

612's comments on Sisney's Answers to Interrogatories, filed 12/11/2009

I wonder why Sisney won't provide answers to the most basic questions in his federal case. He won't tell:

- what the board members did that prevented him from investigating
- what jobs he missed out on because of being fired from BA
- in what way his contract was breached
- what the District did that violated Competitive Bidding laws
- what amount BA has failed to pay him on his contract
- what his damages are

You would think he would be eager to show the proof of his allegations.

Instead, he keeps saying "concerted pattern of retaliation" but doesn't say what they actually did to stop him from investigating. He never explains why they would even want to retaliate against him for trying to investigate. In fact, the emails that have been posted on BAParentsvsBABOE for months show cooperation and concern from Shari Wilkins and Stephanie Updike.

His answers mention events in August, like the meeting boycott. How could the board members boycott of a meeting in August prevent Sisney from notifying authorities of suspected corruption in April?

The only event he mentions that happened before August was that they put "intense, ongoing pressure on the Superintendent to make things right with Air Assurance". We have seen what really happened – Sisney suggested that he apologize to Rampey, then didn't do it. When he wanted to make himself look good at the 8/4/08 meeting, he sent an email to Updike instructing her to try to get Rampey to speak highly of him, telling Rampey that the issues have nothing to do with AA, and promising that Sisney will meet with him and resolve the issues (clear AA's name). We have seen Shari Wilkins' email gently encouraging Sisney to follow through with his suggestion of assuring Rampey that AA had done nothing wrong. We have seen that the board eventually decided to send the letter themselves, without Sisney, only to have it surreptitiously drafted and sent by Stover without the board members even knowing the Stover had received the draft from The Center for Education Law. How does any of this constitute "intense, ongoing pressure"? If there is anything else they did, why will Sisney not say?

Sisney's whole case hinges on the existence of intentional wrongdoing on the part of the board members relating to the HVAC work done by AA. There can be no retaliation if they were not hiding anything. Yet he won't state any laws he claims they broke, stating that the Interrogatory calls for legal conclusions and is protected by attorney-client privilege. This doesn't seem like any way to run a lawsuit. If you're not going to accuse someone of breaking a law, you don't have much of a lawsuit. Why would the law they allegedly broke need to be kept a secret from the judge?

The deadline for discovery is 12/31/2009. What is he waiting for?