

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 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
10 JANE ROE 21, JANE ROE 22,
11 & JANE ROE 23

E-FILED
12/30/2024
Superior Court of California
County of Fresno
By: Yazmin Colin, Deputy

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

10 ****

11 JANE ROE 21, an individual; JANE ROE
12 22; an individual JANE ROE 23, an
13 individual;

14 Plaintiffs,

15 v.

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

24 Defendants.

Case No.: 24CECG05632

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)

25 Based upon information and belief available to Plaintiffs, JANE ROE 21, JANE ROE 22
26 and JANE ROE 23 at all times relevant to the filing of this Complaint Plaintiffs allege as follows
27 against Defendants DOE 1, Local Church, religious corporation form unknown; DOE 2, National
28 Church, religious entity form unknown; DOE 3, District Church, a non-profit California
corporation; DOE 19, an individual; and DOES 20 through 100, inclusive, as follows:

//

//

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1
2 1. Between approximately 1999 and 2004, when Plaintiff JANE ROE 21 was a
3 minor child and a member, congregant, and student of Defendants DOE 1, Local Church, DOE
4 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, in Riverdale, California she was groomed and a
5 victim of childhood sexual assault. Commencing at the age of 12 years old Plaintiff JANE ROE
6 21 was groomed for a sexual relationship by Defendant DOE 19. At the age of 12 years old
7 Defendant DOE 19 initiated and maintained a pattern of grooming and committing acts of
8 childhood sexual assault upon Plaintiff JANE ROE 21 until the time she left Defendant DOE 1,
9 Local Church, at the age of 17 years old.

10 2. Between approximately 2000 and 2003, Plaintiff JANE ROE 22 was a minor
11 child and a member, congregant, and student of Defendants DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2,
12 National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, in Riverdale, California she was groomed and a
13 victim of childhood sexual assault. Commencing at the age of 10 years old Plaintiff JANE ROE
14 22 was groomed for a sexual relationship by Defendant DOE 19. At the age of 10 years old
15 Defendant DOE 19 initiated and maintained a pattern of grooming and committing acts of
16 childhood sexual assault upon Plaintiff JANE ROE 22 until the time she left Defendant DOE 1,
17 Local Church, at the age of 13 years old.

18 3. Between approximately 2003 and 2005, Plaintiff JANE ROE 23 was a minor
19 child and a member, congregant, and student of Defendants DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2,
20 National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, in Riverdale, California she was groomed and a
21 victim of childhood sexual assault. Commencing at the age of 10 years old Plaintiff JANE ROE
22 23 was groomed for a sexual relationship by Defendant DOE 19. At the age of 10 years old
23 Defendant DOE 19 initiated and maintained a pattern of grooming and committing acts of
24 childhood sexual assault upon Plaintiff JANE ROE 23 until the time she left Defendant DOE 1,
25 Local Church, at the age of 13 years old.

PARTIES

26
27 4. Plaintiff, JANE ROE 21 (“ROE 21”), is an adult female resident of Kings
28 County, within the State of California. ROE 21 was a minor throughout the period of child

1 sexual assault alleged herein. At the time of filing this Complaint for childhood sexual assault
2 ROE 21 is under the age of 40 years old. At all times, ROE 21 resided in Fresno County,
3 California. ROE 21 attended Defendant DOE 1, Local Church, (“Local Church”) as a congregant
4 of the church and attended school at DOE 1, Local Church, doing business as Academy
5 (“Academy”) located on the premises of DOE 1, Local Church. ROE 21 brings this Complaint
6 pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 340.1, as amended by Assembly Bill 218, for the
7 grooming and childhood sexual assault she suffered due to DOE Defendants negligence and
8 malfeasance.

9 5. Plaintiff, JANE ROE 22 (“ROE 22”), is an adult female resident of Harris
10 County, in the State of Texas. ROE 22 was a minor throughout the period of child sexual assault
11 alleged herein. At the time of filing this Complaint for childhood sexual assault ROE 22 is under
12 the age of 40 years old. At all relevant times, ROE 22 resided in Fresno County, California. ROE
13 22 attended DOE 1, Local Church, as a congregant and attended school at Academy located on
14 the premises of DOE 1, Local Church. ROE 22 brings this Complaint pursuant to Code of Civil
15 Procedure Section 340.1, as amended by Assembly Bill 218, for the childhood sexual assault she
16 suffered due to Defendants’ negligence and malfeasance.

17 6. Plaintiff, JANE ROE 23 (“ROE 23”), is an adult female resident of Kings
18 County, within the State of California. ROE 23 was a minor throughout the period of child
19 sexual assault alleged herein. At the time of filing this Complaint for childhood sexual assault
20 ROE 23 is under the age of 40 years old. At all relevant times, ROE 23 resided in Fresno County,
21 California. ROE 23 attended DOE 1, Local Church, as a congregant and attended school at
22 Academy located on the premises of DOE 1, Local Church. ROE 23 brings this Complaint
23 pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 340.1, as amended by Assembly Bill 218, for the
24 childhood sexual assault she suffered due to Defendants’ negligence and malfeasance.

25 7. At all relevant times, Defendant, DOE 1, Local Church, was and is a religious
26 corporation form unknown authorized to conduct business and is conducting business in the
27 State of California, with its principal place of business in the County of Fresno, California. At all
28

1 times relevant, DOE 1, Local Church, had responsibility for Church operations in Riverdale,
2 California.

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

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

15 10. At all relevant times, Defendant, DOE 19, an individual ("DOE 19"), is an adult
16 male who, at all times relevant, was associated with, supervised, directed and controlled by DOE
17 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church. While supervised,
18 directed and controlled by DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District
19 Church, DOE 19 committed the acts of grooming and childhood sexual assault alleged herein as
20 an employee of DOE 1, Local Church, and a teacher, Transportation Supervisor at Academy and
21 church elder of DOE 1, Local Church.

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

24 12. At all relevant times DOE 2, National Church, through its agents, servants, and
25 employees, managed, maintained, operated, and controlled DOE 1, Local Church.

26 13. At all relevant times DOE 2, National Church, through its agents, servants, and
27 employees, managed, maintained, operated, and controlled DOE 1, Local Church, and held out
28

1 to the public its agents, servants, and employees as those who managed, maintained, operated,
2 and controlled DOE 1, Local Church.

3 14. At all relevant times DOE 2, National Church, was responsible for and did the
4 hiring and staffing at DOE 1, Local Church.

5 15. At all relevant times DOE 2, National Church, was responsible for and did the
6 recruitment and staffing of volunteers at DOE 1, Local Church.

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

9 17. At all relevant times DOE 3, District Church, through its agents, servants, and
10 employees, managed, maintained, operated, and controlled DOE 1, Local Church.

11 18. At all relevant times DOE 3, District Church, through its agents, servants, and
12 employees, managed, maintained, operated, and controlled DOE 1, Local Church, and held out
13 to the public its agents, servants, and employees as those who managed, maintained, operated,
14 and controlled DOE 1, Local Church.

15 19. At all relevant times DOE 3, District Church, was responsible for and did the
16 hiring and staffing at DOE 1, Local Church.

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

19 21. At all relevant times DOE 19 was on the staff of, acted as an agent of, and
20 served as an employee of DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District
21 Church.

22 22. At all relevant times DOE 19 was acting in the course and scope of his
23 employment with DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church.

24 23. At all relevant times DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
25 materially benefited from the operation of DOE 1, Local Church, including the services of DOE
26 19 and the services of those who managed and supervised DOE 19.

27 24. At all relevant times DOE 19 was employed by DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2,
28 National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, he used his positions as a as a teacher,

1 Transportation Supervisor at Academy and church elder at DOE 1, Local Church, to groom and
2 sexually assault ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23.

3 25. Despite a mandatory reporting obligation to do so, DOE 1, Local Church did,
4 not report the abuse to law enforcement.

5 26. To the extent DOE 1, Local Church, was a different entity, corporation, or
6 organization during the period of time during which DOE 19 used his positions as a teacher,
7 Transportation Supervisor at Academy and church elder at DOE 1, Local Church, to groom and
8 sexually assault ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23, such entity, corporation, or organization is
9 hereby on notice that it is intended to be a defendant in this lawsuit and is identified in the
10 Complaint as DOE 1, Local Church.

11 27. To the extent DOE 1, Local Church, is a successor to a different entity,
12 corporation, or organization which existed during the period of time during which DOE 19 used
13 his positions as a teacher, Transportation Supervisor at Academy and church elder at DOE 1,
14 Local Church, to groom and to sexually assault ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23, such predecessor
15 entity, corporation, or organization is hereby on notice that it is intended to be a defendant in this
16 lawsuit and is identified in the Complaint as DOE 1, Local Church.

17 28. To the extent DOE 2, National Church, was a different entity, corporation, or
18 organization during the period of time during which DOE 19 used his positions as a teacher,
19 Transportation Supervisor at Academy and church elder at DOE 1, Local Church, to groom and
20 to sexually assault ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23, such entity, corporation, or organization is
21 hereby on notice that it is intended to be a defendant in this lawsuit and is identified in the
22 Complaint as DOE 2, National Church.

23 29. To the extent DOE 2, National Church, is a successor to a different entity,
24 corporation, or organization which existed during the period of time during which DOE 19 used
25 his positions as a teacher, Transportation Supervisor at Academy and church elder at DOE 1,
26 Local Church, to groom and to sexually assault ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23, such predecessor
27 entity, corporation, or organization is hereby on notice that it is intended to be a defendant in this
28 lawsuit and is identified in the Complaint as DOE 2, National Church.

1 30. To the extent DOE 3, District Church, was a different entity, corporation, or
2 organization during the period of time during which DOE 19 used his positions as a teacher,
3 Transportation Supervisor at Academy and church elder at DOE 1, Local Church, to groom and
4 to sexually assault ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23, such entity, corporation, or organization is
5 hereby on notice that it is intended to be a defendant in this lawsuit and is identified in the
6 Complaint as DOE 3, District Church.

7 31. To the extent DOE 3, District Church, is a successor to a different entity,
8 corporation, or organization which existed during the period of time during which DOE 19 used
9 his positions as a teacher, Transportation Supervisor at Academy and church elder at DOE 1,
10 Local Church, to groom and to sexually assault ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23, such predecessor
11 entity, corporation, or organization is hereby on notice that it is intended to be a defendant in this
12 lawsuit and is identified in the Complaint as DOE 3, District Church.

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

21 33. Each Defendant is the agent, servant and/or employee of other Defendants, and
22 each Defendant was acting within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as an agent,
23 servant and/or employee of the other Defendants. Defendants, and each of them, are individuals,
24 corporations, partnerships and other entities which engaged in, joined in and conspired with the
25 other wrong doers in carrying out the tortious and unlawful activities described in this
26 Complaint.

27 //
28 //

1 place of residence. Plaintiffs ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23 were housed at DOE 19's residence
2 where ROE 19 and his wife acted as de facto guardians.

3 39. At all-time relevant to this Complaint, DOES 1 through DOE 19 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 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23, DOE 19 was employed by and acted as an
11 agent of DOE 1, Local Church, and of Academy, and was under the direct supervision, employ
12 and control of DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, DOE 3, District Church, and
13 DOES 20 through 100.

14 40. During all times relevant to this complaint, DOE 19 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, Transportation Supervisor at Academy and church
18 elder located on the premises of DOE 1, Local Church.

19 41. At the time of the sexual assaults alleged herein Plaintiffs, ROE 21, ROE 22 and
20 ROE 23, belonged to DOE 1, Local Church, and regularly attended DOE 1, Local Church,
21 services and events sponsored by that congregation. At all relevant times, ROE 21, ROE 22 and
22 ROE 23 attended school at Academy located on the premises of DOE 1, Local Church, where
23 DOE 19 was a teacher, Transportation Supervisor at Academy and church elder at 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 42. Plaintiffs, ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23, began attending services at DOE 1,
27 Local Church, in the 2000's. ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23 attended church services, attended
28 youth groups, participated in volunteer events, were members of the choir, attended mission

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

3 **JANE ROE 21**

4 43. Between approximately 1999 and 2004, ROE 21, who was a minor, was
5 groomed and sexual assaulted by DOE 19. Plaintiff ROE 21 was approximately 12 to 17 years
6 old when DOE 19 groomed and sexually assaulted ROE 21 in his capacity as teacher,
7 Transportation Supervisor at Academy and church elder at DOE 1, Local Church.

8 44. Based on the representations of DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National
9 Church, and DOE 3, District Church, that DOE 19 was safe and trustworthy, ROE 21 and her
10 parents allowed her to be under the supervision of, and in the care, custody, and control of
11 Defendants including when ROE 21 was sexually abused by DOE 19.

12 45. In order to sexually abuse ROE 21 and other children, DOE 19 exploited the
13 trust and authority vested in him by the Defendants by grooming ROE 21 to gain her trust and to
14 obtain control over her.

15 46. Commencing in 1999 when ROE 21 was 12 years old, DOE 19, in his capacity
16 as teacher, Transportation Supervisor at Academy and church elder of DOE 1, Local Church,
17 began grooming ROE 21 for the purposes of initiating an inappropriate sexual relationship.

18 47. From approximately 1999 to 2001, ROE 21 lived with DOE 19 and his wife in
19 their domicile. DOE 19 had a number of other minor girls that attended DOE 1, Local Church,
20 and Academy staying with him at the time. It was known that DOE 19 and his wife regularly
21 housed minor female congregants of DOE 1, Local Church, and Academy students at their
22 residence.

23 48. DOE 19 initiated a pattern of sexual grooming when ROE 21 was
24 approximately 12 years old and staying with DOE 19 at his residence. DOE 19 would come into
25 ROE 21's bedroom at night and touch her, scratching and rubbing her back, both over and under
26 her nightgown, and kiss ROE 21. DOE 19 warned ROE 21 that she could not tell anyone about
27 these occurrences. ROE 21 remained a resident at DOE 19's residence until approximately 2001.
28

1 49. ROE 21 attended Academy located on the premises of DOE 1, Local Church,
2 where DOE 19 was her math teacher and Transportation Supervisor, DOE 19 would touch ROE
3 21 in a sexually wrongful manner. When ROE 21 indicated that she had a question or needed
4 assistance at her desk, DOE 19 would come to ROE 21's desk and touch her in a sexually
5 wrongful manner. This occurred often enough that ROE 21 would stop asking questions in class
6 and made attempts to avoid being in a room alone with DOE 19.

7 50. DOE 19 perpetrated further acts of sexual abuse against ROE 21 when ROE 21
8 was approximately 17 years old. ROE 21 went to DOE 1, Local Church, and Academy to
9 retrieve her academic transcripts when ROE 21 was summoned to DOE 19's office at Academy
10 where ROE 21 took a seat at his desk. DOE 19 closed the door to the office, approached ROE 21
11 and knelt beside her and commenced fondling her thighs. Thereafter, DOE 19 proceeded to touch
12 ROE 21's chest in a sexually wrongful manner until ROE 21 fled the office in distress.

13 51. DOE 19 followed ROE 21 out of his office into another office where he
14 continued to touch ROE 21's chest in a sexually wrongful manner until ROE 21 pushed him
15 away and fled the premises of DOE 1, Local Church, embarrassed, humiliated and emotionally
16 distressed.

17 52. Following the wrongful sexual acts committed by DOE 19, ROE 21 informed
18 her mother what had occurred in DOE 19's office. ROE 21 is informed and believes, and thereon
19 alleges that her mother informed DOE 1, Local Church, and Academy leadership, pastors,
20 teachers and children's supervisors of the incident. DOE 1, Local Church, and Academy leaders,
21 preachers, teachers and children's supervisors took no action to further protect ROE 21 or other
22 minor congregants or Academy students from being sexually abused by DOE 19, by removing
23 him in his capacity as teacher, Transportation Supervisor at Academy and church elder of DOE
24 1, Local Church, and Academy.

25 53. The childhood sexual assault of ROE 21 by DOE 19 occurred using the tasks,
26 premises, or instrumentalities that the Defendants entrusted to DOE 19, including the grounds,
27 bathrooms, modular trailers, offices, the congregation room and classrooms located on the
28 premises of DOE 1, Local Church.

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

5 55. DOE 19's sexual abuse of ROE 21 occurred during activities that were
6 sponsored by or were a direct result of activities sponsored by DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2,
7 National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, including at or during school, youth choir events
8 and tours, seasonal church events, and church sponsored activities.

9 56. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
10 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, held DOE 19 out to the public, to
11 Plaintiff, and to Plaintiff's parents, as their agent and employee.

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

16 58. Plaintiff ROE 21 and Plaintiff's parents reasonably relied upon the acts and
17 representations of DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
18 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, and reasonably believed that DOE 19
19 was an agent or employee of the Defendants who was vetted, screened, and approved by it and
20 who was safe and could be trusted with children.

21 59. Plaintiff ROE 21 and Plaintiff's parents trusted DOE 19 because DOE 1, Local
22 Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, held him out as someone who
23 was safe and could be trusted with the supervision, care, custody, and control of children,
24 including Plaintiff ROE 21.

25 60. Plaintiff ROE 21 and Plaintiff's parents believed that DOE 1, Local Church,
26 DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church, would exercise such care as would a
27 parent of ordinary prudence in comparable circumstances when the Defendants assumed
28 supervision, care, custody, and control of minor Plaintiff, including protecting Plaintiff from the

1 danger of being sexually abused.

2 61. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Academy monitors,
3 teachers and administrators knew of DOE 19's actions and chose to ignore and suppress DOE
4 19's childhood sexual assaults.

5 62. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff ROE 21 has suffered, and
6 will continue to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical
7 manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation,
8 and loss of enjoyment of life; have suffered and continues to suffer spiritually; were prevented
9 and will continue to be prevented from performing Plaintiffs' daily activities and obtaining the
10 full enjoyment of life; will sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or have incurred
11 and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and
12 counseling.

13 **JANE ROE 22**

14 63. Between approximately 2000 and 2003, ROE 22, who was a minor, was
15 groomed and sexual assaulted by DOE 19. Plaintiff ROE 22 was approximately 10 to 13 years
16 old when DOE 19 groomed and sexually assaulted ROE 22 in his capacity as teacher,
17 Transportation Supervisor at Academy and church elder at DOE 1, Local Church.

18 64. Based on the representations of DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National
19 Church, and DOE 3, District Church, that DOE 19 was safe and trustworthy, ROE 22 and her
20 parents allowed her to be under the supervision of, and in the care, custody, and control of
21 Defendants including when ROE 22 was sexually abused by DOE 19.

22 65. In order to sexually abuse ROE 22 and other children, DOE 19 exploited the
23 trust and authority vested in him by the Defendants by grooming ROE 22 to gain her trust and to
24 obtain control over her.

25 66. Commencing in 2000 when ROE 22 was 10 years old, DOE 19, in his capacity
26 as teacher, Transportation Supervisor at Academy and church elder of DOE 1, Local Church, and
27 Academy began grooming ROE 22 for the purposes of initiating an inappropriate sexual
28 relationship.

1 67. From approximately 2000 to 2003, ROE 22 lived with DOE 19 and his wife in
2 their domicile. DOE 19 had a number of other minor girls that attended DOE 1, Local Church,
3 and Academy staying with him at the time. It was known that DOE 19 and his wife regularly
4 housed minor female congregants of DOE 1, Local Church, and Academy students at their
5 residence.

6 68. DOE 19 initiated a pattern of sexual grooming when ROE 22 was
7 approximately 10 years old and staying with DOE 19 at his residence. DOE 19 would come into
8 ROE 22's bedroom at night and touch her, scratching and rubbing her back, over and under her
9 nightgown, and kiss ROE 22. DOE 19 warned ROE 22 that she could not tell anyone about these
10 occurrences. ROE 22 remained a resident at DOE 19's residence until approximately 2003.

11 69. ROE 22 attended Academy located on the premises of DOE 1, Local Church,
12 where DOE 19 was her math teacher and Transportation Supervisor, DOE 19 would touch ROE
13 22 in a sexually wrongful manner. When ROE 22 indicated that she had a question or needed
14 assistance at her desk, DOE 19 would come to ROE 22's desk and touch her in a sexually
15 wrongful manner. This occurred often enough that ROE 22 would stop asking questions in class
16 and attempted to avoid being near DOE 19 when possible.

17 70. The childhood sexual assault of ROE 22 by DOE 19 occurred using the tasks,
18 premises, or instrumentalities that the Defendants entrusted to DOE 19, including the grounds,
19 bathrooms, modular trailers, offices, the congregation room and classrooms located on the
20 premises of DOE 1, Local Church.

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

25 72. DOE 19's sexual abuse of ROE 22 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 73. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
2 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, held DOE 19 out to the public, to
3 Plaintiff, and to Plaintiff’s parents, as their agent and employee.

4 74. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
5 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, held DOE 19 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 75. Plaintiff ROE 22 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 19
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 76. Plaintiff ROE 22 and Plaintiff’s parents trusted DOE 19 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 22.

17 77. Plaintiff ROE 22 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 abused.

22 78. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Academy monitors,
23 teachers and administrators knew of DOE 19’s actions and chose to ignore and suppress DOE
24 19’s childhood sexual assaults.

25 79. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff ROE 22 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 23**

6 80. Between approximately 2003 and 2005, ROE 23, who was a minor, was
7 groomed and sexual assaulted by DOE 19. Plaintiff ROE 23 was a member, congregant, and
8 student at DOE 1, Local Church, and between the ages 10 to 13 years old DOE 19 groomed and
9 sexually assaulted her in his capacity as teacher, Transportation Supervisor at Academy and
10 church elder at DOE 1, Local Church.

11 81. Based on the representations of DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National
12 Church, and DOE 3, District Church, that DOE 19 was safe and trustworthy, ROE 23 and her
13 parents allowed her to be under the supervision of, and in the care, custody, and control of
14 Defendants including when ROE 23 was sexually abused by DOE 19.

15 82. In order to sexually abuse ROE 23 and other children, DOE 19 exploited the
16 trust and authority vested in him by the Defendants by grooming ROE 23 to gain her trust and to
17 obtain control over her.

18 83. Commencing in 2003 when ROE 23 was 10 years old, DOE 19, in his capacity
19 as teacher, Transportation Supervisor at Academy and church elder of DOE 1, Local Church, and
20 Academy began grooming ROE 23 for the purposes of initiating an inappropriate sexual
21 relationship.

22 84. From approximately 2003 to 2005, ROE 23 lived with DOE 19 and his wife in
23 their domicile. DOE 19 had a number of other minor girls that attended DOE 1, Local Church,
24 and Academy staying with him at the time. It was known that DOE 19 and his wife regularly
25 housed minor female congregants of DOE 1, Local Church, and Academy students at their
26 residence.

27 85. DOE 19 initiated a pattern of sexual grooming when ROE 23 was
28 approximately 10 years old and staying with DOE 19 at his residence. DOE 19 would come into

1 ROE 23's bedroom at night and touch her, scratching and rubbing her back, both over and under
2 her nightgown, and kiss ROE 23. DOE 19 warned ROE 23 that she could not tell anyone about
3 these occurrences. ROE 23 remained a resident at DOE 19's residence until approximately 2005.

4 86. ROE 23 attended Academy located on the premises of DOE 1, Local Church,
5 where DOE 19 was her math teacher and Transportation Supervisor, DOE 19 would touch ROE
6 23 in a sexually wrongful manner. When ROE 23 indicated that she had a question or needed
7 assistance at her desk, DOE 19 would come to ROE 23's desk and touch her in a sexually
8 wrongful manner. This occurred often enough that ROE 23 would stop asking questions in class
9 and attempted to avoid being near DOE 19 when possible.

10 87. The sexual abuse of ROE 23 by DOE 19 occurred using the tasks, premises, or
11 instrumentalities that the Defendants entrusted to DOE 19, including the grounds, bathrooms,
12 modular trailers, offices, the congregation room and classrooms located on the premises of DOE
13 1, Local Church.

14 88. During the time that DOE 19 was working for and serving the Defendants, each
15 Defendant had a duty to use reasonable care to prevent DOE 19 from using the tasks, premises,
16 and instrumentalities of his position with the Defendants to target, groom, and sexually abuse
17 children, including ROE 23.

18 89. DOE 19's sexual abuse of ROE 23 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 90. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
23 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, held DOE 19 out to the public, to
24 Plaintiff, and to Plaintiff's parents, as their agent and employee.

25 91. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
26 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, held DOE 19 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 92. Plaintiff ROE 23 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 19
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 93. Plaintiff ROE 23 and Plaintiff's parents trusted DOE 19 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 23.

10 94. Plaintiff ROE 23 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 abused.

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

23 96. DOE 19's wrong childhood sexual assault of ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23 was
24 unlawful sexual molestation under California law, including California Code of Civil Procedure
25 Section 340.1.

26 97. At all relevant times DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3,
27 District Church, through their agents, servants, and employees, knew or should have known that
28 DOE 19 was a danger to children, in that he was likely to sexually abuse them.

1 98. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
2 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, knew that their negligent, reckless, and
3 outrageous conduct would inflict severe emotional and psychological distress, as well as
4 personal physical injury on others, including Plaintiffs ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23.

5 99. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
6 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, concealed the sexual abuse of children
7 by pastors, teachers, school administrators, volunteers, and others, including DOE 19 in order to
8 conceal their own bad acts in failing to protect children from being abused, to protect their
9 reputations, and to prevent victims of such sexual abuse from coming forward during the
10 extremely limited statute of limitations prior to the enactment of the recent legislative
11 amendment that allows Plaintiff to pursue his claim now, despite knowing that these pastors,
12 other religious persons, teachers, school administrators, and other persons would continue to
13 molest children, and continue to intentionally dissuade victims and their families from coming
14 forward.

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

23 101. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiffs ROE 21, ROE 22 and
24 ROE 23 have suffered, and will continue to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional
25 distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem,
26 disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; have suffered and continues to suffer
27 spiritually; were prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing Plaintiffs' daily
28 activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; will sustain loss of earnings and earning

1 capacity; and/or have incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological
2 treatment, therapy, and counseling.

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

4 102. DOE 19's childhood sexual assaults of ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23 were
5 unlawful sexual molestation under California law, including California Code of Civil Procedure
6 Section 340.1.

7 103. At all relevant times DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE
8 3, District Church, through their agents, servants, and employees, knew or should have known
9 that DOE 19 was a danger to children, in that he was likely to sexually abuse them.

10 104. It was reasonably foreseeable to Defendants, through their agents, servants, and
11 employees, that DOE 19's sexual abuse of children would likely result in injury to others,
12 including the sexual assaults of ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23 and other children by DOE 19.

13 105. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
14 through their agents, servants, and employees, knew or should have known that DOE 19 was
15 committing acts of childhood sexually assault at DOE 1, Local Church, including Plaintiffs ROE
16 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23.

17 106. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
18 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, consciously and recklessly disregarded
19 their knowledge that DOE 19 would use his positions with the Defendants to commit acts of
20 sexual assault against children, including Plaintiffs ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23.

21 107. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
22 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, acted in concert with each other and/or
23 with DOE 19 to conceal the danger that DOE 19 posed to children, including Plaintiffs ROE 21,
24 ROE 22 and ROE 23, so that DOE 19 could continue serving the church despite their knowledge
25 of that danger.

26 108. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
27 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, acted in concert with each other and/or
28

1 with DOE 19 to enable DOE 19 to commit acts of childhood sexual assault against children,
2 including Plaintiffs ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23.

3 109. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
4 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, knew that their negligent, reckless, and
5 outrageous conduct would inflict severe emotional and psychological distress, as well as
6 personal mental and physical injury on others, including Plaintiffs ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE
7 23.

8 110. DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, and DOE 3, District Church,
9 through their respective agents, servants, and employees, concealed the sexual abuse of children
10 by pastors, teachers, school administrators, volunteers, and others, in order to conceal their own
11 bad acts in failing to protect children from being abused, to protect their reputations, and to
12 prevent victims of such sexual abuse from coming forward during the extremely limited statute
13 of limitations prior to the enactment of the recent legislative amendment that allows Plaintiffs to
14 pursue their claims now, despite knowing that those pastors, other religious persons, teachers,
15 school administrators, and other persons would continue to molest children.

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

24 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **(Negligence)**

26 **Against Defendants DOE 1; DOE 2; DOE 3, DOE 19, and DOES 20 through 100**

27 112. Plaintiffs incorporate all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.
28

1 113. Defendants, DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, DOE 3, District
2 Church, DOE 19, individually and DOES 20 through 100, had a duty to protect the minor
3 Plaintiffs while they were entrusted to their care by Plaintiffs parents. Plaintiffs' care, welfare,
4 and/or physical custody were temporarily entrusted to Defendants. Defendants voluntarily
5 accepted the entrusted care of Plaintiffs. As such, Defendants owed Plaintiffs, minor children, a
6 special duty of care, in addition to a duty of ordinary care, and owed Plaintiffs the higher duty of
7 care that adults dealing with children owe to protect them from harm.

8 114. All Defendants had a duty to control DOE 19 and to prevent him from sexually
9 assaulting children. Defendants were aware, prior to the conclusion of the sexual abuse of
10 Plaintiffs listed herein, of DOE 19's dangerous and exploitive propensities. Defendants were also
11 aware that they had the ability to place restrictions on DOE 19's access to children, give
12 warnings to the congregation, and otherwise control DOE 19's conduct. Defendants therefore
13 assumed a duty to prevent DOE 19 from sexually assaulting and molesting children. Defendants
14 also had a duty to report known or suspected child abuse or neglect by DOE 19 to law
15 enforcement.

16 115. Defendants had a special duty to investigate and not employ DOE 19 in his
17 position as a teacher, Transportation Supervisor at Academy and church elder, at DOE 1, Local
18 Church. Defendants knew that DOE 19 was likely to harm others in light of the work entrusted
19 to him.

20 116. Defendants, by and through their agents, servants and employees, knew or
21 reasonably should have known of DOE 19's dangerous and exploitive propensities and/or that
22 DOE 19 was an unfit agent. It was foreseeable that if Defendants did not adequately exercise or
23 provide the duty of care owed to children in their care, including but not limited to Plaintiffs, the
24 children entrusted to Defendants' care would be vulnerable to sexual abuse by DOE 19.

25 117. Defendants breached their duty of care to the minor Plaintiffs by allowing DOE
26 19 who they permitted and enabled to have access to Plaintiffs; by failing to investigate or
27 otherwise confirm or deny such facts about DOE 19; by failing to tell or concealing from
28 Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs' parents, guardians, or law enforcement officials that DOE 19 was or may

1 have been sexually abusing Plaintiffs; by failing to tell or concealing from Plaintiffs' parents,
2 guardians, or law enforcement officials that Plaintiffs were or may have been sexually abused
3 after Defendants knew or had reason to know that DOE 19 may have sexually abused Plaintiffs,
4 thereby creating the circumstance where Plaintiffs were less likely to receive medical/mental
5 health care and treatment, thus exacerbating the harm done to Plaintiffs; by holding out DOE 19
6 to the Plaintiffs and their parents or guardians as being in good standing and trustworthy; and/or
7 by failing to report known child abuse of Plaintiffs by DOE 19 to law enforcement. Defendants
8 cloaked within the facade of normalcy Defendants' and/or DOE 19's contact and/or actions with
9 the Plaintiffs and/or with other minors who were victims of DOE 19, and/or disguised the nature
10 of the sexual abuse and contact.

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

19 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

21 **Against Defendants DOE 1; DOE 2; DOE 3, DOE 19, and DOES 20 through 100**

22 119. Plaintiffs incorporate all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

23 120. Between approximately 1999 to 2004, when Plaintiff ROE 21 was
24 approximately 12 to 17 years old, DOE 19 engaged in grooming and unpermitted, harmful, and
25 offensive sexual conduct and contact upon the person of Plaintiff ROE 21.

26 121. Between approximately 2000 to 2003, when Plaintiff ROE 22 was
27 approximately 10 to 13 years old, DOE 19 engaged in grooming and unpermitted, harmful, and
28 offensive sexual conduct and contact upon the person of Plaintiff ROE 22.

1 122. Between approximately 2003 to 2005, when Plaintiff ROE 23 was
2 approximately 10 to 13 years old, DOE 19 engaged in grooming and unpermitted, harmful, and
3 offensive sexual conduct and contact upon the person of Plaintiff ROE 23.

4 123. Said conduct was undertaken while DOE 19 was an agent, managing agent,
5 employee, and/or servant of the Defendants, DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church,
6 DOE 3, District Church, and DOES 20 through 100, and while DOE 19 was acting in the course
7 and scope of his employment, agency, and/or service with the Defendants.

8 124. Said conduct of DOE 19 was known to and ratified by the Defendants.

9 125. Each Defendant had a duty to take reasonable steps to protect Plaintiff, ROE 21,
10 ROE 22 and ROE 23, minor females, from foreseeable harm when they were in their care,
11 custody, and control.

12 126. During the time that DOE 19 was working for and serving the Defendants, each
13 Defendant had a duty to use reasonable care to prevent DOE 19 from using the tasks, premises,
14 and instrumentalities of his position with the Defendants to target, groom, and sexually abuse
15 children, including Plaintiffs ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23.

16 127. Each Defendant breached the foregoing duties by failing to use reasonable care
17 to protect Plaintiffs ROE 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23 from DOE 19, and allowed DOE 19 to groom
18 and to sexually assault the minor females.

19 128. As a direct and proximate result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiffs ROE
20 21, ROE 22 and ROE 23 suffered, and will continue to suffer, great pain of mind and body,
21 shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of
22 self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life, and Plaintiffs were prevented
23 from performing daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life.

24 129. DOE 19 engaged in unpermitted, harmful and offensive sexual contact upon the
25 person of Plaintiff ROE 21, Defendants, DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, DOE
26 3, District Church, and DOES 20 through 100, ratified or approved of that sexual contact.

1 Plaintiffs, the Plaintiffs' family and minor congregants of DOE 19's dangerous propensities and
2 unfitness.

3 137. Defendants, DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, DOE 3, District
4 Church, and DOES 20 through 100, by and through their agents, servants and employees, knew
5 or reasonably should have known of DOE 19's dangerous and exploitive propensities and/or that
6 DOE 19 was an unfit agent. Despite such knowledge, Defendants negligently failed to supervise
7 DOE 19 in the position of trust and authority as a teacher, Transportation Supervisor at Academy
8 and church elder, where he was able to commit the wrongful acts against the Plaintiffs.
9 Defendants failed to provide reasonable supervision of DOE 19, failed to use reasonable care in
10 investigating DOE 19, and failed to provide adequate warning to Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' family
11 of DOE 19's dangerous propensities and unfitness. Defendants further failed to take reasonable
12 measures to prevent future sexual abuse.

13 138. 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 20 through 100**

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

25 140. Defendants, DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, DOE 3, District
26 Church, and DOES 20 through 100, had a duty to not hire and/or retain Defendant DOE 19, and
27 other employees, agents, volunteers, and other representatives, given Defendant DOE 19's
28 dangerous and exploitive propensities.

1 146. Defendants, DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, DOE 3, District
2 Church, and DOES 20 through 100, ratified or approved of the extreme and outrageous conduct
3 of Defendant DOE 19.

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

6 148. 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 19, and DOES 20 through 100**

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

18 150. 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 19 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.

22 151. Defendants, DOE 1, Local Church, DOE 2, National Church, DOE 3, District
23 Church, and DOES 20 through 100, ratified or approved of the violence against them committed
24 by Defendant DOE 19.

25 152. 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

1 153. 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 19 and DOES 20
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 30, 2024

22 DIAS HALL INC.
23 A Professional Corporation

24 
25 _____
26 STEVEN S. DIAS,
27 Attorney for Plaintiffs,
28 JANE ROE 21, JANE ROE 22 and
JANE ROE 23