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    THE COURT: We are going to go on the record, and the first issue we're going to talk about is the request for permission to move to disqualify Ms. Most. So Ms. Spielberg, you can talk to that issue.

MS. SPIELBERG: Thank you, Judge. As the Court saw from my correspondence that $I$ sent the other day, there was a very unfortunate incident where Ms. Most, I presume, intended to e-mail Mr. Kassenoff, but instead sent the e-mail to Ali, one of the parties' children, who then forwarded the e-mail to Charlotte.

It might have been one thing, Judge, if the subject of the e-mail was, "Remind me again what the Court date is," or "Can you send me the link to get on the appearance?" But unfortunately, the subject of the e-mail included a couple of things that are problematic.

The first is that it asked for Allan to assist the children's attorney in doing something. Which in and of itself creates an appearance of impropriety for the children, and would make them wonder why their lawyer, who they have said, time and time again, too, that they want to live with their mother, is aligned in some way with their
father against their mother.
In addition, the e-mail itself inquired about Mom's boyfriend -- e-mails between Mom and her boyfriend. As we all know that those e-mails that Ms. Most referred to are with respect to somebody that my client was involved with prior to the marriage, and also deal with an incident after the marriage that both Mr. and Mrs. Kassenoff are involved in. Whether or not e-mails from ten years ago, ten years prior to the commencement of the divorce, is even relevant, remains to be seen, Judge, but notwithstanding, the issue is that it left the children with this question about -- many questions -- one, does Mom have a boyfriend? Two, does this boyfriend have anything to do with the reason we haven't been able to see her for more than two months? Three, why is my attorney e-mailing my father about using something at a trial? And four, can $I$ trust my own lawyer, who I've told numerous times that $I$ want to live with my Mom and who seems to be advocating otherwise?

They are not aware, Judge, of the extent to which Ms. Most has advocated against their wishes, but $I$ think they would be surprised if they were. I mean, there's plenty of case law
that speaks to the importance of trust in an attorney/client relationship, and there are cases, if your Honor allows me to make the motion that $I$ will cite, that talks about how important it is that a lawyer not have personal interest, which are antagonistic to those of their client.

We have been saying right along, Judge, that we don't believe there's sufficient basis for Ms. Most to be substituting judgment. Since it's been cited in every correspondence with respect to that issue, I think we're all clear on what the standard is, and I don't -- I'm sure that the issue of whether judgment should be substituted for Ali could be up for some debate, we believe it shouldn't, but $I$ presume that there is spirited debate that could take place about that; $I$ have yet to see any reason why Ms. Most should be substituting judgment for Charlie and Jo-Jo.

And while that's somewhat of an
ancillary issue, the real problem is, I don't see how this communication and the resulting questions and conflicts, therefrom, could be fixed. I wrote in my letter: How did the children come to understand this? What conversation could they have with their lawyer that repairs that
relationship and that reinstates their trust in her? Either she says, "Your mother doesn't have a boyfriend," and then they're left wondering: Why would you write that e-mail to my father? Or if she says, "Mom used to have a boyfriend, but doesn't anymore," and then they're wondering: Well, were you telling the truth? Why are you asking these questions?

All of this, Judge, not really
appropriate for these kids to be talking about with their lawyer and something they should not have been privy too.

Lastly, on this issue, Judge, I remind you, as we attached to our correspondence, the children have been inquiring of Ms. Most why she's not advocating for what they've asked for. And I think that this incident tips the scales and sort of pushes it over the edge, as to whether or not these girls feel as though they can trust their lawyer and have an appropriate attorney/client relationship, you know, where the founding principle of that relationship is supposed to be trust and confidence.

So I think for all of these reasons, Judge, I think the damage done to the relationship
between Ms. Most and the children is damaged beyond repair, and $I$ think at this point it's appropriate for them to be appointed a new attorney. And most importantly, Judge, I think it's important that you hold a Lincoln hearing in connection with the hearing that's coming up, because there has been so much controversy about what these girls want, whether -- I think --

THE COURT: Okay. I understand the position. I can tell you right now, I'm not holding a Lincoln hearing, and when we get to custody and there's a trial, then, of course, a Lincoln hearing will be out.

Mr. Dimopoulos, your response, and then Ms. Most, I will give you an opportunity to speak. MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, we all know why Mrs. Kassenoff wants to get rid of Ms. Most, okay, there's no secret here. I don't need to explain it to you, your Honor. We're all thinking adults with at least average intelligence. Okay? This is the same in every case where one party has a disadvantage, seemingly, and they don't feel that they're getting a good result in court. Two things they do is switch lawyers, then they attack the AFC, and then they attack the forensics.

Okay? Two out of the three have been done so far; the third, which is to attack Dr. Abrams, that's coming. We've already seen it in correspondence where he failed to consider this, he failed to consider that. So it's par for the course. This happens in almost every case where the facts are similar to this. It's no surprise. Of course you can explain that to a client a thousand times, but they have to see it to believe it.

Here's the problem with Mrs. Kassenoff's request. It is legally without a basis. Okay. AFC is duty bound to advocate their client's wishes except when they substitute their judgment. Once they substitute their judgment, and Ms. Most, on my reading of the New York state Bar Association's requirements and the relevant rules, 7.2, specifically, has done that, following all of the proper steps.

What Ali or what Charlotte or what

Josephina think of Ms. Most at this point is different than if in the case where she has not substituted judgment. At this particular point, you have to use another example. Okay. Assume for a second there's a child who has been physically abused. We're talking about a
hypothetical now. The child has been physically abused numerous times, but has some level of Stockholm Syndrome where they're bound to a parent. That child wants to be with the abusive parent, and the AFC has substituted judgment.

Do we in those facts care about whether the abused child trusts his or her attorney? No. We've gone beyond that. We've gone to the standard where the Court is exercising it's role as parens patriae. We've gone to the standard where an AFC is -- has reasonable basis to believe that the child or children are in danger. And that's what we have here. Of course it was a mistake in the e-mail. I didn't send it. Ms. Most will talk about it.

What $I$ have issue with is, and Counsel doesn't say that in her letter. She says it could have been a mistake, but then the innuendo throughout is that she did it deliberately. I take issue with that, and $I$ think the court should too. But let's not forget here that what is really going on is that when the chips are stacked against you, you have to knock down all the chips.

That's step one, attack Mr. Kassenoff; that's not working. Step two, attack Ms. Most,
and I'm waiting to see if that's going to work; step three, forensic; and step four, last, but not least, the Judge or Judges. So we can't allow this to happen. We can't allow improper legal standards to get in the way of the distraction, which is what counsel writes, it's nothing more than distractions.

And $I$ would call your attention to the case that Ms. Most cites, which I read; it's Judge Hoffman's case, it's extremely detailed and well thought out, and you will not be surprised, your Honor, in that the husband who brought the motion, did exactly what $I^{\prime} m$ saying that people do, which is attack the AFC and then the forensic, and you won't be surprised to know that he was in a similar situation as Mrs. Kassenoff. So I would urge the court to not give permission to make the motion.

And my final point on this, your Honor, there are, since the beginning of March, okay, my client has incurred over a hundred thousand dollars in counsel fees. He has, in addition to what the Court has seen, in terms of the motions, and I'm not even talking about briefing the counsel fee motion, the privilege motion, I'm
talking about having to file the custody motion to protect his children, deal with the distraction of the motion to vacate, improperly filed, deal with the appellate issue. It's not just that, your Honor. On a daily basis, my client receives anywhere from five to 20 e-mails a day. On a daily basis there is an onslaught from Mrs. Kassenoff to Mr. Kassenoff, all of which at some level have to be dealt with by counsel. There are issues -- it's pertinent to the AFC motion. I'll be brief. But there are issues relating to whether or not she can join -- she's joining the kids' Zoom calls for school. She's interjecting herself in their education.

THE COURT: Okay. That's on the agenda for a later time. I want to deal mainly with the disqualification, so Ms. Most.

MS. MOST: So Judge, obviously it was a
mistake. I was preparing for trial. I wanted some of the documents that were provided by Allan to Dr. Abrams. And since $I$ don't have access to those documents in my office, thinking that we were having the trial one week from today, I needed to have the documents from him. So I was not looking for him to aid me in any other way
then to provide documents that he has provided previously to Dr. Abrams and to me. Clearly, I'm not happy about the error. It was not a good error, but it's not a basis to have me relieved.

As I previously said to you on more than one occasion, I'm under attack by Mrs. Kassenoff. She's attacked me in every motion that she has made over the last, probably, year. I do believe that $I$ have every reason, every strong reason to advocate for my children in a way that uses my discretion, and actually, the Court's discretion, but $I$ believe my children are at risk for emotional harm. I think that the -- Mrs. Kassenoff's behavior has been destructive and really over a period of time really impacts the children, and $I$ think that they are at significant risk for harm.

So I've said that. I think that the Abrams report backs me up. I did not take that position until $I$ saw Dr. Abrams' report, because I felt it was important to have that backup, but I had seen this conduct from day one with the children, and so $I$ do believe that $I$ had every right with all three children, Ali, Charlotte, and Josephina, to take a position that is to use my
discretion. I don't believe that there's a basis to have me dismissed.

MS. SPIELBERG: Judge, may I say one quick thing?

THE COURT: I have limited time today. MS. SPIELBERG: It's in direct response to something that addresses it. I think it is important for the Court to read the case that Ms . Most cited. I think that it does not support her position in that case. In that case, the attorney for the children was substituting judgment on specific issues, health and schooling, and the child was six. So on that basis, the child was not old enough to communicate, necessarily, articulately, or knowingly and voluntarily what the child wanted. And it wasn't on the entire issue of custody, Judge; it was on significant discrete issues, so $I$ don't believe that that case is on point for the circumstances here. And I think that -- $I$ don't want the Court distracted from the issue, which is that, these children have to feel that they can trust their lawyer.

THE COURT: Okay. I heard everything.
It's my position, based upon reviewing the information, that $I$ am not going to permit a
motion to disqualify Ms. Most at this time. I find that she is fulfilling her duties as an AFC in accordance with her ethical obligations as an AFC. I am concerned that the child is continuing to text the mother, when $I$ made a direction that there's no texting or communication between the children, and the mother, other than on the Zoom conference.
I'm also concerned, because my initial reaction when $I$ saw the e-mail was stated to you from my clerk, which is, you simply tell the child that she made a mistake, that you're not seeing a boyfriend, and the reason that you're not seeing her is because the Judge has issued an order. That's what a parent would do that was concerned to ensure that her child's emotional well-being was adhered to. So I have a greater concern about the reaction to the error made by Ms. Most, that what Ms. Most did, it's an error. She has a right to gather information for the trial, and if this was documentation, as Mr. Kassenoff has previously given to Dr. Abrams, that she's entitled to request it from him. Yes, she should be more careful in the future to ensure that it's not inadvertently sent to Ali. But $I$ am questioning
whether -- why Ali didn't bring it to her father's attention, how it got texted to the mother, when the mother is not supposed to be having text communications with the child, and why the initial reaction is to disqualify the AFC as opposed to reassuring her child that she doesn't have a boyfriend, and the reason she's not seeing her is not because of Ms. Most and not because of Mrs. Kassenoff, it's because the Judge has made a decision, and that's who is making the ruling about whether the child can see her mother at this time.

That's it on disqualification. We are moving on to the next issue because $I$ have another conference.

MS. SPIELBERG: Judge, I just want to let you know that my client --

THE COURT: Ms. Spielberg, we are moving on to the next issue.

MS. SPIELBERG: I just wanted to advise the court that that's how my client did deal with the children. She hadn't even gotten your advice; when she had her call, the e-mail came through 15 minutes into the call. So that is how she dealt with it with her children. I just wanted to put
the Court's concern at rest.
THE COURT: Good. I'm glad that's how she dealt with it.

Okay. So Mr. Dimopoulos, you said there was an issue about how Mrs. Kassenoff was interacting on the children's Zoom conferences. You can go ahead and discuss that.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, it's our position that attending the children's school calls is a violation of the order in and of itself. If the Court is inclined to think that a parent innocently listening in on a school call is not a violation, $I$ would understand that, but that's not what's happening.

MS. KASSENOFF: No. That is what's happening.

THE COURT: Mrs. Kassenoff, I will give you an opportunity to respond. The court reporter can only do one at a time.

MS. KASSENOFF: I'm sorry, I didn't even realize $I$ could be heard, because $I$ haven't been. I was sort of talking out loud, but I would like an opportunity to respond.

THE COURT: You have to mute your mic so we don't hear you.

Mr. Dimopoulos, continue.
MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, Charlotte has had a history of picking her skin. She's had in the past many scars on her skin. She's been dealing with those issues directly with her therapist, Dr. Adler. In the last month or so, she stopped picking. Her forehead is clear. If you saw the photos of what this child looked like in February or January or March and what she looks like now, it's remarkable, and Dr. Adler has noted that, that there's a significant improvement in that conduct. I will allow someone with a degree and letters after their name to explain why this happen. We can all surmise.

However, the mother was convinced that Charlotte had a scab, and she wanted to see it, so she kept on e-mailing Allan, and Allan took a picture of the child lying down with a perfectly clear, wonderful-looking children's forehead. And Mrs. Kassenoff, unsatisfied, got on a Zoom call, and $I$ think it was with her soccer team, and, in the presence of others, asked Charlotte to pull back her hair and go up into the hairline so she can find the scab. Charlotte was so embarrassed that she left the Zoom call, and she didn't want
to be called out in front of her friends. MS. KASSENOFF: That's simply not true. THE COURT: Hold on. Mrs. Kassenoff, please. You have to mute your mic if you want to talk out loud, until $I$ say you can talk.

Go ahead, Mr. Dimopoulos.
MR. DIMOPOULOS: She's interjecting herself into the soccer calls, into the violin calls. If I'm getting a detail wrong on whether or not that happened at a violin call or a soccer call, forgive me, my client can clear that up. However, it's improper, it's embarrassing to the children. And she's also using the Zoom calls -her strategy, your Honor, in our opinion, is to try and show that Mr. Kassenoff can't manage the children's schedules. She has deliberately sabotaged scheduling of calls, missing of calls. Your Honor dealt with that and asked each party to send schedules. Okay? Still, there are few where he doesn't get them, and it doesn't matter, it's not the purpose of me mentioning the Zoom calls. She's using the Zoom calls as a way to communicate with the children and then follow up with the children about things like that, and follow up with him. Okay. The other problem is
another violation of the court order is that she's - -

MS. KASSENOFF: Can we turn to the other problems, can $I$ respond?

THE COURT: Wait. Wait.
MS. KASSENOFF: Before we turn to the other problems --

THE COURT: Mrs. Kassenoff, you need to stop.

Go ahead, Mr. Dimopoulos.
MR. DIMOPOULOS: She's using this to send it to Dr. Adler advocating her position.

THE COURT: I get it. I get it.
Go ahead, Mrs. Kassenoff.

MS. KASSENOFF: Thank you, Judge. And I'm sorry I couldn't speak earlier. I have a lot to say on these points, if I may. I just want to say one thing, and that is, I'm very close to my children, and $I$ have now seen what happened over time with Ms. Most and with the lack of trust that they had with her over a long period of time. I'm very disturbed that the Court is not allowing this motion to be made. My kids will not feel comfortable -- do not feel comfortable trusting Ms. Most. They will not share information with
her. They know she is aligned with their father. They know that she is not trustworthy on sharing their views of what they want, and $I$ am going to say, I think the Court is making a very big error here, and $I$ don't think that this would stand up on appeal. That's number one.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, Mrs. Kassenoff, I made my decision on that, so go on to the Zoom calls.

MS. KASSENOFF: Okay, Judge, and I hope that the Court would consider revisiting that issue when you start to see that the children are not going to be able to express themselves, and you see these are assertive, bright girls, who are not in any way manipulated, because it's like herding cats with my children. I can't even get them to sit still if $I$ wanted to, let alone manipulate or coach them. They're smart. They're kids of two lawyers. So the idea that I'm somehow manipulating them to do what? I'm not even sure what the allegation is. I'm manipulating them to do what?

THE COURT: Mrs. Kassenoff, we're directing to the Zoom calls. What happened on the soccer call? MS. KASSENOFF: As to the soccer call -so my daughter, earlier in the day, or the day before, had shown on the Zoom call that she had a large lesion here. I raised the issue with her therapist and with Mr. Kassenoff by e-mail. I said I saw a large lesion here. Mr. Kassenoff turned around and said, "Enough already, Catherine, stop making problems when none exist. Look at this photograph, Catherine, where there's no lesion whatsoever," and he takes a very convenient photo of the hair covering her lesion on her head.

The next -- my next opportunity at the soccer call was not to say, "Charlotte, come and show me that gigantic lesion on your head." I said to her coach, "Coach, can you have her come close to the camera?" I didn't even interact with her at all. I asked the coach, "Can you just have her come to the camera? Go like this, she did it." She was having a terrible day, because she had a huge argument with her friend that Mr. Kassenoff didn't even take care of, she was having a very emotional day, and she believed that other people would think that -- that other people might think that they know what this is about. But it
turned out -- I took -- when the coach asked me what happened, I said she bumped her head. I said it loudly to everybody. There was no mention of having a lesion that she was anxiously picking at.

The problem here is Mr. Kassenoff is trying to create an impression that when the children are with him, all is good in the world, and that was a lie. She had a huge lesion, she continues to have this lesion, Dr. Adler needs to know about it so that she can deal with the anxiety that my daughter is facing, and he's trying to conceal it.

There was no attempt to embarrass, and if $I$ embarrassed my daughter, I feel terrible about it, and $I$ apologized to her about it, because $I$ think maybe inadvertently $I$ did embarrass her because she had to come to the camera, or whatever, but $I$ didn't say to her, you know, in front of other people, "Charlie, show me the," you know --

THE COURT: Okay. Mrs. Kassenoff, I thought $I$ made myself perfectly clear. You can observe on the Zoom calls, but you are not to be speaking to your child.
MS. KASSENOFF: I didn't.

THE COURT: But you asked her coach. You're not supposed to speak to the teacher either. Observe means look and listen. It doesn't mean to have your daughter come and take photographs that you want to use in your divorce action. That's the bottom line. That's the bottom line. Dr. Adler can see what's going on with the lesion. You're not supposed to be sending information to Dr. Adler. She is interacting with the children.

MS. KASSENOFF: But Judge, she was misled to believe that there was no lesion on Charlotte's head.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, can I make one final point?

MS. KASSENOFF: I'm not done, Mr.
Dimopoulos. Judge, the photograph that Allan sent to Dr. Adler did not show the lesion. That's my point. So he was concealing it. And he said, "Enough, already" to, Dr. Adler. He said, "Enough, already, Catherine, she doesn't have any lesions," when she did.

THE COURT: Okay. The point is, you're going to take it on your own time if you wanted to. You don't do it on a Zoom call when she's
involved with other people and ask the coach to get involved in it. That doesn't happen. If you want to participate in the Zoom calls, which I am permitting, it's to observe, look, and hear. Okay? If $I$ hear any more communications where you've done something similar, then $I$ will preclude you observing the Zoom calls. All right? You can continue to observe the Zoom calls now. Look and see, there's no interaction with the teacher, your presence should be silent.

MS. KASSENOFF: I understand.
MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, just one final point. Charlotte sent an e-mail to Maggie, Allan's nanny, when this happened, and in her words, one sentence: "So I was on a meeting when Mommy said, 'Hey, Coach, could you ask Charlotte to come to the camera so $I$ can see her forehead?" So she said, "Charlotte come to the camera." So then $I$ came to the camera, then Mommy said, "I need to take a picture of the things on the side of your forehead." So I was really embarrassed, and then $I$ pointed at my headband and hoped she would get the hint, but she didn't, and said, "Pimples, show me, Honey," and I was so embarrassed. It's really sick.

MS. KASSENOFF: I didn't say it to embarrass her.

THE COURT: Okay. I understand it was an embarrassing situation for Charlotte. I am just making it perfectly clear, on the record, that you are allowed to go to Zoom calls, Ms. Kassenoff, to look and hear.

MS. KASSENOFF: Thanks, Judge.
THE COURT: If you interfere in any way, and that means with Charlotte, the coach, the teacher, the students, then you will be precluded from observing the Zoom calls. Okay? Do you understand what $I$ just said?

MS. KASSENOFF: Yes, I do.
THE COURT: Okay. No, no, no. I have a limited period of time here. That's the same with Dr. Adler. No one is supposed to be communicating or sending information to Dr. Adler. So I understand you sent the photograph -- Mr. Kassenoff sent a photograph. That's it. No more communications with Mr. Adler.

What's going on with the E-TRADE account?

MS. SPIELBERG: Hold on, Judge. I believe the prior order allows them to communicate
with Dr. Adler, so long as they copy both of them. So I just wanted to clarify that.

THE COURT: I thought there was no communication. I read the TRO just now; there's no communication with Dr. Adler other than scheduling.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: That's correct, your Honor. It's a complete misinterpretation of the order.

THE COURT: I already just stated the order, Mr. Dimopoulos. The order says, the most recent order, you can communicate with Dr. Adler only for scheduling purposes. Obviously, if there's a meeting requested by the doctor with both parents, that's different, but neither parent can be communicating with Dr. Adler other than for scheduling purposes without the other parent being involved in the communication. Okay?
All right. So E-TRADE account.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, it's very simple. She signed the authorization when you told her to, directed her to. The authorization was then sent to E-TRADE. E-TRADE was somewhat delayed, according to my client, in processing the check to him, so he reached out to E-TRADE.

E-TRADE said, "We tried calling Mrs. Kassenoff ten times to get verbal confirmation."

THE COURT: Hold on. Mrs. Kassenoff, did you just e-mail a photograph to my law assistant, law clerk?

MS. KASSENOFF: I did. I wanted you to have the photo. I didn't know how else to get it to you, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. That's inappropriate. It can not be e-mailed. It would have to be e-mailed to Mr. Dimopoulos and the other people as well.

MS. KASSENOFF: Sorry, Judge, I don't have the capability to do all of that.

THE COURT: Then you should not be communicating directly with the Court. You go through your attorney.

MS. KASSENOFF: I don't have the ability to --

THE COURT: You go through your attorney. Go through your attorney. I am not going to say it again. Go through your attorney.

Mr. Dimopoulos?
MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, here's what happened. She revoked her consent.

MS. KASSENOFF: That's not true. That's not true.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Can I please speak?
THE COURT: Mrs. Kassenoff, we can only do one at a time.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Okay. She revoked her consent. What she wants, which is contrary to the order and not needed, is allow the release of $\$ 30,000$, but the rest of it should stay frozen. Your Honor dealt with this a month and a half ago, and you said it would be a violation of the automatic stays, give your consent. She doesn't. Here's the problem. She then tells them, in a signed authorization that she herself created, and sent it to them, saying, "Send my client a check for $\$ 30,000 . "$ Here's the problem, your Honor, there's not $\$ 30,000$ in cash in the account. So each E-TRADE could not execute on that.

Secondly, that's not what the order says. There's taxes to be withheld, there's a whole provision on selling shares. E-TRADE is not going to unilaterally decide what equities to sell for the Kassenoffs. It cannot be done.

Your Honor, respectfully, you should
issue an order directing E-TRADE to comply. I don't know that they will comply with your order, being they're not a party to the action. Secondly, you should allow me to file a -- I don't think $I$ even need to file it -- she should be held in contempt with the ability to perjure herself on 24 hours by complying with this. We got Dr.

McGuther lined up. We owe Dr. Adler thousands of dollars. My client doesn't have the money to pay it. She's not paying her 20 percent.

THE COURT: Okay. Hold on. That's enough.

Mrs. Kassenoff?
MS. KASSENOFF: Yes. May I speak to that, Judge, because there are some misrepresentations to that?

THE COURT: Yes.
MS. KASSENOFF: So as you may recall, I was ordered to sign the document that your Honor asked me to sign it, I did it, and sent it to E-TRADE. E-TRADE apparently was calling from some sort of Utah number, which $I$ don't recognize; I don't pick up numbers $I$ don't recognize.

Apparently they tried to call me several times from this number that $I$ didn't know. I thought
that things were taken care of. I had not heard anything. I actually sent them an e-mail saying, "Let me know if there's anything more you need. I haven't heard anything." The next thing $I$ know, Mr. Dimopoulos is running into Court and claiming that $I$ am not following through.

I immediately called E-TRADE and actually called the financial adviser who has been appointed to this case, and I told him that your Honor had issued a ruling, that this was the document that we were to follow. He and I had a conversation about what was happening with the rest of the money. Your Honor knows I had some concerns about that, and I said to the adviser, I said, "Well, the Judge has issued on the record a ruling that if anyone were to touch the other funds, there would be adverse consequences."

THE COURT: Right.
MS. KASSENOFF: He said to me, "Could you please send me that order?" And said, "It's a transcript." I said, "I'm happy to get the transcript and send it to you." And then he said to me, "Do you think that that prevents somebody from actually taking those dollars?" And I said, "No. In theory, they're still -- they are
unrestricted, but $I$ think the Judge's order gives some assurance that if that were to be touched, there would be problems." And he said, "Let me go talk to my legal team" -- and this whole call, by the way, Judge, was recorded. He comes back and he says, "It is E-TRADE's position that we will not allow the restriction to be lifted under the remainder of that account, and we are now going to reinstruct you on how to handle this." we are now proposing language, and he sent me the language that $I$ put into that letter, in which both parties are going to notarize and sign the same document for release of $\$ 30,000$, or if Mr. Dimopoulos says that there isn't 30 , then $I$ guess we can change the number to 20. But this is what they asked for.

And this actually, Judge, it actually addresses my concern, which $I$ can argue against my own interest to E-TRADE about, well, you know you got the Judge's ruling here, but, I mean, now that they offered this avenue, is the way to handle this, I'm not sure why we can't follow this, and I am now starting to wonder why Mr. Dimopoulos is arguing so hard to remove the restriction on the remainder of the account.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Mr. Dimopoulos, if there's a new document that E-TRADE has requested, just have your client sign it, she can sign it, and get it done.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: No, your Honor --
MS. SPIELBERG: I have not had an opportunity, so just a second.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your client is handling it. Don't worry about it. This is false, this is false, Judge.

THE COURT: Stop, stop, stop, stop, stop. This is something $I$ signed two months ago. So if they have a new document that covers her concerns, then just sign it and get it done.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, that is not the point. E-TRADE has now put this account into a suspicion mode. Okay? No document is going to work. There is not $\$ 30,000$ in cash. How do I explain to my client that we have Court orders that she does not follow time and time again and this Court just says, "Well, figure it out." I can't do that, your Honor.

THE COURT: I didn't say, "Well, figure it out." I said, she said, there's a new document.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, she created the document by herself. It's not E-TRADE. Nothing she says is true.

MS. KASSENOFF: Yes, it is, Mr.
Dimopoulos.
THE COURT: E-TRADE is just a regular old account. If both parties sign off on the release of the funds or shares of sales, I don't understand what's so complicated about it.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Because she called them and said all of these things to them in an effort to get the legal team contacted, and say, "I'm not dealing with this."

THE COURT: The legal team just can't unilaterally adhere to the authorization that was provided by their client.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: When she told them that there's a Court order prohibiting exactly that, it raises a suspicion. E-TRADE can do whatever they want. I sent your Honor the voice mail. The voice mail form E-TRADE said she reevoked her consent. I don't know what further proof I need. I really don't. I'm beside myself.

THE COURT: Mrs. Kassenoff, just give the consent, period, on the original order.

MS. SPIELBERG: Judge, give me a moment. I want to be clear. After Mr. Dimopoulos e-mailed your Honor about this issue, I reached out to him with multiple unresponded-to e-mails saying: My client spoke to E-TRADE, they gave her the information, we prepared the letter, my client signed it and had it notarized, and I sent it to Mr. Dimopoulos. He told me it was absurd and ridiculous, and that's why we're here, Judge. MR. DIMOPOULOS: Because there's not 30,000 in cash, Ms. Spielberg, and it can't be done.

MS. KASSENOFF: So make it $\$ 20,000$. THE COURT: I'm not going back and forth. There's an order in effect. You're supposed to sell the shares to net out $\$ 30,000$, and it's -- the mechanism for disbursement of those funds is in my order. So Mrs. Kassenoff, send the authorization that was previously agreed upon and get it done. If it's not done by the end of this week, then Mr. Dimopoulos, you can make a motion. It's like enough already. MS. KASSENOFF: I'm so confused. THE COURT: The therapist needs to be paid. Okay. The next issue on here is release of
the expert report to Dr. Abrams' report.
MS. KASSENOFF: Judge, I'm sorry, I'm confused about my obligation here.

THE COURT: Your obligation is to comply with my order that was issued on March 17th. All you are required to do is do a simple authorization that tells them that the money is being released.

MS. KASSENOFF: Judge, they're not going to release it.

THE COURT: The other issue has nothing whatsoever to do with E-TRADE. Okay. That was for a motion you would make to the Court if Mr. Kassenoff took more money than you were willing to give. It has nothing to do with E-TRADE. So you need to get the authorization done. And I want it done. It's been two months. I want the therapist paid. I want the children getting the treatment the children require.

MS. KASSENOFF: Judge, may I? I'm trying very hard to comply. I don't believe E-TRADE is going to go back on this at this point. I'm suggesting that that new letter get -- you even said it yourself, Judge -- that new letter takes care of everything. And it does. \$20,000
will be released immediately, we will get the next 10,000 next week, or whenever we need it. But that is the only vehicle, $I$ know of, to get this released. It's their discretion, Judge.

THE COURT: That's because you called and you called and created an issue that didn't exist.

MS. KASSENOFF: I didn't. I didn't create an issue. They asked me about what would happen with the remainder of the funds, and $I$ gave them assurances that your order would cover that. And they said, "No, that's not good enough."

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Can I speak, your Honor?

THE COURT: There should be no issue with the remainder of the funds. You were only releasing 30,000 , the balance would stay untouched.

MS. KASSENOFF: No, Judge, the original order that you signed, it actually removed the restriction on the entire account.

THE COURT: I understand it removed the restriction on the entire account because that's what they had to do to get the funds, but the order also said they're only releasing $\$ 30,000$.

MS. KASSENOFF: They're not willing to remove the restriction. I'm just telling you, Judge.

THE COURT: They don't have the authority to do that if the parties consent.

MR. KASSENOFF: Can I speak for one minute on this? This one is very dear to my heart because I'm a litigator as is Mrs. Kassenoff. There's an order --

MS. KASSENOFF: And you're not a litigator.

MR. KASSENOFF: -- March order, ordered in the hearing in February. I probably spent $\$ 30,000$ trying to get enforcement of this order. The only reason this is a problem is because what Catherine told E-TRADE. I've had many conversations with E-TRADE. They said, just get us this letter, notarized by both parties, we open the account, end of story. They don't care what anyone does with the account.

MS. KASSENOFF: They do.
MR. KASSENOFF: Enough. They don't care.

MS. KASSENOFF: Please stop saying that.
THE COURT: Why is it, Mr. Kassenoff,
you can't sign the letter she just drafted and get it done?

MR. KASSENOFF: I have not seen this letter. Mr. Dimopoulos has it. And we talked about it. Here's the issue. Your order says it's for $\$ 30,000$, there's $\$ 19,000$ in that account. I don't even know if they will release the 19 without the account being open. I will assume Mrs. Kassenoff is not making that up, but the order was for 30,000 , and even if there was a hundred thousand dollars in cash, your Honor, I spent a lot of money having Mr. Dimopoulos prepare the papers that led to that order. I shouldn't have to pay another $\$ 30,000$ to get enforcement of that order. I'm beside myself on this issue.

THE COURT: My question is, again, why can't you sign the other order and just get it done?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: I will pull it up right now, your Honor, and discuss it, and hopefully resolve it.

THE COURT: Right. If you can't settle and there's a problem and it's not resolved and she doesn't do what she has to do by Friday, then I will give you the permission to make the
contempt motion.
MR. DIMOPOULOS: I will open that order right this minute.

MR. KASSENOFF: I don't understand why I have incurred tremendous legal fees just to get enforcement of an order that was made on the record in February and then quantified in a written order with very detailed steps, about six or seven steps that had to be followed, where I followed every single one, and now it's May 20 th, and we still don't have this thing opened.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Here's the letter.
THE COURT: Excuse me, one person at a time. Mr. Dimopoulos.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Here's the letter they want us to sign, that $I$ didn't respond to, and that I'm the bad guy, okay? "To whom it may concern. We write as joint tenants with rights of survivorship on the above-referenced account. Please immediately send a check in the amount of $\$ 30,000$ made payable to Allan Kassenoff. Please mail the check to the following address."

Once again, that's not going to work, because E-TRADE doesn't have $\$ 30,000$ to send. So what are they going to do in response to this
letter? Here we are again next week with your Honor. Your Honor, she should be directed to re-sign the authorization to release 30,000 , in compliance with the order, and she should be precluded --

THE COURT: Wait. How is that any different than saying release $\$ 30,000$ ? $I$ don't get it. I thought they had to sell the shares to get $\$ 30,000$.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor --
(Reporter clarification.)
THE COURT: Again, if your client is not comfortable signing the letter, Mr. Dimopoulos, just sign it, and they will release whatever cash they have. If they won't release it, then you're going to say: You're not compliant, and Catherine, you were wrong, and you are going to make a motion for contempt. That's is. And then you can make a motion for contempt.

Now, the last issue is -- because I have another call at 11 . The release of Dr. Abrams' report. Ms. Spielberg, I spoke to Judge Lubell, he says your experts have to sign the same affirmation that you signed that ensures the confidentiality of those reports and that it's not
disclosed to either party or any third party without the Court's express permission.

MS. SPIELBERG: So is it okay that I
then transmit it?

THE COURT: You cannot transmit anything
until $I$ get the affirmation.
MS. SPIELBERG: Okay. I believe that there's an order in this case that has a bit of a heightened bar. I'm not sure that $I$ can transmit it by e-mail. That's my only concern.

THE COURT: You can't. You have to be encrypted or secured, so they cannot -- the confidentiality is maintained. If your e-mail is encrypted to ensure that it goes to one person and it can't be seen by somebody else, that's fine. We transmit it, but our e-mail is encrypted. So you have to make sure that you have security and it's encrypted. If it can't be encrypted, then you have to send it in the means that it goes directly --

MS. SPIELBERG: I can send a hard copy, in the alternative?

THE COURT: Yes. By overnight mail, in a sealed package, to ensure the confidentiality, and, of course, not until we get the signed
affirmations.

MS. SPIELBERG: Thank you.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Judge, may I discuss discovery for a brief moment?

THE COURT: Yes. That was the other issue. Depositions need to go ahead on the financial aspect. What date are they scheduled for?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Currently finalizing Mr. Kassenoff either on June 8th or June 9th, and Mrs. Kassenoff on June 15th.

THE COURT: All right. Those are going ahead as scheduled, no adjournments.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Thank you. It is our hope that we can somehow make the July 13 th hearing date, perhaps a final trial date. Is it possible -- we got deficiency letters yesterday. We're going to respond to them by next week, well in advance of the depositions. Can we have a ruling of the Court setting a firm deadine for discovery, please, your Honor? I remind your Honor that this is --

THE COURT: Discovery is done. All documentary discovery needs to be exchanged before the depositions. The depositions need to go ahead
as currently scheduled.
MS. SPIELBERG: Judge, there's an evacuation of Mr. Kassenoff's partnership that has not -- no work has been done on it because zero documents have been provided to Mr. DeMarco, thus far.

THE COURT: So what's going on with the provision of documents?

MS. SPIELBERG: I can't go to trial without an evaluation.

THE COURT: I understand that, of course.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, Mr. DeMarco reached out to me and asked for documents that, most of which my client does not have. The ones that he does have -- he said, I followed up with him in writing -- my client cannot release them himself, when Greenberg Traurig has already told you he's not releasing them. Your Honor authorized them to subpoena the documents from Greenberg Traurig two months ago, serve the subpoena, it's on you. It's not on me.

THE COURT: Did you serve the subpoena?
MS. SPIELBERG: My understanding was that Ms. Zeiderman had subpoenaed them.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: That's incorrect. No one served anything on Greenberg Traurig; and this issue is about 120 days old, and now somehow we are being faulted with the delays.

THE COURT: You are not being faulted with the delays. Stop. Greenberg Traurig, I thought I authorized for you to subpoena them, because they won't release the records, and I also thought there would be an issue of a confidentiality agreement with Greenberg Traurig. If she did not, in fact, subpoena them, as $I$ authorized that back in February, then $I$ would suggest that you authorize the subpoena now, issue the subpoena now and get those records.

MS. SPIELBERG: I want to be clear that Mr. DeMarco did not send that list of the documents -- resend the list until April 27 th.

THE COURT: I don't have time for this. I'm telling you what to do.

Mr. Kassenoff, if you have the person to whom she should direct it to, to minimize the disruption of your business, tell her who she should send it to.

MR. KASSENOFF: Probably the general
counsel. She has already been in contact with
him.

THE COURT: Okay. Send that to the general counsel, get that out by Friday, and give it $a$ short return date because they have known about the issue and the request for many months.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Judge, one thirty-second issue left. Mrs. Kassenoff has filed a grievance against Mr. Kassenoff --

THE COURT: I looked at that issue of the grievance. The grievance is a confidential procedure, if in fact she signed it. I am not going to interfere with the grievance process, and they will deal with it as they deal with it. I'm done. I have another conference call. I've addressed all of the issues on my list. That's it. The depositions are going ahead as currently scheduled. We will schedule a conference for June 16th, so $I$ can see what documentary discovery is allegedly arising out of the depositions.

MS. KASSENOFF: Your Honor, may I say
one thing before I go?

THE COURT: I have another conference,

Mrs. Kassenoff, I need to go.
MS. KASSENOFF: I can be really quick.

Judge, I miss my children very, very much. If
there is some way that $I$ can at least e-mail them, an e-mail keeps a record. I promise to maintain all records of all e-mails. My kids e-mail me regularly, and $I$ want to be in a position to respond. It's a long time to go until mid-July without so much as a 15-minute phone call every day, which I'm getting interfered with, as it is.

I would like to be able to, please,
Judge, e-mail my kids and keep those e-mails. I will send them to Carol, I will send them to your Honor, I will send them to whoever they want. I just want to be able to talk to my children.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, let me respond to that briefly. Your Honor will be getting an emergency motion for contempt from my office, because we have now realized that in the French portion of the Zoom calls, contrary to Counsel and Mrs. Kassenoff's arguments and sworn statements to this Court, she communicated with the children in French, "You can go to the policeman. Okay." We're having a certified translation. This is beyond the pale.

THE COURT: All right. June 16th -Mrs. Kassenoff, I'm not changing my current order. June 16 th at 11 for the next conference.
MR. DIMOPOULOS: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
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capability [1] 26/14
care [6] 8/6 20/22 29/1 34/25 36/19 36/23
careful [1] 13/24
CAROL [2] 1/18 45/10
case [12] 3/25 6/21 7/6 7/21 9/9 9/10 12/8 12/10 12/10 12/18 29/9 40/8
cases [1] $4 / 2$
cash [5] 27/17 31/18 33/11 37/11 39/14
CATHERINE [7] 1/4 1/21 20/8 20/9
22/21 36/16 39/17
cats [1] 19/16
certified [2] 45/21 46/8
change [1] 30/14
changing [1] 45/24
Charlie [2] 4/18 21/19
Charlotte [13] 2/12 7/19 11/24 16/2
16/16 16/22 16/24 20/14 23/13 23/16
23/18 24/4 24/10
Charlotte's [1] 22/13
check [4] 25/25 27/16 38/20 38/22
CHIARAMONTE [1] 1/14
child [16] $7 / 248 / 18 / 48 / 78 / 1212 / 13$
12/13 12/16 13/4 13/11 14/4 14/6
14/11 16/8 16/18 21/24
child's [1] $13 / 16$
children [32] $1 / 182 / 112 / 223 / 134 / 23$
5/15 6/1 8/12 10/2 11/10 11/12 11/16
11/23 11/24 12/11 12/21 13/7 14/22

14/25 17/13 17/23 17/24 18/19 19/12
19/16 21/7 22/10 34/18 34/19 44/25
45/12 45/20
children's [5] 2/20 15/6 15/9 16/19 17/16
chips [2] $8 / 228 / 23$
circumstances [1] 12/19
cite [1] $4 / 4$
cited [2] 4/10 12/9
cites [1] 9/9
claiming [1] 29/5
clarification [1] 39/11
clarify [1] 25/2
clear [8] $4 / 11$ 16/7 16/19 17/11 21/22
24/5 33/2 43/15
Clearly [1] 11/2
clerk [2] 13/11 26/5
client [22] 3/6 4/2 4/6 5/20 7/8 9/21
10/5 14/17 14/21 17/11 25/24 27/16
28/9 31/3 31/8 31/19 32/16 33/5 33/6
39/12 42/15 42/17
client's [1] 7/12
close [2] 18/18 20/17
coach [9] 19/18 20/16 20/16 20/18
21/1 22/1 23/1 23/16 24/10
come [8] 4/23 20/14 20/16 20/19
21/17 22/4 23/17 23/18
comes [1] 30/5
comfortable [3] 18/24 18/24 39/13
coming [2] 6/6 7/3
commencement [1] 3/10
communicate [4] 12/14 17/23 24/25

## 25/12

communicated [1] 45/19
communicating [3] 24/17 25/16 26/16
communication [5] 4/21 13/6 25/4 25/5 25/18
communications [3] 14/4 23/5 24/21
complete [1] 25/8
compliance [1] 39/4
compliant [1] 39/16
complicated [1] 32/9
comply [4] 28/1 28/2 34/4 34/21
complying [1] 28/7
conceal [1] 21/12
concealing [1] 22/19
concern [5] 13/17 15/1 30/18 38/18

## 40/10

concerned [3] 13/4 13/9 13/15
concerns [2] 29/14 31/14
concluded [1] 46/4
conduct [2] 11/22 16/12
conference [6] 13/8 14/15 44/14 44/17
44/22 45/25
conferences [1] 15/6
confidence [1] 5/23
confidential [1] 44/10
confidentiality [4] 39/25 40/13 40/24
43/10
confirmation [1] 26/2
conflicts [1] 4/22
confused [2] 33/23 34/3
connection [1] 6/6
consent [6] 26/25 27/7 27/12 32/22
32/25 36/5
consequences [1] 29/17
consider [3] 7/4 7/5 19/11
contact [1] 43/25
contacted [1] 32/12

| C | detail [1] 17/9 | 22/20 24/17 24/18 25/1 25/5 25/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| contempt [5] 28/6 38/1 39/18 39/19 | did [16] 4/23 8/19 9/13 11/19 13/19 | drafted [1] 37/1 |
| 45/15 <br> continue [2] 16/1 23/8 | 14/21 20/19 21/16 22/18 22/22 26/4 | duties [1] 13/2 |
| 21/9 | 26/6 28/20 42/23 43/11 43/16 | duty [1] 7/12 |
| continuing [1] 13/4 | didn't [17] $8 / 1414 / 1$ 15/20 16/25 20 $20 / 22$ 21/18 $21 / 25$ 23/23 24/1 $26 / 7$ | E |
| contrary [2] $27 / 7$ 45/17 controversy [1] 6/7 | 28/25 31/23 35/6 35/8 35/8 38/16 | e-mail [21] 2/10 2/10 2/12 2/14 2/17 |
| controversy [1] 6/7 convenient [1] 20/1 | different [3] 7/21 25/15 39/7 | 3/2 5/4 8/14 13/10 14/23 20/5 23/13 |
| $\text { conversation [2] } 4 / 24 \text { 29/12 }$ | DIMOPOULOS [23] 1/12 1/14 6/14 | 26/4 29/2 40/10 40/13 40/16 45/1 45/2 |
| conversations [1] 36/17 | 15/4 16/1 17/6 18/10 22/17 25/11 | 45/3 45/9 |
| convinced [1] 16/15 | 26/11 26/23 29/5 30/ | e-mailed [3] 26/10 26/11 33 |
| copy [2] 25/1 40/21 | 32/5 33/2 33/8 33/21 37/4 37/12 $38 / \begin{aligned} & \text { 39/13 }\end{aligned}$ | e-mailing [2] 3/18 16/17 <br> e-mails [7] 3/3 3/4 3/9 10/6 33/4 45/3 |
| correct [1] 25/7 | direct [2] 12/6 43/21 | $45 / 9$ |
| correspondence [4] 2/7 4/10 5/14 7/3 | directed [2] 25/22 39/2 | E-TRADE [26] 24/22 25/19 25/23 |
| could [9] 4/14 4/16 4/22 4/24 8/17 15/21 23/16 27/18 29/19 | directing [2] 19/24 28/1 | 25/23 25/25 26/1 27/18 27/22 28/1 |
| 15/21 23/16 | direction [1] 13/5 | 28/21 28/21 29/7 30/19 31/2 31/16 |
|  | directly [3] 16/5 26/16 40/20 | 32/2 32/6 32/19 32/21 33/5 34/12 |
| counsel [8] 8/16 9/6 43/25 44/3 45/18 | disadvantage [1] 6/22 | 34/15 34/22 36/16 36/17 38/24 |
| COUNTY [1] 1/1 | disbursement [1] 33/17 | E-TRADE's [1] 30/6 |
| couple [1] $2 / 18$ | disclosed [1] 40/1 | each [2] 17/18 27/18 |
| course [6] 6/12 7/5 7/7 8/13 40/25 | discovery [5] 41/4 41/21 41/23 41/24 | earlier [2] 18/16 20/2 |
| 42/12 | 44/18 | edge [1] 5/18 |
| court [28] 1/1 1/9 1/24 2/7 2/15 6/23 | discrete [1] 12/18 discretion [4] 11/11 $11 / 1112 / 135 / 4$ | education [1] 10/1 |
| 8/9 8/20 9/17 9/23 12/8 12/20 14/21 | discretion [4] 11/11 11/11 12/1 35/4 | effect [1] 33/15 |
| 15/11 15/18 18/1 18/22 19/4 19/11 | discuss [3] 15/7 37/20 41/3 | effort [1] 32/11 |
| 26/16 29/5 31/19 31/21 32/18 34/13 | dismissed [1] 12/2 | either [4] 5/2 22/3 40/1 41/10 |
| 41/20 45/19 46/13 | disqualification [2] | else [2] 26/7 40/15 |
| Court's [3] 11/11 15/1 40/2 | disruption [1] $43 / 22$ |  |
| cover [1] 35/11 | disruption [1] 43/22 | embarrassed [4] 16/24 21/14 23/21 |
| covering [1] 20/11 | distraction [2] 9/5 10/2 | embarrassing [2] 17/12 24 |
| covers [1] 31/13 | distractions [1] 9/7 | emergency [1] 45/15 |
| create [2] 21/6 35/9 | disturbed [1] 18/22 | emotional [3] 11/13 13/16 20/23 |
| created [3] $27 / 1532 / 135 / 6$ creates [1] 2/21 | divorce [2] 3/11 22/5 | encrypted [5] 40/12 40/14 40/16 40/18 |
|  | do [31] 3/15 6/24 8/6 9/13 11/8 11/23 | 40/18 |
| currently [3] | 13/15 15/19 18/24 19/20 19/22 22/25 | end [2] 33/20 36/19 |
| custody [3] 6/12 10/1 12/17 | 24/12 24/14 26/14 27/5 29/23 31/18 | enforcement [3] 36/14 37/14 38/6 |
| D | 35/24 36/5 36/21 37/24 37/24 38/25 | 28/12 33/22 35/12 36/22 |
| daily [2] 10/5 10/7 | 43/ | ensure [4] 13/16 13/24 40/14 40/24 |
| damage [1] 5/25 | doctor [1] 25/14 | ensures [1] 39/24 |
| damaged [1] 6/1 | document [8] 28/19 29/11 30/12 31/2 | entire [3] 12/16 35/21 35/2 |
| danger [1] 8/12 | 31/13 31/17 31/25 32/2 | entitled [1] 13/22 |
| date [5] 2/15 41/7 41/16 41/16 44/4 | documentary [2] 41/24 44/18 | equities [1] 27/23 |
| daughter [4] 20/2 21/11 21/14 22/4 | documentation [1] 13/21 | error [5] 11/3 11/4 13/18 13/19 19/4 |
| day [8] $2 / 810 / 6$ 11/22 20/2 20/2 20/20 | documents [9] 10/20 10/22 10/24 11/1 | ESQ[3] 1/14 1/14 1/17 |
| 20/23 45/7 | 42/5 42/8 42/14 42/20 43/17 | ethical [1] 13/3 |
| days [1] 43/3 | does [8] 3/14 3/15 12/9 31/20 34/25 | evacuation [1] 42/3 |
| deadline [1] 41/20 | 36/20 42/15 42/16 | evaluation [1] 42/10 |
| deal [8] 3/7 10/2 10/3 10/16 14/21 | doesn't [13] 5/2 5/6 8/17 14/6 17/20 | even [12] 3/11 9/24 14/22 15/20 19/16 |
| 21/10 44/13 44/13 | 17/20 22/4 22/21 23/2 27/12 28/9 | 19/20 20/17 20/22 28/5 34/24 37/7 |
| dealing [2] 16/5 32/13 | $\text { doing [1] } 2 / 20$ | every [9] 4/10 6/21 7/6 11/7 11/9 11/9 |
| dealt [5] 10/9 14/24 15/3 17/18 27/10 | dollars [4] 9/22 28/9 29/24 37/11 | 11/23 38/10 45/6 |
| dear [1] 36/7 | don't [32] 4/8 4/12 4/20 6/18 6/22 | everybody [1] 21/3 |
| debate [2] 4/14 4/16 | 10/21 12/1 12/18 12/20 15/25 19/5 | everything [2] 12/23 34/25 |
| [1] $27 / 23$ | 22/25 26/13 26/18 28/2 28/4 28/22 | exactly [2] 9/13 32/18 |
| decision [2] 14/10 19/8 | 28/23 28/23 31/9 32/8 32/22 32/23 | example [1] 7/23 |
| fendant [2] 1/5 17 | 34/21 36/4 36/19 36/22 37/7 38/4 | except [1] $7 / 13$ |
|  | 38/11 39/7 43/18 | exchanged [1] 41/24 |
| degree [1] 16/12 | done [18] 5/25 7/1 7/17 22/16 23/6 | Excuse [1] 38/13 |
| delayed [1] 25/24 | 27/24 31/4 31/14 33/12 33/20 33/20 | execute [1] 27/18 |
| delays [2] $43 / 443 / 6$ | 34/16 34/17 37/2 37/18 41/23 42/4 | exercising [1] 8/9 |
| deliberately [2] 8/19 17/16 DeMarco [3] 42/5 42/13 43/4 | 44/14 | exist [2] 20/8 35/7 |
| oositions [6] 41/6 41/19 41/25 41/2 | down [2] 8/23 16/18 | expert [1] 34/1 |
| 44/16 44/19 <br> destructive [1] 11/14 | $\begin{array}{\|llll} \text { Dr }[23] & 7 / 2 & 10 / 21 & 11 / 2 \\ 16 / 6 & 11 / 20 & 13 / 22 \\ 18 / 12 & 21 / 9 & 22 / 7 & 22 / 9 \end{array} 22 / 18$ | experts [1] 39/23 <br> explain [4] 6/19 7/8 16/13 31/19 |


| $E$ | 40/6 40/25 | $15$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| express [2] 19/13 40/2 extent [1] 3/22 extremely [1] 9/10 | getting [5] 6/23 17/9 34/18 45/7 45/15 <br> gigantic [1] 20/15 <br> girls [3] 5/19 6/8 19/14 <br> give [9] 6/15 9/17 15/17 27/12 32/24 | hearing [6] 6/5 6/6 6/11 6/13 36/13 41/16 heart [1] 36/7 |
| F | 33/1 34/15 37/25 44/3 | heightened [1] 40/9 |
|  | given [1] 13/22 | held [1] 28/5 |
| fact [2] 43/11 44/11 | gives [1] |  |
| facts [2] 7/6 8/6 | go [22] $2 / 1$ 15/7 16/23 17/6 18/10 |  |
| failed [2] 7/4 7/4 | 18/14 19/8 20/19 24/6 26/16 26/20 | 20/4 20/6 21/5 24/16 30/20 33/9 33/25 |
| false [2] 31/9 31/10 far [2] 7/1 42/6 | 26/21 26/22 30/3 34/22 41/6 41/25 | 34/3 39/1 |
| far [2] father [4] $3 / 13 / 18$ l | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42/9 44/21 44/23 45/5 45/20 } \\ & \text { aoes [2] } 40 / 1440 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | here's [7] 7/10 26/24 27/13 27/16 37/5 38/12 38/15 |
| father's [1] 14/1 | going[27] 2/1 2/2 8/22 9/1 12/25 19/3 | hereby [1] 46/8 |
| faulted [2] 43/4 43/5 | 19/13 22/7 22/24 24/22 26/22 27/23 | herself [5] 10/14 17/8 27/14 28/6 32/2 |
| uary [4] 16/9 36/13 38/7 43/12 | 30/8 30/12 31/17 33/14 34/9 34/22 | him [10] 10/24 10/25 13/23 17/25 21/7 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { feel [6] } & 5 / 19 \\ \text { f/22 12/22 18/23 18/24 }\end{array}$ | 38/23 38/25 39/16 39/17 41/12 41/1 | 25/25 29/9 33/3 42/17 44/1 |
| $21 / 14$ | 42/7 44/12 44/16 | himself [1] 42/18 |
| fees [2] 9/22 | gone [3] 8/8 8/8 8/10 | hint [1] 23/23 |
| felt [1] 11/21 | good [5] 6/23 11/3 15/2 21/7 35/12 | his [2] $8 / 710 / 2$ |
| few [1] 17/19 | got [5] 14/2 16/20 28/7 30/20 41/17 | history [1] 16/3 |
| figure [2] 31/21 31/23 | gotten [1] 14/22 | Hoffman's [1] 9/ |
| file [3] 10/1 28/4 28/5 | greater [1] 13/17 | hold [5] 6/5 17/3 24/2 |
| filed [2] 10/3 44/8 | 43/10 | holding [1] 6/11 |
| final [4] 9/19 22/15 23/13 41/16 |  | HON [1] 1/8 |
| finalizing [1] 41/9 | grievance [4] 44/8 44/10 44/10 44/12 guess [1] 30/14 | $\text { Honor [42] } 4 / 36 / 166 / 199 / 129 / 19$ |
| financial [2] 29/8 41/7 | GUS [1] 1/14 | 10/5 15/8 16/2 17/14 17/18 22/14 |
| $\text { [1] } 40 / 15$ | guy [1] 38/17 | 23/12 25/8 25/20 26/24 27/10 27/17 |
| firm [1] 41/20 | H | 27/25 28/19 29/10 29/13 31/5 31/15 |
| first [2] 2/2 2/19 | had [23] 11/22 11/23 14/23 16/3 16/3$16 / 16$ 18/21 $20 / 320 / 3 ~ 20 / 2121 / 8$$21 / 17$ 29/1 $29 / 1029 / 1129 / 1331 / 6$$33 / 735 / 2436 / 1638 / 939 / 842 / 25$ | 37/20 39/2 39/2 39/10 41/21 41/22 |
| five [1] 10/6 |  | 42/13 42/19 44/20 45/11 45/13 45/14 |
| fixed [1] 4/22 |  | 46/1 |
| follow [5] $17 / 2317 / 2529 / 1130 / 22$ |  | hope [2] 19/10 41/15 |
| followed [3] | hadn't [1] 14/22 | hoped [1] 23/22 |
| following [3] 7/17 29/6 38/22 | hair [2] 16/23 20/11hairline [1] 16/23 | hopefully [1] 37/20 |
| forehead [4] 16/7 16/19 23/17 23/2 |  | hours [1] 28/7 |
| forensic [2] 9/2 9/14 | half [1] 27/10 | how [12] 4/4 4/2 |
| forensics [1] 6/25 | handle [2] 30/9 30/21 <br> handling [1] 31/8 <br> happen [4] 9/4 16/14 23/2 35/10 <br> happened [6] 17/10 18/19 19/24 21/2 | 14/24 15/2 15/5 26/7 30/9 31/18 39/6 |
| forget [1] 8/21 |  | However [2] 16/15 17/12 |
| forgive [1] 17/11 |  | huge [2] 20/21 2 |
| form [1] 32/21 |  | hundred [2] 9/21 37/11 |
| forth [1] 33/15 | happening [3] 15/14 15/16 29/12 hypothetical [1] 8/1 |  |
| forwarded [1] 2/12 |  |  |
| founding [1] 5/21 | happens [1] 7/6 <br> happy [2] 11/3 29/21 |  |
| four [2] 3/19 9/2 | ```hard [3] 30/24 34/21 40/21 harm [2] 11/13 11/17 HAROLD [1] 1/15 has [37] 3/23 6/7 6/21 7/17 7/21 7/24``` |  |
| French [2] 45/17 45/20 |  | I'm [38] 4/12 6/10 9/1 9/13 9/24 9/25 |
| Friday [2] 37/24 44/3 |  | $11 / 2 \text { 11/6 13/9 15/2 15/20 17/9 18/16 }$ |
| friend [1] 20/21 |  | 18/18 18/21 19/19 19/20 19/21 22/16 |
| friends [1] 17/1 | 8/1 8/2 8/5 8/11 9/21 9/22 9/23 11/1 | 29/21 30/22 32/12 32/23 33/14 33/23 |
| front [2] 17/1 21/19 | 11/7 11/14 13/14 13/19 13/21 14/9 16/3 16/10 17/16 29/8 29/15 31/3 | 34/2 34/2 34/20 34/23 36/2 36/8 37/15 |
| frozen [1] 27/9 |  | 38/17 40/9 43/19 44/13 45/7 45/24 |
| fulfilling [1] 13/2 | $\begin{aligned} & 31 / 1634 / 1134 / 1537 / 437 / 2440 / 8 \\ & 42 / 342 / 442 / 1843 / 2544 / 7 \end{aligned}$ | I've [4] 3/20 11/18 36/16 44/14 |
| funds [6] 29/17 32/8 33/18 35/10 35/16 35/24 |  | idea [1] 19/19 |
| further [1] 32/22 | have [74] <br> haven't [3] 3/16 15/21 29/4 | immediately [3] 29/7 35/1 38/20 |
| future [1] 13/24 |  | impacts [1] 11/15 |
| G | having [8] 10/1 $10 / 23$ 14/3 20/20 20/22 $21 / 4$ 37/12 45/21 | portant [4] 4/4 6/5 11/21 12 |
|  | he [22] 7/4 7/4 9/15 9/22 11/1 17/20 | importantly [1] 6/4 |
| gave [2] 33/5 | 20/10 22/19 22/19 22/20 25/25 29/11 | impression [1] 21/6 |
|  | 29/19 29/22 30/3 30/5 30/6 30/10 33/8 | improper [2] 9/4 17/12 |
| $\text { get [34] } 2 / 166 / 116 / 17 \text { 9/5 17/20 }$ | 39/23 42/16 42/16 | improperly [1] 10/3 |
| 18/13 18/13 19/16 23/2 23/23 26/2 | he's [2] 21/11 42/19 | impropriety [1] 2/22 |
| 26/7 29/21 31/4 31/14 32/12 33/20 | head [4] 20/12 20/15 21/2 22/13 | improvement [1] 16/11 |
| 34/16 34/23 35/1 35/3 35/24 36/14 | headband [1] 23/22 | inadvertently [2] 13/25 21/16 |
| 36/17 37/1 37/14 37/17 38/5 39/8 39/9 | health [1] 12/12 | inappropriate [1] 26/9 |


| I | just [27] 10/4 14/16 14/20 14/25 18/17 | looking [2] 10/25 16/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| incident [3] $2 / 93 / 75 / 17$inclined [1] $15 / 11$included [1] $2 / 17$incorrect [1] $43 / 1$incurred [2] $9 / 2138 / 5$Index [1] 1/3information [6] $12 / 25 \quad 13 / 20 \quad 18 / 25 \quad 22 / 9$$24 / 1833 / 6$ | 26/4 31/3 31/7 31/14 31/21 | [ |
|  | 25/10 26/4 31/3 31/7 31/14 31/21 32/6 | lot [2] 18/16 37/12 |
|  | 38/5 39/14 45/12 | loud [2] 15/22 loudly [1] 21/3 |
|  | Justice [1] 1/9 | Lubell [1] 39/22 |
|  | K | lying [1] 16/18 |
|  | KASSENOFF [48] | M |
|  | Kassenoff's [4] 7/10 11/14 42/3 45/18 | made [10] 11/8 13/5 13/12 13/18 14/9 |
| ocently [1] 1518181 | Kassenoffs [1] 27/24 | 18/23 19/8 21/22 38/6 38/21 |
| innocently [1] 15/12 | keep [1] 45/9 | Maggie [1] 23/13 |
| innuendo [1] 8 | keeps [1] 45/2 | mail [25] 2/10 2/10 2/12 2/14 2/17 3/2 |
|  | kept [1] 16/17 | 5/4 8/14 13/10 14/23 20/5 23/13 26/4 |
|  | kids [5] 5/10 18/23 19/19 45/3 45/9 | 29/2 32/20 32/21 38/22 40/10 40/13 |
|  | kids' [1] 10/13 | 40/16 40/23 45/1 45/2 45/3 45/9 |
|  | knock [1] 8/23 | mailed [3] 26/10 26/11 33/2 |
|  | know [20] 3/4 5/21 6/16 9/15 14/17 | mailing [2] 3/18 16/17 |
| interacting [2] 15/6 22/10 | 19/1 19/2 20/25 21/10 21/19 21/20 | mails [7] 3/3 3/4 3/9 10/6 33/4 45/3 |
| interaction [1] 23/9 | 26/7 28/2 28/25 29/3 29/4 30/19 32/22 | 45/9 |
| interest [2] 4/5 30/19 |  | $\text { mainly [1] } \quad 10 / 16$ |
| interfere [2] 24/9 44/12 | known [1] 44/4 | maintain [1] 45/2 |
|  | knows [1] 29/13 | maintained [1] 40/13 |
| interjecting [2] 10/1 | KOBA [1] 1/8 | make [12] 2/22 4/3 9/17 22/14 33/13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { is [114] } \\ & \text { isn't [1] 30/14 } \\ & \text { issue [34] } 2 / 2 \text { 2/5 } 3 / 124 / 114 / 134 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | L | 41/15 |
|  | lack [1] 18/ | making [5] 14/10 19/4 20/8 24/5 37/9 |
| issue [34] 2/2 2/5 3/12 4/11 4/13 4/20 | language [2] 30/10 30/10 | manage [1] 17/15 |
|  | large [2] 20/4 20/6 | manipulate [1] 19/18 |
| 14/19 15/5 19/12 20/4 28/1 33/3 33/25 | last [4] 9/2 11/8 16/6 39/20 | manipulated [1] 19/15 |
| 34/11 35/6 35/9 35/15 37/5 37/15 | Lastly [1] 5/13 | manipulating [2] 19/20 19/21 |
| 44/20 41/6 43/3 43/9 43/13 44/5 44/7 | later [1] 10/16 | many [4] 3/13 16/4 36/16 44/5 |
|  | law [3] 3/25 26/4 26/5 | March [4] 9/20 16/9 34/5 36/12 |
| ISsued [4] 13/14 29/10 29/15 34/5 | lawyer [7] 2/23 3/19 4/5 4/25 5/11 5/20 | marriage [2] 3/7 3/8 |
| issues [6] 10/10 10/11 12/12 $16 / 544 / 15$ | 12/22 | Mary [2] 1/23 46/13 |
|  | lawyers [2] 6/24 19/19 | matter [1] 17/20 |
| it's [42] 4/9 6/2 6/5 7/5 7/7 8/9 9/6 9/9 | least [3] 6/20 9/3 45/1 | may [10] 1/6 12/3 18/17 28/14 28/18 |
| 9/10 10/4 10/10 11/4 12/6 12/24 13/19 | led [1] 37/13 | 34/20 38/10 38/17 41/3 44/20 |
|  | left [4] 3/13 5/3 16/25 44/7 | maybe [1] 21/16 |
|  | legal [5] 9/4 30/4 32/12 32/14 38/5 | McGuther [1] 28/8 |
|  | legally [1] 7/11 | me [32] $2 / 14$ 2/15 4/3 10/25 11/2 11/4 |
|  | lesion [11] 20/4 20/6 20/10 20/11 | 11/7 11/19 12/2 17/11 17/21 20/15 |
|  | 20/15 21/4 21/8 21/9 22/8 22/12 22/18 | 21/1 21/19 23/24 28/4 28/20 28/24 |
| 42/22 42/22 45/5 | lesions [1] 22/22 | 29/3 29/19 29/20 29/23 30/3 30/10 |
| itself [3] 2/21 3/2 15/11 | let [5] 14/17 19/17 29/3 30/3 45/13 | 33/1 33/8 35/9 38/13 42/14 42/22 45/3 |
| J | let's [1] 8/21 | 45/13 |
| January [1] 16/9 | letter [13] 4/23 8/17 30/11 33/6 34/23 | mean [3] 3/25 22/4 30/20 |
| JILL [1] 1/17 | 34/24 36/18 37/1 37/4 38/12 38/15 <br> 39/1 39/13 | means [3] 22/3 24/10 40/19 |
| Jo [2] 4/18 4/18 | letters [2] 16/13 41/17 | $\text { meeting [2] } 23 / 15 \text { 25/14 }$ |
| Jo-Jo [1] 4/18 | level [2] 8/2 10/9 | mention [1] 21/3 |
| join [1] 10/12 | lie [1] 21/8 | mentioning [1] 17/21 |
| joining [1] 10/12 | lifted [1] 30/7 | mic [2] 15/24 $17 / 4$ |
| joint [1] 38/18 | like [8] 15/22 16/8 16/10 17/24 19/15 | MICHAEL [1] 1/14 |
| Josephina [2] 7/20 11/25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { like [8] 15/22 16/8 16/10 17/24 19/15 } \\ & 20 / 1933 / 2245 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\operatorname{mid}[1] 45 / 5$ |
| Judge [45] 2/6 2/13 3/12 3/22 4/7 5/9 | limited [2] 12/5 24/16 | mid-July [1] 45/5 |
| 5/13 5/25 6/4 9/3 9/9 10/18 12/3 12/17 | Lincoln [3] 6/5 6/11 6/13 | might [2] 2/13 20/24 |
| 13/14 14/9 14/16 18/15 19/10 22/11 | line [2] 22/6 22/7 | minimize [1] $43 / 21$ |
| 22/17 24/8 24/24 26/8 26/13 28/15 | lined [1] 28/8 | minute [3] 36/7 38/3 45/6 |
| 29/15 30/5 30/17 31/10 33/1 33/9 34/2 | link [1] $2 / 16$ | minutes [1] 14/24 |
| $34 / 934 / 2034 / 2435 / 435 / 1936 / 3$ | list [3] 43/16 43/17 44/15 | misinterpretation [1] 25/8 |
| 39/22 41/3 42/2 44/6 44/25 45/9 | listen [1] 22/3 | misled [1] 22/12 |
| Judge's [2] 30/1 30/20 | listening [1] 15/12 |  |
| Judges [1] 9/3 | $\text { litigator [2] } 36 / 836 / 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { misrepresentations [1] } 28 / 16 \\ & \text { miss [1] } 44 / 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| judgment [8] 4/9 4/13 4/18 7/13 7/14 7/22 8/5 12/11 | live [2] 2/24 3/20 | missing [1] 17/17 |
|  | long [3] 18/21 25/1 45/5 | mistake [4] 8/14 8/18 10/19 13/12 |
| June [6] 41/10 41/10 41/11 44/17 | look[5] 20/9 22/3 23/4 23/9 24/7 | mode [1] 31/17 |
| $45 / 2345 / 25$ | looked [2] 16/8 44/9 | Mom [4] 3/3 3/14 3/21 5/5 |


| M | notarized [2] 33/7 36/18 | P |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mo | nothing [4] 9/6 32/3 34/11 34/15 | package [1] 40/24 |
| moment[2] 33/1 41/4 | notwithstanding [1] 3/12 | paid [2] 33/25 34/18 |
| Mommy [2] 23/16 23/19 | now [18] 6/10 8/1 16/10 18/19 23/8 | pale [1] 45/22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { money } \\ & 37 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | 25/4 30/8 30/9 30/20 30/23 31/16 | papers [1] 37/13 |
| month [2] 16/6 27/10 | 37/20 38/10 39/20 43/3 43/13 43/14 | $\text { parens [1] } 8 / 10$ |
| months [5] 3/17 31/12 34/17 42/21 $44 / 5$ | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { 4 } \\ \text { number [4] } & 19 / 6 ~ 28 / 22 ~ 28 / 25 ~ 30 / 1 ~\end{array}$ | parent [6] 8/4 8/5 13/15 15/12 25/15 |
| more [8] 3/16 9/6 11/5 13/23 23/5 24/20 29/3 34/14 | numbers [1] 28/23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25/17 } \\ & \text { parents [1] 25/1 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | numerous [2] 3/20 8/2 | participate [1] 23 |
| most [27] 1/18 2/4 2/9 3/5 3/23 4/9 | O | particular [1] 7/ |
| /17 5/15 6/1 6/4 6/15 6/17 7/14 7/20 | obligation [2] 34/3 34/4 | parties [4] 30/11 32/7 36/5 36/ |
| 8/15 8/25 9/9 10/17 12/9 13/1 13/18 | obligations [1] 13/3 | parties' [1] 2/11 |
| 13/19 14/8 18/20 18/25 25/11 42/15 | observe [4] 21/23 22/3 23/4 23/8 | partnership [1] 42/3 |
| mother [9] $2 / 253 / 15 / 213 / 513 / 714 / 2$ 14/3 14/11 16/15 | observing [2] 23/7 24/12 | party [5] 6/21 17/18 28/3 40/1 40 <br> past [1] 16/4 |
| motion [17] 4/3 9/12 9/18 9/25 9/25 | obviously [2] 10/18 25/13 occasion [1] 11/6 | patriae [1] 8/1 |
| 10/1 10/3 10/10 11/7 13/1 18/23 33/22 | off [1] $32 / 7$ | pay [2] 28/9 37/1 |
| 34/13 38/1 39/18 39/19 45/15 | offered [1] 30/21 | payable [1] 38/21 |
| motions [1] 9/23 | office [2] 10/22 45/16 | paying [1] 28/10 |
| move [1] 2/3 | okay[33] 6/9 6/18 6/20 7/1 7/11 7/23 | people [6] 9/13 20/24 20/24 21/19 |
| moving [2] 14/14 14/18 | 9/20 10/15 12/23 15/4 17/19 17/25 | 23/1 26/11 |
| $\mathrm{Mr}[42]$ 2/10 3/8 6/14 8/24 10/8 13/21 | 19/7 19/10 21/21 22/23 23/5 24/3 | percent [1] 28/10 |
| 15/4 16/1 17/6 17/15 18/10 20/5 20/6 | 24/12 24/15 25/18 26/9 27/6 28/11 | perfectly [3] 16/18 21/22 24/ |
| 20/21 21/5 22/16 24/19 24/21 25/11 | 31/1 31/17 33/25 34/12 38/17 40/3 | perhaps [1] 41/16 |
| 26/11 26/23 29/5 30/13 30/23 31/1 |  | period [4] 11/15 18/21 24/16 32/25 |
| $32 / 433 / 2$ 33/8 33/21 34/13 36/25 37/4 | old [3] 12/14 32/7 | perjure [1] 28/6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 37 / 1238 / 1439 / 1341 / 1042 / 342 / 5 \\ & 42 / 1343 / 1643 / 2044 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | Once [2] 7/14 38/23 | permission [4] 2/3 9/17 37/25 40/2 permit [1] 12/25 |
| Mrs [30] 3/8 6/17 7/10 9/16 10/7 11/6 |  | permitting [1] 23/4 |
| 11/13 14/8 15/5 15/17 16/20 17/3 18/8 | 19/6 22/15 23/12 23/15 24/17 27/5 | person [3] 38/13 40/14 43/20 |
| 18/14 19/7 19/23 21/21 26/1 26/3 27/4 | 36/6 36/7 38/10 38/13 40/14 43/2 | personal [1] 4/5 |
| 28/13 32/24 33/18 36/8 37/9 41/11 | 44/21 | pertinent [1] 10/10 |
| 44/7 44/23 45/18 45/24 |  | phone [1] 45/6 |
| Ms [29] 2/4 2/4 $2 / 93 / 5$ 3/23 4/9 4/17 | only [8] 15/19 25/13 27/4 35/3 35/16 | photo [2] 20/11 26/7 |
| 5/15 6/1 6/15 6/17 7/14 7/20 8/14 8/25 | $35 / 2536 / 1540 / 10$ | photograph [5] 20/9 22/17 24/19 24/20 |
|  | onslaught [1] 10/7 | $26 / 4$ |
| 14/18 18/20 18/25 24/6 33/11 39/22 | open [3] 36/18 37/8 38/2 | photographs [1] 22/5 |
| much [3] 6/7 44/2 | opened [1] 38/11 | physically [2] 7/25 8 |
| multiple [1] 33/4 |  | pick [1] 28/23 |
| mute [2] 15/24 17/4 | opportunity [5] 6/15 15/18 15/23 20/13 31/7 | picking [3] 16/3 16/7 21 |
| my [59] | opposed [1] 14/5 | picture [2] 16/18 23/20 |
| myself [3] 21/22 32/23 37/15 | order [36] 13/14 15/10 18/1 24/25 25/9 | Pimples [1] 23/24 |
| N | 25/11 25/11 25/12 27/8 27/20 28/1 |  |
| name [1] 16/13 |  | Plaintiff [2] 1/3 1/12 |
| NANCY [1] 1/8 | $36 / 1236 / 1437 / 537 / 1037 / 1337 / 15$ | please [8] 17/4 27/3 29/20 36/24 38/20 |
| nanny [1] 23/14 | $37 / 17 \text { 38/2 38/6 38/8 39/4 40/8 }$ | $38 / 2141 / 2145 / 8$ |
| necessarily [1] 12/14 | ordered [2] 28/19 36/12 | plenty [1] 3/25 |
| need [11] 6/18 18/8 23/20 28/5 29/3 | orders [1] 31/19 | point[11] 6/2 7/20 7/22 9/19 12/19 |
| 32/22 34/16 35/2 41/6 41/25 44/23 | original [2] 32/25 35/19 | 22/15 22/19 22/23 23/13 31/16 34/22 |
| needed [2] 10/24 27/8 | other [18] 2/8 10/25 13/7 17/25 18/3 | pointed [1] 23/22 |
| needs [3] 21/9 33/24 41/24 | 18/7 20/23 20/24 21/19 23/1 25/5 | points [1] 18/17 |
| neither [1] 25/15 | 25/16 25/17 26/11 29/16 34/11 37/17 | policeman [1] 45/2 |
| net [1] 33/16 | 41/5 $25 / 17$ 26/11 29/16 34/11 $37 / 17$ | portion [1] 45/17 |
| new [10] 1/1 1/13 1/17 6/3 7/15 31/2 | others [1] 16/22 | position [9] 6/10 11/20 11/25 12/10 |
| 31/13 31/24 34/23 34/24 | otherwise [1] 3/21 | 12/24 15/9 18/12 30/6 45/4 |
| next [11] 14/14 14/19 20/13 20/13 29/4 | our [5] 5/14 15/8 17/14 40/16 41/14 | possible [1] 41/17 |
| 33/25 35/1 35/2 39/1 41/18 45/25 | out[15] 6/13 7/1 9/11 15/22 17/1 17/5 | preclude [1] 23/7 |
| no [27] 1/3 6/18 7/7 8/7 13/6 15/15 |  | precluded [2] 24/11 39/5 |
| 20/10 21/3 21/13 22/12 23/9 24/15 |  | prepare [1] 37/12 |
| 24/15 24/15 24/17 24/20 25/3 25/5 | over [6] 5/18 9/21 11/8 11/15 18/19 | prepared [1] 33/6 |
| 29/25 31/5 31/17 35/12 35/15 35/19 | over [6] 5/18 9/21 11/8 11/15 18/19 | preparing [1] 10/19 |
| 41/13 42/4 43/1 | overnight [1] 40/23 | presence [2] 16/22 23/10 |
| none [1] 20/8 | overnight [1] 40/23 <br> owe [1] 28/8 | PRESENT [1] $1 / 20$ |
| not [98] |  | presume [2] 2/9 4/15 |
| notarize [1] 30/12 |  | prevents [1] 29/23 |



| S | $43 / 1143 / 1343 / 14$ | $\text { ] } 2$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sign... [2] 39/14 39/23 | subpoenaed [1] 42/25 <br> substitute [2] 7/13 7/14 | 6/25 8/18 9/14 11/1 17/23 23/6 23/19 23/19 23/22 24/11 25/23 26/15 27/13 |
| signed [8] 25/21 27/14 31/12 33/7 | substituted [3] 4/13 7/22 8/5 | 29/22 30/14 31/14 33/21 37/24 |
| 35/20 39/24 40/25 significant [3] 1 | substituting [3] 4/9 4/18 12/11 | 39/15 39/18 40/4 40/18 43/12 |
| signing [1] 39/13 | sufficient [1] 4/8 | theory [1] 29/25 |
| silent [1] 23/10 | suggest [1] 43/13 | therapist [4] 16/6 20/5 33/24 34/ |
| similar [3] 7/7 9/16 23/6 | suggesting [1] 34/23 | there [23] 2/8 4/2 4/15 6/7 9/20 10/7 |
| simple [2] 25/21 34/6 | Su | 10/9 10/11 15/4 17/19 21/3 21/13 |
| simply [2] 13/11 17/2 | support [1] 12/9 | 22/12 25/3 28/15 29/17 30/3 30/14 |
| since [3] 4/9 9/20 10/21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { supposed [6] 5/22 14/3 22/2 22/8 } \\ & 24 / 1733 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | there's [26] 3/25 4/8 6/12 6/18 7/24 |
| single [1] 38/10 | SUPREME [2] 1/1 1/9 | 12/1 13/6 16/11 20/9 23/9 25/4 25/14 |
|  | sure [5] 4/12 19/20 30/22 40/9 40/17 | 27/17 27/21 27/21 29/3 31/2 31/24 |
| situation [2] 9/16 24/4 six [2] 12/13 38/8 | surmise [1] 16/14 | 32/18 33/10 33/15 36/9 37/6 37/23 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \operatorname{six}[2] & 12 / 13 \\ \text { skin }[21 & 16 / 3 \end{array}$ | surprise [1] 7/7 | 40/8 42/2 |
|  | surprised [3] 3/24 9/11 9/15 | therefrom [1] 4/22 |
| Skype [1] 1/6 | survivorship [1] 38/19 | these [9] 5/8 5/10 5/19 5/24 6/8 12/21 |
|  | suspicion [2] 31/17 32/19 | 18/17 19/14 32/11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { smart [1 } \\ & \text { so [55] } \end{aligned}$ | switch [1] 6/24 | they [54] |
| soccer [6] 16/21 17/8 17/10 19/25 20/1 | sworn [1] 45/18 | they're [11] 5/3 5/6 6/23 8/3 19/18 |
| $20 / 14$ | Syndrome [1] 8/3 | 19/18 28/3 29/25 34/9 35/25 36/1 |
| some [10] 2/25 4/14 8/2 10/8 10/20 | T | thing [6] $2 / 13$ 12/4 18/18 29/4 38/11 |
| 28/15 28/21 29/13 30/2 45/1 | take [8] 4/16 8/20 11/19 11/25 20/22 22/4 22/24 23/20 | 44/21 <br> things [6] 2/18 6/24 17/24 23/20 29/1 |
| somehow [3] 19/19 41/15 43/3 | taken [1] 29/1 | $32 / 11$ |
| someone [1] 16/ | takes [2] 20/10 34/25 | think [26] 3/24 4/11 5/17 5/24 5/25 6/2 |
| $31 / 12$ | taking [1] 29/24 | 6/4 6/8 7/20 8/20 11/13 11/16 11/18 |
| somewhat [2] 4/19 25/23 | talk [7] 2/2 2/5 8/15 17/5 17/5 30/4 | 12/7 12/9 12/20 15/11 16/21 19/4 19/5 |
| sorry [4] 15/20 18/16 26/13 34/2 | 45/12 <br> talked [1] 37/4 | 20/24 20/25 21/16 28/5 29/23 30/1 thinking [2] 6/19 10/22 |
| sort [3] 5/17 15/22 28/22 | talking [5] 5/10 7/25 9/24 10/1 15/22 | $\text { third [2] } 7 / 240 / 1$ |
| speak [7] 6/15 18/16 22/2 27/3 28/14 35/13 36/6 | talks [1] 4/4 | thirty [1] 44/7 |
|  | taxes [1] 27/21 | thirty-second [1] 44/7 |
| speaking [1] $21 / 24$ | teacher [3] 22/2 23/10 24/11 | this [70] |
| speaks [1] 4/1 specific [1] 12/12 | team [4] 16/21 30/4 32/12 32/14 | those [11] 3/4 4/6 8/6 10/22 16/5 |
| specific [1] 12/12 specifically [1] 7/17 | tell [3] 6/10 13/11 43/22 | 29/24 33/18 39/25 41/12 43/14 45/9 |
| specifically [1] $7 / 17$ | telling [3] 5/7 36/2 43/19 | though [1] 5/19 |
| spent [2] 36/13 37/12 | tells [2] 27/13 34/7 | thought [7] 9/11 21/22 25/3 28/25 39/8 |
| $33 / 1139 / 22$ | ten [3] 3/9 3/10 26/1 | 43/7 43/9 |
|  | tenants [1] 38/18 | thousand [3] 7/8 9/21 37/11 |
| spoke [2] 33/5 39 | terms [1] 9/23 | thousands [1] 28/8 |
| stacked [1] 8/22 | terrible [2] 20/20 21/14 | three [4] 3/17 7/1 9/2 11/24 |
|  | text [2] 13/5 14/3 | through [6] 14/23 26/17 26/20 26/21 |
|  | texted [1] 14/2 | 26/22 29/6 |
| andard [3] $4 / 12$ | texting [1] 13/6 | throughout [1] 8/19 |
|  | than [9] 3/17 7/21 9/7 11/5 13/7 25/5 | thus [1] 42/5 |
|  | 25/16 34/14 39/7 | time [18] 2/23 2/24 10/16 11/15 12/5 |
| starting [1] 30/23 | Thank [6] 2/6 18/15 41/2 41/14 46/1 | 13/1 14/12 15/19 18/20 18/21 22/24 |
| TATE [2] 1/1 7/15 | 46/2 | 24/16 27/5 31/20 31/20 38/14 43/18 |
| stated [2] 13/10 25/10 | Thanks [1] 24/8 | 45/5 |
|  | that [221] | times [5] 3/20 7/8 8/2 26/2 28/24 |
|  | that's [38] $4 / 196 / 67 / 28 / 138 / 248 / 25$ | tips [1] 5/17 |
| stays [1] $27 / 12$ | 9/1 10/15 13/15 14/10 14/13 14/21 | today [2] 10/23 12/5 |
|  | 15/2 15/14 17/2 19/6 22/6 22/6 22/18 | told [7] 3/20 25/22 29/9 32/17 33/8 |
| steps [3] 7/18 38/8 38/9 | 24/16 24/20 25/7 25/15 26/9 27/1 27/1 | 36/16 42/18 |
| still [4] 17/19 19/17 29/25 38/11 Stockholm [1] 8/3 | 27/20 28/11 33/9 35/5 35/12 35/23 | too[3] 2/24 5/12 8/21 |
| Stockholm [1] 8/3 stop [9] 18/9 20/8 | 38/23 39/18 40/10 40/15 43/1 44/15 | took[3] 16/17 21/1 34/14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { stop [9] 18/9 20/8 31/11 31/] } \\ & 31 / 1131 / 1236 / 2443 / 6 \end{aligned}$ | their [20] $2 / 23$ 2/25 2/25 3/1 3/23 4/6 | touch [1] 29/16 |
| stopped [1] 16/7 | 4/25 5/1 5/11 5/19 7/12 7/13 7/14 | touched [1] 30/2 |
| story [1] 36/19 | 10/14 12/22 16/13 19/1 19/3 32/16 | TRADE [26] 24/22 25/19 25/23 25/23 |
| STRASSFIELD [1] 1/15 | 35/4 | 25/25 26/1 $27 /$ |
| strategy [1] 17/14 | them [28] $2 / 226 / 317 / 20$ 19/17 19/18 | 28/21 29/7 30/19 31/2 31/16 32/2 32/6 |
| Street [2] 1/13 1/16 | 29/2 32/10 32/11 32/17 34/7 35/11 | $36 / 1636 / 1738 / 24$ |
| strong [1] 11/9 | 41/18 42/17 42/19 42/20 42/25 43/7 | TRADE's [1] 30/6 |
| students [1] 24/11 | $43 / 1145 / 145 / 1045 / 1045 / 11$ |  |
| subject [2] 2/14 2/17 <br> subpoena [7] 42/20 42/22 42/23 43/7 | themselves [1] 19/13 | translation [1] 45/22 |


| T | waiting [1] 9/1 | wonder [2] 2/23 30/23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| transmit [4] 40/4 40/5 40/9 40/16 | want [22] 2/24 3/20 6/8 10/16 12/20 | wonderful [1] 16/19 |
| Traurig [5] 42/18 42/21 43/2 43/6 | $32 / 2033 / 234 / 1634 / 1734 / 1838 / 16$ | wondering [2] 5/3 5/6 |
|  | 43/15 45/4 45/11 45/12 | words [1] 23/15 |
| tremendous [1] 38/5 | wanted [9] 10/19 12/16 14/20 14/25 | work [4] 9/1 31/18 38/23 42/4 |
| trial [7] 3/19 6/12 10/19 10/23 13/20 | 16/16 19/17 22/24 25/2 26/6 | working [1] 8/25 |
| 41/16 42/9 | wants [3] 6/17 8/4 27/7 | world [1] 21/7 |
| tried [2] 26/1 28/24 | was [56] | worry [1] 31/9 |
| TRO [1] 25/4 | wasn't [1] 12/16 way [10] 2/25 9/ | would [23] 2/22 3/24 5/4 9/8 9/16 13/15 15/13 15/22 19/5 19/11 $20 / 24$ |
| true [5] 17/2 27/1 27/2 32/3 46/8 | $19 / 1524 / 930 / 530 / 2145 / 1$ | 23/23 26/10 27/11 29/17 30/3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { trust [7] 3/19 4/1 5/15/19 5/23 12/22 } \\ & \text { 18/20 } \end{aligned}$ | we [47] | 35/9 35/11 35/17 43/9 43/12 45/8 |
| trusting [1] 18/24 | we're [8] 2/2 4/11 6/19 7/25 19/23 33 | write [2] 5/4 38/18 |
| trusts [1] 8/7 | 41/18 45/21 | writes [1] 9/6 |
| trustworthy [1] 19/2 | We've [4] 7/3 8/8 8/8 8/10 | writing [1] 42/17 |
| truth [1] 5/7 | Wednesday [1] 1/6 | written [1] 38/8 |
| try [1] 17/15 | week [5] 10/23 33/21 35/2 39/1 41/18 | wrong [2] 17/9 39/17 |
| trying [4] 21/6 21/12 34/21 36/14 | well [10] 5/7 9/10 13/16 19/7 26/12 | wrote [1] 4/22 |
| Tuckahoe [1] 1/13 | well-being [1] 13/16 | Y |
| turn [2] 18/3 18/6 | were [12] 3/25 5/7 10/20 10/23 29/1 | year [1] 11/8 |
| turned [2] 20/7 21/1 | 29/11 29/16 30/2 34/14 35/16 39/17 | years [2] 3/10 3/10 |
| two [9] 3/14 3/17 6/23 7/1 8/25 19/19 31/12 34/17 42/21 | 46/3 | Yes [7] 13/23 24/14 28/14 28/17 32/4 |
| U | what [44] 2/15 4/11 4/24 5/16 6/8 7/19 | yesterday [1] 41/17 |
| under [2] 11/6 30/7 | 7/19 7/19 8/13 8/16 8/21 9/6 9/13 9/23 | yet [1] 4/17 |
| under [2] 11/6 30/7 $6 / 915 / 13$ 23/11 | 12/15 13/15 13/19 16/8 16/9 18/19 | YORK [4] 1/1 1/13 1/17 7/15 |
| understand [11] 4/24 6/9 15/13 23/11 | 19/3 19/20 19/21 19/22 19/24 20/25 | you [111] |
| $42 / 11$ | 21/2 24/13 26/24 27/7 27/20 27/23 | you're [9] 13/12 13/13 22/2 22/8 22/23 |
| understanding [1] 42/24 | 29/12 30/15 32/22 35/9 35/24 36/15 | 33/15 36/10 39/15 39/16 |
| unfortunate [1] 2/8 | 36/19 37/24 38/25 41/7 43/19 44/18 | you've [1] 23/6 |
| unfortunately [1] 2/17 | what's [6] 15/14 15/15 22/7 24/22 32/9 | your [70] |
| unilaterally [2] 27/23 32/15 | 42/7 | yourself [1] 34/24 |
| unresponded [1] 33/4 | whatsoever [2] 20/10 34/12 | Z |
| unresponded-to [1] 33/4 | when [18] 6/11 7/13 8/22 13/5 13/10 | Zeiderman [1] 42/25 |
| unrestricted [1] 30/1 | 14/2 14/23 19/12 20/8 21/1 21/6 22/22 | zero [1] 42/4 |
| unsatisfied [1] 16/20 | 22/25 23/14 23/15 25/21 32/17 42/18 | Zoom [19] 10/13 13/7 15/6 16/20 |
| until [6] 11/20 17/5 40/6 40/25 43/17 | whenever [1] 35/2 | 16/25 17/13 17/21 17/22 19/8 19/24 |
| untouched [1] 35/18 | where [13] 2/9 5/21 6/21 7/4 7/6 7/21 | 20/3 21/23 22/25 23/3 23/7 23/8 24/6 |
| up [13] 4/14 6/6 11/19 16/23 17/11 | 8/3 8/9 8/11 17/19 20/9 23/5 38/9 | 24/12 45/17 |
| 17/23 17/25 19/5 28/8 28/23 37/9 | Whereupon [1] 46/3 |  |
| 37/19 42/16 | whether [9] 3/9 4/13 5/18 6/8 8/6 |  |
| upon [2] 12/24 33/20 | 10/12 14/1 14/11 17/9 |  |
| urge [1] 9/17 | $9 / 1310 / 812 / 2113 / 11 \quad 23 / 327 / 7 \text { 28/22 }$ |  |
| us [2] 36/18 38/16 | $30 / 1130 / 1842 / 1545 / 7$ |  |
| use [3] 7/23 11/25 22/5 | while [1] $4 / 19$ |  |
| used [1] 5/5 | White [1] $1 / 17$ |  |
| uses [1] 11/10 $1711317 / 22181$ | who [10] 2/11 2/23 3/19 3/21 7/24 9/12 |  |
| using [4] 3/18 17/13 17/22 18/11 | $14 / 10 \text { 19/14 29/8 43/22 }$ |  |
| Utah [1] 28/22 | whoever [1] 45/11 |  |
| V | whole [2] 27/22 30/4 |  |
| vacate [1] 10/3 | whom [2] 38/17 43/21 |  |
| vehicle [1] 35/3 | why [16] 2/23 3/17 4/17 5/3 5/7 5/15 |  |
| verbal [1] 26/2 | 6/17 14/1 14/4 16/13 30/22 30/23 33/9 |  |
| very [12] $2 / 8$ 18/18 18/22 19/4 20/10 | will [27] 4/4 6/13 6/15 8/15 9/11 15/17 |  |
| 20/23 25/20 34/21 36/7 38/8 44/25 | 16/12 18/23 18/25 23/6 24/11 28/2 |  |
| 44/25 |  |  |
| Via [1] 1/6 | 30/6 35/1 35/1 $37 / 7$ 37/8 37/19 37/25 |  |
| views [1] 19/3 | 38/2 39/14 44/13 44/17 45/10 45/10 |  |
| violation [4] 15/10 15/13 18/1 27/11 | 45/11 45/14 |  |
| violin [2] 17/8 17/10 | willing [2] 34/14 36/1 |  |
| voice [2] 32/20 32/21 | wishes [2] 3/24 7/13 withheld [1] 27/21 |  |
| voluntarily [1] 12/15 | without [6] 7/11 25/17 37/8 40/2 42/10 |  |
| W | 45/6 |  |
| Wait [3] 18/5 18/5 39/6 | won't [3] 9/15 39/15 43/8 |  |

