

Exhibit B — Evidence Matrix: Board Claim vs. Record

Purpose: Show, claim by claim, what the **video/record actually demonstrates**, whether **corroboration** has been produced to the member, and whether a **written rule** in force on Aug 19, 2025 was **cited**.

Plain-text table (copy/paste into your doc)

Board claim: “Door-propping” is akin to vandalism/breaking windows and warrants suspension.

Video shows: No property damage is depicted; brief contact at/near the threshold is not per se destructive.

Corroboration produced?: No harm/loss documentation provided (no repair invoice, incident loss report, or police report in packet provided to member).

Written rule cited?: **No.** The suspension notice concedes no explicit prohibition in the written Procedures.

Board claim: The video proves *intent* to leave the door open.

Video shows: The clip does not show intent or a plan; it does not establish duration. A later 9:45 pm observation is outside the clip.

Corroboration produced?: Incident report and/or narrative linking frames to a later condition not provided to the member.

Written rule cited?: **No section cited.**

Board claim: The door being open at 9:45 pm resulted from the 9:15 conduct.

Video shows: The clip does not cover 9:15 → 9:45; intervening events are unknown.

Corroboration produced?: No door-status timeline or audit trail tying 9:15 to 9:45 produced to the member.

Written rule cited?: **N/A** (causation assertion, not a rule).

Board claim: This occurred *after hours* and aggravated risk.

Video shows: Timestamp ~9:15 pm. Facility Use allows **presence** until 11:00 pm (entry allowed until 9:00 pm).

Corroboration produced?: Facility Use policy supports presence until 11:00 pm; no contrary exhibit provided to the member.

Written rule cited?: **N/A** (hours policy, as written, supports member's position).

Board claim: No PDK “tag-in” entry for Micah that night.

Video shows: Not shown; outside the clip’s scope.

Corroboration produced?: PDK logs and device-health data **not produced** to the member.

Written rule cited?: **No section cited** that imposes suspension for an unlogged entry on Aug 19.

Board claim: The conduct posed an unreasonable risk/harm to the Club.

Video shows: No unauthorized entry, damage, or loss is depicted.

Corroboration produced?: No loss report or unauthorized-entry exhibit provided to the member.

Written rule cited?: **No section cited.**

Board claim: Discipline can rest on general Code expectations (“logical extensions”).

Video shows: A clip cannot convert a general expectation into a specific violation; the question is whether a **written rule** existed and was violated.

Corroboration produced?: No exhibit identifying a duly adopted, on-point rule provided to the member.

Written rule cited?: **No.** By-Laws limit penalties to violations of **written** by-laws, rules, or procedures.

Notes for footer (optional to include beneath the table):

- **Facility hours (Procedures):** Members may enter 4:00 am–9:00 pm; must leave by 11:00 pm. Thus, **9:15 pm** is within permitted **presence** hours.
 - **Authority to discipline (By-Laws):** Penalties apply to **violations of written by-laws, rules, or procedures**; adoption/interpretation of rules requires a **2/3 vote** and publication to members.
-

Markdown table version (if you prefer)

Board claim

Video shows

**Corroboration
produced?**

**Written rule
cited?**

“Door-propping” is akin to vandalism/breaking windows and warrants suspension.	No property damage depicted; brief contact at/near threshold is not per se destructive.	No harm/loss documentation provided to member (no repair invoice, loss report, or police report).	No. Suspension notice concedes no explicit prohibition in Procedures.
Video proves <i>intent</i> to leave the door open.	Clip does not show intent or a plan; no duration established; 9:45 observation is outside the clip.	Incident report/chain tying frames to later condition not provided to member.	No section cited.
Door being open at 9:45 pm resulted from the 9:15 conduct.	Clip does not cover 9:15→9:45; intervening events unknown.	No door-status timeline or audit trail linking 9:15 to 9:45 produced.	N/A (causation assertion, not a rule).
This occurred <i>after hours</i> and aggravated risk.	Timestamp ~9:15 pm; presence allowed until 11:00 pm (entry until 9:00 pm).	Facility Use supports presence until 11:00 pm; no contrary exhibit produced.	N/A (hours policy supports member’s position).
No PDK “tag-in” entry for Micah that night.	Not shown on video; outside clip’s scope.	PDK logs and device-health data not produced to member.	No section cited imposing suspension for an unlogged entry on Aug 19.
Conduct posed unreasonable risk/harm to the Club.	No unauthorized entry, damage, or loss is depicted.	No loss/unauthorized-entry exhibit produced to member.	No section cited.
Discipline can rest on general Code expectations (“logical extensions”).	A clip can’t convert a general expectation into a specific violation; the issue is whether a written rule existed and was violated.	No exhibit identifying a duly adopted, on-point rule produced.	No. By-Laws limit penalties to violations of written rules/procedure