FILED
Christina Spurlock
CLERK, SUPERIOR COURT
05/12/2023 4:22PM
BY: MBARKER
DEPUTY

1 2 3 4	LAW OFFICES DANIEL J. OEHLER 2001 Highway 95, Suite 15 Bullhead City, Arizona 86442 (928) 758-3988 (928) 763-3227 (fax) djolaw@frontiernet.net				
5	Daniel J. Oehler, Arizona State Bar No.: 002739 Attorney for Defendants				
6					
7	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA				
8	IN AND FOR THE COU	NTY OF MOHAVE			
9	NANCY KNIGHT,	) NO.: CV-2018-04003			
10	Plaintiff,	RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTION TO FEBRUARY			
11	VS.	) 17, 2023 COURT ORDER AND SUBSEQUENT			
12	GLEN LUDWIG and PEARL LUDWIG, Trustees of THE LUDWIG FAMILY TRUST; FAIRWAY	AFFIDAVIT FOR ATTORNEY FEES FILED APRIL 28, 2023			
13	CONSTRUCTORS, INC.; MEHDI ÁZARMI; JAMES B. ROBERTS and DONNA M.				
14	ROBERTS, husband and wife; JOHN DOES 1-10; JANE DOES 1-10; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-10;				
15	and XYZ PARTNERSHIPS 1-10.				
16	Defendants.				
17		,			
18	COME NOW, the Defendants, by and the	rough their attorney, the undersigned, and			
19	provides this Court with their Response to Plaintiff's Objection to the above-referenced filing				
20	hereinabove captioned.				
21	This Response is submitted to the Court requesting that the fees and costs incurred by				
22	the responding Defendants be awarded to the Defendants pursuant to the provisions of				
23	A.R.S. §12-349 all in accord with the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities.				
24	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this day of May, 2023.				
25	,	LAW OFFICES OF DANIEL J. OEHLER			
26		V 21000			
27		Daniel J. Oehler, Attorney for Defendants			
28		Titothoj toi Dolohdanto			

#### **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

Judge Jantzen, at the request of the Defendants, set a Status Conference to consider the multitude of motions that had been filed in this cause of action dating from September 29, 2022, through the end of February 2023. At the conclusion of the February 17, 2023, Status Conference that included a discussion of the various subject motions, the Court entered the following Orders, and I quote:

"IT IS ORDERED denying the Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend the Complaint for Affidavit Fraud.

IT IS ORDERED denying the Plaintiff's Motion for Injunctive Relief.

IT IS ORDERED denying the Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss the Abandonment Claim for Unclean Hands.

IT IS ORDERED denying the Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider the Gag Order except for the Plaintiff can serve the indispensable parties.

IT IS ORDERED denying the Plaintiff's request to vacate the stipulation regarding the indispensable parties.

IT IS ORDERED granting the Defendants' Motion to Strike the Response to the motion to set this Status Conference.

IT IS ORDERED the Plaintiff pay attorney's fees for the motions filed from September 29, 2022, to present except for the Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment filed on February 2, 2023.

Mr. Oehler is directed to file an affidavit of attorney fees and Ms. Knight will have the opportunity to respond to that."

Thereafter, and in accordance with the specific Order entered by the trial court on February 17, 2023, counsel for the Defendants filed an Application for Attorney Fees and Costs pursuant to the Order dated February 17, 2023, that expressly and precisely complied with this Court's Orders as is attested to by the Affidavit of Attorney Fees. The undersigned further prepared and executed a Statement of Costs pursuant to the directive of the Court. Plaintiff has filed a response that in name is titled as an "Objection," however, in reality is some sort of new reconsideration motion regarding multiple prior ruled upon Plaintiff's motions dealing with denied Plaintiff motions for fraud, injunctions, unclean hands, Rule 19

1

3 4

5

6 7 8

10

indispensable parties joinder, formal orders to be served on "necessary and indispensable parties," as well as Plaintiff's bias motions against the Court - decided by a second Judge as not supported and not reflecting bias, determined after review by a Yavapai County Judge that bias was not present:

> "In her response to the *Motions to Dismiss*, she admits she decided to initiate this second suit because she is attempting to avoid a finding from another Superior Court that the CC&Rs have been abandoned. She states further concerns that the Courts have 'been led by the nose' by attorneys. suggests, 'There exists a real possibility that bias is affecting court rulings.' Finally, she alleges 'justice will not prevail with biased judges.' There is no evidence in the record of judges being 'led by the nose' or bias affecting court rulings." See, Knight v. Ludwig, et al., Yavapai County Superior Court Case No. P1300CV202200177, Under Advisement Ruling & Order entered August 11, 2022.

11 12

13

14

15

Plaintiff further cites a "messy document" presented by Defendants' attorney (see, Plaintiff's May 1, 2023 Objection p. 8, line 11) (copy of proposed order filing attached hereto as Exhibit A which is a copy of Plaintiff's attorney's proposed order and a copy of Defendants' attorney's proposed order).

16 17

18

An in-camera review of the Motions for which Defendants have filed an affidavit regarding attorney fees specifically consist of the motion pleadings set forth in Exhibit B attached hereto and made a part hereof as if set forth in full herein and no others.

subject fee request that collectively totals \$13,225.00 plus \$97.14 in costs are limited to only

As is indicated in the Defendants' Application for Attorney Fees and Costs, the

19 20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

the subject Motions filed by the Plaintiff in the time frame directed by the Court despite the fact that were a considerable number of additional motions and/or responses to motions that required replies from Defendants that are <u>not</u> included in the Application for Attorney Fees and Costs. Defendants' requests include specifically the additional time that was expended in preparation of the subject documentation reflected on page 1 of 2 in the fee summary for work that was necessitated directly related to the Court's February 17, 2023 Order, those being the preparation of the draft of fees and costs, the certification affidavit and companion document that were collectively filed on April 3 and April 4, 2023, as well as the Arizona

Turbo Court filing fees that were incurred on April 28, 2023, for the submittal of the ordered documentation.

The Court's in its February 17, 2023, Status Conference minute entry stated:

"Mr. Oehler presents arguments on attorney fees and requests the Court rule on Defendant's Motion to Strike the Plaintiff's response to the request for this hearing.

Ms. Knight presents arguments on the Motion to Strike.

IT IS ORDERED granting the Defendant's Motion to Strike the Response to the motion to set this Status Conference."

A review of the various written responses to the subject Motions for which attorney fees were sought in <u>writing</u> include Defendant's November 18, 2022, Response to Plaintiff's November 2, 2022, Motion to Dismiss Abandonment Claim for Unclean Hands; Defendants' November 23, 2022, Response to Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint for Affidavit Fraud; and Defendants' November 23, 2022, Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Injunctive Relief. There were <u>written</u> requests for fee awards on each of the above-referenced pleadings in addition to Defendants' request verbalized at the February 17, 2023, Status Conference.

Plaintiff's response captioned "Objection" to the award of attorney's fees fails to dispute the accuracy of a single time entry or the work performed regarding any entries that were set forth in either the Fee Summary or the Affidavit in support of the Fee Summary. This Court is referred to A.R.S. §12-349(A) regarding the authority of the Court to enter fee awards for motion practice that:

- "1. Brings or defends a claim without substantial justification.
- 2. Brings or defends a claim solely or primarily for delay or harassment.
- 3. Unreasonably expends or delays the proceeding."

The Defendants' request is for reimbursement of the attorney fees actually incurred regarding these specific motions and/or responses under A.R.S. §12-349 and do <u>not</u> include additional damages or a request therefore that are otherwise also allowed pursuant to A.R.S. §12-349.

The Plaintiff's May 1, 2023, Objection consisting of some 12 pages fails to focus on the issue that is before the Court and that is whether or not the fees requested accrued as a result of the motions which were the specific subject matters specified by the Court. To the contrary, the majority of Plaintiff's May 1, 2023, memorandum deals with an order entered by the trial court initially at the oral argument on the issue of who is to join the indispensable parties that was decided more than a year ago on January 10, 2022. See Plaintiff's May 1, 2023, Objection, p. 5, line 27, argument 4, dealing with Plaintiff's continuing refusal to abide by this court's order requiring Plaintiff to join the indispensable parties. The entirety of p. 6 and p. 7 through line 24 of p. 8, are devoted entirely to a totally irrelevant issue dealing with, once again, Plaintiff's refusals to comply with this Court's prior orders dealing with Rule 19 indispensable parties.

Plaintiff's Objection goes on to a second issue and Plaintiff is arguing about the fully irrelevant issue stated in her first sentence of subparagraph C beginning at line 24 of p. 8:

"C. Recusal of the Court. Plaintiff further objects to the attorney fees pursuant to the judge disqualifying himself on April 27, 2023 for all matters in this case."

The Defendants' fee request submitted does not allocate one minute of time expended as a result of Plaintiff's failed bias affidavits nor the direct self-disqualification that took place of the Court of April 27, 2023. Plaintiff is simply opining on irrelevant facts, irrelevant issues and inserting Plaintiff's inappropriate and improper statements concerning one or more judges that Plaintiff continuously berates and that have nothing whatsoever to do with the issue of the award of attorney fees pursuant to the Court's findings on February 17, 2023.

A review of Plaintiff's conclusions under subparagraph D beginning on p. 9 of her May 1, 2023 Objection, simply amplifies Plaintiff's misdirection, and Plaintiff's disdain and contempt for this Court. Plaintiff's document, once again, has nothing whatsoever to do with the issue of the award of attorney fees. Plaintiff discusses Plaintiff's Yavapai County case which is currently on appeal to Division Two of the Arizona Court of Appeals after having been dismissed at the Superior Court level. Plaintiff is arguing in what is supposed to be her objection to attorney fees but rather discusses Plaintiff's previously failed motion for

consolidation of this case into a dismissed Yavapai County case. 1 2 Finally, ¶4 on p. 10 at line 22, touches momentarily upon the issue before the Court 3 today, however, immediately descends into the additional irrelevant items set forth on page 11, ¶¶5, and 6, and finally at ¶7 wherein Plaintiff is moving this Court to reverse the Court 4 Order of February 17, 2023, 180 degrees and award Plaintiff §12-349 penalties against 5 Defendants' counsel. 6 7 Defendants should be allowed to recover Defendants' additional fees and costs necessitated by the Plaintiff's filing and for the preparation of this Response reflecting Plaintiff's continuing acrimonious dispute and refusal to abide by any order of the Court. RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 12th day of May, 2023. **COPY** of the foregoing emailed 16 this 12th day of May, 2023, to: Honorable Dale P. Nielson Navajo County Superior Court 18 Post Office Box 668 Holbrook, Arizona 86025

Plaintiff's opposition should be ignored as fully non-responsive and denied. LAW OFFICES OF DANIEL J. OEHLER Daniel J. Oehler. Attorney for Defendants

By:

(928) 524-4220

Plaintiff Nancy Knight

kalerma@courts.az.gov

1803 E. Lipan Circle

(928) 768-1537

Fort Mohave, Arizona 86426

nancyknight@frontier.com

Patricia L. Emond, Legal Assistant

Katelin Lerma, Judicial Assistant

27

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28

# Knight v. Ludwig, et al. Mohave County Superior Court Docket No. CV-2018-04003

Response to Plaintiff's Objection to a February 17, 2023
Court Order and Subsequent Affidavit for Attorney Fees Filed
on April 28, 2023

**EXHIBIT A** 

FILED
Christina Spurlock
CLERK, SUPERIOR COURT
09/28/2022 11:30AM
BY: DHISER
DEPUTY

		BY: DHISER DEPUTY			
1	LAW OFFICES DANIEL J. OEHLER				
2					
3					
4					
5	Daniel J. Oehler, Arizona State Bar No.: 002739 Attorney for Defendants				
6	Automey for Defendants				
7					
8	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA				
9	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE				
10					
11	NANCY KNIGHT,	NO.: CV-2018-04003			
12	Plaintiff,	) NOTICE OF FILING PROPOSED ORDERS			
13	vs.	) PROPOSED ORDERS			
14	GLEN LUDWIG and PEARL LUDWIG, Trustees of THE LUDWIG FAMILY TRUST; FAIRWAY	) )			
15	5 CONSTRUCTORS, INC.; MEHDI AZARMI;				
16	JAMES B. ROBERTS and DONNA M.  ROBERTS, husband and wife; JOHN DOES 1-10;  JANE DOES 1-10; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-10;  )				
17	and XYZ PARTNERSHIPS 1-10.	) )			
18	Defendants.	)			
19					
20	COME NOW, the Defendants, by and through their attorney, the undersigned, and file				
21	herewith the following two (2) documents:				
22	Plaintiff's proposed Order titled "R	Revised Proposed Order 9-19-22 (1)" that			
23	includes revisions made by Attorney Coughlin in yellow; and				
24	2. Defendants' proposed Order titled	"Revised Proposed Order 9-23-22 (1)"			
25	which is the document initially prepared by Attorney Coughlin (Document No. 1, above				
26	wherein the undersigned incorporated Attorney Coughlin's revisions that had originally				
27	///				
28	///				

1	appeared in yellow, further edited, revised and rearranged the document in blue, and returned		
2	the same to Attorney Coughlin on September 23, 2022, for further review.		
3	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 28th day of September, 2022.		
4	LAW OFFICES OF DANIEL J. OEHLER		
5	C 010000		
6	Daniel J. Oehler, Attorney for Defendants		
7	Automey for Defendants		
8	COPY of the foregoing emailed this 28 <sup>th</sup> day of September, 2022, to:		
9	Honorable Lee F. Jantzen		
10	Mohave County Superior Court Division 4		
11	401 E. Spring Street Kingman, Arizona 86401		
12	(928) 753-0785 Danielle dlecher@courts.az.gov		
13	Attorney for Plaintiff		
14	J. Jeffrey Coughlin J. Jeffrey Coughlin, PLLC 1570 Plaza West Drive		
15	1570 Plaza West Drive Prescott, Arizona 86303		
16	(928) 445-4400 (928) 445-6828 fax		
17	jjcpllc@gmail.com		
18	By: Hatricia Mond		
19	Patricia L. Emond, Legal Assistant		
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			

1 'J. Jeffrey Coughlin (013801) J. JEFFREY COUGHLIN PLLC 2 1570 Plaza West Drive Prescott, Arizona 86303 3 Telephone: (928) 445-4400 Facsimile: (928) 445-6828 4 jjcpllc@gmail.com 5 6 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA 7 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE 8 9 NANCY KNIGHT, 10 Plaintiff, Case No. B8015CV2018 04003 11 VS. 12 GLEN LUDWIG and PEARL LUDWIG, PROPOSED ORDER 13 Trustees of THE LUDWIG FAMILY 14 TRUST; FAIRWAY CONSTRUCTORS, INC.; 15 MEHDI AZARMI; JAMES B. ROBERTS and DONNA M. ROBERTS, husband and 16 wife; JOHN DOES 1-10; JANE DOES 1-17 10; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-10; AND XYZ PARTNERSHIPS 1-10. 18 Defendants. 19 20 IT IS ORDERED that in the event the Plaintiff does not take 21 substantial steps to join all necessary and indispensable parties within the next 22 one hundred fifty (150) days, this matter will be dismissed. 23 IT IS ORDERED the caption of this case shall not be amended until 24 after service is substantially accomplished and the Court can determine 25

whether to join a landowner who files a responsive pleading as a Plaintiff or Defendant.

IT IS ORDERED at the time Plaintiff requests the Clerk of the Court to issue Summons to be served upon the additional parties, the Plaintiff shall file an Excel spreadsheet in electronic form that lists the Assessor's Parcel Number in numerical order in column A, the specific lot number in column B, as well as name(s) and mailing address of the current owner of each parcel in column C, in the row number corresponding to the Assessor's Parcel Number, in accordance with the current Mohave County Assessor's office information on file, reflecting the owners' respective mailing address and/or addresses.

The spreadsheet shall specifically include those lots that are located in Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates Tract 4076-B, Tract 4076-D and Tract 4163.

Further, the Court shall require Plaintiff to include a full set of the Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for Desert Lakes Golf Course & Estates Tract 4076-D that overlays the full set of the Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for Tract 4076-B. The Notice must also include a statement that Tract 4163 has no separate Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions other than the imposed restrictions in Tract 4076-B that included the lands constituting Tract 4163.

IT IS ORDERED Plaintiff shall cause to be served in compliance with Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 4.1(c)(1)(A)-(G), each and every

owner identified in accord with the provisions of the immediately preceding paragraph.

IT IS ORDERED Plaintiff serve those necessary and indispensable parties with a summons, a copy of the Complaint filed with this Court on January 22, 2018, a copy of the Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions For Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates Tract 4076-B (recorded in Official Records of Mohave County on December 18, 1989 at Book 1641, Page 895) and a Notice approved by the court.

The Notice shall be approved by the Court in the manner set forth below.

IT IS ORDERED the Plaintiff may accomplish service in the following manner:

- The Plaintiff first may attempt to obtain an Acceptance of Service from all property owners.
- 2. For those property owners who will not sign an Acceptance of Service, the Court authorizes alternative service by mail as provided in Rule 4.2(c), *Ariz.R.Civ.P.* whether the property owner(s) are located within Arizona or outside the State.
- 3. For those lot owners who have not signed a return receipt, the Plaintiff shall cause to be completed in conjunction with ARCP Rules 4, 4.1 and 4.2 personal service upon the subject lot owner/s.

2 | 3 |

4. For those property owners who are not served in the ways set forth above, the Court will consider Plaintiffs' request for other forms of alternative service.

IT IS ORDERED by January 31, 2023, or at the time of filing an initial pleading or motion with the Court, whichever is sooner, all parties and attorneys appearing in this case SHALL designate and maintain an e-mail address with the Clerk of the Court and the other parties. The e-mail address will be used to electronically distribute any document, including minute entries and other orders, rulings, and notices described in Rule 125, Rules of the Supreme Court by e-mail or electronic link in lieu of distribution of paper versions by regular mail. The e-mail address shall be designated on each document filed. In the event that a party's e-mail address changes, that change shall immediately be brought to the attention of the Clerk of Superior Court and included on subsequent filings and pleadings.

IT IS ORDERED that the Clerk of the Superior Court is authorized to electronically distribute all pleadings and documents, including minute entries and other orders, rulings, and notices described in Rule 125, Rules of the Supreme Court by e-mail or electronic link in lieu of distribution of paper versions by regular mail.

IT IS ORDERED, after initial service of the Summons, Notice and Plaintiff's Complaint and with the exception that originals of all documents

must be filed with the Clerk of the Court in electronic format, all parties are authorized to transmit documents to all other parties in electronic format and shall attach to the original document filed with Clerk of Court a notice that the document was transmitted electronically to the other parties along with a list of the names of the parties and e-mail addresses to which electronic transmission was sent.

IT IS ORDERED any party who declines to provide the Clerk of the Court and the other parties with an e-mail address SHALL be assessed the actual cost of mailing.

IT IS ORDERED the Clerk of Court of the Mohave County Superior Court shall provide public access to all pleadings previously filed and to be filed in this litigation through its "High Profile Cases" link on its website.

The Court has prepared and attached to this Ruling a draft of a Notice to be served upon all landowners together with a Summons and Plaintiff's Complaint. Counsel shall be given an opportunity for input into the form of Notice as follows.

IT IS ORDERED counsel for both sides shall have until September 30, 2022 to file objections and proposals for the Notice.

1 J. Jeffrey Coughlin (013801) J. JEFFREY COUGHLIN PLLC 2 1570 Plaza West Drive Prescott, Arizona 86303 3 Telephone: (928) 445-4400 Facsimile: (928) 445-6828 4 jjcpllc@gmail.com 5 6 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA 7 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE 8 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 and DONNA M. ROBERTS, husband and 16 wife; JOHN DOES 1-10; JANE DOES 1-17 10; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-10; AND **XYZ PARTNERSHIPS 1-10.** 18 Defendants. 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Case No. B8015CV2018 04003

PROPOSED ORDER

IT IS ORDERED the caption of this case shall not be amended until after service is substantially accomplished and the Court can determine whether to join a landowner who files a responsive pleading as a Plaintiff or Defendant.

IT IS ORDERED at the time Plaintiff requests the Clerk of the Court to issue Summons to the Plaintiff shall provide and input all necessary data

and information for the issuance by the Court system of the Summonses that will be served upon each of the additional parties. The Plaintiff shall simultaneously file with the Clerk of the Court and serve on the existing Defendants an Excel spreadsheet in electronic form that lists the Assessor's Parcel Number in numerical order in column A, the specific lot and tract number in column B, as well as name(s) and mailing address of the current owner of each parcel in column C, in the row number corresponding to the Assessor's Parcel Number, in accordance with the current Mohave County Assessor's office information on file, reflecting the owners' respective mailing address and/or addresses. The spreadsheet shall specifically include those lots that are located in Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates Tract 4076-B, Tract 4076-D and Tract 4163.

IT IS ORDERED Plaintiff shall cause to be served in compliance with Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 4.1(c)(1)(A)-(G), each and every owner identified in accord with the provisions of the immediately preceding paragraph.

IT IS ORDERED Plaintiff shall cause to be served upon each those necessary and indispensable party a set of documents hereinafter referred to as the "Service Packet" that shall include: parties with a (1) their/its personal summons, (2) a copy of the Plaintiff's Complaint filed with this Court on January 22, 2018, (3) a copy of the Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions For Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates Tract 4076-B (recorded in Official Records of

Mohave County on December 18, 1989 at Book 1641, Pages 895-901), (4) a copy of the Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates Tract 4076-D (recorded in Official Records of Mohave County on October 19, 1990 at Book 1808, Pages 509-514), (5) Waiver of Service and Acceptance of Service forms, and (6) a Notice approved and finally prepared by the Court.

IT IS ORDERED the Plaintiff may accomplish service in the following manner:

- 1. The Plaintiff first-may attempt to obtain an Acceptance of Service from all property owners. Plaintiff shall comply fully with the provisions of Rule 4.1 and/or Rule 4.2, *Ariz.R.Civ.P.*, regarding transmittal of a proposed "Acceptance of Service" and the legal effects of "waiving service" per Rule 84, Forms 1-2, *Ariz.R.Civ.P.*, and "accepting service" per Rule 12(a)(1)(A)(ii), *Ariz.R.Civ.P.* The Service Packet including the "Acceptance of Service" documentation shall be sent via United States Postal Service (USPS) first class mail to the parties. Only the Court approved documentation shall be transmitted.
- 2. For those property owners who will-do not sign an Acceptance of Service, the Court authorizes alternative service by mail as provided in Rule 4.2(c), *Ariz.R.Civ.P.* whether the property owner(s) are located within Arizona or outside the State.

3. For those lot owners who have do not signed a return receipt, the Plaintiff shall cause to be completed, in conjunction-full accord with ARCP Rules 4, 4.1 and 4.2, personal service upon the subject lot owner/s.

4. For those property owners who are not served in the ways set forth above, the Court will-may consider Plaintiff's request for other forms of alternative service.

IT IS ORDERED by January 31, 2023, or at the time of filing an initial pleading or motion with the Court, whichever is sooner, all parties and attorneys appearing in this case shall designate and maintain an e-mail address with the Clerk of the Court and the other parties. The e-mail address will be used to electronically distribute any document, including minute entries and other orders, rulings, and notices described in Rule 125, *Rules of the Supreme Court* by e-mail or electronic link in lieu of distribution of paper versions by regular mail. The e-mail address shall be designated on each document filed. In the event that a party's e-mail address changes, that change shall immediately be brought to the attention of the Clerk of Superior Court and included on subsequent filings and pleadings.

IT IS ORDERED that the Clerk of the Superior Court is authorized to shall electronically distribute all pleadings and documents, including minute entries and other orders, rulings, and notices described in Rule 125, Rules of the Supreme Court by e-mail or electronic link in lieu of distribution of paper versions by regular mail.

IT IS ORDERED, after initial service of the Summons, Notice and Plaintiff's Complaint-"Service Packet" and with the exception that originals of all documents must be filed with the Clerk of the Court in electronic format, all parties are authorized to transmit documents to all other parties in electronic format and shall attach to the original document filed with Clerk of Court a notice that the document was transmitted electronically to the other parties along with a list of the names of the parties and e-mail addresses to which electronic transmission was sent.

IT IS ORDERED any party who declines to provide the Clerk of the Court and the other parties with an e-mail address shall be assessed the actual cost of mailing.

IT IS ORDERED the Clerk of Court of the Mohave County Superior Court shall provide public access to all pleadings previously filed and to be filed in this litigation through its "High Profile Cases" link on its website.

IT IS ORDERED Plaintiff shall have no direct nor indirect personal or written contact with the to-be-joined indispensable or necessary parties.

IT IS ORDERED that in the event the Plaintiff does not take substantial steps to have fully complied with the specifics of this Order as set forth herein to join all necessary and indispensable parties within the next one hundred fifty (150) days, this matter will-shall be dismissed.

The Notice approved and finally prepared by the Court to be included in the "Service Packet" shall state, at a minimum, the following:

# Knight v. Ludwig, et al. Mohave County Superior Court Docket No. CV-2018-04003

Response to Plaintiff's Objection to a February 17, 2023
Court Order and Subsequent Affidavit for Attorney Fees Filed
on April 28, 2023

**EXHIBIT B** 

### <u>Knight v. Ludwig, et al.</u> Motions filed by Plaintiff 09/29/2022 - 02/17/2023

1	09/29/2022 11/23/2022 11/25/2022 <b>02/17/2023</b>	Plaintiff Defendant Plaintiff Court	Motion for Leave to Amend for Affidavit Fraud Response Reply <b>Denied</b>
2 3 4 5	10/03/2022 10/03/2022 10/03/2022 10/03/2022 11/11/2022 <b>02/17/2023</b>	Plaintiff Plaintiff Plaintiff Plaintiff Defendant <b>Court</b>	Motion to reconsider gag order on Plaintiff; Motion to reconsider that Plaintiff is to join parties; Motion to reconsider denial of leave to amend complaint; and Motion for consolidation of 8 parties from Yavapai County case Response Denied
6	10/24/2022 11/23/2022 <b>02/17/2023</b>	Plaintiff Defendant Court	Motion for Injunctive Relief Response Denied
7	11/02/2022 11/18/2022 11/21/2022 <b>02/17/2023</b>	Plaintiff Defendant Plaintiff Court	Motion to Dismiss Abandonment Claim for Unclean Hands Response Reply <b>Denied</b>
8	12/01/2022 12/05/2022 12/09/2022 12/12/2022 <b>02/17/2023</b>	Defendant Plaintiff Defendant Plaintiff Court	Request to Set Status Conference Response in Objection to Request Motion to Strike Response Response in Objection to Motion to Strike Status Conference held