

**Arizona Supreme Court**  
**Civil Petition for Review - Juvenile**

**CV-24-0025-PR**

**IN RE DEPENDENCY OF M.R.**

**Appellate Case Information**

Case Filed: **8-Feb-2024** Archive on: 1-Jul-2034 (planned)  
 Case Closed: **1-Jul-2024**

**Dept/Composition**

**Side 1. GELLIANA R., MARCELLA R., RICHARD R., Appellant**  
 (Litigant Group) GELLIANA R., MARCELLA R., RICHARD R.

- Gelliana R. PRO SE
- Marcella R. PRO SE
- Richard R. PRO SE

**Side 2. DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SAFETY, Appellee**  
 (Litigant Group) DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SAFETY

- Department of Child Safety
- Attorneys for: Appellee**  
 Dawn Rachelle Williams, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 20730)

**CASE STATUS**

Jul 1, 2024.....**Case Closed**                      Jul 1, 2024.....**Decision Rendered**

PREDECESSOR CASE(S)	Cause/Charge/Class	Judgment/Sentence	Judge, Role <Comments>	Trial	Dispo
2 CA	2 CA-JV 23-0134				
↪ PIN	JD201700116		Delia Reeves Neal, Judge on PC Comments: (none)		

**CASE DECISION**

**01-Jul-2024 ORDER**

ORDERED: Request for Oral Argument (Treated as a Petition for Review) = DENIED.

Filed: **01-Jul-2024**                      Mandate:

A panel composed of Vice Chief Justice Timmer, Justice Bolick, Justice Lopez and Justice Beene participated in the determination of this matter.

Decision Disposition
<b>Denied</b>

**7 PROCEEDING ENTRIES**

1. 8-Feb-2024 FILED: Request for Oral Argument (Treated as a Petition for Review); Certificate of Service; Certificate of Compliance; Appendix (Appellants Gelliana R., et al., Pro Se)
2. 12-Feb-2024 FILED: Record from CofA: Link to Electronic Record
3. 13-Mar-2024 The Clerk of the Supreme Court having been authorized by the Supreme Court to order any party to file a response to a petition for review at the direction of a Supreme Court staff attorney,  
  
IT IS ORDERED that no response to the petition for review is necessary. The Court will consider the petition for review in due course. (Tracie K. Lindeman, Clerk)
4. 1-Jul-2024 ORDERED: Request for Oral Argument (Treated as a Petition for Review) = DENIED.  
  
A panel composed of Chief Justice Timmer, Vice Chief Justice Lopez, Justice Bolick, and Justice Beene participated in the determination of this matter.  
-----
5. 8-Jul-2024 FILED: Petition to Vacate Void Judgements Based on Fraud and Insufficient Service of Process, Request En Banc Review; Certificate of Service; Certificate of Compliance (Appellants Gelliana R., et al., Pro Se)

**Arizona Supreme Court**  
**Civil Petition for Review - Juvenile**

**CV-24-0025-PR**

**IN RE DEPENDENCY OF M.R.**

**7 PROCEEDING ENTRIES**

6. 8-Jul-2024 FILED: Motion to File Petition Exceeding Word Limit Due to Complexity of Fraud on Case; Certificate of Service (Appellants Gelliana R., et al., Pro Se)
7. 11-Jul-2024 On July 1, 2024, this Court denied Appellants' petition for review. On July 8, 2024, Appellants Richard R., et al., pro se, filed their "Petition to Vacate Void Judgements Based on Fruad [sic] and Insufficient Service of Process; Request En Banc Review" which the Court is treating as a Motion for Reconsideration of the denial of the petition for review. On July 8, 2024, Appellants also filed a "Motion to File Petition Exceeding Word Limit Due to Complexity of Fraud on Case." In accordance with Arizona Rule of Civil Appellate Procedure 22(f), no party may file a motion for reconsideration of an order denying a petition for review. Therefore,
- IT IS ORDERED denying Appellants' Motion for Reconsideration.
- FURTHER IT IS FURTHER ORDERED denying Appellants' "Motion to File Petition Exceeding Word Limit Due to Complexity of Fraud on Case" as moot. (Hon. Kathryn H. King)
-