

Subject: : Conservation

Topic: : Gag Order Imposed on Children

Re: Gag Order Imposed on Children

Author: : FarmerDave

Date: : 2013/8/8 15:21:23

URL:

Quote:

RyanR wrote:

From the article: *During the proceedings, the attorney representing Range Resources, James Swetz, reaffirmed the company sought the gag order on the children. "I guess our position is it does apply to the whole family. We would certainly enforce it," he told the court.*

*Williams Gas/Laurel Mountain Midstream and MarkWest Energy were also defendants in the case.*

*However, once that gag order came to light, two years after the August 2011 proceedings, the company told reporters it did not agree with Swetz's comments. "We don't believe the settlement applies to children," a Range Resources spokesman told the Gazette. He went on to tell the paper that there was no evidence that the Hallowich family was affected by exposure to gas development.*

IMO, it's grandstanding BS by their lawyer which is why I believe he used the words "I guess" in his comments. Even the company supposedly publicly said (as told to the reporters) "they don't believe the agreement extends to the children." As far as the kids are concerned, they can wipe their butts with that gag order because that's about all it's useful for when it comes to them. Again, this is only my opinion.

At the very least I certainly can't see this applying to them AFTER they turn 18. Heck, they didn't sign it and as adults shouldn't be held accountable for it.

LOL!, I knew I was missing something. However, I still have to wonder why they would insist on a gag order like that.

I agree with Greenghost that the lawyers during the original settlement acted sleazy. I also agree with you that Swetz was grandstanding and bullying and he likely gets paid handsomely to do that and provide interpretation that gives greatest advantage to his client.

I also agree that since the company is on record saying it doesn't apply to the kids, then it doesn't. Also, it wouldn't apply anyway once they turned 18.

Disclaimer: I do not think, nor did I say or imply that all lawyers are sleazy.

