

1 **WO**

2
3
4
5
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**
8

9 Nina Alley,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 County of Pima, et al.,

13 Defendants.
14

No. CV-15-00152-TUC-RM

ORDER

15 Pending before the Court is the parties' Joint Motion to Reopen (Doc. 1202) and
16 Plaintiff's Motion to Supplement Joint Motion to Reopen (Doc. 1198).

17 On June 10, 2024, the Court stayed the above-captioned matter pending resolution
18 of former Plaintiff Louis Taylor's¹ state post-conviction proceedings challenging his 2013
19 convictions. (Doc. 1174.) The Court later administratively closed the matter and directed
20 the parties to file a joint motion to reopen following resolution of the state post-conviction
21 proceedings. (Doc. 1192.)

22 In their Joint Motion to Reopen, the parties aver that the state court denied Taylor's
23 Petition for Post-Conviction Relief on November 6, 2025, and they attach a copy of the
24 state court's ruling. (Doc. 1202.) Plaintiff asks the Court to set a status conference in this
25 matter. (*Id.* at 2.) Plaintiff also avers that he intends to file a claim for compensation under
26 a recently enacted statute, A.R.S. § 13-4296. (*Id.* at 2-3.) Plaintiff argues that, if such a
27 claim succeeds, it would "likely" satisfy the favorable termination requirement of *Heck v.*

28 ¹ Taylor's Guardian and Conservator, Nina Alley, has been substituted as the named Plaintiff in this action. The Court refers herein to Taylor interchangeably as Plaintiff.

1 *Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994). (*Id.* at 3.) Plaintiff asks that a trial in the above-captioned
2 matter be set sufficiently far in the future to allow for resolution of his anticipated A.R.S.
3 § 13-4296 claim, but he also argues that any further delays in this case “should and must
4 be minimized.” (*Id.*) Plaintiff requests that the Court rule on any previously filed motions
5 that have not yet been addressed, but that the Court postpone ruling on his Equitable
6 Estoppel Motion until after resolution of his anticipated § 13-4296 claim. (*Id.* at 3-4.)
7 Defendants argue that there is no basis for deferring a ruling on Plaintiff’s Equitable
8 Estoppel Motion. (*Id.* at 10-11.) Defendants request leave to file a supplement to their
9 Response to the Equitable Estoppel Motion and a renewed summary judgment motion
10 addressing the testimony presented during Taylor’s post-conviction hearing. (*Id.* at 11-
11 12.)

12 The Court will grant the parties’ Joint Motion to Reopen and direct the Clerk of
13 Court to mark as pending all previously filed Motions that have not yet been resolved in
14 full. The Court will set a status conference to discuss the scheduling of a firm trial date in
15 this matter. During the status conference, the parties shall also be prepared to discuss (1)
16 Plaintiff’s request to postpone trial and the disposition of his Equitable Estoppel Motion
17 pending resolution of his anticipated A.R.S. § 13-4296 claim; and (2) Defendants’ request
18 for leave to file a supplemental response to Plaintiff’s Equitable Estoppel Motion and a
19 renewed summary judgment motion.

20 In Plaintiff’s Motion to Supplement Joint Motion to Reopen (Doc. 1198),
21 Defendants’ Response thereto (Doc. 1199), and Plaintiff’s Reply (Doc. 1200), the parties
22 quibble over whether Plaintiff’s attorneys played a role in writing or advocating for A.R.S.
23 § 13-4296. The Court will grant Plaintiff’s Motion to Supplement to the extent the Court
24 has read the contents of the Motion to Supplement, Response, and Reply; however, the
25 Court does not find any relevance to the parties’ dispute concerning Plaintiff’s attorneys’
26 alleged involvement in the passage of A.R.S. § 13-4296.

27

28

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Supplement Joint Motion to Reopen (Doc. 1198) is **granted** insofar as the Court has read the contents of the Motion to Supplement, Response, and Reply.

Dated this 18th day of December, 2025.

- 3 -