

NR_key_name: 761A86E50419EADC8525638900624B61
SendTo: mick747 @ aol.com @ internet @ WORLDCOM
CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From: CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 08/17/1996
DisplayDate_Time: 2:46:22 PM
ComposedDate: 08/17/1996
ComposedDate_Time: 1:53:38 PM
Subject: Your telephone message from Friday 8/16/96

I received your phone message when I came into work today (Saturday). I tried calling your office, but there was no answer. I tried to call you at home, but your number is unlisted. I will be out of town for the first half of next week. You may leave messages for me. I have read the letters that you sent to Judge Tunheim. They were, of course, personally distressing to me inasmuch as I had spent an enormous amount of time preparing for the medical depositions. I attempted to conduct professional, conscientious, and thorough depositions on an issue that I believe is of significant importance. Instead of thanking the Board for moving into this difficult area (that the Board was not required to pursue), you created a controversy that undercut my hard work. As I am sure you know, the Board members are all working part time (a few days per month). The professional staff of the Review Board, on the other hand, is full time. Prior to my coming to the Review Board, I had been involved in more than 100 depositions. I am the only one on the staff (or Board) with such experience. What is your basis, given these facts, for thinking that the Board members should have been leading the depositions? Had the Board done so, might someone who is conspiratorially inclined have said indignantly: "Why did the Board members conduct the depositions? They had no expertise in this area. They are only part-timers. The General Counsel had a great deal of expertise, but the Board went ahead and took charge anyway." See how easy accusations are? In my personal opinion, the August 12 letter was 100% counterproductive. It created an unwarranted controversy where there shouldn't have been one. It consumed a great deal of my time as I had to address issues it raised. Unfortunately, it also had the effect of undermining the credibility of those who -- without knowing the facts -- make rather strident allegations.

Body:
recstat: Record
DeliveryPriority: N
DeliveryReport: B
ReturnReceipt:
Categories: