

**From:** Tara DeSisto <[tara.desisto@gmail.com](mailto:tara.desisto@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 10, 2022 10:17 AM  
**To:** [mary@ruwart.com](mailto:mary@ruwart.com)  
**Cc:** [Crawford.cris@gmail.com](mailto:Crawford.cris@gmail.com); [secretary@lpmass.org](mailto:secretary@lpmass.org); [chair@lpmass.org](mailto:chair@lpmass.org);  
[treasurer@lpmass.org](mailto:treasurer@lpmass.org); [contact@ashleyshade.com](mailto:contact@ashleyshade.com); [membership@lpmass.org](mailto:membership@lpmass.org);  
[operations@lpmass.org](mailto:operations@lpmass.org); [political@lpmass.org](mailto:political@lpmass.org); [technology@lpmass.org](mailto:technology@lpmass.org); [judcial@lp.org](mailto:judcial@lp.org)  
**Subject:** Please give Massachusetts so grace as it finds itself.

Good Morning Dr. Ruwart and other members of the Judicial Committee,

Thank you for reaching out to us. It is more than either our Regional Representative or our Regional Alternate have done since this group emerged, however those representatives have been extremely forthcoming in representing this rogue group.

We have materials that we have gathered documenting our process, harassment from factions in the lead up to the Chair's decision and in the aftermath. Derek, our Secretary has a perspective that is very important, unfortunately he had a family death that has taken his focus for the next few days. However we as a State Committee continue to believe that this is a state issue and will be resolved internally at our April 23 convention where the full body will have had an opportunity to weigh in. There are many opinions on this subject, as one would expect from Libertarians, but we know that many long time members of the party have supported and insisted that everyone have a chance to speak on April 23 on the topic of: should these individuals have been expelled and what is a proper response from the body. I find it difficult to believe that individuals who joined the party the day of, and signed the petition the same day would be legitimate sources of information on who runs the state party, but you will for sure see some of that at play here.

It has been a tough year for LAMA, yet we elected a City Councillor and held two offices in town affairs. LAMA is the same organization that helped Dan Fishman for State Auditor earn Ballot Access in 2018 for 2020; received a 45% vote on a referendum to repeal the income tax in 2010; decriminalized marijuana that same year passed in our state with heavy Libertarian influence; We brought casinos into the state; Supported gay marriage on the front lines at City Hall in Cambridge in 2004 before the Supreme Court found it constitutional and before all other states with the exception of Vermont. There is history for our state party that is relevant, and no doubt the details of this episode will be well documented in them. We urge the JC to continue to respect the body that elected the last state committee who are patiently waiting to participate in a resolution.

Yesterday, per our bylaws, 2 weeks prior to convention, we sent a large mailing across the state to all dues paying members to identify changes to the constitution submitted by individuals outside the state committee as well as our Acting Chair Michael Burns, that would build a stronger fabric for Libertarians across the Commonwealth. We have sent several mailings to those members over the last 5 months in the lead up to this convention. The April 23rd Convention in Framingham is a date and location our members have known about; some of who may have no other knowledge of this group who have self identified as the new state affiliate. Many of our members are scholars and subject matter experts who do not find themselves on

facebook chats often or at all. The State Committee members have one collective interest in mind, to pull the body together for the state convention as membership expected when they elected them for a peaceful transition into the new term. I say this, as an individual myself who gives more than is asked to this organization financially and through my time, **please support limited governance on this issue and give people on the ground affected the opportunity to figure this out.**

I would also say that I have personally reached out to several of those expelled who I had no prior relationship with to offer to make a motion of reinstatement of them as an individual. This rogue group is committed to an all or nothing strategy of reaffiliation and insistence of take over of the state committee. They can do that, however they will need to wait for the body to allow for that at our regular convention (which is a bylaw specific term in Mass) on April 23, to determine if they will get their desired outcome. As it stands, January 10th there was a ruling of the chair and that ruling was sustained by the elected committee members. It is worth mentioning that I was not present for that vote. Of the petitions that were submitted to you, how many came from Massachusetts? The process of opening the documents proved too cumbersome for my computer. I have also heard rumors that they are using businesses such as Crowds on Demand as recommended by Angela McArdle to increase turnouts for things such as petitions and hostile takeovers of conventions so I would ask that the committee spend some time vetting the membership of these petitioners against the national database before taking them into consideration.

Finally, Members of this rogue group have been threatening and harrassing to several members of LAMA for many months through email, spam texts, social media, and other means over the internet. They have brought on a "parliamentarian" by the name of Caryn Ann Harlos who continues to make podcasts from Colorado about Massachusetts and specifically naming and targeting State Committee members here. I wish to not have my personal thoughts or email shared with them as they will use it to continue to abuse members in the lead up to convention. I do not recognize their membership at this time and so will not be including Mr. Cordiero on my response addressees. Once again, I will reiterate that **this decision deserves to be decided by the dues paying members of the Libertarian Association of Massachusetts on April 23. I hope you will be receptive to that Libertarian concept and dismiss this complaint.**

Thank you to each member of the JC for your service to the national party.

Be Well and Be Free,  
Tara DeSisto  
Libertarian Association of Massachusetts  
State Committee Member

---

On Sun, Apr 10, 2022 at 6:12 PM Ashley Shade <contact@ashleyshade.com> wrote:

The only decision that the LNC has actually made was to uphold the ruling of the chair that the motion that was made was out of order. This was a procedural vote not a vote of action or

decision against an affiliate or a disaffiliation. A new motion that is in order could be taken up by the LNC.

The only question that is truly at hand is was the motion out of order.

The chair decided it was, and the LNC agreed. I wasn't aware RONR or LP bylaws allowed for a judicial review of a vote of parliamentary procedure. Especially one that was appealed and upheld by the voting body.

That being said, LAMA is and has always been the only recognized affiliate in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The bylaws clearly state that there cannot be multiple state affiliates, and outlines a process for gaining recognition that has not been followed.

Furthermore the so called special convention the former members conducted didn't execute the agenda that was submitted and rejected by the state committee. This means that meeting was not valid and any claims they seek to the state affiliate are invalid.

Finally the Libertarian Party is not allowed to disaffiliate a recognized affiliate within 6 months of a national convention. The organization which I previously served as chair was always recognized as the official affiliate in Massachusetts by every member of the LNC up to at minimum the date of expulsions which was within 6 months of the national convention.

I suggest the judicial committee and the Libertarian Party think very carefully before they violate their own bylaws to force an affiliate to do things it's unwilling to do.

---

From: Tara DeSisto <tara.desisto@gmail.com>  
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2022 8:10 AM  
To: Ashley Shade <contact@ashleyshade.com>  
Cc: Mary J Ruwart <mary@ruwart.com>; Crawford.cris@gmail.com; secretary@lpmass.org; chair@lpmass.org; treasurer@lpmass.org; membership@lpmass.org; operations@lpmass.org; political@lpmass.org; technology@lpmass.org; judcial@lp.org; Whitney Bilyeu <whitney.bilyeu@lp.org>  
Subject: Re: Please give Massachusetts some grace as it finds itself.

Dr. Ruwart and members of the JC,

LAMA State Committee has been informed by more than one member that there will be a motion at the beginning of the meeting to allow those expelled to be able to participate in the debate on the floor. I think that the state committee is aware of this and many state committee members are open to this and if not, have resigned to reality. That is how I can confirm that the 45 will have their due process on the floor. There were only 45 people who were disaffiliated and once again, 17 of those individuals signed up and immediately signed a petition to overthrow the state committee. I ask once again that your hearing be considered moot because it is outside of the scope that the JC was looking into which was the ruling of the chair to disaffiliate as out of order. I agree with Ashley on her opinion on this matter. A week out from convention having a

hearing on this is not only dilatory, it is instituting large governance practices against individuals affected. I will make myself available on a holiday weekend that we specifically avoided planning a convention on so this committee may feel like they have heard enough.

Tara DeSisto

---

From: Tara DeSisto <tara.desisto@gmail.com>  
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2022 2:08 PM  
To: Mary J Ruwart <mary@ruwart.com>  
Cc: Ashley Shade <contact@ashleyshade.com>; Crawford.cris@gmail.com;  
secretary@lpmass.org; chair@lpmass.org; treasurer@lpmass.org; membership@lpmass.org;  
operations@lpmass.org; political@lpmass.org; technology@lpmass.org; judicial@lp.org;  
Whitney Bilyeu <whitney.bilyeu@lp.org>  
Subject: Re: Please give Massachusetts some grace as it finds itself.

Dr. Ruwart,

Please help me understand the role of the JC in this situation. Are you determining whether the LNC followed its bylaws by the petition or are you determining whether we followed ours? Does the JC have jurisdiction over determining state affiliates? Again, there are things set in motion here in our state to determine the final outcome, and if those individuals who were purged were not in fact members of National, is it your purview to allow them representation as well in this claim? Our state has clear designation for membership. National does as well. How many of these 45 are you including in your determination of due process? All of them? What should that due process have looked like? One could say that the state committee was elected in Massachusetts to determine that due process. Again, I understand you are Chair of this committee and I respect your historical relevance to the party as you sit on my bookshelf, I am simply trying to understand the scope of the decision that you are determining so that we as a State Committee can be prepared for this hearing that many of us will be taking on the road from family obligations on a holiday weekend. Thanks to this same group of individuals, I was personally deprived of my last family holiday and dragged through the mud by the particular Caucus leading this #takeover. I would like to be able to enjoy this one.

Tara DeSisto  
LAMA State Committee Member

---

From: Tara DeSisto <tara.desisto@gmail.com>  
Date: April 12, 2022 at 8:14:26 AM EDT  
To: Mary J Ruwart <mary@ruwart.com>  
Cc: Ashley Shade <contact@ashleyshade.com>, crawford.cris@gmail.com,  
secretary@lpmass.org, chair@lpmass.org, treasurer@lpmass.org, membership@lpmass.org,  
operations@lpmass.org, political@lpmass.org, technology@lpmass.org, judicial@lp.org,  
Whitney Bilyeu <whitney.bilyeu@lp.org>  
Subject: Re: Please give Massachusetts some grace as it finds itself.

My understanding is that both sides were appealing to the JC for a ruling in Delaware. In this case one side is appealing the ruling of the chair of the LNC who decided this was out of their scope of action per the bylaws. We are not asking for a judgement because we believe the judgment is for the body in MA to make. Ashley was correct in saying this action took place within the 6 month window and therefore falls out of the scope of the LNC to rule on this issue so close to convention. Again, all of us have religious and family events this weekend and it is incredibly intrusive to demand a hearing at this time. Is it the decision of the whole JC to insist upon a hearing or is that your decision as Chair of the JC? Please consider rescheduling to a later date, preferably after our convention where much of this mess will be reconciled by those impacted by the outcome.

-Tara

---

On Fri, Apr 15, 2022 at 10:39 AM Mary J Ruwart <mary@ruwart.com> wrote:

I have polled the JC as to whether or not we should change the date of the hearing of the Cordio appeal as suggested by several of you. The decision has been made to change the date, most likely to either Saturday April 30 or Sunday May 1. I will likely inform you this weekend of the exact time and date.

The date change opens up the opportunity for the two MA factions to resolve their differences, as requested by Ms. DeSisto.

I would note that two separate conventions are currently scheduled by each of the contesting groups:

Saturday: [https://www.lpmass.org/convention\\_2022](https://www.lpmass.org/convention_2022)

Sunday: Libertarian Association of Massachusetts State Convention | Facebook ;  
<https://www.facebook.com/events/680836806331095/?ref=newsfeed>

There are many ways a resolution could happen (e.g., negotiation between the two groups; reinstating the purged members of the LPMA in the Saturday convention resulting in election of a state board acceptable to all; invitations to attendees at the Saturday convention to the Sunday one to facilitate negotiations; etc.). Another option is, of course, to continue on separate courses. The JC may or may not decide in favor of one group or the other; a credentials fight in Reno and resolution by the convention itself is still another possibility.

If no resolution is reached by next weekend, the expenditure of time and effort by both groups is likely to continue. Instead of fighting the state, we will be fighting each other. Because I would personally rather see LP resources go to fighting the state rather than each other, my personal hope is that resolution by the end of the convention weekend will occur.

Delaying the hearing also gives the LNC time to submit their briefs, should they choose to do so. Since the LNC has expressed confusion through their Chair as to their status and time frame for submitting such briefs, I am stating definitely that the clock for the LNC starts as of this e-mail and ends Friday, April 22nd, at 11:59pm Central time.

The 7 day clock for the respondents stated in the original Cordio submission has already been stated in earlier e-mails.

If there are further questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to let me know.

---Mary J. Ruwart, Chair, Judicial Committee

---

On Fri, Apr 15, 2022 at 10:43 AM Caryn Ann Harlos <carynannharlos@gmail.com> wrote:

Chair Ruwart, thank you. Unless the purged people are delegates they have no say in any "reconciliation."

I cannot speak for them but I felt this was a critical fact left out.

If the other faction truly wishes to reconcile, they will reinstate all the purged and let the chips fall where they may.

Again not speaking for them, but that to me would be a show of good faith.

---

On Fri, Apr 15, 2022 at 11:03 AM Caryn Ann Harlos <carynannharlos@gmail.com> wrote:

Chair Ruwart, I would add - again speaking for no one but myself - the damage has been done. The other MA convention has pricey tickets - and people have already made their weekend plans. The true (IMHO) MA group tried over and over to reconcile and was rebuffed with defamation.

I'd love to see a reconciliation plan and perhaps there is one I'm just not seeing that would work. I presently have COVID and am terribly ill.

---

On Fri, Apr 15, 2022 at 11:11 AM Whitney Bilyeu <whitney.bilyeu@lp.org> wrote:

Thank you for the update. I am pleased to hear of this postponement and I appreciate the explicit guidance with regard to the response deadline.

Whitney Bilyeu  
LNC | Chair  
LP.org

---

On Fri, Apr 15, 2022 at 12:43 PM Tara DeSisto <tara.desisto@gmail.com> wrote:

Dr. Ruwart,

Looking back at the initial email that was sent by you letting us know of the date change, Caryn Ann was not cc'd. So one would question, was she BCC'd on your original email and for what purpose? Just wondering how this woman, who has been so horrible towards members of my state party and many Libertarians, would end up in a thread in my inbox coming with no title and having nothing to do with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Can you help me to understand this?

Thank you,  
Tara

---

On Fri, Apr 15, 2022 at 3:49 PM Thomas Arnold <libertyclaus1@gmail.com> wrote:

Tara,

As an apparent signer of one of the petitions made by those appealing to the JC, she has placed herself as an interested party. Any member of the party can do so.

Peace-Love-Liberty  
Tom Arnold

---

On Fri, Apr 15, 2022 at 12:57 PM Tara DeSisto <tara.desisto@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Tom,

So what you are telling me is that any member of the National Party is allowed to place themselves within the negotiation or resolution process of a state conflict from a National Judicial Committee standpoint? That does not seem like any kind of a healthy due process to uphold due process.

Tara

---

On Fri, Apr 15, 2022 at 1:22 PM Tara DeSisto <tara.desisto@gmail.com> wrote:

I am just not understanding why ANYONE would be BCC'd on these emails.

---

On Fri, Apr 15, 2022 at 1:52 PM Mary J Ruwart <mary@ruwart.com> wrote:

Yes, any member of the national party can request all of the documents submitted to us, attend the hearing (they can't speak at the hearing though), and submit an amicus brief in support of one side or the other. I can either forward the correspondence to them or blind copy them.

I believe we had about 40 amicus briefs on one of our cases. These cases become very public. It's challenging to keep up with sometimes. 😊

---

On Fri, Apr 15, 2022 at 4:30 PM Tara DeSisto <tara.desisto@gmail.com> wrote:

I was not aware that the JC's role had become a public flogging.

Have a good weekend.

Tara

---

On Sat, Apr 16, 2022 at 9:10 AM Mary J Ruwart <mary@ruwart.com> wrote:

The JC isn't flogging anyone; however, the membership can and will. Just take a look at the heat I take on the LNC-discuss list; you might not feel so bad in comparison. 😊

This is just another reason to resolve the LPMA issues if at all possible before the JC hearing, which will be recorded and shared with any LP member who requests it. Any judicial or court process is somewhat or even wholly adversarial as those involved or observe take sides; that will also be true of a credentials fight in Reno. IMO, we should be working together, not against each other, but I do understand that some discord is inevitable.

Those on this list have a chance to avoid further conflict by hammering out a solution, just as you yourself implied might happen if the JC hearing was postponed. I know it's tough to do, but in the long run everyone might find a negotiated compromise preferable to continuing to fight. It is always possible for the appeal to be withdrawn.

If no resolution is forthcoming, the JC will continue with the duties assigned to it by the bylaws. If that doesn't settle the issue, the credentials committee in Reno will likely be called upon for further resolution. In Oregon, which had a similar problem, after the national convention and a credentials fight, court cases continued for the next 7 years or so.

The question becomes do the groups in conflict want to settle this on their own or have others (the JC, the credentials committee in Reno, the courts, etc.) do it?

---



On Sat, Apr 16, 2022 at 9:45 AM Tara DeSisto <tara.desisto@gmail.com> wrote:

But the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee is not over the State Affiliate but the LNC and the ruling of the chair that disaffiliation is out of order, correct?

---

On Sat, Apr 16, 2022 at 11:50 AM Alicia Mattson <agmattson@gmail.com> wrote:

The judicial committee's jurisdiction is detailed in the national party bylaws. Arguments about the jurisdiction are part of what you may wish to cover in written briefs to the JC and in the hearing.

---

On Sun, Apr 17, 2022 at 7:57 AM Mary J Ruwart <mary@ruwart.com> wrote:

Regardless of the JC's decision and the result, once there are two state conventions and two boards elected, a second appeal and/or a credentials fight at the national convention is likely. Appeal to the new LNC and JC could follow as well.

I only mention these things because of your comment about a public flogging. A negotiated compromise might be the best way to avoid further issues. Otherwise, you are relying on others (Credentials Committee, JC, LNC) to make your decisions for you.

---

On Sun, Apr 17, 2022 at 8:41 AM Ashley Shade <contact@ashleyshade.com> wrote:

I'd like to point out that there is and has only been one recognized affiliate in Massachusetts and that's the State Committee of LAMA. This other group decided to have their own conversation, elect their own committee and have never been recognized by the LNC. They have never been recognized as an affiliate and don't have the authority to represent themselves as an affiliate to the libertarian party. They're a rogue group of people who were removed from LAMA which is allowable under LAMA bylaws.

I'd also like to point out that the majority of those expelled from the LAMA affiliate were NOT members of the national party at the time of their expulsion and therefore have no rights as members of the national party on this peticular issue.

Finally, I'm going to request that you remove me from these proceedings and this email thread as I resigned from my position before a new rogue element was formed at their "convention" and I am no longer a member of LAMA.

I no longer wish to associate with or participate in this process or this party. I got involved in the LP to win elections and create real change in line with my principles and values, which I falsely thought was also the goal of this party. I've learned since that a large group of people don't care about operating as a political party, but instead as an organization that wants to fight culture wars and be terribly hateful in their messaging and positions. I no longer wish to be a member of a

party that allows members to send death threats to people they disagree with and then tries to defend them. That's not what I signed up to be apart of, and as such I have no interest in continuing in this process or this party.

While you all spend time arguing about this, pretending to be important and not actually helping advance liberty, I'll be doing real work as an elected official and member of my community that actually helps people and reduces the government interference in our daily lives. I hope you all drop this nonsense and use your time to help the people in your own communities as well.

Good luck to you all and may you find peace in your hearts and liberty in your lifetime.

---

On Sun, Apr 17, 2022 at 9:08 AM Andrew Cordio <cordioace@gmail.com> wrote:

As the rightful chair of LAMA I would like to clarify that my involvement in this process has far less to do with the Mises Caucus than it does the LAMA failing to support my candidacy for local office in both 2017 and 2021.

Ms. Shade can wax poetic all she like but the simple matter at hand is that the LAMA has been derelict in their duties for at least the better part of a decade.

---

On Sun, Apr 17, 2022 at 10:19 AM Whitney Bilyeu <whitney.bilyeu@lp.org> wrote:

Can you please illuminate that to which the LNC is responding?

The LNC's action with regard to this matter has been limited to NOT considering a resolution brought by a group of people claiming to be the LP of Massachusetts. So, are we simply meant to explain why I ruled consideration of the resolution out of order, and why the LNC upheld that ruling?

---

On Sun, Apr 17, 2022 at 5:49 PM Mary J Ruwart <mary@ruwart.com> wrote:

Yes. You only need to respond to why you ruled the resolution out of order. It may be that you will be asked other questions, but that's the main relief requested by the appellants.

---

On Sun, Apr 17, 2022 at 5:51 PM Mary J Ruwart <mary@ruwart.com> wrote:

I wish you success and will take you off the list.

---

On Sat, Apr 23, 2022 at 12:36 PM Brodi Elwood <brodielwood@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Chair Ruwart and the JC:

Thank you for continuing to keep interested party members and my retained parliamentarian informed. I truly appreciate all the work you guys are doing.

Brodi Elwood  
Chair, LP Middlesex  
Technology Director, LAMA

---

On Sat, Apr 23, 2022 at 10:29 AM Mary J Ruwart <mary@ruwart.com> forwarded:  
[to MA parties]

From: Whitney Bilyeu <whitney.bilyeu@lp.org>  
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2022 9:23 PM  
To: judicial <jc@lp.org>; Mary J Ruwart (mary@ruwart.com) <mary@ruwart.com>  
Subject: [judicial] Fwd: LNC response to the appeal regarding LAMA

Sending this to Dr. Ruwart's direct email, as well, just in case.

Please confirm receipt. Thank you.

Whitney Bilyeu  
LNC | Chair  
LP.org

---

On Sat, Apr 23, 2022 at 10:46 AM Caryn Ann Harlos <carynannharlos@gmail.com> wrote:

Thank you. I will advise my client accordingly.

---

On Sat, Apr 23, 2022 at 11:02 AM Tara DeSisto <tara.desisto@gmail.com> wrote:

Again, for the record, I object to the Caryn Ann Harlos being BCC'd on a state party dispute that she has no claim to weigh in on. And I would ask that the Judicial Committee stop Blind Carbon Copying people who are not primary stakeholders of this dispute. I would like to formally complain about the JC process that Dr. Ruwart has taken in allowing Caryn Ann to be included. I believe this body has far overstepped it's role in our state and continue to violate our state party's sovereignty by forcing us to receive Harlos' interjections.

Do better as a Judicial Committee to not interject your personal biases as to what is acceptable into our state. We are free people with freedom of association. Our State Convention delegates have now at our state convention voted not to allow these people back in to the party as a whole group. If you deny the delegates of our state to self determinate you continue to violate Libertarian principles of limited governance.

-Tara

---

On Sun, Apr 24, 2022 at 10:49 AM Mary J Ruwart <mary@ruwart.com> wrote:

Ms. Harlos is involved in the dispute since she is working with the appellant; consequently, she will be getting these documents anyway as Mr. Cordio distributes them to his interested parties.

All LP members, regardless of their state affiliation, have a right to request and obtain all of the documents involved in any JC dispute. Since this appeal involves the LNC as a respondent, the entire LP membership has a stake, since they will be choosing which LNC members to reinstate in Reno. Accordingly, as in our other earlier cases, the JC has given access to any LP member who asks for it. As I mentioned in an earlier e-mail to you, we had around 40 amicus briefs from members in one case. You should be aware that any LP member who wishes it can attend the hearing or listen to the recording.

Clearly, you haven't paid attention to earlier cases, or the strife that will continue if your group and the appellant can't come to a resolution on your own. You might recall that you requested that the JC postpone our hearing to give you an opportunity for such a resolution. I hope you've taken advantage of that delay by making progress towards that end. My only "personal bias" is to hope that both parties can come to some sort of resolution rather than experience months, or even years, of strife fighting each other instead of the state.

If you would like to stop this level of transparency for future appeals, you can present a bylaw revision to the Reno convention prohibiting the distribution of JC documents to the LP's members and limit it only to interested parties. Although I am for transparency, it would certainly make the job of the JC chair much easier not to have it. ☺

---

On Sun, Apr 24, 2022 at 1:20 PM Tara DeSisto <tara.desisto@gmail.com> wrote:

It's not transparency. It's intrusion. People can receive information the same way the rest of the general public receives information. Putting someone who has been thrown off the LNC for excessive harassment of others into the solution oriented conversation of a state that has nothing to do with her voting status is reckless and honestly, a major overstep of this committee. Furthermore, bcc'ing members make you the one who is appearing not to be transparent.

There is a new state committee for LAMA that was elected by the body. Should we assume that they will be the ones that will be expected represent LAMA at the JC hearing?

Tara

---

On Mon, Apr 25, 2022 at 9:20 AM Mary J Ruwart <mary@ruwart.com> wrote:

Each group will have an allotted time to present their case and the choice of who speaks is entirely up to them.

---

On Mon, Apr 25, 2022 at 9:22 AM Mary J Ruwart <mary@ruwart.com> wrote:

If you don't like the general membership to get the appeals and associated documents, you need to take it up with the bylaws committee in Reno.

---

On Mon, Apr 25, 2022 at 1:33 PM Tara DeSisto <tara.desisto@gmail.com> wrote:

The bylaws state that you only have jurisdiction over the LNC yet here we are being dragged into a Judicial Committee hearing, so not sure how much good that would do. Also, the general membership is not BCC'd on judicial emails. Just Caryn Ann seems to be responding.

---