



**Summary**

also threatened to tell the victim's parents that he was gay and that he [the victim] was the one who initiated and pursued the sexual contact with [REDACTED]

According to the file, the victim "asked nothing of the Diocese" and that

*He made no threats to sue [n]or make his allegations public. His only motivation appeared to be to make someone in the diocese aware of what had occurred. [The victim's] concern for his own children brought home the awareness that [REDACTED] might be abusing others.*

Based upon the meeting with the victim and a separate telephone call with him, the Diocese found that his "allegations were consistent in detail."

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]:

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]



## Summary

On [REDACTED], [REDACTED] sent a letter to [REDACTED], advising him that the “*enclosed confidential information comes by way of a friend in law enforcement.*” Among other things, [REDACTED] provided the victim’s current address and date of birth and requested that the Diocese re-send the letter to him (as it had been returned as undeliverable). That way, it could be demonstrated that he had been given an opportunity to appear before the Board. [REDACTED] then provided details of the victim’s criminal history in order to show that he was not a “*credible accuser.*”

Following a meeting of the Diocesan Review Board, the Board concluded that it could not determine “*with certainty*” the credibility of the victim’s claim. The Board recommended that [REDACTED] be allowed to continue in “*non-parochial ministry*” without access to children, in spite of his admission to the Board of his “*attraction to minors.*” Included with the supporting documents for the Board’s recommendation was a four-page letter by [REDACTED] denying any sexual abuse and requesting a return to ministry.

On [REDACTED], the Diocese notified the [REDACTED] County District Attorney’s Office of “*inappropriate sexual contact that occurred sometime between [REDACTED] when [the victim] was a minor of age [REDACTED].*”

In a letter dated [REDACTED], the Diocese advised the victim that [REDACTED] had accepted the Board’s recommendation that [REDACTED] be given a “*limited non-parish assignment.*” It should be noted that in a [REDACTED] that was completed by Diocesan personnel, it was documented that the complaint against [REDACTED] was both internally consistent and consistent with known facts.

On [REDACTED], [REDACTED] sent a letter to [REDACTED] granting him 17 faculties in his role as [REDACTED]. These faculties included [REDACTED].

On [REDACTED], Pennsylvania Child Abuse History Clearance was granted to [REDACTED] certifying that no record existed in the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare’s statewide central registry listing [REDACTED] as a perpetrator of an indicated or founded report of child abuse.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]