

MEMORANDUM

Date: February 8, 2013
To: The Most Reverend John C. Nienstedt
From: Jennifer Haselberger
Re: Father Jon Shelley

Archbishop,

I completely disagree with Father McDonough's assessment of the situation. I disagree with his characterization of the images as 'not pornographic' and, since these images were downloaded (saved) to a hard drive by Father Shelley, I disagree that these were pop-up ads meant to entice him to view pornography rather than images that he perceived to be and used as pornography. I would also point out that in May of 2012 I shared the same images with you and with Father Laird, and neither of you disputed that the images were pornographic.

The request from the CDF of August 2012, and which has not yet been answered, is that you inform them of all aspects of the case. I interpret that request as instruction that the case be assembled and submitted in the same format that was used for Fathers Wehmeyer and Walsh, including using the templates created by the CDF for these purposes and including all of the other concerns that have been raised regarding Father Shelley and his interactions with minors. My understanding was that I was to wait for Father McDonough's report to assemble the necessary documentation for submission. Further, my understanding is that, until the CDF has advised you how to proceed in this matter, Father Shelley ought not to receive an assignment.

I would also point out that this matter has never been brought before the Clergy Review Board. Prior to considering an assignment for Father Shelley I think the Board should be informed of the case and their advice should be sought.

I would also like to reiterate that I think all of this information should be turned over to law enforcement for their determination, in the hopes of avoiding prosecution for you and your staff by offering an affirmative defense.

Finally, I am attaching a memo written by Father McDonough when he made a similar assessment of Father Wehmeyer. His conclusion, which Father Laird supported, was that there was no need or use (his words) to disclose Father Wehmeyer's history to the employees of the parish, as, in Father McDonough's assessment, Father Wehmeyer was 'not all that interested in

ARCHDIOCESE
OF
SAINT PAUL &
MINNEAPOLIS

an actual sexual encounter' and 'there has never been a question' of Father Wehmeyer 'misusing his position as a priest to obtain [sexual] favors...from those to whom he ministers'. In addition to being a factually inaccurate recounting of Father Wehmeyer's history of seeking sexual encounters, Father McDonough's assessment of Father Wehmeyer's interest in and likelihood of engaging in sexual behavior has been proven to be tragically wrong. The fact that Father McDonough set aside the recommendations of the Review Board and others and did not complete the recommended disclosure at Father Wehmeyer's request will prove to be extremely costly and embarrassing for Father McDonough, the Archdiocese, and, I am afraid, you, should [REDACTED] pursue a civil case. I strongly encourage you to consider whether you have an obligation to notify the University of St Thomas of this likelihood, and whether you can trust Father McDonough's recommendations on these matters any longer.

Thank you.