

## **Biographical Information**

100

1

## **Employment/Assignment History**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**ANSWER**

Digitized by srujanika@gmail.com

© 2013 Pearson Education, Inc.

**ANSWER** The answer is 1000. The first two digits of the number are 10, so the answer is 1000.

**ANSWER** The answer is 1000. The first two digits of the number are 10, so the answer is 1000.

**ANSWER** **QUESTION** **ANSWER** **QUESTION** **ANSWER**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**ANSWER**

© 2013 Pearson Education, Inc.

**ANSWER**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**ANSWER** **QUESTION** **ANSWER** **QUESTION** **ANSWER**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**ANSWER**

**ANSWER** The answer is 1000. The first two digits of the number are 10, so the answer is 1000.

**ANSWER**

[View Details](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#)

## Summary

In [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], the Diocese of [REDACTED] received letters from an adult male who reported that he had been sexually abused by [REDACTED] for several years beginning when he was [REDACTED] years of age. It continued until he was [REDACTED] years of age.

The victim first met [REDACTED] after the victim's [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] became involved with his family. After awhile, they went on overnight trips together and [REDACTED] provided him with alcohol and "dirty" magazines. They also began sleeping together and showering together. [REDACTED] then began performing oral sex on him. This abuse occurred approximately once a month for a period of years. Once the victim turned 15 or 16 years old, he told [REDACTED] he wanted the sexual activities to stop and threatened "*to tell on*" him. In response, [REDACTED] grabbed him by the throat and threatened to kill him if he told anyone. [REDACTED]

## Summary

also threatened to tell the victim's parents that he was gay and that he [the victim] was the one who initiated and pursued the sexual contact with [REDACTED]

According to the file, the victim “*asked nothing of the Diocese*” and that

*He made no threats to sue [n]or make his allegations public. His only motivation appeared to be to make someone in the diocese aware of what had occurred. [The victim's] concern for his own children brought home the awareness that [REDACTED] might be abusing others.*

Based upon the meeting with the victim and a separate telephone call with him, the Diocese found that his "*allegations were consistent in detail.*"

## Summary

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] then recommended that [REDACTED] be returned to active ministry. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] referred to [REDACTED] time at [REDACTED] as being due to [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]

On [REDACTED], a letter was sent from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] requesting that he remain as pastor [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] further requested that if the [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

On [REDACTED], a confidential report sent from [REDACTED] to the Diocese advised, among other things, that [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] thereafter sent a letter to [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] wherein he welcomed him back "*following your leave of absence for personal reasons.*" [REDACTED] further advised, "*I share with you my joy at your return to full-time ministry.*"

File documents revealed that from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED], the Diocese paid for counseling sessions for the victim.

On January 6, 2002 an article detailing the Catholic Church's practice of reassigning priests accused of sexual abuse of children was published in the Boston Globe. [REDACTED] sent [REDACTED] a letter dated [REDACTED] advising him that his ministerial faculties were restricted to [REDACTED] and that he was no longer permitted to function as a priest without permission. A memorandum in the file dated [REDACTED] documented a conversation between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] wherein [REDACTED] "in confidence" explained to [REDACTED] that it had become necessary for him to restrict [REDACTED] faculties. The memorandum revealed that [REDACTED] advised [REDACTED] that "*he would keep it confidential.*"

On [REDACTED], the victim notified the Diocese again about his abuse and advised that he was seeking compensation. In a letter to the victim dated [REDACTED], the Diocese advised him that his allegation was never fully substantiated and it had been denied by [REDACTED]. The Diocese further advised that because there was no clear resolution, "*the priest in question is asking to appear before the Ministerial Assessment Board for a review of this allegation.*" The victim was invited to appear before the Board to tell his story.

## Summary

On [REDACTED], [REDACTED] sent a letter to [REDACTED], advising him that the “*enclosed confidential information comes by way of a friend in law enforcement.*” Among other things, [REDACTED] provided the victim’s current address and date of birth and requested that the Diocese re-send the letter to him (as it had been returned as undeliverable). That way, it could be demonstrated that he had been given an opportunity to appear before the Board. [REDACTED] then provided details of the victim’s criminal history in order to show that he was not a “*credible accuser.*”

Following a meeting of the Diocesan Review Board, the Board concluded that it could not determine “*with certainty*” the credibility of the victim’s claim. The Board recommended that [REDACTED] be allowed to continue in “*non-parochial ministry*” without access to children, in spite of his admission to the Board of his “*attraction to minors.*” Included with the supporting documents for the Board’s recommendation was a four-page letter by [REDACTED] denying any sexual abuse and requesting a return to ministry.

On [REDACTED], the Diocese notified the [REDACTED] County District Attorney’s Office of “*inappropriate sexual contact that occurred sometime between [REDACTED] when [the victim] was a minor of age [REDACTED].*”

In a letter dated [REDACTED], the Diocese advised the victim that [REDACTED] had accepted the Board’s recommendation that [REDACTED] be given a “*limited non-parish assignment.*” It should be noted that in a [REDACTED] that was completed by Diocesan personnel, it was documented that the complaint against [REDACTED] was both internally consistent and consistent with known facts.

On [REDACTED], sent a letter to [REDACTED] granting him 17 faculties in his role as [REDACTED]. These faculties included [REDACTED].

On [REDACTED], Pennsylvania Child Abuse History Clearance was granted to [REDACTED] certifying that no record existed in the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare’s statewide central registry listing [REDACTED] as a perpetrator of an indicated or founded report of child abuse.