

## Randy Scott-All Claims Process, LLC

---

**From:** IPPSOA [admin=ippsoa.com@mail123.us2.mcsv.net] on behalf of IPPSOA [admin@ippsoa.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 16, 2012 8:50 PM  
**To:** randy@fortmyersprocess.com  
**Subject:** NAPPS Board of directors and officers file lawsuit against anonymous BLOGGERS

### IPPSOA

The NAPPS board of directors and officers of the National Association of Professional Process Servers filed suit #120809901 in Multnomah County Circuit Court Oregon filed August 8, 2012 against anonymous bloggers John Does 1- 8 relating to NAPPSWATCHER.COM.

The allegations are not fully known at this point. For now IPPSOA knows it is related to the NAPPSWATCHER.com site and the anonymous bloggers who posted on it. The bloggers question the administrations unaudited financial practices as it relates to accounting of the association finances.

I am ordering the file and will update with the specific allegations once it is obtained. In the mean time come over to Facebook group as always that is updated and contributed by others too. I also have an entire copy of NAPPSWATCHER.com before they were deleted and I will be updating IPPSOA to dive into the merits and truth of the comments posted there as the case progresses.

Remember in a previous email I sent I talked about the 100K to New York. Well this suit was brought based on a motion and a second at the annual meeting in Boston in April 2012. The motion was made by Gerald Colasurdo and seconded by Tim Couch to find the nappswatcher.com creators and those who anonymously posted on it and all the authors of negative posts against NAPPS board everywhere on the internet and to remove them from the association if they are members.

The overwhelming majority of the attendees at the NAPPS conference in Boston on April 2012 were members of the New York association that received the 100K from NAPPS. During the new business session of this meeting there were 2 motions. The one I mentioned related to NAPPWATCHER.com and this lawsuit now officially filed. The second one is a doozy also. It is a Motion by Alan Goodman to rescind the resolution from 1985 for an annual audit, 2nd by Paul Tamaroff . Yes I said rescind the audit requirement from 1985. You think that motion appeared with little forethought or planning? In those 27 years there was never one audit by a CPA. This was brought to the members attention by the honorable Steve Janney who was the treasurer leading up

to the conference in Boston. Can you guess what happened in Boston? The conference overwhelmingly consisting of New York members voted to replace Mr Janney with Mr Ezell. When I say overwhelmingly New York it was about 45 of the 130 voters. The entire east coast area around New York made up at least 75% of those in attendance. I clarified and state New York just to show the problem with the system not necessarily the people. Next year it is in Arizona are you prepared for the big flip or can we change this whole ying and yang so all members can have a say? Let us vote online!

Yes only two motions at this conference passed one to codify the failure to perform an audit for 27 years by rescinding the action from 27 years ago and the other to investigate and kick out anonymous bloggers saying bad things about the board and its officers.

Lucky for me I am not anonymous I suppose. And for everyone else what I am talking about are public policy issues relating to a non profit association. That means this association received federal tax subsidies by not having to pay certain taxes. In fact the general public has a right to know if the tax exempt status is properly managed. The general public has a right to request the tax returns whether they are a member or not. In furtherance of this fact NAPPS has become a competitive necessity for most small process servers because of their directory. In this matter even non members could force placement in the directory. Check anti-trust law they will confirm competitive necessity and trade association access. This is an important link in regards to the application of the US Constitutional provision of freedom of speech. Private organization may indeed limit speech but if that speech is by design to prevent the public knowledge involving public policy issues it creates a significant conflict that must error with freedom of speech.

Finally, due to the recent knowledge of the filed lawsuit and since this email has come so quick to the prior one I want to include two previous matter of litigation that NAPPS has been involved going back to 2004 and 2005. I am very confident very few members were ever aware of these. Every state association should be knowledgeable of this issue from Washington because states are more ripe to anti trust concerns than the national is. You can find the files at these following links.

This link relates to NAPPS suing a domain name owner but then terminating the case. These web sites are still operational today.

[http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/search/case.jsp?case\\_id=8383](http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/search/case.jsp?case_id=8383)

This link relates to an Sherman Antitrust and business interference case against NAPPS and the Washington State Association settled in 2005 for an undisclosed amount. It is a very important case for state association to study the depositions of the participants are in the deposition folder at the link. This suit was brought when the State Association and the National Association shared presidents  
<https://docs.google.com/folder/d/0B3NzxdOCxalNdHlucl9COTFPRlE/edit>

That is why I write to all 2000 members because I believe you should know and I propose all 2000 members should be able to vote so the few can be properly placed and overcome by the many.

Come visit and join [IPPSOA.com](http://IPPSOA.com) to bring purpose and strength and equal placement at the table for the independent process server and bring NAPPS with us to reason together under equal application of all rules for all members all the time.

Randy Scott  
IPPSOA  
administrator and a  
NAPPS member for real change

[FACEBOOK GROUP DISCUSSION http://www.facebook.com/groups/processservers/](http://www.facebook.com/groups/processservers/)

INTERESTING CASES ON BLOGGING:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Krinsky\\_v.\\_Doe\\_6](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Krinsky_v._Doe_6)

<https://www.eff.org/bloggers>

thank you

[Unsubscribe](#) randy@fortmyersprocess.com from this list.

Our mailing address is:  
IPPSOA  
343 Hazelwood Avenue S  
Lehigh Acres, FL 33936

[Add us to your address book](#)

Copyright (C) 2012 IPPSOA All rights reserved.

[Forward](#) this email to a friend  
[Update your profile](#)

