NYSCEF DOC. NO. 595

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 07/09/2020

1

```
1
    SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
    COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER
 2
    ALLAN KASSENOFF,
 3
                                   Plaintiff,
             -against-
 4
    CATHERINE KASSENOFF,
 5
                                   Defendant.
 6
    INDEX NO. 58217/2019
                         Westchester County Courthouse
 7
                         111 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
                         White Plains, New York 10601
                         July 2, 2020
 8
                         12:30 p.m.
 9
    BEFORE:
                         HONORABLE NANCY QUINN KOBA,
10
                         Justice of the Supreme Court.
11
    APPEARANCES:
    DIMOPOULOS BRUGGEMANN PC
12
    Attorneys for Plaintiff
13
        73 Main Street
        Tuckahoe, New York 10707
    BY: GUS DIMOPOULOS, ESQ.
14
        MICHAEL CHIARAMONTE, ESQ.
15
16
    HAROLD SALANT STRASSFIELD & SPIELBERG
    Attorneys for Defendant
17
        81 Main Street, Suite 205
        White Plains, New York 10601
    BY: JILL SPIELBERG, ESQ.
18
        ALYSON KURITZKY, ESQ.
19
20
    MOST & SCHNEID, PC
    Attorney for the Children
        222 Bloomingdale Road, Suite 302
21
        White Plains, New York 10605
22
    BY: CAROL W. MOST, ESQ.
23
    ALSO PRESENT:
24
    Allan Kassenoff
    Catherine Kassenoff
25
                                              Gina M. Saline,
                                              Senior Court Reporter
```

INDEX NO. 58217/2019 COUNTY TCHESTER CLERK

- PROCEEDINGS -

1 (The following proceedings were held with all 2 participants appearing via Skype.) (Mrs. Kassenoff was not present at this time.) 3 THE COURT: Let's put our appearance on the record. 4 5 Dimopoulos Bruggemann, Gus MR. DIMOPOULOS: 6 Dimopoulos, Michael Chiaramonte on behalf of the plaintiff 7 Alan Kassenoff who is on the call. Good afternoon, your 8 Honor. 9 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 10 MS. SPIELBERG: Jill Spielberg, Harold Salant 11 Strassfield Spielberg for the defendant who's actually not 12

on the call, Judge. Also, I have in my office Alyson Kuritzky and we have an intern who is also sitting in my office.

> THE COURT: Okay.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Carol Most, attorney for the children. MS. MOST:

THE COURT: Okay. So, this conference was scheduled at the request of Mr. Dimopoulos. Mr. Dimopoulos, you can please put on the record your request for this conference.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, my request for the conference is based upon Mrs. Kassenoff's harassment of the tenant at the New Rochelle house. According to all of the information we have she has signed all of the documents to list the property. A little late but better late than never. The house I think is on the market as of today. We

- PROCEEDINGS -

hope. We believe.

She's reached out to the tenant, told the tenant this court has ordered the tenant to leave on July 15th and she'll be moving in.

As far as my client's concerned, this thirty-seven hundred fifty dollars that he may, they may or may not, may or may not be getting is not worth five court conferences on this ridiculousness. They've had a tenant. She's been a great tenant. She asked if she could stay to August 1st.

Mr. Kassenoff told her he needed to see what the Court would say. The Court, I believe, was clear if she's out by the 15th, great; if she's not, we can't, we can't compel her to leave. I walked away. I ordered the transcript. That's what I read. The information was conveyed to the tenant.

The tenant asked to stay until 8/1.

Miss Kassenoff now told her -- I'm paraphrasing,
because I didn't have time to get my notes together -you've got to be out on the 15th. It is a court order. I
will be there with my belongings to move in.

Nobody wants trouble, your Honor. The tenant doesn't want trouble. We don't want trouble. We just -- you know, this all is just too much at this point. Just give us clear directives on what you think should happen and we don't need to have these conferences but I don't want a situation where, you know, there's going to be police

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 595 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 07/09/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

called. And, you know, frankly, what if the tenant turns around says I'm not leaving; you know what, I'm holding over. There is a buyer. Drama should just be avoided. That's the reason I asked for the conference.

THE COURT: Miss Spielberg.

MS. SPIELBERG: Judge, I think that it's not as simple as Mr. Dimopoulos made it seem. I mean, I find it ironic and a little bit too convenient we have a conversation with the Court, you know, there's a bum rush to sign the stipulation to get the house on the market. My client does it. She complies. There are all these provisions as to when she can move in. She told the Court that she wants to be in the house so that she can be settled for the trial. That's pretty important to her. Then the next day or within a couple of days Mr. Kassenoff is all of a sudden coordinating with the tenant to stay until August 1st. It's clear that a side deal was struck. To my client's detriment. You know, she has a right to move into her home.

And I find it hard to believe that she's, the woman's willing to leave on 7/15 and then as soon as the house is on the market now all of a sudden she's demanding to stay until 8/1. I mean, to me it's all too convenient.

And my client, Judge, my client just needs a place to live.

Like, cut this woman a break at this point. I don't understand why we can't just allow her to move into her

- PROCEEDINGS -

home. I don't believe that the tenant all of a sudden had a, had a divine moment where she decided she wanted to stay two weeks later, conveniently the same day that my client signs the agreement, the listing agreement.

THE COURT: Okay. So, this is how I see it. There is a lease agreement here that goes until July 15th. Then the tenant, if they don't move out, is considered to be a holdover tenant. And the way, that would necessitate these parties commencing an eviction proceeding in order to regain the possession of the house under the R-P-A-P-L.

Now, in the interim the governor has issued an order saying there are no eviction proceedings. That order goes until August 19th. So, none of these parties have a right to harass the tenant out of the premises if the tenant decides to stay over on July 16th. Those are the orders of the governor.

After I read Mr. Dimopoulos's E-mail, I went and looked at the latest order and the order is extended to August 19th. Moreover, the courts are not hearing any eviction proceedings at the present time consistent with the governor's order. So, you can't go in and use self help to evict this tenant if she chooses to stay over. You cannot bring an eviction proceeding; you cannot harass her under the current orders issued by the governor and the Administrative Judge of the New York State Court System.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 595 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 07/09/2020

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

- PROCEEDINGS -

That in and of itself. It has nothing to do with Mrs.

Kassenoff. It has nothing to do with Mr. Kassenoff. That's the law. That's where we exist now. And we're dealing with two attorneys.

Now, when we had this conference last time I said if the tenant moves out on July 15th and of course Miss Kassenoff can take occupancy of her house. I also clearly stated having reviewed again the administrative orders and the governor's executive orders, of which I'm sure Miss Kassenoff as an employee of the governor certainly would be up-to-date to, indicate that you cannot move to evict someone if in fact this tenant chooses to remain in the The fortunate thing for these parties is the property. tenant has indicated if I remain to the end of the month, which was her request, I will again pay the rent issued and I will leave by August 1st. If the tenant chooses not to leave by August 1st, again, neither of these parties can make an eviction proceeding to remove her from the property. And if they persist in harassing her when the law is that she can stay during this particular time then they're looking at some other violation of the law.

The governor's order has already been found by a federal judge that he had the authority to issue it until such time as the New York State Court should determine that he didn't. So, it's the law in effect at the present time.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 595 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 07/09/2020

· PROCEEDINGS -

I appreciate that Mrs. Kassenoff has chosen not to secure permanent housing during the past year. That was as I stated previously her choice. I understand she wishes to move into the premises but it's occupied and the rights right now belong to that particular tenant. She has a right to holdover, not a right but the law allows her and at the present time to continue tenancy in that property until she leaves or until such time as the prohibition on moving to evict tenants leaves. There is some eviction going on on preexisting previously filed evictions where they're only for settlement purposes.

So, right now you have a situation where although you have a tenant that's potentially holdover, she's saying I will leave by July 31st. And, quite frankly, I'd be working out an agreement with her to insure that she in fact is leaving on July 31st given the current situation where you can't move to evict her if she decides to stay beyond July 31st. Okay?

Now, Mrs. Kassenoff indicated to the Court and the Court said it was okay at the time that she was very good friends with this tenant, and if she told the tenant that she really needed the property the tenant would voluntarily leave. The E-mail that was sent to me by Mrs. Kassenoff is not we're really good friends, you know my situation's bad, I'd like you to leave if possible. It was more of a you

- PROCEEDINGS -

need to leave the house. The Court did not issue an order saying this tenant had to move out on July 15th. I don't have authority to issue that order. Nobody frankly as the judge has an authority to issue an eviction order for this person. The law is eviction proceedings are not allowed at

this time. So, I hope there's no misunderstanding now.

The tenant is the one in occupancy of the property and continues in occupancy until such time as she voluntarily vacates or such time that the law is changed and eviction proceedings may resume. And Mrs. Kassenoff cannot be sending communications to this tenant that could be construed as harassing or threatening. If the tenant stays, the tenant stays. And I said that last time and I'm saying it again because that happens to be where the law is at the present time.

MS. SPIELBERG: Judge, can we have an understanding as to what the terms are as discussed between Mr. Kassenoff and the tenant? My understanding is they have come to an agreement which to me does not suggest that she --

THE COURT: My understanding from when we were in court the last time, and Mr. Kassenoff raised this issue before a listing agreement was signed, and before the order was issued selling the house that he had been approached by the tenant that she wanted to stay in the property an additional two weeks until the end of July and she would pay

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 595 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 07/09/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

the balance of the rent due at that time, which is three thousand seven hundred fifty dollars. So there was no under-the-table discussion here. All of those communications, well, at least were brought to the Court's attention before the listing agreement was signed and before the sale order was issued.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, I know, I know that my conduct is under scrutiny by Miss Kassenoff and now repeatedly Miss Spielberg but it is to be very clear we had a conference last week. Prior to the conference the tenant reached out to Mr. Kassenoff. He said I don't know. We've got to go to court. We went to court. He notified the Court of what happened and that's it. There are no backroom deals. And I have no -- just, it's unbelievable that we're accused of it but whatever. It is what it is. We don't care at this point. Accuse us of whatever you want.

THE COURT: Well, there's nothing to be done. The law is you can't move to evict this woman. And she can stay. She can holdover at the present time under the pandemic.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: And, quite frankly, let's all hopes she leaves on the 31st because I guarantee you commence an eviction proceeding you'll see a courtroom in February.

THE COURT: Well, you can't commence an eviction proceeding at the present time.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Well, the executive order is

- PROCEEDINGS -

lifted, which one day it will be, it's not like you're going to get in the court the next day. Let's just hope we play nice with her and she leaves on the 31st and everyone is happy.

THE COURT: Right. All right. So, that's what I have to say.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: That's all we have.

THE COURT: The two hundred dollar fee on the supervisor, I am not directing anyone pay that at this time. I don't understand how a fee was incurred but I'm not directing Mr. Kassenoff to pay.

MS. SPIELBERG: It was incurred because the visit was scheduled and Mr. Kassenoff wouldn't agree to it until my client turned over the citizenship papers.

THE COURT: Exactly. So he didn't schedule it. He did it then it should have been canceled.

MS. SPIELBERG: They agreed to the scheduling of it, Judge, and then they would not go forward with it.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, I have five E-mails, maybe six.

THE COURT: I am not going to deal with that issue.

I'm not directing that he pay the fee at this time.

MS. SPIELBERG: Judge, I just wanted to ask a question about trial. Miss Kuritzky and I have been quarantining together, if you like.

- PROCEEDINGS -

11

1 THE COURT: Yes.

2 MS. SPIELBERG: We have been sharing an office and

3 other things. Is there some way to make an application that

4 the social distancing rules need not apply to us in the

courtroom?

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SPIELBERG: We're happy to sit closer to each

8 other if that makes more space for everybody else.

THE COURT: No.

THE COURT: No.

MS. SPIELBERG: Okay.

THE COURT: We're trying to see if we can move the courtroom down to like one in the annex that it's more space.

MS. SPIELBERG: Okay.

even if we just do with the three attorneys, and your projector, and the expert, and the court reporter, it's pretty cramped. So, my clerk is putting in the request to see if we can be in the annex. Those courtrooms are bigger and may be a little more easier for everyone to deal with it.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: And wholly unused for the most part even before the pandemic. So, that's a really good idea.

THE COURT: Well, but if we can do that that would be, I think answer a lot of questions and people could have who they want to have. It could be up to fifty percent capacity but it has to be social distancing; so if we're

| _ | PROCEEDINGS | - | 12 | 2 |
|---|-------------|---|----|---|
|---|-------------|---|----|---|

down there you should be able to have your clients and -- I was thinking even if -- somebody asked me, I was like even if we just put you at the counsel table, you're really lucky to have your clients in the back row and that's pretty much it. So, hopefully we'll get that done and seems we can accommodate counsel, their associates, and their clients, and the witness on the stand comfortably, and in accordance with the mandates.

MS. MOST: Your Honor, I just have one more question. Are we going day to day?

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. MOST: Okay. So, so probably about two weeks do you think or it could be more?

THE COURT: I don't know.

MS. MOST: All right.

THE COURT: You have a week; so I suggest -- I tend not to lollygag when I'm on trial. I have people go and go and go. I don't deal with histrionics. I don't deal with unnecessary delays. I don't deal with cross talk. I'm here to have the witnesses on the stand.

We have it for a week. If we don't finish it that week, then we'll have to try to figure out how to continue with the following week or we're going to have to get in line behind somebody else. I'm telling people try to put it on. I don't know how many witnesses. I don't have the

PROCEEDINGS -

witness list yet; but if you think it's going to be two weeks, then we'll have to deal with that issue. But I find two weeks on a temporary custody hearing to be quite excessive. This is not a permanency hearing. It is on the application for the temporary order, temporary Order to Show Cause because Mrs. Kassenoff would not consent to having the full permanent custody hearing. So, it is not going to be a full permanent custody hearing. It's going to be a hearing on a motion.

MS. MOST: So just --

THE COURT: That's what we're dealing with.

MS. MOST: If I can just clarify further. We have the expert Mark Abrams. If we have his testimony now can that be adopted for a final trial or you would have him come back? I'm just curious how you would plan on handling that.

THE COURT: I am not planning on handling it any way. I haven't thought about the full custody hearing.

MS. MOST: Okay.

THE COURT: But it would seem to me that people should not spend their money to recreate that which has already been done. But I still don't get how it's not a full permanent custody hearing but that's a different issue.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, I think rather than talking about evictions I think it's important that we at least broach the issue before. I have never been in a

PROCEEDINGS -

situation where you have a temporary custody hearing this close to when the final trial would be. Again, I am not asking for your Honor to opine on this or direct on this but at least consider this that I don't think there exists evidence after this hearing that would be at all probative or assist the Court in rendering a final determination. We have a final forensic evaluation that's dated March, which even if this were a normal case, you wouldn't even have an update. It's too close. So, we know that counsel's had her experts and has her experts lined up.

I would ask the Court to give serious consideration to marking this a final trial because of two very important reasons for your consideration. Number one, the children don't know what the reality looks like right now. They have now, we have now reinstituted in person supervised access with Mom. They don't know when the next one is going to be. They don't know what the schedule is. They don't know what's going on. Finality in this case benefits them more than anybody else. The second thing for your Honor's consideration is, you know, gearing up the way I gear up for trial and prepare and the time spent to do this twice is a tremendous financial burden on Mr. Kassenoff. And quite frankly --

THE COURT: I don't know that you'll need to do it twice. It might be that you do the whole testimony; you do

- PROCEEDINGS -

the whole hearing and the decision is rendered and people look at the evidence and figure out whether or not they could prevail at a later date. I can't speak for Mrs.

Kassenoff or her attorney but I'm assuming they have their reasons.

(Mrs. Kassenoff joined the Skype proceedings.)

THE COURT: And if they're not meritorious, if we have to do this again a second time then one of the arguments will be, you know, on attorneys' fees and awards and stuff like that.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Fine. Thank you, your Honor.

MS. SPIELBERG: Yeah. I mean, just to respond because I understand that everybody thinks that my client, or me, that we're being unreasonable; but the fact is is that we want this hearing to go forward as soon as possible so that if there is a change it also happen as soon as possible.

That being said, you know, I wouldn't have gotten for a final custody hearing the forensics file a week before trial. I would have had more time to work with my experts. We would have had 3101(d) disclosures. We would have had more time to prepare and enable our experts to testify. And for Mr. Dimopoulos to say that as he sits here today he knows of no evidence that will be, that will exist after trial, I mean, obviously that's an impossibility. Something

- PROCEEDINGS -

may happen between this hearing and what would ultimately be a final trial. If nothing happens, everything stays the same, maybe any change to what your Honor decides after this interim hearing will be able to be asked for on a motion or maybe any further hearing with respect to custody --

THE COURT: Or stipulated, who knows.

MS. SPIELBERG: Or might be on a very limited issue. I don't suspect we'll have an entire custody trial again. At this point, especially procedurally and in the wake of corona, one of our experts already has told me she won't appear in person. It is somebody who's very important to us. So, you know, I'm dealing with these kinds of things. We want it now because of what the, because of the temporary order that was entered during COVID, but if I had my druthers I would wait until my witnesses are ready to appear and I would wait until my experts had more than a week to review a forensic file; that I had more than a week to review a forensic file. You know, all those issues.

THE COURT: Let me just talk about the forensic file because I do believe that I scheduled this date in May. Didn't I?

MS. MOST: Yes.

MS. SPIELBERG: Judge --

THE COURT: There was more than ample opportunity to have contacted the forensic in May and dealt with the

- PROCEEDINGS -

files. So, I don't want to hear about how the Court didn't give enough time. I rescheduled this. It was originally scheduled in May. I rescheduled it back then. So, it was more than a week before --

MS. SPIELBERG: Judge.

THE COURT: -- that it was available but I'm not going to argue back and forth. That's their position right now. I don't know what the future holds. And it may be that we do the hearing and they may like the decision, not like the decision, appeal the decision, I have no idea but that's where we are. We're going forward. I suggest you concentrate on your preparation for the hearing. And hopefully we'll get the larger courtroom so everybody can be accommodated safely in accordance with the court protocols.

MS. KASSENOFF: Your Honor.

MS. SPIELBERG: Just a second, Catherine.

The E-mails with Dr. Abrams we'll show you we were in communication with him in May. We did in fact try to start the process in May and he said that he was starting, he was going to go get the file from the warehouse. That was in May.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Can I please? I need to make -THE COURT: I have another conference so I need to
sign off on here. Okay?

MS. KASSENOFF: Can I say something, please? I'm

INDEX NO. 58217/2019 WESTCHESTER COUNTY CLERK 07/09/2020 02:11

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 595 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 07/09/2020

| | - PROCEEDINGS - 18 |
|----|---|
| 1 | sorry. I came late to this call because |
| 2 | THE COURT: No. Mrs. Kassenoff, there's nothing |
| 3 | else to say. Your attorney articulated your position. I |
| 4 | made my ruling. You have the transcript. |
| 5 | MS. KASSENOFF: I'm sorry she doesn't know my |
| 6 | position. I'm getting to this call late. I wanted to be |
| 7 | THE COURT: Mrs. Kassenoff, you don't have a you |
| 8 | have an attorney. You're not self represented. The |
| 9 | attorney |
| 10 | MS. KASSENOFF: Judge |
| 11 | THE COURT: articulated the position. |
| 12 | MS. KASSENOFF: I am not sitting with my lawyer. I |
| 13 | can't communicate it to her. Right? I'm sitting in a |
| 14 | different spot. Do you understand? |
| 15 | THE COURT: The conference is over. Thank you. |
| 16 | MS. KASSENOFF: This is Judge, I'm sorry but I |

would like to say something and that is the following.

(The Court exited the Skype proceedings.)

(The proceedings were concluded at 12:57 p.m.)

CERTIFICATION

Certified to be a true and accurate transcript of the minutes of proceedings taken by the undersigned, to the best of her ability.

22 23

17

18

19

20

21

(PDF NOT CERTIFIED) GINA M. SALINE Senior Court Reporter

25

24