

RULING OF THE APPEALS COMMITTEE

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF THE NEW KENT COUNTY REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE OF THE DECISION OF THE 1ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE

Issued Date: August 23, 2024

FACTS OF THE MATTER

This appeal was brought by the chair and officers of the New Kent County Unit Committee. Following the conclusion of their biennial Reorganization, the New Kent County leadership appointed a credentials committee, which found 245 of 265 applicants had filed properly. Of these 20 candidates found to be “Filed improperly” were the original appellants to the 1st CD, Tom English et al.

With no action taken by the local committee within 21 days, the appeal kicked up to the 1st Congressional district as required by the State Party Plan. On April 29th, a call was published by the 1st CD chairman Jeff Ryer, taking up the appeal by English et al. The Meeting was held on May 6th, with an appeals hearing compliant with SPP Article X of the RPV Party Plan, a Motion was introduced, seconded, and passed 17-2 to grant the appeal, and membership of the 10 appellants to the New Kent County GOP.

From the evidence collected and presented at the May 6th meeting, found these members were compliant with article 1 of the party plan, and having paid for membership, the New Kent County Committee was instructed to allow these members to join, overturning the decision of the credentials committee in New Kent.

ALLEGED VIOLATION

The New Kent County Committee asks in bringing this appeal “... *Under Article X and the August 26, 2016 ruling for the 11th District Congressional Committee and the December 18, 2018 ruling for Augusta County... the May 6, 2024 decision of the First Congressional District Republican Committee on the Appeal of Tom English, et al should be overturned.*”

The New Kent County Unity Committee and their representative presented evidence that the members prohibited from joining had violated the call by paying for multiple memberships with one payment (specified as two members from the same household paying with one check), and presented evidence that alleged the appeal was brought

improperly before the First Congressional District Committee, and as such, asked for the ruling to be overturned.

DECISION AND REASONING

The (SPP), Article X, Section B, Paragraph 1 states: *“Each Unit Committee shall decide all controversies and contests arising within its jurisdiction. A Unit Committee’s decision may be appealed by any Party member, as defined in Article I, adversely affected to the appropriate District Committee. In the case of a split Unit, if the controversy or contest specifically relates to the operations or affairs of a particular Congressional or Legislative District, an appeal shall be taken to that particular Congressional or Legislative District Committee; if not, an appeal shall be taken to the District Committee of the District wherein the person appealing resides.”*

The (SPP), Article X, Section B, Paragraph 3 states: *“Each District Committee shall decide all controversies and contests arising within its jurisdiction. It shall also hear and decide all timely appeals taken from units and legislative districts within the District. A District Committee’s decision may be appealed by any Party member adversely affected to the State Central Committee.”*

As written, the State Party Plan allows for appellants to take their appeal to the Congressional District Committee, following a decision believed to be adverse to the appellant and not compliant with the Party plan. The Appeals committee was unanimous in finding that the First Congressional district committee did have authority to rule on the appeal based on the above two sections of the Party Plan.

Since that was established, the Committee then turned to the matter of harm to the unit. Seeing as the 10 appellants in English et al were former members of the executive committee, and the First Congressional District Committee voted nearly unanimously to allow these appellants membership, the Appeals committee could not find evidence of harm caused to the unit by the admittance of these candidates for membership.

For these reasons, the decision of the First Congressional District Committee to admit these ten appellants as members to the New Kent County Republican Committee is upheld.

FINAL DETERMINATION

The Decision of the 1st Congressional District Republican Committee to permit the appellants, English et al, to become members of the New Kent County Republican Committee is UPHELD.

APPEALS COMMITTEE

This division was unanimously adopted by the members of the appeals committee appointed by the RPV chairman in this matter.

We appreciate the representatives of both the New Kent County Republican Committee and the 1st Congressional District Committee for answering our questions and presenting to our committee.

Steven Statzer

Steven Statzer, Appeals Committee Chair, 9th CD SCC Representative

John Massoud, 6th Congressional District Chairman

Adam Tolbert, 9th Congressional District Chairman

Stephen Kurtz, 6th CD SCC Representative

Jean Gannon, VFRW SCC Representative