The Truth is Verified!!! Regarding School Board Lawbreakers at the Jan 8th, 2024 School Board Meeting!!

Editor's Note: ***Robert A*** ***submitted a formal complaint to the Cleveland County Board of Elections, The State Department of Public Instruction, The NC Governor, The NC Attorney General, Sheriff Alan Norman, CC District Attorney Mike Miller and others regarding the willful and with knowledge aforethought unlawful acts perpetrated by CCS Board Members Robert Queen, Joel Shores, Ron Humphries, Rodney Fitch, Greg Taylor and Walter Scott Spurling at the January 8, 2024 School Board Meeting.*** ***Robert A's*** ***Formal Complaint called for a full investigation of the acts and Censure, Removal from office, and other disciplinary actions against those perpetrators noted above.***

Now a Professional Investigator, Mr. David Poston, who was also in attendance at this January 8, 2024 School Board meeting, has published his own full account of the details of the unlawful acts which are independent from Robert A's Complaint, but confirm and verify the full truth about the shameful and unlawful acts of the named perpetrators.

Note that Mr. Poston's accounts of the meeting's illegal acts are a bit long, but they are correct in every detail. ***Robert A*** ***recommends that, every person with an interest in the education of Cleveland County's children or concern about the numerous failings at CCS, read every word.***

Another long post but it exposes the blatant hypocrisy, ineptitude, and outright stupidity of at least five of the Cleveland County Board of Education (BOE) members and there would probably be a sixth, but he didn't have anything to say

during the debate that this post is about.
This post is about the January 8th BOE meeting and the power mongering by BOE chairperson his majesty King Robert Queen and the absolute absurdity of some of the statements by some of the BOE members and three members in particular.
In a nutshell folks, what happened at the January 8th BOE meeting was nothing more than his majesty King Queen using two witless self-proclaimed law experts, because of their peer perceived vast knowledge and unequaled skills at interpreting law, to broadcast a total misinterpretation of the law in order to stir the emotions of Queen's sheep herd and by doing so, force King Queen's will upon Queen's sheep.
Now if you are not interested to know about the tomfoolery of King Queen and his court jesters, and how Queen is using his abuse of power to keep his jesters in line save yourself some time and move on.
However, if you do care about what the Cleveland County Board of Education is doing, read on.
During the Cleveland County Board of Education "discussion" of the upcoming vote for the school calendar and the probability that six of the BOE members, Queen's sheep herd, were going to vote in favor of violating North Carolina state law and in turn violate the code of ethics each BOE member vowed to uphold by not following the state mandated calendar, BOE member Joel Shores asked that one of the BOE's attorneys to come to the podium. BOE attorney Jonathan Sink came forward. Mr. Shores stated to attorney Sink that Mr. Shores looked up the definition of SHALL on Google and Mr. Shores then cited the following definition. The word SHALL, "Is an imperative command, usually indicating certain actions are mandatory and not permissive." Mr. Shores then went on to laud his extensive law enforcement career and Mr. Shores' proficiency at interpreting law. Mr. Shores said when Mr. Shores saw something that said SHALL, Mr. Shores interpreted that as meaning he did not have a choice. Mr. Shores then asked attorney Sink if attorney Sink agreed with the Google definition of the word SHALL as a correct LEGAL DEFINITION of that word. Attorney Sink indicated that attorney Sink agreed with Google's definition of the word SHALL as read by Mr. Shores to be the LEGAL DEFINITION of the word SHALL. Mr. Shores then went on to ask attorney Sink if a law says you

SHALL consult with parents and school personnel, if that left any choice. Attorney Sink said, “shall, no choice, you have to, it’s compulsory.”
ALL STOP Mr. Shores unequivocally asked attorney Sink for a LEGAL OPINION and attorney Sink was allowed by the chair and head bully Mr. Robert Queen, to state attorney Sink’s LEGAL OPINION.
I’LL SAVE IT FOR THE END BUT KEEP THAT IN MIND FOLKS
From there, BOE member Walter Spurling asked for clarification of what options for the school calendar were available for the BOE members to vote on. Superintendent Dr. Steven Fisher outlined the options. Dr. Fisher presented three options and labeled them A, B and C. Option A very clearly violated North Carolina school law. Knowing option A violates state law, Mr. Shores made a motion that they adopt option A and Mr. Spurling seconded Mr. Shores’ motion.
Now it’s discussion time.
BOE member Aaron Bridges brought up the fact that option A violated the law. Right away, Chairperson Queen said that was open to interpretation and while Mr. Queen was still talking, Mr. Shores chimed in, out of order by the way, and stated that 95% of Cleveland County’s parents were in favor of option A and moronically asked which part of the law they should follow.
MORE ON THAT BRAINLESS QUESTION/STATEMENT LATER but just a hint, it ISN’T a question of which part of the law they should follow. Mr. I know how to interpret the law really doesn’t know how to interpret the law.
Mr. Bridges reminded his fellow board members that during the summer they had discussed ethics, that they had all agreed to follow the code of ethics and that some BOE members had even been censored for alleged ethical violations. By the way, those BOE members that were censored were REQUIRED to reaffirm/sign the code of ethics as part of their censorship.
As soon as Mr. Bridges finished talking about the code of ethics and that he could not violate the code of ethics by breaking the law, Mr. I’m an expert in law interpretation (AKA Joel Shores) once again chimed in with the imbecilic statement that, “Part of the law is following what the parents say” so Mr. Bridges would be breaking that part. No, Mr. I’m an expert law interpreter (but not really), Mr. Bridges WOULD NOT be

breaking “that part” of the law because there isn’t a “that part.” I MIGHT HAVE JUST GAVEN IT AWAY

When Mr. Shores finished his mindless comment, Mr. Grigg, who was one of the censored BOE members that was required to reaffirm the code of ethics by signing them again, reminded his fellow board members that yes, their code says they should do what is best for the children, but the code also says they are to abide by state and federal law. Mr. Grigg also reminded fellow board members that in August the school board association sent a letter advising the BOE they had broken the law and encouraged the board not to break it again. Mr. Grigg concluded his statement by saying he would abide by the code of ethics, the ones he had to reaffirm, and not break the law.

Next, Mr. Spurling called attorney Sink back to the podium and asked attorney Sink wasn’t it correct that somewhere in the code of ethics or somewhere else didn’t it say the BOE had to support what the community says do. Attorney Sink didn’t really answer the question, but Spurling made the point that their code of ethics conflicts in that it says the BOE must follow law but also that they must do what is best and support the community’s wishes. When Mr. Spurling started to laud his COMPLETELY IRRELEVANT military experience, as Mr. Spurling is often prone to do, Mr. Bridges, rightfully so, called for a point of order stating the military had nothing to do with the subject at hand. Mr. Spurling spouted that it had to do with Mr. Spurling’s experience and requested that the chair allow Mr. Spurling to continue. The chair instructed Mr. Spurling to stick with the topic. Thank you Mr. Chair! Let me clarify for Mr. Spurling. If there is a conflict, it is within the BOE’s code of ethics but there is no conflict in the state law about what the BOE SHALL do. To be fair, Mr. Bridges was also out of order by not allowing the chair to recognize Mr. Bridges and ask Mr. Bridges what Mr. Bridges’ point of order was. Mr. Spurling was also out of order by immediately lauding his COMPLETELY IRRELEVANT vast military experience before the chair recognized either one of them.

I’M GETTING AROUND TO WHAT I HINTED TO
PAY ATTENTION TO ATTORNEY SINK’S REPLY!

Attorney Sink gave a very appropriate answer. Attorney Sink stated one was a policy issue (the code of ethics) and the other was a matter of law, whether the calendars that were

presented violated the law, and if it were the will of the board, attorney Sink would answer that question.
NOW PAY ATTENTION TO WHAT I'M IN CHARGE AND DO NOT DARE TO QUESTION ME CHAIRPERSON QUEEN DID NEXT
Chairperson Queen asked Mr. Spurling if Mr. Spurling was finished with Mr. Spurling's question. Mr. Spurling asked if it was okay with the chair, Mr. Spurling wanted attorney Sink to answer the question.
NOW KEEP IN MIND THE BOE ATTORNEY HAS VOLUNTEERD TO PUBLICALLY STATE WHETHER THE CALENDARS PRESENTED VIOLATED THE LAW. I WOULD HOPE THE PERSON THAT WENT TO LAW SCHOOL WOULD KNOW WHETHER IT WAS APPROPRIATE TO PUBLICLY STATE THE ATTORNEY'S OPINION.
Chairperson, now law expert, Queen stated that ATTORNEY ADVICE must be given in closed session. LISTEN UP QUEEN, no one asked for attorney ADVICE and attorney Sink did not offer his ADVICE. Attorney Sink offered to state an OPINION. The OPINION you did not want the attorney to give because you already know what that OPINION will be; that you and the other five lock step stooges know you are violating the law.
Mr. Blanton spoke but said nothing contradictory then Mr. Tayler was given his chance to speak but Mr. Tayler declined.
Now, pay close attention to what BOE member Rodney, I'm third in command at the Cleveland County Sheriff's office and I for sure know the law, or at least I should, Fitch has to say. Mr. Fitch said the way Mr. Fitch interpreted the law; the law is very contradictory. Mr. Fitch then goes into a very passionate but nonsensical tirade about getting laws changed through case law and further stated that if the BOE followed one part of the law, they would break the other part and if they followed the other part, they would be breaking the first part so no matter how they voted, they were going to break the law.
Fitch continues his senseless bloviation with a civics lesson on case law and how the calendar law is contradictory. Fitch concludes his diatribe with telling everyone to read the law and states once again, wrongfully so, that based on his 29 years in law enforcement, you can trust him when he says that no matter how the board votes, they will be breaking the law.
Well, no Mr. third in command at the Cleveland County Sheriff's Office and I'm a law interpreting guru, I don't believe I will trust someone that had to be told to stop

wearing a firearm to school board meetings because it was in violation of FEDERAL LAW, to interpret the law for me. I'll pass.
That legal lecture came from the mind of a dullard who has no clue as to what the law under discussion says!
Now it's Ron Humphries' turn. Mr. Humphries follows in lock step by wrongfully stating there is ambiguity in the law and that ambiguity is that in one place they are to get input of the public (TRUE) and to FOLLOW IT (NOT TRUE) then they are told not to (ALSO NOT TRUE). (HAVE YOU FIGURED IT OUT YET?)
ROUND TWO
First up in round two is self-proclaimed legal expert, Joel Shores. Mr. Shores agreed with Mr. Fitch that no matter how they voted, they would break the law. Mr. Shores then stated Mr. Shores had a copy of the law and held it up. Mr. Shores then read from the law, correctly so I should add, and this is the point of the word SHALL Mr. Shores et al are making such a fuss over. Reading from the law, Mr. Shores read, "Local boards of education SHALL, and Mr. Shores practically shouted the word SHALL, consult with parents and the employed public school personnel in the development of the school calendar." Again, Mr. Shores correctly read word for word what the law states. Good for Mr. Shores! Too bad though that Mr., during my extensive law enforcement career I became an expert law interpreter, Shores doesn't understand the very law Mr. Shores read from. Mr. Shores goes on to repeat that 95% of the people surveyed WANTED a certain calendar. (THAT WAS PART OF THE HINT, DID YA CATCH IT?)
By the way, attorney Sink is still at the podium.
Mr. expert law interpreter asked attorney Sink if it could be argued, from a LEGAL STANDPOINT, that if taking away everything the parents and school personnel had to say, could it be argued that they broke the law. Right away chairperson Queen cautioned Shores to stay away from hypotheticals because, as attorney Sink pointed out, the matter had to go before a judge. No, Mr. Queen, that is NOT what attorney Sink said. Attorney Sink said a judge is the final arbiter of any legal issue, not just THIS issue.
I'm not a law school graduate Mr. law interpreting expert, but a blind pig could look through its anal orifice and see that the answer to your question is UNEQUIVOCALLY NO; the BOE is

only required to “CONSULT” with the aforementioned persons, not do what they say. Well, the cat’s out of the bag for sure now.
Next, Mr. expert law interpreter said one of the most moronic things to ever come out of his mouth, and there have been a sizable number of such things. Mr. Shores said, “At the end of the day, we’re elected by the people and by the parents, and the law says, as Mr. expert law interpreter holds a copy of the law up, do what they say, we MUST do what they say.”
Nothing really different from Mr. Bridges or Mr. Grigg other than Mr. Grigg made a very valid point that if anyone was held accountable for breaking the law it will be the board members that voted to break the law and not the parents or school employees.
When Mr. Grigg was finished attorney Sink VOLUNTEERED to give what attorney Sink described as his, “very strong and clear legal opinion” about the matter in closed session.
For good reason, Queen quickly moved on without comment.
Now it’s Mr. Blanton’s turn again. Mr. Blanton was very straightforward in asking attorney Sink if attorney Sink would give the board attorney Sink’s OPINION of whether the board would be breaking the law if they voted in favor of one of the calendars.
Right away, chairperson Queen shut the matter down by once again half wittedly stating that attorney ADVICE must be given in closed session; that giving legal ADVICE in open session could open up, but Queen didn’t finish saying what it would open, Queen just said he wasn’t going to set that precedent.
Once again Mr. Queen, if you can’t keep up, take notes, Mr. Blanton DID NOT ask for ADVICE. Mr. Blanton asked for attorney Sink’s OPINION.
PAY ATTENTION QUEEN!!!
(Actually, Queen is paying attention. Queen just doesn’t want the attorney to publicly state the attorney’s opinion because Queen knows what that opinion will be.)
Mr. Spurling got to put his foot in his mouth once again by parroting the mindless dribble from third in command at the Cleveland County Sheriff’s office Rodney Fitch about breaking the law no matter which way they voted. In his true ignorance of the law, spurred on by Mr. Fitch’s total ignorance of the law, Mr. spurling parroted that no matter how the board voted

they would be breaking the law and then stated in a very matter of fact way that the law says the board SHALL DO WHAT THE PUBLIC WANTS. No Mr. Spurling, that is NOT what the law says, and you are either too dense to understand the law or just too lazy to read it for yourself.

When Mr. I'm third in command at the Sheriff's Office but I'm too dense to understand the law, Fitch was given his second shot, thank goodness, he didn't embarrass himself further with his nonsense about no matter how they voted, they would break the law.

After everyone had their say, it was time to vote. The members of Queen's sheep herd, that don't have a minds of their own, so they just listened to the opinion of the two legal experts on the board, that really don't know their butts from a hole in the ground about this law, drank the Kool Aid these two legal experts fed them and allowed their emotions to overtake their sense of duty to obey the law and to obey their code of ethics and they, along with King Queen and Queen's two legal expert puppets, voted in favor of option A, thus violating North Carolina state law and violating their own code of ethics. Don't forget folks, it was these six bleating sheep that just a few months ago all voted to censor Danny Blanton and Ronnie Grigg for an alleged ethics violation.

For anyone that does not know what that censorship was about. Several students committed the crime of vandalism at Burns high school and the principal allowed the students into the school to commit that crime. Queen et al wanted to sweep the crime under the rug and lied about several things to include the amount of damage done to not only the school but to the personal property of some of the teachers but when Mr. Blanton and Mr. Grigg were approached by news media and asked about the matter, Mr. Blanton and Mr. Grigg, exercising their first amendment rights, spoke out. Mr. Blanton and Mr. Grigg never identified themselves as BOE members and DID NOT speak on behalf of the BOE members but as private citizens. It was the media that identified those gentlemen as board members. Queen got his panties in a wad and started the let's censor Blanton and Grigg for daring to speak the truth and expose what I was trying to cover up campaign.

Folks, here is a cut and paste from the state law that was the matter under discussion, the one Mr. legal expert Shores held

up and read from. The law is 115C-84.2 School Calendar, more commonly called the school calendar law. In that law, the word SHALL is used 29 times. NOWHERE in that law does it say the BOE SHALL do what the parents or employed public school personnel want the board to do. The law simply states the BOE SHALL "CONSULT" with parents and the employed public school personnel. By Mr. I'm the self-proclaimed BOE expert law interpreter but I really don't know my butt from a hole in the ground's own statement TWICE, the board COMPLIED with that portion of the law. As Mr. Shores stated TWICE, the board CONSULTED the parents.

Curiously, I don't recall that Legal Beagle Shores mentioned consulting with school employees.

Now, back to attorney Sink being disallowed to give an opinion when it didn't suit the bully in charge's agenda.

Let's compare and contrast what board members Blanton and Spurling asked of attorney Sink with what Mr. legal expert Shores asked of attorney Sink.

Board members Spurling and Blanton asked attorney Sink for attorney Sink's OPINION about the school calendars but I'm in charge and do not dare challenge me, chairperson Queen called what the attorney was going to say about the school calendar options was ADVICE and legal ADVICE had to be given in a closed session. Once again, attorney Sink WAS NOT asked for ADVICE. Attorney Sink was asked for attorney Sink's OPINION.

When legal expert Shores asked for attorney Sink's LEGAL OPINION, not just attorney Sink's opinion mind you, but attorney Sink's LEGAL OPINION, about the definition of the word SHALL, bully in charge Queen ALLOWED attorney Sink to give attorney Sink's LEGAL OPINION about that because allowing attorney Sink to give attorney Sink's LEGAL OPINION about that went right along with King Queen's pre planed agenda of using the two witless legal expert's flawed interpretation of the school calendar law to stir up the emotions of the remaining I'll drink whatever you give me feckless sheep in order to make it appear their violation of the law and therefore their violation of their code of ethics seem legitimate. I would argue that super-duper law expert Shore's request for attorney Sink's LEGAL OPINION was a much more egregious violation of King Queen's court rules than Mr. Blanton and Mr. Spurling simply asking for an opinion, yet Queen let that slide.

That is once again just BULLY IN CHARGE Robert Queen’s abuse of power invoking King Queen’s unilaterally concocted rules for thee but not for me and my sheep.
DO NOT take anything I wrote at face value. Listen to the broadcast of the January 8th BOE meeting and get a copy of 115C-84.2 School Calendar and read it for yourself.