RECEIVED CLERK'S OFFICE

BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

MAR - 4 2005

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, by LISA MADIGAN, Attorney General of the State of Illinois,)		STATE OF ILLINOIS Pollution Control Board
Complainant,	.)		•
)	PCB No. 04-207	
v.)	(Enforcement)	
)		4
EDWARD PRUIM, an individual, and)		
ROBERT PRUIM, an individual,)		
)		
Respondents.)		

NOTICE OF FILING

TO: Ms. Dorothy Gunn, Clerk
Illinois Pollution Control Board
James R. Thompson Center
100 W. Randolph Street, 11-500
Chicago, IL 60601

Mr. Christopher Grant Assistant Attorney General Environmental Bureau 188 W. Randolph, 20th Floor Chicago, IL 60601

Mr. Bradley Halloran Hearing Officer Illinois Pollution Control Board 100 W. Randolph Street, Suite 11-500 Chicago, IL 60601

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on March 4, 2005, we filed with the Clerk of the Illinois Pollution Control Board an original and eleven copies of **RESPONDENTS' RESPONSE TO COMPLAINANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**, a copy of which is attached and herewith served upon you.

Attorney for Respondent

Mark A. LaRose Clarissa C. Grayson Attorney No. 37346 LaRose & Bosco, Ltd. 200 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 2810 Chicago, IL 60601 (312) 642-4414 Fax (312) 642-0434

THIS FILING IS SUBMITTED ON RECYCLED PAPER



BEFORE THE ILLINOIS POLLUTION CONTROL BOARDMAR - 4 2005

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,)		STATE OF ILLINOIS Pollution Control Board
Complainant,)		Somot Board
)		
vs.)	PCB No. 04-207	
)	(Enforcement)	
EDWARD PRUIM, an individual, and)		
ROBERT PRUIM, an individual,)		
)		
Respondents.)		

RESPONDENTS' RESPONSE TO COMPLAINANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE RESPONDENTS' SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

This matter coming before the Illinois Pollution Control Board in Respondents' Response to Complainant's Motion to Strike Respondents' Second Affirmative Defense, Edward Pruim and Robert Pruim, Respondents, by and through their attorneys, LaRose & Bosco, Ltd., and in support thereof, state as follows:

- Because Complainant has replied to Respondents' first affirmative defense,
 Respondents' present response, therefore, will only address Complainant's Motion to Strike
 Respondent's second affirmative defense.
 - 2. Respondents' second affirmative defense states as follows:
 - "This Complaint is barred because Complainant has failed to state a claim for personal liability under the Act by failing to allege sufficient facts establishing that Respondent had personal involvement or active participation in the acts resulting in liability. Complainant has merely set forth allegations of Respondent's involvement and participation in the management of the corporation, which are insufficient to establish personal liability under the Act."
- 3. Complainant argues that Respondents' second affirmative defense is improper and legally insufficient because it attacks the legal sufficiency of the complaint and is nothing more than

a restatement of its Motion to Dismiss, which has already been denied by the Board.

4. Complainant's argument, however, misses the mark. The affirmative defense of

failure to state a cause of action assumes only for the purpose of the defense that the allegations are

true but are legally insufficient. Stratman v. Brent, 291 Ill.App.3d 123, 129, 683 N.E.2d 951, 955

(1997); 735 ILCS 5/2-619(a)(9). The defense of failure to state a cause of action may be raised at

any time by motion, answer, or otherwise. 735 ILCS 5/2-619(d).

5. Alternatively, if Complainant's Motion to Strike Respondents' Second Affirmative

Defense is granted by the Board, Respondents hereby request that the issues contained in its second

affirmative defense be preserved and that Respondents be permitted to present evidence at trial

concerning the second affirmative defense.

WHEREFORE, based on the foregoing, the parties respectfully request that the Board deny

Complainant's Motion to Strike Respondent's Second Affirmative Defense and allow Respondents

to present evidence at hearing in support thereof; or alternatively, that the Board order that the issues

contained in Respondents' Second Affirmative Defense be preserved and that Respondents be

permitted to present evidence in support thereof at hearing.

Respectfully Submitted.

One of Respondents' Attorneys

Mark A. LaRose Clarissa C. Grayson

LaRose & Bosco, Ltd.

200 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2810

Chicago IL 60601

(312) 642-4414

2

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned, an attorney, on oath states that she caused to be served a copy of the foregoing RESPONDENTS' RESPONSE TO COMPLAINANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE RESPONDENTS' SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE to the following parties of record, by hand delivery this 4th day of March, 2005:

Mr. Christopher Grant Environmental Bureau Assistant Attorney General 188 West Randolph Street, 20th Floor Chicago, IL 60601

Ms. Dorothy Gunn, Clerk Illinois Pollution Control Board James R. Thompson Center 100 W. Randolph Street, 11-500 Chicago, IL 60601 Mr. Bradley Halloran Hearing Officer Illinois Pollution Control Board 100 W. Randolph Street, Suite 11-500 Chicago, IL 60601

Attorney for Respondents

Mark A. LaRose Clarissa C. Grayson Attorney No. 37346 LaRose & Bosco, Ltd. 200 N. LaSalle Street Suite 2810 Chicago, IL 60601 (312) 642-4414