

May 26, 2020

OFFICE OF THE DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL 4000 S SHERWOOD FOREST BLVD STE 607 BATON ROUGE LA 70816

## Dear Members of the Counsel:

Please accept this letter as my formal appeal of the decision you reached regarding my complaint against attorney Robin Anne Sylvester which you have identified internally as ODC File # 0037659. Pursuant to your letter to me dated April 30, 2020, I have thirty (30) days from that date to file an appeal, which is what I am doing via this letter.

In your letter of dismissal to me, you state that my complaint does not rise to the level of "clear and convincing" evidence of unethical behavior and/or actions on Ms. Sylvester's part.

Was my audio recording to you of late September 2018 wherein Ms. Sylvester was so emphatic that my cause of action against GOHSEP was so strong that she would state, "GOHSEP just needs to say, 'Billy's entitled to this money' (which she computed to be approximately \$850,000)," only for her to approximately three weeks later express apprehension (also supplied to you via audio file) about, "going up against Rusty Stutes, Kelly Fontenot and crooked judges," not clear and convincing? To refresh your memory, you can hear Sylvester make her emphatic statements about the strength of my cause of action against GOHSEP at <a href="https://youtu.be/u3H6U-F8imo">https://youtu.be/u3H6U-F8imo</a>, and you can hear her utter her apprehension about "crooked judges" at <a href="https://youtu.be/a4zulHLkPIY">https://youtu.be/a4zulHLkPIY</a>.

Was her signing a contingency contract with me based upon material I submitted to her that was withheld by the defendants in my litigation in 14<sup>th</sup> JDC only to then totally wimp out after running out the clock for me to



utilize the services of another attorney to file such a claim not "clear and convincing?" Did you even question her on why she permitted this to transpire and if she in fact was not merely assisting prospective defendants by intentionally running out the prescription clock on my ability to file a cause of action against GOHSEP?

Regarding the preceding paragraph, I have provided you with evidence that I subpoenaed both Ms. Sylvester and Attorney General Jeff Landry who, at the time, was serving as my personal attorney and who did not hold any political office either at the time he represented me or at the time I subpoenaed him, so I could question them both under oath regarding whether or not they received the damning emails sent by Kelly Fontenot and other damning material during their discovery efforts. I subpoenaed Attorney General Jeff Landry after he declined to produce an affidavit regarding what documents defendants produced and did not produce during discovery. Mr. Landry said to me, "Subpoena me. I cannot lie under oath." Then, when I did subpoena both he and Ms. Sylvester, neither of them would honor the subpoena! Did you folk delve into their disregard of my subpoenas? Are we average, every day, non attorneys permitted to show such reckless disregard for court-issued subpoenas?

If, Ms. Sylvester and Mr. Landry did in fact receive the damning documents as part of discover in my original litigation, yet they failed to utilize those damning documents to thwart a Motion for Summary Judgment, then in my opinion, that constitutes incompetence of the highest order and clearly forms the basis for me filing a claim against Ms. Sylvester's malpractice policy. As you are aware, prior to filing my complaint with your office, I sought Ms. Sylvester's malpractice carrier and policy number, which she continues to decline to provide. In your correspondence to me, you did not in any way address Ms. Sylvester's steadfast refusal to provide the requested information nor indicate whether she has the right to decline to do so.

You have been provided with courtroom testimony that Mr. Landry and Ms. Sylvester filed an "illegal lien" against the Gravity Drainage District in order to try and collect the money due me. The end result was that I was slapped with a judgment against me totaling a staggering amount of money for the filing of this "illegal lien" which I had nothing to do with but rather it was my attorneys who filed the lien. There again, I firmly believe that the filing of an "illegal lien" against a governmental entity constitutes incompetency of the highest order and is yet another foundation for the basis of my contention that I have a perfectly valid claim against Ms. Sylvester's malpractice insurance policy.



Was Ms. Sylvester's apprehension over having media coverage (specifically video blogger Robert Burns' *Sound Off Louisiana*) of any hearing entailing my case not "clear and convincing?" Did you even question her regarding why she had such incredible hostility toward me entailing media coverage? Should you need to refresh your memory on that hostility, you may do so at the following link: <a href="https://youtu.be/zoz\_YXf7tw">https://youtu.be/zoz\_YXf7tw</a>. I want to emphasize to you that, as evidenced on that short audio file link, Ms. Sylvester went so far as to say, "I'm not going to go," if video blogger Robert Burns "is there."

Did you make the one simple inquiry I asked of you to make and obtain an answer entailing why, at the conclusion of a late-September of 2018 meeting with me, Ms. Sylvester indicated that she was going to set up a meeting with GOHSEP the following week, yet she failed to follow through? That was the **one single item** I asked for you to get resolved for me, yet after 416 days of having my complaint in your office, your correspondence back to me references absolutely nothing in that regard. I want you to feel free to refresh your memory of her stating on audio tape that she would set the meeting up with GOHSEP the following week by listening here: <a href="https://youtu.be/hXnfYoJ45SA">https://youtu.be/hXnfYoJ45SA</a>. Ms. Sylvester even went so far as to indicate to me that, in preparation for that meeting, I needed to focus on "your settlement range." Ms. Sylvester went incommunicado with me following that meeting and was not even willing to return my phone calls to see where everything stood regarding setting up the meeting. My biggest frustration item (though I obviously have many) with the Office of Disciplinary Counsel is that you have failed to perform the one simple task I asked of you entailing not providing me with any explanation whatsoever on the status of the proposed meeting Sylvester references at the preceding audio link.

Given the facts of my case and the way you have chosen to cavalierly dismiss my complaint 416 days after I filed it leads me to only one conclusion: Attorney General Jeff Landry has intervened with your office, and you have acquiesced to his desires that the matter be dropped. Mr. Landry obviously is having to walk a fine line on exposing Calcasieu Parish governmental corruption (of which I content there is a plethora of entailing my case) given the recent revelations in the media (most notably *The Advocate*) that Landry has his own potential looming legal problems entailing the hiring of Mexican workers for the LNG plant in Cameron Parish .

Prior to submitting my complaint to your office, I consulted with one governmental attorney who stated to me that he saw "no way" the Office of Disciplinary Counsel could merely dismiss the extensive evidence I presented to your office. Meanwhile, another attorney stated that I was likely "wasting my time" because he



indicated that your office is literally flooded with complaints entailing attorneys who have abused drugs and/or absconded with client escrowed funds. If, in fact, your office is so inundated with complaints of drug-addicted attorneys and/or those who abscond with client escrowed funds, then that itself speaks volumes about the profession you are charged with policing as well as the incredible degree of latitude that attorneys not engaging in such behavior have to abuse the clients they represent with total immunity from negative consequences from your office. If it is the requirement of this office that only evidence of drug use and/or absconding with client escrow funds is going to be deemed "clear and convincing," then I feel you should make that disclaimer to the public! I see no point to wasting a bunch of time and energy when any conduct falling short of those actions is going to be cavalierly dismissed in the manner you have done with my complaint after first taking 416 days to arrive at that conclusion.

I now conclude my correspondence formalizing my appeal of your decision to dismiss my complaint against Ms. Sylvester, and I anxiously await receiving correspondence from you that you are reversing your decision and proceeding forward with a formal administrative hearing on my complaint.

Billy Broussard

Sinceret