ñε		SUPERIOR COURT OF GUAM
1	LAW OFFICE OF ANTHONY C. PEREZ	OF GUAM
2	Suite 802, DNA Building 238 Archbishop Flores Street	2017 APR -5 AM 11: 48
3	Hagåtña, Guam 96910 Telephone No. (671) 475-5055/7	CLERK OF COURT
4	Facsimile No. (671) 477-5445 E-Mail: acp@perezlawguam.com	BY:
5	Attorney for Plaintiff M.B.	
6	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF GUAM	
7	M.B.,	CIVIL CASE NO. CV 0 3 2 8 - 17
8	Plaintiff,	_ 87
9	vs.	VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
10	ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF	AND EQUITABLE RELIEF
11	AGANA, a Corporation sole, aka ARCHBISHOP OF AGANA, a Corporation	
12	sole, aka BISHOP OF GUAM, a Corporation sole and JOHN DOES 1 through 20,	**
13	Defendants.	
14	VIEDTELED COMPLAINE	
15	VERIFIED COMPLAINT	
16	Comes now Plaintiff M.B., by and through his attorney, Anthony C. Perez, and for a	
17	Verified Complaint against the above-named Defendants, hereby affirms and avers as follows:	
18	I. <u>JURISDICTION</u>	
19	1. This Court has jurisdiction under 7 G.C.A. §3105.	
20	II. PARTIES	
21		
22	,	
23	Guam. Plaintiff is an individual adult male, who brings these claims pursuant to 7 G.C.A. §11301.1	
24	as he was subjected to child sex abuse by Father Andrew Mannetta ("Father Andy") while an altar	
25	boy and parishioner of the Roman Catholic parish located at Santa Teresita Church, Mangilao,	
26 27	Guam. Plaintiff identifies himself-by a pseudonym as the allegations contained in this Verified	
28	Name: <u>faha</u>	ime: 11:59am

B-0005(2017)stb

Complaint are graphic and Plaintiff wishes to maintain his privacy and anonymity with respect to the public.

- 3. Defendant Roman Catholic Archbishop of Agana aka Archbishop of Agana aka Bishop of Guam ("Archdiocese") is, and at all times relevant was a Corporation Sole, organized and existing pursuant to the laws of the Territory of Guam, and the corporate entity under which the Archdiocese of Guam operated. At all times material hereto, Archdiocese was designated by the Roman Catholic Church ("the Church") to operate a Catholic archdiocese and/or diocese in Guam, and Archdiocese was acting by and through, had a special relationship with, and had a degree of responsibility or control over, the perpetrators, priests, employees, agents, and/or other persons described herein, including Father Andy, whose acts or omissions are alleged herein and are the subject of this Verified Complaint, and therefore, Archdiocese is liable for said acts and omissions under the doctrine of respondeat superior, vicarious liability, and ostensible agency.
- 4. Plaintiff is presently unable to ascertain the identities and capacities of Defendants JOHN DOES 1-20 and, therefore, has named said Doe Defendants fictitiously; said Doe Defendants are in some manner presently unknown to Plaintiff, responsible for the injuries and damages described herein, and/or are related to the named Defendants and are the principals, agents, representatives, subsidiaries, parent companies, employers, employees, partners, limited partners, joint venturers, insurers, and/or independent contractors of the named Defendant, and/or had duties of reasonable care to Plaintiff and the breach of one or more of the foregoing duties caused the injuries and damages described herein. Plaintiff will name said Doe Defendants when their identities and capacities are determined.

## III. MATERIAL FACTS

5. Between and inclusive of the years 1986 and 1987, when Plaintiff was 13 years of age, Plaintiff was a parishioner and served as an altar boy at Santa Teresita Church, in Mangilao,

Guam. Father Andy was the parish priest at Santa Teresita Church during this time period and resided at the rectory adjacent to Santa Teresita Church.

- 6. Father Andy would often host sleep overs at the rectory with the Santa Teresita altar boys, including Plaintiff.
- 7. At these sleep overs at the rectory, Father Andy would require Plaintiff and other altar boys to only wear their underwear; would provide alcohol such as Communion Wine to Plaintiff and the other altar boys; and display R-rated sexually explicit movies.
- 8. Father Andy, during these sleep overs, would only be wearing his underwear and would command Plaintiff and the altar boys to provide him a group massage while he laid facedown, with an emphasis on his buttocks.
- 9. Father Andy took special interest in Plaintiff, constantly complimenting him saying he was special, and that God made him special.
- During a sleep over in the time-period alleged, Father Andy sexually assaulted the Plaintiff. Father Andy required that Plaintiff and the altar boys strip down to their underwear, provide them alcohol, display R-rated movies, and command them to group massage him while Father Andy was only wearing underwear. After the massage, Father Andy physically grabbed Plaintiff, and pulled him away from the other altar boys, while again telling Plaintiff how special he was. Father Andy told Plaintiff that he has a special place for him to sleep, and that Plaintiff need not sleep in the living room with the other altar boys. Having been provided alcohol earlier by Father Andy, Plaintiff was intoxicated.
- 11. Father Andy pulled Plaintiff into the bedroom of the rectory, shut the door, and continued complimenting Plaintiff about how special he was. Father Andy grabbed Plaintiff from behind in a forceful hug, and began rubbing his body all over Plaintiff's body while sniffing and running his lips and face over Plaintiff's body. Father Andy further stroked Plaintiff's penis and

inserted his fingers into Plaintiff's buttocks. Father Andy rubbed his penis into Plaintiff's backside, and commanded Plaintiff to touch Father Andy's penis. Plaintiff felt scared and was frozen during the sexual assault, and believed the abuse would never end.

12. The abuse only stopped when another altar boy began knocking at the door and calling for Father Andy. Plaintiff immediately left the sleep over and ran home to his residence, frightened and ashamed. After the sexual abuse, Plaintiff quit serving as an altar boy and attending Mass. Since the sexual abuse, Plaintiff ceased being a Catholic.

## IV. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION - NEGLIGENCE AND GROSS NEGLIGENCE

- 13. The conduct of Father Andy described herein constitutes criminal sexual assault under the Guam Code Annotated.
- 14. The Archdiocese had a special relationship and custodial relationship with Plaintiff, which relationship gave rise to a duty of care on the part of Defendants to (a) warn Plaintiff and Plaintiff's parents of the risk of harm posed by Father Andy, and (b) protect Plaintiff from the predations of Father Andy. The Archdiocese also had a duty of ordinary and/or reasonable care to Plaintiff which required the Archdiocese to prevent Father Andy from having any contact with Plaintiff, supervising Father Andy to prevent him from abusing children and altar boys, including Plaintiff, removing him from the priesthood, and/or placing him in a parish where he did not have access to children.
- 15. Father Andy has been accused of sexual abuse by other altar boys, resulting in civil settlements arising out of such abuse. Father Andy has further undergone treatment for sexual issues and alcohol abuse, and has admitted to providing alcohol to minor boys.
- 16. Although the Archdiocese knew or should have known of Father Andy's heinous and despicable conduct, the Archdiocese, and the Archdiocese's representatives, agents, and employees, failed to take any steps to warn its parishioners of the risk of harm to children, failed to

adequately supervise and/or prevent Father Andy from having contact with children, failed to offer medical treatment, psychological treatment, and/or counseling to Father Andy's victims, and failed to laicize/defrock Father Andy and expose him as a sexual predator.

- 17. The Archdiocese had a practice and pattern of harboring child abusers and protecting their identities, thereby exposing unwitting parents and their vulnerable children to further harm at the hands of said abusers. At all times material hereto, Father Andy was an agent, employee, authorized representative, and/or was under the responsibility or control of the Archdiocese, while acting under the shield and protection of his clerical agency. Rather than taking reasonable and appropriate steps to protect children, the Archdiocese engaged in a pattern and practice of protecting perpetrators, including Father Andy, including at times shuttling the perpetrators to distant and sometimes remote locations, putting children at further risk of harm. The Archdiocese exposed the perpetrator to children, including Plaintiff, to exploitation and sexual abuse.
- 18. The Archdiocese's conduct constitutes negligence, gross negligence, recklessness, and willful and wanton disregard for the rights and safety of Plaintiff.
- 19. As a legal and proximate result of the Archdiocese' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff has sustained severe and permanent injuries, and is entitled to compensation for past and future medical and psychological treatment expenses, past and future wage loss, other out-of-pocket expenses, pain and suffering, emotional distress and mental anguish, embarrassment and humiliation, the loss of future enjoyment of life, and other special and general damages allowed by law in amounts to be proven at trial.
- 20. In addition, the Archdiocese' acted with malice, oppression, and/or fraud, entitling Plaintiff to exemplary and punitive damages.

## V. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION – EQUITABLE RELIEF

- 21. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all other paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 22. Plaintiff is entitled to equitable relief from this Court, for non-monetary redress and the protection of Plaintiff and other similarly situated members of the public, as follows:
  - a. For a period of not less than ten (10) years from entry of judgment,
    the Archdiocese post on the home page of their web sites, if any, the names
    of ALL known members of the Archdiocese who are identified in this
    Complaint or are otherwise known to the Archdiocese as sexual abusers;
  - b. That the Archdiocese establish a toll-free phone number and website where anonymous abuse complaints can be made. If a report of abuse is made formally to anyone in the Archdiocese or through the toll-free number or directly reported to the Archdiocese, that the Archdiocese be required to encourage the victim to report the information to law enforcement and the Archdiocese will also report the information to law enforcement as well;
  - c. That the Archdiocese adopt a whistle blower policy concerning the method by which a report concerning abuse within the Archdiocese can be made and expressly providing that the Archdiocese will not take any retaliatory actions against persons who report such information in good faith;
  - d. That the Archbishop or Bishop on Guam will be available upon reasonable notice to have a private conference with any survivor of sexual abuse perpetrated by a priest, educational, religious or other agent of the Archdiocese;
  - e. Within thirty (30) days after entry of Judgment, the Archdiocese send letters

1	of apology to Plaintiff. Letters of apology will state that Plaintiff was not a		
2	fault for the abuse and that the Archdiocese take responsibility for the abuse		
3	and,		
4	f. Any future settlement related to sexual abuse entered into by the		
5	Archdiocese shall not contain any Confidentiality provision except at the		
6	written request of the settling abuse victim.		
7	VI. <u>REQUEST FOR RELIEF</u>		
8	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief against Defendants, jointly and severally, as		
9			
10	follows:		
11	(A) For special and general damages in amounts to be proven at trial;		
12	(B) For an award of exemplary and punitive damages in an amount to be proven		
13	at trial;		
14	(C) For costs of litigation and attorneys' fees; and,		
15	(D) For such additional and further relief deemed just and appropriate under the		
16	circumstances.		
17 18	VII. <u>DEMAND</u> FOR JURY TRIAL		
19	3		
20	Plaintiff M.B., through his counsel, ANTHONY C. PEREZ, ESQ., hereby demands a jury		
21	trial of six persons in the above-entitled action. The amount in controversy exceeds Twenty-Five		
22	Dollars.		
23	Respectfully submitted this 5/1 day of April, 2017.		
24			
25	By:		
26	ANTHONY C. PEREZ, ESQ.  Attorney for Plaintiff M.B.		
27			
28			
	M.B. v. Roman Catholic Archbishop, et al.  Civil Case No  Verified Complaint for Damages and Equitable Relief		

## VERIFICATION

M.B., declares and attests that he is the PLAINTIFF in the foregoing Verified Complaint; that he has read the Verified Complaint, and knows the contents therein to be true and correct.

I declare under penalty of perjury, this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of April, 2017, that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

By:

M.B.

M.B. v. Roman Catholic Archbishop, et al.

Page 8 of 8