

STATE OF MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN

DISTRICT COURT
FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Christopher Roller,
Plaintiff,

Court File No. 27-CV-09-22812
Judge: Susan N. Burke

v.

**DEFENDANT WAGNER, FALCONER &
JUDD LTD.'S RESPONSES TO
PLAINTIFF'S INTERROGATORIES
DATED APRIL 9, 2010**

Wagner, Falconer & Judd, Ltd (WFJ) via
Prepaid Legal c/o Dan Smith

Honorable Judge Mark Boris via WFJ and
Bosley and State of Minnesota

Attorney Alexander Gese via Bosley,

Defendants.

TO: Plaintiff *pro se*, Christopher Roller, 14806 Quentin Avenue South, Savage, MN 55378:

Defendant Wagner, Falconer & Judd, Ltd. (WFJ) via Prepaid Legal c/o Dan Smith, for its
Answers to Plaintiff's Interrogatories dated April 9, 2010, states and alleges under oath as
follows:

Defendant objects generally to these Interrogatories as an attempt to harass Defendant
and further objects that these Interrogatories are improper under the Rules of Civil Procedure. In
addition, Defendant reserves all arguments set forth in its Motion to Dismiss and Motion for
Summary Judgment. Specifically, Defendant objects to the extent that service has not yet been
effectuated over this answering Defendant and that Plaintiff's claims are without a good faith
basis, either in fact or in law.

INTERROGATORIES

1. Do you understand that {no direct or clear answer} or {Non-direct pleading-the-5th
response} indicates the worst inference by a jury in a civil trial.

ANSWER:

Defendant objects to this Interrogatory as vague, confusing, incapable of ascertainment, calls for a legal conclusion and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving these objections, Defendant answers that such a contention is not supported by Minnesota law.

2. Did you commit any crimes against Chris Roller. What/How/When? {No direct or clear answer} or {Non-direct pleading-the-5th response} indicates you committed crime(s).

ANSWER:

Defendant objects to this Interrogatory as vague, confusing, incapable of ascertainment and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving these objections, Defendant answers no.

3. Does Dan Smith and WFJ understand that you, under PrePaid Legal, represent me when talking on the phone? {No direct or clear answer} or {Non-direct pleading-the-5th response} indicates you represent me while advising me.

ANSWER:

Defendant objects to this Interrogatory as vague, confusing, incapable of ascertainment and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving these objections, Defendant did not form an attorney client relationship with Mr. Roller.

4. Do you hate Chris Roller. Describe the hatred (how) that WFJ ensues when thinking of Chris Roller. {No direct or clear answer} or {Non-direct pleading-the-5th response} indicates extreme hatred toward Chris Roller.

ANSWER:

Defendant objects to this Interrogatory as vague, confusing, incapable of ascertainment and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving these objections, Defendant answers no.

5. Did you discriminate against Chris Roller because of his religious beliefs, mentality, and his legal endeavors? How? {No direct or clear answer} or {Non-direct pleading-the-5th response} indicates extreme hatred toward Chris Roller's attributes.

ANSWER:

Defendant objects to this Interrogatory as vague, confusing, incapable of ascertainment, calls for a legal conclusion and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving these objections, Defendant answers no.

6. Did you give negative advise to Chris Roller because of his belief system, because he says he is God, he sues David Copperfield, sues James Randi, sues CIA, sues GE, sues Bosley, etc. How? {No direct or clear answer} or {Non-direct pleading-the-5th response} indicates you gave negative advise to Chris Roller.

ANSWER:

Defendant objects to this Interrogatory as vague, confusing, incapable of ascertainment and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving these objections, Defendant answers no.

7. Did you consult with David Copperfield, James Randi, CIA, Bosley, or their legal representatives while I was in suit with them (while you advised me). {No direct or clear answer} or {Non-direct pleading-the-5th response} indicates you consulted with my opponents and/or their legal representatives while consulting Chris Roller.

ANSWER:

Defendant objects to this Interrogatory as vague, confusing, incapable of ascertainment and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving these objections, Defendant answers no.

8. Did you conspire with Judge Mark Baris to dismiss case Concilliation Court District 4 080327031 in 2008? How? {No direct or clear answer} or {Non-direct pleading-the-5th response} indicates you committed this crime, a claim for relief.

ANSWER:

Defendant objects to this Interrogatory as vague, confusing, incapable of ascertainment, calls for a legal conclusion and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving these objections, Defendant answers no.

9. Did you conspire, with Alex Gese of RKMC, to dismiss case Concilliation Court District 4 080327031 in 2008? How? {No direct or clear answer} or {Non-direct pleading-the-5th response} indicates you committed this crime, a claim for relief.

ANSWER:

Defendant objects to this Interrogatory as vague, confusing, incapable of ascertainment and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving these objections, Defendant answers no.

10. Have you had access to any of Chris Roller's children? If so, when/how {No direct or clear answer} or {Non-direct pleading-the-5th response} indicates you have access to Chris Roller's children.

ANSWER:

Defendant objects to this Interrogatory as vague, confusing, incapable of ascertainment and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving these objections, Defendant answers no.

11. Have you tried to kill any of Chris Roller's children? How? {No direct or clear answer} or {Non-direct pleading-the-5th response} indicates you committed this crime, a claim for relief.

ANSWER:

Defendant objects to this Interrogatory as vague, confusing, incapable of ascertainment and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving these objections, Defendant answers no.

12. Have molested any of Chris Roller's children? How? {No direct or clear answer} or {Non-direct pleading-the-5th response} indicates you committed this crime, a claim for relief.

ANSWER:

Defendant objects to this Interrogatory as vague, confusing, incapable of ascertainment and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving these objections, Defendant answers no.

13. Did you conspire to kill Chris Roller? How? {No direct or clear answer} or {Non-direct pleading-the-5th response} indicates you committed this crime, a claim for relief.

ANSWER:

Defendant objects to this Interrogatory as vague, confusing, incapable of ascertainment and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving these objections, Defendant answers no.

DOCUMENT REQUEST

1. Produce any documents related to the interrogatory questions.

RESPONSE:

Defendant objects to this Request as beyond the discovery specifically permitted by the Court. Without waiving these objections, Defendant has no documents responsive to this Request.

WAGNER, FALCONER & JUDD, LTD.


Samuel J. Satt 4/10/2010

Subscribed and sworn to before
me this 10th day of April, 2010.

[Signature]

Notary Public

Dated: April 10, 2010



LARSON • KING, LLP

By *[Signature]* 4-10-10

Mark A. Solheim (213226)
Anthony J. Novak (351106)
2800 Wells Fargo Place
30 East Seventh Street
St. Paul, MN 55101
(651) 312-6500

*Attorneys for Defendant Wagner, Falconer &
Judd, Ltd.*