SEARCH

·Home Page
Tommy Shelton
Danny Shelton
ASI
Smokescreen
Abuse of Power
Ethical
Allegations
Financial
Allegations
Correspondence
Untruths
Alleged Illegal
Activities
Taped
Conversations
Questions #6

Phone Records

Danny's Apologists
Leonard Westphal
Litigation, etc.
Letters of Support
News Releases
Contact Us

"Danny, I've Got Some Questions About That Recording"

< Prev.

The writer below shares with 3ABN president Danny Shelton his conversation with Hal Steenson. Interestingly, there are some marked similarities between Hal's approach things and that of Danny's:

- If damage control is needed, regardless of the question or topic, switch the conversation as quick as possible to that of "evil" Linda.
- The proof of innocence is that since we are so godly, we must be doing what' and can't be lying.
- If anyone dares ask to see something for themselves instead of just blindly tr insult them with things like, "You're working for the devil."
- And if that doesn't shut them up, proceed with threats.

Thus far Danny has offered no response at all to the questions that follow about the recording he made of his then-wife's conversation with the doctor treating her son.

-------- Original Message --------
From: Bob
To: Danny Shelton
CC: Walt Thompson, Elder Ken Denslow
Subject: Questions pertaining to conversation with Hal Steenson
Date: Wed, 20 Dec 2006 22:29:36 -0600

Greetings, Danny.

In my email to you of December 6, I left you hanging a bit at the end, and I don't think that's fair. So I thought I'd write you again and fill my comment in a little. In that email I wrote:

> "On November 4 you wrote to me and said, among other things,

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

Added on 3/16/2007
Pregnancy Test

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

Must Read:
Mom in Pain #1

> " 'I will just say this, ... I have done nothing legally wrong in my administration with 3ABN.'
>
> "According to what Hal Steenson and John Lomacang told me, I'm uncertain that this is true. But I won't go into that now."

It isn't fair to you to keep you hanging forever on that one, so I will touch on it now. On August 3 or 4 (most likely 4), 2006, at the ASI Convention, I had opportunity to privately ask Hal Steenson a few questions without anyone overhearing us. One of those questions was simply when your daughter Melody got married. Hal diverted the conversation to that of you and Linda, a topic I wasn't even going to touch, and gave me as proof of Linda's guilt three things:

- Since the only Bible grounds for divorce and remarriage is fornication, and since you got remarried, Linda has to be guilty.
- Since the board is composed of godly people and they went along with it, Linda has to be guilty.
- There is a recording that is so bad, conference presidents have listened to it and after 30 seconds they say, "Turn it off," it is that convincing.

As of late October, your conference president had not yet heard it. Thus,

Question 32: Who all has heard this recording, and which conference presidents have heard it, or did Hal get his details mixed up?

I found the following at http://www.rcfp.org/taping/consent.html and http://www.rcfp.org/taping/states/illinois.html, information that is particularly relevant to reporters. I would imagine that under the statutes individuals would be treated roughly similar, but I'm not an attorney, and so I do not know for sure. The actual state statute appears here, and I'll quote just a little from it as well.

> **"Criminal purpose.** Federal law requires only one-

party consent to the recording and disclosure of a telephone conversation, but explicitly does not protect the taping if it is done for a criminal or tortious
purpose." (http://www.rcfp.org/taping/consent.html)

"720 Ill. Compiled Stat. Ann. 5/14-1, -2: An eavesdropping device cannot be used to record or overhear a conversation without the consent of all parties to the conversation under criminal statutes. An eavesdropping device is anything used to hear or record a conversation, whether the conversation is in person or conducted by any means other than face-to-face conversation, such as a telephone conversation.

"In addition, it is criminally punishable to disclose information one knows or should know was obtained through an eavesdropping device. Offenses of the eavesdropping law are punishable as felonies, with first offenses categorized as lesser felonies than subsequent offenses. 720 Ill. Compiled Stat. Ann. 5/14-4. Civil liability for actual and punitive damages is authorized as well. 720 Ill. Compiled Stat. Ann. 5/14-
6." (http://www.rcfp.org/taping/states/illinois.html)

"Sec. 14-2. Elements of the offense; affirmative defense.

"(a) A person commits eavesdropping when he:

...

"(3) Uses or divulges ... any information which he knows or reasonably should know was obtained through the use of an eavesdropping device." (720 Illinois Compiled Statutes 5/Article 14)

You'll notice that Illinois law appears to cover the recording of any type of conversation, while federal law seems to specifically concern just telephone conversations.

Question 33: Is Hal correct that such a recording exists and/or was made, and if so, how many parties were there to the conversation and how many of those parties gave their consent to being recorded?

Question 34: Assuming that the recording does exist and/or was made, to whom, besides myself, and by whom was information from that recording divulged, and can you demonstrate that the taping was not done for a tortious purpose?

Out of everything that Hal told me, this recording was the one thing that was concrete, not merely based on someone's word. I therefore told him I wanted to hear it. At that point he proceeded to say, "You are led of the pits of hell." "You are one sick puppy." "You are sick." "You need to get a life." "You need to be born again." He then repeatedly threatened to call security. It was quite an unnerving experience.

Question 35: Do you have any explanation for the stark contrast between the relative ease at least one 3ABNer manifested when talking about evidence of Linda's infidelity, and the apparently extreme paranoia manifested when asked to actually give proof that such evidence really exists?

That's it for this one.

Have you found anything to explain the title discrepancy yet? Or anything that would explain the discrepancies that Walt said you told him regarding your brother's child molestations allegations, and which Walt wanted me to verify? Did you get the email I sent Sunday about the proof you said you have about Linda taking a number of vacations with the doctor in the U.S. and Europe between May and October 2004?

Hope to hear from you soon.

Bob

< Prev.

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