RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

Senior Court Reporter

1

1 SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER 2 ALLAN KASSENOFF, 3 Plaintiff, -against-4 CATHERINE KASSENOFF, Defendant. 5 - - -X INDEX NO. 58217/2019 6 Westchester County Courthouse 111 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. 7 White Plains, New York 10601 October 14, 2020 8 4:00 p.m. B E F O R E: HONORABLE NANCY QUINN KOBA, 9 Justice of the Supreme Court. APPEARANCES: DIMOPOULOS BRUGGEMANN PC 10 Attorneys for Plaintiff 11 73 Main Street Tuckahoe, New York 10707 12 BY: GUS DIMOPOULOS, ESQ. MICHAEL CHIARAMONTE, ESQ. 13 HAROLD SALANT STRASSFIELD & SPIELBERG 14 Attorneys for Defendant 81 Main Street, Suite 205 15 White Plains, New York 10601 BY: JILL SPIELBERG, ESQ. 16 ALYSON KURITZKY, ESQ. and 17 SANCTUARY FOR FAMILIES 30 Wall Street, 8th Floor 18 New York, New York 10005 BY: LISA VARA, ESQ. 19 DIANE STEINER, ESQ. 20 MOST & SCHNEID, PC Attorney for the Children 21 222 Bloomingdale Road, Suite 302 White Plains, New York 10605 22 BY: CAROL W. MOST, ESQ. 23 ALSO PRESENT: Irene Ratner, Esq. - Court Attorney Referee 24 Allan Kassenoff Catherine Kassenoff 25 Gina M. Saline,

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

2

1 (The following proceedings were held with all 2 participants appearing via Teams.) 3 THE COURT: Who's Lisa Vara? 4 MS. VARA: I'm Lisa Vara, Sanctuary for Families. 5 I'm co-counsel with Jill Spielberg's law firm. 6 THE COURT: Is everybody else on the line here? I 7 don't see Mrs. Kassenoff. Is she in your office, Mrs. 8 Spielberg? 9 MS. SPIELBERG: She is. She's sitting here. 10 trying to social distance. She won't be on her own screen 11 but she's listening. 12 THE COURT: All right. I'm here along with Irene 13 Ratner. Can you give the appearances from the parties, 14 please? Starting with plaintiff. 15 MS. SPIELBERG: Gus, you're muted. 16 MR. DIMOPOULOS: I'm sorry. For the plaintiff, 17 Dimopoulos Bruggemann, Gus Dimopoulos and Michael Chiaramonte. And Mr. Kassenoff is on the call as well, your 18 19 Honor. Good afternoon. 20 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 21 MS. SPIELBERG: Jill Spielberg and Alyson Kuritzky, 22 Harold, Salant, Strassfield, Spielberg, 81 Main Street, 23 White Plains, New York 10601 for the defendant, Catherine 24 Kassenoff, also present. Good afternoon, Judge. 25 THE COURT: Good afternoon.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

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

THE COURT: Okay. And Miss Vara.

MS. VARA: Also for the defendant, Catherine
Kassenoff, Sanctuary for Families, 30 Wall Street, 8th
Floor, New York, New York 10005. I'm Lisa Vara and Diane
Steiner, my colleague, who I believe is also on the call.

MS. STEINER: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Are you here? Okay.

So, we're having this conference today because Referee Ratner has made me privy to the voluminous E-mail communications that have been going on for the last week or so on topics that I have previously ruled on on multiple, multiple occasions. And, quite frankly, I'm at the point where I'm going to authorize a contempt motion because I keep dealing with the same behavior that I've written about and talked about and made rulings on on multiple conferences.

So there is no misunderstanding, let me state it clearly for the record. There are to be no communications between Mrs. Kassenoff and the children's therapist per the multiple orders of this court other than for scheduling. Period.

After an extremely lengthy temporary custody hearing and after due deliberation and careful consideration

3 of 45

INDEX NO. 58217/2019 COUNTY

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020 NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968

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 -

4

of all the testimony and the documents that were entered into evidence, this court made a determination and awarded temporary custody and sole legal custody to Mr. Kassenoff as well as final decision making authority. I also made it perfectly clear that I would not, no materials were to be provided to the children's therapist because I wanted the therapy to be directed by the children and their therapist. That's it. If I get another E-mail of communications with the therapist contrary to the multiple orders of this court then the party, the adversary to the party violating my order will be given authority to file a contempt motion. Period. It is over.

Under no circumstances did I authorize any party to give a trial testimony transcript that is confidential to anybody. And I certainly didn't authorize detective's testimony to be given to a child's therapist. That therapy is to be directed by the child and the therapist. I don't understand how much clearer I can make that.

So, again, I get a single E-mail again about inappropriate communications with the therapist contrary to the order of myself and Judge Everett a contempt motion will be authorized. Maybe that behavior will finally stop.

> Judge, may I be heard? MS. SPIELBERG:

> > 4 of 45

THE COURT: No. No. I read all the E-mails. I've seen all the E-mails.

INDEX NO. 58217/2019 WESTCHESTER COUNTY CLERK

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

5

MS. MOST: Your Honor, if I could be heard. is Carol Most.

> THE COURT: Yes.

MS. SPIELBERG: I would just ask that the detective -- Judge, I would ask that the directive be to both parties because Mr. Kassenoff has maligned Miss Kassenoff to Dr. McGuffog in ways, telling Dr. McGuffog the same amount of information and my client is not able to set that record straight nor defend herself.

THE COURT: There was one E-mail, there was one E-mail communication from Miss McGuffog. I chastised Mr. Kassenoff. I believe I just stated either party --MS. SPIELBERG:

No.

THE COURT: -- is not to communicate. The current E-mail is from Mrs. Kassenoff who gave the trial testimony of Detective Pompilio to the therapist. Absolutely was not authorized. I was --

MS. SPIELBERG: Judge, there was --

THE COURT: Excuse me. There was an E-mail from Dr. McGuffog several months ago and I spoke to Mr. Kassenoff about that too.

If there is any misunderstanding, let me make it clear. My primary interest here are these children. I've tried to put it in writing and make it perfectly clear to both sides these children are not in the divorce.

18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

19

21

22 23

24

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

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 -

6

therapy is to help them navigate through this extremely difficult time. They are to determine with their therapist what they find to be upsetting to them. They are to be directed at that time as to what's important to them and what they want to talk about. What we perceive may not be what they perceive. It is for them to have that confidential therapeutic relationship with their therapist. Which goes to the other issue that was raised in the E-mail communications. Nobody should be listening to the confidential communications between the children and their therapist. That includes a third party employed by Mr. Kassenoff as alleged. That is a confidential communication between the children where they can feel safe and they can talk about what is upsetting them, or what's important to them, or what they feel they need to talk about.

So, if these Zoom conferences -- are they still Zoom conferences or are they in person yet?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, they're Zoom conferences. The children do their therapy in their room behind closed doors.

THE COURT: What's this allegation about the nanny listening in on their therapy or Mr. Kassenoff?

MS. MOST: Actually, I did speak to Dr. Adler today. She has been trying to get to the house and have in-person therapy sessions with the girls at least every

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

other week. That has been her goal and for the most part that's been happening.

I did also speak to Dr. Adler about the idea that the, that Charlotte said she thought somebody was listening in. And Dr. Adler told me that she explained to Charlotte that it's not likely because of where they were. It is an old house with big, big, thick walls and that she did not see that it was an issue.

THE COURT: I don't think it was an issue as I read the E-mail about somebody listening from Dr. Adler's end.

It was somebody listening in the Kassenoff household.

MS. MOST: Yes.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, I know how it arose.

MS. MOST: Dr. Adler did not see that as an issue.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: It arose because a week or two ago Charlotte enabled the chat function of the Zoom during the call. I watched the video. And she said that she doesn't like her nanny or something along those to the Mom. And they had a chat talk about it on Zoom. And from there Miss Kassenoff began to say or assume that because Charlotte used the chat function that she assumed that the nanny was listening. There's been no proof that the nanny was

The nanny does not listen to the Zoom calls. Mr. Kassenoff is being accused of simultaneously working around

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

8

1 the clock yet somehow being fast enough to get home and 2 listen to Zoom calls at the same time. No one has listened 3 to the calls, your Honor. My client is very, very clear on 4 your orders' directives. No one is listening to the Zoom 5 calls between Miss Kassenoff and the kids or to therapy. 6 And there are no facts been proven or shown they have at 7 all. 8 THE COURT: When you're talking about the chat 9 function, is that the function that I said nobody's allowed 10 to use? 11 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Yeah. And I didn't make a big 12 deal out of it, your Honor, because --13 MR. CHIARAMONTE: Your Honor, can I clarify that. 14 It wasn't the chat function. Catherine, not Catherine. 15 Charlotte was typing, as the names we see for each party, 16 she was using that, changing the names so as to chat with. 17 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Oh. 18 MR. CHIARAMONTE: But in any event I wanted to make 19 that clear. 20 THE COURT: In any event, it's something I direct 21 not to be used, is it not? 22 MR. DIMOPOULOS: It is, your Honor. And I didn't 23 raise it really as an issue because it was initiated by 24 Charlotte. Mom engaged in it briefly but it came to a quick

8 of 45

end and we didn't see it again.

- PROCEEDINGS -

	1	MS. MOST: It came to an end because the call was
. /	2	terminated.
	3	MR. DIMOPOULOS: Correct. Correct.
	4	MS. SPIELBERG: Judge, I need to state for the
	5	record
	6	THE COURT: Did Mrs. Kassenoff terminate the
	7	call
	8	MS. SPIELBERG: Can anybody hear me?
	9	THE COURT: or the supervisor?
	10	MR. DIMOPOULOS: The supervisor terminated the call
	11	because of the use of the chat function.
	12	THE COURT: Miss Spielberg.
	13	MS. SPIELBERG: Can you hear me, Judge?
	14	THE COURT: Yes, I can.
	15	MS. SPIELBERG: Okay. I just need to say for the
	16	record that my client is no longer on the call.
	17	THE COURT: Where is she? I thought she was in
	18	your office.
	19	MS. SPIELBERG: She was but she's no longer in my
	20	office, Judge.
	21	THE COURT: Where did she go?
	22	MS. SPIELBERG: It's unclear. Judge, I just
	23	want
	24	THE COURT: Wait, wait. She left the court
	25	conference?

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

MS. SPIELBERG: She couldn't sign on on her own computer and I was unable to hear the Court while we were sitting in the same room so I had to leave the room, Judge. And she apparently left the office. So, I just need the Court to note to the extent that you're asking her to confirm something she is not here.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, then the Court will put on the record that I directed all parties to attend this conference and counsel. I have two counsel or three counsel for Miss Kassenoff present on the call. I thought she was in your office. You're telling me that she left and that she couldn't hear you. So, is somebody going to call her to see if she's going to call in on her phone like she's done in the past or is she walking away from the conference?

MS. SPIELBERG: We will ascertain that, Judge.

Alyson is calling her. I just want to say --

THE COURT: Well, why don't you put on your position while she's calling her.

MS. SPIELBERG: Well, Judge, I just wanted to say, first of all, I don't know whether this made its way to you but there was an E-mail from Mr. Kassenoff on October 12th to Dr. McGuffog maligning my client, not only the one from weeks or months ago.

THE COURT: Hold on a second.

MS. SPIELBERG: I want to be --

INDEX NO. 58217/2019 TCHESTER COUNTY

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020 NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968

> 11 - PROCEEDINGS -1 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor --2 THE COURT: Send it to me. 3 MS. SPIELBERG: Me, will I send it to you, yes. 4 THE COURT: McGuffog E-mail redacted, is that it? 5 MS. SPIELBERG: Alyson, this was attached to your 6 E-mail, correct, your letter? Alyson sent it to Referee 7 Ratner yesterday. 8 THE COURT: Hold on. Never mind. Miss Ratner will 9 find it for me. Go ahead. 10 MS. SPIELBERG: Okay. 11 THE COURT: But while she's doing that address my 12 other concern. 13 MS. SPIELBERG: Okay. With respect to the issue 14 with the chats, Judge, I don't believe that that ever arose 15 again. My client to my knowledge has been conducting 16 herself from all the reports on these calls, we have watched 17 the video footage and we don't see anything that's

objectionable, Judge. I haven't heard that from anybody.

The issue, Judge, with respect to the access both telephonic and otherwise is that after this week my client put it on her credit card. She cannot, she has no money It's twenty-two, two thousand two hundred fifty dollars a week for her to have her two in-person visits and phone calls on the other days, the five phone calls. fifty dollars a call, fifty dollars a fifteen minute call

23 24 25

18

19

20

21

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

and a thousand dollars an in-person visit. So, at the rate of two two five zero times four point three that is more than my client takes home every month. She cannot afford it.

We filed, we've raised this issue with Referee Ratner the other day and it wasn't resolved. I filed an emergency motion because after this week, Judge, she can't have the access anymore.

THE COURT: That doesn't make sense to me. I don't know why it would be so expensive. They're getting five hundred dollars an hour to go for two hours?

MS. SPIELBERG: No, they get --

THE COURT: I've never heard that any of the time I've done it.

MS. SPIELBERG: They get paid for their transportation time; so it's a hundred seventy-five dollars an hour. It ends up being about three hours of transportation because they come from the city and then it's the visit, and it's about a thousand dollars a visit.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Hold on.

THE COURT: Maybe you can get somebody locally.

MS. SPIELBERG: Judge, we attached to the motion that was filed an affidavit from, from Ruchama Cohen, one of the Sanctuary for Families attorneys, detailing all of the

Gus?

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

new search and so here we are.

- PROCEEDINGS -

efforts made to even find CFS. Nobody else was available. This was the singular, only option. If you recall, Judge, Supervision Services was clear to say they had no availability, not that they weren't willing to attach -- not that they weren't willing to supervise because of Miss Kassenoff but they had no availability. So that started a

If you recall -- and so the affidavit details the efforts made to find somebody else. It's not even like we had a choice. These were the only people. And the visits are just not going to be able to continue. I mean, it is exorbitant I agree but --

MR. DIMOPOULOS: So, release the E*Trade money. She can have a quarter of a million dollars in a day or so.

This is mind boggling. My client is about to write another twenty thousand dollar check to Miss Spielberg's office. He just wrote a hundred fifty thousand dollars worth of checks to Miss Most and I for having the temporary hearing. He's paying every single, solitary bill there is known to man. He is paying every single one of the children's activities, private violin lessons, you name it. And on top of that, he has not made a motion to enforce his statutory rights to receive child support, which I have told him I'm at the point of malpractice by not asking for it, but we're not asking for it due to the sensitivity of this

13 of 45

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

nature. And now we're at the point where we need to pay her for her supervision where she makes a hundred seventy-seven thousand dollars a year against zero expenses and chose to fly to New Mexico to play tennis for four days.

I mean, this is sanctionable to be perfectly honest with you; but, your Honor, I will point out to you their motion was defective for two reasons. Number 1, if it was filed as --

THE COURT: I already looked at it. I'm not signing it. It didn't go in accordance with the matrimonial rules.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: On top of this, if, your Honor's order of August 18th dealt with the issue of cost. There's been absolutely, positively no change in circumstances since then to modify the Court order.

MS. SPIELBERG: Yes, there has been. This is not cost for the time rendered. The cost went up significantly, Number 1. And, Number 2, the motion, I asked permission from Referee Ratner to make the motion and I didn't receive it but it is an emergency because my client after this week cannot have access with her kids. Judge, my hands are tied. I asked for permission.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: She needs to provide --

MS. SPIELBERG: I don't know what else to do. I don't know what the relevance of my client's, I don't know

1.3

- PROCEEDINGS -

what the relevance of my client's -- Gus, please let me finish. I don't know what the relevance of my client's trip to New Mexico is with respect to choosing to play tennis because she's getting paid her salary. It's not as if she works hourly and she chose to do that instead of something else and it's allowing her not to work. My client has a salary and even on that supervision costs alone, notwithstanding any money to eat or utilities, are more than her monthly take home.

And if she doesn't exercise her access, Judge, there's not enough evidence to present to you when we want to lift the supervision. And if she does exercise it, she's out of money.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Agree --

MS. SPIELBERG: We're caught between a rock and a hard place.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Agree to liquidate the four hundred thousand dollars in E*Trade and all of these problems are solved, or --

MS. SPIELBERG: Judge, I note for the record my client is back in the room.

THE COURT: All right. Good.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Or, your Honor, if she makes a hundred seventy-seven thousand dollars a year and she's at a twenty-eight percent tax rate, that's forty-nine. One

)

. /

- PROCEEDINGS -

seventy-nine times forty-nine is a hundred twenty-eight thousand, divided by twelve. She nets ten thousand six hundred dollars per month, zero in expenses, and claims to need five hundred, a hundred seventy-five dollars per hour times three hours is five twenty-five times two is -- five twenty-five times two is a thousand --

MS. SPIELBERG: It's not for three hours, Judge.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Times four point three weeks is forty-five hundred dollars. The math doesn't add up.

MS. SPIELBERG: It's not three hours. We attached proof of cost to the motion, which may not be signed but it's been filed. And the proof of the cost is there. My client is three hours to pay for transportation.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Does the supervisor bill for correspondence?

MS. SPIELBERG: Yeah.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Oh, so maybe your client should stop copying her on seventy-two E-mails a day.

THE COURT: All right. Let's stop. Let's stop. Let's stop.

First of all, I have several issues with the access. My order was issued on August 17th. In that order I delivered, I specifically stated I wanted this twice a week, same time, same day visits so the children would have consistency and their mother would have consistency with

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

2.0

- PROCEEDINGS -

their children. That doesn't seem to have happened yet, and it's three months later. The other reason for doing that was to give them a chance to stabilize their relationship and also in preparation for a further supplemental report from Dr. Abrams so these children and their mother would have a chance to reconnect and go forward and deal with some positive issues.

So, I'm actually quite distressed that the two times a week, consistent same day, same time so these children know when they're going to see their mother barring some extraordinary holiday or event, when they could count on seeing their mother. Okay? So, I want the specific days established.

The second issue that I have here is that I still don't understand why this house in New Rochelle has not been sold in the market that we're in. So, what is the status of that the house? Which, again, would release some funds availability for the mother to pay for the supervision.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, I had a very detailed conversation with Cini Palmer today.

THE COURT: Who's that, the broker?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: One of the brokers. Each party kind of has their own broker working together. And I'll be brief.

The house was purchased, according to Miss Palmer,

- PROCEEDINGS -

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

2008 for one point four three five million. It's one of the reasons Miss Kassenoff doesn't want to reduce the price, she keeps remembering how much they paid. Miss Palmer indicated that when it was purchased it was the height of the market.

THE COURT: Well, 2008, yeah.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Correct. And, you know, quite frankly, the house was much newer when it was purchased some twelve years ago, and it is what it is. In 2015 with this same broker the parties listed it for sale for one point two five million. It was quickly reduced to one point one five million, and this is back in 2015. They received an offer for nine hundred ninety-nine thousand dollars, initially accepted it. Miss Kassenoff later said no, she wouldn't sell it. They decided to rent.

So, here we are five years later. It went back on the market for a million fifty. It didn't get a million five years ago. So, it was a million fifty. It was quickly reduced to nine fifty. Miss Kassenoff will allege, and we'll hear about it, that it was because the parties couldn't agree on the improvements, the wood floors and all this stuff. Okay? The bottom line is that's not true.

THE COURT: I thought all that stuff was done.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: It's resolved. And the broker pointed something very interesting to me. Prior to August 11th -- it was removed off of the market on August 11th to

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

do these repairs. Prior to August 11th they received sixteen showings. After August 11th when the work was done, it received twenty-one showings. There have been thirty-seven showings with I think one lowball, ridiculous offer that was contingent on a million things. The broker said unequivocally that you don't have thirty-seven showings and not one real offer unless you priced it wrong. She's advocating for immediately reducing the price to eight hundred ninety-nine thousand. She brought the manager of the Houlihan Lawrence regional office to the house to give her opinion on what the price should be. And that's what they all agreed to.

She did also say that there's some remedial issues with landscaping and some chipped paint at the doorway that needs to be fixed, which, quite frankly, your Honor, is dealt with in your Honor's order on the New Rochelle house which says that I think each party has to do fifty-fifty up to a cap of a certain amount. Last time something like this came up my client offered to front all of the money provided it gets, fifty percent is reimbursed to him.

THE COURT: Wait. They paid one million four hundred thousand dollars for this house?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Correct. And it was, as she said it, height of the market. And you want to know what, she joked, giggled and said sorry to say this but they overpaid.

*y***<

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

And it was twelve years ago. It was a newer house. And the problem with the house, your Honor, I don't know if you're familiar with the area, is it's, it's -- if you, you go near where New Rochelle High School is and where that Greek church is, there's North Avenue; there's the Hutch. Right back there, the woods there is Lovell Road. That's where they are. The problem is the front of the house is North Avenue. Technically to get to the front of the house you have to walk up through those woods from North Avenue. What they had done years ago is change the address to 80 Lovell but you're actually entering the rear of the house, which to some people it's off putting.

Secondly is the market assessment at the one point four purchase price the taxes are higher than comparably situated houses because of the one point four purchase price.

THE COURT: Right. Did anybody grieve those?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: I don't know. I'll have to ask

Mr. Kassenoff if they've grieved them. Technically they're

grievable now at the new purchase price so they would lower

but from what I understand that's not a guarantee. But it

is a firm suggestion that it gets reduced to eight

ninety-nine and the broker also feels that, you know, there

is a potential in this market with the winter coming up we

only have so much time and this is really our chance.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

	1	THE COURT: Right, but if you bring it down to
,	2	eight ninety-nine, what do they net out of it?
	3	MR. DIMOPOULOS: I think the mortgage is about five
	4	hundred or four fifty, Allan; is that correct? Allan texted
	5	me they
	6	MS. SPIELBERG: Judge, if they further reduce the
	7	price, the house, there'll be no equity left in the house.
	8	THE COURT: That's what I'm saying. What's the
	9	equity?
	10	MR. DIMOPOULOS: What's the mortgage, Allan?
	11	MR. KASSENOFF: My recollection we owe around five
	12	hundred on it. I can confirm it over the course of this
	13	call but it's in the five hundreds.
	14	MR. DIMOPOULOS: So, they'll net four hundred
	15	thousand less expenses.
	16	THE COURT: Well, I don't see the market getting
	17	better. I mean, this is, this is the hottest market and the
	18	mortgage rates are so low. I think that the parties really
	19	need to look at what they can get from the house.
	20	MR. DIMOPOULOS: The problem is Miss Kassenoff in
	21	our
	22	MS. SPIELBERG: She's not agreeing to reduce.
	23	MR. DIMOPOULOS: I know she's not agreeing but
)	24	here's the thing, your Honor, the Court order says
	25	THE COURT: What does my order say? I thought we

- PROCEEDINGS -

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

had an automatic reduction.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Can I just finish, Jill, then I'll let you talk?

MS. SPIELBERG: If I could be heard.

THE COURT: Hold on, Miss Spielberg. I want to know the answer to my question, which is: What does the order say?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: The Court order has mandatory reductions in purchase price but in the very next sentence says at all times the parties will be guided by the recommendations of the broker. So, there can be no disagreement on recommending with the broker. And quite honestly, you know, it will never get reduced; it will never get sold and that only helps one party, the one who's living there for nothing.

So, I can't, I can't forget that we've constantly been complaining I can't see the kids because of no money; I can't do this because of no money but I'm not willing to liquidate the assets that will put hundreds and hundreds and thousands of dollars in my pocket tomorrow.

MR. KASSENOFF: Gus, the mortgage is four hundred ninety-four thousand two fifty-nine.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Thank you.

THE COURT: But after your broker's fee and pay by back the mortgage what are they really netting out of there?

22 of 45

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

PROCEEDINGS - 23

MR. DIMOPOULOS: I'll tell you exactly. If it sells --

MS. SPIELBERG: The issue is -- if I may be heard, Judge. The issue is that we agreed to a reduction initially that was way more than what the order set forth with the understanding that the house would try to sell at that amount. The idea was to drop it enough to get more traffic and there was a tremendous amount of time lost with all the nonsense with the redoing of the floors and not releasing the money and all of that back and forth. And my client is not in a position right now in light of her financial situation to be continually dropping the price of this house. Regardless of what corner it is. You know, we can give it a little bit more time. She's not -- we just reduced it.

I don't profess to be a realtor, or let's just do basic math. If the realtors, if you have thirty-seven showings and you didn't get an offer on the house, there is a problem with the price. They're continuing to pay the mortgage.

Although Mr. Kassenoff continues to pay the mortgage, at some point he's going to come back to Mrs. Kassenoff and say you have to pay me back fifty percent or I'm going to get a credit of fifty percent of what he's going to claim she should have paid. And ultimately I don't know by hanging

23 of 45

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

out and leaving it at nine hundred and not getting it off -what's the current price, nine fifty?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Nine fifty, your Honor. It's fifty thousand --

THE COURT: Even at nine fifty where there hasn't been an offer, while you continue to pay the mortgage and the taxes and all that stuff, what Mrs. Kassenoff is going to end up with is basically nothing after you do all those --

MS. KASSENOFF: Your Honor, may I address the Court?

THE COURT: -- credits, Miss Kassenoff.

MS. KASSENOFF: Judge, I have a proposal I'd like to make. I did already make it to the plaintiff and I didn't get a response, which is as follows. Because of what happens in the last several months with the plaintiff refusing to allow the repairs of the floor, and refusing to deal with the painting, and remember there was this terrible dog smell during the summer months when we had the most of the house --

THE COURT: I remember.

MS. KASSENOFF: Let me just finish. The house was being shown in a really, really terrible condition at the height of the market. My position is the plaintiff has really diminished that asset. He decided to -- you know, he

- PROCEEDINGS -

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

refused to clean the gutters. Now we have a huge problem in the basement with moisture and fungus and all of that.

That's been noted by some of these prospective buyers.

My proposal is as follows. Why not agree to a further reduction but the first fifty thousand goes directly to me because of the plaintiff's dissipation of this asset. I would agree to that.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: That's wonderful. Thank you.

No, your Honor. We won't agree to that. As a matter of fact, here's what we will agree to. I would like permission to make a motion under the DRL to be appointed the temporary receiver to accurately and properly market this property for sale in accordance with your Honor's order which says to be guided by the brokers' recommendations.

According to Miss Palmer, who's been doing this for twenty-five years, you don't show a house thirty-seven times and get zero offers when it's priced right. I wish my house was worth ten million dollars but it's not. The market's going to dictate it.

Miss Kassenoff has zero incentive to sell this house because then she doesn't have a beautiful six-bedroom house to live in for free.

At this point in time, your Honor, our waste claim is being established on a day-by-day basis because if we wait and this house sells for seven fifty it's not going to

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

26

be hard to prove. But here's the bottom line, it's going to be sold at trial no matter what. So the question is: Do we sell it now, get as much as we can for it or do we wait and completely liquidate our waste claim?

The fact that Miss Kassenoff thinks that by showing it sixteen times when it wasn't in good condition, and I can document every single thing, Mr. Kassenoff did everything he was supposed to do, paid these people, all right, perhaps they argued about it for a couple of days, it was done, and then it showed twenty-one times after being repaired. So what happened with --

THE COURT: What was the offer they received?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: I don't remember exactly. I think it was someone offered like eight but that it was conditioned on them selling their house or something ridiculous.

THE COURT: Oh.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: It wasn't a real offer, your

19 | Honor.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

23

24

25

THE COURT: Right.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: But my argument against

22 Miss Kassenoff --

MS. SPIELBERG: Judge.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: -- is twenty-one showings since it's been back on the market as of August 11th. In pristine

26 of 45

- PROCEEDINGS -

condition. Twenty-one. Not one offer.

MS. SPIELBERG: Judge, Judge, the issue is that the order, the order that you entered has the brokers' recommendations with respect to repairs. There was a procedure put in place to reduce the price. That's different, that's separate from the brokers' recommendations.

THE COURT: I don't recall what I said. Is it after thirty days, after forty days? What it is?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: I'll look at the Court order right now.

MR. CHIARAMONTE: I have it right now.

MS. SPIELBERG: Hold on. Let me finish.

THE COURT: Let her finish. Hold on.

MS. SPIELBERG: Judge, my, the issue is that my client agreed to reduce it in excess of the order the first time with the hopes of getting, of jump starting the action on the house. But I will say this, Judge, if Mr. Dimopoulos is going to make the argument that my client is intentionally thwarting the sale of the house, he's going to have to explain away the entire staging of the whole house, which was done by loans and gifts and the kindness of people that Miss Kassenoff gathered in order to make this house look nice for buyers. She would have only done that in order to sell it. Stage the house --

27 of 45

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

28

7 THE COURT: Here's what I recall. 2 MR. DIMOPOULOS: So she'll have nice furniture. 3 THE COURT: The court reporter can take one person. 4 Stop. 5 MS. SPIELBERG: One more second, Judge. 6 THE COURT: No, no. Stop. 7 MS. SPIELBERG: One more --8 THE COURT: This is what I recall. Okay? 9 broker recommended it go on for less than a million dollars. 10 Mrs. Kassenoff wanted to go to a million fifty. I said 11 fine, why not try to see what you'll get if you get it over 12 a million dollars. But let's remember, the broker initially 13 said it should be less than a million dollars. We tried, we 14 said try to get the most you can from it and it didn't work. 15 So, the house needs to be sold. You're not -- you're going 16 to get less money. 17 MS. SPIELBERG: We reduced it to nine fifty, Judge. 18 Let me just say. If Mr., if the Court is inclined to give 19 Mr. Dimopoulos permission to make the motion he requests, I 20 would like permission to cross move for dissipation, 21 wasteful dissipation in light of the plaintiff's delays. 22 That's all. That was my last sentence, Judge. 23 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Okay. Let's --24 THE COURT: Wait. You're going to make a motion

28 of 45

for the -- I remember that whole discussion. Okay?

- PROCEEDINGS -

three thousand dollars and I said use the deposit.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: And we used it, your Honor. The security deposit. The guy was timely paid. He was timely paid. It is a non-issue that everyone's trying to, that Miss Kassenoff is trying to raise.

Look, I don't know how to argue this any better.

Thirty-seven showings at nine fifty, not one offer. I mean,

I don't what else to say.

THE COURT: Here's what I'm going to tell you. All right? My purpose in having this conference was to admonish both sides and the parties not to speak to the therapist about the children and to get a consistent schedule for Mrs. Kassenoff to see the children so they know exactly what days and what times they're going to see their mother.

Now, the last I heard that you were talking about Tuesdays and Saturday mornings; is that it, nine to eleven?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: That's set in stone, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that set in stone? Because that's what I want.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: That has been consistent. Other than when Miss Kassenoff went away, it's been happening every Tuesday and every Saturday. There was a hiccup with rescheduling it this last week because the kids had flu shots, but just changing the time. It's set in stone. Now, the good news is Miss Kassenoff is once again having her

- PROCEEDINGS -

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

Zoom calls, which stopped for a while.

MS. SPIELBERG: Can I bring this back to the beginning, which is that if Miss Kassenoff has to continue to pay a hundred percent of these costs they're not going to continue.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Then they won't continue, Jill.

MS. SPIELBERG: Mr. Dimopoulos's math was wrong.

As I told the Court, it's three hours just for the transportation and then the two-hour visit.

Also, Judge, my client still hasn't gotten her belongings. Before your Honor ends this conference, we have to address that. It's so outrageous. She goes to work --

THE COURT: I don't understand. When we had the hearing in July, I got a list and I said she could go in and get her stuff. And I thought she had done that.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: She did. She just chose not to bring all her clothing. Just some.

MS. SPIELBERG: No, Judge. She was given thirty minutes with a police officer. She got her summer clothes. Now she needs her winter clothes. She needs her other belongings. There were other agreed upon things.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: I can speak very, very clearly --

MS. SPIELBERG: There was a -- no, no, no.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: I'm giving you what you want, Jill. If you just stop, I'll give you what you want.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

THE COURT: He's going to let you go. Stop. Yeah,

I want a date and time and she needs to get her stuff.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor. Your Honor.

THE COURT: And a list. She already had a list.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: This wasn't -- this changes over time. Now it's about her clothing. Originally --

THE COURT: It was about the furniture. I know.

The office. I actually remember this case. I conferenced it multiple times and I've lived with this since July.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: My client will pack up. He's made this offer to Miss Kassenoff directly in an E-mail just yesterday. He would have offered it a week and a half ago or two weeks ago. Here it is. I will bring you all of your clothing packed nicely in suitcases. I will bring it to your house. All I want in return is the renewal registration for my car which you have in your possession but refuse to give to me, and I would like the spare key for my car which you will not give to me, and I will pack everything up nicely and bring it over to you. Then it was no. So --

THE COURT: Hold on a second. This is, this is absurd. Okay? Whoever has the renewal registration for the vehicle, Mrs. Kassenoff, you need to turn it over or your client can just get a lost renewal online.

I want a list of what Mrs. Kassenoff wants to get

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

at the house. Miss Spielberg, did you send that yet, the

MS. SPIELBERG: There is a list that's been negotiated by Miss Steiner with Mr. Dimopoulos.

THE COURT: Do you have something written out Miss Steiner?

MS. STEINER: Yes, yes. We have, we have agreed on the items that are to be removed. The issue was never, at least recently the issue was not on the items. We have a list. The issues was on all the other conditions that was put on my client in order for her to actually turn over and get her belongings.

So, even right now you can see the way the negotiations have gone. He'll agree to pack up her clothing and give it to her but there's always a condition. That's what it's been like dealing with opposing counseling for the past six weeks.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Okay, your Honor, let me respond. It's not a condition. If she was reasonable and gave him his registration and his key there would be no condition, but he'll never get it unless he places a condition.

MS. STEINER: I understand --

MR. DIMOPOULOS: But, Miss Steiner, another thing, I didn't place unreasonable conditions on you. This court has written numerous times that my client is permitted to

new list?

(

- PROCEEDINGS -

place restrictions on her access. Here are my conditions. There were two of them. I need a court order and I need police supervision. They called Larchmont. Larchmont will only give her a half an hour. She wants four hours to come in. We said fine, pay for private security. A hundred seventy-five dollars an hour, then you can have four hours, five hours, six hours.

MS. SPIELBERG: Why does there --

MR. DIMOPOULOS: This is not unreasonable.

MS. SPIELBERG: There is no order of protection.

There is no order of protection anymore.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: It does not matter. Your client has never behaved in a reasonable --

MS. SPIELBERG: If that is something that Mr. Kassenoff feels he needs to be protected then he should pay for it. My client --

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Miss Spielberg.

THE COURT REPORTER: One at a time.

THE COURT: Let me just say something here. Okay?

He decides who goes to the house of which he has exclusive use and occupancy. I require a security person or somebody else because of the relationship between the parties and the level of mistrust between the parties. You can work out how that's going to happen. I want the list that's agreed upon. I will so order it. Work out and negotiate with Miss

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

34

Steiner how you're going to have supervision so that the
level -- given the level of mistrust, I don't think it's
reasonable for Miss Kassenoff to rely upon Mr. Kassenoff to
pack her belongings. She's entitled to go through her own
things -
MS. SPIELBERG: She does not want that, Judge.

THE COURT: What?

MS. SPIELBERG: She does not want him to pack her

MS. SPIELBERG: She does not want him to pack her belongings.

THE COURT: I understand that. I'm agreeing with you. I don't think that's reasonable.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, we have offered this --

MS. SPIELBERG: If she has a third party, does there have to be a law enforcement officer? Can't it be a friend or something?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: No, no.

THE COURT: No. It has to be somebody that's going to maintain decorum and quietness and order and all those things we need. The children absolutely are not going to be there, that goes without saying.

MS. STEINER: Judge.

THE COURT: Who's talking now?

MS. STEINER: Judge, if I might, it's Miss Steiner.

THE COURT: Miss Steiner, yes.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

MS. STEINER: Yeah. If I might talk for a moment. In our negotiations I offered not only that Mr. Kassenoff could pick a person of his own choosing and we would agree to that, but I also offered that any, that any item that would be in dispute that Mrs. Kassenoff would take we would photograph it and it would be without prejudice and we would send the photograph immediately to Mr. Kassenoff and we could resolve the dispute right away or she wouldn't take the items that was photographed.

I have not in thirty years of private practice ever heard my client having to go into a home to get his or her belongings and having to pay a retired police officer a hundred seventy-five dollars an hour to do that. I mean, it just makes no sense. I understand that there's no level of trust but all she is doing is removing the items and it's specified, and they're listed, and they're identified, and she'll be out of there; but she should not have the added responsibility of having to pay someone a hundred seventy-five dollars an hour.

THE COURT: She doesn't have to. Then she can have the police department supervise it for half an hour.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: She can go three times at a half hour with Larchmont for free. I'll agree to that.

MS. STEINER: The half an hour won't do it. The half an hour won't do it. She'll come back three times?

- PROCEEDINGS -

THE COURT: Actually, the half an hour should be more than enough time. This will now be third time I have allowed her access to the house. So, first it was she needed to get her summer clothes because she only had her winter clothes. Now she has to get her winter clothes and I agree with that, but I'm not allowing her access to the house and not directing to have access to the house in the absence of an appropriate person to supervise given the history of these parties. That's it.

MS. STEINER: Could we think of an appropriate person? Can we agree on a different person?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Miss Steiner, no, no. Look, I don't know what more to say. I have an order of this court from you, your Honor, that says he can impose restrictions. He has exclusive occupancy. We have agreed to their list of contents. We've agreed to either go in with Larchmont or if not we'll give you four hours to go with someone. This is about money. That's all it is. She doesn't want to pay the one seventy-five. Well too bad.

MS. STEINER: She can't even afford to feed the children.

THE COURT: I don't blame someone for not wanting to pay the one seventy-five. Is there an alternative person that the both sides trust that they can listen to?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, my client doesn't hate

36 of 45

__

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

37

	1	anyone in this world enough to ask them to go into that
,	2	situation and
	3	THE COURT: There we go, Mr. Dimopoulos.
	4	MR. DIMOPOULOS: No, it's ripe with conflict. I
	5	don't mean because of her. Think about it, two people are
	6	getting a horrible divorce, will you go oversee a tense
	7	matter? Come on. This isn't something like that. What
	8	if
	9	MS. STEINER: It isn't going to be tense because w
	10	have every single item identified. She's not going to take
	11	a single item that is not on that list. That's why we went
	12	through that list and got it done.
	13	MR. DIMOPOULOS: Then go with Larchmont PD. I'm
	14	sorry. I cannot agree.
	15	MS. STEINER: Could we go to Larchmont
	16	MS. SPIELBERG: Judge, they're allowing her
	17	MS. STEINER: Suppose it takes four days for her to
	18	get the items on that list.
	19	MR. DIMOPOULOS: I think it's perfectly reasonable.
	20	If she wants to go in on multiple occasions with Larchmont,
	21	I would tell my client to agree.
	22	THE COURT: That's not going to happen. That's
	23	ridiculous.

37 of 45

THE COURT: Yes, go ahead.

MR. KASSENOFF: Your Honor, can I say one thing?

24

INDEX NO. 58217/2019 TCHESTER COUNTY

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020 NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968

- PROCEEDINGS -

38

MR. KASSENOFF: I received a notice that I needed to renew my car registration about two months ago. I went online. I did it. They -- I got the temporary ten-day renewal. Right. THE COURT:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KASSENOFF: I wait ten days. I don't get the actual thing you need to put in your car. I call the D.M.V. and eventually I figure out because the car was registered in Catherine's name and she's forwarding her mail, the renewal registration's going to her. I've now done this temporary renewal four times.

THE COURT: It's very simple. Mrs. Kassenoff, Mrs. Kassenoff give him the renewal for the vehicle. It's the status quo he's using the vehicle.

MS. KASSENOFF: Your Honor, here's the thing. like to be really clear on this. The plaintiff interfered with my mail. All right? He won't give me the mail. I had it forwarded to multiple addresses because I was evicted from my home very abruptly. Okay? So, first it was Brooklyn. I know this sounds like oh who cares but it is a really big deal to me because I'm the one --

MR. KASSENOFF: Catherine, just give me the registration.

MS. KASSENOFF: So, excuse me, I'm not done. want this court to know that if I don't get my clothing I

38 of 45

- PROCEEDINGS -

will lose my job. Okay? I don't have clothes. I am wearing clothing that has been donated to me. Okay? I can't meet the Governor of New York wearing this. My clothing is so incredibly important. I have waited since March. I'm walking around with holes in my pants. Two pairs of underwear. That is absolutely urgent. And I need it to be handled more so than anything else right now.

And if you're trying to break me, if this court is trying to break me, you're doing a really good job. And I am a strong person. I've been through cancer twice. This is inhuman to do this to somebody.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, I have said --

MS. KASSENOFF: I am not done, Mr. Dimopoulos.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: I said for a month now she can go to Larchmont any time she wants.

MS. KASSENOFF: I need the clothing. I need more than thirty minutes to do so. And I cannot afford some police officer to come at a hundred seventy-five dollars an hour. I made a deal with Mr. Kassenoff the other day. I said, I wrote to him and said I have just received your renewal. He said great, I'm going to come and get it and I'll bring you your clothing. I said sure, that's fine. We made a deal. Guess what he does? He adds a condition on the very last E-mail exchange between the two of us that was unacceptable where he wanted me to relinquish a key to a car

- PROCEEDINGS -

	u ·	
	1	that is marital property when he could go out himself and
,	2	get himself an extra key.
	3	MR. KASSENOFF: Your Honor, that's
	4	MS. KASSENOFF: I said no.
	5	MR. KASSENOFF: the second thing I like to
	6	raise.
	7	MR. DIMOPOULOS: Allan, stop. I feel bad for the
	8	Judge.
	9	THE COURT: This is why you have to have somebody
	10	supervise the removal of clothing. Okay? This is it.
	11	So
	12	MR. KASSENOFF: Your Honor, one last point if I
	13	may.
	14	THE COURT: No. We're done. My court reporter
	15	needs to leave.
	16	MR. KASSENOFF: It is a safety issue, your Honor.
	17	MS. MOST: Your Honor, if I could address
	18	something.
	19	THE COURT REPORTER: One at a time, please.
	20	Everybody stop.
	21	MS. KASSENOFF: Judge, it's so inhuman. It is so
	22	inhuman to not have clothing.
	23	MS. MOST: Your Honor, if I could address you at
	24	the time.
	25	MS. KASSENOFF: Miss Most, it's my issue. It is an
	(1	

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

41

1 emergency. I don't know how else to say this. It is an 2 emergency. I cannot walk around like this. I don't have 3 sweaters. I don't have a jacket. 4 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, can I now address this 5 emergency, please? Just really brief. 6 MS. KASSENOFF: Thousands of dollars in legal fees. 7 THE COURT: I'm terminating this conference because this behavior is unacceptable to me. This is a court of 8 9 People need to act as if it is a court of law. 10 MS. KASSENOFF: I'm trying to, Judge. 11 THE COURT: Everybody needs to stop. 12 Mrs. Kassenoff, you have thirty minutes to go in 13 and get your clothes. 14 Mr. Kassenoff, get the list of things from Miss 15 Steiner. Anything that's non-clothes-wise you can put by 16 the front door to facilitate the quick exit from the house. 17 That's it. She needs to get her clothes. I ordered this in 18 July. Get it done. 19 Mrs. Kassenoff, give the man the renewal to the 20 vehicle because that's the status quo right now in this 21 matrimonial action. 22 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, can I just? I want to

MR. DIMOPOULOS: No, no. Just so we don't leave

THE COURT: No. What is this about class rep?

23

24

25

clarify.

INDEX NO. 58217/2019 TCHESTER COUNTY

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020 NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968

- PROCEEDINGS -

42

this conference and argue, your Honor, I want to clarify your order. I offered the same thing three weeks ago. Larchmont Police Department, thirty minutes, get your clothing. My client will take everything off the list and

Allan, can you put it in the garage? Do you have a garage in your house?

MR. KASSENOFF: Yeah, we have a garage.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: So, he'll place the non-clothing items in the garage.

THE COURT: I guess it wasn't clear enough. thought it was very clear, Mr. Dimopoulos.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, every time --

THE COURT: I'm talking about class rep now. Kassenoff is a class rep with Charlotte at FASNY?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Class mom.

THE COURT: How did that happen? How does she have that when she has supervised visitation with the child?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: What happened is the school was notified and knows about it but the class mom is selected by the PTA that wasn't notified. So, she signed up, wanted to do it and they not knowing of anything they said fine. problem is the school now has asked Mr. Kassenoff, well, what do you want to do? We didn't want to do anything without asking your Honor. We have no idea what being a

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

pack it.

42 of 45

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

class mom entails and whether or not they'll have contact with the kids or not. We just don't know. We don't want to speak to PTA because then we'll get accuse of defaming her.

THE COURT: We're not going to speak to the PTA.

We're not going to defame Mrs. Kassenoff. She has

supervised access to her child. Period. That's it. So,

there can be no communication or interaction at the child's

school while there's supervised access.

That being said. Mrs. Kassenoff, if you could send us a list of what your responsibilities are as a class parent.

MS. KASSENOFF: Your Honor, my --

THE COURT: I am not going to make that decision right now. Okay? What day is she available to go and get her clothes?

MS. KASSENOFF: Your Honor, may I just address that briefly?

THE COURT: What, the class parent?

MS. KASSENOFF: It is a communication issue with my child but not with the school. I did not understand.

THE COURT: I am not dealing with the class parenting. Send me a list of what --

MS. MOST: Your Honor, if I could address.

THE COURT: I don't have enough time. It's two minutes.

43 of 45

44 - PROCEEDINGS -1 MS. KASSENOFF: I'm trying to address --2 THE COURT: The issue we're dealing with here which 3 is get a time and date for Mrs. Kassenoff to get her clothing, give that information to Miss Steiner, Miss 4 5 Steiner, reduce it to an order, or Mr. Dimopoulos, and I 6 will sign it. 7 I will have Maria reschedule a conference next week 8 to talk about the class parent issue. You need to contact 9 Miss Ratner regarding any cross motion you wish to file, 10 Miss Spielberg. 11 Your Honor, if we can also address --MS. MOST: 12 MS. SPIELBERG: Judge, what --13 THE COURT: I have four minutes. Okay? People 14 have wasted our time yelling and screaming about nonsense. 15 MS. MOST: Your Honor. 16 MS. SPIELBERG: Judge, can you tell me what your 17 Honor's determination is with respect to the finances of the 18 supervision? My client would at least like your Honor --19 THE COURT: I'm not dealing with the issue of 20 supervision. I spent a lot of time on that. I argued it.

THE COURT: I'm not dealing with the issue of supervision. I spent a lot of time on that. I argued it. You choose somebody in Westchester County and that's it right now. You'll have another conference next week to talk

about the child -- I mean, the class parent issue and --

MS. SPIELBERG: Judge --

THE COURT: -- and I will look --

25

21

22

23

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 968 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/16/2020

- PROCEEDINGS -

THE COURT REPORTER: One at time. The Judge is speaking.

THE COURT: I am talking. I said we will have another conference. I spent an hour on this conference. We reiterate the same issues over, and over, and over again.

Just follow my orders. We'll notify you of the new date.

Miss Steiner and Mr. Dimopoulos, I'd like to have the stipulation by the end of business -- what's today, Wednesday -- end of business tomorrow so that Mrs. Kassenoff knows what time and what she can go and get her stuff. Have a good night.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Thank you, your Honor.

MS. STEINER: Thank you.

MS. MOST: Thank you.

(The proceedings were concluded at 5:00 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.

Gura malene

GINA M. SALINE

Senior Court Reporter

45 of 45