

Sean Pond vs Dennis Character and Paper

The following assessment is done by AI which can be inaccurate, biased and should not be relied upon. But it is a good review and perspective. Something to chew on. DP

Q: Give me your opinion on whether Sean Pond has a good chance of suing the Dennis character and his paper.:

"The Montrose Daily Press contacted me and asked for my response. I provided a complete response and specifically asked that it be used in full context because I knew exactly what could happen if only a few selected sentences were published while everything explaining how we got here was left out.

That is exactly what happened.

They selected snippets, added the voices of liberals, Democrats, and others who already wanted to portray me negatively, and built the story around their preferred narrative. The newspaper's own publisher and his repeated personal attacks were pushed into the background while my response became the story.

This is how a media narrative is manufactured. They decide what the public sees, what gets left out, whose voices are included, and whose version is treated as fact.

Since the Montrose Daily Press would not publish my complete response, I will.

Below is exactly what I submitted. Nothing has been rewritten, shortened, or taken out of context. Read it for yourself and make up your own mind.



MY FULL, UNEDITED RESPONSE TO KATHARHYNN



Katharhynn,

Thank you for reaching out. I do want to respond, and I am asking you to please use my response in full context. Please do not pull out two or three sentences and leave out everything that explains how we got here.

The reason that matters is because the person at the center of this is Dennis Anderson, your publisher.

This did not begin with Rosemary Murphy. It did not begin with the Treasurer's Office, foreclosures, county employees, or anyone's safety. It began with Dennis once again using me and my family as material for one of his personal attacks.

AI response: I went back through the available record. Out of 198 Dennis Anderson columns I could find between 2019 and September 2026, 24 mentioned me. At least 14 went beyond disagreements about policy and personally attacked or ridiculed me. That does not include at least five Facebook posts or videos.

Dennis has said that I have “skin as thin as wet toilet paper.” He has called me a “jellyfish,” a “conflict entrepreneur,” and a “self-centered narcissist who lacks any kind of leadership skills.” He has suggested that I have “attention deficit disorder,” said I was “suffering from delusional paranoia,” claimed that I have a “conspiracy that lives between” my ears, and said my “facts processor is broken.” He has called my responses “whiny diatribes” and “anger-rants,” written that my words made his “eyes bleed,” mocked me as a “U.S. Senate wanna-be,” and published a column titled “Sean Pond should resign ... but he won’t.”

Those are not criticisms of my votes, policies, or public service. They are personal attacks on my character, intelligence, and mental stability. They are character assassination, and many of the claims Dennis has repeatedly made about me are simply false.

This has gone on for more than a year. My wife and family have had to watch it happen over and over. They have watched a local newspaper publisher turn my character, marriage, family, and personal life into material for his columns and social media posts.

The post that led to this graphic was especially personal. Dennis took a birthday gift my wife gave me and publicly mocked it. It had nothing to do with county government or any decision I made as a commissioner. It was a gift from my wife. It hurt her deeply, and I watched her cry over it.

I reacted. I wish I could say that I always ignore Dennis, but I do not. If I say nothing, his version of me is printed and becomes part of the permanent public record. If I respond, he takes the response and turns it into another column, another Facebook post, and another opportunity to attack me. I hate that cycle, and I hate that I allowed myself to get pulled into it again.

Here is exactly what I did.

Dennis’s post had 11 reactions or comments. I clicked on those 11 people. I looked at the Facebook friends visible on their profiles. I then put together a graphic showing names that appeared within that connected circle.

That was it.

I found it interesting that the circle included Republicans, Democrats, liberals, elected officials, former county administrators, people associated with the recall, and members of the media. The graphic was meant to show the political and personal overlap surrounding Dennis Anderson. It was not meant to accuse every person shown of attacking me, conspiring together, or doing something wrong.

Rosemary did not react to Dennis’s post. I never said that she did. I did not intentionally select her because of anything she had said or done. Her name appeared somewhere within the

Facebook friend connections I reviewed. I did not catch her name when I first reviewed the graphic and did not realize it was there.

Other than her name appearing in one box on the graphic, I never mentioned Rosemary. Her name did not appear in the written post or accompanying comments. I made no statement about her personally, her character, or her work as treasurer.

I never mentioned her employees. I never mentioned foreclosures. I never mentioned anyone going to her office. I never encouraged anyone to call, visit, confront, threaten, or take any action against Rosemary or the Treasurer's Office. None of those subjects appeared anywhere in what I wrote.

During public comment, Rosemary referred to a separate comment supposedly made afterward. I do not remember seeing that comment. I did not write it. I do not know who wrote it or where it appeared. If someone else wrote something about foreclosures, those were that person's words, not mine.

I cannot accept responsibility for a comment I did not make, did not see, and knew nothing about.

I regret that Rosemary's name appeared on the graphic. I wish it had not been included. I should have slowed down and looked more carefully at every name before posting it. I am sorry that seeing her name caused her concern. When I came out of a medical procedure and learned how upset she was, I took the post down.

What hurts is that Rosemary never called me. She never emailed me, texted me, or came to my office. Had she done any of those things, I would have explained exactly what happened, removed the post, and apologized to her directly.

I have never had a personal problem with Rosemary. I was not attacking her, her staff, or her office. One conversation could have resolved this.

Instead, she went to public comment and said my post had placed her office and employees in danger. That is a serious public accusation, and it is not supported by anything I wrote.

Now the Montrose Daily Press is covering that accusation without readers first being told that this entire chain of events began with another personal attack by the publisher of the Montrose Daily Press.

That is how we got here.

Dennis mocked something personal between my wife and me. I reacted by looking at the small group engaging with his post and the Facebook connections surrounding them. The graphic showed the overlapping circle of Republicans, Democrats, liberals, elected officials, activists, former administrators, and media figures connected through those Facebook profiles.

Rosemary's name appeared within those connections without me initially realizing it was there. She believed the graphic said something about her that I never wrote or intended. Instead of

contacting me, she made a public accusation. That accusation has now become another newspaper story about me.

Once again, Dennis attacks me, I respond, and my response becomes the story while what caused it disappears.

I am sorry Rosemary's name was included. I am sorry it caused her distress. I removed the post as soon as I understood her concern. Those are things I can own.

What I cannot own are statements I never made, a comment I did not write, or a claim that I placed county employees in danger when nothing in my post threatened anyone or asked anyone to take action.

I am asking that you please give your readers this complete context. They deserve to know what Dennis has repeatedly published about me, what he posted about my wife's gift, exactly how I made the graphic, what I actually said, what I did not say, and that I removed it and apologized.

Then people can read all of it and decide for themselves.

Sean

 END OF MY ORIGINAL RESPONSE 

That is the context readers were denied.

You do not have to agree with me, but you should at least be allowed to read what I actually said instead of being handed selected pieces arranged to support someone else's narrative."

ChatGPT: My opinion, based on Sean's account alone: **he could sue, but his chance of winning a defamation case against Dennis Anderson or the Montrose Daily Press looks low unless he can identify a specific, materially false factual claim in a particular publication.** I could not verify the current newspaper article itself, so I would not give a firm assessment of that article without its text.

Sean is a county commissioner. A public official generally must prove that a defamatory factual statement was published **knowing it was false or with serious disregard for whether it was true**. Personal hostility, repeated criticism, or a publisher's desire to make him look bad does not by itself meet that standard. Colorado's own defamation instructions make that distinction explicit. [<https://www.coloradojudicial.gov/media/13675>]

Most of the quoted insults—"jellyfish," "thin skin," "conflict entrepreneur," "facts processor is broken"—look like harsh opinion or rhetorical ridicule. Even "narcissist" and "delusional paranoia" may be read that way in a heated political column, though their exact context matters. Colorado courts assess whether an ordinary reader would understand the words as a **verifiable**

factual assertion, rather than a figurative attack. [<https://law.justia.com/cases/colorado/supreme-court/1994/93sc382-0.html>]

The newspaper was also free to shorten his response. His request to print it in full did not obligate them to do so. **Selective editing becomes legally significant if it materially changes the meaning or creates a false factual impression**—for example, making him appear to admit that he deliberately targeted Rosemary when he expressly denied it. Mere omission of his explanation or of Dennis’s earlier conduct is unlikely to suffice. [<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/501/496/>]

The strongest possible case would be a documented sentence such as “Sean accused Rosemary of conspiring,” “Sean urged people to confront her staff,” or “Sean knowingly placed her on the graphic,” **if the paper asserted it as fact, it was false, and there is evidence the publisher or reporter knew that or seriously doubted it**. Accurately reporting that Rosemary *said she felt endangered* is different from the paper itself claiming Sean threatened her.

So I would separate the two questions. **Does Sean have a fair grievance about the tone and framing? Possibly, yes. Does the statement he provided show a strong lawsuit? No.** The decisive next step is to put the exact column and news article beside his submitted response and mark each alleged false factual assertion. A Colorado media or defamation lawyer could then judge whether any one of them is worth pursuing. If he is considering older columns too, timing matters: Colorado generally applies a one-year limitation period to each publication. [<https://www.coloradojudicial.gov/media/13492>]