

LEVITON LAW GROUP, A P.C.

Stuart L. Leviton, Esq.

TELEPHONE (213) 402 - 4576

FACSIMILE (213) 559 - 0572

sleviton@levitonlawgroup.com

Los Angeles Office
515 S. Figueroa St.
Suite 1110
Los Angeles, CA 90071

Palm Springs Office
777 E. Tahquitz Canyon Way
Suite 200-136
Palm Springs, CA 92262

November 27, 2018

Dear Mr. Gochin:

I have been a civil attorney for 25 years. After completing my undergraduate studies at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, I graduated with honors from the University of Texas at Austin School of Law, attaining the degree of Doctor of Jurisprudence. In the United States, I am a member in good standing of the Bars of the United States Supreme Court and the California Supreme Court, among others.

You have requested my professional opinion as to the meaning of the letter from the Committee of the Judiciary dated January 13, 1975, addressed to Mr. Gecys, signed by Joshua Eilberg (the "1975 Letter"). In short, the 1975 Letter has little, if any, meaning today, and should not be relied upon to draw any conclusions regarding Messers. Brazaitis and Slepety's.

The 1975 Letter may well have been a true recitation of a fact in 1975, namely that the subject Committee did not find sufficient evidence from which to draw adverse conclusions regarding these men. Critically, a lack of evidence does not mean, however, that someone is not guilty of wrongdoing; rather, a lack of evidence simply means that as of a certain date, wrongdoing cannot be proven by the applicable standard of proof.

If, subsequent to the issuance of the 1975 Letter, evidence of wrongdoing has been discovered, such evidence must be evaluated and considered and given appropriate weight. It would be and is improper to ignore relevant evidence that may have been discovered after the issuance of the 1975 Letter.

Moreover, regardless of whether subsequently discovered evidence could be used in a court of law, your fundamental concern is about setting the record straight and ensuring, to the extent possible, that truth prevails. To the extent there is subsequently discovered evidence of wrongdoing, it must be considered, and the 1975 Letter in no way changes this outcome.

Anyone who is relying on the 1975 Letter to conclude that these men did not engage in wrongdoing is misusing the 1975 Letter. As noted above, at most, the 1975 Letter documents a lack of evidence in 1975, and says nothing about any evidence that may have been discovered over the next 40+ years.

Sincerely,

LEVITON LAW GROUP, A P.C.

Stuart L. Leviton

Stuart L. Leviton