

## IN THE IOWA DISTRICT COURT FOR JOHNSON COUNTY

MICHAEL KASPER, ROBERT KASPER, )  
and ARDEN KASPER, )

Plaintiffs, )

vs. )

FATHER JAMES ELMER LEU, )  
Individually and as agent )  
of Diocese of Davenport and )  
Roman Catholic Bishop of )  
Davenport; MOST REVEREND )  
GERALD O'KEEFE, FATHER HARRY )  
LINNENBRINK, and MONSIGNOR )  
W. ROBERT SCHMIDT, all )  
individually and as agents )  
of the Diocese of Davenport; )  
THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF )  
DAVENPORT; and THE DIOCESE OF )  
DAVENPORT, )

Defendants. )

LAW NO. 53102

DEPOSITION OF  
MONSIGNOR  
MICHAEL J.  
MORRISSEY

**ORIGINAL**

## DEPOSITION OF MONSIGNOR MICHAEL J.

MORRISSEY, taken at the Law Offices of Lane &  
Waterman, 600 Davenport Bank Building, Davenport,  
Iowa, on January 13, 1992, commencing at 2:05 p.m.,  
before Alanna G. Jeffery, Certified Short Report  
Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of  
Iowa. Also present: Mike St. Charles

**FILED**  
AUG 25 1992  
A.M. 2:05 P.M.

EDWARD F. STEINBRECH  
CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT

EXHIBIT

3

Doc I-A

1 A. Aside from just general working with the  
2 Bishop on anything that he might assign me from  
3 time to time, most of that was the business  
4 operations of the Diocese and in continuing work in  
5 the marriage tribunal.

6 Q. Now, at what point in time did you become  
7 a Monsignor?

8 A. 1981.

9 Q. During the time that you've been  
10 affiliated with the Bishop's office -- and, for the  
11 most part, that's been full-time since 1976. Is  
12 that correct?

13 A. I would say it's been full-time in  
14 general work since 1967.

15 Q. Since that point in time, have you been  
16 aware of any claims made, other than this one, of  
17 any sexual misconduct on the part of any priest or  
18 any other Diocesan employee?

19 A. Yes. One.

20 Q. When was that?

21 MR. MILLER: For clarification, when  
22 was what? When he became aware of **FILED** when  
23 A.M. P.M.

23 Q. (CONTINUING) When was this claim  
24 asserted? When did somebody say, We've got a problem?  
25 problem?

1 A. The incident happened in 1987.

2 Q. What was the claim about?

3 A. That there had been sexual misconduct on  
4 the part of one of our priests.

5 Q. Was that Father Leu or was it somebody  
6 else?

7 A. It was somebody else.

8 Q. What was alleged to have been done?

9 A. This priest had made some sexual advance  
10 on a young man.

11 Q. And how was that issue resolved?

12 MR. MILLER: I'm going to object.  
13 It's vague and indefinite. Do you want to tell  
14 me what you mean by "resolved"? Do you mean  
15 internally in the church, or otherwise?

16 Q. (CONTINUING) Was it resolved to your  
17 satisfaction in one way or another?

18 A. I still don't know how to answer that.

19 Q. Was there any decision made by the  
20 Diocese as to how to handle the claim?

21 A. Yes. The priest was removed from his  
22 assignment. Aside from that, it's still pending.

23 Q. It's still pending?

24 A. That's correct.

25 Q. Is there a lawsuit filed as

**FILED**  
A.M. 9.00  
AUG 25 1992  
EDWARD F. STEINBERG  
CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT  
of

1 that?

2 A. There has been.

3 Q. And who filed the lawsuit?

4 A. The parents of the young man involved.

5 Q. And where was this filed? In Scott  
6 County or someplace else?

7 A. I'm sorry. I don't know today. I don't  
8 remember where it was filed.

9 Q. Has it been filed in a court of law?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And has the priest's name been disclosed  
12 as part of that process? In other words, was he  
13 named?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. What is that individual's name?

16 A. Frank Martinez.

17 Q. Where was he pastoring at or where was  
18 he involved at at the time that this incident  
19 occurred?

20 A. The incident did not occur in the parish,  
21 but he was assigned to the parish at Melcher, Iowa.

22 Q. You say the incident didn't occur in the  
23 parish. Where did it occur?

24 A. In Davenport.

25 Q. Was it on property owned by the parish?

**FILED**  
AUG 25 1992  
EDWARD F. STEINBRECH  
CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT

1 A. No.

2 Q. Why don't you tell me where it occurred  
3 as far as you understand it to be.

4 A. At a motel here in Davenport.

5 Q. And the name of the parents that have  
6 filed the lawsuit?

7 A. The last name is Lalor.

8 Q. Do you know how it's spelled?

9 A. I think it's L-a-l-o-r. I forget today  
10 whether there is a W in there or not. L-a-l-o-r,  
11 I think.

12 Q. When did you first become aware of this  
13 incident?

14 A. At the time that it happened.

15 Q. How did you become aware of it?

16 A. The owner of the motel had called the  
17 police, and the police called me.

18 Q. Had there been any prior allegations of a  
19 similar nature asserted against Father Martinez at  
20 that time?

21 A. No.

22 Q. I'm sorry. The answer is no?

23 A. The answer is no.

24 Q. Thank you.

25 Do you have recollection of the date that

**FILED**  
A. M. .... P. M.

AUG 25 1992  
EDWARD F. STEINBRECH  
CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT

1 the owner of the motel contacted the police, which,  
2 in turn, contacted you?

3 A. It was December 26th. That's an easy  
4 date to remember.

5 Q. 1987, correct?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Is that the only incident that you are  
8 aware of between a priest and anybody of a sexual  
9 nature such as the one you've described?

10 MR. MILLER: I'm going to object.  
11 It's overly broad and burdensome. I will permit  
12 him to answer if that is the only situation he is  
13 aware of between a priest in the Davenport Diocese  
14 and a minor; otherwise you are asking him for the  
15 universe of anything he might have read anywhere.

16 Q. (CONTINUING) I'm not asking for anything  
17 you read anywhere. I'm asking you, Monsignor, for  
18 anything that you know of a claim that's been  
19 asserted against a priest by anyone, whether a  
20 minor or adult, involving any sexual misconduct of  
21 any kind by a priest, other than Frank Martinez and  
22 Father Leu.

23 MR. MILLER: Do you understand the  
24 question?

25 A. I am not aware of any that have

**FILED**  
A.M. .... P.M.

AUG 25 1992

EDWARD F. STEINBRECH  
CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT

1     been made.

2             Q.     Those are the only two.

3             A.     Yes.

4             Q.     Just so that I'm clear as to your  
5     recollection, what has been alleged to have  
6     occurred at that motel? In more specifics than  
7     simply a sexual advance.

8             A.     My understanding is that there was simply  
9     some -- that nothing sexual, per se, happened.  
10    That there was some initial contact, and the young  
11    man went into a panic and ran out to the desk.  
12    That's how the motel owner -- I said owner; it's  
13    really the desk clerk that night -- called the  
14    police.

15            Q.     So, if I understand correctly, there was  
16    a young man -- by "young," I'm assuming you are  
17    talking about a minor. Is that --

18            A.     I think he was 15 at the time.

19            Q.     This 15-year-old boy comes out to the  
20    desk clerk at a motel in Davenport and then the  
21    desk clerk contacts the police, which contacts  
22    you. Correct?

23            A.     That's correct.

24            Q.     And is it your understanding that at the  
25    time that the young man had come out to the desk

FILED

AUG 25 1992

EDWARD F. STENBRECH  
CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT

1 clerk, nothing of a sexual nature had yet occurred?

2 A. That's my understanding.

3 Q. But is it your understanding that what  
4 the family is alleging is that there was some type  
5 of sexual conduct to be expected in that motel  
6 room?

7 MR. MILLER: Can I have that  
8 question back, please?

9 (The reporter read the record as  
10 requested.)

11 A. I don't know what the family is  
12 alleging. It hasn't gotten any farther than the  
13 filing of the suit, so I have no idea what more is  
14 involved in that case than that.

15 Q. So that we are clear, besides the claim  
16 that's been made against Father Martinez and the  
17 claim made here against Father Leu, you are not  
18 aware of any other claims -- I use the word  
19 "claims," by the way, Monsignor, so that I avoid  
20 the use of the term lawsuit, because a claim can be  
21 made by someone that does not necessarily lead to a  
22 lawsuit. Do you understand that?

23 A. Yes, I do.

24 Q. So when I use the term "claim," I am asking  
25 asking you if you are aware of any complaint or

**FILED**  
A.M. .... P.M.  
AUG 25 1992  
EDWARD F. STEINBRECH  
CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT



1 claim made by anyone alleging sexual misconduct by  
2 a priest.

3 Am I to understand that the only ones  
4 that you are aware of are the one that's with  
5 Father Martinez, which you've related to me, and  
6 the one with Father Leu, that's the reason we are  
7 here for?

8 A. That's the only claims that I am aware  
9 of.

10 Q. Are you aware of any incidents in which  
11 no claim or complaint has been lodged but which you  
12 have knowledge, between a priest and a minor of a  
13 sexual nature?

14 A. May I have the question back, please?

15 Q. Sure. Let me rephrase it.

16 I want to make sure that there is nothing  
17 that you are aware of that was not brought to your  
18 attention by somebody else. In other words,  
19 something that you yourself are aware of between a  
20 priest and a minor of a sexual nature.

21 MR. MILLER: Are you asking him, is  
22 he aware of anything other than Leu and Martinez  
23 based upon personal knowledge?

24 MR. DIAZ: Correct.

25 A. No.

**FILED**  
AUG 25 1992  
EDWARD F. STEINKECH  
CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT

1 interrogatories.

2 A. (CONTINUING) Answers to interroga-  
3 tories. I saw those last week.

4 Q. Is there any of the testimony of Father  
5 Linnenbrink that you disagree with?

6 A. The only thing that struck me is that he  
7 says that I was at a meeting at the Ironmen with  
8 the four of them. I don't remember that. I can  
9 visualize the motel because we've had meetings  
10 there frequently, and I've tried to picture the  
11 four of us meeting together there, and I don't.

12 Q. Was there anything in particular about  
13 the conversation or the meeting that he discussed  
14 in his deposition that you have no recollection of?

15 A. I didn't notice anything in reading that  
16 that I strongly disagreed with, except the meeting  
17 at the Ironmen Inn.

18 Q. What about Monsignor Schmidt's  
19 testimony? Is there anything in his that you  
20 disagree with?

21 A. Not that I remember. Nothing struck me  
22 as --

23 Q. What about the Bishop's?

24 A. There was nothing in there that I  
25 remember objecting to or saying, No, that's not

**FILED**  
AUG 25 1992 P.M.

EDWARD F. STEINDRECH  
CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT