

1 **WOODNICK LAW, PLLC**
1747 E. Morten Avenue, Suite 205
Phoenix, Arizona 85020
2 Telephone: [REDACTED]
3 Facsimile: [REDACTED]

4 **Gregg R. Woodnick,** [REDACTED]
5 **Kaci Y. Bowman,** [REDACTED]
6 *Attorneys for Defendant*

7 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA**

8 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA**

9 In Re the Matter of:

10 **LAURA OWENS,**

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 **GREGORY GILLESPIE,**

14 Defendant.

Case No.: CV2021-052893

15 **RESPONSE/OBJECTION TO**
16 **PLAINTIFF'S SECOND MOTION**
17 **TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE A**
18 **RESPONSE**

(Assigned to the Hon. Alison Bachus)

19 Defendant, GREGORY GILLESPIE, by and through undersigned counsel, hereby
20 files his Response/Objection to Plaintiff's Second Motion to Extend Time to File a
21 Response to the Defendant's Motion to Dismiss/Partial Motion for Judgment on the
22 Pleadings. Defendant incorporates his February 28, 2022 Response/Objection to Plaintiff's
23 Motion to Extend Time to File a Response to the extent applicable and provides as follows:

24 1. Currently pending before the Court is Defendant's Motion to Dismiss/Partial
25 Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings ("Motion"), Plaintiff's Motion to Extend Time to
26 File a Response to the Defendant's Motion to Dismiss/Partial Motion for Judgment on the
27 Pleadings, Defendant's Response/Objection to Plaintiff's Motion to Extend Time to File a
28 Response, and now Plaintiff's second Motion to Extend Time to File a Response.

1 2. As iterated fully in Defendant’s initial Response/Objection, Plaintiff has
2 been aware of the deadline to file her Response to Defendant’s Motion since early
3 February. A brief timeline is as follows:

4 a. On February 3, 2022, the parties held an Early Meeting and Plaintiff was
5 informed that Defendant intended to file his Motion, consistent with the requirements of
6 Rules 12(j) and 7.1(h), *Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure* (A.R.C.P.)

7 b. Plaintiff received a draft of the Motion, as courtesy, on February 14, 2022.

8 c. Defendant’s Motion was filed on February 15, 2022. Pursuant to Rules 6(c)
9 and 7.1(a)(3), A.R.C.P., Plaintiff had ten (10) business days in addition to five (5) calendar
10 days to file a Response. Thus, Plaintiff’s Response was due on March 7, 2022.

11 d. On February 25, 2022, Plaintiff requested an extension from undersigned
12 counsel until April 15, 2022. Defendant responded by offering a weeklong extension, until
13 March 14, 2022. Plaintiff filed her first Motion to Extend Time to File a Response to the
14 Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss/Partial Judgment on the Pleadings, asking for an extension
15 until April 14, 2022 (roughly 2.5 months after Plaintiff became aware of Defendant’s
16 Motion).

17 e. On February 28, 2022, Defendant filed his first Response/Objection to
18 Plaintiff’s Motion.

19 f. On March 4, 2022, Plaintiff hired counsel.

20 g. On March 10, 2022, Plaintiff’s counsel withdrew.

1 h. On March 11, 2022, Plaintiff requested an additional extension of time to file
2 her Response and filed another Motion to Extend Time.¹ Plaintiff again requested until
3 April 14, 2022 to file her Response and added that discovery be “*put on hold until*
4 *Plaintiff’s new counsel is hired, which Plaintiff’s plans to do early next week (week of*
5 *March 14th).*”

6
7 3. Notably, Plaintiff inappropriately attempts to further delay her A.R.C.P Rule
8 26.1(f) disclosure obligations in this second request for an extension. This is relevant
9 because, through investigative efforts by Defendant, another matter in California involving
10 Plaintiff and allegations of a fabricated pregnancy (and abortion) was discovered. Seven
11 (7) months after this lawsuit was initiated, and only with effort by Defendant, did this
12 curiously similar matter come to light. To date, Plaintiff has not provided any formal
13 disclosure.
14

15
16 4. Over the course of litigation, Plaintiff’s *modus operandi* has been to
17 overwhelm the Court with allegations and unsustainable legal theories (*see* Plaintiff’s
18 Motion to Seal Court Records; Plaintiff’s Declaration of Fraud, Perjury, Impersonation,
19 Extortion, and Additional Illegal Actions Taken by Defendant and his Counsel; Plaintiff’s
20 Motion to Modify Service Date).

21
22 5. Plaintiff previously indicated she was represented by attorney Joe Cotchett
23 who specifically disavowed involvement in the matter (*see* Defendant’s first
24 Response/Objection to Plaintiff’s Motion to Extend Time to File a Response), her recent
25 attorney withdrew after only a matter of days and now, most recently, it is March 21st and
26
27

28

¹ Plaintiff’s Motion indicates she can tell when counsel’s emails are read. In addition to being inaccurate, it is woefully misleading and inappropriate.

1 Plaintiff has not retained new counsel as she represented to the court she would be doing
2 early in the week of March 14th.

3 6. Defendant's Motion to Dismiss/Partial Motion for Judgment on the
4 Pleadings was filed February 15, 2022 making Plaintiff's Response due March 7, 2022.
5

6 7. Although Defendant agreed to a reasonable one-week extension for Plaintiff
7 to file her Response by March 14, 2022, that time has now come and gone.

8 8. As such, Defendant respectfully submits that his Motion to Dismiss/Partial
9 Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings must be granted as Plaintiff has failed to file a timely
10 Response.
11

12 9. Any further delay would be patently unfair to Defendant who has already
13 been forced to incur significant legal fees responding to allegations not supported by fact
14 or law.
15

16 **WHEREFORE**, Defendant respectfully requests the following:

17 A. That this Court deny Plaintiff's second Motion to Extend Time to File a
18 Response to the Defendant's Motion to Dismiss/Partial Motion for Judgment on the
19 Pleadings;
20

21 B. That this court grant Defendant's Motion to Dismiss/Motion for Judgement
22 on Pleadings of Plaintiff's Abortion Coercion Claim; and
23

24 C. That this Court grant such other and further relief as deemed appropriate.
25

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 21st day of March, 2022.

WOODNICK LAW, PLLC



Gregg R. Woodnick
Kaci Y. Bowman
Attorneys for Defendant


ORIGINAL of the foregoing e-filed
This 21st day of March, 2022, with:

Clerk of Court
Maricopa County Superior Court
201 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

Honorable Alison Bachus
Maricopa County Superior Court

COPY of the foregoing document
e-mailed the same day to:

Zachary Mushkatel
Mushkatel, Robbins & Becker, PLLC



Attorneys for Plaintiff (pending Motion to Withdraw)

By: /s/Sara Seeburg