

Augustine B. Jimenez III
Attorney at Law

Augustine B. Jimenez III, P.C.
2999 N. 44th St., Ste. 318
Phoenix, AZ 85018
Tel: 602-263-7875
Fax: 602-865-8376
Attorney@abjlaw.com

PRESS RELEASE

March 2, 2018

On behalf of our clients Mr. and Mrs. Wilhelmsen, I would like to take this opportunity to address some of the mischaracterizations and false claims made by Mr. Rodriguez in his "Response" to our client's Notice of Claim. Although we have not received a copy of Mr. Rodriguez's response, the press has reported certain accusations made therein.

First, Rodriguez contends that our clients tried to extort him. This claim is false. Our primary concern was for our client's emotional well-being, and we therefore offered to try and resolve our client's claims privately. We believed that it may also be in Mr. Rodriguez's best interests to resolve these claims privately, so last Fall we invited Mr. Rodriguez's former counsel to interview our clients and review our evidence personally. The attorney accepted this invitation, but was unwilling to make a settlement offer. Therefore, the next step in resolving my clients' claims required them to file a Notice of Claim, as they were intending to file claims against a State of Arizona employee. Although we were aware that the Notice would be a public document, and that the media might find it and distribute it throughout the Internet, that was never our intent. By contrast, there was no requirement for Mr. Rodriguez to file a Response to our Notice, but he chose to do so apparently to attack and demean my clients publicly, in an attempt to control the public narrative.

The Response supposedly states that the timing of the Notice of Claim, filed on the day after the University played its bowl game was "vicious, cut-throat, and explainable only as the ultimate threat to extort" Rodriguez. My clients waited until after the bowl game to file their Notice as the ultimate show of respect to the athletes and other staff members of the University, whom they did not want to be affected by any negative publicity. If they were truly vindictive, they would have filed the Notice the week before the bowl game and leaked it to the news media to make sure that Rodriguez and his staff were inundated with questions about the allegations, while they were trying to prepare for the game. My clients also hoped that perhaps the Notice would not be headline news if they waited until after the football season had concluded.

In regard to Rodriguez's claim that a polygraph test he took proves he did not "expose" or "show" his genitals to Melissa, my clients never accused him of that specific act; they claimed that Rodriguez grasped his penis underneath his athletic shorts, while in a closed door meeting with just Melissa and himself. If Rodriguez believes that the victim must have actually seen his genitals in order for sexual harassment to have occurred, he truly does not understand the concept of sexual harassment.

In my clients' prior press release, also necessitated by public attacks by Rodriguez, they addressed Melissa's unwillingness to cooperate with the University's investigation, which was apparently addressed again in Rodriguez's Response. Once again, this so-called "thorough investigation" initiated in October by the University of Arizona into Rodriguez's misconduct is incomplete, as none of the investigators ever spoke with my client or viewed the evidence in her possession regarding the events that took place. Melissa's "refusal" to participate in this investigation should be placed in the proper perspective: Melissa complained to the University about Rodriguez's conduct long before the investigation and, in fact, requested a transfer; that request was denied on the basis that a transfer would upset Rodriguez. It bears emphasizing that the University did not conduct an investigation at that time. Ultimately and as a result, Melissa quit her job rather than continue to be subjected to further harassment. When the University decided to conduct an investigation months later, Melissa had already left her job and she

March 2, 2018

Page 3 of 3

was under no obligation to cooperate with an investigation performed by a private law firm retained by the University. The purpose of this investigation was not to protect Melissa from further harassment by Rodriguez; instead, it was conducted to protect the University from the anticipated harassment claims and, perhaps provide a basis to terminate Rodriguez with cause.

There may be other mistruths and exaggerations in the Response, which we have not yet received, but my clients' goal is not to litigate her claims through the media. This is now the second time that Melissa has been forced to respond publicly after Rodriguez attacked her through the media. We reiterate that my clients did not wish to have any of this information made public, and they are only responding publicly now because those at fault continue to cause further injury by making publicly disparaging false comments. Melissa looks forward to having her day in court.