FILED
Amy Hunley
CLERK, SUPERIOR COURT
11/08/2021 4:33PM
BY: RPORTER
DEPUTY

1 2	BOROWIEC & BOROWIEC, P.C.		
3	1723 S. Highway 92 Sierra Vista, AZ 85635		
4	(520) 417-0221 courtdocs@borowieclaw.com		
5	info@borowieclaw.com		
6	William J. Maledon, 003670		
7	Travis C. Hunt, 035491 OSBORN MALEDON, P.A.		
8	2929 North Central Avenue, Suite 2100		
9	Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793		
10	(602) 640-9000 wmaledon@omlaw.com thunt@omlaw.com		
11			
12	Peter C. Schofield, <i>pro hac vice</i> KIRTON McCONKIE, P.C.		
13	4600 W. Executive Pkwy, Suite 400		
14	Lehi, UT 84043 (801) 426-2100		
15	pschofield@kmclaw.com		
16	Attorneys for Defendants the Church, Herrod	l (except Counts 5-6), and Mauzy	
17			
18	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT O	F THE STATE OF ARIZONA	
19	IN AND FOR THE CO	UNTY OF COCHISE	
20	JANE DOE I; et al.,		
21	D1 : .:00	No. S0200CV202000599	
22	Plaintiffs,	THE CHURCH DEFENDANTS'	
23	v.	ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT	
24	THE CORPORATION OF THE	AMENDED COMPLAINT	
25	PRESIDENT OF THE CHURCH OF	(Assign = 1 to the II 1.1 -	
26	JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS, a Utah corporation sole; et al.,	(Assigned to the Honorable Laura Cardinal)	
27	Defendants.		
28	Z TITINGUI	I	

Pursuant to Rule 15(a), Ariz.R.Civ.P., Defendants Corporation of the President of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (incorrectly sued herein as The Corporation of the Presiding Bishop of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints) (together "COP" or "the Church"); Dr. John Herrod and Sherrie Farnsworth Herrod (together "Herrod"); and Robert Kim Mauzy and Michelle Morgan Mauzy (together "Mauzy"), by and through counsel, hereby submit their Answer as of right in response to Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint ("FAC") by admitting, denying, and affirmatively alleging as follows.

The numbered paragraphs below respond to the numbered paragraphs of the FAC. Collectively, COP, Herrod and Mauzy are referred to herein as "the Church Defendants" or "Defendants." Any allegations set forth in the FAC that are not expressly admitted in this Answer are deemed denied by these Defendants.

INTRODUCTION

- 1. Defendants admit that Plaintiffs allege in their FAC various sexual and other abuse of children perpetrated by the children's father. Defendants further admit that the perpetrator confidentially disclosed to Bishop Herrod, acting in his capacity as a Bishop of the Defendant Church, a very limited aspect of such alleged abuse, and that Bishop Herrod then strongly encouraged the perpetrator and his wife to report the abuse to authorities or authorize Bishop Herrod to report the abuse, but the perpetrator and his wife refused to do either. Defendants were constrained by applicable law from reporting the abuse without permission of the perpetrator or his wife. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 1 of the FAC.
- 2. Defendants admit that Plaintiffs have selectively quoted from a handbook published by the Defendant Church, but Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 2 of the FAC for the reason that such remaining allegations are distortions of fact, argumentative, misleading and otherwise inaccurate.

3. Defendants admit that the Defendant Church operates a Help Line to assist Church leaders with legal matters and related issues, but Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 3 of the FAC.

PARTIES AND JURISDICTION

- 4. Defendants admit, on information and belief, that Paul and Leizza Adams resided in Cochise County, Arizona, that they had six children, and that Paul Adams was a United States Border Patrol Agent. Defendants lack sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 4 of the FAC.
 - 5. Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 5 of the FAC.
- 6. Defendants deny that there currently exists an entity by the name of The Corporation of the Presiding Bishop of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, and Defendants affirmatively allege that such entity changed its name to The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints well before the filing of the FAC. Defendants admit that the main address of the Church is in Utah as stated and that the Church conducts certain activities and owns certain property in Arizona. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 6 of the FAC for the reason that they are argumentative and misleading.
- 7. Defendants admit that COP and the Church are registered to do business in Arizona, that they operate temples and other places of religious worship in Arizona, and that the Church has certain geographic divisions known as stakes, wards and areas. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 7 of the FAC.
- 8. Defendants admit that each ward of the Church has a designated Bishop who serves voluntarily for a limited period of time as the religious leader of the ward and that Defendants John Herrod and Robert Kim Mauzy were appointed Bishops of the Bisbee Ward of the Church in Arizona at certain times relevant to the allegations of the FAC. Defendants further admit that Bishops are the local clergy of the Church and that they hear confessions and counsel with Church members who have sinned or seek

spiritual guidance and counseling. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 8 of the FAC.

- 9. Defendants admit that the Church and Church leaders seek to foster the religious and spiritual needs of Church members, but Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 9 of the FAC.
- 10. Defendants admit that the Church, as is the case with virtually all churches, obtains voluntary contributions from Church members for the purpose of further Church operations. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 10 of the FAC for the reason that they are argumentative, inaccurate and misleading.
- 11. Defendants admit that John Herrod and Sherrie Farnsworth Herrod are married, that they resided in Arizona at certain times relevant to the allegations of the FAC, and that John Herrod served as Bishop of the Bisbee Ward of the Church from approximately 2008 until early 2013. Defendants deny the remaining allegation of Paragraph 11 of the FAC.
- 12. Defendants admit that John Herrod was a licensed physician in Arizona at certain times and that Dr. Herrod provided some medical care for Paul Adams and Leizza Adams on occasion. Defendants deny the remaining allegation of Paragraph 12 of the FAC.
- 13. Defendants admit that Lenzner Medical Services LLC is and/or was a private medical practice with which Dr. Herrod was associated for a period of time. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 13 of the FAC.
- 14. Defendants admit that Robert Kim Mauzy and Michelle Morgan Mauzy are married, that they resided in Arizona at certain times relevant to the allegations of the FAC, and that Robert Kim Mauzy served as Bishop of the Bisbee Ward of the Church from approximately early 2013 to 2018. Defendants deny the remaining allegation of Paragraph 14 of the FAC.
- 15. Defendants admit, on information and belief, that Shaunice Warr was a member of the Church at times relevant to the allegations of the FAC, that she served as

- On information and belief, Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph
- Defendants admit that, from time to time, the Adams family attended Church services in the Bisbee Ward, that some of the Adams children, from time to time, attended Sunday school at the Church, and that, from time to time, Leizza Adams played the piano at certain Church functions. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 23 of the FAC.
- 24. Although Defendants are aware of press reports concerning Paul Adams' arrest and his alleged abuse of some of his children, Defendants are without sufficient personal knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 24 of the FAC, and therefore deny such allegations.
- 25. Defendants are without sufficient personal knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 25 of the FAC, and therefore deny such allegations.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

26.

- 3
- 4
- 6
- 7 8
- 9
- 10 11
- 12
- 13 14
- 15
- 16 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22 23
- 24 25
- 26
- 27

28

to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 26 of the FAC, and therefore deny such allegations. 27. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 27 of the FAC.

Defendants are without sufficient personal knowledge to form a belief as

- 28. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 28 of the FAC.
- 29. Defendants admit that the Church provides spiritual and religious counseling for its Church members and seeks to foster a close relationship between the Church and member families, but Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 29 of the FAC.
- 30. Defendants admit that, among other things, the Relief Society is a women's organization within each Ward that seeks to help women members of a Ward in the manner stated in this paragraph of the FAC.
- 31. Defendants admit that the Relief Society is a women's organization within each Ward. Defendants admit that the visiting teaching program, as it was called at the time, was overseen by the Relief Society. Virtually all adult women in the congregation were assigned to visit other women as visiting teachers and had visiting teachers assigned to them. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 31 of the FAC.
 - 32. Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 32 of the FAC.
 - 33. Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 33 of the FAC.
 - 34. Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 34 of the FAC.
 - 35. Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 35 of the FAC.
- 36. Defendants admit that Defendant Warr was a visiting teacher for Leizza Adams starting in about 2012, but denies that she was assigned to the Adams family because the Church calls female members to serve as visiting teachers for adult female members and not for families. Defendants also admit that Ms. Warr taught Sunday primary school in the Bisbee Ward and that some of the Adams children regularly

attended those classes. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 36 of the FAC.

- 37. Defendants admit that Ms. Warr was a visiting teacher for Leizza Adams starting in about 2012, but Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 37 of the FAC.
- 38. Defendants are without sufficient personal knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of the first sentence of Paragraph 38 of the FAC, and therefore deny those allegations. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 38 of the FAC.
- 39. Defendants are without sufficient personal knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 39 of the FAC, and therefore deny those allegations.
- 40. Defendants are without sufficient personal knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 40 of the FAC, and therefore deny those allegations.
- 41. Defendants lack knowledge of and are otherwise unaware of the interior or the contents of the Adams' home as alleged in Paragraph 41 of the FAC, and therefore deny those allegations.
- 42. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 42 of the FAC and specifically deny that Defendant Warr had a special relationship with the Adams children or that Defendant Warr acted at the direction of the "Mormon Church and its leaders" as alleged or at all.
- 43. Defendants are without sufficient personal knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 43 of the FAC, and therefore deny those allegations.
- 44. Defendants have no personal knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 44 of the FAC, and therefore deny those allegations.

- 45. Defendants have no personal knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 45 of the FAC, and therefore deny those allegations.
- 46. Defendants deny each and every allegation of Paragraph 46 of the FAC, and Defendants affirmatively allege that certain allegations of such Paragraph are contrary to the clergy exception to the Arizona reporting statute.
 - 47. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 47 of the FAC.
- 48. Defendants are without sufficient personal knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the first two sentences of Paragraph 48 of the FAC, and therefore deny those allegations. Defendants specifically deny the allegations of the last sentence of Paragraph 48 of the FAC.
- 49. Defendants assert that the Church Bishops had no right or obligation, consistent with the clergy exception to the Arizona reporting statute and other Arizona law, to disclose a confidential and privileged communication with a Church member and therefore Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 49 of the FAC as those allegations pertain to these Defendants.
 - 50. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 50 of the FAC.
- 51. The matters that are the subject of Paragraph 51 of the FAC involve privileged communications under Arizona law. Without waiving any such privilege, Defendants deny those allegations.
- 52. The matters that are the subject of the first sentence of Paragraph 52 of the FAC involve privileged communications under Arizona law. Without waiving any such privilege, Defendants deny those allegations. Defendants specifically deny that any such privilege was waived, and Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 52 of the FAC as being argumentative and misleading.
- 53. Defendants admit that Bishop Herrod counseled with both Paul and Leizza Adams at times, instructed both of them to report to authorities any abuse of their children that may have occurred or authorize him to do so, but they both refused.

54. Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 54 of the FAC.

- 55. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 55 of the FAC.
- 56. Upon information and belief, Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 56 of the FAC.
 - 57. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 57 of the FAC.
 - 58. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 58 of the FAC.
 - 59. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 59 of the FAC.
- 60. Defendants admit that the Church, through its outside counsel, has a Help Line that is available to Church leaders with respect to certain legal issues that arise from time to time, and Defendants admit that Bishop Herrod called the Help Line at a certain point or points. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 60 of the FAC.
- 61. Defendants admit only that Plaintiffs have quoted a small portion of the Bishops Handbook. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 61 of the FAC.
- 62. Defendants admit that the quoted language appears in the Utah Supreme Court case entitled *MacGregor v. Walker*, but allege that this partial quotation contained in Paragraph 62 of the FAC is used misleadingly by Plaintiffs and that Plaintiffs have failed to point out that the Court in that case held that the Help Line was beneficial and gave rise to no duty to a third party.
 - 63. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 63 of the FAC.
 - 64. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 64 of the FAC.
 - 65. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 65 of the FAC.
 - 66. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 66 of the FAC.
 - 67. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 67 of the FAC.
 - 68. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 68 of the FAC.
 - 69. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 69 of the FAC.
 - 70. Defendants admit that Bishop Herrod ceased his duties as Bishop in

- to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 86 of the FAC and therefore deny those
- 87. Defendants are without sufficient personal knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 87 of the FAC and therefore deny those allegations.
- 88. On information and belief, Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 88 of the FAC.
- 89. On information and belief, Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 89 of the FAC.
- 90. On information and belief, Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 90 of the FAC.
- 91. Defendants are without sufficient personal knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 91 of the FAC and therefore deny those allegations.
- 92. Defendants are without sufficient personal knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of the first two sentences of Paragraph 92 of the FAC and therefore deny those allegations. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 92 of the FAC.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1	127.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 127 of the FAC.
2	128.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 128 of the FAC.
3	129.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 129 of the FAC.
4		COUNT FOUR: BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY
5		(Against All Defendants)
6	130.	Defendants incorporate each of the admissions, denials and allegations of
7	Paragraphs 1	1 through 129 above as if fully set forth herein.
8	131.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 131 of the FAC.
9	132.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 132 of the FAC.
10	133.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 133 of the FAC.
11	134.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 134 of the FAC.
12	135.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 135 of the FAC.
13	136.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 136 of the FAC.
14	COUNT FIVE: MEDICAL MALPRACTICE/MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE	
15		(Against John Herrod/Lenzner Medical Clinic)
16	137.	Defendants incorporate each of the admissions, denials and allegations or
17	Paragraphs 1	1 through 136 above as if fully set forth herein.
18	138.	D C 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / CD 1 1 20 C/ DAG
19		Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 138 of the FAC.
17	139.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 138 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 139 of the FAC.
20	139. 140.	
		Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 139 of the FAC.
20	140.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 139 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 140 of the FAC.
20 21	140. 141.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 139 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 140 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 141 of the FAC.
202122	140. 141. 142.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 139 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 140 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 141 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 142 of the FAC.
20212223	140. 141. 142. 143. 144.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 139 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 140 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 141 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 142 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 143 of the FAC.
2021222324	140. 141. 142. 143. 144.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 139 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 140 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 141 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 142 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 143 of the FAC. Defendants admit that a physician owes a duty of reasonable care to a
202122232425	140. 141. 142. 143. 144. patient, but I	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 139 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 140 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 141 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 142 of the FAC. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 143 of the FAC. Defendants admit that a physician owes a duty of reasonable care to a Defendants otherwise deny the allegations of Paragraph 144 of the FAC.

1	COUNT SIX: MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE/NEGLIGENT	
2	HIRING/RETENTION/SUPERVISION	
3	(Against Lenzner Medical Clinic)	
4	148. Defendants incorporate each of the admissions, denials and allegations of	
5	Paragraphs 1 through 147 above as if fully set forth herein.	
6	149. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 149 of the FAC.	
7	150. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 150 of the FAC.	
8	COUNT SEVEN: RATIFICATION	
9	(Against All Defendants)	
10	151. Defendants incorporate each of the admissions, denials and allegations of	
11	Paragraphs 1 through 150 above as if fully set forth herein.	
12	152. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 152 of the FAC.	
13	153. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 153 of the FAC.	
14	154. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 154 of the FAC.	
15	COUNT EIGHT: CIVIL CONSPIRACY	
16	(Against All Defendants)	
17	155. Defendants incorporate each of the admissions, denials and allegations of	
18	Paragraphs 1 through 154 above as if fully set forth herein.	
19	156. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 156 of the FAC.	
20	157. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 157 of the FAC.	
21	COUNT NINE: PUNITIVE DAMAGES	
22	158. Defendants incorporate each of the admissions, denials and allegations of	
23	Paragraphs 1 through 157 above as if fully set forth herein.	
24	159. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 159 of the FAC.	
25	<u>CASE TIER</u>	
26	160. Defendants admit that this is a Tier 3 case under the Arizona Rules of Civil	
27	Procedure.	
28		

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES 1 2 First Affirmative Defense 3 The FAC fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted against these 4 Defendants. **Second Affirmative Defense** 5 Plaintiffs' claims against Defendants are barred in whole or in part because they 6 7 have not established or sufficiently pled that their claimed injury and damages were 8 caused to any extent by Defendants. 9 Third Affirmative Defense 10 Plaintiffs' claims against Defendants are barred in whole or in part because they 11 have not suffered any damages as a result of any conduct on the part of Defendants. 12 **Fourth Affirmative Defense** Plaintiffs' claims against Defendants are barred in whole or in part because 13 Defendants owed them no duty. 14 15 Fifth Affirmative Defense Plaintiffs' claims against Defendants are barred in whole or in part because their 16 17 injuries are due to the actions, omissions and negligence of persons other than 18 Defendants. Sixth Affirmative Defense 19 Plaintiffs' claims against Defendants are barred in whole or in part because 20 Plaintiffs' damages were caused by the conduct or actions of persons over whom 21 22 Defendants had no control and no duty to control. **Seventh Affirmative Defense** 23 Plaintiffs' claims against Defendants are barred in whole or in part by the 24 25 doctrines of intervening and superseding cause.

Eighth Affirmative Defense

Arizona law does not provide a private cause of action for alleged violation of Arizona's

Plaintiffs' claims against Defendants are barred in whole or in part because

26

27

reporting statutes.

Ninth Affirmative Defense

Any recovery against COP must be diminished, reduced, and allocated as required by Arizona law in proportion to the fault and/or culpable conduct of other persons or entities, whether or not they are parties to this lawsuit.

Tenth Affirmative Defense

Plaintiffs' claims against Defendants are barred under the clergy exception to the Arizona reporting statutes.

Eleventh Affirmative Defense

Plaintiffs' claims, in whole or in part, are barred by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution and related jurisprudence and by the Arizona Constitution as well as the doctrine of religious abstention.

Twelfth Affirmative Defense

Defendant John Herrod, M.D. never treated or examined the Adams children, had no physician/patient relationship with any of them, and never obtained any information from or about them in his professional capacity as a physician. Thus, Dr. Herrod owed no legal duty to Plaintiffs arising out of his practice of medicine.

Thirteenth Affirmative Defense

Plaintiffs' malpractice claims against Dr. John Herrod fail as a matter of law under A.R.S. 12-561 et seq. for the reason that such claims (Counts 5 and 6 of the FAC) do not allege injury to Plaintiffs from the rendering of medical services to Plaintiffs.

Fourteenth Affirmative Defense

Plaintiffs' claim of civil conspiracy fails as a matter of law.

24

26

27

28

21

22

23

25 **GENERAL STATEMENT**

The allegations of Plaintiffs' FAC are, in substantial part, unfounded, immaterial, impertinent, scandalous and knowingly false, and are being pursued against these Defendants by Plaintiffs and their counsel in bad faith within the meaning of A.R.S. 12-

1	349. Accordingly, these Defendants reserve the right to seek sanctions against Plaintiffs	
2	and/or their counsel at the conclusion of this litigation.	
3	WHEREFORE, Defendants pray for relief as follows:	
4	A. For an order dismissing all claims in the FAC against Defendants with	
5	prejudice and on the merits; and	
6	B. For such further relief as the Court may deem appropriate and just.	
7	C. For Defendants' costs incurred in this action.	
8	D. For such other and further relief as is just.	
9	DATED this 8th day of November, 2021.	
10	OSBORN MALEDON, P.A.	
11		
12	By /s/ William J. Maledon	
13	William J. Maledon Travis C. Hunt	
14	2929 North Central Avenue, Suite 2100 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793	
15	BOROWIEC & BOROWIEC, P.C.	
16	Joel P. Borowiec 1723 S. Highway 92	
17	Sierra Vista, AZ 85635	
18 19	KIRTON McCONKIE, P.C. Peter C. Schofield, <i>pro hac vice</i> 4600 W. Executive Pkwy, Suite 400 Lehi, UT 84043	
20	Attorney for Defendants the Church, Herrod	
21	(except counts 5 and 6), and Mauzy	
22		
23		
24	ORIGINAL of the foregoing e-filed and a COPY	
25	e-mailed this 8th day of November, 2021, to:	
26	The Honorable Laura Cardinal	
27	Cochise County Superior Court <u>jcarranza@courts.az.gov</u>	
28	1-arranga/a/- arming 180 i	

1	COPY of the foregoing e-served via AZTurboCourt
2	this 8th day of November, 2021, upon:
3	Lynne M. Cadigan
4	CADIGAN LAW FIRM, PLLC 504 S. Stone Avenue
5	Tucson, AZ 85701
6	lmcadigan@cadiganlawfirm.com dbustamante@cadiganlawfirm.com
7	sabrina.swaim@live.com
8	John C. Manly
9	Ashley Taylor Rayfield, <i>pro hac vice</i> Taylor Boren, <i>pro hac vice</i> pending
10	MANLY, STEWART & FINALDI
11	19100 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 800 Irvine, CA 92612
12	jmanly@manlystewart.com
13	trayfield@manlystewart.com tboren@manlystewart.com
14	kfrederiksen@manlystewart.com
15	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
16	Joel P. Borowiec BOROWIEC, P.C.
17	1723 S. Highway 92 Sierra Vista, AZ 85635
18	jborowiec@borowieclaw.com
19	courtdocs@borowieclaw.com info@borowieclaw.com
	Peter C. Schofield, pro hac vice
20	KIRTON McCONKIE, P.C. 4600 W. Executive Pkwy, Suite 400
21	Lehi, UT 84043 (801) 426-2100
22	pschofield@kmclaw.com ksanford@kmclaw.com
23	jhiggins@kmclaw.com
24	Co-Counsel for Defendants the Church, Herrod (except Counts 5-6), and Mauzy
25	1
26	
27	
28	

1	DeeDee Armer Holden
2	Michael J. Ryan, Of Counsel Nathan S. Ryan
3	HOLDEN & ARMER, P.C. 4505 E. Chandler Blvd., Suite 210
4	Phoenix, AZ 85048 dholden@holdenarmer.com
5	mryan@holdenarmer.com nryan@holdenarmer.com
6	karmer@holdenarmer.com kpenny@holdenarmer.com
7	Attorneys for Defendants Herrod and Lenzner (as to Counts 5-6 only)
8	Anne M. Chapman
9	Kathleen E. Brody MITCHELL STEIN CAREY CHAPMAN, P.C.
10	One Renaissance Square
11	2 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1450 Phoenix, AZ 85004
12	anne@mscclaw.com
13	kathy@mscclaw.com julie@mscclaw.com
14	Attorneys for Defendant Shaunice Warr
15	
16	/s/ Jessica A. Lopez
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	I and the second