



August 11, 2021

Via Email, Fax & U.S. Mail

Kevin M. Funyak
Stacey & Funyak
PO Box 1139
Billings, MT 59103-1139

FX: (406) 259-4540

kfunyak@staceyfunyak.com

Re: *Caekaert & Mapley v. Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc., et al.*

Dear Kevin,

We are in receipt of the redacted documents you produced on behalf of the Hardin Congregation after the Court granted our Motion to Compel. While the Court permitted limited redactions of “names of individuals not involved in the current litigation” on documents 4 and 7, you went beyond that.

First, contrary to the Court’s Order, you redacted names of individuals on document 5. These redactions include names of material witnesses, such as Hardin Congregation members who were on the committee that disfellowshipped Bruce Mapley and other people who were abused by him and know of his conduct that is at issue in this case. All of these people have discoverable information that is material to Plaintiffs’ claims. Plaintiffs are entitled to know who these people are and we are aware of no legal basis to hide these witnesses from Plaintiffs. Because the Court did not permit redactions of document 5, it is our view that you and the Hardin Congregation are in violation of the Court’s July 30, 2021, Order and subject to sanctions under Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 37(b)(2) if you do not produce an unredacted document 5. Please produce an unredacted version of document 5 by close of business on **August 16, 2021**, so that we can avoid further delays, costs, and fees.

Second, in documents 4 and 7 you redacted names of people who are key witnesses to the events at issue in this case and those people are therefore “involved” in the current litigation. By way of example, on document 4 you redacted names of people that Shirley Gibson identified as perpetrators of the sexual abuse at issue in this case. Ms. Gibson also identified an elder who was aware of the abuse but “swept it under the rug.” These people are clearly involved in the current litigation and Plaintiffs are entitled to know who they are. It would appear that you are interpreting the Court’s Order to permit redactions of anyone who is not a party to this case. We

August 11, 2021

Page 2

disagree with such an interpretation because if that is what the Court meant she could have easily said so. And more importantly, there would be no legal basis to permit such redactions which have the effect of hiding key, material witnesses from the Plaintiffs. Please let me know if you will produce unredacted versions of documents 4 and 7 (or if not, your view of why these material fact witnesses are “not involved in the current litigation”) by close of business on **August 16, 2021**.

My genuine hope is that we may work together to avoid further motions practice about these documents and I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

MEYER, SHAFFER & STEPANS, PLLP



Ryan R. Shaffer