



Bill Millios &lt;william.millios@gmail.com&gt;

## Ethics Complaint

Bill Millios &lt;william.millios@gmail.com&gt;

Fri, Jan 29, 2021 at 3:11 PM

To: ethics@rid.org

Ms. Bateson,

Attached you will find my Official Complaint Form, against Heather Mewshaw, NIC Adv., CI, CT.

Narrative:

On January 25, 2021, Ms. Mewshaw was the interpreter for the White House Press Briefing.

Prior to this assignment, Ms. Mewshaw was an enthusiastic participant in "Right Side ASL", a Facebook group dedicated to the provision of interpreted videos that pushed right-wing narratives.

Some of the videos that were published in this group were re-mastered (with an interpreter) videos that had already been banned by Facebook as containing harmful or false information, including those related to health issues specific to the pandemic of COVID-19.

The group was eventually taken down, and re-surfaced under the name "Hands of Liberty". False and misleading information continued to be disseminated. This false information ranged from propagation of the false claims surrounding voting and the "stolen" election, to dangerous medical advice such as medical ailments caused by demon sperm.

While there is no ethical limitation on interpreters providing access to false information - there are two considerations to be made here:

- 1) The videos had, in many cases, already been banned and removed by Facebook, as being in conflict with their terms of service
- 2) Ms. Mewshaw crossed over the line between access and squarely entered the arena of advocacy when she appeared in a video (as herself) celebrating President Trump. I have attached this video for your records:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1W1u8FutXA1TBpB7JIYVPuD68gLAatOWn/view?usp=sharing>

This clearly shows Ms. Mewshaw in a non-interpreter role celebrating President Trump on a channel that was ostensibly to be used only for access.

Upon Ms. Mewshaw appearing on the White House video feed, a great social media uproar ensued. As a result, much of the incriminating content was scrubbed, including the entire contents of the Hands of Liberty Facebook page. (This begs the question - if the content was above-board, then why the rush to scrub it?)

CPC considerations:

The provision of sign language interpreters for the White House Press Briefings (and all other public broadcasts) is intended to provide access for monolingual ASL-using Deaf people who cannot follow or understand the English captions. This point of view has been publicized in the RID Position paper, here:

<https://rid.org/rid-position-statement-cdis-at-press-conferences/>

In addition, Kelby Brick's StreetLeverage article emphasizes that not using a CDI during "serious settings or situations" is a violation of the CPC. Since the White House Press Conference is where critical pandemic health updates are shared, as well as national news and updates, this is definitely a serious setting AND situation. CPC Illustrative behaviors 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 4.1 and 6.3 all apply here.

<https://streetleverage.com/2014/09/interpreting-without-a-deaf-interpreter-is-an-rid-cpc-violation/>

The use of CDIs during Press Conferences is not new. Nearly all 50 states, as well as most major cities, have now adopted the practice.

More specifically to Ms. Mewshaw, however, was her conflict of interest in accepting this assignment. The duplicity of advocating for Trump and his lies, and then appearing on the Biden White House videos, is a violation of Tenet 3.8: (Interpreters shall) Avoid actual or perceived conflicts of interest that might cause harm or interfere with the effectiveness of interpreting services.

Ms. Mewshaw should have known that there was a perceived conflict of interest prior to accepting the assignment.

I look forward to hearing about the next step.

Yours,  
Bill Millios



**Official-Complaint-Form - Heather Mewshaw.pdf**

168K



Bill Millios &lt;william.millios@gmail.com&gt;

---

## Response to Heather Mewshaw's response

---

Bill Millios &lt;william.millios@gmail.com&gt;

Wed, Mar 3, 2021 at 8:55 AM

To: Ethics Department &lt;ethics@rid.org&gt;

Ms. Bateson,

Thank you for your recent email. I understand that the case has been referred to adjudication, thank you for letting me know.

I encourage the adjudicators to schedule a hearing with everyone who is involved; often the facts can be portrayed in an email, but the level of emotion and damage is often obscured. It occurs to me that there may be multiple complainants in this case, and it is possible that for some of these complainants, English may not be their first language. They have the right to express their thoughts and feelings in their native language - the language that all of us within the RID sphere use - American Sign Language.

If you deem it appropriate, you may share this email with Ms. Mewshaw, as well as directly with the adjudicators. It is obvious to me that she is not interested in listening and learning from this situation; instead, her response since the situation has been consistently defensive, and she has actually caused additional harm to Deaf consumers and to the profession.

Out of a sense of obligation to the process, I will respond to her points, however incorrect they may be.

Ms. Mewshaw attests that I do not meet the definition of a person who has grounds to file a complaint.

As a deaf consumer of interpreting services, as a citizen of the United States, and as someone who cares about what comes out of the White House - I am a part of her audience for that assignment. If I had been alone in the room with her, if she had been in person in front of me, then there would be absolutely no question that I would have grounds to file the complaint. Ms. Mewshaw has failed to consider that when you do a public event, any member of the public who is a part of the audience has both direct knowledge of, and involvement in, the interpreting situation in which the alleged violation occurred.

She refers to the vetting process and the disclosures that she made to the White House. While those may or may not have happened, they are irrelevant. The White House is only one party of the interpreting process; any Deaf individual who has standing to watch the broadcast is the other party and is equally entitled to the processes encoded in the CPC and Ethical Practices System.

Now that we've (re-)established that I have grounds to file the complaint, let's move on to the complaint itself.

Tenet 3.8 states: "Avoid actual or perceived conflicts of interest that might cause harm or interfere with the effectiveness of interpreting services."

Ms. Mewshaw goes into great detail on how 1) she did an exemplary job interpreting, 2) there are many people who agreed with her that she did an exemplary job, 3) she attests that she had no conflict of interest, and (my favorite) 4) she is apparently an award-winning interpreter, so that should presumably preclude any and all potential complaints against her.

The key word that she (intentionally?) overlooked in Tenet 3.8 is "perceived"; to wit: was there a **perceived** conflict of interest?

The very fact that there WAS a social media storm (which she acknowledges in her letter, "The Internet storm that followed my final appearance at the White House was as much of a surprise to me as anyone.") is de facto evidence that multiple people perceived a conflict of interest on her part.

If we had been in a doctor's office, and it had been just me, her, and my doctor, and she showed up, and I (as the sole Deaf party) had said, "I'm not comfortable with you as my interpreter," - what would have been the correct response on her part?

The appropriate response is to apologize, assist with finding a replacement, and leave the situation.

Please read the following sentence carefully: **Her actual interpreting is not being questioned.**

(At least, not by me.)

I have no issue with her actual interpreting. It does not matter. What does matter is the perception of a conflict of interest. As the consumer, only my perceptions are what need to be examined.

When interpreters enter the relationship between two consumers (typically, the hearing party and the Deaf party) - there is an assumption of trust. The interpreter is a guest in this relationship. What the interpreter needs to remember is that neither party, given a choice, really wants the interpreter there. They would prefer to communicate directly. Interpreters play vital roles in the lives of Deaf people - quite literally from cradle to grave. I have personally had interpreters present at the birth of my children, and at the death of my father. I did not want them there in either situation - but I had no choice.

Likewise, the individuals who depend upon interpreters to access the White House Press Briefings (and other public broadcasts of similar stature) - would prefer direct communication. But that is not possible. So, we must rely and trust interpreters to mediate the conversation and the information. Interpreters must mediate both language and culture in order to provide an accurate interpretation.

Trust is typically implicit in the interpreting situation; when it is (actually, or perceived to be) violated, the issue then becomes explicit. In this case, the social media firestorm that erupted has made the lack of trust explicit.

I learned in Kindergarten that when you are a guest at someone's house, and they no longer want you there, you should politely leave.

In this case, there is an obvious perception of conflict of interest - by me, and by everyone who participated in the social media storm.

### **The Second Ethical Complaint:**

Ms. Mewshaw also completely (and intentionally?) sidestepped the entire issue of how this type of assignment needs a Deaf interpreter, and the multiple CPC tenets involved. I have gone into detail in that in my previous letter, I will not re-hash the issue here, except to point out that she ignored the issue, but the White House has not - an increasing number of press conferences are now covered by Deaf interpreters.

It is my sincere hope that the adjudication panel makes a ruling on this specific issue - a precedent that would add weight to RID's recent public statement on the use of Deaf interpreters.

### **Conclusion:**

All interpreters will make ethical mistakes. Sometimes they are even confronted with two "unethical" decisions, and must choose one. As Ms. Mewshaw herself pointed out, the CPC is a guide. What matters the most is 1) can the interpreter explain why they made a specific decision, 2) can they learn from their mistakes, and 3) can they apologize and seek to undo the harm that they might have caused by making the wrong decision? Sometimes, the wrong decision is only apparent in hindsight.

Imagine with me for a moment that when this happened, Ms. Mewshaw had simply come forward and said, "I'm sorry. I made a mistake. Upon reflection of the situation, I can see by the response that there is a perception of conflict of interest. The Deaf consumers' needs and perceptions are of primary importance here. In order to salvage the relationship of trust that must exist between Deaf people and the White House, I am stepping out. In addition, I agree with the RID public statement that this situation really deserves a qualified Deaf interpreter, and I will be using my contacts to try and influence future assignments to include them."

If she had done this - a simple apology, an acknowledgment of what went awry, a commitment to remove herself from the situation, and a promise to improve access for Deaf people - she would have advanced Deaf access in a huge way.

Instead, she decided to go on Fox News, Glenn Beck, and other channels. She shared the same defensive talking points that she put in her letter. In doing this, she ignored the fundamental nature of her presence as a guest in the relationship between the two parties, and she has ignored the needs of the Deaf people she has committed to serve. By refusing to reflect and listen to feedback from the Deaf consumers, she also ignored the Code of Professional Conduct that she, as a certified interpreter, committed to following.

While her original actions were forgivable, her subsequent behavior has exacerbated the situation considerably. Deaf people are now being mocked on the news, in broadcast journalism, and on social media. She has caused additional

harm to the trust that Deaf people have in the profession of interpreting. She has caused harm to the Deaf community, and to the profession of interpreting.

I recommend that the adjudication panel view this situation very harshly. I do not have specific recommendations, except to say that I am unaware of any other interpreters who have gone public in such a large scope to mock and shame Deaf consumers of interpreting services.

Please let me know what I can do next to assist this process.

Yours,  
Bill Millios



Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc.

September 17, 2021

William Millios  
8 Derby Drive  
Montpelier, VT 05602

**PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL**

Re: EPS Case 2021.02

Dear Mr. Millios,

RID has assembled a panel of adjudicators who have carefully reviewed and considered your EPS case and make a decision about the allegations included in the complaint. A copy of the panel's decision letter is enclosed for your review.

Either the Complainant or the Respondent may file an appeal. The appeal must include specific grounds on which the initial decision should be reconsidered by a second panel of adjudicators. The purpose of this process is to evaluate any possible inconsistencies in the process or decision. The grounds for appeal must be due to a procedural error by the EPS, and/or because the evidence presented did not support the decision, and/or because the sanction(s) was unduly harsh based upon the violation(s) found.

Requests for appeal must be submitted in writing or on video within 30 days of the date of this decision. In addition to the grounds for appeal, the appeal must also include any specific rationale or evidence to support the reason(s) for the appeal. Additional or new evidence to support the original complaint/response may not be submitted with the appeal request. For further information about the appeals process, go to [EPS POLICY MANUAL](#)

Please direct any questions you may have about this case to [ethics@rid.org](mailto:ethics@rid.org).

Sincerely,

Tressela Bateson  
EPS Administrator  
(571) 384-5849  
[ethics@rid.org](mailto:ethics@rid.org)

Enc: Adjudication Decision

**REGISTRY OF INTERPRETERS FOR THE DEAF, INC.**  
**Ethical Practices System (EPS)**

**Adjudication Review Panel Decision**

**DECISION DATE:** 8/1/2021

**CASE NUMBER:** 2021.02

**COMPLAINANT:** William Millios

**RID MEMBER:** Heather Mewshaw

**NAD-RID CODE OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT (CPC) TENETS ALLEGED TO BE VIOLATED:**

Tenets 2, 3, 4 and 6.

**SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT<sup>1</sup>:** On January 25, 2021, Heather Meshaw provided interpreting services for a President Biden White House Press Briefing. Mr. Millios alleges that this is a violation of Tenet 3, specifically perceived conflict of interest because of Ms. Meshaw's affiliation with Right Side ASL, a Facebook group dedicated to providing interpreting services of conservative videos. Mr. Millios also alleges that the respondent crossed the line from providing access by independently advocating for a candidate by generating a message that shows personal support for the candidate, thus creating a perception of a conflict of interest when the respondent accepted a President Biden White House Press Briefing assignment. The Complainant also alleges that by not advocating for a CDI, which is a standard promoted by RID for critical press briefings and emergency information, the Respondent violated Tenets 2,4 and 6.

**DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED BY COMPLAINANT:** 1. Video titled "Thank You, President Trump" 2. RID Position Statement regarding CDIs at Press Conferences 3. Street Leverage article by Kelby Brick "Interpreting without a Deaf Interpreter is a RID CPC Violation" 4. Narrative 5. Letter in response to referral to Adjudication.

**SUMMARY OF RESPONSE:** The Respondent provided a timely response. She denied allegations and requested the complaint be dismissed stating that the Complainant did not have grounds to file a complaint due to not having direct involvement or knowledge of the interpreting situation. The respondent denies a conflict of interest, asserting that she does not have a personal, financial or professional interest in the related to providing interpreting for this assignment. The respondent claims that there is no evidence to support the allegations based on the evidence provided, and that her professional record is exemplary.

**DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED BY RESPONDENT:** Cover letter from Attorney, copy of page 4 and 5 of the EPS Policy Manual with notes, Copy of the CPC with notes, 11 statements of support with last names redacted, the following footnote links:

<sup>1</sup> <https://rumble.com/vdx3sb-were-not-going-to-be-divided-were-not-going-to-let-society-tell-us-who-to-h.html>

<sup>2</sup> <https://rumble.com/c/HandsofLiberty>

---

<sup>1</sup> Summaries merely highlight some key points. Adjudicators reviewed all documents submitted in order to arrive at their decisions.

<sup>3</sup> <https://heathermewshaw.com>

<sup>4</sup>

<http://www.interpretereducation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/The-Interpreter-Machine.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3iY-BXb25uk&feature=youtu.be>

<sup>6</sup> (ASL Version) <https://rumble.com/vdp8bb-former-wh-interpreter-says-she-was-harassed-for-perceived-trump-support.html>

<sup>7</sup> <https://time.com/5933592/white-house-sign-language-interpreter/>

and Exhibit 1 “ Examples of interpreters using props as part of their work to convey meaning and context. “ with 4 different links showing interpreters using props.

#### EPS ADJUDICATION REVIEW PANEL DECISION:

CPC Tenet Allegedly Violated	No CPC Violation Found	No CPC Violation with Reprimand	CPC Violation Found
1 Confidentiality			<b>X</b>
2 Professionalism			<b>X</b>
3 Conduct			<b>X</b>
4 Respect for Consumers			<b>X</b>
5 Respect for Colleagues			<b>X</b>
6 Business Practices			<b>X</b>
7 Professional Development	<b>X</b>		

#### RATIONALE FOR DECISION:

##### **TENET 1: Confidentiality**

While the complainant does not allege a violation of this tenet, the panel is required to review the complaint holistically and consider all tenets. The guiding principle of Tenet 1 states: “*Interpreters hold a position of trust in their role as linguistic and cultural facilitators of communication. Confidentiality is highly valued by consumers and is essential to protecting all involved.*”

The Respondent posted an Official Statement on her website which included links to White House Briefings that she interpreted. While these links may be public, using those assignments in her official statement to defend her actions is not an “as needed basis,” and is a violation of confidentiality.

The essence of this complaint is centered on the fact that the Respondent appeared on television and gave public statements in defense of her actions in accepting this assignment. The panel recognizes that this interpreting assignment was a public event. The respondent’s actions following this event responding to reactions of criticism in public venues (television interviews, social media) broke the position of trust the Respondent, as an interpreter, was responsible to uphold. Appearing in public venues is not an exception to confidentiality.

***The adjudication panel concludes there was a CPC violation of Tenet 1.***

##### **TENET 2: Professionalism**

The guiding principle of Tenet 2 states that interpreters are expected to stay abreast of evolving language use and trends in the profession of interpreting as well as in the American Deaf community. A team



consisting of CDIs and HI's is the de facto standard for press conferences. While local cities and counties may not have access to CDI/DI's, Washington, DC is not among them. There are 35 registered CDI's in the metropolitan District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia. The Respondent did not address the allegations in her response regarding advocating for a Deaf interpreter, nor did she mention providing information or referral to the hiring entity regarding the use of CDI's.

In addition to the RID Position Statement CDI's at Press Conferences, released prior to this assignment, (April 2020) it is well known that the American Deaf community has been advocating for CDIs for press conferences and emergency announcements. The respondent failed to respond to this allegation but provided examples of her own professional service record.

The panel finds that the Respondent did not assess the situation beforehand thoroughly and consider how the audience would react given her political ties and how her presence as an interpreter for the Biden administration might be construed as a conflict of interest. The Respondent asserts that she rendered the message faithfully. Her skills are not in dispute; however, her failure to address the issue of a CDI in her response as well as her failure to thoroughly consider the situation and her appropriateness to interpret for the general public are evidence of a violation of Tenet 2.

***The adjudication panel concludes there was a CPC violation of Tenet 2.***

### **TENET 3: Conduct**

Illustrative behavior 3.8 states that an interpreter should avoid actual or perceived conflicts of interest. The Complainant asserts that due to the respondent's involvement in Right Side ASL, there was an obvious conflict of interest as well as a perceived conflict that impacted the effectiveness of the respondent's interpretation. The respondent denies having either a perceived or actual conflict of interest, despite stating that the "internet storm that followed my final appearance at the White House was much of a surprise to me as anyone." This storm is evidence of a perceived conflict by many Deaf consumers. Interpreting is built upon trust and it is the interpreter's responsibility to consider how their public support or lack of support may be construed for their consumers. Furthermore, taking her argument onto media venues to defend herself shows poor judgement, and focusing attention on herself, rather than the role of providing interpreting services and facilitating communication.

The panel reviewed the video created "Thank You Mr. President," and could not determine whether the Respondent was generating a message or interpreting a voice that could not be heard in the video submitted. Regardless, this video clearly demonstrates the Respondent's preference for a specific political party/parsonage, thus a conflict of interest is present.

3.7 states that disclosure to hiring entities regarding an actual or perceived conflict is best practice. The Respondent does not state that she disclosed any perceived conflict to the hiring entity. The panel has determined that an actual as well as perceived conflict of interest exists. The panel agrees with the complainant's statement that the Respondent's presence as an interpreter in this situation conflicted with his ability to view the interpretation thus losing the effectiveness of the interpreting services.

***The adjudication panel has determined there was a violation of Tenet 3.***

### **TENET 4: Respect for Consumers**

The Respondent argued that the Complainant was "Simply a member of the community watching" and requested dismissal of the complaint. This dismissive stance overlooks the fact that there are two parties in an interpreting situation; the second party in this situation is the general public, specifically any Deaf Consumer. This panel affirms that the Consumer, and any public consumer, meets the criteria to file a complaint.

4.2 states: "Approach consumers with a professional demeanor at all times." The Respondent's decision

to appear on news outlets to defend herself against those that disagreed with her actions is not reflective of a professional demeanor. The panel finds these actions are disrespectful and contemptuous of the consumers that the Respondent serves.

***The adjudication panel has determined there was a violation of Tenet 4.***

#### **Tenet 5: Respect for Colleagues**

The Respondent's actions of appearing on news outlets shifted focus from providing linguistic and cultural access to defending her behavior. The Respondent prioritized her reputation over the profession and by default, colleagues. This created negative misperceptions about the interpreting profession and was disparaging to colleagues.

***The adjudication panel has determined there was a violation of Tenet 5.***

#### **Tenet 6: Business Practices**

The Respondent provided interpreting services to the previous administration, and had an opportunity to promote conditions conducive to effective communications and seek remedies, ie: to ensure CDI's were procured. However, this did not occur and the practice carried over to the current administration and this incident. The Respondent coercively acted to convince the general public of the correctness of her behavior by appearing on news forums and used her personal website to post a public statement defending her actions. This is blatant unethical business practice that occurred after the provision of interpreting services.

***The adjudication panel has determined there was a violation of Tenet 6.***

#### **Tenet 7: Professional Development**

***The adjudication panel has determined there was no violation of Tenet 7.***

#### **Conclusion:**

We are in an unprecedented time culturally, socially, legislatively, and legally and scrutiny of interpreters' ethics and ethical decision-making processes needs to be highlighted. When interpreting in a public venue, extra care must be taken when considering conflict of interest, perceived or actual. Higher profile assignments require a higher standard of ethics. The driving force behind the guiding principles is the notion that the interpreter will do no harm. Harm was done by the Respondent not only to the profession but also to the consumers served while willfully and knowingly engaging in media venues to disparage those who disagreed. This behavior is conduct unbecoming a professional interpreter, especially one with many years of experience.

#### **SANCTIONS IMPOSED BY THE ADJUDICATION REVIEW PANEL**

1. A two year suspension of membership and certification effective immediately, not to occur concurrently with any other EPS sanction.
2. Arrange for the removal of RID Credentials from Heathermewshaw.com and any other online presence including but not limited to, LinkedIn, Facebook, state agencies etc.
3. Respondent must inform any agencies and/or employers of certification status change.
4. Work with a RID appointed consultant for at least 40 hours. The consultant may decide if more hours are needed. The consultant will be a RID Certified Member with experience mentoring, coaching, supervision and an expert on the ethical decision making process of ASL interpreters.
5. Read "Ethics for the Real World: Creating a Personal Code to Guide Decisions in Work and Life" by Ronald A. Howard, Clinton D. Korver, Bill Birchard.

6. Under supervision of the consultant, develop and submit a reflection paper that:
  - Demonstrates understanding of why each tenet was violated and reflection of why the Respondent's choices were unbecoming of a professional RID interpreter;
  - Explains what should have been done differently, emphasizing on the error of appearing on television and media interviews post-assignment;
  - Includes a plan for monitoring and maintaining ethical practice in the interpreting profession;
  - Summarizes the overall experience of working with a consultant;
  - Reviews the above reading, as well as any other Consultant recommended readings;
  - Requests the panel to remove suspension with a justification for why this should be done;
  - Is of professional quality, free of errors, using appropriate citations and no less than 10 pages of content;
  - Is approved by the consultant in writing.
7. Work with the Consultant to develop and submit an apology for perusal by the Complainant as desired. The apology will:
  - Be a clear and valid acknowledgment of the unethical behavior that led to the filing of this complaint, citing what errors for each tenet were made;
  - Include a clear statement that the behavior will not happen again;
  - Demonstrate regret by showing how others (Deaf community, general public, and the profession) were impacted and harmed by the Respondent's behavior and decisions;
  - Include a plan to make amends through changes in behavior and practice;
  - Be submitted in both ASL and English;
  - Be approved by the consultant in writing.

Conditions of reinstatement:

1. Submission of reflection paper by September 17, 2023;
2. Submission of apology by September 17, 2022 and only after at least 20 hours of documented work with the consultant. The EPS will provide a secure link for uploading the ASL video to the Respondent;
3. Receipt of a final submission from Consultant including a summary of supervisory sessions held, the result of coaching, mentoring, reading, reflection and discussions. Summary will disclose any agreed upon fees between consultant and respondent, dates of meetings and topics covered during each session. Summary will be submitted concurrently with the reflection paper.
4. The Complainant will be provided a copy of the apology for perusal as desired and may submit a response to the apology for the panel's review.
5. Consultant will approve the apology and reflection paper and provide a statement of approval.
6. Panel will review reflection paper, apology and a statement from the respondent (if provided) and determine if all conditions have been satisfactorily met prior to reinstatement of certification and membership.

The respondent's name, violations found and action taken by RID will be published in the VIEWS per C89.15, pending an appeal and results of the appeal, if filed.

**EPS APPEAL PROCESS:**

Either the complainant or respondent may file an appeal. The appeal must include specific grounds on which the initial decision should be reconsidered by a second panel of adjudicators. The purpose of this process is to evaluate any possible inconsistencies in the process or decision. The grounds for appeal must include one or more of the following reasons:

- Procedural error(s) by the EPS.
- The decision was not supported by the evidence presented.
- The sanction(s) was unduly harsh based upon the violation(s) found.

Requests for appeal must be submitted in writing or on video within 30 days of the date of this decision. In addition to the grounds for appeal, the appeal must also include any specific rationale or evidence to support the reason(s) for the appeal. **Additional or new evidence to support the original complaint/response may not be submitted with the appeal request.**

For further information about the appeals process, go to:

<https://documentcloud.adobe.com/link/track?uri=urn%3Aaaid%3Ausc%3AUS%3Ab7666a9b-8b0d-48c4-9c0f-ca5a8ab91dd6#pageNum=1>



Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc.

November 15, 2021

William Millios  
8 Derby Drive  
Montpelier, VT 05602

Re: EPS Case 2021.02

Dear Mr. Millios:

The purpose of this letter is to inform you that EPS Case 2021.02 has been closed. The respondent has relinquished her certifications and resigned as a member of RID. The EPS has no jurisdiction over non-members. Additionally, if Ms. Mewshaw reapplies for certification in the future, she must first satisfactorily complete the sanctions outlined in the adjudication decision letter before RID considers her application for recertification.

If you have any questions, please call (571) 384-5849 or email [ethics@rid.org](mailto:ethics@rid.org).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Tressela Bateson'.

Tressela Bateson  
EPS Administrator  
Standards and Practices