

STATE OF MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF BROWN

DISTRICT COURT
FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Case Type: Personal Injury

Doe 6 and Doe 7,

Court File No.:

Plaintiffs,

v.

SUMMONS

Diocese of New Ulm,

Defendant.

THIS SUMMONS IS DIRECTED TO DEFENDANT DIOCESE OF NEW ULM.

1. YOU ARE BEING SUED. The Plaintiffs have started a lawsuit against you. The Plaintiffs' Complaint against you is attached to this Summons. Do not throw these papers away. They are official papers that affect your rights. You must respond to this lawsuit even though it may not yet be filed with the Court and there may be no court file number on this Summons.

2. YOU MUST REPLY WITHIN 20 DAYS TO PROTECT YOUR RIGHTS. You must give or mail to the person who signed this Summons a **written response** called an Answer within 20 days of the date on which you received this Summons. You must send a copy of your Answer to the person who signed this Summons located at Jeff Anderson & Associates, P.A., 366 Jackson Street, Suite 100, St. Paul, MN 55101.

3. YOU MUST RESPOND TO EACH CLAIM. The Answer is your written response to the Plaintiffs' Complaint. In your Answer you must state whether you agree or disagree with each paragraph of the Complaint. If you believe the Plaintiffs should not be given everything asked for in the Complaint, you must say so in your Answer.

FILED 9-13-13
NO. NW
Caren Mabeck, Court Administrator
Brown County, Minnesota

SEP 13 2013

STATE OF MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF BROWN

DISTRICT COURT
FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Case Type: Personal Injury

Doe 6 and Doe 7,

Court File No.:

Plaintiffs,

v.

SUMMONS

Diocese of New Ulm,

Defendant.

THIS SUMMONS IS DIRECTED TO DEFENDANT DIOCESE OF NEW ULM.

1. YOU ARE BEING SUED. The Plaintiffs have started a lawsuit against you. The Plaintiffs' Complaint against you is attached to this Summons. Do not throw these papers away. They are official papers that affect your rights. You must respond to this lawsuit even though it may not yet be filed with the Court and there may be no court file number on this Summons.

2. YOU MUST REPLY WITHIN 20 DAYS TO PROTECT YOUR RIGHTS. You must give or mail to the person who signed this Summons a **written response** called an Answer within 20 days of the date on which you received this Summons. You must send a copy of your Answer to the person who signed this Summons located at Jeff Anderson & Associates, P.A., 366 Jackson Street, Suite 100, St. Paul, MN 55101.

3. YOU MUST RESPOND TO EACH CLAIM. The Answer is your written response to the Plaintiffs' Complaint. In your Answer you must state whether you agree or disagree with each paragraph of the Complaint. If you believe the Plaintiffs should not be given everything asked for in the Complaint, you must say so in your Answer.

SEP 13 2013


4. YOU WILL LOSE YOUR CASE IF YOU DO NOT SEND A WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE COMPLAINT TO THE PERSON WHO SIGNED THIS SUMMONS. If you do not Answer within 20 days, you will lose this case. You will not get to tell your side of the story, and the Court may decide against you and award the Plaintiffs everything asked for in the Complaint. If you do not want to contest the claims stated in the Complaint, you do not need to respond. A default judgment can then be entered against you for the relief requested in the Complaint.

5. LEGAL ASSISTANCE. You may wish to get legal help from a lawyer. If you do not have a lawyer, the Court Administrator may have information about places where you can get legal assistance. **Even if you cannot get legal help, you must still provide a written Answer to protect your rights or you may lose the case.**

6. ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION. The parties may agree to or be ordered to participate in an alternative dispute resolution process under Rule 114 of the Minnesota General Rules of Practice. You must still send your written response to the Complaint even if you expect to use alternative means of resolving this dispute.

Dated: 7-10-13

JEFF ANDERSON & ASSOCIATES, P.A.



Jeffrey R. Anderson, #2057
Michael G. Finnegan, #033649X
366 Jackson Street, Suite 100
St. Paul, MN 55101
(651) 227-9990

Michael Bryant, #218583
Bradshaw & Bryant, PLLC
1505 Division Street
Waite Park, MN 56387
(320) 259-5414
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

STATE OF MINNESOTA

COUNTY OF BROWN

DISTRICT COURT

FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Case Type: Personal Injury

Doe 6 and Doe 7,

Court File No.:

Plaintiffs,

v.

COMPLAINT

Diocese of New Ulm,

Defendant.

Plaintiffs, for their cause of action against Defendant, allege that:

PARTIES

1. Plaintiffs Doe 6 and Doe 7 are adult female residents of the State of Minnesota and at all relevant times for this Complaint resided in the State of Minnesota. The identities of Plaintiff Doe 6 and Plaintiff Doe 7 have been disclosed under separate cover to Defendant.

2. At all times material, Defendant Diocese of New Ulm (hereinafter "Diocese") was and continues to be an organization or entity, which includes, but is not limited to, civil corporations, decision making entities, officials, and employees, authorized to conduct business and conducting business in the State of Minnesota with its principal place of business at 1400 Sixth Street N., New Ulm, Minnesota. The Bishop is the top official of the Diocese and is given authority over all matters within the Diocese as a result of his position. The Diocese functions as a business by engaging in numerous revenue producing activities and soliciting money from its members in exchange for its services. The Diocese has several programs which seek out the participation of children in the Diocese's activities. The Diocese, through its officials, has control over those activities involving children. The Diocese has the power to appoint,

supervise, monitor, and fire each person working with children within the Diocese.

FACTS

3. At all times material, Father David Roney (hereinafter "Roney"), was a Roman Catholic priest employed by Defendant Diocese. At all times material, Roney remained under the direct supervision, employ and control of Defendant. Defendant placed Roney in positions where he had access to and worked with children as an integral part of his work.

4. Father Roney was employed by the Defendant Diocese from 1946 to 2003 working in various capacities with children. On information and belief, Father Roney died in 2003. He worked at the following locations:

- a. Minneapolis, MN – Basilica of St. Mary, 1946-1952
- b. St. Croix Beach, MN – St. Francis of Assisi Church, 1953-1955
- c. St. John, MN – St. John's Church, 1956-1960
- d. Walnut Grove, MN – St. Paul's Church, 1961-1963
- e. Benson, MN – St. Francis Church, 1964-1967
- f. Willmar, MN – St. Mary's Church, 1968-1979
- g. Lafayette, MN – St. Gregory the Great Church, 1980-1993
- h. New Ulm, MN – Holy Childhood Association

5. Upon information and belief, in 1970 Defendant knew or should have known that Roney had sexually molested several children.

6. Upon information and belief, in 1970 Father Francis Garvey, an agent and/or employee of the Diocese, received complaints from parents and other parishioners that Roney was sexually abusing minor children.

7. Upon information and belief, Sister Virginia McCall, the principal of St. Mary's

School, an agent and/or employee of the Diocese, also knew or should have known that Roney was sexually abusing several children.

8. Upon information and belief, Defendant promised the parents and parishioners that they would get psychological help for Roney. Defendant made these promises in order to prevent the parents from going to law enforcement authorities to report Roney's sexual abuse of children.

9. Upon information and belief, Defendant did not obtain psychological help for Roney in 1970 and made no effort to supervise him or keep him away from children. Instead, Defendant allowed Roney to continue to have unsupervised access to children.

10. The Diocese knew or should have known that Roney was a child molester and knew or should have known that Roney was a danger to children before Roney molested Plaintiffs.

11. The Diocese negligently or recklessly believed that Roney was fit to work with children and/or that any previous problems he had were fixed and cured; that Roney would not sexually molest children and that Roney would not injure children; and/or that Roney would not hurt children.

12. Defendant placed Roney at St. Mary's Parish in Willmar, Minnesota. Roney had unlimited access to children at St. Mary's. Children, including Plaintiffs, and their families were not told what Defendant knew or should have known - that Roney had sexually molested numerous children and that Roney was a danger to them.

13. Plaintiffs Doe 6 and Doe 7 were raised in a devout Roman Catholic family and they participated in activities at St. Mary's. Plaintiffs Doe 6 and Doe 7, therefore, developed

great admiration, trust, reverence and respect for the Roman Catholic Church, including Defendant and its agents.

14. By holding Roney out as safe to work with children, and by undertaking the custody, supervision of, and/or care of the minor Plaintiffs, Defendant entered into a fiduciary relationship with the minor Plaintiffs. As a result of Plaintiffs being minors, and by Defendant undertaking the care and guidance of the then vulnerable minor Plaintiffs, Defendant held a position of empowerment over Plaintiffs.

15. Further, Defendant, by holding itself out as being able to provide a safe environment for children, solicited and/or accepted this position of empowerment. This empowerment prevented the then minor Plaintiffs from effectively protecting themselves and Defendant thus entered into a fiduciary relationship with Plaintiffs.

16. Defendant had a special relationship with Plaintiffs.

17. Defendant owed Plaintiffs a duty of reasonable care because it had superior knowledge about the risk that Roney posed to Plaintiffs, the risk of abuse in general in its programs and/or the risks that its facilities posed to minor children.

18. Defendant owed Plaintiffs a duty of reasonable care because it solicited youth and parents for participation in its youth programs; encouraged youth and parents to have the youth participate in its programs; undertook custody of minor children, including Plaintiffs; promoted its facilities and programs as being safe for children; held its agents including Roney out as safe to work with children; encouraged parents and children to spend time with its agents; and/or encouraged its agents, including Roney, to spend time with, interact with, and recruit children.

19. Defendant had a duty to Plaintiffs to protect them from harm because Defendant's actions created a foreseeable risk of harm to Plaintiffs.

20. Defendant's breach of its duties include, but are not limited to: failure to have sufficient policies and procedures to prevent child sex abuse, failure to properly implement the policies and procedures to prevent child sex abuse, failure to take reasonable measures to make sure that the policies and procedures to prevent child sex abuse were working, failure to adequately inform families and children of the risks of child sex abuse, failure to investigate risks of child molestation, failure to properly train the workers at institutions and programs within each Defendant's geographical confines, failure to have any outside agency test its safety procedures, failure to protect the children in their programs from child sex abuse, failure to adhere to the applicable standard of care for child safety, failure to investigate the amount and type of information necessary to represent the institutions, programs, and leaders and people as safe, failure to train its employees properly to identify signs of child molestation by fellow employees, failure by relying upon mental health professionals, and/or failure by relying on people who claimed that they could treat child molesters.

21. Defendant failed to use ordinary care in determining whether its facilities were safe and/or to determine whether it had sufficient information to represent its facilities as safe. Defendant's failures include, but are not limited to: failure to have sufficient policies and procedures to prevent abuse at its facilities, failure to investigate risks at its facilities, failure to properly train the workers at its facilities, failure to have any outside agency test its safety procedures, failure to investigate the amount and type of information necessary to represent its facilities as safe, failure to train its employees properly to identify signs of child molestation by fellow employees, failure by relying upon mental health professionals, failure by relying upon people who claimed that they could treat child molesters.

22. Defendant Diocese also breached its duties to Plaintiffs by failing to warn them and their family of the risk that Roney posed and the risks of child sexual abuse by clerics. It also failed to warn him about any of the knowledge that Defendant had about child sex abuse.

23. Defendant Diocese also breached its duties to Plaintiffs by failing to report Roney's abuse of children to the police and law enforcement.

24. Defendant Diocese knew or should have known that some of the leaders and people working at Catholic institutions within the Diocese were not safe.

25. The Diocese knew or should have known that it did not have sufficient information about whether or not its leaders and people working at Catholic institutions within the Diocese were safe.

26. The Diocese knew or should have known that there was a risk of child sex abuse for children participating in Catholic programs and activities within the Diocese.

27. The Diocese knew or should have known that it did not have sufficient information about whether or not there was a risk of child sex abuse for children participating in Catholic programs and activities within the Diocese.

28. The Diocese knew or should have known that it had numerous agents who had sexually molested children. It knew or should have known that child molesters have a high rate of recidivism. It knew or should have known that there was a specific danger of child sex abuse for children participating in their youth programs.

29. The Diocese held its leaders and agents out as people of high morals, as possessing immense power, teaching families and children to obey these leaders and agents, teaching families and children to respect and revere these leaders and agents, soliciting youth and families to its programs, marketing to youth and families, recruiting youth and families, and

holding out the people that worked in the programs as safe.

30. Defendant was negligent and/or made representations to Plaintiffs and their family during each and every year of their minority.

31. Between approximately 1972 and 1974, when Plaintiff Doe 6 was approximately 8 to 10 years old, Roney engaged in unpermitted sexual contact with Plaintiff Doe 6.

32. From approximately 1972 to 1973, when Plaintiff Doe 7 was approximately 12 to 13 years old, Roney engaged in unpermitted sexual contact with Plaintiff Doe 7.

33. The Diocese failed to inform law enforcement authorities that Roney had sexually abused minor children. As a direct result, Roney avoided criminal investigation and prosecution and continued to abuse minors.

34. In 2003, Defendant Diocese publicly admitted that there were 12 priests who worked in the Diocese who had been accused of sexually molesting minors. The Diocese has not released those names to the public. As a result, children are at risk of being sexually molested.

35. As a direct result of the Defendant's conduct described herein, Plaintiffs have each suffered, and will continue to suffer, great pain of mind and body, severe and permanent emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, humiliation, physical, personal and psychological injuries. Plaintiffs were prevented, and will continue to be prevented, from performing their normal daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; have incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling; and, on information and belief, have and/or will incur loss of income and/or loss of earning capacity.

**COUNT I: PLAINTIFF DOE 6 v. DEFENDANT DIOCESE –
NUISANCE (COMMON LAW AND MINN. STAT. § 561.01)**

36. Plaintiff Doe 6 incorporates all consistent paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully

set forth under this count.

37. Defendant continues to conspire and engage and/or has conspired and engaged in efforts to: 1) conceal from the general public the sexual assaults committed by, the identities of, and the pedophilic/ephebophilic tendencies of, Roney and Defendant's other agents on its list of credibly accused priests; 2) attack the credibility of the victims of Defendant's agents; and/or 3) protect Defendant's agents from criminal prosecution for their sexual assaults against children.

38. The negligence and/or deception and concealment by Defendant was and is injurious to the health and/or indecent or offensive to the senses and/or an obstruction to the free use of property by the general public, including but not limited to, residents in the Diocese of New Ulm and all other members of the general public who live in communities where Defendant's credibly accused molesters live. It was and is indecent and offensive to the senses, so as to interfere with the general public's comfortable enjoyment of life in that the general public cannot trust Defendant to warn parents of the presence of the current and/or former credibly accused molesters, nor to identify their current and/or former credibly accused molesters, nor to disclose said credibly accused molesters' assignment histories, nor to disclose their patterns of conduct in grooming and sexually assaulting children, all of which create an impairment of the safety of children in the neighborhoods in Minnesota and throughout the Midwest United States where Defendant conducted, and continues to conduct, its business.

39. The negligence and/or deception and concealment by Defendant was specially injurious to Plaintiff's health as she and her family were unaware of the danger posed to young children left unsupervised with agents of Defendant, and in particular unaware of the immense danger that Roney posed to youth, and as a result of this deception, Plaintiff Doe 6 was placed in the custody and control of Roney, an agent of Defendant, who subsequently and repeatedly

sexually assaulted Plaintiff.

40. The negligence and/or deception and concealment by Defendant also was specially injurious to Plaintiff's health in that when Plaintiff Doe 6 finally discovered the negligence and/or deception and concealment of Defendant, Plaintiff experienced mental and emotional distress that Plaintiff had been the victim of the Defendant's negligence and/or deception and concealment; that Plaintiff Doe 6 had not been able to help other minors being molested because of the negligence and/or deception and concealment; and that Plaintiff Doe 6 had not been able to because of the negligence and/or deception and concealment to receive timely medical treatment needed to deal with the problems Plaintiff had suffered and continues to suffer as a result of the molestations.

41. The continuing public nuisance created by Defendant was, and continues to be, the proximate cause of the injuries and damages to the general public and of Plaintiff's special injuries and damages as alleged.

42. In doing the aforementioned acts, Defendant acted negligently and/or intentionally, maliciously and with conscious disregard for Plaintiff's rights.

43. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff Doe 6 has suffered the injuries and damages described herein.

**COUNT II: PLAINTIFF DOE 7 v. DEFENDANT DIOCESE –
NUISANCE (COMMON LAW AND MINN. STAT. § 561.01)**

44. Plaintiff Doe 7 incorporates all consistent paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth under this count.

45. Defendant continues to conspire and engage and/or has conspired and engaged in efforts to: 1) conceal from the general public the sexual assaults committed by, the identities of, and the pedophilic/ephebophilic tendencies of, Roney and Defendant's other agents on its list of

credibly accused priests; 2) attack the credibility of the victims of Defendant's agents; and/or 3) protect Defendant's agents from criminal prosecution for their sexual assaults against children.

46. The negligence and/or deception and concealment by Defendant was and is injurious to the health and/or indecent or offensive to the senses and/or an obstruction to the free use of property by the general public, including but not limited to, residents in the Diocese of New Ulm and all other members of the general public who live in communities where Defendant's credibly accused molesters live. It was and is indecent and offensive to the senses, so as to interfere with the general public's comfortable enjoyment of life in that the general public cannot trust Defendant to warn parents of the presence of the current and/or former credibly accused molesters, nor to identify their current and/or former credibly accused molesters, nor to disclose said credibly accused molesters' assignment histories, nor to disclose their patterns of conduct in grooming and sexually assaulting children, all of which create an impairment of the safety of children in the neighborhoods in Minnesota and throughout the Midwest United States where Defendant conducted, and continues to conduct, its business.

47. The negligence and/or deception and concealment by Defendant was specially injurious to Plaintiff's health as she and her family were unaware of the danger posed to young children left unsupervised with agents of Defendant, and in particular unaware of the immense danger that Roney posed to youth, and as a result of this deception, Plaintiff Doe 7 was placed in the custody and control of Roney, an agent of Defendant, who subsequently and repeatedly sexually assaulted Plaintiff.

48. The negligence and/or deception and concealment by Defendant also was specially injurious to Plaintiff's health in that when Plaintiff Doe 7 finally discovered the negligence and/or deception and concealment of Defendant, Plaintiff experienced mental and

emotional distress that Plaintiff had been the victim of the Defendant's negligence and/or deception and concealment; that Plaintiff Doe 7 had not been able to help other minors being molested because of the negligence and/or deception and concealment; and that Plaintiff Doe 7 had not been able to because of the negligence and/or deception and concealment to receive timely medical treatment needed to deal with the problems Plaintiff had suffered and continues to suffer as a result of the molestations.

49. The continuing public nuisance created by Defendant was, and continues to be, the proximate cause of the injuries and damages to the general public and of Plaintiff's special injuries and damages as alleged.

50. In doing the aforementioned acts, Defendant acted negligently and/or intentionally, maliciously and with conscious disregard for Plaintiff's rights.

51. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff Doe 7 has suffered the injuries and damages described herein.

**COUNT III: PLAINTIFF DOE 6 v. DEFENDANT DIOCESE -
NEGLIGENCE**

52. Plaintiff Doe 6 incorporates all consistent paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth under this count.

53. Defendant Diocese owed Plaintiff Doe 6 a duty of reasonable care.

54. Defendant Diocese breached the duty of reasonable care it owed Plaintiff.

55. Defendant's breach of its duty was the proximate cause of Plaintiff's injuries.

56. As a direct result of Defendant's negligent conduct, Plaintiff Doe 6 has suffered the injuries and damages described herein.

**COUNT IV: PLAINTIFF DOE 7 v. DEFENDANT DIOCESE -
NEGLIGENCE**

57. Plaintiff Doe 7 incorporates all consistent paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth under this count.

58. Defendant Diocese owed Plaintiff Doe 7 a duty of reasonable care.

59. Defendant Diocese breached the duty of reasonable care it owed Plaintiff.

60. Defendant's breach of its duty was the proximate cause of Plaintiff's injuries.

61. As a direct result of Defendant's negligent conduct, Plaintiff Doe 7 has suffered the injuries and damages described herein.

**COUNT V: PLAINTIFF DOE 6 v. DEFENDANT DIOCESE -
NEGLIGENT SUPERVISION**

62. Plaintiff Doe 6 incorporates all consistent paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth under this count.

63. At all times material, Roney was employed by Defendant Diocese and was under Defendant Diocese's direct supervision, employ and control when he committed the wrongful acts alleged herein. Roney engaged in the wrongful conduct while acting in the course and scope of his employment with Defendant Diocese and/or accomplished the sexual abuse by virtue of his job-created authority. Defendant Diocese failed to exercise ordinary care in supervising Roney in his parish assignment within the Diocese and failed to prevent the foreseeable misconduct of Roney from causing harm to others, including Plaintiff Doe 6 herein.

64. As a direct result of Defendant's negligent conduct, Plaintiff Doe 6 has suffered the injuries and damages described herein.

**COUNT VI: PLAINTIFF DOE 7 v. DEFENDANT DIOCESE -
NEGLIGENT SUPERVISION**

65. Plaintiff Doe 7 incorporates all consistent paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully

set forth under this count.

66. At all times material, Roney was employed by Defendant Diocese and was under Defendant Diocese's direct supervision, employ and control when he committed the wrongful acts alleged herein. Roney engaged in the wrongful conduct while acting in the course and scope of his employment with Defendant Diocese and/or accomplished the sexual abuse by virtue of his job-created authority. Defendant Diocese failed to exercise ordinary care in supervising Roney in his parish assignment within the Diocese and failed to prevent the foreseeable misconduct of Roney from causing harm to others, including Plaintiff Doe 7 herein.

67. As a direct result of Defendant's negligent conduct, Plaintiff Doe 7 has suffered the injuries and damages described herein.

**COUNT VII: PLAINTIFF DOE 6 v. DEFENDANT DIOCESE –
NEGLIGENT RETENTION**

68. Plaintiff Doe 6 incorporates all consistent paragraphs of this complaint as if fully set forth under this count.

69. Defendant, by and through its agents, servants and employees, became aware, or should have become aware, of problems indicating that Roney was an unfit agent with dangerous and exploitive propensities, yet Defendant failed to take any further action to remedy the problem and failed to investigate or remove Roney from working with children.

70. As a direct result of Defendant's negligent conduct, Plaintiff Doe 6 has suffered the injuries and damages described herein.

**COUNT VIII: PLAINTIFF DOE 7 v. DEFENDANT DIOCESE –
NEGLIGENT RETENTION**

71. Plaintiff Doe 7 incorporates all consistent paragraphs of this complaint as if fully set forth under this count.

72. Defendant, by and through its agents, servants and employees, became aware, or should have become aware, of problems indicating that Roney was an unfit agent with dangerous and exploitive propensities, yet Defendant failed to take any further action to remedy the problem and failed to investigate or remove Roney from working with children.

73. As a direct result of Defendant's negligent conduct, Plaintiff Doe 7 has suffered the injuries and damages described herein.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF


74. Each Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant in an amount in excess of \$50,000.00, plus costs, disbursements, reasonable attorney's fees, interest, and such other and further relief as the court deems just and equitable.

75. Each Plaintiff requests an order requiring that the Diocese publically release the names of all credibly accused child molesting priests, each such priest's history of abuse, each such priest's pattern of grooming and sexual behavior, and his last known address.

DEMAND IS HEREBY MADE FOR A TRIAL BY JURY.

Dated: 7-10-13

JEFF ANDERSON & ASSOCIATES, P.A.


By: Jeffrey R. Anderson, #2057
Michael G. Finnegan, #033649X
366 Jackson Street, Suite 100
St. Paul, MN 55101
(651) 227-9990

Michael Bryant, #218583
BRADSHAW & BRYANT, PLLC
1505 Division Street
Waite Park, MN 56387
(320) 259-5414

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The undersigned hereby acknowledges that sanctions, including costs, disbursements, and reasonable attorney fees may be awarded pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 549.211 to the party against whom the allegations in this pleading are asserted.