

On Fri, Nov 9, 2018 at 4:33 PM Evgenia Peretz <evgenia.peretz@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Coyle,

I'm a writer at Vanity Fair and I'm working on a piece about Brett Kavanaugh's social milieu in the early 1980s, and how alumni of Georgetown Prep and other schools, as well as others in the community at large, are looking back at the culture 35 years later.

Now that the media circus has died down a bit, I'm hoping to present a clear-eyed, nuanced view of the situation. Not surprisingly, Georgetown Prep has been mentioned in several of my conversations with people. There's been some criticism, but also much support, even among those who disagreed with the confirmation of Brett Kavanaugh. I'd like my article to be as fair, and as complete, as possible. With that in mind, I'm hoping to speak with someone at the school. My reporting deadline is Friday, Nov. 16.

Many thanks for considering this request.

All best,

Evgenia Peretz

On Mon, Nov 12, 2018 at 12:51 PM Patrick Coyle <pcoyl@gprep.org> wrote:

Evgenia,

I have received your note and will certainly try to provide you feedback as best we can on behalf of Georgetown Preparatory School.

I'm hoping that you could lend us a little more detail so that we can understand what you would like us to convey. For example, you indicate that Georgetown Prep has been mentioned in several of your conversations with sources and that some have criticized us. If you could give me some specifics on what they have said about us and their vantage point, I'll do all I can to get you a response.

I'm also not sure what you mean by "looking back at the culture." Can you give me some guidance on what that entails and how you aim to characterize it?

As you point out, our School has endured some very rough treatment by the press in recent weeks. One of the more troubling aspects of that ordeal is that many media outlets withheld key information from us, which then gave readers the false impression that we had nothing to say about those particulars when they appeared in print. Allow me to clear the air and ask here up front, can you assure me that we will have the opportunity to hear any assertions that are being made about our School or its practices so that we can have a full and fair opportunity to respond?

Of course, if you also have specific questions, please feel free to email them to me and I'll give them my quickest attention, keeping your Friday deadline in mind.

Best,
Patrick

On Mon, Nov 12, 2018 at 1:28 PM Evgenia Peretz <evgenia.peretz@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Patrick,

Thanks for your email. You will certainly have an opportunity to the assertions made about the school. In a few days, I will get back to you with specific questions. Do you prefer a phone call or by email? I actually have into next week so that gives us a bit more time.

Thanks again for your attention to this.

Best,

Evgenia

On Mon, Nov 12, 2018 at 2:41 PM Patrick Coyle <pcoyl@gprep.org> wrote:

Evgenia,

Thanks for the assurance and I'll stand ready to take a look at those particulars.

Yes; if you could please email me the various questions you have as well, I will review those straight away.

Any other details on how you regard the culture and what that involves would be most helpful as we think about the input you are asking.

Best,
Patrick

On Wed, Nov 14, 2018 at 5:03 PM Patrick Coyle <pcoyl@gprep.org> wrote:

Evgenia,

Do you have an ETA on sending those specific questions? I know your deadline is this Friday.

The more time we have to look we look into those questions, the better for us to send thoughtful responses.

Best,
Patrick

On November 14, 2018 at 5:35 PM Evgenia Peretz <evgenia.peretz@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Patrick,

I actually have a few more days than I thought. I'd like to get a list of questions to you by either tomorrow night, or Friday morning. If you could respond by Tuesday or Wednesday of next week, that would be great.

Thanks very much,

Evgenia

On November 16, 2018 at 5:29 PM Evgenia Peretz wrote: <evgenia.peretz@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Patrick,

Sorry for the delay in getting you these questions. I won't finish the piece until next week, and after that there's still a week of fact-checking so changes can be made. I'm cognizant of the fact that much of my article pertains to the 80s, when many of the members of the administration were not around. But if anyone was, I wanted to give you/them an opportunity to address these questions and assertions:

The 1983 yearbook struck many people as offensive, particularly in regards to women. What sort of oversight, if any, was there of the yearbook at that time? Have those practices changed in terms of what students can include?

A couple of alums from the 80s and 90s mentioned hazing that went on during football camp, which included seniors hitting underclassmen with socks filled with coins, and "butting." I know that one student was expelled for the latter, but do you think these incidents were met with sufficient consequence? Has that culture changed?

Two alums from the 80s said that during football camp, some of the priests drank with the students. One alum told me that one of the coaches invited seniors to his bachelor party where they was drinking and strippers. Is this accurate and were there any consequence?

I'd like to get a sense of how the school has processed the ordeal surrounding Kavanaugh's confirmation. Clearly, there was a tremendous amount of support at the school for Kavanaugh. Was there any disagreement within the community on the matter?

Have there been any discussions since about how the students can better navigate their social lives and relationships with young women?

Thanks for addressing these. There may be a few more questions down the line. Please know that there are also positive things said about the schools and about particular teachers.

Best,

Evgenia

On Mon, Nov 19, 2018 at 4:10 PM Patrick Coyle <pcoyl@gprep.org> wrote:

Evgenia,

It is Georgetown Prep's policy to have all media responses come from my office. Rev. James R. Van Dyke, S.J., the School's president, and I will be the only representatives from Georgetown Prep that should be contacted by any media outlets.

Here are the responses to your specific questions. I did my best to keep the answers concise. I do have some follow-up questions regarding some of your questions. I have included those follow-up questions below:

Vanity Fair: The 1983 yearbook struck many people as offensive, particularly in regards to women. What sort of oversight, if any, was there of the yearbook at that time? Have those practices changed in terms of what students can include?

I would encourage you to read Fr. Van Dyke's op-ed in [America Magazine](#), a Jesuit sponsored multimedia publication, from October 3, which presents his thoughts on the both the yearbook and the context of how our School tries to guide the students. We think it would serve your readers well to include the hyperlink to the full article in *America*.

On the protocol and oversight of the yearbook, I can speak to my time at Georgetown Prep in my position as Director of Marketing and Communications. We have a dedicated faculty committee, and have for several years, that reviews all content related to the yearbook.

Vanity Fair: A couple of alums from the 80s and 90s mentioned hazing that went on during football camp, which included seniors hitting underclassmen with socks filled with coins, and "butting." I know that one student was expelled for the latter, but do you think these incidents were met with sufficient consequence? Has that culture changed?

Vanity Fair: Two alums from the 80s said that during football camp, some of the priests drank with the students. One alum told me that one of the coaches invited seniors to his bachelor party where they was drinking and strippers. Is this accurate and were there any consequence?

You are raising a number of allegations about specific incidents of misconduct, but I don't understand who is making these claims. Could you please provide me some guidance on the nature of this sourcing and how it is being corroborated?

Also, with respect to the culture question, are you insinuating that Georgetown Prep does not take allegations seriously? Georgetown Prep takes all allegations seriously and takes appropriate disciplinary actions when it is founded.

Vanity Fair: I'd like to get a sense of how the school has processed the ordeal surrounding Kavanaugh's confirmation. Clearly, there was a tremendous amount of support at the school for Kavanaugh. Was there any disagreement within the community on the matter?

As a 501-C3, Georgetown Prep does not get involved in political conversation or political action. We have endured much media attention, most highly negative, since the initial allegations against Justice Kavanaugh surfaced in September. We have, and will continue, to defend our school against mischaracterizations and misconstrued notions against Georgetown Prep made by many national media outlets.

We must take responsibility for our shortcomings, but not at the expense of defending the guiding mission of our School. Yes, we have labored for years to protect students from a broader culture chockablock with degrading influences. And yes, we are painfully aware that all our students, and indeed everyone in our community, sometimes fall short. Human failing, and the effort to reconcile our lives with the teachings of Christ, are at the very heart of our School. We are not indifferent to sin and temptation. Indeed, we have built our lives around confronting them through faith and service.

That's why we returned the phone calls and the emails from reporters. Fr. Van Dyke penned not one but three separate public statements and essays reflecting on where we could have done more while setting the record straight on the falsehoods told about us.

Here are some specifics ignored in the all the media's coverage: Every Georgetown Prep student takes rigorous classes in Christian ethics, personal and social. They all learn Catholic social thought, to understand the demands of a faith that does justice. The students themselves run what's called the Arrupe Society, a service program that runs food drives and blood-donation initiatives, serves the "Best Buddies Program" (founded by an alumnus), volunteers care at an assisted-living facility for elderly women, and tutors in impoverished sections of our community.

Vanity Fair: Have there been any discussions since about how the students can better navigate their social lives and relationships with young women?

Our entire curriculum and our guiding *ethos* as a community is grounded in Christian teachings of interpersonal morality. There is nothing we take more seriously and that includes of course the manner in which our students interact and socialize with women, regardless of their age or station in life. We have always worked in close coordination with other schools in our vicinity and especially our sister school at the Stone Ridge School of the Sacred Heart. Part of the challenge is that our students must confront a wider world of degrading influences and temptations.

It is no small irony that this "perspective piece on the culture of the 1980s and Georgetown Prep" and the critique of our commitment to our mission is being questioned by a publication that routinely parades and promotes the promiscuity of American society.

I do not expect your essay will include any self-reflection about that, but I would certainly encourage it.

You indicated in your previous note that we would have a full and fair chance to hear any specifics criticisms aimed at Georgetown Prep. Do I understand correctly that this latest note represents all those particulars? I have a sense it is somehow less than that.

Please let me know if you have any follow-up questions. I look forward to hearing back from you.

Best,
Patrick

—

On Tue, Nov 20, 2018 at 9:04 AM Evgenia Peretz <evgenia.peretz@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Patrick,

I just wanted you to know that I received this, and will respond fully this afternoon, as I'm tied up with other stuff this morning. Thanks,

Evgenia

—

On November 20, 2018 at 5:33 PM Evgenia Peretz <evgenia.peretz@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Patrick,

Regarding the hazing allegations, I will not be mentioning the thing with the socks. The "butting" thing was from news reports. I will be making the point that at that time, GP stepped up its discipline and four or students were expelled. I will be mentioning the Community the Concern.

In terms of the allegations about the drinking with the priests during football camp, this was told to me by a football player from that time who participated. The source wishes to be anonymous, so I can't give any more information. He did not specify which priests in particular did this.

The source regarding the JV coach's bachelor party was in an '83 alum. He told me the coach was Jim Shea.

Needless to say, please let me know if it's inaccurate.

Thank you for pointing to the headmaster's piece in the journal, which addresses the yearbook, which I hadn't seen and is helpful. And thanks for your general comments. I will try to make sure that some of these responses are included in the article.

There are indeed a few more questions, but I want to discuss with my editor what we wish to include. At that point, I will give you a full list of questions. I promise that you will have opportunity to answer any allegations about the school.

Thanks very much.

Evgenia

—

On Mon, Dec 3, 2018 at 8:44 AM Patrick Coyle <pcoyl@gprep.org> wrote:

Evgenia,

I am writing to follow up with you regarding your full list of questions.

As I recall, we left off awaiting further information/details/particulars from you. Since this is likely to require time for us to research and prepare input to meet your requests, I'm concerned that the longer the delay, the less time we'll have for a full and fair response.

Our sense is that you are aiming to present aspects or criticisms of Georgetown Prep that go beyond what you have presented to us so far. Is that in fact the case?

Thank you.

Patrick

—

On Mon, Dec 3, 2018 at 9:27 AM Evgenia Peretz <evgenia.peretz@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Patrick,

Sorry it has taken me a while to get this to you. This has been complicated. One of the issues I intend to cover in my piece concerns Eric Ruyak and Garrett Orr. I know that Eric sent the headmaster a letter

recently with allegations about how the school handled his accusation against Orr back in 2003. I'd like to ask you about the main charges.

Eric says that after he told Father Eck about the sexual assault by Father Orr, the school didn't report it to the police. The Ruyaks maintain that Eric himself was the one who first contacted the police.

Eric also charges that two of the teachers, Stephen Ochs and Julie Collins, in an effort to protect Garrett Orr, sought to portray Eric as a liar, and wanted him expelled. He says that other alums were enlisted in this effort, and that a cruel rumor mill started.

I understand that Garrett Orr had left the school before Eric made his charge. Was Orr being treated then for Parkinson's? Or was he in a rehabilitation program for sex offenders? Or was there some other reason?

Thanks for your attention to this matter.

Best,

Evgenia Peretz

On Mon, Dec 3, 2018 at 12:16 PM Evgenia Peretz <evgenia.peretz@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Patrick, Mr. Ochs, and Ms. Collins,

Patrick, given that this involves two current teachers, it's necessary for us to contact them directly. Therefore, I'm cc'ing them on the below email I sent you earlier. If you could respond to these allegations by Thursday, end of the day, it would be much appreciated. Thanks.

Sorry it has taken me a while to get this to you. This has been complicated. One of the issues I intend to cover in my piece concerns Eric Ruyak and Garrett Orr. I know that Eric sent the headmaster a letter recently with allegations about how the school handled his accusation against Orr back in 2003. I'd like to ask you about the main charges.

Eric says that after he told Father Eck about the sexual assault by Father Orr, the school didn't report it to the police. The Ruyaks maintain that Eric himself was the one who first contacted the police.

Eric also charges that two of the teachers, Stephen Ochs and Julie Collins, in an effort to protect Garrett Orr, sought to portray Eric as a liar, and wanted him expelled. He says that other alums were enlisted in this effort, and that a cruel rumor mill started.

I understand that Garrett Orr had left the school before Eric made his charge. Was Orr being treated then for Parkinson's? Or was he in a rehabilitation program for sex offenders? Or was there some other reason?

Thanks for your attention to this matter.

Best,

Evgenia Peretz

On Mon, Dec 3, 2018 at 2:26 PM Patrick Coyle <pcoyl@gprep.org> wrote:

Evgenia,

I find myself again perplexed at what you are requesting from us.

None of this topic matter was mentioned by you until now and there's no explanation. Why is that? Also, could you please help me understand what any of this latest question set has to do with the "social milieu of the 1980s" or the "media circus" our school endured recently, which you had previously said was your focus?

I have to say, it's starting to appear as though you are aiming to gather any disparagements ever made about Georgetown Prep, no matter how tangential. That's hardly the "fair...clear-eyed, nuanced view of the situation [that presents] much support for Georgetown Prep" that you assured us when you initially reached out.

Obviously, it will take me some time to research this matter since it dates back so far and involves a long sequence of steps that our school took. Earlier, you had said your deadline was soon approaching, but I hope you would agree that we deserve an ample opportunity to provide input here.

May I have your thoughts on that timing? Also, again, please direct all media inquiries to my office.

Best,
Patrick

—

On Mon, Dec 3, 2018 at 3:28 PM Evgenia Peretz <evgenia.peretz@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Patrick,

I understand your concern. This matter only came up after I'd done with bulk of my reporting. It took me a while to understand the allegations, and then to discuss with my editor whether or not to include it. Sometimes the scope of reporting changes over the course of it. That was the case here.

In terms of timing, Eric sent the letter to the headmaster a couple of months ago. So clearly the school has known about this for some time. I would think that any research would have started from the time he received the letter. I think the end of day Thursday should be ample time to respond. If you need until the end of the week, let me know.

We are committed to getting the facts right. If indeed you think Eric is mistaken in his allegations, we will present your side.

Best,

Evgenia

On Tue, Dec 4, 2018 at 9:54 AM Evgenia Peretz <evgenia.peretz@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Patrick,

There's a specific incident I wanted to ask you about, related to what I sent yesterday. I don't know if this will be in the piece--I just wanted to ask you. Eric mentioned an episode in which he was accused of

authoring a live journal in which he expressed wanting to psychically harm the academic dean. Indeed, this sounds extreme, and I don't know what to make of it. But Eric recalls getting called into a meeting about this with the headmaster, the academic dean, Father George, his father, and his attorney, to discuss this. Was Eric accused of this? And if so, what was it based on?

After Orr pled guilty to charges, were members of the school community discouraged from talking to Eric Ruyak? He and his family got that sense.

Thank you,
Evgenia

—

On Tue, Dec 4, 2018 at 4:42 PM Evgenia Peretz <evgenia.peretz@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Patrick,

I'd like to provide specifics regarding two previous questions. I believe this is all we have.

The first is regarding Ochs and Collins. Eric said they they enlisted the help of the Provincial and sent out a letter to the community that he, Eric wasn't telling the truth about Orr. Eric felt they when the school failed to expel him, that the two teachers were attempting to harass him out of the school. His mother is quoted, saying that Dr. Ochs felt he had enough authority at the school that people would believe his word over Eric's.

The second has to do with the "live journal" that I asked you about earlier. According to Ruyak, an investigator at his father's firm determined that the IP address was from a faculty computer, thus exonerating him.

Thank you for your assistance.

Evgenia

—

On Wed, Dec 5, 2018 at 11:21 AM Evgenia Peretz <evgenia.peretz@gmail.com> wrote:

Regarding this "letter" I refer to in the email below, I have it. It's just from the Provincial, Timothy Brown, in which he he says he's "laying the rumors to rest." So there will no assertion in my piece that Dr. Ochs or Ms. Collins ever wrote a letter to the community. But the Ruyak's still maintain that the teachers wanted him expelled for lying about Father Orr.

—

On Wed, Dec 5, 2018 at 11:38 AM Patrick Coyle <pcoyle@gprep.org> wrote:

Evgenia,

Thank you for your note. I am working on these questions now.

Per my last note, I will do my best to get you a response by Friday.

Could you also kindly give me the contact information for the editor who is supervising the piece?

Best,
Patrick

—

On Wed, Dec 5, 2018 at 11:59 AM Evgenia Peretz <evgenia.peretz@gmail.com> wrote:

Sure. It's claire_howorth@condenast.com

—

On Thu, Dec 6, 2018 at 4:29 PM Patrick Coyle <pcoyle@gprep.org> wrote:

Evgenia:

Allow me to recap our interaction with you and the magazine because I think it will shed light for both readers and our stakeholders about our good faith effort to provide you with a fulsome and principled response.

Your first overture to us, on November 9, indicated you were preparing an article on “how alumni of Georgetown Prep...are looking back” at what you called “the social milieu in the early 1980s.” That note said you are “hoping to present a clear-eyed, nuanced view of the situation” including “much support” you had heard for our school so that the piece would be “as fair and as complete as possible.”

Yet in our dialogue that has ensued, I have become increasingly skeptical about your stated intent. We asked you for a chance to hear any criticizing quotes or characterizations specifically made about us by sources and you have presented only paraphrased allegations almost entirely from unnamed sources. In our response to your set of questions about several reported incidents from years ago and school procedures, we asked if that represented the full range of points aimed at Georgetown Prep. But, although we have repeated that question to you several times now, you have ignored it, despite your promise we “would certainly have an opportunity to [hear] the assertions made about the school.”

It seemed to us more likely that your piece will resemble the anthology of Vanity Fair articles you recently took part in called “Schools for Scandal: The Inside Dramas at 16 of America’s Most Elite Campuses – Plus Oxford!” [Exclamation yours]. It’s also hard to imagine we’ll receive objectivity from your editor, Claire Howorth, who spent recent weeks on social media denigrating our alumnus, Brett Kavanaugh ’83, during his Senate confirmation hearings with pronouncements like “This sh*t is totally unfair and f**ked up.” [Elided for profanity].

Then, on December 3, you said your piece would include a recounting of a legal case involving a former faculty member and a former student that occurred some 15 years ago. When we asked you (again, repeatedly) for explanation on what that had to do with the stated premise of your piece, you disregarded us and insisted we had only until the end of that week to respond. Many aspects of what you presented us on that matter, however, were demonstrably false (a list of which I have attached).

Contrary to the implication in your questions and the material you pointed to, our school handled that matter with the utmost diligence and seriousness. From the moment it was brought to our attention, Georgetown Prep took swift steps to engage with that student and his family and immediately reported the incident to law enforcement and the Maryland Province of the Society of Jesus. We cooperated fully with those investigations while also informing our school community and facilitating any further information that could be found. I have attached those key pieces of communications also.

In that same spirit of candor our president, Rev. James R. Van Dyke, S.J., sent a separate letter to the full school community in early September to convey our school's view on the issue of sexual abuse by clergy and to reiterate our focused attention and care on that issue.

You wrote us that you want your article to be distinct from what you called the "media circus" that has been visited on our school in recent weeks. But the actual premise of your piece, just like the rest of the fevered media theatrics, is the warped assumption that institutions like Georgetown Prep indulge the human sin you highlight and even create a so-called culture that enables it. But in reality our society itself has become a world where all those malign influences assault each of us with troubling regularity. After all, Vanity Fair magazine has long made a neat profit by showcasing and often glamorizing those same dark impulses found in drugs, lurid sexuality, and the headlong pursuit of pleasure for its own sake. Among countless examples, an article just this month faulted a new film about a rock star because it didn't include enough sex and drug use.

Schools like Georgetown Prep exist for the explicit purpose of giving young people the tools and moral education to confront sin in the world by building personal character in a life of service to others. We do that through rigorous education in Christian ethics both personal and social so that they can understand the demands of putting faith into action. Those values are reflected in the lives of our alumni who serve society in elected office, the diplomatic corps, the military, the judiciary, and countless charitable groups such as Somos Amigos Medical Missions, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, the Special Olympics, and Save the Children.

In our 230th year of forming men for and with others, Georgetown Prep remains committed to guiding and safeguarding young men in a world where they will face distorted values and moral compromise but where they have the obligation and opportunity to work for good across a whole sphere of human endeavor. This is our abiding mission, Georgetown Prep's very reason for being, and the essential fabric of our whole school community.

Best,
Patrick

P.S. As a postscript to one particular question, you asked about students mistreating one another during football training camp. All of our athletic programs, both then and now, include specific and strict terms of personal conduct which forbid drinking, violence, or bullying of any kind. In every instance when the school has become aware of any transgression of those rules, we have taken disciplinary action which sometimes included expulsion.

On Fri, Dec 7, 2018 at 1:42 PM Evgenia Peretz <evgenia.peretz@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Patrick,

A have a few questions regarding your email from yesterday.

You contend that "from the moment it was brought to our attention, Prep took swift steps...and immediately reported the incident to law enforcement and the Maryland Province of the Society of Jesus." Multiple sources, including a priest from Prep, told me that the school did not initially contact the police; that it was the Ruyaks themselves who contacted the police first. Furthermore, in your attachment (the letter from Timothy Brown), it states that the date Prep made contact with MC police was May 2004. Eric brought his allegation to school's attention in the fall of 2003. Is it fair to say that the school was in contact with the police 6-7 months after he brought the allegation to the school?

-Regarding Ochs and Collins, Bob Ruyak specifically recalls a meeting in which they told him that Eric was lying and that they wanted Eric to recant. Do they have any comment on this?

-The family maintains that Ochs and Collins pushed for his expulsion. Obviously, as faculty members, this wouldn't be in their power, and indeed he was not expelled. Do they have any comment?

There are two other items that I asked you about that you did not address. Please let me know if you dispute them, and if so, the reason for it:

That Eric was accused of creating a live-journal that included posts about wanting to physically harm the academic dean. A lawyer for the Ruyacs determined that it originated on a faculty computer, which Eric wouldn't have had access to. The family believes the accusation originated with Ochs and Collins. Any comment?

-When Father Orr was sent to St. Louis in the fall of 2003, was this the school's decision? Sources told me that he was being evaluated for a sexual problem.

Thank you.

Evgenia

On Mon, Dec 10, 2018 at 9:25 PM Patrick Coyle <pcoyle@gprep.org> wrote:

Evgenia,

As we explained when you initially broached this additional set of assertions, we are obliged to look back in our archives to confirm both the both the sequence and detail on the circumstances. That involves both legal records and the school's own administrative records over an extended period that occurred some 15 years ago.

I should be able to get you a reply tomorrow.

Best,
Patrick

On Tue, Dec 11, 2018 at 8:32 AM Patrick Coyle <pcoyle@gprep.org> wrote:

Evgenia:

Below are our further points for the record.

On the supposed determination about the IP address, I'll have to insist that you provide some hard basis for that very serious allegation. I'm advised by our IT expert that what you are representing would be almost impossible as a technical, practical matter.

On the several further points you raise:

§ The School has no authority to assign members of the Society of Jesus (Jesuits) and those decisions are made entirely by the Provincial of the Maryland Province of the Society of Jesus. The School was aware of no allegations about Orr at the time he departed in the summer of 2003.

§ From the moment the allegations were made in October, 2004, the School immediately commenced an investigation to determine and gather the facts. The inquiry was done in close consultation with Eric Ruyak's parents who insisted we refrain from involving law enforcement authorities until a thorough review had been done. That necessarily included interactions with faculty and students. At that point, the School directed our attorneys to contact law enforcement which took place on May 15, 2004. The notion that the Ruyak family contacted police prior to that is mistaken because, obviously, those authorities would have in turn reached out to the School, which did not occur. Although the subsequent police investigation did not result in any formal charges or proceedings at that time, the Maryland Province Society of Jesus also reviewed the matter, found the allegations "substantially true" and took punitive measures against Orr.

§ The allegations that any faculty pushed for punitive action toward Mr. Ruyak are completely baseless, entirely outside their authority in school administration, and at odds with the steps that the School actually took. The idea that lay faculty had some nefarious influence with Provincial authorities is demonstrably untrue. Let me emphasize again that Mr. Ruyak's father was the vice-chariman of our Board of Trustees at the time, was chairman for several years thereafter, praised the School in media accounts following Orr's sentencing, and enrolled his younger son following this sequence of events.

§ The claim that faculty computers were somehow used to impersonate Mr. Ruyak and falsely implicate him in threats against administrators is outlandish and also without any actual basis. As a practical matter, ascertaining the IP addresses from which entries were made on an externally hosted interface like LiveJournal would require input from both the School's IT administrator and the external company which so far as we can tell never took place.

Best,
Patrick

—

On Tue, Dec 11, 2018 at 4:24 PM Evgenia Peretz <evgenia.peretz@gmail.com> wrote:

Patrick,

In your latest response, you state that "the School was aware of no allegations about Orr at the time he departed in the summer of 2003." Court documents, however, show that prior to Eric coming forward with his allegation, Ochs and Collins told school officials that they had concerns about Orr having "boundary issues" with students, which is why he was sent to St. Louis. (1) On what date did Ochs and Collins tell the school of their concerns? (2) Did the school know that Orr had been sent to St. Louis?

In his letter to the Prep community on Dec. 17, 2003, Father Orr asserts the following: "I have been falsely accused. I want you to know that I had the school do an official investigation in May. I was completely cleared. I have a legal document attesting to this." These statements appear to contradict your earlier response, "The School was aware of no allegations about Orr at the time he departed in the summer of 2003." If this is the case, then what "investigation" is Orr referring to?

As for Orr's specific assertions in the letter, did the school tell Father Orr that he had been "cleared" by its investigation? Did the school provide any document to Orr regarding the results of its investigation? If the

school did not "clear" Orr, did it take any action to correct his mis-representation to the Prep community? If so, what action was taken?

During Father Orr's sentencing phase, prosecutors reported that the Georgetown Prep headmaster, Peter Relic, had "dismissed the allegations as untrue" after he was informed of them by Father Eck. What form did this dismissal take? And when did it take place?

After Father Orr had his priestly faculties revoked by the Jesuit Provincial in May 2004, did Georgetown Prep inform the Prep community of the Society's actions? If so, when?

You provided no response to my earlier question about whether, after Orr pled guilty, the Prep community was discouraged from speaking with the Ruyaks. The Ruyaks say that when they visited campus after the trial, hoping to speak with the new president, they were told by the headmaster that an attorney had advised the school not to allow faculty or students to talk to them. What was the reason for the attorney's recommendation?

Did Collins or Ochs ever offer the Ruyaks any condolence or apology after Orr pled guilty?

Thank you for your attention this. If you could respond by tomorrow, that would be great.

Best,
Evgenia

On Wed, Dec 12, 2018 at 1:04 PM Evgenia Peretz <evgenia.peretz@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Patrick,

This is our last question.

A Georgetown Prep board member recalls Stephen Ochs telling him, in reference to the accusation of sexual abuse against Father Orr and the subsequent investigation, that it was a "terrible injustice" to Orr. Does he wish to comment?

Thanks,
Evgenia

On Wed, Dec 12, 2018 at 4:44 PM Patrick Coyle <pcoyl@gprep.org> wrote:

Evgenia,

When did this occur, what was the setting, and is there any substantiation for that claim? Separately, because you are withholding the other items you cited in your email of yesterday, some research is required to cross-check the context and accuracy in our files which will necessarily take some time. But, since you are relying on these documents and insist on our urgent response, would you please email to us:

1. The letter from Garrett Orr from December 17, 2003;
2. The full and entire statement from prosecutors you reference;
3. The court documents mentioning Ochs' and Collins' "concerns."

Best,
Patrick

On Wed, Dec 12, 2018 at 5:48 PM Brendan Barr <brendan_barr@condenast.com> wrote:

17750C-11102011-N013211

MS. FENTON: We learned, Your Honor, through records, and, also from an independent witness, a friend of the defendant's that the defendant remember went to St. Louis for

30

	treatment.
	THE COURT: He what?
	MS. FENTON: He went to St. Louis for treatment to a sex offender sort of clinic.
	THE COURT: Are you talking about after the
1 2 3 4 5	plea?
6 7 8 9	MR. MARTELLA: No, before.
	MS. FENTON: No.
10	THE COURT: Oh, okay.
11	MS. FENTON: This is in 2003.
12	THE COURT: Yes.
13	MS. FENTON: In June of 2003, after the
14	abuse of Mr.
15	Ruyak, but before the disclosure, Mr. Oaks, and a Ms.
16	Collins,
17	two other faculty members at the school, went to the
18	school and
19	said they had concerns about his relationships, and
20	lack of
21	boundaries with students.
22	THE COURT: Yes.
23	MS. FENTON: It was because of that that he
24	went to
25	St. Louis. So, at that point, and throughout the records that we have all seen now, he denies any contact. There's the talk of inappropriate boundaries, and inappropriate relationships, but, throughout that treatment, there's never any discussion of any contact like he has now admitted to in court.

MR. MARTELLA: That's right. We agree with that.

MS. FENTON: Okay. So, I just wanted to make sure. He finished that treatment program about simultaneously at the

31

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

time, because he was coming back to the school that Eric made the disclosure.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. FENTON: So --

MR. MARTELLA: But he did the treatment after the alleged acts.

MS. FENTON: After the acts, but there was no --

MS. SMITH: But he never admitted them.

MS. FENTON: -- admitted.

Throughout the treatment records it's always this inappropriate love of students, and getting too emotionally close, but not a physical one; it's always a denial of the physical.

MR. MARTELLA: I agree with that. That's why I said that he has to do this additional therapy, and --

MS. FENTON: I just wanted to make sure that it wasn't something that we were thinking that that --

MR. MARTELLA: Right. Right. Inappropriate age.

MS. FENTON: -- was enough. Appropriate treatment program that he did back in '03.

Condé Nast - Content Integrity Group

On Wed, Dec 12, 2018 at 5:48 PM Brendan Barr <brendan_barr@condenast.com> wrote:

117750C-11102011-N013211

Because Mr. Ruyak felt such strong feelings for the defendant, and thought, you I know, Im not going to tell anyone about this, two years passed from the fall of 2001, and the fall semester of 2003, the defendant was not at Prep. The

12

	defendant was away off campus, and Mr. Ruyak was at the start				
	of his senior year, and everything was going great, he was				
	getting great grades, had been applying to colleges. However,				
	this rumoring and issues attached to the defendant, even though				
1	2	3	4	5	he wasn't on campus, but, through his supporters,
6	7	8	9		continued it
					haunt Mr. Ruyak a senior at the time.
10					It was in that fall, October, specifically,
11					of 2003,
12					that word came back to the school that the defendant
13					was going
14					to be returning to teach at Georgetown Prep in the
15					spring
16					semester and from there on. It was at that point in
17					time, that
18					Mr. Ruyak felt the need to come forward. He disclosed
19					to his
20					counselor, a father of Eck (phonetic sp.) at Georgetown
21					Prep,
22					and the matter was passed up the chain of command,
23					another word
24					we've heard a lot in the last few days, to the
25					headmaster who
					dismissed the allegations as untrue.
					And the matter was not reported to the
					Montgomery
					County Police Department for seven months until I
					believe it
					was late May of 2004, when Eric was in the throes of
					graduation, and attempting to just survive high school,
					and get

out of there, because that entire spring, after the disclosure was made, his time at Prep became even worse. And I know you could see from his victim impact statement, and when you hear him, he still feels the pain from that. It was at that time, I believe, that when the matter was reported to the authorities they did not take any action at

13

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

that time. Instead, the matter got moved to the provincial review board with the Jesuits. Their investigation ensued, and it led to the eventual -- the defendant eventually being laicized, I believe, finally, in 2008.

Brendan Barr
Vanity Fair
Condé Nast - Content Integrity Group

On Wed, Dec 12, 2018 at 5:48 PM Brendan Barr <brendan_barr@condenast.com> wrote:

=====

TEXT OF LETTER FROM FR. GARY ORR

December 17

Dear Friends,

Greetings from cold but lovely St Louis University where I have been on sabbatical. We have had one snow and I am praying that it stay away so that I can get to my mother's for Christmas next week. I wish you all a Blessed and Merry Christmas. You will be in my prayers at the noon mass on Christmas Day.

I am sure that many of you have heard this news but I wanted to communicate with you more personally. I will not be returning to Prep in January. It has been a very difficult time these past number of months but also good months. I am sharing news with you so that you understand.

My health has had it's ups and downs. My back is now in fine shape. I had a bad fall in August which really set me back. I have worked hard at therapy and I am well healed. I will not need back surgery now. My blood pressure is now fine. Over the last year I have noticed a decrease in my energy and some other symptoms. After many tests, I have been diagnosed with the early stages of Parkinson's disease. I have hand tremors and a bit of a balance problem at times. My friends here tease me that they can only tell if I am holding a wine glass. God forbid I should spill a fine Pinot Noir or single malt scotch!!!! I tried a medication that my body did not like. I will try a new one soon. There are many advances in the field and the cure is only a few years away. I am fine with this both mentally and physically.

I will be very candid and honest with you here, the most difficult part of the last few months are the effects of the rumors spread about my character. My reputation has been badly damaged. In the light of what has been happening in the church, this is very damaging to a priest. While I do have my faults, and you know them from working with me, I have been falsely accused. I want you to know that I had the school do an official investigation in May. I was completely cleared. I have a legal document attesting to this. Because I was not at Prep in the fall, the rumors continued. Others have been hurt by this. My family has suffered greatly. Again a FULL investigation was done in the fall and I was found absolutely innocent. Again, I have a legal document. I want you to know that the school has thoroughly investigated this and I am innocent of all the gossip ruining my reputation.

The fact remains that this has severely damaged my good name. Once this happens, it is hard to regain it. The school is unable to insure that I can safely return to Prep. The school is unable to stop the rumors. It is too dangerous for me. I can say no further on this matter due to advise from legal counsel.

Naturally I am very sad over this. I spent 3 years as Prep as a young jesuit. I have been at Prep 14 years. I am hurt and angry by what has happened to my reputation. You have worked with me and know me. There has been much gossip. I believe that I owe you a full explanation of the truth.

The Jesuit Provincial wrote a letter stating that the rumors and false and that I am and have been a priest in good standing in the Church. He **COULD NOT** say that unless it were true.

I will be moving to Loyola College in January and working with Fr. Ruff, who is my closest friend. I will be around Prep at times ... hope to see and sit and chat.

You are free to share what I say here with others. Please feel free to talk to the students if it come up and if you wish to address this issue.

They are confused. I have had a numbers of calls and emails from parents and students with misinformation and hearsay. You are free to email me if you like. I know you were asked not to contact me earlier. That is no longer true. I am sorry this letter is so long, but I wanted you to know the facts. We have all lived too much in hearsay and rumor.

God bless you. I will never forget your kindness and companionship.

With much affection,

Fr. Gary Orr S.J.

Brendan Barr
Vanity Fair
Condé Nast - Content Integrity Group

On Thu, Dec 13, 2018 at 11:13 AM Evgenia Peretz <evgenia.peretz@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Patrick,

Regarding your first question, I can't tell you any more information except that it occurred after Eric made his allegation. I assume you received all the documents you asked for yesterday. If you have any responses, please let me know. We're extending the deadline to 2pm today.

Thank you,

Evgenia

On Thu, Dec 13, 2018 at 11:57 AM Brendan Barr <brendan_barr@condenast.com> wrote:

hello, Patrick, how are you?

I am in the research department at *Vanity Fair* magazine. I have been fact-checking Evgenia Peretz's story.

I am trying to find out more information about parents of prep school students more closely monitoring their children and alcohol.

We have heard that some prep schools have required (or were asking) parents to sign waivers promising a degree of supervision at student parties.

Is Georgetown Prep among schools that do that?

Has Georgetown Prep been involved with the group Community of Concern?

I believe they were founded in the 1990s.

Any clarification or more information you can provide is appreciated.

Many thanks,

Brendan

Brendan Barr
Vanity Fair

Condé Nast - Content Integrity Group

On Thu, Dec 13, 2018 at 12:51 PM Patrick Coyle <pcoyl@gprep.org> wrote:

Brendan:

I am glad to look into this for you but that is necessarily going to take a little time. We have repeatedly asked the magazine to present us with a full and complete set of assertions or characterizations being made about the School, so that we will have a fair opportunity to research and respond. But instead, we continue to receive piecemeal strands of disparate requests along with the insistence that your deadline is imminent. Your colleague Ms. Peretz demands in a note just this morning that we respond no later than 2:00 p.m. today. That is an inappropriate and bad faith way to conduct this dialogue and I would like your assurance that we will have ample time for response to what you are asking.

Best,
Patrick

On Thu, Dec 13, 2018 at 2:01 PM Patrick Coyle <pcoyl@gprep.org> wrote:

Evgenia:

We have shown how many of the ever-shifting claims you have made to us over the last month have proven false and yet you haven't acknowledged that. We have also asked repeatedly for you to present a full set of the assertions about us and yet you have ignored your earlier promise to do just that — while shifting to new topics when the previous ones are refuted. This unprofessional method has now extended to nearly two dozen emails over more than a month.

But where is the documentation on your point about a supposed investigation of our IP addresses? What hard basis is there for the assertion that some school official impersonated Eric Ruyak or that faculty orchestrated a nefarious campaign of disparagement? How do you back up the notion that faculty had some kind of influence with the administration or the Province and tried to steer their actions? How do you justify the manifestly false allegation that the school never contacted authorities?

Below are our further points for the record. On the several points you raise:

§ In the court documented labeled “Court Proceeding One,” there is an assertion that Dr. Ochs and Ms. Collins mentioned “boundary issues” as it relates to Garrett Orr. That is quoted from the prosecutor, Ms. Fenton.

The School has no record of Dr. Ochs or Ms. Collins making any claims or communicating any concerns about Orr to school administration.

§ In the summer of 2003, Orr left Georgetown Prep to go on sabbatical and departed the School for St. Louis. The School was informed in December, 2003 by the Maryland Province that Orr would not return to Prep. Again, the School does not have the authority to reassign Jesuits- that is a function of the Maryland Province of the Society of Jesus.

§ The email you present from Orr, dated December 17, 2003 was not sent with the school's knowledge or approval as you suggest. Instead it was apparently sent to people whom Orr calls "friends" and alludes to two (2) investigations "completed" by the School that "cleared his name." But the School has no record of any investigation involving Orr before Eric Ruyak's allegation against Orr on October 8, 2003. In fact, there was no investigation prior to him leaving Georgetown Prep in the summer of 2003 and certainly he had no authority to call for a School investigation into what he called "rumors." And this "letter" was not a school-sponsored email. It was not written as an official school letter. Orr was not a member of the Prep community at that point and he would have no authority to do so, nor did he have any ability to direct the administration as the letter falsely suggests.

It is crucial to note that during his time at Georgetown Prep, Orr concealed his wrongdoing and misled the School, as both law enforcement authorities and the Provincial affirmed in their respective investigations.

§ You assert that Dr. Relic "dismissed the allegations as untrue." But in fact, throughout the investigatory process beginning in October, 2003, Dr. Relic, the interim Headmaster, and Fr. George, the president at the time, worked closely with the Ruyak family, with great sensitivity towards Eric. The School has contemporaneous notes of that inquiry, and heeded the Ruyak's own wishes that a full fact-gathering take place, and later shared all those facts with law enforcement. All those actions are entirely at odds with the baseless idea that Dr. Relic somehow "dismissed the allegations as untrue." The Province also was still conducting their investigation that began on October 8, 2003 and, as I indicated in an earlier response, found the allegation "substantially true" when the Province concluded their report in April 2006.

If the interim timeframe seems lengthy in retrospect, that diligence took place in an abundance of pastoral concern for Eric and respect for the Ruyak family's wishes, the Montgomery County Police were not called immediately. As news outlets reported at the time, the Ruyak family was reluctant to involve law enforcement during that period.

Nothing in the School's records indicates that Dr. Relic formally informed Orr that "he had been cleared."

§ Orr's priestly faculties were suspended by the Provincial in May, 2004. Because there was an ongoing criminal investigation being conducted by the Montgomery County Police and an independent investigation being done by the Maryland Province of the Society of Jesus, the School had an obligation to refrain from any public comment on Orr or the investigations.

I have already sent you a copy of the letter from April, 2006 in which the School conveyed the findings of the Provincial of the Maryland Province of the Society of Jesus' investigation. I assume you have read that?

§ So far as we can tell, there was no formal statement to inhibit the Ruyaks from contacting the School, and indeed that's at odds with the close engagement the School maintained with them throughout the overall course of events. That of course included during Mr. Ruyak's tenure on the Board of Trustees and during the years when their younger son was a student. In fact, Bob and Eric Ruyak attended as welcomed guests at the memorial Mass on campus for Jeff Jones (who was Dean of Students during Eric's time at school and later Headmaster) in September, 2016, five (5) years after Orr pled guilty.

Best,
Patrick

—

On Thu, Dec 13, 2018 at 7:16 PM Patrick Coyle <pcoyle@gprep.org> wrote:

Brendan:

Yes; Georgetown Prep is involved with Community of Concern. In fact, the Community of Concern was founded at Georgetown Prep in the 1990s by the Georgetown Prep parent.

Each year, we have mandatory events for our students and at least one parent. We have a Community of Concern event for our freshmen and sophomores. At the meeting, health and legal consultants warn our students about the dangers of alcohol and drug use. A health representative from an area hospital presents the medical dangers and risks of alcohol and drug use.

In addition, we host a mandatory event for our junior and seniors who plan on attending our annual prom and their parents. At that meeting, we invite a legal consultant in to discuss the consequences of underage drinking.

Also, before our Prom, a letter is sent to all parents from the Dean of Students asking them to not host an “after party” or endorse an “after party” and encourages all students to attend the School held Post Prom party on campus that is supervised.

In a letter to the School community on September 21, our president, Rev. James R. Van Dyke, S.J., wrote, “And contrary to the caricature as well, the wider school community is not uncaring; I ponder with gratitude the many calls I have received offering help for our needier students and their families, the willingness of our alumni to finance scholarships for applicants from the poorest families in our area, the parents who offer to put in a little extra or to give a little more time so that the families who can't afford something or can't give rides can be included. And I look to the community of parents who long ago formed and continue to pilot to the Community of Concern to help our new parents deal with and educate their sons about the false allure of alcohol, drugs, tobacco, and other destructive habits.”

Best,
Patrick