Judicial Committee
Beemleigh Congregation
April 23, 1990.

Dear Brothers,

In reply to your letter concerning the application for reinstatement, the following information should prove most helpful. In June, July 1989, a Judicial Committee was formed to consider the situation. In time facts showed he had become unscripturally involved with a married sister, Sister REDACTED, to the extent of spending intimate time and involvement with her, much to the detriment of his family. REDACTED separated from his wife and family on the pretext of supposed threatened physical violence and while we believe a problem exists in this regard, he certainly did not have any scripturally based grounds to do so. In time, this demonstrated an initial move to an ulterior motive, i.e., further involvement with a married sister, REDACTED, married in view while she, in turn, intended to divorce her husband, REDACTED, who in turn, had intentions of marrying his eldest daughter, REDACTED, with the approval of REDACTED himself!

Involvement with REDACTED also continued into another congregation, North Cairns, and the elders there too counselled REDACTED relationship with REDACTED. Despite our efforts and counsel along with North Cairns, he chose to ignore Jehovah's standards feeling justified that driving alone with REDACTED at all hours of the night on the pretext of business, to towns hours away etc., did not constitute any wrong. He attempted to twist related information from the publications each time we met with him. They continued meeting alone, even to 2 a.m. and indeed 4.30 a.m. During this time, he admitted to discussing the possibility of marriage and intimate details of a sexual nature when married.

By the series of events, REDACTED motives became apparent, i.e., of deliberate scheming to exclude his wife REDACTED and marry REDACTED. Too, his absolute disregard of Jehovah's standards and his total rejection of counsel from this Committee and the Cairns body of Elders emphasized his TOTAL DISRESPECT of theocratic authority. REDACTED deliberately withheld information and willfully lied throughout our meetings with him.

The Judicial Committee then took the decision to disfellowship on the serious charges of 1) LOOSE CONDUCT
2) LYING

Brothers, we stress again deliberate scheming and his unrepentant attitude. REDACTED appealed the decision. Through our Circuit Overseer, Brother M. Fernam, an Appeals Committee was formed of elders...
not of this congregation. After extensive deliberation they supported
the original decision to disfellowship on the same grounds.
Furthermore, additional charges were brought i.e. sexually molesting
his 2 eldest daughters the most recent occasion being in September
1988 of his 2nd daughter . It was found that he had developed
a warped sexual appetite and mentality that led to the degrading
and abominable practice of sexually abusing his own children.

The Appeals Committee on these grounds, added the following gross
sins: PORNEIA
- MALICIOUS SLANDER

to the original charges. It should be noted that when told of the findings and her scriptural grounds for divorce
due to Porneia, did not wish to do so but desired to return
to consolidate their marriage, and assume his responsibilities.
He has not done so. Instead, he has expressed his plans for
divorce regardless. He had raised certain allegations about his
wife's fidelity, that she has committed adultery, thus providing his
scriptural grounds to divorce her. He has absolutely NO GROUNDS to
proceed. It was on this that the Appeals Committee brought MALICIOUS
SLANDER. He has been advised that if he proceeds to remarry, he
faces the consequences as an adulterer. It would appear that both
and being in close proximity again, may have that
intention. on the other hand, does have grounds to divorce
her husband, on a technical point.

Therefore, brothers, we firmly believe his application for reinstatement
be rejected and extreme caution exercised to any claims of
repentance at this stage. With Jehovah's interests at heart and
the spiritual condition of his congregation to protect, we feel
his deviousness in the past and his actions to date to not right
the wrongs committed and continue his divorce action has not shown
works befitting repentance! He is conducting himself unscripturally
still in that both he and appear to be 'confused' or 'vague'
as to the circumstances—apparently he and perhaps she, still intend
to gain approval to their purpose. This certainly fits the original
pattern with us.

We apologize for the delay to your inquiries about . We pray
these details will assist you in your decision on the matter.

Your Brothers

R. deROOY (chairman) D. ALL