

1 for the last time, there had been a request by another  
2 congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses that covered the  
3 Spanish territory. They wanted to begin meeting at the  
4 facility at 811 Bay Road. So they wanted to meet at  
5 that building, at that Kingdom Hall, at that facility.

6 They did not write a letter and request that  
7 from any of the Watchtower corporations in New York.  
8 Their request to New York would be, can we form a  
9 congregation, you know, and that's what happened in that  
10 case. But as far as can we meet at this building, their  
11 request came to us, which makes its own statement about  
12 property ownership and property control.

13 So that request came to us. I had a meeting  
14 with --

15 Q. Us as in?

16 A. The representatives of the Menlo Park  
17 congregation.

18 So the request was made informally initially to  
19 myself personally. It was Marco Espinosa, who is a  
20 member in the Spanish congregation, I think the Woodside  
21 Spanish Congregation. So he presented the idea of then  
22 beginning to -- or forming a new Spanish congregation  
23 that would meet at the Menlo Park Kingdom Hall at 811  
24 Bay Road.

25 So we had a round of discussions on the topic,

1 and then it was presented to the body of elders and  
2 directors and officers for consideration. The challenge  
3 at that point in time is that we were on the verge of  
4 losing off-street parking, that had been available to us  
5 for decades, as part of the renovation work that was  
6 occurring at the VA Hospital campus in Menlo Park. So  
7 the off-street parking that we had been able to use was  
8 changing.

9           There was a paved parking lot with a fence that  
10 we were able to use for a long time. They arbitrarily  
11 took that parking from us without any advance  
12 communication. They just locked it up. So we couldn't  
13 park there any more. So then we still had the unpaved  
14 parking areas on the west side of --

15           Q. Bay Road?

16           A. Bay Road that we could still use to park. But  
17 the conversation from the construction crew for the VA  
18 was that they were going to extend the border of -- the  
19 fenced border for the property and take that parking.

20           So that put us in a certain situation if we  
21 didn't have that parking to use, because the actual  
22 paved parking lot that is on the property premises for  
23 811 Bay Road only holds eight to ten cars. So that was  
24 one situation.

25           Another situation is, in parking on the street,

1 there was a growing problem with neighbors and residents  
2 that were complaining. Cars blocking their driveway,  
3 too close to their driveway, taking up street parking so  
4 their friends couldn't park there and so forth, and  
5 there were accusations of lawsuits. So it was kind of a  
6 hotbed of a situation at that moment.

7 I conveyed to them that we wanted to hold off,  
8 that we wouldn't be able to accommodate another group at  
9 that time. And that was not good news to them, and I  
10 think they were hurt by that and upset by that and  
11 offended by that, and they made the statement -- Marco  
12 Espinosa said, "Well, we're going to have to climb the  
13 ladder," and that was a reference that they would voice  
14 their complaints to representatives of the Watchtower  
15 Bible and Tract Society. I would assume Patterson, New  
16 York, Christian Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses.

17 And apparently they did, because after we  
18 declined the idea at that point in time, it was always,  
19 you know, pending review of the situation, determining  
20 what would happen with the VA, if we still had the  
21 parking or not. So once we declined, and they voiced  
22 their concerns, then Paul Koehler was dispatched to our  
23 area.

24 And the interesting thing about that is he was  
25 on an assignment in Cincinnati or somewhere in Ohio.

1 Typically the traveling advisors/overseers will fulfill  
2 an assignment three years. It can be two years, three  
3 years or four years, but usually on average it seems to  
4 be three years. So he was pulled from his current  
5 assignment early before completing the three-year cycle,  
6 and he was dispatched to come to our area on the  
7 Peninsula in California.

8 And right away he established a definite  
9 presence. He seemed hostile. He seemed upset. And it  
10 was strange to me, because the traveling advisors  
11 typically don't conduct themselves in that fashion.  
12 Very aggressive.

13 We did a walk through of our meeting facility,  
14 the Kingdom Hall, just, you know, showing him around and  
15 so forth, and at one point he pushed me. And that  
16 struck me as strange. To be clear, it wasn't a friendly  
17 gesture of manly banter, frivolity.

18 I'm not that sensitive, you know, and I've had  
19 other friends and individuals in the faith slap me on  
20 the back or on the shoulder, and you don't think  
21 anything of it and you go on.

22 But this was an actual punch basically into my  
23 shoulder, knocking me back, as he was making one of his  
24 points. So that was really strange.

25 Then he began talking about the Kingdom Hall,

1 the Kingdom Hall, the Kingdom Hall, what are we going to  
2 do with the Kingdom Hall. We need to remodel the  
3 Kingdom Hall. Maybe we need to sell the Kingdom Hall.  
4 We need to do all these things.

5 He appeared to have a very clear agenda, and I  
6 felt his posture and demeanor was directly the result of  
7 the interactions with the Spanish congregation that  
8 wanted to come and begin meeting at the facility and, I  
9 think, the direct result of their complaints back east.

10 So that was an interesting connection. And --

11 Q. When you say back east --

12 A. Yes. And when I say back east, I mean the  
13 Christian Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses,  
14 Patterson, New York. They had received the complaints,  
15 and they made the decision to bring Paul Koehler to our  
16 area.

17 So I just felt that that was a response of some  
18 kind to that situation. So that was the circumstances  
19 of his arrival. And from beginning to end it was all  
20 about the building and what to do with the building.  
21 And he exhibited an air as if he was in a position to  
22 make decisions about the building and whether we agreed  
23 or not. Almost arbitrary.

24 He invited himself to a meeting that was  
25 already planned one week after his visit. I mean, his

1 first visit was October 2008, first or second week,  
2 thereabouts. So after his visit with our  
3 congregation -- which is intended to primarily be an  
4 occasion for spiritual encouragement, spiritual  
5 enrichment, engaging in the preaching work, things of  
6 that nature. However, in his case it was really focused  
7 on the building and what was going to happen with the  
8 building.

9 So after his visit with our congregation, then  
10 he invited himself to the meeting that was already  
11 scheduled with the local Regional Building Committee #7,  
12 as chaired by Leonardo Trevino. The purpose of that  
13 meeting was to consider the modifications that would be  
14 made.

15 We had already initiated that dialogue, and the  
16 Regional Building Committee will typically assist local  
17 congregations in executing their renovation or  
18 remodeling plans. So it was a conversation on that  
19 basis. And I felt that Paul Koehler was there to sort  
20 of size everyone up. He didn't say a whole lot.

21 One thing that was interesting, before the  
22 meeting started, as he greeted Leonardo Trevino, he made  
23 it a real point to say, yes, we want to talk about what  
24 we're going to do with our Kingdom Hall and what we can  
25 do to bring the Spanish congregation to the Kingdom

1 Hall.

2           And when he said that, he looked right at me  
3 very intently, and it appeared he was making a real  
4 strong point. And that kind of helped me finish my  
5 assessment that his presence there was somehow pursuant  
6 to the situation with the Spanish congregation.

7           So anyway, long story short, he began to really  
8 take an active involvement in the plans. We presented a  
9 proposal, what would be done to the meeting facility.  
10 It was very modest, very basic.

11           And then the Regional Building Committee, or  
12 RBC, responded and proposed a more extensive renovation,  
13 well beyond our request, which from our standpoint did  
14 not align with organizational directives as found in the  
15 April 2nd, 2009, and April 6, 2009, letters to the  
16 bodies of elders in all congregations in the United  
17 States.

18           Those communications were outlining how the  
19 engagement would work between the congregations as  
20 represented by the elders and communicating with the  
21 Regional Building Committee and was really calling for  
22 sensible planning and being conservative with the work  
23 that was to be done.

24           It was speaking against full blown renovations  
25 when such really may not be called for. It was talking

1 about showing a regard for the down economy and not  
2 placing any undue burdens on congregation members. And  
3 that fell right in line with our thinking, you know.

4 And the congregation members had in many cases  
5 approached us, because they were afraid or concerned  
6 that the building project was going to put a burden on  
7 them. Many of them had lost jobs in the economy, as so  
8 many had, and we assured them. "Don't worry, we're  
9 going to do what needs to be done, be sensible and  
10 modest."

11 It's the members who provide the financing or  
12 take the lead in doing that, and as circumstances call  
13 for it, then there might be additional financing that  
14 might be obtained from the Christian Congregation of  
15 Jehovah's Witnesses. But the initial financing effort  
16 is really done at a local level according to policy.

17 So a long story short, we were having a  
18 difficulty reaching consensus as to the direction of the  
19 project. Paul Koehler had his point of view. It seemed  
20 as if he was influencing Leonardo Trevino and the other  
21 individuals on the RBC. Seemed that Paul Koehler was  
22 influencing the other congregation that shared the  
23 meeting facility as well, by our invitation, covering  
24 the Japanese territory. So, in general, Paul Koehler  
25 was dominating the proceedings to the exclusion really



1 of input from others.

2 Q. Was that in line with his responsibility and  
3 authority?

4 A. Well, as I understand it, as a lifelong member  
5 of our faith and certainly in reading clearly stated  
6 comments from the governing body of Jehovah's Witnesses  
7 and points that are published in our literature in  
8 letters and so forth, his behavior and attitude seemed  
9 like an aberration. It seemed to be at odds with what  
10 we had learned.

11 As far as the authority of a circuit overseer,  
12 many circuit overseers themselves, even past presidents  
13 of the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society, clearly  
14 stated they are advisors. That's what has been taught  
15 from the platform. The circuit overseer is an advisor.  
16 He will listen to matters and hear them and provide  
17 input, but he doesn't go around making decisions.

18 He will provide direction and advice, but he  
19 works with the body of elders, and there are instances  
20 where he will yield to the view of the elders. And  
21 then, you know, the elders may yield their position to  
22 him. But it's a collaborative process. It's not a  
23 dictatorship.

24 So it seemed in Paul Koehler's mind it was a  
25 dictatorship. I didn't see a basis for his attitude and

1 conduct in any of the printed directives from the  
2 governing body as provisioned through Jehovah's  
3 organization.

4 Q. How did the body of elders respond -- well,  
5 what was done?

6 A. Well, he offered a proposal. He came on the  
7 heels of the proposal for a complete renovation by the  
8 Regional Building Committee, which, you know, I think  
9 quadrupled our initial estimates of what we wanted to  
10 spend.

11 And so Paul Koehler then said, well, if you  
12 have the Spanish congregation start meeting here, they  
13 can help to carry the expense, and if we get South  
14 Redwood City congregation, which is where Ernest Brede  
15 and Don Showers and Larry Laverdure and Luis Contreras  
16 and all those individuals were attending, South Redwood  
17 City -- if we get them all here and altogether, that  
18 will provide a basis to cover all the expenses, and we  
19 can go ahead and move forward with the project.

20 The pressing concern that I had and that was  
21 shared by my fellow elders was that this whole effort  
22 and this whole dialogue seemed to be focused on one  
23 thing, the building. And he very much gave the  
24 impression that he wanted to commandeer the building,  
25 that he wanted to take the building, that he wanted to

1 wrest it from what he may have perceived as our control.

2 And I really again felt that was directly  
3 related to the fact that we weren't able to accommodate  
4 the addition of the Spanish congregation at their  
5 request prior to the arrival of Paul Koehler. So there  
6 evidently was some firm view that our thinking or that  
7 basically this building was desired, and that any steps  
8 would be taken to acquire it if -- by force if  
9 necessary.

10 So that was confusing to me and the other  
11 elders as well. And so the effort was made to initiate  
12 dialogue with the representatives at the Christian  
13 Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, advising them what  
14 had taken place. So a letter of concern was sent  
15 regarding Paul Koehler's behavior September 24th, 2009.

16 Q. Complaint?

17 A. Uh-huh. A complaint about his attitude, his  
18 speech, his behavior, the way he was dominating the  
19 proceedings, and just his -- the whole manner in which  
20 he presented himself.

21 Q. Do you feel that his demeanor was to be  
22 forceful, bully, take advantage in whatever way he  
23 could?

24 A. Without question. I mean he endeavored to be  
25 intimidating. He endeavored to dictate. He was very

1 military like. And that runs contrary to any number of  
2 comments and statements that have been made by the  
3 governing body of Jehovah's Witnesses.

4 They endeavor to imitate Jesus Christ, who was  
5 mild tempered and noble in heart, kind, loving. They  
6 exhibit those qualities themselves, and those are the  
7 qualities that they desire to be exhibited by any and  
8 all representatives of the Watchtower Bible and Tract  
9 Society or the Christian Congregation of Jehovah's  
10 Witnesses. So his whole attitude was out of step with  
11 that completely.

12 Q. Did he demonstrate that in any way, military --  
13 his enthusiasm for the military, what appeared to be?

14 A. Well, he spoke about the military. You know,  
15 he talked about the regimented life. He exhibited an  
16 excessively fast pace as we walked in the ministry. It  
17 was like he was leading the troops. You know, there  
18 were instances where he would give a salute.

19 And so, you know, the time that he spent in the  
20 military by his own accounting seemed to still influence  
21 his thinking and his actions and his behavior is how it  
22 came across to me, which was interesting.

23 Q. Did he have any proof that he was in the  
24 military that you saw? Was there any like a discharge  
25 card or something?

1           A. Oh, no. I -- I mean, there's been any number  
2 of individuals in our faith who used to be in the  
3 military, and so -- and you certainly expect individuals  
4 to present themselves honestly in our faith, in our  
5 organization. You just take it for granted that what a  
6 person is saying is true, that there's some basis.

7           So he presented himself as having been in the  
8 military. The very first time that he and I worked  
9 together in the ministry, I asked him a question about  
10 his background, and he shared with me his experiences  
11 and so forth. And so I just assumed that that was the  
12 truth.

13          Q. Are you aware of a report coming from the  
14 military that stated that they have no record of him  
15 ever have served in the military?

16          A. I have become aware of that, yes.

17          Q. And, of course, as you have mentioned, you  
18 haven't seen any proof that he was in the military.

19          A. No. I would readily believe he was based on  
20 how he presented himself and conducted himself, but, no,  
21 I certainly didn't ask for any credentials, and he  
22 didn't offer any.

23                 It seemed that it mattered to him somehow that  
24 he established that he had a background in the military,  
25 and maybe it was part of him building a certain

1 perception that he felt would be useful in his efforts  
2 to influence and in reality push people to do what he  
3 wanted.

4 Q. If it is that he was not in the military, then  
5 how would that make you feel about his credibility?

6 A. Well, not good. If he was one hundred percent  
7 truthful, I wouldn't feel very good about Paul Koehler.  
8 But if you add to his behavior and conduct the fact that  
9 he's being dishonest and intentionally, then that  
10 certainly wouldn't make me feel any better.

11 Q. Okay. Now let's move along. As you  
12 mentioned -- as you testified to, there was a complaint  
13 filed against Mr. Koehler.

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And where was that sent to?

16 A. That was sent to Christian Congregation of  
17 Jehovah's Witnesses in Patterson, New York. The service  
18 department typically fields that type of correspondence.

19 Q. And what was the response, if any, from them?

20 A. We received a letter of acknowledgment. It was  
21 basically three or four sentences. It was a letter of  
22 acknowledgment, doing just that, acknowledging our  
23 letter of complaint. The letter of acknowledgment was  
24 dated October 20th, 2009.

25 Q. And did Paul Koehler learn of the complaint

1 that was filed on him?

2 A. He did. Actually it was during -- I don't know  
3 if it was his second or third visit with us, and he was  
4 told. In fact, I told him directly that we had  
5 submitted a letter of complaint during the meeting.

6 Q. What appeared to be his overall response?

7 A. He appeared surprised and concerned.

8 Q. And can you put together a timetable of events  
9 that took place from the time that he received a letter  
10 or we received a letter from -- I should say the CEO  
11 received a letter from Patterson, Christian Congregation  
12 of Jehovah's Witnesses, and right after that? What were  
13 the events that transpired?

14 A. Well, as I mentioned, we sent a letter of  
15 complaint that was dated September 24th, 2009. We  
16 received an acknowledgment letter dated October 20th,  
17 2009. A cc of that letter was to the district overseer  
18 Charles Valorz, who is a fine, upstanding individual, a  
19 great example.

20 On January 18th, 2010, we received a letter  
21 from the branch office in Patterson, New York, directing  
22 us to send an S-21 card, which is -- you might think of  
23 it as a membership card or a profile card for each  
24 member of the congregation.

25 And so when a member moves from one

1 congregation to another, the membership card or the S-21  
2 card is sent along with the letter of introduction to  
3 the new congregation where they attend.

4           And so in this particular situation, we had a  
5 member of the congregation who lived in Menlo Park,  
6 which many cases will determine where a person attends,  
7 where they live. So she lived in Menlo Park. However,  
8 she had a job as a live-in caregiver, and that required  
9 her to spend a considerable part of the week in the  
10 Sonoma area as she handled her job. She would wrap up  
11 for the week and come home, and we would see her at the  
12 meetings in Menlo Park.

13           It was her personal desire to remain a member  
14 of the Menlo Park congregation. She expressed that to  
15 us on several occasions. She was emotionally attached  
16 to the congregation, she had encountered some  
17 difficulties, spiritually speaking, and she was helped  
18 to regain her footing spiritually.

19           And pursuant to that, she very much viewed  
20 Menlo Park as her home and said it always would be her  
21 home. So we didn't see any need to force her to  
22 transfer her membership to the other congregation in  
23 view of those facts. She still lived in Menlo Park, and  
24 the governing body has stated more than once that the  
25 decision as to which congregation that a person will



1 attend is to be made by the family heads.

2 So there's a traditional family; a husband,  
3 wife and children. In the beliefs of Jehovah's  
4 Witnesses, the father would be the family head. So the  
5 father would decide what congregation his family would  
6 attend. In the event of a single person who's not  
7 married -- well, obviously, they're a single person --  
8 they have their personal autonomy as a decision maker.  
9 So, in effect, they're the family head in a sense.

10 So it was this particular member's decision  
11 what congregation she would be a part of, and she  
12 verbalized that decision more than once, that she wanted  
13 it to be the Menlo Park congregation. And so we  
14 respected her wishes and also respected by extension the  
15 clearly stated views and directives of the governing  
16 body of Jehovah's Witnesses on that subject matter.

17 So the congregation that she would visit when  
18 she spent time in Sonoma wanted her to become a formal  
19 member of that congregation. Again, she restated to us  
20 she wanted to stay in Menlo Park, so we respected her  
21 wishes.

22 They began to -- the individuals from the  
23 congregation in Sonoma began to reach out to us and  
24 request that we send her card and so forth, and it was  
25 explained what her wishes were, and that's basically how

1 the situation remained.

2 So when we -- that was kind of a back drop or  
3 background for the event of January 18th, 2010. So on  
4 January 18th, 2010, we received a letter from the branch  
5 directing us to send the S-21 card to the congregation  
6 in Sonoma.

7 So we sent a response to that letter to the  
8 branch giving them the background information and the  
9 additional details in summation of what I've expressed  
10 here, so that they would have all the facts of what was  
11 occurring in this case, because we felt that they might  
12 have been viewing this as a regular situation where  
13 someone moves, and we just hadn't sent the card.

14 And we wanted them to understand that that  
15 member still lived in Menlo Park and still desired to  
16 remain part of the Menlo Park congregation. After  
17 having explained all that, we concluded the letter by  
18 saying, we'll follow -- we'll appreciate your direction  
19 on this matter. You know, we're happy to handle it  
20 however, not a problem.

21 So we did not get a response to that letter.  
22 Our letter was dated February 3rd, 2010, and that was to  
23 the branch providing the background information on the  
24 situation. And I think we had also sent a copy of it to  
25 the congregation in Sonoma, those elders.

1 Q. When you say the branch, you mean the Christian  
2 Congregation of --

3 A. Of Jehovah's Witnesses.

4 Q. At Patterson?

5 A. At Patterson, New York, yes.

6 So no response. We didn't get any response to  
7 our letter dated February 3rd, 2010.

8 February 27th, 2010, basically during that week  
9 of February 23rd through the 28th, was another visit of  
10 Paul Koehler, the circuit overseer, and he was joined by  
11 Steve Misterfeld, who was an acting or substitute  
12 district overseer. So we had an expectation it was just  
13 a normal regular visit.

14 However, it -- it became -- it suddenly became  
15 clear to us that Steve Misterfeld claimed to have been  
16 sent in an effort to investigate the basis of concern as  
17 regards us not complying with the directive to send the  
18 S-21 card or the membership card to the congregation in  
19 Sonoma.

20 So he presented to us that our actions, the  
21 elders in Menlo Park, those actions were being viewed as  
22 insubordinate, you know, not following the direction.

23 And so we engaged in a discussion to help Steve  
24 Misterfeld and Paul Koehler understand the  
25 circumstances, our basis of rationale and so forth, but

1 it really was perfunctory.

2 Steve Misterfeld already had it in his mind  
3 that we had done something wrong, and he was not  
4 listening or giving any consideration of what was being  
5 said. He was taking a real firm view, and he really  
6 appeared to be predisposed, and he appeared to have  
7 prejudged the matter.

8 And, again, we weren't even clear that we were  
9 in a position of judgment. We thought it was a  
10 conversation. But we began having the dialogue on  
11 February 27th, 2010. Or was it the 26th? Let me check  
12 my calendar.

13 So the visit was February 23rd through the  
14 28th, so we had the initial discussion with Steve  
15 Misterfeld and Paul Koehler on Friday, February 26,  
16 2010, that evening.

17 So during the course of that discussion, it  
18 became clear that a tribunal hearing of sorts was being  
19 conducted without any prior notice. It wasn't clear to  
20 us that that was going to take place. It also became  
21 clear that Paul Koehler was in essence sitting in  
22 judgment of us, despite the fact that we had already  
23 submitted a letter of complaint about him, and so that  
24 in a sense would probably have disqualified his  
25 participation as a judge in the matter.

1           He might have been able to serve as a witness  
2 perhaps, but he shouldn't have sat in judgment and  
3 contributed to any decision making on that occasion  
4 based on, again, any number of statements and directives  
5 made by the governing body of Jehovah's Witnesses as  
6 regards the importance of impartiality.

7           Q. Let me ask you. Was there any addressing of  
8 the complaint that was filed against Paul Koehler in  
9 around this time of his visit with the district  
10 overseer?

11           A. During that meeting that began on Friday,  
12 February 26, there was a point in the discussion where I  
13 believe Arlen St. Clair made a reference to the letter  
14 of complaint, inquiring as to, you know, what was the  
15 response to that, what was the situation, what's  
16 happening with Paul Koehler, and how is it that he's  
17 here sitting in judgment of us in that circumstance.

18           And the response from Steve Misterfeld very  
19 simply was he -- in reference to Paul Koehler, he didn't  
20 do anything wrong, and that's all he said. There wasn't  
21 any discussion of the details of our letter, the aspects  
22 of the complaint, the circumstances, the concerns.  
23 There was no discussion of it whatsoever, which is  
24 unusual. He flatly stated Paul Koehler did not do  
25 anything wrong.

1 Q. Let me take you back for a moment to Charles  
2 Valorz who was the district advisor at the same time  
3 Paul Koehler was there before he was reassigned to New  
4 York.

5 When he received his copy of the complaint,  
6 that was on that Saturday, must have been. Let's see.  
7 Twenty --

8 A. Yeah. The letter of complaint was dated  
9 September 24th, 2009. The formal dates of Paul  
10 Koehler's visit escape me at the moment.

11 Q. But he was there during the time that the  
12 letter was either sent or prior to it?

13 A. Yeah. Charles Valorz wasn't there in Menlo  
14 Park. Charles Valorz was staying at the designated  
15 residence for district overseers in Fremont, California,  
16 on Osgood Road, but he was stationed and on assignment  
17 in that area.

18 Q. So after he received his information on that  
19 Saturday -- I'm not sure when that was in relation to  
20 the complaint on Mr. Koehler being filed, I'm not sure  
21 where that is. But anyway of Mr. Koehler's visit.

22 A. Yeah. Mr. Koehler -- Brother Paul Koehler's  
23 visit would have been sometime after September 24th  
24 obviously, so without looking at my notes and records,  
25 his visit would have projected to be, you know, the week

1 of September 27th or perhaps the week of October 14th or  
2 maybe even October 13th.

3 But within three to four weeks or so of that  
4 letter having been sent to the branch in Patterson, New  
5 York, Paul Koehler was in Menlo Park conducting a visit,  
6 and that Friday of that visit he was advised by myself  
7 that we had submitted a letter of complaint pursuant to  
8 his behavior. That was Friday.

9 Q. Friday.

10 A. I saw him the next day on Saturday as we  
11 gathered to meet for our ministry.

12 On Sunday morning I was advised that Paul  
13 Koehler -- that his wife had taken ill, and he would not  
14 be in attendance at the meeting on that day. Now I  
15 can't say for sure about the underlying circumstances,  
16 but my impression and that of other observers is that --  
17 who were in the know about the letter of complaint,  
18 basically the other elders' impression was that that  
19 letter of complaint was a factor in Paul Koehler not  
20 being in attendance at the final meeting of his visit.

21 And what I'm getting at is it seemed to me as  
22 if that letter, which had also been sent to Charles  
23 Valorz, accounted for Paul Koehler not being in  
24 attendance pursuant to a basis of inquiry and  
25 potentially, you know -- well, inquiry that might have

1 become a disciplinary matter.

2           Anyway, he wasn't there, and Woodhams -- I  
3 can't think of his first name.

4           Q. Ken Woodhams?

5           A. Ken Woodhams, who was a substitute -- you might  
6 think of him as a back-up quarterback. Ken Woodhams was  
7 told to come in the place of Paul Koehler, conduct the  
8 meeting and finish the week.

9           Q. From what you know or what you have surmised  
10 about Paul Koehler up until that point, would he be  
11 inclined to miss a meeting like that?

12           A. No. No. Based on my observations, especially  
13 in view of the scenario where, if his wife is ill, yes,  
14 it's within the realm of possibility that he would stay  
15 home and care for her. But he had a letter read to the  
16 congregation that Sunday, and, again, forgive me, I  
17 don't know the exact date. I believe it was early  
18 October that this was all happening, 2009.

19           But he had a letter read to the congregation  
20 that she was not well, she was home, and that they had  
21 someone come to the residence to provide care for her, a  
22 house call basically. And that kind of caused me to  
23 feel, if there was someone, you know, that he trusted  
24 that was there to provide the care for his wife, that  
25 would have given him the basis to be at the meeting.



1           So it made it even more strange that he wasn't  
2 at the meeting under that circumstance.

3           Q.   So what do you believe in relation to that, the  
4 fact that he did not show up?

5           A.   My perception of the situation and my belief is  
6 that the letter called out some serious points of  
7 concern regarding Paul Koehler, and those concerns  
8 resonated with someone.  Whether it was someone at the  
9 branch who initiated him being sat down, if you will, or  
10 if it was Charles Valorz who took it upon himself to do  
11 that, I don't know, and I'm sure I never will know the  
12 answer to that question.

13           But I feel that the points in the letter  
14 contributed toward his absence on that occasion.

15           Q.   Okay.  So now from that particular juncture,  
16 what was the next event that took place where -- where  
17 Mr. Koehler and Mr. Misterfeld visited the congregation?

18           A.   Right.  So with the narration we just had about  
19 him staying home and missing the visit and his wife and  
20 so forth -- again, that was around October 2009, maybe  
21 first or second week that that happened.  He usually  
22 came around in October.

23           So after that visit ended, you know, we  
24 continued to wait for any type of response to our letter  
25 of complaint dated September 24th, '09, and we