

1 Lisa Marx  
2 13610 N. 111<sup>th</sup> Ave.  
3 Sun City, AZ 85351  
4 602-748-7781  
5 aimtodogood@gmail.com  
6 Representing self

7 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA**  
8 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA**

9  
10 Lisa Marx  
11 Plaintiff,

Case No. CV 2025-012980

12 vs.

13 Tara Condominiums Association, Inc.,  
14 Defendant.

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE  
TO FILE REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S  
CONSOLIDATED RESPONSE AND  
OBJECTION TO PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY  
AND PERMANENT INJUNCTION  
OUT OF TIME PURSUANT TO  
ARIZONA RULE OF CIVIL  
PROCEDURE 6(b)(1)**

Honorable Randall H. Warner

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 Pursuant to Arizona Rule of Civil Procedure ("ARCP") 6(b)(1), Plaintiff Lisa Marx  
21 respectfully moves this Court for leave to file her Reply to Defendant Tara  
22 Condominium Association, Inc.'s Consolidated Response and Objection to Plaintiff's  
23 Motion for Preliminary and Permanent Injunction ("Reply") out of time. This motion is  
24 supported by the attached Affidavit of Lisa Marx, which establishes good cause and

1 excusable neglect for the delay, as required by ARCP 6(b)(1). The proposed Reply is  
2 attached as Exhibit A.

3 Defendant's Consolidated Response and Objection was filed on October 13, 2025.  
4 Pursuant to ARCP 7.1(a)(3), Plaintiff's Reply was due within 5 days (excluding  
5 weekends and holidays), or by October 20, 2025. As detailed in the attached Affidavit,  
6 Plaintiff was addressing emergency medical needs as an inpatient from October 10,  
7 2025, through October 21, 2025, and has been continuing outpatient treatment  
8 thereafter, which prevented timely filing. This constitutes good cause and excusable  
9 neglect under ARCP 6(b)(1) and Arizona case law (e.g., *Walker v. Kendig*, 107 Ariz.  
10 510, 489 P.2d 849 (1971) (good cause shown for medical emergencies)).

11 Granting this motion will not prejudice Defendant, as discovery is ongoing  
12 (commenced September 4, 2025), no trial date is set beyond October 14, 2026, and the  
13 Reply addresses only the merits of the underlying motion without introducing new  
14 evidence or claims. Denial would prejudice Plaintiff by preventing full briefing on her  
15 Motion for Preliminary and Permanent Injunction, especially given the imminent  
16 November 15, 2025, implementation of the disputed amendments. This Reply  
17 addresses issues consistent with Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Temporary  
18 Restraining Order (filed October 29, 2025), which incorporates post-October 15  
19 developments into the ongoing injunction request.

20 Plaintiff did not confer with opposing counsel pursuant to ARCP 7.1(h) due to futility,  
21 as evidenced by prior interactions and the adversarial nature of the Response and  
22 Objection.

23 A proposed form of order is attached as Exhibit B.

24 DATED: October 30, 2025.

1 Respectfully submitted,

2 /s/ Lisa Marx

3 Lisa Marx, Pro Per

4 13610 N. 111th Ave.

5 Sun City, AZ 85351

6 602-748-7781

7 [aimtodogood@gmail.com](mailto:aimtodogood@gmail.com)

8 **COPY of the foregoing e-mailed**

9 **This 30th day of October, 2025, to:**

10 Charles H. Oldham, Esq.

11 [Chuck.Oldham@chdblawn.com](mailto:Chuck.Oldham@chdblawn.com)

12 Ari Bowhay

13 ari.bowhay@chdblawn.com

14 By: Lisa Marx

15 /s/ Lisa Marx

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24