## COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

CHURCH UNIVERSAL & TRIUMPHANT, INC., A MONTANA CORPORATION,

PLAINTIFF, CROSS-DEFENDANT AND APPELLANT;

ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET,

CROSS-DEFENDANT AND APPELLANT,)

VS.

SUPERIOR COURT NO. C 358191

GREGORY MULL,

DEFENDANT, CROSS-COMPLAINANT AND RESPONDENT.

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

HONORABLE ALFRED L. MARGOLIS, JUDGE PRESIDING

REPORTERS' TRANSCRIPT ON APPEAL

## APPEAR ANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF, CROSS-DEFENDANTS AND APPELLANTS:

FOR THE DEFENDANT, CROSS-COMPLAINANT AND RESPONDENT:

COPY

VOLUME 10 OF 12 VOLUMES PAGES 2142 TO 2292, INCL.

RIORDAN & MC KINZIE
300 SOUTH GRAND AVENUE, SUITE 2900
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071
TELEPHONE: (213) 629-4824

LAWRENCE LEVY, ESQ. 14724 VENTURA BOULEVARD, SUITE 704 SHERMAN OAKS, CALIFORNIA 91403 (818) 905-5971

**-AND-**

LYLE FRANCIS MIDDLETON, ESQ. 2500 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 810 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90057 (213) 381-2277

KATHLEEN H. ADAMS, CSR #2853 - BRIDGET F. GEORGE, CSR #6148 CELESTE HALE, CSR #1310 ERMA DE MAR, CSR #2117 OFFICIAL REPORTERS

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 1986 \* 1 9:40 A.M. 2 HON. ALFRED L. MARGOLIS, JUDGE DEPARTMENT 50 3 (APPEARANCES AS HERETOFORE NOTED.) . 4 5 THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYBODY. 6 7 GRACE MC GUIRE, + 8 THE WITNESS ON THE STAND AT THE TIME OF ADJOURNMENT, RESUMES 9 THE STAND AND TESTIFIES FURTHER AS FOLLOWS: 10 THE CLERK: MA 'AM, YOU HAVE PREVIOUSLY BEEN SWORN AND 11 ARE STILL UNDER OATH. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AGAIN FOR THE 12 13 RECORD. THE WITHESS: MY NAME IS GRACE MC GUIRE. 14 THE CLERK: THANK YOU. 15 THE COURT: PLEASE PROCEED. 16 MR. LEVY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 17 18 CROSS-EXAMINATION + (RESUMED) 19 20 BY MR. LEVY: MISS MC GUIRE, WHEN YOU WERE IN THE SAN 21 FRANCISCO OR REDWOOD CITY AREA, DID YOU EVER VISIT THE 22 TEACHING CENTER IN SAN FRANCISCO? 23 YES, I HAVE. 24 Α ARE YOU AWARE OF THE RULES AT THE TEACHING 25 0 2€ CENTERS? NOT ALL OF THE RULES. 27 Α WELL, WHEN YOU VISITED, DID YOU GET A COPY OF 28 Q

THE RULES? 1 NO, I DID NOT. Α 2 WERE THEY POSTED AT THE TEACHING CENTER? Q 3 I HAVE NEVER OBSERVED THEM. SO YOU WENT TO THE TEACHING CENTER AND YOU HAVE 5 NO IDEA WHAT THE RULES FOR TEACHING CENTERS ARE? 6 1 ATTENDED SERVICES AT THE TEACHING CENTER. I 7 DID NOT LIVE AT THE TEACHING CENTER. 8 DO YOU KNOW OF ANY RULES WITH REGARDS TO 9 DECREES AT THE TEACHING CENTERS? 10 NO, I DON'T. 11 I THINK YOU TESTIFIED YESTERDAY THAT -- MAYBE I 12 AM INCORRECT, SO LET ME ASK YOU TODAY. 13 WHAT ARE DECREES? 14 DECREE IS A COMMAND TO GOD ACCORDING TO THE 15 WILL OF GOD. YOU ASK THAT THAT CALL OR THAT COMMAND BE 16 ADJUSTED, SPOKEN OUT LOUD. 17 IN YOUR CHURCH, IS A DECREE SOMEWHAT LIKE A 31 PRAYER? 19 A YES, SIMILAR TO A PRAYER. 20 ARE THEY DANGEROUS TO DO DECREES? 21 Α NO, THEY ARE NOT. 22 LET ME SHOW YOU WHAT IS MARKED AS EXHIBIT 23 NUMBER 5. THIS IS THE ADDENDUM TO THE HOUSE RULES FOR THE 24 TEACHING CENTER IN SAN FRANCISCO. 25 IF YOU EXAMINE THAT DOCUMENT, YOU WILL SEE 26 THERE IS A PORTION THAT IS UNDERLINED. THE UNDERLINED 27 PORTION INSTRUCTS YOU NOT TO DECREE AROUND PEOPLE WHO APPEAR 28

TO BE UPSET. IT SAYS IT CAN BE EXTREMELY DANGEROUS TO DO 1 2 SO. CAN YOU EXPLAIN TO US WHY IT IS DANGEROUS TO 3 Ą DECREE? MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. THE 5 WITNESS SAID SHE HADN'T SEEN THOSE RULES AND SHE DIDN'T 6 THINK IT WAS DANGEROUS TO DECREE. 7 8 THE COURT: SHE CAN ANSWER. THE WITNESS: I AM NOT FAMILIAR WITH THIS -- THIS 9 10 MEMO. BY MR. LEVY: WHY DON'T YOU TAKE A MOMENT OR 11 Q TWO TO READ IT. 12 HAVE YOU HAD TIME TO READ IT? 13 14 Α YES, I HAVE. CAN YOU TELL US NOW WHY THERE IS A POSSIBILITY 15 THAT DECREEING OR PRAYING, AS YOU DESCRIBE IT, CAN BE 16 17 DANGEROUS? A I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT DECREEING OR PRAYING CAN 18 BE DANGEROUS. 19 WOULD YOU CHARACTERIZE YOURSELF AS A LOYAL 20 Q MEMBER OF THE CHURCH? 21 22 YES, I AM. Α YOU TOLD US YESTERDAY YOUR DAUGHTER'S NAME WAS 23 Q 24 KIRSTEN? 25 KEIRSTEN. Α WHAT IS YOUR SON'S NAME? 26 Q COLIN. 27 A COLIN. DID THERE COME A TIME IN 1979 WHEN 28 Q

COLIN LEFT CAMELOT? 1 HE LEFT FOR THE SUMMER. 2 HOW OLD WAS COLIN AT THAT TIME? 3 TWELVE YEARS OLD. WENT HOME FOR THE SUMMER TO SEE HIS FATHER. 5 WAS THERE A TIME WHEN YOUR SON WAS FOUND TAKING 6 Q DOWN THE UNDERWEAR OF ONE OF ELIZABETH'S CHILDREN; AND AS A 7 RESULT, ELIZABETH BANNED HIM FROM THE CHURCH; AND OUT OF 8 LOYALTY FOR THE CHURCH, YOU STAYED WITH THE CHURCH AND LET 9 YOUR SON BE SENT AWAY? 10 THAT IS NOT -- THAT IS NOT TRUE. COLIN WAS 11 DISCIPLINED FOR AN INCIDENT WITH ONE OF MOTHER'S CHILDREN, 12 THAT IS CORRECT. HE WAS SENT HOME FOR THE SUMMER AS HIS 13 DISCIPLINE TO THINK ABOUT WHAT HE HAD DONE BECAUSE IT WASH'T 14 CORRECT. HE THOUGHT ABOUT IT. AT THE END OF THE SUMMER, HE 15 CAME BACK AND WENT TO SCHOOL TO MONTESSORT FOR ANOTHER YEAR. 16 HOW OLD WAS HE AT THAT TIME? 17 HE WAS 12 YEARS OLD. I FELT IT WAS APPROPRIATE 31 DISCIPLINE. I WENT ALONG WITH IT. IT WAS ALSO AT THE SAME 19 TIME THAT HE WENT TO VISIT HIS FATHER FOR THE SUMMER EVERY 20 YEAR. MY DAUGHTER ALSO WENT HOME FOR THE SUMMER. 21 WAS THAT THE SAME YEAR YOUR DAUGHTER DECIDED 22 Q SHE DIDN'T LIKE IT AT THE CHURCH ANYMORE? 23 NO. SHE WAS THERE FOR ANOTHER TWO YEARS. 24 YOUR LOYALTY IS RATHER TO THE CHURCH, THAT IS 25 YOUR PRIMARY IMPORTANCE --26 THAT IS NOT NOT --27 -- RATHER THAN TO YOUR CHILDREN; IS THAT 28 Q

CORRECT? THAT IS NOT CORRECT. 2 MR. LEVY: NOTHING FURTHER, YOUR HONOR. 3 4 REDIRECT EXAMINATION + 5 б BY MR. KLEIN: YOU CURRENTLY LIVE WITH YOUR DAUGHTER? 7 Q YES, I DO. Α 8 YOU WERE ASKED BY MR. LEVY ABOUT THE WORD 9 "CHELA." THE AMERICAN COLLEGE DICTIONARY DEFINES CHELA AS 10 FIRST, "A NIPPERLIKE ORGAN OR CLAW TERMINATING CERTAIN LIMES 11 OF" --12 THE COURT: IS THIS GOING TO BE A QUESTION? 13 MR. KLEIN: YES, YOUR HONOR. 14 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 15 BY MR. KLEIN: WHEN YOU USED THE WORD, DID YOU 16 MEAN IT AS A CLAW? 17 NO, I DID NOT. 18 A THE SECOND MEANING IS, "A DISCIPLE OF A 19 RELIGIOUS TEACHER." 20 WHEN YOU USED THE WORD "CHELA," DID YOU MEAN TO 21 USE IT LIKE THAT? 22 23 Α YES, I DID. NOW, WITH RESPECT TO THAT SQUARE DANCE 24 INCIDENT, YOU SAID PEOPLE WALKED BY DURING THE TIME THAT MR. 25 FRANCIS WAS TALKING TO MR. MULL? 26 YES. 27 MR. LEVY: I AM GOING TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. THAT 28

\_\_\_\_

MISCHARACTERIZES THE TESTIMONY. THIS WITNESS SPECIFICALLY SAID NOBODY WALKED BY. THERE WERE A NUMBER OF CARS THAT DROVE BY.

THE COURT: PLEASE REPHRASE YOUR QUESTION.

- Q BY MR. KLEIN: DID ANYBODY WALK BY DURING THE TIME MR. FRANCIS WAS TALKING TO MR. MULL?
  - A YES.
  - Q AND DESCRIBE WHAT -- WHO WERE WALKING BY?
- A THOSE THAT I NOTICED WALKING BY WERE LADIES
  FROM THE STAFF FROM GRAPHICS DEPARTMENT WHO WALKED BY,
  PERHAPS ONE OR TWO GENTLEMEN WHO WALKED BY ON THEIR WAY TO
  THE CAFETERIA OF THE SQUARE DANCE. THEY WALKED AND LOOKED
  AND CONTINUED ON. NO ONE STOPPED.
- Q IF ANY GROUP OF MEN WOULD HAVE STOPPED AND STATIONED THEMSELVES IN THE ROAD WHERE MR. FRANCIS AND MR. MULL WERE, WOULD THERE HAVE BEEN ANY WAY THAT YOU WOULD NOT HAVE SEEN THAT?
- MR. LEVY: I AM GOING TO OBJECT AT THIS POINT. THAT

  IS ANOTHER MISCHARACTERIZATION. THIS WITNESS TESTIFIED

  THAT --

THE COURT: JUST STATE THE GROUNDS, PLEASE.

MR. LEVY: MISCHARACTERIZATION OF TESTIMONY.

THE COURT: SUSTAINED. ALSO ASKED FOR A CONCLUSION.

Q BY MR. KLEIN: DURING THE TIME THAT YOU WERE
THERE, DID YOU EVER SEE ANY GROUP OF MEN MOVE INTO THE
VICINITY OF THE AREA WHERE MR. FRANCIS AND MR. MULL WERE AND
BLOCKED THE ROAD?

A NO.

DID YOU SEE ANY GROUP OF MEN IN THE VICINITY AT 1 Q ALL OTHER THAN WHAT YOU HAVE DESCRIBED? 2 NOT AT ALL. Α 3 MR. KLEIN: I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS. ģ MR. LEVY: NOTHING FURTHER, YOUR HONOR. 5 THE COURT: YOU ARE EXCUSED. 6 MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, WE WOULD CALL MR. EDWARD 7 FRANCIS. 8 9 EDWARD L. FRANCIS, + 10 A CROSS-DEFENDANT HEREIN, CALLED AS A WITNESS ON HIS OWN 11 BEHALF, HAVING BEEN FIRST DULY SWORN, TESTIFIES AS FOLLOWS: 12 THE CLERK: PLEASE BE SEATED. STATE YOUR NAME FOR 13 THE RECORD AND PLEASE SPELL YOUR NAME. 14 THE WITNESS: MY NAME IS EDWARD L. FRANCIS. 15 E-D-W-A-R-D, F-R-A-N-C-I-S. 16 THE CLERK: THANK YOU. 17 THE COURT: PROCEED. 18 MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 19 20 DIRECT EXAMINATION + 21 BY MR. KLEIN: 22 MR. FRANCIS, WHAT IS YOUR EDUCATIONAL 23 BACKGROUND? 24 I HAVE THREE AND A HALF YEARS OF UNDERGRADUATE 25 STUDY AT COLORADO COLLEGE AND THE UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO. 26 AND I HAVE -- I ATTENDED THREE AND A HALF YEARS OF LAW 27 SCHOOL AT NIGHT SCHOOL AT WHITTIER COLLEGE HERE IN LOS 28

ANGELES. 1 DID YOU RECEIVE A DEGREE FROM EITHER OF THOSE 2 Q SCHOOLS? 3 Α NO. ARE YOU CURRENTLY AFFILIATED WITH CHURCH Q 5 UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT? 6 7 YES. WHAT IS THE NATURE OF YOUR AFFILIATION? 8 Q I AM A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS. I AM 9 THE VICE PRESIDENT, THE CORPORATE SECRETARY AND THE BUSINESS 10 MANAGER OF THE CHURCH. 11 HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN AFFILIATED WITH CHURCH 12 UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT? 13 SINCE ABOUT 1970, ABOUT THE MIDDLE OF 1970. 14 WITH RESPECT TO YOUR POSITION AS CORPORATE 15 SECRETARY, WHEN DID YOU FIRST OBTAIN THAT POSITION? 16 Α 1976. 17 AND WHAT ARE YOUR DUTIES AS CORPORATE Q 31 19 SECRETARY? THE DUTIES OF THE CORPORATE SECRETARY ARE TO 20 KEEP THE MINUTES AND RECORDS OF DECISIONS OF THE BOARD OF 21 DIRECTORS, AND TO ATTEND MEETINGS OF THE BOARD TO KEEP THOSE 22 RECORDS, TO KEEP CUSTODY AND CONTROL OF THE MINUTES BOOK AND 23 THE CORPORATE SEAL OF THE CHURCH AND TO ATTEST DOCUMENTS AS 24 DIRECTED BY THE BOARD. 25 HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN A MEMBER OF THE BOARD? 26 Q I BECAME A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF THE CHURCH IN 27 1976, AND PRIOR TO THAT OF THE SUMMIT LIGHTHOUSE IN 1972. 28

WHAT ARE YOUR GENERAL DUTIES AS A MEMBER OF THE 0 1 2 BOARD? MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTOR'S PRIMARY DUTY 3 IS TO ATTEND THE MEETINGS OF THE BOARD, AND TO PARTICIPATE 4 IN THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS OF THE CHURCH AND MANAGING 5 THE AFFAIRS OF THE CHURCH FROM A LEGAL STANDPOINT, A 6 7 BUSINESS STANDPOINT. HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN BUSINESS MANAGER? 8 Q 1976. 9 Α WHAT ARE YOUR DUTIES AS BUSINESS MANAGER? 10 0 AS BUSINESS MANAGER, THE MAIN DUTIES INCLUDE 11 OVERSEEING MAJOR FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS, PURCHASES, LEASES 12 AND SALES OF PROPERTY, CONTRACTS, MAJOR CONTRACTS AND 13 PURCHASES, AND COPYRIGHT AND TRADEMARK PROTECTION, 14 REGISTRATIONS, THAT KIND OF THING. 15 HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN VICE PRESIDENT OF THE 16 17 CHUR CH? SINCE 1976. 18 WHAT ARE YOUR DUTIES AS VICE PRESIDENT? 0 19 THE DUTY OF THE VICE PRESIDENT IS TO ACT IN THE 20 PLACE OF THE PRESIDENT WHEN THE PRESIDENT IS UNAVAILABLE OR 21 TO ACT OTHERWISE AS DIRECTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS ON 22 THE BASIS OF A BOARD DIRECTIVE. 23 ARE YOU RELATED TO ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET? 24 Q YES. 25 WHAT IS THE NATURE OF THAT RELATIONSHIP? 26 0 SHE IS MY WIFE. 27 WHEN WERE YOU MARRIED? 28 Q

| - 1 |              |   |
|-----|--------------|---|
| 1   | A            | 1981.   |
| 2   | Q            | DO YOU KNOW MR. MULL?                           |
| 3   | A            | YES.  |
| 4   | Q            | HOW LONG HAVE YOU KNOWN HIM?                    |
| 5   | A            | SINCE 1975.                                     |
| 6   | Q            | TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, DID THE CHURCH EVER LEND ANY |
| 7   | MONEY TO MR. | MULL?   |
| 8   | А            | YES, WE DID.                                    |
| 9   | Q            | APPROXIMATELY HOW MUCH?                         |
| 10  | A            | THIRTY-SEVEN THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED AND SOME     |
| 11  | DOLLARS.     |   |
| 12  | Q            | DID YOU EVER HAVE ANY CONVERSATIONS WITH MR.    |
| 13  | MULL WITH RE | SPECT TO THAT MONEY?                            |
| 14  | A            | YES, I DID.                                     |
| 15  | Q            | WHEN WAS THE FIRST CONVERSATION YOU HAD WITH    |
| 16  | MR. MULL WIT | H RESPECT TO THE MONEY THE CHURCH LOANED HIM?   |
| 17  | A            | THE FIRST CONVERSATION I HAD WITH MR. MULL      |
| 18  | CONCERNING T | HE MONEY WAS IN THE SPRING OF 1979.             |
| 19  | Q            | DO YOU RECALL WHO WAS PRESENT?                  |
| 20  | А            | JUST MYSELF AND HIM TO MY RECOLLECTION.         |
| 21  | Q            | AS BEST YOU CAN RECALL, WHAT DID YOU SAY AND    |
| 22  | WHAT DID HE  | SAY AT THAT CONVERSATION?                       |
| 23  | A            | WELL, PRIOR TO THAT TIME, THE BOARD HAD         |
| 24  | APPROVED LOA | NING HIM A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF FUNDS TO MEET HIS  |
| 25  | EXPENSES. A  | AND I HAD THE CHECK IN MY POSSESSION AND ASKED  |
| 26  | HIM TO COME  | TO MY OFFICE TO PICK UP THE CHECK.              |
| 27  |              | WHEN HE CAME THERE, I TOLD HIM THAT I WOULD     |
| 28  | LIKE TO CONF | FIRM WITH HIM THAT THE MONEY BEING GIVEN TO HIM |
|     | 1            |   |

WAS A LOAN, THAT IT WAS TO BE REPAID FROM THE SALE OF HIS 1 PROPERTY. AND HE ANSWERED THAT THAT WAS HIS UNDERSTANDING 2 AND THAT WAS THE BASIS UPON WHICH HE WAS ACCEPTING THE 3 MONEY. 4 AND THE BULK OF THE CONVERSATION CONCERNED WHAT 5 HE WAS DOING TO PUT HIS PROPERTY ON THE MARKET, WHAT HE WAS 6 GOING TO DO TO SELL IT, WHAT THE TIME TABLE WAS, ET CETERA. 7 THIS OCCURRED IN THE SPRING OF '79 AFTER HE HAD 8 ALREADY MOVED TO CAMELOT, THIS CONVERSATION? 9 THIS IS CORRECT. 10 WHY DID YOU FEEL A NEED TO CONFIRM WITH HIM THE 11 THINGS THAT YOU JUST MENTIONED? 12 WELL, I HAD NEVER TALKED TO HIM BEFORE 13 REGARDING THIS PARTICULAR SITUATION. AND THE EXECUTIVE 14 COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD, WHEN IT HAD AGREED TO LOAN HIM THE 15 MONEY, INFORMED HIM THAT HE SHOULD CONTACT ME REGARDING WHAT 16 HE WAS DOING TO SELL HIS PROPERTY. AND THIS WAS BASICALLY 17 THE FIRST OPPORTUNITY I HAD TO TALK TO HIM ABOUT IT. 18 WAS THERE ANOTHER CONVERSATION BETWEEN YOU AND 19 Q MR. MULL ABOUT THE MONEY THE CHURCH LOANED HIM? 20 YES. 21 Α APPROXIMATELY WHEN DID THAT OCCUR? 22 THIS WOULD HAVE BEEN LATE SPRING OR SOMETIME IN 23 THE SUMMER, 1979. 24 WHO WAS PRESENT? 0 25 JUST ME AND HIM TO MY RECOLLECTION. Α 26 AS BEST YOU CAN RECALL, WHAT WAS SAID? 27 Q I ASKED HIM TO COME TO MY OFFICE TO GIVE HIM 28

ANOTHER CHECK. I BASICALLY USED THE SEVERAL OCCASIONS OF GIVING HIM A CHECK TO INQUIRE ABOUT WHAT HE WAS DOING ON THE SALE OF HIS PROPERTY. AND I INQUIRED ABOUT IT AGAIN.

AND AT THAT MEETING HE INFORMED ME THAT HE THOUGHT THAT HE HAD IT SOLD. HE THOUGHT THAT HE WAS VERY CLOSE TO HAVING IT SOLD. HE TOLD ME THINGS THAT HE WAS DOING TO WORK ON SELLING THE PROPERTY, WHICH INCLUDED FIXING IT UP AND MAKING IT PRESENTABLE FOR PEOPLE TO COME LOOK AT IT.

HE WAS HAVING OPEN HOUSES, HE AND HIS DAUGHTER,
ON THE WEEKEND AND HE HAD SEVERAL PROSPECTS AND BASICALLY
THOUGHT HE HAD IT SOLD.

Q DID THERE COME A TIME WHEN YOU HAD ANOTHER

CONVERSATION -- DID THERE COME A TIME WHEN YOU HAD ANOTHER

CONVERSATION WITH MR. MULL WITH RESPECT TO THE MONEY THE

CHURCH LOANED HIM?

A YES.

Q WHEN WAS THAT?

A SEPTEMBER, MIDDLE TO END OF SEPTEMBER, 1979.

O WHO WAS PRESENT AT THAT CONVERSATION?

A MYSELF, MONROE SHEARER, MR. MULL AND I BELIEVE JIM MC CAFFREY.

Q AS BEST YOU CAN RECALL, WHAT WAS SAID AT THAT MEETING?

A OKAY. WE ASKED MR. MULL TO COME TO AN INFORMAL MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, WHICH WAS MYSELF, MONROE AND JIM MC CAFFREY, AND INQUIRED OF HIM ABOUT AGAIN WHAT WAS BEING DONE ABOUT THE SALE OF HIS PROPERTY IN RESPONSE TO A

REQUEST THAT HE HAD MADE IN SEPTEMBER FOR LOANING HIM MORE

THOUGHT THAT THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT WAS BEING LOANED TO HIM WAS GETTING EXTREMELY LARGE. AND ONE OF THE POINTS THAT WAS RAISED WAS THAT THE AMOUNTS PER MONTH WERE MUCH LARGER THAN WHAT WE HAD EXPECTED OR WHAT HE HAD LED US TO BELIEVE WE FELT. WE HAD EXPECTED ABOUT 2,000 A MONTH AND IT WAS REALLY AVERAGING ABOUT 4,000 A MONTH OR MAYBE EVEN A LITTLE BIT MORE.

AND WE TOLD HIM THE AMOUNT HAD GROWN -- THE TOTAL AMOUNT HAD GROWN MUCH LARGER THAN WHAT WE HAD EVER EXPECTED, AND THAT WE FELT THAT WE COULDN'T CONTINUE TO ADVANCE HIM THESE FUNDS WITHOUT HAVING THE AGREEMENT DOCUMENTED AND THE LOAN TRANSACTION DOCUMENTED.

SO THEREFORE WE TOLD HIM IF HE -- HE WANTED TO

GO -- WE WERE WILLING TO LOAN HIM THE MONEY THAT MONTH. BUT

IF HE WANTED TO GO THROUGH WITH IT, WE HAD TO HAVE A

PROMISSORY NOTE FROM HIM TO DOCUMENT IT.

HE WANTED TO KNOW WHY WE COULDN'T TRUST HIM AT HIS WORD TO REPAY THE MONEY AS HE PROMISED AND WE TOLD HIM WE DID PROMISE HIM, BUT WE FELT THAT WE HAD TO HAVE SOMETHING FOR OUR RECORDS. WE JUST DIDN'T FEEL WE COULD ADVANCE UNDOCUMENTED MONIES IN THIS FASHION IN THE EVENT WE WERE AUDITED OR INVESTIGATED PERHAPS EVEN BY THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE IN AN AUDIT. THESE THINGS ARE SUPPOSED TO BE DOCUMENTED.

SO HE SEEMED AGREEABLE TO THAT AFTER THAT

б

EXPLANATION. THERE WAS ALSO SOME QUESTION ON HIS PART OVER THE INTEREST. HE WANTED TO KNOW WHY WE SHOULD CHARGE INTEREST.

AND I EXPLAINED TO HIM THAT THERE WERE

REQUIREMENTS BY THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE FOR LOAN

TRANSACTIONS TO CHARGE A MINIMUM RATE OF INTEREST. AND AT

THAT TIME THE MINIMUM LEGAL RATE WAS SEVEN PERCENT AND THAT

THAT IS WHY WE HAD CHOSEN THAT AMOUNT.

THAT IF HE WOULD MEET WITH MICHAEL ERLICH, WHO WAS A PERSON WHO WORKED IN THE BUSINESS OFFICE AT THAT TIME, AND GET A NOTE DRAWN UP AND SIGN IT FOR ALL THE MONEY LOANED UP TO THAT DATE, THEN WE WOULD GIVE HIM HIS LOAN FOR SEPTEMBER.

WE ALSO INFORMED HIM THAT THE LOANS COULDN'T
KEEP GOING ON FOR A MUCH LONGER PERIOD OF TIME. AND HE WAS
VERY CONFIDENT THAT HE WAS GOING TO HAVE HIS PROPERTY SOLD
AT THAT TIME ALSO.

SO WE TOLD HIM WE WOULD GO ANOTHER MONTH, BUT THAT HE SHOULD START PLANNING ON OPENING HIS PRIVATE PRACTICE AND FINDING CLIENTS AND BEING PREPARED TO SUPPORT HIMSELF.

- Q DID THERE COME A TIME YOU HAD ANOTHER

  CONVERSATION WITH MR. MULL ABOUT THE MONEY LOANED TO HIM BY

  THE CHURCH?
  - A YES. IN OCTOBER OF '79.
- Q AS BEST YOU CAN RECALL, WHAT WAS SAID AT THAT MEETING?
  - A IT WAS A FAIRLY SHORT MEETING. MYSELF, MR.

MULL AND MONROE. I DON'T KNOW IF JIM WAS PRESENT.

HE HAD REQUESTED ANOTHER LOAN FOR THAT MONTH,

AND WE TOLD HIM THAT WE WOULD GIVE HIM THE LOAN FOR THAT

MONTH PROVIDED HE SIGNED A PROMISSORY NOTE AS BEFORE. AND

THAT PURSUANT TO THE PREVIOUS DISCUSSION, THAT THIS WOULD BE

THE LAST LOAN THAT WE COULD GIVE HIM AND THAT WE THOUGHT HE

SHOULD PREPARE TO TAKE WHATEVER STEPS WERE NECESSARY TO

SUPPORT HIMSELF.

Q WHAT, IF ANYTHING, DID HE SAY? DO YOU RECALL?

HE SAID HE WAS PREPARED TO DO THAT. AND THAT
HE ALSO FELT AGAIN THAT HE HAD A VERY SOLID PROSPECT TO SELL
HIS HOUSE AND EXPECTED TO CLOSE IT WITHIN A COUPLE OF
MONTHS. AND HE DIDN'T FEEL IT WOULD BE A BIG PROBLEM.

Q WAS THERE ANY DISCUSSION AS TO HOW MR. MULL WOULD SUPPORT HIMSELF ONCE THE LOANS WERE DISCONTINUED?

- A YES, THERE WAS.
- Q WHAT WAS SAID?

A HE TALKED ABOUT PUTTING AN AD IN THE NEWSPAPER AND CONTACTING PREVIOUS CLIENTS OF HIS FOR REFERRALS TO GET SOME ARCHITECTURAL JOBS.

Q DID YOU HAVE ANY OTHER CONVERSATIONS WITH MR. MULL ABOUT THE MONEY LOANED TO HIM BY THE CHURCH?

- A YES.
- Q WHEN WAS THE NEXT ONE?
- A LATE APRIL OR EARLY MAY, 1980.
- Q WHO WAS PRESENT?
- A MYSELF, MR. MULL, MONROE SHEARER AND I BELIEVE JIM MC CAFFREY.

Q AS BEST YOU CAN RECALL, WHAT WAS SAID AT THAT MEETING?

A MR. MULL HAD WRITTEN US A LETTER IN APRIL, LATE IN APRIL, AND HAD ASKED THAT WE ACCEPT A \$10,000 PAYMENT AS FULL PAYMENT OF THE ENTIRE LOANS THAT HAD BEEN GIVEN HIM AND THAT WE WAIVE THE BALANCE OF THE LOANS, WHICH AT THAT TIME IT THINK TOTALED OVER \$37,000.

HE SAID THAT HE HAD SOLD HIS HOUSE IN SAN
FRANCISCO FOR I BELIEVE 199,000, AND THAT HE HADN'T CLEARED
ENOUGH MONEY TO BE ABLE TO PAY THE FULL AMOUNT OF THE LOAN
AND THAT THIS WAS ALL THAT HE COULD PAY.

Q THIS BEING \$10,000?

A YES. 10,000. WE CALLED HIM TO A MEETING, AND INQUIRED ABOUT THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE SALE AND TRIED TO REVIEW WITH HIM VARIOUS POSSIBILITIES FOR BEING ABLE TO FULFILL WHAT WE FELT HIS COMMITMENT WAS.

THE LETTER I THINK MENTIONED A DOWN PAYMENT OF \$45,000 OR SO AND WE ASKED HIM -- HE RECEIVED 45,000, YOU KNOW. WHAT HAD HAPPENED TO THE MONEY IF HE COULDN'T AFFORD TO PAY PART OF THE LOAN.

AND HE MENTIONED OTHER BILLS THAT HE HAD HAD.

I THINK BILLS TO THE GOVERNMENT, HIS EX-WIFE WERE MENTIONED.

AND IT ALSO CAME OUT IN THE CONVERSATION THAT HE HAD USED

PART OF THE MONEY TO BUY A NEW CAR FOR HIMSELF, PAYING FOR

IT IN FULL WITH NO LOAN OR ANYTHING.

WE ASKED HIM WHY DID HE HAVE TO BUY A NEW CAR AT THIS POINT IN TIME IN CASH AND NOT BE ABLE TO PAY THE CHURCH PART OF WHAT HE OWED IT? AND HE SAID HE JUST

.

COULDN'T HAVE ANY PAYMENTS HANGING OVER HIS HEAD FOR THE

THERE WAS ALSO DISCUSSION OF THE BALANCE OF THE PURCHASE PRICE, WHICH HE MENTIONED WAS 65- OR \$70,000, THAT HE WOULD RECEIVE IN TWO YEARS. SO I ASKED HIM, "IF YOU COULD PAY PART OF IT NOW, SAY THE 10,000 NOW, COULD YOU AFFORD TO PAY THE BALANCE OF IT WHEN THIS NOTE COMES DUE IN TWO YEARS?"

AND HE SAID THAT HE FELT THAT HE WAS TOO OLD AT THIS POINT IN TIME TO BE ABLE TO CONTINUE TO MAKE A LIVING FOR HIMSELF AND HE WANTED TO SAVE THAT MONEY TO PAY HIS CONDOMINIUM IN WESTLAKE OFF IN FULL WHEN THE -- WHEN THAT PAYMENT CAME THROUGH. AND THEREFORE HE DIDN'T -- HE JUST COULDN'T AGREE TO THAT.

SO THE RESULT OF THE MEETING WAS THAT WE TOLD

HIM THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO TALK TO ELIZABETH ABOUT IT, WHO

WAS OUT OF TOWN AT THE TIME, AND THAT WE WOULD GET BACK WITH

HIM. AND THAT WAS PRETTY MUCH THE END OF THAT MEETING.

- Q WAS THERE ANOTHER CONVERSATION BETWEEN YOURSELF AND MR. MULL WITH RESPECT TO THE MONEY THAT HAD BEEN LOANED TO MR. MULL BY THE CHURCH?
  - A YES.
  - Q WHEN WAS THAT CONVERSATION?
  - A ABOUT TWO WEEKS OR SO LATER.
  - Q WHO WAS PRESENT?
- A MYSELF, MONROE, MR. MULL AND POSSIBLY JIM MC CAFFREY. I AM NOT REALLY SURE.
  - Q AS BEST YOU CAN RECALL, WHAT WAS SAID AT THAT

## MEETING?

A WE TOLD HIM THAT WE HAD DISCUSSED THE CONTENTS

OF THE LAST MEETING WITH ELIZABETH OVER THE PHONE, WHO WAS

OUT OF TOWN STILL FOR AN EXTENDED TIME, AND THAT SHE AGREED

WITH US THAT SHE FELT THAT HE HAD A MORAL COMMITMENT TO THE

CHURCH TO FULFILL HIS WORD, WHICH WAS THE LOAN AGREEMENT

THAT WE HAD HAD.

AND SHE THOUGHT THAT WE SHOULD HAVE ANOTHER MEETING WITH HIM AND PURSUE POSSIBILITIES FOR TRYING TO WORK SOMETHING OUT.

FROM THAT POINT ON, THE CONVERSATION PRETTY

MUCH FOLLOWED THE SAME LINES AS THE MEETING BEFORE. MR.

MULL JUST DIDN'T FEEL THAT HE COULD AFFORD TO COMMIT HIMSELF

TO ANY MORE THAN THE 10,000 THAT HE HAD OFFERED AND THAT HE

WANTED US TO WAIVE THE BALANCE OF IT.

HE DID SAY THAT HE FELT THAT WE WERE NOT BEING CONSIDERATE ENOUGH OF HIM AND THAT HE RAISED THE SUBJECT OF US BEING MORE INTERESTED IN MONEY THAN BEING INTERESTED IN HIS SOUL. WE ASSURED HIM THAT THAT WAS NOT THE CASE, THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO WORK THE SITUATION OUT IN ANY WAY THAT WE COULD TO GIVE HIM WHATEVER LATITUDE WAS POSSIBLE.

BUT HE REPEATED AGAIN THAT THE 10,000 WAS ALL

HE COULD DO AT THIS POINT AND HE JUST WASN'T PREPARED TO

DISCUSS OR NEGOTIATE ANY FURTHER THAN THAT. SO WE SAID THAT

UNDER THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES, WE FELT THAT THE BEST THING AT

THAT POINT IN TIME WAS WE JUST DIDN'T FEEL THAT IT WOULD BE

APPROPRIATE FOR HIM TO CONTINUE TO RECEIVE FREE ROOM AND

BOARD AT CAMELOT. AND WE ASKED THAT HE MAKE ARRANGEMENTS TO

MOVE HIMSELF OFF THE PROPERTY.

HE AGREED TO AND SAID HE PLANNED TO MOVE TO HIS CONDOMINIUM IN WESTLAKE. AND WE AGREED THAT WE WOULD TRY TO TALK ABOUT IT FURTHER WHEN ELIZABETH CAME BACK IN TOWN, WITHIN THE NEXT SEVERAL WEEKS SHE WAS EXPECTED. THAT WAS THE SUM AND SUBSTANCE OF THAT MEETING.

- Q DID YOU HAVE ANY OTHER MEETINGS WITH MR. MULL WITH RESPECT TO THE MONEY THAT THE CHURCH HAD LOANED HIM?
  - A YES. ONE MORE.
  - Q WHO WAS PRESENT AT THAT MEETING?
  - A MYSELF, MR. MULL, MONROE SHEARER AND ELIZABETH.
  - Q WHAT WAS THE DATE OF THAT MEETING?
  - A JUNE 6, 1980.
- Q IS THAT THE MEETING WHICH WE HEARD THE TAPE PLAYED OF?
  - A THIS IS CORRECT.
- Q PRIOR TO THAT MEETING, HAD THERE BEEN ANY DISCUSSION WITH THE BOARD OR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ABOUT MR. MULL'S OFFER TO PAY \$10,000?
  - A YES, THERE WAS A DISCUSSION.
  - O WHAT WAS THAT DISCUSSION?
- A WE DISCUSSED WITH ELIZABETH BEFORE THE MEETING TOOK PLACE THE VARIOUS THINGS THAT WE HAD TALKED ABOUT WITH MR. MULL BEFORE AS WELL AS THE LETTER, THE APRIL LETTER THAT HE HAD SENT OFFERING THE \$10,000.

AND WE AGREED THAT THE CHURCH WOULD BE WILLING TO ACCEPT THE \$10,000 SETTLEMENT OFFERED AND WOULD IN EXCHANGE FOR THAT WOULD PROMISE NOT TO SUE HIM, IN EFFECT WE

| 1  |  |
|----|--|
| 1  | WOULD WAIVE THE BALANCE OF THE AMOUNTS THAT WERE DUE, AND WE |
| 2  | WOULD AGREE TO JUST PART AND GO OUR SEPARATE WAYS.           |
| 3  | Q AT THE JUNE 6TH MEETING, DID MR. MULL PAY THE              |
| 4  | \$10,000?  |
| 5  | A NO, HE DIDN'T.   |
| 6  | Q WITH RESPECT TO ALL OF THE MEETINGS THAT YOU               |
| 7  | HAVE DESCRIBED, DID YOU OR ANYONE ELSE AT THOSE MEETINGS     |
| 8  | EVER RAISE THEIR VOICE TO MR. MULL?                          |
| 9  | A NEVER.   |
| 10 | Q DID YOU OR ANYONE AT ANY OF THOSE MEETINGS EVER            |
| 11 | SHOUT IN ANY WAY AT MR. MULL?                                |
| 12 | A NOT IN ANY WAY.  |
| 13 | Q YOU WERE A BOARD MEMBER IN 1978, 1979 AND 1980?            |
| 14 | A YES.   |
| 15 | Q WERE YOU A MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF            |
| 16 | THE BOARD IN THOSE YEARS?                                    |
| 17 | A YES, 1 WAS.  |
| 18 | Q DID THERE COME A TIME WHEN THE BOARD OR                    |
| 19 | EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DISCUSSED INVITING MR. MULL TO LIVE AND  |
| 20 | WORK AT CAMELOT?   |
| 21 | A YES, WE DID.   |
| 22 | Q WHEN WAS THAT DISCUSSED?                                   |
| 23 | A DECEMBER, 1978.  |
| 24 | Q TO THE BEST OF YOUR RECOLLECTION, WAS THIS THE             |
| 25 | BOARD OR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE THAT FIRST DISCUSSED THIS?  |
| 26 | A IT WAS THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.                            |
| 27 | Q WHO WAS PRESENT?   |
| 28 | A WELL, THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WAS COMPOSED OF              |
|    |  |

MYSELF, MONROE SHEARER AND JAMES MC CAFFREY. AND THAT IS 1 HOW WE ALWAYS MET. WE DIDN'T HAVE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 2 MEETINGS UNLESS ALL THREE PEOPLE WERE THERE. 3 WHEN YOU MET IN LATE 1978 TO DISCUSS INVITING MR. MULL TO CAMELOT, WAS RANDALL KING PRESENT AT THAT 5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING? б DEFINITELY NOT. 7 YOU CERTAIN OF THAT? Q 8 POSITIVE. 9 IN THE YEARS 1978, '79 AND 1980, WAS RANDALL 10 KING EVER PRESENT AT ANY MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE? 11 YES. Α 12 WHEN WOULD HE BE PRESENT? 13 MR. KING WOULD BE PRESENT AT SOME MEETINGS OF 14 THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WHEN HE HAD A PARTICULAR PROPOSAL OR 15 SOMETHING TO DISCUSS REGARDING HIS OWN DEPARTMENT, WHICH WAS 16 THE MULTIMEDIA PRODUCTIONS THAT HE WAS ENGAGED IN. 17 WOULD HE EVER BE PRESENT DURING '78, '79 OR '80 Q 18 AT A BOARD MEETING? 19 POSSIBLY, YES. 20 WHEN WOULD HE BE PRESENT AT A BOARD MEETING? Q 21 HE WOULD BE PRESENT AT BOARD MEETINGS FOR THE 22 SAME PURPOSE. EITHER FOR THINGS RELATED TO HIS OWN 23 DEPARTMENT OR THINGS THAT HE WAS INVOLVED IN SPECIFICALLY IN 24 THE CHURCH, PARTICULAR PROJECTS OR ACTIVITIES. 25 WAS THAT A -- SOMETHING JUST FOR MR. KING OR 26 WERE OTHER CHURCH OFFICIALS ALLOWED TO BOARD MEETINGS AND 27 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS IF THEY HAD A PARTICULAR REASON 28

TO BE THERE?

A THE BOARD WOULD ALWAYS HAVE PEOPLE FROM THE
STAFF ATTEND MEETINGS THAT CONCERNED THEIR PARTICULAR AREA.

IF IT WAS MAKING A DECISION ON A SUBJECT, IT WOULD HAVE THEM

COME IN AND DISCUSS THAT ITEM. SO IN THAT RESPECT, IT WAS

OTHER PEOPLE WERE PRESENT AT TIMES.

Q AND WHEN PEOPLE WERE PRESENT FROM THE STAFF TO DISCUSS SOMETHING THAT RELATED TO THEM OR THEIR DEPARTMENT, WOULD THEY STAY FOR THE WHOLE MEETING OF EITHER THE BOARD OR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OR WOULD THEY LEAVE AT A CERTAIN POINT?

A NO. THEY WOULD LEAVE. ONCE THE DISCUSSION CONCERNING THEIR PRESENTATION WAS OVER, THEN THEY WOULD LEAVE.

Q WAS THE POLICY ANY DIFFERENT FOR MR. KING AS FAR AS LEAVING AS IT WAS FOR EVERYBODY ELSE?

A NO, IT WASN'T. NOT DURING THOSE YEARS.

Q WITH RESPECT TO THAT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MEETING IN LATE 1978 WHEN MR. MULL WAS DISCUSSED, AS BEST

YOU CAN RECALL, WHAT WAS SAID?

MYSELF THAT HE WANTED TO PROPOSE TO INVITE GREGORY MULL TO COME TO CAMELOT TO DO ARCHITECTURAL WORK. AND HE SAID THAT HE WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO OFFER HIM FREE ROOM AND BOARD AND ANY TRAVEL EXPENSES THAT HE MIGHT HAVE TRAVELING FROM SAN FRANCISCO.

AND THAT HE WANTED TO --- OUR PERMISSION TO BE ABLE TO CALL HIM ON THE PHONE AND TO MAKE THIS PROPOSAL TO

HIM AND SEE HOW HE FELT ABOUT IT.

Q AT THAT TIME, DID THE BOARD DISCUSS WHAT PROJECTS MR. MULL WOULD WORK ON IF HE CAME TO CAMELOT?

VARIOUS RENOVATIONS THAT NEEDED TO BE DONE ON THE CAMPUS AS WELL AS THE POSSIBILITY OF THE EXPANSION OF SOME OF THE FACILITIES THAT WE NEEDED.

Q WAS THERE EVER A TIME WHEN THE BOARD DECIDED THAT MR. MULL WOULD WORK ON THE TEN-YEAR CAMELOT PLAN THAT IS DISCUSSED IN THAT BOOKLET THAT WE'VE SEEN, I THINK IT IS NUMBER 1 IN EVIDENCE.

MR. LEVY: I AM GOING TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR, AS TO AMBIGUITY IN THE QUESTION. WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THE BOARD.

I DON'T KNOW WHICH BOARD HE IS TALKING ABOUT.

THE COURT: PLEASE REPHRASE IT.

MR. KLEIN: YES.

Q WAS THERE EVER A TIME THAT THE EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE DISCUSSED MR. MULL WORKING ON THE PROJECTS LISTED

IN THE CAMELOT TEN-YEAR PLAN?

A YES.

Q WHAT WAS THAT DISCUSSION?

A THE DISCUSSION THAT WE HAD WAS IN A SUBSEQUENT MEETING IN LATE DECEMBER, EARLY JANUARY, LATE DECEMBER OR EARLY JANUARY ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF HIM WORKING ON THE MONTESSORI INTERNATIONAL PROJECT.

Q WAS THERE EVER ANY DISCUSSION IN THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OR THE BOARD ABOUT MR. MULL WORKING ON ANY OTHER PROJECTS IN THAT TEN-YEAR PLAN?

|    | l |
|----|---|
| 1  |   |
| 2  |   |
| 3  |   |
| 4  |   |
| 5  |   |
| 6  |   |
| 7  |   |
| 8  |   |
| 9  |   |
| 10 |   |
| 11 |   |
| 12 |   |
| 13 |   |
| 14 |   |
| 15 |   |
| 16 |   |
| 17 |   |
| 18 |   |
| 19 |   |
| 20 |   |
| 21 |   |
| 22 |   |
| 23 |   |
| 24 |   |
| 25 |   |
| 26 |   |
| 27 |   |

A NO, THERE WASN'T.

Q YOU MENTIONED THAT OTHER MEETING BY THE BOARD. WHEN DID THAT OCCUR?

A LATE DECEMBER OR EARLY JANUARY, '78, '79.

Q AS BEST YOU CAN RECALL, WHAT ELSE, IF ANYTHING, WAS SAID AT THAT MEETING OTHER THAN WHAT YOU HAVE JUST TOLD US?

A WELL, MONROE CAME BACK TO THE EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE, AND SAID THAT HE HAD CONTACTED MR. MULL BY

TELEPHONE, AND HAD MADE THIS PROPOSAL TO HIM AND THAT MR.

MULL WAS VERY EXCITED ABOUT IT, REALLY WANTED TO DO IT.

THAT IN ADDITION TO THE ROOM AND BOARD AND TRAVEL EXPENSES, HE HAD OTHER PERSONAL EXPENSES THAT HE NEEDED TO HAVE COVERED SOMEHOW. AND THAT MONROE HAD DISCUSSED CERTAIN VARIOUS POSSIBILITIES OF DEALING WITH THIS, OF A METHOD OF MEETING THESE EXPENSES THAT WERE OVER AND ABOVE MR. MULL'S INCOME, HIS ABILITY TO HANDLE THEM.

THERE WERE SEVERAL DIFFERENT POSSIBILITIES

DISCUSSED. ONE WAS GETTING A LOAN ON HIS HOUSE FROM A BANK.

IN SAN FRANCISCO AND THE OTHER POSSIBILITY WAS THAT OF

BORROWING SOME OF THE MONEY FROM THE CHURCH WHICH HE COULD

REPAY WHEN HE SOLD HIS HOUSE. HE HAD MENTIONED THAT HE HAD

BEEN PLANNING TO SELL HIS HOUSE AT SOME POINT IN THE FUTURE.

SO THE CONCLUSION OF IT WAS THAT IT SOUNDED LIKE IT WOULD BE OKAY TO LET HIM COME DOWN AND GIVE HIM A TRY FOR A WHILE. AND THAT MONROE WOULD CONTINUE TO DISCUSS THESE MATTERS WITH HIM, AND TRY TO COME TO A RESOLUTION OF WHAT MR. MULL'S NEEDS WERE ONCE MR. MULL, YOU KNOW,

QUANTIFIED THAT, AND GAVE HIM SPECIFIC AMOUNTS, AND HOW MUCH FUNDS HE WOULD NEED AND WHETHER HE COULD MEET THEM FROM HIS OWN INCOME AND THAT -- THAT KIND OF THING.

- Q DID THERE COME A TIME WHEN THE BOARD OR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MET AGAIN AND DISCUSSED MR. MULL AND THE FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS WITH HIM?
  - A YES, WE DID.
  - Q WHEN WAS THAT?
  - A MID-MARCH, 1979.
  - Q WAS IT THE BOARD OR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE?
  - A EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
- Q AS BEST YOU CAN RECALL, WHAT WAS SAID AT THAT TIME?

FROM MR. MULL IN FEBRUARY, I THINK IT WAS THE LATTER PART OF FEBRUARY, MAKING A PROPOSAL ON HOW HIS EXPENSES COULD BE HANDLED. AND WE HAD GOTTEN A REQUEST FROM HIM ASKING THAT THE AGREEMENT BE FINALIZED.

AND SO WE MET AND DISCUSSED IT AND WENT
THROUGH, YOU KNOW, VARIOUS POSSIBILITIES OF WHAT WE THOUGHT
WE COULD DO, AND MADE THE DECISION THAT TO INFORM HIM THAT
WE WOULD BE WILLING TO CONTINUE LOANING HIM MONEY TO MEET
HIS MONTHLY EXPENSES WHILE HE WAS WORKING ON THE MI PROJECT
THAT HAD STARTED AND ANY OTHER PROJECTS THAT WOULD COME UP
IN THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE.

AND THAT THESE FUNDS SHOULD BE REPAID FROM THE SALE OF HIS HOUSE, THAT HE SHOULD PROCEED TO PUT HIS HOUSE ON THE MARKET AND GET IT SOLD SO THAT HE COULD REDUCE

THIS -- THIS NEED FOR FUNDS AND REPAY THE LOANS. 1 AND THAT HE SHOULD BE PREPARED IN THE FUTURE 2 BEYOND THE CURRENT PROJECTS, THIS MI AND THE OTHER CURRENT 3 RENOVATIONS AND THINGS THAT WERE HAPPENING, TO SUPPORT HIMSELF IN THE FUTURE, EITHER LOCALLY OR BACK IN SAN 5 FRANCISCO. 6 YOU MENTIONED THE MI PROJECT. WHAT IS THE MI Q 7 PROJECT? 8 MONTESSORI INTERNATIONAL. THAT IS THE PRIMARY 9 AND HIGH SCHOOL. 10 NOW, WHEN MR. MULL CAME TO CAMELOT IN JANUARY 11 OF 1979, DID THE BOARD AT THAT TIME BELIEVE THAT THE 12 TEN-YEAR CAMELOT PLAN WAS STILL FEASIBLE? 13 DEFINITELY. 14 AT THIS POINT, HAVE YOU TOLD US ABOUT ALL OF 15 THE MEETINGS OF EITHER THE BOARD OR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 16 THAT YOU RECALL THAT DEALT WITH FINALIZING THE FINANCIAL 17 ARRANGEMENTS WITH MR. MULL? 18 YES. 19 Α TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, OF ALL THE MEETINGS YOU HAVE 20 DISCUSSED, WAS RANDALL KING PRESENT AT ANY OF THEM? 21 NO. HE DEFINITELY WAS NOT PRESENT. 22 DID THERE COME A TIME WHEN GREGORY MULL STOPPED 23 WORKING ON THE MONTESSORI INTERNATIONAL -- LET ME WITHDRAW 24 25 THAT. WHEN MR. MULL CAME TO CAMELOT, TO YOUR 26 KNOWLEDGE DID HE WORK ON THE MONTESSORI INTERNATIONAL 27 PROJECT? 28

62UU "

A YES, HE DID.

Q DID THERE COME A TIME WHEN HE STOPPED WORKING ON THAT PROJECT?

A YES.

Q WHEN WAS THAT?

A EARLY JULY, 1979.

Q DO YOU KNOW WHY HE STOPPED AT THAT TIME?

A YES. THERE WAS A CONFERENCE — A CHURCH

CONFERENCE TO BE HELD, WHICH IS HELD EVERY YEAR OVER THE 4TH

OF JULY HOLIDAY. AND HE HAD MORE OR LESS COMPLETED A SET OF

PRELIMINARY DRAWINGS FOR HOW HE CONCEIVED THE MONTESSORI

INTERNATIONAL PROJECT TO LOOK, HOW IT WOULD BE DESIGNED.

AND HE MADE A PRESENTATION OF THESE PLANS TO
THE BOARD PRIOR TO THAT CONFERENCE WITH THE EXPECTATION THAT

IF IT WAS APPROVED, IT COULD BE PRESENTED TO THE MEMBERSHIP

AND SHOWN TO THEM AS THE FIRST BUILDING PROJECT THAT WE

WOULD LIKE TO ENGAGE IN.

THE BOARD MET WITH HIM, AND REVIEWED THOSE

PLANS AND DID NOT APPROVE THEM. AND DECIDED THAT IN THAT

THEY BASICALLY JUST WEREN'T PRESENTABLE TO THE MEMBERS — WE

DIDN'T FEEL THAT THIS WAS A PROJECT THAT WE COULD PRESENT TO

THE MEMBERSHIP FOR SUPPORT. WE JUST WEREN'T COMPLETELY

HAPPY WITH IT.

AND SO WE DECIDED AT THAT POINT IN TIME TO NOT PURSUE THAT PARTICULAR PROJECT ANY FURTHER, NOT IN THE WAY THAT IT WAS BEING LOOKED AT.

Q TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, DID MR. MULL WORK ON THE MONTESSORI PROJECT SUBSEQUENT TO THAT DECISION BY THE BOARD?

| 1  | A YES, THERE WAS.  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 2  | Q DO YOU KNOW WHAT THAT DOCUMENT WOULD BE?                   |  |
| 3  | A THE CHART OF ACCOUNTS.                                     |  |
| 4  | MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, AT THIS TIME I WOULD ASK THAT         |  |
| 5  | THIS DOCUMENT CALLED THE CHART OF ACCOUNTS FEBRUARY 13TH,    |  |
| 6  | 1979, BE MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION AND SHOWN TO THE WITNESS. |  |
| 7  | IT WOULD BE NUMBER 112 I BELIEVE.                            |  |
| 8  | THE COURT: SO MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.                     |  |
| 9  | (MARKED FOR ID: ^ EXHIBIT 112, CHART OF                      |  |
| 10 | ^ ACCOUNTS, 2-13-79)   |  |
| 11 | Q BY MR. KLEIN: LOOKING AT WHAT WE HAVE MARKED               |  |
| 12 | NUMBER 112 FOR IDENTIFICATION, DO YOU RECOGNIZE THAT         |  |
| 13 | DOCUMENT?  |  |
| 14 | A YES, 1 DO.   |  |
| 15 | Q WHAT IS THAT?  |  |
| 16 | A IT IS THE CHART OF ACCOUNTS USED BY THE CHURCH             |  |
| 17 | ACCOUNTING DEPARTMENT IN 1979 FOR CODING THECKS AND          |  |
| 18 | FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS TO BE ENTERED ON THE ACCOUNTING BOOKS |  |
| 19 | OF THE CHURCH.   |  |
| 20 | MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, AT THIS TIME I WOULD ASK THAT         |  |
| 21 | DOCUMENT 112 FOR IDENTIFICATION BE RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.     |  |
| 22 | MR. LEVY: NO OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR.                          |  |
| 23 | THE COURT: IT'S RECEIVED.                                    |  |
| 24 | (RECEIVED EVID: ^ EXHIBIT 112)                               |  |
| 25 | MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU.  |  |
| 26 | Q LOOKING AT THAT CHART OF ACCOUNTS, CAN YOU TELL            |  |
| 27 | US WHAT NUMBER 135 15?                                       |  |
| 28 | A NUMBER 135 IS THE TRANSFER CLEARING ACCOUNT.               |  |

Q IN 1979, WHAT IS OR WAS A TRANSFER CLEARING ACCOUNT AT CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT?

A TRANSFER CLEARING ACCOUNT WAS BASICALLY THE SUSPENSE ACCOUNT THAT WAS USED FOR THE CODING OF TRANSACTIONS THAT THE -- THAT WERE CURRENTLY UNDESIGNATED AS TO ANY OTHER ACCOUNTING.

Q SO IT MERELY MEANT UNDESIGNATED AT THAT POINT?

A THAT'S CORRECT. IT WOULD BE WHAT WOULD NORMALLY BE REFERRED TO AS A SUSPENSE ACCOUNT. IT IS USED WHERE THE PERSON CODING THE CHECKS OR MAKING THE BOOKKEEPING ENTRY IS NOT AWARE OF OR DOES NOT CURRENTLY KNOW WHAT THE NATURE OF THE -- EXACT NATURE OF THE TRANSACTION IS.

Q LOOKING ON THAT CHART OF ACCOUNTS, IS THERE AN ACCOUNT NUMBER FOR LOAMS?

A NO, THERE IS NO ACCOUNT NUMBER FOR LOANS.

Q NOW, GOING BACK TO WHAT WE HAVE MARKED EXHIBIT

10 IN EVIDENCE, AFTER APRIL OF 1979, THE CHECK STUBS NO

LONGER HAVE A NUMBER 135 ON THEM.

BEGINNING WITH 5-15-79, IT SAYS, "ARCHITECTURAL RENDERINGS," AND THEN IT SAYS "C9 AG3 VF." 6-7-79 SAYS, "ARCHITECTURAL RENDERINGS C9 AG3 VF." 7-10-79 SAYS JUST, "C9 AG3 VF." 8-16-79 SAYS, "ARCHITECTURAL C9 AG3 VF." 9-25-79 JUST SAYS, "C9 AG3 GF." AND THEN 10-27-79 SAYS, "PROMISSORY NOTE DATED 10-27-79," AND THERE IS NO CODE THERE.

NOW, DIRECTING YOUR ATTENTION TO MAY OF 1979, WAS THERE A CHANGE IN YOUR CHART OF ACCOUNTS OR LISTINGS?

A YES, THERE WAS.

1, '79.

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, AT THIS POINT I WOULD ASK THAT WHAT'S BEEN MARKED AS 113 FOR IDENTIFICATION BE RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.

MR. LEVY: NO OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: RECEIVED.

(RECEIVED EVID: ^ EXHIBIT 113)

Q BY MR. KLEIN: LOOKING AT THE CHART OF ACCOUNTS SUBSEQUENT TO OR DATED 5-1-79, CAN YOU TELL WHETHER THAT DESIGNATION OF C9 AG3 VF, WHETHER ALL THOSE NUMBERS REFER TO ONE PARTICULAR LISTING IN THAT CHART OF ACCOUNTS?

A YES. THEY DO NOT. THEY REFER TO THREE DIFFERENT LISTINGS.

Q AND CAN YOU TELL US, USING THAT CHART OF ACCOUNTS, WHAT C9 AG3 VF WOULD MEAN?

A WELL, THE C9 MEANS ONE THING, THE AG3 MEANS
ANOTHER THING AND THE VF MEANS ANOTHER THING. IT REFERS TO
THREE DIFFERENT SECTIONS OF THE CHART OF ACCOUNTS.

Q WHY DON'T YOU START WITH THE C9. WHAT DOES THAT MEAN PURSUANT TO THE CHART OF ACCOUNTS?

A THE FIRST TWO DIGITS OF THE CODE REFER TO THE DIVISION WITHIN THE CHURCH AND THE LOCATION APPLICABLE. C9 IS THE CHURCH, LOCATION NOT APPLICABLE.

Q CAN YOU GIVE US AN EXAMPLE OF WHEN A LOCATION WOULD BE APPLICABLE?

A WELL, LOCATIONS WERE APPLICABLE WHEN THINGS

WERE -- WHEN TRANSACTIONS WERE ENTERED INTO THAT WERE SITES

SPECIFIC LIKE AN IMPROVEMENT TO A PIECE OF PROPERTY. YOU

WOULD SPECIFICALLY CODE IT WITH THAT LOCATION. IF IT WAS GENERAL, MORE GENERAL IN NATURE, AND DIDN'T ACTUALLY AFFECT THE ACCOUNTING FOR THAT PIECE OF PROPERTY, THEN THE SITE DID NOT GO INTO THE PICTURE.

## Q WHAT DOES AG3 MEAN?

THE MIDDLE THREE DIGITS OF THE CODE REFER TO
THE ACTUAL ACCOUNT ON THE BOOKS THAT A TRANSACTION WOULD BE
ASSIGNED TO. THE FIRST DIGIT REFERS TO THE MAJOR ACCOUNT
GROUPING, THE SECOND DIGIT IS A DEFINITION OF THAT MAJOR
ACCOUNT GROUPING.

THERE IS A DEFINITION IN THE CHART OF ACCOUNTS
ON PAGE 14 WHERE THE MAJOR ACCOUNT GROUPINGS ARE GIVEN. FOR
EXAMPLE A IS CURRENT ASSETS, B IS LONG-TERM ASSETS, C IS
LIABILITIES, ET CETERA.

THE DEFINITION OF THE SECOND DIGIT -
MR. LEVY: EXCUSE ME, YOUR HONOR, AT THIS TIME I WILL

OBJECT. WE WILL STIPULATE THAT MR. FRANCIS HAS A VERY

COMPLICATED ACCOUNTING SYSTEM IF THAT WILL SAVE THE COURT'S

TIME.

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I THINK IT IS PROPER FOR MR. FRANCIS TO GO THROUGH THE CHARTS AND EXPLAIN WHAT AG3 MEANS. WE HAVE HAD A LOT OF TESTIMONY ABOUT IT.

MR. LEVY: IT APPEARS WE ARE GETTING --

THE COURT: IT IS NOT INAPPROPRIATE SO LONG AS IT IS NOT OVERLY LONG.

MR. KLEIN: IT WILL NOT BE OVERLY LONG.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

Q BY MR. KLEIN: MR. FRANCIS, WITH RESPECT TO THE

DOES THE CHART OF ACCOUNTS TELL YOU WHAT VF MEANS?

- A YES, IT DOES.
- Q WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

A THE LAST TWO DIGITS OF THE ACCOUNTING CODE

REFER TO THE CASH FUND THAT IS APPLICABLE TO A PARTICULAR

TRANSACTION. IN THIS CASE, VF REFERS TO VICTORY IN THE HOLY

CITY FUND, WHICH IS THE FUND RAISING CAMPAIGN THAT WAS

APPLICABLE TO THE PURCHASE OF CAMELOT.

Q THANK YOU.

PUTTING ASIDE THE CHART OF ACCOUNTS AND THE CHECK STUBS FOR A MOMENT, DURING THE TIME THAT YOU HAVE BEEN ASSOCIATED WITH CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT, WERE THERE EVER ANY RESTRICTIONS PLACED ON CHURCH MEMBERS WITH RESPECT TO THEIR CONTACTS WITH NONCHURCH MEMBERS, BE IT FAMILY OR FRIENDS WHO WERE NOT CHURCH MEMBERS?

A NO, THERE WERE NOT.

Q DURING THE TIME YOU HAVE BEEN ASSOCIATED WITH THE CHURCH, WERE CHURCH MEMBERS EVER TAUGHT, EITHER SUMMIT UNIVERSITY STUDENTS OR CHURCH MEMBERS, EVER TAUGHT TO FEAR PEOPLE WHO WERE NONMEMBERS OF THE CHURCH?

A NO. THAT IS COMPLETELY OPPOSITE OF WHAT THE

Q DURING THE TIME THAT YOU HAVE BEEN AFFILIATED WITH THE CHURCH, WERE THERE EVER ANY RESTRICTIONS ON CHURCH MEMBERS WATCHING TV, LISTENING TO THE RADIO, GOING TO MOVIES, READING BOOKS?

- A NO, THERE WERE NOT.
- DURING THE YEARS THAT YOU WERE ON THE BOARD OF

DIRECTORS, DID ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET EVER GIVE A DICTATION FROM THE ASCENDED MASTERS CONCERNING AN ISSUE AND THEN HAVE THE BOARD VOTE ON THAT ISSUE? DID ANYTHING LIKE THAT EVER HAPPEN?

A NO. THAT IS JUST NOT HOW THINGS WERE DECIDED

IN THE BOARD. I HAVE NEVER EVER EXPERIENCED THAT IN A BOARD

MEETING OR CONCERNING A BOARD ISSUE.

Q DID BOARD MEMBERS MERELY FOLLOW THE DICTATES OF ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET DURING THESE BOARD MEETINGS THAT YOU WERE AT?

A NO. THAT WAS NOT THE WAY THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS WORKED.

Q WHAT WAS THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS IN THE BOARD MEETINGS?

A PRIMARILY WE HAVE ALWAYS TRIED TO DECIDE THINGS
ON THE BOARD BY CONSENSUS, MEANING THAT THE BOARD LIKES TO
BE ABLE TO REACH EITHER UNANIMOUS OR NEAR UNANIMOUS
AGREEMENT ON A PARTICULAR SUBJECT OR A THING THAT IS BEING
DISCUSSED.

THERE ARE MANY OCCASIONS WHEN A CONSENSUS COULD NOT BE REACHED THAT WE EITHER SIMPLY DID NOT MAKE A DECISION OR POSTPONED IT THEREAFTER, OR THAT IT WAS DISCUSSED MORE AND ONE PERSON OR THE OTHER CHANGED THEIR MIND AFTER DISCUSSING IT.

BUT I -- I'VE SEEN ANY NUMBER OF SITUATIONS
WHERE PEOPLE CAME INTO THE MEETING, INCLUDING ELIZABETH,
INCLUDING ANY OTHER BOARD MEMBERS, THAT THOUGHT ONE WAY WHEN
THEY FIRST CAME INTO THE MEETING, AND WE TALKED ABOUT IT AND

ATTENTION TO SEE WHAT -- HOW TO HANDLE IT, TO GET OUR ADVICE ON WHAT SHE THOUGHT SHOULD BE DONE ABOUT IT.

Q YOU SAID THERE WAS ONE OTHER OCCASION WHERE YOU WERE TOLD BY ELIZABETH THE CONTENTS OF A CLEARANCE LETTER.
WHAT WAS THAT SECOND OCCASION?

A ON THAT OCCASION ELIZABETH TALKED TO ME
PERSONALLY IN PROBABLY 1975 OR MAYBE EVEN '74 ABOUT A
SITUATION INVOLVING A CLEARANCE LETTER IN WHICH THE PERSON
SAID SOMETHING ABOUT HAVING AN URGE TO HARM HER OR KILL HER.
AND SHE WANTED TO KNOW MY OPINION ON WHAT SHE OUGHT TO DO
ABOUT IT.

- Q DID SHE ACTUALLY SHOW YOU THE LETTER?
- A NO.
- Q DURING THE YEARS THAT YOU HAVE BEEN ON THE BOARD, WAS THERE EVER AN OCCASION WHERE DR. YANEY SPOKE TO THE BOARD AND REVEALED INFORMATION THAT HE HAD LEARNED IN COUNSELING SESSIONS WITH CHURCH MEMBERS?
  - A NO. THIS NEVER OCCURRED.
- Q WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO BE ON THE PERMANENT STAFF OF THE CHURCH?

A PERMANENT STAFF IS TO ME ANALOGOUS TO TAKING VOWS TO JOIN A HOLY ORDER. IT IS ANALOGOUS TO BECOMING A MONK OR A NUN.

AND IN OUR CHURCH, IT INVOLVES, SIMPLY PUT, FOR A PERSON WHO WANTS TO MAKE A LIFETIME OR BELIEVES THEY WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A LIFETIME COMMITMENT IN THE CHURCH WHEREBY THE PERSON GIVES THEIR ALL TO THE CHURCH AND THE CHURCH GIVES THEIR ALL TO THE PERSON.

ARE PEOPLE, AS FAR AS YOU KNOW, EVER PRESSURED Q 1 TO BECOME PERMANENT STAFF MEMBERS? 2 NO, THEY ARE NOT. IN FACT THEY HAVE TO APPLY 3 Α IN WRITING TO BECOME A PERMANENT STAFF MEMBER. 4 HAVE PEOPLE EVER BEEN TURNED DOWN WHO APPLIED 5 Q IN WRITING TO BECOME PERMANENT STAFF MEMBERS? 6 7 Α MANY. AFTER MR. MULL WAS ASKED TO LEAVE CAMELOT, DID 8 Q THERE COME A TIME WHEN YOU HAD A CONVERSATION WITH HIS 9 DAUGHTER, LINDA MULL? 10 YES. Α 11 WHO WAS PRESENT? 12 Q MYSELF, MONROE AND LINDA MULL. 13 AS BEST YOU CAN RECALL, WHAT WAS SAID? Q 14 WELL, IT WAS SHORTLY AFTER THE MEETING, THE 15 LAST -- THE SECOND MEETING THAT WE HAD WITH MR. MULL IN MAY 16 WHERE WE TOLD HIM THAT WE FELT HE SHOULD MOVE OFF CAMPUS. 17 WE CALLED HER IN TO LET HER KNOW THAT -- SHE 18 WAS ATTENDING SUMMIT UNIVERSITY AT THE TIME, AND WE CALLED 19 HER IN TO LET HER KNOW THAT THE CHURCH HAD A FINANCIAL 20 DISAGREEMENT WITH HER FATHER AND THAT WE HAD ASKED HIM TO 21 MOVE OFF CAMPUS. 22 WE MERELY DID THIS TO LET HER KNOW THAT, FIRST 23 OF ALL, WE HOPED THAT WE COULD RESOLVE THIS DISPUTE AND, 24 SECONDLY, THAT SHE DIDN'T NEED TO FEEL THAT IT AFFECTED HER 25 RIGHT AND HER ABILITY TO CONTINUE FINISHING HER QUARTER AT 26 SUMMIT UNIVERSITY. 27 28

WE DID NOT CONSIDER IT TO BE A DISPUTE OF THE

| 1  | NATURE OF SUCH A DRASTIC NATURE THAT IT SHOULD AFFECT         |
|----|---|
| 2  | ANYTHING.   |
| 3  | Q DURING THE LOANS DURING THE PERIOD THAT THE                 |
| 4  | CHURCH WAS LOANING MR. MULL MONEY, WHAT WAS THE TOTAL AMOUNT  |
| 5  | THAT WAS LOANED TO HIM?                                       |
| 6  | A ABOUT 37,400.   |
| 7  | Q HOW MUCH DID HE REPAY?                                      |
| ε  | A \$5,000.  |
| 9  | Q WAS THAT THE JUNE 6TH, 1980, MEETING THAT HE                |
| 10 | REPAID THAT?  |
| 11 | A YES.  |
| 12 | Q HAVE YOU HAD OCCASION TO DETERMINE HOW MUCH MR.             |
| 13 | MULL WOULD OWE THE CHURCH TODAY WHEN YOU SUBTRACT THE \$5,000 |
| 14 | HE REPAID AND YOU ADD THE INTEREST AT 7 PERCENT FROM THE      |
| 15 | TIME THE MONEY WAS LOANED UP UNTIL TODAY?                     |
| 16 | A YES, I HAVE HAD OCCASION TO CALCULATE THAT.                 |
| 17 | Q AND WHAT DOES IT COME OUT TO?                               |
| 18 | A WITH INTEREST ADDED AT 7 PERCENT, THE TOTAL                 |
| 19 | BALANCE DUE AS OF THIS DATE IS \$47,503.69.                   |
| 20 | Q DURING THE YEARS THAT GREGORY MULL WAS                      |
| 21 | ASSOCIATED WITH THE CHURCH, HOW MUCH MONEY DID HE ACTUALLY    |
| 22 | DONATE TO THE CHURCH?   |
| 23 | A ACTUALLY DONATED TO THE CHURCH WAS \$1,306.                 |
| 24 | Q THAT WOULDN'T INCLUDE MONEY HE PAID FOR ROOM                |
| 25 | AND BOARD AND TUITION AT SUMMIT UNIVERSITY, WOULD IT?         |
| 26 | A NO. IT DOESN'T INCLUDE ANYTHING ELSE BESIDES                |
| 27 | JUST STRICTLY CONTRIBUTIONS.                                  |
| 28 | Q IN MARCH OF 1981, THE CHURCH SUED MR. MULL FOR              |
|    |   |

THE MONEY THAT IT HAD LOANED HIM.

WHY DID THE CHURCH DO THAT? WHY DID THEY SUE HIM?

MR. MULL WAS BECAUSE OF THE CULMINATION OF A SERIES OF INCIDENTS AND THINGS THAT OCCURRED SUBSEQUENT TO THE JUNE 6, 1980, MEETING.

THE MAIN PRECIPITATING FACTORS WERE MR. MULL'S CONTACT OF CHURCH MEMBERS AND RELATING TO THEM UNTRUE AND FALSE ALLEGATIONS ABOUT THE CHURCH, ABOUT DEROGATORY COMMENTS ABOUT ELIZABETH AND ATTEMPTING TO CONVINCE THEM TO LEAVE THE CHURCH, FIRSTLY.

SECONDLY, THE NOVEMBER, 1980, LETTER WHICH WE RECEIVED FROM MR. MULL WHICH IN ESSENCE SAID THAT HE WANTED US TO PAY HIM THE \$5,000 BACK THAT HE HAD ALREADY PAID. AND IF WE DID NOT DO SO, THAT HE WOULD SUE US, THAT HE WOULD BECOME THE WORST ENEMY THAT THE CHURCH HAD EVER HAD, THAT HE WAS GOING TO WORK TO EXPOSE THE CHURCH, REFER TO ELIZABETH AS THE FALSE PROPHET AND THE GREAT WHORE.

SUBSEQUENT TO THAT, THIRDLY, MR. MULL'S CONTACT
OF NEWSPAPERS AND THE PRESS WITH FALSE ALLEGATIONS OF
SUPPOSED MISCONDUCT BY THE CHURCH, ILLEGALITIES AND VARIOUS
CONDITIONS AT CAMELOT WHICH WERE UNTRUE AND WHICH
PRECIPITATED ON AN ONGOING BASIS A WHOLE SERIES OF NEWSPAPER
ARTICLES IN COOPERATION WITH SEVERAL NEWSPAPER REPORTERS
FROM SEVERAL LOCAL NEWSPAPERS.

IN VIEW OF THOSE OCCURRENCES, WE FELT THAT THERE WAS NO REASON WHY WE SHOULD NOT ATTEMPT TO MAKE MR.

| 1          |  |
|------------|--|
| 1          | Q BY MR. KLEIN: DID YOU KNOW HIM WELL?                       |
| 2          | A I KNEW HIM PRETTY WELL, YES.                               |
| 3          | Q DURING THE TIME THAT YOU KNEW HIM, DID YOU EVER            |
| 4          | HEAR HIM SAY ANYTHING ABOUT TRYING TO MANIPULATE OR CONTROL  |
| 5          | CHURCH MEMBERS IN ANY WAY?                                   |
| 6          | THE COURT: THAT CAN BE ANSWERED YES OR NO.                   |
| 7          | THE WITNESS: NO.   |
| 8          | Q BY MR. KLEIN: DURING THE TIME THAT YOU KNEW                |
| 9          | HIM, DID YOU EVER HEAR HIM SAY ANYTHING ABOUT KEEPING PEOPLE |
| 10         | BUSY ALL THE TIME IF THEY WERE CHURCH MEMBERS?               |
| 11         | A NEVER.   |
| 12         | Q DURING THE YEARS THAT YOU HAVE BEEN AFFILIATED             |
| 13         | WITH THE CHURCH, HAVE YOU EVER HEARD ANY DISCUSSIONS AMONG   |
| 14         | CHURCH OFFICIALS, THE BOARD, ABOUT MANIPULATING AND          |
| 15         | CONTROLLING CHURCH MEMBERS THROUGH SLEEP, DIET, DECREEING OR |
| 16         | ANYTHING ELSE?   |
| 17         | A NO, NEVER.   |
| 18         | Q I WOULD LIKE TO DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO APRIL             |
| 19         | 12TH, 1981, THE DAY OF THE SQUARE DANCE.                     |
| 20         | WERE YOU PRESENT AT CAMELOT ON THAT DATE?                    |
| 21         | A YES, I WAS.  |
| 22         | Q AND DID THERE COME A TIME WHEN YOU ARRIVED IN              |
| <b>2</b> 3 | THE VICINITY OF WHAT'S CALLED THE GUARDHOUSE?                |
| 24         | A YES, I DID.  |
| 25         | Q WHY DID YOU GO TO THAT AREA?                               |
| 26         | A I HAD BEEN CALLED ON THE TELEPHONE BY EUGENE               |
| 27         | GARCIA WHO TOLD ME THAT GREGORY MULL AND A GROUP OF PEOPLE   |
| 28         | WERE CONGREGATING AROUND THE FRONT GATE AND IT LOOKED LIKE   |
|            | · ·  |

|   | 1    | THEY WERE GOING TO BE WALKING IN.                           |
|---|------|---|
| ı | 2    | Q UPON RECEIVING THAT CALL, WHAT, IF ANYTHING,              |
|   | 3    | DID YOU DO?   |
|   | 4    | A I LEFT MY OFFICE AND WALKED DOWN TO THE AREA              |
|   | 5    | AROUND THE GUARDHOUSE.                                      |
|   | σ    | Q WHEN YOU ARRIVED AT THE GUARDHOUSE, WAS MR.               |
|   | 7    | MULL THERE?   |
|   | 8    | A YES, HE WAS.  |
|   | 9    | Q DID YOU SPEAK WITH HIM?                                   |
|   | 10   | A YES, I DID.   |
|   | 11   | Q AS BEST YOU CAN RECALL, WHAT DID YOU SAY AND              |
|   | 12   | WHAT DID HE SAY?  |
|   | 13   | A HE SAID THAT WHEN I FIRST GOT THERE, HE SAID              |
|   | 14   | HE WANTED TO COME SQUARE DANCE. AND I TOLD HIM THAT I       |
| ) | 15   | DIDN'T REALLY BELIEVE THAT.                                 |
|   | . 16 | Q WHY DIDN'T YOU BELIEVE THAT?                              |
|   | 17   | A I DIDN'T BELIEVE IT BECAUSE OF THE EVENTS THAT            |
|   | 18   | HAD TRANSPIRED PRIOR TO THIS DATE, AS WELL AS JUST THE LOOK |
|   | 19   | ON HIS FACE AND THE DEMEANOR OF NOT ONLY HIM, BUT HIS WHOLE |
|   | 20   | PARTY. THEY JUST DIDN'T LOOK LIKE PEOPLE THAT WERE COMING   |
|   | 21   | TO ATTEND A SQUARE DANCE.                                   |
|   | 22   | Q DID THE REPORTERS WHO WERE WITH HIM HAVE                  |
|   | 23   | ANYTHING WITH THEM, ANY EQUIPMENT OR ANYTHING?              |
|   | 24   | A YES. THEY HAD CAMERA AND A TAPE RECORDER TO MY            |
|   | 25   | RECOLLECTION.   |
|   | 26   | MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, WITH THE COURT'S PERMISSION,         |
| • | 27   | COULD MISS MC GUIRE, WHO JUST FINISHED TESTIFYING, BE       |
| • | 28   | PRESENT IN THE COURTROOM?                                   |
|   |      |   |

ε

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

Q BY MR. KLEIN: CAN YOU GO ON WITH WHAT THE CONVERSATION WAS BETWEEN YOURSELF AND MR. MULL, PLEASE?

A AFTER I TOLD HIM THAT I DOUBTED THAT HE WAS

THERE TO ATTEND THE SQUARE DANCE, HE SAID THAT THE REASON HE

HAD CAME — HE HAD COME WAS TO — HE WANTED TO TALK TO

ELIZABETH PROPHET AND THAT THE MALEKS WANTED TO TALK TO

WILLIAM MALEK.

- Q WAS ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET PRESENT ON THE CAMELOT PROPERTY AT THAT TIME?
  - A NO, SHE WAS NOT THERE THAT DAY.
  - Q PLEASE CONTINUE.

A AFTER HE SAID THAT, I TOLD HIM THAT ELIZABETH
WAS NOT THERE AND I SAID THAT IT LOOKED LIKE TO ME LIKE THEY
HAD COME THERE TO PRECIPITATE A CONFRONTATION. I TOLD HIM
THAT I DIDN'T FEEL IT WAS APPROPRIATE FOR HIM TO BE
ATTEMPTING TO COME ONTO THE PROPERTY AND TALK TO PEOPLE
SINCE WE WERE ALREADY ENGAGED IN LITIGATION WITH HIM, THE
LAWSUIT HAD ALREADY BEEN FILED.

Q THIS LAWSUIT?

A THIS IS CORRECT. AND I TOLD HIM THAT IN MY

OPINION, IT WAS INAPPROPRIATE THAT HE SHOULD -- HE SHOULD BE

IN TOUCH WITH US THROUGH LEGAL COUNSEL AT THAT POINT, AND

THAT IT DIDN'T SEEM RIGHT, AND I DIDN'T THINK OUR ATTORNEY

WOULD APPROVE THAT HE HAD COME IN AND STARTED TALKING TO

CHURCH MEMBERS AND SO ON.

AT THAT, HE GOT FAIRLY ANGRY AND STARTED MAKING ALL SORTS OF ACCUSATIONS AGAINST THE CHURCH, AGAINST MYSELF,

AGAINST ELIZABETH AND OTHER PEOPLE THAT WERE PRESENT AT THAT

Q DO YOU RECALL ANYTHING ELSE THAT WAS SAID?

A WELL, HE SAID THAT -- HE SAID THE LEADERSHIP OF THE CHURCH WAS EVIL, HE SAID THAT ELIZABETH WAS A FALSE PROPHET, HE SAID THAT THE CHURCH BREAKS UP FAMILIES AND DESTROYS MARRIAGES.

AND THERE WAS A NUMBER OF OTHER ALLEGATIONS

MADE, THAT THERE WAS -- TIME WAS SPENT DISCUSSING IT,

RESPONDING TO IT. THE REPORTERS AND OTHER PEOPLE PRESENT

WITH HIM JOINED IN THESE DISCUSSIONS.

HE ALSO TURNED HIS ATTENTION AT ONE POINT TO GRACE MC GUIRE AND CRITICIZED HER IN HER OWN FAMILY SITUATION. AND SHE SAID THAT SHE'D APPRECIATE IT IF HE DIDN'T BUTT INTO HER FAMILY AFFAIRS. AND THE DISCUSSION WENT ON IN THAT VEIN FOR PROBABLY A HALF AN HOUR OR MORE.

Q NOW, AT THE TIME YOU ARRIVED IN THE VICINITY OF THE GUARDHOUSE, WHO WAS PRESENT IN THAT AREA WHO WAS AFFILIATED WITH THE CHURCH?

A WELL, EUGENE GARCIA WAS THERE IN THE
GUARDHOUSE. DOUG KENYON WAS THERE. GRACE MC GUIRE AND
SUSAN MC ADAMS WERE THERE. PAULA ZARZYCKI WAS THERE.

Q DURING THE COURSE OF THE TIME THAT MR. MULL WAS PRESENT IN THE VICINITY OF THE GUARDHOUSE, DID ANY OTHER PEOPLE AFFILIATED WITH THE CHURCH COME INTO THAT AREA?

A YES.

Q WHO WAS THAT?

A TOM MILLER.

| 1  | Q AND DID THERE COME A TIME WHEN MONROE SHEARER             |
|----|---|
| 2  | WAS ANYWHERE IN THAT VICINITY?                              |
| 3  | A IF HE WAS, I DIDN'T NOTICE HIM.                           |
| 4  | Q NOW, OTHER THAN THE PEOPLE YOU HAVE MENTIONED,            |
| 5  | DID THERE EVER COME A TIME WHEN SOME GROUP OF MEN CAME FROM |
| 6  | THE AREA FROM THE SIDE OF THE ROAD WHERE THE TREES ARE AND  |
| 7  | BLOCKED THE ROAD?   |
| 8  | A NO, THIS DID NOT OCCUR.                                   |
| 9  | Q DID THERE EVER COME A TIME WHEN A GROUP OF MEN            |
| 10 | CAME FROM ANYWHERE, FORGET THE SIDE OF THE ROAD OR THE      |
| 11 | TREES, DID THEY COME FROM ANYWHERE AND BLOCK THE ROAD WHERE |
| 12 | YOU AND MR. MULL WERE TALKING?                              |
| 13 | A NO. AS A MATTER OF FACT, WE KIND OF MOVED OFF             |
| 14 | TO THE SIDE OF THE ROAD BECAUSE THERE WAS TRAFFIC COMING IN |
| 15 | AND OUT.  |
| 16 | Q DID YOU AT ANY TIME DURING THE PERIOD WHEN YOU            |
| 17 | AND MR. MULL WERE SPEAKING THAT YOU EVER TOUCHED HIM?       |
| 18 | A NO, NEVER.  |
| 19 | Q DID YOU AT ANY TIME EVER THREATEN HIM IN ANY              |
| 20 | WAY?  |
| 21 | A NO, I DID NOT THREATEN HIM.                               |
| 22 | Q DID YOU AT ANY TIME EVER MAKE ANY KIND OF                 |
| 23 | THREATENING GESTURE TOWARDS HIM?                            |
| 24 | A I DID NOT MAKE ANY THREATENING GESTURES.                  |
| 25 | Q DID YOU EVER MAKE ANY GESTURE TOWARDS HIM?                |
| 26 | A YES, I DID. I POINTED MY FINGER IN MAKING A               |
| 27 | POINT ABOUT THINGS THAT WE WERE DISCUSSING.                 |
| 28 | Q DID THE CHURCH THEN OR DOES IT NOW HAVE SOME              |
|    |   |

KIND OF SOUAD OR GROUP OF 8 TO 20 JUDO EXPERTS AS THEIR 1 SECURITY OFFICERS? 2 NO, WE DON'T HAVE A SQUAD OF 8 TO 20 JUDO 3 EXPERTS. DO YOU HAVE ANY JUDO EXPERTS AS YOUR SECURITY 5 Q OFFICERS? 6 NOT JUDO EXPERTS. 7 Α ANY KARATE EXPERTS? 8 THERE WERE SOME PEOPLE THERE THAT KNEW SOME 9 FORM OF MARTIAL ARTS. THERE WERE SEVERAL PEOPLE THAT I KNOW 10 OF. 11 12 WHAT IS THE --INCIDENTALLY, WHEN I SAY, "THERE," I MEAN AT 13 CAMELOT ON CAMPUS, NOT AT THE INCIDENT AT THE GUARDHOUSE. 14 WHY DOES THE CHURCH HAVE SECURITY PEOPLE? 15 WELL, WE HAD A SECURITY DEPARTMENT THAT WAS --16 THE FUNCTION OF IT WAS SEVERAL THINGS. FIRST OF ALL, WE 17 ALWAYS HAD A NIGHT WATCHMAN WHO WOULD WALK AROUND A COUPLE 18 OF HOURS AT NIGHT AND MAKE SURE ALL THE DOORS WERE LOCKED, 10 CHECK THE PLACE TO MAKE SURE IT WAS SECURE. 20 WE HAD CROWD CONTROL THAT WENT ON DURING 21 CONFERENCES, PEOPLE WOULD DIRECT TRAFFIC, THEY WOULD JUST 22 KIND OF GENERALLY KEEP AN EYE ON THINGS AND, YOU KNOW, MAKE 23 SURE THAT IF ANY INCIDENTS OCCURRED OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT, 24 THAT THERE WAS SOMEBODY THERE TO HANDLE IT AND KEEP AN EYE 25 ON IT. 26 THAT WAS REALLY -- THERE WAS ONE OTHER THING 27 AND THAT WAS PERSONAL PROTECTION, PRIMARILY OFF CAMPUS, BUT

28

MAYBE ON CAMPUS ON A FEW OCCASIONS FOR ELIZABETH. 1 THERE WAS A TIME WHEN WE HAD RECEIVED SOME 2 DEATH THREATS AND THERE WAS PERSONAL PROTECTION THAT WE HAD 3 FOR HER. MAYBE ONE PERSON WOULD ACCOMPANY HER FROM ONE PART OF THE CAMPUS TO ANOTHER. THAT IS BASICALLY THE REASON FOR 5 THE SECURITY DEPARTMENT. б DURING THE TIME THAT THE INCIDENT WITH MR. MULL 7 OCCURRED, DID ANYONE MAKE ANY KIND OF GESTURES TOWARDS HIM 8 OTHER THAN WHAT YOU JUST SAID THAT YOU DID WITH YOUR HAND 9 WHEN YOU MADE A POINT? 10 I NEVER SAW ANYBODY MAKE ANY GESTURES TOWARD 11 HIM OTHER THAN THE ONE THAT I MENTIONED. 12 DURING THE TIME THAT YOU WERE IN THE VICINITY 13 Q OF THE GUARDHOUSE, DID YOU ALWAYS HAVE MR. MULL IN YOUR 14 SIGHT, IN YOUR VIEW? 15 YES. 16 Α I TAKE IT THERE CAME A POINT WHEN MR. MULL 0 17 18 LEFT? THIS IS TRUE. 19 Α WHAT HAPPENED? 0 20 WELL, THE DISCUSSION HAD JUST GONE ON FOR A 21 LONG TIME AND I FINALLY JUST SAID, "I AM CALLING TIME. THIS 22 DISCUSSION IS NOW ENDING AND I AM ASKING YOU ALL TO LEAVE 23 THE PROPERTY." 24 AND VERY SHORTLY AFTER THAT, WITHIN 30 SECONDS, 25 THEY AGREED. THEY SAID, "OKAY." AND THEY TURNED AROUND AND 26 27 STARTED WALKING OUT.

DID HE THEN LEAVE THE PROPERTY?

28

Q

YES, HE LEFT THE PROPERTY. BUT AS HE WAS 1 WALKING DOWN THE ROAD ON THE WAY OUT, HE WOULD TURN AROUND 2 PERIODICALLY AND THROW HIS ARMS UP IN THE AIR AND YELLED, 3 "GOD WILL JUDGE YOU, GOD WILL JUDGE YOU." AND THIS HAPPENED 4 SEVERAL TIMES ON THE WAY OUT. 5 MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU. б I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS, YOUR HONOR. 7 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 8 MR. LEVY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 9 MR. KLEIN: OH, I AM SORRY. JUST ONE MORE. IF THE 10 COURT WILL PERMIT, I HAVE JUST ONE SHORT LITTLE QUESTION. 11 12 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. BY MR. KLEIN: I AM SHOWING YOU WHAT HAS BEEN 13 MARKED NUMBER 94 FOR IDENTIFICATION. I WILL PUT IT UP HERE. 14 DO YOU RECOGNIZE THAT? 15 YES. IT IS AN AERIAL SHOT OF CAMELOT. 16 DOES IT FAIRLY AND ACCURATELY DEPICT THE AREA 17 THAT IS CALLED CAMELOT THAT YOU HAVE BEEN TESTIFYING ABOUT 18 HERE? 19 YES, IT DOES. 20 MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD ASK THAT NUMBER 94 21 FOR IDENTIFICATION BE RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE. 22 MR. LEVY: NO OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. 23 THE COURT: IT'S RECEIVED. 24 (RECEIVED EVID: ^ EXHIBIT 94, AERIAL PHOTO 25 ---- OF CAMELOT) 26 MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU. 27 NO FURTHER QUESTIONS. 28

| 1    | CROSS-EXAMINATION +  |
|------|--|
| 2    | BY MR. LEVY:   |
| 3    | Q MR. FRANCIS, I NOTICE YOU HAVE A VERY                    |
| 4    | WELL-MODULATED VOICE. DO YOU EVER RAISE YOUR VOICE?        |
| 5    | A I HAVE DONE IT ON OCCASION.                              |
| 6    | Q DO YOU EVER SHOUT?                                       |
| 7    | A I HAVE DONE IT ON OCCASION.                              |
| 8    | Q DO ANY OF THE PEOPLE IN THE BOARD MEETINGS EVER          |
| 9    | BECOME INTENSE AND RAISE THEIR VOICES?                     |
| 10   | A I CAN THINK OF SOMETIMES BACK IN THE                     |
| 11   | MIDSEVENTIES WHERE THAT MAY HAVE HAPPENED.                 |
| 12   | Q AND AS EVERYBODY GOT OLDER, THEY STOPPED                 |
| 13   | RAISING THEIR VOICES QUITE SO MUCH?                        |
| 14   | A NO. I WOULD SAY THE PEOPLE THAT WERE RAISING             |
| 15   | THEIR VOICES WERE NO LONGER ON THE BOARD.                  |
| 16   | Q WAS MR. RANDALL KING ONE OF THOSE PEOPLE WHO             |
| • 17 | RAISED HIS VOICE?  |
| 18   | A YES.   |
| 19   | Q WAS HE A PROBLEM WITH THE CHURCH?                        |
| 20   | MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT AS TO VAGUE AND            |
| 21   | AMEIGUOUS, YOUR HONOR.                                     |
| 22   | MR. LEVY: WELL, ASIDE FROM                                 |
| 23   | THE COURT: WHY DON'T YOU REPHRASE IT.                      |
| 24   | Q BY MR. LEVY: WOULD YOU SAY THAT HIS CONDUCT              |
| 25   | CREATED PROBLEMS AT THE BOARD MEETINGS?                    |
| 26   | A ON SOME OCCASIONS, YES.                                  |
| 27   | Q WOULD IT BE, BASED ON YOUR TESTIMONY AND THE             |
| 28   | TESTIMONY OF OTHER PEOPLE THAT YOU'VE HEARD, WOULD YOU SAY |
|      |  |

THAT IT WOULD BE A FAIR REPRESENTATION THAT HE IS A LITTLE 1 BIT OF A TROUBLEMAKER? 2 3 Α HE COULD BE. YOU DON'T WANT TO COMMIT YOURSELF ONE WAY OR 5 ANOTHER? 6 NO. THERE ARE TIMES WHEN HE COULD BE A 7 TROUBLEMAKER. HE WASN'T ALWAYS A TROUBLEMAKER. IN YOUR OPINION, SINCE YOU WERE THERE FOR A 8 NUMBER OF YEARS, WAS RANDALL KING AN ACTIVE, INTERESTED, 9 KNOWLEDGEABLE, WONDERFUL PARTICIPANT AT THE CHURCH? 10 MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT. THAT IS A COMPOUND 11 QUESTION. THERE IS A WHOLE BUNCH OF DIFFERENT THINGS THERE. 12 13 THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. LEVY: HOW WOULD YOU BEST DESCRIBE 14 RANDALL KING AND HIS PARTICIPATION AT THE CHURCH? 15 OVER THE WHOLE TEN YEARS? 16 SURE. ALL THE TIME THAT YOU KNEW HIM. 17 Q WELL, DIFFERENT FOR DIFFERENT YEARS. I MEAN I 18 WOULD HAVE TO TELL YOU HOW I SAW HIM AT FIRST AND THEN WHAT 19 20 IT DEVELOPED TO BE. WHY DON'T YOU TELL ME HOW YOU SAW HIM AT LAST. 21 Q AT LAST? 22 Α YES. THE END. 23 Q 19807 24 Α YES. 25 Q I DIDN'T HAVE MUCH INTERACTION WITH HIM THEN. 26 I PROBABLY SAW HIM A LITTLE BIT, BUT HE DID NOT WORK ON 27 28 CAMPUS AND --

Q NO, NO, NO. I DON'T MEAN WHERE HE WORKED.

WITH YOU, MR. FRANCIS, WHAT YOU THOUGHT OF HIS PERFORMANCE

AND JUST HIS GENERAL DEMEANOR AND EVERYTHING ELSE.

A MR. KING COULD BE A VERY DIFFICULT PERSON TO

GET ALONG WITH AND HE HAD A BAD TEMPER. AND IF THINGS

DIDN'T GO QUITE RIGHT, QUITE THE WAY HE WANTED THEM, HE

COULD -- HE WAS SUBJECT TO TEMPER TANTRUMS OR WHATEVER YOU'D

LIKE TO CALL IT. HE COULD BLOW UP. AND IT MADE THINGS

DIFFICULT TO DEAL WITH HIM.

Q YOU CERTAINLY WOULDN'T HAVE RECOMMENDED HIM TO ANYONE ELSE OR ANY OTHER GROUP, WOULD YOU?

A WELL, DEPENDS ON THE SITUATION. THERE ARE SOME SITUATIONS IN WHICH HE COULD FUNCTION OKAY. I WOULD NOT PUT HIM IN AN INTENSE DECISION—MAKING SITUATION BECAUSE HE HAD PROBLEMS IN THAT. HE WOULD GET INTO CONFLICTS WITH PEOPLE AND LOSE HIS TEMPER.

IN OTHER SITUATIONS LIKE, FOR EXAMPLE, WHEN HE USED TO WORK IN THE KITCHEN BACK IN 1970 TO '73, HE WAS FINE.

Q WHAT ABOUT AROUND 1980 WHEN HE WAS PARTING

COMPANY WITH THE CHURCH? AT THAT PERIOD OF TIME, WOULD I BE

CORRECT IN ASSUMING THAT HE LOST HIS TEMPER, HE WAS A

TROUBLEMAKER, HE COULDN'T MAKE DECISIONS?

A NOT IN 1980. THIS WAS MORE DURING THE PERIOD

THAT HE WAS ON THE BOARD THAT I HAD THAT KIND OF INTERACTION
WITH HIM. I DIDN'T HAVE INTERACTIONS WITH HIM IN 1980 WHERE
HE LOST HIS TEMPER WITH ME OR THAT I OBSERVED.

Q WELL, WHAT DID YOU KNOW ABOUT HIM IN 1980?

| 1  | A WELL, HE WORKED OVER AT THE OFFICE WE HAD IN               |
|----|--|
| 2  | WESTLAKE. I DIDN'T SEE HIM VERY OFTEN. AND                   |
| 3  | Q DIDN'T KNOW VERY MUCH ABOUT HIM?                           |
| 4  | A WELL, NOT IN THAT SPECIFIC YEAR. I HAD VERY                |
| 5  | LITTLE INTERACTION WITH HIM IN 1980.                         |
| 6  | Q DIDN'T KNOW HIM, DIDN'T HAVE VERY MUCH                     |
| 7  | INTERACTION WITH HIM, HE WAS JUST A REGULAR OLD BLOW-HARD    |
| 8  | AND REGULAR GUY WHO JUST GOT UPSET, AND COULDN'T MAKE        |
| 9  | DECISIONS, AND LOST HIS TEMPER AND THAT KIND OF THING?       |
| 10 | A I DIDN'T SAY THAT. I DIDN'T SAY HE COULDN'T                |
| 11 | MAKE DECISIONS. I SAID THAT IN INTENSE DECISION-MAKING       |
| 12 | SITUATIONS, HE COULD GET INTO CONFLICTS WITH PEOPLE AND LOSE |
| 13 | HIS TEMPER.  |
| 14 | Q CERTAINLY NOT THE KIND OF PERSON YOU'D                     |
| 15 | RECOMMEND LIKE YOU DID IN THIS LETTER IN MARCH OF 1980.      |
| 16 | WE'D LIKE TO MARK THIS AS EXHIBIT NUMBER 114.                |
| 17 | DID YOU WRITE A LETTER                                       |
| 18 | THE COURT: SO MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.                     |
| 19 | (MARKED FOR ID: ^ EXHIBIT 114, LETTER                        |
| 20 | OF RECOMMENDATION)   |
| 21 | MR. LEVY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.                             |
| 22 | Q DID YOU WRITE A LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION FOR               |
| 23 | RANDALL KING IN MARCH OF 1980 WHERE YOU EXTOLLED HIS         |
| 24 | VIRTUES?   |
| 25 | A YOU MIND IF I TAKE AN OPPORTUNITY TO LOOK AT               |
| 26 | THIS BRIEFLY?  |
| 27 | Q AND AFTER YOU LOOK AT IT BRIEFLY, WHY DON'T YOU            |
| 28 | READ IT FOR THE COURT.                                       |
|    |  |

-- -- -- -

A ALL RIGHT.

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE AN EXTRA COPY FOR ME?

MR. LEVY: 1 JUST GOT AHOLD OF A COPY, YOUR HONOR. 1

DO NOT.

THE WITNESS: SHALL I GO AHEAD?
THE COURT: GO AHEAD, PLEASE.

THE WITNESS: ALL RIGHT. (READING.)

"TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN.

\*CARE OF MR. RANDALL C. KING.

\*LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA.

"REGARDING: LETTER OF

REFERENCE FOR EMPLOYERS.

"TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

"MR. RANDALL C. KING HAS BEEN
IN THE CONTINUOUS EMPLOYMENT OF THE SUMMIT
LIGHTHOUSE SINCE 1970. DURING THAT TIME HE
HAS HELD MANY POSITIONS AND HAS ADVANCED
RAPIDLY IN THE ORGANIZATION. HE SERVED AS
THE MANAGER OF THE FOUR WINDS ORGANIC CENTER
IN COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO, A SPECIALTY
RESTAURANT AND HEALTH FOOD STORE; AND LATER
AS THE MANAGER OF THE FOUR WINDS WHOLESALE
DISTRIBUTORS. THESE ENTERPRISES WERE VERY
SUCCESSFUL PROJECTS CONDUCTED BY OUR
ORGANIZATION FROM 1971 TO '74, AND
CULMINATED IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF LANELLO
RESERVES, INCORPORATED, IN LATE 1973. MR.
KING SERVED AS PRESIDENT OF THIS COMPANY,

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

2627

28

DIRECTING ITS ACTIVITIES WHICH INCLUDED MYRIAD INVESTMENT AND PURCHASING OPPORTUNITIES.

\*MORE RECENTLY, HE HAS BEEN THE DIRECTOR OF MARKETING AND PUBLIC RELATIONS FOR THE ENTIRE ORGANIZATION AND ITS AFFILIATES. THESE RESPONSIBILITIES HAVE BEEN VERY BROAD AND HE HAS EXECUTED THEM WELL. THIS POSITION HAS INCLUDED THE MANAGEMENT OF THE ADVERTISING AND DESIGN STAFF OF THE ORGANIZATION, THE PUBLIC RELATIONS DEPARTMENT AND THE WHOLESALE DISTRIBUTION ACTIVITIES OF THE BOOKS AND PUBLICATIONS OF THE SUMMIT LIGHTHOUSE. ALSO, AS AN ADDITIONAL PROJECT SINCE 1975, MR. KING HAS SERVED AS THE DIRECTOR OF MULTIMEDIA PRODUCTIONS OF THE ORGANIZATION, PRODUCING QUITE AN IMPRESSIVE NUMBER OF QUALITY SLIDE SHOWS IN MULTIMEDIA.

ASSOCIATION, MR. KING HAS ALWAYS

ACCOMPLISHED EXCELLENCE AT WHATEVER HE SET

HIS MIND TO DO. HE HAS BOUNDLESS ENERGY, AN

AMAZING CAPACITY TO LEARN, AND THE ABILITY

TO DEVELOP A TOTAL GRASP OF ALL ASPECTS OF

ANY PROJECT WHICH HE UNDERTAKES. HE COULD

BE RELIED UPON TO PROVIDE SATISFACTORY

SERVICES IN EVERY WAY IN ANY OF THE

POSITIONS MENTIONED ABOVE. WE ARE NOT DISSATISFIED WITH THE PERFORMANCE OF HIS PROFESSIONAL SERVICES IN ANY WAY.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION, THE

SUMMIT LIGHTHOUSE IS A NATIONALLY ORIENTED

RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION, AND

HAS BEEN IN CONTINUOUS OPERATION SINCE 1958.

WE SERVE A LARGE NATIONAL MEMBERSHIP AND THE

GENERAL PUBLIC WITH BOOKS, PUBLICATIONS, AND

LITERATURE, WHICH HAVE ALWAYS BEEN

MAINTAINED AT A STRICT LEVEL OF QUALITY. IN

ADDITION, WE OPERATE TWO SCHOOLS AND SPONSOR

NUMEROUS CONFERENCES AND SEMINARS THROUGHOUT

THE U.S.A. EACH YEAR.

"VERY TRULY YOURS,

"EDWARD L. FRANCIS,

"VICE PRESIDENT AND BUSINESS

## MANAGER.

Q BY MR. LEVY: SAME RANDALL KING YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT BEFORE?

A THAT IS WHO IT REFERS TO.

Q WOULD IT BE A FAIR STATEMENT THAT WHATEVER THE NEEDS OF THE CHURCH WERE AT A PARTICULAR TIME, YOU'D WRITE OR SAY OR DO WHATEVER YOU NEEDED TO DO TO SATISFY WHATEVER THE PURPOSE WAS AT THAT PARTICULAR MOMENT?

A NO, I DON'T THINK THAT IS A FAIR STATEMENT.

Q SO THIS GUY WHO BLEW UP, WHO COULDN'T MAKE DECISIONS, WHO WAS DIFFICULT GOT THAT KIND OF LETTER OF

## 

RECOMMENDATION?

A WELL, WE WANTED TO HAVE A PEACEFUL PARTING OF THE WAYS, FIRST OF ALL. SECOND OF ALL, MY RECOLLECTION IS I BELIEVE HE DICTATED THIS LETTER AND, THIRDLY, THE THINGS THAT I HAVE REFERRED TO IN HERE DON'T REFER TO HIS ACTIVITY ON THE BOARD.

IT REFERS TO HIS ACTIVITY IN THE FOUR WINDS

ORGANIC CENTER, THE KITCHEN TYPE SITUATION I TOLD YOU ABOUT.

AND IT REFERS TO THE TIME THAT HE WORKED IN THE MULTIMEDIA

PRODUCTIONS AREA.

Q DID HE HOLD A GUN TO YOUR HEAD TO MAKE YOU SIGN IT, MR. FRANCIS?

- A NO. I AGREED TO DO IT.
- Q THAT WAS GOOD OF YOU.

  YOU TOLD US THAT YOU KNEW MARK PROPHET.
- A YES.

Q NOW, EVERYBODY KNOWS MARK PROPHET WAS FAMOUS

FOR ONE OF HIS LITTLE STORIES. LET ME TELL YOU THE STORY.

IT IS VERY SHORT. IT SAYS — IT GOES THIS WAU.

YOU ARE WALKING DOWN THE STREET ON A SUN -SUNNY AFTERNOON, AND ALL OF A SUDDEN YOU SAW A NICE FAMILY
WITH TWO SWEET CHILDREN AND THEY RAN BY YOU SCREAMING
BECAUSE THEY WERE SCARED TO DEATH. YOU SAW THEM CLIMB UP A
TREE AND HIDE, AND THEN TWO THUGS CAME RUNNING AFTER THEM
SHOOTING GUNS AND ASKED YOU WHERE THE FAMILY WENT.

AND THEN HE WOULD TELL YOU YOU COULD TELL THE TRUTH THAT THEY WERE IN THE TREE AND THEN YOU COULD WATCH SOME NICE LITTLE INNOCENT CHILDREN GET SHOT, OR YOU COULD

TELL A LITTLE WHITE LIE AND SEND THE THUGS ON DOWN THE 1 STREET. 2 IF I REMEMBER CORRECTLY FROM WHAT I'VE HEARD, 3 MARK WOULD THEN SAY, "WHAT WOULD YOU DO?" 4 DOES THAT SOUND FAMILIAR TO YOU, THAT LITTLE --5 I HAVE NEVER HEARD THAT. 6 NEVER HEARD THAT STORY? 7 0 THAT STORY, NO. 8 WOULD IT SURPRISE YOU IF I TOLD YOU I HEARD IT 9 FROM ABOUT 15 PEOPLE WHO WERE IN THE CHURCH FOR SOME 14 OR 10 15 YEARS AND KNEW MARK PROPHET VERY WELL? 11 WELL, I HAVE NEVER HEARD IT MYSELF. 12 WASN'T THAT THE LITTLE STORY HE TOLD WHEN HE 13 SAID THE END JUSTIFIES THE MEANS; YOU CAN TELL A LITTLE LIE 14 AND SAVE THE LIVES OF THE CHILDREN, OR YOU CAN JUST THROW UP 15 YOUR HANDS AND ABDICATE YOUR RESPONSIBILITY AND YOU CAN LET 16 THE KIDS DIE? 17 WELL, I HAVE NEVER HEARD MARK PROPHET PREACH A 18 SERMON SAYING THAT THE END JUSTIFIES THE MEANS. 19 I DIDN'T SAY PREACH A SERMON. I SAID --20 I NEVER HEARD HIM SAY IT. 21 LET'S GO TO THE SQUARE DANCE. 22 Q NOW, EUGENE GARCIA WAS THE GATE GUARD. BY THE 23 WAY, DO YOU KEEP MR. GARCIA ON A CHAIN OR ANYTHING IN THE 24 GATE -- LITTLE GATEHOUSE, OR IS HE ALLOWED TO LEAVE THERE 25 PERIODICALLY? 26 HE DOESN'T WORK THERE ANYMORE. 27 NOW, MR. GARCIA TESTIFIED HERE THAT AFTER HE 28 Q

SAW MR. MULL AND A GROUP OF PEOPLE WALK THROUGH THE OUTSIDE GATE AND START DOWN THE ROAD TOWARD THE GUARDHOUSE, HE THEN CALLED YOU.

HE FURTHER TESTIFIED THAT WHERE YOU WERE OUT SOME 1,500 FEET AWAY, AND MR. KLEIN WAS KIND ENOUGH TO PROVIDE US WITH A SCALE DRAWING WHICH SAID THE OUTSIDE GATE WAS 705 FEET AWAY, AND THAT HE MADE THE CALL AFTER MR. MULL STARTED WALKING DOWN THE ROAD.

WAS MR. GARCIA ACCURATE AS TO THE DISTANCES AND WAS THE CHART ACCURATE AS TO THE DISTANCES?

A I THINK THE CHART IS ACCURATE, BUT I THINK

1,500 FEET TO MY OFFICE IS PROBABLY A BIT MUCH. IT IS MORE

LIKE 1,000, 1,200 MAYBE.

Q THE ONLY REASON FOR THIS QUESTION IS I AM

REALLY PUZZLED. IF MR. GARCIA WAS NOT LYING TO US, HE SAID

YOU WERE WALKING, AND GREGORY WAS WALKING, AND YOU HAD TWICE

AS FAR TO WALK AND YOU BOTH GOT THERE AT THE SAME TIME.

DO YOU HAVE SOME KIND OF ASSISTANCE FROM UP ABOVE THAT GETS YOU THERE QUICKER THAN OTHER PEOPLE?

A WELL, WHAT I WAS TOLD THAT -- WHEN I WAS CALLED ON THE PHONE WAS THAT THEY WERE CONGREGATING AROUND THE GATE, FIRST OF ALL. SECOND OF ALL, I DIDN'T GET THERE, TO MY RECOLLECTION, AT THE SAME TIME.

WHEN I GOT THERE, THEY WERE -- WHEN I COULD SEE

THEM FROM WHEN I WAS WALKING DOWN THERE, THEY WERE JUST

ARRIVING. SO I PROBABLY GOT THERE WITHIN 30 SECONDS TO A

MINUTE OF THE TIME THAT THEY GOT THERE.

Q ARE YOU CHANGING YOUR TESTIMONY FROM A LITTLE

| 1  | WHILE AGO WHERE YOU SAID YOU WERE CALLED, AND YOU LEFT WHEN |
|----|---|
| 2  | YOU WERE CALLED AND YOU MET THEM WHEN THEY ARRIVED AT THE   |
| 3  | GUARDHOUSE? DO YOU MEAN THEY WERE THERE AND THEN YOU CAME   |
| 4  | JOGGING UP A FEW MOMENTS LATER?                             |
| 5  | A I DIDN'T SAY I MET THEM SIMULTANEOUSLY. I SAID            |
| 6  | WHEN I GOT THERE, I MET THEM.                               |
| 7  | Q OH, I SEE.  |
| 8  | JUST OUT OF CURIOSITY, MR. FRANCIS, HOW OLD ARE             |
| 9  | YOU?  |
| 10 | A THIRTY-FIVE.  |
| 11 | Q AND YOU GOT INVOLVED IN THE CHURCH IN WHAT                |
| 12 | YEAR?   |
| 13 | A 1970.   |
| 14 | Q SIXTEEN YEARS AGO?  |
| 15 | A FIFTEEN. FIFTEEN AND A HALF LET'S SAY.                    |
| 16 | Q SO YOU WERE ROUGHLY ABOUT 20 YEARS OF AGE?                |
| 17 | A TWENTY YEARS OLD, RIGHT.                                  |
| 18 | Q HAD YOU ALREADY COMPLETED YOUR THREE AND A HALF           |
| 19 | YEARS OF LAW SCHOOL WHEN YOU GOT TO THE CHURCH?             |
| 20 | A NO.   |
| 21 | Q WAS THERE A REASON YOU DIDN'T COMPLETE THE                |
| 22 | OTHER HALF YEAR AND GET YOUR DEGREE?                        |
| 23 | A LAW SCHOOL OR UNDERGRADUATE YOU TALKING ABOUT?            |
| 24 | Q WELL, YOU TESTIFIED THAT YOU DIDN'T QUITE                 |
| 25 | COMPLETE UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOL AND YOU DIDN'T QUITE COMPLETE |
| 26 | LAW SCHOOL.   |
| 27 | A WHICH ARE YOU REFERRING TO?                               |
| 28 | Q LAW SCHOOL.   |
|    |   |

A AS FAR AS LAW SCHOOL IS CONCERNED, I PROBABLY HAD ANOTHER YEAR TO GO TO COMPLETE MY DEGREE. AND AT THE TIME THAT I DECIDED TO DISCONTINUE, I HAD MADE A DECISION THAT I WAS NOT GOING TO GO AHEAD AND TAKE THE BAR EXAM AND TRY TO BECOME A PRACTICING ATTORNEY.

AND I FELT THAT I HAD LEARNED WHAT I -- THE MAIN THINGS THAT I WANTED TO LEARN THERE. MOST OF THE COURSES THAT I HAD LEFT WOULD HAVE BEEN PREREQUISITES AND THAT KIND OF THING. SO I DECIDED TO DISCONTINUE.

Q WELL, IN THE COURSE OF LEARNING ALL THE THINGS
THAT YOU DID THERE -- LET'S JUMP TO THAT TWO AND A HALF HOUR
CONVERSATION THAT YOU AND MONROE SHEARER AND ELIZABETH CLARE
PROPHET HAD WITH GREGORY MULL.

DO YOU RECALL YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THAT WITH REGARD TO STATEMENTS THAT WERE MADE BY BOTH YOURSELF AND ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET THAT A TAPE RECORDING COULD NOT BE USED IN EVIDENCE?

A SHE SAID SOMETHING ABOUT A TAPE RECORDING. I

AM NOT -- I DON'T RECALL IF SHE SAID SPECIFICALLY THAT OR

NOT.

Q BUT YOU WITH ALL YOUR LAW TRAINING, YOU EXPLAINED WHAT THAT MEANT, THAT YOU COULD NOT USE TAPE RECORDINGS IN THE COURSE OF A LEGAL PROCEEDING?

MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. THE TRANSCRIPT IS IN EVIDENCE. HE IS ASKING HIM WHAT HE SAID.

THE COURT: SUSTAINED.

MR. KLEIN: BEST EVIDENCE.

Q BY MR. LEVY: AT THAT TIME, DID YOU KNOW

WHETHER OR NOT THE TAPE RECORDING COULD OR COULD NOT BE USED 1 IN A COURT OF LAW? 2 I KNEW THAT TAPE RECORDINGS CAN BE USED UNDER 3 CERTAIN SITUATIONS, SURE. IS THERE ANY REASON WHY YOU TOLD GREGORY MULL 5 THAT THE TAPE RECORDING COULDN'T BE USED? 6 I DON'T RECALL THE CONTEXT OF EXACTLY WHAT WAS 7 SAID THERE. 8 YOU WERE RATHER SPECIFIC ABOUT ALL THE OTHER 9 Q 10 CONTEXT. DO YOU REMEMBER DURING THE COURSE OF THAT 11 CONVERSATION ELIZABETH SAID TO GREGORY, "FORGET THE BOARD. 12 YOU ARE TALKING TO ME"? YOU REMEMBER THAT? 13 YEAH, I REMEMBER THAT. 14 IN YOUR OPINION, DID THAT SUGGEST THAT 15 ELIZABETH HAD THE AUTHORITY TO MAKE DECISIONS WITHOUT THE 16 BOARD? 17 MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT. THAT ASKS FOR A 18 CONCLUSION, YOUR HONOR. 19 THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER. 20 THE WITNESS: NO, THAT IS NOT WHAT IT MEANT AT ALL. 21 SHE SAID THAT BECAUSE SHE HAD ALREADY DISCUSSED THE 22 SITUATION WITH THE BOARD AND WE HAD AGREED UPON WHICH OFFER 23 SHE WAS GOING TO BE ABLE TO NEGOTIATE WITH HIM. 24 Q BY MR. LEVY: LET ME READ TO YOU FROM THAT 25 TRANSCRIPT IF I MAY. 26 MR. KLEIN: WHAT PAGE ARE YOU READING FROM? 27 MR. LEVY: PAGE 18 IN THE ORIGINAL COPY YOU GAVE ME. 28

(READING.)

\*MOTHER: FORGET THE BOARD.

YOU ARE DEALING WITH ME.

\*GREGORY: THERE IS SOMETHING WRONG BECAUSE YOU ARE NOT LOOKING AT THE ENTIRE SITUATION.

"MOTHER: FORGET THE BOARD.
YOU ARE DEALING WITH ME.

\*GREGORY: YOU ARE RESPONSIBLE

FOR THE BOARD -- TOTALLY RESPONSIBLE. 15

THAT WHAT YOU ARE SAYING?

"GREGORY, I AM DEALING
WITH YOU NOW. WHATEVER THE BOARD HAS SAID
BEFORE THIS, YOU DON'T HAVE TO CONCERN
YOURSELF WITH BECAUSE I AM SAYING IT. I AM
SAYING IT TO YOU AND, BELIEVE IT OR NOT, EL
MORYA IS SAYING IT THROUGH ME."

Q NOW, WAS ELIZABETH IN SUFFICIENT CONTROL OF THE BOARD AND WAS SHE IN CHARGE ENOUGH THAT SHE COULD MAKE A DECISION AS SHE WAS SUGGESTING TO MR. MULL SO THAT SHE DIDN'T HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT WHAT THE BOARD WOULD DECIDE OR NOT DECIDE?

A WELL, I WOULDN'T SAY SO IN THAT SPECIFIC SITUATION, NO, BECAUSE, AS I SAID, IT HAD BEEN PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED. AND SHE WAS THE PRESIDENT OF THE CHURCH. AS THE PRESIDENT, SHE HAS THE AUTHORITY TO NEGOTIATE IN SUCH SITUATIONS.

Q SO WHAT YOU ARE SAYING IN A SOMEWHAT A

ROUNDABOUT WAY IS IF SHE DECIDES TO INTERCEDES AND SHE IS THE PRESIDENT, SHE CAN DO PRETTY MUCH WHAT SHE PLEASES?

A NO, THAT IS NOT WHAT I AM SAYING. I AM SAYING SHE ALREADY HAD THE AUTHORITY OF THE BOARD TO NEGOTIATE IN THIS SITUATION. WE HAD ALREADY AGREED THAT WE WOULD ACCEPT HIS \$10,000 OFFER AND AGREE NOT TO SUE HIM.

Q WELL, YOU DID LEARN SOMETHING IN LAW SCHOOL.

YOU GO AROUND IN CIRCLES. NOW LET'S GO BACK AROUND THE

CIRCLE.

THERE WAS A TIME WHEN ELIZABETH SAID TO GREGORY MULL, "WE ARE NOT GOING TO SUE YOU. I AM NOT GOING TO SUE YOU." AND SHE SAID THAT SIX OR SEVEN TIMES.

AND NOWHERE IN THAT ENTIRE TRANSCRIPT IS THERE

ONE STATEMENT BY HER WHICH SAYS, "IF YOU GIVE ME THE

\$10,000, I WILL NOT SUE YOU." THERE IS NOT ONE PLACE IN THE

ENTIRE TRANSCRIPT THAT THEY ARE SAID TOGETHER. WHAT SHE

SAYS SEPARATE AND APART IS, "I AM NOT GOING TO SUE YOU. I

DON'T WANT TO BE TIED UP WITH YOU."

CAN YOU EXPLAIN TO ME, WITH YOUR LEGAL

BACKGROUND OF COURSE, WHY NOWHERE IN THE TRANSCRIPT DOES IT

SAY THAT, "IF YOU PAY \$10,000, I WILL NOT SUE YOU"?

A I DON'T KNOW HOW LONG THAT TRANSCRIPT IS. I AM NOT FAMILIAR WITH EVERY SINGLE THING THAT IS STATED IN THERE.

AS FAR AS THE STATEMENT BY HER, THAT SHE WAS NOT GOING TO SUE HIM OR THAT THE CHURCH WAS NOT GOING TO SUE HIM, THOSE WERE ALL STATED BEFORE HE SAID THAT HE WAS WITHDRAWING HIS OFFER FOR THE \$10,000.

| 1  | Q I AM TALKING ABOUT RIGHT NOW. YOU SAIN            | D THE    |
|----|---|----------|
| 2  | BOARD DECIDED.                                      |          |
| 3  | A OKAY. THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WAS MYS             | ELF AND  |
| 4  | JIM AND MONROE. IF SHE WAS INVOLVED IN A            |          |
| 5  | Q EXCUSE ME JUST A MINUTE.                          |          |
| 6  | A I AM SORRY.                                       |          |
| 7  | Q LET'S GO BACK. THAT IS THE EXECUTIVE              |          |
| 8  | COMMITTEE?  |          |
| 9  | A YES.  |          |
| 10 | Q WHO IS ON THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AT TH            | AT SAME  |
| 11 | TIME, "78 AND "79? YOURSELF?                        |          |
| 12 | A YOU MEAN '80? WHICH YEAR DO YOU WANT              | BECAUSE  |
| 13 | IT DID CHANGE.                                      |          |
| 14 | Q LET'S GO TO 1980.                                 |          |
| 15 | A OKAY. MYSELF, JAMES MC CAFFREY, MONRO             | E        |
| 16 | SHEARER, ELIZABETH AND TOM MILLER.                  |          |
| 17 | Q THREE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTOR            | S OUT OF |
| 18 | FIVE IS THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE?                    |          |
| 19 | A THIS IS CORRECT.                                  |          |
| 20 | Q SO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HAD THE MAJ            | ORITY    |
| 21 | VOTE AND THEY COULD DECIDE WHATEVER THEY WANTED TO? |          |
| 22 | A NO, THAT IS NOT TRUE.                             |          |
| 23 | Q WHO ACTUALLY DECIDED TO SUE GREGORY MU            | LL?      |
| 24 | A THE BOARD DID.                                    |          |
| 25 | Q WHICH BOARD?                                      |          |
| 26 | A THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF CHURCH UNIVE            | RSAL AND |
| 27 | TRIUMPHANT.   |          |
| 28 | Q THEY HAD A FORMAL MEETING, THEY SAT DO            | WN, THEY |
|    | l .   |          |

TOOK MINUTES, THEY SENT NOTICE THAT THERE WOULD BE A BOARD 1 OF DIRECTORS MEETING HELD? 2 WE DIDN'T USUALLY CONDUCT BOARD MEETINGS THAT 3 WAY WITH FORMAL NOTICE. YOU USUALLY CONDUCTED THEM MAYBE ONCE OR TWICE 5 A YEAR ON A FORMAL BASIS, WOULD THAT BE ACCURATE? 6 YOU MEAN WITH NOTICE AND ALL THAT? 7 Α YES, SIR. 0 8 THAT IS PROBABLY TRUE. 9 THE REST OF THE TIME IS LIKE A LITTLE COFFEE 10 Q CLUB, YOU ALL GOT TOGETHER AND TALKED? 11 IT WASN'T THAT INFORMAL. Α 12 YOU WORE SHOES? 13 0 WE HAD A BOARD MEETING, WE GAVE EVERYBODY 14 NOTICE -- MAYBE NOT WRITTEN TYPE NOTICE, BUT WE LET THEM 15 KNOW THAT WE WANTED TO HAVE A BOARD MEETING -- AND WE 16 ARRANGED IT AT A TIME MUTUALLY SATISFACTORY TO THE MEMBERS 17 OF THE BOARD. 18 AND THE BOARD IN ITS ENTIRETY -- WAS THAT A 19 Q UNANIMOUS DECISION, BY THE WAY? 20 I DON'T RECALL. 21 DO YOU REMEMBER MR. MONROE SHEARER WASN'T 22 NECESSARILY HAPPY ABOUT THE IDEA OF SUING GREGORY MULL? 23 DOES THAT RING A BELL? 24 NO. I FRANKLY DON'T REMEMBER THE EXACT MEETING 25 THAT THIS HAPPENED. BUT IT IS THE TYPE OF DECISION THAT 26 WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN MADE JUST BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. 27 IT WOULD HAVE INVOLVED THE WHOLE BOARD. 28

| 1  |   |
|----|---|
| 1  | Q REMEMBER ANYTHING ABOUT MONROE SHEARER WHERE HE           |
| 2  | DIDN'T FEEL THAT EVEN THOUGH HE WAS SUPPORTIVE OF           |
| 3  | ELIZABETH, THAT MAYBE EQUITY WOULDN'T BE DONE IF YOU WENT   |
| 4  | AHEAD AND SUED HIM, SUED GREGORY MULL?                      |
| 5  | A WHAT DO YOU MEAN?   |
| 6  | Q DO YOU REMEMBER ANY DISCUSSION AT ANY OF THOSE            |
| 7  | MEETINGS THAT YOU HAD WHERE MONROE SHEARER VOICED THE       |
| 8  | OPINION THAT ALTHOUGH HE WANTED TO BE SUPPORTIVE OF         |
| 9  | ELIZABETH, THAT IT MIGHT NOT BE THE MOST EQUITABLE THING TO |
| 10 | DO, TO SUE GREGORY MULL?                                    |
| 11 | A NO, I DON'T REMEMBER THAT.                                |
| 12 | Q YOU DON'T REMEMBER THAT?                                  |
| 13 | A NO.   |
| 14 | Q YOU DON'T REMEMBER ANYTHING FAVORABLE ABOUT MR.           |
| 15 | MULL, DO YOU?   |
| 16 | A NO. I REMEMBER SOME THINGS THAT ARE FAVORABLE             |
| 17 | ABOUT HIM.  |
| 18 | Q TELL US ABOUT IT.   |
| 19 | A HE DID SOME PLANS AND DRAWINGS THAT WERE USED             |
| 20 | BY THE CHURCH.  |
| 21 | Q WHICH ONES WERE THOSE?                                    |
| 22 | A THE WILL OF GOD FOCUS.                                    |
| 23 | Q ANYTHING ELSE?  |
| 24 | A WELL, THERE WERE SOME REMODEL PROJECTS THAT               |
| 25 | WERE DONE BY HIM.   |
| 26 | Q ANYTHING ELSE?  |
| 27 | A I CAN T REMEMBER ANYTHING ELSE THAT WAS                   |
| 28 | ACTUALLY DONE.  |
|    |   |

WEREN'T YOU HIS BOSS? 1 0 NOT REALLY. I -- MONROE WAS REALLY THE PERSON 2 WHO RAN THE ARCHITECTURE DEPARTMENT. I DID CONSULT WITH HIM 3 ON SOME OCCASIONS, BUT NOT VERY OFTEN. 4 DID YOU ACTUALLY HAVE AN ARCHITECTURAL 5 DEPARTMENT, OR A BUILDING AND DESIGNER, OR PLANNING 6 DEPARTMENT? WHAT WAS IT ACTUALLY CALLED IN THOSE DAYS? 7 8 ARCHITECTURE. WOULD IT SURPRISE YOU IF I TOLD YOU THAT 9 ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET AT HER DEPOSITION DETERMINED THAT 10 THERE WAS NO ARCHITECTURAL DEPARTMENT, IT WAS A PLANNING AND 11 12 DESIGN? WELL, THERE WAS A DEPARTMENT CALLED PLANNING 13 AND DEVELOPMENT. 14 15 AH. Q ARCHITECTURE WOULD REALLY BE A SUBDEPARTMENT I 16 THINK UNDER THAT BECAUSE MONROE WAS PRIMARILY THE PERSON WHO 17 OVERSAW IT. 18 Q YOU DIDN'T HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH IT? 19 WELL, I HAD A LITTLE BIT TO DO WITH IT, BUT 20 NOT -- I WAS NOT -- I DIDN'T WORK IN PLANNING AND 21 DEVELOPMENT. AND I DID SPEND SOME TIME WITH MONROE AND 22 GREGORY ON A FEW OCCASIONS TALKING ABOUT THE WORK HE WAS 23 GOING TO DO, BUT I DID NOT HAVE AN ACTIVE ROLE IN OVERSEEING 24 THE ACTIVITIES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL WORK. 25 IF I LOOK SURPRISED, I WANT TO APOLOGIZE 26 BECAUSE I RECALL -- AND I WONDER IF MY RECOLLECTION WILL 27 SURPRISE YOU -- THAT ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET TESTIFIED AT 28

HER DEPOSITION THAT YOU WERE RESPONSIBLE FOR WHATEVER
PROJECTS MR. MULL WOULD WORK ON, YOU AS ONE OF THE
AUTHORITIES IN THE CHURCH WOULD CONFER WITH MR. SHEARER AND
YOU WOULD MAKE THE DETERMINATION AS TO WHAT IT WAS GOING TO
BE THAT MR. MULL WOULD WORK ON.

IS YOUR RECOLLECTION DIFFERENT FROM HERS?

A YEAH, I THINK IT IS BECAUSE I AM AWARE THAT

THAT WAS SAID. I WAS AT THE DEPOSITION SESSION. AND THAT

IS NOT EXACTLY THE WAY IT WAS. MONROE WAS THE PERSON WHO

PRIMARILY OVERSAW THE WORK THAT GREGORY DID AS A SUPERVISOR

AND I HAD A MUCH LESS ACTIVE ROLE IN IT.

Q AND TO THE BEST OF YOUR KNOWLEDGE, WITH THIS
LAWSUIT PENDING AND ALL OF THE DISCUSSION THAT HAS BEEN HAD,
IN THE 17 MONTHS THAT MR. MULL LIVED AT CAMELOT AND WORKED
AT CAMELOT, SOMETIMES FOR LONG HOURS DURING THE COURSE OF
THE DAY, YOUR TOTAL RECOLLECTION IS THAT HE WORKED ON THE
WILL OF GOD FOCUS AND HE DID A FEW REMODELING JOBS?

A NO. I SAID THAT THOSE WERE THE ONES THAT WERE ACTUALLY BUILT. THOSE WERE THE JOBS THAT HE WORKED ON THAT WERE ACTUALLY CARRIED THROUGH TO EXECUTION.

Q TELL ME WHAT WAS THE PURPOSE OF BRINGING MR.

MULL ALL THE WAY TO CAMELOT IF HE WAS GOING TO DO A LITTLE

REMODELING AND MAYBE WORK ON THE WILL OF GOD FOCUS AND

ACTUALLY COMPLETE THAT JOB?

A HE WAS GOING TO WORK ON THE MI, THE MONTESSORI
INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL PROJECT.

Q BUT YOU TOLD US YOU DIDN'T FINISH THAT, YOU CANCELED THAT PROJECT?

| 1  | A THAT IS TRUE.   |
|----|---|
| 2  | Q WHEN DID YOU CANCEL 1T?                                   |
| 3  | A JULY, 1979.   |
| 4  | Q WHY DIDN'T YOU SEND MR. MULL HOME AT THAT TIME            |
| 5  | IN JULY OF 1979 IF YOU CANCELED THE MAIN PROJECT THAT YOU   |
| 6  | BROUGHT HIM TO CAMELOT TO DO? WHEN YOU CANCELED IT, WHY DID |
| 7  | YOU KEEP HIM THERE?   |
| 8  | A THERE WERE OTHER JOBS THAT HE WAS WORKING ON AT           |
| 9  | THAT TIME.  |
| 10 | Q PICKING UP PAPER? WHAT OTHER JOBS WAS HE                  |
| 11 | WORKING ON?   |
| 12 | A HE WAS STILL WORKING ON THE WILL OF GOD FOCUS.            |
| 13 | HE STARTED AFTER THAT DESIGNING AN EQUESTRIAN SCHOOL THAT   |
| 14 | UTILIZED THE SAME SURPLUS BUILDINGS THAT HE HAD DESIGNED    |
| 15 | INTO THE MONTESSORI INTERNATIONAL COMPLEX. AND I THINK THE  |
| 16 | BOUTIQUE THAT ENCLOSED THE PATIO, TO CONVERT IT TO THE      |
| 17 | SUMMIT UNIVERSITY BOOKSTORE, HE WAS ALSO WORKING ON AT THE  |
| 18 |   |
| 19 |   |
| 20 |   |
| 21 | DISCUSSING WITH HIM A YEAR OR MORE BEFORE HE ACTUALLY CAME  |
| 22 | TO CAMELOT?   |
| 23 |   |
| 24 |   |
| 25 |   |
| 26 |   |
| 2  |   |
| 2  | AUDITORIUM OR CATHEDRAL OF SOME KIND.                       |
|    |   |

and the second of the second o

THERE WAS ALSO AN OCCASION THAT I RECALL IN '78
WHERE HE CAME DOWN TO LOS ANGELES AND WE MET WITH THEM AT
THE ASHRAM IN LOS ANGELES. AND THEY PRESENTED SOME KIND OF
PROPOSAL THAT THEY HAD. THEY WANTED TO DESIGN AN AUDITORIUM
FOR THE CHURCH.

Q THEY WERE SOLICITING YOUR BUSINESS, AND THEY SAID, "HERE, WE HAVE SOME WONDERFUL DESIGNS WE SPENT HOURS AND DAYS AND WEEKS AND MONTHS ON. WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO LOOK AT IT. WE HAVE DONE ALL THIS WORK BECAUSE WE ARE SO RELIGIOUS AND WE WASTED ALL THESE HOURS SO YOU COULD MAKE A DECISION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT YOU WANT TO BUILD IT LIKE WE'VE DESIGNED IT"?

A I DON'T KNOW WHY THEY DID IT, BUT THEY WERE SOLICITING OUR BUSINESS. AND THE PROPOSAL THAT THEY CAME DOWN WITH CAME OUT OF THE BLUE. IT WAS REALLY THE FIRST TIME THAT WE HAD EVER HEARD OF IT. THE LETTERS THAT HE SENT AND THIS OCCASION WHEN HE CAME DOWN TO LOS ANGELES, THEY WERE DEFINITELY WANTING TO DO THIS PROJECT FOR THE CHURCH.

Q IN THE BROCHURE THAT IS CALLED THE TEN-YEAR PLAN THAT TALKS ABOUT THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAMELOT, IF I REMEMBER CORRECTLY, IT TALKS ABOUT A 3,300 SEAT AUDITORIUM. NOW, IN THE LETTER THAT MR. MULL WROTE YOU IN JANUARY OF 1979, IT INCLUDES A 3,300 SEAT AUDITORIUM.

DO YOU THINK IT WAS JUST SHEER LUCK THAT THEY
DESIGNED A 3,300 SEAT CATHEDRAL AS PART OF YOUR TOTAL
PACKAGE, OR DO YOU THINK THERE MIGHT HAVE BEEN SOME
CONNECTION BETWEEN YOUR TEN-YEAR PLAN AND THE 3,300 SEAT
PROJECT?

A THE TEN-YEAR PLAN AND THE CAMELOT BOOKLET WAS NOT COMPLETED UNTIL JANUARY OF 1978. THAT IS WHEN IT WAS PUBLISHED. THE CONCEPT OF THE 3,300 SEAT AUDITORIUM I AM SURE HAD BEEN TALKED ABOUT BEFORE THAT AS SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE IDEAL TO HAVE.

AS FAR AS THEIR PARTICIPATION IN IT IS

CONCERNED, I HAVE NO SURPRISE THAT THEY WOULD HAVE HEARD

ABOUT IT OR FOUND OUT ABOUT IT AND BE VERY EAGER TO WORK ON

IT, TO GET THAT JOB.

- Q DID THEY SEND YOU THE FULL PLANS FOR THE COMPLETE BUILDING, THE CATHEDRAL?
  - A DEFINITELY NOT.
  - Q THEY WERE JUST NEGOTIATING AT THE OUTSET?
- A THERE WAS SOME KIND OF A ROUGH SKETCH THAT THEY HAD THAT I RECALL WHEN THEY -- WHEN HE CAME DOWN WITH GIOVANNI DINI. IT WAS A ONE-PAGE HAND-DRAWN SKETCH THAT WAS A -- SOME KIND OF A ROUGH DESIGN CONCEPT OF WHAT THEY WANTED TO DO.

AND THEY WANTED TO GET THE GO AHEAD FROM US TO HIRE THEM AND TO GO AHEAD AND DO THIS BUILDING.

Q WERE THERE NOT DISCUSSIONS WITH PEOPLE IN THE CHURCH ABOUT ALL THE THINGS THE CHURCH WOULD HAVE TO DO IF THEY WENT AHEAD WITH THE PROJECT; AND IN THE LETTER OF JANUARY, 1978, DID THEY NOT SAY, "IF WE ARE TO GO AHEAD WITH THE PROJECT, WE ARE GOING TO REQUIRE SO MUCH MONEY AND WE NEED A DECISION BEFORE WE CAN PROCEED"? IS THAT WHAT THE LETTER SAID?

AS TO THE LAST PART OF -- THE FIRST PART OF

YOUR QUESTION, I HAVE FORGOTTEN.

BUT THE LAST PART OF YOUR QUESTION ABOUT THE LETTER IN JANUARY, IT DEFINITELY TALKS ABOUT FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF WHAT IT WOULD TAKE FOR THEM TO DESIGN THIS BUILDING, YES.

THERE WAS A DIALOGUE THAT IS DESCRIBED IN THIS Q LETTER THAT IS MARKED EXHIBIT NUMBER 21, A DIALOGUE THAT IS NOT A ONE-SIDED DIALOGUE. THEY TALK ABOUT WHAT THE CHURCH WILL HAVE TO DO, WHAT THEY WILL HAVE TO DO, WHAT WILL HAVE TO BE COMPLETED BEFORE THEY CAN PROCEED.

LET ME SHOW THE LETTER TO YOU. IT IS DATED JANUARY THE 12TH, 1978. "BELOVED MOTHER AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS, REVEREND MONROE SHEARER."

THEY JUST INVENT ALL THE TECHNICAL DETAILS IN THE LETTER WITHOUT ANY CONVERSATION WITH ANYBODY AT THE CHURCH?

OKAY. THIS IS NOT THE FIRST LETTER THAT WE EVER GOT FROM GREGORY WANTING TO DO ARCHITECTURE. THERE WAS A PRIOR LETTER FROM --

> EXCUSE ME, SIR. WASN'T MY QUESTION. Q

WELL, YOU WERE ASKING ABOUT WHETHER THERE WERE NEGOTIATIONS.

NO. WHAT I WAS ASKING YOU ABOUT WAS WHETHER OR Q NOT THEY JUST MADE UP ALL THE INFORMATION IN THE LETTER ON SHEER TOTAL SPECULATION, OR WHETHER OR NOT THEY HAD BEEN DISCUSSING WITH YOU THE POSSIBILITY OF THE CHURCH'S PARTICIPATION IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF A CATHEDRAL?

WELL, THAT IS WHAT I WAS REFERRING BACK TO THE

27 28

21

22

23

24

25

LETTER PREVIOUS TO THIS. THAT IS WHEN HE FIRST DISCUSSED DOING ARCHITECTURE AT CAMELOT. IT WAS RIGHT AFTER WE PURCHASED CAMELOT IN 1977 THAT HE WROTE AND SAID HE HAD HEARD ABOUT IT AND HE WANTED TO BE INVOLVED IN IT.

THEN THIS LETTER CAME AND IT IS A MORE SPECIFIC PROPOSAL SAYING THAT HE'D LIKE TO DESIGN THIS -- A CATHEDRAL WITH A SEATING CAPACITY OF 3,300 PEOPLE, 65,000 SQUARE FEET AND HOW MUCH IT WOULD COST.

- Q HOW MUCH WOULD IT COST?
- A WELL, ACCORDING TO HIM, IT WOULD COST \$60 PER SQUARE FOOT, WHICH EQUALS \$3,900,000.
- Q NOW, DOES HE GIVE DETAILS AND REQUIREMENTS AS
  TO WHAT THE CHURCH WILL NEED TO DO IF THEY GO AHEAD WITH THE
  PROJECT? THEY WILL HAVE TO CONTACT SOME OF THE BUILDING
  DEPARTMENT AND GET SOME TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEYS AND DO SOME
  OTHER THINGS? WAS THAT JUST TOTAL SPECULATION ON HIS PART?
  - A I AM SURE IT WASN'T.
- Q SO THERE WAS AN ONGOING DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE CHURCH AND GREGORY MULL WITH REGARD TO WHAT HIS ARCHITECTURAL PARTICIPATION MIGHT BE FOR THE CHURCH, WAS THERE NOT?
- A AS FAR AS HIS ARCHITECTURAL PARTICIPATION IS CONCERNED, THAT BEGAN, AS I SAID A LITTLE BIT BEFORE THIS, IN '77. AS FAR AS THE CATHEDRAL IS CONCERNED, THIS IS THE FIRST TIME THAT WE EVER RECEIVED ANY KIND OF PROPOSAL FROM HIM THAT HE WOULD LIKE TO DO IT.
  - Q ONE LAST QUESTION BEFORE LUNCH.

    WAS IT A REASONABLE ASSUMPTION ON MR. MULL'S

PART THAT WHEN HE WAS ASKED TO COME DOWN AND DESIGN THE NEW JERUSALEM, BECAUSE OF THE PRIOR DISCUSSIONS ABOUT CONSTRUCTION, INCLUDING THE CATHEDRAL PROJECT, HE HAD A REASONABLE ANTICIPATION THAT HE COULD EXPECT THERE WOULD BE DESIGN WORK AND MAJOR WORK AT CAMELOT FOR HIM TO DO?

NO, I DON'T THINK THAT WAS A REASONABLE EXPECTATION BECAUSE THE -- FIRST OF ALL, WE DIDN'T CALL IT THE NEW JERUSALEM. IT WAS JUST CALLED CAMELOT.

AND SECONDLY, THE CATHEDRAL PROJECT WAS NOT ACCEPTED AND THIS WAS COMMUNICATED TO HIM THAT WE WERE NOT WILLING TO ACCEPT HIS PROPOSAL FOR THIS DESIGN OF THE CATHEDRAL .

MR. LEVY: MR. FRANCIS, HAVE A NICE LUNCH.

THE WITNESS: I WILL TRY.

THE COURT: WE WILL RESUME AT 1:30.

(AT 12:05 P.M., A RECESS WAS TAKEN UNTIL 1:30 P.M. OF THE SAME DAY.)

| 1  | LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 1986 *        |
|----|---|
| 2  | 1:41 P.M.   |
| 3  | DEPARTMENT 50 HON. ALFRED L. MARGOLIS, JUDGE                |
| 4  | (APPEARANCES AS HERETOFORE NOTED.)                          |
| 5  |   |
| 6  | EDWARD L. FRANCIS, +  |
| 7  | THE WITNESS ON THE STAND AT THE TIME OF THE RECESS, RESUMES |
| 8  | THE STAND AND TESTIFIES FURTHER AS FOLLOWS:                 |
| 9  | THE CLERK: SIR, YOU PREVYOUSLY HAVE BEEN SWORN AND          |
| 10 | ARE STILL UNDER OATH. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AGAIN FOR THE  |
| 11 | RECORD.   |
| 12 | THE WITNESS: EDWARD L. FRANCIS.                             |
| 13 | THE CLERK: THANK YOU.                                       |
| 14 | THE COURT: PLEASE PROCEED.                                  |
| 15 | MR. LEVY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.                            |
| 16 | AT THIS TIME, YOUR HONOR, I'D LIKE TO OFFER                 |
| 17 | EXHIBIT NUMBER 114, THE LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION ABOUT MR.  |
| 18 | KING THAT WAS SIGNED BY MR. FRANCIS, INTO EVIDENCE.         |
| 19 | THE COURT: IT'S RECEIVED.                                   |
| 20 | (RECEIVED EVID: ^ EXHIBIT 114)                              |
| 21 | MR. LEVY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.                            |
| 22 |   |
| 23 | CROSS-EXAMINATION + (RESUMED)                               |
| 24 | BY MR. LEVY:  |
| 25 | Q MR. FRANCIS, YOU TOLD US AS A MEMBER OF THE               |
| 26 | BOARD OF DIRECTORS, IT WAS ONE OF YOUR TASKS TO OVERSEE     |
| 27 | MAJOR EXPENDITURES; IS THAT CORRECT?                        |
| 28 | A YES, THAT'S CORRECT.                                      |
| _  |   |

AND UNLESS YOU PUT IN AN APPLICATION FOR A

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, YOU DON'T HEAR FROM A GOVERNMENTAL

AGENCY AS FAR AS POTENTIAL RESTRICTIONS ON DEVELOPING YOUR

PROPERTY.

Q NOW I AM REALLY CONFUSED BECAUSE MISS FRANCIS

TESTIFIED THAT THEY WERE NOTIFIED -- THE CHURCH WAS NOTIFIED

AND SHE WAS NOTIFIED THAT THERE WOULD BE SOME RESTRICTIONS

ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPERTY AS EARLY AS 1978.

## IS SHE CONFUSED OR MAYBE -

A SHE COULD BE CONFUSED BETWEEN THE CONCEPT OF RESTRICTIONS ON DEVELOPMENT AND GOVERNMENT INTEREST IN PURCHASING CAMELOT. WE HAD HEARD FROM GOVERNMENT AGENCIES ON AN INTEREST IN PURCHASING OR ACQUIRING THE PROPERTY FOR PARK PURPOSES.

Q DO I UNDERSTAND CORRECTLY THAT YOU FIRST PUT IN APPLICATIONS TO DEVELOP THE PROPERTY IN 1983, WHILE IN 1978 YOU PUBLISHED THIS BROCHURE AND WERE ATTEMPTING TO RAISE FUNDS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROJECT?

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, THAT IS A COMPOUND QUESTION.
THERE IS AT LEAST TWO THERE.

THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER.

THE WITNESS: WE DID FIRST PUT IN A DEVELOPMENT

APPLICATION IN 1983. AS FAR AS THE TEN-YEAR MASTER PLAN IS

CONCERNED, MAJOR PART OF THE FUND RAISING WAS TO PAY THE

PURCHASE PRICE OF THE PROPERTY. AND THE PURCHASE PRICE AND

RENOVATIONS THAT WE WANTED TO CONDUCT THERE TOOK PRIORITY

AND THAT WAS ALWAYS EXPLAINED TO THE MEMBERSHIP.

Q BY MR. LEVY: DO I UNDERSTAND CORRECTLY THAT

THE TEN-YEAR PROGRAM THAT YOU WERE RAISING FUNDS FOR THAT STARTED IN 1978, THE PROGRAM TO RAISE FUNDS BACK IN 1978 WAS JUST TO ACQUIRE THE PROPERTY AND NOT TO DEVELOP THE PROPERTY?

A IT WAS FOR BOTH.

Q SO THE PEOPLE THAT YOU WOULD HAVE BEEN TRYING TO RAISE FUNDS FROM WHEN THOSE BROCHURES WERE SENT OUT AND SOLICITATIONS WERE SENT OUT WOULD HAVE HAD TO MADE FURTHER INQUIRY THAN JUST THE BROCHURE BECAUSE NOWHERE IN THE BROCHURE DOES IT SAY WE ARE RAISING FUNDS SOLELY FOR THE ACQUISITION OF THE PROPERTY?

A FIRST OF ALL, THE BROCHURES WERE NOT SENT OUT.

THEY WERE GIVEN TO PEOPLE PERSONALLY. AND SECONDLY, WHEN

THE BROCHURES WERE GIVEN TO PEOPLE, THEY WERE ALWAYS GIVEN

CONCURRENTLY WITH PRESENTATIONS IN PERSON OR AT MEETINGS ON

WHAT THE IMMEDIATE PLANS FOR CAMELOT WERE.

AND THE IMMEDIATE PLANS FOR CAMELOT WAS MADE QUITE CLEAR, WAS TO FINISH FUND RAISING FOR THE DOWN PAYMENT AND SUBSTANTIAL SUM THAT NEEDED TO BE EXPENDED TO RENOVATE THE PROPERTY FOR OUR USES. AND THAT WAS CERTAINLY THE EXPECTATION FOR THE FIRST TWO OR THREE YEARS.

Q MR. FRANCIS, NOW WITH REGARD TO YOU AS THE OVERSEER OF MAJOR EXPENDITURES, YOU TESTIFIED EARLIER TODAY THAT YOU NEVER TALKED TO GREGORY MULL DURING THAT EARLY PART, AND IT WAS SOMETIME INTO MIDSPRING WHEN YOU TALKED TO GREGORY MULL IN THE YEAR 1979.

THAT MEANS THAT MR. MULL CAME TO CAMELOT IN JANUARY, YOU DIDN'T BOTHER TO TALK TO HIM IN JANUARY,

FEBRUARY, MARCH OR UNTIL THE LATTER PART OF APRIL.

IS THERE ANY PARTICULAR REASON WHY YOU WAITED FOUR MONTHS WHEN YOU KNEW THAT THERE WAS AN ONGOING NEGOTIATION AND/OR DISPUTE WITH REGARD TO TERMS OF PAYMENT TO MR. MULL?

A FIRST OF ALL, THAT IS NOT WHAT MY TESTIMONY WAS. I SAID THAT I DID NOT TALK WITH MR. MULL ABOUT THE LOANS UNTIL MID-MARCH, 1979. I CERTAINLY HAD OCCASION TO TALK WITH HIM, GREET HIM, ABOUT MANY DIFFERENT THINGS UP UNTIL THAT TIME. I KNEW HE WAS ON CAMPUS AND I AM SURE THERE IS MANY OCCASIONS THAT WE TALKED TO ONE ANOTHER.

AS FAR AS THE LOANS ARE CONCERNED, I COULDN'T CHARACTERIZE IT AS A DISPUTE THAT WE HAD GOING AS FAR AS THE AGREEMENT WAS CONCERNED. WE HAD TO WAIT UNTIL WE HAD SUFFICIENT INFORMATION FROM HIM AS TO WHAT HIS NEEDS WERE.

AND WE REALLY NEVER KNEW THAT UNTIL HE PROVIDED US WITH THAT INFORMATION AND HENCE WE TRIED TO ACT AS QUICKLY AS WE COULD, WHICH TOOK PLACE IN MID-MARCH.

Q LET'S SEE. HE GAVE YOU AN ITEMIZED STATEMENT FOR HIS NEEDS IN JANUARY AND A CHECK WAS CUT FOR SOME \$1,400. AND THEN IN FEBRUARY HE GAVE YOU ANOTHER ITEMIZED STATEMENT AND ABOUT \$3,000 WENT TO GREGORY. THEN IN MARCH, ANOTHER \$3,000 OR MORE WENT TO GREGORY.

AND IT WAS IN FEBRUARY THAT HE WROTE YOU A

THREE OR FOUR-PAGE LETTER SETTING OUT NOT ONLY HIS TERMS AND

CONDITIONS AND THE FACT THAT HE WOULD NOT MAKE A COMMITMENT

NOR COULD HE MAKE A COMMITMENT UNTIL CERTAIN THINGS WERE

AGREED UPON BY THE CHURCH.

NOW, IF THE LETTER WAS SENT TO YOU AS A MEMBER

OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS IN FEBRUARY, WOULDN'T YOU THINK IT

WOULD HAVE BEEN INCUMBENT UPON YOURSELF TO DO SOMETHING

BEFORE THE END OF APRIL?

A WHO SAID THE END OF APRIL? I SAID MID-MARCH IS WHEN WE MET AND DISCUSSED THIS.

Q THIS MORNING YOU SAID APRIL. SO FROM THIS MORNING WHEN YOU SAID THE LATTER PART OF SPRING TILL NOW WHEN YOU ARE CHANGING IT CHANGING IT TO MARCH —— LET'S GO WITH MARCH THEN. YOU LIKE MARCH BETTER?

MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. THAT MISCHARACTERIZES THE TESTIMONY.

THE COURT: OVERRULED.

- Q BY MR. LEVY: YOU PREFER MARCH?
- A MARCH IS WHAT I SAID.
- Q THE MAN WROTE A LETTER TO YOU IN FEBRUARY,

  FEBRUARY THE 22ND. AND WHEN HE WROTE IT, HE WAS AT CAMELOT

  AND SO WERE YOU, WHICH MEANS YOU GOT THE LETTER IN A MATTER

  OF DAYS.

WAS THERE SOME REASON TO WAIT UNTIL MID OR THE LATTER PART OF MARCH FOR YOU PEOPLE TO CONFRONT MR. MULL AND TELL HIM YOU WERE NOT GOING TO MAKE AN AGREEMENT ACCORDING TO HIS TERMS?

THAT I WAS AT CAMELOT AT THAT TIME. BETWEEN MYSELF, MR.

MC CAFFREY AND MR. SHEARER, ALL OF US HAVE HAD OCCASION TO

TRAVEL QUITE A BIT FOR VARIOUS REASONS.

IT DOESN'T SEEM ODD AT ALL TO ME THAT IT MIGHT

HAVE TAKEN US TWO TO THREE WEEKS TO GET TOGETHER AND TO DISCUSS THAT LETTER TO BE ABLE TO SET ASIDE THAT TIME IN ORDER TO RESPOND TO MR. MULL.

AND SECONDLY, I KNOW FOR A FACT IT IS NOT THE END OF MARCH. IT IS TOWARD ABOUT MARCH 15TH OR 16TH WE FINALLY DID GET BACK TO HIM.

Q YOU TOLD THE COURT EARLIER TODAY THAT YOU COULDN'T ADVANCE DOLLARS WITHOUT DOCUMENTS, I.R.S. POLICY, IMPOSSIBLE TO ADVANCE FUNDS WITHOUT DOCUMENTS. YET YOU ADVANCED THE MAN FUNDS IN JANUARY, IN FEBRUARY, IN MARCH, IN APRIL, IN MAY, IN JUNE, IN JULY, IN AUGUST.

WHAT WAS SO DIFFERENT ABOUT THOSE MONTHS AND SEPTEMBER? IN SEPTEMBER YOU CAME TO THE CONCLUSION YOU COULD NOT ADVANCE FUNDS WITHOUT DOCUMENTS. DID YOU GET A MESSAGE FROM UP ABOVE OR BOLT FROM THE BLUE OR WHAT HAPPENED?

A WELL, I DON'T RECALL TESTIFYING ABOUT ANY
POLICY THAT SAYS FUNDS COULDN'T BE ADVANCED WITHOUT
DOCUMENTS. WHAT I SAID WAS THAT THE AMOUNTS HAD GOTTEN SO
LARGE THAT WE DIDN'T FEEL THAT WE COULD ADVANCE ADDITIONAL
MONIES UNDOCUMENTED.

THERE IS ALSO THE PROBLEM OF THE AMOUNTS OF MONEY THAT WERE BEING ADVANCED. WE NEVER EXPECTED IT TO GET THAT LARGE. THERE IS ALSO THE FACT THAT MR. MULL ADVISED MYSELF, AND I BELIEVE HE ADVISED US BY LETTER ALSO, THAT HE WAS SELLING HIS PROPERTY.

MR. LEVY: EXCUSE ME. I AM GOING TO OBJECT. IT HAS BECOME A RATHER OF A NARRATIVE AND IT IS NOT RESPONSIVE TO

THE QUESTION.

THE COURT: I THINK HE WAS ANSWERING.

JUST STICK WITH THE QUESTION AND GO AHEAD.

THE WITNESS: I WILL.

WHAT I WAS SAYING WAS HE WROTE US IN THE SUMMER, PROBABLY JUNE I BELIEVE, STATING THAT HE THOUGHT HE HAD HIS PROPERTY SOLD. WE JUST DIDN'T THINK IT WAS GOING TO GO ON ANY LONGER.

Q BY MR. LEVY: LET'S EXAMINE THE ISSUE OF HIS PROPERTY BEING SOLD.

YOU ARE NOT GOING TO BUILD ANY MAJOR

STRUCTURES, YOU ARE NOT GOING TO DO WHAT IS IN THE BROCHURE.

YOU ARE GOING TO WORK ON THE WILL OF GOD FOCUS AND YOU MIGHT

DO SOME REFURBISHING OF OTHER BUILDINGS. YOU MAY EVEN WORK

ON THE MONTESSORI SCHOOL.

FOR THOSE PURPOSES, WAS MR. SHEARER CORRECT
WHEN HE TESTIFIED YOU AGREED TO PAY HIS TRANSPORTATION BACK
AND FORTH AND SUPPLY HIM ROOM AND BOARD AND THE REST OF THE
THINGS WOULD BE WORKED OUT LATER? WAS THAT ACCURATE
TESTIMONY?

A WELL, I DIDN'T HAVE THE CONVERSATION BETWEEN MR. MULL AND MR. SHEARER. BUT AS FAR AS THE BOARD'S UNDERSTANDING OR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE'S UNDERSTANDING, THE ARRANGEMENT WITH MR. MULL WAS GOING TO BE -- THE DETAILS WERE GOING TO BE WORKED OUT LATER AS TO THE EXACT AMOUNTS OF HIS NEEDS, THAT IS CORRECT.

Q WHY DIDN'T YOU EXPECT THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT WAS BEING PAID TO MR. MULL TO GET AS LARGE AS IT WAS?

1 2

4 5

BECAUSE HE TOLD US IT WAS ONLY GOING TO BE 1 2 2,000 A MONTH. OH. 3 Q AND HE PUT IT IN WRITING, TOO. 4 NOW WHAT YOU ARE SAYING IS THAT THERE WAS 5 ADVANCE KNOWLEDGE ON THE PART OF THE CHURCH THAT HIS 6 EXPENSES WOULD AT LEAST BE \$2,000 A MONTH? 7 WELL, ALONG ABOUT FEBRUARY AND MARCH, YEAH. 8 HE DIDN T SAY THAT TO MONROE WHEN MONROE CALLED 9 HIM WHEN HE WAS STILL IN SAN FRANCISCO AND SAY, "I CAN'T 10 COME BECAUSE I HAVE TO GET MY EXPENSES COVERED AND THEY 11 COULD RUN AS MUCH AS 2- OR \$3,000"? 12 THIS I DON'T KNOW BECAUSE, OF COURSE, I WASN'T 13 A PARTY TO THAT CONVERSATION. BUT I CAN'T RECALL HAVING 14 HEARD IT UNTIL PROBABLY AROUND FEBRUARY. 15 SO IF I UNDERSTAND CORRECTLY, YOU WEREN'T A 16 Q PARTY TO ALL THESE CONVERSATIONS, AND YOU JUST HEARD WHAT 17 YOU HEARD, AND AT THIS POINT YOU JUST REMEMBER WHAT YOU 31 REMEMBER. NOW I CAN UNDERSTAND THAT BECAUSE YOU WEREN'T ON 19 THE TELEPHONE WITH MONROE SHEARER. 20 WAS THERE EVER A TIME BEFORE MID-MARCH OR APRIL 21 WHEN YOU ACTUALLY KNEW EXACTLY WHAT WAS GOING ON WITH REGARD 22 TO THE ARRANGEMENTS WITH MR. MULL? 23 AS FAR AS THE - THE FINAL AGREEMENT OR FINAL 24 TERMS IS CONCERNED --25 MR. FRANCIS, WOULD YOU JUST -- JUST ANSWER MY 26 0 27 QUESTION. I DON'T KNOW WHAT YOU MEAN BY "WHAT WAS GOING 28

| 1  | ON."   |
|----|--|
| 2  | Q I WANT TO KNOW IF PRIOR TO MID-MARCH, THE DATE             |
| 3  | YOU HAVE CHOSEN, YOU EVER HAD ANY CONVERSATIONS WITH ANYBODY |
| 4  | THAT GAVE YOU A COMPLETE AND TOTAL KNOWLEDGE ABOUT WHAT WAS  |
| 5  | GOING TO BE REQUIRED FOR MR. MULL TO BE AT CAMELOT?          |
| 6  | A NO, I DIDN'T.  |
| 7  | Q PRIOR TO MID-MARCH?  |
| 8  | A NO, I DID NOT.   |
| 9  | Q SO YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT THE ARRANGEMENTS OR THE             |
| 10 | TERMS OR ANYTHING ELSE WAS THAT BROUGHT HIM ORIGINALLY TO    |
| 11 | CAMELOT, DO YOU?   |
| 12 | A I KNOW WHAT MR. SHEARER TOLD THE EXECUTIVE                 |
| 13 | COMMITTEE.   |
| 14 | Q DO YOU HAVE ANY IDEA WHAT MR. MULL NEGOTIATED              |
| 15 | WITH MR. SHEARER?  |
| 16 | A ALL I KNOW IS FROM HIS WRITINGS AND WHAT MR.               |
| 17 | SHEARER SAYS.  |
| 18 | Q BUT YOU HAVE NO PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE BECAUSE YOU             |
| 19 | DIDN'T DO THE NEGOTIATING YOURSELF?                          |
| 20 | A THAT'S CORRECT. I WAS NOT PARTY TO THOSE                   |
| 21 | NEGOTIATIONS.  |
| 22 | Q NOW, FOR THE PAGE AND SOME OF THE RENDERINGS               |
| 23 | THAT THE ARCHITECTURAL FIRM DID FOR YOU BEFORE, WHETHER      |
| 24 | THERE WAS A SUBSIDIARY OF THEIRS OR FIRST COUSINS, THE       |
| 25 | CHURCH PAID \$50,000, DID THEY NOT?                          |
| 26 | A FOR THE PAGE? WHAT DO YOU MEAN?                            |
| 27 | Q LET ME HELP YOU.   |
| 28 | A OKAY.  |
|    |  |

2

5

6 7

8 9

10

11

13

14

12

15 16

17

18 19

> 20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

I KNOW IT GETS SO CONFUSING. Q

THE CENTER PAGE IN YOUR BROCHURE, IT GIVES AN OVERALL PICTURE OF CAMELOT, WHICH TELLS YOU APPROXIMATELY WHAT THE DEVELOPMENT IS GOING TO BE. THE BROCHURE THAT YOU USED TO RAISE FUNDS.

- THAT IS NOT WHAT \$50,000 WAS PAID FOR.
- FOR THAT AND SOME RENDERINGS WITH REGARD TO THE OVERALL LAYOUT?
  - MORE THAN THAT.
  - OH, WHAT ELSE? Q
  - A MASTER PLAN. Α
  - OH, A MASTER PLAN. Q

THAT'S CORRECT. THERE IS 30 SOME PAGES IN THIS BROCHURE. THERE ARE LAYOUTS OF A MASTER PLAN, THERE IS NUMBERS OF PEOPLE. THEY WENT THROUGH A WHOLE PROCESS OF INTERVIEWING ALL THE CHURCH'S DEPARTMENTS AND FIGURING OUT HOW MUCH SPACE WE NEEDED, HOW MANY PEOPLE EACH BUILDING HAD TO SERVE.

THEY LAID IT OUT ON A TOPO PAGE THAT IS ON PAGES 18 AND 19 THAT SHOWS EACH OF THE INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS AND THEN THEY DID LARGER DRAWINGS OF EACH ONE THAT ARE SHOWN IN DETAIL ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES.

THE RENDERINGS THAT IS ON THE CENTER PIECE HERE WAS DONE BY CARLOS DENIZ WHO HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH SMITH AND WILLIAMS. HE IS AN INDEPENDENT THEY TOOK A MASTER PLAN TO AND SAID, "WE WANT YOU TO PUT IT IN A RENDERING, AN ARTIST CONCEPTION OF WHAT IT WOULD LOOK LIKE." THE RENDERING IS TOTALLY SEPARATE AND IN ADDITION TO THE MASTER

PLAN.

Q SO YOU PAID SOMEBODY ELSE ADDITIONALLY FOR THE RENDERING THAT IS IN YOUR FUND RAISING BROCHURE?

A THAT'S CORRECT, BUT IT WAS \$50,000 IN THE AGGREGATE.

Q OKAY. AND FOR THE ARCHITECTURAL FIRM THAT

INTERVIEWED YOUR PEOPLE AND PUT THEIR PICTURES ON THE PAGES,

THE AGGREGATE WAS \$50,000?

A PLUS -- IN OTHER WORDS, THE 50,000 INCLUDES THE SMITH AND WILLIAMS WORK ON THE MASTER PLAN AS WELL AS THE RENDERINGS BY CARLOS DENIZ.

Q WHEN YOU TALK ABOUT THE RENDERINGS, YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT THE ACTUAL PICTURE IN THE CENTER PAGE?

A YES. BUT THERE ARE OTHER RENDERINGS, TOO. NOT ONLY THE CENTERFOLD PAGE, BUT THERE IS RENDERINGS IN DIFFERENT LIKE PERSPECTIVES. LIKE 24 AND 25, THAT IS A WHOLE SEPARATE RENDERING THAT WAS DONE. AND THERE IS A NUMBER OF THOSE, MAYBE HALF A DOZEN.

Q WOULD IT BE FAIR TO SAY THAT WHAT THE CHURCH

SPENT \$50,000 FOR, THE COMPOSITE OF WHAT WAS DONE IS IN THAT

BROCHURE?

A THAT IS TRUE.

Q NOW, DID YOU REALLY ANTICIPATE YOU WERE GOING
TO GET AN ARCHITECT ON PREMISES TO DO THE ARCHITECTURAL
DRAWINGS, TO DO THE ACTUAL WORKING PLANS, TO DO THE
REMODELING AND GET THE PERMITS FOR YOU, TO WORK ON YOUR WILL
OF GOD FOCUS AND YOUR MONTESSORI INTERNATIONAL, AND ALL THE
OTHER PROJECTS, THE BOUTIQUE, THE RIDING ACADEMY, THE

ASHRAM, THE WILL OF GOD FOCUS, WHATEVER ELSE WAS GOING TO BE DONE AND YOU WERE GOING TO GET ALL THAT DONE FOR AS A

- IS THAT WHAT YOU REALLY EXPECTED, MR. FRANCIS?
- NO. BECAUSE THE TEN-YEAR PLAN WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THAT LIST OF THINGS THAT YOU SAID. THAT WAS NOT OUR INTENT, TO HAVE THE TEN-YEAR PLAN DONE BY MR. MULL.
- WHY THEN WAS HE INFORMED THAT HE WAS GOING TO
  - HE WASN'T INFORMED. HE WAS INVITED.
  - OH, HE WAS INVITED TO PARTICIPATE?
- HE WAS INVITED TO GIVE UP HIS BUSINESS, AND TO SELL HIS HOME, AND TO COME TO CAMELOT AND TO DO THAT WORK FOR AS LONG AS YOU REQUIRED FOR NOTHING?
- NOBODY INVITED HIM TO GIVE UP HIS BUSINESS AND SELL HIS HOME. HE WAS INVITED TO COME AND WORK AT CAMELOT IF HE WANTED TO. HE EXPRESSED A GREAT DEAL OF INTEREST IN IT. AND IT WOULD HAVE HAD TO HAVE BEEN HIS DECISION TO SELL HIS HOME, TO GIVE UP HIS BUSINESS, ET CETERA.
- I HAVE HEARD AN AWFUL LOT OF TESTIMONY BY YOU TODAY THAT EVERYTHING WAS PREDICATED ON MR. MULL SELLING HIS
- I ASSUME SINCE YOU WERE ONE OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, THIS IS EXHIBIT NUMBER 28, I AM SURE BY NOW YOU HAVE HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO READ THAT EXHIBIT. ON THE SECOND PAGE OF THE EXHIBIT IT SAYS, "I CANNOT MAKE AN ARRANGEMENT

ONLY MR. MULL'S LETTERS. ONLY THE DOCUMENTS 1 WRITTEN BY MR. MULL. 2 WHO PREPARED THE PROMISSORY NOTES? Q 3 MICHAEL ERLICH. A CHURCH-AFFILIATED ATTORNEY? 5 Q YES. Α 6 AND WERE YOU PRESENT WHEN THE DOCUMENTS WERE 7 ACTUALLY SIGNED, THE PROMISSORY NOTE DOCUMENTS WERE ACTUALLY 8 9 SIGNED? NO, I WAS NOT. 10 MR. MULL HAS TESTIFIED HERE THAT WHEN HE 11 INQUIRED ABOUT SOME OF THE TERMINOLOGY IN THE PROMISSORY 12 NOTE, HE WAS ADVISED THAT IT WAS JUST LEGAL INFORMATION THAT 13 HE REALLY DIDN'T NEED TO BOTHER WITH. I KNOW WHEN I READ 14 IT, THERE ARE A NUMBER OF CODE SECTIONS. 15 DID YOU THINK IT ADVISABLE FOR ANYONE TO 16 EXPLAIN TO MR. MULL WHAT IT WAS THAT HE WAS SIGNING? 17 WELL, I DIDN'T DRAFT THE NOTE AND I DIDN'T SEE 18 THE NOTE BEFORE HE SIGNED IT. 19 IT IS AMAZING TO ME THAT YOU REALLY DIDN'T HAVE 20 TOO MUCH TO DO WITH -- SOMEBODY ELSE ALWAYS HAD SOMETHING TO 21 DO WITH IT. 22 BACK TO MY ORIGINAL QUESTION. 23 DOES THE CHURCH HAVE ONE SINGLE SOLITARY 24 DOCUMENT THAT PURPORTS TO BE AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN MR. MULL 25 AND THE CHURCH THAT THE MONIES THAT WERE PAID TO HIM BY 26 CHECK WHEREIN THE CHECK SAID THE MONEY WAS FOR ARCHITECTURAL 27 SERVICES, DO YOU HAVE ONE DOCUMENT THAT SAYS THE MONEY WAS A 28

LOAN? 1 2 Α DOCUMENTS FROM MR. MULL. COME ON, MR. FRANCIS. THREE AND A HALF YEARS 3 OF LAW SCHOOL, YOU CAN UNDERSTAND MY QUESTION. I AM ASKING IF THERE IS A SIGNED DOCUMENT FROM 5 A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CHURCH AND MR. MULL OTHER THAN A LOT 6 OF EMOTIONAL CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MR. MULL AND YOURSELF 7 THAT ACTUALLY SAYS THAT THE MONEY PAID TO MR. MULL IS A 8 9 LOAN? I WOULD SAY UP UNTIL SEPTEMBER OF 1979, NO. IT 10 WAS A VERBAL AGREEMENT. 11 YOU WERE ABLE TO MAKE A VERBAL AGREEMENT WITH 12 0 HIM UP UNTIL SEPTEMBER OF 1979, AND ALL OF A SUDDEN THE 13 I.R.S. BECAME A QUESTION? 14 WELL, THE AMOUNTS BECAME SO LARGE. 15 IS IT POSSIBLE THAT YOU HAD DEALINGS WITH THE 16 I.R.S. BEFORE AND THE I.R.S. WAS A REAL CONCERN OF YOURS? 17 1 ---18 MR. KLEIN: 1 AM GOING TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. 787 OF 19 THE EVIDENCE CODE AND THE RELEVANCE TO THIS CASE. 20 THE COURT: SUSTAINED. 21 BY MR. LEVY: THERE WAS A TIME IN SANTA BARBARA 22 WHEN THE CHURCH GOT INVOLVED WITH CLAYTON BROKERAGE AND THE 23 I.R.S. AT THE SAME TIME, DID THEY NOT? 24 NOT AT THE SAME TIME, NO. IT WAS PROBABLY AT 25 LEAST A YEAR'S DIFFERENCE. 26 AND IN THE COURSE OF NEGOTIATING A SETTLEMENT 27 IN THOSE CASES, YOUR ATTORNEY ADVISED YOU TO SETTLE THE 28

CLAYTON BROKERAGE CASE BECAUSE IF YOU DIDN'T, YOU'D HAVE TO 1 PERJURE YOURSELF WITH THE 1.R.S.; IS THAT NOT CORRECT? 2 MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO OBJECT. 787 OF 3 THE EVIDENCE CODE AND THE RELEVANCE TO THIS CASE. 5 THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. LEVY: OF THE \$37,000 THAT WAS PAID TO 6 MR. MULL FOR HIS SERVICES, WHAT PORTION OF THAT WAS FOR HIS 7 TRANSPORTATION BACK AND FORTH TO SAN FRANCISCO TO CLOSE OUT 8 9 HIS BUSINESS? 10 A I DON'T KNOW. DO YOU KNOW HOW OFTEN HE WENT BACK AND FORTH TO 11 SAN FRANCISCO TO CLOSE OUT HIS BUSINESS? 12 I THINK CLOSE TO EVERY OTHER WEEKEND. Α 13 FOR ABOUT HOW LONG? Q 14 AT LEAST A COUPLE OF TIMES A MONTH PROBABLY. 15 FOR ABOUT HOW LONG? Q 16 I GUESS EIGHT OR NINE MONTHS. 17 DID YOU DEDUCT THOSE EXPENSES WHEN YOU COMPUTED 18 WHAT MR. MULL OWED YOU? 19 NO. THAT IS CORRECT, I DIDN'T. BUT WE HAVEN'T 20 BEEN GIVEN AN ITEMIZATION OF IT. THERE IS SOME INDICATION 21 IN SOME OF HIS CORRESPONDENCE - SOME OF HIS LISTINGS OF 22 EXPENSES OF SOME THINGS THAT ARE A PART OF TRAVEL EXPENSES, 23 BUT IT IS NEVER BROKEN OUT SO THAT YOU KNOW SO THAT IT IS 24 25 CLEAR. YOU HAD TIME TO FIGURE OUT WHAT THE COMPOUND 26 INTEREST AND EVERYTHING ELSE WAS, BUT YOU NEVER HAD TIME IN 27 THESE LAST FIVE AND A HALF YEARS TO FIGURE OUT THE 28

DIFFERENCE IN THOSE THINGS THAT WERE NOT RETURNABLE OR 1 DEDUCTIBLE EXPENSES, DID YOU? 2 WELL, WE HAVE NEVER BEEN GIVEN AN ITEMIZATION 3 OF IT. IT COULD BE DONE, BUT WE DON'T HAVE THE INFORMATION WITHIN OUR CONTROL TO BE ABLE TO SAY WHAT MR. MULL'S TRAVEL 5 EXPENSES WERE. 6 YOU HAVE GIVEN US A LIST OF -- YOU TOLD US WHAT 7 Q NUMBER 135 WAS? 8 YES. Α 9 EXPENSE ACCOUNT? 0 10 YES. 11 DURING THE TWO AND A HALF HOUR CONVERSATION 12 THAT YOU HAD WITH MR. MULL BEFORE YOU GOT HIS LAST \$5,500, 13 ELIZABETH CLARE FRANCIS TOLD HIM IF HE DIDN'T PAY THE MONEY, 14 THAT LITTLE CHILDREN WOULD HAVE TO PAY THE MONEY; IS THAT 15 RIGHT? IT WAS TAKING THE MONEY AWAY FROM THE LITTLE 16 17 CHILDREN? MR. KLEIN: I WOULD OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. THE BEST 18 EVIDENCE RULE, THE DOCUMENT IS IN EVIDENCE. 19 THE COURT: THIS IS PRELIMINARY TO THE QUESTION 1 20 ASSUME . 21 MR. LEVY: THAT'S CORRECT YOUR HONOR. 22 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 23 THE WITNESS: I DON'T RECALL EXACTLY WHAT THE 24 STATEMENT WAS. 25 BY MR. LEVY: (READING.) 26 Q "GREGORY, IF YOU DON'T PAY THE 27 MONEY, THE LITTLE CHILDREN WILL HAVE TO PAY 28

THE MONEY.

THAT IS WHAT THE STATEMENT WAS. DO YOU REMEMBER IT NOW?

A NO, I DON'T REMEMBER IT EXACTLY LIKE THAT.

Q I AM LOOKING AT THIS LIST THAT SEGREGATES ALL THE DIFFERENT DEPARTMENTS. I AM LOOKING AT THE FIRST PAGE.

THE COURT: WHICH EXHIBIT DO YOU HAVE?

MR. LEVY: NUMBER 112, YOUR HONOR. 102-01, CASH ON HAND, IT GOES ALL THE WAY DOWN TO CASH ON HAND FOR 25

DIFFERENT SECTIONS AND THEN IT STARTS A SECTION BY CASH IN THE BANK.

CASH IN THE BANK, CROCKER NATIONAL BANK. CASH IN THE BANK, SECURITY PACIFIC NATIONAL BANK. CASH IN THE BANK, BANK OF COLORADO. CASH IN THE BANK, SANTA BARBARA NATIONAL BANK. CASH IN THE BANK, INDUSTRIAL BANK OF WASHINGTON, D.C. CASH IN THE BANK, SANTA BARBARA NATIONAL BANK. CASH IN THE BANK, WESTERN MONTANA. CASH IN THE BANK, CROCKER NATIONAL, WESTLAKE. CASH IN THE BANK, SECURITY PACIFIC NATIONAL. CASH IN THE BANK, WELLS FARGO. CASH IN THE BANK, BANK OF AMERICA. CASH IN THE BANK, BANK OF

LITTLE CHILDREN WERE REALLY IN DANGER, WERE THEY NOT, MR. FRANCIS?

A WELL, IT DOESN'T SAY HOW MUCH MONEY IS IN THOSE ACCOUNTS.

Q WHY DON'T YOU HELP ME GUESSTIMATE. WHAT IS THE VALUE OF THE PROPERTY AT CAMELOT IN 1979?

MR. KLEIN: I AM GOING TO OBJECT, YOUR HONOR, TO THE

RELEVANCY OF THAT QUESTION. 1 2 THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. LEVY: WE TALKED ABOUT THE WONDERFUL 3 ACCOMMODATIONS THAT WERE OFFERED TO THE PEOPLE WHO WENT TO 4 SUMMIT UNIVERSITY. I NOTE ON PAGE FIVE WHERE IT LISTS YOUR 5 BUILDINGS, THERE IS A BUILDING CALLED BARRACKS. BARRACKS б USUALLY ARE ASSOCIATED WITH SOLDIERS AND THE MILITARY. 7 DID YOU HAVE SOLDIERS OR THE MILITARY IN YOUR 8 BARRACKS, MR. FRANCIS? 9 Α COULD I LOOK AT THAT --10 SURE. Q 11 -- SO I CAN SEE WHAT IT IS. 12 13 Q IT IS NUMBER 163. 14 OKAY. THANK YOU. THOSE ARE THE SURPLUS BUILDINGS FROM THE STATE 15 SURPLUS AGENCY THAT WERE BEING USED OR PROPOSED TO BE 16 UTILIZED BY MR. MULL TO CONSTRUCT THE MONTESSORI 17 INTERNATIONAL BUILDINGS OUT OF. WE DON'T HAVE ANY BARRACKS 31 ON CAMPUS, BUT THEY WERE SURPLUS BUILDINGS THAT WE HAD 19 ACQUIRED. THEY WERE NOT SET UP. 20 YOU TOLD US EARLIER THAT MR. MULL ATTACKED THE Q 21 CHURCH, THAT PART OF THE REASON YOU SUED HIM WAS BECAUSE HE 22 WROTE LETTERS TO THE NEWSPAPER; IS THAT CORRECT? 23 WROTE LETTERS THAT HAD FALSE ALLEGATIONS IN 24 THEM. THAT WAS THE REASON. 25 FALSE ALLEGATIONS WITH REGARD TO WHAT, MR. 0 26 27 FRANCIS?

28

WELL, ONE OF THE THINGS CLAIMED IN HIS LETTER

TO THE NEWSPAPER WAS THAT THE TENTS THAT WE ERECT ON THE PROPERTY FOR OUR QUARTERLY CONFERENCES ARE ILLEGAL, THAT THEY DON'T HAVE REQUIRED PERMITS. THAT IS A FALSE ALLEGATIONS.

WE ARE NOT REQUIRED TO HAVE A PERMIT FOR THAT AND IT'S BEEN CONCLUSIVELY DETERMINED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING THAT THAT IS IN THE --- A REQUIREMENT AND HAD ALREADY BEEN DETERMINED.

Q THAT TERRIFIED YOU SO MUCH THAT YOU WENT AHEAD TO SUE THIS MAN THAT ELIZABETH PROMISED SIX TIMES THAT SHE WAS NOT GOING TO SUE?

A NOT THAT INDIVIDUAL INCIDENT ALONE. IT WAS AN ADDING UP OF ALL THE VARIOUS THINGS.

Q HE WROTE TO THE BUILDING AND SAFETY DEPARTMENT BECAUSE HE WAS CONCERNED ABOUT THE TENTS BEING IMPROPER, SOME BUILDINGS MAY BE IMPROPER, SOME WIRING MAY BE IMPROPER?

A I DON'T THINK HE WROTE BECAUSE HE WAS CONCERNED ABOUT THAT. WHAT HIS LETTER SAID CLEARLY WAS THAT HE WANTED THEM TO CLOSE US DOWN. HE WANTED THEM TO COME DOWN AND CLOSE OUR CLASSROOM, HE WANTED THEM TO CLOSE DOWN OUR CONFERENCE AND HE TRIED TO COME UP WITH ANY EXCUSE HE COULD TO TRY TO GET THE OFFICIALS TO COME AND CLOSE THESE BUILDINGS.

Q WITH YOUR THREE AND A HALF YEARS OF LAW SCHOOL,
YOU KNEW FULL WELL IF THE BUILDING AND SAFETY DEPARTMENT
CAME OUT AND MADE AN EXAMINATION, THEY DETERMINED WHETHER IT
WAS SAFE OR NOT REGARDLESS OF WHAT MR. MULL WANTED.

YOU KNEW THAT, DIDN'T YOU?

A THAT IS CORRECT. IF -- PROVIDED THAT THEY -THAT THEY ARE PERFORMING THEIR JOB THE WAY THEY ARE SUPPOSED
TO, THAT'S CORRECT.

Q WERE YOU REALLY AFRAID THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY MAY COME OUT AND THEY, TOO, MAY HAVE A VENDETTA AGAINST YOU?

A I CAN'T SAY THAT I WAS AFRAID OF THAT.

Q IF YOU WEREN'T AFRAID OF IT, HAVING HAD THREE
AND A HALF YEARS OF LAW SCHOOL AND KNOWING WHAT THEY CAN DO
LEGALLY AND NOT DO LEGALLY, WHAT WAS IT OTHER THAN HIS
LETTER TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY THAT SO
TERRIFIED YOU THAT YOU WENT AGAINST WHAT WAS PROMISED TO MR.
MULL NOT ONLY BY MISS FRANCIS, BUT BY THE ATTORNEY THAT YOU
HAD EMPLOYED AT THAT TIME WHO WROTE TO MR. MULL AND HE SAID,
"IF YOU CLOSE YOUR MOUTH AND YOU DON'T TALK ANYMORE, WE
WON'T SUE YOU"?

WHAT ELSE WAS THERE THAT FRIGHTENED YOU SO MUCH THAT YOU SUED HIM?

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I HAVE AN OBJECTION. IN ORDER TO ANSWER THE QUESTION, HE HAS TO ASSUME CERTAIN FACTS THAT MR. LEVY HAS SAID ARE TRUE TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION. THAT IS MY OBJECTION. ONE, ASSUMPTION AND, TWO, A QUESTION.

MR. LEVY: MAYBE MR. KLEIN CAN SIT UP THERE AND HELP

MR. KLEIN: I CAN HELP YOU FORM THE QUESTION.
THE COURT: GENTLEMEN.

WHY DON'T YOU REPHRASE YOUR QUESTION.

MR. LEVY: YES, YOUR HONOR.

Q ASIDE FROM THE LETTER TO THE BUILDING AND SAFETY DEPARTMENT THAT APPARENTLY TERRIFIED YOU SO MUCH, WHAT ELSE DID MR. MULL DO THAT CAUSED YOU TO SUE HIM?

BUT AS FAR AS WHAT ELSE HE DID, HE WAS

CONTACTING THE CHURCH MEMBERS WITH UNTRUE ALLEGATIONS AND

FIRST OF ALL, THE LETTER DIDN'T TERRIFY US.

STATEMENTS ABOUT THE CHURCH AND TRYING TO GET THEM TO QUIT

THE ORGANIZATION.

SECONDLY, HE WROTE A LETTER IN NOVEMBER, 1980,
DEMANDING THE \$5,000 BACK THAT HE HAD PAID IN JUNE AND SAID
THAT, "IF YOU DON'T PAY IT BACK TO ME, THEN I AM GOING TO
SUE YOU AND I WILL BE THE BIGGEST ENEMY THAT THE CHURCH HAS
EVER HAD."

HE CALLED ELIZABETH A FALSE PROPHET. IN FACT, THE FALSE PROPHET AND THE GREAT WHORE.

HE WROTE A LETTER TO THE NEWSPAPERS WHICH WE HAVE DISCUSSED HERE WHICH CONTAINED FALSE ALLEGATIONS ABOUT CAMELOT AS WELL AS THE ASHRAM IN LOS ANGELES, CLAIMING THAT A BUILDING PERMIT AT THE ASHRAM IN LOS ANGELES WAS NOT FULFILLED AS IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN, WHEN IN FACT THAT WAS NOT THE CASE.

BUT FINALLY WE DIDN'T SUE HIM BECAUSE WE WERE TERRIFIED OF HIM. WE SUED HIM BECAUSE HE OWED US \$37,000.

Q NOW YOU DID IT AGAIN. YOU GOT ME CONFUSED

AGAIN BECAUSE YOU TOLD ME A LITTLE WHILE AGO THAT WHAT YOU

THOUGHT IT WAS NEGOTIATED DOWN TO WAS \$10,000.

A NO. I SAID WHAT HE HAD DONE WAS OFFERED

10,000, WHICH WE WOULD HAVE BEEN WILLING TO ACCEPT, BUT THEN

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY?

- A I THINK I DID CALL HIM.
- Q AND DIDN'T YOU DURING THE COURSE OF THE TELEPHONE CONVERSATION TELL HIM IF HE DIDN'T KEEP HIS DAMN MOUTH SHUT, YOU WERE GOING TO SUE HIM?
  - A NO. DEFINITELY NOT.
- Q OH. AND THEN HE WROTE A LETTER SAYING HE FELT HE HAD BEEN TREATED UNFAIRLY, CONNED OUT OF HIS LAST \$5,500, AND TREATED UNFAIRLY, AND IF HE WASN'T LEFT ALONE, HE'D SUE YOU TO GET BACK HIS \$5,500.

WAS THAT WHAT FRIGHTENED YOU INTO SUING MR. MULL?

- A WE WEREN'T FRIGHTENED INTO SUING MR. MULL.
- Q WHY AFTER ALL OF THE PROMISES BY THE SPIRITUAL LEADER THE ONE PERSON WHO HAD THE AUTHORITY TO RESOLVE ALL DISPUTES BY HER OWN TERMS, THE ONE PERSON WHO COULD RESOLVE ALL DISPUTES WHY AFTER SHE GAVE HER WORD TO THIS MAN SIX DIFFERENT TIMES THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS DECIDED TO OVERRULE HER, AND BREAK HER PROMISE TO HIM AND SUE HIM ANYWAY?

THAT ELIZABETH MADE TO MR. MULL THAT THE OFFER NOT TO SUE

HIM -- THE STATEMENT THAT SHE DIDN'T INTEND TO SUE HIM WAS

VERY CLOSELY TIED TO TRYING TO RESOLVE THE MATTER COMPLETELY

WITH HIS \$10,000 OFFER OF SETTLEMENT.

AND HE WITHDREW THE OFFER OF SETTLEMENT. THERE
WAS NEVER AN AGREEMENT REACHED NOT TO SUE HIM BECAUSE HE
WITHDREW HIS OFFER TO SETTLE THE MATTER.

O AT THE SQUARE DANCE, YOU TESTIFIED THAT MR. 1 MULL YELLED OUT THAT YOU GUYS BREAK UP MARRIAGES AND YOU 2 BREAK UP FAMILIES. WAS THE CHURCH INVOLVED IN THE BREAKUP 3 OF MR. MULL'S MARRIAGE? NOT TO MY KNOWLEDGE. 5 WEREN'T YOU PRESENT WHEN ELIZABETH ORDERED 6 KATHLEEN MUELLER TO LEAVE THE PREMISES THE NEXT DAY? 7 I WASN'T PRESENT AT ANY SUCH MEETING. 8 YOU ARE JUST LUCKY YOU MISS ALL OF THOSE 9 MEETINGS, DON'T YOU? 10 DOES THE CHURCH BREAK UP FAMILIES? 11 Α NO. 12 GRACE MC GUIRE TESTIFIED THAT HER DAUGHTER WENT 13 TO LIVE WITH HER HUSBAND; THAT HER SON, AFTER AN INCIDENT, 14 WENT TO LIVE WITH HIS FATHER. MR. AND MRS. MALEK CAME TO 15 SEE YOU AT THE SQUARE DANCE TO SEE THEIR SON. THEY WEREN'T 16 17 ALLOWED EITHER. IS THERE SOME REASON THAT PEOPLE HAVE SO MUCH 31 DIFFICULTY WHEN MEMBERS OF THEIR FAMILIES GET INVOLVED WITH 19 THE CHURCH IN SEEING THEM OR BEING ABLE TO LIVE WITH THEM? 20 WELL, AS TO -- TO GRACE MC GUIRE, I THINK SHE 21 MADE IT QUITE CLEAR THAT THE DECISION OF HER DAUGHTER TO GO 22 LIVE WITH HER FATHER WAS HER DAUGHTER'S DECISION. AND SHE 23 ALSO STATED THAT THE SON WENT AWAY FOR THE SUMMER AND THEN 24 25 RETURNED. AS FAR AS THE MALEKS ARE CONCERNED, WILLIAM 26 MALEK WAS NOT ON THE CAMPUS THAT DAY. AND THE MALEKS WERE 27 VERY HOSTILE IN THEIR BEHAVIOR AT THE SAME TIME THAT MR. 28

MULL WAS, THE SQUARE DANCE INCIDENT. THAT IS WHY THEY 1 WEREN'T ALLOWED ON THE PROPERTY. 2 DO YOU FIND IT KIND OF STRANGE THAT EVERY TIME 3 A FAMILY IS DIVIDED, WHEN THE PARENTS COME TO SEE THEIR SON OR SOMEBODY WANTS TO SEE SOMEBODY CONNECTED WITH THEIR 5 FAMILY, THAT INDIVIDUAL IS NOT THERE THAT DAY AND THOSE 6 PEOPLE ARE ALWAYS VERY HOSTILE. 7 IF YOUR FAMILY WAS DIVIDED AND YOU COULDN'T SEE 8 YOUR KID AND SOMEBODY SAID HE WASN'T THERE AFTER YOU HAD 9 SPOKEN TO HIM ON THE TELEPHONE, WOULD YOU BE A LITTLE BIT 10 11 HOSTILE ABOUT IT? MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, THAT SEEMS LIKE A STATEMENT 12 RATHER THAN A QUESTION. 13 THE COURT: SUSTAINED. 14 BY MR. LEVY: WHILE MR. MULL WAS WRITING HIS 15 LETTER TO THE BUILDING AND SAFETY DEPARTMENT AND TALKING TO 16 THE NEWSPAPER, YOU WROTE A LETTER TO THE NEWSPAPER ALSO, 17 18 DIDN'T YOU? AT WHAT TIME WAS THIS? 19 ON FEBRUARY THE 2ND, 1981. 20 Q I COULD HAVE. 21 Α IT IS ADDRESSED, "DEAR MRS. MALEK AND READERS 22 OF THE LAS VIRGENES ENTERPRISE." DOES THIS LOOK FAMILIAR TO 23 YOU? 24 25 THAT LOOKS LIKE MY LETTER. THIS IS THE LETTER YOU WROTE TO THE LAS 26 VIRGENES ENTERPRISE. YOU ACCUSED MISS MALEK OF KIDNAPPING 27 HER SON, DO YOU, IN THIS LETTER? 28

| 1  | A THAT IS MY UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT OCCURRED.               |
|----|--|
| 2  | Q AND HER AGENT WAS STANLEY PIETROWSKI?                    |
| 3  | A THAT IS WHAT WILLIAM MALEK SAID.                         |
| 4  | Q WASN'T STANLEY PETROWSKI A MEMBER OF YOUR                |
| 5  | CHURCH?  |
| 6  | A A FORMER MEMBER.   |
| 7  | Q ANOTHER ONE THAT WAS HAD A VENDETTA AGAINST              |
| 8  | THE CHURCH?  |
| 9  | A WELL, I DIDN'T SAY THAT. BUT WILLIAM MALEK IS            |
| 10 | THE ONE WHO IDENTIFIED STANLEY PETROWSKI AS HAVING BEEN    |
| 11 | INVOLVED IN THIS KIDNAPPING AND DEPROGRAMMING ATTEMPT.     |
| 12 | Q WASN'T THAT THE SAME STANLEY PETROWSKI WHO GOT           |
| 13 | \$20,000 OUT OF CLARE DU BOIS UP IN COLORADO SPRINGS?      |
| 14 | MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO OBJECT. I AM          |
| 15 | GOING TO OBJECT ON GROUNDS OF RELEVANCE AND I WOULD LIKE   |
| 16 | THE COURT: SUSTAINED.                                      |
| 17 | MR. KLEIN: I WOULD LIKE TO PUT SOMETHING ON THE            |
| 18 | RECORD, YOUR HONOR. I WOULD ASK TO BE ABLE TO DO THAT.     |
| 19 | THE COURT: PROCEED.  |
| 20 | Q BY MR. LEVY: DO YOU DECREE, TOO, ALSO, MR.               |
| 21 | FRANCIS?   |
| 22 | A YES.   |
| 23 | Q NOW CERTAINLY IN YOUR ELEVATED POSITION WITH             |
| 24 | THE CHURCH, YOU WOULD KNOW ABOUT ADDENDUMS TO HOUSE RULES, |
| 25 | WOULD YOU NOT?   |
| 26 | A WHICH ADDENDUM TO WHICH HOUSE RULES?                     |
| 27 | Q HOW ABOUT THE ONE WITH THE SAN FRANCISCO                 |
| 28 | TEACHING CENTER DATED 1980 AND IT IS MARKED AS EXHIBIT     |
|    | i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e                    |

NUMBER 5. 1 ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THAT ONE? 2 NO, I AM NOT. ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF YOU 3 HAVING BROUGHT IT TO THIS LAWSUIT IS THE FIRST TIME I EVER SAW IT. 5 LOT OF STUFF GETS BY YOU, DOESN'T IT? 6 Q WELL, THE TEACHING CENTERS ARE AUTONOMOUS. 7 THEY ARE SEPARATE ORGANIZATIONS. THEY HAVE THEIR OWN BOARD 8 OF TRUSTEES AND OFFICERS. THEY CAN MAKE THEIR OWN HOUSE 9 10 RULES. LIKE RORY INGALLS WAS HEAD OF THE SAN FRANCISCO 11 TEACHING CENTER THAT GOT FIRED BY ELIZABETH? 12 I DON'T BELIEVE IT WAS A TEACHING CENTER WHEN 13 HE WAS IN SAN FRANCISCO. I BELIEVE IT WAS JUST A STUDY 14 15 GROUP. WE HAVE HAD FIVE WITNESSES AT LEAST WHO 16 TESTIFIED FOR THE CHURCH THAT THEY ATTENDED CHURCH UNIVERSAL 17 AND TRIUMPHANT'S TEACHING CENTER IN SAN FRANCISCO. 18 WERE ALL OF THOSE PEOPLE INCORRECT IN ASSUMING 19 THAT IT HAD SOMETHING TO DO WITH CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND 20 TR IUMPHANT? 21 IT BECAME A TEACHING CENTER AT A CERTAIN POINT. 22 A TEACHING CENTER IS AN ORGANIZATION THAT GETS A CHARTER 23 FROM US. THEY HAVE A BOARD - AS I SAID, THEY HAVE A BOARD 24 OF TRUSTEES, OFFICERS, AND THEY -- THE TEACHING CENTER 25 ITSELF COMES INTO BEING WHEN THAT CHARTER IS GIVEN. 26 AND THERE IS A CERTAIN POINT IN TIME WHEN IT 27 DID BECOME A TEACHING CENTER AND I AM NOT SURE IF THAT WAS 28

AT A TIME WHEN RORY INGALLS WAS THERE OR NOT. PRIOR TO THAT 1 TIME, IT WAS A VERY INFORMALLY ORGANIZED STUDY GROUP. 2 SO THE TEACHING CENTERS ARE ONLY YOUR TEACHING 3 CENTERS WHEN YOU WANT THEM TO BE YOUR TEACHING CENTERS, OTHERWISE THEY ARE INFORMAL STUDY GROUPS? 5 NO. THEY ARE TEACHING CENTERS WHEN THEY COME 6 INTO BEING. 7 WHEN MR. MULL ATTENDED THE TEACHING CENTER IN 8 SAN FRANCISCO IN 1974, WAS IT AFFILIATED WITH CHURCH 9 UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT OR SUMMIT LIGHTHOUSE AS IT MAY HAVE 10 BEEN KNOWN THEN? 11 I AM SURE IT WASN'T A TEACHING CENTER IN 1974, 12 BUT THE STUDY GROUP THAT THEN EXISTED CERTAINLY WAS 13 AFFILIATED. 14 THE TEACHING CENTER THAT DIDN'T EXIST AT THAT 15 TIME HAD RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR A TEACHING CENTER, BUT IT 16 WASN'T A TEACHING CENTER? 17 NO, I DIDN'T SAY THAT. 31 Α LET'S GO TO SOMETHING THAT MAY BE A LITTLE BIT 19 0 CLEARER THEN. 20 Α OKAY. 21 YOU MET WITH MR. MULL'S DAUGHTER AFTER MR. MULL 22 Q HAD BEEN ASKED TO LEAVE CAMELOT? 23 YES. 24 Α YOU RECALL HOW OLD SHE WAS AT THAT TIME? 25 Q PROBABLY AROUND 18 OR 20. NINETEEN MAYBE. 26 Α AND IF I RECALL YOUR TESTIMONY RIGHT, "WE HAVE 27 ASKED YOUR FATHER TO LEAVE, BUT WE DON'T WANT YOU TO BE 28

Q WAS HE PROGRAMMED AT CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT?

A DEPROGRAMMING IS A TERM THAT IS USED WHERE
PEOPLE ARE KIDNAPPED AND HELD IN CONFINEMENT AND THEY
ATTEMPT TO MAKE THEM RENOUNCE PARTICULAR RELIGIOUS VIEWS
THAT PEOPLE HAVE. IT IS A PHRASE THAT IS COINED FOR THAT.

IT DOESN'T NECESSARILY MEAN THAT THE PERSON IS
PROGRAMMED. IT MEANS THAT MAYBE THE PEOPLE WHO ARE DOING
THE DEPROGRAMMING THINK THAT HE IS PROGRAMMED.

Q NOW YOU TOLD LINDA MULL THAT THERE WAS A DISPUTE, A FINANCIAL DISPUTE BETWEEN HER FATHER AND THE CHURCH AND THAT YOU WERE ATTEMPTING TO RESOLVE IT.

WHAT DID YOU DO BETWEEN THE TIME YOU GOT HIS LAST \$5,500 AND THE TIME YOU SUED HIM TO RESOLVE THE DISPUTE?

A FIRST OF ALL, I DON'T THINK IT WAS HIS LAST \$5,500. I THINK THAT IS --

Q LET'S SAY HIS NEXT TO LAST \$5,500.

WHAT DID YOU DO TO RESOLVE THE FINANCIAL

DISPUTE IF ANYTHING?

A WELL, FIRST OF ALL, FOR A LONG PERIOD OF TIME
WE DID NOTHING, AND WE PROBABLY WOULDN'T HAVE DONE ANYTHING,
UNTIL THE NOVEMBER, 1980, LETTER CAME UP.

WHEN THAT CAME UP, WE ASKED OUR ATTORNEY TO WRITE MR. MULL TO MAKE AN OFFER OF SETTLEMENT WHEREBY IF HE SIMPLY AGREED NOT TO LIBEL THE CHURCH AND ELIZABETH AND ANY OF THE OTHER LEADERS OF THE CHURCH, THAT WE WOULD FORGIVE THE DEBT ENTIRELY AT THAT POINT. THAT IS WHAT WAS OFFERED

TO TRY TO RESOLVE THE DISPUTE. 1 AND THEN WHEN MR. MULL MAINTAINED HIS SILENCE, 2 Q YOU SUED HIM ANYWAY, DIDN'T YOU? 3 HE DIDN'T MAINTAIN HIS SILENCE. DID HE CALL YOU AND LIBEL ELIZABETH? 5 Q NO. BUT HE WROTE TO NEWSPAPERS AND LIBELED 6 ELIZABETH. 7 WE HAVEN'T SEEN ONE NEWSPAPER HERE DURING THAT 8 0 PERIOD OF TIME WHERE HE DID ANYTHING OTHER THAN MAINTAIN HIS 9 10 SILENCE AFTER HE GOT THE LETTER FROM THAT ATTORNEY UP UNTIL 11 THE TIME YOU SUED HIM. WAS THAT A LIE THAT YOU TOLD TO LINDA MULL, 12 THAT YOU WERE GOING TO ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE THE DISPUTE 13 BETWEEN THE CHURCH AND MR. MULL? 14 WAS THE FORMER THING A QUESTION ABOUT NOT 15 SAYING A NEWSPAPER? BECAUSE WHAT I AM SAYING IS I TESTIFIED 16 THAT HE DID WRITE TO THE NEWSPAPERS. 17 COULD YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION ABOUT LINDA AGAIN 18 19 BECAUSE I LOST IT. LET ME TRY TO HELP YOU FIND IT AGAIN. 20 OKAY. 21 Α YOU TOLD HER YOU WERE GOING TO SEE IF YOU COULD 22 RESOLVE THE DISPUTE BETWEEN HER FATHER AND THE CHURCH ABOUT 23 A FINANCIAL MATTER? 24 I TOLD HER WE HOPED WE COULD RESOLVE THE 25 FINANCIAL DISAGREEMENT. 26 EACH TIME I ASK THE QUESTION, YOU TURN IT 27 Q SLIGHTLY. YOU HOPED YOU COULD RESOLVE THE FINANCIAL 28

1 DISPUTE. WAS THERE ANY TIME THAT YOU YOURSELF EVER DID 2 ANYTHING TO GET THE FINANCIAL DISPUTE RESOLVED? 3 Α YES. 5 WHAT WAS IT YOU, ED FRANCIS, DID? Q I TALKED WITH OUR ATTORNEY, MARY GROSS, TO ASK 6 HIM TO WRITE GREGORY MULL A LETTER TO ATTEMPT TO OFFER A 7 SETTLEMENT. 8 AND THE SETTLEMENT WAS SHUT UP AND WE WON'T SUE 9 0 YOU; IS THAT HOW YOU INTENDED TO RESOLVE THE FINANCIAL 10 DISPUTE? 11 A THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SHUTTING UP AND 12 NOT LIBELING. 13 WAS NOT THE GIST OF THE LETTER THAT GREGORY 14 MULL NOT TALK ABOUT HIS EXPERIENCE WITH THE CHURCH, HE WOULD 15 NOT BE SUED? 16 NO, I DON'T THINK THAT IS. 17 Α WELL, LET ME JUST FIND THE LETTER THEN. 18 Q OKAY. 19 Α MR. KLEIN: WHAT IS THE DATE OF THE LETTER YOU ARE 20 REFERRING TO? 21 MR. LEVY: I THINK THE DATE OF THE LETTER IS IN 1980. 22 33. THE DATE OF THE LETTER IS DECEMBER 4TH, 23 1980. IT IS EXHIBIT NUMBER 33. 24 LET ME READ THE EXACT TERMS OF THE LETTER. THE 25 FIRST TWO PAGES ARE AN INTRODUCTION WHERE MR. GRAYSON TELLS 26 MR. MULL THAT HE PERSONALLY IS OFFENDED BY MR. MULL. THEN 27 THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT THAT IS OFFERED BEGIN ON PAGE 28

THREE. 1 MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD ASK THAT WE READ THE 2 ENTIRE LETTER IF WE ARE GOING TO READ PART OF IT. 3 MR. LEVY: I HAVE NO OBJECTION TO THAT, YOUR HONOR. 5 THE COURT: GO AHEAD. 6 MR. LEVY: (READING.) 7 "DEAR MR. MULL: 3 "I HAVE RECEIVED A COPY OF YOUR NOVEMBER 7TH LETTER TO ELIZABETH CLARE 9 10 PROPHET" --THE COURT: JUST A SECOND. 11 12 TO MAKE IT EASIER, WHY DON'T YOU JUST INSERT 13 EXHIBIT 33. 14 MR. LEVY: I WILL START OVER. (AS DIRECTED, EXHIBIT 33 IS COPIED 15 16 INTO THE RECORD AS FOLLOWS:) 17 DEAR MR. MULL: I HAVE REVIEWED A COPY OF YOUR 18 19 NOVEMBER 7 LETTER TO ELIZABETH CLARE 20 PROPHET, A CHORE WHICH I FOUND TO BE MOST DISTASTEFUL. 21 22 IT IS INCREDIBLE TO ME THAT AN ADULT MEMBER OF A RESPECTED PROFESSION COULD 23 WRITE SUCH A VICIOUS AND VINDICTIVE LETTER. 24 WERE I AS AN ATTORNEY TO PUT FORTH SUCH A 25 DIATRIBE, I WOULD RIGHTFULLY BE SUBJECT TO 26 DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS BY THE BAR. 27 THE SHEER LENGTH AND 28

REPETITIVENESS OF THE COMMUNICATION CLEARLY
REFLECTS YOUR TRUE FEELINGS OF REVENGE AND
MALICE TOWARD A GROUP OF PEOPLE YOU ONCE
CALLED YOUR "FRIENDS" BUT WHICH YOU NOW USE
AS A SCAPEGOAT FOR YOUR OWN PERSONAL
PROBLEMS AND FAILURES.

IN ALL MY YEARS AS AN ATTORNEY,

I HAVE NEVER SEEN SUCH AN ABUSIVE AND

THREATENING LETTER DIRECTED EITHER TO A

WOMAN OR TO A MINISTER, AND SUCH A COMPLETE

LACK OF WILLINGNESS FOR A GROWN MAN TO TAKE

RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIS OWN CIRCUMSTANCES IN

LIFE. THE ONLY THING I CAN SAY TO YOU, MR.

MULL, IS THAT YOU SHOULD BE PROFOUNDLY

ASHAMED OF YOURSELF AND HOPE THAT THIS

LETTER NOT BE PUBLICLY REVEALED FOR ALL TO

SEE. OF COURSE, IF THERE IS LEGAL ACTION,

THIS LETTER WILL BE OUR EXHIBIT A.

YOUR LETTER OF NOVEMBER 7,

1980, IS REPLETE WITH FALSEHOODS AND

MISSTATEMENTS WHICH SERIOUSLY IMPUGN THE

INTEGRITY, HONESTY AND GOOD REPUTATION OF MY

CLIENTS. IF YOU ARE ACTUALLY SEEKING A

RESOLUTION OF THE DISPUTE, YOU HAVE A MOST

UNORTHODOX APPROACH. NEVERTHELESS, I WILL

ATTEMPT TO SUPPRESS MY INDIGNATION AND DEAL

WITH YOU AS OBJECTIVELY AS POSSIBLE.

IF, ON THE OTHER HAND, YOU ARE

ATTEMPTING TO HARASS THE CHURCH AND ITS

LEADERS AND TO EXTORT MONEY THROUGH YOUR USE

OF VEILED AND EXPRESS THREATS, WHICH

CERTAINLY APPEARS TO BE THE CASE, THEN

PLEASE ADVISE ME SO THAT I MAY PREPARE A

LAWSUIT.

BEFORE YOU MAKE YOUR DECISION,
HOWEVER, LET ME FIRST WARN YOU OF THE
EXTREME GRAVITY OF YOUR PRESENT COURSE OF
ACTION. YOU MUST CAREFULLY CONSIDER YOUR
ABILITY TO PROVE THE TRUTH OF EACH AND EVERY
DEFAMATORY STATEMENT AND ALLEGATION, FOR IF
YOU CANNOT, YOU COULD BE FOUND GUILTY OF A
VERY SERIOUS LIBEL AGAINST THE GOOD
REPUTATION OF THE CHURCH AND ITS LEADERS.
THE LAW VIEWS THIS TYPE OF CONDUCT WITH
PARTICULAR CONTEMPT AND AWARDS PUNITIVE
DAMAGES ACCORDINGLY SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE
OF PUNISHING AND DETERRING SUCH CONDUCT.

THAT SECTION 527.6 OF THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE PROHIBITS ACTS OF "HARASSMENT" AND PROVIDES THAT AN INJUNCTION MAY BE ISSUED BY A COURT TO PREVENT THREATENED FURTHER ACTS OF HARASSMENT. IN MY OPINION, THE INTENT EXPRESSED IN YOUR RECENT LETTER FALLS WITHIN THE DEFINITION OF THE TYPE OF CONDUCT PROSCRIBED BY THIS

STATUTE.

ON THE OTHER HAND, I KNOW OF NO LEGITIMATE CAUSE OF ACTION THAT YOU HAVE AGAINST THE CHURCH OR ITS LEADERS. THEY HAVE DONE NOTHING TO YOU AND DESIRE TO HAVE NO FURTHER DEALINGS WITH YOU IN THE FUTURE.

I HAVE PERSONALLY KNOWN

ELIZABETH AND THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF

THIS CHURCH FOR A LONGER PERIOD THAN YOU,

MR. MULL, AND I UNEQUIVOCALLY VOUCH FOR

THEIR INTEGRITY. I WILL NOT HESITATE TO

BRING YOU BEFORE A COURT OF LAW FOR REDRESS

FOR YOUR ACTIONS IF YOU PERSIST IN HARASSING

MY CLIENTS IN THIS MANNER. BOTH I AND MY

FIRM WILL UNRESERVEDLY PROVIDE ANY AND ALL

LEGAL ASSISTANCE NECESSARY TO FULLY AND

COMPLETELY PURSUE THIS MATTER, TOTALLY

DISPROVING YOUR UNSUBSTANTIATED CHARGES AND

ACCUSATIONS.

IT IS PARTICULARLY DIFFICULT

FOR ME TO WRITE A LETTER OF CONCILIATION

WHEN MY INITIAL REACTION IS TO ADVISE MY

CLIENTS TO IMMEDIATELY SUE YOU FOR LIBEL AND

SLANDER AS WELL AS FOR THE COLLECTION OF ALL

AMOUNTS LOANED TO YOU WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN

REPAID. HOWEVER, ASSUMING THAT YOUR FIRST

PRIORITY IS TO PEACEFULLY RESOLVE THE

DIFFERENCES HERE, I MAKE THE FOLLOWING

PROPOSAL FOR A FINAL SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT:

1. OF THE \$38,000 ADVANCED TO
YOU AND FOR WHICH YOU HAVE SIGNED PROMISORY
NOTES TO THE CHURCH, WE WILL CREDIT THE
\$5,000 AS PAYMENT THEREON, LEAVING A BALANCE
OF \$33,000.

2. I HAVE TAKEN NOTE THAT ELIZABETH TOLD YOU IN JUNE THAT SHE DID NOT INTEND TO SUE YOU. ALTOUGH MY OPINION IS THAT SHE AND THE CHURCH SHOULD DO SO IMMEDIATELY, PARTICULARLY IN LIGHT OF YOUR RECENT LETTER, SHE HAS TOLD ME THAT SHE INTENDS TO HOLD FIRM TO HER PREVIOUS INTENT. THEREFORE, WE WILL AGREE TO BRING NO ACTION FOR LIBEL OR SLANDER, AND WE WILL COVENANT NOT TO SUE ON THE \$33,000 OUTSTANDING BALANCE AND WILL TAKE NO STEPS TO COLLECT OR RECOVER THE SAME SO LONG AS YOU, IN KEEPING WITH A HIGH STANDARD OF PROFESSIONALISM AND COMMON COURTESY, REFRAIN FROM DISCUSSING TO ANY THIRD PERSON ANY OF YOUR EXPERIENCES OR TRANSACTIONS WITH AND YOUR KNOWLEDGE ABOUT CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT OR ANY OF THE IDIVIDUALS CONNECTED THEREWITH, OR MALIGNING THE CHURCH OR ANY SUCH PERSONS WHICH COULD IN ANY WAY BE CONSIDERED BY A REASONABLE PERSON TO BE HARMFUL TO THE NAME OR REPUTATION OF THE CHURCH OR SUCH

1 2

3

**4** 5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

INDIVIDUALS.

2

3

5

б 7

8

9

10 11

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

3. YOU WILL AGREE NOT TO ATTEMPT TO COMMUNICATE OR CORRESPOND UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES WITH ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET OR ANY PERSON WHO IS CONNECTED WITH CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT, INCLUDING STAFF MEMBERS AT CAMELOT AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH. ANY FUTURE COMMUNICATION WHICH YOU FIND NECESSARY MUST BE MADE DIRECTLY WITH ME AS THE CHURCH'S LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS MATTER.

4. OF COURSE, YOU MUST ALSO RELEASE AND WAIVE ANY AND ALL CLAIMS, DEMANDS OR CAUSES OF ACTION WHICH YOU MAY HAVE AGAINST THE CHURCH OR SUCH INDIVIDUALS ARISING OUT OF ANY TRANSACTIONS OR CAUSES WHATSOEVER UP TO THE PRESENT DATE.

IF THESE TERMS ARE ACCEPTABLE TO YOU, PLEASE SIGN AND RETURN A COPY OF THIS LETTER AND WE WILL CONSIDER IT A BINDING CONTRACT AND A FINAL RESOLUTION OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN US.

I DO REQUEST THAT YOU REFRAIN IN THE FUTURE FROM CONTACTING MY CLIENTS IN ANY WAY, IN KEEPING WITH THE SAME DEMAND CONTAINED IN YOUR LETTER, WHETHER OR NOT YOU AGREE TO THE ABOVE TERMS. IF YOU HAVE ANYTHING TO SAY, YOU MAY CONTACT ME

DIRECTLY.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

MY CLIENTS HAVE TOLD ME THAT THEY SIMPLY WISH TO HAVE A PEACEFUL PARTING OF THE WAYS WITH YOU AND HAVE EXPRESSED THIS TO YOU ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS. NEVERTHELESS, THEY HAVE NO INTENTION OF BEING BLACKMAILED OR EXTORTED OUT OF CHURCH FUNDS UNDER THE THREAT OF A LIBELOUS EXPOSURE AND WILL TAKE WHATEVER STEPS ARE NECESARY TO PROTECT THEIR GOOD NAME AND REPUTATION.

> (THE COPYING OF THE EXHIBIT IS CONCLUDED.) AND IT IS SIGNED BY MARVIN GROSS.

- Q DO YOU RECALL THAT LETTER?
- YES.
- DID YOU READ IT AT THE TIME IT WAS PREPARED AND SENT TO GREGORY MULL?
  - Α YES.
- ESSENTIALLY DOES THE LETTER TELL MR. MULL NOT TO TALK ABOUT HIS EXPERIENCES AT THE CHURCH OR TO TALK ABOUT ANYONE ELSE OR TO MAKE ANY STATEMENT IN ANY REGARD WITH THE CHURCH OR THE CHURCH MEMBERS; AND IF HE AGREES TO DO THAT, HE WON'T BE SUED?

MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO OBJECT. THE LETTER IS HERE. IT SPEAKS FOR ITSELF AS TO WHAT IT SAYS. THE COURT: SUSTAINED.

BY MR. LEVY: WHAT PARTICULARLY AFTER HE GOT THIS LETTER FROM YOUR ATTORNEY DID HE DO THAT FRIGHTENED YOU INTO SUING HIM?

A WE WEREN'T FRIGHTENED INTO SUING HIM.

Q THE LETTER IS DATED DECEMBER THE 4TH, 1980, AND THE COMPLAINT WAS FILED MARCH THE 3RD, 1981. WHAT DID HE DO BETWEEN DECEMBER THE 4TH, 1980, AND MARCH THE 3RD, 1981, THAT CAUSED YOU TO SUE HIM?

A FIRST OF ALL, WE WAITED FOR A TIME TO SEE IF A
RESPONSE WOULD BE RECEIVED TO THIS. AND TO MY
RECOLLECTION --

Q MR. FRANCIS, MY QUESTION WAS WHAT DID MR. MULL DO THAT CAUSED YOU TO SUE HIM?

A WELL, I WAS ABOUT TO EXPLAIN THAT.

WE WAITED FOR A TIME FOR A RESPONSE. AND THE CAUSE OF SUING HIM WAS NOT ONLY WHAT WENT ON BETWEEN THE TIME OF THIS LETTER AND THE TIME THE LAWSUIT WAS FILED, BUT ALSO THE THINGS THAT HAD GONE ON BEFORE.

THIS AND THE TIME THAT WE SUED HIM WAS HIS LETTER TO THE NEWSPAPERS. IT IS A LETTER THAT HE WROTE AND PASSED AROUND TO AT LEAST HALF A DOZEN DIFFERENT NEWSPAPERS THAT MADE FALSE ALLEGATIONS ABOUT THINGS THAT WERE GOING ON ON OUR PROPERTY AND IN OUR ORGANIZATION.

Q WE HAVE BEEN HERE ALMOST SIX WEEKS AND I FOR ONE HAVEN'T SEEN THIS LETTER HE WROTE TO THE NEWSPAPER THAT MAKES FALSE ALLEGATIONS.

CAN YOU TELL US SPECIFICALLY WHAT FALSE

ALLEGATIONS HE MADE AGAINST THE CHURCH AND WHATEVER PAPER

THIS WAS SUPPOSEDLY PUT IN?

A THE FALSE ALLEGATIONS THAT I RECALL SITTING

4 5

RIGHT HERE, NOT HAVING IT IN FRONT OF ME, ARE, FIRST OF ALL,
THE TENT ALLEGATION THAT I MENTIONED TO YOU. HE ALLEGED
THAT WE WERE ERECTING TENTS ILLEGALLY AT CAMELOT, WHICH
SIMPLY WAS NOT THE CASE. WE DIDN'T HAVE TO HAVE A PERMIT TO
ERECT THOSE TENTS AT CAMELOT FOR OUR CONFERENCES.

SECONDLY, HE CLAIMED THAT STRUCTURAL WALLS HAD BEEN REMOVED FROM THE SUMMIT UNIVERSITY CLASSROOM WHICH MADE THE BUILDING UNSAFE AND MADE IT SO THAT IT WOULD COLLAPSE IN AN EARTHQUAKE. THAT SIMPLY IS NOT THE CASE.

ONE OF THE WALLS THAT WAS REMOVED WAS A FOLDING ACCORDION WALL, THE TYPE THAT SLIDES OPEN AND SHUT IN THE MIDDLE OF A ROOM, AND THE OTHER WALL WAS A NONBEARING PETITION. IT WAS ACTUALLY SUPPORTED FROM THE CEILING. IT WAS NOT — HAD NO WEIGHT RESTING ON IT.

ANOTHER FALSE ALLEGATION THAT WAS MADE WAS THAT CONDITIONS OF OVERCROWDING WITH 40 TO 60 PEOPLE LIVING IN ONE ROOM AND SOME PEOPLE SLEEPING WITH GOATS. THAT IS NOT TRUE. I HAVE NEVER SEEN ANYTHING LIKE THAT. IT'S NEVER OCCURRED.

ANOTHER FALSE ALLEGATION THAT HE MADE WAS THAT
THE WILL OF GOD FOCUS AT THE ASHRAM IN DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES
VIOLATED THE BUILDING CODE, AND WAS NOT BUILT ACCORDING TO
PERMIT AND SUPPOSEDLY THERE WAS NOT A POST PUT UNDER A BEAM.
IN RESPONSE TO THAT, A BUILDING INSPECTOR CAME OUT AND
DETERMINED THAT THAT WAS NOT THE CASE. SIMPLY WAS NOT THE
CASE.

Q SO FAR EVERYTHING YOU HAVE TOLD ME HAS GOT TO DO WITH HIS LETTER TO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT WHICH

PRECEDED --1 A I AM TALKING ABOUT HIS LETTER TO THE 2 NEWSPAPERS. THESE ARE ALL INCLUDED IN HIS LETTER TO THE 3 NEWSPAPERS. 4 O DO YOU HAVE A COPY OF HIS LETTER TO THE 5 NEWSPAPERS TODAY? 6 THERE IS A COPY OF IT. I DON'T KNOW WHERE IT 7 IS RIGHT NOW. I DON'T KNOW IF IT IS HERE RIGHT NOW, BUT I 8 HAVE SEEN A COPY OF IT. 9 ISN'T IT A FACT THAT THE NEWSPAPERS GOT 10 INTERESTED WHEN THE BUILDING AND SAFETY DEPARTMENT WENT OUT 11 TO LOOK OVER THE CAMPUS AT CAMELOT? 12 THIS I DON'T KNOW HOW THE NEWSPAPERS GOT 13 14 INTERESTED. BUT YOU KNOW EXACTLY WHAT MR. MULL WROTE TO THE 15 NEWSPAPERS AND YOU GOT ALL THE INSIDE INFORMATION ON WHAT HE 16 DID, BUT YOU DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT WHAT THEY DID OR HOW 17 THEY GOT INTERESTED? 31 YOU MEAN THE NEWSPAPERS? 19 YES. THE NEWSPAPERS. 20 Q I THINK THE NEWSPAPERS GOT INTERESTED BECAUSE 21 HE SENT THE LETTER TO THEM. 22 THEY COULDN'T HAVE GOT INTERESTED, YOU THINK 23 Q THEY GOT INTERESTED. SO WHAT YOU ARE DOING IS CONJECTURE? 24 WELL, I DO HAVE KNOWLEDGE OF WHY THAT WAS --25 WHY I BELIEVE THAT. BECAUSE A NEWSPAPER REPORTER FROM THE 26 THOUSAND OAKS CHRONICLE BY THE NAME OF BOB POOL CALLED ME ON 27 THE PHONE AND READ ME MR. MULL'S LETTER THAT HE HAD 28

1 RECEIVED. THE LETTER TO THE BUILDING AND SAFETY 2 Q DEPARTMENT? 3 WELL, IT WAS SENT TO THE NEWSPAPERS, THAT IS ALL I KNOW. I DON'T KNOW IF IT WAS THE LETTER TO THE 5 BUILDING AND SAFETY. THEY HAVE BEEN ONE AND THE SAME. 6 7 DID THE BUILDING AND SAFETY DEPARTMENT EVER RESPOND TO A LETTER TO COME OUT TO CAMELOT AND TAKE A LOOK 8 9 AR OUND? IN RESPONSE TO A LETTER FROM MR. MULL YOU MEAN? 10 Α IN RESPONSE TO ANY LETTER. 11 I THINK THEY DID. I MEAN I THINK IT WAS IN 12 RESPONSE TO MR. MULL'S LETTER. THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT DID 13 COME OUT AND LOOK AROUND, YES. 14 AFTER THEY LOOKED AROUND AND WHATEVER HAD TO BE 15 Q SATISFIED WAS SATISFIED, YOU STILL WENT AHEAD AND SUED MR. 16 17 MULL? IT TOOK A LONG TIME FOR THAT TO BE SATISFIED. 18 IT WENT WELL BEYOND THE TIME WE FILED OUR LAWSUIT IN OTHER 19 20 WORDS . YOU MEAN THE BUILDING AND SAFETY DEPARTMENT Q 21 ACTUALLY HAD TO COME OUT THERE A NUMBER OF TIMES TO 22 DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THERE WERE VIOLATIONS? 23 YES, THIS IS CORRECT. 24 Α YOU FIND IT OFFENSIVE THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF 25 BUILDING AND SAFETY MIGHT COME OUT TO EXAMINE WHETHER YOU 26 HAVE SAFE PREMISES OR NOT? 27 NO. 28

A I DIDN'T GO TO ANY ARCHITECTURAL SCHOOL.

Q BUT YOU ARE SITTING HERE TESTIFYING ABOUT WHAT IS A NONBEARING AND WHAT IS A BEARING WALL AND WALLS THAT ARE SUSPENDED FROM THE CEILING.

DO YOU HAVE ANY PERSONAL ARCHITECTURAL
KNOWLEDGE BASED ON ANY PROFESSIONAL TRAINING AS TO WHETHER
OR NOT ANY STRUCTURE IS SAFE OR UNSAFE?

A NO. JUST LAY KNOWLEDGE.

Q JUST KIND OF GUESS AT IT?

A NO. I WORKED CONSTRUCTION FOR SEVERAL YEARS
WHEN I WAS IN HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE AND I KNOW THE
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A BEARING WALL AND A NONBEARING WALL. A
BEARING WALL HAS WEIGHT RESTING ON IT AND A NONBEARING WALL
DOESN'T.

Q DIDN'T YOU EMPLOY MR. MULL TO COME TO CAMELOT BECAUSE OF HIS ARCHITECTURAL EXPERTISE? WASN'T CAMELOT PLANNING TO RELY UPON HIS KNOWLEDGE AND HIS EXPERTISE?

A FOR THE PROJECTS THAT WERE ENUMERATED, YES.

Q AND IF MR. MULL IN HIS PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY

FELT THERE MIGHT BE SOMETHING THAT WAS UNSAFE AND HE

REPORTED THOSE UNSAFE THINGS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING

AND SAFETY SO THAT THEY COULD SATISFY THEMSELVES AS TO

WHETHER OR NOT THEY WERE VIOLATIONS, IN YOUR OPINION HE WAS

1 2

DOING SOMETHING SO TERRIBLE THAT YOU SUED HIM?

FIRST OF ALL, HE COULD HAVE BROUGHT IT TO OUR ATTENTION
DURING THE YEARS THAT HE WAS THERE, WHICH I NEVER HEARD.
AND SECONDLY, THE WAY IT WAS BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE
BUILDING AND SAFETY WAS, "I WANT YOU TO GO OUT THERE AND
CLOSE DOWN THEIR CONFERENCE AND CLOSE DOWN THEIR SUMMIT
UNIVERSITY CLASSROOM."

- Q WERE YOU THERE WHEN THEY GOT THE LETTER, THE BUILDING AND SAFETY DEPARTMENT?
  - A WHEN BUILDING AND SAFETY GOT THE LETTER?
  - Q YES.
  - A NO.
- Q HOW DO YOU KNOW IT WAS BROUGHT TO THEIR ATTENTION WITH A DEMAND THAT THEY CLOSE YOU DOWN?
  - A I HAVE SEEN THE LETTER.
- Q AND THE LETTER SAYS WHAT? IT SAYS THERE ARE A LOT OF VIOLATIONS OUT THERE THAT MERIT LOOKING INTO AND BECAUSE IF THERE IS AN EARTHQUAKE, THERE MIGHT BE SOME STRUCTURAL DAMAGE THAT MIGHT ENDANGER SOME OF THE CHILDREN IN THE MONTESSORI SCHOOL AND THE OTHER PEOPLE THERE?
  - A IT DOESN'T SAY IT EXACTLY THAT WAY.
- Q IT DOESN'T SAY IT EXACTLY THE WAY YOU ARE SAYING IT EITHER BECAUSE I HAVE READ IT, TOO.

A IT COMES CLOSE TO IT. IT DOES SAY THAT HE
WANTS THEM TO CLOSE THE SUMMIT UNIVERSITY CLASSROOM BECAUSE
OF THESE GROSS ILLEGALITIES AND HE WANTS THEM TO PREVENT US
FROM BEING ABLE TO ERECT ANOTHER TENT BECAUSE OF THE GROSS

ILLEGALITY OF NOT GETTING A PERMIT. 1 JUST A FEW LAST QUESTIONS, MR. FRANCIS. 2 MR. MULL HAD GIVEN UP --3 THE COURT: LET'S TAKE A RECESS AT THIS TIME AND THEN WE WILL RESUME. 5 MR. MIDDLETON: WHILE WE HAVE A RECESS, YOUR HONOR, 6 IS IT POSSIBLE FOR COUNSEL TO MEET WITH YOU? 7 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 8 (A CONFERENCE WAS HELD IN CHAMBERS 9 WHICH WAS NOT REPORTED.) 10 (RECESS.) 11 THE COURT: PLEASE PROCEED. 12 MR. LEVY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 13 BY MR. LEVY: MR. FRANCIS, ARE YOU A SON OF 14 15 DOMINION? ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT IN THE SENSE OF THE ORDER 16 OF THE SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF DOMINION? 17 THAT'S CORRECT, SIR. Q 18 I BELIEVE -- YES, I AM. 19 WHAT IS A SON OF DOMINION? WHAT DOES A PERSON 20 HAVE TO DO OR BE TO BE A SON OF DOMINION? 21 ORDER OF THE SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF DOMINION WAS 22 A HOLY ORDER THAT WAS FOUNDED MAYBE ABOUT 1971 OR '72 THAT 23 WAS A PARTICULAR LEVEL OF DEDICATION TO THE CHURCH'S 24 TEACHINGS AND THEN IT WAS LATER INCORPORATED INTO THE 25 STRUCTURE OF THE CHURCH WHEN IT WAS INCORPORATED IN 1975 AS 26 A SPECIFIC CATEGORY OF INVOLVEMENT OR MEMBERSHIP IN THE 27 CHURCH. 28

BY MR. LEVY: LET ME SEE IF I CAN HELP REFRESH 1 Q YOUR RECOLLECTION. 2 WHEN YOU PLEDGED YOUR TOTAL OBEDIENCE AND YOUR 3 TOTAL DEDICATION TO ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET, DOES THAT MEAN 4 YOU DO WHATEVER SHE WOULD TELL YOU? 5 NO. THAT IS -- WELL, FROM THE STANDPOINT OF MY 6 RELATIONSHIP AS I KNOW IT TO BE, THAT IS NOT WHAT I BELIEVE 7 IT TO BE. 8 WHAT KIND OF DEDICATION DID YOU PLEDGE TO THE 9 Q CHILDREN? 10 WHICH CHILDREN? 11 TATIANA, SEAN, THE OTHER TWO KIDS? 12 Q I AM THEIR STEPFATHER. 13 WELL, YOU PLEDGED THAT DEDICATION BECAUSE THAT 14 IS ONE OF THE 33 VOWS YOU TAKE WHEN YOU BECOME A SON OF 15 DOMINION, IS IT NOT? 16 WELL, AS I SAID, I DON'T KNOW BECAUSE IT'S 17 18 BEEN --WELL, LET ME --19 -- FOURTEEN YEARS AGO. 20 HERE IS A COPY OF THE 33 VOWS OF THE SONS AND 21 DAUGHTERS OF DOMINION. I CALL YOUR ATTENTION TO THE SECOND 22 PAGE -- WHOOPS, MR. KLEIN, I FORGOT YOU. 23 LET ME SHOW IT TO YOU FIRST. 24 EXCUSE ME, MR. FRANCIS. 25 1 AM LOOKING AT PAGE 2, SECTION 7 AND SECTION 26 8. WHY DON'T YOU TAKE YOUR TIME AND READ THOSE, SECTION 7 27 AND SECTION 8. 28

| 1  | A OKAY.  |
|----|--|
| 2  | Q DOES THAT REFRESH YOUR RECOLLECTION, SIR?                  |
| 3  | A NO, IT REALLY DOESN'T. I CAN'T SAY THAT I                  |
| 4  | RECALL EVER READING THAT.                                    |
| 5  | Q WHEN YOU BECAME A SON OF DOMINION, DID YOU JUST            |
| 6  | AGREE TO PLEDGE YOURSELF TO CERTAIN THINGS WITHOUT KNOWING   |
| 7  | WHAT THE THINGS WERE?  |
| 8  | A WELL, I SUPPOSE I KNEW AT THE TIME. BUT IT'S               |
| 9  | NOT I JUST DON'T REMEMBER READING THOSE SPECIFIC WORDS.      |
| 10 | Q DID YOU READ ANYTHING AT THE TIME?                         |
| 11 | A I THINK I DID. I MEAN I REMEMBER READING                   |
| 12 | SOMETHING.   |
| 13 | Q AS PART OF YOUR AFFILIATION WITH THE CHURCH AND            |
| 14 | WITH ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET, DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF TO    |
| 15 | STILL BE UNDER THAT VOW OF TOTAL DEDICATION?                 |
| 16 | A I CONSIDER MYSELF TO BE UNDER THE VOW OF ANY               |
| 17 | VOWS OF DEDICATION THAT I MAY HAVE TAKEN, BUT I DON'T RECALL |
| 18 | READING THAT SPECIFIC LIST OF VOWS. IT REALLY DOESN'T LOOK   |
| 19 | THAT FAMILIAR TO ME.   |
| 20 | Q DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF AT THIS TIME TO BE                |
| 21 | UNDER A VOW OF TOTAL DEDICATION TO ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET   |
| 22 | AND HER CHILDREN?  |
| 23 | MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO OBJECT AS TO            |
| 24 | VAGUE AND AMBIGUOUS AS TO WHAT "TOTAL DEDICATION" MEANS.     |
| 25 | THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER.                                    |
| 26 | THE WITNESS: I CONSIDER MYSELF TO BE DEDICATED TO            |
| 27 | THEM, YES.   |
| 28 | Q BY MR. LEVY: DO YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT A VOW OF               |
|    |  |

A I THINK THE WORDS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES IN TERMS
OF THE, YOU KNOW, WHAT THEY MEAN TO ANYBODY WHO MIGHT READ
THEM.

Q I AGREE WITH YOU. LET ME READ THEM TO YOU AND SEE IF IT HELPS REFRESH YOUR RECOLLECTION.

MR. KLEIN: AT THIS POINT I WOULD OBJECT. I WOULD LIKE TO AT LEAST READ WHAT HE IS GOING TO READ SINCE IT IS NOT IN EVIDENCE AT THIS POINT. IF HE READS IT, IT IS GOING TO COME IN EVIDENCE. I WOULD LIKE TO SEE WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT.

THE COURT: WELL, IT IS NOT IN EVIDENCE YET. SUSTAINED.

MR. LEVY: WE WOULD OFFER THIS AS THE DOCUMENT NEXT, WE WOULD OFFER IT TO BE MARKED IN EVIDENCE AS DOCUMENT FOR IDENTIFICATION PURPOSES AS -- I BELIEVE WE ARE UP TO NUMBER 115 NOW.

THE COURT: FOR IDENTIFICATION. SO MARKED.

(MARKED FOR ID: ^ EXHIBIT 115, VOWS)

MR. LEVY: NUMBER 7 AND NUMBER 8: (READING.)

#I SHALL TAKE THE VOW OF TOTAL

28

5

8

9

DEDICATION TO THE OUTPICTURING OF THE MOTHER FLAME IN ITS ORIGINAL PRISTINE PURITY IN THE FOUR OUADRANTS OF THE PLANE OF MATTER AND IN THE QUADRANT ASSIGNED TO ME IN THE MANDALA AND THE UPHOLDING OF THAT FLAME AS IT IS ENSHRINED IN THE MESSENGER ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET, MOTHER OF THE FLAME, AND IN THE LITTLE MOTHER, TATIANA MARIE PROPHET, OR IN ANY OTHER WHO IS ANOINTED BY SAINT GERMAIN TO ASSIST AND SUCCEED HER IN THAT OFFICE.

"I SHALL TAKE THE VOW TO EXPAND THE PRECEPTS OF THE FATHER PRINCIPLE OF THE FOUR QUADRANTS OF THE PLANE OF MATTER AND TO UPHOLD THE MESSENGER MARK L. PROPHET, THE ASCENDED MASTER LANELLO, AS HE REPRESENTS THE FATHER PRINCIPLE FOR THE GREAT WHITE BROTHERHOOD AND THE LITTLE FATHER, SEAN CHRISTOPHER PROPHET, OR IN ANY OTHER WHO IS APPOINTED TO ASSIST AND SUCCEED HIM IN THAT OFFICE.

IS THAT THE VOW YOU TOOK?

I DON'T RECALL THAT.

MR. LEVY: YOUR HONOR, AT THIS POINT I'D ASK THAT THIS BE ENTERED INTO EVIDENCE.

MR. KLEIN: I WOULD OBJECT, YOUR HONOR. LACK OF FOUNDATION, LACK OF RELEVANCE.

THE COURT: WE WILL JUST LEAVE IT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION AT THIS TIME.

MR. LEVY: YES, YOUR HONOR. 1 IN YOUR TEACHINGS, ARE YOU KNOWN AS THE 2 REEMBODIMENT OF CAPTAIN COOK? 3 THAT HAS BEEN REFERRED TO. LET ME ASK YOU ONE LAST QUESTION. 5 DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF TO BE THE 6 REINCARNATION OF CAPTAIN COOK? 7 MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO OBJECT ON FIRST 8 AMENDMENT GROUNDS AND RELEVANCY GROUNDS. 9 THE COURT: HE CAN ANSWER. 10 THE WITNESS: YES, I DO. 11 BY MR. LEVY: LET ME ASK YOU THIS ONE AS MR. 12 FRANCIS INSTEAD OF CAPTAIN COOK. 13 RIGHT BEFORE MR. MULL WAS ASKED TO LEAVE THE 14 CHURCH, CONSIDERING HE HAD BEEN THERE FOR 17 MONTHS AND 15 CONSIDERING THE FACT THAT YOU HAD RECEIVED A TELEPHONE CALL 16 FROM ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET, WOULD IT HAVE NOT BEEN MORE 17 CHARITABLE TO ALLOW HIM TO STAY THERE FOR THE SEVERAL DAYS 18 IT WOULD TAKE FOR HER TO GET BACK SO THAT ALL THE MATTERS 19 COULD BE DECIDED INSTEAD OF JUST KICKING HIM OUT? 20 WE DIDN'T KICK HIM OUT. Α 21 JUST TOLD HIM TO LEAVE? Q 22 WE ASKED HIM -- WE TOLD HIM WE FELT IT WOULD BE 23 INAPPROPRIATE FOR HIM TO CONTINUE RECEIVING FREE ROOM AND 24 BOARD SINCE HE WAS NOT WANTING TO FULFILL HIS COMMITMENT, 25 AND WE THOUGHT IT WOULD BE A BETTER IDEA FOR HIM TO MOVE 26 INTO HIS CONDOMINIUM IN WESTLAKE AND HE DIDN'T ARGUE ABOUT 27 IT. HE THOUGHT THAT THAT WAS OKAY. 28

HAD HE NOT BEEN WORKING WITH YOU FOR -- WITHOUT ANY PAYMENT SINCE OCTOBER OF 1979 UNTIL THE DATE HE HAD BEEN

HE RECEIVED FREE ROOM AND BOARD ALL THAT TIME.

AND HE HAD DONE APPROXIMATELY 20 OR MORE HOURS

THAT IS WHAT I UNDERSTAND HE SAYS HE WORKED. I DON'T KNOW FOR A FACT THAT HE WORKED 20 HOURS A WEEK, BUT HE WORKED -- HE DID WORK, YOU KNOW, CERTAIN NUMBER OF HOURS PER

MR. MONROE SHEARER ACKNOWLEDGED THAT HE WORKED ABOUT 20 HOURS A WEEK DOING ARCHITECTURAL WORK FOR THE

SINCE MR. MONROE SHEARER WAS YOUR CO-DEPARTMENT HEAD IN THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT, WOULD YOU RELY UPON MR. MONROE SHEARER'S STATEMENT THAT HE WORKED ABOUT 20 HOURS

MONROE KNEW MORE ABOUT HIS DAY-TO-DAY WORK THAN

WOULD YOU RELY UPON MR. SHEARER'S STATEMENT THAT HE WORKED 20 HOURS A WEEK IN ARCHITECTURAL WORK?

YOU MEAN WOULD I RELY UPON IT RIGHT NOW? I THINK IF MONROE SAID IT, HE MUST KNOW WHAT HE IS TALKING

SO IF THE MAN WAS WORKING 20 HOURS A WEEK FOR YOU DOING ARCHITECTURAL WORK, EVEN GETTING A MINIMAL HOURLY WAGE, WASN'T HE COVERING THE COST OF HIS ROOM AND HIS BOARD, MR. FRANCIS?

1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION + 2 BY MR. KLEIN: 3 ARE YOU DEDICATED IN ANY WAY TO ELIZABETH CLARE Q 4 5 PROPHET? YES. 6 Α IN WHAT WAY? EXPLAIN. 7 I AM DEDICATED TO HER AS MY WIFE, AND I AM 8 DEDICATED TO THE FULFILLING OF WHAT I PERCEIVE TO BE HER 9 SPIRITUAL MISSION IN THAT I BELIEVE IN THE TEACHINGS AND THE 10 SPIRITUAL PRINCIPLES THAT SHE TEACHES. AND TO THE EXTENT 11 THAT SHE CONTINUES TO BE FAITHFUL TO THOSE TEACHINGS AND 12 PRINCIPLES, THAT IS WHAT I AM DEDICATED TO. 13 DO YOU HAVE EXHIBIT 1 THERE, THE CAMELOT 14 TEN-YEAR PLAN? 15 Α YES. 16 COULD YOU DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO PAGE 33, Q 17 PLEASE. 18 ALL RIGHT. 19 Α ON PAGE 33, DOES IT HAVE A SUMMARY OF NEEDS FOR 20 1978 THROUGH 1980? 21 YES, IT DOES. 22 Α AND AMONG THOSE NEEDS, IS THERE ANYTHING ABOUT 23 GETTING MONEY FOR THE DOWN PAYMENT AND MORTGAGE FOR THE 24 CAMELOT PURCHASE? 25 YES. Α 26 WAS THE DISCUSSION THAT YOU HAD WITH LINDA 27 MULL, WAS THAT BEFORE OR AFTER THE MEETING OF JUNE 6, 1980, 28

THE TAPED MEETING THAT WE HEARD?

A IT WAS BEFORE.

Q WHEN YOU TESTIFIED THAT YOU WERE GOING TO -THAT YOU TOLD LINDA MULL THAT YOU WERE GOING TO TRY TO
RESOLVE THE DISPUTE WITH HER FATHER, DID YOU KNOW AT THAT
TIME THAT THERE WOULD BE A MEETING ON OR ABOUT JUNE 6, 1980?
LET ME JUST BACK UP.

AT THE MEETING WITH LINDA MULL, DID YOU KNOW WHEN YOU HAD THAT MEETING THAT THERE WOULD BE A MEETING AT SOME LATER DATE BETWEEN ELIZABETH, YOURSELF, MONROE AND MR. MULL?

A I KNEW THAT WE HAD PLANNED TO DO THAT, YES.

Q BY THE WAY, WHAT IS THE EXTENSION -- THE EXTENT OF YOUR DEDICATION TO THE CHILDREN OF ELIZABETH CLARE PROPHET?

A I AM DEDICATED TO THEM AS THEIR STEPFATHER.

MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU.

I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

MR. LEVY: NOTHING FURTHER AT THIS TIME, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN STEP DOWN. HOWEVER,

YOU ARE NOT EXCUSED.

YOU HAVE BEEN HERE THROUGHOUT THE TRIAL UP

UNTIL NOW AND YOU ARE OBVIOUSLY WELCOME TO BE HERE

THROUGHOUT THE TRIAL. BUT IN THE EVENT YOU ARE NOT HERE,

WHICH IS YOUR DECISION, LET MR. KLEIN KNOW HOW YOU CAN BE

REACHED AND BE PREPARED TO BE BACK HERE ON 24 HOURS' NOTICE

IF NEED BE.

THE WITNESS: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. PLEASE PROCEED. 1 MR. KLEIN: MR. FRANKLIN EASTMAN, YOUR HONOR. 2 3 FRANKLIN EASTMAN, + A PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, HAVING BEEN FIRST DULY SWORN, TESTIFIES AS FOLLOWS: 6 THE CLERK: PLEASE BE SEATED. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME 7 FOR THE RECORD AND PLEASE SPELL YOUR NAME. 8 THE WITNESS: FRANKLIN EASTMAN. THE SPELLING OF THE 9 LAST NAME IS E-A-S-T-M-A-N. 10 THE CLERK: FIRST NAME, ALSO. 11 THE WITNESS: F-R-A-N-K-L-1-N. 12 THE CLERK: THANK YOU. 13 14 DIRECT EXAMINATION + 15 BY MR. KLEIN: 16 MR. EASTMAN, ARE YOU CURRENTLY EMPLOYED? 17 Q YES. 18 WHERE ARE YOU EMPLOYED? Q 19 I WORK FOR CONTINENTAL DEVELOPMENT IN EL 20 SEGUNDO. 21 WHAT IS YOUR POSITION? Q 22 I AM A FACILITIES MANAGER ASSISTANT. IT IS A 23 63-ACRE OFFICE COMPLEX COMPRISED OF 23 BUILDINGS AND OUR 24 OFFICE IS IN CHARGE OF THE MAINTENANCE. 25 ARE YOU CURRENTLY AFFILIATED IN ANY WAY WITH 26 CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT? 27 NO. 28

| 1  | Q WAS THERE A TIME WHEN YOU WERE A STAFF MEMBER?  |
|----|---|
| 2  | A YES.  |
| 3  | Q WHEN WAS THAT?                                  |
| 4  | A FROM 1975 UNTIL 1981.                           |
| 5  | Q AFTER YOU CEASED BEING A STAFF MEMBER IN 1981,  |
| 6  | DID YOU CONTINUE AS A CHURCH MEMBER?              |
| 7  | A NO.   |
| 8  | Q YOU LEFT BOTH THE STAFF AND THE CHURCH IN 1981? |
| 9  | A YES.  |
| 10 | Q WHY DID YOU LEAVE?                              |
| 11 | A I NEEDED SOME SPACE AND I WANTED TO PURSUE      |
| 12 | OTHER THINGS.                                     |
| 13 | Q WHEN YOU DECIDED TO LEAVE IN 1981, DID ANYONE   |
| 14 | DO OR SAY ANYTHING TO PREVENT YOU FROM LEAVING?   |
| 15 | A NO.   |
| 16 | Q ANYBODY HARASS OR THREATEN YOU AFTER YOU LEFT   |
| 17 | THE CHURCH?                                       |
| 18 | A NO.   |
| 19 | Q DO YOU HAVE ANY FRIENDS OR FAMILY MEMBERS WHO   |
| 20 | ARE STILL CHURCH MEMBERS?                         |
| 21 | A YES. MY MOTHER, BROTHER AND SISTER.             |
| 22 | Q DO YOU HAVE CONTACT WITH THEM SINCE YOU LEFT    |
| 23 | THE CHURCH?                                       |
| 24 | A YES.  |
| 25 | Q HAVE YOU BEEN SHUNNED IN ANY WAY BY CHURCH      |
| 26 | MEMBERS SINCE YOU LEFT?                           |
| 27 | A NO.   |
| 28 | Q WHEN YOU LEFT, DID ANYONE SUGGEST TO YOU THAT   |
| •  |   |
|    |   |

| 1    | YOU WOULD NO  | T MAKE YOUR ASCENSION IF YOU LEFT THE CHURCH?   |
|------|---------------|---|
| 2    | A             | NO.   |
| 3    | Q             | DID YOU DECREE WHEN YOU WERE WITH THE CHURCH?   |
| 4    | A             | YES.  |
| 5    | Q             | WHAT EFFECT, IF ANY, DID DECREEING HAVE ON YOU? |
| 6    | A             | A POSITIVE EFFECT. I MEAN IT WAS A FORM OF      |
| 7    | MEDITATION.   | YOU COULD CONTEMPLATE YOUR DAILY ACTIVITIES,    |
| 8    | THINGS IN YO  | UR LIFE.  |
| 9    | Q             | DID YOU EVER FEEL THAT DECREEING IN ANY WAY     |
| 10   | LESSENED YOU  | R ABILITY TO CONTROL YOUR OWN THOUGHTS AND      |
| 11   | ACTIONS?      |   |
| 12   | A             | NO.   |
| 13   | Q             | DURING THE TIME WITHDRAWN.                      |
| 14   |               | DID YOU GO TO SUMMIT UNIVERSITY?                |
| 15   | A             | YES, I DID.                                     |
| 16   | Q             | WHEN DID YOU GO?                                |
| • 17 | A             | I WENT IN THE FALL OF 1973 AND THE SPRING OF    |
| 18   | 1974.         |   |
| 19   | Q             | DURING THE YEARS THAT YOU WERE AT SUMMIT        |
| 20   | UNIVERSITY A  | S WELL AS THE YEARS YOU WERE ON STAFF, WERE YOU |
| 21   | EVER TAUGHT   | THAT YOU SHOULDN'T HAVE ANY COMMUNICATION WITH  |
| 22   | NONCHURCH ME  | MBERS?  |
| 23   | A             | NO.   |
| 24   | Q             | WERE YOU EVER TAUGHT THAT YOU SHOULD FEAR       |
| 25   | NONCHUR CH ME | MBERS?  |
| 26   | A             | NO.   |
| 27   | Q             | DURING THE YEARS THAT YOU WERE AT SUMMIT        |
| 28   | UNIVERSITY (  | OR A MEMBER OF THE STAFF, WERE YOU EVER         |
| -    |               |   |

RESTRICTED IN ANY WAY FROM HAVING CONTACT WITH PEOPLE WHO 1 ARE NOT CHURCH MEMBERS? 2 NO. 3 Α WERE YOU EVER RESTRICTED IN ANY WAY AS TO MOVIES, TV, RADIO, BOOKS THAT YOU COULD READ OR WATCH? 5 Α NO. б HOW WOULD YOU CHARACTERIZE THE YEARS THAT YOU 7 0 LIVED AT CAMELOT? 8 A I ENJOYED IT. I MEAN IT WAS A WAY OF LIFE THAT 9 WAS -- THAT I LIKED. I MEAN THE LIFESTYLE OF LIVING WITH 10 THE FELLOWSHIP, THE CAMARADERIE OF LIVING WITH PEOPLE THAT 11 BELIEVED THE SAME THINGS THAT YOU BELIEVE WAS, YOU KNOW, 12 GREAT, ENJOYABLE. AND THE STUDYING OF THE TEACHINGS OF THE 13 CHURCH WAS THE PRIMARY REASON WHY I WAS THERE. 14 DO YOU REGRET IN ANY WAY YOUR AFFILIATION WITH 15 Q THE CHURCH? 16 NOT AT ALL. 17 MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU. 18 I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS. 19 MR. LEVY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 20 21 CROSS-EXAMINATION + 22 23 BY MR. LEVY: FRANKLIN EASTMAN? 24 Q 25 THAT'S CORRECT. DID YOU WORK WITH MONROE SHEARER? 26 27 YES. DID HE LEAVE THE CHURCH ABOUT THE SAME TIME YOU 28 Q

DID? 1 WHEN DID HE LEAVE? 2 Q 1981. 3 I LEFT IN MAY OF 1981. I REALLY DON'T RECALL WHEN MONROE LEFT. 5 THAT IS WHEN HE LEFT. HE LEFT ABOUT THE SAME 6 Q SO I GUESS YOU LEFT FAIRLY CLOSE TOGETHER? 7 TIME. MUST HAVE. 8 DECREES ARE LIKE MEDITATION, ARE THEY? 9 I THINK SO. 10 DO YOU EVER HAVE TO BOTHER TO READ WHAT IT IS 11 YOU ARE DECREEING? 12 YOU READ IT TO DECREE. 13 Α SO YOU HAVE TO CONCENTRATE ON WHAT YOU ARE Q 14 15 READING? SURE. 16 SO WHILE YOU ARE CONCENTRATING ON WHAT IT IS 17 YOU ARE READING AND DECREEING ABOUT, DURING THE SAME PERIOD 18 OF TIME YOU CAN LET YOUR MIND DRIFT AND USE IT FOR 19 CONTEMPLATION? 20 I WOULDN'T SAY DRIFT. Α 21 WELL, HOW DO YOU DO THOSE SEVERAL THINGS AT THE 22 Q SAME TIME? 23 WELL, WHEN YOU READ, DOESN'T SOMETHING, YOU 24 KNOW, CAUSE YOU TO CONTEMPLATE OR REFLECT ON SOMETHING? 25 AND -- WELL, THAT IS WHAT I FEEL IT DOES. YOU KNOW, IT IS 26 LIKE WHEN YOU READ A BOOK OR READ ANYTHING, IT IS A SOURCE 27 OF THOUGHT. 28

| 1  |               |   |
|----|---------------|---|
| 1  | Q E           | ENJOYED THE LIFESTYLE OUT AT CAMELOT?           |
| 2  | Α 1           | res.  |
| 3  | Q V           | WHEN DID YOU LIVE AT CAMELOT?                   |
| 4  | Α 1           | 1978 THROUGH 1981.                              |
| 5  | Q E           | ENJOYED THE CAMARADERIE?                        |
| 6  | Α '           | YES, SIR.                                       |
| 7  | Q             | ALL THE GOOD VEGETABLES?                        |
| 8  | A             | YES, SIR.                                       |
| 9  | Q I           | DID YOU REALLY LIKE IT OR DID YOU JUST KIND OF  |
| 10 | LIKE IT?      |   |
| 11 | Α             | I THINK I CAN SAFELY SAY I REALLY LIKED IT.     |
| 12 | Q             | AND YET YOU LEFT IN 1981 BECAUSE YOU NEEDED     |
| 13 | MORE SPACE?   |   |
| 14 | A             | WELL, THERE WERE OTHER THINGS THAT I WANTED TO  |
| 15 | DO.           |   |
| 16 | Q             | COULDN'T YOU DO THEM WHILE YOU WERE STILL A     |
| 17 | MEMBER OF THE | CHURCH?   |
| 18 | A             | I FELT THAT I COULDN'T.                         |
| 19 | Q             | YOU WANTED TO GO INTO THE MAINTENANCE BUSINESS  |
| 20 | SO YOU GAVE U | P YOUR RELIGION?                                |
| 21 | . <b>A</b>    | WELL, I WORK AT A COMPANY NOW. I HOPE TO OPEN   |
| 22 | MY OWN BUSINE | SS. I HOPE TO OPEN MY OWN TRAVEL AGENCY OR      |
| 23 | TRAVEL-RELATE | D BUSINESS.                                     |
| 24 | Q             | CAN YOU WORK AND BE A PART OF THIS CHURCH?      |
| 25 | A             | ACTUALLY, I MEAN I AM STILL STUDYING. AND AS A  |
| 26 | MATTER OF FAC | T, I JUST FINISHED A BOOK BY MRS. PROPHET, "THE |
| 27 | LOST YEARS."  | AND I AM STILL READING, RESEARCHING AND         |
| 28 | STUDYING, BUT | I AM NOT EXTREMELY ACTIVE.                      |
|    |               |   |

| 1  | Q YOU LIKED THE LIFESTYLE, YOU LOVED THE                     |
|----|--|
| 2  | CAMARADERIE, IT WAS REALLY A GREAT LIFE, YOU ARE INVOLVED IN |
| 3  | THE TEACHINGS. THE NATURE OF THE WORK I THINK YOU DESCRIBED  |
| 4  | WAS MAINTENANCE?   |
| 5  | A WHERE I AM AT NOW?   |
| 6  | Q YES.   |
| 7  | A YES.   |
| 8  | Q SO YOU LEFT THE CHURCH AND THAT WONDERFUL                  |
| 9  | LIFESTYLE AND ALL THE CAMARADERIE TO DO MAINTENANCE WORK?    |
| 10 | A WELL, I MEAN THAT IS WHAT I DO FOR A LIVING.               |
| 11 | THERE ARE OTHER THINGS THAT I DO BESIDES, YOU KNOW, WORK AT  |
| 12 | CONTINENTAL DEVELOPMENT.                                     |
| 13 | Q DID YOU KNOW MONROE SHEARER WELL WHEN YOU WERE             |
| 14 | AT CAMELOT?  |
| 15 | A COULD YOU DEFINE "WELL"?                                   |
| 16 | Q SEVERAL WAYS. A WELL IS A DEEP HOLE IN THE                 |
| 17 | GROUND.  |
| 18 | AND IN THE CONTEXT I AM USING IT, WAS HE PART                |
| 19 | OF THAT WONDERFUL CAMARADERIE? DID YOU KNOW HIM AS A FRIEND  |
| 20 | WHILE YOU WERE THERE?  |
| 21 | A NOT REALLY.  |
| 22 | Q NOT REALLY. WEREN'T YOU HIS ASSISTANT?                     |
| 23 | A NO.  |
| 24 | Q NEVER WORKED AS AN ASSISTANT TO MONROE SHEARER?            |
| 25 | A NO.  |
| 26 | Q NOT WHEN YOU WERE ON PERMANENT STAFF?                      |
| 27 | A NO.  |
| 28 | Q NEVER HAD ANYTHING TO DO WITH HIM?                         |
|    |  |
|    |  |

| 1  | Α            | WELL, I SPOKE TO HIM.                            |
|----|--------------|--|
| 2  | Q            | THAT IS ABOUT THE EXTENT OF IT?                  |
| 3  | А            | YES.   |
| 4  | Q            | IN 1973, WERE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE LANELLO      |
| 5  | RESERVES?    |  |
| 6  | A            | YES.   |
| 7  | Q            | DID YOU WORK AT THEIR L.A. WAREHOUSE?            |
| 8  | A            | NO.  |
| 9  | Q            | DID YOU HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH THEM?           |
| 10 | A            | I PURCHASED A SUPPLY OF DEHYDRATED FOOD FROM     |
| 11 | THEM.        |  |
| 12 | Q            | WHAT DID YOU DO THAT FOR?                        |
| 13 | A            | I WANTED A SUPPLY OF FOOD FOR CAMPING PURPOSES   |
| 14 | AND FOR JUST | TO HAVE AS AN EMERGENCY SUPPLY OF FOOD.          |
| 15 | Q            | DURING THAT TIME, WEREN'T YOU LIVING IN IDAHO,   |
| 16 | IN MONTANA I | N ONE OF THE SURVIVAL UNITS THAT THE CHURCH HAD? |
| 17 | A            | NO. I LIVED IN MICHIGAN FOR THE FIRST PART OF    |
| 18 | THE YEAR AND | THEN I MOVED OUT TO SANTA BARBARA TO ATTEND      |
| 19 | SUMMIT UNIVE | RSITY.   |
| 20 | Q            | YOU KNOW DONALD TROWBRIDGE?                      |
| 21 | A            | YES, I DO.                                       |
| 22 | Q            | HE SOMETIMES TRAVELED WITH YOU WHEN YOU ARE      |
| 23 | GOING TO THE | SURVIVAL UNITS IN IDAHO AND MONTANA, DIDN'T HE?  |
| 24 |              | LEIN: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO MAKE AN          |
| 25 | OBJECTION AN | ND ASK FOR AN OFFER OF PROOF AT THIS TIME. MY    |
| 26 | OBJECTION IS | S AS TO RELEVANCY.                               |
| 27 | THE C        | COURT: ALL RIGHT.                                |
| 28 |              | (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD             |
|    | I            |  |

----

AT THE BENCH:)

THE COURT: WHAT IS THE RELEVANCY OF THIS?

MR. LEVY: GIVE ME ONE SECOND. I WILL TRY TO THINK

OF AN IDEA.

------

I THINK THE GUY IS A BLATANT LIAR. I HAVE

DOCUMENTS FROM DONALD TROWBRIDGE WHO TESTIFIED HERE WHO HAS

PARTICIPATED WITH HIM IN THESE ACTIVITIES. DONALD

TROWBRIDGE WAS A BOARD MEMBER.

A DOCUMENT I HAVE FROM DONALD TROWBRIDGE

INDICATES THAT HE WAS INVOLVED IN THESE THINGS, THAT HE WAS

THE ASSISTANT TO MONROE SHEARER. I THINK WHAT HE IS DOING

IS PERJURING HIMSELF ON THE STAND.

THE COURT: WHAT IS THE RELEVANCY OF THIS, THOUGH, TO THE ISSUES INVOLVING YOUR CLIENT?

MR. LEVY: THEY ARE PROBABLY PERIPHERAL IF AT ALL.

IF IT IS THE COURT'S SUGGESTION, I WILL MOVE ON.

THERE IS ONE FUND RAISING ISSUE. WHAT HE
TESTIFIED TO, HE BOUGHT THE DRIED FOOD FOR HUNTING. THE
CHURCH WAS IN THE BUSINESS OF PACKAGING THE STUFF AND
SELLING THIS STUFF NOT ONLY TO ITS MEMBERS, BUT TO THE
GENERAL PUBLIC BECAUSE WHAT THEY WERE DOING AFTER MARK
PROPHET DIED, THEY ANTICIPATED THAT THE WORLD WAS COMING TO
AN END.

THE COURT: HOW IS THIS GOING TO HELP ME DECIDE OR HELP THE JURY DECIDE ANY OF THE ISSUES RELATIVE TO GREGORY MULL?

MR. KLEIN: BECAUSE IT WILL PREJUDICE THEM BECAUSE -THE COURT: I AM ALMOST RULING IN YOUR FAVOR. WHY

DON'T YOU LEAVE ME ALONE. 1 MR. KLEIN: I AM SORRY, YOUR HONOR. 2 THE COURT: I HAVE NEVER PREVENTED YOU FROM SPEAKING 3 WHEN YOU HAVE HAD A LEGITIMATE NEED TO DO SO. 4 MR. KLEIN: I AM SORRY, YOUR HONOR. 5 THE COURT: THIS ISN'T GOING -- THIS DOESN'T AFFECT 6 7 MULL REALLY, DOES IT? 8 MR. LEVY: IT IS PERIPHERAL AT BEST, I AGREE. THE COURT: LET'S GET ON WITH SOMETHING. 9 (THE PROCEEDINGS WERE RESUMED IN OPEN 10 COURT IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) 11 BY MR. LEVY: WHILE YOU LIVED AT CAMELOT, DID 12 Q YOU KNOW MR. MULL? 13 YES. Α 14 AND HOW WELL DID YOU KNOW MR. MULL? 15 0 VAGUELY. I ACTUALLY KNEW MR. MULL BEFORE 16 CAMELOT. I -- MYSELF AND SEVERAL STAFF MEMBERS STAYED 17 OVERNIGHT AT HIS HOME IN SAN FRANCISCO DURING ONE OF OUR 18 SEMINARS UP THERE. 19 DID YOU CONSIDER HIM A DEDICATED FOLLOWER OF 20 Q THE CHURCH WHEN YOU STAYED OVERNIGHT AT HIS HOME? 21 YES. I MEAN HE OFFERED HIS HOME TO US. 1'D 22 Α SAY YES. 23 DID YOU HAVE ANY COMMUNICATION WITH MR. MULL 24 Q WHILE DURING THE YEAR '79 AND '80 AT CAMELOT? 25 YES, I BELIEVE SO. MR. MULL PREPARED A MAP FOR 26 ONE OF OUR CONFERENCES. I WAS THE CONFERENCE COORDINATOR 27 THERE AND PROVIDED HIM WITH THE INFORMATION FOR THE LAYOUT 28

OF THE FACILITIES AND HE DREW UP A MAP. 1 DID HE PARTICIPATE IN ANY CONFERENCES WHILE YOU 2 WERE AT CAMELOT OR WHILE YOU WERE A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH? 3 Α YES. AND WHAT WAS THE NATURE OF HIS PARTICIPATION? 5 HE ATTENDED THEM. I MEAN HE WAS THERE IN 6 7 ATTENDANCE. TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, DID MR. MULL EVER DISPLAY 8 0 ANY PLANS THAT HE HAD DRAWN FOR MONTESSORI INTERNATIONAL? 9 HE MAY HAVE. I DON'T KNOW. 10 DID YOU HAVE ANY DAILY CONTACT WITH MR. MULL 11 DURING '79 AND '80 WHEN YOU WERE BOTH LIVING AT CAMELOT? 12 YES. I SAW HIM AT MEALS AND WE WORKED IN THE 13 SAME BUILDING ON DIFFERENT FLOORS. 14 DID YOU EVER HAVE OCCASION TO NOTICE WHETHER HE 15 WORKED FULL DAYS? 16 NO, I WOULDN'T REALLY KNOW. I NEVER PAID ANY 17 ATTENTION. 18 WHAT OFFICE WERE YOU WORKING AT? Q 19 A I WAS ON THE SECOND FLOOR. WELL, I WAS IN A 20 NUMBER OF LOCATIONS. BUT I BELIEVE AT THE TIME WHEN MR. 21 MULL WAS THERE, I WAS ON THE SECOND FLOOR. 22 Q DOING WHAT? 23 I WAS -- MY TITLE THEN WAS A CONFERENCE 24 COORDINATOR. 25 CONFERENCES ARE HELD THREE TIMES A YEAR? 26 FOUR TIMES A YEAR. Α 27 FOUR TIMES A YEAR? 28 Q

YES. 1 WHAT DID YOU DO IN BETWEEN THE TIME THAT 2 CONFERENCES WERE HELD? 3 WE HAD SEMINARS BETWEEN THE CONFERENCES. DID YOU HAVE ANY KIND OF CONTACT OTHER THAN 5 JUST TO SEE MR. MULL AND TO SAY HELLO? 6 OTHER THAN PREPARING THE MAP FOR ONE OF THE 7 CONFERENCES, THAT IS ABOUT IT. 8 IN YOUR OPINION, WAS MR. MULL A PARTICIPANT IN 9 THE GOOD FELLOWSHIP AND CAMARADERIE AT CAMELOT WHILE YOU 10 11 WERE THERE? YES. 12 Α IN YOUR OPINION, WAS HE DEDICATED TO CHURCH 13 UNIVERSAL AND TRIUMPHANT WHILE YOU WERE THERE? 14 YES. 15 WAS MR. MULL A TROUBLEMAKER OF ANY KIND WHEN 16 YOU WERE THERE? 17 NOT WHILE HE WAS ON STAFF. AFTERWARDS, I KNOW 18 HE WAS DISGRUNTLED WITH THE ORGANIZATION. BUT WHILE HE WAS 19 THERE, AS FAR AS I KNOW HE GOT ALONG FINE. 20 TRIED HIS BEST, DID HE? 21 Q WELL, THAT I COULDN'T ANSWER. 22 HOW IS IT YOU KNOW THAT AFTER HE WAS NO LONGER 23 THERE, HE WAS DISGRUNTLED? 24 I BELIEVE HE WAS IN SOME OF THE NEWSPAPERS. 25 AS PART OF YOUR CHURCH ACTIVITY, DID YOU HEAR A 26 TWO AND A HALF HOUR PLAYING OF TAPE THAT DEPICTED A 27 CONVERSATION THAT WAS HAD BETWEEN MR. MULL AND MR. AND MRS. 28

FRANCIS AND MONROE SHEARER? 1 Α NO. 2 NEVER HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT THAT? 3 Q WELL, I HAD HEARD IN A STAFF MEETING THAT MR. 5 MULL HAD -- WAS DISGRUNTLED WITH THE ORGANIZATION AND THAT IS ABOUT ALL I HAD HEARD. I NEVER HEARD, YOU KNOW, ANY TAPE 6 7 ON A MEETING. WHEN YOU SAY HE WAS DISGRUNTLED WITH THE 8 ORGANIZATION, WHAT DO YOU MEAN HE WAS DISGRUNTLED WITH THE 9 10 ORGANIZATION? HE WAS OPPOSED TO THE TEACHINGS AND BELIEFS OF 11 THE ORGANIZATION. 12 WHO TOLD YOU THAT? 13 WELL, I READ IT IN A NEWSPAPER AND HEARD IT 14 FROM -- IN THE STAFF MEETING AND OTHER PEOPLE, OTHER 15 16 INDIVIDUALS. Q WHAT NEWSPAPER DID YOU READ IT IN? 17 A WELL, I DON'T KNOW. IT'S BEEN ABOUT FOUR YEARS 18 19 I THINK, THREE OR FOUR YEARS. WOULD IT SURPRISE YOU TO KNOW THAT MR. MULL HAS 20 Q NEVER ONCE CHALLENGED THE TEACHINGS OF CHURCH UNIVERSAL AND 21 22 TR IUMPHANT? MR. KLEIN: YOUR HONOR, I AM GOING TO OBJECT. THAT 23 IS TESTIMONY FROM COUNSEL. 24 MR. LEVY: NO, IT IS NOT. IT IS A QUESTION. 25 26 THE COURT: PLEASE REPHRASE IT. BY MR. LEVY: TELL ME WHO YOU HEARD IT FROM ON 27 28 STAFF, PLEASE.

I DON'T BELIEVE I CAN -- I RECALL. I REALLY 1 DIDN'T PAY MUCH ATTENTION AND I CAN'T REMEMBER. 2 YOU WERE JUST ENJOYING THE LIFESTYLE SO MUCH 3 0 YOU NEVER REALLY PAID ATTENTION? 4 WELL, NO. THERE WERE OTHER, WHAT I FIGURED, 5 MORE IMPORTANT THINGS, COVERING THE STAFF MEETINGS. AND THE 6 DISPOSITION OF ONE INDIVIDUAL REALLY, YOU KNOW, DIDN'T MAKE 7 THAT MUCH DIFFERENCE TO ME. 8 THAT IS A GOOD RELIGIOUS ATTITUDE. 9 Q 10 LET ME ASK YOU THIS QUESTION: DID YOU EVER DECREE AGAINST GREGORY MULL OR HIS ENERGY? 11 12 AGAINST GREGORY MULL, NO. OR HIS ENERGY? 13 Q 14 FOR THE SITUATION, YES. FOR THE SITUATION? 15 Q YES. THE WHOLE SITUATION AROUND HIS OPPOSITION 16 TO THE BELIEFS OR TEACHINGS AS I HAD STATED EARLIER. 17 AS YOU ARE A FAIR AND EQUITABLE MAN? 18 Q I BELIEVE SO. 19 DID YOU EVER TALK TO GREGORY MULL ABOUT HIS 20 DISAGREEMENT WITH THE CHURCH? 21 AFTER HE LEFT THE CHURCH, I NEVER SAW HIM. 22 TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, DID ANYBODY FROM THE CHURCH, 23 WHO IS AN ACTIVE MEMBER OF THE CHURCH NOW, AFTER HE LEFT THE 24 CHURCH EVER BOTHER TO SEEK HIM OUT AND DISCUSS WITH HIM HIS 25 26 SIDE OF THE STORY? 1 THINK HE SEEKED OUT MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH 27 HIMSELF AND DISCUSSED IT WITH THEM. 28

THAT IS NOT MY QUESTION. 1 Q WELL, THAT WOULD BE MY ANSWER. I DON'T KNOW OF 2 ANYBODY GOING TO HIM TO DISCUSS IT. I MEAN HE HAD BEEN TO SEVERAL OF OUR EVENTS AND HAD, YOU KNOW, BROUGHT IT TO OUR ATTENTION OR THEIR ATTENTION, THE PEOPLE THAT HE SPOKE WITH. 5 WHAT EVENTS DID HE ATTEND WHERE HE BROUGHT IT 6 7 TO YOUR ATTENTION? CONFERENCES AND SEMINARS. 8 9 AFTER HE LEFT? Q I BELIEVE SO, YES. I AM NOT SAYING HE ATTENDED 10 THE CONFERENCES, BUT HE WOULD BE THERE TO TALK TO PEOPLE 11 THAT WERE GOING INTO THE CONFERENCES. 12 TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, DID ANYBODY WITH ANY 13 AUTHORITY WITHIN THE CHURCH EVER EXTEND THEMSELVES TO TALK 14 TO GREGORY MULL ABOUT WHATEVER DIFFERENCES HE MIGHT HAVE HAD 15 WITH THE CHURCH AFTER HE WAS ASKED TO LEAVE THE CHURCH? 16 1 DON'T KNOW. I -- I AM NOT AWARE OF ANY. I 17 REALLY AT THE TIME DID NOT PAY THAT MUCH ATTENTION TO THE 18 19 SITUATION. DID YOU HAVE A LOT OF ARCHITECTS WORKING FOR 20 THE CHURCH AT THAT TIME? 21 Α NOT THAT I AM AWARE OF. 22 DO YOU HAVE ANY KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT IT WAS THAT 23 Q MR. MULL WAS SUPPOSED TO BE DOING AT THE CHURCH? 24 HE WAS AN ARCHITECT. 25 Α DO YOU HAVE ANY KNOWLEDGE ABOUT ANYTHING AT THE 2F CHURCH OTHER THAN THE CONFERENCES? 27 MR. KLEIN: OBJECT. THAT IS JUST VAGUE AND 28

AMBIGUOUS, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: SUSTAINED.

MR. LEVY: IN THE SPIRIT OF CAMARADERIE, I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS, YOUR HONOR.

MR. KLEIN: I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. YOU ARE EXCUSED.

IN THE SPIRIT OF THE HOUR, WE ARE GOING TO STOP FOR THE DAY. WE ARE GOING TO RESUME TOMORROW MORNING AT 9:15. HAVE A VERY PLEASANT EVENING. I LOOK FORWARD TO SEEING ALL OF YOU AT 9:15 TOMORROW.

(AT 4:10 P.M., AN ADJOURNMENT WAS TAKEN UNTIL THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1986, AT 9:15 A.M.)