

The Murphy Report: A Personal Assessment

Pádraig McCarthy*

(Quotations from the Murphy report are in italics. The first number in paragraph references is the chapter number; the second number is the paragraph within that chapter.)

The Murphy Report* of the Commission of Investigation into the handling of allegations of child sexual abuse by priests in the diocese of Dublin 1975 – 2004 seemed to hit the diocese and the country like a runaway train. A reaction of outrage is very understandable. I have been angry at the long-lasting suffering of those abused as children, whether by clergy or by others. I have been angry at the failures in the way complaints were received and handled by the diocese, and at the consequent further suffering caused. I feel shamed in the abuse perpetrated by priests with whom I serve in the diocese, and by the failures by diocesan authorities in acting in an effective pastoral way. However marginally, I am part of that abusive structure. For those reasons, I welcome the publication of the Report.

What I find valuable in the Murphy Report

We have lived for so many years with rumours and partial truth. This has been particularly difficult for those who were abused. Now we can deal with reality on a firmer basis of fact. The Murphy Report documents both effective action and failures on part of church (Dublin diocese, and, where applicable, religious order or congregation) and state (Gardaí, Health Board). The Commission has done valuable service to those who were abused, to the people of this country, and in particular to all the members of the Catholic Church in Ireland. Putting the protection of ordained priests before the protection and service of lay members of the church is an injustice. Those people who were abused and betrayed, and who persisted in challenging the diocese until at last the matter could not be avoided, have done the church a great service. So also have those in the media who supported that challenge.

Truth, we hope, brings justice and new life to those abused. For the church, it impels us towards the end of church as empire, and towards its true nature of the body of Christ: a communion of people, a community of service, a place of reconciliation. That has never been lost, but it has been overshadowed in recent history by a tendency to adopt the model of domination that we find so much in our world. A Church which has lost awareness of its own brokenness is a Church which has lost the ability to serve. Abuse of children was carried out by ordained priests, whose vocation is to encourage and enable respect and reverence for every human being, and to serve all the baptised in the living of their priesthood. This is a shattering betrayal, as great an abomination as the abuse of children by a parent, the very person to whom the child should be able to turn for protection. My prayer is that the present focus on the wrong done by priests will serve also to protect children, and indeed every human being, from abuse in whatever circumstances. We have learned in recent decades that abuse of children, sexual and otherwise, is far more widespread in society than there was any previous awareness of, except on the part of those abused. This shameful episode in the Church could be a lightning-rod to serve to protect the human race at large.

Media coverage of the Report may have given the impression that the Report is a catalogue of unrelieved disaster. It is good to be aware, therefore, that of the 45 cases in which the

+ I am a priest of the diocese of Dublin, ordained in 1967; now retired, but helping out where I can.

* The Murphy Report is available at www.dacoi.ie

Report gives an assessment, handling by the church in 25 cases receives some sort of approval from the Commission; 20 cases receive varying degrees of criticism. (See Appendix)

Since appropriate sections of the Report were sent, prior to publication, to those whose names were mentioned in it for checking for factual errors, I take it that the historical facts of what occurred are accurate. It must have been a very difficult task for the members of the Commission to live with those facts for over three years. The Commission drew conclusions from those facts. It is in the area of those conclusions that I would like to raise some questions.

What right have I to assess the Report?

I have found a kind of gut reaction, where the words and the tone of voice say: *“How dare you do anything which would take away from the recognition which the people who were abused have finally achieved after much effort and suffering! How dare you do anything which would let the perpetrators of the abuse off the hook, or which would exonerate the diocesan authorities who so badly failed those abused people!”* That is my not intention in what I write here. But in our sense of outrage it is important that we do not lose our capacity for rational thought. I find it extraordinary that I have found not one journalist or commentator who has done the kind of review of the Report which would otherwise be normal. The Commission, I am sure, would not wish to be burdened with any claim to infallibility; nor do I. We must not make the report the final and absolute word. There was a Latin saying: *“Roma locuta est – causa finita est!”* – *“Rome has spoken – the case is closed!”* It would not be wise to turn that into *“Murphy locuta est ...!”*

We cannot afford to have unrealistic expectations of what the church, or the justice system of the country, can achieve. The abuse of children is very secretive, whoever the abuser is. Abusers can be highly manipulative. There can be no guarantee that each and every person who was abused will be fully satisfied, or even satisfied at all, with the outcome of proceedings. We know well that our human systems have their limitations and their failures. Law, however admirable, is administered by human beings.

If you are angry at what I write here, I only ask this: Please read what I write, and ask whether it is true. If you judge what I say to be false, please discard it. Even better, try to put into words why you say it is wrong, and let me, or the editor of *The Furrow*, know. This debate is overdue.

The Murphy Report in the context of Irish society.

The Dublin Archdiocese Commission of Investigation was established to report on the handling by Church and State authorities of a representative sample of allegations and suspicions of child sexual abuse against clerics operating under the aegis of the Archdiocese of Dublin over the period 1975 to 2004 (Par. 1.1). The Commission received over 70,000 documents from the diocese in relation to this enquiry (2.18). If all of these documents are relevant to the thirty years, this is an average of over six documents for each and every day of those 30 years. Even if some of these were of marginal value, it is still a staggering quantity of documentation.

In the case of the Health Services Executive (HSE), the Commission was told that, because the HSE files were filed by reference to the name of the abused and were not in any way cross-referenced to the alleged abuser, it would have to examine individually up to 180,000 files in order to ascertain whether an alleged abuser was a priest in the Dublin Archdiocese (2.19). The Report remarks: The health boards and the HSE do not properly record cases of

clerical child sexual abuse (1.98). Also: The Garda Síochaná gave what documentation they had. This documentation was quite extensive for the period after 1995. They were unable to supply files in relation to some of their activities in the 1960s, 1970s, or 1980s as these had been destroyed or mislaid. (2.19)

It may be the case that the work of the Murphy Commission was made easier because the diocese kept such full records. If HSE, Garda and other records are not of equal standard, it may indicate, paradoxically, that the diocese, however faulty, had a greater sense of pastoral responsibility for the abused person and for the abuser. For the fullest possible protection of children, an investigation no less thorough needs to be carried out in those other spheres. Will it take another series of media exposures to stimulate our government into action here?

The SAVI (Sexual Abuse and Violence in Ireland) Report (2002) findings are that “clerical/religious ministers or clerical/religious teachers constituted 3.2% of abusers”. The other 96.8% of abusers are non-clerical. We hear little about how those cases were managed by the relevant bodies. Is it likely that only the diocese managed cases badly? Although not within the remit of the Murphy Commission, it seems important that the records of the HSE, Gardaí, and other organisations which have dealings with children also be examined, so that we know whether the same pattern of concealment and protection is to be found there. Otherwise we could presume without foundation that what was done in Dublin diocese was significantly worse than the rest of society.

How widespread was abuse of children by clergy in the diocese of Dublin?

The Murphy Commission states: *It is abundantly clear, from the Commission’s investigation as revealed in the cases of the 46 priests in the representative sample (see Chapters 11 to 57), that child sexual abuse by clerics was widespread throughout the period under review. (1.7) The volume of revelations of child sexual abuse by clergy over the past 35 years or so has been described by a Church source as a “tsunami” of sexual abuse. He went on to describe the “tsunami” as “an earthquake deep beneath the surface hidden from view”. (1.14)*

Without doubt, even one crime of child sexual abuse is an abomination. The statistics published by the diocese on 26 November 2009 put the “tsunami” image in perspective. The Murphy report covers the period 1975 to 2004, and takes a representative sample of 46 cases out of a total of 172 named priests, and 11 unnamed priests, some or all of whom may be included in the 172 named priests. (1.8) The November 2009 statistics cover the longer period from 1940 to 2009. In this period, about 2800 Diocesan and Religious priests served in the diocese. In that number, allegations have been made against 84 priests of the diocese and against 60 Religious priests – a total of 144, or about 5% of the total. Not all allegations are later proven true. Ten Dublin priests or former priests have been convicted or have cases pending. Two non-diocesan priests who served in Dublin have been convicted. I have found no reliable statistics for the percentage of the general male population who abuse children.

The harm that can be done by even one perpetrator to one child is indeed like a tsunami for that child in its consequences, and is one more than there should ever be. But to say that *child sexual abuse by clerics was widespread throughout the period under review (1.7)* does not accord with the facts. If there were allegations against 5% of teachers, they would rightly protest were this to be described in an official report as “widespread abuse”.

Were the priests of the diocese complicit in concealment of abuse?

The Report states: *Some priests were aware that particular instances of abuse had occurred. A few were courageous and brought complaints to the attention of their superiors.*

The vast majority simply chose to turn a blind eye. (1.24) The Report does not specify what “some” means. The phrase “vast majority” might seem to imply that the number is very large. However, it could mean, for example, that 70 (some) priests were aware of instances; only 9 were courageous, and 61 (the vast majority) turned a blind eye. It could also mean that 11 (some) were aware, and that 8 (the vast majority) turned a blind eye. The Report does not offer precision in this.

It appears that the Editorial of the Irish Times of 27 November, the day following publication of the Report, may have expanded from this paragraph. It stated: “The vast majority of uninvolved priests turned a blind eye.” The context of “some priests were aware” was not supplied. The Editorial therefore alleges that the vast majority of the priests of the diocese were aware of the abuse - they could not be said to turn a blind eye unless they were aware. The Irish Times, in its Corrections and Clarifications section on 16 December, stated in relation to the Editorial: “This related to those priests who were aware that particular instances of abuse had occurred.” This is neither correction nor clarification, since it merely states what was already implied in the editorial. It does not alleviate the seriousness of the allegation, nor does it reduce the scope of the people against whom the allegation was made. In this, the Irish Times does not serve the truth well, nor does it do justice to the Murphy Report.

How did diocesan authorities develop over the review period?

The Report states: *Officials of the Archdiocese of Dublin and other Church authorities have repeatedly claimed to have been, prior to the late 1990s, on “a learning curve” in relation to the matter. Having completed its investigation, the Commission does not accept the truth of such claims and assertions.* (1.14)

The Report states further: *The claim that bishops and senior church officials were on “a learning curve” about child sexual abuse rings hollow when it is clear that cases were dealt with by Archbishop McQuaid in the 1950s and 1960s and that, although the majority of complaints emerged from 1995 onwards, many of the complaints described in this report first came to the attention of the Archdiocese in the 1970s and 1980s.* (1.19) “Many of the complaints” here, as can be seen from the table in the appendix, is 18 out of 46. The Report seems to imply that officials of the diocese had the same knowledge in the 1950s to 1980s as officials had in the late 1990s, and they just did not act on this knowledge as they should until the late 1990s when they were forced to do so.

Surely this is not possible. The whole country was on a learning curve during those years. *Social workers told the Commission that awareness and knowledge of child sexual abuse did not emerge in Ireland until about the early 1980s. The HSE told the Commission that “In the mid 1970s there was no public, professional or Government perception either in Ireland or internationally that child sexual abuse constituted a societal problem or was a major risk to children”.* (6.53)

Bishops, despite their position and inside knowledge of events in a diocese, are not gifted with knowledge and insights that were not available in society in general. Certainly, diocesan officials knew that there were cases of sexual abuse of children, as undoubtedly did the Gardaí and others. There are, however, other dimensions to the learning curve, none of which is simple:

1. Learning the extent of the abuse.
2. Learning to understand the gravity of the effects of child sexual abuse on the child. Few if any people knew then the depth and persistence of the damage to a child by sexual abuse.

3. Learning to understand the mentality and modes of operation of any person who sexually abuses a child, and his or her motivation and deviousness in the process.
4. Learning to devise the best way of assessing offenders, understanding the likelihood or not of the person re-offending whether with or without treatment, and devising and implementing the best methods of treatment and the most effective ways of monitoring the offender afterwards.
5. The process of development of law, and of getting a variety of agencies to communicate and work effectively together on the matter.

The Report states: *The taking out of insurance was an act proving knowledge of child sexual abuse as a potential major cost to the Archdiocese and is inconsistent with the view that Archdiocesan officials were still “on a learning curve” at a much later date, or were lacking in an appreciation of the phenomenon of clerical child sex abuse.* (1.21) Chapter 9 of the Report deals with the matter of insurance in regard to child sexual abuse by clergy in the diocese. The fact that the initial premium in 1987 was the derisory sum of £515 (9.6), even granted the change in money values, shows clearly an amazing lack of appreciation of the gravity of the matter by the diocesan authorities and, indeed, by the insurance company. The Report abounds in evidence of the learning process: paragraphs 1.16, 1.86, 4.54, 6.53, all of Ch.7 about the Framework Document. Bishops are not exempt from the learning process.

Do we judge people, in the matter of things done ten/twenty/thirty years ago, for not having acted according to the knowledge we now have? This has a bearing on the question of whether some course of action or inaction is “inexcusable”. People knew sexual abuse of children was wrong; but without the current level of understanding of the appalling consequences for the abused person and of how difficult it can be to get an abuser to change, the practice then of treating it as no more than a moral failure (although serious) by the abuser is perhaps easier to understand. Thankfully, we know better today.

Learning continues. We are clear nowadays on the wisdom and advisability of referring allegations to civil authorities; clear procedures have been established. This was not the case twenty or thirty years ago. Then, there was much debate among social workers about mandatory reporting, and whether such a provision would inhibit complainants from seeking support or redress if they knew it had to be reported to the Gardaí.

To say there was a learning curve is not a “get-out” clause. It does not mean nothing wrong was done. It does mean that we must take this factor into account in assessing the real level of responsibility and culpability for what was done. In the 1960s to the 1980s, how much attention, if any, was given to child sexual abuse in training for law? In training for psychiatry? In social work? In education? Tony Bates (*Irish Times HealthPlus 8 Dec.*) wrote that in the 1979 edition psychology textbook he used, there was no mention. How much or little did our journalists, newspapers and media, our professional news-finders, know? What records did officials in health or sport or secular education keep? Clerical child abuse is a small percentage of the total. What was the received wisdom then, if any, about management and treatment and rehabilitation? Was there mismanagement or concealment in other spheres and professions? We must address all abuse throughout society: not a witch-hunt, but truth and reconciliation.

One might claim, as one journalist did to me: “The media has a case to answer for its inaction where all of this was concerned. But they too had been in thrall to the power of Church authorities which isn't surprising as most reporters/editors in the past were also educated by the Church.” I wonder what other journalists would say about that. It implies that those involved in the media knew what was happening, but failed to challenge the prevailing culture, due to being “in thrall to the power of Church authorities”.

Did those in authority in the diocese have collective responsibility?

The church, in this diocese at least, has not been conspicuous for practising collective responsibility. In my 42 years of service in the diocese, it has been more conspicuous by its absence. It is important to be able and willing to challenge the prevailing culture. Prevailing culture rarely welcomes or accepts challenges. This is an area in which we need renewal. We cannot presume that there was collective responsibility. There can be no real collective responsibility unless contrary opinions can be openly expressed and valued.

There is also the question of collective responsibility, not just within the church, but with state and other relevant bodies.

How the Irish media have handled this may be instructive. We have seen concerted and persistent pressure on bishops to resign, based at least in part on their alleged failure in collective responsibility. Whether that collective responsibility was a reality needs to be established. By contrast, in the preceding months there was clear failure of collective responsibility in financial controls on the part of government and the governing boards of banks. There were calls for resignations, but not, I suggest, as concerted or persistent as with the bishops. No member of government has resigned. Some senior members of bank management have resigned; many remain. Perhaps some investigative journalist would undertake to establish why there seem to have been two different standards in operation.

How does the law of the state stand in comparison with church law?

The Report deals with Canon Law in chapter 4. It gives no account of current civil law in this matter, except in relation to “misprision of felony” (deliberate concealment of knowledge of a felony) in 5.35 – 5.39. The Report states in 5.38 - 39: *Relatively few of the complaints related to criminal charges that were classified as felonies at the time of the alleged commission of the offence. Furthermore, the distinction between felonies and misdemeanours had been abolished by section 3 of the Criminal Law Act 1997. In the event, no file was sent to the DPP recommending prosecution for this offence.*

Unless there are other provisions of civil law under which the abuse falls, it seems clear that the diocesan authorities did not put themselves above civil law in not reporting the cases to the Gardaí. The Report states: *There is no legal requirement for such reporting.* (1.16)

If few of the complaints were classified as felonies, it seems civil law views child sexual abuse less seriously than church law, as is evident from 1.2: *Canon law and the procedures set out by the Roman Catholic Church for dealing with complaints of what Church law describes as the “worst crime”, that is, sexual interference with a minor.* (This is corrected in 4.25, which makes it clear that the “worst crime” covers a range of offences, including child sexual abuse.)

Any other reservations?

I have a question about the statement in 1.41 that Archbishop Kevin McNamara was seriously ill when he was appointed archbishop in 1984. If this were the case, it would show a serious lack of pastoral care both for Kevin McNamara himself, and for the diocese he was to serve. The good judgment of the church is in question here. My information, which would need to be checked, is that he had had cancer before his appointment, but that he had a medical check-up before he accepted. This gave him the assurance that, if the cancer did not recur within five years, there was no reason why he should not live a normal life-span. As we know, sadly, the cancer did recur.

Paragraph 1.96 reads: *The Church did not start to report complaints of child sexual abuse to the Gardaí until late 1995. The Commission notes that the Gardaí were happy with the co-operation they received from Archbishop Connell in 2002. For many complainants it was a gesture that came too late.* The closing sentence is disquieting. Certainly, it would have been better to take this step earlier; but to belittle it by calling it a “gesture”, as if it had little or no substance, is unworthy of this Report which is so meticulous in other ways.

Where can we go from here?

As Archbishop Diarmuid Martin has said repeatedly, Dublin diocese is in need of deep renewal. There are many possible ways to go about this. Some of the elements I would identify are as follows:

- 1) We must accept that the renewal will take time. Many people have felt anger at what the Report reveals. We can use the information in the Report, assess the conclusions of the Commission in the light of remarks like those above, and harness the anger into a positive force for renewal, rather than a destructive force.
- 2) The renewal will be personal, spiritual, and theological, as well as in the diocese as a community. Structural change alone is not renewal. Renewal will draw on the resources of the lay people and priests of the diocese. It cannot be a closed shop renewal process.
- 3) It will develop ways in which challenge to prevailing culture is not just allowed but encouraged as an essential way of drawing on the resources of all members of the diocese. This cannot exclude challenging church authorities in the Vatican to greater faithfulness and effective pastoral care. This is a duty we owe in love. There must be love in facing the truth: Caritas in Veritate.
- 4) It will involve a growing awareness of our woundedness. The power to grow in wisdom and grace must integrate what we celebrate at Christmas. Jesus changes our world and our hearts not with seven legions of angels, but in the way the very weakness of a child can draw extraordinary love and compassion from the hearts of those around.
- 5) It will, where possible, be done in close cooperation with other Christian churches. The sins we have witnessed in our diocese affect not just the abused and the perpetrators, nor indeed just the members of the Catholic church in our diocese. They wound all members of the Body of Christ, including those with whom we are not in full communion. They have been remarkable in their forbearance in not taking advantage of our failings, but rather have, in their own way, been a silent support. For this, I say Thank You.
- 6) This renewal will draw on the resources of those who have been most hurt by the abuses. Those who battled against such odds in bringing the truth to light when there were so many obstacles put in their way have made such renewal possible. Some, I am sure, will understandably have been so hurt that they will want no more to do with anything to do with our diocese or church.
- 7) Perhaps equally difficult will be to find how we can learn from those who were not themselves abused, but who, in the media and in other ways, have been forthright in their criticisms of the diocese and the church. I have no doubt that we can discern the voice of the Spirit in their words and actions also.

Conclusion

Diarmuid Martin, the Archbishop of Dublin, was under great pressure in the days and weeks after the publication of the Report. What was (and still is) missing, however, is a considered diocesan response. This is surprising, in view of the fact that we have known for some years that the Report was coming.

I have attempted an objective review of the Report, stating clearly what I find valuable, and where I have reservations. Some of my reflections above may bring a strong reaction. I have no mandate to speak for any other person. I hold no brief to defend the diocese, nor ways of exercising authority in the diocese or church of which I have been critical for many years, and which are an impediment to the mission of Jesus Christ and of the church. I do not want to repair the damage done to the church, which the matters dealt with by the Murphy Report deal. Rather, I want a renewed and rebuilt church, more faithful to its mission. As Kevin Kelly reminded us (*Furrow*, Dec. 2009), “Vatican II remains an event in the future waiting to happen.” That mission may be summarised by what Luke tells us of Jesus at the start of his mission, in the synagogue at Nazareth: “The Spirit of the Lord has been given to me ... He has sent me to bring the good news to the poor ... to set the downtrodden free ...” (Luke 4:18). By a divine paradox, in the matters which the Murphy Report covers, the downtrodden – those abused as children – have been the ones to set our diocese on the path to freedom. The last shall be first. We now need the wisdom and courage to set out on that path. We could make use of this year of Luke in the Sunday Lectionary to lay the foundations.

I have no monopoly of wisdom. Others may arrive at quite a different assessment of the Report. This I welcome. This is the debate we should be having, if we are to arrive at truth and reconciliation, at repentance and healing and forgiveness.

In a word, Resurrection. But first, the Cross.

Pádraig McCarthy

Appendix: Summary table below of the 46 cases

Refer to the Report for full details - the 46 cases take 462 pages of the report. The information given by the Commission in each case is variable, depending on what the Commission could find out. In the table below, I use "Status" to indicate whether the individual is/was a diocesan priest (D) or a member of a religious order or congregation (R). Chapter 20 is by far the longest, with 62 pages. Seven chapters have just two pages each.

In the Assessment columns, where possible I tried to use a short phrase directly from the report, if available. Otherwise, I give my own summary. Chapter 19 is blank. Media coverage of the Report may have given the impression that the Report is a catalogue of unrelieved disaster. It is good to be aware, therefore, that of the remaining 45 cases, church handling in 25 cases receives some sort of approval from the Commission; 20 cases receive varying degrees of criticism.

Ch. Name *=Pseudonym	Page	Status	First complaint	Commission's Assessment of Diocese and/or Order D= diocese; O=Order or congregation CSA=Child Sexual Abuse CPS=Child Protection Service of Diocese	Commission's Assessment of State Authorities G=Garda; HB=Health Board or Health Services Executive; SW=Social Worker
12 Fr James McNamee	177	D	1960	More concerned with scandal	G helpful
13 Fr Edmondus*	188	D	1960	Very badly handled	G failed at first. HB mixed
14 Fr Phineas*	210	D	2005	Allegations unclear. Dealt properly	
15 Fr Vidal*	212	UK	1973	Not a good news story	
16 Fr Patrick Maguire	217	R	1974	Very badly handled by Society and diocese	G & HB acted appropriately
17 Fr Ioannes*	239	D	1974	Quite simply disastrous	G dealt well 1994; badly 1995
18 Fr Tyrus*	250	D		Grave concerns	
19	252				
20 Fr	282	D	(2nd) 1978	Encapsulates everything that was wrong	G failed
21 Fr Horatio*	344	D	1980	Blind eye / dealt appropriately	
22 Fr Donal Gallagher	353	R	1981	O failed; diocese not told	G shortcomings. SW acted appropriately
23 Fr Hugo*	360	D	81	D failed	G files no record
24 Fr Ivan Payne	363	D	81	Handled very badly	G dealt appropriately
25 Fr Donato*	386	D	95	PP did not tell diocese	G acted appropriately
26 Fr Harry Moore	390	D	82	Totally inadequate	G acted appropriately
27 Fr Septimus*	400	D	82	Inadequate	
28 Fr William Carney	414	D	83	Nothing short of catastrophic	HB failed. G efficient
29 Fr Thomas Naughton	455	R - D	83	Very poor handling; belatedly acted correctly	G & HB acted well
30 Fr Cicero*	470	Ossory	(86)	Mixed	
31 Fr Clemens*	478	D	88	Dealt quite well	
32 Fr Dominic S Boland	482	R	89	O relatively good for 1989.	G appropriately
33 Fr Quinton*	494	R	91	D was correct	HB should have notified G
34 Fr Marius*	506	D	92	Delays; no monitoring	
35 Fr Noel Reynolds	514	D	94	Extremely badly handled	G thorough investigation. HB not involved
36 Fr Daryus*	529	D	60s; 94	Effective	
37 Fr Terentius*	532	R	94	O dealt well	No complaint to G
38 Fr John Kinsella	544	UK - D	95	D no jurisdiction but acted well	G effective
39 Fr Laurentius*	547	R	(90) 95	O acted well, diocese not told	G acted appropriately
40 Fr Klaudius*	558	R	95	O delayed report to HB. Diocese not told	HB should have notified schools & Dept. Ed.
41 Fr Francis McCarthy	565	D	95	D & State acted well together	
42 Fr Sergius*	575	D	95	D failed	G acted appropriately
43 Fr Dante*	581	D	95	D acted appropriately	G acted appropriately
44 Fr Cassius*	590	D	99	Old complaint: D did what they could.	Old complaint: G did what they could.
45 Fr Giraldu*s	592	R - D	2000	Procedural difficulties. D facilitated complainant	HSE late with documents
46 Fr Aquila*	598	R	2000	O & D acted appropriately	G acted appropriately
47 Fr Blaise*	601	D	2001	Possible Mistaken identity. D acted well	G assisted complainant
48 Fr Benito*	603	D	2001	D acted well; some confusion. CPS acted well	G acted appropriately
49 Fr Magnus*	611	D	2001?	Inappropriate behaviour	

50 Fr Jacobus*	613	R	2002	Conflicting versions; allegation withdrawn. O & D acted well	Complainant did not cooperate with G
51 Fr Guido*	617	D	2002	Inappropriate behaviour. D acted correctly	
52 Fr Rufus*	621	D	2002	Difficult case. D acted properly	
53 Fr Ignatio*	626	R	2002	Probable mistaken identity. O acted well	G acted appropriately
54 Fr Cornelius*	629	D	2002	Inappropriate behaviour. D dealt appropriately	G dealt appropriately
55 Fr Ricardus*	631	D	2003	False allegation. D dealt appropriately	G dealt appropriately
56 Fr Augustus*	635	D	2003	Not CSA. D dealt appropriately	G dealt appropriately
57 Fr Ezio*	637	R	2002	No meaningful investigation possible. O dealt appropriately	G dealt appropriately