



Secrets of
Pedophilia
in an.
American
Religion

Jehovah's Witnesses in Crisis

BARBARA ANDERSON

Court Documents

Tabitha H

vs

Jehovah's Witnesses

1 Rudy Nolen, Esq., SBN 59808
Jonathan Saul, Esq., SBN 189271
2 William L. Brelsford, Esq.,
SBN 202839
3 NOLEN SAUL BRELSFORD
350 University Avenue, Suite 280
4 Sacramento, CA 95825
Telephone: (916) 564-9990
5 Facsimile: (916) 564-9991

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
TABITHA H.

7
8
9 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
10 COUNTY OF NAPA

11 TABITHA H.)

12 Plaintiff,)

13 vs.)

14 ROES 1 through 100 and DOES 110)
through 120, inclusive.)

15 Defendants.)
16 _____)

CASE NO: 26-23959

Jury Trial Demanded

Complaint for Damages:

1. Common Law Negligence
2. Negligent Appointment, Retention, and Supervision
3. Gross Negligence - Wilful Misconduct
4. Breach of Fiduciary Duty
5. Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress
6. Fraud - Intentional Misrepresentation
7. Fraud - Concealment
8. Conspiracy

17
18
19
20 **PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL COMPLAINT**

21 COMES NOW TABITHA H., Plaintiff in the above entitled cause, and files this, her
22 Original Complaint, and alleges as follows:

23 I.

24 **PARTIES**

25 1. Plaintiff TABITHA H., born November 1, 1973, is and at all mentioned herein,
26 was a resident of Napa County, California. At all material times, Plaintiff was also a child
27 entrusted to Defendants' care within the State of California. As a child, Plaintiff was
28

1 sexually abused by an elder appointed by the Defendants' organization within the State
2 of California.

3 2. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that at all relevant times,
4 defendants ROES 1 through 100, inclusive are business or corporate entities incorporated
5 in and/or doing business in California and DOES 110 through 120 inclusive, are
6 individuals.

7 3. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or
8 otherwise, of defendants ROES 1 through 100 and DOES 110 through 120, inclusive, are
9 known and unknown to Plaintiff who therefore sues such defendants by such fictitious
10 names in compliance with Code of Civil Procedure § 340.1(m), and will amend the
11 complaint to show the true names and capacities of each known ROE and DOE defendant
12 pursuant to Court Order and to show the true names and capacities of each unknown ROE
13 and DOE defendant when ascertained. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that each
14 defendant designated as a ROE and DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the
15 events, happenings, and/or tortuous, and unlawful conduct that caused the injuries and
16 damages alleged in this complaint.

17 4. Defendant designated herein as ROE 1 is a corporation organized and
18 existing under the laws of the State of New York, and has conducted business within the
19 State of California through its agents and alter egos. ROE 1 is, based upon best
20 information and belief, a corporate religious entity that has engaged in conduct, or a lack
21 thereof, thereby allowing children affiliated with its entity to be victims of sexual abuse.
22 The identity of ROE 1 is known by Plaintiff and her attorneys, and an order will be sought
23 in compliance with Code of Civil Procedure § 340.1(m) to plead the true identity of ROE
24 1.

25 5. Defendant designated herein as ROE 2 a corporation organized and existing
26 under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania, has conducted business within the State of
27 California through its agents and alter egos. ROE 2 is, based upon best information and
28 belief, a corporate religious entity that has engaged in conduct, or a lack thereof, thereby

1 allowing children affiliated with its entity to be victims of sexual abuse. The identity of ROE
2 is known by Plaintiff and her attorneys, and an order will be sought in compliance with
3 Code of Civil Procedure § 340.1(m) to plead the true identity of ROE 2.

4 6. Defendant designated herein as ROE 3 is a corporation organized and
5 existing under the laws of the State of New York, has conducted business within the State
6 of California through its agents and alter egos. ROE 3 is, based upon best information and
7 belief, a corporate religious entity that has engaged in conduct, or a lack thereof, thereby
8 allowing children affiliated with its entity to be victims of sexual abuse. The identity of ROE
9 3 is known by Plaintiff and her attorneys, and an order will be sought in compliance with
10 Code of Civil Procedure § 340.1(m) to plead the true identity of ROE 3.

11 7. Defendant designated herein as ROE 4 is a corporation organized and
12 existing under the laws of the State of California, with its place location in Napa County,
13 California. ROE 4 is, based upon best information and belief, a corporate religious entity
14 that has engaged in conduct, or a lack thereof, thereby allowing children affiliated with its
15 entity to be victims of sexual abuse. The identity of ROE 4 is known by Plaintiff and her
16 attorneys, and an order will be sought in compliance with Code of Civil Procedure §
17 340.1(m) to plead the true identity of ROE 4.

18 8. Defendant designated herein as ROE 5 is a corporation organized and
19 existing under the laws of the State of California, with its place location in Napa County,
20 California. ROE 5 is, based upon best information and belief, a corporate religious entity
21 that has engaged in conduct, or a lack thereof, thereby allowing children affiliated with its
22 entity to be victims of sexual abuse. The identity of ROE 5 is known by Plaintiff and her
23 attorneys, and an order will be sought in compliance with Code of Civil Procedure §
24 340.1(m) to plead the true identity of ROE 5.

25 9. The Defendant entities are collectively referred to herein as "ROE
26 DEFENDANTS" and each is the agent and alter ego of each other and operates as a
27 single business enterprise. Each of the ROE DEFENDANTS was acting within the scope
28 and course of his or its authority as an agent, servant, and/or alter ego of the other and

1 each of them engaged in, joined in and conspired with the other wrongdoers in carrying out
2 the unlawful activities alleged in this complaint.

3 **II.**

4 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5 10. Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount exceeding the minimum
6 jurisdictional requirements of this Court.

7 11. Venue is proper in Napa County, California because most of the acts or
8 omissions that give rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred in Napa County, California and
9 Defendant ROE 4 and ROE 5 are residents of Napa County.

10 **III.**

11 **FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

12 12. In the past, certain Elders, Ministerial Servants, Pioneers, agents, volunteers
13 and other leaders and representatives of the ROE DEFENDANTS' organization, including
14 Edward Villegas (now deceased), have used their appointed positions of authority within
15 the ROE DEFENDANTS' organization to sexually abuse minors, including Plaintiff. The
16 ROE DEFENDANTS were notified of the abuse of these minors by their appointed elder,
17 Edward Villegas, and others, but intentionally concealed this information and continued to
18 place Edward Villegas in positions of authority where he could abuse children while
19 pursuing activities within the scope of his appointment. The ROE DEFENDANTS failed
20 to take reasonable steps to ensure the safety of Plaintiff and other minor children entrusted
21 to their care and to prevent future acts of molestation. This suit seeks compensation for
22 Plaintiff who was a victim of this sexual abuse.

23 13. All paragraphs of this Complaint are based on information and belief, except
24 for those allegations, which pertain to the Plaintiff and her counsel. Plaintiff's information
25 and belief are based upon, *inter alia*, the investigation conducted to date by Plaintiff and
26 her counsel. Each allegation in this Complaint either has, or is likely to have, evidentiary
27 support upon further investigation and discovery.
28

1 14. The ROE DEFENDANTS' organization has a hierarchical structure in which
2 the GOVERNING BODY, consisting of a small group of men who operate out of various
3 entities within the hierarchical structure, sits at the top of a chain of command that extends
4 over each individual and Defendant entity in the organization including its worldwide
5 operations. These individuals and entities act as agents, servants and alter egos of each
6 other. Authority for actions by the organization and its members derive from the
7 GOVERNING BODY.

8 15. All of the Defendants are the agents and servants of each other and are
9 vicariously liable for each other's acts. The ROE DEFENDANTS are so organized and
10 controlled and their affairs are so conducted that they are alter egos of each other and
11 operate as a single business enterprise.

12 16. Through its hierarchical structure, the ROE DEFENDANTS assume
13 responsibility for the development, protection and discipline of its membership, especially
14 the children of members. Elders, Ministerial Servants, Pioneers and other leaders are
15 appointed and empowered by the GOVERNING BODY to carry out this responsibility.

16 17. To further their goals, the ROE DEFENDANTS authorize male Elders,
17 Ministerial Servants, Pioneers and other appointed male leaders to develop relationships
18 of trust with women, children and families and to assume a role of counselor and advocate
19 for problems that might arise, including claims of child abuse. It is the responsibility of the
20 Elders and those higher in the chain of command, including the GOVERNING BODY, to
21 decide if abuse has occurred and how it should be handled.

22 18. Despite knowledge of a problem with sexual abuse of minors by appointed
23 leaders in the ROE DEFENDANTS' organization, the ROE DEFENDANTS acted to
24 continue to appoint these sexual offenders to positions of authority with the opportunity to
25 abuse children through activities within the scope of their appointment. The ROE
26 DEFENDANTS demonstrated willful indifference and/or reckless and/or intentional
27 disregard for the interest and safety of the children entrusted to their care. Rather than
28 implement measures to redress and prevent the sexual molestation of these children, the

1 ROE DEFENDANTS engaged in a systematic pattern and practice of suppression of
2 information to cover-up and hide incidents of child molestation from law enforcement and
3 their membership in order to protect the ROE DEFENDANTS' reputation as well as those
4 within the ROE DEFENDANTS' organization who committed acts of sexual molestation
5 against children.

6 19. The ROE DEFENDANTS have likewise engaged in the routine practice of
7 maintaining secret archival files regarding sexual abuse by Elders, Ministerial Servants,
8 Pioneers and other appointed leaders in the organization. The existence of these files and
9 the contents thereof were not disclosed or made available to law enforcement authorities
10 or others in order for law enforcement to investigate the crimes of these leaders in the
11 ROE DEFENDANTS' organization. The ROE DEFENDANTS furthered this conspiracy of
12 concealment by, among other things, failing to properly report complaints of sexual
13 misconduct to law enforcement authorities, failing to remove molesting leaders or prevent
14 their access to children. Known molesting leaders were reaffirmed as leaders in good
15 standing in the organization and were given authority that permitted continued frequent and
16 unsupervised access to children in the organization.

17 20. At all material times, the ROE DEFENDANTS prohibited the victim and/or
18 accuser from warning others or speaking about the matter to anyone under penalty of
19 discipline. Victim/accusers were not permitted to report suspected abuse to outside
20 authorities or to other Publishers within the organization, despite secular laws and duties
21 regarding the reporting of sexual Abuse. Violation of this policy would lead to severe
22 sanctions.

23 21. The ROE DEFENDANTS also failed to provide Plaintiff and her family with
24 any notice or warning regarding the past misconduct of, and abuse by, Edward Villegas.
25 The ROE DEFENDANTS represented to Plaintiff, members and the public that Edward
26 Villegas and other leaders were fit to lead, when in fact they were predator pedophiles.
27 The ROE DEFENDANTS knew or had reason to know that Edward Villegas and other
28

1 leader molesters would continue to sexually molest children, using their leadership
2 positions to gain access to and control over their victims.

3 22. Beginning in at least 1970, if not earlier, the ROE DEFENDANTS
4 appointed Edward Villegas to the leadership position of Elder with authority over women
5 and children in the ROE DEFENDANTS' organization.

6 23. Beginning by at least 1972, the ROE DEFENDANTS' agent, Edward Villegas,
7 used his position as an Elder to gain access to children under the care of the ROE
8 DEFENDANTS' organization and to sexually abuse them.

9 24. Beginning in 1977 and continuing through approximately 1980, Edward
10 Villegas used his position as an Elder and leader in the ROE DEFENDANTS' organization
11 to gain access to and sexually abuse Plaintiff, TABITHA H. was approximately 4 years old
12 when the abuse began. Using his delegated authority as a leader in the ROE
13 DEFENDANTS' organization, Edward Villegas repeatedly sexually abused TABITHA H.
14 two to three days a week while she was in his home which was used to provide day care
15 center for Plaintiff, TABITHA H. and other children in the ROE DEFENDANTS'
16 organization. This sexual abuse included, among other things, rape, digital rape, oral sex
17 and fondling. The abuse of TABITHA H. By Edward Villegas also occurred at other ROE
18 DEFENDANT functions, including a gathering of Jehovah's Witnesses at a public park
19 where Edward Villegas used his authority over Plaintiff, TABITHA H. to rape her. When
20 the ROE DEFENDANTS learned of this attack by their agent, they punished Plaintiff,
21 TABITHA H. for masturbating.

22 25. The ROE DEFENDANTS were aware that their agent, Edward Villegas, was
23 using his appointed position as an Elder in the ROE DEFENDANTS' organization to
24 sexually abuse children under the organizations' care. In 1978, the ROE DEFENDANTS
25 privately reprovved their agent for his conduct but took no other steps to hold him
26 accountable or to otherwise notify members and the families of the children whom they had
27 placed under the authority of their agent, Edward Villegas. Therefore, Edward Villegas
28

1 was able to continue to use his position of authority in the ROE DEFENDANTS'
2 organization to abuse Plaintiff for another seven (7) years.

3 26. Plaintiff's position as a minor in the ROE DEFENDANTS' organization, as
4 well as Edward Villegas' position as a spiritual leader and authority figure in the ROE
5 DEFENDANTS' organization allowed him to maintain control and influence over Plaintiff
6 and others. The ROE DEFENDANTS enabled Edward Villegas to abuse Plaintiff and
7 others by appointing him to positions of authority to engage in activities that gave him
8 access to children, and then actively concealing his ongoing sexual abuse. The ROE
9 DEFENDANTS, each of them, used their positions in the organization to aid and abet
10 Edward Villegas and other leaders in the sexual abuse and exploitation of minors in the
11 organization and in furtherance of the conspiracy to conceal the sexual molestation
12 occurring within the ROE DEFENDANTS' organization.

13 27. During this time period, the ROE DEFENDANTS' agent, Edward Villegas,
14 was also using his appointed position of authority as an Elder to sexually abuse other
15 children under the ROE DEFENDANTS' care.

16 28. For over two decades, the ROE DEFENDANTS knew or should have known
17 that their appointed agent, Edward Villegas was using his position of authority in the
18 organization to gain access to and sexually molest and physically abuse adolescents under
19 the care of the organization. Nevertheless, the ROE DEFENDANTS continued to appoint
20 Edward Villegas to leadership positions in their local congregations, entrusting him with the
21 welfare of numerous adolescents in the ROE DEFENDANTS' local congregations. The
22 ROE DEFENDANTS' agent then used his position of authority in the organization to gain
23 access to and sexually molest Plaintiff and others. The ROE DEFENDANTS failed to notify
24 anyone that their agent, Edward Villegas was molesting or had sexually molested
25 adolescents under the ROE DEFENDANTS' care. They further failed to take any steps
26 to protect these young victims from his abuse. Instead, they knowingly concealed this
27 information from Plaintiff and others, thereby aiding and abetting the abuse.
28

1 29. When the ROE DEFENDANTS received reports of their agent's acts of
2 sexual abuse against children entrusted to their care, the ROE DEFENDANTS assumed
3 the exclusive responsibility for dealing with the problem. They instructed families of victims
4 that they should leave the matter to the ROE DEFENDANTS to handle. The ROE
5 DEFENDANTS chose not to report the abuse to law enforcement authorities nor did they
6 warn any other members of the organization that they had appointed a dangerous
7 pedophile to positions of leadership with authority over children. They did not act to help
8 Plaintiff or her family deal with the trauma of abuse and actively prevented them from
9 obtaining help from trained professionals and other available sources. The ROE
10 DEFENDANTS failed to take appropriate steps to hold their agent, Edward Villegas,
11 accountable for his conduct or to assist him in addressing his propensities.

12 30. Edward Villegas used the authority of his position in the ROE DEFENDANTS'
13 organization to gain access to and sexually abuse Plaintiff and others. The ROE
14 DEFENDANTS directly and vicariously caused foreseeable harm to Plaintiff by, among
15 other things:

- 16 a. aiding and abetting the abuse of children by their appointed agents;
- 17 b. blaming, humiliating, sanctioning and/or disciplining victims/accusers of
18 sexual abuse instead of the perpetrator;
- 19 c. intentionally failing to report such sexual abuse, including the abuse by
20 Edward Villegas to law enforcement and governmental child welfare
21 agencies and requiring that members not make such reports;
- 22 d. intentionally refusing to warn Plaintiff, her family, and others of the risk of
23 abuse by Edward Villegas after they knew or should have known of his
24 propensities to use his positions of leadership to engage in acts of sexual
25 abuse against children entrusted to the ROE DEFENDANTS' care;
- 26 e. negligently failing to train its Elders, Overseers, Ministerial Servants and
27 other appointed leaders to identify, investigate, prevent and respond to or
28 report child abuse;

- 1 f. negligently failing to adopt adequate policies and procedures for the
2 protection of children and other members and/or to implement and comply
3 with such procedures that did exist;
- 4 g. failing to properly investigate matters brought to the ROE DEFENDANTS'
5 attention involving child sexual abuse and/or suspicions of child sexual
6 abuse;
- 7 h. negligently failing to provide child abuse victims and their families with
8 assistance in coping with the trauma of abuse and preventing Plaintiff and
9 her family from reporting the abuse to outside authorities and obtaining
10 outside help to deal with the trauma of abuse;
- 11 i. intentionally concealing from Plaintiff and her family that the ROE
12 DEFENDANTS had information that their agent, Edward Villegas was using
13 his position of authority to abuse young children entrusted to their care by
14 the ROE DEFENDANTS;
- 15 j. negligently retaining and failing to properly supervise Edward Villegas as a
16 leader in the organization or to monitor his activities after they knew or
17 should have known of his propensities to use his position of leadership to
18 engage in acts of sexual abuse.

19 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**
20 **COMMON-LAW NEGLIGENCE**

21 31. Plaintiff incorporates herein by this reference and re-alleges paragraphs 1
22 through 30 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

23 32. Plaintiff alleges, at all times herein mentioned, that the ROE DEFENDANTS
24 assumed a duty to protect Plaintiff from sexual predators within the ROE DEFENDANTS'
25 organization. The ROE DEFENDANTS further knew or should have known that Plaintiff
26 was at risk of foreseeable harm by their agent, Edward Villegas, but failed to act to protect
27 her from said harm. The ROE DEFENDANTS breached their duty to Plaintiff, thereby
28 causing great harm to Plaintiff.

1 they knew or should have known of his propensities to use his appointed position to
2 engage in acts of sexual abuse against Plaintiff and other young children under the ROE
3 DEFENDANTS' care.

4 39. As a legal result of Defendants' conduct as described hereinabove, Plaintiff
5 has suffered, and will continue to suffer great pain of mind, body, shock, emotional
6 distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-
7 esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life. Further, Plaintiff was
8 prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing daily activities and obtaining
9 the full enjoyment of life. Plaintiff has sustained loss of earnings and earning capacity.
10 Plaintiff has incurred and will incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment,
11 therapy, and counseling.

12 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**
13 **GROSS NEGLIGENCE/WILFUL MISCONDUCT**

14 40. Plaintiff incorporates herein by this reference and re-alleges paragraphs 1
15 through 39 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

16 41. Plaintiff alleges, at all times herein mentioned, that the ROE DEFENDANTS
17 demonstrated a conscious indifference to the safety and welfare of Plaintiff, who knew or
18 should have known of the dangerous propensities of their agent, Edward Villegas, yet
19 failed to act to protect the health, safety and welfare of children in the custody and care of
20 ROE DEFENDANTS, thereby allowing Plaintiff to be sexually abused. But for the ROE
21 DEFENDANTS' wilful misconduct and gross negligence in failing to implement safeguards
22 to protect Plaintiff, in violation of ROE DEFENDANTS' duty to protect the children
23 entrusted to their and Edward Villegas' care and custody, the sexual abuse would have
24 been prevented.

25 42. Plaintiff further alleges that ROE DEFENDANTS' actions, constituting wilful
26 misconduct and gross negligence described hereinabove, caused significant mental,
27 emotional, and physical injuries as a result of the acts of sexual abuse described
28 hereinabove.

1 Plaintiff has incurred and will incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment,
2 therapy, and counseling.

3 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
4 **INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**

5 48. Plaintiff incorporates herein by this reference and re-alleges paragraphs 1
6 though 47 of the Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

7 49. Plaintiff alleges ROE DEFENDANTS purposefully, intentionally, and after
8 much deliberation, engaged in a pattern of conduct, as described more fully hereinabove,
9 designed and intended to cover up allegations, acts, and investigations pertaining to sexual
10 abuse suffered by children in their organization including, but not limited to, Plaintiff.

11 50. Plaintiff further alleges ROE DEFENDANTS' conduct of quelling complaints
12 of sexual abuse by Plaintiff and others created a dangerous environment for Plaintiff and
13 others to be sexually abused by members and agents in good standing within ROE
14 DEFENDANTS' organization.

15 51. Plaintiff further alleges that after ROE DEFENDANTS were on notice that
16 their members and agents, including Edward Villegas, were sexually abusing Plaintiff and
17 others, ROE DEFENDANTS purposefully, intentionally and deliberately took action to
18 prohibit and prevent Plaintiff and her family from reporting the acts of sexual abuse to legal
19 or secular authorities, where Plaintiff and her family could have obtained assistance to
20 address, prevent and/or resolve the continuous sexual abuse and its residual aftereffects.

21 52. Plaintiff further alleges that ROE DEFENDANTS' conduct was extreme and
22 outrageous and exceeded the bounds tolerated by any civilized community because they
23 purposefully, intentionally and deliberately engaged in a pattern and practice of quelling
24 complaints by Plaintiff and her family of the sexual abuse inflicted by ROE DEFENDANTS'
25 members and agents. Additionally, their conduct was outrageous based on their
26 knowledge, imputed or otherwise, that their member Edward Villegas sexually abused
27 other organization members since at least 1979, yet refrained from taking any action
28

1 whatsoever to prevent or prohibit Edward Villegas from sexually abusing Plaintiff, or to
2 protect Plaintiff from being sexually abused by Edward Villegas.

3 53. Plaintiff further alleges that ROE DEFENDANTS intended to cause Plaintiff
4 emotional distress by engaging in the above described conduct in order to prevent harm
5 their organization's reputation and to avoid civil liability.

6 54. Plaintiff further alleges that ROE DEFENDANTS acted with reckless
7 disregard of the of the probability that Plaintiff would suffer emotional distress, knowing that
8 Plaintiff was present when the conduct was occurring, on-going and continuing to occur
9 because of inaction on the part of ROE DEFENDANTS to protect Plaintiff entrusted to
10 their care from sexual abuse.

11 55. As a result of ROE DEFENDANTS' extreme and outrageous conduct, Plaintiff
12 has suffered and continue to suffer extreme emotional distress and that ROE
13 DEFENDANTS' conduct was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff severe emotional
14 distress.

15 56. As a legal result of Defendants' conduct as described hereinabove, Plaintiff
16 has suffered, and will continue to suffer great pain of mind, body, shock, emotional
17 distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-
18 esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life. Further, Plaintiff was
19 prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing daily activities and obtaining
20 the full enjoyment of life. Plaintiff has sustained loss of earnings and earning capacity.
21 Plaintiff has incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological
22 treatment, therapy, and counseling.

23 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
24 **FRAUD - INTENTIONAL MISREPRESENTATION**

25 57. Plaintiff incorporates herein by this reference and re-alleges paragraphs 1
26 through 56 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

27 58. Plaintiff alleges that after receiving reports that their member Edward
28 Villegas, who remained in good standing at all times mentioned herein, was sexually
abusing adolescents prior to abusing Plaintiff, the ROE DEFENDANTS willfully and

1 intentionally kept the information from Plaintiff, Plaintiff's family, other victims similarly
2 situated and the community-at-large. The ROE DEFENDANTS intentionally
3 misrepresented to Plaintiff and her family that Edward Villegas was a member in good
4 standing, could be trusted, and could interact with Plaintiff and other children, and could
5 be safe during these interactions. The ROE DEFENDANTS further intentionally
6 misrepresented that they would act in the best interests of Plaintiff and other children
7 entrusted to their care. The ROE DEFENDANTS failed to disclose that they knew of
8 Edward Villegas' propensities to use his position of authority to sexually abuse Plaintiff and
9 others and that they were doing nothing to protect the children, including Plaintiff, entrusted
10 their care. Plaintiff did not know of the falsity of the ROE DEFENDANTS' representations,
11 and were entitled to rely upon them, and did in fact rely upon them causing them serious
12 injury and harm.

13 59. Plaintiff further alleges that by holding out Edward Villegas as a member in
14 good standing and allowing him to maintain a position of authority in the organization,
15 allowed to interact with Plaintiff, and representing to Plaintiff and her families that Edward
16 Villegas could be trusted by Plaintiff to be free from being sexually abused, the ROE
17 DEFENDANTS and each of them entered into a fiduciary relationship with Plaintiff based
18 on their direction and guidance required to be followed based on Plaintiff's membership
19 in the organization.

20 60. Plaintiff further alleges that as fiduciaries to Plaintiff, the ROE
21 DEFENDANTS, and each of them, had a duty to obtain and disclose information relating
22 to sexual misconduct by their member and agent, Edward Villegas, who at all times
23 mentioned herein was held out to Plaintiff to be a member in good standing and leader
24 who could be trusted. The ROE DEFENDANTS failed to disclose and later conspired to
25 conceal such information from Plaintiff.

26 61. Plaintiff further alleges that ROE DEFENDANTS representations that Edward
27 Villegas was member in good standing and a leader who could be trusted by other
28 members of the congregations, including Plaintiff, were false.

1 68. Plaintiff further alleges ROE DEFENDANTS intentionally failed to disclose
2 important facts to Plaintiff, namely that Edward Villegas, a known sexual abuser, was safe
3 be around and that they could interact with Edward Villegas despite ROE DEFENDANTS'
4 knowledge of Edward Villegas' propensities to sexual molest and abuse children such as
5 Plaintiff.

6 69. Plaintiff further alleges ROE DEFENDANTS intentionally failed to disclose
7 important facts regarding Edward Villegas' propensities to sexually molest and abuse
8 children, which was known by ROE DEFENDANTS and their agents. Plaintiff was not able
9 to discover by their own means that Edward Villegas was prone to sexually molest and
10 abuse children, until after the sexual abuse, described more fully above, had already
11 occurred.

12 70. Plaintiff further alleges ROE DEFENDANTS actively concealed important
13 facts regarding Edward Villegas' propensities to sexually molest and abuse children, such
14 as Plaintiff, and prevented Plaintiff from discovering these facts.

15 71. Plaintiff further alleges he did not know of the facts concealed by ROE
16 DEFENDANTS regarding Edward Villegas' propensities to sexually abuse children, such
17 as Plaintiff.

18 72. Plaintiff further alleges she reasonably relied on ROE DEFENDANTS
19 deception regarding their concealing the facts pertaining to Edward Villegas' propensities
20 to sexually abuse children and interacted with Edward Villegas believing him to be safe
21 and in good standing, as conveyed by ROE DEFENDANTS' holding out Edward Villegas
22 to be a member in good standing and a leader who could be trusted.

23 73. Plaintiff further alleges she was harmed by ROE DEFENDANTS'
24 concealment of these important facts, which were substantial factors in causing harm to
25 Plaintiff.

26 74. As a legal result of Defendants' conduct as described hereinabove, Plaintiff
27 has suffered, and will continue to suffer great pain of mind, body, shock, emotional
28 distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-

1 esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life. Further, Plaintiff was
2 prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing daily activities and obtaining
3 the full enjoyment of life. Plaintiff has sustained loss of earnings and earning capacity.
4 Plaintiff has incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological
5 treatment, therapy, and counseling.

6 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
7 **CONSPIRACY**

8 75. Plaintiff incorporates herein by this reference and re-alleges paragraphs 1
9 through 74 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

10 76. The ROE DEFENDANTS, in concert with each other and with the intent to
11 conceal, defraud, and misrepresent, conspired to misrepresent, conceal and fail to disclose
12 information relating to the sexual misconduct of their member and appointed agent who
13 they held out to be in good standing and to be trusted, Edward Villegas to Plaintiff. By
14 concealing such information, the ROE DEFENDANTS and each of them committed at least
15 one act in furtherance of the conspiracy.

16 77. As a legal result of Defendants' conduct as described hereinabove, Plaintiff
17 has suffered, and will continue to suffer great pain of mind, body, shock, emotional
18 distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-
19 esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life. Further, Plaintiff was
20 prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing daily activities and obtaining
21 the full enjoyment of life. Plaintiff has sustained loss of earnings and earning capacity.
22 Plaintiff has incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological
23 treatment, therapy, and counseling.

24 **PRAYER**

25 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the ROE DEFENDANTS
26 individually, jointly and severally as follows:

- 27 1. For general damages according to proof;
28 2. For past and future medical expenses according to proof;

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

3. For past and future loss of earnings according to proof;
4. For prejudgment interest;
5. For costs of suit incurred herein; and
6. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: _____

NOLEN SAUL BRELSFORD

Rudy Nolen, Esq.,
Attorneys for Plaintiff