

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF ROGERS COUNTY
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Janice Steidley,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.)
)
William "Bill" Higgins,)
)
Erin O'Quin,)
)
Carl Williams,)
)
Sally Williams,)
)
Edith Singer,)
)
Randy Cowling,)
)
Bailey Dabney,)
)
Salesha Wilken,)
)
Newspaper Holdings, d/b/a/ Claremore)
)
Daily Progress,)
)
Community Newspaper Holdings,)
)
Defendants.)

CJ-2015-370
Case No. _____

Judge SHEILA A. CONDREN
FILED IN THE DISTRICT COURT
ROGERS COUNTY OKLAHOMA

OCT 02 2015

~~KIM HENRY, COURT CLERK~~
AS

PETITION

Pursuant to 12 O.S. §100, Plaintiff hereby re-files her Petition asserting claims against Defendants William Higgins, Erin O'Quin, Carl Williams, Sally Williams, and Edith Singer. In other respects, claims against Randy Cowling, Bailey Dabney, Salesha Wilken, Newspaper Holdings, and Community Newspaper Holdings are being asserted for the first time. In furtherance thereof, Plaintiff alleges and states as follows:

PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

1. Plaintiff Janice Steidley is an individual residing in Rogers County, Oklahoma, and at the material time, she was serving as the District Attorney for the Twelfth District of Oklahoma.

2. Plaintiff at all times relevant was acting as a dedicated public servant, and had a reputation for integrity, truthfulness, and assuring the fair administration of justice.
3. Defendants Carl Williams and Sally Williams (a/k/a, Sally Singer), husband and wife, reside in Tulsa County.
4. Defendant William "Bill" Higgins resides in Rogers County, Oklahoma.
5. Defendant Edith Singer resides in Rogers County, Oklahoma.
6. Erin O'quin resides in Rogers County, Oklahoma.
7. Defendant Wilken, based on information and belief, is a resident of Rogers County and at the material time, was a reporter for the Claremore Daily Progress.
8. Defendant Randy Cowling, an individual, was an editor for the Claremore Daily Progress at all time relevant herein. Mr. Cowling resided in Rogers County, Oklahoma, at the time of the original filing of this suit. Cowling is no longer employed by the Claremore Daily Progress (hereinafter "CP").
9. Defendant Bailey Dabney, an individual, was the Publisher of the CP at all times relevant herein. Mr. Dabney resided in Rogers County, Oklahoma, at the time of the original filing of this suit. Mr. Dabney is no longer employed by the CP.
10. Defendant Community Newspaper Holdings ("CNH") is a Delaware corporation with its principal office in Montgomery, Alabama.
11. Defendant Newspaper Holding Inc., ("NHI") is also a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Birmingham, Alabama.
12. CNH and/or NHI own and operate the Claremore Daily Progress, a daily tabloid that circulates in Rogers, Mays, and Craig Counties.

13. On information and belief Plaintiff states that the egregious acts and omission of Defendants, as is more particularly described below, occurred in Rogers, Craig, Mayes and Tulsa Counties, and other counties in Oklahoma.
14. Because a majority of the parties in this case reside in Rogers County and that is also where part of the acts complained of took place, this Court has jurisdiction over the parties, and venue is proper.

BACKGROUND ALLEGATIONS

15. On August 26, 2013, John Singer (Claremore Police Officer), Scott Walton (the Sheriff in and for Rogers County), Steve Cox (Claremore Police Officer), Russell Guilfoyle, Bill Jones, and Myron Gubowski (all of such individuals being referred to herein as the “Original Petitioners”) signed and filed a “Petition For Grand Jury Investigation” with the Rogers County Court Clerk (Rogers County Case No. GJ-2013-01).
16. The Grand Jury Petition alleged that Plaintiffs, and others, were involved in (i) criminal misconduct, and (ii) the violation of civil statutes. The Original Petitioners falsely accused Janice Steidley of witness tampering, illegal wiretapping, criminal threats, destruction of government records, conspiracy to falsely report crimes, obtaining money by false pretenses, oppression and corruption in office and willful maladministration. Bryce Lair was falsely accused of illegal wiretapping and filing false crimes.
17. The Grand Jury Petition was initially approved by a judge on August 29, 2013, such approval only authorizing such Grand Jury Petition to be circulated for signatures, and not being determinative about the veracity of the statements contained in the document.

18. A certain document titled "Rogers County Grand Jury Petition" (the "Unauthorized Petition") was prepared, at some point, apparently as a document to be utilized to solicit and obtain signatures, but the Unauthorized Petition was never approved by the Court.
19. The body of the Unauthorized Petition contained deliberate falsehoods directed towards Plaintiff. In essence, Defendants deliberately falsified that Plaintiffs were guilty of "various crimes including WITNESS TAMPERING, WIRETAPPING, THREATS, DESTRUCTION OF GOVERNMENT RECORDS, FILING FALSE CRIME REPORTS, ATTEMPTING TO OBTAIN MONEY BY FALSE PRETENSES, LYING IN COURT, VIOLATIONS OF THE VICTIMS RIGHTS ACT, BID-SPLITTING and VIOLATION OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS." The Unauthorized petition further intentionally falsely accused Janice Steidley of oppression and corruption in office and willful maladministration.
20. The Grand Jury Petition and Unauthorized Petition were then circulated, published, re-published and represented all over Rogers County, and ultimately approximately 7,000 signatures were obtained based upon the deliberate falsehoods stated in the documents, and upon the intentional misrepresentations stated by those presenting same.
21. On or before October 2, 2013, the creators, drafters and/or circulators of the Grand Jury Petition and Unauthorized Petition conspired to cause the spoliation of evidence related to the circulation of the Grand Jury Petition and Unauthorized Petition.
22. On October 2, 2013, 640 copies of the Unauthorized Petition were filed with the Rogers County Clerk, along with a "Motion to Seal Completed Petitions". The motion to seal was granted initially, but was later vacated.

23. Ultimately, on October 15, 2013, the Honorable Jefferson D. Sellers dismissed the Grand Jury Petition stating the proponents had “collected and filed signatures on an unauthorized form, not the judicially approved petition.”
24. The creators, drafters, and circulators of the Grand Jury Petition and Unauthorized Petition, knew that the allegations concerning Plaintiffs and others contained in the Grand Jury Petition and Unauthorized Petition were deliberately falsified, highly misleading, and those statements were published with reckless disregard for the truth.
25. Certain of those who sponsored the bogus, false, misleading and untruthful claims contained in the Grand Jury Petition, and Unauthorized Petition, demanded the Oklahoma Attorney General’s Office present the bogus allegations to the multi-county grand jury, which did review the bogus claims. The multi-county grand jury found no illegal acts had been committed by Plaintiff, and Plaintiff was exonerated.
26. John Singer, a defendant in Rogers County Case No. CJ-2013-485, when asked about having assistance from a number of people in preparing the Grand Jury Petition, stated that he “couldn’t have prepared the petition” without the assistance of a number of people, including Defendant William “Bill” Higgins. Higgins had represented Singer as a lawyer, although Singer denied Higgins’ assistance was sought on procedural advice pertaining to the Grand Jury Petition. Higgins, in assisting Singer in preparing the petition, was a creator of same and is liable pursuant to 38 O.S. § 108. Singer also stated Higgins circulated the petition when Singer indicated that “someone said Bill Higgins said this is where to go” in referring to a place where the petition could be found to sign. Thus, based upon Singer’s testimony Higgins assisted, at a bare minimum, in creating and actively circulating the Grand Jury Petition.

27. John Singer has also testified his ex-wife, Defendant Edith Singer, did contribute to the creation and drafting of documents filed in Rogers County Case No. GJ-2013-01, and in particular a motion to seal certain records which was initially granted by order, but later vacated. The motion and corresponding vacated order was a part and parcel of the defamatory effort herein described, and further was a part and parcel of the perversion and abuse of the court system, and malicious prosecution of an effort to indict innocent persons.

28. John Singer also testified that Carl and Sally Williams, his stepfather and biological mother, respectively, were involved in the signature solicitation process for the Grand Jury Petition and Unauthorized Petition, and therefore admitted they were “circulators” of the deliberately falsified grand jury petition drive.

29. The malice and ulterior motives of the other Defendants in this case is evidenced in some measure, by the following conduct, all of which evidences the civil conspiracy between multiple parties, and the aiding and abetting of the wrongful acts herein described:

- a. Defendants and others conspired and colluded among themselves to produce in a body of a grand jury petition deliberate falsehoods with the ulterior motive of harassment and retaliation in an effort to destroy Plaintiff’s reputation, and ruin her politically. Steidley, who won her last primary election with approximately 65% of the vote, lost to Higgin’s former employee, with Steidley only receiving approximately 13 % of the vote. This is a direct and proximate result of the tortuous conduct and activities of the defendants, and others, described herein.

- b. Defendants and co-conspirators knowingly and with reckless disregard for the truth accused Plaintiff of crimes they knew she did not commit, in an effort to endanger the freedom and liberty of Plaintiff.
- c. Defendants and others used the media, including frequent use of the Claremore Daily Progress, as a platform to promote their smear campaign, and to further defame Plaintiff. To be sure, Defendants Dabney, Cowling, and the CP were all sued along with Defendant Wilken for defaming Steidley in CJ-2013-190 (Rogers County). That caused these defendants to retaliate against Steidley. Indeed, after getting sued, Wilken helped circulate the grand jury petition, physically, knowing too well that the allegations in the grand jury petition had been deliberately falsified against Steidley. In fact, Wilken took her deleterious conduct a step further by way of writing article after article detailing the deliberate allegations, and in many cases telling the persons where they could go to sign the petition. Based on information and belief, Dabney and Cowling acquiesced to Wilken's deleterious conduct, knowing fully well that she was publishing deliberate falsehoods. So committed to the cause was Wilken, that she even detailed a fundraiser for the petition. In article after article she had to try and personalize "the Sheriff" "Claremore officers Singer and Cox", "local businessmen Guilfoyle and Grubowski", and Jones, "the father of a rape victim." Her articles were really nothing more than an advertisement for the GJ petition drive, and an extension of her physical circulation of it.
- d. The grand jury efforts above-described, were aimed at harassment, public embarrassment and annoyance, and was directed towards ousting Janice Steidley from office, solely because she had exposed the inadequacies and misuse of the

Rogers County Sheriff's Department and its leader, the Sheriff, as well as exposing the inaccurate police work sponsored by John Singer, the grand jury proponents motivation being to misdirect attention off of themselves, and onto others, and for political and other illicit purposes.

- e. The grand jury efforts above-described where motivated by the ulterior and illicit purpose of assisting John Singer in his baseless federal lawsuit he filed against Janice Steidley, the purpose of which was to misdirect attention off of Singer's own bad deeds.
- f. The grand jury efforts and the deliberate falsehoods inherent in them were aimed towards destroying Plaintiffs' political and professional careers in retaliation against Plaintiffs' decision to comply with *Brady/Giglio* obligations, thereby exposing John Singer's faulty police work and perjury.
- g. John Singers malicious motives specifically adopted and furthered by the defendants sued hereby, were to divert attention away from his prior illegal behavior, perjury and misconduct as an officer of the Claremore Police Department.
- h. Defendants participated in a scheme and conspiracy that misused public funds and property in the illegal and failed grand jury effort.
- i. Defendant Edith Singer conspired to implement a plan to secretly record an assistant district attorney to obtain information against Janice Steidley, same being an illegal and malicious effort, in conjunction with Defendant Erin O'quin, who each worked for the furtherance of the creation of the bogus Grand Jury Petition, same containing intentionally feigned facts about purportedly wrongful criminal allegations asserted against Edith Singer's ex-husband by Steidley, that being the subject of the tape

recording and illegal investigation. In fact, O'quin was fired for cause for, among other things, acting outside her official capacity in performing the aforementioned illegal investigation.

30. The Defendants, and others, who created, drafted and/or circulated the Grand Jury Petition, and Unauthorized Petition, and who otherwise sponsored the acts complained of herein, defamed Plaintiffs, abused the court's process in presenting the Grand Jury Petition and Unauthorized Petition, maliciously prosecuted an effort directed towards indicting innocent persons, whether by grand jury or multi-county grand jury, and did conspire with and aid and abet each other in committing said torts.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

A. DEFAMATION (Libel & Slander, And/Or Per Se) (Against All Defendants)

31. The preceding paragraphs are hereby incorporated by reference.

32. The term "defamation" encompasses both "libel" and "slander".

33. Libel is a writing which exposes any person to public hatred, contempt, ridicule or obloquy, or which tends to deprive him of public confidence, or to injure him in his occupation. 12 O.S. § 1441. The Grand Jury Petition and Unauthorized Petition, created, drafted and/or circulated by Defendants, those they conspired with, and those who they aided and abetted, contain knowingly false statements that Plaintiffs committed criminal acts, exposed the Plaintiffs to public hatred, contempt, ridicule and obloquy, deprived Plaintiffs of public confidence, and injured Plaintiffs in their occupation, and are therefore *per se* libelous.

34. "Slander is a false and unprivileged publication, other than libel, which: 1) Charges any person with crime, or with having been indicted, convicted or punished for crime . . . 3) Tends directly to injure him in respect to his office, profession, trade or business, either by imputing to him general disqualification in those respects which the office or other occupation peculiarly requires, or by imputing something with reference to his office, profession, trade or business that has a natural tendency to lessen its profit . . . 5) Which, by natural consequences, causes actual damage." 12 O.S 1442. The representations, misrepresentations, publications and republications occurring with respect to the Grand Jury Petition and Unauthorized Petition by the co-conspirators of Defendants, and by those who they aided and abetted, are slanderous *per se*, in that the statements made included the false imputation and/or accusation that Plaintiffs committed crimes, and/or were directly injurious in respect of the office, profession, trade and business of Plaintiffs, the statements imputing upon Plaintiffs disqualification in their offices and occupation, and imputing that they were unfit for their offices, trade, profession and legal business.

35. Pursuant to 38 O.S. § 108, "[a]ny person responsible for the creation, drafting or circulating of a grand jury petition may be held liable for civil damages for libel or slander due to any false allegation made in the body of said petition, if such allegations are proven to be made with malice and with an ulterior or illicit purpose."

36. Because of the defamation above described, Plaintiff has been damaged. In light of the fact Defendants engaged, conspired to engage and/or aided and abetted in *per se* libel and slander as above described, damages are presumed.

37. Based upon the above-stated facts, Plaintiff states the following claims for relief against all Defendants: 1) Defamation (*per se* and otherwise) by the written word in the creation, drafting and/or circulation of the bogus and failed Grand Jury Petition 38 O.S. § 108, and/or by the spoken word orally in publishing, republishing, presenting, representing and misrepresenting the contents thereof; 2) Defamation (*per se* and otherwise) in the preparing, publishing, republishing, presenting, representing and misrepresenting by written and spoken words of the bogus Unauthorized Petition; 3) abusing the process of the court in that the defendants improperly used the court's process for ulterior and improper purposes, with resulting damage to the Plaintiffs; 4) Defamation under the doctrines of libel *per se* and slander *per se*; 5) malicious prosecution, in that Defendants, their co-conspirators, and those they aided and abetted, instituted an effort to impanel a grand jury to indict innocent persons, and later demanded the Oklahoma Attorney General's Office indict innocent persons by the use of the multi-county grand jury, both proceedings being terminated in Plaintiff's favor, the Defendants having no probable cause for calling for a grand jury or multi-county grand jury investigation of Plaintiff, the Defendants, their co-conspirators and those they aided and abetted having sponsored the grand jury efforts with malice, as evidenced by Defendants' conduct, and the conduct of those they conspired with, and those who they aided and abetted, and who aided and abetted Defendants, all of which resulted in damages to Plaintiff 6) civil conspiracy to defame in every manner stated herein, and 7) aiding and abetting others to defame in every manner stated herein.

38. Plaintiff seeks damages in an amount in excess of \$10,000, said amount to be proved at trial. Plaintiffs each individually claim their damages also exceed the amount-in-controversy limit established by 28 U.S.C. §1332.

**B. FALSE LIGHT
(Against All Defendants)**

39. Plaintiff hereby incorporates the entirety of the preceding paragraphs as though stated *verbatim* below.

40. Defendants gave publicity to a matter placing Plaintiff before the public in a false light.

41. The false light portrayed by Defendants would be highly offensive to any reasonable person under the circumstances.

42. Defendants had knowledge of, or acted in reckless disregard as to the falsity of, the publicized matters and the false light (Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference in their entirety as though stated herein *verbatim*, paragraphs 10-25, *supra*).

43. As a result of Defendants' acts in portraying Plaintiff before the public in a false light, Plaintiff has sustained damages.

**C. PUNITIVE DAMAGES
(Against All Defendants)**

44. Plaintiff hereby incorporates the entirety of the preceding paragraphs as though stated *verbatim* below.

45. In addition, Defendants' conduct described above rises to the level of willful, wanton, heinous, grossly negligent, and/or reckless conduct for which they should be punished, individually, by an award to each Plaintiff of exemplary and punitive damages in an amount sufficient, taking into consideration the assets and worth of each Defendant, to render the consequences of their conduct an example to themselves, and others. In this


regard, and under the specific facts of this case, Defendants are liable for both Category I and Category II punitive damages, as described in 12 O.S. § 9.1.

46. Under Category I, Defendants plainly acted in reckless disregard of the rights of others, thereby entitling Plaintiffs to a potential jury award of punitive damages in the amount equal to the actual damages awarded by the jury for Defendants' conduct, or the amount of \$100,000 in punitive damages, whichever is more.
47. Defendants are also liable for Category II punitive damages under Section 9.1 of Title 23 because they acted intentionally and with malice towards others. Requisite malice may be inferred from gross negligence that indicates conscious indifference to consequences of one's acts or reckless disregard for the safety of others. *Silkwood v. Kerr-McGee Corp.*, 769 F.2d 1451 (10th Cir. 1985). Accordingly, Defendants should be liable for punitive damages of the greater of \$500,000, or twice the amount of actual damage.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiff requests that the Court enter judgment against Defendants consistent with and under the theories presented above for actual and punitive damages, for costs incurred by Plaintiff, including attorneys' fees, for pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, and for such other relief to which Plaintiff is entitled at-law or in equity.

Respectfully,


Gary L. Richardson, OBA No. 7547
Charles L. Richardson, OBA No. 13388
Mbilike Mwafulirwa, OBA No. 31164
Richardson Richardson Boudreaux
7447 S. Lewis Ave.
Tulsa, OK 74136

BY
Laroy
Stedley

(918) 492-7674 Phone
Attorneys for Plaintiff Janice Steidley

&

Larry R. Steidley Jr. – OBA #18000
P.O. Box 98
Claremore, OK 74018-0098
(918) 343-2060
Attorney for Plaintiff Janice Steidley