

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

WO

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Kathy L. Jamieson, an individual,
Plaintiff,
v.
Lawrence B. Slater, et al.,
Defendants.

Monica Jagelski,
Plaintiff,
v.
Kathy Marchant (a.k.a Jamieson),
Defendant.

James Bret Marchant, Oasis Pipeliner,
LLC,
Plaintiffs,
v.
Kathy Jamieson, James Jamieson, and
Kassie Kientz,
Defendants.

) No. CV 06-1524-PHX-SMM
) No. CV 06-2261-PHX-SMM
) No. CV 06-2631-PHX-SMM
) (consolidated)

ORDER

Before the Court is Defendants Lawrence B. Slater, Sandra G. Slater, and Slater & Associates, P.C.’s (collectively, “Slater”) Motion for Clarification (Doc. 213). Plaintiff Kathy Jamieson (“Jamieson”) filed a Response (Doc. 218).

1 On February 20, 2009, Defendants Slater filed a motion for partial summary judgment
2 (Doc. 133). The Court granted the motion on September 8, 2009, and dismissed Count One
3 for slander of title against Defendants Slater (Doc. 175). Subsequently, Defendant Monica
4 Jagelski (“Jagelski”) filed a motion for summary judgment on June 26, 2009 (Doc. 161).
5 Defendants Slater then filed a joinder to Jagelski’s motion (Doc. 165). On April 1, 2010, the
6 Court granted Jagelski’s motion and dismissed Counts One, Two, and Three against Jagelski
7 (Doc. 203). Based upon their joinder with Jagelski’s motion, Defendants Slater request
8 clarification as to whether the Court’s Order dismissing Counts One, Two, and Three against
9 Jagleski also dismissed those counts against Defendants Slater.

10 Count One already was dismissed as to Defendants Slater when the Court granted
11 their partial summary judgment motion on September 8, 2009 (Doc. 175). Additionally, in
12 her response to Jagelski’s summary judgment motion, Jamieson stated that she was
13 abandoning her claim for abuse of process (Count Three). As a result, Count Three can be
14 dismissed against Defendants Slater. Therefore, the focus of Defendants Slater’s Motion for
15 Clarification is Count Two for tortious interference.

16 In her Response to Defendants Slater’s motion (Doc. 218), Jamieson concedes that
17 the Court’s past Orders have eliminated Jamieson’s claims against Defendants Slater in this
18 case. However, Jamieson states that Lawrence Slater will likely be an important witness at
19 any trial.

20 Accordingly,

21 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED GRANTING** Defendants Lawrence B. Slater, Sandra
22 G. Slater, and Slater & Associates, P.C.’s (collectively, “Slater”) Motion for Clarification
23 (Doc. 213). Counts One, Two, and Three of Kathy Jamieson’s Amended Complaint (Doc.
24 12) are dismissed against Defendants Lawrence B. Slater, Sandra G. Slater, and Slater
25 & Associates, P.C.

26 ///


27 ///

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants Lawrence B. Slater, Sandra G. Slater,
and Slater & Associates, P.C. are dismissed from this case.

DATED this 21st day of May, 2010.



Stephen M. McNamee
United States District Judge