

members and some of the directors apparently do not apply to all directors and staff; they are applied only to those who dissent from the positions of our Managing Agent and not those directors who simply follow the "advice" of that agent.

The attempts to avoid the promised transparency are numerous. One prime example occurred in 2005, and is memorialized in the case of Michael W. Curtis v. Professional Community Management, Inc., United Laguna Hills Mutual, Golden Rain Foundation of Laguna Woods, and others, Case No. 06CC11364 in the Superior Court of The State of California for the County of Orange. The complaint in that case was filed by a resident of United Mutual who regularly criticized the actions or inaction of PCM, United and GRF. Curtis continues with his attempts to convince the directors that they should control the activities of the corporations, and should terminate or restructure the relationship with PCM. The filing of the complaint resulted from the action of Janet Price, an employee of PCM as Administrative Director and Director of Human Resources. Curtis was not the ordinary critic protesting at a meeting. He had worked for the same employer for over 31 years. He developed a reorganization plan that called for the elimination of PCM as the management company of Laguna Woods Village. Accidentally he sent this plan by email to an employee of PCM. In preparing this email, Curtis used equipment of his employer. The employee of PCM sent the email to Milt Johns, Janet Price and nine other PCM employees. Milt Johns asked Janet Price to find out where the email had originated. Janet Price had another PCM employee perform a search to determine the origination point of the email, and the origin was determined to be the server of Curtis' employer.

Janet Price then proceeded to contact Curtis' employer by telephone and by written communica-

tion, alleging that Curtis was attending meetings during working hours and sending documents from the employer's office. In his complaint, Curtis contended that Price's action was malicious and had the intent to cause him the loss of his employment. Price, on the other hand, and her attorneys, contended that "Janet Price contacted (the employer) out of concern as a human resources director because she would want to know whether her employees were taking time off when they were suppose (sic) to be working." You be the judge-- who is telling the truth and who is telling the lie?

Price forwarded to Curtis' employer a copy of the email which Curtis had accidentally sent to the PCM employee, and a list of the board meetings that Curtis had attended with copies of the board meeting minutes. An investigation by Curtis' employer lasted from approximately August 2005 to December 2005. Curtis was unaware of the investigation until about October 27, 2005. He was finally informed by his employer about December 1, 2005 that "the investigation came out perfectly normal and that he was not in any sort of trouble with his employer." The final disposition of this matter is unknown to the public since the settlement was "confidential" but Curtis continues to appear at meetings and to criticize the directors and officers who fail to exercise their power to control and direct the affairs of the corporations to which they owe a fiduciary duty. There are other matters in which the final disposition was treated as confidential. Are the fees that were paid in these cases also confidential? Should not PCM and the directors and officers who caused the litigation respond for those fees? The question remains: Who benefits from the lack of candor and disclosure? Certainly not the corporations nor their members.