

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2017-003266

12/12/2018

HONORABLE HUGH HEGYI

CLERK OF THE COURT

G. Verbil

Deputy

LAKWOOD COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION,
THE

QUINTEN T CUPPS

v.

1630 S 36TH L L C, et al.

JOHN L CONDREY
STEPHEN S EDWARDS
16030 S 36TH ST
PHOENIX AZ 85048
MICHAEL GARDNER
16202 S 36TH ST
PHOENIX AZ 85048
MAUREEN MULVANEY
16026 S 36TH ST
PHOENIX AZ 85048
MICHAEL R PERRY
JUDGE BARTON
JUDGE HEGYI

MINUTE ENTRY

This matter came on for evidentiary hearing before the Court September 28, 2018 with regard to the Lakewood Community Association's 3/13/18 Motion to Declare Stephen Edwards a Vexatious Litigant that was joined by Third Party Defendant Quentin Cupps on April 4, 2018 (hereafter, collectively referred to as the "Motion"). The hearing was noticed through this Court's July 11, 2018 Minute Entry that reflects service on Mr. Edwards. All parties were notified by minute order of the relevant deadlines for lists of witnesses and exhibits for the evidentiary hearing, exchanging

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2017-003266

12/12/2018

exhibits, and marking exhibits. Mr. Edwards failed to file a list of witnesses and exhibits, exchange exhibits with the other parties, or mark any exhibits for the hearing. Mr. Edwards filed a September 24, 2018 pleading captioned "Special Action Motion" that was denied by Presiding Civil Judge Pamela Gates September 27, 2018 and that, among other things, asked to vacate the September 28 evidentiary hearing. Mr. Edwards did not appear at the hearing. The Court finds that Mr. Edwards was aware of the hearing, since he asked the Court to vacate it, and that he voluntarily waived his right to participate in it by failing to appear.

Following hearing, the Court allowed the parties to submit proposed written findings of fact and conclusions of law until October 12, 2018. The Lakewood Community Association and Mr. Cupps submitted timely proposed findings. Mr. Edwards has not submitted proposed findings.

The Court took the matters presented under advisement October 12, 2018. Having further considered those matters, the Court enters its recommendations to Presiding Judge Janet Barton through this minute entry.

A.R.S. § 12-3201 provides, in part:

A. In a noncriminal case, at the request of a party or on the court's own motion, the presiding judge of the superior court or a judge designated by the presiding judge of the superior court may designate a pro se litigant a vexatious litigant.

B. A pro se litigant who is designated a vexatious litigant may not file a new pleading, motion or other document without prior leave of the court.

C. A pro se litigant is a vexatious litigant if the court finds the pro se litigant engaged in vexatious conduct.

...

E. For the purposes of this section:

1. "Vexatious conduct" includes any of the following:

(a) Repeated filing of court actions solely or primarily for the purpose of harassment.

(b) Unreasonably expanding or delaying court proceedings.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2017-003266

12/12/2018

(c) Court actions brought or defended without substantial justification.

...

(f) Repeated filing of documents or requests for relief that have been the subject of previous rulings by the court in the same litigation.

2. "Without substantial justification" has the same meaning prescribed in § 12-349.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Edwards' History of Filing Meritless Claims

The Court finds Stephen S. Edwards ("Edwards") has filed lawsuits in state and federal courts in Arizona, Michigan, New Jersey, California, Oregon, and Wyoming. He has brought at least twelve claims for relief in the United States District Court for the District of Arizona alone.

As discussed below, the Court is aware of forty-one civil cases in which Edwards has been a party in this Court. Edwards' claims have been unsuccessful in twenty-nine, three have been settled, two were removed to federal court, three were not pursued or were abandoned by the other party, and four are not yet resolved or their resolution is not recorded in the Clerk's file. Cumulatively, then, the Court's record does not reflect a single case of the forty-one in which Edwards' claims have been successful.

The Court takes judicial notice of the following actions that Edwards has brought in this Court, together with their outcomes:

1. CV2008-019061, Stephen Edwards v. Alan Sfadi/Access Recover & Repossession, filed August 8, 2008. Lawsuit to prevent vehicle repossession of a SuperLimo vehicle. Dismissed.
2. ST2009-000234, Stephen Edwards v. Maricopa County, filed October 1, 2009. Unsuccessful challenge of property tax assessment.
3. ST2009-000235, Stephen Edwards v. Maricopa County, filed October 1, 2009. Property tax assessment appeal. Dismissed.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2017-003266

12/12/2018

4. CV2012-090065, Stephen Edwards v. Martin Smith, et. al., filed January 1, 2012. Defamation and emotional distress claims against witnesses who testified against Edwards in CV2010-095487, a lawsuit by Edwards' community association against him. Dismissed by stipulation.
5. CV2012-090245, Stephen Edwards v. Michael Black, filed February 8, 2012. Edwards claimed defamation for Defendant's testimony against Edwards in CV2011-055841, in which Defendant, an electrical contractor, successfully sued Edwards for breach of contract. Dismissed by stipulation.
6. CV2012-092110, Stephen Edwards v. Innovative Cabinetry Designs, et. al., filed March 23, 2012. Edwards claimed breach of contract and emotional distress resulting from cabinetry work. Motion to dismiss granted.
7. CV2012-095984, Stephen Edwards v. Magnus Title Agency, filed 10/12/12. Lawsuit against title company for failure to disclose judgments against Edwards to his lender. Dismissed. Denial of motion to set aside affirmed by Court of Appeals. Petition for review denied. Special action dismissed by Court of Appeals.
8. CV2012-096539, Stephen Edwards v. CIT Group, filed October 23, 2012. Action for breach of contract and negligence after Defendant attempted to obtain an outstanding judgment against Edwards. Judgment for Defendant affirmed by Court of Appeals.
9. CV2012-096712, Stephen Edwards v. Title Security Agency of Pinal County. Filed November 14, 2012. Action against a different title company than in CV2012-095984, discussed above. This action, too, was for failing to disclose judgments against Edwards to his lender. Dismissed.
10. CV2012-096901, Stephen Edwards v. American Express, et al., filed October 31, 2012. Action for breach of contract. Removed to federal court.
11. CV2013-093124, Stephen Edwards v. Title Security Agency of Pinal County, filed April 25, 2013. Second lawsuit against title company for same circumstances alleged in CV2012-096712, discussed above. Dismissed.
12. CV2013-093125, Stephen Edwards v. Magnus Title Agency, filed April 25, 2013. Second lawsuit against title company for same circumstances alleged in CV2012-095984, discussed above. Dismissed.
13. CV2013-090995, Stephen Edwards v. American Express, filed October 17, 2013. Action for negligence and breach of fiduciary duty. Dismissed.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2017-003266

12/12/2018

14. CV2015-094117, Stephen Edwards v. Lakewood Community Assoc., filed July 21, 2015. Edwards' lawsuit against his community association for same circumstances as alleged in his counterclaims in CV2014-092726, discussed below. Dismissed.

15. CV2015-094118, Stephen Edwards v. Sandra Smith, Maureen Mulvaney, filed July 21, 2015. Edwards' lawsuit concerning the same circumstances discussed in CV2014-092726, discussed below. Dismissed.

16. CV2015-012081, Stephen Edwards v. Best Buy Co. of Minnesota, Inc., filed December 15, 2015. Edwards claims that he was sexually assaulted by Best Buy employee who grabbed him. Removed to federal court.

17. CV2015-009256, Stephen Edwards v. Mike & Patricia Gardner, filed December 28, 2015. Edwards' lawsuit against neighbors for defamation and infliction of emotional distress regarding an issue with a wall and a \$500 payment. Arbitration award for Defendants not appealed.

18. CV2015-009257, Stephen Edwards v. Lakewood Community Assoc., filed December 28, 2015. Lawsuit against Edwards' homeowners association unreasonable fees and assessments, defamation, and using false evidence and testimony to obtain a judgment against him. Dismissed.

19. CV2017-012833, Stephen Edwards v. PHH Corporation, filed October 3, 2017. Sued mortgage company for providing Edwards with two different payoff amounts on property allegedly causing him to lose prospective buyers and requesting injunctions against sale of Edwards' home. Dismissed. Edwards has appealed.

20. CV2018-009743, Stephen Edwards v. PHH Corporation, et al., filed July 18, 2018. Same claims as in CV2017-012833 above. Not yet resolved.

21. CV2018-013307, Stephen Edwards v. Quinten Cupps, et al., filed October 23, 2018. Lawsuit against attorney for community association and this Division's judicial assistant for alleged use of fraudulent evidence to obtain a judgment against plaintiff, libel and slander. Not yet resolved.

Thus, of the twenty-one claims Edwards has filed in this Court of which the Court is aware, the Court is not aware of a single case in which Edwards has been successful. His claims have been unsuccessful in fifteen cases, two have been dismissed by stipulation, two removed to federal court, and two are as yet unresolved.

The Court also takes judicial notice of the following actions in which Edwards has been named as a defendant in this Court:

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2017-003266

12/12/2018

1. CV2000-002709, Sprint Spectrum v. Stephen Edwards, filed February 10, 2000. Injunction Against Harassment granted against Edwards May 26, 2000.
2. CV2000-018172, Catholic Healthcare West v. Stephen Edwards, filed October 4, 2000. Injunction against Harassment sought against Edwards. Because of the age of this file, the Clerk's Docket does not indicate the outcome of the petition.
3. CV2002-016397, Martin Jones v. Stephen Edwards, et al., filed August 22, 2002. Edwards sued for traffic accident. Notice of Settlement filed November 21, 2003.
4. CV2003-010189, Sovereign Bank Network Capital Alliance Div'n v. Stephen Edwards, et al. filed May 23, 2003. Breach of contract and replevin action. Summary judgment entered against Edwards. Edwards' appeal dismissed.
5. CV2004-006026, CIT Group Equipment Financing v. Stephen Edwards/SuperLimo, filed March 29, 2004. Breach of contract concerning purchase of Lincoln Towncar. Judgment against Edwards. Edwards' appeal dismissed.
6. CV2004-010795, Kristen Curry v. Stephen Edwards, filed June 4, 2004. Petition for Injunction against Harassment by Edwards' former attorney granted.
7. CV2005-005061, Chase Bank v. Stephen Edwards, filed March 23, 2005. Debt collection. Judgment entered against Edwards.
8. CV2010-095487, Cobblestone at the Groves Comm. Assoc. v. Stephen Edwards, filed August 9, 2010. Foreclosure action. Decree of Foreclosure and Order of Sale entered May 14, 2012. Edwards' appeal dismissed February 21, 2012. Stipulation to Dismiss filed June 28, 2012.
9. CV2011-055841, Innovative Cabinetry Designs, Inc. v. Stephen Edwards, filed September 2, 2011. Breach of contract action. Judgment entered against Edwards. Judgment satisfied and parties stipulated to vacate judgment. Edwards' appeal dismissed.
10. CV2013-096402, CAE v. Stephen Edwards, filed December 6, 2013. Petition for Injunction against Harassment granted. Order affirmed following hearing requested by Edwards.
11. CV2013-096401, Jerod Bybee v. Stephen Edwards, filed December 6, 2013. Petition for Injunction against Harassment. Abandoned because relief requested was effectively granted in CV2013-096402 above.
12. CV2014-092726, Lakewood Community Association v. Stephen Edwards, et al. filed March

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2017-003266

12/12/2018

6, 2014. Community association lawsuit for violation of covenants, conditions and restrictions by Edwards. Judgment entered against Edwards. Three motions for reconsideration denied.

13. CV2014-094131, James Lester v. Stephen Edwards, filed July 10, 2014. Petition for Injunction Against Harassment against Edwards granted.

14. CV2014-094139, John Kasel v. Stephen Edwards, filed July 17, 2014. Petition for Injunction Against Harassment. Resolution does not appear in Clerk's Docket.

15. CV2014-094513, Falcon Field Air Traffic Control Tower v. Stephen Edwards, filed July 17, 2014. Petition for Workplace Harassment against Edwards granted.

16. CV2014-096533, City of Mesa v. Stephen Edwards, filed November 8, 2014. Injunction against Workplace Harassment against Edwards granted.

17. CV2016-000456, Debra Polly v. Stephen Edwards, filed January 19, 2016. Notice of dismissal filed by Plaintiff before response filed.

18. CV2017-003266, Lakewood Community Assoc. v. Stephen Edwards, et al., filed May 1, 2017. Lawsuit to enforce orders entered in CV2014-092726. Edwards counterclaims filed. Judgment against Edwards entered.

19. CV2017-012220, Britani Henniger v. Stephen Edwards, filed September 20, 2017. Petition for Injunction Against Harassment by judicial assistant regarding allegedly harassing emails and phone calls. Not yet resolved. Notice of Intent to Dismiss for lack of service filed by Court Administration November 29, 2017.

20. TJ2018-004852, Wells Fargo Bank, NA v. Stephen Edwards, filed October 24, 2018. Transcript of judgment from San Tan Justice Court. Judgment entered against Edwards.

Thus, of the twenty civil matters filed against Edwards in this Court of which the Court is presently aware, the record, again, does not reflect that Edwards' claims were successful in any. He was unsuccessful in fourteen cases, settled one, three were abandoned by the Plaintiffs and no resolution is recorded as to two.

As discussed above, the Court is aware of forty-one civil cases in which Edwards has been a party in this Court. Edwards has participated in thirty-eight of these cases. His claims have been adjudicated unsuccessful in twenty-nine. The remainder were otherwise resolved, or diverted to other forums, are not yet resolved, or a record of their resolution is not readily available because of the age of the cases. Of the twenty-nine that were adjudicated, Edwards has not been successful

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2017-003266

12/12/2018

in a single case. The Court concludes Edwards has consistently brought and defended meritless claims in this forum.

The Court further finds that Edwards has often filed or defended these actions and actions in other jurisdictions on behalf of, or in his purported capacity as owner, member, manager, officer, director or shareholder of various LLCs and corporations, including 1630 S. 36th LLC ("1630"); Gucci Blue, LLC; Stephen S. Edwards, Inc.; Super Trust Fund u/t/d/ June 15, 2001; and Mesa Blue, LLC.

Ample further evidence of Edwards' meritless claims is found in the record. The Court notes only one additional case as an example. Edwards' lawsuit filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona on December 15, 2017, Docket Number 2:17-cv-04661-DLR, concerned purported civil rights violations. Edwards named as defendants the Lakewood Community Association ("Lakewood") in which Edwards resides, twelve Judges of that Court, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, the Maricopa County Superior Court, the State Bar of Arizona, and the Family of Christ Lutheran Church. His complaint was dismissed by the court four days after filing as frivolous, pursuant Rule 12(b)(6), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Trial Exhibit 4:27-28.

**Filing of Repetitive Claims Previously Determined/
Expanding and Delaying Litigation**

In many instances Edwards' has filed claims in identical or nearly identical lawsuits. He frequently and repeatedly requests reconsideration by various procedural devices without any rational basis. For example, in the following matters as to which the Court takes judicial notice, on October 12, 2012, in Maricopa Cause CV2012-095984 (the "First Magnus Case"), Edwards brought a lawsuit against Magnus Title Agency, LLC and "Magnus Title Agency, a division of Title Security Agency of Arizona, Inc.", alleging damages in five counts for Defendants' alleged failure to disclose judgments against Edwards to a lender in the course of a title search for a construction loan that Edwards had apparently failed to disclose in his loan application. The gravamen of Edwards' complaint, then, was that Magnus harmed him because it failed to disclose to Edwards' lender what Edwards, himself, had also failed to disclose to that lender.

Not surprisingly, his claims were dismissed December 21, 2012. His motion to set aside was denied March 19, 2012. Edwards appealed three days later. The Court of Appeals issued its decision affirming the dismissal February 27, 2014. Edwards requested reconsideration. His request was denied March 14, 2014. The Court of Appeals Mandate was received by the Superior Court September 2, 2014.

On October 20, 2017, three years later, Edwards filed a special action in the same matter asking to vacate the judgment and remove the original Superior Court Judge who had entered the

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2017-003266

12/12/2018

judgment against him because, he contended, the Judge was ill at the time the Judge entered the judgment and unable to make a proper decision. He failed to pursue the appeal, and the Court of Appeals returned the Superior Court file January 26, 2018.

A month after filing the First Magnus Case, on November 14, 2012, in CV2012-096712 (the "First Title Security Case"), Edwards brought another lawsuit, this time against Title Security Agency of Pinal County, LLC ("Title Security"), rather than against one of its divisions, as in the prior case. The complaint alleged the same claimed failure to disclose judgments against Edwards as were alleged in the First Magnus Case, albeit this time in six counts. His claims were dismissed April 2, 2013. Edwards appealed the dismissal April 10, 2013. The dismissal was affirmed by the Court of Appeals June 12, 2014.

On April 25, 2013 Edwards filed a new complaint in Maricopa Number CV2013-093124 (the "Second Title Security Case") alleging the same underlying facts as in the 6712 Case and ten counts for relief that were largely repetitive of his six prior theories. Judgment against Edwards was entered October 30, 2013. Edwards noticed his appeal November 26, 2013, but failed to prosecute the appeal. The Court of Appeals deemed the appeal abandoned and returned the Superior Court's file February 14, 2014.

On the same date that he filed the Second Title Security Case Edwards filed Maricopa Cause CV2013-093125 (the "Second Magnus Case"), claiming the same alleged failures as in the previous matters. The Court dismissed these claims as barred by res judicata and as failing to state a claim upon which relief might be granted August 15, 2013. Edwards requested reconsideration September 10, 2013. His request for reconsideration was denied December 12, 2013.

Edwards noticed his appeal the next day. That appeal was dismissed as premature February 14, 2014. Judgment was entered February 21, 2014. Edwards noticed a new appeal March 5, 2014. The appeal was dismissed March 24, 2014. Edwards asked this Court to reinstate his appeal June 15, 2014. That request was denied June 24, 2018.

Another example of Edwards' repetitive actions and frivolous claims is found in litigation that ensued following the 2014 filing in this Court of the case of the Lakewood Community Association v. 1630 S. 36th LLC, Maricopa Cause CV2014-092726, as to which contents the Court takes judicial notice. In that action, Lakewood, the homeowners' association for the community in which Edwards resides, brought an action against 1630 S. 36th LLC ("1630"), a single member LLC that owns Edwards' present residence, to require him to remove a wall he had constructed in violation of the community's conditions, covenants and restrictions.

On November 26, 2014, this Court entered a permanent injunction ordering the removal and awarding the association its fees and costs. Edwards then requested reconsideration three times,

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2017-003266

12/12/2018

on February 22, 2016, June 20, 2016, and September 28, 2016, all of which were denied. In the same matter, Edwards requested reconsideration of a different decision of the Court. His December 5, 2017 motion was, not uncharacteristically, captioned "Motion for Reconsideration of Stupid Decision to Release Attorney Quinten Cupps from Criminal Conduct".

Edwards then brought several additional lawsuits in this Court concerning the original litigation: Stephen S. Edwards v. Lakewood Community Association, CV2015-009257, that was dismissed by the Court; Stephen S. Edwards v. Lakewood Community Association, CV2015-094117, dismissed by the Court and the subject of three motions for reconsideration or to set aside dismissal by Edwards, all of which were denied; Stephen Edwards v. Sandra Smith, et al. CV2015-094118, Edwards' action against Lakewood's property manager, management company and one of his neighbors; Stephen Edwards v. Gardner, CV2015-009256, in which Edwards sued another neighbor for statements made in testifying against Edwards. All were unsuccessful.

In Maricopa Cause Number CV2017-003266 Counter-Claimant Stephen S. Edwards ((hereafter referred to as the "Motion") "Edwards") asserted claims against Counter-Defendant Lakewood Community Association ("Lakewood"), Lakewood's attorney, Quinten Cupps ("Cupps"), members of the Lakewood Community Association and others, all also related to the original litigation by Lakewood handled by Mr. Cupps. He also filed an action against Mr. Cupps' law firm, Vial Fotheringham LLP, in the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon (Docket Number 3:17-cv-01878-SI), alleging claims against the firm related to Mr. Cupps' representation of Lakewood Community Association in the instant action. That lawsuit was dismissed twice, reconsideration was denied, and a judgment of dismissal was entered with prejudice. Trial Exhibit 28.

Further, the Court finds the information and allegations contained in Trial Exhibit 4 is accurate and hereby incorporates by reference as if fully set forth in these findings. The exhibit describes 28 cases in which Edwards took actions which were clearly improper, including repeatedly filing motions requesting the same relief that was previously denied and attempting to prolong litigation by filing frivolous pleadings.

Edwards' Use of Litigation to Harass

Recounting all instances of Edwards' harassing and inappropriate communications evidenced by the record before the Court would require more time than is available to this Division. As examples only, the Court finds Edwards has made the following improper statements and statements indicating his state of mind to use litigation to harass and to use frivolous litigation and motions for the express purpose of increasing his opponent's litigation costs:

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2017-003266

12/12/2018

1. Stephen Edwards ... demand[s] that this Court ... forward this case to trial without any further bullshit or delay ...

So what the Hell are you thinking letting criminals loose?

Judge Strong [the Judge to whom Edwards' pleading is addressed] is a former alcoholic and current pot head and should be checked for marijuana use while sitting on the bench. I ask: What the Fuck are you thinking allowing a person who injured to not receive justice ...

You have a Weak Mind to allow such injustice. You must be a Sick Fuck to think it's ok to Deny People Justice. Edwards proclaims: "Not in my world" ... you should act like a Human ... you little Coward.

Craig Strong - I don't give a damn what the fuck you think about me. I Don't Like Stupid People regardless of your quest for power ... What kind of fucking person do you think you are in denying me justice?

Judge Strong - You want to act like a criminal? I'm going to talk to you like a fucking criminal! Get your head out of your ass and leave my case alone for the Jury to decide not a stupid old fuck who doesn't know not to speak and whom is legally incompetent ... You're probably a Dr. Nasser supporter, or you support the officials of Flint who allowed people of Flint to drink poisoned water ... Not here Craig - not on my watch. If you want to stay on this case then you will act like a professional, not some Old Stupid Fool who neglects his professional duties.

[Sic] Edwards' undated Amended Motion for Reconsideration filed in Edwards v. Citizens Insurance Company of America, Case 17-015676-NZ, Circuit Court for Wayne County, Michigan, Trial Exhibit 25:5-8.

2. To [Maricopa County Superior Court Judge] Hugh He[gy]i

I personally hold you and [Maricopa County Superior Court Judge David] Udall responsible for the escalation and potential violence in this community. Let's test your intelligence

Are you stupid as [Maricopa County Superior Court Judge] Karen Mullins ...

[Former Maricopa County Superior Court Judge] Robert Ober[bil]lig Who you quoted ... [is] an idiot or he's a corrupt individual ... I'm not trying to call you stupid

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2017-003266

12/12/2018

but you keep showing me stupid so what the hell do you expect. I know how much you make you live a miserable life sitting on the bench having to deal with a bunch of stupid assholes from an HOA.

Hugh Would you allow your family member to be raped // Are you sure ?? You said it's OK for me to be raped?? #funnyHuman

[Sic] Edwards October 18, 2016 e mail re "DEATH Threats to me and my Friend" at Trial Exhibit 6.

3. We're not slaves I'm not anybody's nigger or any of my investors do you understand me?

[Y]ou have a duty as an employee of the state of Arizona so you work for me and I'm going to keep you busy, until you screw your head on right and get this corrected. Cupps is a liar and now you come across the same!

Thomas do you condone pedophilia I'm under the impression you do?? You're a sick fuck.

So in conclusion I don't think it's wise to try to spar with me do you?

[Sic] Edwards January 23, 2018 e mail to, among others, an employee of the State Bar of Arizona at Trial Exhibit 6 (emphasis added).

4. Larry, Hope you're well, you heard me say in the past that there are new causes of action forthcoming I expect should be ready by Monday. It's gonna take this whole entire situation to another level.

It's not a good thing when you have a corporate individual with the resources to investigate his adversaries! Trust me I could have so much more litigation people realize it's not a smart thing so if your clients continue to be in denial no worries they're going to pay it out one way or another ...

And I did mention to you another two years of litigation so when people don't want to take me serious I just sit back and wink

See Cobblestone v. Edwards 2015/ they racked up \$110,000 judgment against me and I still came back and won monetarily!

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2017-003266

12/12/2018

Let me know if your clients want to stay in denial or do they want to avoid a new complaint in federal court?

Sent from: Super Steve

[Sic] Edwards' November 30, 2017 e mail to, among others, Attorney Larry Langley at Trial Exhibit 10 (emphasis added).

5. We're going to keep going after licensed crooked criminal minded [Attorney] Quinten [Cupps] as we did a thorough investigation him along with [Maricopa Superior Court Judge] David Udall and it's not pretty. I'm advising you right now this whole entire situation is about to go to another level in the courtroom.

I promised you new litigation in fact everything that I have stated I have done so I'm sure you shouldn't have any doubt by now ... I'm Muhammad Ali and we're going to go for 15 rounds one (me) against 20! So let them keep messing with me I'm going to keep striking back.

[Sic] Edwards' November 19, 2017 e mail to, among others, Attorney Larry Langley at Trial Exhibit 11 (emphasis added).

6. [I]f I have to file anything new in the future I will include you and your law firm ...

Edwards' September 25, 2017 e mail to, among others, Attorney Larry Langley at Trial Exhibit 12 (emphasis added). Other examples of communications between Edwards and others are found in Trial Exhibits 5-12.

The Court concludes that Edwards has consistently used litigation in this Court in order to harass and to publish scandalous, nonsensical and completely baseless insults in a forum in which he requires captive audiences to spend valuable time reading and digesting what is best characterized as meritless drivel because of the remote possibility that his missives might contain a kernel of value that requires response. It finds that he does so for the sole purposes of increasing his opponents' litigation costs and harassing his opponents. It further finds that he makes these statements with impunity because he believes himself to be immune to judgments and because of the protection from defamation actions this Court's mantle provides him.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2017-003266

12/12/2018

Conclusions of Law

1. Edwards has consistently filed and defended court actions solely or primarily for the purpose of harassment.
2. Edwards has consistently filed claims or requests for relief that have been the subject of previous rulings by a court in the same litigation.
3. Edwards has consistently brought and defended court actions without substantial justification, and has advanced claims and defenses that are meritless and not made in good faith.
4. Edwards has consistently unreasonably expanded or delayed court proceedings.
4. Edwards has engaged in repeated harassment, threats, intimidation, and bullying behavior in oral argument, emails, and court filings in this Court and in every forum in which this Court is aware that he has litigated. This conduct has been directed toward parties, their attorneys, witnesses, judges, third parties, and court staff.

Recommendations

This Division recommends that Edwards be declared a vexatious litigant by the Maricopa County Superior Court Civil Presiding Judge, pursuant to A.R.S. §12-3201.

This Division further recommends that Edwards, as well as any entity as to which Edwards is the sole owner, member, or shareholder, including, but not limited to, 1630 S. 36th LLC ("1630"); Gucci Blue, LLC; Stephen S. Edwards, Inc.; Super Trust Fund u/t/d/ June 15, 2001; and Mesa Blue, LLC., be prohibited from filing any new pleading, motion or other document without prior leave of the court, pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-3201(B).

Dated this 12th day of December, 2018.

/S/ HONORABLE HUGH HEGYI

HONORABLE HUGH HEGYI
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT