

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (9/30/2009 9:48:46 AM)

My last three comments posted on the 9/28 TW story:

QUOTE

Jolie2, (9/29/2009 5:54:11 PM)

I also wonder if one of the motivations for getting a copy of the detailed billing released was in the hopes of discovering possible clues as to what information was being prepared for the upcoming trials and which witnesses had been interviewed. Is that cynical of me? Fortunately, RFR redacted all names of witnesses and interviewees to protect confidentiality.

END QUOTE

\*\*\*

QUOTE

Jolie2, (9/29/2009 6:00:03 PM)

Correction to my second to last post (expenses related to Sisney's suspension and termination were likely billed and paid during last school year of 2008/2009).

END QUOTE

\*\*\*

QUOTE

Jolie2, (9/30/2009 9:42:53 AM)

Dr. Gerber has reinstated John Lare as a Partner in Education for BAPS, effective November 2, 2009, after Mr. Lare requested the reinstatement in August. He had been suspended from the PIE program for one year for using the e-mail addresses of PIE members for distributing information related to this controversy and some members complained to the administration.

The BA Ledger has a full article on the subject today, Sept. 30, with excerpts from Mr. Lare's letter and Dr. Gerber's response included.

END QUOTE

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (9/30/2009 10:20:42 AM)

Judy Collis, News Editor at the Broken Arrow Ledger, has published an editorial entitled "Help Us Keep First Amendment Alive" in which she congratulates the Ledger for taking on the tough job of reporting the facts and then being criticized for just doing its job. One paragraph in particular stands out:

QUOTE

Ethics, like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder. Frequently, ethics is seen by some as having more to do with who or what you're writing about than it does with unfairness or untruths. Just ask some of those whose actions have been aired out by this newspaper. They're unhappy with the exposure but don't have reasonable answers for their actions. It's the "kill the messenger" mentality.

END QUOTE

---

This is my response in a comment I submitted this morning to the Ledger:

QUOTE

Reporting only part of a story and not making every attempt to answer the questions raised, and analyze and investigate all sides of an issue, including factual research into law and policy, omitting information that has been available and brought to the paper's attention, and censoring public comments in response, is worse than not reporting it at all, in my opinion. It creates misconceptions and misleads the public. The Ledger has been repeatedly guilty of this over the past year. Citizens have been left to their own devices to try to find the truth. Unfortunately, many can't or won't take the time to do that. Our local media has let us this community down by its biased coverage of the school district controversy.

Sorry, Ms. Collis, but I won't be joining in the praise while you're 'patting yourself on the back' for a job well done, because it hasn't been done well, no matter how much the Ledger tries to defend itself.

I hope with Bob Lewis's retirement, the editorial policies of this paper will become more fair in its approach and restore integrity and fairness to its reporting.

END QUOTE

It may not get published on the Ledger but it will be here, and also on the 9/28 article.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (9/30/2009 10:35:58 AM)

The Ledger is on the job, and it published my comment on the editorial, too. :)

I liked the first response published just as much:

QUOTE

laughing wrote on Sep 30, 2009 10:10 AM:

" What a load of manure. "

END QUOTE

That kind of sums it up in a nutshell. :)

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (9/30/2009 11:17:05 AM)

Ok, I added my comment. Think I should tell them how I really feel?

-----

Prove it. The Ledger has refused time and time again to publish a comment referring readers to brokenarrowforum dot net for court documents and other information involving Sisney's lawsuits against BAPS.

The Ledger has repeatedly refused to print comments informing readers of additional critical information that was in a Tulsa World article but inexplicably NOT in the Ledger article. Examples are on the website, in a document called "33 questions which suggest there is more to the corrupt-board story than has been reported".

It's obvious the Ledger is extremely biased in this matter, and shares the blame for the damage caused to our district.

That's brokenarrowforum dot net.

As always, this comment will be copied to the TW story "BA School Board Rejects Probe".

Go ahead. Make my day.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (9/30/2009 11:47:03 AM)

And a followup on the same Ledger opinion article:

-----

I posted a comment on this article informing readers of a website that contains pdf's of the court documents in both of Sisney's lawsuits against the school district. I have attempted many times to post the location of this information; the Ledger has never published my comment. We will see if this time is any different, in the spirit of "upholding and exercising America's First Amendment right of free speech".

I should mention that the Ledger saw fit many times to publish comments directing readers to another website devoted to the school board issues.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (9/30/2009 12:01:48 PM)

One more on the Ledger opinion article about free speech (choke sputter)

-----  
Some of us posting an alternate point of view to the one endorsed by the Ledger have had more than our share of the "kill the messenger" mentality. For our attempts to point out additional information or inconsistencies, or suggest other possible explanations, we get responses like the following:

QUOTE

TO jolie and 612 wrote on Mar 3, 2009 1:31 PM:

" If you wouldn't be so rude and biased, maybe all of your comments would be posted. All you do is trash talk everyone, including the newspaper, EXCEPT for the BOE and Gerber. YOU DO NOT KNOW WHO IS GUILTY-PERIOD! You are not superior to the rest of us, so quit talking like it. We are ALL sick of you both! "

END QUOTE

Isn't that lovely?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (9/30/2009 12:11:09 PM)

They didn't post either comment accusing them of refusing to post comments. My response, which they will probably post:

-----  
Thought so.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (9/30/2009 12:13:43 PM)

That answers our question about whether the Ledger staff will continue to be biased.

Fortunately, many people read the Tulsa World and the readers' comments which very strikingly point out by these examples that the Ledger is being intentionally deceptive and biased in reporting this story.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (9/30/2009 12:14:46 PM)

The "thought so" was published immediately. At least they seem to be a better about the delay these days.

So, on an article trumpeting the importance of free speech and reader participation, they suppress reader participation about free speech.

Not surprising at all, but chock full of irony.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (9/30/2009 12:18:50 PM)

We'll see if this one makes it...

-----  
Two comments censored so far on this article. Ironic, isn't it.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (9/30/2009 12:21:19 PM)

to 612

I think you should post this specific example of bias by the Ledger on the 9/28 TW article comments, particularly since I already brought up the subject of this editorial. Don't forget to publish your "Thought so" comment, too. :)

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (9/30/2009 12:26:54 PM)

Good idea, there may be more people watching that article.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (9/30/2009 12:27:45 PM)

Oops, I accidentally published a copy of the following comment on the 9/28 TW article, before your explanation/post was submitted. I meant to post it here first and then wait.

QUOTE

In case anyone is wondering, 612's "Thought so" refers to two posts that she submitted this morning that point out a very specific, important example of the Ledger's bias and censorship on this subject. The Ledger chose not to allow this information, ironically on an editorial written by the editor about free speech.

END QUOTE

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (9/30/2009 12:33:51 PM)

Posted on the Ledger article "Lare reinstated as Partner in Education"

-----  
I believe Mr. Lare is sincere when he says he "would never intentionally do anything to violate its rules or embarrass ... the district".

The question is - who is he listening to that made the things he has done seem like a good idea?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (9/30/2009 12:35:34 PM)

I'll put this episode on the website. BLATANT LEDGER BIAS! READ ALL ABOUT IT!

Of course, the people who need to know don't know about the website...

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (9/30/2009 12:45:17 PM)

They published my most recent comment with the following remark attached

QUOTE

(Editor's Note: The Web site in question is anonymous and contains personal information about a board member unrelated to the school board issues.) "

END QUOTE

In response I am submitting this comment to the Ledger.

QUOTE

So a public official serving on the local school board, files a bankruptcy on \$4 million in debt, it is nobody's business? Isn't it possible that it IS connected to the school board controversy in that this board member may be cooperating with Dr. Sisney and his contingency in creating a PR nightmare for the district and board (as Ms. Flippo said he threatened to do last summer), due to possibly coercion from Dr. Sisney that he would expose her financial troubles to the public if she didn't?

The court records on the bankruptcy that are linked on the forum are a matter of public record.

Even if it is not connected directly to the controversy, why would the Ledger think this bankruptcy of this enormous sum is insignificant. A school board official is in charge of overseeing our district and approving spending on a 100,000,000 annual budget. Her ability to handle her responsibilities with fiscal prudence in her own personal life have a direct bearing on her fitness for the job of board member, I believe.

END QUOTE

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (9/30/2009 12:55:08 PM)

I think it's time to the Tulsa World did a story focused solely on Ms. Updike's bankruptcy. The Ledger won't touch it, but if the TW and Ledger, et al, can publish allegations about the board, district, and Air Assurance, then why not report factual information about a public official's bankruptcy, particularly when it involves a very significant sum of money.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (9/30/2009 12:55:57 PM)

Another comment on the Ledger first amendment article:

-----

Bankruptcy documents are public record. The information is there; people can draw their own conclusions.

Or does the first amendment apply selectively? Are you "unhappy with the exposure"?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (9/30/2009 1:08:17 PM)

Jolie, something good may come of this - Ledger readers have never before gotten any hint of the website or the scandalous (!) board member bankruptcy. They may search for the website out of curiosity.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (9/30/2009 1:10:02 PM)

The Ledger published that last comment, 612. I'm surprised that they're allowing the bankruptcy to be mentioned at all. Given that you're not a supporter of Sisney's, readers are going to know its one of two particular board members you're talking about. They haven't published my comment. Maybe because it uses the word "she" and narrows it down to one particular board member.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (9/30/2009 1:20:51 PM)

Submitted to the Ledger just now:

QUOTE

At least the Tulsa World publishes all comments submitted. For more information on this subject, readers are encouraged to check out the recent story published there on 09/28/09 entitled "BA District's legal fees skyrocket" and read the comments that follow the story.

END QUOTE

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (9/30/2009 1:40:16 PM)

I wondered about the excuse that the website is anonymous.

Posted on the Ledger opinion article:

-----

There is nothing in the Ledger's posted policy that prohibits referring to another website, anonymous or otherwise. Posting court documents is not infringing on privacy rights, since they are public record. They can't be libel because they are actual court documents.

The statement below is from the Ledger's policy, and serves as a disclaimer to the content of readers' comments. So what's the problem? The editor has a right to choose what comments the Ledger publishes. So why does the editor choose to publish comments like "blah blah blah Jolie" and not a reference to a website with relevant, factual information? Does that not look like censorship, especially when the website provides information that might throw some doubt on the point of view that has been put forth by the Ledger?

"You acknowledge and agree any use and/or reliance on any information obtained through the interactive forums at your own risk. We are not in any manner endorsing the content of the interactive forums and will not vouch for its reliability."

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (9/30/2009 3:47:38 PM)

Posted on Ledger opinion article

-----

Another example of selectively publishing comments, since my last attempt was not published.

Ledger article "Forgery Rumors Debunked", 2/27/2009

QUOTE

Jack Kitchen said he and his wife were approached by Lare and agreed to join a group of 10 citizens in demanding that the school board investigate possible wrongdoing by district personnel and Air Assurance Co.

The Kitchens, along with Richard and Freida Roberts, later asked that their names be removed from the letter.

UNQUOTE

Tulsa World article, "BA school board rejects probe ", 2/26/2009

QUOTE

The Robertses and Kitchens withdrew from the demand, Mann said. In a letter dated Jan. 14, the Kitchens wrote: "I did not agree to anything that was in this letter or even seen it. I do not want to be part of this action."

END QUOTE

My attempt to post on the Ledger, which did not get published:

QUOTE

How did they manage to sign something they had never seen? The Tulsa World article has the text of the letter from the Kitchens dated January 14, where they stated that they did not agree to anything in the letter and had never seen it. Take a look, and compare with what is reported in this article.

Maybe there is a good explanation for these apparently conflicting stories. Mr. Richardson?

Ledger - this is my 5th try asking the same question. Is there some technical problem or other issue with what I have written?

UNQUOTE

What is wrong with this? Why did the Ledger choose not to publish it or its 4 predecessors?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (9/30/2009 4:04:08 PM)

Well, blow me down. The Ledger just published your latest comment about the Kitchens' signatures.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (9/30/2009 4:42:07 PM)

It's about time! Seven months ago would have been nice!

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (9/30/2009 8:40:02 PM)

Thanks, Joe Cook, for the comments on the Ledger's "Info-sharing, public meeting set before school board" article. I'd post agreement on the Ledger but that might spoil it for some people.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jinxed**, CA (9/30/2009 9:05:49 PM)

wow, what a waste of web space. get a life people.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (9/30/2009 11:25:30 PM)

We're back (temporarily) on the Most Commented list (hence the inane comment above). The only February story in the bunch!

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/1/2009 9:42:58 AM)

As of yesterday, Sisney has a new attorney on his district case:

Keesling, David R(Bar # 17881)

Keesling & Associates, PC

Maybe this one can spell :)

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/1/2009 2:13:26 PM)

I think he better get a new attorney on his federal case too. Consider this fine bit of logic:

Sisney's federal wrongful termination lawsuit claims that he waived his hearing because it wouldn't have been fair, since the three board members are biased. He points to the fact that he sued them as proof of their bias.

How can his actions against them be taken to prove bias on their part? Was that the real purpose of the defamation case? To set the stage for the wrongful termination case Sisney expected to file?

Is Richardson on drugs?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/1/2009 4:45:03 PM)

This probably won't make get published - there's almost a reference to the website - but who knows. Posted on "(CORRECTED) Complete list of school bond projects released by board, 10/1/2009"

Thanks for your input, Joe Cook. I expect the comments on this article reflect a disproportionate number of board critics compared with the opinions of citizens in general.

Since the beginning of the Sisney controversy, there has been a group of people making a coordinated effort to steer people's opinions through comments. You know who you are, Timberbrook.

Anyone who is interested in the other side of the story, just do a yahoo search on Sisney Broken Arrow, and see what comes up first.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/1/2009 4:54:24 PM)

And another version, in hopes that one will get through:

Thanks for your input, Joe Cook. I expect the comments on this article reflect a disproportionate number of board critics compared with the opinions of citizens in general.

Since the beginning of the Sisney controversy, there has been a group of people making a coordinated effort to steer people's opinions through comments. You know who you are, Timberbrook.

Posting this near-duplicate in case my original gets censored for attempting to point people toward actual information.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/1/2009 4:57:46 PM)

I also posted a cranky response to PBG's ignorant comment: "6. Why didn't the school board just let Sisney's contract run out in 10 months instead of spending \$300K in legal fees and lawsuits still pending. It would have cost a lot less"

(forgot to copy it before I posted it, but it was very close to this:)

PBG, You don't know why the board fired Sisney. There was a reason they had to remove him immediately. You don't know what it is, so you can't say they did the wrong thing. And - hello - HE filed the lawsuits.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/1/2009 10:54:20 PM)

Congratulations, 612; all of your comments were published on the Sept. 22 Ledger story. I don't know how many folks are still checking and reading on that story, but it's a start and maybe the next time a board/district article comes up, they'll accept a similar remark with the Sisney Broken Arrow search phrase.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/1/2009 11:12:03 PM)

As long as Joe Cook checks back, I'm happy. He sounds like a voice of reason, and deserves some support. I am sad to say I did not rise to his level of diplomacy. I want to be like Joe Cook!

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/2/2009 10:44:44 AM)

PBG responded to me:

PBG wrote on Oct 2, 2009 7:40 AM:

" 612, the air conditioning company in the law suit gave orders to the school board to "get rid" of Sisney. Really, this has nothing to do with the contents of the school bond. "

My responses:

PGB, Sisney alleges AA gave orders to get rid of Sisney. Sisney alleged a lot of things, many of which have been disproven and many more that just don't add up.

Read the court documents. Rampey disproved Sisney's claims of fraud in the very papers Richardson filed in

Sisney's original district lawsuit. How much credibility should we give Sisney in light of this, and so many other inconsistencies in his story? You can find the court papers posted online. Try to read them with an open mind, instead of basing your conclusion on the premise that Sisney put forth.

Regardless of what you believe is behind all this, it's wrong to join Sisney in smearing people with unproven accusations online. When the accusations are proven, smear away. You don't know what happened, and it's not right to post comments as if you do, because it can influence other people's thinking.

The school board issue is relevant to the bond vote, because people are bringing up concerns about trusting the board and administration in deciding how they will vote.

If we don't know the truth about the situation, the best we can do is to avoid muddling the issue and perpetuating the mistrust by repeating unfounded accusations.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/2/2009 12:36:03 PM)

Posted on Ledger article "(CORRECTED) Complete list of school bond projects released by board"

-----

That's right, "funny", all five board members were at the meetings when the blanket PO's were approved, through all the years that Sisney says there was a conspiracy - going back to "at least the 1990's" in his words. How did the 3 amigos manage that, when one of them didn't become a board member until 2008?

The CFO and superintendent were aware all those years how the HVAC contracts were handled. If blanket PO's were against policy, why did the superintendent not raise this issue at any time in the previous 5 years? Why did he act surprised at this "revelation", as it was reported?

I notice that this bond issue was approved by all five of the current board members.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/2/2009 12:59:34 PM)

Censored again on the response to PBG. What about my post did the Ledger not like? I can only assume it's the message. At least they gave me a chance to correct my typo.

-----

PBG, Sisney alleges AA gave orders to get rid of Sisney. Sisney alleged a lot of things, many of which have already been disproven, and many more that appear disingenuous.

Read the court documents. Rampey disproved Sisney's claims of fraud in the very papers Richardson filed in Sisney's original district lawsuit. How much credibility should we give Sisney in light of this, and so many other inconsistencies in his story? Try to read the court documents with an open mind, instead of basing your conclusion on the premise that Sisney put forth.

Regardless of what you believe is behind all this, it's wrong to join Sisney in smearing people with unproven accusations online. When the accusations are proven, smear away. You don't know what happened, and it's not right to post rumors and accusations as if you do, because it can influence other people's thinking.

The school board issue is relevant to the bond vote, because people are bringing up concerns about trusting the board and administration in deciding how they will vote.

If we don't know the truth about the situation, the best we can do is to avoid muddling the issue and perpetuating the mistrust by repeating unfounded accusations.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/2/2009 1:55:17 PM)

Censored again.

Posted on Ledger...

-----

I posted an answer to PBG's statement about the A/C company giving orders to get rid of Sisney, but I was censored again. No links or references to websites.

As we have seen, rudeness and libel don't seem to be impediments to getting comments posted. In fact, they may be preferred.

I would like to know what the screener found objectionable in my post. Is "612" a dirty word?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/2/2009 6:51:22 PM)

That one didn't make it either.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/5/2009 11:05:28 AM)

Hey, this wasn't me. On the Ledger opinion article about the first amendment:

-----

Giggles wrote on Oct 4, 2009 8:57 PM:

" What a joke. The Ledger has not been airing out peoples actions. They have been biased from the start. They clearly have a point of view and will skew the news to it. They print half truths. Period.

Welcome to Mass Media....biased reporting at your service. "

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**1adam12**, (10/5/2009 4:40:42 PM)

to 612 after reading your posts and looking at your website I come to one conclusion, can you say diversion. If you wanted the attention to be taken off of yourself you might create a diversion, smoke and mirrors. It really does not have anything to do with a HVAC vendor or its billing practices. everyone keeps looking there instead of looking for the real reason. And it has worked. It has gotten a lot of people including two board members on his side working for him and destroying the district. There were 5 reasons he was fired. think about it, how can a little hvac vendor have so much power to get a powerful superintendent fired. This is not the mafia. Any normal person would look at the facts that have been presented and see that this is a diversion. He used the lawsuit to intimidate the board in not firing him and it worked on two. members. This city owes a debt of gratitude to the three amigos.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/5/2009 5:21:23 PM)

Agree completely, 1adam12. Sisney was very believable because of who he was - a successful, popular superintendent of a big school district. People respect people in positions like that. I think that's why so many people (me included) were shocked at the beginning of this, and were stunned at what we were being told the school board was doing.

As I have looked at Sisney's allegations and thought about how difficult - if not impossible - it would have been for the school board to actually pull off this long-term conspiracy undetected for this long, it became increasingly clear that his claims just didn't add up.

Put that together with the analysis of the claims themselves - that amount to policies that didn't exist not being followed, invoices being paid at the end of the fiscal year in the same way they always were, and business-as-usual blanket purchase orders that everybody knew about, and you have to start wondering what it's really about.

In light of this, can you really poo-hoo the board's stated reasons for firing him? Especially when you realize that they knew fully well that they had to follow procedures to the letter in order to avoid a (viable) wrongful termination lawsuit? There is no way they suddenly turned on him and fired him without following procedures to document problems ahead of time. Have you seen how many witness interviews are documented in the legal fee bills? How can anyone be completely sure the board's reasons were trumped up? Yet that's what we hear from commenters.

On the other hand, when you think about what action the school board should have taken IF the things we have heard about Sisney's behavior are true - you come up with exactly what they did.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/6/2009 9:19:36 AM)

Posted (maybe) on Ledger "Info-sharing, public meeting set before school board"

Thank you, Joe Cook, for helping others understand that all is not as we have been led to believe regarding this controversy. Dr. Sisney was very effective, popular, and influential, and it is understandable that our first impulse would be to take him at his word. However, it's not right to malign others on unproven - and in some cases, downright shaky - claims of wrongdoing.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/6/2009 10:13:51 AM)

Posted on Ledger article...

-----

Joe Cook, I had heard Sisney had filed lawsuits in other districts. Can you give any more information on this?

If there is a pattern, I think it's important for people to see it.

Thanks.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/6/2009 4:58:56 PM)

Doug Mann is getting commended by TW editors in an op-ed titled "Trojan Pride" for his work on two investigations he conducted:

Here's an excerpt from that piece that mentions Mann:

QUOTE

Jenks officials deserve congratulations for their frank, public and thorough investigation into questions about the program. The choice of Doug Mann — the same attorney who previously helped Tulsa Public Schools get to the bottom of allegations at the Tulsa Academic Center — was a brave one. It was a choice that announced that the district wasn't interested in half-way measures.

END QUOTE

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/6/2009 5:02:37 PM)

The op-ed is dated October 6, 2009, and relates to the recruiting/rewarding of players in the Jenks football program that has been discovered, leading to self-imposed penalties by the district and possible further sanctioning by the Oklahoma Secondary School Activities Association, the governing body of high school sports in Oklahoma. The OSSAA meets tomorrow night to review the situation.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/6/2009 5:23:34 PM)

I think the BA school board members made a good choice too, if Doug Mann is familiar with controversy and investigations.

Sisney has made public accusations against Mann. I wonder if Mann will take steps to clear his reputation when Sisney's lawsuits are finished.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/8/2009 10:53:34 AM)

I just posted this on a TW article on another BA subject, "Firm seeks \$6 million from BA FlightSafety wants to build a new facility — with the city's help" dated 10/07/09

QUOTE

Jolie2, (10/8/2009 10:48:09 AM)

ttr1975, you should have finished that sentence:

" It all went to the lawyers representing Broken Arrow Schools and its heat and air contractor"

with

because a disgruntled employee decided to file a defamation lawsuit based on as-yet unconfirmed allegations and then a wrongful termination suit against the district, which has no basis because he never requested the due process hearing he was entitled to.

BTW, the heating and air contractor is paying for his own lawyer, from his own pocket, to represent him on the defamation lawsuit.

Read "35 Questions that Suggest that Sisney Wasn't Railroaded" on brokenarrowforum dot net

That website also has links to official court documents from both of Sisney's lawsuits, as well as court documents related to Board Member Stephanie Updike's \$4 million bankruptcy filed this summer.

END QUOTE

I clicked on ttr1975's username and read his profile. He lives in Sand Springs but works as an HVAC technician. I wonder for which company? I'll ask if he responds back.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/8/2009 10:56:30 AM)

Why wait? I went ahead and posted the question right after the last comment, for better effect.

QUOTE

to ttr1975,

BTW, which HVAC company are you a technician for? Yes, I did read your profile.

END QUOTE

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/8/2009 11:51:57 AM)

Good eye, Jolie! I hadn't seen that article. If we can get a mention of the website whenever the board controversy is mentioned, it might keep the misinformation from spreading quite as much.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/8/2009 12:06:31 PM)

Posted on the Ledger article "Gerber: Not a candidate for superintendent"

-----  
I'm with Giggles. No wrongdoing has been shown yet on the part of Dr. Gerber and the board members. Many of Dr. Sisney's claims have been disproven – some of them in the very court papers his attorney filed – and many others appear inconsistent with the events as he described them.

What are we going to do if the OSBI investigation reveals that there was no intentional wrongdoing, and confirms the January audit's conclusion that there was only typical "irregularities and sloppiness"? Are we going to assume that OSBI is in on the coverup, so we can continue to denounce Dr. Gerber and the board members as crooks? What's it going to take?

It's not right to continue to malign these people based on rumors. And no, you DON'T know what happened. If you did, you would be under the same gag order that the board members are under. The people claiming to be "in the know" will be embarrassed when the truth comes out, and they find out just how reliable their source really was.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/8/2009 7:13:01 PM)

612, thanks. Unfortunately, the article isn't getting much attention today, as it's not a prominent headline or link anywhere on the page or on the short list of viewed/commented. I'll keep trying to get the word out, whenever I can, though. :)

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/12/2009 11:54:04 AM)

Posted on Ledger "Gerber: Not a candidate for superintendent" in response to BA-Native's question on whether irregularities and sloppiness should be tolerated:

-----  
A bit adversarial, aren't we, BA-Native?

A certain level of irregularities and sloppiness has to be tolerated, simply because we're human. Requiring perfection is impractical. There was agreement in April and May of 2008 among Sisney, board members, and BA staff that procedures needed to be established to better manage the work order/vendor services/invoice payment processes. They were put in place; see the Tulsa World article "BA district sets new procedures", published 9/28/2008.

But that's not what the accusations are. The board members and Gerber are accused of intentionally defrauding the district. There is a big difference between not having sufficient procedures and controls in place and committing criminal acts to provide business to one vendor to the detriment of the district. Is there not? The OSBI investigation should be able to tell us which category Sisney's allegations (if true) fall under.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/12/2009 11:55:40 AM)

And on the same article, in response to PBG's question: "To 612, what are you going to do if the OSBI investigation reveals that arrest warrants need to be issued?"

-----

PBG, that is exactly my point: I don't know what happened, and neither do you. Yet you and others continue to assert your point of view as if you are imparting classified knowledge from a position of an inside observer. If that's what you believe based on your observations, of course feel free to say so. But when you try to influence others' thinking by giving the impression of being an insider, you are misleading people and contributing to ruining reputations of people who for all you know are completely innocent. For all you know, they may have been steadfastly doing the right thing in spite of the heat put on them by self-righteous, uninformed people who take pleasure in others' perceived misfortune.

Many of the commenters on this topic seem to react emotionally to the articles and comments from other posters, but seem to have a lack of curiosity about related events and issues. I wonder why people are so quick to comment but so reluctant to do any research or analysis. Maybe their conclusions would be different if they did.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/12/2009 12:04:37 PM)

And another one, addressing PBG's actual question:

-----

PBG, to answer your question, "To 612, what are you going to do if the OSBI investigation reveals that arrest warrants need to be issued?"

As I have stated before, I will join in the condemnation of illegal activity by the board and administration - when it's proven. I have not said - ever - that I know the board and administration is innocent. I can't know that, any more than you can know they're guilty.

I have said that from what has been reported, it seems extremely unlikely - maybe impossible - for the board to have pulled off the conspiracy that Sisney accused them of.

My point is - and has been for months - not that everyone should believe the board is innocent, but that anyone commenting should consider all sides, and exercise the appropriate restraint in casting stones at potentially innocent people.

Do you believe we should not look at all sides, and should feel free to condemn people based on our own individual impressions, in the absence of the critical information that these people had when they made their decisions - information that we DON'T have?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/12/2009 12:54:46 PM)

I think I'm just bordering on cranky today :)

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/12/2009 1:23:37 PM)

The Ledger published the two to PBG but not the one to BA-Native. Is there something in the TW article I referenced that they don't want people to read? I don't really think they need to worry about their readers flocking over to the TW to look up the article...

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/12/2009 3:02:20 PM)

Trying again, without the specific TW article reference:

-----

A certain level of irregularities and sloppiness has to be tolerated, simply because we're human. Requiring perfection is impractical. There was agreement in April and May of 2008 among Sisney, board members, and BA staff that procedures needed to be established to better manage the work order/vendor services/invoice payment processes. They were put in place; Ann Wade was quoted explaining the new procedures.

But that's not what the accusations are. The board members and Gerber are accused by Sisney and by commenters of intentionally defrauding the district. There is a big difference between not having sufficient procedures and controls in place and committing criminal acts to provide business to one vendor to the detriment of the district. Is there not? The OSBI investigation should be able to tell us which category Sisney's allegations (if true) fall under.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/12/2009 5:02:26 PM)

Ok, the Ledger published that one. I wonder what the problem was with the earlier version.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/13/2009 1:55:48 PM)

It looks like Sisney has moved to dismiss his federal case. I will put up the documents on brokenarrowforum dot net.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/13/2009 2:32:58 PM)

The reason for moving to dismiss as stated in the plaintiff's motion:

QUOTE

Through discovery and case development, Counsel has determined that Plaintiff's claims and remedies are not, at this time, of a federal nature, but those that sound in the laws governed by the state courts. Accordingly, in the interest of justice, Plaintiff seeks dismissal of his federal case without prejudice.

UNQUOTE

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/13/2009 2:53:04 PM)

Presumably Doug Mann knew that it wasn't necessary to spend much time on the federal case. He has, according to the documents, spent some time chasing down Sisney's counsel to get them to comply with the requirements. He has asked the court to award to the District "its attorney fees and costs associated with this matter, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a)(5), together with such other relief as the Court deems just and proper."

This latest move contributes further to the appearance that this lawsuit was filed as a bluff. Sisney's attorney had to know just as well as Mann that the federal case had no merit since Sisney waived his hearing. I sincerely hope BA gets their money back on this one.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/13/2009 2:54:34 PM)

I posted a tiny comment on the Gerber story on the Ledger, saying that Dr. Sisney had filed to dismiss his federal case. We'll see if they publish it.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/13/2009 6:17:54 PM)

The Ledger posted my comment about the federal case, and I got this response:

To 612 "that is a bald faced non truth and you know it"

They really did their research on that one, didn't they?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/13/2009 6:21:49 PM)

The defamation case has some notes about a "protective order pertaining to confidential information". I guess we expected that - we probably won't ever know what's in Sisney's personnel file.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/13/2009 6:31:38 PM)

The Ledger now has a Breaking News article on Sisney's motion to dismiss the federal lawsuit, saying Sisney "confirmed" that he plans to dismiss. Oddly, Richardson is quoted as saying he will be filing papers to dismiss tomorrow. He already filed the motion to dismiss on 10/7.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/13/2009 6:34:51 PM)

Posted on the Ledger article "(BREAKING NEWS) Former superintendent's federal suit to be dropped  
Attorney: Plans are to keep other wrongful termination suit"

-----

Dr. Sisney's attorney filed a motion to dismiss the federal case on 10/07/2009. The reason stated in the motion:

QUOTE

Through discovery and case development, Counsel has determined that Plaintiff's claims and remedies are not, at this time, of a federal nature, but those that sound in the laws governed by the state courts. Accordingly, in the interest of justice, Plaintiff seeks dismissal of his federal case without prejudice.

UNQUOTE

Since the motion to dismiss was filed last week, what do they plan to file tomorrow?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/13/2009 6:37:22 PM)

I am so obnoxious today. I added another post to the Ledger story. I'm sure they love me.

-----

P.S. the other lawsuit is not wrongful termination. Sisney had not been terminated or even suspended when he filed it.

It's defamation, injurious falsehood, invasion of privacy - false light, tortious interference with a business contract, and intentional infliction of emotional distress.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/13/2009 6:50:46 PM)

Item #5 in Sisney's motion to dismiss says:

QUOTE

Counsel for Plaintiff has contacted Counsel for Defendant, Bo Rainey of Rosenstein, Fist, & Ringold, and Counsel for Defendant objects to this request.

UNQUOTE

Does that really mean that the District doesn't want it dismissed?

I'm wondering if Sisney had Updike and Stover object so vigorously to hiring RFR because Sisney knew that RFR was very familiar with education law, and would not be a pushover in a case as shaky as Sisney's.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/13/2009 6:54:50 PM)

I wonder if the Ledger will publish my comments stating that the motion to dismiss was filed last week, after pretending it was "Breaking News" and saying that the papers are going to be filed tomorrow.

Calling it breaking news and not mentioning that the papers were already filed is either extremely poor followup (good heavens, they know where the court papers are posted) or just plain lying to readers.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/13/2009 7:00:53 PM)

Posted on Ledger story, because they had the nerve to say "No additional details were forthcoming". Well, 612 isn't making this stuff up!

-----

People may be interested to know that Sisney asked for 2.5 million in compensatory damages, and 2.5 million in punitive damages. This can be found in the document "Plaintiff's Supplemental Rule 26 Disclosures".

In addition, the motion to dismiss states that Counsel for the Defendant objects to the motion for dismissal.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 7:41:41 AM)

The Ledger printed some of my comments, but not the one about the news being a week old. People need to know this, and that the paper they're getting their news from is unreliable. Trying again.

-----

Dr. Sisney's attorney filed a motion to dismiss the federal case on 10/07/2009. If he filed the motion to dismiss a week ago, why is he saying he is GOING to file to dismiss today? Is he planning to file something else today?

What did counsel for the defendant have to say when the Ledger contacted them?

1

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 8:00:07 AM)

Posted on the Gerber article. Someone said I "got caught not knowing my stuff again"...? That have never happened, so I don't know what they are referring to.

-----

"Hey 612", have you read the motion to dismiss? I have.

What are you saying I got wrong? Sisney filed to dismiss on 10/7/2009.

Back when he filed it I predicted he would drop it if BA refused to settle. The case has no merit because he waived his hearing. He knows it and the lawyers know it.

1

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 8:03:42 AM)

Posted on the Gerber article. 3 people have denied that Sisney filed to dismiss his federal lawsuit! I'm starting to understand why it's been such a battle to get people to accept that there might be another side to this story.

This one probably won't make it because it points out the week-long delay in the Breaking News.

-----

Does the fact that the Ledger reported that Sisney's counsel said he is GOING to file papers today to ask for dismissal, when in fact the papers were filed a week ago, not put any doubt in anybody's mind about other "facts" presented in the story?

Does anybody still take Richardson at his word?

Read the court papers for yourselves.

Talk about shooting the messenger - all I said was that Sisney had filed to dismiss his federal case (Jerry, honey, I specified federal - read my post again), which is absolutely 100% true. 3 people so far have denied it! Is this how the Sisney supporters process information? Unbelievable.

2

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 8:16:45 AM)

Posted on the Gerber story. I can't believe these people are denying that Sisney filed to dismiss based on the Ledger's story, which appears to be based only on what Richardson said.

-----

Y'all look at the timing on this story. I posted my comment about Sisney filing to dismiss his wrongful termination case at 2:23 yesterday. The original story appeared in the Ledger at 4:52.

Where do you think they got the tip?

The court papers are available to look at on the official court website; they were filed a week ago. But it doesn't look like the Ledger looked at them. Instead, they seem to have called Richardson, and just reported what he said.

3

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 8:34:00 AM)

The Ledger corrected its story as far as calling the district lawsuit "the other wrongful termination" case. It has not made any corrections regarding the papers having been filed last week.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 9:33:44 AM)

I am skeptical of the possibility that wrongful termination can be added to the existing defamation case, which was filed before Sisney was suspended or terminated.

Wrongful termination cannot be pursued by Sisney in any court - federal or state - at this time, because he waived his

hearing. The only remedy the court would typically order would be for the board to offer him another hearing, and then only if the plaintiff did not get a chance to request a hearing, as in the Sperry case. It seems unlikely that that would be an outcome Sisney would want.

But I'm not really sure that's what Richardson was saying anyway. He just said that they could accomplish what they want to with the defamation case. I'm not going to read adding wrongful termination into that statement.

4

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 9:39:02 AM)

Posted on the Gerber article (so was the previous post, at 9:33:44).

-----

If you would like to have a real discussion on the facts, feel free to read and post on the Tulsa World article, "BA School Board Rejects Probe", February 26, 2009. There's a whole world of information out there that you won't find in Ledger articles.

The Ledger frequently declines to publish my comments, so I am prevented from responding when people post incorrect information.

On the other hand, if you'd like to continue the misinformed drive-by's and keep yourselves in the dark with your wishful thinking, you're in the right place.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/14/2009 9:50:20 AM)

Submitted to the Ledger this morning

QUOTE

Thanks, 612, for bring this motion to dismiss the lawsuit to everyone's attention. The motion was filed more than a week ago, as you discovered online.

I hope the district's attorney can keep the case open and go ahead and prove that Sisney's termination was justified. They've gone to all the work and expense of preparing for the case. The taxpayers deserve to know the truth.

I expect that Sisney will also back out of the defamation lawsuit, just before trial. He probably never intended for information to be disclosed at trial.

I hope the supporters of Sisney are taking a close look at this.

END QUOTE

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/14/2009 9:58:20 AM)

Submitted to the Ledger on its "Breaking" News story:

QUOTE

It would be nice if the Ledger would call the district's attorney, too, to get their reaction to the request for dismissal of the only wrongful termination lawsuit that Sisney filed. That's what's called fair and balanced reporting.

Don't forget to ask why they object to the approval of this motion to dismiss.

END QUOTE

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 10:06:30 AM)

Emailed to Clifton Adcock:

-----

Mr. Adcock,

I wonder if the World will be publishing anything about the latest development in the Sisney/Broken Arrow School Board story.

Sisney filed on 10/07/2009 to dismiss his federal lawsuit for wrongful termination. Many times the Broken Arrow Ledger has reported developments as dictated to them by Sisney or his attorney. They did not report anything on this one until I brought it up in a comment yesterday afternoon on a Ledger article. Two hours later, the Ledger put up an article quoting Sisney's attorney saying that he was GOING TO file the motion to dismiss today. They didn't mention anything in the court papers, which are readily available online (at the court website and on my website, brokenarrowforum dot net), and they didn't mention even trying to get hold of the attorney for the Broken Arrow school district. And of course they called it "Breaking News" and didn't mention that it happened a week ago!

The Ledger also stated that Sisney was going to keep his "other wrongful termination" lawsuit going. The other lawsuit is not wrongful termination - it was filed before Sisney was fired or even suspended. After I pointed this out in a comment, the Ledger reworded this.

I am disgusted by the Ledger's poor reporting on this. It would be helpful to get the real story out there for people to see.

Thank you.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/14/2009 12:02:15 PM)

612 - Thanks for sending that letter to Mr. Adcock at the Tulsa World. I hope he takes the time to report all sides of this story. It could be a great opportunity for the TW to take the lead in reporting it from a fresh angle instead of the Sisney's-been-wronged-for-doing-what's-right slant.

The Ledger surprisingly published both of my comments submitted this morning.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 12:03:03 PM)

The Ledger printed all my comments from this morning, except for the one directing people to this article.

At least people will have the opportunity to know that the Ledger reported inaccurately and/or incompletely. Whether they choose to accept it is out of my hands.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/14/2009 2:48:46 PM)

Submitted to the Ledger this afternoon

QUOTE

to "please"

What's the problem? Someone doesn't like it when the facts start coming out?

612 is doing this community a service by providing actual, verifiable information.

Why do you think the Ledger didn't know about this story and she had to bring it to others' attention through her comment on this site? Because Sisney didn't feed it to the Ledger or anyone else in the media, as he has in previous announcements regarding his litigation and this controversy that he started last year. Ask yourself why he'd want to keep this news quiet. Maybe because this is a defensive move on his part and the beginning of the end of his entire case based on his allegations against the district, Board members, and Air Assurance.

The district and board members that have been sued need to keep moving forward with all litigation initiated by Sisney UNTIL THE COURT DECIDES these matters and issues rulings. Their reputations are at stake, money has been spent defending them, and if they have been wronged by untruthful allegations made by Sisney, this needs to be corrected so that the public knows once and for all what the facts are.

Bullies should never be rewarded for their bad behavior.

END QUOTE

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 3:03:15 PM)

Thanks, Jolie! I also posted a response:

-----

Does it say anything about the people posting on one side of this controversy that they jumped all over a comment that was accurately, truthfully, and objectively bringing up a new development? That instead of checking into whether it was in fact true or waiting to see if it was reported, they immediately called the person who brought it up a liar?

Feeling a little defensive maybe? Why do you see this as a bad thing, if Sisney is justified in what he is doing, and you are sure he will achieve his goal with the one lawsuit?

Why jump all over 612 just for telling you about the latest news? Don't you want to know?

Maybe because your point of view is threatened?

I'm sorry if reality offends you. I can't make you accept it, but at least I can point out the irrationality of your attacks on people offering information.

"Never fear the truth, Drover. Even when it proves you wrong". – Hank the Cowdog

P.S. For the record, I am not Ms. Flippo. She does not need to be blamed for comments made by someone else. You may, of course, believe what you want.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 3:56:45 PM)

I think I know the overriding reason Ms. Flippo held her press conference. I noticed that she made her remarks about Rep. Reynolds and the sick pay issue before bringing up the history with Sisney's threats.

I think that at the time, it was critical to get the message across to people about Reynold's reckless actions, and point out his possible motive. She says,

QUOTE

The real question that needs to be asked is, "What and/or who motivated Rep. Reynolds to make the statements he did at this particular time?" I believe the purpose of these very public allegations was clear. The purpose was clearly to affect both the upcoming school board election and the superintendent selection process - by use of falsehoods and half truths."

UNQUOTE

This was, of course, right before the school board election. We know that one of the candidates supported Sisney. Ms. Flippo also mentioned the superintendent selection process.

Is it possible that she believed that there was a chance Sisney could be hired back? That is the sense I get from her comments.

Again, Ms. Flippo appears to have put the district's well-being ahead of her own popularity and comfort, as she made public statements that she knew would be strongly criticized.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 4:07:01 PM)

The Ledger published both our comments. :)

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/14/2009 4:21:24 PM)

The Ledger's reporting of the issue still stinks but I do appreciate that they are not stonewalling most of our comments like they used to when Lewis was on board.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 4:27:01 PM)

Another possible connection - reported in TW article "BA board hopefuls plow ahead" 2/8/2009. I had forgotten who Ms. Flippo's opponent was.

-----

Flippo ran for the House District 80 seat in 2008, but she lost in the Republican primary to Mike Ritze.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 5:47:37 PM)

On Sisney's district case, dated today:

CANTRELL, DAMAN: STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER PERTAINING TO CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION IS GRANTED; ORDER ENTERED

Drat.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 6:22:09 PM)

Posted on Ledger article about the federal case being dropped. I notice we don't have any real challengers there. It's a little disappointing since in this case there is so much hard data, but on the other hand, we're still at the Ledger's mercy as far as getting published...

-----

"please", I'm sorry that you are not interested in actual information regarding this controversy. Judging from the fact that you have clicked on this article at least twice, I have to wonder what you expected to find here.

However, from the number of hits on my website, where the official court documents are posted, it is apparent that plenty of people are interested. This is encouraging to me, as I think it's important for people to be able to analyze the raw data for themselves.

You can feel free to skip over my posts. Be assured that your criticism will not deter me from my efforts to point out relevant information to readers.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 7:14:06 PM)

Remember that article Bob Lewis wrote in August, giving a glowing review of Sisney's work and asking what's taking so long to decide whether to renew his contract?

QUOTE

To be completely fair, it must be noted there are five members of the school board and the Ledger is told the votes behind this delay are far from unanimous.

UNQUOTE

The Ledger was told how the votes were going? The article states that these discussions were happening in executive session, "behind closed doors". Was this one of the leaks mentioned by Ms. Wilkins in the 6/29 board meeting?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 7:39:13 PM)

Not surprisingly, there is nothing new filed in the federal lawsuit. It's possible that Richardson filed something and it's not scanned in and posted on the website. I'll check tomorrow.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/14/2009 8:28:25 PM)

612, in response to your writing, "The Ledger was told how the votes were going? The article states that these discussions were happening in executive session, "behind closed doors". Was this one of the leaks mentioned by Ms. Wilkins in the 6/29 board meeting?"

---

It could be. Isn't it possible it was Sisney that was passing this along to Lewis directly? I know that he was present during the executive sessions that were discussing his contract, according to his defamation lawsuit documentation, but I don't know if he would have been present during their actual vote on whether to renew his contract or not. Do you?

Either way, if it were Sisney or Updike, either one would have been violating the confidentiality of the executive session, if they shared that information with someone outside of the room.

Very good question, 612.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/14/2009 9:33:42 PM)

Hm, I didn't get the impression that Sisney attended the executive session meetings to discuss his contract. I know that Sisney claims that both the Rampeys attended the third and final 6-hour meeting, and Rampey denies it.

I would definitely not put it past Sisney to inform Bob Lewis of what went on in executive session, or, if he wasn't there, what he suspected or heard from one of the board members went on.

I wonder what Bob Lewis was thinking, reporting on something that he shouldn't have even known.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/14/2009 10:12:45 PM)

I made the assumption he was present in the executive sessions of the board discussing his contract, but after reviewing the defamation lawsuit paperwork again, I confirmed that it is not stated as such. So, we're down to someone from the executive session talking to Sisney or to Lewis. The timing does coincide with one of the two instances that Updike is alleged to have leaked information from an executive session. I would expect that if Sisney were not in the meeting, it was Updike who spoke with Sisney and he then spoke with Lewis. This is only conjecture on my part.

There is an undated letter (marked Plaintiff Exhibit B) in the lawsuit package filed on 09/04/08 by Sisney addressed to Stephanie Updike and marked 'Confidential' for Board Members eyes only. Was each letter personally addressed to each board member, including a personal salutation or was this letter directed specifically to Updike with only copies of the same letter addressed to her given to Board members? If it is the second, how strange for him to do address the letter to her, as Stover was the president of the board at the time. If it was addressed to Updike alone with copies to the board, it would definitely show a close association between the two of them.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/15/2009 8:25:35 AM)

I wondered about the letter addressed to Updike too. It didn't seem to be meant for her only. I thought maybe there was some convention about addressing letters to the board, maybe to a specific officer.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/15/2009 7:31:03 PM)

In Stephanie Updike's comments in June, she says,

QUOTE

"I have to ask again why the big rush to fire (former superintendent) Dr. (Jim) Sisney," Updike said. "If there were problems, why couldn't the board have voted sanctions, applied close supervision and at least let him finish the year?"

UNQUOTE

Would it have been possible to let him finish out just the current year? I was under the impression that since his contract was already approved through June 2011, it would be necessary to fire him if they wanted to get him out before then.

Is Ms. Updike suggesting that the board should have fired Sisney at the end of the fiscal year? Or is there something in his contract that allows them to cut it short of his contract expiration date, that isn't actually firing him?

I wonder what sanctions a board would put in place against a superintendent? I'm sure there are guidelines for this sort of thing. Maybe the board already did vote sanctions and apply close supervision (can you imagine Sisney being closely supervised?).

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/15/2009 7:46:11 PM)

I also wonder what problems Updike could mean that could be remedied with close supervision. Now I'm really curious.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/16/2009 8:36:54 AM)

Posted on Ledger article about Sisney's federal lawsuit, in response to PBG's comment that the board should have just let Sisney's contract run out:

-----

PBG, I remember Stephanie Updike suggesting that very thing - letting Sisney's contract run out. She suggested that any problems could be addressed with sanctions and close supervision and he could be dismissed at the end of July 2008.

I think the problem with letting his contract run out was that it didn't run out until June 30, 2011. Each year it is approved on a 3-year rolling basis.

I don't know if there would have been a way to keep him on until the end of the fiscal year (2008), short of firing him. There might be a clause in his contract; I have not heard anything about that.

Even so, we don't know the reasons for the board taking the swift and, some say, hasty and unnecessary, action of firing Sisney. Surely they knew it would cost the district, and surely they knew there would be intense criticism. I think we have to at least consider the possibility that there could be overriding reasons for these seemingly outrageous actions.

Remember, if there are, we wouldn't know.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/16/2009 8:47:59 AM)

Posted on Sisney federal case story in response to Jerry's "thank you":

Thanks, Jerry. I'm really not trying to convince anybody of anything except that all the information should be considered when drawing conclusions. I have posted all the official court documents on my website. If you do a yahoo search on Sisney Broken Arrow, it will come up at or near the top of the results.

I was immediately called a liar when I posted the news about the filing to dismiss the federal case. I have never posted anything as fact that could not be verified; when I posted that information, I had already put the court documents on my website. I hope people will consider the possibility that information I post as fact is true, and then verify it.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/16/2009 9:15:32 AM)

Posted on Ledger Sisney federal lawsuit article, in response to the usual tedious claim that current employees were not interviewed when they fired Sisney (as if that person knows):

-----  
"I'll ask one more time" - Sisney's lawyer filing to dismiss the lawsuit does not indicate that Sisney is a meanie. Lawsuits are dropped for all kinds of reasons, and it doesn't necessarily mean the plaintiff is in the wrong.

In this case, Richardson filed to dismiss because he recognized that the matter was not of a federal nature. I tried to post the text from the motion but my comment was not published. You can read it in the court document though.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/16/2009 11:42:48 AM)

Posted on Ledger. I noticed that my comment to PBG was kinda confusing. Not sure this is any better...

-----  
A couple of clarifications to my earlier post regarding PBG' suggestion that the board let Sisney's contract run out (if my earlier comment gets published).

The way I wrote it, it might look like Ms. Updike's suggestion that the board could have let Sisney finish out the year was made before he was fired. She actually made her comment in June 2009, saying that she didn't know why the board didn't do it that way.

I also wrote that, since his contract is approved on a 3-year rolling basis, it would not have been up until June 2011.

I meant to say, "I don't know if there would have been a way to keep him on until the end of the fiscal year (2008), short of firing him at that time, in June 2008."

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/16/2009 12:05:36 PM)

Posted on Ledger:

-----  
R egarding Ms. Updike's June 2009 suggestion that the school board should have let Sisney finish out the year - I wondered if there was a way they could have ended his employment at the end of June 2008 without firing him, since his contract was approved through 2011.

I don't know about Sisney's specific contract, but one possibility is that the board could have bought out the remainder of his contract. So his employment would have ended on June 30, 2008, and the district would have paid a negotiated lump sum to him, to avoid a breach of contract situation.

It would be interesting to know if this was considered by the board. It's even possible that it was considered and negotiated - maybe that's why they had all those long executive sessions in August - but fell through. Remember that at the 8/4/2008 board meeting the board tabled the vote on approving Sisney's contract extension, so they could discuss modifications. We have no way of knowing at this point of course.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/16/2009 1:44:34 PM)

I think Jerry's post is worth copying and pasting here, as soon the Ledger article it appeared on will be archived.

QUOTE

Jerry wrote on Oct 14, 2009 7:30 PM:

" @612, IF mr. Sisney proves out to be the BAD GUY, in all of this, I will certainly, accept & eat my part of the humble pie. Even though I am a Sisney supporter , for reason other than any of this mess, I DO appreciate your talent and ability to find and report the actual facts, that are available to all of us, but some of us dont know how to go about finding them. I will say Thank you ,and keep up the good work. "

END QUOTE

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/16/2009 3:12:07 PM)

Posted on Ledger article about Sisney's federal case being dropped:

-----  
I'm sure these charges will sound familiar to anyone who has read Dr. Sisney's federal wrongful termination case:

[HVAC company] received \$x million worth of air conditioning work from the school system during the past four years, according to school system record."

"...[the employees] are accused of conspiring to illegal affect the awarding of air conditioning work so that [HVAC company] received a vast majority."

"[HVAC company], which got millions of dollars in air-conditioning work on schools, overcharged for work that was done, billed for work on rooms that didn't exist and replaced air-conditioning units that were working properly."

We've heard it all before, right? But these charges are not from Broken Arrow's controversy. They are from another district's strikingly similar fraud scandal, where an FBI investigation was started in the June 2008 timeframe. In July 2008, Mrs. Flippo claims, Dr. Sisney threatened to "go public with the Air Assurance story".

Coincidence? Or plagiarism?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/16/2009 3:45:17 PM)

Here is Question 36:

Charges virtually identical to Sisney's allegations against the district were being investigated by the FBI in Bossier City, LA starting in the June 2008 timeframe. Sisney allegedly told Flippo that if she didn't get the board to agree to what he wanted, he would "go public with the Air Assurance story" in July 2008. Are these similarities due to coincidence, or plagiarism?

Bossier City: "Air Repair received \$8.6 million worth of air conditioning work from the school system during the past four years, according to school system record."

Sisney's federal lawsuit: "In total, from July 2002 to present, Air Assurance and the Rampeys have been paid \$3,100,000.00 by the BASD."

Bossier City: "...[the employees] are accused of conspiring to illegal affect the awarding of air conditioning work so that Air Repair received a vast majority."

Sisney's federal lawsuit: "Employees of the School district engaged in an ongoing enterprise with AA to keep AA's competition from competitively bidding work for the Broken Arrow School District. The ongoing criminal activity damaged other HVAC vendors in the area by eliminating competition."

Bossier City: "Air Repair, which got millions of dollars in air-conditioning work on parish schools, overcharged for work that was done, billed for work on rooms that didn't exist and replaced air-conditioning units that were working properly."

Sisney's federal lawsuit: "AA, over extended periods of time, padded their invoices to the District – by overcharging, by charging for services not performed, or by providing unnecessary repairs and parts."

The Bossier City statements are from articles on the KTBS Channel 3 website.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/16/2009 4:43:05 PM)

Posted on Ledger article:

Curiouser and curiouser. First we have a plaintiff who wants to dismiss the case and a defendant who appears to object; then we have a settlement conference set.

Who is going to be settling with who?

The Settlement Conference Order was filed today by the judge in Sisney's federal case.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/16/2009 5:04:12 PM)

Posted on Ledger, in response to "2 things", who pointed out that, contrary to "I'll ask one more time"s claim, people have been interviewed:

-----

A note for "2 things":

The listing of legal billing details includes many references to interviews conducted in preparation for Dr. Sisney's due process hearing, since they had to prepare in case he requested it. Of course the names are not mentioned, but that does add weight to your statement that people have been interviewed.

Of course, any information at all about who was interviewed or what they said would be strictly confidential, both because it relates to personnel issues and because of the pending litigation. That's why I don't put much stock in people's claims about who was or wasn't interviewed - anybody who knows shouldn't be talking.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/16/2009 6:09:47 PM)

612, it looks like the Ledger won't publish your comment about the possibility of Sisney cypocattng the Bossier situation in his allegations. They've published one of your more recent comments, though.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/16/2009 9:59:14 PM)

Third try responding to Jerry. All I did last time was mention putting the court documents on my website. They didn't post it. Pathetic.

-----

Man! I keep trying to respond to Jerry but my comments don't get through. Trying again...

Thanks, Jerry. I'm really not trying to convince anybody of anything except that all the information should be considered when drawing conclusions.

I was immediately called a liar when I posted the news about the filing to dismiss the federal case. I have never posted anything as fact that could not be verified; I had already reviewed the court documents when I posted that information. I hope people will consider the possibility that information I post as fact is true, and then verify it for themselves.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/16/2009 11:27:43 PM)

Posted on Ledger:

-----

Maybe I just didn't click the "Post Comment" button. I can't identify anything in this post that would violate the Ledger's policy. Trying again.

I'm sure these charges will sound familiar to anyone who has read Dr. Sisney's federal wrongful termination case:

[HVAC company] received \$x million worth of air conditioning work from the school system during the past four years, according to school system record."

"...[the employees] are accused of conspiring to illegal affect the awarding of air conditioning work so that [HVAC company] received a vast majority."

"[HVAC company], which got millions of dollars in air-conditioning work on schools, overcharged for work that was done, billed for work on rooms that didn't exist and replaced air-conditioning units that were working properly."

We've heard it all before, right? But these charges are not from Broken Arrow's controversy. They are from another district's strikingly similar fraud scandal, where an FBI investigation was started in the June 2008 timeframe. In July 2008, Mrs. Flippo claims, Dr. Sisney threatened to "go public with the Air Assurance story".

Coincidence? Or plagiarism?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/16/2009 11:36:20 PM)

I don't know what to make of the Ledger's refusal to publish my comments, except that they contain ideas/information/viewpoints that they don't want readers to be exposed to. What is so dangerous about the Bossier City comparison? If they are not protecting Sisney, why would they not publish it?

If they have any other explanation, they have ability to put it before the public. They also have my email address. Until they provide a reasonable alternate explanation, I'm assuming they're censoring with the intent to promote a particular point of view.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/17/2009 9:50:13 AM)

The Ledger had no problem publishing the Bossier story when they could use it to make the Board and Air Assurance look guilty by comparison. Remember?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/17/2009 11:11:13 AM)

That's right, the Ledger was the first to point out the similarities. At the time, it seemed to make Sisney's claims more plausible = "see, this stuff really happens".

But it looks different now, after seeing how weak Sisney's specific claims in the police report are (as listed in the affidavit), seeing those claims debunked or explained, seeing the audit which did not find evidence of kickbacks or bid-rigging, watching as Sisney went to the press and the courts but took 8 months to involve law enforcement, and seeing a sequence of events that are more consistent with the actions of an employee who feared for his job and reputation than with years of hidden schemes and corruption.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**WoodyWayne**, (10/17/2009 11:20:52 AM)

This is my first post on the Sisney misadventures, and I must say it has been hard to refrain, but I cannot help myself at this time...

1. It appears that Richardson had to drop out of the picture on the District Court Case because there is no money in it for him.
2. It appears that Richardson had to go ahead and try to dismiss the Federal Case because Sisney cannot find another lawyer to take on a case that has no merit.
3. It appears that the case filed in Federal Court may cost Sisney and/or his attorneys some money since there was no merit. Sisney & Richardson filed a petition to drop the Federal case, but BAPS attorneys are asking the court to not drop the case. BAPS attorneys know Sisney/Richardson can be held liable for expenses incurred and possible fines for filing a court case with no grounds or merit.
4. Sisney is hanging on to the District Court case because he is trying to save face. He has to hold on to the opportunity to make others believe he is a good guy.
5. Those who cross path with Sisney should recognize these signs. He acts like a good ole boy and wants to be your friend; however, you will never really know him as he lacks true social skills. He will hide behind closed doors, unless he is at a baseball field. But even then, you will not really know him. He only has a few stories to shares, and they will be repeated in various situations whether or not the story has any meaning or even it is not relevant to the situation. Most of the time, you will leave wondering what he was talking about; but, he will tell you how smart he his. Most people carrying his torch do not know him, other than to casually meet him. I challenge someone to find a group of true close friends that have know this man for a long time, share personal experiences and work experiences with

him over a long period of time. You won't find them. Some people are good at telling you how, smart, wonderful and caring they are, and others show you by their actions. Beware of someone who can charm you and gain power, even though you have no real documentation or first hand experience to evaluate their skills.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/17/2009 11:31:26 AM)

Woody, good to hear from you. About the federal case having no merit and the BAPS attorneys not allowing them to just dismiss it - that was what it looks like to me, but I'm not too sure about interpreting court papers.

We knew from the moment they filed the federal case that it had no merit, and I think Richardson did too. How could he not? That's why my impression has always been that it was done for show. I think maybe Sisney underestimated Mann's willingness to take him on, and hoped that all the pressure Updike is trying to stir up on the legal fees would cause him to cave in and settle. I have little doubt that Updike is continually bringing up legal fees for this very reason. It is unfortunate that it leads some people to taking actions that waste even more time and money.

I believe the district case is also for show, and that the board is capable of showing overwhelming evidence that they did what they had to do. I don't believe it will make it to trial.

I hope we will hear from you again. Any insight you can provide is welcome.

If you haven't already, please see the documents on my website at brokenarrowforum dot net.

612

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/17/2009 4:03:42 PM)

Sanctions for bringing a case without merit were mentioned when Richardson dismissed Mann from the defamation lawsuit:

Mann said the removal of his name from the lawsuit took place "just minutes before the judge was to hear arguments in the matter from my attorney. Just ask Sisney and his lawyers why they dismissed. The answer is obvious. It was a ridiculous and frivolous lawsuit that should never have been filed and the only way for them to avoid sanctions being imposed against them by the court was for them to dismiss it."

I have seen Richardson say and do some questionable things, the most recent being supposedly telling the Ledger that he was going to file for dismissal, when it was readily verifiable online that he had in fact done it a week ago. But the more I see of Mann's actions, the more he looks like he knows what he's doing.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/19/2009 9:25:10 AM)

Posted on Ledger article in response to someone who is sure that nobody had a problem with Sisney's behavior, is under the impression that people involved with the investigation can talk about it, and insists on referring to me as Ms. Flippo:

-----

None of the "higher-ups" are free to talk about anything regarding the lawsuits or Sisney's personnel information. That restriction would definitely include any information on who was interviewed and what they said. Because of that, anything I hear from somebody who claims to know indicates to me either lack of knowledge or lack of integrity. Not something that I want to base my conclusions on.

Based on what I have seen reported, I believe Sisney did a lot of good things for Broken Arrow. But I also believe his behavior WAS an issue. We will see.

I said earlier that anybody who knows shouldn't be talking. You may assume that since I'm talking, I don't know anything.

It doesn't hurt me any if you think I'm Ms. Flippo, but I will state for the record (and for her sake) that I'm not.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/19/2009 9:57:38 AM)

Posted on Ledger to the person who says I'm Ms. Flippo and still expects to be taken seriously:

-----

To "Hey 612 AKA Flippo",

You may want to consider this when posting as fact something you haven't verified: someone else who reads it may know the truth. If your goal is to discredit my point of view by suggesting that I'm Ms. Flippo, you make have some success there with people who automatically dismiss what she has to say.

But you put a big dent in your credibility with me when you posted your assumption that I'm Ms. Flippo. You don't know my identity; but I do. That tells me that you are willing to insist that something is true when you don't really know. I have to consider the information you offer in that light.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/19/2009 4:31:27 PM)

This is my post submitted to the Ledger in response to BA Citizen who wants you to reveal your identity, 612.

QUOTE

Concentrate on the facts, BA Citizen. It doesn't matter who is presenting them to you for to investigate and evaluate for yourself, does it?

The information that 612 has on her website are copies of official court documents, news stories, press releases, etc.

Why should she open herself up to personal harrassment by some individuals within the community by identifying herself?

Just re-read some of the hateful posts that have been written directed at her, myself, and anyone else who questions Sisney's version of events and/or defends the board members accused of wrongdoing. Then ask yourself if you would want to put you and your own family in jeopardy by revealing your true identity just because you wanted to speak out for the truth and ask for fair treatment of our fellow Broken Arrow citizens. You don't even identify yourself on your own Ledger posts and you are not even taking a stand here and therefore have a much smaller exposure and risk of vengeful retaliation by doing so.

I wish the world were a safer, better place and that human beings could be trusted to always do the right thing. Sadly, we have to live in the real world, where some people behave very badly when someone opposes their agenda or point of view.

That's why I will remain 'Jolie' online and I think '612' will remain 612.

END QUOTE

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/19/2009 4:59:50 PM)

Thank you, Jolie! I hope it gets published - I haven't gotten away with even mentioning my website lately. I also responded. These people will argue with anything - even something they can find online and see in black and white for themselves! Why do they feel so threatened when someone just points out the facts?

-----

BA Citizen, it doesn't really matter to me if some people dismiss what I have to say on the basis that I don't give my name.

I am posting information for people who are interested in looking at the facts about this issue. Believe it or not, there are some people who are. Like I said earlier, I'm not trying to convince anybody of anything except that all the information should be considered when drawing conclusions.

How much "credibility" does a person need in order to point out verifiable facts? What have I stated as fact that you don't believe is true?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/19/2009 9:44:29 PM)

Jolie, they posted both our comments, AND a supporting comment from Jerry! I guess he was also unimpressed with the notion that comments only count when you put your real name on them (from someone who didn't put his real name on it).

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/19/2009 11:09:35 PM)

The TW has published an article about Sisney's attorney filing to dismiss the federal lawsuit. The article states Richardsons's reasons from the 10/7 filing, saying that he should have filed it in state court rather than federal.

I am pleased that they contacted Bo Rainey. According to the article, Rainey "said he will file a motion by Oct. 26 asking that the motion be denied. He said the reason for the district's objection will be in that filing."

Wow.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/20/2009 3:57:32 AM)

Submitted to the Ledger early Tuesday morning:

QUOTE

The Tulsa World has a new article up on this subject dated 10/19/09 (published late) and titled "Former BA superintendent moves to dismiss lawsuit"

Here is the first line of the article:

QUOTE

Attorneys for Broken Arrow Public Schools said they will ask a federal judge to deny a request by former Superintendent Jim Sisney to dismiss a federal lawsuit against the district.

END QUOTE

Read the rest at the TW, and don't forget the comments, too. :)

END QUOTE

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**C. Tharp**, (10/20/2009 11:10:02 AM)

I have a procedure question here. and no I havent read the latest about the fed lawsuit on 612's page.

But assuming the above postings are correct about Bo Rainey saying stuff and making decisions about the lawsuit continuing. Since Mr. Rainey is representing the district on the Fed lawsuit (right?) then shouldn't any decisions about the fed lawsuit come before the board for Vote to make that decision?

I am not saying anything one way or the other about the lawsuit dismissed or such, but I would just think an important decision like that should come before the BOE, in my opinion. Am I correct? I would just think a lawsuit with taxdollars involved should have the public body voting to decide to continue or not.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**C. Tharp**, (10/20/2009 11:14:12 AM)

as far as I know there has not been an agenda item or meeting discussing such issues.

Just hope Mr. lawyer is not contacting board members by phone to make decisions like that.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/20/2009 12:29:54 PM)

Good question, Chris. It's hard to say how much we would know about that since there are such big confidentiality requirements on all this. Clearly these decisions have to be made at some point, and counsel has to be authorized to take action.

Depending on how the settlement works out, there may no longer be tax dollars involved in this. The expenditures may be reimbursed.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/20/2009 12:34:46 PM)

Posted on Ledger:

-----

Like I said, "Hey 612", your claims don't carry much weight with me. I'll continue to look for and report on actual information as it becomes available.

"question", I must not be communicating very well if I've given the impression that I have answers for everything. Though actually I do remember saying on this thread that since I'm talking, you can assume I don't know anything.

I don't think I understand your question, but I can tell you (again) that the presumed unfairness of the due process hearing is irrelevant at this point. It would be relevant only if Sisney had held his due process hearing and THEN filed a complaint. The law says (not me - the law) - he HAS to go through his due process hearing in order to have the court consider the circumstances of his dismissal. If he was denied the opportunity for a due process hearing (as in the Sperry case filed against Sisney), the court would typically order a "do-over", and order the board to offer him one. If he did have a due process hearing but thought it was unfair, then the court could look at his complaint. There are precedents for this very situation – a presumption of bias on the board - and the court does not get involved when the hearing was waived.

That's the law. I'm just trying to help people understand the constraints involved here. You're welcome.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**C. Tharp**, (10/20/2009 12:45:49 PM)

I understand that it would not be an open discussion. But you would think that the atty would meet with all as a "board" and give an update and make vote if needed in executive session.

I mean, the district is getting sued in fed court, but yet nothing is ever given to the "board" as a hole.

We would know that since it would at least be mentioned in agenda, correct? So how are directions from the "board" being communicated to the atty concerning the fed lawsuit??

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/20/2009 12:50:35 PM)

Posted on Ledger in response to some claims made by Interested Citizen:

-----

Interested Citizen, if you have documents that show proof of your claims, I will post them.

Are there specific statements in the audit that describe missing and altered documents? The audit mentions that there were two quotes missing. Is this what you are referring to, or is there something else in that audit or a different audit? If a different audit, please provide the document so I can post it.

Can you verify the claim that Trish Williams made the unauthorized payment on her last day over the objections of the superintendent?

If you can't point to any verifiable evidence, I will consider your claims hearsay. Anybody can say anything, and pretend to be "in the know" in an attempt to influence others' opinions. You are telling people to refocus - I think maybe you are trying to take the focus OFF this most recent development.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/20/2009 4:58:16 PM)

The Ledger hasn't published my comment to Interested Citizen, and now the comment from Interested Citizen isn't there. Was it removed? Maybe I was looking at a different article? Did anybody else see a comment from Interested Citizen on the Ledger, or am I just in the Twilight Zone?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (10/20/2009 5:36:56 PM)

612, Earlier today I read your comment in response to 'Interested Citizen' and tried to find the post you were responding to but was unable to find it. It may have been there once, but I haven't seen it.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/20/2009 9:30:59 PM)

I also thought the Ledger article said 35 comments, then went back to 34. Or I could be responding to imaginary comments. Hm. Say good night, Gracie.