

Mr M Maynard
41 Liverpool Avenue
Ainsdale
Southport
PR8 3NP
(by email)

2nd December 2022

Dear Martin

Appeal against CoM's decision to dismiss the complaint v Mr A Wood

The Committee of Management acknowledges the lodging of an appeal against the decision to dismiss the complaint made against Mr A Wood, which was received on 27th November 2022 and circulated to CoM upon receipt.

There are only three principles which can lead to the granting of an appeal by a member. Firstly, that the investigative process was not carried out in accordance with that specified; secondly that information given was deliberately misleading and thirdly that the RAYNET Rules were infringed in any way.

The dispute was referred to the Committee of Management by the Zone 10 co-ordinator and the decision reached during a meeting at which all but one Zonal Co-ordinator was present. In line with the process set out to manage this complaint, the information offered by both parties to substantiate the complaint/rebuttal was reviewed by the Committee of Management and the decision reached was unanimous. The Chairman, CEO and ZC10 chose to abstain.

The Zone 10 co-ordinator's document was written as a means of assisting CoM members to focus on the important and relevant aspects of the complaint, in order to reach a sound decision, and was adjudged to be a fair and balanced synopsis of the situation.

On the third point – that the RAYNET Rules were infringed –

- The case did not involve a refusal of membership (RAYNET Rule 6.1.a)
- The decision made by CoM did not give a warning or reprimand, and purely advised both parties to resolve the matter amicably (RAYNET Rule 6.1.b)

Furthermore, the Committee of Management did not move to recommend your removal from the membership on the grounds that, in their opinion, your continued membership would be harmful to the Company; nor did it issue a warning or reprimand, either verbally or in writing, as required under the Disciplinary and Grievance procedure and also with reference to Item 11 of the Articles of Association.

- Your membership was not suspended or terminated by CoM under Article 10 (RAYNET Rule 6.1.c)
- Your membership was not suspended or terminated by a group controller under Article 13 (RAYNET Rule 6.1.d)
- Your membership was not suspended or terminated by a county/area controller under Article 16 (RAYNET Rule 6.1.e)
- CoM has not withheld permission to establish a new group under Article 13 (RAYNET Rule 6.1.f)
- CoM has not withdrawn or withheld approval for the name, area or scope of a Group or the County/Area under 13.a in the Articles of Association.

Having considered the content of the submitted document, there are no grounds upon which to invoke an appeals panel in this instance, as the submission does not constitute an appeal against an infringement of the RAYNET Rules or incorrect procedure, but is yet another rebuttal of the evidence already investigated as part of the original complaint.

You do not therefore have the right to appeal against CoM's decision simply because it did not find in your favour. It must be proved that the RAYNET Rules have been infringed, or that the procedure was incorrect.

CoM also noted that your original submission included a statement that, should a decision not be made in your favour, you would tender your resignation from RAYNET.

The matter is now closed, the appeal has been denied, and no further communication will be acknowledged or acted upon.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "CM Clark". The letters are cursive and somewhat stylized.

Chairman/Company Secretary