

**THE QUEEN'S BENCH
Winnipeg Centre**

BETWEEN:

B.L.N.

Plaintiff

and

RONALD J. LEGER, LA CORPORATION ARCHIÉPISCOPALE
CATHOLIQUE ROMAINE DE SAINT-BONIFACE and
CLERCS DE SAINT-VIATEUR DU CANADA

Defendants

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

*Robert P.M. Talach
630 Richmond St.
London, Ontario
N6A 3G6*

*TEL: 519-673-4994
FAX: 519-432-1660*

**THE QUEEN'S BENCH
Winnipeg Centre**

BETWEEN:

D.M.N.
B.L.N.

Plaintiff

and

RONALD J. LEGER, LA CORPORATION ARCHIEPISCOPALE
CATHOLIQUE ROMAINE DE SAINT-BONIFACE and
CLERCS DE SAINT-VIATEUR DU CANADA

Defendants

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

TO THE DEFENDANTS:

A LEGAL PROCEEDING HAS BEEN COMMENCED AGAINST YOU by the plaintiff. The claim made against you is set out in the following pages.

IF YOU WISH TO DEFEND THIS PROCEEDING, you or a Manitoba lawyer acting for you must prepare a statement of defence in Form 18A prescribed by the *Queen's Bench Rules*, serve it on the plaintiff's lawyer or where the plaintiff does not have a lawyer, serve it on the plaintiff, and file it in this court office, WITHIN TWENTY DAYS after this statement of claim is served on you, if you are served in Manitoba.

If you are served in another province or territory of Canada or in the United States of America, the period for serving and filing your statement of defence is forty days. If you are served outside Canada and the United States of America, the period is sixty days.

IF YOU FAIL TO DEFEND THIS PROCEEDING, JUDGEMENT MAY BE GIVEN AGAINST YOU IN YOUR ABSENCE AND WITHOUT FURTHER NOTICE TO YOU.

JUN 15 2016
Date

Issued D. CHAMPAGNE
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
COURT OF THE QUEEN'S BENCH
FOR MANITOBA

TO: Ronald J. Leger
c/o Clercs de Saint-Viateur du Canada
450 Avenue Querbes

served on 16 day of June
2016

J. LONSDALE
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
COURT OF THE QUEEN'S BENCH
FOR MANITOBA

AND

TO: La Corporation Archiépiscope
Catholique Romaine de Saint-Boniface
151 de la Cathédrale Avenue
WINNIPEG, MB R2H 0H6

AND

TO: Clercs de Saint-Viator du Canada
450 Avenue Querbes
MONTREAL, QC H2V 3W5

CLAIM

1. The plaintiff, B.L.N., claims damages as follows:
 - a) non-pecuniary damages for pain and suffering in the amount of \$400,000.00;
 - b) past and future pecuniary damages estimated in the amount of \$1,000,000.00;
 - c) special damages in the amount of \$100,000.00;
 - d) aggravated damages in the amount of \$100,000.00;
 - e) punitive and exemplary damages in the amount of \$500,000.00;
 - f) pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on the above-noted amounts pursuant to the terms and provisions of *The Court of Queen's Bench Act*, as amended;
 - g) his costs of this action on a substantial indemnity basis; and
 - h) such further and other relief as to this Honourable Court may deem to be just.

Parties:

2. The plaintiff, B.L.N. (the "Plaintiff"), was born on December 15, 1993 and presently resides in the City of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba. The Plaintiff was at all material times a parishioner of the La Corporation Archdiocésale Catholique Romaine de Saint-Boniface (the "Archdiocese").
3. The perpetrator, Ronald J. Leger ("Leger"), was during all material times a priest of the Roman Catholic Church and jointly employed by the Clercs de Saint-Viateur du

Canada (the "Order") and the Archdiocese to serve as the priest and religious mentor to Catholic parishioners and youth. All defendants owed a duty of care to the Plaintiff due to the proximity of their activities to the Plaintiff's life and the foreseeability of interaction.

4. The defendant Archdiocese is an archdiocese of the Roman Catholic Church charged with the administration of parishes and ministries of the Roman Catholic Church within its geographical jurisdiction. The Archdiocese's head office is located in the City of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba.

5. The Archdiocese, during all material times, had the following purposes and responsibilities:

- a) the establishment and maintenance of a uniform set of rules and principles which collectively define the ideology of the Roman Catholic religion;
- b) the establishment of churches and schools to teach and inculcate these rules and principles in their members;
- c) the recruitment, selection and training of priests to carry out their purposes; and
- d) the overall supervision and oversight of all Catholic ministries operating within its geographical jurisdiction, including but not limited to those of the Order.

6. The Archdiocese had a duty of care to its parishioners owing to the close proximity of its priests to the lives of the parishioners as well as the level of trust and faith which the parishioners and others extended to the Archdiocese, its priests and employees.

7. The defendant Order is a Roman Catholic religious order whose mission is to the underprivileged and the young, primarily in the fields of Christian education, the establishment and development of Christian communities, and promoting the quality of liturgical life. Its head office is located in Montreal, Quebec.

8. During the material time, the Order provided priests to serve in the Archdiocese, acting in partnership or a joint venture. The Order and the Archdiocese had a duty of care to parishioners owing to the close proximity of their priests to the lives of the members as well as the level of trust and faith which the members and others extended to the Order and the Archdiocese, their priests and employees.

The Actions of Leger

9. In 1965 Leger was ordained into the priesthood by the Order following the Order's recruitment, selection and training of him. He was immediately posted to work in schools in Ontario and then Manitoba. In or about 1980 he founded Teen Stop, a youth drop-in centre.

10. In or about 1995, when the Plaintiff was 2 years old, the Plaintiff met Leger

through his step-father whom had a longstanding priest-parishioner relationship with Leger. Through his position as a priest and a representative of the Archdiocese and the Order, Leger was to the Plaintiff an important ecclesiastical authority. He was over the years leading up to and during the abuse, a family priest to the Plaintiff and his step-father.

11. Leger engaged in activities with the Plaintiff in his capacity as a priest, counselling the Plaintiff in religion and mentoring him as a child and later as a teenager. His activities included providing spiritual guidance, counselling him in religion, Catholic education and other matters.

12. Leger used his position as a priest of the Archdiocese and the Order, which was a position of authority and trust, to develop a close personal relationship with the Plaintiff when he was young. The relationships that Leger developed with the Plaintiff, under the guise of a priest-parishioner relationship, allowed Leger an opportunity to be alone with the Plaintiff and to exert total control over him, prey upon him and sexually abuse him.

13. Commencing in or about 2004, when the Plaintiff was 12 years old, and for two years thereafter, Leger repeatedly sexually abused, assaulted, and molested the Plaintiff. The particulars of same include, but are not limited to the following:

- a) Leger hugged the Plaintiff;
- b) Leger fondled the clothed body of the Plaintiff, including but not limited to

his penis and scrotum;

- c) Leger exposed his naked body, or parts thereof, to the Plaintiff; and
- d) Leger engaged in other sexual activities with the Plaintiff.

14. The aforementioned behaviours occurred on a repeated basis at various locations where Leger could get the Plaintiff alone.

15. In order to facilitate the abuses Leger engaged in a pattern of behaviour which was intended to make the Plaintiff feel that he was special in the eyes of Leger, the Church, and God.

16. Leger used his position of authority and trust, as well as the dependency relationship that he had fostered with the Plaintiff, to ensure that the Plaintiff did not tell anyone about the behaviours they had engaged in.

17. The aforementioned behaviour occurred on a regular and repeated basis, increasing in frequency, nature and intensity as it progressed.

18. All of the aforementioned behaviours were related to pastor/parishioner activities.

19. Leger's behavior constituted sexual abuse and assault. It was also a breach of the duty of care that he owed to the Plaintiff in that, *inter alia*, he did willfully and/or

negligently inflict pain and suffering, mental suffering, humiliation and degradation upon the Plaintiff, assaulted the Plaintiff and interfered with his normal upbringing solely for the purpose of his own gratification. Leger's behavior also constitutes a breach of the fiduciary duty which he owed to the Plaintiff.

20. Leger was convicted of sexual assaulting the Plaintiff and two other boys and sentenced to two years custody in February of 2016.

The Actions of the Archdiocese:

21. The Archdiocese taught the Plaintiff as well as other members of the Catholic Church the following:

- a) that the Roman Catholic Church is the one true religion and is the representation of God's true teachings on earth;
- b) that the authority of the Roman Catholic Church is supreme;
- c) that by following the rules, principles and ideologies of the Roman Catholic Church one will gain the right to go to Heaven and that by failing to follow same one will not go to Heaven and will go to Hell;
- d) that parents must bring their children up in the ways of the Roman Catholic Church and that children must attend at Catholic schools so that they can be educated with respect to the ways of the Church;
- e) that you must go to church at least once per week and attend Catholic schools where the rules, principles and ideologies of the Roman Catholic Church and religion are taught;

- f) that the rule of God is supreme and that to disobey the rule of God is a mortal sin that will cause one to go to Hell;
- g) that God's representation on earth and the teachings of God are done through priests;
- h) that priests are the chosen representatives on earth of God and have special powers; and
- i) that priests are to be viewed with special reverence, power, respect, honour and authority.

22. The Archdiocese employed Leger to carry out the purposes and teachings referred to above in dealing with the Plaintiff. It provided Leger with the opportunity and means to come into contact with the Plaintiff. It fostered a relationship between Leger and the Plaintiff. It provided Leger with a position of respect and trust which the Plaintiff was bound by the rules set out above to follow and honour. It provided Leger with access and control of Diocesan facilities which further added to his position of power and respect.

23. The Plaintiff pleads that, at all material times, Leger was acting in the course of his duties as a priest of the Roman Catholic Church and the Archdiocese and was using the aforementioned rules, principles and ideologies to further his attempts to manipulate the Plaintiff and engage in deviant activities.

24. The Plaintiff pleads that the aforementioned rules, principles and ideologies of the Archdiocese created an opportunity for Leger to exert power and authority over the Plaintiff. This power and authority allowed Leger to engage in the aforementioned behaviour and to continue to engage in same without resistance or question of the Plaintiff for many years without risk of getting caught, and thereby put the Plaintiff at risk of being abused by Leger.

25. The Plaintiff pleads that Leger was, as a result of his position with the Archdiocese which allowed him to use the premises owned by the Archdiocese where the aforementioned behaviours and activities occurred, and to gain access to the Plaintiff, afforded an opportunity to foster a trusting relationship with the Plaintiff and to engage in the aforementioned behaviours for a considerable period of time without the risk of getting caught and thereby put the Plaintiff at risk of being abused by Leger.

26. As a result, the Archdiocese is vicariously responsible and liable for the actions of Leger.

27. The Plaintiff pleads that the Archdiocese was negligent and failed in its duty to the Plaintiff, the particulars of which are set out below:

- a) it failed to recognize that a certain percentage of priests would become sexually deviant and would make sexual advances to children and young people;

- b) it failed to instruct priests in training and ordained priests about the possibilities of becoming sexually deviant and/or making advances to children and young people;
- c) it failed to properly investigate Leger's background, character and psychological state prior to accepting him to serve in the Archdiocese;
- d) it failed to document, discipline or expel Leger for his shortcomings;
- e) it failed to follow its own internal policies in allowing Leger to serve in the Archdiocese;
- f) it failed to warn Leger's immediate supervisors, parishioners, students and others who may come into contact with Leger of his difficulties;
- g) it failed to educate members of the Roman Catholic Church about the possibilities of such deviant behaviours;
- h) it failed to have any, or a proper, system of self-reporting, other-reporting or counselling in place for priests who engage in such behaviour;
- i) it fostered a system, based on the rules, principles and ideologies of the church, in which deviant sexual practices were bound to develop among a percentage of the priests;
- j) it fostered a system, based on the rules, principles and ideologies of the church, in particular, the rule that priests have absolute authority, whereby the reporting of such deviant sexual behaviour of a priest by its members would be considered to be "wrong";
- k) it denied the existence, or alternatively was wilfully blind to the existence of the behaviours described herein;

- l) it implemented and maintained a system which was designed to cover-up the existence of such behaviour if such behaviour was ever reported;
- m) it failed to protect the Plaintiff from Leger when it knew or ought to have known that he was vulnerable to the attentions and influence of Leger;
- n) it failed to properly supervise, control and give guidance to their employee Leger;
- o) it failed to screen and/or monitor the character, sexual orientation and sexual activity of Leger;
- p) it failed to warn the Plaintiff and others of the propensities of Leger;
- q) it failed to remove Leger from his duties upon learning of the allegations of sexual and other inappropriate conduct thereby leaving the Plaintiff exposed to Leger and his actions without protection;
- r) it failed to protect the Plaintiff;
- s) it failed to take steps to investigate the activities of Leger once it was fully aware of his shortcomings in an effort to locate and assist any victims;
and
- t) it failed to identify, counsel and assist the Plaintiff once it knew of Leger's prior behaviour.

28. In addition to, and in the alternative to, the above the Plaintiff pleads that the Archdiocese knew that Leger had the propensity to engage in such deviant behaviours and that he was, in fact, engaging in such deviant behaviour because of the following:

- a) Leger's difficulties as a seminarian;

- b) Leger's difficulties with alcohol;
- c) Leger's difficulties with his sexuality;
- d) the concerns of other clergy, parishioners, students and others;
- e) the frequency with which the Plaintiff and other children and young people were involved with Leger;
- f) the unusual interest that Leger took in young people and children, particularly the Plaintiff;
- g) the duration of time in which the Plaintiff, other children and young people spent regular time alone with Leger;
- h) the fact that parents and others at Leger's previous parish postings or schools had complained about his actions with young people; and
- i) the fact that Leger would have, in accordance with the rules of the Roman Catholic Church, confessed about these deviant sexual behaviours (i.e. sins) from time to time to one or more of the other priests.

29. Despite its knowledge of same, the Archdiocese took no steps to stop the behaviour or to protect the Plaintiff and, instead, took steps to attempt to cover-up the behaviour.

30. In the alternative, if the Archdiocese did not have direct knowledge of the aforementioned behaviours, the Plaintiff pleads that the Archdiocese ought to have known about same because of the circumstances, as detailed above, surrounding the acts.

31. If the Archdiocese did not know of the aforementioned behaviour, it was because of the existence of its own rules, principles and ideologies and its lack of due diligence in permitting Leger to minister in the Archdiocese which allowed Leger to conceal his activities and cover up his deviant behaviour.

32. The Plaintiff pleads that the Archdiocese owed a special duty to the Plaintiff by virtue of its relationship with him to identify the Plaintiff and counsel and render assistance to the Plaintiff once they became aware of the behaviour of Leger. Furthermore, they should have sought out Leger's victims upon later learning of his misconduct.

33. The Archdiocese knew or ought to have known that Leger had engaged in deviant behaviour while ministering and failed to investigate such. In failing to investigate and identify any past failings of Leger it also failed to identify any victims who may have been in need of counselling, assistance and support because of the actions of Leger. Such assistance would be necessary in order to minimize the consequences of Leger's actions and the effect of same on the Plaintiff. It has failed, to this day, to investigate the extent of Leger's past behaviour and has failed to render any assistance to the Plaintiff, contrary to its own internal policies and the policies of the Canadian Catholic Conference of Bishops.

34. The Plaintiff states that the relationship between him, the Archdiocese and Leger commenced when the Plaintiff was a child and, as such, the defendants owed to the Plaintiff a high duty and standard of care and, in particular, a duty to protect him from harm by its employees (i.e. priests) and specifically sexual abuse. The Archdiocese also breached the fiduciary duty that it owed to the plaintiff.

35. The Plaintiff says that the Archdiocese, for the aforementioned reasons, failed in its duty of care to him and was thereby negligent.

The Actions of the Order:

36. The defendant Order, in partnership with the defendant Archdiocese, engaged in the teachings referred to in paragraph 22 above.

37. The defendant Order employed Leger and other members of the Order in partnership with the Archdiocese to carry out the purposes and teachings referred to above in dealing with the Plaintiff. It provided Leger with the opportunity and means to come into contact with the Plaintiff. It fostered a relationship between Leger and the Plaintiff. It provided Leger with a position of respect and trust which the Plaintiff was bound by the rules set out above to follow and honour. It provided Leger with access and control of Diocesan facilities which further added to his position of power and respect.

38. The Plaintiff pleads that, at all material times, Leger was acting in the course of his duties as a priest of the Order and was using the aforementioned rules, principles and ideologies to further his attempts to manipulate the Plaintiff and to engage in deviant activities.

39. The Plaintiff pleads that the aforementioned rules, principles and ideologies of the Order created an opportunity for Leger to exert power and authority over the Plaintiff. This power and authority allowed Leger to engage in the aforementioned behaviours and to continue to engage in same without resistance or question of the Plaintiff for many years without risk of getting caught, and thereby put the Plaintiff at risk of being abused by Leger.

40. The Plaintiff pleads that Leger was, as a result of his position with the Order which allowed him to use the premises owned and managed by the Archdiocese and/or Order, where the aforementioned behaviours and activities occurred, and to gain access to the Plaintiff, afforded an opportunity to foster a trusting relationship with the Plaintiff and to engage in the aforementioned behaviours for a considerable period of time without the risk of getting caught and thereby put the Plaintiff at risk of being abused by Leger.

41. As a result, the Order is vicariously responsible and liable for the actions of Leger.

42. The Plaintiff pleads that the Order was negligent and failed in its duty to the Plaintiff, the particulars of which are set out below:

- a) it failed to recognize that a certain percentage of priests would become sexually deviant and would make sexual advances to children and young people;
- b) it failed to instruct priests in training and ordained priests about the possibilities of becoming sexually deviant and/or making advances to children and young people;
- c) it failed to properly investigate Leger's background, character and psychological state prior to accepting him into the seminary and later the priesthood;
- d) it failed to document, discipline or expel Leger for his shortcomings as a seminarian;
- e) it failed to follow its own internal policies in ordaining Leger to the priesthood;
- f) it failed to warn Leger's immediate supervisors, parishioners, students and others who may come into contact with Leger of his difficulties as a seminarian;
- g) it failed to educate members of the Roman Catholic Church about the possibilities of such deviant behaviours;
- h) it failed to have any, or a proper, system of self-reporting, other-reporting or counselling in place for priests who engage in such behaviour;

- i) it fostered a system, based on the rules, principles and ideologies of the church, in which deviant sexual practices were bound to develop among a percentage of the priests;
- j) it fostered a system, based on the rules, principles and ideologies of the church, in particular, the rule that priests have absolute authority, whereby the reporting of such deviant sexual behaviour of a priest by its members would be considered to be "wrong";
- k) it denied the existence, or alternatively was wilfully blind to the existence of the behaviours described herein;
- l) it implemented and maintained a system which was designed to cover-up the existence of such behaviour if such behaviour was ever reported;
- m) it failed to protect the Plaintiff from Leger when it knew or ought to have known that he was vulnerable to the attentions and influence of Leger;
- n) it failed to properly supervise, control and give guidance to their employee Leger;
- o) it failed to screen and/or monitor the character, sexual orientation and sexual activity of Leger;
- p) it failed to warn the Plaintiff and others of the propensities of Leger;
- q) it failed to remove Leger from his duties upon learning of the

allegations of sexual and other inappropriate conduct thereby leaving the Plaintiff exposed to Leger and his actions without protection;

- r) it failed to protect the Plaintiff;
- s) it failed to take steps to investigate the activities of Leger once it was fully aware of his shortcomings in an effort to locate and assist any victims; and
- t) it failed to identify, counsel and assist the Plaintiff once it knew of Leger's prior behaviour.

43. In addition to, and in the alternative to, the above the Plaintiff pleads that the Order knew that Leger had the propensity to engage in such deviant behaviours and that he was, in fact, engaging in such deviant behaviour because of the following:

- a) Leger's difficulties as a seminarian;
- b) Leger's difficulties with alcohol;
- c) Leger's difficulties with his sexuality;
- d) The concerns of other clergy, parishioners, students and others;
- e) the frequency with which the Plaintiff and other children and young people were involved with Leger;
- f) the unusual interest that Leger took in young people and children, particularly the Plaintiff;
- g) the duration of time in which the Plaintiff, other children and young people spent regular time alone with Leger;

- h) the fact that parents and others at Leger previous parish postings or schools had complained about his actions with young people; and
- i) the fact that Leger would have, in accordance with the rules of the Roman Catholic Church, confessed about these deviant sexual behaviours (i.e. sins) from time to time to one or more of the other priests.

44. Despite its knowledge of same, the Order took no steps to stop the behaviour or to protect the Plaintiff and, instead, took steps to attempt to cover-up the behaviour.

45. In the alternative, if the Order did not have direct knowledge of the aforementioned behaviours, the Plaintiff pleads that it ought to have known about same because of the circumstances, as detailed above, surrounding the acts.

46. If the Order did not know of the aforementioned behaviour, it was because of the existence of its own rules, principles and ideologies which allowed Leger to conceal his activities and cover up his deviant behaviour.

47. The Plaintiff pleads that the Order owed a special duty to the Plaintiff by virtue of its relationship with him to identify the Plaintiff and counsel and render assistance to the Plaintiff once they became aware of the behaviour of Leger. Furthermore, they should have sought out Leger's victims upon later learning of his misconduct.

48. The Order knew or ought to have known that Leger had engaged in deviant behaviour while ministering and failed to investigate such. In failing to investigate and identify any past failings of Leger they also failed to identify any victims who may have been in need of counselling, assistance and support because of the actions of Leger. Such assistance would be necessary in order to minimize the consequences of Leger's actions and the effect of same on the Plaintiff. They have failed, to this day, to investigate the extent of Leger past behaviour and have failed to render any assistance to the Plaintiff.

49. The Plaintiff states that the relationship between him, the Order and Leger commenced when the Plaintiff was a child and, as such, the defendants owed to the Plaintiff a high duty/standard of care and, in particular, a duty to protect him from harm by its employees (i.e. priests) and specifically sexual abuse. The Order also breached the fiduciary duty it owed to the Plaintiff.

50. The Plaintiff says that the Order, for the aforementioned reasons, failed in its duty of care to him and was thereby negligent.

Damages:

51. The Plaintiff states, and the fact is, that as a direct result of the behaviour of the defendants he has suffered damages and losses the particulars of which are as follows:

- a) mental anguish;

- b) nervous shock, humiliation, degradation;
- c) shame, guilt and feelings of worthlessness;
- d) loss of enjoyment of faith;
- e) loss of religious life/beliefs;
- f) impairment of his opportunity to experience a normal adolescence and adulthood;
- g) impairment of his ability and opportunity to obtain and complete an education appropriate to his abilities/aptitude;
- h) impairment of his ability to earn an income and support himself and time off work due to emotional trauma;
- i) impairment of his physical health, mental health and emotional well-being;
- j) suicidal thoughts;
- k) anxiety and depression;
- l) inability to develop and engage in normal human relations, including difficulties with trust and difficulty in establishing relationships of intimacy;
- m) mistrust of authority figures;
- n) alcohol abuse and other addictive behaviours;
- o) hyper-vigilance;
- p) sleeping difficulties and "flashbacks";
- q) a propensity to engage in reckless and careless behaviour;
- r) symptoms of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder; and
- s) a loss of enjoyment of life.

52. The Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer physical, emotional and mental pain and suffering and a loss of enjoyment of life. The Plaintiff was deprived of a normal adolescence as a result of the actions or in-actions of the defendants. The life of the Plaintiff was fundamentally and forever changed by the above-noted behaviour.

53. The Plaintiff was so profoundly negatively affected by these behaviours and activities that he spent many years of his life struggling to deal with the physical, mental, psychological and emotional sequelae of these events.

54. The Plaintiff has suffered a tremendous loss of enjoyment of life and ongoing pain and suffering. His ability to carry on a normal life has been extinguished or impaired.

55. The Plaintiff has suffered physical, mental, psychological and emotional stress, shock and suffering which will continue forever.

56. The Plaintiff has been required to undergo medical treatment and psychological counselling and will continue to require same indefinitely throughout his lifetime.

57. The Plaintiff has sustained out-of-pocket expenses the particulars of which will be provided prior to the trial of the within action.

58. The Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer economic losses, including, past income loss, future and ongoing income loss, and various other out-of-pocket expenses the particulars of which will be provided.

59. The Plaintiff pleads that the conduct of Leger described herein was harsh, high-handed, and malicious and, as such, should be punished with aggravated and/or punitive damages, for which the Order and the Archdiocese are vicariously liable.

60. The Plaintiff further pleads that the conduct of the Order and the Archdiocese described herein was harsh, high-handed and malicious, and as such, should be punished with aggravated and/or punitive damages, including but not limited to:

- a) failing to appropriately react to reports of Leger's sexual misconduct and instead transferring him to new postings where further unsuspecting victims awaited;
- b) consciously and deliberately suppressing information concerning his sexual misconduct in an effort to protect the reputation of the Order and the Archdiocese over the safety of people;
- c) promoting a culture of secrecy with respect to the sexual misconduct of clergy which was intended to benefit the Order and the Archdiocese rather than stop the misconduct or assist the victims; and
- d) failing to contact the Plaintiff's parents and secular authorities upon learning of Leger's actions.

61. The Plaintiff has only recently been able to face these effects and still to this day has not fully realized the extent of his victimization. The Plaintiff became sufficiently capable of appreciating the impact of Leger's actions in early 2015 and relies upon the principle of discoverability. The Plaintiff was incapable of commencing this action earlier due to the psychological effects of the abuse including guilt, shame, depression and symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder.

62. In the alternative to damages, the Plaintiff claims appropriate equitable compensation.

63. The Plaintiff relies on the *Criminal Code of Canada*, RSC 1985, c C-46, *The Tortfeasors and Contributory Negligence Act*, CCS, c T90, *The Limitation of Actions Act*, CCSM c L150, the *Occupiers' Liability Act*, CCSM, c O8, and any and all predecessor legislation.

64. The Plaintiff proposes that this action be tried in the City of Winnipeg, in the Winnipeg Capital Region.

JUN 15 2016
Date of Issue:

R.P.M. TALACH (LSUC# 45130J)
BECKETT
Personal Injury Lawyers
630 Richmond Street
London ON N6A 3G6
Tel: (519) 673-4994
Fax: (519) 432-1660

Solicitors for the Plaintiff