

From: David Zink Music dz@davidzinkmusic.com

Subject: Re: EC Meeting Called - Motion to send reply to the Receiver Letters

Date: July 30, 2018 at 1:38 PM

To: Susan Dobra sdobra2@yahoo.com

Cc: Jennifer Petersen pair-o-dice@comcast.net, Pyramid Michael pyramidmichael@gmail.com, Karen Quattlander karenquattlander@gmail.com, verna myers vernamyers@icloud.com, Dan Joseph josww@sbcglobal.net



As I've heard from all of you, let's bring the discussion to an end, and move to the vote.

You are all on record with your preference already, so let's let the record reflect the following summary:

The proposed letter is revised to include our advisor Verna's gentle edits. Our advisor Susan approves.

EC members Dan, Jennifer, Karen (via text), Pyramid, and Dan have all voiced approval for sending the proposed letter. Let us count these as Aye votes. Including mine, we are unanimously agreed, and the motion passes.

I will print and send the document today/tomorrow.

Thank you for your time and attention!

Best regards,

David

On Jul 30, 2018, at 8:44 AM, susan dobra <sdobra2@yahoo.com> wrote:

Sounds like an appropriate response to me too. Thank you David.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

On Monday, July 30, 2018, 10:14 AM, JENNEIFER PETERSEN <pair-o-dice@comcast.net> wrote:

David,

I agree with the idea that we need to respond and this seems an appropriate response, with Vern's edit.

Thank you for taking the time to do this, I'm sure it's a lot of work on your end.

Jennifer

On July 29, 2018 at 9:41 PM David Zink Music <dz@davidzinkmusic.com> wrote:

Jennifer, do you have any comments?

Karen, what about you?

Please note that Verna has offered an edit to clarify the intent of #2. The meaning is unchanged. I will use it.

Susan, your comments are welcome.

David

On Jul 29, 2018, at 5:50 PM, Michael Walden <pyramidmichael@gmail.com> wrote:

This makes sense to me.

On Sunday, July 29, 2018, verna myers <vernamyers@icloud.com> wrote:

I understand

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 29, 2018, at 12:05 PM, David Zink <dz@davidzinkmusic.com> wrote:

It has been moved and seconded.

Let us now move to Discussion. I will hold this open up to 48 hours. Anyone who has not contributed something by then will receive a call from me to be sure you are aware of the motion. If everyone has commented before that time, I will call the motion for a vote.

Questions, comments?

David

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 29, 2018, at 11:23 AM, JENNEIFER PETERSEN <pair-o-dice@comcast.net> wrote:

Thank you David for the advisement,

I second the motion.

Jennifer

On July 29, 2018 at 6:51 AM David Zink Music <dz@davidzinkmusic.com> wrote:

EC Folks (and Verna and Susan, who may join in the discussion after we have a second to the motion below),

A meeting is called to order on an urgent matter, and there is a motion below.

Preface:

I understand from Fort Bragg attorney Ron Britt that non-response to the receivership letter may result in the Grange simply turning over the amounts it claims we owe (past dues, loans) to a collections agent, which would put us on a potentially costly defensive.

The argument that they have billed the wrong entity, or some other one — Paradise Grange NO. 490 — would not hold up in Court, as our corporate number was once attached to that name. Just as we argue that the California Guild has a right to claim its history dating to 1946, so do we claim our history dating to 1949, which includes our former corporate name. A judge would thus dispatch the argument.

California Superior Court (Sacramento) Judge Brown has directed that —

"The Receiver is authorized to turn over to the Grange the rights related to the receivables addressed in the Revoked Charter Letter, the Delinquent Dues Letter, and the Promisory Note Letter, as deemed appropriate by the Receiver after the billings for same, at the Receiver's discretion, either immediately or following negotiation or other further administration by the Receiver, on a case-by-case basis, without further court order..."

Thus we don't know when the Receiver may turn over rights to the receivables claimed, or when the Grange may act on those rights. The sooner we act, the better.

There are all kinds of things wrong about the Grange's claims that we owe anything to them; indeed, we owe nothing. A carefully worded letter to the Receiver will put us on record challenging their claims and, as I understand it, prohibit them from using the collections agency tactic. Instead, they would have to initiate a suit to establish the claims.

Bob McFarland has advised that Attorney Steven Shumway, who represented our chapter as a "Party In Interest" at the 3/21/18 Receivership hearing, is running silent. An effort is underway by

Butte Regional Guild to secure a lawyer for its member chapters, but that will likely take months. We need to act sooner.

I have reviewed Attorney Britt's letter to Robert Greeley, Receiver, and drafted a similar, carefully-worded reply on behalf of Paradise Community Guilds. Yesterday I met with Bruce Broderick, who participated in drafting the Fort Bragg Guild reply to Greeley, and with whom I had shared this draft, and he thought it was good to go.

We need a motion, a second, and then we can move to discussion.

Here comes the motion:

I move we immediately send the attached letter by mail to Robert Greeley, Receiver, in reply to his May 9 and May 10 letters which claim that we owe the newly chartered California State Grange past dues and repayment of a loan taken.

Is there a second?

-David

--

More Light, Be Love,
Pyramid Michael

