

periods of time or once a week at other periods of time, or they would not take place for one or two weeks at a time. They followed a pattern whereby Father Soper would call the Claimant into his office on a pretext and cane him on his buttocks. The caning was carried out by Father Soper not as any form of punishment, but either as a prelude to more serious sexual assault or solely for his own sexual gratification. Following the caning, Father Soper would order the Claimant to drop his trousers under the pretext of checking that the Claimant was alright, before proceeding to touch the Claimant indecently on his legs, buttocks and penis. On some of these occasions, Father Soper would then bugger the Claimant. On other occasions, he would get the Claimant to masturbate, which the Claimant would do to ejaculation. He would also order the Claimant to masturbate him, but the Claimant always refused. On a few occasions, both buggery and masturbation would take place.

With the exception of the period 18 February 1972 to March 1972, there were a few occasions where Father Soper only canded the Claimant, but again this was solely for his own sexual gratification.

In 1972 or 1973 the Claimant was taken on holiday to [DPA] with a group of boys from the school for a period of two weeks. During this time at a youth hostel, Father Soper indecently assaulted and buggered the Claimant on 3 to 4 occasions.

Between the 18 February 1972 and around the 18 February 1974, Father Soper also encouraged three other students at the school, [RC-A668], [RC-A654] and [RC-A667] [RC-A667] to physically assault the Claimant. This occurred about once a fortnight.

During one term for a period lasting from 18 February 1972 to March 1972, the Claimant was canded on 56 occasions by Father Soper but on half of these occasions, he was not sexually assaulted in any other way. During this period, on two occasions, the Claimant was physically and sexually abused twice by Father Soper in one day.

5. The acts described in paragraphs 4 and 5 arose in circumstances where the Defendants entrusted the safekeeping and care of the Claimant to Father Soper, delegated those tasks to Father Soper and undertook its care and safekeeping of the Claimant through the services of the Father Soper. Further, those acts were committed in the course of or