

585

586

---

## DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

---

587

588

589 The Complaints Team was aware of the requirement of Standing Order 1124 (18) that, in  
590 taking the steps provided by this Standing Order, it must not come to any conclusion on the  
591 facts or merits of the complaint except to the extent necessary to reach the decisions  
592 required.

593

### 594 **Burden of proof**

595

596 In accordance with Methodist Church practice the burden of proof in this investigation was  
597 judged on the "*balance of probabilities*".

598

599 This meant that the Complaints Team had to be convinced that the complaint was 51% likely  
600 to be true; that is, that the complainant's story only had to be slightly more plausible than  
601 the respondent's story. Expressed another way, the complainant's case would need to be  
602 accepted as more likely than not to be true for the complaint to succeed; that it is more  
603 probable than not.

604

### 605 **Choices facing the Complaints Team**

606

607 The role of the Complaints Team is to investigate the complaints for the purpose of deciding  
608 whether further steps should be taken and, if so, what those further steps should be.

609

610 The team decided to take the three complaints separately and examine whether there were  
611 any features which brought them together.

612

### 613 **Choices facing the team** (see Appendix E)

614

615 On completion of its investigation the Complaints Team had a number of choices under  
616 Standing Order 1124 (7) and its findings are as follows:

617

#### 618 **A. There is no scope for reconciliation.**

619

#### 620 **SO 1124 (7) (i) Reconciliation**

621

622 (i) In Complaint One, Ian Pruden offered to meet the complainant in the  
623 presence of a member of the District Reconciliation Group but this was not taken up.  
624