

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2025-016780

08/22/2025

HONORABLE SUSANNA C. PINEDA

CLERK OF THE COURT
T. Williams
Deputy

STETSON VALLEY OWNERS ASSOCIATION CHARLENE A CRUZ

v.

ACINAD INVESTMENTS L L C, et al.

ACINAD INVESTMENTS L L C
5014 W LARIAT LN
PHOENIX AZ 85083

RESIDENTIAL REAL ESTATE
HOLDINGS L L C
251 LITTLE FALLS DR
WILMINGTON DE 19808
PAMELA G TOMPSETT
5014 W LARIAT LN
PHOENIX AZ 85083
JUDGE PINEDA

MINUTE ENTRY

Plaintiff has filed a Motion to Reconsider Court's Order Dated July 30, 2025. Plaintiff brought suit against Acinad Investments, LLC, and others. Service appears to have been made on the respective LLC's of the original complaint. On June 18, 2025, Plaintiff filed its amended complaint. There is no indication Plaintiff has served the Amended Complaint upon any defendant. On that same day, Pamela Tompsett filed an "answer" on her own behalf, indicating that she is the owner of the property in question and files the answer to protect her interest in the property at issue. Plaintiff sought to strike her answer, arguing that she is incapable of answering on behalf of the defendant LLC. As the Court noted, her answer clearly stated that she was

Plaintiff has not served its motion for reconsideration upon Ms. Tompsett.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2025-016780

08/22/2025

answering on her own behalf as the property owner. She did not answer on behalf of any LLC defendant. In fact, no answer has been filed on behalf of any LLC.

Arizona Rule of Civil Procedure 24(a) provides that a court must permit intervention of right when a party (1) has an unconditional right to intervene under a statute, or (2) claims an interest relating to the subject of the action and is so situated that the disposition of the action may impair or impede their ability to protect that interest, unless the existing parties adequately represent it. While Plaintiff acknowledges that a party may intervene under Rule 24, it argues that Ms. Tompsett did not follow the proper procedure set forth in Rule 24 to do so. Plaintiff's objection is one of form over function. They were clearly aware that Ms. Tompsett has indicated an interest in the property at issue. As a person with an interest in the property, the Court must permit intervention.

IT IS ORDERED denying Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration.