INDEX NO. 5821//201

1

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/26/2019

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER - CIVIL TERM - PART DEE 2 ALLAN KASSENOFF, 3 Plaintiff, 4 -against-Index#58217/2019 CATHERINE KASSENOFF, Defendant. 6 CONFERENCE 7 Westchester County Courthouse 111 Dr. M.L.K., Jr. Blvd. White Plains, New York 10601 June 19, 2019 9 10 BEFORE: 11 HONORABLE DAVID F. EVERETT, Supreme Court Justice 12 APPEARANCES: 13 MANIATIS & DIMOPOULOS, PC 14 Attorneys for Plaintiff 73 Main Street 15 Tuckahoe, New York 10707 BY: GUS DIMOPOULOS, ESQ. 16 LIEBERMAN & LEBOVIT 17 Attorneys for Defendant 334 Underhill Avenue - Suite 4A 18 Yorktown Heights, New York 10598 BY: MITCHELL P. LIEBERMAN, ESQ. 19 20 Nicole Ameneiros 21 Senior Court Reporter 22 23 24 25

2

3

.4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Proceedings

No. 3 on the calendar, Kassenoff versus THE CLERK: Kassenoff, Index No. 58217 of 2019. State your appearance for the record.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Good afternoon, your Honor. Dimopoulos, Maniatis & Dimopoulos, on behalf of the plaintiff, Allan Kassenoff, who's in the hallway.

MS: MOST: Good afternoon, your Honor. Carol Most, attorney for the children.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Good afternoon, Judge. Mitch Lieberman, Lieberman & Lebovit, with our associate Cali Lieberman on behalf of Mrs. Kassenoff, who's outside.

THE COURT: Okay. So where are we? There was an issue about the --

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor --

THE COURT: There was an issue about the supervisor.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Yeah, Ms. Kassenoff wanted to add another party to the order. We have no issue with it. just wanted to get an amended order.

The second thing that we thought was prudent, if you'll recall, your Honor, when we were here doing this we had -- I'll never forget her first name, Lily, but I forget her last.

THE COURT: Cousin Lily.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Cousin Lily was here and you spoke

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Proceedings

to her and advised her of her role. For subsequent people I want something in the order very simply that says whoever is going to be doing this is going to be advised of the terms of the court order and acknowledge them and that we should update -- amend the order accordingly. That was the only reason I sought your Honor's attention. And then --

THE COURT: I see Mr. Lieberman is ahead of the game and he's already working on it.

MS. MOST: No, no, no. He's just taking notes.

MR. LIEBERMAN: No, no.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LIEBERMAN: There's not actually much that he said so far that I've agreed with, so go ahead.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: That you have agreed with?

MR. LIEBERMAN: Right.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Or have not agreed with?

MR. LIEBERMAN: There is not much you have said that I agreed with.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Then it's just a regular day for you and I so we're good.

Okay. The second issue that I need addressed before it becomes a real issue is the order required the parties to begin searching for a full-time live-in nanny to 'replace the current nanny.

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

1

THE COURT:

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Right. MR. DIMOPOULOS: The reason being, the current

nanny is not a live-in. She has a son. She has to leave at a certain time.

THE COURT: So I think the term of art is au pair.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: You know, I'm confused too. think au pair means they have to come from another country and they have to be here for a limited period under a contract so none of these people are actually au pairs, they are nannies, but.

MR. LIEBERMAN: They can come from Kansas too.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: They can?

MS. MOST: Actually --

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Again he doesn't agree with me.

THE COURT: Like you said, another country.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: So the problem that's arisen here is that my client began to do searches and find candidates and send them over to his wife for her consideration. now has a term that doesn't exist in the order that I find to be ridiculous.

THE COURT: What's the term?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: The person has to be a native French speaker.

MR. LIEBERMAN: That's not what she said.

THE COURT: What did she say?

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

-12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Proceedings

5

MR. LIEBERMAN: We discussed it here. We were pretty open about it.

So what happened is we were told by Mister, not directly, I was with you, that it was his understanding that the nanny would not be -- would not be able to do full-time.

THE COURT: That's the nanny. We know that.

MR. LIEBERMAN: The current. Well, that turns out we were wrong. That's Orale (ph). Turns out when she speaks to Orale her son is leaving for college at the end of the summer. She has indicated to my client that she is fine becoming a full-time nanny, that way the kids wouldn't be introduced to someone new. The concern was two-fold --

THE COURT: French speaking?

MR. LIEBERMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Lilly --

MR. DIMOPOULOS: You have to speak French to work in the Kassenoff house.

MR. LIEBERMAN: There's no question about that.

This is what they have done for years so that their children are bilingual. She's from Nova Scotia.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: They don't speak French there, but, okay, go ahead.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Really?

MS. MOST: Actually, the children do speak French.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: The children do but'I don't think

2324

6

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

. 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. LIEBERMAN: And she's Canadian and she speaks

MS. MOST: Nova Scotia they don't speak French.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Okay, guys.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Anyway.

THE COURT: Let's cut to the chase.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Part of Canada. She speaks French. She's Canadian originally. They've always done this. This is not a new wrench. So we discussed this. I think we discussed a lot the last time we were here, and it was discussed that the person we were going to select would need to be able to speak French with the children. That's not a new issue. So, anyhow, what happens as they're going through these people, she's -- Orale is in the house and she has a discussion with Orale. Orale says, whoa, whoa, I don't want to leave. I could become full-time. I could stay here and it's not an issue.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Live-in?

MR. LIEBERMAN: Live-in.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Oh, okay. This is news to me.

She --

MR. LIEBERMAN: No, it's not news. That's what I wrote to you and you wrote me back.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: That's not true.

23

24

THE COURT: What are the kids names and ages again? 2 MR. DIMOPOULOS: The children are Ali who's 10. 3 THE COURT: Right, okay. 4 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Charley. 5 MS. MOST: Charley. 6 MR. DIMOPOULOS: We're just going with Charley. 7 We're not doing real names. And Jo Jo who's eight. Charley 8 who's eight and Jo Jo who's five. Ali I'm not sure she 9 turned 10 or she's nine. I think she turned 10. Actually, 10 hold on. Let me just get this. 11 THE COURT: You think it's 10, 7 and 5? 12 MR. LIEBERMAN: Yes. 13 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Okay. If that -- Mitch, I 14 apologize, if you sent this to me last night I didn't read 15 my email from last night --16 MR. LIEBERMAN: And you responded pretty quick. 17 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Not to that one. To the other 18 19 one. MR. LIEBERMAN: I'm kidding. 20 MR. DIMOPOULOS: If she's willing to be a live-in 21 nanny then I'll go discuss that with him because --22 MR. LIEBERMAN: And I think I have another person 23

7 of 38

supervisor issue.

24

25

for you also that I think he'll be okay with on the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Proceedings

ρ

On the supervisor issue, this order -- these are two practicing lawyers. My client is special counsel to the governor. We don't need this order. She doesn't need this order. And they don't need this order floating around because this is an interim order without findings. read this order you might draw certain conclusions that the Court has not drawn, that no fact finder has drawn. So if instead we want to say whoever the person is, because they're not supervisors, whoever the person is who's required to be there when she's there will be apprised of their obligations, I have no problem. And I know Carol is going to hate me for this, but that's tough, I have no problem with Carol generating an email to those people or having a conversation with them saying, do you understand this is it and getting a written response and then we're good to go.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: That's all I asked for.

THE COURT: Let me hear Ms. Most.

MS. MOST: I'm fine to do it. Of course, I'm leaving tomorrow --

THE COURT: Right.

MS. MOST: -- for two weeks, but, you know, if you get me the phone call -- the phone numbers I'll call them tomorrow morning first thing.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: You can also do it by email.

25

Proceedings

I have no --MS. MOST: 1 MR. DIMOPOULOS: You don't want the email floating 2 around, the order. 3. THE COURT: We're on the record so it's ---4 MS. MOST: I want everybody to be on the same page 5 with what I'm going to tell them. 6 MR. LIEBERMAN: Okay. So we'll take a second call 7 and we'll write out what you're going to tell them. 8 MS. MOST: That's fine. We don't need a second 9 call. 10 THE COURT: Let's bring in the parties. 11 MS: MOST: I have a couple other issues while we're 12 13 here. THE COURT: Yes. 14 MS. MOST: In speaking to the father today, the 15 parties called Child Mind, and, apparently, there was such 16 discordance on the telephone between the parties they have 17 been told that they're not willing to take their matter, so. 18 MR. LIEBERMAN: That's actually not what Child Mind 19 said. That may be the father's interpretation. 20 THE COURT: What did Child Mind say? 21 MR. LIEBERMAN: Child Mind said, we've reviewed 22 your matter, we've reviewed the intake and we're making the 23 following two recommendations for you. They don't take 24

every case that comes in. They referred this out.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Proceedings

1.0

THE COURT: So what were the recommendations?

MR. LIEBERMAN: There's two recommendations.

They've called both people. I believe they've already had one call today and they're trying to pin down who they're going to go to.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: I've never professed to be an expert in Child Mind, but to me, in further investigation and further talking to people who know Child Mind, that's them saying we're not interested. Regardless of the interpretation, it doesn't matter. It's unfortunate because, as Mr. Lieberman explained to me and as my partner explained, Child Mind is the number one place, but it is what it is. They recommended I think a doctor -- Dr. Alan Ravitz in the city, who we're fine with, and then another institute Ackerman, that we are not.

MS. MOST: Ackerman I'm not fine with.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: We're not fine with at all.

MS. MOST: Yeah.

THE COURT: They have to go down to the city?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: You know, Dr. Ravitz is --

MS. MOST: He's well-known.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: He's a --

THE COURT: So let's use him.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Yeah, it will be inconvenient,

but.

FILED: WESTCHESTER COUNTY CLERK 06/26/2019 12:01 PM INDEX NO. 58217720

· · · · ·

Proceedings

| 1 | MR. LIEBERMAN: Are you using Ravitz for anything |
|----|--|
| 2 | else right now? |
| 3 | MR. DIMOPOULOS: I've never used Ravitz, nor do I |
| 4 | currently use him for anything else. |
| 5 | MR. LIEBERMAN: You? |
| 6 | MS. MOST: Nor I. I've heard about him though. |
| 7 | MR. LIEBERMAN: I don't know the man, never heard |
| 8 | of the name before. I don't do very much custody law just |
| 9 | every day. |
| 10 | THE COURT: Before you |
| 11 | MR. LIEBERMAN: But we'll use him. |
| 12 | THE COURT: Let's just get them in. |
| 13 | MR. DIMOPOULOS: Can I just get two minutes to |
| 14 | speak to my client about the new development with the nanny? |
| 15 | MR. LIEBERMAN: If we could have a second call. |
| 16 | Could we leave our stuff? |
| 17 | THE COURT: Yes, absolutely. |
| 18 | (Recess taken.) |
| 19 | THE COURT: So we have the parties here. Mr. & |
| 20 | Mrs. Kassenoff are present. |
| 21 | All right. So do you want to put on record what we |
| 22 | discussed? |
| 23 | MR. DIMOPOULOS: Yes, your Honor. |
| 24 | THE COURT: Everyone else can sit down. |
| 25 | MR. DIMOPOULOS: Mr. Lieberman has a Microsoft Word |

Proceedings .

version of the order that we were working on -- .

MR. LIEBERMAN: Actually, it was signed.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Right. That ultimately got signed. He's going to email me a copy of that. If he wants to do it himself, that's fine, otherwise --

THE COURT: I think we should try to do it right now.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: I am happy to do it now, to add a few names on, to add a provision, that Ms. Most is going to reach out to each of these supervisors to apprise them of the terms of their assignment under the order, you know.

And on the issue of the nanny that we discussed,

Mr. Lieberman advises the current nanny, Orale (ph), is

willing to become a live-in nanny. We don't have, as it was

explained to me, we don't yet have the terms in terms of

hours, days, compensation. So what I was going to recommend

so that -- because I think the parties are -- should each

have a meeting, discussion with her and then come to some

confirmation in writing as to when she's going to begin,

which should be forthwith, and what the hours are, days are,

terms of compensation and then we can perhaps have a

conference call with your Honor on Monday and avoid that

issue altogether. But I think we're going to need a little

more time.

THE COURT: · Okay.

Proceedings

MR. LIEBERMAN: So, before we get there, because I don't think we need to amend this order, I think what we're doing is actually a lot of back and forth if you want to add that provision. We could add people on. Whether we make a record, whether it be here or in writing between --

MR. DIMOPOULOS: That's --

MR. LIEBERMAN: And have Ms. Most apprise the people, I have the judge so-ordering this transcript, that she will apprise the people of the terms.

However, I want to alert everyone because I just told Gus, and I know Carol is aware, my client has in fact inserted intensive therapy with a PhD. Things are going really, really well she said, four or five visits. We anticipate speaking with that doctor within the next couple of days. I'm waiting for a -- I think she has one more visit and then we're anticipating a letter to be generated and for it to be sent to Ms. Most and counsel for consideration about lifting the need for this. If we can't get that consent; I am going to want to come back here pretty quickly --

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. LIEBERMAN: -- anyhow so I'm not that concerned what we do in the very short run.

In terms of Orale, they should both meet with her together so if there's ever been a he-said, she-said case,

2

3

4

Proceedings

14

this is it. If they're both in the same room they might still do that, but at least Oral'e will know what both of them said to her and what her understanding is and either she'll be willing to do this or she won't. Until then, we do have additional folks who we would like to have available as potential supervisors.

THE COURT: You want to put their names on the record?

MR. LIEBERMAN: Sure.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Before you do that --

MR. LIEBERMAN: Yeah.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: -- my client has no objection.

Again, under the provision that now you have about 13 phone calls to make.

MS. MOST: Okay. So someone has to get me all those names and numbers.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Right. If you could put that on the record.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Okay. So, in addition, Meredith

Grant was the person we provided the name that's been agreed
to already, and then Odile, O-D-I-L-E, Grisard

G-R-I-S-A-R-D. I am so sorry because these don't get
easier. Cynthia -- well, this one does -- DeMonte,

D-E-M-O-N-T-E; Diane C-I-V-I-D-A-N-E-S; Heleno, H-E-L-E-N-O,
Hofer, H-O-F-E-R; Jacinda Economas, J-A-C-I-N-D-A,

Proceedings

E-C-O-N-O-M-A-S, and Ewa, E-W-A, Wojcik, W-O-J-C-I-K. Those persons are acceptable. My client will provide to Ms. Most their contact information so that Ms. Most can advise him.

We have a specific provision actually in the order that details what the obligations of these nonparties are. She can advise them of that, make sure they're willing. I don't need it in writing. If you want it in writing, that's fine. However you folks want to do it. Because, again, maybe I'm just guardedly optimistic, I don't see this going on much more than a week or two anyhow. But, if it does, at least we have a good list of people and a vehicle in place for everyone to be assured that they know what their obligations are.

THE COURT: Just so --

MR. DIMOPOULOS: And to be clear, your Honor, I had no objection to Mr. Lieberman's placing that on the record, providing your Honor so-order the transcript. We don't have to go through the process of amending the order.

THE COURT: Just so it's clear, I don't know because I don't have it in front of me, the specifics of the order, but I know what I told --

MR. LIEBERMAN: We have a copy right here, Judge.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Lily, cousin Lily.

THE COURT: I know I explained to cousin Lily in detail that the children were never to be out of her

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/26/2019

Proceedings

presence when Mrs. Kassenoff was there and that's to continue. Is that in the order?

MR. LIEBERMAN: No. What was in the order and that is agreed to is on the bottom of page three as follows:

Ordered: The parties shall adhere to the attached children's bill of rights and the above-referenced persons who will be with the defendant during her access shall observe and enforce the same. The foregoing persons shall be obligated to immediately notify the AFC in the event of a perceived violation of this order or the attached children's bill of rights.

THE COURT: All right. Since --

MR. LIEBERMAN: If I could have one more second, Judge.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Because I think what you said may actually appear otherwise, which is why we put it in the terms of this order. I don't want to misspeak. If I could.

Page three on the top of the page, I just read the bottom of that page, ordered that:

Pending further order of the Court, the defendant shall have any one or more of the following people present during all times of her access time with the girls and she shall notify the plaintiff of the person or persons to be present for each such access period.

24

25

Proceedings

17

So that does in fact indicate what your Honor 1 indicated, and we have no problem with Ms. Most advising the 2 parties, these nonparties rather, of the first decretal 3 paragraph and of the last decretal paragraph on page three. 4 THE COURT: All right. Since this record will be 5 so-ordered, I just want to make it very clear that, 6 Ms. Most, please be sure to communicate to each of the 7 people on the risks of supervising visits that the children 8 are not to be alone in the presence of Mrs. Kassenoff --9 MS. MOST: Okay. 10 THE COURT: -- during the period of time that they 11 are supervising the visits. 12 MS. MOST: Okay. 13 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, if I --14 THE COURT: For any period of time whatsoever. 15 16 Yes? MR. DIMOPOULOS: If that concludes that part of our . 17 discussion, I'd like to just bring up one brief thing just 18 for clarification. Do we need to say anything more --19 MS. MOST: Dr. Ravitz. 20 21

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Yeah, so we're transitioning,

okay, so we can cut there for --

THE COURT: Just so it's clear, when I say any -- at any time I mean even for a few minutes. It has to be --

MS. MOST: I get it.

17 of 38

18

1 THE COURT: It has to be constant.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: All right. The next issue I just want to bring up, I don't think it's going to be an issue, but those are famous last words, my client has made an appointment to treat with a Dr. Tracy Markowitz as his psychologist. She is a PsyD versus a PhD, same degree, same license, but, you know, PsyD's focus a little more on clinical practice versus research. I just wanted to get Mr. Lieberman's consent on a PsyD versus a PhD.

MR. LIEBERMAN: If I could just have a moment.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. LIEBERMAN: I think counsel is asking -- I've never consented to a PsyD to do anything in a custody case so if I could just have a second.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. LIEBERMAN: No, Judge, we did this before. of page four, quote, ordered that each party shall immediately commence psychotherapeutic services with a therapist of at least a PhD or MD qualification.

THE COURT: So it's -- PsyD is a PhD, no?

MR. LIEBERMAN: No, no.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, I've researched the issue. I didn't come here unprepared, so. Just give me a second.

THE COURT: It's not a doctorate level.

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

·13

14.

15

16

. 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

19

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Of course it is. 1. MS. MOST: It is a doctorate. 2 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Of course it is. 3 MR. LIEBERMAN: It's not -- we used pretty specific -- at least a PhD level. You can't get a PhD on the same 5 credits that you can get PsyD. 6 7 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, a PsyD --MR. LIEBERMAN: Is less credits. MR. DIMOPOULOS: -- a PsyD or a Doctor of 9 Psychology degree is an alternate degree that focuses on the 10 clinical and applied aspects of psychology. A PsyD's study 11 revolves around prepared -- anyway. And that's -- here's 12 the -- allpsychologyschools.com. 13 MR. LIEBERMAN: What are we reading from? We just 14 found something on the internet? 15 THE COURT: Let me ask you this, this is --16 MR. DIMOPOULOS: He asked if it was the same 17 degree. . 18 THE COURT: This is supposed to be therapeutic for 19 Mr. Kassenoff; is that correct? 20 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Yes.

21

22

23

24.

25

THE COURT: It's not something about which we're

going to be taking testimony.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: No, it says psychotherapeutic

service.

MR. LIEBERMAN: No, no, no. What it says is, in a consent order where we were very careful and we've been held to the letter of every single letter in this order, what it says is a therapist of at least a PhD or MD qualification. It's my understanding, from having had this issue and having had PsyD's on the stand and PhD's on the stand, that there are more credits and more resident hours that are involved in getting a PhD doctorate than getting a PsyD.

THE COURT: So let me ask you this, Mr. Lieberman, I can understand if you were taking that stance as to someone who's doing a forensic evaluation, but if this is supposed to be therapeutic and this is a person who Mr. Kassenoff can benefit from, I don't know what the objection is. I understand —

MR. LIEBERMAN: The objection is --

THE COURT: I can modify the order but --

MR. LIEBERMAN: Here's the objection, you were provided with an ex parte application with video that made my client out to be this monster. Elephants don't marry giraffes, Judge, not here, not anywhere, okay. We didn't give you our treasure troll. We didn't bring out all of this. We'll be happy to share it. I don't think it moves us forward, it would be shared with the forensic evaluator. But the screaming and the yelling, it's not just my client. The cursing at the child, taking the child's clothes out

Proceedings

after she puts her clothes away because she didn't do it quick enough and throwing them on the floor and telling her, with profanity, that she has to do it again within a time

THE COURT: Let's assume --

MR. LIEBERMAN: -- who saw that --

THE COURT: Hold on. Let's assume that to be accurate.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Okay. Well, we were all real concerned whether my client was in with a PhD or MD and we have the same concerns. If you want, I'll come in tomorrow with an order to show cause ex parte with our video and I assure you you will have the same concerns.

THE COURT: But here's the thing, if she were to have -- there is -- I was not aware of the specific provision PhD -- PhD PsyD, that's not a grave concern to me. It's who could do the most benefit. If you were to come in and tell me that your client would get the most benefit out of seeing a PsyD I would have no issue with that.

MR. LIEBERMAN: That's not what I have heard.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor --

MR. LIEBERMAN: I heard this is the person he found ---

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, my client called six therapists, had conversations with them. He had a

5

4

limit --

1

2

3

6

U

7

8

9

10

1.1

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Proceedings

connection with this person, okay, didn't even cross his mind, you know, it would be an issue. I raised it knowing that it might be an issue because of a nuance, and I just ask you modify the order, your Honor. It's --

MR. LIEBERMAN: Wait a second.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: -- academic.

MR. LIEBERMAN: No, no, no. This is a consent order where we crafted this language. I challenge the Court to find this language in another order that's currently before it. We did this for this case for a reason. you're going to rule against us, I got it. I'm letting you know now that a PsyD does not have the credentials for the issues that we believe are present. If they believe that's the case, they want to take the risk, we're not going to file contempt on that, but I'm telling everybody right now I'm certainly going to look for an adverse inference when we get to trial and we find out that the PsyD wasn't qualified and therefore he hasn't moved through the therapeutic process the way he could have and should have. That's on them. As far as we're concerned, he's in violation of an order, not seeking contempt, not seeking enforcement, I have a court order. Those are his choices. They're both They know what they're doing.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, again, I'm going to the appellate division tomorrow, I'm filing an order to show

24

1.0

. 20

Proceedings

cause tomorrow, I'm -- I don't want to put myself -- can you please, he's looking to get some therapeutic services required by the order. There is a nuance in degrees.

They're both doctors. I really don't think there is a problem here for your Honor to just modify the order and have him go to a PsyD, I really don't.

MR. LIEBERMAN: If you do modify a consent order under these circumstances, without even having anything before you in sworn form, there will be an objection and we will not consent to it. If they want to take this risk and they believe it's the same, that's on them.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: I'll swear --

MR. LIEBERMAN: I think the proper way to do this would have been to say, hey, Mitch, before we get there today, my client is thinking of going in with this person, allow us to check this person out, maybe she's a PsyD but she's got a very good reputation and we'll be comfortable with it, but to give me a name of someone on the face of things who is not qualified and say, oh, it's a nuance, it's not a nuance, it's a consent order.

THE COURT: Why don't we -- we're going to keep the -- as stated on the record, to this point, the order will remain in place as I had -- as was initially signed and so-ordered with the modification in addition to the names and other terms that I dictated into the record and it will

24

be so-ordered. As to the PsyD, do you want to -- I think maybe we can avoid conflict if Mr. Lieberman has an opportunity to look into this. I mean, listen --

MR. LIEBERMAN: She may be great. Just get me her CV, let me find out who she is. I've never heard of her.

THE COURT: By the way, I'm not saying I might not modify the order in any event, but I would much prefer we could do this by consent to avoid problems.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Why don't we do this, do you want to do this rather than have everybody come in at all kinds of times and expenses, do you want to do this by letter agreement?

MR. LIEBERMAN: Sure. Why don't you get me a CV by Friday and by Tuesday if there's a problem I'll let Gus know.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Okay.

MR. LIEBERMAN: If there's not a problem, I'll let Gus know.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Okay.

THE COURT: I would appreciate it, Mr. Lieberman, if you would be liberal in doing this, because, you know what, if it's a question — there's no doubt in my mind that if this was a forensic I would view it that it should be a PhD or an MD. On the other hand, what's therapeutic for one

18

 $\cdot 20$

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

of the individuals and one of the individuals thinks that the PsyD would certainly be better than a PhD --

MR. LIEBERMAN: For us, Judge, it's actually -- I don't understand that. If he's going to feel comfortable talking to somebody and not feel comfortable talking to somebody that we think he should talk to then the whole purpose of this is defeated. So I'm approaching this with the point of view as long as somebody doesn't tell me she's horrible or something that would disqualify --

THE COURT: I wouldn't --

MR. LIEBERMAN: I'm not a doctor. I'm a lawyer, you know. Or what was the Star Trek, I'm a doctor, Jim, no, I'm just a lawyer, I'm not a doctor. I'm not about to make a call for who Mr. Kassenoff should be seeing. I just want to make sure the person --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LIEBERMAN: -- is qualified --

THE COURT: So let's say -- `

MR. LIEBERMAN: -- in accordance with the order, that's all.

THE COURT: So you'll get it to Mr. Lieberman by Friday?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Yes. And the final thing -THE COURT: When will you get it to him by?
MR. DIMOPOULOS: We will call Dr. Markowitz -- I

.3

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Proceedings.

mean. I don't know how long it's going to take her to send a We'll endeavor to get it done by Friday.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Just when you leave here --

THE COURT: That's fine. By Friday. And then by next Wednesday you'll --

MR. LIEBERMAN: I'll have it by Tuesday.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Okay.

THE COURT: There will be a letter by Mr. Lieberman either saying yea or nay and --

MR. DIMOPOULOS: And the final thing I want to address with your Honor, I don't expect your Honor to have to get involved in it at this point, but I just need to make a record of it because it's starting to be a problem, okay. My client has access time with the children. Ms. Kassenoff has access time with the children. Each party is free, under the terms of the order, to exercise their parenting time as they wish.

THE COURT: Correct.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: My client is getting consistent emails from Mrs. Kassenoff directing him on what to do with his parenting time, where to go, how to do it, and the emails are starting to get concerning, okay. I would like -- we walked out --

> THE COURT: Concerning how?

24

25

26 of 38

Proceedings

MR. DIMOPOULOS: She's trying to control everything that he does during his parenting time, and my advice to him

MR. LIEBERMAN: Why don't you give those emails to the, Judge.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Sure.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Because what it is, Judge, you have three kids who are pretty heavily scheduled --

THE COURT: Hold on. Are they scheduling issues or

MR. DIMOPOULOS: No, it's not just scheduling.

Family Wizard is to be implemented to put up the schedule, okay. Already the kids are being enrolled in programs without my client's consent. At this particular point in time — it just happened with soccer, okay — what I am asking, okay, what I'm not even asking, what I'm putting on the record is that she is not to interfere with my client's parenting time. He knows what to do. Provided the schedule is there, he will handle his parenting time his way and she will handle her parenting time her way. The emails are getting more and more acrimonious. They're getting more and more bossy, and they're getting more and more controlling and it's a problem, it's a problem.

MR. LIEBERMAN: I've read the emails. I don't think anybody is being bossy or controlling. When we were

.

28

25

here last time there was a concern expressed on Mr. Kassenoff's behalf that he didn't know their schedule because that hadn't been his role in the family. faulting him. That's the way things got delegated. client did all of that, violin lessons, from soccer, to camp, to everything. She scheduled everything. So what has now happened is he's unaware of their historic schedules, he's unaware that Charley -- Charlotte got invited to join the soccer team quite some time ago, it's because she works so hard and did so well it was a natural evolution of where she was going with her soccer program. If they were together this would have happened, so. She was registered for the program. They were registered for camp. The notion is that I'm going to put the kids in little league soccer and you're going to put the kids in little league baseball because we both can do what we want on our time and ignore what the kids want to do... so what my client thought she was doing was the right thing, by continuing the same activities and the anticipated activities for the children that they've always been in. If we need to, in the interim time, implement a parent coordinator for better communication, seems a little silly, these two people do talk and we're not talking about anything extraordinary, we're talking about she made the travel soccer program because she's really, really good, we're talking about camp,

. 14

. 17

Proceedings

we're talking about violin.

We want to talk about issues, okay, you can't let
Ali go to school and then have her locked out of the house
when it's your day and have the neighbor call my client
yesterday and say, you know, Ali's locked out of the house,
she doesn't have a key. I didn't come in here to complain,
Judge, but if we want to get into serious issues, my view of
this is it's going to take a couple of weeks for these
people to sort things out and learn how to co-parent within
this nesting arrangement.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: I don't disagree.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Otherwise, otherwise, what was my client supposed to do? Because her next call to me is do I run home and get the key? I said, no, it's not your time.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: As I -- I don't necessarily disagree with everything Mr. Lieberman said, unlike him disagreeing with everything I said, but here's the actual email. As Jo Jo's mom, I would like your assurance that she's getting to her activity on time with a responsible adult per the court order. If you can't assure me of that then I will raise it with my lawyer. This is two days after the ink is dry. He knows what he's doing. He's been a dad for as long as she's been a mom, okay. Let him do his thing, let her do her thing. I'm bringing this to the Court's attention to head this off. This isn't something

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Proceedings

30

that requires Court intervention, but I need to raise it because if it gets worse it --

MR. LIEBERMAN: It's not going to get worse. My client is going to do what has historically been done for the children. Hopefully, continue what these children have historically enjoyed, soccer, enjoyed violin, enjoyed going to camp. If he wants to be the one to say we're going to stop doing what we have historically done, what we agreed to do four weeks ago before this fiasco blew up, there's going to be a real serious problem.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, your Honor, that's not fair.

MS. MOST: It isn't fair.

THE COURT: Hold on.

MS. MOST: Because --

THE COURT: Ms. Most, hold on.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Isn't fair?

THE COURT: Hold on, hold on.

MR. LIEBERMAN: If not, raise this with me.

THE COURT: One second, please.

MR. LIEBERMAN: How do you know it's not fair --

THE COURT: Let me, let me. All right. First of all, if one party, one parent is going to make plans for a child that falls out on the time that the other parent has

with the child they have to get the agreement of the other

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Proceedings

31

parent which should not be unreasonably withheld.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Agreed.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LIEBERMAN: What about things that were put in place before we got here?

MS. MOST: There should be discussion -- there should be no sign-ups for anything unless the parties talk about it.

THE COURT: I agree 100 percent. Well, if it falls out within the timeframe that one parent has that child, for example, a violin lesson, if it falls out during

Mrs. Kassenoff's time, that's fine, but if it falls out during Mr. Kassenoff's time, he has to be consulted and agree to it. It's very --

MR. LIEBERMAN: Can we talk about that? The kids have been in violin lessons forever. Are we now going to say if a violin lesson is on his time he doesn't want it the kid gets pulled?

THE COURT: This is what I said, it shall 'not be unreasonably withheld. I think we're all attorneys here.

MR. LIEBERMAN: So when my --

MR. DIMOPOULOS: This is all --

MR. LIEBERMAN: Excuse me. What my client was writing was that this was an event that she understood that Jo Jo was going to be in, that she understood everyone knew

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

.15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Proceedings

32

about, and that if he was going to have a problem with it, okay, I'll bring it to my lawyer. Frankly, that's what I told her to do.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LIEBERMAN: That's what I would do if, God forbid, I was in this situation and I couldn't work it out.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: I think the point is made, okay, I will not tolerate interference with my client's parenting time. That's all I want to say.

THE COURT: That's fine. I think we're all in agreement with that.

MS. MOST: So -- &

THE COURT: But again, but again, if it's something that was already in place for a long period of time, I don't think Mr. Kassenoff wants to be the bad guy and say, no, you can't go to these lessons that you've been going to all the time just because --

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Right.

THE COURT: -- it now falls on my time. The question is not unreasonably withhold --

MR. DIMOPOULOS: That never --

THE COURT: Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Lieberman.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Here's the thing, that's not even the issue. We're not even disputing what's going on. What we're saying is stop emailing him repeatedly on his

Proceedings

parenting time, asking him questions about what he's doing, where he's doing it, how he's doing it, how he's getting there. He's a very, very responsible adult, he can handle it.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Judge, the only other email that came was when the neighbor called and said Ali was locked out. She sent an email, do you know Ali is locked out? Do you know you have to give her a key in the morning? It's not that she is controlling. He's never had this role before.

THE COURT: I understand, but still, let's use some discretion here.

MS. MOST: Judge, the last thing is --

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. MOST: -- do the parties agree to go to

Dr. Ravitz? I don't know where that -- where we are with

that.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: We consent.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Just so we're clear, Judge, there's a question being posed like we're in the way of it. The parties just got -- the parties just got an email yesterday, I believe, about these two -- or the day before about the two recommendations, and I think yesterday the parties agreed to start interviewing, it might have even before this --

Proceedings

MR. DIMOPOULOS: We're just confirming. We're not saying --

MR. LIEBERMAN: So I understand the plaintiff has objected to one of the two.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Correct.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Okay. We just found that out eight minutes ago when I was standing here that they objected to one of the two. This isn't even 24 hours old. I will speak to my client about the other doctor. I've told her and she's already reached out to her husband to say let's have a joint call. I don't know why this is an issue before you. Everything is being posed like we're in the way. We're not in the way. My client is doing what she's supposed to do.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: We need matters confirmed, that's all.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LIEBERMAN: In fact, my client today suggested a 9:30 call with the doctor and has still yet to get a responsive email about that.

Judge, in terms of the soccer, just so we can clear it up, it was -- it was a continuation. She's been in soccer all year. My client did sign her up in June for the travel team. She just thought that since they had been -- had her in and she got invited that everybody would be on

Proceedings

the same page. It wasn't done to deprive your client of time with his daughter. It was done because there was a common belief that this is what she wants to do.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: You know my client's response, what he said to me which I thought was brilliant? He said, Catherine, this is the new normal, so let's just not -- this isn't -- these parties are going through a divorce.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Okay. But can the kid be on the soccer team?

THE COURT: One at a time. Let's address the one
-- let's do one issue at a time. Soccer team, okay.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: No idea what days it is, no idea what the commitment is, no idea how many times a week, no idea.

MR. LIEBERMAN: It's all in the email he objected to.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: It is not. It is not.

THE COURT: Hold on. Let's adhere -- let's do it right now. What are the dates so your client -- ;
Mr. Lieberman?

MR. LIEBERMAN: Did you send me that email with the attachment?

From what the email says, it's Mondays and
Thursdays from 4:45 to 6 p.m. at Harbor Island. Games are
Sunday afternoons. WISL full schedule will be confirmed by

36

| | 110000411190 |
|----|--|
| 1 | mid August. |
| 2 | MR. DIMOPOULOS: Did you say Mondays and what? |
| 3 | MR. LIEBERMAN: Wednesdays Thursdays. |
| 4 | THE COURT: We're talking about the fall? |
| 5 | MR. LIEBERMAN: This is you practice for the |
| 6 | summer and you start your games in August and you go through |
| 7 | it. It's soccer. |
| 8 | MR. DIMOPOULOS: When does it start? August? |
| 9 | August what? |
| 10 | MR. LIEBERMAN: No, no, no, no, no. That's |
| 11 | when the full schedule comes out. When's the first |
| 12 | practice, Catherine? September? |
| 13 | This is not interfering with anyone's summer plans, |
| 14 | this is for September, but you had to register now. |
| 15 | THE COURT: I don't think Mr. Kassenoff wants to |
| 16 | stand in the way of his daughter's soccer lesson, soccer |
| 17 | practice. |
| 18 | MR. DIMOPOULOS: Let's just say this in a very |
| 19 | non-adversarial way, we need to know have we begun using |
| 20 | Family Wizard? |
| 21 | MR. KASSENOFF: A little bit. |
| 22 | MR. DIMOPOULOS: A little bit. Okay. |
| 23 | What I think we need to do is, now that we have |
| 24 | this new activity, we need to set a date that everybody has |

to be updated on Family Wizard so my client knows what's

.2

3.

4

5

6

7

. 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Proceedings

37

going on, including the soccer traveling and all this stuff.

You know, it's a process where everyone is going to trip

over their own shoelaces.

THE COURT: Here's what we're going to do, we're going to give each side an opportunity to upload it to --Family Wizard it's called?

MS. MOST: Yes.

THE COURT: Family Wizard. We'll set a date that it has to be uploaded and then we'll do a week later for objections. How's that?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Correct. That will be perfect.

THE COURT: Pick a date that each side has to -- each party has to upload the plans for the girls and then within a week -- $\,\sim\,$

MR. LIEBERMAN: By next Wednesday.

THE COURT: 'Fine.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: We'll have responses by that Friday.

THE COURT: All right. Is that enough time for everybody?

All right. So --

MR. LIEBERMAN: And I just sent counsel the soccer email again that was sent to his client by my client.

THE COURT: All right. So I'm not going to update -- the order doesn't need to be updated --

38

1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

. 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

MR. LIEBERMAN: No.

THE COURT: -- with the sub-limitation that's in the record and that's in the order and I'm going to so-order the transcript.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Just so we're clear -- excuse me,

Ms. Most.

MS. MOST: Yes.

THE COURT: Next Wednesday everything's uploaded to Family Wizard; by Friday any objections, and let's do it -you can upload any letters of objection to the e-filing and just drop off a hard copy with the Court so we have it.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Thank you for your time again, Judge.

THE COURT: Very well. And good luck to everybody.

SO-ORDERED BY

DAVID F

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND

ACCURATE TRANSCRIPTION OF MY STENOGRAPHIC NOTES.

Nicole Amene

Senior Court Reporter