

this Complaint Administratively Out of Order. Furthermore, in the same e-mail he indicated he was “not sure if the wording of the request fully represents my heart in the matter” and also that he “was not able to review the wording of the document” prior to it being filed.

CASE 2015-03
RE STEVE FLESHER AND RE RANDY WEEKLY
VS.
METRO ATLANTA PRESBYTERY
DECISION ON COMPLAINT
March 3, 2016

Because the issues raised in Complaint 2015-03 were adjudicated in Appeal 2015-08, the Complaint 2015-03 is moot. The SJC approved this decision on the following vote:

Barker, <i>Concur</i>	Duncan, <i>Concur</i>	Meyerhoff, <i>Concur</i>
Bise, <i>Concur</i>	Evans, <i>Concur</i>	Neikirk, <i>Concur</i>
Burnet, <i>Absent</i>	Fowler, <i>Concur</i>	Nusbaum, <i>Concur</i>
Cannata, <i>Absent</i>	Greco, <i>Concur</i>	Pickering, <i>Concur</i>
Carrell, <i>Concur</i>	Gunn, <i>Concur</i>	Fowler, <i>Concur</i>
Chapell, <i>Concur</i>	Jones, <i>Concur</i>	Terrell, <i>Concur</i>
Coffin, <i>Concur</i>	Kooistra, <i>Concur</i>	White, <i>Recused</i>
Donahoe, <i>Concur</i>	McGowan, <i>Concur</i>	Wilson, <i>Concur</i>

CASE 2015-04
COMPLAINT OF JOHN B. THOMPSON
VS.
SOUTH FLORIDA PRESBYTERY
DECISION ON COMPLAINT
MARCH 3, 2016

The SJC finds the Complaint judicially out of order as the objections raised in the Complaint ought to be raised by a defendant during process with the court of original jurisdiction (*BCO* 32-14), or thereafter, if not satisfied, by an appellant on appeal (*BCO* 42-3).