

**Susan Simon**

**Bath, PA - Community Hub** you're quiet today. Did you get 'spanked'?

**3d Like Reply Share**



**Richard Williams**

What happened in Court? Hello. Crickets!!!!

**13h Like Reply Share**





Richard Williams the borough council, finally received a wake-up call. All the horse manure they've been peddling was nothing but that. I'll create a separate post to delve deeper into this matter. However, today, I'm going to provide a comprehensive walkthrough of how they've been stealing money through a process known as "lapping."

In December 2019, Brad stole \$93,452 to purchase his girlfriend's ex-husband's half of a home. Later, in March 2020, he used the same money to buy another half of the home, as he needed the funds for down payments and taxes. Notably, the mayor benefited in 2019 by redirecting dog park funds to cover her insurance costs. This pattern continued until 2022, when they used other funds from that year.

They also engaged in similar practices with the secretary, Tanya, from 2018 to 2020. After her full-time hiring, she was finally approved for coverage under the borough's healthcare plan.

In March 2018, Cynthia Anderson resigned from the council. The council immediately announced plans to advertise the opening and conduct interviews the following month, which they did. After a 3-3 tie, the current Council President, Frank Hesch, was chosen by the mayor, who received the tie-breaker vote.

In October 2021, Mark Saginario was hired as the Tatamy Borough Manager. He arrived on October 4, 2021, but he was late for the Tatamy meeting, which coincided with the borough's meeting. He was officially hired at that meeting and informed the council of his resignation when they were in executive session.

On the day Cynthia resigned and Mark resigned, every council member and official was aware of the process, as Frank was chosen in the previous instance. However, on this day in 2021, they decided to keep the matter secret and conspired by email to appoint the mayor's husband to the seat.

It's important to note that this entire process is governed by state law (<https://www.legis.state.pa.us/cfdocs/legis/LI/consCheck.cfm?chpt=9&div=0&sctn=1&subsctn=0&ttl=08&txtType=HTM&t=> ).

By law, the council's vote is the deciding factor, with the mayor only receiving a vote in the event of a tie. However, there are discrepancies in the record. Eleven emails reveal secret conversations between Brad, Michelle (who assumed the role of council president after Mark's departure), and the solicitor. Additionally, there's a single instance of a conversation between only the solicitor and Brad, which occurred before Mark even resigned on October 3, 2021.

Technically, since Brad is not eligible to vote for a council member as he lacks the necessary authority and competence in this situation by law, yet he initiated and led discussions about the process, it's important to note that these conversations have been the subject of significant public interest and have been the reason for the borough's substantial expenditure on keeping them confidential.

From the outset, the borough has consistently refused to provide access to these conversations. They have lost not once but twice at the Office of the Open Records (OOR) regarding these emails and have filed three separate appeals with the courts in an attempt to overturn these decisions. However, the first two appeals were premature and ineffective.

Despite these setbacks, the borough continues to pay an attorney to pursue a valid appeal. However, it's worth noting that these conversations were procedural or factual in nature and cannot be covered by attorney-client privilege. This point was initially raised in my initial right-to-know request, and I was dismissed by the lawyer as being mistaken because it wasn't the law. Fortunately, I was proven correct.



LEGIS.STATE.PA.

US

Title 8

4h Like Reply Share



Richard Williams In addition to my request for the resignation letter of Marena Rasmus, which the borough also denied, I have raised concerns about the sudden and unexpected departure of the office manager and bookkeeper, who left on April 3, 2022. The borough has claimed that she resigned due to personal issues at home, but this explanation lacks transparency and raises questions about the circumstances leading up to her departure.

Well, when I reached out to her, she said, "I'm genuinely uncomfortable discussing anything related to Bath. I left there and want to leave it behind. While I had a good tenure and made friends there, the working environment wasn't something I wanted to be a part of anymore."

As a resident of Bath, you have the right to investigate the actions of your local officials and take any action you wish. However, I'd prefer to stay out of this matter.

It doesn't sound like someone with family issues. It's also right after the audit for 2021 should have been completed. However, they're resisting handing it over.

Now, let's talk about the council seat. There are emails from October 2021 between Bradford and the solicitor, as well as others involving Michelle and the mayor herself. The emails suggest a clear conflict of interest and nepotism. As you read through the email chain, you'll notice that they believe they know better than residents and don't want the seat to come up in the election. There are two more emails, and if you notice, a part is missing. The mayor refers to something Brad said that explained how they would handle the situation. The same Brad who prepared these documents requested under RTK, and three if you understand that they were embezzling because they were the mayor's responses at 4 a.m. makes it obvious that she was concerned about not having someone she could trust or control in that seat. Then, there's an email in December 2021 where the solicitor offered advice regarding Manny's appointment to the council. They later claimed that the advice was inaccurate after submitting it under affidavit. Only at the very end of the January meeting in 2022 did they mention that Mark was stepping down, and Manny was immediately given the seat.

Now, let's talk about the mayors' insurance. I handled their insurance claims and publicly criticized them for not turning over the checks she wrote for the payments. They even went as far as to edit original documents, which is a form of fraud. For instance, there's an email chain that's clearly tampered with. If you read it closely, you can tell that a message has been removed. However, using forensic document software for PDFs, I was able to prove it. The email chain was exported from Outlook on April 28, 2023, and then on May 4, 2023, it was modified using the Aspose LTD library in Visual Studio. This is a serious crime, especially since it's being done to a responsive document in a Request to Knowledge (RTK) request.

On top of this, there's a significant court case involving conversations being claimed as protected by attorney-client privilege involving Brad and his solicitor. It's quite evident that Brad's message, which was the one that was removed, was likely him disclosing these conversations. If that's the case, the privilege no longer applies.

So, to answer your question, if the borough had any chance of success, they would already have three new YouTube videos. The judge saw right through their lies, and the borough attorney is considered the top RTK lawyer in the state. He literally wrote the book on this subject, and this is an outcome that the current solicitor is fully aware of.

That's why he suddenly decided to leave municipal law. The borough is interviewing replacements for the solicitor at their next meeting.

Even this is just the tip of the iceberg. There's so much wrong going on here that it's hard to believe. Trust me, I understand. I've tried to explain exactly what's happening to people, but the reason they've been able to get away with what they've been doing for so long is that it's complex. On top of that, they manipulate data in a way that makes something complex almost impossible to track. They keep creating new bank accounts, only to use them to further obfuscate the situation, where no new accounts are actually needed. For example, two years ago, they moved trash to its own account, which was essentially a slush fund used for laundering. Now, they want a trash escrow account too. Why? Why would a new trash fund need its own secondary fund that would only serve to hide more money from the books?

Here's another example. The borough had budgeted \$30,000 for new computers this year. In 2022, they replaced the managers' PC, the secretary's PC, and the server. There are only two more main computers in the entire building: the one the mayor uses to talk smack on Facebook during the day when she's supposedly employed as a clerk. A clerk who also doesn't have any access to accounting, which is a significant part of a clerk's job to enter invoices, typically.

So, why do I endure all the negativity and villainization perpetuated by the borough? Because I firmly believe that anyone occupying my position would want to ensure that they are held fully accountable for their actions.

**4h Like Reply Share**

