Summary

This matter concerns two interconnected issues.

1. My personal experience

Over several years I repeatedly notified church leadership of concerns regarding:

- the treatment of a ministry I co-founded;
- organizational conduct;
- failures of accountability;
- requests for policy review;
- concerns regarding governance.

These concerns were communicated through meetings and extensive written correspondence.

The British Columbia Conference and General Conference were copied on multiple communications.

Following these communications, I was informed by Local Leader 2 that the conferences would not respond.

During that meeting he stated that the official position was that I was "being a threat to the organization" because I continued seeking accountability.

Despite repeated requests, I did not receive meaningful organizational engagement or policy review.

2. Broader governance concerns

Separate from my own circumstances, I also became aware of concerns involving the organization's response to reports regarding individuals with histories of sexual offending attending Camp Meeting.

These concerns were also brought to leadership within the same organizational structure.

This separate matter is legally relevant to assessing organizational governance and institutional responses after notice of potential harm.

I am not relying on that matter to prove my personal allegations.

Rather, I ask whether both matters together demonstrate a recurring organizational approach to governance after receiving reports of harm.

Central Question

The central issue is:

When senior leadership of a religious organization receives repeated notice of serious concerns involving harm, safeguarding, organizational conduct, and requests for accountability, what legal duties arise, and were those duties fulfilled?

Chronology

2016

Co-founded a ministry supporting single mothers and their children.

2017

Accepted an invitation from Local Leader 1 to use Organization One's building and offered support to build as a grassroots effort.

2018–2022

Experienced significant concerns regarding:

- organizational conduct;
- the relationship between the ministry and the organization;
- lack of promised partnership;
- hostile takeover of the ministry
- resulting financial and professional harm.

These concerns were repeatedly communicated to leadership.

November 2022

Developed Long COVID.

This substantially affected my health, financial security, and ability to continue the work.

2023–2025

Initiated a deliberate process of restorative accountability including:

- private dialogue with Local Leader 2 and Support-Leader 1
- Direct communication with Local Leader 1 and Support-Leader 1
- requests for accountability;
- requests for policy reform;
- requests for reconciliation;
- requests for restitution;
- copied to organizational administration at all levels

These efforts are documented.

Notice to Leadership

Throughout this process the British Columbia Conference and the General Conference received correspondence outlining my concerns.

I possess copies of these communications.

Following these communications, I was informed that the conferences would not respond.

I also experienced what felt like an attempt at intimidation when in a meeting with Local Leader 2 and Local Leader 3 after direct communication with Local Leader 1, Support-Leader 1 following the restorative pattern recommended by Jesus in Matthew 18, both LL2 and LL3 tried to convince me that I was being threatening by seeking accountability, since Local Leaders only have their reputation on which to live.

They intimated that not waiting longer than six years after the event and eighteen months after discussions with Local Leader 2 and Support-Leader 2 was a demonstration of impatience. I just needed to wait.

At the same meeting Local Leader 2 informed me that the official position of the Seventh-Day Adventist Executive Leadership was that they would continue to ignore me. So what was I supposed to wait for?

Questions Regarding Governance

The evidence demonstrates failures of Seventh-Day Adventist institutional governance, including:

- failure to investigate after notice;
- failure to meaningfully engage;
- failure to review policies;
- failure to implement appropriate safeguards where required;
- failure to exercise reasonable oversight.

Safeguarding

Additionally, there are specific concerns regarding individuals with histories of sexual offending attending Camp Meeting.

My concern is not limited to those events. Leadership did not exercise reasonable governance after concerns affecting children's safety and vulnerable people were brought to its attention.

This matter highlights a broader public policy issue.

Unlike many publicly regulated child-serving environments, religious organizations may not be subject to routine independent review of their safeguarding governance.

Where senior leadership chooses not to acknowledge or investigate concerns or implement additional publicly stated safeguards, there may be limited mechanisms for independent accountability unless through criminal proceedings or civil litigation occur.

This governance gap has legal relevance in this case and raises broader issues of public importance.

Harm

I believe these matters caused significant harm including:

Financial

- lost opportunities;
- financial losses;
- diminished earning capacity.

Professional

- loss of leadership opportunities;
- reputational harm.

Personal

- emotional harm;
- family impact;
- significant hardship while living with Long COVID.

Community

- loss of trust;
- concerns regarding institutional accountability;
- concern that governance failures may continue to expose vulnerable people to preventable harm.

Evidence Available

I possess evidence including:

- extensive email correspondence;
- accountability letters;
- timelines;
- meeting notes;
- ministry documentation;
- public articles;
- organizational publications;
- witness information;
- social media records;
- additional documents supporting chronology.

Objectives

My objectives are:

1. Accountability.

2. Institutional learning.

3. Improved safeguarding.

4. Policy reform.

5. Financial restitution where justified.

6. Recognition of the responsibilities of institutional leadership when serious concerns are brought to their attention.

Closing Statement

I have intentionally sought restorative resolution for numerous years before coming to litigation. My efforts included direct dialogue, written accountability processes, requests for reconciliation, and proposals for policy reform. I am now proceeding with litigation because I have concluded that the organization's internal processes do not provide meaningful accountability.

I am not asking the Court to decide matters of theology or religious belief. I seek redress regarding enforceable duties of governance owed by institutional leadership after receiving notice of serious concerns affecting individuals and vulnerable members of the community.