

# Flynn campaign: Refuting the falsehoods in the Gazette article and piece

Posted on Wednesday, May 9, 2018

>> **WisPolitics is now on the State Affairs network. Get custom keyword notifications, bill tracking and all WisPolitics content. [Get the app or access via desktop.](#)**

On questions regarding defending priests is the same as defending the Archdiocese: “Each of the priests had their own lawyer. Neither I nor the Archdiocese defended the conduct of the priests. Because the priests had little money, the victims also sued the Archdiocese for negligence, and the Archdiocese paid the settlements.”

On Fr. Arimond specifically: “Arimond was removed from the priesthood and spent time in jail. A background check by a future employer, or licensing authority, would show that conviction. I had no knowledge of Arimond’s application of a license or job after he was removed from ministry. If I had known that he was applying for any counseling license, I certainly would have objected to the licensing authorities, and questioned why a background check hadn’t discovered Arimond’s criminal history.”

On bullying of victims: “I treated all victims with dignity and respect. It is false to say that any victims were bullied, but I do understand the sensitivity of this case and the terrible pain felt by many, and that any inquiry about the facts could be considered intrusive by victims. However, it was essential to find out the facts in a deposition so that priests were removed from the priesthood.”

On the accusations stated by “Susan” in the Gazette article: “Susan was treated with dignity and respect. Depositions are required in every civil case to arrive at the facts. The length of the depositions as she mentions is inaccurate. Understandably, victims may view any deposition as intrusive, even if it is required. The depositions in that case were the minimum necessary and in the least amount of time necessary to arrive at the facts.

On costs, what “Susan” is referring to is the routine taxation of costs in favor of the prevailing party in litigation (a judge dismissed her case). I gave strict orders that no victim would have these costs taxed against them, and that the Archdiocese would waive any claim for cost. I am aware of 2 cases in which these costs were nevertheless mistakenly included in the judgement of dismissal, and in one of them where the victim called and informed me, the Archdiocese immediately satisfied and waived the cost.”