

288 PC (Child Molest)

6-12-86

Page 1

Classification

Date of This Report

DETAILS:

5-5-86  
1150 Hours

I received a telephone call from \_\_\_\_\_ She told me on May 2, 1986, at four p.m.. she went to the Saint Bonaventure rectory to speak with \_\_\_\_\_ She was told that \_\_\_\_\_ was in counseling at this time and would not be available to speak with her.

I told \_\_\_\_\_ that in conversation with \_\_\_\_\_ of the Orange County Archdiocese, he was told by \_\_\_\_\_ that the letter sent by \_\_\_\_\_ regarding the child molest of her son could be destroyed as long as action was taken against Father Chris ANDERSON. \_\_\_\_\_ said that that was never a statement made by her to \_\_\_\_\_ or any other person belonging to the church and archdiocese. \_\_\_\_\_ said that she never made a statement to that effect or \_\_\_\_\_ that the report she prepared to him could be destroyed if the case was properly handled. She also told me that at this time she would be leaving for vacation and would be gone for approximately three weeks.

6-10-86  
0900 Hours

I received a telephone call from \_\_\_\_\_ She told me that she and her family were back from their vacation in New York. In talking with her, she reiterated her statement to me from 5-5-86 wherein she never \_\_\_\_\_ that her report of the molest of her \_\_\_\_\_ by Father Chris ANDERSON could be destroyed by church officials if proper action by them was taken against the priest.

\_\_\_\_\_ said that she was concerned about the lack of information coming to her or other mothers of young altar boys who were allegedly molested by Father ANDERSON. She said that some were getting concerned about the upcoming preliminary hearing because they haven't heard any information about how to proceed with this type of hearing. She suggested that I contact all of the altar boys who were allegedly sexually abused, with their parents, and have a meeting to explain what lies ahead as far as any court appearances and any testimony.

I told \_\_\_\_\_ that I thought that was a good idea and I would first contact Deputy District Attorney \_\_\_\_\_ to get his reaction to that proposal.

6-10-86  
0945 Hours

I telephoned \_\_\_\_\_ I explained to him my conversation \_\_\_\_\_ and the idea of having a meeting of all the altar boys and their parents at the Huntington Beach Police Station. \_\_\_\_\_ said that he felt that was a good idea and that he would also like to be in attendance. He said that this Thursday, 6-12-86,

288 PC (Child Molest)6-12-86Page 2

Classification

Date of This Report

## DETAILS:

6-10-86  
0945 Hours  
(cont.)

in the morning hours would be a convenient time for him. He said any time after that would be in conflict with his trial schedule. The only other alternative date that he felt would be accessible to him would be later this month, possibly June 30th.

I then made telephone calls and later, . It was quite obvious that it would be difficult for both of these ladies and their families to attend a meeting on Thursday, 6-12-86, as suggested. I then immediately telephoned D. A. Investigator assignee. I told her that it would be difficult at this time for me to arrange a meeting with the victims and their parents. She then volunteered to arrange a meeting with all concerned parties and D. A. She told me that after that meeting was arranged, that she would contact me.

## Supplementary &amp; Follow-Up Report

DR No.

FOLLOW-UP REPORT - 288(a) PC (CHILD MOLEST)

6/12/86

Classification

Date of This Report

## DETAILS:

6/12/86  
1550 Hours

I telephoned the Orange County Archdiocese to speak with phone number: The purpose of this telephone call was to request the name of the psychiatrist who was seeing Father CHRIS after his encounter with in April of 1983. In my conversation with on 4/29/86 at 1025 Hours, I learned, at that time, that Father CHRIS was sent to counseling. He informed me that the counseling was done by an outside, private psychiatrist and it cost the Archdiocese \$90.00 a visit. I told me that Father CHRIST was paying the Diocese back \$10.00 for each of the visits.

This telephone call today was to determine the name of this psychiatrist. It appears that when this molest information was presented to the psychiatrist, it was not reported to the Child Abuse Registry as mandated by law. A check of the Child Abuse Registry files shows no record. It is also quite obvious through the reports sent to the Diocese, that this information was readily available for review.

DET. SGT. G. BROOKS/se