

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

)

)

) Master Docket Case No. 19-cv-1717

)

In re: WATTS COORDINATED) Judge Valderrama

PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS)

) Magistrate Judge Finnegan

)

) JURY DEMANDED

)

)

This Document Relates to *Rickey Henderson v. City of Chicago*, No. 22-cv-129

DEFENDANT KALLATT MOHAMMED'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT

Defendant Kallatt Mohammed (“Mohammed”), by and through his attorneys, Daley Mohan Groble, P.C., respectfully submits the following amended answer to the Complaint filed by Plaintiff, David Walker, as well as his defenses and jury demand, and states as follows:

1. This is a civil action arising under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1343 and 1337.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed admits that this action purports to be brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983 and admits to the jurisdiction of this Court but denies any allegation of wrongdoing or other misconduct alleged herein.

I. Parties

2. Plaintiff Rickey Henderson is a resident of the Northern District of Illinois.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

3. Defendant City of Chicago is an Illinois municipal corporation.

ANSWER: Upon information and belief, Defendant Mohammed admits the allegations contained in this paragraph.

4. Defendants Ronald Watts, Brian Bolton, Miguel Cabrales, Darryl Edwards, Robert Gonzalez, Alvin Jones, Manuel Leano, Kallatt Mohammed, Douglas Nichols Jr., Calvin Ridgell, Elsworth Smith Jr., Michael Spaargaren, and Jerome Summers Jr. (the “individual officer defendants”) were at all relevant times acting under color of their offices as Chicago police officers. Plaintiff sues the individual officer defendants in their individual capacities.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed admits that he was employed by the City of Chicago as a police officer during certain time periods alleged in plaintiff’s Complaint and admits that he acted within the scope of his employment at those times. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

5. Defendant Philip Cline was at all relevant times Superintendent of the Chicago Police Department. Plaintiff sues Cline in his individual capacity.

ANSWER: Upon information and belief, Defendant Mohammed admits that Philip Cline was Superintendent of the Chicago Police Department. He lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

6. Defendant Debra Kirby was at all relevant times the Assistant Deputy Superintendent of the Chicago Police Department, acting as head of the Chicago Police Department Internal Affairs Division. Plaintiff sues Kirby in her individual capacity.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

II. Overview

7. Plaintiff Henderson is one of many victims of the criminal enterprise run by convicted felon and former Chicago Police Sergeant Ronald Watts and his tactical team at the Ida B. Wells Homes in the 2000’s.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies each of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

8. As of the date of filing, fifty individuals who were framed by the Watts Gang have had their convictions vacated by the Circuit Court of Cook County.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed admits that many individuals have had their convictions vacated by the Circuit Court of Cook County. Defendant Mohammed denies that those individuals were "framed" and denies each of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

9. Several of these other victims of the Watts Gang are currently prosecuting federal lawsuits. Pursuant to an order of the Court's Executive Committee dated July 12, 2018, these cases have been coordinated for pretrial proceedings with the lead case *Baker v. City of Chicago*, 16-cv-8940.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed admits that many federal civil cases filed by other individuals have been coordinated for pretrial proceedings under the caption *In Re: Watts Coordinated Pretrial Proceedings*, 19-CV-01717. Defendant Mohammed denies each of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

10. The Executive Committee's Order states that additional cases, such as this one, filed with similar claims and the same defendants shall be part of these coordinated pretrial proceedings.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed admits the allegations contained in this paragraph.

11. The Watts Gang of officers engaged in robbery and extortion, used excessive force, planted evidence, fabricated evidence, and manufactured false charges.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies each of the allegations contained in this paragraph to the extent those allegations are directed to him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

12. High ranking officials within the Chicago Police Department were aware of the Watts Gang's criminal enterprise, but failed to take any action to stop it.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph to the extent those allegations are directed to him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

13. The Chicago Police Department's official policies or customs of failing to discipline, supervise, and control its officers, as well as its a "code of silence," were a proximate cause of the Watts Gang's criminal enterprise.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph to the extent those allegations are directed to him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

14. On four separate occasions, Watts Gang officers arrested Henderson without probable cause, fabricated evidence against him, and framed him for a drug offense for which he was imprisoned for a total of more than four years.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies each of the allegations contained in this paragraph to the extent those allegations are directed to him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

15. Based on the powerful evidence that has become known about the Watts Gang's nearly decade-long criminal enterprise, the Circuit Court of Cook County has vacated all four of plaintiff's convictions and granted him four Certificates of Innocence.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed admits that plaintiff's convictions were vacated by the Circuit Court of Cook County but denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph.

16. Henderson brings this lawsuit to secure a remedy for his illegal incarceration, which was caused by: the Watts Gang officers, the failure of high-ranking officials within the Chicago Police Department to stop the Watts Gang, the code of silence within the Chicago Police Department, and the Chicago Police Department's defective discipline policy.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed admits that plaintiff's convictions were vacated by the Circuit Court of Cook County but denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph.

III. The First False Arrest and Illegal Prosecution of Plaintiff

17. On June 25, 2002, plaintiff was arrested by defendants Bolton, Gonzalez, and Watts (the "June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers") in front of a building at the Ida B. Wells Homes.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

18. At the time of plaintiff's arrest:

- a. None of the June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers had a warrant authorizing the arrest of plaintiff;
- b. None of the June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers believed that a warrant had been issued authorizing the arrest of plaintiff;
- c. None of the June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers had observed plaintiff commit any offense; and
- d. None of the June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers had received information from any source that plaintiff had committed an offense.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

19. After arresting plaintiff, the June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers conspired, confederated, and agreed to fabricate a false story in an attempt to justify the unlawful arrest, to cover-up their wrongdoing, and to cause plaintiff to be wrongfully detained and prosecuted.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

20. The false story fabricated by the June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers included their false claim that they saw plaintiff selling drugs from a bag and that when they approached him, he attempted to place the bag in his mouth.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

21. The acts of the June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers in furtherance of their scheme to frame plaintiff included the following:

- a. One or more of the June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers prepared police reports containing the false story, and each of the other June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers failed to intervene to prevent the violation of plaintiff's rights;
- b. One or more of the June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers attested to the false story through the official police reports, and each of the other June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers failed to intervene to prevent the violation of plaintiff's rights;
- c. Defendant Watts formally approved one or more of the official police reports, knowing that the story set out therein was false; and
- d. One or more of the June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers communicated the false story to prosecutors, and each of the other June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers failed to intervene to prevent the violation of plaintiff's rights.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

22. The wrongful acts of the June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers were performed with knowledge that the acts would cause plaintiff to be wrongfully held in custody and falsely prosecuted for an offense that had never occurred.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

23. Plaintiff was charged with a drug offense because of the wrongful acts of the June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

24. Plaintiff knew that proving that the June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers had concocted the charges against him would not be possible.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

25. Accordingly, even though he was innocent, plaintiff pleaded guilty to a drug offense on September 11, 2002, and received a sentence of three years imprisonment.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

26. Plaintiff was deprived of liberty during his incarceration because of the above-described wrongful acts of the June 25, 2002 Arresting Officers.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

27. Plaintiff was continuously in custody from his arrest on June 25, 2002 until he was released on parole (“mandatory supervised release”) from the Illinois Department of Corrections on June 23, 2003.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

IV. The Second False Arrest and Illegal Prosecution of Plaintiff

28. On August 27, 2003, plaintiff was arrested by defendants Bolton, Edwards, Jones, Mohammed, Ridgell, Spaargaren, Summers Jr., and Watts (the “August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers”) behind a building at the Ida B. Wells Homes.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed admits that on August 27, 2003, Plaintiff was arrested in the vicinity of the Ida B. Wells Homes.

29. At the time of plaintiff’s arrest:

- a. None of the August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers had a warrant authorizing the arrest of plaintiff;
- b. None of the August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers believed that a warrant had been issued authorizing the arrest of plaintiff;
- c. None of the August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers had observed plaintiff commit any offense; and
- d. None of the August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers had received information from any source that plaintiff had committed an offense.

ANSWER: Upon information and belief, Defendant Mohammed admits the allegation contained in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph. Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in subparagraphs (b)-(d) of this paragraph that are directed against

him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in subparagraphs (b)-(d) of this paragraph as they apply to other defendants.

30. After arresting plaintiff, the August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers conspired, confederated, and agreed to fabricate a false story in an attempt to justify the unlawful arrest, to cover-up their wrongdoing, and to cause plaintiff to be wrongfully detained and prosecuted.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph that are directed against him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

31. The false story fabricated by the August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers included their false claim that they saw plaintiff drop a bag containing drugs and run away.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph that are directed against him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

32. The acts of the August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers in furtherance of their scheme to frame plaintiff included the following:

- a. One or more of the August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers prepared police reports containing the false story, and each of the other August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers failed to intervene to prevent the violation of plaintiff's rights;
- b. One or more of the August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers attested to the false story through the official police reports, and each of the other August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers failed to intervene to prevent the violation of plaintiff's rights;
- c. Defendant Watts formally approved one or more of the official police reports, knowing that the story set out therein was false; and
- d. One or more of the August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers communicated the false story to prosecutors, and each of the other August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers failed to intervene to prevent the violation of plaintiff's rights.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph that are directed against him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

33. The wrongful acts of the August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers were performed with knowledge that the acts would cause plaintiff to be wrongfully held in custody and falsely prosecuted for an offense that had never occurred.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph that are directed against him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

34. Plaintiff was charged with a drug offense because of the wrongful acts of the August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed admits that Plaintiff was charged with a drug offense. Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph that are directed against him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

35. Plaintiff knew that proving that the August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers had concocted the charges against him would not be possible.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies he falsified or otherwise “concocted” the criminal charges against Plaintiff. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

36. Accordingly, even though he was innocent, plaintiff pleaded guilty to a drug offense on December 8, 2003, and received a sentence of 18 months imprisonment.

ANSWER: Upon information and belief, Defendant Mohammed admits that Plaintiff received a sentence of eighteen months of imprisonment, lacks knowledge as to guilty plea, and denies the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

37. Plaintiff was deprived of liberty during his incarceration because of the above-described wrongful acts of the August 27, 2003 Arresting Officers.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies he engaged in the wrongful acts alleged by plaintiff and, therefore, denies the allegations contained in this paragraph as directed against him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

38. Plaintiff was continuously in custody from his arrest on August 27, 2003 until he was released on parole (“mandatory supervised release”) from the Illinois Department of Corrections on May 6, 2004.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

V. The Third False Arrest and Illegal Prosecution of Plaintiff

39. On March 12, 2005, plaintiff was arrested by defendants Bolton, Cabrales, Gonzalez, Leano, Nichols, and Watts (the “March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers”) in a common area of a building at the Ida B. Wells Homes.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

40. At the time of plaintiff’s arrest:

- a. None of the March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers had a warrant authorizing the arrest of plaintiff;
- b. None of the March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers believed that a warrant had been issued authorizing the arrest of plaintiff;
- c. None of the March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers had observed plaintiff commit any offense; and
- d. None of the March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers had received information from any source that plaintiff had committed an offense.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

41. After arresting plaintiff, the March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers conspired, confederated, and agreed to fabricate a false story in an attempt to justify the unlawful arrest, to cover-up their wrongdoing, and to cause plaintiff to be wrongfully detained and prosecuted.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

42. The false story fabricated by the March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers included their false claim that they saw plaintiff trying to hide drugs in vent in the hallway of a building at the Ida B. Wells Homes.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

43. The acts of the March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers in furtherance of their scheme to frame plaintiff included the following:

- a. One or more of the March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers prepared police reports containing the false story, and each of the other March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers failed to intervene to prevent the violation of plaintiff's rights;
- b. One or more of the March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers attested to the false story through the official police reports, and each of the other March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers failed to intervene to prevent the violation of plaintiff's rights;
- c. Defendant Watts formally approved one or more of the official police reports, knowing that the story set out therein was false; and
- d. One or more of the March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers communicated the false story to prosecutors, and each of the other March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers failed to intervene to prevent the violation of plaintiff's rights.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

44. The wrongful acts of the March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers were performed with knowledge that the acts would cause plaintiff to be wrongfully held in custody and falsely prosecuted for an offense that had never occurred.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

45. Plaintiff was charged with a drug offense because of the wrongful acts of the March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

46. Plaintiff knew that proving that the March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers had concocted the charges against him would not be possible.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

47. Accordingly, even though he was innocent, plaintiff pleaded guilty to a drug offense on July 28, 2005, and received a sentence of 42 months imprisonment.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

48. Plaintiff was deprived of liberty during his incarceration because of the above-described wrongful acts of the March 12, 2005 Arresting Officers.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

49. Plaintiff was continuously in custody from his arrest on March 12, 2005 until he was released on parole (“mandatory supervised release”) from the Illinois Department of Corrections on June 9, 2006.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

VI. The Fourth False Arrest and Illegal Prosecution of Plaintiff

50. On July 22, 2006, plaintiff was arrested by defendants Gonzalez, Jones, Mohammed, Nichols, Smith and Watts (the “July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers”) in a common area of a building at the Ida B. Wells Homes.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed admits that on July 22, 2006, Plaintiff was arrested in the vicinity of the Ida B. Wells Homes.

51. At the time of plaintiff’s arrest:

- a. None of the July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers had a warrant authorizing the arrest of plaintiff;
- b. None of the July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers believed that a warrant had been issued authorizing the arrest of plaintiff;
- c. None of the July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers had observed plaintiff commit any offense; and
- d. None of the July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers had received information from any source that plaintiff had committed an offense.

ANSWER: Upon information and belief, Defendant Mohammed admits the allegation contained in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph. Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in subparagraphs (b)-(d) of this paragraph that are directed against him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in subparagraphs (b)-(d) of this paragraph as they apply to other defendants.

52. After arresting plaintiff, the July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers conspired, confederated, and agreed to fabricate a false story in an attempt to justify the unlawful arrest, to cover-up their wrongdoing, and to cause plaintiff to be wrongfully detained and prosecuted.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph that are directed against him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

53. The false story fabricated by the July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers included their false claim that they saw plaintiff trying to hide drugs in a closet in the hallway of a building at the Ida B. Wells Homes.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph that are directed against him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

54. The acts of the July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers in furtherance of their scheme to frame plaintiff included the following:

- a. One or more of the July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers prepared police reports containing the false story, and each of the other July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers failed to intervene to prevent the violation of plaintiff's rights;
- b. One or more of the July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers attested to the false story through the official police reports, and each of the other July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers failed to intervene to prevent the violation of plaintiff's rights;
- c. Defendant Watts formally approved one or more of the official police reports, knowing that the story set out therein was false; and
- d. One or more of the July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers communicated the false story to prosecutors, and each of the other July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers failed to intervene to prevent the violation of plaintiff's rights.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph that are directed against him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

55. The wrongful acts of the July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers were performed with knowledge that the acts would cause plaintiff to be wrongfully held in custody and falsely prosecuted for an offense that had never occurred.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph that are directed against him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

56. Plaintiff was charged with a drug offense because of the wrongful acts of the July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed admits that Plaintiff was charged with a drug offense. Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph that are directed against him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

57. Plaintiff knew that proving that the July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers had concocted the charges against him would not be possible.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies he falsified or otherwise “concocted” the criminal charges against Plaintiff. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

58. Accordingly, even though he was innocent, plaintiff pleaded guilty to a drug offense on August 25, 2006, and received a sentence of four years imprisonment.

ANSWER: Upon information and belief, Defendant Mohammed admits that Plaintiff received a sentence of four years of imprisonment, lacks knowledge as to guilty plea, and denies the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

59. Plaintiff was deprived of liberty during his incarceration because of the above-described wrongful acts of the July 22, 2006 Arresting Officers.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies he engaged in the wrongful acts alleged by plaintiff and, therefore, denies the allegations contained in this paragraph as directed against him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

60. Plaintiff was continuously in custody from his arrest on July 22, 2006 until he was released on parole (“mandatory supervised release”) from the Illinois Department of Corrections on January 18, 2008.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

VII. Plaintiff’s Exonerations

61. Plaintiff challenged his convictions after he learned that federal prosecutors and lawyers for other wrongfully convicted individuals had discovered the Watts Gang’s criminal enterprise.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

62. On September 24, 2018, the Circuit Court of Cook County granted the State's motion to set aside plaintiff's convictions; immediately thereafter, the Court granted the State's request to *nolle prosequi* all four cases.

ANSWER: Upon information and belief, Defendant Mohammed admits that plaintiff's conviction was vacated but lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

63. On November 2, 2018, the Circuit Court of Cook County granted plaintiff four Certificates of Innocence.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

VIII. Plaintiff's Arrests and Prosecutions Were Part of a Long-Running Pattern Known to High Ranking Officials within the Chicago Police Department

64. Before the Watts Gang engineered plaintiff's above-described wrongful arrests, detentions, and prosecutions, the Chicago Police Department had received numerous civilian complaints that defendant Watts and the Watts Gang were engaging in robbery, extortion, the use of excessive force, planting evidence, fabricating evidence, and manufacturing false charges against persons at the Ida B. Wells Homes.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies that he engineered plaintiff's arrest, detention or prosecution and lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

65. Criminal investigators corroborated these civilian complaints with information they obtained from multiple cooperating witnesses.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

66. Before the Watts Gang engineered plaintiff's above-described wrongful arrests, detentions, and prosecutions, defendants Cline and Kirby knew about the above-described credible allegations of serious wrongdoing by Watts and the Watts Gang and knew that criminal investigators had corroborated these allegations.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies that he engineered plaintiff's arrest, detention or prosecution and lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

67. Defendants Cline and Kirby also knew, before the Watts Gang engineered plaintiff's above-described wrongful arrests, detentions, and prosecutions, that, absent intervention by the Chicago Police Department, Watts and his gang would continue to engage in robbery and extortion, use excessive force, plant evidence, fabricate evidence, and manufacture false charges.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies that he engineered plaintiff's arrest, detention or prosecution and lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

68. The Internal Affairs Division of the Chicago Police knew about the lawlessness of Watts and his gang by 2004.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies that he engineered plaintiff's arrest, detention or prosecution and lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

69. Defendants Cline and Kirby had the power and the opportunity to prevent Watts and his gang from continuing to engage in the above-described wrongdoing.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies that he engineered plaintiff's arrest, detention or prosecution and lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

70. Defendants Cline and Kirby deliberately chose to turn a blind eye to the pattern of wrongdoing by Watts and his gang.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies that he engineered plaintiff's arrest, detention or prosecution and lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

71. As a direct and proximate result of the deliberate indifference of defendants Cline and Kirby, Watts and his gang continued to engage in robbery and extortion, use excessive force, plant evidence, fabricate evidence, and manufacture false charges against persons at the Ida B.

Wells Homes, including but not limited to the wrongful arrests, detentions, and prosecutions of plaintiff, as described above.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies that he engineered plaintiff's arrest, detention or prosecution and lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

IX. Official Policies and Customs of the Chicago Police Department Were the Moving Force behind the Defendants' Misconduct

72. At all relevant times, the Chicago Police Department maintained official policies and customs that facilitated and condoned the Defendants' misconduct.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies that he engineered plaintiff's arrest, detention or prosecution and, therefore, denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.

A. Failure to Discipline

73. At all relevant times, the Chicago Police Department maintained a policy or custom of failing to discipline, supervise, and control its officers. By maintaining this policy or custom, the City caused its officers to believe that they could engage in misconduct with impunity because their actions would never be thoroughly scrutinized.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph to the extent those allegations are directed to him.

74. Before plaintiff's arrest, policymakers for the City of Chicago knew that the Chicago Police Department's policies or customs for disciplining, supervising, and controlling its officers were inadequate and caused police misconduct.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

75. Despite their knowledge of the City's failed policies and customs for disciplining, supervising, and controlling its officers, the policymakers failed to take action to remedy these problems.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

76. Before the Watts Gang engineered plaintiff's above-described wrongful arrests, detentions, and prosecutions, the individual officer defendants had been the subject of numerous formal complaints of official misconduct.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies he engineered plaintiff's arrest, detention or prosecution and lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

77. As a direct and proximate result of the Chicago Police Department's inadequate policies or customs for disciplining, supervising, and controlling its officers and the policymakers' failure to address these problems, Watts and his gang continued to engage in robbery and extortion, use excessive force, plant evidence, fabricate evidence, and manufacture false charges against persons at the Ida B. Wells Homes, including but not limited to the wrongful arrests, detentions, and prosecutions of plaintiff, as described above.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.

B. Code of Silence

78. At all relevant times, the Chicago Police Department maintained a "code of silence" that required police officers to remain silent about police misconduct. An officer who violated the code of silence would be severely penalized by the Department.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph to the extent those allegations are directed to him and lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

79. At all relevant times, police officers were trained at the Chicago Police Academy not to break the code of silence. Officers were instructed that "Blue is Blue. You stick together. If something occurs on the street that you don't think is proper, you go with the flow. And after that situation, if you have an issue with that officer or what happened, you can confront them. If you don't feel comfortable working with them anymore, you can go to the watch commander and request a new partner. But you never break the code of silence."

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph to the extent those allegations are directed to him and lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

80. This “code of silence” facilitated, encouraged, and enabled the individual officer defendants to engage in egregious misconduct for many years, knowing that their fellow officers would cover for them and help conceal their widespread wrongdoing.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.

81. Consistent with this “code of silence,” the few people within the Chicago Police Department who stood up to Watts and his gang or who attempted to report their misconduct were either ignored or punished, and the Watts Gang was thereby able to engage in misconduct with impunity.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph to the extent those allegations are directed to him and lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

82. Watts and his gang are not the first Chicago police officers whom the City of Chicago allowed to abuse citizens with impunity while the City turned a blind eye.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies that he abused citizens and lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

83. One example of this widespread practice is Chicago police officer Jerome Finnigan, who was convicted and sentenced on federal criminal charges in 2011. One of the charges against Finnigan involved his attempt to hire a hitman to kill a police officer whom Finnigan believed would be a witness against him.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

84. Finnigan was part of a group of officers in the Defendant City’s Special Operations Section who carried out robberies, home invasions, unlawful searches and seizures, and other crimes.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

85. Finnigan and his crew engaged in their misconduct at around the same time that plaintiff was subjected to the abuses described above.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies he engineered plaintiff's arrest, detention or prosecution and denies he otherwise "abused" plaintiff as alleged herein. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

86. Finnigan, like the defendants in this case, had been the subject of many formal complaints of misconduct.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

87. Finnigan revealed at his criminal sentencing hearing in 2011, "You know, my bosses knew what I was doing out there, and it went on and on. And this wasn't the exception to the rule. This was the rule."

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

88. Defendants Watts and Mohammed were criminally charged in federal court in February 2012 after shaking down a federal informant they believed was a drug dealer.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed admits that in 2012, he was criminally charged for violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 641 and 642. Except as specifically admitted, Defendant Mohammed denies the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

89. Defendant Mohammed pleaded guilty in 2012.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed admits that he pleaded guilty in 2012 to a violation of 18 USC §641. Except as specifically admitted, Defendant Mohammed denies the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

90. Defendant Watts pleaded guilty in 2013.

ANSWER: Upon information and belief, Defendant Mohammed admits the allegations contained in this paragraph.

91. In the case of *Obrycka v. City of Chicago et al.*, No. 07-cv-2372 (N.D. Ill.), a federal jury found that as of February 2007, “the City [of Chicago] had a widespread custom and/or practice of failing to investigate and/or discipline its officers and/or code of silence.”

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

92. In December 2015, Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel acknowledged the continued existence of the code of silence within the Chicago Police Department; Emanuel, speaking in his capacity as Mayor, admitted that the code of silence leads to a culture where extreme acts of abuse are tolerated.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

93. In April 2016, the City’s Police Accountability Task Force found that the code of silence “is institutionalized and reinforced by CPD rules and policies that are also baked into the labor agreements between the various police unions and the City.”

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

94. In an official government report issued in January 2017, the United States Department of Justice found that “a code of silence exists, and officers and community members know it.”

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph.

95. The same code of silence in place during the time period at issue in the *Obrycka* case and recognized by the Mayor, the Task Force, and the Department of Justice was also in place when plaintiff suffered the wrongful arrests, detentions, and prosecutions described above.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies he engineered plaintiff’s arrest, detention or prosecution. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

96. As a direct and proximate result of the City’s code of silence, Watts and his gang continued to engage in robbery and extortion, use excessive force, plant evidence, fabricate evidence, and manufacture false charges against persons at the Ida B. Wells Homes, including but not limited to the wrongful arrests, detentions, and prosecutions of plaintiff, as described above.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph to the extent those allegations are directed to him. Defendant Mohammed lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph.

X. Claims

97. As a result of the foregoing, all of the defendants caused plaintiff to be deprived of rights secured by the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.

98. As a supplemental state law claim against defendant City of Chicago only: as a result of the foregoing, plaintiff was subjected to four malicious prosecutions under Illinois law.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed makes no answer to the allegations contained in this paragraph which are not directed against him. To the extent any allegation contained in this paragraph can be said to be directed against him, said allegation is denied.

99. Plaintiff hereby demands trial by jury.

ANSWER: Defendant Mohammed admits that plaintiff demands a trial by jury and joins in said demand.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

1. To the extent Defendant Mohammed was in fact involved in Plaintiff's arrest at issue, Defendant Mohammed is entitled to qualified immunity. He is a government official who performed discretionary functions. At the time of the incidents referenced in Plaintiff's Complaint, Defendant Mohammed was an on-duty member of the Chicago Police Department who was executing and enforcing the law. At all times relevant to Plaintiff's Complaint, a reasonable police officer objectively viewing the facts and circumstances that confronted Defendant Mohammed

could have believed his actions to be lawful, in light of clearly established law and the information the officers possessed at the time.

2. Defendant Mohammed cannot be held liable for Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims unless he individually caused or participated in an alleged constitutional deprivation because individual liability for damages under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 is predicated upon personal responsibility. *See Wolf-Lillie v. Sonquist*, 699 F.2d 864, 869 (7th Cir. 1983).

2. To the extent Defendant Mohammed was in fact involved in Plaintiff's arrest at issue, Defendant Mohammed is not liable for his individual participation in the arrest because, as a public employee, his actions were discretionary and he is immune from liability. 745 ILCS 10/2-201.

3. A public employee is not liable for his act or omission in the execution of any law unless such act or omission constitutes willful or wanton misconduct. 745 ILCS 10/2-202. To the extent Defendant Mohammed was in fact involved in Plaintiff's arrest at issue, Defendant Mohammed was acting in the execution and enforcement of the law at the time of any interactions with Plaintiff and Defendant Mohammed's individual acts were neither willful nor wanton. As a result, Defendant Mohammed is not liable to Plaintiff.

4. To the extent Plaintiff failed to mitigate any of his claimed damages, any verdict or judgment obtained by Plaintiff must be reduced by application of the principle that Plaintiff had a duty to mitigate his damages, commensurate with the degree of failure to mitigate attributed to Plaintiff.

5. Under the Tort Immunity Act, to the extent Defendant Mohammed was in fact involved in Plaintiff's arrest at issue, Defendant Mohammed is not liable for any injury allegedly caused by the instituting or prosecuting of any judicial or administrative proceeding when done

within the scope of his employment, unless such action was done maliciously and without probable cause. 745 ILCS 10/2-208.

6. Under the Tort Immunity Act, Defendant Mohammed is not liable for any injury caused by the action or omission of another public employee. 745 ILCS 10/2-204.

7. To the extent Plaintiff seeks to impose liability based on testimony given by Defendant Mohammed, if any was in fact given by him, Defendant Mohammed is absolutely immune from liability. *Rehberg v. Paulk*, 132 S. Ct. 1497 (2012); *Briscoe v. LaHue*, 460 U.S. 325, 330-31, 103 S. Ct. 1108, 1113 (1983); *Jurgensen v. Haslinger*, 295 Ill. App. 3d 139, 141-42, 692 N.E.2d 347, 349-50 (3d Dist. 1998)

8. Plaintiff's claims in the Complaint are barred by the doctrines of *res judicata* and collateral estoppel.

WHEREFORE, Defendant, Kallatt Mohammed, denies that Plaintiff David Walker is entitled to the relief requested in the Complaint, or to any relief whatsoever, against Mohammed and demands: 1) entry of a judgment dismissing Plaintiff's Complaint in its entirety as to Defendant Mohammed; 2) for an award of the costs incurred in defending this action; and 3) for such other relief as the Court deems appropriate.

JURY DEMAND

Defendant, Kallatt Mohammed, hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Eric S. Palles #2136473

ERIC S. PALLES
Special Assistant Corporation Counsel

Eric S. Palles
Sean M. Sullivan
Lisa Altukhova
Daley Mohan Groble P.C.

55 W. Monroe St., Suite 1600

Chicago, IL 60603

(312) 422-9999

epalles@daleymohan.com

ssullivan@daleymohan.com

lisaa@daleymohan.com

Counsel for Defendant Kallatt Mohammed

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on September 30, 2024, I caused the foregoing Defendant Kallatt Mohammed's Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint to be served on all counsel of record using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to all counsel of record.

/s/Eric S. Palles
Special Assistant Corporation Counsel
One of the attorneys for Kallatt Mohammed