

**Ex. P**

1354 County Highway 21  
Halstad, MN 56548  
(218) 456-2568  
May 28, 2008

Jerrie M. Hayes  
Siegel, Brill, Greupner, Duffy & Foster, PA  
100 Washington Avenue South, Suite 1300  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401

Dear Ms. Hayes:

This is in response to your letter of May 27, 2008. We will plan on conferring at 4 pm on Thursday, May 29, 2008, but we must convey to you the following clarifications of our positions.

First, my correspondence was DATED May 16, 2008, and was emailed and faxed to you that same day, as well as mailed.

Did your fax machine mess up the date on the letter? If so, you should get it fixed.

Second, we are happy to discuss whatever concerns or wishes the plaintiffs may have as to preserving the confidentiality of the confidential information in the Nick Miller items in their Rule 26(a)(1) materials. However, we must point out that such conferring should have occurred prior to the end of the seven-day period after we notified you of our intent to use that material.

Third, you will recall your reply of May 9, 2008, to my request of that same day that we be provided a list of which documents the plaintiffs consider relevant and irrelevant. Your reply stated that such a document could be prepared by May 20, which I did not feel acceptable. Now in your communication of yesterday, May 27, we are left with the impression that we will not have the full picture of the plaintiffs' views of what is relevant and what is not until July 11, more than seven months after my Requests to Produce were first served. This is unacceptable and demonstrates that either you or the plaintiffs are still playing games.

Furthermore, your proposed schedule resurrects the old questions of privilege and donor information. It gives us no assurance that we will have access to the donor-identifying information on an accompanying confidential list, and fails to explain what privileges the plaintiffs plan on invoking.

By the way, where is the plaintiffs' motion to extend discovery if they don't intend to provide a privilege log until July 11?

However, if the plaintiffs are serious about stipulating to the terms in the motion to compel, conferring on this topic would be valuable. For the sake of efficiency, I suggest that the plaintiffs be available to participate in the conference.

Jerrie Hayes  
May 28, 2008  
Page 2

On quite another topic, I think it is time that we clarify who is representing which plaintiff. Since Danny Shelton has exposed 3ABN to serious and considerable liability, we do not feel that you, your colleagues, or either law firm can fairly represent both clients at the same time. And the necessary nature of the communications between the plaintiffs and their counsel make it highly questionable whether any of you can fairly represent either plaintiff.

Furthermore, you, John Pucci, Gerald Duffy, and both law firms are now co-defendants with 3ABN and Danny Shelton in a lawsuit in U.S. District Court with issues overlapping those in our lawsuit. The allegations against you resulted from your violation of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code, a violation which exposed your own clients, 3ABN and Danny Shelton, to liability.

These conflicts of interest lead me to quote from your letter of September 13, 2007, to Mr. Laird Heal as my final thoughts:

“We would expect to see your Notice of Withdrawal and Substitution of Counsel as to both matters in the very near future.”

Sincerely,

  
Bob Pickle,*pro se*

cc: John Pucci via email and fax  
Gailon Arthur Joy via email

Ex. Q

## FAX JOURNAL REPORT

TIME : 06/10/2008 22:46  
 NAME : PICKLE PUBLISHING  
 FAX : 2052033751  
 TEL : 2184562568  
 SER. # : L7J558637

NO.	DATE	TIME	FAX NO./NAME	DURATION	PAGE(S)	RESULT	COMMENT
#001	02/26	15:28	*7016123396591				
#002			[REDACTED]				TX ECM
#003			[REDACTED]				TX PC ECM
#004			[REDACTED]				TX PC ECM
#007	04/11	17:04	*671612339-6591				TX PC ECM
#008			[REDACTED]				TX PC ECM
#009			[REDACTED]				TX PC ECM
#010			[REDACTED]				TX PC ECM
#011	05/16	20:25	*671612339-6591				TX PC ECM
#012	05/19	10:59	*671413585-0787				TX PC ECM
#012	05/19	11:02	*671612339-6591				TX PC ECM
#012			[REDACTED]				TX PC
#013			[REDACTED]				TX PC ECM
#014			[REDACTED]				TX PC ECM
#015			[REDACTED]				TX PC ECM
#016			[REDACTED]				TX PC ECM
#017	05/21	20:03	*671612339-6591				TX PC ECM
#018	05/21	20:06	*671413585-0787				TX PC ECM
#021			[REDACTED]				TX PC
#024			[REDACTED]				TX PC
#025	05/22	16:34	*671612339-6591				TX PC ECM
#026	05/22	16:35	*671413585-0787				TX PC ECM
#027			[REDACTED]				TX PC
#028			[REDACTED]				TX PC ECM
#029			[REDACTED]				TX PC ECM
#030	05/28	16:26	*671612339-6591				TX PC ECM
#031	05/28	16:28	*671413585-0787				TX PC ECM
#032	05/29	16:30	*671612339-6591				TX PC ECM
#033	05/29	16:31	*671413585-0787				TX PC ECM
#034	06/03	11:43	*671612339-6591				TX PC ECM
#035	06/03	11:44	*671413585-0787				TX PC ECM
#036	06/03	11:45	*671612339-6591				TX PC ECM
#037	06/10	18:01	*671612339-6591				TX PC ECM
#038			[REDACTED]				TX PC ECM
#039			[REDACTED]				TX PC ECM
#040			[REDACTED]				TX PC ECM

BUSY: BUSY/NO RESPONSE  
 NG : POOR LINE CONDITION / OUT OF MEMORY  
 CV : COVERPAGE  
 POL : POLLING  
 RET : RETRIEVAL  
 PC : PC-FAX

**Ex. R**

1300 Washington Square  
100 Washington Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401  
T (612) 337-6100 F (612) 339-6591  
[siegelbrill.com](http://siegelbrill.com)

**SIEGEL BRILL  
GREUPNER DUFFY  
& FOSTER P.A.**

JERRIE M. HAYES  
612-337-6142  
[jerriehayes@sbgdf.com](mailto:jerriehayes@sbgdf.com)

March 7, 2008

**VIA U.S. MAIL**

Mr. Robert Pickle  
1354 County Highway 21  
Halstad, MN 56548

**Re: Three Angels Broadcasting Network, Inc. and Danny Lee Shelton vs.  
Gailon Arthur Joy and Robert Pickle  
Court Docket No. 07-40098-FDS  
Our File No. 24,681-D-002**

Dear Mr. Pickle:

Enclosed and served upon you, please find a copy of the Subpoena of Bluehost Inc.

Sincerely,

  
Jerrie M. Hayes

JMH/gkh

Gerry Duffy  
Lizette Richards (Via e-mail)  
John Pucci (Via e-mail)

1300 Washington Square  
100 Washington Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401  
T (612) 337-6100 F (612) 339-6591  
siegelbrill.com

SIEGEL BRILL  
GREUPNER DUFFY  
& FOSTER P.A.

JERRIE M. HAYES  
612-337-6142  
jerriehayes@sbgdf.com

March 6, 2008

**VIA MESSENGER**

Keeper of Records  
Bluehost Inc.  
1215 N. Research Way  
Orem, UT 84097


**Re: Three Angels Broadcasting Network, Inc. and Danny Lee Shelton vs.  
Gailon Arthur Joy and Robert Pickle  
Our File No. 24,681-D-002**

Dear Sir or Madam:

Enclosed and served upon you please find:

1. Subpoena; and
2. a check in the amount of \$79.45 for your mileage and deposition fee.

Best regards,

  
Jerrie M. Hayes

JMH/akh  
Enclosure

DAO88 (Rev. 1/94) Subpoena in a Civil Case

## Issued by the

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF UTAH

Three Angels Broadcasting Network, Inc.,  
an Illinois non-profit corporation, and  
Danny Lee Shelton, individually,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Gailon Arthur Joy and Robert Pickle,

Defendants.

## SUBPOENA IN A CIVIL CASE

Case Number:<sup>1</sup>

(District of Utah)

TO: Keeper of Records  
Bluehost Inc.  
1215 N. Research Way  
Orem, UT 84097

YOU ARE COMMANDED to appear in the United States District court at the place, date, and time specified below to testify in the above case.

PLACE OF TESTIMONY	COURTROOM
DATE AND TIME	

YOU ARE COMMANDED to appear at the place, date, and time specified below to testify at the taking of a deposition in the above case.

PLACE OF DEPOSITION	DATE AND TIME
Garcia and Love Reporting, 257 East 200 South, Suite 300, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111	March 17, 2008, 9:30 a.m.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YOU ARE COMMANDED to produce and permit inspection and copying of the following documents or objects at the place, date, and time specified below (list documents or objects):	
See Attached Schedule A.	

PLACE	DATE AND TIME
Garcia and Love Reporting	March 17, 2008, 9:30 a.m.

**Rule 45, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Parts C & D:****(c) PROTECTION OF PERSONS SUBJECT TO SUBPOENAS.**

(1) A party or an attorney responsible for the issuance and service of a subpoena shall take reasonable steps to avoid imposing undue burden or expense on a person subject to that subpoena. The court on behalf of which the subpoena was issued shall enforce this duty and impose upon the party or attorney in breach of this duty an appropriate sanction which may include, but is not limited to, lost earnings and reasonable attorney's fee.

(2) (A) A person commanded to produce and permit inspection and copying of designated books, papers, documents or tangible things, or inspection of premises need not appear in person at the place of production or inspection unless commanded to appear for deposition, hearing or trial.

(B) Subject to paragraph (d) (2) of this rule, a person commanded to produce and permit inspection and copying may, within 14 days after service of subpoena or before the time specified for compliance if such time is less than 14 days after service, serve upon the party or attorney designated in the subpoena written objection to inspection or copying of any or all of the designated materials or of the premises. If objection is made, the party serving the subpoena shall not be entitled to inspect and copy materials or inspect the premises except pursuant to an order of the court by which the subpoena was issued. If objection has been made, the party serving the subpoena may, upon notice to the person commanded to produce, move at any time for an order to compel the production. Such an order to comply production shall protect any person who is not a party or an officer of a party from significant expense resulting from the inspection and copying commanded.

(3) (A) On timely motion, the court by which a subpoena was issued shall quash or modify the subpoena if it

(i) fails to allow reasonable time for compliance,  
(ii) requires a person who is not a party or an officer of a party to travel to a place more than 100 miles from the place where that person resides, is employed or regularly transacts business in person, except that, subject to the provisions of clause (c) (3) (B) (iii) of this rule, such a person may in order to attend

trial be commanded to travel from any such place within the state in which the trial is held, or

(iii) requires disclosure of privileged or other protected matter and no exception or waiver applies, or  
(iv) subjects a person to undue burden.

**(B) If a subpoena**

(i) requires disclosure of a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information, or

(ii) requires disclosure of an unretained expert's opinion or information not describing specific events or occurrences in dispute and resulting from the expert's study made not at the request of any party, or

(iii) requires a person who is not a party or an officer of a party to incur substantial expense to travel more than 100 miles to attend trial, the court may, to protect a person subject to or affected by the subpoena, quash or modify the subpoena, or, if the party in whose behalf the subpoena is issued shows a substantial need for the testimony or material that cannot be otherwise met without undue hardship and assures that the person to whom the subpoena is addressed will be reasonably compensated, the court may order appearance or production only upon specified conditions.

**(d) DUTIES IN RESPONDING TO SUBPOENA.**


(1) A person responding to a subpoena to produce documents shall produce them as they are kept in the usual course of business or shall organize and label them to correspond with the categories in the demand.

(2) When information subject to a subpoena is withheld on a claim that it is privileged or subject to protection as trial preparation materials, the claim shall be made expressly and shall be supported by a description of the nature of the documents, communications, or things not produced that is sufficient to enable the demanding party to contest the claim.

**YOU ARE COMMANDED to permit inspection of the following premises at the date and time specified below.**

PREMISES	DATE AND TIME

Any organization not a party to this suit that is subpoenaed for the taking of a deposition shall designate one or more officers, directors, or managing agents, or other persons who consent to testify on its behalf, and may set forth, for each person designated, the matters on which the person will testify. Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 30(b)(6).

ISSUING OFFICER'S SIGNATURE AND TITLE (INDICATE IF ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF OR DEFENDANT)	DATE
 Attorney for Plaintiff	March 4, 2008

ISSUING OFFICER'S NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER
Jerrie M. Hayes, Esq.
Siegel, Brill, Greupner, Duffy & Foster, P.A.
100 Washington Ave. So., Ste. 1300
Minneapolis, MN 55401
(612) 337-6142

(See Rule 45, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Parts C & D on next page)

<sup>1</sup> If action is pending in district other than district of issuance, state district under case number.

#### PROOF OF SERVICE

	DATE	PLACE
SERVED		
SERVED ON (PRINT NAME)		MANNER OF SERVICE
SERVED BY (PRINT NAME)		TITLE

#### DECLARATION OF SERVER

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing information contained in the Proof of Service is true and correct.

Executed on	DATE	SIGNATURE OF SERVER
		ADDRESS OF SERVER



- 1) All access logs, both administrative and public, if maintained separately, from the website [www.AdventTalk.com](http://www.AdventTalk.com).
- 2) All identifying information, including registration information and IP addresses, in your possession, custody or control, for the following posters to the website [www.AdventTalk.com](http://www.AdventTalk.com) (the dates, times and posting thread of a recent post by each poster is included to assist in isolating and identifying the poster):

POSTER NAME/ HANDLE	THREAD TITLE	POST DATE	POST TIME
childoftheking	Why lie?	2/10/08	
Chrissie	Why lie?	2/10/08	10:41:55 AM
Inga	Why lie?	2/22/08	10:42:21 AM
Artiste	Sheltonism: How Can We Ensure That It Won't Happen Again?	2/14/08	4:41:06 PM
sonshineonme	Sheltonism: How Can We Ensure That It Won't Happen Again?	2/15/08	7:46:30 PM
Daryl Fawcett	Re: The Unauthorized History of 3ABN Continues	1/22/08	8:56:44 AM
Sister	Re: The Unauthorized History of 3ABN Continues	1/23/08	7:46:38 PM
Johann	Re: The Unauthorized History of 3ABN Continues	1/30/08	9:51:09 PM
Ozzie	Re: The Unauthorized History of 3ABN Continues	2/15/08	11:37:10 PM
Gregory	Re: The Unauthorized History of 3ABN Continues	2/16/08	8:10:49 AM
Snoopy	Re: 3ABN Annual Membership Meeting and First Board Meeting of 2008	1/24/08	8:29:15 PM
SoulEspresso	Re: 3ABN Annual Membership Meeting and First Board Meeting of 2008	1/24/08	9:08:39 PM
Bonnie	Re: What's Happening With the Lawsuit?	2/10/08	1:17:30 PM
Fran	Re: Linda Shelton: Show me the irrefutable evidence	2/18/08	1:08:02 PM

**Ex. S**

1300 Washington Square  
100 Washington Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401  
T (612) 337-6100 F (612) 339-6591  
[siegelbrill.com](http://siegelbrill.com)

**SIEGEL BRILL  
GREUPNER DUFFY  
& FOSTER P.A.**

JERRIE M. HAYES  
612-337-6142  
[jerriehayes@sbgdf.com](mailto:jerriehayes@sbgdf.com)

May 14, 2008

Mr. Robert Pickle  
1354 County Highway 21  
Halstad, MN 56548

**Re: Three Angels Broadcasting Network, Inc. and Danny Lee Shelton vs.  
Gailon Arthur Joy and Robert Pickle  
Court Docket No. 07-40098-FDS  
Our File No. 24,681-D-002**

Dear Mr. Pickle:

Enclosed and served upon you please find the Amended Subpoena of Calvin Eakins.

Sincerely,



Jerrie M. Hayes

JMH/gkh

cc: Gailon Arthur Joy (Via U.S. Mail)

OAO88 (Rev. 1/94) Subpoena in a Civil Case

**Issued by the  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

Three Angels Broadcasting Network, Inc.,  
an Illinois non-profit corporation, and  
Danny Lee Shelton, individually,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Gailon Arthur Joy and Robert Pickle,

Defendants.

**SUBPOENA IN A CIVIL CASE**

Case Number: <sup>1</sup>	07-40098 FDS (District of Massachusetts)
---------------------------	---

**TO:** Calvin Eakins  
17745 Dorcas Circle  
Omaha, NE 68130

**YOU ARE COMMANDED to appear in the United States District court at the place, date, and time specified below to testify in the above case.**

PLACE OF TESTIMONY	COURTROOM

**X** **YOU ARE COMMANDED to appear at the place, date, and time specified below to testify at the taking of a deposition in the above case.**

PLACE OF DEPOSITION	DATE AND TIME
Thomas & Thomas Court Reporters 3861 Farnam Street, Omaha, NE 68131	June 6, 2008, 9:00 a.m.

**X** **YOU ARE COMMANDED to produce and permit inspection and copying of the following documents or objects at the place, date, and time specified below (list documents or objects):**


See Attached Schedule A.

PLACE	DATE AND TIME
Siegel, Brill, Greupner, Duffy & Foster, P.A., Attn: Jerrie M. Hayes 100 Washington Ave S., Suite 1300, Minneapolis, MN 55401	May 30, 2008, 9:00 a.m.

YOU ARE COMMANDED to permit inspection of the following premises at the date and time specified below.	
--	--

PREMISES	DATE AND TIME

Any organization not a party to this suit that is subpoenaed for the taking of a deposition shall designate one or more officers, directors, or managing agents, or other persons who consent to testify on its behalf, and may set forth, for each person designated, the matters on which the person will testify. Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 30(b)(6).

ISSUING OFFICER'S SIGNATURE AND TITLE (INDICATE IF ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF OR DEFENDANT)	DATE
 Attorney for Plaintiff	May 13, 2008

ISSUING OFFICER'S NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER
Jennifer M. Hayes, Esq. Siegel, Brill, Greupner, Duffy & Foster, P.A. 100 Washington Ave. So., Ste. 1300 Minneapolis, MN 55401 (612) 337-6142

(See Rule 45, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Parts C & D on next page)

<sup>1</sup> If action is pending in district other than district of issuance, state district under case number.

### PROOF OF SERVICE

SERVED	DATE	PLACE
SERVED ON (PRINT NAME)	MANNER OF SERVICE	
SERVED BY (PRINT NAME)	TITLE	

### DECLARATION OF SERVER

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing information contained in the Proof of Service is true and correct.

Executed on	DATE	SIGNATURE OF SERVER
		ADDRESS OF SERVER

**Rule 45, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Parts C & D:****(c) PROTECTION OF PERSONS SUBJECT TO SUBPOENAS.**

(1) A party or an attorney responsible for the issuance and service of a subpoena shall take reasonable steps to avoid imposing undue burden or expense on a person subject to that subpoena. The court on behalf of which the subpoena was issued shall enforce this duty and impose upon the party or attorney in breach of this duty an appropriate sanction which may include, but is not limited to, lost earnings and reasonable attorney's fee.

(2) (A) A person commanded to produce and permit inspection and copying of designated books, papers, documents or tangible things, or inspection of premises need not appear in person at the place of production or inspection unless commanded to appear for deposition, hearing or trial.

(B) Subject to paragraph (d) (2) of this rule, a person commanded to produce and permit inspection and copying may, within 14 days after service of subpoena or before the time specified for compliance if such time is less than 14 days after service, serve upon the party or attorney designated in the subpoena written objection to inspection or copying of any or all of the designated materials or of the premises. If objection is made, the party serving the subpoena shall not be entitled to inspect and copy materials or inspect the premises except pursuant to an order of the court by which the subpoena was issued. If objection has been made, the party serving the subpoena may, upon notice to the person commanded to produce, move at any time for an order to compel the production. Such an order to comply production shall protect any person who is not a party or an officer of a party from significant expense resulting from the inspection and copying commanded.

(3) (A) On timely motion, the court by which a subpoena was issued shall quash or modify the subpoena if it

(i) fails to allow reasonable time for compliance,

(ii) requires a person who is not a party or an officer of a party to travel to a place more than 100 miles from the place where that person resides, is employed or regularly transacts business in person, except that, subject to the provisions of clause (c) (3) (B) (iii) of this rule, such a person may in order to attend

trial be commanded to travel from any such place within the state in which the trial is held, or

(iii) requires disclosure of privileged or other protected matter and no exception or waiver applies, or  
(iv) subjects a person to undue burden.

**(B) If a subpoena**

(i) requires disclosure of a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information, or

(ii) requires disclosure of an unretained expert's opinion or information not describing specific events or occurrences in dispute and resulting from the expert's study made not at the request of any party, or

(iii) requires a person who is not a party or an officer of a party to incur substantial expense to travel more than 100 miles to attend trial, the court may, to protect a person subject to or affected by the subpoena, quash or modify the subpoena, or, if the party in whose behalf the subpoena is issued shows a substantial need for the testimony or material that cannot be otherwise met without undue hardship and assures that the person to whom the subpoena is addressed will be reasonably compensated, the court may order appearance or production only upon specified conditions.

**(d) DUTIES IN RESPONDING TO SUBPOENA.**

(1) A person responding to a subpoena to produce documents shall produce them as they are kept in the usual course of business or shall organize and label them to correspond with the categories in the demand.

(2) When information subject to a subpoena is withheld on a claim that it is privileged or subject to protection as trial preparation materials, the claim shall be made expressly and shall be supported by a description of the nature of the documents, communications, or things not produced that is sufficient to enable the demanding party to contest the claim.

**SCHEDULE A**

- 1) All access logs from the website [www.BlackSDA.com](http://www.BlackSDA.com), which is registered to and operated by you, for all threads related to 3ABN (Three Angels Broadcasting, Inc.)
- 2) All identifying information, including registration information and IP addresses for the following posters to the website [www.BlackSDA.com](http://www.BlackSDA.com) (the dates, times and posting thread of a recent post by each poster is included to assist in isolating and identifying the poster):

POSTER NAME/ HANDLE	BlackSDA Member No.	THREAD TITLE	POST #	POSTING DATE	POSTING TIME
husbandoftheyear	2,078	Save 3abn Website, site registered to Gailon Joy	7	1/13/07	11:18 A.M.
watchbird	1,712	The 3abn Massachusetts Lawsuit Poll	3	1/27/07	5:32 P.M.
Erik	2,782	Rumors, Lies & False Accusations Travel with Joy	221	2/26/08	2:28 P.M.
LaurenceD	3,035	Rumors, Lies & False Accusations Travel with Joy	220	2/26/08	2:20 P.M.
Sonshineonme	1,709	Rumors, Lies & False Accusations Travel with Joy	217	2/26/08	11:58 A.M.
Observer	1,664	Rumors, Lies & False Accusations Travel with Joy	202	2/26/08	5:02 A.M.
Pickle	1,960	Rumors, Lies & False Accusations Travel with Joy	197	2/25/08	11:18 P.M.
justice4jesus	4,268	Rumors, Lies & False Accusations Travel with Joy	184	2/25/08	12:42 P.M.
Sister	762	Rumors, Lies & False Accusations Travel with Joy	172	2/25/08	5:03 A.M.
Richard Sherwin	2,753	Rumors, Lies & False Accusations Travel with Joy	153	2/24/08	4:59 P.M.
ex3ABNemployee	2,722	Rumors, Lies & False Accusations Travel with Joy	123	2/23/08	9:28 P.M.
Snoopy	2,808	Rumors, Lies & False Accusations Travel with Joy	134	2/24/08	12:47 A.M.
Johann	686	An Unauthorized History of 3ABN continues	380	2/20/08	10:43 P.M.
Fran	529	The Lawsuit Continues	207	2/13/08	8:49 P.M.
Lurker	676	Jim Gilley Takes Over As President	442	2/21/08	8:53 A.M.
Princessdi	47	Rumors, Lies & False Accusations Travel with Joy	181	2/25/08	12:16 P.M.

- 3) All e-mails, letters or other documents sent to you by any of the following individuals or sent by you to any of the following individuals:  
Gailon Arthur Joy

Robert Pickle  
Linda Shelton  
Darryl Fawcett  
Johann Thorvaldsson

4) All e-mails, letters or other documents sent to you by any of the following posters to the website [www.BlackSDA.com](http://www.BlackSDA.com) or sent by you to any of the following posters to the website [www.BlackSDA.com](http://www.BlackSDA.com):

Erik  
LaurenceD  
sonshineonme  
Observer  
Pickle  
justice4jesus  
sister  
Richard Sherwin  
ex3ABNemployee  
Snoopy  
Johann  
Fran  
lurker  
princessdi

that mention, discuss, refer or relate to Three Angels Broadcasting Network, Inc., Danny Shelton, Tommy Shelton, Linda Shelton, the lawsuit *Three Angels Broadcasting, Inc. and Danny Lee Shelton v. Gailon Arthur Joy and Robert Pickle* (District of Massachusetts), the bankruptcy of Gailon Arthur Joy (District of Massachusetts), the dissolution of the marriage of Danny Lee and Linda Shelton, the 3ABN discussion forum on the BlackSDA.com website, or any of the 3ABN discussion threads on the BlackSDA.com website, or that mention, discuss, refer or relate to the identity of the above-listed posters.



**Ex. T**

1300 Washington Square  
100 Washington Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401  
T (612) 337-6100 F (612) 339-6591  
[siegelbrill.com](http://siegelbrill.com)

**SIEGEL BRILL  
GREUPNER DUFFY  
& FOSTER P.A.**

JERRIE M. HAYES  
612-337-6142  
[jerriehayes@sbgdf.com](mailto:jerriehayes@sbgdf.com)

May 9, 2008

Mr. Robert Pickle  
1354 County Highway 21  
Halstad, MN 56548

**Re: Three Angels Broadcasting Network, Inc. and Danny Lee Shelton vs.  
Gailon Arthur Joy and Robert Pickle  
Court Docket No. 07-40098-FDS  
Our File No. 24,681-D-002**

Dear Mr. Pickle:

Enclosed please find a copy of the Subpoena of Linda Shelton.

Sincerely,

  
Jerrie M. Hayes

JMH/gkh

cc: Gailon Arthur Joy (Via U.S. Mail)

CAO88 (Rev. 1/94) Subpoena in a Civil Case

Issued by the

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF CENTRAL  
ILLINOIS

Three Angels Broadcasting Network, Inc.,  
an Illinois non-profit corporation, and  
Danny Lee Shelton, individually,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Gailon Arthur Joy and Robert Pickle,

Defendants.

## SUBPOENA IN A CIVIL CASE

Case Number: <sup>1</sup>	07-40098 FDS (District of Massachusetts)
---------------------------	---

TO: Linda Shelton  
2125 Renwick Dr.  
Springfield, IL 62704

**YOU ARE COMMANDED to appear in the United States District court at the place, date, and time specified below to testify in the above case.**

PLACE OF TESTIMONY	COURTROOM
DATE AND TIME	

YOU ARE COMMANDED to appear at the place, date, and time specified below to testify at the taking of a deposition in the above case.

PLACE OF DEPOSITION	DATE AND TIME
Advantage Reporting Service 118 West Edwards, Suite 101 Springfield, IL 62704	June 2, 2008, 9:00 a.m.

YOU ARE COMMANDED to produce and permit inspection and copying of the following documents or objects at the place, date, and time specified below (list documents or objects):

See Attached Schedule A.

PLACE

DATE AND TIME

**Advantage Reporting Service  
118 West Edwards, Suite 101  
Springfield, IL 62704**

**June 2, 2008, 9:00 a.m.**

**YOU ARE COMMANDED to permit inspection of the following premises at the date and time specified below.**

PREMISES	DATE AND TIME

Any organization not a party to this suit that is subpoenaed for the taking of a deposition shall designate one or more officers, directors, or managing agents, or other persons who consent to testify on its behalf, and may set forth, for each person designated, the matters on which the person will testify. Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 30(b)(6).

ISSUING OFFICER'S SIGNATURE AND TITLE (INDICATE IF ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF OR DEFENDANT)	DATE
<i>Jerrie M Hayes</i> Attorney for Plaintiff	April 29, 2008
ISSUING OFFICER'S NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER	
Jerrie M. Hayes, Esq. Siegel, Brill, Greupner, Duffy & Foster, P.A. 100 Washington Ave. So., Ste. 1300 Minneapolis, MN 55401 (612) 337-6142	

(See Rule 45, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Parts C & D on next page)

<sup>1</sup> If action is pending in district other than district of issuance, state district under case number.

#### PROOF OF SERVICE

SERVED	DATE	PLACE
SERVED ON (PRINT NAME)	MANNER OF SERVICE	

SERVED BY (PRINT NAME)	TITLE
------------------------	-------

#### DECLARATION OF SERVER

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing information contained in the Proof of Service is true and correct.

Executed on	DATE	SIGNATURE OF SERVER
		ADDRESS OF SERVER

## Rule 45, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Parts C &amp; D:

## (c) PROTECTION OF PERSONS SUBJECT TO SUBPOENAS.

(1) A party or an attorney responsible for the issuance and service of a subpoena shall take reasonable steps to avoid imposing undue burden or expense on a person subject to that subpoena. The court on behalf of which the subpoena was issued shall enforce this duty and impose upon the party or attorney in breach of this duty an appropriate sanction which may include, but is not limited to, lost earnings and reasonable attorney's fee.

(2) (A) A person commanded to produce and permit inspection and copying of designated books, papers, documents or tangible things, or inspection of premises need not appear in person at the place of production or inspection unless commanded to appear for deposition, hearing or trial.

(B) Subject to paragraph (d) (2) of this rule, a person commanded to produce and permit inspection and copying may, within 14 days after service of subpoena or before the time specified for compliance if such time is less than 14 days after service, serve upon the party or attorney designated in the subpoena written objection to inspection or copying of any or all of the designated materials or of the premises. If objection is made, the party serving the subpoena shall not be entitled to inspect and copy materials or inspect the premises except pursuant to an order of the court by which the subpoena was issued. If objection has been made, the party serving the subpoena may, upon notice to the person commanded to produce, move at any time for an order to compel the production. Such an order to comply production shall protect any person who is not a party or an officer of a party from significant expense resulting from the inspection and copying commanded.

(3) (A) On timely motion, the court by which a subpoena was issued shall quash or modify the subpoena if it

(i) fails to allow reasonable time for compliance,

(ii) requires a person who is not a party or an officer of a party to travel to a place more than 100 miles from the place where that person resides, is employed or regularly transacts business in person, except that, subject to the provisions of clause (c) (3) (B) (iii) of this rule, such a person may in order to attend

trial be commanded to travel from any such place within the state in which the trial is held, or

(iii) requires disclosure of privileged or other protected matter and no exception or waiver applies, or  
(iv) subjects a person to undue burden.

## (B) If a subpoena

(i) requires disclosure of a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information, or

(ii) requires disclosure of an unretained expert's opinion or information not describing specific events or occurrences in dispute and resulting from the expert's study made not at the request of any party, or

(iii) requires a person who is not a party or an officer of a party to incur substantial expense to travel more than 100 miles to attend trial, the court may, to protect a person subject to or affected by the subpoena, quash or modify the subpoena, or, if the party in whose behalf the subpoena is issued shows a substantial need for the testimony or material that cannot be otherwise met without undue hardship and assures that the person to whom the subpoena is addressed will be reasonably compensated, the court may order appearance or production only upon specified conditions.

## (d) DUTIES IN RESPONDING TO SUBPOENA.

(1) A person responding to a subpoena to produce documents shall produce them as they are kept in the usual course of business or shall organize and label them to correspond with the categories in the demand.

(2) When information subject to a subpoena is withheld on a claim that it is privileged or subject to protection as trial preparation materials, the claim shall be made expressly and shall be supported by a description of the nature of the documents, communications, or things not produced that is sufficient to enable the demanding party to contest the claim.

**SCHEDULE A**

1) A physical or electronic copy of any and all correspondence (including email) that you have sent to any person, or that you have received from any person, since January 1, 2005, which references, discusses, refers to, or mentions any of the following:

- a) Three Angels Broadcasting Network, Inc. ("3ABN");
- b) Your termination of employment from 3ABN or your Separation Agreement with 3ABN, dated by you June 4, 2005;
- c) Any past or present 3ABN Board Member, including but not limited to Danny Lee Shelton, Nick Miller, Walt Thompson, and Mae Chung;
- d) Any past or present 3ABN employee (paid or volunteer), including but not limited to Mollie Steenson, Hal Steenson, Larry Ewing, Tammy Larson, Tammy Chance, Brenda Walsh, and Tommy Lee Shelton;
- e) Any past or present donors or financial supporters of 3ABN;
- f) Any of the following internet websites:
  - Save3ABN.com
  - Save3ABN.org
  - Save-3ABN.com
  - Save-3ABN.org
  - BlackSDA.com
  - Maritime-SDA-Online.org
  - AdventTalk.com; or
- g) Any litigation involving Three Angels Broadcasting Network, Inc., Danny Lee Shelton, Gailon Arthur Joy, or Robert Pickle.

2) A physical copy of any and all documents (including but not limited to email, correspondence, memorandum, notes, summaries, photographs, audio or visual recordings, records, and files) that have been produced, provided or supplied by you to any of the following individuals since January 1, 2005 or that have been produced, provided or supplied to you by any of the following individuals since January 1, 2005:

- a) Gailon Arthur Joy, or any person acting as his representative or agent
- b) Robert Pickle, or any person acting as his representative or agent
- c) Johann Thorvaldsson, or any person acting as his representative or agent
- d) Darryl Fawcett, or any person acting as his representative or agent
- e) Nick Miller, or any person acting as his representative or agent
- f) Laird Heal, or any person acting as his representative or agent
- g) Dr. Arild Abrahamsen, or any person acting as his representative or agent

3) A physical or electronic copy of any and all postings you have made, under any nickname, "handle" or other manner of identification, to any of the following internet websites:

- BlackSDA.com
- Maritime-SDA-Online.org
- AdventTalk.com
- ChristianForums.com
- Save3ABN.com
- Save3ABN.org

**Ex. U**

1354 County Highway 21  
Halstad, MN 56548  
(218) 456-2568  
March 13, 2008

Alan Lovejoy, CPA  
Gray Hunter Stenn LLP  
2602 W. DeYoung  
P.O. Box 1728  
Marion, Illinois 62959

Dear Alan:

On April 6, 2007, Danny Shelton and 3ABN filed suit against Gailon Arthur Joy and myself in federal court. Among other things, the complaint filed with the lawsuit states:

46. Gailon Joy and Robert Pickle have published numerous untrue statements that 3ABN and its President Danny Shelton have committed financial improprieties with donated ministry funds. Among those untrue statements made by Joy and Pickle are, *inter alia*, that: ...

e. The 3ABN Board of Directors has failed in its responsibility to oversee and manage 3ABN's financial assets. ...

g. 3ABN Board members have personally enriched themselves as officers and directors of 3ABN in violation of the Internal Revenue Code.

h. Danny Shelton wrongfully withheld book royalties from 3ABN and refused to disclose those royalties in proceedings before a court of law related to the distribution of marital assets.

We have also been asked to describe under oath what "accounting process" we "conclude 3ABN failed to set up" "to account for sums gifted."

In preparing our defense against these and other allegations, we need to examine various financial documents concerning Danny Shelton, 3ABN, their DBA's, and the corporations they have jointly or separately controlled, including but not limited to Three Angels Enterprises, LLC, Crossbridge Music, Inc., and DLS Publishing. Thus we are asking for documents pertaining to such that either you or Gray Hunter Stenn LLP possess.

At the same time we want to avoid Gray Hunter Stenn LLP having to incur any copying expenses, and thus, unless you have another suggestion, we would provide our own equipment to do the copying with and would do our own copying.

We have chosen the date of January 1, 1998, to commence with because we have documented transactions in that year and onward that could be considered private inurement.

March 13, 2008  
page 2

We would imagine that it might be more convenient for both you and us if we inspect and copy these documents at your offices there in Marion, but just in case this is not convenient for you, we have reserved a room on the lower floor of Sam C. Mitchell & Associates in West Frankfort for April 17, 2008, at 8am.

Given the possibility that the volume of material may be more than one can go through in a day, we have reserved a room for the 21st as well. Perhaps when you have an idea of how many years of documents you have in your possession, and whether a foot high of work papers is about the average amount per year, you could let me know so I can better plan the length of time the room really needs to be reserved for. And you can let me know if you would prefer that we do the inspecting and copying at your offices instead.

Attorney Litzenburg indicated, as I recall, that we would be forced to file a motion to compel in U.S. District Court there in Southern Illinois before being able to obtain any documents whatsoever. We hope that will not be necessary, as we would then need to request the court to award us our reasonable expenses in so doing.

Danny Shelton and 3ABN chose a venue of Massachusetts for their federal lawsuit. When considering federal questions, federal privilege law applies (see Federal Rule of Evidence 501), and there is no accountant-client privilege in federal law for a case such as this one

Thanks so much for your assistance.

Sincerely,



Bob Pickle  
*Bob Pickle, pro se*

Gailon Arthur Joy, *pro se*

cc: Deeana Litzenburg

**Ex. V**

## **Earliest Creation Dates for Files on Save-3ABN.com**

Using the earliest of the three system timestamps for the files on Save-3ABN.com, this page calculates the earliest time that that file could have been created by on the server.

These dates only relate to when the file in question was created, not to when it was published so that the public could view it.

Title & URL	Earliest Calculated Creation Time
<a href="#">tribute-to-tommy-shelton-240x180-102k.wmv</a>	01/10/07 21:19:12
<a href="#">tribute-to-tommy-shelton-320x240-273k.wmv</a>	01/10/07 21:50:57
<a href="#">tribute-to-tommy-shelton-160x120-24k.wmv</a>	01/10/07 22:21:31
<a href="#">Tribute to Alleged Pedophile Tommy Shelton</a>	01/15/07 17:28:47
<a href="#">Save 3ABN (Three Angels Broadcasting Network)</a>	01/15/07 18:12:32
<a href="#">counter.png</a>	01/15/07 18:12:34
<a href="#">glenn-dryden-to-d-michael-riva-june-2003-excerpt.gif</a>	01/16/07 08:56:55
<a href="#">ezra-lights.gif</a>	01/16/07 08:56:57
<a href="#">pastor-glenn-dryden.gif</a>	01/16/07 08:56:58
<a href="#">glenn-dryden-to-walter-thompson-may-2003-a.gif</a>	01/16/07 08:57:00
<a href="#">2003-dryden-letter-mail-receipt.gif</a>	01/16/07 08:57:01
<a href="#">d-michael-riva-to-glenn-dryden-june-2003-b.gif</a>	01/16/07 08:57:03
<a href="#">d-michael-riva-to-glenn-dryden-june-2003-a.gif</a>	01/16/07 08:57:04
<a href="#">roger-clem-to-tommy-shelton-2004-b.gif</a>	01/16/07 08:57:06
<a href="#">cog-letterhead-flame.gif</a>	01/16/07 08:57:07
<a href="#">george-newton.gif</a>	01/16/07 08:57:08
<a href="#">1985-il-cog-letter.gif</a>	01/16/07 08:57:21
<a href="#">Tommy Shelton's "Confession" to One of His Victims</a>	01/16/07 08:58:41
<a href="#">New Year's Eve Tribute to Tommy Shelton</a>	01/16/07 08:58:42
<a href="#">Tommy Shelton's "Confession" Critiqued by a Child Molestation Victim</a>	01/16/07 08:58:43
<a href="#">Pastor Glenn Dryden's June 2003 Reply to 3ABN Attorney D. Michael Riva</a>	01/16/07 08:58:44
<a href="#">Mike Riva's Threatening Reply to Pastor Glenn Dryden</a>	01/16/07 08:58:45
<a href="#">Tommy Shelton Alleged Victim: Brad Dunning</a>	01/16/07 08:58:46
<a href="#">3ABN's Tribute to Alleged Pedophile Tommy Shelton</a>	01/16/07 08:58:47
<a href="#">Tommy Shelton Alleged Victim: Duane Clem: His Statement</a>	01/24/07 08:57:42
<a href="#">Tommy Shelton Alleged Victim: Duane Clem: His Apology</a>	01/24/07 08:57:43
<a href="#">Tommy Shelton Alleged Victim: Duane Clem: Background</a>	01/24/07 08:57:44
<a href="#">Tommy Shelton Alleged Victim: Roger Clem</a>	01/24/07 22:12:34
<a href="#">Tommy Shelton's Ordination Suspended for Sexual Misconduct</a>	01/25/07 15:31:36
<a href="#">Mike Riva's Threat to the Dunn Loring Congregation</a>	01/25/07 15:31:50
<a href="#">Scott Clem on Tommy Shelton's Alleged Health Problems</a>	01/25/07 15:31:53
<a href="#">Scott Clem Expresses His Deep Concern over the Future of 3ABN</a>	01/25/07 15:31:54
<a href="#">Scott Clem on Mike Riva's Latest Threat</a>	01/25/07 15:31:55
<a href="#">footer_text.gif</a>	01/25/07 16:05:07

<a href="#">Contact Us</a>	01/25/07 16:05:15
<a href="#">New Allegations in Virginia</a>	01/25/07 16:49:49
<a href="#">Broken-Hearted Mother #1</a>	01/25/07 21:46:02
<a href="#">Danny Shelton's Grand Smokescreen Scheme</a>	01/28/07 15:34:55
<a href="#">Lee Defends Danny's Cover Up of the Tommy Shelton Child Molestation Allegations</a>	01/28/07 16:13:14
<a href="#">The Apologists of Danny Shelton et. al.</a>	01/28/07 16:13:15
<a href="#">spacer.gif</a>	01/28/07 18:03:56
<a href="#">Steps Toward ASI Panel Review Negotiations: #2</a>	01/28/07 21:15:54
<a href="#">Steps Toward ASI Panel Review Negotiations: #1</a>	01/28/07 21:15:55
<a href="#">Steps Toward ASI Panel Review Negotiations: #4</a>	01/29/07 07:38:49
<a href="#">Duane Clem Fired for "Bad Attitude" (a.k.a. Being a Whistle Blower)</a>	01/29/07 21:42:17
<a href="#">Financial Allegations Against Danny Shelton</a>	01/30/07 04:33:19
<a href="#">Danny Shelton's Correspondence with Pastor Johann Thorvaldsson</a>	01/30/07 06:38:11
<a href="#">Gailon Arthur Joy Unknown? Not True!</a>	01/30/07 09:54:21
<a href="#">Danny Shelton's Grand Smokescreen Scheme</a>	01/30/07 09:54:39
<a href="#">I Finally Admitted My Guilt!</a>	01/30/07 12:43:00
<a href="#">3ABN's 2004 Form 990</a>	01/30/07 20:52:07
<a href="#">3ABN's 2005 Form 990</a>	01/30/07 20:52:41
<a href="#">3ABN's 2003 Form 990</a>	01/30/07 20:53:07
<a href="#">Bystander Says, "Linda Is Crazy like a Fox"</a>	02/01/07 04:32:31
<a href="#">wave.gif</a>	02/01/07 04:35:01
<a href="#">blink.gif</a>	02/01/07 04:57:38
<a href="#">Bystander Admits, "3ABN Knew These Guys Were Convicted Sex Offenders"</a>	02/01/07 11:43:12
<a href="#">judy-woods-sig.gif</a>	02/01/07 16:40:59
<a href="#">Judy Woods: "I Was There"</a>	02/01/07 17:17:53
<a href="#">judy-woods-jan-18-2007-3.gif</a>	02/01/07 17:18:49
<a href="#">judy-woods-jan-18-2007-2.gif</a>	02/01/07 17:18:51
<a href="#">judy-woods-jan-18-2007-1.gif</a>	02/01/07 17:18:52
<a href="#">yes.gif</a>	02/01/07 17:19:21
<a href="#">Gailon Joy to Gerry Spence: "Can You Suggest a Law Firm?"</a>	02/02/07 10:56:03
<a href="#">Gerald Duffy to Gailon Joy: "Cease &amp; Desist!"</a>	02/02/07 12:16:34
<a href="#">gerald-duffy-to-gailon-joy-1-30-07-b.gif</a>	02/02/07 12:18:16
<a href="#">gerald-duffy-to-gailon-joy-1-30-07-c.gif</a>	02/02/07 12:18:18
<a href="#">gerald-duffy-to-gailon-joy-1-30-07-a.gif</a>	02/02/07 12:18:20
<a href="#">gerald-duffy-sig.gif</a>	02/02/07 14:32:03
<a href="#">Gailon Joy to Gerry Spence: "Can You Suggest a Law Firm?"</a>	02/02/07 16:30:40
<a href="#">Document Entitled "Procedural Suggestions" Sent Out on October 31, 2006</a>	02/03/07 21:06:53
<a href="#">Mable Dunbar Speaks Out</a>	02/05/07 06:09:51
<a href="#">3ABN's 2001 Form 990</a>	02/05/07 15:22:36
<a href="#">Broken-Hearted Mother #2</a>	02/05/07 20:12:04
<a href="#">Round One: Gailon Joy: "Proposed Foundation for Hearings Regarding 3ABN"</a>	02/05/07 20:54:01
<a href="#">The Confidentiality Agreement Harold Lance Required</a>	02/05/07 20:54:03
<a href="#">Round One: Gregory Matthews</a>	02/05/07 20:54:05

<u>Round One: Bob Pickle</u>	02/05/07 20:54:07
<u>Round One: Proposed Document Edited by GW</u>	02/05/07 20:54:08
<u>charlotte-hopper-sig.gif</u>	02/05/07 21:42:52
<u>tommy-shelton-victims-family-mom-2-c.gif</u>	02/05/07 21:42:53
<u>tommy-shelton-victims-family-mom-2-b.gif</u>	02/05/07 21:42:54
<u>tommy-shelton-victims-family-mom-2-a.gif</u>	02/05/07 21:42:57
<u>Eyewitness Account: Sherry Avery</u>	02/06/07 10:04:56
<u>Round Two: Gailon Joy Seeks Answers</u>	02/06/07 11:24:49
<u>Round Two: Gregory Matthews</u>	02/06/07 11:24:52
<u>Round Two: Gailon Joy</u>	02/06/07 11:24:53
<u>Round Two: Harold Lance</u>	02/06/07 11:24:54
<u>sherry-avery-eyewitness-d.gif</u>	02/06/07 11:26:25
<u>sherry-avery-eyewitness-b.gif</u>	02/06/07 11:26:26
<u>sherry-avery-eyewitness-a.gif</u>	02/06/07 11:26:29
<u>sherry-avery-eyewitness-c.gif</u>	02/06/07 11:26:30
<u>JW Shares from Her Own Experience</u>	02/06/07 12:02:38
<u>letters-of-support-jw-1.gif</u>	02/06/07 12:05:45
<u>illinois-title-status.gif</u>	02/06/07 16:11:33
<u>2003-toyota-sequoia-title-800.jpg</u>	02/06/07 16:11:35
<u>2003-toyota-sequoia-title-400.jpg</u>	02/06/07 16:11:45
<u>lindas-payment-history-5.gif</u>	02/06/07 19:07:50
<u>lindas-payment-history-4.gif</u>	02/06/07 19:07:52
<u>lindas-payment-history-3.gif</u>	02/06/07 19:07:53
<u>lindas-payment-history-1.gif</u>	02/06/07 19:07:54
<u>lindas-payment-history-2.gif</u>	02/06/07 19:07:58
<u>"Danny Shelton Paid Off Linda's Car"</u>	02/06/07 19:12:06
<u>Duane Clem Fired for "Bad Attitude" (a.k.a. Being a Whistle Blower)</u>	02/06/07 19:12:07
<u>Round Three: Bob Pickle</u>	02/06/07 20:43:25
<u>Round Three: Gailon Arthur Joy</u>	02/06/07 20:43:26
<u>Round Three: Gregory Matthews</u>	02/06/07 20:43:27
<u>Round Three: Harold Lance</u>	02/06/07 20:43:30
<u>sherry-avery-sig-b.gif</u>	02/06/07 21:40:41
<u>sherry-avery-sig-a.gif</u>	02/06/07 21:40:42
<u>lindas-payment-history-2-500.gif</u>	02/07/07 10:51:11
<u>lindas-payment-history-1-500.gif</u>	02/07/07 10:51:12
<u>"Danny Shelton Paid Off Linda's Car"</u>	02/07/07 10:51:32
<u>illinois-title-status-500.gif</u>	02/07/07 12:39:21
<u>"Walt, 3ABN Needs Better Damage Control"</u>	02/07/07 18:45:11
<u>Danny Shelton Evades and Stonewalls</u>	02/07/07 18:45:12
<u>Gailon Joy Responds to Danny Shelton's Accusations That He Is an Embezzler</u>	02/07/07 18:45:13
<u>Walt Thompson Confesses, "Danny Told Me That"</u>	02/07/07 22:24:55
<u>Bosley Medical v. Michael Steven Kremer</u>	02/08/07 14:03:57
<u>Pastor Glenn Dryden Lends His Moral Support</u>	02/08/07 17:11:27

<a href="#">An Appeal to 3ABN President Danny Shelton</a>	02/09/07 16:09:08
<a href="#">Yet Another Verification Attempt</a>	02/09/07 16:09:09
<a href="#">Reply to Danny Shelton's Evasive Reply</a>	02/09/07 16:09:10
<a href="#">Danny Shelton Stonewalls Again</a>	02/09/07 16:09:11
<a href="#">Verification Attempt #2</a>	02/09/07 16:09:12
<a href="#">Verification Attempt #1</a>	02/09/07 16:09:13
<a href="#">Steps Toward ASI Panel Review Negotiations: #3</a>	02/09/07 16:31:18
<a href="#">Answers to Danny Shelton's Defiant Reply</a>	02/10/07 20:58:41
<a href="#">The ASI Tribunal: In Limbo</a>	02/11/07 11:56:42
<a href="#">06-8-10-topical-320x240-300k.wmv</a>	02/14/07 10:04:45
<a href="#">06-8-10-chronological-160x120-24k.wmv</a>	02/14/07 10:34:11
<a href="#">06-8-10-chronological-240x180-102k.wmv</a>	02/14/07 10:36:19
<a href="#">06-8-10-topical-160x120-24k.wmv</a>	02/14/07 10:44:51
<a href="#">06-8-10-topical-240x180-102k.wmv</a>	02/14/07 10:47:13
<a href="#">06-8-10-chronological-320x240-300k.wmv</a>	02/14/07 10:48:51
<a href="#">"Linda's Daughter Is Lying (50+ Excerpts Presented Topically)"</a>	02/14/07 14:34:38
<a href="#">"Linda's Daughter Is Lying (50+ Excerpts Presented Chronologically)"</a>	02/14/07 14:34:39
<a href="#">We're Not Going to Defend Ourselves. And Linda's Daughter Is a Liar.</a>	02/14/07 14:35:06
<a href="#">Defending Danny Against Allegations of Sexual Assault (3ABN Live, August 10, 2006)</a>	02/14/07 14:35:07
<a href="#">Linda Shelton Now Demands, "Make the Evidence Against Me Public!"</a>	02/15/07 17:52:23
<a href="#">Danny Shelton Refuses to Let Linda Shelton Defend Herself</a>	02/17/07 20:41:02
<a href="#">The One-Way Gag Order</a>	02/17/07 20:41:03
<a href="#">3abn-and-linda-shelton-separation-contract-3.gif</a>	02/19/07 22:47:49
<a href="#">3abn-and-linda-shelton-separation-contract-2.gif</a>	02/19/07 22:47:50
<a href="#">3abn-and-linda-shelton-separation-contract-1.gif</a>	02/19/07 22:47:51
<a href="#">separation-contract-signatures.gif</a>	02/19/07 22:47:52
<a href="#">Jettison Joy &amp; Get Rid of Gailon</a>	02/20/07 17:08:43
<a href="#">Round Four: Bob Pickle: Reply to Harold Lance</a>	02/20/07 18:26:43
<a href="#">Round Four: Bob Pickle: Reply to Harold Lance</a>	02/20/07 18:26:45
<a href="#">Round Four: Harold Lance: Reply to Bob Pickle</a>	02/20/07 18:26:47
<a href="#">Round Four: Harold Lance: Reply to Bob Pickle</a>	02/20/07 18:26:48
<a href="#">Round Four: Gregory Matthews</a>	02/20/07 18:26:49
<a href="#">Round Four: Bob Pickle</a>	02/20/07 18:26:50
<a href="#">Round Four: Harold Lance: "What's Happening?"</a>	02/20/07 18:26:51
<a href="#">Leonard Westphal Said That and Got Away with It?</a>	02/21/07 16:16:15
<a href="#">Harold Lance's Statement of January 24, 2007</a>	02/22/07 20:24:20
<a href="#">Bob Pickle Responds to Harold Lance's January 5 Statement</a>	02/22/07 20:24:23
<a href="#">Gregory Matthews Responds to Harold Lance's January 5 Statement</a>	02/22/07 20:24:24
<a href="#">Gailon Joy Responds to Harold Lance's January 5 Statement</a>	02/22/07 20:24:25
<a href="#">Harold Lance's Statement of January 5, 2007</a>	02/22/07 20:24:26
<a href="#">Gregory Matthews Acknowledges the Breach of the Confidentiality Agreement</a>	02/26/07 16:42:51
<a href="#">Bob Pickle Replies to Harold Lance's Reply</a>	02/26/07 16:42:52

**Ex. W**

**From:** "Linda Shelton" <linda.shelton@3abn.org>

**Date:** Thu, 25 Mar 2004 20:17:39 -0600

**To:** "Arild Abrahamsen" <aaedta@online.no>

I was thinking about our conversation on the phone when you said you were not emotionally or otherwise involved with my wife, that you had not crossed any professional or Christian lines. Well all of that has been proven a lie. She has confessed everything all the lies, all the phone calls, some for over FOUR HOURS AND NINE MINUTES at a time. At other times you talked to my wife, March 15, for example for 59 minutes, then another conversation for 75 minutes, then another for 13 minutes, plus that same day you called her from your phone at least once that I know of and talked between 30 minutes and an hour. All in one day! And you maintain that were did not cross a line with her. The eye of flesh got in the way. She's young ,beautiful, and intelligent, and a television personality. You used her son to get to her. The devil deceived you both.

Sabbath March 13th, when she was at Brendas house you talked for 4 hrs and nine minutes according to ATT prepaid phone card records! And you still have the nerve to lie about your involvement with my wife? Those dozens of recorded phone conversations were not about her son or the high and lofty spiritual things that you both lied about but now at least is admitted by my wife. During those conversations you tried to get her to say she was afraid of me. Now I know why.

Brenda told me that you said that you would never marry my wife if she divorced me because of you. but it she divorced me over abuse?? Brenda told me that you wanted her to promise that if I ever abused her, that she would let you know. It sounds to me as those you intended to fly across the ocean, and rescue her into your arms so that you two could properly live together the rest of your lives, feeling that God had blessed your union! What a lie.

You had planted those seeds in her, as she has never even mentioned the word abuse until the last few weeks, when she would contend that she was now being mentally abused. Praise the Lord, the Demonic control that Satan used you to put her under has been broken by prayer.

I have written proof that you talked from her phone only, not including the times you called her, approximately for 30 HOURS IN LESS THAN THE LAST 3 WEEKS BEFORE YOU WERE CAUGHT, trying to steal another man's wife.

John and Brenda told me that you accused her of being the aggressor, and didn't want to take any blame. Shame of you! If you're secretly involved with another man's wife the least you could do was protect her. She also told me of your planned vacations to have my wife stay with you in your private condo in Fla., of course without my knowledge. You knew that I wasn't happy with your relationship with her because she told me that she had confided some of our personal problems with you. Yet you planned a secret vacation with you to have her sleep in your condo.

She also told me about you taking her on a secret 10 day vacation around Scandinavia, staying at nights in hotels. Using Brenda all along to make it look innocent. My wife has asked God to forgive her for all the lies and the Spiritual adultery that took place between you. She is not still lying to herself. When are you going to come clean about your latest intentions to take this relationship from swooping her off her feet emotionally to the bedroom. Every Doctor and Counciler, knows that is the next step.

You have sinned just as surely as she has sinned, regardless of how innocent it all seemed. She was the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, the only problem is-- that she is some other man's pot of Gold.

There is only one name for this sin. Pastor John says it is spiritual adultery, which is the same in God's sight as physical adultery. Remember Eve's sin started in the mind before she ate the apple!

I expect a confession and apology on your part or am praying about contacting your Division, Union, and local conferences, to inform them as what you almost accomplished.

I also have proof of what you told her to dispose of to hide written messages between the two of you! Need I say any more?

Please ask God to forgive you and then apologize to me as the bible would have you to do.

I'm using Matt. 18 to resolve this. I first went to you by phone, and then by email. Brenda says you wanted me to believe that you didn't read them. I know you did.

You can't ignore me. I first contacted you, to know avail, next I contacted pastor John, to no resolve and if you don't answer me now then according to the bible I should contact the church.

So if you pretend that you didn't get this email, the next you hear from me could be your local church.

Also Brenda informed me of all your conversations with her concerning my wife. You probably were not aware that we have been friends since we were kids!

You can contact me with a written apology if you choose to resolve it this way at [dls3@shawneelink.net](mailto:dls3@shawneelink.net)

**Ex. X**

**Subject:** Re: Comments re the process

**From:** Bob

**Date:** Sun, 03 Dec 2006 22:35:24 -0600

**To:** "G. Arthur Joy"

**CC:** Harold Lance, Gregory Matthews,  
linda@, Deb Young, Ron Christman,  
Walt Thompson, danshelton@

Greetings, Harold.

Here are my thoughts, stated in the context that I am not overly biased toward or against Linda. I just haven't seen any evidence, even when it was promised that I could see it.

When I asked Hal Steenson last summer regarding the date of Melody's wedding, he very soon diverted the conversation to that of Linda's alleged guilt. I had absolutely no intention of discussing that topic at all.

Danny has made it fairly clear to me that he only wants the issue of he and Linda looked into by ASI, nothing else.

What I am saying is that there is a pattern of wanting to concentrate only on the issue of Danny vs. Linda, and thus if ASI goes along with that idea, they can easily be accused of being less than impartial, of doing just what Danny wants, as they have unfortunately already been accused of doing. I am not sure that it would be wise to allow that to happen.

Secondly, as you state below:

"The request from the 3ABN Board of Directors to ASI was: ...'request to ASI that it establish a commission to evaluate and determine Danny's legal and moral right to remarry.' "

The 3ABN board is further compromising its reputation by making such a request. The idea was for the board to allow an impartial ASI panel to look into the allegations, but they have up front determined that the ASI panel must agree with their own conclusions, namely, that the only issue needing to be resolved is that of Linda. Thus they have already determined that the ASI panel cannot be allowed to be impartial on the most critical point of what needs to be examined.

That the board would decide thus is rather odd given the fact that the Tommy Shelton child molestation allegations were brought to the Illinois Conference president's attention in August, and are essentially what has brought us down to the point of considering a panel review process. To ignore the very issue that has done more to produce motivation for considering this process than any other, it just seems inappropriate.



Thirdly, you state below:

"At the conclusion of the matter the Panelists findings of facts and recommendations would become publicly available."

I believe that given the current situation, to release only findings and recommendations without evidence will not accomplish a thing, unless, like Ted Haggard did, someone confesses. In the absence of a confession, if all parties (definitely more than two) refuse to admit wrong doing, the controversy will continue, to the further detriment of the reputations of 3ABN, ASI, and our denomination. And I would very much hate to see that happen.

Fourthly,

"During the hearing any Information not relevant to the agreed upon issues will be excluded."

I think there needs to be some clarification as to how this would be implemented. For example,

- Dr. Walt Thompson informed in writing within the last week or so that Danny had essentially misled him in 2003 regarding the child molestation allegations against Tommy Shelton, and that he and the board never did an adequate investigation of the matter in 2003.
- Another person of note, a former prominent 3ABNer who is not pro-Linda, has informed me in writing that Danny threatened him/her to back off regarding financial, operational, and personal concerns, and when he/she didn't, that Danny ordered the fraudulent manufacturing of evidence against him/her, which thus produced a damaging allegation against him/her, and led to his/her resignation, without the board investigating whether his/her claim of such deceit was legitimate, even when it was brought to their attention. I wish I could say that that case was ancient history, but it was definitely not.

Now suppose 3ABN, ASI, Danny, and Linda all make, in my opinion, the unwise decision to confine the discussion to just Linda and Danny. The above information establishes a pattern of behavior that calls into question the trustworthiness of Danny's word as well as the reliability of the board's decisions in dealing with serious issues. And that undermines their credibility when considering whatever evidence they bring to the table regarding Danny and Linda. But the way that the above is worded, there is no guarantee that such evidence will be allowed despite its relevance in the hypothetical situation where the issues are confined so narrowly.

As far as what Gailon says regarding the appropriateness of whether a panel can move forward while the civil case regarding marital assets is still pending, I have no experience on that one. Do you have any thoughts, Harold, given your experience as an attorney?

Bob

G. Arthur Joy wrote:

Do we understand that the 3ABN Board only wants to address the issues related to the allegations by Danny Shelton, from the period of approximately Feb 2004 to the present, to various persons and entities that lead to accusations of adultery, and claimed to have had evidence thereto, and resulted in a divorce, Linda's response, the responses of various parties and entities, including, but not limited to, Johann Thorvaldson, Dr. Arild Abrahamsen, 3ABN employees, purported counselors, the 3ABN Chairman, the

3ABN investigative committee, the 3ABN Board of Directors, 3ABN statements to its world viewing audience, 3ABN statements in various publications or letters, 3ABN statements on various web-sites and blogs, The West Frankfort / Thompsonville SDA church and leadership, the Springfield SDA church and leadership, The Illinois Conference- leadership- executive committee, Linda's communications with various parties and entities, Linda's website and such other information as may be pertinent to motive, purpose and results of the actions of each party? That such consideration is to be based upon the biblical standard?

Is it clear that this is the only issue that the panel is being asked to address and is solely based upon the 3ABN board request?

And just what is the scope of the possible recommendations allowed by the panel pursuant to this clearly delimited process?

And what assurance does the church laity have that the ASI panel recommendations would be implemented by the 3ABN board?

And what is everyone's view of the appropriateness to empanel a panel to review this issue while the civil case involving distribution of marital assets is still pending?

That ASI does not intend, in fact, refuses, to address any other issue?

And what would be the proposed timeline for such a limited panel?

Gailon Arthur Joy

----- Original message -----

From: Harold Lance

> Good Morning Friends;

>

> CONFIDENTIAL-FYEO DO NOT REDISTRIBUTE

>

>

> Thank you for your involvement in discussions aimed at achieving an  
> agreeable process for issues involving 3ABN and some of its' personnel. I  
> have read with interest the ideas and background information sent by Mathew  
> and Bob. Art and I have had 2 extended conversations that have helped me  
> appreciate some of your concerns and perspectives. We are all committed  
> Seventh-day Adventist Christians who have a good faith interest in resolving  
> our issues. I appreciate each of your willingness to work in confidentiality  
> to attempt agreement on a process.

>

> I wish to confirm that those of us from ASI have no predetermined "ax to  
> grind", except to be used in a process that will hopefully bring resolution  
> to some obvious problems. I am a newcomer to the public discussions that

> have been swirling around. My initial reaction to Debby Young when she  
> contacted me about possible ASI involvement was: "Don't get involved"! As we  
> have reflected on it further we believe the issues, including the impact on  
> the Church, are of such importance that it is essential that we make our  
> best efforts to assist. In the last 32 years ASI has only gotten involved  
> in "external" issues two or three times. In each instance it resulted in  
> benefit to our members and ASI.  
>  
> I know there are many issues being discussed. I have counted at least 23 in  
> the last few weeks. Some issues are already the subject of ongoing  
> litigation. The request from the 3ABN Board of Directors to ASI was:  
> ..."request to ASI that it establish a commission to evaluate and determine  
> Danny's legal and moral right to remarry". ASIs' membership criteria  
> includes a component that requires the applicant or its leaders to be in  
> regular standing with the SDA Church. We check that factor in every  
> application. Membership in the SDA Church is the exclusive province of the  
> local church (except for membership in the "Conference Church", not involved  
> here). The rather unique situation of the Church associated with 3ABN  
> creates a different perspective from the typical SDA Church on matters of  
> membership.  
>  
> All of us know ASI has no jurisdiction to act as a court with authority to  
> make orders and awards that disputants are required to follow. What we may  
> have that could be of assistance is some stature and credibility that would  
> make its' findings hard for the parties to ignore. This can only have a  
&gt; possibility of succeeding if the parties support and respect that potential.  
> Because of ASI's membership requirements there is some logic for ASI's  
> involvement on issues that directly reflect on 3ABNs' membership status in  
> ASI. We believe that ASI could properly focus on issues revolving around the  
> biblical appropriateness of the Shelton's divorce and Danny's subsequent  
> remarriage, issues relating to Linda's and Danny's employment status at 3ABN  
> and actions taken concerning Linda's membership in the local SDA Church.  
>  
> Because of my career as a trial lawyer I have familiarity with court  
> process. There are some basic concepts of fair play and order that we can  
> borrow without becoming involved in a court trial with all its grinding  
> impact on all involved. The following are some fundamentals I think we need  
> in place:  
>  
> 1. A clear statement of the issues we are addressing and the basis of all  
> decisions reached by the panel i.e. What are biblical grounds for divorce  
> and remarriage as expressed in the SDA Church Manual?  
>  
> 2. A fair and predictable time table of requirements and schedule of events.  
> For example who will proceed on which issues and how will the available time  
> be allotted?  
>  
> 3. A process that requires each side, in a timely fashion, to identify those

> who will give information and the essence of their expected facts, including  
> authority for the panel to refuse to consider offered information that was  
> not previously disclosed.  
>  
> 4. A mutually required disclosure of documentary information furnished  
> simultaneously to all sides. The right of each party to request of the other  
> parties documents relevant to issues on reasonable time tables i.e. within  
> twenty days after the request.  
> > **5. A prohibition of all sides from unilateral contact with the panelists.**  
>  
> **6. Findings of fact by the panel that are based upon the information**  
> provided in the process and not from any private undisclosed sources.  
>  
> **7. Recommendations of the panel that are relevant to the facts they find to**  
> be true.  
>  
> **8. A private hearing environment that is for all parties and panelists fair,**  
> orderly, comfortable, and free of intimidation. The primary questioning of  
> people appearing before it to be done by the panel under the direction of  
> its' chairperson. The parties or their representative will have opportunity  
> to submit to the panel written questions and lines of inquiry not covered by  
> the panel. We expect that the hearing process will involve much prayer for  
> wisdom, discernment, and truth.  
>  
> **9. In the hearing meeting an opportunity by the parties or th eir > representative to**  
provide an introductory statement orally or in writing as  
> to their position on the issues, their supporting facts and the outcome they  
> expect. During the hearing any Information not relevant to the agreed upon  
> issues will be excluded. After the presentation of all information the  
> parties or their representative will have the opportunity to make comment on  
> the information presented and why it supports their position.  
>  
> **10. Panelists selected by ASI, with input from the parties, will be persons**  
> that are fair, intelligent, and spiritual, without preconceived opinions as  
> to the outcome or any stake personally or philosophically in the outcome.  
>  
> **11. The timely, perhaps within 30 days, rendition by the panelist to ASI and**  
> the parties of its factual conclusions and recommendations for action.  
>  
>  
> I believe the items mentioned (and perhaps others should be included as  
> well) are directly transferable concepts from legal process without the  
> labels and jargon. There are other court practices that I don't think fit  
> our purposes:  
>  
> **A Direct and cross examination by legal counsel.**  
>  
> **B. Subpoena power to compel attendance and production of documents and**

> things.

>

> C. The use of a "judge" to direct the process, trial counsel representing  
the parties, and a jury to find the facts and apply them to the law.

>

> D. The use of orders, judgments or decrees.

>

> E. The creation of a record by electronic recording or a reporter.  
transcript.

>

> F. Taking of depositions or discovery interrogatories.

>

>

>

> ASI functions almost completely through volunteers, except for a small staff  
of three or four employees at the NAD/GC facilities. The current officers  
do not have the availability to become involved in this matter and carry on  
their other commitments to ASI and their ministries or businesses. Except  
for the current officers and those ASI members who are excludable by # 10  
above would be eligible for consideration as well as other qualified SDA  
church members. We expect that there will be a gender balance. We are open  
to proposed panelist completing an agreed questionnaire that would be  
revealing of their background and biases. Keep in mind that the panelists  
will be volunteers and would not likely accept an assignment that is unduly  
intrusive.

>

> You may have learned that it is the ASI position that there needs to be a  
balance between the process of being open and on the other hand be  
respectful of the legitimate privacy concerns of the parties. Government,  
worldly businesses, charitable organizations and the Church all recognize  
this need. When sensitive personnel matters are under consideration Boards  
typically go into executive session for such discussions. Accordingly we  
expect that this process would do the same and that information and  
documentation would be received and held in confidence by all of the parties  
and their representatives. At the conclusion of the matter the Panelists  
findings of facts and recommendations would become publicly available.

>

> I have requested that all of the parties select a representative to work  
with me in not just deciding the process but to make it happen. I have had  
no direct contact with either Danny or Linda and to a very limited extent  
with Dr. Walt Thompson on behalf of 3ABN. I also asked him to convey my  
request to Danny that he consider the selection of a representative and that  
public discussions cease as I believe they are counter productive to our  
focus. It is my preference that I work with a selected representative for  
each party so that we have a defined way of communicating needed  
information. If any of you would like further information on my background I  
will respond. I can clearly state that I have no preconceived opinion of  
the facts or an outcome.

>  
> I have been asked about what is meant by a neutral site in the area. I know  
> it shouldn't be at 3ABN, but should be convenient to where most of the  
> involved people are located. Whether that is 50 miles or 500 away from  
> 3ABN, I don't know, but I don't think it should be across the country  
> either.

>  
> I realize that our proposals don't meet all of your expectations, but I do  
> think it will work, that it will be fair, and the results will be better  
> than what's out there now.

>  
> I suggest you look this over prayerfully and carefully. Give me your ideas  
> and if looks like we are far enough along I'll revise my initial proposal  
> and distribute it.

>  
> Thank you for your willingness to address this important matter.  
>  
>

> **Harold lance**  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

**Ex. Y**

**Subject:** Re: Process: round three

**From:** Bob

**Date:** Mon, 11 Dec 2006 10:00:35 -0600

**To:** Harold Lance

**CC:** "G. Arthur Joy", Linda Shelton, Gregory Matthews, Ron Christman, Deb Young, danshelton@, Walt Thompson

Greetings, Harold.

I want to thank you for all the time and effort you have put into this. I'm sure it hasn't been easy.

I, unlike others, have always felt that an ASI panel could be impartial. My primary concern in a number of issues has been one of appearances, and I still think that unless the findings are accompanied by either enough evidence or a confession of the "losing" party, it will be difficult for ASI to avoid accusations of not being impartial. Of course, it's hard to avoid all criticism, but that has been my concern.

Regarding the email interchanges, you will recall that my most recent interchange with Danny began at the request of Dr. Walt Thompson that I verify what he had told me that Danny had said in 2003 regarding the Tommy Shelton child molestation allegations. In my four emails to Danny I gave him every opportunity to explain the discrepancies, and thus provide some other conclusion than that he had lied to his board chairman in 2003.

Whether the molestation allegations are true or not is irrelevant to the main point: Walt said that Danny said that the allegations were 30 years old while at the same time Walt received a letter in 2003 indicating that there were allegations as recent as three years old at that time. Walt said that he was led to believe that Pastor Glenn Dryden's accounts were apparently the only ones out there, when Roger Clem had publicly come forward in early 2003 in the small community surrounding 3ABN. Walt said he was led to believe that all these allegations were the result of a feud and jealousy between Pastor Dryden and Tommy, yet they either had not met yet or lived 800 miles apart during all the time the alleged actions occurred, except for 1993-1995. Thus, even if every last allegation is false, we still have Walt indicating that Danny misled him.

There are either two choices: either Walt Thompson or Danny Shelton told a huge lie. And we also have a 3ABN attorney threatening a non-Adventist minister in order to shut him up, using only the reasoning, from what I can tell from reading a fax of the original letter, that "Even if the actions did occur," the statute of limitations has run out.

You very well may be correct about there not being a problem with ascending liability, and you are certainly more qualified to address that question than I am. But I wasn't necessarily thinking of ascending liability. I am told that the IL Conf. pressured 3ABN to terminate Tommy in the mid-1990's for these very issues. If that really is true, or even if it isn't, what about the following three facts?

- The IL Conf. president sits on the 3ABN board and may even have participated in the reversal of the earlier decision despite the new allegations being brought to the board's attention. (I'm sure not wanting to come across as negative in any way in saying this.)
- The 3ABN general manager sits on the conf. committee and could be arguably aware of the ongoing

allegations going back decades.

- An official Broadview Academy campus exists at Thompsonville ([http://www.bvanet.org/index.php?option=com\\_na\\_content&task=view&id=48](http://www.bvanet.org/index.php?option=com_na_content&task=view&id=48)). (Just surfing around I've come up with addresses of 3577 Angel Ln. for both the church and the school, and 3941 and 4007 Angel Ln. for 3ABN. That suggests that the church and school both sit on the 3ABN campus.)

Would this scenario pose any greater theoretical risk to the conference if a student at that particular Broadview Academy campus were to be victimized in the future? If conference officers and a member of the conference executive committee had opportunity to know or did know about the negligence involved with the ongoing employment of an alleged pedophile at 3ABN, and still allowed academy students to be in a situation in which that alleged pedophile could possibly have ready access to them, would that not involve the conference in greater risk if a student was victimized?

And it isn't as if proper precautions have been made. John Lomcang as of September 1 did not know a thing about the child molestation allegations against Tommy Shelton, based on what he told me. Thus the pastor of the very church where the school is located has been kept in the dark by Danny, 3ABN, and the conference administration (assuming they were in the know, which may not be the case). Therefore, John Lomacang had no way of knowing that special precautions needed to be taken.

Regarding email interchanges on other topics than Linda vs. Danny, if the ASI panel will not be reviewing other issues, then what would be the point of not seeking clarification on these other issues in as kind and redemptive a way as possible? My understanding is that there are a lot of individuals who are neither the typical pro-Danny or pro-Linda type of folks, folks who normally would tend to be pro-3ABN, who believe that this information needs to get out without waiting for an ASI review, and if that ASI review is not going to be dealing with these issues anyway, why not?

Plus, you specifically asked those on "Linda's team" to desist, and I am not really a member of her team. I am still unconvinced of either her innocence or her guilt since neither side has provided me any concrete evidence to that effect. Yet I will say that the events of the last two and a half weeks have clearly demonstrated that what Danny and the board merely say cannot be trusted as being fact.

I do have a question for you. Do you anticipate the ASI panel reviewing whether the recording Hal Steenson told me about was created without violating either state or federal law? Hal claimed that that recording proved Linda's guilt, and thus it directly relates to the review if the review is narrowed down as you propose, but will the question of its legality be considered? If not, will that recording be able to be presented as evidence at all? If evidence has been illegally obtained, will it be admissible anyway?

The same question applies to the phone card phone records that John Lomacang claims exists. Were they legally acquired? If not, will they still be able to be submitted as evidence?

Personally, though everyone may disagree with me, I have a difficult time seeing the wisdom in going forward with a process that Danny has made very clear that he intends to use as a smokescreen. As he wrote to me last Tuesday,

"ASI will decide who is doing the cover up. Somebody is lying! After hearing the testimony and evidence from both sides ASI will make a decision. Should ASI decide that the 3ABN

board and myself did not 'scapegoat Linda' to cover up my sins, then, in my opinion it will become obvious to the public that maybe many of these other accusations are lies also."

Thus, he is hoping to get a positive decision from the ASI panel, and then use that decision to make all the other allegations go away, even allegations that are based on the word of his own board chairman. I have a real problem with that.

Lastly, if you were to look at the various aspects that both sides would like to see incorporated into the review process, as it presently stands, how many of the aspects proposed by Danny's/3ABN's side are on the table, and how many proposed by Linda's side or myself (since I am not really on "Linda's side") are on the table? Are any of the proposed changes that Gailon/Linda proposed even being considered by ASI, and if not, if there is no give and take on "both" sides, does that not appear to demonstrate a lack of impartiality on the part of ASI, even if they really are impartial?

Or, did ASI both arrive at and choose to stick with the original proposal without any input whatsoever from 3ABN and/or Danny Shelton? If that be the case, and if that can be made clear, then perhaps ASI can indeed be impartial in appearance as well as in fact during the setting-up-of-the-process phase.

However, there is a challenge in establishing that ASI arrived at the rules as originally proposed without any input whatsoever from 3ABN or Danny. Gloria sent her email to Linda on Sunday, November 12. Yet it was back on October 17 that Mollie informed me that the evidence that was emphatically promised that I could see would not be shown to me, and that the findings of some sort of panel would be made public. I then expressed my concern of what would happen if evidence was not made public as well, and received no reply whatsoever. And way back on August 4 when I asked a question of Hal Steenson about Melody, he diverted the conversation to the question of Linda's guilt, something I had no intention of bringing up. Thus it is apparent that narrowing the focus to just that of Linda and keeping the evidence secret forever has been part of 3ABN's strategy even before, at least for some aspects of the question, ASI ever got involved, and definitely before November 12.

Thus it appears to me that if none of the more major elements proposed by Gailon/Linda are incorporated by ASI into the original proposal that 3ABN appears to have requested, we have clear evidence of a lack of impartiality on the part of ASI as well as undue influence of 3ABN upon the ASI panel review process. Frankly, I'm unaware of any of the major elements proposed by Gailon/Linda that have been incorporated, even though they have been suggested more than once.

I would therefore recommend, if this is the way things have to be, that for the good of ASI's reputation it decline to get further involved.

God bless.

Bob

Harold Lance wrote:

Greetings friends:

CONFIDENTIAL FYEO DO NOT REDISTRIBUTE

I have now heard from/been in touch with each one or their representative. You have provided much to consider. There are many thoughts that have surfaced that can be grouped for consideration rather than "chase every rabbit" as they have appeared.

What we are attempting is new ground to a great extent, because the choices out there don't fit. For me the easiest thing would be to transplant a litigation model, agree on the standardized Federal Rules of Evidence and Procedure, find ourselves a judge and proceed. But that won't work. It would crush all the parties. Even if limited to the simplest issues it would cost many tens of thousands of dollars (that's not an exaggeration) and would not end with a redemptive result or persuade the Church that the right thing had been done. The Church has an established process for dispute resolution, but that doesn't fit well either and they are unwilling to get involved. We could allow things to keep going unchecked and open-ended with a vigilante outcome. It is because we are all wanting to be faithful to our calling that I think we must find a way to proceed the best we can in good faith, respecting each other.

It will help if we:

Realize that all will be benefited by resolution and closure.

Can accept the fact that there may be a degree of truth and fault in each sides position.

Accept that everyone involved is a person that God loves.

Consider how Jesus dealt with Judas, Simon, Mary M, and the woman at the well etc.?

The order that I discuss issues doesn't indicate its' importance, I just have to start somewhere. I may not get to each concern you have raised, I may have forgotten it or it may be beyond the scope of what I can surround just now.

I'll state each issue raised by at least one of you in the form of a question that reflects your comments to me.

#### WILL OUR PROCESS CONFLICT WITH THE PENDING ASSET DIVISION LITIGATION?

I believe the Shelton's decided by written agreement to obtain their divorce in Guam and defer to the local court the pending issues related to division of assets. The suggested issues for the ASI panel relating to Biblical divorce and remarriage are not to decide their marital status, but rather to provide clarity for matters of ASI relationships, employment concerns as well as to give clarity to the conduct of the parties. We will in no way consider the pending property issues. I believe we should leave to the civil authorities all matters that clearly involve a primary public interest. I'll get to more on that later.

**IS ASI IMPARTIAL OR IN DANNY'S HIP POCKET?**

This is a critical question for everyone, including ASI. If we are not able to accept that ASI can act fairly, impartially, honestly, then it certainly should not be involved. Don't expect ASI to "toot its own horn" on this issue. They can't and they won't. They are either trustworthy or they are not. There is no question that there has been a longstanding relationship between ASI and 3ABN that has been mutually beneficial. 3ABN probably was launched as the result of a presentation Danny made at the ASI Convention in Big Sky in 1985. To the extent that the relationship was beneficial to 3ABN both Shelton's received whatever that benefit was until a short time ago. 3ABN has given public exposure to ASI and hundreds of supporting ministries in programming. In turn 3ABN has received financial support that has assisted in offsetting its' costs of production of our convention programming, and 3ABN has benefited from the programming itself. The outcome of our process could also affect 3ABN membership status in ASI. We are completely open to accepting what ever outcome occurs. For those of you in doubt ask questions about ASI and their players. If I don't know the answers we'll do our best to find the information you need. If after your inquiry you do not believe ASI cannot be trusted, let's cut the process as soon as possible and go on to something better.

**SINCE THERE ARE MANY OTHER CONCERNS WHY LIMIT THE ISSUES TO THOSE SUGGESTED?**

There are other implications to the request of 3ABN to ASI then may appear on the surface. Even though the 3ABN employees are probably "employees at will", If the allegations justifying termination are NOT true, than the question arises; was the action taken by 3ABN appropriate? Likewise was the local Church action correct? Was the divorce and remarriage biblical? If not, would there be an impact on the membership status of 3ABN in ASI? That is why I have suggested that there are three sides rather than just two. To resolve these issues will require the personal presence and a careful inquiry of the parties and others who may have first hand relevant information. The hearing is likely to require several days (probably 2-4) plus travel considerations for some of 2 additional days. That is stretching the commitment that we can expect from the participants. If we were to add to the list of issues, how do you decide which of the many out there should be added? Why some and not others? Who would be able to commit to an open-ended process that sought to resolve every expressed concern? Our limited view of issues to be considered has nothing to do with 3ABNs' request, rather it's our own belief that if we can surround what's pending that will be all ASI can handle. I urge all parties to understand and accept ASIs' decision. I'll deal with some of the other reoccurring requests as the next issue.

**DO ACTIVITIES AND PERSONNEL ACTIONS THREATEN LIABILITY FOR THE SDA CHURCH?**

In the materials just received there is a reoccurring (three or more times) suggestion/urging that we include issues relating to the alleged misconduct of Shelton family members. The stated reason was urged primarily by a concern for ascending liability for the Illinois Conference of SDAs'. (finding someone who could pay and be legally liable was the search of my career) I understand how liability may attach to others "up the food chain".

It is never in the abstract, but always built upon a relationship of some kind (employment, agency, etc). The alleged conduct occurred, if at all, elsewhere, while there was no employment relationship with any of the parties and certainly with no connection to the SDA Church or its' entities. I don't believe there has ever been any case establishing ascending liability from a supporting ministry to the SDA Church. There has never been an adequate connection between them to ground liability in the Church. There just are not any facts presented here suggesting that there is a viable risk to the Church. I used the term alleged to describe claimed misconduct, because that is what it is. The Supreme court within the last month ruled that a web site holder/server was immune from legal liability for libel and slander for information sent to it, but affirmed that liability would attach to the sender/publisher but not the receiver. I have a concern that if libelous matter is sent to us and then inadvertently re-sent that we by resending could become liable for publishing such information. I know that those who have sent such information believe strongly that they have the truth, and that truth would be a defense. Remember that there has been no prosecution or judgment establishing the truth of the allegations made. It would be incumbent on the publisher to prove the very facts the States of Illinois and Virginia has been unable/unwilling to do. I don't think we want to go there. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE INTERCHANGES, CONTAINING DEROGATORY INFORMATION, STOP AMONG THE PARTIES AND THEIR TEAM MEMBERS. I have recently had a personal conversation with Danny strongly urging that he stop the email interchanges. He has agreed. I am appealing to those of you on Linda's' team to stop this as well. I really do already understand your factual positions.

#### SHOULD AN SDA JUDGE BE USED TO CONDUCT THE PROCEEDINGS?

There will inevitably be questions that arise in our process that could be ruled on if a judge were in charge of the proceedings, but then that would not be ASI's process, but rather that of Judge and a quasi- court proceeding. I believe we can establish a process that lay people can understand and effectively function within without lawyers, a Judge, etc. What we can do is provide a panel of ASI members that can bring intelligence, common sense and fairness in a way that will be respected and supported.

#### DO PARTIES WHO MAY BE "PUBLIC FIGURES" GIVE UP THEIR RIGHT TO PRIVACY?

I believe there is some confusion about how the rules relating to "public figures" and privacy apply. It has been suggested that because the Shelton are "public figures" they are therefore not entitled to any privacy in their personal lives. It is likely that both the Shelton's are public figures, but what does that mean? Does it mean that their personal lives are open to public scrutiny without any restraint? The "public figure" concept relates to the proof required in litigation, before a public figure can recover money damages for slander and libel. In an action for libel a public figure must prove that the publisher (slanderer or libeler) was motivated by malice and had an intent to harm, not merely that an untruth was published about a public figures personal life. This concept plays no part here justifying exposure of the parties personal lives on a concept that the public somehow has a right to know. It is our belief that the usual and

customary practices of confidentiality adhered to by the Church, government, and business needs to be followed in our proceedings. What the public has a "right to know" can be provided by the panels factual findings and recommendations.

SHOULD THE PANEL INCLUDE EXPERTS THAT COULD ASSIST IN THEIR COMPREHENSION OF THE INFORMATION?

You will recall that one of the concepts(#6) in our memo to you December 3, we suggested was that the findings of the panel should be based upon the information presented and not from any private undisclosed source. This is a typical requirement with courts and juries that they not seek information upon which to base their findings other than what was received into evidence. If there are special concepts not known by laity( concept of "transference" as suggested) that help should be provided to the panel by a witness, not from someone planted in their midst as a member.

WHAT STANDARD IS TO BE USED IN WEIGHING THE BIBLICAL DIVORCE REMARRIAGE ISSUE?

We all probably have examples of how a local church dealt harshly or too liberally with members in a divorce situation. We need to avoid that outcome. That is why I suggested the Church Manual as I believe that is the standard SDA Churches are required to follow. I believe ASI is compelled to follow that standard as well in considering its' membership.

WHAT STANDARD WILL BE USED IN ALLOWING INFORMATION TO BE CONSIDERED ?

Was the witness disclosed and a fair summary of their information furnished to the parties ?

Does the information tend to establish or disprove a fact of an agreed upon issue or contention? (in other words, is it relevant?)

Does the witness have direct knowledge of the facts to be presented?

HOW WILL PANEL PROCEED AND THE QUESTIONING OCCUR?

The order of the proceedings will be established by prior agreement of the parties. i.e. define the issues and decide the sequence to be followed.

The parties will be physically present and with a representative (one) if they choose.

HJL will be present to assist in the process.

The parties may orally and/or in writing present an opening statement detailing their respective position on the issues and the facts that support their position.

The party asserting a position will be obligated to establish the facts

needed to support that position. For example Danny/3ABN will need to provide information (proof) that the divorce was Biblical. They would go first on that issue followed by information presented by Linda that disputes that position. Etc

The questioning will be by the panelists not the parties or their representative. The schedules and convenience of witnesses will be respected in so far as possible.

The parties may provide to the panel written suggestions for questions of any witness.

After the questioning process is completed the witness will be excused to leave.

The hearing will be confidential and private, not recorded or reported by the panel, the parties, or the representative.

After the panel has heard from all witnesses, and considered the documents/things submitted the parties will/may make a closing statement to invite the panel to accept or reject the information presented and what the panel should include in its' findings and recommendations.

The panel will thereafter meet privately at its' own schedule to review the information, develop its findings and recommendations to the parties.

After the hearing process is completed the panel will within 30 days deliver to ASI and the parties its' findings and recommendations.

Thank you for your patience in awaiting my thoughts. Please read this carefully. If you have questions feel free to express them. Whenever we have clarified adequately we will put our process information into a document that we can all sign on to, then begin the details of scheduling, etc.

Harold lance

**Ex. Z**

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

**Subject:** Re: Linda Shelton & ecclesiastical authority

**Date:** Mon, 25 Sep 2006 03:00:36 +0000

**From:** G. Arthur Joy

**To:** Gregory Matthews

**CC:** Linda Shelton, Pastor Mark Finlay

I spoke with Linda for nearly seven hours (yup, add me to the list of Danny's spiritual adulterers) and found a woman of profound Faith, albeit frustrated by an onslaught of innuendo's, accusations and diatribes that have elided over time from "proof of an adulterous affair" to "proof of a spiritual adultery with no absolute proof of biblical adultery" to "Linda is guilty of adultery with proof we have elected not to embarrass her with".

This is wearing on the strongest of Faiths, but I found a woman very reluctant to participate in directed civil litigation to prove her innocence, unless 3ABN, et al, first file a complaint and she is forced to defend her integrity. I found this position profound but the clearest evidence of her Faith in the Gospel of Jesus Christ and God's Remnant Church.

Given that we have good sources that seem to be telling us that at best 3ABN has a weak circumstantial case for an "inappropriate relationship", which she categorically denies the efficacy of such a relationship, it would seem unlikely they will actually file any complaint for fear that we would use such a platform for extensive counter-claims for the claims they or a surrogate would make, adding third party defendants or complainants as appropriate to include allegations of Libel, Slander, breach of implied contract, fraud, conversion, conspiracy to commit fraud, racketeering, influence peddling and corrupt organization, most likely invoking a class action for all those similarly situated, etc. This would allow us LIBERAL discovery, including but not limited to interrogatories, request to produce, depositions with subpeona duces tecum and request's to admit. My guess would be they do not have the stomach for this, but we are prepared to accomodate them with the public civi

1 alle

gations that will be fielded via a multi-media approach.

However, keep in mind, we have three clear and distinct avenues of potential authority that must be each allocated its due process under law; civil, criminal and canonical law, in order to fully restore Linda to the level of integrity and public faith she once enjoyed, and even these have overlapping concerns:

Civil - issues of public interest that would include the hypocrisy of proclaiming the "un-diluted Three Angels Messages" while allegedly living as charlatans and philanderers in a virtual modern day Peyton Place, Dallas and James Bakker ministry all rapped into one profit for Shelton, Non Profit institution;

Criminal - issues that must be ultimately resolved by federal, state and even international governments relating to alleged criminal conspiracy to defraud constituents, consumers and donors of the various gifts granted or lent and and alleged conversion of some of those assets by various direct and indirect means to the use of primarily Sheldon Family members or those who constituted close personal or business acquaintances, some employees and others non-employees allegedly virtually at Danny's choosing and direction.

Canonical or Ecclesiastical Authority - in the SDA church we have a near federalist system with a quasi-congregational system as the local community given powers in out-reach, community services, education and invariably church discipline. However assets and the regional or state administration processes are given over to the conference corporation which also grants credentials to ministries and ministers and manage a host of departments, including education and ministerial supervision. The association of churches gives and can take local church charters. Union, NAD and GC really serves as sources of experience and wisdom and has taken certain specialty concerns, such as hospital, colleges, universities and other major assets of the corporation. However, the potential use of heirarchical authority within the Union, NAD and GC cannot be ignored by the conference leadership lest they find their careers stagnated or ended. And the issue of large sums of money either as tithes, gifts,

loans or trusts being transferred into non-ecclesiastical lines with little or no accountability to the church entities, constituents, donors or trustators that made these sums available to the alleged corrupt organization also must ultimately be addressed as part of this very serious challenge to the church. In fact, if the allegations prove to be reasonably accurate, this could be the largest challenge to the Seventh-day Adventist church since John Harvey Kellogg.

Given this reality, for Linda to regain a status of acceptability to get back into the churches, there must be a process of clear and ecclesiastically acceptable exoneration for her to pursue the ministry that she wishes to get back to. Therefore, we must logically address ecclesiastical concerns as well as civil and criminal.

Criminal has a momentum of it's own and all anyone can do is provide appropriate documentation or point investigators in the direction they need to search to find meaningful evidence. This process has begun, for better or for worse, but will invariably take time.

Civil issues are already being investigated and researched and reports will be made available as the sources and stories are verified and, whenever possible, documented. They can be released to a variety of media designed to give the widest possible circulation for those that need to be aware and to make educated decisions as to how they will Tithe, donate, gift, loan or trust to the entity known as 3ABN.

In addition I have become aware of at least two books that are being prepared for publication that will address various issues relating to the allegations currently under research and investigation. These will most probably be given very wide circulation and go far toward defining the various charges and counter-charges.

Since the current clear allegation from Allyssa has hit the streets, 3ABN directors have expressed they would like proof that Allyssa was the source of the allegation and then, if she is the source, they would like to ask her to meet and discuss the allegations.

Since these are no longer the only allegations on the table for discussion, I am proposing that we accomodate the entire series of allegations by empanelling a panel to look at the Allyssa allegations; the Pastor Dryden allegations against Tommy Shelton; the allegations that Linda had an inappropriate relationship with Arild Abrahamsen; the issue that prior to, during and after the Linda/Arild allegations that Danny was clearly being observed having multiple inappropriate realtionship; and other inappropriate financial allegations; that there have been several open and notorious inappropriate inter-staff relationships, some by allegation and some of which were clearly "caught" or "confessed"; all of which the local church has failed to discipline or the institution has failed to equally apply due process or any process at all due to clear and obvious conflicts.

The panel should be given all the powers of a tribunal / arbitration panel with appropriate counsel for both sides present to conduct direct and cross-examination of the witnesses, with the tribunal to have authority to make direct inquiry of the witnesses, with as broad a rule of evidence as the tribunal feels is necessary to find the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Provision needs to be made to allow the introduction of witnesses in executive session such that not only are witnesses protected from the peering eyes of various leadership, but can give open and honest and unimpeded testimony as Witness x, y, z et seq. I am proposing that the original parties, the 3ABN board and Linda/Allyssa each be allowed to have two observers sworn to protect the witnesses from retaliation by Leadership and others to observe the proceedings and to be able to certify the process as fair and appropriate.

The panel would be convened for a period of up 5 days (or longer at their determination) at a sight to be determined in southern Illinois, would take testimony, would look at each allegation separately and distinctly, would issue a report of the allegations and their conclusions, would make those conclusions available to the various churches or church affiliates that become involved in allegations against individual parties or institutions and even recommend the convening of appropriate business sessions to deal with the discipline required.

Since certain allegations directly import the agreement with the GC and with ASI and its bylaws for participation, it would be expected they would act expeditiously to protect the church or its affiliates from any ongoing harm. Perhaps the panel would issue an issues specific report on the caliber of the "Issues..." reports of the 1990's.

If the church or church affiliate fails to convene appropriate business sessions or refuses to administer discipline, then the panel would be empowered to approach the appropriate conference committee with a copy of the report and to seek a special constituency to determine if the offending church body should be disbanded from the brother-hood of churches. Since the Illinois conference is of particular focus, then we would expect the officers and conflicted directors to recuse themselves and to allow the Union President to preside over these particular proceedings. Of course any appeal would be to the Union, NAD or GC.

I trust this would clarify why I feel we need to also address the ecclesiastical authority. I assume the fairest of panels would clearly exonerate Linda and Arild, although this is obviously not assured, and this goes without saying, the fastest way to open the gates of churches to welcome her deeply Spiritual Ministry back into the churches. I will leave the results relating to Danny, et, al, 3ABN, et seq, to your various imaginations.

Thank-you for your inquiry and please let me know if you have further questions as this discussion helps to mold the process into a clear basis for pursuit of the issues within the Remnant Church.

Gailon Arthur Joy

----- Original message -----  
From: "Gregory Matthews"

**Ex. AA**

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

Subject: today  
From:  
Date: Thu, September 28, 2006 8:26 pm  
To: linda@

Hi Linda

I talked to Mark today about this and he said that as far as he knows, no one at the GC as ever suggested that you not be invited to speak. He suggests that you find out from the contact person who at the GC told the pastor you were not to be invited.

He also talked to me about the ASI committee that is being set up to evaluate 3ABN, Tommy, Danny, etc. He hopes that you will not reject this committee, because since 3ABN is an ASI affiliate, that should be the governing body to decide on discipline, action, etc, rather than the GC, since the GC really doesn't have any authority over 3ABN. He thinks you will have more credibility with ASI if you accept this committee. I told him it will be important that the persons on the committee are neutral and not Danny's buds.

Mark, btw, said he is not doing any more taping for 3ABN.

Blessings!

\*\*\*\*\*

>From: linda@  
>To:  
>Subject: RE: [SPAM] today  
>Date: Thu, 28 Sep 2006 06:04:11 -0700  
>  
>Hi \*\*\*\*\*,  
>  
>Just a quick question. I had an invitation pending to go to  
>Santa Rosa, CA to speak. The pastor recently told my contact  
>person that this was no longer possible. When she pressed him for  
>more information he told her to call the GC. Have you any  
>information about this?  
>  
>Anyway...have a great day!

>  
>Blessings,  
>  
>Linda

**Ex. BB**

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

**Subject:** Re: Emergency Board Action Required

**Date:** Fri, 8 Dec 2006 07:32:40 -0500

**From:** B S

**To:** G. Arthur Joy, Bob Pickle

Gailon:

I wrote a couple of stanzas to the 3abn theme song, see what you think.

This is for Tommy:

"I want to spend my life molesting bro-kid people  
I want them to spend thier lives re-living pain"

This is for Danny:

"I want to spend my life protecting bad kin people  
I want to spend my loot defending sin"

This is for Danny:

"I want to spend my life promoting Pro-King people  
I want them to spread my lies, receiving pay"

Got to go..... B S

**Ex. CC**

**Subject:** Re: Merger Information  
**From:** "Walt Thompson"  
**Date:** Fri, 17 Aug 2007  
**To:**

Dear \*\*\*\*\*,

Thank you for your frank response. I will reply in the order your comments were given.



I find it interesting that you would respond in the case of a child of yours in trouble. Were you aware that Danny's life and the life of his family has been threatened by some of the very ones you believe are telling the truth?

I am sorry, but these people never came to us seeking truth. I first heard about plans to expose the "problems" at 3abn from another source, and called to try to clarify some issues. No one ever came to me honestly seeking truth, but only to try to get me to prove their accusations were wrong. That is not the way to communicate. And, yes, it is also true that we did not, and do not now believe the cause of Christ is benefited by fighting on the Internet and other public forums. Nor were the charges against Linda trumped up, nor were attempts made to cover Tommy's "problems." You may believe what you wish, but truth is truth, which is why we have taken the issue to court.

I am well aware of the questions being asked long before the present people became involved, and we were fielding those questions honestly. The issues as discussed in the letters we sent out were true as written, then as now.

There is no attempt to hide any facts discovered by the court. The intent of our request is only to allow the case to be tried in court, not on the Internet void of ethical concerns.

Yes, Danny made some choices, and I and the board made some choices. Though I would not necessarily agree that all of Danny's choices were wise and discrete, they were not illegal or immoral. As far as my choices and the choices of the board are concerned, I am comfortable with them, for I know the basis upon which they were made. I do find it interesting that you appear willing to believe the report of one first person and many hearsay witnesses, but are unwilling or unable to believe a whole administration and board of first hand witnesses. Something seems amiss here to me. I might pose another question as well. What kind of a fool must I be to invest my life and reputation in defense of a mere man? I have had a full life in my profession, and an impeccable record of honesty and professionalism, yet I have spent immeasurable hours during the past 3 + years voluntarily defending what I have seen to be truth, only to be condemned. Why would anyone do such a thing? You may not understand, by I have a Friend that does.

A few years ago, I would have parroted your claims about taking a brother to court. It is interesting how perspectives change when situations change. For most of my life, I have had trouble reading many of the psalms because I could not relate with David's pleas to God for justice with his enemies. That has all changed, and I now am able to read the Psalms with real heartfelt meaning and understanding of David's concerns. I will not pray for you to have a similar experience to be able to appreciate his Psalms.

I appreciate your prayers. And yes, we all need them. God hears and answers honest prayers of intercession for one another.

Thanks, and God bless you and yours,

Walt  
Walter Thompson MD

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

**From:** [Walt Thompson](#)

**Ex. DD**



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

[Home Page](#)  
[Site Map](#)  
[Tommy Shelton](#)  
[Danny Shelton](#)  
**ASI**  
[Smokescreen](#)  
[Conspiracy?](#)  
[Prelude](#)  
[ASI: Step One](#)  
[ASI: Step Two](#)  
[ASI: Step Three](#)  
[ASI: Step Four](#)  
[In Limbo](#)

[Round One](#)  
[Round Two](#)  
[Round Three](#)  
["What's Happening?"](#)  
**ASI Statement #1**  
**ASI Statement #2**

[Abuse of Power](#)  
**Ethical Allegations**  
[Financial Allegations](#)  
[Correspondence](#)  
[Untruths](#)  
[Alleged Illegal Activities](#)  
[Mene, Mene, Tekel, Parsin](#)

[Danny's Apologists](#)  
[Leonard Westphal](#)  
[3ABN Board](#)  
[Litigation, etc.](#)  
[Letters of Support](#)  
[Letters of Criticism](#)  
[News Releases](#)  
[Sign Up!](#)  
[Contact Us](#)

[Added 5/23/2008](#)  
[Initial Tax Case](#)  
[Public Record](#)

## **Steps Toward ASI Panel Review Negotiations: #1**

[< Prev.](#)

[Next >](#)

### **3ABN Live, August 10, 2006: Damage Control Time**

In order to properly understand the significance of parts of Harold Lance's ASI statement, we must first take a look at certain key steps that led to ASI's attempt to find a resolution for the current crisis at 3ABN. And to do that, we must first go back to August 10, 2006.

On that date Danny Shelton aired a special damage control edition of 3ABN live. The reason? A signed, confidential statement had started circulating among pastors and church leaders, a statement written by his step-daughter, a statement alleging that Danny had sexually assaulted her.

Through the two-hour broadcast, Danny Shelton and crew repeatedly stated that lies were being told about them and Danny, that they and Danny were being persecuted, and that they and Danny weren't going to defend themselves.

In the first hour John Lomacang had an interesting sermon about Moses, a sermon that under normal circumstances would have been quite good, with just a tad left out.

"The Israelites had to acknowledge that God had chosen Moses to lead them. I want to stop and say that, we may not always agree with who God chooses, but when God chooses someone, **disagreeing with that one can bring on us adversity**, discouragement, and the loss of our vision."

"Moses was the instrument that God used, as Danny Shelton is the instrument that God uses here at 3ABN. Moses was

**Added 4/10/2008**

Tax Case Lost

Copyright Trouble

**Added 3/29/2008**

Gilley Winning Staff

**Added 3/7/2008**

Terminated

**Added 2/10/2008**

Objections Heard

**Added 1/25/2008**

Church Vote

**Must Read:**

Mom in Pain #1

Mene, Mene,

Tekel, Parsin

The Actual Lawsuit

IRS Criminal

Investigation

not the deliverer. Danny's not the deliverer. He's simply the chosen servant of God."

(John Lomacang on 3ABN Today Live, 1st hour, replayed at 3pm CDT, Sunday, August 13, 2006)

While Danny Shelton has been much loved by many Seventh-day Adventists, the idea of it being wrong to disagree with him, as if his position of authority were akin to the pope, just doesn't ring true.

In the second hour, amidst more claims that they weren't going to defend themselves, Shelley Quinn had a talk about another famous person:

"As a faithful witness for God, he spoke out against a couple who had entered into a sinful relationship. Now the woman entangled in this situation became offended. She was embittered, and she felt scorned. And you know, there's something about her, that she was unconcerned about her relationship in the eyes of the Lord. Her worry revolved more around the possibility of losing her prominent position. So what did she do? She devised a plan to eliminate this one who had exposed her, and she enlisted the help of her young daughter. Now prompted by her mother, this daughter became **entangled in the web of deceit**, and she set out to set her mother's position and save it by destroying this man of God. What we see here is that the scheme was to go forward and go straight for the throat and have his head served up on a platter. Does this story sound familiar to you? To whom am I referring? John the Baptist, of course."

"Now how could such a holy, Spirit-filled man, who was hand-picked by God, and called to such an important ministry, fall victim to such vile persecution? Why would God allow it?"

(Shelley Quinn on 3ABN Today Live, 2nd hour, replayed at 4pm CDT, Sunday, August 13, 2006)

Now anyone familiar with the Bible story about how Herodias and her daughter Salome got the head of John the Baptist knows that the Bible does not depict Salome getting "entangled in the web of deceit." There is no description of their deceiving anyone. We are left with the conclusion that Danny and crew were really talking about his ex-wife Linda, and Linda's daughter's confidential testimony alleging sexual assault by Danny.

Danny Shelton not defending himself?

## **Shelley Quinn's Talk: a Powerful Motivator**

Three days later on Sunday, August 13, far away from Thompsonville, Illinois, in northwest Minnesota, Seventh-day Adventist researcher and apologist Bob Pickle watched a rerun of that broadcast. A retired pastor and good friend had been calling him periodically for months and months with concerns about some of the events transpiring at 3ABN, and he had asked a few questions of a few folks. During the previous month or so he had spent a little time here and there perusing [BlackSDA.com](#), and trying to sort through all the he said, she said stuff, looking for concrete facts that could be proven or disproven.

Danny's strategy has been to deflect every allegation of any sort with the claim that it all is because his ex-wife Linda is out to get him. Yet even if that is so, and even if Linda's daughter's allegation of sexual assault by Danny is all a lie, to call it a lie in a globally televised TV broadcast while at the same time claiming not to defend one's self, that crossed a line in Pickle's mind. Right then and there during Shelley Quinn's talk, he decided to not just stand on the sidelines and ask a few questions, but to wade into the morass and find out the truth of it all, regardless of the consequences.

That decision was followed the next day by the discovery of the [2003 Glenn Dryden letter](#).

[< Prev.](#)

[Next >](#)

**Ex. EE**

March 27, 2006

On March 24, 2006, our office went out to lunch at Home Town Buffet. Those present were Rita, Leonard Westphal, K [REDACTED] T [REDACTED], K [REDACTED] B [REDACTED].

Leonard and K [REDACTED] were sitting next to each other and as the meal progressed, Leonard stated making comments about the fat people that come to eat there. Then he went on and commented about being careful who you marry and about the fat person being on top of the skinner person in bed. Be careful not to be on the bottom. He went on and on and then proceeded to tell us about a case where he knew of a couple that went to a hotel and got drunk and she was so fat that when she rolled over on top of her husband, she crushed him. In the morning every rib in his body was broken.

Leonard kept on making these kinds of comments and was leaning in towards K [REDACTED] and his face was inches from hers. He was looking at her while making these comments. I felt uncomfortable by these comments and I'm sure K [REDACTED] must have been. K [REDACTED] just looked down at her food, kinda blushed and was real quite and was picking at her food.

I think Rita was embarrassed, she told him to knock it off.

Then Leonard kept up these kinds of comments and started saying that the people are so fat, they probably don't even know what's running between their legs. That a person could run between their legs and they wouldn't even know it.

He continued talking like this. He finally stopped.

Then when we were done eating he started talking with a couple and visiting with them. He told them the three of us ladies were his wives. We just laughed and Rita corrected him. Then he told the people where he worked and what kind of work he did. Rita gave the people one of her business cards and I handed them one of Leonard's cards that I had with me.

**Ex. FF**

**Subject:** Fw: Concerned  
**From:**  
**Date:** Wed, 9 Aug 2006 13:12:18 -0500  
**To:** <bob>

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

**From:** [Hal Steenson](#)  
**To:**  
**Sent:** Monday, October 10, 2005 9:59 AM  
**Subject:** Concerned

Dear pastor \*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*\* ,

Thank you for calling and asking our position on John Lomachang's presentation Friday night. Here is 3ABN's statement on this matter. Thank you for helping us pass this on to everyone. Once again we apologize for what happened. It was a total surprise to all of us.

Thank You,

Hal Steenson

**This is the statement I sent to Dr. Thompson.**

Dr Walt,

I'm hurt, and I'm mad about what John Lomachang preached Friday night. I came out of gross error and felt assured, until his series, that I was moving in the truth. I'm not a scholar on the trumpets, however, even I knew that was wrong. The sad thing is that so many people watching now think this is what we all believe. And all the new people in our church may now accept it as the gospel truth. John's arrogance Sabbath morning goes along with what I told him months ago, "he has become a law unto himself." He is neither answerable nor accountable to no one and as he put it Sabbath morning, he owes no one an apology. If he wants to cut his own throat, so be it, but he sliced 3ABN up by teaching his "Adventists futuristic" opinion on live worldwide television. What he did was not **of God or from God**.

I'm amazed,

Hal Steenson

[Add FUN to your email - CLICK HERE!](#)

**Ex. GG**

From: "Hal Steenson"  
To:  
Subject: Trumpets  
Date: Mon, 16 Apr 2007 09:24:49 -0500

My dear brother \*\*\*\*\*,

As much as I would like to impress you with my biblical knowledge of the trumpets; I can't. The reason that I can't is that I have only been in the Adventist church for six years. I know very little about the trumpets and until coming into this denomination had never heard them mentioned. I have never-- at anytime ever sent out an email to anyone concerning what Pastor Lomacang preached about this subject. I have never discussed what Pastor Lomacang shared on this topic with him or anyone. As a matter of consideration, I was not even in our town or the state of Illinois when they were shared. I'm sorry for any confusion resulting from this untruthful email; however, we both know who the author of confusion is, and his tactics.

Sincerely,

Hal Steenson