

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF PULASKI, ARKANSAS

SEAN LYNN; and
LAURA HAMMETT

PLAINTIFFS

v.

Case No. 60CV-26-216

BOARD OF TRUSTEES of the UNIVERSITY
of ARKANSAS, in their official capacity;
et al.

DEFENDANTS

PLAINTIFFS' EXHIBIT 2 – Complete Blog Post “Does UAMS Attorney Hallucinate; Or Does She Use ChatGPT? [Redacted for Error on 11/1/2025]”

A Higher Law *And the Madness of Our Courts*

October 10, 2025

- in Uncategorized
- Leave a comment
-

Does UAMS Attorney Hallucinate; Or Does She Use ChatGPT? [Redacted for error on 11/1/2025]

My sincere apology. It is I who made the error, quoting the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, instead of the Arkansas rules, which do use the word "amend."

Still, UAMS chose to lie to the Commission by submitting the original answers. UAMS's counsel has access to the authors of the medical record and is paid to read the record; yet, counsel failed to admit that there was no written consent by Lynn to be found when she wrote the original responses.

You can download the full documents that were filed in this volley of motion practice, here:

BEFORE THE ARKANSAS STATE CLAIMS COMMISSION

SEAN LYNN AND
LAURA HAMMETT
CLAIMANTS

V.

NO. 250191

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
FOR MEDICAL SCIENCES
RESPONDENT

MOTION TO REMOVE OBJECTIONS, COMPEL DISCOVERY RESPONSES
AND IMPOSE SANCTIONS

Sean Lynn and Laura Hammett ("Lynn," "Hammett," and collectively
"Claimants"), pro se with aligned interests, state as follows:

1. Claimants made a good-faith effort to resolve these discovery disputes through emails to which the three letters filed contemporaneously here were attached, and by several unaccepted offers to discuss the discovery dispute in person.
2. UAMS refused to participate in the meet and confer communications. Counsel Sherri Robinson demanded more time to respond to the written communications.

Motion to Remove Objections, Compel Discovery Responses and Impose Sanctions

Motion to Compel Discovery Responses and Sanctions Abridged (<https://court-corruption.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/motion-to-compel-discovery-responses-and-sanctions-abridged.pdf>) Download (<https://court-corruption.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/motion-to-compel-discovery-responses-and-sanctions-abridged.pdf>)

BEFORE THE ARKANSAS STATE CLAIMS COMMISSION

SEAN LYNN AND
LAURA HAMMETT CLAIMANTS

V. NO. 250191

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
FOR MEDICAL SCIENCES RESPONDENT

**RESPONSE TO CLAIMANTS'
MOTION TO REMOVE OBJECTIONS,
COMPEL DISCOVERY RESPONSES AND IMPOSE SANCTIONS**

Comes now Respondent, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences (UAMS), by and through its undersigned counsel, and for its Response to Claimants' Motion to Remove Objections, Compel Discovery Responses and Impose Sanctions, states as follows:

Introduction

Once again, Claimants have filed a motion for extreme relief on a specific limited issue and then proceeded to argue why all of their allegations in the case are true, and that UAMS and its employees are being intentionally difficult by not agreeing with Claimants' position. First and foremost, Claimants do not seem to understand, or accept, that they have the burden to prove their claims to the Commission. They also do not seem to understand that disagreeing with UAMS' discovery responses is not an invitation to argue, again, the points of their claims in an effort to persuade UAMS or the Commission that their allegations are true.

UAMS has repeatedly attempted to work with Claimants, most notably Hammett, who seems to be the only Claimant pursuing this matter; however, Hammett only wants to do things on her schedule and in the manner she prefers and

UAMS Response to Motion to Remove Objections Compel Response Impose Sanctions (1) (<https://court-corruption.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/uams-response-to-motion-to-remove-objections-compel-response-impose-sanctions-1.pdf>) Download (<https://court-corruption.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/uams-response-to-motion-to-remove-objections-compel-response-impose-sanctions-1.pdf>)

BEFORE THE ARKANSAS STATE CLAIMS COMMISSION

SEAN LYNN AND
LAURA HAMMETT
CLAIMANTS

V. NO. 250191

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
FOR MEDICAL SCIENCES
RESPONDENT

Reply to UAMS's Response to Claimants' Motion to Remove Objections, Compel Discovery Responses and Impose Sanctions

Comes now Claimants, Sean Lynn and Laura Hammett ("Lynn," "Hammett," collectively "Claimants"), appearing pro se with claims arising from or related to the identical conduct, and hereby Reply to UAMS's Response to Claimants' Motion to Remove Objections, Compel Discovery Responses and Impose Sanctions and Brief in Support:

1. Claimants filed their motion with attached brief in support on September 15, 2025 ("Motion to Compel"). "Claimants request[ed] that the Commission compel UAMS to remove all objections from its responses to discovery, answer the interrogatories with specificity and thoroughness, provide access to all the documents requested, and do it quickly." *Motion to Compel* at 23 and throughout.
2. Claimants further asked that "the motion filed by UAMS to limit discovery, both in quantity and a cut-off, should be denied. UAMS should pay the costs of 10 depositions of Claimants' choosing." *Id.*

Reply to UAMS response to compel discovery (<https://court-corruption.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/reply-to-uams-response-to-compel-discovery.pdf>) Download (<https://court-corruption.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/reply-to-uams-response-to-compel-discovery.pdf>)

Tags: Attorney who hallucinate or use Gen AI, UAMS Attorney Sherri Robinson, UAMS tries to substitute unethical responses



About LauraLynnHammett

Regular people like you and I should have access to justice, even if we can't afford an attorney. Judges must stop their cronyism. Attorneys who use abusive tactics against pro se litigants should be disbarred.

This site discusses some of the abuses by our legal professionals. It also gives media attention to cases that are fought and sometimes won by the self represented.

[View all posts by LauraLynnHammett »](#)

A Higher Law

Blog at WordPress.com.