

with her unless both parties agreed, but that it was acceptable for the parties to share information if they wish. Respondent will testify that, to date, she has not seen this information, nor has she seen any internal file from Wolinetz; she has merely reviewed the documents filed with the Court.

Based on Respondent's remarks from the bench, Lantz prepared an *ex parte* CPO Order that did not include the Camburn children; Respondent signed it and set it for a full hearing on January 25, 2005.⁶² She set the matter for a full hearing one week later, January 25, 2005, and instructed the Clerk to notify Mrs. Camburn.⁶³ Although the Notices were attempted on January 18, they were not served on Mrs. Camburn until February 3, 2005.⁶⁴

Tuesday, January 25, 2005

Lantz appeared in Respondent's courtroom for the full hearing on Mr. Camburn's CPO, but the evidence will show Mrs. Camburn had not yet been served the order so the hearing could not proceed. Respondent therefore granted a continuance through February 3, 2005, and extended the CPO until that date.⁶⁵

Despite the fact the hearing was vacated, Respondent permitted Lantz to approach the bench several times that day. During one of these approaches, the evidence will show Lantz asked Respondent what her court's process was for seeking an *ex parte* Emergency Custody Order, explaining Respondent was also the assigned judge in Mrs. Camburn's

⁶² Exhibit F5.

⁶³ Exhibits F5, F6, and F7.

⁶⁴ Exhibits F6 and F7.

⁶⁵ Exhibit F8.

divorce case.⁶⁶ The evidence will further show Respondent told her this needed to be accompanied by supporting affidavits, but, given the lack of evidence in support of the motion for CPO, she currently lacked sufficient evidence to grant such an Order.

Respondent will testify she believed from this conversation that Lantz was improperly abusing the CPO and ECO processes to obtain a “mini divorce,” relative to the Camburn children’s custody. That is, these procedures are reserved for instances in which the children are in imminent danger of serious harm with the opposing parent. Especially in a two-week timeframe in which Respondent’s docket was overwhelmed with other critical cases, she will testify she found this repeated pattern troubling.

Friday, January 28, 2005

On January 28, Lantz showed Respondent an initial motion for ECO and supporting exhibits.⁶⁷ The evidence will show Respondent reviewed the Motion and told Lantz it was currently insufficient without additional affidavit testimony from someone with firsthand knowledge of the regular dynamic of the Camburn home; when Lantz suggested they could obtain an affidavit from Mr. Camburn’s mother, Respondent specifically indicated this would be insufficient, as she was located in another city and would lack sufficient firsthand information to change the outcome of the motion.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Exhibit G1.

⁶⁷ Exhibit G2

⁶⁸ Exhibit G12, pp. 5-8, 12-13