



Forensic Intelligence International, LLC

the Kauth house, 318 Cooper Avenue, Hancock, Michigan 49930

151 Moore Street SE, Crawfordville, Georgia 30631

Tel. 906-370-9993 (MI), 706-456-2696 (GA), 706-294-9993 (cellular)

Fax & Voice Mail 603-452-8208 | E-mail: sdresch@forensic-intelligence.org

Monday, August 5, 2002

Allen Welch, First Assistant General Counsel
Oklahoma Bar Association
P.O. Box 53036
Oklahoma City, OK 73152-3036

Re: Grievance against Jay M. Galt, IC 02-717

Dear Mr. Welch:

I am in receipt of your letter of September 12, 2002, concerning the above-referenced matter and am puzzled by two statements which you make.

· “[I]t is our opinion that we are not in a position *to resolve this matter for you.*” [Italics added.] I do not believe that I requested that any matter *be resolved for me [on my behalf]*. Rather, I was calling to the attention of the Oklahoma Bar Association the evident violation by an Oklahoma attorney of the Oklahoma Rules of Professional Conduct, the enforcement of which is the responsibility of the General Counsel of the Association.

· “Although the conduct of an attorney may seem inappropriate to you, it may not necessarily constitute a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct.” This statement impresses me as a nonsequiter. First, I expressed no personal opinion of the appropriateness (or inappropriateness) of Mr. Galt’s conduct. I simply pointed out that Mr. Galt appears to have violated the Oklahoma Rules of Professional Conduct.

Second, on the substance of the matter, I identified (a) a specific rule [3.3 (a) “A lawyer shall not knowingly: (1) make a false statement of fact or law to a tribunal”] which I believe was violated, (b) Mr. Galt’s action which constituted a violation of this rule [the filing with the Oklahoma Corporation Commission in Cause PUD No. 98000188 of his letter of May 28, 2002, to Michael McAdams, in which he made the statement, “I was never associated with Bill Anderson on either a professional or personal basis”], and (c) evidence that Mr. Galt’s statement was false [summarizing and placing in context an entry in a document (**CHRONOLOGY; 194A-463**) of the Federal Bureau of Investigation which states: “1/8 or 1/9/89 **JAY GALT** gives **ANTHONY** \$1000 & list of names from **ANDERSON**. Per Anthony 2/19/92”].

In reaching your decision to “take no further action in this matter at this time,” did you conclude that (a) I had misstated or misinterpreted the rule quoted in (a), above, (b) I had misstated or misinterpreted Mr. Galt’s statement in his filing before the Commission, quoted in (b), above, which, if false, would constitute a violation of the rule quoted in (a), above, or (c) the evidence, summarized in (c), above, would not support the conclusion that Mr. Galt’s statement, quoted in (b), above, was false, or (d) there exist compelling reasons to take no further action despite the apparent violation of the Oklahoma Rules of Professional Conduct?

I will appreciate your explicated response to the four prongs of the preceding question.

Sincerely,

Stephen P. Dresch, Ph.D.