

# Exhibit 10

## Vote Result 20250123-02

20250123-02		Ballot Ends 1/30/25				
Motion:						
Resolved, that a committee comprised of Meredith Hays, Paul Darr, Bill Redpath, Andrew Chadderdon, and Steven Nekhalla be appointed by the Libertarian National Committee to investigate allegations of misconduct by our Chair, Angela McArdle, which, if true, cast doubt on her fitness to continue in office, and that the Committee be instructed, if it concludes that the allegations are well-founded, to report resolutions covering its recommendations.						
Co-Sponsors: Bost, Haman, Malagon, Thompson (Region 3 and Region 4 ceded sponsorship to their alternates)						
Member/Alternate	Yes	No	Abst.	Did Not Vote	Alt Vote	Notes/Misc
Bost	X				N/A	
Darr/Thompson	X				YES	Region 3 ceded vote to alternate.
Dassing/Bracco	X					
Ford/Weir				X		
Garcia/Shawhan (2)	X					
Haman/Chadderdon	X					
Harlos	X				N/A	
Hays/Malagon	X				YES	Region 4 ceded vote to alternate.
McGee/Johnson	X					
McArdle				X	N/A	
Nanna/Hertzsch	X					
Nekhalla	X				N/A	
Redpath	X				N/A	
Vinson	X				N/A	
Watkins	X				N/A	
Yeniscavich	X				N/A	

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1OMLmOstNc1IE2fMrdFZxFVwaz29jzhmn/edit?gid=931453655#gid=931453655>

## Exhibit 11

### Excerpt of McVay vs. Hinds vs. LNC

*than 25 would not be in order, even with unanimous consent. Had notice been given that it was proposed to increase the dues to more than \$25 or to reduce them below \$10, members who opposed such a change might have attended the meeting to vote against the amendment."*

Notice is a communication intended to be received by members, informing them about the range of options to be considered, and thus impacting the members' decisions whether to exercise their fundamental right to attend meetings to either support or oppose proposed actions. In the unique case of LPDE, after receiving notice the affiliate's three county organizations could have potentially acted to change their representation on the state board to prevent an objectionable amendment from being adopted by the board.

McVay asserts that notice of the October 1 proposed change was given by virtue of a vague August 31 post on the LPDE Facebook group, a post that did not even at minimum say it was intended to constitute notice. It merely said, "Change Bylaw 4?:" Especially given that the Facebook group is used for broad general discussion, it's important to expressly say that it is notice so as to distinguish that post from one merely seeking feedback on a draft idea. This vague phrasing in such a mixed-use forum should not be considered as notice having been properly given.

When the bylaws require notice, it is understood that this precludes engaging in acts intended to thwart its receipt by members. For example, if the bylaws required a mailed notice, the bylaws wouldn't also have to say that hijacking the mail carrier's truck after placing the notices in the mailbox is prohibited. The bylaws don't have to say that a hypothetical white text on a white background isn't valid notice. Requiring that notice be given inherently implies that one cannot take actions to intentionally prevent members from receiving the notice, and that is what undeniably, admittedly happened in this case. An admittedly orchestrated meme dump happened immediately after the Facebook post was made so as to bury it from view. Comments on the post were turned off (initially by Mr. McVay himself) to further make it less visible in the Facebook algorithms. Further, there were none of the customary hashtags applied to the post to identify it as being notice.

If action is taken to prevent previous notice from having its effect, no proper notice was given. Observers of the Facebook page would mostly never even see the post, and if they did, would not likely think it constituted notice. No proper notice was given for the purported October 1 bylaw amendment. That amendment proposed lowering the bar for removing members of the ten-member State Board. Instead of requiring a 4/5 vote of the State Board (provided it is later affirmed by a majority vote at the next Convention), the language purportedly adopted on October 1 allows removal by a vote of two of the three County Chairs and dispenses with the required affirmation vote at the Convention. Effectively, the amendment empowers two people to remove any and all members of the board.

LPDE Bylaw 3.B adopts RONR as its parliamentary authority. Under RONR, without proper notice, the purported October 1 adoption of the bylaw amendment was action taken in violation of a rule in the bylaws protecting absentees. (See RONR 23:6 especially exception (e), also 23:9, 39:5). A requirement for previous notice of a bylaw amendment is a rule protecting absentees (RONR 25:10). RONR 23:9 provides that a finding of an RONR 23:6(e) violation means the action must be declared null and void.

#### **4.2 Actions Relying on Purported October 1 Bylaw Amendment**

Moments after the purported bylaw amendment on October 1, two LPDE County Chairs while serving on the State Board (rather than at a noticed meeting of County Chairs) relied on the invalid bylaw