



March 12, 2026

### Explanation of Supreme Court's Denial of Certiorari

As you may have heard, on Monday, March 9, 2026, the United States Supreme Court denied certiorari in the case of *Family Federation for World Peace and Unification International, et al. v. Hyun Jin Moon, et al.* This means that the highest court in the U.S. is declining to accept our request to review the D.C. Court of Appeals' finding that the disputes between our organization and Preston Moon involve too many religious issues for U.S. courts to decide them without violating the U.S. Constitution's First Amendment religious freedom protections. In 2011, True Father initiated this case against his son and others working with him to recover assets belonging to the church that Preston Moon and his associates had illicitly seized and converted for their own use. The Supreme Court's denial of our request to be heard marks the end of this case in the U.S. courts.

Denial of certiorari is not a ruling in favor of one side or the other in a dispute. It only means that the Supreme Court has decided that this case will not be among the limited number of cases it has the discretion to accept for full briefing, review, and consideration. Statistically, this decision is not unusual. Each year, the Supreme Court receives 7,000-8,000 petitions for certiorari from parties dissatisfied with the outcome of the final decisions made by other courts, but the Supreme Court typically agrees to hear only 50-80 cases per term, meaning parties petitioning this high court have roughly a 1-3% chance of having their case heard. The Supreme Court does not share its reasons for denying certiorari in any particular case. The role of the Supreme Court is not to "retry" cases or to step in to correct manifest injustices. Under its rules, it accepts only cases in which a majority of Justices believe present a combination of facts and legal issues that allow it to resolve inconsistent decisions about issues of national importance or constitutional rights in various state or federal courts, or to decide important questions of federal law.

In applying for certiorari in this case, we argued vigorously that the District of Columbia Court of Appeals' 2022 and 2025 rulings holding the lower trial court should have abstained from rendering a judgment in favor of the Church and against Preston Moon merely because the fact that Preston Moon claimed there was a leadership dispute shrouded in religious issues was wrong and unconstitutional because these rulings deprived the Church of a legal forum to adjudicate a property dispute against Preston and his small coterie of dissident UCI director accomplices.

We also argued that these religious abstention rulings conflicted with the high courts of other states, which have not refused to hear church property disputes involving leadership disputes, even those touching marginally on religious issues. We took the position that the D.C. Court of Appeals could have, and should have, decided whether Reverend Moon was the leader of the Church at the time Preston and his dissident directors seized control of the UCI board of directors because there were neutral, non-religious facts that showed Reverend Moon was the leader at the relevant time, including Preston Moon's 2008 Report to Parents in which Preston makes repeated admissions that he was subordinate to Reverend Moon at the time. We also shared with the Court Reverend Moon's own statements declaring Preston subordinate to him and that Reverend Moon removed Preston from his positions and ordered him to stay by his side

"GOD'S DREAM, ONE FAMILY"

for a year. The Court of Appeals felt it could not decide who was in charge at the time Preston and his cohort transferred the Church's assets without "answering core questions about religious doctrine," which, according to the D.C. court, would violate the First Amendment. By denying certiorari in this case, the Supreme Court let this determination stand without passing on whether it was right or wrong.

It may come as a surprise to members of our Church, but it is true, that as this litigation progressed, in his court filings, Preston Moon began to claim he has been the leader of the Unification Church since 1998, and that True Father, one of the most subjective men in the history of the world, was unable to realize his vision of dissolving the Unification Church as an institution in favor of the ecumenical movement which Preston favored and argued was his father's dream since 1994 due to the opposition of unnamed church clerics.

According to Preston's narrative in the litigation, to save True Father from the clerics and himself, Preston, had to step in and a) seize control over UCI contrary to True Father's wishes, b) refuse to accept True Father's directions to step down from his position as chairman of UCI and c) send all but a sliver of its assets to a Swiss entity which was legally barred from having a religious purpose, which entity then transferred the assets to opaque offshore jurisdictions such as the Cayman Islands and Labuan, jurisdictions known as havens for hiding and laundering assets, and d) after jumping through many hoops to get his hands on the money, claimed to the D.C. court, under oath, that he divested himself of control over the Swiss entity including the right to receive reports from it about its use of the funds.

This extraordinary story, of course, is defied by common sense and objective facts. The trial court, which did not think these disputes were too religious to adjudicate, made factual findings that Preston Moon's stories about transferring the assets were not credible, and ordered Preston Moon removed from his fiduciary position and entered an approximate \$500 million judgment against him. Thus, when a ruling on the merits was made, it was decisively against Preston Moon.

Unfortunately, the pretextual claims by Preston were perceived by the Court of Appeals as sounding in a religious dispute, which it found the First Amendment forbids courts from becoming entangled in. Thus, ultimately, the sole reason our judgment against Preston Moon was vacated was on First Amendment grounds, despite extensive fact findings in the trial courts after months of evidentiary hearings that Preston and the UCI dissident directors had breached their fiduciary duties and were liable for the loss of the Church's assets.

We are considering our next steps in our crusade for justice.

"GOD'S DREAM, ONE FAMILY"