UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

FILED
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

01 MAR 27 AM II: 48

UNITED STATES

V.

Plaintiff

CIV 01-00+2 BB/WWD

STATE OF NEW MEXICO Engineer, et al

Answer to Complaint

Comes now Louis E. DePauli, Sr. a named defendant in the above entitled cause for his answer to Plaintiff's complaint states that:

I

Defendant is without sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs I(1),II(2),III(3),

IV(4,5,6,)V(7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32 33 and 34), and therefore denies each and every allegations set forth in Plaintiff's complaint.

II

Further answering Plaintiff's complaint Defendant Louis E. DePauli, Sr. requests that this answer to Plaintiff's original complaint be deemed to be the answer to each and every amended complaint which the Plaintiff may file in this matter.

Wherefore Defendant prays that the Complaint of the Plaintiff be dismissed and,

29

For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted this 26th day of March, 2001,

Louis E. DePauli, Sr.

Attorney Pro Se

1610 Redrock Drive

Gallup, N.M. 87301

Telephone 505-863-3483

I hereby certify that I have mailed a copy of this answer to Charles E. O'Connell, Jr. at 601 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W. Washington D.C. 20004 on the 26th day of March, 2001.

Louis E. DePauli, Sr.