

ATTACHMENTS

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2020-104765-002 DT

09/15/2022

HONORABLE ROY C. WHITEHEAD

CLERK OF THE COURT
S. Yoder
Deputy

STATE OF ARIZONA

VINCE IMBORDINO
JOSH MAXWELL
CATHERINE FERGUSON-GILBERT

v.

GUSTIN RAY WOODMAN JR. (002)

BRUCE E BLUMBERG
DANIELA H DE LA TORRE

CAPITAL CASE MANAGER

MINUTE ENTRY RULING

Pending before the Court are the State's motion to Quash Ex Parte Order (filed July 15, 2022), Defendant's response (filed August 1, 2022), and the State's reply (filed August 2, 2022).

The Court has also reviewed the ex parte order at issue, authored by defense counsel and signed by this Court on October 15, 2015. The order includes language that agencies, public bodies, or entities served with the order shall not inform the prosecution or any law enforcement agency that Defendant has made a request for records or that the agency, public body, or entity possesses such records. This provision appears designed to protect defense counsel's work product and does not violate any ethical or procedural rule.

The order also includes language, however, limiting the dissemination of records to the prosecution or other law enforcement agencies. This appears to be a restriction without qualification and would hamper the State's lawful acquisition of responsive evidence.

The Court finds the ex parte order is overbroad, as Defendant is not entitled to limit the State's investigation in this manner.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2020-104765-002 DT

09/15/2022

IT IS ORDERED quashing the ex parte order signed October 15, 2015.

This Court will not address the question of whether defense counsel violated the rules of professional conduct by requesting and obtaining such an order. The order, which was clearly issued in error, must be excised and replaced. Accordingly, if defense counsel wishes to have the continued power of this Court in support of their mitigation investigation, they shall submit a new proposed ex parte order. This order shall not include a provision limiting the dissemination of evidence to the State.

Because the order has been in place for nearly seven years, it is possible that numerous agencies, public bodies, or entities are under the misapprehension that they may not give evidence to the State, even where the State is lawfully entitled to such evidence. In the interest of protecting defense counsel's work product, this Court will not order the production of every order issued, as the State has requested. Instead, defense counsel shall inform every agency, public body, or entity served with the order that the order is no longer in force and that they are therefore not prohibited from giving the State any records covered by the order. However, defense counsel may inform such agencies, public bodies, or entities that they are still restricted from informing the State that a request for records was initially made pursuant to the now quashed order.

In its motion to extend deadline to respond to Defendant's Objection to State's Review or Use of Privileged Tablet Messages Between Mr. Woodman and His Capital Defense Team, the State indicated that it required a ruling from this Court on the motions discussed above before it could respond to the privilege motion. The State shall therefore have 10 days from today's date to respond to Defendant's privilege motion.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2023-119447-001 DT

03/11/2026

c
HONORABLE JEFFREY A. RUETER

CLERK OF THE COURT
D. McHardy
Deputy

STATE OF ARIZONA

KRISTIN LARISH
RYAN GREEN

v.

ZION WILLIAM TEASLEY (001)

ERIKA A WARNER
BRIAN LOUIS BORRELLI

CAPITAL CASE MANAGER
JUDGE RUETER

COLLEEN CLASE

MINUTE ENTRY

The Court has received and reviewed the Defendant's Motion for Leave to File Motions and Orders *Ex Parte* and Under Seal: Defense Filings #26 through #34, filed 03/06/2026.

There being good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED granting the Motion.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2017-130352-001 DT

03/05/2020

HONORABLE DEAN M. FINK

CLERK OF THE COURT
I. Huerta
Deputy

STATE OF ARIZONA

KRISTIN LARISH

v.

GUSTAVO ALEJANDRO RUIZ LAMAR (001)

GERALD M BRADLEY
ELEANOR R KNOWLES

CAPITAL CASE MANAGER
JUDGE FINK

CAPITAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

9:22 a.m.

Courtroom CCB 501

State's Attorney:	Above named counsel
Defendant's Attorney:	Above named counsel
Defendant:	Present
Court Reporter:	Jessica Wasdyke

A record of the proceedings is also made digitally.

The Court has received and reviewed a Capital Case Management Plan filed by counsel for the defendant.

Based on the information contained in the Plan, the Court notes a Motion to Continue will be filed. Counsel have interviewed one Mesa Police Department witness, and another Crime Scene Specialist should be interviewed prior to the next Complex Case Management Conference.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2017-130352-001 DT

03/05/2020

Defense counsel advises the Court the Motion to Continue was filed on 03/04/2020.

Discussion is held regarding the status of the outstanding interviews.

The Court has received and reviewed the State's Motion to Deny any Motions for Filing *Ex Parte* Without Notice to the State and Victims, the defendant's Response and the State's Reply.

The Court's ruling is set forth on the record.

The following are requirements for any *ex parte* proceedings, requests or communications with this Court:

1. The requesting party will file two written documents. a. A Notice of Lodging *Ex Parte* Motion (Notice of which shall be given to the opposing party and to the victim's attorney, if represented). b. The substantive *ex parte* motion. The second motion may be filed under seal with the requisite motion to file under seal and proposed form of order.
2. The substantive motion must include not only the specifics of the request but the reasons why there is a need for confidentiality per Rule 6.7(b) and *Morehart v. Barton*, 226 Ariz. 510 (2011). The Court will determine whether a proper showing for confidentiality has been made before any motion is granted.
3. Any *ex parte* communication will be done on the record.

IT IS ORDERED affirming the **Trial Date of 05/04/2020 at 10:30 a.m.** before this division.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED vacating **Final Trial Management Conference (FTMC)** set on 04/03/2020 and resetting same to **04/09/2020 at 8:30 a.m.** before this division.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that no time be excluded. **LAST DAY REMAINS: 06/03/2020.**

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED affirming prior custody orders.

9:37 a.m. Matter concludes.