

**Extract from analysis of the connexional panel's final report –  
submitted to Church House by Peter Timms on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2017**

Limitation on submissions.

Lines 133ff 173 – 177 “The complainant sent to the team three  
unsolicited bundles of documents..”

219ff.

“These papers were inappropriately long”

The other half of the truth:

The above lines suggest that there was no procedure for the  
introduction of the documents – and that there was a limit on the  
length of any such contributions.

As far as I can determine, Standing Orders contain no limit or  
guidance on how many supplementary complaints can be added to an  
original complaint, nor any length to which such submissions must be  
limited.

Limitations were put onto my submissions, both verbal and on paper.  
This, in my mind, was not in accordance with Standing Orders.

I am not aware of any such limitations in Standing Orders

The documents were prepared for a meeting in January 2017 ( see  
above) That they were finished in time for the December date is purely  
by chance. It was the panel who moved the date from January to  
December.

**XI**

The half truth:

Line 228:

“it was specified that these responses should be no more than on  
half of a side of A4 in 12 point font for each question. The complainant  
had not addressed these questions and had not observed the brevity  
requested.

The other half of the truth:

The letter was sent on 24<sup>th</sup> November. It included eight questions  
which I have dealt with in the addendum 3 to the set aside motion.

However, it no longer gave me the option of presenting my case – whether on three separate pages of A4 or within a ten minutes speech.

I was now restricted simply to answering the eight questions.

## XII

### The half truth:

Line 269 : The complainant refused to sign the undertaking. This did not disadvantage him as there were no new documents which could have been provided.”

### The other half of the truth:

This is not really a half-truth, for it is completely untrue.

At line 205 the panel list a document they considered, being a letter to them from Rev Ian Wales. I was never given that document – I did not even know of its existence. I can make no comment on it because I have not seen its content. I was therefore disadvantaged by the action of refusing to show me further documents.