

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2019-015684

07/23/2021

HONORABLE JAMES D. SMITH

CLERK OF THE COURT
B. Lopez-Mori
Deputy

EDET EFFIONG ASUQUO

EDET EFFIONG ASUQUO
1701 W TUCKEY LN # 201
PHOENIX AZ 85015

v.

LA FUENTE CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION JONATHAN S WALLACK

JUDGE J. SMITH

MINUTE ENTRY

Defendant filed a motion asking the Court to declare Plaintiff a vexatious litigant. As our rules permit, Plaintiff responded on July 6, 2021. Also as our rules permit, Defendant filed a reply July 13, 2021.

But Plaintiff then filed the improper Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's Reply in Support of Motion to Designate Plaintiff a Vexatious Litigant (filed 07/19/2021). This is not the first time Plaintiff has filed an improper sur-reply. The Court again explains to Plaintiff that our rules allow: (1) a motion, (2) a response to the motion, and (3) a reply in support of the motion. Briefing is then complete, and neither party may file anything else on that topic without the Court's permission. Motion practice does not involve continuous supplements, responses, replies, and the like beyond those three submissions. The Court expects Mr. Asuquo to follow this order. If Mr. Asuquo again files an improper sur-reply (however denominated), then the Court will impose sanctions of \$250.00 on him. If Mr. Asuquo is uncertain about this order, then he must first review the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure. If he remains uncertain after reviewing the rules, then Mr. Asuquo should file a brief statement (no more than two pages and without any attachments) asking for clarification. Such a brief statement cannot level allegations against Defendant or its counsel.

IT IS SO ORDERED.