1	DOYLE LAW GROUP		
2	5010 East Shea Blvd., Suite A-106 Scottsdale, Arizona 85254		
	Telephone: 602-494-0556		
3	Facsimile: 602-494-0621		
4	John C. Doyle, Esq. (Bai No. 010002)		
5	Jonathan L. Sullivan, Esq. (Bar No. 026619)  Attorneys for Plaintiff		
6			
7	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA		
		I OF MARICOPA	
8	REDECCA DEASLET, illulvidually as tile)	CASE NO. CV2010-050624	
9	surviving spouse of ORVILLE THOMAS) BEASLEY III, and as personal representative)		
10	of the ESTATE OF ORVILLE THOMAS)	REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR	
11	BEASLEY III; and ORVILLE THOMAS) II and ANNA ELIZABETH BEASLEY,)	CLARIFICATION	
12	husband and wife and parents of ORVILLE)	(Tort: Non-Motor Vehicle)	
	THOMAS BEASLEY III.		
13	Plaintiffs, ) v.	(Assigned to the Honorable Linda Miles)	
14	,		
15	JOHN C. STUART and JANE DOE  STUART, a married couple; JOHN and		
16	JANE DOES I-V; BLACK & WHITE )		
	CORPORATIONS VI-X; and ABC )		
17	)		
18	Defendants.		
19	Plaintiffs Rebecca Beasley, the Estate of Orville Thomas Beasley III, and Orville Thomas II		
20			
21	and Anna Elizabeth Beasley, by and through undersigned counsel, file this Reply in support for		
22	their Motion for Clarification Regarding Defendant's Answer/Motion titled "Answer And/Or		
23	Response To Plaintiff's Baseless, Frivolous, and Unla	wful Compaint [sic] Submitted Under Duress	
24	And Viet Armis And No Granting Jurisdiction Defendant Is Only Appearing Specially And Not		
25	Generally" (hereinafter Defendant's "Answer").		
26	Defendant's Response fails to address the issues raised in Plaintiff's Motion, which is the		
	determination of what type of pleading Defendant file	d on March 31, 2010. Defendant's Response	

1	does not explain or clarify the document filed by Defendant on March 31. Defendant's Response		
2	reiterates some of the statements made in his "Answer" but also raises new issues like a request for		
3	dismissal based on the failure to join an indispensable party. Additionally, Defendant has still not		
4	explained his decision to included language in his "Answer" that indicate he is filed an Answer to		
5	Plaintiff's Complaint, is asserting counter-claims, and a third-party complaint. As such,		
6 7	Defendant's Response is not helpful in clarifying to the Court, or Plaintiff, if a responsive pleading		
8	is required by Plaintiff.		
9	Until the Count makes a final determination of the true of also ding Defendant filed on		
10	March 31, 2010, Plaintiff requests the Court strike all of legal issues raised in Defendant's		
11	"Answer" and Response. If the Court rules that Defendant's "Answer" is actually a Motion to		
12	Dismiss, or some other pleading besides and "Answer," Plaintiff reserves the right to respond to all		
13	of the issues raised in Defendant's "Answer" and Response.		
<ul><li>14</li><li>15</li></ul>	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 29th day of April, 2010.		
16	DOVI E LAW CDOUD		
17	/s/John C. Doyle		
18	John C. Doyle Jonathan L. Sullivan		
19	5010 E. Shea Blvd. Suite A 106 Scottsdale, Arizona 85254		
20	Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
21	ORIGINAL of the foregoing electronically filed this 29th day of April, 2010 with:		
22	Clerk of Court		
23	Maricopa Superior Court		
24	Northeast Regional Center 18380 N. 40th Street		
25	Phoenix, AZ 85032		
26			

1	<b>COPY</b> of the foregoing distributed by electronic filing this 29th day of April, 2010 to:
2	The Honorable Linda Miles
3	Maricopa Superior Court
4	Northeast Regional Center 18380 N. 40th Street
5	Phoenix, AZ 85032
6	COPY of the foregoing mailed
7	this 29 <sup>th</sup> day of April, 2010 to:
8	John Stuart, Pro per 10407 W. Trumbull Road
9	Tolleson, Arizona 85353
10	By:_/s/ Jennelle DeAtley
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	