

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

MARK W. RASMUSSEN, RECEIVER §  
FOR ARISEBANK §  
Plaintiff, §  
v. § Case No. 3:18-CV-1034  
RICHARD SMITH, JR., and §  
KURT F. MATTHEW, JR. §

**DEFENDANT MATTHEW’S ORIGINAL ANSWER TO THE COMPLAINT**

COMES NOW the Defendant KURT F. MATTHEW, JR., and files this Original Answer the Plaintiff’s Complaint (“Complaint”).

**ANSWER**

1. This is a legal conclusion to which no response is needed.
2. This is a legal conclusion to which no response is needed.
3. This is a legal conclusion to which no response is needed.
4. This is a legal conclusion to which no response is needed.
5. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 5 of the Complaint.
6. Defendant admits that he is a resident of Palm Beach, Florida.
7. This is a legal conclusion to which no response is needed. Also, Defendant

lacks sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 7 of the Complaint.

8. This is a legal conclusion to which no response is needed. Also, Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 8 of the Complaint.

9. This is a legal conclusion to which no response is needed.

10. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 10 of the Complaint.

11. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 11 of the Complaint.

12. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 12 of the Complaint.

13. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 13 of the Complaint.

14. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 14 of the Complaint.

15. Defendant admits he received some monies for a bona fide transaction, but lacks sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 15.

16. Defendant admits that the subject transaction has yet to be completed, but

denies that there is a basis for returning the monies.

17. Defendant reincorporates his respective responses to Paragraphs 1 -16.

18. Defendant denies that he has been unjustly enriched.

19. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 19 of the Complaint.

20. Defendant admits that he received some funds from Smith, but denies the allegations otherwise.

21. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 21.

22. Defendant reincorporates his respective responses to Paragraphs 1 -16.

23. This is a legal conclusion to which no response is needed.

24. Defendant admits he received some monies from Smith as a bona fide transaction, but lacks sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief about the truth of the allegations about transfer of coins. Otherwise, Defendant denies allegations.

25. Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 25 of the Complaint.

26. This allegation contains legal conclusions to which no response is needed.

27. Defendant reincorporates his respective responses to Paragraphs 1 -16.

28. This allegation contains legal conclusions to which no response is needed.

Otherwise, Defendant lacks sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 28.

29. This allegation is a request for relief. Otherwise, the Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 29.

30. This allegation contains legal conclusions to which no response is needed.

WHEREFORE, Defendant MATTHEW prays that Plaintiff take nothing by this suit, that the Defendant recovers costs of court without delay, and for such other and further relief, both at law and in equity, to which the Defendant is justly entitled, and demands a trial by jury.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John Teakell  
JOHN TEAKELL  
Law Office of John R. Teakell  
2911 Turtle Creek Blvd.  
Suite 300  
Dallas, TX 75219  
Tele. (214) 523-9076  
Fax (214) 523-9077

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, John Teakell, hereby certify that on this the 28<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2018, a copy of the foregoing Defendant Matthew's Original Answer to the Complaint was served on the all parties of record.

/s/ John Teakell  
John Teakell