

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2007-053132

04/17/2008

HON. PAUL A KATZ

CLERK OF THE COURT
W. Bobrowski
Deputy

DOMINICK ABATEMARCO

BRIAN M BERGIN

v.

CANTERRA AT SQUAW PEAK
CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION INC, et al.

MARK A HOLMGREN

TELEPHONIC PRETRIAL SCHEDULING CONFERENCE SET

The Court has received Defendants' Request for Scheduling Conference.

IT IS ORDERED setting a Telephonic Pretrial Scheduling Conference for **May 7, 2008 at 8:45 a.m.**, in this division (602) 506-5806. Counsel for the Plaintiff shall initiate the telephone call. Counsel are advised that all parties shall use a landline and that no party will be allowed to appear by cell phone.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that by **May 2, 2008**, the parties shall submit to the Court a Joint Pretrial Memorandum setting forth the following:

1. The parties proposed schedule for additional discovery including depositions and all other discovery pursuant to the rules of procedure or as agreed upon by the parties. **NOTE:** The date for disclosure of non-expert witnesses must be at least forty-five days before the completion of discovery.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2007-053132

04/17/2008

2. The parties' proposed schedule for disclosure of expert witnesses and designation pursuant to Rule 26(b)(4). **NOTE:** The disclosure should be within ninety days of the scheduling conference except upon a showing of good cause.
3. The parties' proposed schedule for any agreed upon amendments to the pleadings and any requested amendments to the pleadings.
4. The parties' proposed date for a settlement conference.
5. The parties' proposed date for trial. **NOTE:** The parties should come to the scheduling conference with the trial calendars of the attorneys responsible for trial.

If there are any discovery disputes, they must be filed with the Court by motion at least ten days prior to the scheduling conference. A response must be filed not less than three days prior to the conference. No reply will be filed. The Court will assess any appropriate sanction if the Court finds that any party or attorney engaged in unreasonable, groundless, abusive or obstructionist discovery.