

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Anmarie Calgaro,

Plaintiff,

v.

St. Louis County et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-3919 (PAM/LIB)

**ST. LOUIS COUNTY AND LINNEA MIRSCH'S ANSWER  
TO ANMARIE CALGARO'S VERIFIED COMPLAINT  
FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF AND INJUNCTION**

St. Louis County and Linnea Mirsch (collectively, the “St. Louis County Defendants”) submit this answer to Anmarie Calgaro’s Verified Complaint for Declaratory Relief and Injunction (Docket No. 1). The St. Louis County Defendants deny all allegations in the complaint that are not specifically admitted, denied, or handled pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(b)(5) below.

**INTRODUCTION**

As a parent and mother, Anmarie Calgaro seeks to have this Court affirm her parental rights over her minor children. Minnesota common law allows for the emancipation of minor children. However, while the law provides no distinct process for emancipation, there is no process for a parent to protect their fundamental parental rights to make decisions concerning the care, custody and control of their children.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St.

Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the allegations in the second sentence and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

Under Minnesota Statute § 144.341, Minnesota's "emancipation law" for medical services, Ms. Calgaro has no statutory or common law cause of action to (1) challenge Defendant St. Louis County Public Health and Human Service's eligibility determination to pay for and/or approve payment of J.D.K.'s medical services at Park Nicollet and Fairview without parental consent, nor (2) to challenge Defendants Park Nicollet's and Fairview's determination of emancipation of J.D.K. to provide medical services without parental consent. Meanwhile, as J.D.K.'s mother, she is denied access to his medical records. Likewise, there is no statutory or common law cause of action for Ms. Calgaro to fully or partially regain her parental rights over her minor child.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny that the St. Louis County Department of Public Health and Human Services made an eligibility determination to pay for and/or approve payment of J.D.K.'s medical services at Park Nicollet and Fairview without parental consent and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

In addition, based upon an attorney's opinion letter regarding emancipation, St. Louis County School District officials have refused her access to common school district records, including class assignments, grades, and the like of her minor child J.D.K. The letter of emancipation J.D.K. obtained from a legal aid service agency is not a court order. The School District provided Ms. Calgaro no notice or hearing prior to terminating her parental rights regarding J.D.K.'s education nor a hearing or process afterwards to regain her parental rights over her minor child.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that the letter of emancipation J.D.K. obtained from a legal aid service agency is not a court order and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

Meanwhile, her minor child J.D.K. received, and continues to receive, major elective medical services provided by Park Nicollet—and paid by St. Louis County—for a sex change without her consent or court order of emancipation. Similarly, Fairview prescribes narcotics to J.D.K. without her consent and without a court order. As with the St. Louis School District, Park Nicollet and Fairview Health Services did not provide Ms. Calgaro notice or a hearing that resulted in the loss of her parental rights.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations in the first sentence as they relate to St. Louis County and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

Ms. Calgaro seeks declaratory and injunctive relief and damages under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for the loss of her right to due process which directly affected her parental rights over her minor child. She seeks further relief necessary to prevent the Defendants from offering any additional services to her minor children without parental consent until she has had an opportunity in state court to petition to restore all or part of her parental rights before an emancipation is adjudicated before a court of law.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St.

Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the characterization of the relief sought by Ms. Calgaro but deny that she is entitled to any relief against them.

Finally, she demands that the Defendants provide her medical records, educational records, and similar records of her minor child J.D.K. and prevent the Defendants from refusing to provide the same records of her minor children until legal processes described above are followed. Attorney fees for the prosecution of this action are also demanded.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the characterization of the relief sought by Ms. Calgaro but deny that she is entitled to any relief against them

### **JURISDICTION**

1. The U.S. District Court has federal issue jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and civil rights jurisdiction under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that this Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over this action as it relates to the St. Louis County Defendants under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 28 U.S.C. § 1343 and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

2. 42 U.S.C. § 1983 is a federal statute authorizing private persons to bring civil rights lawsuits against defendants who operate under state law and violate federal legal rights.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny that Ms. Calgaro has a valid claim against them under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, admit that 42 U.S.C. § 1983 is a federal statute authorizing private persons to bring civil rights lawsuits against defendants who operate under state law and violate federal legal rights under certain circumstances, and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

### **PARTIES**

#### **Plaintiff:**

3. Anmarie Calgaro is a resident of St. Louis County and of the State of Minnesota. Ms. Calgaro is the biological mother of her minor child, 17 year old son J.D.K. Ms. Calgaro has four additional minor children: J.D.K. born on [REDACTED] 1999; J.J.K. born on [REDACTED] 2005; J.J.C. born on [REDACTED] 2009; and a step-daughter M.R.C. born on [REDACTED] 2003. As a parent, she makes decisions regarding her minor children's care, custody and management. Ms. Calgaro has not relinquished any of her parental rights over her minor children.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the allegations concerning J.D.K.'s date of birth and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

**Defendants:**

4. St. Louis County is a political subdivision of the State of Minnesota. The County and its officials are responsible for creating, adopting, approving, ratifying, and enforcing policies, customs, practices, or procedures (or lack of procedures), which includes the lack of notice or hearing to retain or restore the parental rights of Ms. Calgaro either before or after a decision the County or County officials made concluding J.D.K, Ms. Calgaro's minor child, was emancipated. The County provided financial aid, and/or approval thereof, to J.D.K. for living or medical expenses or both.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the allegations in the first sentence, admit that St. Louis County and its official are responsible for creating, adopting, approving, ratifying, and enforcing certain policies, customs, practices, or procedures and otherwise deny the allegations in the second sentence, deny that St. Louis County provided financial aid, and/or approval thereof, to J.D.K. for the medical expenses at issue and that St. Louis County provided financial aid to J.D.K. for the living expenses at issue and otherwise admit the allegations in the third sentence.

5. The St. Louis County's policies, customs, practices, or procedures (or lack of procedures), acting under the color of state law, were the moving force behind the constitutional violations asserted in this Complaint.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

6. St. Louis County Public Health and Human Services Department (“Department of Public Health”) is a county agency which provides services in the areas of Adults, Children & Families, Disabilities, Elderly, Financial Assistance and Public Health. Under the facts of this case, St. Louis County provided to the minor child of Ms. Calgaro, J.D.K., funds and/or approved funding for medical services and other living expenses. As a county which provides social services to minor children, it is responsible for adhering to its policies, state law and federal law. The Department of Health and its officials are responsible for creating, adopting, approving, ratifying, and enforcing policies, customs, practices, or procedures (or lack of procedures), which includes the lack of notice or hearing to retain or restore the parental rights of Ms. Calgaro either before or after a decision the Department of Health officials made concluding J.D.K, Ms. Calgaro’s minor child, was emancipated. The Department of Health provided financial aid, and/or approval thereof, to J.D.K. for living or medical expenses or both.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the allegations in the first sentence, deny that St. Louis County provided to the minor child of Ms. Calgaro, J.D.K., funds and/or approved funding for the medical services at issue and that St. Louis County provided to the minor child of Ms. Calgaro, J.D.K., funds for the other living expenses at issue and otherwise admits the allegations in the second sentence, admits the allegations in the third sentence, admits that the St. Louis County Department of Public Health and Human Services and its officials are responsible for creating, adopting, approving, ratifying, and enforcing certain policies, customs, practices, or procedures and otherwise deny the allegations in the fourth sentence, and admits that the St. Louis County Department of Public Health provided approval of financial aid for J.D.K.’s living expenses and otherwise denies the allegations in the fifth sentence.

7. The Department of Public Health's policies, customs, practices, or procedures (or lack of procedures) were the moving force behind the constitutional violations asserted in this Complaint.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

8. Defendant Linnea Mirsch is the interim director of the St. Louis County Health and Human Services Department. The director is the final decision and policy maker for the Department.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

9. Ms. Mirsch is an agent, representative, or employee of the Department of Health. As such, she is acting under the color of state law and is being sued in her individual and official capacity as the director of the Department of Health.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that Ms. Mirsch acts under color of state law under certain circumstances and that she is being sued in her individual and official capacities and otherwise deny the allegations.

10. Park Nicollet Health Services ("Park Nicollet") is a Minnesota non-profit corporation which provides medical services to the members of the public. It receives state funding to provide medical services to the public. In Minneapolis, Park Nicollet

Minneapolis has a Gender Services Clinic. At this clinic, Park Nicollet provides medical services to change sex identity. As a medical service provider, Park Nicollet is responsible for adhering to its policies, state law and federal law. Park Nicollet and its officials are responsible for creating, adopting, approving, ratifying, and enforcing policies, customs, practices, or procedures (or lack of procedures), which includes the lack of notice or hearing to retain or restore the parental rights of Ms. Calgaro either before or after a decision Park Nicollet officials made concluding J.D.K, Ms. Calgaro's minor child, was emancipated under Minnesota Statute § 144.341. Park Nicollet provided medical services to J.D.K. without the consent or knowledge of Ms. Calgaro.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

11. Park Nicollet's policies, customs, practices, or procedures (or lack of procedures), acting under the color of state law, were the moving force behind the constitutional violations asserted in this Complaint.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

12. Fairview Health Services ("Fairview") is a Minnesota non-profit corporation which provides medical services to the members of the public. Fairview receives state funding for services provided to the public. In Hibbing, Fairview has a hospital known as Fairview Range Hospital. At the Range Hospital, Park Nicollet provides medical services to the public. As a medical service provider, Park Nicollet is responsible for adhering to its policies, state law and federal law. Fairview and its officials are responsible for creating, adopting, approving, ratifying, and enforcing policies, customs, practices, or procedures (or lack of procedures), which includes the lack of notice or hearing to retain or restore the parental rights of Ms. Calgaro either

before or after a decision Fairview officials made concluding J.D.K, Ms. Calgaro's minor child, was emancipated under Minnesota Statute § 144.341. Fairview provided medical services to J.D.K. without the consent or knowledge of Ms. Calgaro.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

13. Fairview's policies, customs, practices, or procedures (or lack of procedures), acting under the color of state law, were the moving force behind the constitutional violations asserted in this Complaint.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

14. St. Louis County School District is a Minnesota school district which includes J.D.K. as a student enrolled at Cherry School in post secondary educational opportunities. The School District is a governmental entity and receives state funding. The School Board is the final decision and policy maker for the School District. The School District and its officials are responsible for creating, adopting, approving, ratifying, and enforcing policies, customs, practices, or procedures (or lack of procedures), which includes the lack of notice or hearing to retain or restore the parental rights of Ms. Calgaro either before or after a decision School District officials made concluding J.D.K, Ms. Calgaro's minor child, was emancipated. The School District provided educational services to J.D.K., refused to provide Ms. Calgaro with district documents regarding J.D.K.'s education and refused to provide her an opportunity to participate in J.D.K.'s educational opportunities.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

15. The School District's policies, customs, practices, or procedures (or lack of procedures), acting under the color of state law, were the moving force behind the constitutional violations asserted in this Complaint.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

16. Michael Johnson is the principal at Cherry School within the St. Louis County School District. As principal, Mr. Johnson is the final decision- and policy maker directly affecting the school, including how to implement district-wide policies for Cherry School.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

17. Mr. Johnson is an agent, representative, or employee of the School District. As such, he is acting under the color of state law and is being sued in his individual and official capacity as the principal of Cherry School.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

18. J.D.K. is a 17 year old son of Ms. Calgaro and a resident of St. Louis County, State of Minnesota. J.D.K. is an interested party as it relates to the allegations asserted in this Complaint.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the allegations concerning J.D.K.'s age and residence and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

### **BACKGROUND FACTS**

**I. J.D.K. is the biological child of Ms. Calgaro and remains a minor under Minnesota law.**

19. Ms. Calgaro is the biological mother and parent of J.D.K.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

20. J.D.K. is Ms. Calgaro's child.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

21. Ms. Calgaro is also the mother and parent of additional minor children, born after J.D.K.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

22. Ms. Calgaro brings this lawsuit on behalf of her parental rights regarding these children as well.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

23. J.D.K. was born on [REDACTED] 1999.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the allegations.

24. Park Nicollet's and Fairview's determination of emancipation was based on the government's willingness to pay for the medical services via Defendant St. Louis County's determination that J.D.K. was emancipated and was eligible for such benefits.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations as they relate to St. Louis County and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

25. There is no parental cause of action under Minnesota statute or common law to challenge St. Louis County's, Park Nicollet's and Fairview's determinations which led to the government-paid medical services being provided to J.D.K. without parental consent.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny that St. Louis County made any determination which led to government-paid medical services being provided to J.D.K. without parental consent and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

26. The Minnesota statute allowing the medical service provider to determine emancipation does not provide a cause of action for a parent to bring a lawsuit to restore full or partial parental rights.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

27. Although Minnesota common law recognizes a minor child's right to petition for emancipation, there is no Minnesota common law cause of action for a parent to bring in court to restore full or partial parental rights once a child is emancipated for medical services without a court order.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

28. Specifically, Minnesota Statute § 144.341, enacted in 1971, authorizes medical service providers to determine whether a minor child such as J.D.K. is emancipated without a court order:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any minor who is living separate and apart from parents or legal guardian, whether with or without the consent of a parent or guardian and regardless of the duration of such separate residence, and who is managing personal financial affairs, regardless of the source or extent of the minor's income, may give effective consent to personal medical, dental, mental and other health services, and the consent of no other person is required.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St.

Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that Minn. Stat. § 144.341 was enacted in 1971 and that the statute, as amended, contains the quoted language and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

29. There is no corresponding right of a parent to regain or contest the medical service providers' determination of the minor's consent to medical services.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

30. According to the statutes, Park Nicollet and Fairview in determining J.D.K.'s emancipation took into account under "regardless of the source or extent of minor's income" that St. Louis County had determined J.D.K's eligibility for government-paid benefits.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

31. Moreover, if the medical service provider had refused treating J.D.K. as emancipated, J.D.K. was entitled under Minnesota common law to proceed with a petition for emancipation.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

32. Conversely, even though Ms. Calgaro as a mother objects to J.D.K.'s life-changing operation and narcotic drug prescriptions, Ms. Calgaro has no legal rights under Minnesota Statute § 144.341 to bring a cause of action against the medical service providers Park Nicollet and Fairview to restore her full or partial parental rights.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

33. Further, Minnesota common law has never recognized a cause of action for a parent to sue in district court to restore full or partial parental rights after emancipation.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

34. The medical service providers do not provide parental notice and opportunity to be heard prior to or after the emancipation determination terminating parental rights.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St.

Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

35. There is no parental corollary under Minnesota common law for the minor child's petition for a court order of emancipation.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

36. A parent under Minnesota common law has no right to bring a lawsuit after a medical service provider has determined a minor child is "emancipated" under Minnesota Statute § 144.341 without a court order.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

37. Since Minnesota Statute § 144.341 does not authorize a parent to bring such a lawsuit, parents have no legal cause of action in court to challenge a medical service provider's determination of "emancipation" under Minnesota Statute § 144.341.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St.

Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

38. J.D.K. who is a minor child has never obtained a court order of emancipation.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

39. J.D.K has never been involved in Child In Need of Protection or Services (CHIPS) petition court proceedings, foster placement court proceedings, child protection court proceedings nor child custody court proceedings.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

40. Meanwhile, Minnesota courts recognize that J.D.K. as a minor child is not emancipated until a state court decides the minor child J.D.K. is emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

41. Minnesota Statute § 645.451 defines that an individual is an emancipated adult at age 18.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

42. Therefore, under Minnesota law, J.D.K. will be emancipated on [REDACTED] 2017.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

43. Ms. Calgaro's other minor children will reach the age of emancipation later.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

44. Pursuant to a paternity order dated April 14, 2008, Ms. Calgaro has sole physical custody and joint legal custody of J.D.K. (Cty. of Benton v. Justin Gerald Karl, et. al., Ct. File. No. 05-FA-07-3058, Findings of Fact, Concl. of Law, Or. and Jdgmt, Benton Cty. Dist. Ct. (Apr. 14, 2008)).

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

45. J.D.K.'s father, Justin Karl, also has joint legal custody. Although Ms. Calgaro and Karl are divorced, that has not interfered with their communication regarding the welfare of their son J.D.K. Notably, Mr. Karl has been informed about the instant litigation and the claims asserted and has consented to Ms. Calgaro's lawsuit.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

**II. Federal courts have recognized that parents have a fundamental right to the care, custody and control of their children.**

46. As a parent, Ms. Calgaro has a fundamental right to make decisions concerning the care, custody and control of her children.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that, as a parent, Ms. Calgaro has a fundamental right to make certain decisions concerning the care, custody,

and control of her children under certain circumstances and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

47. In *Slaven v. Engstrom*, 710 F.3d 772, 779 (8th Cir. 2013), quoting *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57,66 (2000) (plurality opinion), the Eighth Circuit wrote, “the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment protects the fundamental right of parents to make decisions concerning the care, custody, and control of their children.”

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the allegations.

48. The United States Supreme Court in *Quilloin v. Walcott*, 434 U.S. 246, 255 (1978) wrote, “We have recognized on numerous occasions that the relationship between parent and child is constitutionally protected.”

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the allegations.

49. The United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit in *King v. Olmstead County*, 117 F.3d 1065, 1067 (8th Cir. 1997) wrote, “We have recognized a right to familial relations, which includes the liberty interest of parents in the custody, care, and management of their children.”

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the allegations.

50. Ms. Calgaro has always offered a home to J.D.K. She has also communicated with J.D.K. about how he is always welcome in their home.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

51. Ms. Calgaro has always made efforts to ensure a connection between her and J.D.K.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

52. Ms. Calgaro has never willingly or implicitly given up control or custody of J.D.K.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

53. In 2015, J.D.K. moved in with his father and then moved out. Although J.D.K. refused to come back home, Ms. Calgaro has never surrendered her parental rights over her son's actions or in any other way attempted to sever their relationship as mother and child.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

54. St. Louis County, over Ms. Calgaro's objections, has provided and/or approved moneys to J.D.K. to allow him to live apart from his mother Ms. Calgaro.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that St. Louis County approved certain moneys, deny that it did so over Ms. Calgaro's objections, and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

55. Meanwhile, Ms. Calgaro, at all times, has offered to J.D.K. to live in her home.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

**III. A legal aid clinic provides J.D.K. with a “letter of emancipation,” but fails to investigate the veracity of the allegations asserted.**

**Name change efforts of J.D.K. highlight the lack of a distinct process in emancipation law.**

56. During this period, J.D.K. succeeded in obtaining legal advice from Mid-Minnesota Legal Aid Clinic that he is emancipated without a court order.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the allegations.

57. The lawyer’s “To Whom It May Concern” letter does not accurately reflect the relationship between J.D.K. and Ms. Calgaro.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

58. The letter reflects only what J.D.K. stated were “his” facts.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

59. The Legal Aid Clinic did not contact Ms. Calgaro to investigate, question, confirm or affirm the alleged “facts” asserted by J.D.K. about their relationship.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

60. There was no district court hearing regarding any “factual” allegations asserted in the letter regarding Ms. Calgaro.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

61. There was no administrative hearing regarding any “factual” allegations asserted in the letter regarding Ms. Calgaro.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

62. A district court did not issue a court order stating that J.D.K. was emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

63. There was no district court hearing that adjudicated J.D.K. as emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

64. There was no administrative order that adjudicated J.D.K. as emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

65. There was no administrative hearing that adjudicated J.D.K. as emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St.

Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

66. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a copy of the Mid-Minnesota Legal Aid Clinic letter which states that J.D.K. is emancipated without a court order.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the allegations.

67. Exhibit A has a filing date of October 8, 2015 in Stearns County district court.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the allegations.

68. The filing is in regard to a hearing held on January 20, 2016, wherein J.D.K. tried to change his name to E.J.K., a female name.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

69. The order denying the attempted name change was issued on April 15, 2016 and is attached as Exhibit B.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the allegations.

70. In the April 15, 2016 order, the district court noted that J.D.K. had earlier attempted to change his name in Stearns County.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that the order states that “Petitioner advised the court that a previous application for a change of name had been brought in Stearns County, State of Minnesota,” and otherwise deny the allegations.

71. The court in that earlier proceeding denied J.D.K.’s request noting that:

the Petitioner failed to comply with the statute authorizing change of name in Minnesota, which requires an application for change of name of a minor child be brought in the name of that child by the parent or guardian. Minn. Stat. §259.10.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

72. In the April 15, 2016 order, the district court stated that “a legal issue exists as to whether the juvenile Petitioner herein has a legal basis to assert emancipation, and if

so, how that would affect Petitioner's entitlement to bring an action as a juvenile for a change of name in the State of Minnesota." Exhibit B.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the allegations.

73. The district court stated that based upon the record before it finding:

- the lack of a parent or guardian bringing the Application on behalf of the juvenile;
- the lack of any Minnesota trial court adjudication relative to emancipation;
- the lack of proper notice upon the parents of the juvenile Petitioner;
- among other reasons.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

74. The procedural jurisdictional defects would not allow the court to resolve J.D.K.'s application for a name change and dismissed it without prejudice. Exhibit B.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that the district court

noted certain procedural and potentially jurisdictional defects and that the district court dismissed the application without prejudice and otherwise deny the allegations.

75. Ms. Calgaro was not present at the hearing. She did not, as the order reflected, get notice of the hearing. See Exhibit B.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

76. Meanwhile, Ms. Calgaro has made repeated attempts to retain or regain her parental rights regarding J.D.K. She has repeatedly asked for J.D.K.'s school records from defendant St. Louis School District officials, including the Cherry School principal(s), but they refused her access to his records and refused to communicate with her regarding matters affecting her son.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

77. Ms. Calgaro has made repeated attempts to retain or regain her parental rights regarding J.D.K. with the Defendants St. Louis County and St. Louis County Public Health and Human Services Department. Both officials from these Defendants have refused to provide her with any information regarding J.D.K. and in fact, have refuted further attempts by her to speak with County officials.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that St. Louis County denied a request for government data made by Ms. Calgaro on November 10, 2016, and otherwise deny the allegations.

78. Ms. Calgaro has made repeated attempts to retain or regain her parental rights with officials defendants Fairview Health Services and Park Nicollet Health Services to retain or to regain her parental rights regarding J.D.K. They have refused and refuted any attempts by Ms. Calgaro to obtain any information regarding medical services being provided to J.D.K.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

79. Likewise, Ms. Calgaro sought legal counsel advice from private attorneys about processes or procedures available to maintain, regain, or restore her parental rights in full or in part; however, multiple counsel identified that there is no distinct process in Minnesota to assert her rights as it pertained to maintaining, regaining, or restoring parental rights against the emancipation of her minor child under the circumstances described.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

**IV. In Minnesota, procedural due process is afforded to parents regarding children on matters from marital dissolution proceedings to child protection proceedings.**

80. Minnesota has a strong legal tradition of protecting parental rights.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

81. For instance, in the context of marital dissolution, paternity, and child protection, Minnesota provides parents due process—notice and an opportunity to be heard—prior to or after terminating parental rights.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

82. Moreover, procedural due process rights relating to parental rights are statutorily codified in the contexts of marital dissolution, paternity, and child protection.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

83. Parents in the contexts of marital dissolution, paternity and child protection receive statutorily-required notice and opportunity to be heard in court prior to or after parental rights are terminated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

84. Minnesota Statute § 518.09, et seq., requires notice and hearing, that is due process, relating to parental rights as part of a marital dissolution proceeding.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that Minn. Stat. § 518.09 addresses certain procedural matters relating to proceedings for dissolution or legal separation and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

85. Minnesota Statute § 257.57 requires notice and hearing, that is due process, relating to parental rights as part of a paternity proceeding.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that Minn. Stat. § 257.57 addresses certain procedural matters relating to actions seeking a declaration

with respect to the existence or nonexistence of a father-child relationship and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

86. Minnesota Statute § 260C.141 requires notice and hearing, that is due process, relating to parental rights as part of a child protection proceeding.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admits that Minn. Stat. § 260C.141 addresses certain procedural matters relating to petitions concerning children in need of protection and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

**V. Minors may obtain medical services, including sex change procedures, based on a health service provider’s determination of emancipation without notice or hearing regarding the affected parental rights.**

87. Minnesota Statute § 144.341, enacted in 1971, authorizes medical service providers to determine whether a minor child such as J.D.K. is emancipated without a court order:

**144.341 LIVING APART FROM PARENTS AND MANAGING FINANCIAL AFFAIRS.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, *any minor* who is living separate and apart from parents or legal guardian, whether with or without the consent of a parent or guardian and regardless of the duration of such separate residence, and who is managing personal financial affairs, regardless of the source or extent of the minor’s income, *may give effective consent* to personal medical, dental, mental and other health services, and the consent of no other person is required.

(Emphasis added).

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that Minn. Stat. § 144.341 was enacted in 1971 and that the statute, as amended, contains the quoted language and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

88. There are no rules promulgated by the state or any other agency regarding the implementation of Minnesota Statute § 144.341.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

89. Under § 144.341, there is no provision providing for a process or procedure to give notice to the minor's parent or parents before or after "effective consent" is determined, regarding their protected right to the care, custody, and control of their child.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

90. Under § 144.341, there is no provision providing for a process or procedure to provide the minor's parent or parents a hearing, before or after "effective consent" is determined, regarding their protected right to the care, custody, and control of their child.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

**VI. There is no distinct process to challenge, retain or restore parental rights after an emancipation determination under Minnesota Statute § 144.341 concerning medical services or under common law regarding all matters for which a minor's emancipation determination is used.**

91. Procedural due process rights relating to parental rights after a minor child's emancipation for medical services under Minnesota Statute § 144.341 are not statutorily codified.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

92. Minnesota common law does not recognize a parental cause of action to restore partial or full parental rights in an emancipation context.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St.

Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

93. Notably, the Minnesota judicial website recognizes and states that there is no “specifically defined process” for a minor to become emancipated:

Minnesota Statutes define who is a minor and who is an adult at MN Statutes § 645.451. Generally, being “emancipated” means that a **minor has the same legal responsibilities as an adult.** Minnesota Statutes do not specifically define a process by which a minor can become emancipated.

Courts will review “Petitions for Emancipation” and decide on a case-by-case basis if there is sufficient evidence to find that a minor may live “independently” of his/her parents or guardian. However, the courts **do not** publish forms or instructions to petition for “emancipation.” The Legal Fact Sheet on Emancipation published by Mid- Minnesota Legal Aid explains the basics on this area of law. To get legal advice on your situation, you should talk with a lawyer.<sup>1</sup>

(Original emphasis).

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that, as of December 7, 2016, the cited website includes the quoted language and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

94. Notably, the Minnesota judicial website does not identify a corollary process for a parent to petition for a full or partial restoration of parental rights in the context of an emancipation application or petition in the context of an agency or entity recognizing the emancipation of a minor in the absence of any judicial review process as outlined in the website.

---

<sup>1</sup> Website: <http://www.mncourts.gov/Help-Topics/Emancipation.aspx> (emphasis added).

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

95. In other words, Minnesota courts recognize that a “petition for emancipation”—and the due process for the parent(s) relating thereto—is necessary prior to terminating parental rights in the context of a minor child being emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

96. However, the state legislature, unlike in the subjects areas of marital dissolution, paternity and child protection, have not statutorily codified the procedural due process rights of parents with respect to emancipation of a minor child or with respect to emancipation as determined under Minnesota Statute § 144.341 by finding a minor’s giving of “effective consent.”

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

97. Minnesota Statute § 144.341, as to medical treatment for an emancipated minor child without a court order, terminates parent rights and provides no procedure before nor after to retain, regain, or restore parental rights:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any minor who is living separate and apart from parents or legal guardian, whether with or without the consent of a parent or guardian and regardless of the duration of such separate residence, and who is managing personal financial affairs, regardless of the source or extent of the minor's income, may give effective consent to personal medical, dental, mental and other health services, and the consent of no other person is required.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that Minn. Stat. § 144.341 includes the quoted language and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

98. Minnesota Statute § 144.341 does not provide Minnesota parents with any procedural due process rights prior to or after a minor child being emancipated for the purposes of medical, dental, mental, and other health services.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

99. Neither Park Nicollet nor Fairview provided notice and opportunity to be heard to Ms. Calgaro to participate in or challenge their emancipation decisions regarding J.D.K. before or after the termination of her parental rights.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St.

Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

**VII. The County, Park Nicollet and Fairview determined J.D.K. is emancipated under Minnesota Statute § 144.341 without parental consent and without a court order and denied Plaintiff access to J.D.K.'s medical records.**

100. J.D.K., without parental consent, succeeded in obtaining medical services from Park Nicollet and Fairview.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

101. J.D.K., without parental consent, succeeded in obtaining medical services in the form of prescription drugs, including narcotics, from Fairview, and succeeded in obtaining medical services to change sex from a male to a female from Park Nicollet.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

102. St. Louis County is paying for and/or approving payment for J.D.K.'s medical services through the Department of Health.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

103. The governmental moneys compensate Fairview and Park Nicollet for the medical services provided to J.D.K.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

104. Attached hereto as Exhibit C is a copy of Park Nicollet Minneapolis Gender Services letter which states that J.D.K. is receiving medical services to change sex from a male to a female.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

105. Park Nicollet and Fairview are treating J.D.K. as an adult with exclusive rights to information and decision-making regarding the medical procedures and services J.D.K. is receiving.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

106. Elective medical services for a sex change for a minor child is a life-changing event.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

107. Seeking elective medical services for a sex change by minor child is a life-changing decision.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

108. Park Nicollet did not contact Ms. Calgaro about J.D.K.'s request or consent for a sex change.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

109. Park Nicollet and Fairview did not sufficiently inquire about the sincerity and/or veracity of the minor child J.D.K..

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

110. Without any investigation or inquiry regarding the consent of J.D.K. for elective medical services, neither Park Nicollet nor Fairview can assert that either entity rendered the medical services or procedures in good faith under Minnesota Statute § 144.345.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

111. Further, Park Nicollet and Fairview have determined that medical records will not be provided to Ms. Calgaro under Minnesota Statute § 144.346 governing when medical professions may inform parents about medical treatment where the failure to inform the parent would jeopardize the health of the minor child:

The professional may inform the parent or legal guardian of the minor patient of any treatment given or needed where, in the judgment of the professional, failure to inform the parent or guardian would seriously jeopardize the health of the minor patient.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that Minn. Stat.

§ 144.346 includes the quoted language and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

112. Therefore, under the circumstances of this case, Ms. Calgaro has no access to J.D.K.'s medical records from Park Nicollet, nor Fairview.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

113. In 2016, and through the date of filing of this Complaint, Ms. Calgaro has requested J.D.K.'s medical records from Park Nicollet and has asked to participate in J.D.K.'s medical decisions.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

114. Park Nicollet refused and refuses Ms. Calgaro's requests because Park Nicollet has determined J.D.K. is emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

115. There is no court order granting J.D.K. emancipation that would allow him to give effective consent for medical services, particularly that of a sex change.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

116. Park Nicollet has provided and continues to provide medical services to J.D.K. without Ms. Calgaro's consent.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

117. Moreover, Park Nicollet does not provide a process in which Ms. Calgaro can regain or otherwise retain her parental rights over the care, custody and control of her minor child J.D.K. regarding the medical services Park Nicollet is providing J.D.K.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

118. In 2016 and through the date of filing this complaint, Plaintiff has requested J.D.K.'s medical records from Fairview and asked to participate in J.D.K.'s medical decisions, but Fairview refuses because Fairview has determined J.D.K. is emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

119. There is no court order granting J.D.K. emancipation that would allow him to give effective consent for medical services, particularly that of prescribed narcotics.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

120. Fairview has provided and continues to provide medical services to J.D.K. without Ms. Calgaro's consent.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

121. Moreover, Fairview does not provide a process in which Ms. Calgaro can regain or otherwise retain her parental rights over the care, custody and control of her minor child J.D.K. regarding the medical services Fairview is providing J.D.K.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

122. During this period, J.D.K., without parental consent, has also succeeded in convincing St. Louis County that he is emancipated without court order for the purposes of receiving government-paid medical benefits.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

123. St. Louis County determined, without a hearing or notice to Ms. Calgaro, that J.D.K. is emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that St. Louis County accepted Mid-Minnesota Legal Aid's determination that J.D.K. was emancipated for the limited purpose of considering whether J.D.K. was eligible for certain assistance other than medical assistance and that it did so without a hearing or notice to Ms. Calgaro and otherwise deny the allegations.

124. It is the practice and custom of St. Louis County to determine that a minor is emancipated without notice to or a hearing for the minor child's parents.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

125. St. Louis County's determination of J.D.K. as emancipated has effectively terminated the parental rights of Ms. Calgaro.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

126. Furthermore, the St. Louis County is providing or approving other governmental moneys to J.D.K. related to living expenses.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

127. St. Louis County is treating J.D.K. as an adult with exclusive rights to information and decision-making.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

128. Therefore, Ms. Calgaro has no access to his county records or legal authority to affect J.D.K.'s decision-making with the county.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

129. In 2016, and through the date of filing this complaint, Ms. Calgaro has made requests to the County to access county records and to participate in J.D.K.'s decision-making with the County.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that Ms. Calgaro made a request for government data on November 10, 2016, and otherwise deny the allegations.

130. The County refuses Ms. Calgaro's requests to participate and for access to J.D.K.'s county records.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that St. Louis County denied a request for government data made by Ms. Calgaro on November 10, 2016, and otherwise deny the allegations.

131. St. Louis County's determination that J.D.K. was eligible for government-paid medical services was the cause of why Park Nicollet and Fairview determined that J.D.K. was emancipated for the purposes of providing medical services.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

132. St. Louis County provides no process of notice to or hearing for Ms. Calgaro, as the biological mother and parent of J.D.K., to regain, retain, or restore in full or in part her parental rights.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

133. In summary, without parental consent and without a court order adjudicating emancipation, St. Louis County, Park Nicollet and Fairview paid for and provided medical services to J.D.K. and denies Plaintiff access to J.D.K.'s records.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that St. Louis County denied a request for government data made by Ms. Calgaro on November 10, 2016, and otherwise deny the allegations.

**VIII. The School District has determined J.D.K. is emancipated without parental consent and without a court order and denied Plaintiff access to J.D.K.'s educational records.**

134. In 2016, Ms. Calgaro requested the School District to allow her to participate in J.D.K.'s educational decisions and to have access to J.D.K.'s educational records.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

135. The School District has denied Ms. Calgaro's request to participate in J.D.K.'s educational decisions and has denied access to his educational records.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

136. At about the same time, Ms. Calgaro requested the principal of Cherry School an opportunity to participate in J.D.K.'s educational decisions and to have access to J.D.K.'s school records.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

137. The principal of Cherry School refused Ms. Calgaro's requests.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

138. The School District determined J.D.K. emancipated without Ms. Calgaro's knowledge or parental consent.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

139. The School District did not give notice or hold a hearing when it determined J.D.K. emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

140. The determination by the School District effectively terminated the parental rights of Ms. Calgaro.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St.

Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

141. The School District is aware of parental rights.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

142. The School District is aware that parental rights are protected under the U.S. Constitution.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

143. It is the policy, practice, and custom of the School District not to give notice or hold a hearing with the parent(s) present when it determines a minor child is emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

144. Further, the School District does not have a process in which a parent may seek to retain or restore in full or in part their parental rights.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

145. Ms. Calgaro was not provided a process in which she was given notice or an opportunity to have a hearing to retain or restore in full or in part her parental rights over J.D.K.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

146. Notably, there is no statute that allows the School District to make an emancipation decision for a minor, to refuse parents access to school records or to refuse parents an opportunity to participate in the decision-making of the educational opportunities of a minor child.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

147. Unlike the medical service providers, described above, the School District has no statute to rely on for its emancipation decision.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

148. The School District's policy does not provide parents with notice and opportunity to be heard prior to or after school district emancipation without a court order.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

149. The School District did not obtain nor have in hand a court order prior to declaring J.D.K. emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

150. Further, the common law provides no right for Ms. Calgaro to petition the School District to restore full or partial parental rights after the School District's determination of emancipation of J.D.K.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

151. Likewise, the common law provides no right for Ms. Calgaro to petition the court to restore full or partial parental rights before the School District determined J.D.K. as emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

152. So, Ms. Calgaro, as the biological mother and parent of J.D.K., has no recourse to the courts prior to or after the school district's emancipation determination.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

153. Likewise, the principal of Cherry School is an agent, representative, or employee of the School District.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

154. The principal implements the policies, practices, and customs of the School District as it would be applied to the Cherry School.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

155. Moreover, the principal is also provided some discretion to decision-making regarding matters as it affects the school and, therefore, acts as the final-decision maker regarding policies, practices, and customs at Cherry School.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

156. The principal of Cherry School interacts with students and parents on a daily basis.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St.

Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

157. The principal is well aware of parental rights in the context of educational services and decision-making for minor children.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

158. The principal understands that parental rights are protected under the U.S. Constitution.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

159. The principal of Cherry School determined that J.D.K. was emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

160. The principal did so without notice or a hearing involving Ms. Calgaro as J.D.K.'s parent and biological mother.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

161. The principal's determination effectively terminated the parental rights of Ms. Calgaro.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

162. It is the policy, practice and custom of the principal of Cherry School not to give notice or hold a hearing with the parents present when the principal determines a minor child is emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

163. Further, the principal does not have a process in which a parent may seek to retain or restore in full or in part their parental rights.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

164. Ms. Calgaro was not provided a process in which she was given notice or an opportunity to have a hearing to retain or restore in full or in part her parental rights over J.D.K.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

165. Notably, there is no statute that allows the principal of a school to make an emancipation decision for a minor, to refuse parents access to school records or to refuse parents an opportunity to participate in the decision-making of the educational opportunities of a minor child.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

166. The school principal's policy does not provide parents with notice and opportunity to be heard prior to or after school district emancipation without a court order.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

167. The school's principal did not obtain nor have in hand a court order declaring J.D.K. emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

168. Further, the common law provides no right for the Ms. Calgaro to petition the principal of a school to restore full or partial parental rights after the principal's determination of emancipation of J.D.K.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

169. Likewise, the common law provides no right for Ms. Calgaro to petition the court to restore full or partial parental rights before the principal determined J.D.K. as emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

170. So, Ms. Calgaro, as the biological mother and parent of J.D.K., has no recourse to the courts prior to or after a school principal's emancipation determination.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

171. The School District has violated Plaintiffs' federal due process rights to notice and an opportunity to be heard.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

## COUNT I

**The Defendants violated Ms. Calgaro's protected rights under the Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution Fourteenth Amendment.**

172. All of the above paragraphs are incorporated herein as if they were stated in their entirety.

The St. Louis County Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to the preceding paragraphs.

173. This complaint is a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights action based on the U.S. Constitution Fourteenth Amendment Due Process Clause seeking a declaratory judgment and injunction enjoining defendants from acting as if minor child J.D.K. is emancipated without a court order until Plaintiff as the minor's mother is afforded an opportunity by statute to petition in state court to restore her partial or full parental rights.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the characterization of the complaint but deny that the complaint states a valid claim against them.

174. The Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution states:

[N]or shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the allegations.

175. Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the statutory provisions provide persons a federal cause of action based on persons operating under color of state law violating of federal law:

Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be

liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress . . . .

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that 42 U.S.C. § 1983 includes the quoted language and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

176. Courts have recognized that the Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution protects the fundamental right of parents to make decisions concerning the care, custody and control of their children, as expressed for instance in *Santosky v. Kramer*, 455 U.S. 745, 753 (1982) and *Quilloin v. Walcott*, 434 U.S. 246, 255 (1978).

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that courts have recognized that the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution protects the fundamental right of parents to make certain decisions concerning the care, custody, and control of their children under certain circumstances and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

177. Courts have recognized that the right to familial relations includes the liberty interest of parents in the custody, care and control of their children, as expressed for instance in *King v. Olmstead County*, 117 F.3d 1065, 1067 (8th Cir. 1997) and *Slaven v. Engstrom*, 710 F.3d 772, 779 (8th Cir. 2013) quoting *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57, 66 (2000) (plurality opinion).

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that courts have recognized that the right to familial relations includes the liberty interest of parents in the custody, care, and control of their children under certain circumstances and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

178. Parental due process rights regarding termination of parental rights are clearly established.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

179. At all times, the Defendants knew that their respective determination of J.D.K.'s emancipation effectively terminated the protected constitutional parental rights of Ms. Calgaro.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

180. At all times, the Defendants knew that their respective determination of J.D.K.'s emancipation without notice nor a hearing before or after their decision violated the federal due process rights of Ms. Calgaro.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

181. At all times, the Defendants have refused to provide Ms. Calgaro notice and an opportunity to be heard to retain or to restore her parental rights in full or in part over her minor child J.D.K.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

182. At all times, the Defendants purposefully failed to provide Ms. Calgaro notice or an opportunity to be heard before they determined J.D.K. emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that St. Louis County accepted Mid-Minnesota Legal Aid's determination that J.D.K. was emancipated for the limited purpose of considering whether J.D.K. was eligible for certain assistance other

than medical assistance and that it did so without providing Ms. Calgaro notice or an opportunity to be heard and otherwise deny the allegations.

183. Parental rights are considered a protected fundamental right and, specifically, a “liberty” interest under the Fourteenth Amendment which, therefore, may not be terminated without “due process of law.”

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that certain parental rights are considered protected fundamental rights under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

184. A governmental determination of emancipation effectively terminates the custody and control decision-making of a parent or parents.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

185. The decisions concerning the custody and control over a minor child involve parental rights protected under the U.S. Constitution.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St.

Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

186. A decision that has the legal effect of granting a minor child emancipation, effectively terminating parental rights of the child's parent(s), requires notice to the parent(s).

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny that they made any such decision and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

187. A decision that has the legal effect of granting a minor child emancipation, effectively terminating parental rights of the child's parent(s), requires a hearing involving the parent(s).

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny that they made any such decision and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

188. Under Minnesota Statute § 144.341, there is no provision allowing Ms. Calgaro, as J.D.K.'s biological mother and parent to restore in full or in part her parental rights protected under the U.S. Constitution regarding medical services the Defendants Department of Public Health, Fairview Health Services, and Park Nicollet Health Services have provided and continue to provide to J.D.K. without parental consent.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny that they provided medical services to J.D.K. without parental consent and that they continue to provide such services to J.D.K. without parental consent and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

189. Under Minnesota common law, there is no private cause of action allowing Ms. Calgaro, as J.D.K.'s biological mother and parent to restore in full or in part her parental rights protected under the U.S. Constitution to challenge the St. Louis County School District's and Cherry School's determination and enforcement of the "emancipation letter" of the Mid-Minnesota Legal Aid clinic or J.D.K.'s declaration that he is emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

190. Under Minnesota common law, there is no private cause of action allowing Ms. Calgaro, as J.D.K.'s biological mother and parent to restore in full or in part her parental rights protected under the U.S. Constitution to regain or restore in full or in part, her parental rights over J.D.K. that the St. Louis County School District and Cherry School have refused to recognize by their respective determination and enforcement actions of the "emancipation letter" of the Mid-Minnesota Legal Aid clinic or J.D.K.'s declaration that he is emancipated.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

191. This complaint based on the U.S. Constitution Fourteenth Amendment Due Process Clause seeks a declaratory judgment and injunction enjoining all defendants from acting as if any of Ms. Calgaro's children are emancipated without a court order until Ms. Calgaro has an opportunity to petition the state court to restore full or partial parental rights.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the characterization of the complaint but deny that the complaint states a valid claim against them.

192. Ms. Calgaro's parental rights are fundamental rights recognized and protected under the U.S. Constitution.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

193. As fundamental rights, Ms. Calgaro's parental rights cannot be terminated without procedural due process under the U.S. Constitution Fourteenth Amendment Due Process Clause.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

194. St. Louis County, Park Nicollet, Fairview, the School District, and their respective officials, acting under the color of state law and their own policies, customs, or usages by emancipating J.D.K., without a prior court order of emancipation, have subjected Ms. Calgaro to the deprivation of her procedural due process rights secured by the U.S. Constitution prior to and after the termination of her parental rights by the respective Defendants.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

195. The Defendants' actions, individually and collectively, have violated Ms. Calgaro's procedural due process rights under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

196. Ms. Calgaro is entitled to a court process—notice and opportunity to be heard—prior to or after termination, or both, concerning her parental rights.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St.

Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

197. In this lawsuit relating to medical and educational services provided to a minor, Ms. Calgaro claims that the Defendants violate her federal procedural Due Process Clause rights because she has no statutory or common law cause of action in court (1) to challenge Defendant St. Louis County Public Health and Human Service's eligibility determination to pay for J.D.K.'s medical services at Park Nicollet and Fairview and deny parental access to medical records without a court order; (2) to challenge Defendant Park Nicollet's and Defendant Fairview's determination of emancipation of J.D.K. to provide medical services and deny access to medical records without a court order; and (3) to challenge the School District's and the principal of Cherry School determinations of emancipation of J.D.K. to provide educational services and deny access to educational records without a court order.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the characterization of Ms. Calgaro's claims but deny that she has asserted a valid claim against them.

198. Park Nicollet's and Fairview's determination of emancipation without a court order was based upon the government's willingness to pay for the medical services via Defendant St. Louis County's determination that J.D.K. was eligible for such benefits.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny that St. Louis County paid for the medical services at issue and that St. Louis County made a determination that

J.D.K. was eligible for the medical benefits at issue and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

199. There is no parental cause of action under Minnesota statute or common law to challenge St. Louis County's, Park Nicollet's, and Fairview's emancipation determinations without a court order which led to the government-paid medical services being provided to J.D.K. without parental consent.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny that St. Louis County made any determination which led to government-paid medical services being provided to J.D.K. without parental consent and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

200. The Minnesota statute § 144.341, allowing the medical service provider to determine emancipation, does not provide a cause of action for a parent to bring a lawsuit to restore full or partial parental rights.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

201. Although Minnesota common law recognizes a minor child's right to petition for emancipation, there is no Minnesota common law cause of action for a parent to bring in court to restore full or partial parental rights once a child is emancipated by Defendants without a court order.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

202. Specifically, Minnesota Statute § 144.341 authorizes medical service providers to determine whether a minor child such as J.D.K. is emancipated without a court order:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any minor who is living separate and apart from parents or legal guardian, whether with or without the consent of a parent or guardian and regardless of the duration of such separate residence, and who is managing personal financial affairs, regardless of the source or extent of the minor's income, may give effective consent to personal medical, dental, mental and other health services, and the consent of no other person is required.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that Minn. Stat. § 144.341 includes the quoted language and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

203. According to the state statute, Park Nicollet and Fairview in determining J.D.K.'s emancipation took into account under "regardless of the source or extent of minor's income" that St. Louis County had determined J.D.K.'s eligibility for government-paid benefits.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

204. Moreover, if the medical service provider had refused treating J.D.K. as emancipated, J.D.K. was entitled under Minnesota common law to proceed with a petition for emancipation.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

205. Conversely, even though Ms. Calgaro as a mother objects to J.D.K. being provided such medical services without court order and without parental consent, Ms. Calgaro has no legal rights under Minnesota Statute § 144.341 to bring a cause of action to restore her full or partial parental rights prior to or after the Defendants' determinations of emancipation under state law.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

206. Further, Minnesota common law has never recognized a cause of action for a parent to sue in district court to restore full or partial parental rights after a determination of emancipation under Minnesota Statute § 144.341 or otherwise.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

207. There is no parental corollary under Minnesota common law for the minor child's petition for a court order of emancipation.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

208. A parent under Minnesota common law has no right to bring a lawsuit after a Defendant has determined a minor child is "emancipated" under Minnesota Statute § 144.341 or otherwise without a court order.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

209. Since Minnesota Statute § 144.341 does not authorize a parent to bring such a lawsuit, parents have no legal cause of action in court to challenge the government's and medical service provider's determination of "emancipation" under Minnesota Statute § 144.341 to provide medical services to a minor child.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St.

Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

210. Further, Plaintiff has requested from the School District to participate in J.D.K.'s educational decisions and have access to J.D.K.'s educational records.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

211. The School District has denied Plaintiffs' request to participate in J.D.K.'s educational decisions and denied Plaintiff access to J.D.K.'s educational records.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

212. The School District has emancipated J.D.K. without parental consent and without a court order.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

213. However, unlike the medical service providers, the School District has no statute to rely as its legal authority for its emancipation decision.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

214. The School District's policy does not provide parents with notice and opportunity to be heard prior to or after school district determines emancipation without a court order of emancipation.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

215. The common law provides no right for the Plaintiff to petition to restore full or partial parental rights after the school district's determination of emancipation.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

216. So, Ms. Calgaro has no recourse to the courts prior to or after school district emancipation to restore partial or full parental rights.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

217. The School District has violated Ms. Calgaro's federal due process rights to notice and opportunity to be heard.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

218. Under these circumstances, parents like the Plaintiff have no notice nor opportunity to be heard pre-deprivation nor post-deprivation.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

219. Ms. Calgaro's federal due process rights have been violated by Defendants.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

220. The Defendants' violative actions have caused damages to Ms. Calgaro including loss of wages, personal injury and emotional distress.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

221. The Defendants' violative actions have caused damages to Ms. Calgaro in an amount exceeding \$50,000.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants deny the allegations.

## **COUNT II**

### **DECLARATORY JUDGMENT**

222. All of the above paragraphs are incorporated herein as if they were stated in their entirety.

The St. Louis County Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to the preceding paragraphs.

223. The Court has inherent or statutory authority to issue declaratory judgments.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that the Court has authority to issue declaratory judgments under certain circumstances and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

224. Ms. Calgaro seeks a declaratory judgment declaring that her due process rights under the U.S. Constitution Due Process Clause were violated by Defendants because she has no statutory or common law cause of action to challenge in state court the Defendants' determinations of emancipation without a court order which led to the medical, educational and other services being provided and denial of access to medical, educational and other records without parental consent and without a court order.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the characterization of Ms. Calgaro's claims but deny that she has asserted a valid claim against them.

### **COUNT III**

### **INJUNCTION**

225. All of the above paragraphs are incorporated herein as if they were stated in their entirety.

The St. Louis County Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to the preceding paragraphs.

226. The Court has legal authority to issue injunctions.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the

allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit that the Court has authority to issue injunctions under certain circumstances and otherwise state that they lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations.

227. The Ms. Calgaro petitions for an injunction enjoining the Defendants from providing any additional services to the minor children of Ms. Calgaro without parental consent until she has had an opportunity in state court to petition to restore all or partial parental rights or until a state court order of emancipation is issued.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the characterization of Ms. Calgaro's claims but deny that she has asserted a valid claim against them.

228. Additionally, Ms. Calgaro petitions for an injunction requiring the Defendants to provide medical, educational and other records of the minor children to Ms. Calgaro until she has had an opportunity in state court to petition to restore all or partial parental rights or until a state court order of emancipation is issued.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the characterization of Ms. Calgaro's claims but deny that she has asserted a valid claim against them.

### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

229. Plaintiff Anmarie Calgaro also demands a jury trial regarding the allegations asserted in the instant Complaint.

To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are not asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants have no obligation to respond to the allegations. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are asserted against the St. Louis County Defendants, the St. Louis County Defendants admit the allegations.

### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

1. The complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted against the St. Louis County Defendants.

2. Ms. Calgaro's claims against Ms. Mirsch in her individual capacity are barred by the doctrine of qualified immunity.

3. Ms. Calgaro's claims against the St. Louis County Defendants are barred because she failed to exhaust state remedies before commencing this action.

WHEREFORE, the St. Louis County Defendants respectfully request that the Court:

A. dismiss with prejudice the complaint to the extent it asserts claims against them;

B. enter judgment in their favor;

C. award them the reasonable costs and attorneys' fees they have incurred in defending this action; and

D. grant them such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: December 9, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

MARK S. RUBIN  
ST. LOUIS COUNTY ATTORNEY

s/ Nick D. Campanario

---

Nick D. Campanario (#0316179)  
Assistant County Attorney  
St. Louis County Attorney's Office  
St. Louis County Courthouse  
100 North Fifth Avenue West, Room 501  
Duluth, Minnesota 55802-1298  
Telephone: (218) 726-2323  
Fax: (218) 726-2332  
campanario@stlouiscountymn.gov

Attorney for Defendants St. Louis County and  
Linnea Mirsch, in her individual and official  
capacities