

Dear LPCA Judicial Committee:

Chair Dehn added me to the communications list after I was referenced directly in a response to an appeal. I found that surprising (and odd) since I am not a named party nor was I a delegate at the convention in question. Further, I specifically went out of my way not to be an official part of this process. I was asked to sign on to the brief. I declined (ironically to avoid being dragged into drama). Apparently, the appellees heartily desire my official presence, but apart from this communication and attending the hearing, I decline. If I had wanted to be officially involved, I would have signed on to the brief.

Appellees have turned a platform dispute into a fascinating “I-spy” episode of who killed Mr. Boddy in the library and have concluded that I did by examining document metadata and unusual style of prose. I could have saved everyone a lot of high drama by being asked. I wrote the document. Appellees seem to think that this is some feat of forensic sleuthing that would never have occurred to some wily ghost author who wished to remain unknown. I purposefully did not change my style, and in fact commented to multiple interested people that it will be obvious who wrote the bulk of it (I did not examine the final brief to see if anything was added since my contribution was given with free reign to use as much or as little and to edit away to anyone’s heart’s content). I am a paralegal with extensive experience in fraud investigations so I am very aware of metadata and have a document metadata “cleaner.” I did not use it. I have extensive knowledge of the forensic methods of determining actual authorship of texts (*i.e.*, in my case it surrounds the argument over whether or not the Apostle Paul wrote the pastoral epistles, and one of the key data points is similarity or dissimilarity in style and language). I did not lose all of this knowledge in a fit of sudden dementia. Thus, I obviously did not (and still do not) care who knows that I assisted in the brief and (depending on whether or not it was edited or added to afterwards), could be its only author. I am also the only author of multiple court filings that are signed by the filer, *i.e.*, the attorney. My preparation does not make those filings mine. My work product is subsumed by the signatory.

As far as transparency, since my Facebook page is of interest, I wrote multiple times that I was assisting in a brief. I said at the convention that if anyone was planning on an appeal, I would be willing to assist. This was no secret to be uncovered by digital detectives. But let’s assume it was a secret. If it weren’t for those snoop kids and that damned dog, I would have gotten away with it too! .... No. In a quasi-legal or legal setting it is not unusual at all for documents to be authored by unidentified assistants as long as they are signed off on by the filers or attestors, and it is outside any proper scope of discovery to make an issue out of the identity of such persons absent fraud. Are the appellees alleging fraud?

In closing, I did not sign on to the brief and am not a party (and wish to remain in that condition) and do not appreciate the attempt by the appellees to turn me into some kind of shadowy figure lurking in the background. I don’t lurk, and my hair makes it impossible for me to hide. I openly assisted and advised members at convention and continue to this day to do so, and there is absolutely nothing wrong with that. I did not initiate the appeal. My assistance was proactively solicited long after I had believed that the matter was dropped.

I don't need metadata to know that Ms. Mattson wrote that excellent response-her style and knowledge shines through, and it was a joy to read with my copy of RONR open. To save everyone the trouble of trying to figure out who prepared any possible future replies, if I am asked, I will assist the appellants. So far, I have not been asked.

I trust this solves the *WhoWroteIt* mystery and matters can move beyond silly personal drama. This is not about people but about issues, and if anything I authored (again I do not know if my work was edited) gave any impression of a personal attack, that is not my intention, and I would be more than glad to clarify at the hearing. First and foremost, my work should **never** be interpreted as an inherent criticism of Ms. Robson who handled her chairwomanship admirably in a prickly situation, nor of Ms. Mattson who is a secretary and parliamentarian of the first order. Both women have my deepest respect.

Respectfully Submitted in Liberty,

*Caryn Ann Harlos*