

ROBINS KAPLAN LLP

RAYNA E. KESSLER, ESQ.
NJ ID No. 031782010
399 Park Avenue, Suite 3600
New York, New York 10022
Telephone: (212) 980-7431
Facsimile: (212) 980-7499
Email: RKessler@RobinsKaplan.com

GIANFORCARO LAW

GREGORY G. GIANFORCARO, ESQ.
NJ ID No. 024551988
80 South Main Street
Phillipsburg, New Jersey 08865
Telephone: (908) 859-2200
Facsimile: (908) 859-3441
Email: gianforcarolaw@msn.com

JEFF ANDERSON & ASSOCIATES PA

JEFFREY R. ANDERSON, ESQ. (*pro hac motion to be filed*)
MICHAEL G. FINNEGAN, ESQ. (*pro hac motion to be filed*)
366 Jackson Street, Suite 100
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
Telephone: (651) 227-9990
Facsimile: (651) 297-6543
Email: jeff@andersonadvocates.com
mike@andersonadvocates.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

EDWARD HANRATTY,
Plaintiff,

v.

NEW JERSEY CATHOLIC
CONFERENCE; ARCHDIOCESE OF
NEWARK a/k/a ROMAN CATHOLIC
ARCHDIOCESE OF NEWARK a/k/a
ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF
NEWARK a/k/a THE ROMAN
CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF
NEWARK; THE DIOCESE OF TRENTON
a/k/a THE ROMAN CATHOLIC

:
: SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
: LAW DIVISION: ESSEX COUNTY
:
: DOCKET NO.: _____

CIVIL ACTION

**COMPLAINT, JURY DEMAND, AND
DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION OF
DOCUMENTS**

BISHOP OF TRENTON; THE DIOCESE :
 OF CAMDEN, NEW JERSEY a/k/a :
 DIOCESE OF CAMDEN a/k/a THE :
 ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF :
 CAMDEN; THE DIOCESE OF :
 PATERSON a/k/a THE ROMAN :
 CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF PATERSON :
 a/k/a THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP :
 OF PATERSON; THE DIOCESE OF :
 METUCHEN a/k/a THE ROMAN :
 CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF METUCHEN :
 a/k/a THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP :
 OF METUCHEN, :
 :
 :
Defendants. :

Plaintiff, Edward Hanratty, by way of Complaint against the Defendants, brings this action and alleges as follows:

THE PARTIES
AS TO ALL COUNTS

1. Plaintiff Edward Hanratty is an adult citizen and resident of the State of New Jersey. Plaintiff was a minor during the incidents described herein.

2. At all times material, Defendant New Jersey Catholic Conference (hereinafter “NJCC”) was and continues to be an organization or entity which includes, but is not limited to, civil corporations, decision making entities, officials and employees authorized to conduct business and conducting business in the State of New Jersey with its principal place of business at 149 North Warren Street, Trenton, New Jersey 08608. The NJCC was founded in approximately 1949. The NJCC represents New Jersey bishops and archbishops and their dioceses. The NJCC functions as a business by engaging in activities promoting, advancing and furthering the policies, practices and interests of Catholic institutions in New Jersey. The executive leadership of the NJCC includes Cardinal Joseph W. Tobin, C.SsR. Archbishop, Archdiocese of Newark, Most Rev.

David M. O'Connell, C.M., Bishop, Diocese of Trenton, Most Rev. Dennis J. Sullivan, Bishop, Diocese of Camden, Most Rev. Arthur J. Serratelli, Bishop, Diocese of Paterson, and Most Rev. James F. Checchio, Bishop, Diocese of Metuchen. The NJCC coordinates its efforts in conjunction with each Diocese in New Jersey.

3. At all times material, Defendant Archdiocese of Newark a/k/a Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Newark a/k/a Roman Catholic Diocese of Newark a/k/a the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Newark (hereinafter "Newark Archdiocese") was and continues to be an organization or entity which includes, but is not limited to, civil corporations, decision making entities, officials, and employees, authorized to conduct business and conducting business in the State of New Jersey with its principal place of business at 171 Clifton Avenue, Newark, New Jersey 07104. The Newark Diocese was established in approximately 1853. Later the Diocese created a corporation called the Roman Catholic Diocese of Newark, which eventually became the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Newark, to conduct some of its affairs. The Newark Archdiocese operates its affairs as both a corporate entity and as an organization named the Archdiocese of Newark, with the Archbishop as the top official. Both of these entities and all other corporations and entities controlled by the Archbishop are included in this Complaint as being the Newark Archdiocese. The Archbishop is the top official of the Archdiocese and is given authority over all matters within the Newark Archdiocese as a result of his position. The Archdiocese functions as a business by engaging in numerous revenue producing activities and soliciting money from its members in exchange for its services. The Newark Archdiocese has several programs which seek out the participation of children in the Archdiocese's activities. The Newark Archdiocese, through its officials, has control over those activities involving children. The Newark Archdiocese has the power to appoint, supervise, monitor and fire each person working with children within the

Archdiocese of Newark.

4. The Newark Archdiocese is a resident of the State of New Jersey because its principal place of business is in the state.

5. At all times material, Defendant The Diocese of Trenton a/k/a the Roman Catholic Bishop of Trenton (hereinafter “Trenton Diocese”) was and continues to be an organization or entity which includes, but is not limited to, civil corporations, decision making entities, officials, and employees, authorized to conduct business and conducting business in the State of New Jersey with its principal place of business at 701 Lawrenceville Road, Trenton, New Jersey 08648. The Trenton Diocese was created in approximately 1881. Later the Diocese created a corporation called The Diocese of Trenton to conduct some of its affairs. The Trenton Diocese operates its affairs as both a corporate entity and as an organization named the Diocese of Trenton, with the Bishop as the top official. Both of these entities and all other corporations and entities controlled by the Bishop are included in this Complaint as being the Trenton Diocese. The Bishop is the top official of the Diocese and is given authority over all matters within the Trenton Diocese as a result of his position. The Diocese functions as a business by engaging in numerous revenue producing activities and soliciting money from its members in exchange for its services. The Trenton Diocese has several programs which seek out the participation of children in the Diocese’s activities. The Trenton Diocese, through its officials, has control over those activities involving children. The Trenton Diocese has the power to appoint, supervise, monitor and fire each person working with children within the Diocese of Trenton.

6. The Trenton Diocese is a resident of the State of New Jersey because its principal place of business is in the state.

7. At all times material, Defendant The Diocese of Camden, New Jersey a/k/a Diocese

of Camden a/k/a the Roman Catholic Bishop of Camden (hereinafter “Camden Diocese”) was and continues to be an organization or entity which includes, but is not limited to, civil corporations, decision making entities, officials, and employees, authorized to conduct business and conducting business in the State of New Jersey with its principal place of business at 631 Market Street, Camden, New Jersey 08102. The Camden Diocese was created in approximately 1937. Later the Diocese created a corporation called The Diocese of Camden, New Jersey, to conduct some of its affairs. The Camden Diocese operates its affairs as both a corporate entity and as an organization named the Diocese of Camden, with the Bishop as the top official. Both of these entities and all other corporations and entities controlled by the Bishop are included in this Complaint as being the Camden Diocese. The Bishop is the top official of the Diocese and is given authority over all matters within the Camden Diocese as a result of his position. The Diocese functions as a business by engaging in numerous revenue producing activities and soliciting money from its members in exchange for its services. The Camden Diocese has several programs which seek out the participation of children in the Diocese’s activities. The Camden Diocese, through its officials, has control over those activities involving children. The Camden Diocese has the power to appoint, supervise, monitor and fire each person working with children within the Diocese of Camden.

8. The Camden Diocese is a resident of the State of New Jersey because its principal place of business is in the state.

9. At all times material, Defendant The Diocese of Paterson a/k/a the Roman Catholic Diocese of Paterson a/k/a the Roman Catholic Bishop of Paterson (hereinafter “Paterson Diocese”) was and continues to be an organization or entity which includes, but is not limited to, civil corporations, decision making entities, officials, and employees, authorized to conduct business and conducting business in the State of New Jersey with its principal place of business at 777

Valley Road, Clifton, New Jersey 07013. The Paterson Diocese was created in approximately 1937. Later the Diocese created a corporation to conduct some of its affairs. The Paterson Diocese operates its affairs as both a corporate entity and as an organization named the Diocese of Paterson, with the Bishop as the top official. Both of these entities and all other corporations and entities controlled by the Bishop are included in this Complaint as being the Paterson Diocese. The Bishop is the top official of the Diocese and is given authority over all matters within the Paterson Diocese as a result of his position. The Diocese functions as a business by engaging in numerous revenue producing activities and soliciting money from its members in exchange for its services. The Paterson Diocese has several programs which seek out the participation of children in the Diocese's activities. The Paterson Diocese, through its officials, has control over those activities involving children. The Paterson Diocese has the power to appoint, supervise, monitor and fire each person working with children within the Diocese of Paterson.

10. The Paterson Diocese is a resident of the State of New Jersey because its principal place of business is in the state.

11. At all times material, Defendant The Diocese of Metuchen a/k/a the Roman Catholic Diocese of Metuchen a/k/a the Roman Catholic Bishop of Metuchen (hereinafter "Metuchen Diocese") was and continues to be an organization or entity which includes, but is not limited to, civil corporations, decision making entities, officials, and employees, authorized to conduct business and conducting business in the State of New Jersey with its principal place of business at 146 Metlars Lane, Piscataway, New Jersey 08854. The Metuchen Diocese was created and incorporated in approximately 1981. The Metuchen Diocese operates its affairs as both a corporate entity and as an organization named the Diocese of Metuchen, with the Bishop as the top official. Both of these entities and all other corporations and entities controlled by the Bishop

are included in this Complaint as being the Metuchen Diocese. The Bishop is the top official of the Diocese and is given authority over all matters within the Metuchen Diocese as a result of his position. The Diocese functions as a business by engaging in numerous revenue producing activities and soliciting money from its members in exchange for its services. The Metuchen Diocese has several programs which seek out the participation of children in the Diocese's activities. The Metuchen Diocese, through its officials, has control over those activities involving children. The Metuchen Diocese has the power to appoint, supervise, monitor and fire each person working with children within the Diocese of Metuchen.

12. The Metuchen Diocese is a resident of the State of New Jersey because its principal place of business is in the state.

13. Venue is proper in this county pursuant to Rule 4:3-2 because Defendant NJCC is doing business within Essex County, Defendant Newark Archdiocese resides in Essex County, and events that are relevant to this action occurred within Essex County.

14. The Newark Archdiocese, Trenton Diocese, Camden Diocese, Paterson Diocese, and Metuchen Diocese are collectively referred to as "Defendants" herein.

15. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that in all matters alleged herein each of the Defendants were the co-conspirators, employees, agents, ostensible agents, managing agents, servants, owners, joint venturers, managers, directors, officers, representatives, alter egos, partners, general partners, trustees, co-trustees, co-venturers, and/or employees of the other defendants, and in doing the activities herein alleged were acting within the course and scope of their co-conspiracy, employment, agency, ownership, joint venture, management or their status as an officer, director, or managing agent of Defendants. Each of the Defendants' actions, omissions, and conduct were known to, authorized and ratified by Defendants. Plaintiff is informed

and believes and thereon alleges that all the acts, omissions, and/or conduct by the Defendants, which was outside the scope of their authority, were known to, authorized and ratified by the Defendants.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

16. Plaintiff was raised in a devout Roman Catholic family and attended St. Francis of Assisi in Ridgefield Park, New Jersey, in the Newark Archdiocese where they came in contact with Father Gerald Sudol (hereinafter “Fr. Sudol”) as an agent and representative of Defendants. Plaintiff was raised to trust, revere and respect the Roman Catholic Church, including Defendants and their agents, including Fr. Sudol.

17. From approximately 1987 to 1991, when Plaintiff was approximately 10 to 14 years old, Fr. Sudol engaged in unpermitted sexual contact with Plaintiff.

18. Defendants have failed and continue to fail to report known and/or suspected sexual abuse of children by their agents to the police and law enforcement.

19. Defendants have maintained and continue to maintain sexually abusive priests in employment despite knowledge or suspicions of child sex abuse.

20. Defendants hold their leaders and agents out as people of high morals, as possessing immense power, teaching families and children to obey these leaders and agents, teaching families and children to respect and revere these leaders and agents, soliciting youth and families to their programs, marketing to youth and families, recruiting youth and families, and holding out the people that work in their programs as safe.

21. As a result, Defendants’ leaders and agents have occupied positions of great trust, respect and allegiance among members of the general public, including Plaintiff.

22. Since 1949, Defendant NJCC has assembled the Bishops of the Dioceses in New Jersey in coordinating, creating, deciding and disseminating the policies, practices and agendas to be implemented in each Diocese in New Jersey.

23. Defendant NJCC functions as a convener for the bishops of each Diocese in New Jersey to discuss and respond collectively as a governing body over Catholic institutions and issues in New Jersey.

24. Defendant NJCC, on behalf of each New Jersey Diocese, has made representations about the safety of programs in Catholic institutions in New Jersey.

25. Defendant NJCC has repeatedly pledged to restore trust for victims of sexual abuse through accountability and justice. These pledges are inconsistent with New Jersey Dioceses' policies, practices and actions demonstrating secrecy and concealment of information about priests who have sexually assaulted children in New Jersey.

26. Defendants have fraudulently represented and continue to fraudulently represent to the public, including Plaintiff, that 1) there is no danger of child sex abuse at its facilities and in its programs; 2) they respond to allegations of sexual abuse promptly and effectively; 3) they cooperate with civil authorities; 4) they discipline offenders; and/or 5) they provide a means of accountability to ensure the problem of clerical sex abuse is effectively dealt with.

27. Defendants have also fraudulently represented and continue to fraudulently represent to the public that any sexual misconduct by its agents is a problem of the past and that its programs and schools do not currently pose any risk to children.

28. Each Defendant has repeatedly and fraudulently represented that it will take action to prevent sexual abuse while simultaneously concealing information about its knowledge of sexual abuse of minors from law enforcement and the general public.

29. Defendants have a duty to refrain from taking actions that it knows or should know interrupt or interfere with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public.

30. Despite this duty, Defendants have for decades, and continue to adopt policies and practices of covering up criminal activity committed by its agents. These practices continue to the present day.

31. Defendants' practices have endangered numerous children in the past and these practices will continue to put children at risk in the future.

32. Defendants owe a duty to warn all children and their parents that come into contact with their agents or former agents of allegations of sexual misconduct by the agents and former agents because these children and their parents hold many of these agents and former agents in esteemed positions, believe in the infallibility of Defendants' agents, and the trustworthiness of Defendants, all of which gives them virtually unlimited access to children.

33. In 2018, Cardinal Joseph Tobin, the Archbishop of the Newark Archdiocese, indicated that the New Jersey dioceses would release the names of all priests and deacons credibly accused of sexual abuse of minors in the year 2019.

34. In February 2019, Defendant Newark Archdiocese publicly released a list of 63 clerics who had worked in the Newark Archdiocese and who had been credibly accused of abusing children, which included Fr. Sudol. Despite this release, Defendants continue to conceal important information about the priests on the lists, including Fr. Sudol's history and background, and the names and information about accused priests not on the lists. Additional information has also not been disclosed about the credibly accused priests' patterns of grooming and sexual abuse. As a result, children are at risk of being sexually assaulted.

35. In February 2019, Defendant Trenton Diocese publicly released a list of 30 clerics who had worked in the Trenton Diocese and who had been credibly accused of abusing children. Despite this release, Defendants continue to conceal important information about the priests on the lists and the names and information about accused priests not on the lists. Additional information has also not been disclosed about the credibly accused priests' patterns of grooming and sexual abuse. As a result, children are at risk of being sexually assaulted.

36. In February 2019, Defendant Camden Diocese publicly released a list of 57 clerics who had worked in the Camden Diocese and who had been credibly accused of abusing children. Despite this release, Defendants continue to conceal important information about the priests on the lists and the names and information about accused priests not on the lists. Additional information has also not been disclosed about the credibly accused priests' patterns of grooming and sexual abuse. As a result, children are at risk of being sexually assaulted.

37. In February 2019, Defendant Paterson Diocese publicly released a list of 28 clerics who had worked in the Paterson Diocese and who had been credibly accused of abusing children. Despite this release, Defendants continue to conceal important information about the priests on the lists and the names and information about accused priests not on the lists. Additional information has also not been disclosed about the credibly accused priests' patterns of grooming and sexual abuse. As a result, children are at risk of being sexually assaulted.

38. In February 2019, Defendant Metuchen Diocese publicly released a list of 11 clerics who had worked in the Metuchen Diocese and who had been credibly accused of abusing children. Despite this release, Defendants continue to conceal important information about the priests on the lists and the names and information about accused priests not on the lists. Additional information

has also not been disclosed about the credibly accused priests' patterns of grooming and sexual abuse. As a result, children are at risk of being sexually assaulted.

39. Upon information and belief, prior to and since Defendants' disclosures, Defendants failed to report multiple allegations of sexual abuse of children by its agents to the proper civil authorities. As a result, children are at risk of being sexually assaulted.

40. Further, the public is under the mistaken belief that Defendants do not have undisclosed knowledge of clerics who present a danger to children.

41. As a direct result of Defendants' conduct described herein, Plaintiff has suffered, and will continue to suffer, great pain of mind and body, severe and permanent emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, humiliation, physical, personal and psychological injuries. Plaintiff was prevented, and will continue to be prevented, from performing normal daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; and/or has incurred and will continue to incur expenses for psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling, and, on information and belief, has and/or will incur loss of income and/or loss of earning capacity.

EQUITABLE TOLLING OF APPLICABLE STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS

42. Plaintiff asserts all applicable state statutory and common law rights and theories related to the tolling or extension of any applicable statute of limitations, including the discovery rule and/or fraudulent concealment.

43. Plaintiff files this lawsuit within the applicable statute of limitations period of first suspecting or having reason to suspect any wrongdoing, and within the applicable limitations period of first discovering the cause of his injuries and the wrongful conduct that caused such

injuries. Plaintiff could not by exercise of reasonable diligence have discovered any wrongdoing, nor could have discovered the causes of Plaintiff's injuries at an earlier time because some injuries occurred without initial perceptible trauma or harm, and when Plaintiff's injuries were discovered, their causes were not immediately known. Consequently, the discovery rule should be applied to toll the running of the statute of limitations until Plaintiff discovered, or by the exercise of reasonable diligence should have discovered, that Plaintiff may have a basis for an actionable claim.

44. The discovery rule should be applied to toll the running of the statute of limitations until the Plaintiff discovered or reasonably should have discovered Plaintiff's injury and the causal connection between the injury and Defendants' conduct.

45. Information sufficient to ascertain the cause of Plaintiff's injury had not been discovered, identified, or determined prior to the expiration of the period within which the action or claim would have been authorized. Therefore, under the appropriate application of the discovery rule, Plaintiff's suit was filed well within the applicable statutory limitations period.

46. Defendants are estopped from asserting a statute of limitations defense because Defendants fraudulently concealed from Plaintiff the truth, quality and nature of Plaintiff's injuries and the connection between the injuries and Defendants' tortious conduct. Defendants, through their affirmative misrepresentations, concealment, and omissions, actively concealed from Plaintiff the risk their abusers continued to pose.

47. Defendants were under a duty to disclose the true character, quality and nature of the risks associated with their agents and volunteers accused of sexual misconduct with children as this was non-public information over which Defendants had and continue to have exclusive control and because Defendants knew that this information was not available to Plaintiff. In

addition, Defendants are estopped from relying on any statute of limitation because of their intentional concealment of these facts.

48. Plaintiff had no knowledge that Defendants were engaged in the wrongdoing alleged herein. Because of the fraudulent acts of concealment of wrongdoing by Defendants, Plaintiff could not have reasonably discovered the wrongdoing at any time prior.

COUNT I: NUISANCE (COMMON LAW)
AGAINST DEFENDANTS

Plaintiff incorporates all consistent paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth under this Count.

49. Defendants continue to conspire and engage and/or have conspired and engaged in efforts to: 1) conceal from the general public the sexual assaults committed by, the identities of, and the pedophilic/ephebophilic tendencies of its accused priests; and/or 2) conceal from proper civil authorities sexual assaults and abuse committed by its agents against minor children in violation of law, including but not limited to N.J.S.A. § 9:6-8.14; and/or 3) attack the credibility of victims of Defendants' agents; and/or 4) protect Defendants' agents from criminal prosecution for their sexual assaults and abuse against children; and/or 5) allow known child molesters to live freely in the community without informing the public; and/or 6) after receiving reports or notice of misconduct by clerics, transfer them to new parishes without any warning to parishioners of the threat posed by such clerics, in violation of law; and/or 7) make affirmative representations regarding Defendants' pedophilic and/or ephebophilic agents' fitness for employment, in positions that include working with children, while failing to disclose negative information regarding sexual misconduct by such clerics; and/or 8) concealing Defendants' actions and their agents' actions from survivors of past abuse causing separate current harm.

50. The negligence and/or recklessness and/or deception and concealment by Defendants constitutes an unreasonable interference with a right common to the general public in that Defendants' conduct involves a significant interference with the exercise of the common rights of the health, safety, and welfare to the citizens of New Jersey, and has maintained or permitted a condition which unreasonably endangers the safety and health of the members of the general public in New Jersey, including, but not limited to, children and residents in New Jersey and other members of the general public who live in communities where Defendants' agents who molested children live. Defendants' failure to report multiple allegations of sexual assault and abuse of children to proper authorities, as well as their failure to inform the public about sexual abuse, or agents and volunteers accused of sexual abuse of minors, has prevented the public from knowing of a real danger, and has thereby endangered the safety and health of the members of the general public by allowing child molesters to avoid prosecution and remain living freely in unsuspecting communities and working with and around children. These child molesters, known to Defendants but not to the public, pose a threat of additional abuse to a considerable number of members of the public.

51. The negligence and/or recklessness and/or deception and concealment by Defendants was and is injurious to the health and/or indecent or offensive to the senses of the general public including, but not limited to, residents in New Jersey and other members of the general public who live in communities where Defendants' accused molesters live. It was and is indecent and offensive to the senses, so as to interfere with the general public's comfortable enjoyment of life in that many in the general public cannot trust Defendants to warn parents of the presence of the current and/or former accused molesters, nor to identify their current and/or former accused molesters, nor to disclose said credibly accused molesters' and other accused molesters'

volunteer histories, nor to disclose their patterns of conduct in grooming and sexually assaulting children, all of which create an impairment of the safety of children in the neighborhoods in New Jersey and throughout the eastern United States where Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, their business.

52. The Defendants' negligence and/or recklessness and/or deception and concealment is of a constant and continuing nature.

53. The Defendants know or have reason to know that their actions interfere with the citizens of New Jersey's public health, safety and welfare and the public's right to be free from unnecessary danger.

54. The negligence and/or recklessness and/or deception and concealment by Defendants was specially injurious to Plaintiff's health and/or Plaintiff's personal enjoyment of life as Plaintiff was sexually assaulted by Defendants' agent, Fr. Sudol.

55. The negligence and/or recklessness and/or deception and concealment by Defendants also was especially injurious to Plaintiff's health and/or Plaintiff's personal enjoyment of life in that when Plaintiff finally discovered the negligence and/or recklessness and/or deception and concealment of Defendants, Plaintiff experienced mental, emotional and/or physical distress because he had been the victim of Defendants' negligence and/or deception and concealment.

56. Plaintiff has suffered and/or continues to suffer special, particular, and peculiar psychological and emotional harm and/or peculiar pecuniary harm, different in kind from the general public, after learning of Defendants' concealment of names and information about volunteers accused of sexually molesting minors and as a result of the dangerous condition maintained and/or permitted by Defendants, which continues as long as decisions are made and actions are taken to keep the information about the abuse and/or the accused volunteers concealed.

As a result of the negligence and/or deception and concealment, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer lessened enjoyment of life, and/or impaired health, and/or emotional distress, and/or physical symptoms of emotional distress and/or pecuniary loss including medical expenses and/or wage loss.

57. Plaintiff was unable to disclose the abuse he suffered for years after the abuse occurred, in part because of Defendants' concealment of information and records pertaining to Defendants' sexually abusive agents. Defendants' concealment made Plaintiff even more inclined to suppress his thoughts and feelings related to the abuse, and caused Plaintiff to feel invalidated and dismissed. Plaintiff's injuries were exacerbated by Defendants' concealment, which caused him to feel betrayed by the institution that he had idealized as a child.

58. Plaintiff has suffered anxiety, anger and stress-related illness as a result of Defendants' concealment.

59. Plaintiff has suffered special and peculiar injury in the form of pecuniary and economic harm as a result of Defendants' concealment.

60. Plaintiff's injuries are also particular to him and different from certain members of the public who have not been harmed by the nuisance. People who have not been harmed by the nuisance include those who have not suffered any injury at all, those who are unaware of the nuisance, those who do not believe that Defendants ever concealed anything about child sex abuse, and those who think that any concealment only occurred decades ago.

61. The continuing public nuisance created by Defendants was, and continues to be, the proximate cause of Plaintiff's special injuries and damages as alleged.

62. In doing the aforementioned acts, Defendants acted negligently and/or recklessly and/or intentionally and/or maliciously and with conscious disregard for Plaintiff's rights.

63. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff has suffered the injuries and damages described herein.

64. This public nuisance can be abated, in part, through public release of all of the identities and Personnel Files of Defendants' agents who have been accused of sexual misconduct with minors.

COUNT II: CIVIL CONSPIRACY
AGAINST DEFENDANTS

Plaintiff incorporates all consistent paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth under this Count.

65. Each and every Defendant named in this action entered into an express or implied agreement with the common purpose of concealing from the public the true nature and scope of the sexual abuse of minors in the Dioceses across New Jersey.

66. Each and every Defendant entered into a civil conspiracy and concerted action to pursue the common purpose of 1) concealing the sexual assaults of, the identities and patterns of its agents; 2) concealing sexual assaults and abuse committed by its agents from proper civil authorities; 3) attacking credibility of victims of Defendants' agents; 4) protecting Defendants' agents from criminal prosecution for sexual assaults and abuse against children; 5) allowing known child molesters to live freely in the community without informing the public; 6) after receiving reports or notice of misconduct by clerics transferring them to new locations without warning parishioners or the public of the threat posed by such sexual abusers; 7) making affirmative representations regarding Defendants' agents' fitness for employment in positions that include working with children, while failing to disclose negative information regarding sexual misconduct by clerics; 8) concealing Defendants' actions and their agents' actions from survivors of past abuse

causing separate current harm; and 9) moving priests from diocese to diocese within the state of New Jersey in order to help accomplish the goals of secrecy and protection of offenders.

67. Each Defendant acted in concert in performing the overt actions set forth above to inflict a wrong against or injury upon children and other members of the general public across the State of New Jersey who would come in contact with Defendants' sexually abusive agents, including Plaintiff.

68. As a proximate result of Defendants' actions, Plaintiff has suffered the injuries and damages described herein.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants, jointly, severally and/or in the alternative, for punitive damages, together with interest and costs in an unspecified amount, plus costs, disbursements, reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, and such other and further relief as the court deems just and equitable.

To abate the continuing nuisance, Plaintiff requests an order requiring that Defendants: 1) publicly disclose the names of all agents, including priests, accused of child molestation, each agent's history of abuse, each such agent's pattern of grooming and sexual behavior, and his last known address; 2) publicly disclose Defendants' documents on the agents, including priests, accused of child molestation; and 3) discontinue their current practices and policies of dealing with allegations of child sexual abuse by their agents secretly, and that they work with civil authorities to create, implement and follow a policy for dealing with such molesters that will better protect children and the general public from further harm.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

The Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all of the triable issues of this Complaint, pursuant to New Jersey Court Rules 1:8-2(b) and 4:35-1(a).

DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to Rule 4:18-1, Plaintiff demands the production for purposes of inspection and copying at the offices of Robins Kaplan LLP, 399 Park Avenue, Suite 3600, New York, New York 10022, within 50 days after service of the within pleadings, of the following items pertaining to the allegations of this Complaint:

1. All documents relating to or referring to Defendants' awareness or knowledge about child sex abuse.
2. All documents relating to Defendants' awareness or knowledge of alleged child sex abuse by its agents.
3. All transcripts or recordings of testimony, pleadings and discovery responses in any civil case, administrative action, insurance action or Canon law proceeding arising in whole or in part from the acts or conduct of priests accused of sexually molesting minors.
4. All documents identifying, referring or relating to any and all priests or laity who have worked or continue to work in the Diocese who have been accused of sexually molesting minors.
5. All documents identifying, referring or relating to any and all priests or deacons whose names appear on the lists of priests and deacons credibly accused of sexually abusing minors released by the five dioceses in February 2019.
6. All documents reviewed, referred to, or relating to Defendants' investigation of its files or provided to investigators in creation of the lists of priests and deacons credibly accused of sexually abusing minors released by the five dioceses in February 2019.
7. All correspondence to or from any Vatican official or entity including, but not limited to, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, referring or relating to any priest and/or deacon accused of sexually abusing a minor.

Dated: May 6, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

ROBINS KAPLAN LLP

By: /s/Rayna E. Kessler

Rayna E. Kessler, Esq.
NJ ID No. 031782010
399 Park Avenue, Suite 3600
New York, NY 10022
Telephone: (212) 980-7431
Facsimile: (212) 980-7499
Email: RKessler@RobinsKaplan.com

GIANFORCARO LAW

GREGORY G. GIANFORCARO, ESQ.
NJ ID No. 024551988
80 South Main Street
Phillipsburg, New Jersey 08865
Telephone: (908) 859-2200
Facsimile: (908) 859-3441
Email: gianforcarolaw@msn.com

JEFF ANDERSON & ASSOCIATES PA

JEFFREY R. ANDERSON, ESQ. (*pro hac motion to be filed*)

MICHAEL G. FINNEGAN, ESQ. (*pro hac motion to be filed*)

366 Jackson Street, Suite 100
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
Telephone: (651) 227-9990
Facsimile: (651) 297-6543
Email: jeff@andersonadvocates.com
mike@andersonadvocates.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

DESIGNATION OF TRIAL COUNSEL

Pursuant to Rule 4:25-4, Rayna E. Kessler, Esq. is hereby designated as trial counsel for Plaintiff.

/s/Rayna E. Kessler
Rayna E. Kessler, Esq.

Dated: May 6, 2019

CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO RULE 4:5-1

I certify that the dispute about which I am suing is not the subject of any other action pending in any other court or a pending arbitration proceeding to the best of my knowledge and belief. Also, to the best of my knowledge and belief no other action or arbitration proceeding is contemplated. Further, other than the parties set forth in this complaint, I know of no other parties that should be made a part of this lawsuit. In addition, I recognize my continuing obligation to file and serve on all parties and the court an amended certification if there is a change in the facts stated in this original certification.

/s/Rayna E. Kessler
Rayna E. Kessler, Esq.

Dated: May 6, 2019

Civil Case Information Statement

Case Details: ESSEX | Civil Part Docket# L-003360-19

Case Caption: HANRATTY EDWARD VS NEW JERSEY
CATHOLIC CONFEREN

Case Initiation Date: 05/06/2019

Attorney Name: RAYNA ELIZABETH KESSLER

Firm Name: ROBINS KAPLAN LLP

Address: 399 PARK AVENUE STE 3600
NEW YORK NY 10022

Phone:

Name of Party: PLAINTIFF : HANRATTY, EDWARD

Name of Defendant's Primary Insurance Company
(if known): Unknown

Case Type: TORT-OTHER

Document Type: Complaint with Jury Demand

Jury Demand: YES - 12 JURORS

Hurricane Sandy related? NO

Is this a professional malpractice case? NO

Related cases pending: NO

If yes, list docket numbers:

Do you anticipate adding any parties (arising out of same transaction or occurrence)? NO

THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ON THIS FORM CANNOT BE INTRODUCED INTO EVIDENCE

CASE CHARACTERISTICS FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING IF CASE IS APPROPRIATE FOR MEDIATION

Do parties have a current, past, or recurrent relationship? YES

If yes, is that relationship: Other(explain) Plaintiff was a parishioner in Defendants' institutions.

Does the statute governing this case provide for payment of fees by the losing party? NO

Use this space to alert the court to any special case characteristics that may warrant individual management or accelerated disposition:

Do you or your client need any disability accommodations? NO

If yes, please identify the requested accommodation:

Will an interpreter be needed? NO

If yes, for what language:

Please check off each applicable category: Putative Class Action? NO **Title 59?** NO

I certify that confidential personal identifiers have been redacted from documents now submitted to the court, and will be redacted from all documents submitted in the future in accordance with *Rule 1:38-7(b)*

05/06/2019
Dated

/s/ RAYNA ELIZABETH KESSLER
Signed