- 1	
	Nancy Knight 1803 E. Lipan Circle Fort Mohave, AZ 86426 (928) 768-1537 nancyknight@frontier.co
	1803 E. Lipan Circle
	Fort Mohave, AZ 86426
	(928) 768-1537
	nancyknight@frontier.co
1	

FILED

2020 MAY -7 PM 3: 01

VIRLYNH TINKELL SUPERIOR COURT CLERK

Plaintiff Pro Per

# IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE

NANCY KNIGHT

Plaintiff.

**JANE** 

PARTNERSHIPS 1-10.

CORPORATIONS

GLEN LUDWIG and PEARL LUDWIG, Trustees of THE LUDWIG FAMILY TRUST;

AZARMI; JAMES B. ROBERTS and DONNA

M. ROBERTS, husband and wife; JOHN DOES

**DOES** 

Defendants.

1-10;

1-10;

and

**ABC** 

XYZ

10

1-10;

12

11

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

23

22

24

25

Case No.: CV 2018-04003

# FAIRWAY CONSTRUCTORS, INC.; MEHDI PLAINTIFF'S 4th SUPPLEMENTAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

(Assigned to the Hon. Lee Jantzen)

Plaintiff, Nancy Knight (hereinafter "Plaintiff"), through self-representation, pursuant to Rule 26.1 of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure, hereby submits her 4th Supplemental Disclosure Statement. Further investigation and discovery may bring to light additional information that may have a bearing on Plaintiff's claims. The contents of



9

17

21

23 24

25

this Disclosure Statement are provisional and subject to supplementation, amendment, explanation, change and amplification.

Clarification of abandonment and reversion to acreage. The Land Division Regulations for Mohave County, Arizona defines abandonment and reversion to acreage in Sec. 30-8. "The abandonment of ... public utility easements, or portions thereof, created by recorded subdivision plats, shall require the submittal of a petition of abandonment to the board of supervisors via the development services department." "The reversion to acreage of lots or parcels typically will be encountered when an applicant wishes to subdivide ...land that has previously been platted. The board may approve the reversion to acreage by resolution. It can be considered concurrently with a subdivision preliminary plat for that property."

In 1990 the process of creating a preliminary plat for Parcel VV and the sliver of Parcel KK was changed from possible cluster apartment development to the conditionally approved 25 lot scheme, with Desert Lakes' Special Development Zoning, and the land was designated as the alphabetically suffixed Tract 4076-E. Abandonment procedures were to be completed prior to final approval. **Exhibit A** – Resolution 90-362 and Prelim. Plat of Lipan Circle Loop Street.

The abandonment and reversion process began on April 1, 1991 "for a portion of Parcel KK (a public utility easement and drainage easement) and all of Parcel VV (a future multifamily property) shown on Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates Tract 4076-PLAINTIFF'S 4TH SUPPLEMENTAL DISCLOSURE - 2

B." The abandonment and reversion to acreage was intended to be designated Tract
4076-E upon recording a final plat. Exhibit B – Resolution 91-98

The preliminary subdivision plan for Tract 4076-E was approved for 23 lots with a change from a loop street to a cul-de-sac on July 1, 1991. **Exhibit C** – Resolution 91-185

Parcel VV was never abandoned from Tract 4076-B within the Desert Lakes Golf
Course and Estates Subdivision Tract 4076. **Exhibit D** – Photo of Desert Lakes Golf
Course and Estates Entrance Sign at Lipan Circle.

Several years passed without development and the plan was again changed for 32 lots that was given the designation of Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates Tract 4163 Unit E. Since the CC&Rs run with the land, these lots continued to be imposed with the Tract 4076-B CC&Rs.

Five-foot side yard setback shortfalls may be deemed in compliance for the purpose side yard setbacks are intended which is for air, light, and fire safety of adjacent structures. A zero-foot lot line is allowed when a total distance of ten feet exists between adjacent structures. Plaintiff's approximately 4.5 foot side yard setback is not out of compliance for the intended purpose since the adjacent neighbor's home is over twenty-five feet from the Plaintiff's home. **Exhibit E** – Page 2 Resolution 98-348

# I. FACTUAL BASIS FOR CLAIMS AND DEFENSES

Refer to the Plaintiff's prior Disclosures for Factual Basis of Claims and Defenses.

### II. LEGAL THEORY OF CLAIMS AND DEFENSES

Refer to prior Disclosures for past legal theory of claims.

Plaintiff has, since inception of the Complaint, maintained that Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates is a Master Planned Community. The factual basis for this claim is supported by State Law reference—A.R.S. § 32-2101 Definition 34. "Master planned community" means a development that consists of two or more separately platted subdivisions and that is either subject to a master declaration of covenants, conditions or restrictions, is subject to restrictive covenants sufficiently uniform in character to clearly indicate a general scheme for improvement or development of real property or is governed or administered by a master owner's association. (Underscored emphasis supplied as pertinent to Desert Lakes CC&Rs).

Indispensable parties: Abrogation of the CC&Rs through the Defendants' Motion requires the joining of 673 indispensable parties. **Exhibit F** – Excel Spreadsheet pages for Indispensable Parties.

In *Siler v. Superior Court*, 83 Ariz. 49, 54, 316 P.2d 296, 299 (1957); Ariz. R. Civ. P. 19. "Indispensable parties are those without whom the action cannot proceed".

In Gila Bend v. Walled Lake Door Co., 107 Ariz. 545, 549, 490 P.2d 551, 555 (1971). "In Arizona, the test of indispensability is whether the absent person's interest in the controversy is such that no final judgment or decree could be entered, doing justice between the parties

3

4 5

6 7

8 9

10

11

12

14

13

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

actually before the court and without injuriously affecting the rights of others not brought into the action."

In Wright v Incline Vill. Gen, Improvement Dist. 597 F. Supp. 2d, 1191, 1207 (D. Nev 2009) "In an action to set aside a lease or contract, all parties who may be affected by the determination of the action are indispensable.

In Karner v. Roy White Flowers, Inc 527 S.E.2d 40, 44 NC 2000 "It is only necessary to join other lot owners in an action to abrogate and not to enforce CC&Rs. All property owners affected by a restrictive covenant are necessary parties to an action to invalidate that covenant."

The original developer's purpose for the twenty-foot setbacks and wrought iron fencing design, front and rear, is for views. Views of the golf course and surrounding area and unobstructed views as people drive down our streets. According to GMC.com, pickup trucks can be as long as nineteen feet. Less than a twenty-foot driveway with a parked truck obstructs views and defeats the purpose for which a twenty-foot long driveway was intended.

Citizens for Covenant Compliance, an unincorporated association, appealed their case for rights to prosecution all the way to the California Supreme Court who reversed the Appeals Court decision in favor of Citizens. The California Supreme Court (1995) 12 Cal.4th 345 discussion on restrictions is relevant. "These subdivision restrictions are used to limit the type of buildings that can be constructed upon the property or the type of activity permitted on the property, prohibiting such things as commercial use or development within the tract, limiting the height of buildings, imposing setback restrictions, protecting views or imposing similar restrictions." (Emphasis supplied)

Remedy: When remedy is available, the Restatement Third of Property: Servitudes (section 7) supports prosecution and remedy of violations. A servitude, in this matter, is the right to restrict the use of land.

#### III. WITNESSES

Refer to prior Disclosures for any and all prior witnesses whose identity has been disclosed in Plaintiff's Initial Disclosure and her 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup> Supplemental Disclosures.

Additional witnesses in this 4<sup>th</sup> Supplemental Disclosure includes the Defendants' nine Affiants. They are expected to testify to all claims made in their affidavits and provide real evidence in support of those claims. Affidavits submitted with false statements of material issues in this case is a Class 4 Felony carrying a minimum sentence of one year in prison.

#### IV. PERSONS WITH KNOWLEDGE

Plaintiff is unaware at this time of new persons with knowledge since the filing of the Plaintiff's prior disclosures.

#### V. PERSONS WHO HAVE GIVEN STATEMENTS

All persons who have given statements are disclosed in Email Correspondences as Exhibits. Additional email communication with Gina Harris is attached regarding real estate advertising bragging of No HOA and lack of full disclosures regarding CC&Rs.

Exhibit G – Email: Gina Harris with copies to Realtor Terry Ayala.

# VI. EXPERT WITNESSES

Areas of expert witnesses have been disclosed. Names of some experts have been disclosed in prior disclosures with the Plaintiff reserving rights to add additional expert witnesses to the list.

#### VII. COMPUTATIONS AND MEASURE OF DAMAGES

All paragraphs submitted in the Plaintiff's prior Disclosures includes additional amounts found due by a jury and/or found due by judgment of the Court including sanctions.

Additional measures of damages includes ongoing Attorney consult fees.

Additional measures of damages for Plaintiff's lost opportunity costs for wages as a teacher and lost opportunity for full COVID 19 related unemployment compensation due to low wages in the State calculations for the 2020 benefit year. **Exhibit H** — Unemployment Compensation Denial Letter.

Pending are Plaintiff's attorney fees and costs incurred for Appeal or Trial pursuant to law and A.R.S. SS 12-349 and Rule 11, A.R.C.P. and contract law and any other applicable law together with interest on those sums, where applicable, at the legal rate from the date of Judgment until paid in full.

For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable in the premises. Amount at the discretion of Jury / Court.

Expert Witness Fees and Taxable Costs under §12-1364, Arizona Revised Statutes. To Be Determined.

Plaintiff reserves the right to\_supplement this Section of her Rule 26.1 Disclosure as additional information becomes known and available to Plaintiff.

## VIII. TRIAL EXHIBITS AND TANGIBLE EVIDENCE

In the event Plaintiff determines other tangible evidence and documents that are not provided herein, or previously disclosed, and as necessary, Plaintiff will supplement its Disclosure Statements accordingly.

# IX. VOLUMINOUS ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS

Email correspondences, not included in this Disclosure, are unknown to be pertinent to the Defendant's defense at this time; if needed at time of trial for Plaintiff's claims or Defendant's crossclaims, the pertinent information will be disclosed to the Defendant's attorney before trial.

In the event Plaintiff determines additional electronic or other documents are necessary, Plaintiff will supplement its Disclosure Statements accordingly.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 7th day of May, 2020.

NANCY KNIGHT

COPY of the foregoing emailed on this 7th day of May, 2020 to:

djolaw@frontiernet.net

Attorney for Defendants

Daniel J. Oehler, Esq.

Law Offices of Daniel J. Oehler

2001 Highway 95, Suite 15

Bullhead City, Arizona 86442