

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

Presbytery of New York City
Appellant (Respondent))
)
vs.)
)
Ruling Elder Mildred McGee, Teaching)
Elder Flora Wilson Bridges, Ruling Elder)
Douglas Howard, Teaching Elder Lonnie)
Bryant, Ruling Elder Daniel Amiot Priso,)
Teaching Elder Phillip Newell, Ruling Elder)
Emmanuel Gouad Njayick, Teaching Elder)
George Todd, Ruling Elder Estella Taylor,)
and Ruling Elder Norita Chisolm)
Appellees)
(Complainants)

DECISION AND ORDER

Remedial Case 221-08

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 Northeast (SPJC) rendered on September 11, 2013. The Notice of Appeal was received by the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly on September 23, 2013.

Parties

Appellant/Respondent is The Presbytery of New York City (PNYC).
Appellees/Complainants are Ruling Elder Mildred McGee, Teaching Elder Flora Wilson Bridges, Ruling Elder Douglas Howard, Teaching Elder Lonnie Bryant, Ruling Elder Daniel Amiot Priso, Teaching Elder Phillip Newell, Ruling Elder Emmanuel Gouad Njayick, Teaching Elder George Todd, Ruling Elder Estella Taylor, and Ruling Elder Norita Chisolm.

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

Appellant/Respondent was represented by John Griem and Reade Ryan. Appellees/Complainants were represented by Tee Gee Wilson and Lisa Borge.

History

On February 13, 2013, the Stated Clerk of the Synod of the Northeast received a Remedial Complaint from Ruling Elder Mildred McGee, *et alia*, alleging that the action of the PNYC in adopting and implementing its Gracious Dismissal Policy (GDP) was irregular in regard to constitutional requirements of The Presbyterian Church U.S.A. (PC(U.S.A.)).

The development of the GDP by the PNYC began early in 2012, informed by Resolution 04-28, GA Minutes (2008, Part II, pp. 284-285) of the 218th General Assembly (2008) (GA) urging presbyteries to formulate a gracious and pastoral response to churches requesting dismissal from the PC(U.S.A.). This GA resolution, although not an authoritative interpretation, was used as the basis for the development of the GDP. Just after that Assembly, in October 2008, the PNYC through its Committee on Mission and Finance, which also served as the Board of Trustees (BoT), obtained a realtor's opinion of value of the properties held by all its congregations. Almost four years later, in July 2012, the BoT created a draft GDP that was distributed to the PNYC for its meeting on July 28, 2012. There was no discussion of the draft at that meeting. A later draft was given a first reading and discussion at the December 6, 2012, meeting of the PNYC. After two open hearings on December 13 and 20, 2012, the present GDP was approved by the PNYC on January 29, 2013, by a vote of 56 in favor and 49 against.

The SPJC summarized the GDP in the following way:

...[T]he PNYC GDP allows sessions to request initiation of the dismissal process following a 2/3 vote. Upon receipt of the notice, the stated clerk then calls one or more meetings between the Special Resolutions Committee of the presbytery and the session (or its representatives), as well as the BOT (or its representatives) during the 120-day period following receipt of the notice. If the filing notice is not withdrawn at the end of the period, a congregational meeting is called (50% quorum) and dismissal is approved if confirmed by a 3/4 congregational vote. Financial arrangements include payment of any arrears in per capita, five years of per capita payments on a declining scale, and compensation for church property of 10% of the assessed value that exceeds \$1,000,000, with a cap on the compensation of \$2,000,000.

In addition, the policy allows for a downward adjustment or waiver in the case of hardship.

With the remedial complaint, Complainant also requested a Stay of Enforcement. The Executive Committee (EC) of the SPJC answered the Preliminary Questions in the affirmative and the Stay of Enforcement was subsequently granted by the SPJC.

Respondent requested an extension of the deadline for filing its response and the SPJC granted this extension. Respondent submitted a motion to the SPJC on April 29, 2013, to refer the case to the GAPJC, to which Complainants responded on May 14, 2013. The SPJC denied the motion on May 23, 2013. Respondent filed a second motion on July 2, 2013, asking the

SPJC to reconsider its decision to deny the earlier motion to refer the case to the GAPJC, to which Complainants again responded on July 16, 2013. The SPJC EC denied this motion on July 27, 2013.

Complainant filed for relief on February 13, 2013, and this remedial case was decided by the SPJC on September 11, 2013. In its decision, the SPJC sustained five of the seven specifications of error by Complainant and ordered that the GDP of the PNYC shall be set aside and shall have no force or effect.

Specifications of Error

Specification of Error No. 1: The SPJC erred in constitutional interpretation by holding that the Presbytery GDP conferred a unilateral right on a congregation to depart from the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), in violation of G-4.0207 and Sundquist v. Heartland Presbytery, GA PJC 219-03.

This specification of error is not sustained.

While it may be understandable for a presbytery to develop a policy dealing with congregations considering dismissal with the intention of avoiding costly litigation, the GDP at the center of this case breaches the bounds of the Constitution of the PC(U.S.A.). The PNYC GDP exhibits substantial constitutional flaws in at least three ways concerning this specification of error. First, the GDP establishes a dismissal process that, as the SPJC notes, is “self-executing,” whereby fulfillment of a series of steps and conditions automatically enacts dismissal upon their completion. A final vote by the PNYC is purposefully denied in the GDP in order to avoid divisive and argumentative response to a dismissal request, as admitted by the PNYC in the record and during arguments. Even though the process contains provisions for consultation with the PNYC and congregational input, it is in fact a predetermined and formulaic mechanism that replaces a final specific review and vote by the PNYC. The Constitution at G-3.0301a reserves as a direct act of the presbytery the authority to dismiss a church, a polity provision explicitly reasserted by G-4.0207.

As the SPJC noted, the PNYC does not need an independent policy in order to accomplish a just and effective dismissal:

The Respondent has asserted that an order by this Commission to set aside this GDP would leave the presbytery in limbo and render it unable to reach any agreements on dismissal agreements, leaving only the option of costly litigation. This is a seriously overreaching assessment. We are sensitive to the difficult situation in which the PNYC finds itself and appreciate its sincere desire to deal with that as well as it can....[A dismissal agreement] can be achieved, either through Administrative Commissions appointed in each case that presents itself and is empowered to do so, or, indeed, by a Special Resolutions Committee, preparing the proposal for presbytery action. Considering that the presbytery mustered a majority vote, however slim, for the GDP under consideration in this case, and with the case-by-case requirement satisfied in these cases, it ought to be possible for the PNYC to reach agreement on approval for such dismissal arrangements.

The second constitutional error in the GDP is its provision that the vote by a congregation effectuates the dismissal process. This vote terminates the process and has the authority to effect dismissal without any constitutional authority so to act. The final certification by the PNYC is merely perfunctory. Further, such a congregational vote is not authorized within the permitted functions of a congregation in G-1.0503 and is specifically prohibited in *Sundquist et al. vs. Heartland Presbytery*: “Withdrawal from the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) is not a matter that can be considered at a congregational meeting” and the consultations of presbytery with members of the congregation “are not meetings at which business of the congregation may be conducted.” *Sundquist 219-03, 2008*. [GA Minutes, (2010, Part II, pp. 362-367).] It should also be noted that the General Assembly in 1991 declared: “Nowhere is written that the congregation is permitted to make the decision that the presbytery commits itself in advance to confirm.” GA Minutes (1991, Req. 91-24, Part I, p.411). In spite of this stream of clear constitutional interpretation, the GDP portrays a self-implementing dismissal rooted in a congregational decision in violation of the exclusive right and responsibility of a presbytery to dismiss a congregation.

The third constitutional error of the GDP is that a predetermined, formulaic mechanism runs counter to constitutional provisions for mutual dialogue and particular discernment. This Commission has previously rejected such approaches in matters related to ordination and membership *Larson 221-04, 2012*. The presbytery's right and responsibility for specific review and the necessity of individualized consideration on sensitive matters in the life of the church remain a core concept of PC(U.S.A.) polity.

Specification of Error No. 2: The SPJC erred in constitutional interpretation by holding that the GDP does not give effect to the Trust Clause (G-4.0203) as required by Tom v. Presbytery of San Francisco, GA PJC 221-03 and G-4.0204.

This specification of error is not sustained.

The Book of Order provides in G-4.0203 that “[a]ll property held by or for a congregation, a presbytery, a synod, the General Assembly, or the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), ...is held in trust nevertheless for the use and benefit of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.).” The Trust Clause was interpreted by this Commission in *Tom, et al., v. Presbytery of San Francisco*, as it related to that presbytery's gracious dismissal policy, in the context of a number of factors including both spiritual and pecuniary aspects of the fiduciary responsibility. In *Tom*, this Commission said:

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. Payment for per capita for missions obligations are not satisfactory substitutes for the separate evaluation of the value of the property held in trust. *Tom, et al., v. The Presbytery of San Francisco*, Remedial Case 221-03, 2012.

This Commission is again called upon in this case to clarify the parameters of the Trust Clause. The Trust Clause creates an express trust in favor of the PC(U.S.A.) as a whole and not for the presbytery, the congregation, or any other body. Therefore, the presbytery, acting in the role of trustee, must exercise due diligence such that its determination is both reasonable and evident in the record. While presbytery is entitled to deference in making the fiduciary decisions under the Trust Clause, such deference is limited by the fiduciary obligations owed to the whole church.

Under the facts of this case, the PNYC argues that the requirement of due diligence under the Trust Clause has been met by adopting a formula for determining the value of the property at the time of enacting the GDP by the PNYC. However, the fiduciary nature of the Trust Clause requires an individual determination of the facts and circumstances related to dismissal of any church rather than a set formula, which may not be appropriate to the particular circumstances of a congregation. As stated by the SPJC, there must be an "individual assessment and valuation of the church's unique situation, finances, history, spiritual needs and financial needs" when considering dismissal.

In addition, the exercise of the fiduciary duty must be carried out during the course of discernment of a particular church's request for dismissal. A formulaic predetermination fails to account for the individualized requirement demanded by proper application of the fiduciary duty incumbent upon a presbytery. The SPJC correctly determined that the PNYC, acting as a fiduciary, may not abdicate this role (G-4.0207 and G-3.0303b). The record shows that the PNYC sought to avoid conflict and litigation. However, concern about conflict and litigation cannot justify abandonment of constitutional mandates.

Thus, the presbytery, in exercising its authority to perform due diligence under the fiduciary duties required by the Trust Clause, is required to make an appropriately timed, individual, unique determination of the circumstances applicable to any church requesting dismissal. In accountability to the PC(U.S.A.) as the beneficiary under the Trust Clause, such determination must be reasonable and based on documented facts. The GDP enacted by the PNYC fails to meet these requirements and, therefore, is unconstitutional.

Specification of Error No. 3: The SPJC erred in constitutional interpretation by holding that the GDP did not provide specific guidance regarding discernment of theological differences as a basis for dismissal, in violation of F-1.0302a and F-1.0301.

This specification of error is not sustained.

The PNYC adopted the GDP "to provide for reconciliation and resolution within the Presbytery of New York City" and to permit their congregations to be dismissed to join another Reformed denomination for theological reasons. The policy did not seek reconciliation and resolution as the initial step in the process (G-4.0207). The policy accepts notice from a congregation of perceived theological differences as sufficient for dismissal without concern for mutual discernment and dialogue (Sundquist). It is the nature and weight of theological difference that is critical in a justification for dismissal. The mere presence of theological differences does not preclude coexistence within the PC(U.S.A.). As stated in F-3.0105 "there are truths and forms with respect to which men of good characters and principles may differ. And in all these we think it the duty of private Christians and societies to exercise mutual forbearance toward each other." The GDP contains no procedures to encourage early discussion

with the PNYC about a congregation's perceived differences. As indicated in F-3.0204 "Presbyters are not simply to reflect the will of the people, but rather to seek together to find and represent the will of Christ." Without dialogue there cannot be a mutual understanding of the will of the people. Without joint discernment councils can misunderstand the will of Christ. The SPJC rightly concluded it was important that the PNYC "ensure that dismissal is the only viable remedy for the relevant theological differences."

Specification of Error No. 4: The SPJC erred in constitutional interpretation by holding that the GDP did not provide an opportunity for the minority of a church in schism to retain the property of a congregation, in violation of G-4.0207.

This specification of error is not sustained.

The PNYC GDP ignores the constitutional requirement under G-4.0207 to "determine if one of the factions is entitled to the property because it is identified by the presbytery as the true church within the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)." The GDP process is initiated when the PNYC receives a written notice from the session. At that point, the PNYC automatically surrenders its constitutional obligation to determine whether a loyal faction exists and is entitled to the property. Under the GDP provisions, there is no attempt to identify the true church within the PC(U.S.A.). A fully implemented GDP effectively guarantees the property for those seeking dismissal.

It is clear what a presbytery must do when confronted with a property issue. Under G-4.0207, a presbytery is obligated to serve the interests and guard the rights of the "true church within the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)," regardless of who is in the majority of any session or congregational vote. The presbytery shall determine if one of the factions is entitled to the property because it is the "true church within the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)," majority notwithstanding. Any negotiation and decision about the disposition of the property must consider this interest of the true church. The GDP failed to comply with G-4.0207.

Specification of Error No. 5: The SPJC erred in constitutional interpretation by holding that the GDP allowed a dismissed congregation to retain its records, in violation of G-3.0107.

This specification of error is not sustained.

According to G-3.0107, when a congregation is dismissed to another denomination its session ceases to exist as a council of the PC(U.S.A.). The successor to a former church council is the presbytery and upon dismissal of the congregation the minutes and registers of the session become the property and responsibility of the presbytery. The presbytery may make provision for the departing congregation to retain copies of the records for historical purposes.

Decision

For the reasons set forth above, this Commission finds that The Permanent Judicial Commission of the Synod of the Northeast did not err and affirms its decision.

Order

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Decision of the Synod of the Northeast Permanent Judicial Commission is hereby sustained in its entirety and that the Gracious Dismissal Policy of The Presbytery of New York City be set aside and shall have no force or effect.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Stated Clerk of the Synod of the Northeast report this Decision to the Synod of the Northeast at the first meeting after receipt, that the Synod of the Northeast enter the full Decision upon its minutes and 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 New York City report this Decision to the Presbytery of New York City at the first meeting after receipt, that the Presbytery of New York City enter the full Decision upon its minutes and 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 did not participate in the hearing or deliberations.

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 221-08, The Presbytery of New York City, Appellant (Respondent), v. Ruling Elder Mildred McGee, Teaching Elder Flora Wilson Bridges, Ruling Elder Douglas Howard, Teaching Elder Lonnie Bryant, Ruling Elder Daniel Amiot Priso, Teaching Elder Phillip Newell, Ruling Elder Emmanuel Gouad Njayick, Teaching Elder George Todd, Ruling Elder Estella Taylor, and Ruling Elder Norita Chisolm, Appellees (Complainants), made and announced at San Antonio, TX this 4th day of May, 2014.

Dated this 4th day of May, 2014.

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 San Antonio, TX this 5th day of May, 2014.

John M. Griem, Jr., Committee of Counsel for Appellant (Respondent)
Trina Moore, Counsel for Appellees (Complainants)
Stated Clerk, Synod of the Northeast
Stated Clerk, Presbytery of New York City
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 C. Laurie Griffith, on May 4, 2014.

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 San Antonio, TX on May 4, 2014, in Remedial Case 221-08, The Presbytery of New York City, Appellant (Respondent) v. Ruling Elder Mildred McGee, Teaching Elder Flora Wilson Bridges, Ruling Elder Douglas Howard, Teaching Elder Lonnie Bryant, Ruling Elder Daniel Amiot Priso, Teaching Elder Phillip Newell, Ruling Elder Emmanuel Gouad Njayick, Teaching Elder George Todd, Ruling Elder Estella Taylor, and Ruling Elder Norita Chisolm, Appellees (Complainants) and that it is the final judgment of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) in the case.

Dated at San Antonio, TX on May 4, 2014.

C. Laurie Griffith
Manager of Judicial Process and Social Witness