

**IN THE DIOCESE OF VIRGINIA
BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD IN THE
TITLE IV MATTER OF
THE REVEREND DR. CAYCE RAMEY, RESPONDENT**

**CHURCH ATTORNEY'S RESPONSE TO RESPONDENT'S MOTION
TO RECONSIDER SANCTIONS NOS. 2 AND 4**

The Church Attorney responds as follows to the Respondent's Motion to Reconsider Sanctions 2 and 4 ("Motion").

1. The "not later than" language in the Disciplinary Board's Decision is important. It signals a recognition by the Disciplinary Board that the Respondent had already had ample time to consider and obey the sanction imposed in paragraph 2. The Church Attorney suggested that sanction to the Hearing Panel in his original Motion for Sanctions of November 6, 2023. The Hearing Panel issued that sanction with the same "no later than fifteen days" deadline in its December 4, 2023, Order. Thus, by the time the Disciplinary Board issued the January 15 Order over two and one half months had elapsed and by the time the Respondent filed the Motion another two weeks had passed, for a total of almost three months since the Respondent was first put on notice that he might have to send to the Church Attorney "the names and communications addresses of all Clergy, but not Laity, to whom the September 23, 2023 email was sent."

2. There is nothing new for the Disciplinary Board to consider. In the interest of economy and moving cases along, reconsideration should be limited to relevant new matters, and not the same matters already considered, or which could have been considered if the moving party (here, Respondent) had brought them to its attention. There is no relevant new matter in the Motion.

3. Much of the Motion is irrelevant. The Respondent spills most of his ink in his Motion discussing racial justice. While much of what he says may be true, it has nothing to do with the matter before the Disciplinary Board. It is a polemic.

4. Reprisals and retaliation. The Respondent claims that anonymous clergy fear reprisals and retaliation. He offers no documentation. No proof. Nothing but his own uncorroborated, self-serving assertion that the Bishop could conceivably entertain the thought that he would punish clergy "friends" of the Respondent who have done nothing but receive the Respondent's canonically erroneous, ill-conceived email that both this Disciplinary Board and the Hearing Panel have condemned as "contrary to the integrity of the proceedings."

That should be enough to dispose of the argument. But if the Respondent is serious and if the Disciplinary Board wants to entertain the argument Respondent should be required to identify and produce these anonymous members of the clergy to

testify, under oath and subject to cross examination, so that the Disciplinary Board can assess their credibility, and Respondent's in making the argument.

Respondent makes much of Bishop Stevenson's restriction on the Respondent's ministry. That restriction was imposed pursuant to the bishop's Canon IV.7.3 authority to place precautionary measures if the bishop determines that a Member of the Clergy "**may** have committed any Offense, or that good order, welfare or safety of the Church or any person or Community **may** be threatened by that member of the Clergy." (Emphasis added.) Bishop Stevenson used the identical language in his restriction on ministry. There is no prejudgment.

The Respondent requested review of the restriction by the Conference Panel pursuant to Canon IV. 7.10-12, as was his right. The Conference Panel affirmed the restriction on ministry.

5. At the end of his Motion, the Respondent says this:

There is no real dispute regarding the facts of the underlying situation regarding these sanctions, but rather this is a theological issue.

He is half right. The facts in this case are largely undisputed. If Respondent would agree that he has committed the canonical offenses charged, much of the anticipated testimony, including that of Respondent's friends that is the subject matter of this Motion, would perhaps be undisputed and the Hearing Panel could proceed to the matter of a sentence to recommend to the Bishop.

But Respondent is profoundly wrong when he says this is a "theological issue." This case is solely to determine whether Title IV offenses have been committed by Respondent, and if so, what the Hearing Panel should recommend to the Bishop to do about that. Neither this Disciplinary Board nor the Hearing Panel is a council of the Church convened to wrestle with any theological issues. Neither is it a theological debating society. There are no theological issues in this case. Title IV contains no "higher authority" exception or "conscience" clause. If a priest's conscience prevents him from conforming to the requirements of Title IV, he should in good conscience resign.

Date: February 2, 2023

/s/ Bradfute W. Davenport, Jr., Church Attorney
davenportbw@gmail.com; (804) 690-3136