

1 **JELLISON LAW OFFICES, PLLC**  
2 18801 North Thompson Peak Parkway  
3 Suite D235  
4 Scottsdale, Arizona 85255  
5 Telephone: 480.659.4244  
6 JAMES M. JELLISON, ESQ., #012763  
7 E: jim@jim@jellisonlaw.com  
8 E: admin@jellisonlaw.com  
9 *Counsel for Defendant City of Prescott*

10  
11  
12 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA**  
13  
14 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI**

15 ELI DALTON-WEBB,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 CITY OF PRESCOTT, a municipal  
19 corporation in Arizona; OFFICER  
20 CARON (#517); OFFICER TRUILLO;  
21 SGT. GERLACH; LT. NOVAK;  
22 OFFICER BRAMBILA; CHIEF  
23 BONNEY, peace officers of the Prescott  
24 Police Department, JOHN DOESI-X;  
25 JANE DOES I-X; ABC  
26 CORPORATIONS 8-X; XYZ  
27 PARTNERSHIPS I-X; UNKNOWN  
28 ENTITIES I-X,

Defendants.

Case No. S1300CV202500445

**DEFENDANT CITY OF PRESCOTT'S  
PORTION OF RULE 16(c) JOINT  
REPORT AND PROPOSED  
SCHEDULING ORDER**

(Assigned to Honorable John Napper)

1 Defendant City of Prescott,<sup>1</sup> by and through counsel, submits the following in  
2 response to the Court's Order filed on March 6, 2026, as well as Plaintiff's filing dated  
3 May 4, 2026.<sup>2</sup>

4 **Defendant's Witnesses:**

5 Defendant anticipates calling the following witnesses:

- 6 • The individually named Defendant officers who have been dismissed as parties;
- 7 • Any additional Prescott Police Department personnel involved in or with knowledge  
8 of the May 22, 2024 incident;
- 9 • City of Prescott employees with knowledge of the adoption, interpretation, and  
10 enforcement of the City Code provisions at issue;
- 11 • Custodians of records for the City of Prescott;
- 12 • Any witnesses identified by Plaintiff;
- 13 • Any rebuttal or impeachment witnesses as may be necessary.

14 Defendant reserves the right to supplement its witness list pursuant to Rule 26.1.

15 **Defendant's Depositions:**

16 Defendant anticipates taking the following depositions:

- 17 • Plaintiff;
- 18 • Plaintiff's supervisor for his employment at time of the incident;
- 19 • Any witnesses identified in Plaintiff's disclosures;

---

20  
21 <sup>1</sup> Pursuant to this Court's Order dated February 19, 2026, all Individual Defendants  
22 have been dismissed from this case.

23 <sup>2</sup> On May 1, 2026, Plaintiff (pro per) emailed defense counsel at 8:21 a.m. regarding  
24 the Joint Report. Defense counsel responded at 9:35 a.m. requesting a draft and offering a  
25 telephonic meeting on May 4, 2026 sometime in the late morning or early afternoon.  
26 Plaintiff replied at 11:00 a.m. that he was working on his portion and would send it shortly  
27 and later left a voicemail at 12:09 p.m. while defense counsel was out of the office. On  
28 May 4, 2026, at 2:25 p.m., Plaintiff emailed that he would file unilaterally if he did not  
hear from defense counsel. Plaintiff thereafter filed his portion at 11:57 p.m. Undersigned  
never received Plaintiff's draft of the Joint Report to add Defendant's portions.

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  
27  
28

- Any third parties with knowledge of the events at issue;
- Any expert witnesses disclosed by Plaintiff.

Defendant further anticipates that the scope of discovery should be limited to matters relevant to Plaintiff’s claims and Defendant’s defenses and should not extend to broad or speculative inquiries into unrelated City policies, community perceptions, or generalized “secondary effects” absent a showing of relevance and proportionality.

**Defendant’s Disclosures:**

Defendant anticipates disclosing:

- Police reports, incident reports, and related documentation concerning the May 22, 2024 incident;
- Any available audio/video recordings (if any exist);
- Relevant City Code provisions;
- Policies and procedures, to the extent relevant and non-privileged;
- Any other materials required under Rule 26.1.

Defendant will produce responsive, non-privileged materials consistent with its disclosure obligations.

**Defendant’s Position Regarding Discovery Tier:**

Defendant asserts that Tier 1 is appropriate.

As reflected in Plaintiff’s own filing, the alleged damages appear limited, or even non-existent, and primarily consists of non-economic claims. The issues presented are not complex and do not justify the expansive and burdensome discovery contemplated by Plaintiff, including wide-ranging depositions of City officials, residents, and unrelated third parties.

Plaintiff’s proposed Tier 3 discovery is disproportionate to the needs of the case and appears designed to explore generalized policy issues rather than the specific facts underlying Plaintiff’s claims.

**Defendants’s Position Regarding Plaintiff’s Proposed Stipulations:**

Defendant does not agree to Plaintiff’s proposed stipulations at this time.

1 Several proposed stipulations:

- 2 • Contain disputed facts;
- 3 • Mischaracterize the conduct of the Defendant's officers;
- 4 • Seek legal conclusions rather than factual agreements;
- 5 • Are incomplete and lack necessary context.

6 Defendant is willing to meet and confer regarding appropriate, limited stipulations  
7 following initial disclosures.

8 **Defendant's Position on Scheduling:**

9 Defendant objects to Plaintiff's proposed schedule to the extent it is based on Tier  
10 3 discovery and overly broad discovery assumptions.

11 Defendant proposes the following alternative schedule:

- 12 • **Initial Disclosures:** within 40 days of the Court's order
- 13 • **Non-Expert Disclosures:** 60 days after initial disclosures
- 14 • **Written Discovery Deadline:** 60 days after initial disclosures
- 15 • **Fact Depositions Completed:** 90 days after initial disclosures
- 16 • **Expert Disclosures (if any):** 90 days after initial disclosures
- 17 • **All Discovery Completed:** 150 days after initial disclosures
- 18 • **Dispositive Motions:** 30 days after close of discovery
- 19 • **Proposed Trial Date:** to be set by the Court (approximately 6-9 months after close  
20 of discovery)
- 21 • **Length of Trial:** 2-3 days

22 **Settlement / ADR:**

23 Defendant believes that a settlement conference or mediation would be premature  
24 at this stage and would be more productive after the completion of initial disclosures and  
25 Plaintiff's deposition.

26 **Other Matters:**

27 Defendant remains willing to meet and confer in good faith regarding appropriate  
28 scheduling moving forward.

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  
27  
28

**WHEREFORE**, the undersigned respectfully requests that the Court grant this Motion and permit Attorney James Jellison to appear at the scheduled oral argument remotely, and for such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DATED this 5<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2026.

JELLISON LAW OFFICES, PLLC

/s/ James M. Jellison  
James M. Jellison, Esq.  
*Counsel for Defendant City of Prescott*

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  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF FILING & SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on May 5, 2026 I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk’s Office using the TurboCourt System for filing with e-service and mail on the following:

Eli Dalton-Webb  
5009 E. Ironwood Circle  
Sierra Vista, Arizona 85650  
E: [dw4az@proton.me](mailto:dw4az@proton.me)  
*Plaintiff pro se*

By: /s/ Valerie Hall