	FOR THE STATE OF OREGON OMAH COUNTY
DAVID KOENIG	Case No. 23CV15424 DEFENDANT JENNIFER
Plaintiff vs	CLINCHY'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION
EVANS CLINCHY JENNIFER CLINCHY and BRIANNA (LOLA) McKISSEN	
Defendants	

RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC REQUESTS

REQUEST NO. 1: You have never witnessed Plaintiff use physical violence against another human being.

RESPONSE: Objections: form, undefined terms. Notwithstanding the objections, reasonable inquiry has been made and the information known or readily obtainable by defendant is insufficient to enable defendant to admit or deny without knowing the definition of the vague term "physical violence against another human being."

REQUEST NO. 2: You were in a romantic relationship with Plaintiff from approximately 2014 to approximately 2016.

RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION – Page 1 of 7

RESPONSE: Objections: form, undefined terms. Notwithstanding the objections, reasonable inquiry has been made and the information known or readily obtainable by defendant is insufficient to enable defendant to admit or deny without knowing the definition of the vague term "romantic."

REQUEST NO. 3: The last time you were in the same place as Plaintiff was July 17, 2018 at the wedding of Chris Lipe and Randi Goldberg in Aruba.

RESPONSE: Objections: form, undefined terms. Notwithstanding the objections, admit, so far as defendant understands the request.

REQUEST NO. 4: At the July 17, 2018 wedding, you initiated a brief conversation with Plaintiff, approaching him at the bar area and asking how he was doing.

RESPONSE: Objections: form, undefined terms. Notwithstanding the objections, admit, so far as defendant understands the request.

REQUEST NO. 5: At the July 17, 2018 wedding, there was no further interaction between yourself and Plaintiff following that brief conversation.

RESPONSE: Objections: form, undefined terms. Notwithstanding the objections, admit, so far as defendant understands the request.

REQUEST NO. 6: Since January 6, 2017, plaintiff has only sent a direct communication to you one time, apart from e-mails sent to multiple recipients, and that was on September 17, 2018 in response to your email of September 13, 2018.

RESPONSE: Objections: form, undefined terms. Notwithstanding the objections, reasonable inquiry has been made and the information known or readily

RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION – Page 2 of 7

obtainable by defendant is insufficient to enable defendant to admit or deny, so far as defendant understands the request.

REQUEST NO. 7: Since March 26, 2019, plaintiff has never communicated with you at all, not even by copying you on a group email.

RESPONSE: Objections: form, undefined terms. Notwithstanding the objections, reasonable inquiry has been made and the information known or readily obtainable by defendant is insufficient to enable defendant to admit or deny, so far as defendant understands the request.

REQUEST NO. 8: You have never sought a restraining order against Plaintiff.

RESPONSE: Objections: form, undefined terms. Notwithstanding the objections, reasonable inquiry has been made and the information known or readily obtainable by defendant is insufficient to enable defendant to admit or deny without knowing the definition of the vague terms "sought" and "restraining order."

REQUEST NO. 9: Prior to 2022, you had never contacted law enforcement in any way regarding Plaintiff.

RESPONSE: Objections: form, undefined terms. Notwithstanding the objections, reasonable inquiry has been made and the information known or readily obtainable by defendant is insufficient to enable defendant to admit or deny without knowing the definition of the vague term "law enforcement."

RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION – Page 3 of 7

REQUEST NO. 8: You are the co-founder of the Scrabble tournament organization The Collins Coalition ("CoCo").

RESPONSE: Admit, so far as defendant understands the request.

REQUEST NO. 9: One of the motivations for the founding of CoCo was to exclude plaintiff from participating in its tournaments.

RESPONSE: Objections: form, undefined terms. Notwithstanding the objections, deny, so far as defendant understands the request.

REQUEST NO. 10: You said that it was your husband Evans Clinchy who held a grudge against Plaintiff, and not yourself.

RESPONSE: Objections: form, undefined terms. Notwithstanding the objections, reasonable inquiry has been made and the information known or readily obtainable by defendant is insufficient to enable defendant to admit or deny the use of the exact phrase and wording in the request, so far as defendant understands the request.

REQUEST NO. 11: Prior to April 2022, you never made a complaint to any of the three leading Scrabble tournament organizations regarding Plaintiff.

RESPONSE: Objections: form, undefined terms. Notwithstanding the objections, reasonable inquiry has been made and the information known or readily obtainable by defendant is insufficient to enable defendant to admit or deny without knowing the definitions of the undefined terms used in the request.

REQUEST NO. 12: In the September 9, 2022 statement that you submitted

RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION – Page 4 of 7

to NASPA, you included a letter to Jason Idalski with two sentences highlighted. The first highlighted sentence is, "Like so many women, I have been sexually assaulted in the past." This sentence does not refer to Plaintiff.

RESPONSE: Objections: form, undefined terms. Notwithstanding the objections, reasonable inquiry has been made and the information known or readily obtainable by defendant is insufficient to enable defendant to admit or deny without knowing the definition of the vague term "refer."

REQUEST NO. 13: In the same letter, the second highlighted sentence is, "I forfeited the game because I would find it intensely distressful to relive that trauma by playing against a man who has harassed and behaved disrespectfully towards women." This sentence refers to Sam Kantimathi, NOT to the Plaintiff.

RESPONSE: Objections: form, undefined terms. Notwithstanding the objections, admit, so far as defendant understands the request.

REQUEST NO. 14: Did you state, while employed the White House Office of Technology and Policy, that it would be smarter to assassinate a Supreme Court Justice than to assassinate a President?

RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION – Page 5 of 7

1	
2	RESPONSE: Defendant respectfully objects for the reasons stated in the pending
3	motion for protective order.
4	June 8, 2023
5	RESPECTFULLY FILED,
6	
7 8	/s/ Michael Fuller Michael Fuller, OSB No. 09357
° 9	Lead Trial Attorney for Defendant OlsenDaines
10	US Bancorp Tower
11	111 SW 5th Ave., Suite 3150 Portland, Oregon 97204
12	<u>michael@underdoglawyer.com</u> Direct 503-222-2000
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION – Page 6 of 7

1	
2	PROOF OF SERVICE
3	I certify that I caused this document to be served on:
4	
5	Plaintiff David Koenig c/o attorney Marc Mohan
6	1525 SE 22nd Avenue
7	Portland, Oregon 97214 <u>veritelawcompany@gmail.com</u>
8 9	
10	Defendant BriAnna McKissen
11	Ashley L. Vaughn 3835 NE Hancock St., Ste. GL-B
12	Portland, Oregon 97212 <u>ashley@dumasandvaughn.com</u>
13	
14	June 8, 2023
15	5 une 6, 2025
16	<u>/s/ Michael Fuller</u> Michael Fuller, OSB No. 09357
17	Lead Trial Attorney for Defendant
18	OlsenDaines US Bancorp Tower
19	111 SW 5th Ave., Suite 3150 Portland, Oregon 97204
20	michael@underdoglawyer.com
21	Direct 503-222-2000
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION – Page 7 of 7