

CHAT.TXT

In the Matter of *Roos et al. vs. LNC*

Judicial Committee Hearing

Oct 26, 2025, 3pm CDT

[https://lpedia.org/wiki/In_re:_Adoption_of_Special_Investigatory_Report_and_Other_Resolutions_Adopted_at_June_9,_2025_Special_Meeting_\(Roos_et_al._vs._LNC\)](https://lpedia.org/wiki/In_re:_Adoption_of_Special_Investigatory_Report_and_Other_Resolutions_Adopted_at_June_9,_2025_Special_Meeting_(Roos_et_al._vs._LNC))

15:06:44 From Hector Roos : @Mike Seebeck check the registration again please

16:25:18 From Susan Hogarth : Could non-speakers please mute? Someone is breathing heavily

16:25:57 From Mike Seebeck : They are muted.

16:32:06 From Andrew Chadderdon : Kathy yenicavich - member of the SIC - encourages McArdle to commit one of the violations that was specified in the SIC - later voted in favor of this violation

16:32:20 From Austin Martin : Reacted to "Kathy yenicavich - ..." with ☹️

16:34:10 From Abbra Green : Reacted to Kathy yenicavich - ... with "🙄"

16:40:13 From Hector Roos : We have 2 SIC members present in the room:Steven NekhailaDoug KneabelMaybe they want to talk about their work product?

16:45:40 From Rob Stratton : Seem to be having mic problems

16:47:53 From Rob Latham : We, on the contrary, deny the right of any government to do these things, and hold that where governments exist, they must not violate the rights of any individual: namely, (1) the right to life ,Ã accordingly we support the prohibition of the initiation of physical force against others; (2) the right to liberty of speech and action ,Ã accordingly we oppose all attempts by government to abridge the freedom of speech and press, as well as government censorship in any form; and (3) the right to property ,Ã accordingly we oppose all government interference with private property, such as confiscation, nationalization, and eminent domain, and support the prohibition of robbery, trespass, fraud, and misrepresentation.

16:50:13 From Abbra Green : Article 2:

"The Party is organized to implement and give voice to the principles embodied in the Statement of Principles,Ã"

And Article 7 explicitly binds the LNC to adhere to Article 2:

"The National Committee shall have control and management of all the affairs, properties and funds of the Party consistent with these bylaws. The Libertarian National Committee shall establish and oversee an organizational structure to implement the purposes of the Party as stated in Article 2."

16:50:29 From Hector Roos : JJ next

16:50:33 From Hector Roos : please

16:56:18 From Rob Latham : 43:21 Refraining from Attacking a Member,Ãs Motives. When a question is pending, a member can condemn the

nature or likely consequences of the proposed measure in strong terms, but he must avoid personalities, and under no circumstances can he attack or question the motives of another member. The measure, not the member, is the subject of debate. If a member disagrees with a statement by another in regard to an event that both witnessed, he cannot state in debate that the other's statement is false. But he might say, "I believe there is strong evidence that the member is mistaken." The moment the chair hears such words as "fraud," "liar," or "lie," used about a member in debate, he must act immediately and decisively to correct the matter and prevent its repetition.

16:58:10 From Hector Roos : 39:7

17:09:01 From Rob Latham : 39:7 No motion can be introduced that is outside the object of the society as defined in the corporate charter, constitution, or bylaws (see 56:18), unless by a two-thirds vote the assembly agrees to its consideration (see 10:26(2)). Except as may be necessary in the case of a motion of censure or a motion related to disciplinary procedures (61, 63), a motion must not use language that reflects on a member's conduct or character, or is discourteous, unnecessarily harsh, or not allowed in debate (see 43).

17:15:05 From Hector Roos : The contract was renewed unanimously

17:15:16 From Austin Martin : wow

17:15:32 From Andrew Chadderdon : the SIC had gaps in the data it received - then in absence of evidence took the most incriminating assumption in place of the missing evidence. there are multiple specific examples of this behavior documented in my amicus that was sent unfortunately only just before the hearing today

17:19:19 From Kyle Davis : I have offered to show Mr. Martin that data and never had a response from him.

17:19:49 From Chuck Moulton : Reacted to "I have offered to sh..." with ❌

17:20:05 From Hector Roos : Replying to "I have offered to sh..."

Why does someone not involved in the SIC have this data?

17:20:33 From Hector Roos : Replying to "I have offered to sh..."

WHYYYYYYYYY?

17:20:35 From Kyle Davis : Replying to "I have offered to ..."

Why does someone on the IS committee have the ability to get to IS tools?

I don't need the SIC report to open Kixie, lol

17:20:43 From Kyle Davis : Replying to "I have offered to ..."

I have told YOU this before, as well, Mr. Roos.

17:21:29 From Chuck Moulton : Replying to "I have offered to sh..."

@Jonathan McGee Someone should bring up this fact from chat.

17:23:31 From Kyle Davis : Replying to "I have offered to ..."

I'm not paid staff, but I'm certainly on the IS committee and have offered help.

17:23:50 From Kyle Davis : Replying to "I have offered to ..."

Where's the evidence that someone stated that the logs were destroyed?

17:23:50 From Hector Roos : Replying to "I have offered to sh..."

@Kyle Davis Dump the data you have. Remove the PII.

17:23:59 From Hector Roos : Replying to "I have offered to sh..."

You can put here.

17:24:04 From Kyle Davis : Replying to "I have offered to ..."

That's ALL under NDA.

17:24:13 From Kyle Davis : Replying to "I have offered to ..."

Mr. Martin is part of the LNC.

17:24:20 From Hector Roos : Replying to "I have offered to sh..."

ASK FOR A RELEASE IF YOU REALLY HAVE IT

17:24:27 From Hector Roos : Replying to "I have offered to sh..."

OR SUBMIT UNDER SEAL TO THE JC

17:24:44 From Kyle Davis : Replying to "I have offered to ..."

Yawn.

17:24:53 From Andrew Chadderdon : w-9 - from pages 3, 9 and 27 of the SIC report - this is a direct example of the unequivocal misrepresentation - the statements on pages 3 and 9 specifically contradict with the claims on page 27

17:26:42 From Andrew Chadderdon : there has been an extensive pattern within the LNC that dissenting members have had their rights repeatedly violated - improperly removed from meetings - denied access to counsel. and much more

17:27:08 From Kyle Davis : Replying to "there has been an ..."

Ironic.

17:28:02 From Steven Nekhaila : Replying to "there has been an ex,Ä¶" Mr. Chadderdon had every request satisfied to speak with counsel and the last time the request was submitted he did not attend

17:30:03 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "there has been an ex..."

lies... i was given the condition that if i wanted to attend i had to violate my duties to the state chairs in my region by signing a defacto gag ordernekhaila attempted to force LNC members to sign an NDA to participate in discussions about Vest vs LNC litigation - this was after we have all participated in previous discussions about that specific lawsuit had he allowed us to attend without having a complete gag order over us, then he wouldn't be allowed to stifle the misconduct that has been uncovered against him

17:30:52 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "there has been an ex..."

we have all been allowed to participate in past discussions, because we are already under an appropriate NDA.the new one was specifically tailors to suppress whistleblowers

17:31:08 From Steven Nekhaila : Replying to "there has been an ex,Ä¶"

This was with Ackerman, not our general counsel. Ackerman requested and drafted the NDA, not me. An NDA is not a gag order. Your issue with signing it is puzzling but it is your decision.

17:32:16 From Kyle Davis : Whose cat is meowing?

-Amanda Griffiths

17:33:01 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "there has been an ex..."

every LNC member has been under an NDA all term you tried to force us to sign a new NDA that required members "to protect the interests of the LNC by, among other ways, protecting the confidentiality of attorney-client advice, communications, thoughts, mental impressions and strategies;" our THOUGHTS and MENTAL IMPRESSIONS were attempted to be gagged. far beyond any reasonable NDA consideration

17:33:02 From Hector Roos : Reacted to "Whose cat is meowing..." with ☐üòç

17:33:03 From Hector Roos : Removed a ☐üòç reaction from "Whose cat is meowing..."

17:35:02 From Steven Nekhaila : Replying to "there has been an ex,Ä¶" I will reiterate once again, the NDA was requested by Ackerman, not by me.

The substance of the NDA is specific to Ackerman, not the LNC. As constituents of the LNC are not clients, per Ackerman. You were asked to sign an NDA and chose not to. They would not have allowed you to participate. Case closed.

17:36:11 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "there has been an ex..."

what defamatory comments did you tell akerman to misrepresent the whistleblower actions against you to solicit that demand? there a formal request pending that the party is obligated answer

17:36:22 From Austin Martin : I will reiterate once again, the NDA was requested by Ackerman, not by me.

The substance of the NDA is specific to Ackerman, not the LNC. As constituents of the LNC are not clients, per Ackerman. You were asked to sign an NDA and chose not to. They would not have allowed you to participate. Case closed.

That violates their duties to clients. They only would have been justified if someone had contacted them to communicate defamatory information about certain members.

17:36:37 From Austin Martin : after all, Sarwark wasn,Äôt required to sign that NDA

17:36:39 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "there has been an ex..."

are those records also going to be not available?

17:37:24 From Steven Nekhaila : Replying to "there has been an ex,Ä¶" I did not tell them anything, this is what they requested. For the umpteenth time.

17:37:36 From Hector Roos : Policy Manual Rule 1.02-1 reads:,ÄúAn LNC Member may satisfy the requirement of giving previous notice of their

intention to introduce an original main motion at the next session by:1. Announcing this intention at the previous session in the presence of a quorum, providing an accurate and complete statement of purport, with such notice to be taken note of in the minutes; or2. Sending the complete language of the motion to the entire LNC by e-mail at least five (5) days prior to the session.,Ä

17:37:53 From Austin Martin : Reacted to "Policy Manual Rule 1..." with ☐üëç

17:39:10 From Steven Nekhaila : Replying to "I will reiterate onc,Ä¶" Individual board members are not considered clients

17:39:39 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "I will reiterate onc..."

nope but the board is... we are part of the board. stop playing semantics games

17:40:00 From Austin Martin : Replying to "I will reiterate onc..."

I wasnt asking to attend in my capacity as a private individual, but as a member of the board of directors of the LNC

17:40:58 From Austin Martin : Replying to "I will reiterate onc..."

unlike sarwark

17:42:12 From Hector Roos : 10:47 If previous notice is given at a meeting, it can be given orally unless the rules of the organization require it to be in writing,Äiwhich is often the case with notice of amendments to bylaws. Unless the rules require the full text of the motion, resolution, or bylaw amendment to be submitted in the notice, only the purport need be indicated; but such a statement of purport must be accurate and complete,Äias in ,Äúto raise the annual dues to \$20,Äù,Äisince it will determine what amendments are in order when the motion is considered. The notice becomes invalid if the motion is amended beyond the scope of the notice (see also 35, 57).

17:42:13 From Hector Roos : 10:52 A motion to adopt (or accept or agree to) an officer,Äôs or a committee,Äôs report or recommendations which the assembly (by means of a main motion) directed the officer or committee to prepare is an incidental main motion. A motion to adopt or accept a report or the recommendations of a standing committee prepared on the committee,Äôs own initiative and dealing with a subject that was not expressly referred to the committee, however, is an original main motion.

17:42:58 From Steven Nekhaila : Replying to "I will reiterate onc,Ä¶" @Andrew Chadderdon the corporation is, not the board

17:43:13 From Rob Stratton : Ok folks I have to bow out of the rest of the hearing . I have a prior engagement.

17:43:51 From Hector Roos : 9:15, 9:60

17:44:18 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "I will reiterate onc..."

LNC Inc is exclusively the members of the LNC - the directors. the attorney is engaged with LNC Inc. I am a director of LNC Inc.

17:44:45 From Steven Nekhaila : Replying to "I will reiterate onc,Ä¶" If you wish to ask Ackerman why you had to sign an NDA, there is an NDA you can sign to speak with them

17:45:25 From Hector Roos : 9:15 The only business that can be transacted at a special meeting is that which has been specified in the call of the meeting. This rule, however, does not preclude the consideration of privileged motions, or of any subsidiary, incidental, or other motions that may arise in connection with the transaction of such business or the conduct of the meeting. If, at a special meeting, action is taken relating to business not mentioned in the call, that action, to become valid, must be ratified (see 10:54,Äi57) by the organization at a regular meeting (or at another special meeting properly called for that purpose).

17:45:29 From Sylvia Arrowwood : Replying to "I will reiterate onc..."

Still meet quorum with Stratton gone?

17:49:05 From Hector Roos : Replying to "I will reiterate onc..."

Does it matter if they are not going to take action?

17:49:34 From Austin Martin : Reacted to "Still meet quorum wi..." with ☐üëç

17:56:35 From Richard Brown : Failure to have or permit debate is not a continuing breach.

17:57:44 From Sylvia Arrowwood : Replying to "I will reiterate onc..."

Minutes should reflect at 6:42 PM Stratton departed. Not sure if chat is recorded.

17:58:28 From Austin Martin : i believe the SIC was adopted on June 9th, and the appertunant motions were re-voted on the 24th

17:58:55 From Hector Roos : Replying to "i believe the SIC wa..."

August

18:04:16 From Kyle Davis : I told HECTOR that I could not give HECTOR data. He knows that and is directly lying about what was stated above.

18:04:35 From Hector Roos : Replying to "I told HECTOR that I..."

If you're not otherwise bound by the NDA, SEND THE DATA

18:04:41 From Hector Roos : Replying to "I told HECTOR that I..."

No more excuses or stories

18:05:01 From Kyle Davis : Replying to "I told HECTOR that..."

Mr. Martin can be shown things, as an LNC member, that you cannot, Hector. This is obvious. Please attempt to read.

18:05:42 From Hector Roos : Replying to "I told HECTOR that I..."

Just send it to entire.lnc@lp.org

18:06:37 From Caryn Harlos : A body can end debate. A body can sustain the ruling of the Chair. Others cannot like that. This is not a JC matter.

18:07:04 From Caryn Harlos : It is not a continuing breach of the bylaws.

18:07:45 From Caryn Harlos : I hope everyone sees the tactics here are to dogpile and steamroll while the LNC is respecting time by not having three people respond.

18:08:09 From Chuck Moulton : Reacted to "I hope everyone sees..."
with ☐ü\$î
18:08:37 From Caryn Harlos : One person should be chosen to respond
to each side.
18:09:03 From Caryn Harlos : There was no agreement with the LNC,
that would be unethical on her part.
18:09:19 From Keith Thompson : Her agreement with whom for
resigning??
18:09:33 From Steven Nekhaila : Reacted to "Her agreement with w,Ä¶"
with ☐üëÜ
18:09:56 From Austin Martin : thats a dangerous question
18:09:57 From Caryn Harlos : LPCO would be doing its own internal
email audit JJ, you do not need to stick your nose into everything.
18:10:18 From Keith Thompson : Reacted to "Her agreement with w..."
with ☐üëÜ
18:10:27 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "Her agreement with
w..."

Kathy yeniscavich and Adrian malagon

18:10:29 From Caryn Harlos : We have SoS email she WAS involved.
18:10:51 From Keith Thompson : By what authority could they possibly
make a deal?
18:11:00 From Caryn Harlos : Replying to "Her agreement with w..."

She knows that they would have no authority, this is all BS

18:11:05 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "Her agreement with
w..."

you'd have to ask them

18:11:36 From Keith Thompson : Replying to "Her agreement with w..."

Them thinking they have authority where they clearly have none does not
make it such.

18:11:38 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "Her agreement with
w..."

the whole "factionless board" was behind them

18:12:00 From Steven Nekhaila : Replying to "Her agreement with w,Ä¶"
Ms. McArdle resigned to take a job in the Trump Administration according
to official court documents. So I am not sure what Mr. Chadderdon is
talking about

18:12:32 From Caryn Harlos : This three speaking for one is grossly
inequitable

18:12:50 From Keith Thompson : Interesting to argue that the
membership pledge now binds LNC members considering that was the very
essence of the previous censure.

18:13:21 From Caryn Harlos : ,ÄúI,Äù certify

18:16:01 From Keith Thompson : Reacted to "Ms. McArdle resigned..."
with ☐üëÜ

18:21:19 From Andrew Chadderdon : June 9 meeting had the SIC report
adopted, and most relevant to this discussion - 2 additional
"appurtenant" resolutions.JJ's position is that the SIC Report adoption
was in order, and the 2 appurtenant resolutions were not in orderhector
position is that all 3 of those were out of order.going into the Aug 24

meeting - both appurtenant resolutions were ruled out of order, and 2 replacement motions were noticed for the august 24 meeting.at the aug 24 meeting - 2 replacement appurtenant resolutions were adopted

18:21:39 From Hector Roos : 10:52 A motion to adopt (or accept or agree to) an officer,Äôs or a committee,Äôs report or recommendations which the assembly (by means of a main motion) directed the officer or committee to prepare is an incidental main motion. A motion to adopt or accept a report or the recommendations of a standing committee prepared on the committee,Äôs own initiative and dealing with a subject that was not expressly referred to the committee, however, is an original main motion.

18:30:05 From Caryn Harlos : Kangaroos is making no senses

18:30:33 From Caryn Harlos : They need to be not be able to keep raising their hands and dogpile. It should be one person per question.

18:31:15 From Caryn Harlos : There was a motion to rescind which failed

18:34:49 From Caryn Harlos : THERE WAS A MOTION TO RESCIND THAT FAILED

18:34:51 From Andrew Chadderdon : the LNC is required to not deny access to counsel systematically by action of the chair

18:34:55 From Caryn Harlos : They had their opportunity

18:35:24 From Andrew Chadderdon : the chair systematically blocked access to counsel so that LNC members could not be properly informed to do the business on Aug 24

18:35:29 From Caryn Harlos : There is absolutely no allegation that there was not enough time to review by the time the motion to rescind came up

18:35:52 From Andrew Chadderdon : yes there was. it is on video

18:35:57 From Caryn Harlos : Ask Austin Martin if he thinks the LNC is full of socialists getting paid by Soros

18:36:33 From Caryn Harlos : You are purposefully miscasting Chadderdon, there was sufficient time to review by the time the rescind motion came up

18:36:36 From Kyle Davis : Replying to "yes there was. it ..."

We literally read it over the course of 4 hours, including with silly voices, for everyone to be able to understand it without having to read it themselves. You're telling me that 3 days wasn't enough time to find 4 hours?

18:36:51 From Caryn Harlos : While I have your attention you need to be talking to the new CO Chair and communicate to the LNC they oppose your actions

18:37:06 From Andrew Chadderdon : there were pending, critical and foundational legal questions that were denied answers systematically. those questions remained unanswered going into that meeting by design

18:37:26 From Caryn Harlos : And the majority disagreed as is their right

18:37:31 From Caryn Harlos : A minority cannot hijack the majority

18:37:41 From Caryn Harlos : You said that all the time in MI

18:38:04 From Andrew Chadderdon : there wasn't systematic deprivation of access to retained counsel in Michigan

18:38:36 From Hector Roos : We hereby determine that the word ,Äúsession,Äù in sections 14 and 15 of Article 7 of the Party Bylaws

therefore includes doing business by electronic mail balloting. (Robson vs. LNC)

18:38:46 From Caryn Harlos : Doesn't matter, the majority gets to decide what is in order

18:39:00 From Caryn Harlos : You seem to like that when you are in majority

18:39:32 From Caryn Harlos : Speaking of the Robson decision, stop having secret discussions

18:39:51 From Caryn Harlos : When the special meeting was called, it was in email and therefore notice was given on the email list

18:41:27 From Andrew Chadderdon : You said that all the time in MI@Caryn Harlos you said on August 7 of this year that it was unacceptable for directors to be denied access to counsel. Your exact statement: "This is abrogating an LNC member's fiduciary duty to be informed. Since things with counsel will likely be privileged you are adopting a "trust me bro" attitude with the Chair as gatekeeper they can't even consult with someone else. "

18:41:49 From Austin Martin : respectfully, I disagree with that narrative, Mrs. Harlos. We only wanted access to staff to make informed decisions and do our due diligence.

That isn't , hijacking, and the characterization is frankly, absurd.

18:42:09 From Hector Roos : ASk here @Blay Tarnoff

18:42:13 From Steven Nekhaila : Replying to "the chair systematic," False, and you asked questions at the eleventh hour with no reasonable expectations that your questions would be answered in time. Furthermore, you had all questions answered in time

18:42:43 From Austin Martin : Replying to "the chair systematic..."

You presented the Report at the 11th hour.

18:42:57 From Blay Tarnoff : my question is: was the sic report (re-)adopted on 8/24, or not?

18:42:58 From Hector Roos : Replying to "the chair systematic..."

@Austin Martin 11:59 PM

18:43:00 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "the chair systematic..."

prove that - i already submitted the receipts proving your claim false @Steven Nekhaila - the JC has that already

18:43:14 From Steven Nekhaila : Replying to "the chair systematic," Your questions were answered Mr. Chadderdon

18:43:29 From Keith Thompson : Replying to "my question is: was ..."

The report itself, no - the accompanying resolutions, yes.

18:43:29 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "the chair systematic..."

prove it

18:43:57 From Steven Nekhaila : Replying to "the chair systematic," Your questions were answered in writing and in the 4hr session you requested

18:44:48 From Caryn Harlos : THERE WERE NO INTERVENING EMAIL BALLOTS YOU DOLT

18:45:22 From Caryn Harlos : Sorry @Blay Tarnoff I originally sent that to you personally and not to the group.

18:45:24 From Steven Nekhaila : Replying to "the chair systematic,Ä¶" And then leaked by Mr. Martin violating executive session, once again

18:45:43 From Keith Thompson : More lawsuits from whom?

18:45:43 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "my question is: was ..."

here are the two motions that were considered and adopted on Aug 24:Resolution 1:Whereas, the Special Investigatory Committee has found that former Chair Angela McArdle engaged in actions that, in the LNC's view, violated fiduciary duties to the Libertarian Party, including concealing conflicts of interest and misusing donor funds; Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Libertarian National Committee censures Angela McArdle for conduct in violation of the fiduciary duties and ethical standards expected of Party leaders; Be it further resolved, that the Libertarian National Committee expresses its opinion that Angela McArdle's conduct, as detailed in the Special Investigatory Committee report, reflects behavior inconsistent with the standards expected of those serving in leadership roles of the Libertarian Party or as a candidate representing it. Chair Nekhaila ,Ä August 18th, 2025

18:45:46 From Austin Martin : Replying to "the chair systematic..."

We did not get key questions answered, and the shaky answers we eventually did get were very late after the fact.

18:45:47 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "my question is: was ..."

Resolution 2: Whereas, the Special Investigatory Committee finds that former Chair Angela McArdle financially benefitted from her deception of the Libertarian National Committee; Be it resolved, that the Libertarian National Committee shall explore fundraising and/or pro bono legal counsel to pursue the recovery of funds, under any legal procedures available, as outlined in this report and any supplemental report(s) produced by the Special Investigatory Committee. Chair Nekhaila - August 18th, 2025

18:46:09 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "my question is: was ..."

the SIC report itself was not touched on Aug 24

18:46:45 From Steven Nekhaila : Replying to "the chair systematic,Ä¶"

We had a 4hr session that was ended at Mr. Chadderdon's request. If questions were unanswered it was the fault of the requester

18:46:50 From Caryn Harlos : The SoP is about government.

18:46:57 From Caryn Harlos : The Pledge is about individuals.

18:47:03 From Keith Thompson : Reacted to "The SoP is about gov..." with ☐üëÜ

18:47:18 From Keith Thompson : Replying to "The SoP is about gov..."

I would also suggest, though, that the SoP is not violated by the SIC report.

18:47:19 From Caryn Harlos : I know this intimately by being on the APRC. Roos is way off base.
18:47:37 From Caryn Harlos : Replying to "The SoP is about gov..."

It is not but I was laying that record for future.

18:47:43 From Keith Thompson : Reacted to "It is not but I was ..." with ☹️

18:47:57 From Caryn Harlos : There is now yielding. For the love of Zeus stop saying that.

18:48:06 From Caryn Harlos : No yielding.

18:48:40 From Hector Roos : Groups are made of individuals. There is a group identity with regards to the pledge.

18:48:54 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "the chair systematic..."

@Steven Nekhaila This session didn't happen until Sept 10 - you are lying that it happened before Aug 24 -

18:49:04 From Austin Martin : Reacted to "@Steven Nekhaila Thi..." with ☹️

18:49:09 From Chuck Moulton : Replying to "No yielding."

I yield the balance of my comments to Caryn Ann.

18:49:12 From Caryn Harlos : Groups have no rights or obligations, only individuals do.

18:49:15 From Austin Martin : Reacted to "@Steven Nekhaila Thi..." with 🤔

18:49:18 From Caryn Harlos : Replying to "No yielding."

LOLOLOL

18:49:20 From Steven Nekhaila : Replying to "the chair systematic,Ä" I never said it did

18:49:28 From Kyle Davis : Reacted to "Groups have no rig..." with ☹️

18:49:31 From Austin Martin : Reacted to "The SoP is about gov..." with 🤔

18:49:36 From Austin Martin : Reacted to "The SoP is about gov..." with ☹️

18:49:36 From Hector Roos : Reacted to "I yield the balance ..." with 🤔

18:49:37 From Kyle Davis : Replying to "Groups have no rig..."

A foundational Libertarian concept.

18:49:37 From Austin Martin : Removed a ☹️ reaction from "The SoP is about gov..."

18:49:38 From Austin Martin : Removed a 🤔 reaction from "The SoP is about gov..."

18:49:46 From Caryn Harlos : Martin lied about when Steve spoke to Sarwark

18:50:01 From Caryn Harlos : It was in August. It is reported on Third Party Watch. Go look.

18:50:09 From Blay Tarnoff : another q: was the sic report amended since 6/9?

18:50:13 From Austin Martin : The Idea that the LNC is allowed to commit intentional misrepresentations and refuse to correct them is both absurd and repugnant.

18:50:17 From Hector Roos : Replying to "another q: was the s..."

NO

18:50:22 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "the chair systematic..."

False, and you asked questions at the eleventh hour with no reasonable expectations that your questions would be answered in time. Furthermore, you had all questions answered in time you just said the opposite, barely a few minutes ago - quoted here...If any members of the JC need evidence of misrepresentation, look no further

18:50:41 From Caryn Harlos : The minority is just mad the majority won,Ät bend to their bullying.

18:51:06 From Caryn Harlos : And since Chadderdon is once again paying attention, CONSULT WITH THE NEW CHAIR OF CO and inform the LNC of their opposition to your conduct.

18:51:21 From Andrew Chadderdon : Replying to "It was in August. I..."

the email with sarwark occurred on august 16 - in that exchange they discuss a meeting that occurred "months prior", which has been separately confirmed by Nekhaila and by oliver hall.that is the meeting he is talking about

18:51:24 From Caryn Harlos : McGee was a PRO

18:51:26 From Austin Martin : I can,Ät believe fraud is being legitimized as an argument.

The NAP must be upheld.

18:51:35 From Caryn Harlos : There is zero fraud

18:51:40 From Steven Nekhaila : Replying to "the chair systematic,Ä" You may not have gotten all you answers in 30minuttee but they were answered

18:51:57 From Caryn Harlos : I would argue your cyber bullying is a violation of the party property