

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2014-091592

07/31/2014

HON. MARK F. ACETO

CLERK OF THE COURT
M. Scott
Deputy

ANTHONY CAMBONI, et al.

ANTHONY CAMBONI
1437 W. SADDLE BUTTE
APACHE JUNCTION AZ 85210

v.

GOLDEN HILLS H O A, et al.

JONAH E RAPPAZZO

ANGIE BAROLDY
NO ADDRESS ON RECORD
JOHN BAROLDY
NO ADDRESS ON RECORD
YOUVE GOT BETTER THINGS TO DO
INC
1437 W SADDLE BUTTE
APACHE JUNCTION AZ 85120
SHANNON CHABOUDY
12910 W RINCON DR
SUN CITY WEST AZ 85375
LOU DISSETTE
NO ADDRESS ON RECORD

MINUTE ENTRY

The Court makes note of the following:

- Plaintiffs filed their Complaint on January 14, 2014.
- On June 4, 2014, pursuant to Plaintiffs' request, the Court extended the deadline for service to September 11, 2014.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2014-091592

07/31/2014

- One of the Plaintiffs is “You’ve Got Better Things to Do, Inc.” Because it is a corporation, this Plaintiff may properly file pleadings and participate in court proceedings only through an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of Arizona.
- To date, no attorney has appeared on behalf Plaintiffs.
- Parties who are not represented by an attorney are charged with responsibility for knowing the law.
- On July 1, 2014, Defendants Heywood Realty, Marcus Klingler, Jana Brandt, and Adam Brandt (“Defendants”) filed a “Motion to Dismiss”. Among other things, through this motion, Defendants gave Plaintiffs specific notice that the corporate Plaintiff could appear in court only if represented by an attorney.

Under the circumstances,

IT IS ORDERED denying *without prejudice* the “Motion to Dismiss” filed by Defendants on July 1, 2014.

On July 11, 2014, Plaintiffs filed a “Motion for Enlargement Concerning...Motion to Dismiss”. As the “Motion to Dismiss” has been denied, Plaintiffs’ “Motion for Enlargement” is denied as moot.

On July 11, 2014, Plaintiffs filed a “Motion for Opportunity to retain professional counsel”. Through this motion, Plaintiffs request (1) an opportunity to retain a licensed attorney and (2) an opportunity to file an amended Complaint. Under the circumstances,

IT IS ORDERED denying Plaintiffs’ “Motion for Opportunity”. That said, Plaintiffs have had and continue to have the right to retain an attorney. Further, to the extent authorized by the Rules, Plaintiffs also have had the right to file an amended Complaint or a motion for leave to amend.

On July 11, 2014, Plaintiffs filed a “Motion to Amend Service of Process”. Pursuant to this motion,

IT IS ORDERED extending the deadline for service to September 30, 2014.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2014-091592

07/31/2014

By September 30, 2014, this case will be over 8 months old and Plaintiffs will have had a full and fair opportunity to (1) retain an attorney and (2) accomplish service on Defendants. Under the circumstances, the Court makes note of the following:

- It is quite unlikely that the deadline for service in this case will be further extended.
- Time is clearly of the essence regarding efforts by Plaintiffs to retain counsel. The Court does not expect that it will further delay the progression of this case to allow Plaintiffs more time to retain counsel.
- Unless service is accomplished and proof of service is filed by **September 30, 2014**, all claims against unserved Defendants will be dismissed without further notice.

On Court's own motion,

IT IS ORDERED extending the deadline for the filing of a responsive pleading to Plaintiffs' Complaint by the above listed Defendants to **October 20, 2014**.