has made a determination eclectically about the issues regarding these parties, and that the parties are under church's jurisdiction. And basically, your honor, we will be asking the defendants to comply what they agreed to at the church mediation.

We all agree that the church has jurisdictional matters. The church is supreme and issued before themselves in the court. It's a hierarchical church entity here with COGIC, and therefore, we all agree -- stipulated that we will abide by what COGIC renders. Then they made that rendering. So then we should go by that rendering and take this matter out of the court's hands.

But let me say this, if defendants do not comply what they agreed to, but the -- would agree to it April 9, and unfortunately come back here again to enforce the agreement. But as to issues how they resolved --

THE COURT: Well, no, I don't think you come back to this court to enforce that agreement. The church has made it very clear, and I feel like it's almost been an abuse of the court system. Because their position is completely 180 of what was argued in front of me numerous times about jurisdiction. I did an enormous amount of research

and I entered an order on that issue. And now they're saying, oh, well, Pastor Watts wasn't really out of the church, he really was in it. So this court never had jurisdiction.

This was always an issue for the church, which has never been the plaintiff's position in this case, ever. They argued strenuously against that from day one by asking for, just listen to me for a second. For Judge Dannheisser to enter the temporary injunction and then for the continued litigation in this case. The way I read what's been filed in the court file is that is the church's position, and that it has been requested that everybody sign this joint stipulation.

And that if Pastor Watts and the other defendants don't do it, then they will handle any repercussions, including essentially kicking him out of the church or banning him from the church. And that would be how it would be handled if he doesn't sign the agreements to address the deed issues. And that would not be something that I'm not in it. I don't see how this court would ever be in a position to enforce a directive from the church about that.

I mean, that's completely outside of this court's jurisdiction, in my opinion, Mr. Gant and we

may just agree to disagree on that, but I mean, they can't have it both ways.

MR. GANT: If I may --

THE COURT: That's what they tried to do, is do that when it benefited them, have the court involved, but when it didn't, then, oh, we have jurisdiction, the court shouldn't be involved. And I feel like it's like been batting the court back around, back and forth in this -- I think it's been very unfair and how this has been tried to be presented to the court, again, in a way, it's advantageous for their position at the time. So you know their position and it's in writing, this court has jurisdiction.

MR. GANT: If I may judge, if I may judge. What the court just articulated in my view, and I could be wrong, exactly what the defendants have been doing throughout this proceedings, in my opinion. Number one, Judge Dannheisser, on issue of the church property, issue of real property in the State of Florida. Ownership of property rules in our favor on that issue.

THE COURT: Right. In all candor, I would not have granted that temporary injunction at the time. I don't think there was sufficient basis to.