

For research purposes only. Courtesy of New York State Unified Court System eTrack.
Available here: <https://iapps.courts.state.ny.us/webcivil/etrackLogin>



Summons & Complaints and all public documents subsequently completed and filed by Phillips & Paolicelli LLP. Address: 747 3rd Ave 6th floor, New York, NY 10017. Phone: (212) 388-5100.

Summons & Complaints relying on the research of James G. Faluszczak:

NYS UCS Case Number	Alleged Perpetrator	Defendant #	Defendants	Plaintiff
70000/2020E	Tremaroli, Mr. Rudy	3	Archdiocese of New. York & Our Lady of Mt. Carmel Church & School.	M., A.

STATE OF NEW YORK
SUPREME COURT: COUNTY OF BRONX

<p>A.M.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff,</p> <p>vs.</p> <p>THE ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK, CHURCH OF OUR LADY OF MOUNT CARMEL, and OUR LADY OF MOUNT CARMEL SCHOOL,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendants.</p>

SUMMONS

Index No.:

TO THE ABOVE NAMED DEFENDANTS:

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED to answer the complaint in this action and to serve a copy of your answer, or, if the complaint is not served with this summons, to serve a notice of appearance, on the plaintiffs' attorney within 20 days after the service of this summons, exclusive of the day of service (or within 30 days after the service is complete if this summons is not personally delivered to you within the State of New York); and in case of your failure to appear or answer, judgment will be taken against you by default for the relief demanded in the complaint.

DATED: New York, New York
 January 3, 2020

Phillips & Paolicelli, LLP
Attorneys for Plaintiffs



By: Diane Paolicelli
dpaolicelli@p2law.com
Michael DeRuve
mderuve@p2law.com
Phillips & Paolicelli, LLP
747 Third Avenue, Sixth Floor
New York, New York 10017
212-388-5100

J. Devitt Cooney (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)
Cooney & Conway

dcooney@cooneyconway.com
120 N LaSalle St
Chicago, IL 60602
312-236-6166
Attorneys for Plaintiff

ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK
1011 First Avenue, New York, NY 10022

CHURCH OF OUR LADY OF MOUNT CARMEL
2465 Bathgate Avenue, Bronx, New York 10458

OUR LADY OF MOUNT CARMEL SCHOOL
2465 Bathgate Avenue, Bronx, New York 10458

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF BRONX

<p>A.M.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff,</p> <p>vs.</p> <p>THE ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK, CHURCH OF OUR LADY OF MOUNT CARMEL, and OUR LADY OF MOUNT CARMEL SCHOOL,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendants.</p>

COMPLAINT

Index No.:

Plaintiff A.M., by and through his undersigned attorneys, as and for his Complaint, alleges as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This action is brought pursuant to the Child Victims Act, codified at CPLR 214-g.
2. Plaintiff A. M. was repeatedly sexually abused and assaulted by Rudy Tremaroli, a coach/janitor and serial pedophile, who was hired, retained, supervised, placed, directed and otherwise authorized to act by Defendants, The Archdiocese of New York, Church of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, and Our Lady of Mount Carmel School (collectively "Defendants") in the Bronx, New York.
3. The Defendants have long known that substantial numbers of priests, clergy members, and adult staff at their institutions and facilities throughout history, and up to and

including the present day, commit criminal acts by soliciting sexual contact with minor parishioners and students, like Plaintiff, who are entrusted to their spiritual care and guidance. Official Church documents dealing with this unspeakable misconduct span the centuries, many of which were and are well known to Defendants.

4. Notwithstanding this knowledge, and the fiduciary duty and relationship of trust owed to lay worshipers and their children, Defendants negligently, recklessly, and willfully failed to protect Plaintiff from sexual abuse by Rudy Tremaroli, negligently hired Rudy Tremaroli, permitted the abuse to occur, failed to supervise Rudy Tremaroli, failed to timely investigate Rudy Tremaroli's misconduct, failed to educate and train minors, parents, clergy members, and/or adult staff about the risk of sexual abuse in their institution and schools, to identify signs of sexual abuse, grooming behaviors, or sexual predators, and to report any suspicion that a minor may be getting abused, maltreated, groomed, or otherwise sexually abused, acted to protect their own self-interest to the detriment of innocent children including the plaintiff when he was a minor, and are otherwise responsible for Rudy Tremaroli's sexual assault of Plaintiff, and Plaintiff's consequential injuries and damages.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff is an individual residing in Westchester County, New York.
6. Plaintiff was born in 1979.
7. Defendant, The Archdiocese of New York ("Archdiocese") is, and at all relevant times was, a non-profit organization or entity, which includes but is not limited to civil corporations, decision-making entities, officials, and employees, authorized to conduct business and doing business at 1011 First Avenue, New York, NY 10022.

8. The Archdiocese of New York controls all Catholic religious, pastoral and educational functions in the boroughs of Manhattan, the Bronx and Staten Island, and in other counties in the greater New York metropolitan area. The Archdiocese operates and controls approximately 370 parishes, 274 schools and 90 Catholic charities. The Archdiocese is a citizen and resident of the State of New York.

9. At all relevant times, Defendant Archdiocese oversaw, managed, controlled, directed and operated parishes, churches and schools within the Archdiocese.

10. At all relevant times, Defendant Church of Our Lady of Mount Carmel was and still is a Roman Catholic Church, organized pursuant to the laws of the State of New York and located at 2465 Bathgate Avenue, Bronx, New York 10458.

11. At all relevant times, Defendant Church of Our Lady of Mount Carmel was and still is under the direct authority, control and province of Defendant Archdiocese.

12. At all relevant times, Defendant Archdiocese owned the premises where Defendant Church of Our Lady of Mount Carmel was located.

13. At all relevant times, Defendant Archdiocese oversaw, managed controlled, directed and operated Defendant Church of Our Lady of Mount Carmel.

14. At all relevant times, Defendant Our Lady of Mount Carmel School was and still is a Roman Catholic High School, organized pursuant to the laws of the State of New York and located at 2465 Bathgate Avenue, Bronx, New York 10458.

15. At all relevant times, Defendant Our Lady of Mount Carmel School was and still is under the direct authority, control and province of Defendants Archdiocese and Church of Our Lady of Mount Carmel.

16. At all relevant times, Defendants Archdiocese and Church of Our Lady of Mount Carmel owned the premises where Defendant Our Lady of Mount Carmel School was located.

17. At all relevant times, Defendants Archdiocese and Church of Our Lady of Mount Carmel oversaw, managed controlled, directed and operated Defendant Our Lady of Mount Carmel School.

18. At all relevant times, Defendants Archdiocese and Church of Our Lady of Mount Carmel oversaw, managed, controlled, directed and assigned priests, teachers, school employees, and other clergy to work in parishes, churches, and schools of the Archdiocese, including Defendant Our Lady of Mount Carmel School.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

Rudy Tremaroli

19. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

20. Upon information and belief, Rudy Tremaroli was hired by the Defendants in the early to mid-1960's to operate a Catholic Community Center formerly known as "Ciati Hall" (now known as "Our Lady of Mount Carmel Community Center") located at 2380 Belmont Avenue Bronx, New York 10458. The community center was owned, operated, maintained, staffed and/or controlled by the Defendants.

21. Upon information and belief, Rudy Tremaroli contemporaneously worked for the Defendants at Church of Our Lady of Mount Carmel and Our Lady of Mount Carmel School.

22. Through his employment by the Defendants at the community center and Our Lady of Mount Carmel, Rudy Tremaroli gained access to hundreds of local children by hosting a youth program, movie nights, and a summer camp.

23. Upon information and belief, Rudy Tremaroli sexually assaulted and abused countless numbers of boys while working at the community center and summer camp owned, operated, maintained, and/or controlled by the Defendants.

24. Upon information and belief, in approximately 1974, one of Rudy Tremaroli's victims reported his acts of sexual abuse to Emilia Longo, an employee at the community center owned, operated, maintained, staffed and/or controlled by the Defendants.

25. Upon information and belief, in the mid-1970's, the Defendants removed Rudy Tremaroli from the community center and reassigned him exclusively to Our Lady of Mount Carmel School, despite direct knowledge Defendants received regarding Rudy's previous criminal sexual behavior against young boys.

26. Rudy Tremaroli continued to sexually assault and abuse young male students and members of the community while serving in his new capacity at Our Lady of Mount Carmel.

27. Rudy Tremaroli continued working for Defendants at Our Lady of Mount Carmel until his death in 1992.

28. To date, there are nine (9) other CVA cases alleging sexual abuse by Rudy Tremaroli at Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church and School. *See* John Doe I v. Archdiocese of N.Y., et al., Index No. 950211/2019; John Doe II v. Archdiocese of N.Y., et al., Index No. 950210/2019; John Doe III v. Archdiocese of N.Y., et al., Index No. 950208/2019; John Doe IV v. Archdiocese of N.Y., et al., Index No. 950210/2019; John Doe V v. Archdiocese of N.Y., et al., Index No. 950212/2019; John Doe VI v. Archdiocese of N.Y., et al., Index No. 950213/2019 (N.Y. County Sup. Ct.); John Doe VIII v. Archdiocese of N.Y., et al., 950254 (N.Y. County Sup. Ct.); John Doe X v. Archdiocese of N.Y., et al., Index No. 950256/2019

(N.Y. County Sup. Ct.); Gennaro Bizzaro v. Archdiocese of N.Y., et al., Index No. 950255/2019
(N.Y. County Sup. Ct.).

Plaintiff A.M.'s Abuse

29. From approximately 1985 through 1990 Plaintiff attended Our Lady of Mount Carmel School.

30. At all relevant times, Rudy Tremaroli was a janitor employed by the Archdiocese of New York and Our Lady of Mount Carmel School. He was also an assistant coach for of the Our Lady of Mount Carmel middle school basketball team.

31. At all relevant times, Rudy Tremaroli was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of the Defendants.

32. By assigning Rudy Tremaroli to these roles, Defendants gave Rudy Tremaroli complete access to minors, including Plaintiff, and empowered him to exercise complete authority over minors.

33. Rudy Tremaroli's duties and responsibilities included supervising, coaching, interacting with, and mentoring minor boys.

34. In the performance of their duties, Defendants authorized Rudy Tremaroli to be alone with minor boys, including Plaintiff, and to have unfettered and unsupervised access to them on Defendants' property during school hours and on weekends.

35. At all relevant times, James Irwin was the Principal of Our Lady of Mount Carmel School. Irwin was the highest ranking official on site at Our Lady of Mount Carmel School, and charged with day-to-day responsibility for supervising and , protecting minor students at Our Lady of Mount Carmel School.

36. At all relevant times, James Irwin was under the direct supervision, employ, and control of the Defendants.

37. By assigning James Irwin as Principal, Defendants gave him complete access to minors, including Plaintiff, and empowered him to exercise complete authority over minors.

38. Defendants required students, like Plaintiff, to accept direction from James Irwin, Rudy Tremaroli, and other school employees, and to obey their instructions.

39. Rudy Tremaroli engaged in unlawful, unpermitted, harmful, sexual contact with Plaintiff on multiple occasions, beginning in approximately 1985 and ending in approximately 1990.

40. The acts of sexual abuse committed by Rudy Tremaroli occurred on the Our Lady of Mount Carmel School premises.

41. In addition to the sexual contact Plaintiff suffered, Rudy Tremaroli also took photographs of Plaintiff naked and/or half clothed, with the assistance of Principal James Irwin, on the Our Lady of Mount Carmel premises.

42. Upon information and belief, Defendants were given actual notice of Rudy Tremaroli's sexual abuse of minor boys prior to the abuse suffered by Plaintiff.

43. James Irwin, the principal of Our Lady of Mount Carmel School, was not only aware of Tremaroli's sexual misconduct, but actively participated and facilitated Rudy Tremaroli's sexual abuse of minor students.

44. By virtue of his position as principal, James Irwin's knowledge of Tremaroli's prior acts of sexual abuse is imputed to the Defendants.

45. Defendants knew or should have known that Rudy Tremaroli was a danger to minor boys like Plaintiff before he sexually abused Plaintiff.

46. Upon information and belief, Defendant Archdiocese was not only aware of sexual abuse of children, but it participated in perpetuating and later covering up Rudy Tremaroli's and James Irwin's unlawful, sexual acts.

47. Upon information and belief, James Irwin received nude photographs of Rudy Tremaroli's victims, presumably Plaintiff as well. James Irwin was arrested in 2000 for possession of child pornography and later pled guilty to charges in 2001.

48. Upon information and belief, Our Lady of Mount Carmel School Monsignor, John Ruvo, and other school employees and/or agents removed and destroyed nude photographs of Rudy Tremaroli's victims from Rudy Tremaroli's home.

49. Defendants owed Plaintiff a duty of reasonable care because they had superior knowledge about the risks their facilities posed to minor children, the risk of abuse in general, and the risks that Rudy Tremaroli posed to Plaintiff.

50. The sexual abuse of Plaintiff by Rudy Tremaroli was foreseeable and/or wanton and reckless.

51. At all relevant times, the Defendants knew or should have known that Rudy Tremaroli was unfit, dangerous, and a threat to the health, safety and welfare of the minors entrusted to his counsel, care and/or protection.

52. With such actual or constructive knowledge, the Defendants provided Rudy Tremaroli unfettered access to Plaintiff and gave him the opportunity to commit foreseeable acts of child sexual abuse or assault.

53. Defendants owed Plaintiff a reasonable duty of care because they affirmatively solicited children and parents to send their children to Our Lady of Mount Carmel School; they undertook custody of minor children, including Plaintiff; they promoted their facilities and

programs as being safe for children, they held out their agents, including Rudy Tremaroli, as safe to work with and around minor boys, they encouraged parents and children to spend time with their agents; and/or authorized their agents, including Rudy Tremaroli, to spend time with, interact with, and recruit children.

54. Defendants owed Plaintiff a heightened, fiduciary duty of care because they held themselves out as being able to provide a safe and secure environment for children, including Plaintiff; Plaintiff's parents entrusted Plaintiff to Defendants' care, and expected that Plaintiff would be safe and properly supervised in an environment free from harm and abuse; Plaintiff was a vulnerable minor, and unable to protect himself; and Defendants affirmatively assumed a position of empowerment over Plaintiff.

55. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer great physical and mental pain and anguish, severe and permanent emotional distress, psychological injuries, fear and anxiety; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing his normal daily activities; was and will continue to be deprived of the enjoyment of life's pleasures; has suffered and continues to suffer loss of spirituality; has suffered and will continue to suffer loss of earnings and earning capacity; has incurred and will in the future incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, and was otherwise damaged in an amount that exceeds the jurisdictional limits of lower courts in this State.

56. To the extent that any Defendants plead, or otherwise seek to rely upon Article 16 of the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules (CPLR) to have fault apportioned to another allegedly culpable party, Plaintiff expressly states that Defendants' conduct falls within one or more of the subdivisions of CPLR 1602.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

NEGLIGENT HIRING, RETENTION, SUPERVISION, AND DIRECTION

57. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

58. At all relevant times Defendants had a duty to exercise due care in hiring, appointing, assigning, retention, supervision and direction of Rudy Tremaroli and James Irwin, so as to protect minor children, including Plaintiff, who were likely to come into contact with him, and/or under his influence or supervision, and to ensure that Rudy Tremaroli and James Irwin did not use their assigned positions to injure minors by sexual assault, contact or abuse.

59. Defendants were negligent and failed to use reasonable care in hiring, appointing, assigning, and retention, of Rudy Tremaroli and James Irwin, failed to properly investigate their background and employment history, and/or hired, appointed and/or assigned them to Defendant Our Lady of Mount Carmel School, when Defendants knew or should have known of facts that would make them a danger to children; and Defendants were otherwise negligent.

60. Defendants were negligent and did not use reasonable care in their supervision and direction of Rudy Tremaroli and James Irwin, failed to monitor their activities, failed to oversee the manner in which they carried out the duties to which Defendants assigned them, even though they knew or should have known that Rudy Tremaroli posed a threat of sexual abuse to minors; allowed the misconduct described above to occur and continue; failed to investigate Rudy Tremaroli's dangerous activities and remove him from their premises; and Defendants were otherwise negligent.

61. Defendants were negligent and did not use reasonable care in their training, if any, of minors about the risk of sexual abuse in their facilities, to identify signs of sexual abuse,

grooming behaviors, and sexual predators, and to report suspicions that a minor was abused, maltreated, groomed, and/or otherwise sexually abused.

62. Defendants were negligent and did not use reasonable care in their training, if any, of adult staff about the risk of sexual abuse in their facilities, to identify signs of sexual abuse, grooming behaviors, and sexual predators, and their statutory duty to report suspicions that a minor was abused, maltreated, groomed, and/or otherwise sexually abused.

63. Rudy Tremaroli would not have been in a position to sexually abuse Plaintiff had Defendants not been negligent in the hiring, retention, supervision, and direction of Rudy Tremaroli and James Irwin.

64. At all relevant times, Rudy Tremaroli and James Irwin acted in the course and scope of their employment with Defendants.

65. Defendants' aforesaid actions were willful, wanton, malicious, reckless, and/or outrageous in their disregard for the rights and safety of Plaintiff.

66. Plaintiff suffered grave injury as a result of Rudy Tremaroli's sexual abuse and misconduct, and James Irwin's misconduct, including physical, psychological and emotional injury as described above.

67. By the reason of the foregoing, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages, in an amount that is greater than the jurisdictional limits of all lower courts that otherwise have jurisdiction, together with interest and costs.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

NEGLIGENT, RECKLESS, AND WILLFUL MISCONDUCT

68. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

69. At all relevant times, Defendants affirmatively and/or impliedly represented to minor children, their families and the general public that agents of the Archdiocese, including Rudy Tremaroli and James Irwin, did not pose a risk and/or that they did not have a history of sexually abusing children, and that children, including Plaintiff, would be safe in their care.

70. Defendants knew or should have known this representation was false and that employing Rudy Tremaroli and James Irwin, and giving them unfettered access to children, including Plaintiff, posed an unacceptable risk of harm to children.

71. Defendants were negligent and did not use reasonable care in their training, if any, of minors and/or parents about the risk of sexual abuse in their institution and facilities, to identify signs of sexual abuse, grooming behaviors, or sexual predators, and to report any suspicion that a minor may be getting abused, maltreated, groomed, or otherwise sexually abused.

72. Defendants were negligent and did not use reasonable care in their training, if any, of clergy members and/or adult staff about the risk of sexual abuse in their institution and facilities, to identify signs of sexual abuse, grooming behaviors, or sexual predators, and their statutory duty to report any suspicion that a minor may be getting abused, maltreated, groomed, or otherwise sexually abused.

73. Defendant Archdiocese maintained a policy and practice of covering up criminal activity committed by clergy members and other agents within the Archdiocese.

74. Over the decades, this “cover-up” policy and practice of the Archdiocese resulted in the sexual assault of untold numbers of children, and put numerous other children at risk of sexual assault.

75. Defendant Archdiocese failed to report multiple allegations of sexual abuse by its employees, agents and representatives, to the proper authorities, thereby putting children at risk of sexual assault.

76. Upon information and belief, Defendants covered up acts of abuse by Rudy Tremaroli and James Irwin, and concealed facts concerning Rudy Tremaroli’s sexual misconduct from Plaintiff and his family.

77. By failing to disclose the identities, histories and information about sexually abusive agents in their employ, including Rudy Tremaroli, Defendants unreasonably deprived the families of children entrusted to their care, including Plaintiff, of the ability to protect their children.

78. Defendants failed to warn Plaintiff and his parents that Rudy Tremaroli posed a risk of child sexual assault.

79. The conduct of Defendants as described herein was done with utter disregard as to the potential profound injuries which would ensue, and with depraved indifference to the health and well-being of children, and to the fact that Defendants were knowingly subjecting children in their charge, including Plaintiff, to sexual crimes.

80. Defendants’ aforesaid actions were negligent, reckless, willful and wonton in their disregard for the rights and safety of children, including Plaintiff.

81. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' misconduct, Plaintiff suffered grave injury, including the physical, psychological and emotional injury and damages as described above.

82. By the reason of the foregoing, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages, in an amount that is greater than the jurisdictional limits of all lower courts that otherwise have jurisdiction, together with interest and costs.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

83. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

84. The sexual abuse of Plaintiff was extreme and outrageous conduct, beyond all possible bounds of decency, atrocious and intolerable in a civilized world.

85. Defendants' aforesaid negligent, grossly negligent and reckless misconduct, endangered Plaintiff's safety and caused him to fear for his own safety.

86. Defendants knew or disregarded the substantial probability that Rudy Tremaroli would cause severe emotional distress to Plaintiff.

87. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' foregoing misconduct, Plaintiff suffered severe emotional distress including psychological and emotional injury as described above.

88. By the reason of the foregoing, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages in an amount that is greater than the jurisdictional limits of all lower courts that otherwise have jurisdiction, plus interest and costs.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**PREMISES LIABILITY**

89. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

90. At all relevant times, Defendants owned, operated, and /or controlled the premises known as Our Lady of Mount Carmel School, including the areas where the sexual abuse of Plaintiff occurred.

91. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was rightfully present at the aforementioned premises.

92. Defendants had a duty to see that the premises at which Plaintiff was rightfully present were in a reasonably safe condition for the intended use by students, like Plaintiff, whose presence was reasonably anticipated.

93. Defendants willfully, recklessly, and negligently failed to provide a reasonably safe premises that was free from the presence of sexual predators and/or the assault by the occupants of the premises, including Rudy Tremaroli and James Irwin. Defendants thereby breached their duty of care of Plaintiff.

94. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' misconduct, Plaintiff suffered grave injury, including the physical, psychological, and emotional injury and damages as described above.

95. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages in an amount that is greater than the jurisdictional limits of all lower courts that otherwise have jurisdiction, plus interest and costs.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY

96. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

97. At all relevant times, there existed a fiduciary relationship of trust, confidence and reliance between Plaintiff and each Defendant. The entrustment of Plaintiff to the care and supervision of the Defendants while Plaintiff was a vulnerable child, imposed upon Defendants fiduciary duty to act in the best interests of Plaintiff.

98. Defendants were entrusted with the well-being, care, and safety of Plaintiff, which Defendants had a fiduciary duty to protect.

99. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants breached their fiduciary duties to Plaintiff.

100. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' foregoing breach, Plaintiff suffered grave injury, including the physical, psychological and emotional injury and damages as described above.

101. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages in an amount that is greater than the jurisdictional limits of all lower courts that otherwise have jurisdiction, plus interest and costs.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

BREACH OF DUTY *IN LOCO PARENTIS*

102. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

103. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was a vulnerable child entrusted to Defendants care, and was under the supervision and control of Defendants, such that Defendants owed him a duty to act *in loco parentis* and to prevent foreseeable injuries.

104. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants breached their duties to act *in loco parentis*.

105. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' foregoing breach, Plaintiff suffered grave injury, including the physical, psychological and emotional injury and damages as described above.

106. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages in an amount that is greater than the jurisdictional limits of all lower courts that otherwise have jurisdiction, plus interest and costs.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

BREACH OF STATUTORY DUTIES TO REPORT

107. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein

108. Pursuant to N.Y. Soc. Serv. Law §§ 413 and 420 and New York Education Law Article 23-B, Defendants had a statutory duty to report reasonable suspicion of abuse of children in their care.

109. Defendants breached their statutory duty by failing to report reasonable suspicion of abuse by Rudy Tremaroli of children in their care.

110. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' foregoing breaches, Plaintiff suffered grave injury, including the physical, psychological and emotional injury and damages as described above.

111. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages in an amount that is greater than the jurisdictional limits of all lower courts that otherwise have jurisdiction, plus interest and costs.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

- a. Awarding Plaintiff compensatory damages for his injuries, in an amount that is greater than the jurisdictional limits of all lower courts that otherwise have jurisdiction;
- b. Awarding Plaintiff punitive damages for his injuries, in an amount that is greater than the jurisdictional limits of all lower courts that otherwise have jurisdiction;
- c. Awarding Plaintiff prejudgment interest, to the extent available by law;
- d. Awarding Plaintiffs costs and disbursements and attorneys' fees to the extent available by law; and
- e. Awarding such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

112. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury of all issues triable by jury in this action.

Dated: January 3, 2020

Yours, etc.

PHILLIPS & PAOLICELLI, LLP



By: Michael DeRuve
mderuve@p2law.com
Diane Paolicelli
dpaolicelli@p2law.com
Phillips & Paolicelli, LLP
747 Third Avenue, Sixth Floor
New York, New York 10017
212-388-5100

J. Devitt Cooney (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)
Cooney & Conway
dcooney@cooneyconway.com
120 N LaSalle St
Chicago, IL 60602
312-236-6166
Attorneys for Plaintiff