

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 COCHISE

Eli Dalton-Webb, Plaintiff v. CITY OF SIERRA VISTA, a municipal corporation in Arizona, OFFICER E. SLUSSER, R. Hertman, OFFICER S. McHunting, M. Partidge, peace officers of the Sierra Vista Police Department, Defendants	Case No. CV202400628 Assigned to: Hon. David Thorn Civil Rights Violations; Article 2 § 5 of the Arizona Constitution, etc. RE: Request to Reply to Defendant's Response To Motion to Strike
---	---

REQUEST TO REPLY

1. Plaintiff filed a Motion for Alternative Means of Service on 13 December 2024 with the filing titled "Response to Motion to Deny Application for Entry of Default; **MOTION FOR ALTERNATIVE SERVICE**; Motion for Sanctions". On 26 December 2024 the Defendant filed a "Defendants' reply in support of their objection to plaintiff's application for entry of default judgment and **RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR ALTERNATIVE SERVICE**". On 30 December 2024, Plaintiff filed a "Motion For Reconsideration; **MOTION TO STRIKE**; Reply to Defendants' Response to Motion for Sanctions". On 13 January 2025, Defendant filed a "Defendant's response to Plaintiff's motion to strike".

1 2. Basically, (1) Plaintiff filed a Rule 4.1(k) motion, (2) the Defendant
2
3 responded in opposition to it, and (3) Plaintiff asserted that Defendant had no
4
5 standing to file a response and filed a motion to strike, and (4) the Defendant
6
7 responded to the motion to strike.
8

9 2. Plaintiff wishes to reply to the Defendant's 13 January 2025 response to
10
11 motion to strike, pursuant to Rule 7.1(f)(2)(C), and hereby requests this Court to
12
13 allow the Plaintiff to reply to the Defendant's 13 January 2025 filing.
14

15 3. Plaintiff wishes to explain to this Court that Rule 12(f) is not the only
16
17 motion to strike, but there is at least another motion to strike under Rule 7.1(f).
18
19 Additionally, Plaintiff wishes to inform the Court the Defense Counsel has never filed
20
21 a Notice of Appearance for appearing in this Court to respond to the Rule 4.1(k)
22
23 Motion for Alternative Service, nor to respond to the Motion to Strike.
24
25

26 4. Plaintiff is not engaging in dilatory behavior, but the Defense is being
27
28 dilatory. They are trying to appear for the sole purpose of making sure that they
29
30 obstruct and frustrate this lawsuit. They don't want to be served. When Plaintiff
31
32 attempts to resolve service of process issues (Rule 4.1(k) alternative service motions),
33
34 they are "appearing but not appearing", and filing ridiculous "on behalf of the
35
36 Defendant City" filings instead of "behalf of the Defendant Officers". Defense
37
38 Counsel is trying to separate Defendant City and Defendant Officers to buy them
39
40 more time and frustrate this lawsuit and frustrate this Court, but then is trying to use
41
42 the City to respond on behalf of the Defendant Officers, which is ridiculous. With this
43
44 kind of logic, the Plaintiff could start filing stuff on behalf of the Defendants.
45
46
47
48

This will be sent to:

DGraffious@JSHFIRM.COM

CTevis@JSHFIRM.COM

CWong@jshfirm.com

MMolinario@Jshfirm.com

lbegnoche@courts.az.gov

JONES, SKELTON & HOCHULI P.L.C.
40 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2700
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

SIGNATURE

Submitted respectfully, this 21st day of January, 2025.



Eli Dalton-Webb