BY: 92 Pa

2018 MAY 21 PM 3: 41

VIÄLYKNITHIMELL SUPERIOR COURT CLERK

NANCY KNIGHT 1803 E. Lipan Circle Fort Mohave, Arizona 86426 (928) 768-1537 nancyknight@frontier.com

Plaintiff Pro Per

## IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

## IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE

NANCY KNIGHT,

Plaintiff.

vs.

GLEN LUDWIG and PEARL LUDWIG, Trustees of THE LUDWIG FAMILY TRUST; FAIRWAY CONSTRUCTORS, INC.; MEHDI AZARMI; JAMES B. ROBERTS and DONNA M. ROBERTS, husband and wife; JOHN DOES 1-10; JANE DOES 1-10; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-10; and XYZ PARTNERSHIPS 1-10.

Defendants

Case No.: CV 2018 04003

NOTICE OF LODGING FINDINGS AND ORDER COUNT 2

Honorable Derek Carlisle

Notice is hereby given that the attached Findings and Order for Count 2 of the

Plaintiff's Complaint has been Lodged with this Court on this date.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this  $\frac{3}{2}$  day of May, 2018

Nancy Knight

Plaintiff Pro Per

25

III BERKATAKENTAKENTAKEN

B8015CV201804003

l	COPY of the foregoing hand delivered this 3 15 day of May, 2018 to:
2	
3	The Law Office of Daniel Oehler
4	2001 highway 95, Suite 15 Bullhead City, Arizona 86442
5	Nation of the Client in Dullhard City
6	Notice of the filing in Bullhead City emailed to Mary King, District II
7	Lake Havasu City, AZ making@courts.az.gov
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

1 NANCY KNIGHT 2 (928) 768-1537 3 4 Plaintiff Pro Per 5 6 7 NANCY KNIGHT, 8 9 vs. 10 11 12 13 10. 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1803 E. Lipan Circle Fort Mohave, Arizona 86426 nancyknight@frontier.com

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

Plaintiff,

GLEN LUDWIG and PEARL LUDWIG, Trustees of THE LUDWIG FAMILY TRUST; FAIRWAY CONSTRUCTORS, INC.; MEHDI AZARMI; JAMES B. ROBERTS and DONNA M. ROBERTS, husband and wife; JOHN DOES 1-10; JANE DOES 1-10; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-10; and XYZ PARTNERSHIPS 1-

Defendants

Case No.: CV 2018 04003

PLAINITFF'S FINDINGS AND **ORDER COUNT 2** 

Honorable Derek Carlisle

The Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss alleging Plaintiff had no authority whatsoever to bring any claim for CC&R enforcement as her Tract 4163 had no CC&Rs and her home's builder, T&M Ranching and Development, was not imposed with any CC&R restrictions. The Court considered all of the evidence submitted by both sides including the Plaintiff's Response, The Defendant's Reply, and the Plaintiff's Objections to the Defendant's Reply and scheduled Oral Arguments in a Motion for Summary Judgment for April 2, 2018. The Court looked at the narrow issue whether the Plaintiff had

1

the authority to bring a claim and determined the Plaintiff had authority to bring a claim for Tract 4076B in Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates.

The Plaintiff appeared in person and the Defendants Ludwig, Azarmi, and Fairway Constructors appeared through their attorney, Daniel J. Oehler for Tract 4076B. The Court dismissed Count 1 (Violations of CC&Rs) for Tract 4076A at this time. The Court did not dismiss Count 2 (Injunctive Relief and all allegations for Violations of CC&Rs as cited for Count 2 in the original Complaint) for Tract 4076B.

## MEMORANDUM AND POINTS OF AUTHORITY

For each count included in the original Complaint, Plaintiff incorporated all other allegations and averments contained in the Complaint as though fully included and restated herein. For Count 2, which was not dismissed, the Plaintiff incorporated all allegations of Violations of CC&Rs cited in Count 1 as though fully set forth herein.

At all times, in the filing of the original Complaint, the Plaintiff believed there existed only one CC&R Declaration for Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates defined in accordance with her Title Insurance Policy as located in Book 1641.

Based on the evidence of Tract 4076A having a separate CC&R Declaration recorded in Book 1554, Count 1 (Violations of CC&Rs for Tract 4076A) was dismissed at that time and is pending whether Count 1 is dismissed with prejudice as the Defendant wishes or without prejudice as the Plaintiff wishes.

Based on the evidence of Tract 4163 being a resubdivision of parcel VV of Tract 4076B and given that parcels and lots are subject to the CC&Rs which run with the land, the Plaintiff was found to have authority to bring a claim for Tract 4076B.

The opposing counsel, Mr. Oehler, had a duty to assure his allegations of no CC&Rs for the Plaintiff's Tract 4076B were not frivolous. Mr. Oehler failed in his duty since he was the opposing counsel for case 2016 04026 whereby his signature was applied citing the Plaintiff's Tract 4163 was subject to Tract 4076B CC&Rs. What is required of lawyers, in accordance with ER 3.1 (2), is that they inform themselves about the facts of their clients' cases and the applicable law and determine that they can make good faith and nonfrivolous arguments in support of their clients' positions.

The Plaintiff's Oral Argument for the "attempt and/or threat to violate" is found in the Plaintiff's numerous references to the BOS Resolutions cited in the Complaint under "Allegations Common To All Counts" in Paragraphs 35-37 whereby the Plaintiff references the BOS Resolutions for reduced setbacks "revealed an attack specifically directed on Desert Lakes CC&Rs". It was revealed on April 4, 2018 that this attack was orchestrated at the request of the defendant Developer at a cost to the taxpayer of Mohave County in the amount of an estimated \$12,500 and, as evidenced by the BOS Resolution meeting minutes, with the full support of former Supervisor Moss.

While the Plaintiff was successful in her pleading to the BOS for denial of the setback reductions, the attempted violation needs to be punished and an injunction against

1	any future attempts by this defendant Developer for permits, variances, or future BOS
2	Resolutions needs to be adjudicated.
3	The Court made the following finding:
4	A. The Court found in favor of the Plaintiff that she does have the authority to asser
5	violations of signage on unimproved lots in Tract 4076B.
6	
7	B. The Court found in favor of the Plaintiff that she does have the authority to asser
8	other violations in Tract 4076B.
10	C. The CC&Rs for Tract 4076B says, "the violation or threatened or attempted
11	violation shall be lawful for any person or persons owning real property located with
12	the subdivision to prosecute"
13	NOW THEREFORE, THE COURT ENTERS THE FOLLOWING ORDERS
14	1. Immediate removal, not to exceed 10 days from the date of this Order, of al
15	signage on unimproved lots in Tract 4076B.
16	2. Injunction prohibiting any future placement of signage on unimproved lots in
17	Tract 4076B.
18	3. Injunction prohibiting the Defendants from violating CC&R Tract 4076E
19	provisions including but not limited to any future circumvention utilizing Mohave County
20	permits, variances, and BOS Resolutions.
22	
23	4. Compensation in the amount of \$2,019.40 for the Plaintiff's costs and legal
24	expenses as described in the Plaintiff's Affidavit of Costs or an amount of \$
25	as determined by the Court.
	4

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5. Reimbursement of taxpayer dollars in the amount of \$ to the Mohave County General Fund for the estimated costs incurred of \$12,500 as cited by Director Walsh of Mohave County Development Services for Mehdi Azarmi's request for the BOS Resolutions for setback reductions in Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates. 6. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable in the premises in the amount of \$ due to the frivolous claim that the Plaintiff had no authority whatsoever to bring any claim for CC&R enforcement. 7. Denial of any attorney fees to the Defendant under any rules of Section 12 of Arizona Civil Procedure given that the Plaintiff was justified in filing this action as evidenced by the interest of the Attorney General SIS and the FBI who advised this civil Complaint. At no time did the Plaintiff have knowledge that five separate Tract CC&Rs governed her Desert Lakes community. At no time did the Plaintiff believe that paragraph 22 on page 900 of Tract 4076B CC&Rs would not protect the entire Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates with any grammatical change necessary to protect the entire community as one subdivision rather than limit enforcement to an individual who owned property in only one of the five separate subdivisions. Nor did the Plaintiff believe that The Law on Property would not grant the Plaintiff rights to uphold CC&Rs unconditionally throughout Desert Lakes given that the entire tract of land that was subdivided into lots by Desert Lakes Development L.P. and encompassed approximately 300 acres subdivided for a Golf

Course, Clubhouse, Sewer Treatment Plant and over 700 homes would be at risk of blight

and because the mutuality of burden and benefit as between the grantees arising out of the imposition of such restrictions on the land itself would be limited to enforcement within small areas of the community. This mutuality of burden and benefit should constitute reciprocal promises between all the grantees, each supported by that of the other and not to the benefit of one Developer who egregiously caused an attempt to violate the rights of hundreds of Desert Lakes property owners. 8. If approved by the Court as initialed for this item, the Plaintiff will submit a Declaratory Judgment relieving all property owners subject to the CC&Rs for Tract 4076B in Desert Lakes Golf Course and Estates from any liability for violations of CC&Rs or County setbacks that occurred before the purchase of that property and that are not the fault **RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED** this day of May, 2018. Plaintiff Pro Per Honorable Derek Carlisle