

Exhibit Q — Record Contradictions on a “Door-Propping Rule” (Admissions, Omissions, and the Late “Signage Since June” Claim)

Purpose. To document that (a) the Board **did not cite** any adopted, written rule in September; (b) the President **admitted** in email the Board was *not* basing its decision on whether a rule explicitly forbade the conduct; (c) **no time-stamped, published minutes** establishing a pre-Aug-19 rule were produced; and (d) a later claim about **signage “since June”** is, at most, notice—not proof of an adopted disciplinary rule.

SERC Dear Micah

1) What SERC itself wrote in September (contemporaneous admissions).

- **No explicit rule cited.** The September 12 notice states: “there is **nothing in our Procedures that explicitly says** members can’t leave the door propped open,” pivoting instead to Code-of-Conduct concepts and analogies (e.g., vandalizing boats).
Micah Blumberg Letter Sept 12 2...
The September 13 “revised” letter repeats that same point and the same reliance on general Code language rather than any adopted section.
Micah Blumberg Letter Sept 12 2...
- **Decision not tied to a specific rule.** In email, the President wrote: “the Board is **not agreeing to base its decision on whether a rule explicitly forbade your conduct.**” That is a plain, contemporaneous admission that no adopted rule would be the decision’s legal anchor.
SERC Dear Micah

2) Minutes and verification.

- The President also explained the Board’s **record-control** practices for closed session: “documents are handed out shortly before the meeting and collected after,” and “**minutes for closed session items are kept but not published.**” In other words, there is **no published, time-stamped minutes record** for members to verify a pre-Aug-19 rule adoption.
SERC Dear Micah
- To date, **no pre-Aug-19 minutes/resolution** adopting a door-propping rule (with exact text and section) have been produced to the appellant. That absence aligns with the September letters’ own concessions.
Micah Blumberg Letter Sept 12 2...

Micah Blumberg Letter Sept 12 2...

3) The late “signage since June” claim (October) and why it doesn’t cure the defect.

- Weeks later, a Board officer asserted that signage with this “exact rule” had been posted “since June 2025,” and referenced a May 6, 2024 “ClubSpot” blast. The exhibit compiling that claim shows **notice artifacts** (a poster and web blurb) but **no citation** to a Board vote or Procedures section demonstrating **formal adoption** of a disciplinary rule before Aug 19.

Exhibit P — Signage and “ClubSp...

- Even on its face, the sign’s wording focuses on “**do not leave [the door] unattended,**” which presupposes proof of unattended **duration**; the short clip the Club relies on does not establish intent or duration, so it would not prove a violation of the sign text—much less an adopted rule.

Exhibit P — Signage and “ClubSp...

Conclusion. The **contemporaneous** September notices and the President’s email establish that **no specific, adopted rule** was in force or relied upon; **no published minutes** have been produced to verify any pre-Aug-19 adoption; and the later “signage since June” message is **notice, not authority**, absent a Board vote and codified Procedures section.

Micah Blumberg Letter Sept 12 2...

[https://github.com/n5ro/serc/blob/main/Micah%20Blumberg%20Letter%20Sept%2012%202025%20\(1\).pdf](https://github.com/n5ro/serc/blob/main/Micah%20Blumberg%20Letter%20Sept%2012%202025%20(1).pdf)

Micah Blumberg Letter Sept 12 2...

[https://github.com/n5ro/serc/blob/main/Micah%20Blumberg%20Letter%20Sept%2012%202025%20Revised%20\(1\).pdf](https://github.com/n5ro/serc/blob/main/Micah%20Blumberg%20Letter%20Sept%2012%202025%20Revised%20(1).pdf)

SERC Dear Micah

<https://github.com/n5ro/serc/blob/main/SERC%20Dear%20Micah.pdf>

Exhibit P — Signage and “ClubSp...

<https://github.com/n5ro/serc/blob/main/Exhibit%20P%20%E2%80%94%20Signage%20and%20%E2%80%9CClubSpot%E2%80%9D%20Email%20Are%20Not%20a%20Substitute%20for%20an%20Adopted%20Rule.pdf>

Requested Board action (for the record).

1. Forward **time-stamped emails** and **board records** showing when the specific door language was **created, approved, and noticed**; otherwise, record that the **proponent was unable to produce time-stamped proof** of the claims.

2. **Basis for these requests:** SERC's own September letters **acknowledged no explicit Procedural rule** on "door-propping," and the President wrote the Board was **not agreeing to base its decision** on whether a rule explicitly forbade the conduct; closed-session minutes are "**kept but not published**," which is why **time-stamped** artifacts are essential.
3. If none exists, **withdraw** the suspension or **convert** it to a **neutral, non-disciplinary policy reminder**, and **adopt a clear, prospective** door policy by proper vote with official notice and matching signage.

Post-Tense Language

The Board **failed to produce** any pre-Aug 19, 2025 agenda or minutes—emailed and time-stamped—showing a 2/3 vote adopting a door-propping rule, nor did it identify the exact text or Procedures section of any such rule allegedly in force.

For the record, they **failed to provide** any authenticated, time-stamped emails or minutes demonstrating that an adoption ever occurred. They also **failed to show** any contemporaneous, published record establishing that a rule existed prior to the incident.

Because no such evidence was furnished, the only reasonable inference is that **no adopted rule existed**. The Board therefore should **withdraw the suspension** or treat the matter as a **neutral, non-disciplinary reminder**, and only then adopt a **clear, prospective door policy** by proper vote with official notice and matching signage.

Offered to clarify governance requirements. This exhibit admits no identity, conduct, or intent; rights reserved.