

**PERMANENT JUDICIAL COMMISSION  
OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH (U.S.A.)**

-----  
Wilber Tom, David Hawbecker, and )  
Thomas Conrad, ) **Decision and Order**  
Appellants (Complainants), ) Remedial Case 221-03  
)  
v. )  
)  
Presbytery of San Francisco, )  
Appellee (Respondent). )  
-----

**Arrival Statement**

This filing before the Permanent Judicial Commission of the General Assembly (GAPJC or this Commission) is an appeal of a Decision of the Permanent Judicial Commission of the Synod of the Pacific (SPJC) rendered on March 23, 2012. The Notice of Appeal was received by the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly on May 10, 2012.

**Jurisdictional Statement**

This Commission finds that it has jurisdiction, that Appellants have standing to file the Appeal, that the Appeal was properly and timely filed, and that the Appeal states one or more of the grounds for appeal under D-8.0105.

**Appearances**

Wilbert Tom, David Hawbecker, and Thomas Conrad (Appellants), were represented by JoAn Blackstone. Presbytery of San Francisco (Presbytery or Appellee) waived its appearance at the hearing and chose to rely on its written submissions.

**History**

Presbytery formed a workgroup on December 11, 2008, to develop a policy regarding any church located in the Presbytery that wished to be dismissed from the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) (PC(U.S.A.)). Scott Farmer (Farmer), Senior Pastor, Community Presbyterian Church of Danville (Danville) served on that workgroup. While the exact date is unknown, it is not disputed that Danville had begun discussions regarding the dissolution of their relationship with the PC(U.S.A.) at the time of Farmer's selection to the policy workgroup.

Presbytery, at its September 15, 2009, stated meeting, adopted what was known as the "Gracious Dismissal Policy" (GDP) as a result of the recommendation of the policy workgroup. While the GDP acknowledged *Book of Order* G-8.0201 (now G-4.0203) (the Trust Clause) that

provides all property held by or for a congregation "is held in trust nevertheless for the use and benefit of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)," the GDP interpreted the Trust Clause "to reflect the church's organic unity as it fulfills 'The Great Ends of the Church,' strengthening its ability to guide its member churches into their witness to the broader community." The GDP found that it was "the right of a congregation to seek and request dismissal with its property to another reformed denomination." The GDP also set forth that the Trust Clause was not to be used as a weapon to threaten civil action against a congregation over issues of conscience.

To mitigate financial impact on mission and ministry of Presbytery, the GDP requested the congregation seeking dismissal to pay Presbytery annually for five years: (1) funds to offset declining per capita and (2) funds to offset a declining contribution to the mission budget. The GDP did not mention payment of any other funds to Presbytery, such as payment for the value of the congregation's real property and other assets.

Five months after the adoption of the GDP by Presbytery, the session of Danville, of which Farmer was moderator, notified Presbytery in February 2010 of its intention to seek dismissal to the Evangelical Presbyterian Church (EPC). Pursuant to the GDP, a Presbytery Engagement Team (PET) was appointed by Presbytery during its stated meeting on April 13, 2010, to work with the session and congregation of Danville to effect reconciliation, if possible, or to negotiate the terms of the dismissal. Also pursuant to the terms of the GDP, Danville formed a Special Committee of the Congregation (SCC), on which Farmer participated, to negotiate with PET. During a called congregational meeting on September 12, 2010, Danville voted to seek dismissal from the PC(U.S.A.) pursuant to the terms negotiated by PET and SCC. The terms of the negotiation were subject to approval by Presbytery.

According to the testimony of members of PET, the GDP did not include a requirement to consider the value of the congregational property for the use and benefit of the PC(U.S.A.). Under the terms of the final agreement reached with PET, Danville agreed to make a lump sum payment of \$108,640 to Presbytery to compensate for declining per capita. Additionally, Danville agreed to pay \$42,000 per year for five years to support targeted PC(U.S.A.) ministries, missions and ministers. No other monies were contemplated or discussed by PET with SCC.

At its November 9, 2010, stated meeting, Presbytery conditionally approved the terms of the dismissal as set forth by PET and SCC. The resolution provides:

The effective date of [Danville's] dismissal will be November 10, 2010. If there is no stay or filing of a complaint during a 90-day waiting period, consistent with the interval identified in the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) *Book of Order* for the filing of stays and complaints, full implementation will occur on February 9, 2011.

At that same meeting, Presbytery voted to suspend the GDP. Subsequently, Presbytery adopted a new GDP which is not relevant to this appeal.

On February 2, 2011, within the 90-day time frame approved by Presbytery, Appellants filed a remedial complaint against Presbytery with the SPJC. On June 4, 2011, SPJC answered all the preliminary questions affirmatively under D-8.0105. An amended complaint was filed on October 14, 2011.

Trial was held on March 22, 2012. At the beginning of the trial, Appellants moved to disqualify a commissioner pursuant to D-7.0401b(2), alleging that the commissioner was predisposed to rule against Appellants as evidenced by the "tenor of his comments" set forth in an October 6, 2011, email. The motion was denied by SPJC.

During the trial a number of documents were offered for inclusion in the record. These documents included the PC(U.S.A.)'s *Amicus Curiae* Brief before the California Supreme Court and the Annual Statistical Report of Danville which had been sent to the Stated Clerk of Presbytery. The moderator sustained Presbytery's objections to the admission of these documents. The Appellants objected to the admission of other documentary evidence, including an email from a PET member summarizing her conversation with a representative of the Department of Constitutional Services within the Office of the Stated Clerk. Appellants' objections were overruled.

Additionally, while questioning a witness, a commissioner stated, "The agreement that you struck between the Presbytery and CPC Danville, my home church, also referred to as CPC, so Central, however, has several points in it with subpoints." Neither party made an objection regarding disqualification of this commissioner at that time for any possible conflict of interest, if the commissioner meant by his comment that Danville was his "home church."

On March 23, 2012, SPJC ordered that the action of Presbytery on November 9, 2010, dismissing Danville pursuant to the terms of the agreement, be affirmed.

On May 7, 2012, Appellants mailed their Notice of Appeal to the GAPJC and all other appropriate recipients. During the Presbytery stated meeting on May 8, 2012, the PET reported that the new implementation date of the agreement would fall between May 21 and May 26, 2012. Appellants believe that PET, at this stated meeting, was aware of the Notice of Appeal to the GAPJC.

On May 18, 2012, the GAPJC issued its preliminary order finding that it had jurisdiction, that the Appellants had standing to file the Appeal, that the Appeal was properly and timely filed, and that the Appeal stated one or more of the grounds for appeal under D-8.0105. Notice of such GAPJC decision accepting the Appeal was timely mailed to the parties. On May 21, 2012, Presbytery executed quitclaim deeds to Danville and Danville paid the per capita and mission funds pursuant to the agreement.

### **Specifications of Error**

*Specification of Error No. 1: (Appellants' Specification of Error No. 1) The proceedings of the Synod Permanent Judicial Commission (SPJC) were irregular, in that the decision is inconsistent with substantial evidence from the testimony of witnesses at the trial, that in determining the terms of its dismissal of a large suburban church the Presbytery of San Francisco (Presbytery) failed to consider or to understand the meaning of the property trust clause (G-4.0202, formerly G-8.0201) or that the church property in question was in fact unequivocally owned by the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.).*

This Specification of Error is sustained.

*See the rationale below Specification of Error 7.*

*Specification of Error No. 2: (Appellants' Specification of Error No. 10) The SPJC erred in constitutional interpretation, in that it failed to apprehend or give effect to the plain meaning of the language of the express trust now at G-4.0203 (formerly G-8.0201) in the context of a church seeking dismissal, that all property held by a congregation "is held in trust nevertheless for the use and benefit of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)."*

This Specification of Error is sustained.

*See the rationale below Specification of Error 7.*

*Specification of Error No. 3: (Appellants' Specification of Error No. 11) The SPJC erred in constitutional interpretation, in that it failed to consider or give effect to a relevant Authoritative Interpretation (AI) of the Book of Order (Request 9-88), an answer provided by the General Assembly of 1988 on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on the Constitution (ACC) which, in the context of a presbytery's response to a church seeking dismissal, interprets the property trust clause to require proper consideration to be given to the interests of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) as provided in Chapter VIII. This AI goes on to say, "in particular, G-8.0201 recognizes the principle that all property for or by a particular church is held in trust for the use and benefit of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) Thus the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) is a party in interest when a presbytery takes action with respect to a request to dismiss a church with its property."*

This Specification of Error is sustained.

*See the rationale below Specification of Error No. 7.*

*Specification of Error No. 4: (Appellants' Specification of Error No. 12) The SPJC erred in constitutional interpretation, in that it failed to consider or give effect to a subsequent AI of the property trust clause, in an answer provided by the General Assembly in 1989 on the recommendation of the ACC: "When dealing with a request by a church for dismissal with its property pursuant to G-11.0103i and G-11.0103y, the presbytery is responsible for exercising the express trust provisions of G-8.0201 recognizing and protecting the interests of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.). Separate consideration should be given to the questions of dismissing the congregation, the disposal of property, and the relationships of ministers of Word and Sacrament." "Each request for dismissal should be considered in the light of the particular situation and circumstances involved."*

This Specification of Error is sustained.

*See the rationale below Specification of Error No. 7.*

*Specification of Error No. 5: (Appellants' Specification of Error No. 13) The SPJC erred in constitutional interpretation, in that it disregarded testimony of members of the Presbytery's*

*PET who had negotiated the terms of dismissal of the CPCD and whose recommendation the Presbytery had adopted. This testimony demonstrated, among other things, a consistent failure to understand the meaning of the property trust clause as expressed in the Book of Order, a failure to have read or considered relevant Authoritative Interpretations of the Constitution, an apparent failure to understand that the PC (U.S.A.) owned the church property, a failure to grasp the fact that a transfer of the real property without consideration amounted to a gift, an exclusive reliance on the Presbytery's previously approved dismissal policy as understood by members of the PET, a failure to understand how to apply the trust clause other than in the context of specific process steps in the policy, and a belief that the policy precluded even having a discussion about having the church property remain in the hands of the denomination or asking for any payment for the property upon its transfer.*

This Specification of Error is sustained.

*See the rationale below Specification of Error No. 7.*

*Specification of Error No. 6: (Appellants' Specification of Error No. 14) The SPJC erred in constitutional interpretation, in that it upheld the Presbytery's action as being within its discretion as trustee of the church property, based on Presbytery's contention that the transfer of the property without consideration would serve "the Great Ends of the Church" and further the "total ministry and witness for Christ," thus making any further recognition of the property trust unnecessary or inappropriate.*

This Specification of Error is sustained.

*See the rationale below Specification of Error No. 7.*

*Specification of Error No. 7: (Appellants' Specification of Error No. 15) The SPJC erred in constitutional interpretation, in that its decision would indicate that a presbytery has unfettered discretion with respect to church property being used by a congregation seeking dismissal to another Reformed denomination, while the Book of Order places the fiduciary and related responsibilities of a trustee of the property on the presbytery.*

This Specification of Error is sustained.

Presbytery voted to approve the transfer of the valuable Danville property unless a complaint or stay was filed within 90 days. A complaint was so filed. Following the ruling by SPJC, a new implementation date for the agreement was set. In the interim, an appeal was filed to this Commission and accepted with a preliminary order being entered May 18, 2012. Nevertheless, on May 21, 2012, Presbytery executed a quitclaim deed to Danville before this Commission was able to conduct the hearing on this appeal.

Presbytery, having transferred title while this case was pending, argued that the transfer of title renders the case moot because the quitclaim deed had been signed and could not be revoked.

Notwithstanding the transfer of title, in cases where circumstances prevent a remedy, this Commission may exercise its declaratory authority to provide guidance to lower councils and prevent future violations. *Daniel J. McKittrick v. The Session of the West End Presbyterian Church* (Remedial Case 215-5, 2003).

The *Book of Order* provides in G-8.0201 (now G-4.0203) that:

All property held by or for a congregation, a presbytery, a synod, the General Assembly, or the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), whether legal title is lodged in a corporation, a trustee or trustees, or an unincorporated association, and whether the property is used in programs of a congregation or of a higher council or retained for the production of income, is held in trust nevertheless for the use and benefit of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.).

Under the Trust Clause, a presbytery's discretionary authority to determine property rights, while broad, must be guided by the presbytery acting as a fiduciary for the benefit of the PC(U.S.A.), the beneficiary of the Trust Clause. A congregation's financial and all other assets are also understood to be covered by the Trust Clause. *Chesterbrook Taiwanese PC v. National Capital Presbytery*, Remedial Case 217-12, 2006.

Under the fiduciary obligations inherent in the Trust Clause, a presbytery must take into consideration the PC(U.S.A.)'s use and benefit of the property in every decision concerning its disposition. To comply with the Trust Clause, the presbytery must consider the interest of PC(U.S.A.) as a beneficiary of the property. Payments for per capita or mission obligations are not satisfactory substitutes for valuations of the property held in trust. (G-4.0203)

The Trust Clause reflects our understanding of the church as a communion of saints across time, with responsibilities both to those who came before and those who will follow. When a congregation seeks to leave the PC(U.S.A.), it is breaking what is often a significant historic relationship; it is also departing from a fellowship in which its officers have participated, by whose polity they have pledged to be governed, and with which many members may feel bonds of affection.

Based on an examination of the record, this Commission finds that the GDP developed by Presbytery, its implementation, and SPJC in its trial decision, failed to duly consider the economic interests of the PC(U.S.A.). Such consideration is essential. SPJC's exclusion of documents which were the most convincing evidence of the position of PC(U.S.A.) in regard to the Trust Clause and of the financial position of Danville, strongly supports the allegation of erroneous interpretation. Failure to consider the property value and the PC(U.S.A.)'s beneficial interest in the property was a fatal omission of the trustee's duty to the PC(U.S.A.).

The justification given by Presbytery for dismissal of the Danville church with property, which included only "Great Ends of the Church" and avoidance of litigation, was erroneously upheld by SPJC. While certainly valid, such considerations alone are not sufficient to satisfy the due diligence requirement imposed by the Trust Clause. SPJC erred in finding that due consideration had been given to the interest of the PC(U.S.A.) as the trust beneficiary under the *Constitution*. Due diligence, of necessity, will include not only the spiritual needs of the

congregation and its circumstances, but an examination of the congregation's financial position and the value of the property at stake. It is undisputed that Presbytery failed to make such an examination. SPJC erred in failing to require that financial due diligence be undertaken by Presbytery.

*Specification of Error No. 8: (Appellants' Specification of Error No. 2) The proceedings of the SPJC were irregular, in that one of its commissioners made a comment, before a witness could answer a question, to the effect that the attorney-client privilege would preclude answering the question, and cast doubt on the witnesses' ability to waive the privilege.*

This Specification of Error is not sustained.

There was no error in having the question of attorney-client privilege raised by a commissioner. If the moderator was incorrect in finding that the witness could not waive the privilege, such ruling was harmless because ultimately the witness was allowed to testify concerning the information objected to.

*Specification of Error No. 9: (Appellants' Specification of Error No. 3) The proceedings of the SPJC were irregular, in that in questioning a witness one of its commissioners made reference to, and quoted, a provision of the Book of Order that was not in effect at the time of the disputed action (G-4.0201), thus providing misleading support for the Presbytery's position.*

This Specification of Error is not sustained.

References to provisions of the *Book of Order* are not evidence. They may be incorrect or untimely but they have no impact without a determination or decision being based on the provisions that are considered.

*Specification of Error No. 10: (Appellants' Specification of Error No. 4) The proceedings of the SPJC were irregular, in that one of its commissioners belatedly revealed, near the conclusion of the trial in which he had materially participated as described at 2. and 3., above and at other times during the proceedings, that the "Danville church" (the church that was to have been dismissed by the Presbytery under the disputed terms), was his home church. In addition, there is nothing from the record that would indicate other than the same commissioner's full participation in the SPJC deliberations that followed the trial, despite the appearance of a significant conflict of interest.*

This Specification of Error is not sustained.

Having reviewed the record, it is clear the commissioner was not referring to Danville as his home church. Support for this conclusion can be found in that there was no objection or question of conflict of interest raised by anyone after his statement.

*Specification of Error No. 11: (Appellants' Specification of Error No. 5) The SPJC erred in declining to receive as proper evidence the Amicus Curiae Brief of Clifton Kirkpatrick et al. in support of the position of the Episcopal Church before the Supreme Court of California in the*

*Episcopal Church Cases. This brief sets forth the official legal position of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) with respect to church property as provided in the property trust clause in the Book of Order.*

This Specification of Error is sustained.

Failure to receive the *Amicus Curiae* Brief into the record was an abuse of discretion in that it was a clear statement of the legal position of the PC(U.S.A.) as it related to the Trust Clause. Recognition of the legal position of the PC(U.S.A.) as the beneficiary under the Trust Clause is integral to any presbytery analysis concerning disposition of church property.

*Specification of Error No. 12: (Appellants' Specification of Error No. 6) The SPJC erred in declining to receive as proper evidence the Annual Statistical Report for the Community Presbyterian Church of Danville (CPCD), which was sent by its Clerk of Session to the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of San Francisco. Appellants believe this report provides useful information concerning the number of members and financial strength of CPCD, matters which the Presbytery failed to consider but should have considered in negotiating the terms of its dismissal.*

This Specification of Error is sustained.

The failure to receive the report on Danville was an abuse of discretion because it provided relevant information which should have been considered as part of the dismissal.

*Specification of Error No.13: (Appellants' Specification of Error No. 7) The SPJC erred in receiving as proper evidence a copy of an E-mail communication from a member of the Presbytery Engagement Team (PET), the ad hoc committee that was charged with negotiating the terms of dismissal with representatives of CPCD, to the other members of the PET, describing her telephone conversation with a third party, despite her testimony that there was no follow-up discussion of its contents on the part of the PET and hence no indication that the PET based its actions on that conversation or E-mail message.*

This Specification of Error is not sustained.

There was no abuse of discretion by SPJC in receiving such evidence.

*Specification of Error No. 14: (Appellants' Specification of Error No. 8) The SPJC erred in receiving as proper evidence a copy of an E-mail communication from a member of the PET to the other members of the PET in which she related her understanding of the reasons for the CPCD Sessions' desire to leave the PC(U.S.A.). At no time was any evidence testimony produced to suggest that the Presbytery's terms of dismissal were influenced in any way by the matters discussed in that communication.*

This Specification of Error is not sustained.

There was no abuse of discretion by SPJC receiving such evidence.

*Specification of Error No. 15: (Appellants' Specification of Error No. 9) For the reasons stated at 10 (Appellants' 4) and 14 (Appellants' 8), above, there was a manifestation of prejudice in the conduct of the case.*

This Specification of Error is not sustained.

This Commission did not sustain either Specifications of Error No. 10 or No. 14 (Appellants' No. 4 and No. 8). Therefore, there was no manifestation of prejudice as a result of the conduct alleged in those Specifications of Error.

### **Decision**

When the lower council's actions cannot be undone, this Commission may exercise its declaratory authority to provide guidance to lower councils and to prevent future violations.

When a congregation seeks dismissal under G-11.0103i (now G-3.0301a), it is the responsibility of the presbytery to fulfill its fiduciary duty under the Trust Clause. This fiduciary duty requires that the presbytery exercise due diligence regarding the value of the property of the congregation seeking dismissal. Due diligence, of necessity, includes not only an evaluation of the spiritual needs of the congregation and its circumstances but also financial analysis of the value of the property at stake. Payments for per capita or mission obligations are not satisfactory substitutes for the separate evaluation of the value of the property held in trust.

### **Order**

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Decision of the Synod of the Pacific Permanent Judicial Commission is affirmed in part and reversed in part as set forth above.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Stated Clerk of the Synod of the Pacific report this Decision to the Synod of the Pacific at its first meeting after receipt, that the Synod of the Pacific enter the full Decision upon its minutes, and that an excerpt from those minutes showing entry of the Decision be sent to the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of San Francisco report this Decision to the Presbytery of San Francisco at its first meeting after receipt, that the Presbytery of San Francisco enter the full Decision upon its minutes, and that an excerpt from those minutes showing entry of the Decision be sent to the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly.

### **Absences and Non-Appearances**

Commissioner Mary Charlotte McCall was not present and did not participate in this decision. Commissioner Patrick Notley did not participate in this decision.

### **Concurring Opinion of H. Clifford Looney and Terry Epling**

We concur in the majority decision.

Transfers of property remain within the discretion of Presbytery but the Presbytery must be mindful of the interest of the PC(U.S.A.) in maintaining the presence of the denomination to meet the needs of that affected Community including that portion of the church membership that wishes to remain within the PCUSA.

We also join in the majority's conclusion that the language of the Gracious Dismissal Policy adopted by the Presbytery of San Francisco did not require adequate consideration of property retention issues. The needs of future congregations, the involved debt, the probability that a substantial number of dissenting members may be enabled to continue a PCUSA congregation would compel retention of a property or equity facilitating those or similar interests are all matters to be considered to be involved in the Presbytery trustee's decision. The Gracious Dismissal Policy did not require the PET to deal with those aspects of the dismissal decision.

However erroneous the omissions of the GDP, and the construction given by its PET, it may well have been within the discretion of the Presbytery to dismiss the Danville church with its property.

Many factors other than the attempt to be "gracious" with the Danville congregation may have been considered. Those include:

This Danville congregation acquired these assets and had been paying on them and had been successful in meeting the need of a Presbyterian witness for the Christian faith in this community for many years;

The church had tried development of other PC (USA) churches in the area without success;

Only 4% of the congregation voted against the dismissal decision;

The PET felt, apparently with substantial basis, that the needs of the community for Presbyterian witness to the faith would be met by this church as it was constituted, and that no plan for an additional church was presently feasible, so that there was no need to use any of the equities of the property interests of the church for that purpose; and that no resources of the denomination had been used in the form of loans, nor was there any remaining indebtedness which was not being assumed by the Danville church.

In short, there may have been no apparent reason to require retention by the PC (USA) of any property interest. With the evidence in that stature, the burden of proof that the Complainant would had to have met to show an abuse of discretion by the Presbytery would have been heavy.

The testimony of Lois Quick (record p. 262 & 286) indicates that the properties were encumbered by about three million dollars in debt that the Danville congregation agreed to pay in accepting the property. Rev. Kathy Runyeon indicates at page 174 of the record that the Presbytery had no competing plans for the property.

The facts here presented to the PET are not ones that suggest that there would be substantial benefit from retaining the property. What the Presbytery did in securing additional mission and per capita payments may or may not have been sufficient to “balance the books” in this particular scenario, but it was within their discretion once they exercised due diligence and considered all the factors inherently required by the fiduciary duty of a trustee.

### **Certificate**

We certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the decision of the Permanent Judicial Commission of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) in Remedial Case 221-04, Wilbert Tom, David Hawbecker, and Thomas Conrad, Appellants (Complainants), v. Presbytery of San Francisco, Appellee (Respondent), made and announced at Louisville, KY this 28<sup>th</sup> day of October 2012.

Dated this 28<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2012.

---

Bradley C. Copeland Moderator  
Permanent Judicial Commission of the General Assembly

---

Jay Lewis, Clerk  
Permanent Judicial Commission of the General Assembly

I certify that I did transmit a certified copy of the foregoing to the following persons by Federal Express Next Day Air, directing C. Laurie Griffith to deposit it in the mail at Louisville, KY, this 28<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2012.

JoAn Blackstone, Counsel for Appellant (Complainant)  
Linda Lee, Committee of Counsel for Appellee (Respondent)  
Stated Clerk, Synod of the Pacific  
Stated Clerk, Presbytery of San Francisco  
General Assembly Permanent Judicial Commission

I further certify that I did transmit a certified copy of the foregoing to the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) by delivering it in person to Joyce Lieberman, on October 28, 2012.

---

Jay Lewis, Clerk  
Permanent Judicial Commission of the General Assembly

I certify that I received a certified copy of the foregoing, that it is a full and correct copy of the decision of the Permanent Judicial Commission of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), sitting during an interval between meetings of the General Assembly, in Louisville, KY on October 28, 2012 , Remedial Case 221-04 Wilbert Tom, David Hawbecker, and Thomas Conrad, Appellants (Complainants), v. Presbytery of San Francisco, Appellee (Respondent),, and that it is the final judgment of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) in the case.

Dated at Louisville, KY on October 28, 2012.

---

Joyce Lieberman, Assistant Stated Clerk