

**SUMMARY AND TRANSCRIPT OF ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE
CFA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
NOVEMBER 29, 2022**

Secretary’s note: This index is provided only as a courtesy to the readers and is not an official part of the CFA minutes. The numbers shown for each item in the index are keyed to similar numbers shown in the body of the minutes.

(1) APPROVE ORDERS OF THE DAY.....	3
(2) HUMPHREYS AND SIEVING HEARING.....	5
(3) FRIEMOTH HEARING.	14
(4) PEET HEARING.....	21
(5) DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS AND SUSPENSIONS.....	29

Secretary's Note: The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. met on Tuesday, November 29, 2022, via Zoom video conference. **President Richard Mastin** called the Special Meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. Eastern Time. A roll call by **Secretary Rachel Anger** found the following members to be present:

Mr. Richard Mastin (President)
Mr. Russell Webb (Vice-President)
Ms. Rachel Anger (Secretary)
Ms. Kathy Calhoun (Treasurer)
Ms. Sharon Roy (NAR Director)
Mrs. Pam Moser (NWR Director)
Ms. Paula Noble (GSR Director)
Mr. John Colilla (GLR Director)
Mr. Michael Shelton (SWR Director)
Mrs. Cathy Dunham (MWR Director)
Mr. Kenny Currle (SOR Director)
Ms. Yukiko Hayata (Japan Regional Director)
Ms. Pam DelaBar (Europe Regional Director)
George Eigenhauser, Esq. (Director-at-Large)
Mr. Mark Hannon (Director-at-Large)
Mrs. Carol Krzanowski (Director-at-Large)
Ms. Melanie Morgan (Director-at-Large)
Mrs. Annette Wilson (Director-at-Large)

Also Present:

Shelly K. Perkins, Attorney at Law, CFA Legal Counsel
Allene Tartaglia, Executive Director
James Simbro, IT Systems Analyst

Absent:

Eva Chen, ID-China Representative
Matthew Wong, ID Representative

Secretary's Note: For the ease of the reader, some items were discussed at different times but were included with their particular agenda.

Mastin: Madame Secretary, will you please do a roll call. **Anger:** I will. Hello everybody. Sorry about my voice. [**Secretary's Note:** Secretary Rachel Anger called the roll, as reflected above.] I will turn it over to you Mr. President. **Mastin:** Thank you Rachel. [Side discussions regarding attendees were not transcribed.] I'm going to call the meeting to order.

TRANSCRIPT

Reports of Officers, Boards, and Standing Committees

(1) APPROVE ORDERS OF THE DAY.

CFA EXECUTIVE BOARD		
Special Meeting		
Open Session Board Citation Hearing Agenda		
November 29, 2022		
8:00 p.m.	Roll Call	Mastin
8:05 p.m.	Call Meeting to Order; turn over Hearing Process to Shelly Perkins	Mastin
8:10 p.m.	Humphrey and Sieving Hearing	Perkins
9:05 p.m.	Friemoth Hearing	Perkins
9:40 p.m.	Peet Hearing	Perkins
10:10 p.m.	OPEN SESSION ADJOURNED	

Mastin: Before I turn things over to CFA’s Legal Counsel Shelly Perkins, I want to welcome all participants and attendees to this meeting. I also want to lay out a little bit of the process. Any board members who have questions are to raise your hand and you will be called on in order of you raising your hand. Additionally, before we move forward, Rachel do you have a question? **Anger:** Just to mention we have quite a few panelists who are not on mute and that makes you very difficult to hear. **Mastin:** Yes, if you are not speaking please mute. Allene, you may have to mute everybody and then we will go in and unmute. May I have a motion and a second to accept this meeting’s agenda? **DelaBar:** DelaBar moves. **Mastin:** I’ve got Pam DelaBar making the motion. I did not hear a second. **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Mastin:** Thank you. Does anybody have any concerns or changes to the agenda? Does anybody have any objections to the agenda? Raise your hand. Seeing no objections, the agenda is in order and we will proceed.

The Orders of the Day were accepted without objection and became the Orders of Business.

Open session hearing process conducted by Shelly Perkins:

1. Introduction of the case by CFA Attorney into the record.
2. Introduction into the record of the written evidence which includes the complete set of exhibits already provided along with any additional submissions provided by you.
3. Respondents may at their discretion make an opening statement and present any verbal evidence and remarks to supplement the written exhibits/record if desired.
4. Questions by the Board to Respondents, if any.

5. Questions by the CFA Attorney to Respondents if any.
6. Respondents may make closing remarks if desired.
7. Respondents are dismissed and shall leave the meeting.
8. The Board shall deliberate in closed executive session, without the parties present.
9. An informal email shall be sent by the CFA Attorney to the parties immediately following deliberations briefly outlining the board's ruling.
10. A formal letter shall be sent by CFA to the parties within 7 days outlining the board's formal ruling in its entirety.

(2) **HUMPHREYS AND SIEVING HEARING.**

22-008 *CFA v. Humphreys, Sherri*
Violation of CFA Show Rules 1.01, 1.03, 6.34;
Violation of CFA Bylaws Article XV, Section 4

22-010 *CFA v. Sieving, Kimberly*
Violation of CFA Show Rules 1.01, 1.03, 6.34;
Violation of CFA Bylaws Article XV, Section 4

Present: *Sherri Humphreys*
Kimberly Sieving
Ryan Byers, Attorney for Respondents

Mastin: Shelly, at this time I am going to turn the proceedings over to you. **Perkins:** Thank you. We are ready for the board citation or a combined hearing for Sherri Humphreys and Kimberly Sieving, along with their attorney Ryan Byers who would need to be elevated into this meeting. **Tartaglia:** They are. They're already elevated. **Perkins:** OK. Sherri Humphreys, Docket No. 22-008 and Kimberly Sieving, Docket No. 22-010. This hearing is combined at the request of the parties, through their counsel Mr. Byers. At this time I would move to admit into evidence all the exhibits 1 through 166, along with the memorandum. There is in File Vista a few extra documents pertaining specifically to this matter that was supplied by Mr. Byers, including his memorandum to me and his emails between he and I that have been saved there for review. Based on that, I would go ahead and provide Respondents with a chance to make their opening statement and present any verbal evidence or remarks to supplement the written exhibits in the record. Just of note, those exhibits have already been reviewed by the entire board. There is no reason to re-enter them but you can point us to any exhibits that you would like us to pay further attention to, but this is a time, Mr. Byers, for you to supplement the written record that you have already been provided with.

Byers: Thank you Ms. Perkins and first of all, as a matter of procedure and of evidence, there has been a motion made before this board to admit the exhibits that were assembled by Ms. Perkins. If my records are accurate, there are 166 of them in total and my clients have objections to the admission of many of those exhibits. I would like to begin by stating those objections for the record. For individuals and board members who do not have a legal background and may not be aware, typically in order for a document to be presented into evidence in a court or a semi-judicial proceeding, there needs to be some sort of foundation laid for that record before it can be considered by a judge, jury or other adjudicatory body. Typically that foundation would include an identification of what the document is, a statement of who authored the document and a sworn statement that the copy being introduced is a fair and accurate copy of the original. In this particular case – **Perkins:** Mr. Byers, before you continue I notice that Ms. Anger has her hand raised. This is not a judicial proceeding so your objections to the documents that the board has already reviewed are duly noted. I would call on Ms. Anger at this time. **Anger:** My question was regarding a motion that you made, Shelly, to admit the exhibits. Do we need to make a motion and vote on it? **Perkins:** Yes, although I know Mr. Byers wants to be heard on this issue and he is in the middle of being heard. However, I would remind Mr. Byers that this is not a

judicial proceeding, this is a civil proceeding. In fact, we are not even required to allow counsel for your clients. The rules of evidence do not apply here. As part of our customary practices with CFA, we have considered any kind of evidence that we felt necessary and so I am introducing those, not because I need to introduce them to lay foundation or because this is a judicial proceeding, but simply to put them into the record so that they appear in our minutes and so that they are available for review, as is customary in these proceedings by the board and because this is open session, I suppose by the body at large, if they are released from the board. So, in that vein Mr. Byers, you may continue for a few more minutes but I'm not inclined to grant any objections to exhibits, considering that this is not a legal proceeding. **Byers:** This may not be a legal proceed, but the fact of the matter remains, my clients under case law that I have cited to in my motion are afforded certain due process rights still, and those due process rights would include an opportunity to fairly confront the allegations that have been made against them. By my objection, I am pointing out to this body flaws in that evidence and even if this is a situation in which my objections may not be taken for the purpose of excluding certain exhibits, at the very least my objections would go to the weight that this body ought to afford those exhibits. **Perkins:** Thank you for that input. I believe then now is the time to have a motion to introduce the exhibits. **Byers:** I don't believe I have concluded my objection, but in any event.

Mastin: May I have a motion and a second please? **Eigenhauser:** George will move. **Mastin:** Do I have a second? **DelaBar:** I'll second. **Mastin:** I've got George making the motion, Pam DelaBar second. Shelly, proceed. **Eigenhauser:** Point of order. Now we have to vote. **Perkins:** I wasn't sure if you wanted debate on this or if the board wants any debate on it, but in any case, is there any debate on the motion? **Mastin:** Does the board have any – it's open for discussion. Any comments from the board? Shelly, do we want to grant any additional comments from Mr. Byers? **Perkins:** If Mr. Byers has any succinct, brief comments considering the posture of this case and these exhibits, I'm not going to shut him down on those. We did receive, Mr. Byers, your written memorandum so this is not a time to restate everything in that memorandum, but to supplement it. **Byers:** My objections to the exhibits were not contained in that memorandum, which is why I am making them now. Are we still on the issue of the exhibits, or would you like me to move into the substance? **Perkins:** We are on the issue of the exhibits. The board is about to vote on the admission into the record of those exhibits, so if you have any succinct comments, now would be the time. **Byers:** My succinct comments regarding the – my additional comments regarding the exhibits would be furthermore, in addition to the issue of lack of foundation, there are some exhibits that are not clear as to what they are on their face. My clients cannot provide a defense to those exhibits. Furthermore, many of the exhibits, if offered into evidence at a more formal proceeding, would constitute hearsay and we have not had an opportunity to confront in these proceedings the individuals who have made those hearsay statements. **Perkins:** Thank you. I think we are ready for the motion. **Mastin:** By a show of hands, if you are in favor of the motion, please raise your hand. I will remind the board not to lower your hand until after I ask everybody to lower your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Anger and Currle abstained.

Mastin: Those voting in favor are Melanie Morgan, George Eigenhauser, Kathy Calhoun, Carol Krzanowski, Mike Shelton, Annette Wilson, Pam DelaBar, John Colilla, Mark Hannon, Cathy Dunham, Paula Noble, Pam Moser, Russell Webb, Sharon Roy, Yukiko Hayata. Please lower your hand. Those opposed raise your hand. Any abstentions? Kenny Currle, Rachel

Anger. Lower your hand. Rachel, please call the vote. **Anger:** That's 15 yes, zero no, 2 abstentions. **Mastin:** Thank you Rachel.

Mastin: Shelly, proceed. **Perkins:** Thank you. This is the time for the Respondents to present any kind of opening statement as to the issues at hand and provide any supplemental remarks that they would like to supply to the written records. **Byers:** Thank you Ms. Perkins and thank you to the members of the Board of Directors for the opportunity to be heard this evening. I would again – don't mean to belabor any points and I will try to keep my remarks succinct, as I have been urged to do up to this point. However, the issues before you are significant and they are several. Therefore, we do believe that we deserve a fair opportunity to be heard. That being said, I would first like to make some additional comments in addition to what was previously made in writing regarding the posture of these proceedings. I, in an initial memorandum, had indicated that there is a significant lack of due process that has been afforded to my clients. In the original citations that they were served with, they were not even made aware of what the allegations were against them. **Perkins:** Mr. Byers, I'm going to stop you. This is your time to make – there is no more time for motions or arguments or anything of that nature in regards to whether or not you believe that the allegations were appropriate. This is your time to discuss the facts at hand. If you have an opening statement or supplement to the written record in regards to the actual allegations that were made as you understand them against your clients, this would be the time to provide those – not to provide more argument as to whether or not you believe that the allegations were appropriate or not. **Byers:** Frankly Ms. Perkins, this is the third or fourth time you have interrupted me this evening and it's beginning to cause me to question whether we are going to be provided a fair hearing at all, but if that is your position then we will move on to the substance of the facts, reserving all arguments previously made as to the nature of these proceedings. **Mastin:** Mr. Byers, can you hold on one second? My apologies for interrupting. I will ask Ms. DelaBar to make a comment and then, if we can, let's allow Mr. Byers to continue. Mr. Byers, please follow what Ms. Perkins has asked so we can move along on this process. Ms. DelaBar, please share your comments. **DelaBar:** I was going to say, as past president for several years of this organization, and having represented this organization in several different court matters, our process has received actually comments from the court on how we continue to follow the same procedure and everyone is very much aware of the procedure. Shortly and succinctly, the more that we get into the minutia of the legal proceedings, all this takes away from the time for your clients to speak for themselves to this board so we can make an informed decision. We have read through the – excuse me, it's 3:00 in the morning for me – we have read through all of the matters that were presented to the board and we have a pretty good idea, since we're all fairly astute individuals, on what can be garbage and what can be fact, so please allow your people to use their time to get through and communicate to the board. **Mastin:** Ms. DelaBar, thank you. Mr. Byers, please continue. **Byers:** Thank you Mr. Mastin.

Byers: I would first like to highlight the fact that the items that my clients stand accused of today are referred to in the citations that have been issued by this board as stuffing and reverse stuffing. It should be noted that nowhere, at least within the documents that we were able to obtain, are those alleged defenses defined. Without such a definition, this is not a circumstance in which my clients can be held responsible for those activities. Because they are not defined, I think it would be beneficial for us to, at the very least, have an opportunity to say what it is we believe we're being accused of briefly so that if that is not accurate it can be corrected at this juncture. Our understanding of the term "stuffing" is that it is a practice which involves entering

a large number of cats into a particular cat show with the purpose of increasing the count of cats and thereby increasing the points that a victorious cat can receive in that show. Our understanding of the term “reverse stuffing” is essentially a situation in which an individual enters a large number of cats into a show and then at the last minute withdraws those cats essentially with the intention of, for lack of a better term, luring a competitor to enter that show, thinking that there is going to be a large number of points, only for that to not be the case when the show actually occurs. That is our best understanding of what we stand accused of here this evening and, in particular, we believe that we have been – even though this was not referenced in the citation – we believe that we have been accused of those acts in order to benefit the Cat of the Year standings of one particular cat known as Topknot’s Woodspirit of Lumos [*sic*, Topknot’s Lumos of Woodspirit] who we will refer to as “Lumos” throughout the course of these proceedings. Again, we have no definition as it relates to these items, but we do have shows that have been identified and we have an identification of whether stuffing or reverse stuffing is alleged at each show.

Byers: First, as it relates to the March 19, 2022 Cat Spring Irregulars/Bengal Alliance show; that is, a show at which Kimberly Sieving is accused of stuffing the count, it should be noted quite clearly that from the records we have received and reviewed, the cat at issue, Lumos, was not present at that show. If, in fact, stuffing is the practice of increasing the count to benefit a particular cat, it is hard to see show stuffing could have occurred if a cat allegedly to have benefitted was not even a competitor. Furthermore, I would like to point out that Ms. Sieving had 12 cats entered at this show. In earlier shows of the season in which she is not accused of stuffing, she had 7 entries, she had 8 entries, and in fact if you look at the records that have now been admitted into evidence, it was not uncommon at all for Ms. Sieving to be at a show and to be the exhibitor who had the most cats entered. So, one of the questions that we have for this body is, where is the line? For the shows in which she had 7 or 8 cats entered, Ms. Sieving is not accused of stuffing or any other inappropriate behavior, so why is 7 cats acceptable but 12 is not? Why is 8 cats acceptable but 12 is not?

Byers: This would also be applicable to the March 26, 2022 Tennessee Valley Cat Fanciers show where again Ms. Sieving is accused of stuffing. She had 12 entries and it should be noted that each of those 12 entries competed in at least one ring, indicating that they are, in fact, legitimate entries and not sent to the show solely for the purpose of inflating the count.

Byers: Moving on to the April 9, 2022 Just Cat-In Around event, this is the only show at which one of my clients is accused of reverse stuffing. This is a circumstance in which Ms. Sieving is accused of that practice. She had 9 entries originally for the Just Cat-In Around show but ultimately removed all of those entries from the show. Essentially, reverse stuffing as we understand it requires evidence and proof of intent. As folks who have shown cats know, there are any number of reasons why you might initially enter a cat and then subsequently withdraw the cat from competition. However, to the best that we can understand the charge, the distinction between reverse stuffing and removing a cat from a show for another reason is the actual intent to harm your opponent. Evidence in the record before you indicates that Ms. Sieving did withdraw her 9 entries from the Just Cat-In Around show but evidence is contrary to the fact or the allegation that that action was taken in order to cause any other competitor any harm. Specifically, if you look to Respondents’ Exhibit 4, that is a series of text messages between Ms. Sieving and Sabrina Grisier, who was the president [*sic*, show manager] of the club sponsoring

the show. In those text messages, it is indicated that there was a circumstance in which Ms. Sieving actually intended to enter more cats but she missed the deadline, she missed the cut-off due to a misunderstanding regarding time zones. Then, when Ms. Sieving was not able to enter all of her cats, she felt that it was not worth her time or effort to continue with the remainder of the entries. In fact, if you are to look to the exhibits that were tendered by Ms. Perkins earlier in these proceedings, there are messages – and it's not clear with whom they were exchanged – but there are messages between Ms. Grisier and another individual in which Ms. Sieving's entries into the Just Cat-In Around show are discussed and there is no indication that there was any impropriety and, in fact, Ms. Grisier's statement in those FaceBook messages is that there was nothing "incriminating" about her conversations with Ms. Sieving. So, again, there can be no reverse stuffing at the April 9 show because the fact of the matter is the intent to reverse stuff is just not present and is contradicted by other evidence in the record.

Byers: If we move to the April 16, 2022 North Texas Cat Club show, that is the first show at which there is an accusation against Ms. Humphries. In fact, Ms. Humphries and Ms. Sieving are both accused of stuffing that show, both of them by my review of the records indicates that they had 14 entries for that show, although 2 of Ms. Sieving's entries were kittens, putting her at 12 cats for the show. Again, we have the question of, where is the line? We're not accused of stuffing for 7 or 8, so why is 12 or 14 problematic? It's also worth noting that the records from the Just Cat-In Around show on April 9th indicate that there was an exhibitor by the name of Mischa Taylor who had 9 entries for that event and, to the best of our knowledge – I'm sorry, I see we have a hand up from Mr. Colilla. Mr. Mastin, would you like to acknowledge him at this time or should I continue? **Mastin:** No, I'm going to hold off at this time. I ask the board please hold your hands until Mr. Byers is done. I don't want to interrupt. **Colilla:** I pushed it by accident, I'm sorry. **Mastin:** Thanks John. Go ahead Mr. Byers. **Byers:** Thank you. So, there was an entrant at the April 9 Just Cat-In Around show, Mischa Taylor, who had 9 entries. Again, where is the line? We are not aware that she stands accused of stuffing. What's the difference between 9 and 12? We don't see any appreciable difference, particularly because, again, additional entries benefits all entrants because it makes more points available to all entrants in the show.

Byers: Then we move on to the April 23, 2022 New Vision Cat Club show. At the April 23rd New Vision show, both Ms. Sieving and Ms. Humphries are both accused of stuffing. This is a situation that is similar to the Cat Spring Irregulars show because the records that I was able to review indicate that Lumos, the cat that we understand was alleged to try to benefit here, was not present for the New Vision Cat Club show. Again, how can there be any problematic stuffing when the cat that is the subject of the alleged benefit is not even a competitor? Also, ladies and gentlemen and others, I think this is really where we have a smoking gun in favor of my clients, not just for this show but at all of the shows at which they were accused of stuffing. If you look to the exhibits that were put before this board by Ms. Perkins, and specifically if you look at Exhibit 136 which I understand to be a list of the exhibitors at the event, there is an entry on that exhibit for a couple by the name of Ann and Eric Paul. If I have counted and interpreted the document correctly, Ann and Eric Paul had 18 cats entered in the New Vision Cat Club show. I am not aware, my clients are not aware, of any allegations of stuffing against Ann and Eric Paul. Meanwhile, my clients at this particular show had 14 entries. Why is it that my clients' 14 entries are alleged to be stuffing when 18 entries by another exhibitor are not considered to be stuffing,

apparently? In fact, that 18 entries exceeds the number of entries that my clients had at any show at which they are accused of stuffing.

Byers: We appreciate the effort that this board took to clarify its allegations after we raised some questions about the initial citation, but now that we have those clarified allegations, the evidence underlying them just does not pan out to demonstrate that there was any improper behavior by my clients. First of all, the alleged offenses are not define and, to the extent that my clients and I have been able to construct what the definition may be, that definition is not met. Other individuals have entered more cats without being accused of stuffing, which again is a practice which only serves to benefit all of the competitors, and as it relates to the allegations of reverse stuffing, there is a viable, reasonable explanation for why Ms. Sieving did not attend the show at which the reverse stuffing allegedly occurred. For those reasons, we would request that this board dismiss all charges against my clients, both of them, and I would at this time, assuming that Mr. Mastin believes that this is the appropriate time, I would be glad to address any questions from the board on behalf of my clients.

Mastin: Shelly? **Perkins:** Thank you. At this time we will take questions from the board to Mr. Byers. **Moser:** The question is, due to any of the actions over the last two months of the show season, do you believe it had a negative effect on the goals of other exhibitors? **Byers:** Our belief is that no, it did not have a negative effect on the goals of any exhibitors. If you look at the allegations, the allegations are predominantly allegations of stuffing. Again, as I have mentioned on a couple of different occasions, adding additional cats to a count at the show, if those cats actually compete, increases the number of points available for everybody in that show. It is not a circumstance in which a cat that was not already going to win will suddenly win because the show is stuffed. If a cat is not going to win a show that had a smaller number of competitors – entrants – then the cat is not going to win a show that has a larger number of entrants. Because of that, we're only talking about the volume of points available, we're not talking about affecting the outcome – the winner – and the fact of the matter is that those points are equally available to everybody who participates in the show, assuming that they have a cat that will be a winner. So, for those reasons, we don't believe that the allegations of stuffing negatively impacted anybody's goals in regards to the season. As far as the one allegation of reverse stuffing, again my understanding, our understanding, of reverse stuffing is that there is an intention to lure somebody to a particular show, only for the count of that show to collapse and for there to be no points available. If there is any evidence that that actually happened as it relates to the April 9th Just Cat-In Around show where reverse stuffing is alleged, that's not in the record that has been put before us. There is no document that I have reviewed prior to this evening's proceedings which indicates that any behavior of my clients in regards to the Just Cat-In Around show resulted in any individual receiving any less points than they would have otherwise. **Mastin:** Pam Moser, do you have any additional questions? **Moser:** No, thank you. **Mastin:** Does anybody else have any questions for Mr. Byers? Shelly, I don't see any hands up asking for questions. **Perkins:** OK, I have one question. Mr. Byers, why did your client withdraw the entries from the Just Cat-In Around on April 9th – all 9 entries that were placed for her? Why did she withdraw those? **Byers:** Those were withdrawn and again I believe that this is highlighted in the text messages that are Exhibit 4. They were withdrawn because it had been her intention to enter not just the 9 cats but some additional. She missed the deadline to enter the additional cats because she had a misunderstanding as to time zone difference, the time zone that the deadline was falling in and, simply put, when she wasn't able to enter all of the cats she intended to enter,

she decided that the trip wasn't worth her time and effort – much as any of us engage in a cost/benefit analysis to decide whether we're going to do anything in life. She said, “you know what, my time isn't worth the trip if I don't have my additional entries.” **Perkins:** Did she notify the entry clerk that she did not plan to attend after all and then perhaps cancel any grooming cages or anything else that she had associated with those entries to conserve her fees, since she planned not to attend? **Byers:** I do not have any information regarding the grooming or cages that are the subject of your question, but my understanding is that she did have communication with Sabrina – I'm not going to try her last name this time because I think I have mangled it on a couple of occasions now – but she had direct communication with Sabrina about her intent to not have the entries in the show and that is in the record before this board. **Perkins:** Does anybody have any follow-up questions due to my questions I asked? **Morgan:** I'm not a lawyer and I'm not familiar with legal proceedings, but I do want to admit to everyone that I'm somewhat confused by the definition as you presented of stuffing versus harm, etc. 99% of us have started as exhibitors, and when we exhibit, 99% of the time we take our cats and we put them in the rings. It's not normal for the majority of us to take a large number of cats to a show. Moreover, it's really not normal for us to take anywhere between 5 and 15 cats and put them in one ring alone, especially when generally we're trying to achieve titles on our cats. To me, I'm curious as to how your clients can justify taking cats that are opens or haven't even earned their championship over and over and over and not say that that's trying to manipulate the count. **Byers:** I think the answer to that question, Ms. Morgan, would be where is the harm? #1, as you correctly pointed out, there is some confusion over the definition. In fact, I don't think that there is a formal definition at all and I think that that needs to be established before anybody is held responsible for these alleged misdeeds, but the fact of the matter is, I think it goes back to my earlier comment. This is a situation in which a cat is not going to win a show because of stuffing if it wasn't going to win already. The best cat is still going to be adjudicated the winner of the show and everybody has an equal opportunity to have the best cat. **Mastin:** Melanie, continue with your questioning. **Morgan:** However, the show rule as it's stated doesn't need to be specific. It says “blatant” which basically insinuate flagrant. This shows a repeated history of doing this over and over and over again. To me, that speaks to intent and to blatant manipulation of count. **Byers:** If I could address that, again, my question is, where is the line? Ms. Morgan, in your comments you have indicated that it's unusual to take 5 or 6 or half a dozen cats. Apparently the CFA Board does not consider it problematic to take 7 or 8 cats, because when Ms. Sieving took 7 or 8 cats, she was not charged with stuffing the show. When this other exhibitor, Mischa, took 9 cats, to the best of our knowledge she was not accused of stuffing the show. When this individual or these individuals, Mr. and Mrs. Paul at the New Vision show, brought 18 cats, we're not aware of any allegations of stuffing there. So, the question is, where is the line and what is the difference between an individual who is trying to manipulate the count or an individual who just has a large number of cats who they feel they would like to show. As I noted in some of my earlier remarks, it was not uncommon for Ms. Sieving to regularly have some of the highest count totals at shows throughout the course of the season, even before there was any allegation of stuffing. **Morgan:** I'm not going to go back and forth and debate this because I don't want to waste everyone's time on this, but I think again it speaks to the consistency on that. There are certainly instances where there's a home show where the show is close. I don't know the specifics of Mischa Taylor's or whatever's cats, but often if you are very close to home, you might enter more cats to help out the club or for whatever reason and to show them and get titles on them. We don't see that pattern with your clients. They went far and wide

with cats that were clearly not trying to get titles because they only went in one ring, but thank you for your response. **Mastin:** Ms. Morgan, thank you for your questions and comments. **Currle:** We are an organization and we have to carry a lot of the blame because of our rules. They do allow to a certain extent the opportunity for this to occur. I can remember way back when I was showing cats, stuffing was really not a thing because we didn't have the internet and nobody knew what points we had, but there were people, particularly in the Washington area, that would bring 9, 10, 15 cats to a show and show them. They would even have handlers that would help bring them to the ring. I think the problem here is that it has become a commonplace situation to have this occur. We call it the bad times in April where people tend to manipulate show counts, but just as this gentleman has said, you can't really prove intent. I really feel bad that we're even going through this. I think it's an embarrassment to the organization, and I do know that all of these principals involved that we'll be hearing tonight are our cat fanciers and they do contribute a lot to CFA. So, I just wanted to state that our show rules do allow for the numbers to be there, but as far as the intent and deception that may or may not be intended, that would be up to the individual. **Perkins:** Mr. Currle, do you have a question? This is the time for questions with Mr. Byers. Do you have a question for him? **Currle:** Yes. Do you think that your clients did this on purpose? **Byers:** No, I do not. I think that again if you look at the history prior to when Ms. Sieving in particular was accused of stuffing, again she regularly had the highest number of cats at any given show that she entered. It was just her practice to have quite a few cats and wished to show them. I think the other thing that I will say in response to Mr. Currle's question is, if the board believes that it has a problem as a result of what occurred in the 2021-2022 season, it would be our recommendation that what needs to occur to address that problem is new, more clear rules on practices that the board believes to be problematic need to be adopted and those rules can be enforced once they are adopted, as opposed to attempting to go through the sort of proceeding that we're going through right now. It's my understanding that actually perhaps there have been some ad hoc committees assembled to already begin looking at such rules. **Mastin:** Mr. Currle, thank you. Mr. Byers, please let's not reiterate something that has already been brought up 2, 3, 4 times. We appreciate your direct answers to the questions and some of the stuff we are hearing multiple times.

Humphries: The only thing that I want to add to this is that Kimberly Sieving has four catteries. It was her three daughters and her, so there were always multiple cats at cat shows. In addition to that, our cats were not one plus. They were not just shown in one ring overall. Kim showed her cats all day on one day and started home the next day, and as far as I went, my cats, the majority of them were shown in at least 3 to 5 rings, if not more. So, we were granding those cats. The cats that we entered and shows that we did enter them in, as far as I know, they were local shows to me. I've been backed up all season with needing to show cats. As far as Kim goes, she was coming to help me. While she came, she brought her cats. To my knowledge, there is no rule against how many cats that you can enter in a cat show, there is no rule against what cats, if all or none you bring to a cat show, there is no rule against if you enter a cat show, that you have to go. So, the charges against us, in my mind, are completely unfair. I'm done. **Mastin:** Thank you Ms. Humphries.

Perkins: OK, it is time now. Is there any follow-up questions to the last statements made by Ms. Humphries or Mr. Byers? OK, Mr. Byers, did you want to make any closing remarks? **Byers:** At this point, I think the questions by the board were inciteful and the questions by the board drew out the vast majority of what I would say in any closing remarks. We do just again

believe that the charges against our clients are not founded and ask that they would be dismissed in total. **Perkins:** OK, thank you. You may be excused. **Mastin:** Allene, will you please remove Mr. Byers and Ms. Sieving and Ms. Humphries from participating? **Tartaglia:** I'm doing that right now. **Mastin:** Mr. Byers, Ms. Sieving and Ms. Humphries, thank you for attending. **Byers:** Thank you.

Eigenhauser: Are we going to be able to take a quick 5 minutes before the next hearing starts? **Mastin:** I wasn't planning on taking a break at this time. **Eigenhauser:** If they are ready to go, then let's plow through then. **Mastin:** That was my intent, was to plow through it.

(3) **FRIEMOTH HEARING.**

22-007 *CFA v. Friemoth, Lorna*

*Violation of CFA Show Rules 1.01, 1.03, 6.34;
Violation of CFA Bylaws Article XV, Section 4*

Present: *Lorna Friemoth
Ralph Shelton II, Attorney for Respondent*

Mastin: Allene, do you know if the next parties are available and ready to attend?
Tartaglia: Yes, they are. I'm going to promote them right now. **Mastin:** Ms. Perkins, are you prepared to proceed? **Perkins:** Yes, I am. **Mastin:** OK, let's get the next party. [Side discussions regarding attendees were not transcribed.] **Mastin:** Shelly, proceed. **Perkins:** At this time, Mr. Shelton, I'm just going to bring into the record for consideration all of the exhibits which are 1 through 166, as well as any additional emails or communications that you sent me that have made their way into File Vista. The board has reviewed those and considered those, and so we will make a motion under that order. **Eigenhauser:** I'll move. **Mastin:** May I have a second please? **DelaBar:** DelaBar seconds. **Mastin:** OK, I have a motion by Mr. Eigenhauser and a second by Ms. DelaBar. Are there any comments? Seeing no comments, I will call for the vote. If you are in favor, raise your hand. A reminder, when I call your name please do not lower your hand until I have called all names.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Anger abstained.

Mastin: I have Mark Hannon, Kathy Calhoun, George Eigenhauser, Carol Krzanowski, Melanie Morgan, Yukiko Hayata, Cathy Dunham, John Colilla, Paula Noble, Pam Moser, Mike Shelton, Pam DelaBar, Sharon Roy, Russell Webb. Please lower your hand. **Currle:** I'm a yes, too. I'm sorry, I was late. **Mastin:** OK Rachel, Kenny said he was a yes. Kenny, you can lower your hand. Anyone opposed please raise your hand. I do not see anyone opposed. If you are an abstention raise your hand. Rachel Anger. Rachel, lower your hand. Rachel, please call the vote. **Anger:** I did not get a vote from Annette. **Wilson:** I'm a yes, I'm sorry. My laptop closed. **Mastin:** Thank you Annette. **Anger:** That's 16 yes, zero no, 1 abstention. **Mastin:** Thank you Rachel.

Mastin: Shelly, please proceed. **Perkins:** Thank you Mr. Shelton. It is at this time that you are allowed at your discretion to make any kind of opening statement and present any verbal evidence and/or remarks that you would like to do into the record to supplement the written record, including testimony or, I should say, discussion by your client. **R. Shelton:** Thank you Ms. Perkins. First off, I want to thank the board for their time and particularly your counsel Ms. Perkins for the professionalism in preparing for this hearing. I wanted to first off – and Ms. Perkins, I will direct this to you – I indicated to you by email that there was a communication that had been received. It appears to have been generated November 28th. There was not adequate time to enter it into the exhibits but it appears to have been or was intended to be addressed to Ms. Anger for distribution to the board. I don't know if that occurred, but when I got a copy that appeared to be the intent. It was from Mary Kolencik. **Perkins:** The evidentiary written record is closed and it was closed under the timeline that I gave you in our earlier communication, so that is not one of the exhibits before the board. **R. Shelton:** OK, I understand

what the timeline was, but that would be inapplicable to a subsequently generated document that I thought was something that should be reviewed. I will take that to mean then that it has not been distributed to the board. **Perkins:** The writing, to be clear, was distributed to the board in some form or some portion of the board. I can't be certain who all has received it, Mr. Shelton, but I can tell you that I didn't find it to be evidentiary. I found it mostly to be argument and I didn't see a lot of supporting information in the way of exhibits or anything. It appeared only to be opinion and so therefore I'm not sure that much weight could have been given to someone's opinion without any supporting information to back up that opinion. That being said, I don't believe it's before the board for consideration in any event. It would have been argument and I'm certain that you are, in fact, going to make arguments on behalf of your client that you deem appropriate. **R. Shelton:** Yes, I am. I won't belabor any procedural issues. It is what it is.

R. Shelton: Directing our attention to the rule violations, we're talking about a very specific rule violation, which is that of blatant manipulation. *6.34 Blatant manipulation of show counts for the benefit of an entry.* I just want to get us all on the same page to begin with. I can speak the language, I have shown cats. Manipulating the count requires that the cat be entered and be present in at least one ring. Moreover, that's substantially different from entries. So, we are talking about manipulating the count, and that could only occur if there was a blatant attempt to do that through a cat who is present or absent based on that, and we're looking at intent here, as we all know. The reason I referenced the communication from Mary Kolencik is that she is the rules committee chairperson and does have a read on that rule. I thought that if the board has had the opportunity to consult with her or at least read her thoughts, that might be helpful. It would be beneficial, I would think, given that the rule in question – I'm going to just touch on this point without getting into argument about it; I can do that later if needed – is that blatant is bad. Blatant manipulation is bad. Subtle, crafty or sneaky manipulation appears to be OK, if not encouraged. So, let's focus on what is manipulation. The first 7 counts just fail. I want to point to the facts that you have. Count #1, she had her three cats; all three were present. Count #2, there were two cats in championship; they were present. #3 – again, these are each an allegation of stuffing the show – three cats entered; all three were absent. That's three. It's not a huge difference in the entry count that someone might look at, but none of the cats were present so none of the cats could have manipulated the count. #4, this she entered 16 cats. She brought them, she showed them. She brought assistants to assist her and paid the assistants. It made for a very long show, but it was an evaluation process. We're going to come back to reference that one again. Looking at #5, April 9, 2022, there were 3 cats entered; again, not stuffing. #6, Mad Catters show. Two cats entered in championship. They were both absent. Neither could have affected the count of that show. #7, she had 4 cats that were entered. They were absent. As you know – I'm sure this board knows, and I'm not going to belabor something that you clearly know – once you have entered a cat, the entry cannot be clawed back. You enter, you pay, you're done. Whether or not the 4 cats appear, whether or not she is able to come, whether there is some intervening circumstance, they are still going to be entered. Problematically, looking at some of these allegations, we see the contention that through friends she controlled a large number of cats. A couple of points on that that I will come back to, but I want to highlight that that one has 4 cats involved, with the allegation that she controlled 20 to 30 entries.

R. Shelton: Now let's look at Counts 8 and 9, April 23 and April 24. At that show, she entered 15 cats. The count in the allegation here is that she somehow controlled as many as 40 cats. She entered 15, she realized frankly that that was not wise. She entered 16 cats for the prior

that's referenced in Count 4, and that was for the April 2 Mid-Ohio Cat Fanciers show. She entered 16, she brought 16. As I indicated, she expended a great deal of effort and money in showing those 16 cats. Prior to that show, she had already entered her cats in the April 23/24 shows, so those entries existed, they couldn't be clawed back. But, after her experience on April 2, she realized it would be impractical, costly and physically taxing to present 15 entries and the April 23 and/or 24 shows. She couldn't undo the entries, but she did not bring 15 cats. She brought 4 to one show, she brought 5 to the next. She had neither the ability nor the staff to show more than that. Her intent has not become apparently to manipulate counts. Her intent here is to show and evaluate cats. If anything, the allegation that she is somehow controlling up to 40 cats at these shows – 35 in one and 40 in 2 others – would seem to be more evidence, if even possibly true, of subtle, sneaky or crafty, not of blatant. Blatant would indicate that she is flagrantly flaunting the rules. That would indicate that she is showing up with 16 cats or the 40 she somehow controls and getting them all in rings. Now they are going to count for the rest of the exhibitors. They are present, they're part of the count, as opposed to scaling back on the entries, not having been in rings, not having the support to do it. At no time did she blatantly manipulate a show count, and the evidence does not support it. There may be some tangential support found in unsworn statements of persons who would like to do harm to another person involved in the cat fancy, and that's unfortunate. They happen. I've had to handle more than one case in another association where that was the exact problem – someone decided to back bite, someone decided to complain, someone decided to bring a protest, but the protest does require proof. In this instance it requires – and I know you just went through this, but I'm compelled to make the argument – it requires proof of her intent to manipulate the show counts and it needs to be proved that she blatantly did so. We have no evidence of intent. There's nothing to demonstrate it.

R. Shelton: With that, I would now entertain any questions that any of the panel members may have. **Mastin:** Do any board members have any questions for Mr. Shelton? **Perkins:** I do have a question. You indicated that on Count #4, I think it was the April 2 show, that your client brought 16 cats to the show and she hired people. My questions are, did she show the cats in all the rings and were they all in championship? #2, you indicated that there was some sort of evaluation process you were going to come back to. I'm not sure you actually came back to that. Can you tell me what was her purpose in bringing 16 cats to that show and how many rings did she show them in? **R. Shelton:** Let's start with, first and foremost, it was in the Great Lakes Region near her home. It was supportive of the show to bring cats to the show. The club benefitted from the entries. Secondly, all 16 cats were in championship and all 16 cats were shown. I have bred, as every member of this panel has, bred and shown cats. I have bred and shown beautiful cats that I did not know were going to be a problem until they were at a show. That's part of the evaluation process that one considers. You have a beautiful cat, you think it's going to be a great show cat. It may or may not be. Moreover, if you're looking at your field that you're working with, you may want a judge to evaluate them as part of that process in determining who you are going to show. Does that adequately describe the evaluation process? I said I would come back to that Count. The reason I wanted to circle back to it, that's the one on April 4 – when I say "Count", that's the citation here – the April 4 show, the #4 allegation was the show from which she learned and experienced the difficulty in showing that many cats, something she decided not to do again. She tried it, it did not work. **Mastin:** Mr. Shelton, Ms. Perkins asked the question specific to, were all 16 cats shown in all rings or were they shown in just a certain number of rings. I don't recall an answer to that. Do you know that answer? **R.**

Shelton: Thank you. I do not and will respectfully defer to Ms. Friemoth so that she can answer that question. **Mastin:** OK. Ms. Friemoth, are you prepared to answer that? Do you know the answer? **Friemoth:** Roughly, yes. Because the show was 40 minutes from my home, I brought some cats on one day and some cats on the second day. They were not shown in all rings, but it was just a simple matter of transportation and ability to get all the cats to the show hall. **Mastin:** Ms. Friemoth, were they shown in one ring or more than one ring each day? **Friemoth:** I don't recall the number of rings each were shown in. Some were shown in more than one ring, some were shown in one. If they were afraid, they were shown in one ring and that was the end of it. I also brought some cats for photography, as Chanan was present at the show, so we did some cats' photos and took them home afterward. **Mastin:** OK Ms. Friemoth. Thank you. **R. Shelton:** To more adequately answer the question, I just wanted to point out, she had her 16 cats in the show. Transportation limitations, not any other ulterior motive, resulted in some coming one day, some coming the next. There were at least one cat that was shown in a single ring but if they were afraid, if there was a problem with the cat showing, it may have been pulled. However, it appears that a majority of the cats were shown in multiple rings. **Mastin:** Mr. Shelton, thank you for clarifying that. **Perkins:** Does anybody have any more questions? Now would be the time. **Morgan:** Looking at this, it seems to me that the crux of the matter really revolves around the last show of the season, which was in April at Sign of the Cat and Nova, where there are allegations that there were up to 40 entries controlled by one exhibitor. Although I wasn't there, understanding that they were actually looking at the count and calculating the numbers and I totally get the reasoning behind that, but in order to determine whether cats would be present or not in a ring. I guess my question would be this; I have so much empathy for where someone would be at that point, but I also have empathy for all the people who became collateral damage, and my question would be, how do you think those actions at that show or any actions impacted other exhibitors and if you had the chance, would you do anything differently? **R. Shelton:** I'm going to take that in two parts. First, how do you feel about how it may have impacted other people. Let's look at, first of all it would be necessary for her to have controlled virtually every, single absentee from the show in order for that to be true. I don't know how she has this swami-like control over that many cats, but somehow. However, we can only focus on the 16 cats. Now, how did that impact other people? There are disappointments. That is the nature of a competitive activity such as this; which is, some cats will do better than other cats. Secondly, as humans we feel empathy for those people. However, if their cats did well, their cats did great. If their cats are not up to snuff, they're not. Please give me again the second part of your question. Secondly I think was, would you do it again. The answer to that is, well, she entered cats for an April 2 show and she entered cats for an April 23/24 show. The April 2 show was the first experience when she took a large number of cats. That became a learning experience. Clearly, that taught her, no, this was not a good idea. She already didn't do it again. It's pretty clear that she's not going to bring 15-16 cats to a show. It became impractical, both for transportation and just show hall management. **Mastin:** Ms. Morgan, are you satisfied? **Morgan:** Thank you.

Calhoun: I do have a question about the last weekend of the show season and the activities therein; specifically, for the April 23, 2022 show, Sign of the Cat. I believe the entries that Ms. Friemoth had were never absented on the absentee list. So, by virtue of the fact that they weren't absent on the absentee list, would leave one to believe that they were present. Typically, when you check in at a show and you have cats that you have entered but are not there, they are absented. It's my understanding that the cats were not absented on the absentee list, but they were specifically absent in specific rings. It may be a result of who else might have

been there at the show. Do you have any feedback on that, Mr. Shelton? **R. Shelton:** On day one, she didn't bring all of the cats. If they're not absenteed – the ones that weren't there – unfortunately that doesn't reflect anything other than very poor record keeping, and that is not on the part of my client. If the cat is not there, it did not check in. The cats that were there and did check in would be the competing cats. That's step one. Step two, on day two, other cats were brought. Some of the cats were brought, some were not brought back. The same applies there. It only impacts the count if they are shown in a ring at the show. That applies to each of the two individual shows. Last, the question was, I believe the reasoning why some cats may not have shown. Ms. Friemoth already indicated that, first of all, there were cats that may have been scared and she decided they would not be proper to show. We have all experienced that, I'm sure. If not, some of us certainly have. That cat that seems so perfect that blows in a ring or does not get along with judges, as it turns out, or is negatively impacted by the presence of others around. Now, she may have pulled a cat here and there for competitive reason. Question; was it blatant? I'm not saying she did, I'm just saying was it blatant? We don't know, from everything that has been presented, it was merely an inference – it's not blatant. **Mastin:** Ms. Calhoun, do you have any additional questions? **Calhoun:** I do not. **Mastin:** Ms. Friemoth, I saw that you had your hand raised. Did you want to address any of the questions? **Friemoth:** Sure. I was just going to add, I was running late. As I'm sure most of you know it's not my forte getting to shows with enough time to set up, but I was running late and my focus was on coming to the show, paying my entry fees and setting up my benching area so that my entry, who was my primary focus, could get into her cage and have her treats and decompress and go through all of her normal show routines that she normally goes through, because when you have shown a cat for 52 weeks, they come to expect certain things. My friend Julie Keyer came to my benching area. She wanted to make sure that I was OK because I was not having a good mental health day. We sat together and made a list of my absentees. She was the first ring of the day and she made sure the cats that were with me and ready to be shown were the only ones that were present in that ring, as well as the second ring of the day. She handed my list off to the next judge, and once I had more time to gather my thoughts and everything, and check on the rest of the cats that were present with me that day, that's when we entered additional cats into the show. **Mastin:** Thank you Ms. Friemoth. Does any other board members have any questions for Mr. Shelton? **Perkins:** I have one question. Mr. Shelton, maybe you can answer this, or Ms. Friemoth. So, you entered these 16 cats at the April 2 show. When did you realize that entering 16 cats was too much for you to handle? **R. Shelton:** I'll let Ms. Friemoth answer that question. **Friemoth:** At the time, being only 40 minutes from my house, having lots of friends available and additionally my cattery help to help me bathe all of the cats for the show, which closed on a Tuesday not a Wednesday, it was OK to get everything together to go to the show in my region. It wasn't exactly ideal but I felt at that point I had made the commitment, I had the available resources to do it, so I went ahead and did it. It was in a weak point of desperation when I entered the number of entries I did in Sign, because I knew going into the weekend, with the point differential, that I needed to outscore my competitor by 5 points per ring to be able to stay in #1. When the counts came out, it was a shock to all of us, really. I was afraid that the counts were going to tank, because oftentimes when you have a show as a large count like that, the local exhibitors they chicken out and they just don't come. It was just a really, really stressful couple of days and between my job and my family I just wasn't able to prepare all my entries for the show. **Perkins:** So, I guess my question for you is, I'm looking at the two shows and you have one April 2 and one April 20, so you went to the show on April 2 and you knew how difficult it was, in your own

words, because you entered 16 cats, but then at the April 20 show you turned right around and I think you entered 15 again just, you know, whatever it is, two or three weeks later. At Mid-Ohio is where you entered the 16 cats that you said were too much for you and you realized that at the show. You turned around and entered the same number of cats for Sign of the Cat that you did not take them to. Is that right? **R. Shelton:** You know what? I'm going to take that one because it's somewhat argumentative and I should probably answer it. I pointed out already but I will re-emphasize the obvious. Prior to the April 2 show, the entries had to be made for the later shows. One does not enter the show the week before. She had her entries decided and in, and then had that experience at the April 2 show. **Perkins:** Oh, are you saying then that she had already entered for the April 20 show at the same time, prior to entering for the April 2 show? **R. Shelton:** No, I'm saying that she had already made the commitment, the decision, to do that. The entries themselves weren't completed. She was in the process, so the entries were entered, she reflected on it after the show. So, we have a show, we enter some cats, we then reflect on the experience, we have to also look to see at that point who we have available, so subsequent to entry we evaluate who we have available, do we have the support, do we have the ability to run all of these cats? So, I apologize if I was misleading and if it sounded that way. We have an April 2 show, we then enter all those cats again, but then there's an evaluation leading up to the 23/24 of that month. It's a three week window we're dealing with here, so during that period of time it was determined that was a really bad experience. She has also referenced the mental health day issue; she was having a tough day, she was having a tough experience. **Mastin:** I just want to be clear on this, because I think it's a little bit confusing after what I heard earlier and what I'm just hearing now. Let me finish please. At the April 2 show, we heard from Lorna – Ms. Friemoth – and Mr. Shelton that at some point in time Lorna determined it was too much to handle, OK? For the April 23/24 show, when did the 15 cats – for the April 23/24 show, when were the entries submitted? Was it before the April 2 show or was it thereafter? That, I believe, is what Ms. Perkins is asking. **R. Shelton:** That would be best responded to by Ms. Friemoth. **Mastin:** OK, Ms. Friemoth? **Friemoth:** I'm sorry, I'm having a little bit of a hard time following the line of questioning. I entered the cats – when I entered them, which was late on Tuesday before Sign of the Cat. After I entered them, I was sitting there Wednesday morning and I realized it was just way too much for me to handle at the show. I didn't have the help that I thought I would have. My husband got a job offer that week. He had to leave Sign of the Cat early on Sunday. We drove two cars to the show. He drove one with half the cats and I drove the other with my mother. It just became too – trying to be able to show all these cats just wasn't possible. **Mastin:** OK, Ms. Friemoth, thank you for clarifying that. If I understood your answer, you said you entered the cats late on Tuesday before the Sign of the Cat show, which would have been April 19. **Friemoth:** I'm just checking my calendar. **Mastin:** The purpose for the clarification on this is, earlier during the discussion when Mr. Shelton was presenting some of the facts of each of the dates, I believe I heard the cats were entered before the end of the April 2 show for April 23/24. It's Ms. Perkins' intent to clarify the answer on when the cats were entered for April 23/24. **Friemoth:** Yes, that's correct. They were entered on April 19 before the show closed. **Mastin:** Very good. **Friemoth:** Looking at the numbers, we all watch breed summaries. I truly believed, as did all of my friends, that the New Vision show was going to be the only show that had count that weekend and, as the day progressed, it appeared that New Vision would be comparable in count so I decided to enter additional entries in the show. **Mastin:** OK, thank you very much. **R. Shelton:** I'll say that if I – I obviously misspoke on that issue, so my apologies. **Mastin:** OK, thank you.

Perkins: Does anybody have any follow-up questions to any of that? I don't see any, so at this time – **Morgan:** Sorry. I was just reading through some of the files and one of the exhibits that we have has a Messenger FaceBook thing that says, "Well ... recount from friends this morning. I do actually have 40 entries in Pennsylvania." My question is, I thought that we were – I mean, Mr. Shelton, I think that you said that there was no proof that there were 40 entries and that there was some question about why we were bringing that up and we could only talk about the entries that Ms. Friemoth entered. To me this seems pretty clear that there was control of some sort over quite a number of entries. Just asking for clarification on this message. **R. Shelton:** It's fair to say that I did argue that there was no evidence of control. There is this statement and I'll let Lorna answer that. She could best describe what she meant by that. **Friemoth:** The conversation that you're referencing is between myself and Leslie Carr. It had become increasingly clear that, although I believed Leslie was a friend of mine, that she was working to benefit the other party. I may have said things that were sarcastic in nature to her that she took as fact. **R. Shelton:** In other words, she points out to my client that she has friends there that are showing and there's this large group, and she makes one statement to her, "oh well, I guess you're right, I do have 40." That was not an assertion of her control or some swami-like image. That's really all we've got by way of showing that. It's virtually nothing. **Morgan:** Thank you. Very helpful.

Perkins: OK Mr. Shelton. It doesn't look like there's anymore questions, so now would be the time for you to make any closing remarks if you have any. **R. Shelton:** Yes, and really briefly, there are a number of manipulating things that occur across the board in every competitive activity and in the cat fancy there are problems. There's no question. The remedy at this time appears to be an effort to enforce a facially problematic rule, one that is difficult to enforce if not impossible because of it's terminology. It's problematic for another reason. At its base, as I mentioned earlier, it says you can't do something blatant that's bad, but by inference that means if you do it in a real crafty way, you can do a bad thing. I don't think that's in the spirit of what CFA intends. To try and re-interpret it to say what you intend, the best approach is to rewrite it. It could use some work, and you are best suited to make that determination. You have committees for that purpose. You have obviously a great deal of experience on this panel. That's issue #1. It's just a really, really problematic rule. Secondly, it does require clear evidence of intent and if you are trying to make an example of a problem, this is really a poor choice, particularly when you are looking at someone who has been a very active and supportive member of the showing community, that found herself unfortunately in one of those experiences where someone is just trying to set her up, and at the end of the show season did enter 15-16 cats and wasn't able to follow up on that. She described what played into that – the various circumstances in life that impacted her ability. None of that indicates an intent to manipulate the count. The reverse stuffing is technically not even a violation of this rule. This allegation that someone could enter into a show a number of cats and then absent them and crash the number that are there, that would have to be an intent. That's really a backward way to go about this intent to manipulate a count. Moreover, it would need to be, again, blatant. It really does not rise to that level and I think that the board should seriously consider whether anyone should be disciplined under this rule until it is revised. With that, we submit. **Perkins:** OK. At this time, you are dismissed. Thank you for your time Mr. Shelton and Ms. Friemoth-Gallion. **Friemoth:** Thank you.

(4) **PEET HEARING.**

22-009 *CFA v. Peet, David and Shirley*

*Violation of CFA Show Rules 1.01, 1.03, 6.34;
Violation of CFA Bylaws Article XV, Section 4*

Present: *David Peet
Shirley Peet*

Perkins: The next hearing starts at 9:40. [Side discussions regarding attendees were not transcribed.] **Mastin:** It appears as though we have Mr. Peet and Ms. Peet in attendance. Ms. Perkins? **Perkins:** This is the matter of David and Shirley Peet. We have a board citation right now. At this time I would ask the board to make a motion to introduce into the record the Exhibits 1 through 166, which are the exhibits, and anything else in File Vista that is in the Peet file that could be communications between Mr. and Mrs. Peet and myself. **DelaBar:** DelaBar moves. **Mastin:** Thank you Ms. DelaBar. Do we have a second? **Eigenhauser:** George seconds. **Mastin:** Thank you Mr. Eigenhauser. Do we have any discussion on the motion? OK, I'm going to call for the vote on this. If you are in favor raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Currle voting no. Anger and Webb abstained.

Mastin: Kathy Calhoun, Mark Hannon, George Eigenhauser, Carol Krzanowski, Paula Noble, Annette Wilson, Pam DelaBar, Melanie Morgan, Yukiko Hayata, Mike Shelton, Sharon Roy, Pam Moser, John Colilla, Cathy Dunham. Please lower your hand. If you are opposed raise your hand. Kenny Currle. Lower your hand. If you are an abstention raise your hand. Russell Webb, Rachel Anger. Lower your hand. Ms. Anger, please read the vote. **Anger:** I have 14 yes, 1 no, 2 abstentions. **Mastin:** Thank you.

Mastin: Ms. Perkins? **Perkins:** At this time, David and Shirley Peet, it's your time to make any opening statement that you wish to make and/or present any verbal statements to the board in support of your case, if you desire to do so. **D. Peet:** I do. First, I don't know exactly how all this stuff works, so forgive me. I'm not much one for microphones, as most of you know. I do have a lot of things that I want to go over that are in the exhibits that you have there that are not correct. I have those listed. First, I should tell you I'm not at home. I got stuck in Cincinnati so I don't have my actual notes, etc. that I had prepared for this meeting. I don't have those with me, so I had to make this up. Actually, I stayed up here and made it up today. I might have missed something; it could be out of order. Please just bear with me. The one objection that I would have, and maybe that's not the right word, but this board when looking at the charges brought against Shirley and I, and others, the board created a committee to look into remedies or validity of some of these charges, and during that process actually installed one of the supposed aggrieved exhibitors as a member of that Committee. I find that extremely objectionable and quite hurtful, to be honest with you. I don't know why it was done but it just seems like, as several of these things in here do, that it is a type of selective persecution and I don't understand it. Shirley and I have not done it. We've worked very hard in CFA and it really does hurt. Anyway, that being said, one of your exhibits was written by Ginger Meeker, which is nothing more than her opinion and suspicions. I'm surprised that it even was a part of this,

because there were some very negative things in there, including and referring to the #1 premiership cat for the season as “POTTY” which, you might say that’s a misprint. It’s not a misprint. If you look at the entire letter that she wrote and the spirit it was written in, it’s not a misprint. Anyone that showed a cat in CFA, especially in premiership, would be extremely offended by that and I certainly am.

D. Peet: Let’s start at why Mad Catters existed. We got our judges in 2019 and 2020, contrary to what your facts say. We got those in 2019 and 2020 for a show at Frederick, Maryland – Mad Catters – which was cancelled because of COVID. The 2021 show was cancelled because of the gathering limits not being raised high enough, so it was pushed off to 2022. The judges that we had contracted for the 2020 show, some of them in 2019 and I think one of them in 2018, were simply asked to go forward and do the 2022 show. Our hotel in Frederick, Maryland, because of changing staff, booked our date. Even though they had our deposit, our contract, they booked our date and would not listen to my arguments. It would have taken me far too long to get it. Parkville was available, so we decided to go to Parkville. We asked the board, went to Parkville and, because of the difference in the hotel costs charging by the day – Parkville charges by the weekend – we went from a one day 6 ring show to a much calmer 2 day 8 ring show in Parkville. That did require us to get a couple of new judges. When going through our “already selected” list all the way back from 2019, we had Bob Goltzer was on that list. He declined. He wanted to do his judging assignments strictly in Florida. He didn’t want to come up to Maryland, so we released that contract and, as a matter of a very sad point, he actually passed away the day of our show or the day prior to our show early that morning. A second one was Gene Darrah. He was on a medical leave that had just expired and we asked him, could he come and do it since his medical leave expired and he said that he would rather not. It was very soon for him since his expiration and he would rather not, so we released that and now we have to all of a sudden find four. We looked for judges that were close. I don’t know if I should say their names or not. I guess it doesn’t hurt anything. It was Chuck Gradowski, John Adelhoch. They were both at another show. Jeri Zottoli who had had knee surgery. Tracy Petty who frequently does the show for us. She wanted to exhibit, and she did exhibit at the show only on Saturday. She didn’t return Sunday, but she exhibited on Saturday. Anyway, we filled our remaining slots as best we could, based on people that we normally use. It was a normal line-up for our show. It had nothing to do with – and obviously the ones that we contracted in 2018 or 2019, you don’t have any idea what’s going to be out there in 2022. You don’t know. To think that the judges would be persuaded in any way I think is just plain wrong. If we don’t have some faith in these judges, I don’t want to hire them. Anyway, that’s to let you know how that show happened. Now, it was late. We were actually driving home from our Coastal Paws show in Raleigh when we found out that we couldn’t get into Frederick and that there had been an individual specifically – we basically cancelled our show. We thought there was nothing we could do about it. Mary Kolencik who has already been mentioned here put a post up and was looking forward to spending time with her family in Baltimore, blah, blah, blah, and there were others, but Mary specifically said that we should petition the board and see if we could have it done anyway, which we did, and the board passed it. The board said OK, so we held our show in Parkville as a two day 8 ring show and that’s how that came about. It wasn’t anything connived, sneaky, underhanded, just nothing. That’s how it happened. It’s the end of the season and people do want to have this show. It would be a shame to miss one, especially one like Mad Catters. It was held all the time.

D. Peet: We stand accused here of entering cats, as the gentleman just said, for blatant manipulation to help our own entry only, to benefit our own cat – no one else, just our own cat. From March of 2020 most of you know when COVID hit us, before that Shirley and I had run I believe 10 national winners. Not an easy thing to do, but we did in a 12 year period. When COVID got us, that really hurt our income, because that's what we do, we set up shows. We couldn't do it. We couldn't do it for 20 months, so we didn't show anything. We still have not, when the Mad Catters show came around, one of the very, very common things to do, and most clubs do, we just did it again with a show that we closed at 6 p.m. tonight, by the way, and that is; when you get close to getting top 15 in a category – whether it be kittens, championship, premiership, pets – when you get close, many clubs ask. They put that out, “we need 4 more in premiership,” “we need 3 more pets” or whatever it is, and we did that with Mad Catters, as well. We had top 15 in championship I believe, we had top 15 in Household Pets, and it would be nice to get a third category. Most shows never do that, which would be premiership. We asked for those entries on the list, not calling people individually and saying, “hey bring a cat.” We don't do that. We asked for those entries on the list to get to top 15, which helps people because all of a sudden now you have 15 finals instead of 10. Extra points for everybody. I gave Shirley, because we had been off for so long, a lot of the cats at home had been altered, either neutered or spayed, whichever is appropriate. They had been altered because we weren't doing anything with them for 2 years. I can't just have them sitting around. I gave Shirley I think it was 9, maybe 10, 9 or 10 names, parents, birthdates, colors, classes, etc., over the phone the evening that we were supposed to close around dinnertime so she could write them all down, and if she needed them she could put them in the show and we would get our top 15 in premiership. I'm not going to do that unless I take my cats to the show and show them, which we did do, by the way. But anyway, she wrote all the information down, she put them into the show – I think 8 or 9 of them, whatever it was – and Saturday morning we had I think 6 that had already been groomed up, prettied up enough to go into a ring; in other words, bathed and groomed. We took those, we put them in the very first ring of the day. All of you have shown, I think. We did not take these cats to the show hall and let them sit in their cages to see how a specific cat – whether it be one that we had bred or anybody else – would make how, how they would do for the day or for the show. We put them in the very first ring. That means the points are there. They are there for everybody. They are there for our competition, they're there for people that need those bottom 5 finals on the 11-15. The points are there. The only reason we didn't do all 8 or 9 of them on Saturday was because I didn't have time to get them all groomed. Saturday at check-in, Shirley did most of the check-in. I helped her some, then I went around and made sure before the show started, and made sure all the judges had their podiums right – most of you experienced that, too – to have the podiums the right height, etc. Right when the check-in was finished, I went through and handed out the menus in the rings and then proceeded to make sure that my cats got to the first ring. Once that was finished, I left. I was not physically in the show hall. I left the show. I went home. I had a physical problem. I don't really want to say what it was here. Nothing serious, but it's a problem, plus to get the rest of my cats washed and bring them back on Sunday. I was not there. One of the exhibits that you have says that I was in and out of rings all day. That's impossible, because I wasn't even in the show hall. I got the cats washed, came back Sunday morning, put them in the first ring on Sunday morning, again so that they count for everybody, not just me. I'm not looking to see how our cat did, I put them in the first ring. By the way, 3 of the cats that we brought – entered as what has been referred to here as “stuffers” – 3 of those cats finaled. They made finals. They weren't junk cats, they were cats that we were considering looking to see

when we start back up showing, what do we want to show? Do we want to show Bowling Ball, do we want to show Two Ton? Which cat here do we want to show? I apologize for some of the stupid names but if you saw some of these cats, you would understand why the names fit. Three of them did final. Some of them just retracted back to the back of the cage. They were scared to death, which happens. Some of them were not easy to bathe, but we're talking about a show that is literally 20 minutes from my house. It's our club, so to speak. We participate heavily in the show management and the running of the club, so it benefits a local club that we are part of to bring those cats. It also benefits the people that are there that need the points, so that's why we did that. You know what? By putting those cats in the first ring of the day, if the cat that I bred that was right up there at the top fighting for the top spot, if she had had a bad day – like, for example, the Maine Coon did – if she had a bad day, it would have been all over. If I wanted to manipulate, I would have waited and put those cats in the last ring, or not put them up at all. We didn't do that.

D. Peet: As far as numbers, I know that the attorney ahead of me – or maybe it was the first attorney, I don't know; all attorneys look alike – I'm sorry Shelly, I didn't mean that.

Perkins: That's OK. **D. Peet:** The attorneys made a point of a line distinction in how many cats you can bring to a show. You all know that there is none. There is no distinction. If I remember correctly, it was a long, long, long time ago now, 25 years or maybe more, that there were upwards of 40 that were brought to one show by one exhibitor. I haven't seen that for a long time, but we do have exhibitor lists that show many people – many people – bringing more cats than what we did to either Sign of the Cat or Mad Catters who are not here. They're not charged with anything. Honestly, if you tried to set a number, I think your clubs would have an issue. They are scrapping now for all the entries they can get anyhow, but taking 8 or 9 cats – I think it was 9; Sarah said it was 8 but I think it was 9 – taking those cats to a local show that you are in control of or running, it helps. We almost filled that show. Next year when that show is put on, exhibitors are going to see that that show came close to filling up with 222, I think, and they may be more apt to enter than if we had gotten 150 or 100. They are wasting their time. That's the reason that stuff was done.

D. Peet: Let me just glance and make sure I don't have something down here that I absolutely don't want to miss. Oh, yes I do. We did run a special on our flyer. That flyer went in to CFA and it wasn't objected to either, just to let you know, but the special that we ran was for opens, champions, opens in premiership or premiers. They were discounted I think in 3 packs or 4 packs, I don't really remember. Again, I'm not home so I don't have my flyer in front of me. That special is one that we have run many times. We usually run it at Coastal Paws. It's run at the end of the season so that individuals can bring out their opens or their champions, they can grand them, the cats that they are intending to run next season. The name or the theme of this club, the Mad Catters club that is, I think it was "welcome to the grand party" or "join the grand party"; meaning, to grand your cats. Now, in order to do that, you need the opens and champions present so that they can get their points. We are now participating in the OCP rings for that same reason, to try to help people get their points and grand their cats.

D. Peet: Now, the Sign of the Cat show is a totally different ball game. We have nothing to do with show management on that show, we are not members of the club, we're not members of the show committee. We did set it up. We set up the cages. I took I think 5 or 6 – Sarah said 6, so if that's not right, get her. We took 6 cats for that show. Again, it's local. I love Karen and Jill.

We have supported their show for many, many, many years. It's only an hour and a half away, but it's not 20 minutes away so we didn't take 9; we only took 6 and we only entered them on Saturday. We did not enter them both days because we had already seen at Mad Catters how some of these cats just hid back in the back of the cage. There's probably no chance that we're going to be able to show them, so some of these cats they stayed home. There's no point in taking them again. We took 6 to get a second view on some. Again, they went into the very first ring. We didn't hold them out to wait to see how the Exotic that we bred did. We didn't hold them out. We put them in the very first ring. Again, by the way, we finalized in that ring with some of these "stuffer cats". We did decide on what we wanted to do as far as exhibiting. We pretty much narrowed it down to two cats, plus one that's brand new that we hadn't had out yet.

D. Peet: The only reason that we hadn't done any of that is because COVID did really hurt dollars and cents wise. It really, really hurt. I'm going through some stuff right now that's terrible. However, I know what we want to do. We haven't done it yet for two reasons. #1 is COVID and #2 is this here, the stuff that we're attending today. I feel again I'll use the term "selective persecution" or prosecution, however you want to call it. I don't know why we were picked out, especially when we can have anywhere near the highest number of cats at any of these shows or none of them. Take them to a local show, take them to a show that you have supported because they are personal friends for a long time and you get hammered for it. I understand that maybe people were upset with coming in 2nd or 3rd or what have you. Again, the Maine Coon involved lost probably at Mad Catters because of not being able to take breed in the rings. A new cat entered and took them away from her, but I understand that. It is competition and stuff does happen. Sometimes it happens at the last minute. Look at the ratings last week [inaudible] extra point. I hate that. I'm not going to stray too much here because I'm ready to quit, but I watched Jeff Gordon get knocked out in the final turn of the final lap for a championship, and it happens. It's competition, and as long as you're not doing something that's really, really horrid, I just really don't see the problem. Competition is competition, and there's going to be some rubbing involved. It's abrasive. We don't mean for it to be, but it is. The only example of blatant manipulation for your own personal benefit that I can think of, there is one. Maybe some of you have even done it. I haven't, but maybe some have. That is – and I don't think it's a horrible thing, either. Many times people, especially with minor breeds, will show a cat and wind up in 180, 190, 195 points in championship trying to grand your cat and you just can't get those last few points. The cat is going to go out of condition, it's just a horrible thing, so you grab one of your own cats that you can take with you to the show and you take it to a ring and then you absent it, and then you pick up those last 5 points by default. Now you've just blatantly manipulated points for your own personal benefit and no one else's, but I don't really see that that's so horrible, I really don't. It has nothing to do with what we're talking about here today, in my opinion.

D. Peet: I don't think that I've missed anything, but if some of you have questions for me, please ask. I am listening to you, but I'm also going to scan through my hieroglyphics which are hard to read because I should have been a doctor and make sure I didn't leave off something that I wanted. **DelaBar:** David, you mentioned that there was a Committee member that you felt had negative feelings towards your actions during last show season. Do you mind sharing who that was? **D. Peet:** Jodell Raymond. **DelaBar:** Thank you. **D. Peet:** As a matter of fact, I have an email that she put out right after the show season. If you want to read it, you will understand exactly why I say that. She was a co-owner on the black Persian that I think finished second for

the year. **Calhoun:** Hi Dave. I just have one question for you. I think I know part of the answer, but I don't know the second part. The two shows in question, the cats that were in the top 3 spots, I'm fairly certain that all 3 cats were at Mad Catters. I'm not so sure that all 3 cats were at Sign. **D. Peet:** They were. **Calhoun:** They were, yeah. So, by virtue of your putting your cats in one ring, everyone had the same opportunity to benefit from those cats. **D. Peet:** I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt you Kathy. Go ahead and finish, and then I'll answer you. **Calhoun:** So, everyone that was in the hunt for the top spot had an equal chance to benefit from those cats that you had, as with any other cats that were in the show. **D. Peet:** That's absolutely correct, and that's why I made it a point to make sure that everyone on this board understands that I put those cats in the very first ring. I did not take the cats to the show, set them in a cage, let them sit there all day long and then determine which one of these three cats did better and then say, "my cat did better, I'm going to put them up." No, I didn't do that. I put them in the very first ring, so all 3 cats had the same – if we had tanked, if we had done bad or if Pandora had bit somebody, we would have been up the crick and I would have done it to myself, but I still would have accomplished one thing that I wanted; that was, getting 3 top 15 categories at our show, getting 220-some cats at this show, and giving the 11-15 slots where people needed points, giving them some extra points. We accomplished that. We did it without, in my opinion, hurting anybody. **Calhoun:** Thank you. **Morgan:** Kathy, thanks. You asked the first of my two questions and thank you Dave for answering that. It certainly makes sense. I think what we're trying to do here is clarify intent in all these parties, and in doing so we need to look at patterns of behavior. So, my question to you Dave is this. I appreciate all the information you have given us. I know that Mad Catters was licensed with an exception and it was within 30 days but it wasn't way less than. It was like 3 weeks or something like that, and you have explained why. My understanding, and I would like to clarify this which is my question, is that many of the shows that you've had because of the situation with COVID and show halls have been licensed fairly late or at the last minute recently, so that Mad Catters – although a few days out of the norm – was actually in line with the way that you were licensing many of the other shows that have come through. Is that correct? **D. Peet:** It's correct and there's a reason for that, Melanie. The reason is, as I said earlier here, COVID really hurt. I don't think that you guys can imagine what COVID did to Shirley and I, and it's not finished. The majority, and I think we put on 7 or 8 shows ourselves. When I say "ourselves" I'm talking about myself, Shirley, Lee Hughes and Sarah, maybe one or two others here and there, but us 4. I think it's 7, it might be 8. We assist other show committees with helping them in whatever respect, getting their vendors or their rosettes or something, or supplies. We do a lot of that, but the ones that we are putting on do not – I know this will shock all of you – they do not have huge bank accounts. So, therefore, the funding for these things comes from Shirley and I. We fund it. We put the money up when it's needed, because it isn't there. If we didn't do that, these clubs wouldn't have their show. So, when COVID hurt us as bad as it did, we didn't have all that to fork out, so we would have to wait until closer to show time. We couldn't license 6 months out. We might license 3 months out or 2 months out or 6 weeks out. The reason was to make sure that we had the capital to float that show in case we got 50 entries. You know, you still have the bills, and the club can't do it. We had to make sure that we #1 had it and that we were willing to fork it out if it came to that. The Mad Catters was a little bit different in that there really was no doubt in our minds we thoroughly intended to hold that show and what tied up its licensing was more the hotel booking our date after they already had our deposit, than anything else. **Morgan:** Thank you. **Mastin:** Ms. Morgan, did Mr. Peet answer your question? **Morgan:** Yes, thanks. **Dunham:** I really just have a comment. I would like to

follow up on something that Dave referred to and then Pam DelaBar asked clarification of. Jodell Raymond yes was, in fact, on the ad hoc committee but she did make it very, very clear that she recused herself on any discussions that related to this particular matter when it was discussed. She left the meeting, she had nothing to say about it, she did not participate in anything related to this matter. I just want that to be very clear so that there's no confusion, thanks. **D. Peet:** Her email following the show season was also very clear. If you want me to send it to you all, I would be happy to. I'm sorry, that was a FaceBook post. It was not an email, it was a FaceBook post, my bad. **Mastin:** Ms. Dunham, do you have additional questions or comments? **Dunham:** No Rich, I'm done, thank you.

Perkins: I have no questions, so Mr. Peet, considering that you told your story yourself, do you have any final closing remarks, or do you rest on what you've already said? **Mastin:** While Mr. Peet is looking through his notes if he has closing remarks, can we give Ms. Peet an opportunity to share any thoughts or concerns she has? Ms. Peet? **S. Peet:** I really don't have any thoughts. I just closed a cat show and I'm brain dead, so there really isn't any thoughts in my head. I have to stay up all night, print judges' books, master clerk books. These people that want to leave the show open until Wednesday, they don't have a clue what work goes into it. It's just ridiculous, so I don't really have any comments. **Mastin:** Thank you Ms. Peet. Mr. Peet? **D. Peet:** Rich, the only thing that I missed, and it's kind of irrelevant but I guess not really. It's in one of your exhibits as a notation that I covered where people had said I was in and out of rings all day, which is totally not true. I wasn't even in the show hall. One other comment that was made was that we benched ourselves back in the back so that nobody could see us. If you've been at Parkville, there's a main room. Then there is a hallway with bathrooms in it and a smaller room where we usually put our master clerk and whatever cats the master clerk has entered, as well as, then there's a back room where we usually have one or rings and the clerks' cats from that room go into the smaller room next to that. In this case, I knew that we were taking our cats so that we could see how they did in the rings. We had no intention on running those cats all day long every day, we just wanted to see which ones we might want to bring out. There was no point to me taking up 10 cages out in the main floor. Allow everybody else to be out there where there's 4 rings. I put myself in that side room. It's not really a side room. Everyone has to walk through it to get to the back room. Everybody is going to walk through there and see my cats. As a matter of fact, I took pictures of all my cats in the rings, but you're going to walk through there. The cats are going to see a lot of people walking, carrying other cats. That's the reason that I put myself there. I didn't want to steal space from people who needed to be out in the main show hall and have to get into 4 rings when I knew probably ours would go in one just for us to be able to judge how they handled the show. By the way, the one that we called Two Ton is the one that did the best, in my opinion. **Mastin:** Thank you Mr. Peet. **Roy:** I just want to support something that Dave did express earlier, and that had to do with judges' contracts. I was one of the judges for the show. He had had my contract for at least two, maybe three years prior to that show. It was not something that was done at the last minute. It had been planned and circumstances led to the fact that it was not licensed earlier. Thank you. **Mastin:** Thank you Ms. Roy. Do any other board members have any questions for Mr. Peet or Ms. Peet? **S. Peet:** Melanie, I'm sorry your cat didn't make it in the show last weekend.

Perkins: I have no questions, and so I believe that is the end. Thank you for coming Mr. Peet and Ms. Peet. You may be released. **D. Peet:** Thank you. **S. Peet:** Thank you. **Mastin:** Thank you both. **S. Peet:** Have a good night. Merry Christmas. **Currle:** Merry Christmas.

* * * * *

Mastin: Shelly, do you have anything additional for the board at this time? **Perkins:** Only in closed session. Nothing in open session. **Mastin:** Do any board members have anything at this time? OK, then I'm going to thank everyone for attending and I'm going to adjourn the meeting. We're going to break for 15 minutes and we'll come back at roughly 10:38 in closed session. Thank you all.

The open session meeting adjourned at 10:22 p.m. EST.

* * * * *

The executive session meeting adjourned at 1:17 a.m. EST.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Rachel Anger, Secretary*

(5) **DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS AND SUSPENSIONS.**

Disciplinary Hearings And Suspensions: Cases that have been reviewed by the Protest Committee and for which a recommendation was presented to the Board. The following case was heard, a tentative decision was rendered, timely notice was given to the parties, and no appeal and/or appeal fee was filed. Therefore, final disposition is as follows:

None

Appeals: Cases that have been reviewed by the Protest Committee and for which a recommendation was presented to and heard by the Board, a tentative decision was rendered, timely notice was given to the party, an appeal and/or appeal fee was timely filed, and the appeal was heard by the Board of Directors. Therefore, final disposition is as follows:

None

Board-Cited Hearings: The Board may consider any protest filed by any member of a member club or in any other manner brought to the attention of the Executive Board. The Board may delegate authority to one or more persons to review, investigate, and determine if probable cause exists for the filing of a formal protest. This case was heard on direct cite by the CFA Executive Board. Timely notice was given to the parties, and the matter was heard. Final disposition is as follows:

22-008 *CFA v. Humphreys, Sherri*

*Violation of CFA Show Rules 1.01, 1.03, 6.34;
Violation of CFA Bylaws Article XV, Section 4*

Respondent was found to be in **violation** of all counts. Sentence of a direct Letter of Reprimand by the Board.

22-010 *CFA v. Sieving, Kimberly*

*Violation of CFA Show Rules 1.01, 1.03, 6.34;
Violation of CFA Bylaws Article XV, Section 4*

Respondent was found to be in **violation** of all counts. Sentence of a direct Letter of Reprimand by the Board.

22-007 *CFA v. Friemoth, Lorna*

*Violation of CFA Show Rules 1.01, 1.03, 6.34;
Violation of CFA Bylaws Article XV, Section 4*

Respondent was found to be in **violation** of counts 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9. Sentence of a direct Letter of Reprimand by the Board and a fine of \$1,500 to be paid within 30 days. If the restitution is not paid in full within 30 days, Respondent shall be suspended from all CFA services until the restitution is paid in full.

22-009

CFA v. Peet, David and Shirley

Violation of CFA Show Rules 1.01, 1.03, 6.34;

Violation of CFA Bylaws Article XV, Section 4

Respondents were found to be **not in violation** of any show rules or Bylaw provisions.