1	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA		
2	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA		
3	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE ROBERT MCGUINESS		
4	DEPARTMENT 22		
5			
6			
7	JANE DOE, ) No. HG115588324		
8	Plaintiff, )		
9	) ASSIGNED FOR ALL PURPOSES TO  v. ) JUDGE ROBERT McGUINESS,		
10	) DEPARTMENT 22 WATCHTOWER BIBLE AND ) TRACT SOCIETY OF NEW )		
11	YORK, INC., a )		
12	corporation, et al., )		
13	Defendants. )		
14	)		
15	JURY TRIAL		
16	MAY 29, 2012		
17	DAY 1		
18			
19	ATKINSON-BAKER, INC.		
20	COURT REPORTERS (800) 288-3376		
21	www.depo.com		
22	REPORTED BY: KATHRYN LLOYD, CSR NO. 5955		
23			
24	JOB NO: A604CB8		
25			

```
1
                     APPEARANCES:
2
    FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
3
    FURTADO, JASPOVICE & SIMONS
4
    BY: RICK SIMONS, ESQ.
5
    BY: KELLY KRAETSCH, ESQ.
6
    22274 Main Street
7
    Hayward, CA 94541
8
    Tel: 510-582-1080
9
    Fax: 510-582-8254
10
    Email: Kellyk@fjslaw.com
11
    Email: Rick@fjslaw.com
12
13
    FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
14
    THE NORTH FREMONT CONGREGATION OF
15
    JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES
16
    THE McCABE LAW FIRM
17
    BY: JAMES M. McCABE, ESQ.
18
    4817 Santa Monica Ave, Suite B
19
    San Diego, CA 92107
20
    Tel: 619-224-2848
21
    Fax: 619-224-0089
22
    Email: Jim@mccabelaw.net
23
24
25
     (CONTINUED)
```

```
1
    APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)
 2
    FOR THE DEFENDANT:
 3
    THE WATCHTOWER BIBLE AND TRACT SOCIETY
 4
    OF NEW YORK, INC.
 5
    JACKSON LEWIS, LLP
 6
    BY: ROBERT SCHNACK, ESQ.
 7
    801 K Street, Suite 2300
8
    Sacramento, CA 95814
9
    Tel: (916) 341-0404
10
    Fax: (916) 341-0141
11
    Email: Schnackr@jacksonlewis.com
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
                               --000--
22
23
24
25
```

1	INDEX
2	PAGE
3	JURY INSTRUCTIONS: 11
4	OPENING STATEMENTS
5	BY MR. SIMONS 30
6	BY MR. McCABE 46
7	BY MR. SCHNACK 67
8	
9	INDEX OF EXAMINATIONS:
10	
11	EVIDENCE CODE 776, ADVERSE WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
12	PAGE
13	WITNESS: GARY ABRAHAMSON
14	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY: MR. SIMONS 86
15	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY: MR. McCABE 127
16	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY: MR. SIMONS 158
17	
18	WITNESS: MICHAEL CLARKE
19	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY: MR. SIMONS 162
20	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY: MR. McCABE 190
21	
22	
23	
24	000
25	

1		1
1 2	INDEX OF EXHIBITS:	
3	NUMBER	ADMITTED
4		
	Defendant's 17	111
5	Plaintiff's 37	115
6	Plaintiff's 9, Defendant's 98	135
7	Plaintiff's 1, Defendant's 26	181
8		
9	(not attached)	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	00	

MAY 29, 2012 8:36 A.M

3 PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: All right. We are back on the record in the matter of the Candace Conti versus

Watchtower Bible and Tract Society, New York, Inc., a corporation, and the Fremont, California Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, North Unit, and Jonathan Kendrick.

All counsel are here. Counsel arrived promptly at 8:00 o'clock this morning.

I am going to ask Mr. Schnack if he has unedited versions of the letters explaining the purpose as to what my rulings were. And I will recite the agreement on the things we decided, the terms, Mr. Schnack.

MR. McCABE: Your Honor, with respect to the letter from the North Congregation to Watchtower Bible and Tract Society, dated November 15, 1993, the entire last paragraph of the first page has been redacted by agreement among counsel.

On the second page, the first paragraph at the top, the language that will remain in the document are, quote: "Here are the facts as best as we can present them."

And the rest of that sentence has been

```
1
    redacted, according to your ruling.
 2
                The bullet point Number 1 on the second page
 3
    of that letter has been redacted by agreement among
 4
    counsel.
 5
                The second bullet point, the following words
    are being redacted by agreement of counsel:
 6
 7
                "We assume that Brother Kendrick does not
 8
    qualify any longer as ministerial servant."
 9
                Let me back up. The word "ministerial
10
    servant" stays in, and following sentence stating:
11
                "We will announce to the congregation that he
12
    is no longer serving as such. If this is incorrect,
13
    please inform us."
14
                And with respect to Item Number 3, the
15
    following words stating:
16
                "The Legal Department has given us some
17
    direction."
18
                And the balance of that sentence is being
19
    redacted, according to your ruling.
20
                THE COURT: I think that is an accurate
21
    statement as to the rulings, counsel.
22
                Do you agree, Mr. Simons?
23
                MR. SIMONS: I do.
24
                THE COURT: Okay. Next letter.
25
                MR. McCABE: Then with respect to the letter,
```

```
1
    dated December 20, 2009, from the North Congregation to
 2
    the Oakley Congregation, the last three sentences of the
 3
     second paragraph have been redacted, pursuant to
 4
    agreement of counsel.
 5
                The last paragraph on the first page of that
 6
    December 20, 2009 letter, the first sentence that reads:
 7
     "Her biggest concern seems to be protecting other
 8
    children from harm" will stay in.
 9
                The balance of that paragraph will be
10
    redacted at this point in time with respect to opening
11
    argument through ruling of the court.
12
                Turning to the second page, the defense
13
    objected to all but the first sentence of the first
14
    paragraph, the second page.
15
                The court ruled that the entire first
16
    paragraph on the second page shall remain in.
17
                The parties redacted by agreement, from the
18
    end of that first paragraph down to the heading
19
     "12-16-09" by agreement.
20
                And that covers that letter.
21
                THE COURT: And I would agree.
22
                Mr. Simons?
23
                MR. SIMONS: I do as well.
24
                THE COURT: Counsel raised other issues with
25
    the court, including motion in limine regarding Dr.
```

```
1
    Applewhite, which I will read during my lunch hour; and
 2
    likewise, I will look at Plaintiff's Number 10.
 3
               MR. McCABE: And we also had a brief
 4
    discussion, your Honor, about no mention of a duty to
 5
    warn during the opening statements.
 6
                Can that be addressed to the court?
 7
                THE COURT: Agreed.
 8
               MR. SIMONS: Agreed.
 9
              (Whereupon, the following proceedings
10
              were heard in the presence of jurors)
11
                THE COURT: All right. Several things.
12
    First of all, thank you for your time.
13
                Because of all the activity going on around
14
    here, I started with counsel and I, making decisions
15
    since 8:00 o'clock this morning, relative to this
16
    particular matter.
17
                In the future, and starting tomorrow morning,
18
    Wednesday, you will have your own jury room. So you are
19
    welcome to come early, go about your business, do
20
    whatever you need to do. Hill will take you to your
21
    jury room so you know where it is.
22
                I will ask you not to come in between 8:00
23
    and 8:30 because, again, I may be in the middle of
24
    making some decisions.
25
               As you work, I work. I work outside the
```

1 province of the jury, making decisions and other 2 decisions and things of that nature. So Hill will 3 educate you as to that. 4 I expect, other than today -- we have had to 5 set up the courtroom, and I had to make a number of decisions regarding today and the presentation 6 7 circumstances. 8 Tomorrow, I would expect to have you in those chairs at 8:30. Hopefully, you had a nice Memorial Day 9 10 weekend. I have indicated to all counsel -- Mr. Simons 11 12 has been hobbling a little bit. But it comes with a 13 territory as some part of the aging process. 14 So I have invited each counsel to either 15 stand or sit, depending upon what they would like to do. 16 I thought I would make some mention of that. 17 I inferred -- I have also mentioned that during the course of the trial, either Ms. Conti or any 18 19 party -- today we have Mr. Clarke and Mr. Abrahamson --20 Gentlemen, why don't you stand up. 21 -- on behalf of the Congregation. And that 22 may change daily. 23 So Plaintiff and Defendants, to the extent 24 somebody comes that I feel a need to introduce to you, I 25 will. I just want you to understand that it happens all the time in civil trials that the parties may be here for a portion, all of it at their choice, and subject to any other demands they have. And so I will say that.

Now, in a minute I'm going to give you the -- what I call pre-flight instructions, including about no taping and whatnot.

You know, all judges have their own different assessments of these things. Most now -- and I insist upon giving you the assess of what your duties are and what is going to happen here, so you are not thinking about as to what is going to happen all through the case.

I call it pre-flight and I do it because I am concerned the jurors will assess what your duties are, you know, in terms of how you evaluate things, the burden of proof.

So that having been said, let me give you some of what I call pre-flight instructions.

## JURY INSTRUCTIONS

THE COURT: All right. Casey 100:

Preliminary Admonitions. Before I read this, when I started as a lawyer, a number of years ago, there was a lot of Latin going on in the courtroom. There were a whole different set of jury instructions. California spent eight years trying to make the process more

intelligible and understandable by those who sit as jurors.

And in terms of the use of language, don't think for a minute that there is a hundred percent success. I can tell you and look you all in the eye, collectively and individually, that you don't hear much Latin around here. The only word you'll hear is the voir dire process, which is seeking impartial jurors, that's a Latin phrase, of course. But you rarely hear Latin in the State of California any longer. You rarely hear it anywhere.

Let me give you the preliminary admonitions:

You each have now been sworn as jurors in
this case. I wanted to impress on you the seriousness
and importance of serving on a jury.

Trial by jury is a fundamental right in California. The parties have a right to a jury that is selected fairly, it comes to the case without bias, and it will attempt to reach a verdict based upon evidence presented.

Before we begin, I need to explain how you must conduct yourself during the trial.

I just violated my first rule. And when I do that, I fine myself and put it in the kitty for the department. And so forgive me. I will fine myself.

Forgive me.

All right. Before we begin again I need to explain how you must conduct yourself during the trial. Do not allow anything that happens outside this courtroom to affect your decision. During the trial, do not talk about this case or the people involved in it with anyone, including family and persons living in your household, friends and co-workers, spiritual leaders, advisors or therapists or anyone else for that matter, whatever their title.

This prohibition is not limited to face-to-face conversations. It also extends to all forms of electronic communications.

Do not use any electronic device or any media such as cell phone or Smart phone, PDA, computer, the internet, any internet service, any text or instant messaging service, any internet chat room, blog or website, including social networking websites or online diaries to send or receive any information to or from anyone about this case or your experience as a juror until after you have been discharged from your jury duty.

We had a little monologue about that. Please do not do it. It imperils the fairness of the trial and it doesn't matter as to what it is. It really imperils

1 the fairness as to each party involved in this matter. 2 Upon contact, you may say you are on a jury 3 and how long the trial may take, but that is all. You 4 must not even talk about the case with the other jurors 5 until after I tell you it is time for you to decide the 6 case. 7 During the trial, you must not listen to 8 anyone else talk about the case or the people involved 9 in the case. 10 You must avoid any contact with the parties, 11 the lawyers, the witnesses and anyone else who may have 12 a connection to the case. 13 If anyone tries to talk to you about the 14 case, tell that person that you cannot discuss it 15 because you are a juror. 16 If he or she keeps talking to you, simply 17 walk away and report the incident to the court, 18 Mr. Martin, my attendant, as soon as you can. 19 After the trial is over and I release you 20 from your jury duty, you may discuss the case with 21 anyone, but you are not required to do so. 22 During the trial, do not read, listen to or 23 watch any news reports about this case. 24 And I have no information that there will be

news reports about the case. But, again, please do not

25

1 read, watch or listen to any. 2 This prohibition extends to use of the 3 internet in anyway, including reading any blog about the 4 case or have anyone involved with it or using internet 5 maps or mapping programs or any other program or device 6 to search for or to view any place discussed in the 7 testimony. 8 Do not do any research on your own or as a group. Do not use dictionaries, the internet or other 9 10 reference materials. 11 Do not investigate the case or conduct any 12 experiments. 13 Do not contact anyone to assist you, such as 14 family, accountant, doctor or lawyer. 15 Do not visit or view the scene of any event 16 involved in this case. 17 If you happen to pass by the scene, do not 18 stop or investigate. 19 If you do view the scene during trial, you 20 will be taken as a group with proper group supervision. 21 You must decide this case based only on the 22 evidence presented in the trial and instructions of the 23 law that I will provide. 24 Nothing that you see, hear or learn outside 25 this courtroom is evidence, unless I specifically tell

1 you it is. 2 If you receive any information about this 3 case from any source outside of the courtroom, promptly 4 report it to Mr. Martin, my court attendant. 5 It is important that all jurors see and hear 6 the same evidence at the same time. 7 It is important to keep an open mind about 8 this trial. Evidence can only be presented a piece at a 9 time. 10 Do not form or express an opinion about this 11 case while the trial is going on. You must not decide on the verdict until 12 13 after you have heard all the evidence and discuss it 14 thoroughly with your fellow jurors in deliberations. 15 Do not concern yourselves with the reasons for the rulings I will make during the course of this 16 17 trial. 18 Do not guess about anything your verdict 19 should be from anything I might say or do. 20 When you begin your deliberations, you may 21 discuss this case only in the jury room and only when 22 all the jurors are present. 23 You must decide what the facts are in this 24 matter. And I repeat, your verdict must be based only 25

on evidence you hear or see in this courtroom.

1 Do not let bias, sympathy, prejudice or 2 public opinion affect your verdict. 3 At the end of the trial, I will explain the 4 law you must follow to reach your verdict. You must 5 follow the law as I explain to you, even if you do not agree with the law. 6 7 101: Overview of Trial. 8 To assist you in your cast as jurors, I will 9 now explain how the trial proceeds. 10 I have previously identified counsel and the 11 parties in this lawsuit. 12 Ms. Conti is called a Plaintiff. She seeks 13 damage from the Defendants in this matter. 14 I have indicated to you that the Defendants 15 in this matter are the Defendant, Watchtower Bible and 16 Track Society of New York Inc, and the North 17 Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, Fremont, 18 California. 19 First, each side may make an opening statement, but neither side is required to do so. 20 21 MR. McCABE: Your Honor, sorry to interrupt 22 but Jonathan Kendrick is also a defendant in this case. 23 THE COURT: Forgive me. And Mr. Jonathan 24 Kendrick, as I indicated, is also a defendant in the 25 case.

First, each side may make an opening statement, but neither side is required to do so. An opening statement is not evidence. It is simply an outline to help you understand what that party expects the evidence will show.

Also, because it is often difficult to give you evidence in the order we prefer, the opening statement allows you to keep an overview of the case in mind during the presentation of the evidence.

Next, you will hear the evidence. Ms. Conti, through her counsel, will present evidence first. When she is finished, the defendants -- I have just named them, including Mr. Kendrick -- presuming he is here. He is not here up to this point -- will have an opportunity to present evidence.

Each witness will first be questioned by the side that asks the witness to testify. This is called direct examination. And the other side is permitted to question the witness. This is called cross-examination.

Documents are obviously referred to during the trial, are called exhibits. Exhibits are given either a number or letter so they may be clearly identified. The exhibits are not evidence until I admit them into evidence.

During your deliberations, you will be able

to look at all exhibits admitted into evidence. There are many rules that govern whether something will be admitted into evidence. As one side presents evidence, the other side has a right to object and to ask me to decide if the evidence is permitted by the rules.

Usually, I will decide immediately, but sometimes I may have to hear arguments outside your presence.

After the evidence has been presented, I will instruct you on the law that applies to the case and the attorneys will make closing arguments.

What the parties say in closing argument is not evidence. The arguments are offered to help you understand the evidence and how the law applies to it.

Casey 102: Taking notes during the trial.

You have been given notebooks and may take notes during the trial. Please do not take the notebooks out of the courtroom or jury room at any time during the trial.

You may take your notes into the jury room during deliberations.

You should use your notes only to remind yourself of what happened during the trial. Do not let your note taking interfere with your ability to listen carefully to all the testimony and to watch the witnesses as they testify, nor should you allow your

impressionable witness or other evidence to be influenced by whether or not other jurors are taking notes.

Your independent recollection of the evidence should govern your verdict and you should not allow yourself to be influenced by the notes of other jurors if those notes differ from what you remember.

The court reporter is making a record of everything that is said. If during the deliberations you have a question about what the witness said, you should ask that the court reporter read that to you.

You must accept the court reporter's record as accurate.

At the end of the trial your notes will be collected and destroyed.

Multiple Parties 103. There is one plaintiff in this trial. You should decide the case of the plaintiff separately as if it were a separate lawsuit. The plaintiff is entitled to separate consideration of her claims.

There are three defendants in this trial.

You should decide the case against each defendant
separately as if it were a separate lawsuit. Each
defendant is entitled to separate consideration of his
or their own defenses.

Unless I tell you otherwise, all instructions

1 apply to the Plaintiff and each Defendant. 2 104: Non-person Parties. 3 A corporation is a party to this lawsuit. 4 The corporation is entitled to the same fair and 5 impartial treatment you would give to an individual. 6 You must decide this case with the same fairness that 7 you would use if you were deciding the case between individuals. 9 When I use words like "person" or "he" or 10 "she" in any instructions -- in these instructions -- to 11 refer to a party, these instructions also apply to the 12 corporation involved. 13 105: Insurance. You must not consider 14 whether any of the parties in this case have any 15 insurance. The presence or absence of insurance is 16 totally irrelevant. You must decide this case based 17 only upon the law and the evidence. 18 Casey 106: Evidence. Sworn testimony, 19 documents or anything else may be admitted into 20 evidence. 21 You must decide what the facts are in this 22 case from the evidence you see or hear during the trial. 23 You may not consider as evidence anything that you see

or hear when court is not in session, even something

done or said by one of the parties, attorneys or

24

25

1 witnesses. 2 What the attorneys say during the trial is 3 not evidence. In their opening statements and closing 4 arguments, the attorneys will talk to you about the law 5 and the evidence. What the lawyers say may help you 6 understand the law and the evidence, but their 7 statements and arguments are not evidence. 8 The attorney's questions are not evidence. Only the witnesses' answers are evidence. 9 10 You should not think that something is true 11 just because an attorney's question suggests that it is 12 true. 13 However, the attorneys for both sides can 14 agree that certain facts are true. This agreement is 15 called a "stipulation." 16 No other proof is needed, and you must accept 17 those facts as true in this trial. 18 Each side, again, has a right to object to 19 evidence offered by the other side. If I do not agree 20 with the objection, I will say it is overruled. 21 If I overrule an objection, the witness will 22 answer and you may consider the evidence. 23 If I agree with the objection, I will say, 24 it's sustained. If I sustain an objection, you must 25 ignore the question.

If the witness did not answer, you must not guess what he or she might have said or why I sustained the objection.

If the witness has already answered, you must ignore the answer.

An attorney may make a motion to strike testimony that you heard. And if I grant the motion, you must totally disregard that testimony, and you must treat it as though it did not exist.

Casey 107: Witnesses.

A witness is a person who has knowledge related to this case. You will have to decide whether you believe each witness and how important each witness' testimony is to the case. You may believe all, part or none of the witness' testimony.

In deciding whether to believe a witness' testimony, you may consider among other factors, the following:

- (A) How well did the witness see, hear or otherwise sense what he or she described in court?
- (B) How well did the witness remember and describe what happened?
- (C) How did the witness look, act and speak while testifying?
  - (D) Did the witness have any reason to say

something that was not true? Did the witness show any bias or prejudice? Did the witness have a personal relationship with any of the parties involved in the case? Does the witness have a personal stake in how this case is decided?

(E) What was the witness' attitude toward this case about giving testimony?

Sometimes the witness may say something that is not consistent with something else he or she said.

Sometimes different witnesses will give different versions of what happened. People often forget things or make mistakes in what they remember.

Also two people may see the same event but remember it differently. You may consider --- but do not decide the testimony is untrue just because it differs from other testimony.

However, if you decide that a witness has deliberately testified untruthfully about something important, you may choose not to believe anything the witness said.

On the other hand, if the think the witness testified untruthfully about some things but told the truth about others, you may accept what you think is true and ignore the rest.

Please do not make any decisions simply

because there were more witnesses on one side than the other. If you believe it is true then a testimony of a single witness is enough to prove a fact.

You must not be biased in favor of or against any witness because of his or her disability, gender, race, religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation, age, national origin or socioeconomic status.

111: Instructions to Alternate Jurors.

As an alternate juror -- or as alternate jurors, you are bound by the same rules that govern the conduct of the jurors who are sitting on the panel. You will observe the same trial and should pay attention to all of my instructions just as if you were sitting on the panel.

Sometimes a juror needs to be excused during a trial for illness or some other legitimate reasons.

If that happens, an alternate will be selected to take that juror's place.

112: Questions from Jurors.

If during the trial you have a question that you believe should be asked of a witness, you may write out the question and send it to me through my staff. I will share your question with the attorneys and decide whether it may be asked.

Do not feel disappointed if your question is

not asked. Your question may not be asked for a variety of reasons.

For example: The question may call for an answer that is not allowed for legal reasons. Also, you should not try to guess a reason why a question is not asked or speculate about what the answer might have been.

Because the decision whether to allow the question is mine alone, please do not hold it against any of the attorneys or their clients if your question is not asked.

Remember, you are not an advocate for one side or the other. Each of you is an impartial judge of the facts.

Your question should be posed in as neutral a fashion as possible. Please do not discuss the question asked by any juror or any other juror until after the deliberations can be done.

113: Casey, Bias.

Each of us has biases about or certain perceptions or stereotypes of other people. We may be aware of some of our biases, though we do not share them with others. We may not be fully aware of some of our other biases. Our biases are in effect when we act favorable or unfavorably towards someone.

Bias can enter our thoughts, how we remember, what we see and hear, whom we believe or disbelieve and how we make important decisions.

As jurors, you are being asked to make very important decisions in this matter. Please do not let bias, prejudice or public opinion influence your decision.

Your verdict, again, must be based solely on the evidence presented. You must carefully evaluate the evidence and resist any urge to reach a verdict as influenced by bias for or against any partner -- any party or witness.

114: Bench Conferences and Conference in Chambers.

From time to time during the trial, it may become necessary for me to talk with the attorneys out of the presence of the jury either by having a conference at the bench, when you are present, or by calling a recess to discuss matters outside of your presence.

The purpose of these conferences is not to keep relevant information from you, but to decide how certain evidence is to be treated under the rules of evidence. Please do not be concerned about our discussions or try to guess what is being said.

I might deny an attorney's request for a conference. Do not consider my granting or denying a request for a conference as any indication of my opinion about the case or my view of the evidence.

116: Why Electronic Communications and Research are Prohibited.

I know that many of us are used to communicating, perhaps even learning by electronic communication or research. However, there are good reasons why you must not electronically communicate or do any research on anything having to do with this trial or parties.

In court, jurors must make important decisions that have consequences for the parties. Those decisions must be based only on the evidence that you hear in this courtroom.

The evidence that is presented in court can be tested. It can be shown to be right or wrong by either side. It can be questioned and it can be contradicted by other evidence, which might be either right or wrong, out of date or inapplicable to this matter.

The parties can receive a fair trial only if the facts and information upon which you base your decisions are presented to you as a group with each

juror having the same opportunity to see and hear all the evidence.

Also, the trial is a public process and depends on disclosure of important facts and evidence. Using information gathered in secret by one or more jurors undermines the public process and violates the rights of the parties.

Casey 200: Obligation to Prove are Likely True or Not True.

A party must persuade by evidence presented in court that what he or she is required to prove is more likely to be true than not true. This is referred to as, quote, the burden of proof, end of quote.

After weighing all of the evidence, if you cannot decide if something is more likely to be true than not true, you must conclude that the parties did not prove it.

You should consider all the evidence no matter which party produced the evidence.

In criminal trials, the prosecution must prove that the defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. But in civil trials, such as the one before you, the burden is to prove something, only prove that it is more likely to be true than not true.

Mr. Simons, do you have an opening statement?

MR. SIMONS: I do, your Honor.

3 OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. SIMONS

MR. SIMONS: Ladies and Gentlemen, Candace
Conti was sexually abused repeatedly by Jonathan
Kendrick when she was nine and ten years old. Mr.
Kendrick gained access to Candace Conti through their
years of involvement together in the North Fremont
Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses.

She, as a young girl was raised in the Jehovah's Witnesses family. Mr. Kendrick, was a trusted and respected adult member of that congregation.

Ladies and Gentlemen, what Candace Conti, her parents and the good people who were members of that congregation did not know, but what was known and documented and kept secret by a few elders of the North Congregation and by the people at the Watchtower New York Corporation that supervised and instructed and provided the rules for North Fremont Congregation.

What was known and kept secret by them was that only two years earlier, Jonathan Kendrick had sexually molested another member.

And because of the policy of secrecy that Watchtower New York had adopted and instructed it's local elders to follow, and which they did follow, that

information was not provided to your shared group, but was kept secret from the people who in that congregation could have seen and prevented the sexual abuse of young Candace.

Now, back in 1993, you will learn that it was already well-known by religious organizations and professionals of all kinds, that childhood sexual abusers used religious organizations to gain access to their victims.

The family atmosphere of the religious organization, the trust that comes with being a fellow member of a congregation were devices that sexual predators could use to gain access to their victims.

And this was well known and it was well established and it was even reflected in publications issued by Watchtower through its magazines, Awake and Watchtower Magazines.

It was known also at that time that policies were necessary to prevent child sexual abusers from using religious organizations as the vehicle to molest victims.

These policies that had been adopted by the major religions throughout the country; Methodist,

National Council of Churches, the Catholic Church, they didn't always follow their policies, but the need for

policies to protect children from childhood sexual abuse was well established by that time.

And these policies were necessary and included a need that when a childhood sexual abuser was identified, as it was with Mr. Kendrick, that that individual not be given the opportunity to molest any other children within the religious organization.

There is no single more important fact to be known at that time in the prevention of childhood sexual abuse in the religious context than that an individual has previously molested a child. That was the single, most important thing to know, because when that was known, it was also known that there was a high risk that that individual would molest again.

Jonathan Kendrick had molested, in 1993, his stepdaughter, 13 year old Andrea. And this was before he ever layed a hand on Candace. And the abuse was serious, and it involved skin-to-skin contact with his hand on Andrea's breast and putting his hand under her underwear into her pelvic area.

That information, which was told to the elders, is what was kept secret in 1993 and '94 and '95 and '96, during the time that Candace was being abused.

I would like to show you a photograph of Candace at that time. And apologize if we are in the

1 way. Space is limited. 2 You will see during the trial, once 3 technology is sorted through, that Candace as a nine and 4 ten years old was much as she shows herself today, 5 freckle-face red-head girl, and she was a memorable girl. She was the only child of Neal and Kathleen 6 7 Conti. 8 She was born in Fremont, raised in Fremont. 9 The family was of humble origins. Kathy Conti, 10 Candace's mother, was a high school dropout, and had a 11 variety of different jobs, one failed marriage and while 12 working in National Semiconductor met Neal. 13 Neal was also on his second marriage. He met 14 Kathy at work, and they had fallen in love and got 15 married in 1985. That's when Candace was born, 16 November 1985. 17 And Candace, by the time that she was a baby 18 was active in the Jehovah's Witnesses religion in the 19 North Fremont Congregation with her parents, and on 20 occasions with an older stepbrother, Neal's son from his 21 first marriage. 22 But by 1995, Candace's life was marked really 23 by three things. One is chaos. One is her resiliency, 24 and one is her vulnerability.

And when I say "chaos," you will learn that

25

33

1 Candace's mother, Kathy, had also been sexually abused 2 as a child. And in this time period in 1994 she began 3 to exhibit severe mental breakdown, bizarre activity, 4 and was no longer functioning. 5 She was unable to care for Candace. And 6 Neal, who was an unemotional man in many ways, not given 7 to strong attachments. 8 And, in fact, you are going to learn that he 9 has no relationship with Candace at all anymore, and 10 really has not since she was high school age. 11 Emotionally distant man was not able to 12 provide for Candace and was not able to provide for 13 Kathleen. This was a family in chaos. 14 And Kathleen and Neal relied on the people in 15 the congregation to give them some help because they 16 were unable to take care of themselves and their family. 17 And when I say "resiliency," Candace, you 18 will see when you meet her, is a person of spirit. One 19 of the elders in a deposition in this case called her 20 spunky. 21 She is a person who comes back from trouble. 22 And would get up in the morning and even though her 23 parents' home life was very, very difficult and unhappy 24 in the morning, you know, Candace would start a new day.

And she was often a smiling, young child,

25

34

even with this trouble around her. And people remember that about her. And she was a child that people in the congregation loved.

That spirit of resiliency has marked, really, her entire life. And you are going to learn a little bit about what she has been through and how she has come out of it and why she is here today.

But you are also going to learn that at that time she was extremely vulnerable child. She was vulnerable because there was no parental ability to manage her, and they needed and relied on others in the Jehovah's Witnesses Congregation family to help. And people could see that in her, and Jonathan Kendrick saw that in her.

Now, Jonathan Kendrick was a big man. He was physically big. He was an iron worker. He had come to the Jehovah's Witnesses later in life. Late thirties, early forties. And he had been with the congregation for only eighteen years.

But yet, he was well-liked. He was a flamboyant man. He was a loud man. He expressed his opinions and talked and sometimes bragged a lot. And he was the kind of person that people took to.

And he rose through the Jehovah's Witnesses to become what is called a ministerial servant. And

1 that's a position of technical assistance, in the way 2 of -- it is not a religious position, but it is the men 3 who helped the elders, they pass the microphone at 4 meetings or gather books and the magazines, the 5 publications and pass them out. 6 Jonathan Kendrick had achieved that position 7 which required not only recommendation by the local 8 elders, but also approval by Watchtower New York. 9 And Jonathan Kendrick was a part -- together 10 with his then wife, Evelyn Kendrick -- of the Jehovah's 11 Witnesses family. 12 And it was a family atmosphere. They not 13 only call each other brother and sister, but it is a 14 family atmosphere because they spend a lot of time 15 together. 16 There are usually meetings at the Kingdom 17 Hall, which is a church. 18 There are meetings in homes where Bible study 19 is done. 20 There are the field service where Jehovah's 21 Witnesses go out into the neighborhood to spread the 22 word of their beliefs and their religion. And many 23 times four and five days a week.

And part of their family situation is that the Jehovah's Witnesses did not mix much with other

24

25

faiths or other people.

Their lives centered around the congregation and their fellow members. And so because they didn't celebrate things like birthdays and Christmas as part of their beliefs, Candace and her family were much more tied into the other families of the congregation than might be seen in other situations.

And there was a trust placed in the fellow members of the congregation. And the North Fremont Congregation was not a particularly large one. Hundred members, maybe a hundred and twenty, including the children. But like in all small congregations, the people knew each other.

The Jehovah's Witnesses are not an organization that is unstructured. They are very structured. There is a group, a small group of men called the "governing body." And the governing body is at the top of the hierarchy of the Jehovah's Witnesses.

And the governing body operates, sets all the policies. It sets and instructs all of the elders throughout the country and all the congregations on what policies they follow. And it acts through a series of different corporations.

In this time, the 1990s, Watchtower New York was the principal corporation that the governing body

acted through and which directed the activities of the Jehovah's Witnesses throughout the United States.

And a number of various positions, certain overseers and et cetera, kept this hierarchy in place and allowed communications from the governing body through the Watchtower, through the bodies of elders and into the congregation itself.

And that's how instructions were disseminated and that's how policies were made and enforced from the top down.

Now, Jehovah's Witnesses is not a youth organization. It is not Campfire Girls, but it is an organization where children and adults engage in all of the activities together. They are together in the home services, they get together in the homes of members doing Bible study. They are together in the field doing service work, and they are together in many, many ways and activities.

And because of that togetherness, there is no real border, and there is no real one place that the Jehovah's Witnesses would be together. They could be in a neighborhood anywhere in the congregation. And they would go sometimes to activities in the district level, et cetera, and participate together there.

And so this family was together very much,

brothers and sisters, looked on each other as a family and felt that that was part of their responsibility.

And there was a togetherness there and a trust. And that's what was abused by Jonathan Kendrick in this case.

The Jehovah's Witnesses were notified. The Fremont elders were notified by Evelyn Kendrick in November 1993 that Jonathan has sexually molested her daughter from her first marriage, Andrea.

First, the Kendricks, they tried to deal with this at home, in the family. But that wasn't successful.

And so Evelyn turns to the elders, to Elder
Abrahamson and to Elder Clarke. But in particular,
Elder Abrahamson, you are going to hear from, because
that was the Jehovah's Witnesses' way, not to go to
police or the outsiders, but to go to elders for safety,
protection and guidance. And that's what she did.

And there was a family meeting with Andrea and Evelyn and Jonathan Kendrick and Elders Clarke and Abrahamson in November 1993, and a written report of that meeting was sent to Watchtower New York so that instructions could be received.

And in that meeting, Andrea and Evelyn told that there had been an argument about Andrea's

involvement with a boy, and that the argument had ended and Jonathan had given Andrea some Vicodin, and she had gone to bed and she had gone to her bedroom with her to sit and watch TV.

And when she was half asleep, he placed his hands under her bra and into her underwear. And she was aware of that and got up and went to the bathroom, cried, and then went and told her mother.

And that's what was told to the elders. That conduct was described to the elders in the family meeting.

Jonathan Kendrick did not agree with that version and claimed that it had only been a brief touch outside the clothes.

And that's the version that was reported to Watchtower New York by Elders Abrahamson and Clarke.

But even that conduct was described in the report as child abuse and recognized as child sexual abuse.

Now, Jonathan Kendrick no longer served as a ministerial servant by 1995 when the abuse of Candace was ongoing, but he was still a member in good standing with the congregation.

He still went to Kingdom Hall. He was still there with all the members. He was still a trusted member. And no one was told that he had sexually

molested a child. It was kept secret.

And Jonathan Kendrick continued to do field service, and he continued to go to homes for Bible study and meetings.

And the reason no one was told was a written policy issued in 1989 by Watchtower New York. And that policy, which the elders had no discretion to depart from, that policy mandated that certain matters, including child abuse, be kept confidential, secret.

And the reason for that policy, which you will get to read -- and it is a long several-pages of policy -- but the reason stated time and again within that policy was to avoid lawsuits and financial penalties.

The governing body, through this policy, had made a determination that its own needs would be placed above protection of children and an indifference to children like Candace who were placed at risk by the presence of known sexual abusers within the congregations and the secrecy that surrounded it.

That is what this case is about.

Now, I just want to talk a little bit about the harm that Candace has suffered. She suffered in silence, abuse that occurred on many, many occasions.

It was very serious and intrusive abuse. And

it is sad to say that it involved not only skin-to-skin contact, but nudity and oral sex and the insertion of a foreign object, a pen, into her. It is the most horrific kind of abuse, and it happened on many occasions.

And these occasions would arise when Jonathan Kendrick, being the helpful person that he was, would take Candace when her parents were unable to deal with her. They were too distracted by their own problems.

And he would take her for a ride or babysit her or take her rollerblading or play or take her home from a meeting and or stop by, run an errand.

Sometimes the congregation members came to the Conti house. Neal had a paint booth and they would come over and they would paint cars and they painted a car for Sister Crawford on one occasion. And all the elders helped this sister who was unable to take care of her own needs.

And so they were all used to each other, being in each other's lives. It was part of the congregation.

And this abuse that she kept silent was because there was no one who was safe for her to share it with.

Soon after, 1996, after a year,

year-and-a-half of the abuse, Candace's parents separated and divorced.

And Candace was placed in family therapy, primarily for herself, with a woman named Laura Fraser, a family therapist.

And Laura Fraser is now down in San Diego.

She is going to appear in this case by videotape

deposition. And so we know what her evidence will be

because we have all been down there and heard.

And she described Candace's vulnerability at that time. That Candace was a girl who was not getting the love of her father, she was competing with Jehovah's Witnesses, and her mother was unable to care for her.

In fact, Candace was really the caretaker, in many ways, of the family. Candace was living, as Laura Fraser will testify, in a family that really had three children in it.

And there was no safe place for her to go.

She could not go to her mother. She could not go to her father. And she went nowhere, and suffered this in silence for some years.

And that is not unusual in child sexual abuse victims. You are going to hear something called the "Child Sexual Abuse Accommodation Syndrome" what professionals call "Delayed Disclosure." Children don't

tell. Some do -- Andrea did -- if they feel they have a safe place to go. And many do not. And Candace did not. So she suffered this in silence.

And she did not tell anyone until -- the first person she told was when she was 16 years old. She was battling depression, and she told a doctor that she saw on one occasion, Dr. Afruma, Bay Valley Medical Group about it. That's the first reporting of it that she told anyone.

2003, when she was 18, she told her parents separately. Her mother was moving out of state and was really of no support to her. Her father, then on his fourth marriage, indifferent. Didn't get involved at all.

And Candace turned, during her high school years, to self-medicating for treating her trauma and treating her own feelings that she couldn't share with anyone.

She self-medicated with drugs. And she self-medicated with a very bad drug, methamphetamine.

And she took it for some time. For years she was using on and off.

And she hid from the trauma. But over time she began to be able to face what had happened to her and to face her trauma.

1 She suffers from a post-traumatic stress 2 disorder. She has gone through depression. She has 3 gone through some dark times. But that resilient Candace Conti has now been 4 5 sober for two years and is on the track to become a 6 veterinary tech, to become a productive member of 7 society, to become the good person that has been inside of her all of this time. She will need therapy. She will need a lot 9 10 of help over the years. And there will be times when 11

she is again vulnerable to the emotional harm resulting from this abuse. But she is a resilient person, and she does have the ability to stand up.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And when she met with the elders in Fremont to tell them about her abuse, in 2009, she told them the very same thing that you will learn as to why we are here, and that's to make sure that children are protected.

I appreciate your attention and I appreciate your service. And on behalf of Ms. Conti and myself, thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. McCabe, do you have an opening statement on behalf of North Congregation Jehovah's Witnesses, Fremont, California.

MR. McCABE: I do, your Honor.

## OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. McCABE

MR. McCABE: Thank you all for your patience and your endurance to getting to this point. It is very important in our system of justice that you are here to serve. And this is a very important trial. It's important for Ms. Conti, as her attorney has just outlined for you. She is a young woman who has been through an ordeal and suffered a lot. And she is trying to heal. So it is an important case for her.

But this case is also about some very good, hard-working, everyday, ordinary, common people. And I want to tell you what the evidence is going to show about that.

My clients, they are -- as Mr. Simons pointed out a hundred or hundred and twenty or so people who associate together at the Fremont Congregation.

Their official title is Fremont Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, the North Unit. But that is a big mouthful to get out. So I'm just going to call them the Fremont Congregation.

This is a civil lawsuit. No filters. You file a lawsuit, and unless prior to, you settle, it comes before a court or a jury like this.

In this case, Ms. Conti and her lawyers are suing the Fremont Congregation for negligence. But I

1 think the evidence will show that no one in the 2 congregation, no elder, no member, no one, saw 3 Mr. Kendrick ever act inappropriately with Ms. Conti. 4 Not only did no member see it, but Ms. 5 Conti's own parents did not see anything inappropriate. 6 The evidence will show you that, and Mr. 7 Simons has pointed out, that Ms. Conti didn't tell the 8 anyone in the congregation until 12 years after the 9 abuse had stopped. 10 It goes without saying, I think, based on all 11 the experiences we have had together the past few days 12 through the juror questionnaire and the conversations you have had with the jurors that child abuse is always 13 tragic. It is horrible. 14 15 This lawsuit, though, isn't just about child 16 It is what the congregation knew and when they abuse. 17 knew it. 18 The evidence will show that the Fremont 19 Congregation was a small group of people, about a 20 hundred, hundred twenty, it varies over the year 21 depending on economic situation, people moving in and 22 out of the area. 23 And presiding over the congregation is not a 24 priest or one minister or a religious leader, but it is

25

an elder.

And in the congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, it is not just one elder, but it is what they call the body of elders, made up of three, maybe as many as ten, twelve, depending upon the circumstance of the congregation.

And this case is important to them. They spend a good lot of time caring for the congregation.

But it is also important to members of the congregation, as you will see.

And I think it is important for members of the congregation regardless of what their religious denomination is.

It is important for associations like Little League or Oakland Soccer Club or any organization that involves families.

It is important because the allegations here essentially say the organization, any organization can be held responsible for what a rank and file member of the organization does, even when the behavior doesn't have anything to do with the organization, doesn't happen within the organization, doesn't happen on the organization's activities.

Now, the evidence will show that Ms. Conti and her attorneys are claiming that my client, the Congregation, represented by the elders, is responsible

for the horrendous actions of someone who simply attended the church.

Now, it is not a case where the pastor or clergy or religious leader perpetrated some of this. It was a rank and file member. It is not a case where the abuse happened at church or in church activities.

It is not a case where the pastor, the religious leaders saw something happening and didn't do anything about it. It is not that kind of case.

That's why we are here. That's why I stand up for some good people and try to present to you what they knew and when they knew it. People did not know or did not have a way of knowing that Ms. Conti was being abused.

And you will see testimony from the members and the elders from the Fremont Congregation. They will tell you about themselves.

The evidence will show they are people just like everyone else. They are like your neighbors, like the people you work with, friends.

The evidence will show that they're mothers, fathers, they're grandfathers, grandmothers. I even have one great-grandmother who will testify.

And we will present to you and having them testify what they saw, or more importantly what they

didn't see and didn't hear.

I would like to take a few minutes just to outline the case, just for the purpose of giving you a thread to weave through the testimony that you are going to hear in the next few days. So at the end of the case you will be able to use that thread and kind of tie it all together and deliberate to a just conclusion.

First, I would like to talk just a little bit about Jehovah's Witnesses, who they are and what they believe.

And next I would like to talk about what happens with Mr. Kendrick with his 15-year-old stepdaughter. And you have heard a lot about that already. But we will talk about that just a little bit.

But keep in mind this lawsuit is not about what happened between Jonathan Kendrick, his wife Evelyn, and Jonathan Kendrick's stepdaughter, 15-year-old Andrea. This case is about the abuse of Ms. Conti.

And you will see that the congregation didn't know about it until years after Mr. Kendrick had moved away, Ms. Conti had moved away, and they brought the abuse to their attention.

Now, the evidence will show that Jehovah's Witnesses are pretty normal in some ways and pretty

unique in others.

You will see that they base their beliefs and practices on the Bible as they understand it. They have two meetings a week currently in a church that they call Kingdom Hall. I guess because they talk about God's kingdom.

And you will see that, like other congregations, we would expect if we took a microscope and looked into their religious services, they open their meetings with where they all stand up sing a song, have a prayer, and then they discuss the Bible in various ways. They end the meeting same way. Sing a song, say a prayer.

And the instruction, the sermons, if you will, is usually provided by the elders who are the teachers, the shepherds, the religious leaders in the congregation.

That all seems ordinary and common. But what is really unique about Jehovah's Witnesses is they don't have Sunday school. They don't have church camp. They don't have Vacation Bible School. They don't offer any programs that separate children from their parents. The religion is family-based.

You will hear that they all meet together.

You will see a picture of the auditorium where they all

meet together. No separation of children from their parents.

And this is important because the parents are the main source of instruction, guidance and protection from their children.

I think when you hear the elders testify, you will see that they are very ordinary men. They don't wear special garb or clothing, they don't wear collars or anything. They are not paid for the 10 to 20 hours that they spend serving the congregation each week of their lives. They are all peers.

They work to prepare meetings of instruction.

They visit the sick. They respond when somebody in the congregation has a problem.

They do what most ministers or pastors do in any religious congregation regardless of the denomination. Pretty ordinary. They help guide and teach those that attend the church.

But they also support themselves and their families, because most are, like I said, married, and have children or grandchildren of their own. They support themselves working in the community.

For example, the elders that will, I believe, testify in this case, Michael Clarke, does clerical work for a parts company.

Gary Abrahamson is a janitor, works nights cleaning offices.

Larry Lamerdin, a pool cleaner, been doing that for a number of years, just humble hard-working men trying to take care of their families, support their families, live in the community and worship God with their congregation.

They are a little bit unusual too. I think everybody here on this jury panel raised their hand and said Jehovah's Witnesses had called on them and some of us here were irritated with it. Some weren't.

But if that's all we know about Jehovah's Witnesses, it is not enough. There is a whole lot more. They are just normal people. Church, their religious mission is part of their life, but there is more to them. They are human beings with jobs. They live in typical neighborhoods. They have typical neighbors, typical friends.

You know, it is kind of funny, but I wouldn't say this probably, wouldn't have to say this about anybody else, but they go to public school. They go to high school. They get trades.

We wouldn't have to say that about Lutherans, Methodists or Atheists, but Jehovah's Witnesses are just typical people.

The bottom line is, they're just like Jewish people. They're just like Buddhists. They're just like any denomination. They are like Atheists too. They are people.

But the elders are a little different. They meet some scriptural qualifications. They get to preside, teach in the congregation. That is only difference there is.

The thing is, they are not therapists, they are not social scientists, they are not medical doctors, they have no special training in law enforcement or psychology. They are simply men who study the Bible and associate with the congregation in Fremont. That is the background. They take the lead, provide spiritual encouragement.

That's what Mr. Clarke and Mr. Abrahamson did on November the 11, 1993. They were invited to the Jonathan Kendrick home by Mr. Kendrick because, as he put it when he talked to Michael Clarke, he inadvertently touched his 15-year-old stepdaughter.

The Kendricks invited the elders to come to their home and provide spiritual encouragement. You'll hear testimony how they arrived with Bibles in hand, sat at the kitchen table, offered prayer, and they listened. They listened to what Kendricks had to say.

And I don't think anybody will testify that knows exactly what was said verbatim in that meeting, almost 20 years ago.

But the elders will tell you what they heard, how they responded. They knew immediately from talking to Evelyn, Andrea and Jonathan this was no inadvertent touching. This was a sexual touching. And they knew right away that Jonathan Kendrick needed to be removed as a ministerial servant.

And that's what they did. They went back and they met with the rest of the body of elders. And Mr. Simons talked about it and he also mentioned about the type of worship service worker, or someone who assists them to -- passes the microphone when people make comments or seats latecomers, takes care of the parking lot, things like that. Well, Mr. Kendrick no longer qualified for even that position in the organization.

And after the elders met together as a body and discussed what Mr. Kendrick told them, Mrs. Kendrick told them, Andrea told them, they announced to the congregation that he had been removed as a ministerial servant.

And remember when the event took place, the meeting with the two elders, Mr. Abrahamson and Mr. Clarke, the event that is being discussed, that

1 happened four months earlier. The family was still 2 together. They wanted it to be that way. They hadn't 3 gone to the police. They were choosing not to do that 4 and keep the matter confidential and within the family. 5 And that's what Mr. Clarke and Mr. Abrahamson 6 allowed them to do, didn't try to force them to go to 7 the police and didn't want to make it public. 8 But you will hear that when Mr. Kendrick was 9 removed as a ministerial servant, that's a significant 10

event, it doesn't happen every day, that's a signal that something is wrong.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But from that point on, after admonishing Mr. Kendrick, in that meeting with his wife and stepdaughter, from the scriptures about how inappropriate his conduct was, you will hear testimony from the elders that they watched him. They observed They counseled him to stay away from children. Avoid being with them. And when he was at the church, Kingdom Hall or related functions, they observed him.

The Kendrick family, of course, continued to have problems. There were no more reports of any inappropriate activity between Jonathan Kendrick and his stepdaughter, Andrea.

But eventually Mrs. Kendrick and her daughter decided to make a report to the police. So a meeting

took place with the elders in November 1993, but the police in Fremont were notified in February of 1994, and Mr. Kendrick was prosecuted, dealt with.

What you will find is, as we go through the testimony of various witnesses, is the Kendricks eventually separated about August, September, October 1996, and they divorced sometime after that.

You will also hear testimony that Mr.

Kendrick took a job in San Diego following the separation, and then moved in with another family in the Fremont congregation, a family of father, Rod Francis, his wife Claudia, and two teenage boys. You will hear the family cared for Jonathan. Never suspected he was abusing anyone.

Eventually, Jonathan moved away in the year 1997. The entire time that Jonathan Kendrick was attending the congregation meetings in North Fremont, no one heard anything about the abuse of Candace Conti. No one saw anything that made them suspicious and reported it to the elders. No one made any allegations.

Like I said, no one reported anything going on between Jonathan Kendrick and Candace Conti or any other child.

You can imagine the shock when the lawsuit comes to the congregation.

Mr. Simons mentioned that you will hear testimony about policy. It is kind of hard to pinpoint policy sometimes, but policy, in this particular organization, comes from the governing body in the form of letters to the bodies of elders.

It also comes in the form of magazines that they distribute publically and they use in their congregation at the worship services. It is called the Watchtower Magazine and Awake Magazine.

And one of the letters that you will see as evidence, and you will have an opportunity to look at it and to scrutinize it was a July 1, 1989 letter to all bodies of elders.

It was a letter about confidentiality and about the responsibility of elders who receive personal and confidential information about people that they are shepherding and caring for in the congregation needs to be kept confidential.

And you will see the letter explaining why.

Lawsuits results from defamation, child custody matters,

divorce proceedings. Lawyers can get embroiled in these
things through subpoenas or other techniques where
people want to have an elder or minister come in and
testify he said/she said in divorce proceedings.

You will see by the letter. No policy and

secrecy there. Just common sense, confidentiality, maintained by lawyers and their clients, doctors and their patients, ministers and their congregants in every religion.

Now, the elders were finally informed about the abuse of Ms. Conti from Ms. Conti herself. They met with her. They did what they did before to prepare for the meeting to try to comfort and encourage her. And that's what you would expect for a member who was dearly loved as a child.

So why are my clients being sued? Well, Candace will tell you, Ms. Conti will tell you that the elders should have known what was going on, and they should have known what was happening to her, and they should have protected her. But there was no evidence that anyone saw any of the activity that she will testify about.

Certainly no one reported to the elders that something was going on with Jonathan Kendrick and Candace Conti.

They will tell you that -- we will bring them in, the mothers and grandmothers that were there and in tune, and they were in tune to this issue because they had policy information that was given to them from the Watchtower organization in the form of their magazines.

But they will tell you that they never saw

Candace Conti sitting on Jonathan Kendrick's lap. They

will tell you they never her giving big bear hugs to

Jonathan Kendrick. It would be inappropriate.

And they will never tell you that they saw

And they will never tell you that they saw her leaving week after week with Jonathan Kendrick alone from the Kingdom Hall.

The evidence will tell you that this isn't an easy case. It is a difficult case. We all feel for someone who comes from a troubled family background like Candace Conti did. I think everyone who testifies feels horrible that anything bad would happen to Candace Conti.

We find it tragic what she's been through. Eight years of methamphetamine abuse, troubled thoughts, the nightmares.

But I think we can all agree, we are all grateful to see that she is on the right track now. Clean and sober. She has made a lot of progress.

We can certainly testify, as Mr. Simons did, as to her resilience, that she is glad she has her life together, career plans, education plans.

Now, you will hear a lot of evidence and you will see articles themselves, will be put up on the screen here what Watchtower has published in the form of

information about the child abuse. And I think you will be impressed.

The evidence will show that they have been publishing for over 30 years about this subject. They are not an organization that puts their head in the sand and say it doesn't exist.

And what they have done, you will see in the evidence is, they educate the parents. First line of defense. The parents. The ones that guide, direct, teach, and protect their children.

Some might argue, well, if they published all those materials, it certainly must be a problem unique to Jehovah's Witnesses. No it's not. It is a societal problem.

And the fact that Jehovah's Witnesses write about it indicates that they are trying to address a societal problem for their membership, like they would alcohol abuse and drug abuse and any other plague in society today.

This problem is not a unique problem to the Catholics or the Jehovah's Witnesses or the Boy Scouts, it is a societal problem. That is what the evidence will show.

Now the matters with Andrea, the 15-year-old stepdaughter of Jonathan Kendrick, that took place

1 sometime during the summer of 1994, it is going to be 2 disputed what was said at that meeting, evidently from 3 what Mr. Simons has outlined. 4 My clients didn't hear anything about 5 Vicodin. They didn't hear anything about going below 6 the belt. They didn't hear that. 7 And they made a report immediately after 8 that, which they had no motivation to fabricate, and 9 send to the Watchtower. You will hear about that too. 10 But you know, looking back, which every 11 account you will find most credible, listening to the 12 witnesses, that account, or that abuse of the 13 15-year-old stepdaughter today gives us the vantage 14 point of hindsight. And you know what they say about 15 hindsight, it is 20/20. 16 But as you hear the testimony, try to listen 17 to the evidence in terms of what Mr. Clarke and Mr. 18 Abrahamson knew, what they were told by the family, and 19 how they were working on it. 20 Now, clearly, they weren't fooled by Mr. 21 Kendrick saying it was an inadvertent touch. It was 22 clearly wrong behavior. And they acted accordingly and 23 removed him from his minor position in the congregation. 24 Everyone's demeanor and everyone's 25 conversation that day in November 1993 was that the

family had worked out the problem, they were working it out. They didn't want to go to the police. But they eventually did. Didn't change anything. Wouldn't change anything the elders would do.

But for a minute just try to put the situation with Andrea in a little box. Let's focus on the claims of Candace Conti.

This case is not about Andrea. And the evidence will show this. It is about what the elders thought, heard, did, and when they did it and when they knew it.

I think the evidence will show you that they didn't see or hear anything. Because no one reported it to them. They didn't hear it from the parents, Neal and Kathleen Conti.

So I want to make sure that we don't make any mistake here. There is a villain in this case. It is Mr. Kendrick. It is not Gary Abrahamson, Michael Clarke or Larry Lamerdin.

The questions that you will have to decide at the end of the trial is: Were my clients negligent?

Michael Clarke, Gary Abrahamson, Larry Lamerdin? The people in the Fremont Congregation, were they so oblivious and so uncaring and so unconcerned that they let something important happen right in front of their

eyes? I think the evidence will show that they weren't.

Essentially, the Plaintiff, even though no one heard or saw anything -- and that includes not only Neal and Kathleen Conti, but Laura Fraser who was doing weekly therapy with Candace Conti, apparently, during the time that some of this abuse was allegedly going on.

It wasn't apparent to her school counselor.

It wasn't apparent to her grandmother, Neal's mother,
who she lived with.

So that is what this case is about, what the elders knew and saw, when they knew it.

I want to thank you for going through the screening process. And it was important that we do that. It might have been a little burdensome, and we had, maybe, some confusing questions in there.

And we did that because there is some delicate things that are going to be talked about in this case, and there are some serious questions that are going to be raised. And we wanted people who could do it dispassionately and objectively by weighing the evidence. And I am confident you are that group of people. Mr. Simons is too.

I think you will see as the evidence develops the elders had nothing to hide, they had nothing to conceal. They did their job to the best of their

1 ability. 2 And sitting here today in 2012 with 20/20 3 vision, hindsight, we all wish Candace Conti could have 4 been spared the scurge of child abuse, the plague of the 5 earth. 6 In a perfect world, every child should be 7 loved and cherished by a mother and father that cares 8 for her. Candace Conti didn't live in a perfect world. 9 And we don't either. Her family was quite troubled. She suffered. 10 11 But I think when you look at all the evidence 12 and sum it all up, you will see that the elders in the 13 congregation didn't do it. 14 I think you will see from the evidence at the 15 end of this trial that the blame for Candace Conti's 16 problems needs to be put where it properly belongs, and 17 that's on the broad shoulders of this perpetrator, 18 Jonathan Kendrick. 19 THE COURT: Do you have an opening statement 20 on behalf of the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society, 21 Inc.? 22 MR. SCHNACK: I do, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: All right. 24 Let's take a 15-minute break, and we will 25 have opening statement for Bible and Tract Society of

```
1
    New York.
2
                           (Break taken)
3
              (Whereupon, the following proceedings
 4
              were heard outside the presence of jurors)
5
               MR. SIMONS: One of the jurors was having a
6
    chat with Mr. Clarke. Mr. McCabe had a chance to talk
7
    to him.
8
               MR. McCABE: I inquired of Mr. Clarke and he
9
    said there was some more conversation than that.
10
                THE COURT: Referring to this department?
11
               MR. SIMONS: Yes.
12
                THE COURT: Okay. I will admonish the jurors
13
    once again.
14
               MR. McCABE: I have told Mr. Clarke not to
15
    talk to them.
16
              (Whereupon, the following proceedings
17
              were heard in the presence of jurors)
18
                THE COURT: All right. If I can remind the
19
    jurors that no conversations whatsoever with lawyers,
20
    parties, or witnesses. I can't say that enough. Like I
21
    said, let your conscience lead your conduct.
22
                So even if I don't reference it every
23
    session, you are under a continuing duty to observe that
24
    order as to no-contact discussions. Certainly a good
25
    warning is appropriate. Anything beyond that, though,
```

1 could be looked askance by this court with appropriate 2 action taken. 3 All right. Mr. Schnack. 4 MR. SCHNACK: Thank you, your Honor. 5 6 OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. SCHNACK 7 MR. SCHNACK: Ladies and Gentlemen, I too, 8 like Mr. Simons, want to thank you for your service. We 9 appreciate your patience in getting though this process 10 this far. We appreciate that you are giving this matter 11 your attention. 12 I represent Watchtower Bible and Tract 13 Society of New York. As Mr. Simons referred to several 14 times, it is a corporation and that's technically 15 correct. 16 What Watchtower Society basically is, is the 17 national church entity. It is a New York corporation, 18 it is a religious non-profit corporation that was set up 19 so that the Jehovah's Witnesses faith could practice 20 their faith in the United States like other religious 21 corporations, like other denominations do. 22 Let's turn to what the case is really about. 23 What Ms. Conti is claiming here is that Jonathan 24 Kendrick criminally and sexually assaulted her for,

perhaps, two to three years, starting sometime in '94 or

25

'96 to '97, when she was age nine to 11. And she wants
Mr. Kendrick to pay her for that.

And, indeed, if Mr. Kendrick did that, I don't think that there is any dispute from Watchtower or even from North Congregation, that if Mr. Kendrick criminally and sexually assaulted her for that time period, he should obviously pay for it.

But that's not why Mr. McCabe and why I am here today. Ms. Conti, as you are aware, is also suing the North Congregation and Watchtower. She is suing the church, the national church. And she wants the congregation and the entire church to pay her for Mr. Kendrick's criminal conduct.

And that's why we are here today, Mr. McCabe and I, to talk about our clients' involvement or their lack of involvement in this matter.

So specifically, what do Ms. Conti's claims really involve? This starts in November of '93. And as Mr. Simons explained, partially correctly, and Mr. McCabe has referenced, Jonathan Kendrick went to the elders in the North Fremont Congregation to tell them that back in July of '93, he had in a single time inappropriately touched his stepdaughter. That's Evelyn Kendrick's daughter, Andrea.

Andrea was 14 or 15 years old at the time,

and they tried to deal with it within the family, and
then Mr. Kendrick went to the elders in early November,

I think it was November 10.

And in the very next day in the afternoon,

two elders -- consistent with their religious practices,

It was at that meeting first of all, like Mr. McCabe stated, they took their Bibles, they started with a prayer. And then Mr. Kendrick confessed to what he called an inadvertent touching.

two of them went to the Kendrick household to meet with

Mr. Kendrick, with Evelyn, and with Andrea.

But again, you will see in the letter that was sent, they still labeled that as child molestation.

They weren't fooled by Mr. Kendrick that it had been merely an inadvertent touching.

They also talked with family that day, they offered them some spiritual counseling. But the elders also told Evelyn and Andrea that if they wanted to go to police, they could. That was their option.

And, indeed, what Mr. Simons didn't tell you, that within a couple months, they did go to the police.

They went to the police, they reported it. The police and Child Protective Services conducted an investigation. That happened in mid-February.

You will probably hear from the police

officer that conducted that investigation as to what was said.

With respect to the Vicodin issue, Andrea told the police that she had a bad back, she took the Vicodin, and that later these things happened.

Again, there is going to be some disputes as to what was said there.

But nonetheless, after that meeting with Mr. Kendrick and his family in November 1993, the local elders removed Mr. Kendrick from his position as a ministerial servant.

You have heard a brief description of what a ministerial servant does. There is two appointed positions within a local congregation. There is an elder, and there is a ministerial servant.

A ministerial servant, essentially, is a church assistant, is a church helper. They will get the literature ready for the sermon. They will get the microphones set up for the services, kind of like what Mr. Martin did last week, when we were getting the microphones set up.

If latecomers show up to the service, the ministerial servants will help them find their seats.

They will help in the parking lot, things like that.

Ministerial servants don't give sermons, they

don't conduct Bible studies, and, again, they function as helping the church elders.

Again, I don't think we can repeat this enough, that once Mr. Kendrick confessed to the elders on November 11, 1993, he was removed from his position as ministerial servant.

That is an appointed position. Once again, there is only two appointed positions within each congregation, elders and ministerial servants. But he was removed, and there was an announcement made to the congregation that he no longer held that position, that he had been removed.

He never again served in any appointed position in the church. And that's up to the present time. Mr. Kendrick still lives in Alameda County. He still works in the county.

For whatever reason, he has chosen not to come here and defend himself today, but nonetheless, Mr. Kendrick never served in any appointed position within any congregation, including the North Fremont Congregation after he was removed as a result of that November 1993 incident.

Now, again the elders, on November 11, 1993, told Evelyn and Andrea and, indeed, Mr. Kendrick, that it was their choice as to whether to report it to the

police.

Now, the judge will instruct you later that as of 1993, clergy, including ministers, elders, rabbis, pastors, whatever, are not what we call mandated reporters under California law.

That means that if someone is a mandated reporter, such as therapist or a doctor, someone like that, receives a report of the child abuse, they have to go to authorities.

Clergy were not included within that, under state law, as of January 1, 1997. So the fact that the elders did not go to police at that point can't be held against them because, again, they weren't required to.

But they did tell the family they had a right to report the matter to the police. And, indeed, within a couple months they did go to the police. And Evelyn and Andrea went to the police.

And you will see the police report in evidence here. The police conducted a thorough investigation. They talked to Andrea, they talked to Evelyn, they talked to Jonathan Kendrick. They were told that the story had been told to the elders.

But the police never let the elders know that they were conducting an investigation. The police did not talk to the elders. Andrea and Evelyn did not tell

the elders that they had gone to the police.

But nonetheless, the police did their investigation, Child Protective Services was involved in the investigation, a report was made to the district attorney. The district attorney charged Mr. Kendrick in this, and there was a conviction.

So this was all prior to the time that Candace will tell you that Jonathan Kendrick abused her.

Let me now turn, again, just to repeat a couple key factors here, because I think a lot of focus from Mr. Simons' part is going to be on this report about Andrea, and indeed that did happen? No one disputes it.

There is going to be some discussion about what was said at that November 11th meeting, but again the elders were not fooled by Jonathan Kendrick's contention that it was inadvertent.

You will see in the report they sent to Watchtower back in New York that they called it a child molestation.

So again, Mr. Kendrick, at the time that Candace alleges he abused her, again in '94 to '96 or '97, he was not in a position of authority with the church. He was simply a rank and file member of the North Congregation.

Two, as Mr. McCabe mentioned, from that point forward, from November '93 forward, the elders were watching him at the Kingdom Hall. Candace will testify as she testified earlier in her deposition that at the Kingdom Hall, Mr. Kendrick would bear hug her. She would squirm to get away. But he held her inappropriately on his lap.

The elders were watching. You'll hear the elders will testify that they never saw any such conduct at the Kingdom Hall.

You will hear from other members of the congregation at the time, from mothers and grandmothers, from others, that they also did not see any such conduct like that at the Kingdom Hall. And indeed Ms. Conti's own parents will tell you they never saw that at the Kingdom Hall.

The bottom line in this regard, is that no one in the church saw Mr. Kendrick do anything inappropriate with Candace or the children at the Kingdom Hall.

Indeed it wasn't until sometime in 2009 or thereabouts that anyone with the North Fremont Congregation or even Watchtower, back in New York, had heard or saw anything that signaled that Mr. Kendrick had abused Candace.

The other folks have covered some of this. I will just page through and save us some time.

You will learn in this case about the Jehovah's Witnesses's faith, that like many other Christian religions, they hold church services on Sunday.

They hold these at the Kingdom Hall. And again, the Kingdom Hall is like the church that the Jehovah's Witnesses use. It is no different than the Catholic, calling their church a cathedral, the Jewish religion calling their house of worship a synagogue. The Kingdom Hall is just a name for their physical church for the building.

They hold Sunday services at the church. One night during the week they will have Bible studies there. There was a period of time where those Bible studies were held at elder's houses. And you will hear some testimony about that.

But you will also hear something that is very unique to the Jehovah's Witnesses' faith that is unlike a lot of other religions.

The Jehovah's Witnesses, they do not offer or sponsor any services or programs that separate children from their parents. That is unlike a lot of other churches.

Let me say that again. The Jehovah's Witnesses do not sponsor any program or any activity where they separate children from their parents.

So what does that mean? Unlike the church I attend, there aren't any Sunday School classes for children. Those of you who are familiar with Sunday School classes, the children are separated in a separate room, they are taught by a teacher. The parents aren't involved in that. The Jehovah's Witnesses faith does not separate children from their parents that way.

Also, different from the church I attend, there is not a teen fellowship group that might meet on a Thursday nights with a youth pastor.

The Jehovah's Witnesses don't segregate teenagers. They don't segregate children separately for services, like a youth fellowship group.

Also, unlike my church, there is no Vacation
Bible School classes in the summer. A lot of churches
will do that, where the kids are out of school for the
summer, they set up a week where there is Vacation Bible
School classes. The Jehovah's Witnesses don't have that
type of class setup where the children are separated
from there their parents.

They also don't operate a summer camp where children attend for a week where the parents drop them

off with camp counselors maybe older teenagers, people in their twenties. The Jehovah's Witnesses don't have summer camps like that.

So what does this mean? This means that adults within the congregation don't have any special or unique access to children, like, for example, Boy Scouts might do, where a scout master will take some scouts out on an overnight camp.

There aren't, like, youth sports programs.

You have soccer. You have baseball, Little League,
basketball. Parents drop off their kids at these
practices. The coach works with them for an hour, hour
and a half or whatever and the parents pick them up
afterwards.

The Jehovah's Witnesses faith doesn't have any kind of activities like that where the children are separated from their parents.

So in that sense, the Jehovah's Witnesses are a different from a lot of churches, they are different from Boy Scouts, they are different from public schools.

It is, again, not a situation where the children are separated, such as someone like Kendrick would have unique access to Candace or any other children.

If you ask the Jehovah's Witnesses why they

do that, why do they function this way, it is because they consider they are worshiping a family activity. It not only brings families closer to God, but closer to each other.

And they view it as a scriptural responsibility for parents to educate their children about their religion. And that's why again, the children aren't separated from their parents in all the activities.

So keep that in mind when you hear it.

Because Mr. Kendrick, again, was just a rank and file

member of church at the time Candace said that he abused

her. He didn't have any type of unique access to her.

He didn't have unrestricted as access to her either as

Sunday school teacher or out in field service or

anything like that. They simply do not separate their

children from their parents.

Some other evidence you are going to hear includes that Candace Conti's parents -- and you heard a little bit about Kathleen and Neal Conti, they will each testify that Candace never went to the Kingdom Hall unless one or both of them were in attendance.

She was never sent there with a friend. If Candace was at the Kingdom Hall, she went with her parents, one or both of them.

Both Neal and Kathy Conti will testify that they never allowed Candace to leave the Kingdom Hall alone with Jonathan Kendrick.

Candace will testify that for several times a month, over a two or three-year period, that she was allowed to leave the Kingdom Hall with Jonathan Kendrick, that he would take her to his home and from there, he would sexually abuse her.

The parents are going to tell you that never happened on their watch. And again they are going to tell you that she was never at the Kingdom Hall unless one or both of them was there.

You are going to hear from other persons in the North Fremont Congregation, the mothers and grandmothers, they will testify that they never saw Kendrick bear hug Candace at the Kingdom Hall.

They never saw Kendrick have Candace on his lap, they never saw her trying to squirm to get away from him, because they just didn't see that happen.

Let me shift gears here just a little bit.

Mr. Simons referred to policy of secrecy and Mr. McCabe

addressed that briefly. There is going to be testimony

about that. And there was no policy of secrecy here.

There will be evidence to the effect through the

witnesses.

1 There has also been some mention about 2 Watchtower and Awake Magazines. For over 30 years 3 Watchtower has published educational articles that go 4 out to all of the parents in the congregation, they go 5 out to all the members of the congregation. They are available at the kingdom halls. They go to the elders. 6 7 The elders use the publications within their sermons, 8 within their Bible studies. 9 And this is all part of the educational 10 11 parents, and indeed to people outside the church as 12

services that Watchtower provides to its members, to the well.

The first one we have up here is from a June 22nd, 1982 Awake.

And again, as I mentioned, they have been doing this for about 30 years.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You will hear some testimony that the Jehovah's Witnesses were indeed in the forefront of publishing these types of materials and putting this information into the hands of parents.

The next one is a January 22, 1985 article. You have got another one that has come up on October 8, 1991. And then a final one, October 8th, 1993.

This is just a rough sample of the types of things that Watchtower was putting into the hands of its members. Educating parents.

You will even read one of these articles from 1985 that tells parents to be alert to your own religious leaders, that you might think twice before you leave your children with your elders, with your ministers. That was the type of information that was being disseminated to the congregation.

And as Mr. McCabe mentioned, they didn't publish these articles, they didn't put this information into the hands of the parents and the members of the congregation because they had a unique or serious problem any more than any other organization, it is simply because the church acknowledges at the time, and correctly so, that there was a societal problem.

Churches don't operate like that. They

function within society as a whole. And the Jehovah's

Witnesses acknowledged this and decided to put this

information out there so that the parents could get it,

the parents could be educated, the elders could have it

to work with, they could incorporate it into their

sermons, whatever needed to be done.

It is somewhat ironic that plaintiff

appears -- you know, if they hadn't published these

materials and put this information out there, I'm sure

Mr. Simons would say Watchtower was negligent and that

the congregation was negligent.

Now, the fact that these materials are put out there, that they do educate parents about their own responsibilities, they equip the elders with this information, that is negligent too. It is something, you just can't have it both ways.

Let me just sum up a few things that I think the evidence will show in this case, going back again to November 11,1993. Mr. Kendrick confessed to the two elders in the North Fremont Congregation that back in July, he had inappropriately and sexually touched Andrea, his 15-year old stepdaughter.

Secondly, the elders provided scriptural guidance to the family, and told the family that they could, indeed, report it to the police. That's not a policy of secrecy, telling them that they could report it to the police.

Third, the elders removed Mr. Kendrick right away after receiving this confession from this one-time incident.

They removed him from his position as a ministerial servant, and they announced that fact to the congregation.

And after that, the elders also monitored Mr. Kendrick when he was at the Kingdom Hall performing any

church-related activities.

And fourth, Andrea and Evelyn Kendrick did report this to the police. And as I have mentioned, the police investigated, they conducted the investigation, they interviewed the people involved. It was reported to the district attorney. Child Protective Services got involved. And there was a criminal prosecution of Mr. Kendrick. And this was all in 1994.

And then fifth, the Jehovah's Witnesses do not separate the children from the parents -- I have gone over that several times -- so there was no unrestricted access that Mr. Kendrick had to either Candace or any other child at the time.

Without question, child sex abuse is a horrendous societal problem. I don't think anybody disputes that. Unfortunately, pedophiles have learned to hide their behaviors quite well.

In this case, if Jonathan Kendrick criminally and sexually abused Candace, he should pay for it.

There is no dispute about that. He should pay for it financially or criminally because of the damage he has caused her.

But Watchtower should not be responsible for things that they did not know or could not know. They also should not be held responsible simply because they

1 are a religious corporation, to use Mr. Simons' words. 2 Whatever criminal and sexual abuse Jonathan 3 Kendrick perpetrated against Candace, he should be 4 responsible for. And, again, he is the villain here. 5 It is not the church. It is not the congregation. 6 Like all organizations, whether they are 7 churches or youth organizations, when there is a member 8 who commits abuse against another member, it just wrong 9 to hold the organization liable. 10 Again, Mr. Kendrick wasn't an elder. 11 wasn't like a scout master. He wasn't like a priest. He wasn't like a school teacher. He wasn't a coach, 12 13 where he had unique and truly unfettered and 14 unrestricted access to kids for a period of time. 15 Holding the organization responsible for the 16 criminal misconduct of someone like Kendrick is just 17 wrong, and it shouldn't be done here. 18 MR. SIMONS: Object, your Honor. This is 19 argumentative. 20 THE COURT: Strike the last comment. 21 MR. SCHNACK: Thank you, your Honor. 22 Finally, in closing, I am asking that you 23 place the blame in this case where it really lies. It 24 should go on Jonathan Kendrick. He should have to pay 25 for what he did, and by returning your verdict, you can

1 tell him that. 2 Find that Jonathan Kendrick was responsible 3 for whatever abuse he perpetrated against Candace. But 4 the blame does not fall on Watchtower. It does not fall 5 on the congregation. 6 Again, like the other attorneys, I appreciate 7 your time and attention. Thank you. 8 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 9 Mr. Simons, do you have a witness for us? 10 MR. SIMONS: Yes, your Honor. Pursuant to 11 Evidence Code 776, we call Mr. Gary Abrahamson. 12 THE COURT: All right. Under 776, the 13 plaintiff is calling Mr. Abrahamson as a so-called 14 adverse witness. He is obviously appearing on behalf of 15 the congregation this morning. But I wanted to alert, 16 he is being called under a specific evidentiary section 17 as an adverse witness. 18 19 GARY ABRAHAMSON, 20 WAS DULY SWORN TO TELL THE TRUTH BY THE CLERK 21 AND TESTIFIED AS FOLLOWS: 22 23 THE CLERK: Would you please state and spell 24 your first and last name for the record? 25 THE WITNESS: My name is Gary Abrahamson.

```
1
    G-A-R-Y, A-B-R-A-H-A-M-S-O-N.
2
               THE COURT: All right. Mr. Simons.
3
 4
                       DIRECT EXAMINATION
5
    BY MR. SIMONS:
6
               Thank you, your Honor. Mr. Abrahamson, we
         Q.
7
    have met on several occasions including two sessions of
    your deposition. Correct?
9
               Correct.
         Α.
10
         Q.
               And you are an elder at the North Fremont
    Congregation?
11
12
         Α.
              Yes, I am.
13
         Q.
               And you have been an elder for many years
14
    there. When did you start as an elder in Fremont?
15
         Α.
               In Fremont, 1986.
16
               And is it correct that before Fremont you had
         Ο.
17
    served as an elder at a different location?
18
         Α.
              Yes.
19
               When did you first become an elder anywhere?
20
               1982, I believe.
         Α.
21
               Is it correct that there are no paid clergy
         Q.
22
    within Jehovah's Witnesses?
23
         Α.
               That is correct.
24
               And so the persons who have administrative
25
    responsibility for each congregation are the elders?
```

1 A. Correct.

5

6

7

- Q. And the elders -- I use the word "plural"
  because there is more than one elder in each
  congregation, typically.
  - A. Typically, correct.
  - Q. And in Fremont, there may be somewhere between maybe six or eight or ten elders at any given time?
- 9 A. That's true.
- Q. And those elders, when they meet together, that's called the body of elders?
- 12 A. Yes, correct.
- Q. And the congregation itself, even though
  people may come and may leave, generally speaking it is
  about a hundred -- hundred and twenty people?
- 16 A. That would be a good estimate.
- Q. And that includes both adults and children.
- 18 | Correct?
- A. That includes adults and children that are actually publishing the "Good News."
- Q. And by "publishing," that means children who are going out into the neighborhoods to promote the Jehovah's Witnesses beliefs?
- A. Yes, correct.
- Q. And some of those publishers are baptized?

- 1 A. Some of them are.
- 2 Q. And some are not?
- 3 A. They are called unbaptized publishers.
- Q. And some of the -- in your experience at least -- some of the baptized publishers may be as young as six years old?
  - A. That is rare, but that could be true, very serious six-year old person with parental training.
    - Q. And there are a number of different meetings, if you will, that go on within the Jehovah's Witnesses congregations, including Fremont?
- 12 A. Correct.

7

8

9

10

11

19

20

21

22

- Q. There will be meetings at, for example, the Kingdom Hall?
- 15 A. Correct.
- Q. And those meetings involve both children and adults together?
- 18 A. Yes. We don't separate our children.
  - Q. Now, we have heard a little that it is always parents and children, but isn't it true, Mr. Abrahamson, that there are children who will become involved in these congregations whose parents are not involved?
- A. Again, it is probably rare.
  - Q. But it happens?
- A. And by children, we are thinking what age

1 group?

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

21

22

- Q. Eight? Ten? Twelve? Fourteen?
- 3 A. A little older where they can -- obviously it 4 is with the parents' permission that they would come.
  - Q. But there are children who are involved without their parents?
    - A. That could happen, yes.
  - Q. And sometimes there is children who are involved, but for different reasons their parents may not be able to attend a particular event. Isn't that something that you experienced?
- 12 A. That's true.
  - Q. Now, the Fremont Congregation itself, we called it a congregation, and that's how we all referred to it, but it is actually a corporation?
    - A. That would be true.
- Q. And the directors and officers of this corporation are taken from the elders within the congregation?
- 20 A. Correct.
  - Q. And as elders, isn't it correct that you are required to follow any instructions or policies that are provided to you from Watchtower New York?
- A. Yes. We follow those policies, but they are always scriptural-based and they are always within the

1 law.

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 2 Q. And do you have any ability to create 3 exceptions to the policies that are provided to you by Watchtower New York? 4
  - A. Well, I don't know what you mean by -- what area of exceptions. For example, they may say conduct a meeting, but they may not tell you what date. So you are at liberty to choose the date to conduct the meeting.

Is that what you mean?

- 11 Q. No. I mean, do you depart or deviate from 12 the policies that are provided to you by Watchtower New 13 York?
  - No. Like I said, they are scripturally Α. based. They're within the realm of the law. They're legal. So I would want to follow them.
  - Is it accurate to say that there are often five or more meetings a week within the Jehovah's Witnesses congregations?
    - Α. That's what we have. Five days a week.
- Q. Some of these meetings occur in people's 22 homes -- the homes of members?
- 23 A. Back at that time they did. Yes. Now they 24 all occur at the Kingdom Hall.
- 25 Q. And back then, some of the meetings might

occur in the Kingdom Hall, of course? 1 2 Α. Correct. 3 And the door-to-door work, the field service, 4 that would occur in neighborhoods throughout -- in the case of this congregation, at least -- Fremont? 5 6 The public canvassing, that would be correct. Α. 7 Generally, our meetings for field service is also done at the Kingdom Hall. 8 9 And then the groups would go out from there 10 to neighborhoods. Correct? 11 Α. Yes. 12 And that service would be a brief service Q. 13 before publishers go out to the neighborhoods? 14 Α. Correct. 15 And all of these activities are engaged in Q. 16 with adults and children together? 17 Α. Yes. 18 Usually the parents, but sometimes not? Q. 19 It would be rare, again, but usually with the Α. 20 parents, absolutely. 21 But sometimes not? Q. 22 It would be rare. And if it got to be the Α. 23 practice of the parent, then I would talk to the parent, 24 "You need to be out with your child." 25 Q. All right. Did you ever talk to Kathleen

Conti about being present more at Jehovah's Witnesses congregations with Candace?

- A. If her husband, Neal, were there, that would be all right. But I never saw Candace without either her parents or -- well, either her mom or dad.
  - Q. Actually, you have no recollection whatsoever of Candace; isn't that true?
  - A. Well, at the deposition you did show me a photograph of her, and I thought, boy, I can't picture her. But as soon as I saw her today I knew it was Candace.
  - Q. But when you testified in this matter before on the occasion of your deposition, you told us you had absolutely no recollection whatsoever of Candace Conti?
  - A. Well, I don't believe I stated that. If I stated that, that's not what I meant.
- Q. Well, let's take a look at your testimony at page 67 of the deposition from lines 3 through 19.
- 19 (Whereupon, the video recording was played)
  20 BY MR. SIMONS:
  - Q. When did you first meet Candace Conti?
  - A. My recollection of Candace Conti is that she was Neal Conti's daughter from a previous marriage. And so occasionally she would come with Neal and his new wife to the meetings. You have pictures there. I don't

even know. I can't recall what she even looks like.

2 Q. All right. And that was going to be, 3 actually, the purpose of these pictures. Let me just 4 show you a photograph marked as Exhibit 11, because we 5 have some other documents there that we have not yet attended to but which I have marked 1 through 10, and 6 7 ask if seeing that photograph refreshes your

8 recollection as to Candace Conti?

> I'm sorry it does not. No. Α.

(Whereupon, the video recording was stopped) BY MR. SIMONS:

- Q. Now, you have since learned that Candace Conti is not the stepdaughter of Neal Conti from a prior marriage. Correct?
- Α. Correct.

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- And your recollection of her from seeing her Q. today is not the basis that you are telling us that she was always there with Neal Conti, is it?
  - Obviously not, no. Α.
- So you are telling us that, although you don't really remember her, you remember that whenever she was at the meetings, she was always there with her father -- her stepfather, you thought?
- Α. Yes. If she wasn't with her parents, one parent, then it would be, "Where did she come from?"

I would have noticed her more at that point and tried to find out her circumstances.

- Q. Well, you were aware, Mr. Abrahamson, that sometimes the parents might not attend and that, if they didn't, that usually they would make arrangements for their child, if she was going to attend something, to get transportation with somebody else from the congregation; isn't that true?
- A. You kind of lost me in that whole dialogue.

  Could you rephrase the question please and repeat it?
- Q. Yeah. You testified that if the parents weren't able to bring the child to some of the Jehovah's Witnesses activities, that undoubtedly the parents would arrange transportation with another congregation member at times?
  - A. At times, correct.
- Q. And so back in the 1990s, you knew that there were times that arrangements would be made by parents to have another congregation member transport their child to Jehovah's Witnesses events?
  - A. That could be true.
- Q. Did you use the word "undoubtedly" in your testimony?
- A. Probably. I do that from time to time, yes.

- 1 Q. Do you still stand by that?
- A. Undoubtedly? On rare occasions, sure.
- 3 Q. Do you remember Jonathan Kendrick?
- 4 A. Yes, I do.

- Q. How did you first meet him?
- 6 A. He came to the Kingdom Hall.
- 7 Q. And did he come alone?
- A. I don't have a recollection if he came alone
- 9 or not. I assume that he did.
- 10 Q. Did you like him when you met him?
- 11 A. He was a likeable fellow, yes.
- 12 Q. How would you describe him -- his
- 13 | personality?
- 14 A. Well, he was, as you mentioned, an iron
- 15 worker, so he was kind of gruff. And he kind of came
- 16 across that way too. He appeared gruff and he seemed
- 17 gruff too.
- 18 Q. Was he loud?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. But is it fair to say that he, in a somewhat
- 21 | short time, became fairly popular within the
- 22 | congregation?
- A. Well, we always like it when someone comes in
- 24 and changes their personality.
- Q. And he become active in the congregation?

- A. He was active in the congregation, true.
- Q. And you recommended him soon after his baptism to Watchtower New York to be accepted as a ministerial servant?
  - A. He was making good progress, yes.
- Q. Now, we have heard about ministerial servants. Is a ministerial servant, as Mr. Schnack told us, a person who helps out at the services, in the parking lot, with microphones and books and literature?
  - A. Right. That would be his duty.
- Q. Not a religious position.

- A. It would be more of an assistant position as was mentioned.
  - Q. What was the duties that Mr. Kendrick had as a ministerial servant?
    - A. He would distribute literature to friends and would keep account of that.
      - Q. Did he do a good job of that?
        - A. He did an adequate job, good job, sure.
    - Q. If a ministerial servant did not do a good job with providing books, for example, was irregular in their attendance, or had some other reasons, personality or otherwise, would they be subject to being removed from that position?
- 25 A. They could be removed for that.

- Q. So the fact that a person is removed as a ministerial servant does not necessarily tell anyone that that person has committed an act of child abuse?
- A. Well, you first have to realize that they would have been trained to -- if there was some reason they weren't able to fulfill their job, then that comes on us. Why didn't they have the training? So we would train him properly.

And if it lack of meetings, then you know the friends that are attending, and so you can have an assistant that can help you. But if neither of you can be here, you have to make arrangements and you have to try to be here.

- Q. Back to my question, the fact that a person is removed as a ministerial servant could be for many, many reasons. Correct?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. And it does not tell anyone that because a person has been removed as a ministerial servant that they have committed some kind of child sexual abuse?
  - A. It would not be limited to that, no.
- Q. Was Mr. Kendrick ever reproved for loud and boisterous conduct?
- A. No.
- Q. Now, do you recall back in November of 1993

- being contacted by Evelyn Kendrick concerning Jonathan?
- A. Yes. I was at that meeting. They actually contacted by Michael Clarke and then he and I went to their house.
- Q. Did you receive a phone call first from Evelyn Kendrick?
  - A. Not to my knowledge. I think it was Mike Clarke that received that phone call.
  - Q. Did you have a relationship with Evelyn Kendrick?
- 11 A. Yes.

1

7

8

9

10

20

21

- 12 Q. And how would you describe that relationship?
- A. As a shepherd to a sheep?
- Q. And was she eligible to be a ministerial servant or elder?
- A. Women are not allowed to be ministerial servants or elders.
- Q. Did you socialize, you and your family, in any way, with Mr. and Mrs. Kendrick?
  - A. We had meals together.
  - Q. And how often would you estimate that you would have social interactions with the Kendricks?
- A. Well, we are all so busy that most of our social interacting, besides meals, takes place at the Kingdom Hall. But we would do other things on the side,

- occasionally, with other members -- not just with them,
  but other members of the congregation as well.
  - Q. Approximately how many families were involved in this congregation?
  - A. Well, a hundred and twenty. Probably that would represent, maybe 60, 50 families, I'm thinking.
    - Q. Some of the families have children?
- A. That's what I was thinking as families. Most of them with children, yes.
- 10 Q. I think there were four people in your family 11 at that time?
- 12 A. Four children. Correct.
- 13 Q. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

- 14 A. But myself and my wife, that would be six.
- Q. And some of the families were as large as your family, or maybe two or three children?
- 17 A. Yes.
- Q. So is it fair to say there may be two dozen families or so in that congregation at that time?
- A. I'm not very good at doing the math in my head, but that sounds reasonable.
- Q. And you would socialize, not just with the Kendricks, but with many of the other families as well?
  - A. Correct.

24

Q. And the same would be true for the other

```
1
    elders?
 2
          Α.
                That would be true.
 3
                Is that part of your responsibility as an
          Q.
 4
    elder is to become acquainted with the families and
 5
    learn who they are as people?
 6
                Right. And we usually do that on shepherding
          Α.
 7
    visits.
                And does that mean that you go to their home?
          Q.
 9
                Correct.
          Α.
10
         Q.
                So you had been to the Kendrick home?
11
         Α.
                Yes.
12
         Q.
                And you had been to the Conti home?
13
         Α.
                Uh, yes.
14
                And is it true that within -- at least from
          Q.
    your experience within the congregation, that families
15
16
    will socialize with each other to a certain extent in
17
    the ways that you described?
18
         Α.
               Yes.
19
                Even if there is not an elder involved?
          Ο.
20
                That's true.
         Α.
21
                Do you recall Mr. Conti having a paint booth
         Q.
22
    out in his garage?
23
                When you mentioned that, a vague memory of
          Α.
24
    that came across my mind. But I'm not much of a
25
    painter. I wasn't involved in that project with the
```

1 Crawford car. 2 But you remember the project? 3 I remember that it was done. I don't Α. 4 remember where it was done. 5 Now, when you had that family meeting, Evelyn 6 Kendrick was there. Correct? 7 A. Correct. 8 And Andrea was there? Ο. 9 Α. Correct. 10 Q. Do you remember if she was there for the whole meeting or came in partly through? 11 12 A. From my recollection, I would think she was 13 there for the whole meeting. They knew we were coming, and I'm sure, hopefully, she was there for the whole 14 15 meeting. 16 And Jonathan Kendrick was there? Ο. 17 Α. Yes. 18 Yourself and Elder Clarke? Q. 19 Yes. Α. 20 Had you already spoken to Jonathan Kendrick 21 at that time about what the meeting was going to be 22 about? 23 Α. Michael told me -- informed me what the 24 meeting was going to be about prior to us going to the 25 meeting.

1 Had you spoken to Jonathan Kendrick at all? 0. 2 Michael had spoken to Jonathan about it. Α. 3 What did you understand, when you went to the Ο. 4 meeting, that the meeting was going to be about? 5 Α. Abuse of Andrea. Sexually abusing Andrea. 6 And what did Jonathan Kendrick say in this Ο. 7 meeting that he had done to Andrea? 8 A. He had said that the house was dark. She was 9 sleeping on the couch. He walked in. And he used the 10 word "inadvertently" touched her breast. But it was more deliberate than that. 11 12 Q. And how did you determine in your own mind 13 that it was more deliberate than that? 14 Well, it had occurred four months before. 15 And now he's saying that it is bothering his conscious. 16 And if you raised your hand and inadvertently hit a 17 woman's breast, you would say, "Excuse me. I'm sorry." 18 And I don't think four months later you worry about it, 19 and you would say, Oh, this is keeping me awake at night 20 because I inadvertently touched a woman's breast. 21 Let's look at the report. You remember that 22 a written report was prepared after this. Correct? 23 Can we see Exhibit 9? 24 Now, are you able to see that there where you 25 are, Mr. Abrahamson?

1 Not clearly, no. Α. 2 First of all, your Honor, Exhibit 9 is in Ο. 3 evidence, I believe. 4 THE COURT: So Number 9 is evidence by 5 agreement. 6 BY MR. SIMONS: 7 Now, this is a letter that yourself and Mr. Q. 8 Clarke sent to Watchtower New York on November 15, of 9 1993. Correct? 10 Α. Yes. 11 And it was sent after the meeting had been Q. 12 held in the Kendrick family home? 13 Α. Correct. 14 And you did, as you said, recognized that the Q. 15 subject matter was, was a case of child abuse? 16 Α. Yes. 17 Ο. Why were you reporting this to Watchtower New 18 York? 19 To get direction. Α. 20 And in all of your work as an elder that 21 involves anything in this type of matter, you would get 22 your direction and instruction from New York. Correct? 23 Α. In a lot of these cases that legal matters 24 are involved, we are always encouraged to call the Legal 25 Department because how could we know all the laws. And

1 the laws change from state to state, but our Legal 2 Department could help us through this. 3 And you used the word "encouraged" but Ο. 4 actually you are required to call New York? 5 Α. You might put it that way. Yes. 6 I did put it that way. Do you agree? Q. 7 I agree you put it that way. Α. 8 Do you agree that you were required to call Q. 9 New York? 10 Α. Yes. Now, the confession that you refer to in the 11 Q. 12 next paragraph: 13 "We met on November 11 with Jonathan 14 Kendrick, a ministerial servant, who confessed 15 to child abuse with his 15-year-old 16 step-daughter." 17 Did that occur in the meeting with Andrea and 18 Evelyn, and yourself and Elder Clarke all present? 19 That is what we are referring to. Correct. Α. 20 And it says: Q. 21 "And he confessed to touching the 22 breast of his stepdaughter while she was 23 sleeping. She awoke, et cetera, et cetera." 24 You did not put in the letter, the word 25 "inadvertent." Is that true?

1 Mike actually composed the letter. And my 2 recollection of the letter, I don't know if it was used 3 or not. 4 Q. You signed the letter. If we see page 2, you 5 signed the letter. 6 MR. McCABE: Objection; the document speaks 7 for itself. THE COURT: Let's let the witness take a look 9 at the document. 10 THE WITNESS: Michael Clarke signed the 11 letter. 12 BY MR. SIMONS: 13 Q. Did you review the letter before it was sent? A. I don't have a recollection that I reviewed 14 15 it, but I'm sure I did. 16 Q. So your recollection is that Mr. Kendrick 17 said "inadvertent." The report does not refer to that. 18 Do you have a specific recollection as you sit here 19 today, many years later, that Mr. Kendrick said that 20 this was an inadvertent touching? 21 A. Yes. That was the impression that I got 22 during the meeting many years later. 23 Q. And your impression of that, is that, based 24 on a specific recollection, that that is what he told 25 you?

1 Α. Yes. 2 Even after this time, you recall that he told Ο. 3 you that it was inadvertent? 4 That's what I recall. Α. 5 And so you knew that he had lied to you about Q. 6 that? 7 He did not divulge the full truth. That's Α. 8 true. 9 Is that another word for "lie"? Q. 10 Α. It probably is. 11 Q. Reading here: 12 "Brother Kendrick thought since he 13 was sorry and his family was willing to forget 14 the abuse, he would not have to report it to 15 the congregation elders." 16 Did you think that was a lie? 17 Α. That -- I believe that's the way he explained 18 it to Mike. That's the way he felt. 19 Do you recall him saying that with you Q. 20 present? 21 I don't think that became an issue because he Α. 22 had already confessed to Mike. 23 More to the focus of my question, which I Q. 24 apologize for being unclear about, but did you think he 25 lied when he said that he was sorry?

1 Α. I believed him when he said he was sorry. 2 It says that: 0. 3 "He said that his conscience continued to bother him." 4 5 And I think you have already told us that you 6 did not believe that. 7 Well, it didn't line up with what the Α. 8 circumstances were. It seemed more was involved. 9 And so you knew that was a lie as well? Q. 10 Α. That he was not being completely truthful. 11 Correct. 12 And we call that a lie? Q. 13 A. You could. You could call it not being truthful and trying to protect himself. 14 15 Q. All right. Thank you. 16 Did you report to Watchtower New York that 17 Mr. Kendrick had not been truthful with you? 18 We did not address that issue, no. Α. 19 Why not? Q. 20 Well, we felt that it wasn't -- wasn't --Α. 21 probably, we had the idea that it wasn't necessary at 22 that time. 23 Q. Do you recall specifically why you did not 24 report that Mr. Kendrick was not being truthful with you 25 to Watchtower New York?

1 Α. No. 2 Did you feel some degree of sympathy for your Ο. friend, Mr. Kendrick? 3 4 No. If he is a child abuser, he should be 5 dealt with, without a doubt. 6 What did Andrea tell you had happened? Ο. 7 Andrea agreed with the situation that Α. 8 Jonathan -- I think we encouraged Andrea to come, and 9 she did not contradict anything that was said between 10 either Evelyn, Jonathan or Andrea. They agreed. 11 Q. Do you recall Andrea saying anything? 12 I can't recall any specific thing that she Α. 13 said. 14 But your general recollection is that she Ο. agreed with everything that Jonathan Kendrick said? 15 16 Yeah. If there was anything out of the Α. 17 ordinary, I would have remembered that she said, "Hey, 18 that's not the way that it happened." 19 Was Andrea a quiet girl? Q. 20 Probably. Around me, she was quiet. Α. 21 Isn't it true that Andrea told you that Mr. Q. 22 Kendrick had given her some Vicodin that night? 23 Α. No. That never came up in that meeting. 24 Q. Isn't it true that she told you that this

abuse happened in her bed and not on the couch?

A. No, that didn't happen.

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Isn't it true that she said that Jonathan Kendrick was watching TV next to her?
  - A. They never brought that up.
- Q. Isn't it true that Andrea told you in this meeting, and Elder Clarke, that Jonathan Kendrick had touched her breast skin-to-skin?
  - A. He didn't say that.
  - Q. Did she say that?
  - A. She didn't say that.
- Q. And isn't it true that she said that he had put his hand into her underwear?
  - A. No. That never came up.
- Q. What did Evelyn say in this meeting?
- A. She corroborated the story. There was never any objection that we fielded on her part or Andrea's part.
  - Q. Isn't it true that Evelyn told you that shortly after the abuse occurred that Andrea had come out of the bathroom crying and told her mother what had happened?
  - A. I don't remember that during the meeting. I think Evelyn was asleep, the impression I'm getting, and I don't know when she found out about it. Maybe she went in and woke her up.

1 Did Evelyn disagree with anything that Mr. 0. 2 Kendrick said? 3 Α. Not to my recollection. 4 Did you feel that it was important for you to 5 get to the truth of what had happened? 6 Α. Yes. 7 And did you talk to Andrea separately from 8 Jonathan Kendrick? 9 No, we did not. Α. 10 Q. Did you talk to Evelyn separately from 11 Jonathan Kendrick? 12 Α. No, we did not. 13 Now, as we have already heard, you had Q. 14 received, over the years, quite a bit of information 15 from Awake and Watchtower Magazines on the subject of 16 child and sexual abuse. Correct? 17 Α. Yes. 18 And if we could look at Exhibit 17. Before Q. 19 we show it. Exhibit 17 is in evidence as well, from 20 January 22, '85? 21 Do you have any objection --22 MR. SCHNACK: No. 23 MR. SIMONS: -- to showing it. 24 THE COURT: Mr. Simons, is it for 25 identification only?

```
1
               MR. SIMONS: Well, it is more of admission,
    and if there is an objection, I will have to do
2
3
    foundation.
 4
               MR. McCABE: There is no objection, your
5
    Honor.
6
               MR. SIMONS: May it be admitted?
7
               MR. McCABE: It may be.
8
                THE COURT: 17 is now in.
9
                  (Whereupon, Defendant's Exhibit Number 17
10
                  was admitted into evidence)
    BY MR. SIMONS:
11
12
         Q.
               During the time that you were an elder, would
13
    you read every Awake?
14
         Α.
               I would try to.
15
               It is part of your obligation as an elder,
16
    isn't it?
17
         Α.
               Yes.
18
               And part of the weekly Bible studies and the
19
    studies that you do is to study the Awake and the
20
    articles in it?
21
               To read them over, yes.
22
               So you would have read and been familiar with
         Q.
    this 1985 Awake issue. Correct?
23
24
         Α.
              Correct.
25
         Q. And if we could look at page 4. Do you have
```

```
1
    page 4?
 2
          Α.
                I do.
 3
                Down at the bottom it says:
          0.
 4
                   "Sue was molested by a man who was
 5
          running a church group. He ran a youth club.
 6
         Everybody agreed that he was very pleasant.
 7
          But he sexually abused Sue and other girls."
 8
                You knew, in 1993, when you went to the
 9
    Kendrick home, that persons in religious groups can use
10
    the religious group as a way to get children for sexual
11
    molestation.
12
          Α.
                Yes.
13
          Q.
                And sad as it is, that is a fact of life,
14
    that you knew long before the meeting in the Kendrick
15
    house?
16
          Α.
                Yes.
17
                And you knew these people can be very
18
    pleasant, like Mr. Kendrick?
19
         Α.
                Yes.
20
                And you knew that --
          Q.
21
                Let's look at page 5.
22
                At the top of page 5 in that first column,
23
    you knew that, in most cases, children were molested by
24
    people they know and trust. Correct?
25
                That's what research shows, yes.
          Α.
```

1 And you knew back in '85 and from then on Ο. 2 that that made protecting children more difficult. 3 Α. Yes. 4 And you also knew that sexual abuse may be 5 described as playful or affectionate conduct. Correct? 6 Α. Correct. 7 Did Jonathan Kendrick ever have playful or 8 affectionate conduct with other children in the 9 congregation? 10 Α. No. Not that I was aware of. 11 Something you never observed? Q. 12 Α. Right. 13 You did try, after this meeting at the Conti Q. 14 house, to observe him closely? 15 Α. Yes. 16 But that's not something that you ever 0. 17 observed? 18 Α. Correct. 19 Let's look at page 8. In this part that 20 says: If the Worst Should Happen. 21 You knew in 1985 and thereafter that: 22 "First, the child and other children 23 too must be protected from any further abuse. 24 This must be done whatever the cost." 25 You were aware of that.

1 A. Yes.

- Q. What did you do to protect Andrea from further abuse?
- A. We removed Jonathan as a ministerial servant. And at that meeting, we tried to comfort Andrea and let her know that she was simply a victim. She wasn't at fault. She wasn't the reason. But we are very sad that she had become a victim of child abuse.
- Q. Because this abuse occurred in the home of a congregation member and members, how would removing Mr. Kendrick as a ministerial servant have protected Andrea from further abuse?
- A. Well, we hoped that our meeting protected Andrea from further abuse.
- Q. Did you provide any advice to Evelyn Kendrick in how to keep Andrea safe in the future?
- A. I can't -- it is hard to remember everything way back there. But I would assume that I told her that it is important to set propriety in the house, rules of conduct, and that it would be inappropriate for Jonathan to be in a room alone with Andrea.
- But I can't remember saying that. But I hope
  I would have.
- Q. Did you tell Evelyn Kendrick at that meeting that this was her fault?

```
1
         Α.
              No.
2
         Q. Did you tell her any words to the effect that
    it was partly her fault?
3
 4
         Α.
              No.
5
               Let us look at the October -- before we bring
6
    it up, the October 8, 1993 Awake Magazine, that is
7
    Exhibit 37.
               Is that stipulated into evidence?
9
               MR. McCABE: So stipulated, your Honor.
10
               THE COURT: All right. Thirty-seven is in.
11
                 (Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 37
12
                  was admitted into evidence)
13
    BY MR. SIMONS:
14
         Q. This issue of Awake is dated October 8, 1993.
15
    Correct?
16
         Α.
              Correct.
17
         Ο.
               And you would have received it and reviewed
18
    it?
19
         A. Yes.
20
              Studied it?
         Q.
21
         A. Yes.
22
               Tried to do what is taught in there?
         Q.
23
         A. Correct.
24
         Q.
              And this was just about a month before your
25
    meeting at the Kendrick household?
```

1 Α. Correct. 2 And if we could look at page 4. Ο. 3 You knew looking down on page 4 here on the 4 second paragraph that: 5 "Adult society often unwittingly 6 corroborates with child abusers. How so? By 7 refusing to be aware of this danger and by 8 fostering a hush-hush attitude about it." 9 You knew that. Right? 10 Α. Yes. 11 And did you tell anyone in the congregation, Q. 12 the parents in the congregation who have an obligation 13 to protect their children, that Jonathan Kendrick had 14 sexually molested a child? 15 Α. There was no need to. If we, upon observing 16 Jonathan Kendrick, we saw him isolating a child, we saw 17 him getting close to a child, then we would inform the 18 parents. 19 Well, you didn't see anything with regards to Ο. 20 how Jonathan Kendrick had abused Andrea. Correct? 21 Α. Yes. 22 And you knew from these publications that 23 child abusers operate in secret. Correct? 24 Α. Correct. 25 And you knew that they don't usually have Q.

witnesses to child sex abuse. Correct? 1 2 A. Correct. 3 Q. And you knew that Jonathan Kendrick was 4 continuing to be active in the congregation. Right? 5 He was removed as a ministerial servant. Α. 6 But he was still a member in good standing? Q. 7 A. After he was removed, he was placed on 8 restrictions. 9 Q. Was he a member in good standing? 10 Α. No, not at that time. 11 Q. Did the congregation know that he was on 12 restrictions? 13 They probably were aware of it because he 14 would be restricted from commenting. They probably 15 noticed that. 16 Q. Were they aware of the fact that he posed a 17 threat to children of sexual abuse? 18 A. We didn't see that he posed a threat to 19 children. 20 Q. And you, therefore, kept a hush-hush attitude 21 about his sexual abuse of Andrea? 22 MR. McCABE: Objection; argumentative. 23 THE COURT: Overruled. 24 THE WITNESS: Well, you are trying to use the 25 "hush-hush attitude" as if we were a secret society, but

1 we are the ones that published this. And it --2 Let me get back to my thought. 3 It --4 Could you repeat your last thought? I lost 5 my thought. 6 BY MR. SIMONS: 7 Q. Let me just withdraw it. 8 Let's look at the last sentence of this 9 paragraph we are looking at: 10 "Ignorance and misinformation and 11 silence give safe haven to abusers, not their 12 victims." 13 You knew that. Correct? 14 Α. Yes. 15 Now, we have heard that the parents are the Q. 16 primary protectors of their children in Jehovah's 17 Witnesses. Correct? 18 Α. Correct. 19 And to do that, parents need to know what 20 risks they are going to protect their children against? 21 Α. Correct. 22 But they did not know in this congregation 23 that one of the risks to protect their children against 24 was that Jonathan Kendrick had already sexually molested 25 one child?

- A. They do know this material that we are referring to, and they should have studied this and been aware. And if they saw any danger in the congregation, that this would alert them to the danger.
  - Q. Well, we know that these child sexual abusers -- and we knew in 1993 from the article in the Awake that these child sexual abusers don't necessarily give out clues. They operate in secret.

Didn't we know that?

A. Yes.

Q. And so the best way to allow parents to protect their children in the congregation is to identify for them the individuals who are positively identified already as having sexually molested a child.

Don't you agree?

- A. How about identifying the traits of individuals. And you can look at a person, and if he shows those traits, and then you have a suspicion, don't let your child go with that. If you have a suspicion, you are under no obligation to let your child go with that person.
- Q. Well, from the last Awake Magazine that we looked at, we know that one of those traits might be they are a pleasant, well-liked church group leader?
  - A. That's true. That has happened.

- 1 Wouldn't it have been much more helpful to Ο. 2 the parents in the congregation to know what to look for 3 with Jonathan Kendrick and to protect their own children 4 if they knew that he had sexually molested a child? 5 I think this information gives them good 6 ammunition to look at individuals to see how they line 7 up to these situations, and if they would want to trust 8 their children with them. And they can make a call on 9 that. 10 Q. Let's look up the next part of page 4. 11 Sexually Molested. 12 This references: 13 "The Catholic Conference of Bishops 14 concluded that it was a general conspiracy of 15 silence that allowed gross child abuse to 16 persist among the Catholic clergy for 17 decades." 18 And you knew that in 1993 of October. 19 Correct? 20 Α. Correct. 21 Q. That's all for that exhibit. Thank you. 22 Did you know in 1993 that sexual molestation of a child was a secular crime? 23 24 Α. Yes.
  - Q. And did you know -- I think it was said

```
1
    earlier that you offered to the Kendricks -- Evelyn and
 2
    Andrea -- that they could go to the police if they
 3
    chose. Correct?
 4
         Α.
                Correct.
 5
          Q.
                Did you encourage them to go to the police?
 6
                We didn't encourage them; we didn't
         Α.
 7
    discourage them. It was up to them.
 8
                If the police had contacted you regarding
         0.
 9
    what was admitted by Jonathan Kendrick in this meeting,
10
    would you have told them?
11
                I would first call Legal.
          Α.
12
         Q.
               Now, Mr. Abrahamson, in fairness to you, all
13
    of your instruction and training and education in how to
14
    address child sexual abuse when it came to your
15
    congregation came to you through Watchtower New York?
16
         Α.
               Correct.
17
                And it is true that this was not the first
18
     instance of child sexual abuse that you had been called
19
    upon to look into?
20
                I believe it may have been one of the first.
         Α.
21
               All right. Let's see if your deposition at
         Q.
22
    page 130, line 3 through 7?
23
               MR. McCABE: Can we have a minute before that
24
    is shown, your Honor.
25
                THE COURT: Sure.
```

```
1
               MR. McCABE: What line it is, counsel?
2
               MR. SIMONS: Three through seven.
3
               MR. McCABE: 130?
 4
               MR. SIMONS: Yes. Page 130. Am I on the
5
    right page? Sexual abuse.
6
               MR. McCABE: I don't seem to have it. Sexual
7
    abuse.
8
               Your Honor, I'm going to object. Can we
9
    approach the bench?
10
               THE COURT: You may.
11
                (Sidebar discussion at the bench)
12
                (Whereupon, video recording was played)
13
    BY MR. SIMONS:
14
         Q. All right. Had there been other
15
    investigations that you had participated in, in your
16
    years of service as an elder, which involved allegations
17
    of sexual abuse of a child?
18
         A. Yes.
19
                     (Whereupon, video recording was stopped)
20
    BY MR. SIMONS:
21
         Q. After this meeting in the Kendrick home, did
22
    Jonathan Kendrick continue to go into field service?
23
         A. Yes, he did.
24
         Q. And he would go into field service with other
25
    members of the congregation?
```

1 Α. Yes. 2 Ο. And on occasions, that would include 3 children? 4 Α. No. 5 Q. Never? 6 Α. Never. 7 And was Jonathan Kendrick continued to be Q. 8 called "brother" within the Jehovah's Witnesses? 9 Yes. Α. 10 Q. And he continued to go to homes of people for 11 Bible study? 12 Α. Yes. 13 Q. And he continued to go to Kingdom Hall, of 14 course? 15 Α. Yes. 16 Let's talk about the Conti family a little Q. 17 bit, Mr. Abrahamson. You were aware that problems had 18 developed in their marriage? 19 Α. Yes. 20 And, in fact, Kathleen had stopped coming to 21 activities almost completely in the last year or so of 22 their marriage. Correct? 23 Α. Yes. 24 And you knew that she was having serious 25 mental health problems? Correct?

1 A. Correct.

- Q. You had observed, yourself, what we might call certain bizarre activity by her?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. What can you describe for us that you had observed?
  - A. I had observed her not attending the meetings.
  - Q. And when you did observe her, did you observe activity by her or actions by her or hear words by her, anything that you observed in her that made you feel that she was a person with mental health problems?
    - A. I can't think of any specifics, no.
  - Q. Do you have a general impression that her behavior was -- I will use a very lay term, flakey.
  - A. Well, with Candace's testimony, she did have a difficult time, and apparently she was not a very good mother.
    - Q. What did you observe in that respect?
  - A. I just basically observed them when they were at the Kingdom Hall. And she maybe cried or had an emotional upset at times, and perhaps ran out of the Kingdom Hall. I can't even absolutely say I remember that, it happening like that, but it could have happened. It does happen.

1 So it is fair to say that these many years 2 later -- 17 years later -- you don't really have a 3 recollection of Candace Conti's mother being unable to 4 care for her? 5 Not a serious -- something serious that would Α. 6 prevent her from caring for her daughter. 7 But you knew that she had stopped coming to Q. 8 the meetings? 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. And that was probably for a year or so before 11 the couple divorced? 12 Α. Yes. 13 So you knew that Candace Conti's mother had Q. 14 stopped coming, not only to meetings, but to field 15 service? 16 Α. Yes. 17 Ο. And to Bible study groups? 18 Α. Right. 19 And to people's homes for the meetings? Q. 20 Α. Right. 21 And to social events. Correct? Q. 22 Yes. She apparently did not want to be one Α. 23 of the Jehovah's Witnesses. 24 Q. And so you knew that she was in no position

to be able to protect her daughter from sexual abuse by

```
1
    from someone like Jonathan Kendrick?
               MR. McCABE: Objection; calls for a
2
3
    conclusion; speculation.
 4
               THE COURT: Sustained.
5
    BY MR. SIMONS:
6
         Q. Now, Neal Conti still continued to come to
7
    Jehovah's Witnesses events and meetings and publishings.
    Correct?
9
         A. Yes.
10
         Q. Do you recall that there were times that he
    was unable to do so because he had to stay home with
11
12
    Kathy?
13
               It probably happened. I didn't hear maybe
14
    why he was missing. But he was missing, I'm sure.
15
         Q.
               And on those occasions, Candace would
16
    sometimes be there by herself?
17
               I don't recall that.
18
               Did you pay any particular attention to
19
    Candace Conti as an at-risk child within the
20
    congregation who someone like Jonathan Kendrick might
21
    try to take advantage of?
22
               I wouldn't single her out as one that -- she
         Α.
23
    was a happy fun-loving child as I recall.
24
               MR. SIMONS: Nothing further, your Honor.
25
    Thank you.
```

1	THE COURT: Mr. McCabe?
2	MR. McCABE: Thank you, your Honor.
3	
4	CROSS-EXAMINATION
5	BY MR. McCABE:
6	Q. Mr. Abrahamson, where do you live?
7	A. I live in Fremont.
8	Q. What kind of dwelling do you live in?
9	Apartment complex? Single-family dwelling?
10	A. In a single family dwelling.
11	Q. How many houses are on your particular street
12	or block?
13	A. Our block is short. It's probably just 25
14	houses. Twelve on each side.
15	Q. Do you know your neighbors?
16	A. Yeah, for the most part.
17	Q. Do they know you?
18	A. Yeah.
19	Q. Are you married?
20	A. I am.
21	Q. What is your wife's name?
22	A. Leslie.
23	Q. Do you have any children?
24	A. We have four children.
25	Q. Do you still have them?

1 Yeah, we do. They are not at home, but we Α. 2 still have them. 3 Q. How old are they? 4 Thirty-six down to 27. Α. 5 Are your children married? Q. 6 Three of them are married; one is not. Α. 7 Where did you go to high school? Q. 8 I went to high school in Palo Alto High Α. 9 School. 10 Ο. Did you participate in any sports or any activities in high school? 11 12 A little bit of basketball. Α. 13 Q. And when did you graduate? 14 In the Class of '72. Α. 15 Or, no. 16 Yes, it was the Class of '72. 17 Ο. 1972? 18 Or '70. Might be '70. I'm sorry. Α. 19 Well, we won't hold you to that. So sometime Q. 20 in the seventies you graduated from high school? 21 Yeah. I'm trying to think of what class it Α. 22 was. 23 Did you go to any other educational Q. 24 institution after you graduated from Palo Alto High 25 School?

```
1
          Α.
                No, I did not.
 2
          Ο.
                Are you employed?
 3
          Α.
                Yes, I am.
 4
                What do you do for employment?
          Q.
 5
          Α.
                I do janitorial.
 6
                What kind of janitorial work do you do?
          Q.
 7
                Office buildings.
          Α.
 8
                When do you do your work?
          Q.
 9
                In the evening, generally.
          Α.
10
          Q.
                How long have you been doing that?
11
                About 40 years.
          Α.
12
          Q.
                Has that been your principle occupation since
13
    you left high school?
14
          Α.
                Yes.
15
                And you own your own business?
          Q.
16
                Yes.
          Α.
17
                Mr. Simons asked you some details about your
18
    being an elder. Tell us, when were you baptized into
19
    the Jehovah's Witnesses?
20
          Α.
                I was baptized in 1970.
21
                How old were you?
          Q.
22
                I was 17.
          Α.
23
                And where did you attend meetings at that
          Q.
24
     time?
25
          Α.
               At that time, we were in the Palo Alto
```

1 Congregation. 2 Ο. When did you move to the North Fremont 3 Congregation? 4 We moved in 1986. Α. 5 And when you moved in 1986, had you already 6 been appointed an elder in the Palo Alto? 7 Α. Yes. 8 And tell us how you get to be an elder? Ο. 9 Well, there are scriptural qualifications 10 that are outlined in scriptures such as First Timothy, Chapter 3. And these qualifications must be met before 11 12 an individual like myself would be recommended as an 13 elder. 14 And who recommends you to be an elder? Q. 15 The body of elders. Α. 16 So the already existing elders? Q. 17 Α. It's already existing. 18 Who do they make the recommendation to? Q. 19 They make the recommendation to the Α. 20 Watchtower Society. 21 How much time do you spend currently in your Q. 22 duties as an elder in the North Fremont Congregation? 23 I spend about 20 hours a week. Α. 24 Q. And was that true back in the mid-1990s when 25 the details of this case occurred?

1 Α. Yes. 2 Does it vary from time to time? Ο. 3 Α. Oh, yeah. 4 Do you sometimes spend more time? Q. 5 Α. Yes. 6 Are you paid for your work as an elder? Q. 7 No. Α. 8 So your work is voluntary in the Q. 9 congregation? 10 Α. Yes. 11 And do you get any training as an elder after Q. 12 you are appointed? 13 Yes. We do have schools that we go to. 14 just completed a week course, five days, and it was an 15 intense Bible study. And we went through a lot of 16 points on shepherding, teaching, evangelizing. 17 And do you have any other training that you 18 get from Watchtower on being an elder, other than these 19 schools? 20 Well, we have a ministry school that we have Α. 21 each week at our meeting. 22 And what does that train you to do? Q. 23 That trains you to be a better evangelizer, Α. 24 better teacher, better shepherd. 25 Okay. And you have heard some talk about Q.

1 letters that the body of elders gets from the Watchtower 2 Bible and Tract Society. 3 Does that provide also education instruction? 4 Α. Absolutely. 5 Q. And do you read those letters? 6 Oh, yes. Α. 7 You have also seen some information about the Q. 8 Watchtower and Awake Magazines back in the '90s. How did you obtain those magazines? 10 Α. The magazines would come through the mail by 11 subscription. 12 Q. Do they still come that way? 13 Α. Not any longer. 14 How do you get them now? Q. 15 At our Kingdom Hall. Α. And back in the '90s, were members of the 16 Q. 17 congregation encouraged to have a subscription of the 18 Watchtower Magazine? 19 Yes. Most congregation members did have a Α. 20 subscription. So they got the magazine a little bit 21 before the date. 22 When you say "a little bit before the date," Q. 23 how in advance of the publication date would you get 24 your subscription?

Probably a month before the publication date,

25

Α.

1 maybe even longer. Now, we talked, too, about your memory of 2 Ο. 3 what happened in November of 1993. Do you have a clear 4 memory of going to the Kendrick home for that meeting? 5 Yes. Yes. I have a clear memory of that. I 6 have a clear memory of where we sat in the house. 7 Where did you sit in the house? Q. 8 Α. It was in the kitchen. 9 Did you bring anything with you to that Q. 10 meeting? 11 Α. Yes. I brought my Bible with me. 12 Did Mr. Clarke bring his Bible? Q. 13 Α. Yes. 14 And did you use the Bible during that Q. 15 meeting? 16 Α. Absolutely. 17 Ο. Do you recall how the meeting started? 18 I started with a prayer. Α. 19 Q. Okay. 20 And knowing their circumstances, I wanted to Α. 21 make sure they felt relaxed and comfortable. So I do 22 remember in my prayer I prayed that, especially, Andrea, 23 that she could relax -- it might be embarrassing for 24 her. It might be hard for her to tell. But we wanted 25 to know the truth about what happened.

```
1
                And then for Evelyn, that she probably felt
    devastated by the sexual abuse on a couple of different
 2
    levels; the fact that she is a wife, and the fact that
 3
    she is a mother too. So I wanted to make sure I
 4
 5
    included her in the prayer.
 6
              And do you remember saying that prayer out
         Q.
 7
    loud?
 8
         Α.
               Yes.
 9
                And this is all sitting around the kitchen
         Q.
10
    table?
11
         Α.
               Yes.
12
         Q.
               How long did you know Evelyn Kendrick?
13
         Α.
                Probably, I would say about four years.
14
                Was she a quiet woman?
         Q.
15
                She was not as loud as her husband.
         Α.
16
                Was she able to speak her mind?
         Q.
17
                She was. She was a strong woman that way.
         Α.
18
                I would like to show you an exhibit --
         Q.
19
                Number 98. I believe it is in evidence.
20
                I believe it is your Exhibit 9.
21
                MR. SIMONS: My Exhibit 9.
22
                THE COURT: No objection?
23
               MR. SIMONS: I think it is in evidence
24
    already. It is Exhibit 9. It was a dual exhibit.
25
                THE COURT: Out of abundance of caution,
```

```
1
    without question, it is now in.
 2
                  (Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 9
 3
                   and Defendant's Exhibit Number 98
 4
                   was admitted into evidence)
 5
    BY MR. McCABE:
 6
               You saw this with Mr. Simons showed it to
         Ο.
 7
    you?
         Α.
               Correct.
 9
                Did you write the letter?
         Q.
10
         Α.
                I did not write the letter.
11
                Did you sign the letter?
         Q.
12
         Α.
                It appears that I did not sign the letter.
13
         Q.
                Were you aware of it being sent from the
14
    North Fremont Congregation in 1993 to the Watchtower?
15
         Α.
                Yes.
16
         Q.
                Did you discuss the letter with Mr. Clarke?
17
         Α.
                Right.
18
                Did you have a discussion with him, an
    exchange back and forth about what you would put in the
19
20
    letter, or did you just read the letter after it was
21
    typed up.
22
               My recollection's not real clear about that.
         Α.
23
    I'm not sure how that came about.
24
         Q. Does the letter mention anything about
25
    Vicodin?
```

1 Α. Anything about what? 2 Ο. Vicodin. 3 Α. Vicodin? No. It never was mentioned. 4 Why was it not mentioned in the letter? Q. 5 Because we did not hear that when we went on Α. 6 the call. 7 So Andrea did not bring up that she had taken Q. 8 a Vicodin when you visited the Kendrick home in November 9 of 1993? 10 Α. Not at all. 11 Did Evelyn bring anything up about a Vicodin Q. 12 when you were there? 13 Α. No. 14 Was there any discussion between yourself, Q. 15 Mr. Clarke, and the Kendricks, about the extent of the abuse of Andrea Kendrick, other than the touching of her 16 17 breasts? That was it. 18 Α. 19 How large is the congregation in North 20 Fremont? 21 It is about a hundred and twelve publishers Α. 22 currently. 23 What do you mean by "publishers"? Q. 24 Α. The ones that are publishing the Good News. 25 They're active witnesses. You might see them in your

1 neighborhood going door-to-door. So they are a 2 publisher with their book bag and talking to the 3 neighbors. 4 Q. And that is a practice that you have engaged 5 in since you have been a Witness? 6 Α. Yes. 7 And most Witnesses do the same thing? Q. 8 Α. Yes. 9 What is your position on the body of elders? Q. 10 Α. I am a service overseer. 11 Could you tell the jury what that means to be Q. 12 service overseer? Okay. We refer to our work as evangelizers 13 14 as field service. We go from door-to-door. We go out 15 into the field. And it probably is an offshoot from 16 going out and harvesting. 17 That jesus said, "Our harvest is the world." 18 And the field is a world. So we go out and try to Witness, door and door, to all that we can. 19 20 Okay. And what are your responsibilities as Q. 21 a service overseer on the body of elders? 22 As service overseers, things that are related Α. 23 to the field ministry, such as make sure we have 24 literature so that they can use it in the ministry. 25 Make sure that we have territory that we can

```
1
    go to, and we won't be going to one territory until we
 2
    complete the other territories. So we do it in a
 3
    systematic way, so people don't feel overwhelmed, like
 4
    we are coming too often, to try to only come after we
 5
    complete one territory.
 6
                And any other matters that are related to the
 7
    ministry field service. So I would be the service
 8
    overseer taking care of those things.
 9
                Before people in your congregation go out to
10
    neighborhoods, do they have a meeting somewhere to
11
    discuss what they are going to do?
12
         Α.
                Yes. We call that a meeting for field
13
     service.
14
                And where is that meeting held?
         Q.
15
                Generally, it is held at the Kingdom Hall.
16
                Okay. Do you preside over that meeting from
         Q.
17
    time to time?
18
         Α.
                Yes.
19
               How often?
         Q.
20
                I preside over that meeting, probably, twice
         Α.
21
    a week.
22
                Okay. Was that true back in 1993?
         Q.
23
                It might have been more often, but that would
          Α.
24
    be a good guess. Probably twice a week.
25
               How about '94 and '95?
         Q.
```

- A. At least twice a week, probably more.
- Q. And in that meeting that you preside over as a field service overseer, do you arrange groups for people? Do you assign partners? How do you do it?
- A. Yes, we assign partners. Let's say the jury was my group. So maybe the first four would go together, the second four would go together, and the last six might go together, and the couple, we can split up.

Not that they were a couple. We wouldn't split up families, but he would go with the first group, she would go with the second group.

- Q. Do people ever come to that meeting for field service who already have partners?
  - A. Oh, yes.

- Q. Would you ever assign back in the 1990s a single male to work with a single female in a car to go alone?
  - A. No. That would not be appropriate.
- Q. Would you ever assign someone's child to work with another adult member of the congregation, let's say a member of the opposite sex, back in the 1990s?
  - A. No.
  - Q. Why not?
- A. It wouldn't be appropriate. And articles

1 like this, there is always that possibility of child 2 molestation. So we want to protect our children. 3 love our children. 4 And when you say "articles like this," what 5 are you referring to? 6 The article on molestation -- child Α. 7 molestation, and the fact that you can protect your 8 children. 9 Did you ever have an occasion back in the Q. 10 1990s where parents would drop off a child or children 11 to go out in the field of ministry and not accompany 12 them themselves? It was rare. And if it happened, then we 13 Α. 14 would talk to the parent to help them to appreciate that 15 the children are their responsibility. They come out 16 with their children. They don't drop them off for 17 someone else to care for. 18 Did you ever assign Jonathan Kendrick to Q. 19 conduct one of these meetings for field service? 20 Α. No. 21 Did you ever assign Jonathan Kendrick to work 22 with Candace Conti in the field ministry?

Did you ever see Jonathan Kendrick working in

23

24

25

Α.

No.

the field ministry with Candace Conti?

1 A. No.

4

5

9

10

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Now, you mentioned that there was five meetings a week?
  - A. Correct.
  - Q. A meeting every day of the week or what?
- A. Okay. We have two meetings that we consider on Sunday, and then the three meetings are on a date during the mid-week.
  - Q. So, really, you only have two dates from which you conduct all five meetings?
- 11 A. Correct.
- Q. And how long -- when you have the three meetings, how long does that last?
- 14 A. It lasts about an hour and a half.
- Q. And the two meetings?
- A. About an hour and a half as well.
- Q. What are the two meetings that you have on Sunday?
- 19 A. The two meetings on Sunday are:
  - (1) we have a discussion of the Watchtower Magazine that is an hour. And prior to that, we have a public talk. Talks designed for people that would come into the congregation. They would get a good understanding of what the Bible says on a particular subject.

Q. And when you say a "Watchtower discussion," what do you mean by that?

A. That we receive a study issue of our Watchtower Magazine, and then we study this magazine and prepare ourselves each week to come to the meeting. And we can offer comments on that issue of the Watchtower that we are studying.

For example, last week, it just happened to be "Don't look at the things behind."

And it referenced Lot's wife, who turned into a pillar of salt, if you might remember, because she did look at the things behind. And how can we apply that to today? How can we not have that attitude of looking behind. And it was an enjoyable study.

- Q. How is it conducted?
- A. There is a Watchtower study conductor. And so he asks the questions, and then the audience is allowed to give comments. And then we have a reader that reads each paragraph before it is discussed.
  - Q. So can children answer in that discussion?
- A. We have a lot of our children answering that discussion.
- Q. How many children do you have presently in the North Fremont Congregation?
- A. We have, probably, 30 that are under twelve.

- 1 Is that in addition to the hundred members? Ο. 2 Yeah. Most of those would not be publishers, Α. 3 veah. 4 O. So what would be your attendance at a typical 5 Sunday meeting? 6 Our attendance would usually be over a Α. 7 hundred, a hundred and twelve or fifteen. 8 Q. Let's talk about the Conti family for a 9 minute. Did you know them in 1994? 10 Α. Yes, I did. 11 Who did the family consist of? Q. 12 It consisted of Kathy, the mother; Candace, Α. 13 the daughter; and Neal, the father. 14 Ο. Were there any other children ever in 15 attendance at the meetings with the Conti's? 16 Α. Yes. They had a -- Neal had a son from 17 another marriage, and I believe his name was Ricky. 18 Did he attend meetings with the Conti family Q. 19 too? 20 When he was with the Conti family, they came Α. 21 to the meetings and they brought him with them as well.
  - Q. Was there ever a time that you observed Candace Conti at a meeting in the Kingdom Hall on a Sunday by herself, without one of her parents?
- 25 A. I never observed her alone.

22

23

1 Did you ever observe her on a weeknight Ο. 2 meeting at the Kingdom Hall without one of her parents 3 being present? 4 No. And if I did, I would wonder how did she Α. 5 get here. 6 Did you ever observe her being dropped off at Q. 7 the Kingdom Hall by one or both of her parents for a meeting for field service? 9 Α. No. 10 Q. Now, during this meeting with the Kendrick 11 family, did you end it with prayer? 12 Α. Yes. 13 Before you ended, did you give any scriptural Q. 14 admonitions to Mr. Kendrick about his behavior? 15 Α. Yes. 16 And did you do that in front of Andrea and in 0. 17 front of Evelyn Kendrick? 18 Α. Yes. 19 Do you recall what any of that admonition Q. 20 was? 21 Well, specifically, I can't remember what Α. 22 scriptures we used. But it might have been scriptures 23 such as those that practice the works of the flesh, 24 which include fornication, uncleanness, lude conduct

25

will not inherit God's kingdom.

1 So Jonathan was in store for not inheriting 2 God's kingdom if he were to continued with the abuse. 3 0. Did he tell you whether or not he intended to continue the abuse? 4 5 He said that he was not going to, that he was 6 ashamed of what he had done, and he would not continue, 7 he would absolutely not do the abuse to anyone. 8 Q. Did you believe him when he said he was 9 ashamed of what he had done? I did believe him. 10 Α. 11 Is that what led you to conclude that his Q. 12 touching of Andrea had been more than inadvertent? 13 Α. Yes. 14 Q. Did he provide any other details of what he had done? 15 16 Α. Not to my recollection. 17 He didn't tell you that this touching took place in Andrea's bedroom while she was asleep? 18 19 No. He said it was on the couch, that she Α. 20 was on the couch. 21 After this meeting, did you meet back at the Q. 22 Kingdom Hall with the body of elders at some time? 23 Α. Yes. 24 Q. Did you personally partake in that meeting? 25 Α. Yes.

- 1 Did you personally inform the elders of what Ο. 2 you learned at that meeting with the Kendrick family? 3 Α. Correct. 4 What did you tell them? 5 We told them what Jonathan told us, that Α. 6 Andrea was asleep on the couch, and he came in and 7 touched her breasts and she woke up. Ο. Did the elders come to any conclusion after 9 you informed them of this fact? 10 Α. Yes. They concluded that no longer was he qualified to serve as a ministerial servant. 11 12 And was he then removed at that time? Q. 13 Α. Yes. 14 And when a person is removed as a ministerial Q. 15 servant, how often does that happen in your experience 16 in the years that you have been in the North Fremont 17 Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses? 18 It is rare. Offhand, I can't think of anyone Α. 19 else, but I know there is. There is others, but nobody 20 comes to my mind. So that is rare. 21 Announcing someone is no longer serving as a 22 ministerial servant in the congregation can be a 23 significant announcement?
  - A. It is a big deal.

24

Q. Do you recall after this meeting that -- did

1 the Kendrick family stay together? 2 Α. They did stay together. 3 Do you know for how long? 4 I think it was a couple years after this Α. 5 meeting that they separated and divorced. 6 Did you ever learn, personally, after the Q. 7 meeting at the Kendrick home that Evelyn and Andrea 8 reported the matter to the police? 9 I did not know at the time that they did. Α. 10 Q. A couple years later you found out? 11 Α. Yes. A couple of years later I found out. 12 Do you know when? Q. 13 Α. I do know when we wrote a letter to the 14 Oakley Congregation. I knew at that time. 15 Q. Do you recall when that was? 16 Α. 1998. 17 Ο. But you didn't know it in 1994? 18 Α. No. 19 The Fremont Police never contacted you in the Q. 20 1994? 21 Α. No. 22 District Attorney's office never contacted Q. 23 you? 24 Α. No. 25 What about the Child Protective Services? Q.

1 Α. No. 2 How about the Alameda County Probation Ο. 3 offices? 4 Α. No. 5 Do you recall how you learned that they had 6 gone to the police? 7 That they had gone to the police? Α. 8 Yes. How did you learn? Ο. 9 We wrote a letter of introduction to the Α. 10 Oakley Congregation. In that letter we stated that they 11 did go to the police. And I think it is one of the 12 other elders that came by that knowledge, because I did 13 not come by that knowledge until after the meeting. 14 So Evelyn never kept you informed? Q. 15 Didn't inform me personally, no. Α. 16 Was Evelyn a member of the congregation in Ο. 17 North Fremont at the time of this meeting? 18 I think she probably would have been. She 19 wasn't actively coming to the meetings at that time. 20 What about Andrea? Q. 21 Andrea -- I don't think that Andrea was Α. 22 attending the meetings either at that time. 23 Do you recall when it was that the Kendrick Q. 24 family broke up? When did Jonathan and Evelyn separate? 25 I would think it would be around '95, '96. Α.

So you are not sure when? 1 Ο. 2 Α. I'm not sure when. 3 But it was a significant time after your 4 visit with Mr. Clarke to the Kendrick home? 5 Α. Yes. 6 Do you know where Jonathan lived after the Q. 7 separation? I'm speaking of Jonathan Kendrick. 9 Jonathan Kendrick. I believe that he lived Α. in the garage of the Francis home, the Francis family. 10 11 And who is the Francis family? Q. 12 Α. They were a member of our congregation at 13 that time. 14 And who is it? Ο. 15 Rod Francis, Claudia Francis, and they had 16 two sons. 17 And Rod would be the father and husband? Ο. 18 Α. Yes. 19 Was he a member of the body of elders in Q. 20 1993? 21 In 1993, I believe that he was. Α. 22 Do you know how long he had been with the Q. 23 body of elders of the North Fremont Congregation in 1993? 24 25 A. I don't think it was too long. It was a

1 short time -- months -- years -- a few years. 2 Do you know how long Mr. Kendrick resided in 3 the garage of the Francis family? 4 I don't know exactly. Α. 5 After this meeting with the Kendrick family 6 in November of 1993, did you ever observe Candace Conti 7 sitting on Jonathan Kendrick's lap at the Kingdom Hall? Α. No. 9 Did you ever observe Candace Conti sitting on Q. 10 his lap during a meeting at the Kingdom Hall? 11 Absolutely not. Α. 12 Q. Did you ever observe her sitting on his lap 13 before or after? 14 Α. No. 15 During the same time period, did you ever Q. 16 observe Jonathan Kendrick giving Candace Conti a big 17 bear hug in the Kingdom Hall? 18 Α. No. You never saw anything like that? 19 20 Α. No. 21 Did you ever observe Jonathan Kendrick Q. 22 leaving the Kingdom Hall property with Candace Conti alone in his vehicle? 23 24 Α. No. Absolutely not. 25 MR. McCABE: Your Honor, might this be a good

1 time to take a break? 2 THE COURT: It is. We will take a break. 3 will take our lunch break. I will see everybody back 4 here promptly at 1:30. 5 And counsel, let me also tell you that this 6 coming Friday, I'm going to be performing a number of 7 additional functions in this particular matter. So 8 Friday is on me. 9 I will be working on this case listening to 10 things and having decisions. You will have the day off. 11 We will keep on our same time frame that I have given to you relative to when the case will be over. 12 13 Remember, the following Thursday and Friday 14 I'm in Sacramento with judicial responsibilities also. 15 But I'm not changing anything I told you as to the 16 expected date. We want this to go to your consideration 17 for decision, but I do want to tell you about this 18 Friday. 19 So we will see everybody at 1:30. 20 (Whereupon, the following proceedings 21 were heard outside the presence of jurors) 22 THE COURT: There is a differences in the 23 books I want to get cleaned up. 24 MR. SIMONS: Yes. On the Awakes, you are 25 right. My apologies.

```
1
                THE COURT: No apology necessary. I just
2
    want to make sure my record is in good order.
3
               MR. SIMONS: Yes. No. It's 17 and 37 are
 4
    the defense numbers.
5
               THE COURT: And I agree. I just want to make
6
    sure we cleaned up the record.
7
               Now, in the same vein, I have quite a lunch
8
           I do want to make a decision I need to make in
    hour.
    terms of getting witnesses this afternoon. It was
10
    originally referenced in Plaintiff's Number 10. There
11
    is a letter. First of all, I want to find it, so I can
12
    take a look at it during my so-called lunch hour.
13
                It is the Defense 99. Do we agree, Mr.
14
    Simons?
15
               MR. SIMONS: Yes.
16
                THE COURT: All right. So I will take a look
17
    at Defense 99. And I will come back and greet you all
    at 1:15, so I can do whatever we need to do.
18
19
                    (Lunch recess)
20
              (Whereupon, the following proceedings
21
             were heard outside the presence of jurors)
22
                THE COURT: Back on the record in the matter
23
    of the Candace Conti versus The Watchtower Bible and
24
    Tract Society of New York Inc., et al. I am getting
25
    better relative to the joint presentation here.
```

```
1
               Regarding, I believe, the letter that counsel
2
    is wishing to address -- I could be wrong. But it seems
    to me it could be the filter I used was Defendant's 99.
3
 4
               And then according to the joint exhibit book
5
    that is Plaintiff's 10. So Plaintiff's 10 and
6
    Defendant's 99. Can we at least agree on that? Can I
7
    hear a symphony of yes?
8
               MR. SIMONS: Yes, your Honor.
9
                THE COURT: I had the same problem we had a
10
    little bit earlier today. The one layer I'm looking at
11
    has a significant redaction already superimposed.
12
                Does that lead me to believe that you would
    agree, at least, to redacting that portion which starts
13
14
    apparently after the word quote uncleanness, end of
15
    quote, and then goes down to the trust above.
16
                Is that an agreed upon redaction?
17
               MR. SIMONS: Yes.
18
                THE COURT: Now, what would you like me to
19
    do? What is the nature of the argument? Because not
20
    having seen the unredacted letter, I'm not sure what the
21
    debate is about.
22
               MR. SIMONS: The debate -- let's all get on
23
    the same page here.
24
               THE COURT: Mr. McCabe?
25
               MR. McCABE: Yes, your Honor.
                                               The two
```

```
1
    unredacted paragraphs we would like to see redacted are
    the second and third letter and they are talking about
2
3
    the religious discipline to be imposed by the
 4
    congregation or not to be imposed by the congregation.
5
                THE COURT: It may be that again -- and I may
6
    be repeating myself -- the letter I'm looking at already
7
    has that. I don't have another version.
8
               MR. McCABE: I'm sorry, your Honor. I have
9
    two here.
10
                THE COURT: All right. I see. And actually
11
    I don't have any thoroughly unredacted version. But
12
    defense counsel just gave me that same letter,
13
    December 3.
14
                The only thing redacted from that is
15
    paragraph 4 after, quote, in the future, end of quote.
16
               Now whose presentation is that? Is that
17
    Plaintiff's?
18
               MR. SIMMONS: As to the fourth paragraph,
19
    your Honor?
20
               THE COURT: Yes.
21
               MR. SIMMONS: The deleted paragraph is by
22
    agreement.
23
                THE COURT: That's by agreement. All right.
24
    Now on the bottom of the principle, I'm going to bounce
25
    back again. So we have got paragraph 4 by agreement,
```

```
1
    and then the debate goes as to paragraphs 2 and 3.
2
    Correct?
3
               MR. SIMMONS: Correct.
 4
               MR. McCABE: Correct.
5
                THE COURT: All right. Let's go to defense
6
    counsel.
 7
               MR. McCABE: Your Honor, both of these
8
    paragraphs, to me, speak of the disciplinary procedures
9
    that the religion would take based upon the definition
10
    of the sin, and what he confessed to.
11
                And in previous rulings, we were going to
12
    leave out anything to do with judicial and duty to
13
    disfellowship and/or recruiting, which these two
14
    paragraphs don't specifically state that that's what
15
    they're talking about.
16
                THE COURT: Mr. Simons, to you.
17
               MR. SIMMONS: Your Honor, I think, as to
18
    paragraph 2, the language has the language of the
19
    confession in it, and then --
20
                THE COURT: I'm not troubled by that.
21
               MR. SIMMONS: -- and then since this incident
22
    is known by outside members of the family, I would
23
    agree -- I think that from where it is appropriate
24
    forward from the rest of the sentence, I have no problem
25
    redacting.
```

```
1
               But "since the incident is known by outside
    members of the family" is a significant fact,
2
    particularly if we are going to be mentioning defamation
3
 4
    in the suits and that sort of thing in the opening
5
    statement as we did.
6
               THE COURT: Okay. And then what is your view
7
    of the next paragraph?
8
               MR. SIMMONS: The third paragraph -- you
9
    know, my original take was it not be redacted, but as I
10
    look at it again, I feel it should.
11
                THE COURT: Thank you. Because that was my
12
    opinion on the first read.
13
                So let's go back. I'm going to redact the
14
    third paragraph. I think it is in the nature of --
15
                "Essentially, since this incident is known by
16
    outside members of the family."
17
               Whose family are we talking about? Are we
18
    talking about the occasional family or the immediate
19
    family?
20
               MR. McCABE: We are talking about the
21
    Kendrick family, and we are talking about Toi Register.
22
                THE COURT: I don't know whom we are talking
23
    about. Do you agree with that conceptually?
24
               MR. SIMONS: I don't know about the Toi
25
    Register, but it certainly says it is known by outside
```

1 members of the family, and that, to me, seems to imply 2 that we are talking about the Kendricks and not members 3 of another family. 4 THE COURT: Give me a moment. 5 Yeah. I think is quite susceptible to any 6 number of interpretations. Here is what is going to be 7 deleted. 8 "It's only your repetition and confession to 9 what had happened:" 10 Starting with the sentence: 11 "incidence is known by outside members of the 12 family," forward is deleted through the following 13 paragraph. 14 And then "by your agreement -- " 15 (Interruption) 16 All right. So paragraph 4 is in, by your 17 agreement, is deleted, and those will be my orders. 18 Now, it is going to help me in terms of you, 19 so we don't have to keep doing this: If it is a jointly 20 agreed upon admissible exhibit -- because of the way you 21 set this binder up, dual reference -- Mr. Simons, if it 22 is going to be a jointly-admitted exhibit, just read 23 Plaintiff's 11 and Defendant's 100, or something, so we 24 have a clean record and we don't have all these 25 juxtapositions.

1	Is that fair?
2	MR. SIMMONS: Very much so.
3	THE COURT: All right. The record should
4	reflect, and I will confirm it, my orders as to what
5	was that exhibit number? Mr. Simons?
6	MR. SIMMONS: Yes. It was the one we just
7	discussed earlier that was 10/99.
8	THE COURT: Okay. I just want something so I
9	can make a record after we discussed it.
10	MR. SIMMONS: That was $14/101$ that we just
11	looked at.
12	THE COURT: All right. Forgive me. Mr.
13	Simons. Back to you.
14	Strike that.
15	Mr. McCabe?
16	MR. McCABE: I have no more questions, your
17	Honor.
18	MR. SCHNACK: Your Honor, I will pass the
19	witness.
20	THE COURT: Anything further of this witness?
21	MR. SIMMONS: Just briefly, yes.
22	
23	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. SIMMONS:
25	Q. Mr. Abrahamson, we talked a lot today with

1 both counsel about all of the different things you did 2 with regard to the congregation and Mr. Kendrick, et 3 cetera. All of the things we talked about today have 4 been things that you did within your scope of your 5 duties as an elder. Correct? 6 Α. Correct. 7 You mentioned in your cross-examination that 8 you believed that Mr. Kendrick was sincere in his 9 repentance; is that correct? 10 Α. Yes. 11 But you knew that he had lied to you about Q. 12 other things? 13 Α. Shaded the truth. Correct. 14 And weren't you of the understanding that Q. 15 child molesters always say that they are sincere in 16 their repentance? 17 Α. Yes. 18 And you mentioned Elder Francis, who was an 19 elder during that time. Did Elder Francis have some 20 health issues during this time in the '90s? 21 He currently has some health issues. I don't 22 know if it was during the mid-nineties. 23 Was there a time, if you recall, back in the Q.

mid-nineties, that you recall he was unable to attend to

24

25

his duties as an elder?

1 Yes, that is true. But it wasn't for health. Α. 2 But for whatever reasons, which we don't need Ο. 3 to hear about, there was a period of time in the 4 mid-90s, '94, '95, '96, in particular that Elder Francis 5 was unable to attend to his duties? 6 Α. Since you are being specific with dates, I 7 would just have to say, I don't know. I'm not sure. 8 MR. SIMMONS: Thank you. That's all that I 9 have on Redirect. 10 THE COURT: Mr. McCabe? 11 MR. McCABE: Nothing. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Schnack? 13 MR. SCHNACK: Nothing. 14 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You may step 15 down. 16 MR. SIMMONS: Your Honor, before we call the 17 next witness, there are three requests for admissions 18 that I'm going to introduce, I assume, by reading? 19 THE COURT: Yes. 20 MR. SIMMONS: These requests for admissions 21 are responses are dated December 8th of 2011. They are 22 verified by Gregory Allen on behalf of the Watchtower 23 Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc., and they are 24 Set 3, commencing with Request for Admission, Number 3. 25 And I direct you to Watchtower Bible Tract

1 Society, Number 3: 2 "Do you admit that during the time he performed services as an elder at the North 3 4 Congregation Fremont, between January 1st, 1993 and December 31, 1998, Gary Abrahamson 5 6 was acting as an agent of Watchtower Bible and 7 Tract Society of New York, Inc." 8 And response is: 9 "Defendant admits that between 10 January 1, 1993 and December 31, 1998, while 11 Gary Abrahamson was acting within the course and scope of his duties as an elder in the 12 13 North Congregation Fremont California, he was 14 acting as an agent of Watchtower Bible and 15 Tract Society of New York, Inc." 16 As to Number 4: 17 "Do you admit that during the time he 18 performed services as an elder at the North 19 Congregation Fremont, between January 1st, 20 1993 and December 31st, 1998, Michael Clarke 21 was acting as an agent of Watchtower Bible and 22 Tract Society of New York, Inc." 23 And the response: "Defendant admits that between 24 25 January 1st, 1993 and December 31, 1998, while

	Michael Clarke is acting within the course and
2	scope of his duties as an elder in the North
3	Congregation Fremont, California he was acting
4	as an agent of Watchtower Bible and Tract
5	Society of New York, Inc."
6	And our next witness, your Honor, pursuant to
7	Evidence Code 776, would be Mr. Clarke.
8	THE CLERK: All right, Mr. Clarke. Again,
9	you are being called as an adverse witness under the
10	Evidence Code.
11	MICHAEL CLARKE,
12	WAS DULY SWORN TO TELL THE TRUTH BY THE CLERK
13	AND TESTIFIED AS FOLLOWS:
14	
15	THE CLERK: Would you please state your name
16	and spell your first and last name for the record?
17	THE WITNESS: Michael Clarke. M-I-C-H-A-E-L.
18	Clarke. C-L-A-R-K-E.
19	THE COURT: And, Mr. Clarke if you need water
19 20	THE COURT: And, Mr. Clarke if you need water at any time, just let us know.
20	
20	at any time, just let us know.
<ul><li>20</li><li>21</li><li>22</li></ul>	at any time, just let us know.  DIRECT EXAMINATION

1 And you have served and continue to serve as Ο. 2 an elder at the North Congregation in Fremont? 3 Α. Yes. 4 When did you first become an elder in the 5 North Fremont Congregation? 6 Α. 1989. 7 And had you served as an elder anywhere 8 before that? 9 Yes, in Hayward. Α. 10 Q. And when did you first become an elder? 11 Α. 1977. 12 Q. Before serving as an elder, did you serve as 13 a ministerial servant? 14 Α. Yes. 15 And when did you first commence your service Q. 16 in that capacity? 17 Probably 1974, '75, somewhere around there. Α. 18 You continue to be an elder today? Q. 19 Α. Yes. 20 And at North Fremont? Q. 21 Α. Yes. 22 There, back in the 1990s, were meetings held Q. 23 regularly in the congregation and among the congregation 24 for many purposes. Correct? 25 Meetings held? Α.

1 Ο. Yes. 2 Α. Yes. 3 And some of these meetings were to study the Ο. 4 Bible or to study the teachings of Awake or Watchtower? 5 Α. Yes. 6 And these meetings would be held in homes. Q. 7 Correct? Α. Yes. 9 And many of the homes they would be held in 10 would be homes of congregation members other than 11 elders? 12 Α. Yes. 13 Q. Would you go to all of the meetings, 14 yourself? 15 Α. No. 16 Would there be one meeting for all of the Q. 17 congregation or would the congregation be broken up into 18 smaller groups for these meetings? 19 Well, the meeting you are referring to would Α. 20 be called a Congregation Bible Study, and it was held in 21 private homes. At the time, we may have had six or 22 seven locations. Most of them held in the homes of 23 elders. 24 And we had, generally, maybe 15 to 20 that 25 would attend the small groups, 10, 15 total. They were

1 held once a week, generally had one meeting, for an 2 hour. 3 But the other meetings that you might be 4 referring to were at the Kingdom Hall. 5 The meetings that were held in the homes, is 6 it correct that an elder would always be present? 7 Α. Yes. 8 But it would not necessarily be correct that 0. 9 more than one elder would be present? 10 Α. No. 11 Because there weren't enough elders for all Q. 12 the meetings. Correct? 13 A. Correct. 14 Q. And in these different meetings that would be 15 held, the elder would have a lot of responsibilities for 16 example, to chair and conduct the meeting? 17 Yes, he would. 18 And he would have to make the arrangements Q. 19 for where the meeting was going to be each week? 20 No. It was usually in the same home, usually Α. 21 his home. 22 What about when the meetings were held in Q. 23 other people's homes -- the congregation member's home? 24 Α. Was there a question there? 25 Yes. Would an elder have to make the Q.

1 arrangements for those meetings? 2 Α. No. It is pre-arranged. Sometimes it would 3 be there for years. 4 Who would decide which homes the Bible study Q. 5 meetings would be held in? 6 The body of elders. Α. 7 Were the Bible study meetings ever held in 8 the Kendrick home? 9 Α. No. 10 Q. Were they ever held in the Conti home? 11 Α. No. 12 Q. So for any such meetings that Mr. Kendrick 13 would have attended, he would have had to go someone 14 else's house? 15 Α. Yes. 16 And the same with Candace Conti? Ο. 17 Α. Yes. 18 Now, do you recall being contacted concerning 19 Jonathan Kendrick having committed some sort of 20 misconduct with his stepdaughter? 21 Α. Yes. 22 And how did you receive your very first 23 contact on the subject? 24 Α. I believe it was a phone call. 25 And do you recall who it was from? Q.

1 Α. Mr. Kendrick. 2 What were you told? Ο. 3 That he needed to talk with us about a Α. 4 serious matter. 5 And did he tell you what the matter was? Q. 6 I think he said inappropriate touching of his Α. 7 stepdaughter, or he might have said just a serious 8 matter. I don't recall exactly. It was just a quick 9 phone call and we set up a meeting. 10 Ο. How long between the phone call and the 11 meeting? 12 We met the same week. Α. 13 Q. And where did the meeting occur? 14 At the Kendrick home. Α. 15 Did you know Jonathan Kendrick before you Q. 16 were an elder in Fremont? 17 Α. No. 18 Was Jonathan Kendrick already a member of the Q. 19 congregation when you came to Fremont? 20 Α. I believe so. Yes. I came in '89, and I 21 think he was already there. 22 And do you recall, when you first met Q. 23 Mr. Kendrick, what your impression of him was? 24 Α. Just a quiet man. Outgoing, friendly. 25 Q. Did you like him?

- 1 A. Pretty much, yes.
- Q. And you call him "quiet." When you say he was a quiet man, what did you mean?
  - A. He didn't speak a lot. He wasn't a talker, anything like that. Just a quiet man.
    - Q. In the context of outside of the meetings, did you have some relationship with Mr. Kendrick?
  - A. No.

- Q. Did you, for example, ever go to his home for any reason, other than this meeting after the phone call?
- A. Probably a shepherding visit, as we call it.

  Probably just to get to know the family better. I don't recall if it was myself that went or I went with someone else. It was our practice, then, as it is now to make home visits. That's about the extent of it.
- Q. Did you ever have any social contact with Mr. Kendrick?
  - A. No, I don't think so. I don't recall.
- Q. For example, did you and anyone from your family have a dinner, share a meal with Mr. Kendrick and Evelyn Kendrick?
  - A. I don't recall. I don't think so.
- Q. Did you ever meet him at some social occasion at some location other than his house, for example,

1 maybe at the garage of the Conti house? 2 Α. I don't think so. I don't recall. It is a 3 long time ago. 4 You remember the Conti family? Q. 5 Α. Yes. 6 And do you remember Candace as a child? Q. 7 Α. Yes. 8 What do you remember about her? Q. 9 Just a happy little girl. Α. 10 Q. Do you recall her being a spunky child? 11 I don't know if she'd want me to call her Α. 12 spunky, but she was happy. 13 Q. And what do you recall about her mother, 14 Kathleen? 15 A. Not too much. She was a good mother, and she 16 really loved her daughter and still does, I'm sure. I 17 don't have too much of a recollection of her. I know 18 she had a lot of emotional things that she was dealing 19 with that we tried to help her with. 20 And do you recall at some point in the Q. 21 mid-nineties that those emotional difficulties became 22 overwhelming to her? 23 Α. Yes. We made several visits trying help 24 their marriage. 25 Q. And what did you observe, if anything, in

- 1 Mrs. Conti -- Kathleen, in terms of her conduct or 2 demeanor that you felt evidenced her emotional problems? 3 A. At times she was happy, and at times she was 4 sad. She had guite a few highs and lows. Some of our 5 visits, she was more positive than at other times. 6 When you say happy and sad, do you mean Q. 7 outside the range that we might consider to be kind of 8 normal, happy or sad for people? 9 I would say, it's a long road. I just 10 remember our concern for her and for the family and 11 trying to help her through this emotional time. 12 Q. Did you ever have a concern that she was 13 dysfunctional, unable to care for herself or her family? 14 I don't believe I had a concern like that, 15 no. 16 Q. What about Neal Conti? Were you friends with 17 him? 18 Α. Yes. 19 Q. And did you do social events of any kind with 20 Mr. Conti? 21 I don't recall social events. But we spoke 22 at each meeting.
  - A. Mostly a greeting. How are you today? How

more serious or in-depth discussion?

Q. Does that mean the nature of greeting or a

23

24

- 1 has your week been? What happened at work? Have you
- 2 | had any positive experiences in the door-to-door
- 3 | ministry? Things like that.
- Q. Would you describe the relationship you had with Mr. Conti as something deeper than just a
- 6 relationship?

7

- A. No. Not deeper, no.
- Q. Let's go back to the meeting at the Kendrick
  home. Who do you recall being present?
- 10 A. Gary Abrahamson, Mr. Kendrick,
- 11 Mrs. Kendrick, stepdaughter, Andrea, and myself.
- Q. And what do you recall being the first thing that happened at the meeting?
- A. Well, our pattern -- our habit is to open
  with a prayer. So I would have had Gary Abrahamson open
  with a prayer.
  - Q. What was the next thing that happened?
- A. Then we normally will read a scripture or
  two, trying to set a spiritual tone, and then we invited
  Mr. Kendrick to tell us why he had us come over.
- Q. Now, as you sit here today, even though many years have passed, you still have a recollection of that meeting, don't you?
- A. Yes. I reviewed my letter that you have a copy of.

1 And that helped refresh your recollection? Ο. 2 To a degree, yes. Α. 3 But you also remember sitting in the house? Ο. 4 Yes, I remember the chair I sat in. It faced Α. 5 the window. 6 And do you remember the room it was in? Q. 7 In the kitchen or dinette area. Α. 8 Do you remember seeing these people in your Ο. 9 mind's eye during that meeting? 10 Α. Yes. Very vividly. It's not something you 11 forget. 12 Q. And would it be fair to say that you have 13 been to hundreds and hundreds of such meetings with 14 different families that may have had some trouble -- not 15 necessarily childhood sexual issues, but some kind of 16 problems over the years? 17 Α. Yes. 18 And in these hundreds and hundreds of 19 meetings, this one stands out to you vividly. 20 Why is that? 21 Because it dealt with child abuse. Α. 22 And you knew, in 1993, at the time of this Q. 23 meeting, that that was a very serious subject? 24 Α. Yes, sir. 25 And what did Mr. Kendrick say when you Q.

invited him to speak?

A. He admitted to touching his daughter's chest while she was sleeping on the couch. He claims it was inadvertent, but, nonetheless, he said it happened three or four months previous, and it had been bothering his conscience, even though the family talked about it.

He asked his stepdaughter and his wife for forgiveness. They acknowledged that they had given their forgiveness, and they wanted to move on. And so he confessed to this one-time touching.

- Q. You used the word "inadvertent."

  Was that Mr. Kendricks's word?
- A. Yes. It was his words. Also, the daughter confirmed it.
- Q. When you say "the daughter," do you mean Andrea, the stepdaughter?
  - A. Andrea, the stepdaughter, yes.
- Q. And when you say she confirmed it, what do you mean?
  - A. She acknowledged that in her mind it was inadvertent. I think she used the word "accident." The room was dark, he claims, when he walked in the room, and she was lying on the couch.
  - Q. Did you believe that Mr. Kendrick was telling you the truth when he said it was inadvertent?

1 Α. No. 2 Why not? Q. 3 I don't think you can inadvertently do 4 something like that and not know that you are doing it. 5 And that's why we immediately classified this as child 6 abuse and took appropriate steps. 7 If we could, let's look at your letter of Q. 8 November 15, 1993, which is Exhibit 9/98. 9 All right. Let's look at page 2 of the 10 letter. 11 Do you see your signature at the bottom? 12 Α. Yes. 13 Is it normal that this type of letter to Q. 14 Watchtower New York be signed by two elders? 15 Α. It is now. Back there, one signature was 16 sufficient. But I did talk with Mr. Abrahamson before 17 we mailed it off and made sure I didn't leave anything 18 out. 19 In your talking with Mr. Abrahamson, did you Q. 20 actually show him the letter? 21 No. I read it to him over the phone. Α. 22 Okay. So he knew what was in it before it Q. 23 went? 24 Α. Yes.

Q. And did he disagree with you as to any of the

25

1 proposed language in the letter? I don't recall any disagreement or I would 2 Α. 3 change it. 4 Did you have to make any changes? Q. 5 Α. No. 6 Let's go back to page 1. Q. 7 Now, you told us a few minutes ago that you 8 did not believe Mr. Kendrick when he said it was 9 inadvertent. 10 Did you inform Watchtower New York that 11 Mr. Kendrick had not been truthful to you? 12 Well, we stated in the letter that we were Α. 13 recommending his deletion as a ministerial servant. 14 And we also stated in the letter that he had committed child abuse. So we felt that was 15 16 coincidental. 17 Q. But did you tell Watchtower New York in your 18 letter that Mr. Kendrick had not been truthful to you? 19 No. Not in those words, no. Α. 20 Did you see the words "inadvertent" or 21 "accidental" anywhere in the letter? 22 Α. No. 23 So was it important to you, at the time of Q. 24 the meeting, that Mr. Kendrick had not been candid with 25 you about the full extent of what had happened?

1 It was important, yes, and that's why we 2 stated in the letter that we were recommending his 3 deletion -- no longer qualified. He had committed child 4 abuse. It was clear to us. 5 But in your letter, you chose not to tell 6 Watchtower New York that he had lied to you in the 7 addition to the conduct that he had committed that he 8 did report? 9 THE WITNESS: Rephrase that again, please. 10 I'm not sure what you are asking. BY MR. SIMMONS: 11 Q. You chose not to tell Watchtower New York 12 13 that Mr. Kendrick had not been truthful with you? 14 A. I don't know if I chose. I just didn't put 15 it in the letter. We felt that what we had in the letter was sufficient. 16 17 Q. Did Mr. Kendrick express his repentance to 18 you? 19 A. Yes. 20 And did you believe him? Q. 21 Yes. Α. 22 And you knew from Awake Magazines and other Q. 23 education that you had received that child sexual 24 abusers often give false statements of repentance. 25 A. Yes.

1 So you knew he had lied to you, and you knew Ο. 2 child sex abusers give false statements of repentance. 3 Did you feel that Mr. Kendrick had given you 4 a false statement of repentance? 5 We believed him. Α. 6 Had Mr. Kendrick, in the past, exhibited Q. 7 problems with his temper that you were aware of? Α. Yes. 9 In what way? Q. 10 Α. Well, outbursts with his wife, Evelyn. 11 argued a lot. 12 And were you able to talk to Andrea Ο. 13 separately from the room that Mr. Kendrick was in? 14 Α. No. 15 Did you talk to Evelyn separately? Q. 16 No. We all stayed at the kitchen table. Α. 17 Did you have the thought at that time that 18 perhaps you should talk to Andrea separately when Mr. 19 Kendrick, who you knew to have violent outbursts, was 20 not present? 21 Α. No. 22 Was Mr. Kendrick ever --Q. 23 I will rephrase. 24 Did he ever exhibit that temper in any of the 25 Jehovah's Witnesses activities?

A. Not that I recall, no.

- Q. So in all of the various meetings and field service and everything else that you saw him in over the course of several years, you have no recollection of him ever exhibiting an outburst of temper?
- A. No. Just what he had told us and his wife had said had happened in the privacy of their home, married couples arguing.
- Q. Were you concerned that there was something more to Mr. Kendrick, in terms of hiding that outburst of temper that he was prone to at home, that he was not all that he claimed to be, if you will, or all that he presented to be, was the exact phrase, in the meetings?
- A. I can't recall if I thought that or not. It is so long ago.
- Q. Back when Mr. Kendrick was recommended for the position of ministerial servant, were you one of the elders who supported that recommendation?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And is it true that in 1993, until this report was received, you were considering him for the position, and recommending him for the position of elder?
- A. We always look at ministerial servants and hoping they will progress, develop in qualities needed

- 1 to be an overseer or elder. But we never recommended
  2 him, no.
  - Q. But you did have the thought in mind, at least until this meeting, that Mr. Kendrick was a candidate for elder?
    - A. I don't know if I would go that far. Because we have already mentioned that he was having marital problems and arguments with his wife. So one of the qualifications of being an elder is that they have to preside over the family in a fine manner. And he was having problems with his stepdaughter. He was not following the rules.
      - Q. Did Andrea Kendrick tell you in this meeting that Mr. Kendrick had touched her breast under the clothes?
    - A. No.

- Q. Did she tell you in this meeting that he had placed his hand down into her pelvic area, again, under her clothes?
  - A. No, sir.
  - Q. Did she tell you that he had given her Vicodin before any of the touching had occurred?
  - A. Absolutely not, no.
- Q. The congregation was never told that Mr.

  Kendrick had committed an act of child sexual abuse.

1 Correct?2 A.

A. Correct.

Q. And parents -- as opposed to children might be present -- but parents were not separately warned that he had committed an act of child sex abuse?

A. No. We don't do that.

- Q. And you don't do that because there is a policy that Watchtower New York has provided to you and provided to you before this that says that information is not to be divulged to the congregations?
- A. Yes. It is confidential, just like if a person committed adultery and came to us and confessed to adultery, and he was repentful or she was repentful, we wouldn't get up at the next meeting and announce that Mr. Smith has committed adultery.

That's confidential. That's privileged information.

- Q. You used the example of adultery. Is there any difference in your mind between adultery between consenting adults and childhood sexual abuse?
- A. Oh, yes. Child abuse is abhored, a horrible act. And they are both sins in God's eyes. But on a level -- you can't put them on the same level.
- Q. Adults who may engage in an illicit relationships, at least can make their own decisions and

1 enter into those relationships, whether they are sinful 2 or not, on their own. 3 Sure, yes. They are free agents, yes. 4 But you knew that children are often unable 5 to protect themselves against childhood sexual abusers? 6 Α. Yes. 7 The policy that you refer to, which you call 8 confidential, that was a policy given to you as an elder 9 and the body of elders for the North Congregation in 10 Fremont in a letter from Watchtower New York. Correct? 11 A. Yes. It would come to us in the form of a 12 letter, yes. 13 And if we were to look at Plaintiff's Exhibit Q. 14 1, which is Defendant's 026 --15 First of all, before we look at it, may it be admitted into evidence? 16 17 MR. McCABE: We would agree with that, your 18 Honor. 19 MR. SCHNACK: Yes. 20 THE COURT: All right. Plaintiff's 1 is 21 admitted into evidence. 22 (Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 1 23 and Defendant's Exhibit Number 26 24 was admitted into evidence) 25 MR. SIMMONS: And for your copy, sir.

1 THE WITNESS: I'm not going to be able to see 2 that. 3 MR. SIMMONS: No, you are not. 4 BY MR. SIMMONS: 5 Q. Do you recognize this as a policy letter, if 6 you will, the body of elder letter with regard to 7 confidentiality? Yes. It says on it "confidential." 9 Q. Now, this particular body of elder letter, do 10 you recall actually receiving it back in 1989? 11 A. Oh, yes. 12 Q. And it was discussed at that time within the 13 body of elders? 14 A. Yes. The whole body of elders was brought 15 together. It was read and discussed and filed. 16 Q. And when we are talking about the body of 17 elders, we are talking about the Fremont North 18 Congregation body of elders? 19 A. Yes. 20 But you know from your own experience that 21 this directive of July 1, 1989 went out to every body of 22 elders in the entire country? 23 Α. Yes. 24 Q. Let's go to the very last page. 25 Do you see the signature line?

1 Where it says "Your Brothers"? Α. 2 Yes. Ο. 3 Α. Yes. Watchtower Bible and Tract Society? 4 The document is signed, actually, by what we Q. 5 will call, I guess, a corporate signature. Correct? 6 Sure. Α. 7 And that was typical of all of the 8 communications that you received from Watchtower New 9 York? 10 Α. Correct. 11 Whether they were bodies of elder letters or Q. 12 whether they were individual letters having something to 13 do with a specific matter within your congregation, if 14 it came from New York, it was always signed by 15 Watchtower Bible and Tract Society New York, Inc.? 16 Α. Yes. 17 Did you ever know who the particular 18 individuals were who were sending you the letters? 19 Α. No. 20 Now, let's look at the first page of this. Q. 21 And let's go down to the third paragraph. 22 I have highlighted a section. Perhaps we can 23 enlarge it. 24 "Improper use of the tongue by an 25 elder can result in serious legal problems for

1 the individual, the congregation and even the 2 society." 3 You knew back in 1989 and throughout the time 4 that this policy has been in effect, that the primary 5 purpose of this policy was to avoid serious legal 6 problems. 7 And to protect confidentiality of people. Α. 8 Everybody wants to have their confidential matters 9 protected. So, yes, that is the purpose of the letter. 10 We don't want people suing us. 11 And when you say, "We don't want people suing Q. 12 us," are you talking about people who are suing you for 13 disclosing confidential information? 14 Α. Yes. 15 Is that the only kind of lawsuits that people 16 were worried about as you understood and talked about 17 this letter in 1989? 18 I don't recall. I don't recall what Α. 19 conclusions we came to, other than what the letter talks 20 about. It talks about divulging information that could 21 lead to legal problems. 22 But you knew that Mr. Kendrick's abuse of Q. 23 Andrea was no longer confidential? 24 Α. It is still confidential. She told us --25 they told us in confidence. And Evelyn --

1 Mrs. Kendrick -- and both -- her stepdaughter said -they wanted to keep it confidential. We respected that. 2 3 Ο. They told you that in a meeting in which 4 there were five people? 5 Α. Yes. 6 And it is your recollection that Andrea and Q. 7 Evelyn are the ones that asked for confidence? 8 Α. Yes. My recollection, yes. 9 Not Jonathan? Q. 10 Α. No. He was very quiet after he confessed. 11 Okay. So the confidentiality that you needed Q. 12 to protect was that of the victim, not of the 13 perpetrator? 14 Α. Of course. 15 So there was nothing about confidentiality 16 that would have been violated by telling the 17 congregation that Jonathan Kendrick had sexually abused 18 a child? 19 Anything that is discussed in a meeting like Α. 20 this is confidential. It cannot be revealed. We can 21 only follow the law, and we can only follow these 22 procedures. If we go any further, we are opening 23 ourselves up to liability. 24 MR. SIMMONS: May I approach, your Honor? 25 THE COURT: You may.

1 (Sidebar discussion) 2 BY MR. SIMMONS: 3 Ο. The next paragraph down: 4 "Worldly persons are quick to resort 5 to lawsuits if they feel their rights have 6 been violated. Some who oppose the kingdom 7 preaching work readily take advantage of any 8 legal provisions to interfere with it or 9 impede its progress." 10 Do you see that? 11 Α. Yes. 12 And do you understand that to be referring to Q. 13 Andrea and Evelyn Kendrick? 14 Α. No. It's referring to persons who are not 15 Jehovah's Witnesses. 16 Q. And so this basis for this policy is not 17 rooted solely in Jehovah's Witnesses, it's rooted in 18 people who are not Jehovah's Witnesses and the fact they 19 may bring lawsuits? 20 It is rooted in everyone, both Witnesses and Α. 21 non-Witnesses. Even Witnesses may bring lawsuits. 22 And it is rooted in a concern for lawsuits Q. 23 because there would not be any confidential information 24 that you would obtain from non-Jehovah's Witnesses? 25

I don't understand your question.

Α.

1 Thank you. It is a very bad question. 0. 2 rephrase it. 3 You are not receiving confidential 4 information from persons outside the faith? 5 We might in some circumstances. I can't 6 recall a case where we have ever received confidential 7 matters from outside sources. But it doesn't preclude it could happen. 9 And let's keep going a little bit. Let's go Q. 10 on to page 2. 11 And let's look at the first highlighted 12 section. 13 "The spirit of the world has 14 sensitized people regarding their "legal 15 rights" and the legal means by which they can 16 expect punishment if such rights are violated. 17 Hence, a growing number of vindictive or 18 disgruntled ones as well as opposers have 19 initiated lawsuits to inflict financial 20 penalties on the individual, the congregation, 21 or the society. Many of these lawsuits are 22 the result of the misuse of the tongue." 23 And did you understand in 1989 that this was

talking about child sexual abuse?

24

25

A. No. I don't think it was precisely talking

- about that. It's talking about all types of abuse of the tongue and protecting confidentiality.
- Q. And did you understand that persons who had been abused as children -- sexually abused as children -- in Jehovah's Witnesses, by someone who was known to the Jehovah's Witnesses to have committed sexual abuse before might bring such a lawsuit as this?
- A. If I understand your question, yes, that could definitely happen, yes.
  - Q. So the mandate of July 1, 1989, and when I say "mandate," you had no discretion as an elder to depart from this policy. Correct?
    - A. Correct.

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

- Q. It was not up to you as an elder in North

  Fremont to decide when to apply this policy and when not

  to apply?
  - A. Correct.
  - Q. If there was any doubt in your mind, all of the instructions came from New York?
    - A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And so it was your understanding then, and
  22 remains your understanding now, that reports of
  23 childhood sexual abuse within the congregation must be
  24 kept secret, according to this policy?
- A. Well, you used the word "secret." It is kept

confidential. We don't announce those things, but the body of elders would become aware of it. They would all be informed. So that's what we mean by keeping it confidential. We didn't publicly make it known, but just known to the body of elders.

- Q. And the reason was to avoid lawsuits.
- A. And also to protect confidentiality. Why would anybody come to us with their problems if they knew that as soon as they came to us we were going to announce it? Why would anybody confess to a Catholic priest if they knew that after they confessed it was going to be announced at mass next week. It is ludicrous.

So these were put in place so that the friends would feel comfortable coming to us and we could keep confidence.

- Q. And all of your understanding of what had to be kept in confidence, all of your understanding came from Watchtower New York?
  - A. Yes. They gave us the guidelines.
  - Q. You, yourself, are -- no legal training.
- 22 | Correct?

- 23 A. No.
- Q. You do not presume to be passing on what is or isn't confidential. Correct?

1	A. Excuse me?
2	Q. You weren't passing yourself on what is or
3	what isn't?
4	A. No. We weren't interpreting. Is that what
5	you meant?
6	Q. Yes. All of the decisions came from New
7	York?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. And looking at page 3 at the top of the
10	correspondence, the body of elder letter, July 1, 1989,
11	the subject matters included in this were, among other
12	things, child abuse?
13	A. Child abuse, search warrants, subpoenas, you
14	name it, all sorts of parameters that confidentiality
15	has to be maintained.
16	MR. SIMMONS: No further questions. Thank
17	you.
18	THE COURT: Mr. McCabe?
19	MR. McCABE: Thank you, your Honor.
20	
21	CROSS-EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. McCABE:
23	Q. Mr. Clarke, where do you live?
24	A. Fremont.
25	Q. How long have you lived in Fremont?

1 Α. Thirty-five years. 2 And where did you live before that? Ο. 3 San Leandro. Α. 4 Where did you go to high school? Q. 5 Hayward -- a high school called Tennyson, Α. 6 called Tennyson High School? 7 Q. Did you graduate from there? 8 Α. Barely, yes. 9 What year did you graduate? Q. 10 Α. Sixty-eight. 11 Were you involved in any extracurricular Q. activities at the school? 12 13 Yeah. A little baseball. Α. 14 Did you play baseball? Q. 15 Α. Yeah, varsity ball, yes. 16 Are you still a baseball fan? Q. 17 Oh, yeah. Go A's. Α. 18 Do you ever get out to the park and attend Q. 19 the games? 20 Α. Oh, yeah, about three times a year, and I 21 watch it on TV all the time. 22 Are you married, Mr. Clarke? Q. 23 Α. Yes. 24 Q. How long have you married? 25 Α. Over 40 years.

1 Ο. Okav. 2 Α. Same woman too. 3 Ο. What is your wife's name? 4 Catherine. Α. 5 Do you have children? Q. 6 Three. Α. 7 How old are they? Q. 8 Α. My son is 40. I have two daughters, 38 and 9 36. 10 Q. What is your occupation? 11 I work for an electrical contractor, and I'm Α. 12 a purchasing agent. 13 And how long have you been there? Q. 14 Sixteen years. Α. 15 And you were first appointed an elder before Q. 16 you came to the North Fremont Congregation. Correct? 17 Α. Yes. 18 And what year was that? Q. 19 I believe it was '77, '78. Α. 20 How does one get to be an elder in the Q. 21 congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses? 22 Α. First of all, they have to become a member, a 23 baptized member. And then they have to meet certain 24 scriptural qualifications that are in the Bible. 25 Things like presiding over their household in

1 a fine manner, having self-control. Then they develop an art of teaching. So there is a whole list of 2 3 requirements there. And eventually, if you meet those 4 requirements, you would be recommended. 5 And who would make the recommendation? Q. 6 The body of elders that you are serving with. Α. 7 That would be in the congregation? Q. 8 Yes. The congregation of body of elders. Α. 9 What congregation were you in when you were Q. 10 recommended to be an elder? 11 Α. San Leandro. 12 Q. And the recommendation goes to Watchtower? 13 Α. Yes. 14 And if they approve -- so now it's the Q. 15 congregation --16 Α. Yes. 17 Do you get any training as an elder? Ο. 18 Yes. We go to schools, we receive letters Α. 19 and we receive the Watchtower and the Awake, which has a 20 lot of training for elders. 21 How large is the congregation in Fremont? 22 If you put all the members and children Α. 23 together, I think it is probably a hundred and forty. 24 Q. How many children currently attend, say,

25

under the age of 12?

A. It's probably 25 or 30.

- Q. Was that true back in the 1990s?
- A. I don't think we had quite that many children back then. We have had quite a production of children in the past few years.
  - Q. When you go to a meeting at the Kingdom Hall, can tell us -- for instance for a Sunday, what happens?
  - A. Our meeting starts at 10:00. So about 9:30, the members start driving in to attend, visiting in the parking lot. And there is a lot of talking going on.

    There is a lot of visiting. A lot of noise. Sometimes you can't hear yourself think, especially with 25 kids running around. There is music playing. Eventually the chairman will call to order, and we will open with a song.
    - Q. Is that followed by a prayer?
  - A. Yes. Song and opening prayer. And then on Sunday, we have a talk that is given for 30 minutes.

    And we refer to it as a public talk, because some of the subjects deal with things that benefit both Witnesses and the public. But mostly it is geared towards the public. We hope new ones will come.
  - And then following that, we actually study the Bible using our journal called the Watchtower. It is questions and answers, and the whole audience can

participate by raising their hand, and we will give them the microphone.

- Q. And you also have another meeting that's held during the week at the Kingdom Hall?
- A. Yes. Ours is held on Wednesday. We actually have three meetings that night that are each 30 minutes long.

The first one is a Congregation Bible Study.

I think the term we referred to is it used to be held in homes, but now is held at the Kingdom Hall. So that's for 30 minutes.

And then after that, we actually have a theocratic ministry school. We call it the school, but anyone can be enrolled in it. And I've been giving little talks in that since I was ten. And boys and girls, men and women, they participate in it.

And then a third meeting is a called a service meeting, which is designed to train us in techniques to use in our door-to-door ministries.

So when we meet people at the door, we can engage in conversations, tell them all about the questions, share about the scripture. It is just designed to help us to be more conversational.

Q. You also talked about another meeting that was held in private homes for a time? When did that

1 meeting stop? 2 Α. A couple, three years ago they made it in the 3 Kingdom Hall. We no longer have it in private homes. It is called a Congregation Bible Study. 4 5 Back in the mid-1990s, you had some of those 6 meetings in private homes? 7 Α. Yes. 8 Would you also have a similar meeting like 0. 9 that in the Kingdom Hall? 10 Α. Yes. And we didn't have enough locations to 11 go around, so we would sometimes have that at the --12 they called it Congregation Bible Study, we had at the 13 Kingdom Hall. Mostly it was held in homes. 14 And the meeting would be conducted by one of Ο. 15 the elders in the congregation. Is that correct? 16 Α. Correct. 17 Do you recall the Conti family being in the 18 congregation when you moved to North Fremont? 19 Yes. I think they were there. I can't say Α. 20 for sure if they came after that -- I came in '89. They 21 might have come a year or so after or a year or so 22 before. It is not precise in my mind. 23 Q. Do you have a clear recollection of who was 24 in the family? 25 A. Who was in it?

1 0. Yes.

- A. Mr. Conti -- Neal; Catherine Conti; Candace;

  and I believe they had a little Neal, or maybe it was

  Catherine who had a son from a previous marriage. I

  don't remember his name though.
  - Q. Did you socialize with the Conti family in the mid-1990s?
    - A. Other than at the meetings, I don't recall.
  - Q. This meeting that you had with the Kendricks at their home, that was in November of 1993?
- 11 A. Correct.
- Q. And did you do anything to prepare for that meeting?
  - A. Yes. We would look over articles regarding abuse, and we also would look over scriptures that we thought would be encouraging.
    - Q. Do you recall doing that in November of 1993?
    - A. I don't specifically recall, but it was my habit. You just don't go to a meeting unprepared. So he gave us the nature of what he was going to talk to us about, even though he didn't give us specifics over the phone. So we would go into our volumes, our index, and look for articles that could help us in our deliberation.
  - Q. Mr. Simons directed you to Plaintiff's Number

1 64, Defense Exhibit Number 37. 2 I think you have it there in front of you. 3 If I may approach, your Honor? 4 THE COURT: You may. 5 BY MR. McCABE: 6 O. Do you see the date of publication of Exhibit 7 Number 37? Α. The date is October '93. 9 October what? Q. 10 Α. Eighth. October 8. 11 Do you recall in 1993 how you came in Q. 12 possession of that magazine, if you did? 13 I would have had a subscription. Because at 14 that time, the Awake was mailed to the homes of 15 Jehovah's Witnesses. I was the subscriber for years. 16 Q. And during that time period, do you recall, 17 would you get the magazine on the date of its publication or when would you receive it? 18 19 It usually came out a month -- or at least a Α. 20 month ahead of time. So I probably got it early 21 September, late August. 22 What was your custom and habit when you 23 received a magazine from Watchtower in the mail? 24 A. Well, read it immediately. We always looked 25 forward to receiving a new magazine, so I would

thoroughly read it.

Q. So as you sit here today, do you believe that you read this magazine before you met with the Kendricks in November of 1993?

- A. Oh, no doubt. I have three children. In those years my children were young, so this article would be definitely be one we would read.
- Q. And was the magazine also made available at the Kingdom Hall?
- A. Yes. For those that didn't subscribe, we always had extra copies. And we also distributed these to the public then and now, and so the public in our community would get this magazine so they could protect their children.
- Q. When you met with the Kendricks, you testified for Mr. Simons, Mr. Abrahamson opened with a prayer, you have got your Bible.

Was there any dispute among the Kendricks about what had taken place between Jonathan and Andrea?

- A. None whatsoever. Once he confessed, he was quiet and the discussion went on.
- Q. Did Evelyn engage in the discussion? Did she speak?
  - A. Yes, she did.
- Q. Can you tell me what kind of personality

1 Evelyn had? Was she a quiet, mousy woman, or what would 2 you think? 3 A. No. She was very, very vocal. She could 4 express herself quite well. 5 You mentioned that -- was it previous to 6 this, there had been some problems between the Kendricks 7 that came to your attention as marital difficulties that 8 they had been having? 9 Yes. They had violence, yelling. And they 10 asked us to come over to help them with that. 11 Q. On those occasions -- did you respond to 12 those calls? 13 A. Yes. 14 And on those occasions, did Evelyn Kendrick Q. 15 have any problem expressing herself? 16 A. Oh, no. No. She was much more vocal than 17 Mr. Kendrick. 18 Now, you indicated that Mr. Kendrick called Q. 19 his touching of his stepdaughter "inadvertent." 20 But you didn't believe that, did you? 21 Α. No. 22 What did you believe? Q. 23 That he purposely touched her breasts. Α. 24 Q. Was that clear from the conversation you had 25 around the kitchen table?

1 Α. Yes. 2 And because of that, you took certain actions Ο. 3 afterwards? A. Yes. We advised our branch office and told 4 5 them our decision was to remove him as a ministerial 6 servant. And they immediately responded. They 7 confirmed our assessment. And it was announced that he 8 was no longer a ministerial servant. 9 Now, during the course of the conversation 10 does anything about making a police report come up? 11 Α. You mean about making a police report? 12 We told Evelyn and the stepdaughter that they 13 could make a police report. 14 Q. Did they indicate to you whether they wanted 15 to or not? 16 Α. They said no. 17 I would like to call your attention to page 9 18 of this exhibit. 19 Okay. The bottom here. I don't know if you 20 can see it on the copy in front of you. Page 9 of the 21 exhibit. 22 What is the indication from Watchtower here 23 about reporting incidents of sexual child abuse? 24 Α. Are you referring to that (indicating)?

Which part?

1 Referring to the highlight here. Ο. 2 This is all blacked out here. Α. 3 Well, can you read it on the screen as it is? Ο. 4 Α. It says: 5 "Some legal experts advised to report 6 the abuse to the authorities as soon as 7 possible. In some lands, the legal system may 8 require this." 9 Okay. Is that your understanding of the 10 situation in 1993, that individuals could report it to 11 the police if they wanted to? 12 A. Well, of course. Yeah. We would never tell 13 them not to report it. 14 Is that what you communicated to Evelyn Ο. 15 Kendrick on this occasion of your meeting with her and 16 her daughter and Mr. Abrahamson and Mr. Kendrick? 17 Most assuredly, yes. Did you consider the matter of this meeting, 18 Q. 19 the subject matter of it, to be confidential? 20 Α. Yes. 21 Is there any religious reasons why you 22 considered it to be confidential? 23 MR. SIMMONS: Objection. 24 THE COURT: Overruled. 25 THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question?

1 BY MR. McCABE:

- Q. Yes. Were there any scriptural or religious reasons why you considered the meeting at the Kendrick home to be confidential?
- A. Well, because it is a privileged conversation between a member of the church and a minister; therefore, it is confidential.
- Q. And you felt, personally, that you should keep the information confidential; is that correct?
- A. I felt personal, based on my training and also Evelyn -- Mrs. Kendricks's request.
- 12 Q. She asked you to keep it confidential?
  - A. Yes. She said it was a private matter. She said that they had gotten beyond it. They had forgiven Mr. Kendrick. It happened four months previous. It was a one-time touching, and that he promised not to do it again.
  - But we still considered it child abuse. So that's why we took the action that we did. And that's why the whole body of elders was made aware of this action.
  - Q. Well, if they were made aware of it, how was it confidential?
  - A. Because they are trained not to reveal confidential matters, not even to their wives.

1 So the matters that you learn of in your role Ο. 2 as an elder, confidential matters, you understand that you can share it with other elders? 3 4 Only other elders, yes. Was that done in this case after the meeting 5 6 at the Kendrick home? 7 Yes. We would, as a body of elders, after we Α. 8 got confirmation back from the branch that we were 9 removing him as a ministerial servant, we met as a body 10 of elders and it would have been explained why we were removing Mr. Kendrick. 11 12 Q. And then that's exactly what happened to Mr. 13 Kendrick? 14 Α. Exactly, yes. 15 How long after the meeting at the Kendrick 16 home it was announced at the congregation that Mr. 17 Kendrick was no longer a ministerial servant, that he 18 had been removed? 19 I quess within -- we got the notice back Α. 20 within 30 days. So I'm sure it was within 30 days. Ι'm 21 not quite sure of the exact date, but that is a fair 22 quess. 23 Was the reason for the removal announced? Q. 24 Α. No. We don't announce the removal.

25

Why not?

Q.

1 Confidential. We can't divulge such details. 2 Like I mentioned earlier, if somebody had committed 3 adultery, and they were an elder or a ministerial 4 servant, we would not announce the reason we were doing 5 it. We would only announce that they had been removed. 6 That, in and of itself, puts the congregation on notice. 7 It doesn't happen very often. 8 Q. When you say it doesn't happen very often, 9 how many years had you been in North Fremont 10 congregation? 11 A. Oh, twenty years since 1989. 12 Q. How many announcements of deletions of 13 ministerial servants in your congregation have been 14 made? 15 A. Oh, just maybe three. Two, three, four at 16 the most. 17 Over a 20-year period? 18 Yes. That's not very many. It just doesn't Α. 19 happen very often. 20 Q. Now, after you finished the meeting with the 21 body of elders, you authored the letter that went to 22 Watchtower; is that correct? 23 A. Excuse me? 24 Q. You authored a letter that was sent to

Watchtower from the body of elders; is that correct?

1 Α. The 1993 letter? 2 Yes. That's what I'm referring to. Ο. 3 That letter was sent immediately after we talked to Kendrick. 4 5 Is that the letter you are referring to? 6 I am referring to Exhibit 098 for the Defense Ο. and 9 for the Plaintiff. 7 8 Do you have that letter in front of you? 9 What's the number again? Α. 10 Q. It's going to be Number 9 in that book? 11 All the way to the front. Α. 12 And is that the one on the screen? 13 Q. Yes. 14 Yes, that letter was authored the very next Α. 15 day after we met with the Kendricks, withing the next 16 day or so. 17 Q. Let me ask you this: Before you authored 18 this letter, did you call the Legal Department at 19 Watchtower? 20 A. That morning. We met with the Kendricks that 21 evening. The next morning we called the branch. And 22 after that meeting we authored the letter. We didn't sit on it. 23 24 Q. Is this letter a response to -- or further 25 follow-up with a phone call you made to Watchtower?

A. Yes. They asked us to put it in writing.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. What was the purpose of sending this letter to Watchtower?
  - A. They asked for it to be written, confirming in writing what we told them on the phone and what we were requesting. And that's why we put it in writing.
  - Q. What was the important fact of this letter that you needed to communicate?
    - A. That Mr. Kendrick was guilty of child abuse.
  - Q. The fact that he minimized it or lied about it, the extent or the nature of it, was that an important fact that you needed to communicate to the Watchtower?
  - A. We felt the most important thing was that he admitted to child abuse, that he touched his stepdaughter in a sexual way.
    - Q. And you communicated that?
  - A. In a letter, yes.
- Q. And Watchtower did respond to the letter and he was removed as a ministerial servant?
  - A. Correct. And we announced that.
- Q. Did you consider Jonathan Kendrick, then, to
  be a child molester after this meeting with the family
  in 1993?
- 25 A. Child molester?

1 Q. Yes.

A. Well, he abused his daughter. So, yes, he is a child molester.

- Q. And after removing him as a ministerial servant to the congregation, did you take any other action with regard to Mr. Kendrick and his activities in the congregation?
- A. Well, we informed, like I said, the body of elders. So now we have, instead of two sets of eyes watching him, we have twelve, thirteen sets of eyes watching him.
  - Q. What do you mean "watching him"?
- A. Well, when we had our congregation meetings, when he turns up to go out to the door-to-door evangelizing work, we are aware of what he has done and we are watching him. We make sure that he doesn't get too friendly to children. We make sure that he doesn't show any affection to children, that he is not going to come close to abusing a child again.
- Q. In regards to the field ministry, did you observe Mr. Kendrick go out into the door-to-door activity following this November 1993 meeting?
- A. Yes.
- Q. To your knowledge, was he ever assigned to work with a child?

1 Oh, absolutely not. That would be suicidal, Α. 2 no. 3 Ο. Who would he be assigned to work with? 4 He would work with another elder, another Α. 5 adult. 6 Did you ever see Mr. Kendrick, after this 7 November 1993 meeting, meet for field service and then 8 go out and accompany children? 9 No, sir. Α. 10 Q. Would you have allowed it? 11 Absolutely not. Α. 12 Q. Now, in regards to his activity in the 13 congregation, did you ever see Jonathan Kendrick, after 14 this November of 1993 meeting, being overly-friendly to 15 the children of the congregation? 16 No, sir. He would come to the meetings, very Α. 17 quiet now, as he was before, and he would generally 18 always sit up against the aisleway against the wall. 19 Did you ever see him hold Candace Conti on Q. 20 his lap before a meeting? 21 No, I did not. Α. 22 Did you ever see him do that after a meeting? Q. 23 No, sir. Α. 24 Q. Did you ever see him do that during a 25 meeting?

1 No, I did not. Α. 2 Did you ever personally notice Mr. Kendrick Ο. 3 at the meetings at the Kingdom Hall? 4 Personally notice him? Α. 5 Q. Yes. 6 Yes, I kept my eye on him. Α. 7 How about during the actual conduct of the Q. 8 meetings, say, when the public talks would be? 9 Oh, yes, I would sometimes see him if I was Α. 10 walking down the hall. 11 Q. What would you see with regards to Mr. 12 Kendrick? 13 Again, sitting by himself, because at that Α. 14 time his wife Evelyn and stepdaughter weren't coming 15 with him. And he would pretty much sit by himself and 16 stay to himself. 17 Ο. And this is what year? '94, '95. 18 Α. 19 Was Evelyn Kendrick a member of the 20 congregation in 1993? 21 Α. Yes. 22 And do you know how long she had been a 23 member of the congregation? 24 Α. I can't say how long she was a member. 25 Did you ever counsel Mr. Kendrick after this Q.

- 1 November 1993 meeting about his conduct with children, 2 again, in the future? 3 Α. No. Nothing every showed up that alerted us. 4 Did you counsel him with his wife and his 5 stepdaughter Andrea present when you had the meeting? 6 The '93 meeting? Α. 7 Q. Yes. 8 Yes, we were all there. Α. 9 What did you tell him? Q. 10 Α. We told him limitations as to what he could 11 and couldn't do. 12 He could not, like I said, show affection to 13 children, put children on his lap, work with them out in 14 the door-to-door ministry, work with children in the 15 Kingdom Hall. 16 And we made it clear to him that we were 17 going to be watching him. And we did, all, the whole 18 body of elders. 19 What about counsel regarding his stepdaughter Ο. 20 Andrea when you had the meeting? Did you give any 21 counsel there? 22 Counsel to the daughter? Α.
- Q. No. With Mr. Kendrick about his conduct with his stepdaughter, Andrea.
- A. It would be all encompassing, we would have

- counseled him regarding children in general, that he needed to not put his stepdaughter on his lap if that was the custom. He was not to show affection, and he was to treat her with dignity.
  - Q. After that meeting, did you have any doubt about the protection and safety of Andrea in the Kendrick home?
- A. No.

5

6

7

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Do you feel her mother, being aware of the situation, was a good protection for her?
- 11 A. Oh, yeah. She was a protector and she was
  12 the first line of defense.
- Q. And how old was Andrea at the time of this
  14 1993 meeting, if you recall?
  - A. Oh, she was a teenager. I want to say 15.
  - Q. Did you later learn that a police report was made about this 1993 incident?
  - A. We found out about it years later. It wasn't months later, but years later we found out that a police report had been made. We assumed it had been made by Mrs. Kendrick.
    - Q. How did you find that out?
- A. I don't really recall. I just remember in some document that we noted that.
- Q. Did you know what happened as a result of the

1 police report? 2 Α. There was something about him being put on 3 probation. 4 Q. Were you ever contacted by the Fremont Police 5 in connection with this case? 6 Α. No. 7 Were you contacted by Child Protective 8 Services of Alameda County regarding Mr. Kendrick? 9 No, sir. Α. 10 Q. How about the Probation Department? 11 No. No contact at all from the authorities. Α. 12 Q. Now, do you recall when Mr. Kendrick 13 separated from Mrs. Kendrick? 14 Not exactly. I would be giving you a guess. 15 Was it real close in proximity to the meeting Q. 16 that you had with the family in November 1993? 17 A. No. It was a couple years later. Maybe a 18 year-and-a-half later. I couldn't give you the exact 19 month. 20 Q. Do you know if, after they separated, who 21 stayed in the home in Fremont that they occupied 22 together? 23 A. I don't know who stayed or even if they kept 24 the home. 25 Q. Do you know where Mr. Kendrick next lived?

1 Α. Where Mr. Kendrick lived? 2 Yes. Ο. 3 I believe he was offered to stay in the Francis home. 4 5 Do you recall when that was? Q. 6 I don't recall when, no. Α. 7 Do you know how long he lived there? Q. 8 It was just a few months, if I'm not Α. 9 mistaken. I don't think it was very long. 10 Q. Do you ever recall, after this 1993 meeting at the Kendrick home, Candace Conti being given a big 11 12 bear hug by Jonathan Kendrick? 13 I never witnessed anything like that -- and 14 no one ever reported it. Do you ever recall seeing that happen out in 15 Q. 16 the parking lot of the Kingdom Hall? 17 Α. No. 18 Do you recall seeing that anywhere? Q. 19 No, sir. Α. 20 And following this 1993 meeting, did you ever 21 see Candace Conti leave the Kingdom Hall premises with 22 Jonathan Kendrick? 23 A. By themselves? No. 24 Q. Did you ever see him leaving with somebody 25 else?

1 Α. No. 2 Did anyone ever report that to you that they Ο. 3 saw Jonathan Kendrick with Candace Conti alone in a 4 vehicle? 5 Α. No, sir. 6 Do you know what kind of vehicle Jonathan 7 Kendrick had in 1993, 1994, 1995? Α. Some kind of a truck. 9 Was it a pickup truck or a van or what? Q. 10 Α. No. It was a pickup truck. He was an iron 11 worker. 12 Q. Why do you have a confidentiality among the 13 body of elders in the congregation matters? 14 Well, as I mentioned earlier, they have to be 15 comfortable coming to us to talk with us about their 16 problems so we can offer them scriptural help, spiritual 17 quidance. If they feel that we are going to blab it to 18 our wifes or to announce it from the platform, we 19 wouldn't get too many people coming to us. So 20 confidentiality is important for a minister. 21 Do you think there is any scriptural basis 22 for your maintaining confidentiality of certain matters?

MR. SIMMONS: Objection; that asks for expert

THE COURT: Sustained.

23

24

25

opinion.

```
1
    BY MR. McCABE:
2
         Q. I want to direct your attention to
    Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, Defendant's Exhibit 26, which is
3
4
    in front of you, I think it is Number 1.
              Number 1?
5
         Α.
6
               The July 1, 1989 letter.
         Q.
7
               THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, I thought you
8
    said Plaintiff's 1 and Defendant's 26.
9
               MR. McCABE: That's what I thought, your
10
    Honor.
11
               THE COURT: And what I'm looking at in my
12
    book is twelve bodies of elders in the United States,
13
    July 1, '89.
14
               MR. McCABE: Correct.
15
               THE COURT: Is that what you want?
16
               MR. McCABE: Yes, sir.
17
               THE COURT: Okay.
18
    BY MR. McCABE:
19
               You told Mr. Simons you recall this letter?
         Q.
20
               Yes.
         Α.
21
              What is the subject matter of this letter?
         Q.
22
               The maintaining of confidentiality.
         Α.
23
         Q. How much of this letter has to do with child
24
    abuse?
25
         A. I believe it's just one small paragraph,
```

1 paragraph B on page 3. 2 I would like to direct your attention to that 3 paragraph B on page 3. 4 Do you have that in front of you? 5 Α. Yes, sir. 6 Okay. And what is the direction and policy Q. 7 that is given by Watchtower in connection with child abuse in this letter? 9 A. It says that when elders receive reports of 10 physical or sexual abuse of a child, they should contact 11 the Society's Legal Department immediately. 12 Q. What other direction does it give bodies of 13 elders in this paragraph? 14 It says that they should see this Awake 15 article January 22, 1985. 16 Q. Anything else? 17 Victims of such abuse need to be protected 18 from further danger. So, yes, we have to take quick 19 action to protect. 20 And is that something you agreed with back in Q. 21 1983? 22 Α. Of course, yes. 23 And through 1995, '96 and '97? Q. 24 Α. Right up to today, yes. 25 It also mentions a lot of other situations on Q.

```
1
    this six-page letter having to do with lawsuits.
 2
                Do you recall what was going on during the
 3
    late 1880s (sic) in society that prompted this letter?
 4
                THE WITNESS: I think the letter mentioned in
 5
    the opening that there was a proliferation of lawsuits
 6
    popping up everywhere.
 7
                THE COURT: You said the "1880s."
 8
                MR. McCABE: I'm sorry. Sir, I meant 1980s.
 9
    BY MR. McCABE:
10
         Q.
                I notice in the first page of the second
11
    paragraph, there are two scriptures cited; is that
12
    correct?
13
         Α.
               First page.
14
                First page, second paragraph.
         Q.
                July 1st, 1989?
15
         Α.
16
                That's correct.
         Q.
17
                How about the third paragraph?
         Α.
18
                No. I'm thinking of the second paragraph.
         Q.
19
                "Jesus commanded that what you hear
         Α.
20
    whispered, preach from the housetops."
21
                Yes. That's scripture, isn't it?
         Q.
22
         Α.
                Yes.
23
               And there's another scripture, Acts 4:20 in
         Q.
24
    the same paragraph.
25
                "We cannot stop speaking about the things we
          Α.
```

1 have seen and heard." 2 Q. And then the third paragraph, there is a reference to Ecclesiastes 3:7. Do you know what that 3 4 says? 5 A. It says, "There is a time to keep quiet and 6 there is a time to speak." 7 Q. And, in fact, in every paragraph on this page 8 there is scriptures; is that correct? 9 Α. Oh, yes. 10 Q. And the reference on page 3 to child abuse, 11 it references you to the Awake Magazine of January 22, 1985. 12 13 A. Yes. 14 That has previously been admitted as Q. Plaintiff's Number 59 and Defense Number 17. 15 16 Do you recall that issue of the Awake 17 Magazine? 18 Α. If I ever get there, I might, if I read it. 19 Okay. You probably have it in front of you. Q. 20 But we can put it on the screen too. It would be 21 Exhibit Number 17 in that book. It is on the screen 22 now. 23 A. Yes. "Child molester: You can protect your 24 child." 25 But I don't have it here in this book.

1 MR. McCABE: May I approach, your Honor? 2 THE COURT: Why don't you go another five 3 minutes. BY MR. McCABE: 4 5 Let's go to page 3 of this exhibit. And you 6 see the section that is highlighted under the 7 sub-heading there? 8 Α. If he makes it bigger, I might. 9 Yes, I see it now. 10 Ο. What does the Watchtower Bible and Tract 11 Society acknowledge in this paragraph about the plague 12 of child abuse? 13 That it is everywhere, it's widespread, yes. Α. 14 And this was in 1985? Q. 15 Yes. Α. 16 And if you go over to the next page, "Child Q. 17 molesting. Who would do such a thing?" 18 Who were the people that are described as 19 being perpetrators of child abuse in this article? 20 Well, in that second paragraph it says that Α. 21 this woman, Sue, was molested by a man who was running a 22 church group. 23 So it could be someone in a church group, a 24 youth group. It could be a boy scout leader. It could 25 be anyone.

1 Ο. And you knew that? 2 Α. Yes. 3 And that helped you protect your children 4 when you ponder those things? 5 Yes, these magazines have been invaluable for 6 years to my family and others. 7 Q. I'd like to go to the next page. 8 And where it says "Molester at work here." 9 Do you recall the information that is in this 10 about the techniques that child molesters will use? 11 Several of the articles have mentioned Α. Yes. 12 that molesters, many times, will offer, like, a present 13 or something to the child to get their affection or to 14 make the child feel comfortable around them. 15 Other times, they will tell the child, "Let's 16 have a secret together. It will just be our secret." 17 And sometimes they use actual fear tactics where they threaten the child. 18 19 So these articles would help put myself and 20 other parents on alert what to look for. 21 And as an elder back in 1993, after Mr. 22 Kendrick confessed to sexually touching his 23 stepdaughter, were you looking for these kind of activities with Mr. Kendrick? 24 25 Oh, yes. We discussed those with the body of Α.

1 elders and went over this article, the '93 article, it 2 would help all the elders to be on alert to look for 3 things. 4 And after November of 1993, did you see Mr. Q. 5 Kendrick exhibit any of these characteristics of a child 6 molester in the congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses? 7 Α. No, I did not. 8 Okay. Let's go to one more page. And that's Ο. the next page. 9 10 "Child molesting: You can protect your 11 child." 12 In the Jehovah's Witnesses faith, in your 13 congregation, who was this information directed to? 14 Α. Excuse me? 15 Who was this information directed to here? 16 It is directed to parents as to -- it is to Α. 17 forewarn the parents. 18 And is that who you believe had the Q. 19 responsibility for protecting their children? 20 Well, they are the first line of defense. Α. Ιf 21 we can help the parents to know what to look for and 22 what situation not to put their children in, that goes a 23 long way in protecting the children. 24 Q. And just so we are clear, you are not the

only -- the elders are not the only ones who get these

1 magazines in the mail. You can pick them up at the 2 Kingdom Hall? 3 Everybody gets these. Every member of every 4 congregation gets them. We distribute them to the 5 public as a community service. We want the children 6 protected, both inside our congregation and outside our 7 congregation. 8 MR. McCABE: Would this be an appropriate 9 place to adjourn? 10 THE COURT: I think so. 11 All right. We will start again in the 12 morning promptly at 8:30. 13 To the members of the jury, thank you for 14 your patience, your diligence. 15 I'm presuming they know where their abode is? 16 COURT ATTENDANT: That's correct, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: All right. What do you think? 18 Okay. And then again, I'm going to ask you 19 and reiterate several things. One, I'm making rulings 20 consistently throughout this trial because of the nature 21 of the circumstances. So please do not come in the 22 courtroom until, let's say, 8:25. I will be -- I'm 23 sure -- huddling with the counsel starting at 24 8:00 o'clock. 25 Please, other than the collegial "good

1 morning" or "good afternoon" or "good -- I'm not sure we will get to "good evening," please do not discuss this 2 3 matter with anyone. 4 And further, certainly -- let's see, 5 internet, LinkedIn, Facebook, Twitter, handheld device, nothing about the case. 6 7 Thank you, as always, for your attention and 8 your commitment to this matter. See you tomorrow 9 morning at 8:30. 10 (Whereupon, the following proceedings 11 were heard outside the presence of jurors) 12 THE COURT: To the extent we have any further 13 redaction-type issues or whatnot, please email me. But 14 I probably won't see them until 6:30 tomorrow morning. 15 I do want to get on the record, we were a 16 little informal about that one document where I made a 17 ruling as to Number 4, 5, essentially being religious 18 activity and discipline. 19 And, again, I'm having a bit -- although I'm 20 getting pretty much on board with your joint exhibit 21 binder, I wanted to take care of that on the record and 22 anything else you wanted to take care of on the record 23 at 8:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. 24 MR. McCABE: May we inquire of Mr. Simons who 25 he intends to call tomorrow morning?

1	THE COURT: Yes. Mr. Simons in terms of the
2	rules of court of this department, whom are you calling
3	tomorrow?
4	MR. SIMMONS: We are going to finish with Mr.
5	Clarke. We hope.
6	And then we have Evelyn Kendrick and Andrea
7	Becerra, Claudia Francis, Kathleen Conti, Dorothy Conti
8	and, hopefully, we will get to Cliff Williams and Mr.
9	Lamerdin, but that might be somewhat
10	THE COURT: Well, I made a series of rulings
11	as to some of those folks, not all of them. Seems like
12	it is going to be an active day in Department 22, and it
13	is what it is. Just be ready to go. I'll be ready to
14	go, and we will go.
15	(Proceedings were adjourned at 2:58 p.m.)
16	
17	000
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## 1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 2 I, KATHRYN LLOYD, CSR No. 5955, Certified Shorthand 3 Reporter, certify: 4 That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me 5 at the time and place therein set forth, at which time the witnesses were put under oath by the court clerk; 6 7 That the testimony of the witnesses, the questions 8 propounded, and all objections and statements made at 9 the time of the examination were recorded 10 stenographically by me and were thereafter transcribed; 11 That the foregoing is a true and correct transcript 12 of my shorthand notes so taken. 13 I further certify that I am not a relative or 14 employee of any attorney of the parties, nor financially 15 interested in the action. 16 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws 17 of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Dated this\_\_\_\_, day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2012. 18 19 20 21 KATHRYN LLOYD, CSR No. 5955 22 23 24 25