Exhibit A

From: <u>Joan Weyrauch - SUPCRTX</u>

To: du Mee, Matthew; ps@strojnik.com; Fabian Zazueta (fabian@aid.org)

Subject: RE: CV2016-090506, Advocates for Individuals with Disabilities v. Consolidated Defendants

Date: Friday, January 13, 2017 12:00:01 PM

Okay. Perfect. I will set this matter for 1 hour oral argument on 2-17-2017 @ 11:00 am. I will have our clerk issue out the minute entry asap.

Thank you for your quick responses. It is greatly appreciated.

Joan Weyrauch
Judicial Assistant to Judge David M. Talamante
222 E. Javelina, Suite 2G
Mesa, AZ 85210

Office: (602) 506-6251 Fax: (602) 372-8660

From: du Mee, Matthew [mailto:Matthew.duMee@azag.gov]

Sent: Friday, January 13, 2017 11:58 AM

To: Joan Weyrauch - SUPCRTX; ps@strojnik.com; Fabian Zazueta (fabian@aid.org)

Subject: RE: CV2016-090506, Advocates for Individuals with Disabilities v. Consolidated Defendants

Ms. Weyrauch,

Both dates work for us, although Feb. 17 at 11 AM would work better.

Thanks, Matthew

From: Joan Weyrauch - SUPCRTX [mailto:jweyrauc@superiorcourt.maricopa.gov]

Sent: Friday, January 13, 2017 11:47 AM

To: ps@strojnik.com; Fabian Zazueta (fabian@aid.org); du Mee, Matthew

Subject: RE: CV2016-090506, Advocates for Individuals with Disabilities v. Consolidated Defendants

Thank you Mr. Strojnik. Once I hear back from Mr. duMee I will firm up the date with everyone.

Joan Weyrauch
Judicial Assistant to Judge David M. Talamante
222 E. Javelina, Suite 2G
Mesa, AZ 85210

Office: (602) 506-6251 Fax: (602) 372-8660

From: ps@strojnik.com [mailto:ps@strojnik.com]

Sent: Friday, January 13, 2017 11:43 AM

To: Joan Weyrauch - SUPCRTX; Fabian Zazueta (fabian@aid.org); du Mee, Matthew

(Matthew.duMee@azag.gov)

Subject: RE: CV2016-090506, Advocates for Individuals with Disabilities v. Consolidated Defendants

Importance: High

Hi, Joan. Either date is fine with me.

Cordially Yours,

Peter Strojnik STROJNIK, P.C. 2375 East Camelback Road Suite 600 Phoenix, Arizona 85016 Telephone: 602-524-6602 e-mail ps@strojnik.com

Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in this electronic e-mail and any accompanying attachment(s) is intended only for the use of the intended recipient and may be confidential and/or privileged. If any reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited, and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by return e-mail, and delete the original message and all copies from your system. Thank you.

----- Original Message ------

Subject: CV2016-090506, Advocates for Individuals with Disabilities v.

Consolidated Defendants

From: Joan Weyrauch - SUPCRTX < jweyrauc@superiorcourt.maricopa.gov >

Date: Fri, January 13, 2017 11:31 am

To: "ps@strojnik.com" <ps@strojnik.com>, "Fabian Zazueta (fabian@aid.org)" <fabian@aid.org>, "du Mee, Matthew (Matthew.duMee@azag.gov)" <Matthew.duMee@azag.gov>

Good Morning!

Judge Talamante has received the State of Arizona's Motion to Dismiss and Motion for Judgment on Pleadings along with Plaintiff's Response and the State's Reply regarding the above matter. He wants to set this matter for a 1 hour oral argument. I have the following dates available:

2-17-2017 @ 11:00 am 2-24-2017 @ 2:00 pm

Can you please take a look at your calendars and let me know which date and time works best for you? You can respond to me through this e-mail or by contacting me at the number listed below.

Thank you!

Joan Weyrauch
Judicial Assistant to Judge David M. Talamante
222 E. Javelina, Suite 2G
Mesa, AZ 85210
Office: (602) 506-6251

Fax: (602) 372-8660

Exhibit B

From: <u>du Mee, Matthew</u>

To: "ps@strojnik.com"; "Fabian Zazueta"

Cc: sydney@aid.org

Subject: RE: Request to Extend Time for Oral Arguments - CV2016-090506

Date: Thursday, February 09, 2017 9:07:09 AM

Mr. Strojnik,

In weighing the lack of explanation and documentation requested against the hardship of the delay to the individuals concerned, we will be forced to oppose the continuance.

Thanks, Matthew

From: ps@strojnik.com [mailto:ps@strojnik.com] **Sent:** Wednesday, February 08, 2017 4:27 PM

To: du Mee, Matthew; 'Fabian Zazueta'

Cc: sydney@aid.org

Subject: RE: Request to Extend Time for Oral Arguments - CV2016-090506

No. Either agree or we file a motion.

Cordially Yours,

Peter Strojnik STROJNIK, P.C. 2375 East Camelback Road Suite 600 Phoenix, Arizona 85016 Telephone: 602-524-6602 e-mail ps@strojnik.com

Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in this electronic e-mail and any accompanying attachment(s) is intended only for the use of the intended recipient and may be confidential and/or privileged. If any reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited, and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by return e-mail, and delete the original message and all copies from your system. Thank you.

----- Original Message -----

Subject: RE: Request to Extend Time for Oral Arguments - CV2016-090506

From: "du Mee, Matthew" < Matthew.duMee@azag.gov>

Date: Wed, February 08, 2017 4:25 pm

To: "'ps@strojnik.com'" <ps@strojnik.com>, 'Fabian Zazueta'

<fabian@aid.org>

Cc: "sydney@aid.org" < sydney@aid.org >

Mr. Strojnik,

Can you please present documentation showing:

- (1) when the arbitration was scheduled,
- (2) when the arbitration deadline was set, and

(3) what the arbitration deadline is?

Thanks, Matthew

From: ps@strojnik.com [mailto:ps@strojnik.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2017 4:09 PM

To: du Mee, Matthew; 'Fabian Zazueta'

Cc: sydney@aid.org

Subject: RE: Reguest to Extend Time for Oral Arguments - CV2016-090506

Gentlemen, please see below.

- (1) How this arbitration got scheduled for a date that Mr. Strojnik had already reserved on his calendar? **Arbitration was schedule after the hearing.**
- (2) What attempts Mr. Strojnik has made to reschedule the arbitration? **Arbitration deadline prevents rescheduling.**
- (3) Why Mr. Strojnik believes a forty-day continuance is necessary? I will attempt to get some vacation time.

Cordially Yours,

Peter Strojnik STROJNIK, P.C. 2375 East Camelback Road Suite 600 Phoenix, Arizona 85016 Telephone: 602-524-6602 e-mail ps@strojnik.com

Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in this electronic e-mail and any accompanying attachment(s) is intended only for the use of the intended recipient and may be confidential and/or privileged. If any reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited, and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by return e-mail, and delete the original message and all copies from your system. Thank you.

----- Original Message -----

Subject: RE: Request to Extend Time for Oral Arguments - CV2016-

090506

From: "du Mee, Matthew" < Matthew.duMee@azag.gov>

Date: Wed, February 08, 2017 2:21 pm To: 'Fabian Zazueta' < fabian@aid.org>

Cc: "ps@strojnik.com" <ps@strojnik.com>, "sydney@aid.org" <sydney@aid.org>

Mr. Zazueta,

I was surprised to receive your email, because Mr. Strojnik confirmed to the Court on January 13, 2017 that this date and time worked for him (see attached). While we are generally happy to stipulate to extended briefing deadlines as a professional courtesy, this is a firm court date that was set almost a month ago. Taking this hearing off calendar would result in a lengthy delay, and approximately one thousand defendants are waiting for resolution of this motion. Can you please give me additional details as to:

- (1) How this arbitration got scheduled for a date that Mr. Strojnik had already reserved on his calendar?
- (2) What attempts Mr. Strojnik has made to reschedule the arbitration?
- (3) Why Mr. Strojnik believes a forty-day continuance is necessary?

Any documentation you have related to these points would be very helpful. Once you provide these additional details and documents, we will be able to make a more informed decision with regard to your request.

Thanks, Matthew

From: Fabian Zazueta [mailto:fabian@aid.org] Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2017 1:44 PM

To: du Mee, Matthew

Cc: ps@strojnik.com; sydney@aid.org

Subject: Request to Extend Time for Oral Arguments - CV2016-090506

Mr. du Mee,

I hope this message finds you well. I have been informed that Mr. Strojnik has an arbitration that conflicts with the oral argument scheduled on February 17. Before Mr. Strojnik moves to continue the hearing for forty (40) days, I wanted to see if you consent and are willing to stipulate to his request to continue.

Please let us know by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, February 10, 2017, whether you consent and are willing to stipulate. If you do not agree, Mr. Strojnik intends to file his motion on Monday (2/13). Thank you for your anticipated professional courtesy.

best,

Fabian Zazueta, *In-House Counsel* **Advocates for Individuals with Disabilities**40 North Central Avenue, Ste 1400
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Telephone: (774)-768-2233

Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in this electronic e-mail and any accompanying attachment(s) is intended only for the use of the intended recipient and may be confidential and/or privileged. If any reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited, and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by return e-mail, and delete the original message and all copies from your system. Thank you.

Exhibit C



RULE 408 PROTECTED SETTLEMENT COMMUNICATION

October 24, 2016

Mark A. Tucker Attorney at Law By E-mail and U.S. Mail *Mark@tuckerlawaz.com*

Re: Advocates for Individuals with Disabilities Foundation, Inc. v. Rokar, LLC;

CV2016-008862

Dear Mark:

A judicial stay has been placed in this matter. There will be no motion practice from either side for now. Unfortunately, this stay delays the adjudication of the matters for many months to come, not including the subsequent appeals which are anticipated by all sides in the current dispute. In the meantime, we will consider settling your individual case(s), which would remove your case from the list of consolidated matters. Overtime, our cost and expenses for each individual matter will rise. Offers to settle now will likely not reflect potential future settlement amount offers. We firmly believe that this matter should and will settle, and the best time to do this would be now. The Foundation is prepared to accept 1) remediation of the alleged parking violations. 2) Confidentiality Covenant. 3) a one-time total payment of \$1,750.00 to cover all attorney's fees, expenses and costs. This offer will remain open for 10 business days.

Sincerely,

Peter Strojnik, Esq.

Profit-

WEB: WWW.AID.ORG

Exhibit D

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Advocates for Individuals with Disabilities, LLC, and David Ritzenthaler,

ORDER

No. CV-16-01969-PHX-NVW

Plaintiffs,

v.

MidFirst Bank,

Defendant.

Before the Court are two pending matters. First is the Court's Order to Show Cause (Doc. 20) and Plaintiffs' Response (Doc. 22) concerning whether Plaintiffs have standing. The Court gave Plaintiffs until October 17, 2016, to file an amended complaint if they wish to allege more that could affect standing. Plaintiffs filed no amended complaint. For the reasons stated in the Order to Show Cause (Doc. 20), Plaintiffs have not alleged sufficient standing to invoke federal jurisdiction. The standing and jurisdictional allegations in this case are materially identical to those found insufficient in *Advocates for Individuals with Disabilities LLC v. WSA Props. LLC*, No. CV-16-02375-PHX-DGC, 2016 WL 5436810, at *1 (D. Ariz. Sept. 29, 2016), an action filed by the same counsel. This Court adopts the analysis and discussion of the court in that case.

Also before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Remand (Doc. 24), which seeks remand to the state court of both the parallel state law claim and of the federal Americans with Disabilities Act claim. Therefore, the Court must determine whether the parallel

state law claims must be remanded to the state court or dismissed because it is "absolutely certain" that Plaintiff would not be allowed to proceed in state court due to lack of injury and standing. *Bell v. City of Kellogg*, 922 F.2d 1418, 1424 (9th Cir. 1991). It is necessary to have additional information before that question can be answered.

As background to the inquiries stated below, the Court is aware from several news media accounts widely disseminated in this community that Plaintiffs' counsel Peter Strojnik has filed more than a thousand similar cases in the Arizona Superior Court. Many, like this one, have been removed to federal court. It appears from those reports that Mr. Strojnik files those actions without prior demand on the defendants and without opportunity to cure before litigation. It appears that many of the alleged violations are easily cured with minimal expense. Mr. Strojnik has stated in some news reports that he always insists that the defendant pay him \$7,000 in attorney fees to dismiss the case, even after immediate remediation at trivial cost and minimal effort by Mr. Strojnik.

This raises a question of whether Mr. Strojnik has engaged in a pattern of professionally unethical conduct by demanding attorney fees for bringing litigation that is unnecessary and for which the reasonable attorney fees would be nothing. There is a similar question whether he has engaged in a pattern of professionally unethical conduct, even if some attorney fees could be sought, by demanding payment of fees in a highly unreasonable amount. The circumstances raise the question whether Mr. Strojnik has used these cases to abuse people with unethical fee demands that are more economical to pay than defeat. These questions could bear upon whether in this case it is absolutely certain that Arizona law would not indulge the rare allowance of litigation without an injured plaintiff. These questions must be explored to decide whether this action should be remanded in whole or in part or dismissed entirely.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiffs' counsel Peter Strojnik and Fabian Zazueta appear in person on November 28, 2016, at 9:30 a.m. to give full answers to the following questions:

- 1. Did Mr. Strojnik make a pre-suit demand on Defendant in this case? If so, what was the demand?
- 2. Has Mr. Strojnik generally not given pre-suit demands before filing actions of this nature? If he has generally given pre-suit demands, what have they been? What is the approximate percentage of cases of this nature in which Mr. Strojnik has not given pre-suit demand?
- 3. Has Mr. Strojnik generally demanded some amount of money to dismiss cases of this nature, regardless of the defendant's immediate remediation and of variations of actual time spent on each case? If so, what has the amount been?

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs file by 5:00 p.m. on November 25, 2016, a memorandum of law addressing:

- 1. Whether it violates the Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct in a fee recovery case to demand payment of attorney fees from an opposing party that is unreasonably high.
- 2. Whether it violates the Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct to charge a client attorney fees for litigation services in an action that could have been resolved by a request and without a lawsuit.
- 3. Whether it violates the Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct in a fee recovery case to demand payment from an opposing party of attorney fees for litigation services in an action that could have been resolved by a request and without a lawsuit.
 - 4. All Arizona cases allowing litigation to proceed without party standing.
- 5. Any reason why it is less than absolutely certain that under Arizona law this action would not be allowed to proceed without injury and standing.

Dated this 16th day of November, 2016.

Néil V. Wake Senior United States District

Exhibit E

	_
	10
	11
2	12
LAW	13
YS AT	14
TTORNE	15
APRO	16
	17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2.7

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Mark I. Harrison, Bar No. 001266
Geoffrey M.T. Sturr, Bar No. 014063
Josh Bendor, Bar No. 031908
Osborn Maledon, P.A.
2929 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100
Phoenix, AZ 85012-2793
mharrison@omlaw.com
gsturr@omlaw.com
jbendor@omlaw.com
(602) 640-9000

Attorneys for Peter Strojnik and Fabian Zazueta

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Advocates for Individuals with Disabilities, LLC, and David Ritzenthaler,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

MidFirst Bank,

Defendant.

CV-16-01969-PHX-NVW

NOTICE OF APPEARANCE AND MOTION TO CONTINUE ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE HEARING

Pursuant to LR Civ. 83.3, Osborn Maledon, P.A., by and through Mark Harrison, Geoffrey Sturr, and Josh Bendor, hereby give notice that they have been retained to represent Peter Strojnik and Fabian Zazueta, counsel for Plaintiffs in this action, in connection with the Court's Order to Show Cause (Doc. 26), and appear in this action for that limited purpose.

Messrs. Strojnik and Zazueta hereby move the Court to continue the scheduled November 28, 2016 OSC hearing and reset it for a date on or after December 7, 2016, and to also reset the related deadline for the submission of a memorandum of law. A brief continuance is requested because: (1) as set forth in an accompanying declaration, Mr. Strojnik has long-standing travel plans to be out of state on November 28; (2) with the Thanksgiving holiday, Messrs. Strojnik and Zazueta believe they will need some

Case 2:16-cv-01969-NVW Document 27 Filed 11/21/16 Page 2 of 3

	$oldsymbol{H}$
1	additional time to review available records and consult with counsel so that they will be
2	in a position to answer fully Questions 2 and 3 the Court has posed for the OSC hearing:
3	and (3) undersigned counsel would appreciate having additional time to assist Messrs.
4	Strojnik and Zazueta in submitting a memorandum of law and prepare for the OSC
5	hearing. The request that the hearing be rescheduled for a date on or after December 7 i
6	made because of commitments Mr. Strojnik and undersigned counsel have before that
7	date.
8	Undersigned counsel has personally conferred with counsel for defendant
9	MidFirst Bank, which does not object to the requested continuance.
10	A proposed form of Order accompanies this motion.
11	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 21st day of November, 2016.
12	OSBORN MALEDON, P.A.
13	
14	By: s/Geoffrey M.T. Sturr
15	Mark I. Harrison Geoffrey M.T. Sturr
16	Josh Bendor 2929 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100
17	Phoenix, AZ 85012-2793
18	Attorneys for Peter Strojnik and
19	Fabian Žazueta
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I hereby certify that on November 21, 2016, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following CM/ECF registrants: John A. Doran, Esq. 201 E. Washington St., Suite 800 Phoenix, AZ 85004 jdoran@shermanhoward.com Counsel for Defendant s/ Debra Huss

Exhibit F

	9
	10
	11
2	12
LAW	13
EYS AT	14
TTORN	15
A	16
	17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	Mark I. Harrison, Bar No. 001266
2	Geoffrey M.T. Sturr, Bar No. 014063 Josh Bendor, Bar No. 031908
3	Osborn Maledon, P.A. 2929 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100
4	Phoenix, AZ 85012-2793 mharrison@omlaw.com
5	gsturr@omlaw.com jbendor@omlaw.com (602) 640-9000
6	
7	Attorneys for Peter Strojnik and Fabian Zazueta
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

CV-16-01969-PHX-NVW

DECLARATION OF PETER STROJNIK IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO CONTINUE ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE HEARING

Advocates for Individuals with Disabilities, LLC, and David Ritzenthaler,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

MidFirst Bank,

Defendant.

I, Peter Strojnik, declare:

- 1. I am one of the attorneys representing the plaintiffs in this action.
- 2. I have received the Court's Order (Doc. 26), requiring me to appear in person on November 28, 2016 to answer the questions posed in the Order.
- 3. I could not attend the scheduled November 28 hearing without substantial personal hardship because my family and I have long-standing plans to travel to Hawaii, leaving on Wednesday, November 23, 2016, and returning to Phoenix on Wednesday, November 30, 2016. Our plane tickets have been paid and could not be cancelled without a penalty.
- 4. Because of these travel plans, I respectfully request that the Court continue the scheduled November 28 hearing.

Case 2:16-cv-01969-NVW Document 27-1 Filed 11/21/16 Page 2 of 2

1	5. A continuance will also allow sufficient time for me to obtain information
2	so that I may answer fully the questions posed by the Court in its Order.
3	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America
4	that the foregoing is true and correct.
5	Executed on November 21, 2016 in Phoenix, Arizona.
6	
7	
8	s/ Peter Strojnik Peter Strojnik
9	Peter Strojnik
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

Exhibit G

du Mee, Matthew

From: Dennis Clancy <dclancy@ravlaw.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 2:39 PM

To: du Mee, Matthew

Subject: RE: Arbitration in CV2015-096056

Matthew – the arbitration date was chosen during a deposition on 1-18-17. Changing the time to 1:00 pm would be no problem at all. I expect the arbitration to last less than one hour. I have no problem changing the arbitration date although getting a new date before the 28th would likely be a problem for the Arbitrator as his schedule has been tough to crack. I will help out in any way possible. Mr. Strojnik is an interesting character.

From: du Mee, Matthew [mailto:Matthew.duMee@azag.gov]

Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 10:21 AM

To: 'dclancy@ravlaw.com'

Subject: Arbitration in CV2015-096056

Importance: High

Mr. Clancy,

I represent the Attorney General's office in CV2016-090506, where we have consolidated over a thousand cases related to alleged parking lot violations under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Mr. Strojnik is counsel of record on all of those cases.

In mid-January, Mr. Strojnik agreed to have oral argument on our motion to dismiss the consolidated cases on February 17 at 11 AM. Now, Mr. Strojnik has filed an emergency motion claiming that the oral argument needs to be moved because of the arbitration in your case.

Mr. Strojnik attached your notice of arbitration hearing (see attached). Can you please let me know:

- 1) Whether Mr. Strojnik agreed to this date and time for the arbitration (and if so, when he did so);
- 2) Whether it is possible to have the arbitration at 1 PM instead of 12:30 PM;
- 3) Whether it is possible (based on your schedule) to have the arbitration on a different date prior to the Feb. 28 arbitration deadline?

Based on the emergency nature of Mr. Strojnik's motion, it would be incredibly helpful to have this information today.

Thank you in advance for any assistance you can provide.

~Matthew

Matthew du Mée | Office of the Arizona Attorney General

Senior Litigation Counsel
Consumer Protection and Advocacy Section
1275 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
(602) 542-7731
MduMee@azag.gov

Exhibit H

Michael K Jeanes, Clerk of Court
*** Electronically Filed ***
E. Hailes, Deputy
8/29/2016 9:34:00 AM
Filing ID 7680525

1 RAVEN, CLANCY & McDONAGH, P.C. 182 NORTH COURT AVENUE 2 TUCSON, AZ 85701 (520) 628-8700 3 DENNIS J. CLANCY SBN 011425 4 dclanev@ravlaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff 5 6 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA 7 AHERN RENTALS, INC., a Nevada corporation, NO. CV2015-096056 8 Plaintiff, STIPULATION TO EXTEND 9 THE ARBITRATION **DEADLINE AND CONTINUE** v. 10 ON THE DISMISSAL CIRCUS ODELAY, LLC, an Arizona **CALENDAR** 11 limited liability company; ALEX CALLAN, in his individual capacity; [Assigned to Arbitrator Raymond S. 12 CORPORATIONS 1-10, Dietrich] 13 Defendants. [Assigned to Honorable David M. Talamante] 14 15 16 Plaintiff Ahern Rentals, Inc. and Defendants Circus Odelay, LLC and Alex Callanby and 17 through counsel undersigned, stipulate to an extension of the arbitration deadline and respectfully 18 request that this Court enter an Order continuing this matter on the dismissal calendar for the 19 reasons set forth: 20 1. The arbitrator was appointed May 13, 2016, setting the deadline to hold an 21 arbitration hearing of September 9, 2016. 22 2. The parties were in negotiations in an attempt to settle the matter and delayed 23 setting a hearing date for that reason. 24 25 DJC\kal\ 8185-256 \August 26, 2016 8:08am 26 Stip Ext Arb DDL.wpd

1	3. As the arbitration deadline approached, the arbitrator was contacted to set an
2	arbitration hearing.
3	4. The arbitrator's first available hearing date is the end of October, well past the
4	September 9, 2016 deadline to hold the hearing.
5	5. Pursuant to the 150 Day Order from the Court, a Joint Report and Proposed Joint
6	Scheduling Order, Rule 16(b)(c) or an Appeal from Arbitration are to be filed on or before
7	September 19, 2016.
8	Wherefore the parties stipulate to an extension of the deadline to hold the arbitration
9	hearing, setting the new deadline to hold the hearing of November 30, 2016, and request an Order
10	from this Court continuing the matter on the Dismissal Calendar until January 31, 2017.
11	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this <u>29</u> day of August 2016.
12	RAVEN, CLANCY & McDONAGH; P.C. STROJNIK, P.C.
13	By June 1 By June 1 Care
14	Dennis J. Claney Attorneys for Plaintiff Attorney for Defendants
15	
16	
17	Copy of the foregoing mailed/delivered this <u>39</u> day of August 2016, to:
18	RAYMOND SCOTT DIETRICH
19	ARBITRATOR 2355 E CAMELBACK RD STE 618
20	PHOENIX AZ 85016-9040
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Exhibit I

1 RAVEN, CLANCY & McDONAGH, P.C. 182 NORTH COURT AVENUE 2 **TUCSON, AZ 85701** (520) 628-8700 3 DENNIS J. CLANCY SBN 011425 4 dclancy@ravlaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff 5 6 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA 7 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA 8 AHERN RENTALS, INC., a Nevada corporation, NO. CV2015-096056 9 Plaintiff, MOTION TO EXTEND THE 10 ARBITRATION DEADLINE AND CONTINUE ON THE v. 11 DISMISSAL CALENDAR CIRCUS ODELAY, LLC, an Arizona 12 limited liability company; ALEX CALLAN, [Assigned to Arbitrator Raymond S. in his individual capacity; Dietrich] 13 CORPORATIONS 1-10. [Assigned to Honorable David M. 14 Defendants. Talamante] 15 16 Plaintiff Ahern Rentals, Inc. by and through counsel undersigned, submits this Motion 17 to Extend the Arbitration Deadline and Continue on the Dismissal Calendar and respectfully 18 requests that this Court enter an Order continuing this matter on the dismissal calendar for the 19 reasons set forth: 20 1. The arbitrator was appointed May 13, 2016, setting the deadline to hold an 21 arbitration hearing of September 9, 2016. 22 2. The parties submitted a Stipulation to extend the arbitration deadline on August 23 29, 2016 and an Order Extending Arbitration Deadline and Continuing Matter on Dismissal 24 25 DJC\kal\ 8185-256 \November 7, 2016 10:34am 26 Mot Ext Arb DDL.wpd

1	Calendar was entered on September 6, 2016. The arbitration deadline was extended to November
2	30, 2016 and the matter placed on the dismissal calendar for dismissal on January 31, 2017.
3	3. The arbitration hearing was set for October 25, 2016
4	4. On September 20, 2016, Plaintiff scheduled the deposition of Defendants for
5	October 12, 2016. Defendants failed to appear for the deposition as scheduled. Subsequently,
6	Plaintiff's counsel unsuccessfully attempted to resolve the discovery dispute and thereafter filed
7	a Motion for Sanctions on October 24, 2016.
8	5. Due to Defendants' failure to appear at the deposition, the arbitration hearing set
9	for October 25, 2016 was cancelled.
10	6. With the November 30, 2016 arbitration deadline approaching, Plaintiff's Motion
11	for Sanctions pending, Plaintiff's need to reschedule the deposition of Defendants, and the
12	difficulty of scheduling an arbitration hearing prior to the November 30, 2016 arbitration
13	deadline, Plaintiff is requesting the arbitration deadline be extended to <u>January 31, 2017</u> and the
14	matter be extended on the dismissal calendar until March 15, 2017.
15	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 7 th day of November 2016.
16	RAVEN, CLANCY & McDONAGH, P.C.
17	By /s/Dennis J. Clancy #011425
18	Dennis J. Clancy Attorneys for Plaintiff
19	
20	Copy of the foregoing mailed/delivered this 7 th day of November 2016, to:
21	PETER STROJNIK
22	STROJNIK PC 2415 EAST CAMELBACK RD STE 700
23	PHOENIX AZ 85016
24	
25	
26	DJC\kal\ 8185-256 \November 7, 2016 10:34am 2 Mot Ext Arb DDL.wpd

1	RAYMOND SCOTT DIETRICH
2	ARBITRATOR 2355 E CAMELBACK RD STE 618
3	PHOENIX AZ 85016-9040
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	DJC\kal\ 8185-256 \November 7, 2016 10:34am 3

Exhibit J

Michael K Jeanes, Clerk of Court

*** Electronically Filed ***

D. Sandoval, Deputy

12/16/2016 1:42:00 PM

Filing ID 7957821

1 2 Peter Strojnik, 6464 STROJNIK, P.C. 3 2375 East Camelback Road, Suite 600 4 Phoenix, Arizona 85016 Telephone: 602-524-6602 5 E-mail: ps@strojnik.com Attorney for Defendants 6 7 IN THE MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT STATE OF ARIZONA 8 9) NO. CV2015-096056 10 AHERN RENTALS, INC. a Nevada Corporation, STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME 11 Plaintiff,) Honorable David M. Talamante 12 13 VS. 14 CIRCUS ODELAY, LLC, an Arizona limited liability company; ALEX 15 CALLAN, in his individual capacity; **CORPORATIONS 1-10** 16 Defendants.) 17 18 Pursuant to the Court's December 12, 2016 ME, the parties have tentatively agreed to take 19 20 the 30(b)(6) deposition of Defendant on January 18, 2016. However, it will be logistically 21 difficult to schedule the arbitration prior to January 31, 2017 as currently ordered because 22 Counsel for Defense has a significant jury trial commencing on January 30, 2016 before the 23 Honorable Jo Lynn Gentry captioned Security Title Agency v. Lupypciw and Vegas Land, 24 25

1	CV2013-001159. Therefore, the parties stipulate to extend the time to complete the arbitration to
2	February 28, 2017.
3	The [Proposed] Order is appended hereto.
4	DATED this 14 TH day of December, 2016.
5	RAVEN, CLANCY & McDONAGH, P.C.
6	By /s/Dennis J. Clancy #011425
7	Dennis J. Clancy Attorneys for Plaintiff
8 9	STROJNIK, P.C.
10	/s/ Peter Strojnik
11	Peter Strojnik Counsel for Defendants
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18 19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	