

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [Group owners should only be able to own one group.](#)

Hexicidal - October 27, 2014, 11:07 am

Yeah, I know no rule suggestions, but this is such a situational case that I believe there should be a publicly posted rule regarding it. Just like how there is only one official group owner.

Only downside of this rule is group owners monopolizing on their products/groups.

I asked Omni previously about this, and he stated that he only wants one group to one owner anyway. (I was interested in purchasing another group myself at a point in time.) It's time this should be policy.

Roger Waters - October 27, 2014, 11:08 am

I had thought this was always a rule but I agree, it should be something set in stone.

Perfectionist - October 27, 2014, 11:09 am

I honestly wouldn't care if this rule was put in place, I'm not a group owner / member.

Btw, I recall Vinnie posting somewhere that he also was about to buy another group, but Omni said he doesn't want him to play Monopoly with HF groups.

He seems to be a great leader though.

Grin - October 27, 2014, 11:10 am

Hi,

It makes sense because it's apparent that most group leaders can hardly run one group.

IpSiety - October 27, 2014, 11:11 am

I don't really understand. What purpose would this serve?

Hexicidal - October 27, 2014, 11:12 am

(Oct 27, 2014 11:11 AM)Geoxyx Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I don't really understand. What purpose would this serve?

Sets a policy in stone so there is no further discussions regarding it.

CRT - October 27, 2014, 11:12 am

I guess it gives other members a chance to own a group. Btw wasn't this already a rule? I'm sure I seen a post from Omni a while back saying so

Eternal. - October 27, 2014, 11:14 am

(Oct 27, 2014 11:12 AM)Curt. Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I guess it gives other members a chance to own a group. Btw wasn't this already a rule? I'm sure I seen a post from Omni a while back saying so
Pretty much, but not official policy. Omni has made exceptions.

Cyrus - October 27, 2014, 11:15 am

This is an un-written rule but yeah should be put down in writing. ?

IpSiety - October 27, 2014, 11:17 am

(Oct 27, 2014 11:12 AM)Hexicidal Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Sets a policy in stone so there is no further discussions regarding it.

If this was an already accepted rule. Then yes, I suppose this is a good suggestion. It's like the unwritten constitution, no real point in having it unwritten.

Aceman - October 27, 2014, 11:39 am

Well Tibit was the only other person besides Anonymous to own two groups and he only owns one now. I think this is as good a time as any to put a policy like this in place. Helps to make sure that if worse came to worse there would only be one group slot gone. It would also help to stop people from monopolizing groups.

420 Blaze It - October 27, 2014, 12:45 pm

Even if it does, then people will just get someone to own the group, but really under their command, as you can be infinite leaders.

SIM-1729678 - October 27, 2014, 12:49 pm

There are 2 people that currently own 2 groups.

Spoiler [\(Click to View\)](#)

Emylbus - October 27, 2014, 12:55 pm

As you said, it's already a policy. As shown in your example, he also enforces it frequently. He also makes an exception in certain circumstances also, as he rarely does with some rules too.

If someone asks about owning a second group, you should inform them of Omni's position on the matter.

It seems like you're suggesting that Omni make a policy to never make exceptions on this rule, which of course would be a policy suggestion in of itself. And as you know, policy suggestions are auto closed and denied.