## Bob Wilbur

**From:** "Carol Del" <caroldchina5@yahoo.com>
**Date:** Saturday, December 28, 2013 2:00 PM
**To:** "Bob Wilbur" <bbwilbur@broadstripe.net>
**Subject:** Re: Quick question

Bob,
So sorry that I did not see this sooner.

Just spoke with Ed and here is the run-down:

- There was an e-mail discussion of meeting dates ("they" suggested the 4th, Ed asked for the 18th, "they" compromised with the 11th).
- Ed received only sketchy knowledge of the mailing - not when it was going out or nor full knowledge of what was in it. Particularly that it did NOT include the summary he drafted that was approved by Vasu and his attorney.
- Ed did not know the slate for sure until it arrived in our mail. His suggestion (by e-mail) that they label the budget "temporary" was not included.
- Ed was not included in discussion of ballot procedures.

Awful to be so out of contact as we drove down the coast. hope you can get this note to Chris before the hearing.

Thanks for all your work.
Carol

On Thursday, December 26, 2013 8:07 AM, Bob Wilbur <bbwilbur@broadstripe.net> wrote:

Hi Carol and Nate,
Trust you are rested and peaceful on this day after so now to jolt you back to the real world, need a quick check on this before sending to Skinner. To your *knowledge* did I get Ed and Suzy's lack of notice right? ...Bob

Hi Chris,
Just realized there is an added solid point that may strengthen our position in your back and forth with Vasu.

Article VII section 4 requires <u>each</u> Director be notified of any meeting, including special meetings. Certainly something as fundamental as revising the annual meeting date and establishing procedures for the election balloting should have been considered by convening a special meeting of the full board, but no such meeting notice was called. In fact, two board members were not notified of any decision-making meeting to set the annual meeting date, the slate, and the balloting procedures. Instead it was simply announced to them post hoc. By failing to notify two board members, these important board-level decisions were conducted in a manner that failed to comply with article VII section 4.

In addition, the ballot process adopted at their improperly convened meeting once again did not preclude fraudulent voting, even though that specific problem had been pointed out in the hearing and in our declarations and before that in various posts and emails to the board. It was one of the important reasons for initiating this suit. Given their insistence on not fixing this problem when it had been so openly addressed, exacerbates my concern over

their motives.

By not complying with article VII section 4 and the need for a signed ballot process (anonymous or not, but consistent with the bylaws deference to Roberts), the board seems to have willfully decided to ignore the judge's oral ruling, which clearly stated that the board, in conducting the election and in annual meeting, were to comply strictly with the bylaws.