

documented since 1950.

2. The minister has or might have seriously impaired the mission, witness or integrity of the church by his or her words, acts or omissions (including words, acts, or omissions in situations of confidentiality or pastoral care), having regard to his or her office or standing in relation to the Church in that:
 - a. During a police investigation into a serious sexual allegation involving PR-A10 in [1990's] he made an inappropriate telephone call to her mother.
 - b. In that call he implied PR-A10 was not telling the truth regarding the allegation made to the Police in [1990's] involving the perpetrator of the abuse, who was subsequently convicted of a sexual assault against PR-A10.
 - c. Further, during the call the minister informed PR-A10's mother that he would not be offering any counselling or support to her but he would be supporting the perpetrator of the abuse.
 - d. This caused distress and hurt to the mother of PR-A10 and subsequently caused distress, alarm and hurt to PR-A10.
 - e. Further, during the telephone conversation the minister failed to offer any counselling or support to the victim of a serious sexual assault.

The complaint was considered by the Committee in a hearing on 19 November 2019. PR-A10 attended with a support person present. The complaint was brought by a Connexional Advocate. The Committee heard evidence from PR-A10 and from the minister and also reviewed documentary materials relating to the complaint.

The Committee found that Charge 1 was established, in that the minister had failed to report a serious incident to the PCR. The Committee held that his failure to report the incident was due to a misunderstanding and not an intention to cover up the incident.

The Committee also found that Charge 2 was established in part. It held that a phone call did take place and that it was not inappropriate for the minister to have made the phone call, but that he had struggled to find the appropriate words to convey his meaning. It found that he did not intentionally imply that PR-A10 was not telling the truth, that he did not say that he would be supporting the perpetrator and that he did not expressly state that he would not support PR-A10. The Charge was established in part because the minister had failed to offer pastoral support to PR-A10.

The Committee proposed to PR-A10 that the matter be resolved by way of a "heartfelt, freely made apology in writing" from the minister to the complainant. The Committee stated that if the apology was not produced by 29 November 2019, alternative sanctions would need to be considered. The Connexional Advocate informed the Committee that PR-A10 had said that she would not accept an apology from the minister.

In its final report, dated 9 December 2019, the Committee decided not to impose any penalty on the minister in pastoral charge. Their reasons for reaching this conclusion included: that safeguarding in the Church was at an early stage of development at the time when his actions took place and that the minister had served the Church well for over 40 years.

The decision of the Committee was appealed by the Connexional Advocate on 17 December 2019 and the appeal remains ongoing.