

1 Larry J. Crown (No. 013133)
Elan S. Mizrahi (No. 017388)
2 **BRUECKNER SPITLER SHELTS PLC**
8355 East Hartford Drive, Suite 200
3 Scottsdale, Arizona 85255
Telephone: 480-483-9600
4 Facsimile: 480-483-3215
Emails: lcrown@bss.law
5 elan@bss.law

6 *Attorneys for Defendant Sacred Journey, Inc.*

7
8 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA**
9 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA**

10 JENSEN PIKE, surviving parent and
11 representative of all statutory beneficiaries
of Emily Pike, deceased,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 SACRED JOURNEY, INC., an Arizona
for profit corporation, et al.,

15 Defendants.

Case No. CV2025-027552

**DEFENDANT SACRED JOURNEY,
INC.'S ANSWER TO FIRST
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

(Assigned to the Honorable Adam
Driggs)

16
17 Defendant Sacred Journey, Inc. (“Sacred Journey”), by and through counsel
18 undersigned and for its Answer to Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint, hereby admits,
19 denies and alleges as follows:

20 1. Sacred Journey has insufficient information to either admit or deny the
21 allegations contained in paragraph 1, and therefore it denies the same and demands strict
22 proof thereof.

23 2. Paragraph 2 is a legal conclusion to which no response is required.

24 3. Sacred Journey admits the allegations contained in paragraph 3.

25 4. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 4 as it relates to
26 it and has insufficient information to either admit or deny the remaining allegations contained
27 in paragraph 4, and therefore denies the same and demands strict proof thereof.
28

- 1 21. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 21.
- 2 22. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 22.
- 3 23. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 23.
- 4 24. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 24.
- 5 25. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 25.
- 6 26. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 26.
- 7 27. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 27.
- 8 28. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 28.
- 9 29. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 29.
- 10 30. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 30.
- 11 31. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 31.
- 12 32. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 32.
- 13 33. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 33 as it relates to
14 it and has insufficient information to either admit or deny the remaining allegations contained
15 in paragraph 33, and it therefore denies the same and demands strict proof thereof.
- 16 **COUNT TWO: NEGLIGENT HIRING/RETENTION/SUPERVISION/TRAINING**
- 17 34. Sacred Journey incorporates all of its responses in the preceding paragraphs as
18 if fully set forth herein.
- 19 35. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 35 as it relates to
20 it and has insufficient information to either admit or deny the remaining allegations contained
21 in paragraph 35, and it therefore denies the same and demands strict proof thereof.
- 22 36. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 36.
- 23 37. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 37.
- 24 38. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 38
- 25 39. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 39.
- 26 40. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 40.
- 27 41. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 41.
- 28 42. Sacred Journey denies the allegations contained in paragraph 42.

- 1 b. Non-parties at fault include but are not limited to:
- 2 i. Emily Pike’s murderer who remains unknown and at large. The
- 3 specific details of Emily’s murder are unknown and this crime is
- 4 unsolved by law enforcement authorities.
- 5 ii. Emily Pike – Emily was a 14-year-old girl who intentionally and
- 6 voluntarily left Sacred Journey’s residential house which was a
- 7 non-secure residential group home and the residents were placed
- 8 there voluntarily. Emily left the group home of her own free will.
- 9 iii. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Carlos Apache Children’s
- 10 Court, and professionals who evaluated Emily and collectively
- 11 assessed and determined that Emily could be placed with Sacred
- 12 Journey, which they knew to be a non-secure, voluntary residential
- 13 home.
- 14 iv. Oasis Behavioral Health, 2190 North Grace Boulevard, Chandler,
- 15 Arizona 85225. Emily resided at Oasis for one year prior to
- 16 returning to Sacred Journey. Oasis is a lock-down facility. The
- 17 professionals at Oasis assessed and determined that Emily was
- 18 ready for discharge and subsequent to a standard level, non-secure
- 19 group home. The group home selected for Emily was Sacred
- 20 Journey. The decision-making professionals fully knew that Sacred
- 21 Journey provided a non-secure, voluntary, residential house for its
- 22 residents.

23 7. Plaintiff’s alleged damages are the result of Plaintiff’s sole fault, intentional

24 misconduct, negligence, assumption of risk, or comparative fault, and/or the sole or

25 comparative fault of third parties or entities that may not be parties to this action.

26 8. Sacred Journey hereby reserves all affirmative defenses identified in Rule 8,

27 Ariz.R.Civ.P.

28 ///

