

BUY™

SELL™

SHOP™



Downloaded From  
[www.TextBookDiscrimination.com](http://www.TextBookDiscrimination.com)



**SELL YOUR OWN SAMPLES**

(help others get the justice that they deserve)



**BUY™**

**SELL™**

**SHOP™**

[www.TextBookDiscrimination.com](http://www.TextBookDiscrimination.com)

Get **Booked Up** on Justice!

© TBD Corporation. All Rights Reserved.

PROVIDED TO MARTIN  
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION  
ON 12/23/15  
FOR MAILING

**SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA**

**GARY L. CROOKS,**  
Petitioner,

v.

Case Number: T.B.A.

**THE 2<sup>ND</sup> JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**  
**COURT OF LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA,**  
Respondent.

---

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS**

**COMES NOW**, the Petitioner, Gary L. Crooks, and pursuant to Fla. R. App.

9100, respectfully petitions this Honorable Court for a Writ of Mandamus compelling the lower tribunal of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Judicial Circuit, Leon County, the appointment of an attorney to inventory the files of the subject attorney, Bernard F. Daley, Jr., case no.: SC15-330 and Fla. Bar File No.: 2015-00, 495(2b) NDR, and to take such actions as seems indicated to protect the interests of clients of the subject attorney.

**I. BASIS FOR INVOKING JURISDICTION**

This court has jurisdiction to issue a writ of mandamus under Article V, section 3(b)(8) of The Florida Constitution and Rule 9.030(b)(3) of the Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure. Mandamus is the proper remedy since the duty to appoint an attorney to inventory the files of the subject attorney, permanently disbarred, to protect the interests of existing clients if subject attorney does not have a partner, personal representative is a ministerial duty of this State agency.

FILED  
JOHN A. TOMASINO  
DEC 28 2015

CLERK, SUPREME COURT  
BY

Sky Lake Gardens Recreation, Inc. v. District Court of Appeal Third District, 511 So.2d 293(Fla. 1987).

## II. STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

Petitioner retained the legal representation of Bernard F. Daley, Jr., of the Daley Law Firm to properly research, prepare, file and represent any timely post-conviction relief available. On November 16, 2012, a contract agreement was made (See: Exhibit G), where a complete breakdown of payment is shown. Accordingly, Mr. Daley agreed to properly research, prepare, file and represent for Federal Writ of Habeas Corpus and represent the Petitioner in post-conviction proceedings. The agreement extended to any rehearing and appeals if necessary to obtain relief. Mr. Daley was paid a total of \$13,000.00.

On February 25, 2015, as shown in the Florida Supreme Court case docket "Petition for Disciplinary Revocation Without Leave to Reapply for Readmission" was filed by the Florida Bar counsel (Allison Carden Sackett, Fla. Bar No:582700, Fla. Supreme Court case no: SC15-330. See (Exhibit A).

On April 24, 2015, as shown in the docket an order granting disciplinary revocation was issued (Exhibit A). Also see: (Exhibit B) Supreme Court order.

However, on July 27, 2015, The Florida Bar counsel, Allison Carden Sackett, filed a notice of non-compliance. See: (Exhibit A) specifically stating

“The Florida Bar's notice to the Florida Supreme Court of Petitioner's non-compliance with this court' order dated April 24, 2015.”

During the course of his representation, specifically during the time frame between February 25, 2015 when initial Petition to Revoke Mr. Daley was filed and the last entry of July 27, 2015 when Petition was filed for noncompliance with the Florida Supreme Court order dated April 24, 2015, Petitioner's case was actually pending in the 15<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit Court, Palm Beach County, case no.: 202005 CF 002359 A, the Fourth District Court of Appeal case no.: 4D15-0282, and the United States District Court Southern District of Florida, case no: 9:13-CV-80200-DPG.

**This all breaks down to the following:**

- a) Mr. Daley adopted petition for writ of habeas corpus, failing to respond to report and recommendation resulting in being denied without an objection. Therefore **abandoning Claimant!**
- b) Mr. Daley lied about being able to file COA because he couldn't and didn't
- c) Mr. Daley never filed 3.800(b) as agreed further **abandonment!**
- d) Mr. Daley never asked for anything further past the original 90 day extensions granted leaving it to expire.

- e) Mr. Daley failed in handling any current client's business in securing other counsel as mandated – as in pertaining to Claimant.
- f) No further action on Claimant's appeal of the 3.800(a) hearing. Therefore, Claimant has been forced to request additional extensions of time while waiting for records of appeal from the 3.800(a) proceedings. Furthermore, Claimant is desperately attempting to arrange the necessary proper assistance in formulating the initial brief for appeal.

**What Claimant had to do to date and was accomplished.**

- a) On May 19, 2015, handwritten letter to U.S. District Court explaining Claimant's peril.
- b) July 9, 2015 Motion for Authorization to file belated objection to magistrate's report and recommendations.
- c) U.S. District Court grants 7/9/15 motion for 45 days on 7/17/15.
- d) 7/24/15 file motion 4<sup>th</sup> DCA to dismiss counsel due to abandonment, and proceed pro se, along with an extension of time.
- e) Based on Claimant's 7/24/15 motion, 4<sup>th</sup> DCA grants motion for pro se, and allows 90 day extension to file Initial Brief.
- f) Filed objection on August 26, 2015 to magistrate's report and recommendation prior to deadline.

- g) September 1, 2015 request for records and transcripts of September and December hearing and any remaining documents since Mr. Daley's retention.
- h) November 5, 2015, filed 3.800(b) followed by amended 3.800(b) November 12, 2015.

Mr. Daley, the subject attorney, abandoned the Petitioner in these proceedings and it was during this time frame that Petitioner discovered online all the complaints filed by multiple clients of Mr. Daley, along with the Florida Bar disciplinary actions towards him. This discovery was in no way the information contained in the letter received on May 16, 2015, sent by an attorney unknown to Petitioner named Wayne Mitchell, who deceitfully claimed that Mr. Daley was simply retiring and was trying to obtain further compensation from Petitioner if he wanted to continue with his representation. See (Exhibit C) and (Exhibit D, letter to Florida Bar Counsel Allison C. Sackett about this ordeal with the subject attorney and Wayne Mitchell's attempt to extract additional money).

Furthermore, the Petitioner has no knowledge of any proper attorney or representatives to take care of the subject attorney's existing clients, nor does Petitioner know of any being appointed by the circuit court or any State agencies involved in the subject attorney's permanent revocation. Petitioner has been negatively affected by the subject attorney's revocation, and the Petitioner's status

lacking representation compounded with it will take to go forward, and by not having been afforded any accommodations to protect the Petitioner's best interest is a clear violation of the Petitioner's legal rights according to the applicable rule.

### **III. NATURE OF THE RELIEF SOUGHT**

The nature of the relief sought by the Petitioner is for a Writ of Mandamus to be granted compelling the applicable state agency and/or the Respondent to perform its legal duty to appoint an attorney to inventory the files of the subject attorney and to take such action as seems indicated to protect the interest of the Petitioner, an existing client of the subject attorney.

### **IV. ARGUMENT**

A client of an active licensed attorney in good standing with the Florida Bar has a clear legal right for his interest to be protected in case his or her attorney is no longer capable of conducting any legal affairs in his clients best interest.

Under the rules governing the Florida Bar Rule 1-3.8(a) states:


“Whenever an attorney is suspended, disbarred, becomes a delinquent member, abandons a practice, disappears... and no partner, personal representative, or other responsible party capable of conducting the attorney's affairs is known to exist, the appropriate circuit court, upon proper proof of the fact, may appoint an attorney or attorneys to inventory (hereinafter referred to as “the subject attorney”) and to take such action as seems indicated to protect the interests of clients of the subject attorney”.

Thus, when the subject attorney got permanently disbarred and when the Florida Bar filed a petition of notice that subject attorney was in non-compliance

with this court's order, (Exhibit A), which clearly ordered subject attorney to make the appropriate accommodation to protect his clients best interest, the court had a legal duty to appoint an attorney to protect the subject attorney's existing clients, including the Petitioner.

The official legal duty under Rule 1-3.8(a) as a ministerial duty and the performance being required is directed by law. The Petitioner has a clear legal right for his best interest as an existing client to be protected and the Respondent along with other state agencies involved have unperformed its obligation.

Respectfully Submitted,



Gary L. Crooks, DC# B03434

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I **HEREBY CERTIFY** that a copy of this petition was furnished to the hands of prison officials to be mailed to: The 2<sup>nd</sup> Judicial Circuit Court, Leon County Courthouse, 301 S. Monroe St., Rm. 225-L, Tallahassee, Fl. 32301-1803, on this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of DECEMBER, 2015.



Gary L. Crooks DC# B03434  
Martin Correctional Institution  
1150 S.W. Allapattah Road  
Indiantown, FL 34956

#### CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I **HEREBY CERTIFY** that this petition complies with the font requirements of Rule 9.100(1) of the Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.



Gary L. Crooks DC# B03434

# Exhibit A

## *Florida Supreme Court Case Docket*

**Case Number: SC15-330 - Closed**

**IN RE: PETITION FOR DISCIPLINARY REVOCATION OF BERNARD F. DALEY,  
JR. vs.**

**Lower Tribunal Case(s): 2015-00,495 (2B) NDR**

[Right-click to copy shortcut directly to this page](#)

12/09/2015 11:03

Doc.	Date Docketed	Description	Filed By	Notes
	02/25/2015	PETITION-DISCIPLINARY REVOCATION	PT The Florida Bar FB BY: PT Allison Carden Sackett 582700	FILED AS "PETITION FOR DISCIPLINARY REVOCATION WITHOUT LEAVE TO REAPPLY FOR READMISSION"
	02/26/2015	No Fee Required		
	02/26/2015	ACKNOWLEDGMENT LETTER-NEW CASE	Supreme Court Florida FSC BY: Supreme Court Florida FSC	
	03/30/2015	RESPONSE	PT The Florida Bar FB BY: PT Allison Carden Sackett 582700	TO PETITION FOR DISCIPLINARY REVOCATION
	03/30/2015	MOTION-OTHER SUBSTANTIVE	PT The Florida Bar FB BY: PT Allison Carden Sackett 582700	FILED AS "MOTION TO ASSESS COSTS"
	04/24/2015	DISP-DISCIPLINARY REVOCATION GRANTED		The uncontested petition for disciplinary revocation, as provided by Rule 3-7.12, Rules Regulating The Florida Bar, without leave to seek readmission, is granted subject to the continuing jurisdiction of this Court. See Florida Bar v. Ross, 732 So. 2d 1037, 1040-42 (Fla. 1998). Disciplinary revocation is tantamount to disbarment. Florida Bar v. Hale, 762 So. 2d 515 (Fla.

2000). The disciplinary revocation shall be effective thirty days from the date of this order, as agreed by the Bar and petitioner, so that petitioner can close out his practice and protect the interests of existing clients. If petitioner notifies this Court in writing that he is no longer practicing and does not need the thirty days to protect existing clients, this Court will enter an order making the revocation effective immediately. Petitioner shall accept no new business from the date this order is filed. Inasmuch as petitioner's disciplinary revocation petition was submitted without leave to seek readmission, his revocation is permanent. Petitioner shall fully comply with Rule Regulating the Florida Bar 3-5.1(h). Judgment is entered for The Florida Bar, 651 East Jefferson Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2300, for recovery of costs from Bernard F. Daley, Jr., in the amount of \$17,016.74, for which sum let execution issue. Not final until time expires to file motion for rehearing, and if filed, determined. The filing of a motion for rehearing shall not alter the effective date of this revocation. As with disbarment, in seeking readmission to The Florida Bar, petitioner "may be admitted again only upon full compliance with the rules and regulations governing admission to the bar." R. Regulating Fla. Bar 3-7.10(n).

	07/27/2015	NOTICE-NON COMPLIANCE	PT The Florida Bar FB BY: PT Allison Carden Sackett 582700	FILED AS "THE FLORIDA BAR'S NOTICE TO THE FLORIDA SUPREME COURT OF PETITIONER'S NONCOMPLIANCE WITH THIS COURT'S ORDER DATED APRIL 24, 2015"
--	------------	-----------------------	--	---

# Exhibit B

# Supreme Court of Florida

FRIDAY, APRIL 24, 2015

CASE NO.: SC15-330

Lower Tribunal No(s): 2015-00,495 (2B) NDR

IN RE: PETITION FOR  
DISCIPLINARY REVOCATION OF  
BERNARD F. DALEY, JR.

---

The uncontested petition for disciplinary revocation, as provided by Rule 3-7.12, Rules Regulating The Florida Bar, without leave to seek readmission, is granted subject to the continuing jurisdiction of this Court. See Florida Bar v. Ross, 732 So. 2d 1037, 1040-42 (Fla. 1998). Disciplinary revocation is tantamount to disbarment. Florida Bar v. Hale, 762 So. 2d 515 (Fla. 2000). The disciplinary revocation shall be effective thirty days from the date of this order, as agreed by the Bar and petitioner, so that petitioner can close out his practice and protect the interests of existing clients. If petitioner notifies this Court in writing that he is no longer practicing and does not need the thirty days to protect existing clients, this Court will enter an order making the revocation effective immediately. Petitioner shall accept no new business from the date this order is filed. Inasmuch as petitioner's disciplinary revocation petition was submitted without leave to seek readmission, his revocation is permanent. Petitioner shall fully comply with Rule Regulating the Florida Bar 3-5.1(h).

Judgment is entered for The Florida Bar, 651 East Jefferson Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2300, for recovery of costs from Bernard F. Daley, Jr., in the amount of \$17,016.74, for which sum let execution issue.


Not final until time expires to file motion for rehearing, and if filed, determined. The filing of a motion for rehearing shall not alter the effective date of this revocation. As with disbarment, in seeking readmission to The Florida Bar,

CASE NO.: SC15-330  
Page Two

petitioner "may be admitted again only upon full compliance with the rules and regulations governing admission to the bar." R. Regulating Fla. Bar 3-7.10(n).

LABARGA, C.J., and PARIENTE, LEWIS, QUINCE, CANADY, POLSTON, and PERRY, JJ., concur.

A True Copy  
Test:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John A. Tomasino  
Clerk, Supreme Court



dd  
Served:

ALLISON CARDEN SACKETT  
BAYA HARRISON, III  
ADRIA E. QUINTELA

# Exhibit C

## THE DALEY LAW FIRM, PA

---

Attorney At Law  
901 North Gadsden Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32303

Telephone: (850) 224-5823  
Fax (850) 222-4045  
Email: daleylaw@nettally.com

May 12, 2015

Gary L. Crooks, DC# B03434  
Martin Correctional Institution  
1150 S.W. Allopattah Road  
Indiantown, Florida 34956-4397

Re: **GARY L. CROOKS vs. STATE OF FLORIDA**  
Case No.: 4D15-0282 L.T. Case No.: 202005-CF-002359A

Dear Mr. Crooks:

As of now you may have heard of Mr. Daley's situation and his decision to resign from practicing law. While it is unfortunate, it was a decision he made in his best interest and for his own health. Please allow me to introduce myself, My name is Wayne Mitchell and Mr. Daley has asked me to review your case to see if I would be interested in assisting you in the appellate level. I have had my paralegal, Mr. Raymond Gissendaner look over the case and he has indicated to me that he feels there may be some merit to your issues.

I would like to discuss assuming your case and pursuing your appellate claims, if we can come to some agreement. We would be able to easily obtain the complete file from Mr. Daley, file a notice of appearance and start to work on the initial brief. As your record from proceedings below is voluminous, it will require a considerable amount of time to go over the case files, and determine whatever issues can be raised on appeal with merit and strong likelihood of prevailing.

I am forwarding a copy of this letter to your brother, who I understand from Mr. Daley is your point of Contact. Once you both have had the opportunity to review and discuss this, you may call me at Mr. Daley's office regarding us handling your appeal. We can discuss any concerns at that time and discuss the terms for our representation to move forward. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

I look forward to hearing from you both in the very near future.

Sincerely,

*Wayne Mitchell*  
Wayne Mitchell, Esq.  
Attorney at Law

WAGNER COLLEGE

Donald Crooks <dcrooks@wagner.edu>

---

**Re: FW: Donald Crooks/Chat Transcript - MuscalawSex Crimes/Florida/908  
803 2338**

2 messages

---

crooks1@verizon.net <crooks1@verizon.net>

Thu, May 28, 2015 at 7:39 PM

To: Wayne@muscalaw.com, parasourcelegal@gmail.com, crooks1@verizon.net

Cc: daleylaw@nettally.com, Harley@muscalaw.com, Wayne@muscalaw.com, dcrooks@wagner.edu

Mr Mitchell Thank you for your email.

1. Can you kindly provide me with a copy of the letter that you sent to my brother alerting him that Bernard Daley had suddenly retired and that you were also going to send to me. Where is the responsibility to be truthful and explain exactly what happened to Mr Daley and part of public record, which made you appear juvenile, at best. In that letter, I believe, you referenced that you would be contacting both my brother and myself regarding his case going forward.
2. I anticipate, never assume, that you had rather substantial discussions with Mr Daley regarding my brother's case as you alluded to the fact that Daley told you that you would need to talk to me, and POA for my brother
3. You have in your possession a letter I sent to you and (received by and ) signed by Raymond and the "life time contract" that I had with Mr Daley and that it was fully to be transferred to anyone assuming his practice whether he retired or passed his practice on. Your issue is with Daley and his 'Breach of Contract" If you buy a stolen car and know it is stolen then you are as guilty and complicit as the original thief. Don't insult my intelligence and I won't insult yours.
4. You said that none of my documents are still in your office however Raymond is and has been very familiar about this case and indeed assured me that all issues would be settled and not let to expire. So do you want to rethink that answer!!
5. Within the first two minutes of the conversation you attempted to extort \$10,000 from me to take the case, when you are aware of the case and so is Raymond, there is very little to be done at this point but to put the finishing touches and set the dates with the lower court and the Feds.
6. Daley is supposed to take care of all existing clients (within 30 days) and you by acting as his agent and sending out letters for him have assumed that responsibility---instead you see a person in dire need and attempt to take advantage of it
7. Please explain why you hung up on me---is this the way you represent the office in which you sit and indeed your new firm , MUSCA.
8. You only recently changed the voicemails at the Daley Law firm and your extension was listed up until a few days ago
9. Please provide me with the contact information of your Managing Partners
10. I am in contact with Ms Sackett, Counsel for the Florida Bar
11. We are talking ethics. integrity and the very basis of professional behavior with you and especially Daley.

I look forward to further discourse with you

Dr Donald L. Crooks

On 05/28/15, Wayne Mitchell<Wayne@muscalaw.com> wrote:

Raymond: Mr. Crooks apparently seeks to correspond, but he needs to correspond with Bernie @Daley Law. I have not been involved in this matter, and do not represent Mr. Crooks and never have. Please redirect for Bernie. Mr. Crooks as I told you this matter is not a case I have involvement with. Thank you.

Musca Law--Tallahassee Office

901 N. Gadsden Street

Tallahassee, Florida 32303

(850) 558-5860

# Exhibit D

PROVIDED TO MARTIN  
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION  
ON 11/25/15  
FOR MAILING

Monday, November 23, 2015

Allison Carden Sackett  
Bar Counsel  
The Florida Bar  
651 East Jefferson Street  
Tallahassee, Fl. 32399

RE: Letters sent regarding Bernard Daley

Dear Ms. Sackett,

I hope this letter finds you well. Furthermore, I also hope by now you are in receipt of a copy of a letter to P.J. Osborne, coordinator of the Client's Security Fund.

Ms. Sackett, I also correct copied you a letter of October 16, 2015 to Mr. Harrison for the sole purpose of apprising the Florida Bar of Mr. Daley's continued blatant lies as in failing to protect my interest as an existing client as stipulated. This letter to Mr. Harrison was a courtesy, while copying you with the intent of notification regarding the continued defiance based on the continued fraudulent method of operations being perpetuated, hoping to spark some sort of reply.

Ms. Sackett, the next letter, written by Mr Tejera of November 2, 2015 was a group letter specifically sent to you as the counsel representing the Bar's uncontested petition of terms for Mr. Daley's revocation brokered by Mr. Harrison, Attorney for Mr. Daley. The primary focus of this letter was to explain the continued abandonment by Mr. Daley regarding us, his clients in the pipeline during Mr. Daley's revocation process. Therefore attempting to make you fully aware of our existence, and continued need in the protection of our interest. Within the last paragraph the word reimbursed was stated once, predicating the forwarding of this letter to the Client's Security Fund without a simple reply of acknowledgment to our primary concerns, as not being relevant.

Ms. Sackett, both of these letters were intended to ebb the flow of frustration, in allowing for a last chance to a possible mediation and resolve, in a continued effort to exhaust all remedies, since all four of us in one way or another have been left in a precarious situation of abandonment predicated by the courts indulgence of Mr. Daley's contemptible defiance.

Ms. Sackett, it is my belief with 30 plus years in a career where ethics were not an option, but demanded as a condition in registration and employment, that the fiduciary responsibilities of notifying the court of Mr. Daley's improprieties of fraudulent defiance rests on you shoulders, with no disrespect intended.

Ms. Sackett, also when the four of us wrote to you as the prosecuting attorney, we expected a reply in good faith pertaining to any and all options afforded by your position, as far as assuring us how our rights would be protected as existing client's of Mr. Daley, as stated as a primary condition.

Instead, we are once again abandoned by the very agency that unconditionally accepted Mr. Daley's terms without any formal contingency plan, nor any apparent attempt to follow-up on Mr. Daley's adherence, or lack for.

Since Mr. Daley's petition was granted subject to the continuing jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Florida, and whereas the terms of this order ignored, all orders granting relief should be reinforced, or an arrangement for a conservatory for the remaining clients be assigned to protect their interest with the power to have local court appointed board certified attorneys represent the remaining open cases through all facets as they apply. In the alternative, Mr. Daley should have stronger consequences remanded, as done everyday to a common thief who habitually orchestrates a scam of deception and fraud with what appears to be a blind eye and a deaf ear combined with denial to the existence of the facts by the governing body, therefore making the ones in the know just as guilty as him, by letting us to wilt away.

Ms. Sackett, this letter can also serve as an additional effort to exhaust all means of attempting in good faith to receive the proper assistance necessary as deemed by the court, at no additional costs over the fully paid fee agreement executed between my brother, Dr. Donald Crooks and Mr. Bernard Daley. Mr. Daley's idea of securing resolve for existing clients included a proposed arrangement by Mr. Wayne Mitchell, who appears to have assumed Mr. Daley's practice of sorts, by attempting to exhort an additional \$10,000.00 for a smooth transition in continuing representation based on the knowledge of the issues of my case, and the probability as stated by the paralegal in the office. This was a one time take or leave it proposal made to my brother by Mr. Mitchell six months ago. I can provide e-mails.

Mr. Daley's continued procrastination in honoring his terms of revocation has created additional unjustifiable expenses, harm, and distress on the four existing clients in our group, not to mention the toll that has impacted our families and friends is unconscionable. There are limits to the anguish that we must endure, and there isn't any amount of compensation that can replace what we have lost, we seek our freedom, and Mr. Daley strung us along with false hopes and promises of performance.

Ms. Sackett I am quite dumbfounded on how none of us have ever been contacted by the court, since Mr. Daley was ordered to provide the names of existing clients as stated in an e-mail to my brother by the paralegal in Daley's office.

Ms. Sackett, I have one final request of you, since I don't have access to all public records and you do, I must ask as to the date you were first notified of Mr. Daley's intentions for the revocation, and if you would provide me with the dockets of records pertaining all court entries, as well as any bar records or ledger entries. I am probably not referencing this correctly, but I'm sure you know what I mean, This request will help explain an extremely important element germane to my case, and psyche.

Ms. Sackett, I hope you find my letter as an exhibit of the frustration in the emptiness of being abandoned like a dog from a system and people I placed my trust in. With all this said, at no time in this letter did I mean any disrespect with my candor, now when considering "the damn if I do, damn if I don't" scenario when addressing someone of your status and stature. The

possibilities of reprisals is something I hope would never become a factor, while exposing what has been allowed to go on for too long. Life is so short and family is so important, and I would like to be with them again. My patience which is not my strong suit and is wearing to the bone, and has been taken for weakness, and at this point I must pursue this until the deaf ears listen and the blind see.

Ms. Sackett, I've started with you with the hope and prayers this will end with you!

Sincerely,

/s/ Gary L. Crooks

Gary L. Crooks DC# B03434  
Martin Correctional Institution  
1150 S.W. Allapattah Roadside  
Indiantown, Fl. 34956


Bernard

11/16/2012

Enclosed please find a check in the amount of \$5,000 as part of a total contract fee of \$13,000. Payments of \$800 per month for 10 months will proceed starting 1/1/2013. The fee will cover all of Gary's legal issues for the term he is incarcerated including any medical or classification concerns. You will maintain communication both phone and in person as fulfill Gary's needs. In the case of your retirement or transmitting your business please include Gary in the book of business/legal responsibilities your transfer to any new owners.

Respectfully


Donald



Please sign and return to Donald L. Crooks

96 Clark Road

Bernardsville N.J. 07924



**EXHIBIT G**

BUY™

SELL™

SHOP™



Downloaded From  
[www.TextBookDiscrimination.com](http://www.TextBookDiscrimination.com)



**SELL YOUR OWN SAMPLES**

(help others get the justice that they deserve)



**BUY™**

**SELL™**

**SHOP™**

[www.TextBookDiscrimination.com](http://www.TextBookDiscrimination.com)

Get **Booked Up** on Justice!

© TBD Corporation. All Rights Reserved.