that to the extent Plaintiff has settled or should settle hereafter for any of the alleged injuries and damages with any persons, whether parties or non-parties, GRI is entitled to a credit and/or offset in the amount of the settlement(s) and/or payment(s), which are not subject to the collateral source doctrine, and/or for the amount of the settling and/or paying parties' allocated percentage of fault.

**NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

GRI avers that the Plaintiff has not suffered compensable damage as a result of any alleged wrongdoing on the part of GRI or any of their agents or representatives. If Plaintiff suffered any damage, as alleged, such damage was caused in whole or in part by the action or inaction of persons or entities (whether parties or non-parties) for whom GRI is not responsible.

**TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

Plaintiff lacks standing.

**ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

LAHC fraudulently induced GRI to enter into an Administrative Services Agreement with LAHC.

**TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

LAHC failed to pay GRI \$56,832.74 for services performed from July 1, 2014 to December 31, 2015 and \$115,000.00 for the remainder of the last month GRI performed under

the Administrative Services Agreement. GRI is entitled to a set-off as outlined herein against the amount owed to Plaintiff, if any.

**THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

GRI reserves the right to amend and/or supplement the foregoing affirmative defenses to assert such other affirmative defenses as may become known to it during the course of this litigation.

1.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 1 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition do not require a response.

2.

The jurisdictional allegations contained in Paragraph 2 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are admitted. All other allegations contained therein are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

3.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 3 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied, except to admit that GRI has transacted business and/or provided services in Louisiana.

4.

GRI admits that venue is proper in the 19<sup>th</sup> Judicial District Court for the Parish of East Baton Rouge, State of Louisiana.

5.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 5 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

6.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 6 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

7.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 7 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

8.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 8 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

9.

Paragraph 9 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition does not require a response from GRI. To the extent a response may be required, the allegations contained in Paragraph 9 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

10.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 10a-f are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

11.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 11a are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein. The allegations contained in Paragraph 11b are denied, except to admit that GRI is a foreign corporation domiciled in the State of Georgia, with its principal place of business in the State of Georgia. GRI admits that it contracted with and did work for LAHC.

12.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 12a of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

13.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 13a and b of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

14.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 14a of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

15.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 15(1), 15(2), 15(3), 15(4), 15(5) and 15(6) of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

16.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 16 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

17.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 17 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

18.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 18 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

19.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 19 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are admitted.

20.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 20 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

21.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 21 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

22.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 22 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

23.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 23 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

24.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 24 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

25.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 25 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are admitted.

26.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 26 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition call for a legal conclusion and are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

27.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 27 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

28.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 28 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are admitted.

29.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 29 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

30.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 30 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

31.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 31z of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied. All other allegations contained in Paragraph 31 are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

32.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 32 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are admitted.

33.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 33 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are admitted.

34.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 34 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

35.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 35 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are admitted.

36.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 36 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are admitted.

37.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 37 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

38.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 38 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

39.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 39 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

40.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 40 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

41.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 41 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

42.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 42 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

43.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 43 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

44.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 44 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

45.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 45 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

46.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 46 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

47.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 47 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

48.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 48 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied, except to admit that LAHC and GRI entered into an Administrative Services Agreement, which was amended.

49.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 49 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

50.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 50 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein. Without waiver of the foregoing denial, the Administrative Services Agreement is the best evidence of its contents.

51.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 51 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

52.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 52 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.



53.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 53 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

54.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 54 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

55.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 55 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

56.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 56 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

57.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 57 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

58.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 58 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

59.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 59 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

60.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 60 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

61.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 61 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are admitted.

62.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 62 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

63.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 63 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

64.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 64 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

65.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 65 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

66.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 66 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

67.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 67 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

68.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 68 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

69.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 69 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

70.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 70 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

71.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 71 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

72.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 72 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

73.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 73 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

74.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 74 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

75.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 75 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

76.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 76 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

77.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 77 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

78.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 73 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

79.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 79 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

80.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 80 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

81.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 81 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

82.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 82 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

83.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 83 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

84.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 84 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

85.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 85 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

86.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 86 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

87.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 87 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

88.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 88 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

89.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 89 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

90.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 90 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

91.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 91 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

92.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 92 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

93.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 93 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

94.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 94 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

95.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 95 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

96.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 96 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

97.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 97 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

98.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 93 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

99.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 99 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

100.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 100 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

101.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 101 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

102.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 102 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are admitted.

103.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 103 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are admitted.

104.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 104 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

105.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 105 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

106.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 106 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

107.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 107 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

108.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 108 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

109.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 109 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

110.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 110 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

111.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 111 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

112.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 112 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

113.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 113 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

114.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 114 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

115.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 115 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

116.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 116 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

117.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 117 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

118.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 118 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

119.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 119 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

120.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 120 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

121.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 121 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

122.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 122 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

123.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 123 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

124.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 124 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

125.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 125 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

126.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 126 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are admitted.

127.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 127 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are admitted.

128.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 128 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

129.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 129 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

130.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 130 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

131.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 131 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

132.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 132 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.



133.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 133 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

134.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 134 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

135.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 135 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

136.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 136 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

137.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 137 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

138.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 138 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

139.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 139 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

140.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 140 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

141.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 141 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied.

142.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 142 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

143.

The allegations contained in Paragraph 143 of the First Supplemental and Amending Petition are denied for lack of sufficient information to justify a belief therein.

144.

Group Resources Incorporated is entitled to and hereby requests a trial by jury on all issues.

**Prayer**

WHEREFORE, Defendant, Group Resources Incorporated, prays that this Answer be deemed good and sufficient, and that after the lapse of all legal delays and due proceedings had, that there be judgment herein in its favor and against Plaintiff, James J. Donelon, Commissioner of Insurance for the State of Louisiana, in his capacity as Rehabilitator of Louisiana Health Cooperative, Inc., with full prejudice, at Plaintiff's costs.

WHEREFORE, Group Resources, Inc. prays for a trial by jury on all issues and for such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and equitable under the circumstances.

By Attorneys:



---

W. Brett Mason, #22511  
Douglas J. Cochran, #20751  
Justin P. Lemaire, #29948  
Michael W. McKay, #09362  
**STONE PIGMAN WALTHER**  
**WITTMANN LLC**  
One American Place, Ste. 1150  
Baton Rouge, LA 70825  
Telephone: (225) 490-8912  
Fax: (225) 490-5860

*Attorneys for Defendant*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the above and foregoing pleading has been served upon all counsel of record by placing same in the United States Mail, postage prepaid and properly addressed, this 13<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2017.



---

W. BRETT MASON