

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE INTERNET,  
IN THE ABSOLUTE STATE OF THIS, THE IMMATERIAL PLANE  
Hellmouth Division**

---

<b>The New York Millenials</b> <i>on behalf of themselves and the 99% of Baseball players &amp; fans similarly situated,</i> Plaintiff	)	
	)	<b>CASE NO. 99%</b>
	)	
v.	)	<b>ANSWER, MOTIONS FOR</b>
	)	<b>DISMISSAL, AND</b>
<b>Parker MacMillan III, in his official capacity</b> <i>as Chief Executive Officer, Commissioner Prime Minister, Internet League Blaseball, and</i>	)	<b>COUNTERCLAIM</b>
	)	
<b>That Coin, Probably a/k/a the Boss,</b> Defendants	)	
	)	

---

Defendants Parker Macmillain III and the Boss by and through the undersigned council, do hereby respond to the complaint served by the Millenials on October 21, 2020.

First Defense

1. Defendants Parker MacMillan III (hereinafter “MacMillan”) and That Coin, Probably a/k/a the Boss (hereinafter “Boss”) admit in part and deny in part, the allegations in paragraph 1 of the complaint. The allegations are admitted insofar as the Fans did vote following the 3d season, but are denied in the rest.
2. On paragraphs 2 to 6, Defendants lack the required knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the veracity or falsity thereof, which shall have the effect of denial
3. Defendants deny all allegations in paragraph 7 of the complaint
4. On paragraph 8, Defendants lack the required knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the veracity or falsity thereof, which shall have the effect of denial
5. Defendants deny all allegations in paragraph 9 of the complaint.
6. Defendants admit in part and deny in part, the allegations in paragraph ten of the complaint. The allegations are admitted insofar as there was a statement made that “We’re fans, just like you.” but are denied in the rest.

### Second Defense

The Commissioner is doing a GREAT job. The suggestion that the Commissioner is doing anything BUT a great job is not only factually untrue, but it is tantamount to unsportsmanlike conduct on behalf of the plaintiffs in this present case.

### Third Defense

The plaintiff's claim for relief fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted against defendants MacMillan and Coin, because neither party communicated a promise to Plaintiffs, and in the alternative, any promise made was not reasonably relied upon. Defendants move then, for dismissal pursuant to IPRCP 12(b)(6).

### Fourth Defense

This action must be dismissed because it fails to lay proper venue in the forum district. Seeing that venue would be proper nowhere, Defendants motion for the case to be dismissed under the doctrine of forum non conveniens.

### Fifth Defense

This action must be dismissed because the plaintiff has failed to serve or join the proper parties. As MacMillain and Boss were not CEO and Owner of Blaseball respectively, until after the Season 10 election, they were not agents of the venture and thus, not responsible for any of its liabilities that occurred prior to the election like EtR if it were found to be liable for such at all.

### Sixth Defense

The plaintiff's claims are improper where the relevant rule, "Eat the Rich" likely refers, not to the eating of the materially wealthy, but to "Eating the Rich[ards]" or in other words, all those individuals who are named Rich in some variation.

### Seventh Defense

The plaintiff, in filing this suit, has effectively cried. The Book itself states that crying in Blaseball is [REDACTED]. Though forbidden knowledge, if this rule states that crying is to be forbidden, then this suit is improper. If, in the alternative, the book permits crying, then the plaintiff has failed to exhaust administrative remedies prior to bringing suit, thus depriving the court of jurisdiction.

### Eighth Defense

In the present action, as the plaintiffs have affirmed, there existed no contract with either of the named defendants. Nor did there exist any form of quasi-contract on which plaintiffs may have relied upon. Point in fact, the only contract that did exist at the time was between the fans and Blaseball itself which is found in the Terms of Services and expressly allows for such changes to be made without notice to those fans.

WHEREFORE, Defendants request that the court dismiss the plaintiff's complaint and award Defendants their costs and legal fees, together with such other relief as the court finds just and equitable under the circumstances.

### Motion to Consolidate Claims

In the instant case, were the Court not to grant dismissal for the above reasons, Defendants would respectfully request that the Court join the present action with that currently entitled Firefighters v. Sunman, Case No. CV-20-451, in this the Superior Court of the Internet, Hellmouth Division. Defendants therefore motion for the consolidation of these cases pursuant to IPRCP 42, and on the grounds stated hereafter:

1. At issue in both actions at hand are common questions of both law and fact. Due to the very nature of this resplendent Court, nearly all questions of law are ones of first impression. Where the various claims stated may impose liability on Defendants for the actions of themselves and Blaseball's agents, such a question of law should be decided together so that justice might not be upended by alternative rulings.
2. In the alternative, for the convenience of this Court during this, the time of the Grand Siesta, the relevant actions should still be consolidated. IPRCP allows even for claims not sharing a common issue of law/fact to be consolidated for the sake of convenience of the court, and to avoid prejudice to parties involved. Ask keepers and various representatives of Blaseball to volunteer more of their time during this Siesta presents just such a reason to avoid further inconvenience than the complaining parties have already imposed.

### COUNTERCLAIM OF DEFENDANTS MACMILLAN & COIN

#### Claim of Defamation

Defendants MacMillan and Coin counterclaim against the plaintiff as follows:

1. This court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under the authority vested by the greater powers that be in the immaterial realm and § 1332 of the relevant statutory authority. This counterclaim is a permissive counterclaim under IPRCP 13(b). If this court finds that it would have personal jurisdiction over the original claim, it will have supplemental jurisdiction pursuant to § 1367(a) of the relevant statutory authorities.
2. A claim for defamation requires (1) the aggravating party made a false and defamatory statement about the plaintiff; (2) they shared the statement with a third party; (3) if the defamatory matter is of public concern, they acted in a manner which amounted at least to negligence; and (4) they caused damage to the aggrieved party. Alternatively, an action may exist for defamation per se when certain false statements are so harmful as to create a presumption of injury to reputation. Among others this includes, accusing someone of a crime and adversely reflecting on a person's fitness to conduct their business.
3. In the present action and the moments leading up to giving notice of this action, plaintiffs made statements regarding their alleged conclusion that Defendants collectively committed wire fraud and more importantly, made assertions that MacMillan was, mother crab forbid, NOT doing a good job and these statements were shared publicly on twitter.
4. A showing that the plaintiffs made such false and defamatory statements about the Commissioner, and that they communicated such claims to the Blaseball community at large, is sufficient to state a claim upon which relief can be given for defamation per se.

WHEREFORE, defendants MacMillan and Coin demand judgement from the plaintiff in the form of [REDACTED].

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Under IPRCP 38(b), Defendants demand a jury trial of all issues raised by the plaintiff's complaint and Defendants' counterclaims.

Dated: November 8, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Claw P. Right Esq.

Claw P. Right Esq.  
Crab™ LLC Legal Services  
Formerly the Crabitat  
Locked behind the gates of baseball2

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

We hereby do certify that on this date, we, the undersigned served a true copy of the above answer and counterclaims upon the Millennials by means of Existential Service and Twitter, in accordance with IPRCP 3.14(repeating).

/s/ Claw P. Right  
Claw P. Right Esq.