

-----Original Message-----

From: Wendy Burgower <wendy@brfamilylaw.com>  
To: Melody Goodwin <melody@brfamilylaw.com>; Mary-Olga Lovett <lovettm@gtlaw.com>  
Cc: rkuehm@williamskherkher.com; Trip888@aol.com  
Sent: Fri, Mar 12, 2010 8:48 am  
Subject: RE: Response to Motion for Compelled Psychiatric Evaluation

Wally, please remind your client that I will not discuss this type of motion with him. You and I have clear understanding of this and as for the “evidence that clearly establishes any (and I repeat any) violation” I remind all that I have been found guilty of NOTHING – I am not emailing this to him as again, you are the attorney of record. I have checked the rules and Mo is correct. Under the rules, since you are the ONLY attorney, you are the attorney in charge. I will only serve you and I will only accept a valid service under Rule 21 a if you send it to me. Are we clear?

Wendy S. Burgower  
Burgower & Rainwater, L.L.P  
3355 W. Alabama, Suite 825  
Houston, Tx 77098  
(713) 529-3982

---

**From:** Dan Gawlikowski [<mailto:Dan.Gawlikowski@idera.com>]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 12, 2010 8:21 AM  
**To:** [LovettM@gtlaw.com](mailto:LovettM@gtlaw.com)  
**Cc:** [rkuehm@williamskherkher.com](mailto:rkuehm@williamskherkher.com); [wendy@brfamilylaw.com](mailto:wendy@brfamilylaw.com); [Trip888@aol.com](mailto:Trip888@aol.com); Dan Gawlikowski  
**Subject:** Response to Motion for Compelled Psychiatric Evaluation

Mrs. Lovett,

I'm aware of the demand you made to my attorney that the Response to your Motion for Compelled Psychiatric Evaluation be withdrawn. Let me start off this email by saying that the Response will not be withdrawn.

It was **my** use of the word grievance in the Response, evidenced by my signature on the Response, and I used the word grievance not to gain an advantage, but to point out to the Judge that there is evidence **clearly establishing** that a violation of **Rule 4.04 of the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct** has been committed by lawyers Mary Olga Lovett, Wendy Burgower and Robert Kuehm at the February 11, 2010 hearing and others.

Please review **Canon 3 (D) (2) of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct** when you have an opportunity and you will find that it is the **Judge's responsibility** to take appropriate action with the Office of General Counsel of the State Bar of Texas when the Judge **receives knowledge that a lawyer has committed a violation**. The Texas Code of Judicial Conduct states that a Judge having knowledge that a lawyer has committed a violation of the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct raises a **substantial question as to the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer**.

When you, Wendy and Robert used the grievances that I filed with the State Bar at the February 11, 2010 hearing, you did so in an effort to **gain an advantage in the pending custody case and with the Judge**. Especially, Robert Kuehm's comments that my use of the grievances was, how did Robert put it, **"it's outrageous!"**

I suggest you, Wendy and Robert review the Court's record from the February 11, 2010 hearing if your unable to recall the comments that all 3 of you made with regards to the grievances that I filed with the State Bar. The court's record from the February 11, 2010 hearing is available for review in the Motion to Disqualify or Recuse Judge Hellums.

Again, the Response will not be withdrawn.

**Daniel Gawlikowski** • Idera • Key Account Manager

Office: (713) 285-5316 | Cell: (713) 256-6488

Fax: (713) 583-5923 | Email: [dang@idera.com](mailto:dang@idera.com)