Clerk of the Superior Court \*\*\* Electronically Filed \*\*\* T. Hays, Deputy 1/20/2022 4:22:23 PM Filing ID 13843852

1		
1 2	Wilenchik & Bartness	
	—— A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION ——	
3	Attorneys at Law	
4	The Wilenchik & Bartness Building 2810 North Third Street Phoenix, Arizona 85004	
5	Telephone: 602-606-2810 Facsimile: 602-606-2811	
6	Dennis I. Wilenchik, #005350 John "Jack" D. Wilenchik, #029353	
7	Jordan C. Wolff, #034110	
8	admin@wb-law.com	
9	Attorneys for Defendant Cyber Ninjas, Inc.	
10	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA	
	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA	
11		
12	AMERICAN OVERSIGHT,	Case No. CV2021-008265 Case No.: LC2021-00180-001
13	Plaintiff,	
14	VS.	<b>OBJECTION AND MOTION</b>
15	KAREN FANN, et al.	TO RECONSIDER
16	Defendents and	
17	Defendants, and	
18	CYBER NINJAS, INC.,	(Assigned to the Honorable Judge Kemp)
	<b>Real Party in Interest.</b>	
19		
20	PHOENIX NEWSPAPERS, INC., an	
21	Arizona corporation, and KATHY	
22	TULUMELLO,	
23	Plaintiffs,	
24	vs.	
25	ARIZONA STATE SENATE, a public body	
26	of the State of Arizona; KAREN FANN, in	
27	her official capacity as President of the Arizona State Senate; WARREN	
	PETERSEN, in his official capacity as the	
28	Chairman of the Arizona Senate Committee	

on the Judiciary; SUSAN ACEVES, in her official capacity as Secretary of the Arizona State Senate; and CYBER NINJAS, INC.;

**Defendants**, and

CYBER NINJAS, INC.,

**Real Party in Interest.** 

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Undersigned counsel is in receipt of this Court's January 18<sup>th</sup> Order granting Plaintiff
American Oversight's January 8<sup>th</sup> Motion to Compel and awarding \$1,000 in attorneys' fees to
American Oversight on the Motion. CNI hereby moves to reconsider the award of fees. Because
CNI was not afforded the time under the Rules to file a response to the Motion (which would be
January 31<sup>st</sup>) and there was no order providing for expedited briefing, CNI has not been heard on
the matter and this Objection and Motion are proper. Ariz.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)(3); A.R.S. Const. Art.
2 § 4.

Fees should be not be awarded against CNI because (1) the deposition notice for January 5<sup>th</sup> violated Rule 26(f), which provides that a party may not seek discovery from any source before 16 it serves its initial disclosure statement, "[u]nless the court orders otherwise for good cause"; (2) 17 to date, Plaintiff has not served an initial disclosure statement, and as of January 5th the Court had 18 not ordered a deposition; (3) there was no meet-and-confer pursuant to Rules 26(i) and 7.1(h) on 19 the subject of setting another deposition prior to Plaintiff's Motion to Compel; and (4) CNI 20notified Plaintiff more than 24 hours in advance of the deposition that nobody would be appearing 21 and so there should be no deposition costs. CNI also advised Plaintiff that the deposition notice 22 violated Rule 26(f) before Plaintiff motioned this Court to set another deposition. Finally, to the 23 extent it could be argued that Rule 26(f) does not apply because this is a special action: there is in 24fact no discovery allowed in a special action absent a court order; and again, the Court did not 25 order any deposition on January 5<sup>th</sup>. See Special Action Rules, Rule 4(f)("[i]f a triable issue of 26 fact is raised in an action under this Rule, it shall be tried subject to special orders concerning 27

28

discovery"); see also Riggins v. Graham, 20 Ariz. App. 196, 198, 511 P.2d 209, 211 (1973).<sup>1</sup>
Plaintiff was also specifically advised of this provision of the Rules of Special Actions before
motioning the court for another deposition and the fees award. The Court's award of \$1,000 for
the Motion to Compel is therefore unwarranted, and CNI asks the Court to reverse the award of
fees. Finally, the parties have conferred and Plaintiff has agreed to make proper disclosures before
any deposition, including disclosure of all documents that it intends to question Logan/CNI about.
CNI also reserves the right to object to deposition scope if and as appropriate.

**RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED** January 20, 2022.

## WILENCHIK & BARTNESS, P.C.

/s/ John "Jack" D. Wilenchik Dennis I. Wilenchik, Esq. John "Jack" D. Wilenchik, Esq. Jordan Wolff, Esq. 2810 North Third Street Phoenix, AZ 85004 admin@wb-law.com Attorneys for Cyber Ninjas, Inc.

ELECTRONICALLY filed January 20, 2022,
 via AZTurboCourt.com

 18 COPY electronically transmitted by the Clerk of the Court via AZTurboCourt.com
 19 to the Honorable Michael Kemp

<sup>1</sup> "There is neither case law not comment which sheds much light as to the scope of discovery in special actions. The 1969 State Bar Committee note states as follows: . . . Discovery in special action proceedings may be necessary in particular circumstances, though it will certainly not be routinely required...The Rule gives necessary latitude to allow discovery in those rare instances when it is necessary. Rule 4(a) places the burden of determining this question where it belongs—on the trial court. That court in its discretion determines whether discovery is to be had and, if so, the type and degree. The very nature of a special action is a unique remedy designed for an unusual set of circumstances where the speedy determination of the issue is of prime consideration. To allow a wide range of discovery, attendant with the delays involved, would tend to defeat the very purpose of a special action." Emphasis added.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

20

21

**ELECTRONICALLY** served January 20, 2022 via 1 AZTurboCourt.com and emailed upon: 2 Keith Beauchamp, Esq. 3 Roopali H. Desai, Esq. 4 D. Andrew Gaona, Esq. **COPPERSMITH BROCKELMAN PLC** 5 2800 North Central Avenue, Suite 1900 Phoenix, Arizona 85004 6 kbeauchamp@cblawyers.com rdesai@cblawyers.com 7 agaona@cblawyers.com 8 Attorneys for American Oversight 9 Kory Langhofer, Esq. 10 Thomas Basile, Esq. STATECRAFT PLLC 11 649 N. Fourth Ave., 1<sup>st</sup> Fl. 12 Phoenix, Arizona 85003 kory@statecraftlaw.com 13 tom@statecraftlaw.com  $14 \| Attorneys for Senate \overline{De} fendants$ 15 David J. Bodney, Esq. Craig C. Hoffman, Esq. 16 BALLARD SPAHR LLP 17 1 East Washington Street, Suite 2300 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2555 18 bodneyd@ballardspahr.com hoffmanc@ballardspahr.com 19 Attorneys for Phoenix Newspapers, Inc. and Kathy Tulumello 20By: /s/ Christine M. Ferreira 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

WILENCHIK & BARTNESS