

Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF ST. LOUIS COUNTY

TWENTY-FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

STATE OF MISSOURI

Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Official Court Document Official Court Document

Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

T.C., K.P., M.M., R.R., D.G., J.H., J.M., B.J.,)
G.C., D.S., A.S., G.H., T.L., H.T., J.M. 2, J.M.) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
3, M.M. 2, T.M., W.C., T.B., E.M., G.D., H.N.,)
J.K., G.D. 2, P.D., J.S.) Case No. _____

Plaintiffs

vs.

ARCHDIOCESE OF ST. LOUIS,
ARCHBISHOP MITCHELL T. ROZANSKI

Respondent

PETITION FOR DAMAGES

1. COME NOW the Plaintiffs, T.C., K.P., M.M., R.R., D.G., J.H., J.M., B.J., G.C., D.S., A.S., G.H., T.L., H.T., J.M. 2, J.M. 3, M.M. 2, T.M., W.C., T.B., E.M., G.D., H.N., J.K., G.D. 2, P.D., and J.S. (“Plaintiffs”), and for their causes of action against Defendants alleges as follows:

NATURE OF PETITION

2. Defendants Archdiocese of St. Louis (“Archdiocese”) and Archbishop Mitchell T. Rozanski in his official capacity (“Archbishop”) have knowingly enabled, covered up, and concealed that for multiple decades their employees sexually abused minors. Moreover, Defendants have covered up and concealed their own intentional misconduct in enabling this sexual abuse by exploiting the trusting and confidential relationship the Defendants encouraged and established with Plaintiffs while they were impressionable young children. This shameless cover-up spanned decades

and allowed various clergy and other employees to access and sexually abuse numerous children, including Plaintiffs, and hindered Plaintiffs from discovering their causes of action against the Defendants for their negligent and intentional conduct.

3. Plaintiffs bring this lawsuit in order to hold the Defendants responsible for the injuries Defendants have caused and to protect other children from the pain of childhood sexual abuse.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This Court has jurisdiction over the causes of action asserted herein and over the parties to this action. Plaintiffs assert claims under Missouri common law. This Court has jurisdiction because Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop are licensed to do business or transact business in Missouri and have obtained the benefits of the laws of the State of Missouri and the benefits of Missouri locations for their parishes, schools and other organizations set forth herein. All of the sexual molestation, harassment, abuse, and fraudulent activity described herein occurred in the State of Missouri.

5. Venue is proper in St. Louis County, Missouri under R.S.Mo. § 508.010, inasmuch as this is the location of Defendant Archdiocese's principal place of business and the place of first injury is located in St. Louis, Missouri.

PARTIES

6. Plaintiff T.C. is an adult resident citizen of Marshfield, Missouri.

7. Plaintiff K.P. is an adult resident citizen of Godfrey, Illinois.

8. Plaintiff M.M. is an adult resident citizen of St. Louis, Missouri.

9. Plaintiff R.R. is an adult resident citizen of Seligman, Missouri.
10. Plaintiff D.G. is an adult resident citizen of Ballwin, Missouri.
11. Plaintiff J.H. is an adult resident citizen of St. Louis, Missouri.
12. Plaintiff J.M. is an adult resident citizen of Florissant, Missouri.
13. Plaintiff B.J. is an adult resident citizen of St. Louis, Missouri.
14. Plaintiff G.C. is an adult resident citizen of Cedar Hill, Missouri.
15. Plaintiff D.S. is an adult resident citizen of Olathe, Kansas.
16. Plaintiff A.S. is an adult resident citizen of St. Louis, Missouri.
17. Plaintiff G.H. is an adult resident citizen of Kansas City, Missouri.
18. Plaintiff T.L. is an adult resident citizen of O'Fallon, Missouri.
19. Plaintiff H.T. is an adult resident citizen of Florissant, Missouri.
20. Plaintiff J.M. 2 is an adult resident citizen of St. Charles, Missouri.
21. Plaintiff J.M. 3 is an adult resident citizen of St. Louis, Missouri.
22. Plaintiff M.M. 2 is an adult resident citizen of Wentzville, Missouri.
23. Plaintiff T.M. is an adult resident citizen of Winnebago, Missouri.
24. Plaintiff W.C. is an adult resident citizen of Alton, Missouri.
25. Plaintiff T.B. is an adult resident citizen of Winfield, Missouri.
26. Plaintiff E.M. is an adult resident citizen of St. Louis, Missouri.
27. Plaintiff G.D. is an adult resident citizen of St. Louis, Missouri.
28. Plaintiff H.N. is an adult resident citizen of St. Louis, Missouri.
29. Plaintiff J.K. is an adult resident citizen of St. Louis, Missouri.

30. Plaintiff G.D. 2 is an adult resident citizen of Hazelwood, Missouri.

31. Plaintiff P.D. is an adult resident citizen of Massachusetts.

32. Plaintiff J.S. is an adult resident citizen of Missouri.

33. The Plaintiffs were minor residents of the State of Missouri at the time of the sexual abuse alleged herein.

34. Plaintiffs join their claims pursuant to Mo. R. Civ. P. 52.05 as they assert a right or rights to relief jointly, severally, or in the alternative in respect of or arising out of the same transaction, occurrence or series of transactions or occurrences and questions of law or fact common to all of them will arise in the action.

35. At all times material, Defendant Archdiocese of St. Louis (hereinafter “Archdiocese”) was and continues to be a not-for-profit corporation doing business in Missouri with its principal place of business located at 20 Archbishop May Drive, St. Louis, Missouri.

36. Defendant Archbishop Mitchell T. Rozanski is a citizen of the State of Missouri and is the Archbishop of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of St. Louis in Missouri and is sued solely in his capacity as an officer, director and / or chief executive officer of the Archdiocese of St. Louis. Given the official capacity in which he is sued, he is hereinafter referred to as “Archbishop” which term encompasses all Archbishops who officially supervised or failed to supervise the employee abusers set forth herein.

37. Archbishop was the supervisor of the abusers identified herein and at all times acted on behalf of or at the behest of the Archdiocese.

38. All of the perpetrators of sexual abuse upon Plaintiffs as set forth below at all times acted at the behest of, in the course and scope of employment of, and under the control of the Archdiocese and Archbishop.

39. For many decades, the Archdiocese has known of the sexual abuse perpetrated upon its young parishioners and children in the community by several of its employees, agents, servants, priests, reverends, brothers, nuns, teachers, chaplains, or other persons acting at the behest of, in the course and scope of employment of, and under the control of the Archdiocese and Archbishop. Defendants often transferred the perpetrators to a different location within the Archdiocese and/or the Catholic Church or sent them away for treatment before returning them to unsupervised access to children. To the extent it published anything at all about this misconduct, the Defendants often came to the defense of the perpetrators even in the face of known convictions of sexual abuse.

40. For example, Father James L. Gummersbach was ordained in 1954. Father Gummersbach was employed at St. Patrick Parish in Rolla, Immaculate Conception in Union, St. Gregory in St. Ann, Immaculate Conception in St. Louis, Annunziata in Ladue, Immaculate Conception in Park Hills, St. Rose of Lima and St. Agnes in St. Louis, and Little Flower Parish in Richmond Heights. He was also a chaplain at St. Joseph Hospital in St. Charles, St. Louis Children's Hospital and Deaconess Hospital. Father Gummersbach admitted in a 1994 lawsuit that he abused boys in several parishes over decades. Moreover, in a sworn statement, he acknowledged that from his ordination in 1954 through the 1990's that "the only known action taken by the defendant archdiocese in response to the accusations that defendant Father Gummersbach had sexual contact with minors was to transfer Father Gummersbach and instruct him to obtain personal counseling."

In 1999, a St. Louis jury awarded \$1.2 Million to a man who alleged that Father Gummersbach sexually abused him as a boy in the 1960s. Several other victims testified at the trial. While the verdict was overturned, the matter was resolved by settlement. Father Gummersbach was removed from the ministry in 1994 and laicized in 2006. The Archdiocese never told any Plaintiffs herein of its knowledge and coverup of abuse by Father Gummersbach and others.

41. Father Thomas “Tom” J. Graham was ordained in 1960. He taught at St. Thomas Aquinas High School from 1960-64 and was associate pastor at Good Shepherd Parish in Ferguson, Missouri from 1960 to 1966, St. Mary in Bridgeton, Missouri from 1966 to 1973, St. Pius V Parish in St. Louis, 1973-75, the Basilica of St. Louis, King of France (Old Cathedral) from 1975 to 1980, and a chaplain at Nazareth Living Center in 2002 when he was placed on administrative leave after criminal charges. He was a pastor at St. Alban Roe Parish in Wildwood, Missouri from 1980 to 1989 and St. Bernadette Parish in Lemay, Missouri from 1989 to 1999. Father Graham sexually abused a minor in 1970 and was sentenced to 20 years in prison. Multiple other parishioners have come forth with claims of wrongful sexual conduct against Father Graham. The Archdiocese turned a blind eye to his problematic history of sexual abuse of minors dating back as far as 1966 until 2002 when it placed him on administrative leave and canonical suspension. Nonetheless, the Archdiocese never told any Plaintiffs herein of its knowledge and coverup of abuse by Father Graham and others.

42. Father Leroy Valentine was ordained for the Archdiocese of St. Louis in 1977. Father Valentine served at several different locations including Immacolata in Richmond Heights (1977), Mary Queen of Peace in Webster Groves (1981), St. Pius X in Glasgow Village (1982), St. Gabriel the Archangel in south St. Louis (1984), Immaculate Heart of Mary in south St. Louis

(1988), St. Joseph in Farmington (1994), Sacred Heart in Elsberry (1994) and St. Thomas the Apostle in Florissant (1999). In 1995, Father Valentine was named in a lawsuit against the Archdiocese for sexual misconduct with a minor while Father Valentine was associate pastor of St. Pius X Parish in Glasgow Village in 1982, at which time he was placed on administrative leave. In 1998, the Archdiocese paid a settlement to three children who accused Father Valentine of sexual misconduct. Father Valentine was sent for treatment and transferred, but never completely removed from the ministry until 2013. Nonetheless, the Archdiocese never told any Plaintiffs herein of its knowledge and coverup of abuse by Father Valentine and others.

43. Michael S. McGrath was a St. Louis archdiocesan priest, ordained in 1975. He assisted in parishes in Florissant, Wentzville, Overland, Concord Village, Pagedale, Bridgeton, and was lead priest in Jennings. In 1993 the Archdiocese placed Father McGrath on leave and sent him for treatment for a year after the Archdiocese received an allegation of sexual misconduct but returned him to active ministry. In 1997 he was suspended again after a concerned priest reported that Father McGrath had taken a group of boys on a trip to New Orleans. The Archdiocese allowed and enabled Fr. McGrath to establish the Catholic Student Transportation Service under the auspices of the Archdiocese. He bought several buses with Church funds and used them to transport underage students across state lines to Illinois and elsewhere. He allowed them to drive and abused them while they drove. Approximately 21 lawsuits have been filed by people who alleged abuse by Father McGrath. Father McGrath was laicized in 2005. Nonetheless, the Archdiocese never told any Plaintiffs herein of its knowledge and coverup of abuse by Father McGrath and others.

44. Reverend James A. Beine was removed from ministry in 1977 as a result of allegations of sexual abuse and formally defrocked in 2005. He was convicted of possession of child pornography and sexual misconduct, and the St. Louis Circuit Attorney's office has received at least 36 complaints of child sexual abuse involving Father Beine. Upon information and belief, Father Beine moved to Illinois and changed his name to Mar James. Upon information and belief, the Archdiocese enabled him in his efforts to accept a position as a teacher, for which the Archdiocese gave a recommendation. Nonetheless, the Archdiocese never told any Plaintiffs herein of its knowledge and coverup of abuse by Father Beine and others.

45. Father Donald H. Heck abused an altar boy in 1990, and the Archdiocese of St. Louis sent him for treatment for stress and reassigned him. In 1991 he was indicted, convicted of sexual assault in 1992, and sentenced to four years imprisonment. He registered as a sex offender and died in 2015. The Archdiocese never told any Plaintiffs herein of its knowledge and coverup of abuse by Father Heck and others.

46. Father Hubert Creason was ordained in St. Louis in 1958. He served in a missionary apostolate in southern Missouri and then in 1960 was named assistant pastor of the old Ste. Louise de Marillac Parish in Jennings. In 1971 he became associate pastor of Mary, Queen of Peace Parish in Webster Groves and later became pastor of Ascension Parish in Normandy in 1978, Our Lady, Queen of Peace Parish in House Springs in 1983 and St. James in 1991. Amidst two legitimate allegations of sexual misconduct decades earlier, Father Creason resigned in 2002. The Archdiocese never told any Plaintiffs herein of its knowledge and coverup of abuse by Father Creason and others.

47. Father Kevin Hederman was ordained for the St. Louis archdiocese in 1975 and went on to serve as an assistant priest at a number of parishes. He was pastor of North American Martyrs parish and chaplain of Christian Brothers College High School in the 1990s. There, he was accused of sexually abusing a male high school student several years earlier. Reverend Hederman was subsequently sent out of the country to Belize. The Archdiocese took up collections from several of its parishes to support Father Hederman's work in Belize. In 2009 another man accused Father Hederman in a lawsuit of sexually abusing him when he was a high school student in St. Louis in the early 1990s. Father Hederman was removed from active ministry. Multiple other allegations of sexual misconduct have been lodged against Father Hederman. The Archdiocese never told any Plaintiffs herein of its knowledge and coverup of abuse by Reverend Hederman and others.

48. Father Norman Christian is believed to have abused at least twelve parishioners between 1963 and 1986. Upon information and belief, he was sent to a treatment center run by the Servants of the Paracletes, a center designed for treatment and rehabilitation of catholic priests with personal difficulties in 1986. A personnel file believed to have been maintained by the Archdiocese noted that Father Christian took a boy to his room at the rectory and molested him 10 or 11 times. The Archdiocese removed him from active ministry in 1995 after at least 8 boys came forward with allegations of abuse. He was arrested in St. Louis in 2003 on sexual abuse charges and later named in several civil suits filed in 2004 and 2005. He was buried as a priest in good standing. The Archdiocese never told any Plaintiffs herein of its knowledge and coverup of abuse by Father Christian and others. One survivor of Father Christian's sexual abuse brings suit herein.

49. Father James P. Grady was a priest at Holy Innocents Catholic Parish. He worked at various other Archdiocese locations. He was arrested in 2009 after arranging via the internet to have sex with a 16-year-old girl at a secret location. Later indictment said child pornography was found on his computer. He was placed on a leave of absence from the Archdiocese. In 2010, he pleaded guilty to charges involving child pornography and an agreement to pay for sex with a 16-year-old child. He was sentenced to more than six years imprisonment, registered as a sex offender, and was laicized. The Archdiocese never told any Plaintiffs herein of its knowledge and coverup of abuse by Father Grady and others.

50. Several other employees, agents, servants, clergy, and others acting at the behest of the Archdiocese sexually abused Plaintiffs as set forth herein. Upon information and belief, the Archdiocese knew of and covered up the sexual abuse and deviant tendencies of not only these abusers but of the Archdiocese and Archbishop as well.

51. In September 2018, the Archbishop and Archdiocese promised to publish the names of clergy who had substantiated claims of sexual abuse of minors against them. The Archbishop and Archdiocese failed to release the names until July 26, 2019, when they released a list of 66 names of Archdiocese clergy whose sexual deviance and/or abuse was substantiated.

52. In September 2019, the Missouri Attorney General (“AG”) referred 12 former clergy members for criminal prosecution as a result of sexual deviance. In its report dated September 13, 2019, the AG reported:

For decades, faced with credible reports of abuse, the church refused to acknowledge the victims and instead focused its efforts on protecting its priests. During this time, the responsibility for evaluating and responding to

reports of abuse and misconduct was controlled by a small circle of priests in diocesan leadership and the bishops.

Lay members of the church were generally not informed of reports, much less allowed a role in dealing with them. The standard response to reports of abuse by church leadership was to move an offending priest into a short-term period of treatment and then reassign him to public ministry in a new parish. Members of an offending priest's old and new parishes were not notified of the reason for a transfer in these cases. At best, victims were offered limited counseling services to help recover from the abuse.

53. Notwithstanding the Church's painfully delayed and untimely publication of substantiated abusers and the AG's exposure of the intentional conduct of the Archdiocese in causing this sexual abuse, the Archdiocese nonetheless never advised Plaintiffs, other parishioners, or community members of their intentional misconduct in enabling and ultimately perpetrating the abuse on the Plaintiffs and other children similarly situated.

BACKGROUND FACTS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

54. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference as if set forth fully herein.

55. Plaintiffs were children at the time of the events set forth in this Petition. They did not understand and could not comprehend the actions of the those who abused them. Moreover, they did not factually, nor could they legally consent to the abuse perpetrated by their abusers.

56. At all times material hereto, the abusers set forth herein (collectively "Abusers") were employees, agents, or servants of and under the direct supervision and control of the Archdiocese and its representative the Archbishop. All acts of sexual abuse alleged herein took place during events in which the Abusers had custody or control of Plaintiffs in their role as a priest or other authority figure.

57. At all relevant times, the Archdiocese and Archbishop did not act in any manner to protect the young children of its parishes, churches, community, and other organizations within its ambit. To the contrary, the Archbishop and Archdiocese engaged in several decades of intentional misconduct in turning a blind eye to the sexual abuse by its priests and other employees. Instead of removing the Abusers from its employ and control and reporting the abuse to authorities as required by law, Defendants enabled and emboldened the Abusers to continue perpetrating horrific conduct upon Plaintiffs by giving Defendants' employees, agents, and servants unfettered access to Plaintiffs and other children by reassigning the Abusers to other parishes or organizations, sending Abusers away for treatment for a short time, or otherwise failing to take any remedial action whatsoever. As a result of the actions and inactions of the Archbishop and the Archdiocese, Plaintiffs and other children were abused.

58. As a result of misrepresentations made by and failures to disclose of the Defendants Archdiocese, Archbishop and the Abusers identified herein, and by virtue of the fact that Defendants held themselves out as the counselors and instructors on matters that were spiritual, moral, and ethical, Defendants had domination, custody, and influence over Plaintiffs.

59. In addition, by accepting the care, custody and control of the minor Plaintiffs, Defendants stood in the position of an in loco parentis relationship with the minor Plaintiffs. As a result of these special relationships between Plaintiffs, Defendants, and the Abusers, Plaintiffs trusted and relied upon Defendants to nurture and protect them while in Defendants' care and custody. The power imbalance between young children and Defendants increased the Plaintiffs' vulnerability to all Defendants.

60. Defendants held a position of trust and confidence in the care and supervision of Plaintiffs constituting a fiduciary relationship and a duty to disclose to Plaintiffs their knowledge of the sexual abuse occurring within the Archdiocese before and after the abuse identified herein and to disclose their own culpability in enabling and perpetrating said abuse.

61. At the time that the Abusers had unlawful sexual contact with Plaintiffs, all Defendants falsely represented to Plaintiffs that Defendants were providing spiritual counseling, comfort, mentorship and advice to Plaintiffs.

62. The actions of Defendants identified herein were outrageous and utterly repugnant to a civilized society.

63. Defendants Archbishop and Archdiocese knew or should have known that by allowing the Abusers access to young children as part of the Abusers' official duties after reports of impropriety involved an unreasonable risk of causing emotional distress to Plaintiffs and other similarly situated individuals.

64. The actions of the Archdiocese and Archbishop that enabled Abusers to continue to have access to children and hold themselves out as priests, father figures, or mentors to their parishioners and young children with whom they came into contact, were outrageous and utterly repugnant to a civilized society. All Defendants acted with depraved hearts knowing harm would occur, including the damages to Plaintiffs described herein and other similarly situated children. Defendants knew or should have known this outrageous behavior would cause emotional distress to the families of the victims and the victims, including Plaintiffs.

65. The sexual abuse of Plaintiffs and the circumstances under which the abuse occurred, caused one or more Plaintiffs to develop various psychological coping mechanisms and symptoms of psychological distress, including repression of memory, great shame, guilt, self-blame and depression. As a result, one or more Plaintiffs were unable to know or have reason to know that they were victims of sexual abuse committed upon them by the Abusers identified herein. The sexual abuse and exploitation of the Plaintiffs and the circumstances under which it occurred caused one or more Plaintiffs to develop various psychological coping mechanisms which made them incapable of ascertaining the resulting damages from that conduct.

66. Furthermore, upon information and belief, after learning of the wrongful conduct of Defendants and the Abusers identified herein, one, multiple, or all Plaintiffs were distinctly injured for the first time or distinctly injured in addition to prior damage resulting from the actions and omissions of Defendants. Defendants individually and/or by and through its agents, ratified the wrongful conduct described herein by failing to report it to law enforcement authorities, the Plaintiffs, prospective parishioners, current parishioners, their families, victims, and the public.

67. Defendants' conduct in concealing their own culpability communicated to Plaintiffs and other victims that Defendants' conduct was proper and that legal action was not necessary. Defendants knew or should have known, that their actions would silence Plaintiffs and other victims, prevent them from discovering their injuries, their complaints or possible other complaints or victims, and ultimately exacerbate their emotional distress and trauma.

68. Defendants' conduct in misrepresenting the extent to which they knew of the Abusers' conduct prior to and after the abuse described herein prevented Plaintiffs from learning that they had a cause of action against Defendants.

69. By absconding or concealing themselves and/or by other improper acts, the Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop prevented the commencement of this action for many years, and in many cases several decades.

70. Moreover, the improper acts of and concealment of the Archbishop and Archdiocese constituted a legal hindrance to and impairment of all Plaintiffs' ability to know of or maintain a cause of action against the Archdiocese and Archbishop.

71. As such, Plaintiffs' claims either did not accrue until within five years of the filing of this Petition or, in the alternative, they accrued and were tolled pursuant to the doctrine of fraudulent concealment, repressed memory, and/or delayed discovery until within five years of the filing of this Petition.

72. Defendants therefore cannot succeed or assert, and/or are equitably estopped from raising, any defense that Plaintiffs' action is not timely because Defendants individually and in concert with each other fraudulently concealed the wrongfulness of the conduct set forth herein and the causal relationship of the harm suffered by Plaintiffs.

73. As a direct result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered and continue to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; were prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing their daily

activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; have sustained loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or have incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

Sexual Abuse of T.C.

74. T.C. was born in 1978 and resided in St. Louis, Missouri within St. Louis City at the time of his abuse.

75. T.C. was raised in a devoutly Catholic family, all of whom attended Catholic school and regular church services. T.C.'s parents encouraged T.C. to become an altar boy at a young age.

76. T.C., influenced by his family, developed a great admiration, trust, reverence, and respect for the Catholic Church and its agents.

77. T.C. attended school at St. Pius X Church of Glasgow Village, located at 335 Shepley Dr., Glasgow Village, 63137 in St. Louis County. He attended school at St. Pius X from approximately pre-kindergarten to fourth grade, from approximately 1981 to 1988. The church is now closed.

78. St. Pius X Church of Glasgow Village was at all relevant times located in St. Louis County.

79. At all relevant times, St. Pius X Church of Glasgow Village was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

80. There, an individual believed to have gone by the name Father Hart (hereinafter "T.C. Abuser") served as a priest at St. Pius X. T.C. expects to learn the true and full identity of his abuser during the course of discovery.

81. In 1983 when T.C. was between the ages of 6 and 7, T.C. Abuser lured T.C. to the rectory under the guise of altar boy training, where he ordered T.C. to sit on his lap.

82. T.C. Abuser groped T.C.'s genitals and ordered him to undress and sit on his lap again. T.C. did as he was told.

83. T.C. Abuser groped, fondled, and masturbated T.C.'s genitals.

84. T.C. Abuser sexually abused T.C. in this manner twice a week for one month, until T.C. stopped being an altar boy.

85. T.C. Abuser told T.C. that if T.C. told his parents about the sexual abuse they would not love T.C. anymore.

86. T.C. Abuser gave T.C. candy, snow cones, gum, and licorice as part of the scheme to abuse T.C.

87. T.C. Abuser regularly visited T.C. while T.C. was in class to give him candy and threaten him to keep quiet about the abuse.

Sexual Abuse of K.P.

88. K.P. was born in 1974.

89. K.P. was living in Jennings, Missouri, in St. Louis County, when she was sexually abused.

90. K.P. attended school at Corpus Christi Catholic Church (“Corpus Christi”), located at 8449 Jennings Station Road, St. Louis, Missouri 63136 in St. Louis County. Corpus Christi closed in 2005, and the building is now used as an elderly care center.

91. Corpus Christi was under the direct supervision, employ and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

92. K.P. had trust in and respect for the church, was baptized, confirmed at Corpus Christi, and believed in the power of prayer.

93. When K.P. was abused at home, she turned to the Church for comfort and support.

94. K.P. attended religious school at Corpus Christi from approximately 1979 through 1988 when K.G attended kindergarten through 8th grade graduation.

95. Father Kevin Hederman sexually abused K.P. from approximately 1987 to 1988, when K.P. was in the 7th and 8th grades.

96. Father Hederman regularly interacted with students at the church and school by offering Confessions to the students. K.P. confided in Father Hederman, who K.P. trusted, to help her cope with troubling personal events that happened in her life, including sexual abuse.

97. Instead of helping K.P. cope with these issues, Father Hederman himself sexually abused K.P.

98. Father Hederman invited K.P. to a separate building on the Church property to give Confession in an empty classroom.

99. K.P. and Father Hederman sat in folding chairs back-to-back during the Confession and then turned to face each other after completing the Sacrament of Confession.

100. After Confession, Father Hederman hugged K.P. in between his legs and Father Hederman rubbed K.P.'s body against his genital area.

101. K.P. felt and saw Father Hederman's erection on two occasions.

102. Father Hederman hugged K.P. for extended periods of time and rubbed K.P.'s body against him on 20 occasions.

103. When Father Hederman hugged K.P., he demanded that she hug him back and to "let him love her."

104. K.P. did not speak to anyone about Father Hederman until 2023.

105. Through therapy, K.P. has begun to remember facts about when she was abused by Father Hederman.

106. K.P. learned in therapy that she "disassociated" from the time of the abuse.

Sexual Abuse of M.M.

107. M.M. was born in 1962.

108. M.M. attended St. Francis of Assisi Catholic Church ("St. Francis of Assisi") located at 4566 Telegraph Road, St. Louis, Missouri 63219 in St. Louis County.

109. St. Francis of Assisi Catholic Church was under the direct supervision, employ and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

110. M.M. was sexually abused by an individual known to M.M. as Father Rausch from approximately 1977 to 1979, when M.M. was approximately 15 to 17 years old.

111. M.M. resided in St. Louis, Missouri at the time of the abuse.

112. M.M. grew up attending St. Francis of Assisi Catholic Church, attending through grade school until he went to college in 1985.

113. At age 15, M.M. got a job at the priest's house working odd jobs including answering phone calls and preparing materials.

114. M.M. first met Father Rausch while working at the priest's house and began to form a relationship with him.

115. In high school, M.M. joined the Catholic Youth Counsel (CYC) group, a youth group for highschoolers in the parish community.

116. Father Rausch worked as an associate pastor at St. Francis of Assisi Catholic Church and also was the leader of the CYC youth group.

117. Father Rausch had a passenger van in which he would take only youth boys to and from events and drop them off at home.

118. Father Rausch would drop M.M. off last at his home or would take him to empty parking lots of a nearby park.

119. Father John sexually abused M.M. in the passenger van and in the priest's house.

120. Father John forced M.M. to perform oral sex, performed oral sex on M.M., and anally raped M.M.

Sexual Abuse of R.R.

121. R.R. was born in 1964.

122. R.R. resided in St. Louis, Missouri in St. Louis County at the time of the abuse.

123. R.R. attended elementary school at St. George School which stood adjacent to St. George Catholic Church, located at 4890 Heege Road, St. Louis, Missouri 63123 in St. Louis County. St. George Catholic Church is now known as St. John Paul II Roman Catholic Church.

124. St. George Catholic Church was under the direct supervision, employ and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

125. Reverend Norman Christian sexually abused R.R. from approximately 1972 to 1974, when R.R. was in approximately 3rd and 4th grade.

126. Reverend Christian regularly interacted with the students at St. George School and escorted male students from their classrooms or mass to the rectory.

127. Initially Reverend Christian invited R.R. with other male students to the rectory,

128. A few days later, Reverend Christian brought R.R. to the rectory alone where Reverend Christian and R.R. prayed.

129. Thereafter, Reverend Christian removed R.R. from class, and took R.R. to the rectory where Reverend Christian sexually abused R.R.

130. Reverend Christian fondled R.R.'s genitals, forced R.R. to fondle Reverend Christian's genitals, forcibly performed oral copulation on R.R., forced R.R. to perform oral copulation on Reverend Christian, and, using both his penis and fingers, anally penetrated R.R.

131. Reverend Christian sexually abused R.R. at least weekly when R.R. was in the third and fourth grades.

Sexual Abuse of D.G.

132. D.G. was born in 1959.

133. D.G. lived in Lemay, Missouri, in St. Louis County, at the time of the abuse set forth herein.

134. D.G attended St. Andrew Catholic School, located at 309 Hoffmeister Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63125 within St. Louis County, from approximately 1965 to 1973. Father Bernard Suellentrop regularly sexually abused D.G. in the St. Andrew Catholic Church rectory from 1970 to

1971, when D.G. was between 11 and 12 years old. At the time of the abuse, D.G. lived about a three-minute walk from the school and church.

135. At all relevant times, St. Andrew Catholic School was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

136. At all relevant times, St. Andrew Catholic Church was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop

137. D.G. was raised in a strictly devout Catholic home.

138. D.G. was baptized at a different church but had her first holy Communion and confirmation at St. Andrew Catholic Church.

139. D.G. attended Mass daily when she attended St. Andrew Catholic School and on Sundays with her family.

140. D.G. first met Father Bernard Suellentrop when he tutored D.G. in spelling and reading.

141. Father Suellentrop appeared intoxicated during tutoring sessions.

142. After approximately five tutoring sessions, Father Suellentrop sexually abused D.G. when they were alone in the rectory.

143. Father Suellentrop touched and fondled D.G.'s genitals under the clothing

144. Father Suellentrop forced D.G. to touch his penis, to perform oral copulation on him, performed oral copulation on D.G., and raped D.G.

145. Father Suellentrop gave D.G. candy and explained to D.G. that God wanted him to do these things to her.

146. Father Suellentrop sexually abused D.G. at least two times each week for a year.

147. D.G. hid under her bed and pleaded with her parents to keep her home from school.

148. D.G. attended St. Andrew Catholic School through 8th grade and pleaded with her parents to send her to public high school.

149. D.G. did not tell anyone about the sexual abuse until recently.

Sexual Abuse of J.H.

150. J.H. was born in 1987.

151. J.H. attended school at St. Simon the Apostle Greek Park (“St. Simon”), located at 10011 Mueller Road, St. Louis, Missouri 63123 in St. Louis County.

152. St. Simon was under the direct supervision, employ and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

153. J.H.’s mother was single and worked full-time. She was a notable figure within the community and made a large donation to St. Simon.

154. As a child, J.H. frequently spent time at St. Simon for school and after-school activities while her mother worked.

155. In approximately 1992, when J.H. was approximately 5 years old, Deacon Carl baptized J.H. In 1994, Deacon Carl attended J.H.'s first communion.

156. Around the time of her first communion, Deacon Carl frequently began ordering J.H. to sit on his lap and talk with him.

157. On many occasions, Deacon Carl rubbed J.H.'s thighs under her school uniform.

158. Deacon Carl made sexual comments about J.H.'s body and called her legs "ham hocks" that he wanted to eat.

159. Beginning when J.H. was seven, Deacon Carl regularly told J.H. that she was a "loose woman" who was "putting herself out there" for adult men to desire her.

160. On several occasions, Deacon Carl removed J.H. from class and bought her cheeseburgers from McDonald's.

161. On many occasions, Deacon Carl approached J.H. during recess to grope J.H.'s thighs during "uniform checks".

162. This abuse occurred on several occasions while J.H. was between the ages of 6 and 12. When J.H. entered sixth grade, Deacon Carl lost interest in her and focused his attention on younger girls who were "new to the faith."

163. J.H. told her mother about Deacon Carl's sexually abusive behavior. J.H.'s mother reported the sexual abuse to Ms. Wooliver, the principal of the school. Ms. Wooliver said she would report Deacon Carl to the Archdiocese of St. Louis. Ms. Wooliver told J.H. and her mother that they, in the meantime, should not speak about the sexual abuse.

164. Shortly after this incident, Ms. Wooliver left her position. Ms. Wooliver was replaced by Ms. Frielien. J.H. and her mother attempted to report Deacon Carl to Ms. Frielien, but Ms. Frielien did not believe J.H. and said that Deacon Carl had innocent intentions.

Sexual Abuse of J.M.

165. J.M. was born in 1974 and resided in St. Louis, Missouri in St. Louis County at the time of the abuse set forth herein.

166. J.M. started attending St. Martin of Tours School (“St. Martin”), located at 610 W Ripa Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63125 in St. Louis County, in 1979 for kindergarten.

167. St. Martin was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

168. J.M.’s mother was a devout parishioner at St. Martin of Tours Catholic Church, the church associated with St. Martin.

169. J.M. was baptized at St. Martin of Tours Catholic Church.

170. St. Martin of Tours Catholic Church and School were located in St. Louis County.

171. Monsignor Runge sexually abused J.M. in the early 80s, approximately the winter of 1981/1982, when J.M. was in 2nd grade. J.M. expects to learn the full identity of Monsignor Runge through the course of discovery.

172. Monsignor Runge followed J.M. to the restroom during class one day. Monsignor Runge unzipped his pants in the urinal next to J.M.

173. Instead of using the urinal, Monsignor Runge turned towards J.M. and put his penis on J.M.’s face.

Sexual Abuse of B.J.

174. B.J. was born in 1954 and currently resides in St. Louis, Missouri, in St. Louis City County.

175. B.J. grew up in a devout Catholic family, attending Catholic grade school, weekly mass and holiday services. B.J. was baptized, confirmed, and served as an altar boy starting in the second grade. B.J. was taught to trust and respect clergy members because they are close to Christ.

176. B.J. was sexually abused by Father Hanlon at Mary Queen of the Universe Church (“Mary Queen”), located at 4230 Ripa Ave, St. Louis, Missouri 63125, St. Louis County.

177. Father Hanlon, whose full identity B.J. expects to learn during discovery, appeared to be in his 60s, German, have a stocky build, and semi-balding, thin grey hair.

178. At all relevant times, Mary Queen was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

179. One Sunday after mass, when B.J. was eight or nine years old and serving as an altar boy, B.J. went into the sanctuary next to the altar with Father Hanlon. The usual routine was to put away the cloth, the water, and the wine along with another altar boy. On this occasion, however, the other altar boy left B.J. and Father Hanlon alone in the sanctuary.

180. Usually, Father Hanlon removed his vestment and went outside to smoke a cigar. On this occasion, however, Father Hanlon ordered B.J. to help Father Hanlon remove the vestment. With B.J. standing in front of him, Father Hanlon reached out and grabbed B.J.’s genitals. Father Hanlon then asked B.J. to complete other tasks that were out of the ordinary routine.

181. When B.J. was done with his duties and on his way to leave the church, he walked by Father Hanlon who was standing by the door near the confessionals. Father Hanlon threatened B.J. that if B.J. told anyone about what had happened, Father Hanlon would tell B.J.’s parents about what B.J. shared during confession.

182. B.J. buried the memory of the sex abuse for some time.

Sexual Abuse of G.C.

183. G.C. was born in 1948.

184. In approximately 1955, when G.C. was approximately seven years old, G.C. and his family moved to University City, Missouri. G.C. attended St. Catherine of Siena (“St. Catherine”), then located at 6815 Page Ave, St. Louis, Missouri 63133, St. Louis County.

185. G.C. lived in University City, Missouri, in St. Louis County, at the time of the abuse.

186. At all relevant times, St. Catherine was under the direct supervision, employ and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

187. G.C. was raised in a devout Catholic family that attended church multiple times a week. G.C.’s family encouraged him to volunteer to serve mass. G.C., influenced by his family, developed a great admiration, trust, reverence, and respect for the Catholic Church.

188. At the church, G.C. regularly interacted with Father Lyons, the lead pastor; Father Bermann, a priest; and Father Kennedy, a priest.

189. In 1958 when G.C. was 9 years old, Father Lyons invited G.C. and two other boys to drink wine with him in the sacristy. G.C. did not want to drink the wine, but Father Lyons coerced him into drinking.

190. Father Lyons continued to coerce G.C. and the two boys to drink with him at least weekly.

191. After two or three weeks of inviting the boys to drink with him, Father Lyons invited G.C. to drink with him in the sacristy without the other boys. Once G.C. was drunk, Father Lyons groped G.C.’s genitals over G.C.’s clothes. Father Lyons told G.C. that he wanted to perform

oral copulation on G.C. so G.C. could “see how good it would make [him] feel.” Father Lyons forcibly performed oral copulation on G.C.

192. Thereafter, Father Lyons regularly and repeatedly brought G.C. to the sacristy and/or the rectory, where Father Lyons masturbated G.C., performed oral copulation on G.C., forced G.C. to perform oral copulation on him, digitally penetrated G.C., and penetrated G.C. with his penis.

193. Approximately one month after Father Lyons began abusing G.C., Father Bermann and Father Kennedy told G.C. that, since G.C. performed sexual acts with Father Lyons, G.C. should perform sexual acts with them too.

194. Father Bermann frequently brought G.C. to the sacristy or the rectory where he masturbated G.C., performed oral copulation on G.C., forced G.C. to perform oral copulation on him, digitally penetrated G.C., and penetrated G.C. with his penis.

195. Father Kennedy frequently brought G.C. to the sacristy or the rectory where he masturbated G.C., performed oral copulation on G.C., forced G.C. to perform oral copulation on him, digitally penetrated G.C., and penetrated G.C. with his penis.

196. Father Lyons, Father Bermann, and Father Kennedy frequently sexually abused G.C. in groups of two or three at a time.

197. Father Bermann and Father Kennedy frequently brought two adult female church volunteers into the rectory with G.C. The women took Polaroid photographs of G.C., masturbated G.C., performed oral copulation on G.C., and forced G.C. to perform the same sexual acts on them.

While Father Bermann and Father Kennedy sexually abused G.C., the women watched and masturbated themselves.

198. Father Lyons, Father Bermann, and Father Kennedy gave G.C. preferential treatment including extra opportunities to serve mass and collect money from the congregation.

199. Father Lyons, Father Bermann, and Father Kennedy told G.C. that G.C.'s parents would be angry with G.C. if they knew about the sexual abuse.

200. Father Lyons, Father Bermann, and Father Kennedy collectively sexually abused G.C. at least two to three times a week from 1958 to 1961, when G.C. was between the ages of 9 and 13, until G.C. left the school.

Sexual Abuse of D.S.

201. D.S. was born in 1972.

202. D.S. lived in Affton, Missouri, in St. Louis County, at the time of the abuse.

203. D.S. met Father George Lucas in approximately 1988, when D.S. was approximately 16 years old and attending St. Louis Preparatory Seminary, located at 5200 Shrewsbury Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63119 within St. Louis County. Father Lucas was a priest and the Dean of Education at the St. Louis Preparatory Seminary School.

204. At all relevant times, St. Louis Preparatory Seminary was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

205. D.S. was raised in a devout Irish Catholic environment. D.S. went to mass daily and on Sundays.

206. D.S. was baptized, confirmed, served as an altar boy in eighth grade, and attended Catholic school.

207. D.S. was taught that the Pope was infallible, and priests had a connection to God that deemed them holy. D.S. was taught not to question anything clergy people said and what clergy people said was law.

208. D.S. lived 12-15 minutes from St. Louis Preparatory Seminary by car and took Social Studies and Current Events classes with Father Lucas.

209. Father Lucas required D.S. to meet with him for regular one-on-one check-in sessions. Eventually, these check-in sessions proved to be a ruse for Father Lucas to sexually abuse D.S.

210. Father Lucas started sexually abusing D.S. when D.S. was a junior in high school.

211. The check-in sessions occurred in a small office with two chairs and a table behind the classroom. When D.S. entered the office for a check-in session, Father Lucas sat in one of the chairs with black drape over his lap. D.S. saw Father Lucas' legs sticking out from underneath the drape and someone else's head moving in an up and down motion beneath the drape.

212. Father Lucas told D.S. to wait outside while Father Lucas "finished."

213. D.S. understood that another student, whose name D.S. recalls and intentionally withholds from publication at this juncture, was performing oral copulation on Father Lucas underneath the drape.

214. During D.S.'s session that day, Father Lucas asked D.S. what D.S. saw and what D.S. thought about what he saw. Two days later, Father Lucas asked D.S. additional questions about the incident, if D.S. had a girlfriend, and if D.S. ever received oral copulation.

215. After asking more questions, Father Lucas performed oral copulation on D.S. and masturbated while performing oral copulation on D.S.

216. On multiple other occasions, Father Lucas masturbated D.S. and forced him to masturbate Father Lucas.

217. Father Lucas failed D.S. on an assignment and told D.S. that D.S. could perform oral copulation on Father Lucas for a better grade.

Sexual Abuse of A.S.

218. A.S. was born in 1997.

219. A.S. resided in St. Louis, Missouri at the time of abuse.

220. A.S. grew up in a Catholic home, and her parents sent her to Sacred Heart School ("Sacred Heart") in Valley Park, Missouri within St. Louis County.

221. Sacred Heart was, at all relevant times, under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

222. Growing up in a devout Catholic home, A.S. was taught to trust and respect clergy members.

223. Sacred Heart was a Catholic school affiliated with Sacred Heart Catholic Church, located at 17 Ann Avenue, Valley Park, Missouri 6088, St. Louis County.

224. At all relevant times, Sacred Heart and Sacred Heart Catholic Church were under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants archdiocese and archbishop.

225. In 2007, when A.S. was in the fourth grade, a visiting priest (“A.S. Abuser”) at Sacred Heart sexually abused her.

226. A.S. Abuser, whose full identity A.S. expects to learn during discovery, had short brown hair, a medium build, and was approximately in his mid-20s to early 30s.

227. Through Sacred Heart, A.S. was required to attend Mass and attend confession.

228. A.S. Abuser was assigned to Sacred Heart to offer confession.

229. When it was A.S.’s turn to give confession, she knelt in the confessional. A.S. Abuser told her that they were all God’s children, so it was okay for him to see her. A.S. Abuser was very welcoming and A.S. felt safe with him, so she moved to the area where he could see her. At some point during the confession, A.S. Abuser got A.S. to sit on his lap.

230. Once she confessed, A.S. read a prayer from a sheet of paper that A.S. Abuser gave her. A.S. concentrated intently on reading the prayer because she was dyslexic. As she was focused on reading, A.S. Abuser put his hand up A.S.’s skirt and touched her vaginal area and buttocks.

231. Once A.S. finished reading the prayer, the interaction ended.

Sexual Abuse of G.H.

232. G. H. was born in 1963.

233. G.H. attended St. Ferdinand Parish (“St. Ferdinand”) located at 1765 Charbonier Road, Florissant, Missouri 63031, St. Louis County.

234. G.H. attended Catholic school from first through eighth grade, Mass every weekend with his family, served as an altar boy, and was baptized and confirmed all at St. Ferdinand.

235. At all relevant times, St. Ferdinand was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

236. G.H. was sexually abused by Father Michael McGrath when G.H. was approximately 12 and 13 years old.

237. Father McGrath took G.H. and other altar boys to activities such as getting ice cream and to the movies and would sometimes take the boys to Father McGrath's mother's house. Father McGrath would let the boys sit in his lap and drive his van.

238. G.H. sat between Father McGrath's legs and in Father McGrath's lap while G.H. drove the vehicle.

239. Father McGrath fondled G.H.'s genitals over the clothes on approximately 5 occasions while G.H. drove the vehicle.

240. G.H. never spoke about the abuse as a child.

Sexual Abuse of T.L.

241. T.L. was born in 1978.

242. T.L. resided in St. Ann, Missouri in St. Louis County at the time of the abuse.

243. T.L. was raised in a Catholic family. They attended mass every Sunday and T.L.'s parents enrolled their children in Catholic school.

244. T.L.'s parents put great emphasis on respecting the authority and values of the Catholic Church.

245. T.L. was a student at the grade school affiliated with St. Mary of the Assumption Parish (“St. Mary”) at 4605 Long Road, Bridgeton, Missouri 63044, located in St. Louis County. The parish is now closed.

246. At all relevant times, St. Mary was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

247. St. Mary was at all relevant times located in St. Louis County.

248. Father Michael McGrath (“McGrath”) was a priest at St. Mary.

249. In 1990, when T.L. was 12 years old, McGrath first invited T.L. on rides in McGrath’s church van.

250. During the rides, McGrath forced T.L. to sit on his lap while McGrath drove his van to other churches and schools believed to be within the ambit, control, and employ of the Archdiocese.

251. During the ride, McGrath groped, fondled, and masturbated T.L.’s genitals.

252. McGrath frequently sexually abused T.L. between 1990 and 1992 when T.L. was between 12 and 14 years old.

253. McGrath took T.L. and his T.L.’s friends to sporting events as part of the scheme to abuse T.L.

254. In the years following the abuse, T.L. questioned his sexuality and had feelings of depression, anxiety, and worthlessness due to the abuse.

255. T.L. attended some college at St. Louis Community College but did not obtain a degree. T.L. has a license to practice real estate in the State of Missouri.

256. McGrath's sexual abuse of T.L. caused T.L. to experience mental anguish and other psychological injuries.

257. T.L. did not report the sexual abuse to friends, law enforcement, medical professionals, lawyers, or the Diocese. T.L. worried that his loved ones would perceive him differently and feared potential retribution from the Archdiocese if he ever reported the incident.

Sexual Abuse of H.T.

258. H.T. was born in 1955.

259. H.T. resided in Florissant, Missouri, in St. Louis County, when he was sexually abused by Father Thomas Graham.

260. In 1979, H.T. graduated from Southwest Missouri State College in Southwest, Missouri with a degree in agriculture/business with a minor in economics.

261. H.T. currently resides in Florissant, Missouri.

262. H.T., along with his seven siblings, attended mass every weekday at St. Ferdinand Parish ("St. Ferdinand"). H.T. regularly attended Sunday mass with his family.

263. H.T. attended St. Ferdinand from 1st to 8th grade.

264. H.T. and his family had respect and trust in the Church and its leaders.

265. From approximately between 1966 and 1968, Father Thomas Graham sexually abused H.T.

266. Father Thomas Graham was a priest at St. Mary's Parish in Bridgeton, Missouri, St. Louis County, which was a few miles from St. Ferdinand Parish.

267. St. Mary was at all relevant times located in St. Louis County.

268. St. Mary was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

269. As children, H.T. and his friends rode their bicycles to Koch Park, which was approximately two blocks from H.T.'s childhood home in Florissant, Missouri.

270. Koch Park was adjacent to Love's Hill where a local woman, Mrs. Love, owned a horse barn.

271. On one occasion when H.T. and his friends were at Koch Park, Father Graham was riding his horse through the Koch Park area.

272. Father Graham approached H.T. and his friends, allowing them to interact with his horse.

273. Within the week, Father Graham invited H.T. and his friends to the horse barn to ride Father Graham's horse.

274. Each of the boys took turns riding the horse with Father Graham. Father Graham sat H.T. on the saddle in front of Father Graham.

275. Father Graham put his hand down H.T.'s pants and fondled H.T.'s testicles. Father Graham told H.T. he was holding H.T.'s testicles to "prevent H.T. from hitting himself on the horn of the saddle."

276. On another occasion, Father Graham invited H.T. and his friends to get a sweet treat, like ice cream or soda.

277. Father Graham let the boys take turns driving his car.

278. Father Graham sat H.T. on his lap in the driver's seat, allowing H.T. to steer the car while Father Graham operated the gas and brake pedals.

279. Father Graham put his hand down H.T.'s pants and fondled H.T.'s testicles. Father Graham told H.T. he was holding H.T.'s testicles to "prevent H.T. from hitting his testicles on the steering wheel."

280. H.T. did not tell his parents, who were devout Catholics, what happened.

281. H.T. never told anyone about the sexual abuse until recently.

Sexual Abuse of J.M. 2

282. J.M. 2 was born in 1956.

283. J.M. 2 resided in Bridgeton, Missouri, in St. Louis County at the time of abuse.

284. J.M. 2's family were devout Catholics and enrolled J.M. 2 in the school associated with St. Mary's Parish ("St. Mary's") on Long Road in Bridgeton, Missouri.

285. St. Mary's was, at all relevant, times located in St. Louis County.

286. Father Graham also became friends with J.M. 2's parents since Father Graham was frequently a guest at J.M. 2's neighbor's home.

287. Father Graham sexually abused J.M. 2 from approximately 1968 to 1970, when J.M. 2 was between 12 and 14 years old.

288. J.M. 2 attended St. Mary's from approximately 1962 to 1970 for the 1st-8th grades.

289. J.M. 2 met Father Graham at St. Mary's Catholic School where Father Graham taught health classes.

290. Father Graham drove J.M. 2 to a horse barn on Charbonier Road in Hazelwood, Missouri, located in St. Louis County, to feed and ride Father Tom's horses.

291. At the horse barn, Father Graham groped and fondled J.M. 2's genitals.

292. Father Graham also sexually abused J.M. 2 in Father Graham's car at a nearby cemetery and in an airport parking lot.

Sexual Abuse of J.M. 3

293. J.M. 3 was born in 1958 and raised in Bridgeton, Missouri in St. Louis County, when he was sexually abused by Father Thomas Graham.

294. J.M. 3 was raised in a devout Catholic household, attended Mass every Sunday, and was surrounded by Catholicism. J.M. 3 was baptized, confirmed, and served as an altar boy for approximately 3 years.

295. Respect for the Church and its clergy members was imbued in J.M. 3 from a young age.

296. Father Thomas Graham sexually abused J.M. 3 between 1967 and 1970, when J.M. 3 was between the ages of 9 and 12.

297. J.M. 3 first met Father Graham in 1964 when J.M. 3 enrolled in St. Mary's Catholic School ("St. Mary's") on Long Road in Bridgeton, Missouri.

298. St. Mary's was at all relevant times located in St. Louis County.

299. St. Mary's was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

300. Father Graham had a close friendship with J.M. 3's neighbors and was frequently a guest at their home. This gave Father Graham the opportunity to gain the trust of J.M. 3 and his brothers.

301. As part of Father Graham's scheme to sexually abuse J.M. 3, Father Graham offered J.M. 3 the opportunity to take J.M. 3 to ride horses at Father Graham's horse barn located in St. Louis County.

302. Father Graham drove J.M. 3 to the horse barn. On the way to the horse barn, Father Graham parked his car to fondle, grope, and masturbate J.M. 3's genitals.

303. Father Graham sexually abused J.M. 3 several times.

Sexual Abuse of M.M. 2

304. M.M. 2 was born in 1963.

305. M.M. 2 resided in Bridgeton, Missouri, in St. Louis County, when he was sexually abused by Father Thomas Graham.

306. M.M. 2 currently resides in Wentzville, Missouri in St. Charles County.

307. M.M. 2 was raised in a devout Catholic household and attended Mass every Sunday.

308. M.M. 2 attended Catholic school from 1st through 12th grade at St. Mary's Catholic School ("St. Mary's") in Bridgeton, Missouri, in St. Louis County.

309. St. Mary's was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

310. M.M. 2 was baptized, received his First Holy Communion, and was confirmed.

311. Respect for the Church and its clergy members was imbued in M.M. 2 from a young age. M.M. 2's father raised M.M. 2 to believe that the Church was the ultimate authority and that priests were oracles of God.

312. Father Thomas Graham sexually abused M.M. 2 in the summer of 1969 when M.M. 2 was 6 years old.

313. At the time of the abuse, Father Graham was the acting priest at St. Mary's.

314. Father Graham was friendly with M.M. 2's neighbors. M.M. 2's neighbors owned horses and let Father Graham ride their horses.

315. Father Graham took M.M. 2 to ride the horses at M.M. 2's neighbor's house, located in St. Louis County.

316. Father Graham sat behind M.M. 2 on the saddle of the horse, reached his arms around M.M. 2, and put his hands down M.M. 2's pants and fondled his penis.

Sexual Abuse of T.M.

317. T.M. was born in 1953 and was living in Bridgeton, Missouri in St. Louis County when he was sexually abused by Father Thomas Graham.

318. T.M. was raised in a devout Catholic household and attended Mass every day at school and on Sundays.

319. He was baptized, confirmed, received his First Holy Communion, and gave his first confession at St. Mary's Parish, located on Long Road in Bridgeton, Missouri.

320. From approximately 1959 to 1967, when T.M. was ages six to 14 years old, T.M. attended St. Mary's Catholic School ("St. Mary's") located on Long Road in Bridgeton, Missouri.

321. St. Mary's was at all relevant times located in St. Louis County.

322. St. Mary's was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

323. Father Thomas Graham sexually abused T.M. from approximately 1966 to 1967, when T.M. was 13 years old.

324. T.M. met Father Thomas Graham at St. Mary's when he was serving as an altar boy.

325. T.M.'s parents were fond of Father Graham, so T.M. felt encouraged to trust, respect, and admire Father Graham.

326. Father Graham had a new Chevrolet Impala. Within a year, Father Graham offered T.M. and other neighborhood boys the opportunity to drive it.

327. To practice driving, Father Graham sat T.M. on his lap and allowed T.M. to steer the car, whereupon Father Graham put his hand down T.M.'s pants and fondled T.M.'s genitals.

328. Father Graham also offered T.M. the opportunity to pet, feed, and ride his horse.

329. Father Graham invited T.M. to the horse barn located in St. Louis County where Father Graham boarded his horse.

330. The horse barn was on Charbonier Road in Hazelwood, Missouri.

331. At the horse barn, Father Graham took T.M. inside the home adjacent to the horse barn. Father Graham pulled T.M.'s pants down and masturbated T.M.

Sexual Abuse of W.C.

332. W.C. was born in 1969 and raised in a devout Catholic home. He lived in St. Louis City County when he was sexually abused.

333. W.C. attended church at St. Alban Roe Catholic Church (“St. Alban Roe”) located at 2001 Shepard Rd, Glencoe, Missouri, which at all relevant times was located in St. Louis County.

334. St. Alban Roe was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

335. W.C.’s father was very religious and punished W.C. when W.C. did not want to attend mass. W.C. attended Sunday school, was baptized, made his first holy Communion, and was confirmed. W.C.’s father pushed W.C. to serve as an altar boy at St. Alban Roe for approximately two to three years.

336. Brother Ralph Wehner sexually abused W.C. between approximately 1982 to 1984, when W.C. was 13 to 15 years old. The abuse occurred on at least three occasions.

337. Brother Ralph oversaw training new altar boys giving him the opportunity to sexually abuse W.C.

338. Brother Ralph helped W.C. dress in W.C.’s altar boy robes. Brother Ralph used this opportunity to touch, grope and fondle W.C.’s genitals while Brother Ralph “smoothed things out on the robes.”

Sexual Abuse of T.B.

339. T. B. was born in 1980.

340. T.B. attended Corpus Christi Catholic Church (“Corpus Christi”) located at 8449 Jennings Station Road, Jennings, Missouri in St. Louis County. Corpus Christi has since been demolished.

341. Corpus Christi was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

342. T.B. served as an altar boy in fourth and fifth grades.

343. Father Doyle sexually abused T.B. from approximately 1989 to 1990, when T.B. was approximately nine and ten years old.

344. Father Doyle entered the rectory when T.B. was drinking wine.

345. Father Doyle was angry and T.B. cried because he felt threatened by Father Doyle.

346. Father Doyle undressed T.B. and touched T.B.’s genitals.

347. Father Doyle told T.B. he would not tell anyone about T.B. drinking wine if T.B. returned to the rectory and remained quiet while Father Doyle sexually abused T.B.

348. T.B. engaged in psychological coping mechanisms that prevented ascertainment of his injuries.

Sexual Abuse of E.M.

349. E.M. was born in 1972.

350. E.M. was living in University City, Missouri, St. Louis County when E.M. was sexually abused.

351. E.M. was raised in a Baptist household and was taught from a young age that “people of the cloth” were trustworthy and deserved respect.

352. Throughout his childhood, E.M. and other children in E.M.'s neighborhood gathered at a local parking lot adjacent to All Saint's Church ("All Saints"), located at 6403 Clemens Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63130, St. Louis County. E.M. and the other local children treated the parking lot as a playground, often playing games like stickball.

353. At all relevant times, All Saints was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

354. In the spring of 1987, when E.M. was 14 years old, E.M. was playing at the parking lot next to All Saints. Father O'Brien came out of All Saints and approached E.M.

355. Father O'Brien invited E.M. and E.M.'s friend ("Friend") to lift weights at Father O'Brien's fitness center.

356. Father O'Brien took E.M. and Friend from All Saints grounds to the fitness center at Continental Cable in Overland, Missouri, St. Louis County. After Father O'Brien, E.M. and Friend exercised, Father O'Brien took them to the locker room to shower.

357. Once E.M. and Friend were undressed, Father O'Brien, who was also nude, followed E.M. and Friend into the shower. Father O'Brien "washed" E.M.'s body and fondled E.M.'s buttocks.

Sexual Abuse of G.D.

358. G.D. was born in 1975 and currently resides in St. Louis, Missouri, in St. Louis City County.

359. G.D. attended Ascension Catholic School and Church (“Ascension”) previously located at 3801 Nelson Drive, Normandy, Missouri 63121, in St. Louis County. Ascension was relocated to 230 Santa Maria Drive, Chesterfield, Missouri 63005, located in St. Louis County.

360. At all relevant times, Ascension was located in St. Louis County.

361. Ascension was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

362. In 1987 and 1988, Father Donald Heck sexually abused G.D. on at least five separate occasions by, among other acts, touching G.D.’s breasts and buttocks during a confession session.

Sexual Abuse of H.N.

363. H.N. was born in 1967.

364. H.N. was living in St. Louis, Missouri, St. Louis County at the time of the abuse.

365. H.N. was raised in a devout Catholic household, served as an altar boy between sixth and eighth grade, attended Mass every Saturday and Sunday, and attended religious school from kindergarten through eighth grade.

366. H.N. attended church and religious school at Ascension Catholic School and Church (“Ascension”) located at 3801 Nelson Drive, Normandy, Missouri 63121, St. Louis County. Ascension has since relocated to 238 Santa Maria Drive, Chesterfield, Missouri 63005, St. Louis County.

367. At all relevant times, Ascension was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

368. Father Hubert Creason sexually abused H.N. during the summers of 1980, 1981, and 1982, when H.N. was 13 to 15 years old.

369. H.N. met Father Creason through his work during the summers and as an altar boy at the church.

370. H.N. worked as a groundskeeper of Ascension with three other boys during the summertime. Their duties included cutting grass, setting up summer activities at the church, and assisting with mealtimes at the church.

371. H.N. completed these duties in addition to his altar boy duties which included assisting with Mass.

372. H.N. and the other boys were given access to many facilities at the church including the basketball court and the rectory, where H.N. and the boys spent their free time with Father Creason.

373. Over 20 times each summer, in the rectory living room, H.N. sat on the couch next to Father Creason with a blanket over their laps. Father Creason fondled H.N.'s genitals under the blanket while the other boys were in the room.

374. Over 15 times each summer, Father Creason also took H.N. to the rectory where H.N. changed into his altar boy clothes. When Father Creason and H.N. were alone, Father Creason forced H.N. to perform oral copulation on Father Creason.

375. H.N. never spoke about the abuse with anyone until recently.

Sexual Abuse of J.K.

376. J.K. was born in 1963.

377. J.K. resided in St. Louis, Missouri, in St. Louis County at the time of the abuse.

378. J.K. attended De Smet Jesuit High School located at 233 North New Ballas Road, Creve Coeur, Missouri 63141, in St. Louis County.

379. De Smet Jesuit High School was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

380. Gerry Boehm sexually abused J.K. from 1977 to 1979, when J.K. was between 14 to 16 years old.

381. Boehm was a teacher and basketball coach at De Smet Jesuit High School.

382. As part of the scheme to sexually abuse J.K., Boehm asked J.K. to join the basketball team and invited J.K. to Boehm's home to stay for extended periods of time.

383. At Boehm's home, Boehm entered J.K.'s room at night, touched J.K.'s genitals, performed oral copulation on J.K., forced J.K. to touch Boehm's genitals and attempted to anally penetrate J.K.

384. Boehm also sexually abused J.K. after basketball practice at the De Smet Jesuit High School.

Sexual Abuse of G.D. 2

385. G.D. 2 was born in 1984.

386. G.D. 2 resided in St. Peters, Missouri, St. Charles County at the time of the abuse.

387. G.D. 2 attended religious school from sixth to eighth grade at Gateway Academy, which was, at relevant times, located at 1360 Grandview Drive, Florissant, Missouri 63033, St. Louis County.

388. At all relevant times, Gateway Academy was under the direct supervision, employ and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

389. G.D. 2 was raised in a devout Catholic home. G.D. 2 was baptized and confirmed, served as an altar boy, and attended church on Sundays with his mother.

390. In 1999, when G.D. 2 was in eighth grade, he was sexually abused by Mr. Judd, a teacher employed by the Archdiocese, whose full identity G.D. 2 expects to learn during discovery.

391. Mr. Judd was a tall, white male who had grey hair and was approximately in his 60s.

392. G.D. 2 was serving detention after school and Mr. Judd oversaw detention.

393. Mr. Judd approached G.D. 2, fondled G.D. 2's genitals underneath G.D. 2's clothing and performed oral sex on G.D. 2.

394. After sexually abusing G.D. 2, Mr. Judd released G.D. 2 from detention.

395. G.D. 2 never spoke about the sexual abuse in detail with anyone until recently.

Sexual Abuse of P.D.

396. P.D. was born in 1981 and was living in the St. Louis County, Missouri, at the time of the abuse set forth herein.

397. P.D. currently resides in Massachusetts.

398. P.D. grew up in a home in which his parents were very religious. When P.D. was a child, he and his family attended Christ, Prince of Peace Parish, located at 415 Weidman Rd., Manchester, MO 63011, in St. Louis County.

399. Christ, Prince of Peace Parish was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop.

400. While attending Christ, Prince of Peace Parish School, P.D. served as an Altar Server for approximately two years or more.

401. P.D.'s best recollection is that his service as an Altar Server included approximately the years 1989 through 1992, when he was about 8 or 9 to 11 years old. During that time period, P.D. was sexually abused on numerous occasions by Father James McLain.

402. Fr. McLain's sexual abuse of P.D. occurred at two locations in the Parish, the Sacristy and the Rectory, as described below.

403. Before or after mass, when Fr. McLain and P.D. were alone in the Sacristy, Fr. McLain would instruct P.D. to undress him (McLain), at times down to his underwear. Sometimes Fr. McLain would have P.D. remove McLain's underwear and touch McLain's genitals and buttocks, and some of those times Fr. McLain would have P.D. masturbate him.

404. On other occasions, when P.D. was with Fr. McLain in the Rectory, McLain would instruct P.D. to undress him (McLain), touch McLain's genitals and masturbate him, and would force P.D. to perform oral sex on him. Also in the Rectory, Fr. McLain would instruct P.D. to undress himself.

405. P.D. was taught that Priests had ultimate authority, and as a result, he always followed Fr. McLain's instructions.

406. P.D. wondered whether what Fr. McLain did to him, and what Fr. McLain instructed or forced P.D. to do to McLain, were normal activities for a Priest.

407. Shortly after the abuse by Fr. McLain ended, P.D. lost all memory of it until early in 2020. P.D.'s memory started to return in approximately January 2020 when he learned that the Archdiocese of St. Louis published a list of Priests who had sexually abused children and that Fr. McLain's name was on it. That information and the sudden return of the memories of Fr. McLain's abuse was very shocking and traumatic for P.D.

Sexual Abuse of J.S.

408. J.S. was born in 1994.

409. J.S. was approximately 15 years old when an agent of the Archdiocese of St. Louis ("J.S. Abuser") sexually abused him in approximately 2006 to 2007 in St. Louis, Missouri. J.S. Abuser was at all relevant times a white male estimated to be in his 40s and approximately 6'0 in height. He had a shaved head. J.S. expects to learn the full name and identity of his abuser through the course of discovery.

410. J.S. Abuser inappropriately touched J.S.'s genitals and forced J.S. to touch J.S. Abuser's genitals.

CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT I – Childhood Sexual Abuse

411. Plaintiffs incorporate all paragraphs of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.

412. Abusers engaged in harmful sexual contact upon Plaintiffs. That contact was aided, abetted, and ratified by Defendants.

413. As a direct result of the Abusers' conduct and the conduct of the Defendants aiding, abetting, and ratifying these actions, Plaintiffs suffered severe medically diagnosable psychological injury, emotional distress, lost earnings and lost earning capacity, past and present medical and counseling expenses, and damaged emotional development causing Plaintiffs to engage in self-destructive and other harmful activities, including loss of hope and faith.

414. One or more Plaintiffs, because of various psychological coping mechanisms and the insidious long-term and late-developing injuries, did not discover and/or could not ascertain the nature or extent of their injuries and could make no causal connection between their psychological sequelae and the abuse until recently. One or more Plaintiffs fully and completely repressed all memory of these events for an extended period of time. One or more Plaintiffs were prevented from ascertaining their cause of action against Defendants due to the Defendants' fraudulent concealment.

415. The Defendants' actions were intentional, willful, wanton, and reckless.

COUNT II – *Intentional Failure to Supervise Clergy*

416. Plaintiffs incorporate all paragraphs of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.

417. At all times material, Defendant Archdiocese through Archbishop and his designees, was the supervisor and employer of the Abusers.

418. The Abusers, enabled by their employment with Defendants who at all relevant times had the right to control the Abusers, engaged in actions that were known by the Archdiocese and Archbishop. Said actions were matters over which the Archdiocese had both the power and the duty to control.

419. Defendants were aware of previous sexual misconduct by clergy within its boundaries, including the Abusers, and that future harm was certain or substantially certain to result without proper supervision and disregarded this known risk. Defendants caused one or more Abusers to be transferred from earlier assignments because of inappropriate touching of young boys and girls.

420. The Defendants subjected themselves to liability by retaining in their employ servants who, to their knowledge, were in the habit of conducting themselves in a manner dangerous to others.

421. Upon information and belief, the Archbishop and his designees as the Chief Executive Officer of the Archdiocese was a supervisor of the Abusers, all of whom worked for and under the auspices of or the apparent authority of the Archdiocese.

422. The Archbishop and his designees, including the Priests of the Archdiocese, had the duty to report to the Archdiocese unethical and/or inappropriate behavior of others including other priests.

423. The Archbishop and the Archdiocese each had the duty to report to the police, Department of Social Services or the proper legal authorities, suspicions that the children who came into contact with the Abusers might be abused.

424. The Archbishop and Archdiocese each had the duty to report to the police, Department of Social Services or the proper legal authorities, its suspicions that children who came into contact with the Abusers might be abused.

425. The Archbishop and Archdiocese each failed in their duties to supervise the actions of the other by failing to report the sexual misconduct they observed and/or of which they had notice.

426. Each of the Defendants disregarded the known risk of sexual abuse.

427. Defendants' inaction caused injury to Plaintiffs.

428. One or more Plaintiffs were sexually abused on the property owned and operated by Defendant Archdiocese and/or was abused on premises that the Abusers were allowed on solely due to their status as priests or employees, servants, or agents of the Archdiocese.

429. Defendants Archbishop and Archdiocese knew or should have known that inappropriate touching of young children by their employees and/or designated agents would cause or was substantially certain to cause those children harm.

430. Despite the risk posed by the Abusers, Defendants continued to place them in positions in which they would have daily contact with children.

431. Despite the risk posed by the Abusers, Defendant Archdiocese and Defendant Archbishop ratified the actions of being alone with small children by approving and paying for travel expenses and other expenses associated with outings with children.

432. By engaging in these actions, Defendant Archdiocese and Archbishop disregarded the risk posed by the Abusers to these children.

433. All Defendants' actions and/or inactions were willful, wanton and reckless for which punitive damages and/or damages for aggravating circumstances are appropriate.

434. One or more Plaintiffs, because of various psychological coping mechanisms and the insidious long-term and late developing injuries, did not discover and/or could not ascertain the

nature or extent of their injuries and could make no causal connection between their psychological sequelae and the abuse until recently. One or more Plaintiffs fully and completely repressed all memory of these events for an extended period of time. One or more Plaintiffs were prevented from ascertaining their cause of action against Defendants due to the Defendants' fraudulent concealment.

435. As a result of Defendants' failures to properly supervise, Plaintiffs were injured and have suffered, and continue to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress that are medically diagnosable and significant, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; were prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing their daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; have sustained loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or have incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

COUNT III – Negligent Failure to Supervise Children and Report Sexual Abuse

436. Plaintiffs incorporate the foregoing paragraphs of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.

437. Defendants had a duty to protect children served by their churches from known risks of harm and pursuant to Mo. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 210.115, to report sexual abuse of minors.

438. As set forth herein, since Defendants knew that the Abusers had a sexual propensity to abuse minors, the injuries inflicted upon Plaintiffs were foreseeable.

439. Defendants, by and through their agents, servants and employees, knew or reasonably should have known of the Abusers' dangerous propensities to sexually violate children.

440. Defendants had a duty to protect children commensurate with the risk of harm.

441. Since Defendants knew many of the Abusers were predators, Defendants had reasonable cause to believe that Plaintiffs were being sexually abused.

442. Defendants breached their duty to protect Plaintiffs when they failed to supervise them, placing them with known predators.

443. Defendants' actions and/or inactions were willful, wanton, and reckless.

444. As a direct result of defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiffs memories were repressed and have suffered and continue to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; were prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing their daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; and/or have incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

445. One or more Plaintiffs, because of various psychological coping mechanisms and the insidious long-term and late developing injuries, did not discover and/or could not ascertain the nature or extent of their injuries and could make no causal connection between their psychological sequelae and the abuse until recently. One or more Plaintiffs fully and completely repressed all memory of these events for an extended period of time. One or more Plaintiffs were prevented from ascertaining their cause of action against Defendants due to the Defendants' fraudulent concealment.

COUNT IV – Negligence *Per Se*

446. Plaintiffs incorporate all paragraphs of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.

447. Defendants violated one or more statutes or regulations.

448. Plaintiffs were at all relevant times members of the class of persons intended to be protected by the statute or regulation.

449. Plaintiffs' injuries are the kind the statute or regulations were designed to prevent.

450. Defendants' violations of the statutes or regulations were the proximate cause in whole or in part of Plaintiffs' injuries herein.

COUNT V – Breach of Special Relationship/Duty

451. Plaintiffs incorporate all paragraphs of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.

452. As set forth herein, since Defendants knew that the Abusers had a sexual propensity to abuse minors, the injuries inflicted upon Plaintiffs were foreseeable.

453. As a result of Plaintiffs being minors at the time of the sexual abuse, and by Defendants undertaking the care and guidance of the then-minor, vulnerable Plaintiffs, Defendants held a position of empowerment over Plaintiffs.

454. Defendants, by holding out themselves, the parishes and religious institutions at which the Abusers served, as safe and secure institutions and holding themselves out as shepherds and leaders of the Roman Catholic Church, solicited and/or accepted this position of empowerment. Defendants entered into a special, confidential, custodial, and/or fiduciary relationship with Plaintiffs.

455. Plaintiffs reposed trust and confidence in all Defendants as their spiritual guides, authority figures, teachers, mentors and confidantes.

456. As a fiduciary or confidante to Plaintiffs, Defendants had a duty to obtain and disclose information relating to sexual misconduct and other inappropriate behavior of Defendants'

agents, including Abusers. As their caretaker, confidante and fiduciary, each Individual Defendant owed Plaintiffs the duty of trust and loyalty, and the duty to work solely for their benefit. Moreover, Defendants had a duty to disclose to Plaintiffs and others the wrongful nature of the abuse.

457. Defendant Archdiocese breached its duties to Plaintiffs and abused its position of trust and confidence for its own personal gain, including without limitation, the following:

a. Defendants used Plaintiffs' dependency and innocence as a child to prevent them from recognizing that the abuse was wrongful and threatened their security, their parents' love, and their everlasting soul if they told anyone of the abuse.

b. Defendants accomplished this end by enforcing the secrecy around the acts and/or by teaching Plaintiffs that the acts were normal or necessary to the relationship.

c. Keeping known pedophiles in the presence of children such that they would be allowed to molest Plaintiffs.

d. Hiding the fact of the previous abuse from any individuals who might intervene including parents, state authorities, parishes, and parishioners.

e. Failing to provide a safe environment for the children who relied upon them for their care, nurturance and support.

f. Violating their duties of care imposed by their status as in loco parentis to the children over whom they exercised dominion and control.

g. Failing to abide by their own internal, secular policies and procedures concerning removal, sanction, or discipline of their agents and employees, knowing the individuals whom they serve rely upon those rules, policies and procedures.

h. Ratifying the abuse by Abusers by continuing to pay their travel expenses, allowing outings with and access to children including Plaintiffs to continue, and hiding the fact of their abuse from other individuals or organizations that might intervene to protect the children under their care, custody and/or control after reports of abuse were made.

i. Failing to warn Plaintiffs' families of the possibility of sexual abuse.

458. Defendant Archbishop breached his duties to Plaintiffs and abused his position of trust and confidence for his own personal gain and advancement, including without limitation, the following:

a. The Archdiocese and its employees, servants, and agents knew that individual priests and other employees were having inappropriate physical contact with children.

b. During therapy ordered by the Archbishop and/or Archdiocese, one or more Abusers admitted to being sexually attracted to children.

c. Even while still in therapy, one or more Abusers began sexually abusing other children.

d. Despite extensive knowledge of abuse by the Abusers, the St. Louis Archdiocese did not remove them from ministry promptly or at all.

e. After allegations of abuse became known to the Archdiocese about one or more Abusers, they were sent away for treatment, the Archdiocese and/or Archbishop placed or continued to place them at an Archdiocese-sponsored ministry with access to children.

f. Defendants enforced secrecy around sexual improprieties of one or more Abusers by placing the reputation of the Church over the safety of the children.

g. After certain allegations were released about certain Abusers, the Archdiocese released statements suggesting that the Abusers were innocent of wrongdoing despite criminal convictions and other indicia of reliability of the accusations.

h. At all relevant times, Defendant Archbishop and Archdiocese were mandated reporters under Missouri law. Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop did not report the Abusers' sexual improprieties to the appropriate authorities after receiving reasonable suspicion that one or more of them may abuse children.

i. Defendant's actions in failing to report were part of an ongoing fraudulent scheme to prevent parishioners, children and the public from knowing that one or more Abusers were predators.

j. Defendant kept more than one pedophile in the presence of children such that they would be allowed to molest one or more Plaintiffs.

k. One or more Abusers were eventually prosecuted for their crimes in perpetrating sodomy and other sexually deviant acts on young children. Representatives of the Archdiocese, in fact, sent letters of support to the Prosecutor seeking leniency for one or more Abusers, often after knowing for years that one or more Defendants had been abusing children. These acts were in furtherance of a fraudulent scheme to prevent parishioners, children and the public from knowing that one or more Abusers were known predators.

l. Defendants hid the fact of the previous abuse from any individuals that might intervene including parents, state authorities, parishes, and parishioners by falsely, often by representing that one or more Abusers were individuals of character and safe to be with

children at the same time that it received reports of abuse, sent one or more Abusers to counseling and treatment, then returned them to ministry and access to children, made misleading statements to the press with the intention that the public would be duped, failed to report actions to the proper authorities even though they were mandated reporters, and tried to influence the prosecution of one or more Abusers.

m. Defendants failed to provide a safe environment for the children who relied upon them for their care, nurture and support.

n. Defendants failed to warn Plaintiffs' families of the possibility of sexual abuse.

459. Defendants violated their duties of care and duty to warn imposed by their status as in loco parentis to the children over whom they exercised dominion and control. Defendant Archdiocese failed to abide by its own internal, secular policies and procedures concerning removal, sanction or discipline of their agents and employees, knowing the individuals whom they serve rely upon those rules, policies and procedures.

460. Defendant Archbishop ratified the abuse by the Abusers by continuing to place one or more of them in parishes even after receiving multiple reports of sexual misconduct, sending one or more of them to treatment by placing them at other ministries and schools, paying travel expenses, allowing outings with and access to children including Plaintiffs to continue, moving them from parish to parish and hiding the fact of the abuse from other individuals or organizations that might intervene to protect the children under their care, custody and/or control after reports of abuse were made.

461. Abusers breached their fiduciary duties to Plaintiffs and abused their position of trust and confidence for their own personal gain, including without limitation, the following:

- a. Engaging in sexual misconduct with the Plaintiffs;
- b. Representing to one or more Plaintiffs that the actions were appropriate and were part of their spiritual growth and counseling;
- c. Making sexual contact an implicit and/or explicit condition to the continuance of care, nurture, support and spiritual guidance;
- d. Silencing the children abused by threatening them, making them live in secret shame, fear and degradation while then ministering to them psychologically, emotionally and spiritually.

462. Defendants' actions and/or inactions were willful, wanton and reckless for which punitive damages and/or damages for aggravating circumstances are appropriate.

463. As a direct result of Defendants' breach of their duties and special relationship with Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs have suffered, and continue to suffer great pain of mind and body, repressed memories, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; have been prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing his daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; have sustained loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or have incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

COUNT VI – Fraud and Conspiracy to Commit Fraud

464. Plaintiffs incorporate all paragraphs of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.

465. Defendants Archbishop and Archdiocese knew or should have known of the sexual misconduct and other inappropriate behavior of their agents, including Abusers as described herein.

466. Defendants engaged in trickery, deceit and acts of deluding Plaintiffs and those who were in a position to act on Plaintiffs' behalf while they were minors.

467. Defendants misrepresented, concealed or failed to disclose information relating to sexual misconduct of their agents, including engaging in willful acts intended to deceive as set forth herein.

468. At all relevant times, Defendant Archbishop and Archdiocese were mandated reporters under Missouri law. Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop did not report Abusers' sexual improprieties to the appropriate authorities after receiving reasonable suspicion that they may abuse children.

469. Defendant's actions in failing to report were part of an ongoing fraudulent scheme to prevent parishioners, children and the public from knowing that one or more Abusers were predators.

470. Defendants kept one or more known pedophiles in the presence of children allowing the Abusers to molest Plaintiffs.

471. Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop maintained publicly that the Priests of the Archdiocese were appropriate, well-trained and men of excellent character who were above reproach and safe role models who nurtured, trained, and formed the character of children.

472. Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop expressly and impliedly made these representations.

473. At the time that these representations were made, the Archdiocese and Archbishop had a pattern and practice of sending priests who had abused children to the St. Luke Institute in Silver Spring, Maryland or other treatment facilities for perpetrating and sexually deviant priests, then returning them to ministry, including ministry with children.

474. The Archdiocese and Archbishop had a pattern and practice of moving perpetrating priests from location to location to protect the perpetrating priests from criminal penalties and civil lawsuits.

475. Although the Archdiocese and Archbishop owed the children and parents of the Archdiocese duties commensurate with their position, the Archdiocese and Archbishop kept from the parents information concerning the Abusers that would affect their decisions regarding whether to allow their children to be alone with them, including information that one or more Abusers were known to abuse children.

476. In the face of the special knowledge that the Archdiocese and Archbishop had as well as the special relationship they had with the parishioners and children of the Archdiocese, the Archdiocese and Archbishop refused to provide information to parishioners and their children about the hidden dangers that were posed by one or more Abusers.

477. Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop intentionally represented that Abusers were fit for the ministry including his ministry with children, even after having actual knowledge that they exhibited paraphilia and engaged in boundary violations with children.

478. Defendant Archdiocese and Archbishop followed a policy that hampered investigation into allegations of sexual misconduct by its priests.

479. Defendant Archdiocese and Archbishop failed or refused to take reports by parishioners and even employees of the abuses of one or more Abusers, even after publishing a website encouraging parishioners to come forward if they have allegations of sexual abuse.

480. Defendant Archdiocese ignored reports that the Abusers were engaging in inappropriate sexual activity with children.

481. Defendant Archdiocese and Archbishop deliberately failed to warn or inform Parishioners, family members or any other individuals or organizations about Abusers using their children for their own sexual gratification, instead encouraging parishioners, including the small children, to maintain relationships with them.

482. Defendants deliberately misled its parishioners and the public in its communications regarding one or more Abusers.

483. Defendant Archdiocese and Archbishop hid the abuses of Abusers preventing investigation into them and covering up the allegations, making them accessories before, during and after the fact in the following particulars without limitation:

- a. Failing to provide a safe environment for the children who relied upon them for their care, nurturance and support;
- b. Violating their duties of care imposed by their status as in loco parentis to the children over whom they exercised dominion and control;
- c. Failing to abide by their own internal, secular policies and procedures concerning removal, sanction or discipline of their agents and employees, knowing the individuals whom they serve rely upon those rules, policies and procedures;

d. Ratifying the abuse by Abusers by continuing to employ and support them and granting them unfettered access to children, giving them positions requiring supervisory duty over children, moving them from posting to posting to avoid being “caught” abusing children, giving them positions requiring their contact with children after having gained actual knowledge that they had a propensity to abuse children and failing to report and/or hiding the fact of his abuse from other individuals or organizations that might intervene to protect the children under their care, custody and/or control.

484. Defendants knew that they misrepresented, concealed, or failed to disclose information they had the duty to disclose relating to sexual misconduct of its agent.

485. Defendants had superior knowledge or information not within the fair and reasonable reach of Plaintiffs and failed to disclose that information.

486. Defendants knew of the existence of the torts of sexual abuse and failure to supervise.

487. Defendants used deception to conceal these torts from Plaintiffs and those who were in a position to act on behalf of Plaintiffs while they were minors.

488. Plaintiffs relied upon that deception and concealment, remaining ignorant that torts were committed upon them.

489. The fact that Abusers had in the past and/or would in the future be likely to commit sexual misconduct with another minor was a material fact that, if known, would have influenced

Plaintiffs and their family's decision whether to allow them to attend and participate in activities at church and with Defendants' agent in church sanctioned and/or sponsored activities.

490. Upon information and belief, Defendants, in concert with each other, with the intent to conceal and defraud, conspired and came to a meeting of the minds whereby they would misrepresent, conceal, and fail to disclose information relating to the sexual misconduct of Abusers, prohibiting public scrutiny or investigation into their acts of sexual misconduct.

491. By so concealing, Defendants committed at least one act in furtherance of the conspiracy.

492. Defendants' actions and/or inactions were willful, wanton and reckless for which punitive damages and/or damages for aggravating circumstances are appropriate.

493. As a direct result of Defendants' fraud and conspiracy, Plaintiffs have suffered, and continue to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; have been prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing their daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; and/or have incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

COUNT VII – *Fraudulent Misrepresentation*

494. Plaintiffs incorporate the foregoing paragraphs of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.

495. Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop engaged in ongoing misrepresentation regarding the status of Abusers.

496. The Defendant Archdiocese by and through its agents and administrators, represented that Abusers were priests or other officials with whom children could be trusted. The Defendants engaged in fraudulent misrepresentations as set forth herein.

497. At all relevant times, Defendants Archbishop and Archdiocese were mandated reporters under Missouri law. Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop did not report Abusers' sexual improprieties to the appropriate authorities after receiving reasonable suspicion that Abusers may abuse children.

498. Defendants' actions in failing to report were part of an ongoing fraudulent scheme to prevent parishioners, children and the public from knowing that Abusers were predators.

499. Defendants kept one or more known pedophiles in the presence of children such that they would be allowed to molest Plaintiffs.

500. Defendants hid the fact of the previous abuse from any individuals that might intervene including parents, state authorities, parishes, and parishioners by falsely representing that one or more Abusers were individuals of character and safe to be with children at the same time that it received reports of abuse, sent one or more Abusers to counseling and treatment then returned them to the ministry, made misleading statements to the press with the intention that the public would be duped, failed to report Abusers' actions to the proper authorities even though they were mandated reporters, and tried to influence the prosecution of one or more Abusers.

501. Defendants failed to provide a safe environment for the children who relied upon them for their care, nurture and support.

502. Defendant Archbishop ratified the abuse by the Abusers by continuing to place one or more of them in parishes even after receiving multiple reports of sexual misconduct, sending one or more of them to treatment by placing them at other ministries and schools, paying travel expenses, allowing outings with and access to children including Plaintiffs to continue, moving them from parish to parish and hiding the fact of the abuse from other individuals or organizations that might intervene to protect the children under their care, custody and/or control after reports of abuse were made.

503. Defendants continued to hold the Abusers out to the community of the faithful and its parishioners as safe, secure parish priests and mentors.

504. Abusers, by holding themselves out as priests and other officials in good standing, falsely represented to the Plaintiffs that they intended to help, protect and instruct them.

505. One or more Abusers, by indicating the abuse was part of spiritual counseling, mentoring and advice, falsely represented to the Plaintiffs that the acts in which they engaged were part of God's will and plan and for the Plaintiffs.

506. One or more Abusers, by telling Plaintiffs that they would lose their church, family, and soul (and other such coercive, fraudulent misrepresentations) if they told of the actions that occurred in the sacristy and elsewhere, defrauded the plaintiff.

507. All Defendants knew such statements were false at the time they were made.

508. The Archdiocese and Archbishop intentionally hid from parents and others that one or more Abusers had abused children in the past.

509. Plaintiffs believed the statements so made by defendants were true and reasonably relied, to their detriment, upon them. They moreover capitulated to the very trust in the Archdiocese and Abusers instilled in them by their families and all Defendants such that Defendants' silence constituted fraudulent misrepresentation.

510. As a result of Defendants' fraudulent misrepresentations, Plaintiffs have been injured. Each and every one of his injuries caused by the sexual abuse by defendants has been exacerbated by this additional violation of the plaintiff's trust.

511. Defendants' actions and/or inactions were willful, wanton and reckless for which punitive damages are appropriate.

512. The fact that Defendants' agents, including Abusers had in the past and/or would in the future be likely to commit sexual misconduct with minors at the parish to which he was assigned would have been a material fact in Plaintiffs and their families' decisions whether to associate with the Abusers.

513. Plaintiffs justifiably relied upon Defendants for information relating to sexual misconduct of Defendants and their agents. Plaintiffs further relied upon Defendants to ensure their safety while in the Defendants' care and custody.

514. As a direct result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered and continue to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; have been prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing their

daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; and/or have incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

COUNT VIII – Constructive Fraud

515. Plaintiffs incorporates all paragraphs of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.

516. Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop, by holding Abusers out as a reliable, trustworthy shepherd, representative, and leader of the Roman Catholic Church, solicited and/or accepted a position of power. This position of trust prevented the Plaintiffs or those in charge of their safety from effectively protecting them and Defendants thus entered into fiduciary and/or confidential relationships with Plaintiffs.

517. As fiduciaries and/or confidantes to Plaintiffs, Defendants had a duty to obtain and disclose information relating to sexual misconduct and other inappropriate behavior of Defendant agents.

518. Defendant had prior knowledge of past allegations of abuse and/or sexual impropriety with children involving some or all Abusers.

519. Defendants had a duty to protect Plaintiffs and others from known perpetrators by warning them and others of the abuse, abusive propensities, and/or preventing Abusers from accessing young children in their role with the Church.

520. Defendants failed to disclose information regarding Abusers’ abusive tendencies and history of inappropriate and sexually abusive relationships with children, or to prevent the priests from unfettered access to children.

521. Defendants failed to disclose their knowledge of Abusers' history of using their position as priest and counselor, the church properties, and the church resources and status to attract and gain access to unsupervised time with children.

522. Defendants actively represented that some or all Abusers were capable counselors, brothers, priests, and mentors when they knew some or all Abusers had a propensity to sexually abuse children in the past.

523. Defendants actively developed a plan and a strategy for keeping Abusers' abusive tendencies away from public light, a plan which included:

- a. Misrepresenting the safety of leaving a child alone with Abusers;
- b. Failing to warn Plaintiffs of the propensity of the Abusers to sexually abuse children;
- c. Moving some or all Abusers from parish to parish following reports of sexual misconduct;
- d. Failing to report any of the Abusers' sexual misconduct or other behaviors involving minors to law enforcement or state authorities;
- e. Aiding and abetting Abusers' abuse;
- f. Encouraging one or more Abusers to sexually abuse the Plaintiffs;
- g. Failing to take any action to stop the abuse it knew was occurring;
- h. Failing to provide a safe environment for the children who relied upon them for their care, nurturance and support;

- i. Violating its duties of care imposed by its status as *in loco parentis* to the children over whom it exercised dominion and control and the parents who entrusted their most precious possessions, their children;
- j. Enforcing the secrecy around the acts and/or teaching Plaintiffs that the acts were normal or necessary to the relationship;
- k. Hiding the fact of the previous abuse from any individuals that might intervene, including parents, state authorities, parishes and parishioners;
- l. Failing to abide by its own internal, secular policies and procedures concerning removal, sanction, or discipline of their agents and employees, knowing the individuals whom they serve rely upon those rules, policies and procedures;
- m. Failing to abide by its own internal, secular policies and procedures concerning investigation and/or reporting of their agents and employees, knowing that the individuals whom they serve rely upon those rules, policies and procedures;
- n. Representing that the Abusers were clergy or other agents of the Archdiocese in good standing.

524. Plaintiffs justifiably relied upon Defendants for information relating to sexual misconduct of Defendants' agents. Plaintiffs and their families further relied upon defendants to ensure the safety of children in the Defendants' care and custody.

525. Defendants' actions and/or inactions were willful, wanton, and reckless such that punitive damages are appropriate.

526. As a direct result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered and continue to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; and will continue to be prevented from performing their daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; and/or have incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

COUNT IX – *Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress*

527. Plaintiffs incorporate all paragraphs of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.

528. Defendants intentionally failed to supervise, remove or otherwise sanction some or all Abusers after they had actual notice of their dangerous propensities to abuse children and continued to place them in positions of authority over children and adolescents, including Plaintiffs.

529. Defendants knew or should have known that Abusers were unsuitable for the positions they held.

530. Defendants failed to adequately review and monitor the services which were provided by Abusers, intentionally turning a blind eye to misconduct directed at children.

531. Defendants intentionally failed to confront, remove, or sanction Abusers about known irregularities in employment.

532. Defendants failed to act upon information gained during the course of their supervision of Abusers.

533. Defendants intentionally failed to supervise the children within their care, custody or control from coming in contact with the known risk presented by Abusers.

534. At all times relevant, Defendant Archdiocese was in a fiduciary and/or confidential relationship with Plaintiffs. Instead of acting in the best interest of Plaintiffs, as required when one is in a fiduciary status, Defendant Archdiocese held out the Abusers with known histories of child sexual abuse as appropriate individuals with whom Plaintiffs should interact.

535. Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop allowed and/or encouraged its agents to turn a blind eye toward sexual abuse of minors in furtherance of its policy of covering up these crimes.

536. Moreover, Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop aided, abetted, and ratified the conduct of Abusers, who at the behest of Defendants held themselves out as moral teachers, guides, and religious authorities, as well as kind and caring surrogate father figures and mentors for Plaintiffs with the titles of legitimacy and trust Defendants bestowed upon them.

537. Abusers' teachings and positions within the Archdiocese juxtaposed against their sexual impropriety with Plaintiffs created a psychological and emotional conundrum for the young Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs could not process the value-laden messages in these contradictory acts, causing Plaintiffs to develop psychological dysfunction that resulted in his inability to discern or discover his injury and its cause.

538. The actions of Abusers were taken intentionally to cause such emotional distress as to prevent the Plaintiffs from revealing and/or understanding the import of the abuse, with reckless disregard as to the probable injuries that would result.

539. Abusers had a fiduciary and/or confidential relationship with Plaintiffs by virtue of their roles as priests, mentors, father figures, and authority figures to the young Plaintiffs. The power imbalance between Defendants and Plaintiffs increased Plaintiffs' vulnerability.

540. Abusers engaged in unconscionable, outrageous conduct beyond all possible bounds of decency and utterly intolerable in a civilized society. Said actions included without limitation, engaging in inappropriate sexual contact with Plaintiffs, using their role as a priest or other position to require Plaintiffs' silence either directly or indirectly, intentionally creating for Plaintiffs a psychological and moral disconnect that would ensure the silence of the Plaintiffs, and using their position of trust and confidence with Plaintiffs for their own personal and sexual gratification.

541. Upon information and belief, Defendants, by and through their agents, servants and employees, knew or reasonably should have known of Abusers' dangerous and exploitative propensities and/or that they were unfit agents, and despite such knowledge, Defendants and Abusers breached their duty to protect Plaintiffs when they failed to protect Plaintiffs from the sexual abuse described herein.

542. Abusers' actions and/or inactions were willful, wanton, and reckless such that punitive damages and/or damages for aggravating circumstances are appropriate.

543. The emotional distress experienced by Plaintiffs as a result of Abusers conduct is medically diagnosable and is of sufficient severity so as to be medically significant.

544. At all times relevant, Defendant Archdiocese and Archbishop engaged in extreme and outrageous conduct, intended to cause or committed in reckless disregard of the probability of

causing emotional distress and harm. Additionally or in the alternative, the conduct of Defendants and Abusers was extreme and outrageous and committed with the sole purpose of inflicting emotional distress upon Plaintiffs.

545. Defendants Archdiocese and Archbishop engaged in unconscionable, outrageous conduct beyond all possible bounds of decency and utterly intolerable in a civilized society. Defendants' conduct caused Plaintiffs severe emotional distress of such a nature that no reasonable person in a civilized society could be expected to endure it.

546. Defendants' actions and/or inactions were willful, wanton and reckless for which punitive damages and/or damages for aggravating circumstances are appropriate.

547. Plaintiffs suffered medically significant and diagnosable distress as a result of Defendants' actions as set forth in the Background Facts Applicable to All Counts.

548. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered, and continue to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress that is medically diagnosable and significant, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; have been prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing their daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; have sustained loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or have incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

COUNT X – Aiding and Abetting

549. Plaintiffs incorporate all paragraphs of this petition as if set forth fully herein.

550. At all relevant times, the Archdiocese and Archbishop had the right to control the Abusers as set forth herein.

551. Furthermore, the Archdiocese and Archbishop at all relevant times countenanced, approved, aided, abetted, and encouraged as principal the tortious acts of its employees (Abusers), of committing sexual abuse and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, breach of special relationship and fiduciary duty, fraud, fraudulent misrepresentation, fraud, and intentional infliction of emotional distress. The Archdiocese and Archbishop are vicariously liable for all wrongful acts and omissions of the Abusers set forth herein.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

552. Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury on all issues triable in this case.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs ask that this Court award judgment against Defendants as follows:

1. Awarding compensatory, statutory, punitive, and any and all damages as allowed by law in favor of Plaintiffs and against Defendants for damages sustained as a result of the wrongdoings of Defendants, together with interest thereon;
2. Awarding Plaintiffs their costs and expenses incurred in this action; and
3. Granting such other and further relief as the Court deems appropriate and just.

Dated: July 24, 2024

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ D. Todd Mathews

BAILEY & GLASSER, LLP

D. Todd Mathews, Esq., Missouri Bar #52502

Amy Rubin, Esq., Missouri Bar #49397

34 N. Gore Avenue, Suite 102

Webster Groves, MO 63119

T: 314.863.5446

F: 304.342.1110

tmathews@baileyglasser.com

arubin@baileyglasser.com

LEVY KONIGSBERG, LLP

Jerome Block, Esq., Missouri Bar #48510

Jacob Jordan, Esq. (*pro hac admission anticipated*)

605 Third Avenue, 33rd Floor

New York, New York 10158

T: (212) 605-6200

F: (212) 605-6290

jblock@levylaw.com

jjordan@levylaw.com

RANDES MATA, LLC

Rebecca M. Randles, Missouri Bar #40149

851 NW 45TH STREET, SUITE 310

KANSAS CITY

T: (816) 931-9901

F: (816) 931-0134

rebecca@randlesmatalaw.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS