

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE CITY OF ST. LOUIS  
TWENTY-SECOND JUDICIAL  
STATE OF MISSOURI

JANE DOE 92,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ARCHDIOCESE OF ST. LOUIS, a Non-  
Profit Corporation, ARCHBISHOP  
ROBERT J. CARLSON of the Archdiocese  
of St. Louis, and FATHER JOSEPH Ross

Defendants.

Cause No. 1122-CC10165

Division 1

**DEFENDANT ARCHDIOCESE OF ST. LOUIS' RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO  
PLAINTIFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS**

Defendant Archdiocese of St. Louis, by and through counsel, hereby submits its Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's First Request for Production of Documents.

**GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

1. These responses are made solely for purposes of this civil action. Each response is subject to any and all objections as to competency, relevancy, materiality, propriety, and admissibility and to any and all other objections and grounds that would require the exclusion of any information contained herein, or contained in any document identified herein, if said information was asked of a witness present and testifying in court, all of which objections are hereby expressly reserved and may be interposed at or before the time of trial.

2. The following responses are based upon information and writings presently available to and located by the Archdiocese and its attorneys and, except for facts expressly admitted herein, no incidental or implied admissions are intended hereby. The fact that the Archdiocese has responded to a discovery request or any part thereof, or has identified or produced a document or writing or any part thereof, should not be taken as an admission that the

Archdiocese accepts or admits the existence of any "fact" set forth or assumed by the request for which said response was made or for which said document or writing was identified or produced, or that any response or objection to the request, or any document or writing identified or produced, constitutes admissible evidence. The fact that the Archdiocese has responded to all or part of any request, or has identified or produced all or part of any document or writing, is not and shall not be construed as a waiver by the Archdiocese of all or part of any objection to any request made herein.

3. Investigation and discovery in this civil action has not been completed. The Archdiocese reserves the right to rely upon such facts, documents, writings, information, and materials, and any witnesses who have knowledge of any such facts, documents, writings, information and materials, as may be derived or identified through discovery or through their continuing investigation in this matter, and as may be adduced at trial. The Archdiocese's responses are based on the investigation as conducted thus far, which may be supplemented by further investigation and inquiry by the Archdiocese.

4. To the extent that any or all of the requests herein call for information, material or documents prepared in anticipation or defense of litigation or for trial, or for information, material or documents covered by the attorney work product doctrine, or privileged from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or any other privilege, the Archdiocese objects to each and every such request and thus will not supply or render any information, material or document protected from discovery by the Missouri Rules of Civil Procedure, the attorney work product doctrine or the attorney-client privilege.

5. To the extent any or all of the requests seek Defendant Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and

local laws and regulations, the Archdiocese objects to each and every request, and will not supply any responsive information except upon prior written notice to counsel for Ross that allows Ross adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court.

6. To the extent any or all of the requests seek information, documents or material contained in Ross's personnel file, the Archdiocese objects to each and every request on the ground that "Missouri recognizes a right of privacy in personnel records that should not be lightly disregarded or dismissed." State ex. rel. Delmar Gardens North Operating, LLC v. Gaertner, 239 S.W.3d 608, 611-12 (Mo. 2007) (en banc) (citing State ex rel. Crowden v. Dandurand, 970 S.W. 2d 340, 343 (Mo. banc 1998)) (emphasis added). The Archdiocese will not supply any responsive information except upon prior written notice to counsel for Ross that allows Ross adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court.

7. To the extent any of all of the requests seek information, documents or material concerning Ross's laicization, communications between the Archdiocese and the Holy See and any other communications that are protected by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, the Archdiocese objects to and will not supply or render any such information, on the basis that it is protected under the First and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution

8. The Archdiocese objects to Plaintiff's definition of "documents" as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive and for the reason that such definition would include documents protected by the Attorney Client Privilege and the Work Product Doctrine.

9. The Archdiocese objects to Plaintiff's "Identification of Privileged Documents" section as beyond the scope of permissible discovery in that they seek to require the Archdiocese to prepare a privilege log concerning documents requested that are protected from disclosure.



10. These General Objections are incorporated by reference into each applicable Response. All of the Archdiocese's Responses to Plaintiff's Requests are subject to these General Objections as well as any specific objections listed below.

**SPECIFIC RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO  
REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS**

1. All documents identified or referred to in your Answers to Plaintiff's First Interrogatories to the Archdiocese of St. Louis, including any referenced by Plaintiff or Defendant.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged documents responsive to this request, if any, including the personnel file and health records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request as it fails to comply with the Missouri Rules of Civil Procedure in that it fails to identify any category of documents with sufficient specificity. Furthermore, this overly broad request would encompass documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

2. All documents relating, referring, or otherwise pertaining to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, including personnel and/or health records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the

alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the ground that it requests Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, and therefore invades Ross's right of privacy. "Missouri recognizes a right of privacy in personnel records that should not be lightly disregarded or dismissed." State ex. rel. Delmar Gardens North Operating, LLC v. Gaertner, 239 S.W.3d 608, 611-12 (Mo. 2007) (en banc) (citing State ex. rel. Crowden v. Dandurand, 970 S.W. 2d 340, 343 (Mo. banc 1998)) (emphasis added). The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it requests every document relating, referring or otherwise pertaining to Ross regardless of the subject matter or date, and regardless of whether any such document has any connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial, overly broad and would encompass documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

3. All seminary or other scholastic records for Father Ross, including, but not limited to, evaluations by the faculty, evaluations of summer diaconate work, and documents relating or referring to disciplinary action taken against Father Ross during seminary or other schooling.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time



to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the ground that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, and therefore invades Ross's right of privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

4. The personnel file for Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the ground that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, and therefore invades Ross's right of privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments. The Archdiocese further

objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

5. The employment file of Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request in that Plaintiff has not defined "employment file" and it is not clear how this request differs from the request made for Ross's "personnel file" in Request No. 4 above. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, and therefore invades Ross's right of privacy. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

6. The restricted access file for Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order



by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request in that Plaintiff has not defined "restricted access file" and it is not clear how this request differs from the requests made for Ross's "personnel file" and "employment file" in Request Nos. 4 and 5 above. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, and therefore invades Ross's right of privacy. The Archdiocese also objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

7. The archive file for Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request in that Plaintiff has not defined "archive file" and it is not clear how this request differs from the requests made for Ross's "personnel file," "employment file" and "restricted access file" in Request Nos. 4, 5 and 6 above. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, and therefore invades Ross's right of privacy. The Archdiocese also objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it is not limited to documents which may have some



connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

8. All documents referring or relating to Accounts of Conscience by or otherwise related to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objection or the General Objections, as the Archdiocese does not understand this request, no response is provided at this time. The Archdiocese objects to this request in that Plaintiff has not defined "Accounts of Conscience."

9. All assignment histories for Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, including personnel records for Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the ground that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, and therefore invades Ross's right of privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese also objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

10. All documents relating or referring to Father Ross's employment with, services for, transfer to, or departure from any parish, school, or other entity affiliated with the Archdiocese.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the ground that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, and therefore invades Ross's right of privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it requests Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. The Archdiocese also objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments. The Archdiocese further objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.



11. All pagellas sent to Father Ross by the Archdiocese.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objection or the General Objections, as the Archdiocese does not understand this request, no response is provided at this time. The Archdiocese objects to this request in that Plaintiff has not defined the term "pagella."

12. All documents referring to suspicions or information that Father Ross engaged in sexual misconduct.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, including personnel records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the ground that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, and therefore invades Ross's right of privacy. The Archdiocese also objects to the definition of "sexual misconduct" in that it is not limited to minors. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

13. All calendars of correspondence entries referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it requests all entries referring or relating to Ross, regardless of date and regardless of whether any such entry has any connection to this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

14. All summaries referring or relating to Father Ross's files.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information responsive to this request, if any, including personnel and/or health records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the basis that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it requests all summaries, regardless of date and regardless of whether any such summary has any connection to this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent it encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request is unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

15. All documents referring or relating to sabbaticals, administrative leaves, sick leaves, or leaves of absence requested for or taken by Father Ross.



**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information responsive to this request, if any, including personnel and/or health records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent that it requests Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, and therefore invades Ross's right of privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

16. All documents related to the removal of Father Ross from the clerical state, including, but not limited to, petitions, applications, processes, declarations, and votum.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information responsive to this request, if any, including personnel and/or health records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to

counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent that it requests Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, and therefore invades Ross's right of privacy. The Archdiocese also objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese also objects on the basis that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

17. All documents relating or referring to termination of Father Ross as an employee, volunteer, or agent of the Archdiocese.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information responsive to this request, if any, including personnel records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged



documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the ground that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, and therefore invades Ross's right of privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese also objects on the basis that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

18. All documents referring or relating to red flags (as defined above) in Father Ross's behavior.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent that it requests Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, and therefore invades Ross's right of privacy. The Archdiocese also objects to the definition of "red flags" as vague, ambiguous and overly broad, in that it

encompasses conduct that is not sexual abuse (i.e., buying gifts for a child, etc.) and therefore is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant and immaterial. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

19. All correspondence with third parties referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent that it requests Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, and therefore invades Ross's right of privacy. The Archdiocese also objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work



product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

20. The training file of Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request in that Plaintiff has not defined "training" and it is not clear how this request differs from the requests made for numerous other "files" relating to Ross, including requests for Ross's "personnel file," "employment file," "restricted access file," and "archive file" in Request Nos. 4 through 7 above. The Archdiocese further objects on the ground that, to the extent it requests information in Ross's personnel file, it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

21. All of Father Ross's requests for Holy Orders.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time

to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects on the ground that, to the extent it requests information in Ross's personnel file, it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

22. All documents conferring faculties to minister upon Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects on the ground that, to the extent it requests information in Ross's personnel file, it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

23. All assignment and transfer letters referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects on the ground that, to the extent it requests information in Ross's personnel file, it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

24. All correspondence between Father Ross and any agent, representative or employee of the Archdiocese.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, including personnel records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent it requests Ross's personnel records. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant,



immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

25. All files created, generated, or maintained by the Office of Ministry to Priests referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent it requests Ross's personnel records, on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

26. All secret files created, kept or maintained that refer or relate to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections of the General Objections, the Archdiocese has no knowledge of any "secret" files and did not maintain any such files. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, including for the reasons that Plaintiff has not defined the term "secret files" for purposes of this request, and the request is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit.

27. All subsecreto files created, kept or maintained that refer or relate to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections of the General Objections, the Archdiocese has no knowledge of any "subsecreto" files and did not maintain any such files. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, including for the reasons that Plaintiff

has not defined the term "subsecreto files" for purposes of this request, and this request is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit.

28. All Canon 489 files created, kept, or maintained referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese has no knowledge of any "Canon 489" files referring or relating to Ross and did not maintain any such files. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, including for the reasons that Plaintiff has not defined the term "Canon 489" for purposes of this request, and this request is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's claims in this lawsuit.

29. All "Archbishop's Eyes Only" files created, kept, or maintained that refer or relate to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese has no knowledge of any "Archbishop's Eyes Only" files and did not maintain any such files. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, including for the reasons that Plaintiff has not defined the term "Archbishop's Eyes Only" for purposes of this request, and this request is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's claims in this lawsuit.

30. All confidential files created, kept or maintained that refer or relate to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to



Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent it encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it requests Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent it requests Ross's personnel records, on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

31. Correspondence and memoranda generated by any Archbishop or Archbishop's designee referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to

this request to the extent it requests Ross's personnel records, on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

32. All documents referring or relating to complaints, claims, demands or allegations of inappropriate behavior, inappropriate comments or inappropriate touching or sexual abuse by Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent it requests information from Ross's personnel file on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese also objects to this request on the ground that "sexual abuse" is not defined and the request is not limited to sexual abuse, inappropriate behavior, etc. with minors. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client



privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

33. All investigative reports, statements or documents relating or referring to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent it encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it requests Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent it requests Ross's personnel records, on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese also objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

34. All internal memoranda and correspondence of the Archdiocese referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent that it requests Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent it requests Ross's personnel records, on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese also objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

35. Diaries and calendars referring or relating to Father Ross created or otherwise maintained by any archbishop, bishop, chancellor, vicar general, vicar for clergy, dean, director of ministry to priests, provincial minister, prior, socius, house superior, definitor, mentor, superior, guardian, or aftercare monitor.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it requests all diaries and calendars referring or relating to Ross created or maintained by the Archdiocese or any number of other persons affiliated with the



Archdiocese, regardless of date and regardless of whether the contents of any such diary or calendar have any connection to this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

36. The diaries, desk calendars, personal calendars, and other calendar of Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it requests all of Ross's diaries and calendars, regardless of date and regardless of whether the contents of any such diary or calendar have any connection to this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

37. The diaries, desk calendars, personal calendars, and other calendars of the Archbishop's priest secretaries for all dates between Jan 1, 1988 and Present.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it requests all diaries and calendars of the Archbishop's priest secretaries for a period of time spanning a quarter of a century, regardless of whether the contents of any such diary or calendar have any connection to this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

38. All documents, including deposition transcripts, pleadings and discovery responses generated in defense of other claims arising in whole or in part from the acts or conduct of Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine and the insured-insurer

privilege. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

39. All documents created or maintained by the Promoter of Justice during canonical proceeding relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

40. All transcripts or recordings of testimony given by Father Ross in any case, administrative action, canon law proceeding, grand jury proceeding, criminal action, or litigation.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the ground that it requests documents that are protected from disclosure under the First and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it calls for information equally available to Plaintiff. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

41. All grand jury findings relating to investigations of misconduct committed by any employee, affiliate, or agent of the Archdiocese.



**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, harassing, vexatious, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. Stated another way, Plaintiff has not demonstrated that any such information relating to any employee, affiliate, or agent of the Archdiocese other than Ross has any bearing on any of the issues raised in this lawsuit. Further, Plaintiff has not defined the vague and overbroad term "misconduct."

42. All documents produced by the Archdiocese in any case, administrative action, or canon law proceeding arising in whole or in part from the acts or conduct of Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected from disclosure under the First and Fourteenth Amendments. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as this request is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit.

43. All claims, charges, and complaints and records thereof, made against or to the Archdiocese, or brought to Archdiocese's attention in any form, for alleged misconduct by Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as this request is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in

this lawsuit. Further, Plaintiff has not defined the vague and overbroad term "misconduct." The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it seeks documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine and/or the insured/insurer privilege.

44. All documents referring or relating to Father Ross's interactions with or interest in children or minors.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent that it requests Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it requests every document referring or relating to Father Ross's interactions with or interest in children or minors regardless of the date, and regardless of whether any such document has any connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

45. All pleadings, interrogatory answers, and documents produced by or to the Plaintiff or his [sic] counsel in any action or proceeding arising from the acts or conduct of Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent that it calls for information equally available to Plaintiff. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it requests Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, and requests information that is irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as this request is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit.

46. All documents referring or relating to monies paid or loans made by the Archdiocese to Father Ross or paid on Father Ross's behalf for (1) medical, psychological or psychiatric treatment and/or evaluation, (2) the settlement with victims of sexual misconduct, or (3) legal expenses related to allegations of sexual misconduct.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the ground that it requests Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, and therefore invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The Archdiocese also objects to the definition of "sexual misconduct" in that it is not limited to minors.



47. All documents referring or relating to the forgiveness of loans made by the Archdiocese to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the basis that it is irrelevant, immaterial, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as this request is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit.

48. All documents referring or relating to Plaintiff, members of Plaintiff's family, or anyone purporting to act on Plaintiff's behalf.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, vague, ambiguous, irrelevant, immaterial, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

49. All correspondence between the Archdiocese and Plaintiff or anyone purporting to act on the Plaintiff's behalf.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese is not aware of any such correspondence. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, vague, ambiguous, irrelevant, immaterial, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

50. All documents referring or relating to the monitoring or supervision of Father Ross by the Archdiocese as a result of suspicions, concerns, allegations, or complaints of sexual misconduct.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time

to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent it requests information from Ross's personnel file on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese also objects to this request in that the definition of "sexual misconduct" is not limited to minors. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as it is not limited to documents which may have some connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it seeks documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, and/or the insured/insurer privilege.

51. All documents referring or relating to document retention policies, practices, and instructions of the Archdiocese in effect since 1969[.]

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the ground that it is not reasonably limited in time and scope, as it is not limited to the time period covering the allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it is overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

52. All documents referring or relating to document destruction policies, practices, and instructions of the Archdiocese in effect since 1969.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the ground that it is not reasonably limited in time and scope, as it is not limited to the time period covering the allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it is

overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

53. All documents referring or relating to the sexual abuse reporting policies, procedures, instructions, and guidelines in effect in the Archdiocese since 1969.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese states that its policy, whether oral or written, is and was to be compliant with Missouri law. The Archdiocese objects to this request because the term “sexual abuse” is undefined and as such is vague, ambiguous, overly broad and not limited to minors. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it is not reasonably limited in time and scope, as it is not limited to the time period covering the allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese also objects to this request on the ground that it is overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

54. All documents referring or relating to policies, procedures, instructions, or guidelines for investigation of a complaint or of allegations of sexual misconduct or abuse by clergy, employees or volunteers in the Archdiocese in effect since 1969.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving this objection, the Archdiocese states that its policy, whether oral or written, is and was to be compliant with Missouri law. The Archdiocese objects to this request because the term “abuse” is undefined and as such is vague, ambiguous, overly broad and not limited to minors. The Archdiocese further objects on the ground that the definition of “sexual misconduct” is not limited to minors. The Archdiocese also objects to this request on the ground that it overly broad, unduly burdensome and not reasonably limited in time and scope, as it is not limited to the time period covering the allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese also objects to this request on the ground that it is overly broad, vague,



ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

55. All documents referring or relating to Father Ross generated or maintained by the parishes where Father Ross lived, worked, or was otherwise assigned.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, including personnel records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the ground that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, and therefore invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it requests every document referring or relating to Ross regardless of the subject matter or date, and regardless of whether any such document has any connection to Plaintiff's allegations in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it seeks documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, and/or the insured/insurer privilege.

56. All documents referring or relating to payments made to third parties on Father Ross's behalf for expenses relating to mental health evaluation or treatment.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent that it requests Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under the

Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

57. All Archdiocesan Directories published between 1969 and 2002.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, harassing, vexatious, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, in particular because Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

58. All parish bulletins referring to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, harassing, vexatious, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, in particular because Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

59. All parish directories referring to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, harassing, vexatious, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, in particular because Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the ground that any

information requested for dates before or after Plaintiff's alleged abuse is irrelevant to Plaintiff's claims in this action.

60. All documents of any parish in which Father Ross was assigned that identify persons living in the parish rectory or residence during the period in which Father Ross was assigned to the parish.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the ground that any information requested for dates before or after Plaintiff's alleged abuse is irrelevant to Plaintiff's claims in this action.

61. All documents of any parish in which Father Ross was assigned that identify persons performing work or services in the parish during the period in which Father Ross was assigned to the parish, including clergy, employees, and volunteers.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the ground that any information requested for dates before or after Plaintiff's alleged abuse is irrelevant to Plaintiff's claims in this action.

62. All documents referring or relating to canonical investigations of Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information responsive to this request, if any, including personnel records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross



which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy.

63. All documents referring or relating to suspicions, allegations, or complaints that Father Ross violated Canon law, including, but not limited to Canons 1395.2 and 1387.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information responsive to this request, if any, including personnel records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy.

64. All documents referring or relating to suspicions, allegations, or complaints that Father Ross violated the Sixth Commandment of the Decalogue.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

65. All documents relating or referring to the excommunication of Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information responsive to this request, if any, including personnel records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous,



overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy.

66. All documents referring or relating to a change or request for change in the canonical status or status in ministry of Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information responsive to this request, if any, including personnel records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client



privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

67. All Judicial Vicar reports referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

68. All documents generated or maintained by members of the Priests' Personnel Board referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information responsive to this request, if any, including personnel records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese

further objects to this request to the extent that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy.

69. All personal files of any Archbishop referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese is not aware of any responsive documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it invades the privacy of individuals not parties to this lawsuit.

70. All personal files of any Vicar General(s) referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese is not aware of any responsive documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it invades the privacy of individuals not parties to this lawsuit.

71. All personal files of any Bishop referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese is not aware of any responsive documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the

discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it invades the privacy of individuals not parties to this lawsuit.

72. All personal files of any Director of Ministry to Priests referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese is not aware of any responsive documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it invades the privacy of individuals not parties to this lawsuit.

73. All personal files of any Vicar for Priests referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese is not aware of any responsive documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it invades the privacy of individuals not parties to this lawsuit.

74. All personal files of any Deacon(s) referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese is not aware of any responsive documents. The Archdiocese objects



to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it invades the privacy of individuals not parties to this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine.

75. All personal files of any chancellor referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese is not aware of any responsive documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it invades the privacy of individuals not parties to this lawsuit.

76. All Archdiocesan statutes and norms in effect between 1969 and 2002 that Father Ross was expected to follow.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, not reasonably limited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it encompasses documents which are protected under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

77. All school yearbooks for the years in which Father Ross was assigned to or otherwise provided services to a school.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, harassing, vexatious, not reasonably limited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

78. All documents referring or relating to the organizational structure of the parishes where Father Ross lived, worked, or was otherwise assigned during the period in which he was living, working, or otherwise assigned to the parish.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, not reasonably limited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

79. All reports received by the Archdiocese referring or relating to Father Ross's mental health treatment or evaluation, including, but not limited to, intake reports and aftercare supervisors' reports.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information responsive to this request, if any, including personnel and/or health records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the ground that it requests Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under

the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the ground that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file, as it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

80. All reports to the Holy See referring or relating to priests accused, suspected, or investigated for violations of Canon law between 1969 and 2002.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it encompasses documents protected from disclosure under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, vexatious, harassing, irrelevant and immaterial.

81. All Quinquennial Reports sent to the Holy See between 1969 and 2002.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it encompasses documents protected from disclosure under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, vexatious, harassing, irrelevant and immaterial.

82. All documents provided to the Holy See, including, but not limited to, the Congregation of the Clergy, Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, Congregation for the Institutes of Consecrated Life, and the Apostolic Delegation referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the ground that it encompasses documents that are protected from disclosure under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the



United States Constitution. The Archdiocese further objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, vexatious, harassing, irrelevant and immaterial.

83. All documents referring or relating to insurance claims relating to mental health treatment or evaluation of Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the insured-insurer privilege. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it requests Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent it requests Ross's personnel records, on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

84. All letters indemnifying or otherwise limiting the liability of the Archdiocese for the misconduct of Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

85. All documents received from or sent to mental health treatment providers referring or relating to Father Ross, including, but not limited to, the Evaluation Report to the Archbishop, Monthly Treatment Reports, aftercare contracts, house journals, catalogus, elenchus, ordo, and the Final Evaluation of Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the ground that it requests Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent it requests Ross's personnel records, on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

86. All correspondence with the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops relating to the sexual abuse of children.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, vexatious, harassing, irrelevant and immaterial. Plaintiff has not limited this request to documents that pertain to Ross and his alleged sexual activity with minors, but instead asks for all correspondence with the U.S. Conference of

Catholic Bishops relating to the sexual abuse of children. Plaintiff also has failed to limit this request in time or scope. Furthermore, this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence pertaining to Plaintiff's claims that she was sexually abused by Ross while a minor.

87. All correspondence with attorneys for the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, including, but not limited to, Mark Chopko, Esq. referring or relating to the sexual abuse of children.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, vexatious, harassing, irrelevant and immaterial. Plaintiff has not limited this request to documents that pertain to Ross and his alleged sexual activity with minors, but instead asks for all correspondence with attorneys for the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops referring or relating to the sexual abuse of children. Plaintiff also has failed to limit this request in time or scope. Furthermore, this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence pertaining to Plaintiff's claims that she was sexually abused by Ross while a minor.

88. All joint defense agreements between the Archdiocese/Archbishop and other bishops/dioceses regarding allegations of child sexual abuse by members of the Roman Catholic clergy.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine or the joint defense privilege. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, vexatious, harassing, irrelevant and immaterial. Plaintiff has not limited this request to documents that pertain to Ross and his alleged sexual activity with minors, but instead asks for all joint defense agreements between the



Archdiocese/Archbishop and other bishops/dioceses regarding allegations of child sexual abuse by any clergy members. Plaintiff also has failed to limit this request in time or scope. Furthermore, this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence pertaining to Plaintiff's claims that she was sexually abused by Ross while a minor.

89. All minutes of the Personnel Board, Senate, Board of Consultors, Definitorium, or other advising body referring or relating to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent it requests Ross's personnel records, on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

90. All personal files created or maintained by the Office of Communications relating or referring to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese is not aware of any responsive documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

91. All personal files created or maintained by the Director of the Safe Environment Program relating or referring to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese is not aware of any responsive documents. The Archdiocese objects

to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

92. All personal files created or maintained by any priest, agent, employee, or official of the Archdiocese referring or relating to Father Ross that is kept separate and apart from the main personnel file or "priest file" for Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

93. All personal files created or maintained by the Director of Victim Assistance Ministry referring or relating to allegations, suspicions, or complaints that Father Ross engaged in misconduct.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese is not aware of any responsive documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. Further, Plaintiff has not defined the vague and overbroad term "misconduct." The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request

encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine and/or the insured/insurer privilege.

94. All agendas for the Priest Personnel Board, Board of Consultors, Senate, Definitorium, or other advising body that refer or relate to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

95. All reports from the Priest Personnel Board, Board of Consultors, Senate, Definitorium, or other advising body that refer or relate to Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit.

96. All documents generated by or provided to any lay or clergy review board that refer or relate to Father Ross, or allegations, suspicions, or complaints that Father Ross engaged in misconduct.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information responsive to this request, if any, including personnel records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file on the ground that it invades the privacy of Defendant Ross.



The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, unlimited in time and scope, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Plaintiff has made no attempt to tailor her request in any way to the claims made in this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

97. All documents referring or relating to any arrest, criminal investigation or prosecution of Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information responsive to this request, if any, including personnel and/or health records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file on the ground that it invades the privacy of Defendant Ross. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unlimited in time and scope, as it requests all information regarding arrests, criminal investigations or prosecutions, regardless of date and regardless of whether such arrest, investigation or prosecution has any connection to this lawsuit. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request is vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

98. Any and all documents that the Archdiocese distributed to parishioners, law enforcement, or members of the general public that Father Ross was suspected, accused, or investigated for misconduct at any time between 1969 and the present.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The Archdiocese further objects on the ground that Plaintiff does not limit this request to the time period of the alleged events. The Archdiocese also objects on the ground that Plaintiff has not defined the vague and overbroad term "misconduct."

99. Any and all documents that the Archdiocese distributed to members of the clergy that Father Ross was suspected, accused, or investigated for misconduct at any time between 1969 and the present.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The Archdiocese further objects on the ground that Plaintiff does not limit this request to the time period of the alleged events. The Archdiocese also objects on the ground that Plaintiff has not defined the vague and overbroad term "misconduct."

100. All memoranda of understanding between the Archdiocese and law enforcement authorities, including, but not limited to, police and prosecutors.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, vexatious, harassing, irrelevant and immaterial. Plaintiff has not limited this request to documents that pertain to Ross and his alleged sexual activity with minors, but instead asks for all memoranda of understanding between the Archdiocese and law enforcement authorities. Plaintiff also has failed to limit this request in

time or scope. Furthermore, this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence pertaining to Plaintiff's claims that she was sexually abused by Ross while a minor.

101. All documents sent to or received from the Florida Conference of Catholic Bishops relating to child sexual abuse by Roman Catholic clergy.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, vexatious, harassing, irrelevant and immaterial. Plaintiff has not limited this request to documents that pertain to Ross and his alleged sexual activity with minors, but instead asks for all documents sent to or received from the Florida Conference of Catholic Bishops relating to child sexual abuse by Roman Catholic clergy. Plaintiff also has failed to limit this request in time or scope. Furthermore, this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence pertaining to Plaintiff's claims that she was sexually abused by Ross while a minor.

102. All documents sent to or received from the Holy See, including, but not limited to the office of the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, regarding Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the ground that it encompasses documents that are protected under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. The Archdiocese further objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, vexatious, harassing, irrelevant and immaterial.

103. All documents referring or relating to the termination of Father Ross from the priesthood.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information responsive to this request, if any, including personnel records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of



an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file on the ground that it invades the privacy of Defendant Ross. The Archdiocese further objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time or scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant and immaterial. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, the insured/insurer privilege and/or the protections afforded under the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

104. All documents evidencing insurance coverage for the acts of sexual abuse and negligence alleged in Plaintiff's Complaint.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese is not aware of any policies of insurance that would apply to this matter. The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent that it invades the work product privilege by calling upon the Archdiocese to draw legal conclusions. The Archdiocese also objects to this request to the extent it requests the Archdiocese to disclose information protected by the insured-insurer privilege. Furthermore, this request seeks information beyond the scope of Rule 56.01(b)(2) of the Missouri Rules of Civil Procedure and seeks information that is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

105. In the event Father Ross was transferred between Dioceses, all indemnity agreements between the Archdiocese and any other Diocese regarding Father Ross.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time or scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant and

immaterial. Furthermore, this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence pertaining to Plaintiff's claims that she was sexually abused by Ross while a minor.

106. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops *Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People* (a/k/a the "Dallas Charter") and all subsequent revisions and supplements to which the Archdiocese adheres.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Furthermore, this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence pertaining to Plaintiff's claims that she was sexually abused by Ross while a minor.

107. All copies of *De Modo Procedendi in Causis Sollicitationis*, promulgated by the Holy See on or about June 9, 1922, maintained by the Archdiocese.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Furthermore, this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence pertaining to Plaintiff's claims that she was sexually abused by Ross while a minor.

108. All copies of *Humana Persona, Declaration on Sexual Ethics*, promulgated by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in approximately 1975 and maintained by the Archdiocese.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Furthermore, this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence pertaining to Plaintiff's claims that she was sexually abused by Ross while a minor.

109. All copies of *Letter on Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons*, promulgated by the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith in approximately October, 1986 and maintained by the Archdiocese.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Furthermore, this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence pertaining to Plaintiff's claims that she was sexually abused by Ross while a minor.

110. All copies of *Restoring Trust, Vol. 1*, published and distributed by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops in approximately 1994 and maintained by the Archdiocese.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Furthermore, this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence pertaining to Plaintiff's claims that she was sexually abused by Ross while a minor.

111. All copies of *Restoring Trust, Vol. 2*, published and distributed by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops in approximately 1995 and maintained by the Archdiocese.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Furthermore, this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence pertaining to Plaintiff's claims that she was sexually abused by Ross while a minor.



112. All copies of *Restoring Trust, Vol. III*, published and distributed by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops in approximately 1996 and maintained by the Archdiocese.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Furthermore, this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence pertaining to Plaintiff's claims that she was sexually abused by Ross while a minor.

113. All copies of *Sacramentorum Sanctitatis Tutela*, promulgated by Pope John Paul II on or about April 30, 2001 and maintained by the Archdiocese.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Furthermore, this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence pertaining to Plaintiff's claims that she was sexually abused by Ross while a minor.

114. All copies of *De Delictis Gravioribus*, promulgated by the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith in approximately 2001 and maintained by the Archdiocese.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Furthermore, this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence pertaining to Plaintiff's claims that she was sexually abused by Ross while a minor.

115. All documents which reflect Plaintiff's involvement with the Defendant including, but not limited to: education records; records of involvement in youth groups; letters of recommendation by the Defendant and its representatives; documents provided by Plaintiff pursuant to applications for acceptance in any education or other program; and funds provided by the Defendant to assist Plaintiff in any

education or other program attended by him [sic] or any other documents in any file or files of the Plaintiff maintained by Defendant.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent that it calls for information equally available to Plaintiff.

116. All documents setting forth the qualifications for and the procedures necessary to qualify for employment as a priest or other clergy with the Defendant from 1969 to present.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The Archdiocese further objects on the ground that Plaintiff does not limit this request to the time period of the alleged events.

117. All documents referencing Defendant Joseph Ross's time in the St. Luke Institute.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, including health and/or personnel records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the ground that it requests Ross's personal health information that is protected against unrestricted disclosure and use under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. The Archdiocese further objects to this request to the extent that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope,



unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

118. All documents referencing inquiries made to Defendant Archdiocese about Joseph Ross, including but not limited to, inquiries by other priests regarding Ross's fitness to serve as clergy, and/or inquiries made by victims or victims' families regarding Joseph Ross' fitness to serve as clergy.

**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese will provide relevant non-privileged information relevant to Plaintiff's claims, if any, including personnel records of Ross, if any, only upon notice to counsel for Ross which allows him adequate time to object to any production of documents and upon the entry of an appropriate protective order by the Court, or, in the alternative, upon the entry of an appropriate order by the Court requiring the Archdiocese to provide responsive non-privileged documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request to the extent that it requests information contained in Ross's personnel file on the ground that it invades Ross's privacy. The Archdiocese further objects on the grounds that this request is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The Archdiocese further objects on the basis that this request encompasses documents which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, and/or the insured/insurer privilege.

119. All documents showing the relationship with and/or ownership of, St. Cronan's Church and Parish Center.

**RESPONSE:** The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

120. All documents that would aid in identifying where Father Ross currently resides.



**RESPONSE:** Subject to and without waiving the following objections or the General Objections, the Archdiocese is not aware of any such documents. The Archdiocese objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unlimited in time and scope, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, immaterial and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Dated: July 5, 2012

GREENSFELDER, HEMKER & GALE, P.C.

By   
 Edward S. Bott, Jr., #31934  
[esb@greensfelder.com](mailto:esb@greensfelder.com)  
 Bernard Huger, #21319  
[bch@greensfelder.com](mailto:bch@greensfelder.com)  
 Lucie F. Huger, #49125  
[lfh@greensfelder.com](mailto:lfh@greensfelder.com)  
 Robert L. Duckels, #52432  
[rld@greensfelder.com](mailto:rld@greensfelder.com)  
 10 S. Broadway, Suite 2000  
 St. Louis, MO 63102  
 Telephone: (314) 241-9090  
 Facsimile: (314) 241-8624

*Attorneys for the Archdiocese of St. Louis*

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing document was served on the following counsel of record, via U.S. Regular Mail, with postage prepaid, this 5 day of July, 2012:

Kenneth M. Chackes  
 M. Susan Carlson  
 Nicole Gorovsky  
 CHACKES, CARLSON & HALQUIST, LLP  
 230 South Bemiston Avenue, Suite 800  
 Clayton, Missouri 63105

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

Jeffrey R. Anderson  
 Patrick W. Noaker  
 JEFF ANDERSON & ASSOCIATES, P.A.  
 366 Jackson Street, Suite 100  
 St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

*Alcee F. Hugu*