2 3

1

4

5

8 9

10

11

14

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

24

25

23

27

28

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

The Wilenchik & Bartness Building 2810 North Third Street Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Telephone: 602-606-2810

Facsimile: 602-606-2811

John D. Wilenchik, #029353

Jordan C. Wolff, #034110

admin@wb-law.com

Attorneys for Defendant

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

IN AND FOR PIMA COUNTY

RAFAEL "RAY" A. IHLY, individually; individually, CHERYL CASWELL, ANASTASIOS TSATSAKIS, individually, 13 SUZANNE individually, JENKINS, EILEEN WILSON, individually, LEIANN individually, ANDERSON, ROBERT 15 | MONTGOMERY, individually, ELIZABETH SPECK, individually, RONALD HART, individually, PAULINE HART. individually. **BOBBY** and WILSON, individually,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

SHELLEY KAIS, as putative Chairwoman of the Pima County Republican Committee,

Defendant.

Case No. C20221370

REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO CLARIFY/AMEND

> (Assigned to the Honorable Greg Sakall)

Defendant Shelley Kais ("Defendant Kais") hereby files this Reply in support of her Motion to Clarify or Amend. In short, Plaintiffs appear to concede that the Court should clarify

Defendant notes that she originally filed a combined "Motion to Strike" and "Motion to Clarify/Amend." The Rules do not provide for a Reply on a Motion to Strike but they do allow for a Reply on a Motion to Clarify or Amend.

that the dismissal previously entered in this matter was not stipulated to by Defendant Kais; that the Court did not decide the ultimate merits of this matter, or otherwise "approve" the settlement agreement (in fact, the settlement agreement was with a non-party and should be stricken); and since the Plaintiffs are voicing no opposition to an award of taxable costs under A.R.S. § 12-341, then the Court should allow for an award upon the submission of a Statement of Costs by Defendant Kais (absent a valid subsequent objection thereto).

As Plaintiffs concede, the Pima County Republican Committee is a "private organization," as opposed to a public one; therefore its Chair is not a "public officer," and the rule on automatic substitution of public officers (Rule 25(d)) does not apply. Moreover, the Plaintiffs did not change the caption on their "Stipulation for Dismissal" to indicate the substitution of another defendant, but the filing indicated that "[t]he parties hereby give notice of settlement," which gave the misleading impression that Defendant Kais had agreed to it. On the other hand, Defendant Kais does not object to dismissal, so long as it is clarified that the dismissal is not the result of a settlement between the parties, but rather the result of Plaintiffs voluntarily requesting a dismissal; and again, she requests leave to submit her Statement of Costs under A.R.S. § 12-341.

Finally, while undersigned counsel was aware (as was Defendant Kais) of the fact that another person (Dave Smith) replaced her as Chair of the Pima County GOP, that is no excuse for Plaintiffs' failure to serve a copy of court filings on her, including the Motion to Dismiss; and of course, Defendant Kais was not a party to the settlement in between Plaintiffs and non-party Smith so she was unaware of its terms or that it was being unnecessarily filed in Court.

For the foregoing reasons, Defendant Kais asks the Court to clarify that this matter is dismissed based on the Plaintiffs' voluntary request; that there was no settlement with Defendant Kais (and to strike the Settlement Agreement that was submitted); that the Court did not reach the merits of this matter; and that the Court grant leave for her to submit her Statement of Costs.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED on 7/24/2023.

WILENCHIK & BARTNESS, P.C.

/s/ John D. Wilenchik

John "Jack" D. Wilenchik, Esq. Jordan C. Wolff, Esq. The Wilenchik & Bartness Building 2810 North Third Street Phoenix, Arizona 85004 admin@wb-law.com Attorneys for Defendant

ELECTRONICALLY filed 7/24/2023, via AZTurboCourt.com WILENCHIK & BARTNESS L

COPY electronically transmitted by the Clerk of the Court via AZTurboCourt.com to the Honorable Greg Sakall.

COPY electronically served via AZTurboCourt.com and email on 7/24/2023, to:

Timothy A. La Sota TIMOŤHY A. LA SOTA, PLC 2198 East Camelback Road, Suite 305 Phoenix, Arizona 85016 tim@timlasota.com Attorney for Plaintiffs

By: /s/ Christine M. Ferreira

20

15

16

17

18

19

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

WILENCHIK & BARTNESS L

GOOD FAITH CONSULTATION CERTIFICATE

To the extent that a "good faith consultation certificate" is or may be required under Rule 7.1(f),(h)(with respect to motions to strike): the movant hereby certifies and demonstrates that she has, by counsel, tried in good faith to resolve the issue by conferring with—or attempting to confer with—the party or person against whom the motion is directed. In particular, counsel for Defendant attempted to call counsel for Plaintiff but was unable to reach him. (Plaintiffs' counsel may be out of the country. If and when Defendant's counsel receives a call back then counsel will continue to attempt to meet and confer with respect to the motion to strike.

However, because the motion raises other related issues, including a request to clarify or amend the judgment of dismissal, then this filing is proper in the meantime.)

> /s/ John "Jack" D. Wilenchik John "Jack" Wilenchik, Esq. Counsel for Defendant