

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF CRAIGHEAD COUNTY, ARKANSAS  
FIRST DIVISION**

**RACHEL ANDERSON**

**PLAINTIFF**

**V.**

**CASE NO. 16JCV-23-2110**

**RICK ELLIOTT, Individually and  
In his official capacity as Police Chief  
Of the City of Jonesboro; and  
HAROLD COPENHAVER, Individually  
And in his official capacity as Mayor of  
The City of Jonesboro**

**DEFENDANTS**

---

**ANSWER**

---

COME Defendants, Rick Elliott, individually and in his official capacity as Police Chief of the City of Jonesboro, and Harold Copenhaver, individually and in his official capacity as Mayor of the City of Jonesboro, and for their Answer to the Complaint, state:

1. Defendants acknowledge the bases of Plaintiff's claims but deny any wrongdoing on part of Defendants. Defendants admit venue is proper. Defendants admit this Court has jurisdiction. Defendants admit that Rick Elliott is the Chief of Police of the City of Jonesboro and that Harold Copenhaver is the Mayor of the City of Jonesboro.

2. Defendants admit that Plaintiff was an employee of the City of Jonesboro and was terminated in November 2023. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 2 of the Complaint.

3. Defendants acknowledge the allegations in paragraph 3 of the Complaint but lack sufficient knowledge and information to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 3 of the Complaint and, therefore, deny them.

4. Defendants acknowledge the allegations in paragraph 4 of the Complaint but lack sufficient knowledge and information to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 4 of the Complaint and, therefore, deny them.

5. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph 5 of the Complaint.

6. Defendants acknowledge the allegations in paragraph 6 of the Complaint but lack sufficient knowledge and information to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 6 of the Complaint and, therefore, deny them.

7. Defendants acknowledge the allegations in paragraph 7 of the Complaint and admit that Plaintiff spoke at the hearing in November 2023. Defendants state that the hearing was recorded and Plaintiff's statements speak for themselves. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 7 of the Complaint.

8. Defendants admit that Plaintiff was terminated for violations of City and JPD policies. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 8 of the Complaint.

9. Defendants deny that Plaintiff's actions at the November 2023 hearing were consistent with City and JPD policies. Defendants admit the remaining allegations in paragraph 9 of the Complaint.

10. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph 10 of the Complaint.

11. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 11 of the Complaint.

12. Defendants acknowledge the allegations in paragraph 12 of the Complaint but lack sufficient knowledge and information to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 12 of the Complaint and, therefore, deny them.

13. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 12 of the Complaint.

14. Defendants acknowledge the allegations in paragraph 14 of the Complaint but lack sufficient knowledge and information to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 14 of the Complaint and, therefore, deny them.

15. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 15 of the Complaint.

16. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 16 of the Complaint.

17. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 17 of the Complaint.

18. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 18 of the Complaint.

19. Defendants restate the foregoing paragraphs.

20. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 20 of the Complaint.

21. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 21 of the Complaint.

22. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 22 of the Complaint.

23. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 23 of the Complaint.

24. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 24 of the Complaint.

25. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 25 of the Complaint.

26. Defendants restate the foregoing paragraphs.

27. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 27 of the Complaint.

28. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 28 of the Complaint.

29. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 29 of the Complaint.

30. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 30 of the Complaint.

31. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 31 of the Complaint.

32. Defendants restate the foregoing paragraphs.

33. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 33 of the Complaint.

34. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 34 of the Complaint.

35. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph 35 of the Complaint.

36. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph 36 of the Complaint.

37. Defendants acknowledge the allegations in paragraph 37 of the Complaint but lack sufficient knowledge and information to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 37 of the Complaint and, therefore, deny them.

38. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 38 of the Complaint.

39. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 39 of the Complaint.

40. Defendants acknowledge the JPD policy quoted in paragraph 40 of the Complaint but deny that Plaintiff is entitled to declaratory judgment or any other relief.

41. Defendants acknowledge the basis of the law cited in Paragraph 41 of the Complaint.

42. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 42 of the Complaint.

43. Defendants acknowledge the provision of the City Handbook cited in paragraph 43 of the Complaint but deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 43 of the Complaint.

44. Defendants acknowledge that Plaintiff sent the email quoted in paragraph 44 of the Complaint but deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 44 of the Complaint.

45. Defendants acknowledge the email quoted in paragraph 45 of the Complaint.

46. Defendants acknowledge the text message quoted in paragraph 46 of the Complaint.

47. Defendants acknowledge the allegations in paragraph 47 of the Complaint but lack sufficient knowledge and information to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 47 of the Complaint and, therefore, deny them.

48. Defendants acknowledge the email quoted in paragraph 48 of the Complaint but deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 48 of the Complaint.

49. Defendants acknowledge the allegations in paragraph 49 of the Complaint but lack sufficient knowledge and information to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 49 of the Complaint and, therefore, deny them.

50. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 50 of the Complaint.

51. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 51 of the Complaint.

52. Defendants acknowledge the allegations in paragraph 52 of the Complaint but lack sufficient knowledge and information to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 52 of the Complaint and, therefore, deny them.

53. Defendants acknowledge the allegations in paragraph 53 of the Complaint but deny that Plaintiff was unlawfully censored as alleged in paragraph 53 of the Complaint.

54. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 54 of the Complaint.

55. Defendants acknowledge the allegations in paragraph 55 of the Complaint but lack sufficient knowledge and information to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 55 of the Complaint and, therefore, deny them.

56. Defendants acknowledge the allegations in paragraph 56 of the Complaint but lack sufficient knowledge and information to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 56 of the Complaint and, therefore, deny them.

57. Defendants acknowledge Plaintiff's request for a jury trial and request the same.

58. Defendants deny that Plaintiff is entitled to the relief she seeks in the WHEREFORE clause of the Complaint.

59. Defendants deny, generally and specifically, each material allegation of the Complaint not admitted.

60. Defendants affirmatively state they did not violate the constitutional or statutory rights of Plaintiff.

61. Defendants deny any and all wrongdoing.

62. The allegations in the Complaint fail to state claims upon which relief can be granted and should be dismissed pursuant to Ark. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).

63. As a separate, alternative affirmative defense to the Complaint, Defendants allege Plaintiff's claims may be barred by any or all of the affirmative defenses set forth in Rule 8(c) of the state and federal rules of civil procedure. The extent to which Plaintiff's claims may be barred by one or more

affirmative defenses, not specifically set forth, cannot be determined until Defendants have an opportunity to complete discovery.

64. Defendant may seek leave of Court to plead additional defenses upon the discovery of new or additional information.

WHEREFORE, premises considered, Defendants, Rick Elliott, individually and in his official capacity as Police Chief of the City of Jonesboro, and Harold Copenhaver, individually and in his official capacity as Mayor of the City of Jonesboro, pray the Complaint be dismissed, for their costs and attorney's fees, and all other appropriate relief.

Respectfully submitted,

FUQUA CAMPBELL, P.A.  
Riviera Tower  
3700 Cantrell Road, Suite 205  
Little Rock, AR 72202  
(501) 374-0200

By: /s/ Chris Stevens  
Chris Stevens, Ark. Bar No. 2012289  
cstevens@fc-lawyers.com

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Chris Stevens, hereby certify that on this 12th day of January, 2024, I filed a copy of the foregoing with the Court's electronic filing system, which shall send notice to all counsel of record.

/s/ Chris Stevens\_\_\_\_\_