

APPENDIX T

business referred to it" (*BCO* 15-1). In the motion it adopted, Session clearly delineated what business would be referred to this particular commission.

Presbytery erred when it did not sustain the Complaint challenging the formation a governance commission to operate in accordance with the document "Village Seven Governance Commission." Session's action on its third motion therefore is annulled. This annulment, however, in no way precludes V7PC Session from refining its document to avoid constitutional infirmity.

This decision was written by TE Guy Waters and revised and approved by the Panel and adopted/amended by the full SJC on the following roll call vote:

Bankson <i>Concur</i>	M. Duncan <i>Concur</i>	Neikirk <i>Concur</i>
Bise <i>Concur</i>	S. Duncan <i>Concur</i>	Nusbaum <i>Disqual.</i>
Cannata <i>Concur</i>	Ellis <i>Concur</i>	Pickering <i>Concur</i>
Carrell <i>Concur</i>	Greco <i>Concur</i>	Ross <i>Concur</i>
Chapell <i>Concur</i>	Kooistra <i>Concur</i>	Terrell <i>Concur</i>
Coffin <i>Concur</i>	Lee <i>Concur</i>	Waters <i>Concur</i>
Donahoe <i>Concur</i>	Lucas <i>Concur</i>	White <i>Concur</i>
Dowling <i>Concur</i>	McGowan <i>Concur</i>	Wilson <i>Concur</i>
(23-0-0)		

**CASE NO. 2021-07
RE J. LANCE ACREE
VS.
TENNESSEE VALLEY PRESBYTERY
COMPLAINT
March 3, 2022**

This case began as an attempt by a Ruling Elder to file a *BCO* 43-1 Complaint with Presbytery as the original court, even though he was not a commissioner at the Presbytery meeting where the action was taken. The Officers reviewed the Complaint and recommended the Case be found Administratively Out of Order. (*OMSJC* 9.1.a) The Officers determined that the Case could not be put in order (*OMSJC* 9.2), because the Complainant was not identified in the roster of Ruling Elder Commissioners at the April 2021 meeting of the Presbytery in which the action was taken from which his Complaint arises. The Presbytery Clerk confirmed he was not a commissioner at that meeting. The Officers

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

notified RE Acree that they were making this recommendation to the SJC. Therefore, the SJC rules the Complainant did not have standing to file a *BCO* 43-1 complaint with Presbytery. Presbytery should have also found his Complaint out of order and declined to adjudicate at its July 2021 meeting. See similar SJC rulings on standing in:

- Case 2020-13, *Benyola v. Central Florida*, (M48GA, 2021, p. 817),
Case 2020-01, *Benyola v. Central Florida* (M48GA, 2021, p. 801),
Case 2013-08, *RE Warren Jackson v. Northwest Georgia* (M43GA, 2015, p. 568),
Case 2012-06, *Deacon Don Bethel v. Southeast Alabama* (M41GA, 2013, p. 614), and
Case 92-9b, *Mr. Overman v. Eastern Carolina* (M21GA, 1993, p. 223).

Bankson <i>Concur</i>	M. Duncan <i>Concur</i>	Neikirk <i>Concur</i>
Bise <i>Concur</i>	S. Duncan <i>Concur</i>	Nusbaum <i>Concur</i>
Cannata <i>Concur</i>	Ellis <i>Concur</i>	Pickering <i>Concur</i>
Carrell <i>Concur</i>	Greco <i>Concur</i>	Ross <i>Concur</i>
Chapell <i>Disqual.</i>	Kooistra <i>Concur</i>	Terrell <i>Concur</i>
Coffin <i>Concur</i>	Lee <i>Concur</i>	Waters <i>Concur</i>
Donahoe <i>Concur</i>	Lucas <i>Concur</i>	White <i>Concur</i>
Dowling <i>Concur</i> (23-0-0)	McGowan <i>Concur</i>	Wilson <i>Concur</i>

**CASE NO. 2021-08
IN THE MATTER OF
KOREAN SOUTHWEST ORANGE COUNTY PRESBYTERY
March 3, 2022**

The SJC cited Korean Southwest Orange County Presbytery (KSWOC) to appear at the March 3, 2022 Stated Meeting in Case No. 2021-08, unless the Presbytery provided satisfactory responses in writing by January 14, 2022 to part (d) of the RPR Report presented to the 2021 General Assembly in the review of Presbytery's records.

The SJC has not yet received a response adopted by Korean Southwest Orange County Presbytery. We understand the Presbytery did not have a Stated Meeting scheduled between the SJC's October 21, 2021 Decision and the SJC's March 3, 2022 meeting. We appreciate that the Presbytery's Clerk has