

Colin F. Campbell, 004955  
Geoffrey M. T. Sturr, 014063  
Joseph N. Roth, 025725  
Joshua M. Whitaker, 032724  
OSBORN MALEDON, P.A.  
2929 North Central Avenue, 21st Floor  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793  
(602) 640-9000  
[ccampbell@omlaw.com](mailto:ccampbell@omlaw.com)  
[gsturr@omlaw.com](mailto:gsturr@omlaw.com)  
[jroth@omlaw.com](mailto:jroth@omlaw.com)  
[jwhitaker@omlaw.com](mailto:jwhitaker@omlaw.com)

Attorneys for Plaintiff

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA

Peter S. Davis, as Receiver of DenSco  
Investment Corporation, an Arizona  
corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

Clark Hill PLC, a Michigan limited  
liability company; David G. Beauchamp  
and Jane Doe Beauchamp, husband and  
wife,

Defendants.

No. CV2017-013832

**RECEIVER'S RESPONSE TO  
CLARK HILL'S MOTION TO FILE  
REPLY ON ITS MOTION IN LIMINE  
TO PRECLUDE USE OF  
DOCUMENTS IDENTIFIED IN  
RULE 807(b) NOTICES**

(Assigned to the Honorable  
Daniel Martin)

Of course, the Court has complete discretion to read the Motion in Limine and the Response and determine for itself whether a reply would be helpful to the Court. The Receiver suggests even a quick review of the pleadings will demonstrate that Clark Hill filed the motion prematurely, and now just wants to file additional motions in limine to address other evidentiary rules it should have thought of.

Clark Hill's motion to file a reply, however, contains the best reason why it should be denied. In trying to explain the value of a reply, Clark Hill states:

For example, the Court could rule that the Journals and Letters do not have exceptional guarantees of trustworthiness necessary for admission under Rule of Evidence 807(b), as Defendants argue in the Motion, while leaving for a later time whether statements *in those documents*

could be admissible under another evidentiary rule for some limited purpose, as Plaintiff suggests.

(Motion on page 4) (emphasis added) The Receiver does not intend to move into evidence the entire Journals, only selected portions of them. A ruling on them “as a whole” is completely unnecessary. The selected portions of the Journals will be considered under Rule 807, the residual exception, only if not admitted under any other rules of evidence. Even on the selected portions, Rule 807 is not now ripe for determination. As to the letters, Clark Hill had them in its possession when Clark Hill undertook to represent DenSco after Chittick’s death. What it knew is a non-hearsay use of the document.

The Court should deny the motion for additional briefing and rule on the motion in limine without additional briefing or oral argument. Receiver withdraws its request for oral argument.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 22nd day of July, 2019.

OSBORN MALEDON, P.A.

By /s/Colin F. Campbell

Colin F. Campbell

Geoffrey M. T. Sturr

Joseph N. Roth

Joshua M. Whitaker

2929 North Central Avenue, 21st Floor

Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793

Attorneys for Plaintiff

1 This document was electronically filed  
2 and copy delivered\*/e-served via the  
3 AZTurboCourt eFiling system  
this 22nd day of July, 2019, on:

4 Honorable Daniel Martin\*  
5 Maricopa County Superior Court  
101 West Jefferson, ECB-412  
6 Phoenix, Arizona 85003

7 John E. DeWulf  
8 Marvin C. Ruth  
9 Vidula U. Patki  
COPPERSMITH BROCKELMAN PLC  
10 2800 North Central Avenue, Suite 1900  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
11 [jdewulf@cblawyers.com](mailto:jdewulf@cblawyers.com)  
12 [mruth@cblawyers.com](mailto:mruth@cblawyers.com)  
[vparki@cblawyers.com](mailto:vparki@cblawyers.com)  
13 *Attorneys for Defendants*

14  
15 /s/Karen McClain  
8152997