The Dissimulation of Concealment

(November 2026)

WHEN A COURT OF JUSTICE DOESN'T BOTHER TO REVIEW EVIDENCE

Imagine a Director, one of only three on a corporation's Board of Directors, accused by the Board's chairman of egregiously concealing payments by an overseas subsidiary, although said chairman had received a full, extensive record of those very payments several years earlier [1] and said record had been warmly acknowledged.

Following an accusation of embezzlement at a board meeting, the Director indignantly denied the chairman the satisfaction of an immediate answer, although he immediately communicated a detailed breakdown of the payments to:

1. The third Director present at the Board of Directors meeting, and
2. An attorney for the overseas subsidiary.

However, the accuser subsequently produced as incontrovertible evidence of the alleged concealment the very email forwarded by the accused Director to the attorney, which reproduced his communication to the third Director.

Some concealment indeed, and a rather remarkable exercise in sophisticated dissimulation, considering that:

- **a.** the information had been fully disclosed years prior;
- **b.** two of the three Directors were in on this alleged concealment;
- **c.** and so was an attorney for the overseas subsidiary.

Had the judge misplaced her reading glasses?

[1] To be exact, 3 years, 8 months, 3 weeks, and 2 days prior