

DRAFT: Reconciliation Agreement between John Troughton (complainant) and Peter Timms (respondent)

**Background**

David Booth (in his capacity as Local Complaints Officer) referred the complaint to Graham Hindle (Convenor of the District Reconciliation Group).

Graham made initial contact with John and Peter, by telephone, and both said that they were prepared to meet together, with Graham, with a view to exploring the possibility of some form of reconciliation.

**Reconciliation Meetings**

John, Peter and Graham met at *The Servants with Jesus*, in Bexhill on Monday 5th March, 2018 and Tuesday 20th March, 2018. Both John and Peter had suggested the location, independently, when Graham had asked about a suitable 'neutral' venue in which to meet. Each meeting lasted approximately two hours. John and Peter met willingly and listened attentively and respectfully to each other.

Much ground was covered in the first meeting but ended without a clear resolution in sight. Both parties agreed to meet again.

Most of the second meeting was spent discussing the substance of what John and Peter wanted in terms of an agreed resolution—in particular, agreeing upon a form of words and actions that both were willing to undertake. The conversation during this meeting was frank and open but it was clear that an agreed form of words and actions would not be reached in the scheduled time. Graham asked John and Peter if it would be helpful for him to suggest a form of words for their consideration?

Both parties welcomed Graham's offer. Graham explained, that he would need to give the situation careful reflection before offering a suggested form of words etc., and that he hoped to offer something in the lead up to Easter (most likely Holy Week). Unfortunately, Graham was taken ill not long after the meeting. As a matter of courtesy, Graham telephoned Peter and John (during Holy Week) to explain that he had been ill and apologised for the delay, with the undertaking that he would engage with the task as soon as he was able. Both were gracious in their responses.

Graham received an email (6th April) from David Booth explaining that Peter has been taken into hospital and that Peter may need an operation to fit a pacemaker. Graham received a further email (8th April) from David confirming that Peter had now had a pacemaker fitted and that he was due home very shortly. Graham replied to David saying that he would hold back on re-engaging with the situation for a week or so, unless he heard that Peter was well enough to resume. Peter emailed Graham on the 11th April explaining that he was now the owner of Cardiac Pacemaker; and that it would help him if the situation between himself and John could be resolved.

**John's Complaint**

The substance of John's complaint was that Peter was continuing to 'campaign' in relation to an official complaint that Peter had raised, locally, in 2014, and then via the Connexional Complaints Panel, in 2016. John said that his only recourse was to bring a formal complaint against Peter.

Early on, in the first meeting, John explained that he had written to David Booth and withdrawn six of the thirteen points (points 8 to 13) of his original complaint against Peter. John offered Peter a sincere apology for including these and said, that after further reflection, that they should not have been included.

John said that 'three pillars' of his original complaint remained.

1. Correspondence sent by Peter to John in November 2017 and January 2018; and email correspondence from Virginia Reynolds [gr.piereynolds@outlook.com]
2. The information on the website — <https://www.url.com/Timms2017>
3. The Video Interview (circulated as a DVD) — 'A Question of Conscience'

John explained that all three amounted to a continued 'campaign' by Peter, and that this was having an adverse effect upon the health and wellbeing of the Circuit.

**Peter's Response**

Peter said that he personally was not, nor ever had been, running a campaign.

1. Peter explained that his purpose in sending the correspondence to John (as Senior Circuit Steward) was to bring to John's attention what he saw as a breach in Standing Orders.
2. Peter accepted that the content on the website contained correspondence relating to three complaints that he took to the Connexional Complaints Panel, but that he did not post the material on the website himself.
3. Peter also said that that did not commission the video/DVD, nor did he have any editorial control over it, although he did contribute to it since he was the main subject. Peter explained that his friend, Mr P. Hill, had produced the film, because of the way that he had been treated. Peter said that he had no editorial control over the film.

**Reconciliation Agreement**

John and Peter listened to each other, attentively and respectfully, and acknowledge that even though their respective perspectives may still differ they accept the honesty and integrity of what they said to each other.

Peter confirms that he has no intention of sending any more letters to Circuit Officers etc., in respect of Standing Orders (in particular, SO 040) and the matter of his concerns over the way his complaint was dealt with by the Connexional Complaints Panel.

John accepts that Peter did not commission the film, 'A Question of Conscience'.

John accepts Peter's rationale for sending the correspondence to him as Senior Circuit Steward, however, these matters are now beyond the bounds of the Circuit since the Connexional Complaints Panel has ruled on this issue. The Connexional Complaints Panel did not uphold Peter's complaints that three ministerial colleagues had breached SO 040. The CCP also said that there was no appeal against this decision.

Peter accepts that the matter is now closed, within the bounds of the HBR Circuit, in the light of the CCP's decision.

In respect of the material posted on the same website as the film, 'A Question of Conscience'. Peter to ask the person(s) who originally posted the material, to a) remove the content entirely or, b) redact the contacts so that personal names and addresses are removed.

John also accepts Peter's offer to contact 'Ginnie' to ask her to stop sending emails to John and other circuit and church colleagues since the matter has now moved beyond the bounds of the HBR Circuit.

John acknowledges that Peter had the right to raise the issue over Standing Orders in John's capacity as HBR Senior Circuit Steward.

John acknowledges that his personal allegations against Peter, in his original complaint, were misplaced.

Duly signed in a spirit of reconciliation

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Rev Peter Timms O.B.E., M.A.)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Mr John Troughton, Senior Circuit Steward)

Dated \_\_\_\_\_

This documents contains privileged, confidential and sensitive information and is intended solely for the the Rev Peter Timms and Mr John Troughton. Please do not copy, print, store or forward this document to any other party.

DRAFT -- CONFIDENTIAL -- TIMMS