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1. In its Report into the Catholic Archdiocese of Dublin, the Commission recorded the fact that, just as that report was being finalised in June/July 2009, new information was received. This new information would have brought another cleric within the remit of the Commission. This cleric has been dead for many years.

2. The Commission was concerned that relevant information may have been withheld from it and that the failure to supply this information in time to allow it to be incorporated into its examination of the handling of complaints required further investigation.

3. In January 2003 an adult made a complaint to the Eastern Health Board that he had been abused by this cleric. This complaint, although clearly within the Commission’s remit, was not made known to the Commission when the HSE made its discovery. In May 2009, it was made known to Mr Phil Garland who was at the time the Director of Child Protection in the Archdiocese of Dublin. He informed Archbishop Martin and the Archdiocese immediately informed the Commission. The HSE subsequently provided the documentation on this case to the Commission.

4. When the Archdiocese became aware of the complaint which had been made to the health board, it conducted a further search of its files. This search identified the existence of a letter to the solicitors for the Archdiocese which showed that there was an awareness among a number of people in the Archdiocese that there had been a concern expressed about this cleric in 1999. The Archdiocese gave this letter to the Commission in early July 2009. The Commission’s report was almost completed at that stage and was, in fact, submitted to the Minister for Justice, Equality and Law Reform on 21 July 2009.

5. The Commission investigated the circumstances surrounding the failure of the HSE to include the documentation about this complaint in its discovery to the
Commission. The Commission is satisfied that this was due to human error. The Commission also examined the circumstances surrounding the awareness of a concern within the Archdiocese of Dublin about the same cleric. Having done so, it is satisfied that the Archdiocese had no knowledge of the identity of the source of the concern or the details of the concern and was never in a position to investigate it.

6. In 2010, Archbishop Martin told the Commission that he had received another complaint in respect of this cleric. Archbishop Martin was under no obligation to give the Commission this information. The Commission considers that, at this stage, it is a matter for the Archdiocese of Dublin to investigate all complaints against this cleric.