NAME: DATE OF BIRTH:	Fr. Martin Cingle January 14, 1947
STATUS:	Suspended
ORDINATION:	May 5, 1973
<u>ASSIGNMENTS</u> :	
05/1973-05/1978	Our Mother of Sorrows, Johnstown, PA
.05/1978-06/1981	Our Lady of Victory, State College, PA
06/1981-02/1986	Holy Name Church, Ebensburg, PA
02/1986-04/1987	St. Mary Immaculate Conception, Altoona, PA
04/1987-08/1988	Most Holy Redeemer, Revloc, PA
08/1988-06/1992	Saints Cyril & Methodius, Windber, PA
06/1992-04/1993	St. John the Evangelist, Altoona, PA
04/1993-0619/95	St. Matthew Church, Tyrone, PA
06/1995-07/2000	Visitation of the Blessed Virgin, Johnstown, PA
*07/24/2002	Saint Luke's Institute
07/2000-10/2015	St. Francis of Assisi, Johnstown, PA
40404	

In 1979, Martin Cingle groped the genitals of a child while sleeping next to the child on a cot in his underwear. Cingle stopped fondling the boy's penis when the boy awoke and struck him. Father Cingle met his 15-year-old victim when the boy served as an altar boy at Our Lady of Victory in State College, Pennsylvania. This child had felt a very close relationship to Father Cingle and looked to him as an older brother and trusted friend. Father Cingle's actions were a profound violation of that trust.

Removed from active ministry due to OAG investigation

10/2015

Years later, and after undergoing counseling, the victim met with Bishop Joseph Adamec on June 24, 2002. The victim explained what occurred to Bishop Adamec who vowed to take action.

Records from the Diocese show that on July 2, 2002, Bishop Joseph Adamec met with Father Cingle. The notes indicate that Cingle stated he could not remember any action that would cause the allegation but did remember traveling with the child and the child striking him. The Bishop sent Cingle to treatment which concluded on August 3, 2002 that "there is no evidence of psychopathology in the psychological data" but noted "repression is not a viable explanation for Father not remembering." The report also noted that nothing in "Father's history" which would be consistent with "attempting to initiate sexual relations with a man." Following "treatment" Father Martin Cingle returned to fulltime ministry within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown.

Bishop Adamec requested that the victim provide a written account of what had occurred to him. The matter was closed on June 24, 2003 when the victim did not provide the Bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown with a written statement that he was molested as a child by Father Martin Cingle, a Roman Catholic Priest in the Diocese of Altoona Johnstown.

On September 15, 2015 Martin Cingle was called by the Grand Jury to account for his actions. Cingle stated he was currently pastoring at two parishes and teaching at three worship centers in the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. Cingle initially indicated he could not recall what occurred with that child back in 1979. The following exchange occurred:

Mr. Dye: Were you involved—the young man you were with at the time, do you recall his name?

Fr. Cingle: Yes.

Mr. Dye: What was his name?

Fr. Cingle: (REDACTED)

Mr. Dye: (REDACTED) was the young man, and this was approximately 1980?

Fr. Cingle: Yes.

Mr. Dye: And why were you sleeping in the same room again? Where were you at?

Fr. Cingle: We were out on the porch, screened-in porch area.

Mr. Dye: Of?

Fr. Cingle: Of his -I believe his aunt's house.

Mr. Dye: Why were you staying there with him?

Fr. Cingle: We were — we only spent one night there. Well, we were on vaca — he went on — I took him on vacation to his relatives', to his grandmother and her great grandmother is what it was, and then for Mass.

Mr. Dye: Okay. Is it your habit to take 16-year-old boys on trips?

Fr. Cingle: No.

Mr. Dye: Why did you take this individual boy on a trip?

Fr. Cingle: Well, he asked and his mother said it was okay.

Mr. Dye: Is it your habit to sleep with a 16-year-old boys in briefs and a t-shirt or sleep near a 16-year-old boy in briefs and a t-shirt?

Fr. Cingle: Well, I didn't have no – we weren't—we were staying over his grandmother's. That's where my clothes were.

Mr. Dye: Okay.

Fr. Cingle: My pajamas and things like that.

Mr. Dye: This individual, you obviously had a positive relationship with him to offer, you know---

Fr. Cingle: Well, yeah, we did, yeah, you could say.

Mr. Dye: What was the nature of this relationship that you would take him on a trip? I mean, obviously there's some closeness there.

Fr. Cingle: Oh, we used to go hunting together. Fishing.

Mr. Dye: Okay.

Fr. Cingle: And go over his house, you know, watch—

Mr. Dye: This is somebody that you spent time with then?

Fr. Cingle: Yeah, I spent some time with him and his mom.

Mr. Dye: What would you watch? I guess you would watch television, I assume?

Fr. Cingle: Well, yeah, with his mother. H—well, they had HBO and so I guess way back then in the---

Mr. Dye: And whenever you would--- let me ask you this. Again, this sounds very positive. It sounds like even now this was a very positive relationship and you think fondly of this person?

Fr. Cingle: I don't have nothing against him, no.

Mr. Dye: Why would this person lie?

Fr. Cingle: I—I can't answer that question.

Mr. Dye: Why would this person say that they were touched if they weren't touched?

Fr. Cingle: I can't answer that question. I don't know.

Mr. Dye: In terms of the relationship after the allegation was made, did you stay in contact with this individual?

Fr. Cingle: Not really, no.

Mr. Dye: Is it "no" or "not really"?

Fr. Cingle: Well, no. I would say no, because I don't think he wanted anything to do with me.

" (After 16 of the proposition of the proposition of the

Mr. Dye: Okay.

Fr. Cingle: Of course, he did stop to talk to me in the sacristy sometimes after Mass and talk to me, but that was it. I never went back to the house.

Mr. Dye: I mean, it sounds to me like at least from a 16-year-old boy's perspective he felt he had a positive relationship – that he had built a meaningful relationship with you of some kind.

Fr. Cingle: Yeah.

Mr. Dye: And so it there --- follow me here. If you can't think of any reason he would lie, it's a positive relationship of which this child is getting much benefit, you're taking him places, you're doing things with him, you're spending time with him, it would seem to me that what he alleged happened did happen. Would you disagree with me?

Fr. Cingle: I cannot disagree with you.

Mr. Dye: You cannot disagree with me. Because it did happen, correct?

Fr. Cingle: I don't remember.

Mr. Dye: Sir---

Fr. Cingle: I'm sorry. I'm serious.

Mr. Dye: Okay, let me finish my question. You are under oath?

Fr. Cingle: Yes.

Mr. Dye: You have counsel. (Present in the Grand Jury Chambers)

Fr. Cingle: Right.

Mr. Dye: This is many, many years ago.

Fr. Cingle: Right.

Mr. Dye: Perjury today is not many, many years ago.

Fr. Cingle: I know. I understand.

Mr. Dye: Perjury today is very chargeable.

Fr Cingle: Right.

Mr. Dye: So I want to be absolutely clear on this. I'm going to ask you with a chance to correct any misstatements you may have made thus far, did you touch this 16-year-old's genitals?

Fr. Cingle: If I did this way (indicating), yes, I did.

Father Cingle attempted to clarify by gesturing with his arm straight up into the air then curving back down.

The Grand Jury was appalled to hear Father Cingle's attempt obfuscate by saying that he could have accidentally fondled the penis of a 16-year-old boy while he was sleeping. The Grand Jury took note that throughout his testimony Cingle made it very clear he was lying on a cot in his underwear and a t-shirt three inches away from a 16-year-old boy in his underwear and a t-shirt. Cingle went on to clarify that he had explained this version of events to Bishop Adamec as he had to the Grand Jury.

That same day, Deputy Attorney General Daniel J. Dye dispatched a letter to the current Bishop of the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown stating "Bishop, you are certainly aware of the nature of our ongoing investigation. Please remove Father Martin Cingle from active ministry. Father Cingle should not be in contact with minors." Bishop Bartchak acted upon that letter and suspended Cingle from ministry pending an investigation.

Bishop Joseph Adamec was asked if Father Cingle ever explained his version of events to the Bishop. The Grand Jury notes that Adamec stated that Cingle had told him it was somehow an "accidental" fondling of a minor. Adamec made the exact same gesture to demonstrate for the agents as Cingle had made when testifying before the Grand Jury.

The Grand Jury concludes that Cingle's clearly incriminating statement to Adamec that he had accidentally fondled a partially undressed child, whom he was sleeping next to while partially undressed himself, warranted Cingle's removal at that time. The Grand Jury is left to wonder why the account that both Adamec and Cingle recalled does not appear in diocesan records. Moreover, why Cingle was left in ministry until the current Bishop responded to the Deputy Attorney General's request. We must conclude this is yet another example of the Bishop's reliance on self-reporting to treatment centers which render conclusions upon a paucity of evidence and a desire to

avoid scandalizing the Diocese on his watch. Bishop Joseph Adamec never reported Cingle's conduct or his admission to law enforcement.