FILED Christina Spurlock CLERK, SUPERIOR COURT 07/06/2023 5:35PM BY: LYIRWIN DEPUTY

1 LAW OFFICES DANIEL J. OEHLER 2001 Highway 95, Suite 15 Bullhead City, Arizona 86442 (928) 758-3988 (928) 763-3227 (fax)

diolaw10@gmail.com

NANCY KNIGHT,

VS.

Daniel J. Oehler, Arizona State Bar No.: 002739 Attorney for Defendants

6

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

COME NOW, the Defendants, in response to Plaintiff's above-referenced pending Motion filed May 15, 2023, and provide the Court with Defendants' responses hereinafter set forth.

Plaintiff's request for reconsideration should be denied and the Defendants' approved Order (updated) should remain in place. A standard Summons and standard Rule 4(f) and 4.1, 4.2 Waiver and Acceptance approved as to exact form by the Court should issue. Plaintiff's proposed documents are not in compliance with the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 4, contain improper, inappropriate and wrongful statements of the law and fact. Defendants should be awarded their attorney fees and costs associated herewith, all as

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE

Plaintiff, GLEN LUDWIG and PEARL LUDWIG, Trustees of THE LUDWIG FAMILY TRUST: FAIRWAY CONSTRUCTORS, INC.; MEHDI AZARMI: JAMES B. ROBERTS and DONNA M. ROBERTS, husband and wife; JOHN DOES 1-10;

Defendants.

and XYZ PARTNERSHIPS 1-10.

JANE DOES 1-10; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-10;

NO.: CV-2018-04003

RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF FINAL ORDERS FOR SERVICE ON INDISPENSABLE PARTIES DATED FEB. 17, 2023 FOR INAPPROPRIATE CONTENT AND FAILURE OF THE COURT TO PROVIDE THE SUMMONS AND WAIVER OF SERVICE FORM

Honorable Dale P. Nielson

is set forth in the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 6th day of July, 2023.

LAW OFFICES OF DANIEL J. OEHLER

Daniel J. Oehler.

Attorney for Defendants

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Plaintiff's initial statement in her Motion for Reconsideration filed May 15, 2023, is that the Court Order issued by Judge Jantzen on February 17, 2023, "was not well thought out" (p. 1, lines 25-26). The longstanding history on this issue reflects that the subject Order was actually entered on February 17, 2023, via the Court's signature but not filed by the Clerk until February 21, 2023. A copy of the Order with the Court's interlineations is attached hereto and referenced as **Exhibit A**. At the time of its entry by the Court, via interlineation, the Court changed the date ascribed in the last paragraph of p. 2, from January 31, 2023, to May 30, 2023. This new date, approximately 110 days after entry of the subject Order, fixed a time for the to-be-joined necessary and indispensable parties to provide the Court with the parties' initial pleadings and each party's email address.

Note that the Defendants' proposed order was originally filed on or about August 19, 2022 (Exhibit B), almost 11 months prior to the preparation of this Response. Defendants' proposal, at that point in time, simply left the time period for a response from the indispensable parties blank, "______(date)," in other words, open for the Court to determine. On September 28, 2022, Defendants filed a copy of both Plaintiff's attorney's "proposed order" with revisions highlighted in yellow (Exhibit C), and Defendants' "proposed order" that incorporated Plaintiff's attorney's initial yellow highlighted revisions along with Defendants' revisions added in blue (Exhibit D). These documents had been exchanged between Plaintiff's then attorney, Jeffrey Coughlin, and Defendants' attorney, Daniel J. Oehler. Comparing these documents resulted in a finding that there were very few significant variances in the work products and proposals submitted by both attorneys over

27

28

the appropriate content of the subject proposed Court Notice and Order for inclusion in the prospective "summons packet." At the time of this exchange, this Court should take note of the fact that Plaintiff's attorney proposed a date of January 31, 2023, for the necessary and indispensable parties to respond – see Plaintiff's proposed Order, p. 4, line 8 (Exhibit C). Defendants, having incorporated many of Plaintiff's attorney's proposed amendments, utilized this same date in their proposed Order, p. 4, line 8 (Exhibit D). Thereafter, Defendants made a few adjustments in preparing the Final Proposed Order that Defendants filed with the Court on November 11, 2022 (Exhibit E) that combined the January 31, 2023 (Coughlin requested date) on p. 4, and as was signed by Judge Jantzen on February 17, 2023 with the Court's handwritten selected date of May 30, 2023, for the indispensable parties to respond.

Note should be taken that in the interim period between the initial filing between July 2022 and February 17, 2023, approximately 35 Plaintiff motions/requests were filed by Plaintiff including a Motion to Withdraw Plaintiff's attorney, Affidavit of Court Bias, Change of Judge, Order Transfer to New Judge re Bias Review, Denial of Court Bias, Plaintiff's Motion for Change of Venue, Motion for Reconsideration of Claim of Bias, Plaintiff's First Corrected Motion to Reconsider Bias, a Denial of the Motion to Reconsider the Filing of an Order Denying Bias, Reconsideration Motion to Alternate Judge, a court finding that Plaintiff's efforts were for delay, filing of a Judicial Complaint, Recusal (short list through April 27, 2023) followed immediately by Plaintiff's May 1, 2023, objection to the Court's request and authorization for Defendants to file an affidavit of attorney fees and costs that were incurred in responding to multiple of Plaintiff's motions over a designated period of time "...September 29, 2022, to present [February 17, 2023] except for the Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment filed on February 2, 2023" each of which Motions and others had been denied. Plaintiff objected to the trial court's intent to enter a fee order against Plaintiff and Plaintiff in response filed a request that the Court award Plaintiff A.R.S. §12-349 fees in the amount of \$5,000.00 from opposing counsel apparently to compensate Plaintiff's failed motion practice within the September 29, 2022 to

February 17, 2023 time frame designated by the Court.

The Jantzen Order signed February 17, 2023, filed by the Clerk of the Court on February 21, 2023, is specific, straight forward and to the point needed for service on the necessary and indispensable parties. Obviously, as a result of the multitude of motions that were filed between February 21, 2023, and June 12, 2023 (at least 10 by Plaintiff and two by Defendants), the time periods originally generated in August 2022 need to be updated as was done by the former Judge handling this file and needs to be again updated. Similarly, the 150 days referenced on p. 3, ¶6, needs to be tied to a definite trigger date, perhaps 150 days from the Clerk's office issuing the proper and appropriate summons prepared for each new party by the Plaintiff and delivered to the Clerk of the Court in a form that is fully pre-approved by the Court and compliant with ARCP Rule 4 (Exhibit F). Note that Plaintiff continuously suggests that once the Court determines the precise form of the summons, waiver, acceptance and notice/order, the Plaintiff includes a repetitive comment suggesting that the Clerk of the Court is to prepare each of the individualized service documents. Indeed the Plaintiff is obligated to do so and the Clerk of the Court's obligation is to issue the summons, not do the secretarial work.

ARCP Rule 4(a)(2) clearly directs that the Plaintiff is obligated to prepare the Summons and present it to the Clerk for signature and sealing. More specifically, the exact language that obligates Plaintiff to prepare each of the necessary and indispensable parties' Summons reads:

"(2) Issuance. On or after filing a pleading, the filing party may present a summons to the clerk for signature and seal. If the summons is properly completed, the clerk must sign, seal, and issue it to the filing party for service. A summons-or copy of the summons if addressed to multiple parties-must be issued for each party to be served."

Plaintiff must prepare and deliver each required and correct Summons regardless of the number of times Plaintiff states in Plaintiff's pleading that someone else, the Court or the Clerk, is to do so once this Court specifically approves the exact form.

No issue is taken by the Defendants herein that the Plaintiff's service packet include

a "Waiver of Service of Summons" (as set forth in 16 A.R.S. Rules of Civil Procedure Form 2 (**Exhibit G**), including the specific language to be printed on the reverse side of the waiver document) and an "Acceptance of Service."

PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED FINAL ORDER

Plaintiff's proposed Final Order is replete with improprieties or unacceptable commentary.

- p.1 of Plaintiff's proposed Final Order, line 28, seeks court authority to allow Plaintiff to use "...Plaintiff's best guess."
- p.3 of Plaintiff's proposed Final Order, line 23, July 15, 2023, of course, doesn't work.
- p.3, ¶3 of Plaintiff is inaccurate and deletes a mandatory filing requirement of every party to be joined.
- Plaintiff's proposed issuance by this Court regarding alleged "unnecessary costs of service (lines 15-16) and the following suggested automatic issuance of an "order judgment for payment... to the Plaintiff" by this Court (p.3, lines 18-19) is fully inappropriate and cannot be used.
- Defendants believe that the Clerk of the Court's high profile website address should be set forth on the Summons, Waiver of Service and Acceptance of Service documents, not simply on only one or in a possible waiver document. The website address is: www.mohavecourts.com/court-departments/clerk-superior-court/high-profile-cases.
- p.4, lines 21-28 and p.5, lines 1-4 must be deleted in their entirety.

A few but not all the reasons are:

- 1. The case issue brought by the Plaintiff is an effort to enforce the CC&Rs. The law requires that if the covenants are enforced against one, they are to be enforced against all. The defense is that the CC&Rs have been abandoned.
- 2. Plaintiff suggests an examination of the prohibition of contact pre-service on the necessary and indispensable parties, i.e., in the current Jantzen signed Order February 21,

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

2023, the no contact is applicable to those parties that are "to be joined indispensable parties" p.3, ¶6. It is not intended to be applicable to the joined parties once they are actually joined. At that point, Plaintiff cannot represent any of the additional parties. Similarly, the Defendants cannot represent any of the additional parties as the defendants, similar to the Plaintiff, are not licensed to practice law. Defendants are represented by a licensed attorney and provided compliance of all ethical requirements including client approval Defendants attorney could in fact speak to, discuss and potentially could represent one or more of the Rule 19 additional parties.

3. Plaintiff has authored a document that Plaintiff has recorded in the Mohave County records that Plaintiff apparently believes has some legal efficacy. Plaintiff calls this document an Unincorporated Association (hereinafter "UA") and purports that it deals with Desert Lakes Tract 4076, a tract that does not exist in fact and never has existed in Mohave County, Arizona. Plaintiff suggests facts regarding this entity be included in the service packet. Plaintiff purports that Plaintiff formed the entity in accordance with the laws of the State of Arizona dealing with "planned communities" and under the provisions of A.R.S. §§33-1801 to 33-1819. There is no "planned community" within any one of the several different subdivisions in or around Mohave Valley, Arizona, specifically including Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates Tracts 4076-B, 4076-D or 4163. Yet, Plaintiff alleges to nearby residents, including the necessary and indispensable parties, that they should join this invalid entity that may already have slandered title to some or all of these individual subdivisions and adversely affected all of the Desert Lakes Tracts. Residents including those owning property within Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates Tracts 4076-B, 4076-D and 4163 have also never been informed that even if Plaintiff's UA had been a properly formed entity, and it is not, that the UA would be treated for tax and other legal purposes as a partnership exposing all who joined to joint and several liability for all actions, judgments and other liabilities and actions taken by the entity which, of course, is to be represented by the Plaintiff, its self-declared president.

On p.4, ¶6 effectively is a commentary on evidence or potential evidence that has no

1

9 10

11 12

13

14 15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

26

25

27

28

place in the service packet or orders to be entered by the Court.

Finally, Plaintiff's request that the Court provide a figure of 75% of the first service efforts taken by Plaintiff should be considered "substantial" compliance with the Court Order. This is a faulty way to measure Plaintiff's compliance. This is an issue that must be decided by the Court after hearing on why one-quarter of the parties could not be successfully served. The number may be less than 75% of the APNs or well may be more than even the 85% of the property owners Plaintiff suggests in her Motion for Reconsideration but the correct number can only be judged by the efforts taken or shirked by the Plaintiff in completing or failing to complete proper service on each of the subject lot owners.

PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED WAIVER OF SERVICE

Plaintiff's May 15, 2023, proposed "Waiver of Service" purports to be in accord with ARCP Rule 4(f) however it does not comply in multiple ways and multiply issues that Plaintiff has improperly included on the first page and more particularly the "two" back pages of the document. Plaintiff's omissions and additions are of extreme import and potential impact delivering to the new defendants multiple erroneous statements of both fact and law that we will examine more completely, at least in part, in this Response.

While Plaintiff talks about waiver and includes some of the correct ARCP portions of Rule 4(f), Plaintiff ignores the parties' rights to consider acceptance of service (Rule 4(f)(2)), and voluntary appearance (Rule 4(f)(3)), all of which should be included. On the reverse side of the waiver form, Plaintiff has created a "box" dealing with Plaintiff's interpretation of "duties" and while the initial two paragraphs are generally in accordance with Rule 4, the third paragraph is a direct misrepresentation of the Rule 4 requirement where the Plaintiff is directing the new defendants to deliver the proof of service documents and proposed waiver documents to the Plaintiff rather than advising the new defendants that they must file the same with the Clerk of the Court. See Plaintiff's May 15, 2023, proposed Final Order, p. 2, lines 12-15, that reads:

"... (5) Two Waiver of Service forms for each property owner

listed for their Assessor Parcel Number(s) and sufficient self-addressed stamped envelopes for return of one copy of each signed waiver to be <u>returned to the Plaintiff</u> for filing with the court." (Emphasis supplied.)

See also, Plaintiff's May 15, 2023, proposed Summons and Waiver of Service Language, p. 2, ¶3, that reads in pertinent part:

"...(5) Two Waiver of Service forms for each property owner listed for your Assessor Parcel Number and sufficient self-addressed stamped envelopes for return of one copy of each signed waiver to be <u>returned to the Plaintiff</u> for filing with the court." (Emphasis supplied)

Rule 4(f)(1) and (2), ARCP, deals with both waiving service and accepting service and clearly states the signed waiver or the signed acceptance must "...be filed <u>in the action</u>." (Emphasis supplied.)

Next, Plaintiff in the attached narrative on p. 2 states that the Rule 19 parties "...are not being sued", when indeed they are being sued initially as defendants in the litigation and will become designated defendants or plaintiffs dependent upon their filings with the Court.

Plaintiff also misstates the Plaintiff's claim that the issue is "abandonment" of the CC&Rs rather than the fact that the claim by the Plaintiff, the person that has brought this litigation, is suing to enforce the CC&Rs and that violators (necessary and indispensable parties) are subject to potential court ordered removal of all CC&R violations.

Plaintiff's proposed waiver form is fatally defective. Plaintiff alleges that it is in accord with ARCP Rule 4(f) as well as Rules 4.1 and 4.2, however, Plaintiff incorporates only a portion of the specific terminology of Rule 84 of Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure and making an intentional effort to delete what the served parties must do to respond to the actions taken by the Plaintiff in initiating this litigation.

On the other hand, Plaintiff appears to use only those portions of the Rule 84 Form 2 that the Plaintiff wishes to use, and ignores what Plaintiff wishes to ignore. There are several examples of this in Plaintiff's proposed Waiver of Service document submitted to this Court.

- A. First, Plaintiff fails to identify the Defendants.
- B. Plaintiff delivers Plaintiff's judgment language to suit Plaintiff from both a

time and content basis. Plaintiff's paragraph reads:

"JUDGMENT. I understand that a judgment may be entered against me (or the party on whose behalf I am acting) if I fail to return this signed waiver within thirty (30) days after this waiver was sent, which was __/___ (date sent) for the costs involved in either a second mailing, personal process service or service by publication."

What it should say: ARCP Rule 84 Form 2 reads:

"I understand that a judgment may be entered against me (or the party on whose behalf I am acting) if an answer or motion under Rule 12 is not served upon you within sixty (60) days after [Date Request Was Sent], or within ninety (90) days after that date if the request was sent outside the United States."

C. Plaintiff on the reverse side of the form appears to have accurately quoted the first two paragraphs of the rule advising the served necessary and indispensable parties what they must do with the summons, waiver, etc., stating:

"DUTY TO AVOID UNNECESSARY COSTS OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS

Rule 4.1 and Rule 4.2 of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure require certain parties to cooperate in saving unnecessary costs of service of the summons and a pleading. A defendant located in the United States who, after being notified of an action and asked by a plaintiff located in the United States to waive service of a summons, fails to do so will be required to bear the cost of such service unless good cause be shown for its failure to sign and return the waiver.

It is not good cause for a failure to waive service that a party believes that the complaint is unfounded, or that the action has been brought in an improper place or in a court that lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action or over its person or property. A party who waives service of the summons retains all defenses and objections (except any relating to the summons or to the service of the summons), and may later object to the jurisdiction of the court or to the place where the action has been brought."

These first two paragraphs are correct, however, and perhaps most importantly, Plaintiff's third paragraph within the "box" does not conform to the rules and reads as follows:

"A defendant who waives service must, within the time specified on this waiver form, serve the plaintiff's attorney (or unrepresented plaintiff) a response to the complaint and served within this time, a default judgment may be taken against that defendant. By waiving service, a defendant is allowed more

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28 time to answer than if the summons had been actually served when the request for waiver of service was received."

Versus the requirement that is clearly set out in the accurate ARCP Rule 84, Form 2, that reads:

> "A defendant who waives service must, within the time specified on the waiver form, serve on the plaintiff's attorney (or unrepresented plaintiff) a response to the complaint and also must file a signed copy of the response with the court. If the answer or motion is not served within this time, a default judgment may be taken against that defendant. By waiving service, a defendant is allowed more time to answer than if the summons had been actually served when the request for waiver of service was received." (Emphasis supplied.)

It appears that the Plaintiff might simply have forgotten to advise that necessary and indispensable parties must file their response with the Court. In fact, Plaintiff states that the necessary and indispensable parties are prohibited from contacting the Court as set forth below.

D. Plaintiff goes on to attempt to misinform the parties of a series of additional facts such as these parties are "not being sued" when in fact they are added as parties to Plaintiff's attempt to enforce the CC&Rs and Defendants' position that the CC&Rs are not enforceable and that judgment/s may or will be entered against the party for service costs. Finally, on yet an additional page, Plaintiff proposes that the Court has entered or will enter specific orders in advance against or prohibiting these parties from contacting the Court and others, stating:

> "You are prohibited from contacting the Court, the Defense counsel, Defendants or the Plaintiff for advice or information. This is a high-profile case and documents filed in the matter are available for viewing online at

> You are advised to consult an attorney for information on becoming a Plaintiff or a Defendant in this matter. You will not be allowed to join with either the original Plaintiff Pro Per or the three existing Defendants in the case who are represented by an attorney.

> Tract 4163 has no separate Declaration of Covenants. Conditions and Restrictions ("CC&Rs") because the CC&Rs run with the land and Tract 4163 is land that is included in Tract 4076-B.

Much of the Original Compliant is obsolete at this time. Roberts and the one home with setback violations was dismissed in June 2018 for being in Tract 4076-A. This case involves incidents on lots subject to the Tract 4076-B CC&Rs."

SUMMATION

Each of these Plaintiff position statements are inappropriate and/or improper to include on a waiver or acceptance document and when referring to a court order that does not exist they are an intentional misrepresentation.

The content of the Order/Notice was well thought out unlike this the second or third effort by the Plaintiff to rewrite the facts and law.

For all of the preceding reasons, the Defendants request that the existing Notice/Order issued by Judge Jantzen on February 21, 2023, with updated time frames remain in place and that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration dated May 15, 2023, be denied.

Defendants request that this Court utilize a straight forward Summons, together with Rule 84 Form 2 Waiver and a standard Acceptance of Service form attached as **Exhibit H**. If requested by the Court, Defendants will prepare a form of Summons for Court approval and for the Plaintiff to then produce for each new party and then be presented for issuance by the Clerk of the Court for service on each new party.

Defendants request that this Court issue an order awarding Defendants their attorney fees and costs herein incurred for the preparation of this Response after submittal and approval of an affidavit of attorney fees and costs.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 6th day of July, 2023.

LAW OFFICES OF DANIEL J. OEHLER

Daniel J. Oehler,

Attorney for Defendants

| 1 | COPY of the foregoing emailed this (2 to day of July, 2023, to: |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | |
| 3 | Honorable Dale P. Nielson Navajo County Superior Court Post Office Box 668 |
| 4 | Holbrook, Arizona 86025 (928) 524-4220 |
| 5 | Katelin Lerma, Judicial Assistant kalerma@courts.az.gov |
| 6 | METERS OF ENGLISHED |
| 7 | Plaintiff Nancy Knight 1803 E. Lipan Circle |
| 8 | 1803 E. Lipan Circle Fort Mohave, Arizona 86426 |
| | (928) 768-1537 |
| 9 | nancyknight@frontier.com |
| 10 | |
| 11 | By: Attricia L. Emond, Legal Assistant |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |

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

Response to Motion for Reconsideration of Final Orders

LIST OF EXHIBITS

| <u>Exhibit</u> | Description |
|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| A | 02/17/2023 Order for Service of Non Dispensable Parties |
| В | 08/19/2022 Defendants' Proposed Notice and Opposition to Plaintiff's Proposed Notice |
| С | Coughlin Proposed Order (Yellow Highlight) |
| D | Defendants Proposed Order (Blue Text) |
| Е | Defendants 11/11/2022 Notice of Proposed Final Form Order |
| F | 16 A.R.S. Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 4 |
| G | 16 A.R.S. Rules of Civil Procedure, Form 2 |
| Н | Acceptance of Service |

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

Response to Motion for Reconsideration of Final Orders for Service on Indispensable Parties

EXHIBIT A

FILED
Christina Spurlock
CLERK, SUPERIOR COURT
02/21/2023 8:51AM
BY: AMOULTON
DEPUTY

LAW OFFICES
DANIEL J. OEHLER
2001 Highway 95. Suite 15
Bullhead City, Arizona 86442
(928) 758-3988
(928) 763-3227 (fax)
djolaw@frontiernet.net

Daniel J. Oehler, Arizona State Bar No.: 002739 Attorney for Defendants

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE

| NANCY KNIGHT. |) NO.: CV-2018-04003 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| |) |
| Plaintiff. |) PROPOSED ORDER |
| |) For service of |
| VS. |) non-Dispensable Parlies |
| GLEN LUDWIG and PEARL LUDWIG, Trustees |) |
| of THE LUDWIG FAMILY TRUST; FAIRWAY |) |
| CONSTRUCTORS, INC.; MEHDI AZARMI; |) |
| JAMES B. ROBERTS and DONNA M. |) |
| ROBERTS, husband and wife; JOHN DOES 1-10; |) |
| JANE DOES 1-10; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-10; |) |
| and XYZ PARTNERSHIPS 1-10. |) |
| Defendants. | 30 ₁ |
| both Plaintiff and Defendant and adopts the follows |) The Court has considered the positions of ing order for Affdinhilf to bring in non-dispensable parties. |

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 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 necessary and indispensable party a set of documents hereinafter referred to as the "Service Packet" that shall include: (1) their/its personal summons. (2) a copy of 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 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 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 do not sign a return receipt, the Plaintiff shall cause to be completed, in 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 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 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 "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 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:

The Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for Desert Lakes Golf Course & Estates Tract 4076-B and Tract 4076-D overlays the full set of the Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for Tract 4076-B.

- 2. Tract 4163 has no separate Declaration of Covenants. Conditions and Restrictions other than the restrictions for Tract 4076-B that included the lands constituting Tract 4163.
- 3. 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 Court has prepared and attaches to this Ruling a draft of the Notice to be included in the "Service Packet" and served upon all landowners.

IT IS ORDERED counsel shall be given an opportunity for input into the form of Notice for a period of twenty (20) days after the Court's proposed form is electronically delivered to Plaintiff's and Defendants' counsel.

DONE IN OPEN COURT this 17 day of Februar

Judge of the Superior Cour

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

Response to Motion for Reconsideration of Final Orders for Service on Indispensable Parties

EXHIBIT B

FILED Christina Spurlock CLERK, SUPERIOR COURT 08/19/2022 4:14PM BY: DHISER DEPLITY

1 LAW OFFICES DANIEL J. OEHLER 2001 Highway 95, Suite 15 Bullhead City, Arizona 86442 (928) 758-3988 (928) 763-3227 (fax) 4 diolaw@frontiernet.net 5 Daniel J. Oehler, Arizona State Bar No.: 002739 Attorney for Defendants 6 7 8 9 10 11 NANCY KNIGHT, 12 Plaintiff, 13 VS.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE

GLEN LUDWIG and PEARL LUDWIG, Trustees of THE LUDWIG FAMILY TRUST; FAIRWAY CONSTRUCTORS, INC.; MEHDI AZARMI; JAMES B. ROBERTS and DONNA M. ROBERTS, husband and wife; JOHN DOES 1-10; JANE DOES 1-10; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-10; and XYZ PARTNÉRSHIPS 1-10. Defendants.

NO.: CV-2018-04003

DEFENDANTS' PROPOSED NOTICE TO PROPERTY OWNERS AND OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED NOTICE

COME NOW, the Defendants, by and through their attorney, the undersigned, and delivers to this Court the Defendants' proposed form of Notice to Property Owners within Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates Tracts 4076-B, 4076-D and 4163.

Previously, Plaintiff has submitted a proposed form of property owner notice that fails to include multiple required and needed provisions, including but not necessarily limited to include the Defendants' Answer as well as a general statement as to Defendants' position on the issues that are before the Court. Defendants believe that given the fact that Plaintiff has previously and intentionally transmitted to each of the affected property owners multiple documents that purport to support Plaintiff's position on the litigation issues, including

statements that are believed to be inaccurate or grossly inaccurate both from a fact and law standpoint, that it is necessary and equitable for the Court to provide the property owners not only a copy of Plaintiff's Complaint and a complete and accurate set of Declarations (applicable exclusively to Tract 4076-B and Tract 4076-D, as Tract 4163, although created from two parcels located within Tract 4076-B, has no independent nor exclusive additional declarations applicable to it other than those that may be applicable to Tract 4076-B).

Plaintiff has poisoned the pool by improperly sending to each of the property owners in a mass mailing Plaintiff's litigation objectives (see Request for Status Conference filed herein by Defendants on or about June 10, 2022, Exhibit A).

Plaintiff's Complaint asks for relief that is believed to be not available and may cause significant confusion to the future parties to this litigation, namely, most importantly Plaintiff's request for relief in Plaintiff's Complaint at page 17, paragraph F at line 15, which reads:

"F. A declaratory judgment <u>forgiving</u> any CC&R construction violations that were not the fault of the purchaser of the home who unknowingly purchased a home that had been built, in error or deliberately by any builder, as out of compliance with the CC&Rs." (Emphasis supplied.)

The subject request is squarely in violation of the long standing rule in Arizona as espoused by the Supreme Court of Arizona in O'Malley, et al. v. Central Methodist Church, 194 P.2d 444 (1948), that effectively mandates that if the restrictions are not universal, they cannot be reciprocal. If they are not reciprocal and not carrying all of the properties, they are effectively unenforceable. "The burden follows the benefit and, where there is no benefit, there should be no burden." <u>Id.</u>, at p. 451.

It is respectfully requested that Defendants' "Notice to Property Owners" filed herewith be utilized by the Court and to be served upon each property owner with the accompanying documents set forth in Defendants' proposed Notice. It should further be noted that accomplishing this objective will require, as set forth on page 2, lines 14-18 of the "Notice" that the Clerk of the Superior Court, prior to Plaintiff's commencing service of

| ///

process on each property owner, set up electric public access to all pleadings filed in this 2 matter. RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 19th day of August, 2022. 3 4 LAW OFFICES OF DANIEL J. OEHLER 5 6 7 Attorney for Defendants **COPY** of the foregoing emailed this 19th day of August, 2022, to: 8 Honorable Lee F. Jantzen Mohave County Superior Court 10 Division 4 401 E. Spring Street Kingman, Arizona 86401 (928) 753-0785 Danielle dlecher@courts.az.gov 11 12 13 Attorney for Plaintiff J. Jeffrey Coughlin
J. Jeffrey Coughlin, PLLC
1570 Plaza West Drive 14 15 Prescott, Arizona 86303 (928) 445-4400 16 (928) 445-6828 fax jjcpllc@gmail.com 17 18 By: 19 Patricia L. Emond, Legal Assistant 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

28

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE

3

5

6

8

1

4 NANCY KNIGHT,

VS.

Plaintiff.

Case No. B8015CV2018 04003

NOTICE TO PROPERTY OWNERS

GLEN LUDWIG and PEARL LUDWIG, Trustees of THE LUDWIG FAMILY TRUST; FAIRWAY CONSTRUCTORS, INC.; MEHDI AZARMI; JAMES B. ROBERTS and DONNA M. ROBERTS, husband and wife; JOHN DOES 1-10; JANE DOES 1-10; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-10; and XYZ PARTNERSHIPS 1-10.

Defendants.

fe;)

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22.

23

24

25

26

27

28

10

THIS LAWSUIT MAY AFFECT YOUR DESERT LAKES PROPERTY RIGHTS

You have been served as a party in this lawsuit based upon your interest in real property subject to the Declarations of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates Tract 4076-B and Tract 4076-D (referred to herein collectively as "Declarations") so that you can decide what action you wish to take regarding this pending lawsuit.

Tract 4163 was developed in 2002 on two parcels that were part of Tract 4076-B when it was recorded as a subdivision in 1989. Tract 4076-D was developed in 1997 from a third parcel that was in Tract 4076-B. A copy of the Declarations are included in this Notice along with Plaintiff's Complaint that is being served upon you, and Defendants' Answer.

Plaintiff's claims against Defendants James B. Roberts and Donna M. Roberts and all lots in Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates Tract 4076-<u>A</u> are no longer at issue in this litigation and have been dismissed.

This lawsuit involves claims by the Plaintiff that the Defendants, The Ludwig Family

Trust, Fairway Constructors, Inc., and Mehdi Azarmi, are violating certain terms of the Declarations for Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates Tracts 4076-B, 4076-D and 4163.

The Defendants have denied the Plaintiffs claims and further claim that the Plaintiff is not able to enforce the 1989 Declarations claiming that the Declarations have been ignored through the violations of: (a) minimum property line setbacks, (b) wall height, (c) gate access to the golf course, (d) universal exterior color palette, (e) home and garage square footage requirements, (f) fence violations, and others. The Defendants have alleged that the Declarations have been so thoroughly disregarded as to result in such a change in the area as to destroy the effectiveness of the restrictions, defeat the purposes for which they were imposed and consequently they have been abandoned.

The Defendants allege that if the Declarations are enforceable against Defendants, The Ludwig Family Trust, Fairway Constructors, Inc., and Mehdi Azarmi, the Declarations are enforceable against all homes on all lots that are subject to the Declarations.

If you wish to obtain additional information regarding this case, you may access the Mohave County Superior Court website to review the file in this case at https://www.mohavecourts.com. The Clerk 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.

In the event you choose to file a responsive pleading in this case, you must do so within the time set forth in the Summons. The Court will determine from your response whether you should be joined with the Plaintiff or the Defendants.

In the event you choose to do nothing after being served with this lawsuit, you will be bound by the decisions of this Court regarding the validity of the Declarations for Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates Tracts 4076-B, 4076-D and 4163.

Since you have been served with this lawsuit, you must comply with the Orders of this Court as follows:

IT IS ORDERED if you no longer own an interest, or in the event you sell or transfer your interest during the pendency of this lawsuit, in the real property that is subject to the

Declarations for Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates Tracts 4076-B, 4076-D or 4163, you shall provide written Notice to the Court and the other parties to this lawsuit that you no longer own or are selling or transferring your interest in the property. The Notice shall include your Assessor's Parcel Number together with the name, address and phone number of the new owner, as well as a copy of any documentation reflecting the change in ownership. Your Notice and any supporting documentation shall be mailed to the Court and the attorneys for Plaintiff and Defendants within twenty (20) days of receipt of the Summons and addressed as follows:

To the Court:

Mohave County Superior Court
Division 4 - Attn: Danielle

Mohave County Superior Court Division 4 - Attn: Danielle Post Office Box 7000 Kingman, Arizona 86402-7000 (928) 753-0785 dlecher@courts.az.gov

To Plaintiff's Attorney

J. Jeffrey Coughlin, Esq. J. Jeffrey Coughlin, PLLC 1570 Plaza West Drive Prescott, Arizona 86303 (928) 445-4400 (928) 445-6828 fax jjcpllc@gmail.com

To Defendants' Attorney

Daniel J. Oehler, Esq. Law Offices of Daniel J. Oehler 2001 Highway 95, Suite 15 Bullhead City, Arizona 86442 (928) 758-3988 (928) 763-3227 fax djolaw@frontiernet.net

IT IS ORDERED in the event you sell or transfer your interest in the property while this case is pending, you shall provide the purchaser or transferee with a copy of this Notice, the Plaintiff's Complaint and Declarations, and Defendants' Answer no later than the close of escrow or the date of transfer.

| 1 | IT IS ORDERED by(date) or at the time of your filing an |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | initial pleading or motion with the Court, whichever is sooner, all parties and attorneys |
| 3 | appearing in this case SHALL designate and maintain an email address with the Clerk of the |
| 4 | Court and the other parties. The email address will be used to electronically distribute any |
| 5 | document, including minute entries and other orders, rulings, and notices described in Rule |
| 6 | 125, Rules of the Supreme Court, by email or electronic link in lieu of distribution of paper |
| 7 | versions by regular mail. The email address shall be designated on each document filed. In |
| 8 | the event that a party's email address changes, that change shall immediately be brought to |
| 9 | the attention of the Clerk of the Superior Court and included on subsequent filings and |
| 10 | pleadings. |
| 11 | IT IS ORDERED any party who declines to provide the Clerk of the Court and the |
| 12 | other parties with an email address SHALL be assessed the actual cost of mailing. |
| 13 | DATED this day of, 2022. |
| 14 | |
| 15 | HONORABLE LEE F. JANTZEN |
| 16 | TIOINOIMADDE PER E, MAINTARA |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |

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

Response to Motion for Reconsideration of Final Orders for Service on Indispensable Parties

EXHIBIT C

22

23

24

25

'J. Jeffrey Coughlin (013801) **J. JEFFREY COUGHLIN PLLC**1570 Plaza West Drive
Prescott, Arizona 86303

Telephone: (928) 445-4400 Facsimile: (928) 445-6828

jjcpllc@gmail.com

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE

NANCY KNIGHT,

Plaintiff,

Case No. B8015CV2018 04003

VS.

GLEN LUDWIG and PEARL LUDWIG, Trustees of THE LUDWIG FAMILY TRUST; FAIRWAY CONSTRUCTORS, INC.;

MEHDI AZARMI; JAMES B. ROBERTS and DONNA M. ROBERTS, husband and wife; JOHN DOES 1-10; JANE DOES 1-10; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-10; AND XYZ PARTNERSHIPS 1-10.

Defendants.

PROPOSED ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that in the event the Plaintiff does not take substantial steps to join all necessary and indispensable parties within the next one hundred fifty (150) days, this matter will be dismissed.

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 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:

- 1. 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.

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.

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

Response to Motion for Reconsideration of Final Orders for Service on Indispensable Parties

EXHIBIT D

23

24

25

J. Jeffrey Coughlin (013801)
J. JEFFREY COUGHLIN PLLC

1570 Plaza West Drive Prescott, Arizona 86303 Telephone: (928) 445-440

Telephone: (928) 445-4400 Facsimile: (928) 445-6828

jjcpllc@gmail.com

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE

NANCY KNIGHT,

Plaintiff,

Case No. B8015CV2018 04003

VS.

GLEN LUDWIG and PEARL LUDWIG, Trustees of THE LUDWIG FAMILY TRUST; FAIRWAY CONSTRUCTORS, INC.; MEHDI AZARMI: JAMES B. DORERTS

MEHDI AZARMI; JAMES B. ROBERTS and DONNA M. ROBERTS, husband and wife; JOHN DOES 1-10; JANE DOES 1-10; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-10; AND XYZ PARTNERSHIPS 1-10.

Defendants.

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 eonjunction-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:

- 1. The Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for Desert Lakes Golf Course & Estates Tract 4076-B and Tract 4076-D that overlays the full set of the Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for Tract 4076-B.
- 2. Tract 4163 has no separate Declaration of Covenants,
 Conditions and Restrictions other than the imposed restrictions in for Tract
 4076-B that included the lands constituting Tract 4163.
- 3. 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 Court has prepared and attaches to this Ruling a draft of a-the

Notice to be included in the "Service Packet" and served upon all landowners.

together with a Summons and Plaintiff's Complaint

IT IS ORDERED counsel shall be given an opportunity for input into the form of Notice as follows. for a period of twenty (20) days after the Court's proposed form is electronically delivered to Plaintiff's and Defendants' counsel.

DONE IN OPEN COURT this _____ day of _______, 2022.

Judge of the Superior Court

Response to Motion for Reconsideration of Final Orders for Service on Indispensable Parties

EXHIBIT E

FILED
Christina Spuriock
CLERK, SUPERIOR COURT
11/11/2022 5:29PM
BY: FSHADE
DEBUTY

DEPUTY 1 LAW OFFICES DANIEL J. OEHLER 2001 Highway 95, Suite 15 Bullhead City, Arizona 86442 3 (928) 758-3988 (928) 763-3227 (fax) 4 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 COUNTY OF MOHAVE 9 10 NANCY KNIGHT, NO.: CV-2018-04003 11 Plaintiff, NOTICE OF PROPOSED FINAL FORM ORDER 12 ٧s، 13 GLEN LUDWIG and PEARL LUDWIG, Trustees of THE LUDWIG FAMILY TRUST; FAIRWAY 14 CONSTRUCTORS, INC.; MEHDI AZARMI; JAMES B. ROBERTS and DONNA M. 15 ROBERTS, husband and wife; JOHN DOES 1-10; JANE DOES 1-10; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-10: and XYZ PARTNÉRSHIPS 1-10. 16 17 Defendants. 18 COME NOW, the Defendants, by and through their attorney, the undersigned, and 19 20 submit to this Court a clean copy of the Proposed Order previously filed herein on September 28, 2022. The attached final form Proposed Order is identical to the Defendants' September 21 22 28, 2022, Proposed Order excepting only that the few strikeouts that were included in the 23 September 28, 2022 document have now been removed and the color distinction such that 24 the Court in September could recognize Defendants' proposed additional language that was added to the Plaintiff's former attorney's language, could be instantly recognized as a result 25

-1-

26

27

28

///

///

of its inclusion in blue ink.

| 1 | The attached form of Proposed Order is in final form submitted herewith, |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 9th day of November, 2022. |
| 3 | LAW OFFICES OF DANIEL J. OEHLER |
| 4 | |
| 5 | Daniel L Oobles |
| 6 | Daniel J. Oehler, Attorney for Defendants |
| 7 | |
| 8 | COPY of the foregoing emailed this 11th day of November, 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 | Plaintiff |
| 14 | Nancy Knight |
| 15 | 1803 E. Lipan Circle Fort Mohave, Arizona 86426 (928) 768-1537 |
| 16 | nancyknight@frontier.com |
| 17 | By: Authorica Mond |
| 18 | Patricia L. Emond, Legal Assistant |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |

LAW OFFICES
DANIEL J. OEHLER
2001 Highway 95, Suite 15
Bullhead City, Arizona 86442
(928) 758-3988
(928) 763-3227 (fax)
djolaw@frontiernet.net

Daniel J. Oehler, Arizona State Bar No.: 002739 Attorney for Defendants

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE

| NANCY KNIGHT, |) NO.: CV-2018-04003 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Plaintiff, |) PROPOSED ORDER |
| VS. |) |
| GLEN LUDWIG and PEARL LUDWIG, Trustees of THE LUDWIG FAMILY TRUST; FAIRWAY CONSTRUCTORS, INC.; MEHDI AZARMI; JAMES B. ROBERTS and DONNA M. ROBERTS, husband and wife; JOHN DOES 1-10; JANE DOES 1-10; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-10; and XYZ PARTNERSHIPS 1-10. |)))))))) |
| Defendants. |))) |

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 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 necessary and indispensable party a set of documents hereinafter referred to as the "Service Packet" that shall include: (1) their/its personal summons, (2) a copy of 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 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 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 do not sign a return receipt, the Plaintiff shall cause to be completed, in 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 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 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 "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 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:

1. The Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for Desert Lakes Golf Course & Estates Tract 4076-B and Tract 4076-D overlays the full set of the Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for Tract 4076-B.

- 2. Tract 4163 has no separate Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions other than the restrictions for Tract 4076-B that included the lands constituting Tract 4163.
- 3. 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 Court has prepared and attaches to this Ruling a draft of the Notice to be included in the "Service Packet" and served upon all landowners.

IT IS ORDERED counsel shall be given an opportunity for input into the form of Notice for a period of twenty (20) days after the Court's proposed form is electronically delivered to Plaintiff's and Defendants' counsel.

| DONE IN OPEN COURT | this | day of | f | _, 2022. |
|--------------------|------|--------|--------------------|----------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | Ju | dge of the Superio | or Court |

Response to Motion for Reconsideration of Final Orders for Service on Indispensable Parties

EXHIBIT F

Home Table of Contents

Rule 4. Summons

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated Rules of Civil Procedure for the Superior Courts of Arizona

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated

Rules of Civil Procedure for the Superior Courts of Arizona (Refs & Annos)

II. Commencing an Action; Service of Process, Pleadings, Motions and Orders; Duties of Counsel

16 A.R.S. Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 4

Rule 4. Summons

Currentness

(a) Issuance; Service.

- (1) Pleading Defined. As used in this rule, Rule 4.1, and Rule 4.2, "pleading" means any of the pleadings authorized by Rule 7 that bring a party into an action--a complaint, third-party complaint, counterclaim, or crossclaim.
- (2) Issuance. On or after filing a pleading, the filing party may present a summons to the clerk for signature and seal. If the summons is properly completed, the clerk must sign, seal, and issue it to the filing party for service. A summons--or a copy of the summons if addressed to multiple parties--must be issued for each party to be served.
- (3) Service. A summons must be served with a copy of the pleading. Service must be completed as required by this rule, Rule 4.1, or 4.2, as applicable.

(b) Contents; Replacement Summons.

- (1) Contents. A summons must:
 - (A) name the court and the parties;
 - (B) be directed to the party to be served;
 - (C) state the name and address of the attorney of the party serving the summons or—if unrepresented—the party's name and address;
 - (D) state the time within which the defendant must appear and defend;
 - (E) notify the party to be served that a failure to appear and defend will result in a default judgment against that party for the relief demanded in the pleading;
 - (F) state that "requests for reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities must be made to the court by parties at least 3 working days in advance of a scheduled court proceeding";
 - (G) be signed by the clerk; and
 - (H) bear the court's seal.
- (2) Replacement Summons. If a summons is returned without being served, or if it has been lost, a party may ask the clerk to issue a replacement summons in the same form as the original. A replacement summons must be issued and served within the time prescribed by Rule 4(i) for service of the original summons.
- (c) Fictitiously Named Parties; Return. If a pleading identifies a party by a fictitious name under Rule 10(d), the summons may issue and be directed to a person with the fictitious name. The return of service of process on a person identified by a fictitious name must state the true name of the person who was served.

(d) Who May Serve Process.

(1) Generally. Service of process must be made by a sheriff, a sheriff's deputy, a constable, a constable's deputy, a private process server certified under the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration § 7-204 and Rule 4(e), or any other person specially appointed by the court. Service of process may also be made by a party or that party's attorney if expressly authorized by these rules.

- (2) Special Appointment.
 - (A) Qualifications. A specially appointed person must be at least 21 years of age and must not be a party, an attorney, or an employee of an attorney in the action in which process is to be served.
 - (B) Procedure for Appointment. A party may request a special appointment to serve process by filing a motion with the presiding superior court judge in the county where the action is pending. The motion must be accompanied by a proposed order. If the proposed order is signed, no minute entry will issue. Special appointments should be granted freely, are valid only for the cause specified in the motion, and do not constitute an appointment as a certified private process server.
- (e) Statewide Certification of Private Process Servers. A person seeking certification as a private process server must file with the clerk an application under Arizona Code of Judicial Administration § 7-204. Upon approval of the court or presiding judge of the county in which the application is filed, the clerk will register the person as a certified private process server, which will remain in effect unless and until the certification is withdrawn by the court. The clerk must maintain a register for this purpose. A certified private process server will be entitled to serve in that capacity for any state court within Arizona.
- (f) Accepting or Waiving Service; Voluntary Appearance. There are two ways to accomplish service with the assent of the served party—waiver and acceptance. A party also may voluntarily appear without being served.
- (1) Waiving Service. A party subject to service under Rule 4.1 or 4.2 may waive issuance or service. The waiver of service must be in writing, signed by that party or that party's authorized agent or attorney, and be filed in the action. A party who waives service receives additional time to serve a responsive pleading, as provided in Rule 12(a)(1)(A)(ii).
- (2) Accepting Service. A party subject to service under Rule 4.1 or 4.2 may accept service. The acceptance of service must be in writing, signed by that party or that party's authorized agent or attorney, and be filed in the action. A party who accepts service does not receive the additional time to serve a responsive pleading under Rule 12(a)(1)(A)(ii).
- (3) Voluntary Appearance.
 - (A) In Open Court. A party on whom service is required may, in person or by an attorney or authorized agent, enter an appearance in open court. The appearance must be noted by the clerk on the docket and entered in the minutes.
 - (B) By Responsive Pleading. The filing of a pleading responsive to a pleading allowed under Rule 7 constitutes an appearance by the party.
- (4) Effect. Waiver, acceptance, and appearance under (f)(1), (f)(2), and (f)(3) have the same force and effect as if a summons had been issued and served.
- (g) Return; Proof of Service.
- (1) *Timing*. If service is not accepted or waived, and no voluntary appearance is made, then the person effecting service must file proof of service with the court. Return of service should be made by no later than when the served party must respond to process.
- (2) Service by the Sheriff. If a summons is served by a sheriff or deputy sheriff, the return must be officially marked on or attached to the proof of service and promptly filed with the court.
- (3) Service by Others. If served by a person other than a sheriff or deputy sheriff, the return must be promptly filed with the court and be accompanied by an affidavit establishing proof of service. If the server is a registered private process server, the affidavit must clearly identify the county in which the server is registered.
- (4) Service by Publication. If the summons is served by publication, the return of the person making such service must be made as provided in Rules 4.1(I) and 4.2(f).
- (5) Service Outside the United States. Service outside the United States must be proved as follows:
 - (A) if effected under Rule 4.2(i)(1), as provided in the applicable treaty or convention; or
 - (B) if effected under Rule 4.2(i)(2), by a receipt signed by the addressee, or other evidence satisfying the court that the summons and complaint were delivered to the addressee.
- (6) Validity of Service. Failure to make proof of service does not affect the validity of service.
- (h) Amending Process or Proof of Service. The court may permit process or proof of service to be amended.
- (i) Time Limit for Service. If a defendant is not served with process within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court--on motion, or on its own after notice to the plaintiff--must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time. But if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate period. This Rule 4(i) does not apply to service in a foreign country under Rules 4.2(i), (j), (k), and (l).

Credits

State Court Rules are current with amendments received and effective through July 1, 2023. The Code of Judicial Administration is current with amendments received through July 1, 2023.

END OF DOCUMENT

Response to Motion for Reconsideration of Final Orders for Service on Indispensable Parties

EXHIBIT G

Home Table of Contents

Form 2. Waiver of Service of Summons

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Rules of Civil Procedure for the Superior Courts of Arizona

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Rules of Civil Procedure for the Superior Courts of Arizona (Refs & Annos)
X. General Provisions

16 A.R.S. Rules of Civil Procedure, Form 2

Form 2. Waiver of Service of Summons

Currentness

TO: [Name of Plaintiff's Attorney or Unrepresented Plaintiff]

I acknowledge receipt of your request that I waive service of a summons in the action of [Caption of Action], which is case number [Docket Number] in the Superior Court of the State of Arizona in and for the County of [County]. I also have received a copy of the complaint in the action, two copies of this instrument, and a means by which I can return the signed waiver to you without cost to me.

I agree to save the cost of service of a summons and an additional copy of the complaint in this lawsuit by not requiring that I (or the entity on whose behalf I am acting) be served with judicial process in the manner provided by the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure.

I (or the entity on whose behalf I am acting) will retain all defenses or objections to the lawsuit or to the jurisdiction or venue of the court except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the service of the summons.

I understand that a judgment may be entered against me (or the party on whose behalf I am acting) if an answer or motion under Rule 12 is not served upon you within sixty (60) days after [<u>Date Request Was Sent</u>], or within ninety (90) days after that date if the request was sent outside the United States.

| Dated this day of,, | |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------|
| [Signed] | |
| | [Printed or Typed Name of Defendant] |
| | as [Title] |
| | of [Name of corporate Defendant, if any] |

Form 2. Waiver of Service of Summons (Cont.)

To be printed on reverse side of the waiver form or set forth at the foot of the form:

DUTY TO AVOID UNNECESSARY COSTS OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS

Rule 4.1 and Rule 4.2 of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure require certain parties to cooperate in saving unnecessary costs of service of the summons and a pleading. A defendant located in the United States who, after being notified of an action and asked by a plaintiff located in the United States to waive service of a summons, fails to do so will be required to bear the cost of such service unless good cause be shown for its failure to sign and return the waiver.

It is not good cause for a failure to waive service that a party believes that the complaint is unfounded, or that the action has been brought in an improper place or in a court that lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action or over its person or property. A party who waives service of the summons retains all defenses and objections (except any relating to the summons or to the service of the summons), and may later object to the jurisdiction of the court or to the place where the action has been brought.

A defendant who waives service must, within the time specified on the waiver form, serve on the plaintiff's attorney (or unrepresented plaintiff) a response to the complaint and also must file a signed copy of the response with the court. If the answer or motion is not served within this time, a default judgment may be taken against that defendant. By waiving service, a defendant is allowed more time to answer than if the summons had been actually served when the request for waiver of service was received.

Credits

Added Sept. 2, 2016, effective Jan. 1, 2017.

16 A. R. S. Rules Civ. Proc., Form 2, AZ ST RCP Form 2 State Court Rules are current with amendments received and effective through July 1, 2023. The Code of Judicial Administration is current with amendments received through July 1, 2023.

END OF DOCUMENT

Response to Motion for Reconsideration of Final Orders for Service on Indispensable Parties

EXHIBIT H

| Person Filing: | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Address (if not protected): | | | | |
| City, State, Zip Code: | | | | |
| Telephone: | | | | |
| Email Address: | | | | |
| Lawyer's bar Number. | **** | | | |
| Licensed Fiduciary Number: | | | | |
| Representing □ Self, without a Lawyer or □ Attorney for □ Plaintiff OR □ Defendant | | | | |
| | | | | |
| CUREDIAN COURT | NE ADIZONA | | | |
| SUPERIOR COURT (| OF ARIZONA | | | |
| IN AND EOD THE COUNT | TV OF MOUAVE | | | |
| IN AND FOR THE COON | I I OF WORKE | | | |
| | Case No. | | | |
| (Name of Plaintiff) | | | | |
| , | ACCEPTANCE OF SERVICE | | | |
| | ACOLI IANOL OI OLIVIOL | | | |
| | | | | |
| (Name of Defendant) | | | | |
| Licensed Fiduciary Number: | ☐ Plaintiff OR ☐ Defendant OF ARIZONA | | | |

Read Carefully. By signing your name on the next page in the presence of a Notary Public or a Clerk of the Superior Court, you are stating under oath or affirmation that you have read this document and understand its contents and that you received and voluntarily accepted legal service of the listed court papers. (Rule 4(f)(2), Rules of Civil Procedure for the Superior Courts of Arizona or other applicable Arizona Court Rule.)

Accepting these court papers does not affect your right to disagree with them.

- 1. ACCEPT SERVICE. I voluntarily accept service of the listed court papers. I understand that by accepting service, it is the same as if I were personally served under Arizona law.
- 2. RESPONSE DEADLINE. I understand that accepting service of these court papers does not affect my right to file a written Response, Answer, etc., to this court case if I disagree. I understand that if I wan t t o dis agree with any relief asked for in the court papers, I must file a written Response, Answer, etc., within the same time limit as if I were personally served under Arizona law.
- 3. **DEFAULT JUDGMENT, ORDER OR DECREE**. I understand that if I do not appear and defend in this court case in court within the time allowed by law, then I may lose my right to be heard in this case. I understand that my failure to file a written Response, Answer, etc., may result in the Court giving the other party any and all things requested in the other party's court papers, such as through a Default Judgment, Order or Decree.

On the following page, list each individual document received.

| Cas | se Number: |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4. | LIST OF DOCUMENTS. I received and voluntarily accepted service of the cour papers listed below: (List name/title of document. Example: "Complaint", "Petition" "Summons".) |
| | |
| 5. | MILITARY SERVICE. I am not covere by the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (SCRA) or if I am covered by SCRA, I waive the protection of SCRA. |
| 6. | HIGH PROFILE CASE WEBSITE . The website to view high profile cases in Mohave County is: www.mohavecourts.com/court-departments/clerk-superior-court/high-profile-cases . |
| | UNDER OATH OR BY AFFIRMATION |
| | ear or affirm under penalty of perjury that the contents of this document are true and ect to the best of my knowledge and belief. |
| Sign | nature Date |
| Print | ted Name |
| STA | TE OF |
| COL | JNTY OF |
| Subs | scribed and sworn to or affirmed before me this: by(date) |
| (nota | ary seal) Deputy Clerk or Notary Public |
| | 1,, |