

BEFORE THE HEARING BOARD
OF THE
ILLINOIS ATTORNEY REGISTRATION
AND
DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION

In the Matter of:)	
)	
CORY JAY ARONOVITZ,)	
)	Commission No. 2026PR00043
Attorney-Respondent,)	
)	
No. 6217268.)	

COMPLAINT

Lea S. Gutierrez, Administrator of the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission, by her attorney, Richard Gleason, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 753(b), complains of Respondent Cory Jay Aronovitz (“Respondent”), who was licensed to practice law in Illinois on November 4, 1993, and alleges that Respondent has engaged in the following conduct which subjects him to discipline pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 770:

(Plagiarism and Dishonesty)

1. At all times related to this complaint, Respondent was the sole owner of a law firm in Chicago styled as The Casino Law Group. Respondent was the only attorney at the law firm and focused his practice on advising clients who were engaged in, or planned to engage in, commercial gambling and online gambling.

2. In May of 2024, an online gaming company asked Respondent to provide it with a written legal opinion analyzing federal laws that applied to an online gaming product of the company’s. Respondent and the company agreed that Respondent would write the opinion letter in exchange for a flat fee of \$5,000. On or about May 12, 2024, Respondent provided the company with a seven-page written legal opinion which analyzed federal laws that applied to the company’s product.

FILED
5/21/2026 11:52 AM
ARDC Clerk

3. In late May or early June, 2024, after Respondent had provided the company with his initial written opinion, the company contacted Respondent and asked for a revised written legal opinion in which Respondent would also provide a State-by State analysis of gambling laws that could or would apply to the company's product. The company and Respondent agreed that Respondent would provide the revised legal opinion for a flat fee of \$2,500, and that Respondent would additionally provide the company with a certificate attesting to the applicability of the opinion to the company's product for an additional flat fee of \$1,500.

4. Prior to June 12, 2024, Respondent obtained a copy of a legal opinion drafted by an attorney named William Gantz, who was employed at the law firm Duane Morris. Mr. Gantz authored the legal opinion in 2023 and provided it to his client, an online gaming company. The legal opinion was 181 pages long, and provided a State-by-State survey of the gaming laws that could affect Mr. Gantz's client. The first page of Mr. Gantz's legal opinion was on Duane Morris letterhead, and stated "confidential – attorney work product." The footer on each page stated, "[copyright] Duane Morris 2023." In his 2023 legal opinion, Mr. Gantz required that he be notified before the legal opinion was disclosed to any third parties beyond his client and his client's payment processors.

5. On or about June 12, 2024, Respondent copied Mr. Gantz's 2023 legal opinion to create what purported to be a 181-page written legal opinion for his client, the company. The purported written legal opinion was entitled, "Social IGaming Legal Opinion," and purported to contain Respondent's legal analysis of each State's gaming laws that could affect the operation of the company's product throughout the United States. In the June 12, 2024 purported written legal opinion, Respondent stated that the analysis of the various State laws, the legal opinions, conclusions, and research contained in the written legal opinion were The Casino Law Group's.

On the same date, Respondent executed a document entitled, “Form Officers Certificate and Opinion of Counsel.” In the document, Respondent certified that the June 12, 2024 legal opinion had been issued by the Casino Law Group. On June 12, 2024, Respondent provided both the purported written legal opinion and the certificate to his client, the company.

6. Respondent’s statements which were contained in the June 12, 2024 legal opinion, described in paragraph five, above, were false. The work contained in the legal opinion was not Respondent’s. Instead, Respondent copied the analysis of the various State laws, the legal opinions, conclusions, and research contained in the June 12, 2024 legal opinion directly from Mr. Gantz’s 2023 written legal opinion, described in paragraph four, above. Respondent knew the statements were false when he made them, and that the written legal opinion was authored by Mr. Gantz, and not Respondent, because before passing the purported written legal opinion off to his client, Respondent deleted Duane Morris’s name from header, deleted Duane Morris’s copyright notation on each page of the written legal opinion, replaced Mr. Gantz’s name and Mr. Gantz’s client’s name with his name and his client’s name throughout the document, and removed Mr. Gantz’s signature at the end of the document and replaced it with his own signature. In all other respects, the written legal opinions were identical.

7. At the time Respondent provided the written legal opinion which purported to be his own, he knew that his client would provide the purported written legal opinion to its payment processors and banks, and that the payment processors and banks would rely on the purported written legal opinion in assessing the legality of the client’s online gaming product. Respondent did not seek Mr. Gantz’s permission to use Mr. Gantz’s written legal opinion before Respondent provided it to his client.

8. By reason of the conduct described above, Respondent has engaged in the following misconduct:

- a. conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation, by conduct including falsely representing the June 12, 2024 legal opinion as containing the work and legal opinions of Respondent's law firm, and by plagiarizing the 2023 written legal opinion of William Gantz and the law firm Duane Morris, in violation of Rule 8.4(c) of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct (2010).

WHEREFORE, the Administrator requests that this matter be referred to a panel of the Hearing Board of the Commission, that a hearing be conducted, and that the Hearing Panel make findings of fact, conclusions of fact and law, and a recommendation for such discipline as is warranted.

Respectfully submitted,

Lea S. Gutierrez, Administrator
Attorney Registration and
Disciplinary Commission

By: /s/ Richard Gleason
Richard Gleason

Richard Gleason
Counsel for Administrator
One Prudential Plaza
130 East Randolph Drive, Suite 1500
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6219
Telephone: (312) 565-2600
E-mail: ARDCeService@iadc.org
E-mail: rgleason@iadc.org

4930-1815-6710, v. 1