

ATTACHMENT A
RECEIVED
FEB 22 1982
1000 FRIENDS OF OREGON

COMPLAINANT: Buck Coe

RESPONDENT: Richard Cantrell, Wasco County Judge

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT:

The complaint alleges Judge Cantrell violated ORS Chapter 244 when he voted in favor of a petition for the incorporation of the City of Rajneeshpuram, at such time a transaction was pending between Judge Cantrell and the Rajneeshpuram for the purchase of over \$17,000 worth of Cantrell's cattle. The complainant further alleges that many irregularities surrounded the cattle sale, including lack of a brand inspection, discrepancies in the number sold, and a purchase price which exceeded the fair market value. (Attachment 1).

BACKGROUND:

In 1981, a 100 ^{300 Acre} ~~acre~~ ranch in Wasco County was purchased to form a community (Rajneeshpuram) for Indian guru Baghwan Shree Rajneesh and approximately 200 of his followers. According to Judge Cantrell, the Jefferson and Wasco County Commissioners met jointly at Rajneeshpuram in "early August", 1981, to review the site prior to making certain land use decisions, i.e., housing needs of the community. During the visit, a member of the Rajneesh community, David Knapp, told Judge Cantrell they needed cattle to "eat stubble". In addition, if an experimentally planted crop of sunflowers failed, the crop would be used as silage. Judge Cantrell then advised Mr. Knapp that he should buy the equivalent of "hamburger priced cows".

During the "last part of the summer", Judge Cantrell contacted a registered cattle buyer (Art Rice) who assisted Cantrell in establishing the price of \$625 for pairs of late summer/early fall cattle, and \$.50/lb. for the remainder of his stock. Judge Cantrell said he then "let it be known" that his cattle were for sale.

On October 13, Judge Cantrell contacted the Rajneesh community and offered his cattle for sale at the above price. Two representatives of the Rajneesh community (John Shelfer and Bob Harvey) surveyed the livestock on October 22, and on October 25, told Judge Cantrell they wished to purchase "40 or 50 head". Shelfer and Harvey later selected the cattle they wanted, and on November 5, Harvey and Chuck Rolfe (cattle transporter) loaded the cattle into a stock truck, weighed the cattle at Dufur and transported the cattle to the Rajneesh community.

On November 15, the cattle were paid for with a check to Judge Cantrell and United States National Bank, who held a note on the cattle.

According to County records and a newspaper article (sworn to

as an accurate statement of facts by its author, Austin Abrams, Attachment 2), Rajneesh representatives contacted County officials on October 7 about incorporating the community as a city. On October 14, the County Court received petitions from Rajneesh community residents seeking the incorporation. On November 4, Judge Cantrell presided over a public hearing on the incorporation, and voted in favor of the petition authorizing Rajneesh community residents to decide the issue at a May 18 election (Attachment 3). The petition was approved by the County Commission 2-1.

The complainant alleges that in addition to Judge Cantrell's bias on the issue of incorporation, several irregularities surrounded the cattle sale. Specifically, Judge Cantrell failed to have a brand inspection performed at the time of sale for which he was cited. The brand inspectors felt the price paid was high considering the time of year and quality of cattle involved, and that the flat rate per pound was unusual. Finally, there is a discrepancy in the number of cattle sold: a transportation certificate signed by Judge Cantrell shows 48 head of cattle were transported, but a certificate signed by Bob Harvey shows 50 head were transported. (See Attachments 4-10).

In the opinion of Judge Cantrell, the disapproval of the petition by the County Commission would not have affected the cattle purchase, because the Rajneesh community "would have appealed it all the way to the Supreme Court". Further, he felt they would "stay even if there was no city" because, in his opinion, they had other options:

- 1) Create a service area
- 2) Move to Antelope
- 3) Current zoning permitted one house per 80 acres

John Shelfer agreed that disapproval of the petition by the County Court "would have had absolutely no effect on their decision to stay".

However, Mark Greenfield, a Portland attorney who has filed a petition for review of the County Court's action with the Land Use Board of Appeals, argues that incorporation is a prerequisite to the community's ability to remain at their present location. He argues that unless the community incorporates, they are in violation of ORS 215.213(1)(f):

"(1) The following uses may be established in any area zoned for exclusive farm use:

(f) The dwellings and other buildings customarily provided in conjunction with farm use". (Emphasis added).

Further, Greenfield argues that far fewer than "1 house per 80 acres" would be permissible because the dwelling density refers to 80 acres as a minimum size, and the community is presently divided into much larger parcels.

JURISDICTION AND PERTINENT STATUTES:

Judge Cantrell is a public official as defined by ORS 244.020(9), and is subject to the requirements of ORS Chapter 244, including:

1) ORS 244.120(1)(a),

"(1) When involved in a potential conflict of interest, a public official shall:

(a) If he is an elected public official, other than a member of the Legislative Assembly, or an appointed public official serving on a board or commission, announce publicly the nature of the potential conflict prior to taking any official action thereon".

Note: ORS 244.020(4) defines potential conflict of interest as,

"(4) 'Potential conflict of interest' means any transaction where a person acting in a capacity as a public official takes any action or makes any decision or recommendation, the effect of which would be to the private pecuniary benefit or detriment of the person or a member of the person's household ..."

2) ORS 244.130(1),

"(1) When a public official gives notice of a potential conflict of interest, the potential conflict shall be recorded in the official records of the public body, and a notice of the potential conflict and how it was disposed of may in the discretion of the public body be provided the commission within a reasonable period of time. The commission may by rule establish criteria for cases in which such information shall, shall not, or may be provided to it".

3) ORS 244.040(1),

"(1) No public official shall use his official position or office to obtain financial gain for himself, other than official salary, honoraria or reimbursement of expenses, or for any member of his household, or for any business with which he or a member of his household is associated".

4) ORS 244.040(4),

"(4) No public official shall further his personal financial gain through the use of confidential information gained in the course of or by reason of his official position or activities in any way".

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION:

1. Regarding ORS 244.120, it appears Judge Cantrell was faced with a potential conflict of interest which should have been publicly announced because the cattle transaction was still pending (payment had not yet been made) at the time of the incorporation hearing, and the effect of Judge Cantrell's action could have altered completion of the transaction.
2. Regarding ORS 244.040(1), there is at the least, insufficient evidence to support a finding of violation.
3. Regarding ORS 244.040(4), it appears Judge Cantrell used information, not available to the general public and obtained by reason of his public office, to obtain personal financial gain. Specifically, he was told in his official capacity of the community's desire to purchase cattle, and later contacted the community regarding the sale of his cattle. In deciding whether Judge Cantrell violated ORS 244.040(4), the OCEC should determine whether such information was "confidential" within the meaning of ORS 244.040(4).

County Judge's Impartiality On Rajneesh Issue Challenged

By AUSTIN ABRAMS

Chronicle Managing Editor
The impartiality of County Judge Rick Cantrell during the incorporation hearing for the proposed city of Rajneeshpuram is being officially challenged.

Petitioners seek a hearing before the Land Use Board of Appeals saying they wish to present evidence that Cantrell had private pecuniary interests influencing his decision in the proceeding and that he failed to disclose those interests as a potential conflict of interest. No hearing date is set.

The petitioners are 1000 Friends of Oregon and six individuals: Kelly McGreer, Rosemary McGreer, James G. Perkins, Shirlee Perkins, David Dickson and Melinda Dickson. The McGreers are neighbors to the Big Muddy Ranch near Antelope where followers of Indian spiritual mystic Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh bought 67,000 acres July 10 and have been farming and locating 200 residents in mobile housing since.

Particulars of the challenge area are not listed in it, but Cantrell assumes it relates to a sale of cattle he made to the Big Muddy banking the money Nov. 16. He says as early as Aug. 12 during a meeting of Wasco and Jefferson County officials at the ranch on official business, ranch representatives said they would need to buy beef cattle.

Cantrell says that in September he made two ranchers aware he would have cattle for sale, then the first week in October he made the Big Muddy aware by letter he had cattle

available and then a fourth buyer was made aware, all at the same price. He says the Big Muddy buyer was first to notify him of a serious interest to purchase whereupon he talked to his family and together decided "We had given our word to them and we decided to keep it."

On Oct. 7 Big Muddy representatives inquired of county officials about incorporating and on Oct. 14 the court received petitions by Big Muddy residents seeking incorporation.

Cantrell says he advised his commissioners, Jim Comini and Virgil Ellett, of his pending cattle sale prior to Oct. 14. He also said Comini later said he did not recall the notice and Comini told The Chronicle Friday night he first knew of the sale a week after the Nov. 4 public hearing on incorporation which was presided over by Cantrell. Ellett could not be reached by phone but Cantrell says Ellett could recall his notice about the sale.

Cantrell also says he telephoned a lawyer in the secretary of state's office and advised him of the situation as he did the director of the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission. This was after the Nov. 4 hearing, said Cantrell, because that was when word came to him that there might be a question. He said the two state officials he talked to told him they saw no connections in the matters.

Why didn't he announce at the hearing the pending sale? He said it was his first such hearing, he felt that he was conducting his affairs as he had

for years growing and selling cattle. He and Ellett went to Antelope town council meeting where Cantrell related the sale details following the Nov. 4 hearing, Cantrell said.

Some 50 head of cattle bringing \$17,540 were sold, he said.

Saturday



Pass the

The Dalles Junior High Christmas program will be at 7:30 p.m. Monday. The Christmas program will be at The Dalles 1 p.m. Tuesday. The high school choir and Chorales and Harmonies will be in

Dufur plans its school Christmas program high school choir and band performing at 7 p.m. Tuesday. They will present a play directed by Steve Hodges: "A Salute to Santa" at 10 a.m. Monday is also open to the pu

City police reported Friday at 7:57 p.m. a eastbound lane of Interstate 84 near The Dalles hit by a pickup truck. The driver, from The Dalles, called police. The victim was semi-conscious here. He was a member of the Yakima police said. No names were released Fri

The Dalles and Hood River: Windy periods with rain through Saturday. Decreasing rain Sunday. Lows in the upper 30s east to mid 40s west. Highs in the mid 40s to low 50s. East wind 15-30 mph with higher gusts at times.

Ann Lande Church Classified Comics Living Sports

BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
OF THE STATE OF OREGON

1000 FRIENDS OF OREGON, the)	
assumed name of Oregon Land)	
Use Project, Inc., an Oregon)	
nonprofit corporation, KELLY)	
MC GREER, ROSEMARY MC GREER,)	
JAMES G. PERKINS, SHIRLEE)	
PERKINS, DAVID DICKSON and)	
MELINDA DICKSON,)	LUBA 81-132
)	
Petitioners,)	AFFIDAVIT OF
)	AUSTIN L. ABRAMS
v.)	
)	
WASCO COUNTY COURT,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

I, Austin L. Abrams, being duly sworn, do depose and say that:

I am the Managing Editor of The Dalles Chronicle.

I authored an article entitled "County Judge's Impartiality on Rajneesh Issue Challenged," which appeared on the front page of The Dalles Chronicle dated Saturday, December 19, 1981. A correct copy of that article is attached to this affidavit.

The above-mentioned article recites facts attributed to County Judge Richard Cantrell, which I learned from a conversation with Judge Cantrell that occurred prior to my authoring this article. These facts relate to a cattle sale between the Judge and followers of Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh.

The facts and statements attributed to Judge Cantrell in this article are an accurate report of the facts Judge

Cantrell provided me.

Austin L. Abrams
Austin L. Abrams

STATE OF OREGON)
) ss.
County of Wasco)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 28 day of
December , 1981.

J. Wright
Notary Public of Oregon

My commission expires:

My Commission Expires July 30, 1984





January 20, 1982

ATTACHMENT C

Paul Muller
19872 Arrow Wood Dr.
Bend, Oregon 97702

Dear Paul:

I received your letter this morning and appreciated your writing. It is alot nicer to have someone express his feelings to your face than to your back, and believe me my back is getting just a little raw.

There are a few things that are not being brought out in these articles that people do not see nor recognize.

First the cattle issue. Each fall or winter I sell cattle - if I am short of money and hay, or if I have a chance to sell alot of hay or if I have no sale for hay - will determine the amount of cattle I sell. I have Art Rice help me determine the price and then I let it be known what I have to sell and I sell them. Since these were bred cows I didn't want to sell them for hamburger at the auction yard so I priced cows, calves, pure bred white face, five year old bull, and yearling heifers at 50¢ a pound straight through. The check was made out to the U.S. National Bank and myself, as they hold the note on the cattle. I don't believe this price was in any way out of line. Al Limmeroth has purchased them several times, I have gone through the auction yard, I have sold to Martin Forrey, Lon London, Ben Smith, Don Wink, and I don't know how many other individuals. Which, of course, is my business and my prerogative. This year I did the same thing and John Shelfer asked for them, before Al and Art made it known they wanted them. Granted in looking back I should have announced at the hearing that I had sold cattle to Shelfer, but, remember please, I have sold cattle for about 40 years and have had only one hearing like this.

Buck Coe asked me to come out to talk to him on the 24th of November, 1981, which I did, with a witness. He wanted Virgil and I to rescind or reconsider our vote for a month or six weeks to let things cool off. I made him aware of all the facts of the cattle sale. (I also went to a city council meeting in Shaniko and told them, I told Scotta Callister of the Oregonian, Austin Abrams of The Dalles Chronicle, the reporters from AP, the Journal, and the Bend paper so there would be no question if I did or did not.) But I also sold at least that many cows to other Wasco County people. I called

the Attorney for the State Department of Oregon, and L.C.D.C., and told them all that had transpired and also asked them to contact the State Ethics Commission if they felt there was a problem so it could be investigated.

In regards to the hearing, we were instructed by L.C.D.C. and by the District Attorney that we could only hear information on the city boundary, and if they addressed the L.C.D.C. laws. Our Engineer looked at the boundaries and okayed them. The Planning Commission stated the L.C.D.C. goals were properly addressed. (40 pages). We three Commissioners agreed that the above were complied with. At this point State Law decrees that the Court must give the petitioner the right to hold an election.

Nothing gives us the right to judge morals, if they are moving too fast, or anything else.

Then when we voted, Jim voted "nay" using the reason they were moving too fast, and voted after Virgil and I did. Now he has a right to vote as he wishes but he never made any objections known in the discussion and the Court tape and the record bears this out. Every Attorney in The Dalles who was present has stated we had no other choice. Also, the Commissioner from Jefferson County who made the comments on Town Hall came to me after the meeting and stated (and I quote) "You made the only decision you could and we would probably have done the same." "As for the houses, both counties did agree on them."

Paul, the law of the land states that they have the legal right, the same as you and I, to do their thing as long as it is within the law. I swore an oath to be impartial and promised to give an honest opinion. I will do my best to live up to this and protect your legal rights, theirs, anyone elses, and mine, impartially.

What my personal opinion is cannot, and does not, enter into my Court decisions.

Also, Paul, I understand Kelly McGreer sold his potato crop to the Rajneesh, and Buck Coc offered to clear 10,000 acres of and for them at a price. It is my opinion that they had a right to do this.

I value the friendship I have had with you and your family and hope this will show my side of the events. If you get the chance ask John Conroy, George Ward, Sandy McCabe, or John Forman what they think of me, my dealings, or the Rajneesh issue will you?

Your friend



Rick Cantrell

D-1

ATTACHMENT D

State of Oregon
Department of Agriculture
OFFICERS REPORT

County Wasco

No. _____

Subject SELLING CATTLE WITHOUT CHANGE OF OWNERSHIP
BRAND INSPECTION

Date December 22, 1981

SUSPECT: Cantrell, Richard Carleton
Route 1, Box 186
Dufur, OR
Phone: (503) 467-2366
DOB 03-25-20

Writer received information from several ranchers in the area that Rick Cantrell sold cattle to Rajoneesh Foundation International, Antelope, Oregon, without brand inspection.

On December 7, 1981, writer went to Big Muddy Ranch, Antelope, Oregon, and was advised by several members that they bought cattle from Judge Cantrell; that they had a bill of sale, but after approximately 1 1/2 hours of searching couldn't produce it. The man in charge of the cattle, Bob HarWay, Antelope, Oregon, phone 489-3336, was in Salem and he probably had the bill of sale with him, but the deal was legal because they dealt with the judge. Writer tried on several different occasions to contact Bob HarWay at different times, but always got a busy signal. Writer was advised the cattle would be brought in next week. As soon as their branding iron was made, the cattle would be branded, Bangs and TB tested, and I would be advised to do the brand inspection.

On December 8, 1981, Rick Cantrell contacted writer by phone and stated he sold cattle to the Rajnees on November #9, 1981, but he didn't collect any money till two or three weeks later because of some hearing that was going on; that he didn't know he needed brand inspection because Art Rice, The Dalles, does most of his buying; that he sells most of his cattle through the auction sale where brand inspection is required. He will contact Bob HarWay and have brand inspection on the cattle next week while they are being tasted.

On December 18, 1981, Rick Cantrell contacted writer at Mid-Columbia Auction and stated that he has tried to contact Bob HarWay by phone but the line was always busy, but he wrote him a letter and advised, put the cattle in the corral within a few days and have them brand inspected; that they have a transportation slip he made out for a bill of sale, like he always fills out when he sells cattle; that they probably wouldn't show it to me because they were trying to protect him; that he should hear from HarWay by Monday, re: brand inspecting the cattle.

On December 21, 1981, writer and Loren Corwin, Madras, went to Big Muddy Ranch to meet Rick Cantrell at 3:00 p.m. He couldn't remember how many cattle he sold and couldn't find his papers of the sale, but he brought the correct bill of sale for the branded cattle he had bought and had not rebranded at other auction sales. Cantrell stated he sold 7 prs. at \$625.00, and the other cattle were sold for \$.50 a lb. Later he corrected the number to 9 prs.

At 4:00 p.m. writer wrote inspection on 48 cattle.

1 brind WF C	J	RH
1 WF B	Co-	RH
1 Blk WF C	W.	LH
3 Char Blk WF C	C J	RH
1 Blk C	T J	R Shoulder
2 Blk H	C J	RH

39 cows calf and yearlings, no brand. Cattle were mixed breeds, Ang, WF, Simu, Char., Hol.

Bob HarWey never came out while inspection was being made. Writer was advised twice by members and once by Cantrell, Bob HarWey would come out.

On December 22, 1981, writer contacted Rick Cantrell in his office at The Dalles, who stated he made the cattle deal with John Shelfer, Antelope, Oregon, the ranch manager; that he weighed the cattle at the Dufur Elevator; that he sold 9 pairs, and the other cattle were weighed in 3 drafts: Weights 8,610, 8,630, 6,890; that it was late in the afternoon when they finished the weighing; that Huck Rolff hauled the cattle.

A warning citation was issued. At this time, writer picked up transportation slip made out by Rick Cantrell for 48 cattle.

D.D. Hodges
Livestock Brand Inspector

ssR8-9E

E-1
BEFORE THE WASCO COUNTY COURT
OF THE STATE OF OREGON

true copy
Mark [Signature]
ATTACHMENT E

IN THE MATTER OF the
Designation of Certain Lands
as Rural Residential in the
Wasco County Plan (in the
area of Rajneeshpuram)

)
)
) No. _____
)
) AFFIDAVIT OF
)
)
) BUCK HODGES

I, Darrell Dwain ("Buck") Hodges, being duly sworn, do depose and say that:

I am the branding^{BH} inspector that examined the cattle sold by Judge Richard Cantrell to Rajneesh Foundation International. I have worked as a branding^{BH} inspector all over the state for 25 1/2 years. I reside in the Madras area. I estimate that I inspect 50,000 to 75,000 cattle a year depending on the year.

The branding^{BH} inspector inspects the brands on cattle to prevent livestock theft. I make sure that the brand on the cattle being sold is the brand of the seller, or that the seller has the bill of sale for those cattle. Whenever more than five cattle are sold, they must be brand inspected. Ordinarily they are inspected at the time of sale, normally over the scales. Usually the seller contacts the branding^{BH} inspector to let him know when he should be available to brand inspect the animals. It is extremely unusual for the branding^{BH} inspector to have to inspect the cattle after the sale has been made. The steps I had to go through in inspecting the cattle sale between Judge Cantrell and the Rajneesh were extremely unusual. Those steps are stated in the attached Officers Report, dated December 22, 1981, which is incorporated by

reference in this affidavit.

At the branding^{BN} inspection the brand inspector must be satisfied in his own mind that the person presenting the cattle for sale does own them. If the cattle^{previously BN} belonged to another man, the seller must show a bill of sale for that brand. Of the 48 cattle inspected in this sale, only three had the Judge's brand. The Judge had bills of sale for the other cattle. The Judge had not put his brand on the other cattle he had purchased in previous sales, which is unusual for a cattle operation.

The fee involved at the time of brand inspection is \$.50 for the brand inspection (per animal) and \$.50 for the Beef Council (per animal).

As stated in the attached Officers Report, the 48 cattle were sold, transported and paid for before I inspected them. The transfer of cattle took place on November 9, 1981. Judge Cantrell told me that he collected the money two to three weeks after the date of the transfer. I didn't inspect the cattle until December 21, 1981. At 4:00 P.M. on that day I wrote an inspection on 48 cattle.

Judge Cantrell told me that he sold seven pairs of cattle at \$625 a pair. He later corrected that number to nine pairs. He said he sold the other cattle at \$.50 a pound. The cattle sold by the pound were weighed in three drafts. The first draft was 8,610 pounds, the second draft 8630 pounds, and the third draft 6,890 pounds. In other words, total weight was 24,130 pounds for the cattle sold at \$.50 a pound.

On December 21, when I inspected the cattle, I was not given the transportation slip by Judge Cantrell. It is extremely unusual not to be given this slip at the time of inspection. I received the transportation

slip at Judge Cantrell's office in The Dalles at 12:00 noon on December 22, 1981. When I inspected the cattle Judge Cantrell could not remember how many cattle he had sold, which is also very unusual.

In 25 1/2 years of being a branding^{ing} inspector, I have never seen a sale in which cows, calves, heifers, bull calves and large bulls were all weighed together and sold at the same price. In my opinion a price of \$625 a pair is a very high price considering the time of year of the sale and the type and quality of cattle involved. In November, in the sale yard report for the Madras auction yard, pairs paid between \$435 and \$470, with \$470 for a good quality pair. The cattle involved in this sale were not of good quality for beef, in my opinion, and not of good quality for dairy. Some of them had bills of sale dating back to 1971.

For the cattle sold by the pound, ordinarily they are split up by sex, size and type of cattle and weighed separately. A flat \$.50 per pound is a very unusual type of arrangement. In my opinion none of the cattle involved were of good quality for beef. Many were of poor quality. About half of the cattle were old.

D. D. Buck Hodges

Buck Hodges

STATE OF OREGON)
)
County of Jefferson) ss.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 26th day of January, 1982.

Milner C. Dickson












Notary Public for Oregon
My commission expires: 6-5-85

Oregon Transportation Certificate

ATTACHMENT F

"THIS CERTIFICATE DOES NOT AUTHORIZE TRANSPORTATION OF LIVESTOCK
OUT OF OREGON."

Name of owner Chidailos R. M.C. Date 11/9 1981
 Address P.O. Box 1217 Astoria County Wasco
 Shipped from P.O. Box to Astoria
 Carrier Ronald Rolfe Vehicle or car No. _____

No.	Breed	Sex	Brand or Eartag No.	Location of Brand	Lot Number	Ear Marks R. . L.
50	Mixed	mixed	None			
						
						
						
						
						
						
						
						
						
						

I, Robert Morris, this 8 day of Nov, 1981, do certify that I am in lawful possession of the above described animals.
Chidailos R. M.C.
 Name of Owner

By Agent (if any)

**IMPORTANT! IF CHANGE OF OWNERSHIP OCCURS, FORM
ON REVERSE SIDE MUST BE FILLED OUT AND SIGNED.**

Oregon Transportation Certificate

"THIS CERTIFICATE DOES NOT AUTHORIZE TRANSPORTATION OF LIVESTOCK OUT OF OREGON."

Name of owner: Rick Cantrell Date: 9 Nov 1987

Address: Debar Ave County: Wasco

Shipped from: Debar to: Antelope

Carrier: Ronald Kelle Vehicle or car No.:

No.	Breed	Sex	Brand or Earline No.	Location of Brand	Lot Number	Ear Marks R L
1	WF	B	CO-	RH		
1	B ₁ F	C	C ♪	RH		
1	B ₁ W	C	W1	LH		
1	WEG	C	C J A	RH		
1	B ₁ W	C	C J	RH		
1	WEG	C	WOM			
1	WFC	C	J	RH		
1	BWF	C	MOM			
3	B ₁ K	C	NOM			
2	Chapel	C	NOM			

I, Rick Cantrell, this 9 day of Nov, 1987, do certify that I am in lawful possession of the above described animal.

Name of Owner: Rick Cantrell

By Agent (if any) _____
IMPORTANT! IF CHANGE OF OWNERSHIP OCCURS, FORM ON REVERSE SIDE MUST BE FILLED OUT AND SIGNED.

6-1

ATTACHMENT G

Oregon Transportation Certificate

"THIS CERTIFICATE DOES NOT AUTHORIZE TRANSPORTATION OF LIVESTOCK OUT OF OREGON."

Name of owner: Richard Carl Bell Date: _____ 19____
 Address: Aspen County: Wasco
 Shipped from: Portland to: Portland
 Carrier: Randall Vehicle or car No.: _____

No.	Breed	Sex	Brand or Ear Tag No.	Location of Brand	Lot Number	Ear Marks R. L.
1	H	C	None			
5	WF	C	None			
1	BIK	H	None			
2	BIK	H	C E	RH		
4	WF	H	None			
7	WF	H	None			
1	chick	H	None			
1	RW	S	None			
1	BIK	S	None			
2	SW	S	None			

I, Richard Carl Bell, this 9 day of Nov 1981, do certify that I am in lawful possession of the above described animal.

Name of Owner: Richard Carl Bell

By Agent (if any) _____
 IMPORTANT! IF CHANGE OF OWNERSHIP OCCURS, FORM

18 Feb 82



BuckCoe
Dear Buck:

Thanks for the phone call yesterday; I appreciated it. If someone has a personal problem with what I did, tell them to come in & I'll try to explain my side of it. I realize 1000 friends are doing all they can to win their case & that is fine for that is what they get paid for. I don't believe I have changed my story any & I think most of it has been in print or court record. If I've missed anything I'll sure try to make it available. So far



A-2

5TH & WASHINGTON STREET
THE DALLES, OREGON 97058

I have not responded to accusations in depth because of attorney's advice on the upcoming hearings, so it may look like I'm dodging issues.

On the transportation slip, if there was anything I wanted hidden, all that had to be done was to have destroyed them + said as much for there is no need of a transportation slip except while stock are being transported. No bill of sale was made because I had never gotten over there. There does not have to be a bill of sale made. However, after the brand inspection was made & signed, it acts as a bill of sale and at this point



H-3

5TH & WASHINGTON STREET
THE DALLES, OREGON 97058

The legal transfer of stock has taken place. This all came from Brand Dept.

The only reason I accepted the warning citation was to get the people off Buck Hodges back. I feel very badly about the treatment he is receiving from people. He certainly does not deserve that for he was doing his job. I have found Buck very considerate. If those persecuting him knew how much it affects a person's system they'd back off.

Again, thanks for your call.

Sincerely,
Rick

C: Buck Hodges

Mark Corwin

ATTACHMENT I

IN THE MATTER OF the)
Designation of Certain Lands)
as Rural Residential in the)
Wasco County Plan (in the)
area of Rajneeshpuram))
)
)
)

No. _____
AFFIDAVIT OF
LOREN CORWIN

I, Loren Corwin, being duly sworn, do depose and say that:

I have worked for the Madras ^{and Redmond} auction yard off and on for 20 years.

I observe the cattle market every week in that capacity. My duties with the auction are those of a field man. I talk with the ranchers, work in the ring during sales, and appraise the value of cattle. Determining the value of cattle is one of my day to day duties. At the Redmond auction yard in 1979 I handled and sorted about 45,000 head of cattle. Last year the amount was fewer because of the year.

I also run about 150 cattle of my own and 150 cattle on a share deal, where I run the cattle for others. I buy and sell cattle regularly.

On December 21, 1981, I accompanied Buck Hodges, the branding inspector, on his visit to the Muddy Ranch to inspect the cattle sold to the Rajneesh by Judge Rick Cantrell. I accompanied Buck Hodges as a helper. I saw each of the 48 cattle inspected.

In my opinion, the quality of the cattle sold was "off-quality." There was a mix of bulls, heifers, yearlings, and other breeds. The quality of the cattle was "dairy quality", which is poor for beef production. Of the 48 cattle involved in the sale, a few of the cattle were of good quality for beef, but those of good quality were old. The young ones were not much good

for a commercial herd for beef production, and poor kinds of cattle to make money with.

In my opinion, not more than 12 of the 48 cattle I saw would have brought \$.50 a pound at sale at that time. Those that would have brought that price were some calves and light cattle. Generally, in determining the value of cattle, you need to separate them by kind, weight, age, sex, etc., and weigh them. Mixing all types of cattle together and weighing them and selling them at a fixed price is very unusual.

When I saw the 48 cattle I did not do an evaluation of their value by type. However, I noticed that these cattle were dairy quality, that is, beef cattle bred with dairy cows. Dairy quality cattle sell at about 20¢ a pound less ~~as~~ beef cattle than good beef production cattle. However, if these cattle were sold for dairy purposes, a dairyman would not have bought them due to poor quality.

The ~~cattle~~ ^{Cows &c} I saw would have brought at that time, in my estimation, about 33¢ to 35¢ a pound. At the time of sale they may have brought another five cents a pound. Good quality steer will bring about 62¢ a pound today, and good quality heifers 50¢ a pound. These cattle were not good quality. There were no ~~steer~~ calves. There were about one dozen ^{Mixed &c} ~~bull~~ calves that would bring 50¢ a pound.

Of the pairs sold for \$625, I could not determine which nine pairs were sold, because some of the cows and calves were not sold as pairs, but by the pound. A fair estimate for pairs is that the cows would weigh approximately 800 pounds and sell at 40¢ a pound (\$320 percow) and that the calves would sell at \$200/head, for a total of \$520 a pair.

The three drafts for the cattle sold by the pound weighed a total of 24, 130 pounds. When the nine pair (18 cattle) are removed, the average weight per head (including one bull) equals 804 pounds per head. Sold at \$.50 a pound, this figure is \$402 per head for bulls, heifers, cows, etc. In my estimation, these weights and prices are way out of line. They could not have weighed that much and brought that amount of money, considering the kinds of cattle involved in this sale, in a normal sales transaction. The value of these cattle was much lower.

Loren Corwin
 Loren Corwin

STATE OF OREGON)
) ss.
 County of Jefferson)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 26th day of January, 1982.

Milner S. Wickes
 Notary Public for Oregon
 My commission expires: 6-5-85