

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2005-003559

07/06/2006

HONORABLE TIMOTHY J. RYAN

CLERK OF THE COURT  
B. Navarro  
Deputy

FILED: 07/11/2006

HUFFMAN APPRAISAL GROUP INC

ROBERT R BAUER

v.

SCOTT M COOPER, et al.

MARIA CRIMI SPETH

**MINUTE ENTRY**

The Court has received Plaintiff/Counterdefendant's Motion for Clarification of Summary Judgment Order, which is a thinly veiled Motion for Reconsideration. The Defendants filed their Response, but the Plaintiff/Counterdefendant has not filed its reply.

**IT IS ORDERED** denying the Motion. The Court has adopted each and every argument advanced in the Defendant/Counterclaimants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and their Reply. That is why the Court chose to state, "For the reasons...", as opposed to employing the phrase, "For a reason." Specifically stated, the term, "clientele" is ambiguous, which renders the agreement unenforceable. The geographical scope is unreasonably broad in scope, and the Plaintiff cannot cure it with a unilateral rewrite to two counties after the fact. The time limit is unreasonably long in scope, and should have been something more in the line of six months under the facts of this case. The agreement, as a matter of public policy, should not be enforceable in any way, shape or form.