

The 2025 NRSPOA Board Election

Where the Legal Action Started

In September 2025, when the Board requested nominations to run for the open positions, Elizabeth Handley submitted her biography to have her name added to the ballot. When the ballot was printed and mailed to members, her name was absent from the list. She was told by the board that she was “not in good standing” and therefore not eligible to run.

👉 Here's the truth:

- The Handleys have paid the annual assessment amount every year since purchasing their home in North River Shores. The Association has consistently accepted these payments without objection.
- Sometime before the election, the Board claimed a “letter” was sent from the Board to the Handleys in 2021 that was never received. This letter was allegedly sent via regular US mail and threatened legal action if the Handleys did not respond. Since the alleged letter was not received by the Handleys, no response was made. No follow up or legal action to the alleged letter was taken by the Board in the approximate four years after.

👉 These facts below defy the claim that a letter was ever sent or that the Handleys were ever classified as “Members Not in Good Standing”:

- The Board approved the Handley boat/lift project in 2022. You have to be a Member in Good Standing to have a project approved. Dave Weston himself signed off on it.
- The Handleys were allowed to vote at every election. At the Annual meetings, there is a member list where “Members Not in Good Standing” are marked, sometimes with highlighter, to prevent them from voting. The Handley’s name was never highlighted or marked as a “Member Not in Good Standing”.
- There is no proof that this letter was sent. It was not sent via certified mail, even though certified mail is a process historically recommended by the POA when requesting variance approvals from neighbors.
- This issue or the letter was never mentioned to the Handleys over the years—even though there were several social interactions with Board members, specifically Tim Newton and Dave Weston.
- A NRSPOA Board member stated that leaving Elizabeth off the ballot was possibly a mistake but they would not reprint a new one with her name included.

👉 What this really is:

- Retaliation for speaking out about the North Shore Park dock project.
- Reprisal for exposing their project and informing our neighbors.
- An attempt to silence voices that want transparency, accountability, and fairness.

👉 Other questionable practices during the 2025 election:

- Ballots were taken home by the administrator and results came out days later, rather than being counted by two persons and announced at the meeting per Robert's Rules of Order.
- Requests to review the ballots were ignored.

👉 Questionable practices during the 2024 election:

- Four seats were open and there were four candidates on the ballot but for unknown reasons, only two candidates were selected for the board even though the bylaws state:

In order to be elected, a candidate for Director must receive total votes in favor of their election in excess of ten percent (10%) of the membership. In addition to the requirement that a Director must receive "yes" votes in excess of ten percent (10%) of the membership, the candidate for Director must also receive more "yes" votes than "no" votes. Candidates who receive more "no" votes than "yes" votes may not be elected to nor appointed to the Board. Vacancies on the Board will be filled in descending order beginning with the candidates having the greatest number of "yes" votes but also meeting the requirements of ten percent (10%) of positive vote and more "yes" votes than "no."

The two candidates that were not selected met the above requirements.

- Requests to review the ballots were ignored.

👉 Questionable practices during the 2026 election:

- The Board chose to do it again this election because they got away with it last year. The Board denied Elizabeth Handley the opportunity to run for the Board again, stating that she is still not a member in good standing. The Board had a lawyer send her a letter informing her that she would not be on the ballot again. More frivolous usage of a lawyer that contributed to legal fees.
- The POA President puts his personal preferences to be elected as Board members in the official ballot/budget mailer. His personal preferences are even marked with asterisks on the official ballot.

👉 Why it matters to YOU:

If they can block a candidacy even while paid up and in good standing, then they can do it to anyone who speaks up. That means fewer choices, less democracy, and a Board that thinks it answers to no one. Candidates that rightly won a position on the Board were denied the position. What could be the purpose of controlling who gets on the Board? What recourse do any of us have when our rights are taken away? The only civilized option is to take it to the courts.