

**THE PERMANENT JUDICIAL COMMISSION  
OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH (U.S.A.)**

**JOHN F. VELDHUIZEN**  
Complainant/Appellant

v.

**Remedial Case 206-1**

**PRESBYTERY OF SAN FRANCISCO**  
Respondent/Appellee

This is a remedial case which has come before this commission on appeal by John F. Veldhuizen, minister, from an order of the Permanent Judicial Commission of the Synod of the Pacific.

**HISTORY**

An accusation against a minister member of the Presbytery of San Francisco was filed and presbytery formed a special disciplinary committee in accordance with the Rules of Discipline. The special disciplinary committee reported on March 31, 1992, that "there is insufficient evidence to provide probable cause to believe that an offense was committed by the accused," and no charges were filed.

John F. Veldhuizen, minister, filed a complaint against the Presbytery of San Francisco based on the special disciplinary committee's actions and decision. The Permanent Judicial Commission of the Synod of the Pacific heard the complaint and, in an order dated January 6, 1993, dismissed the case on the basis that the complaint did not state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

The General Assembly Permanent Judicial Commission finds that the Synod of the Pacific acted appropriately to dismiss the case. The Rules of Discipline clearly assign the responsibility for determining whether or not charges are to be filed to the special disciplinary committee. In D-7.0800, the Book of Order states what the special disciplinary committee is to do. Dissatisfaction with the outcome or the process used to reach the outcome does not provide the opportunity for a remedial complaint seeking to address the same issues.

The decision of the General Assembly Permanent Judicial Commission in the case of The Rev. John F. Warner v. Presbytery of the Pacific (Minutes, 1986, Part I, pp. 155-56) applies directly. The report of the special disciplinary committee duly concluded the matter.

### **ORDER**

It is ordered that this case be dismissed.

The untimely death of Harold Densmore, member of the commission, on October 24, 1993, precluded his participation in the proceedings. Ferdinand Pharr, member of the commission, was not present and took no part in the proceedings.