

MSJ Judge, Michael Orfield, June 18, 2008:

“Defendant’s motion for summary judgment is denied. The Court notes at the outset that its ruling on this motion is governed by the “law of the case” established by the Court of Appeal in its decision affirming this Court’s denial of Defendant’s anti-SLAPP motion.. Defendant also argues that she did not publish the article with actual malice. Again, however, the **Court of Appeal already found that Plaintiffs made a prima facie showing of malice.**” (Appellant’s Appendix Vol.II Ex.18:257-258)

Trial Judge, Lisa Schall, August 18, 2008

“That’s why I like reading their [sic Appellate anti-SLAPP panel] ruling because I know what I’d do. I won’t upset them if I follow their guidance to start with. They did a pretty good job on pointing to the kinds of evidence they considered in the anti-SLAPP, which is key because it’s the same thing that was adopted in the motion for summary judgment ruling that was made by Judge Orfield.” (Vol.1 RT.4)

Trial Judge, Lisa Schall, December 12, 2008 (last day before moving to Family Court)

“I can’t be drawn into that kind of petty behavior asking Mr. Scheuer to explain himself on things.”

Presiding Judge North County, Joel Pressman, January 9, 2009

The Court denies Defendant Kramer’s Motion for Reconsideration... The Amended Judgment was entered in this case on **December 18, 2008.** (Appellant Appendix Vol.V Ex.33:1078)

(The original judgment was never amended to accurately reflect Sharon Kramer prevailed over GlobalTox and is entitled to costs. **There is no record in the North County file of any judgment entered on 12/18/08.** Nor was any notice ever sent of this purported judgment entered on this purported date that caused the lower court to lose the ability to review)

The Honorable William S. Dato, April 3, 2009 (took over the court for Judge Schall):

Mrs. Kramer, just so you understand, **I don’t have any authority to go back and revisit issues that were decided by Judge Schall,** okay.

.....
But to the extent that you’re talking about things that this court previously did, and I realize it’s the same court now, it was a different judge –(Vol.9 RT.597)

.....