

Plaintiff, JA/GG DOE 14, by and through Plaintiff's attorneys, by way of Amended Complaint against the Defendants, states and alleges as follows:

PARTIES AND BACKGROUND

1. At all times material to this Amended Complaint, Plaintiff resided in the State of New Jersey.

2. At all times material, Defendant Cardinal Theodore E. McCarrick (hereinafter "McCarrick") was an adult male resident of the State of New Jersey and an agent and/or employee of Defendant Diocese of Metuchen.

3. At all times material, Cardinal Theodore McCarrick was a Roman Catholic cleric employed by the Diocese of Metuchen. McCarrick remained under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendant Diocese, and was appointed by the Pope as Bishop of Metuchen.

4. Upon information and belief, prior to the sexual abuse of Plaintiff, from approximately 1969 to 1976, McCarrick repeatedly sexually abused James Grein. The abuse started when Grein was a minor and continued for years into Grein's adulthood. At the time of his abuse of Grein, McCarrick was a priest of the Archdiocese of New York.

5. Upon information and belief, from approximately 1970 to 1990, McCarrick sexually assaulted at least 8 minor boys

6. Upon information and belief, in 1971 and 1972, at Christmas Masses, McCarrick sexually assaulted a minor altar boy and who had been selected to assist McCarrick with serving Christmas Mass. In 2018, the Archdiocese of New York found these allegations credible and substantiated.

7. In 1981, McCarrick was appointed Bishop of the Diocese of Metuchen in New Jersey.

8. 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 “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.

9. The Diocese of Metuchen was created and incorporated in approximately November of 1981 from the Diocese of Trenton. The Diocese operates its affairs as both a corporate entity and as an organization known as the Diocese of Metuchen. Both of these entities and all other corporations and entities controlled by the Bishop are included in this Complaint as being the “Diocese.” The Bishop of Metuchen is the top official of the Diocese and is given authority over all matters within the Diocese of Metuchen as a result of his position. The Diocese of Metuchen functions as a business by engaging in numerous revenue-producing activities and soliciting money from its members in exchange for its services.

10. The Diocese of Metuchen has several programs which seek out the participation of children in the Diocese’s activities. The Diocese of Metuchen, through its officials, has control over those activities involving children. The Diocese of Metuchen has the power to appoint, supervise, monitor and fire each person working with children within the Diocese of Metuchen.

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

12. At all times material, Defendant, The Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Newark a/k/a Archdiocese of Newark (hereinafter “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.

13. The Newark Diocese was established in approximately 1853 and erected an Archdiocese in approximately 1937. Later, the Archdiocese created a corporation called the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Newark to conduct some of its affairs. The Archdiocese operates its affairs as both a corporate entity and as an organization known as the Archdiocese of Newark. Both of these entities and all other corporations and entities controlled by the Archbishop are included in this Complaint as being the Archdiocese of Newark. The Archbishop is the top official of the Archdiocese and is given authority over all matters within the 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.

14. The Archdiocese of Newark has several programs which seek out the participation of children in the Archdiocese's activities. The Archdiocese, through its officials, has control over assignments of clerics within the Archdiocese as well all activities within the Archdiocese, including those activities involving children. The Archdiocese of Newark has the power to appoint, supervise, monitor and terminate each person including those working with children within the Archdiocese of Newark.

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

16. At all times material, St. Francis Xavier was and continues to be under the direct authority, control, and province of Defendant Archdiocese of Newark and the Archbishop of the Archdiocese of Newark. St. Francis Xavier includes any school affiliated with St. Francis Xavier. At all times material, St. Francis Xavier and Defendant Archdiocese of Newark owned, operated, managed, maintained, and controlled the St. Francis Xavier School.

17. At all times material, Essex Catholic Boys High School (hereinafter "Essex Catholic") was under the direct authority, control, and province of Defendant Archdiocese of

Newark and the Archbishop of the Archdiocese of Newark.

18. At all times material, Holy Trinity was and continues to be under the direct authority, control, and province of Defendant Archdiocese of Newark and the Archbishop of the Archdiocese of Newark. Holy Trinity includes any school affiliated with Holy Trinity. At all times material, Holy Trinity and Defendant Archdiocese of Newark owned, operated, managed, maintained, and controlled Holy Trinity School.

19. At all times material, Our Lady of the Lake was and continues to be under the direct authority, control, and province of Defendant Archdiocese of Newark and the Archbishop of the Archdiocese of Newark. Our Lady of the Lake includes any school affiliated with Our Lady of the Lake. At all times material, Our Lady of the Lake and Defendant Archdiocese of Newark owned, operated, managed, maintained, and controlled Our Lady of the Lake School.

20. At all times material, St. Cassian was and continues to be under the direct authority, control, and province of Defendant Archdiocese of Newark and the Archbishop of the Archdiocese of Newark. St. Cassian includes any school affiliated with St. Cassian. At all times material, St. Cassian and Defendant Archdiocese of Newark owned, operated, managed, maintained, and controlled St. Cassian School.

21. At all times material, Immaculate Conception was and continues to be under the direct authority, control, and province of Defendant Archdiocese of Newark and the Archbishop of the Archdiocese of Newark.

22. St. Francis Xavier, Essex Catholic, Holy Trinity, Our Lady of the Lake, St. Cassian and Immaculate Conception are hereinafter collectively referred to as “Entities Under the Control of the Archdiocese of Newark,” all of which at all times relevant to this Complaint were and continue to be under the direct authority, control, and province of Defendant Archdiocese of Newark and the Archbishop of the Archdiocese of Newark.

23. At all times material, Defendant Archdiocese of Newark employed Father Anthony Nardino (hereinafter “Fr. Nardino”); Fr. Nardino was a Roman Catholic cleric assigned to St. Francis Xavier. During his assignment to St. Francis Xavier, Fr. Nardino remained under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendant Archdiocese of Newark.

24. Defendants Archdiocese of Newark and St. Francis Xavier placed Fr. Nardino in positions where he had direct and unfettered access to and worked with children as an integral part of his work. Fr. Nardino was placed in charge of the altar boys at St. Francis Xavier, of which Plaintiff was one.

25. At all times material, the Archdiocese of Newark employed Brother Andrew Thomas Hewitt, C.F.C. (hereinafter “Br. Hewitt”) who was a Roman Catholic cleric and also belonged to the Irish Christian Brothers assigned to Essex Catholic. As Principal of Essex Catholic, Br. Hewitt remained under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendant Archdiocese of Newark.

26. Defendant Archdiocese of Newark and Essex Catholic placed Br. Hewitt in positions where he had direct and unfettered access to children and supervised and worked with children as an integral part of his work as Principal of Essex Catholic High School.

27. At all times material, the Archdiocese of Newark employed Father Gerald Ruane (hereinafter “Fr. Ruane”) who was a Roman Catholic cleric, and was assigned to Holy Trinity and Our Lady of the Lake, also within the Archdiocese of Newark. Fr. Ruane remained under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendant Archdiocese of Newark.

28. Defendant Archdiocese of Newark, Holy Trinity, and Our Lady of the Lake, placed Fr. Ruane in positions where he had direct and unfettered access to and worked with children as an integral part of his work, inclusive of his having access to children at Essex Catholic when Ruane would visit Brother Hewitt Principal of Essex Catholic High School.

29. At all times material, the Archdiocese of Newark employed Father Michael Walters (hereinafter “Fr. Walters”) who was a Roman Catholic cleric and assigned to St. Cassian. Fr. Walters remained under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendant Archdiocese of Newark.

30. Defendant Archdiocese of Newark and St. Cassian placed Fr. Walters in positions where he had direct and unfettered access to and worked with children as an integral part of his work, inclusive of his having access to children at Essex Catholic when Ruane would visit Brother Hewitt Principal of Essex Catholic High School.

31. At all times material, the Archdiocese of Newark employed Father John Laferrera (hereinafter “Fr. Laferrera”) who was a Roman Catholic cleric assigned to Immaculate Conception. Fr. Laferrera remained under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendant Archdiocese of Newark and Immaculate Conception.

32. Defendant Archdiocese of Newark and Immaculate Conception placed Fr. Laferrera in positions where he had direct and unfettered access to and worked with children as an integral part of his work, inclusive of his having access to children at Essex Catholic when Laferrera would visit Brother Hewitt, Principal of Essex Catholic High School and his own biological brother, who was also a cleric the Dean of Discipline at Essex Catholic High School.

33. Whenever reference is made to any Defendant entity, such reference includes that entity, its parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, predecessors, and successors. In addition, whenever reference is made to any act, deed, or transaction of any entity, the allegation means that the entity engaged in the act, deed, or transaction by or through its officers, directors, agents, employees, or representatives while they were actively engaged in the management, direction, control, or transaction of the entity’s business or affairs.

34. The Defendant ABC ENTITY, its priests, reverends, teachers, deacons, directors,

officers, employees, agents, servants, representatives and/or volunteers, is a fictitious name of an entity believed to have employed Bp. McCarrick, Father Anthony Nardino, Brother Andrew Thomas Hewitt, C.F.C., Father Gerald Ruane, Father Michael Walters, and Father John Laferrera.

35. The Defendant JOHN DOES 1-5, individually, and in their capacity as a former and/or current priest, reverend, teacher, deacon, director, officer, employee, agent, servant, representative and/or volunteer of the defendants, are persons whose identities are unknown to Plaintiff.

JURISDICTION, VENUE AND NEW LAWS

36. This Court has jurisdiction over this action as Defendants' principal places of business are in New Jersey and because the unlawful conduct complained of herein occurred in New Jersey.

37. Venue is proper in this county pursuant to New Jersey Court Rule 4:3-2 because this County is the principal place of business of Defendant Archdiocese of Newark. In addition, events that are relevant to this action occurred within this County.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

38. Plaintiff hereby incorporates the Parties and Background section of this complaint into the Factual Allegations by reference as if set forth at length herein.

39. Defendant Diocese of Metuchen placed McCarrick in positions where McCarrick had direct and unfettered access to and worked with children as an integral part of his work.

40. Having been appointed by the Pontiff as Bishop of Metuchen, cloaked in Papal authority, McCarrick cultivated a culture of fear and intimidation of other clerics, as well as children, that supported McCarrick's personal objectives.

41. Plaintiff was raised in a devout Roman Catholic family and as such, attended Church at St. Francis Xavier in Newark, said Church being under the control of the Archdiocese

of Newark.

42. Plaintiff participated in youth activities and/or church activities at St. Francis Xavier and Essex Catholic. Plaintiff, therefore, developed great admiration, trust, reverence, and respect for the Roman Catholic Church, including Defendants, the Entities Under the Control of the Defendant Archdiocese of Newark and their agents.

43. During and through these activities, Plaintiff, as a minor and vulnerable child, was dependent on Defendants. Defendants had custody and/or supervision of Plaintiff and accepted the entrustment of Plaintiff and, therefore, had responsibility for Plaintiff and authority over Plaintiff.

44. As a young child of a devout Roman Catholic family, Plaintiff who was also a parishioner of St. Francis Xavier, joined the group of altar servers who served under the direction, supervision and control of Fr. Nardino who was put in charge of the altar boys.

45. Fr. Nardino was given unhampered access to Plaintiff regularly, and Plaintiff while in this altar service to the Roman Catholic Church as an altar boy, in approximately 1978, when Plaintiff was approximately 11 years old, Fr. Nardino engaged in unpermitted sexual contact with Plaintiff.

46. Fr. Nardino's unpermitted sexual contact with Plaintiff was Plaintiff's first introduction to the dark side of the Roman Catholic Church's culture, that of perversion and sexual exploitation and abuse of children, in this case Plaintiff.

47. After Plaintiff graduated grammar school, his mother made the financial sacrifice to continue his Catholic education within the Archdiocese of Newark in East Orange at Essex Catholic High School, where Br. Hewitt was placed in the highest position of the school, Principal.

48. Br. Hewitt, Principal of Essex Catholic, perpetrated unpermitted sexual contact against Plaintiff from approximately 1981 to 1983, when Plaintiff was approximately 14 to 16 years old and a student at Essex Catholic.

49. While Plaintiff was a 9th grade student at Essex Catholic, Plaintiff's mother could not afford his tuition, so Plaintiff had to see Br. Hewitt to discuss the issue and for Br. Hewitt to provide options. One of the "options" was an order by Hewitt to Plaintiff to stop participating in sports so that he could clean classrooms to contribute to tuition.

50. During these after school hours while the 14-year-old Plaintiff worked to stay in Catholic school, Br. Hewitt would call Plaintiff to his office from work and sexually abused Plaintiff after school.

51. Br. Hewitt continued the sexual abuse of Plaintiff on a regular basis for months and months until Plaintiff was no longer a student at Essex Catholic, and included the summer months beginning in the summer before 9th grade.

52. During the months while Plaintiff worked after school and was regularly sexually abused by Br. Hewitt, Plaintiff also saw on a regular basis clerics who visited Br. Hewitt at Essex Catholic: these were men that he came to know as Father "Jerry" Ruane, Fr, Thomas Walters and Father John Laferrera who also visited his brother, the Dean of Discipline at Essex Catholic.

53. Upon information and belief, these clerics who visited Essex Catholic would "hang out" together, like a clique or crew.

54. Br. Hewitt, the head of this crew, introduced Plaintiff to Father Ruane.

55. Br. Hewitt, the head of this crew, introduced Plaintiff to Father Walters.

56. Plaintiff recalled Father Laferrera from St. Francis Xavier.

57. In addition to ordering that Plaintiff work after school cleaning classes to supplement tuition, which Plaintiff did, Br. Hewitt informed Plaintiff that he would need to see the "Boss," who could also help with his tuition problem. Br. Hewitt's declaration made clear that only person to help with the tuition situation was the person he referred to as "the Boss."

58. Plaintiff learned later that the "Boss" was Bishop McCarrick of the Diocese of

Metuchen.

59. In approximately 1982, after perpetrating various acts of sexual abuse against Plaintiff in his office and other locations at Essex Catholic, Br. Hewitt, Principal of Essex Catholic, orchestrated a meeting between Plaintiff and the Boss, McCarrick, under the guise that McCarrick would help Plaintiff pay his school tuition.

60. Vulnerable and in need of financial assistance, Plaintiff obediently followed the course that was set for him by Br. Hewitt.

61. Br. Hewitt procured and delivered Plaintiff to the Boss, McCarrick, for the meeting to discuss tuition, and once delivered to the Boss, McCarrick sexually abused Plaintiff.

62. Plaintiff was able to continue as a student in Essex Catholic.

63. After the first meeting with McCarrick, Plaintiff and other minor boys were taken on overnight and weekend trips to the Jersey Shore.

64. On these trips which were referred to as “camping trips” by the crew of priests organized by Br. Hewitt, Br. Hewitt who procured Plaintiff, arranged for a van to transport Plaintiff, other boys and Fr. Ruane and Fr. Walters to the shore house where McCarrick was. Fr. Laferrera was at the house but did not travel with the rest of the crew in the van.

65. The boys were directed to a room to play video games while the various priests and men would congregate, recreate and consume alcohol.

66. There was often a second group of boys that were not known to Plaintiff who were also brought to the Jersey Shore.

67. The boys that Plaintiff did not know were kept separate and apart from Plaintiff and the boys that he knew while the various priests and men would congregate, recreate and consume alcohol.

68. Upon information and belief, McCarrick ordered the sleeping arrangements,

choosing his victims from the boys, seminarians and clerics present at the beach house.

69. Upon information and belief, McCarrick would choose which boy or boys he would sleep with, with the other clerics and seminarians falling in line and accepting the sleeping assignments having been paired with a minor boy pursuant to McCarrick's orders.

70. Upon information and belief, often, Br. Hewitt would coordinate the sleeping plans and gather Plaintiff and the other minor boys from the game room where they waited while playing video games.

71. On these occasions, the sleeping plans would include room assignments where the minor boys were assigned to different rooms and paired with adult clerics.

72. Plaintiff was instructed to face away from the priest to whom he had been assigned when the priest was in the room.

73. Upon information and belief, Br. Hewitt would summon the boys, including Plaintiff, from the room and bring them to their assigned rooms to sleep with the adults, in Plaintiff's case, Bishop of Metuchen McCarrick, known as the "Boss," Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters and Fr. Laferrera.

74. Once in bed, Plaintiff having been directed to his room, usually by Hewitt, McCarrick would enter his room and perpetrate unpermitted sexual contact against Plaintiff.

75. On one occasion in which Plaintiff was chosen by the Boss, McCarrick, McCarrick summoned another cleric to come into the room and assist him with something, then dismissed the cleric, then continued his unpermitted sexual contact and abuse of Plaintiff. There were multiple "camping trips" in which Plaintiff and other boys were ushered to the perverse sex parties described above, and Plaintiff had multiple clerics with whom he was paired.

76. Bishop McCarrick, Father Ruane, Father Walters and Father John Laferrera attended parties where Plaintiff was forced to attend, all of which were arranged in a similar

fashion as described above with Br. Hewitt procuring the children, delivering the children to McCarrick where McCarrick would have first choice at his child bedmate, and order the assignments of the other children to other clerics.

77. Under the instruction of McCarrick who assigned the children to the adults, and the organization and management of Br. Hewitt who procured the children for these perverse parties at the shore, each priest, Bp. McCarrick, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera, was given unrestricted turns to engage in unpermitted sexual contact with Plaintiff on the shore “camping trips” and did so under the coercive, abusive power of McCarrick, a Bishop appointed by the Pontiff as Bishop of Metuchen and cloaked in Papal authority and in obedience to him, furthering McCarrick’s own perverse and disturbing personal objectives as well as their own

78. For Plaintiff, there was no “camping trip” that ever resulted in camping, and there was no overnight where Plaintiff was present that did not include unpermitted sexual contact by either Bishop McCarrick, Father Ruane, Father Walters and/or Father Laferrera, who were in attendance at overnights in which Plaintiff was forced to participate.

79. Sometime after the last “camping trip,” Br. Hewitt called Plaintiff to his office and threw him out of Essex Catholic High School for boys, telling him he was “done.” Plaintiff did not complete high school at Essex Catholic and instead finished his junior and senior year elsewhere.

80. For Plaintiff’s entire time in Essex Catholic, beginning the summer months before his Freshman year until the time he was forced to go to another school, Plaintiff was victimized over and over at the hands of the Boss and his crew who abused their power and employed patterns and practices resulting in the systemic sexual abuse of Plaintiff.

81. From approximately 1982 to 1983 when Plaintiff was approximately 14 to 16 years old, Bishop McCarrick, the “Boss,” repeatedly engaged in unpermitted sexual contact with

Plaintiff.

82. From approximately 1982 to 1983, when Plaintiff was approximately 14 to 16 years old, Fr. Ruane, a member of Hewitt's crew under McCarrick, engaged in unpermitted sexual contact with Plaintiff.

83. From approximately 1982 to 1983, when Plaintiff was approximately 14 to 16 years old, Fr. Walters, a member of Hewitt's crew under McCarrick, engaged in unpermitted sexual contact with Plaintiff.

84. From approximately 1982 to 1983, when Plaintiff was approximately 14 to 16 years old, Fr. John Laferrera, a member of Hewitt's crew under McCarrick, engaged in unpermitted sexual contact with Plaintiff.

85. The sexual abuse of Plaintiff at the Jersey Shore occurred while McCarrick was employed as the Bishop of the Diocese of Metuchen, and McCarrick's flagrant abuse of power and pattern of misconduct as described herein was his *modus operandi*.

86. Upon information and belief, McCarrick had a custom and practice of offering assistance to children, and by coercion, McCarrick abused the children.

87. Upon information and belief, McCarrick's custom, practice and pattern included having children transported to the Jersey Shore, or transporting children to the Jersey Shore himself, for his own perverted objectives.

88. Upon information and belief, this custom, practice, and pattern was employed against the Plaintiff and other minor children and included sexual abuse of those children by McCarrick and other clerics at the Jersey Shore.

89. Upon information and belief, Geoffrey Downs was one such child who was subject and witness to McCarrick's abuse of power and his personal perverse sexual objectives.

90. Upon information and belief, Geoffrey Downs was an altar boy in the 1980s serving

in the Diocese and serving with then-Bishop McCarrick.

91. Upon information and belief, in 1982 or 1983, when Downs was 15 or 16 years old, Downs was sexually abused by Bishop McCarrick while preparing for services at St. Francis of Assisi Parish in Metuchen.

92. Upon information and belief, a year prior to the abuse he suffered in 1982 or 1983, Geoffrey Downs had attended an altar boy retreat at the Diocese Beach House and had observed another boy being sexually abused by an unknown priest.

93. Upon information and belief, Downs visited the Jersey Shore house just once, but Downs remembers other groups had gone there for retreats as well.

94. Upon information and belief, while Bishop McCarrick was abusing Geoffrey Downs, Bishop McCarrick was saying "he could help [him] with [his] grades, and could arrange for alone time at the beach house at the shore."

95. Upon information and belief, when Bishop McCarrick spoke those words as he abused Downs, Downs remembered what had happened at the beach house when he was there with McCarrick approximately a year prior.

96. Upon information and belief, Downs had witnessed another boy being abused by an unknown priest at the beach house at the Jersey Shore approximately a year prior to his being abused by Bishop McCarrick.

97. In 1986, McCarrick was appointed Archbishop of the Archdiocese of Newark in New Jersey by the Pontiff.

98. In the late 1980s, Reverend Boniface Ramsey, O.P., a cleric teaching at Immaculate Conception Seminary, reported his concerns about McCarrick's inappropriate conduct with seminarians to the rector of the seminary.

99. In 1993, Fr. Ramsey again expressed concerns to his friend, the Archbishop of

Louisville, Kentucky Thomas Kelly, O.P. regarding McCarrick's conduct with seminarians. Archbishop Kelly responded, "we all know."

100. In 1993, the Diocese of Metuchen learned of McCarrick's sexual exploitation of a young seminarian.

101. In 1994, a priest of the Diocese of Metuchen wrote to the Bishop of the Diocese of Metuchen, Edward T. Hughes, that McCarrick had inappropriately touched him when he was a seminarian.

102. Upon information and belief, from 1994 to 2008, multiple reports about McCarrick's transgressions with seminarians were made to American bishops, the Pope's representative in Washington, and Pope Benedict XVI.

103. Upon information and belief, in 1994, Robert Hoatson, a former New Jersey priest, as a young religious brother, expressed concern about McCarrick relationships with seminarians to an official in the Archdiocese of Newark.

104. In approximately 1995 or 1996, McCarrick sexually abused a minor altar boy at St. Francis of Assisi in Hackensack, NJ.

105. In 1997, McCarrick, a founding member of The Papal Foundation, began serving as its President. The Papal Foundation provided funds to the Vatican and Catholic Missions.

106. In 2000, McCarrick began serving as a Board member of Catholic Relief Services. He served on that Board until 2014. Catholic Relief Services provided funds to the Vatican and Catholic Missions.

107. In 2000, Fr. Ramsey sent a letter to Nuncio Archbishop Gabriel Montalvo expressing his concerns about McCarrick and his inappropriate behavior with seminarians.

108. In 2001, McCarrick was appointed Cardinal Archbishop of Washington, D.C.

109. Upon information and belief, in 2002, McCarrick announced the new Vatican

policy on sexual abuse by priests from Rome. McCarrick outlined a multi-step process in which an accused priest would be put on administrative leave and removed from clerical duties while a case was investigated.

110. Upon information and belief, in the early to mid-2000s, two former priests, Robert Ciolek and an unnamed man, were paid settlements for harassment and sexual abuse they suffered by McCarrick in the 1980s when they were seminarians.

111. In 2018, Carlo Maria Viganò, Titular Archbishop of Ulpiana and former Apostolic Nuncio in the United States, released a letter indicating that the Holy See had been informed in at least 2000 of McCarrick's "gravely immoral behavior with seminarians and priests."

112. In 2018, Fr. Ramsey released an October 2006 letter that he had received from a top official of the Vatican Secretariat of State. In the letter, then-Archbishop Leonardo Sandri acknowledged receipt of the allegations regarding McCarrick in 2000.

113. Upon information and belief, after 2008, sanctions were imposed by Supreme Pontiff Benedict XVI upon McCarrick due to his inappropriate behavior with seminarians and fellow priests. The sanctions provided that McCarrick leave the seminary where he was living, and McCarrick was forbidden to celebrate public Mass, participate in public meetings, or travel with the obligation of dedicating himself to a life of prayer and penance.

114. Upon information and belief, the sanctions imposed by Pontiff Benedict XVI were not enforced.

115. Upon information and belief, in 2009, in violation of Pontiff Benedict XVI's sanctions, McCarrick continued to travel and celebrate public Mass, and did so with noteworthy officials. This included a celebration of public Mass by McCarrick with the Dominican Sisters in Summit, New Jersey.

116. Upon information and belief, during 2011, 2012, and 2013, in violation of Pontiff

Benedict XVI's sanctions, McCarrick continued to travel and celebrate public Mass.

117. Archbishop Viganò indicated in his 2018 letter that he informed Supreme Pontiff Francis of McCarrick's inappropriate behavior and history of abuse in 2013: "Holy Father, I don't know if you know about Cardinal McCarrick, but if you ask the Congregation for Bishops there is a dossier this thick about him. He corrupted generations of seminarians and priests and Pope Benedict ordered him to withdraw to a life of prayer and penance."

118. Upon information and belief, in 2013, laicization of McCarrick was initiated.

119. Supreme Pontiff Francis remained complicit in the cover-up of McCarrick and did not take action as to McCarrick or accept McCarrick's resignation from the College of Cardinals until July 2018 after several accusations that McCarrick had sexually abused minors became public.

120. On August 12, 2018, the Office of Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania released its Grand Jury Report regarding child sex abuse in Catholic Dioceses within Pennsylvania.

121. On August 25, 2018, Archbishop Viganò publically released his letter concerning information about McCarrick.

122. Upon information and belief, on February 13, 2019, McCarrick was defrocked.

123. Upon information and belief, in August 2019, Seton Hall Seminary announced findings from a report they had commissioned for an independent review.

124. The independent review found that, "McCarrick created a culture of fear and intimidation that supported his personal objectives. McCarrick used his position of power as then-Archbishop of Newark to sexually harass seminarians."

125. The review further found that the Title IX policies in place "were not always followed at Immaculate Conception Seminary and St. Andrew's Seminary, which resulted in

incidents of sexual harassment going unreported to the University.

126. Defendant Diocese knew or should have known that McCarrick was a danger to children before McCarrick sexually assaulted Plaintiff.

127. Defendant Archdiocese of Newark knew or should have known that Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera were a danger to children before Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera sexually assaulted Plaintiff.

128. Prior to the sexual abuse of Plaintiff, Defendants Diocese and Archdiocese learned or should have learned that McCarrick, Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera were not fit to work with children. Defendants Diocese and Archdiocese, by and through their agents, servants and/or employees, became aware, or should have become aware of McCarrick's, Br. Hewitt's, Fr. Ruane's, Fr. Walters', and Fr. Laferrera's propensity to commit sexual abuse and of the risk to Plaintiff's safety. At the very least, Defendants Diocese and Archdiocese knew or should have known that they did not have sufficient information about whether or not its leaders and people working at Catholic institutions were safe.

129. Defendants Diocese and Archdiocese knew or should have known that there was a risk of child sex abuse for children participating in Catholic programs and activities within the Diocese and Archdiocese. At the very least, Defendants Diocese and Archdiocese knew or should have known that it did not have sufficient information about whether or not there was a risk of child sex abuse for children participating in Catholic programs and activities within the Diocese and Archdiocese.

130. Defendants Diocese and Archdiocese knew or should have known that it had numerous agents who had sexually molested children. Defendants Diocese and Archdiocese knew or should have known that child molesters have a high rate of recidivism. Defendants Diocese and Archdiocese knew or should have known that some of the leaders and people working in Catholic

institutions within the Diocese and Archdiocese were not safe and that there was a specific danger of child sex abuse for children participating in their youth programs.

131. Instead, Defendants Diocese and Archdiocese negligently deemed that McCarrick, Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera was fit to work with children and/or that any previous problems were fixed or cured and/or that McCarrick, Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera would not sexually assault children and/or that McCarrick, Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera would not injure children.

132. Defendants Diocese and Archdiocese owed Plaintiff a duty of reasonable care because it had superior knowledge about the risk that McCarrick, Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera posed to Plaintiff, the risk of abuse in general in its programs and/or the risks that its facilities posed to minor children.

133. Defendants Diocese and Archdiocese owed a duty to Plaintiff to protect Plaintiff from harm because its actions created a foreseeable risk of harm to Plaintiff. As a vulnerable child participating in the programs and activities Defendants offered to minors, Plaintiff was a foreseeable victim. As a vulnerable child who McCarrick had access to through Defendants' facilities and programs, Plaintiff was a foreseeable victim.

134. Defendants Diocese and Archdiocese also breached its duty to Plaintiff by actively maintaining and employing McCarrick, Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera in positions of power and authority through which McCarrick, Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera had access to children, including Plaintiff, and power and control over children, including Plaintiff.

135. Defendants Diocese and Archdiocese breached its duties to Plaintiff. Defendants failed to use ordinary care in determining whether its facilities were safe and/or determining whether it had sufficient information to represent its facilities as safe. Defendants' breach of their

duties include, but is not limited to: failure to protect Plaintiff from a known danger, failure to have sufficient policies and procedures to prevent child sex abuse, failure to properly implement policies and procedures to prevent child sex abuse, failure to take reasonable measures to make sure that policies and procedures to prevent child sex abuse were working, failure to adequately inform families and children of the risks of child sex abuse, failure to investigate risks of child sex abuse, failure to properly train the employees at institutions and programs within Defendants Diocese's and Archdiocese's geographical confines, failure to train parishioners within Defendants Diocese's and Archdiocese's geographical confines about the risk of sexual abuse, failure to have any outside agency test its safety procedures, failure to protect the children in its programs from child sex abuse, failure to adhere to the applicable standard of care for child safety, failure to investigate the amount and type of information necessary to represent the institutions, programs, leaders and people as safe, failure to train its employees properly to identify signs of child sexual abuse by fellow employees, failure by relying upon mental health professionals, and/or failure by relying on people who claimed that they could treat child molesters.

136. Defendants Diocese and Archdiocese also breached their duty to Plaintiff by failing to warn Plaintiff and Plaintiff's family of the risk that McCarrick, Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera posed and the risks of child sexual abuse in Catholic institutions. Defendants Diocese and Archdiocese also failed to warn them about any of the knowledge that Defendants had about child sexual abuse.

137. Defendants Diocese and Archdiocese additionally violated a legal duty by failing to report known and/or suspected abuse of children by McCarrick, Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera and/or its other agents to the child protection agencies, police and law enforcement.

138. Defendants Diocese and Archdiocese were negligent and/or made representations

to Plaintiff and Plaintiff's family during each and every year of Plaintiff's time within the Archdiocese as a parishioner and student.

139. As a 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.

**COUNT I: PLAINTIFF v. DEFENDANT MCCARRICK –
SEXUAL BATTERY**

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

140. From approximately 1982 to 1983, Defendant McCarrick inflicted unpermitted harmful and offensive bodily sexual contact upon the person of Plaintiff.

141. Plaintiff did not consent to the harmful bodily contact.

142. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing, Plaintiff sustained physical, emotional and psychological injuries, along with pain and suffering.

143. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount which exceeds the jurisdictional limits of all lower courts which would otherwise have jurisdiction.

**COUNT II: PLAINTIFF v. DEFENDANT DIOCESE OF METUCHEN -
NEGLIGENCE**

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

144. Defendant Diocese owed Plaintiff a duty of reasonable care to protect the Plaintiff

from injury.

145. Defendant Diocese owed Plaintiff a duty of care because it had a special relationship with Plaintiff.

146. Defendant Diocese also had a duty arising from the special relationship that existed with Plaintiff, Plaintiff's parents, and other parents of young, innocent, vulnerable children, to properly train and supervise its clerics. This special relationship arose because of the high degree of vulnerability of the children entrusted to their care. As a result of this high degree of vulnerability and risk of sexual abuse inherent in such a special relationship, Defendant Archdiocese of Newark had a duty to establish measures of protection not necessary for persons who are older and better able to safeguard themselves.

147. Defendant Diocese owed Plaintiff a duty to protect Plaintiff from harm because Defendant Diocese also had a special relationship with McCarrick.

148. Defendant Diocese owed Plaintiff a duty of reasonable care because it solicited youth and parents for participation in its youth programs; encouraged youth and parents to have the youth participate in its programs; undertook custody of minor children, including Plaintiff; promoted its facilities and programs as being safe for children; held its agents, including McCarrick, out as safe to work with children; encouraged parents and children to spend time with its agents; and/or encouraged its agents, including McCarrick, to spend time with, interact with, and recruit children.

149. By holding McCarrick out as safe to work with children, and by undertaking the custody, supervision of, and/or care of the minor Plaintiff, Defendant Diocese entered into a fiduciary relationship with the minor Plaintiff. As a result of Plaintiff being a minor, and by Defendant Diocese undertaking the care and guidance of the then vulnerable minor Plaintiff, Defendant Diocese held a position of empowerment over Plaintiff.

150. Further, Defendant Diocese, by holding itself out as being able to provide a safe environment for children, solicited and/or accepted this position of empowerment. Defendant Diocese thus entered into a fiduciary relationship with Plaintiff. Defendant Diocese exploited its position of empowerment, putting Plaintiff at risk to be sexually assaulted.

151. By accepting custody and/or supervision of the minor Plaintiff, Defendant Diocese established an *in loco parentis* relationship with Plaintiff and in so doing, owed Plaintiff a duty to protect Plaintiff from injury. Further, Defendant Diocese entered into a fiduciary relationship with Plaintiff by undertaking the custody, supervision of, and/or care of the minor Plaintiff. As a result of Plaintiff being a minor, and by Defendant Diocese undertaking the care and guidance of the Plaintiff, Defendant Diocese also held a position of empowerment over Plaintiff. Further, Defendant Diocese, by holding itself out as being able to provide a safe environment for children, solicited and/or accepted this position of empowerment. Defendant Diocese, through its employees, exploited this power over Plaintiff and thereby put the minor Plaintiff at risk for sexual abuse.

152. By establishing and/or operating the Diocese, accepting the minor Plaintiff as a participant in its programs, holding its facilities and programs out to be a safe environment for Plaintiff, accepting custody of the minor Plaintiff *in loco parentis*, and by establishing a fiduciary relationship with Plaintiff, Defendant Diocese entered into an express and/or implied duty to properly supervise Plaintiff and provide a reasonably safe environment for children, who participated in their programs. Defendant Diocese owed Plaintiff a duty to properly supervise Plaintiff to prevent harm from foreseeable dangers. Defendant Diocese had the duty to exercise the same degree of care over minors under its control as a reasonably prudent person would have exercised under similar circumstances.

153. By establishing and operating the Diocese, which offered educational programs to

children, and by accepting the enrollment and participation of the minor Plaintiff as a participant in those educational programs, Defendant Diocese owed Plaintiff a duty to properly supervise Plaintiff to prevent harm from generally foreseeable dangers.

154. Defendant Diocese owed Plaintiff a duty to protect Plaintiff from harm because Defendant Diocese invited Plaintiff onto its property and McCarrick posed a dangerous condition on Defendant Diocese's property.

155. Defendant Diocese breached its duties to Plaintiff by failing to use reasonable care. Defendant Diocese's failures include, but are not limited to, failing to properly supervise McCarrick, failing to properly supervise Plaintiff, and failing to protect Plaintiff from a known danger.

156. As a direct result of the foregoing, Plaintiff sustained physical, emotional, and psychological injuries, along with pain and suffering.

**COUNT III: PLAINTIFF v. DEFENDANT DIOCESE OF METUCHEN-
NEGLIGENT TRAINING AND SUPERVISION**

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

157. At all times material, McCarrick was employed by Defendant Diocese and was under Defendant Diocese's direct supervision, employ, and control when he committed the wrongful acts alleged herein. McCarrick engaged in the wrongful conduct while acting in the course and scope of his employment with Defendant Diocese and/or accomplished the sexual abuse by virtue of his job-created authority.

158. Defendant Diocese had a duty, arising from its employment of McCarrick, to ensure that McCarrick did not sexually molest children.

159. Further, Defendant Diocese owed a duty to train and educate employees and administrators and establish adequate and effective policies and procedures calculated to detect,

prevent, and address inappropriate behavior and conduct between clerics and children.

160. Defendant Diocese was negligent in the training, supervision, and instruction of its employees. Defendant Diocese failed to timely and properly educate, train, supervise, and/or monitor its agents or employees with regard to policies and procedures that should be followed when sexual abuse of a child is suspected or observed.

161. Defendant Diocese was additionally negligent in failing to supervise, monitor, chaperone, and/or investigate McCarrick and/or in failing to create, institute, and/or enforce rules, policies, procedures, and/or regulations to prevent McCarrick's sexual abuse of Plaintiff.

162. In failing to properly supervise McCarrick, and in failing to establish such training procedures for employees and administrators, Defendant Diocese failed to exercise the degree of care that a reasonably prudent person would have exercised under similar circumstances.

163. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing, Plaintiff sustained physical, emotional, and psychological injuries, along with pain and suffering.

**COUNT IV: PLAINTIFF v. DEFENDANT DIOCESE OF METUCHEN -
NEGLIGENT RETENTION**

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

164. At all times material, McCarrick was employed by Defendant Diocese and was under Defendant Diocese's direct supervision, employ, and control when he committed the wrongful acts alleged herein.

165. Defendant Diocese became aware or should have become aware of McCarrick's propensity for sexual abuse and failed to take any further action to remedy the problem and failed to investigate or remove McCarrick from working with children.

166. Defendant Diocese negligently retained McCarrick with knowledge of McCarrick's propensity for the type of behavior which resulted in Plaintiff's injuries in this action.

167. Defendant Diocese negligently retained McCarrick in a position where he had access to children and could foreseeably cause harm which Plaintiff would not have been subjected to had Defendant Diocese taken reasonable care.

168. In failing to timely remove McCarrick from working with children or terminate the employment of McCarrick, Defendant Diocese failed to exercise the degree of care that a reasonably prudent person would have exercised under similar circumstances.

169. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing, Plaintiff sustained physical, emotional, and psychological injuries, along with pain and suffering.

COUNT V: PLAINTIFF v. DEFENDANT ARCHDIOCESE OF NEWARK
NEGLIGENCE

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

170. Defendant Archdiocese owed Plaintiff a duty of reasonable care to protect the Plaintiff from injury.

171. Defendant Archdiocese owed Plaintiff a duty of care because it had a special relationship with Plaintiff.

172. Defendant Archdiocese also had a duty arising from the special relationship that existed with Plaintiff, Plaintiff's parents, and other parents of young, innocent, vulnerable children, to properly train and supervise its clerics. This special relationship arose because of the high degree of vulnerability of the children entrusted to their care. As a result of this high degree of vulnerability and risk of sexual abuse inherent in such a special relationship, Defendant Archdiocese had a duty to establish measures of protection not necessary for persons who are older and better able to safeguard themselves.

173. Defendant Archdiocese owed Plaintiff a duty to protect Plaintiff from harm because Defendant Archdiocese also had a special relationship with Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and

Fr. Laferrera.

174. Defendant Archdiocese owed Plaintiff a duty of reasonable care because it solicited youth and parents for participation in its youth programs; encouraged youth and parents to have the youth participate in its programs; undertook custody of minor children, including Plaintiff; promoted its facilities and programs as being safe for children; held its agents, including Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera, out as safe to work with children; encouraged parents and children to spend time with its agents; and/or encouraged its agents, including Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera, to spend time with, interact with, and recruit children.

175. By holding Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera out as safe to work with children, and by undertaking the custody, supervision of, and/or care of the minor Plaintiff, Defendant Archdiocese entered into a fiduciary relationship with the minor Plaintiff. As a result of Plaintiff being a minor, and Defendant Archdiocese undertaking the care and guidance of the then vulnerable minor Plaintiff, Defendant Archdiocese held a position of empowerment over Plaintiff.

176. Defendant Archdiocese, by holding itself out as being able to provide a safe environment for children, solicited and/or accepted this position of empowerment. Defendant Archdiocese thus entered into a fiduciary relationship with Plaintiff. Defendant Archdiocese exploited its position of empowerment, putting Plaintiff at risk to be sexually assaulted.

177. Further, by accepting custody and/or supervision of the minor Plaintiff, Defendant Archdiocese and Essex Catholic established an *in loco parentis* relationship with Plaintiff and in so doing, owed Plaintiff a duty to protect Plaintiff from injury. Defendant Archdiocese entered into a fiduciary relationship with Plaintiff by undertaking the custody, supervision of, and/or care of the minor Plaintiff. As a result of Plaintiff being a minor, and by Defendant Archdiocese

undertaking the care and guidance of the Plaintiff, Defendant Archdiocese also held a position of empowerment over Plaintiff. Defendant Archdiocese, by holding themselves out as being able to provide a safe environment for children, solicited and/or accepted this position of empowerment. Defendant Archdiocese, through its employees, exploited this power over Plaintiff and thereby put the minor Plaintiff at risk for sexual abuse.

178. By establishing and/or operating the Archdiocese and Essex Catholic, accepting the minor Plaintiff as a participant in its programs, holding its facilities and programs out to be a safe environment for Plaintiff, accepting custody of the minor Plaintiff *in loco parentis*, and by establishing a fiduciary relationship with Plaintiff, Defendant Archdiocese entered into an express and/or implied duty to properly supervise Plaintiff and provide a reasonably safe environment for children, who participated in their programs. Defendant Archdiocese owed Plaintiff a duty to properly supervise Plaintiff to prevent harm from foreseeable dangers. Defendant Archdiocese had the duty to exercise the same degree of care over minors under its control as a reasonably prudent person would have exercised under similar circumstances.

179. By establishing and operating the Archdiocese and Essex Catholic, which offered educational programs to children, and by accepting the enrollment and participation of the minor Plaintiff as a participant in those educational programs, Defendant Archdiocese owed Plaintiff a duty to properly supervise Plaintiff to prevent harm from generally foreseeable dangers.

180. Defendant Archdiocese owed Plaintiff a duty to protect Plaintiff from harm because Defendant Archdiocese and Essex Catholic invited Plaintiff onto its property and McCarrick posed a dangerous condition on Defendant Archdiocese's property at Essex Catholic High School.

181. Defendant Archdiocese breached its duties to Plaintiff by failing to use reasonable care. Defendant Archdiocese's failures include, but are not limited to, failing to properly supervise Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera, failing to properly supervise Plaintiff, and

failing to protect Plaintiff from a known danger.

182. As a direct result of the foregoing, Plaintiff sustained physical, emotional, and psychological injuries, along with pain and suffering.

**COUNT VI: PLAINTIFF v. DEFENDANT ARCHDIOCESE OF NEWARK -
NEGLIGENT TRAINING AND SUPERVISION**

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

183. At all times material, Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera were employed by Defendant Archdiocese and were under Defendant Archdiocese's direct supervision, employ, and control when they committed the wrongful acts alleged herein. Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera engaged in the wrongful conduct while acting in the course and scope of their employment with Defendant Archdiocese and/or accomplished the sexual abuse by virtue of his job-created authority.

184. Defendant Archdiocese had a duty, arising from its employment of Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera, to ensure that Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera did not sexually molest children.

185. Further, Defendant Archdiocese owed a duty to train and educate employees and administrators and establish adequate and effective policies and procedures calculated to detect, prevent, and address inappropriate behavior and conduct between clerics and children.

186. Defendant Archdiocese was negligent in the training, supervision, and instruction of its employees. Defendant Archdiocese failed to timely and properly educate, train, supervise, and/or monitor its agents or employees with regard to policies and procedures that should be followed when sexual abuse of a child is suspected or observed.

187. Defendant Archdiocese was additionally negligent in failing to supervise, monitor, chaperone, and/or investigate Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera and/or in failing

to create, institute, and/or enforce rules, policies, procedures, and/or regulations to prevent the sexual abuse of Plaintiff.

188. In failing to properly supervise Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera, and in failing to establish such training procedures for employees and administrators, Defendant Archdiocese failed to exercise the degree of care that a reasonably prudent person would have exercised under similar circumstances.

189. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing, Plaintiff sustained physical, emotional, and psychological injuries, along with pain and suffering.

**COUNT VII: PLAINTIFF v. DEFENDANT ARCHDIOCESE OF NEWARK -
NEGLIGENT RETENTION**

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

190. At all times material, Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera were employed by Defendant Archdiocese and were under Defendant Archdiocese's direct supervision, employ, and control when they committed the wrongful acts alleged herein.

191. Defendant Archdiocese became aware or should have become aware of Br. Hewitt's, Fr. Ruane's, Fr. Walters', and Fr. Laferrera's propensity for sexual abuse, and failed to take any further action to remedy the problem and failed to investigate or remove Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera from working with children.

192. Defendant Archdiocese negligently retained Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera with knowledge of Br. Hewitt's, Fr. Ruane's, Fr. Walters', and Fr. Laferrera's propensity for the type of behavior which resulted in Plaintiff's injuries in this action.

193. Defendant Archdiocese negligently retained Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera in a position where they had access to children and could foreseeably cause harm which Plaintiff would not have been subjected to had Defendant Archdiocese taken reasonable

care.

194. In failing to timely remove Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera from working with children or restrict or terminate the employment of Br. Hewitt, Fr. Ruane, Fr. Walters, and Fr. Laferrera, Defendant Archdiocese failed to exercise the degree of care that a reasonably prudent person would have exercised under similar circumstances.

195. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing, Plaintiff sustained physical, emotional, and psychological injuries, along with pain and suffering.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants, jointly and/or severally for compensatory damages, and 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.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

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

RULE 4:5-1 CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the matter in controversy is not the subject of any other pending and/or contemplated action or pending and or contemplated proceeding. I know of no other parties who should be joined in this action at this time.

JEFF ANDERSON & ASSOCIATES PA

/s/ Jeffrey R. Anderson / Trusha P. Goffe /
Rita M. Gribko / Nahid Shaikh
 Jeffrey R. Anderson, Esq.
 Trusha P. Goffe, Esq.
 Rita M. Gribko, Esq.
 Nahid Shaikh, Esq.
 Attorneys for Plaintiff

GIANFORCARO LAW

/s/ Gregory G. Gianforcaro
 Gregory G. Gianforcaro, Esq.
 Attorney for Plaintiff

Dated: September 9, 2020

DESIGNATION OF TRIAL COUNSEL

Pursuant to Rule 4:25-4, Plaintiff hereby designates Jeffrey R. Anderson, Esq., as trial counsel for Plaintiff.

JEFF ANDERSON & ASSOCIATES PA

GIANFORCARO LAW

/s/ Jeffrey R. Anderson / Trusha P. Goffe /

/s/ Gregory G. Gianforcaro

Rita M. Gribko / Nahid Shaikh

Gregory G. Gianforcaro, Esq.

Jeffrey R. Anderson, Esq.

Attorney for Plaintiff

Trusha P. Goffe, Esq.

Rita M. Gribko, Esq.

Nahid Shaikh, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Dated: September 9, 2020