Association for the Protection of Vaishnava Children, Inc.

P.O. BOX 1438 ALACHUA, FLORIDA 32616-1438

904-418-0882 • FAX: 904-418-0982

EMAIL: Dgovinda@aol.com

CONFIDENTIAL: ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGE AND WORK PRODUCT

Official Decision on the case of Guru Gauranga dasa

This judgment, decided on February 14, 2001, was rendered in accordance with the guidelines for adjudicating cases of alleged child abuse established by the ISKCON Child Protection Task Force Report and ratified by the ISKCON Governing Body Commission. This judgment is the official decision of the Association for the Protection of Vaisnava Children (APVC) on the child abuse case of Guru Gauranga dasa (Mr. Graeme Duncan).

This decision defines the parameters of the relationship of Guru Gauranga dasa with ISKCON. The APVC advises child abuse victims, their parents, and all members of the ISKCON organization to report allegations of child abuse to governmental social service and law enforcement authorities. Also, the APVC advises all members of ISKCON to learn and follow their local laws regarding child abuse and mandated reporting of child abuse.

According to the ISKCON Child Protection Task Force Report, the criteria for determining validity of claims of child abuse is "preponderance of evidence", in contradistinction to the criteria of "beyond a reasonable doubt".

Guru Gauranga dasa is a white-bodied person, born on July 28, 1966, in South Africa, who received initiation from Bhakti Caru Maharaja and who has served in the Mauritius yatra, in Mayapur, and in San Diego.

Below are sections of the ISKCON Child Protection Task Force Report concerning definitions of child abuse that are relevant to this case.

"I. Child Maltreatment

A. Definition- A broad range of mistreatment of children including neglect, physical, abuse, sexual abuse, and psychological abuse.

1. Child- a child is defined as 0-18 years of age OR whatever the legal definition for a child is in the particular country where the alleged maltreatment occurred.

B. Types of Child Maltreatment

...B.3. Sexual Abuse- An act of commission (perpetration) where a child is coerced, induced, persuaded, enticed, seduced, or entrapped into sexual acts with another person. The coercion can be either physical or verbal. The other person could be either an adult, an adolescent (12-18 years of age), or even another child (less than 12 years of age). The abuser uses his/her position of authority or power (size, age, social position, cognitive differential) to exert control over the victim.

a) Forms of sexual abuse include:

(1) voyeurism ("Peeping Tom") (2) exhibitionism (flashing) (3) taking pornographic pictures of the child (4) having the child watch while the perpetrator masturbates (5) forced masturbation (6) kissing (7) fondling (8) digital/object penetration of vagina and/or anus (9) oral sex (10) sodomy (11) intercourse"

In July, 1998, the APVC received an email from a young woman (claimant #1) who made first-hand allegations that Guru Gauranga dasa sexually abused her when she was a teenager by touching her breasts and rubbing his genitals against her. She also described an incident wherein Mr. Duncan, on the pretext of checking whether she was a virgin, allegedly touched her genitalia, and an incident where he allegedly forced her to perform oral sex. Claimant #1 also described that Guru Gauranga on several occasions made her rub his genitals. These alleged incidents occurred between 1993 and 1995, and, according to claimant #1, Guru Gauranga continued to make approaches towards her for a sexual relationship till 1997.

Guru Gauranga dasa responded to these allegations and denied them. Mr. Avinoam Sapir, an expert in forensic written content analysis evaluated the statements of claimant #1 and Guru Gauranga. Regarding the statement of claimant #1, Mr. Sapir cited several examples in her statement of "unnecessary links", and explained "An 'unnecessary link' is only 'unnecessary' for the reader/listener. However, it is very important for the subject who included it in the statement. An 'unnecessary link' indicates that this bit of information came from memory, indicating truthfulness. This link should be considered as a very, very important one." Mr. Sapir also cited some instances in the language of claimant #1 that indicated less than complete straightforwardness. Analyzing Guru Gauranga's statement, Mr. Sapir pointed out some usages of language that may indicate that sexual contact between he and claimant #1 could have occurred.

In August, 1998, the APVC received a written statement from claimant #2, who alleged that Guru Gauranga dasa sexually abused her, starting when she was 12 years old in 1991, till 1996. This alleged abuse included several incidents of intercourse. She wrote "The first time he [Guru Gauranga dasa] tried was when I got him a guava. He asked me to sit down and when I started to sit on the sofa, he told me to sit on the bed where he was lying...He made me feel his heart beating, then started caressing me, at the same time pulling me on to the bed. He pin me with his body and started kissing me and putting his hand under my dress...The next day he asked me if I had informed anyone about what had happened and when I answered that I had not, which I was too ashamed to do, he made me promise not to tell anyone...His second attempt was in October, the same year...Graeme pulled a sofa near mine. He watched the movie, Hindi movie, for a few minutes then started kissing me. He then started pulling my dress up but then he picked me up and took me in his room. He put me on the bed...and tried to introduce it into me but I succeeded to escape...He started making me feel that he loves me and that he cared...Then one day that same year he succeeded. He broke my virginity and immediately afterward went out, taking the blanket on which we had been, to be thrown away. He told me that I should stop my bleeding by taking a shower...He continued to have a sexual relationship with me afterward, until he went to India...He would penetrate me, always giving me pain...I

told him that these things hurt me he would say that it does not matter and that it will stop one day...When I asked him what will happen to me, he said that I could become his second wife and that not to worry..He made me promise not to say anything, which he knew I would not do such thing for I blamed myself for everything that had happened." Claimant 2 goes on to describe alleged incidents wherein Guru Gauranga performed oral sex on her and made her perform oral sex on him, as well as incidents of anal penetration.

Guru Gauranga dasa denied the allegations of sexual misconduct made by claimant #2 against him. He wrote "As far as [claimant #2's] false allegations, I have read them and have nothing to write about them except that it is all lies, probably written by [ ], or else she has a very elaborate imagination." He described his relationship with claimant #2 as "Neutral, friendly at times."

Mr. Sapir, commenting on the testimony of claimant #2, wrote "The statement you have sent me includes enough 'unnecessary links' to conclude that the statement is based upon memory and thus truthful."

Claimant #3 also made accusations of sexual abuse allegedly committed against her by Guru Gauranga dasa. Guru Gauranga denied these allegations. Concerning claimants #1 and #3, Guru Gauranga claimed that the young women made advances towards him. He described that he persistently refused their advances and did not engage in sexual activity with them.

The APVC requested Guru Gauranga dasa to undergo a psychological evaluation and a polygraph examination. After doing some research of professionals in the San Diego area, where Guru Gauranga resided at the time, the APVC located a few mental health professionals to potentially conduct the psychological evaluation. Guru Gauranga contacted one of them and began the process to arrange an evaluation. However, after some disagreement with the mental health professional concerning policies regarding giving Guru Gauranga a copy of the evaluation report, Guru Gauranga decided not to be evaluated by that therapist. He then contacted another therapist, who was approved by the APVC to conduct the evaluation.

In December, 1998, before being psychologically evaluated, Guru Gauranga dasa underwent a polygraph examination conducted by Barbara J. Wallace, who was pre-approved by the APVC. In a report dated Dec. 30, 1998, she wrote:

"Three Charts were conducted during this examination with the final results derived from the following Three Chart Exploratory Polygraph Examination Scoring Index:

Truthful (+18 to +4)

Inconclusive (+3 to -6)

Deceptive (-7 to -18)

The following relevant questions were asked during the examinations:

Question #33: Re: [claimant #1], did you touch her with any part of your body for sexual purposes?

Question #35: Re: [claimant #2], did you touch her with any part of your body for sexual purposes?

The examinee responded 'NO' to all questions.

Test Results: After a careful analysis of the subject's polygrams, it is my considered opinion that his final scores on the relevant questions were as follows: Question #33: +1

Question #35: +4

Conclusion: Mr. Duncan arrived promptly for his appointment today. He appeared to be open and candid and was cooperative throughout the entire procedure. He denied touching either of the females for sexual purposes. He said that [claimant #1] had exposed herself to him on one occasion but he did not respond to her actions.

His final score on Question #35 falls within the Truthful Scoring Range... Based on that it is my opinion that he was truthful with regard to this issue.

His final score on Question #33 falls into the Inconclusive Scoring Range...I feel it is important to note that he is only three points from the Truthful Range while it would require eight points in the opposite scoring direction for him to be considered deceptive. I am precluded form making a conclusive statement as to his veracity with regard to [claimant #1], however, from experience I would not feel an individual with this score would be suspect."

Avinoam Sapir, a polygraph examiner and the expert in written content analysis referred to above, suggested that the APVC inquire from the polygraph examiner "What were the control questions for each of the relevant questions?" and "What were the reactions to the control questions?" Ms. Wallace responded:

"Control Questions used on test for Mr. Duncan

46: Between the ages of 15 and 25 do you remember doing something sexual with an adult that could be considered unnatural?

#47: During the first 25 years of your life do you remember doing something sexual with an adult that you would be embarrassed to tell your parents?

#48: During the first 25 years of your life do you remember lying to someone in authority to get out of serious trouble?

The control questions are not given numerical scores as we compare the reactions on the control questions with the reaction on the relevant question between them and assign a numerical rating to the relevant question...The basis for the scoring is that the individual will exhibit physiological reactions to the question that poses the greatest threat to his well being. In this case he had less reaction to the relevant questions and that is how we determine if a person is truthful within our scoring parameters."

Mr. Sapir responded "'...as we compare the reactions on the control questions with the reaction on the relevant question between them...' This means that the polygraph examiner will choose control questions that would have the same emotional intensity as the relevant questions. The assumption is: since the subject is being questioned

about this recent incident then if the subject will react MORE to the control questions that he should be declared truthful. However, if he would react MORE to the relevant questions then he should be declared deceptive...Let's ask a simple question: What would happen if the control questions would be more threatening to the subject than the relevant questions? This is especially true when we deal with sex crimes. For example, a person is suspected of sexual harassment. The control questions will deal with the subject's deviant behavior in the past. What if the subject would like to conceal in his past that the subject already raped several women and molested several others? For the subject, these past cases would change the picture his supervisors have of him. Then the subject will react more to the control than the relevant and the subject would be declared truthful...As a matter of fact, John Reid, the one who developed the modern polygraph technique stated that when a subject reacts to both the relevant and control that we should say that the subject lied in both of the sets of questions... The polygraph examiner chose the following control questions...It is quite clear that question #48 is a very weak control question that should not be used in a sex related case. Such a question would definitely bring the subject to come 'truthful' on the compared relevant question. Even the first two questions are relatively problematic. They deal with the subject...doing something sexual with an adult. The questions don't specify that the other person is younger or older than the subject. Our case deals with the subject using his authority over people younger than him and basically subjected to his authority. Therefore, the questions should have been:

#46: Between the ages of 15 and 25 do you remember doing something sexual with somebody else younger than you and under your supervision which can be considered unnatural?

#47: During the first 25 years of your life do you remember doing something sexual with somebody else younger than you and under your supervision?

These questions would deal with the issue in question and not if the subject was a victim. Let's continue to quote from the polygraph examiner's response: '...In this case he had less reaction to the relevant questions...' The main question is: How much less? This is the main point. When you deal with relativity to 'assign a numerical rating to the relevant question' doesn't tell the consumer much. For example, if the subject had a very strong reaction to the relevant and then a less strong reaction to the control- are we going to say that the subject is truthful? Or, maybe we should say that the choice of control questions generated this ultimate result. But the main problem that we have is that the alleged victim in this case also alleges that she talked with her friends and they told her that the subject also molested them. This allegation would make the polygraph examination a lot more difficult. What would be the control questions in such a case?...Moreover, the fact that the control questions are dealing with an 'adult' and not with a 'minor' would raise the suspicion that the subject might have given the polygraph examiner some admissions BEFORE the polygraph test. Usually, these admissions would remain confidential between the polygraph examiner and the subject and they will not be given to the consumer = the one who ordered the test...I would suggest that you would show this letter to your polygraph examiner and ask that the examiner to answer the concerns in this letter."

The APVC shared Mr. Sapir's letter with Ms. Wallace, who responded [underlined words are directly from Ms. Wallace's letter.] "Your unnamed expert has raised questions regarding control questions that have been used very successfully on the hundreds of tests I have conducted. I would suggest contacting Cleve Backster about these types of questions as these are taught in his school. 619-233-6669. I performed this test for my client and he gave permission for me to discuss the results with you. I don't feel it is necessary for me to defend something I have done- I followed all polygraph procedures and it is always easy to find an expert who will disagree or argue with anything on earth or heaven. I stand by my findings and if you have questions about the questions or scoring, Mr. Backster is the expert I learned from."

The APVC wrote to Mr. Cleve Backster, sending him the documents relevant to this discussion and asking for his comments. The APVC sent these documents by FAX and registered mail, and also left phone messages with his receptionist and on his answering machine. Mr. Backster has not responded to the APVC. Guru Gauranga dasa was informed by the APVC, in an email dated November 5, 2001, as well as in person when representatives of the APVC interviewed him in North Carolina, about the correspondence concerning the polygraph examination, and about Mr. Backster's lack of response.

Dr. Dan Whitehead, who holds a Ph.D. in psychology and is a diplomate of the American Board of Forensic Examiners, conducted an evaluation of Guru Gauranga dasa. He interviewed and tested Guru Gauranga on January 14th and January 18th, 1999. During the course of the evaluation Guru Gauranga completed many standardized tests and inventories, including the NEO Personality Inventory-Management Development Version, the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-III, the Shipley Institute of Living Scale, and the Personality Assessment Inventory.

In his evaluation report Dr. Whitehead wrote "...after completing my psychological testing of Mr. Duncan, I think that the polygraph results are accurate indications that Mr. Duncan is truthfully denying the allegations...Overall, the testing results were quite consistent and basically point toward a non-pathological personality style currently under situational stress. Given the allegations that have been made, this stress could be expected in most individuals...Based on an overall analysis of my interviews and the quite extensive and far-ranging psychological testing I conducted, I find it highly unlikely that Mr. Duncan would be capable of having committed the acts he is alleged to have committed in this case. Based upon this, I would not class him as a danger to the ISKCON Community...These findings are based on the evaluation sessions only. Additional or new forensic material may cause a need to modify these opinions. As in any evaluation of this type, second opinions are always a viable option."

In November, 2000, the APVC requested Guru Gauranga to be interviewed by Dr. Michael Teague, who works as a forensic psychologist for the Police Department of Raleigh, North Carolina, and who has more than twenty years of forensic experience. Dr. Teague is the founder of the North Carolina Association for the Management and Treatment of Sex Offenders, the North Carolina Training School Sex Offender

Programs, and the Cumberland County Sex Offender Program. After some preliminary attempts to arrange a meeting between Guru Gauranga dasa and Dr. Teague, Guru Gauranga wrote to the APVC "...I did however speak to my lawyer and after reviewing the evidence you have so far, it seems that to get another psychological report will be redundant. The psychologist I spoke with in San Diego recommended by your office was very qualified. He is involved with doing character reports and profiles to find out if psychologists who have been accused of sexually abusing their patients are guilty or not. I think that he would know every trick in the book that could be used for deception. I feel very confident that he was able to detect that I was not only truthful but also not the kind of person that could perform such horrible acts as described in the false testimonies of those girls."

During the summer of 1999 Dr. Robert J. Fernando, a clinical psychologist, interviewed claimants #1, #2, and #3. In a report dated July 29th, 1999, he wrote "I spent considerable amount of time analyzing testimony, cross checking interview notes, body language & abreaction, etc. of the alleged victims...My findings are that the victims are telling the truth concerning sexual abuse..." Dr. Fernando describes the methodology of his evaluations as including "Review and analysis of the different documents sent by [director of APVC]; One-to-one clinical interview with the alleged victims on several occasions separately; Cross-tabulation of clinical interview record with written record of allegations; Verbal report from Dr. [redacted] Obstetrician - Gynecologist, following a visit for a clinical interview and examination."

Regarding claimant #1, Dr. Fernando wrote [Underlined and bold words are directly from Dr. Fernando's report.] "In all I had scheduled six clinical interviews to assess validity and reliability of her claim of sexual abuse by the alleged abuser. All her descriptions of sexual abuses were examined along with relevance to time, place and circumstances to provide insight into truthfulness and also to ascertain for any exaggerations in her allegations. I could establish **beyond any reasonable doubt** that [claimant #2's] claims of having been subjected to unsolicited sexual advances and abuse by the alleged perpetrator are **not fabrications**. The manner in which the subject presented her claims and her completely believable demeanor convinced me of her**truthfulness and seriousness of purpose**. In my clinical judgment the following sexual abuse incidents, as far as I could ascertain, **had taken place**.

The incident of alleged virginity check by the perpetrator; Several incidents of the alleged abuser recoursing to rubbing his genitals against her and fondling her breasts; The incident that took place in the sugarcane field in [name of place] where the alleged victim pleaded with the abuser to save her virginity for her marriage and the abuser forcing her, as an alternative, to perform oral sex on him and ejaculating in the victim's mouth, etc; The experience in Singapore where the alleged abuser after failing in his efforts to pressurize her (after her marriage) into sexual activity with him, declared that 'he has a fire in him that only she can quench and that he'll be waiting for her.'

This married young woman is an honest, self-effacing and unassuming person. She demonstrates a natural innocence and childlike simplicity...Her way of speaking and conducting herself show both sincerity and religious/spiritual orientation...Her husband...also briefly met me to talk about his association with the alleged perpetrator. In my opinion this couple do not seek vengeance nor redress..."

Regarding claimant #2, Dr. Fernando wrote "This young lady shows considerable signs of sexual abuse. She was able to describe in many details sexual abuse that took place since 1991 when she was 12 years of age.Throughout the six different sessions, inquiry and cross questioning the veracity of the different statement descriptions, etc., her narration of the experience of sexual abuse have remained **consistent** and **reliable**. Dr. [redacted] in a separate meeting examined the different episodes of sexual abuse without the help of any input on my part nor written material. Later we met and compared our respective notes. Both of us found validity to the allegations of sexual abuse of a child." Dr. Fernando continued his report regarding claimant #2, "...There was no exaggeration in her narrative nor any tendency to fabricate. She acknowledged her fascination for the alleged abuser and explained how in her childlike trustful manner believed in the perpetrator's declaration of love for her and repeated promises to marry her when she attained the age of 18...She repeatedly said that she bears no grudge towards him but does not want to meet him alone. She expressed much anxiety and was very apprehensive about her future: 'I dislike being a girl. I don't like to wear girl's clothes.' 'I feel very dirty now, nobody will marry me.'...

In my clinical judgment sexual abuse of a serious and debilitating nature was perpetrated on this young lady over quite a few years...She does not claim to have resisted sexual advances but claims to have pleaded with him on several occasions not to hurt her...[claimant #2] shows signs of severe distress and trauma now that she had to relive the abusive experiences...The systematic manner in which the alleged abuser had taken advantage of [claimant #2's] trust should be a cause for much concern...**The help the alleged abuser needs most urgently is help in admitting that he needs help**..."

Regarding claimant #3, Dr. Fernando wrote "...I do not believe that she is fabricating incidents of the alleged abuser trying to force sexual activity on her and finally succeeding in obliging her to have sexual intercourse with him..."

In conclusion, Dr. Fernando wrote "All the three alleged victims narrated their experience of sexual abuse in a simple and straightforward manner. Internal consistency to their narration and sincerity in their presentation indicate truthfulness regarding sexual abuse experiences. [Claimant #2] shows severe consequences of sexual abuse. [Claimant #1] seemed to have coped with the results of sexual abuse with the help of her spouse. [Claimant #3's] defense mechanisms had been to rationalize and suppress..."

On August 24, 1999, the director of the APVC spoke with Dr. Fernando on the phone. During this conversation Dr. Fernando reiterated the points made in his written report.

In September, 2000, a representative of the APVC conducted in-person interviews with claimants 1, 2, and 3, and with Dr. Fernando. In November, 2000, three representatives of the APVC, including two of the panel members on this case and a Vaisnava mental health professional, visited North Carolina and conducted in-person interviews with Guru Gauranga dasa.

This panel has deliberated on the many statements, interviews, and reports described above. Additionally, the case file contains many character references, some favorable and some unfavorable, about Guru Gauranga dasa from persons who know him in various capacities. Considering this impressive mass of documentation, this panel finds that the report by Dr. Whitehead, several character references, and many of Guru Gauranga's statements serve as evidence to exonerate him from accusations of child sexual abuse. Evidence that tends to incriminate him in such acts includes direct statements from the three claimants, the report from Dr. Fernando, and the in-person interviews with the claimants, wherein their presentations are consistent with previous statements. This panel has found the polygraph examination to be evidence in support of Guru Gauranga dasa's claims and denials. However, the panel also finds the concerns about the validity of the polygraph examination that were expressed by Mr. Sapir to contain validity, and the failure of Mr. Backster to respond to these concerns substantially weakens the strength of the polygraph evidence. Regarding written content analysis, this evidence tends to support the claims of the alleged victims. Claimant #2's written statement apparently contains no signs of deception.

The panel also considered statements from several persons describing that many years ago Guru Gauranga, when he was in his early 20s, was engaged to be married to a girl who was 14 years old. According to statements in the case file, during this engagement he had sexual relations with her, and Guru Gauranga has acknowledged this. Although this is not being considered a case of child sexual abuse to be processed through the adjudicatory system of the office, due to the fact that neither the young woman nor her parents want to pursue it, mainly because the couple was engaged, this panel does consider Guru Gauranga's relations with this girl to be indicative of a propensity to engage in sexual relations with underage girls.

As described above, the criteria of the APVC for determining validity of claims of child abuse is "preponderance of evidence", in contradistinction to the criteria of "beyond a reasonable doubt". This panel has determined that there is not sufficient evidence to support the allegations that Guru Gauranga dasa committed sexual abuse against claimants #1 and #3 when they were children. Thus, this panel is not convinced that any sexual episodes that may have occurred between Guru Gauranga dasa and claimants #1 and #3 are within the jurisdiction of the APVC. Concerning the accusations made by claimant #2 against Guru Gauranga dasa, this panel has determined, based on the criteria of a preponderance of evidence, that the majority of evidence does support the allegations made by claimant #2 that Guru Gauranga dasa sexually abused her when she was a child. Though Guru Gauranga dasa and Dr. Whitehead each suggest motivations and causes for claimant #2 to fabricate allegations against Guru Gauranga dasa, this panel finds their reasoning and arguments to be weak, and this panel accepts the testimony of claimant #2, stating

that Guru Gauranga dasa sexually abused her several times over a period of a few years when she was an adolescent. This panel finds the written and verbal statements of claimant #2 to be the most compelling evidence in the file.

Based on the conclusions described above, this panel has decided as follows.

1) Guru Gauranga dasa must write an apology letter to claimant #2. In this letter he must fully acknowledge his transgressions against her, take complete responsibility for them, and sincerely offer to rectify himself and make amends in whatever way he can. This letter should be sent to the APVC, not directly to claimant #2.

2) Guru Gauranga dasa must pay restitution in the amount of at least $9,000 during the next three years, with at least $3,000 paid within one year from the date of this official decision. Of this $9,000, $3,000 will go directly to claimant #2, and $3,000 will be held by the APVC, to be used by claimant #2 for educational and therapeutic purposes. Claimant #2 can request these funds from the APVC as needed. Another $3,000 will be paid to the APVC as reimbursement for expenses on this case.

3) Guru Gauranga dasa must undergo a program of mental health therapy, focusing on issues related to his transgressions against claimant #2, and conducted by a mental health professional pre-approved by the APVC. Guru Gauranga dasa must arrange for reports from his therapist to be sent to the APVC at least every three months.

If Guru Gauranga dasa does not comply with items 1, 2, and 3, then he is completely banned from all ISKCON and ISKCON-related organizations. This ban will include a restriction from entering the property of ISKCON and ISKCON-related organizations, and from attending the events of ISKCON and ISKCON-related organizations. If Guru Gauranga demonstrates that he is in compliance with items 1, 2, and 3, then he may visit ISKCON temples and participate in ISKCON activities in accord with the following restrictions:

4) Guru Gauranga dasa must show this document to the Temple President of any temple he visits, or the manager of any ISKCON project he visits, and obtain a signed statement that the president or manager has read this decision. Guru Gauranga shall send the signed copy of the decision to the ICOCP. If Guru Gauranga only visits a temple once or twice during public functions, such as Sunday Feasts, then he does not need to obtain a signed statement from the temple president or manager. If he visits a temple more than two times, then he must obtain such a signed statement.

5) Guru Gauranga dasa must not assume any leadership positions in ISKCON. This includes a prohibition from leading kirtana and giving class on ISKCON property or at an ISKCON function.

6) Guru Gauranga dasa must not assume any position of influence that is connected with ISKCON. This stipulation also includes a prohibition from representing ISKCON.

7) Guru Gauranga dasa must not reside or stay overnight on an ISKCON property, though he may attend temple functions, such as Mangala-arati, Srimad-Bhagavatam

Class, Sunday Feasts, Ratha yatras and other festivals, within the parameters described in this Official Decision.

8) Guru Gauranga dasa must not have ISKCON service, or service with an organization affiliated with ISKCON, that involves connection with minors.

9) If any of the victims of Guru Gauranga dasa attends a function at an ISKCON temple where Guru Gauranga is present, then Guru Gauranga must leave the premises, unless the victims give uncoerced permission for Guru Gauranga to remain.

10) Guru Gauranga must not be shown any special privilege or preference at an ISKCON temple or in an ISKCON project, or in a project or organization affiliated with ISKCON. For example, he should not be offered the special privilege of garlanding Srila Prabhupada at an ISKCON program.

11) Guru Gauranga dasa should not visit ISKCON schools, or schools affiliated with ISKCON, or other ISKCON projects primarily designed for children, unless such visits are necessary for Guru Gauranga to care for his biological child(ren).

12) Guru Gauranga should not be alone on ISKCON property with children who are not his biological children.

If Guru Gauranga dasa violates any of the above conditions, then he is prohibited from any connection with ISKCON or ISKCON-affiliated organizations until his case is reviewed by the APVC.

If, based on credible evidence that the ICOCP deems to be valid, it is later determined that Guru Gauranga dasa sexually abused children other than those who are described in this Official Decision, then Guru Gauranga dasa will be completely banned from all connection with ISKCON and ISKCON-affiliated organizations for 15 years from the date that the APVC determines the new allegations to be valid. After the period of this 15 year ban, Guru Gauranga dasa may apply to the APVC for reinstatement to the ISKCON society. If Guru Gauranga dasa admits to the existence of additional child sexual abuse victims before April 1, 2001, then this 15 year ban will not be applied. If Guru Gauranga reveals the existence of additional victims, the APVC will ask that he genuinely apologizes to those victims, and that he pays monetary restitution to them in an amount to be negotiated between Guru Gauranga dasa and the APVC.

The Child Protection Office requests that anyone, including alleged victims themselves, with information concerning child abuse allegedly committed by Guru Gauranga dasa, please report this information to the Child Protection Office. The Child Protection Office will investigate these allegations.

Guru Gauranga dasa has been steadily dedicated to Srila Prabhupada's ISKCON for many years. This panel humbly requests him to continue in that mood by abiding by this Official Decision and continuing to perform valuable devotional service within Srila Prabhupada's movement.

If Guru Gauranga dasa fully complies with all the items described above, then as of January 20, 2008, he may apply to the APVC for restrictions 4-8 and 10-11 to be

lifted. If Guru Gauranga demonstrates compliance with items 1, 2, and 3 within one month of the date of this official decision, then the APVC will refrain from widely publicizing this document amongst ISKCON leadership, as is the standard with most official decisions of this office. This panel humbly requests ISKCON spiritual and managerial authorities to fully encourage Guru Gauranga dasa to rectify himself by complying with this decision.

Full documentation of the case is on file with the APVC.

These judgments constitute the minimum restrictions that an ISKCON organization may place on Guru Gauranga dasa . Any specific ISKCON organization may choose to invoke more stringent restrictions.

While this Official Decision has delineated various restrictions and conditions, the panel members realize that engagement in devotional service to Sri Krsna is essential for purification. Though it is not the function of this panel to determine or suggest the type of devotional service that Guru Gauranga dasa should perform, we want to mention that, within the restrictions described herein, there are countless ways in which Guru Gauranga dasa may serve Srila Prabhupada's mission, and we encourage him to do so. Also, we wish to state that the directives described in this document, such as writing apology letters and donating for the betterment of the children of Srila Prabhupada's movement, are also forms of bhakti-yoga.

According to the ISKCON Child Protection Task Force Report, Section 5, in cases where an allegation(s) of child abuse are determined to be valid, the accused may appeal the Official Decision to the GBC Executive Committee and the ISKCON Minister of Justice within one month of the date of this decision. The Official Decision described in this document is effective immediately, and the perpetrator must abide by its guidelines during the appeal process, should he choose to appeal this decision.

Panel members serving on this case were: Laxmimoni dasi, Mathuresa dasa, and Nanda dasi. The Case Manager for this case was Dhira Govinda dasa. The Director of APVC at the time of this Official Decision was Dhira Govinda dasa.

To: Guru Gouranga Das

From: Kalakantha Das, recording secretary for EC meeting, July 2002

Re: Case appeal

Prabhu,

Please accept my humble obeisances. All glories to Srila Prabhupada.

At their meeting in Houston on July 10, 2002, the EC discussed the appeal of the decision in your case by the CPO. After reviewing the various evidence submitted, they have decided, by majority vote, to uphold the ruling of the original panel.

Contact with the victim by your friends and advocates was considered detrimental to your appeal.

Although the EC members acknowledged some mitigating circumstances, in the context of ISKCON to which this decision applies, the deliberations concluded as above.

This is for your information and that of the CPO. I do not have further information. Kindly refer other inquiries to the CPO office.

Your servant,

Kalakantha Das

CC: Dhira Govinda Das