Before the PTA Official's perjuries on 06-10-05, my wife's attorney and my attorney battled it out over whether or not the PTA Official should be allowed to testify. It was clear that neither she nor the Principal had been properly disclosed or subpoenaed, but the magistrate allowed the testimony anyway:

```
: At this time, Your Honor, we
14
                   MR.
    would call our last witness, Miss
15
                              : Your Honor, this is the first
                   MS.
16
     I've heard of Miss
17
                              : Your Honor, we had --
                   MR.
18
                             : There's been no disclosure.
                   MS.
19
 1
    We disclosed all of them.
 2
                   MS.
                            : Your Honor, they disclosed them
    for a temporary restraining order hearing, not for a
 3
 4
    temporary orders hearing.
                               Your Honor, without opposing
 6
    counsel having identified these witnesses for this
 7
    particular hearing, the burden is on me to contact
 8
    potential witnesses for a hearing that was supposed to have
 9
    taken place back in February about a restraining order when
10
    I wasn't even on the case and I assumed that that issue was
11
12
    a dead issue.
                             . And Your Honor, I would also
14
    point out that Mr. did not even identify on Monday
15
     that this witness was going to be called. He simply stated
16
17
     that the principal was going to be called and the Court
     ruled at that time to dismiss the police officer he had
18
     called and to allow the principal's testimony. I think
19
     it's highly unfair and certainly trial by ambush for him to
20
     show up now today four days later with another witness, and
21
     I don't know how many witnesses he's got sitting out in the
22
     hallway right now.
23
```

(My attorney did an excellent job of arguing her points and the magistrate agreed at first.)

```
THE COURT: Okay. Normally what's supposed
```

- 18 to happen in these cases is that a status conference is
- 19 held and temporary orders are scheduled, if necessary,
- 7 There was a change of counsel but it appears
- 8 to me that nobody's ever bothered to do a Trial Management
- 9 Certificate 'cause I don't have one and
- guys, we're six months out and there's not a reason
- 17 why people aren't being disclosed and people aren't being
- 18 told about stuff and told that people are going to come in
- 19 and testify and that sort of thing and what they're going
- 20 to testify about. That's the only way that you could
- 21 possibly have a meaningful settlement conference
- I don't know why Ms. is here. I don't
- 6 know what the purpose of her testimony is or what it may
- 7 have to do with temporary orders or not

(The magistrate was then concerned about a motion to modify (and got one from my side after temporary orders were issued, but denied it without a hearing to retaliate for firing her friend.))

- THE COURT: On the other hand and the other
- 16 piece of this is very clear to me that, you know, I can say
- 17 okay, she can't be called and then she isn't called and
- 18 then we get the motion to modify because here's this other
- 19 evidence and -- or worse, I enter one kind of order and
- 20 everybody's endorsed them appropriately for permanent
- 21 orders and I have children who have lived in this situation
- 22 for a period of time that they shouldn't have lived in
- 23 because I didn't have all the information.
- So you want to do your offer of proof now?
- MR. :: Yes, Your Honor.

(See "Offer of Proof")

```
And that's what Miss 's testimony, as I
13
    understand it, would be, Your Honor.
14
15
                   THE COURT: Miss.
                                I'm shocked. I'm -- I'm just --
16
    this is exactly my point.
                               This is trial by ambush and we
17
    have the Rules of Civil Procedure for a reason and this is
18
    just grossly unfair. And I understand that the Court's
19
    position, if you're concerned about the children and we
20
    want to do what's best for the children, but there's no way
21
    I can respond to these witnesses showing up when I have no
22
    idea what they're going to testify to or we would have
23
    lined up 25 witnesses to come in and all clear my client's
24
    name as to what a great father he is. This is grossly
25
1
    unfair.
                  MR.
                                If we could get the names of
2
3
    those 25 witnesses.
                             : And unprofessional.
4
                  MS.
                   THE COURT: I'm going to allow her to
5
6
    testify. Go ahead.
```

(See "Perjury – PTA Official". The magistrate's decision was just as shocking as my wife's attorney's "Offer of Proof", but we didn't begin to realize until 07-22-05, following the final temporary orders' hearing, how devastating not only the perjuries were to my case, but also how devastating the judicial bias would be to my entire family. This magistrate, as I found out in the post-divorce, is just another man-hater that has managed to gain a position of trust in our community, which she obviously uses to accomplish her hateful agenda. Recently, it was explained to me that her lesbianism has gotten in the way of her doing her job in the past too, which explains the yelling and screaming at me in her courtroom one day in front of many others that were waiting for their cases to be called up. However, there is no excuse for the things she did to fix the divorce against me and there is no doubt that she was biased in favor of my wife, was working with my wife's attorney and the CFI to influence judicial proceedings even after she was disqualified from the case. This magistrate's salary is a complete waste of taxpayer money, and she, my wife's attorney and the CFI should be disbarred.)