

2013 AUG 19 AM 9:27 ✓

SANDRA E. HARRIS, CLERK
BY: Bechee

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

FAVOUR & WILHELMSSEN, PLLC
Post Office Box 1391
Prescott, AZ 86302
928-445-2444 – Telephone
928-771-0450 – Facsimile
FMWlaw@fmwlaw.net
David K. Wilhelmsen 007112
Lance B. Payette 007556

Attorneys for Property Owner James Varilek

**SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
YAVAPAI COUNTY**

JOHN B. CUNDIFF and BARBARA C.
CUNDIFF, husband and wife; ELIZABETH
NASH, a married woman dealing with her
separate properly; KENNETH PAGE and
KATHRYN PAGE, as Trustee of the
Kenneth Page and Catherine Page Trust,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DONALD COX and CATHERINE COX,
husband and wife, et al., et ux.,

Defendants.

Case No. CV 2003-0399

Division 4

(Assigned to Hon. Kenton Jones)

**JAMES VARILEK'S REPLY TO
RESPONSE AND OBJECTION TO
PLAINTIFFS' REQUESTS FOR
AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES**

In replying to Defendants' self-described "monumental" *Response and Objection*, aligned Plaintiff property owner James Varilek ("Varilek") does not feel the need to burden the Court with a similarly monumental effort of his own. Defendants are understandably irritated that the last two of their affirmative defenses have turned into pumpkins and that Plaintiffs' and Varilek's victory is now complete; the *Response and Objection* reflects their anger as well as their desperation to avoid paying the attorney fees that they have caused Plaintiffs and Varilek to incur. Varilek simply urges the Court to keep in mind a few indisputable truths that effectively eviscerate everything Defendants have to say. Before addressing those truths, however, Varilek first wishes to clarify a few points specifically regarding his application for attorney fees:

1 **Varilek is responsible for the payment of his attorney fees.** The portion of the
2 *Response and Objection* in which Defendants contend that non-party Alfie Ware is
3 underwriting Plaintiffs' legal fees has no application to Varilek. Varilek is responsible for
4 paying his own attorney fees pursuant to a written fee agreement, and there has been no
5 discussion of Mr. Ware paying or reimbursing any of the attorney fees incurred by
6 Varilek.

7 **Varilek seeks an award of his attorney fees only as against Defendants Cox.**
8 Varilek seeks an award of attorney fees only as against Defendants Cox and not against
9 the other Defendants who have simply ridden the Coxes' coattails. This is made clear in
10 the form of *Final Judgment* that Plaintiffs and Varilek have lodged with the Court, in
11 which attorney fees would be awarded only as against the Coxes. It was the Coxes'
12 violation of the Declaration of Restrictions that precipitated this litigation, and it was the
13 Coxes' persistence in their misguided affirmative defenses of waiver and abandonment
14 that caused this litigation to drag on for many more years than it should have. The other
15 Defendants have either taken no active role or merely joined in the Coxes' filings and
16 have not caused Varilek to incur additional attorney fees. Varilek thus believes it would
17 be unfair for an award of his attorney fees to be entered against any of the Defendants
18 other than the Coxes.

19 **Varilek's agreement to dismiss his complaint against Veres in No.**
20 **P1300CV20090822 included no promise to refrain from participating in No.**
21 **P1300CV20030399.** Illustrative of Defendants' desperation and the depths to which they
22 will sink is the absurd statement at pages 40-41 of the *Response and Objection*, "After the
23 *Varilek v. Veres* case [No. P1300CV20090822] was consolidated with this case [No.
24 P1300CV20030399], they stipulated to dismissal with each party to bear their own
25 attorneys' fees, costs and expenses. In doing so, we believe that Varilek essentially agreed
26 to take a back-seat position in this case to allow the Court to render a final decision and
27 with both to be subject to that decision."
28

1 The *Stipulation to Dismiss Without Prejudice* in No. P1300CV20090822 was filed
2 on February 27, 2013, and the Court’s order of dismissal was entered on March 6, 2013 –
3 some two months *after* Varilek had filed his joinder in Plaintiffs’ *Motion for Summary*
4 *Judgment* in No. P1300CV20030399 (and a month *after* Veres himself had filed his
5 response and controverting statement of facts)! Defendants did not have and could not
6 have had any understanding that Varilek would “take a back-seat position” in this
7 litigation, nor did Varilek “essentially agree” to anything of the kind, and Defendants’
8 suggestion that he should be denied an award of attorney fees on this basis serves only to
9 illustrate their desperation and the depths to which they will sink.

10 Varilek did not “consistently [take] the position that he was not properly
11 joined as a party to the litigation.” A further illustration of Defendants’ desperation is
12 provided by their argument at page 35 of the *Response and Objection* that Varilek cannot
13 be a “successful party” within the meaning of A.R.S. § 12-341.01(A) because he
14 “consistently took the position that he was not a party to the litigation.” Defendants
15 provide no examples of Varilek “consistently taking” such a position because *there are*
16 *none*. The issue as to whether joinder had been properly accomplished was first raised by
17 Varilek in his *Motion to Require Defendants Cox to Serve the Indispensable Parties with*
18 *Documents Comporting with Due Process*, which was filed on April 8, 2013 – some three
19 months *after* Varilek had joined in Plaintiffs’ *Motion for Summary Judgment*.¹

20 Judge Mackey’s *Notice* of June 15, 2010 that was served on the indispensable
21 parties notified them that the Court would determine from the nature of their responses
22 whether they should be aligned with the Plaintiffs or the Defendants. Varilek was
23 subsequently aligned with Plaintiffs and thereafter consistently took an active role in
24 supporting Plaintiffs’ positions without the faintest suggestion that he “was not a party to
25 the litigation.” He believes that his filings in support of Plaintiffs’ *Motion for Summary*

26 ¹ Varilek, through his counsel, had previously expressed concern as to whether the service on
27 the indispensable parties comported with due process, but his motion was the first formal
28 expression of this concern – and he certainly never took the position that he was not a party to
the litigation.

1 *Judgment* were instrumental in the Court's decision to grant the motion. Varilek is clearly
2 a "successful party" within the meaning of § 12-341.01(A), and Defendants' suggestion to
3 the contrary serves only to illustrate their desperation.

4 In short, Varilek is a successful party within the meaning of § 12-341.01(A)
5 because he participated actively in this litigation in support of Plaintiffs and contributed
6 significantly to their victory on their *Motion for Summary Judgment*. The determination
7 of successful parties is within the discretion of the Court, is reviewable only for an abuse
8 of discretion, and will be upheld if there is any reasonable basis to support it. *Maleki v.*
9 *Desert Palms Professional Properties, LLC*, 222 Ariz. 327, 334, 214 P.3d 415, 422 (App.
10 2009).

11 Varilek will now turn to the indisputable truths that eviscerate Defendants'
12 *Response and Objection*:

13 **Plaintiffs and Varilek have been as "successful" as they possibly could have**
14 **been.** In the *Response and Objection*, Defendants spend an inordinate amount of time on
15 bizarre arguments to the effect that Plaintiffs and Varilek have not really been all that
16 successful. In fact, Plaintiffs have prevailed on precisely what they sought to establish by
17 the filing of their *First Amended Complaint* – i.e., that the Declaration of Restrictions of
18 Coyote Springs Ranch is enforceable against the Coxes and that the Coxes' use of their
19 property for a tree farm violates the Declaration. In so doing, Plaintiffs and Varilek have
20 prevailed against every affirmative defense asserted by the Coxes – estoppel, laches,
21 unclean hands, waiver and abandonment. When Defendants state at pages 2-3 of the
22 *Response and Objection* that "Plaintiffs' fee request does not 'demonstrate a thoughtful
23 and deliberate review of client billings to expunge excessive or duplicative time and to
24 eliminate work related to issues or claims on which they did not prevail' as is required,"
25 the short answer is: *There were no issues or claims on which Plaintiffs and Varilek did*
26 *not prevail.*

27 Defendants seemingly have some odd notion that 10+ years of litigation must be
28 scrutinized for purposes of § 12-341.01(A) on a motion-by-motion and minute entry-by-

1 minute entry basis, with every minor ruling in their favor being a “non-success” by
2 Plaintiffs and thus excludable from the award of attorney fees. This is why, in
3 Defendants’ minds, the preparation of the *Response and Objection* required them to
4 “revisit virtually every event that occurred in the case over that time period and to review
5 each and every motion, disclosure statement, discovery request and response, minute
6 entry and ruling” (*Response and Objection* at pages 2-3).

7 This is simply not the law, and Defendants simply wasted their time in conducting
8 their microscopic review. The seminal *China Doll* decision makes this clear:

9 [A] plaintiff (or appellant) may present *distinctly*
10 *different claims for relief that are based on different facts and*
11 *legal theories.* Where claims could have been *litigated*
12 *separately*, fees should not be awarded for these unsuccessful
13 separate and distinct claims which are unrelated to the claim on
14 which the plaintiff prevailed.

15 On the other hand, one claim for relief may involve
16 related legal theories. ... *Thus, where a party has*
17 *accomplished the result sought in the litigation, fees should be*
18 *awarded for time spent even on unsuccessful legal theories.*

19 *Schweiger v. China Doll Restaurant, Inc.*, 138 Ariz. 183, 189, 673 P.2d 927, 933 (App.
20 1983) (emphasis added).

21 A *multitude* of subsequent Arizona decisions recognize the distinction that
22 Defendants ignore, between a lack of success on distinct claims or issues that could have
23 been separately litigated and a lack of success on routine rulings during the course of
24 litigation in which success is ultimately achieved. *See, e.g., Orfaly v. Tucson Symphony*
25 *Soc.*, 209 Ariz. 260, 266, 99 P.3d 1030, 1036 (App. 2004). Here, Plaintiffs and Varilek
26 prevailed on *every* claim and against *every* affirmative defense. There is *nothing* on
27 which Defendants prevailed that could have been separately litigated. Whatever
28 “victories” Defendants achieved were favorable interlocutory rulings that did not affect in
the slightest the *complete* success that Plaintiffs and Varilek ultimately achieved.

In the same vein, Defendants argue at page 36 of their *Response and Objection* that
“up until this Court's grant of summary judgment on Plaintiffs' December 28, 2012,

1 *Motion for Summary Judgment*, the sheer majority of decisions in this case were in favor
2 of Defendants.” (Defendants’ argument here is weirdly similar to their misguided
3 “violation counting” approach to abandonment, whereby they sought to establish an
4 abandonment by pointing to scores of inconsequential violations of the Declaration of
5 Restrictions while ignoring that abandonment requires violations so massive and
6 pervasive as to alter the fundamental character of the development.) In light of Plaintiffs’
7 and Varilek’s complete victory as described above, this statement would be irrelevant
8 even if it were true – but it is *patently untrue*:

- 9 • Plaintiffs were awarded summary judgment in 2005 on the Coxes’ affirmative
10 defenses of estoppel, laches and unclean hands. This award was affirmed by the
11 Court of Appeals in its *Memorandum Decision* in No. 1 CA-CV 06-0165.
- 12 • The Coxes were *incorrectly* awarded summary judgment in 2005 on Plaintiffs’
13 claim that the Coxes’ tree farm violated the Declaration of Restrictions. This
14 award was reversed by the Court of Appeals in its *Memorandum Decision*, the
15 court finding that the tree farm violated the Declaration as a matter of law.
- 16 • The Court of Appeals’ decision left the Coxes’ affirmative defenses of waiver
17 and abandonment as the only substantive matters to be decided, and Plaintiffs
18 and Varilek prevailed on those when their *Motion for Summary Judgment* was
19 granted.
- 20 • The only matter of significance on which the Coxes’ can claim a victory of sorts
21 is the Court of Appeals’ reversal of this Court’s denial of their *Motion to Join*
22 *Indispensable Parties*. But as is explained below, the joinder of indispensable
23 parties was necessitated *solely* by the Coxes’ *own* abandonment defense, so this
24 can scarcely be claimed as a victory over Plaintiffs.

1 The reality is, Plaintiffs' and Varilek's victory in this case has been *complete*, and
2 Defendants cannot make any argument to the contrary that will pass the "straight face
3 test."²

4 **Defendants' arguments concerning joinder are red herrings.** Despite what
5 Defendants persist in saying, the joinder of the other property owners in Coyote Springs
6 Ranch was necessitated *solely* by the Coxes' abandonment defense. This was clearly
7 recognized by the Court of Appeals, but Defendants in the *Response and Objection* once
8 again stubbornly refuse to acknowledge this reality.

9 Plaintiffs' *First Amended Complaint* was against the Coxes for violations of the
10 Declaration of Restrictions. The declaratory judgment that Plaintiffs sought was in this
11 narrow context – *i.e.*, they sought a judgment that the Declaration of Restrictions
12 remained enforceable against the Coxes for purposes of establishing the alleged
13 violations. As the Court of Appeals recognized, a declaratory judgment that the
14 Declaration remained enforceable against the Coxes would have had no binding effect on
15 anyone except the Coxes: "Because none of the absent property owners is a party to this
16 action, the doctrines of *res judicata* and collateral estoppel could not be employed to limit
17 their claims or defenses in a subsequent case." *Mem. Op.* at 19, ¶ 32.

18
19
20 ² In perhaps their ultimate act of grasping at straws, Defendants state at page 38 of the *Response*
21 *and Objection* that "the claims or breach of contract that relate to paragraphs 7e and 15 of the
22 Declaration have never been litigated." Hence, they say, "This case is not yet finished and
23 Plaintiffs have not prevailed on all of the relief sought." The alleged violations of paragraphs
24 7e (prohibiting structures other than residential ones) and 15 (prohibiting outside toilets) are
25 trivial and ancillary to the core allegation that the Coxes' tree farm violates paragraph 2.
26 Waiting until litigation has dragged on for 10+ years, a form of *Final Judgment* has been
27 lodged with the Court, and an application for attorney fees is pending is surely "just a bit" too
28 long to wait before attempting to inject an issue such as this. Moreover, Varilek feels certain
that, should the Court deem it necessary in order to conclude this litigation, Plaintiffs would
amend the *First Amended Complaint* to eliminate the allegations concerning paragraphs 7e and
15. The key point is that, even if Defendants could manage to prolong this litigation for
another ten years with endless wrangling over paragraphs 7e and 15, and even in the unlikely
event they should prevail in regard to those alleged trivial violations, this could not alter the
fact that Plaintiffs are the successful parties for purposes of § 12-341.01(A).

1 In contrast, the Coxes' affirmative defense of abandonment required a
2 determination that wholesale violations of the Declaration had been ignored to such an
3 extent that the character of *the entire development* had changed. In other words, it
4 required a determination that *all* of the restrictions had been violated *throughout the*
5 *development* to such an extent that *none* of them should be enforced *anywhere in Coyote*
6 *Springs Ranch*.

7 Here is what the Court of Appeals actually said about abandonment and why it
8 required joinder:

9 The Coxes argue, as they did below, that all owners of property
10 subject to the Declaration must be joined as parties to this lawsuit
11 because an issue in the case is whether the Declaration *has been*
12 *abandoned*.

13 . . .
14 A ruling in this case that the restrictions *have been abandoned*
15 and are no longer enforceable against the Coxes' property would
16 affect the property rights of all other owners subject to the
17 Declaration.

18 [A North Carolina case held that] all property owners subject to
19 the restrictions at issue in that case were necessary parties in the
20 plaintiffs' suit to enforce the restrictions because the defendant had
21 asserted a change-of-circumstances defense. . . . *That defense is,*
22 *essentially, the abandonment defense the Coxes assert here.*

23 . . .
24 However, even if a ruling *in favor of the Coxes on their*
25 *affirmative defense of abandonment* were to apply only to the Coxes'
26 property, all property owners' rights would still be affected simply by
27 the Coxes' continued use of their property, or by any future use
28 adverse to the restrictions. . . .

We conclude that the absent property owners are necessary
parties *given the issue to be decided in this case* [i.e., whether the
Declaration has been abandoned].

Mem. Op. at 17-21, ¶¶ 30-36 (emphasis added).

For Defendants to keep suggesting that Plaintiffs' *First Amended Compliant*
precipitated the need for joinder flies in the face of logic and the Court of Appeals'
decision. Nevertheless, Defendants continue to make statements to this effect in the
Response and Objection. At page 29, for example, they state, "More than eight years ago,

1 Defendants recognized that a decision in this case would affect each and every one of the
2 Absent Owners *as a result of Plaintiffs' pursuit of a declaration from the Court that the*
3 *Declaration of Restrictions was fully enforceable* and Defendants' assertion that the
4 Declaration of Restrictions was abandoned [emphasis added].”

5 Building on this misstatement, which is flatly contrary to what the Court of Appeals
6 determined, Defendants then argue that this Court was precluded from ruling on
7 Plaintiffs' and Varilek's *Motion for Summary Judgment* until all issues concerning joinder
8 had been resolved: “Until the Court determines that all of the indispensable parties have
9 properly been joined, the Court was proscribed from ruling on Plaintiffs' *Motion for*
10 *Summary Judgment* and request for attorneys' fees.” This is simply incorrect. As Varilek
11 pointed out in footnote 1 on page 2 of his *Motion to Require Defendants Cox to Serve the*
12 *Indispensable Parties with Documents Comporting with Due Process*, “The filing of this
13 motion should not affect the Court's ruling on Plaintiffs' pending *Motion for Summary*
14 *Judgment* (in which Varilek has joined) concerning the Coxes' abandonment defense. If
15 the *Motion for Summary Judgment* is granted, this motion will become moot because, as
16 is explained herein, the Coxes' abandonment defense is the only aspect of this case that
17 required the joinder of the absent owners as indispensable parties in the first place. If the
18 *Motion for Summary Judgment* is denied, on the other hand, the Coxes' abandonment
19 defense will remain alive and this motion will require a decision.” The correctness of this
20 statement was tacitly acknowledged by the Court in its *Under Advisement Ruling* of June
21 14, 2013, wherein it granted Plaintiffs' *Motion for Summary Judgment* and deemed
22 Varilek's motion to be moot.

23 Defendants are flatly wrong when they state at page 16 of the *Response and*
24 *Objection* that “the Court was affirmatively obligated to ensure that joinder was
25 completed prior to rendering dispositive summary rulings. That is the case because, as
26 recognized by the Court of Appeals, a ruling on the issue of abandonment will affect each
27 of the Absent Owners in Coyote Springs Ranch.” Joinder was indeed completed, as Judge
28 Mackey recognized when he accepted the *Notice of Compliance with June 17, 2010*

1 *Notice Re: Service of Property Owners* that Plaintiffs filed on April 18, 2011. Whether
2 the joinder comported with due process, which was the subject of Varilek's motion,
3 became a moot issue when the Court determined that no abandonment had occurred.
4 Contrary to what Defendants state, the Court of Appeals recognized only that a ruling *in*
5 *the Coxes' favor* on the issue of abandonment would affect the absent owners, and this
6 Court properly recognized that a ruling *against the Coxes* on the issue of abandonment
7 would render moot any issue as to whether joinder had been properly accomplished.³

8 **The Coxes are responsible for, and have profited from, this litigation dragging**
9 **on for ten years.** The Coxes have been in no hurry to resolve this litigation because they
10 have continued to operate their tree farm while it drags on. The handwriting was on the
11 wall in 2007 when the Court of Appeals issued its *Memorandum Decision* finding that the
12 Coxes' tree farm violated the Declaration of Restrictions as a matter of law, but the Coxes
13 refused to see it. Rudimentary research into the Arizona case law would have informed
14 the Coxes that their waiver defense was hopeless due to the ironclad non-waiver provision
15 in the Declaration and that their abandonment defense would require a near-impossible
16 showing that Coyote Springs Ranch was no longer a rural residential development. The
17 statement at page 39 of the *Response and Objection* concerning a supposed change in the
18 law during the pendency of this case ("While it may be true that the issues of enforcement
19 of restrictive covenants is not new to the Arizona courts, it is also true that the law
20 governing those issues changed during the pendency of this case when the *College Book*
21 *Centers* decision was rendered by the Court of Appeals thereby changing the law in the
22 midstream of this case") is absurd; the court in *College Book Centers* simply applied the
23 standard that had been announced 56 years earlier in *Condos v. Home Development (i.e.,*
24 *that to constitute an abandonment, "the restrictions imposed upon the use of lots in a*

25
26 ³ Weirdly, at pages 31-32 of the *Response and Objection*, Defendants set forth a "relatively
27 simple" seven-step procedure that, they now say, Plaintiffs should have followed in order to
28 properly accomplish joinder. Of course, Defendants never suggested *any* of this to the Court
or complained in the slightest about the procedure that Plaintiffs actually did follow, even
though joinder was necessitated solely by the Coxes' abandonment defense.

1 subdivision [must] have been so thoroughly disregarded as to result in such a change in
2 the area as to destroy the effectiveness of the restrictions, defeat the purposes for which
3 they were imposed and consequently to amount to an abandonment thereof”). No, the
4 Coxes simply failed to do their homework and to make a realistic assessment of their
5 waiver and abandonment defenses.

6 It is near-comical for Defendants to suggest that the Coxes’ affirmative defense of
7 abandonment presented “novel” issues of law, that the joinder of indispensable parties
8 (necessitated solely by the Coxes’ abandonment defense) presented “extremely
9 complicated” legal issues, and that Plaintiffs’ suggestions to the contrary are “absolutely
10 false.” The reality is that the Coxes are single-handedly responsible for this litigation
11 dragging on for 10+ years and for the attorney fees that Plaintiffs and Varilek have
12 incurred. Indeed, 100% of Varilek’s attorney fees relate directly to the Coxes’ misguided
13 waiver and abandonment defenses.

14 Equally comical and indicative of desperation is Defendants’ suggestion that this
15 litigation could have been over much sooner if Plaintiffs and Varilek had not waited so
16 long to file their *Motion for Summary Judgment*: “Had Plaintiffs filed their December 28,
17 2012, *Motion for Summary Judgment* much earlier in this case and long before the passing
18 of ten years the fees incurred on behalf of Plaintiffs ... would not have been incurred.”
19 *Response and Objection* at 39. Defendants apparently believe that Plaintiffs and Varilek
20 bear some responsibility for not pointing out much sooner that the affirmative defenses to
21 which the Coxes were stubbornly clinging had no basis in fact or law! This would be a
22 strange basis indeed for reducing a successful party’s award of attorney fees pursuant to
23 § 12-341.01(A).

24 While the *Response and Objection* may have been a “monumental” undertaking on
25 the part of Defendants, it is filled with misstatements, untruths and obvious attempts to
26 shift the Court’s focus away from what really matters. *Nothing* that Defendants say in the
27 *Response and Objection* can alter the reality that Plaintiffs and Varilek have achieved a
28 complete victory, this litigation has dragged on for 10+ years only because the Coxes had

1 no real incentive to bring it to a conclusion and thus stubbornly clung to affirmative
2 defenses having no hope of success, and all of the attorney fees incurred by Varilek
3 flowed from the Coxes' abandonment defense and the joinder of indispensable parties that
4 it necessitated.

5 An award of attorney fees pursuant to § 12-341.01(A) is within the discretion of the
6 Court and is reviewable only for an abuse of discretion. *Maleki v. Desert Palms*
7 *Professional Properties, LLC*, 222 Ariz. at 334, 214 P.3d at 422 (App. 2009). All of the
8 factors identified in *Associated Indemnity Corp. v. Warner*, 143 Ariz. 567, 694 P.2d 1181
9 (1985), and *Wagenseller v. Scottsdale Memorial Hosp.*, 147 Ariz. 370, 710 P.2d 1025
10 (1985), point toward the conclusion that Varilek should be awarded the full amount of the
11 attorney fees he has incurred:

- 12 • *None* of the Coxes' affirmative defenses was meritorious, and their key defenses
13 bordered on frivolous.
- 14 • The Coxes showed *no* inclination to settle and, in fact, profited by dragging out
15 this litigation for as long as they did.
- 16 • Because the Coxes could have brought this litigation to an end years ago but
17 chose to cling to their waiver and abandonment defenses and to continue their
18 operation of the tree farm, they are scarcely in a position to claim extreme
19 hardship now.
- 20 • Plaintiffs and Varilek did indeed prevail with respect to all of the relief sought.
- 21 • Neither Plaintiffs' claims nor the Coxes' affirmative defenses presented any
22 novel legal questions, and abundant Arizona case law should have told the
23 Coxes that their waiver defense was hopeless and their abandonment defense
24 virtually impossible to prove.
- 25 • There is no way that an award of attorney fees would have a chilling effect on
26 future litigants with tenable claims or defenses; apart from the fact that the
27 Coxes' have managed to drag it out for 10+ years, this is nothing more than a
28

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

garden-variety "violation of restrictive covenants" case of the sort in which attorney fees are routinely granted.

For the foregoing reasons, Varilek respectfully requests that the Court award the full amount of his attorney fees as set forth in his *Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees* (\$90,490.00), together with taxable costs of \$118 as set forth in his *Statement of Costs and Notice of Taxation*.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED August 19, 2013.

FAVOUR & WILHELMSSEN, PLLC

By: 
David K. Wilhelmsen
Lance B. Payette
Attorneys for Property Owner James Varilek

Original and one copy of the foregoing *Reply* filed August 19, 2013 with:

Clerk, Superior Court of Yavapai County
120 S. Cortez Street
Prescott, AZ 86302

Copy of the foregoing *Reply* hand-delivered August 19, 2013 to:

The Honorable Kenton Jones
Yavapai County Superior Court
120 S. Cortez Street
Prescott, AZ 86303

///
///
///
///

1 Copy of the foregoing *Reply*
2 mailed August 19, 2013 to:

3 Jeff Adams
4 THE ADAMS LAW FIRM PLLC
5 125 Grove Avenue
6 P.O. Box 2522
7 Prescott, AZ 86302
8 Attorney for the following named
9 Defendants:

10 Donald & Catherine Cox;
11 Leon H. & Noreen N. Vaughn;
12 Martha Lillian Caudill;
13 Sandra Godinez;
14 Curtis Kincheloe;
15 John L. & Gena D. Hatfield, Trustees of
16 the Brit-Char Trust UDT 7-10-07;
17 Cindi E. Lebash;
18 Roberta L. Baldwin;
19 James H. & Doris L. Strom;
20 Joy D. Basset;
21 James B. & Lorraine Darrin, Trustees of
22 the Darrin Family Trust UDT 12-14-98;
23 Tracy L. Greenlee;
24 Franklin B. & Laura L. Lamberson;
25 Rhonda L. Folsom;
26 Daniel & Louella Bauman;
27 Theresa E. Massardi;
28 James & Shirley Stephenson;
West R. & Catherine S. Rivers;
Lawrence K. & Heide J. McCarthy,
Trustees of the McCarthy Living Trust
UDC 5-20-81;
Edward C. & Christine Woodworth;
Donald J. & Charlotte F. Klein, Trustees
of the Klein Family Trust;
Jeff & Mychel Westra;
Christine L. Bowra;
Charles R. Coakley, Trustee of the
Charles Coakley Trust UTD 6-10-91;
Else Clark, Trustee of the 2005 Else
Clark Revocable Trust UTD 10-27-05;
Wendy L. Changose;
Kari L. Dennis;
John P. & Karen R. Hough;
James Barstad;
Michael J. & Diane Glennon;
Michael D. White;
Steve M. & Deborah D. Wilson;
Ottis R. & Delores F. Clark;
Mark S. & Soma D. Williams, Trustees
of the Mark & Soma Williams Trust
UTD 10-10-07;

1 Geoffrey M. McNabb & Kristen D.
McNabb;
2 Grant L. & Pamela L. Griffiths;
Charles A. & Sherry S. Marx;
3 Kenneth R. & Elizabeth A. Yarbrough;
Gary Wanzek; and
4 Vincent J. & Dorothy M. Wanzek

5 Mark W. Drutz
Sharon-Sargent-Flack
6 MUSGROVE DRUTZ & KACK, P.C.
1135 W. Iron Springs Road
7 P.O. Box 2720
Prescott, AZ 86302
8 Attorneys for Defendant Veres

9 Hans Clugston
HANS CLUGSTON, PLLC
10 1042 Willow Creek Road
Suite A101-PMB 502
11 Prescott, AZ 86301
Attorney for Defendants
12 Northern Arizona Fiduciaries,
Inc.

13 Robert E. Schmitt
14 MURPHY, SCHMITT,
HATHAWAY & WILSON
15 117 East Gurley St.
Prescott, AZ 86301
16 Attorney for Robert H. Taylor &
Terri A. Thomson-Taylor

17 Noel J. Hebets
18 NOEL J. HEBETS, PLC
127 East 14th Street
19 Tempe, AZ 85281
Attorney for Defendant
20 William M. Grace

21 William Fred and Theresa Hyder
11411 E. Sweetwater Ave.
22 Scottsdale, AZ 85259

23 Joyce Hattab Trust
3449 Lorilou Ln. #D
24 Las Vegas, NV 89121

25 Leon H. and Noreen Vaughan
9235 N. Coyote Springs Rd.
26 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

27 Gordon and Becki Nash
7901 N. Coyote Springs Rd.
28 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

1 Jimmy and Nancy Hoffman
2 P.O. Box 639
3 Dewey, AZ 86327

4 Rodney and Victoria Page
5 8920 E. Smittys Pl.
6 Prescott Valley, AZ 86314

7 Deborah Ann and Richard A Davis
8 P.O. Box 4388
9 Prescott, AZ 86302

10 Bruce K and Teri A. Morgan
11 8520 E Lonesome Valley Road
12 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

13 Deborah Ann Curtis
14 6070 Little Papoose Dr.
15 Prescott Valley AZ 86314

16 Jeffrey and Renita Donaldson
17 2175 N. Concord Dr. #A
18 Dewey, AZ 86327

19 Corea Family Trust
20 Nicholas and Patricia Corea
21 4 Denia
22 Laguna Niguel, CA 92677

23 Charles and Kelly Markley
24 8999 E. Pronghorn Ln.
25 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

26 Thomas and Nancy Tierney
27 7711 W. Michigan Ave.
28 Glendale, AZ 85308

Jerry L. Emerson
P.O. Box 27254
Prescott Valley, AZ 86312

Mary Ferra
4930 Antelope Dr.
Prescott, AZ 86301

Kirk and Joy Smith
8650 E. Marrow Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Jeffrey A. and Kimberly A. Sharp
8320 E. Plum Creek Way
Prescott valley, AZ 86315

- 1 Logan and Theresa Franks
8233 W. Country Gables Dr.
2 Peoria, AZ 85381
- 3 Humberto and Ana Pimentel
8419 E. Tracy Drive
4 Prescott Valley, AZ 86314
- 5 Jeffrey Carlson
1451 W. Irving Park Rd. #317
6 Itasca, IL 60143
- 7 Richard and Jessica Compsom
8805 E. Marrow Drive
8 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315
- 9 Stanley and Sharon Gonzales
8820 E. Slash Arrow Drive
10 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315
- 11 Bernard and Mary Milligan
29835 N. 56th Street
12 Cave Creek, AZ 85331
- 13 Autery Family Trust
8175 N. Coyote Springs Road
14 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315
- 15 Patrick and Vickie DiNieri
35807 N. 3rd Street
16 Phoenix, AZ 85086
- 17 George L. Gillan and Yuan-Ling Hong
8625 Mountain View Rd.
18 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315
- 19 Jacob McAllister
8620 Slash Arrow Dr.
20 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315
- 21 Jack and Delores Richardson
505 Oppenheimer Drive #412
22 Los Alamos, NM 87544
- 23 Paul J. and Mary E. Temple
535 Metropolitan Avenue
24 Brooklyn, NY 11211
- 25 David Ungerer
13229 W. Doty Ave #4A
26 Hawthorne, CA 90250
- 27 Peter J. Trevillian
8600 Turtle Rock Rd.
28 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

1 John and Deirdre Feldhaus
2 3331 E. Sundance Cir.
3 Prescott, AZ 86303

4 Bonnie Rosson
5 8950 E. Plum Creek Way
6 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

7 Marty and Sharon Mason
8 8945 E. Spurr Ln.
9 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

10 Evelyn M. Sadler Trust
11 10575 N. Coyote Springs Road
12 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

13 Ronald and Kellene Litchfield
14 8415 E. Marrow Road
15 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

16 Stanley D. Hall and Anne Womack-Hall
17 8450 Morning Star Ranch Road
18 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

19 Wayne L. and Bonnie L. Battram
20 8400 E. Morning Star Ranch Rd
21 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

22 Watkins Family Trust
23 7455 Coyote Springs Road
24 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

25 Loren James and Tracy Lee Peterson
26 P.O. Box 25977
27 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

28 Gunther Family Living Trust
Richard H. and Lois M. Gunther
1035 Scott Dr. #256
Prescott, AZ 86301

James and Vicki Biscay
7090 N. Coyote Springs Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Central Baptist Church of Prescott
3298 N. Glassford Hill Rd. #104
Prescott Valley, AZ 86314

Robert Mancini
7425 N. Gueneviers Pl.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 1 Robert Laquerre
Laquerre Family Living Trust
2 8594 E. Kelly Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86314
- 3
4 Daniel L. and Charlotte E. Sanders
P.O. Box 2542
Prescott, AZ 86302
- 5
6 Margaret Sue Pennington
Pennington MS Living Trust
7 5655 N. Camino Del Conde
Tucson, AZ 85718
- 8
9 Michael A. Kelley Family Trust
P.O. Box 26232
Prescott Valley, AZ 86312
- 10
11 Kenneth Paloutzian
8200 Long Mesa Drive
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315
- 12
13 Faith Inc.
7225 N. Coyote Springs Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315
- 14
15 John D. and Sheila K. Fox
1520 Scenic Loop
Fairbanks, AK 99701
- 16
17 Rosario Carrillo
8989 N. Coyote Springs Rd.
Prescott Valley AZ 86315
- 18
19 Jose and Rosario Carrillo
8989 N. Coyote Springs Rd.
Prescott Valley AZ 86314
- 20
21 Michael and Judy Strong
4415 N. 9th Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85013
- 22
23 Cong Van Tong and Phi Thi Nguyen
8775 N. Coyote Springs Rd.
Prescott Valley AZ 86315
- 24
25 Nadia Y. Clark
8595 E. Turtle Rock Rd #1116
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315
- 26
27 James Wilson Holmes
8615 Windmill Acres Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86314
- 28

1 Thomas P. and Kimberly L. Marty
8610 E. Marrow Rd.
2 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

3 Donald S. Benker and D. Lynn Wheeler-Benker
8700 E. Marrow Rd.
4 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

5 Amanda G. Deane
8250 E. Spurr Ln.
6 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

7 Jennifer Silva and Carl and Jeanette Samuelson
8490 E. Spurr Ln.
8 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

9 Neil B. Vince
8450 E. Spurr Ln.
10 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

11 Gary W. and Dianna R. Cordes
8370 E. Spurr Ln.
12 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

13 Terry L. and Grace M. Jones
10492 E. Old Black Canyon Hwy.
14 Dewey, AZ 86327

15 Kevin Eden
8275 E. Turtle Rock Rd.
16 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

17 Guaranty Mortgage Trust, L.L.C.
15240 N. 44th Pl.
18 Phoenix, AZ 85032

19 Dana E. and Sherrilyn G. Tapp
8595 E. Easy St.
20 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

21 Craig C. and Bronte J. Casperson
8301 E. Spouse Dr.
22 Prescott Valley, AZ 86314

23 Anthony and Angela Lawrence
8575 E. Far Away Pl.
24 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

25 Richard A. and Patricia A. Pinney
43945 W. Kramer Ln.
26 Maricopa, AZ 85238

27 Leonara Cardella and Santo Fricano
12404 N. 33rd St.
28 Phoenix, AZ 85032

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

Daniel and Christine Turner
8959 E. Lonesome Valley Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Larry Michael and Debra Ann Kirby
Kirby Family Trust
8801 Lonesome Valley Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Christopher Lefebvre
8250 E. Sparrow Hawk Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Karen L. Thompson
8100 E. Sparrow Hawk Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Weldon Family Trust
P.O. Box 9208
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067

Sergio Martinez and Susana Navarro
10150 N. Lawrence Ln.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Bernard D. and Diana M. Anderson
7601 N. Gueneviers Pl.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

William J. Lumme
7570 N. Coyote Springs Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Santo and Rosa Fricano
5902 W. Cortez
Glendale, Arizona 85304

William E. Brumbill Trust
8910 Morrow Drive
Prescott Valley, Arizona 86314

Kevin Paul Sasse
9125 E. Dog Ranch Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Jesus O. and Rosa M. Manjarrez
105 Paseo Sarta #C
Green Valley, AZ 85614

Rackley Family Living Trust
8565 Dog Ranch Road
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

1 Jayme Salazar
11826 Coyote Springs Road
2 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

3 Anglin Living Trust
11950 Coyote Springs Road
4 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

5 Renee Meeks
8975 N. Lawrence Lane
6 Prescott Valley, Arizona 86315

7 Ken and Fay Lawrence
P.O. Box 25905
8 Prescott Valley, Arizona 86312

9 Kenneth and Lois Fay Lawrence Trust
P.O. Box 25905
10 Prescott Valley Arizona 86312

11 Anthony and Patricia Sinclair
P.O. Box 25457
12 Prescott Valley, AZ 86312

13 Gary L. and Suzanne J. Spurr
8240 E. Spurr Ln.
14 Prescott Valley, AZ 86314

15 Joshua F. and Anita D. Ollinger
Ollinger Family Revocable Trust
16 14202 N. 68th Pl.
Scottsdale, AZ 85254

17 Lisa Soronow
18 Ginomai Living 2004 Trust
3530 Wilshire Blvd. #1600
19 Los Angeles, CA 90010

20 Fritz and Janet Doerstling Revocable Trust
8610 Mountain View Rd.
21 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

22 Ernest and Judy Rojas
Rojas Family Living Trust
23 8310 N. Coyote Springs Rd.
Prescott Valley, Arizona 86315

24 Anthony B. Lee
25 8496 Coyote Springs Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

26 Thomas K. and Gwendolyn D. Anderson
27 8922 E. Windmill Acres
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

28

1 Nguyen Nghia Huu and Le Dung Ngoc
2 3616 W. Country Gables Dr.
3 Phoenix, AZ 85023

4 Donald G. and Deborah T. Southworth
5 7595 Coyote Springs Rd.
6 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

7 Janis Revocable Trust
8 7685 N. Coyote Springs Rd.
9 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

10 Christiene R. Andrews
11 16355 Orchard Bend Rd.
12 Poway, CA 92064

13 Valentino and Hildegard Muraca
14 Muraca Trust
15 10895 E. Manzenita Trl.
16 Dewey, AZ 86327

17 Dorothy T. Baker Revocable Trust
18 190 Wildwood Dr.
19 Prescott, AZ 86301

20 Francis M. Moyer
21 6 Meadow Green Ct.
22 Johnson City, TN 37601

23 James W. and Corrine A. Stueve
24 Stueve Living Trust
25 10025 N. Coyote Springs Rd.
26 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

27 Thanh Huu and Dung L. Nguyen
28 Nguyen Family Trust
12601 N. 29th Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85029

William and Joanne Friend
Friend Family Trust
17661 Mariposa
Yorba Linda, CA 92886

Art and Debra G. Gustafson
9975 N. Coyote Springs Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

James R. and Barbara L. Bowman
P.O. Box 2959
Okeechobee, FL 34973

Hendrickson 2002 Family Trust
P.O. Box 13069
Prescott, AZ 86304

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

Howard P. Roberts
9936 Coyote Springs Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Mainland Water Investments, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 2945
Prescott, AZ 86302

Paul and Amella Stegall
8275 E. Spurr Lane
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Robert and Starr Ladehoff
7805 E. Pharlap Ln.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Opal L. Belland
Opal L. Belland Trust
10936 Caloden St.
Oakland, CA 94605

Kennard L. Easter
10350 N. Lawrence Ln.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Jerry and Leann Carver Family Trust
8940 E. Spurr Ln.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Justin Gardner and Kathy Welsh
10791 N. Coyote Springs Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Terri A. Carver
P.O. Box 3499
Los Altos CA 94024

Richard and Regina Recano
14090 E. Camino Pl.
Fontana, CA 92337

Robert Lee and Patti Ann Stack
Robert Lee and Patti Ann Stack Trust
10375 Lawrence Ln.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Kathy A. Ware and Patricia Pursell
Ware Family Living Trust
1525 S. Verde Dr.
Cottonwood, AZ 86326

Todd A. Swaim
8500 E. Turtle Rock Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

1 Richard and Darlene Mauler
9655 N. Coyote Springs Road
2 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

3 Jane L. Hesse
4729 N. Sauter Dr.
4 Prescott Valley, AZ 86314

5 Terry Lee Pettigrew
6721 W. Villa St. #12
6 Phoenix, AZ 85043

7 Nancy A. Painter Family Trust
Nancy A. Painter
8 1022 N. Cloud Cliff Pass
Prescott Valley, AZ 86314

9 James D. Borel MD LTD Restated PRFT Plan
10 P.O. Box 9870
Phoenix, AZ 85068

11 Masumi Gavinski
12 P.O. Box 27377
Prescott Valley, AZ 86314

13 Jesus and Inez Valdez
14 Valdez Trust
2410 E. Whitton
15 Phoenix, AZ 85016

16 Wiley and Kathleen Williams
9575 E. Turtle Rock
17 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

18 Glenn and Gina Higa
9350 E. Mountain View Rd.
19 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

20 Gilstrap Family Trust
Ladonna J. Leppert
21 6361 Mann Ave.
Mira Loma, CA 91752

22 Richard and Beverly Strissel
9350 E. Slash Arrow Dr.
23 Prescott Valley, AZ 86314

24 Michael and Julie Davis
9147 E. Morning Star Ranch Road
25 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

26 Edward R. and Anna E. Fleetwood Family Trust
4838 E. Calle Redonda
27 Phoenix, AZ 85018

28

- 1 John and Paula Warren
9180 E. Pronghorn Lane
2 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 3 1999 Winter Family Trust
10830 E. Oak Creek Trail
4 Cornville, AZ 86325

- 5 Steven and Becky Ducharme
9410 Slash Arrow
6 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 7 Charles and Billie Hutchison
5737 N. 40th Lane
8 Phoenix, AZ 85019

- 9 Gerald and Laurel Osher
9015 E. Mummy View Dr.
10 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 11 Wiechens Living Trust
2501 S. Avenue 44 E
12 Roll, AZ 85347

- 13 Grass Family Trust
1640 W. Acoma Drive
14 Phoenix, AZ 85023

- 15 Bolen Trust
9525 Mummy View Dr.
16 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 17 Linda J. Hahn Revocable Living Trust
10367 W. Mohawk Lane
18 Peoria, AZ 85382

- 19 William R. and Judith K. Stegeman Trust
9200 W. Far Away Place
20 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 21 Travis Clinton Black
9148 E. Mummy View Drive
22 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 23 Edward A. and Jane M. Toasperm
Brent E. and D A Schoeneck Trust
24 2526 E. Huntington Dr.
25 Tempe, AZ 85282

- 26 Plan B Holdings, L.L.C.
340 W. Willis St. #2
27 Prescott, AZ 86301

- 28

1 Bradley T. Copper
1401 E. Westcott
2 Phoenix, AZ 85024

3 Robert Taylor
10555 N. Orion Way
4 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

5 Robert and Heather Gardiner
9690 Plum Creek Way
6 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

7 Eric Cleveland Trust
9605 E. Disway
8 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

9 Donald D. Chase
3125 Duke Drive
10 Prescott, AZ 86301

11 Linda Annette Gravatt
9612 E. Mummy View Dr.
12 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

13 David and Michelle Krause Revocable Trust
3824 Topeka Dr.
14 Glendale, AZ 85308

15 Madelein C. Alston Trust
9270 E. Turtle Rock Road
16 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

17 Leo and Marilyn Murphy
9366 E. Turtle Rock Road
18 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

19 Ross and Kara Rozendaal
9336 E. Turtle Rock Road
20 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

21 James and Kathryn McCormack
11780 N. Dusty Rd.
22 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

23 Leslie J. Laird
11795 North Hawthorne Lane
24 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

25 Koller Family Revocable Trust
P.O. Bo 27191
26 Prescott Valley, AZ 86312

27 Fannie Mae
14523 SW Millikan Way #200
28 Beaverton, OR 97005

- 1 1981 Bolin Trust
9525 E. Mummy View Drive
2 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 3 Mantione Family Living Trust
7761 E. Day Break Circle
4 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 5 Francis H. Jr. and Patricia A. Smith
11605 N. Hawthorne Lane
6 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 7 Robert and Gladys Tarr
11550 N. Dusty Road
8 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 9 Wayne and Jeanette Doerksen
10610 N. Wits End
10 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 11 Spurr Holding L.L.C.
14153 Grand Island Rd.
12 Walnut Grove, CA 95690

- 13 Jerry and Paulette Getz
P.O. Box 25567
14 Prescott Valley, AZ 86312

- 15 Gary W. Cordes
8370 E. Spurr Ln.
16 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 17 Holly Lucero
aka Holly Denise Bowers
18 1426 S. Rita Lane
19 Tempe, AZ 85281

- 20 Harold and Diana Muckelroy
6650 E. Sunset Lane
21 Prescott Valley, AZ 86314

- 22 HVS LLC
3287 E. Raven Ct.
23 Chandler, AZ 85286

- 24 John Mitchell and Troy Stoll
P.O. Box 249
25 Fort Bridger, WY 82933

- 26 Michael Zager and Susan Bette-Zager
9397 Mountain View Road
27 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 28

1 Karen Messenlehner
3650 N. Zircon Drive
2 Prescott Valley, AZ 86314

3 Michael Furness
9990 E. Turtle Rock Road
4 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

5 Aaron and Kathleen Cormier
9860 E. Turtle Rock Road
6 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

7 Dennis J. Booth
9425 E. Mummy View Drive
8 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

9 William E. Probst
9440 E. Far Away Place
10 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

11 Kathryn M. Pyles
254 Monroe Ave.
12 N. Martinsville, WV 26155

13 Timothy and Virginia Kilduff
9315 E. Spurr Lane
14 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

15 Kenneth and Sharon Petrone
3267 WW Avenue
16 Wellman, IA 52356

17 John D. Rutledge and Elaine Gordon
9425 E. Spurr Lane
18 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

19 Daniel C. Mussey
7777 E. Main St. #355
20 Scottsdale, AZ 85251

21 Michael and Lisa Faircloth
9100 E. Lonesome Valley Rd.
22 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

23 Michael and Julie Davis
9147 E. Morning Star Ranch Road
24 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

25 Ann and Noel Fidel
1010 W. Monte Vista Road
26 Phoenix, AZ 85007

27 Dick Living Trust
9955 E. Disway
28 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 1 Ronald J. Smith
9180 E. Spurr Ln.
2 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 3 Gary and Sabra Feddema
9601 E. Far Away Place
4 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 5 David L. and Lisa P. Bradley
9450 E. Spurr Ln.
6 Prescott Valley AZ 86315

- 7 David and Lori Rentschler Revocable Living Trust
9251 E. Far Away Place
8 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 9 Madelein C. Alston and Nicholas Faulstick
Madelein C. Alston Trust
10 9270 E. Turtle Rock Road
11 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 12 Angel and Lillian Aguilera
9220 E. Turtle Rock Road
13 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 14 Joyce E. Ridgway
4060 Salt Creek Road
Templeton, CA 93456

- 15 Robert L. Weaver and Diana K. Garcia
16 P.O. Box 25717
17 Prescott Valley, AZ 86312

- 18 James and Jennifer Woods
4554 N. Grafton Drive
19 Prescott Valley, AZ 86314

- 20 George and Romala Heady
705 W. Happy Valley Road
21 Phoenix, AZ 85085

- 22 Warren Don Oster
3401 W. Mauna Loa Lane
Phoenix, AZ 85053

- 23 Todd and Barbara Bloomfield
24 9010 E. Plum Creek Way
25 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 26 Launders Family Trust
9295 E. Spurr Lane
27 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

- 28

1 Michaelis Family Trust
2 6930 Parsons Trail
3 Tujuga, CA 91042

4 Dave Slate
5 9910 E. Spurr Lane
6 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

7 Donn and Valerie Jahnke
8 9950 E. Spurr Lane
9 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

10 Patricia A. Hennis
11 9825 E. Mummy View Dr.
12 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

13 Regina A. Anglin
14 508 W. Villa Rita Dr.
15 Phoenix, AZ 85023

16 William and Shaunla Heckethorn
17 9715 E. Far Away Place
18 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

19 Rynda and Jimmy Hoffman
20 9650 E. Spurr Lane
21 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

22 John and Rebecca Feddema
23 9550 E. Spurr Lane
24 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

25 Daniel and Cynthia Warta
26 9125 E. Pronghorn Lane
27 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

28 Kenneth and Jacquelyn Kimsey
537 N. Hassayampa Drive
Prescott, AZ 86303

James R. Griset
444 Old Newport Blvd. #A
Newport Beach, CA 92663

Kathleen Marie Wargo
5801 Woodlawn Gable Dr. #D
Alexandria, VA 22309

Michael and Karen Wargo
9200 E. Spurr Lane
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Arvid and Donna Severson
9920 E. Far Away Place
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

1 Leon F. Cardini
2 275 S. 4th Street
3 Camp Verde, AZ 86322

4 Nancy L. Reed and Kimberly Hodges
5 9825 E. Mummy View Dr.
6 Prescott Valley, AZ, 86315

7 Debra A. Krakower
8 13941 E. Vista Verde Drive
9 Chandler, AZ 85249

10 Michael R. & Lynda K. Vyne
11 12864 N. 65th Pl.
12 Scottsdale, AZ 85254

13 James Leroy & Velia Lupe Wafflard
14 19711 W. Encanto Blvd.
15 Buckeye, AZ 85326

16 James A. & Linda D. Kirk Family Trust
17 105 2nd St.
18 Buckeye, AZ 85326

19 Yavapai Title Co.
20 Dennis J. Huber Living Trust
21 721 W. Summit Pl.
22 Chandler, AZ 85225

23 John C. Kennedy
24 8577 E. Saddlehorn Trl.
25 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

26 James D. & Cheryl J. Nardo
27 11410 N. Coyote Springs Rd.
28 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Carl G. Pisarik
8610 E. Mummy View Dr.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Kaaren L. Trone
8690 Mummy View Dr.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Furbee Family Trust
William W. & Linda Furbee
3019 Amity Rd.
Pearcy, AR 71964

Steven Lee Grahlmann
P.O. Box 25271
Prescott Valley, AZ 86312

1 Carl Hendrickson Living Trust
2 Carl Hendrickson
3 1112 Woburn Green
4 Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302

5 Elvera M. Barycki
6 2828 Monogram Ave.
7 Long Beach, CA 90815

8 Timothy L. Konkol
9 8685 E. Mummy View Dr.
10 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

11 Patrick & Ann Bresett
12 25313 W. Pueblo Ave.
13 Buckeye, AZ 85326

14 Todd D. Steven
15 8575 Mummy View Dr.
16 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

17 David J. & Susan M. Waters
18 9111 Alicia Dawn Dr.
19 Rogers, AR 72758

20 Howard and Elaine Boucher
21 P.O. Box 27845
22 Prescott Valley, AZ 86312

23 Roberta Hartmann
24 8555 E. Plum Creek Way
25 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

26 Timothy Jon Miller
27 10125 N. Orion Way
28 Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Paul M. Shifrin Trust
Paul M. Shifrin
2040 E. Camero Ave.
Las Vegas, NV 89123

Jose A. & Gloria G. Garza
9200 E. Lonesome Valley Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Mark S. Phillips
8480 N. Coyote Springs Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Scott & Audrey Hovelsrud
9085 E. Mountain View Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

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

Jesus & Beatriz Martinez
9150 E. Slash Arrow Dr.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Pauline Matheson Trust
Pauline Matheson
4755 E. Main St.
Mesa, AZ 85205

Christopher Mattson
7515 N. Coyote Springs Rd.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315

Prescott Valley Growers, L.L.C.
6750 N. Viewpoint Dr.
Prescott Valley, AZ 86314

By 
David K. Wilhelmsen