

# BOSA: Taxpayers' attack on Crisp not personal

By Rose Dodge  
THE BERLIN DAILY SUN

**BERLIN**—Richard Bosa says city attorney Jack Crisp is off base with his charge that the Taxpayers Association's campaign to get rid of him and have the city sue him for malpractice is nothing more than a personal vendetta.

His problem, Bosa said, is he is sensitive to a survey revealing how much the city has spent on legal fees the last five years, and it shows taxpayers can't afford that kind of money.

"I don't even know him [Crisp]. Why should I have a vendetta? How can he accuse me of a personal vendetta when he has all our [taxpayers] money?" he

see BOSA page 5

BOSA from page one

said.

The city has hired big, expensive law firms and political ones at that, Bosa said. He questions whether or not the city does hire lawyers for political reasons under Crisp's direction, but assumes it does. Taxpayers can't afford that kind of advice if it is true, he said. It is one of the questions the group wants answered when it meets with City Manager Mitch Berkowitz next Wednesday, he added.

Bosa took exception to several remarks Crisp made in response to the group's call for his dismissal this week. The attorney and Berkowitz had stated they did not know how the association had arrived at the \$354,743 figure it said was amount the city has paid the Crisp as city attorney in the last five years. According to Bosa the bottom line figures, the money to Crisp and the remainder to other lawyers which totaled \$597,875 in that time period, were figures given to them by the city's comptroller when they requested them.

The taxpayers group is sticking by its guns in asking for answers to its questions concerning what the city pays out in legal fees, said Bosa. The group is concerned because in looking at the legal vouchers for the city, which are not itemized, they can't even determine how much of that amount has been spent on the Richard Grondin

case alone: a case they feel the city has botched because of Crisp's advice and one that has cost the city taxpayers dearly. They question the city's latest action of petitioning the Superior Court to allow them to place the officer's back pay in a bank account until the issue of whether or not the court had jurisdiction to grant him an injunction preventing the city from firing him in 1991 when there was a question whether it should have been handled through the arbitration process. The group wants to know why the city didn't dispute the court ruling in favor of Grondin when it took place. These are the questions the group wants answers to, he said.

Court records show that the city did take such action in Coos County Superior Court in May and June of 1991. Attorney Kathleen Peahl of the law firm of Wadleigh, Starr, Peters Dunn and Chiesa filed an objection to Grondin's petition for a temporary and permanent injunction to prevent the police commission from firing him and it was denied by Judge Harold Perkins on June 6, 1991. He then granted Grondin the injunction. Peahl had argued that injunctive relief was not appropriate in the case since Grondin had an adequate remedy either through grievance procedure or alternatively at law and that the police department's grievance procedure was the exclusive remedy available to him.