

scanning. Still the circuit court order dismissed this report, and these photographs, and Plaintiff's opening statement, and Appellant's filed exhibits, including original Plaintiff's flashdrive.

The magistrate set Plaintiff up by coordinating with the flooring inspector to ensure his absence in court. Plaintiff had no idea about courts or rules of evidence, and therefore didn't know her inspection exhibit is not admissible if it is not supported by the inspector's testimony. That inspection report was only Plaintiff's exhibit which should not have been admitted by the magistrate. The magistrate should have instructed Plaintiff of that deficiency and allowed her to correct it. Instead, the magistrate admitted the inspection report, - or pretended to admit it, - so as to prevent Plaintiff from taking corrective action. His intention was to partition the responsibility for the intentionally botched installation to protect Defendant and teach Plaintiff the rules. When Plaintiff appealed to the circuit court, the magistrate coordinated with the circuit court clerks, removed key exhibits from his return on appeal, but allowed the inspection report to remain because he knew it had not been supported by testimony and therefore can't be used against his judgment.

But the law clerk had no way of knowing this.

Nowhere in the magistrate's summary, or other returned documents, or any filed exhibits is there information about the flooring inspector failing to appear in court. Yet the law clerk dismissed that inspection report as "another flooring company", even though it bears the heading of "Tony Jone's Flooring Inspections". An impartial, unbiased judiciary could not have dismissed an inspection report that says it is an inspection report, looks like an inspection report, contains all the function, information, and format of an inspection report, is corroborated by Plaintiff's statement and flashdrive, and is returned by the magistrate, meaning it was admitted into evidence at trial. Yet the law clerk dismissed that inspection report as "another flooring company's opinion".

This is possible only if the law clerk is coordinated with the magistrate, and the magistrate told him the flooring inspector didn't testify at trial.

The circuit court order proves that its author, the law clerk, did review the magistrate's return, because it uses the phrase "Respondent's work...did not meet industry standards" to