

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)

To: [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org); [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com);

[FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com);

[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org);

[CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com)

Sent: 3/27/2002 9:33 AM

Subject: Re: Our Big Mistake

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

Sister Judy,

Thanks so very much! I truly appreciate your getting this task done.

John: when drafting the letter to Parks, we need to state very clearly something along these lines:

"In those few old cases involving allegations of the sexual abuse of a minor, each case has been referred to the appropriate law enforcement agency for their review and investigation. We have no cases, old or new, that have not been referred appropriately."

I think we also need to refresh Parks' memory about other aspects of the statute, including the fact that the responsibility for mandated reporting is an individual mandate, that the statute states clearly that confidentiality must be maintained [11167.5 (a) and (b)].

Since we have only 2 cases of the 8 that fall within the LAPD, I think our best approach is to tell him that and give him the LAPD case numbers for those two cases. We need to inform him that since they investigated the cases, they would have all the information, even more, than we would have.

We need to review a draft of that letter today, if at all possible.

Many thanks to all! What a Holy Week--filled with Good Fridays, no Easter Sundays!!

+RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: Miller, Lucille  
To: Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.  
Sent: 4/3/2002 3:28 PM  
Subject: Call I took for Monsignor Craig this afternoon....

Monsignor,

This is a call I took for Monsignor Craig this afternoon. I thought you might want to know about it. He did not want me to transfer the call to you, but since you are involved with the Victim Abuse I am sending it to you as an F.Y.I.:

- Fr. John Mayhew called from St. Louis Montfort, Santa Maria. He said he spoke to you at the Clergy Workshop in Santa Barbara about a family who had talked to him about a man who had relations with their daughter who was 16 or 17. He knows both families. At the time he did not know that he was a mandated reporter. He discussed this with you at the workshop and you said he needed to report the incident. He met with the family to let them know what he was going to do, and they asked him for a few days so that they could speak to the man and ask him to turn himself into the authorities. Two days later he committed suicide and he just buried him today. He just wanted you to be aware of what can happen in these matters. His number is (805) 937-4555. I offered to transfer him to Monsignor Loomis, but he just asked that I pass this message on to you, since you are the one with whom he discussed this matter.

-----Original Message-----

From: Miller, Lucille  
To: Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.  
Sent: 4/3/2002 2:34 PM  
Subject: Call from Mr. Gary Leo  
Importance: High

Gary Leo, Senior Vice-President from Cedars Sinai Community Relations (which is in charge of Chaplains) would like to speak to Monsignor Cox regarding Father Mike Wempe. He asked if he could get a call soon. His number (310) 423-3661. This was an audix message. If you think it should wait for Monsignor Craig's return, let me know.

L.M.

-----Original Message-----

From: John McNicholas  
To: Cardinal Mahony  
Cc: Sr. Judy Murphy; Msgr. Loomis  
Sent: 4/2/2002 11:25 AM  
Subject: Fresno

Dear Cardinal,

I just spoke to Pat Gordon, H. R., Diocese of Fresno. They completed the transcript last night. It is 40 pages.

At 2:30 p.m. they will take the transcript to Flora Mae for signature and release.

They then will take a copy to Det. Attkisson at Fresno P. D. and send me a copy.

Best regards,

John

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)

To: [msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org); [FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com);  
[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [FrPMAlbee@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:FrPMAlbee@la-archdiocese.org);  
[MsgrPAlbee@aol.com](mailto:MsgrPAlbee@aol.com)

Sent: 4/3/2002 7:39 AM

Subject: Msgr Matt Kelly

All:

Someone needs to check the back files on Msgr. Matt Kelly at Nazareth House.  
He is surely dying now.

Since I will be gone next week, that may be a blessing. It may be best if someone else were to handle his Funeral anyway given his past difficulties.

Please keep an eye on all of this.

Thanks!

+Roger

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)

To: [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org); [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com);  
[FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com);  
[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org);  
[Media@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:Media@la-archdiocese.org); [accmed14@hotmail.com](mailto:accmed14@hotmail.com);  
[MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com);  
[CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com)

Sent: 4/3/2002 6:49 AM

Subject: Times Story

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

All:

Well, the Times article did not turn out as negative as I feared. They were able to get in some positive things for a change.

As always, they got a few factual things wrong or inaccurate.

But now I am freed from the accusation that I am hiding from the press and unwilling to discuss these issues publicly. Larry Stammer said that a lot of good has been done with the press and media by doing the interview, and that he stands ready to help if we have a story we want to get out.

Larry is going to do a story on our Seminaries soon--that will be helpful.

My best estimate is that by mid-May any new problems will have been uncovered, and that we can begin the healing process over the coming months. If it starts before then, that is fine. It's the new cases, like the Jesuits today, that keep the story alive.

And I did not give numbers!! In fact, with our various cases now I don't even know what the numbers are myself!!

+RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)

To: [msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org); [FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com); [MsgRRLoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgRRLoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org); [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)

Sent: 4/1/2002 7:14 AM

Subject: Pat H.

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

Craig and Dick:

I think we need to think through carefully how to deal with Pat H. His case troubles me.

Craig definitely needs to call him and let him know that his case is under scrutiny now, and that we will await his return before finalizing our decision. But I am leaning towards giving it to the LAPD to review. We

could be very vulnerable on any case where there is a dispute between

folks,  
and we have not referred it out.

I would appreciate your guidance here!

+Roger

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)  
To: [FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com); [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org);  
[jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com);  
[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org);  
[Media@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:Media@la-archdiocese.org); [accmed14@hotmail.com](mailto:accmed14@hotmail.com);  
[MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com);  
[CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com)  
Sent: 4/1/2002 7:08 AM  
Subject: Re: Giving Numbers

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

All:

Good arguments all around re numbers!! I'm still considering how to approach it.

Maybe the best thing to do is "to state that in working closely with the LAPD and other law enforcement agencies they prefer that no further public information about the identity of the priests under investigation be given at this time. That may change in the future, and if it does, I would be open to re-visiting the question of numbers." And since that is weeks and months down the road, I hope interest by then would have waned.

We definitely have to get ourselves to July 1st!!

Thanks for the input!

+RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)  
To: [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org); [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com);  
[FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com);  
[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org)  
Sent: 3/30/2002 1:24 PM  
Subject: A Question

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

Sr. Judy,

I just want to confirm that the big 8 included in group A have all been either directly referred to a local police unit over the years, or you

at  
least "consulted" with Barraclough about them.

That is really important information for me as I am having an interview with Larry Stammer on Tuesday. I want to have that fact really correct!

Thanks!!

+RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)

To: [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org); [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com); [FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com);

[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org);

[MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com); [CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com)

Sent: 3/30/2002 7:57 AM

Subject: Victims

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

All:

Just a brief note to tell you that I have met confidentially with three victims Thursday and Friday. Separately for one, with two others together.

Folks were referred to me by two priests--calls sent to my private phone

since one is a Dean and has the number. Worked out really well.

All Catholics, all not bitter at the Church. A real life-giving experience.

All from very old cases, two from the big 8.

They are anxious to have the Church do something for them spiritually, not just psychologically. I was deeply moved!

All insisted strongly that I not release the names of their perpetrators

since their own personal lives would be placed in jeopardy--marriages, jobs, etc.

I am now thinking about beginning some type of Victims' Group that would be almost entirely spiritual. It would be headed by two folks: a Sister and a priest who would be skilled spiritual leaders. I have some names in mind.

They would meet probably once a month; purely voluntary. No legal

issues  
would be discussed, etc. This group, or groups, would be spiritual  
support  
groups, not therapy groups.

I would like to announce some initiatives soon in April, and this would  
be  
one of them.

I have a couple more in mind, and will share those with you shortly.

It is my hope to be able to announce three different, broad  
initiatives:

one  
to help protect our children, one to nourish spiritually our victims,  
and one  
to help our priests spiritually. We must move forward with some key  
things,  
in my opinion.

A blessed Easter to all.

+RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)

To: [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org); [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com);

[FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com);

[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org);

[MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com); [CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com)

Sent: 3/28/2002 8:52 AM

Subject: Confidential Matter

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

CONFIDENTIAL

All:

On Good Friday morning, the USA Cardinals and Bp Wilton Gregory (our  
Conference Pres.) will have a phone conference call.

We will be discussing all of the current problems in the Church across  
the country.

I would welcome any ideas, suggestions, etc., that you think I could  
bring to the conversation.

I presume that we need to discuss the extent of the damage, what next  
steps need to be taken for the good of the Church, etc.

Thanks for the input!!

+RMM

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)  
To: [FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com); [MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org);  
[msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org); [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org)  
Sent: 3/28/2002 8:49 AM  
Subject: Phone Calls

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

Dick and Craig,

Following on Sr Judy's very good meeting with the LAPD folks yesterday, do you think it would be wise for you to call those priests whose names were given to the PD for review? They should probably have some heads up lest the PD comes knocking at their doors without notice.

Thanks.

+RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)  
To: [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org); [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com);  
[CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com); [MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com); [FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com);  
[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [Media@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:Media@la-archdiocese.org);  
[accmed14@hotmail.com](mailto:accmed14@hotmail.com); [msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org)  
Sent: 3/28/2002 7:19 AM  
Subject: Almost Final Version: Parks Letter

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

All:

I have incorporated Sr. Judy's excellent suggestions into the draft of the Parks letter.

Please review at your earliest convenience and let me know if it is OK to finalize and deliver to his offices.

Suggestion: that Tod then release both letters to the media, with a brief media advisory and with a clarifying statement from me [I'm working on that piece right now]. We are in a good position to clarify once again our policies and what we have done, and how we act now.

Thanks to all!!

+RMM

<<parks letter march 28 02.doc>>

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)

To: [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org); [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com);  
[CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com); [MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com); [FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com);  
[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [Media@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:Media@la-archdiocese.org);  
[accmed14@hotmail.com](mailto:accmed14@hotmail.com)

Sent: 3/28/2002 7:04 AM

Subject: Re: Parks Response

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

Sr. Judy and all:

Sister has good suggestions. I'm incorporating them this morning, and will send them to you.

I think a final letter is at hand.

Re media: should Tod speak with the Chief's office and suggest that we jointly release the two letters? I think we should get ahead of the curve.

Thanks!

+RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)

To: [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com); [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org)

Cc: [MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [ttamberg@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:ttamberg@la-archdiocese.org)

Sent: 3/28/2002 7:01 AM

Subject: Re: Phone message - Pat Gordon

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

John,

Good work! It will be key to get the Flora Mae transcript into the hands of both the Fresno PD and the LAPD.

They should then interview her themselves.

I would find it difficult to drive up to Fresno during these days for an

interview, but would gladly do so on the telephone. Would that work for

them?

With all the Holy Week services, Easter, etc., these days are busy. On April

3 I have to go to Dallas, back on the 4.

But the Fresno PD can call me anytime for a telephone interview; they can

tape record the interview, and I don't need an attorney on the line.  
Since I  
have no recollection of every meeting the lady, I welcome the  
interview.

Please give them my home number if they wish to call during these days  
of  
Holy Week or over the weekend.

Thanks!

+RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)  
To: [MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com);  
[MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org); [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org);  
[jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)  
Cc: [MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com)  
Sent: 3/27/2002 2:46 PM  
Subject: Re: Initial Draft Response to the Chief Parks letter

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

Msgr. Loomis and all:

I agree with Msgr. Loomis' points. Chief Parks needs some instruction  
on the  
Act and how it works. I think we need to give it to him--and by so  
doing,  
will be giving it to the media since he will surely make sure the media  
gets  
it.

Let's take a crack at a new draft that incorporates these various  
points.

Thanks.

+RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)  
To: [Media@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:Media@la-archdiocese.org); [accmed14@hotmail.com](mailto:accmed14@hotmail.com);  
[SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org); [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com); [FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com);  
[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org)  
Sent: 3/27/2002 11:26 AM  
Subject: Fresno Statement

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

Tod:

I am sending along an updated possible press release/statement.

I agree fully with you: should we get any inquiries from the media

about the  
Fresno matter, I need to hold a press conf. The press conf would do  
two

things:

1. I would read the statement about Fresno, and respond to questions. Hopefully, we would have more info about what the Fresno PD is doing, as well as a transcript of the interview to hand out.

2. I would also state that with regards the small group of priests no longer carrying on priestly ministry, each and every case was duly reported to the appropriate law enforcement agency over the years.

Please review the updated Statement and make suggested changes.

Thanks.

+RMM

<<hickman Statement march 02.doc>>

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)

To: [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org); [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com);  
[MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com); [CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com); [FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com);  
[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org)

Sent: 3/27/2002 7:00 AM

Subject: Our Big Mistake

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

Sr. Judy,

As the drum beats continue from every side for us to release the "names," I must still point to what I consider our greatest tactical mistake of the past few weeks.

If I recall, of the 8 priests involved, 5 had already been reported to local law enforcement agencies. That leaves 3.

Recall also that I pressed for you to meet with Det Barraclough and "consult" him about the other 3 so that we could state without hesitation that all priests no longer in service had been reported to various law enforcement agencies.

You resisted quite strongly that suggestion.

I hope you have changed your mind by now! By doing it back then, we would not appear to be crumbling under public pressure. It was a huge mistake on our part.

If we don't, today, "consult" with the Det. about those 3 names, I can guarantee you that I will get hauled into a Grand Jury proceeding and I

will be forced to give all the names, etc.

I must now insist that this matter is no longer open for discussion. You must consult with the Det. about those 3 cases.

In my response to Parks, I want to state that every single case of the few priests was reported to the appropriate law enforcement agency over the years.

I must be able to state that--even publicly. And soon.

I'm not sure you grasp the gravity of the situation and where this is heading--not only with the media, but with the law enforcement and legal folks.

The best place to state it would be in my letter to Parks, and then in a follow-up letter to Cooley.

If we don't take immediate, aggressive action here--the consequences for the AD are going to be incredible: charges of cover-up, concealing criminals, etc., etc.

PLEASE make this task your highest priority this morning! I have reached the point where if I cannot guarantee that all 8 have been appropriately reported, then I will have to call the Det. and do it myself--today.

There is no middle ground on this one; we are losing the battle because we are somehow "hiding" those 3. The best way is to "consult" with the Det. about them, and let them decide what needs to be done next.

Thanks for listening. This public media pressure will never stop until we can announce that those few priests have all been reported to the appropriate authorities over the years.

+RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)

To: [Media@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:Media@la-archdiocese.org); [MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org);

[SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org); [MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org)

Sent: 3/26/2002 5:13 PM

Subject: Re: Letters

Tod,

No problem with releasing the DA letter exchange.

Yes, the media will be disappointed! But they will also be disappointed

with

the Parks letter and our response--since no names will be given out.

We can chat tomorrow.

+RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)

To: [MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org)

Cc: [MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org)

Sent: 3/24/2002 3:44 PM

Subject: Re: Allegation Against Rev. David Granadino

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

Craig,

Really sad news. I am pleased with his openness to the process, and his willingness to provide the altar server list, etc.

Let's hope that the investigations can proceed quickly so that this can be finalized as early as possible. The Sheriff's dept will want to speak to each altar server, I presume.

It's too bad that the allegation did not at least specify a name or two--someplace to begin with.

Thanks for your work on this!

+Roger

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)

To: [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org)

Cc: [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com); [MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org);

[MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org)

Sent: 3/22/2002 6:59 AM

Subject: Re: Update

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

Sr. Judy:

Many thanks for the update. Sad to learn of the St. Jane Frances de Chantal connection, as well as Bp Arzube.

We need to investigate fully to see what is there in the files. John may need to interview Bp Arzube.

Never a dull moment!!

+RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)

To: [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)

Cc: [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org); [MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [mnussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:mnussbaum@rothgerber.com)

Sent: 3/20/2002 8:11 PM

Subject: Re: Response to Delgadillo letter

John,

Yes, we could take some "safe" folks from the AD, maybe at the ACC, and have them go through their session to see what it's like.

We could tell him that his staff could do a dry run for us, and we in turn, could then do the training for the rest of our lay employees.

I like the idea. It doesn't sound as if we are rebuffing him.

+RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: Cox, Msgr. Craig A.

To: Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.

Sent: 4/1/2002 11:56 AM

Subject: FW: Pat H.

Dick,

We may need to talk about this before my break is over. If so, please call. I could conceivably call Pat from up in the mountains too.

Craig

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com) [mailto:[Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)]

Sent: Monday, April 01, 2002 7:15 AM

To: [msgrcaco@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:msgrcaco@la-archdiocese.org); [FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com); [MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org); [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)

Subject: Pat H.

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

Craig and Dick:

I think we need to think through carefully how to deal with Pat H. His case troubles me.

Craig definitely needs to call him and let him know that his case is under scrutiny now, and that we will await his return before finalizing our decision. But I am leaning towards giving it to the LAPD to review.

We

could be very vulnerable on any case where there is a dispute between folks, and we have not referred it out.

I would appreciate your guidance here!

+Roger

-----Original Message-----

From: Cox, Msgr. Craig A.  
To: Murphy, Sr. Judy  
Cc: Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.  
Sent: 4/1/2002 8:18 AM  
Subject: RE: Status

Attorney-Client Privileged Communication

Sister Judy,

The plan for H is to have a new evaluation, then return to a restricted ministry, including a move to a parish with no school.

I have not been able to free up the time to go visit. I am beginning to fear I will have to do this by phone. Far less ideal, but the time is short.

Craig

-----Original Message-----

From: Murphy, Sr. Judy  
Sent: Sunday, March 31, 2002 11:08 PM  
To: Cox, Msgr. Craig A.  
Cc: '[FrDick@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:FrDick@la-archdiocese.org)'  
Subject: Status

Attorney-Client Privileged Communication

As you can probably determine, I decided not to answer the Cardinal's question as to all reported. The reason being - What will be the status of H? Is it restricted ministry as it was before he went to study? I believe that's why my subconscious helped me to forget him.

On another note, Msgr. Loomis, I now wish we had removed OG from the list. His case should not be part of the count since not "recently removed". In fact, he was never removed as far as I know. But "so be it".

When I saw the "number" memo this morning, I couldn't believe it! His need to bring this to closure is getting in the way. When he said, "We are in for the long haul", I guess long for him is 6 weeks. Since you two are "j's", you can understand, but for this "p", we have just begun.

As to the dear Sheriffs, should I try for a "Come to Jesus" meeting with me tomorrow afternoon?

Sister Judy

-----Original Message-----

From: Cox, Msgr. Craig A.  
To: Murphy, Sr. Judy  
Cc: Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.  
Sent: 4/1/2002 8:09 AM  
Subject: RE: St. Frances of Rome

ATTOENY - CLIENT PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATION

Sister Judy,

Here is the data you requested:

MICHAEL STEPHEN BAKER  
DOB: December 26, 1947 in Pasadena, CA  
SS: 570-68-0856  
Last known address: P.O. Box 1117, La Mirada, CA 90637  
Last known phones: home: (562) 435-8058  
cell: (818) 618-8443

As to Azusa, I like your recommendation. A red envelope with the assignment data is on your chair. I was not planning to be in the office this afternoon, but can be if needed. If Monsignor Loomis can go, that would be fine.

I'll try to get Mike Sears this morning.

Craig

-----Original Message-----

From: Murphy, Sr. Judy  
Sent: Saturday, March 30, 2002 5:18 PM  
To: '[FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com)'; Cox, Msgr. Craig A.; Murphy, Sr. Judy  
Subject: RE: St. Frances of Rome

May I suggest that I request a meeting with whomever the Sheriffs wish to send on Monday afternoon to discuss next steps. Both or either one of

you can be present. No assignment list until a meeting. It would be helpful if Sunday night or Monday morning one of you can obtain from Fr.

Mike the pulse of the parish.

Now I get to tell the Cardinal, I forgot H. in reply to his "Question" e-mail. I was planning to do it on Monday which I will do. Early dementia on my part. Oh well, another "Our One Big Mistake" e-mail. What he hasn't put together and probably never will was my plan that we had to give the LAPD some names for continuing cooperation concept.

Just

consultations without names was not going to cut it. If you all remember permission to do this was not given until Tuesday. He was reluctant about B. Msgr. Cox, you could help me if you could get for me B's full name, birth date, social security number, and last known address. This would also be helpful for C. I know we do not have address. We better do the same for P.

Happy Holy Saturday and Easter Sunday!

Sister Judy

-----Original Message-----

From: [FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com)

To: [MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org); [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org)

Sent: 3/30/2002 4:30 PM

Subject: Re: St. Frances of Rome

I would really like to follow your path, Craig. If they will let us make the announcements, we can explain that an investigation is under way, as we have in the past. Do we need their permission to make announcements? This is a free country and it would hardly interrupt their efforts. The sheriffs' activities have been on Channel 4 and other media, after all. We certainly would not be tipping their hand.

When our counselors go to Saint Frances of Rome, they will be taking the heat the sheriffs ought to be taking -- or Dave should be taking if indeed he has done something. If we can minimize further disruption and panic among the people of God, we ought to try.

To be fair, I have to give one thought, however: if my memory serves me well, the message on the tape says that Fr. Mike is there to supervise Dave "because of his history," as well as saying something about altar servers now. It was the "history" phrase that led me to think it might be the same family as the young man Msgr. Richey and I went to see. And I hoped the sheriffs would start their investigation by identifying the caller and her concerns rather than a shotgun attack on the parishioners.

**Dick**

-----Original Message-----

From: Cox, Msgr. Craig A.

To: Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.

Sent: 3/29/2002 10:49 AM

Subject: RE: St. Dominic Savio

Dick,

I spoke with Gael. Nothing has happened at the school as of that conversation yesterday midafternoon.

Obviously, school is now out for the Easter break. So if there is an

arrest, it will not be in the "on campus highly public" fashion, or it will be delayed.

Craig

> -----Original Message-----

>From: Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.  
>Sent: Friday, March 29, 2002 10:08 AM  
>To: Cox, Msgr. Craig A.  
>Subject: St. Dominic Savio

>

>I still have a note to keep in contact with Fr. Gael Sullivan. Though  
>I left messages, I never actually reached him. I heard you speaking  
>with him yesterday. If this has been handled, please let me know.

>

>Thanks!

-----Original Message-----

From: Cox, Msgr. Craig A.  
To: Mahony, Cardinal Roger M.; Murphy, Sr. Judy;  
'[jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)';  
'[FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com)'; Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.; Tamberg, Tod;  
'[accmed14@hotmail.com](mailto:accmed14@hotmail.com)'; '[MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com)';  
'[CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com)'  
Sent: 3/28/2002 8:27 AM  
Subject: RE: Clarifying Statement

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

Dear Cardinal and all,

I share Tod's concerns. You have been clear; it is the media that has not listened. The perfect example was the editorial in The Times yesterday. Either they deliberately distorted what you said, or they simply did not listen. I fear the clarifying statement will be viewed as a sign of defensiveness. The letter to Chief Parks, RELEASED BY US and not by him, is good.

If you decide that some sort of clarifying statement is needed, I am uncomfortable with lines 24-27 of the current text. As written, it gives the impression that for years we gave names over to law enforcement contemporaneously with the time we learned of events. If an example of even one case comes out where we didn't pass on the name then, but only more recently, it will blow up.

Craig

-----Original Message-----

From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com) [mailto:[Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)]  
Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2002 8:12 AM  
To: [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org); [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com);  
[FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com);  
[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [Media@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:Media@la-archdiocese.org);  
[accmed14@hotmail.com](mailto:accmed14@hotmail.com); [MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com);  
[CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com); [msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org)

Subject: Clarifying Statement

Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

All:

It is obvious that the media has got several things mixed up. I propose my issuing a clarifying statement; it could go out with the Parks letter release.

It tries to separate two issues, and uses language from the Chrism Mass homily.

I welcome ideas, etc.

+RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: Cox, Msgr. Craig A.  
To: Murphy, Sr. Judy  
Cc: Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.  
Sent: 3/26/2002 7:32 AM  
Subject: RE: 8:00 AM visit

Attorney-Client Privileged Communication

Sister Judy,

Thank you for the advice, and all your extraordinary efforts in these months. I haven't taken the time to express my appreciation and admiration for all you have done.

Msgr. Loomis and I will keep you posted.

Craig

> -----Original Message-----

>From: Murphy, Sr. Judy  
>Sent: Monday, March 25, 2002 5:58 PM  
>To: Cox, Msgr. Craig A.; '[FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com)'  
>Cc: Mahony, Cardinal Roger M.  
>Subject: 8:00 AM visit

>

>

>Attorney-Client Privileged Communication

>

>Well, Men, here's the drill. William Bevins to be known as Bill and

>Thomas McNeil to be known as Tom will be at the ACC at 8AM to interview

>Msgr. Cox and Msgr. Loomis. Badges are down at the mezz. level and

>instructions left was for them to call you Msgr. Cox when they arrive

>and you will direct them from there. Your extension is on the badges.

>I will leave the tape of the anon. call on your chair Msgr. Cox to be  
>given to the Sheriffs. The addresses were faxed to Sergeant Boyett.  
>As to the interview, remember Sergeant Joe Friday - "Only the facts  
>sir, only the facts." Listen to their questions and take your time  
>answering. Do not volunteer information. This is not a session to be  
>chatty. I am not sure if you will interviewed together or separate. I  
>believe in the spirit of cooperation, therefore, I will not be  
present  
>and besides 8AM is against my religion. You both will be fine.  
>I'm afraid this investigation will take some time. I was asked when  
>Easter vacation began, etc. If they decide to go the school route, I  
>see no activity until April 8th. Sergeant Boyett interviewed a victim  
>today for this case. The DA's office is involved but a specific DA  
has  
>not been appointed. Sergeant Boyett said this is happening because  
the  
>Sheriffs want to avoid mistakes. It will not be inappropriate to push  
>for a speedy investigation at the end of the interview. The number 94  
>has them scrambling.  
>At the end of the day, Sergeant Boyett left a long message on my audix  
>which will be typed out tomorrow praising our cooperation and how  
happy  
>the Captain is. I guess they figured out that honey works better than  
>vinegar.

>  
>All for now.

>  
>**Sister Judy**

-----Original Message-----  
From: Cox, Msgr. Craig A.  
To: Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.  
Sent: 3/25/2002 10:22 AM  
Subject: RE: LBPD

Dick,

Well done. Thanks.

Craig

> -----Original Message-----  
>From: Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.  
>Sent: Monday, March 25, 2002 9:33 AM  
>To: Cox, Msgr. Craig A.; Murphy, Sr. Judy; Tamberg, Tod  
>Subject: LBPD

>  
>We have the Long Beach police on board for this evening's Chrism Mass.  
>I explained that there would be a large contingent of clergy,  
including  
>400 to 500 priests, five bishops and the Cardinal. They also know  
that  
>lay people from all over the Archdiocese will be there representing  
>their parishes.

>  
>I also informed them that media coverage will be heavy due to the

>announced topic of the sermon: the child abuse scandals in the Church  
>-- and that there would almost certainly be demonstrators from SNAP or  
>other victim organizations, as well.

>

>My contact is Lt. Jerry Gadbow, who is the assistant to the Chief of  
>Police in Long Beach. If he does not command the operation himself,  
he

>will make sure that someone competent is in charge and will make sure  
>we have open lines of communication.

>

>RAL

-----Original Message-----

From: Cox, Msgr. Craig A.

To: Mahony, Cardinal Roger

Cc: Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.; Tamberg, Tod; Murphy, Sr. Judy

Sent: 3/25/2002 10:14 AM

Subject: Press Conference

I just finished meeting with Tod and we spoke about the press  
conference  
you will be having this evening. You are in my prayers.

Tod has briefed me with regard to the kinds of dialogue about questions  
and advice that you have received up to this point. I want to add one  
comment that is -- to my way of thinking -- very important. To say or  
even give the impression that none of the "priests removed" were in  
parish ministry creates multiple problems. First, it "narrows the  
search" for any news organizations that are trying to ferret out names.  
It would realistically almost certainly "out" one or more. Even those  
not in parish ministry were assisting in parishes, and you could be  
challenged about that. Some were resident in parishes. Not being  
assigned full time to parishes does not mean there was no parish  
ministry. If you say something that the press later decides was  
inaccurate, they will be merciless in attacking. All the men involved  
were doing Sunday supply at times. In the popular mind set that will  
be  
seen as parish ministry. Secondly, should some names be "outed" of  
men  
who were in predominantly parish ministries, even if restricted, the  
distinction will not carry any weight in the press. You will again be  
attacked mercilessly.

I recommend that in your press conference you make no indication  
whatsoever of the "type" of ministry involved, but indicate that no  
priest was put into any ministry where we had any concern that he would  
be a danger to young people. If asked to say more than that, you can  
respond by going back to your principles about not disclosing names.

I will be arriving at the parish around 3:15 today and will remain  
there  
through the time of the press conference in case I will be needed.

Craig

-----Original Message-----

From: Cox, Msgr. Craig A.  
To: Murphy, Sr. Judy  
Cc: Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.  
Sent: 3/24/2002 3:18 PM  
Subject: Fr. David Granadino

SisterJudy,

You should have received a copy of my email to theCardinal on this.

Fr. Granadino firmly denies any misconduct. He will be faxing me the server roster on my confidential fax. I'll have that to you ASAP Monday morning. Monsignor Loomis will have his summary of the conversation with you.

When you communicate the roster to the Sheriff, I'd appreciate it if you could stress the urgency that they act quickly and discreetly. This is Holy Week and Easter. Fr. Granadino's absence is particularly noticeable and creates burdens on others in our most sacred and busiest of times. If there is something to the allegations, then we want to be sure he is removed from ministry. But if the allegations are unfounded, the sooner that can be established and he restored to ministry, the better. If he is innocent, I am most concerned that his reputation not be damaged more than it will already be by having things drag on and on and on. I know we cannot require the Sheriff to act promptly, but if we can at least communicate the importance that they act promptly that would be appreciated.

If the Sheriff's office needs to speak with Fr. Granadino, he will be at St. Andrew's Abbey, Valyermo, and available to them. The phone there is (661) 944-2178. In fact, my sense is that he will be eager to tell his story to the investigators.

I'll keep you posted.

**Craig**

-----Original Message-----

From: Cox, Msgr. Craig A.  
To: Mahony, Cardinal Roger  
Cc: Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.; Murphy, Sr. Judy  
Sent: 3/24/2002 3:11 PM  
Subject: Allegation Against Rev. David Granadino

Roger,

As I believe Sr. Judy Murphy communicated to you, on late Friday afternoon an anonymous complaint came in our 800 number alleging that Fr. David Granadino was abusing altar servers. As you are also aware, the L.A. County Sheriff's Office has been investigating an unnamed priest at St. Francis of Rome, Azusa.

Given that the hotline message provided the name of a priest, Monsignor Loomis and I arranged to meet with Fr. Granadino at 2:15 p.m. today. In accord with his duty as Auditor, Monsignor Loomis is preparing his formal report to you and will communicate that to you on Monday.

In summary, I can say that Fr. Granadino denied forcefully any misconduct. He was shocked and chagrined by the allegations. When asked to provide for us a roster of the altar servers in order to assist the Sheriff in their investigation, he showed no hesitancy whatsoever. He will fax that to me right away, and I will have Sr. Judy provide that to the Sheriff. I will ask Sr. Judy to communicate with the Sheriff to stress the need for them to act quickly.

Fr. Granadino reluctantly accepted the need for him to move out of the parish for a brief time while the investigation is underway. Given that it is Holy Week and with Easter around the corner, this was agonizing for him. I offered several options, and he agreed to go to St. Andrew's Abbey, Valyermo. I was particularly pleased with that. It is a supportive environment, with good spiritual directors he can consult, and if he has to stay there through Holy Week and Easter will enable him to take part in the liturgies of the Triduum. I have already spoken with Abbot Francis and made the arrangements for Fr. Granadino to go there Monday afternoon.

Obviously, Fr. Granadino is hurting. We both encouraged him to be in touch with his counselor and spiritual director.

I will keep you posted.

Craig

-----Original Message-----

From: Cox, Msgr. Craig A.  
To: Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.  
Sent: 3/22/2002 10:03 AM  
Subject: Fathers McGowan and Hill

Dick,

Would you please be so kind as to print out (or email) and supply me the summary you did of the records of these two priests?

The Cardinal and I meet with Tim on Monday of Easter week. I am trying to schedule a trip to see Pat in the near future.

Thanks.

Craig

-----Original Message-----

From: John McNicholas

To: Charles Goldberg

Cc: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com); [Media@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:Media@la-archdiocese.org);

[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org); L.

Martin

Nussbaum

Sent: 3/14/2002 11:24 AM

Subject: Re: Press & Reporting Issues Related to Haigh Settlement

Chuck,

1. I'm on for 3:30 PM today.
2. It is possible that Tony McDonnell could have fit that description 20 years ago. I repeat, "possible." He told me very forcefully that he was never involved with minors. Lets discuss.

Regards,

John

> From: "Charles Goldberg" <[CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com)>

> Date: Thu, 14 Mar 2002 09:49:10 -0700

> To: <[jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)>

> Cc: <[Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)>, <[Media@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:Media@la-archdiocese.org)>,

> <[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org)>, <[SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org)>,

"L.

Martin

> Nussbaum" <[MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com)>

> Subject: Re: Press & Reporting Issues Related to Haigh Settlement

>

> John,

>

> Hi.

>

> I just received a call from Tod who is in the midst of some training exercises

> with priests; he told me he and Fr. Dick will be calling me at 3:30 P.M.

> (PDT). He gave me no options. Are you available. If so, I'll see you are

> tied in. Let me know.

>

> Most importantly, does the description of the priest you interviewed, Rev.

> Michael Anthony McDonnell provided by Katherine Freberg in her letter dated  
> March 12, 2002 (Martin faxed this to you yesterday). Does Rev. McDonnell fit  
> the description of one, 20 years ago who was short, stocky, possibly in his  
> 40's, tight curly hair? Please let us know ASAP by e-mail in advance of our  
> call today so we can begin to think of how we craft our p.r. responses.  
>  
> Thanks.  
>  
> Chuck  
>  
> Charles Goldberg, Esq.  
> Rothgerber Johnson & Lyons LLP  
> 1200 17th Street, Suite 3000  
> Denver, Colorado 80202  
> 303-628-9609  
> 303-623-9222  
> [CGoldberg@Rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@Rothgerber.com)  
>  
> The information contained in this electronic communication and any document  
> attached hereto or transmitted herewith is attorney-client privileged,  
work  
> product, or otherwise confidential and intended for the exclusive use of the  
> individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the  
> intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering  
it to  
> the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any examination, use,  
> dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication or any part  
> thereof is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in  
> error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone or reply e-mail and  
> destroy this communication. Thank you.  
>  
>>>> John McNicholas <[jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)> 03/13/02 06:09PM >>>  
> All,  
>  
> Can we teleconference Thursday at 2:00pm?  
>  
> John  
>  
>> From: "Charles Goldberg" <[CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com)>  
>> Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 18:05:11 -0700  
>> To: <[jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)>, <[LMN@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:LMN@mcnicholaslaw.com)>  
>> Subject: Re: Press & Reporting Issues Related to Haigh Settlement  
>>

>> As for me, I am available anytime Friday and tomorrow from 1 P.M.  
(PDT) and  
>> thereafter.  
>>  
>> Chuck  
>>  
>> Charles Goldberg, Esq.  
>> Rothgerber Johnson & Lyons LLP  
>> 1200 17th Street, Suite 3000  
>> Denver, Colorado 80202  
>> 303-628-9609  
>> 303-623-9222  
>> [CGoldberg@Rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@Rothgerber.com)  
>>  
>> The information contained in this electronic communication and any  
document  
>> attached hereto or transmitted herewith is attorney-client  
privileged, work  
>> product, or otherwise confidential and intended for the exclusive  
use  
of the  
>> individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is  
not the  
>> intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for  
delivering it to  
>> the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any  
examination,  
use,  
>> dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication or any  
part  
>> thereof is strictly prohibited. If you have received this  
communication in  
>> error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone or reply  
e-mail and  
>> destroy this communication. Thank you.  
>>  
>>>> John McNicholas <[jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)> 03/13/02 03:41PM >>>  
>> All,  
>>  
>> I am available Thursday 9:00 am -11:00 am and from 2:00 PM until the  
end of  
>> the day.  
>>  
>> I am travelling on Friday.  
>>  
>> Regards,  
>>  
>> John  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>> From: "L. Martin Nussbaum" <[MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com)>  
>>> Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 14:32:27 -0700  
>>> To: <[Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)>, <[FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com)>, <[Media@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:Media@la-archdiocese.org)>,  
>>> <[MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org)>, <[SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org)>,  
>>> <[jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)>, "Charles Goldberg"  
<[CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com)>

>>> Subject: Press & Reporting Issues Related to Haigh Settlement  
>>>  
>>> Privileged Attorney-Client Communication  
>>>  
>>> In addition to the possible public relations issues identified by  
Chuck, I  
>>> would suggest we need to put on the agenda discussion of the  
additional  
>>> issues  
>>> below related to the Haigh settlement. As suggested by Chuck, I  
think we  
>>> would benefit from several or all of us convening a meeting to  
discuss how  
>>> to  
>>> handle these issues. Tod, will you attempt to convene a meeting  
of  
the  
>>> appropriate set of people. (I have a court appearance on Friday  
morning  
>>> which will occupy me from 7:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. (Pacific time).  
>>> Otherwise,  
>>> I am available on both Thursday and Friday of this week.  
>>>  
>>> 1. Should ADLA announce the settlement in advance of Ms. Freberg  
and  
>>> thereby, get in front of her on this story?  
>>>  
>>> 2. When and how should ADLA coordinate with the Diocese of Orange  
re PR  
>>> issues and the settlement?  
>>>  
>>> 3. Other questions which may come from the press:  
>>>  
>>> a. Who is the ADLA priest mentioned in the complaint? What has  
been done  
>>> to  
>>> find him?  
>>>  
>>> b. Has ADLA reported the ADLA priest mentioned in the complaint  
to  
law  
>>> enforcement? Has ADLA complied with the reporting law as regards  
Lenihan  
>>> and  
>>> the un-identified ADLA priest?  
>>>  
>>> c. Is the ADLA priest mentioned in the complaint still in service?  
>>>  
>>> 4. I would also note that Steve Lopez's screed in today's LA  
Times,  
while  
>>> predictable in its criticism of the Church, is really rather  
surprising in  
>>> his  
>>> overly lenient description of the Archdiocese's statutory reporting  
duties.  
>>> He contends that the statute:

>>>  
>>> a. Does not require clergy to report instance of child abuse which occurred  
>>> before 1987 (we think the correct date is 1996, when the legislature added clergy to the list of mandatory reporters);  
>>>  
>>> b. Does not require clergy to report if the victim is an adult when the cleric learns of the earlier abuse (Lopez says that a prosecutor told him that this is how the statute reads. I think that this is only a possible interpretation of the statute which requires "mandated reporter" to report whenever he or she "has knowledge of or observes a child whom the mandated reporter knows or reasonably suspects has been a victim of child abuse . . ."); and  
>>>  
>>> c. Does not require clergy to report unless "a minor makes a complaint (I see no support in the statute for this interpretation. Accordingly, I read the statute as requiring clergy to report regardless whether a minor complains.  
>>>  
>>> 5. With all the vultures circling, we should continue to closely analyze whether ADLA's personnel are complying with the reporting statutes:  
>>>  
>>> a. See paragraph 3(b) supra.  
>>>  
>>> b. Does ADLA, for example, require its mandated reporter employees to sign the statutorily-prescribed form which puts the employee on notice of his statutory duties. Section 11166.5 requires this. Does ADLA maintain copies of these forms?  
>>>  
>>> c. When ADLA's mandated reporters report, do they do so both verbally and in writing. (A written report is good risk management and is also required by 11166(a). In fact, the written report must be on the state-prescribed form.  
>>> See Section 11168.)

>>>  
>>> 6. As a point of information, I would note that even if ADLA were inclined  
>>> to  
>>> release information about previous reports to law enforcement, any such  
>>> actions would violate the statute which makes the release of any such  
>>> reports  
>>> a criminal misdemeanor punishable by not more than 6 mos. in jail and a fine  
>>> of \$500 or both. See Section 11167.5. Further, if ADLA had made reports  
>>> to  
>>> the three sheriffs mentioned in the LA Times' articles and editorials, the  
>>> sheriffs would violate the statute if they released the names of any  
>>> individual or entity which had made a report. Section 11167(d)(1) which  
>>> states: "The identity of all persons who report . . . shall be confidential  
>>> and disclosed only among agencies receiving or investigating mandated  
>>> reports,  
>>> to the district attorney . . .", etc. It also states that "No agency or  
>>> person listed in this subdivision shall disclose the identity of any  
>>> person  
>>> who reports under this article." Section 11167(d)(2).  
>>>  
>>> 7. Finally, I continue to fear that the next wave of this press feeding  
>>> frenzy may well focus on clerics who have had romantic or sexual liaisons  
>>> with  
>>> other adults. I think it prudent to begin reviewing personnel disciplinary  
>>> files to assess the scope of any such problem.  
>>>  
>>> The information contained in this electronic communication and any document  
>>> attached hereto or transmitted herewith is attorney-client privileged, work  
>>> product, or otherwise confidential and intended for the exclusive use of the  
>>> individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is  
>>> not the  
>>> intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to  
>>> the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any examination, use,  
>>> dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication or any  
>>> part

>>> thereof is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in  
>>> error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone or reply e-mail and  
>>> destroy this communication. Thank you.  
>>>  
>>>>> Charles Goldberg 03/13/02 12:09PM >>>  
>>> Hello Tod,  
>>>  
>>> What follows is obviously highly confidential at this moment in time:  
>>>  
>>> It appears that we will soon (Friday is the target) accept the outstanding  
>>> offer to settle the Haigh matter for \$1.2 million dollars in exchange for a  
>>> complete, comprehensive release of all claims. As of this moment, there is  
>>> no  
>>> reason to believe that this settlement will be confidential. The settlement  
>>> sum will be paid 80% by the Diocese of Orange and 20% by the Archdiocese of  
>>> Los Angeles.  
>>>  
>>> Subject to our self insured retention obligation, the Archdiocese of  
Los  
>>> Angeles' portion of the settlement will be paid by our insurers who insured  
>>> the Archdiocese in 1978-1979. The same carrier insured us post 1979  
until  
>>> The  
>>> Ordinary Mutual was formed.  
>>>  
>>> Here are the public relations challenges:  
>>>  
>>> 1. At the moment we have not asked that this settlement remain  
>>> confidential.  
>>> Unless there is a strong contrary view, we do not anticipate asking for  
>>> confidentiality.  
>>>  
>>> 2. Regarding the 80/20 split, the question arises whether we inform Ms.  
>>> Freberg at the time of acceptance of her offer (which will likely occur on  
>>> Friday, March 15th) of the precise split? Do we hold that information and  
>>> release it to her later when the releases are prepared and executed?  
Do we  
>>> keep the 80/20 confidential. We are leaning toward disclosing the split in  
>>> the acceptance letter to Ms. Freberg subject, of course, to your advice from

>>> a  
>>> p.r. perspective.  
>>>  
>>> 3. Here are some the questions that come to mind that the press will likely raise:  
>>>  
>>> Why is the Archdiocese of Los Angeles ("ADLA") contributing at all to this settlement?  
>>>  
>>> Who is the ADLA priest who is accused of sexually molesting Ms. Haigh?  
>>> Where is he now? If he is not in ministry, why not? When was he removed from ministry? What were the reasons for his removal? Tod, we think we know who he is but, at this moment, are not absolutely certain who it is. Further,  
>>> we have never indicated to Ms. Freberg that we know who he is although she has asked repeatedly?  
>>>  
>>> Why is Ms. Haigh receiving \$1.2 MM when the victims in Boston may receive less than \$300,000 per victim?  
>>>  
>>> Did you report Ms. Haigh's allegations to the police under the Child Abuse Reporting Statute?  
>>>  
>>> Why are you paying so much money when her claim appears to be so old?  
>>>  
>>> Where is Fr. Lenihan now? When was he removed? Is he going to be laicized by Rome?  
>>>  
>>> Is this settlement being paid by insurance?  
>>>  
>>> 4. Note that Ms. Freberg could go public upon receipt of our letter and prior to any releases being executed.  
>>>  
>>> These are some of the issues that we need to conference with everyone about between now and Friday. Please let us now when we can all gather fo discuss these sensitive p.r. issues.  
>>>

>>> Chuck  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> Charles Goldberg, Esq.  
>>> Rothgerber Johnson & Lyons LLP  
>>> 1200 17th Street, Suite 3000  
>>> Denver, Colorado 80202  
>>> 303-628-9609  
>>> 303-623-9222  
>>> [CGoldberg@Rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@Rothgerber.com)  
>>>  
>>> The information contained in this electronic communication and any document  
>>> attached hereto or transmitted herewith is attorney-client privileged, work  
>>> product, or otherwise confidential and intended for the exclusive use of the  
>>> individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the  
>>> intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to  
>>> the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any examination, use,  
>>> dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication or any part  
>>> thereof is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in  
>>> error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone or reply e-mail and  
>>> destroy this communication. Thank you.

-----Original Message-----  
From: John McNicholas  
To: Msgr. Loomis  
Sent: 3/20/2002 1:13 PM  
Subject: FW: Delgadillo letter

-----  
From: John McNicholas <[jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)>  
Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 10:13:49 -0800  
To: <[Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)>  
Subject: Re: Delgadillo letter

Cardinal,

I am working on a draft. However, I think we should discuss his offer in the third paragraph. We have taken the position that we have complied with

the  
statutory reporting laws and continue to do so. We are, even now,  
cooperating with investigations initiated by the Los Angeles Police  
Department and by the Los Angeles Sheriff's Office. Sr. Judy, as you  
know,  
has met with both agencies and has established a good working  
relationship  
with them.

So, what am I worried about having the City Attorney ("C.A.") conduct  
training sessions with clergy, et al.? I am concerned about direct  
contact  
with our clergy and lay personnel. For example, training sessions  
usually  
have a question and answer period. Judging from the reception of Di  
Maria  
settlement, the monetary amount and the non-monetary terms, a question  
and  
answer period could be problematic and "misunderstood" by the Deputy  
City  
Attorneys providing the training. The third paragraph is, in my  
opinion,  
the kind of investigation done by Grand Juries. In essence, the third  
paragraph provides the C. A.'s office with uncontrolled "free"  
discovery.

Martin called me as I was preparing the e-mail. He agrees with the  
above  
and sees a Constitutional issue as well: this is an ecclesiastical  
function; we should not hand over our authority to the C. A.

We suggest that we provide him with our policies and welcome  
suggestions. .  
We then can make a choice to include them or not. If we include them  
we  
have the imprimatur of the City Attorney.

Best regards,

John

> From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)  
> Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 10:16:56 EST  
> To: [MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com), [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org),  
> [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com), [CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com), [FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com),  
> [Media@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:Media@la-archdiocese.org), [accmed14@hotmail.com](mailto:accmed14@hotmail.com)  
> Subject: Delgadillo letter  
>  
> Privileged Client--Attorney Communication  
>  
> All:  
>  
> I would appreciate your drafting a response to Delgadillo for me. We  
should  
> take him up on his offer to assist training sessions--we will need  
those for  
> teachers, parish staffs, youth folks, etc.

>  
> That would give us the opportunity to give them the summary of the  
law  
and to  
> have them sign that form which the Act requires anyway.  
>  
> I say--let's go for it!  
>  
> Thanks.  
>  
> +RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: John McNicholas  
To: Murphy, Sr. Judy  
Cc: Msgr. Loomis  
Sent: 3/20/2002 1:03 PM  
Subject: Re: Storm on the horizon

Dear Sister,

I spoke with Msgr. Cox. On the subject of who should report the matter to the authorities, he wants to talk to you first. He is of the opinion that you should be the one to report it because of your working relationship with Det. Barraclough. I disagreed but acquiesced to his request--there being no choices. He also said that you and he agreed that this is not reportable under the statute.

The Carmelite's attorney is Jim Geoly, Warren, McKay & Serentella in Chicago. (I got this from Fr. Kevin McBrien, O. Carm., whose name was given to me by Msgr. Cox. Fr. McBrien told me that the Carmelites did not report it because of the statute of limitations.)

Msgr. Cox is opposed to the removal of Fr. Liuzzi who teaches a one hour course once a week at Crespi reasoning that if he was good enough to be on the Cardinal's staff, he is OK to teach at Crespi H.S. (Disagree.) All homosexuals are not pedophiles. (Agree.) If the Cardinal was to tell the Carmelites to remove Fr. Liuzzi, that is his decision. There has never been a claim about Fr. Liuzzi.

I left a short version of the above on your Audex.

Let's discuss.

John

> From: "Murphy, Sr. Judy" <[SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org)>  
> Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 07:10:38 -0800  
> To: "'[jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com) '" <[jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)>  
> Subject: RE: Storm on the horizon  
>  
> John,  
> Please put a call into Msgr. Cox. He is in santa Barbara today with  
> the  
> last Boundaries Workshop. The carmelite priest below is well know in  
> the  
> Valley and is a therapist. Presently, some of our priests go to him.  
> An  
> adult came forward and made a complaint that he was molested as a  
> minor.  
> The priest denied this charge but from what I know admitted another  
> which  
> happened years ago. When you reach Msgr. Cox, see if you can find  
> out  
> who  
> their lawyer is and deal with him\her. For the Carmelites (and ours)  
> best  
> interest, they should call this in to law authorities. If the Order  
> does  
> not have some police contact, then suggest Detective Barraclough. As  
> to the  
> other priest, he is the priest who ministered at the ACC to gay and  
> lesbian  
> Catholics. He stayed on the narrow line until he wrote his book. He  
> is gay  
> and the Catholic Mission (the off the wall right wing throw-away  
> newspaper)  
> has been gunning for him for years.  
> Thank you,  
> Sister Judy  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: [FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com)  
> To: [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org); [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)  
> Sent: 3/19/2002 9:27 PM  
> Subject: Storm on the horizon  
>  
> PRIVILEGED ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION  
>  
> Sister & John,  
>  
> I have learned that the Carmelites at Crespi High School are  
> currently  
> preparing an announcement for faculty, parents and students  
> concerning  
> Father Dominic Savino's removal from active ministry. Father Savino  
> is  
> the President of Crespi HS. I do not know when the announcement will  
> be

> made but it will undoubtedly draw a great deal of public attention.  
The  
> Carmelites are introspective as an order and may not think to warn us  
> before notifying the school community.  
>  
> Also, though hearsay has it that these allegations are from years ago  
> and all alleged victims are now adults, I certainly hope they have  
> thought of obtaining legal advice regarding the reporting laws.  
>  
> If Monsignor Cox is not in direct communication with the Provincial,  
I  
> suggest that he ought to speak with Father Quinn Connors at  
tomorrow's  
> workshop and establish direct communication on this matter. Since  
> Father Connors was out here for our workshops and is himself a former  
> Provincial, he was delegated by the current Provincial to confront  
> Father Savino with the allegations. If you agree with my concerns,  
> would a call from legal counsel to Monsignor Cox be better than one  
from  
> me to set this in motion?  
>  
> A complicating fact: I believe that Father Peter Liuzzi is being  
> assigned to Crespi Carmelite HS as a faculty member. A  
representative  
> of the "Lay Catholic Mission" has approached a Carmelite priest who  
> occasionally helps here at Saint Charles to question "the wisdom of  
> assigning Father Liuzzi to an all-boy school." On top of that,  
Father  
> Liuzzi and Father Savino have lived in the same community house for  
as  
> long as I have worked at the ACC -- not quite seven years. They are  
> close friends. I am not sure how many people know these facts and I  
> would not want to tip my hand.  
>  
> Everything in this "complicating fact" paragraph would be tracked  
right  
> back to me. I would not want it made public if it can be avoided.  
But  
> my thought is that one issue might ignite the other in the press,  
both  
> secular and retro-Catholic.  
>  
> Dick  
>  
>  
> Rev. Msgr. Richard A. Loomis  
> Director, Secretariat for Administrative Services  
> 3424 Wilshire Boulevard  
> Los Angeles, CA 90010  
> Voice: 213 637-7890  
> Fax: 213 637-6890  
>  
> The information contained in this electronic communication and any  
> document attached hereto or transmitted herewith is attorney-client  
> privileged, work product, or otherwise confidential and intended for  
the  
> exclusive use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader

of  
> this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent  
> responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are  
hereby  
> notified that any examination, use, dissemination, distribution, or  
> copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly  
> prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please  
> immediately notify the sender by telephone or reply e-mail and  
destroy  
> this communication. Thank you.  
>

-----Original Message-----

From: John McNicholas  
To: Cardinal Mahony  
Cc: Sr. Judy Murphy; Msgr. Loomis; Martin Nussbaum  
Sent: 3/20/2002 4:25 PM  
Subject: Reply to Rockard Delgadillo, L.A. City Attorney

Dear All,

I offer the enclosed draft reply to Mr. Delgadillo's letter for your suggestions.

In the interest of consistency I have borrowed generously from the Pastoral Statement and from the March 13, 2002 letter to the District Attorney, Steve Cooley.

I did not include a paragraph accepting in part Mr. Delgadillo's training offer. In my last e-mail I suggested a partial acceptance by designating someone or a trusted select few to receive the training and then to train others. Such a paragraph is easily grafted onto this or whatever letter you decide to send.

Regards,

John

<<Delgadillo 03/20/02>>

-----Original Message-----

From: John McNicholas  
To: Cardinal Mahony  
Cc: Sr. Judy Murphy; Msgr. Loomis; Martin Nussbaum  
Sent: 3/20/2002 3:02 PM

Subject: Response to Delgadillo letter

Cardinal,

As I draft a reply, the thought occurs to me that perhaps we could designate someone or a few select individuals for the training suggested by Delgadillo in the third paragraph of his letter(?).

Let's discuss.

Regards,

John

-----Original Message-----

From: John McNicholas

To: Murphy, Sr. Judy; Mahony, Cardinal Roger M.

Cc: Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.; Cox, Msgr. Craig A.

Sent: 3/22/2002 11:55 AM

Subject: Re: Update

All,

I have calls into Jim Geoly, the attorney who is handling this matter for the Carmelites.

Regards to all,

John

> From: "Murphy, Sr. Judy" <[SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org)>  
> Date: Thu, 21 Mar 2002 19:33:44 -0800  
> To: "Mahony, Cardinal Roger M." <[CardRMM@aol.com](mailto:CardRMM@aol.com)>  
> Cc: "John McNicholas (E-mail)" <[jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)>, "Loomis, Msgr. Richard A." <[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org)>, "Cox, Msgr. Craig A." <[MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org)>  
> Subject: Update  
>  
>  
> Attorney-Client Privileged Communication  
>  
> Cardinal,  
>  
> 1. I made contact with Detective Barraclough and told him to expect a call from a Fr. McBrien about a complaint from an adult victim re a Carmelite priest that happened over 20 years ago. The priest at that time had been a

> teacher at Crespi High School. I said the complaint had come through  
our  
> hotline and referred to the Carmelites. Although this complaint does  
not  
> fall under the mandating reporting law, I wanted our lines of  
communication  
> to stay open. I then contacted Fr. McBrien and encouraged him to  
contact  
> Detective Barraclough. Hopefully contact was made.  
>  
> 2. John had been in contact with the Carmelites attorney in Chicago.  
> Comments were made re their proposed letter to the Carmelite High  
School  
> Family. In conversation, John was told that the priest in question  
had  
> molested a teenager when he was a parish priest at St. Jane Frances  
de  
> Chantal Parish in 1979. This is a parish staffed by the Carmelites.  
The  
> matter was handled quietly, the priest was sent for treatment, and  
the  
> Archdiocesan contact was Bishop Azube. John, if you could follow up  
with  
> this with the attorney to see if they have anything in writing.  
Msgr.  
Cox  
> can you check to see if anything in the Carmelite files. It is  
amazing the  
> connections.  
>  
> 3. John retrieved his old file in the Tammy Helm civil litigation  
against  
> us and sent me a copy of the police report I will make you a copy,  
Msgr.  
> Cox, to place in Fr. R's file. Throughout the El Segundo Police  
report, the  
> mother of Tammy references her phone calls with Bishop Manning. The  
gist of  
> the phone conversations is that Bishop Manning wanted the church to  
take  
> care of the matter, and he would see that it was done properly .It  
appears  
> that based on this representation, the mother refused to press  
charges  
and  
> wrote: "I just want the Father helped and feel the Church can best do  
it."  
>  
> All for now.  
>  
> Sister Judy

-----Original Message-----

From: John McNicholas

To: Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.; Murphy, Sr. Judy; Tamberg, Tod

Sent: 3/22/2002 2:32 PM  
Subject: Re: St. Francis High School

> From: "Loomis, Msgr. Richard A." <[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org)>  
> Date: Fri, 22 Mar 2002 12:45:53 -0800  
> To: "Murphy, Sr. Judy" <[SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org)>, "Tamberg,  
> Tod" <[Media@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:Media@la-archdiocese.org)>  
> Cc: "John McNicholas (E-mail)" <[jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)>  
> Subject: St. Francis High School  
>  
> PRIVILEGED ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION  
>  
> Sister, John & Tod,  
>  
> Father Chris Kearney (sp?), OFM Cap., a former faculty member at St.  
Francis  
> High School (not the principal), has been removed from his position  
at  
San  
> Lorenzo Seminary, due to allegations of past abuse of minors.  
>  
> From what I found out from Msgr. Cox, he was discussed on one of the  
talk  
> shows and the Capuchins did a quick check. Also, an anonymous  
complaint  
> came in on Orange's 800-line about a Father Chris, but there was no  
last  
> name and no further reference as to what school. Due to whatever  
they  
found  
> out, Father Chris has been removed by the Capuchins. Msgr. Cox sais  
that  
> this Father Kearney used to supervise Saturday detention. Kids could  
get  
> leave early if the would wrestle with him. The winner was the one  
who  
could  
> grab the other's testicles while wrestling. :-P  
>  
> Msgr. Cox told me that the Capuchins were supposed to be sending us a  
copy  
> of whatever they were going to announce this weekend. (The "this  
weekend"  
> reference came from Bishop Curry who was told they were announcing it  
this  
> weekend.)  
>  
> That's all I know at this point. Msgr. Cox will call the Capuchins  
this  
> afternoon and see what their plans are.  
>  
> RAL  
>  
> Rev. Msgr. Richard A. Loomis  
> Director, Secretariat for Administrative Services

> 3424 Wilshire Boulevard  
> Los Angeles, CA 90010  
> Voice: 213 637-7890  
> Fax: 213 637-6890

-----Original Message-----

From: John McNicholas  
To: Loomis, Msgr. Richard A.; Murphy, Sr. Judy; Tamberg, Tod  
Sent: 3/22/2002 2:32 PM  
Subject: Re: St. Francis High School

> From: "Loomis, Msgr. Richard A." <[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org)>  
> Date: Fri, 22 Mar 2002 12:45:53 -0800  
> To: "Murphy, Sr. Judy" <[SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org)>, "Tamberg,  
> Tod" <[Media@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:Media@la-archdiocese.org)>  
> Cc: "John McNicholas (E-mail)" <[jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)>  
> Subject: St. Francis High School  
>  
> PRIVILEGED ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION  
>  
> Sister, John & Tod,  
>  
> Father Chris Kearney (sp?), OFM Cap., a former faculty member at St.  
Francis  
> High School (not the principal), has been removed from his position  
at  
San  
> Lorenzo Seminary, due to allegations of past abuse of minors.  
>  
> From what I found out from Msgr. Cox, he was discussed on one of the  
talk  
> shows and the Capuchins did a quick check. Also, an anonymous  
complaint  
> came in on Orange's 800-line about a Father Chris, but there was no  
last  
> name and no further reference as to what school. Due to whatever  
they  
found  
> out, Father Chris has been removed by the Capuchins. Msgr. Cox sais  
that  
> this Father Kearney used to supervise Saturday detention. Kids could  
get  
> leave early if the would wrestle with him. The winner was the one  
who  
could  
> grab the other's testicles while wrestling. :-P  
>  
> Msgr. Cox told me that the Capuchins were supposed to be sending us a  
copy  
> of whatever they were going to announce this weekend. (The "this  
weekend"  
> reference came from Bishop Curry who was told they were announcing it  
this

> weekend.)  
>  
> That's all I know at this point. Msgr. Cox will call the Capuchins  
this  
> afternoon and see what their plans are.  
>  
> RAL  
>  
> Rev. Msgr. Richard A. Loomis  
> Director, Secretariat for Administrative Services  
> 3424 Wilshire Boulevard  
> Los Angeles, CA 90010  
> Voice: 213 637-7890  
> Fax: 213 637-6890  
>  
> The information contained in this electronic communication and any  
document  
> attached hereto or transmitted herewith is attorney-client  
privileged,  
work  
> product, or otherwise confidential and intended for the exclusive use  
of the  
> individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is  
not  
the  
> intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for  
delivering  
it to  
> the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any examination,  
use,  
> dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication or any  
part  
> thereof is strictly prohibited. If you have received this  
communication in  
> error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone or reply  
e-mail and  
> destroy this communication. Thank you.  
>

-----Original Message-----  
From: John McNicholas  
To: Cardinal Mahony; Sr. Judy Murphy  
Cc: Msgr. Loomis; Tod Tamberg  
Sent: 3/27/2002 2:09 PM  
Subject: FW: Phone message - Pat Gordon

Cardinal,

The message (infra) from Pat Gordon is a follow-up to my voicemail  
message  
left earlier today. Transcript tomorrow. When I receive it I will  
distribute it to the team and then send a copy to Chief Dyer, Fresno  
P.D.  
(see, infra).

I have just learned from Sr. Judy (who received the information from Det. Barraclough) that this matter has been reported to Jerry Dyer, Chief of Police, Fresno. I called Chief Dyer. He is out for the rest of the day.

I told Debra, who took the call in the Chief's absence, the following:

(1) that the LAPD had referred a matter relating to a claim by Flora Mae Hickman of Fresno against you;

(2) that you self-reported the matter to Det. Barraclough, LAPD;

(3) that you followed up that report with a letter to Det. Barraclough;

(4) that I thought that LAPD had probably forwarded a copy of your letter to them;

(5) that the Fresno Police Dept. has a file for Flora Mae Hickman relating to a stolen baby; and,

(6) that Pat Gordon, H. R., Diocese of Fresno, has a two hour tape of his interview with Flora Mae.

It is problematic how much of this Derba wrote down. She said that she will have the Chief call me tomorrow.

I will keep all posted.

Regards,

John

-----  
From: Paula Arviso <[pma@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:pma@mcnicholaslaw.com)>  
Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2002 11:08:23 -0800  
To: John McNicholas <[jpm@McNicholasLaw.com](mailto:jpm@McNicholasLaw.com)>  
Subject: Phone message - Pat Gordon

Phone message on 3/27/02 at 11:06 am:

Pat Gordon

Message: My assistant is working on the transcript as I speak. It may take her all day and tomorrow to complete the tapes. I should be able to get the statement to you by tomorrow some time. Any questions call me.

-----Original Message-----

From: John McNicholas

To: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com); [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org);  
[CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com);

[MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com); [FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com);

[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org);

[Media@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:Media@la-archdiocese.org); [accmed14@hotmail.com](mailto:accmed14@hotmail.com)

Sent: 3/27/2002 4:50 PM

Subject: Re: Parks Response

Dear Cardinal,

Excellent letter. Need to change "identify" to "identity" on line 72.

Regards,

John

> From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)

> Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2002 18:56:53 EST

> To: [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org), [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com),

> [CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com), [MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com), [FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com),

> [MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org), [Media@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:Media@la-archdiocese.org),

> [accmed14@hotmail.com](mailto:accmed14@hotmail.com)

> Subject: Parks Response

>

> Privileged Client--Attorney Communication

>

> All:

>

> I have tried to take all the suggestions and have crafted a response  
to

> Parks.

>

> I agree with Loomis: we need to make this a teachable moment for  
Parks. He

> and his staff obviously don't understand the Act. Since this will  
end

up in

> the hands of the media, maybe they will learn something along the  
line!!

>

> I would like to finalize the letter by noon on Thursday, if possible,  
and

> then have it delivered to Parks' office.

>

> I have placed it in double-spaced, numbered lines, format.

>

> Sr. Judy: do we have the LAPD case numbers I refer to in line 69?  
Were both

> prosecuted and served probation? I don't know the precise facts  
here.

>

> Thanks to all!!

>  
> +RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: John McNicholas  
To: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com); [MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org);  
[CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com); [MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org);  
[SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org)  
Cc: [MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com)  
Sent: 3/27/2002 3:17 PM  
Subject: Re: Initial Draft Response to the Chief Parks letter

Dear Cardinal,

I agree . . . working on it.

John

> From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)  
> Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2002 17:46:29 EST  
> To: [MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org), [CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com),  
> [MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrCACox@la-archdiocese.org), [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org),  
> [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)  
> Cc: [MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com)  
> Subject: Re: Initial Draft Response to the Chief Parks letter  
>  
> Privileged Client--Attorney Communication  
>  
> Msgr. Loomis and all:  
>  
> I agree with Msgr. Loomis' points. Chief Parks needs some  
instruction  
on the  
> Act and how it works. I think we need to give it to him--and by so  
doing,  
> will be giving it to the media since he will surely make sure the  
media gets  
> it.  
>  
> Let's take a crack at a new draft that incorporates these various  
points.  
>  
> Thanks.  
>  
> +RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: John McNicholas  
To: Charles Goldberg; [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com); [FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com);  
[accmed14@hotmail.com](mailto:accmed14@hotmail.com);  
[Media@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:Media@la-archdiocese.org); [msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org);  
[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org); [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org); L.  
Martin  
Nussbaum

Sent: 3/28/2002 11:51 AM  
Subject: Re: Almost Final Version: Parks Letter

Dear Cardinal,

The letter is excellent as presently constituted. Kudos to all.

Happy and Holy Easter,

John

> From: "Charles Goldberg" <[CGoldberg@rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@rothgerber.com)>  
> Date: Thu, 28 Mar 2002 10:23:56 -0700  
> To: <[Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)>, <[FrDick@aol.com](mailto:FrDick@aol.com)>, <[accmed14@hotmail.com](mailto:accmed14@hotmail.com)>, <[Media@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:Media@la-archdiocese.org)>, <[msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:msgrcacox@la-archdiocese.org)>, <[MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:MsgrRALoomis@la-archdiocese.org)>, <[SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org)>, <[jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com)>, "L. Martin Nussbaum" <[MNussbaum@rothgerber.com](mailto:MNussbaum@rothgerber.com)>  
> Subject: Re: Almost Final Version: Parks Letter  
>  
> Dear Cardinal,  
>  
> The most recent iteration of the letter is good and should be sent. The  
> letter is a direct response to Chief Parks and a good tutorial.  
>  
> I have a couple of stylist observations for your consideration:  
>  
> In the 3rd to the final paragraph, do you think substituting the word  
> "previously" for "duly" would aid the reader? The sentence would  
then  
read:  
>  
> "Recently dismissed priests who were in the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles  
Police Department have been previously reported."  
>  
> Instead of the final closing line, consider:  
>  
> "I trust this fully responds to your inquiry. With ever best wish, I  
am"  
>  
> Nice work.  
>  
> Chuck  
>  
> Charles Goldberg, Esq.  
> Rothgerber Johnson & Lyons LLP  
> 1200 17th Street, Suite 3000  
> Denver, Colorado 80202  
> 303-628-9609  
> 303-623-9222  
> [CGoldberg@Rothgerber.com](mailto:CGoldberg@Rothgerber.com)  
>  
> The information contained in this electronic communication and any  
document  
> attached hereto or transmitted herewith is attorney-client

privileged,  
work  
> product, or otherwise confidential and intended for the exclusive use  
of the  
> individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is  
not the  
> intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for  
delivering  
it to  
> the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any examination,  
use,  
> dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication or any  
part  
> thereof is strictly prohibited. If you have received this  
communication in  
> error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone or reply  
e-mail and  
> destroy this communication. Thank you.  
>  
>>>> <[Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)> 03/28/02 08:19AM >>>  
> Privileged Client--Attorney Communication  
>  
> All:  
>  
> I have incorporated Sr. Judy's excellent suggestions into the draft  
of  
the  
> Parks letter.  
>  
> Please review at your earliest convenience and let me know if it is  
OK  
to  
> finalize and deliver to his offices.  
>  
> Suggestion: that Tod then release both letters to the media, with a  
brief  
> media advisory and with a clarifying statement from me [I'm working  
on  
that  
> piece right now]. We are in a good position to clarify once again  
our  
> policies and what we have done, and how we act now.  
>  
> Thanks to all!!  
>  
> +RMM

-----Original Message-----

From: John McNicholas  
To: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)  
Cc: Sr. Judy Murphy; Msgr. Loomis  
Sent: 4/2/2002 12:13 PM  
Subject: Fresno

Dear Cardinal,

I sent you an e-mail at 11:25 this morning in which I said that the transcript was finished last night and that it is being taken to Flora Mae at 2:30 p.m. for signature and release; thence to Det. Attkisson at Fresno P. D. and a copy sent to me.

I am concerned that you did not receive the 11:25 a.m. e-mail -- and that you may not receive this one. I have a lunch appointment and will try to contact you when I return.

Regards,

John

> From: [Cardrmm@aol.com](mailto:Cardrmm@aol.com)  
> Date: Tue, 2 Apr 2002 14:40:01 EST  
> To: [jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com](mailto:jpm@mcnicholaslaw.com), [SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org](mailto:SrJMurphy@la-archdiocese.org)  
> Subject: Fresno  
>  
> Privileged Client--Attorney Communication  
>  
> John,  
>  
> I was wondering if you have heard anything from Fresno yet.  
>  
> For your info, I depart in the morning for Dallas, back on Thursday morning.  
> A quick overnight to Dallas--hope to bring back a good Cathedral gift!  
>  
> If the PD up there wants to speak with me, then they should contact me here  
> at home today; I will have my cell phone with me on the Dallas trip: (213)  
> 706-4014. Should be back by early noon on Thursday; here that day and  
> Friday. Home phone the best.  
>  
> This coming weekend, I have two Confirmations on each Sat and Sun, so away a  
> lot.  
>  
> Off next week until Friday noon--some R & R. Would like to do the PD  
> interview before next Monday, if possible.  
>  
> Many thanks!!  
>  
> +RMM