

From: Mark C. Brandenburg  
Sent: 7/16/2015 9:16:04 AM  
To: Dianne Reed  
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

Ms. Reed

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina has addressed The Citadel's disciplinary system twice since 2004, in *Vega v. Saleeby*, (D.S.C. 2004) and *Carter v. Citadel Board of Visitors, et al*, (D.S.C. 2011). The Citadel follows the prescriptions in those cases in the execution of its disciplinary system, and it reviews all appeals in accordance with them. The Citadel did so in your son's case, and it is confident it met all requirements. In other words, The Citadel is confident that the process it used to conclude your son committed the disciplinary violation of hazing, and the punishment it imposed therefor, met all legal standards.

As indicated before, your son has exhausted his administrative remedies. The Citadel considers this matter closed and will not respond to any further arguments, inquiries, or requests in this matter.

Mark

Mark C. Brandenburg

*General Counsel*

The Citadel, The Military College of South Carolina

171 Moultrie Street <x-apple-data-detectors://2/0>

Charleston, SC 29409 <x-apple-data-detectors://2/0>

(843) 953-5252 <tel:(843)%20953-5252> (office)

(843) 953-7592 <tel:(843)%20953-7592> (facsimile)

[mark.brandenburg@citadel.edu](mailto:mark.brandenburg@citadel.edu) <mailto:mark.brandenburg@citadel.edu>

*The information transmitted in this message is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender, destroy any printed copies, and delete the material from any computer*

**IF YOU ARE THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OF THIS E-MAIL AND IT CONTAINS THE CAPTION "PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL" YOU MAY NOT FORWARD THIS MESSAGE TO ANY OTHER PARTY WHATSOEVER WITHOUT THE PRIOR CONSENT OF THE OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL.**

On Jul 11, 2015, at 9:06 PM, Dianne Reed <[sdianne.reed@gmail.com](mailto:sdianne.reed@gmail.com)> wrote:

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](mailto: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