SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF KING

T.O. NO. 13-2-32756-2 SEA

VS

The Watchtower Bible and Tract Society | AND AREA DESIGNATION

CASE INFORMATION COVER SHEET AND AREA DESIGNATION

CAUSE OF ACTION

(PIN) - PERSONAL INJURY (PIN 2)

AREA DESIGNATION

SEATTLE - Defined as all King County north of Interstate 90 and including all of Interstate 90 right of way, all of the cities of Seattle, Mercer Island, Issaquah, and North Bend, and all of Vashon and Maury Islands.

1.1. This claim arises from childhood sexual abuse that Plaintiff T.O. suffered at the hands of fellow members and publishers of the Jehovah's Witness Hazel Dell Kingdom Hall in Clark County, Washington.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES - 1 of 12

23

24

1.2. At the time T.O. was sexually abused by the members and publishers of the Jehovah's Witness Hazel Dell Kingdom Hall, the defendants knew or should have known that the members and publishers posed a threat of foreseeable harm to T.O., but despite their knowledge, the defendants failed to take reasonable steps to protect T.O. from that harm.

II. PARTIES

- 2.1 At all times material hereto, Plaintiff T.O. was young girl living with her family in Clark County, Washington. T.O. was a minor at the time of the sexual abuse and exploitation alleged herein. In the interest of privacy, this complaint identifies T.O. by her initials only.
- 2.2 At all times material hereto, Defendant Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. (hereinafter referenced as Defendant "Watchtower"), was, and is, a New York corporation with its principal place of business in Patterson, New York, that was, and is, authorized to conduct business in the State of Washington, including King County and Clark County. At the time T.O. was sexually abused as alleged more fully herein, Defendant Watchtower conducted business in King County and Clark County, Washington, and Defendant Watchtower currently conducts business in King County and Clark County, Washington. Defendant Watchtower is the highest level of Jehovah's Witness governance, and it is responsible for administration of the Jehovah's Witness Church worldwide. This includes the operations of the Jehovah's Witness Church in Washington, such as the operations of Defendant Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses in Hazel Dell, Washington.
- 2.3 At all times material hereto, Defendant Hazel Dell Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses (hereinafter referred to as "Hazel Dell") had its principal place of business in Clark County, Washington, and conducted business in Clark County, Washington, including

business at the Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses that is, or was, located in Hazel Dell, Washington. At all times material hereto, Defendant Hazel Dell was responsible for supervising and controlling the operations of the Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses in Hazel Dell, Washington, subject to the authority, supervision, and control of Defendant Watchtower. Upon information and belief, Defendant Hazel Dell was, and is, an unincorporated association of individuals, but to the extent Defendant Hazel Dell was, or is, a corporation or other legal entity, Plaintiff's claims in this complaint are intended to include that corporation or other legal entity. Likewise, to the extent the individuals responsible for supervising and controlling the operations of Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses in Hazel Dell, Washington, during the times relevant to this lawsuit assert that they were acting as the agents of some other corporation or legal entity, Plaintiff's claims in this complaint are intended to include that corporation or other legal entity.

2.4 At all times material hereto, Defendant Salmon Creek Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses (hereinafter referred to as "Salmon Creek") had its principal place of business in Clark County, Washington, and conduced business in Clark County, Washington. Upon information and belief, Defendant Salmon Creek is a successor to all of the assets and liabilities of Defendant Hazel Dell. Upon further information and belief, Defendant Salmon Creek acquired all or substantially all of the assets of defendant Hazel Dell without paying sufficient consideration for those assets.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3.1 At the time this cause of action arose, and currently, defendant Watchtower transacted business throughout King County, Washington.

3.2 As such, this Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to RCW 2.08.010, and venue is proper in this Court pursuant to RCW 4.12.020 and RCW 4.12.025.

IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 4.1 The Jehovah's Witness Church is organized as a strict hierarchy. Defendant Watchtower is head of the Jehovah's Witness hierarchical structure. Defendant Watchtower is directed by a governing body, which is comprised of elders. Authority flows downward from Defendant Watchtower to the local church level, which is made up of congregations like Defendants Hazel Dell and Salmon Creek. Defendant Watchtower supervises, directs, controls, and ratifies church-level conduct and decisions, including recordkeeping, discipline, and appointment of congregation officials and members.
- 4.2 Defendant Watchtower exercises control of the organization and running of its local congregations through the publication and distribution of handbooks, which instruct elders how to manage the organization. These handbooks are supplemented by letters from Defendant Watchtower to all elders. All of Defendant Watchtower's materials are written, approved, and published by Watchtower, and all church leaders and members are required to abide by the materials, which allows Defendant Watchtower to supervise and control the day to day activities of the organization.
- 4.3 For example, Defendant Watchtower supervises, directs, controls, and ratifies church-level decisions regarding the danger of child sexual abuse, including how local leaders and members must respond if they believe a child is in danger of being sexually abused by a church member or leader. Defendant Watchtower reserves for itself the authority and control over these decisions, and to the extent the local leaders and members make the initial decisions, they do so with the authority of Defendant Watchtower and on its behalf.

4.4 Likewise, Defendant Watchtower supervises, directs, controls, and ratifies church-level decisions regarding the appointment of members to elders or ministerial servants. Defendant Watchtower also appoints circuit and district overseers, who are responsible for supervising, directing, and controlling the activities of local congregations on behalf of Defendant Watchtower.

- 4.5 Elders, as the highest authority at the congregational level, organize and govern local congregations. Elders are responsible for the daily operations and governance of the local church, including direction of proselytizing efforts, selection of potential ministerial servants and elders, organization of weekly church meetings, evaluation of individuals' appointment to publisher or ministerial servant, and determination of the guilt, repentance and punishment of church members who engage in serious misconduct. Defendant Watchtower authorizes elders to do the foregoing on its behalf and retains the authority to supervise, direct, control and ratify their conduct in doing so.
- 4.6 Congregations are grouped in to circuits, which in turn make up districts. Each circuit is staffed by an overseer who is directly appointed by Defendant Watchtower and who is controlled by Defendant Watchtower. The overseer conducts regular visits to each congregation and meets with congregation elders regarding the overall function of the congregation as well as specific issues of importance, such as allegations of child molestation by a church member. The meeting also includes reviewing congregation members' eligibility to be appointed as ministerial servants or elders. Overseers participate in field service, observing congregation function. The overseer prepares a report on each congregation that is forwarded to Defendant Watchtower, and also forwards recommendations for member appointments to Defendant Watchtower. Defendant Watchtower authorizes overseers to do

the foregoing on its behalf and retains the authority to supervise, direct, control and ratify their conduct in doing so.

- 4.7 Defendant Watchtower establishes processes for the discipline of members accused of wrongdoing, and receives and keeps records of determinations of disfellowship (similar to excommunication), or of reproval of individuals (similar to public or private censure). This includes, but is not limited to, members who are appointed by Defendant Watchtower as ministerial servants or elders.
- 4.8 Defendant Watchtower strictly regulates and monitors who can be a Jehovah's Witness. An applicant must undergo bible study with a baptized congregation member and then apply to the congregation's Body of Elders. Approval of the elders is necessary to become a publisher. Once a person is approved as an unbaptized publisher, he is authorized to represent the Jehovah's Witness faith in his specific congregation and to engage in field service.
- 4.9 Unbaptized publishers may become a baptized publisher after additional study. Baptism is considered an ordination as a minister of the Jehovah's Witness faith. Applicants are tested and approved by elders of the local congregation. Male baptized publishers may be appointed as a "ministerial servant," who have duties roughly similar to deacons, and assist the elders in their responsibilities. A ministerial servant must be a publisher in good standing with Defendant Watchtower. Again, the elders are responsible for identifying and reviewing potential candidates and making a recommendation to Defendant Watchtower if the candidate is deemed appropriate and moral. Defendant Watchtower has the ultimate authority as to whether a candidate is approved and becomes a ministerial servant.

4.10 Defendant Watchtower monitors each publisher's field service records, standardizes methods to be used during proselytizing activities, provides the only approved literature to be distributed during field service, directs where publishers will perform field service, controls access to sought-after positions, and determines appointments as ministerial servants, elders and circuit overseers. Defendant Watchtower also implements the Jehovah's Witness practice of shunning, which involves isolating and not interacting with members who have been disfellowshipped or have voluntarily left the church.

- 4.11 Defendant Watchtower also controls personal grooming, appearance and dress, as are a publisher's use of alcohol, tobacco, or drugs. Defendant Watchtower also regulates and controls the sexual activities of publishers, including both legal and illegal sexual conduct. Defendant Watchtower even controls legal sexual conduct that occurs in the privacy of a member's home.
- 4.12 If a member has a problem, particularly with another member, Defendant Watchtower encourages them to bring the problem to the congregation elders rather than resolve the problem elsewhere. In practice, when a member commits an act of wrongdoing, such as the sexual abuse of a child, that matter may be brought to an elder to be resolved. Defendant Watchtower requires elders to investigate such claims and dictates how the elders investigate the claim and what steps they take in response to the investigation. If there are two witnesses to the wrongdoing, or if the accused confesses his wrongdoing, a Judicial Committee will be convened. If there are not at least two witnesses and the accused denies the wrong, then no action is taken by Defendant Watchtower.

4.13 If convened, the Judicial Committee will consist of the two original elders and a third, who will hear the case and impose punishment on the wrongdoer. Possible outcomes of a Judicial Committee range from private reproval to disfellowship.

4.14 Private reproval is a private censorship of the wrongdoer that generally results in a limitation of the wrongdoer's privileges to engage in field service. No announcement is made to the congregation when a wrongdoer is privately reproved. Disfellowship is expulsion from a congregation. When a wrongdoer is disfellowshipped, an announcement is made to the congregation that the wrongdoer is no longer one of Jehovah's Witnesses, but no details are given regarding the nature of the wrongdoing. A person who is disfellowshipped can seek reinstatement.

4.15 During all relevant times to the sexual abuse of Plaintiff T.O., Defendant Watchtower maintained a policy of not voluntarily reporting sexual abuse of minors to law enforcement authorities and of encouraging members to keep wrongful conduct within the congregation, abiding by the elders' determination. Defendant Watchtower also maintained a policy of not providing warning to other members of the dangerous propensities of known sexual molesters, and discouraged victims from informing other members to be wary of known abusers. Defendant Watchtower maintained these policies even though it knew that its policies would increase the likelihood that known sexual molesters would continue to molest children.

4.16 In the 1970s and 1980s, and when she was a minor, Plaintiff T.O. and her family lived in the area of Vancouver, Washington. T.O.'s parents were practicing Jehovah's Witnesses and participated in the services and activities of defendants, including the services and activities at the Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses in Hazel Dell, Washington. As a

result, Plaintiff T.O. was frequently placed within the custody and control of the defendants, she and her parents relied upon and trusted the defendants to protect her from foreseeable harm, and she and her parents relied upon and trusted the defendants to warn her and/or her parents of such harm.

- 4.17 Between approximately 1981 and 1985, Plaintiff T.O. was repeatedly sexually abused by several members and publishers of the defendants, including John Doe 1, John Doe 2, John Doe 3, John Doe 4, and John Doe 5. The sexual abuse often occurred during activities that were sanctioned by the defendants and when T.O. was in the custody and control of the defendants, such as regularly scheduled bible and book study sessions that took place at the Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses in Hazel Dell, as well as church activities in the homes of the members of the defendants. The abuse also occurred in the homes of elders of the defendants while T.O.'s family was there for church activities.
- 4.18 Upon information and belief, the defendants knew or should have known that some or all of these publishers were sexually abusing Plaintiff.
- 4.19 For example, in approximately 1983 or 1984, an elder of the defendants was informed that Plaintiff T.O. was being sexually abused by members and publishers of the defendants. Following this report, T.O. was called to a meeting with multiple elders at the Kingdom Hall in Hazel Dell, and T.O. explained that she had been sexually abused by members and publishers John Doe 1, John Doe 2, John Doe 3, John Doe 4, and John Doe 5. Despite this notice, the defendants did nothing to protect T.O. from those individuals and the abuse continued.
- 4.20 Upon further information and belief, in approximately 1984, elders of the defendants were told that some of the foregoing members and publishers had sexually abused

24

another child member. Despite this notice, the defendants did nothing to protect T.O. from the members and publishers and the abuse continued.

V. CAUSES OF ACTION

A. Negligence

- 5.1 Plaintiff T.O. re-alleges the paragraphs set forth above and below.
- 5.2 When Plaintiff was in the custody and control of the defendants, the defendants had a duty to exercise reasonable care to protect her from foreseeable harm. The defendants also had a duty to exercise reasonable care to protect Plaintiff from danger posed by its members, including those in leadership positions, such as publishers. This is particularly true where Plaintiff and her parents relied upon the defendants to protect Plaintiff from foreseeable harm, including harm posed by people that the defendants held out as safe and trustworthy.
- 5.3 The defendants breached these duties by failing to exercise reasonable care in protecting Plaintiff from the danger posed by its members and publishers, including John Doe 1, John Doe 2, John Doe 3, John Doe 4, and John Doe 5.
- 5.4 As a direct and proximate result of the negligent and grossly negligent acts and omissions of the defendants, Plaintiff T.O. suffered general and special damages, including physical, psychological, and emotional damage.
- 5.5 The defendants also knew or should have known that their attempt to cover-up the sexual abuse of children, including abuse by the foregoing publishers, would, if discovered, likely cause increased emotional suffering to his victims and their families, including Plaintiff. Despite that notice the defendants did nothing to protect Plaintiff or to help her mitigate the damages she suffered as a result of the abuse.

B. Outrage and Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress

5.6 Plaintiff re-alleges the paragraphs set forth above and below.

- 5.7 The Defendants engaged in extreme and outrageous conduct by failing to take any steps to protect Plaintiff from being sexually abused despite knowing that she was being sexually abused by a number of their publishers. The defendants did so in order to protect their reputation and to prevent victims from coming forward, including Plaintiff, despite knowing that these individuals would continue to molest children.
- 5.8 As a result of this extreme and outrageous conduct, the defendants' publishers continued to sexually abuse Plaintiff.
- 5.9 The defendants knew that this extreme and outrageous conduct would inflict severe emotional and psychological distress on others, including Plaintiff T.O., and T.O. did in fact suffer severe emotional and psychological distress as a result. Her emotional damages include severe mental anguish, humiliation and emotional and physical distress.

C. Ratification

- 5.10 Plaintiff re-alleges the paragraphs set forth above.
- 5.11 At all relevant times, the defendants maintained complete authority and control over the publishers who sexually abused Plaintiff, and the defendants were empowered with an obligation to prevent their abuses of Plaintiff.
- 5.12 The defendants are liable for the sexual abuse of Plaintiff by their publishers because they ratified their conduct, reaping the benefits of their labor and services for the church, while later trying to repudiate the consequences of their actions. Despite knowledge that their publishers were sexually abusing children, the defendants continued to give them access to Plaintiff and they continued to sexually abuse Plaintiff. Given these circumstances, the defendants should be held liable for ratifying the sexual abuse of Plaintiff.

2

VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff T.O. prays for judgment against the defendants for general and special damages in an amount to be proven at the time of trial, for her reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, for statutory interest, prejudgment interest, punitive damages, and for such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

Plaintiff T.O. specifically reserves the right to pursue additional causes of action, other than those specifically outlined above, that are supported by the facts pleaded herein or that may be supported by other facts that emerge during discovery.

DATED this 18th day of September, 2013.

PFAU COCHRAN VERTETIS AMALA PLLC

By: Michael T. Pfau, WSBA 6. 24649

michael@pcvalaw.com

Jason P. Amala, WSBA No. 37054

jason@pcvalaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff

4821-2839-0421, v. 1