

**Yale-New Haven  
Hospital**

20 York Street, New Haven, CT 06504

March 17, 1993

Child Sexual Abuse Clinic Evaluation of [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] was referred to the Child Sexual Abuse Clinic of Yale-New Haven Hospital in September 1992. The referral was made by the Connecticut State Police at a meeting of the Police (Beatrice Farlekas and John Mucherino), State's Attorney Frank Maco, and members of the Child Sexual Abuse Team. At that meeting, the history that the police had at the time was briefly presented, and the videotape (taken by Ms. [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] telling what had reportedly happened to her was reviewed. Two major questions that were posed in the referral were:

Is [REDACTED] telling the truth, and did we think that she was sexually abused?

To determine the meaning of [REDACTED] statements and whether they were true, we interviewed her on nine occasions. In addition, because the family context and [REDACTED] past psychiatric history are important in understanding the meaning of her statements, we met with both of her parents, two babysitters, and two psychotherapists who had evaluated and treated [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

The chronology of our evaluation is outlined below:

- 9/08/92 - Meeting with State Police and State's Attorney Maco for presentation of case.
- 9/15/92 - Meeting of Ms. Sawyer and Detective John Mucherino to present more details of the information known by the police.
- 9/18/92, 9/25, 10/2, 10/9, 10/16, 10/23, 10/30, 11/6, 11/13 - Interviews of [REDACTED] alone and interviews with Ms. [REDACTED] alone by Ms. Sawyer and Dr. Hamilton.
- 10/14/92 - Interview of babysitter, Kristie Groteke by Ms. Sawyer and Dr. Hamilton.
- 11/17/92, 11/30/92, 1/7/93 - Interviews of Mr. Woody Allen by Ms. Sawyer, Dr. Hamilton, and Dr. Leventhal.
- 12/04/92 - Interview of Ms. [REDACTED] by Ms. Sawyer, Dr. Hamilton, and Dr. Leventhal (videotape reviewed with Ms. [REDACTED]).

In summary, [REDACTED] presented as an intelligent, verbal 7-year-old whose story telling was quite elaborate and fantasy-like at times and who manifested loose associations in her thinking. She appeared confused about what to relate to the interviewers and was very controlling of what she would say. In her statements and her play she elaborated interrelated themes. She was upset by the loss of her father and [REDACTED] and worried that her father might take her from her mother's care. She felt protective of and worried for her mother. [REDACTED] was very much attuned to her mother's pain, and her mother reinforced [REDACTED] losses and her negative view of her father.

Assessment of Whether [REDACTED] was Sexually Abused:

It is our expert opinion that [REDACTED] was not sexually abused by Mr. Allen. Further, we believe that [REDACTED] statements on videotape and her statements to us during our evaluation do not refer to actual events that occurred to her on August 4, 1992. Our initial impression was formulated in December 1992 before reviewing any outside materials and before meeting with anyone outside the family except the Connecticut State Police and Kristie Groteke, a babysitter. Our opinion was reinforced by the additional information that we gathered throughout the rest of the evaluation.

In developing our opinion, we considered three hypotheses to explain [REDACTED] statements. First, that [REDACTED] statements were true and that Mr. Allen had sexually abused her; second, that [REDACTED] statements were not true but were made up by an emotionally vulnerable child who was caught up in a disturbed family and who was responding to the stresses in the family; and third, that [REDACTED] was coached or influenced by her mother, Ms [REDACTED]

While we can conclude that [REDACTED] was not sexually abused, we can not be definitive about whether the second formulation by itself or the third formulation by itself is true. We believe that it is more likely that a combination of these two formulations best explains [REDACTED] allegations of sexual abuse. The major reasons for our opinion that [REDACTED] was not sexually abused are the following:

- (1) There were important inconsistencies in [REDACTED] statements in the videotape and in her statements to us.
- (2) She appeared to struggle with how to tell about the touching.
- (3) She told the story in a manner that was overly thoughtful and controlling. There was no spontaneity in her statements, and a rehearsed quality was suggested in how she spoke.
- (4) Her descriptions of the details surrounding the alleged events were unusual and were inconsistent.