

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
COUNTY OF NEW YORK**

\_\_\_\_\_X  
**DENNIS KILKENNY AND PATRICIA KILKENNY,**

**Plaintiffs,**

v.

**AII ACQUISITION, LLC,**

**Defendants.**

**Index No. 190011/2024**

**VERIFIED ANSWER TO  
PLAINTIFFS' VERIFIED  
COMPLAINT, CROSS-  
CLAIM AND ANSWER TO  
CROSS-CLAIMS OF IMO  
INDUSTRIES INC.**

\_\_\_\_\_X

Defendant Imo Industries Inc, sued incorrectly as IMO INDUSTRIES INC. ind. and as suc to DELAVAL TURBINE, TRANSAMERICA DELAVAL AND IMO DELAVAL”, hereinafter (“Imo”), by its attorneys Leader Berkon Colao & Silverstein LLP, hereby answers the Verified Complaint (hereinafter “Complaint”) filed on January 9, 2024, as follows:

1. Imo denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 1 of the Complaint.
2. Imo denies the allegations contained in paragraph 2 of the Complaint insofar as they are directed against Imo, except admits that it has conducted business in the City and the State of New York and otherwise denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 2 of the Complaint.
3. Imo denies the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 3 through 7 of the Complaint insofar as they are directed against Imo, and otherwise denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 3 through 7 of the Complaint and refers all questions of law to the Court.
4. Imo denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 8 through 9 of the Complaint.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

5. With regard to the unnumbered paragraph under the section labeled “FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION”, Imo repeats, reiterates and realleges each and every response as to paragraphs 1 through 9 of the Complaint as if more fully set forth herein.

6. Imo denies the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 10 through 35 (inclusive) of the Complaint, including all sub-parts therein, insofar as they are directed against Imo, and otherwise denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 10 through 35 of the Complaint.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

7. With regard to the unnumbered paragraph under the section labeled “SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION”, Imo repeats, reiterates and realleges each and every response as to paragraphs 1 through 35 of the Complaint as if more fully set forth herein.

8. Imo denies the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph (inclusive) of the Complaint, insofar as they are directed against Imo, and otherwise denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in 36 through 39 of the Complaint.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

9. With regard to the unnumbered paragraph under the section labeled “THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION”, Imo repeats, reiterates and realleges each and every response as to paragraphs 1 through 39 of the Complaint as if more fully set forth herein.

10. Imo denies the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 40 and 41 of the Complaint, insofar as they are directed against Imo, and otherwise denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 40 and 41 of the Complaint and refers all questions of law to the Court.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

11. With regard to paragraph 42 of the complaint, Imo repeats, reiterates and realleges each and every response as to paragraphs 1 through 41 of the Complaint as if more fully set forth herein.

12. Imo denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 43 through 68 of the Complaint, including all sub-parts, as these allegations do not pertain to it.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

13. With regard to paragraph 69 of the Complaint, Imo repeats, reiterates and realleges each and every response as to paragraphs 1 through 68 of the Complaint as if more fully set forth herein.

14. Imo denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 70 through 82 of the Complaint, as these allegations do not pertain to it.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

15. With regard to paragraph 83 of the Complaint, Imo repeats, reiterates and realleges each and every response as to paragraphs 1 through 82 of the Complaint as if more fully set forth herein.

16. Imo denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 84 through 92 of the Complaint, as these allegations do not pertain to it.

17. Imo denies the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 93 through 98 of the Complaint, insofar as they are directed against Imo, and otherwise denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 93 through 98 of the Complaint and refers all questions of law to the Court.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

18. With regard to the unnumbered paragraph under the section labeled “SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION”, Imo repeats, reiterates and realleges each and every response as to paragraphs 1 through 98 of the Complaint as if more fully set forth herein.

19. Imo denies the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 99 of the Complaint.

AS AND FOR A FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

20. The Complaint fails to state a cause of action upon which relief can be granted against Imo.

AS AND FOR A SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

21. Plaintiffs’ claims are time barred by reason of the applicable statute(s) of limitations.

AS AND FOR A THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

22. Plaintiffs’ claims are barred by the operation of the doctrine of estoppel.

AS AND FOR A FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

23. Plaintiff has waived all claims against Imo.

AS AND FOR A FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

24. This Court lacks both general and specific personal jurisdiction over Imo. Imo further objects to and denies an exercise of general jurisdiction over it, notwithstanding any Plaintiff’ allegations in the complaint purporting to establish a basis for general jurisdiction (see, e.g., Daimler AG v. Bauman, 571 U.S. 117 (2014); BNSF Ry. Co. v. Tyrrell, 137 S.Ct. 1549 (2017); Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Sup. Ct. of Cal., S.F. Cty, 137 S.Ct. 1773 (2017); cf., Gibson v. Air & Liquid Sys. Corp., 173 AD3d 519 [1<sup>st</sup> Dept., 2019]).

AS AND FOR A SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

25. The venue of this action is improper.

AS AND FOR A SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

26. Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the doctrines of res judicata and/or collateral estoppel.

AS AND FOR AN EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

27. Plaintiffs' speculative, uncertain and/or contingent damages have not accrued and are not recoverable.

AS AND FOR A NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

28. This cause of action must be dismissed in the event Plaintiff has another action pending against Imo for the same cause of action in another court.

AS AND FOR A TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

29. In the event Plaintiff executed a settlement agreement releasing and discharging Imo from all claims arising out of Plaintiffs' alleged injury, all claims alleged by Plaintiff should be dismissed.

AS AND FOR AN ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

30. To the extent that Plaintiff has given a release or covenant not to sue or not to enforce a judgment to an alleged co-tortfeasor of Imo, Plaintiffs' claim herein is reduced to the extent of any amount stipulated by the release or covenant, in the amount of the consideration paid for it, or in the amount of the released tortfeasor's equitable share of the damages, whichever is greater.

AS AND FOR A TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

31. Plaintiff was not injured by exposure to Imo's products.

AS AND FOR A THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

32. In the event that Plaintiff was employed by any of the Defendants, Plaintiffs' sole and exclusive remedy is under the Worker's Compensation Law of the State of New York.

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.