

*Priest K* had been troublesome for the Diocese as a child molester and, essentially, an unassignable priest, years before the clinicians recommended in 1999 that he should be offered nothing more than a nursing home assignment. Previous evaluations had labeled his conduct predatory. Even *Priest O*, who himself admitted to the abuse of a dozen young boys, asked for *Priest K* to be removed from his assignment because of his, “manipulative”, relationships with boys. The Diocese finally removed his faculties to act as a priest in 2001. In early 2002, *Priest K* was diagnosed with clinical pedophilia.

There were no recommendations made with respect to *Priest V* because the committee ran out of time. *Priest V* was ultimately allowed to retire from active status after serious, credible allegations of child abuse against him were brought to the attention of the Diocese, within the criminal statute of limitations. The allegations were that, when *Priest V*'s victim was an altar server at age nine or ten, *Priest V* would force him to sit in a chair, would place one hand over his mouth to keep him silent and fondle his genitals over his clothing. The conduct escalated to where *Priest V* would force the young boy to lie on the floor and partially disrobe him by sliding his underpants and trousers to his knees. Thereafter, he would restrain his victim by using his own knee and hold his hand over his mouth. He would then fondle his genitals.

Three years later, *Priest V* was arrested for the sexual abuse of another boy. In a memo to high-ranking Diocesan officials about the arrest and the prior complaint, a member of the Intervention Team writes:

In January of 1999, *Priest V* was accused of having sexually molested (name omitted), an altar server.

*Priest V* vehemently denied those specific allegations and insisted that attraction to youngsters is “not part of my makeup”. While the present allegations are not direct evidence that these earlier allegations are true (to the extent they are true), the present allegations are direct evidence that *Priest V* did not tell us (or the clinicians who treated him last year) the truth about his inclinations.

This statement is disingenuous since the Diocese was aware that, at the time of the original complaint, a school principal had specifically asked *Priest V* to stay away from the school because his involvement was inappropriate. (Grand Jury Exhibit 230, p. 4). In typical fashion, this did not signal anything to the Diocese about *Priest V*.

The Intervention Team member author of this memo admits to lying about what the Diocese knew about *Priest V* to the press. He writes:

In dealing with the press in connection with the present allegations, I have responded to questions about past allegations against *Priest V* by saying that I have no knowledge of “similar allegations”.

He argues this was done exclusively to protect the confidentiality of the prior victim. Nevertheless, the writer is very concerned that his statements have angered the victim’s family to the extent they may go public.

„revelation of the (name omitted) allegations will make it seem that the Diocese has attempted to “cover up” *Priest V*’s past conduct and (name omitted) family may decide to bring a civil lawsuit against *Priest V* and the Diocese. For a variety of reasons, a suit against the Diocese in connection with the present allegations would probably fail in court, but the anticipated attendant publicity would be extremely harmful.

*Priest V* was eventually sent to prison for his crimes against children.

In the Diocese of Rockville Centre, it apparently did not matter if you were a priest or lay person; as a victim of sexual abuse committed by a priest, you were likely to be treated badly. The case of *Priest W* is instructive on this point.

*Priest W* attended the seminary and was ordained as a priest of the Diocese of Rockville Centre in 1993. Subsequent to his ordination and while serving as a priest, he sexually abused an underage parishioner. This abuse led to his arrest.