

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendants' portrayal of this lawsuit as an "incest case" is troubling. Yet, it is a fitting example of Defendants' callous and uncompromising approach to handling allegations of child sexual abuse. For decades, Defendants have battled lawsuits and government investigations across the globe related to their dangerously inadequate policies and procedures for handling reports of child sexual abuse. Those cases, like this one, are the result of Defendants' teachings of secrecy, deception, and distrust of authority that protect pedophiles and needlessly expose children to sexual abuse. Though the victims in each case are different, the issues are the largely the same.

Given the overlap, Defendants have made critical admissions in these other proceedings that are relevant to this case. Equally important are their inconsistencies. For the reasons discussed below, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court deny Defendants' motion for protective order.

II. ARGUMENT

Plaintiffs' discovery requests are targeted to statements that Defendants have made under oath on issues that are directly relevant to this case.¹ Defendants contend that this information is irrelevant because the perpetrator in this case was 1) related to the Plaintiffs and 2) did not hold a position of authority within the local congregation.

Defendants' motion should be denied for two reasons. First, as mentioned above, Defendants' view of this case is overly narrow. Plaintiffs' claims in this case are against the Jehovah's Witnesses organization for its systematic failures in handling Plaintiffs' allegations of

¹ Plaintiffs have withdrawn their Requests for Production Nos. 5, 6, 8, 12. Therefore, only RFP No. 7 (transcripts) and RFP No. 9 (affidavits and declarations) are still in dispute. *See* Defs. Motion at 10-11.

child sexual abuse. Defendants have made critical admissions on those exact issues and should be required to produce them in this case. Second, Defendants' corporate representative's declaration in support of its motion for protective order lacks credibility and should be ignored. At his deposition, Mr. Douglas Chappel was forced to admit that he did not have personal knowledge of facts that he swore to in his declaration. Exhibit A, April 24, 2018 Deposition Transcript of Douglas Chappel, at 57:1-60:22.

A. Defendants' Sworn Statements on Issues Involved in This Case Are Relevant

Defendants' objections that Plaintiffs' requests for production are overbroad or that they were designed to burden, harass and embarrass the Defendants should be denied. As an initial matter, this information is highly relevant. Rule 401 of the Montana Rules of Evidence defines relevant evidence: "Relevant evidence means evidence having any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence. Relevant evidence may include evidence bearing upon the credibility of a witness or hearsay declarant." Plaintiffs' requests are narrowly tailored to statements made under oath in lawsuits that involve the same Defendants and many of the same issues that are at dispute in this case. The fact that there is a large number of these specific type of lawsuits is not a reason to deprive Plaintiffs of otherwise relevant evidence. Plaintiffs are aware of at least the following lawsuits that involved Defendants and allegations of child sexual abuse.

- *Charissa W, et al v. Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, et al.*
- *McFarland v. W. Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, Lorain, OH, Inc., et al.*
- *Berry v. Watchtower Bible & Tract Soc'y of N.Y., Inc., et al.*
- *Bryan R. v. Watchtower Bible & Tract Soc'y, Inc., et al.*
- *Fessler v. Watchtower Bible & Tract Soc'y of N.Y., Inc., et al.*
- *Lopez v. Watchtower Bible & Tract Soc'y of N.Y., Inc., et al.*
- *Conti v. Watchtower Bible & Tract Society of New York, Inc., et al.*
- *Padron v. Watchtower Bible & Tract Society of New York, Inc., et al.*
- *Grafmyer v. Watchtower Bible & Tract Society of New York, Inc., et al.*
- *Lewis v. Watchtower Bible & Tract Society of New York, Inc*

In all of these cases (and others), Defendants WTNY and/or CCJW have taken positions on many of the following topics:

- Jehovah's Witnesses policies and procedures related to handling allegations of child sexual abuse
- The practice of not reporting child sexual abuse to authorities outside the organization
- The relationships among different corporate entities and departments within the overall Jehovah's Witness organization including WTNY and CCJW
- The role of the Governing Body within Jehovah's Witnesses
- The roles of an Elders within Jehovah's Witnesses
- The development and enforcement of church policies and procedures
- The two-witness rule
- Judicial Committee investigations
- The factors taken into account when disfellowshipping and reinstating an alleged perpetrator of child sexual abuse

All of these topics are relevant to this case. Because these other cases addressed the very same issues, Defendants' sworn statements in deposition transcripts, affidavits, declarations and stipulations regarding these topics are relevant to Plaintiffs' claims here.

B. Defendants' Inconsistent Statements in Other Sexual Abuse Cases Are Relevant

Equally as important are statements that are *contrary* to positions Defendants have taken in this case. In many cases—including this one—Defendants have sworn to facts that were misleading and later proven to lack credibility.

Most recently, Defendants' corporate representative in this case, Douglas Chappel, testified that he was a member of the Service Department and that Defendant CCJW provided him with a monthly stipend, food, travel, housing, and an office. Exh. A at 9:6-15:1. This was contrary to what Mr. Chappel previously swore to in his declaration submitted in support of Defendants' motion for protective order where he stated that, "The U.S. Branch Committee and the Service Department **operate separately** from Watchtower and CCJW, although they have from time to

time collaborated with Watchtower and CCJW to provide various services.” Decl. Chappel ¶ 16 (emphasis added). As a result, Mr. Chappel was forced to admit that in fact he did not know whether what he swore to in his declaration was accurate. *Id.* at 57:1-60:22.

In *Lopez v. Watchtower Bible & Tract Society of New York, Inc.*, Governing Body member Gerrit Losch submitted a declaration explaining why he should not have to testify. In his declaration, Losch claimed “I am not, and never have been, a corporate officer, director, managing agent, member, or employee of Watchtower. **I do not direct, and have never directed, the day-to-day operations of Watchtower. I do not answer to Watchtower. I do not have, and never have had, any authority as an individual to make or determine corporate policy for Watchtower or any department of Watchtower.**” Exhibit B at ¶8 (emphasis added). The court found this statement contrary to testimony provided by a corporate designee in a separate sexual abuse case involving Watchtower where the representative testified the Governing Body “‘is a committee that oversees the worldwide activity of Jehovah's Witnesses,’ and is responsible for approving policies and guidelines governing the religion and the religious organization, including those contained in Watchtower documents known as Body of Elder letters pertaining to child sexual abuse matters.” 246 Cal. App. 4th 566, 579 (2016). Indeed, Mr. Losch’s declaration is inconsistent with the testimony provided in this case by Mr. Chappel. *See* Exh. A at 161:11-162:2 (“The governing body oversees the religious organization of Jehovah's Witnesses.”)

These are just two known examples of the efforts Defendants have taken to deceive Plaintiffs and judges in cases related to sexual abuse. There are likely many more. The relationship among corporate entities and departments within Jehovah’s Witnesses is just one of the disputed issues in this case. Indeed, Defendants allege in their motion that Plaintiffs misunderstand the roles that each Defendant corporation has within Jehovah’s Witnesses. Defs. Motion at 5. Defendants’

prior admissions on this issues and others at dispute in this case are highly relevant. Defendants should not be permitted to deceive Plaintiffs and this Court with false statements while attempting to hide relevant evidence.

C. There are No Third-Party Privacy Concerns with Defendants' Statements

Defendants claim there are third-party privacy concerns with providing this information. As shown in Plaintiffs' Requests for Production, Plaintiffs offered in each Request, "To the extent Defendants consider documents responsive to this request as confidential, they may be produced under the protective order in this case. If Defendants object based on confidentiality agreements and/or protective orders, please produce those agreements or orders." See Defs. Motion at 10-11. Defendants have not produced any documents or produced any protective orders. Plaintiffs' offer still stands as long as Defendants can show the documents were designated under a protective order in each respective case. Further, Defendants can redact out personally identifiable information if necessary. As discussed above, it is the Defendants' statements that are relevant to this case.

III. CONCLUSION

For decades, Watchtower policies have directed members to hide cases of child sexual abuse from law enforcement agencies as well as their own congregations. As discussed above, Defendants are trying to hide information in litigation as well. For the reasons described herein, Defendants' previous statements made under oath in other lawsuits involving allegations of sexual abuse should be produced in this case. Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court deny Defendants' motion.

DATED: This 7th day of May, 2018

Attorney for Plaintiffs:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ross L." with a stylized flourish.

By: _____
Ross Leonoudakis

NIX, PATTERSON & ROACH, LLP
1845 Woodall Rodgers Fwy., Suite 1050
Dallas, Texas 75201
Ph: (972) 831-1188
Fax: (972) 444-0716
dneilsmith@me.com
RossL@nixlaw.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff

GALLIK, BREMER & MOLLOY, P.C.
777 E. Main St., Suite 203
Bozeman, MT 59771-0070
Telephone: (406) 404-1728
Facsimile: (406) 404-1730
jim@galliklawfirm.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing instrument has been served upon all attorneys of record via Email on this the 7th day of May, 2018.

Kathleen L. DeSoto
Tessa A. Keller
Garlington, Lohn & Robinson, PLLP
PO Box 7909
Missoula MT 59807-7909
523-2500
kldesoto@garlington.com
takeller@garlington.com

Email

Joel M. Taylor
Associate General Counsel
Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc.
100 Watchtower Drive
Patterson NY 12563
845-306-1000
jmtaylor@jw.org

Email

Maximo Reyes
PO Box 566
Plains MT 59859-0566

First class mail postage prepaid

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ross Leonoudakis". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line underneath the name.

Ross Leonoudakis

EXHIBIT A



Deposition of
Douglas Chappel

Date: April 24, 2018

Case: Alexis Nunez and Holly McGowan v. Watchtower Bible
and Tract Society of New York, Inc., et al.

No. DV 16-84

Court Reporter: Mary R. Sullivan, RMR, CRR

Paszkiewicz Court Reporting

Phone: 618-307-9320

Toll-Free: 855-595-3577

Fax: 618-855-9513

www.spreporting.com

MONTANA TWENTIETH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
SANDERS COUNTY

ALEXIS NUNEZ and HOLLY)
MCGOWAN,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
vs.) Cause No. DV 16-84
)
WATCHTOWER BIBLE AND TRACT)
SOCIETY OF NEW YORK, INC.;)
WATCHTOWER BIBLE AND TRACT)
SOCIETY OF PENNSYLVANIA,)
INC.; CHRISTIAN)
CONGREGATION OF JEHOVAH'S)
WITNESSES, and THOMPSON)
FALLS CONGREGATION OF)
JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES,)
)
)
Defendants/Third-Party)
Plaintiffs,)
)
vs.)
)
MAXIMO NAVA REYES,)
)
Third-Party Defendant.)
)

Taken at 350 Ryman
Missoula, Montana
Tuesday, April 24, 2018 - 10:12 a.m.

30(b)(6) VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION

OF

DOUGLAS CHAPPEL

Reported by Mary R. Sullivan, RPR, RMR, CRR
Paszkiewicz Court Reporting
855.595.3577 scheduling@spreporting.com

A P P E A R A N C E S

1
2 For the Plaintiffs:

3 ROSS LEONOUDAKIS, Esq.
4 D. NEIL SMITH, Esq.
5 Nix, Patterson & Roach, LLP
6 1845 Woodall Rodgers Freeway, Suite 1050
7 Dallas, Texas 75201
8 RossL@nixlaw.com
9 dneilsmith@me.com

10 For the Defendants/Third-Party Plaintiffs Watchtower
11 Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc.; Christian
12 Congregation of Jehovah's Witness:

13 JOEL TAYLOR, Esq.
14 JARED BRANNON
15 100 Watchtower Drive
16 Patterson, New York 12563-9204
17 LegalDept@jw.org

18 For the Defendants/Third-Party Plaintiffs Thompson
19 Falls Congregation:

20 KATHLEEN L. DeSOTO, Esq.
21 Garlington, Lohn & Robinson
22 350 Ryman
23 Missoula, Montana 59802
24 klidesoto@garlington.com

25 ALSO PRESENT: Michael McFarland, Videographer
Sheri Hazlett, Videographer

1 **U.S.**

2 Q. Where does the branch office get its money
3 from?

4 **A. The branch office is a part of CCJW, I**
5 **believe.**

6 Q. Okay. So is it fair to say that CCJW provides
7 you with a stipend, room and board?

8 **A. I think that's correct.**

9 Q. From where does CCJW receive money? How does
10 it have income coming in so that it can pay you a
11 stipend, room and board?

12 **A. My understanding is that money comes from**
13 **assemblies and conventions.**

14 Q. What do you -- What do you mean when you say
15 "assemblies"?

16 **A. We meet together as Jehovah's Witnesses. We**
17 **come together for Bible discussions and talks and**
18 **spiritual encouragement and -- at these assemblies.**
19 **Some of them are smaller and some of them are larger.**

20 Q. Okay. Do they charge money for those or do
21 they pass a hat and raise donations?

22 **A. No. They do not charge, it's all free.**
23 **Anyone is welcome, and they do not pass the hat.**

24 Q. All right. So how do they get money at
25 assemblies and conventions if they neither charge nor

1 accept donations?

2 A. We have contribution boxes around the sites of
3 wherever the venue is, and everyone that comes knows
4 where those are, and they donate.

5 Q. So Mr. Chappel, in answer to my question, at
6 these assemblies and conventions, they do receive
7 donations.

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And that money goes through CCJW; is that
10 correct?

11 A. That's my understanding, yes.

12 Q. How much are you paid in a stipend?

13 A. I believe right now it's at \$130.

14 Q. Per?

15 A. Month.

16 Q. Has it been that way for some time?

17 A. Yes. When I first went there in 1975, it was
18 \$14.

19 Q. And your room and board, is that -- could you
20 describe what your room and board accommodations are?

21 A. I have a -- a place where my wife and I live,
22 we have a bedroom, we have a kitchen, we have a living
23 room in it.

24 Q. Is that in a home, is it in a dormitory, is it
25 in a hotel?

1 **A. My particular location is in a -- is in a**
2 **building, a residence.**

3 Q. Where -- Where is that residence located?

4 **A. Right now we are living in Wallkill, New York.**

5 Q. Okay. Do other families live in that
6 residence?

7 **A. Other members of -- like us, yes. But**
8 **families, what do you mean by "families"?**

9 Q. Well, when I say "family," I mean people who
10 are related by blood that reside together. Are there
11 other people that --

12 **A. There are other married couples that are**
13 **there, yes.**

14 Q. Well, families can also be -- parents and
15 children would also be a definition of a family.

16 **A. That's true. There are some situations like**
17 **that, I guess. Not very many.**

18 Q. Well --

19 **A. But they wouldn't be living together.**

20 Q. -- without guessing, who are the other people
21 that live in a home with you?

22 **A. Other members of the religious order.**

23 Q. How many other people live in your residence
24 right now?

25 **A. I don't know. It's a pretty big building.**

1 Q. Okay. When --

2 A. **Three floors.**

3 Q. Okay. My -- That's my mistake. When I hear
4 "residence," I thought you were referring to a home.

5 A. **Sorry. That's just what we call it,**
6 **residence.**

7 Q. Okay. So when I -- Is it more like a
8 dormitory?

9 A. **Perhaps.**

10 Q. Okay.

11 A. **I -- I think of dormitory like you don't have**
12 **a bathroom in your room, but it's not like that.**

13 Q. Okay. Well, my dormitory had a bathroom in
14 it, so you --

15 A. **Okay.**

16 Q. -- must have stayed in a different place than
17 me.

18 So the -- the building you're describing, you
19 said it's three floors.

20 A. **Um-huh.**

21 Q. Is that correct?

22 A. **Yes.**

23 Q. It has bedrooms on the different floors?

24 A. **Yes.**

25 Q. And each bedroom has a bathroom?

1 A. Each room has a bathroom, each room -- some of
2 them have a separate bedroom, yes.

3 Q. Can you approximate how many rooms there are
4 in this three-story building?

5 A. I'd be guessing. I'm thinking maybe 60 rooms
6 or so per floor.

7 Q. Based upon what you've told me, is it fair to
8 say you have not paid any federal income taxes for the
9 last 43 years?

10 A. No, that's not entirely correct. For the
11 first few years I did pay an income tax, but it's
12 been -- been quite a while since I haven't because I
13 just don't make enough. For a while, I think, the -- I
14 think the law was a little different or something. I'm
15 not sure what the -- I'm not sure what that was about,
16 but for the last 10, 15 years I have not had an income
17 enough -- high enough that I needed to report.

18 Q. In those, let's just say, the last five years
19 for -- for right now for our discussions, even if you
20 did not pay income tax, did you file a federal income
21 tax return?

22 A. No, I didn't have to because I was -- I just
23 didn't make any money at all.

24 Q. You --

25 A. You have to have income, I think, right?

1 **Isn't that how it works?**

2 Q. I -- I don't know the answer. It sounds like
3 you have income. Would you agree with me that you do
4 receive \$130 a month?

5 **A. Yes.**

6 Q. Would you agree with me that you're provided
7 with housing?

8 **A. Yes.**

9 Q. Would you agree with me that you're provided
10 with food?

11 **A. Yes.**

12 Q. Would you agree with me that your travel is
13 provided for? Your travel here today.

14 **A. The travel here today I was provided for, yes.**

15 Q. Would you agree with me that your job is
16 carrying out tack -- tasks for an organization that is
17 part of the Jehovah Witness faith. Would you agree
18 with me on that?

19 **A. Yes.**

20 Q. And would you agree with me that you refer to
21 that as the branch office?

22 **A. Correct.**

23 Q. And would you also agree with me that the
24 branch office is part of the Christian Congregation of
25 Jehovah Witnesses?

1 **A. That's the way I understand it, yes.**

2 Q. Tell me when you first became involved --
3 We're going to talk about this from two viewpoints. I
4 want to ask you when you first became involved with the
5 Jehovah Witness faith, first from a religious
6 standpoint, that's the first way I want to ask it.

7 So do you consider yourself a member of the
8 Jehovah Witness faith?

9 **A. Jehovah is God's name, so we're not a Jehovah**
10 **Witness, we're Jehovah's Witnesses, and you can find**
11 **that in Isaiah 43:10 where Jehovah told the nation of**
12 **Israel "You are my witnesses," so we are Jehovah's**
13 **Witnesses.**

14 Q. Let -- Let me ask it this way, and maybe we
15 can clear it up. If I ask some of the lawyers involved
16 in this case, "What church do you go to?" They might
17 say, "I'm Catholic."

18 **A. Um-huh.**

19 Q. Other people I may say, "Where do you go to
20 church," they might say "I'm Methodist." If I say,
21 "Where do you go to church," what would be your answer
22 to that question?

23 **A. The answer is I don't go to a church. A**
24 **church is a building, so I would go to a Kingdom Hall**
25 **as one of Jehovah's Witnesses.**

1 Exhibit No. 36. I want you to take a look at 36. I'm
2 going to ask you questions about it.

3 MR. SMITH: Do you need a copy?

4 MR. TAYLOR: Sure. Thank you.

5 BY MR. SMITH:

6 Q. And let me know if you're familiar with
7 Exhibit No. 36.

8 A. (Reviewing document.)

9 Q. Is that your signature on Page 14 of Exhibit
10 No. 36?

11 A. (Reviewing document.) Yes, it is.

12 Q. Did you read this document before you signed
13 it?

14 A. (Reviewing document.) Yes, I did.

15 Q. Did you assure yourself that everything in
16 here was true and correct?

17 A. (Reviewing document.) Yes.

18 Q. And did you swear to it with personal
19 knowledge?

20 A. (Reviewing document.) Yes.

21 Q. All right. Let's take a look at Paragraph 5.

22 Is it a correct statement that Watchtower is a
23 501(c)(3) not for profit?

24 A. (Reviewing document.) Yes.

25 Q. Is it correct that it was organized as a

1 501(c)(3) not for profit -- profit with religious
2 purposes?

3 A. (Reviewing document.) I don't know. I -- I
4 know that it's -- it's used for religious purposes,
5 yes.

6 Q. All right. Let's look over at Paragraph 15
7 and 16.

8 A. (Reviewing document.)

9 Q. Now I'm looking at Paragraph 16, and it says,
10 "On the contrary." Do you see that?

11 A. (Reviewing document.) Um-huh.

12 Q. That sentence?

13 A. (Reviewing document.) Yes.

14 Q. It says, (As Read): "The U.S. Branch Committee
15 and the Service Department operate separately from
16 Watchtower and CCJW, although they have from time to
17 time collaborated with Watchtower and CCJW to provide
18 various services."

19 A. (Reviewing document.) Yes.

20 Q. Now, did we discuss earlier that CCJW gives
21 you a stipend?

22 A. Yes, we did.

23 Q. And CCJW provides you housing?

24 A. Yes, we did.

25 Q. CCJW provides you with an office.

1 **A. Apparently.**

2 Q. You think it's accurate to say that the
3 service department that you're in operates separately
4 from CCJW in light of the fact that they pay you, give
5 you housing, and give you an office?

6 **A. Well, I don't know how -- I know that this**
7 **statement is true, that we're not a division,**
8 **subsidiary or sister corporation of either of those two**
9 **corporations, so where the money is from, I guess I --**
10 **I misspoke.**

11 Q. Okay. So, then, this sentence right here, did
12 you misspoke -- or misspeak when you signed saying that
13 that's a true statement? Is that --

14 **A. No --**

15 Q. That's not --

16 **A. -- this is a true statement.**

17 Q. I'm not talking about the first sentence, I'm
18 talking about the second sentence that says (As Read):
19 "the Service Department operates separately from
20 Watchtower and CCJW."

21 **A. (Reviewing document.) Well, that's correct,**
22 **because as I mentioned to you earlier, we do use CCJW**
23 **Corporation, we use that for communicating with**
24 **congregations.**

25 Q. And for paying you, correct?

1 **A. I don't know where the pay comes from.**

2 Q. Now, did you tell me earlier it came from
3 CCJW?

4 **A. (Reviewing document.) Yeah, but I'm looking**
5 **at this now, and that -- I'm not sure that I was**
6 **correct in that statement.**

7 Q. Well, sir, you've got two different things
8 under oath so far.

9 **A. Yeah. I don't like that position, I can**
10 **assure you. I don't know where the money comes from**
11 **for my stipend.**

12 Q. So you can't say as you've sworn to in
13 Paragraph 16 that the service department operates
14 separately from CCJW, can you?

15 **A. I don't know the answer.**

16 Q. Because you don't know where the money comes
17 from.

18 **A. I do not.**

19 Q. And you don't know if they're separate or not,
20 do you?

21 **A. I do not know where the money comes from.**

22 Q. Okay.

23 **A. Which corporation.**

24 Q. All right. Let's talk about who are clergy
25 members within the Jehovah Witness -- within the

1 what this -- where this exhibit came from?

2 **A. I think it came from Australia.**

3 Q. Where did you find that out from?

4 **A. I asked counsel if they'd seen it before, and**
5 **that's where they thought it was from.**

6 Q. Okay. So your testimony is that this flow
7 chart comes from some litigation in Australia, maybe?

8 **A. Another branch. This isn't used in -- in our**
9 **branch. I've never seen -- Until this case, I've never**
10 **seen this before.**

11 Q. You mentioned when we talked about the
12 hierarchy of the organization, at the top is the
13 governing body?

14 **A. The governing body is the faithful and**
15 **discreet slave, yes.**

16 Q. How many members of the governing body?

17 **A. There are presently eight.**

18 Q. Do they hold those positions for life?

19 **A. Generally.**

20 Q. Who appoints the new member when it's
21 necessary to appoint a new one?

22 **A. It's decided among the governing body.**

23 Q. If someone is a Jehovah's Witness in the
24 country of Australia, would the governing body be
25 there, the top of their religious hierarchy?

1 **A. The governing body oversees the religious**
2 **organization of Jehovah's Witnesses.**

3 Q. Is there one person who is the leader of the
4 governing body?

5 **A. No. They are governing body.**

6 Q. Let me show you what's been marked as
7 Deposition Exhibit No. 44.

8 EXHIBIT:

9 (Deposition Exhibit 44 marked for
10 identification.)

11 **A. (Reviewing document.)**

12 BY MR. SMITH:

13 Q. Do you know what Exhibit No. 44 is?

14 **A. (Reviewing document.) No. Never seen it**
15 **before.**

16 Q. Did you -- You haven't seen it before today?

17 **A. (Reviewing document.) I don't think so. Let**
18 **me keep looking.**

19 This wording's very similar to this Exhibit 43
20 that you gave me in the introduction.

21 Q. Okay. But you haven't seen it before today,
22 and you can't speak to it?

23 **A. We don't use this in the United States branch.**
24 **Oh, yeah, right here (indicating). "This would not be**
25 **difficult in Australia," so this is from Australia.**

EXHIBIT B

FILED
Clerk of the Superior Court
FEB 05 2014

FILED
Clerk of the Superior Court
14 FEB 5 4:34
FEB 05 2014

By: _____ Deputy

1 Megan S. Wynne, Esq., SBN 183707
2 Ashley A. Escudero, Esq., SBN250473
3 MORRIS POLICH & PURDY LLP
4 One America Plaza
5 600 West Broadway, Suite 500
6 San Diego, California 92101
7 Tel: (619) 557-0404
8 Fax: (619) 557-0460

9 Donald T. Ridley, Esq.
10 *Pro Hac Vice*
11 THE MANDEL LAW FIRM
12 370 Lexington Avenue, Suite 505
13 New York, NY 10017
14 Tel: (212) 697-7383
15 Fax: (212) 681-6157

16 Attorneys for Gerrit Lösch

17 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
18 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

19 JOSE LOPEZ, an Individual,
20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 DOE 1, LINDA VISTA CHURCH;
23 DOE 2, SUPERVISORY
24 ORGANIZATION; DOE 3,
25 PERPETRATOR; and DOES 4 through
26 100, inclusive,
27 Defendants.

CASE NO. 37-2012-00099849-CU-PO-CTL

DECLARATION OF GERRIT LÖSCH IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION TO QUASH
ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO COMPEL DEPOSITION OF
GERRIT LÖSCH.

Hearing Date: TBD
Time: TBD
Dept: C-65
Judge: Joan M. Lewis
Complaint Filed: June 29, 2012
Trial Date: June 27, 2014

28 I, Gerrit Lösch, declare as follows:

1. I am over 18 years of age, of sound mind, and competent to make this Declaration.

I have personal knowledge of the matters contained herein, and they are all true and correct.

2. I provide this Declaration to support the Motion to Quash Order Granting Plaintiff's "Motion to Compel the Deposition of Gerrit Lösch and the Underlying Notice of

1
DECLARATION OF GERRIT LÖSCH

1 Taking the Deposition of Gerrit Lösch, with Production of Documents Required – Videorecorded
2 for Use at Trial.”

3 3. If called upon to testify in this civil action, I would provide the information
4 contained in this Declaration.

5 4. I was not served with the Notice of Deposition, but I learned that Plaintiff vacated
6 the original deposition date after Watchtower objected to the Notice.

7 5. I recently learned that this Court entered an Order compelling Watchtower Bible
8 and Tract Society of New York, Inc. (sued as Doe 1; hereinafter referred to as “Watchtower”) to
9 produce me for deposition, but I have not been served with a copy of the Court’s Order.

10 6. I am a member of the ecclesiastical Governing Body of Jehovah’s Witnesses,
11 having been appointed to serve in that capacity on July 1, 1994. I was not on the Governing Body
12 in 1986 when the Plaintiff alleges he was abused by Gonzalo Campos.

13 7. The Governing Body of Jehovah’s Witnesses is the highest ecclesiastical authority
14 for the faith of Jehovah’s Witnesses, and it exercises spiritual oversight for Jehovah’s Witnesses
15 worldwide.

16 8. I am not, and never have been, a corporate officer, director, managing agent,
17 member, or employee of Watchtower. I do not direct, and have never directed, the day-to-day
18 operations of Watchtower. I do not answer to Watchtower. I do not have, and never have had,
19 any authority as an individual to make or determine corporate policy for Watchtower or any
20 department of Watchtower.

21 9. Watchtower does not have, and never has had, any authority over me.

22 10. I have no personal knowledge of any facts or circumstances concerning the subject
23 matter of this case because, among other things:

24 (a) I do not supervise or work for, and I have never supervised or worked for, the
25 Watchtower Legal Department or the U.S. Service Department.

26 (b) I did not move to live in the United States until July, 1990.

27 (c) Prior to July 1990, I resided in Austria.

28 (d) I do not know and have never met the Plaintiff, Jose Lopez.

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

(e) I do not know and have never met Leticia Lopez, the mother of Plaintiff Jose Lopez.

(f) I do not know and have never met the Defendant, Gonzalo Campos, who is sued as Doe 3.

11. I am a resident of the State of New York, as I live and work in Brooklyn where the world headquarters of Jehovah's Witnesses is located.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this Declaration is executed this 4th day of February 2014.

Gerrit Lösch
Gerrit Lösch