

STATE OF NEW YORK  
SUPREME COURT: COUNTY OF ERIE

<p>PB-11 DOE,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff,</p> <p>vs.</p> <p>THE DIOCESE OF BUFFALO, N.Y., HOLY NAME OF JESUS CHURCH and HOLY NAME OF JESUS CATHOLIC SCHOOL,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendants.</p>
--

**SUMMONS**

Index No.:

**TO THE ABOVE NAMED DEFENDANTS :**

**YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED** to answer the complaint in this action and to serve a copy of your answer, or, if the complaint is not served with this summons, to serve a notice of appearance, on the plaintiffs' attorney within 20 days after the service of this summons, exclusive of the day of service (or within 30 days after the service is complete if this summons is not personally delivered to you within the State of New York); and in case of your failure to appear or answer, judgment will be taken against you by default for the relief demanded in the complaint.

DATED:       New York, New York  
              January 23, 2020

Phillips & Paolicelli, LLP  
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*



By:   Diane Paolicelli  
      Michael DeRuve  
      747 Third Avenue, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
      New York, New York 10027  
      212-388-5100  
      [dpaolicelli@p2law.com](mailto:dpaolicelli@p2law.com)  
      [mderuve@p2law.com](mailto:mderuve@p2law.com)

Paul K. Barr

Fannizzi & Barr, P.C.  
2303 Pine Avenue  
Niagara Falls, NY 14301  
716-284-8888  
pbarr@fanizziandbarr.com

TO:

THE DIOCESE OF BUFFALO, NY  
795 Main St.  
Buffalo, NY 14206

HOLY NAME OF JESUS CHURCH  
1947 Bailey Ave.  
Buffalo, NY 14211

HOLY NAME OF JESUS SCHOOL  
1947 Bailey Ave.  
Buffalo, NY 14211

STATE OF NEW YORK  
SUPREME COURT: COUNTY OF THE ERIE

PB-11 DOE,

Plaintiff,

vs.

THE DIOCESE OF BUFFALO, N.Y., HOLY  
NAME OF JESUS CHURCH and HOLY NAME  
OF JESUS CATHOLIC SCHOOL,

Defendants.

**COMPLAINT**

Index No.:

Plaintiff PB-11 Doe, by and through his undersigned attorneys, as and for his Complaint, alleges as follows:

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. This action is brought pursuant to the Child Victims Act, codified at CPLR 214-g.
2. Plaintiff PB-11 Doe was repeatedly sexually abused and assaulted by Fr. Edward J. Walker ("Fr. Walker"), who was hired, retained, supervised, placed, directed and otherwise authorized to act by Defendants.
3. Plaintiff was about 12 years old when the abuse began and lasted for approximately 6 years, while an altar boy for Defendants Diocese of Buffalo, N.Y., and Holy Name Of Jesus Church and a student at Holy Name Of Jesus Catholic School.
4. Despite years of refusal to publically address rampant child abuse by priests, Defendant The Diocese of Buffalo, N.Y. recently published a long list clergy in their employ who were credibly accused of molesting children. The list includes Fr. Walker, who is now deceased.

{00048417}

5. In fact, the Roman Catholic Church and Defendants have long known that substantial numbers of priests throughout history, and up to and including the present day, violate their vows or promises of celibacy and otherwise misbehave by soliciting sexual contact with parishioners and others, in particular with children like Plaintiff, who are entrusted to their spiritual care and guidance. Official Church documents dealing with this unspeakable misconduct span the centuries, many of which were and are well known to Defendants.

6. Notwithstanding this knowledge, and the fiduciary duty and relationship of trust owed to parishioners and their children, Defendants negligently, recklessly, and willfully failed to protect Plaintiff from sexual abuse by Fr. Walker, permitted the abuse to occur, failed to supervise Fr. Walker, failed to timely investigate Fr. Walker's misconduct, failed to train minor students, altar boys, clergy members and/or adult staff about the risk of sexual abuse in their school, to identify signs of sexual abuse, grooming behaviors, or sexual predators, and to report any suspicion that a minor may be getting abused, maltreated, groomed, or otherwise sexually abused, acted to protect their own self-interest to the detriment of innocent children, and are otherwise responsible for Fr. Walker's sexual assault of Plaintiff, and Plaintiff's consequential injuries and damages.

### PARTIES

7. Plaintiff is an individual residing in Erie County, New York.
8. Plaintiff was born in 1960.
9. Defendant The Diocese of Buffalo, N.Y. (herein "Diocese") is a New York not-for-profit corporation, organized pursuant to the laws of the State of New York, and which operated at all relevant times in Niagara County, New York, with its principal place of business at 795 Main Street, Buffalo, New York 14206. At all relevant times, Defendant Diocese

{00048417}

2

oversaw, managed, controlled, directed and operated parishes, churches and schools within the Diocese.

10. At all relevant times, Defendant Holy Name of Jesus Church and Holy Name of Jesus Catholic School (collectively herein "Holy Name of Jesus") was a Roman Catholic Church and school, organized pursuant to the laws of the State of New York and located at 1947 Bailey Avenue, Buffalo, New York 14211.

11. At all relevant times, Defendant Holy Name of Jesus was under the direct authority, control and province of Defendant Diocese.

12. At all relevant times, Defendant Diocese owned the premises where Defendant Holy Name of Jesus was located.

13. At all relevant times, Defendant Diocese oversaw, managed controlled, directed and operated Defendant Holy Name of Jesus.

14. At all relevant times, Defendant Diocese oversaw, managed, controlled, directed and assigned priests and other clergy to work in parishes, churches and schools of the Diocese, including Defendant Holy Name of Jesus.

### FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

15. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

16. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and his family were parishioners of Defendant Holy Name of Jesus.

17. From approximately 1972 through 1978 Plaintiff was a student at Defendant Holy Name of Jesus.

{00048417}

3

18. In or about 1972 and thereafter, Plaintiff was recruited to serve as an altar boy for Defendants Diocese and Holy Name of Jesus (collectively "Defendants"), and was made to serve in that capacity under Fr. Walker.

19. At all relevant times, Fr. Walker was a Roman Catholic priest employed by Defendants.

20. At all relevant times, Fr. Walker was under the direct supervision and control of the Defendants. His assigned duties included serving as a priest and Monseigneur, interacting with, mentoring and counseling children, including altar boys and children attending Defendant Holy Name of Jesus like Plaintiff.

21. By assigning Fr. Walker to the role of priest, Defendants gave Fr. Walker complete access to minors, including Plaintiff, and empowered him to exercise complete authority over minors.

22. In the performance of their duties, Defendants authorized Fr. Walker to be alone with minor children, including Plaintiff, and to have unfettered and unsupervised access to them on Defendants' property.

23. Defendants required students and altar boys, like Plaintiff, to accept and obey instruction from Fr. Walker and other clergy and teachers.

24. Plaintiff was raised as a Catholic, and at all relevant times had developed a reverence, respect and/or fear for the Catholic Church and its clergy, including Fr. Walker.

25. When Plaintiff was approximately 12 years old, he was a student and altar boy at Defendant Holy Name of Jesus.

{00048417}

4

26. On multiple occasions over the course of approximately 6 years, at Defendant Holy Name of Jesus, Fr. Walker engaged in unlawful, unpermitted, harmful sexual contact with Plaintiff.

27. Plaintiff's relationship to Defendants as a vulnerable child and student, and the culture of the Catholic church which Defendants endorsed, put pressure on Plaintiff not to report Fr. Walker's abuse or his threats.

28. Defendants knew or should have known that Fr. Walker was a danger to minor boys like Plaintiff before he sexually abused Plaintiff.

29. The Vatican and other church authorities addressed the problem of clergy sex abuse on countless occasions prior to Fr. Walker's abuse of Plaintiff, and communicated as much with all levels of Church hierarchy including bishops and other Diocesan leaders. As such, at all relevant times, Defendants were well aware that errant sexual behavior by some priests was not only widespread but predictable.

30. Upon information and belief, not only was Defendant Diocese aware of sexual abuse of children, but it participated in covering up such heinous acts by moving errant priests and clergy members from assignment to assignment, thereby putting children in harm's way.

31. Defendants owed Plaintiff a duty of reasonable care because they had superior knowledge about the risks their facilities posed to minor children, the risk of abuse in general, and the risks that Fr. Walker posed to Plaintiff.

32. Prior to the time of Plaintiff's abuse by Fr. Walker, Defendants knew or should have known of numerous acts of sexual assault committed by clergy members within the Diocese and elsewhere in the Roman Catholic Church, and knew that there was a specific danger of child sex abuse for children in their institutions and programs.

{00048417}

5

33. The sexual abuse of Plaintiff by Fr. Walker was foreseeable.

34. Prior to the time of Plaintiff's abuse by Fr. Walker, Defendants knew or should have known of Fr. Walker's acts of child sexual abuse on other minors.

35. Defendants owed Plaintiff a reasonable duty of care because they affirmatively solicited children and parents to send their children to Holy Name of Jesus; they undertook custody of minor children, including Plaintiff; they promoted their facilities and programs as being safe for children, they held out their agents, including Fr. Walker, as safe to work with and around minor boys, they encouraged parents and children to spend time with their agents; and/or authorized their agents, including Fr. Walker, to spend time with, interact with, and recruit children.

36. Defendants owed Plaintiff a heightened, fiduciary duty of care because they held themselves out as being able to provide a safe and secure environment for children, including Plaintiff; Plaintiff's parents entrusted Plaintiff to Defendants' care, and expected that Plaintiff would be safe and properly supervised in an environment free from harm and abuse; Plaintiff was a vulnerable minor, and unable to protect himself; and Defendants affirmatively assumed a position of empowerment over Plaintiff.

37. Defendants owed Plaintiff a duty to protect him from harm because Defendants' acts and omissions created a foreseeable risk of harm to Plaintiff.

38. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer great physical and mental pain and anguish, severe and permanent emotional distress, psychological injuries, fear and anxiety; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing his normal daily activities; was and will continue to be deprived of the enjoyment of life's pleasures; has suffered and continues to suffer loss of spirituality; has suffered and will continue

{00048417}

6



to suffer loss of earnings and earning capacity; has incurred and will in the future incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, and was otherwise damaged in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional limits of the lower courts in this State.

39. To the extent that any Defendants plead, or otherwise seek to rely upon Article 16 of the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules (CPLR) to have fault apportioned to another allegedly culpable party, Plaintiff expressly states that Defendants' conduct falls within one or more of the subdivisions of CPLR 1602.

### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **NEGLIGENT HIRING, RETENTION, SUPERVISION, AND DIRECTION**

40. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

41. At all relevant times Defendants had a duty to exercise due care in hiring, appointing, assigning, retention, supervision and direction of Fr. Walker, so as to protect minor children, including Plaintiff, who were likely to come into contact with him, and/or under his influence or supervision, and to ensure that Fr. Walker did not use this assigned position to injure minors by sexual assault, contact or abuse.

42. Defendants were negligent and failed to use reasonable care in hiring, appointing, assigning, and retention, of Fr. Walker, failed to properly investigate his background and employment history, and/or hired, appointed and/or assigned him to Defendant Holy Name of Jesus, when Defendants knew or should have known of facts that would make him a danger to children; and Defendants were otherwise negligent.

43. Defendants were negligent and did not use reasonable care in their supervision and direction of Fr. Walker, failed to monitor his activities, failed to oversee the manner in which

{00048417}

7

he carried out the duties to which Defendants assigned him, even though they knew or should have known that Fr. Walker posed a threat of sexual abuse to minors; allowed the misconduct describe above to occur and continue; failed to investigate Fr. Walker's dangerous activities and remove him from their premises; and Defendants were otherwise negligent.

44. Fr. Walker would not have been in a position to sexually abuse Plaintiff had Defendants not been negligent in the hiring, retention, supervision, and direction of Fr. Walker.

45. At all relevant times, Fr. Walker acted in the course and scope of his employment with Defendants.

46. Defendants' aforesaid actions were willful, wanton, malicious, reckless, and/or outrageous in their disregard for the rights and safety of Plaintiff.

47. Plaintiff suffered grave injury as a result of Fr. Walker's sexual abuse and misconduct, including physical, psychological and emotional injury as described above.

48. By the reason of the foregoing, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages, in an amount to be determined at trial, in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional limits of the lower courts in this State, together with interest and costs.

## **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

### **NEGLIGENT, RECKLESS, AND WILLFUL MISCONDUCT**

49. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

50. Defendants were negligent and did not use reasonable care in their training, if any, of minor students and altar boys about the risk of sexual abuse in their institution and facilities, to identify signs of sexual abuse, grooming behaviors, or sexual predators, and to

report any suspicion that a minor may be getting abused, maltreated, groomed, or otherwise sexually abused.

51. Defendants were negligent and did not use reasonable care in their training, if any, of clergy members and/or adult staff about the risk of sexual abuse in their institution and facilities, to identify signs of sexual abuse, grooming behaviors, or sexual predators, and their statutory duty to report any suspicion that a minor may be getting abused, maltreated, groomed, or otherwise sexually abused.

52. At all relevant times, Defendants affirmatively and/or impliedly represented to minor children, their families and the general public that clergy working in the Diocese, including Fr. Walker, did not pose a risk and/or that they did not have a history of sexually abusing children, and that children, including Plaintiff, would be safe in their care.

53. Defendants knew or should have known this representation was false and that employing Fr. Walker and giving him unfettered access to children, including Plaintiff, posed an unacceptable risk of harm to children.

54. Defendant Diocese maintained a policy and practice of covering up criminal activity committed by clergy members within the Diocese.

55. Over the decades, this “cover-up” policy and practice of the Diocese resulted in the sexual assault of untold numbers of children, and put numerous other children at risk of sexual assault.

56. Defendant Diocese failed to report multiple allegations of sexual abuse by its employees, agents and representatives, to the proper authorities, thereby putting children at risk of sexual assault.

57. Upon information and belief, Defendants covered up acts of abuse by Fr. Walker, and concealed facts concerning Fr. Walker's sexual misconduct from Plaintiff and his family.

58. It was not until April 2019 that Defendant Diocese publicly named Fr. Walker as having been accused of sexual assault of a minor. Abuse by Fr. Walker was determined to be eligible for compensation under the IRCP.

59. By failing to disclose the identities, histories and information about sexually abusive clergy in their employ, including Fr. Walker, Defendants unreasonably deprived the families of children entrusted to their care, including Plaintiff, of the ability to protect their children.

60. Defendants failed to warn Plaintiff and his parents that Fr. Walker posed a risk of child sexual assault.

61. The conduct of Defendants as described herein was done with utter disregard as to the potential profound injuries which would ensue, and with depraved indifference to the health and well-being of children, and to the fact that Defendants were knowingly subjecting children in their charge, including Plaintiff, to sexual crimes.

62. Defendants' aforesaid actions were negligent, reckless, willful and wonton in their disregard for the rights and safety of children, including Plaintiff.

63. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' misconduct, Plaintiff suffered grave injury, including the physical, psychological and emotional injury and damages as described above.

64. By the reason of the foregoing, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages, in an amount to be determined at trial, in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional limits of the lower courts in this State, together with interest and costs.

{00048417}

10

### **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**

65. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

66. The sexual abuse of Plaintiff was extreme and outrageous conduct, beyond all possible bounds of decency, atrocious and intolerable in a civilized world.

67. Defendants' aforesaid negligent, grossly negligent and reckless misconduct, endangered Plaintiff's safety and caused him to fear for his own safety.

68. Defendants knew or disregarded the substantial probability that Fr. Walker would cause severe emotional distress to Plaintiff.

69. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' foregoing misconduct, Plaintiff suffered severe emotional distress including psychological and emotional injury as described above.

70. By the reason of the foregoing, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages in an amount to be determined at trial, in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional limits of the lower courts in this State, plus interest and costs.

### **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **PREMISES LIABILITY**

71. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

72. At all relevant times, Defendants owned, operated, and /or controlled the premises known as Holy Name of Jesus, including the areas where the sexual abuse of Plaintiff occurred.

73. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was rightfully present at the aforementioned premises.

74. Defendants had a duty to see that the premises at which Plaintiff was rightfully present were in a reasonably safe condition for the intended use by students, like Plaintiff, whose presence was reasonably anticipated.

75. Defendants willfully, recklessly, and negligently failed to provide reasonably safe premises that was free from the presence of sexual predators and/or the assault by the occupants of the premises, including Fr. Walker. Defendants thereby breached their duty of care of Plaintiff.

76. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' misconduct, Plaintiff suffered grave injury, including the physical, psychological, and emotional injury and damages as described above.

77. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages in an amount to be determined at trial, in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional limits of the lower courts in this State, plus interest and costs.

#### FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

#### BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY

78. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

79. At all relevant times, there existed a fiduciary relationship of trust, confidence and reliance between Plaintiff and each Defendant. The entrustment of Plaintiff to the care and supervision of the Defendants while Plaintiff was a vulnerable child, imposed upon Defendants fiduciary duty to act in the best interests of Plaintiff.

80. Defendants were entrusted with the well-being, care, and safety of Plaintiff, which Defendants had a fiduciary duty to protect.

81. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants breached their fiduciary duties to Plaintiff.

82. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' foregoing breach, Plaintiff suffered grave injury, including the physical, psychological and emotional injury and damages as described above.

83. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages in an amount to be determined at trial, in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional limits of the lower courts in this State, plus interest and costs.

#### **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **BREACH OF DUTY IN LOCO PARENTIS**

84. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

85. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was a vulnerable child entrusted to Defendants care, and was under the supervision and control of Defendants, such that Defendants owed him a duty to act *in loco parentis* and to prevent foreseeable injuries.

86. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants breached their duties to act *in loco parentis*.

87. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' foregoing breach, Plaintiff suffered grave injury, including the physical, psychological and emotional injury and damages as described above.

88. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages in an amount to be determined at trial, in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional limits of the lower courts in this State, plus interest and costs.

**SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**BREACH OF STATUTORY DUTIES TO REPORT**

89. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein

90. Pursuant to N.Y. Soc. Serv. Law §§ 413 and 420 and New York Education Law Article 23-B, Defendants had a statutory duty to report reasonable suspicion of abuse of children in their care.

91. Defendants breached their statutory duty by failing to report reasonable suspicion of abuse by Fr. Walker of children in their care.

92. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' foregoing breaches, Plaintiff suffered grave injury, including the physical, psychological and emotional injury and damages as described above.

93. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages in an amount to be determined at trial, in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional limits of the lower courts in this State, plus interest and costs.

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

- a. Awarding Plaintiff compensatory damages for his injuries, in an amount to be determined at trial;
- b. Awarding Plaintiff punitive damages for his injuries, in an amount to be determined at trial;



- c. Awarding Plaintiff prejudgment interest, to the extent available by law;
- d. Awarding Plaintiffs costs and disbursements and attorneys' fees to the extent available by law; and
- e. Awarding such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

94. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury of all issues triable by jury in this action.

Dated: January 23, 2020

Yours, etc.

**PHILLIPS & PAOLICELLI, LLP**



By: Diane Paolicelli  
dpaolicelli@p2law.com  
Michael DeRuve  
mderuve@p2law.com  
747 Third Avenue, Sixth Floor  
New York, New York 10017  
212-388-5100

Paul K. Barr  
Fanizzi & Barr, P.C.  
2303 Pine Avenue  
Niagara Falls, NY 14301  
716-284-8888  
pbarr@fanizziandbarr.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

{00048417}

15