

**THE PERMANENT JUDICIAL COMMISSION
OF THE PRESBYTERY OF SEATTLE
OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH (U.S.A.)**

Eric Tronsen,)	
)	
Complainant,)	DECISION
)	
v.)	REMEDIAL CASE 2017-01
)	
University Presbyterian Church,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
<hr/>		

This is a remedial case brought before this Permanent Judicial Commission by a complaint filed by the complainant against the Session of the respondent.

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

The Permanent Judicial Commission finds that it has jurisdiction, that the complainant has standing to complain, that the complaint was properly and timely filed, and that the complaint states a claim upon which relief can be granted.

HISTORY

This action concerns practical issues regarding how to deal with conflict between congregants, and the tools available to churches for dealing with the conflict, including the due process to which congregants are entitled.

A. Background Facts. Eric Tronsen (“Mr. Tronsen” or “complainant”) is a member of respondent University Presbyterian Church (“UPC” or “respondent”). In late 2016 and early 2017, Mr. Tronsen and another congregant, both of whom served as ushers, had conflictual interactions in the narthex of the church before and after worship. The staff of respondent received written and oral reports of the conflict from Mr. Tronsen, the other member, as well as from uninvolved congregants.¹ Various members of the UPC staff attempted to intervene

¹ Even though Mr. Tronsen occasionally denied the existence of conflict, he also reported conflictual interactions to UPC staff (as did the other congregant). Mr. Tronsen suggests that the reports of events that staff did not personally witness are “mere gossip.” The Commission does not agree. Staff or affected councils do not need to personally witness events to take appropriate action, and reports of conflict to staff by witnesses do not constitute gossip. In any event, Mr. Tronsen cannot claim that his own reports to staff of conflict are gossip.

pastorally, but the conflict continued.

On February 8, 2017, after communicating with Mr. Tronsen and others, staff notified Mr. Tronsen that he could not serve as an usher or greeter or linger in the narthex between worship services until the conflict was mediated (94). Limits were also imposed on the other congregant.

These limitations proved insufficient to eliminate the conflict. Despite the ongoing disruptions, Mr. Tronsen requested reinstatement of his ushering duties. When his request was denied, Mr. Tronsen asked that he be provided notice of the charges against him and an opportunity to be heard (e.g., 111).

As the conflict continued, staff asked Mr. Tronsen to meet regarding further limitations on his participation at UPC. He declined to meet unless the other congregant also attended. On April 17, 2017, a member of pastoral staff barred Mr. Tronsen from “participating in the life of UPC in any way [including] worship,” unless and until he met with her (129). Mr. Tronsen met with her on April 25, 2017, at which time they agreed to the following restrictions for about six months: Mr. Tronsen would only attend a specified worship service, would not attend Christian education, would not participate in specific fellowship events, and would not engage in specified leadership roles and service opportunities (132,134) (the “April 25 agreement”). The agreement and limitations were set forth in an email dated April 28, 2017. Mr. Tronsen met with staff a few days later and stated that he had changed his mind and would not be bound by the limitations.

On May 8, 2017, two pastoral staff members wrote an “official letter” to Mr. Tronsen barring him from the church campus altogether except to meet with staff and until he agreed to abide by the April 25 agreement (138). The letter advised that if he otherwise returned, he would be removed from the property by the police. Respondent’s staff testified that they viewed this letter as a conditional informal pre-disciplinary action that was intended to encourage further dialogue with Mr. Tronsen in order to resolve the dispute. However, in anticipation of the action, one staff member indicated that she “didn’t see any way around trespassing him” (136). Mr. Tronsen interpreted the May 8, 2017 letter as a banishment from the church premises. It is evident from these proceedings that the restriction of his access to the church deeply wounded him, and appears to have left him highly distrustful of staff and their openness to hear his perspectives.

Following the May 8, 2017 letter, Mr. Tronsen again challenged the procedures used and the authority of staff, without the involvement of Session, to impose what he called an “excommunication” from UPC (140-41). Staff requested that he meet with them, but Mr. Tronsen declined. Three weeks after the May 8 letter, the congregant with whom Mr. Tronsen was having conflict left the church. According to staff, this removed the need for the limits they had imposed on Mr. Tronsen except for leadership service. Although staff reached out to Mr. Tronsen on a number of occasions to meet, the invitations did not indicate that he was welcome to return to UPC. Mr. Tronsen continued to decline to meet.

B. Procedural History. Mr. Tronsen filed this remedial action by letter dated July 17, 2017 (received by Presbytery on July 20, 2017)(4-7). The complaint alleged that Mr. Tronsen had been denied due process in the actions taken by staff against him, including that Session had not been involved in the process. (UPC advised the Commission that prior to the filing of this action Session had not as a body been advised of the controversy and the actions taken against Mr. Tronsen by staff.) The relief Mr. Tronsen requested included a written letter of apology and that he be allowed to “fully take part in the life of UPC,” including reinstatement of his usher/greeter duties. A committee of counsel was appointed, investigated the matter, and met with Mr. Tronsen.

On August 17, 2017 one of the pastoral staff emailed Mr. Tronsen that he was “welcome to come back to worship and fellowship” (147) because the congregant with whom he had been having conflict had left the church. The email encouraged Mr. Tronsen to meet with pastoral staff to “clear the air.” In a subsequent email, staff clarified that Mr. Tronsen would not be eligible to fill any sort of leadership role until he met with them (149). Although he returned to worship at UPC, Mr. Tronsen continued to decline to meet with staff.

UPC alleged that its reinstatement of Mr. Tronsen’s fellowship and worship privileges has mooted any relief that could be requested in this remedial action. However, Mr. Tronsen sought to be allowed to “fully participate” in the life of UPC, which request extended beyond reinstatement of worship and fellowship. Even if the remedial aspects have been mooted, the Commission still has authority to issue declaratory relief as to the propriety of the process by which limitations were imposed on Mr. Tronsen’s membership. *Tom v. Presbytery of San Francisco*, Remedial Case 221-03 (even where the possibility of remedial relief has been mooted, “the Commission may exercise its declaratory authority to provide guidance to lower councils and prevent future violations”). The Commission finds that declaratory relief would aid the parties and the other churches within the Presbytery in appropriately dealing with challenging situations when they arise.

The Commission immediately concluded that this matter deeply called for reconciliation between the parties and restoration of right relationships, and that a non-judicial process might help resolve this matter in a loving and reconciling way. The Commission urged the parties to meet and consider alternatives to litigation, including negotiation or mediation. Respondent offered Mr. Tronsen two apologies, which he declined to accept. Mr. Tronsen twice requested to briefly speak with respondent’s Session. Respondent declined his requests to meet during what it referred to as the “business” portion of the Session meeting, but offered instead an extended meeting with Session members who could attend an “early convening” of a Session meeting to listen to his concerns and pray for him.² Mr. Tronsen declined the early convening

² Although respondent suggested that this would have constituted a meeting with “Session,” the record is not clear in that respect. Although there was testimony that the early convening meeting was a part of the Session meeting and that all Session members would be invited, the guidelines for the early convening indicate that two or three elders might listen and pray, but would not take action because they could not as individual elders speak for Session (50).

invitations. Subsequently the Commission directed the parties to engage in formal mediation arranged by the Commission. Although Mr. Tronsen initially agreed to participate in mediation, he ultimately decided not to do so over concerns regarding the process.

Throughout the course of these proceedings, Mr. Tronsen filed a number of requests with the Commission seeking various forms of relief. The Commission conducted a number of pretrial conferences to consider how the matter might be resolved and to focus and narrow the disputes. Based on a brief Mr. Tronsen submitted before one of the pre-trial conferences, the Commission determined that the essence of Mr. Tronsen's complaint was that his church membership rights had been limited without due process. A trial date of July 10, 2018 was set, and the parties were directed to designate witnesses and documents and to agree where possible on the facts and issues. Mr. Tronsen filed a final amended complaint July 7, 2018. The Commission accepts the filing of this amended complaint as setting the bounds of this matter.

On July 10, 2018, The Commission heard argument concerning due process standards under the Book of Order. The trial followed immediately, during which the Commission heard testimony and reviewed exhibits.³ After trial, the Moderator of the Commission presided at a ritual of reconciliation and anointing.

C. Identification of Issues and Analysis.

Both parties faced difficult challenges in this action. Mr. Tronsen increasingly lost rights and privileges at his church home under processes that he believed did not protect his rights. The Commission perceived that he did not feel that the church was creating a safe space for him and that he could not trust staff. Respondent also faced difficult challenges. It sought to mediate a dispute between congregants that had intruded into the life of the church. The other congregant alleged that she did not physically feel safe, although Mr. Tronsen denies that she had any basis to so claim. Through its actions, respondent sought to make separate spaces where both members could continue to participate and flourish in the life of the congregation without engaging in conflict. Respondent viewed these efforts as pre-disciplinary pastoral and administrative actions aimed at preserving the rights of both members and the peace and worship of the church. When Mr. Tronsen largely stopped cooperating in the process, resolution of the matter was made more difficult.

The Commission agrees that, where available, pastoral intervention and informal processes are efficient, non-confrontational, and flexible ways of resolving disputes. However, absent free and voluntary consent of the affected party, informal attempts at resolving disputes

³ Neither party having objected to the relevance or admissibility of the records and documents submitted by each other, the Commission accepted into evidence all of the evidentiary materials submitted by the parties, as well as a proposed conflict policy submitted by respondent and an annotated version of the same.

cannot abrogate the protections of due process afforded under our Constitution.⁴ In this case, the informal efforts to seek resolution crossed over into formal actions that invoke due process rights.

1. Under Section G-1.0304 of the Book of Order, the ministry of members includes “taking part in the common life and worship of a congregation,” as well as the giving of money, time, and talents, engaging in service to others, participating in church governance, and other ways in which one’s service and worship may grow and be increased. In Section F-1.0403, the Book of Order provides that the PCUSA “shall guarantee full participation . . . in its worship, governance, and emerging life to all persons . . . within its membership. No member shall be denied participation . . . for any reason other than those stated in this Constitution.”

2. These rich aspects of membership must be broadly construed and protected. While the right to due process is implicit in many aspects of the governance of the church, the extent of due process may vary depending on the rights or matters that are at risk. The rights to participate in worship and fellowship are subject to the highest protection, and any limitations on them without heightened due process must be viewed with considerable skepticism. The Commission construes the “governance” in F-1.0403 to refer primarily to a member’s voting and speaking rights. Those rights, too, must be vigorously protected. Members may have a protectable right to be considered in general for participation in leadership. However, a member’s involvement in particular aspects of leadership are decisions best left to the Session or departments or committees of a church, and not the disciplinary process. Limitations on particular aspects of leadership therefore likely involve a reduced level of due process protection.

3. Basic administrative due process consists of the right to have notice of the matter, to be heard and present one’s arguments, and to have it decided by an unbiased decision-maker. E.g., *Westbrook v. Presbytery of New Hope*, Remedial Case 219-14 (2010). In some contexts, this may include a right to appeal. On the other hand, the Rules of Discipline provide a heightened form of due process (“judicial due process”), including the right to counsel, to present and cross-examine witnesses at trial before the session or the Permanent Judicial Commission, and the right to appeal. Book of Order, Chapter D-11. Upon following these procedures, a church may temporarily limit “the exercise of . . . membership.” D-12.0104.

4. The February 8, 2017 limitations on specific leadership responsibilities in which Mr. Tronsen was engaged -- and where conflict was playing out -- appear modest and directly focused on particular leadership ministries and geographic locations where conflict was arising.

⁴ Following the filing of this action, respondent’s Session adopted a written policy for resolving conflicts between congregants (161-62), as well as a proposed revised policy. The Commission applauds these efforts by Session to thoughtfully and proactively consider the appropriate and Constitutional ways of resolving these matters. Although respondent asks the Commission to approve its policy, we decline to do so because it did not apply the policy in this matter and the validity of neither the policy or revision were fully briefed by both parties.

It would appear that the basic administrative due process protections were met, in that Mr. Tronsen was advised regarding the issue and heard by the decision maker, whom the Commission did not have any reason to consider biased.

5. In contrast, the April 17, 2017 email restricted Mr. Tronsen from “participating in the life of UPC in any way [including] worship” until he met with staff. Mr. Tronsen was not warned that these broad limitations were a possible action to be taken against him.

6. The April 25 agreement significantly limited Mr. Tronsen’s exercise of membership, including limits on access to specific worship services, Christian education, service and fellowship, and leadership roles. However, these limitations were for a specified time period, and were the subject of an agreement between Mr. Tronsen and staff.⁵

7. Finally, the “official letter” dated May 8, 2017 purported to bar Mr. Tronsen altogether from the church campus (on penalty of trespass and removal by the police) until he met with staff and would abide by the April 25 agreement. This letter was issued without warning, and completely and indefinitely restricted Mr. Tronsen’s membership rights until he met with staff.

8. The broad scope of the April 17 and May 8 letters appear to deny Mr. Tronsen “full participation” in the “worship, governance, and emerging life” of UPC. F-1.0403. The only Constitutional provisions that explicitly authorize such actions are under the Rules of Discipline. Respondent has effectively acknowledged that it did not apply the Rules of Discipline or judicial due process in taking these actions.

9. Respondent asserts a number of arguments as to why its actions were proper. First, it asserts that its actions were implicitly authorized under Section G-3.0201. That section empowers sessions to guide congregations and govern their witness so that they become communities of “faith, hope, love, and witness.” Secondly, UPC suggests that it was forced to take these actions because Mr. Tronsen was uncooperative in addressing the conflict, that its actions were “pre-disciplinary,” and that they were intended to facilitate an informal dialogue and resolution of the matter. Thirdly, it observes that Mr. Tronsen agreed to the April 25 agreement. Finally, it contends that staff were delegated the authority to make the decisions in question because they were related to guiding and nurturing the spiritual life of the congregation and were pre-disciplinary. We address each of these points in turn.

⁵ The April 25 agreement permitted Mr. Tronsen to attend a specified worship service of several offered at UPC. The Commission has considered whether, since he could attend a service, this agreement limited his “right to worship.” In the end, we believe it does. Members can and do attend multiple services, and may choose to attend a particular service on a particular day because of differences in worship styles or the attendees or other aspects of their schedule for that day. In addition, the agreement completely prevented him from attending Christian Education, which is potentially a form of worship.

10. Respondent argues that G-3.0201 provides it implied administrative authority to separate congregants in conflict so that it may maintain peace in the context of worship and the church facility, promote living in unity, and direct organizations of the congregation (in this case ushers and greeters). It acknowledges it has found no cases permitting limiting member's rights under Section G-3.0201. Authorities note, however, that while the Constitution defines "the powers of the various governing bodies to ensure that all persons and governing bodies are treated fairly within the concept of due process of law, [t]he Book of Order is not a straitjacket which prevents a governing body from exercising its powers in a reasonable way so as to carry out its basic functions and duties with efficiency." *Bolton v. Alamance Church*, Remedial Case 207-1 (GA PJC 1995)(Book of Order Section G-4.0301i (1995 edition) states that "governing bodies possess whatever administrative authority is necessary to give effect to [their] duties and powers").

11. While sessions have broad express and implied authority to guide and nurture the spiritual growth and flourishing of their members, Section F-1.0403 provides that members' full participation shall not be infringed "for any reason other than those stated in this Constitution." Given the limitation of this provision to "stated" authority, the Commission is loath to imply authority to restrict guaranteed rights. The use of implied authority is especially questionable because the Rules of Discipline specifically contemplate their application in the context of "restoring the unity of the church by removing the causes of discord and division." D-1.0101.⁶ Labeling the actions as "pre-disciplinary" or "administrative" or as "setting boundaries" using other powers within the Book of Order does not change the fact that the restrictions took the form of relief which is specifically within the scope of the Rules of Discipline.

12. We are mindful that the underlying conflict was a multi-party dispute, and that UPC sought to protect the rights of both Mr. Tronsen and the other congregant by creating space where they both might flourish. Although UPC's actions certainly hindered Mr. Tronsen's ability to flourish, it can also be said that Mr. Tronsen's lack of cooperation hindered the efforts of staff to avoid conflict and its ability to guarantee to the other party to the conflict the right to fully participate in the life of the congregation. Mr. Tronsen's reluctance to engage with staff around these issues, while divisive, frustrating, and non-respectful of proper authority, may be subject to the Rules of Discipline. But Mr. Tronsen's non-cooperation does not independently create an authorization "stated in the Constitution" to restrict his rights.

⁶ The restrictions barred Mr. Tronsen from "participating in the life of the church in any way," and from "[being] on the UPC campus [or] involved in any UPC related activities." (129, 138). Respondent acknowledged in its commentary to its proposed conflict avoidance policy that because "temporary exclusion from the exercise of membership is a formal remedy obtainable through church disciplinary process only (D-12.0101) [, this] mitigates strongly against the wholesale elimination of participation in worship and fellowship in the absence of a disciplinary proceeding."

13. Respondent also contends that these actions were pre-disciplinary because they were intended to encourage Mr. Tronsen to meet with them and resolve the matter without resort to disciplinary process. The Commission rejects this argument. Our Church disciplinary process would be rendered moot if staff could impose blanket and indefinite limits on guaranteed rights in order to force congregants to meet with them, or in order to avoid going through the disciplinary process.⁷ A member is guaranteed the right to fully participate in the life of a congregation. The termination of that right – effectively the most extreme penalty in the Book of Order-- should be the last step in the disciplinary process, and not a step taken before the disciplinary process even begins.

14. Respondent implicitly argues that Mr. Tronsen agreed to the April 25 restrictions, and was therefore bound by them. Although it seems likely that restrictions on membership rights to which a member freely and voluntarily agrees may be binding, no authorities have been cited to the Commission and we make no holding on this point. Be that as it may, we reject an argument based on consent in the circumstances of this case. Mr. Tronsen’s agreement was procured only after he had been improperly barred from “participating in the life of the church in any way [including] worship” (129). This exclusion created an undeniably coercive backdrop to the April 25 meeting. We decline to give effect to a consent obtained under those circumstances. Because we do not recognize the consent given here, we do not address whether Mr. Tronsen could rescind the consent given.

15. The Session of UPC was not advised of the actions taken against Mr. Tronsen by staff until after this remedial action was filed. Throughout the underlying conflict, Mr. Tronsen argued that only Session could impose such restrictions upon him. Respondent argues that Session’s involvement in these matters was unnecessary because the matters were pre-disciplinary or administrative. UPC also argues that, at the time, Session had delegated to the Executive Pastor its authority to deal with conflict between members. Because we hold that at least in two instances the restrictions imposed on Mr. Tronsen could only be imposed through

⁷ We note in this regard that the rules of discipline are not an evil to be avoided. Discipline is available to remedy “any act or omission by a member or . . . that is contrary to the Scriptures or the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)” (D-2.0203b). As the Book of Order provides, “Church discipline is the church’s exercise of authority given by Christ, both in the direction of guidance, control, and nurture of its members and in the direction of constructive criticism of offenders. . . . [The] purpose of discipline is to honor God by making clear the significance of membership in the body of Christ; to preserve the purity of the church by nourishing the individual within the life of the believing community; to achieve justice and compassion for all participants involved; to correct or restrain wrongdoing in order to bring members to repentance and restoration; to uphold the dignity of those who have been harmed by disciplinary offenses; to restore the unity of the church by removing the causes of discord and division; and to secure the just, speedy, and economical determination of proceedings” D-1.0101.

the disciplinary process, which required action by the session, we hold that any delegation to staff to take those actions would be ineffective. The Rules of Discipline provide that the “councils of the church for judicial process are the session, the presbytery, the synod, and the General Assembly. The session itself conducts trials.” D-2.0102. While sessions may delegate their administrative authority to commissions, G-3.0109, a commission must be composed of at least two ruling elders and a teaching elder (G-3.0109b). Because the matter has not been argued by the parties, we express no view as to whether a session may delegate its disciplinary authority to a commission.⁸

16. While the prohibitions in this case were sufficiently broad that they ran afoul of the guarantee of F-1.0403, we do not hold that every restriction on any aspect of a member’s involvement in the life of the church requires resort to a formal disciplinary process absent freely provided consent of the member. We do suggest, however, that it should be assumed that restrictions on the right of worship and fellowship should be treated as if they require disciplinary process. What should a church do when it has a conflict that must be addressed and a member does not engage with an informal resolution process? If pastoral intervention and mediation does not effectively address the conflict, the member should be warned (perhaps twice) (Titus 3:10) that if the conduct does not stop or if arrangements cannot be reached to protect the rights of the congregation or other members, the church will be forced to initiate disciplinary proceedings.⁹ If disciplinary proceedings become necessary, any limitations on the member’s participation in the life of the congregation should be the least restrictive to effectively bring an end to impact of the conflict and protect the rights of other members.

17. Both parties bear some responsibility that this action has proceeded this far. As respondent directly and repeatedly acknowledged, it did not do as good a job as it could have in hearing Mr. Tronsen out and appreciating his perspectives and positions. Respondent’s failure to provide Mr. Tronsen with adequate procedural protections aggravated the situation and appeared to lead to distrust on his part. However, after this action was brought, respondent engaged in what we perceive as obvious and faithful self reflection, repeatedly apologized to complainant, and sought reconciliation with him in a number of ways. Mr. Tronsen also bears responsibility for prolonging the conflict. Throughout the underlying dispute and this matter, he appeared to focus on “who was right and who was wrong,” frequently refused to meet or communicate with UPC staff, and often seemed more enamored with engaging in legal procedure than in resolving the matter. During these proceedings, he appeared to refuse to abide by the goals of “conciliating, mediating, and adjusting differences without strife” D-

⁸ We do note however, that the subsection of the Book of Order on judicial commissions provides that “Sessions shall provide the function of a judicial commission for the Congregation.” G-3.0109a.

⁹ Reference to the Rules of Discipline in these circumstances appears appropriate as the Rules of Discipline are intended to address “division and discord” within the church. D-1.0101. An “offense” is defined in the Book of Order as “any act or omission . . . that is contrary to the Scriptures or the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)” D-2.0203b.

1.0103, refused to accept apologies and other attempts at reconciliation, and declined to mediate this matter before an outside mediator arranged and paid for by the Commission after having agreed to do so.

SPECIFIC IRREGULARITIES OR DELINQUENCIES

Mr. Tronsen filed an amended complaint on July 9, 2018. The irregularities or delinquencies alleged are summarized as follows, as are the Commission's determination concerning each one as Sustained/Not Sustained.

1. Regarding the improper restrictions of worship, fellowship, and the emerging life of the congregation, complainant's assertions are Sustained for the reasons set forth above.

2. Regarding the improper restrictions on leadership within the congregation, complainant's assertions are Not Sustained for the reasons set forth above.

3. Regarding the failure to provide due process, complainant's assertions are Sustained (except with respect to the February 8, 2017 action) for the reasons set forth above.

4. Regarding the failure to inform or act by way of session, complainant's assertions are Sustained for the reasons set forth above.

5. Regarding the validity of the conflict resolution procedure subsequently adopted by respondent, complainant's assertions are neither Sustained nor Not Sustained for the reasons set forth above.

6. Regarding the allegations concerning failure to warn, complainant's assertions are Sustained for the reasons set forth above.

7. Regarding the allegations of reliance on gossip, complainant's assertions are Not Sustained for the reasons set forth above.

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. The Commission has stated declaratory relief as to the appropriate actions that should have been undertaken in this matter.

2. The only additional relief sought by Mr. Tronsen is reinstatement of his participation in leadership and service at UPC. Mr. Tronsen and UPC shall meet for the purpose of discussing the parameters and circumstances under which he might be considered for leadership responsibilities either in general or with respect to particular aspects of service. In accordance with UPC's conflict resolution procedure, at least one teaching elder and two ruling elders shall attend on its behalf. The Commission expresses no view on whether Mr. Tronsen should be reinstated to a particular (or any) aspect of leadership. If Mr. Tronsen declines to meet, his

claims regarding participation in leadership will be deemed to have been waived.

3. The Commission invites UPC to revise its proposed conflict resolution policy in conformance with the principles of this decision. UPC may submit a revised policy to the Stated Clerk for review and interpretation.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of Seattle report this Decision to the Seattle Presbytery at its next meeting, that the Presbytery enter the full Decision upon its minutes, and that an excerpt from those minutes showing entry of the Decision be sent to the Stated Clerk of the Synod. (D-7.0701)

ABSENCES AND NON-PARTICIPANTS

Einer Handeland, Mark Zimmerly, and Marty Shelton-Jenck, members of the Permanent Judicial Commission, were not present and took no part in the trial proceedings.

DATE

Dated this 23 day of July, 2018.



Carol Kirkpatrick
Moderator, Permanent Judicial Commission



Bennet McConaughy
Clerk, Permanent Judicial Commission