


"H"

Ellis, John

From: Ellis, John
 Sent: Friday, 28 March, 2003 1:39 PM
 To: 'John F. Davoren'
 Subject: RE: Progress on your complaint

This and the ~~following~~ ^{following} 1 pages comprise the
 annexure marked "H" referred to in the annexed
 affidavit of John Andrew Ellis
 sworn at ~~Somers~~ ^{Somers} this 4th day of FEB
 20.03 before me:


 DAVID BECC, SOLICITOR

John

Thank you for your response, and for the steps you have taken to progress this matter with the Archbishop's office.

I trust that you will not take what I have to say next as being "difficult", but rather as an attempt to clearly communicate my wishes, with a view to achieving the objectives of the Towards Healing process.

In that context, I cannot agree with the statement that "the matter of Fr Duggan's capacity to respond to the charges is central to the case, and that is the issue that must be addressed first"

I have raised some fairly fundamental issues of process and communication in my e-mail of 21 March, and do not feel that an adequate response has been made to those matters. In fact, to call a spade a spade, there has been no response.

I refer in particular to my first two requests - relating to the identification of a Contact Person and the appointment of assessors. These matters, it appears, must be the first priority to get the process "back on track". If no assessors have been appointed, who is going to consider and decide upon "the matter of Fr Duggan's capacity to respond to my complaint"?

I agree that FR Duggan's capacity to respond is an important issue in moving towards a resolution of the complaint. What I do not necessarily accept is that it is a "central" issue, in the sense of being something that dictates the outcome or progress of the process. I also find it unhelpful that your language has shifted to a language of "charges" and "case", rather than language more appropriate to a compassionate healing process. For the avoidance of doubt, I also do not accept that this is what must be done "first" in the context of the whole process from here (although it is obviously a matter which will need to be a high priority for the assessors once appointed). In this context, contemporaneously with appointing assessors, you should continue your dialogue with the Church authority in terms of removing any barriers from the Church authority to the assessors speaking with Fr Duggan, or even ascertaining whether they are (practically) able to do so.

I look forward to your advice as to who my Contact Person is, who have been appointed as the 2 assessors, and the other matters raised in my e-mail of last week.

Best regards

John Ellis
 Direct telephone: **REDACTED**
 Fax:
 Mobile:
 Email: john.ellis@baker.net.com

-----Original Message-----

From: John F. Davoren [mailto:john.davoren@cathprofstandards.com]
 Sent: Friday, 28 March, 2003 12:09 PM
 To: Ellis, John
 Subject: Progress on your complaint

Dear John,

1

I was able to discuss your recent e-mails with the Archbishop's office yesterday. The Archbishop, himself is overseas at the moment.

Obviously the matter of Fr Duggan's capacity to respond to the charges is central to the case, and that is the issue that must be addressed first.

Your request for a copy of the advice given by the Archdiocesan lawyers on this issue was noted, and the Archdiocese will now pursue the matter directly and refer your request, and the matter generally back to its lawyers for their advice.

John Davoren