

Confidential

W-  
S-

April 29, 1999

John W. Crumley, P.C.  
Attorney At Law  
316 University Central  
1300 South University Drive  
Fort Worth, TX 76107-5735

Re: - Father Philip A. Magaldi

Dear Mr. Crumley:

Your letter of April 21, 1999 in response to my letter of April 9, 1999 is hereby acknowledged.

I am astounded that you would write the following on behalf of the Diocese of Fort Worth wherein you state:

"Even if the claims by \_\_\_\_\_ were not barred by the statute of limitations, prior to, at the time and for several years after the alleged incident Rev. Magaldi was not a priest employed by or associated with the Diocese of Fort Worth"

For your edification I enclose a copy of an article from The Dallas Morning News, which appeared in the Providence Journal on \_\_\_\_\_ 27, 1999 written by Brooks Egerton and Aline McKenzie which states:

"Bishop Delaney hired Father Magaldi about a decade ago after he had been suspended by the Diocese of Providence in connection with the theft allegation, but before the criminal case unfolded."

Are you suggesting this written statement supports your position that Father Magaldi's relationship with Bishop Delaney is not associated with the Fort Worth Diocese? Respectfully, I believe that is a stretch beyond anybody's imagination.

10-04-04 Order  
0654

John W. Crumley, P.C.  
April 29, 1999  
Page 2

I have further learned that the source of the newspaper article in the Dallas Fort Worth Morning News was none other than Father Magaldi who addressed a group of his parishioners sometime after April 9, 1999.

As the bard once wrote "He doth protest too much".

We have discovered that it was the Bishop of the Fort Worth Diocese that referred Rev. Magaldi to [redacted] in [redacted], after the Bishop discovered that a similar incident concerning the use of an enema upon a male victim in Texas.

Concerning your statement that the statute of limitations has expired on any claim that [redacted] feels he has against Rev. Magaldi, I suggest you review Massachusetts General Laws c. 260 s. 4A and cited cases.

**DOCUMENT IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED.**

Your veiled threat that we may expose ourselves to sanctions under Federal Rule 11(c) will not deter us from seeking justice in this matter.

Further comment from your would be appreciated.

Very truly yours

enclosure

10-04-04 Order  
0655