



**REVIEW OF THE CASE FOR CDM PROCEEDINGS IN RELATION TO THE CLERGY  
INVOLVED IN THE MATTER OF TIMOTHY STOREY**

The independent case review report on the Diocese of London's response to the case of Timothy Storey contained within it a recommendation [5 (c)] that consideration should be given as to whether, in the light of the findings in the review, an investigation under the Clergy Discipline Measure would be "warranted or appropriate in relation to clergy persons A & B."

The Associate Archdeacon of London, the Venerable Rosemary Lane-Priestly, was asked to respond to this recommendation and I have been asked by the Bishop of London to adjudicate on her report. I have treated this as a "Stage 1" matter under Sections 10 and 11 of the Clergy Discipline Measure Code of Practice. The two priests concerned have both made written submissions in response to the independent case review report, and I am therefore treating the Archdeacon's report as a recommendation not to proceed to a formal "second stage" complaint under the Clergy Discipline Measure.

I do so for the following reasons highlighted in the Archdeacon's report (numbers cross-refer to the paragraphs of her report).

- 1) HV's role as a Bishop's Adviser for Child Protection was voluntary and not undertaken as part of his duties of office as an ordained minister (3)
- 2) HV contests and repudiates many of the findings of the independent review in relation to the actions he took at the time (9-12)
- 3) The Diocese of London did not at the time of the TS case have in place the robust framework for safeguarding that now exists. HV undertook his task as a volunteer who advised the bishop and those working with him (who were not interviewed by the person who wrote the independent report) (10-11)
- 4) JC made decisions in his role which were naïve, inappropriate and at times plain stupid, but did not relate directly to his duties of office as a priest with a parish (15-19)
- 5) A CDM complaint, if it were to proceed to formal consideration would inevitably be contested and would lead to an open and detailed challenge to the findings of the independent review. This would eventuate in further pain for all concerned, particularly the survivors (12, 20 and 34)