

**THE PUBLIC REVIEW BOARD
INTERNATIONAL UNION, UAW**

APPEAL OF:

BOB AND ALMA KING, MEMBERS
UAW LOCAL UNION 600
(Dearborn, Michigan),
Appellants

-vs-

CASE NO. 1464

UAW LOCAL UNION 600 EXECUTIVE BOARD
REGION 1A
(THE UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE
AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT
WORKERS OF AMERICA),
Appellee.

DECISION

(Issued April 27, 2004)

PANEL SITTING: Prof. Theodore J. St. Antoine, Chairperson,
Prof. Benjamin Aaron, Prof. Janice Bellace,
Prof. James J. Brudney, Prof. James E. Jones,
Jr., and Prof. Paul Weiler.

Bob and Alma King argue that the charges they filed against Russell Leone, Jerome Sullivan and Vince Bruno satisfied the requirements of Article 31, §3, of the International Constitution.

FACTS

Following the general elections conducted at UAW Local Union 600 in May 2002, retired member Bob King began writing letters to Local 600's officers criticizing their administration. A letter written by Local 600 Recording Secretary, Al Murlone, on August 26, 2003, indicates that by March 2003, the Local had accumulated "boxes and boxes" of letters, cartoons and leaflets written by King.¹ At that time, Murlone states, the Local President, Jerome Sullivan, gave a box of King's letters to member Vince Bruno to take to the Dearborn Police Department to see if anything could be done to stop King from writing them.

¹ Record, p. 28.

A Dearborn Police Department Case Report dated March 31, 2003, indicates that Bruno presented a dozen envelopes addressed to different Local Union officers. The police report states that the envelopes contained harassing and threatening messages.² The police report also indicates that Local 600 Financial Secretary, Russell Leone, a target of some of King's correspondence, telephoned the Police Department on March 20, 2003, and stated that he was willing to sign a complaint against King.³ Recording Secretary Al Murlone reports that the Dearborn City Attorney determined that the letters provided sufficient evidence to support a criminal charge against King.⁴

King was eventually charged with "malicious annoyance by writing."⁵ King filed a motion to dismiss the charge. The matter came before the District Court for the city of Dearborn on November 6, 2003, and District Judge William C. Hultgren issued an Opinion and Order dismissing the Complaint on November 19. The Court found that the statute under which King was charged required that the writing in question be obscene, and that the writings sent by King were not obscene.⁶

Meanwhile, on March 29, 2003, King had filed charges against Local 600 Financial Secretary Leone pursuant to Article 31, §3, of the International Constitution. King asserted that it was conduct unbecoming a union member for Leone to file a complaint against him with the Dearborn Police Department.⁷ King argued that Leone's criminal complaint also violated Article 33, §5, of the Constitution which requires union members to exhaust their internal union remedies before going to a civil court or

² The report states:

"Vince Bruno, acting as an agent for the U. A. W. Hall, responded to the Police Dept. to file this report. Bruno provided a dozen envelopes addressed to different officers of the union. The contents contained HARRASSING/THREATENING MESSAGES. Bruno added that there are numerous unopened envelopes still sitting in a box at the UAW Hall." (Record, p. 3)

³ Record, p. 3.

⁴ Record, p. 28.

⁵ Record, p. 68.

⁶ Record, p. 70.

⁷ The relevant part of King's charge states:

"Pursuant to the provisions of Article XXVII, Sections 1-2 and 3 and Article 31, Section 1-2 and 3 of the UAW Constitution: I hereby charge Local 600 Financial Secretary-Treasurer, Russell W. Leone with engaging in conduct unbecoming a union member and specific violations of the UAW Constitution. Wherein on or about March 27, 2003, he filed with the Dearborn Police Department an erroneous complaint (see enclosed relevant letter) designed to continue a reign of attempted intimidation toward me, that began with already officially protested acts of misconduct perpetrated against me as a candidate for the office of Financial Secretary in the 2002 Local 600 Officers Election." (Record, p. 1)

governmental agency for redress.⁸ On March 31, Bob King's wife, Alma, who is also a retired member of UAW Local 600, sent a letter to Recording Secretary Murlone asking to be considered a "co-charging party" with her husband in relation to the charges he filed against Russell Leone on March 29.⁹

King also filed charges against Local 600 member Vince Bruno on April 5, 2003, accusing him of conduct unbecoming a union member as well as of violating Article 33, §5, of the Constitution.¹⁰

On May 5, 2003, Recording Secretary Murlone advised King that the Local Executive Board had reviewed his charges against Leone and found them improper under Article 27, §3(c), of the Local Union Bylaws.¹¹ King appealed that ruling to the International Executive Board ("IEB") on May 7.

On June 9, 2003, Alma King filed charges against Local 600 President Sullivan pursuant to Article 31 of the Constitution. King's charges state that on June 5 Sullivan conspired with Detective Sergeant Eric Cullum of the Dearborn Police Department and Dearborn City Attorney Robert Hedges by lodging "trumped up" charges against her

⁸ The relevant part of the charge states:

"...With this most recent misconduct, Leone has violated the provisions of Article 33, Section 5 of the UAW Constitution, which states: Obligations to Exhaust Internal Remedies, "It shall be the duty of any individual or body, if aggrieved by any action decision or penalty imposed, to exhaust fully the individual or body's remedy and all appeals under the Constitution and the rules of this Union before going to civil court or governmental agency for redress..." (Record, p. 1)

⁹ Record, p. 125.

¹⁰ Bob King's charge against Vince Bruno states:

"In accord with Article 31, Sections 1-2 and 3 of the UAW Constitution and the provisions of Article XXVII, Sections, 1-2 and 3 of the Local 600 Bylaws, I hereby charge Vince Bruno, the self-professed "Agent of the UAW Hall" as attested to in Dearborn Police Department Case report 2003-00012067 (enclosed) with unbecoming conduct and specific violations of the UAW Constitution, Article 33, Section 5, "Obligation to Exhaust Internal Remedies" and Article 38, Section 6, "To Uphold All Provisions of the UAW Constitution." Bruno engaged in this unbecoming conduct on 3/19/03.

Furthermore this unbecoming conduct was a fabrication of unfounded and baseless charges of stalking and intimidation lodged against me in a conspiracy with Local 600 Financial Secretary Russell William Leone, as a continuation of Leone's concentrated efforts to harass and intimidate me for having accepted the candidacy to run against him for the position of Local Financial Secretary." (Record, p. 126)

¹¹ Article 27 of the Local 600 Bylaws sets forth provisions for the filing of charges similar to those in Article 31 of the International Constitution. Article 27, §3(c) of the Local Union's Bylaws is the equivalent of Article 31, §3(c) of the International Constitution, which states:

"The Act complained of does not sustain a charge of a violation of the Constitution or conduct unbecoming a member of the Union."

husband, Bob King, in the Dearborn District Court.¹² King filed charges against Vince Bruno on June 9, identical to those she filed against Sullivan.¹³ Bob King filed charges against Sullivan identical to Alma King's on June 16, 2003.¹⁴

An excerpt from the Local 600 Executive Board Meeting Minutes for August 4, 2003, indicates that a motion to process Bob and Alma King's charges against Jerry Sullivan was unanimously defeated.¹⁵ On August 4, Recording Secretary Murlone advised Bob King that the Local Executive Board had reviewed his charges against Jerome Sullivan and found them to be improper under Article 31, §3(c) and (e), of the Constitution. Alma King received a similar notice on August 6. Alma King appealed the Local Executive Board's ruling on her charges against Sullivan to the IEB on August 7, 2003. Bob King appealed the ruling on August 11, 2003.

Presidential Administrative Assistant Eunice Stokes-Wilson prepared a report on Bob King's appeal from the Local Union's rejection of his charges against Russell Leone for the IEB. Stokes-Wilson stated that it was never the intent of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention for Article 33, §5, to form the basis for charges pursuant to Article 31.¹⁶ Stokes-Wilson concluded that the act described in King's charges against

¹² Alma King's charges state, in pertinent part:

"Jerome Sullivan, on or about June 5, 2003, entered a conspiracy with a member of the Dearborn Police Department, Detective Sergeant Eric Cullum and Dearborn City Attorney Robert Hedges to do my husband harm by lodging trumped up charges against him in the Dearborn District Court. This filing of charges, absolutely violated the provisions of Article 33, §5 of the UAW Constitution and accordingly the provisions of Article 38 §6 of the UAW Constitution..." (Record, p. 8)

King concluded her charge against Sullivan with the following statement:

"This scurrilous act on the part of Jerome Sullivan is certainly contrary to what is expected of a Trade Unionist and in particular a member and officer of UAW Local 600, and should be dealt with accordingly, as provided in Article 31 of the UAW Constitution. This brazen violation by Jerome Sullivan caused my retired husband to be subjected to being treated as a suspected criminal. He was hand-cuffed, finger-printed and had a mug shot taken. This experience and the stress of the Court procedures have caused me grievous personal harm. Herein I have presented a prima facie case of serious and grievous unbecoming conduct perpetrated by Jerome Sullivan. Therefore the holding of a trial as called for in Article 31 is the Local Union's obligation." (Record, p. 8)

¹³ Record, p. 127.

¹⁴ Record, p. 9.

¹⁵ The excerpt from the August 4, 2003, minutes state:

"We received a complaint against Jerry Sullivan by Mr. & Mrs. Bob King. Article 31-Conduct Unbecoming states that we must vote to push the charge forward. Vote was taken and unanimously denied. Charges were found to be improper." (Record, p. 10)

¹⁶ Record, p. 23.

Leone did not rise to the level of conduct unbecoming a union member so the charges were properly disqualified under Article 31, §3(c), of the Constitution. The IEB adopted Stokes-Wilson's report as its decision and notified King on August 21, 2003. King appealed the IEB's decision on his charges against Leone to the Public Review Board ("PRB") on August 25, 2003.

In response to an inquiry from the International President's office on Bob and Alma King's charges against Jerome Sullivan, Recording Secretary Murlone wrote that Sullivan's name was mentioned by the City Attorney at Bob King's pretrial hearing as one of the officers of Local 600 who was being intimidated by King's letters. Murlone stated that Sullivan was not involved in initiating any complaints against King, so that the charges against him were improper.¹⁷

Presidential Administrative Assistant Gary Bryner prepared a report for the IEB on the Kings' appeal from the Local Union's determination that their charges against Jerome Sullivan were improper. Bryner found that the Kings' charges failed under Article 31, §3(c), of the Constitution in that they did not sustain a charge of a violation of the Constitution or conduct unbecoming a union member. Bryner stated that Article 33, §5, was not intended to force Local Union members to forego their rights as citizens. Furthermore, Bryner pointed out that the Kings had not identified any remedy under the Constitution that Sullivan should have used in response to Bob King's letters.¹⁸ The IEB adopted Bryner's report as its decision and notified Bob King on September 17, 2003. Bob and Alma King appealed the IEB's decision on their charges against Jerome Sullivan to the PRB on September 20, 2003.

On September 19, 2003, Bob and Alma King appealed to the IEB the Local 600 Executive Board's ruling that their charges against Vince Bruno failed to satisfy the requirements of Article 31, §3, of the International Constitution. In their appeal, the Kings explained that they had received notice of the Local Executive Board's decision on their charges against Bruno on September 18, 2003.¹⁹

Presidential Assistant Bryner prepared a report on the Kings' charges against Vince Bruno for the IEB. Once again, Bryner questioned what procedure the Constitution would offer as a response to King's letters. Bryner wrote:

"In this case, the Appellant does not identify how Vince Bruno should have proceeded, using the International Constitution. Further, it is not clear that the International Constitution would offer any procedure to deal with the allegation raised by the Appellant. More importantly, Article

¹⁷ Record, p. 28.

¹⁸ Record, pp. 32-33.

¹⁹ Record, p. 34.

33, Section 5, of the International Constitution provides the Union a defense when it is a defendant in a suit brought against it when there is a remedy within the International Constitution that has not been exhausted."²⁰

In any event, Bryner found that the Kings had not sustained a charge of conduct unbecoming a union member or a violation of the Constitution. Bryner also found that the charges lacked the specificity required by Article 31, §3(a), of the Constitution. Bryner explained:

"Brother King alleges that Brother Vince Bruno conspired with Brother Russell William Leone, as a continuation of Leone's concentrated efforts to harass and intimidate him for having accepted the candidacy to run against him for the position of Local Financial Secretary.

Other than the written words, Brother King offers nothing in support of his charges concerning Brother Bruno's alleged conspiracy with Brother Leone."²¹

Accordingly, Bryner ruled that the Kings' charges against Bruno failed under Article 31, §3(a) and (c), of the Constitution. The IEB adopted Bryner's report as its decision and notified Bob King on October 27, 2003. Bob King appealed the IEB's decision on the charges against Bruno to the PRB on October 31, and Alma King appealed on November 4, 2003.

On December 8, we notified the parties that the three appeals arising out of the Complaint filed by Russell Leone with the Dearborn Police Department would be consolidated since the underlying facts were the same in all three cases. The record in this case was forwarded to the parties on February 18, 2004. On February 21, Bob King advised the PRB staff that he considered the record to be incomplete. He argued that the excerpt from the Local 600 minutes of August 4, 2003, submitted by the Local was an inadequate response to President Gettelfinger's August 14 request for information concerning his appeal from the determination that the charges against Sullivan were improper. King requested that a full copy of the August 4 minutes be included in the record. He stated:

"A complete copy of the minutes for the August 4, 2003, Executive Board meeting is requested for placement in the record. Perhaps the ambiguity of the Recording Secretary's

²⁰ Record, p. 51.

²¹ Record, p. 52.

two (2) sentence report will be clarified with the contents of the complete minutes."²²

King also requested "full disclosure" from the Local Union in response to his appeals from the disqualification of his charges against Bruno and Leone.

The PRB staff forwarded King's letter regarding the record to the International President's office on February 25. On March 8, 2004, Presidential Assistant Stokes-Wilson wrote to the PRB that all of the minutes relevant to the Kings' appeals were included in the record, and that the IEB had ruled that the minutes of the Local 600 Executive Board and the Membership Meeting minutes were not to be distributed.²³ In the meantime, on March 4, 2004, Stokes-Wilson forwarded copies of leaflets submitted by Bob King to be included in the record.²⁴ On March 8, Recording Secretary Murlone objected to the inclusion of Bob King's leaflets in the record. Murlone stated that these materials have no relevance to the issues presented by the Kings' appeals.²⁵

ARGUMENT

A. Alma King and Bob King:

Russell Leone, Jerome Sullivan and Vincent Bruno entered into a conspiracy with the Dearborn Police Department and the Dearborn City Attorney's Office in an effort to intimidate retired member Bob King with a criminal misdemeanor charge with the aim of suppressing his right to free speech. We filed charges against Leone, Sullivan and Bruno pursuant to Article 31 of the Constitution.

The charges absolutely meet the requirements of Article 31, §3(a) through (e), of the Constitution and should be remanded to Local 600 for a trial. The two Local Union officers and member Bruno clearly engaged in conduct unbecoming Union members when they triggered a criminal prosecution against Bob King for exercising his right to freedom of speech and to freely criticize the policies and personalities of Union officials, as guaranteed by the Ethical Practices Codes.

If the Local Union officers were actually intimidated by the letters and cartoons sent to them by Bob King, they could have exercised their right to submit charges pursuant to Article 31 of the Constitution. That is not the issue before the PRB, however, and will have to be addressed by the Trial Committee. We ask to have the charges remanded to the Local Union for a trial.

²² Record, p. 118.

²³ Record, p. 139.

²⁴ Record, pp. 129-136

²⁵ Record, p. 138.

B. International Union, UAW:

The Kings' have not shown that Sullivan, Leone, or Bruno acted with any wrongful intent or that they knowingly or intentionally engaged in conduct unbecoming a union member.

The Public Review Board has ruled that Article 33, §5, (formerly §12), does not limit a member's right to conduct civil and criminal proceedings. In *Scriber v. Local 699*, 3 PRB 99 (1980), the Board considered a claim that Article 31 charges should be disqualified because the charging party also filed criminal charges. The Board found that claim without merit stating that Article 33, §12, does not seek to regulate the conduct of civil and criminal proceedings among members of the Union.

If a union member witnessed a crime committed by another union member, King suggests that it would be "conduct unbecoming a union member" for him to report it. Such an argument is contrary to public policy. Citizens are encouraged to report wrongdoings. It is up to the attorneys who represent the people of the community to decide how much evidence is needed to warrant a criminal charge. In this case, it was the Dearborn City Attorney who decided that King may have committed a criminal act.

The decision of the IEB should be affirmed.

C. Alma King and Bob King, rebuttal:

We have asserted that Sullivan, Leone and Bruno deliberately trumped up criminal charges against Bob King with the Dearborn Police Department in an effort to suppress his right to free speech. It is not for the Local Executive Board or the IEB to decide the merits of this charge. That is for the Trial Committee. The charge is clearly one of conduct unbecoming a union member.

We have volumes of evidence to prove our case against Sullivan, Leone and Bruno, including Police Reports, Court Transcripts and the legal brief that was offered in support of Bob King's successful Motion to Dismiss. This evidence is not relevant here but will be offered at the trial to prove that our charges against Sullivan, Leone and Bruno were warranted.

DISCUSSION

Our task in reviewing appeals from the disqualification of charges presented pursuant to Article 31 of the Constitution is to assume that the allegations made in the charges are true and to apply the tests of Article 31, §3, of the Constitution. Because this process is typically straightforward, we do not ordinarily schedule oral argument in such appeals. Appellant King has argued that we should conduct a hearing in this case, however, because the record is incomplete. He has insisted that Local 600 ought to have forwarded the entire text of the minutes of the August 4, 2003, Local Executive

Board meeting during which his charges against President Sullivan were found to be improper. He has pointed out that the record does not contain any minutes from the Local Executive Board meetings where his charges against Leone and Bruno were considered. King has expressed doubt that the IEB had made any ruling forbidding the distribution of these minutes, as claimed by Stokes-Wilson. King maintains that these minutes are on file in the Local 600 Recording Secretary's office, and that they ought to have been forwarded to the PRB in accordance with Rule 4(a) of the Board's Rules of Procedure.²⁶

Appellant King is correct that the Local Executive Board minutes ought to have been forwarded to the PRB. It was error for the International President's Administrative Assistant not to require Local 600 to forward its Executive Board meeting minutes to the PRB in connection with this appeal. Our rules of procedure clearly state that a complete set of all relevant minutes should be forwarded to the PRB at the time that the International Union files its answer to the appeal. The Constitution specifically charges the Local Executive Board with the task of reviewing charges submitted under Article 31 to determine if they satisfy the requirements of Article 31, §3. Such minutes are, therefore, relevant to the Kings' appeal. We do not believe, however, that the absence of these minutes in the record compels us to conduct a hearing on this appeal.

The terse notation of the Local Executive Board's action on the Kings' charges against Sullivan in the August 4, 2003, minutes is fairly typical of the record made of such actions. Minutes of meetings of Local Union Executive Boards rarely contain any detailed report of the members' deliberations on the issues. King has not provided any basis for concluding that the August 4, 2003, minutes contain any further reference to his charges beyond the excerpt that was provided by the Local Union. Similarly, there is no basis to conclude that the Local 600 Executive Board minutes of May 5, 2003, contain any reference to the Kings' charges against Russell Leone beyond the sentence communicated to Bob King in Recording Secretary Murlone's letter of May 5. The record does not contain the notice of the Local Executive Board's action on the Kings' charges against Vince Bruno, which it received on September 18, 2003. The Kings describe the notice as a "one sentence letter" in their appeal to the IEB, and we assume that the one sentence reflects a similarly cryptic reference in the minutes of the meeting where the matter was decided. Once again, the Kings have not suggested that there is any particular material in these minutes relevant to their appeals. We have the text of the charges. We are informed of the Local Executive Board's action on the charges, and we have the IEB's decision on the Kings' appeal from that action. We have

²⁶ Rule 4(a) of the PRB's Rules of Procedure, Series 17, states:

"At the time the International Union files its Answer it shall forward to the PRB a complete set of all of the written documents that have been submitted in connection with the case, including all correspondence, briefs or written arguments, minutes, transcripts and exhibits submitted by the parties at the local union level or during the International Union proceedings."

concluded, therefore, that the record is adequate to rule on the propriety of the Kings' charges under Article 31.

The leaflets submitted by appellant Bob King and forwarded to the PRB by the International Union will be included in the record, despite the Local Union's objection to them. The leaflets provide us with examples of the kind of material that triggered the City of Dearborn's prosecution of King, which ultimately led to his charges, so they do have some bearing on the issues presented by the Kings' appeal. They also contain Bob King's comments about the Union's handling of his appeal. It is our practice to include in the record such comments from an appellant.

All of the charges submitted by the appellants assert that the charged parties violated Article 33, §5, of the UAW Constitution which requires union members to exhaust their internal union remedies before going to a civil court or governmental agency for redress.²⁷ We can quickly dispose of these claims, because Article 33, §5, only applies to appeals and claims for relief arising under provisions of the UAW Constitution or the bylaws of a local union. As we ruled in *Schriber v. Local Union 699*, *supra*, this section does not require members to forgo their rights to pursue civil or criminal actions against other members. A member who felt he had been injured by another member's negligence, for instance, would not be precluded by Article 33, §5, from seeking damages in a civil suit. A member who is the victim of a criminal act on the part of another member is not restricted to presenting his complaint as charges pursuant to Article 31 of the Constitution, rather than reporting the matter to the police.

The District Court ultimately dismissed the criminal charge against King after determining that his letters to the various officers of Local 600 were neither threatening nor obscene. The court gave the following description of King's correspondence with Local 600:

“...All in all, Defendant sent hundreds of letters to these various officials. The union officials interpreted these letters as threats and contacted the Dearborn Police. For the most part, the letters are mainly cartoon drawings depicting various union officials, some of them contain [epithets] and some allege corruption...”²⁸

King's letter writing campaign arose in the context of a Local Union election in which he ran for Financial Secretary in opposition to Leone. We have previously held that leaflets

²⁷ Article 33, §5, states:

“OBLIGATION TO EXHAUST INTERNAL UNION REMEDIES. It shall be the duty of any individual or body, if aggrieved by any action, decision or penalty imposed, to exhaust fully the individual or body's remedy and all appeals under this Constitution and the rules of this Union before going to a civil court or governmental agency for redress.”

²⁸ Record, pp. 68-69.

such as those described by the Court would not support charges under Article 31 of the Constitution. In *Dombeck vs. Local Union 1645*, 5 PRB 493, at 497 (1988), we stated:

“...we have held repeatedly that the sharp attacks to which one may be subjected as a result of his candidacy for elective office are to be expected and will not be the basis for overturning an election. It follows that if the right to make sharp attacks on one’s political opponent is protected free speech under the UAW Constitution, then it is not conduct unbecoming a union member to author campaign literature of this type.” (Footnote omitted.)

It was certainly unwise for Recording Secretary Leone to involve the Dearborn Police Department in the Local Union’s political affairs on the basis of leaflets and letters that were not actionable under the UAW Constitution. Union political activity is not for the faint of heart, and warding off the verbal slings and arrows of unhappy members is an often familiar aspect of a union official’s job. We find, however, that the Kings’ charges against Leone, Sullivan and Bruno do not describe with sufficient specificity acts which would constitute conduct unbecoming a member of the union to satisfy the requirements of Article 31, §3(a), of the Constitution.

In his charge against Russell Leone, Bob King characterizes Leone’s complaint against him as “erroneous.”²⁹ In their charges against Jerome Sullivan, and Vince Bruno, Bob and Alma King describe the criminal charge against King as having been “trumped up.”³⁰ They do not describe, however, in what sense the complaint was erroneous or manufactured. The charges do not assert that Bob King was not the author of the letters that led to his prosecution by the City of Dearborn. It is not suggested that Sullivan and Leone fabricated evidence for the purpose of inducing the Dearborn City Attorney to bring a criminal action against him. Sullivan and Bruno only presented the letters to the police to inquire whether they could be legally stopped. Although Leone indicated a willingness to sign a criminal complaint against King, it was the City Attorney’s decision to prosecute King that set in motion the processes that King found so objectionable.

The charges against Sullivan and Bruno mention a conspiracy with the Dearborn Police Department, Detective Sergeant Eric Cullum and the Dearborn City Attorney but they do not describe any acts on the part of Sullivan and Bruno that would amount to conspiring. The Kings complain that Sullivan and Bruno subjected Bob King to being hand-cuffed, finger-printed, and having his mug shot taken. These occurrences were simply the consequence of the City Attorney’s decision to prosecute, however. There is no specific allegation that the Local Union’s officers wielded any undue influence over

²⁹ Record, p. 1.

³⁰ Record, pp. 8, 9, 126, 127

the City Attorney or the Dearborn police through some particular course of conduct or the payment of money.

It is not sufficient under Article 31, §3(a), of the Constitution to allege a conspiracy with the promise of providing more specific details when the matter is presented to the trial committee. The actual conspiratorial or deceptive acts must be described in the charges with sufficient detail to give the accused notice of what conduct will be scrutinized by the trial committee. Because the Kings' charges fail to point to any specific actions on the part of the accused officers that would constitute an improper influence over the decisions of the Dearborn Police or the Dearborn City Attorney, they fail under Article 31, §3(a), of the Constitution.

The appeal is denied.