```
Page 1
 1
       IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 2
             IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
 3
                     UNLIMITED JURISDICTION
 4
                             ---000---
 5
     JOHN DOE, an incompetent
     person by and through his
 6
     Guardian Ad Litem, WILLIAM
 7
     B. HIRSCH,
                      Plaintiff,
 8
                                          No. CGC-06-452168
 9
                  VS.
10
     THE GREEK ORTHODOX
     METROPOLIS OF SAN FRANCISCO,
     a nonprofit corporation, FR.
11
     MICHAEL RYMER and ROES 1-10,
     inclusive,
12
13
                      Defendants.
14
15
                             ---000---
16
17
18
                          DEPOSITION OF
19
                     METROPOLITAN GERASIMOS
                             VOLUME 1
20
                   Thursday, November 1, 2007
21
22
23
2.4
     REPORTED BY: JOHN P. SQUIRES, CMR, CRP
25
                   CSR No. 2001
```

Page 100 Page 98 'rape', close quote. Do you see that? the part of the witness. It is misrepresenting the 2 Yes. 2 document. 3 MS. HARTLEY: Object to the extent it calls 3 You can answer the question. for speculation on the part of the witness. THE WITNESS: That represents Father Paul 4 4 MR. GROSS: Q. You understand that in this 5 5 Schroeder's personal opinion. 6 letter Father Schroeder concludes that, as he says in 6 MR. GROSS: Q. So your understanding is 7 point 3, "Their relationship was therefore one of 7 that that is what Father Schroeder -victimization and not a consensual sexual That's what he said. 8 8 relationship"? Is that how you understand this 9 9 MS. HARTLEY: Same objections. 10 letter? 10 MR. GROSS: Q. Let me finish the question. 11 MS. HARTLEY: Lacks foundation, calls for 11 A. speculation on the part of the witness, and O. So your understanding from reading the 12 12 misinterprets what the letter says. The question is letter is that Father Schroeder's personal opinion 13 13 also vague and ambiguous. was that the relationship between Father Rymer and 14 14 15 THE WITNESS: That is his response. That's 15 was one of victimization and not a 16 consensual sexual relationship; is that correct? his opinion. 16 MS. HARTLEY: Same objections. 17 MR. GROSS: Q. So your opinion in reading 17 the letter is that Father Schroeder concluded the 18 18 THE WITNESS: Yes. 19 relationship was one of victimization and not a 19 MS. HARTLEY: We're going to need to quit 20 consensual sexual relationship; is that correct? 20 for the day. MS. HARTLEY: Same objection. 21 21 MR. GROSS: Hold on one moment. 22 THE WITNESS: No, that is not my conclusion. 22 (Off the record) 23 Because Father Schroeder wrote it, that doesn't mean 23 MR. GROSS: May I have a few more minutes? that I am adopting it. 24 I mean if you have to go, you have to go. 24 25 MR. GROSS: Q. I understand. 25 MS. HARTLEY: Do you have a few minutes if Page 101 Page 99 But your understanding of the letter was you call Father Earl now? 1 1 2 THE WITNESS: Yeah, we can have a few more 2 that Father Schroeder concluded that the relationship 3 between Father Rymer and was one of 3 minutes, until he comes in. victimization and not a consensual sexual 4 4 (Off the record) 5 relationship; is that correct? 5 MR. GROSS: Q. I show you what has been 6 A. previously marked as Exhibit 13. It's a letter on 7 7 the letterhead of the Monastery of St. John of San MS. HARTLEY: Lacks foundation, calls for 8 speculation on the part of the witness and 8 Francisco to Archbishop Demetrios of the Greek 9 misinterprets the document. 9 Orthodox Archdiocese in New York. 10 THE WITNESS: It's not correct because, as I 10 Have you seen this letter before? 11 told you, the letter was read by me some time ago and 11 A. I did not base my decisions or my discussion with 12 12 Q. Can you read it for a moment. Father Paul on this particular letter. I don't 13 A. recall doing that. 14 14 O. Now, you understand that the Monastery of 15 MR. GROSS: Q. I'm asking you now as you 15 St. John San Francisco is where Father Rymer is 16 read the letter. 16 residing now? 17 A. Okay. 17 A. 18 Q. As you read the letter, do you understand Q. Now, Father Rymer was defrocked by the Greek from reading the letter that Father Schroeder was 19 Orthodox Church; isn't that correct? concluding that the relationship -- as is said in 20 And in this letter the Monastery of St. John 21 point 3, that the relationship between Father Rymer 21 Q. 22 was one of victimization and not a 22 of San Francisco is requesting the Archdiocese of the 23 consensual sexual relationship? 23 Greek Orthodox Church to assist so that -- and I read MS. HARTLEY: The question is vague, from the next to last paragraph -- so that Father 24 24 ambiguous, lacks foundation, calls for speculation on Rymer, quote, might retain priestly faculties to 25 25

26 (Pages 98 to 101)