

Stephen Novack
snovack@novackmacey.com

August 18, 2010

BY ELECTRONIC FILING AND MESSENGER

The Honorable Virginia Kendall
United States District Court
Northern District of Illinois
Eastern Division
219 South Dearborn Street
Room 2319
Chicago, IL 60604

**Re: *David Grochocinski v. Mayer Brown
Rowe & Maw LLP, et al. – Case No. 06 C 5486***

Dear Judge Kendall:

Regrettably, we must write again to clarify an issue raised in Mr. Spehar's repeated correspondence to the Court -- this time, his most recent letter dated August 13, 2010. That letter attached an August 11, 2010 Order in which Judge Squires noted the irony of the current litigation between Mr. Spehar and the Trustee given their past history of teaming together to pursue this malpractice case against Mayer Brown. Mr. Spehar incorrectly asserts that Judge Squires' comment demonstrates that Mr. Spehar was not the Trustee's "puppetmaster" and that the Trustee did not represent his interests in this case.

Contrary to Mr. Spehar's assertion, Judge Squires' comment has absolutely no bearing on the prior findings of this Court or its decision to grant Defendants' summary judgment motion. This Court's prior findings and ruling were based on, among other things: (a) the relationship between Mr. Spehar and the Trustee before the malpractice case was filed; (b) the Trustee's failure to take any action to vacate the Default Judgment obtained by Spehar; and (c) the lack of any pre-filing investigation by the Trustee. All of these events happened before this malpractice case was filed, before the litigation before Judge Squires began, and before the relationship between Mr. Spehar and the Trustee later became adversarial.

The Honorable Virginia Kendall
August 18, 2010
Page 2

In short, Judge Squires' comment about the irony of what happened long after this malpractice case was filed has nothing to do with this Court's findings and ruling, which were based on what happened (or did not happen) before this malpractice case was filed. To use an analogy, a conspiracy is still a conspiracy even if the conspirators later have a falling out.

Accordingly, contrary to Mr. Spehar's assertion, Judge Squires' decision is irrelevant to any of the issues currently pending before this Court.

Respectfully,

/s/ Stephen Novack
Stephen Novack
One of the Attorneys for Defendants

cc: Counsel of Record (*via electronic filing*)
R. Gerard Spehar (*via First Class Mail*)