

to present his case to get it overturned. She suggested that he really wanted to keep Judge Tusan on his case to hear the Motion for New Trial because if he kept up enough pressure on her she would have to change her decision. She advised him to file a complaint with the Judicial Qualifications Commission. ("It would f—k with her day.") She told him it was an illegal move to assign his case to another judge.

Ms. Moore was asked about the relationship between Judge Tusan and the Guardian Ad Litem and she said she didn't know much about that and that she didn't recall the issues with the Guardian Ad Litem. Regarding Plaintiff's attorney, Erin Stone, and her earlier allegation that Judge Tusan was biased in favor of Plaintiff, Ms. Moore explained that the bias was because Ms. Stone was a staff attorney for one of the judges and "other than that, I don't know." She added that all of the attorneys that practice in the family law area are friendly with the three family law judges; which is "an injustice in the system."

The April 30, 2013 conversation ended with Ms. Moore giving Defendant additional legal advice as to how to get her testimony in without the other side having the right to contradict her. She advised him to file a Notice to Produce and told him to send her a draft and she would look it over for him.

Defendant has not shown that Judge Tusan held any personal bias against him, that she engaged in any ex parte communications with anyone regarding his case or that she did anything to warrant a *sua sponte* recusal. Again, for a *sua sponte* recusal, "generally the conduct or remark of the judge must be an egregious violation of a specific standard for reversal." It "must be of such a nature and intensity to prevent the defendant from obtaining a trial uninfluenced by the court's prejudgment." The acts or remarks of the judge must arise from something outside the case. *Vautrot v. West*, 272 Ga. App. 715(2005).