

Asia Pacific

Bangkok
Beijing
Brisbane
Hanoi
Ho Chi Minh City
Hong Kong
Jakarta
Kuala Lumpur*
Manila*
Melbourne
Seoul
Shanghai
Singapore
Sydney
Taipei
Tokyo
Yangon

**Europe, Middle East
& Africa**

Abu Dhabi
Almaty
Amsterdam
Antwerp
Bahrain
Barcelona
Berlin
Brussels
Budapest
Cairo
Casablanca
Doha
Dubai
Dusseldorf
Frankfurt/Main
Geneva
Istanbul
Jeddah*
Johannesburg
Kyiv
London
Luxembourg
Madrid
Milan
Munich
Paris
Prague
Riyadh*
Rome
Stockholm
Vienna
Warsaw
Zurich

The Americas

Bogota
Brasilia**
Buenos Aires
Caracas
Chicago
Dallas
Guadalajara
Houston
Juarez
Lima
Los Angeles
Mexico City
Miami
Monterrey
New York
Palo Alto
Porto Alegre**
Rio de Janeiro**
San Francisco
Santiago
Sao Paulo**
Tijuana
Toronto
Washington, DC

* Associated Firm

** In cooperation with
Trench, Rossi e Watanabe
Advogados

11 July 2025

CONFIDENTIAL AND NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Artem Bryl
By email only

Our ref: 51265177

By email only

Dear Artem Bryl

Concerns Notice – Defamation Act

We act for Ms Valerie Griswold (**Ms Griswold**).

We write to you in your capacity as a lawyer previously attached to Odtojan Bryl Lawyers (**OBL**) and in your personal capacity.

This letter is a concerns notice pursuant to Part 3, section 12A, of the *Defamation Act 2005* (NSW).

1. Parties

- 1.1 Ms Griswold is the Director, Legal Regulation, at the Law Society of New South Wales. The Law Society's Legal Regulation Department includes the Professional Standards Department (**PSD**).
- 1.2 We are instructed that OBL is a law practice based in Parramatta NSW, where you were a named lawyer.
- 1.3 Your wife, Ms Odtojan, was the only other lawyer, and Principal, at OBL.

2. Summary

- 2.1 In the publications referred to in this concerns notice, OBL has complained that Ms Griswold has engaged in serious acts of criminality and misconduct in her official capacity. You have published and/or republished substantially similar content on various social media platforms. So has Ms Odtojan.
- 2.2 OBL has published content in which it appears to hold the view that each of you and Ms Odtojan are victims having made substantially similar allegations against various lawyers and judges in legal proceedings that concern you. Those allegations were considered in *Odtojan v Condon* [2023] NSWCA 129. There, the NSW Court of Appeal:

- (a) observed that each of you and Ms Odtojan demonstrated (at [8]) *“a capacity... to make allegations of serious criminality and misconduct without a proper foundation”*; and
 - (b) observed (at [77]) that *“...it seems that if conduct occurs which is not to the liking of Ms Odtojan and Mr Bryl then they readily leap to making unfounded allegations of serious wrongdoing”*.
- 2.3 The Court’s judgment in that case, together with the whole of the papers, were referred to the NSW Legal Services Commissioner: *Odtojan v Condon* [2023] (No 2) NSWCA 143.
- 2.4 After seeking and obtaining further material from you and submissions in relation to your application to renew your practising certificate, on 30 May 2025, the Council of the Law Society of New South Wales (**Council**) had:
 - (a) resolved not to renew your practising certificate under s 45 *Legal Profession Uniform Law* (NSW) (**Uniform Law**). In summary, Council was of the opinion that neither you, or Ms Odtojan, were fit and proper persons; and
 - (b) appointed a Manager to oversee OBL’s operations for two years under s 334 of the Uniform Law.
- 2.5 Despite the above, each of OBL, you, and Ms Odtojan have continued to publish and/or republish content online alleging that our client has been engaged in serious acts of criminality and misconduct.
- 2.6 Each of the below publications, and republications, are plainly responsive to your disciplinary matter before the Council. We request that you take the steps set out at the end of this concerns notice. Failing to do so may result in our client seeking appropriate interlocutory relief without further notice to you.

3. First Matter Complained Of

Publication and republication

- 3.1 On about 3 September 2024, OBL published online a “Public Notice” on the OBL website.
- 3.2 The “Public Notice” was publicly accessible at the following URL: <https://www.odtojanbryllawyers.com.au/public-notice-credit-corp-white-collar-crime> (**First Matter Complained Of**).
- 3.3 The First Matter Complained Of identified Ms Griswold by name and position, and contained the following statement:

Ms Valerie Griswold, director of Professional Standards Department (PSD) of the Law Society of the NSW has interfered with the legal practitioners' practising certificates based on her unfounded statements of fact of findings of misconduct/prior misconduct recorded under a regulatory body's office letterhead, circumventing and contravening the established process under the LPUL.

- 3.4 The First Matter Complained Of also comprised hyperlinked letters which were sent on 13 August 2024 to Ms Griswold in her capacity as Director of the Law Society's Legal Regulation Department (which includes the PSD), and on 15 August 2024 to the NSW Law Society Council and the then-President of the NSW Law Society (**Letters**). You co-authored at least the latter letter with your wife and former Principal of OBL.
- 3.5 A copy of the First Matter Complained Of (comprising the public notice and the Letters as a composite) is attached to this letter and marked "A".
- 3.6 Whilst our client will rely on the whole of the First Matter Complained Of, please find attached and marked "B" a schedule of some specific statements you have made in each of the Letters (and which comprise part of the First Matter Complained Of).
- 3.7 The natural and probable consequence of the publication of the First Matter Complained Of was that it would be republished.
- 3.8 Between about 3 and 17 September 2024, the sense and substance of the First Matter Complained Of was, in fact, republished by OBL, you and Ms Odtojan. We specifically draw your attention to the following:
 - (a) OBL republished the sense and substance of the First Matter Complained Of:
 - (i) on about 3 September 2024, when it posted publicly available content on its online blog accessible at the following URL:

<https://www.odtojanbryllawyers.com.au/single-post/obl-public-notice-a-case-of-law-against-corruption-and-titles>.

This post provided a hyperlink to the First Matter Complained Of. In the circumstances the Court will readily infer that such content has been widely republished;
 - (ii) on 3 September 2024, when it posted publicly available content on its TikTok page, the content of which is accessible at the following URL:

<https://www.tiktok.com/@oblalawyers/video/7410319165568912657> (**OBL's TikTok**).

This post provided a link to the First Matter Complained Of and has currently amassed over 10,300 views online. In the circumstances, the Court will readily infer that the First Matter Complained Of has been widely republished on TikTok;

- (iii) on 4 September 2024, when it posted publicly available content on its Facebook page, the content of which is accessible at the following URL:

<https://www.facebook.com/share/p/15ykXjAjBN/> (**OBL Facebook Post**).

The OBL Facebook Post provided a link to the First Matter Complained Of. In the circumstances, the Court will infer that it has been widely republished on Facebook and at least to OBL's 351 followers;

- (iv) on 4 September 2024, when it posted publicly available content entitled: "*A case of Law against Corruption and Titles*" on its LinkedIn page, which is accessible at the following URL:

<https://www.linkedin.com/company/odtojanbryllawyers/posts/?feedView=all> (**First OBL LinkedIn Post**).

The post also provided a link to the First Matter Complained Of. In the circumstances, the Court will infer that the First Matter Complained Of has been widely republished on LinkedIn, and at least to by OBL's 133 LinkedIn followers;

- (v) on 9 September 2024, when it posted publicly available content on the social media platform known as "X" (formerly Twitter), and which content is accessible at the following URL:

<https://x.com/OdtojanBrylLaw/status/1832994181096394918> (**OBL X Post**).

The Court will infer that the OBL X Post has been widely republished on X, and read by at least the 117 persons recorded to have "viewed" it, including OBL's 49 followers; and

- (vi) on 17 September 2024, when it again posted publicly available content entitled “*#PSA #Breaking To all NSW Legal Practitioners and to all lawyers*” on its LinkedIn page, which is accessible at the following URL:

<https://www.linkedin.com/feed/update/urn:li:activity:7239898392133296128/> (**Second OBL LinkedIn Post**).

The post also provided a link to the First Matter Complained Of. In the circumstances, the Court will infer that the First Matter Complained Of has again been widely republished on LinkedIn, and at least to by OBL’s 133 LinkedIn followers.

- (b) Ms Odtojan republished the sense and substance of the First Matter Complained Of:

- (i) between about 12 and 17 September 2024, when she reposted the First and Second OBL LinkedIn Post on her own public LinkedIn page, which is accessible at the following URL:

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/marie-odtojan-b409521b/>.

In the circumstances, the Court will infer that the First Matter Complained Of has been widely read, and by at least 1,393 of her followers on LinkedIn; and

- (ii) on about 4 September 2024, when she reposted the OBL Facebook Post to about 160 of her own followers on her personal Facebook page, which is accessible at the following URL:
<https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100006083866094>. In the circumstances, the Court will infer that it has been widely republished on Facebook.

- (c) You republished the sense and substance of the First Matter Complained Of between 12 and 17 September 2024, when you reposted the First and Second OBL LinkedIn Post to your own public LinkedIn page, accessible at the following URL:

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/artem-bryl-62624b79/recent-activity/all/>.

In the circumstances, the Court will infer that the First Matter Complained Of has been read by at least your 281 followers on LinkedIn.

- 3.9 Our client will rely on the use of salacious language and hashtags in each of the above republications to promote the First Matter Complained Of to as many recipients as possible.
- 3.10 You are liable as publisher of the First Matter Complained Of because you have republished it in apparent approval. Further, and in any event, aside from your wife, you were the only other lawyer at OBL that is the subject of the First Matter Complained Of. Previously, you have jointly authored correspondence with Ms Odtojan to the Law Society concerning substantially similar allegations (for example, on 15 August 2024 which has been republished widely online including in the First Matter Complained Of above), and in social media posts that are ostensibly controlled by OBL. In the circumstances, the Court will readily infer that you either authored the First Matter Complained Of jointly with Ms Odtojan and/or otherwise authorised it and/or approved it and/or conducted it, but in any event participated in the publication of the First Matter Complained Of on the OBL website.
- 3.11 Ms Griswold will rely on extent of publication and republication of the First Matter Complained Of, as evincing a clear intention by each of OBL, you and Ms Odtojan to disseminate it as wide, and as far, as possible to cause maximum damage to our client's reputation. Ms Griswold will further rely on the grapevine effect.
- 3.12 We note that the First Matter Complained Of remains publicly available online.

Imputations of concern

- 3.13 In its natural and ordinary meaning, the First Matter Complained Of conveys the following defamatory imputations (or imputations that do not differ in substance):
- (a) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has deliberately fabricated claims of misconduct about Ms Marie Odtojan and Mr Artem Bryl to cover up a matter of great public importance;
 - (b) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, is prepared to engage in corrupt and unethical conduct to cover up a matter of great public importance in Australia;
 - (c) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has knowingly interfered with the practising certificates of NSW lawyers in contravention of her duties and obligations under the Uniform Law;
 - (d) Ms Griswold, is such a dishonest Director of Legal Regulation, that the public can have no faith in the administration of justice in New South Wales;

- (e) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, is so corrupt and unethical that she should be removed.

Alternatively: Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, is so corrupt and unethical that there are reasonable grounds for the for the Law Society to investigate and remove her; and

- (f) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has deliberately denied two solicitors due process, procedural fairness and natural justice.

3.14 We are instructed that all of the above imputations are demonstrably false.

4. Second Matter Complained Of

Publication

- 4.1 On about 28 September 2024, OBL published the following post on the social media platform known as “X”.



Odtojan Bryl Law
@OdtojanBrylLaw



Valerie Griswold, Director of PSD NSW Law Society, fabricated findings of misconduct to unlawfully prevent the renewal of the practising certificates of 2 legal practitioners. In Aug, notice was given of her corrupt & unlawful conduct. No reply to date.

tinyurl.com/34xwtcf5

11:34 AM · Sep 28, 2024 · 61 Views



(Second Matter Complained Of)

- 4.2 The Second Matter Complained Of identified Ms Griswold by name. It also included the Second OBL LinkedIn Post (referred to above) embedded by the hyperlink: “tinyurl.com/34xwtcf5”.
- 4.3 A copy of the Second Matter Complained Of (comprising a composite of the OBL post on X together with the Second OBL LinkedIn Post) is annexed to this letter and marked “C”.
- 4.4 We note that as at the date of this letter, the Second Matter Complained Of remains publicly available online, and that it has been viewed at least 59 times, and been republished at least once. Our client will further rely on the grapevine effect to establish that the Second Matter Complained Of has been widely published.
- 4.5 For substantially similar reasons explained above (at [3.10]-[3.11]), you are liable as publisher of the Second Matter Complained Of.

4.6 Imputations of concern

4.7 In its natural and ordinary meaning, the Second Matter Complained Of conveys the following defamatory imputations (or imputations that do not differ in substance):

- (a) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has unlawfully interfered with the legitimate renewal of the practising certificates for each of Ms Odtojan and Mr Bryl;
- (b) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has deliberately fabricated claims of misconduct about Ms Odtojan and Mr Bryl to cover up a matter of great public importance in Australia;
- (c) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has knowingly interfered with the practising certificates of NSW lawyers in contravention of her duties and obligations under the Uniform Law;
- (d) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has conducted herself in such a dishonest way that a law practice and two of its lawyers need to make it publicly known for their own protection; and
- (e) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, is so corrupt and unethical that she should be removed.

Alternatively: Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, is so corrupt and unethical that there are reasonable grounds for the for the Law Society to investigate and remove her.

4.8 We are instructed that these imputations are demonstrably false.

5. Third Matter Complained Of

Publication and republication

5.1 On 17 May 2025, OBL published a video on OBL's public YouTube page, and which was accessible at the following URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_MmSqQTymeQ (**Third Matter Complained Of**).

5.2 In the Third Matter Complained Of, Ms Griswold was referred to by image, name and title.

5.3 It is to be inferred from the salacious nature of the Third Matter Complained Of that OBL intended to promote it as far and as wide as possible. Currently, the Third Matter Complained Of has been viewed over 2,000 times on YouTube and has generated reactions (in the form of likes, shares and comments) by other internet users.

5.4 The natural and probable consequence of the publication of the Third Matter Complained Of was that it would be republished. Between 17 May and 18 June 2025, the sense and substance of the Third Matter Complained Of was, in fact, republished by each of OBL, you and Ms Odtojan. Specifically, we draw your attention to the following:

(a) OBL republished the sense and substance of the Third Matter Complained Of:

(i) on 17 May 2025, when it published the content on OBL's TikTok, accessible at:

https://www.tiktok.com/@oblalawyers/video/7505309015346384146?is_from_webapp=1&sender_device=pc&web_id=7516344519752320532.

This post has currently amassed over 441 views online. In the circumstances, the Court will infer that the Third Matter Complained Of has been widely republished on TikTok;

(ii) on 17 May 2025, when it reposted the content at (i) on a TikTok page titled "Odtojan Bryl Justice Project" accessible at the following URL:

<https://www.tiktok.com/@oblalawyers/video/7505309015346384146>;

(iii) on 18 May 2025, when it published the content on the social media platform, "X", accessible at the following URL:

<https://x.com/OdtojanBrylLaw/status/1924045530344440289>.

This post has currently been "viewed" over 143 times. It is to be inferred in the circumstances that the Third Matter Complained Of has been widely republished on X;

(iv) on 30 May 2025, when it published the content on the OBL Facebook Page, accessible at the following URL:

<https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1Y1jrxfaX3/>.

This post has generated a number of reactions and has been shared at least 8 times. In the circumstances, the Court will infer that the Third Matter Complained Of has been widely republished on Facebook;

- (v) on 30 May 2025, when it published the content on the website “change.org” and which was accessible at the following URL:

<https://www.change.org/p/call-for-nsw-attorney-general-daley-mp-mcdermott-to-resign-for-condoning-unlawful-acts> (**Change.Org Petition**).

This petition has generated at least 30 verified signatures. In the circumstances set out in this notice, the Court will infer that the Change.Org Petition has been widely republished;

- (vi) on 30 May 2025, when it published the content on the website “gofundme.com” accessible at the following URL:

<https://www.gofundme.com/f/justice-for-artem-marie-unlawful-acts-by-nsw-law-society>. (**Go Fund Me Post**).

This fundraiser has purportedly generated the sum of \$1,250. In the circumstances set out in this notice, the Court will infer that the Go Fund Me Post has been widely republished;

- (vii) on about 31 May 2025, when it republished the Change.Org Post on OBL’s Facebook accessible at:

<https://www.facebook.com/share/p/186T79e4CK/>.

It has been shared at least 7 times and may be inferred has been widely republished and by at least OBL’s 351 followers;

- (viii) on about 31 May 2025, when it republished the Go Fund Me Post on OBL’s Facebook, accessible at:

<https://www.facebook.com/share/p/186T79e4CK/>.

It has been shared at least 7 times and may be inferred has been widely republished and by at least OBL’s 351 followers;

- (ix) on about 13 June 2025, when it posted content on the OBL website, accessible at the following URL:

<https://www.odtojanbryllawyers.com.au/single-post/public-notice-urgent-call-for-criminal-investigation-into-corrupt-conduct-in-nsw-legal-system-legal>.

In the circumstances set out in this concerns notice, the Court will infer that the post has been widely republished;

- (x) on or around 13 June 2025, when it posted content on the OBL website, accessible at the following URL:

<https://www.odtojanbryllawyers.com.au/single-post/law-society-of-nsw-unlawfully-prevents-the-legitimate-renewal-of-ms-odtojan-and-mr-bryl-s-practising>.

In the circumstances set out in this concerns notice, the Court will infer that the post has been widely republished;

- (xi) on about 18 June 2025, when it posted content on the OBL LinkedIn page, accessible at the following URL:

https://www.linkedin.com/posts/odtojanbryllawyers_marie-odtojan-lawyer-womaninlaw-poc-sydney-activity-7340969117425770496-TGKi?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_desktop&rem=ACoAAAFS9JEBEmQIUgmZBB9vQC1C14cL9_Xg00M.

In the circumstances, the Court will infer that the Third Matter Complained Of has been widely republished, and by at least 269 of OBL's followers on LinkedIn; and

- (i) on 10 July 2025, when it posted content on the OBL YouTube page, accessible at the following URL:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cLHQCF LZSCE>.

The video has been reviewed at least 25 times. In the circumstances, the Court will infer that the video has been widely republished.

- (b) Ms Odtojan republished the sense and substance of the Third Matter Complained Of:

- (i) on about 18 May 2025 when she posted content on X accessible at URL:

<https://x.com/MarieOdtojan/status/1924035004071596262>.

This post has been viewed at least 774 times, and it may be inferred that it has been republished widely on X;

- (ii) on about 14 June 2025, when she reposted the content on her Facebook page accessible at the following URL:

<https://www.facebook.com/share/p/19HPMJPs6y/>.

The Court will infer that this post has been widely republished, and to at least 161 followers on Facebook;

- (iii) on about 14 June 2025, when she reposted the Change.Org Petition on her Facebook, accessible at URL:

<https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1CNhdvYJS3/>.

The Court will infer that this post has been widely republished, and to at least her 161 followers on Facebook;

- (iv) on about 14 June 2025, when she reposted the Go Fund Me Post on her Facebook page, accessible at URL:

<https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1CNhdvYJS3/>.

The Court will infer that this post has been widely republished, and to at least her 161 followers on Facebook;

- (v) on about 18 June 2025, when she reposted it to her LinkedIn page, accessible at URL:

https://www.linkedin.com/posts/marie-odtojan-b409521b_marie-odtojan-lawyer-womaninlaw-poc-sydney-activity-7340960444079067138-1DX?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_desktop&rcm=ACoAAAFS9JEBEmQIUgmZBB9vQC1C14cL9_Xg00M.

This post has generated nine reactions, five comments and two reposts. The Court will infer that it has been widely republished; and

- (vi) on about 25 June 2025, when she posted content to X, accessible at URL:

<https://x.com/MarieOdtojan/status/1937769774928310626>

This post has currently received 78 views. It may be inferred that it has been widely republished on X.

- (c) You republished the sense and substance of the Third Matter Complained Of on about 18 June 2025, when you posted content to your LinkedIn page, accessible at URL:

https://www.linkedin.com/posts/marie-odtojan-b409521b_marie-odtojan-lawyer-womaninlaw-poc-sydney-activity-7340960444079067138-

[1DX?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_desktop&rcm=ACoAAAFS9JEBEmQIUgmZBB9vQC1C14cL9_Xg00M](https://www.facebook.com/1DX?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_desktop&rcm=ACoAAAFS9JEBEmQIUgmZBB9vQC1C14cL9_Xg00M).

This post has generated 9 reactions, 5 comments and 2 reposts. The Court will infer that it has been widely republished.

- 5.5 By the use of salacious hashtags in each of the above republications, it was the natural and probable consequence that the Third Matter Complained Of would generate reactions (in the form of likes, shares and comments) from other social media users and be published widely. In this regard, our client will also rely on the following statement within the body of the YouTube post (which comprises part of the Third Matter Complained Of):

“We need help fighting these corporations & the continuous infliction of oppression & injustice. You can help by liking, sharing, saving & commenting on this video. Further info on how to support & donate will be shortly provided via bio & website. We have created an Odtojan Bryl Justice Project, so if one can help & be part of our team, reach out to us 🙌👉 Contact us and/or make enquires at objusticeproject@gmail.com”

- 5.6 The Court will readily infer that one of the reasons why OBL, you, and Ms Odtojan have promoted the Third Matter Complained Of widely was to generate revenue for the “Odtojan Bryl Justice Project”. That project was promoted in the Go Fund Me Post and Change.Org Petition (referred to above) and seeks to raise \$1 million which is relevantly to pay: “[l]egal fees in pursuit of legal actions against the Law Society of NSW and the Office of the Legal Services Commissioner”. Amongst other things, internet users are invited to share “[your] cause and videos etc” (including the Third Matter Complained Of) by using the hashtag “#Justice4MarieAndArtem”, and invited to: “...bring mass public attention and support by donating to this cause” because it “ [is] of great public importance”.
- 5.7 Within a month of the publication of the Third Matter Complained Of, we observe that the “Odtojan Bryl Justice Project” has received donations in the sum of about \$1,250. Given that nexus, the Court will infer that the Third Matter Complained Of has been widely published.
- 5.8 For substantially similar reasons explained above (at [3.10]-[3.11]), you are liable as publisher of the Third Matter Complained Of. Additionally, in further support of the stated inference in those paragraphs, we will rely on you being named as essentially a victim in the Change.Org Petition and Go Fund Me Post. We will also rely on the inclusive language such as “we urge the community to stand with us as we call for accountability and transparency in our governing bodies” in the former post, and “we need

your help” in the latter post. In the circumstances, the Court will infer that you published and/or republished the Third Matter Complained Of.

- 5.9 A copy of the transcript of the Third Matter Complained Of is annexed to this concerns notice and marked “D”. As at the date of this letter, the Third Matter Complained Of (and each republication) remains publicly available online.

Imputations of concern

- 5.10 In its natural and ordinary meaning, the Third Matter Complained Of conveys the following defamatory imputations (or imputations that do not differ in substance):

- (a) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has unlawfully tampered with data that informed the legitimate renewal of the practising certificates for each of Ms Odtojan and Mr Bryl.
- (b) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has deliberately fabricated claims of misconduct about Ms Marie Odtojan and Mr Artem Bryl to cover up a matter of great public importance.
- (c) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has knowingly interfered with the practising certificates of NSW lawyers in contravention of her duties and obligations under the Uniform Law.
- (d) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has conspired with the Law Society Council to fabricate findings against Ms Odtojan and Mr Bryl to prevent them from renewing their practising certificates and subsequently mocked them.
- (e) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has knowingly engaged in, and approved, a targeted and discriminatory hate crime with respect to the renewal of practising certificates for each of Ms Odtojan and Mr Bryl.
- (f) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has engaged in fraudulent conduct to damage each of Ms Odtojan and Mr Bryl and subsequently relied on her position to conceal it.
- (g) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has deliberately ambushed Ms Odtojan and Mr Bryl to deny them due process, procedural fairness and natural justice.
- (h) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has knowingly fabricated claims of misconduct about Ms Odtojan and Mr Bryl to prevent Ms Odtojan from exposing unlawful coordinated acts committed by other lawyers.

- (i) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, condones fraud and criminality amongst the legal sector as well as the impersonation of lawyers.
- (j) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has conducted herself in such a way that the integrity of the Courts and the legal profession have been irreparably damaged, and the public can have no faith in the administration of justice in New South Wales.
- (k) Ms Griswold, in her role as Director, Legal Regulation, has done unlawful acts and fabricated findings of misconduct.

5.11 We are instructed that each of the above imputations are demonstrably false.

6. Fourth Matter Complained Of

Publication and republication

6.1 On 25 June 2025, OBL published a video on OBL's public YouTube page, which is accessible at the following URL:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OexTHYD8cME> (**Fourth Matter Complained Of**).

6.2 In the Fourth Matter Complained Of, Ms Griswold was referred to by image, name and title.

6.3 The salacious nature of the Fourth Matter Complained Of that OBL is clearly intended to promote the content as far and as wide as possible. Currently, the Fourth Matter Complained Of has been viewed over 119 times on YouTube and has generated reactions (in the form of likes, shares and at least one comment) by other internet users.

6.4 The natural and probable consequence of the publication of the Fourth Matter Complained Of was that it would be republished. On about 25 June 2025, the sense and substance of the Fourth Matter Complained Of was, in fact, republished by each of OBL and Ms Odtojan. Specifically, we draw your attention to the following:

6.5 OBL republished the sense and substance of the Fourth Matter Complained Of:

- (a) on 25 June 2025, when it published the content on OBL's TikTok, accessible at:

<https://www.tiktok.com/@oblalawyers>.

This post has currently amassed over 106 views online. The Court will infer that the Fourth Matter Complained Of has been widely republished on TikTok;

- (b) on 25 June 2025, when it published the content on the social media platform, “X”, accessible at the following URL:

<https://x.com/OdtojanBrylLaw>.

This post has currently been “viewed” over 52 times. The Court will infer in the circumstances that the Fourth Matter Complained Of has been widely republished on X; and

- (c) on 25 June 2025, when it published the content on the OBL Facebook Page, accessible at the following URL:

<https://www.facebook.com/odtojanbryllawyers>.

This post has generated at least one reaction and has been shared at least two times. The Court will infer in the circumstances that the Fourth Matter Complained Of has been widely republished on Facebook.

6.6 Ms Odtojan republished the sense and substance of the Fourth Matter Complained Of:

- (a) on about 25 June 2025 when she posted content on X accessible at URL:

<https://x.com/MarieOdtojan/status/1937769774928310626>.

This post has been viewed more than 175 times, and it may be inferred that it has been republished widely on X; and

- (b) on about 25 June 2025, when she posted content to X, accessible at URL:

<https://x.com/MarieOdtojan/status/1937769774928310626>.

This post has received at least 179 views. It may be inferred that it has been widely republished on X.

6.7 By the use of salacious hashtags in each of the above republishations, it was the natural and probable consequence that the Fourth Matter Complained Of would generate reactions (in the form of likes, shares and comments) from other social media users and be published widely.

6.8 For substantially similar reasons explained above (at [3.10]-[3.11]), you are liable as publisher of the Fourth Matter Complained Of. Additionally, in further support of the stated inference in those paragraphs, we will rely on you being named as essentially a victim in the Fourth Matter Complained Of, which includes the following oral statements: “the Law Society issued a section 45 certificate against me and Artem and they declared us unfit to practice law” and “This also applies to Artem.” We

will also rely on the inclusive language such as “we already gave them notice” and “it doesn’t matter what we do” in the Fourth Matter Complained Of. In the circumstances, the Court will infer that you published the Fourth Matter Complained Of.

- 6.9 A copy of the transcript of the Fourth Matter Complained Of is annexed to this concerns notice and marked “E”. As at the date of this letter, the Fourth Matter Complained Of (and each republication) remains publicly available online.

Imputations of concern

- 6.10 In its natural and ordinary meaning, the Fourth Matter Complained Of conveys the following defamatory imputations (or imputations that do not differ in substance):
- (a) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, deliberately fabricated claims of misconduct about Ms Marie Odtojan and Mr Artem Bryl to cover up a matter of great public importance.
 - (b) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has knowingly interfered with the practising certificates of NSW lawyers in contravention of her duties and obligations under the Uniform Law.
 - (c) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, conspired with the Law Society Council to fabricate findings against Ms Odtojan and Mr Bryl to prevent them from renewing their practising certificates.
 - (d) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has engaged in fraudulent conduct to damage each of Ms Odtojan and Mr Bryl.
 - (e) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has deliberately ambushed Ms Odtojan and Mr Bryl to deny them due process, procedural fairness and natural justice.
 - (f) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has knowingly fabricated claims of misconduct about Ms Odtojan and Mr Bryl.
 - (g) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has conducted herself in such a way that the integrity of the Courts and the legal profession have been irreparably damaged, and the public can have no faith in the administration of justice in New South Wales.
 - (h) Ms Griswold, in her role as Director of Legal Regulation, has acted unlawfully and fabricated findings of misconduct.
 - (i) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has conspired with the Law Society Council to fabricate findings against Ms Odtojan and

Mr Bryl to prevent them from renewing their practising certificates and subsequently mocked them.

- (j) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has disregarded the law to such an extent that she is responsible for a state of disorder within the Law Society of NSW.
- (k) Ms Griswold, Director, Legal Regulation, has such disregard for the rule of law, that the public need protecting.

6.11 We are instructed that each of the above imputations are demonstrably false.

7. Serious Harm

7.1 Publication of the matters complained of has caused, or is likely to cause, our client serious harm within the meaning of section 10A of the *Defamation Act* 2005 (NSW).

7.2 Ms Griswold is a qualified lawyer of the NSW Supreme Court and has held the position of Director, Legal Regulation, since October 2023.

7.3 Previously, Ms Griswold has held roles as a Senior Deputy District Attorney in California, as Director of NSW Fair Trading Legal Services, and as Executive Director for Better Regulation, Department of Customer Service in NSW. Our client has therefore built a portfolio of work over the past 36 years where her reputation is of particular importance.

7.4 As the Director of Legal Regulation, for the Law Society, Ms Griswold is responsible for the assessment and investigation of matters referred for appropriate consideration under the Uniform Law. She also oversees litigation, the regulation of trust accounts maintained by solicitors and is involved in the provision of services and assistance to the profession by way of general assistance. Ms Griswold and her team are therefore responsible for undertaking the regulatory activities associated with the Council and the Law Society's obligations under the Uniform Law. The Department licences and registers the NSW legal profession, assesses and investigates complaints in relation to the conduct of practitioners which are referred to it by the NSW Legal Services Commissioner, the Courts and various Tribunals.

7.5 The PSD plays a crucial role in maintaining high professional and ethical standards and investigating potential misconduct within the legal profession. Our client's obligations to the legal profession and the public of NSW include acting as a model litigant.

7.6 Consequently, it is crucial to ensure public confidence in the judicial system for our client to hold the reputation as someone that is objective, impartial, fair and reasonable person and who provides natural justice and

procedural fairness to every person. All of this is inherent to all aspects of her work.

- 7.7 Indeed, prior to the publication of each matter complained of, our client held such a reputation in the legal sector, as well as in NSW generally. In her long and distinguished career, Ms Griswold has not been the subject of any investigations, adverse findings, or disciplinary action. She was also well known to provide a professional high-level investigative service that has produced information, including reports, capable of withstanding scrutiny by NSW Tribunals and Courts. In that way, Ms Griswold also held the reputation as a someone that ensured public confidence in the administration of justice.
- 7.8 Each matter complained of has caused, or is likely to cause, damage to our client's reputation in the above sectors of her life. They each portray her as the antithesis of what she is – an objective, fair, honest and respectable professional.
- 7.9 The harm already caused to Ms Griswold's reputation is plainly evident from the reaction from members of the public to the Change Petition and Go Fund Me Post above. In this regard, we note some members of the public that have apparently signed the petition believing the matters complained of to be true and have donated their own money to the "Odtojan and Bryl Justice Project".
- 7.10 The publication of the matters complained of are further likely to cause serious harm because of:
- (a) the gravity of the imputations of concern. These include allegations of criminality, corruption, dishonesty. The publication of the matters complained of therefore has the inherent tendency to cause serious harm to Ms Griswold's reputation;
 - (b) each of the imputations of concern strike at the heart of Ms Griswold's professional role as Director, Legal Regulation, namely honesty and integrity;
 - (c) the circumstances, manner and extent of publication. Specifically, each matter complained of:
 - (i) was published in the context of an investigation conducted by Ms Griswold into your conduct as a NSW solicitor and each of the matters complained of are responsive to that investigation;
 - (ii) contained salacious and tendentious content calculated to fuel discussion and to reach as wide an audience as possible;

- (iii) was published and/or republished as part of a targeted online campaign by you and OBL against Ms Griswold. The clear intent of the campaign was to spread each matter complained of as far and as wide as possible to cause maximum damage to Ms Griswold's professional reputation. Whilst our client will rely on each matter complained of in this regard, we specifically will rely on the third matter complained of which has been viewed over 2,000 times on YouTube, and OBL's TikTok that has been viewed over 10,000 times;
- (iv) was purportedly authored and/or approved by a law practice and/or practising solicitors that held themselves out to be innocent victims of fraud at the hands of Ms Griswold. The matters complained of therefore had the imprimatur of officers of the Court, which increased their credibility;
- (v) were published to persons, including Ms Griswold's employer, that have power and influence over Ms Griswold's position. It is to be inferred that this was done to cause maximum damage to Ms Griswold's internal reputation within the Law Society, and ultimately, to have her summarily removed; and
- (vi) was published either in the knowledge that each of the above imputations of concern were false, or at the very least, recklessly and with an indifference to their truth or falsity.

8. Aggravated damages

- 8.1 Our client's hurt and harm occasioned by reason of the publication of the matters complained of was aggravated by her knowledge of the matters set out in this letter.
- 8.2 To the extent that we are instructed to commence defamation proceedings against you and seek damages, our client may rely on those matters as particulars of aggravation.
- 8.3 In particular, our client may amongst other things rely upon the following:
 - (a) Ms Griswold's knowledge of falsity with respect to each imputation set out above;
 - (b) your conduct in publishing or republishing each matter complained of on social media platforms for unrestricted downloading and sharing by users;

- (c) your conduct in using salacious and tendentious language to promote each matter complained of;
- (d) your conduct in publishing the matters complained of, which contain allegations of criminality and serious misconduct, without any proper basis to do so;
- (e) your conduct in republishing the matters complained of as evidence of your continuing campaign against Ms Griswold;
- (f) your conduct in publishing the matters complained of in response to an investigation conducted by Ms Griswold into your conduct as a solicitor of NSW; and
- (g) your conduct in publishing each of the matters complained of despite the findings of the NSW Court of Appeal set out at [**Error! Reference source not found.**] above.

8.4 Further particulars may be provided in due course.

9. Next Steps

9.1 We are instructed by our client to request you to do the following:

- (a) permanently remove each matter complained of (or material that is substantially similar);
- (b) provide in writing an apology to Ms Griswold (**Apology**) on the following terms:

From September 2024 to June 2025, Odtojan Bryl Lawyers and Artem Bryl published material that was defamatory of Valerie Griswold in which we imputed, amongst other things, that she was corrupt and dishonest, and had acted unlawfully.

That material published by us was a complete fabrication. We did so with the intention to injure Valerie Griswold's reputation because she was undertaking a lawful investigation of Mr Bryl's conduct as a NSW Solicitor.

We retract our statements and unreservedly apologise to Valerie Griswold for the damage to reputation, hurt and distress that we caused her.

- (c) publish the apology to each location controlled by you on which the matters complained of (or material that is substantially similar) were published and/or republished;
- (d) agree to pay Ms Griswold's reasonable legal fees in relation to this matter; and

- (e) provide a written undertaking that you will not publish content including the imputations of concern set out above, or imputations that do not differ in substance, regarding Ms Griswold.
- 9.2 If you do not agree to those demands by 5:00 pm on **Friday, 8 August 2025**, our client reserves her rights to commence defamation proceedings against you without further notice, including to seek an urgent interlocutory injunction.
- 9.3 In that context, in the event that OBL or you publish any further content of a substantially similar nature to the matters complained of set out above, our client may approach the Common Law Duty Judge seeking leave to commence proceedings prior to the expiry of 28 days and rely on your conduct on the question of costs in accordance with ss 12B and 40 respectively of the *Defamation Act 2005* (NSW).
- 9.4 Further, and notwithstanding that this concerns notice is clearly marked “confidential and not for publication”, should any of its contents be published by you or OBL, or each of you cause any of its contents to be published, we will seek instructions to seek urgent interlocutory relief from the Court without further notice to you.
- 9.5 Our client otherwise reserves all rights.

Yours faithfully

Baker McKenzie
+61 2 9225 0200
www.bakermckenzie.com

Encl.