

EXHIBIT C

Process Clarifications 1/10/24, 12:01 am MST:

Greetings,

I'm sending this email to pass along information about the upcoming Women's Council.

Date and Time: This Sunday, January 14, 2024 @ 8:00 am

I will send you an invite on ZOOM on Saturday.

Also, I fielded several questions about the email I sent out last Friday with the three reports, so I will address a few of your questions here in this email. If you have any more questions, we will talk about them on Sunday during our Zoom call.

The first question is, will [MIQ] speak at the Council or participate in any way?

No.

Does [MIQ] know about the Council?

Yes. [MIQ] has been aware for several weeks that the Council is taking place soon. After learning that a Council had been scheduled based on events that transpired in the UK, he informed Kyle Walters that he planned to write a statement containing his side of the story and send it to Kyle. However, as of this writing, Kyle has not received anything from [MIQ].

Are we required to allow the accused to speak to the Council and call witnesses on their behalf?

No.

I realize that the answer may surprise some of you who have participated in other Women's Councils, so let me explain how Jennifer [Bowler] and I came to that conclusion.

The short of it is that when I began researching the procedure for a Women's Council to learn how it is done (since I have never participated in one), I noticed two sets of guidelines exist. Within those two sets, I found several discrepancies in how they direct a Council's procedures. The first set of guidelines was given in a 2014 talk by Denver and recorded in *Preserving the Restoration*, published in 2015. The second set of guidelines is found in T & C 157:57 & 175:32 as recorded in the RE scriptures after being voted on and accepted in 2017 at the Covenant Conference.

In *Preserving the Restoration*, pg. 510-511, this is the counsel:

“Sustaining is by women, and removing authority to act within a community or fellowship is likewise to be done by the vote of women. If a man’s worthiness to function is called into question, then a conference can be convened to deal with the question. **In removing authority,**

at least two witnesses should speak against the accused, and he should be allowed to speak on his behalf and call upon such witnesses as he chooses. Men can be witnesses, but only women are allowed to vote. Removal should be by unanimous vote* of the women present, with at least 12 votes against a man to end his authority to act in the fellowship community. As for his family, he is free to do as he chooses, but he cannot act in the community until restored by the vote of a conference of that community (emphasis is mine).

In T&C 157:57, these are the guidelines:

“...I have told you that to remove authority to use priesthood outside a man’s family requires a unanimous decision by twelve women. A council of twelve women must be convened, either in the man’s home fellowship among those who are acquainted with his daily walk, or in private at a general conference, also including among the twelve women from the conference those who are acquainted with his daily walk, so that no injustice results.” (Also recorded in T&C 175:32)

As you can see, the discrepancy is that in the T&C 157:57 & 175:32, there is no provision for the man to speak on his behalf or call upon such witnesses as he chooses.

After pondering this for several days and discussing it with other women on the council, we concluded that T&C 157:57 & 175:32 best represent the official position of the Lord on this matter for two reasons. First, that was the set of guidelines selected to be included in the T&C by the scripture committee, in that form, meaning without the provision of the accused being allowed to speak on his behalf and call upon witnesses of his choosing. And second, that was the version that was presented to the Lord for acceptance and to the people for a vote. That vote was taken, and the Lord accepted it as scripture in 2017, two years after *Preserving the Restoration* was published. That is how we decided that the Women's Council would proceed based on the parameters in T&C 157:57.

After reaching that conclusion, I felt that one more step might be helpful. That step was to reach out to Denver via email to point out the discrepancy we encountered and then explain that we planned to proceed according to T&C 157:57 based on the reasons I laid out above. So, I sent him an email on Thursday, December 28, explaining our conclusions and how we got there, and then asked him to please respond to my email if he felt that we would be amiss by proceeding according to the guidelines in T&C 157:57. As of this writing, I have received no response.

Additionally, there are other procedural points that we have adopted in the interest of being fair and balanced to all parties.

One is that [the wife] is not being called as a witness, nor was she invited to be on the Council. And neither was she asked to write a statement. We have intentionally kept her out of the loop concerning this Women's Council. If [the wife] were invited or allowed to participate in person or by providing a written statement, fairness would require us to include the same from [MIQ]. And as stated, we had determined that [MIQ] would not participate.

The evidence that will be considered by the members of this Women's Council is what you have read in the three reports, which are based on multiple eyewitness accounts of the events in question and do not rely on "he said/she said," speculation, or conjecture. The six people mentioned directly in the reports (including myself) have been very close friends and ardent supporters of [MIQ] for years and, in some cases, nearly a decade. I speak for all of us when I say we have enjoyed his friendship and sincerely wish that none of this had happened. The bottom line is that none of us have an ax to grind against [MIQ] and are not seeking to malign him in any way.

Lastly, some of you have expressed a concern that perhaps this is a "marriage issue" between [MIQ] and [his wife] as husband and wife and, therefore, should stay between them. Unfortunately, though it may have started that way, it quickly grew into a "group problem" that we as a group were forced to deal with when [MIQ] sent a group text to 16 other people he hand-picked to serve as an audience (without [his wife's] inclusion or knowledge) for which he could publicly _____ and _____ his wife and her character while at the same time inferring wrong-doing and _____ activity by his friends who sought only to help his wife whom he had placed in a precarious position _____. When asked to retreat from his very _____ stance against her and the entire group, he chose to double down and defend his unwarranted and _____ actions, taking no responsibility for them.

I hope this has helped answer some of your questions and concerns.

Please be sure to look for the ZOOM invite on or before Saturday.

And for any who would like to participate in a group fast, I plan to begin a fast on Saturday afternoon and conclude it after the council adjourns on Sunday.

Again, thank you for taking the time to consider these weighty matters,

Amberli