

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF PULASKI, ARKANSAS  
16th DIVISION**

**SEAN LYNN; and  
LAURA HAMMETT**

**PLAINTIFFS**

vs.

**CASE NO.: 60CV-26-216**

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES of the UNIVERSITY  
of ARKANSAS; ET AL**

**DEFENDANTS**

**SEPARATE DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION FOR 10 DAY STAY**

Comes now Separate Defendants Dr. Joseph Margolick (“Dr. Margolick”), Britney Beumeler, APRN (“Beumeler”), and Dr. Benjamin Davis (“Dr. Davis”) by and through their counsel, Wright, Lindsey & Jennings LLP, and for their Response to Plaintiffs’ Motion for 10 Day Stay, state:

1. Separate Defendants respectfully oppose the Plaintiffs’ requested 10 day “stay” of the lawsuit. It should be *DENIED* for numerous reasons.
2. Such a precedent is ill-advised. Plaintiff Hammett has made the request for a stay due to mental health reasons and in support has attached a letter from her therapist. Stress from litigation is not a legitimate reason to stay a case. Does this mean that Hammett gets to request extensions / stays when litigation becomes stressful? Lynn has not advanced an excuse for a stay. Plaintiffs sued 80 plus medical care providers and are seeking millions of dollars; they initiated this process. Such a request like this one does not come from licensed attorneys. And as further discussed below, Hammett and Lynn are held to the standards of attorneys in litigating their lawsuit.

3. But more importantly, according to emails, Hammett initially indicated that she wanted a “break during the summer” for a “vacation” to allow her to see Sean Lynn on June 24 for his birthday, presumably at his apartment in Las Vegas, Nevada, where he is playing poker. *See* Email Chain from April 26 and June 4-5, 2026, attached as Exhibit A. Plaintiff conveniently omitted this from her Motion.

4. It is not usual and customary for Arkansas Courts to enter a “stay” for a case when the litigators go on vacation or are stressed. This does not happen.

5. That being said, undersigned counsel agrees not to schedule any depositions, hearings, or other obligations that would require attendance during the June 20-30, 2026 timeframe.

6. Separate Defendants should be allowed to continue to litigate the case and file pleadings, serve discovery, etc. to prepare their defense, which is already being hampered by Plaintiffs’ deficient discovery responses, as well as non-responses. Plaintiffs have not even served all of the defendants despite filing this case back in January.

7. Separate Defendants warned this Court previously of Plaintiffs’ behavior of extending time. *See* Separate Defendants’ Response to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Four Motions to Dismiss filed April 29, 2026, which is incorporated herein by reference.

8. In their Motion, it is troublesome that Plaintiffs lead with the argument that they are pro se, and thus, presumably should be treated differently. Arkansas law dispels their reasoning – it is well established that pro se litigations, like the Plaintiffs, are held to the same standards as licensed attorneys and must exercise reasonable diligence in keeping up with their cases; “the duty to conform to procedural rules applies even when the petitioner proceeds pro se,

as all litigants must bear the responsibility for conforming to the rules of procedure....” *O’Neal v. State*, 2016 Ark. 94, 3, 484 S.W.3d 671, 672 (2016).

9. The Arkansas Supreme Court has also stated Plaintiffs’ duty of timeliness in another appropriate way:


... plaintiff chose to utilize the court system to try to redress wrongs that had allegedly been done to her. When invoking such aid, a plaintiff should be prepared and willing to follow the rules that keep that system running in an orderly and efficient manner. *Noncompliance with court orders and rules may cause the system to bog down and may adversely affect other litigants. When a plaintiff is personally responsible for this type of delay, he or she prejudices not only the defendant but also the ability of other persons—persons that are doing what is necessary to follow the rules—to utilize the system.*”

*Calandro v. Parkerson*, 333 Ark. 603, 608-09, 970 S.W.2d 796, 799-800 (1998) (citing *Rush v. Fieldcrest Cannon, Inc.*, 326 Ark. 849, 855-56, 934 S.W.2d 512, 516 (1996)).

10. Plaintiffs chose to utilize the court system and have sued over 80 defendants, requesting millions of dollars. They need to be prepared to litigate this case. *See Calandro, supra*. Arkansas law does not give them special treatment – all litigants must be responsible for following the rules of procedure. *See O’Neal, supra*.

WHEREFORE, Separate Defendants respectfully request that the Court deny Plaintiffs’ Motion for 10 Day Stay, for their costs and attorney’s fees, and for all other relief to which they may be entitled.


WRIGHT, LINDSEY & JENNINGS LLP  
 3333 Pinnacle Hills Parkway, Suite 510  
 Rogers, Arkansas 72758-8960  
 (479) 986-0888  
 FAX: (479) 986-8932  
 E-MAIL: gritter@wlj.com

By   
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Glenn S. Ritter (2011146)  
 Attorneys for Defendants Dr. Margolick,  
 Brittney Beumeler, APRN, and Dr. Davis

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on June 9, 2026, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the Arkansas Judiciary Electronic Filing System, which shall send notification of such filing to the attorneys of record. I also sent a copy of the foregoing to the following as indicated below:

Sean Lynn, Pro Se – Via Email 10 Theresa Drive North Little Rock, AR 72118 SeanLynnP@yahoo.com	Sherri L. Robinson – Via Email Sr. Associate General Counsel UAMS 4301 West Markham, Slot 860 Little Rock, AR 72205 SLRobinson@uams.edu
Laura Hammett, Pro Se – Via Email 16 Gold Lake Club Road Conway, Arkansas 72032 bohemianbooks@yahoo.com	William M. Griffin III – Via Email Taryn E. Bewley FRIDAY, ELDREDGE & CLARK, LLP 400 West Capitol Avenue, Suite 2000 Little Rock, Arkansas 72201-3493 griffin@fridayfirm.com tbewley@fridayfirm.com Attorneys for Defendant Karrar Aljiboori, M.D.
Tim Boone – Via Email Sarah Greenwood Jennifer Flinn Attorneys for Defendants Dr. Boyette and Dr. Navuluri	Brad Runyon – Via Email Attorney for Defendants Dr. Nolan Bruce and Dr. Natalie Applebaum
Brandon Cole – Via Email Amelia Sandrock Attorneys for Dr. Prashanth Reddy Damalcheruvu	

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Glenn S. Ritter