

# The Cheyenne Herald

*Exclusive to the website - May 27, 2010*

## More on the action taken by *your* local community college to try to suppress the Cheyenne Herald's coverage of the 2008 trip to Costa Rica taken by the president of LCCC

© The Cheyenne Herald 2010

### THE SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

On May 5, I received a copy of the two page Care Team Report that was generated after input from students who took the Costa Rica trip back in 2008. LCCC president Hammon and another also completed Care Team "referral forms" related to the trip. Confusion has resulted by the Wyoming Tribune-Eagle saying they had the "Care Team Report" and that they had 16 pages. Beyond the two page Report, what the WTE has is the "file" on the Costa Rica trip. I have never had those other 14 pages in my possession and would have been uncomfortable to have received them because students were promised confidentiality if they would complete a "referral form" and provide input about that trip.

I did not publish anything about the Care Team Report in my May 11 Cheyenne Herald, even though I had it, because I already had several pages involving LCCC with my coverage of the wrongful termination hearing of Dr. James Cook. So, I "teased" on the front page of that issue that coverage of the "Costa Rica trip" would come in the May 25 Cheyenne Herald.

That set off a mad scramble by the WTE. They desperately wanted a copy of the report that they had made a public records request for on April 7, 2010. LCCC denied the WTE a copy. Subsequent to my promise on May 11 to release information from that Report on May 25, the WTE virtually begged for a copy of the Report. They did not want me to beat them to print. The WTE said that they had finally been provided a copy of the Care Team file on Thursday, May 20th. That was 15 days after the Cheyenne Herald had a copy of the Report and I suspect they may have paid for their copy.

On Friday morning, the 21st, I was tipped that the WTE had the file and was preparing a story for their Saturday paper. That knowledge came because evidently the WTE reporter called LCCC for comment for the story. Not the brightest move after being thwarted by LCCC for so long in accessing the data. But that is what was done.

Being informed that the WTE was trying to beat my print edition onto the streets (I print on Monday for an on-street day of Tuesday even though some copies are out on Monday evening), I decided to complete my stories and put them and the Care Team Report up on the Cheyenne Herald website on Friday afternoon and that was accomplished by about 2:00 on Friday, May 21, 2010. Five total pages were made available on the website that day rather than wait for my normal Monday or Tuesday availability. After having the data for so long, I didn't want the Tribune-Eagle to be able to claim they were first to publish a story about the Care Team and Costa Rica trip.

Based on just the possibility that the daily would publish a story of some sort related to the Costa Rica trip in the next few days, attorneys for LCCC filed for and were granted a temporary restraining order against the Wyoming Tribune-Eagle, effectively preventing them from publishing anything from that Care Team file.

A "teleconference" was held Friday afternoon, presumably before the 3:30 pm TRO service on the WTE. I was not a part of that teleconference. Now I think I understand why. I believe it was because LCCC was not going after the Cheyenne Herald, even though the two page Care Team Report was up on my website prior to their teleconference and I had promised more coverage in my following Monday's publication.

### THE WTE "RATTED" ME OUT

I was served with a Temporary Restraining Order last Friday at a little after 5:00 pm. I was reminded of the memorable scene from the Bob Newhart television show in which he was an innkeeper in Vermont. I think it was in the first episode. Bob needed somebody to dig in the basement of his inn. Three guys showed up. Introducing himself, the front man said to Bob, "I'm Larry. This is my brother Darryl. And this is my other brother Darryl."

Bob wanted someone to dig up the grave of a woman who had been a witch 300 years earlier. So, he brought in the three woodsmen. Larry gave Newhart a business card that identified his and his brother business. It said, "Anything For A Buck."

When a baseless and unwarranted TRO was dumped on me without affording me an opportunity to convince a judge just how foolish the action would be, I thought of that scene. And the attorneys who had hastily prepared the TRO. Anything for a buck.

Hank Bailey is senior partner in the law firm representing LCCC in this despicable action. I have long considered Hank a friend. We have partnered in more than one effort, most notably trying to prevent the closing of Albin's junior and senior high schools. I was proud to be introduced to the gathered crowd of about 300 along with Hank at the final graduation in the Albin gym. Hank has long been a supporter of the Cheyenne Herald and he knows how I operate. For him to allow his law firm to be used as "Anything for a buck" against me was disappointing. He could have looked at my website on Friday and easily determined that the Care Team Report was already posted and that it contained no information that compromised the identity of any student who made the Biology class trip to Costa Rica in August of 2008. He could have called me and asked if I planned to publish anything that might identify students and I would have told him "no." I hadn't, I didn't and I won't.

Yet, after receiving direction from the Wyoming Tribune-Eagle - that's right, not his client LCCC, but my competitor in Cheyenne, the Wyoming Tribune-Eagle - to look at my website, that I already had the "offending" Care Team Report posted, he quickly modified the TRO already served on the WTE and had it approved by an unprepared and disinterested district court judge and served on me. Without prior notice or attempt to notify me. I was given no opportunity, as was the WTE, to explain or justify my actions. I guess that's what friends do.

Elephants come to me when they've forgotten. They know I never forget. And I don't.

Anything for a buck.

Why do I allege that the WTE "ratted" me out or, at minimum, pleaded with Hank Bailey and/or his law partner to have me served with a TRO so I could not provide the "news" the WTE so falsely claimed was their motivation in seeking to gain a copy of the Care Team Report? News I had already made available on my website to local readers and they didn't have their hands on yet.

I believe that to be the case because of the docket numbering and timing of the filing in the Laramie County District Court office. My docket no. is 176-099. It was filed very late in the day on Friday, May 21, 2010. The TRO was served on me after 5:00 pm that day - at a time that made it more difficult for me to access legal advice and at a time that could easily have resulted in my not being able to remove my posting of the Care Team Report from my website over the weekend. But, I did and I did.

The docket no. for the WTE matter is 176-092 - six filings were received between that one and mine. Filings from different attorneys and on different legal matters. I believe, without proof but based on my experience of how low the WTE would sink, that when they (the WTE) were served and made their case to still be able to use the two page Report to generate a story for a weekend issue and were denied by the stumbling judge, they "outed" me - they told everyone that I had to be served with the same TRO because they were. That shows a real interest in First Amendment rights, doesn't it? That shows a professional courtesy. They are so embarrassed about my always beating them on important stories and so embarrassed that sources will always trust me and seldom them, that they made sure that I could not provide the news to readers that they themselves were fighting to provide. Such professionals.

Had Bailey's firm intended to have both "newspapers" in Cheyenne served with the TRO, they would have been prepared at the same time, signed by the judge at the same time and filed in the district court office together. They weren't. The newspaper was served at 3:30.

(Continued from above -- page 2 of 4)

Further support for my belief is that the TRO against me personally and the Cheyenne Herald was obviously prepared, hastily and feverishly, from the one generated for the WTE. That is why the woman who signed an Affidavit which includes the line, "I have personal knowledge of all matters set forth herein" had to lie to complete the Affidavit. She had no personal knowledge about anything about the Cheyenne Herald.

And, she also lied when she attested, "Upon information and belief, David L. Featherly dba The Cheyenne Herald has obtained a copy of the report and intends to prepare an article for tomorrow's edition of the newspaper disclosing information contained in the report."

That is absolutely false swearing. If she had any personal knowledge about matters, she would have known that the Cheyenne Herald does not publish on Saturday ("tomorrow's edition of the newspaper"). I also don't publish on Sunday. Nor Monday, technically. She's a liar.

The WTE's only interest in freedom of the press is how it applies to them - certainly not to me. Had they kept their mouth shut, my website posting would have remained over the weekend. Instead, out of respect for the Courts even if not for the judge, I pulled down three pages of articles and the two page Care Team Report. I pulled the articles because a 1/2 page story referenced the Care Team Report (reproduced below) and I didn't have time to rewrite and repost the three pages after being served after 5:00 pm on a Friday afternoon.

## MY LEGAL REPRESENTATION

Obviously, when I was served with the Temporary Restraining Order, I needed to get some legal advice quickly. After the work day on a Friday afternoon, that can be difficult. But I was able to make an unexpected contact and a response was planned. While I could have resisted pulling down my articles and the Report on the website because the judge had granted an incomplete version of a real TRO (leaving out what I was supposed to do or not do), it just wasn't worth the risk. Knowing that both LCCC and the judge, Peter Arnold, were capable of further stupidity on the weekend, I couldn't risk a contempt of court citation, however improper or unlikely, because I had a Cheyenne Herald to complete, so I phoned and e-mailed my webmaster.

My counsel, Jack Speight, was leaving the country on a trip to Israel and Rome on the following Monday but I didn't think there was anything that bunch of lightweights could throw at me that I couldn't handle pro se so I didn't seek an interim attorney during his absence.

Not only was the TRO itself granted by the judge and served on me in a very unprofessional manner, the next day I received a copy of the pleadings leading up to the TRO from Bailey's office but the mailing was lacking the Complaint. I had received it in the personal service on Friday late afternoon but it should have been included in the packet mailed as well. Anything for a buck.

On Monday morning, first thing, at 7:00 am, I e-mailed the office of Peter Arnold with my contact information

LCCC claimed to lack - the reason they used for not "noticing" me at the time the TRO was granted. Then, at 9:00 am, I visited the third floor of the County Courthouse to check Arnold's calendar for the day. He was booked with a few dozen sentencing and probation matters so I knew he wasn't going to do anything on Monday. I asked the girl in the judge's chambers office to notify me in one way or another if there would be a hearing scheduled. Of course, they did not.

The fact of the matter is that I was the only one damaged by these shenanigans. I had already published a story related to the Care Team Report and the Report itself. The WTE was only in the process of such reporting.

By Tuesday morning, 10:00 am, the judge had surrendered under heavy attack and "dissolved" the unwarranted and unconstitutional TRO.

What will Speight and I do when he returns from his international trip? Wait and watch. It could be fun. I favor letting them stew in their own juices for awhile but I will take my counsel's advice on course of action.

## THE STORY THAT WAS REMOVED

In the box below is one of the stories that was on my website on Friday (included in the three pages of articles I had posted earlier in the day, along with the Care Team Report) when I was served with the TRO. It was the only one with any references to the Care Team Report that was the subject of the temporary restraining order and I had it removed as a precaution.

# The Report

First published on the Cheyenne Herald Website on Friday, May 21, 2010

At Laramie County Community College, a CARE Team was formed a few years ago. "The CARE Team is a coordinating group of student services staff and instructional faculty and staff who assist 'individuals of concern' with accessing the appropriate campus resources in an effort to assist them with meeting their educational goals in Laramie County Community College." (from LCCC website)

"An individual of concern is any individual who demonstrates disruptive behavior, personal difficulties, mental and/or emotional instability, or otherwise causes another member of the campus community to feel distress."

Upon returning from Costa Rica, some students who were on that trip made a report to the LCCC CARE Team about the distressed student from the trip. Students thought they were supposed to hear back within 24 hours of their referral but they received no response.

On some basis of gathering information about the Costa Rica trip, the LCCC CARE Team generated what has become known as the CARE Team Report but what they called the "Care Team Process feedback."

This two page unsigned "Report" is the document the Wyoming Tribune-Eagle has feverishly sought for six weeks, only recently reaching a solution wherein a judge is to review a file, including the Report, and decide whether LCCC should release all or part of the file to the WTE.

The complete file should have the students referrals and other documents with students' names. They expected confidentiality when they submitted those referrals and were promised same on the Referral Form. It says: "**All referral information is confidential.**"

In their effort to withhold the Care Team Report from the WTE, LCCC repeatedly lied about its contents and the legal reason for refusing to provide the Report to the newspaper. LCCC claimed they could not provide the Report due to federal law that prevents the disclosure. That is not true. They are referring to a law known as "FERPA" - Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

First, I'll tell readers what is included in the Report, then I'll explain why I believe I am perfectly within my rights to release this information to the public and why LCCC has lied about withholding it.

Because the WTE will gain access to the CARE Team Report and do their typically lousy job of coverage, I have provided it in its entirety on my website.

The Report is addressed to "Dr. Darrel Hammon, President," and it is from the "LCCC Care Team." It is titled "Care Team Process feedback" and it is mistakenly dated January 6, 2008. It should be 2009. **Note: The "Care" Team is alternately shown in all caps and as here.**

In the Report, the Care Team refers to the Costa Rica trip and the Biology 2470 class. They phrase what they are providing as "recommendations" and repeat "its function is to monitor behavioral patterns ... that might indicate a potential for harm to self or others, be responsible for initiating proactive interventions and referrals on individuals of concern." The Report then reverts to a "student of concern" (SOC) but never provides a name or other identifying characteristics.

One conclusion in the Report is that students were assigned caretaker duty for the SOC, "[for] which they were not qualified; therefore, hampering their educational endeavors and endangering the health of the SOC." The Report also states that, school officials, including the Director of Counseling, should have been immediately notified at the outset of "a crisis involving a SOC" and, whether intentional or not, admonished the LCCC president for sharing "any details of the SOC's condition during the trip," which he repeatedly did, and later admitted, to gain the cooperation of students on the trip.

The Report also criticized the president for appointing an unqualified and unlicensed student to serve as "pharmacist" (Hammon's word) and point out that, had he erred in meds he provided, LCCC "could have faced significant liability."

The Care Team referenced the "power differential" which caused students and LCCC employees to take on duties they were untrained to accept. Care also points out another "actionable violation" from the relationship Hammon established with the SOC without qualifications, licensure, training or authority (my words, not theirs). They also criticized the chaperone "selection" process, of which they really was none. If you were a daughter of the president, you were deemed prepared to serve as a chaperone on that international trip. The Report is highly critical of Darrel Hammon and that is why it has been withheld. It is not covered by FERPA.

(Continued from above -- page 3 of 4)

### **WOULD I HAVE POSTED STUDENT REPORTS ON THE COSTA RICA TRIP THAT WERE IN THE FILE GIVEN TO THE WTE?**

I would not. I would not have posted the contents of the Care Team referrals submitted by students and others (except Hammon himself) because they were enticed into cooperation by being promised confidentiality. It is the wrong message to send our youth. Compromising their messages even while protecting their identities is not the way to build trust. I may have used the contents to develop stories but I would not have posted the Care Team Referral Forms in their entirety. It was the wrong message to send and it was unnecessary to the story telling. The WTE has once again proven itself to be very unprofessional by posting the redacted versions of the Form. One LCCC employee will have to contend with Hammon because her words are posted on the WTE website.

Hammon claims in his campuswide e-mail that the reason LCCC fought to prevent the release of the Care Team Report had nothing to do with hiding anything - that he wanted to protect the privacy of students. That is an unmitigated crock.

Remember, the real Care Team Report is the two page summary which is posted on my website (and several days later, on the WTE website) in its entirety.

Readers can determine for themselves what student privacy is involved in the Report. None. The Report is a two page scathing criticism of how a college president handled what could have led to a fatal end on a trip to beautiful Costa Rica. A trip that the college president made clear was a "family vacation" for him and his two daughters, and which now has been shown to be a free trip paid for by students who took the same trip and paid additional money to fund his free travel.

### **SHOULD HAMMON BE TERMINATED?**

The Tribune-Eagle does not believe Hammon did anything during or surrounding the Costa Rica trip to warrant his dismissal.

I disagree.

Here is a college administrator who believed that asking a friend for a one-time loan of a credit card to purchase an airline ticket for a stranded son (and the cost would be given that friend by check on the spot) was grounds for termination. And that a vice president's audacity of having met with a trustee without the president's permission was grounds for termination.

Yet, the daily doesn't think that the fact that Hammon confiscated free travel for himself and at least one daughter at the expense of students and their families who

## ***The dissembling continues . . . an e-mail sent by Darrel Hammon after his attempt to prevent release of information critical of him failed.***

**From:** Hammon, Darrel

**Sent:** Tuesday May 25, 2010 1:21 pm

**To:** LCCC Distribution List

**Cc:** (gregoryphomas@msn.com); Bill Dubois (bilduw@bresnan.net); Boreing, Vicki; Brenda Lyttle (blyttl@state.wy.us); George McClivaine (grandpamc@aol.com); Hammon, Darrel; Kaiser, John; mamamerrell@bresnan.net; TOM BAUMAN (tbaum1@msn.com)

**Subject:** Care Team Report

Everyone

As you are undoubtedly aware, the College attempted to prevent the release of the CARE Team report pertaining to a 2008 educational trip to Costa Rica. The reason the College asked for a temporary restraining order was to protect students mentioned in that report.

It was not, as was erroneously reported by an advocacy journal in Cheyenne, to hide anything. The issues brought up by the CARE Team have been addressed in the year and a half since that trip, including the installation of a new travel policy to prevent similar situations from taking place again.

The other glaring inaccuracy in the advocacy journal was the source of the funding for the trip. The College did not pay for any part of the trip. Students paid their own way, and the travel agency that set up the trip donated a certain number of tickets for chaperones. No general fund money was used for the trip.

We anticipate significant news coverage of this issue.

If you have any questions regarding this or any other College-related matter, please attend the question-and-answer session at 3:15 p.m. today in the Student Lounge.

Darrel L. Hammon, Ph.D.

### **DID THE HAMMONS STEAL FREE TRIPS THAT SHOULD HAVE GONE TO MORE QUALIFIED AND MORE DESERVING STUDENTS OR CHAPERONES?**

Absolutely they did. Read the message in the box above. Then, please, read it again.

Hammon takes exception to my having pointed out that he and his daughter(s) did not pay their own way for the exotic trip to Costa Rica. He corrects my allegation that the college paid for the trip, then is corrupt enough to admit that the trips were "donated" by the travel agency that planned and scheduled the trip to Costa Rica. He assured the board that his travel did not cost the college anything. Doesn't he realize what he is admitting? Doesn't he realize that he just admitted to the LCCC board of trustees, those seven elected officials who are supposed to insure that the college is run professionally by an honest man with the college's best interests at heart - that he admitted that he "stole" trips that should have gone to more deserving, more needy, more worthy, more valuable students, staff, employees or chaperones?

Hammon considers this free trip for himself and his daughter(s) to be perks of his office. He once referred to his "presidential prerogative" in demanding that an unqualified friend of the family be interviewed for a position she was not going to be hired to fill.

He cannot possibly honestly claim that he didn't know that "free" tickets for a junket based on a certain number of tickets being sold (and that may be a reason why the troubled girl was allowed to make the trip - her family could afford to pay for it and LCCC needed numbers to claim the free travel that would permit the Hammons to travel without paying for any part of the trip) so he and his kids could travel on the students' payments.

The trustees should demand to know, right now, not tomorrow, not next week, not at Hammon's next review, they should demand to know how many free trips were provided by the travel agency and who used them. They also should question Hammon whether he and his daughter(s) who presumably benefited from the free trips claimed the value as income on their 2008 federal tax returns, as is required. Also, who else traveled free?

paid for their travel to Costa Rica is reason for termination? And never disclosing that fact to trustees?

The daily doesn't think Hammon assigning an unqualified, unlicensed EMT to be the "pharmacist" for the terribly distraught young lady who may have died in Costa Rica if the wrong medications had been provided and the unwitting young man could have been incarcerated in Costa Rica had that happened - they don't think that is grounds for termination? Millions at risk for LCCC?

And they don't think Hammon's dereliction of responsibility in the handling of the girl on the trip - he couldn't be bothered because he and his daughters were on the trip as a family vacation - dereliction that could have cost the fragile girl her life and LCCC millions in damages. That isn't grounds for termination?

And, Hammon "counseling" the girl after return to the U.S. even though he is unqualified and unlicensed, but competent in his mind and assertion because he's done similar in his church, isn't grounds for termination? But borrowing a credit card for a one-time purchase is?

**CHEYENNE HERALD MAIL SUBSCRIPTIONS ARE AVAILABLE - REFER TO THE CH WEBSITE**

(Continued from above -- page 4 of 4)

### WHAT DID HAMMON SAY ABOUT HIS BEHAVIOR, CONDUCT AND ACTIONS ON THE COSTA RICA TRIP?

The president of LCCC, who tried to prevent the release of the Care Team Report critical of him, claims that he did so to prevent violation of privacy rights of students.

Yet, during the ten days in Costa Rica, he repeatedly and without hesitation shared intimate details of a student on the trip who suffered from mental issues.

When the Care Team asked, or encouraged, submission of Referral Forms from students and others who had taken the trip to Costa Rica (see the responsibilities of the Care Team in the story on page 2 of this posting), Darrel Hammon was among those asked. Students submitted their referrals promptly. Hammon soon did.

And when he did, he made admissions that would have led to termination by him if he were judging a vice president. Or, if he hadn't made the trip at student expense, but someone else had been in charge and conducted themselves exactly as Hammon did, based on the moralistic positions taken at a recent wrongful termination hearing of a LCCC employee, he would have terminated that person in a heartbeat. And he would have jumped onto his soapbox to decry the poor handling and thanked God that the young student had not died on the trip.

There is no clear understanding as to just what role Hammon played on the trip. He alternately referred to himself as "a chaperone" to steal the free trip and as "an instructor" to avoid returning to the States with the troubled young girl. On the roster, he is not shown as a chaperone and, based on the interviews I've done, he did not act as a chaperone on the trip. His one decision that might have designated him a chaperone was to allow the troubled girl, after ten days of him witnessing her fragile state, to purchase a large knife over the objections of students on the trip.

In Hammon's referral, he hid from the truth about his knowledge of past mental issues with the girl. He admitted to meeting with the real instructor on the trip - and the only instructor - and laying responsibility on her for the decision to allow the troubled student to make the trip to Costa Rica. He wrote, "The only concern she had with [the girl] was that she was taking medication. Nothing was revealed about [the girl] and her other challenges." Not to mention, apparently, that her parents could afford to write a check for the trip, which might have put Hammon and his daughter(s) that much closer to their own free trip.

Hammon admitted in his referral that the girl had initially been assigned to share a room with his daughters. But, on the first night, when the distressed girl acted up by taking too much medication, Hammon evicted her from his daughters room and reassigned her. He wrote that he "designated one of our chaperones, a male and an EMT, her 'pharmacist'." The guy was no chaperone.

Then, claiming more care than he deserved, Hammon wrote, "For the next two nights, we constantly watched her." Who's "we" Hammon? You played a very minor part in watching this young woman, didn't you? You assigned a college employee who was traveling as a student, and had paid her own way, to become guardian of the student so you and your daughters sight-seeing would not be hampered. Then you had the nerve to write that the reason you reassigned the girl was that you felt she should have more mature supervision, "a different level of maturity than one of our young chaperones." That young chaperone was your youngest daughter, wasn't it? 18 or 19 years old. A child too young to chaperone anyone on the trip - under any conditions for any reason.

Even though others were traveling as students in the biology class or as a companion, you prevailed on those

who had any level of healthcare training for medical advice, didn't you, instead of taking the girl in such desperate need of mental health supervision, because that might interfere with your own enjoyment of the trip? Because, above all else, you were on the Costa Rica trip to see the sights with your beloved daughters, weren't you?

Much of what Hammon wrote on his referral form is what he was told, not what he witnessed, I have been reliably informed. And, please, Darrel Hammon, sue me for libel. I would like nothing better than to depose you - to get you under oath.

Then, after all of the problems other students and staff had to deal with on the trip related to this girl, you "in essence," gave her "six items she had to do to stay on the trip." As though she were in an emotional state to make a bargain with the college president. You had the responsibility to correctly size up the situation and get her back to her family and professional mental health care. Not to provide her a list of six "do's" that she had to obey. Hammon even wrote that his thoughts never included taking the girl home but only taking her to San Jose, where her parents would have to "come down" and retrieve her. The care and compassion for this young girl who Hammon had approved to make the trip, was nil. He just couldn't be bothered.

Hammon thinks he is such a skilled psychiatrist, such a blessed psychologist, albeit without training or license, that he could accomplish what other mental health specialists hadn't been able to - by giving the girl a list of six things she had to do. Hammon, you jerk, the poor girl would have agreed to anything. She probably had no idea what she was expected or required to do, so fragile was her mental health at the time.

After the first night and her instance of a possible overdose, what you should have done is this: You should have called a meeting of the others on the trip, except for your daughters who could have stayed with the girl for the hour it would take for this meeting. You should have told those gathered that there were issues with one of the students and you had determined she needed to return to Cheyenne. You should not have shared anything about her mental health - that would have been a violation of her privacy rights - but asked for a male volunteer to travel with her back to the States, with the promise that, if he had paid for the trip, not been one provided free travel, his expenses would be reimbursed by the college. If nobody volunteered, you should have assigned a male who was traveling free to return with her. As a last resort, you should have told the group, as one who was traveling free and who had no real interest in the educational purposes of the trip, you would personally accompany the troubled student back to Cheyenne. That's what you should have done. That is what a professional, a leader, a responsible adult, would have done.

Hammon also wrote about allowing the girl to purchase a "large knife." In spite of all the concerns he claimed to have had about the mental fragility of the girl and her specific threats against herself, he wrote; "After some negotiation, and compromise and against better judgment, I allowed her to purchase the knife for her collection." And had it not been for students who refused to reboard the bus if the girl had the "large knife," you would not have returned the knife, would you? Every important decision on the trip was forced on you, wasn't it? You made no right decisions, no critical decisions, to insure the safety and learning experience of other students on the trip, did you? It was all about, you, you, you.

Hammon's admissions in his Care Team referral are damning. One could question whether the lack of care and treatment of this young girl for ten days in a foreign country exacerbated her mental health problems. And, then, whether Hammon serving as a "counselor" upon return also damaged her further. LCCC is probably not out of the woods. The publicity generated by stories in the WTE and here could lead to further action.

### COVERAGE OF THE TRO STORY AND THE LCCC 2008 COSTA RICA TRIP

The Cheyenne Herald has never had more fans nor more defenders than during this Care Team Report fiasco. It is a fiasco because LCCC, in its misguided efforts to protect an undeserving president, contributed to making the story viral. It is everywhere.

Every recognizable print publication in the country and even some from outside our borders have weighed in on the foolish grant of a TRO to suppress my providing stories about the trip and beyond. The words "The Cheyenne Herald" have appeared from California to New York, from Miami to Minneapolis and even in the UK newspaper, The Guardian. A fine English language newspaper in Costa Rica has also written about my coverage. I have done interviews with First Amendment groups in Indianapolis and Arlington, Virginia. My website has been linked from .com operations around the country. Thousands.

*Note: I do not return calls from the Associated Press because they misquoted me during a political campaign two years ago. There was no correction. The Casper Star would not correct the error because it was an AP offering so I canceled my subscription with them. I need neither. I will respond to written questions from other media but will not again take a chance of words being taken out of context, misused, misquoted, etc.*

The president of the Wyoming Press Association, whom I know well, took a strong stand against the prior restraint action by LCCC and the judge's granting a TRO and pledged to use WPA resources on behalf of "both newspapers." I am not a dues paying member of WPA. Thanks, Jeff. I didn't need other representation but I appreciate the gesture.

Of all the U.S. and Great Britain coverage, only a handful produced their own columns. One, the one in Costa Rica, did the best job. They actually commented on assertions in my story and did a little research from my website to inform their readers as to what my Cheyenne Herald is. The New York Post website also did a supportive column about First Amendment rights and suggested those of us out here in the vast netherlands who were fighting this intrusion into freedom of the press were his friends. The best line sent to me directly was on the Subject line of the e-mail from amcostarica.com. It said simply: "Come on down." I told the editor that, unlike Darrel Hammon, I don't accept free travel so I would probably never make it to Costa Rica.

### THE JUDGE

One of the most embarrassing aspects of the fiasco surrounding the granting of a TRO that prevented my sharing important information about the Costa Rica trip and the Care Team Report for nearly four days was the performance of District Court Judge Peter Arnold. Not only did he exclude me from the teleconference hookup in which he and other participants discussed the TRO, he did not read any of the pertinent documents, nor my website offerings, before siding with LCCC and granting the very unintelligent TRO. An action that was condemned by legal scholars all around the country.

I have been highly critical of Arnold's lack of judicial knowledge and temperament and his decision is further proof of my accuracy. He took an action that virtually no other judge in the nation would have taken. And he took it unprepared. It is a toss-up as to whom I most detest now. He, LCCC or the Bailey law firm. They denied me my opportunity to again prove I get the important stories first and best. They, by the TRO, have put me in the court files as one having been served a TRO - an action usually reserved to those accused of domestic abuse or the like. The action was taken against me personally but not against Mike McCracken personally. Granted, his is a corporation and mine is not but that doesn't change the fact that there is no permanent stain beside his name.

**WWW.CHEYENNEHERALD.COM  
CHEYENNEHERALD@YAHOO.COM**