

DRAFT 2/10/2010

**Answering the Chesapeake Presbytery's (CP)
Judicial Commission's Report Referencing
My Complaint Against Severna Park Evangelical
Presbyterianism Church (SPEP)**

A dog barks when his master is attacked. I would be a coward if I saw that God's truth is attacked and yet would remain silent. - John Calvin

On November 29, 2008 Michael McNeil made a [complaint to the Session at SPEP about Sarah McNeil filing for divorce for unjust reasons and for various other actions she has done](#). Since, then multiple complaints have been filed with the church, and now the issue is before the Presbyterian Church in America's (PCA) General Assembly (GA), and is being adjudicated by a panel of the Standing Judicial Commission (SJC).

What follows here after is a **work in progress** as to Michael McNeil's response to the [CP Judicial Commission Report](#), which was ratified on September 19, 2009 by member of CP. Again, please realize that this is a work in progress and is not complete, therefore it is recommended to the reader to withhold their judgment until the author has stated that he is done with his response. This information is provided so that the church will be made aware of the directions that the CP goes, and as a fulfillment of my duty to God and his people so that the Church may be edified and be made pure.

1 Summary of the Facts:

1.1 Is Michael McNeil under church discipline?

According to the ratified CP's Commission report, the main reason why SPEP did not have to really consider Michael McNeil's complaint was that they considered him to be under discipline, and therefore they did not error in denying his complaints. However, though in this report states that Michael McNeil is under discipline, CP has reversed its position, and even SPEP itself has reversed its position stating that Michael McNeil is not under discipline. However, in the end, it matters what CP and SPEP do, not what they say. They have continued to treat Michael McNeil as being under discipline even though they state that he isn't.

1.1.1 From CP's Report:

Sarah P. McNeil, member in good standing at Severna Park Evangelical Presbyterian Church, and wife of Michael A. McNeil, Complainant, who is also a member of Severna Park Evangelical Presbyterian Church and under discipline, filed a "COMPLAINT FOR LIMITED DIVORCE" with the civil court on November 13, 2008. On this same day, the Session of Severna Park Evangelical Presbyterian Church (PCA), Respondent, found the Complainant guilty of 'abusive, selfish, and controlling behavior against his wife and children' at the end of a trial that lasted several months. The Complainant was

DRAFT 2/10/2010

inflicted with a censure of admonition, which was delivered to him at a meeting of the Respondent court on November 20, 2008. The judgment of the Respondent is currently under appeal with the Chesapeake Presbytery. The judgment and censure were in affect up until the appeal was filed with the presbytery on December 16, 2008.

1.1.2 Michael McNeil's Response:

First, it is interesting on how CP decided to word these opening statement. If a person was not paying attention, they might be led to believe that Michael McNeil was the one who file the “COMPLAINT FOR A LIMITED DIVORCE”.

Second, note, CP clearly states that Sarah McNeil is a member in good standing, while they state that Michael A. McNeil is under discipline, and was inflicted a censure. However, the since then, [Michael McNeil has complained to CP that he was not under discipline](#) by the mere fact that he had appealed the matter, and according to the PCA constitution he was to be granted an automatic stay on such discipline until the matter has been heard by the next higher court.

“BCO 42-6. Notice of appeal shall have the effect of suspending the judgment of the lower court until the case has been finally decided in the higher court. However, the court of original jurisdiction may, for sufficient reasons duly recorded, prevent the appellant from approaching the Lord’s Table, and if an officer, prevent him from exercising some or all his official functions, until the case is finally decided (cf. BCO 31-10; 33-3). This shall never be done in the way of censure.”

Therefore, logic would have it, that since Michael McNeil filed an appeal, that he was still to be considered in good standing. However, CP has not accepted Michael McNeil's point of view, but has instead come up with their own reason why Michael McNeil is still in “good standing” and not under any kind of censure or admonition. And CP apologized to Michael McNeil at the last stated meeting. However, Michael McNeil did not accept this apology, since CP had informed the GA and other that he was under discipline. The Moderator of CP stated that he would look into that issue, and see about remedying the issue if CP had indeed informed the GA of this. To this day, CP has not issued a formal apology, nor to Michael McNeil knowledge corrected their false statement to the GA, and they have failed to modify this report.

On December 15, 2009, CP held a called meeting to ratify the [CP Judicial Commission's report concerning Michael McNeil's appeal form SPEP's judgment](#). The Commission's Report was indeed ratified according to the Stated Clerk of CP. Oddly enough, on the last page, second from the last paragraph CP declares that Michael McNeil is not under discipline, and states that member of the court were in error in making these statements. However, they don't state that member of the court were in error in treating Michael McNeil as being under discipline. Nor does the Judicial Commission apologize to Michael McNeil for treating him as being under discipline in regards to this very report. Note, in CP's declaration, they stated that the Censor of Admonition was inappropriate and improper for the circumstances and not available to SPEP to administered, according to BCO 30-1.

“BCO 30-1. The censures, which may be inflicted by church courts, are admonition, suspension from the Sacraments, excommunication, suspension from office, and deposition from office. The censures of admonition

DRAFT 2/10/2010

or definite suspension from office shall be administered to an accused who, upon conviction, satisfies the court as to his repentance and makes such restitution as is appropriate. Such censure concludes the judicial process. The censures of indefinite suspension or excommunication shall be administered to an accused who, upon conviction, remains impenitent.”

Therefore, the CP Commission remands the whole issue for discipline back to SPEP. Since it is obvious that Michael McNeil has never agreed to SPEP's ruling. By doing this, CP has given SPEP the opportunity to fix its mistakes, and perhaps suspend Michael McNeil from the sacraments, or excommunicate him altogether.

However, notice, CP never comments on BCO 42-6. In CP's view, once a court has found you guilty of something, that verdict stands and all discipline is to remain in affect, even if a timely appeal is put forward. And while your appeal is pending, you do not have the same rights as all other member of the church, and if you complain to the GA about your appeal taking too long, they will simply send a note to the GA stating that you are under discipline and to not to listen to you. [See CP's Letter to the GA on August 8, 2009, paragraph 2b](#). Also, note, that CP in their efforts to prevent their unconstitutional practices from getting out, willfully misinformed the GA as to the status of the complaints, pretending that they are adjudicating the matter in accordance with the BCO, and that they are hearing the matter in a timely matter. I guess CP believes that taking almost a year to hear a matter is to be considered timely.

1.2 Did the SPEP know that Sarah McNeil had planned to file for divorce?

It's all about the timing and the fact that this did not happen in a vacuum, and the fact that wives of SPEP elders were deeply involved in Sarah McNeil's filing for a divorce. RE Chip Wilford's wife has been deeply involved in the process, so has RE Dave Wolfe. No one has denied this as being fact. Additionally, Sarah McNeil filed for a divorce on the same day that SPEP made a determination as to Michael McNeil's guilt. There is no doubt that there is a relationship between the two events, and there can be little doubt if not more than one elder at SPEP knew exactly what Sarah McNeil was doing. To believe otherwise is simply deciding to be ignorant. And for the elders of SPEP to go around and pretend they didn't know is just them promoting a lie.

1.2.1 From CP's Report:

On November 22, 2008 the Complainant informed TE Glenn Parkinson that Sarah P. McNeil had indeed filed a complaint against the Complainant in Howard County Circuit Court. The Complainant gave to the Respondent the docketing information that he found on the county court's web site as evidence. TE Parkinson, in turn, informed other members of the Respondent.

On November 24, 2008 TE Glenn Parkinson sent an email to the Complainant stating that “Sarah's action was not planned with the Session, and [that the Session] did not know about it.”

1.2.2 Michael McNeil's Response:

Notice how the commission specifically stated in brackets that the Session did not know about the fact

DRAFT 2/10/2010

Sarah was filing for a divorce. This would seem to imply that there were members of the Session that did know about it, but for some reason chose to not share with the rest of the SPEP Session. In any event, the facts speak for themselves. SPEP came to a guilty verdict on November 13, 2009, as stated in the trial minutes and they freely admitted to that during the hearing. Also, according to the trial minutes, they decided to inform her of the verdict. Also, it is well known that she had been working closely with two elders' wives, Mrs. Wilford, and Mrs. Wolfe. Mrs. Wilford is a lawyer, and has been giving Sarah McNeil legal advice through out her the whole situation. Mrs. Wolfe was the women's church councilor, who has spoken about a dislike for Michael McNeil. It is clear that though the whole SPEP Session may have not known all the detail, it is however equally clear that some did. And SPEP and CP are simply playing parliamentary tricks to avoid responsibility and accountability.

1.3 Meeting Agreed to on December 11, 2008. Mrs. McNeil requires that her lawyer be present for a counseling Session with the church?

1.3.1 From CP's Report:

On December 11, 2008 TE Glenn Parkinson contacted the Complainant and Sarah McNeil individually, requesting that they meet with the established Commission, for the expressed purpose of working toward reconciliation. TE Glenn Parkinson subsequently sent an email to both the Complainant and Mrs. McNeil, reiterating the same request. Both the Complainant and Mrs. McNeil agreed to such a meeting.

On the evening of December 11, 2008 the Complainant, Sarah McNeil, Elaine Wilford, RE Mark Good, RE Dave Reed, and TE Glenn Parkinson met at the SPEP Ministry Center. There was a brief discussion about Elaine Wilford's presence and the issue of confidentiality. Following this discussion, the Complainant objected to Mrs. Wilford's presence in the meeting. It was decided that the Commission would meet with the Complainant and Mrs. McNeil separately, with Mrs. Wilford present for the discussion with Mrs. McNeil.

1.3.2 Michael McNeil's Response:

It was quite evident from the begging that SPEP was in full support of the divorce. If they were not so, then why did they themselves not object to Sarah McNeil's demand that her attorney be present? After all, this meeting was supposed to be an ecclesiastical matter, and the PCA church demonstrates that lawyers should not be part of ecclesiastical matter, for BCO 32-19 clearly prohibits the use of lawyers in cases of process. One would think that this principle of not having lawyers be involved with church discipline would also hold true for trying to reconcile a marriage.

BCO 32-19. No professional counsel shall be permitted as such to appear and plead in cases of process in any court; but an accused person may, if he desires it, be represented before the Session by any communing member of the same particular church, or before any other court, by any member of that court. A member of the court so employed shall not be allowed to sit in judgment in the case.

DRAFT 2/10/2010

1.4 The Agreement or Lack Thereof

1.4.1 From CP's Report:

During the separately held meetings, Mrs. McNeil and Mrs. Wilford met with the Commission first. The Commission proposed a draft copy of an agreement that could be used to assist the Complainant and Mrs. McNeil in moving toward reconciliation. The Complainant agreed to try to work with the agreement, on condition that Mrs. McNeil withdraws her Complaint for Limited Divorce. Mrs. McNeil expressed willingness to withdraw her Complaint for Limited Divorce upon condition that the Complainant commits to the Agreement. The result was that neither party committed to the proposed Agreement.

1.4.2 Michael McNeil's Response:

This supposed agreement that that the commission put forward was just a simple outline with no meaning that could be widely interpreted. It had no meaning nor force, but would leave Michael McNeil open and would have been the source of even more disputes. In short, it was a farce attempt by elders of SPEP. Michael McNeil stressed that if the agreement didn't include the withdraw of the divorce complaint, that it would only have an overall negative affect. For if the agreement was meant to bring about reconciliation, the first thing that needed to stop was the attacks Sarah McNeil was making against him in civil court. Sarah McNeil had no intention on stopping her attacks, but instead was using the church to assist her in her law suite. It should be noted, that Sarah McNeil has continuously tried to get the transcripts of the ecclesiastical trial into the civil court arena. Michael McNeil was force to get a protection order from the church having to release these documents. It is clear, that Sarah McNeil from day one has been using the PCA ecclesiastical courts in order to obtain a better divorce settlement, and it is equally clear that various elders and their wives are in league with her to do this thing. And it is equally clear, that other elders of CP have also aligned themselves with Sarah McNeil on this matter to assist her in gaining an unfair settlement in a civil divorce proceedings.

An elder of CP even went out of his way to defame Michael McNeil just outside of the divorce court room in front of Sarah McNeil's lawyer. Additionally, another elder and his wife showed up to give Sarah McNeil emotional support and perhaps give testimony. The efforts that SPEP and CP have gone through to ensure that a divorce occurs is simply unheard of and is unprecedented.

2 Statement of Issues

2.1 From CP's Report

The following issues that must be adjudicated are before the Commission:

1. Did the Respondent err in not considering any presumption of guilt regarding the charges alleged by the Complainant on November 29, 2008 against Sarah P. McNeil, until the Complainant's judicial

DRAFT 2/10/2010

appeal regarding his church censure had been settled in the higher ecclesiastical courts (per letter from SPEP Session to Complainant-1/19/2009)?

2. Did the above alleged delinquency, if held to be true, promote sin to rule in the congregation of Severna Park Evangelical Presbyterian Church?
3. Is the allegation that Sarah P. McNeil attacked the Complainant on January 1, 2009 properly before this Judicial Commission?

2.2 Michael McNeil's Response

Notice how CP's Commission dodges the real issues at hand? They are ignoring the plain facts that Sarah McNeil has deserted her marriage to Michael McNeil and has filed for a divorce. In the eyes of CP, if a person is not in good standing, and if that person comes to church and if another member should take a bat to that person's car and destroy it, and then afterwards if that person should complain to the church about that member, CP will refused to hear charges from the owner of the car. They only listen to members in good standing.

So if you are a member of a church that is part of this presbytery, and they should find something about you, bring you up on charges, it is better to keep away from these churches. For any member of these churches can come up to you, and beat you, and do all sorts of terrible things to you, and elders in these churches will not lift one finger to help you. This is how they think, this is where their believe in God leads them.

One must ask, how are the courts of CP more righteous than the civil courts? Corinthians 6 instructs the believer not to take a matter to the civil courts but to the church to be adjudicated. Since the least of those in the church should are far better to settle matters between believers. However, these elders of CP have demonstrated that their judgments concerning this matter is far cry less righteous than any civil court could ever be. At least the civil court in the US would have said that the complaint against desertion is to be heard, and not to be dismissed outright because of any standing the the Plaintiff might have. And they wouldn't have dismissed the assault charge unless there was lack of evidence. But that would have been something for a trial to decide.

3 Judgment of The Court

3.1 From CP's Report

Regarding Issue # 1 above as to whether or not the Session of Severna Park Evangelical Presbyterian Church erred in not considering any presumption of guilt regarding the charges alleged by the

DRAFT 2/10/2010

Complainant on November 29, 2008 against Sarah P. McNeil, until the Complainant's judicial appeal regarding his church censure had been settled in the higher ecclesiastical courts, the Court hereby judges that the Session of Severna Park Evangelical Church did not err.

The court also finds that that Issue # 2 above is moot, since it was judged that the Respondent did not err with respect to Issue # 1.

Regarding Issue # 3 above, the Court hereby finds the allegation brought by the Complainant against Sarah P. McNeil is not properly before this court.

The Court hereby judges that the Complaint by Michael A. McNeil against the Session of Severna Park Evangelical Presbyterian Church is denied.

3.2 Michael McNeil's Response

One must asked why CP didn't just rule the whole complaint out of order since they believe that Michael McNeil is under censure? Why did they spend all this time? CP's position is clear. If your local Session find you to be guilty of something, then you better stop going to that church. For if you continue to go to that church, anyone in that church can beat you, rob you, and destroy your property, and the elders will just simply say, hey your not in good standing, don't expect any help from us. And yeah, we don't care if you appealed your ruling and what our church constitution says. And hey, if you appeal the matter to a higher court, you will still not be in good standing. Also, if you tell anybody about what we say, we will bring you up on more charges. We like to keep these abuses of our to ourselves.

4 Reasoning and Opinion

4.1 CP Attempt to Use Parliamentary Procedures As An Excuse

4.1.1 From CP's Report

It was quite clear from the documentation reviewed and the arguments heard that the Respondent did not conduct a BCO 31-2 investigation of the charges alleged by the Complainant against his wife Sarah P. McNeil. It was stated in the letter of admonition to the Complainant by TE Glenn Parkinson on behalf of the Respondent, and it was also stated during the complaint hearing. The question arises whether or not this decision by the Respondent is a failure or delinquency against the procedures outlined in the BCO Rules of Discipline. It is the opinion of this court that there was no failure or delinquency on the part of the Respondent.

4.1.2 Michael McNeil's Response

Here CP twist the issues so that they can sound Presbyterian, when they are just siting the church's constitution out of context. The complaint had to do with Sarah McNeil filing for a divorce. There has never been a dispute on whether or not she did that. SPEP and CP recognized that she had done this thing. The point of BCO 31-2 investigation is to determine if someone needs to be charged with some sin, if no one comes forward and charges that person with sin. Michael McNeil has charged Sarah

DRAFT 2/10/2010

McNeil, and SPEP had a duty to hear the matter. However, since their own guilt is so wrapped up in the whole thing, they chose not to, nor is it likely they ever will. For if they find her guilty, they will find the whole Session guilty of the same thing. According to SPEP's constitution, Sarah's act of filing divorce not based on Adultery or Willful Desertion of her husband make her guilty of the sin of Adultery. And since the elders of SPEP has permitted Sarah McNeil to desert her husband, and file for a divorce, and that the fact that some of their own wives have encouraged her to do these acts, they are all guilty of violating the 7th Commandment themselves. And since the elder of CP also approved of these acts, they too are guilty of the sins of the 7th Commandment.

Q. 139. What are the sins forbidden in the seventh commandment?

A. The sins forbidden in the seventh commandment, besides the neglect of the duties required, are, adultery, fornication, rape, incest, sodomy, and all unnatural lusts; all unclean imaginations, thoughts, purposes, and affections; all corrupt or filthy communications, or listening thereunto; wanton looks, impudent or light behavior, immodest apparel; prohibiting of lawful, and dispensing with unlawful marriages; allowing, tolerating, keeping of stews, and resorting to them; entangling vows of single life, undue delay of marriage; having more wives or husbands than one at the same time; unjust divorce, or desertion; idleness, gluttony, drunkenness, unchaste company; lascivious songs, books, pictures, dancings, stage plays; and all other provocations to, or acts of uncleanness, either in ourselves or others.

4.2 CP's First Justification for Not doing the Right Thing

Now that CP has committed their great sins, they seek to justify their actions by explaining how they followed process and procedures. This demonstrates that men can write up great process and procedures, and laws, but if they do not have integrity in their heart, and they don't have a relationship with the Law Giver, then their judgment will always be flawed and sinful.

4.2.1 From CP's Report

The reasons are twofold. First, the Respondent had every right to take into consideration the status of the accuser when considering discipline issues. In this case, the Complainant had already been judged guilty of "abusive, controlling and selfish" behavior by the Respondent after a lengthy trial, to which the Complainant filed an appeal with the Chesapeake Presbytery. BCO 31-8 states, "Great caution ought to be exercised in receiving accusations from any person who is known to indulge a malignant spirit towards the accused; who is not of good character; who is himself under censure or process; who is deeply interested in any respect in the conviction of the accused; or who is known to be litigious, rash, or highly imprudent." The fact that the Complainant was under discipline at the time he brought charges against his wife and does have a "[deep interest] in any respect in the conviction of the accused [Mrs. McNeil]" would give the Respondent enough rationale to not pursue any disciplinary process against Mrs. McNeil until the appeal by the Complainant is settled. Members of the Court were also disturbed by the Complainant's indirect and somewhat negative response to the question, "Do you love your wife?" and several members of the Court also observed the Complainant's unwillingness to respond to a right hand of fellowship offered by both TE's LoPiccolo and Parkinson. These types of actions and responses lend credence to the use of BCO 31-8 as a reason for not pursuing disciplinary action against Mrs. McNeil. A personal pursuit of discipline against another member in the church that serves the personal purposes of the accuser is not biblical discipline as defined in BCO 27-3. Had the Complainant come with a spirit of reconciliation and genuine care and concern for his wife, perhaps the Court would have reviewed this case from a different perspective. Hence, it is the opinion of this Court that the Respondent acted wisely in not pursuing a discipline process against Mrs. McNeil.

DRAFT 2/10/2010

4.2.2 Michael McNeil's Response

First, CP stress the fact that Michael McNeil was under some sort of discipline. When this very same commission ruled later that he was not. One would of thought that the men of the Commission would have acted to revisit this report to see if they did Michael McNeil any wrong. But this has yet to ever happen.

Second, they stress the fact that Michael McNeil has a deep interest in the case. Of course he does!!! What husband who would file such a complaint not have a deep interest in the matter. Sarah McNeil had first deserted him, then she and the church charged him with bogus charges of sin that still required hear say evidence, and that the prosecutor set as a judge in order to convict him. Also, Michael McNeil does have a deep interest in whether or not his church will act according to it's constitution. These interest are more that appropriate, and should have never been used as a factor in the case. On the other hand, these same men had an interest themselves, and that interest was not to find the Session of SPEP guilty of anything. This has been made evident by the fact that CP has avoided like crazy to bring TE Glenn Parkinson on heresy charges.

Third, CP faults Michael McNeil for not taking the right hand of fellowship with a person who has preached heresy, which is partly responsible for his divorce. Also, this men of SPEP have demonstrated that they do not care to follow the PCA Church's Constitution while going about pretending that they are men of integrity. For Michael McNeil to take these men's hand in fellowship would be saying that he agreed with them, which he does not.

4.3 CP's Second Justification for Not doing the Right Thing

4.3.1 From CP's Report

Second, it was clearly stated by the Respondent that Mrs. McNeil's filing for Limited Divorce was for the purpose of protecting the well-being both for her and the children. The Court agrees that protection and provision for women and children are legitimate considerations in cases such as this. The Complainant was given multiple opportunities to come to an agreement that would have been mediated by the Respondent and thus would have removed the need for involvement by the civil courts. However, as stated by the Complainant, he had no intention of coming to an agreement as long as the lawsuit filed by Mrs. McNeil for Limited Divorce remained in effect. The Court believes, due to the well-being of her family being of great concern , Mrs. McNeil had every right to seek such protection with the civil magistrate, given that such protection is a primary duty of the civil magistrate as stated in WCF 24.3. The Complainant would have been better served for all parties had he relented on his stance that the lawsuit be withdrawn, and thus communicated to his wife that he had genuine concern for her and that he did not desire for her to lose any confidence that she and the children would be provided and cared for. The Court believes that the Complainant is correct that lawsuits should not be filed between believers until the matter has been duly judged by the church leadership.

4.3.2 Michael McNeil's Response

Here CP makes a determination that was not discussed about during the hearing, and that is whether

DRAFT 2/10/2010

nor not Sarah McNeil's filing for divorce had any justification. This kind of justification is something that would have to be determined at a trial. However, with that said, her justification would have to be for Adultery or Willful Desertion on Michael McNeil's part. Also, Sarah McNeil specifically stated in her divorce complaint that she had left Michael McNeil on May 16, 2008 and that his was the final act of her marriage to him. Her filing for a limited divorce was not so that the marriage could remain in tact. Her filing for a limited divorce had to do with the fact that since there was no desertion or adultery, that the state of Maryland only allows for a limited divorce, until such a time that adultery or a two year period of separation has occurred. As far as her wanting to use the courts to protect the children, there are Domestic Violence Courts that can do that, and even enforce a support obligation be made by the husband. However, since Michael McNeil has NEVER been found guilty of Domestic Violence, even though he has been charged by Sarah McNeil twice, the courts have either decided not to rule on the matter, or have dismissed the charges completely. The only thing that it can be said that Michael McNeil is guilty of, is arguing with his wife and/or not giving into her unreasonable demands.

As to CP's using WCF 24.3, here is a good example how CP tries to use the church's constitution by siting passages completely out of context. This should give anyone pause as to whether or not that these men are duping God's people into believe lies, when they site simple passage of the PCA Constitution and apply this is such an erroneous matter. Note, CP is using WCF 24.3 as justification as to why it is right for Sarah McNeil to sue Michael McNeil in civil court against Paul's instruction in Corinthians 6, where Paul instructs the believer not to take one another to court. Below is the actual passage of WCF 24.3. Note, the WCF 24.3 is not scripture, and scripture would trump anything the WCF would teach contrary to it. But the fact is that WCF 24.3 does not contradict Paul's teaching. CP is just siting passage erroneous thinking that no one will ever check up on them. It is also obvious that not one elder who voted at CP seems to know the PCA own confession of faith, even though they made vows that the WCF is their own confession of faith. Look for yourself below, do you see where CP's argument siting WCF 24.3 has any legitimacy?

WCF 24.3 It is lawful for all sorts of people to marry, who are able with judgment to give their consent. Yet it is the duty of Christians to marry only in the Lord. And therefore such as profess the true reformed religion should not marry with infidels, papists, or other idolaters: neither should such as are godly be unequally yoked, by marrying with such as are notoriously wicked in their life, or maintain damnable heresies.

Unfortunately, if the elders of CP were not so busy trying to protect their fellow elders, they might have glanced down a few more paragraphs of their own confession to discover the following:

WCF 24.6 Although the corruption of man be such as is apt to study arguments unduly to put asunder those whom God hath joined together in marriage: yet, nothing but adultery, or such willful desertion as can no way be remedied by the Church, or civil magistrate, is cause sufficient of dissolving the bond of marriage: wherein, a public and orderly course of proceeding is to be observed; and the persons concerned in it not left to their own wills and discretion in their own case.

It is indeed sad that the men of CP do not know or even understand their own confession of faith. It is clear from the above actions that CP as a whole Presbytery has denied the church's confession of faith, and is only acting in such a matter as to do that which is right in their own eyes.

DRAFT 2/10/2010

4.4 CP's Justification for Sarah McNeil filing for a Divorce

4.4.1 From CP's Report

However, believers also have the right to appeal to the civil magistrate for safety and protection, and the Court believes that this type of appeal is out of the hands of the ecclesiastical courts. Additionally, the affect of such a lawsuit for Limited Divorce was in a “filed” status, and thus the Complainant could have proceeded with the agreement being mediated by the Respondent, knowing that such an agreement, if satisfactory for both parties, would have potentially brought the Complainant and Mrs. McNeil closer towards a process of reconciliation and would have led to the withdrawal of such a lawsuit. The Complainant’s refusal to participate in the conciliatory process offered by the Respondent simply fueled the distrust that Mrs. McNeil already had for her husband.

4.4.2 Michael McNeil's Response

4.5 CP Turns a Blind Eye to the Obvious

4.5.1 From CP's Report

Furthermore, the Court’s opinion is based solely on the processes undertaken by the Respondent. The Court did not take up any direct consideration of the alleged accusations by the Complainant (infidelity, unbiblical divorce, malicious actions, unbiblical lawsuit) against his wife due to the fact that the Respondent did not conduct an investigation. The Court’s judgment was based on whether or not the Respondent erred in NOT considering the case and it was not based on the accusations themselves. Had the Court ruled to sustain the complaint, the matter would have been remanded back to the Respondent with instructions to conduct a thorough BCO 31-2 investigation regarding the alleged charges by the Complainant.

4.5.2 Michael McNeil's Response

Here again, CP tries to misuse BCO the BCO in order to avoid the issues. Michael McNeil filed a complaint charging Sarah McNeil with sin. By filing this complaint, if it was found to be frivolous and without merit he himself would be subject to discipline for that action, for wrongly accusing the brethren. There is no requirement for a BCO 31-2 investigation when a complaint and charge is on the table. The only way to dispose of it properly was to have a trial. Michael McNeil according to the church's constitution must be afforded to prove his charges. If he can not prove them, then he should be subject to discipline. The elders of SPEP did not have the option to just ignore the complaint. If this be the case, then the elders could ignore any and every complaint. Which is pretty much what they have done. Unfortunately CP has a history of ignoring complaints, especially when the clergy are involved. Unless there are criminal charges against the clergy, then they are ready to act.

DRAFT 2/10/2010

4.6 And CP Continue to Turn a Blind Eye to the Obvious

4.6.1 From CP's Report

Regarding the allegation that Mrs. McNeil attacked the Complainant on January 1, 2009, this Court finds this portion of the complaint regarding this allegation is not properly before it. The Complainant originally filed a complaint with the Respondent on January 2, 2009, alleging delinquencies of the Respondent that occurred on December 4, 2008. That is the case before this court presently. The Complainant then filed a separate complaint against his wife on January 7, 2009, alleging the attack on him by his wife that occurred on January 1, 2009. Both of these matters were deliberated during a meeting of the Respondent on January 8, 2009. However, the Complainant's complaint of January 7, 2009 is in reality a separate charge against his wife. Again, the Respondent, for whatever reason it had, did not pursue a BCO 31-2 investigation. That particular matter is not before this Court. The reason why the accusation of the attack is not properly before this court is that the Complainant did not file a formal complaint with the Respondent first (for its actions on January 8, 2009 regarding the alleged attack) to the higher court.

4.6.2 Michael McNeil's Response

This is a prime example of what Paul was talking about, when church's allow sin to rule in their congregation. If church's do not discipline their members, sin within the congregation will only worsen. Unfortunately, the McNeil divorce is being further drawn out, and Sarah McNeil allegedly attacked Michael McNeil in October 2009. She has also allegedly continued to make false accusations against Michael McNeil which one has been proven to be false by the state of Maryland. None of her accusations of abuse have been substantiated. Additionally Sarah McNeil has been using the McNeil children as a lever to punish Michael McNeil or try to gain an edge on the divorce proceedings.

5 Conclusion

CP and SPEP as a whole are in a sad state of affairs. By their continued actions they have clearly denied the PCA's Confession of Faith, the PCA Church Constitution, and Christ words concerning divorce. One now sits and wonders what the GA will do with a presbytery who openly denies the PCA Constitution.