

June 7, 2026

Laura Hammett

Bohemian_books@yahoo.com

To Glenn Ritter by email

Dear Mr. Ritter,

My apologies. I inadvertently did not calendar responses to Defendant Margolick's first set of interrogatories and requests for production to me, and the second set of interrogatories and requests for production of documents to Mr. Lynn. The set to me was emailed on April 13, 2026. When I cross checked what documents were pending when we wrote our granted motion for extension of time to respond to MTDs, I only looked at my "documents filed" file. Interrogatories and requests for production are not filed.

I was also overwhelmed and under extreme pressure, with many documents and finals approaching. You would not agree to an extension of time to respond, requested from you on April 14, 2026, and I forgot to add the interrogatories in the request the Court granted, because I had not added them to the calendar.

As I informed you many times, from the complaint through our motion for a stay, I am suffering from acute anxiety – caused in substantial part from the incident complained of and remembering it over and over again to force your client and the other defendants to compensate us appropriately. To push through the documents that are on my calendar, I am taking .5 Mg. Clonazepam as needed prescribed by Cara Meckfessel, APRN on 11/26/2025. I received 20 doses on that day. In the past 24 hours I have taken 2 doses. I have 10 doses left.

That means I took 8 doses in over six months. I anticipate using the other 12 doses in this two week period.

I do not think taking these pharmaceuticals is safe. That is why I need time to regulate my cortisol naturally.

Please allow Sean and me to answer the requests 30 days after July 1, 2026. We will give reasonable answers, but it is not possible to answer some questions. For example, “**INTERROGATORY NO. 6**: State the names, addresses and telephone numbers of all persons who know anything about the alleged incidents giving rise to your claims in this lawsuit.”

I could not possibly remember or identify every person who knows anything about the alleged incidents. My blog has been read by about 2,300 discrete visitors in each of 2024 and 2025. There have been almost 2,000 discreet visitors in the first half of 2026. I have no idea who most of these people are.

If you are talking about only the people who eye witnessed the incident, I also don't know who was there. The UAMS surveillance videos were destroyed, and it would take discovery for me to determine some of the people in the videos that I was able to take. The medical report is incomplete, but there are over 72 names of people involved.

And I have no idea yet which attorneys advised or did not advise Dr. Margolick and the other UAMS medical providers to hold and treat Sean without consent and without a court order. Nor do I know what administrators were aware of the situation.

Therefore, we request that we be able to make the objections we could make if I did not inadvertently and excusably neglect to respond and remind Sean to respond in a timely manner.

Further, though we did not formally submit the answers to the requests, the objections and answers to most of the interrogatories and requests for production are including in the production made on May 13, 2026.

Without your client's stipulation to this extension, we have two ways to proceed.

First, we will move the Court to allow for the extension.

Second, we will voluntarily dismiss Defendant Joseph Margolick without prejudice and file claims against him arising from the same transaction and occurrence in the Federal Court under 42 USC 1983.

It is our intention, regardless of this issue, to file the 1983 suit, which has a three year statute of limitations, against all defendants who are dismissed by the Court here, a few who are not dismissed, because of the potential appeal of the extension of time to serve summons and the sufficiency of summons, and to add other defendants not yet named in both this suit and the 1983 suit. (All before January 12, 2027.)

I will add again, it is best if all the parties voluntarily enter ADR.

That would benefit me, because when this massive lawsuit is put to rest, I would have a chance to regulate my system.

It would benefit Sean, because he would have enough money to live on modestly for the rest of his life and would not need to try to find work with his disabilities or take the risk involved and spend the grueling hours to be a professional poker player.

The individual defendants would not need to worry about paying for the damages they caused by intentional conduct.

The state would not have the huge expense that this litigation is causing.

The University can possibly mitigate some of the damage done to its reputation. Especially the University might adopt some of the equitable relief for which we are asking.

The University would not face a potential appellate decision that deems the Supreme Court approved summons as insufficient. Such a decision opens the door to countless actions to set aside default judgments that were obtained in UAMS debt collection cases using the identical summons.

The University and State in general will not need to pay for the damages that are not covered by insurance.

It is difficult for me to understand why General Counsel and the individual defendants are not advocating for indemnity for the negligent acts of its employees, which would probably satisfy the plaintiffs in compromise.

Thank you for your consideration,

/s/ Laura Hammett

Laura Hammett