

Warehouse Point Congregation

c/o [REDACTED], 144 Regina Dr., East Windsor, CT 06088-9759

August 15, 2004

Christian Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses
2821 Route 22
Patterson, NY 12563-2237

Dear Brothers:

We are writing with regard to the reinstatement of [REDACTED]. Although the *NOTIFICATION OF DISFELLOWSHIPING OR DISASSOCIATION* form, S-77, (also enclosed) does not request an explanation of the proceedings relative to the reinstatement, we felt that one was necessary because of your letter of June 24, 2004 that provided reminders and counsel regarding the matter and because of the nature of the case. The judicial committee met with [REDACTED] on August 7, 2004 to hear his reinstatement plea. Since the former chairman has moved from the Warehouse Point congregation to South Carolina, our circuit overseer asked [REDACTED] to serve on the committee. Brother [REDACTED] had previously served on the appeal committee at the time of the disfellowshipping.

All members of the committee had previously been apprised of the information in your letter and had several weeks to meditate on the information presented therein. Prior to meeting with [REDACTED] the committee met. Brothers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] provided Brother [REDACTED] with some background information on the original committee's observation on the disfellowshipping. The committee at that time had serious concerns regarding the accusations raised by the younger daughter, [REDACTED]. Since at the time the committee was not able to pursue determining the validity of her claim, the committee sought to establish whether there was guilt on the charges made by [REDACTED]. So the committee based its decision solely on his confession to the charges raised by her. Regarding the charges made by the younger daughter, [REDACTED] the committee believed that if there was validity to the second charge, the disfellowshipping might draw out a confession to the second charge since he may feel that there was nothing to lose by admitting to the charge. It was noted that at the time of the disfellowshipping that [REDACTED] had displayed a measure of repentance though not to the degree necessary.

It was also noted that the reinstatement committee that met on May 29, 2004 felt that [REDACTED] displayed a considerable amount of remorse over his actions towards [REDACTED]. However, he continued to categorically deny the charges raised by [REDACTED]. Because of the shortness of time that had elapsed since his disfellowshipping and with a desire to attempt to clear up the misgivings the disfellowshipping committee had regarding the [REDACTED] charges, the committee postponed its decision in an effort to possibly question [REDACTED] and thus become more convinced of the charges she leveled. Also, since [REDACTED] and her husband placed a restraining order on [REDACTED] and has been able to face him in a court of law, we felt that she may be willing to meet with the committee and possibly even face her father before a judicial committee. Hence our letter of May 30, 2004 to you brothers.

This reinstatement committee then turned their attention to your letter of response dated June 24, 2004. The letter was read and the references cited were read and discussed. Particular attention was given to the information in *ks91* pages 114-115 and *it-2* pages 710-714. After discussing the material, [REDACTED] was invited in and allowed to present his plea for reinstatement.

Again, as at the disfellowshipping hearing and the first reinstatement hearing [REDACTED] rambled on regarding the tremendous stress that he has had to face in the last few years, losing his brother and his second wife to death, losing contact with his fiancé, the shame of being disfellowshipped, the guilt of

realizing what he had done to his older daughter. He also seem to be fixated in trying to clear his name regarding the accusation made by [REDACTED]. The committee grilled him regarding charges brought by both daughters.. He would get very distraught about the problems his abusive actions has no doubt caused his older daughter, [REDACTED]. In his words "she has been damaged" and "I have adversely affected how she could relate to her husband". He said, although he did not see it at the time, he now sees how his actions likely caused her tremendous trauma and though at the time he did not mean to cause her such harm, he did it partly at the behest of his first wife. He said that he has since appreciated that his first wife was stricken with a mental disorder which has also been medically diagnosed as such. He also said that because he felt uncomfortable with the examination of his daughter for masturbation and so sought the help of an elder at the time. We noted that this claim, i.e. seeking the help of an elder, is substantiated by [REDACTED]'s statements when questioned by the Palmer elders in November, 1999 and the October 4, 1999 letter from the Fort Kent Congregation to the Society. He stated that his examination was not for sexual gratification but to get his former wife off his back who had made the claim that [REDACTED] was masturbating. He did repeat his admission that he had been abusive in his disciplining of the girls, especially of [REDACTED].

In considering the charges raised by [REDACTED], [REDACTED] categorically denied the charges. In our efforts to get at the truth we noted that he was extremely distraught whenever his actions toward [REDACTED] were discussed, whereas he would emphatically deny [REDACTED] sexual abuse accusation.

[REDACTED] was dismissed and the committee considered the information that we had gathered. At the first reinstatement hearing it was felt that [REDACTED] had displayed repentance and had sought to right the wrongs where possible. He had also been extremely diligent in his meeting attendance, most times arriving well ahead of most of the brothers. At that hearing, there were two areas of concern: First, [REDACTED] and his fiancé, [REDACTED], had been maintaining indirect contact with each other via [REDACTED]'s non-witness sister. He was asked if he thought that such contacts were in keeping with the spirit of the scriptural instructions regarding disfellowshipped individuals. He saw the point and readily agreed that it was not appropriate and also agreed to desist from such contacts.

Second, that committee felt that the only other thing that would preclude his reinstatement would be a substantiation of [REDACTED]'s charges. It was felt that although the charges that [REDACTED] had been very clearly established, the charges that [REDACTED] had leveled had not. It was from that standpoint that that committee sought to at least question [REDACTED] so that her charges could be substantiated.

[REDACTED] had been asked if he had stopped making indirect contacts with [REDACTED] and he said he had. Brother [REDACTED] stated that he had done some investigating of his own to see if he had stopped making contacts and had determined that he had complied with our. Both at the original disfellowshipping hearing and at both reinstatement hearings the committee was not satisfied with the manner in which [REDACTED] "faced" her father with her charges. The committee considered the accusation to her father on [REDACTED] 24, 2003 via the telephone as inadequate in establishing the charges. As reported by her husband, in his April 27, 2003 letter to the judicial committee, [REDACTED]'s statement was: "This occurred without my mother's knowledge, and she did not know until very recently. I am charging you with sexual abuse including penetration during my childhood!" She then hung up without either the father or the elder that was listening being able to make any statements or ask any questions.

In his ^{page} April 27, 2003 letter her husband also said: "[REDACTED] has told me she was being raped by [REDACTED] from four (4) years onward." However, in the November 14, 1999 letter from the Palmer Congregation, the elders stated that [REDACTED] "suggests that [REDACTED] first alluded to sexual abuse at about 15 years old." Also that letter stated that [REDACTED] reported that when "she was 3 years old her father started to molest her." These elders then stated that she stated that the molestation "went on for years and eventually escalated to her being raped by [REDACTED] at the age of 8-years old." The report continued: "This developed into a history of about 4-years of continued rape." In the October 4, 1999 letter from [REDACTED] of the Fort Kent Congregation, Maine, Brother [REDACTED] states that his

daughter [redacted] had told him that [redacted] had "allegedly told [her] of [redacted]'s progressing from oral sexual abuse to vaginal intercourse AFTER her rape, since he purportedly considered her 'soiled' anyway." Her alleged rape (which itself left many questions unanswered) took place at the age of 13 years. So, based on just this one item we have reported statements, in chronological order, that she was raped by her father beginning at 13, 15, 8 and 4 years of age. Also, we wondered whether there could truly be recollections of molestations and/or rape from the age of 3 years.

Because of these and other unanswered questions regarding her charges the first reinstatement committee desired to at least question [redacted] regarding the charges she brought. Since [redacted] had filed a restraining order on her father and was willing to face him in a worldly court of law, it was felt that she should be willing to talk with the committee.

We believe that because [redacted] has an overly zealous approach to whatever he does he went overboard in the disciplining of his daughters. In the matter of [redacted] examining his daughters "for masturbation" that it was not of a prurient nature since he sought the assistance of elders at the time. We noted that he truly regretted the problems his actions caused and sought to make amends.

Because Brother [redacted] served on the appeal committee he was able to add his observations regarding [redacted]'s demeanor at the appeal hearing as compared to the second reinstatement hearing. He stated that there was a failure on his part to acknowledge that the beatings were abusive and that his actions could be labeled as sexual abuse, even though he may not have had sexual gratification in mind. However, he noted that that disposition had been reversed and that he had reversed that position and had displayed true repentance. *OK*

Having manifested significant repentance at both reinstatement hearings, and, without any evidence to the contrary, both judicial committees concluded that he could be reinstated.

We hope that the above information will prove helpful to you brothers.

Your brothers in the service of our loving Father, Jehovah and his dear Son, Jesus,

[redacted]

[redacted], Chairman

[redacted]