

Email to [glenn dot hagele at usaeyes dot org](mailto:glenn_dot_hagele_at_usaeyes_dot_org)

<http://www.USAEyes.org>

<http://www.ComplicatedEyes.org>

I am not a doctor.

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)



You must [Sign in](#) before you can post messages.

To post a message you must first [join this group](#).

Please update your nickname on the [subscription settings](#) page before posting.

You do not have the permission required to post.

[View profile](#)

**serebel** You're as bad as Link when it comes to posting these baby whines, Sandy.

Feb 25 2006,  
1:22 am

You're as bad as Link when it comes to posting these baby whines, Sandy.

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)



You must [Sign in](#) before you can post messages.

To post a message you must first [join this group](#).

Please update your nickname on the [subscription settings](#) page before posting.

You do not have the permission required to post.

**Glenn -** [View](#)  
**USAEyes.org** [profile](#)

Feb 25 2006,  
2:04 am

>LC, what is interesting is that Hagele is doing the investigating  
>himself. Usually that is handled for you if there is litigation  
>involved.

Wrong again, Keller. **Investigators** in **five states** have been doing the bulk of the work, but I do what I can.

> He either has a lazy, cheap attorney or he's just trying to  
>intimidate me.

My attorneys are quite energetic, outrageously over-priced (but worth every cent), and "as if" Keller could be intimidated with mere words

in a newsgroup. I suspect much more would be required.

> Nothing he could possibly dig up on me (nothing which  
>is actual fact and not some made up crap like the "business deals gone  
>south" lie of his) would embarrass me.

Perhaps you would not be embarrassed. Stranger things have happened.  
Hanson does not seem to be embarrassed by being sentenced to jail.  
Heck, he won't even acknowledge it.

>What's next Glenn? Gonna  
>obtain my medical records and tell everyone how long I was in labor for  
>each baby? Post my grades from high school?

As far as I know, these things have nothing to do with refractive  
surgery.

>What is so disgusting is that Glenn thinks Brent is terrible for  
>discovering personal things about him and posting them,

And you don't, Keller? You don't think it is disgusting to publish  
personal things about someone that have nothing to do with the issue  
at hand? You sure got your panties in a bunch when I pointed out that  
it could happen to you, too.

>and then Glenn  
>turns around and does the same to me.

Not true, Keller, but I did respond to your implied threat regarding  
what my ex may or may not have said a decade and a half ago. I  
responded by pointing out that if the shoe is on the other foot you  
probably would not like it. Your tirade of late would indicate I was  
right. It seems I touched a nerve by showing the tables can be turned  
on you.

>RT scolds me for simply  
>commenting on what Brent found, but doesn't say a word when Glenn posts  
>what he thinks he's found out about me.

Keller, Hanson's personal attack on me was/is unwarranted, unprovoked,  
and has nothing to do with refractive surgery.

I responded to your direct statement about me. Apparently Keller

cannot see the difference between publicizing irrelevant old history and suggesting that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

>Glenn thinks he's being coy by asking if it's now time to post  
>information about my divorce, rather than just coming out and posting  
>it.

There is no purpose in posting such information, as far as I can tell. Such information has nothing to do with refractive surgery. That is exactly the point I was making, Keller. A point that you seem adamant to refuse to see. I suppose you will blame that on Lasik too.

You talk about what my ex may or may not have said 15 years ago, I point out that you (and probably everyone for that matter) have a few people who have less than flattering things to say about you about issues that have nothing to do with refractive surgery. The shoe was simply pointed at the other foot. You don't seem to be able to deal with being put in the same situation as you suggest putting me into.

Brent Hanson of LasiFraud.com being found by a Texas judge to be a danger to a refractive surgeon (who had nothing to do with Hanson's own surgery), publishing anti-Lasik anti-doctor websites against court orders, trying to hide his ownership of those websites, and defying a court order to not defame a refractive surgeon actually has something to do with this newsgroup.

The suggestion of having YOUR personal dirty laundry aired in public seems to have caught your attention, but you don't seem to think it inappropriate to suggest that mine should be aired. That's being a hypocrite, Keller.

>He accomplished what he set out to do, but attempted to look  
>innocent doing so.

Keller clearly does not have the foggiest idea what I set out to do.

>Then he tries to cover up what he has done by  
>stating that he was only re-posting information I've already posted,  
>which is an outright lie.

I have not stated that you have posted anything about your bad business dealings or anything like that. As far as I know you have

not. I have not posted any such information so I could not possibly be "re-posting" such information either originally posted by you or by me. Heaven knows you do have an imagination - twisted though it may be.

>He posts a question about my "business deals gone south" which implies  
>that I've had business deals that went south, seemingly without coming  
>right out and making a bold statement.

Yes Keller, I asked what you would think of someone posting details of your business deals that have gone south and negative things others have said about you in direct response to your suggestion that something said by my ex-wife during a divorce 15 years ago should be published. The point, which seems to have escaped you completely, is that you should not suggest doing to others what you would not want done yourself. It's called the "Golden Rule", Keller. You may want to look it up sometime.

>The net effect is just what he  
>wanted. He has people thinking that he's found something about bad  
>business deals I've made and justifies what he is doing with his  
>statement that he's only re-posting what I've already posted.

Read my post, Keller. I questioned how you would feel if bad things about you (that have nothing to do with refractive surgery) were made public in this forum. I have not made those things public. I have not said that I would make them public. I asked rhetorically if it is time for you to see your dirty laundry aired, if you are going to be talking about what an ex may or may not have said about me.

> Outright  
>lie again.

The opposite of the truth is a lie. When you distort my words into something that was not said it's not surprising that what you come up with is a lie. It's just that I didn't say it.

>I really don't think a judge or jury would think his little question  
>game is very funny.

I don't know about a judge or jury, but I find you bringing up publishing what may be in my personal divorce papers appalling, crude, and so very typical of you. I find your outrage that I suggest the

same thing could happen to you very typical of the hypocrisy that you drag around with you in this forum.

>I think they would see it just as being just as  
>intentional as it is. Pre-meditated and intentional.

Is that how you see what you said? It is exactly how I saw it and I responded appropriately.

Glenn Hagele  
Executive Director  
USAeyes.org

"Consider and Choose With Confidence"

Email to glenn dot hagele at usaeyes dot org

<http://www.USAEyes.org>

<http://www.ComplicatedEyes.org>

I am not a doctor.

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)



You must [Sign in](#) before you can post messages.

To post a message you must first [join this group](#).

Please update your nickname on the [subscription settings](#) page before posting.

You do not have the permission required to post.

[View profile](#)

On 24 Feb 2006 21:17:56 -0800, "Sandy" <sa...@savvysneaks.com> wrote: >I didn't mention "a case of contempt, lies, threats, fines and >incarceration", did I? Yes, actually you have. > There you go again. I was speaking in >generalities and you cannot seem to see past this one particular case. Then please clarify exactly what generalities to which you were speaking that have anything to do with refractive surgery. Glenn Hagele Executive Director USAeyes.org "Consider and Choose With Confidence" Email to glenn dot hagele at usaeyes dot org <http://www.USAEyes.org> <http://www.ComplicatedEyes.org> I am not a doctor.

Glenn -  
USAeyes.  
org

Feb 25 2006,  
2:07 am

On 24 Feb 2006 21:17:56 -0800, "Sandy" <sa...@savvysneaks.com> wrote: