

From: Dianne Reed
Sent: 7/11/2015 9:05:36 PM
To: Mark C. Brandenburg
Cc: COL Eugene L. Gene Pinson; COL Allison Dean Love; COL Dylan W. Goff; Eugene Paluso; COL Myron C. Harrington; Haley, Nikki; COL Peter M. McCoy, Sr.; COL Robert H. Nuttall, Sr.; John W. Rosa; COL Tee Hooper, Jr.; blivingston@gregoryelectric.com; LT GEN John B. Sams, Jr.; Gregory A. Lapointe; Stanley L. Myers; William B. Ashworth; Fred L. Price; LT GEN W. Michael Steele; Spearman, Molly; George Reed
Subject: Re: Hazing - Jonathan L Reed Sierra Company

Mr. Brandenburg,

I responded to your email 5 days ago asking for you to respond to Jonathan's outline of the violations of his due process. Your statements as far as what Jonathan is NOT entitled to and that The Citadel has considered my son's case seriously is nothing short of a spin to not address what has been presented.

If your position is to not address the violations of due process - could you please note this next to each point that he has presented in his letter that was sent to the Presidents office.

Sincerely,

Dianne Reed

Thanks,

Dianne Reed

On Mon, Jul 6, 2015 at 5:49 PM, Dianne's Work <sdianne.reed@gmail.com> wrote:

Mr. Brandenburg,

Our goal is follow the procedures that is outlined in writing from the administration at The Citadel. Jonathan's letter showing failure to provide due process was not required to be presented during his class I hearing, in fact it is stated in memorandum 2-018, dated 17 September, 2013:

POLICY

A. The President will only consider a grant of relief from a disciplinary decision on the following grounds:

1. That the hearing officer or board failed to provide due process, or
 2. That significant information has been discovered since the board or hearing, which would probably change the result, but which could not, in the exercise of due diligence, have been presented to the board or hearing.
2. A cadet or non-cadet student may appeal an applicable disciplinary decision by preparing an appeal to the President based only on either or both grounds outlined in Paragraph 4A above. The preparation and submission of the appeal, which must include grounds on which relief is being sought, is exclusively the responsibility of the cadet or non-cadet student.
1. An appeal must include all materials necessary for the President to fully evaluate the appeal.
 2. In cases in which an appeal alleges that significant evidence has been discovered since the hearing that was not available at the time the decision was reached, the appeal must include that evidence, or, if unavailable, a written description of such evidence in sufficient form as to fully apprise the President of the nature of the evidence and the material impact it would have had on the proceedings below.

Jonathan's outline in regards to numerous errors as it relates to his due process needs to be considered and addressed. Your statement "The Citadel takes great care to provide all of the due process and fairness the law requires" does not satisfy what has been presented to the administration.

We have presented material where there was a failure to provide due process. We believe the outline provided gives significant information which has been discovered since the hearing. which would probably change the result, but which could not, in the exercise of due diligence, have been presented to the board or hearing.

"No free man shall be seized or imprisoned, or stripped of his rights or possessions, or outlawed or exiled, or deprived of his standing in any other way, nor will we proceed with force against him, or send others to do so, except by the lawful judgement of his equals or by the law of the land.

Magna Carta, Chapter 29

Sincerely,

Dianne Reed

June 15, 1215On Jul 6, 2015, at 3:47 PM, Mark C. Brandenburg <brandenburm1@citadel.edu <<mailto:brandenburm1@citadel.edu>>> wrote:

Ms. Reed

Please understand that The Citadel considered your son's case very seriously. As President Thomas Jefferson wrote after he created the University of Virginia, "The article of discipline is the most difficult in American education." Thus, in every case in which The Citadel requires a cadet to spend time away from school, The Citadel takes great care to provide all of the due process and fairness the law requires.

In this case, your son was provided the opportunity to raise these arguments in his appeal to his dismissal for hazing. To the extent that he did, the school did not find them significant enough to warrant reversal. To the extent he did not, The Citadel does not provide any additional opportunity to do so.

At this point, your son has exhausted his administrative remedies at The Citadel, and it will not consider any further arguments or requests in his case.

As you know, though, your son is eligible to apply during the Spring, 2016, Semester, for readmission after graduation in May of 2016. Thus, we look forward to receiving that application, and trust he can be readmitted to the Corps of Cadets at the appropriate time.

Mark