

Bob Wilbur

From: "Suzy Palmer" <suzyalmer1@me.com>
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2014 2:13 PM
To: "Bob Wilbur" <bbwilbur@broadstripe.net>
Cc: "Kurt S. Blankenship" <kblankenship@bluewilliams.com>; "Ed Delahanty" <whshed@live.com>; "Chris Hendrickson" <Hendrickcj@gmail.com>; "Steve Morrow" <stevem@broadstripe.net>; "Fred Salmon" <pheffy@aol.com>; "Dustin Frederick" <dustin@local519.org>
Subject: Re: A request/your thoughts?

Great...I agree it would be best to have Ed, Steve and Kurt be a part of the discussion.
 Suzy

Suzy Palmer
 195 Perry Dr.
 Coupeville, WA 98239
 suzyalmer1@me.com
 Cell: (847) 902-4922
 Home: (360) 639-6050
 Email: suzyalmer1@me.com

The information in this e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed. If you believe this e-mail was sent to you in error and the e-mail contains confidential medical information, please contact Suzy Palmer at 847-902-4922 or notify suzyalmer1@me.com for proper handling of this information.

On Jun 24, 2014, at 12:46 PM, Bob Wilbur <bbwilbur@broadstripe.net> wrote:

Yes, that is what we need to do, so Suzy, rather than have the tail (the respective attorneys) wag the dog, since we are the parties that need to find concurrence, it will be faster and easier if we do it and then provide it to the attorneys to massage as needed and present to the judge.
 Cheers...Bob

From: [Kurt S. Blankenship](#)
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2014 12:11 PM
To: [Suzy Palmer](#) ; [Bob Wilbur](#)
Cc: [Ed Delahanty](#) ; [Chris Hendrickson](#) ; [Steve Morrow](#) ; [Fred Salmon](#) ; [Dustin Frederick](#)
Subject: RE: A request/your thoughts?

I'm assuming what we are talking about is submitting a consent judgment, agreed to by both sides, that will make the preliminary injunction a permanent one and then the case will be over.

Kurt S. Blankenship
 Partner



3421 North Causeway Blvd., Suite 900
 Metairie, Louisiana 70002
 Direct: (504) 830-4935
 Fax: (504) 849-3028
kblankenship@bluewilliams.com
[Download vCard](#)

From: Suzy Palmer [mailto:suzyalmer1@me.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2014 1:21 PM
To: Bob Wilbur
Cc: Ed Delahanty; Chris Hendrickson; Steve Morrow; Fred Salmon; Dustin Frederick; Kurt S. Blankenship
Subject: Re: A request/your thoughts?

I don't have any experience with court requirements or how to anticipate what the next step may be to get this settled. My small understanding is that we need Judge Hancock to produce a written final judgement that supports the TRO. If that is the case let's meet with our lawyer and get this done as soon as possible. The contentiousness grows as we wait...
 Suzy

Suzy Palmer
 195 Perry Dr.
 Coupeville, WA 98239
suzyalmer1@me.com
 Cell: (847) 902-4922
 Home: (360) 639-6050
 Email: suzyalmer1@me.com

The information in this e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed. If you believe this e-mail was sent to you in error and the e-mail contains c

On Jun 23, 2014, at 05:57 PM, Bob Wilbur <bbwilbur@broadstripe.net> wrote:

All,

I am increasingly concerned about the misinformation re the TRO and the now-frenetic dialog on ND about the lawsuit. Even the pool supporters are starting to get confused.

My attorney is out until June 30 and I leave June 30 for about a week, and I know Ed and Carol will be gone sometime in July, meaning schedules aren't too good.

So, I suggest we have a work session this week aimed at developing a mutually acceptable draft declaratory judgment to run past our respective attorneys, and then after tweaking and in full concurrence, to Hancock. Without concurrence I fear it is going to be very difficult to develop a robust solution to this quagmire.

I suggest a non-quorum of three Board members and I meet this week to see if we can put something viable together. The membership, if you think wise (and I do), should be informed via ND and/or the web site (probably just after the work session), with something along the following explanation:

- 1) The long delays due to attorney schedules and legal issues has prompted serious misinformation and the expansion of erroneous conclusions, the latest being that the lawsuit is over when in fact it is now down to one defendant (the current board) and the one plaintiff (i.e., moi).
- 2) Because this lawsuit has been delayed for far too long and given the judge has determined the plaintiff is likely to persevere in a trial, the Board has agreed to meet and work with the plaintiff to develop settlement conclusions consistent with Judge Hancock's findings of fact in the TRO and to then settle the lawsuit without additional strife, burdensome legal costs, and increased insurance rates.

I am really tiring of this, as I'm sure you are. It is time to put it to bed. That is, can't we get a leg up and get this thing moving across our attorneys' respective desks now, versus down the road sometime.

Cheers,

Bob

CONFIDENTIALITY MESSAGE

Privileged:

This email contains PRIVILEGED and CONFIDENTIAL information intended only for the use of the specific individual or entity named above. If you or your employer is not the intended recipient of this e-mail or an employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any unauthorized dissemination or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately delete the message.

Circular 230:

Pursuant to federal tax regulations imposed on practitioners who render tax advice ("Circular 230"), we are required to advise you that any advice contained in this communication regarding federal taxes is not written or intended to be used, and cannot be used, by any person as the basis for avoiding federal tax penalties under the Internal Revenue Code, nor can such advice be used or referred to for the purpose of promoting, marketing or recommending any entity, investment, plan or arrangement.