

Exhibit C

Letter from P. Webster
dated October 3, 2011



2600 WEST BIG BEAVER ROAD, SUITE 300
TROY, MI 48064-3312
TELEPHONE: (248) 433-7200
FACSIMILE: (248) 433-7274
<http://www.dickinsonwright.com>

PETER H. WEBSTER
PWebster@dickinsonwright.com
(248) 433-7513

October 3, 2011

Via E-mail and First Class Mail

Richard H. Bernstein, Esq.
The Sam Bernstein Law Firm
31731 Northwestern Hwy., Ste. 333
Farmington Hills, MI 48334

**RE: Angelo Binno v. American Bar Association
Case No. 2:11-cv-12247 (E.D. Mich.)**

Dear Mr. Bernstein:

As we discussed during our phone conversation on Tuesday afternoon, Defendant respectfully disagrees that Plaintiff's LSAT scores and the comparative percentile rankings of applicants who took the same tests under standard testing conditions is irrelevant information or that it was offered for an improper purpose. However, because these facts are not essential for Defendant to prevail on its Motion to Dismiss or, Alternatively, Motion for Summary Judgment, Defendant agrees to strike the following bolded portion of the referenced sentence from its brief: "Plaintiff admittedly scored 133 and 136 out of 180 on the LSAT, **which would place his performance in the bottom 4th and 7th percentile, respectively, of all applicants who took the LSAT under standard testing conditions from June 2008 to February 2011.**" (Dkt. Entry #17, pg. 3, n. 1). I think that this will alleviate one aspect of your motion.


During our phone conversation, we did not discuss Plaintiff's additional objections to the Affidavit of Hulett H. Askew. As I mentioned to you, I had not read Plaintiff's Proposed Motion to Strike at the time of our conversation, and so I was not aware of this aspect of Plaintiff's motion when we spoke. Defendant cannot agree to strike the challenged statements in Mr. Askew's affidavit because Plaintiff's objections to those statements are without merit. Plaintiff's objection that the "Standards themselves are the best evidence" does not make Mr. Askew's testimony regarding the Standards inadmissible. Plaintiff also fails to explain how Mr. Askew's statements are inadmissible hearsay. It appears that Plaintiff's hearsay objection largely mirrors his objection and claim that Mr. Askew's statements are not based on personal knowledge. But Mr. Askew clearly attested that "[t]he information contained in this affidavit is based on my personal knowledge." He further attested that he is familiar with the Standards for Approval of Law Schools issued by the ABA Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions because of his duties as Consultant on Legal Education for the ABA. Mr. Askew's title of "Consultant" should not be read as connoting a limited transitory role with the ABA; Mr. Askew

Richard H. Bernstein, Esq.
October 3, 2011
Page 2

is one of the most knowledgeable persons on ABA accreditation matters. Plaintiff's objections seem to challenge the weight to be given to Mr. Askew's statements, not their admissibility.

Please call me to discuss. It seems that with regard to one aspect of your proposed motion we could reach an accord, and perhaps with additional dialogue, we could reach an understanding as to the second and avoid court involvement. I look forward to speaking with you soon. Thank you.

Very truly yours,



Peter H. Webster

PHW:AAM

cc: David R. Deromedi
Allyson A. Miller