

LFJ

B

FILED

BY: *[Signature]*

2020 APR -6 AM 9:34

VALYNN TINNELL  
SUPERIOR COURT CLERK

1 NANCY KNIGHT  
2 1803 E. Lipan Circle  
3 Fort Mohave, AZ 86426  
4 (928) 768-1537  
5 nancyknight@frontier.com

6 Plaintiff Pro Per

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

9 NANCY KNIGHT,  
10 Plaintiff,

11 vs.

12 GLEN LUDWIG AND PEARL LUDWIG,  
13 TRUSTEES OF THE LUDWIG FAMILY  
14 TRUST; FAIRWAY CONSTRUCTORS, INC.;  
15 MEHDI AZARMI; JAMES B. ROBERTS  
16 AND DONNA M. ROBERTS, HUSBAND  
17 AND WIFE; JOHN DOES 1-10; JANE DOES  
18 1-10; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-10; AND XYZ  
19 PARTNERSHIPS 1-10.

20 Defendants.

CASE NO.: CV 2018-04003

**REQUEST FOR A RULE 60(D)(3)  
ARCP RULING**

**( HON. JUDGE JANTZEN  
PRESIDING)**

21 COMES NOW Nancy Knight, Plaintiff Pro Per, respectfully requesting the Court  
22 to rule that there exists a difference between Plaintiff's pending March 12, 2020 "Motion  
23 to Set Aside Dismissal of Count One for Fraud Upon the Court" under rule 60(d)(3) that  
24 was filed with evidence of fraud and her pending February 28, 2020 "Motion for  
25 Reconsideration of Dismissal of Count One and Adjudicate Count Two by Authority of  
26 the Arizona Constitution" under Rule 7.1 (e)(1) that was filed with new evidence alleging  
27 that "said tracts" are not separate subdivisions as was assumed by the Hon. Judge Carlisle  
28 in April 2018 and the finding of the Arizona Constitution Authority of Judges.



1 ARCP uses distinctly different language between Rule 7.1 and Rule 60. The  
2 specific language in 60(d)(3) is “**set aside** a judgment for fraud on the court”. (Emphasis  
3 supplied). The specific language in Rule 7.1 that differentiates it from Rule 60 motions  
4 appears to be found in Rule 7.1(e)(3) “... **A motion for reconsideration** is not a  
5 substitute for a motion filed under **Rule** 50(b), 52(b), 59, or **60**....” (Emphasis supplied)  
6

7  
8 The evidence that is supplied to the Court for Reconsideration of Dismissal of  
9 Count One and the judge’s authority to rule in Count Two for Injunctive Relief that had  
10 been ruled as a matter of fact for the jury is separate from the evidence of fraud. While  
11 both motions carry the possibility of dismissal/setting aside the April 2, 2018  
12 Ruling/Order/Judgment of the Hon. Judge Carlisle for Count One, the Injunctive Relief  
13 sought by authority of the Constitution is a separate reconsideration issue. Also, the  
14 separate issue of fraud carries a possibility of consequences that does not exist for the  
15 motion for reconsideration of either Count One or Count Two. It is worthy of note that  
16 evidence takes time, patience and diligence that has resulted in Plaintiff’s numerous  
17 filings for reconsideration under Rule 7.1 as new evidence is discovered.  
18  
19

20  
21 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 6<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2020.

22  
23   
24 NANCY KNIGHT  
25 Plaintiff Pro Per

26 COPY of the foregoing emailed on this 6th day of April, 2020 to:  
27 djolaw@frontiernet.net Attorney for Defendants  
28 Daniel J. Oehler, Esq.  
Law Offices of Daniel J. Oehler  
2001 Highway 95, Suite 15, Bullhead City, Arizona 86442