



Andrew Chadderdon &lt;andrew.chadderdon@gmail.com&gt;

---

## Questions regarding Parliamentary Opinion for LPMI

---

jjparlia@yahoo.com &lt;jjparlia@yahoo.com&gt;

Fri, Dec 23, 2022 at 12:57 PM

To: Andrew Chadderdon &lt;andrew.chadderdon@gmail.com&gt;

You may forward this.

First, while my opinion was written prior to that of Martin and Brown, reading their opinions has not changed my opinion in the least.

Second, the LPMI Bylaws supersede RONR, so when they define something, that definition supersedes RONR. The definition of a regular is expressed in Article VI, Section and is limited to the meeting held in odd-numbered years. Even if RONR has a different definition, it is the definition in the bylaws that is controlling. There is no ambiguity to that.

RONR may define "regular meeting" as happening at a specific interval, but the definition in your bylaws supersedes the RONR definition.

Third, the ambiguity is based in the allegation that the bylaws also create these other specified meeting as regular meetings. Based on the rule of interpretation, which are binding on the assembly, the expression of one thing precludes other things of the same type (56:68 #4). That should end any debate as to the question.

Basically, your bylaws have created a separate class of meetings, specified meetings, that are neither regular nor special meetings as RONR uses the term. They may deal with only that business authorized in the bylaws.

Fourth, since several people have insisted that, in spite of 56:68 #4, these could be regular meetings, I will address it. As noted in my oral arguments, the claim that all these specified meetings are regular meetings would conflict with the term of office of two years ending at the next regular meeting. The interpretation that all these specified meetings are somehow regular meetings violates 56:68 #2, I did not discuss this in my opinion because I had not seen anyone claiming it and did not expect anyone to make a claim that so demonstrably absurd.

I will note that in the 3rd quarter 1994 *National Parliamentarian*, a peer reviewed journal of the National Association of Parliamentarians, I wrote an article dealing with the relationship between the rules. I wrote: "It is necessary for a parliamentarian to be aware that there may exist a higher authority, national, state, local laws, as well as the **society's bylaws** and special rules that supersede RONR." I can only repeat the same advice 28 years later.

Jonathan M. Jacobs, PRP-R, CPP  
630 North 63rd Street, Apt 3 FL R,  
Philadelphia, PA 19151  
(215) 229-1185