

APPEAL TO THE NATIONAL LIBERTARIAN PARTY JUDICIAL COMMITTEE (JC)

RE: ADOPTION OF REVISIONS TO POLICY MANUAL PROVISION 1.01.4 IN EMAIL BALLOT ENDING JANUARY 2, 2024

Appellant: Brittany Kosin on behalf of signatories to appeal

Appellee: Libertarian National Committee (LNC)

Date: January 6, 2025

Jurisdiction: LP Bylaws Articles 7.12 and 8.2

Bylaws Alleged to be Violated: Articles 7:14, 7:15, and 16 (incorporating RONR)

Relevant RONR Provisions: Will be cited throughout as needed

Interested Parties: LNC and every national Libertarian Party Member

1. DECISION APPEALED

Motion passed via email ballot found here:

<https://groups.google.com/g/lnc-public/c/nY7MEZVPaz4/m/Xj8Ra8aeBgAJ> stating:

To strike out the current Section 1.01.4 text and insert the following:

4) Removal from Office

A Party Officer or At-Large Member may be disciplined as per the Bylaws Article 6.7 and 7.5, for cause, by the trial procedure outlined in the parliamentary authority. This requirement shall be modified by the following rules:

1. At least 14 days' notice shall be given to the accused.
2. The accused's rights of membership, except as they relate to the trial, may be suspended by a two-thirds vote upon the adoption of the charges and pending the disposition of the charges.
3. The accused may appear either personally or by counsel. Defense counsel may be either a sustaining member of the national Libertarian Party as per Bylaws Article 4.4, a licensed attorney, or both.

4. The manager for the Party shall be a sustaining member of the national Libertarian Party, as per Bylaws, Article 4.4.

5. Testimony and deliberations, as being “pending or potential litigation,” as per Bylaws, Article 7.15, may be held in Executive Session. The LNC may, however, order a transcript or recording be made of the session even if in Executive Session.

6. The LNC may act on the report of an investigatory committee at any point prior to the final adjournment of the next Libertarian National Convention.

7. Prior to the commencement of the trial, the LNC, by majority vote, adopts a resolution to govern the trial specifying details not inconsistent with the procedures described in the Bylaws, rules in the policy manual, or the parliamentary authority.

2. CLARIFICATION ON APPEAL

I, as primary Appellant, am not alleging that every section is violative, but as it was passed as one motion, a successful appeal would revert the language back to language that was subject to my prior appeal submitted December 18, 2024, which should then be immediately considered re-submitted as it was temporarily mooted due to this attempted intervening Policy Manual Change with the appropriate time frames in the Judicial Committee Rules of Appellate Procedure being invoked.

3. POLICY MANUAL CANNOT UNILATERALLY RE-DEFINE TERMS IN CONTRADICTION TO ORIGINAL INTENT OF BYLAWS TO QUALIFY FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION NOR VIOLATE DUE PROCESS

Executive Session may only be used as specified in the Bylaws which read as follows:

LP Bylaw 7.15

The National Committee and all of its committees shall conduct all votes and actions in open session; executive session may only be used for

discussion of personnel matters, contractual negotiations, pending or potential litigation, or political strategy requiring confidentiality.

The LNC cannot by fiat declare something “potential litigation” as it attempts to do in this Policy Manual amendment. As they tried in the Harlos trial, the LNC will likely point to RONR as follows:

RONR 9:24

[...] In any society, certain matters related to discipline (61, 63), such as trials, must be handled only in executive session. [...]

The LP Bylaws only adopt the parliamentary authority when not inconsistent with the Bylaws. Here the LP Bylaws overrule RONR:

LP Bylaw 16

The rules contained in the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised shall govern the Party in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with these bylaws and any special rules of order adopted by the Party.

“Potential litigation” isn’t a mere possibility that the LNC might get sued. As was shown in the Colorado debacle, anyone can threaten to sue without basis, and therefore nearly any action of the LNC, including the removal vote itself, is cause for potential litigation. Therefore, “potential litigation” is a matter of interpretation, and thereby ambiguous, and RONR provides clear guidance on how ambiguous Bylaws are to be interpreted (highlighting added):

RONR 56:68 Some Principles of Interpretation

[...]

1) Each society decides for itself the meaning of its bylaws. When the meaning is clear, however, the society, even by a unanimous vote, cannot change that meaning except by amending its bylaws. An ambiguity must exist before there is any occasion for interpretation. **If a bylaw is ambiguous, it must be interpreted, if possible, in harmony with the other bylaws. The interpretation should be in accordance with the intention of the society at the time the bylaw was adopted, as far as this can be determined.** Again, intent plays no role unless the meaning is unclear or uncertain, but where an ambiguity exists, a majority vote is all that is required to decide the question.

In anticipation of an LNC argument that *they* can decide the meaning by a majority vote, this passage is speaking of *the society*, meaning the Party in Convention. This is made clear by the earlier reference to amendment of the Bylaws by *the society*. The rest of the relevant Bylaws (6:7, 7:5, 7:15) make it clear that the presumption is transparent and open sessions and also provides for an appeal to the JC which requires a public record as the JC is an appeals body. It does not conduct a trial *de novo*. If a trial is conducted in secret, the JC will not have access to the trial proceedings to examine errors made by the LNC and judge the justice or injustice of their decision. The LNC may rejoin that this Policy Manual amendment allows that “The LNC may, however, order a transcript or recording be made of the session even if in Executive Session.” If such a record exists, it defeats their argument that this is to protect against potential litigation as such a record can be subpoenaed as secrecy cannot be used to protect against actionable torts. Further, this violates the due process of the accused as only the LNC would be “permitted” to record, and not the accused who then is placed at a disadvantage in preparing an appeal. Such a lop-sided privilege is completely offensive to any idea of due process. To remind the JC, a prior removal of Harlos was overturned as follows:



VOIDING OF REMOVAL OF CARYN ANN HARLOS AS LNC SECRETARY

Brodi Ellwood (MA) raised a **POINT OF ORDER** stating the following:

Ms. Harlos should have had full due process, including a trial, for her removal as Secretary. Ms. Harlos' removal from the position of Secretary is null and void for that reason.¹⁵

The Chair ruled the point of order **NOT WELL-TAKEN**.

Mr. Ellwood **APPEALED** from the ruling of the Chair.

James Jenneman (MN) moved to end debate.

The motion to end debate **PASSED** upon a show of hands.

The ruling of the Chair was **OVERTURNED** upon a show of hands, and the prior removal of Caryn Ann Harlos as LNC Secretary was declared null and void.

Several things are important to note here. The delegates assembled in convention determined that Harlos (and thus any accused Officer or At-Large member) was entitled to **full due process** not just a trial. Thus the JC is bound to interpret any single act or provision for removal under the philosophy of **FULL due process** in a Libertarian context, not merely RONR. Granting extra rights to the LNC that are denied to the accused is hardly full due process. If Libertarians

would lose their minds over the State doing something, it should not be allowed in our Party.

So the first prong of harmonizing with rest of Bylaws is only satisfied by not allowing trials to be held in secret (say that out loud please so that the full offensiveness of that idea to Libertarian sensibilities is truly felt).

So, the only remaining prong is to see if the intention of the society at the time was adopted can be ascertained. Happily, it can. I will draw heavily from evidence presented in the initial Harlos Petition.

The LP Bylaws only allow Executive Session for certain exceptions, none of which are matters of discipline. This is even more evident from discussions of the Bylaws Committee when this Bylaw was proposed and recommended for adoption of the convention in 2020. Dr. Chuck Moulton served as secretary of the LP Bylaws committee during this term. He reports the bylaw was initially proposed by Andy Craig, who initially wanted to extend open session rules to subcommittees and let the LNC adopt rules governing their use as follows:

Subject: [2020_Bylaws] LNC & other committees - executive session
Date: Mon, 22 Jun 2020 14:17:24 -0400
From: Andy Craig <andy@andycraig.org>
To: bylaws2020 <bylaws2020@lphq.org>

Colleagues,

The use of executive sessions has often been controversial but is not directly addressed by the bylaws. Currently, the LNC itself has fairly restrictive rules it has adopted in the Policy Manual (including most notably that all votes must take place in open session), but these restrictions do not apply to other committees created by the LNC, some of which rarely if ever meet in open session. Some of them have good reason to and would be allowed to under the LNC rules (for example the Employment Policy and Compensation Cmte.); but others should generally be in open session except when considering genuinely confidential contract and employment information.

I'd like to get feedback before making a motion on this, but in the interest of transparency I'd like to consider something like the following as a new section in Article 7 (National Committee):

15. The National Committee shall adopt rules governing the use of executive session and limiting the subject matters which may be discussed in executive session. No action may be taken in executive session, but actions may be taken in open session pursuant to discussions that take place in executive session. The same rules shall apply to bylaws-mandated committees and other committees created by the National Committee, which shall meet in open session except as authorized.

Thanks,
Andy Craig

--

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to bylaws2020+unsubscribe@lphq.org <<mailto:bylaws2020+unsubscribe@lphq.org>>.

After backchannel workshoping, he proposed modified language which was eventually adopted by the committee and the convention as follows:

On Tue, Jun 23, 2020, 3:46 PM Andy Craig <andy@andycraig.org>
<<mailto:andy@andycraig.org>>> wrote:

After workshoping it a bit more and incorporating some feedback, I'd like to propose the following and ask if there is anybody who'd like to cosponsor it for an email ballot. I don't think it merits calling another meeting just for this one proposal! But if we start a ballot here fairly quickly it could be done in time for finalizing our report. Of course I also welcome any further discussion or debate, or suggested changes that a potential sponsor might prefer.

Thanks,
Andy Craig

Article 7

[...]

15. The LNC and all of its committees shall conduct all votes and actions in open session; executive session may only be used for discussion of personnel matters, contractual negotiations, pending or potential litigation, or political strategy requiring confidentiality.

Rationale: This proposal would adapt the LNC's current policy on executive session, elevate it to the bylaws, and apply it to other LNC-created committees. It would also take the reasons which the LNC Policy Manual currently allows for executive session called by a majority (instead of two thirds for anything else) and make those the only permissible reasons. In practice, the LNC only ever uses those reasons anyway, but this would close a loophole for potential abuse and strengthen the requirements for transparency and accountability. It would also require other committees to adopt the LNC's good practice of rising from executive session before taking votes or other actions.

-- To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to bylaws2020+unsubscribe@lphq.org <<mailto:bylaws2020+unsubscribe@lphq.org>>.

--

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to bylaws2020+unsubscribe@lphq.org <<mailto:bylaws2020+unsubscribe@lphq.org>>.

Dr. Moulton asked the Bylaws Committee:

Would disciplinary proceedings be appropriate for executive session as well? When allegations are being made, I would think an organization may want to guard against possible defamation litigation.

Andy Craig, the author of the proposal responded:

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject: Re: [2020_Bylaws] Request for sponsors: transparency proposal
Date: Wed, 24 Jun 2020 09:40:20 -0400
From: Andy Craig <andy@andycraig.org>
To: Kenneth Olsen <drkbolsen@gmail.com>
CC: bylaws2020 <bylaws2020@lphq.org>

Disciplinary procedures for employees would be covered under personnel matters. Potential expulsion of an LNC member is something that's always been discussed and acted upon in open session, so I don't think that's a problem. Indeed, I don't think potential expulsion or other discipline of an elected board member /should/ take place in executive session. That's stuff the delegates have a right to know about.

The awards committee is an interesting case but I don't know if it merits an exception, but I'm willing to add that if we need to and that'd satisfy that concern.

The LNC always votes on approving contracts in open session, even if they've been discussed in executive session first. Nothing new about that.

The Bylaws Committee consciously looked at the list of exceptions contemporaneously in the LNC Policy Manual and decided to include some but not others. At the time of the Bylaws proposal, the LNC Policy Manual included a list of topics which would allow Executive Session to be used by a majority vote and required a 2/3 vote for all other topics. The Bylaws Committee elevated this matter to be in the Bylaws and made the language much more restrictive in that there is no allowance for other topics by a 2/3 vote and some of the topics allowed by a majority vote were not included.

Topics previously allowed for Executive Session by the LNC Policy Manual using a majority vote:

- Legal matters (potential, pending, or past)
- Regulatory and compliance matters (potential, pending, or past)
- Contractual compliance
- Personnel matters (including evaluation, compensation, hiring, or dismissal)
- Board self-evaluation
- Strategic issues (only those requiring confidentiality)
- Negotiations (potential, pending, or past)

(see LNC Policy Manual as of June 5, 2020, 1.02.5, page 11,
<https://lpedia.org/w/images/e/eb/LNC-Policy-Manual-Adopted-thru-2020-06-05.pdf>)

The Bylaws Committee included personnel matters, contractual negotiations, pending or potential litigation, or political strategy requiring confidentiality. This is much more

limiting. “Legal matters” were changed to “litigation” to limit this matter to actual lawsuits rather than just laws; discussion of past litigation was not included because it should be in open session. “Regulatory and compliance matters” were removed entirely – because in the opinion of the Bylaws Committee compliance should only be secret if it dealt with litigation, which was subsumed by the previous category. “Contractual compliance” was limited to only the negotiations of contracts. “Personnel matters” were still included, and the Bylaws Committee understood the meaning of “personnel matters” to match the previous definition “evaluation, compensation, hiring, or dismissal”. “Board self-evaluation” was removed entirely – because in the opinion of the Bylaws Committee this should be in open session. “Strategic issues requiring confidentiality” was limited to only political strategy, not all forms of strategy. “Negotiations” were limited to contractual negotiations.

The Bylaws Committee reported out this proposal by a 9-1 vote with full knowledge that it modified existing policy narrowing the exceptions allowing Executive Session. In fact, the lone no vote Alicia Mattson voted against because *“I think this goes too far. It is narrower than the existing LNC policy”*.

So yes, the original intention is easily ascertained and thus this ambiguity must be interpreted in harmony with that intention. It is up to the delegates in convention if they wish to give further secrecy power to the LNC. At the very most, the bylaws *might* allow this to be decided on a case by case basis (though that would eviscerate appeal rights) but *certainly* does not allow this blanket categorization.

I would also note here that the LNC cannot make this argument in good faith considering its retaliatory actions against Harlos. This will be detailed below in “Unclean Hands of the LNC.”

4. POLICY MANUAL CANNOT UNILATERALLY SHORTEN NOTICE REQUIREMENT FOR TRIAL IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS

The LNC seems to be relying upon 63:32fn10 for its authority to shorten the notice requirement from thirty days to fourteen days. That RONR provision reads as follows:

The assembly may vary the procedures described here through adoption of special rules of order for disciplinary proceedings either by previous notice and a two-thirds vote or by a vote of a majority of the entire membership.

However, the “procedures described here” described above as that which could be varied has to be determined in reviewing the context—and once done, it is apparent it is referring to that subsection of RONR beginning at 63:30 entitled “Trial Procedure.” It is the procedure of the trial that can be varied, not due process rights. The notice requirement doesn’t appear under trial procedure because the notice precedes the trial, and the section of RONR dealing with notice does as well, as it is stated in RONR 63:21 thusly:

With reference to an appropriate date for which to set the trial, thirty days is a reasonable time to allow the accused to prepare his defense.

If thirty days is a *reasonable* time, anything less than thirty days is *unreasonable*, and thus a violation of the strong emphasis on the due process rights of the accused as emphasized by the 2022 Convention decision referenced above. Notice is sacrosanct, and you cannot treat it lightly. There is no harm to the LNC in following due process notice timeframes, and great potential harm to the accused, and risks (and should result in) any removal being overturned by a subsequent convention once again. Libertarians bend over backwards for due process. Since the 2022 Convention demanded “**full** due process”—this would include the full thirty day reasonable notice requirement.

Further, the language in the amendment is ambiguous, particularly where it is placed. Since it precedes a statement regarding the preferal of charges, it can reasonably be interpreted as requiring 14 days notice before any meeting at which the preferal of charges can be considered. If that is the meaning, I have no objection. I am not the only one with uncertainty about the meaning of this provision as the following discussion happened on Third Party Watch:¹

¹ I, and the JC, should note how Mr. Jacobs presumes to speak for the LNC in authoritatively stating that it refers to the trial. That is not his call to make. It is almost as if he, and not the LNC, wrote this provision. This is significant only as his preoccupation with removal as it comes to Harlos has come before the JC in the past. The third comment mentions the completely inappropriate reference that Mr. Jacobs makes to a pedophilia scandal which also has been brought to the JC’s prior attention.



Anonymous Observer
DECEMBER 30, 2024

Section 5 is absurd. “Pending or potential litigation” has a very specific meaning, and suspension or removal of an LNC member isn’t that. That violates the Bylaws.

14 days notice of what?

Do these people have any clue what they’re doing, or are they just desperate to silence dissent?



J. M. Jacobs
DECEMBER 31, 2024

Generally, there is a high risk of litigation with disciplinary action, leading to axiom, “Even if you do everything right, you still have about a fifty percent chance of being sued.” See “Procedural Aspects of the Penn State Scandal,” Parliamentary Journal, October 2014.

14 days’ notice is the minimum notice for the trial.



Anonymous Observer
JANUARY 3, 2025

So the LNC gets all the time it needs to trump up bullshit charges against a member but the member only has 14 days to prepare a defense in and around their real jobs and lives.

Yeah, that’s fair. It’s also why RONR recommends 30 days. Pass the blue-and-white striped caps and cue up the melody of The Yellow Rose of Texas.

And comparing the LNC to a university pedophilia scandal? Really? That is far beyond cognitively dissonant.

5. POLICY MANUAL CANNOT CLAIM TO APPOINT A TRIAL MANAGER FOR THE “PARTY”--CAN ONLY APPOINT FOR LNC

Removal authority in our Bylaws, which would ordinarily rest solely under the province of the assembly (the Party), has been delegated to the LNC. As such, just as trial is conducted by the LNC, the Trial Manager is one for the LNC not the Party. This is the same reason why resolutions passed at a convention are resolved in the name of the Party but contrariwise, resolutions passed by the LNC are resolved in the name of the LNC.

6. POLICY MANUAL AMENDMENT LACKS CLARITY OR ILLEGITIMATELY CLAIMS A RIGHT TO SUSPEND MEMBERSHIP RIGHTS IN THE PARTY

Similar to the above, all members of the LNC are required to be members of the Party per the Bylaws so a statement claiming a suspension of membership rights must be clear that it is referring only to membership rights as an LNC member and not as a Party member which the LNC has no power to do.

7. UNCLEAN HANDS OF LNC

The LNC cannot credibly claim “fear of litigation” since it went out of its way to publish its former Investigatory Committee report to every single state chair and others over the express legal objections of its subject Caryn Ann Harlos. It is apparent to nearly everyone that retaliation was the motive, and they cannot have it both ways. In fact, the allegedly “neutral and fair, and known for his good judgment” Chair of that committee sent this outrageous and very possibly legally actionable email to the entire membership of California sending out the document which was initially distributed to the LNC with the prefix “confidential” (as related by Harlos) to over a thousand people:



428 J Street, Suite 400, Sacramento, CA 95814 • office@ca.lp.org • 916.446.1776

December 29, 2024

Letter from the Office of the Chair

Libertarian Party of California Members, Supporters, and Others:

I hope everyone is currently enjoying a blessed and joyous Christmas season.

On August 25, 2024, the Libertarian National Committee (LNC) voted to form an Investigatory Committee (IC) to “investigate allegations of misconduct” of then LNC Secretary, Caryn Harlos. On October 6, 2024, the IC submitted a comprehensive 31-page report to the LNC containing its findings and recommendations, which subsequently led to the temporary suspension of Ms. Harlos, pending a trial. You can find the report [here](#). On November 9, 2024, the LNC held a trial and overwhelmingly found Ms. Harlos guilty of all charges and specifications brought forward, which resulted in her permanent suspension from the LNC, currently pending appeal.

Why is this important, and what does this have to do with the Libertarian Party of California (LPCA)?

On October 21, 2024, the LPCA Executive Committee unanimously voted to hold its 2025 Annual Convention in Walnut Creek, California, on the dates of February 22-23, 2025. On October 22, 2024, the LPCA Secretary sent out proper notice on the LPCA Public List with the place, date, and time of the LPCA Annual Convention as required by Bylaw 20, Section 2. On November 13, 2024, the Chair sent an email blast outlining registration instructions. The Chair sent the email after signing the contract with the venue, paying the deposit, and creating and launching the convention website.

Shortly after the LPCA Secretary sent out notice, Ms. Harlos, still reeling from her recent and rightful suspension, took it upon herself to very publicly manufacture outrage, falsely asserting that “valid notice” had not been given and urging LPCA members to “appeal to the Judicial Committee” in a series of bizarre social media posts that lasted weeks and, in some ways, continue to this day.

On December 3, 2024, the LPCA Executive Committee received notice that an appeal submitted by Jessica Tewksbury, Chris Minoletti, Mark Hinkle, Elizabeth Brierly, and Aaron Bonn was being entertained by the LPCA Judicial Committee with a hearing scheduled for December 19, 2024.

Under normal circumstances, the LPCA Executive Committee would have done more than the minimum requirement to defend its correct and common-sense position, which is brilliantly laid out in a parliamentary decision that can be found [here](#). On August 18, 2024, however, an effort ironically spearheaded by Ms. Harlos led the LPCA Executive Committee to unanimously censure LPCA Judicial Committee Chair Honor “Mimi” Robson and members Avens O’Brien, David Bowers, and Wendy Hewitt for “reaching a decision without a hearing [or] informing the parties” and falsely “presenting to the Libertarian Party’s Credentials Committee [a] properly adopted decision of the Judicial Committee [that] disturbed the wellbeing of the Libertarian Party of California and hampered it in its work...violating the Bylaws [and] violating the rights of the parties in the appeal.” You can find the full text of the adopted resolution [here](#). With the LPCA Judicial Committee Chair and other aforementioned members’ reputations tarnished, it was almost a certainty that the outcome would not be objective or proper.

On December 20, 2024, the LPCA Judicial Committee rendered its predictable decision. As a result, the 2025 Annual Convention is being postponed to a date that has yet to be determined given the logistical hurdles that must now be overcome.

Anyone who booked a flight, a room, or is otherwise inconvenienced or upset by this development is encouraged to contact Ms. Harlos, who, as a reminder, has no standing in the LPCA in any capacity. Anyone who booked a flight, a room, or is otherwise inconvenienced or upset by this development is also encouraged to contact Ms. Robson by emailing office@ca.lp.org. One of the officers will forward all correspondence to Ms. Robson.

An update regarding the new date for the 2025 Annual Convention is expected to be announced by mid-February 2025. All current registrations will be cancelled in the coming days and will have to be redone once a new date, and possibly new venue, is announced.

I wish you all a continued happy Christmas and New Year. Please don’t hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Magna est Veritas et Prævalet,



Mr. Adrian F Malagon
Chair, Libertarian Party of California

This is made worse by his reckless disregard of the fact that an appeal was ongoing so his statement of “recent and rightful suspension” was malicious and reckless (particularly since he never mentioned the appeal as it was ongoing at the time).² It is also noted that there is an encouragement to harass people though that cannot be imputed to an action of the LNC the way the malicious distribution of the report can be.

If this fear of “potential litigation” is real, and as the LNC previously determined, “putting the LNC in danger of litigation” is a removable offense, then every single member of the LNC who did not object to its release, particularly the Chair and Adrian Malagon, should resign immediately.


Yes, motives matter if they can obviously be determined. It is obvious this LNC is continually moving goalposts to try to exact revenge upon one person. Let’s not pretend otherwise. We are supposed to be examples of how we would govern.

8. REMEDY REQUESTED

- A voiding of the appealed decision so that the Policy Manual reverts to its former language. If successful, my prior appeal submitted December 18, 2024 (RE: ADOPTION OF REVISIONS TO POLICY MANUAL PROVISION 1.01.4 AT DECEMBER 7, 2024 LNC MEETING) which was mooted by this intervening amendment, should be considered immediately re-submitted with the applicable time frames in the Judicial Committee Rules of Appellate Procedure being in effect.
- Alternatively, even though the LNC did not pass this amendment as a series of amendments, to leave the non-violative language in place, and striking the violative language.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS REQUESTED

Respectfully, while I do believe it is outside the scope of the JC to make remedial recommendations to the Policy Manual or the Bylaws, the JC does not agree with me as it made certain recommendations in its opinion voiding the Charges and Specifications against Harlos. I hope the JC abandons that practice, but if it feels such

² This is not even considering Adrian Malagon’s comments about Ms. Harlos’ sex life which certainly can be considered sexual harassment—the standards and worries about litigation seem very very selective. See: 

recommendations are appropriate, I would respectfully ask the JC to make a recommendation that the next Bylaws Committee or convention delegates decentralization and de-weaponize removal power by taking it back from the LNC and giving it back to a lower level of the Party such as a super-majority of state chairs or convention delegates with a bylaws amendment granting recall power. This current removal power and the political weaponization of same (this goes back to as early as 2008 in the matter of Angela Keaton) has caused our Party innumerable woes and turmoil.

POSTSCRIPT: This will now be the third appeal I have filed (though one conditionally withdrawn), and I am aware of several other past member appeals and enough signatures have been gathered for one that is coming soon. The signatures for all these appeals have not only **exceeded both** thresholds, but were reached in 48 hours (with the potential exception of the Phillies appeal about which I have little knowledge on his signature gathering). This is unprecedented and shows a deep discontent in the Party with members turning to you to control an LNC that is out of touch with its membership and doesn't listen to their concerns. This is a heavy burden but the future of the Party is very much in your hands. Please listen to us.

Sincerely,
Brittany Kosin