

Laramie County District Court judge has been on the mat more often "Scrap Iron" George Gadaski. Down for the count more often than Jerry Strickland. Licked more often than a cheap No. 10 envelope. He's been defeated more often than the New York Nationals. And he hasn't learned a thing. Not a thing.

"The Court is aware that shared custody is not favored by the Wyoming Supreme Court, however, in this case, the parties voluntarily set up such an arrangement and the Court is simply ratifying an arrangement selected by the parties prior to the presentation of evidence to the Court."

Judgment and Decree of Divorce, Laramie County District Court Judge Peter Arnold (October 9, 2008, 18 months after the trial)

"Finally, we are concerned that, despite this Court's repeated admonition that shared custody is disfavored, and despite the lack of any evidence in this record these two parents could ever make a success of shared custody, that is what district court ordered."

And, "Perhaps one needs to read the entire trial transcript to see why shared custody was such a bad idea in this case."

Finally, "The district court abused its discretion by entering a decree containing child custody provisions that were not in the best interests of the child. We reverse and remand for a new custody hearing, which we assume will be scheduled promptly, and at which the current circumstances of the parties and the child shall be considered."

Supreme Court Opinion, written by Chief Justice Barton Voigt, March 30, 2009 2009 WY 44

Peter Arnold's obvious shortcomings as a judge are even being recognized by Cheyenne's daily newspaper, as their recent coverage of this child custody dispute indicates. Arnold is so glaringly deficient that even the WT-E can't miss it.

I have said on these pages several times in the past that Peter Arnold simply is not up to the task of being a judge. He was not a particularly noteworthy attorney and why those who chose him over other candidates thought differently is a mystery.

Repeatedly, the Supreme Court has had to step in and reverse Arnold's flawed decisions. How many other cases he's tried have not been appealed to the Supreme Court and stand? How many other times has he rendered wrong decisions but, because there was no appeal, they have been unchallenged? Unchanged.

The statements by Peter Arnold and Chief Justice Barton Voigt above oversimplify what the case was. And the case file takes a long time to return from the Supreme Court to the Laramie County District Court office so this synopsis comes from only the Supreme Court's ruling.

This couple was married in 1988 and the child at the center of the custody dispute was born in 1998. In 2006, the mother told the father that she was "having an affair with TM," who "has a bad background but has cleaned himself up, that he is a felon and he used drugs."

Not exactly the picture you'd want painted regarding access to your son. The father filed for divorce and both parties agreed to several custody arrangements, with each having "temporary joint legal and physical custody of Child, with physical custody alternating on a weekly basis."

The Father soon filed for modification of the temporary custody order because "Mother and Child spent substantial amounts of time" with TM, "who recently was found to be in possession of cocaine, drug paraphernalia, cutting agents, and a false urine sample .."

The Mother responded that she "had severed all ties with TM and that neither she nor Child will be spending any time around [TM] in the future."

The District Court "disposed of Father's motion in relevant part," and wrote:

"2. The parties agree that [TM] was arrested on December 22, 2006 for the unlawful possession of a controlled substance. [Mother] has, through her counsel, advised the Court that she has terminated all contact with [TM]."

"3. Because of [Mother's] representation, the Court does not find it necessary at this time to conduct a separate evidentiary hearing on [Father's] motion for modification of temporary custody."

"4. In view of [TM's] present circumstances, [Mother] should be ordered not to permit any verbal, written or personal contact, of any kind, between [TM] ... and [Child]."

The mother's pretrial statement stated, in part:

"I still do not feel like I know all of the details and truth about the charges and why they were dismissed. ... I do not consider [TM] a boyfriend any longer or even a potential boyfriend. He has made a very big mistake, he was dishonest, and he has an addictive personality. I have continued to talk to him on the phone, however, as a friend. ... [Child] is the most important person in my life, and if it means I cannot talk to [TM] on the phone, then so be it."

At the divorce trial, the "Mother testified repeatedly that she had no intention of resuming a relationship with TM, that her relationship with TM 'terminated' when she learned about the 'drug bust,' and that it was not appropriate for Child to have further contact with TM."

The court-appointed "custody evaluator," testified, "Given the history that he [TM] has and the concerns that surround that history, drug use or the arrest, and the fact that he was arrested before, I think in

January of this year, and it is acknowledged that he's got this problem, that he is not personally of good character to be around the child and given the child's perception that that's done with, maintaining that relationship I think is a very bad situation for the child."

Sounds cut and dried, doesn't it? The Mother and child evaluator both agreed that allowing [TM] any contact with the Child was a bad idea.

Before Arnold issued a decision, the Father had to come back to Court, informing the Court that Mother had allowed Child to have telephone contact with TM and that she had resumed a relationship with TM. Mother responded that she had "had dinner with TM" and that "[Child] had answered the telephone when TM called." Arnold denied the Father's motion, stating "Mother did not act willfully in allowing the telephone contact," but ignoring the admission that she'd had dinner with TM. What's wrong with this judge?

In his decision letter, Arnold wrote, among other things: "... each parent is a competent and fit parent." And, "I believe that Father's structured thinking would operate to Child's disadvantage." Then, "it will be the order of the Court that Mother will be designated the primary residential custodian. I am concerned that if Father is designated the primary residential custodian, he would seek ways to influence or control Mother's conduct and manner of handling Child which would create animosity and anxiety that would adversely affect Child."

This is too bizarre to be real. Peter Arnold wants the Father to avoid trying to influence the Mother's conduct when she's admitted to a relationship that has always involved a man's drug use and arrests?

The Father not only filed the motion about the Mother resuming her relationship with TM, after she had testified she would not and that promise had been a basis for the custody decision of Arnold. Father filed another motion alleging TM had moved into Mother's residence. She responded to his motions and admitted "that she was cohabiting with TM, and admitting that he was the father of her newborn child."

Ward Churchill

How would you like to live in Boulder?

They can't solve a crime and they can't convict a guy who admitted to the offenses of which he was charged.

The Jon Benet Ramsey case gets colder with each passing day. Today the police has the case, tomorrow, it's back to the district attorney's office. When they're not flying some lunatic back from an exotic land so he can confess to a murder he knows only what he's read, they're exonerating a man who may be brought back into the case at a later date by an office that hasn't yet exonerated anyone.

College professors are entitled to their own opinion - most often it will involve antigovernment and anti-American sentiments in some fashion. So long as they are stated as opinions, free speech protects them, too. Parents and other students will have to de-program students who begin he believe the garbage those professors spew - but their opinions are protected under the Constitution.

When a college professor opines that we (the United States) deserved the 9/11 terrorist attacks and resulting deaths because of what we've done to others in the past, he is entitled to hold such an opinion - no matter how insane or out of touch with reality that lunacy is.

But, when he teaches that the United States government introduced diseases into Indian tribes in order to eradicate them, he's gone too far. Unless he has some irrefutable evidence to prove his assertion, no one wants a nut like that in the classroom. Any classroom.

Clifford Irving wasn't allowed to peddle his hoax book about Howard Hughes as non-fiction. Had there been no standards applied by the publisher, his book would have been a best seller nonfiction story of another crazy man, Howard Hughes.

Ward Churchill got more than he deserved from the jury - \$1.00. If he is reinstated at CU, his classes will fill. Impressionable kids should be taught the truth - not fiction under the guise of intellect.

Father also attached a copy of TM's criminal record a letter from Child's counselor "detailing Child's difficulties with TM."

Peter Arnold thought the Child was better off being in the physical custody of that mother? He does not have a clue how to do his job. There is something in his past that leads him to rule as he does. What it is will come out. The Cheyenne Herald will give him no cover. Every poor decision he makes on child custody cases will be presented to readers. He has to go.



Hot Ham & Cheese
Large Drink
Large Fries

\$5.99
plus tax

Burger Inn

Pershing & Snyder

MAXIE MNDAYS - \$1.25