

ObedientFemme

to

Dear Members:

I am in receipt of the document from the State of Washington, Department of Health, concerning the allegations that Anne A. Lawrence, MD, had inappropriately examined a female minor. Of the 10 page document provided to me, I have reproduced the most pertinent three pages as text.

Appendix G indicates that Anne Lawrence plea bargained in order to avoid a complete investigation. This, in my humble opinion, is not indicative of someone who is innocent.

If a charge of sexual impropriety had been directed at me, I would seek a thorough investigation to clear my name and remove any suspicion. Why would an innocent person do any less?

Lawrence, at one point, had two attorneys defending her. I doubt that the little girl's parents could afford the ensuing legal battle. Consequently, Lawrence is cleared by default.

Each of us, I'm sure, will reach his or her own conclusions. However, I must say that the activities do not sit well with me. I've seen this kind of thing before. A dirty doctor walks away unscathed but an innocent child, though not physically harmed, is emotionally scarred for life.

With Kind Regards,

Roberta Angela Dee

PS If anyone suspects that I might have doctored the document or that I omitted any pertinent information, the address is provided and you may request a copy of the original document.

STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
1300 SE Quince Street - P.O. Box 47866 - Olympia, WA 98504-7866

November 20, 1997

Anne A. Lawrence, MD

SUBJECT: Anne A. Lawrence, MD
Case No: 97-05-0042MD

Dear Dr. Lawrence:

The Medical Quality Assurance Commission considered an Adverse Action Report

After careful consideration of the records and information obtained during its investigation, the Medical Quality Assurance Commission has determined to close this case no cause for action because evidence did not support a violation. However, this case may be reconsidered if additional information is received that warrants further investigation. The complainant will also be advised of the decision to close this case.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter. If you have any question, please feel free to contact me at (360) 664-0244.

Respectfully,

Maryella Jansen, Program Manager
Medical Quality Assurance Commission

RPT029.doc 11/20/97

APPENDIX G
ACTIVITY REPORT

Date Action taken
05-16-97 Complaint intake.
05-20-97 Complaint reviewed. To case staffing G. Heye, M.D.
05-20-97 File assigned, V. Renz.
05-22-97 Call from Lee Norman. Lawrence resigned. Reason threat of adverse action. She plea bargained to stave off investigation. Unauthorized exam of patient. Respondent has been having bizarre behavior for a while. The patient was not harmed. Question of moral turpitude.
05-29-97 1440, Msg that Bruce Hilyer called. 206-546-6505. Attorney for Ann Lawrence.
05-30-97 1552, T/C from K. Barron, 206-223-1515. She has been retained by A. Lawrence. Attorney Bruce Hilyer had been retained by Lawrence to deal with the hospital issues. Lawrence now wants Barron to represent. Just wanted to alert me to this.
05-30-97 Faxed letter and notice of appearance, K. Barron.
06-03-97 Hard copy of letter dated 5/30/97 and notice of appearance from attorney Barron.
06-04-97 Courtesy copy of letter and notice of appearance rec'd.
06-05-97 T/C from Bruce Hilyer. Asked him to fax me a letter that he no longer represents Lawrence
06-09-97 Letter from Bruce Hilyer re: no longer attorney for Respondent.
07-01-97 1355, Msg. That Katherine Barron called about A. Lawrence. Call her

Case #97-05-05-0042MD/Anne A. Lawrence, M.D.
Page 6 of 9

Tomorrow, 206-223-1515
07-18-97 Call from K. Barron. 206-223-1515. Her client wants to get this over quickly so she can do other things.
08-06-97 Letter of cooperation to Respondent.
08-26-97 Data received from Respondent and attorney.
09-02-97 T/C to Lee Norman, M.D. 206-386-3090. Msg. Left with Christine re: August 8 letter. When is the data coming?
09-12-97 Data received from Swedish Hospital.
09-15-97 File submitted for Program Management review.

Case # 97-05-0042MD/Anne A. Lawrence, M.D.
Page 7 of 9

Loree Thomas

to

obedie...@aol.com (ObedientFemme) wrote in message news:<20021010165105...@mb-fe.aol.com>...

> Dear Members:
>
> I am in receipt of the document

We know where you got the document and how you heard about it... we were all reading the same newsgroup.

So ... some anonymous person with an axe to grind makes a post to usenet and YOU follow up on it? How pathetic is THAT? How does it feel to be used as a patsy by some anonymous asshole?

> Appendix G indicates that Anne Lawrence plea bargained in order to avoid a
> complete investigation. This, in my humble opinion, is not indicative of
> someone who is innocent.

IOW, You hate Anne and want to defame her, but even this document provides no actual proof.

What a putz you are.

Loree

Farlie A

to

"Loree Thomas" <lor...@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:387e7ef5.02101...@posting.google.com...

Loree.
Even if the document concerned is genuine, the use it's been put to might be defamatory (IANAL so treat this with caution)

Unless ObFemme has some kind of 'public-intrest' or qualified prvilge reason for posting it here (which I doubt), her post would IMO be considered slander (if not libel.)

Alex

Loree Thomas

to

"Farlie A" <nospam@farlie_a_at_hotmail.com> wrote in message news:<aof6f2j\$207\$1\$8300...@news.demon.co.uk>...

> "Loree Thomas" <lor...@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:387e7ef5.02101...@posting.google.com...
> > IOW, You hate Anne and want to defame her, but even this document
> > provides no actual proof.
> >
> >
> > Loree.
> Even if the document concerned is genuine, the use it's been
> put to might be defamatory (IANAL so treat this with caution)
>
> Unless ObFemme has some kind of 'public-intrest'
> or qualified prvilge reason for posting it here (which I
> doubt), her post would IMO be considered slander (if not libel.)

Not being a lawyer either, I have no idea if RAD's ill considered speculation about Anne's guilt or innocence rises to the level of libel or slander, nor do I care. Anne is a big girl and can (and does) take care of herself.

I just thought I'd point out that RAD was obviously reading her own bias into the document (which is what the original asshole hoped would happen) and simply displaying (once again) her complete lack of anything approaching decency or common sense (in my opinion, of course).

However you feel about Anne personally (and how many of you actually know her personally?) or about her website or published papers, this kind of attack should raise your hackles. It's kind of disheartening to me that no one else has spoken up about RADs despicable behavior.

I suppose that it just fits in with the usual defamation, negative speculation and outright lies that have become almost normal in the trans groups and so simply went unnoticed.

Loree

Diane

to

On 11 Oct 2002 14:15:13 -0700, lor...@yahoo.com (Loree Thomas) wrote:

>
> I suppose that it just fits in with the usual defamation, negative
> speculation and outright lies that have become almost normal in the
> trans groups and so simply went unnoticed.

More likely Loree most of us have Robert twit filtered out.

KarenA1013

to

>However you feel about Anne personally (and how many of you actually
>know her personally?) or about her website or published papers, this
>kind of attack should raise your hackles.

Around these parts, it's on of the milder atrocities.

I've never met, nor do I wish to... IMO when she was posting on the newsgroup she did not come across very favorably and her support of AGP theory (which IMO is way too simplistic - and just plain wrong in it's scope) has doen TS's a heck of a lot of harm.

BTW have you met Nicki yet?

- Karen

TransCOYOTE

to

In soc.support.transgendered Message-ID
<387e7ef5.02101...@posting.google.com>, on 11 Oct 2002 14:15:13

-0700, lor...@yahoo.com (Loree Thomas) wrote:

> It's kind of disheartening
> to me that no one else has spoken up about RADs despicable behavior.
>
> I suppose that it just fits in with the usual defamation, negative
> speculation and outright lies that have become almost normal in the
> trans groups and so simply went unnoticed.

Well yes, now that you mention it Loree, Obedient's straight-faced glee in posting something negative about Dr. Lawrence was rather unseemly. But typical. I initially skipped over the post, unused, when I saw who it was from and what it was about, having learned a while back that, for some reason, Obedient not only takes every opportunity but actually goes out of her way to manufacture opportunities to slam AL and anyone who so much as mentions her without also taking a gratuitous swipe. So I figured that no matter the content of the "File on Anne A. Lawrence, M.D.", there'd be more reliable and complete sources than Obedient -- that is, if I cared enough to pursue it, which so far I haven't.

FWIW, I suspect that Obedient, who is a politician at heart, doesn't really care one way or another about AL, but instead thinks that attacking her somehow curries favor among transsexuals who resent Lawrence's having introduced the concept of autognephilia to a broader audience. As best I can tell, for the last few years that's been AL's only real and substantial "crime." Personally, I admire her for having the courage to put into wider circulation an idea -- a relevant and rich idea, I'll add -- that she knew would be extremely controversial and that would make her few friends. I say more power to anyone willing to do that and shake up parochial little mindsets, which I'm sorry to say make up much of the current trans "community", quote unquote.

As for the current controversy that triggered this thread, I have no information and, honestly, just about as much real interest. I'll still recommend Anne Lawrence's site as one of less than a handful of truly useful and necessary trans resources on the internet -- running rings around these newsgroups, that's for sure. www.annelawrence.com/twr/

TransCOYOTE

Karen A.

to

Nicki <x...@xx.xx> wrote:
> Loree and I got together one of the very first weekends I was up here. We
> had a good time, including dinner at 'Ivar's Acres of Clams.' (Really,
> That's the name.)

I spent anout 3 Days in Seattle visiting a friend before taking a train down to Portland for SRS, but we enever went there! :)

> I'm getting pressed up against time for a trip back to MA to close on the
> sale of my house there.

Glad you sold it... I keep hearing more and more speculations that house prices are going to drop here a good bit in the near future!

- karen

Loree Thomas

to

Diane <diane...@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<uqeh58k...@news.supernews.com>...

Dohl!

You're right, of course.

My bad.

Loree

Loree Thomas

to

karen...@aol.com (KarenA1013) wrote in message news:<20021011174801...@mb-cg.aol.com>...

>
> BTW have you met Nicki yet?

Yes... we did lunch. Nice woman.

Loree

Karen A.

to

Loree Thomas <lor...@yahoo.com> wrote:

She is very shy ... and it takes a lot to get her to speak her mind...

Did she talk about Dr. O and/or laser Skin resurfacing? :~)

- karen

Loree Thomas

to

kap...@attbi.com (Karen A.) wrote in message news:<1fjx03p.1b81o9o3dg8z2N%kaa...@attbi.com>...

Look here Karen, your long running antagonism towards Nicki is well known and I do NOT appreciate your using me as a foil to get your digs in.

As a matter of fact she didn't talk about Dr. O... but we did talk about you. I must say she had a better opinion of you than I do.

Loree

Karen A.

to

Loree Thomas <lor...@yahoo.com> wrote:
> Look here Karen, your long running antagonism towards Nicki is well
> known and I do NOT appreciate your using me as a foil to get your digs
> in.

If you knew Nicki better, you would know that she would likely take offense (or not much - depending on mood) at that. She know she tends to be overly 'informative' at times. That was friendly needing ... something she does more than a little of.

> As a matter of fact she didn't talk about Dr. O... but we did talk
> about you.

How did i come up? I've not had that much of a presense in the newsgroups for awhile now and I've seen her in person only about 4 times in the last 5 years.

>I must say she has a better opinion of you than I do.

<shrug> I've stopped needing the approval of people I've never met (and most I have) a while back. In any case if you think you really know either Nicki *or* me, I suggest you reconsider.

- karen