

Pursuant to the motion, I wish to substantiate the charge of "Inattention to Duty".

By now the timeline comparing election cycles should be with all of you. I am unanimous that LACRALO leadership was inattentive to their duty freely entered with LACRALO.

If the usual claim of ignorance of the LACRALO Rules of Procedure is to be sustained, then it is reasonable to conclude that acceptance of the nominations was deceptive, even fraudulent acts.

If the claim is inability to access the meaning of LACRALO organising instruments after time in office, then inattention is proved. Otherwise, it is reasonable to conclude incompetence.

If the leadership knowingly made decisions and failed to acknowledge the LACRALO Rules of Procedure or seek guidance from those knowledgeable of the Rules of Procedure, it is reasonable to conclude gross irresponsibility and recklessness.

I am requesting official translation of this message by At-Large Staff.

-Carlton Samuels

=====
Carlton A Samuels
Mobile: 876-818-1799
Strategy, Planning, Governance, Assessment & Turnaround
=====