

“statute of limitations” defense in this case; there have been no press reports of this case

Priest R

This is a \$100,000,000 lawsuit being brought by two of the young men who were members of *Priest R*'s “inner circle” at (name omitted) Diocesan High School; although there is no statute of limitations defense, we will certainly argue that any acts which *Priest R* may have committed were not within the “scope of his authority and duties” as an agent of the Diocese. There have been no press reports of this case.

Priest S

This \$23,000,000 lawsuit alleging sexual abuse of a late-teen-age girl more than thirty years ago. We have a statute of limitations defense. This case has been reported in the press. In addition, the attorney representing the plaintiff has been retained by *three additional complainants* and another attorney has contacted us represented a *fifth* complainant. I believe there is a high potential for further press exposure. See the “Decision Item” outlined below.

There are also descriptions of other cases some of them have been previously outlined in Part II of this report and some have not. For example, *Priest T* and *Priest U* have not been previously described. Those cases are discussed in the memo as follows:

Priest T

Based on one report of sexual abuse of a young teen-age boy about eight years ago, we interviewed *Priest T* and found reason to believe there had been other similar cases. *Priest T* was evaluated at Hartford, and we told him that he would not be reassigned unless he underwent extensive in-patient treatment. At his request, the treatment was not arranged for at Hartford, but he was sent to Villa St. John Vianney in Pennsylvania. *Priest T* has now said that he does not want to continue this treatment. There have been no press reports of this case.

Priest U

We have very positive reports that *Priest U* is doing very well. The young man who was the focus of his mother's complaint to the Diocese has now retained an attorney and is asking for financial help with counseling. The initial request is for \$50,000. We believe we can settle this matter for even less than that amount. There was oblique reference to this case in the press coverage of the *Priest Q* case.

The cases of *Priest Q* and *Priest A*, whose sexually abusive histories have been more fully described in Part II of this report, were also discussed in this memorandum. The writer explained with respect to these cases,

Priest A

While there are no specific allegations of any sexual misconduct, there have been elaborate allegations of questionable relationships. Although I felt we should have written report of a low-level evaluation of *Priest A*, the committee decided only to ask him to arrange for such an evaluation on his own. The person who brought the concerns to our attention is a very verbal, rather unstable, employee of one of our parishes. One family in that parish has hired an attorney to represent them in connection with statements she has made about them and *Priest A*, and she has hired an attorney to represent her. There have been no press reports of this case, but there may be considerable scandal being spread in the parish.

Priest Q

We have now spent nearly \$35,000 in providing treatment for the young man who lodged the complaint against *Priest Q*. He contacts us regularly, often five or six times a day, and continues to ask for (expensive) in-patient treatment. We are about to tell him that we will continue with out-patient care for six months, but will take no further responsibility for in-patient care. This case has been reported in the press.

With respect to the “Decision Item” referred to, the memorandum discloses that the following decisions had been made about *Priest S*, who five women had complained sexually abused and raped them when they were young girls.

The recent developments in the case of *Priest S* present special problems on which I will advise you, but with respect to which I need a decision from you.

Priest S denies the allegations of each of the four “new “ complainants. He goes so far as to say that he has never even heard of one of them.

If we believe *Priest S’s* denials, we should offer only limited, pastoral assistance to the complainants: e.g. out-patient treatment in one of our hospitals or in one of our Catholic Charities clinics.

If we do not believe *Priest S’s* denials, we must make a decision about how far to go in responding to these complainants’ requests for help, including whether we will continue to pay more than \$650 per day for psychiatric care of one

complainant (my offer to provide help in that case was a time-limited offer of one week of assistance; that week technically expired last Friday)

In any event, we must reconsider our decision to allow *Priest S* to continue in his assignment. That decision was based on an evaluation in which *Priest S* only grudgingly participated; that evaluation was based on the allegation of a single, isolated situation. I believe, and I urge most strongly that he now be re-evaluated by clinicians in light of the new allegations. *Priest S has asked me to tell you that he does not want to undergo any re-evaluation.* (Italics in the original document)

The Grand Jury finds that it was no coincidence that the recommendation that the assignment of *Priest S* as a parish priest be reconsidered came on the very day that a letter was received from one of the complainants attorney's indicating that “*Priest S's* resignation or dismissal is a pre-condition” for their acceptance of any legal settlement. (Grand Jury Exhibit 215)

The Grand Jury is puzzled by the exhaustive description in the memo about the change in the nature of the cases that were being reported to the Diocese. In fact, witnesses involved in the handling of these cases for the Diocese, who testified before the Grand Jury, could not recall but one or two situations they were aware of that were ongoing when the initial report came to their attention. Indeed, the Grand Jury finds that many on going cases of abuse that should have come to the attention of Diocesan officials, did not, because other priests and pastors ignored clear evidence of inappropriate conduct by brother priests with children. Moreover, in a number of cases, Diocesan officials knew or should have known of sexually abusive priests, because they were warned of their inappropriate and clearly sexual behaviors with children. The inaction of these officials placed children in danger of being sexually abused and in fact, they were. (For examples of this see *Priest D*, about whom a formal complaint was made that was ignored and *Priest A*, where the same thing happened.) The vast majority of cases reported to the Diocese have always been disclosures by adults of sexual abuse that occurred when they were children.

For the reasons articulated in Part III of this report (Child Sexual Abuse Syndrome) the Grand Jury finds that this fact is not surprising.

The Grand Jury believes that the purpose of this portion of the memo is to explain to high-ranking Diocesan officials that the potential for new lawsuits and the possibility of significant Diocesan liability resulting in large settlements is legitimate and to lay the blame for this squarely at the feet of complainants, not the Diocese or its sexually abusive priests.

The Grand Jury finds that this memo is replete with inaccuracies and attempts to minimize the conduct of the priests in question. For example, the characterization that the Diocese effectively responded to children and their parents who were in need and offered them assistance is belied by the many victims who testified before the grand jury about the insensitive manner in which they were treated by these very same Diocesan officials. Moreover, *Priest R's* case involved allegations made by seven boys involving sexual abuse, pornography, alcohol and drugs. The description of *Priest R's* actions provided in the memo is silent with respect to any of this conduct and only briefly describes two instances of touching.

In November, 1994, another memorandum was sent to high-ranking Diocesan officials regarding personnel supervision matters. (Grand Jury Exhibit 216) It too was labeled, CONFIDENTIAL, Prepared in Connection with Litigation. A number of personnel supervision matters were discussed. They are, in relevant part,

Priest I

The plaintiff and his mother both called my office in the last week. He is “unraveling” psychologically, and wants to meet with me. I have given them the message that I cannot meet with him without his attorney’s approval. He says he will dismiss his attorney.

Priest R

(Name omitted) has had contact in the last week with the family of one of the boys who had been involved with *Priest R* (but *not* one of the boys who is now suing). The (sic) continue to be angry at the “Diocese” and at me in particular...

Priest S

Priest S has been re-evaluated. That institution is recommending that he should have extended residential therapy. This kind of therapy would, once again, raise the question of his resignation or removal.

Priest T

(Name omitted) has been to see *Priest T* and may have an up-date for us on the case. We have begun to pay for counseling for the one young man we have identified.

Priest U

(Name omitted) had a rather angry letter from *Priest U* complaining that “ the Diocese has let him down” and asking when we are going to “solve” his problem. In fact we are about to settle the case for the \$50,000 initially requested (on advice of our insurance people). This is only one small part of *Priest U's* “problem” and it is the only part we can solve. The question of whether the young man will ever make trouble for him, and the more vexing question of what the young man’s mother may do, are beyond us.

Priest Q

Priest Q who is now on full retirement stipend (supplemented out of our Uninsured Perils fund for a 12-month period which will end in April, 1995, to \$2,000 per month) has now asked for an “application for disability”. I believe this is part of his inability to grasp fully what is going on. We have offered to provide him with re-training for another kind of work, but have made it plain that he will, as of next April, drop down to the retirement stipend.

New matters arising since the last report were also noted. They involved both *Priest E*, and *Priest L*, who have heretofore been described in Part II of this report.

Priest E

We have dealt with two complaints about *Priest E* thus far. A third complainant came to see me in the past week, asking for assistance with counseling. In my estimation, there is no significant danger of litigation or press reporting.

Priest L

Priest L came to see (name omitted) a few months ago because he had received phone calls from a young man who alleges *Priest L* abused him many years ago. *Priest L* paid this young man \$1700 before coming to see (name omitted). I contacted the young man, who is now living out of the country. I offered him counseling help, but he says he does not need it since his government provides the help he needs through their health plan. His brother, who lives on Long Island, has now contacted us asking for help with counseling.