

ONE EAST MAIN STREET
POST OFFICE BOX 2719
MADISON, WI 53701-2719
TEL 608-257-3911
FAX 608-257-0609
www.gklaw.com

September 10, 2008

## **BY HAND DELIVERY**

David R. Schanker, Clerk Wisconsin Supreme Court 110 E. Main Street #215 P.O. Box 1688 Madison, WI 53703-1688

RE: McLellan, et al. v. Charly

Dane County Case No. 05-CV-3412

Appeal No. 2007AP1120

Response to Purported Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure

Dear Mr. Schanker:

We write on behalf of our clients, Petitioners Richard G. McLellan, Rick Bogle and the Primate Freedom Project, to address a September 2, 2008 letter to the Court from counsel for Defendant-Appellant-Cross-Respondent Roger L. Charly.

The present action asks whether our clients are entitled to enforce an executed option contract, in which Charly offered to sell McLellan commercial property located directly between two University of Wisconsin primate research centers. As detailed in the Petition for Review (the "Petition"), our clients' intended use for the property is to house an exhibition hall critical of primate research. In their correspondence, Charly's counsel point to this intended use, and a competing option contract Charly entered with the UW, to suggest that Chief Justice Abrahamson's and Justice Bradley's spousal ties to the UW may raise a conflict of interest for those justices in hearing the Petition.

As an initial matter, our clients do not believe there is a conflict of interest and, if there is such a conflict, they expressly waive any objection to Chief Justice Abrahamson's and Justice Bradley's participation in this matter. As opposing counsel note, the UW supports Charly's position, so that any potential conflict of interest runs in Charly's favor—and against our clients. Consequently, our clients' waiver should alleviate any concerns in this regard, precluding the need for recusal.

David R. Schanker, Clerk September 10, 2008 Page 2

In addition, we object to opposing counsel's correspondence (and Response brief) to the extent that it expounds on issues wholly irrelevant to the legal issues raised by the Petition. As the full record reflects, our clients' interest in the property at issue is peaceful. (*See, e.g.,* R.42:3(FOF#38(h.))). Opposing counsel's insinuations to the contrary are unnecessarily inflammatory—and simply inappropriate.

Sincerely,

GODFREY & KAHN, S.C.

Kendall W. Harrison

KWH:jad

cc:

Michael Van Sicklen

Jon Manzo

3160152 1