

1 **WO**

2

3

4

5

6

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

7

8

9

JAN E. KRUSKA,

No. CV 08-0054-PHX-SMM

10

Plaintiff,

ORDER

11

v.

12

PERVERTED JUSTICE FOUNDATION)
INCORPORATED, et. al.,

13

14

Defendant.

15

16

17

Before the Court is Plaintiff’s Motion and Affidavit with Exhibits to Quash
Replies, Memorandums, etc., Motion for Judgment in Full, and Motion to Recover
Services Expenses (“Motion to Quash”) (Doc. 73) and Motion to Withdraw Judicial
Notice, Special Motion, Motion for Judgment (In Reference to Doc. 73 Only) (“Motion to
Withdraw”) (Doc. 87).

22

In her Motion to Quash, Plaintiff asserts that Steven G. Ford, counsel for
Defendants Christopher Brocious and Barbara Ochoa, is not admitted to practice with the
District Court of Arizona (Doc. 73, ¶9). Plaintiff indicates that she checked the Arizona
District Court website and was unable to locate any Steven Ford admitted to practice
(Doc. 73, ¶10). As a result, Plaintiff requests that the Court quash all motions, replies,
and filings by defense counsel (Doc. 73). Further, Plaintiff asks the Court to grant

28

1 judgment in full in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants Brocious and Ochoa (Doc.
2 73).

3 In the Response filed by Defendants, counsel attaches a printout from the U.S.
4 District Court of Arizona website showing his admission and active status (Doc. 79).
5 Subsequently, Plaintiff filed her Motion to Withdraw in which she indicates a computer
6 “glitch” was to blame for her inability to locate defense counsel on the District Court
7 website (Doc 87, ¶6). Despite searching the website three times for Steven Ford, Plaintiff
8 received the same message, “the query returned no matches” (Doc. 87, ¶2). Based upon
9 this inability to verify that defense counsel was admitted to practice in the District Court
10 of Arizona, Plaintiff submitted the Motion to Quash (Doc. 87, ¶4).

11 In light of the evidence that defense counsel Steven Ford is admitted to practice in
12 the District Court of Arizona, the Court will grant the withdrawal of Plaintiff’s Motion to
13 Quash.

14 Accordingly,

15 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED DENYING** Plaintiff’s Motion and Affidavit with
16 Exhibits to Quash Replies, Memorandums, etc., Motion for Judgment in Full, and Motion
17 to Recover Services Expenses (Doc. 73).

18 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED GRANTING** Motion to Withdraw Judicial
19 Notice, Special Motion, Motion for Judgment (In Reference to Doc. 73 Only) (Doc. 87).

20 DATED this 15th day of November, 2008.

21
22
23 
24 Stephen M. McNamee
25 United States District Judge
26
27
28