

Arizona Supreme Court
Civil Petition for Review - Juvenile

CV-24-0145-PR

IN RE DEPENDENCY OF K.M. AND K.A.M.

Appellate Case Information

Case Filed: 5-Jul-2024
 Case Closed:

Dept/Composition

Side 1. HANNAH A., Appellant
 (Litigant Group) HANNAH A.

- Hannah A.

Attorneys for: Appellant

David J Euchner, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 21768)

Side 2. DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SAFETY, K.M., K.A.M., Appellee
 (Litigant Group) DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SAFETY

- Department of Child Safety

Attorneys for: Appellee

Amber E Pershon, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 31042)
 Kristin K Mayes, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 22584)

(Litigant Group) K.M., K.A.M.

- K. M.
- K. A. M.

Attorneys for: Guardian Ad Litem for Minor Child

Jillian Aja, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 27761)
 David Peter Miller, Esq. (AZ Bar No. davidmiller)

CASE STATUS

Jul 5, 2024.....Pending

PREDECESSOR CASE(S)	Cause/Charge/Class	Judgment/Sentence	Judge, Role <Comments>	Trial	Dispo
2 CA 2 CA-JV 23-0111					
↪ PIM JD20180618			Kristin Schriener, Pro Tem Comments: (none)		

7 PROCEEDING ENTRIES

1.	5-Jul-2024	FILED: Petition for Review to Arizona Supreme Court; Certificate of Service; Certificate of Compliance; Memorandum Decision (Appellant)
2.	5-Jul-2024	FILED: Motion for Procedural Order; Motion to Exceed Word Limit; Certificate of Service (Appellant Hannah A.)
3.	8-Jul-2024	FILED: Record From CofA: Link to Electronic Record
4.	8-Jul-2024	A "Motion for Procedural Order; Motion to Exceed Word Limit" (Appellant Hannah A.) having been filed with a 3,781-word count petition for review, and the Clerk of the Court having been authorized by the Supreme Court to enter orders granting or denying requests for extended word count, IT IS ORDERED granting Appellant's motion to exceed the word count limit on the petition for review by 281 words for a total of 3,781 words. The petition for review shall be filed this date. (Tracie K. Lindeman, Clerk)
5.	11-Jul-2024	FILED: Notice of Supplemental Authority; Certificate of Service (Appellant Hannah A.)
6.	22-Jul-2024	FILED: DCS's Notice of No Response; Certificate of Service (Appellee DCS)
7.	22-Jul-2024	The Clerk of the Supreme Court having been authorized by the Supreme Court to order any party to file a response to a petition for review at the direction of a Supreme Court staff attorney, IT IS ORDERED that no response to the petition for review is necessary. The Court will consider the petition for review in due course. (Tracie K. Lindeman, Clerk)