

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2025-064908

03/24/2026

HONORABLE QUINTIN CUSHNER

CLERK OF THE COURT
A. Hayes
Deputy

JASJEET KAUR

JASJEET KAUR
20100 N 51ST AVE
STE F 635
GLENDALE AZ 85308

v.

JOHN YORK, et al.

JOHN ERIC YORK

BARRY M AYLSTOCK
JONATHAN A DESSAULES
CHANDLER W TRAVIS
FABIAN ZAZUETA
JUDGE Q CUSHNER

MINUTE ENTRY

The Court has reviewed and considered: (1) *Defendants Chandler W. Travis and Melissa S. Doolan's Motion to Dismiss*, filed on January 5, 2026, Plaintiff Jasjeet Kaur's *Opposition to Defendants' Chandler W. Travis and Melissa S. Doolan's Motion to Dismiss*, filed on January 9, 2026, and Defendant *Chandler W. Travis and Melissa S. Doolan's Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss*, filed on January 14, 2026; (2) Defendant Jonathan Dessaulles' *Motion to Dismiss*, filed on January 12, 2026, Plaintiff's *Opposition to Defendant Jonathan Dessaulles' Motion to Dismiss*, filed on January 16, 2026, and Defendant *Jonathan Dessaulles' Reply in Support of Defendant's Motion to Dismiss*, filed on February 2, 2026; (3) Defendant John York's *Motion to Dismiss With Respect to Defendant John York for Failure to State a Claim on Which Relief Can be Granted*, filed on January 26, 2026 and Plaintiff *Jasjeet Kaur's Opposition to Defendant John York's Motion to Dismiss*, filed on January 29, 2026; (4) *Defendants David Degnan, Mark Horne and Sarah*

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2025-064908

03/24/2026

Langtry's Notice of Joinder in Motions to Dismiss, filed on February 12, 2026; (5) Defendants Degnan, Horne, and Langtry's *Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6)*, filed on February 27, 2026, *Plaintiff's Opposition to David Degnan, Mark Horne and Sarah Langtry ("Defendants") Motion to Dismiss*, filed on March 3, 2026, *Defendants David Degnan, Mark Horne and Sarah Langtry's Notice of Joinder in Motions to Dismiss*, which the Court construes as a reply, filed on March 16, 2026; and (6) *Defendant Barry Aylstock's Notice of Joinder in Motions to Dismiss and Replies*, filed on March 19, 2026.

I. Background

Plaintiff Jasjeet Kaur filed this action on December 8, 2025, asserting six claims against multiple attorneys: (1) intentional infliction of emotional distress; (2) aiding and abetting; (3) civil conspiracy; (4) fraud and deceit, (5) abuse of process, and (6) negligence and breach of fiduciary duties. Plaintiff alleges the claims arise from litigation in CV2023-053991, *Sohnasukh, LLC v. Escuda Office Plaza Unit Owners Association*, and that Plaintiff is the sole member of Sohnasukh, LLC.

The above-referenced motions to dismiss have been filed in this case, which the Court addresses in this Order.

II. Analysis

"Arizona follows a notice pleading standard." *Coleman v. City of Mesa*, 230 Ariz. 352, 356 (2012) (quoting *Cullen v. Auto-Owners Ins. Co.*, 218 Ariz. 417, 419 (2008)). The purpose of a complaint is to "give the opponent fair notice of the nature and basis of the claim and indicate generally the type of litigation involved." *Cullen* 218 Ariz. at 419 (quoting *Mackey v. Spangler*, 81 Ariz. 113, 115 (1956)). A complaint that states only legal conclusions, without supporting factual allegations, does not comply with Rule 8's notice pleading standard. *Id.* If a complaint does not comply with Rule 8, the defendant may move to dismiss for failure to state a claim. *Id.*; Ariz. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). Claims based upon alleged fraud must be pled with particularity. Ariz. R. Civ. P. 9(b).

When reviewing a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss, the Court will "assume the truth of the well pled factual allegations and indulge all reasonable inferences therefrom," but only to the extent that those allegations are well-pleaded and not legal conclusions. *Cullen*, 218 Ariz. at 419 ¶ 7. The Court will grant the motion only if the plaintiff is not entitled to relief "under any facts susceptible of proof in the statement of the claim." *ELM Ret. Ctr., LP v. Callaway*, 226 Ariz. 287, 289 ¶ 5 (App. 2010) (quoting *Mohave Disposal, Inc. v. City of Kingman*, 186 Ariz. 343, 346 (1996)). The Court will not "speculate about hypothetical facts that might entitle the plaintiff to relief," nor will it supply missing elements of a claim. *Cullen*, 218 Ariz. at 420 ¶ 14. Nor will the Court "accept as true allegations consisting of conclusions of law, inferences or deductions that are not necessarily implied by well-pleaded facts, unreasonable inferences or unsupported

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2025-064908

03/24/2026

conclusions from such facts, or legal conclusions alleged as facts.” *Jeter v. Mayo Clinic Ariz.*, 211 Ariz. 386, 389 ¶ 4 (App. 2005).

Here, the Court finds that Plaintiff’s *Complaint* alleges misconduct by multiple attorneys. The *Complaint* alleges “collusion,” “conspiracy,” “fabrications,” and “undisclosed arrangements” in a manner that does not consistently place each Defendant on notice of what conduct is being alleged as to that Defendant. *See Cullen*, 218 Ariz. at 419. Further, the Court finds that certain allegations allege fraud, which requires pleading with particularity. Ariz. R. Civ. P. 9(b).

The Court also notes that the *Complaint* makes repeated reference to CV2023-053991, which was brought by Sohnauskh, LLC, not Plaintiff. The Court does not find that Plaintiff’s *Complaint* clearly alleges what Plaintiff alleges were personal to Plaintiff, rather than derivative of Sohnauskh, LLC’s interests.

Therefore, the Court will dismiss Plaintiff’s *Complaint* without prejudice pursuant to Arizona Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). In so finding, the Court does not reach Defendant York’s request for dismissal pertaining to Ariz. R. Civ. P. 13(a), and grants Defendant York’s motion only on Rule 12(b)(6) grounds. The Court notes that Plaintiff has sought leave to amend in Plaintiff’s response to at least some of the motions to dismiss. Therefore, the Court will provide Plaintiff with 30 days to amend Plaintiff’s complaint.

III. Ruling

IT IS ORDERED granting without prejudice *Defendants Chandler W. Travis and Melissa S. Doolan’s Motion to Dismiss*.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED granting without prejudice Defendant Jonathan Dessaulles’ *Motion to Dismiss*.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED granting without prejudice Defendant John York’s *Motion to Dismiss With Respect to Defendant John York for Failure to State a Claim on Which Relief Can be Granted* to the extent set forth in this Order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED granting without prejudice Defendants Degnan, Horne, and Langtry’s *Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6)*.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED granting all pending joinders to the extent consistent with this Order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED dismissing Plaintiff’s *Complaint* without prejudice.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff shall have 30 days from the date of this order to file an amended complaint.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2025-064908

03/24/2026

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all requests for attorney fees, costs, and sanctions, including under A.R.S. § 12-349, are denied without prejudice.