

1 Robert V. Wren, Esq.  
2 RITSEMA LAW  
3 410 N. 44<sup>th</sup> Street, Ste. 405  
4 Phoenix, AZ 85008  
5 (602) 888-0100  
6 (303) 297-2337 fax  
7 [bobby.wren@ritsemalaw.com](mailto:bobby.wren@ritsemalaw.com)  
8 Attorney for Defendants  
9

10 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA**  
11 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA**

12 **ELI DALTON-WEBB**

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 **INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF**  
16 **ARIZONA**

17 Defendant.

Case No.: **CV2025-035545**

**DEFENDANT’S RESPONSE TO  
REQUEST FOR RULING ON  
MOTION FOR EXPEDITED  
MANDAMUS RELIEF**

18 COMES NOW Defendant Industrial Commission of Arizona, by and through its  
19 attorney Bobby Wren of Ritsema Law, and hereby submits its Response to Request for  
20 Ruling on Motion for Expedited Mandamus Relief.

- 21
- 22 1. This matter involves Plaintiff’s demand for the Industrial Commission of  
23 Arizona to produce claim files of workers’ compensation matters maintained  
24 by the ICA pursuant to a public records request.  
25  
26

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

2. The ICA takes the position that the claim files are confidential as a matter of rule and statute, and therefore not subject to disclosure as public records.

3. Plaintiff's motion for mandamus relief seeks an index of records withheld. However, as Defendant previously advised Plaintiff, the index requirement only pertains to records that are considered public, but have been withheld for other reasons. This is not the case in this instance. The records Plaintiff is seeking are not public records in the first instance, and therefore there is no requirement to produce an index.

4. Even if an index is required, Plaintiff was notified that the specific records requested were being withheld pursuant to the confidentiality rules and statutes in the ICA's initial response dated October 8, 2025. In that response, the ICA specifically identified the requested documents by reference to Plaintiff's specific request, and responded with the basis for withholding those documents, if any were withheld. Given this response, no index is required, as Plaintiff is already aware of the documents that were not produced and the basis on which the ICA relied on for not producing them. [Exhibit A].

5. Because Plaintiff already has the information required by A.R.S. 39-121(D)(2), his motion should be denied.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

DATED this 4<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026.

RITSEMA LAW

By: /s/ Bobby Wren  
Bobby Wren, Esq.  
410 N. 44<sup>th</sup> Street, Ste. 405  
Phoenix, AZ 85008  
(303) 297-7297  
*Attorney for Defendant*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 4<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026, true and correct copies of the foregoing **DEFENDANT’S RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RULING ON MOTION FOR EXPEDITED MANDAMUS RELIEF** were served upon the following parties by email/facsimile/U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, addressed to the following:

VIA EMAIL: dw4az@proton.me  
Eli Dalton-Webb

VIA EFILE: AZ Turbo Court  
Superior Court of the State of Arizona  
County of Maricopa

/s/ Darla Banks