2162678649 p.2 1 CURRY, PEARSON & WOOTEN, PLC 2 Attorneys at Law 3 814 West Roosevelt Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007 4 Telephone: (602) 258-1000 Fax: (602) 523-9000 5 Michael W. Pearson, SBN 016281 6 Robert D. Wooten, SBN 019640 Attorneys for Plaintiff 7 8 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA 9 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA 10 CV2007-016329 11 JOHN GILDING, a married man. No. 12 Plaintiff, **CIVIL SUMMONS** IF YOU WANT THE ADVICE OF A LAWYER, YOU MAY WISH TO CONTACT 13 THE LAWYER REFERRAL SERVICE AT 602-257-4434 OR ON-LINE AT 14 JOHN S. CARR, a married man, JOHN WWW.LAWYERFINDERS ORG. LRS IS DOES I-V and JANE DOES I-V, inclusive; SPONSORED BY THE MARICOPA 15 COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION and ABC ASSOCIATIONS I-V, inclusive: 16 Defendant(s). 17 18 THE STATE OF ARIZONA TO THE DEFENDANTS: 19 JOHN S. CARR 2600 Fairfield Drive 20 Avon Ohio 44011-4772 21 YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED and required to appear and defend, within the time 22 applicable, in this action in this Court. If served within Arizona, you shall appear and defend within 20 days after the service of the Summons and Complaint upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If 23 served out of the State of Arizona - whether by direct service, by registered or certified mail, or by publication - you shall appear and defend within 30 days after the service of the Summons and 24 Complaint upon you is complete, exclusive of the date of service. Where process is served upon the Arizona Director of Insurance as an insurer's attorney to receive service of legal process against it in this state, the insurer shall not be required to appear, answer or plead until expiration of 40 days after date of such service upon the Director. Service by registered or certified mail without the State of 26 Arizona is complete 30 days after the date of filing the receipt and affidavit of service with the Court.

Service by publication is complete 30 days after the date of first publication. Direct service is

complete when made. Service upon the Arizona Motor Vehicle Superintendent is complete 30 days

Seb 18 U/ 10:33a

1 222, 28-503.2 3 Complaint. 4 5 6 7 8 Michael W. Pearson Curry, Pearson & Wooten 9 814 W. Roosevelt St. Phoenix, Arizona 85007 10 602-258-1000 11 12 proceeding. 13 SIGNED AND SEA 14 Clerk 15 By 16 17 Method of Service: 18 \_Private Process Service 19 Sheriff or Marshall Personal Service 20 Registered/Certified Mail (Out of State) 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

after filing the Affidavit of Compliance and return receipt or Officer's Return. R.C.P. 4; A.R.S. 20-YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that in case of your failure to appear and defend within the

time applicable, judgment by default may be rendered against you for the relief demanded in the

YOU ARE CAUTIONED that in order to appear and defend, you must file an Answer or proper response in writing with the Clerk of this Court, accompanied by the necessary filing fee, within the time required, and you are required to serve a copy of any Answer or response upon the Plaintiff's attorney. R.C.P. 10(D); A.R.S. 12-311; R.C.P. 5.

The name and address of the plaintiff's attorney is:

Requests for reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities must be made to the division assigned to the case by parties at least 3 judicial days in advance of a scheduled court

Deputy Clerk

MICHAEL K. JEANES, CLERK RECEIVED CCC #7 RECEIVED CCC #7 1 CURRY, PEARSON WOOTEN, PLC 2 D7 SEP 11 PM 4: 37 Attorneys at Law 3 814 West Roosevelt Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007 4 Telephone: (602) 258-1000 Fax: (602) 523-9000 5 Michael W. Pearson, SBN 016281 6 Robert D. Wooten, SBN 019640 Attorneys for Plaintiff 7 8 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA 9 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA 10 11 JOHN GILDING, a married man, No. CV2007-016329 12 Plaintiff, AMENDED COMPLAINT 13 ٧. (TORT; NON-MOTOR VEHICLE) 14 JOHN S. CARR, a married man, JOHN DOES I-V and JANE DOES I-V, inclusive; 15 and ABC ASSOCIATIONS I-V, inclusive; 16 Defendant(s). 17 18 Plaintiff by and through counsel undersigned and for their complaint against Defendant(s), 19 hereby allege as follows: 20 JURISDICTION AND VENUE 21 Plaintiff John Gilding ("Gilding") is a citizen of the State of Arizona residing in 1. 22 Maricopa County, Arizona. 23 Defendant John S. Carr ("Carr") is a citizen of the State of Ohio, residing in Lorain 2. 24 County, Ohio, and has engaged in specific and purposeful contact and conduct, related to the forum 25 State of Arizona, and has caused the events complained of herein to occur in the State of Arizona. 26 Defendants John Does I-V, Jane Does I-V, and ABC Associations I-V, are individuals 3. 27 or entities that, on information and belief, have engaged in specific and purposeful contact and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

25

26

27

conduct, related to the forum, State of Arizona, and have caused the events complained of herein to occur in the State of Arizona,

- The true identity of defendants John Does I-V, Jane Does I-V, and ABC Associations 4. I-V, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff at this time. Plaintiff expects to identify additional defendants as this matter progresses and will seasonably amend his Complaint when such true names become known.
- At all times mentioned herein, defendants John Does I-V, Jane Does I-V, and ABC 5. Associations I-V, inclusive, and each of them, were the agents, servants and employees of the remaining co-defendants, and each was at all times acting within the course and scope of said agency, service and employment.
- All defendants were either joint tortfeasors or otherwise secondarily liable for said acts 6. and omissions of all other defendants.
- Any and all married defendants were jointly acting for and on behalf of the respective 7. marital communities at all times relevant to this Complaint.
- 8. Jurisdiction and venue are appropriate in this Court. The amount in controversy exceeds the minimal jurisdictional limits of this Court.

#### GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- All previous paragraphs of the Complaint are realleged as if set forth more fully 9. herein.
- Plaintiff is employed as a Support Manager for Training by the Federal Aviation 10. Administration ("FAA") at the Phoenix Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON) and/or Tower located in Phoenix, Arizona.
- Defendant Carr does, and at all times herein mentioned continues to do, business as the 11. owner, proprietor, author, and publisher of a so-called "blog" style internet web site on which Carr authors and publishes what amounts to aviation industry type gossip.

	12.	Defendant	Carr	utilized,	and	continues	to	utilize,	the	web	site	known	0.0
"www	themai	nbang.typep	ad.com	ı", (the "b	log(s)	") to criticis	ze th	e FAA n	nd m	al 1	1 .	MINANII	a:
on var	ious FA	A employee	a off.				JO 111	CIAA a	ua m	ake ad	homi	nem atta	icks
		A employee	s, omi	ers, agent	s, and	officials as	soci	ated there	ewith	١.			

- 13. On information and belief, several defendant John Does are employed by the FAA as air traffic controllers (a/k/a "certified professional controller" or "CPC"), at the Phoenix Tower/TRACON.
- 14. On information and belief, defendants Carr, John Does I-V, Jane Does I-V, and ABC Associations I-V, inclusive, have a long history of acrimony, discontent, hatred, and personal animosity with the plaintiff due to the plaintiff's various supervisory roles and status within the FAA.
- Associations I-V have intentionally, maliciously, and/or with reckless disregard for the truth, published false statements and information to defendant Carr, and others, accusing the plaintiff, inter alia, of the death of a former FAA CPC, as well as falsely accusing plaintiff of intentionally threatening and intimidating an FAA employee in training ("Developmental CPC") to such an extent that the Developmental CPC "...decided to change career fields...", want of skill and integrity, lack of professional judgment, and dishonesty.
- 16. On or about July 30 and July 31, 2007, defendant Carr authored and published a two-day series of blogs based on "information" allegedly submitted to defendant Carr by, among others, "...members of the PHX and P50 (Phoenix TRACON) locals...", (hereinafter identified as John Does) for the purpose of publication on defendant Carr's blog with the specific knowledge and intent of all defendants that the blogs would be published, circulated, and distributed in Arizona, as well as other communities nationwide, where plaintiff has an professional reputation with the FAA.
- 17. In these blogs, defendant Carr intentionally took select information from an administrative EEOC hearing, as well as other information provided by various John Doe defendants out of context, utilizing fallacy of composition and innuendo, in order to defame and harm plaintiff and place him in a false light.
  - 18. In the blogs, defendant Carr falsely accused plaintiff, inter alia, of:

A.	Lying under oath in an administrative hearing;
----	--

- B. Harassing and intimidating a subordinate CPC to death;
- C. Contributing to a culture and a working environment that was "...unlawful..."; and "...brutal...";
- D. "Shocking" everyone by treating a Developmental CPC in such a manner that the developmental CPC "...was shaken, his confidence shattered..." to such an extent that the developmental CPC "...is now exploring other employment opportunities. He isn't sure he wants to continue in the FAA as an air traffic controller...."
- 19. Defendant Carr's blogs falsely and maliciously:
- A. Impugned plaintiffs ability and fitness to serve the people of the community, and the FAA, in a position of trust;
  - B. Charged plaintiff with dishonest conduct;
  - C. Charged plaintiff with illegal conduct; and
  - D. Charged plaintiff with unethical practices.
- 20. Through his July 31, 2007, blog, defendant Carr further intentionally painted the plaintiff in a false and defamatory light through innuendo by accusing plaintiff of a laundry list of negative and inflammatory "charges" placed against him by disgruntled union employees by failing to publish that most, if not all, of the "charges" and grievances against plaintiff, were not sustained by the plaintiff's supervisors. That is, although plaintiff was accused by select subordinates of wrongdoing due to his position as a supervisor, most, if not all, of the charges placed by the disgruntled employees were found to be fabricated or without merit.
- 21. Through his July 31, 2007, blog, defendant Carr furthermore encouraged and facilitated tortious interference with plaintiff's employment by asking blog readers to "...[r]esist the urge to vomit, and instead email the FAA Administrator at marion.blakey@faa.gov and weigh in on her tacit approval of this grossly inappropriate personnel move...the promotion of this miscreant, and his transfer back...to the scene of the crime...."

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Curry, Pear on & Wooten, P.L.C.

- 22. The words printed and published, of and concerning plaintiff, in defendant Carr's blog were false, malicious, and defamatory by, inter alia, imputing to plaintiff complicity in the death of a CPC, falsely accusing plaintiff of intentionally threatening and intimidating an FAA employee to such an extent that the Developmental CPC decided to change career fields, want of skill and integrity, lack of professional judgment, and dishonesty.
- 23. Defendant Carr acted jointly and in concert with defendants John Does I-V, Jane Does I-V, and ABC Associations I-V, in maliciously conspiring and formulating a plan to intentionally incite individuals to harm the plaintiff, by relying on the published false information in defendant Carr's blog, into sending electronic mail to the FAA Administrator complaining about plaintiff.
- 24. The blogs were authored and published by defendant Carr for the sole purpose of recklessly and maliciously damaging plaintiff's reputation, causing plaintiff emotional distress, and tortiously interfering with plaintiff's current FAA, as well as future, employment and employment prospects.
- 25. Defendant Carr engaged in a series of intentional, sustained, specific and purposeful contacts with, inter alia, Arizona FAA CPC employee defendants John Does I -V, while acting in concert with the same, in jointly planning and executing their malicious, reckless, and tortious attack upon the character of the plaintiff.
- 26. The blogs of defendant author and publisher Carr was circulated and distributed widely in Arizona as well as other areas and communities where plaintiff has a long-established reputation for professional skill and ability, honesty, integrity, and good character.
- 27. On information and belief, defendants John Does I-V, Jane Does I-V, and ABC Associations I-V have, inter alia, intentionally, maliciously, and with reckless disregard for the truth, published false statements accusing and involving the plaintiff in the suicide of a former FAA CPC, falsely accusing plaintiff of intentionally threatening and intimidating an FAA employee to such an extent that the Developmental CPC decided to change career fields, and accused the plaintiff of want of skill and integrity, lack of professional judgment, and dishonesty.

		1
	;	2
	;	3
	•	4
	4	5
	(	5
	7	7
	8	}
	9	)
	10	)
	11	
`	12	
3200	13	
MIZOL	14	
UCCI IIX	15	
Ī.	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	The second second
	25	
	26	

28. attempt to des ridicule.	Defendants jointly, and acting in concert, intentionally conspired with each other in an stroy the plaintiff's business reputation and expose the plaintiff to contempt, hatred, and

- Defendants John Does I-V, Jane Does I-V, and ABC Associations I-V, have 29. collectively, and at various times, threatened to "...do what they have to do..." if the FAA didn't cede to their demands by taking improper job action(s) against the plaintiff.
- On August 2, 2007, Plaintiff Gilding's immediate supervisor placed plaintiff on 30. administrative leave due directly to the tortious and improper activities of Defendants and removed plaintiff from his position as Support Manager for Training.
- Upon further investigation by the FAA, the malicious and false allegations by the 31. defendants were found to be without merit, and the plaintiff returned to operational duties several weeks after being placed on administrative leave.
- 32. Although plaintiff has returned to work, he has not been allowed to resume his position as Support Manager for Training, due to the malicious and intentional false portrayal of his character and actions by defendants Carr, John Does I-V, Jane Does I-V, and ABC Associations I-V.

### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

#### Defamation

- 33. All previous paragraphs of the Complaint are realleged as if set forth more fully herein.
- Defendants engaged in a series of false and defamatory communications (written and 34. verbal) about, and referring to, the plaintiff, with various individuals.
- 35. Defendants authored and published such statements with malice because they either knew the statements to be untrue, or made the statements with reckless disregard for the truth.
- Defendants published the defamatory statements during the period July and August of 36. 2007.
  - The statements exposed the plaintiff to hatred, contempt, ridicule, and disgrace. 37.

-	38.	The statements were specifically intended to injure, and did injure, plaintiff in his
	occupation an	I, therefore, are libel per se.
l	39	Plaintiff has a constant

- 39. Plaintiff has suffered general, special, and punitive damages, in an amount to be proven at trial.
  - 40. Wherefore, plaintiff requests judgment against defendants as set forth below.

# SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress

- 41. All previous paragraphs of the Complaint are realleged as if set forth more fully herein.
- 42. Defendants intentionally, or with reckless disregard, published a series of false statements regarding the plaintiff.
- 43. Defendants' conduct was extreme and outrageous because the conduct exposed the plaintiff to hatred, contempt, ridicule, disgrace and was intended as a personal attack and meant to destroy the plaintiff's reputation.
- 44. Defendants' conduct was intentional and/or reckless in that it was intended to cause the plaintiff severe emotional distress.
- 45. Defendants' conduct has, and continues to cause, the plaintiff severe emotional distress.
- 46. Plaintiff has suffered both general, special, and punitive damages, in an exact amount to be proven at trial.
  - 47. Wherefore, plaintiff requests judgment against defendants as set forth below.

## THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION Tortious Interference with Contract

- 48. All previous paragraphs of the Complaint are realleged as if set forth more fully herein.
- 49. Plaintiff's duties as an FAA manager included those of Support Manager for Training for the Phoenix area facilities.

50.	Defendants knew of the plaintiff's status as Support Manager for Training.
51	Transfer for framing.

- 51. Defendants intentionally and wrongfully interfered with plaintiff's job status and duties, causing the FAA to terminate plaintiff's status as training manager.
  - 52. Defendants' conduct was improper as enumerated herein.
- 53. Plaintiff has suffered both general and special damages in an amount to be proven at trial.
  - 54. Wherefore, plaintiff requests judgment against defendants as set forth below.

## FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION Aiding and Abetting

- 55. All previous paragraphs of the Complaint are realleged as if set forth more fully herein.
- 56. On information and belief, defendants Carr, John Does I-V, Jane Does I-V, and ABC Associations I-V, inclusive, acting jointly and in concert, engaged in tortious conduct for which they are liable to the plaintiff.
- 57. Defendant Carr was aware that defendants John Does I-V, Jane Does I-V, and ABC Associations, I-V, inclusive, were going to engage in the tortious conduct and actually encouraged and facilitated the same.
- 58. Defendants provided substantial assistance, false information, and encouragement to each other, with the specific intent of promoting the tortious conduct.
- 59. Due to defendants' conduct as outlined in this cause of action, the plaintiff has suffered both general and special damages in an amount to be proven at trial.
  - 60. Wherefore, plaintiff requests judgment against defendants as set forth below.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff requests judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

- 1. Reasonable general, special, and punitive damages in excess of this Court's jurisdictional minimum;
- 2. Taxable costs,

	]	Į
	2	)
	3	3
	4	ļ
	5	i
	6	,
	7	į
	8	
	9	
	10	
	11	
7	12	
na 850(	13	
, Arizor	14	
хич	15	
1,	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	-

24

25

26

27

3. For such other and further relief as the court considers just and proper.

Dated this day of September, 2007.

CURRY, PEARSON & WOOTEN, P.L.C.

Michael W. Pearson, Esq. Robert D. Wooten, Esq. 814 W. Roosevelt Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007 Attorneys for Plaintiff

## CURRY, PEARSON & WOOTEN, PLC

Attorneys at Law 814 West Rooseveit Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Telephone: (602) 258-1000 Fax: (602) 523-9000

Michael W. Pearson, SBN 016281 Robert D. Wooten, SBN 019640 Attorneys for Plaintiff

### COPY

SEP 0 6 2007



# IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA

JOHN GILDING, a married man,
Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN S. CARR, a married man, JOHN DOES I-V and JANE DOES I-V, inclusive; and ABC ASSOCIATIONS I-V, inclusive:

Defendant(s).

No. CV2007-016329

PLAINTIFF'S CERTIFICATE REGARDING COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

Plaintiff, by and through counsel undersigned, hereby certifies that the largest award sought by the complainant, including punitive damages, but excluding interest, attorneys' fees, and costs does exceed the limits set by Local Rule for compulsory arbitration. This case IS NOT SUBJECT TO the Uniform Rules of Procedure for Arbitration.

1/1//

25

26

Curry, Pearso & Wooten, P.L.C. 814 West Roosevelt Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dated this 6 day of September, 2007.

CURRY, PEARSON & WOOTEN, P.L.C.

Michael W. Pearson, Esq. Robert D. Wooten, Esq. 814 W. Roosevelt Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007 Attorneys for Plaintiff Sep 18 07 10:38a 2162678649 p.15 1 CURRY, PEARSON WOOTEN, PLC 2 Attorneys at Law 3 814 West Roosevelt Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007 4 Telephone: (602) 258-1000 Fax: (602) 523-9000 5 Michael W. Pearson, SBN 016281 6 Robert D. Wooten, SBN 019640 Attorneys for Plaintiff 7 8 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA 9 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA 10 11 JOHN GILDING, a married man. No. CV2007-016329 12 Plaintiff. NOTICE OF CHANGE OF JUDGE 13 v. (Honorable Janet Barton) 14 JOHN S. CARR, a married man, JOHN DOES I-V and JANE DOES I-V, inclusive; 15 and ABC ASSOCIATIONS I-V, inclusive; 16 Defendant(s). 17 18 Plaintiff John Gilding, pursuant to the provisions of Rule 42(f), Ariz.R.Civ.P., hereby 19 exercises the right to a change of judge in this matter. The name of the Judge to whom this matter is 20 presently assigned and who is to be changed by virtue of this Notice is the Honorable Janet Barton. 21 Undersigned counsel for plaintiff hereby certifies that this Notice of Change of Judge is 22 timely under the Rules, that the right to secure a change of judge by notice has not previously been 23 waived, and that plaintiff has not previously been granted a change of judge as a matter of right in 24 this case. 25 26

27

26

27

Dated this 13 day of September, 2007.

2162678649

#### CURRY, PEARSON & WOOTEN, PLLC

Michael W. Pearson 814 W. Roosevelt Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007 Attorneys for Defendants