



Dennis I. Wilenchik
diw@wb-law.com

WILENCHIK & BARTNESS
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
The Wilenchik & Bartness Building
2810 North Third Street Phoenix Arizona 85004

Licensed in Arizona,
Texas, New York,
and the District of
Columbia

Telephone: 602-606-2810 Facsimile: 602-606-2811

June 19, 2020

Via Email Only

JAllen@azleg.gov
RCobb@azleg.gov
DDeGrazia@azleg.gov
KEngel@azleg.gov
GGriffin@azleg.gov
kokanovichm@ballardspahr.com

RE: Response to your June 11th Report regarding Representative David Cook

First, let us point out that we object to this truncated process you have devised and the accelerated response. It is neither fair nor in keeping with due process and the rule of law. Quite frankly, it should be shocking to any fair-minded citizen.

The fact that an “ethics” committee of the legislature would conduct its business in this fashion reeks of a third world country and not the United States of America. Is this the best we can do here in our beloved State of Arizona? There is a clear agenda we see in this process that House Leadership has devised that is neither fair nor just in treating one of its elected members this way. The call of the House Speaker to send this matter to the House for a vote is even more disturbing since there has never been even the hint of a fair process. We have seen our country torn apart by an impeachment process where a hearing ignored the fundamental tenets of a democratic society, and now we are treated to this apparent witch hunt here in a state that we always believed prided itself on being better, not worse than what we have come to expect nationally. Now we are treated to a legislative process designed to convict and not to hear the true facts. The Chairman’s letter basically denying the fundamental rights of an accused to have a full hearing, with the ability to actually confront his accusers and cross examine them and fully present evidence; and, the Speaker’s stated intent to simply and apparently do the same in submitting the matter to the full House for a vote is a pre-ordained conclusionary process based on a biased and completely twisted report by one or two paid individuals hired by the Committee or the House leadership to advance its agenda.

No one should be fooled into thinking this process was objective or fair in the least. The conclusions reached were entirely subjective and simply flat out wrong. In any event, what conclusions were actually reached are inconclusive to boot, crying out for a fair and thorough hearing with witnesses and documents being examined.

Let us be perfectly clear. Neither the public or Representative Cook’s constituency have been damaged or harmed in any way. There is not even any hint of an alleged affair between Representative Cook and a lobbyist, or that any vote of his was ever effected differently than what he has stood for always and consistent with his voting record in the past.



WILENCHIK & BARTNESS
----- A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION -----

June 19, 2020

Page 2 of 9

Second, there is absolutely no evidence to support any “crime” or other infraction of the law or to be more blunt, any “bribery” or other misconduct that can ever be proven with respect to Representative Cook’s research into, or actions concerning protecting the public from wrongful forfeitures by the Sheriff’s Office, or procedures designed to deter citizens from avoiding them based on rejection of partial payments. There was no “quid pro quo” ever sought or established by any action of Representative Cook that will ever be proven by a fair exposition of the facts. Instead, what we have been entertained here with are rumors, gossip, insinuations, and lack of any actual proof of anything that warrants the Committee proceeding in any way against Representative Cook. We have seen even worse -- introduction of allegations of drunkenness -- that was not even part of any complaint that was lodged, that is based on pure hearsay, and is fully disputed. We have said clearly that following an unfortunate DUI episode in the past, Representative Cook fully got the message and does not drink in public or frankly at all in any way that would be of concern to anyone but himself. It is nothing short of ludicrous for this Committee to try to stand in judgment of any member on such a ridiculous claim. It is disturbing that this Committee sees it as its responsibility to police the outside conduct of any member that does not affect the business of the House at all, and were this the standard, then all of the members should be gravely concerned about what is transpiring here.

I. Representative Cook was fully cooperative in the investigation.

The June 11th report is full of misrepresentations, and unsubstantiated opinion based on subjective conclusions, and is slanted and unfair.

The statement that “Representative Cook did not produce any documents before the subpoena’s deadline.” insisting that Cook was non-responsive and uncooperative borders on libel were it made in another context. Again on page 5, the claim is made that: “Because Representative Cook failed to cooperate and produce documents voluntarily, the Ethics Committee issued a legislative subpoena compelling Representative Cook to produce documents that even Representative Cook described as “reasonable” and related to the complaints.” This is patently false. At all times Cook was fully cooperative, producing prodigious amounts of material, and providing all he had. The claim that he was not forthcoming because materials were also obtained from other sources that he did not keep or maintain, or that frankly were none of the Committee’s business or the public’s, is not grounded in reality or fact. The simple fact also is that much of the information sought would not be obtainable in a true court of justice. Much of what was requested involved private and confidential communications that were simply none of this Committee’s business and which proved irrelevant. Indeed, even with the information obtained elsewhere, even if true, there is no conclusion from any of it worth a farthing’s difference, or that in any way substantiates the Salem witch hunt going on here, related to matters that are purely between two individuals. You now know full well that Representative Cook was always trying to help an old friend recover from the devastation wreaked on her by a powerful lobbyist father and a jealous husband. There are political reasons for this matter proceeding that further the interests of her father, who is quite influential, and who wrongfully believes Representative Cook needs to be ousted. The simple truth is there was no affair ever between Representative Cook and the purported victim, who has repeatedly advised every one of the same, however, that has



WILENCHIK & BARTNESS
----- A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION -----

June 19, 2020

Page 3 of 9

repeatedly been tossed aside and ignored here, for reasons we cannot fathom from any objective view.

The third paragraph on your page 5 states, “Despite the legislative subpoena, Representative Cook produced no additional documents in response to the subpoena before the subpoena deadline.” This is also false.

Representative Cook provided over one thousand pages of documents even before the subpoena was issued. After the subpoena was issued, Representative Cook and his attorneys went through the documents previously produced and identified in detail which produced documents belong to the specific numbered subpoena request. Even at his “deposition”, efforts were made to identify just what the investigators needed, and why. It must be noted that the subpoena was overbroad, as confirmed by the Senate’s own attorney. Notwithstanding, Representative Cook responded completely to the subpoena request as best he could with any relevant information he had.

II. The Ethics Committee was not cooperative during the investigation at all.

Representative Cook, through counsel, sent a request for production of documents early on to the Ethics Committee so he could try to understand better where this investigation was headed and what its true purpose was. This was never even responded to. The sheer arrogance of this should be astounding to anyone fairly reviewing the circumstances. If the legislature we entrust to make our laws, and to insure they are fair, has so little regard for fundamental due process, our citizens need to be alarmed. There were numerous attempts by Representative Cook’s counsel requesting that information be provided, that any prosecutor in any fair proceeding would be required by law to provide an accused to mount a defense. Nothing was responded to. There was no answer, not ever. Just arrogance in response. We have no idea as to how this so called investigation occurred, the nature of the full interviews with accusers or complainants, or witnesses and the manner in which information was obtained, let alone assessed by a few individuals who were somehow entrusted with the ability to opine on what THEY say they reviewed. That is why we have trials and not trial by prosecutors who become invested with proving their predetermined point. That is why there are impeachment trials, or trials of any kind for that matter in this country.

In addition, there was a FOIA request sent to Representative Allen, which was delegated to a staff member at the legislature, which also was never responded to. It is ironic that the Ethics Committee is now attempting to besmirch Representative Cook for allegedly not complying with requests when it was the Ethics Committee which failed to provide any documents so as to notify Representative Cook as to what exactly the rambling investigation was based on so he could confront accusers, or so he could intelligently prepare for an interview or determine the relevance of various irrelevant requests for more information. It was only days before the hearing, that Representative Cook received any documents at all. For example, none of the documents produced to Representative Cook were summaries of the interviews of the witnesses let alone full interviews. No opportunity was ever provided, then or now, to confront these alleged witnesses to question them, or their motives, or to cross examine, which is the



WILENCHIK & BARTNESS
----- A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION -----

June 19, 2020

Page 4 of 9

lynchpin of justice and the hallmark of our system of justice. It was not Representative Cook that was uncooperative. He cooperated in every way possible through the investigative process. He also, throughout, supplemented the discovery requests from the Ethics Committee and tried to cooperate to determine what exactly it needed and why. In return, the committee provided nothing to Representative Cook in response to Cook's reasonable request for production of documents and the FOIA request. Is this the kind of America you are proud of? It was the Ethics Committee through their counsel that was totally uncooperative. Not Cook.

Pretending Representative Cook did not produce documents is a sloppy and slanted way of trying to make him look uncooperative and as if he was trying to hide something. Well let us be clear, there is nothing to hide.

Similarly, regarding when he testified, their initial date was while he was out of state at his Oklahoma farm. It was also during the Covid-19 lockdown and no one was putting even 3 or 4 people into the same room for four hours. Mr. Cook was following the advice of counsel, and being reasonable, not attempting to in any way thwart the committee or be disrespectful to it.

No attorney would allow a client to be ambushed in an interview without one piece of evidence to refer to, or without fully understanding the framework or parameters of it. For example, rambling inquiry into his personal life or drinking habits, having nothing to do with any complaint is unseemly, but more importantly irrelevant. Counsel for Representative Cook required a number of reasonable disclosures from the investigators, many of which took forever, or were not delivered until counsel threatened to go to court to force the issues.

III. The Subpoena was overbroad yet Cook answered it.

We would remind the Ethics Committee that the subpoena itself was abusively overbroad and should not have been complied with at all. In many years of practice, would any lawyer believe that because one side, obviously not believed to be objective, demanded information or whatever, that this would be simply not contested or challenged? Does that make the lawyers uncooperative, let alone their client? Nonsense. Any lawyer experienced in trial work knows better. That is not just our opinion. That was the opinion of the State Senate's attorneys who objected to how poorly written the discovery requests were.

IV. Due Process.

We harken to the comments of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Judges' questions at oral argument, in the recent oral argument regarding the Shooter matter, which we commend you should all familiarize yourself with in doing justice here. If a legislative body decides to simply oust members with no fundamental due process right of a full hearing and the ability to confront accusers and cross examine them, where are we as a nation, and what does this say about all we should hold dear about our unique system of justice that is the bulwark of our society?



WILENCHIK & BARTNESS
----- A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION -----

June 19, 2020

Page 5 of 9

This absolutely, in our opinion, (which we believe carries as much weight as attorneys hired at great expense to the taxpayers to issue this Report), was a fishing expedition to find something negative about Representative Cook or to portray anything to do so. It resulted in no evidence supportive of the two complaints- one based entirely on hearsay from a lady who says she read about him in the Yellow Sheet, based upon what she read the woman claimed Representative Cook should be investigated for his voting record. If our House of Representatives seizes upon every such request, we are not aware of it. If that is so, then there will be many requests made about every member from here on out, that you will be demanded to investigate. But that is not the reality. The reality is the House seized on this so-called request, as an excuse to go after Representative Cook for other reasons. Where is the complainant? Was she interrogated? Have we had the right to question why she wrote the letter, at whose instance she wrote it, if she wrote it, and who put her up to it? In any event, there has been no evidence found that Representative Cook voted in any way based on anything improper that could be alleged, let alone proven, that he otherwise would not have.

The second complaint is from someone who accuses Representative Cook of facilitating bribes to the Pinal County Sheriff in return for special treatment for his friend. This is a serious charge. One that would be a crime. One that has never been reported or prosecuted because there is insufficient evidence to even infer any crime, let alone prove one in a court of law. There was no quid pro quo or benefit derived by Representative Cook other than doing his job and pursuing an issue important for his constituents. There is no evidence of any money being given to him or his campaign for any vote, or any action attempting to influence anyone to do anything, and Representative Cook has so testified. Neither complaint was true. No evidence supported either, despite the Ethics Committee's extensive investigation through their investigator. Trying to turn innocent letters expressing love, humor, sarcasm, and support into some kind of twisted effort to claim Representative Cook violated some "ethics" of the House is a sham and every citizen should know that by now. Hopefully, the House will as well if there is any justice.

ETHICS' COMMITTEE'S CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions offer no real conclusions or recommendations in the end. Again, we are reminded that the two complaints relate to bribery of a public official and some vote being somehow compromised because of an alleged romantic relationship with an old friend which never happened. See letter of AnnaMarie Knorr, **Exhibit 1** to this Response and incorporated herein by this reference. Only one of the so-called conclusions even touches on either of these issues, and it does so in contradiction of the evidence/testimony- which exculpates Cook.

1. The investigators want to believe there was a romantic relationship when there was none proven, Ex. 1. Their basis are the letters that Mr. Cook wrote only while Ms. Knorr was in rehab and only at her request. She understood their meaning even if the investigators or others did not. There were no romantic interludes or other sexual escapades for the entertainment of others now trying to establish otherwise. Both parties to the conversations agree on this. So, who are these investigators to question it? The investigators know that Mr. Cook based his letters on a letter Ms. Knorr



WILENCHIK & BARTNESS
----- A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION -----

June 19, 2020

Page 6 of 9

received from her former employer that "meant the world to her" receiving that also expressed equal concern and affection to build her spirits up, yet this information is excluded from the report. Why??? It is incredible to us, unless there was clearly a hidden agenda here, which we are convinced of. Worse still, the "testimony of witnesses" that the investigators claim conflict with the statements of Cook and Knorr come from Knorr's father, an extremely influential and vindictive lobbyist, who is largely responsible for this entire sham, and who has targeted both his own daughter and Cook in unspeakable ways she herself has expressed, but which is not fully contained in any Report, requiring her to actually again separately reach out to bring truth and sanity to this process.

The Report is also allegedly corroborated by the testimony given by her ex-husband during a custody or divorce proceeding in which he also claimed that Ms. Knorr's claims that she was being followed by private investigators was just her being paranoid. A divorce proceeding? A custody battle? Can any of you understand as we know from years of legal experience how such a proceeding warps entirely the perspective and credibility of interested parties? Of course, financial records showed that first her father, and then her ex-husband, were in fact paying thousands of dollars to private investigators to have her followed. Worth noting -- all that money and all of those investigators turned up ZERO EVIDENCE OF ANY IMPROPER RELATIONSHIP with Cook. Had they had evidence, you can be sure it would have made an appearance in the custody hearings and certainly as part of their war against Knorr and Cook, yet there is NO EVIDENCE. And yet, this is the kind of unsubstantiated allegation you would sanction or remove a member over? Outrageous.

2. The investigators claim that Ms. Knorr lobbied Mr. Cook on legislation and policies pursued by her employer. Where is there any evidence of this at all, and even were there any such evidence so what? Where is there any evidence at all that Representative Cook voted on anything differently than he otherwise does? But Further, this is directly contradicted by Ms. Knorr's own testimony, which made it clear that Western Growers Association has a contract lobbyist who dealt with Mr. Cook on matters related to WGA bills. There is no evidence to the contrary and the investigators never bothered to confirm the facts with WGA's contract lobbyist.
3. There is no justifiable conclusion at all here, rather a continuation of the investigators insisting on an inappropriate relationship that did not occur and was not proven. They then attempted to find Cook "guilty" of not disclosing this relationship to the House. What relationship? And, what was there to disclose? If there is a process by which legislators are supposed to reveal personal friendships and relationships "to the House" we are not aware of them. It would be ridiculous as they would have to list probably thousands of people they come in contact with. Is the Committee aware of a process by which each House member is to disclose "the nature of their relationships" with lobbyists? If so, we will be glad to find out the relationships with her father too, which has never been disclosed. Even if there were such a duty, being friends with a lobbyist is not improper or all legislators would be ousted today. Not even dear family



WILENCHIK & BARTNESS
----- A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION -----

June 19, 2020

Page 7 of 9

friends like this must be disclosed. No requirement is even cited. No case law, no statute or other Rule on point. We also note that this point is immaterial to both complaints that were filed. It has no proper place in the report again, other than to find some infraction by these opinionated investigators. Let us be clear, they are entitled to their opinions like all of us, but to elevate their uninformed opinions into facts is the issue here. Those facts should be determined by a fair exposition and not an exhibition. And certainly not in the conclusions section. Experienced trial lawyers will recognize it as purposefully prejudicial while some non-lawyers may not recognize the distinction at all.

4. This so-called conclusion is an unsupported smear. It presents something the Committee and the entire House needs to come up with rules to deal with in future investigations. Allowing so-called witnesses to come forward without being placed under oath encourages people to mislead or outright lie, in an effort to settle grudges or to help friends. Again, any experienced trial lawyer knows this. The investigators claimed that Kirk Adams gave testimony about an event, but the claims had no corroboration, and were directly contradicted by Mr. Cook's description of the events. And yet, Cook's account is entirely discounted? While Mr. Cook has admitted he previously struggled with alcohol in years past, he made clear that was in the past and had no relevance to any event in question by any complaint made so why was this even made an issue here? At no time was Cook a "day drinker" or someone who drank at work. There is no complaint about this to the contrary. How can an investigation truly morph into such a sideshow in fairness? Is this what anyone would call due process- being notified of the accusations and having a fair hearing to challenge them, where no one even complained? Did you give investigators a free reign to just delve off at taxpayer expense into every area they felt like pursuing when they could find no real evidence to support the actual complaints? It would certainly either appear so, or you must question this process and the investigation in fairness. This is immaterial to either of the complaints.
5. Mr. Cook's detailed description of this call and the Sheriff's telling of it, are both available to the Committee and are worth listening to. There is no bribery or crime of any kind that occurred. As Mr. Cook said, he did not mention the Knorr farm specifically and you can hear the Sheriff confirm that on multiple occasions. So how on God's green earth was this not only pursued, but how could any conclusion of any improper activity be derived from it? He further stated that Cook's call did the people of Pinal County a great favor and service by alerting him to an area where his office could do better for the constituents (including Mr. Knorr and Mr. Aja as it turns out). Ultimately, Representative Cook was asked by Pinal County officials to run legislation to fix this problem being experienced by his constituency, which he did, along with others. Even here, the investigators omit all those details, in their transparent effort to try to spin it as some favor to the Knorr farm, when the testimony of everyone they asked about it was to the contrary and where it served a great benefit to all who were effected, not just the family of Ms. Knorr. Assisting constituents of all kinds in any event from problems being encountered with government in general is part of any



WILENCHIK & BARTNESS
----- A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION -----

June 19, 2020

Page 8 of 9

legislator's duties. But, critically, nothing of value was ever provided to Representative Cook for doing anything that might arguably benefit the Knorr family as well as others. Again, that is why we have cross examination and a fair hearing to expose the truth, and not whispers or rumors and gossip for ulterior motives.

6. This is a lie. As discussed earlier, Rep Cook provided massive numbers of documents in his best effort to satisfy the demands of the investigators. Further, the subpoena was absurdly broad, asking at one point for EVERY DOCUMENT OF ANY KIND THAT RELATES TO ANY LEGISLATION THAT REP COOK HAS BEEN INVOLVED WITH FOR THE ENTIRETY OF HIS TIME AT THE LEGISLATURE. To send such a subpoena is improper. Then the investigators claim that they did not have what they needed to decipher conversations because they didn't have all of the texts, they believe Mr. Cook should have. These same investigators now claim they were not fairly treated? Is that sensical to accept their version of their own dispute and give no credence whatsoever to the other side of it or hear the facts relating to why they make such a claim in a full hearing if this nonsense is to be considered further to oust or sanction a Representative? Yet they admit that they had those same texts courtesy of whichever other person was involved in those conversations. Would not Cook also understand they would be so obtained? Would he have any reason to therefore hide anything if he maintained these? Why would the investigators even find a need to comment on this at all, or need two copies of the same conversation to determine what occurred? It has been the goal of the investigators, since early in the process, to paint Mr. Cook as uncooperative and to find anything negative. This includes comments to that effect made directly to the media in violation of protocols. It includes releasing their report by this committee without any concern for the other side's position. Mr. Cook always acted on advice of counsel, and properly so, and was very forthcoming. We remind you that the State Senate itself objected to full compliance. Are they part of Rep. Cook's infractions too? It is ridiculous to accept the investigator's version of their own reality, and their own positions.

Again, there was no improper relationship, much as Ms. Knorr's ex-husband and father might wish there were.

There was no improper conduct related to any legislation. In fact, not a single piece of legislation is even mentioned in this exhaustive final report, except the one requested by Pinal County officials.

There was no bribery. In fact, if you listen to the testimony provided, neither the Sheriff nor Ms. Knorr were even asked about bribery. Why does no one find it odd that in an investigation into the alleged bribery of a Sheriff, the interview of the Sheriff himself would not spend time on questions of bribery? Instead, investigators were interested in Mr. Cook's alcohol consumption, which was not a part of either complaint.

So, there is nothing conclusive in evidence that relates to any of the allegations the Committee is supposed to be reviewing.



WILENCHIK & BARTNESS
----- A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION -----

June 19, 2020

Page 9 of 9

Why are we still here?

Any serious prosecutor's office would have dropped this matter months ago and saved the taxpayers tens of thousands of dollars. It is time for this Committee to end this fishing trip and restore, to the degree it is possible, some semblance of David and Diana Cook's and Anna Marie Knorr's reputations.

If you are determined to proceed, then why not have a full hearing and give the right to the fundamental protections every citizen of our country would reasonably expect to have? If you don't, then you will make the House a country club, where only those who are in the majority get to determine who sits and who doesn't, and thus thwart not only the will of the people to vote who they wish, but at the same time thwart the whole point of this wonderful democracy and the Constitution that governs it. We sincerely request you think about this carefully before any further rights become trampled on. Thank you for hopefully considering these points in the true spirit of that. We do not mean to, or choose to, unnecessarily offend anyone or the investigators for that matter and hope that can be understood. But we would be lying if we said we were not disappointed and discouraged by what we have seen so far.

Sincerely and with respect for our system,

Dennis I. Wilenchik and Carmen Chenal Horne
Attorneys for Representative Cook

Enclosure

EXHIBIT A



Anna marie Knorr <annamarienorr@yahoo.com>

11:53 AM
(2 hours
ago)

to kengel@azleg.gov, jallen@azleg.gov, Gail, rcobb@azleg.gov, ddegrazia@azleg.gov

June 18, 2020

To the Members of the House Ethics Committee:

Over the last 9 months I have experienced some tremendous highs and lows. Yet even with so many memorable lows to deal with, what I witnessed last Friday at the House Ethics Committee stands out to me in a great many ways. I am dismayed that having sat through a lengthy interview, in which I spoke plainly and honestly, and having written a lengthy declaration putting what I know to be true in writing, I still ended up reading a work of near-fiction that purported to be conclusive work performed by professional investigators hired by lawyers who were hired by the House Ethics Committee. I find it remarkable that I am compelled to write you again.

My entire life for the last 9 months has been on public display for the sake of a political vendetta turned circus. While I am not ashamed of the rehabilitation treatment I received last year, it was never intended to be a news story and no one should have to endure a process such as this because of it. That is just one reason we have HIPAA privacy laws. Yet I find myself once again in the public eye because I will not just stand by and allow the persecution of a good man and his reputation because he doesn't do the bidding of those who think themselves in charge.

Let me set the record straight once again. There was false testimony presented to the investigative team that they did not fact check, or corroborate. My recovery was not in any way harmed by Representative Cook and his wife, Diana. I have been sober 8 1/2 months, as witnessed by many, and the Cook's support has been instrumental in my recovery during this critical time.

To fit their narrative, the investigators dismissed my description of my recovery in favor of Mr. Aja's description, even though Mr. Aja was not present for it and continues to try to actually thwart my recovery. Mr. Aja claimed that I admitted to an affair with Representative Cook during my intervention. That was false, and my own testimony refuted Mr. Aja's assertion, yet once again the investigators accepted the version that advanced the narrative requested of them, and made sure they did not interview anyone else that could possibly contradict it. Remarkably, the motivations of Mr. Aja to create this trouble and to lie to investigators received virtually no attention from the investigators. This occurred in spite of ample evidence of malice and spite.

The Ethics Committee is eager to NOT learn of any new information or evidence, to the point of prohibiting Representative Cook from presenting it. I will share one tidbit with you all the same.

In the legal proceedings for my pending divorce, in verified court pleadings, it was that my estranged husband took the letters from my personal belongings, made copies, and gave them only to Mr. Aja. Mr. Aja claimed that he did not give the letters to the media. Rather, he stated under oath that he only gave them to Speaker Rusty Bowers and his Chief of Staff Michael Hunter. Unlike the hearsay collected by your investigators, this

testimony was given under penalty of perjury, which raises two distinct but equally important possibilities:

Either, 1. Mr. Aja is a liar who has perjured himself. He did send an unknown quantity of anonymous packages containing copies of the stolen letters to various members of the news media in an effort to ruin Representative Cook and inflict maximum damage on my personal and professional reputation.

Or 2. Mr. Aja is actually telling the truth for once. He gave the stolen letters to Bowers/Hunter which were then sent in anonymous packages to various members of the news media in an effort to ruin Representative Cook and inflict maximum damage on my personal and professional reputation.

It pains me that one of these is true. However, this is why it is so important that you understand why Representative Cook is not allowed to call his own witnesses, not allowed to cross-examine old witnesses, not allowed to face and question his accusers, and not allowed to introduce evidence. Should Option 1 be true, then the entire investigative report relies on the word of a perjurer. And as bad as that might sound to you, we all understand that it is far preferable for you as legislators compared to Option 2, which calls into question -- not the motivations of one liar trying to settle a grudge -- but the leadership of this House, and all of their subsequent actions, appointments, and remarks throughout this process.

I, and my personal legal team, look forward to finding out who is responsible. In the meantime, I can only tell you that my life as I knew it is completely destroyed for the sake of a vendetta that one or both of these men has against Representative Cook.

I truly believe that everything happens for a reason and I have no interest in martyring myself as a victim. But I will not simply stand by and allow this to continue without objection. There are too many people at the Capitol who refuse to stand up to bullies and political threats because they fear the price of the inevitable retribution. I used to be one of those people.

What a hidden blessing it is to know that surviving an assassin's bullet can actually free you from fear itself. The nightmare of the last nine months has given me a new strength to stand up for what is right, regardless of the cost. Now it is time for this Committee to do the same, throw this garbage out, and apologize for what has been done to an exceptional man, his family, and their name and reputation.

Sincerely,

AnnaMarie Knorr
(602)451-0658

P.S. As the actions of the investigators and recent motions by the Ethics Committee have not given me any reason to believe that my remarks will be considered or weighed fairly, I will be copying them to members of the media and of the House itself.



ReplyReply allForward