

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Charles8854 <Charles8854@protonmail.com>

Date: On Monday, September 9th, 2024 at 1:51 AM

Subject: Re2: Seeming Failure of Alternative-Banking Plan, Lost Money, Traumatized Women, & Leaked Email.

To: Patriots Buy Houses <lynn@patriotsbuyhouses.com>

CC: Carrie Dugan <cdugan.cd@gmail.com>, Carrie Wagner <carrie@zoewellnesscenter.com>, Eric Dingis <ericdingis@gmail.com>, Sandy Miarecki <sandy10m@yahoo.com>, Charles-Cgus <charles@constitutionalgov.us>

Lynn;

Thank you for your prompt, comprehensive, & detailed response here.

I particularly appreciate your concluding-comment, that:

"I have confidence that Eric will do the right thing and make this right".

Eric gave me a phone call after he saw my email here;

& we shared in a healthy & detailed conversation, 40-minutes or so, perhaps an hour; where-in we discussed not only this specific issue, but larger surrounding-issues as well.

While Eric & i agree on many issues; we dis-agree on many issues also; but our conversations always proceed in tones & words of mutual-respect; even tho, among other less-diplomatically-skilled people, such disagreements would cause the discussions to brutally abort.

And, Eric there-in said that he intends to send out his own email regarding this same issue, with-in 24-hours or so here.

I am sure we will all benefit from reviewing his words there-in.

But, broad-stroking general-concerns here-by being addressed;

I next reply to your points, line-by-line, point-by-point, to the best of my ability, as follows:

~~~~~

On 9/8/24 10:11 PM, Lynn Wagner wrote:

- > Charles, as I stated to you Several times,
- > my opinion of the situation changed 180 degrees
- > a few weeks after our July group conversation
- > when Eric stated to me that
- > he wanted to simply deliver the server to the investor group,
- > which he believed would entirely fulfill his obligations,

Yes, you did "several times" tell me that Eric had said those things to you, Lynn.

And, I am inclined to believe you; but,

Eric deserves a chance to deny your account of these events before our group here might come to any agreement as-to whether or not your account of these events is actually the truthful-account of what actually happened.

And, thus-far, because of our group here's failure to be firmly-committed to constitutional due-process; Eric has not yet been asked to affirm or deny this important-point precisely.

If Eric agrees, then we can move forward smoothly.  
If Eric denies, then we are going to need to spend some more time & energy in investigating this issue more fully.

> knowing it would be useless to them at that point.

This is another important point, which, again, similarly, Eric deserves a chance to deny.

- > Having possession of a server
- > would obviously be of no benefit
- > without the bank, vault and the placement of the server,
- > including proper and adequate training and support of that server.

Agreed.

- > This response from Eric shocked me.
- > I was operating under the premise "Innocent until proven guilty",
- > not in the irresponsible manner you suggest.

You should Not have Affirmed Eric's Version of the nature of the Contractual-Agreement between Eric & the Investors, if you did not then know for absolutely-positive sure, that, Eric's version was absolutely-positive "True".

You should have been content to just sit down & keep quiet, in your response to Eric's bold proclamations of his own innocence in all of this.

You chose to make your own bold statement affirming the righteousness of Eric's bold statement.

If you had not then made your own bold-statement; then, I would not have leaked Carrie Dugan's email to you both; & there-under, Eric may have been pressured to bring this whole dispute to a more quick & justified resolution.

Your false-testimony, as to the righteousness of Eric's behavior under his contractual-agreement with the investors, has likely caused this entire problem to evade prompt & efficient resolution.

In hind-sight, now, that was clearly "Irresponsible", Lynn.

- > Rather than make assumptions and accusations,
- > I did the only thing I could, which was to wait until I had proof.

Yes. But you could have waited just as easily,  
with-out volunteering your irresponsible-words  
in support of Eric's self-proclaimed innocence.

- > Eric's confession was the proof I needed to hear
- > to confirm my suspicions
- > and instantly change my opinion of the situation.

You should have realized previously;  
that there was a possibility, in the future,  
that you might have to "change our opinion" on all of this.

There-under, you should have sat down & stayed quiet,  
when Eric so confidently proclaimed his own innocence.

- > Then when Carrie Wagner let Eric know
- > the investors did not want to take delivery,
- > Eric told me he would look for another buyer for the server
- > to be able to repay the investors the missing ~\$116k.
- >> I sent Eric a text a few weeks ago
- > asking if he had been able to find a buyer
- > and what his plans for repayment were.
- > He stated that he needed to know what the investors wanted.
- >
- > Carrie then had each investor send her an email
- > stating their wishes to move forward.
- > Every investor said No.

Thank you for these details, Lynn.

- > I let Eric know this via text
- > and suggested he return the vehicle
- > and repay the investors with the proceeds
- > to offset the loss.

Good suggestion.

- > I have not heard from him since.

Yes.

That does seem to indicate his intent to evade accountability.  
Perhaps.

- > Carrie Wagner and I had even visited with Bob Sisson in early July,

- > Eric's benefactor (perhaps employer is a better word?).
- > Bob stated his disappointment in Eric's truck purchase,

Nice. This is news to me; & it is good news to my ears & eyes.  
Thank you.

- > and when we explained that \$116k had been spent,
- > he suggested Eric be made to pay the investors back double.

Ha.

That is a bit much; but,  
I am glad that Bob seems to be inclined to agree with the rest of us,  
that, Eric should not have used that money  
to purchase that expensive brand-new truck.

- > Bob's name is on the joint bank account with Eric.
- > When Eric returned from the last out-of-state trip (that I am aware of),
- > I had him add me to the account.
- > 2 days later
- > I returned the remaining funds to each of the investors,
- > drawing the account to zero.

Good move, Lynn.  
Very good move.

- > The unpaid balance of \$116k is still due the investors,
- > plus interest (and possibly damages?).

Yes.

- > Unfortunately, there was no written contract;
- > however, a contract is held together by value and consideration,
- > which both parties must agree to.
- > The investors will need to confirm this,
- > but it appears to me they do not agree.
- >
- > To date, there has been no value
- > or adequate consideration given to the investors,
- > nor have they received any benefit.
- >
- > Charles, to suggest that the plan might still work
- > is a bit ridiculous to me,
- > given the harm and severe trauma already done
- > to not only the ladies you refer to
- > but all of the investors.

Perhaps.

Maybe only 1% or 2% chance, but still possible, imho.

- > Just because I was not made aware of
- > actual harm or trauma to the others,
- > we have no right or reason to assume
- > they were not all harmed to some extent.

You above said: it appears to you, the investors "do not agree".  
That, seems to me, to imply, that, some of the investors  
do not consider them-selves to have been harmed.

But, as you last here imply, it does seem to me, "reasonable",  
to conclude, that, under the totality-of-the-circumstances, that,  
all of the investors were harmed.

More time needs to be spent inventorying & polling  
the more precise feelings & judgements of all of the investors here.

As Eric argues, it is possible,  
some of the investors may have been playing-off differing factions;  
pitting them "one against the other"; Eric being a victim on one side,  
& the more seriously damaged two women, & others, on the other-side.

I believe that is Eric's most powerful counter-argument;  
& i further believe, if we are going to secure "Justice" here, that,  
we need to investigate what has been happening, then & now,  
in the minds & hearts of each of these investors.

- > Charles - Correction to your claim:
- > NO money was Donated to the investment.
- > The investors were told
- > they would receive at least an 8% return on their investment.

Ok, i chose-my-words poorly there.  
Thank you for correcting me, Lynn.

- > The Group Leader, or Executive Trustee, is Carrie Wagner.

Thank you for this important point of clarification.

- > I am sure she can and will speak for herself
- > but it is unfair to claim
- > it is her fault for misconstruing Eric's legitimate offer.

I believe i only suggested that as a possibility;  
& that i did not solidly affirm this point as a "claim".  
And I did not know it was Carrie Wagner  
who was in the position of group-leader here.

That would seem to create a strong polarity  
between Carrie Wagner & Eric Dinges.

It would seem to me, that,  
either Eric was opportunistically taking advantage of the entire group;  
or else, from the start, Carrie Wagner was involved in a conspiracy  
to create conflict between Eric & the more innocent group-members.

And, it seems clear, the conflict only erupted  
after Eric purchased that expensive brand-new truck.

And I have difficulty imagining  
how Carrie Wagner could have prompted Eric to buy that truck.

> It should not be her role to "get the project up and running".

I am inclined to agree with you now.  
But, in essence, your testimony was different,  
during our private conversation with Eric, on July-18.

> This was Eric's sole responsibility as the project manager  
> as this was a project he had been working on for years.> It was his brainchild, and he  
took great pride in that

Agreed; as we both should have been telling Eric back on July-18th.

> In my opinion,  
> this whole thing could and would have been avoided  
> if the truck had not been purchased  
> before the deliverables of the bank and server were in place.

Agreed.

> Or at least a request or notification for use of funds  
> before purchasing the vehicle or  
> using the funds for travel to other states,  
> which had nothing to do with the TN investors' bank purchase.

Agreed.

> The optics caused extreme distrust in Eric and his plan.

Agreed.

> As for my involvement,  
> Eric asked me to be his Administrator,  
> but was never able to define the role for me.  
> I have extensive experience doing  
> very large multi million dollar budgets for various county departments  
> (Housing, IT, Facilities & Maintenance, etc),  
> but the budget for this investment was a disaster from day 1.

Sounds correct.

- > I questioned Eric incessantly about the budget and the truck.
- > I never got a straight answer.

I am inclined to believe you, Lynn.

- > I was never compensated for any of my work either.
- > Nor did I invest any money into this project.
- > My loss is in time, not dollars.

Time is valuable; & Energy is associated with that time;  
both of which are valuable.

- > Charles, you have made many bold claims in your email
- > that are simply not true.

Perhaps.

But, please substantiate your accusation here against me; Lynn.

- > Much of this is due to the fact that
- > you are in TX and the rest of us are in TN,
- > and this transpired over weeks and months.

Those facts are not relevant to  
whether or not i have spoken or typed falsely, Lynn.

- > You took the liberty of hearing a few conversations
- > and filling in holes with your own opinions. > This is dangerous.

I will calculate my own dangers, thank you.  
I still do not see any "Evidence", from you, that,  
some-how, some-where, i have spoken or typed  
some form of false-communication, which is "Not True"; Lynn.

- > Sandy et al are not being given an accurate depiction of the facts.

You have free-liberty to correct errors in my presentation.  
If i did not say so previously;  
I encourage all involved here to correct any errors i may make.

I am sure i have made at least a few errors; but, i do believe,  
those errors are neither numerous, nor are they significant.

- > My thesis herein aims to correct many of them.

Please be specific.

Thus far, i see Nothing of any substance,

substantiating your accusation, that,  
i have spoken or typed any words which are "Not True", Lynn.

> I hope others will correct any I have missed.

Your words here, in full context, seems to imply, that,  
you are only here seeking for others to correct me,  
in areas where you have missed pointing-out errors that i have made.

Here-under; you seem to be avoiding the possibility, that,  
you here-in may be typing some of "your own errors".

You know, like where you here-in above say,  
I have previously typed or said words which are "Not True".

You might want to watch first & more closely, for "your own errors";  
before you go making accusations which you can not prove, that,  
others have spoken or typed words which are "Not True"; Lynn.

> I pray this is rectified quickly and fairly.

Very good. Agreed.

> I have confidence that Eric will do the right thing  
> and make this right

Yes; at least so far as it may be proven, that,  
Eric is the one who is fully at fault.

Again, Eric is clearly mounting counter-arguments;  
& all of these conflicting arguments  
deserve to be resolved thru constitutional due-process.

God's kingdom come,  
God's will be done; ...

Charles Stewart; in Coleman, Texas.  
325-603-0334; home/office, land-line-voip-1; Best.  
325-400-2712; home/office, land-line-voip-2.  
325-232-0241; cell, (usually turned off; used for texting, & back-up).

> Blessings,  
> Lynn Wagner  
>

\*\*\*\*\*



> On Sun, Sep 8, 2024, 7:08 PM  
> Charles8854 <Charles8854@protonmail.com> wrote:  
>  
> Carrie Dugan, Carrie Wagner, & Sandy Miarecki;  
> this email is mainly directed towards you three ladies;  
> but it is also being copied to Eric Dinges, Lynn Wagner;  
> because, to a lesser extent, the subjects i am presenting here-in,  
> also involves them.  
<snip>