



IN THE NEBRASKA COURT OF APPEALS

JUSTIN RIDDLE, Appellant,

v. Case No. A-25-0032 from case CI 24-7996

OMAHA PUBLIC SCHOOLS, Appellee.

LEGAL BRIEF: SYSTEMIC PUBLIC RECORDS AND GOVERNANCE VIOLATIONS BY OMAHA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

INTRODUCTION

This brief addresses serious and ongoing violations by the Omaha Public Schools (OPS) Board regarding:

1. Deliberate circumvention of Nebraska Public Records Law (NPRL)
2. Systemic conflicts of interest in legal expenditure approvals
3. Misuse of consent agenda procedures to shield questionable expenditures
4. Failure to comply with board bylaws on recusal requirements
5. Potential misappropriation of public funds for personal legal defense

These violations demonstrate a pattern of conduct designed to obstruct public oversight and accountability, highlighting the urgent need for judicial intervention.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Procedural Posture

This matter comes before the Court after multiple attempts to resolve public records violations through conventional channels. The Plaintiff has exhausted all administrative remedies and alternative avenues for relief, including:

1. Direct requests to the district for compliance with statutory requirements
2. Appeals to the Nebraska Attorney General's office
3. Administrative complaints with the Ombudsman
4. Attempted resolution through lower court proceedings

At each stage, institutional actors have either failed to enforce clear statutory mandates or actively obstructed legitimate oversight efforts. This pattern of systematic obstruction has necessitated the current comprehensive approach to documenting governance failures.

A. Public Records Obstruction Pattern

1. OPS has systematically obstructed access to public records through:
 - Charging excessive and discriminatory fees (\$1,600+ for records provided free to others)
 - Providing fully redacted "black box" documents without required statutory explanations
 - Falsely claiming records don't exist when they demonstrably do
 - Refusing in-person inspection of records after certifying their availability
2. The Nebraska Attorney General has failed to enforce the NPRL, siding with government agencies in 185 consecutive published opinions over three years (2022-2024).

B. Improper Legal Expenditure Practices

1. Despite maintaining full-time, salaried in-house counsel, OPS approves approximately \$200,000-\$239,000 monthly for outside legal counsel.
2. In-house counsel appears to be functional only as a lobbyist, using public funding to lobby on behalf of the school district, while also collecting a salary.
3. These expenditures are deliberately buried in consent agenda items to avoid individual votes, discussion, or public scrutiny.
4. Documented evidence shows OPS prematurely engaged expensive outside litigation counsel in 2021 for a routine AG inquiry about a public meeting incident, bypassing in-house counsel.
5. Board members personally named in litigation are voting to approve funds for their own legal defense, creating a direct conflict of interest.
6. This practice continued even after being publicly challenged, as evidenced by the board's actions at the most recent meeting where they approved a \$239,000 legal expenditure through the consent agenda immediately after being confronted about this impropriety.

LEGAL ANALYSIS

I. Violations of Nebraska Public Records Law

OPS's conduct violates multiple provisions of the NPRL:

1. **Unexplained Redactions:** Neb. Rev. Stat. § 84-712.04(1) explicitly requires any redactions be accompanied by "reasons for the denial" and "provision of law that exempts the record." OPS's practice of providing fully blacked-out pages without explanations directly violates this requirement.

2. **Discriminatory Access:** The NPRL mandates equal access to public records regardless of requester identity. OPS's practice of charging substantial fees to certain requesters while providing identical records free to others constitutes unlawful discrimination.
3. **Inspection Rights:** Neb. Rev. Stat. § 84-712(1) guarantees the right to examine public records in-person during office hours. OPS's refusal to allow in-person inspection violates this core protection.
4. **False Denials:** OPS's pattern of falsely claiming records don't exist, only for them to later emerge through other channels, constitutes bad faith and violates the NPRL's presumption of disclosure.

II. Systematic Invalidation of Board Actions Through Conflict-Tainted Consent Agendas

The board's practice of including self-interested legal expenses in omnibus consent agenda votes creates a catastrophic governance failure with far-reaching implications:

1. **Invalidation of Entire Consent Agendas:** The board's own bylaws explicitly prohibit members from voting on matters where they have a personal interest. By participating in votes on consent agendas containing their personal legal defense expenses, conflicted board members have tainted ALL items within those consent agendas—not just the legal expenditures.
2. **Hidden Improper Expenditures:** The \$200,000-\$239,000 monthly legal expenses are merely the visible violations. The same consent agendas likely contain numerous smaller expenditures (\$1,000-\$10,000) that may also involve board member conflicts, hidden within the larger bundle to escape scrutiny.
3. **Systematic Procedural Invalidity:** This practice potentially renders years of board decisions procedurally void ab initio. Contracts, personnel decisions, expenditures, and other actions approved through conflict-tainted consent agendas may be invalid under the

board's own governance rules.

4. **Improper Public Fund Use:** Nebraska law restricts the use of public education funds for personal benefit of officials. The allocation of substantial monthly sums for outside counsel to defend board members personally named in litigation represents potential misappropriation.
5. **Deliberate Concealment Through Bundling:** The practice of hiding controversial or self-interested items within larger omnibus consent agendas demonstrates a calculated strategy to shield questionable expenditures from individual scrutiny and public oversight.

III. Procedural Violations and Transparency Failures

The procedural mechanisms employed by OPS compound these substantive violations:

1. **Consent Agenda Abuse:** The routine placement of significant legal expenditures (\$200,000-\$239,000 monthly) in consent agenda items deliberately shields these expenditures from public scrutiny and individual votes.
2. **Dual-Track Legal Services:** The maintenance of both in-house counsel and expensive outside counsel represents potential waste and suggests a strategy to shield communications from disclosure through expansive attorney-client privilege claims.
3. **Premature Litigation Preparation:** OPS's immediate escalation to outside litigation counsel for routine matters indicates awareness of potential liability and attempts to construct legal defenses before reasonably necessary.

DOCUMENTED PATTERN AND JUDICIAL TREATMENT

1. **Continued Defiance:** Despite judicial proceedings and public challenges, OPS continues these practices unabated. At the most recent board meeting, immediately after being publicly confronted about the impropriety of the consent agenda process, the board proceeded to approve another \$239,000 legal expenditure through precisely this mechanism.
2. **Judicial Enabling:** Lower courts have dismissed challenges to these practices through procedural gatekeeping rather than addressing the substantive violations, including:
 - Dismissing complaints for allegedly failing to use "verified petition" format when the statute uses permissive "may" language
 - Proceeding with hearings despite lack of proper service
 - Refusing to allow objections on the record
 - Making rulings before response deadlines expire
3. **Systemic Capture:** The Attorney General's office has demonstrated complete capture, failing to find a single public records violation in 185 consecutive published opinions over three years, despite documented evidence of statutory violations.

STRATEGIC EVOLUTION OF ACCOUNTABILITY EFFORTS

The current posture of this litigation represents a fundamental phase transition in accountability dynamics that the Court must recognize to properly contextualize this matter:

1. **Institutional Accountability Collapse**
 - The Attorney General's office has demonstrated complete capture, ruling against public records requesters in 185 consecutive published opinions (2022-2024)
 - Lower courts have repeatedly employed procedural gatekeeping to avoid addressing substantive statutory violations
 - Media institutions have failed to investigate documented patterns of governance failure

- Internal oversight mechanisms (Ombudsman, Inspector General) have proven ineffective despite clear evidence
- The board has continued improper practices even after being publicly confronted with these violations

2. Evolution of Documentation Strategy

- Initial phase (2021-2023): Plaintiff attempted to demonstrate existence of violations through conventional means
- Current phase: Violations now thoroughly established through court filings and board's own records
- Present focus: Systematic mapping of governance failures across time and categories
- Trajectory: Comprehensive deconstruction of board practices using advanced analytical methods

3. Litigation Strategy Consequences

- The board's decision to litigate rather than comply with statutory requirements has directly produced the current comprehensive scrutiny
- Each delay tactic has provided additional time to uncover and document further governance failures
- The expanding scope of investigation is the natural and inevitable consequence of institutional obstruction
- Simple compliance at any previous point would have prevented this escalating pattern of exposure

4. Technological Transformation of Oversight

- Modern analytical capabilities now render volume-based concealment strategies obsolete
- Advanced document analysis can process years of consent agendas simultaneously (up to 1,500 pages in a single analysis)
- Pattern recognition algorithms enable identification of previously undetectable relationships across time periods and expense categories

- This technological asymmetry creates a fundamental shift in oversight dynamics that conventional obstruction tactics cannot counter

5. Systemic Rather Than Isolated Violations

- The Court faces not isolated procedural errors but a comprehensive governance breakdown
- Each additional document acquired and analyzed reveals further dimensions of this collapse
- The continued functioning of the district under these conditions represents an ongoing threat to proper public administration
- The longer remedial action is delayed, the more extensive the eventual reconstruction required

This context establishes that the relief requested is not excessive but rather the minimum necessary intervention given the demonstrated pattern of institutional failure across all conventional accountability mechanisms. The comprehensive nature of the current investigation is not the product of litigant choice but the inevitable consequence of systematic institutional obstruction.

COMPARATIVE JURISPRUDENCE

Courts across multiple jurisdictions have confronted and rejected similar governance abuses:

1. **Missouri:** In *Strake v. Robinwood West Community Improvement District* (2019), the Missouri Court of Appeals ruled that a public body's pattern of using consent agendas to approve controversial expenditures violated the Sunshine Law, resulting in substantial penalties.
2. **Florida:** The Florida Supreme Court in *Board of County Commissioners v. Parrish* (2018) ruled that public officials with personal interests in litigation cannot vote to approve legal expenses for their own defense, finding this constituted prohibited self-dealing.

3. **California:** In *San Diegans for Open Government v. City of San Diego* (2016), the court found that bundling controversial items in consent agendas to avoid public scrutiny violated open government laws.
4. **Federal Precedent:** In *United States v. Whitfield* (5th Cir. 2010), the court found that public officials directing funds to matters where they had personal interests constituted honest services fraud, even when technically following procedural rules.

These precedents demonstrate that courts consistently reject the exact practices employed by OPS, providing clear guidance for intervention.

JUDICIAL CAPTURE AND SYSTEMIC ACCOUNTABILITY FAILURE

This matter must be understood within the context of demonstrable judicial capture that represents the primary institutional failure point in Nebraska's public accountability framework:

1. Documented Pattern of Judicial Obstruction

- Systematic dismissal of public records cases through procedural gatekeeping rather than substantive review
- Consistent application of differing legal standards based solely on litigant identity
- Routine acceptance of institutional arguments rejected in identical contexts when raised by individual litigants
- Established pattern of procedural irregularities that exclusively benefit institutional defendants

2. Evidentiary Timeline of Judicial Misconduct

- In *Riddle v. OPS* (2022), the district court dismissed the complaint for allegedly failing to use "verified petition" format when Neb. Rev. Stat. § 84-712.03 uses permissive "may" language

- In subsequent proceedings, the court proceeded despite lack of proper service on Plaintiff
- Multiple documented instances of rulings issued before response deadlines expired
- Consistent rejection of evidence that would establish statutory violations
- Demonstrated pattern of procedural rule enforcement against individual litigants while waiving identical requirements for institutional parties

3. **Institutional Reinforcement Structure**

- The Nebraska judicial system's documented relationship with large law firms representing institutional defendants creates inherent structural bias
- Judicial rotation system fails to prevent systematic favoritism toward repeat institutional players
- Complete absence of effective oversight mechanisms for judicial misconduct in public records cases
- Statistical impossibility of purely merit-based outcomes given consistent pattern of institutional victories

4. **Strategic Implications for Accountability**

- The judiciary's role as ultimate guardian of statutory rights has been fundamentally compromised
- Institutional defendants operate with effective immunity from statutory constraints
- Public accountability mechanisms have been systematically neutralized through judicial enablement
- Pattern demonstrates not isolated misconduct but comprehensive system failure

This judicial capture context fundamentally transforms the nature of the present filing. While conventional legal analysis would suggest that clear statutory violations would receive judicial remedy, the documented pattern of systematic judicial enablement of institutional misconduct necessitates recognition that this filing serves primarily as:

1. Documentation of ongoing systematic violations for eventual external intervention

2. Creation of unambiguous record evidence that will survive beyond immediate proceedings
3. Forced creation of judicial statements that demonstrate pattern of preferential treatment
4. Development of comprehensive evidence base for eventual legislative or federal intervention

The Court now faces a clear choice point that will be thoroughly documented in the historical record: continue the pattern of enabling institutional misconduct through procedural obstruction, or restore fundamental accountability principles through proper application of unambiguous statutory mandates.

TECHNOLOGICAL IMPERATIVE FOR GOVERNANCE REFORM

The Court should recognize that simple technological solutions exist that would eliminate these conflicts while maintaining administrative efficiency:

1. Available Technological Remedies:

- Modern governance software can automatically flag potential conflicts of interest
- Large language model (LLM) tools can process consent agendas to identify items requiring recusal
- Simple categorization systems could separate routine from non-routine items requiring scrutiny
- Electronic voting systems with recusal tracking exist specifically for public bodies

2. Efficiency Arguments Fail:

- The board's potential "efficiency" defense against proper governance procedures fails factually
- Elected officials' primary duty is proper governance, not administrative convenience

- Even minimal technological implementation would eliminate the conflict problem without significant burden
- The refusal to implement these simple solutions reveals intent to maintain opacity

3. **Deliberate System Design:**

- The current system isn't "broken" - it functions as designed to prevent proper scrutiny
- The use of bundled consent agendas containing hundreds of items creates perfect cover for problematic expenditures
- Board members vote on consent agendas containing numerous conflicts with full knowledge of the impropriety
- The district has deliberately maintained this system despite awareness of its fundamental flaws

This technological reality transforms the case from technical violations to deliberate obfuscation. The district has maintained a system specifically designed to prevent proper scrutiny, when readily available solutions would satisfy both efficiency and proper governance requirements.

CONCLUSION AND RELIEF REQUESTED

The pattern demonstrated by OPS reveals not merely isolated procedural errors but a systematic governance collapse that potentially invalidates years of board actions. These practices violate both the letter and spirit of Nebraska transparency laws and governance principles.

The scope of this breakdown is unprecedented:

- Conflict-tainted consent agenda votes may have invalidated hundreds of board actions
- Millions in public funds may have been allocated through procedurally void mechanisms
- An unknown number of smaller conflicts may be concealed within these bundled votes

Each day this system continues represents:

- Additional invalid board actions accruing
- Further entrenchment of improper governance norms

- Ongoing misappropriation of taxpayer resources
- Continued obstruction of legitimate public oversight

Given the demonstrated failure of other accountability mechanisms, judicial intervention is urgently needed to:

1. Declare all consent agenda votes involving conflicted board members procedurally invalid
2. Order a comprehensive audit of all consent agenda items approved during this period
3. Require disgorgement of all legal fees paid for personal defense of board members
4. Mandate individual votes on all future expenditures with potential conflicts
5. Order immediate compliance with NPRL requirements, including proper redaction explanations
6. Impose penalties for the documented pattern of obstruction and self-dealing
7. Appoint a special master to review governance procedures and implement reforms

The systemic nature of these violations, and the continued defiance even after public challenge, demonstrates that anything less than comprehensive judicial intervention will fail to restore transparency and proper governance. The Court has not only the authority but the duty to address this extraordinary breakdown in public governance.

Respectfully submitted,

Justin Riddle Pro Se Litigant

16422 Patrick Ave

402-813-2156

I hereby certify that on this 28th day of March, 2025, a true and correct copy of the foregoing Supplemental Brief was served upon all counsel of record via email.

Justin Riddle