

APPENDIX T

Barker, <i>Concur</i>	Duncan, <i>Concur</i>	Meyerhoff, <i>Concur</i>
Bise, <i>Concur</i>	Evans, <i>Concur</i>	Neikirk, <i>Concur</i>
Burnett, <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>NotQual</i>
Coffin, <i>Concur</i>	Kooistra, <i>Absent</i>	White, <i>Absent</i>
Donahoe, <i>Abstain</i>	McGowan, <i>Concur</i>	Wilson, <i>Concur</i>

CASE 2015-07
JOHN B. THOMPSON
VS.
SOUTH FLORIDA PRESBYTERY
DECISION ON COMPLAINT
AUGUST 12, 2015

The Standing Judicial Commission (SJC) finds the above-named Complaint Administratively Out of Order (*OMSJC* 9.1.a.) in that the next Stated Meeting of South Florida Presbytery was August 11, 2015, and it had not yet considered the complaint. The SJC finds this case cannot be put in order within the Rules of Discipline of the *BCO* and the requirements of the *OMSJC*, and that this case should be dismissed for the reason that it was prematurely filed, i.e., *BCO* 43-2 does not require a court to consider the complaint until “its next stated meeting.”

Officers’ Recommendation finding this case Administratively Out of Order was approved unanimously because the Petitioner’s *BCO* 40-5 Application was prematurely filed with the SJC. Roll call 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>
Burnett, <i>Absent</i>	Fowler, <i>Concur</i>	Nusbaum, <i>Concur</i>
Cannata, <i>Concur</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>Absent</i>
Coffin, <i>Concur</i>	Kooistra, <i>Absent</i>	White, <i>Concur</i>
Donahoe, <i>Concur</i>	McGowan, <i>Concur</i>	Wilson, <i>Concur</i>