

August 19, 2026

**In the Matter of The Rt. Rev. Derek Jones
(Bishop, Special Jurisdiction for the Armed Forces and Chaplaincy)**

FINAL JUDGMENT

The Court having considered the Anglican Church in North America's Motion for Summary Judgment ("Motion") in the matter of Bishop Derek Jones ("Respondent") is of the unanimous opinion that the Motion should be GRANTED. The Court's opinion is as follows:

SUMMARY

1. The episcopal office is fundamentally pastoral. A bishop is entrusted with the care of Christ's flock and is therefore called to exercise authority as a shepherd, not as a lord who employs another's livelihood as leverage to obtain financial support, loyalty, or submission. The conduct of Bishop Derek Jones demonstrated in the record before this Court falls grievously short of that standard.

2. This Court unanimously finds Bishop Derek Jones guilty of each of the four canonical offenses brought against him in the October 21, 2025 Presentment and respectfully refers these findings to the College of Bishops for sentencing following the canonical thirty-day appellate period found in Canon IV.5.5.1.¹

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

3. The Presentment in this matter was signed on October 21, 2025 ("Presentment") by Bishop Julian Dobbs, Bishop Clark W.P. Lowenfield, and Bishop Eric Menees in accordance with Canon IV.4.1.

4. A Summons from this Court along with the Presentment was served upon Respondent via hand-delivery by a process server on April 24, 2026 in accordance with Rule 2(c) of the Court's Rules of Procedure.

5. In accordance with Rule 5(c) of this Court's Rules of Procedure, Respondent had thirty days to file an Answer with the Court. Accounting for May 24, 2026 as a Sunday and May 25, 2026 as a holiday, Respondent's Answer was due May 26, 2026. Respondent made no Answer.

¹ The Anglican Church in North America ("ACNA") Canons applicable in this matter are those ratified by the June 2024 Provincial Assembly and do not include any changes ratified in June 2026. All references herein are to the 2024 ACNA Canons.

6. In accordance with Rule 10(a)(1) of this Court's Rules of Procedure, the Provincial Prosecutor filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on all claims in this matter on July 7, 2026, more than thirty days after the Answer deadline.

7. In accordance with Rule 10(a)(1) of this Court's Rules of Procedure, the Court held a hearing on the Motion on August 10, 2026, more than twenty days after the filing of the Motion. The Court heard argument from the Provincial Prosecutor, deliberated, and herein renders its verdict.

CANONICAL CHARGES

8. Four canonical charges have been brought against Respondent in the Presentment:
- i. Title IV, Canon 2.1.12: Willful refusal to follow a Godly Admonition;
 - ii. Title IV, Canon 2.1.9: Disobedience to or willful contravention of the Canons of this Church;
 - iii. Title IV, Canon 2.1.4: Having exhibited conduct giving cause for scandal or offense, including the abuse of ecclesiastical power; and
 - iv. Title IV, Canon 2.1.2: Having promoted and caused schism within this Church

STANDARD OF REVIEW

9. All matters before this Court must be proven by clear and convincing evidence. *See* Canon IV.5.7. To meet this standard, as this Court stated in *In re Ruch*, the Court must find that:

- (1) the factual predicate of the charge is established with clarity;
- (2) the evidence demonstrates personal misconduct by the bishop; and
- (3) the proof rises above speculation, inference, rumor, or subjective impression.

In re Ruch, p. 34.

FINDINGS OF FACT

10. The findings in this case are the bare bones of the environment this Court found within the SJAFRC that promoted isolation, authoritarian submission, doubt, hopelessness, and deceit. The Respondent sought to force submission and wield power, rejecting Godly authority and inquiry in a manner that is as unlike Christ as one can imagine.

I. Background

- 11. Respondent was consecrated as a bishop on January 6, 2007.
- 12. Respondent was received into the ACNA in 2010.

13. The United States Armed Forces and certain other jurisdictions require formal recommendations from a chaplain's religious organization, known as endorsements, for each chaplain. An endorsement designates a chaplain to represent that religious organization and conduct religious observances or ceremonies. Endorsements must be renewed upon career advancement in the military and certain other events, depending upon the organization. In particular, all United States military chaplains are required to submit a DD Form 2088, Statement of Ecclesiastical Endorsement, at the start of their chaplaincy and at each change of career status. An endorser has the right to withdraw an endorsement, which, in the military context, can result in separation from the military if a new endorsement is not given within a particular time frame.

14. The Special Jurisdiction for the Armed Forces and Chaplaincy ("SJAFC") was formed in 2014 to provide a single avenue for chaplain endorsement in the ACNA. The purpose of the SJAFC is as follows:

...a Special Jurisdiction to oversee the Church's ministry of clergy serving in Endorsed Chaplaincies to include Governmental agencies, such as the Armed Forces of the United States, Veteran's Administration, and Department of Justice, and non-governmental agencies which require formal ecclesiastical endorsement...The Bishop of the Armed Forces and Chaplaincy is the ecclesiastical endorser for chaplains in this Church as may be needed to meet the professional requirements of governmental and institutional chaplaincies.

Canon I.11.1.

15. At the time of its formation in 2014, the Bishop of the SJAFC was not the sole endorser of chaplains in the ACNA. A representative of the Reformed Episcopal Church ("REC") also had the authority to endorse chaplains within the ACNA until at least 2023, when certain efforts by Respondent to consolidate authority over chaplain endorsement went into effect. *See* Canon I.11.13.

16. Provincial oversight of the SJAFC rests with the Archbishop of the ACNA in accordance with Canon I.11.11.

17. Respondent was elected to be Bishop of the SJAFC by the College of Bishops in accordance with Canon I.11.1.

18. Respondent is and continues to be a bishop under the jurisdiction of the ACNA.

19. As of the issuance of this Opinion, Respondent has not been released from the governance or discipline of the ACNA.

20. As bishop of the SJAFC, Respondent exercised the authority to officially endorse ACNA clergy who served as chaplains to their respective organizations or military branches, in accordance with Canon I.11.

21. Clergy discipline is governed by Title IV of the ACNA canons and corresponding sections of diocesan canons.

II. Structure of the SJAFc

22. The SJAFc is a “Special Jurisdiction” within the ACNA, not a diocese. While dioceses are addressed by Canon I.5, the SJAFc is specifically and separately addressed and established in Canon I.11. Importantly, the SJAFc is a group of individual clergy, not a group of congregations. *See* Canon I.5.1, *compare* Canon I.11.2.

23. The SJAFc is unique among the jurisdictions within the ACNA in that there are no laity in the SJAFc.

24. Many non-military chaplains, such as some prison or medical chaplains, do not require endorsement in the manner of military chaplains.

25. Respondent required that all chaplains in the ACNA, not just those in the armed forces, join the SJAFc rather than remaining canonically resident in their local diocese, including medical and prison chaplains. This is despite language in Canon I.11.1 establishing the SJAFc specifically for those in *endorsed* chaplaincies and making membership optional for other chaplains. *See* Canon I.11.2.

26. Respondent required all individuals under his authority to adhere to three requirements to remain in “Good Standing”: (1) submit regular Ember reports; (2) attend annual convocations; and (3) remit a certain percentage of all income as a mandatory donation to the SJAFc under the “Tithing Policy,” in lieu of or before a tithe to a local parish.

III. General Treatment of Chaplains Under Respondent’s Authority

27. Respondent developed a culture which discouraged chaplains from seeking pastoral care because it was characterized or viewed as complaining.

28. Respondent required chaplains who sought pastoral care from SJAFc bishops to seek counseling from a counselor of Respondent’s choosing. Respondent also required those who brought complaints about his leadership style or other aspects of the SJAFc to see a mental health counselor of his choosing, who was believed to report directly back to Respondent.

29. Failure to remain in “Good Standing” in the SJAFc under Respondent could and did result in the withholding of endorsements or approval to transfer one’s orders into another jurisdiction or diocese, effectively leaving chaplains stuck without career advancement or simply in the SJAFc when they wished to leave. This was particularly insidious as “Good Standing” in the SJAFc had such clear financial requirements.

30. Healthcare and prison chaplains and potentially others were required to pay out of pocket for convocation transportation and lodging, which presented an undue financial burden for many. In extreme cases, written permission could be obtained prior to convocations to excuse attendance. Permission to excuse attendance was required to be in writing.

31. The SJAFc “Tithing Policy” required a minimum pledge of all expected income for a given year, based upon income reported to the SJAFc as of November 15 of the year prior. The “Tithing Policy” varied in its required “mandatory donation” to the SJAFc from 5% to 10%,

depending upon how much income was derived from chaplaincy, whether the chaplain attended and tithed to a local ACNA parish, and some other factors.

32. Once the “pledge” was established, chaplains were required to remit the full amount of their monthly tithe via electronic deposit through a system monitored by SJAFC.

33. No leeway in “giving” was provided for unexpected expenses, loss of income, or other change in financial situation.

34. Respondent’s daughter was the receiver of any reports of misconduct by Respondent. She was additionally an administrator involved in finance and programs in the SJAFC.

35. Chaplains were not permitted to have contact with any other ecclesial authority, including with ACNA bishops and the ACNA Archbishop, without Respondent’s knowledge. Doing so would risk the chaplain’s “Good Standing” and possible Title IV proceedings.

IV. General Treatment of Clergy Not Under Respondent’s Authority

36. Respondent pressured clergy chaplains not under his authority to leave their dioceses or jurisdictions to join the SJAFC.

37. When clergypersons not under his authority chose not to acquiesce to his demands, Respondent would attempt to leverage their careers or holy orders to force the hand of the clergy not under his authority and get his way, whatever that might be.

38. Respondent deliberately interfered in the ministry and careers of those outside of his authority through the spread of falsehoods and rumors and through other manipulations.

V. Godly Admonition and Response

39. With the requisite consents from the College of Bishops, a Godly Admonition was issued by Archbishop Steve Wood to Respondent on September 12, 2025 in a video conference and then in written form on the same day (“Godly Admonition”). *See* Canon IV.2.2.

40. The Godly Admonition included nine credible complaints under investigation by the ACNA via the Title IV disciplinary process that could, if borne out, carry a charge of “conduct giving just cause for scandal or offense, including the abuse of ecclesiastical power” under Canon IV.2.1.4. Not all of these complaints have been brought before this Court by the Province, so this Court will refrain from reciting them here in full. However, the nine complaints included using the Title IV process to manipulate clergy, attempts to discipline persons not under Respondent’s authority, and inflicting financial, emotional, and psychological stress on persons under Respondent’s care, all of which and more have been substantiated via documentary evidence, video evidence, and sworn affidavit testimony before this Court.

41. The Godly Admonition correctly stated that:

Per Canon I.5 §8, it is the moral duty of the whole Church to see that the flock of Christ is protected from abuse. But a particular duty rests upon the bishop to ensure that justice and mercy are administered in his jurisdiction (Canon III.8 §1).

42. Included in the Godly Admonition were Directives including, but not limited to, the following instructions:

- i. Not to communicate in any way with any person, other than members of your immediate family, any legal counsel you may retain, and anyone I [the Archbishop] approve to provide you pastoral care and spiritual counsel, about the allegations or the investigation.
- ii. Not to communicate in any way with bishops or clergy of the Special Jurisdiction of Armed Forces and Chaplaincy and their families about any matter pertaining to the allegations or the investigation.
- iii. Not to ask or encourage any person, including your family, friends and supporters, to speak to any person other than those outlined in paragraph 1 [of the Godly Admonition] above about the allegations or the investigation.
- iv. Not to engage, or have an advocate engage, in any behavior towards any person that is, or could reasonably be considered to be retaliatory or bullying.
- v. To cooperate fully and honestly with the Provincial leaders and investigators as they do their work.

43. On September 16, 2025, the Chancellor and Co-Chancellor of the SJAFc sent a letter to Archbishop Wood protesting the Godly Admonition, investigation, and discipline of the Church. The September 16 letter indicated that cooperation with the process would not be forthcoming.

44. On September 18, 2025, an email was circulated by Mrs. Lauren Ullman, daughter of the Respondent and employee of the SJAFc, to the SJAFc chaplains instructing:

Our JAFc Chancellors have requested that staff and chaplains are not to cooperate with any requests from the Archbishop, his staff, or his investigators for interviews, answers to questions, emails, hard copy documents, and any other records they may possess.

45. Also on September 18, 2025, a similar email was circulated by the SJAFc communications team.

46. On September 20, 2025, Respondent sent a letter withdrawing from the ACNA and the College of Bishops in response to the Godly Admonition and indicating that Respondent would not cooperate with any investigation undertaken by the ACNA.

47. To date, Respondent has not cooperated with or aided in the ACNA's investigation into his conduct or the related Title IV proceedings.

VI. Inhibition

48. On September 21, 2025, Archbishop Wood inhibited Respondent ("Inhibition") with the written consent of the required senior bishops. *See* Canon IV.9.3.

49. The Inhibition included the following instructions for Respondent during the period of inhibition:

- i. You are not to communicate about this Inhibition in any way with any person, other than members of your immediate family, any legal counsel you may retain, and anyone the Archbishop approves to provide you pastoral care and spiritual counsel, about the allegations or the investigation (I have appointed Bishop Chip Edgar to be your chaplain throughout the course of the Inhibition).
- ii. You are not to function or present yourself as a member of the clergy.
- iii. You are not to wear a clerical collar or vestments.
- iv. You may not attend meetings, events, or other gatherings of the SJAFC during the course of this Inhibition.
- v. You may not be in contact with chaplains or other members of SJAFC, other than your Chancellor, except with my prior written permission.

VII. Promoting Schism

50. On September 22, 2025, Respondent directed SJAFC to send a letter purporting to withdraw from the ACNA, allegedly pursuant to Article II.3 of the ACNA Constitution. As SJAFC is not a diocese, Article II.3 does not apply.

51. On September 23, 2025, Respondent called an "All Hands" video conference meeting where he displayed the Godly Admonition, discussed the Godly Admonition at length, and indicated that the SJAFC was no longer part of the ACNA. Respondent indicated that chaplains who wished to remain in the ACNA were able to leave, but indicated that the ACNA was a "sinking ship." This video was later posted on YouTube without restriction.

52. On October 6, 2025, Respondent filed a lawsuit against the ACNA on behalf of the SJAFC, alleging intellectual property rights violations and unfair competition. The lawsuit characterizes chaplains as consumers rather than clergy receiving episcopal oversight. *See* Case No. 2:25-cv-12848-RMG, *Jurisdiction of the Armed Forces Chaplaincy v. Anglican Church in North America*, pending in the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina.

53. On or about December 2025, Respondent, in collaboration with Bishops MacClellan, Nordstrom, and Williams, formed the Anglican Reformed Catholic Church, specifically for chaplains.

54. On June 10, 2026, Respondent, in full vestments, consecrated Andrew Hayler in direct violation of the Inhibition, which has not been lifted.

INDIVIDUAL CHAPLAIN EXPERIENCES

55. This Court received affidavit testimony from three chaplains. The members of this Court offer their sincere thanks for that testimony, which is recounted in brief and anonymized in the following paragraphs. The Court received this testimony in sworn affidavits with identifying information from each of the chaplains.

I. Chaplain A

56. Chaplain A is a military chaplain who served in the SJAFC from around the time it was formed through 2023, when he transferred his orders to an African Anglican jurisdiction. Chaplain A remained in Good Standing with SJAFC by participating in the requirements previously listed, including the required donations and attendance at convocations.

57. In January 2021, Chaplain A discovered that Respondent was claiming that SJAFC was a diocese and attempting to transfer it as a diocese to the Church of Nigeria North American Mission (“CONNAM”). Chaplain A reported the scheme to the Archbishop of the ACNA. The Archbishop confronted Respondent about the report. Respondent in turn, knowing Chaplain A made the report, threatened Chaplain A with a Godly admonition.

58. In the Spring of 2021, CONNAM listed Respondent as a bishop of CONNAM and Respondent announced at the annual convocation that SJAFC was a diocese of CONNAM. Chaplain A reported these events to senior ACNA bishops.

59. In retaliation for reporting the news about CONNAM, Respondent inhibited Chaplain A and initiated the Title IV disciplinary process against Chaplain A by bringing a presentment against him.

60. In response to the allegations brought against him, Chaplain A chose to leave the ACNA in 2023, transferring to the aforementioned Anglican jurisdiction geographically located on the African continent. Chaplain A also medically retired from the military around this time and began work with a nonprofit aiding impoverished children.

61. Some time later, Respondent called the offices of the nonprofit organization and slandered Chaplain A, alleging serious financial misconduct without basis in fact. Chaplain A also reported that Respondent spread the same rumors to other bishops and believes this has impacted his vocational trajectory.

II. Chaplain B

62. Chaplain B is a hospice chaplain who likened his time in the SJAFC to his childhood spent in a cult. Chaplain B was told by Respondent that the Respondent “owned all chaplains” in the ACNA.

63. While resident in the SJAFC, Chaplain B experienced a period of unemployment followed by a certain mental health diagnosis which caused him to step away from chaplain work. Chaplain B had also recently moved to an area with no nearby ACNA parishes and was attending a parish of a different continuing Anglican jurisdiction. As a result of these factors, Chaplain B requested a transfer out of the SJAFC and into the other continuing Anglican jurisdiction.

64. Due to the unemployment and move, Chaplain B had fallen behind on his mandatory tithe pledges. Chaplain B met all other requirements for Good Standing in the SJAFC.

65. Upon receipt of Chaplain B's request for transfer, Respondent refused to authorize the transfer until Chaplain B met all of the requirements for Good Standing. Respondent accused Chaplain B of failing to attend convocations even though Chaplain B had obtained the required written permissions to excuse him based upon financial inability to attend. Respondent threatened Chaplain B with a Letter of Admonishment threatening Chaplain B's holy orders, though no such letter was ever provided to Chaplain B.

66. As there were no other outstanding issues, it was apparent that Respondent was withholding the transfer of Chaplain B's holy orders and threatening his holy orders based upon the pledged tithe amounts that had not been paid.

67. Chaplain B eventually requested that Respondent only communicate with him via mail because of the increasingly aggressive number and tone of his emails and text messages. Instead, Respondent increased his harassment of Chaplain B via phone calls and text messages, even once sending fifteen text messages in a single day.

68. Respondent also contacted the Bishop of the continuing Anglican jurisdiction Chaplain B sought to transfer into and falsely represented to Chaplain B that that Bishop supported Respondent's withholding of the transfer.

69. Respondent had an inhibition against Chaplain B drafted and hand-delivered via process server to Chaplain B's place of residence. Chaplain B interpreted this method of delivery, rather than via email, mail, FedEx, or any other method, as a threat from Respondent.

70. Chaplain B appealed his inhibition to the Archbishop of the ACNA. The Archbishop denied the appeal, but recommended to Respondent that Chaplain B's holy orders be transferred. Respondent then transferred Chaplain B's holy orders to the other continuing Anglican jurisdiction.

71. Chaplain B suffered significant emotional, psychological, and reputational harm as a result of Respondent's actions. He continues to suffer the economic consequences of Respondent's conduct due to the need to seek counseling and other services to recover from the unwarranted and unrelenting harassment.

III. Chaplain C

72. Chaplain C is a military chaplain. Chaplain C began his ministry resident in a certain diocese of the ACNA other than the SJAFC. Chaplain C originally obtained his endorsement through the REC. Chaplain C describes several "hostile" interactions with members

of the SJAFc over the course of his career in which he was told that he needed to join SJAFc in order to remain a chaplain in the ACNA, despite the REC's continued ability to endorse and support him in his ministry. In addition, Chaplain C was informed that he could not refer to himself as an "Anglican chaplain" because it was a SJAFc copyrighted term.

73. In December 2022, Chaplain C and all chaplains endorsed by the REC received a letter informing them that, effective 2023, the REC would not be issuing any new endorsements. The endorsements already in place from the REC would remain valid, but no new ones for changes in rank or status or any other reason would issue.

74. As a result, in 2023, Chaplain C "regretfully" began the application process for entry into the SJAFc to ensure that, should the need arise, he had a new endorser in place. While Chaplain C expected a simple change of canonical residency due to his status as an ACNA priest, he instead found an arduous application process. The process included "numerous essays, a spousal letter of support, disclosures of personal matters that were very intrusive to a bishop I did not trust, [and] a charge of \$350 for a new background check." Chaplain C remarked in his affidavit that the SJAFc "appeared from the outside purpose built to exercise total control over chaplains while maintaining minimal oversight by other bishops or even the provincial office."

75. Around this time, a member of the SJAFc provided the SJAFc tithing policy to Chaplain C for his review, evidencing the link between "tithing," "Good Standing," and endorsement in the SJAFc. As Chaplain C observed in his affidavit, "[t]he combination of these policies seemed to lock chaplains into an unethical, highly dubious system of mandatory financial contributions." This Court agrees.

76. Given his expanded knowledge of the SJAFc, Chaplain C discontinued his application to join the SJAFc and never finished the application process. He additionally never received access to the SJAFc online system for reporting tithes. Chaplain C was never canonically resident in the SJAFc. He did not even request that his canonical letters be moved to the SJAFc.

77. Chaplain C decided to transfer his orders and endorsement from his home diocese and the REC to the Anglican Mission in America ("AMiA"). On December 4, 2023, Chaplain C received a letter of canonical residency from AMiA. The AMiA endorser contacted the REC endorser on December 7, 2023 regarding Chaplain C and received no response.

78. On December 12, 2023, Chaplain C received an email from Respondent issuing a Godly Admonition against Chaplain C and attempting to inhibit him. Respondent accused Chaplain C of breaking ordination vows, violating canonical discipline, disobeying bishops, committing moral and ethical failure, and habitually neglecting duty. The basis of the charges was Chaplain C's non-participation in the online tithing system.

79. In addition, Respondent threatened to inform the Chief of Chaplains for Chaplain C's branch of the military that Chaplain C was under investigation, even though Respondent was neither Chaplain C's bishop nor his endorser.

80. As shown by the metadata from the Godly Admonition sent to Chaplain C, the document was backdated from its date of creation, December 12, 2023, to December 3, 2023 by

Respondent to give the appearance that Chaplain C was attempting to leave the ACNA while under discipline.

81. Respondent also reached out to AMiA, threatening to dissolve a concordat between AMiA and SJAFC that allowed chaplains to concelebrate together. Respondent informed Chaplain C that he had instructed the AMiA endorser to “hold off” on endorsing Chaplain C.

82. Ultimately an agreement was reached in which Respondent withdrew his noncanonical Godly admonition after a phone call and letter from Chaplain C, reluctantly placating Respondent in the interest of maintaining the relationship between AMiA and ACNA chaplains.

IV. Unsworn Reports

83. The Court received other, unsworn, reports from chaplains under the authority of Respondent. The Court did not consider these reports in its deliberations because unsworn statements do not have the requisite evidentiary value for use in such deliberations, but wishes to acknowledge that it is aware of other reports of abuses of ecclesiastical power by the Respondent and understands that Respondent’s abuses extended beyond the sworn statements before the Court. Nevertheless, in the interest of a fair adjudication of this matter, the Court has confined its deliberations and decision to the sworn evidence before it.

HOLDINGS

I. COUNT 1: Willful Refusal to Follow a Lawful Godly Admonition (Canon IV.2.1.12) – GUILTY

84. The Godly Admonition issued on September 12, 2025 to Respondent was in all respects lawful under the Canons of this Church. *See* Canon IV.2.2.

85. Respondent willfully refused to follow the Godly Admonition in defiance of the Canons of this Church.

86. In particular, Respondent refused to constrict his communications about the Godly Admonition as instructed, including posting and discussing it online to an unknown number of listeners at the September 23, 2025 video conference, later posted without restriction on YouTube.

87. Respondent had his Chancellor and Co-Chancellor reach out to the Province, including in the September 16, 2025 letter, in an attempt to bully the Province into backing down from the Godly Admonition and investigation, in violation of the Godly Admonition.

88. In addition, Respondent refused to work with Provincial investigators on the investigation, rather instructing those under his authority explicitly not to cooperate, attempting to withdraw from the ACNA, suing the ACNA in Federal Court, and creating his own denomination, all in defiance of the Godly Admonition.

89. Based upon these reasons, the Province has shown by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent is guilty of willfully refusing to follow a Godly Admonition. *See* Canon IV.2.1.12.

II. COUNT 2: Disobedience to or Willful Contravention of the Canons of this Church (Canon IV.2.1.9) – GUILTY

90. The Inhibition issued on September 21, 2025 was in all respects lawful under the Canons of this Church. *See* Canon IV.9.3.

91. Respondent willfully failed to comply with the Inhibition and has continued to act as a bishop and hold himself out as an Anglican bishop through the Anglican Reformed Catholic Church.

92. Respondent held a meeting with SJ AFC chaplains on September 23, 2025 in willful violation of the Inhibition.

93. Respondent also willfully violated the Inhibition by continuing to wear vestments in public during the period of inhibition.

94. Respondent also willfully violated the Inhibition by performing episcopal services in vestments during the period of inhibition.

95. In willfully violating or failing to comply with the Inhibition placed upon him in accordance with the Canons of this Church, the Province has shown by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent is guilty of disobeying or willfully contravening the Canons of this Church, specifically Canon IV.9.3. *See* Canon IV.2.1.9; IV.9.3.

III. COUNT 3: Having Exhibited Conduct Giving Cause for Scandal or Offense, Including the Abuse of Ecclesiastical Power (Canon IV.2.1.4) – GUILTY

96. This charge is at the root of this matter. Investigation into these by the Province set off the chain of events which led to each of Respondent's other canonical violations. This charge cuts to the heart of what went wrong in the SJ AFC under Respondent's authority. Each of the other charges show Respondent's recklessness and disregard for authority outside of himself. This charge, however, shows how Respondent exercised a fear-based, controlling authority over those under his jurisdiction that, as displayed in the non-exhaustive list that follows, constitutes extensive abuse of ecclesiastical power.

97. This Court finds ample evidence that Respondent engaged in abusive behavior to manipulate clergy, attempted to discipline persons not under Respondent's authority, and inflicted financial, emotional, and psychological stress on persons under Respondent's care.

98. Respondent used the Title IV disciplinary process to manipulate clergy under his authority and outside of his authority, including Chaplains A, B, and C.

99. Respondent's draconian approach to tithing, which was tied to career advancement, endorsement, and security, constitutes an abuse of ecclesiastical power. While tithing is a spiritual discipline to be promoted in the Church and among the clergy, a draconian approach to a required tithe which connects a tithe to one's career advancement or one's livelihood is an abuse of ecclesiastical power. Tithing is a matter of conscience and a rightly ordered episcopal administration understands that there are circumstances, particularly among those who make

significant financial sacrifices in terms of income level to take positions in furtherance of a calling, where a strict ten percent tithe is not possible, despite best efforts. There is more than one measure of faithful stewardship.

100. Respondent's use of tithes as leverage against chaplains, including Chaplains B and C, constitutes an abuse of ecclesiastical authority.

101. Respondent withheld the transfer of Chaplain B's canonical residence improperly, based upon the abusive system of tithes.

102. Respondent abused his ecclesiastical power to harass Chaplain B extensively in the process of obstructing the transfer of Chaplain B's canonical residence.

103. Respondent improperly instituted Title IV processes against Chaplain A in retaliation for Chaplain A's reports of Respondent's movements with respect to CONNAM.

104. Respondent intentionally interfered with Chaplain A's vocational trajectory by providing false rumors of financial scandal to his employer.

105. Respondent fraudulently backdated at least one document to obstruct the lawful transfer of Chaplain C's canonical residency. While this Court cannot infer a pattern of fraudulent documentation from a single document, one is certainly enough to cause scandal.

106. Respondent grossly interfered with Chaplain C, his holy orders, and his career, despite the fact that Chaplain C was not under Respondent's canonical authority.

107. Respondent improperly attempted to discipline Chaplain C, who was not under his canonical authority, using Title IV.

108. Based upon these reasons, the Province has shown by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent is guilty of having exhibited conduct giving cause for scandal or offense, including the abuse of ecclesiastical power. *See* Canon IV.2.1.4.

IV. COUNT 4: Has Promoted and Caused Schism Within this Church (Canon IV.2.1.2) – GUILTY

109. Respondent has directly caused schism within the Church by starting his own denomination, the Anglican Reformed Catholic Church, and by targeting ACNA chaplains and encouraging them to join him.

110. Respondent repeatedly interfered with the ACNA's relationship with other continuing Anglican jurisdictions, including in his obstruction of the transfer of Chaplain C's orders and his attempt to move SJAFC as a diocese to CONNAM.

111. Respondent's acts in attempting to sever the SJAFC from the ACNA have also promoted schism.

112. Respondent's act in allegedly consecrating a new bishop without authorization additionally promoted schism.

113. Based upon these reasons, the Province has shown by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent is guilty of promoting and causing schism within this Church. *See* Canon IV.2.1.2.

CONCLUSION

114. The Court unanimously finds Bishop Derek Jones guilty of each of the four canonical offenses brought against him in the October 21, 2025 Presentment and respectfully refers these findings to the College of Bishops for sentencing following the canonical thirty-day appellate period found in Canon IV.5.5.1.

115. This Court has one further concern: the chaplains who served under or encountered the Respondent. As one of the chaplains who offered sworn testimony remarked, "Surely a pastoral response to a wolf involves the protection of sheep."

116. This Court, with its limited jurisdiction, has no authority to alter the disciplinary actions of the Respondent against those under his canonical authority. However, the members of this Court respectfully request that the College of Bishops prayerfully consider a biblical and canonical response to the disciplinary actions taken by the Respondent and, where warranted, reversal of any undue disciplinary actions.

117. The members of this Court deeply regret the pain and suffering caused by the abuses of the Respondent against the individuals under his authority and sincerely pray for God's healing, peace, and restoration in their lives.

SIGNED this 19th day of August 2026.

THE COURT FOR THE TRIAL OF A BISHOP

Bishop David Bryan

Bishop Allen Kannapell

Bishop Ryan Reed, *President of the Court*

The Reverend Canon Jonathan Millard

The Reverend Canon Dr. Kathleen Rankin

Mr. Larry Doyle

Ms. Katherine Grosskopf, *Presiding Officer*