

1 **STEVEN S. DIAS, #251138**
2 **BRIAN J. FORSYTHE, #338685**
3 **DIAS HALL INC.**
4 A Professional Corporation
5 1141 West Shaw Avenue, Suite 101
6 Fresno, California 93711
7 Telephone: (559) 540-2911
8 Facsimile: (559) 354-0318
9 bforsythe@diashall.com
10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
11 JANE ROE 14, JANE ROE 15,
12 JOHN ROE 16, JANE ROE 17,
13 & JANE ROE 18.

E-FILED
12/16/2022 11:18 AM
Superior Court of California
County of Fresno
By: I. Herrera, Deputy

9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA**
10 **COUNTY OF FRESNO**

11 ****

12 [22CECG04025](#)

13 JANE ROE 14, an individual; JANE ROE
14 15; an individual JOHN ROE 16, an
15 individual; JANE ROE 17, an individual;
16 JANE ROE 18; an individual;

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.

19 DEFENDANT DOE 1, Local Church, a
20 religious corporation form unknown;
21 DEFENDANT DOE 2, National Church,
22 religious entity form unknown;
23 DEFENDANT DOE 3, District Church, a
24 non-profit California corporation;
25 DEFENDANT DOE 4, an individual;
26 and DOES 5 through 100, inclusive,

27 Defendants.

Case No.:

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES:

1. **NEGLIGENCE**
2. **CLAIM FOR CHILDHOOD SEXUAL ASSAULT**
(California Civil Code § 340.1)
3. **NEGLIGENT SUPERVISION/ FAILURE TO WARN**
4. **NEGLIGENT HIRING/RETENTION**
5. **INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**
6. **BREACH OF STATUTORY DUTY**
(California Civil Code § 51.7)

24 Based upon information and belief available to Plaintiffs, JANE ROE 14, JANE ROE 15,
25 JOHN ROE 16, JANE ROE 17 and JANE ROE 18 at all times relevant to the filing of this
26 Complaint Plaintiffs allege as follows against Defendants DOE 1, Local Church, religious
27 corporation form unknown; DOE 2, National Church, religious entity form unknown; DOE 3,
28

1 District Church, a non-profit California corporation; DOE 4, an individual; and DOES 5 through
2 100, inclusive, as follows:

3 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

4 1. Between approximately 2010 and 2014, when Plaintiff JANE ROE 14 was a
5 minor child and a member, congregant, and student of Defendants DOE 1, Local Church, DOE
6 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, in Riverdale, California she was groomed and a
7 victim of childhood sexual assault. Commencing at the age of 13 years old Plaintiff JANE ROE
8 14 was groomed for a sexual relationship by Defendant DOE 4. At the age of 13 years old
9 Defendant DOE 4 initiated and maintained a pattern of grooming and committing acts of
10 childhood sexual assault upon Plaintiff JANE ROE 14 until the time she left Defendant DOE 1,
11 Local Church, at the age of 17 years old.

12 2. Between approximately 2004 and 2009, Plaintiff JANE ROE 15 was a minor
13 child and a member, congregant, and student of Defendants DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2,
14 National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, in Riverdale, California she was groomed and a
15 victim of childhood sexual assault. Commencing at the age of 13 years old Plaintiff JANE ROE
16 15 was groomed for a sexual relationship by Defendant DOE 4. At the age of 13 years old
17 Defendant DOE 4 initiated and maintained a pattern of grooming and committing acts of
18 childhood sexual assault upon Plaintiff JANE ROE 15 until the time she left Defendant DOE 1,
19 Local Church, after reaching the age of majority.

20 3. Between approximately 2004 and 2009, Plaintiff JOHN ROE 16 was a minor
21 child and a member, congregant, and student of Defendants DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2,
22 National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, in Riverdale, California she was groomed and a
23 victim of childhood sexual assault. Commencing at the age of 13 years old Plaintiff JOHN ROE
24 16 was groomed for a sexual relationship by Defendant DOE 4. At the age of 13 years old
25 Defendant DOE 4 initiated and maintained a pattern of grooming and committing acts of
26 childhood sexual assault upon Plaintiff JOHN ROE 16 until the time she left Defendant DOE 1,
27 Local Church, after reaching the age of majority.

28 //

1 the time of filing this Complaint for childhood sexual assault ROE 15 is under the age of 40
2 years old. At all relevant times, ROE 15 resided in Fresno County, California. ROE 15 attended
3 DOE 1, Local Church, as a congregant and attended school at Academy located on the premises
4 of DOE 1, Local Church. ROE 15 brings this Complaint pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure
5 Section 340.1 for the childhood sexual assault she suffered due to Defendants’ negligence and
6 malfeasance.

7 8. Plaintiff, JOHN ROE 16 (“ROE 16”), is an adult male resident of the State of
8 California. ROE 16 was a minor throughout the period of child sexual assault alleged herein. At
9 the time of filing this Complaint for childhood sexual assault ROE 16 is under the age of 40
10 years old. At all relevant times, ROE 16 resided in Fresno County, California. ROE 16 attended
11 DOE 1, Local Church, as a congregant and attended school at Academy located on the premises
12 of DOE 1, Local Church. ROE 16 brings this Complaint pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure
13 Section 340.1 for the childhood sexual assault she suffered due to Defendants’ negligence and
14 malfeasance.

15 9. Plaintiff, JANE ROE 17 (“ROE 17”), is an adult female resident of the State of
16 California. ROE 17 was a minor throughout the period of child sexual assault alleged herein. At
17 the time of filing this Complaint for childhood sexual assault ROE 17 is under the age of 40
18 years old. At all times, ROE 17 resided in Kings County, California. ROE 17 attended Defendant
19 DOE 1, Local Church, as a congregant of the church and attended school at DOE 1, Local
20 Church, doing business as Academy located on the premises of DOE 1, Local Church. ROE 17
21 brings this Complaint pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 340.1 for the grooming and
22 childhood sexual assault she suffered due to DOE Defendants negligence and malfeasance.

23 10. Plaintiff, JANE ROE 18 (“ROE 18”), is an adult female resident of the State of
24 California. ROE 18 was a minor throughout the period of child sexual assault alleged herein. At
25 the time of filing this Complaint for childhood sexual assault ROE 18 is under the age of 40
26 years old. At all times, ROE 18 resided in Kings County, California. ROE 18 attended Defendant
27 DOE 1, Local Church, as a congregant of the church and attended school at DOE 1, Local
28 Church, doing business as Academy located on the premises of DOE 1, Local Church. ROE 18

1 brings this Complaint pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 340.1 for the grooming and
2 childhood sexual assault she suffered due to DOE Defendants negligence and malfeasance.

3 11. At all relevant times, Defendant, DOE 1, Local Church, was and is a religious
4 corporation form unknown authorized to conduct business and is conducting business in the
5 State of California, with its principal place of business in the County of Fresno, California. At all
6 times relevant, DOE 1, Local Church, had responsibility for Church operations in Riverdale,
7 California.

8 12. At all relevant times, Defendant, DOE 2, National Church, ("National Church")
9 was and is a religious entity form unknown, with its principal place of business in the State of
10 Missouri. At all times relevant, DOE 2, National Church, organized, administered and directed
11 the congregational affairs of Church members in the United States. At all times relevant DOE 2,
12 National Church, owned, operated, managed, and/or controlled local churches and schools
13 throughout California, including DOE 1, Local Church, in Riverdale, California.

14 13. At all relevant times, Defendant, DOE 3, District Church, ("District Church")
15 was and is a non-profit California corporation with its principal place of business in Irvine,
16 California. At all times relevant, DOE 3, District Church, organized, administered and directed
17 the congregational affairs of Church members in the United States. At all times relevant DOE 2,
18 National Church, owned, operated, managed, and/or controlled local churches and schools
19 throughout California, including DOE 1, Local Church, in Riverdale, California.

20 14. At all relevant times, Defendant, DOE 4, an individual ("DOE 4"), is an adult
21 male who, at all times relevant, was associated with, supervised, directed and controlled by DOE
22 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church. While supervised,
23 directed and controlled by DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District
24 Church, DOE 4 committed the acts of grooming and childhood sexual assault alleged herein as
25 an employee of DOE 1, Local Church, and a teacher and/or school supervisor at Academy
26 located on the premises of DOE 1, Local Church, and in his capacity as pastor at DOE 1, Local
27 Church.

28 //

1 15. At all relevant times DOE 2, National Church, was the owner of DOE 1, Local
2 Church, and held itself out to the public as the owner or controller of DOE 1, Local Church.

3 16. At all relevant times DOE 2, National Church, through its agents, servants, and
4 employees, managed, maintained, operated, and controlled DOE 1, Local Church.

5 17. At all relevant times DOE 2, National Church, through its agents, servants, and
6 employees, managed, maintained, operated, and controlled DOE 1, Local Church, and held out
7 to the public its agents, servants, and employees as those who managed, maintained, operated,
8 and controlled DOE 1, Local Church.

9 18. At all relevant times DOE 2, National Church, was responsible for and did the
10 hiring and staffing at DOE 1, Local Church.

11 19. At all relevant times DOE 2, National Church, was responsible for and did the
12 recruitment and staffing of volunteers at DOE 1, Local Church.

13 20. At all relevant times DOE 3, District Church, was the owner of DOE 1, Local
14 Church, and held itself out to the public as the owner or controller of DOE 1, Local Church.

15 21. At all relevant times DOE 3, District Church, through its agents, servants, and
16 employees, managed, maintained, operated, and controlled DOE 1, Local Church.

17 22. At all relevant times DOE 3, District Church, through its agents, servants, and
18 employees, managed, maintained, operated, and controlled DOE 1, Local Church, and held out
19 to the public its agents, servants, and employees as those who managed, maintained, operated,
20 and controlled DOE 1, Local Church.

21 23. At all relevant times DOE 3, District Church, was responsible for and did the
22 hiring and staffing at DOE 1, Local Church.

23 24. At all relevant times DOE 3, District Church, was responsible for and did the
24 recruitment and staffing of volunteers at DOE 1, Local Church.

25 25. At all relevant times DOE 4 was on the staff of, acted as an agent of, and served
26 as an employee of DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church.

27 26. At all relevant times DOE 4 was acting in the course and scope of his
28 employment with DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church.

1 27. At all relevant times DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
2 materially benefited from the operation of DOE 1, Local Church, including the services of DOE
3 4 and the services of those who managed and supervised DOE 4.

4 28. At all relevant times DOE 4 was employed by DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2,
5 National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, he used his positions as a as a teacher and/or
6 school supervisor at Academy and as pastor at DOE 1, Local Church, to groom and sexually
7 assault ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18.

8 29. Despite a mandatory reporting obligation to do so, DOE 1, Local Church did,
9 not report the abuse to law enforcement.

10 30. To the extent DOE 1, Local Church, was a different entity, corporation, or
11 organization during the period of time during which DOE 4 used his positions as a teacher and/or
12 school supervisor at the Academy and as pastor at DOE 1, Local Church, to groom and sexually
13 assault ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18, such entity, corporation, or
14 organization is hereby on notice that it is intended to be a defendant in this lawsuit and is
15 identified in the Complaint as DOE 1, Local Church.

16 31. To the extent DOE 1, Local Church, is a successor to a different entity,
17 corporation, or organization which existed during the period of time during which DOE 4 used
18 his positions as a teacher and/or school supervisor at Academy and as pastor at DOE 1, Local
19 Church, to groom and to sexually assault ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18, such
20 predecessor entity, corporation, or organization is hereby on notice that it is intended to be a
21 defendant in this lawsuit and is identified in the Complaint as DOE 1, Local Church.

22 32. To the extent DOE 2, National Church, was a different entity, corporation, or
23 organization during the period of time during which DOE 4 used his positions as a teacher and/or
24 school supervisor at Academy and as pastor at DOE 1, Local Church, to groom and to sexually
25 assault ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18, such entity, corporation, or
26 organization is hereby on notice that it is intended to be a defendant in this lawsuit and is
27 identified in the Complaint as DOE 2, National Church.

28 //

1 33. To the extent DOE 2, National Church, is a successor to a different entity,
2 corporation, or organization which existed during the period of time during which DOE 4 used
3 his positions as a teacher and/or school supervisor at Academy and as pastor at DOE 1, Local
4 Church, to groom and to sexually assault ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18, such
5 predecessor entity, corporation, or organization is hereby on notice that it is intended to be a
6 defendant in this lawsuit and is identified in the Complaint as DOE 2, National Church.

7 34. To the extent DOE 3, District Church, was a different entity, corporation, or
8 organization during the period of time during which DOE 4 used his positions as a teacher and/or
9 school supervisor at Academy and as pastor at DOE 1, Local Church, to groom and to sexually
10 assault ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18, such entity, corporation, or
11 organization is hereby on notice that it is intended to be a defendant in this lawsuit and is
12 identified in the Complaint as DOE 3, District Church.

13 35. To the extent DOE 3, District Church, is a successor to a different entity,
14 corporation, or organization which existed during the period of time during which DOE 4 used
15 his positions as a teacher and/or school supervisor at the Academy and as pastor at DOE 1, Local
16 Church, to groom and to sexually assault ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18, such
17 predecessor entity, corporation, or organization is hereby on notice that it is intended to be a
18 defendant in this lawsuit and is identified in the Complaint as DOE 3, District Church.

19 36. Defendant DOES 5 through 100, inclusive, are individuals and/or business or
20 corporate entities incorporated in and/or doing business in California whose true names and
21 capacities are unknown to Plaintiffs who therefore sue such defendants by such fictitious names,
22 and who will amend the Complaint to show the true names and capacities of each such DOE
23 Defendant when ascertained. Each such Defendant DOE is legally responsible in some manner
24 for the events, happenings and/or tortious and unlawful conduct that caused the injuries and
25 damages alleged in this Complaint. Defendants DOE 1, DOE 2, DOE 3, DOE 4 and DOES 5
26 through DOE 100, are sometimes hereinafter referred to collectively as the "DEFENDANTS".

27 37. Each Defendant is the agent, servant and/or employee of other Defendants, and
28 each Defendant was acting within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as an agent,

1 servant and/or employee of the other Defendants. Defendants, and each of them, are individuals,
2 corporations, partnerships and other entities which engaged in, joined in and conspired with the
3 other wrong doers in carrying out the tortious and unlawful activities described in this
4 Complaint.

5 **BACKGROUND FACTS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS**

6 38. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and upon such information and belief
7 hereby allege the following:

8 39. Defendant DOE 1, Local Church, is located in Riverdale, County of Fresno,
9 California, and at all times relevant is and was a member church of Defendants, DOE 2, National
10 Church, and DOE 3, District Church.

11 40. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendants operated a church in
12 Riverdale, California, and invited the participation of the public, including ROE 14, ROE 15,
13 ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18, into the church community. As part of the church community,
14 minors were invited to participate in youth group activities, attend the Academy for their
15 schooling, participate in volunteer events and participate in DOE 1, Local Church, sponsored
16 choir tours. Additionally, members were invited to participate in other church activities including
17 mission trips, bible study, and choir trips throughout United States. The choir tours and other
18 activities were organized and chaperoned by paid staff and/or volunteers that were selected,
19 approved and maintained by Defendants and operational agents in the church community.
20 Defendants accepted these paid staff and/or volunteers as agents of DOE 1, Local Church, DOE
21 2, National Church and DOE 3, District Church.

22 41. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Plaintiffs ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16,
23 ROE 17 and ROE 18 attended DOE 1, Local Church, as congregants, and attended Academy
24 located on the premises of DOE 1, Local Church, as students.

25 42. At all times relevant to this Complaint, DOE 4 acted in the capacity as a church
26 elder and was a pastor at DOE 1, Local Church. Further, DOE 4 acted as a teacher and/or school
27 supervisor at Academy located on the premises of DOE 1, Local Church. Additionally, DOE 4,
28 was a chaperone on DOE 1, Local Church, choir tours which were sanctioned, managed, and/or

1 controlled by Defendants DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District
2 Church.

3 43. At all-time relevant to this Complaint, DOES 1 through DOE 4 facilitated
4 activities, including but not limited to, bible study, church and Academy functions, chaperoning
5 events including, sports activities, choir activities, interstate travel for DOE 1, Local Church,
6 purposes, administration of DOE 1, Local Church, and school administration of Academy. Their
7 positions and responsibilities within DOE 1, Local Church, were evident to all church attendees
8 as DOE 1, Local Church, would advertise their involvement with various activities through
9 announcements and flyers, and through the operation of the Academy. At the time of the sexual
10 assaults of Plaintiffs, ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18, DOE 4 was employed by
11 and acted as an agent of DOE 1, Local Church, and by Academy, and was under it's the direct
12 supervision, employ and control of DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, DOE 3,
13 District Church, DOE 4, and DOES 5 through 100.

14 44. During all times relevant to this complaint, DOE 4 was employed by DOE 1,
15 Local Church, and Academy, and was employed by and acted as an agent of DOE 1, Local
16 Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, and was under their direct
17 supervision and employment as a teacher and/or school supervisor at Academy located on the
18 premises of DOE 1, Local Church, and pastor at DOE 1, Local Church.

19 45. At the time of the sexual assaults alleged herein Plaintiffs, ROE 14, ROE 15,
20 ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18, belonged to DOE 1, Local Church, and regularly attended DOE
21 1, Local Church, services and events sponsored by that congregation. At all relevant times, ROE
22 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18 attended school at Academy located on the premises
23 of DOE 1, Local Church, where DOE 4 was a teacher and/school supervisor. DOE 1, Local
24 Church, was operated and controlled by senior pastors who performed duties to control, operate,
25 supervise and direct staff and volunteers at both DOE 1, Local Church, and Academy.

26 46. Plaintiffs, ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18, began attending
27 services at DOE 1, Local Church, in the 2000's. ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE
28 18 attended church services, attended youth groups, participated in volunteer events, were

1 members of the choir, attended mission trips, attended school at Academy and travelled with the
2 choir on interstate tours where they were housed with other minor members of the church.

3 **JANE ROE 14**

4 47. Between approximately 2010 and 2014, when ROE 14 was a minor, she was
5 groomed and sexual assaulted by DOE 4. Plaintiff ROE 14 was approximately 13 to 18 years old
6 when DOE 4 groomed and sexually assaulted ROE 14 in his capacity as teacher, school
7 supervisor and pastor at DOE 1, Local Church.

8 48. DOE 4 first initiated grooming ROE 14 by greeting her at church with a
9 handshake, where he would grasp her hand with both of his hands, ROE 14 describes the way he
10 grabbed her hand in an "intimate" manner. When ROE 14 attempted to release the handshake
11 DOE 4 would tighten his grip, while massaging the top of ROE 14's hand and rubbing between
12 the webbing of the thumb and index finger. ROE 14 began to grow increasingly more
13 uncomfortable with the handshakes as she realized they were deliberate and inappropriate in
14 nature.

15 49. Commencing in 2010, DOE 4 would utilize the Academy's integrated computer
16 system to direct message ROE 14 compliments and give her special attention. The messages sent
17 by DOE 4 started as simple compliments and progressed overtime to become inappropriate and
18 sexual in nature.

19 50. During class at Academy, DOE 4 would stand behind ROE 14 to answer her
20 academic questions, DOE 4 would press himself against ROE 14, pushing his genitals against
21 ROE 14's neck and upper back. DOE 4 would press his genitals against ROE 14's upper back
22 and neck with such force that she was pinned against and unable to move away from her desk.

23 51. During class at Academy, when ROE 14 would request assistance on a
24 computer assignment DOE 4 would deliberately press his genitals against ROE 14's back and
25 neck, reach over her and put his hand over her hand on the computer mouse. ROE 14 grew
26 increasingly uncomfortable as DOE 4 would press himself against her and take control of her
27 hand every time she would request assistance.

28 //

1 52. When DOE 4 had an opportunity to touch ROE 14 during class he would. DOE
2 4 would rub ROE 14’s back and shoulders while giving her complements. On occasion when
3 DOE 4 would massage ROE 14’s shoulders DOE 4’s hands would move down ROE 14’s chest
4 touching her upper breast.

5 53. ROE 14 began to avoid using Academy’s flag system to alert DOE 4 teacher
6 and school supervisor that she needed academic assistance in hopes to avoid any acts of
7 childhood sexual assault by DOE 4.

8 54 Commencing in middle school, ROE 14 wore multiple solid colored Jelly
9 bracelets. During ROE 14’s sophomore year, DOE 4 approached ROE 14 at her desk in class and
10 asked her if she knew what her solid color Jelly bracelets meant. ROE 14 responded in the
11 negative. Thereafter, DOE 4 proceeded to explain to ROE 14 that each color of the bracelets
12 symbolized a different sexual act she had performed with a man. ROE 14 was shocked that the
13 bracelets she had been wearing for years had a sexual meaning, and she even more shocked and
14 disturbed that DOE 4, as a teacher/school supervisor, was explaining to her that she was
15 displaying emblems of sexual acts. After the encounter with DOE 4, ROE 14 went straight home,
16 removed the bracelets and threw them into the garbage feeling shame and disgust.

17 55. The childhood sexual assault of ROE 14 by DOE 4 occurred using the tasks,
18 premises, or instrumentalities that the Defendants entrusted to DOE 4, including the grounds,
19 bathrooms, modular trailers, offices, the congregation room and classrooms located on the
20 premises of DOE 1, Local Church.

21 56. During the time that DOE 4 was working for and serving the Defendants, each
22 Defendant had a duty to use reasonable care to prevent DOE 4 from using the tasks, premises,
23 and instrumentalities of his position with the Defendants to target, groom, and sexually assault
24 children, including ROE 14.

25 57. DOE 4’s sexual assault of ROE 14 occurred during activities that were
26 sponsored by, or were a direct result of activities sponsored by DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2,
27 National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, including at or during school, youth choir events
28 and tours, seasonal church events, and church sponsored activities.

1 58. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
2 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, held DOE 4 out to the public, to
3 Plaintiff, and to Plaintiff’s parents, as their agent and employee.

4 59. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
5 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, held DOE 4 out to the public, to
6 Plaintiff, and to Plaintiff’s parents, as having been vetted, screened, and approved by them as
7 someone who was safe and could be trusted with children.

8 60. Plaintiff ROE 14 and Plaintiff’s parents reasonably relied upon the acts and
9 representations of DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
10 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, and reasonably believed that DOE 4
11 was an agent or employee of the Defendants who was vetted, screened, and approved by it and
12 who was safe and could be trusted with children.

13 61. Plaintiff ROE 14 and Plaintiff’s parents trusted DOE 4 because DOE 1, Local
14 Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, held him out as someone who
15 was safe and could be trusted with the supervision, care, custody, and control of children,
16 including Plaintiff ROE 14.

17 62. Plaintiff ROE 14 and Plaintiff’s parents believed that DOE 1, Local Church,
18 DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, would exercise such care as would a
19 parent of ordinary prudence in comparable circumstances when the Defendants assumed
20 supervision, care, custody, and control of minor Plaintiff, including protecting Plaintiff from the
21 danger of being sexually assaulted.

22 63. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Academy monitors,
23 teachers and administrators knew of DOE 4’s actions and chose to ignore and suppress DOE 4’s
24 childhood sexual assaults.

25 64. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff ROE 14 has suffered, and
26 will continue to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical
27 manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation,
28 and loss of enjoyment of life; have suffered and continues to suffer spiritually; were prevented

1 and will continue to be prevented from performing Plaintiffs' daily activities and obtaining the
2 full enjoyment of life; will sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or have incurred
3 and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and
4 counseling.

5 **JANE ROE 15**

6 65. Between approximately 2004 and 2009, when ROE 15 was a minor, she was
7 groomed and sexual assaulted by DOE 4. Plaintiff ROE 15 was approximately 13 to 18 years old
8 when DOE 4 groomed and sexually assaulted ROE 15 in his capacity as teacher, school
9 supervisor and pastor at DOE 1, Local Church.

10 66. DOE 4 first initiated grooming ROE 15 by greeting her at church with a
11 handshake and a compliment. DOE 4 would massage the top of ROE 15's hand and between the
12 webbing of the thumb and index finger. When ROE 15 tried to pull her hand away DOE 4's
13 would squeeze her hand until he saw fit to release his grasp. ROE 15 began growing increasingly
14 more uncomfortable with the handshakes when DOE 4 began cupping her hands in an intimate
15 manner with both of his hands.

16 67. During class at Academy, DOE 4 would stand behind ROE 15 to answer her
17 academic questions, DOE 4 would press himself against ROE 15, pushing his genitals against
18 ROE 15's upper back. DOE 4 would press his genitals against ROE 15's upper back with such
19 force that she was unable to move away from her desk.

20 68. During class at Academy, when ROE 15 would request assistance on a
21 computer assignment DOE 4 would press himself against ROE 15, in the manner outlined above,
22 reach over her and put his hand over her hand on the computer mouse. ROE 15 grew
23 increasingly uncomfortable as DOE 4 would press himself against her and take control of her
24 hand every time she would request assistance.

25 69. When DOE 4 had an opportunity to touch ROE 15 during school he would. The
26 touching progressed to rubbing ROE 15's back and shoulders while giving her complements.

27 70. Commencing in 2006, DOE 4 would utilize the Academy's integrated computer
28 system to direct message ROE 15 compliments about her smile and give her special attention.

1 71. When DOE 4 had an opportunity to touch ROE 15 during class he would. DOE
2 4 would rub ROE 15's back and shoulders while giving her complements. When DOE 4 would
3 massage ROE 15's shoulders his hand would move down the front of ROE 15's uniform shirt
4 and grope her upper breasts.

5 72. ROE 15 began to avoid using Academy's flag system to gain the attention of
6 teachers in the hope of avoiding any acts of childhood sexual assault by DOE 4. Further, ROE 15
7 began sitting on the edge of her seat to create a space between her and the seatback whenever she
8 observed DOE 4 approaching her desk in an effort to avoid DOE 4 pressing his genitals against
9 her back.

10 73. The childhood sexual assault of ROE 15 by DOE 4 occurred using the tasks,
11 premises, or instrumentalities that the Defendants entrusted to DOE 4, including the grounds,
12 bathrooms, modular trailers, offices, the congregation room and classrooms located on the
13 premises of DOE 1, Local Church.

14 74. During the time that DOE 4 was working for and serving the Defendants, each
15 Defendant had a duty to use reasonable care to prevent DOE 4 from using the tasks, premises,
16 and instrumentalities of his position with the Defendants to target, groom, and sexually assault
17 children, including ROE 15.

18 75. DOE 4's sexual assault of ROE 15 occurred during activities that were
19 sponsored by, or were a direct result of activities sponsored by DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2,
20 National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, including at or during school, youth choir events
21 and tours, seasonal church events, and church sponsored activities.

22 76. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
23 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, held DOE 4 out to the public, to
24 Plaintiff, and to Plaintiff's parents, as their agent and employee.

25 77. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
26 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, held DOE 4 out to the public, to
27 Plaintiff, and to Plaintiff's parents, as having been vetted, screened, and approved by them as
28 someone who was safe and could be trusted with children.

1 78. Plaintiff ROE 15 and Plaintiff's parents reasonably relied upon the acts and
2 representations of DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
3 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, and reasonably believed that DOE 4
4 was an agent or employee of the Defendants who was vetted, screened, and approved by it and
5 who was safe and could be trusted with children.

6 79. Plaintiff ROE 15 and Plaintiff's parents trusted DOE 4 because DOE 1, Local
7 Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, held him out as someone who
8 was safe and could be trusted with the supervision, care, custody, and control of children,
9 including Plaintiff ROE 15.

10 80. Plaintiff ROE 15 and Plaintiff's parents believed that DOE 1, Local Church,
11 DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, would exercise such care as would a
12 parent of ordinary prudence in comparable circumstances when the Defendants assumed
13 supervision, care, custody, and control of minor Plaintiff, including protecting Plaintiff from the
14 danger of being sexually assaulted.

15 81. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Academy monitors,
16 teachers and administrators knew of DOE 4's actions and chose to ignore and suppress DOE 4's
17 childhood sexual assaults.

18 82. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff ROE 15 has suffered, and
19 will continue to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical
20 manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation,
21 and loss of enjoyment of life; have suffered and continues to suffer spiritually; were prevented
22 and will continue to be prevented from performing Plaintiffs' daily activities and obtaining the
23 full enjoyment of life; will sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or have incurred
24 and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and
25 counseling.

26 **JOHN ROE 16**

27 83. Between approximately 2004 and 2009, when ROE 16 was a minor, he was
28 groomed and sexual assaulted by DOE 4. Plaintiff ROE 16 was a member, congregant, and

1 student at DOE 1, Local Church, and between the ages 13 to 18 years old DOE 4 groomed and
2 sexually assaulted him in his capacity as teacher, school supervisor and pastor at DOE 1, Local
3 Church.

4 84. During class at Academy, DOE 4 would utilize the schools integrated computer
5 system to direct message ROE 16 compliments and give him special attention. The messages
6 sent by DOE 4 started as simple compliments and progressed overtime to become inappropriate
7 and sexual in nature.

8 85. During class at Academy DOE 4 would walk up behind ROE 16 while he was
9 sitting at his computer and thrust his pelvis into ROE 16's back, pushing his genital against ROE
10 16.

11 86. When DOE 4 had an opportunity to touch ROE 16 during school he would. The
12 touching progressed to rubbing ROE 16's back, shoulders and earlobes while giving him
13 complements. On occasion when DOE 4 would massage ROE 16's shoulders DOE 4's hand
14 would move down ROE 16's chest to his nipples.

15 87. DOE 4's unwanted wrongful sexual advances made ROE 16 uncomfortable and
16 guarded when DOE 4 approached his desk at Academy. ROE 16 would lean forward in his chair
17 to avoid DOE 4's genitals being pressed into his back. ROE 16 began to avoid using Academy's
18 flag system to gain the attention of the teacher in hopes to avoid any acts of childhood sexual
19 assault by DOE 4.

20 88. The sexual assault of ROE 16 by DOE 4 occurred using the tasks, premises, or
21 instrumentalities that the Defendants entrusted to DOE 4, including the grounds, bathrooms,
22 modular trailers, offices, the congregation room and classrooms located on the premises of DOE
23 1, Local Church.

24 89. During the time that DOE 4 was working for and serving the Defendants, each
25 Defendant had a duty to use reasonable care to prevent DOE 4 from using the tasks, premises,
26 and instrumentalities of his position with the Defendants to target, groom, and sexually assault
27 children, including ROE 16.

28 //

1 90. DOE 4’s sexual assault of ROE 16 occurred during activities that were
2 sponsored by, or were a direct result of activities sponsored by DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2,
3 National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, including at or during school, youth choir events
4 and tours, seasonal church events, and church sponsored activities.

5 91. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
6 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, held DOE 4 out to the public, to
7 Plaintiff, and to Plaintiff’s parents, as their agent and employee.

8 92. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
9 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, held DOE 4 out to the public, to
10 Plaintiff, and to Plaintiff’s parents, as having been vetted, screened, and approved by them as
11 someone who was safe and could be trusted with children.

12 93. Plaintiff ROE 16 and Plaintiff’s parents reasonably relied upon the acts and
13 representations of DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
14 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, and reasonably believed that DOE 4
15 was an agent or employee of the Defendants who was vetted, screened, and approved by it and
16 who was safe and could be trusted with children.

17 94. Plaintiff ROE 16 and Plaintiff’s parents trusted DOE 4 because DOE 1, Local
18 Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, held him out as someone who
19 was safe and could be trusted with the supervision, care, custody, and control of children,
20 including Plaintiff ROE 16.

21 95. Plaintiff ROE 16 and Plaintiff’s parents believed that DOE 1, Local Church,
22 DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, would exercise such care as would a
23 parent of ordinary prudence in comparable circumstances when the Defendants assumed
24 supervision, care, custody, and control of minor Plaintiff, including protecting Plaintiff from the
25 danger of being sexually assaulted.

26 96. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff ROE 16 has suffered, and
27 will continue to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical
28 manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation,

1 and loss of enjoyment of life; have suffered and continues to suffer spiritually; were prevented
2 and will continue to be prevented from performing Plaintiffs' daily activities and obtaining the
3 full enjoyment of life; will sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or have incurred
4 and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and
5 counseling.

6 **JANE ROE 17**

7 97. Between approximately 2009 and 2014, when ROE 17 was a minor, she was
8 groomed and sexual assaulted by DOE 4. Plaintiff ROE 17 was approximately 13 to 18 years old
9 when DOE 4 groomed and sexually assaulted ROE 17 in his capacity as teacher, school
10 supervisor and pastor at DOE 1, Local Church.

11 98. DOE 4 first initiated grooming ROE 17 by greeting her at church with a
12 prolonged handshake, where he would grasp her hand with both of his hands, ROE 14 describes
13 the way he grabbed her hand as uncomfortable in duration and feeling, as DOE 4 would massage
14 her hand. When ROE 17 attempted to release the handshake DOE 4 would tighten his grip, while
15 massaging the top of ROE 17's hand.

16 99. Commencing in 2009, DOE 4 would utilize the Academy's integrated computer
17 system to direct message ROE 17 compliments and give her special attention. The messages sent
18 by DOE 4 started as simple compliments and progressed overtime to become inappropriate and
19 sexual in nature.

20 100. During class at Academy, DOE 4 would stand behind ROE 17 to answer her
21 academic questions, DOE 4 would press himself against ROE 17, pushing his genitals against
22 ROE 17's neck and upper back. DOE 4 would press his genitals against ROE 17's upper back
23 and neck. ROE 17 was unable to move away from DOE 4 pushing his genitals against her back
24 as he would push his pelvis against her with great force.

25 101. During class at Academy, when ROE 17 would request assistance on a
26 computer assignment DOE 4 would press himself against ROE 17, in the aforementioned
27 manner, reach over her and put his hand over her hand on the computer mouse.

28 //

1 102. When DOE 4 had an opportunity to touch ROE 17 during class he would. DOE
2 4 would rub ROE 17's back and shoulders while giving her complements. On occasion when
3 DOE 4 would massage ROE 17's shoulders DOE 4's hands would move down ROE 17's chest.

4 103. The childhood sexual assault of ROE 17 by DOE 4 occurred using the tasks,
5 premises, or instrumentalities that the Defendants entrusted to DOE 4, including the grounds,
6 bathrooms, modular trailers, offices, the congregation room and classrooms located on the
7 premises of DOE 1, Local Church.

8 104. During the time that DOE 4 was working for and serving the Defendants, each
9 Defendant had a duty to use reasonable care to prevent DOE 4 from using the tasks, premises,
10 and instrumentalities of his position with the Defendants to target, groom, and sexually assault
11 children, including ROE 17.

12 105. DOE 4's sexual assault of ROE 17 occurred during activities that were
13 sponsored by, or were a direct result of activities sponsored by DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2,
14 National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, including at or during school, youth choir events
15 and tours, seasonal church events, and church sponsored activities.

16 106. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
17 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, held DOE 4 out to the public, to
18 Plaintiff, and to Plaintiff's parents, as their agent and employee.

19 107. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
20 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, held DOE 4 out to the public, to
21 Plaintiff, and to Plaintiff's parents, as having been vetted, screened, and approved by them as
22 someone who was safe and could be trusted with children.

23 108. Plaintiff ROE 17 and Plaintiff's parents reasonably relied upon the acts and
24 representations of DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
25 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, and reasonably believed that DOE 4
26 was an agent or employee of the Defendants who was vetted, screened, and approved by it and
27 who was safe and could be trusted with children.

28 //

1 109. Plaintiff ROE 17 and Plaintiff’s parents trusted DOE 4 because DOE 1, Local
2 Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, held him out as someone who
3 was safe and could be trusted with the supervision, care, custody, and control of children,
4 including Plaintiff ROE 17.

5 110. Plaintiff ROE 17 and Plaintiff’s parents believed that DOE 1, Local Church,
6 DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, would exercise such care as would a
7 parent of ordinary prudence in comparable circumstances when the Defendants assumed
8 supervision, care, custody, and control of minor Plaintiff, including protecting Plaintiff from the
9 danger of being sexually assaulted.

10 111. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Academy monitors,
11 teachers and administrators knew of DOE 4’s actions and chose to ignore and suppress DOE 4’s
12 childhood sexual assaults.

13 112. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff ROE 17 has suffered, and
14 will continue to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical
15 manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation,
16 and loss of enjoyment of life; have suffered and continues to suffer spiritually; were prevented
17 and will continue to be prevented from performing Plaintiffs’ daily activities and obtaining the
18 full enjoyment of life; will sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or have incurred
19 and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and
20 counseling.

21 **JANE ROE 18**

22 113. Between approximately 2005 and 2010, when ROE 18 was a minor, she was
23 groomed and sexual assaulted by DOE 4. Plaintiff ROE 18 was approximately 13 to 18 years old
24 when DOE 4 groomed and sexually assaulted ROE 18 in his capacity as teacher, school
25 supervisor and pastor at DOE 1, Local Church.

26 114. Commencing in 2005, DOE 4 would utilize the Academy’s integrated computer
27 system to direct message ROE 18 compliments and give her special attention. The messages sent
28

1 by DOE 4 started as simple compliments and progressed overtime to become inappropriate and
2 sexual in nature.

3 115. During class at Academy DOE 4 would talk in a sexually explicit manner to
4 ROE 18, giving her scenarios and the sexual acts he would perform on her if they were away
5 from other students and congregants.

6 116. During class at Academy, DOE 4 would stand behind ROE 18 to answer her
7 academic questions, DOE 4 would press himself against ROE 18, pushing his genitals against
8 ROE 18's neck and upper back with force. When possible, ROE 18 attempted to avoid ROE 4
9 pressing his genitals against her back and neck, but was only successful when she saw ROE 4
10 approaching her desk.

11 117. When DOE 4 had an opportunity to touch ROE 18 during class he would. DOE
12 4 would rub ROE 18's back and shoulders while giving her complements. When DOE 4 would
13 massage ROE 18's shoulders his hand would move down the front of ROE 18's uniform shirt to
14 her chest.

15 118. The childhood sexual assault of ROE 18 by DOE 4 occurred using the tasks,
16 premises, or instrumentalities that the Defendants entrusted to DOE 4, including the grounds,
17 bathrooms, modular trailers, offices, the congregation room and classrooms located on the
18 premises of DOE 1, Local Church.

19 119. During the time that DOE 4 was working for and serving the Defendants, each
20 Defendant had a duty to use reasonable care to prevent DOE 4 from using the tasks, premises,
21 and instrumentalities of his position with the Defendants to target, groom, and sexually assault
22 children, including ROE 18.

23 120. DOE 4's sexual assault of ROE 18 occurred during activities that were
24 sponsored by, or were a direct result of activities sponsored by DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2,
25 National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, including at or during school, youth choir events
26 and tours, seasonal church events, and church sponsored activities.

27 //

28 //

1 221. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
2 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, held DOE 4 out to the public, to
3 Plaintiff, and to Plaintiff’s parents, as their agent and employee.

4 222. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
5 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, held DOE 4 out to the public, to
6 Plaintiff, and to Plaintiff’s parents, as having been vetted, screened, and approved by them as
7 someone who was safe and could be trusted with children.

8 223. Plaintiff ROE 18 and Plaintiff’s parents reasonably relied upon the acts and
9 representations of DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
10 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, and reasonably believed that DOE 4
11 was an agent or employee of the Defendants who was vetted, screened, and approved by it and
12 who was safe and could be trusted with children.

13 224. Plaintiff ROE 18 and Plaintiff’s parents trusted DOE 4 because DOE 1, Local
14 Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, held him out as someone who
15 was safe and could be trusted with the supervision, care, custody, and control of children,
16 including Plaintiff ROE 18.

17 225. Plaintiff ROE 18 and Plaintiff’s parents believed that DOE 1, Local Church,
18 DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, would exercise such care as would a
19 parent of ordinary prudence in comparable circumstances when the Defendants assumed
20 supervision, care, custody, and control of minor Plaintiff, including protecting Plaintiff from the
21 danger of being sexually assaulted.

22 226. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Academy monitors,
23 teachers and administrators knew of DOE 4’s actions and chose to ignore and suppress DOE 4’s
24 childhood sexual assaults.

25 227. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff ROE 18 has suffered, and
26 will continue to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical
27 manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation,
28 and loss of enjoyment of life; have suffered and continues to suffer spiritually; were prevented

1 and will continue to be prevented from performing Plaintiffs' daily activities and obtaining the
2 full enjoyment of life; will sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or have incurred
3 and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and
4 counseling.

5 128. DOE 4's wrong childhood sexual assault of ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17
6 and ROE 18 was unlawful sexual molestation under California law, including California Code of
7 Civil Procedure Section 340.1.

8 129. At all relevant times DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE
9 3, District Church, through their agents, servants, and employees, knew or should have known
10 that DOE 4 was a danger to children, in that he was likely to sexually assault them.

11 130. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
12 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, knew that their negligent, reckless, and
13 outrageous conduct would inflict severe emotional and psychological distress, as well as
14 personal physical injury on others, including Plaintiffs ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and
15 ROE 18.

16 131. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
17 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, concealed the sexual assault of children
18 by pastors, teachers, school administrators, volunteers, and others, including DOE 4 in order to
19 conceal their own bad acts in failing to protect children from being assaulted, to protect their
20 reputations, and to prevent victims of such sexual assault from coming forward during the
21 extremely limited statute of limitations prior to the enactment of the recent legislative
22 amendment that allows Plaintiff to pursue his claim now, despite knowing that these pastors,
23 other religious persons, teachers, school administrators, and other persons would continue to
24 molest children, and continue to intentionally dissuade victims and their families from coming
25 forward.

26 132. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiffs ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE
27 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18 have suffered, and will continue to suffer great pain of mind and body,
28 shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of

1 self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; has suffered and continues to
2 suffer spiritually; were prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing Plaintiffs'
3 daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; will sustain loss of earnings and earning
4 capacity; and/or has incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological
5 treatment, therapy, and counseling.

6 133. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiffs ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE
7 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18 have suffered, and will continue to suffer great pain of mind and body,
8 shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of
9 self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; have suffered and continues to
10 suffer spiritually; were prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing Plaintiffs'
11 daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; will sustain loss of earnings and earning
12 capacity; and/or have incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological
13 treatment, therapy, and counseling.

14 **DOE 1, DOE 2 and DOE 3**

15 134. DOE 4's childhood sexual assaults of ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and
16 ROE 18 were unlawful sexual molestation under California law, including California Code of
17 Civil Procedure Section 340.1.

18 135. At all relevant times DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE
19 3, District Church, through their agents, servants, and employees, knew or should have known
20 that DOE 4 was a danger to children, in that he was likely to sexually assault them.

21 136. It was reasonably foreseeable to Defendants, through their agents, servants, and
22 employees, that DOE 4's sexual assault of children would likely result in injury to others,
23 including the sexual assaults of ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18 and other
24 children by DOE 4.

25 137. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
26 through their agents, servants, and employees, knew or should have known that DOE 4 was
27 committing acts of childhood sexually assault at DOE 1, Local Church, including Plaintiffs ROE
28 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18.

1 138. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
2 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, consciously and recklessly disregarded
3 their knowledge that DOE 4 would use his positions with the Defendants to commit acts of
4 sexual assault against children, including Plaintiffs ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and
5 ROE 18.

6 139. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
7 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, acted in concert with each other and/or
8 with DOE 4 to conceal the danger that DOE 4 posed to children, including Plaintiffs ROE 14,
9 ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18, so that DOE 4 could continue serving the church
10 despite their knowledge of that danger.

11 140. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
12 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, acted in concert with each other and/or
13 with DOE 4 to enable DOE 4 to commit acts of childhood sexual assault against children,
14 including Plaintiffs ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18.

15 141. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
16 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, knew that their negligent, reckless, and
17 outrageous conduct would inflict severe emotional and psychological distress, as well as
18 personal mental and physical injury on others, including Plaintiffs ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16,
19 ROE 17 and ROE 18.

20 142. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
21 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, concealed the sexual assault of children
22 by pastors, teachers, school administrators, volunteers, and others, in order to conceal their own
23 bad acts in failing to protect children from being assaulted, to protect their reputations, and to
24 prevent victims of such sexual assault from coming forward during the extremely limited statute
25 of limitations prior to the enactment of the recent legislative amendment that allows Plaintiffs to
26 pursue their claims now, despite knowing that those pastors, other religious persons, teachers,
27 school administrators, and other persons would continue to molest children.

28 //

1 143. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiffs ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE
2 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18 have suffered, and will continue to suffer great pain of mind and body,
3 shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of
4 self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; has suffered and continues to
5 suffer spiritually; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing Plaintiff's
6 daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; will sustain loss of earnings and earning
7 capacity; and/or has incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological
8 treatment, therapy, and counseling.

9 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **(Negligence)**

11 **Against Defendants DOE 1; DOE 2; DOE 3, DOE 4, and DOES 5 through 100**

12 144. Plaintiffs incorporate all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

13 145. Defendants, DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, DOE 3, District
14 Church, DOE 4, individually and DOES 5 through 100, had a duty to protect the minor Plaintiffs
15 while they were entrusted to their care by Plaintiffs parents. Plaintiffs' care, welfare, and/or
16 physical custody were temporarily entrusted to Defendants. Defendants voluntarily accepted the
17 entrusted care of Plaintiffs. As such, Defendants owed Plaintiffs, minor children, a special duty
18 of care, in addition to a duty of ordinary care, and owed Plaintiffs the higher duty of care that
19 adults dealing with children owe to protect them from harm.

20 146. All Defendants had a duty to control DOE 4 and to prevent him from sexually
21 assaulting and molesting children. Defendants were aware, prior to the conclusion of the sexual
22 assault of Plaintiffs listed herein, of DOE 4's dangerous and exploitive propensities. Defendants
23 were also aware that they had the ability to place restrictions on DOE 4's access to children, give
24 warnings to the congregation, and otherwise control DOE 4's conduct. Defendants therefore
25 assumed a duty to prevent DOE 4 from sexually assaulting and molesting children. Defendants
26 also had a duty to report known or suspected child abuse or neglect by DOE 4 to law
27 enforcement.

28 //

1 147. Defendants had a special duty to investigate and not employ DOE 4 in his
2 position as a teacher, school supervisor, pastor, and choir tour chaperone. Defendants knew that
3 DOE 4 was likely to harm others in light of the work entrusted to him.

4 148. Defendants, by and through their agents, servants and employees, knew or
5 reasonably should have known of DOE 4's dangerous and exploitive propensities and/or that
6 DOE 4 was an unfit agent. It was foreseeable that if Defendants did not adequately exercise or
7 provide the duty of care owed to children in their care, including but not limited to Plaintiffs, the
8 children entrusted to Defendants' care would be vulnerable to sexual assault by DOE 4.

9 149. Defendants breached their duty of care to the minor Plaintiffs by allowing DOE
10 4 who they permitted and enabled to have access to Plaintiffs; by failing to investigate or
11 otherwise confirm or deny such facts about DOE 4; by failing to tell or concealing from
12 Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs' parents, guardians, or law enforcement officials that DOE 4 was or may
13 have been sexually abusing Plaintiffs; by failing to tell or concealing from Plaintiffs' parents,
14 guardians, or law enforcement officials that Plaintiffs were or may have been sexually assaulted
15 after Defendants knew or had reason to know that DOE 4 may have sexually assaulted Plaintiffs,
16 thereby creating the circumstance where Plaintiffs were less likely to receive medical/mental
17 health care and treatment, thus exacerbating the harm done to Plaintiffs; by holding out DOE 4 to
18 the Plaintiffs and their parents or guardians as being in good standing and trustworthy; and/or by
19 failing to report known child abuse of Plaintiffs by DOE 4 to law enforcement. Defendants
20 cloaked within the facade of normalcy Defendants' and/or DOE 4's contact and/or actions with
21 the Plaintiffs and/or with other minors who were victims of DOE 4, and/or disguised the nature
22 of the sexual assault and contact.

23 150. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered, and
24 continue to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical
25 manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation,
26 and loss of enjoyment of life; have suffered and continue to suffer spiritually; were prevented
27 and will continue to be prevented from performing Plaintiffs daily activities and obtaining the
28 full enjoyment of life; will sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or have incurred

1 and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and
2 counseling.

3 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **(Claim for Childhood Sexual Assault Pursuant to C.C.P. § 340.1)**

5 **Against Defendants DOE 1; DOE 2; DOE 3, DOE 4, and DOES 5 through 100**

6 151. Plaintiffs incorporate all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

7 152. Between approximately 2010 to 2014, when Plaintiff ROE 14 was
8 approximately 12 to 17 years old, DOE 4 engaged in grooming and unpermitted, harmful, and
9 offensive sexual conduct and contact upon the person of Plaintiff ROE 14.

10 153. Between approximately 2004 to 2009, when Plaintiff ROE 15 was
11 approximately 15 to 18 years old, DOE 4 engaged in grooming and unpermitted, harmful, and
12 offensive sexual conduct and contact upon the person of Plaintiff ROE 15.

13 154. Between approximately 2004 to 2009, when Plaintiff ROE 16 was
14 approximately 15 to 18 years old, DOE 4 engaged in grooming and unpermitted, harmful, and
15 offensive sexual conduct and contact upon the person of Plaintiff ROE 16.

16 155. Between approximately 2009 to 2014, when Plaintiff ROE 17 was
17 approximately 13 to 18 years old, DOE 4 engaged in grooming and unpermitted, harmful, and
18 offensive sexual conduct and contact upon the person of Plaintiff ROE 17.

19 156. Between approximately 2005 to 2010, when Plaintiff ROE 18 was
20 approximately 13 to 18 years old, DOE 4 engaged in grooming and unpermitted, harmful, and
21 offensive sexual conduct and contact upon the person of Plaintiff ROE 18.

22 157. Said conduct was undertaken while DOE 4 was an agent, managing agent,
23 employee, and/or servant of the Defendants, DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church,
24 DOE 3, District Church, and DOES 5 through 100, and while DOE 4 was acting in the course
25 and scope of his employment, agency, and/or service with the Defendants.

26 158. Said conduct of DOE 4 was known to and ratified by the Defendants.

27 //

28 //

1 159. Each Defendant had a duty to take reasonable steps to protect Plaintiff, ROE 14,
2 ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18, minor females, from foreseeable harm when they were
3 in their care, custody, and control.

4 160. During the time that DOE 4 was working for and serving the Defendants, each
5 Defendant had a duty to use reasonable care to prevent DOE 4 from using the tasks, premises,
6 and instrumentalities of his position with the Defendants to target, groom, and sexually assault
7 children, including Plaintiffs ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18.

8 161. Each Defendant breached the foregoing duties by failing to use reasonable care
9 to protect Plaintiffs ROE 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18 from DOE 4, and allowed
10 DOE 4 to groom and to sexually assault the minor females.

11 162. As a direct and proximate result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiffs ROE
12 14, ROE 15, ROE 16, ROE 17 and ROE 18 suffered, and will continue to suffer, great pain of
13 mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress,
14 embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life, and
15 Plaintiffs were prevented from performing daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of
16 life.

17 163. Between 2010 and 2014, DOE 4 engaged in unpermitted, harmful and offensive
18 sexual contact upon the person of Plaintiff ROE 14, Defendants, DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2,
19 National Church, DOE 3, District Church, and DOES 5 through 100, ratified or approved of that
20 sexual contact.

21 164. Between 2004 and 2009, DOE 4 engaged in unpermitted, harmful and offensive
22 sexual contact upon the person of Plaintiff ROE 15, Defendants, DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2,
23 National Church, DOE 3, District Church, and DOES 5 through 100, ratified or approved of that
24 sexual contact.

25 165. Between 2004 and 2009, DOE 4 engaged in unpermitted, harmful and offensive
26 sexual contact upon the person of Plaintiff ROE 16, Defendants, DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2,
27 National Church, DOE 3, District Church, and DOES 5 through 100, ratified or approved of that
28 sexual contact.

1 Plaintiffs, the Plaintiffs' family and minor congregants of DOE 4's dangerous propensities and
2 unfitness.

3 173. Defendants, DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, DOE 3, District
4 Church, and DOES 5 through 100, by and through their agents, servants and employees, knew or
5 reasonably should have known of DOE 4's dangerous and exploitive propensities and/or that
6 DOE 4 was an unfit agent. Despite such knowledge, Defendants negligently failed to supervise
7 DOE 4 in the position of trust and authority as a teacher and/or school supervisor, pastor and
8 chaperone, where he was able to commit the wrongful acts against the Plaintiffs. Defendants
9 failed to provide reasonable supervision of DOE 4, failed to use reasonable care in investigating
10 DOE 4, and failed to provide adequate warning to Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' family of DOE 4's
11 dangerous propensities and unfitness. Defendants further failed to take reasonable measures to
12 prevent future sexual assault.

13 174. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered, and
14 continue to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical
15 manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation,
16 and loss of enjoyment of life; have suffered and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented
17 and will continue to be prevented from performing Plaintiffs daily activities and obtaining the
18 full enjoyment of life; will sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or have incurred
19 and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and
20 counseling.

21 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **(Negligent Hiring/Retention)**

23 **Against Defendants DOE 1; DOE 2; DOE 3 and DOES 5 through 100**

24 175. Plaintiffs incorporate all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

25 176. Defendants, DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, DOE 3, District
26 Church, and DOES 5 through 100, had a duty to not hire and/or retain Defendant DOE 4, and
27 other employees, agents, volunteers, and other representatives, given Defendant DOE 4's
28 dangerous and exploitive propensities.

1 182. Defendants, DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, DOE 3, District
2 Church, and DOES 5 through 100, ratified or approved of the extreme and outrageous conduct of
3 Defendant DOE 4.

4 183. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiffs experienced and continue to
5 experience severe emotional distress resulting in bodily harm.

6 184. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered, and
7 continues to suffer physical injury, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of
8 emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of
9 enjoyment of life; have suffered and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will
10 continue to be prevented from performing Plaintiffs daily activities and obtaining the full
11 enjoyment of life; will sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or have incurred and
12 will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and
13 counseling.

14 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **(Breach Of Statutory Duty-California Civil Code§ 51.7)**

16 **Against Defendants DOE 1; DOE 2; DOE 3, DOE 4, and DOES 5 through 100**

17 185. Plaintiffs incorporate all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

18 186. Pursuant to California Civil Code§ 51.7(a), Plaintiffs have the right to be free
19 from any violence, or intimidation by threat of violence, committed against their person on
20 account of her gender. DOE 4 had a statutory duty to not perpetrate violence or the threat of
21 violence upon Plaintiffs. Defendants repeatedly breached that duty as alleged in the facts above.

22 187. Defendants, DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, DOE 3, District
23 Church, and DOES 5 through 100, ratified or approved of the violence against them committed
24 by Defendant DOE 4.

25 188. At all material times, Plaintiffs were persons within the jurisdiction of this State
26 and, at all material times, Defendants were required to comply with the laws of this State,
27 including, but not limited to, California Civil Code § 51.7.

28 //


1 189. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered, and
2 continue to suffer physical injury, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of
3 emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of
4 enjoyment of life; have suffered and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will
5 continue to be prevented from performing Plaintiffs daily activities and obtaining the full
6 enjoyment of life; will sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or have incurred and
7 will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy and counseling.

8 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiffs pray for a jury trial and for judgment against Defendants,
9 DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, DOE 3, District Church, DOE 4 and DOES 5
10 through 100, and each of them, as follows:

- 11 1. General damages in an amount to be shown according to proof at the time of
12 trial;
- 13 2. Special damages including medical and psychological care expenses in an
14 amount to be shown according to proof at the time of trial;
- 15 3. Treble damages, pursuant to CCP § 340.1(b);
- 16 4. Costs of suit incurred herein;
- 17 5. For punitive damages;
- 18 6. For prejudgment and post-judgment interest as may be allowed; and
- 19 7. Such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

20
21 DATED: December 9, 2022

22 DIAS HALL INC.
23 A Professional Corporation

24 
25 _____
26 STEVEN S. DIAS,
27 Attorney for Plaintiffs,
28 JANE ROE 14, JANE ROE 15,
JOHN ROE 16, JANE ROE 17 &
JANE ROE 18