


BOB FRANK'S RESPONSES TO MIKE DIXON'S JULY 27, 2008 DISCLAIMER

Para.	Statute Violations	Mr. Dixon's Comments Followed By My Responses
	<p>This column reports on Dixon violations in his words quoted from his letter of July 27, 2008 and as stated in his September '07 & case IS-07-1588.</p> <p>Violated NRS 116.760.4 by knowingly submitting a false or fraudulent affidavit with the Division.</p>	<p><u>Introduction:</u></p> <p>The following are my responses to the paragraphs in Mr. Dixon's letter of July 27, 2008 where he has attempted to rebut my allegations of his statute violations. Mr. Dixon's statements are included in a different type font and within quotes. My responses follow and Mr. Dixon's statute violations will be described as we go along.</p> <p>As we proceed through this document, we need to recall that Mr. Dixon never provided me with a NRS 116.760-directed chance to defend myself against unsubstantiated allegations of a year ago--before he filed his original affidavit. Instead, he ignored due process, and his letter confirms he continues to deny he has made any mistakes.</p> <p>In addition, we must keep in mind that Dixon's flawed/non-compliant IA (case # IS-07-1588) remains open and unresolved. As specified in NRS 116.760, I believe that Mr. Dixon's affidavit submitted in September 2007 should have been rejected as non-compliant upon receipt by the Nevada Real Estate Division. And, it should also have been rejected as soon as attorney Bob Maddox pointed out Dixon's statute violations in January '08.</p> <p>Of course, one does not expect someone like Mike Dixon to admit flagrant and repeated violations of NV statutes. But, his distorted, convoluted statements can be seen as evidence of intent to deceive the Nevada Real Estate Division into supporting his personal agenda for harassing and retaliating against me.</p> <p>This document could be viewed as providing compelling justification to dismiss case IS-07-1588 with prejudice.</p>  <p>Robert E. Frank, Colonel, USAF(Ret.). Director, Sun City Anthem Community Association, Inc. 702-505-9959 September 25, 2008</p>

<p>Para. 1 Dixon Letter of 27jul08</p>	<p>Violated NRS 116.760 & NAC 400.1 & .2: Dixon failed to provide me with reasonable details of allegations, and failed to provide me an opportunity to correct any confirmed violations before filing his IA. He also failed to <u>uniformly</u> enforce SCA governing documents as directed by NAC 116.400.2. He has not filed affidavits against any other fellow directors even though there are many known examples of statute violations.</p> <p>Violated NAC 116.405.2: Dixon was acting for reasons of self-interest, gain, prejudice or revenge by submitting IA and simultaneously punishing me by removing me as Vice President while totally disregarding due process.</p>	<p><i>“In response to your certified letter of July 15, 2008, I believe that the Intervention Affidavit I filed on September 7, 2007 was appropriate and lawful and in keeping with the fiduciary duty I assumed as a director. See NRS 116.3103 (1). Ironically, failing to report your conduct may have been a violation of the Nevada Administrative Code. See NAC 116.400 (1) and 116.405 (3).”</i></p> <p><u>My Response:</u> Mr. Dixon consistently denies his mistakes. There would have been no disputes with me if he had simply allowed me to perform my director’s duties as I saw fit. He can not tolerate dissention, and he is not sufficiently confident of his decisions to allow them to be evaluated in public--as required by NRS. He only began his campaign to try to destroy me using the Nevada Real Estate Division when it became clear he could not bully me into being silent about his frequent misconduct, and he could not force me to resign from the board with his intense political pressure using community resources and communications channels.</p> <p>There is no local evidence that he has previously held a responsible executive management position, and his unethical behavior reflects the kind of frustration one sees when an inexperienced person is unable get his way except through intimidation and bullying. As a retired senior military officer and senior corporate executive, such tactics are not effective on me.</p>
<p>Para. 2 Dixon Letter of 27jul08</p>	<p>Violated NAC 116.405.4 by failing to obtain <u>written member consent</u> before using private email or correspondence in his IA submission.</p>	<p><i>“You are incorrect in your assertion that I lacked the right to possess and use the documentation attached to the Intervention Affidavit. In filing the intervention Affidavit, I utilized certain documents, most of which were public in nature. However, as a member of the Board I was rightfully in possession of the non-public documents. Those documents were only used in a confidential manner. See NRS116.757(1)”</i></p> <p><u>My Response:</u> His statements are brazenly false. I have seen no evidence he had received any written consent from any of the dozens of member documents used in his</p>

	<p style="text-align: center;">Violated NAC 116.405.4 by failing to obtain <u>written member consent</u> before using private email or correspondence in his IA submission.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Violated NRS 82.211.3 by failing to comply with SCA By- Laws 4.4 and SCA Board Resolutions on the succession of officers in the absence of the Board President</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Violated NRS 116.760.4 by knowingly submitting a false or fraudulent affidavit with the Division.</p>	<p>47 exhibits in his affidavit. Each failure to obtain consent is a violation of NAC 405.4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Example</u>: Dixon's affidavit item #4 is a personal email from MikTiernan@aol.com to his friends (not to Mr. Dixon) that Dixon used without obtaining consent. Mr. Dixon's action clearly violated the statute. - <u>Example</u>: Dixon's affidavit item #13 was a private email between Retired California State Senator, John V. Briggs and myself with an intended copy to my wife, Kay Frank. But, Sen. Briggs failed to notice that his email auto-fill feature had automatically entered Board Member Kay Dwyer's email address instead of my wife's. However, instead of notifying Sen. Briggs of his error, Director Kay Dwyer forwarded it to Mr. Dixon. Mr. Dixon used the private email in his affidavit without obtaining Sen. Briggs' consent. Had Mr. Dixon requested consent as required by the law, Sen. Briggs would have refused. That is an unusually clear example of a violation of that Nevada statute. - <u>Example</u>: Dixon's affidavit item #14 concerned my inquiry on August 14, 2007 why Mr. Dixon intended to go to the East Coast for a few days, but refused to acknowledge that as VP, I was the responsible person for emergencies while he was away. Based on my prior command and executive experiences, if I needed to remain in the area to make emergency decisions in Mr. Dixon's absence, I wanted to be sure that the proper authority documents had been accomplished before he left town. But, for apparently personal and political reasons, Mr. Dixon refused to comply with NRS 82.211.3, SCA By-laws 4.4 and SCA Board Resolution of April 27, 2006. Instead, he appointed Ms. Roz Berman, Treasurer, to be in charge in his absence. When I asked to see written evidence of his claimed legal advice on this decision, he refused. And, in one of his many <u>willful false claims</u> he said on page 5 of 110 that I had violated NAC 405 (5). But, that statute citation was only about actions to impede or interfere with a Division investigation. It has nothing to do with the kind of "legal issues" he was alleging. <p><u>Example</u>: Dixon's item #18 (page 5 of 110) alleges I violated NAC 116.400(1) because I openly advised members there was to be a briefing by our insurance broker for the following years proposed coverage. Once again we have a <u>willfully false claim</u> that has wasted Division time and resources and violated NRS</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Violated NRS 116.760.4 by knowingly submitting a false or fraudulent affidavit with the Division.</p> <p>Violated NRS 116.760.4 by knowingly submitting a false or fraudulent affidavit with the Division.</p>	<p>116.760.4.</p> <p><u>Example:</u> Dixon’s item #21 on page 48 of 110 claimed that I violated “NRA 116.3103(1)”. I have to assume he was meaning to say “NRS 116.3103.1” that has to do with fiduciary duty and business judgement. His claim that my request to the Community Manager for SCA insurance documents for preparing for an insurance broker meeting was violating statutes would be a joking matter if it had not been submitted in his affidavit. In that case it becomes another false claim violation of NRS 116.760.4.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> None of Mr. Dixon’s 18 allegations of statute violations against me were valid. His 47 exhibits in 110 pages were false and retaliatory. While I could go through every one and describe the flaws, this was already done in my January 3, 2008 response to Mr. Dixon’s affidavit. His entire set of allegations are just one big massive group of false claims in flagrant violation of NRS 116.760. As stated previously, Mr. Dixon’s affidavit was NOT about any real concern he might have had about my violating statutes. His agenda was personal, punitive and retaliatory.</p> <p>-</p>
<p>Para. 3 Dixon Letter of 27jul08</p>	<p>Violated NAC 116.405.1 & .2 by willfully acting for reasons of self-interest, gain, prejudice or revenge and for using the Association Attorney for personal gain.</p> <p>Violated NAC 116.405.1 & .2 by failing to obtain <u>written member consent</u> before using private email or correspondence in his IA submission.</p>	<p><i>“By accepting a position on the Board and serving as the President of the Association I did not abdicate my rights as an owner or member of the Association; The law allows any owner (or a director for that matter) to file an Intervention Affidavit. See NRS 116.760 (1). I exercised my right as an owner to file the Intervention Affidavit. The Intervention Affidavit does not state that it was filed "on behalf of the Board of Directors." However, the Board of Directors did authorize me to consult with the Association's legal counsel.”</i></p> <p><u>My Response:</u> It is outrageous of Mr. Dixon to attempt to claim that he had the right to act as a regular association member (with no access to board confidential information or to the association attorney’s counsel) at the same time he claims to be acting as a Director and as the Board President. And, that in this dual authority he claims to be able to have the rights to freely use private and/or confidential documents in his personal affidavit, as he wished, and without obtaining consent from document owners as required by NAC 116.405.4. I believe this is not legally possible, and I consider it to be willfully false and grossly deceptive to attempt to claim such nonsense because I believe he knows that he can chose to be one or the other, but he can not have the benefit of the legal authorities of both at the same time.</p>

	<p>Violated NRS 116.760.4 by knowingly submitting a false or fraudulent affidavit with the Division.</p> <p>Violated NAC 116.405.4 by failing to obtain <u>written member consent</u> before using private email or correspondence in his IA submission.</p> <p>Violated NRS 116.760.4 by knowingly submitting a false or fraudulent affidavit with the Division.</p> <p>Violated NRS 116.760.2</p>	<p>It is also outrageous to falsely claim he was not acting on behalf of the Board, but that the Board of Directors did authorize him to use the Association's legal counsel at SCA expense. There is no information available to me showing that there was an executive board meeting or minutes to make such a decision to authorize Mr. Leach's time at SCA expense to serve Mr. Dixon's private agenda. If there was, it would simply prove that Mr. Dixon was in fact serving the Board's agenda when he filed his affidavit.</p> <p>Mr. Dixon signed the affidavit on page 2 of 110 as "Michael A. Dixon, SCA Board President" using the SCA address of 2450 Hampton Road.</p> <p>In paragraph 7 of the basic affidavit on page 2 or 110, Mr. Dixon showed his clear purpose was to represent the SCA Board and demand that I be punished for 18 counts of statute violations that he had restricted knowledge of due to his status as Board President. <u>There can be no doubt that it would have been impossible to file his affidavit as written without his having been a director and President.</u> To try at this late date to claim he was only filing as a single member of this community without using his Director authority and access to board confidential information is truly insulting to everyone.</p> <p><i>"Over the past several months, the Board has received numerous written complaints alleging violations of provisions of NRS 116 and NAC 116 by Board member Robert Frank, who was also Board Vice President. The allegations and supporting documentation (attached) were reviewed by our attorney, John Leach, who determined that both statutes had been violated. After several attempts by the Board President, fellow Board members, our attorney, and the CAM to resolve the matter with Mr. Frank failed, on Mr. Leach's advice the Board sent a certified letter to Mr. Frank on August 6, 2007, advising him of the alleged violations and asking him to agree in writing to cease violating the law (Exhibit 1). Mr. Frank refused to agree in writing to obey all applicable laws and our governing documents instead responding that he did not believe that his actions were in violation of the statutes (Exhibit 2). The Board again met with our attorney to discuss further action and possible sanctions. Our discussions with Mr. Frank and with Mr. Leach on these matters took place in Executive Session, but since any sanction by the Board must be voted on at an open meeting, on August 23 the Board added an item "Complaints Against Board Members (Action May Be Taken)" to the Agenda of the August 26 2007 Board Meeting. Upon motion made by a board member to remove Mr. Frank from the office of Vice</i></p>
--	---	--

	<p>by willfully denying my due process rights as a respondent. Notice he admits that no prior hearing to determine the facts was held. I also was not allowed to defend myself in front of the community against his unsubstantiated allegations. Yet, he admits he and four of his board collaborators sanctioned/punished me for the unsubstantiated allegations without due process. Note also the date of his original affidavit was September 7, 2007 and his team's public punishment was enforced on August 23, 2007—how could his personal sanction be implemented and still be asking the Division for further punishment?</p> <p>Can there be any doubt this whole sordid Dixon affidavit affair for the past year was just a private political game and all of us have been manipulated to serve his self-interests?</p>	<p><i>President of the Board Mr. Frank was removed as Vice President by a vote of 5-1 with Mr. Frank dissenting and one abstention. The Board believes that Mr. Frank's actions continue to put the Association at risk of a lawsuit: however, Mr. Frank refuses to resign and getting sufficient votes for a recall is unrealistic in a community of over 7000 homes. On the advice of Mr. Leach and as Board President I am requesting that the Ombudsman's Office and the Commission exercise your jurisdiction to investigate this matter without delay and to take appropriate action. I have attached a narrative explanation of Mr. Frank's violations and supporting documentation."</i></p> <p>After studying the above, how could anyone say or believe that Mr. Dixon was doing no more than behaving as any other member might do?</p> <p>In addition, since the SCA D&O insurance company and the SCA Board of Directors authorized and provided Attorney Joe Garin to defend me against Mr. Dixon's affidavit, how could any one of the past and/or current SCA Directors try to claim that the complaints filed by Mr. Dixon against me "<i>refers to independent actions taken by you not related to your normal, expected, requested or authorized activities and responsibilities as a member of the Board?</i>" (These words are quoted from a Board Letter to me dated 19nov07-- attached to a different affidavit.)</p>
<p>Para. 4 Dixon Letter of 27jul08</p>		<p><i>"You further misstate the contents of the letter sent to you on November 19, 2007 by other members of the Sun City Anthem Board of Directors. That letter clearly stated that your behavior and actions which resulted in my filing the Intervention Affidavit were outside the scope of your duties as a board member. See NAC 116.405 (1). As such, these board members believed that</i></p>

	<p>Violated NRS 116.760.4 by knowingly filing a false or fraudulent affidavit with the Division.</p>	<p><i>you were not entitled to reimbursement of legal fees.”</i></p> <p><u>My Response:</u> Mr. Dixon is once again attempting to manipulate people to suit his personal agenda. In paragraph 7 of his affidavit he clearly shows that he is alleging statute violations base on his personal observations as a director and as board president. He states that “The Board” has received complaints about my board activities and that “The Board” believed that my board actions were creating a potential law suit. It would have been <u>impossible</u> to file his affidavit without having access to board confidential documents and board data.</p> <p>But, it is clear to everyone that if I was truly behaving in what they considered objectionable ways as an individual member of this community, they would have the power as the board majority to take legal and administrative actions against me directly. The only valid reason Mr. Dixon had for filing his affidavit and for hoping to get the Division to consider removing me from the board is because the other directors recognize they have limited powers to deal with me when I am fully complying with NV laws and governing rules. Since I received about 80% community support from SCA voters in my board election, Dixon and friends know it a removal election is likely to backfire on them. A secret/deceptive attack through the Division that contains over 100 pages of complex allegations by Mr. Dixon and his collaborators was the best chance they had of getting rid of me. But, it has totally failed.</p>
<p>Para. 5 Dixon Letter of 27jul08</p>	<p>Violated NRS 116.760.4 by knowingly filing a false or fraudulent affidavit with the Division.</p> <p>Violated NAC 116.400.2: Dixon has failed to uniformly enforced the provisions of governing documents and/or of</p>	<p><i>“As to my statements on March 27, 2008, I gave a general status of the situation in response to the many inaccurate statements you had previously made in various Sun City Anthem Board of Directors venues. I released no information on the details of the Affidavit, even though I had the right to do so. NRS-116.757 imposes confidentiality restrictions on the Real Estate Division, not on the complainant or respondent. However, until you chose to publicize the matter and made several inaccurate statements, I did not speak publicly about the Intervention Affidavit.”</i></p> <p><u>My Response:</u> Mr. Dixon’s above statement in paragraph of his 27jul08 letter</p> <p>Mr. Dixon’s outrageously false “President’s Report” statement as read on March 27, 2008, posted on the SCA web site, and sent out via email to all residents is quoted below.</p>

statutes. His actions on multiple occasions during board meetings to attack me and refuse me the opportunity to defend myself and then to publish false information he was reading is a clear violation of NAC 116.400.1 & .2 as well as NAC 116.405.2

**Violated
NRS 116.760.4**
by knowingly filing a false or fraudulent affidavit with the Division.

**Violated
NAC 116.405.2**
by willfully acting for reasons of self-interest, gain, prejudice or revenge.

“As many of you know, last year an affidavit was filed against Bob Frank with the Ombudsman's office. Yesterday I learned that, because the investigation of this matter is complete, it is no longer a confidential matter and I've decided to summarize the situation. As early as last July, the Board felt that some of Bob Frank's actions as a Board Member were not in the best interests of the community. After lengthy discussions the Board sent Mr. Frank a certified letter, detailing the behavior we believed was improper, and asking Mr. Frank to agree in writing that he would cease the behavior. When he did not comply with the request, I, as Board President, and with the support of the Board, filed an Affidavit for Intervention with the Ombudsman's, office alleging violations of NRS 116. The Ombudsman offered mediation. When this offer was declined, the complaint was sent to the Real Estate Division for investigation. This week I was informed that the Division completed their investigation several weeks ago and determined that the allegations are not frivolous, not fraudulent, and not false. They determined that there was good cause to proceed with a hearing on the alleged violations and filed a formal complaint with the Commission. The Commission must hold a hearing on the complaint within 90 days of the date when the Division filed the complaint with the Commission. Mr. Frank will be notified by the Division of the date of the hearing. The Commission is required to make a final decision on the merits of the complaint within 20 days of the hearing. Their decision will also determine whether Mr. Frank or the Association's D&O policy will be responsible for the cost of the investigation, any fines and costs imposed upon Mr. Frank, and Mr. Frank's attorney's fees.”

To try to reduce the personal damage intended by Dixon, my attorney, Bob Maddox, sent the below letter to Mr. Dixon, and he stopped distributing his false claims within a few days. But, of course, by that time, he had already reached almost all 7,000+ homes and the damage to my reputation and his election strategy was already done.

*“Dear Mr. Dixon:
I represent Bob Frank. I am in receipt of your "President's Message" dated March 27, 2008. There are many statements of fact in your "President's Message" that are false and / or misleading. Please accept this letter as Mr. Frank's demand for an immediate retraction. Please be advised that if you fail to immediately retract your defamatory remarks, Mr. Frank will institute an action for defamation (libel & slander) seeking recovery of all damages provided by law including punitive damages. Govern your conduct accordingly.”*

	<p>Violated NRS 116.760.4 by knowingly filing a false or fraudulent affidavit with the Division.</p> <p>Violated NAC 116.405.2 by willfully acting for reasons of self-interest, gain, prejudice or revenge.</p> <p>Violated NAC 116.405.2 by willfully acting for reasons of self-interest, gain, prejudice or revenge.</p>	<p>Mr. Dixon’s above statement was read at the board meeting, attached to the minutes, and distributed to our community without providing me with any advanced notice. It was a classic political ambush. I was so shocked that he would do such an obviously illegal act that initially I was stunned. As he kept reading his prepared, false statement it became clear what he was doing. I tried to interrupt him and object to his reading such a flagrantly false statement. But, he was prepared for my reaction. He ignored me while he yelled louder and louder into the microphone to drown me out—until he was done.</p> <p>I have high-quality, digital recordings of this event, and most other board meetings and committee meetings, in case my claims need to be verified. Since Mr. Dixon’s action on this violation occurred during the last two weeks before voting on SCA directors began, it was clear his outrageous behavior was a deliberate maneuver to (illegally) help his preferred candidates to get elected to the Board. He was successful--by a very narrow margin.</p> <p>In my opinion, without Mr. Dixon’s frequent use of his presidential powers to confuse and adversely influence our 7,144 homeowners through our extensive communications channels, his preferred candidates would have not been elected and the board of directors would be operating today under much different policies and practices.</p> <p>As of the date of this affidavit, no action has been officially announced by the Division. Even Mr. Alitt advised Mr. Garin (my D&O insurance attorney) that Mr. Dixon was not stating the facts as the Division understood them. So, everyone involved has accused Mr. Dixon of making false statements at one time or another. Again, it is clear that he is willing to do or say what ever it takes to achieve his personal agenda.</p>
<p>Para. 6 Dixon Letter of 27jul08</p>	<p>Violated NRS 116.760.4 by knowingly submitting a false or fraudulent affidavit with the</p>	<p><i>“I find your assertion that I filed a “false or fraudulent” Affidavit to be ludicrous in two respects. First, the State of Nevada has never invested you with the authority to determine whether anything in my Affidavit was “false or fraudulent,” that authority rests with the Real Estate Division. And because the Real Estate Division referred the Affidavit to the state Attorney General’s office, they had to have determined that the Affidavit was neither false nor fraudulent nor frivolous (NRS-116.765).”</i></p>

	<p>Division.</p> <p>Violated NAC 116.405.2 by willfully acting for reasons of self-interest, gain, prejudice or revenge</p>	<p><u>My Response:</u> Of course, the only thing “ludicrous” is Mr. Dixon’s rejection that I have the inherent right to defend myself and declare his statements to be false and/or fraudulent. It is his responsibility to prove his very serious allegations of law violations. Since he has shown he does not feel obligated to follow due process and to be careful to file accurate, substantiated allegations, it should not be a surprise that he appears unconcerned he could be found guilty of filing a false and fraudulent IA.</p> <p>In addition, since it is understood the referral to the AG staff officer is to assist the Compliance Section with validating its legal assumptions, <u>Mr. Dixon has no basis for concluding the Division has found his affidavit to be factual.</u></p>
<p>Para. 7 Dixon Letter of 27jul08</p>	<p>Violated NRS 116.760.4 by knowingly submitting a false or fraudulent affidavit with the Division.</p> <p>Violated NRS 116.760.4 by knowingly submitting a false or fraudulent affidavit with the Division.</p>	<p><i>“I filed the Intervention Affidavit because I believed then and still believe that your actions did not display “the ordinary and reasonable care of directors of a corporation, subject to the business-judgment rule.” As a matter of fact, your behavior has continued to violate NRS-116.3103. Can you imagine any director of any major U.S. Corporation threatening to use the Internet to post derogatory comments about a shareholder in an effort to negatively affect the shareholder's private business, as you recently did? To find evidence that you continue to violate NRS-116.3103 you need only look in your email program and in posts you have made on your internet website (www.anthemvoice.org) and on other Internet sites. You will find evidence and details of the assertions in my August 6, 2007 certified letter to you in the same locations.”</i></p> <p><u>My Response:</u> Mr. Dixon displays his hubris by presuming that he alone had the perfect judgment on whether my actions displayed behavior that served the best interests of this community. When he originally filed his IA he clearly was intending to represent the Board of Directors interests.</p> <p>Then, he has conspired with his collaborating SCA directors and attorney Leach to attempt to deny or delay indemnification as a respondent to their affidavit complaints. Now, we find him trying to reverse himself again and claim he is only concerned about my fiduciary duty and business judgment. Well, those factors would not be relevant unless I was truly acting on my director’s roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>I trust the Division will see through Mr. Dixon’s deception and take the action needed to remove him as a director and ensure he does not become involved in CIC governance again in the future.</p>

<p>Para. 8 Dixon Letter of 27jul08</p>	<p>Violated NRS 116.760.4 by knowingly submitting a false or fraudulent affidavit with the Division.</p>	<p><i>“Mr. Frank, NRS-116.31183 states that: "An executive board, a member of an executive board or an officer, employee or agent of an association shall not take, or direct or encourage another person to take, any retaliatory action against a unit's owner because the unit's owner has: 1. Complained in good faith about any alleged violation of any provision of this chapter ." A good faith complaint begins with a certified letter to the violator informing him that a violation has occurred. On September 7, 2007, I "complained in good faith" that you had violated NRS-116 and NAC-116. Your certified letter of July 15, 2008 demanding that I request dismissal of my complaint and the accompanying threats found therein represents an attempted retaliation by you against me, and as such is a further violation of NRS-116.”</i></p> <p><u>My Response:</u> Mr. Dixon’s way of concluding his letter is indicative of how he thinks and behaves. He seems to act like he believes the Board of Director duty is just a big game. He is condescending to those he dislikes, and patronizing to those he does not need something from. He seems able to delude himself into stating and/or believing he does no wrong, that others are always at fault, and that he is often a victim. This is his typical behavior that fellow board members have to accommodate when we have to be in the same room with him and working on SCA Board business.</p>
--	---	--