

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2008-013449

10/20/2009

HONORABLE BETHANY G. HICKS

CLERK OF THE COURT  
M. Sahli  
Deputy

JEAN PISERCHIA, et al.

RICHARD A KASPER

v.

TERRAVITA COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION  
INC, et al.

ROBERT GRASSO JR.

DENISE O'ROURKE

MINUTE ENTRY

9:20 a.m. In chambers. This is the time set for Telephonic Status Conference. All parties appear telephonically. Plaintiff is represented by counsel, Richard Kasper. Defendant Terravita Community Association is represented by counsel, Robert Grasso. Defendant Terravita Golf Club is represented by counsel, Denise O'Rourke.

Court reporter, Michael Babicky is present.

Court and counsel discuss the status of the case.

**IT IS ORDERED** setting a telephonic Status Conference for **November 24, 2009 at 9:45 a.m.** with **Plaintiff to initiate** call to this Division, telephone number 602-506-2139.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that **3 days prior** to the Status Conference, the parties shall submit a written **Joint Notice of Statement of the Case** indicating the following:

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2008-013449

10/20/2009

- The status of the case;
- Compliance with the Court's deadlines,
- Issue(s) that they have resolved; and
- Any problems or motions to address.

**NOTE: Counsel are directed to provide the Court with a hard copy of the Notice as well as any document efiled that exceeds a 10-page limit.**

**Suggestions to conference call attendees calling from outside the court system:**

- Do not use a speaker phone.
- Do not use a cell phone. If possible, use a desk phone.
- Avoid noisy areas.
- Mute phone when not speaking.
- State your name every time you address the Court.

Counsel are advised that the Court is available to discuss, by joint telephone call, discovery disputes or any other matter that may impact the parties' ability to resolve this case in a just, speedy, and inexpensive manner. See Rule 1, Ariz.R.Civ.P.

With respect to discovery disputes, counsel are also advised that, as the Court interprets Civil Rule 37(a)(2)(c), an exchange of correspondence between counsel is not sufficient to satisfy the "personal consultation" requirement of the Rule, except in extraordinary circumstances. At a minimum, counsel must speak to each other by telephone to attempt to resolve the dispute in good faith before involving the Court.

9:22 am. Matter concludes.

**NOTE: The parties are advised that failure to appear at a hearing may result in sanctions, including a Default Judgment.**

This case is eFiling eligible: <http://www.clerkofcourt.maricopa.gov/efiling/default.asp>