Very truly yours,

Russell R. Mirabile

7932 Oakdale Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland 21237.

September 23, 1995.

D. Bruce Pearson, *Esquire*

U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 555 Fourth Street, N.W., Room 9901, Washington, D.C. 20001, Fax: 202–616–5980, Revised Response

Re: Case number 1:95CV01211

Dear Mr. Pearson: In response to and as input to MSL vs. ABA Anti Trust Action, and corresponding as a victim of this over twenty-year scheming by the ABA to prevent people from education and practicing law, I hope the following would be implemented.

No person, no group, no government or agency can give back a life, a livelihood as a result of the calculated law school genocide by the ABA. However, to make amends and prepare a preventive program will be a beginning against future open-handed injustices.

These vicious actions taken by the ABA to minimize one's liberties and freedom should be dealt with in a very severe manner. The ABA has produced a million dollar business by making a selective discrimination process.

First: The time limit for responses to this action should be extended. *Notice* to all offended person(s) has *not* been accomplished nor been effective.

Most graduates of non-ABA schools that were discriminated against or victims of this monopolistic scheme are in other walks of life and may not be associated with the practice of law to receive the Law Journal. Thus, these victims have no way of becoming aware of a welcomed response by the State Department.

Non-ABA schools that fell victim to those monopolistic schemes should present student enrollment lists to the ABA and the ABA should send notices to all affected students so that responses are possible. There should be a full scale effort upon the ABA; they have made millions of dollars from these victims. The price of a letter and stamp is minimal in comparison.

Second: Remuneration should be awarded to those non-ABA schools, students, etc. who were injured due to the intentional starvation of these victims.

Third: Those persons, either directly or indirectly involved with these ABA monopoly practices, should be disbarred and never allowed to practice again in any state or territory. Their licenses to practice law should be suspended until proper hearings are held, then forever be banished from practicing law.

Fourth: The ABA should be monitored for years to come for their intrusive, intentional improprieties. The group should be independent with severe sanctions and penalties attached to those millions of dollars that have been gathered from the victims' backs. *Or,* the ABA should be disbanded

Fifth: The ABA should be completely severed form any administering of education or testing of LSAT and all testing for multi-state examinations. The multi-state courses that have made millions of dollars for the ABA should be independent with no leadership or influencing input from the ABA. The ABA should not be involved in any testing or correcting of Multi-State Test scores or examinations. If contamination has not be declared or thought of, then there is plenty of room for irresponsibility and mistrust. There should be complete removal from testing by the ABA.

Sixth: Students who have graduated from non-ABA Law Schools should be waived into states or territories affected by these over twenty-year practices of the ABA.

Seventh: The non-ABA graduates that were affected by this law school genocide of the ABA should be allowed to take undergraduate courses at ABA law schools for credit for any reason.

There should be a complete acknowledgment and credit for past work, accomplishments and performances at non-ABA schools.

Eighth: Liability should be broadened and a time table should be prepared for punishment for these ABA leaders who had the intent to deprive people from the liberty and right to achieve an education and practice law as a livelihood, or for any reason.

In conclusion, if the defendants, members of the ABA and defendants that were engaged in these violations of the Sherman Act, graduate from ABA schools, then these violators are a product of an ABA education. But, the ultimate question is, ''Were they educated in Anti Trust Law, or is the ABA above the law?'' I would hope this government will protect the citizens and punish severely those involved in this ABA scandal and correct a twenty-year wrong.

The bottom line is what is the difference which law school, place and manner that one learns the laws as long as a person passes the bar exam in reference the knowledge of the law. I would hope that this government will protect the citizens.

Very truly yours,

Russell R. Mirabile

September 21, 1995.

Mr. John F. Greaney,

Chief Computers and Finance Section, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 555 Fourth Street NW., Room 9903, Washington, D.C. 20001

Dear Mr. Greaney: I am writing in response to United States vs. American Bar Association, No. 951211. I have a profound concern that this order will be futile unless needed changes are made.

I graduated from a state-accredited law school in Alabama that lacks ABA accreditation, and I am fully licensed to practice law in both federal and state court in Alabama. I recently applied to an ABA accredited law school in another state in order to obtain a law license in that state. The dean of the law school was aware of the United States vs. ABA case and even had a copy of the final order on his desk. However, when I inquired about which classes would receive transfer credit, he responded that the law school was not in a position to accept any of my credits.

It appears as if either collusion exists between the ABA and the accredited law schools not to accept any credits pursuant to Section four, Part two of the order or that the law school was reluctant to act due to potential repercussions from the ABA. Furthermore, I have been advised by fellow attorneys that this same scenario has occurred at other ABA accredited law schools in different states.

I strongly believe that modifications or changes need to be considered before a final order is entered. The rule as it stands lacks any meaning because ABA accredited law schools remain free to ignore the order and continue the exact restraints on trade and competition as alleged in the lawsuit.

Due to the fact that I have an application pending with a law school in this state, I would please request that my name and address be withheld from this comment. Thank you.

Justice Department: I am writing to propose that the *Final Judgement* regarding *US* v. *ABA* (Civil Action No. 95–1211 (CR), filed 7/14/95) be modified.

Under Section IV, subsection D(2), I propose that the phrase, ''except that the ABA may require that two-thirds of the credits required for graduation must be successfully completed at an ABA-approved law school'', be dropped entirely from the *Final Judgement.*

The restrictions on offering transfer credits for coursework completed at non-ABA-approved schools is still an unreasonable restraint of grade aimed at deterring effective competition from law schools that are likely to pay less in salaries and benefits to their professional staffs.

The number of seats available to transfer students is very low compared to the number of applicants for those seats (see Barron's Guide to Law Schools), and even lower in comparison with the untold numbers who would apply if seats were more copious in number.

On top of the great statistical challenge already at hand for the transfer applicant, the difficulty of transferring becomes compounded when the applicants are from non-ABA-approved schools. They are competing against applicants from ABA-approved schools who will be looked at in a more favorable light because of the perception that they gained greater academic achievement. In fact, I suspect that many of the ABA-schools will take it upon themselves not to consider non-ABA applicants, or consider their credits transferable, thereby lessening the total number of available transfer seats. The number of potential seats for non-ABA-applicants will dwindle further when potential mid-second year and third year seats are made unavailable due to the daunting prospect of spending an additional ten to twenty thousand dollars on one's legal education because their second or third year courses won't transfer. This rings especially true to the socio-economically deprived students who benefit most from the lower costs of non-ABA-approved schools.

The bottom line will be that very few, if any, transfers will occur because the non-ABA-applicants will face a monumental statistical probability that they will not be able to successfully transfer; and a monumental financial hurdle for many who won't be able to afford to transfer. Section IV,