

RETURN DATE: JUNE 2, 2015

ANDREW ASPINWALL : SUPERIOR COURT  
V. : JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
OF NEW LONDON  
THE NORWICH ROMAN CATHOLIC  
DIOCESAN CORPORATION a/k/a : AT NEW LONDON  
THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF  
NORWICH, BISHOP DANIEL REILLY,  
SOCIETY OF ST. EDMUND, INC.  
a/k/a SOCIETY OF SAINT EDUMUND,  
THE SACRED HEART CHURCH  
CORPORATION a/k/a SACRED HEART  
PARISH, and CHARLES MANY : DATE: MAY 6, 2015

**COMPLAINT**

**FIRST COUNT :** (NEGLIGENCE AS TO DEFENDANTS THE NORWICH ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESAN CORPORATION a/k/a THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF NORWICH, BISHOP DANIEL REILLY, AND THE SACRED HEART CHURCH CORPORATION a/k/a SACRED HEART PARISH)

1. At all times herein, the Plaintiff, Andrew Aspinwall, was a parishioner along with his family at the Defendant, The Sacred Heart Church Corporation a/k/a Sacred Heart Parish (hereinafter referred to as "Defendant Church"), in Groton, Connecticut.

2. At all times herein, the Defendant, The Norwich Roman Catholic Diocesan

Corporation a/k/a The Roman Catholic Diocese of Norwich (hereinafter referred to as "Defendant Diocese"), a non-stock corporation, was and is incorporated in the State of Connecticut, which controls, supervises, and is responsible for the actions and conduct of its personnel within the Defendant Diocese.

3. At all times herein, the Defendant Church, a parish within the Diocese of Norwich, was and is incorporated in the State of Connecticut, and controls, supervises, and is responsible for the actions and conduct of its personnel.

4. From 1975 through 1994, the Defendant, Bishop Daniel Reilly, was Bishop and Chief Executive Officer of the Defendant Diocese, and thereby directed the activities of said corporation, had ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Roman Catholic priests in the Defendant Diocese and controlled, supervised, advised and was responsible for the actions and conduct of all clergy within said Diocese.

5. At all times herein, the Defendant, Charles Many, was an Edmundite priest who was under the supervision and control of the Defendants Diocese, Church, and Bishop Daniel Reilly after being transferred from Canada to Connecticut and assigned to said parish as an associate pastor, and held out to the general public as a servant, agent, apparent agent, or employee of the Defendants Diocese, Church, and Bishop Reilly.

6. At all times material herein, the Defendant, Charles Many, maintained a place of residence at in Groton, Connecticut.

7. At all times material herein, the Plaintiff was raised in a devout Catholic family with a strict Catholic upbringing, observing Catholic tradition, serving as an altar boy, attending Sunday Mass, and observing Catholic Holy Days of Obligation.

8. The Plaintiff's parents were devout Catholics and active members of the Defendant Church.

9. At all times material herein, the Plaintiff was himself an active member of the Defendant Church, attending mass frequently and later handpicked by the Defendant, Charles Many, to be an altar boy at said parish.

10. The Plaintiff was raised to put his faith and trust in his parish, its clergy, and the priests that served there for his moral and spiritual welfare. As a result of the facts alleged above, the Plaintiff developed a justifiable trust in the Catholic Church, including the Defendants, Diocese of Norwich, Sacred Heart Parish, Bishop Reilly, and Charles Many.

11. The Defendant, Charles Many, had superiority of knowledge, authority and influence over the Plaintiff, and there existed a special relationship of trust and confidence between the Plaintiff and the Defendant, Charles Many.

12. From on or about 1978 to 1981, the Defendant, Charles Many, initiated various forms of contact with the Plaintiff, including but not limited to, personally picking the Plaintiff to be an altar boy at Defendant Church, when the Plaintiff was approximately eleven years old, at which time the Defendant, Charles Many, began sexually abusing him on church grounds and during Mass times, finding ways to be alone with the Plaintiff, and attempting to arrange overnight trips alone with the Plaintiff.

13. At said times, while the Defendant, Charles Many, was under the supervision, employ, apparent authority, and control of the Defendants, Diocese of Norwich, Sacred Heart Parish, and Bishop Reilly, he sexually assaulted the Plaintiff on numerous occasions by hugging the Plaintiff, fondling the Plaintiff, thrusting his body and penis against the Plaintiff from behind, touching the Plaintiff's body and penis, putting his hands down the Plaintiff's pants, kissing the Plaintiff, and forcing the Plaintiff to touch his body and penis, among other acts of sexual assault.

14. At said times, the Defendant, Charles Many, invoked his pastoral authority over the Plaintiff to subject the Plaintiff to unwanted sexual encounters with him, and manipulated the Plaintiff into compliance by saying, "The quicker we can get this over with, the quicker you can go to your mom."

15. During the period of 1974 through and including 1981, the Defendants Diocese, Church, and Bishop Reilly, knew or should have known that the Defendant, Charles Many, sexually assaulted and battered young children through improper and illegal sexual conduct, including the Plaintiff.

16. The injuries and damages sustained by the Plaintiff were the result of the negligence and carelessness of said Defendants, their agents, servants and/or employees, in one or more of the following particulars, in that they:

- (a) knew or should have known in the exercise of reasonable care that the Defendant, Charles Many, was sexually abusing, sexually exploiting and sexually assaulting the Plaintiff and allowed such conduct to continue;
- (b) knew or should have known that the Defendant, Charles Many, was taking overnight trips with individual minor boys;
- (c) knew or should have known that the Defendant, Charles Many, was seeking out the company of minor boys;
- (d) knew or should have known that the Defendant, Charles Many, was seeking out one-on-one company of minor boys;
- (e) knew or should have known that the Defendant, Charles Many, was inviting and/or bringing minor boys to his room and was alone with them for extended periods of time;
- (f) failed to adequately evaluate the mental fitness of the Defendant, Charles Many, to serve in the capacity of a Catholic priest with its related responsibilities to parishioners, Catholic faithful, and others;

- (g) failed to periodically evaluate the mental fitness of the Defendant, Charles Many, to continue to serve in his capacity as a Catholic priest;
- (h) failed to adequately supervise the Defendant, Charles Many, in his interaction with and conduct toward parishioners and, in particular, minor parishioners;
- (i) failed to report to the appropriate authorities, in accordance with law, reasonable suspicions that the Defendant, Charles Many, was engaging or had engaged in child abuse;
- (j) failed to investigate the incompetence of the Defendant, Charles Many, to interact with children, when an investigation would have revealed that he was engaging in improper behavior;
- (k) failed to provide training and/or educational programs to the Defendant, Charles Many, to inform him of proper conduct toward parishioners, especially minor parishioners;
- (l) failed to report suspicious conduct of the Defendant, Charles Many, to others in authority;
- (m) failed to promulgate policies and rules proscribing priests, including the Defendant, Charles Many, from taking children into private rooms and private apartments, or taking children on trips, when they knew or should have known that, for years, priests in the Defendant Diocese, including the Defendant, Charles Many, had sexually assaulted children under such circumstances and in such places and on such occasions;
- (n) failed to immediately remove the Defendant, Charles Many, from the priesthood upon learning of the allegations of child abuse;
- (o) failed to obtain independent professional counseling for the Plaintiff when they knew, or should have recognized, that he had been sexually molested;

- (p) failed to retain independent investigators, counselors and other such professionals to determine that the Plaintiff and/or others were, in fact, molested and then take proper corrective actions and provide appropriate care to the victims including the Plaintiff;
- (q) failed to protect the children of the Catholic faithful, such as the Plaintiff, from sexual abuse, sexual exploitation and sexual assault by agents, apparent agents, servants or employees of the Defendants after inducing them to entrust their children's moral and spiritual well-being, and safety to priests.
- (r) failed to warn the Plaintiff's parents and the parents of other children within the Defendant Diocese, of the dangers associated with developing and maintaining a relationship with the Defendant, Charles Many, and of the dangers associated with allowing children to be alone with him, and of accompanying him on trips and other non-chaperoned events;
- (s) failed to develop and implement a program or policy to protect children within the Defendant Diocese, from the harm associated with pedophile priests, such as by developing information handouts, giving talks and seminars, and conducting educational events addressing the issue of improper sexual conduct by adults in general and priests in particular;
- (t) failed to establish, maintain and enforce a policy of reporting, investigating and pursuing members of its clergy engaged in sexual misconduct, including failing to develop and adhere to a policy encouraging the dissemination of information regarding sexual misconduct of priests with children, but rather adhering to a policy of failing to disseminate such information;
- (u) failed to advise parishioners dealing with priests of the dangers said priests posed to children and of the dangers associated with allowing relationships to develop between said priests and children;

- (v) failed to develop a policy of reporting sexual misconduct to the Bishop and/or other officials of the Defendants by other priests who might be aware of misconduct or suspicious behavior of a priest with a child;
- (w) failed to police activities of priests and in particular, the Defendant, Charles Many, upon premises it owned and controlled, including failing to provide or enforce a prohibition on clergy having children in bedrooms or private residences and on non-chaperoned trips;
- (x) failed to take any remedial actions, when the Defendants, their agents, servants and/or employees knew or, in the exercise of reasonable care, should have known of the improper conduct of the Defendant, Charles Many;
- (y) failed to warn or advise the Plaintiff's parents of the threat that the Defendant, Charles Many, posed to the Plaintiff and other children, or otherwise to safeguard the Plaintiff and others from continuing harm when the Defendants, their agents, servants and/or employees knew or, in the exercise of reasonable care should have known, of the improper conduct of the Defendant, Charles Many, including complaints of sexual assault upon a minor;
- (z) failed to inform other parishes, dioceses and parishioners in Connecticut of the Defendant, Charles Many's predisposition to engage in improper conduct with boys;
- (aa) allowed the Defendant, Charles Many to continue to use the Plaintiff as his sex object when the Defendants, their agents, servants and/or employees knew or, in the exercise of reasonable care should have known, of his improper conduct; and
- (bb) violated § 17a-101a et seq. of the Connecticut General Statutes by failing to report known or reasonably suspected acts of child sexual abuse committed by the Defendant, Charles Many, to the State of Connecticut Department of Children and Families, law enforcement

agencies, or any other authority existing at said times, as mandated by state statute.

17. As a result of the negligence and carelessness of the Defendants, the Plaintiff suffered and will continue in the future to suffer serious and permanent injuries, physical and mental in nature, with the latter including, but not limited to, emotional distress, anxiety, depression, low self-esteem, frustration, fear, psychological and psychiatric disorders, pain, suffering, and permanent psychological and psychiatric scarring.

18. As a further result of the negligence and carelessness of the Defendants, the Plaintiff was required to spend various sums of money for his medical care, treatment, evaluation, and medication necessitated by his injuries, and has sought and received, and continues to receive, treatment from mental health professionals including psychiatrists and psychologists and will continue to do so into the foreseeable future.

19. As a further result of the negligence and carelessness of the Defendants, the Plaintiff, who was baptized and was a devout and practicing Catholic, has suffered emotional and spiritual loss, substantially affecting his belief in his faith.

20. As a further result of the negligence and carelessness of the Defendants, the capacity of the Plaintiff to attend college, work and earn a living has been and will continue in the future to be impaired, and he has suffered and will continue in the future

to suffer lost earnings.

21. As a further result of the negligence and carelessness of the Defendants, the Plaintiff was prevented and will continue in the future to be prevented from fully performing his daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life.

**SECOND COUNT: (RECKLESS AND WANTON CONDUCT AS TO DEFENDANTS THE NORWICH ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESAN CORPORATION a/k/a THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF NORWICH, BISHOP DANIEL REILLY, AND THE SACRED HEART CHURCH CORPORATION a/k/a SACRED HEART PARISH)**

1-15. Paragraphs one (1) through fifteen (15) of the First Count are hereby incorporated and made paragraphs one (1) through fifteen (15) of this, the Second Count.

16. The injuries and damages sustained by the Plaintiff were the result of the reckless and wanton acts of the Defendant, their agents, servants and/or employees, in one or more of the following particulars, in that they:

- (a) totally disregarded complaints that the Defendant, Charles Many, was sexually exploiting minor parishioners, thus exposing many children, including the Plaintiff, to his sexually aberrant behavior;
- (b) knew that the Defendant, Charles Many, was sexually abusing, sexually exploiting and sexually assaulting the Plaintiff and allowed such conduct to continue;
- (c) refused to promulgate policies and rules proscribing the Defendant,

Charles Many, from taking children into private rooms and private areas of rectories, when they knew that, for years, he had sexually assaulted children under such circumstances and in such places and on such occasions;

- (d) refused to timely investigate other charges and allegations of sexual assault and exploitation brought against the Defendant, Charles Many, and known to officials of the Defendants, when an investigation would have revealed that he was engaging in ongoing improper behavior;
- (e) refused to protect the children of the Catholic faithful, such as the Plaintiff, from sexual abuse, sexual exploitation and sexual assault by their agents, apparent agents, servants or employees after inducing them to entrust their children's moral and spiritual well-being, and safety to priests;
- (f) did not warn the Plaintiff's parents and the parents of other children within the Defendants, Diocese of Norwich and Sacred Heart Parish, of the dangers associated with developing and maintaining a relationship with the Defendant, Charles Many, and of the dangers associated with allowing children to be alone with him, and of accompanying him on trips and other non-chaperoned events;
- (g) did not inform the dioceses in Connecticut of the Defendant, Charles Many's predisposition to engage in improper conduct with children;
- (h) refused to develop and implement a program or policy to protect children within the Defendants, Diocese of Norwich and Sacred Heart Parish, from the harm associated with pedophile priests, including the Defendant, Charles Many, such as by developing information handouts, giving talks and seminars, and conducting educational events addressing the issue of improper sexual conduct by adults in general and priests in particular;
- (i) refused to establish, maintain and enforce a policy of reporting, investigating and pursuing members of its clergy engaged in sexual misconduct, including developing and adhering to a policy encouraging the dissemination of information regarding sexual misconduct of priests

with children, but rather adhered to a policy of failing and refusing to disseminate such information;

- (j) refused to advise parishioners dealing with priests, including the Defendant, Charles Many, of the dangers posed to children and of the dangers associated with allowing relationships to develop between priests and children;
- (k) refused to develop a policy of reporting sexual misconduct to the Bishop or other officials by priests who might be aware of the misconduct of a priest with a child;
- (l) refused to properly investigate claims of sexual misconduct of priests and refused to seek out victims of sexual assault, abuse or exploitation in order to render assistance to them and to prevent or reduce further damage to victims;
- (m) refused to police activities of priests upon premises they owned and controlled, including not providing or enforcing a prohibition on clergy having children in bedrooms or private apartments and on non-chaperoned trips;
- (n) knew of the improper conduct of the Defendant, Charles Many, but refused to warn the Plaintiff or his parents or to take any remedial actions, including removing the Defendant, Charles Many, from the ministry or isolating him from children;
- (o) knew of the improper conduct of the Defendant, Charles Many, with the Plaintiff but refused to advise his parents or otherwise safeguard him from continuing harm;
- (p) knew of the Defendant, Charles Many's improper conduct, but allowed him to continue to use the Plaintiff as his sex object, while continuing to hold its priests, including the Defendant, Charles Many, out as representatives of God, and foster trust in them, and condone such improper and outrageous conduct;

- (q) were willfully blind to the conduct of priests, including the Defendant, Charles Many, by allowing them to sexually assault the Plaintiff and others over a period of years; and
- (r) violated § 17a-101a et seq. of the Connecticut General Statutes by refusing to report known or reasonably suspected acts of child sexual abuse committed by Defendant Many to the State of Connecticut Department of Children and Families, law enforcement agencies, or any other authority existing at said times, as mandated by state statute.

17. As a result of the reckless and wanton conduct of the Defendants, the Plaintiff suffered and will continue in the future to suffer serious and permanent injuries, physical and mental in nature, with the latter including, but not limited to, emotional distress, anxiety, depression, low self- esteem, frustration, fear, psychological and psychiatric disorders, pain, suffering, and permanent psychological and psychiatric scarring and damages.

18. As a further result of the reckless and wanton conduct of the Defendants, the Plaintiff was required to spend various sums of money for his medical care, treatment, evaluation, and medication necessitated by his injuries, and has sought and received, and continues to receive, treatment from mental health professionals including psychiatrists and psychologists and will continue to do so into the foreseeable future.

19. As a further result of the reckless and wanton conduct of the Defendants,

the Plaintiff, who was baptized, a devout and practicing Catholic, has suffered emotional and spiritual loss, substantially affecting his belief in his faith.

20. As a further result of the reckless and wanton conduct of the Defendants, the capacity of the Plaintiff to attend college, work, and earn a living has been and will continue in the future to be impaired, and he has suffered and will continue in the future to suffer lost earnings.

21. As a further result of the reckless and wanton conduct of the Defendants, the Plaintiff was prevented and will continue to be prevented from fully performing his daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life.

**THIRD COUNT: (BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY AND SPECIAL DUTY OF CARE OWED TO CHILDREN AS TO DEFENDANTS THE NORWICH ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESAN CORPORATION a/k/a THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF NORWICH, BISHOP DANIEL REILLY, AND THE SACRED HEART CHURCH CORPORATION a/k/a SACRED HEART PARISH)**

1-15. Paragraphs one (1) through fifteen (15) of the First Count are hereby incorporated and made paragraphs one (1) through fifteen (15) of this, the Third Count.

16. The Defendants, their agents, servants and/or employees, including the Defendant, Charles Many, had a fiduciary relationship with the Plaintiff and, therefore, owed him a fiduciary duty.

17. The fiduciary duty of the Defendants included the obligation to investigate

complaints that the Defendant, Charles Many, was sexually abusing children and/or was inappropriately attempting to have sexual relations with children, and to warn or inform parishioners of the Defendant Diocese, that the Defendant, Charles Many, was a danger to children with whom he would have contact.

18. The Plaintiff relied on that fiduciary relationship, a relationship that finds its foundation in the unique bond between the parish, the priest and parishioners. The Plaintiff, recognizing and trusting that unique bond, availed himself to the pastorship and leadership of the Defendant, Charles Many.

19. The Defendants breached their duty to the Plaintiff by engaging in the negligent and wrongful conduct described herein.

20. The Defendants further breached their fiduciary duty to the Plaintiff by failing to take any action to protect the Plaintiff from the misconduct of the Defendant, Charles Many.

21. As a result of the Defendants' breach of their fiduciary duty to the Plaintiff, he suffered and will continue in the future to suffer serious and permanent injuries, physical and mental in nature, with the latter including but not limited to emotional distress, anxiety, depression, low self-esteem, frustration, fear, disgrace, humiliation, psychological and psychiatric disorders, pain, suffering, and permanent psychological

and psychiatric scarring and damages resulting in the loss of enjoyment of life.

22. As a further result of the Defendants' breach of their fiduciary duty to the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff was required to spend various sums of money for his medical care, treatment, evaluation, and medication necessitate by his injuries, and has sought and received, and continues to receive, treatment from mental health professionals including psychiatrists and psychologists and will continue to do so into the foreseeable future.

23. As a further result of the Defendants' breach of their fiduciary duty to the Plaintiff, who was baptized and was a devout and practicing Catholic, has suffered emotional and spiritual loss, substantially affecting his belief in his faith.

24. As a further result of the Defendants' breach of their fiduciary duty to the Plaintiff, his capacity to attend college, work, and earn a living has been and continues to be impaired and he has suffered and will continue in the future to suffer lost earnings.

25. As a further result of the Defendants' breach of their fiduciary duty to the Plaintiff, he was prevented, and will continue in the future to be prevented, from fully performing his daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life.

**FOURTH COUNT: (CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT FRAUD AS TO DEFENDANTS THE NORWICH ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESAN CORPORATION a/k/a THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF NORWICH, BISHOP DANIEL REILLY, AND THE SACRED HEARTH CHURCH CORPORATION a/k/a SACRED HEART PARISH)**

1-15. Paragraphs one (1) through fifteen (15) of the First Count are hereby incorporated and made paragraphs one (1) through fifteen (15) of this, the Fourth Count.

16. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), formerly known as the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB), [hereinafter collectively referred to as the "USCCB"], is a non-stock corporation organized in the District of Columbia whose purposes are, in part, to coordinate, promote, and carry out Catholic activities in the United States, and coordinate and oversee the conduct of the business activities and personnel of the Catholic Dioceses and Archdioceses within the United States.

17. At all relevant times, the Defendant Diocese, is a separate non-stock corporation from the USCCB that actively participates and coordinates its activities with those of the USCCB on a national basis and within the Defendant Diocese.

18. From on or about 1970 to present, it has been and continues to be the policy of the USCCB to conceal allegations of child abuse made against the Catholic clergy from law enforcement authorities, governmental and social service agencies, parishioners and the public. The USCCB has encouraged the maintenance of secret archives and/or "sub-secret" files containing documents and records regarding child

sexual abuse which are then accessible only to bishops and hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church.

19. The Defendants, Diocese of Norwich, Sacred Heart, and Bishop Reilly, in his capacity a Diocesan Bishop, participated in a conspiracy with the USCCB and with other Catholic Bishops throughout the United States who are the Chief Executive Officers of other Diocesan Corporations to intentionally, recklessly and/or negligently develop and carry out a plan or scheme designed to conceal criminal conduct of Catholic priests, aid and abet the concealment of that criminal conduct, aid and abet criminal sexual conduct, fail to report criminal conduct to proper authorities, obstruct justice, obstruct criminal investigations, obstruct state and/or local law enforcement of criminal activity, evade criminal and/or civil prosecution or liability of priests, bribe or pay victims in order to keep criminal conduct secret, violate civil rights of children or families, commit fraud and/or fraudulent inducement of its parishioners in furtherance of a scheme to protect molesting priests and other clergy from criminal prosecution, to maintain or increase charitable contributions, and tuition payments, and/or to avoid public scandal in the Roman Catholic Church.

20. From 1975 through 1981 and thereafter, the Defendant, Bishop Reilly, attended and participated in numerous meetings, conferences and policy making

sessions of the USCCB in his aforesaid capacities, conferring and conspiring with other Bishops of other Catholic Diocesan Corporations and with officials of the USCCB, and implemented and carried out the aforesaid USCCB policies, plans and schemes within the Defendant Diocese.

21. During said period, the Defendant, Bishop Reilly, along with other Bishops and Cardinals, purposely and with intent defrauded the public, their parishioners, and, in particular, the Plaintiff and his parents, by withholding damaging information and material regarding a widespread problem of priests who had allegedly molested children, and carrying out the USCCB practice of moving and transferring priests and damaging information regarding priests who molest minors, despite knowing that such a practice of consciously concealing such files to gain immunity from discovery in criminal prosecution and civil litigation was improper and illegal.

22. The Defendants have conspired with the USCCB and other unnamed bishops and/or members of the clergy to intentionally, recklessly and/or negligently carry out a plan or scheme designed to conceal criminal conduct of diocese and church personnel, aid and abet the concealment of criminal conduct, aid and abet criminal sexual conduct, fail to report criminal conduct, obstruct justice, obstruct criminal investigation, obstruct state and/or local law enforcement, evade criminal and/or civil

prosecution and liability, bribe and/or pay money to victims in order to keep its criminal conduct secret, and commit fraud and/or fraudulent inducement of its parishioners in furtherance of its scheme to protect predatory personnel from criminal and civil prosecution, to maintain and increase charitable contributions and/or avoid public scandal in the Roman Catholic Church.

23. In furtherance of this scheme to defraud parishioners, including the Plaintiff, agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendants made false representations to parishioners and the general public regarding the fitness of the Defendant, Charles Many, to serve as a priest and to interact safely with children.

24. These false representations were made through Defendants' oral statements of praise of the Defendant, Charles Many's abilities as a priest, and through Defendants' conduct in assigning, authorizing and encouraging the Defendant, Charles Many, to provide counseling and spiritual guidance to children throughout the Defendant Diocese, and various other locations, including Canada and Connecticut, over the course of his religious career.

25. These false representations concerning the Defendant, Charles Many's fitness to serve were patently false and known to be false by agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendant Diocese, including the Defendant, Bishop Reilly, as said

agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendant Diocese had received complaints of inappropriate sexual behavior with minor children of many of its priests as early as the 1960s and then adopted the USCCB criminally conspiratorial policies of concealment and cover-up.

26. In accordance with this widespread cover-up, these representations concerning the Defendant, Charles Many's fitness to serve were made by agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendants with the intent of inducing parishioners, including the Plaintiff, to rely on them in order to put their trust and faith in the Defendants, and all their agents, apparent agents, servants, and/or employees, and with the intent of convincing parishioners that the Defendant, Charles Many, was not a danger to children with whom he could have contact, including the Plaintiff.

27. Minor parishioners throughout the Defendant Diocese, including the Plaintiff, relied upon these representations by putting their complete trust and faith in the Defendant, Charles Many, as a counselor and adviser who could safely interact with young children. As a result, many of them, including the Plaintiff, were significantly harmed in that they were sexually abused by the Defendant, Charles Many, while interacting with him privately.

28. In furtherance of its scheme to conspire and defraud, the Defendants, their

agents, servants and/or employees:

- (a) successfully concealed allegations of child sexual abuse made against clergy, including the Defendant, Charles Many, from law enforcement officials, governmental social service agencies, parishioners and the public, including the Plaintiff by privately addressing them by sending him to treatment and/or ignoring them by failing to investigate them and/or refusing to notify parishioners of them so that they could protect themselves and/or their children;
- (b) made false representations of fact regarding sexual abuse by the Defendant, Charles Many, and other members of the clergy to law enforcement officials, governmental social service agencies, parishioners and the public, including the Plaintiff, with the intent that hearers would rely on these false statements and the hearers did rely on these false statements to their detriment;
- (c) moved the Defendant, Charles Many, from parish to parish numerous times after allegations of sexual abuse of children had repeatedly been made against him that he continually denied without informing parishioners or the public of these allegations or the danger the Defendant, Charles Many, posed to young parishioners;
- (d) maintained confidential "sub-secret" files relating to the sexual misconduct of the Defendant, Charles Many, which were not available to parishioners or the public, including the Plaintiff;
- (e) fraudulently and consciously misled parishioners and the public, including the Plaintiff, into believing the Defendant, Charles Many, was mentally fit and qualified to be a priest, when in fact they knew or had reason to believe he was a pedophile as they had received complaints of his inappropriate sexual conduct with children; and
- (f) fraudulently expended substantial sums from charitable contributions donated by parishioners for use to benefit the Catholic community to conceal the Defendant, Charles Many's misconduct.

29. The Defendants' actions, including maintaining a *sub-secret* file, shielding the Defendant, Charles Many, from criminal prosecution, and failing to report the allegations against the him for sexually molesting minors was done as part of a national scheme to conspire, defraud, and conceal the sexual molestations of minors by employees, agents, or servants of the Catholic Church, coordinated and directed by the USCCB, which has been conducted for many years in the past and continues to the present. Such national scheme was developed, implemented, and encouraged by the USCCB with the purpose of fraudulently benefiting the Defendants and other diocesan parish corporations throughout the United States.

30. As a result of the Defendants' conspiracy to defraud, thousands of children, including the Plaintiff, were subjected to sexual abuse and deceit by Roman Catholic clergy, including the Defendant, Charles Many, over a period of at least five decades.

31. As a result of this conspiracy and this scheme to intentionally, recklessly and/or negligently carry out a plan or scheme designed to conceal criminal conduct of employees, agents, apparent agents, and servants of churches and dioceses, aid and abet the concealment of criminal conduct, aid and abet criminal sexual conduct, fail to report criminal conduct, obstruct justice, obstruct criminal investigation, obstruct state

and/or local law enforcement, evade criminal and/or civil prosecution and liability, bribe and/or pay money to victims in order to keep its criminal conduct secret, and commit fraud and/or fraudulent inducement of its students, parishioners and the public carried out by the Defendants, the USCCB, and other unnamed bishops and/or members of the clergy, the Plaintiff has suffered and will continue in the future to suffer permanent physical and mental pain and suffering, permanent psychological trauma and stress, past and future economic losses including mental health treatment expenses, and past and future lost earnings as alleged in the First Count herein.

**FIFTH COUNT: (NEGLIGENCE AS TO THE SOCIETY OF ST. EDMUND, INC.,  
a/k/a SOCIETY OF SAINT EDMUND)**

1. At all times herein, the Plaintiff, Andrew Aspinwall, was a parishioner along with his family at the Defendant, Sacred Heart Church Corporation (hereinafter referred to as "Defendant Church"), in Groton, Connecticut.

2. At all times herein, the Defendant, the Society of Saint Edmund, Inc. a/k/a Society of Saint Edmund (hereinafter referred to as "Defendant Society"), was and is incorporated in the State of Vermont, and controls, supervises, and is responsible for the actions and conduct of its personnel.

3. At all times herein, the Defendant Church, was under the pastoral care of the Defendant Society.

4. At all times herein, the Defendant, Charles Many, was an Edmundite priest an agent, servant, and/or employee of the Defendant Society, under the supervision and control of said Defendant, and was transferred from Canada to Connecticut and assigned to Defendant Church, as an associate pastor.

5. At all times herein, the Defendant, Charles Many, maintained a place of residence at in Groton, Connecticut.

6. At all times herein, the Plaintiff was raised in a devout Catholic family with a strict Catholic upbringing, observing Catholic tradition, serving as an altar boy, attending Sunday Mass, and observing Catholic Holy Days of Obligation.

7. The Plaintiff's parents were devout Catholics and active members of the Defendant Church.

8. At all times herein, the Plaintiff was himself an active member of the Defendant Church, attending mass frequently and later handpicked by the Defendant, Charles Many, to be an altar boy at said parish.

9. The Plaintiff was raised to put his faith and trust in his parish, its clergy, and the priests that served there for his moral and spiritual welfare. As a result of the facts alleged above, the Plaintiff developed a justifiable trust in the Catholic Church, including the Defendant, Charles Many.

10. The Defendant, Charles Many, had superiority of knowledge, authority and influence over the Plaintiff, and there existed a special relationship of trust and confidence between the Plaintiff and the Defendant, Charles Many.

11. From on or about 1978 to 1981, the Defendant, Charles Many, initiated various forms of contact with the Plaintiff, including but not limited to, personally picking the Plaintiff to be an altar boy at Defendant Church, when the Plaintiff was approximately eleven years old, at which time the Defendant, Charles Many, began sexually abusing him on church grounds and during Mass times, finding ways to be alone with Plaintiff, and attempting to arrange overnight trips alone with the Plaintiff.

12. At said times, while the Defendant, Charles Many, was under the supervision, employ, and control of the Defendant Society, he sexually assaulted the Plaintiff on numerous occasions by hugging the Plaintiff, fondling the Plaintiff, thrusting his body and penis against the Plaintiff from behind, touching the Plaintiff's penis, putting his hands down the Plaintiff's pants, kissing the Plaintiff, and forcing the Plaintiff's hand to touch and rub his body and penis, among other acts of sexual assault.

13. At said times, the Defendant, Charles Many, invoked his pastoral authority over the Plaintiff to subject the Plaintiff to unwanted sexual encounters with him, and manipulated the Plaintiff into compliance by saying, "The quicker we can get this over

with, the quicker you can go to your mom.”

14. At all times herein, and before, the Defendants, Society of Saint Edmund, knew or should have known that the Defendant, Charles Many, sexually assaulted and battered young children through improper and illegal sexual conduct, including the Plaintiff.

15. The injuries and damages sustained by the Plaintiff were the result of the negligence and carelessness of said Defendant, its agents, servants and/or employees, in one or more of the following particulars, in that it:

- (a) knew or should have known in the exercise of reasonable care that the Defendant, Charles Many, was sexually abusing, sexually exploiting and sexually assaulting the Plaintiff and allowed such conduct to continue;
- (b) knew or should have known that the Defendant, Charles Many, was taking overnight trips with individual minor boys;
- (c) knew or should have known that the Defendant, Charles Many, was seeking out the company of minor boys;
- (d) knew or should have known that the Defendant, Charles Many, was seeking out one-on-one company of minor boys;
- (e) knew or should have known that the Defendant, Charles Many, was inviting and/or bringing minor boys to his room and was alone with them for extended periods of time;
- (f) failed to adequately evaluate the mental fitness of the Defendant, Charles Many, to serve in the capacity of a Catholic priest with its

- related responsibilities to parishioners, Catholic faithful, and others;
- (g) failed to periodically evaluate the mental fitness of the Defendant, Charles Many, to continue to serve in his capacity as a Catholic priest;
  - (h) failed to adequately supervise the Defendant, Charles Many, in his interaction with and conduct toward parishioners and, in particular, minor parishioners;
  - (i) failed to report to the appropriate authorities, in accordance with law, reasonable suspicions that the Defendant, Charles Many, was engaging or had engaged in child abuse;
  - (j) failed to investigate the incompetence of the Defendant, Charles Many, to interact with children, when an investigation would have revealed that he was engaging in improper behavior;
  - (k) failed to provide training and/or educational programs to the Defendant, Charles Many, to inform him of proper conduct toward parishioners, especially minor parishioners;
  - (l) failed to report suspicious conduct of the Defendant, Charles Many, to others in authority;
  - (m) failed to promulgate policies and rules proscribing priests, including the Defendant, Charles Many, from taking children into private rooms and private apartments, or taking children on trips, when they knew or should have known that, for years, priests in the Defendant Society, including the Defendant, Charles Many, had sexually assaulted and abused children under such circumstances and in such places and on such occasions;
  - (n) failed to immediately remove the Defendant, Charles Many, from the priesthood upon learning of the allegations of child abuse;
  - (o) failed to obtain independent professional counseling for the Plaintiff

when they knew, or should have recognized, that he had been sexually molested;

- (p) failed to retain independent investigators, counselors and other such professionals to determine that the Plaintiff and/or others were, in fact, molested and then take proper corrective actions and provide appropriate care to the victims including the Plaintiff;
- (q) failed to protect the children of the Catholic faithful, such as the Plaintiff, from sexual abuse, sexual exploitation and sexual assault by agents, apparent agents, servants or employees of the Defendants after inducing them to entrust their children's moral and spiritual well-being, and safety to priests.
- (r) failed to warn the Plaintiff's parents and the parents of other children within the Defendants, Diocese of Norwich, and Sacred Heart Parish, of the dangers associated with developing and maintaining a relationship with the Defendant, Charles Many, and of the dangers associated with allowing children to be alone with him, and of accompanying him on trips and other non-chaperoned events;
- (s) failed to develop and implement a program or policy to protect children within the Defendants, Diocese of Norwich, and Sacred Heart Parish, from the harm associated with pedophile priests, such as by developing information handouts, giving talks and seminars, and conducting educational events addressing the issue of improper sexual conduct by adults in general and priests in particular;
- (t) failed to establish, maintain and enforce a policy of reporting, investigating and pursuing members of its clergy engaged in sexual misconduct, including failing to develop and adhere to a policy encouraging the dissemination of information regarding sexual misconduct of priests with children, but rather adhering to a policy of failing to disseminate such information;
- (u) failed to advise parishioners dealing with priests of the dangers said

priests posed to children and of the dangers associated with allowing relationships to develop between said priests and children;

- (v) failed to develop a policy of reporting sexual misconduct to the Bishop and/or other officials of the Defendants by other priests who might be aware of misconduct or suspicious behavior of a priest with a child;
- (w) failed to police activities of priests and in particular, the Defendant, Charles Many, upon premises it owned and controlled, including failing to provide or enforce a prohibition on clergy having children in bedrooms or private residences and on non-chaperoned trips;
- (x) failed to take any remedial actions, when the Defendant, its agents, servants and/or employees knew or, in the exercise of reasonable care, should have known of the improper conduct of the Defendant, Charles Many;
- (y) failed to warn or advise the Plaintiff's parents of the threat that the Defendant, Charles Many, posed to the Plaintiff and other children, or otherwise to safeguard the Plaintiff and others from continuing harm when the Defendants, their agents, servants and/or employees knew or, in the exercise of reasonable care should have known, of the improper conduct of the Defendant, Charles Many, including complaints of sexual assault upon a minor;
- (z) failed to inform other parishes, dioceses and parishioners in Connecticut of the Defendant, Charles Many's predisposition to engage in improper conduct with boys;
- (aa) allowed the Defendant, Charles Many to continue to use the Plaintiff as his sex object when the Defendants, their agents, servants and/or employees knew or, in the exercise of reasonable care should have known, of his improper conduct; and
- (bb) violated § 17a-101a et seq. of the Connecticut General Statutes by failing to report known or reasonably suspected acts of child sexual

abuse committed by the Defendant, Charles Many, to the State of Connecticut Department of Children and Families, law enforcement agencies, or any other authority existing at said times, as mandated by state statute.

16. As a result of the negligence and carelessness of the Defendants, the Plaintiff suffered and will continue in the future to suffer serious and permanent injuries, physical and mental in nature, with the later including, but not limited to, emotional distress, anxiety, depression, low self-esteem, frustration, fear, psychological and psychiatric disorders, pain, suffering, and permanent psychological and psychiatric scarring.

17. As a further result, the Plaintiff was required to spend various sums of money for his medical care, treatment, evaluation, and medication necessitated by his injuries, and he has sought and received, and continues to receive, treatment from mental health professionals including psychiatrists and psychologists and will continue to do so into the foreseeable future.

18. As a further result, the Plaintiff, who was baptized and was a devout and practicing Catholic, has suffered emotional and spiritual loss, substantially affecting his belief in his faith.

19. As a further result, the capacity of the Plaintiff to attend college, work, and earn a living has been and will continue in the future to be impaired, and he has

suffered and will continue in the future to suffer lost earnings.

20. As a further result, the Plaintiff was prevented and will continue to be prevented from fully performing his daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life.

**SIXTH COUNT: (RECKLESS AND WANTON CONDUCT AS TO DEFENDANT SOCIETY OF ST. EDMUND, INC. a/k/a SOCIETY OF SAINT EDMUND)**

1-14. Paragraphs one (1) through fourteen (14) of the Fifth Count are hereby incorporated and made paragraphs one (1) through fourteen (14) of this, the Sixth Count.

15. The injuries and damages sustained by the Plaintiff were the result of the reckless and wanton acts of the Defendant, its agents, servants and/or employees, in one or more of the following particulars, in that it:

- (a) totally disregarded complaints that the Defendant, Charles Many, was sexually exploiting minor parishioners, thus exposing many children, including the Plaintiff, to his sexually aberrant behavior;
- (b) knew that the Defendant, Charles Many, was sexually abusing, sexually exploiting and sexually assaulting the Plaintiff and allowed such conduct to continue;
- (c) refused to promulgate policies and rules proscribing the Defendant, Charles Many, from taking children into private rooms and private areas of rectories, when it knew that, for years, he had sexually assaulted children under such circumstances and in such places and on such occasions;

- (d) refused to timely investigate other charges and allegations of sexual assault and exploitation brought against the Defendant, Charles Many, and known to officials of the Defendants, when an investigation would have revealed that he was engaging in ongoing improper behavior;
- (e) refused to protect the children of the Catholic faithful, such as the Plaintiff, from sexual abuse, sexual exploitation and sexual assault by its agents, apparent agents, servants or employees after inducing them to entrust their children's moral and spiritual well-being, and safety to priests;
- (f) did not warn the Plaintiff's parents and the parents of other children within the Defendants, Diocese of Norwich and Sacred Heart Parish, of the dangers associated with developing and maintaining a relationship with the Defendant, Charles Many, and of the dangers associated with allowing children to be alone with him, and of accompanying him on trips and other non-chaperoned events;
- (g) did not inform the dioceses in Connecticut of the Defendant, Charles Many's predisposition to engage in improper conduct with children;
- (h) refused to develop and implement a program or policy to protect children within the Defendants, Diocese of Norwich and Sacred Heart Parish, from the harm associated with pedophile priests, including the Defendant, Charles Many, such as by developing information handouts, giving talks and seminars, and conducting educational events addressing the issue of improper sexual conduct by adults in general and priests in particular;
- (i) refused to establish, maintain and enforce a policy of reporting, investigating and pursuing members of its clergy engaged in sexual misconduct, including developing and adhering to a policy encouraging the dissemination of information regarding sexual misconduct of priests with children, but rather adhered to a policy of failing and refusing to disseminate such information;
- (j) refused to advise parishioners dealing with priests, including the

Defendant, Charles Many, of the dangers posed to children and of the dangers associated with allowing relationships to develop between priests and children;

- (k) refused to develop a policy of reporting sexual misconduct to the Bishop or other officials by priests who might be aware of the misconduct of a priest with a child;
- (l) refused to properly investigate claims of sexual misconduct of priests and refused to seek out victims of sexual assault, abuse or exploitation in order to render assistance to them and to prevent or reduce further damage to victims;
- (m) refused to police activities of priests upon premises it owned and controlled, including not providing or enforcing a prohibition on clergy having children in bedrooms or private apartments and on non-chaperoned trips;
- (n) knew of the improper conduct of the Defendant, Charles Many, but refused to warn the Plaintiff or his parents or to take any remedial actions, including removing the Defendant, Charles Many, from the ministry or isolating him from children;
- (o) knew of the improper conduct of the Defendant, Charles Many, with the Plaintiff but refused to advise his parents or otherwise safeguard him from continuing harm;
- (p) knew of the Defendant, Charles Many's improper conduct, but allowed him to continue to use the Plaintiff as his sex object, while continuing to hold its priests, including the Defendant, Charles Many, out as representatives of God, and foster trust in them, and condone such improper and outrageous conduct;
- (q) was willfully blind to the conduct of priests, including the Defendant, Charles Many, by allowing them to sexually assault the Plaintiff and others over a period of years; and

- (r) violated § 17a-101a et seq. of the Connecticut General Statutes by refusing to report known or reasonably suspected acts of child sexual abuse committed by Defendant Many to the State of Connecticut Department of Children and Families, law enforcement agencies, or any other authority existing at said times, as mandated by state statute.

17. As a result of the reckless and wanton conduct of the Defendant, the Plaintiff suffered and will continue in the future to suffer serious and permanent injuries, physical and mental in nature, with the latter including, but not limited to, emotional distress, anxiety, depression, low self- esteem, frustration, fear, psychological and psychiatric disorders, pain, suffering, and permanent psychological and psychiatric scarring and damages.

18. As a further result of the reckless and wanton conduct of the Defendant, the Plaintiff was required to spend various sums of money for his medical care, treatment, evaluation, and medication necessitated by his injuries, and has sought and received, and continues to receive, treatment from mental health professionals including psychiatrists and psychologists and will continue to do so into the foreseeable future.

19. As a further result of the reckless and wanton conduct of the Defendant, the Plaintiff, who was baptized, a devout and practicing Catholic, has suffered emotional and spiritual loss, substantially affecting his belief in his faith.

20. As a further result of the reckless and wanton conduct of the Defendant, the capacity of the Plaintiff to attend college, work, and earn a living has been and will continue in the future to be impaired, and he has suffered and will continue in the future to suffer lost earnings.

21. As a further result of the reckless and wanton conduct of the Defendant, the Plaintiff was prevented and will continue to be prevented from fully performing his daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life.

**SEVENTH COUNT: (BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY AS TO DEFENDANT SOCIETY OF ST. EDMUND, INC. a/k/a SOCIETY OF SAINT EDMUND)**

1-14. Paragraphs one (1) through fourteen (14) of the Fifth Count are hereby incorporated and made paragraphs one (1) through fourteen (14) of this, the Seventh Count.

15. The fiduciary duty of the Defendant included the obligation to investigate complaints that the Defendant, Charles Many, was sexually abusing children and/or was inappropriately attempting to have sexual relations with children, and to warn or inform parishioners of the Defendants, Diocese of Norwich and Sacred Heart Parish, that the Defendant, Charles Many, was a danger to children with whom he would have contact.

16. The Plaintiff relied on that fiduciary relationship, a relationship that finds its

foundation in the unique bond between the parish, the priest and parishioners. The Plaintiff, recognizing and trusting that unique bond, availed himself to the pastorship and leadership of the Defendant, Charles Many.

17. The Defendant breached its duty to the Plaintiff by engaging in the negligent and wrongful conduct described herein.

18. The Defendant further breached its fiduciary duty to the Plaintiff by failing to take any action to protect the Plaintiff from the misconduct of the Defendant, Charles Many.

19. As a result of the Defendant's breach of its fiduciary duty to the Plaintiff, he suffered and will continue in the future to suffer serious and permanent injuries, physical and mental in nature, with the latter including but not limited to emotional distress, anxiety, depression, low self-esteem, frustration, fear, disgrace, humiliation, psychological and psychiatric disorders, pain, suffering, and permanent psychological and psychiatric scarring and damages resulting in the loss of enjoyment of life.

20. As a further result of the Defendant's breach of its fiduciary duty to the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff was required to spend various sums of money for his medical care, treatment, evaluation, and medication necessitate by his injuries, and has sought and received, and continues to receive, treatment from mental health professionals including

psychiatrists and psychologists and will continue to do so into the foreseeable future.

21. As a further result of the Defendant's breach of its fiduciary duty to the Plaintiff, who was baptized and was a devout and practicing Catholic, has suffered emotional and spiritual loss, substantially affecting his belief in his faith.

22. As a further result of the Defendant's breach of its fiduciary duty to the Plaintiff, his capacity to attend college, work, and earn a living has been and continues to be impaired and he has suffered and will continue in the future to suffer lost earnings.

23. As a further result of the Defendant's breach of its fiduciary duty to the Plaintiff, he was prevented, and will continue in the future to be prevented, from fully performing his daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life.

**EIGHTH COUNT: (CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT FRAUD AS TO DEFENDANT SOCIETY OF ST. EDMUND, INC. a/k/a SOCIETY OF SAINT EDMUND)**

1-14. Paragraphs one (1) through fourteen (14) of the Fifth Count are hereby incorporated and made paragraphs one (1) through fourteen (14) of this, the Eighth Count.

15. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), formerly known as the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB), [hereinafter collectively referred to as the "USCCB"], is a non-stock corporation organized in the District of

Columbia whose purposes are, in part, to coordinate, promote, and carry out Catholic activities in the United States, and coordinate and oversee the conduct of the business activities and personnel of the Catholic Dioceses and Archdioceses within the United States.

16. The Conference of Major Superiors of Men of the United States, Inc. (CMSM) is a non-stock corporation, incorporated in the State of Maryland, whose purpose, in part, is to collaborate with the USCCB to coordinate, promote, and carry out Catholic activities in the United States, and co-ordinate and oversee the conduct of the business activities and personnel of the Religious Orders of Men in the United States.

17. At all relevant times, the Defendant Society, is a separate non-stock corporation from the USCCB and the CMSM that actively participates and coordinates with those of the USCCB and the CMSM on a national basis, with the Defendant Diocese, and within the Defendant Society.

18. From on or about 1970 to present, it has been and continues to be the policy of the USCCB and the CMSM to conceal allegations of child abuse made against the Catholic clergy from law enforcement authorities, governmental and social service agencies, parishioners and the public. The USCCB has encouraged the maintenance of secret archives and/or "sub-secret" files containing documents and records regarding

child sexual abuse which are then accessible only to bishops and hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church.

19. The Defendant Society, in their capacity as Superiors of the Edmundites, participated in a conspiracy with the USCCB, the CMSM, and with other Catholic Bishops and Superiors throughout the United States who are the Chief Executive Officers of other Diocesan Corporations, including the Defendants, Diocese of Norwich, and Bishop Reilly, and to intentionally, recklessly and/or negligently develop and carry out a plan or scheme designed to conceal criminal conduct of Catholic priests, aid and abet the concealment of that criminal conduct, aid and abet criminal sexual conduct, fail to report criminal conduct to proper authorities, obstruct justice, obstruct criminal investigations, obstruct state and/or local law enforcement of criminal activity, evade criminal and/or civil prosecution or liability of priests, bribe or pay victims in order to keep criminal conduct secret, violate civil rights of children or families, commit fraud and/or fraudulent inducement of its parishioners in furtherance of a scheme to protect molesting priests and other clergy from criminal prosecution, to maintain or increase charitable contribution, and tuition payments, and/or to avoid public scandal in the Roman Catholic Church

20. From 1975 to present, Superiors of the Edmundites have attended and

participated in numerous meetings, conferences, and policy making sessions of the USCCB and the CMSM in their aforesaid capacities, conferring and conspiring with Superiors of Religious Orders and with officials of the USCCB, and has implemented and carried out the aforesaid USCCB policies, plans and schemes within the Diocese of Norwich.

21. The Defendant Society has conspired with the USCCB, CMSM, and other unnamed bishops and/or members of the clergy to intentionally, recklessly and/or negligently carry out a plan or scheme designed to conceal criminal conduct of diocese and church personnel, aid and abet the concealment of criminal conduct, aid and abet criminal sexual conduct, fail to report criminal conduct, obstruct justice, obstruct criminal investigation, obstruct state and/or local law enforcement, evade criminal and/or civil prosecution and liability, bribe and/or pay money to victims in order to keep its criminal conduct secret, and commit fraud and/or fraudulent inducement of its parishioners in furtherance of its scheme to protect predatory personnel from criminal and civil prosecution, to maintain and increase charitable contributions and/or avoid public scandal in the Roman Catholic Church.

22. In furtherance of this scheme to defraud parishioners, including the Plaintiff, agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendants made false

representations to parishioners and the general public regarding the fitness of the Defendant, Charles Many, to serve as a priest and to interact safely with children.

23. These false representations were made through Defendants' oral statements of praise of the Defendant, Charles Many's abilities as a priest, and through Defendants' conduct in assigning, authorizing and encouraging the Defendant, Charles Many, to provide counseling and spiritual guidance to children throughout the Defendant Diocese and within Defendant Church, and various other locations, including Canada and Connecticut, over the course of his religious career.

24. These false representations concerning the Defendant, Charles Many's fitness to serve were patently false and known to be false by agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendant Society, as said agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendant had received complaints of inappropriate sexual behavior with minor children of many of its priests as early as the 1960s and then adopted the USCCB criminally conspiratorial policies of concealment and cover-up.

25. In accordance with this widespread cover-up, these representations concerning the Defendant, Charles Many's fitness to serve were made by agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendant with the intent of inducing parishioners, including the Plaintiff, to rely on them in order to put their trust and faith in the

Defendants, and all their agents, apparent agents, servants, and/or employees, and with the intent of convincing parishioners that the Defendant, Charles Many, was not a danger to children with whom he could have contact, including the Plaintiff.

26. Minor parishioners throughout the Defendant Diocese, and of the Defendant Church, including the Plaintiff, relied upon these representations by putting their complete trust and faith in the Defendant, Charles Many, as a counselor and adviser who could safely interact with young children. As a result, many of them, including the Plaintiff, were significantly harmed in that they were sexually abused by the Defendant, Charles Many, while interacting with him privately.

27. In furtherance of its scheme to conspire and defraud, the Defendant, its agents, servants, and/or employees:

- (a) successfully concealed allegations of child sexual abuse made against clergy, including the Defendant, Charles Many, from law enforcement officials, governmental social service agencies, parishioners and the public, including the Plaintiff by privately addressing them by sending him to treatment and/or ignoring them by failing to investigate them and/or refusing to notify parishioners of them so that they could protect themselves and/or their children;
- (b) made false representations of fact regarding sexual abuse by the Defendant, Charles Many, and other members of the clergy to law enforcement officials, governmental social service agencies, parishioners and the public, including the Plaintiff, with the intent that hearers would rely on these false statements and the hearers did rely on these false statements to their detriment;

- (c) moved the Defendant, Charles Many, from parish to parish numerous times after allegations of sexual abuse of children had repeatedly been made against him that he continually denied without informing parishioners or the public of these allegations or the danger the Defendant, Charles Many, posed to young parishioners;
- (d) maintained confidential "sub-secret" files relating to the sexual misconduct of the Defendant, Charles Many, which were not available to parishioners or the public, including the Plaintiff;
- (e) fraudulently and consciously misled parishioners and the public, including the Plaintiff, into believing the Defendant, Charles Many, was mentally fit and qualified to be a priest, when in fact they knew or had reason to believe he was a pedophile as they had received complaints of his inappropriate sexual conduct with children; and
- (f) fraudulently expended substantial sums from charitable contributions donated by parishioners for use to benefit the Catholic community to conceal the Defendant, Charles Many's misconduct.

28. The Defendant's actions, including maintaining a *sub-secret* file, shielding the Defendant, Charles Many, from criminal prosecution, and failing to report the allegations against the him for sexually molesting minors was done as part of a national scheme to conspire, defraud, and conceal the sexual molestations of minors by employees, agents, or servants of the Catholic Church, coordinated and directed by the USCCB, which has been conducted for many years in the past and continues to the present. Such national scheme was developed, implemented, and encouraged by the USCCB with the purpose of fraudulently benefiting the Defendants and other diocesan

parish corporations throughout the United States.

29. As a result of the Defendant's conspiracy to defraud, thousands of children, including the Plaintiff, were subjected to sexual abuse and deceit by Roman Catholic clergy, including the Defendant, Charles Many, over a period of at least five decades.

30. As a result of this conspiracy and this scheme to intentionally, recklessly and/or negligently carry out a plan or scheme designed to conceal criminal conduct of employees, agents, apparent agents, and servants of churches and dioceses, aid and abet the concealment of criminal conduct, aid and abet criminal sexual conduct, fail to report criminal conduct, obstruct justice, obstruct criminal investigation, obstruct state and/or local law enforcement, evade criminal and/or civil prosecution and liability, bribe and/or pay money to victims in order to keep its criminal conduct secret, and commit fraud and/or fraudulent inducement of its students, parishioners and the public carried out by the Defendant, the USCCB, the CMSM, and other unnamed bishops and/or members of the clergy, the Plaintiff has suffered and will continue in the future to suffer permanent physical and mental pain and suffering, permanent psychological trauma and stress, past and future economic losses including mental health treatment expenses, and past and future lost earnings as alleged in the Fifth Count herein.

**NINTH COUNT: (INTENTIONAL SEXUAL ASSAULT AND BATTERY OF A MINOR CHILD AS TO DEFENDANT CHARLES MANY)**

1. At all times herein, the Plaintiff, Andrew Aspinwall, was a parishioner along with his family at the Defendant, The Sacred Heart Church Corporation, a/k/a Sacred Heart Parish (hereinafter referred to as "Defendant Church"), in Groton, Connecticut.

2. At all times herein, the Defendant, Charles Many, was an Edmundite priest assigned to said Defendant Church, as an associate pastor.

3. At all times material herein, the Defendant, Charles Many, maintained a place of residence at in Groton, Connecticut.

4. At all times material herein, the Plaintiff was raised in a devout Catholic family with a strict Catholic upbringing, observing Catholic tradition, serving as an altar boy, attending Sunday Mass, and observing Catholic Holy Days of Obligation.

5. The Plaintiff's parents were devout Catholics and active members of the Defendant Church.

6. At all times material herein, the Plaintiff was himself an active member of the Defendant Church, attending mass frequently and later handpicked by the Defendant, Charles Many, to be an altar boy at said parish.

7. The Plaintiff was raised to put his faith and trust in his parish, its clergy,

and the priests that served there for his moral and spiritual welfare. As a result of the facts alleged above, the Plaintiff developed a justifiable trust in the Defendant, Charles Many.

8. The Defendant, Charles Many, had superiority of knowledge, authority and influence over the Plaintiff, and there existed a special relationship of trust and confidence between the Plaintiff and the Defendant.

9. From on or about 1978 to 1981, the Defendant initiated various forms of contact with the Plaintiff, including but not limited to, personally picking the Plaintiff to be an altar boy at Defendant Church, when the Plaintiff was approximately eleven years old, at which time the Defendant began sexually abusing him on church grounds and during Mass times, finding ways to be alone with Plaintiff, and attempting to arrange overnight trips alone with the Plaintiff.

10. At said times, the Defendant, Charles Many, in his capacity as a Catholic priest, sexually assaulted the Plaintiff on numerous occasions by hugging the Plaintiff, fondling the Plaintiff, thrusting his body and penis against the Plaintiff from behind, touching the Plaintiff's body and penis, putting his hands down the Plaintiff's pants, kissing the Plaintiff, and forcing the Plaintiff's hand to touch and rub the Defendant's body and penis, among other acts of sexual assault.

11. At said times, the Defendant invoked his pastoral authority over the Plaintiff to subject the Plaintiff to unwanted sexual encounters with him, and manipulated the Plaintiff into compliance by saying, "The quicker we can get this over with, the quicker you can go to your mom."

12. The injuries and losses and damages sustained by the Plaintiff were the direct and proximate result of the acts and intentions of the Defendant, in that he sexually abused, exploited, assaulted and battered the Plaintiff while the Plaintiff was a minor child, being substantially certain that such acts against a minor would result in injury.

13. As a result of the intentional sexual assault and battery by the Defendant, the Plaintiff suffered and will in the future continue to suffer serious and permanent injuries, physical and mental in nature, with the latter including but not limited to emotional distress, anxiety, depression, low self-esteem, frustration, fear, psychological and psychiatric disorders, pain, suffering, and permanent psychological and psychiatric scarring.

14. As a further result of the intentional sexual assault and battery by the Defendant, the Plaintiff was required to spend various sums of money for his medical care, treatment, evaluation, and medication necessitated by his injuries, and has sought

and received, and continues to receive, treatment from mental health professionals including psychiatrists and psychologists and will continue to do so into the foreseeable future.

15. As a further result of the intentional sexual assault and battery by the Defendant, the Plaintiff, who was baptized and was a devout and practicing Catholic, has suffered emotional and spiritual loss, substantially affecting his belief in his faith.

16. As a further result of the sexual assault and battery by the Defendant, the Plaintiff's capacity to attend college, work, and earn a living has been and will continue in the future to be impaired and he has suffered and continues to suffer lost earnings.

17. As a further result of the intentional sexual assault and battery by the Defendant, the Plaintiff was prevented and will continue in the future to be prevented from fully performing his daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life.

**WHEREFORE**, the Plaintiff claims:

1. Compensatory damages;
2. Punitive damages;
3. Exemplary damages;
4. Attorney's fees and costs; and
5. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

THE PLAINTIFF

By:   
Kelly E. Reardon  
THE REARDON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
His Attorneys

RETURN DATE: JUNE 2, 2015

ANDREW ASPINWALL : SUPERIOR COURT  
V. : JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
OF NEW LONDON  
THE NORWICH ROMAN CATHOLIC  
DIOCESAN CORPORATION a/k/a : AT NEW LONDON  
THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF  
NORWICH, BISHOP DANIEL REILLY,  
SOCIETY OF ST. EDMUND, INC.  
a/k/a SOCIETY OF SAINT EDUMUND,  
THE SACRED HEART CHURCH  
CORPORATION a/k/a SACRED HEART  
PARISH, and CHARLES MANY : DATE: MAY 6, 2015

**STATEMENT RE: AMOUNT IN DEMAND**

The amount in demand is greater than Fifteen Thousand and No/100  
(\$15,000.00) Dollars, exclusive of interest and costs, pursuant to §52-91 of the  
Connecticut General Statutes.

THE PLAINTIFF

By:   
Kelly E. Reardon  
THE REARDON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
His Attorneys