

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)	IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
)	
COUNTY OF YORK)	SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
)	
Jane Doe #5, individually, and now over the)	
age of eighteen (18) and Jane Roe #5, as the)	Civil Action No.: 2024-CP-46-
parent and natural guardians of Jane Doe #5)	
while she was under the age of eighteen (18),)	AMENDED SUMMONS
)	(Jury Trial Demanded)
)	
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	
)	
Morningstar Fellowship Church, Richard)	
Joyner, David Yarnes, Douglas Lee,)	
Comenius School for Creative Leadership)	
("CSCL") and Sandra Woods)	
)	
Defendants.)	

TO: DEFENDANTS AND THEIR COUNSEL:

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED and required to Answer the Complaint in this action, a copy of which is herewith served upon you, and to serve a copy of your Answer to said Complaint on the subscriber at his office at 1539 Health Care Drive, Rock Hill, South Carolina, 29732, within thirty (30) days from the service hereof, exclusive of the date of such service; and if you fail to Answer the Complaint within the time aforesaid, judgment by default will be rendered against you for the relief demanded in the Complaint.

**MCGOWAN, HOOD, FELDER & PHILLIPS,
LLC**

s/S. Randall Hood
S. Randall Hood, SC Bar No. 65360
Chad A. McGowan, SC Bar No. 9943
1539 Health Care Drive
Rock Hill, SC 29732
Phone: (803) 327-7800
Facsimile: (803) 324-1483
rhood@mcgowanhood.com
cmcgowan@mcgowanhood.com

February 12, 2025
Rock Hill, South Carolina

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
 COUNTY OF YORK)
)
 Jane Doe #5, individually, and now over the)
 age of eighteen (18) and Jane Roe #5, as the)
 parent and natural guardians of Jane Doe #5)
 while she was under the age of eighteen (18),)
)
 Plaintiff,)
 vs.)
)
 Morningstar Fellowship Church, Richard)
 Joyner, David Yarnes, Douglas Lee,)
 Comenius School for Creative Leadership)
 (“CSCL”) and Sandra Woods)
)
 Defendants.)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
 SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Civil Action No.: 2024-CP-46-

**AMENDED COMPLAINT
 (Jury Trial Demanded)**

TO: DEFENDANTS AND THEIR COUNSEL:

Plaintiffs Jane Doe #5 and Jane Roe #5, complaining of Defendants, respectfully show unto this Court and allege as follows:

SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Churches in the Unites States of America are supposed to be places of fellowship and safety.
2. Some churches, such as the Defendant Morningstar, have also created schools within the corporate structure of their church.
3. Most church schools, as in the case at bar, do not have separate corporate identify from the church and are controlled by the church and its leaders.
4. Too often, in the last thirty years, the American public has been informed of religious institutions ignoring the safety of children.
5. First the Catholic Church was exposed for their willingness to shuttle priests back and forth between parishes when accused of credible sexual exploitation and abuse of children.
6. The Southern Baptist Convention had a day of reckoning where it was exposed that they had

hidden behind years of knowledge of sexual exploitation and abuse of children.

7. There are scads of other instances where religious institutions abused their power structure, hid behind church ideology, and allowed corrupt and deviant persons to exploit and abuse children.

8. The first amendment of the United States creates a separation of church and state.

9. Too often, churches in the United States have hidden behind immunity granted to churches and allowed sexual abuse and exploitation to proliferate in order to protect their reputation.

10. If scandals come out, churches lose members, and when they lose members, the money goes away.

11. Money is at the heart of this failure to protect children from known and dangerous predators.

12. Churches are NOT immune from running their institutions in a secular corporate manner for the protection of children.

13. Evil exists and the church should not be allowed to hide behind a wall of silence and protect a predator at the victims expense.

14. It is time to shed light on the corruption and misery propagated on children by seemingly responsible and reputable religious institutions.

15. In the case at hand, a large church in Fort Mill, South Carolina has had multiple instances of sexual exploitation and abuse of children since its origin.

16. Prior instances of sexual abuse and exploitation were swept under the rug and WERE NEVER REPORTED TO LAW ENFORCEMENT, though such reporting was mandatory.

17. This church, Morningstar Fellowship Church located in Fort Mill, South Carolina, created a school within its church structure to provide education to children.

18. The name of this school at Morningstar in 2017-2019 was “Comenius School for Creative Leadership”, (hereinafter, “CSCL”) which is now known as Kingdom Leadership Academy.

19. The principal of CSCL during the relevant time frame was Sandra Woods (hereinafter, “Woods”).

20. There were multiple instances between 2017-2019 where minor children were exposed to inappropriate actions by other students, all known about or should have been known by Sandra Woods, and other administrators at the school and all other Defendants and they did nothing to protect the children at that time.

21. The sexually harassing or exploitative actions of male students on female students at CSCL was foreseeable and should have been prevented or addressed.

22. Richard Joyner, David Yarnes, Douglas Lee, and Sandra Woods were all aware of past instances of sexual abuse at Morningstar Church/CSCL before Jane Doe #5 was assaulted and/or harassed at CSCL and had the ability to craft solutions not involving church polity that would have protected children from exploitation by predatory students at CSCL.

23. Plaintiff Jane Roe #5 has suffered harm and will likely have to undergo psychiatric/psychological care for the remainder of her life due to actions or inactions of the Defendants

24. Defendants acted in dereliction of their duties to Plaintiffs by failing to prevent the foreseeable harm perpetrated by a male student at CSCL onto Plaintiff Jane Doe #5.

PARTIES

Plaintiffs

25. Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 (hereinafter, "J.D., or Doe") is a person now over the age of Eighteen (18), but while she was a minor at CSCL, she was assaulted and/or harassed by another student at CSCL.

26. Jane Roe #5 (hereinafter, "Jane or Jane Roe #5") is the parent of Jane Doe #5 (hereinafter, collective, "Parents").

27. The Plaintiff Jane Doe #4 is a now a citizen and resident of Mecklenburg County, North Carolina and Jane Roe #5 is a citizen and resident of York County, South Carolina.

28. Plaintiffs are filing this action anonymously under the pseudonym Jane Doe #5 and Jane Roe #5 because the subject matter of this lawsuit could bring embarrassment and publicity to the Plaintiffs.

29. Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 risks humiliation and embarrassment if she is identified since some of

his allegations involve descriptions of sexual acts foisted upon her and allowing her to proceed with a pseudonym brings her comfort.

30. If the ability to proceed with a pseudonym is not allowed, the Plaintiffs will experience further harm because of exercising their legal rights.

31. If Plaintiffs are forced to disclose their identities, that disclosure will amplify the injuries that are at issue in this litigation.

32. The public interest in the disclosure of Plaintiffs identities is minimal and not outweighed by the substantial harm of revealing their identity.

33. There will be no furtherance of justice by requiring the public disclosure of Plaintiffs.

34. Once the Defendants are served and retain counsel, Plaintiffs' identities will be revealed to Defendants in a confidential manner, if not already known.

35. Defendants are not prejudiced by allowing Plaintiffs to proceed anonymously, and any potential prejudice will be mitigated by the confidential disclosure of Plaintiffs' actual identities soon after this lawsuit is filed.

Defendants

36. Defendant, Morningstar Fellowship Church, is an organization created under the laws of the State of Mississippi, having its principal place of business in Fort Mill, South Carolina.

37. Defendant Richard Joyner is the founder of Morningstar, was senior pastor of the church during many of the events described in this action and is a citizen and resident of York County, South Carolina

38. Defendant David Yarnes was the vice president of Morningstar Church at the time of all allegations contained in the complaint and is a citizen and resident of a state in the United States.

39. Defendant Douglas Lee was a senior member of Morningstar Church leadership at the time of the allegations of this complaint and is a citizen and resident of South Carolina.

40. Defendant Comenius School for Creative Leadership ("CSCL") is a wholly owned subsidiary of Morningstar but is a legally cognizable entity separate and apart from Morningstar.

41. Morningstar and Joyner controlled CSCL within the framework of Morningstar church.

42. Defendant Sandra Woods was the principal of CSCL at the times relevant to this complaint.

43. Sandra Woods and other Defendants had the ability and duty to prevent sexual abuse and harassment of students at CSCL by other students.

44. Defendants have duties and responsibilities to direct and control the way CSCL agents and/or employees provide secular services to minors and their parents.

45. All individually named Defendants were employees and agents of Morningstar and/or CSCL for all allegations contained within this complaint.

46. Defendants have duties and responsibilities to protect minor children from foreseeable harm.

47. Defendants Morningstar, Joyner, Yarnes, Lee, and Woods have the right or power to direct and control the way their employees and/or agents train, monitor, and supervise, staff under their employment or agency.

48. Upon information and belief, Defendants Morningstar, Joyner, Yarnes, Lee, and Woods had or should have had non-ecclesiastical policies, procedures, and guidance on how to protect students from student-on-student sexual assault or harassment, including common sense admonitions on ways to prevent foreseeable sexual assault and/or harassment of minor children.

49. Upon information and belief, Defendants Morningstar, Joyner, Yarns, Lee and Woods should have created, communicated, and implemented non-ecclesiastical policies, procedures, and guidance on how to protect students from student-on-student sexual assault or harassment, including common sense admonitions on ways to prevent foreseeable sexual assault and/or harassment of minor children.

50. Consistent with the standards recognized in secular organizations or churches with youth programs, Defendants Morningstar should have policies, procedures, and guidelines related to employee training, supervision, and monitoring, which includes, at a minimum, the duty to ensure minors are protected from preventable predatory behavior.

51. Defendants Morningstar, Joyner, Yarns, Douglas Lee, and Woods had a non-delegable duty

to provide employees and/or agents with adequate knowledge and training to protect students from student-on-student sexual assault or harassment, including common sense admonitions on ways to prevent foreseeable sexual assault and/or harassment of minor children.

52. This training on policies, procedures, safety features, supervisory responsibility and predatory behavior would include employees of Morningstar, CSCL the parents of minor students at CSCL children, and the students at CSCL.

53. Before the events underlying this case began in 2017-19, Defendant Morningstar (and its wholly owned church school, CSCL) and its employees and/or agents had actual knowledge that a vulnerable population of students could be subject to dangers of being assaulted or harassed if reasonable precautions were not exercised in training, supervision, and monitoring, of staff, members, or volunteers in the CSCL church school.

54. Morningstar (and its wholly owned church school, CSCL) and its employees and/or agents had the opportunity to prevent harm against vulnerable children, and yet, Defendant Morningstar and its employees and/or agents ignored signs of concerning behaviors by students which foreshadowed the acts which were perpetrated on Jane Doe #5.

55. At all times relevant hereto, Joyner, Yarnes, Douglass Lee, and Sandra Woods acted within the course and scope of their employment and/or agency with Defendant Morningstar.

56. Defendants knew that minor children (CSCL students) exposed to preventable assault and harassment by other students were at risk of harm.

57. The negligent, grossly negligent, reckless, willful, or wanton acts, omissions, and liability of Defendants includes that of their agents, principals, employees, and/or servants, both directly and vicariously, pursuant to principals of non-delegable duty, corporate liability, apparent authority, agency, ostensible agency, and/or respondeat superior.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

58. The Plaintiffs reside in North Carolina and York County, South Carolina.

59. At least one Defendant is located in or has its principal place of business in York County, South Carolina.

60. A primary portion of the facts alleged in this matter occurred in York County, South Carolina.

61. Each Defendant interacted with South Carolina in a systemic and pervasive way, such that this Court may exercise personal jurisdiction without offending the notions of justice.

62. Each of the Defendants has a present and lasting contact with the State of South Carolina by virtue of revenue, ownership of land, or other qualifying state jurisdictional criteria

JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY

63. The above-named Defendants are jointly and severally liable for all damages alleged herein since their negligent, grossly negligent, reckless, and wanton acts and omissions, singularly, or in combination, are the contributing proximate causes of Plaintiffs' injuries, damages, and losses.

DAMAGES ALLEGATIONS AS TO DEFENDANTS

64. Defendant Morningstar will likely claim to be a charitable entity which would subject them to charitable immunity caps.

65. The Charitable Immunity Act ("CIA") references the South Carolina Tort Claims Act as the predicate statutory authority for the number of caps to be imposed by any person or entity against a CIA entity.

66. In relevant part, regarding limitations of liability under the South Carolina Tort Claims Act ("TCA"), S.C. Code Ann. Section 15-78-120, provides as follows:

- (a) For any action or claim for damages brought under the provisions of this chapter, the liability shall not exceed the following limits:
 - (1) Except as provided in Section 15-78-120(a)(3), no person shall recover in any action or claim brought hereunder a sum exceeding three hundred

thousand dollars because of loss arising from a single occurrence regardless of the number of agencies or political subdivisions involved.

- (2) Except as provided in Section 15-78-120(a)(4), the total sum recovered hereunder arising out of a single occurrence shall not exceed six hundred thousand dollars regardless of the number of agencies or political subdivisions or claims or actions involved.

67. Under S.C. Code Ann. Section 15-78-30: “Occurrence” is defined as “an unfolding sequence of events which proximately flow from a single act of negligence.”

68. Each act of negligence, gross negligence, recklessness, and/or willful and wanton conduct by any person employed by or an agent of Morningstar is an act or occurrence regarding the South Carolina Tort Claims Act/CIA.

69. There are multiple breaches of duties of care and industry standards in this case, and, upon information and belief, each breach (or occurrence) can be stacked to create multiple “caps” for any Defendant under the TCA/CIA (depending on what a jury ultimately decides).

70. All Defendants who are alleged to have committed grossly negligent or reckless acts and/or omissions are named individually.

71. If there is a finding by a jury of gross negligence or recklessness against any individually named Defendant, they are subject to liability outside any “cap” and have unlimited exposure for damages.

72. Plaintiff is further alleging that Defendants, and their agents and/or employees committed grossly negligent and/or reckless acts which breached the duties of care and industry standards for which caps do not exist under the TCA/CIA.

73. Plaintiff has identified multiple breaches of duties by Defendants and their agents and/or employees which are known and there are other breaches not addressed which are unknown at this time.

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE AND ECCLESIASTICAL PRIVILEGE

74. In accordance with the constitutional freedom of religion and corresponding separation of church and state enshrined in the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, religious organizations must be given “an independence from secular control or manipulation, in short, power to decide for themselves, free from state interference, matters of church government as well as those of faith and doctrine.” Kedroff v. St. Nicholas Cathedral, 344 U.S. 94, 116, 73 S.Ct. 143, 97 L.Ed. 120 (1952).

75. To put that principle into practice, South Carolina Courts have held that civil courts “may not engage in resolving disputes as to religious law, principle, doctrine, discipline, custom, or administration.” Pearson v. Church of God, 325 S.C. 45, 52, 478 S.E.2d 849, 853 (1996).

76. However, South Carolina courts have also recognized that civil courts may hear cases touching upon religious organizations where the dispute may be resolved entirely by neutral principles of law. See id. at 51–53, 478 S.E.2d at 852–53.

77. Under the neutral principles of law approach, courts may apply “property, corporate, and other forms of law to church disputes.” All Saints Parish Waccamaw v. Protestant Episcopal Church in Diocese of S.C., 385 S.C. 428, 444, 685 S.E.2d 163, 172 (2009).

78. In other words, so long as a court can hear a case without deciding issues of religious law, principle, doctrine, discipline, custom, or administration, the court must entertain jurisdiction. Id.

79. Certain ecclesiastical actions have a privilege or immunity from civil liability and other actions do not.

80. The actions by employees or agents of a church can be both ecclesiastical and secular in nature.

81. Preaching a sermon to minor children is ecclesiastical in nature and subject to 1st Amendment privilege.

82. Whether someone molested a child during the preaching of a sermon involves neutral principles of law subject to civil court jurisdiction.

83. An ecclesiastical polity is the operational and governance structure of a church, church-school or of a Christian denomination.

84. Church organizations often refer to problems or troubles as ecclesiastical in nature when the problem or trouble is secular in nature or involves neutral principle of law questions.

85. There is a difference between ecclesiastical issues or questions (relating to church or church-school doctrine and religious indoctrination) and those involving neutral principles of law questions subject to civil court jurisdiction (secular or non-ecclesiastical).

86. For example, failing to act on knowledge that students are sexually assaulting or harassing other students or failing to have proper policies and procedures in place to prevent student on student sexual assault or harassment, training (including secular safety protection policies and procedures) , monitoring or supervision in the prevention or exploitation (provision of alcohol or abuse to minor) and/or abuse of minors is secular in nature and involves neutral principles of law.

87. The actions and behavior of the church entity or organization and their agents and/or employees must be examined to determine if issues or circumstances can be decided by the application of neutral principles of law.

DUTIES OF MORNINGSTAR, JOYNER, YARNES, DOUGLAS LEE AND WOODS TO PLAINTIFFS

88. The Defendants Morningstar, Joyner, Yarnes, Douglas Lee, and Woods had duties to the Plaintiffs.

89. In the State of South Carolina, a duty from a defendant to an aggrieved party can be created by a number of different ways.

90. In this matter, these duties were created by the special relationship between the Defendants Morningstar, Joyner, Yarnes, Douglas Lee, and Sandra Woods to minor aged students at CSCL.

91. The duty to protect the minor children at the CSCL school from harm was created by Morningstar when they informed parents of children in the CSCL program that their children would be safe and protected while in the school environment.

92. Additionally, the parents of students at CSCL were paying tuition to CSCL and Morningstar to provide their children with a safe education and free from foreseeable harm.

93. Morningstar, Joyner, Yarnes, Douglas Lee, and Woods undertook certain voluntary precautions in running the CSCL school at Morningstar.

94. They documented situations where a student was alleged to have harmed another student though they were under no obligation to do so.

95. Morningstar and CSCL undertook the duty to create policies and procedures concerning students and their safety at Morningstar and CSCL.

96. Once they undertook these duties, they must ensure that any such policies and procedures were created, implemented, communicated and enacted in a reasonable manner.

97. The framework of the creation of a safe and nurturing environment by Morningstar and CSCL was not supposed to be lip service but real policies and procedures and real actions to protect students.

98. Once Morningstar, CSCL and their agents and employees undertook these actions voluntarily, they had to perform such duties in a reasonable manner.

99. Teachers at CSCL from 2017-2019 were told to pass any concerning information on to Principal Sandra Woods and it would be handled.

100. Once Sandra Woods agreed to and accepted that duty, she had to perform it in a reasonable manner.

101. This was part of what Defendants considered to be reasonable practices in running a school and supposedly protecting students.

102. Under section 323 of the restatement of torts (recognized in South Carolina), if an entity or person voluntarily undertakes an action, they must do so in a reasonable manner.

103. Morningstar, Joyner, Yarnes, Douglas Lee and Wood's documentation of student-on-student assault or harassment created the duty to protect minors in the CSCL school in a reasonable manner..

104. The duties of Morningstar, Joyner, Yarnes, Douglas Lee, and Woods to the minors at CSCL school were breached by them in failing to train, monitor, or supervise employees/volunteers at CSCL about child protection.

105. The duties of Morningstar, Joyner, Yarnes, Douglas Lee, and Woods to the minors at CSCL school were breached by them in failing to create, communicate and implement reasonable policies and procedures to protect children in at CSCL.

THE FAILURE TO PROTECT CHILDREN FROM OTHER PREDATORY STUDENTS , FAILURE TO TRAIN/MONITOR/SUPERVISE EMPLOYEES OF CSCL TO PRIOTECT CHILDREN, AND FAILURE TO CREATE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO PROTECT CHILDREN AT RISK OF PREDATORIAL CONDUCT INVOLVE NEUTRAL PRINCIPLE OF LAW ANALYSIS AND JURISDICTION VESTS IN CIVIL COURT.

106. Though church organizations (including church schools like CSCL) are founded on ecclesiastical principles, they must utilize non-ecclesiastical principles (secular) in training,

monitoring, and supervision, of employees or leaders church schools like CSCL and the creation of policies and procedures to prevent harm to children.

107. These neutral principle of law actions which are secular in nature are necessary because reasonable training, monitoring, and supervision requires a church organization (which has a school like CSCL) to protect minor children from foreseeable harm.

108. The prevention of sexual assault and harassment to students at a church school and actual sexual misconduct and abuse by a fellow student at a church school is not ecclesiastical in nature.

109. The neutral principle of law actions of Morningstar, their agents and/or employees had to be performed in a reasonable manner to protect minor children from harm.

110. The creation, communication and implementation of safety policies and procedures by Morningstar and responses to signs of sexual assault or harassment by students at CSCL and signs of exploitation or possible abuse of minor children at CSCL involves neutral principles of law and are secular in nature.

111. In this case, Defendants Morningstar, Joyner, Yarnes, Doug Lee, and Woods were all complicit from a neutral principle of law perspective in regard to the assault and harassment perpetrated on Jane Doe #5.

112. Defendants have a non-delegable non-ecclesiastic duty to provide CSCL employees and/or agents, and its minor participants with adequate knowledge, training, monitoring, and supervision to prevent exploitation and sexual abuse of a minor child at CSCL.

113. The provision of knowledge, training, monitoring, and supervision of CSCL employees and/or agents, its students, and other volunteers at Morningstar/CSCL to prevent exploitation and/or abuse of minor children at CSCL involves neutral principles of law and is secular in nature.

114. For decades, the church has hidden behind the cloak of ecclesiastical privilege.

115. This privilege is an abused form of leniency and immunity propagated by the church to shirk their responsibility for the misconduct of their pastors, employees, teachers/coaches, volunteers, and fellow students onto a minor child.

116. Before the underlying events in this case took place, employees and/or agents of Defendants knew, or reasonably should have known, its vulnerable population of minor students would likely be subject to exploitation or abuse if reasonable neutral principle of law policies and procedures were not created, communicated, or implemented and proper steps taken in the training, monitoring and, supervision, of employees and/or agents.

117. Morningstar and CSCL facilitated an improper non-ecclesiastic environment of exploitation and abuse in their church sponsored school which resulted in injuries and harm to Plaintiffs.

118. Whether defendants' conduct was actionable or not regarding the assault or harassment, exploitation, or abuse of minor students at CSCL from a training, monitoring, or supervision aspect or from the creation, communication or implementation of proper policies and procedures standpoint involves neutral principles of law subject to South Carolina Civil Court Jurisdiction.

**NEUTRAL PRINCIPLE OF LAW STANDARDS IN THE INDUSTRY FOR
PROTECTION OF MINORS BY CHURCH ORGANIZATIONS**

119. An industry standard refers to a set of criteria, guidelines, or characteristics established by consensus among industry members, which defines the acceptable level of quality, safety, performance, or compatibility for products, services, or processes within that industry.

120. These standards are often developed and published by leading standard-setting organizations, industry groups, or regulatory bodies to ensure consistency, interoperability, and quality across the industry.

121. They can cover a wide range of topics, including product specifications, manufacturing processes, testing methodologies, and service delivery practices.

122. Industry standards play a crucial role in facilitating trade, enhancing product reliability, ensuring consumer safety, and fostering innovation by providing a clear framework within which companies can develop and offer their products or services.

123. The industry standard for church organizations includes neutral principle of law standards and requirements established to ensure that church leadership and church staff (such as schools like CSCL) are adequately trained, supervised and/or monitored to prevent assault, harassment, exploitation, or abuse to minor children at CSCL.

124. The industry standard for church organizations includes neutral principles of law standards and requirements established to ensure that church leadership and church staff (including Sandra Woods at CSCL) create, communicate, and implement policies and procedures to prevent the assault, harassment, exploitation, or abuse to minor children at CSCL.

125. These neutral principle of law industry standards are critical for the safety of minor children.

126. The neutral principle of law duty of training, monitoring or supervision extends to CSCL activities, including school related activities, field trips, athletic endeavors, and any youth program -related functions at CSCL.

127. The duty does not change because organized activities were held on campus or off campus.

128. The neutral principle of law duty of creating, communicating, and implementing child safety policies and procedures at a church school was applicable to Defendants Morningstar, Joyner, Yarnes, Douglas Lee, and Sandra Woods.

129. If a church organization, or their employees and/or agents breaches neutral principle of law industry standards concerning the safety of children, it can result in devastating harm to a minor child

130. Defendants had duties and responsibilities to Plaintiffs to abide by neutral principle of law industry standards in church organizations (and their affiliated schools) to protect minor children and they failed.

131. The negligence, gross negligence, and/or recklessness in multiple breaches of neutral principle of law industry standards by all Defendants resulted in damages and injuries to the Plaintiffs.

KNOWLEDGE OF CHURCH ORGANIZATION AND ITS LEADERS OF PROR INSTANCES OF EXPLOTATIONA ND ABUSE/ASSAULT OF MINORS

132. Morningstar, Rick Joyner David Yarns, Doug Lee, and Sandra Woods made up the leadership of Morningstar and CSCL for the actionable events of this complaint

133. Rick Joyner was the senior pastor and CEO of Morningstar/CSCL at most of the times mentioned in this complaint.

134. David Yarnes was Morningstar/CSCL second in charge for most of the times mentioned in this complaint

135. Douglas Lee was head of security for Morningstar/CSCL for most of the times mentioned in this complaint and was also referred to as a school resource officer by Joyner and Woods.

136. Woods was the principal of CSCL and worked in conjunction with other individually named Defendants to operate the school within Morningstar.

137. Defendants had a duty and responsibility to provide a safe and nurturing environment for students at CSCL.

138. Defendants were supposed to ensure that Morningstar and CSCL were run in a competent manner regarding the safety of children and minor students.

139. Defendants were charged with protecting the minors at CSCL from assault, harassment, exploitation, or abuse by other students.

140. Sometime in the 2000s, two women in Morningstar University were sexually assaulted by an employee of Morningstar.

141. This put Morningstar, Joyner, Yarns, and Lee on notice of the potential danger to vulnerable persons by predatorial people.

142. Predators hide in plain sight.

143. The provision of safety and enacting safety measures provides for the prevention of predatorial conduct or actions by employees or members of the church.

144. In order to prevent harm to vulnerable persons at the church (and at CSCL school), including children, the church had to be proactive in its mission to prevent harm within their control.

145. There was a second sexual assault involving Morningstar sometime after the church was created.

146. Upon information and belief, a child was going on a field trip with a program at Morningstar.

147. Upon information belief, the mother of the minor was leery of a particular Morningstar University volunteer and specifically asked that her child not be exposed to that person.

148. Morningstar and its church did not protect the minor and he was abused and assaulted by the specific person warned about by the mother.

149. Both of these incidents of sexual abuse and assault were covered up by the church.

150. Morningstar Church also had wholly owned entities called CSCL (a church school) and Morningstar University since the early 2000s.

151. There have been instances at both facilities that were known by Joyner, Yarnes, Douglass Lee, and Woods.

152. There have been multiple children assaulted and sexually harassed at CSCL.

153. This was known by church leadership, and they did nothing.

154. There were multiple instances of administrators at Morningstar University harassing or sexually exploiting students within the program.

155. One such instance became well known

156. Rick Joyner sent out an email to all students asking them to meet and discuss two specific administrators that may have been exploiting students.

157. Many, many students showed up to this meeting.

158. Rick Joyner personally attended it.

159. He heard all of the accusation and acknowledged a problem yet referred to the women as “jezebels” and accusing them of creating lust in the men.

160. All of these instances have been ongoing for decades.

161. Rick Joyner was also responsible for a convicted pedophile to be hired by the church.

162. In his infinite wisdom, Rick Joyner ensured that the convicted child abuser had an office near the church nursery.

163. In 2021, it became known by Rick Joyner that his personally selected head pastor was engaging in inappropriate actions with a member of Morningstar University.

164. Rick Joyner helped orchestrate covering up this transgression, until it leaked.

165. Then he turned on the former senior pastor and exposed him to the press

166. In all instances, the victims were encouraged not to report these unbelievable circumstances to anyone, including law enforcement.

167. Upon information and belief, Joyner, Yarnes, and Doug Lee (and Woods, where applicable) knew of these exploitations and assaults, and helped orchestrate the victims not reporting the conduct to anyone.

168. The actions by Morningstar, Joyner, Yarns and Doug Lee (and Woods, where applicable) in the investigation and actions of them after each exploitation, assault or incident involved neutral principles of law.

169. At a minimum, the admonition not to contact law enforcement when someone has been sexually assaulted or exploited is reckless, and at its worst, is a criminal offense punishable by incarceration.

170. These separate incidents are the tip of the iceberg of the exploitation, assaults and harassment that has been ongoing at Morningstar (and also in part at CSCL) for two decades.

171. There is no telling how many others have occurred and were shut down by Morningstar and its leadership.

172. These incidents (from the first to the present) are notice to Morningstar and all leaders that a vulnerable population exists at the church.

173. These incidents place the leaders of the church, including Joyner, Yarnes, and Doug Lee, and leader of the School, Woods, on notice that there are predators that exist within the church hierarchy, Morningstar University and CSCL School.

174. These incidents are actual notice of the need to ensure proper training, monitoring, and supervision of CSCL employees and/or agents and the students who attend CSCL

175. These incidents are actual notice that Morningstar needs to have proper policies, procedures, and other written admonitions to protect vulnerable members of the church and CSCL school, including minor children.

176. Failure by Defendants to act on actual notice of multiple sexual abuse and exploitation events is not only negligent, but reckless and grossly negligent.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS SUPPORTING THE CAUSES OF ACTION

177. During all times that Jane Doe #5 was a minor child in the CSCL school at Morningstar, Sandra Woods was the principal of the school.

178. The Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 attended CSCL from Fall of 2012 till the end of her sophomore year (summer 2018).

179. The Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 first began noticing concerning issues at CSCL when she reached middle school (7th-8th grade)

180. The school dynamic changed once they brought in athletes who were not at the school for the stated purpose- to grow in faith and academics.

181. The students who were brought in cared about their sports and frequently harassed the female students at the school.

182. Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 was harassed at school and through social media which was reported the school.

183. The school did nothing about the complaints except tell the parents to handle the situation with the abuser.

184. In June 2018, Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 was in art class when the teacher showed a movie to the class and Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 was sitting on a couch.

185. A male student sat down beside Plaintiff Jane Doe #5..

186. He pulled out his penis while forcibly pulling Jane Doe #5's hand to his penis and used a pillow to cover his actions.

187. The teacher and other kids were in class next door as this happened.

188. Jane Doe #5 was mortified and but did not want to immediately cause a scene with younger kids in the classroom.

189. She was also in shock and embarrassed all at the same time and did not know what to do.

190. Jane Doe #5 told her parents that day and let them read texts to confirm it did happen.

191. The Plaintiffs reported this to Sandra Woods the night it happened via a phone call from Jane Roe #5 to Woods.

192. Sandra Woods expressed her sympathy but asked for Jane Roe #5 to let the school handle it instead of reporting it to the police.

193. Jane Roe #5 also emailed Woods the day after the incident requesting the offending student's parent's phone number and advising Woods that the Plaintiffs planned to raise the issue higher.

194. Jane Roe #5 inquired about the boy's parents number because earlier in the school year, a boy had cussed out her daughter Jane Doe #5 in Bible class during a midterm, and when

Sandra Woods was shown the texts, her response was that the parents of Jane Doe #5 should contact the boy's parents vs. the school handling it.

195. Thus, Jane Roe #5 thought they were going to have to handle things again as opposed to the school doing their job.

196. There has been no response to the email sent to Sandra requesting the phone number.

197. Sandra Woods ended the school year with no response to Jane Roe #5's request for information after convincing Jane Doe #5's family she would handle it.

198. After no response from Sandra Woods for five days after the event happened, Jane Roe #5 met informally with Sandra Woods on June 10 to let her know that Jane Roe #5 was going to contact Rick Joyner.

199. Woods suddenly became interested in Jane Doe #5's predicament again.

200. This prompted Jane Doe #5 to email Rick Joyner about the situation and the lack of action

201. Jane Doe #5 and Jane Roe #5 then met with Sandra Woods on two occasions.

202. The first one was informal, and Woods asked Jane Doe #5 about what happened.

203. The family of Jane Doe #5 thought Woods actions were genuine, but they were not.

204. Jane Doe #5 and Jane Roe #5 then had a 10 minute meeting in which Woods told Doe #5 and Roe #5 that a) Doug Lee investigated by bringing the boy in and he talked trash about Jane Doe #5 so Doug said it was a he said/she said event, b) and advised Jane Doe #5 Purity: The New Moral Revolution and she may want to consider other options for schooling

205. Woods made this meeting as traumatic and dismissive as possible.

206. After Rick Joyner had requested for Jane Doe #5's family to provide information as to what happened to her, they were then ghosted with zero response from Joyner.

207. Woods second meeting with Jane Doe #5 and Jane Roe #5 was entirely different as she knew she wasn't facing any trouble from Rick Joyner, and she no longer wanted to help them, but wanted to make them us pay for damaging her reputation with Rick Joyner.

208. Woods told the Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 she knew the Plaintiff had not been keeping pure and that is why she was assaulted.

209. Additionally, she put the blame on Jane Doe #5 and said that if it happened to her own daughter that she would blame the daughter and teach her to keep pure.

210. The end result of the meeting was Woods saying that CSCL was not the best fit for Jane Doe #5 and, upon information and belief, did not contact the boy's parents at all.

211. There were other events/incidents that were addressed with little to no response:

212. In 2019, a senior student drew a penis on a car window over my and another girl's name in plain view of anyone turning into the lot or little kids outside.

213. Jane Doe #5 and her friends were sitting together in gym class watching the guys play basketball one day and Jane Doe #5 said hello to one of the players and his response was "hey this" and grabbed himself while his friends commented to the girls about whipping their things out.

214. A 7th grader sent Jane Doe #5 nude pictures while her mom was next to her in the living room.

215. Jane Doe #5 then blocked him immediately.

216. This student contacted jane Doe #5 on other social media apologizing but confirmed asking her for pictures which she ignored.

217. On Monday at school, the student told many people that Janne Doe #5 sent him nude pictures.

218. This had occurred before.

219. Jane Doe #5 eventually had to have a friend walk her to classes next door held in the Movement Church building because she was fearful of walking by herself without being harassed by boys.

220. Jane Doe #5 avoided using the restroom in certain areas because she was concerned for her safety.

221. The bathroom in one area of the school is secluded and far from the classroom.

222. The one time that Jane Doe #5 went to the secluded bathroom on her own, a student cornered her in the open walkway area trying to make her feel uncomfortable.

223. Jane Doe #5 was solicited by a student (the same one that cornered her by the bathroom) to go outside to someone's car to perform sexual acts on him.

224. It's apparently known that cameras are not in the parking lots and things go on there during school.

225. A student attempted to forcibly kiss Jane Doe #5.

226. She was successful in pushing him off.

227. While Jane Doe was at Morningstar with friends, they were playing hide and go seek when a male pulled out a Ziplock bag and a hair tie and made a "condom," asking Jane Doe #5 if she wanted to hook up while the others were hiding.

228. The causes of actions in this complaint include multiple allegations of negligence, conspiracy, reckless or intentional infliction of emotional distress and a necessities claim.

229. Plaintiffs suffered injury by all of the actions and inactions of Defendants.

FOR A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Negligence, Gross Negligence and Recklessness)

230. Plaintiffs reincorporate and reallege all above paragraphs verbatim.

231. All Defendants had multiple neutral principle of law duties to Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 to prevent her from suffering harm through CSCL school at Morningstar.

232. As alleged above, Defendants Morningstar, Joyner, Yarnes, Doug Lee, CSCL and Woods had a neutral principle of law duty to protect Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 from foreseeable harm.

233. As alleged above, Defendants Morningstar, Joyner, Yarnes, Doug Lee, CSCL and Woods were aware of or should have been aware of different students harassing or assaulting Jane Doe#5 or other students.

234. At all relevant times, prior to the student pulling his penis out and making Jane Doe #5 touch it, Defendants Morningstar, Joyner, Yarnes, Doug Lee, CSCL and Woods knew of sexual misconduct incidents involving different students at CSCL.

235. Though Defendants were aware of different incidents of sexual assault that mandated reporting to law enforcement, the Defendants encouraged parents and students to handle it on their own or let Morningstar/CSCL handle and not to report to law enforcement.

236. These incidents put Defendants Morningstar, Joyner, Yarnes, Doug Lee, CSCL and Woods on notice that they had a duty to use neutral principle of law principles in their training, monitoring and oversight of students and administrators/teachers at CSCL.

237. These incidents put Defendants Morningstar, Joyner, Yarnes, Doug Lee, CSCL and Woods on notice that they had a duty to implement neutral principle of law policies and procedures to protect minor students at CSCL.

238. Defendants Morningstar, Joyner, Yarnes, Doug Lee, CSCL and Woods had a duty to create and promote a neutral principle of law culture of safety to prioritize the well-being of

children and young adults to protect them from negligent, grossly negligent, reckless, predatory, and abusive students.

239. Defendants Morningstar, Joyner, Yarns, Doug Lee, CSCL and Woods had a duty to train, monitor and supervise CSCL employees on protecting students and reporting inappropriate conduct to law enforcement authorities or members of church leadership.

240. Defendants breached their duties to Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 in multiple ways

241. Defendants Joyner, Yarnes, Doug Lee, Erickson Lee, CSCL and Woods failures as indicated herein amount to the total absence of care.

242. Defendants breached several neutral principle of law duties owed to Plaintiffs in a negligent, grossly negligent, and reckless manner in committing one or more of the following acts of omission or commission, any, or all of which were breaches of the duties owed to Plaintiffs:

- a. As an unfolding sequence of events proximately flowing from failing to ensure Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 was not exposed to injurious behavior by students at CSCL;
- b. As a separate and independent unfolding sequence of events flowing from Defendant's failure to undertake proper protections of the minors when only documenting reports of sexual behavior by students at CSCL;
- c. As a separate and independent unfolding sequence of events flowing from Defendant's CSCL employees and/or agent failing to report students misconduct.
- d. As a separate and independent unfolding sequence of events flowing from Defendant's failure to train CSCL employees and/or agents in a proper manner.
- e. As a separate and independent unfolding sequence of events flowing from Defendant's failure to train CSCL employees and/or agents on ways to protect children at CSCL.
- f. As a separate and independent unfolding sequence of events flowing from Defendant's failure to train agents and/or employees about exploitative, dangerous, or illegal conduct.
- g. As a separate and independent unfolding sequence of events flowing from

Defendant's failure to act on reports of misconduct by students toward Jane Doe #5 in a proper manner.

- h. As a separate and independent unfolding sequence of events flowing from Defendant's failure to monitor students in a proper manner.
- i. As a separate and independent unfolding sequence of events flowing from failing to protect Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 from being assaulted and harassed while at CSCL.
- j. As a separate and independent unfolding sequence of events flowing from failing to ensure Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 was safe while at CSCL.
- k. As a separate and independent unfolding sequence of events flowing from Defendant's failure to create, implement and communicate policies and procedures engineered to protect children at CSCL.
- l. As a separate and independent unfolding sequence of events flowing from failing to properly investigate previous incident of sexual assault, harassment, exploitation, or abuse and take proper steps to protect children who were under the stewardship of CSCL from acts by other students.
- m. As a separate and independent unfolding sequence of events flowing from failing to train all employees and/or volunteers at CSCL in a manner that would promote personal safety for minors.
- n. As a separate and independent unfolding sequence of events flowing from failing to follow industry standards in neutral principles of law.
- o. In such other particulars as will be discovered through discovery undertaken pursuant to the S.C. Rules of Civil Procedure.

243. A As a direct and proximate result of the negligent, grossly negligent, and reckless, actions and inactions of Defendants, the Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 has suffered and will continue to suffer damages and Plaintiffs are entitled to judgment against Defendants for all actual damages and against Joyner, Yarnes, Doug Lee, and Woods for actual and compensatory damage, punitive damages, and such other relief in law or equity as may be determined by a jury.

FOR A SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
AS TO WOODS

(Outrage/Intentional or Reckless Infliction of Emotional Distress)

244. Plaintiff realleges and reincorporates all above paragraphs herein verbatim.

245. Defendant Woods recklessly or intentionally inflicted severe emotional distress on Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 by virtue of her actions and it was certain or substantially certain that such distress could result from her conduct.

246. Defendant Woods recklessly or intentionally inflicted severe emotional distress on Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 by blaming her for causing a male student to sexually assault her.

247. Defendant Woods recklessly or intentionally inflicted severe emotional distress on Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 by telling her that she was unpure, and her femininity was the cause of the sexual assault.

248. Defendant Woods was the principle of CSCL and had authority over Jane Doe #5.

249. Woods used her position of authority to bully and intimidate Jane Doe #5.

250. One of the reasons for these bullying and intimidating actions by Woods was to silence the Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 from making her accusations public.

251. Woods was trying to shut down any types of known sexual assaults, harassment, exploitation, or abuse from public knowledge as had been done for decades at Morningstar.

252. Woods also made Jane Doe #5 feel unwelcome at the school she had attended from age 4-16.

253. Woods helped ensure that Jane Doe #5 had to leave a where all her friends were even though Doe #5 was only two years from graduation.

254. Defendants' conduct was extreme and outrageous as to exceed all possible bounds of decency and is intolerable in a civilized community.

255. Defendants' actions caused Plaintiffs emotional distress.

256. The emotional distress suffered by Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 was so severe that no reasonable person could be expected to endure it and this distress manifested itself in physical symptoms.

257. The emotional distress caused by actions and inactions of all Defendants, includes, but is not limited to, medical problems, emotional issues, mental anguish, and behaviors that are capable of objective diagnosis.

258. As a direct and proximate result of the intentional and/or reckless infliction of emotional distress on Plaintiff Jane Doe #5, they have suffered damages.

259. As a direct and proximate result of the reckless or intentional infliction of emotional distress by all Defendants, the Plaintiff Jane Doe #5 has suffered and will continue to suffer damages and Plaintiff is entitled to judgment against Defendant Morningstar for actual and compensatory damages, and are entitled to judgment against Woods for actual and punitive damages and such other damages in law or equity as may be determined at a trial of this matter.

FOR A THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
AS TO ALL DEFENDANTS
(Necessaries Claim)

260. Plaintiff Jane Roe #5 realleges and reincorporates all above paragraphs verbatim.

261. As a direct and proximate result of the acts and/or omissions described herein, Jane Roe #5 was responsible for the following expenses related to her minor child until she turned the age of eighteen (18):

- a. Substantial medical expenses that are certain to occur for a significant amount of time, if not for the rest of her life;
- b. Substantial life-care expenses that are reasonably certain to occur for a significant amount of time, if not for the rest of Jane Doe #5's life;
- c. Care related to Jane Doe #5's disability that are likely to occur before he reaches the age of majority;

- d. The provision of extraordinary medical care to Jane Doe #5;
- e. The general expense of obtaining resources for Jane Doe #5 before the age of eighteen, including, but not limited to, special assistance and other medical treatment and/or therapies which may alleviate some of Jane Doe #5's suffering which took place due to Defendants' conduct as alleged herein.
- f. The time and expense associated with Jane Roe #5's care of Jane Doe #5 from time missed from work, transportation costs and other assorted expenses.

262. Plaintiffs Jane Roe #5 was responsible for the medical bills, medical care, and overall care for her minor child until the age of eighteen (18).

263. If Jane Doe #5 is under a disability, she may be required to undergo care for an undetermined length of time after she reaches eighteen years of age.

264. Plaintiff Jane Roe #5 will also suffer other economic damages, including, but not limited to, the provision of extraordinary medical care, life care expenses, transportation costs, counseling services, and special programs for their child Jane Doe #5 because of Defendants' actions and/or inactions.

265. Plaintiff Jane Roe #5 should be awarded all damages flowing from any necessities claim or any other economic damages she may suffer because of Defendants' actions and/or inactions.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully pray for judgement against all Defendants for all actual damages and against all Defendants Joyner, Yarnes, Doug Lee, and Woods for all punitive damages alleged herein, and for such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems just and proper.

SIGNATURE PAGE TO FOLLOW

**MCGOWAN, HOOD, FELDER & PHILLIPS,
LLC**

s/S. Randall Hood

S. Randall Hood, SC Bar No. 65360
Chad A. McGowan, SC Bar No. 9943
1539 Health Care Drive
Rock Hill, SC 29732
Phone: (803) 327-7800
Facsimile: (803) 324-1483
rhoor@mogowanhood.com
cmogowan@mogowanhood.com

February 12, 2025
Rock Hill, South Carolina