

DATE	MAIN EVENT	NOTES	STATUTES	BYLAWS	RONR
THESE ARE VERY LOOSE NOTES WHILE I WAS REVIEWING DOCUMENTS AND FROM INFORMATION GLEANED DURING THE 8/11 LNC MEETING. THEY ARE NOT INTENDED TO BE FORMAL FINDINGS BUT A WAY FOR ME TO GET MY THOUGHTS AND OPINIONS TOGETHER AND TO PRESERVE THE RECORD SINCE THE CASE MAY GO TO AN APPEAL					
THEY CAN BE REVISED IF ADDITIONAL ARGUMENTS OCCUR TO ME OR ADDITIONAL FACTS ARE BROUGHT TO LIGHT. DATES ARE INTENDED TO BE "ON OR ABOUT" AND MAY BE OFF BY A DAY OR TWO. SINCE I DID SHARE THIS DOCUMENT WITH THE LNC, I AM MAKING IT PUBLIC FOR TRANSPARENCY PURPOSES BUT THESE ARE MY NOTES AND THOUGHTS ALONE AND ARE NOT ENDORSED BY THE LNC EXCEPT TO THE EXTENT THEY COMPORT WITH ANY PROPERLY VOTED ON RESOLUTION OF MOTIONS OF THE LNC. THEY ARE ALSO NOT INTENDED TO BE PROFESSIONAL PARLIAMENTARY WORK PRODUCT AS I AM NOT THE PARTY'S PARLIAMENTARIAN AND I APPEAL TO PRINCIPLES OVER PROCEDURE WHERE THERE MIGHT BE AN UNJUST IMPOSSIBILITY. THE STATUTES/BYLAWS/RONR CITATIONS ARE ALSO FOR MY QUICK REFERENCE AND NOT INTENDED TO BE EXHAUSTIVE OR UNDULY REPETITIVE. I ALSO USED THESE NOTES TO BE SURE WE HAD ALL PERTINENT DOCS FOR THE ONE NOTE FOR THE MEETING.					
6/26/21	2021 LPID Convention	There were no PCs elected in 2020.			
Mid-Feb 22	Convention called	By officers - there was no elected SCC outside of officers due to no PCs being elected and no CCCs or LDs being organized by alternative means <i>though there could have been pursuant to the bylaws</i> . There is a dispute over whether or not the officers are voting members of the SCC or members of the SCC at all. The ID state law does not include them in its definition of the composition of the SCC but it does not expressly say the SCC cannot include more positions than in the statute - and if non-voting, the state really wouldn't care. The bylaws expressly make the officers voting members of the SCC and as a note so does the Republican Party bylaws. But without unambiguous voting members of the SCC, and the duty to set the date and time falling upon the body of which they are officers, they have to comply to best spirit and intent of the law and the bylaws otherwise the party would cease to function. This does not render the call defective as no member rights were violated and this decision can be ratified by a future body (and it was ratified by the delegates at convention - a superior body). The bylaws do conflict with state law in that it says the executive board sets the date and time - but that is not a defect to render the convention invalid. This isn't new either - the new part is the part that sets the convention for April rather than June and no one had an issue with this before. The officers by accepting this decision is de facto ratifying and adopting it. Further if there were no SCC, and this was some existential threat to the party, the prior board is in effect the one responsible for it. They cannot seize back the party after the delegates and one person who was elected as PC took steps to cure what they screwed up. This is the flimsiest of reeds. Further some officers were left entirely in the dark about this.	34-707	V.1	
2/28-3/11/22	Filing date for PCs				
4/2/22	LPID Convention	At time of convention there were no elected members to SCC except the officers (see note above about the calling of the convention). New officers and Executive Board members were elected included Robert Imhoff as Chair and Jennifer Imhoff as Region 2 Chair. The delegates ratified any irregularity with the date of the convention. Robert Imhoff kept referring to it as a "suspension of the rules" after the fact but it was more properly a ratification of suspension of the rules done without a prior motion.	34-504, 34-707		
5/17/22	Primary Election for PCs	Corsetti only one to achieve the five votes to be elected.			
5/19/22	Verify if any PCs Elected	Todd called Bannock, Power, Franklin counties elections to verify LP PCs for Legislative District 28. He was only one, turns out he was only one elected statewide.			
5/19/22	County Agendas written	Bannock CCC & LD28 CC agendas written			
5/20-5/21/22	County Meetings	LD28 CC & Bannock CCC meetings held. Corsetti was sole member (he was only validly elected Precinct Committeeman). He elected himself Chair and Secretary. He elected his wife Amber Cosetti for State Committeewoman.			
5/24/22	County Canvassing complete				
5/24/22	Executive Board Meeting	It is noted that Callear pushed back on the Executive Board setting a 2023 convention date as only the SCC can set the date. However, this is not analogous to the setting of the April 2 convention because the officers were one and the same as the SCC at that time, but not this time so this cannot be cited as some kind of acknowledgement that the prior setting was wrong. And even if so, it could simply be just to avoid having to go through another ratification by delegates. It is best to avoid that.			Who can call a meeting is a rule intended to protect absentees, if notice is otherwise proper, who calls it is not by necessity fatal. 1:7, 25:10
5/27-5/29/22	National Convention	There was dispute over identity of delegation chair with delegation selecting someone other than the elected LPID Chair Robert Imhoff.			
5/28/22	5 Notices sent to ExComm calling for recognition of various county chairs	See note below			
5/29/22	Minutes sent	Bannock CCC& LD28 CC meeting minutes sent to ExBoard. All claims to valid formation of county central committees except Bannock and LD28 were withdrawn around 6/1/22.0			
5/29/22	Email accounts of Belnap, Callear, and Ward deleted				
5/30/22	Imhoff letter to SOS	This was sent by Jennifer Imhoff as Chair letting them know they invalidated the prior convention because "SCC members did not properly organize and call that meeting." It was signed only by Jennifer Imhoff, Jennifer Luoma, Joe Evans, Beth Clark, and Robert Imhoff (who was claiming the title of acting Treasurer - he was not the prior Treasurer). Aaron Mason, Dan Karlan, and Cathy Smith did not sign the document, and Karlan at the 8/11 LNC meeting expressly disclaimed knowledge and approval of this action - there was no meeting at which this was decided - thus their absentee rights were violated even if there was a legitimate case for a rollback of the prior board. And if no SCC no one to even have any authority to make any such determination - but there was a valid SCC member - Corsetti who was not consulted at all - Corsetti being a clear SCC member at this time is a huge sticking point.	34-1208		
5/31/22	Todd emailed Bannock Co of CCC				
5/31/22	RobertImhoff met with SoS	Per request to JC by the Imhoffs to vacate, "the suggested process was to convert the board back to the previous officers and re-establish a convention that meets ID election law." SUGGESTED BY WHO? It appears that this was a suggestion by the Imhoffs themselves, ala Tyrion Lannister saying "a wise man once said" then revealing he was the source. The Idaho SOS does not involve itself in offering such advice, it receives filings.			
5/31/22	Executive Board replaced	By what authority if the only goal was to cure the convention? It should have been a holding pattern until then since that former board is the one who allegedly screwed everything up or perhaps they should have been working their rears off to get counties and LDs organized to get a robust SCC.			

DATE	MAIN EVENT	NOTES	STATUTES	BYLAWS	RONR
5/31/22	Corsetti emailed Bannock County Elections Office stating he was elected Chair of the Bannock CCC	Per request to JC by the Imhoffs to vacate and stating that the LPID Executive Board was not cc'd or notified of this conversation.			
5/31/22	Liberty Monitor email sent on invalid convention	"On April 2, 2022, the Libertarian Party of Idaho held an annual convention. A new Executive Board was formed during this meeting. During a Regular Meeting of that board, the meeting minutes were reviewed for accuracy. It was noted that Idaho Law 34-707 was not correctly followed by the calling of the April 2nd meeting, as State Central Committee members did not get proper notice and organize in line with Idaho Law 34-502." This blurb differs slightly but importantly from how the reasoning has evolved - this talks about proper notice and organization not the lack of a State Central Committee. If one does not exist, there is no one to get notice. If they organize yearly or every other year, the opportunity to organize was last year and continue until the new election this year (or every even numbered year). The fact that the even numbered year election was later does not mean "there was no opportunity to organize" - sure there was, at the last election.	34-502, 34-707		
6/1/22	Treasurer Belnap sent email to the 4/2 elected board	Calling on the elected Chair Robert Imhoff to put a stop to this and have the duly elected board recognized and offering to find time to discuss this and stated he would refuse to sign off on any expenditure of party funds not properly authorized			
6/1/22	SoS issued certificates of candidacy and it was sent to Jennifer Imhoff as Chair	The Imhoff group seems to be using the colour of communications with the SoS and confirmation of their filings as the imprimatur of approval by the SoS when that is not the case, SoS does not involve itself in internal disputes, these are pro forma in accordance with information supplied to them.			
6/2/22	Email responding to Ada County Elections Office	Jennifer Imhoff as stated Chair said that Joe Evans would be Ada County Chair in lieu of an incumbent			
6/5/22	Liberty Monitor email	States that the LPID is in process of building a proper SCC in order to call a proper convention and asks interested people to apply to be PCs. The process laid out was very unclear - there is a process in the bylaws for electing PCs outside of the Idaho election.			
6/6/22	Email sent to LPID members	Soliciting people to volunteer to become PCs without describing the process (and a mere volunteer process is not the way the Bylaws prescribe)			
6/15/22	Letter to Imhoffs about 6/20 SCC meeting with intent to hear disciplinary grievances	The Imhoffs received on 6/16/22. They did not attend.			
6/16/22	Phone call from SoS rep Houck to Sorensen group attorney	Per request to JC by the Imhoffs to vacate - it states that Houck notified the attorney that Jennifer Imhoff was the chair of record. This whole sequence is unclear here as to how this call came about.			
6/17/22	Letter from Attorney	Attorney opinion was convention was valid. The officers acted as the vacant SCC and Bylaws say convention would be in final two weeks of April or in accordance with Idaho Law. Idaho Law says the SCC can set the date - so the Bylaws allow two possibilities for valid convention dates - either the final two weeks of April or a date selected by the SCC (and his opinion is that the officers had the authority to act as the vacant SCC - my opinion differs somewhat in that I believe the officers not only could act "as" or "on behalf of" the vacant SCC, they are full voting members, and thus comprised the SCC- this difference in opinion is a distinction without a conclusory difference here). He also noted they could not just unilaterally undo this convention date.	34-502, 34-504, 34-707	V.1, VII.1	
6/20/22	1st SCC meeting	Voting members listed as Todd and Amber Corsetti. Non-voting members included the officer (which I do not agree are non-voting members). The Imhoffs though invited were not in attendance. A resolution was adopted recognizing the validity of the 4/2/22 convention. The Imhoffs were suspended. As far as suspending Robert Imhoff as Chair, I would argue his prior actions were a de facto resignation and thus this not necessary. Sorensen appointed as Chair for remainder of term. JC tasked with considering expulsion of the Imhoffs. 2023 convention date set. This information was to be conveyed to the SOS (NOT SURE IF THIS HAPPENED). It was also determined that mediation would be acceptable if the Imhoffs would agree.			
6/23/22	Petition to JC to consider expulsion of Imhoffs	This came about as a result of the 6/20/22 SCC meeting.			
6/23/22	Investigatory subcommittee created	To determine facts if expulsion was warranted for Imhoff in accordance with due process			
6/25/22	Email to JC enclosing memo re vacating	The Imhoffs argue that Corsetti lacked standing to ask the JC to hear this matter as he is not properly on the SC and the Executive Committee was excluded			
6/25/22	Imhoffs file Direction to Vacate Judiciary Intentions	I will not repeat comments made elsewhere about how nothing about the convention required NEW PCs so the date did not require it to be invalidated (just in summary, the bylaws allow this date, and ID law allows for an alternate date which it would not do if different dates would invalidate conventions). Both sides are alleging failure to take up grievances properly, but properly demands a point of reference. The convention has a rebuttable presumption of validity so the pro-active actions MUST come from those challenging it and the burden NOT placed on those presuming its validity. The unilateral removal of the emails shows this did not happen (this included removal of the presumptively elected Vice-Chair). A conflict of interest is cited with regards to some JC members but as per RONR there can be no requirement for recusal and a COI is one in which members of a body have a compelling conflict that is not shared in common with other members of the body in question. That is not the case here. The argument is circular as the same charge can be said of the respondents. Everyone here has interests that arise out of the same source. And exclusion cannot be claimed of potential future position holders (such as potential future elected PCs), only of PRESENT ones, presently holding rights. It is further claimed that only bylaws sustaining members can be on the SCC. This document also fundamentally misunderstands the "quorum" requirement of conventions in RONR.	34-502, 34-504, 34-507, 34-1205, 34-1208, 34-1211, 34-624A	III.2, VII.1, VII.3	3:3, 45:4-5

DATE	MAIN EVENT	NOTES	STATUTES	BYLAWS	RONR
6/27/22	Letter from JC to AG and SOS	Inquiring whether pursuant to 34-504 the composition of the SCC is limited to those positions stated, or whether those positions stated are just a minimum. They received no response to this inquiry. The question is to decide if the officers are voting members of the SCC. The bylaws clearly state that they are officers of the SCC but is silent on whether they are voting members. It is my opinion that any exclusion from being voting members (or making them members but without voting rights) is what needs to be explicit not the other way around. The bylaws make it clear that they are members of the SCC, and membership as per RONR carries with it voting rights. It is noted that the Idaho Republican Party has as its SCC also the officers, the same situation here, except their bylaws make their voting rights explicit. But this would seem to disprove the idea that it is absolutely clear that 34-504 LIMITS the SCC to only those members as that would invalidate the Republican Party in far reaching ways, and while the state is more than happy to screw around with the LP, it is doubtful they are going to take a stand with such serious implications for the duopoly and it is highly unlikely, though not impossible, that the superior money and attorney power of the Republican Party has not investigated this issue - perhaps that is why they made voting rights explicit, but that does not help the statutory argument but merely turns it into parliamentary/bylaws interpretation argument which is not the grounds upon which the convention was allegedly invalidated and it is the body in convention that has the ultimate right to interpret its own bylaws. And it is noted that the LPID bylaw on this read in its entirety DOES explicitly grant voting rights to SCC members, and that the officers are in fact members, ipso facto they have voting rights.		VII.1, VII.2	
6/27/22	Letter from Jennifer Imhoff to Amber Corsetti	States that she cannot hold office in Bannock County as she is not dues-paying member of LPID. Cited bylaws that define dues-payer member but does not demonstrate this is a requirement.		III.2, VII.1	
6/27/22	Cease and Desist letters from Jennifer Imhoff to Corsetti, Merrill Callear, Sorensen, Loesby	Demands to stop claiming to be acting in an LPID official capacity. Claims Callear is registered Republican.			
6/30/22	2nd SCC meeting	Resolution passed indicating that mediation with the Imhoffs would be acceptable to resolve issue if Imhoffs would agree to such a procedure			
7/6/22	JC interviews the Imhoffs	There is recording with video images redacted			
7/7/22	JC Interviews Coresetti	There is video recording			
7/8/22	Dissenting opinion of JC Member Raty	Holding that Corsetti could not validly call a meeting			
7/12/22	Emails from ID JC Chair to selected LNC members	The email requested the LNC or the national JC to handle - Secretary Harlos responded in detail.			
7/12/22	JC met to consider issue of vacation				

DATE	MAIN EVENT	NOTES	STATUTES	BYLAWS	RONR
7/13/22		<p>JC decides they do have the jurisdiction to hear this case and that Corsetti validly had jurisdiction because election of Corsetti to the SCC was valid.</p> <p>Notes that the Idaho law on filing the vacancies in county chairmanships refers to the State Chair filling or as the party bylaws may otherwise provide, but the party bylaws pretty much quote the state laws, but also add it should be done to follow state law to the extent practical which creates a self-referential loop subject to interpretation. The forming or reactivation of a dormant CCC must be done in ten days of the election (Imhoffs say after county canvassing) - the JC cites 34-102 to support their position that it is election day. Further there is here an actual conflict of interest not in common with all other similarly situated members, the Imhoffs would have a compelling interest NOT to facilitate the forming of the Bannock CCC since the sole PC obviously was pursuing their expulsion and making him a voting SCC member (or making that likely depending on how voting member for forming the CCC and electing chair is defined) would make that end much more likely.</p> <p>Principle cannot allow the state chair simply to refuse to call a meeting to keep from having results they may not want particularly when there is a time limit under the law. RONR has a procedure for calling together a committee meeting when the committee chair (or first name member fails to) which provides a guiding principle here as long as there is reasonable notice to everyone entitled to notice (though yes the Bannock "Committee" is in actuality a Board). (there is a parallel situation here to what happened in Vermont- that was handled by PRP Sylvia Arrowwood) - there is a disagreement here as to who are the members entitled to notice with Corsetti finding himself, as the only elected PC to be the only member, the Imhoffs argue that all LPID bylaws-sustaining members were entitled to notice. The bylaws are cited to agree with the JC that the voting members in forming a CCC are the elected PCs. Corsetti was the only elected PC. Also there is no requirement that the persons elected at such an organizational meeting to hold positions be bylaws sustaining members. Amber Corsetti is a registered Libertarian though not a bylaws sustaining member.</p> <p>Note out of the four interpretations offered as to whether or not the officers are voting SCC members, I hold to interpretation 1 - reasons stated why earlier about how lack of voting rights needs to be explicit.</p> <p>The dissent relies nearly entirely on the identity of the person calling the meeting, not the fairness of the process, whether all entitled to vote were notified, or anything substantive, but who pushed a metaphorical button whether that had any real world impact or not. This is classic "we exist to serve the rules rather than the rules exist to facilitate business." RONR nor bylaws are intended to obstruct but to facilitate. The persons entitled to vote were one person - Mr. Corsetti who obviously agreed to the suspension and did not raise a point of order. NO RIGHTS WERE VIOLATED, which is the purpose of rules, not to hold formation of legitimate Party organizations hostage. Further, if we are going to rely on Idaho Statute 34-502, the calling of the meeting of the PCs to form a county committee is described as a DUTY of the state chairman, and when a committee meeting is not properly called by those who are supposed to RONR gives us principles to go by where a valid voting can do so - in this case Mr. Corsetti. I respect Mr. Raty's writing skills and ability to debate, but I find the dissent completely without merit. Even if one was to say there was no valid call due to the absence of a SCC, once Corsetti was elected PC (on the issue of the validity of his being the Bannock CCCC Chair - I am ignoring the LD28 Chair since he can have only one vote but he also validly holds that position) then he and Mrs. Corsetti would be the ones to decide the issue - with or without the rest of the officers depending on ones interpretation of 34-502 - and could ratify the prior action - which he in fact did. The issue of Corsetti renders the entire argument fatally flawed. This appears to be why the Imhoffs kept switching arguments:</p> <p>Argument 1: the convention MUST be after the county canvassing to allow any PCs to have SCC input - this is without merit, there is no bylaw or law that says this and if PCs were elected in 2020 they would have had input. Future potential rights are not a means to invalidate a past convention before those rights existed.</p> <p>Argument 2: there was no SCC to call a convention which means that there was no SCC to invalidate one either, and this concedes that the officers have no voting rights to call a new convention - yet they are claiming they did just that by reverting to the prior board. The same prior board that allegedly did not have that authority, but yet excluded the very position they were claiming to wish to protect by excluding Corsetti from being a valid SCC voting member.</p> <p>It doesn't pass the sniff test.</p> <p>Votes: 1 in favor of vacation, 2 opposed to vacation, and 1 express abstention. PRP Jonathan Jacobs noted in footnote he has no doubt Corsetti was validly Bannock County Chairman though the details not given in opinion. [UPDATED FROM NOTES ON DESKTOP]</p>	refers to statutes already referenced elsewhere with the addition of 34-102	VII.2, VII.3	50:21:00
7/25/22	Email announcing purported 8/27/22 convention	This was sent minutes before the scheduled and noticed JC expulsion hearing - this timing does not pass the sniff test			
7/25/22	JC conducts expulsion hearing	Imhoffs did not attend. Of note in the decision of the committee describing the Imhoffs action it says "they have coordinated together to shuffle party officer positions as if they own the entire organization; they have disenfranchised party members who attended the April convention; they have taken advantage of their access to party resources in order to remove their opposition; and they have refused to engage with any attempts to challenge their authority, except on terms which they control." I concur with this reasoning even if I on general principle tend to disapprove of expulsions, not on any procedural grounds. The JC decision also explicitly recognized Sorensen as Interim Chair, Callar as Vice-Chair, Belnap as Treasurer, and Ward as Region 1 Chair. Also they note the very glaring omission from the agenda of the allegedly curative convention to fix the bylaws problems they claimed were part of the whole problem! This renders hollow the prior reasons and more properly shows them as excuses as there was no effort to fix the alleged "problem."			
8/1/22	JC Meeting and Final Decision on expulsion	The Imhoffs were expelled from the Party - 3-0 vote.			
8/4/22	Resolution to consult Parliamentarian adopted	<p>We do not have a copy of these minutes or the resolution. These are the questions referred:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether Robert Imhoff had the authority to revert the executive board of the LPID to what it was before the April 2, 2022 convention. 2. Did Jennifer Imhoff-Dousham, the prior Chair of the LPID, have the authority to take that action? 			

DATE	MAIN EVENT	NOTES	STATUTES	BYLAWS	RONR
8/7/22	Parliamentary Opinion	He states the core question is the validity or not of the claim that the Chair can declare the actions of an assembly null and void, and can do so outside of a meeting of that, or of a superior, assembly. (It seems to me that issue is the actual validity of the convention - no matter where the declaration is made - at least as far as the LNC is concerned as the LPID can cure any procedural difficulties of having it declared properly if that should be the proper declaration, no matter how parliamentarily heretical that may be - though parliamentary-wise her ability to declare the convention invalid ended when her term ended - she cannot not have term end, then use that nonexistent position to declare the position back into existence). The parliamentarian's opinion is that in order for the convention to be legally determined to be invalid (which is separate from our ability to declare so in order to determine who is our rightful affiliate) it must be found so at a future convention, by the Judicial Committee (though that is another chicken and egg scenario since they were elected at that selfsame convention, if they declare it invalid, they invalidated their right to declare it invalid), or as a result of a court order. It is a fact though that members have been denied basic appeal rights whether Ms. Imhoff as a non-Chair declared it so, or Mr. Imhoff as the newly elected Chair declared it so.		IV.1, VI.1, XI, XIII.5.b	24:1, 47:7 4 and 6)
8/8/22	Email to Membership setting convention for 8/27/22	Notice states that agenda will only include intental party elections for officers and judicial committee.			
8/11/22	LNC Investigatory meeting	The LNC heard testimony from both sides. Harlos introduced a resolution after the meeting recognizing the validity of the 4/2 convention and the elections taken therein which stand along with any successors in the ordinary course of business following the convention. She recommended to the Sorensen group that the bylaws be seriously reviewed as they have a lot of issues and that a professional parliamentarian should be retained to assist.			