

## Side-by-Side Comparison: Carol Gamble and Scott Markowitz's Perjury Cases & Todd Spitzer's Treatment

Criteria	Carol Gamble (Rancho Santa Margarita)	Scott Markowitz (Fullerton)
<b>Political Affiliation</b>	Republican, personal friend of DA Todd Spitzer	Democrat
<b>Charge</b>	Perjury related to falsifying nomination paperwork	Two felony counts: perjury by declaration, and falsifying a record
<b>Nature of Offense</b>	Signed nomination paperwork attesting to an inaccurate statement	Falsely claimed to have collected the signatures on his nomination papers
<b>Legal Action Taken</b>	No arrest, no formal charges filed	Arrested by Orange County DA investigators, charged with two felonies
<b>Outcome</b>	Suspended campaign, voluntarily promised to resign if elected	Pled guilty to a misdemeanor; sentenced to 1 day in jail, 1 year probation, 160 hours of community service
<b>District Attorney's Public Statement</b>	No confirmation or denial of an investigation into Gamble	Publicly condemned Markowitz for jeopardizing the electoral process
<b>Impact on Election</b>	Still on the ballot; voluntary resignation if elected	Declared ineligible to serve if elected, forcing potential special election
<b>Political Ramifications</b>	Maintained goodwill with constituents, citing personal responsibility	Faced public disgrace and arrest, directly damaging his candidacy
<b>Favoritism or Bias</b>	Despite nearly identical circumstances, Gamble was not arrested or charged; her case appears to have been handled with discretion.	Faced immediate legal consequences, including arrest and public charges, with harsh comments from Spitzer on the integrity of the electoral process.
<b>Todd Spitzer's Role</b>	As a Republican and friend of Gamble, Spitzer's office handled her case quietly, avoiding public investigation or charges.	Spitzer aggressively pursued Markowitz, making a public statement condemning his actions and the damage to the electoral process.

### Critical Analysis of Favoritism:

The clear discrepancy in how Todd Spitzer handled these two nearly identical perjury cases reveals a potential bias rooted in personal and political connections.

- **Carol Gamble's Case:** Todd Spitzer, a fellow Republican and personal friend, did not publicly announce any investigation into Gamble's falsified paperwork. She suspended her campaign voluntarily and promised to resign if elected, essentially avoiding public scrutiny or legal consequences. The DA's office neither confirmed nor denied investigating her, allowing Gamble to gracefully step down with minimal repercussions.
- **Scott Markowitz's Case:** On the other hand, Scott Markowitz, a Democrat, was aggressively pursued by Spitzer. Markowitz was publicly arrested, charged with two felonies, and faced harsh criticism from the DA's office for undermining the electoral process. Spitzer's public comments framed Markowitz as a significant threat to democracy, despite the similar nature of the offense compared to Gamble.

**Favoritism:** The treatment of Gamble and Markowitz suggests that political and personal affiliations played a significant role in how each case was handled. Markowitz was made an example of, while Gamble was allowed to step down quietly, without the same level of legal or public consequences.