



***An Attempt to Mend a Broken Network
& Save the Cause of Christ from Reproach***

- Home Page
- Tommy Shelton
- Danny Shelton
- ASI
- Smokescreen
- Abuse of Power
- Ethical
- Allegations
- Financial
- Allegations
- Correspondence
- Untruths
- Linda's Car Title
- Paid Off Car
- Paid Off Car #2
- Furniture
- Walt Admits
- Embezzler
- Danny Dialog
- Appeal to Walt
- His Admission

- Tommy, etc.
- ASI Willing to ...

**Dr. Walt Thompson Admits: Danny Told Him
"The Allegations Are 30 Years Old"
But They Clearly Aren't**

[Next >](#)

Here you can read the story of how 3ABN president Danny Shelton ended up in the present crisis. Based on the testimony of Dr. Walt Thompson, his own board chairman and staunch defender, Danny must have lied in a major way about the Tommy Shelton child molestation allegations in 2003. No other explanation has been forthcoming, and it is fairly clear that such a prevarication puts 3ABN in extreme financial jeopardy if yet another alleged incident takes place.

For the moment, for the sake of discussion, let's assume that there is no other explanation for all the discrepancies that have been uncovered other than that Danny has lied. In comparison, lying about your name being on a car title, lying about paying off your ex-wife's car, even lying about your ex-wife having an affair, all these things pale in significance when compared to the number of young lives that are put at risk when you lie in order to cover up child molestation allegations.

The "Embezzler"

It all started with quite a different topic. According to various sources, a common Shelton tactic over the years has been to dig up dirt about anyone who raises questions and use it to silence them. Accordingly one of Danny Shelton's apologists operating on BlackSDA.com, an individual who goes by the name fallible humanbeing, "fhh" for short, started alluding on November 20, 2006, to something he or someone else had found. The following day he got more specific.

- Added on 4/1/2007
- Furniture

- Added on 3/28/2007
- Defy the Board
- Board Action

- Added on 3/22/2007
- Book Deals
- Emails
- Financial Aff.

- Added on 3/20/2007
- The Lost Bet

- Added on 3/17/2007
- Walt Admits: No
- Evidence

The Investigator Of 3abn	
<u>fallible humanbeing</u>	Posted on: Nov 21 2006, 06:54 AM
	PB,
	Do a Yahoo search and include the

Added on 3/16/2007
Pregnancy Test

Added on 3/15/2007
Dan & Brandy
Abused You?

Must Read:
Mom in Pain #1

	<p>word Vermont along with Mr. Joy's name. The first link that comes up is a partial document (you can purchase the whole thing) but it raised some questions in my mind.</p> <p>- fhb</p>
	<p>Forum: 3ABN · Post Preview: #160950 · Replies: 179 · Views: 9,020</p>

What came up in such a search was a 1988 Vermont Supreme Court decision against Mr. Gailon Arthur Joy, which found him guilty of one count of embezzlement for an incident that occurred in 1981. In order to help prevent the discussion from getting diverted to a different topic, Gailon issued an explanation on November 22, 2006, which appears below.

The most important part of the explanation is the idea that if you keep a sum of money belonging to someone else, and that sum equals the amount that someone else owes you, you can still be found guilty of embezzlement in Vermont. In over-simplified terms, in Vermont you can be convicted of embezzlement if you steal your own money.

----- Original Message -----

From: G. Arthur Joy
To: Gregory Matthews
CC: Linda Shelton, Bob, Gregory Matthews
Subject: Re: We got a problem.
Date: Thu, 23 Nov 2006 04:30:03 +0000

13 V.S.A. § 2531.
Embezzlement generally

TITLE 13

Crimes and Criminal Procedure

PART I

Crimes

**CHAPTER 57. LARCENY AND
EMBEZZLEMENT**

Subchapter II. Embezzlement

§ 2531. Embezzlement generally

An officer, agent, bailee for hire, clerk or servant of a banking association or an incorporated company, or a clerk, agent, bailee for hire, officer or servant of a private person, partnership, tradesunion, joint stock company, unincorporated association, fraternal or benevolent association, except apprentices and other persons under the age of sixteen years, who embezzles or fraudulently converts to his own use, or takes or secretes with intent to embezzle or fraudulently convert to his own use, money or other property which comes into his possession or is under his care by virtue of such employment, **notwithstanding he may have an interest in such money or property, shall be guilty of embezzlement** and shall be imprisoned not more than ten years or fined not more than \$500.00, or both. (Amended 1971, No. 199 (Adj. Sess.), § 15.)

That's right, it is not a text but a statute, one which has an unusual statement rarely seen in the embezzlement statutes of the various states (**in Bold type**). And one which I have become very familiar with, much to my chagrin. And one so infrequently charged, that, yes, I am the singular citation in the Northeast Reports, a legal research text of precedent setting cases.

It is in fact true...I was an officer and major stockholder of Credit Management Services Corporation starting in 1978. I believe I began as a secretary to the corporation and vice president for operations. Beginning in 1980 the firm became embroiled in a series of legal battles brought by clients of

Legal Services Corporation of Vermont (Legal Aide) that continued until Dec 1984. The first claims were brought in Vermont Superior court and were defeated with rather unusual, but effective, legal tactics.

In 1981 LSC of Vt brought a seperate but far more extensive action in US District Court accusing CMS of violating the Federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, a class action case for injunctive relief and individual hearings on the merits for damages. Injunctive relief was not granted. The case was put on the docket for 58 seperate trials on the merits for damages.

Shortly after filing the action, at one of the first hearings, LSC of VT offered then corporate counsel, Atty Thomas Koch, to settle for \$1500 in legal fees to LSC of Vt and a stipulated injunction for new collection rules that exceeded the US FDCPA. The management took the matter up and made a clear decision citing a **standard that I fully supported, THEN and NOW: Millions for Defense, not a single farthing for tribute!!!**

The President and CFO, also the other stockholders, did not have the stomach for the litigation and had wanted to accept the offer to settle. The other managers and I refused. The firm was bleeding badly financially and being a big fish in a little pond we were a constant source of news, deemed to be negative public relations associated with the process. I agreed to buy out the 60% I did not own and I also agreed to hold the sellers harmless of any and all litigation. After I bought out the other stock-holders in 1982 I was personally named a party by LSC of VT Atty's Benjamin and Sussman to intimidate and attempt to force a settlement by threatening personal assets. I refused to negotiate and ordered interrogatories and depositions of the 58 named plaintiffs and counterclaimed one by one.

Frankly, I reveled at the opportunity to defend personally and entered an appearance "pro se" as I was not happy with the corporations lawyers. I had bought out the two other share-holders so I could have control of the entire litigation process and by being named a defendant, the insurance carrier could not over-ride my wishes and settle to avoid years of legal fees!!!

In the fall of 1982 Atty Sue Sussman became an asst AG.

and shortly thereafter filed a civil suite by the AG. We also fought that action and it was settled and dismissed sometime in the Spring of 1984. In December 1984 the LSC of Vt made the very poor legal strategic decision of simply dismissing me personally in the hopes the insurance company would settle. We promptly brought an action for mis-use of process and our Atty, now Sen Vincent Illuzzi, received a settlement for \$40,000 in legal fees. Touche'!!!

Sometime during the civil litigation battles, the AG's criminal division got into the fray and contacted clients we had ongoing disputes with regarding receivables for sums owed to CMS or vice versa. Several of these filed formal complaints and the AG upped the ante and brought a criminal complaint for embezzlement against myself, personally, in 1985. The basis was the highlighted portion of the statute listed above, which simply means that because we did not remit the net due to Stacey in a timely fashion and converted the sum payable to corporate use, **notwithstanding our interest in the sum collected, I had committed embezzlement.** Legally correct!!! Even though I had not been on the payroll since 1980 and was living in Maine at the time, therefore did not personally benefit, except in the egotistical sense of keeping the firm going to defeat the legal allegations, and achieve vindication. The buck still stopped at my desk!! !

We were able to get all but one claim dismissed because they owed us more than we owed them. In Stacey Fuel's case, Stacey had accepted partial payments from the debtors and refused to pay fees for service on the direct to Stacey's payments and we did indeed withhold payment until we were properly notified of payments and they were credited to the balance. I don't recall if they ever verified reported payments to CMS, despite debtor notification to us. Stacey cancelled service before the payment arrangements were finished and CMS gave notice of intent to bill them for the entire commission due but, unfortunately, never did. Frankly, because we had with-held payment, we were in violation of 13 VSA sec 2531!!!

The AG decided to take the one claim to trial in the sum \$1152.15 which we fought it all the way to the Vt Supreme Court (Decision was in 1988) and the personal conviction was affirmed on the basis that the Vt Embezzlement statute allows for a charge against an individual rather than the

corporation and could do so regardless of the charged person's interest in the balance due the offended party.

In any event, the sentence was easy enough: I was ordered to pay the account and did so. Regardless of the technicality the entire legal issue was clearly my responsibility. I did not, nor would I try, to blame another. The facts were the facts and the Vt Supreme Court affirmed the fact that it was illegal to do what was done. Therefore the buck stopped at my desk and I took responsibility.

The harsh reality is, at the beginning of 1982 I controlled five companies, National Businessmens Credit Association, the National Business Trust, Green Mountain Credit Bureau, Capital Funding Corporation, and acquired the balance of CMS mid year. I put it all on the line for what I felt were irreversible principals that I and my management would not compromise on. By 1985 I had to sell or close every single business and had to start all over again. And I did!!! Some would argue that discretion is the greater part of valor and we should have settled in 1982 and we would be here today, handcuffed and cowering to LSC of Vt...an unacceptable option. I believe in Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness and in the absolute right of conscience. I will not live with the alternative without a fight. SO, the question frequently comes up...would you do it all again? Well, I would certainly handle invoicing differently and would be dis-inclined to own a collection agency today, but other than that, given the same circumstances and given hindsight, YES, I WOULD PUT IT ALL ON THE LINE AGAIN, UNQUESTIONABLY, AND BE WILLING TO LOOSE IT ALL AGAIN, UNCONDITIONALLY.

I will forever stand for principal at any cost, and believe me when I say I have paid dearly. From that experience I have only my wife and family, praise the Lord, and many, many friends and business associates that we have helped to launch careers or beat back challenges to their lives and businesses. White Knight or greivous ogre, I would suppose it would depend on which side of the battles you were on!!!

Others would argue that we won the battles but lost the war... perhaps, but I would rather fight for principals and the right of conscience and loose than live with the alternative. If that disqualifies me from offering my experience and perspective to help victims of an unfair system in the sight

of some, so be it, but I will always be available to help slay dragons and I will NEVER GIVE UP!!!

In summary, I have felt the sting of Justice and the comfort of Mercy. Justice makes one more human and understand the issue of accountability. It also makes you look hard at yourself and realize just how easy it is to be a "fallible human being" and how hard it is to earn the Mercy of humanity and how little we deserve the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ. And in the end, I know what it is to be willing to give up everything we have worked so hard for, to stand for principals, albeit human principals, and how much more important it is to stand for the principals of righteousness within the Church of God. May every "fallible human being" learn the same lesson, is my prayer as we move forward to clean up any stench in the nostrils of the Lord!!!

Gailon Arthur Joy

The explanation went out to everyone on Gailon Joy's email list via blind copy, and that included Danny Shelton. His reply was surprising.

Next >

Save3ABN.com
Not © 2007

EEEEH

***"Truth invites examination & needs no defense.
Lies hide in darkness & blame everyone else."***