

IMMEDIATE PRESS RELEASE

October 16, 2018

Contact: Barb Hernandez

Phone: 608-235-1623

Email: bchonpoint@gmail.com

**ED WALL RELEASES THE “UNPUBLISHED CHAPTER” OF HIS BEST-SELLING BOOK,
UNETHICAL; LIFE IN SCOTT WALKER’S CABINET AND THE DIRTY SIDE OF POLITICS**

New details provide proof that Scott Walker and Brad Schimel are lying about what happened when they decided to destroy Ed Wall’s career

In this unpublished chapter, Wall goes into detail regarding the corrupted state personnel appeal system that forced him into a situation where the only people who would be allowed to hear from him and judge his credibility were three of Governor Scott Walker’s political appointees, serving the attorney general of the same political party. Walker merely wanted Wall and his story to disappear because of his political exposure with Lincoln Hills.

“In the past few weeks, the Walker administration has continued to lie about what happened to make me leave a job I loved with the Department of Justice (DOJ),” said Ed Wall. “To be very clear, I did not violate open records laws. I am releasing this final chapter to provide details about what really happened to me when Walker and Brad Schimel decided it was time for me to go. Here are the details.”

Excerpt One from “The Unpublished Chapter” described the deposition by Attorney Lester Pines of Deputy Attorney General Andy Cook with regards to the DOJ intentionally violating the open records laws in trying to create a case against Wall for *suggesting* someone *evade* the open records law:

Attorney Lester Pines also examined the issue involving the release of the records to the press in violation of the public records laws:

Lester: *And this document, Exhibit 19, was a document that was generated in the course of the disciplinary proceedings with regard to Mr. Wall, correct?*

Cook: *Correct. Correct.*

Lester: *And you're aware of a requirement in the open records law that a person be given notice about the release of documents that are generated during a disciplinary proceeding, correct?*

Cook: *Correct.*

Lester: *And Mr. Wall wasn't given notice of this, was he?*

Cook: *No.*

Lester: *Before it was released?*

Cook: *No.*

- more -

In this exchange, the deputy attorney general admitted under oath that the DOJ had intentionally violated the open records laws, which he was aware of, not once, but twice in an effort to influence public opinion.

Excerpt two:

So naturally, my interpretation of what a public record was would have had everything to do with the manner with which I sent the document and the comments I made. However, it would turn out that Connell, the third in charge of the DOJ and senior counsel to the attorney general, did not really care what my intentions were and he also apparently did not fully understand the open records laws either:

Lester: *Okay. But you are the special counsel to the attorney general in the state of Wisconsin, right?*

Connell: *Senior counsel.*

Lester: *Senior counsel, excuse me.*

Connell: *That's okay.*

Lester: *And in that capacity, you are familiar with the public records law of the state of Wisconsin?*

Connell: *I have, I would say, a good working knowledge, as well as folks I turn to when I have specific questions.*

Lester: *And you are aware that a draft document is not a public record, correct?*

Connell: *The law in this area is somewhat in flux, and given my things I work on, there's been some cases in this area recently about drafts dealing with the Wisconsin Idea I seem to remember recently from Dane County Circuit Court and I haven't read in a while. That sounds right, Mr. Pines, but I'm not -- that sounds like -- I don't think you're trying to trick me, but that sounds correct, but I don't know that I would agree with that for sure without doing some research.*

Lester: *And I'm not trying to trick you, but the issue of what's a draft and what isn't a draft is sometimes difficult to determine, correct?*

Connell: *That I would agree with, in light of the state of the law.*

There you have it. Not only could the attorney general's primary advisor not determine what was a draft and what was not, but he would have to do some research to make a determination. Yet Brad Schimel and his appointees drew their own conclusions on a law they didn't really understand and used it as a pretext to end my career.

Third Excerpt from the deposition of Governor Scott Walker's Chief of Staff, Rich Zipperer:

Lester: *Taking a look at the first paragraph on the letter from Mr. Wall to you, DOJ-E-90.*

Zipperer: *DOJ-E-90.*

Lester: *Can you review that. Just take a moment to review that paragraph.*

Zipperer: *Sure.*

(Witness examines document)

Lester: *All right. Have you had a chance to review it?*

Zipperer: *More or less, yes.*

Lester: *You didn't believe that Mr. Wall was directing you to, directing you to shred the document?*

Zipperer: *No.*

It all boiled down to the simple fact that the person receiving the note at the center of my termination did not believe I was instructing him to shred the document, despite what they would let play out in the media without so much as a word in defense. Connell and Cook, who initially claimed that I was directing Zipperer to shred the document, now testified behind closed doors that I hadn't directed anyone to do anything, but they would not say that to the press. They also testified that draft documents were not releasable and my document was a draft as Zipperer clearly understood it and admitted as much. Yet, Schimel said that he had learned that I had "directed" someone to shred a document that he would portray as a "public record" despite it being a draft. So, with all of that, why wouldn't the DOJ even ask the person receiving the note if they felt they were being directed to shred a public record? Because, it would have interfered with their mission. In fact, the DOJ never interviewed Zipperer or anyone else in their "investigation".

The Unpublished Chapter and additional documents are available for free on this website:

Unethicalbook.com

###