FILED
DONNA McQUALITY
CLERK, SUPERIOR COURT
08/05/2025 12:27AM
BY: EHERMSTAD
DEPUTY

Eli Dalton-Webb
5009 E. Ironwood Circle
Sierra Vista, Arizona 85650
email: dw4az@proton.me
Plaintiff

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI

Eli Dalton-Webb, Plaintiff v. CITY OF PRESCOTT, a municipal corporation in Arizona, OFFICER CARON (#517), OFFICER TRUJILLO, SGT. GERLACH, LT. NOVAK, OFFICER BRAMBILA, CHIEF BONNEY, peace officers of the Prescott Police Department, et al., Defendants	Case No. S-1300-CV-202500445 Division: A, Hon. Kristyne Schaaf-Olson Civil Rights Violations; Article 2 § 6 of the Arizona Constitution; A.R.S. § 32-1101.01; etc. RE: Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Motion to Dismiss

1. On 4 August 2025, Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss. Civil Procedure Rule 7.1(a)(3) provides for a response "within 10 days". Considering that Defendants served it via electronic means, pursuant to Civil Procedure Rule 6, the deadline to file a response to the Motion to Dismiss is 25 August 2025. Technically, the Defendant could serve the Motion to Dismiss under Rule 5(c)(2)(A) or (B) some time today on 5 August 2025 and move up the deadline to 19 August 2025 if they so chose.

2. Plaintiff wishes to make complex legal arguments regarding the Notice of Claim issue. John Simon from Simon v. Maricopa Med. Ctr., 225 Ariz. 55 terribly litigated his case. John Simon was a homeless man who could not put a quality

lawsuit together. In the trial court, the defense attorneys had trouble understanding what his claim was about, much of the lawsuit was handwritten, and for an obvious example, John Simon tried citing California rules of procedure inside of an Arizona court. The lawsuit was mostly void of citing statutes and caselaw.

3. Plaintiff wishes to file the highest quality possible response to the motion to dismiss to preserve the court record so that it doesn't have to be said in oral argument. He wishes to make arguments that John Simon did not present to either the trial court nor the Court of Appeals. For example, Simon did not appear to argue that Simon was an indigent person and argue that the Notice of Claim requirements violated his rights under Article 2 § 13 of the Arizona Constitution.

4. Plaintiff hereby requests an extension of time to respond to the motion to dismiss. Plaintiff requests to respond to the motion to dismiss to be extended to 3 September 2025, considering that he wants to prepare for complex legal arguments.

5. Plaintiff hereby notifies the Court and Defendants that he may consider filing a motion for leave to amend the complaint later on.

6. Order proposal is attached.

A COPY OF THIS WILL BE SENT TO:

rebecca@jellisonlaw.com
jim@jellisonlaw.com

Submitted respectfully this day, 5 August 2025,

/s/Eli Dalton-Webb

Plaintiff