JUDGE STEVEN S. WEISMAN
THE SUPERIOR COURT
(RETIRED)

SUITE 955 WEST TOWER

9100 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIFORNIA 90212

TELEPHONE (213) 274-8902

January 18, 1979

VIA AIR EXPRESS

Mr. Herbert W. Armstrong 7845 Calle de la Escarpa Tucson. Arizona 85715

Dear Mr. Armstrong:

Apparently there has been some confusion and misunderstanding about the purpose of the Los Angeles Superior Court proceedings in the Order appointing me as a Receiver. Please let me assure you that it is not the purpose of the Court Order, nor my purpose as Receiver, to interfere in any way with the ecclesiastical functions of the Church. As you will note in the language used by the Judge, the receivership is concerned exclusively with the financial and business affairs of the Church. The ecclesiastical affairs of the Church will continue to be controlled and directed by the Church's duly authorized ecclesiastical authorities. There have been allegations of misfeasance and neglect concerning the financial and business affairs of the Church, and it is my duty as a Receiver, as authorized by the Court, to conduct an audit of the financial and business dealings of the Church.

You will note that the Court was careful to notify all concerned that if there is any misunderstanding or dispute between the Receiver and ecclesiastical authorities as to whether or not a particular matter is in fact ecclesiastical in nature, the Court has provided procedure for resolution of any such misunderstanding or dispute by the Court.

I am writing this letter hoping that whatever problems there may be, may be resolved in a spirit of cooperation for all concerned. If it is not possible for you, for any reason, to come to Los Angeles, I would be glad to meet with you at your headquarters and/or home in Tucson, subject to our mutual convenience. So there will be no misunderstanding with respect to the Court's Order and comments, I have enclosed a copy of pages 392 to 413 of the transcript of the Court proceeding.

Very truly yours,

Judge Steven S. Weisman

Receiver SSW/kei

Enclosures

cc: See attached sheet

cc: Lawrence R. Tapper, Deputy Attorney General of
the State of California
Hillel Chodos, Esq.
Cohn and Lifland
Allan Browne, Esq. of Ervin, Cohen and Jessup
All Ministers of the Worldwide Church of God

Now the court is fully aware of the potential damage which has been argued very ably by Mr. Browne, the damage which might accrue to the church if the operations were brought to a halt or seriously interrupted by the appointment of a receiver and by injunctive means. And, of course, I have to do the best I can to balance this threat against what the plaintiff contends will be irreparable damage if this situation is permitted to continue.

I do note in that regard that while I think it is perfectly clear that there was some immediate and serious damage to the church when the receiver was first appointed, it seems to have geared up again. The computers are now operating again, and as I understand it, the operation is now presently back and it is operating -- maybe not as efficiently as before because of the confusion caused by the receivership -- but nevertheless it is operating.

Now, bearing all of these considerations in mind, and bearing in mind the history of what has occurred since the receiver was appointed, I am going to make the following orders in the matter:

Firstly, all prior orders regarding the appointment of the receiver and any restraining orders are vacated and dissolved.

Secondly, Judge Steven S. Weisman -- under the assumption that he accepts the appointment -- is appointed as receiver pendente lite in the matter of the three corporate defendants to carry out the duties which will be specified in this order.

The three corporations -- rather than name them each individually as we deal with this problem -- will be just referred to by me as the church, generally.

Now, the receiver is to take possession and control of the church, including all of its assets, both real and personal, tangible and intangible, of every kind and description, except as I otherwise provide in the order.

Now, in spite of this order of possession, it is the further order of the court that all the authorized employees of the church shall be permitted to continue to carry out their duties and to continue all activities and operations of the church.

The receiver nevertheless shall have the right and power to supervise and monitor all of the business and financial operations and activities of the church; however, he shall not interfere therein, unless he determines in his sound discretion that such interference is necessary to avoid damage or loss to the church of any kind.

Now if he so determines, he shall then have the right to take over the management and control to the extent that he deems it necessary in his sole discretion.

Now the receiver is also empowered to hire and employ and retain his own counsel, accountants and any other personnel employees which he deems necessary to assist him in the discharge of his duties under this order.

He is authorized to pay to them reasonable compensation out of the funds and assets of the church, subject to the supervision of this court as it is needed and as hereafter

provided.

Also except as otherwise provided in the order, with reference to Messrs. Armstrong and Rader, the receiver is authorized to suspend or terminate any employee, officer or agent of the church in his sole discretion as he deems necessary. That will be subject, however, to any contractual employment rights which the suspended or terminated employee or party may have.

And he shall also have the right to direct that any such officer or employee or agent not be permitted access to the grounds or facilities of the church from and after the date of that termination or suspension.

Now it is not the purpose of this court nor the intention of this court to allow the receiver to interfere in any way with ecclesiastical functions of the church, as distinguished from the college or the foundation, and the receiver is ordered not to do so.

This receivership will concern itself exclusively with the financial and business affairs of the church.

The ecclesiastical affairs of the church will continue to be controlled and directed by its duly authorized ecclesiastical authorities, notwithstanding the authority of the receiver to terminate or suspend persons from employment as already ordered.

Such termination or suspension from employment shall in no way affect the membership or standing in the church.

Now, in the event that any dispute arises between the receiver and the ecclesiastical authorities of the church over whether or not a particular matter is, in fact, ecclesiastical in nature, those authorities are authorized to employ counsel to apply to this court for a resolution of that dispute, and that dispute will be resolved by the court.

Any such counsel so employed may thereafter apply for reasonable compensation from the church funds to the court, and the court will make an order for reasonable attorney's fees, if they are justified under the circumstances.

Now regarding the books and records. The receiver shall have possession and control of all the books and records of the church, but those books and records shall be made available for the use of the employees of the church in the carrying out of all their duties.

Those books and records shall also be made available to the representatives of the plaintiffs,

for use in preparing for the trial in this action.

I have already indicated, I believe, that while the receiver only has the right to supervise and monitor the business and financial operations, and shall not interfere unless he deems it necessary, that he shall have the right to interfere if he does determine in his own discretion that it is necessary to interfere. And to that extent he will have the right and it is so ordered that he has the right to take over any portion of that operation he deems necessary in order to protect the church and its essets.

Now Messrs. Armstrong and Rader will be permitted to continue in their prior functions as representatives and authorities of the church, unless and until they are, either of them, removed by proper action of the church, pursuant to the laws and the articles and bylaws of the church, or unless they are removed by further order of the court pursuant to an application on the part of the receiver.

Now if the receiver deems it necessary at any time hereafter pending the trial to move the court to remove either Mr. Armstrong or Mr. Rader or both, the receiver may file a petition with the court on notice to the defendants, and the court will hear the matter and make a determination on that issue.

However, subject to their rights under the existing employment contracts which they have -- that is which Messrs. Armstrong and Rader have -- to the

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

extent that those rights may be hereafter determined by the court, their compensation for services and any expenses that are incurred by them during the course of that employment, shall only be in such amounts as may be determined by the receiver in his discretion from time to time.

The receiver is authorized to conduct a thorough audit of the financial and business dealings of the church, and to commence that audit forthwith. And he shall have the right to compensate his professional assistants in regard to that audit out of the church treasury, and it shall all be subject to supervision of the court as hereinafter provided.

The receiver is also to review all allegations of malfeasance and neglect concerning the financial and business affairs of the church, and to apply to the court where appropriate for leave on behalf of the church for any relief which may be necessary.

Now anything that I have said to the contrary, it shall not be necessary initially for the receiver to take possession of, nor to deposit in any special receiver's account, the funds of the church now or hereafter received by the church; but the receiver shall supervise the deposits and disbursements of the funds by the church in accordance with this order.

The funds of the church shall continue to be handled by its employees in the same manner and with the same bookkeeping, accounting and disbursement procedures

26 27 28

as were in effect at the time of the commencement of the ex parte receivership, subject to the supervision of the receiver. But in any event, the receiver in his discretion shall have the right at any time by notification to the court and the defendants to take possession and control of the funds of the church forthwith, and deposit them in a special receiver's account, if he deems it necessary. That will be something completely in the discretion of the receiver.

Now, until there has been a final disposition of this matter by trial and an order of the trial court, the defendants and each of them and all of their agents, employees and all persons acting in concert with them are hereby enjoined and restrained from interfering with or obstructing the receiver in the discharge of his duties, or from withholding from him any of the assets, properties, books, or records of the church; and they are further enjoined and restrained from selling, mortgaging, encumbering, or otherwise disposing of any of the assets of the church or its associated corporations.

Notwithstanding this injunction that I have just referred to, however, based upon the appraisal of the Big Sandy campus of Ambassador College at Big Sandy, Texas, as set forth in the declaration of Michael Wierwille of Valuation Research Corporation, of the sale of said real property for the sum of \$10.6 million as provided for in the pending escrow covering that sale shall be permitted to go forward to a conclusion of said sale.

1 2 3

Now it is the purpose and intention of the court under this order to secure the full cooperation of the church authorities and the employees with the receiver, and of the receiver with such authorities and employees to the end that the affairs of the church shall only be minimally interfered with until this action can be tried.

Now all the authorities and employees of the church are ordered to use reasonable efforts to extend that cooperation to the receiver.

The last thing -- I think I already referred to it in connection with the priority of this matter on the trial calendar, I referred to that, did I not?

All right, gentlemen, I am going to order counsel for the plaintiff to prepare an order in connection with my comments, and a copy to opposing counsel.

MR. CHODOS: May I ask a couple of questions, Your Honor.

I have heard your order, and I don't mean to argue the matter, but I have three things.

First of all in the matter with respect to Big
Sandy. I will have to concede that there has been no convincing
showing of an evidentiary nature as to the value of Big Sandy
versus the sales price.

On the other hand, Your Honor, no one other than Mr. Rader and Mr. Helge have inspected those papers, really.

THE COURT: Which papers?

MR. CHODOS: The Big Sandy transaction -- in other words, it hasn't really been fully presented here.

THE COURT: The purchase price is \$10.6 million.

MR. CHODOS: All I am suggesting, Your Monor, is that perhaps the court -- it is my understanding that the people are willing to wait a little while. In fact, there is a telegram here for that purpose.

THE COURT: You mean the buyers?

MR. CHODOS: Yes. All I ask is the receiver be given an opportunity in the next few days just to look at it, and if there is more there than we have been able to get from the outside, to bring it to the court's attention. That is all I

am really saying.

THE COURT: Is it anything but a cash sale, an unconditional cash sale?

MR. BROWNE: I believe it is, Your Honor. The point is we have these documents available for Mr. Chodos. He asked us to bring the Big Sandy file down to the court, and subpoensed it. And it has been here ever since the beginning.

It is subject to a binding contract of sale. The escrows have closed.

THE COURT: I will do this, gentlemen, but nothing further

I will give -- assuming that the documents are all

available at this time -- Are they, Mr. Browne?

MR. BROWNE: I don't know if we have them in this court this instant. We had them yesterday.

THE COURT: Well, all right. I think the receiver -How much time would you need to take a look at those documents,
Judge Weisman, to make certain there is no problem?

I am just making the assumption, frankly -- and perhaps I was wrong in that regard -- this is a cash transaction with no conditions attached, and when the escrow closes, \$10.6 million is to be handed to the sellers, less any possible escrow --

MR. CHODOS: Mr. Helge's telegram of January 5 says to
Mr. Turner, who is the lawyer for the buyers, attached to his
declaration, he says, "We ask that interest at the rate of
10 percent per annum on the balance of the purchase price of
10 percent -- on the balance of purchase price of \$10,100,000
shall be paid directly to Worldwide Church of God; said

interest shall be payable on biweekly installments, accruing from January 4, 1979, and payable until the close of escrow."

And I believe it is continuing to February 27.

If the receiver could have a few days just to examine that.

THE COURT: Judge, how much time --

MR. CLEMENS: May it please the court, I am Michael Clemens, the attorney for the receiver.

I believe it would it be quite unreasonable, Your Honor, for you to put an onus on Judge Weisman, the receiver in this matter, to allow him three days to -- Oh, I assume that what Your Honor and what Mr. Chodos is trying to get at is whether or not this is a fair sale, and I don't believe it is possible to determine that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't know why not. All you have to do is read the instructions.

What is so difficult about that, counsel?

MR. CLEMENS: Except --

THE COURT: You can read them in three days.

MR. CLEMENS: We can read them in three days, Your Honor, but none of the people whose documents are in there have been retained by Judge Weisman for the specific purpose of making an appraisal of the property.

THE COURT: I don't think it has to be appraised again. This is an appraisal that was filed from a very reputable appraisal concern, and I am not even suggesting that you go to the expense of another appraisal.

5

MR. CLEMENS: If it is just for Judge Weisman to determine what is in the documents, and to see that the appraisal states what it is supposed to represent, there is no problem of that, sir.

THE COURT: I will do this. Since it doesn't close until February --

MR. CHODOS: February 27.

THE COURT: All right. In that case, there is no urgency. I am going to give the receiver ten days within which to examine the documents and the transaction, and unless he files a motion with the court within that ten-day period opposing the sale because of some basis that I don't know about at this time, I will assume the sale will go forward.

Is that satisfactory?

MR. CLEMENS: There is one further thing, Your Honor, on the powers of the receiver, as long as I am standing. When we talk about the receiver having control and monitoring and supervision of the finances, is there any procedure that we can have right now, guidelines, Your Honor, insofar as check writing to a certain amount, that if the check is about \$500 or \$1,000, that the receiver must affix his initials thereon.

THE COURT: No. I think I am going to permit the church to operate on its own. The receiver does have the right to monitor, and to the extent he needs personnel to do that, why he should employ them. And if there is any question about any of those transactions, he can

question them and he can stop any expenditures under my order until it is resolved.

Is there something else you wanted to add,
Mr. Browne?

MR. BROWNE: I have three questions, when the court is available.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWNE: Your Honor, a clarification. You said that possession, control of books and records are with the receiver, and indicated that the plaintiffs' representatives are to have access to those materials, as I recall.

THE COURT: That is correct.

MR. BROWNE: Now, Your Honor, I am faced with a practical difficulty in that order, in the sense that this was precisely the problem we had when the receiver first came into office.

It seems to me that we -- my client should be given an opportunity to object to the use of any documents based upon constitutional privileges.

THE COURT: What privileges?

MR. BROWNE: Well, let's assume that an attorney wrote a letter, confidential letter, an attorney-client letter to the church or to one of the employees, or that some of the records that were taken, Your Honor, may pertain to this. They were taken from the desks, filing cabinets. There may be personal letters from Mr. Rader to a relative.

2

3

6

5

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

20

19

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

Now is that something that is the subject of --

I can't rule on all those matters, THE COURT: can I, counsel?

Here is what I am asking for, Your MR. BROWNE: Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

I am asking for an order that before MR. BROWNE: access is granted, that the normal rules of discovery apply.

THE COURT: I am not getting into any discovery rules in this matter, Mr. Browne. We will start all over again if you attempt to assert that kind of a right.

MR. BROWNE: What I am suggesting, Your Honor, That if the Attorney General wishes to inspect is this: all books and records of the corporation, as a category, it seems to me that a subpoena re deposition to the receiver

THE COURT: I am not going into any proceedings with subpoenas. He has the right to inspect those records.

Now as to any particular record which you feel he shouldn't inspect, you can consult with the Attorney General, you take it up with him and see if you can't resolve it. If you can't, you come in on a motion and I will resolve it.

I will not get into discovery now between the receiver and the church. That would be completely preposterous as far as I am concerned.

5

7

8

6

9

10

11

13

12

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

22

25

24

26

27

28

MR. BROWNE: May I suggest a problem. On Monday morning, the Attorney General comes in and says, "We want to look at that filing cabinet over there." Now, I haven't looked at the filing cabinet myself. I don't know what is in there.

How can I assert any objection if I don't know what is in there?

If I give you the right to go through THE COURT: all the records before they go through them, this will grind to a halt, and I will not do it, Mr. Browne.

MR. BROWNE: So the Attorney General need only ask the receiver to open up whatever he has?

The same as you can do; you have the THE COURT: same rights.

MR. BROWNE: Well --

THE COURT: You are counsel for the church, presumably, and you are counsel for the other defendants. You have the same rights to the documents as the Attorney General does.

That was not covered, Your Honor, MR. BROWNE: I think in your order. That is what troubled me. You mentioned the plaintiffs' representatives had access to those documents, but there was no mention in that --

THE COURT: That is not correct. I said the defendants will have the full use of the documents, the church, which includes the defendants; does it not?

MR. BROWNE: Thatdoes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. They have full access

to the use of the records.

Do you have some comments you wish to make, Judge Weisman?

JUDGE WEISMAN: Yes, I would like to make a statement, if I can.

I am willing to live with that order, and I am willing to cooperate with Mr. Rader, and I hope it is a two-way street.

However, I would like some clarification as to what happens if I tell Mr. Rader I don't think this action ought to be taken, and I am going to apply to the court --

THE COURT: I don't think you have to apply to the court in every instance now. I have given you full discretion.

JUDGE WEISMAN: All right.

THE COURT: What I have done essentially here -as I would summarize it, Judge -- is to provide that
the management of the day-to-day affairs of the church
are to be conducted by their employees, subject to your
monitoring and your supervision.

If you determine something is out of order, out of line, you are entitled to take over on that, and it is your decision which you will control.

JUDGE WEISMAN: The burden is on the other side to come into court?

THE COURT: As far as I am concerned, I am leaving it up to you. I am inviting no one to come into court

2 3

5 6

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

with respect to those issues.

MR. CHODOS: Is that true that the Judge has discretion also if Mr. Rader --

THE COURT: You mean Judge Weisman?

That Judge Weisman has discretion MR. CHODOS: if he feels that Mr. Rader is not conducting himself properly to suspend him from his duties, as opposed to his pay, and have Mr. Rader come into the court to talk about it?

That is one instance which I indicated that if there is a desire to suspend Mr. Rader or Mr. Armstrong that is the one matter which they may make a motion with the court.

MR. CHODOS: What happens in the interim?

THE COURT: I don't know what happens in the interim. You get in here in a hurry.

MR. CHODOS: Very well.

I don't think anything can be that THE COURT: crucial that you couldn't get into court. Come down informally and discuss it with me if you have to, with notice to other counsel.

Yes, sir?

MR. BROWNE: Your Honor, two other points. I mentioned I had three.

Would the court be willing to make an order to preserve the confidentiality of whatever records are in the possession of the receiver?

I think during this investigatory period,

it is extremely important, for example, that the records remain in the possession of the receiver, and that if the Attorney General wishes to review them, that the Attorney General or its representatives be permitted to do so; but that, for example -- and also the parties themselves -- the relators, for example, that they not be given access to those documents, because those particular people -- and I think the record is clear on this, at least there is conflict on it and I think an inference can be drawn -- do not have the best interests of the church at heart insofar as the ecclesiastical nature of it is concerned.

THE COURT: They would argue with you on that, wouldn't they?

MR. BROWNE: They might. But, Your Honor, we are talking about a very delicate subject here, and, you know, we are talking about --

MR. CHODOS: I can save counsel the trouble. My relators, Your Honor, have completed their function. For all practical purposes, they are no longer in this case. I don't go over the documents with them. This is a matter for the Attorney General. They are not parties to this lawsuit, and the Attorney General has no interest in religious factions, and neither do I.

THE COURT: Do you wish to be heard?

MR. TAPPER: Yes, please. We are not talking about religious documents; we are talking about financial records.

I have had some experience in how to conduct an investigation.

There is no way that we can conduct a proper investigation if we were to be given access to a record but we can't check the record by talking to somebody to see if the transaction occurred the way the record claims the transaction occurred.

I do not wish to see us crippled in the way Mr. Browne is suggesting.

THE COURT: I don't know what Mr. Browne has in mind, to be honest with you.

MR. TAPPER: He is saying he doesn't want to show these records to anybody, and particularly to the relators, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't think it would be inappropriate to make an order to the effect you may show it to anyone who has a reasonable interest in it, who has a right to be concerned, and not to any strangers to the transaction.

MR. TAPPER: Your Honor, we certainly conduct our investigations with discretion.

THE COURT: I think you are raising an issue which is not an issue, Mr. Browne.

You have the cooperation of the Attorney General in that regard. They are not going to disclose these documents to anyone unless it is someone who has a reasonable interest in the documents and is connected in some way with the

1

transaction.

MR. BROWNE: Could we have an order along the lines if they are going to disclose those documents to anyone outside of the Attorney General staff people working for them --

THE COURT: No, sir, I won't get into that.

MR. BROWNE: May I finish?

THE COURT: I know what you have in mind. I am not getting into that.

MR. BROWNE: I would like some notice, Your Honor, give us five days notice that they are going to have those records shown to these people.

THE COURT: I don't think it is necessary, Mr. Browne, and it is unduly hampering and creating more paperwork. This is going to be a mountain of paper as it is. We already have so many lawyers involved here that it is really unbelievable. I am not going to get into any more legal activity than is required.

I don't think that is reasonably necessary. Your motion is denied.

Mr. Browne has one more matter.

MR. BROWNE: Your Honor, I would like to request a stay order for a reasonable period of time for us to get the transcript and take appropriate relief up to the State court of appeal also to the federal court.

THE COURT: That is denied, counsel. This has to be moved along.

I don't know how much time you have in mind.

MR. BROWNE: If I could get the transcript tomorrow, a

3

6

5

9

10 11

13

12

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27

28

stay order until Tuesday would be fine. I am ready to work as much as necessary to get this thing heard.

THE COURT: That is denied. We have given this a full -really as full a hearing as possible, under the circumstances.

Counsel, I have made my ruling. I think they are entitled to go ahead to protect what I believe should be protected here.

You take whatever remedies you may deem necessary at this time. You have all your remedies.

MR. BROWNE: Could we ask about how long it would take to get the reporters' transcript of it?

THE COURT: Address that question to the reporter.

MR. BROWNE: Is there a way to expedite it? We would like to be in the federal court and state court on Monday morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You make your arrangements with the reporter. I think you might be able to make some arrangements. Talk to her about it. You may be able to get it expedited. Have somebody work on the weekend. Whatever, take it up with her.

MR. CLEMENS: One final clarification regarding the receivership. He does have the checking account now in the receivership's name as trust account, and in the amount of \$50,000.

What is the disposition of that, according to Your Honor's order?

THE COURT: Didn't I already make an order in that regard? If it is not clear, I will make an order then.

That is to continue in the same way, and you may

use that account for whatever purpose you may deem necessary.

Replenish it as reasonably as is necessary to carry out your duties.

Anything further, gentlemen? Very well.

(At 3:30 p.m. the proceedings were concluded.)

--00o--