

****ARC BOARD, HODGES & RIZZO ACCEPT ALL ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THEM AS TRUE IN THE AMENDED FEDERAL COMPLAINT****

In a recent development, the ARC Board, along with Hodges and Rizzo, have once again acknowledged and accepted all allegations against them as true in the amended federal complaint. These allegations include multiple criminal acts that have been brought against them. One notable aspect of their defense strategy is the invocation of the Doctrine of Ecclesiastical Abstention to shield themselves from accountability.

But what does it really mean to claim "Ecclesiastical Abstention"? Essentially, when pleading "ecclesiastical abstention," Hodges, Rizzo, and the ARC Board are admitting to the truth of the accusations leveled against them. However, they are asserting that the court does not have the authority to investigate or intervene in their actions.

Their argument is centered around the idea that their privileged and elite ecclesiastical status places them above the laws that apply to every other citizen. By invoking Ecclesiastical Abstention, they seek to shield themselves from legal consequences and accountability for their alleged criminal activities.

This legal maneuver raises important questions about the boundaries between religious institutions and the legal system, as well as the implications of allowing individuals to evade accountability based on claims of ecclesiastical privilege.

As this case unfolds, it will be crucial to closely examine the implications of Ecclesiastical Abstention and its potential impact on the pursuit of justice and accountability in cases involving religious organizations and their leaders. Stay tuned for further updates as this story continues to develop.