

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2023-010718

08/05/2024

HONORABLE JOHN L. BLANCHARD

CLERK OF THE COURT  
Y. Rodriguez  
Deputy

SANCTUARY AT THE CHUCKWAGON L L C, SCOTT GRIFFITHS  
et al.

v.

HAPPY TRAILS COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC FATIMA BADREDDINE

DOCKET CV TX  
JUDGE BLANCHARD

MINUTE ENTRY

The Court has reviewed the Motion for Withdrawal Without Client Consent by Scott Griffiths, attorney for Plaintiffs. The requirements of Rule 5.3 A.R.C.P. having been met, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** granting the motion and permitting Scott Griffiths, and the law firm of Scott Griffiths to withdraw as counsel of record for Plaintiffs for all further proceedings.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that unless and until Plaintiff, Sanctuary At The Chuckwagon LLC retains new counsel, all future correspondence shall be sent directly to:

Steven Bison's  
2201 N. 201<sup>st</sup> Ave.  
Buckeye, Arizona 85396  
623-910-7547  
[steven.bison@yahoo.com](mailto:steven.bison@yahoo.com)

Matthew Bison  
[mbison7@icloud.com](mailto:mbison7@icloud.com)  
480-599-9192

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2023-010718

08/05/2024

Because Sanctuary At The Chuckwagon LLC is a business entity, it must be represented by an attorney to appear in superior court. *See* Rule 31, Rules of the Supreme Court of Arizona.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Sanctuary At The Chuckwagon LLC shall have until **September 4, 2024**, to file a Notice of Appearance by properly admitted counsel. If no such Notice is filed by this date, the Court may dismiss the case. See e.g., *Boydston v. Strole Dev. Co.*, 193 Ariz. 47, 49, 969 P.2d 653, 655 (1998); see also *Ramada Inns, Inc. v. Lane and Bird Adver., Inc.*, 102 Ariz. 127, 128, 426 P.2d 395, 396 (1967) (“Absent statutory authority a corporation cannot practice law even in its own behalf. A corporation cannot appear in court by an officer who is not an attorney, and it cannot appear in propria persona.”); *Mohr, Hackett, Pederson, Blakley, Randolph & Haga, P.C. v. Superior Court*, 155 Ariz. 150, 150, 745 P.2d 208, 208 (Ct. App. 1987) (the general rule is that a “corporation, unlike a natural person, cannot represent itself in court”); *Hunt Invest. Co. v. Eliot*, 154 Ariz. 357, 362, 742 P.2d 858, 863 (Ct. App. 1987) (“And, of course, it has long been held that a corporation must be represented by a licensed attorney – it cannot be represented by a lay employee or appear in propria persona.”).