CONFESSION, COUNSELLING AND CONFIDENTIALITY: MANAGING LEGAL RISK FOR RELIGIOUS LEADERS

JULY 2026



Oladiran Falore
Managing Partner



Adaora Obi-Dike
Associate Counsel

Introduction

Confession, counselling and confidentiality are central to the work of many clergy and other religious leaders. In the course of providing spiritual guidance, they frequently receive highly sensitive information relating to an individual's personal life, family relationships, financial affairs and, on occasion, criminal conduct. Such disclosures are ordinarily made in the expectation that they will remain confidential, reflecting both religious doctrine and the trust that underpins the relationship between a religious leader and a congregant or adherent.

The legal position, however, is often more complex. While many faith traditions recognise an obligation of confidentiality, the extent to which that obligation is protected by law varies across jurisdictions. In an era of heightened regulatory scrutiny, clergy must navigate competing obligations arising from safeguarding laws, mandatory reporting requirements, data protection legislation, criminal investigations and civil liability. Circumstances may therefore arise in which preserving confidentiality conflicts with a legal duty to disclose information.

For clergy and religious organisations, the consequences of getting this balance wrong can be significant. A failure to maintain confidentiality where the law requires it may expose religious institutions to claims for breach of confidence, privacy or data protection obligations. Conversely, withholding information in circumstances where disclosure is required may result in criminal, regulatory or civil consequences.

This article examines the legal risks that arise in relation to confession, pastoral counselling and confidentiality. It considers the extent to which communications between clergy and congregants are protected, the circumstances in which confidentiality may lawfully be overridden, and the practical steps that religious organisations can take to reduce legal risk while maintaining the integrity of pastoral ministry.

The Origin of Clergy–Penitent Privilege

One of the oldest legal doctrines associated with religious practice is the clergy–penitent privilege, sometimes referred to simply as the clergy privilege. Broadly speaking, it is an evidentiary rule that protects certain confidential communications made to a member of the clergy or other recognised religious leader in the course of spiritual counselling or confession from being disclosed in legal proceedings. The privilege exists to encourage individuals to seek spiritual guidance without fear that their disclosures will later be compelled as evidence before a court.

The concept has its origins in the practices of the early Christian Church and became firmly established within the Roman Catholic tradition through the Sacrament of Penance (also known as the Sacrament of Reconciliation or Confession). Under canon law, a penitent confesses sins to a priest in confidence, receives spiritual guidance and absolution where appropriate, and performs the prescribed penance. Central to this sacrament is the Seal of Confession, an absolute obligation of secrecy prohibiting the priest from disclosing anything revealed during confession, regardless of the circumstances. A breach of the seal constitutes one of the gravest offences under Catholic canon law.

The legal recognition of confidential religious communications developed differently across jurisdictions. Although the principle influenced legal thinking, English common law has historically been reluctant to recognise a general clergy–penitent privilege comparable to legal professional privilege. By contrast, many jurisdictions, particularly the United States, Canada and parts of Europe, now recognise some form of clergy–penitent privilege through legislation or rules of evidence, although its scope and the circumstances in which it may be overridden vary considerably.

The absence of a uniform approach illustrates an important distinction between religious confidentiality and legal privilege. While many faith traditions impose a moral or religious obligation of confidentiality upon religious leaders, the extent to which that confidentiality is recognised and protected by civil law ultimately depends on the legal framework of the relevant jurisdiction

Legal Basis for The Privilege

Unlike legal professional privilege, the clergy–penitent privilege is not recognised uniformly across jurisdictions. Its existence, scope and limitations depend largely on the constitutional, statutory and evidentiary framework of the relevant legal system.

United States

The United States affords some of the strongest legal protection to confidential communications between religious leaders and congregants. Although the privilege is not expressly provided for in the United States Constitution, it is generally recognised under state legislation, state rules of evidence and the federal common law of privileges developed pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 501.

The constitutional foundation for the privilege is often traced to the First Amendment, which guarantees the free exercise of religion and prohibits governmental interference with religious practice. These constitutional protections have influenced the development of evidentiary rules that enable individuals to seek spiritual guidance and make confidential religious disclosures without fear that such communications will ordinarily be compelled in legal proceedings.

Generally, the privilege applies where:
• the communication is made to a recognised member of the clergy or other authorised religious leader;
• it is intended to be confidential;
• it is made in the course of the religious leader's professional or spiritual functions; and
• it is made for the purpose of confession, spiritual counselling or religious guidance.
The underlying rationale is one of public policy. The law recognises that society benefits when individuals are able to seek spiritual advice in confidence and that compelling disclosure may undermine the free exercise of religion and the effectiveness of religious ministry.

Australia and Canada
Common law jurisdictions have adopted a more restrained approach.
In Australia, the recognition of clergy privilege varies between jurisdictions and has increasingly been qualified by mandatory reporting obligations relating to child sexual abuse. Several States and Territories have enacted legislation requiring members of the clergy to report certain offences against children, including information obtained during confession in some circumstances. These reforms reflect an increasing legislative emphasis on safeguarding vulnerable persons over maintaining absolute confidentiality.

Canada similarly does not recognise a universal statutory clergy privilege. Instead, courts generally determine claims of privilege on a case-by-case basis by applying the Wigmore criteria, established by the Supreme Court of Canada in *R. v. Gruenke*. Under this approach, confidentiality will only be protected where the public interest in preserving the communication outweighs the public interest in the administration of justice. However, this privilege has been restricted in cases of child abuse, requiring clergy to report even confessional disclosures.

These developments illustrate a broader international trend towards balancing religious confidentiality against competing public interests, particularly the protection of children and the investigation of serious crime.

Nigeria
Nigeria adopts a markedly different approach. Although the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 (as amended) guarantees the right to privacy and protects freedom of thought, conscience and religion, it does not expressly recognise a clergy–penitent privilege. These constitutional protections provide an important foundation for confidential religious practice but stop short of creating an evidentiary privilege capable of preventing disclosure in judicial proceedings.

Similarly, while the Evidence Act 2011 recognises several forms of privileged communication, including legal professional privilege, it contains no equivalent protection for confidential communications made to clergy or other religious leaders. Consequently, unlike legal practitioners, members of the clergy have no statutory basis upon which to resist a court order requiring disclosure of information obtained during confession or religious counselling.

This legislative omission has attracted academic criticism. Oraegbunam, for example, argues that the absence of statutory protection places clergy in an invidious position by exposing them to competing obligations, compliance with a court order may require them to violate religious duties of confidentiality, while refusing to disclose may expose them to contempt proceedings.

It is also noteworthy that the provisions of the Evidence Act relating to confessional statements are directed primarily at confessions made to law enforcement authorities during criminal investigations. Likewise, the Administration of Criminal Justice Act 2015 regulates the admissibility of confessional statements obtained in the course of criminal investigations and prosecutions. Neither statute addresses confidential religious confessions or spiritual counselling.

The practical consequence is that Nigerian law recognises the importance of religious freedom and personal privacy but provides no express evidentiary privilege protecting confidential communications between clergy and congregants. Religious leaders may therefore find themselves caught between their religious obligation to preserve confidentiality and a legal obligation to disclose information where required by law.

Balancing Confidentiality and Legal Compliance

The absence of a statutory clergy–penitent privilege in Nigeria does not diminish the importance of confidentiality in religious practice. Rather, it underscores the need for religious leaders and faith-based organisations to exercise greater caution in managing confidential communications. As legislative and regulatory frameworks continue to evolve, particularly in areas such as child protection, criminal justice and data protection, religious organisations must ensure that their internal practices are aligned with applicable legal requirements without compromising the integrity of their religious obligations.

To mitigate legal and operational risks, religious organisations should adopt clear governance frameworks governing confessions, counselling and other confidential communications. Such frameworks should address record management, confidentiality obligations, safeguarding procedures, mandatory reporting requirements where applicable, and the circumstances under which legal advice should be sought before information is disclosed or withheld. Regular legal and compliance training for clergy and other religious leaders is equally essential to ensure that those entrusted with confidential information understand both their religious duties and their legal responsibilities.

In practice, situations involving allegations of abuse, threats to life or public safety, or suspected criminal conduct often require careful legal assessment. Religious leaders should therefore avoid making disclosure decisions based solely on ecclesiastical considerations where the law may impose competing obligations. Obtaining timely legal advice in such circumstances may assist in reconciling religious duties with statutory and common law obligations while minimising the risk of criminal liability, civil claims or regulatory sanctions.

Ultimately, confidentiality remains a cornerstone of religious ministry. However, in contemporary legal systems, it is no longer viewed as an absolute obligation but as one that must be exercised within the limits prescribed by law. Religious organisations that proactively strengthen their governance, compliance and safeguarding frameworks will be better positioned to preserve the trust reposed in them by congregants while fulfilling their legal obligations and promoting the wider public interest

Conclusion

Confession, counselling and confidentiality remain fundamental aspects of religious practice, fostering trust and enabling individuals to seek spiritual guidance in confidence. However, evolving legal standards on safeguarding, accountability and the administration of justice mean that confidential religious communications are no longer insulated from legal scrutiny. As this article has demonstrated, the extent of legal protection afforded to such communications varies considerably across jurisdictions.

In Nigeria, although the Constitution guarantees the rights to privacy and freedom of religion, the absence of an express clergy–penitent privilege under the Evidence Act 2011 leaves members of the clergy and other religious leaders without clear statutory protection where confidential communications become the subject of judicial proceedings. This creates the potential for conflict between religious obligations and legal duties.

Religious organisations should therefore strengthen their governance frameworks by adopting clear policies on confidentiality, safeguarding and legal compliance, while ensuring that religious leaders receive appropriate legal training. At the same time, there is a compelling case for legislative consideration of confidential religious communications in Nigeria to provide greater legal certainty while preserving appropriate exceptions in the interests of public safety, child protection and the administration of justice.

Ultimately, preserving public confidence in religious institutions requires a careful balance between protecting the sanctity of confidential religious communications and ensuring compliance with the law. Achieving that balance will remain an important legal and policy consideration as Nigeria's legal framework continues to evolve.

References

• The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999 as amended
• The Evidence Act, 2011 as amended
• The Administration of Criminal Justice Act, 2015
• Donze, C. *Breaking the Seal of Confession: Examining the Constitutionality of the Clergy-Penitent Privilege in Mandatory Reporting Law*.
• Onoja, E. O. *The Relationship between the Constitutional Right to Silence and Confessions in Nigeria*, African Journal of Legal Studies.
• Hammar, R. R. *The Clergy–Penitent Privilege in General*.
• Hammar, R. R. *The Clergy–Penitent Privilege and Consent to Disclosure*.
• First Amendment Encyclopedia. *Priest–Penitent Privilege*.
• Fleming, D., Keenan, J., & Zollner, H. (2023). Doing Theology and Theological Ethics in the Face of the Abuse Crisis. *Journal of Moral Theology*, *3*(1).
• O'Brien, P. M. (2020). Transparency as a means to rebuild trust within the Church: a case study in how Catholic dioceses and eparchies in the United States have responded to the clergy sex abuse crisis. *Church, Communication and Culture*, *5*(3), 456–483.
• Oraegbunam, I. K. E. (2010). *The Seal of Confession and the Nigerian Law of Evidence: A Case for Reform*. Nnamdi Azikiwe University Journal of International Law and Jurisprudence.
• *R. v. Gruenke*, [1991] 3 S.C.R. 263

Disclaimer

The information provided in this publication does not, and is not intended to constitute legal advice. It is intended for general informational purposes only. Please see contact details below for further information.

© 2026 - Syntegral Legal Practice

info@syntegrallp.com | @syntegral_lp | www.syntegrallp.com