EXHIBIT K

```
Page 1
 1
                IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
 3
      Will McRaney,
                                        )
                                        )
 4
            Plaintiff,
                                        )
                                        ) CASE NO.
 5
                                        )1:17-cv-00080-GHD-DAS
      vs.
 6
       The North American Mission
                                        )
       Board of the Southern Baptist
 7
       Convention, Inc.,
                                        )
                                        )
            Defendant.
 8
                                        )
 9
10
11
                            DEPOSITION OF
12
                             KEVIN EZELL
                            March 2, 2023
13
14
                               8:58 a.m.
15
16
                           Butler Snow, LLP
17
                       1170 Peachtree Street NE
18
                               Suite 1900
19
                           Atlanta, Georgia
20
21
                 Robin K. Ferrill, CCR-B-1936, RPR
22
23
2.4
25
```

| | Page 154 | | Page 156 |
|----------|---|----------|--|
| 1 | MR. GANT: The American Psychiatric | 1 | A. Right. |
| 2 | Association. | 2 | Q. Was Rolland Slade an employee of NAMB at |
| 3 | A. I have heard of them, yes. | 3 | the time? |
| 4 | (Plaintiff's Exhibit 16, Medscape | 4 | A. No. |
| 5 | definition of Delusional Disorder, Updated | 5 | Q. And you responded to an e-mail, Mr. Tom |
| 6 | 6/6/22, marked for identification.) | 6 | Unzicker, same day, September 17, 2018, at 8:15 a.m. |
| 7 | Q. (By Mr. Gant) I'm handing you what's been | 7 | A. Yes. |
| 8 | marked as Exhibit 16. This is a printout from the | 8 | Q. You wrote, It's the same old lies, correct? |
| 9 | website called Medscape, with an overview of | 9 | A. That's correct. |
| 10 | delusional disorder. | 10 | Q. You were referring to statements by |
| 11 | Do you see it says, "Delusional disorder is | 11 | Dr. McRaney when you said "same old lies," correct? |
| 12 | an illness characterized by at least one month of | 12 | A. I'm assuming I assume so. It's the |
| 13 | delusions but no other psychotic symptoms, according | 13 | same it's the same song, yes. |
| 14 | to the American Psychiatric Association's Diagnostic | 14 | Q. You can put that aside for now. |
| 15 | and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 5th | 15 | (Plaintiff's Exhibit 18, E-mail string to |
| 16 | edition, text revision." | 16 | Ezell from Brodbent, 7/10/20, Bates stamped NAMB |
| 17 | Do you see that? | 17 | 9188 - 90, marked for identification.) |
| 18 | A. I see that. | 18 | Q. (By Mr. Gant) Exhibit 18 is Bates labeled |
| 19 | Q. Have you ever seen that before? | 19 | NAMB 9188 through 90. |
| 20 | A. No, sir. | 20 | A. Yes. Yes. |
| 21 | Q. Okay. You can put that aside. Thank you. | 21 | Q. Tell me when you are ready for a question. |
| 22 | (Plaintiff's Exhibit 17, E-mail string to | 22 | A. Okay. |
| 23 | Ezell from Unzicker, 9/17/18, Bates stamped NAMB | 23 | MR. PERLA: You haven't read it. |
| 24 | 8240 - 41, marked for identification.) | 24 | THE WITNESS: I read the first |
| 25 | Q. (By Mr. Gant) Exhibit 17 is Bates labeled | 25 | MR. PERLA: You can wait to hear what the |
| | Page 155 | | Page 157 |
| 1 | NAMB 8240 through 41. Please let me know when you | 1 | question is, but there are other pages. |
| 2 | have reviewed it. | 2 | THE WITNESS: Okay. I didn't realize there |
| 3 | A. Okay. | 3 | were other pages. All right. |
| 4 | Q. Who is Pastor Rolland Slade? | 4 | Okay. |
| 5 | A. He's a pastor in California. Was the | 5 | Q. (By Mr. Gant) Who is Al Brodbent? |
| 6 | chairman of the executive committee of the SBC a year | 6 | A. I don't I don't recall. |
| 7 | or so ago. | 7 | Q. It says here it refers his e-mail |
| 8 | Q. He sent you an e-mail in this exhibit on | 8 | refers to pastor-counselor. |
| 9 | September 17th, 2018, correct? | 9 | Do you see that? |
| 10 | A. That's what it says, yes. | 10 | A. Yeah, but I just don't recall. |
| 11 | Q. And then there were some there was a | 11 | Q. Al Brodbent was not with NAMB at the time |
| 12 | response from you. It looks like you may have | 12 | of this e-mail exchange, was he? |
| 13 | forwarded it to someone. | 13 | A. Again, I don't recall who he is. So I |
| 14 | Who's Todd Unzicker? | 14 | don't know everybody who works at NAMB. |
| 15 | A. He's the looks like at the time of the | 15 | Q. His e-mail address is not an e-mail address |
| 16 | e-mail Tom Unzicker is currently the state exec at | 16 | from NAMB, is it? |
| 17 | North Carolina. At the time of the e-mail, he was at | 17 | A. No. |
| 18 | some church in Raleigh/Durham. | 18 19 | Q. Is there anything to indicate here that he was with NAMB? |
| 19 | Q. Was Tom Unzicker with NAMB? | 20 | A. Not that I see. |
| 20 | A. We had a contract with J.D. Greer and the | | |
| 21 | summit folks to speak for us at certain times and to | 21 22 | Q. And you wrote in an e-mail to Al Brodbent on July 10, 2020, "All of his assertion are untrue. |
| 22 23 | do some things, but he wasn't an employee of NAMB, | 23 | Simply never happened." |
| 43 | no. | 24 | Do you see that? |
| 24 | 1) SO IOM I Indicker was not an amniowed of Nill Will | | |
| 24 25 | Q. So Tom Unzicker was not an employee of NAMB at the time? | 25 | A. Right. |

Page 158 Page 160 A. Okay. 1 Q. And by "his," you were referring to 1 2 Q. They produced this to us. 2 Dr. McRaney? 3 A. Yes. 3 A. Uh-huh. Q. On the second page you'll see there was an 4 Q. You can put that aside for now. Thank you. 4 5 e-mail. Dr. McRaney wrote, Dear NAMB Trustee. 5 Who's Russell Moore? Do you see that? A. He's a former president of the ERLC, the 6 6 7 A. Yes. 7 Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission. 8 Q. The ERLC is another entity of the SBC? 8 Q. And then the second to last paragraph says, 9 A. Yes. The attached letter is being sent. 10 Q. Kind of a sister organization of NAMB? 10 Do you see that? 11 A. Right. 11 A. Yes, it was another entity. Uh-huh. 12 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 19, E-mail string to 12 Q. Do you know if that's the letter that you 13 Palmer from Moore, 9/20/22, Bates stamped ERLC 1 13 were referring to as a very long e-mail earlier 14 today? 14 - 2, marked for identification.) 15 Q. (By Mr. Gant) The ERLC is not itself part 15 A. No, this doesn't look like the one that was 16 a real long e-mail. 16 of NAMB, correct? Q. Well, I meant the attachment. Do you 17 A. Right. 17 18 know if the -- I know you don't have it in front of 18 Q. Let me -- how many pages do you have there? you so it may be hard to answer. But do you know if A. On the front and back? the attachment to that e-mail called Letter of 20 O. What? Number 1 and Number 2? 21 21 A. Yes, sir. Concern was the very long e-mail you were referring 22 Q. Okay. On the first page you wrote an 22 to earlier? 23 23 e-mail to a number of people on February 5, 2016, A. I don't -- just don't know. 24 correct? The middle of the first page. 24 Q. And you responded to someone, can't quite 25 tell here, but it looks like to Russell Moore from 25 A. The middle of the first page. Page 159 Page 161 Q. At 5:45 a.m. 1 1 the subsequent e-mails. A. It looks like to -- not to a number of 2 2 A. Right. 3 people. Q. You wrote to Russell Moore about Q. Right. From this format we can't tell who 4 4 Dr. McRaney, what an idiot, correct? you sent it to. Do you know who you sent it to? 5 A. Uh-huh. Uh-huh. That would have been --A. No. Well, it looks like in this format it 6 yeah. I'm sorry. Yes. 7 starts on two and it looks like it was forwarded to Q. Okay. Thank you. You can put that aside. 8 Russ, possibly. 8 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 20, E-mail string to 9 Q. Okay. 9 Williams from Moore, 9/20/22, Bates stamped ERLC 10 A. I can't tell in the format. 10 18 - 20, marked for identification.) Q. Okay. That's fair enough. I can't tell 11 11 Q. (By Mr. Gant) Did I read in the Bates 12 either. That's just the way we received it from 12 numbers for the prior exhibit? Just for the record, 13 NAMB. 13 the prior exhibit, Exhibit 19, was Bates labeled A. Yeah. 14 14 ERLC1 through 2. 15 Q. You wrote -- you forwarded and responded to 15 The next exhibit, Exhibit 20, is Bates 16 an e-mail from Dr. McRaney that was sent to NAMB 16 labeled ERLC18 through 20. Is that what you have in 17 trustees and copied to you, correct? 17 front of you? 18 A. Right. 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. And that was entitled Letter of Concern. 19 Q. Tell me when you're ready for a question. 20 It says -- the subject line is Letter of Concern. 20 A. Okay. 21 A. Yes, the Letter of Concern. Okay. Yes, I 21 Q. Now, this is another e-mail chain regarding 22 see. 22 the Letter of Concern from Dr. McRaney. If you look 23 Q. And then although it's not attached to this 23 on the first page of the exhibit, ERLC18, you wrote 24 version -- we received this from -- sorry. I said it an e-mail on February 5th, 2016 at 9:40 a.m. FYI, in 24 25 was from NAMB. This was from ERLC. 25 case you run into this nut case.

Page 290 Page 292 1 A. Well, Jeff Christopherson -- and, again, I 1 someone else's? 2 have to look at the date. But Jeff Christopherson 2 A. Yeah. The only reason I hesitate, we don't 3 and Steve Davis, they all had regions, but they 3 make decisions like that. We get in a room. And I 4 crossed pon- -- they cross-referenced each other. 4 know what I don't know and I trust the people. So 5 Even if it wasn't their responsibility, say how can I the decision's made through the conversation with the handle this, how can I handle this? people who know what they're talking about and then I 7 trust them. So if you say ultimately whose decision, That's why Davis is the most detailed, has 8 I mean, you could say it was mine, but ultimately it 8 the best memory, is more methodical and administrative than Christopherson, and that's why he would fall under counsel. 10 said, hey, I need help here. 10 Q. (By Mr. Gant) Do you review legal briefs --11 So I don't know when that all happened, the 11 12 dates that it happened, but I'm sure Davis had 12 Q. -- to the Court of Appeals before they are something to do with this as well. 13 filed? 14 Q. All right. You can put that aside. 14 A. I refer everything. I trust George to 15 You said that the general counsel of NAMB 15 review all that. 16 16 reports to you, correct? Q. Do you read the briefs after they're filed? 17 A. Yes. 17 A. No, sir. I'm sorry. 18 Q. I understand he's in the room, George. 18 Q. Did you read NAMB's request that the 19 A. Yes. 19 Supreme Court review this case? 20 Q. In terms of the decisions about things like 20 A. I was aware that we were filing something, 21 whether to take an appeal, are those matters that you 21 but I didn't read it. 22 personally get involved with or do you just defer and 22 Q. Were you involved in the decision to ask 23 delegate all that to general counsel of NAMB? 23 the Supreme Court to review this case? 24 A. I trust counsel. 24 A. Just kind of asked and answered -- our process is the same. We get in a room, discuss it, I 25 Q. So are you aware that in this case, after 25 Page 291 Page 293 1 hear what they think and ultimately have always gone 1 the district court dismissed the case, the case went with what they think, because I didn't know. 2 up to U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit? 3 3 Q. Why didn't you read the brief that NAMB A. Yes, I'm aware of that. submitted to the Supreme Court? Q. And are you aware that in the Fifth 5 Circuit, the Fifth Circuit reversed the dismissal in A. Because I trust our attorneys. I don't know -- all I knew is we did not do this. 6 favor of Dr. McRaney and reinstated the case? 7 Q. Did you review the decision of the Fifth A. Yes, I'm aware of that. Circuit Court of Appeals? Q. And were you aware that NAMB had requested 8 9 that the full Court of Appeals review the decision A. No. 10 Q. Did you read any of the briefs that were 10 that had been made by a panel of the Court of 11 submitted by any party in the Fifth Circuit Court of 11 Appeals? 12 A. Yes, I'm aware of that. 12 Appeals? Q. And were you involved in that decision to 13 14 take the -- to request what's called en banc review, 14 Q. Did you read the amicus brief that was submitted to the Fifth Circuit by the Thomas More 15 review by the whole court? 15 Society and the ERLC? 16 16 MR. PERLA: You can give a yes or no to 17 A. No. I was told about that and notified 17 that. Were you involved with the decision? about the ERLC, but I didn't read it. 18 A. I was -- I was, yes. I guess -- I mean, I 18 19 was --19 Q. What were you told about it? 20 MR. PERLA: Don't talk about conversations 20 MR. PERLA: Start with the yes if yes is 21 21 the answer. If it's other than that, it's going with counsel --22 22 to be privileged. A. It was conversation --23 MR. PERLA: -- otherwise you can testify. 23 Q. (By Mr. Gant) Was it your decision or did 24 A. It was conversation with counsel about it. 24 someone inform you of the decision? 25 25 MR. PERLA: I was going to instruct you not MR. PERLA: Stick with your decision or

Page 294 Page 296 1 question. 1 to testify to that conversation. 2 2 Q. (By Mr. Gant) Did you hear from sources A. Okay. 3 other than counsel that there was a lot of 3 Q. Have you seen this before? 4 controversy and complaints about the ERLC and Thomas 4 A. I don't recall it, but it's got my name on 5 it and it's from NAMB so I don't dispute it. 5 More Society amicus brief submitted to the Fifth Q. It attributes this e-mail to you, correct? 6 Circuit? 6 7 7 A. Right, right. A. That was very public, so yeah. SBC drama. 8 Q. Did you write it? 8 I mean, the public article and all. 9 But you understand what I do -- I don't --A. Oh, no. 10 I don't -- you know, I mute people on Twitter. You 10 Q. Do you know who did? 11 A. Probably George -- George, Mike Ebert, and, 11 know, I just don't read all that distraction too 12 you know, typically there's, like, a team of three 12 much. And Mike Ebert surveys that information and if 13 there's something he thinks I need to see, he shows that would write stuff like that, just to double and triple check each other and to convey our state 14 it to me, but I don't read it. I don't read any of 14 15 it. 15 execs, especially the 15 south. And then they constantly get pelted with questions about things and 16 Q. Mike Ebert is a public relations they just want to make sure that they know at 17 professional, not a lawyer? 17 least -- here's the basics of what we know. 18 A. Mike Ebert, if he thinks I need to read 19 something, yes. I trust the attorneys to read the 19 O. The second paragraph of this e-mail, which says it's from you, and it's unclear who it went 20 legal documents, yes, but we had nothing to do with 20 21 21 the brief. to -- well, it says, Dear State Executive Director. 22 22 Does that tell you who the recipients were? Q. But the drama you referred to a second 23 A. Yeah, those 42 state conventions. I 23 ago --24 A. It would be --24 don't -- and, again, I don't -- I'm not aware if we sent this. We send things to different groups so 25 O. Go ahead. Page 297 1 A. Baptists -- you know, anything that was in 1 sometimes it would be the 15, sometimes it would be 2 like -- you know, where people are talking about the the 42, and the 15 being a part of the 42. differences between the two. He said, hey, man, 3 Q. Is there anything about this e-mail that 4 look, here's what happened. 4 tells you which it is? 5 Q. I'm sorry. Who said what? 5 A. No. It looks like it's a to -- yes, it's A. Mike Ebert said here's what happened with 6 back to me. Didn't mention -- I don't -- I don't 7 the briefs and that ERLC filed one and that it was 7 know. But typically these type would be probably -inaccurate. 8 I don't know. I just don't know. 9 Q. Do you remember when he told you that? 9 Q. Do you know why this e-mail drafted under 10 A. I have no idea, no. 10 your name wanted to, as it says in the second Q. And what, if anything, did you do after 11 11 paragraph, make clear that NAMB respects and values 12 Mike Ebert informed you that the ERLC brief had 12 the autonomy of every church association, state 13 contained inaccuracies? 13 convention, and entity within the Southern Baptist 14 A. I probably ate an Oreo. That's what I do 14 family of faith? 15 every time someone -- I really -- I didn't do 15 A. Yeah. 16 anything. It had nothing I could do about it, you 16 Q. Why? 17 know, it's -- and I really actually probably did eat 17 A. Because there were articles circulating out 18 an Oreo. 18 there. People were again implying that we were not 19 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 51, E-mail to Ezell 19 for the autonomy of the local church and -- which was 20 from Ezell, 6/28/21, Bates stamped NAMB 9309, 20 not the case, so ... 21 marked for identification.) 21 Q. So you thought or someone writing this for 22 Q. (By Mr. Gant) Exhibit 51 is Bates labeled 22 you thought that was important to make clear? 23 9309. 23 A. That was the questions coming in from the 24 A. Okay. 24 state execs. We write this in response to typically

25 what they're asking us about, frequently asked

25

Q. Just let me know when you're ready for a