



Brothers and Sisters:

I wanted to take this opportunity to address an issue that came up in several questions during my meetings with a large crowd of Grange members at the Sebastopol Grange on Tuesday and the North Fork Grange today: the status of Subordinate Grange property following reorganization of the California State Grange. I understand that the McFarland Group has been telling people that the California State Grange and the National Grange are simply after the property of Subordinate Granges. That any Grange that returns to good standing in the Order will have its property seized by the National Grange. This simply is not true. Any Grange with an active Charter is entitled to full possession and control of the Grange property it holds. End of story. I don't know how I can say it any more clearly than that.

Other than the San Marcos Grange, which sold its property while making no attempt to comply with Grange rules, I have not revoked the Charter of any Subordinate or Pomona Grange since being elected and installed as Master of the California State Grange in July 2014. There are more than 150 Subordinate and Pomona Granges in California with active Charters. All of them are members of the California State Grange. (Regrettably, many of them are not in good standing, but that is a situation all of us are working to fix.) All of these Granges have full control over the Grange property that they hold. None of their property is subject to the lawsuit, and none of their property has ever been subject to the lawsuit. The McFarland Group has claimed that the National Grange tried to add Subordinate Grange property to the lawsuit and were thwarted by the McFarland Group. This is false. It has no basis in fact whatsoever. Since the very beginning of this lawsuit, the property at issue has been the property that should be held by the California State Grange, but that has been improperly retained by the McFarland Group after they left The Grange. That property consists of the property held in the California State Grange's name (we know about the property on U Street in Sacramento and several bank accounts so far), and property held in trust for inactive Subordinate and Pomona Granges (i.e., Granges with no

active Charter). That's it. That is the only property that has ever been at issue in the lawsuit. The issue the McFarland Group points to was in the National Grange's second amended complaint. Throughout that complaint, the National Grange referred to Grange property under the McFarland Group's control. However, one paragraph (paragraph 57) of the complaint referred to property held "by any subordinate Grange under" the McFarland Group's control. This should have read "inactive Subordinate Granges" as that was what was meant. Essentially, this was a typo. The McFarland Group objected to this language, and the National Grange corrected the typo and filed a new complaint (the third amended complaint). That is all that happened. But don't just take my word for it. Read all about it in the court documents here ([see pp. 2 & 7-9 of the brief](#); the [complaint with the typo in paragraph 57 is also attached](#)).

I hope that this helps clear up some of the misconceptions being spread by the McFarland Group. As always, I urge you to get the facts, and not simply rely on propaganda. If the McFarland Group says that they prevented the National Grange or California State Grange from doing something to your property, ask to see the court documents where that happened. If the McFarland Group says our lawyers threatened Subordinate Grange property, ask to see the court transcript. The McFarland Group will not give you those documents, because they do not exist. The property of Subordinate and Pomona Granges with active Charters has never been part of the lawsuit, and the National Grange and the California State Grange have never tried to make it part of the lawsuit.

I am now going to echo what our National Master said earlier this week: the courts have spoken, and the rules of our Order have meaning and apply to all members. The McFarland Group lost in both courts. The McFarland Group is not a Grange, and it is not a part of the Order of Patrons of Husbandry. They will lose their appeals, if they follow through with them. Rather than continue with this pointless waste of Grange assets, it is my sincere hope that the Granges of California will take the steps necessary to returning to good standing so that we can all move forward with the task of restoring and growing the Grange in California.

As always, please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or would like to discuss anything at all.

Fraternally yours,

Ed Komski, President/ Master
California State Grange

760-310-6500

ekomski@castategrange.orgwww.CaliforniaStateGrange.org



©2015 California State Grange | 1311 Willow Glen Rd., Fallbrook, CA 92028