1	STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF WESTCHESTERX
2	
3	ALLAN KASSENOFF,
4	Plaintiff,
5	vs. Index No.
6	58217/19 CATHERINE KASSENOFF, SKYPE Conference
7	Defendant.
8	X
9	October 21, 2020 Westchester County Courthouse 111 Dr. M.L.K., Jr. Boulevard White Plains, New York 10601 BEFORE: IRENE RATNER, Court Attorney Referee
10	
11	
12	
13	APPEARANCES:
14	DIMOPOULOS BRUGGEMANN, P.C. Attorney for Allan Kassenoff 73 Main Street Tuckahoe, New York 10707
15	
16	914.472.4242 BY: GUS DIMOPOULOS, ESQ.
17	
18	HAROLD, SALANT, STRASSFIELD & SPIELBERG Attorney for Catherine Kassenoff 81 Main Street White Plains, New York 10601 914.683.2500 BY: JILL F. SPIELBERG, ESQ.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Jennifer Gruseke, Senior Court Reporter
25	

```
1
     MOST & SCHNEID, P.C.
     Attorney for the Children
     222 Bloomingdale Road, Suite 302
 2
    White Plains, New York 10605
 3
     914.997.9181
     BY: CAROL W. MOST, ESQ.
 4
 5
     SANCTUARY FOR FAMILIES
     Attorneys for Catherine Kassenoff
     PO Box 1406
 6
     Wall Street Station
 7
     New York, New York 10268
     212.349.0669
 8
     BY: DIANE STEINER, ESQ.
                 and -
 9
          HRUCAMA COHEN, ESQ.
10
    Also present: Catherine Kassenoff
11
                    Allan Kassenoff
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
              MR. DIMOPOULOS: For the Plaintiff, Your Honor,
 2
     Gus Dimopoulos, Dimopoulos Bruggemann. I don't know that
     my client is in. He's not in. He just texted me. I
 3
     don't actually see him on the admit list. Why don't you
 4
 5
     go through everyone else and let me just call him.
              MS. STEINER: So this is Diane Steiner for Ms.
 6
     Kassenoff. I just got a text she's in. I'd like to hang
 7
     up and come back in again. Let me try to do that on the
 8
     link.
 9
10
              MS. COHEN: Hrucama Cohen.
11
              REFEREE RATNER: Are you an attorney?
12
             MS. COHEN: Yes.
13
             MS. SPIELBERG: Jill Spielberg also for the
14
     Defendant.
15
             MS. MOST: Carol Most, attorney for the
16
     children.
17
              MR. DIMOPOULOS: And Referee Ratner,
18
     Mr. Kassenoff is waiting to get in. He's not been
19
     admitted.
20
              REFEREE RATNER: Admit all." Okay. I'm new at
21
     this. There's a learning curve.
22
              MR. DIMOPOULOS: We all are.
23
              REFEREE RATNER: Okay. So we have Ms. Steiner,
24
     Ms. Cohen, Ms. Spielberg, Ms. Most, Mr. Dimopoulos.
25
     You're the only one so far except for your client, the
```

only man. 1 2 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Yeah. I had him get out and 3 try to get back in. So let me just --4 REFEREE RATNER: Okay. So --5 MR. DIMOPOULOS: If you can admit him now, he's 6 just waiting. MS. MOST: Ms. Ratner, can I address one thing? 7 I've received a number of e-mails and they are quite 8 disturbing e-mails to me from Catherine Kassenoff 9 advising me that I don't have the right to speak with the 10 11 girls' therapist or that I can only speak to them by e-mail or that I'm not allowed to have any communication. 12 13 I want to state for you that I am the only one 14 who is allowed free access to my clients' therapist. And 15 Mrs. Kassenoff can send me as many e-mails as she likes. 16 It's not going to change that fact. It has been 17 discussed in court prior to this on numerous occasions.

MS. SPIELBERG: Referee Ratner, I believe the miscommunication -- and we would happily take Judge Koba's direction on this. I recall specifically there being a conference where we asked that all communication with the therapist be in writing because there was some confusion as a result of certain entries on the bill, conversations that were had, what they were about, whether they were had. And I had asked Judge Koba if all

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

communication could be in writing. Not necessarily that we all be copied all the time, but there be some record that conversations were had.

As recently as a couple of weeks ago, Dr. Adler informed my client that she had no idea that the children were not seeing her. I mean, if there's some conversation -- and then it becomes he said/she said as between Ms. Most and Dr. Adler. If all these communications are in writing, then we can appropriately ascertain whether or not she was in fact ever informed that the kids are not seeing her.

Certainly, Referee Ratner, you'd agree that whether or not two children are seeing their mother is relevant to that doctor's therapy and treatment of those kids.

REFEREE RATNER: What I find surprising is you're blaming it on everyone else. Clearly the children didn't say anything to the therapist which is very strange.

MS. SPIELBERG: Ms. Most had many conversations with her. I'm not saying whether Dr. Adler is telling the truth or Ms. Most, but these issues keep popping up. So I had asked the Judge at a prior conference that all communication be in writing. It was my understanding, and I believe that Catherine sent the transcript to

```
Carol, that the Judge agreed. If the Judge --
 1
              MS. MOST: It wasn't my communication that had
 2
 3
    to be in writing.
              REFEREE RATNER: That was my recollection.
 4
 5
    Also, it was the communication of the parents.
 6
              MS. SPIELBERG: My client is not allowed to
     communicate with her. Of course it's not in writing,
 7
     it's -- that's not my understanding. It's in the
 8
     transcript.
 9
10
              REFEREE RATNER: We're going to lose the court
11
     reporter. I will speak to Judge Koba and you'll get
12
    your --
13
              MS. SPIELBERG: Referee Ratner, can you refer
14
    the Judge to the transcript from August 6th, Page 9.
15
    That's where we believe that she said that. If we have
16
    misinterpreted what the Judge said, that's fine, but we
17
    believe that's Where it is, the August 6th transcript,
18
     Page 9.
19
              REFEREE RATNER: Okay. So now we're going to go
20
    to Mr. Dimopoulos' request.
21
              MR. DIMOPOULOS: I'm going to be very brief,
22
     Your Honor. There are a couple of things that need to
23
    happen that I think we could all agree on. Number one,
24
     if you could just -- I know Judge Koba has been in
    back-to-back trials for the longest.
25
```

There is a protective order that's been signed by all parties which is required for Greenberg Traurig to get the financial expert the documents. Judge Koba has to so order that it's been submitted. If you could just remind her of that, it would be very helpful towards getting a final trial date.

REFEREE RATNER: Not trial date.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Trial readiness order, correct, yes. So this afternoon we got a letter from Ms. Kassenoff that asks for various relief that has been denied by Judge Koba.

REFEREE RATNER: Mr. Dim Dimopoulos, I'll get to that after we finish with your request for the premotion conference which was sent significantly prior. It was sent on the 19th days ago. That's what this was submitted for, time to --

MR. DIMOPOULOS: I can make a motion for various relief. One is I've spent upwards of 7 or \$8,000 in counsel fees negotiating various orders for Ms. Kassenoff to come into the house. The other day Judge Koba instructed us to submit an order. It was signed and, inexplicably, she didn't show up. I have no idea why, but she didn't show up and then immediately thereafter asking to let her in later.

There's an order of this Court that required her

to deliver the car registration and a spare car key and 1 present it at the house. As far as we're concerned, 2 we're not negotiating any more orders. She's in contempt 3 of that order because we don't have the key which is 4 right in the order. I'd like permission to submit a 5 6 motion for contempt on that. 7 REFEREE RATNER: And contempt regarding the key. I'm going to try to answer them piece by piece. 8 9 MR. DIMOPOULOS: okay. 10 REFEREE RATNER: Contempt re: car key. Has the 11 registration been turned over? 12 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Yes. 13 MS. SPIELBERG: Referee Ratner, I'm going to 14 refer this issue to the Center for Families attorneys who 15 are on the call now because they have been handling this 16 with Gus and I wanted them to handle this issue. 17 MR. DIMOPOULOS: The most important thing from 18 our perspective is Ms. Kassenoff's conduct is never going 19 to change unless there are some financial ramifications 20 compelling her to change her conduct. 21 Okay. So we ask permission at this point to 22 make a motion for pendente lite child support and for 23 counsel fees. 24 REFEREE RATNER: Wait, Mr. Dimopoulos. I'll get

25

back to you.

Ms. Steiner.

Ms. Steiner simply wanted to respond regarding the access to the house only. She didn't show up.

I can't hear you. I can't hear you. You have to unmute your mic.

MS. STEINER: How about that?

REFEREE RATNER: The bottom line is she did not show up.

MS. STEINER: She did not and let me explain to you why. It's not -- there is a reason for this. So I spoke with lieutenant Olsen last week. I learned later, maybe mistakenly, that what he wanted was that Catherine should call the police station on Monday morning early in the morning to arrange the time that the police will be available to go to the house with her. Notwithstanding that, we know that July 30th it was up to the police as to when they were going to be available.

The order said -- so it was her understanding that -- from me that she's to go to the police, they would go with her to the house, she would get the clothing.

Catherine did call the police on Monday morning and was told by them that they needed an order in advance, which I didn't understand to be the case, and they wouldn't speak to her, they would speak to only a

1 lawyer. So our lawyer called the police, Hrucama Cohen now on the call, to inquire how to get them the order. 2 Got the e-mail address, sent over the order, and at the 3 same time the police confirmed that, yes, they had spoken 4 to Catherine earlier in the day. 5 Jill then sent the letter to Gus -- forgive me 6 for not using last names. Everybody can call me Diane --7 that Catherine could not find the spare key. She did 8 have the car registration. She did take the car 9 10 registration then over to her husband's residence. 11 REFEREE RATNER: Did she notify her husband --12 MR. DIMOPOULOS: No. 13 REFEREE RATNER: -- that she was showing up at 14 9:30? 15 MS. STEINER: She did not notify her husband. 16 Let me tell you why. Because it was Gus' position in 17 response to Jill saying in the letter that she found the 18 registration but didn't have the key -- it was his 19 position in sum and substance, no key, no clothing. 20 REFEREE RATNER: That's not what the order says. 21 You're a lawyer. Have you read the order? I have the 22 order right in front of me. Defendant has access on

25 accessories. Where does it say without the registration

for purpose of retrieving her female clothing,

Monday, the 19th, and for 30 minutes shall make access

23

she can't go to the house? I don't see it. The children can be present. She's allowed access.

MS. STEINER: The order does say to return the key and registration.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Referee Ratner --

no one had the courtesy of advising Mr. Dimopoulos or Mr. Kassenoff that she would not be there. I do not see anything where it says that she has to -- she says she shall return when she goes to visit the house. So she wasn't going to the house but she was supposed to return the key, but you're saying she couldn't go to the house.

MS. STEINER: Respectfully, what I'm saying is that it was Gus' position that you don't -- you don't give us back the key, we're not giving you back the clothing. That was what we understood. That was a very big mix-up. It wasn't willful.

REFEREE RATNER: Ms. Steiner, Gus can say,
Mr. Dimopoulos can say, whatever he wants, but you have a
court order that specifically states she has the right to
go there, Mr. Dimopoulos or Mr. Kassenoff or someone is
going to be there, be at the house for her. She never
had the courtesy nor did her attorney have the courtesy
to call Mr. Dimopoulos --

MS. STEINER: And --

REFEREE RATNER: Don't interrupt me. -- to advise him she would not be showing up because there was an issue with the police. Judge Quinn Koba has determined on this issue about the clothing. The Judge says she will not issue any other order on access for Ms. Kassenoff to get her belongings. She had an order and failed to appear. She will have to get the consent from the husband as to the other items other than the clothing and to work out a time when she can go to pick up her clothing and personal belongings.

Her distribution and her getting the other items on the extensive list that was provided for in the order for her to retrieve will await resolution of the action along with other personal property unless the parties can agree and stipulate to the same.

Next topic, Mr. Dimopoulos.

MS. STEINER: Referee Ratner, on that topic had I understood correctly that it should have been a lawyer that called the police and not Catherine, this never would have happened. So I am taking this on my head that this happened because --

REFEREE RATNER: I'm sorry?

MS. STEINER: Mistakenly, I did not advice my client correctly.

REFEREE RATNER: Excuse me. Common courtesy,

Ms. Steiner, you know someone is waiting at the house for her to show up there was a big deal. There was an order, a counter-order. What part of common courtesy do people not understand. No one bothered to call Gus. It's done. That's the Judge's determination.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, we have an eight-day old recommendation from the real estate broker. The price of the house in New Rochelle be ordered -- a Judge order signed June 30th, 2020, signed by Judge Koba, "At all times until the New Rochelle home is sold, the parties shall abide by the recommendations of the brokers as to the reduction in the then listing price."

REFEREE RATNER: So the broker has recommended?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: A reduction to \$899,000.

Ms. Kassenoff refuses. I would like to make a motion for my client to be appointed a temporary receiver to list, market, and sell the house. Otherwise this will never happen.

REFEREE RATNER: At this point the Judge is declining. She does not want a motion to be appointed the receiver, but she did say that the price is to be reduced pursuant to the previous signed order.

MS. SPIELBERG: The order accounts for her percentage reduction. It does not account for the broker to guide the price.

1 MR. DIMOPOULOS: It absolutely does, 2 Ms. Spielberg. It says right after -- listen, why argue. The Judge has just told us what to do. She can do 3 whatever she wants. 4 REFEREE RATNER: Pursuant to the order, the 5 price is to be reduced. I don't have the order in front 6 7 of me. It's my recollection that it was not only a percentage but reduced pursuant to the recommendation of 8 the broker. 9 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, that's going to 10 11 happen. REFEREE RATNER: I remember that from the prior 12 13 conference. 14 MR. DIMOPOULOS: I'm going to notify the broker that Judge Koba has done that. The broker is going to 15 16 say we need one of two things, either a court order or we're going to require the -- an e-mail directly to MLS 17 18 from both Mr. and Mrs. Kassenoff. So I will submit a 19 proposed order, and hopefully Judge Koba will sign it. 20 REFEREE RATNER: The reduction is in accordance 21 with the prior court order. 22 MS. SPIELBERG: It's in accordance with the 23 order which we do not believe says the same thing. 24 MR. DIMOPOULOS: All right. I would like 25 permission at this point -- there's got to be some

financial ramifications. I'd like permission to file my motion for credit again. My client is paying a hundred percent of everything retroactive and child support. It's not something that's going to require immediate adjudication, Referee Ratner, but there has to be some financial implication. My client just got through paying upwards of \$450,000 and \$100,000 to Ms. Kassenoff's attorneys, Ms. Most, me. The goal Ms. Kassenoff is trying -- she has Sanctuary for Families, three lawyers pro bono. Every issue gets dragged out, every court conference. Then the Judge says, "No, I deny that," and then they write another letter.

REFEREE RATNER: We're cutting it short. The trial ready order is going to issue as soon as we get the report about the husband's partnership interest. Okay. Regarding the credit, without prejudice without trial. The Court will determine all credits. There are two houses here. Ms. Kassenoff would probably be entitled to a portion of the net proceeds of each of those houses. To the extent you wish to make an application that she has to -- a certain amount has to be credited against her interest, you'll make that application. It will be determined at trial.

You have enough money here. So there's enough money to credit against whoever she would owe. We're not

going to have a mini trial again. There already was a hearing regarding the temporary access. All of these issues are reserved for trial.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: The last issue and I think it's the most important and we briefly touched upon this with Judge Koba, is Mrs. Kassenoff while under the restriction of therapeutically supervised visitation has made herself the class mom of Charlotte. She did so because the school itself has been notified of the order, but the parent-teacher association was not. If she wants to be the class mom, then there is to be absolutely no contact either digitally or otherwise with Charlotte, then we don't have a problem with that. But we need the authority of The Court to notify the parent-teacher association of the existing court order that is restricted. Otherwise, she can't do it.

The reason I'm overly concerned, Referee Ratner, is because we found out today that despite countless court orders, despite countless times Judge Koba has given us her time to tell Ms. Kassenoff she can't communicate with the children via the chat, Zoom, via anything, and all contact is to be therapeutically supervised, we learned she continues to text-message with the children. We have a screen-shot of her texts with Alexandra in recent days. We are now looking at whether

or not there are others.

Okay. She is consistently and on a near daily basis violating the orders of this Court. So under other circumstances, this class mom thing would be okay, but we think it should be utterly restricted at this point.

MS. SPIELBERG: Referee Ratner, I submitted to The Court a description of the position. It doesn't require, according to the description, any interaction with Charlotte. It's interaction with the other parents. It's -- as The Court likely reviewed, it is -- it's almost like an administrative position where if the parent has issues with the teacher or school, generalized issues, that they are to bring them to the class parents. This does not say there's going to be any communication between the class parents and the children.

And, frankly, it seems to me that any need for The Court to contact the parent-teacher association would be only in furtherance of a goal to humiliate my client and alienate her from the FASNY community. I would submit to The Court that that is not in the best interest of Charlotte to be embarrassed to any extent if The Court has to communicate with other parents in the school. And there doesn't seem to be any connection between being a class parent and communicating with Charlotte outside of therapeutic supervision.

REFEREE RATNER: No one wants to embarrass

Ms. Kassenoff. Therefore, she has determined that

Ms. Kassenoff cannot act as a class parent. She is not

to have any access outside of the restrictions of the

Covid order. It will be up to either you, Ms. Spielberg,

or Mr. Dimopoulos to advise the parent-teacher

association that Ms. Kassenoff is resigning the position.

I prefer that Mr. Dimopoulos not be the one to contact them and advise them that she cannot continue in that position.

So, Ms. Spielberg, discuss it with your client, how you want to handle Ms. Kassenoff's resignation.

MS. SPIELBERG: It appears to me, Referee Ratner, that this would in fact then embarrass Charlotte anyway. It's confusing as to whether if the goal is not to embarrass Charlotte, how to have her mother resign would not be in furtherance of that goal.

REFEREE RATNER: So do you want a court order from Mr. Dimopoulos advising the PTA that she is not permitted to be the class representative? Would you prefer that? I don't think so. I don't think that's a very positive thing. I think it would be much smarter to simply have Ms. Kassenoff submit a resignation that she cannot function as the class rep this year.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: If I had any interest in

embarrassing her, I would have done it already. 1 2 raising this issue so hopefully she can resign on her It's very easy to say, "I'm just too busy. 3 I can't do it." 4 MS. SPIELBERG: Referee Ratner, we would hope 5 6 that this would be something that The Court would encourage my client to participate in so that she can 7 have a connection to her children and their schooling. 8 9 REFEREE RATNER: Ms. Spielberg --10 MS. SPIELBERG: We detailed in our letter, 11 Referee Ratner --12 REFEREE RATNER: Listen to what I am saying. 13 don't have enough time. I read to you what Judge Koba 14 She cannot be the class rep. It's out. She 15 cannot have access with any of the children outside the 16 restrictions of the order. I would suggest she submit 17 her resignation. If not, Mr. Dimopoulos will advise The 18 Court within a week if she hasn't submitted her 19 resignation. 20 Next issue. 21 MR. DIMOPOULOS: I have no further issues. 22 MS. SPIELBERG: We put in our letters. There's 23 so many. I think it's related to what we were just 24 discussing, which is that Mr. Kassenoff continues to act

unilaterally despite the fact that The Court was very

clear in its lengthy opinion that he is to consult Mrs. Kassenoff prior to making any final decisions. has failed to do that in numerous instances, including enrolling Charlotte in a violin class, unilaterally discontinuing long-standing activities like tennis, robotics, French, and skating. He's allowing Ally who is 11 to wear make-up. These are things that are to be communicated with Ms. Kassenoff.

The Judge was clear that the father will not be satisfying his obligation of sole legal custody without consulting the mother before he acts if all he does is informing her that he's going to do something and doing it without allowing to give her a say.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Referee Ratner, can I have 30 seconds?

REFEREE RATNER: Yes.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Number one, violin we have exchanged 10,000 e-mails on this. Consultation lasted a year at which point my client exercised his authority and enrolled them in private violin lessons. Two, tennis, they talked about it. They e-mailed. I saw the e-mails. They went back and forth. My client said to Ms. Kassenoff, "I don't feel comfortable in Covid having them inside of a bubble." That was a consultation. He made the final decision. Robotics, he spoke to the

child. The child didn't want to do it. He let her know. She said to do it anyway. He said, "I'm not forcing the child." Ice-skating, there is no ice-skating. It canceled because of Covid.

Lastly, Ally does not wear make-up outside of the house. She is a 10-year-old girl. Every once in a while perhaps she might put some on. She's not allowed to wear it in school or outside of the house. And just the other day the event she's talking about, her costume for Halloween involves make-up. She's been goofing around with it. It's as simple as that. These are all issues where Ms. Kassenoff is trying to get some traction. He is acting in accordance with the order every single step of the way.

REFEREE RATNER: And Judge Koba's response on this issue is that not every decision requires a full consultation with the mother, just major decisions. The wife, the mother, Ms. Kassenoff, has no decision-making authority. And what he did not consult her on and she -- I will say that my recollection is that Ms. Kassenoff went and applied for the scholarship I believe without consulting Mr. Kassenoff. When it was a fait accompli he was notified. So that's a problem too.

But, anyway, the Judge has said only major decisions. Wearing make-up, those are not major

decisions.

Next issue, Ms. Spielberg.

MS. SPIELBERG: Referee Ratner, we'd like to understand from The Court -- we'd like permission to make a motion to go remove supervision on behalf of my client and/or in the alternative to have The Court delineate some benchmarks for my client to attain in order to decrease the supervision. Also, my client would like to be able to have -- celebrate holidays with her kids and have some holiday-related access, be able to go to their sporting events, some of this -- some sort of a decrease in some regard with respect to the finances of the visitation.

we refer The Court again to the affidavit that outlines that the supervisor she has is the only one that's doing in-person supervision that we could find, including the prior supervisors in this case, and the issue is that, you know, she can't prove to you that she should be off supervision if at the same time she isn't able to conduct the act without supervised access.

In any event, there's been six visits. CFS's reports have been stellar and glowing. She has called every day. There haven't been any issues. So if The Court is not inclined to lift supervision, which we hope at some point in the near future, then contemplate same

in the order after the trial, and we would hope that The Court would at least give us some direction as to what the benchmarks are so that my client can hope to at some point have unsupervised access with her children.

We also ask, Referee Ratner, in the same vein and category, that if her calls are only going to be 15 minutes and in an effort to save funds rather than be 15 every day, maybe 30 every other day, since it costs her \$50 regardless of how long the phone call is up to an hour, we're trying to find ways for my client to be able to continue her relationship and communication with the kids but also be able to continue to pay utilities and be fed.

REFEREE RATNER: I can't hear you.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Very briefly on this.

According to an e-mail from Cava White, the supervisor there is absolutely no in-person therapeutic supervision occurring at the current time because Ms. Kassenoff is in a billing dispute with them. There was no visit yesterday.

MS. SPIELBERG: My client has a visit on Saturday. What are you talking about, Gus?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Jill, we got an e-mail yesterday from Ms. White saying nothing has been scheduled until the billing dispute is sorted out. Okay.

So it's unbelievable that your client can come to court and ask to lift the supervision that she is voluntarily not undertaking and undergoing right now.

MS. SPIELBERG: It's not voluntary. It's related to the finances. I don't know how much clearer I can be.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Very simply, if you can tell me using mathematics, an abacus, calculator, or otherwise how someone who makes \$177,000 a year and has zero in expenses perhaps other than her cell phone bill, how she can't afford \$175 an hour four hours a week and \$50.00 a day for Zoom calls, I'll be happy to figure that out with you.

Secondly, she can agree -- it's up to her -- to relinquish her claim, release the E-Trade funds, give her approximately \$200,000 in her pocket so that she could see her children. Alternatively, she would rather keep coming back to court and making applications that were denied not 48 or 78 hours ago by a justice of the Supreme Court. This is sanctionable, period.

MS. SPIELBERG: My client will agree to release some of the E-Trade money to pay for her supervision.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: No, no, no. Don't go through this exercise. No, no.

MS. SPIELBERG: You just offered it.

1 MR. DIMOPOULOS: I will talk to my client. It's 2 all or nothing release. It is not just take out money just to pay for supervision. 3 REFEREE RATNER: Would it be for both of them? 4 5 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Split the account, sell it, and 6 split it subject to each party's claim at trial. 7 REFEREE RATNER: Is that acceptable? MR. DIMOPOULOS: Of course it's not. Watch --8 MS. SPIELBERG: I'd have to have an opportunity 9 10 to consult with my client on this, but I would only raise the issue, Referee, that we've made this request now, as 11 Mr. Dimopoulos so eloquently told The Court, twice within 12 13 a week, and this offer was never made to us other than 14 during this conference in front of Your Honor so --15 REFEREE RATNER: It doesn't matter. As to your 16 first request for lifting supervision, Judge Koba dealt 17 with that already. The answer is no. As far as the 18 expense of supervision, Judge Koba just dealt with that. 19 The answer is no. 20 As far as guidelines, we are going to order an 21 updated report from Dr. Abrams. I don't think that there 22 will be any updated -- any change in the supervision

Okay. The FASNY role was dealt with. Your client will either resign -- let me know within a week

subject to the receipt of that report from Dr. Abrams.

23

24

```
what your client wants to do, whether she wants to resign
 1
 2
     or whether The Court has to take appropriate action.
    will be very sad to tell Judge Koba we have to do that.
 3
              MS. SPIELBERG: Your Honor, has the Judge
 4
 5
     advised you or will somebody advise us with respect to
    whether or not it's okay for Mr. Kassenoff to be
 6
    disparaging my client to the therapist when he's not
 7
     supposed to be communicating with them either. What's
 8
     good for the goose should be good for the gander.
 9
10
              REFEREE RATNER:
                               I gave the therapist
     transcripts of a police officer and other transcripts
11
     from the hearing.
12
13
              MS. SPIELBERG: Because she asked my client for
14
    materials.
15
              REFEREE RATNER:
                              That's not true.
16
              MR. DIMOPOULOS: We dealt --
17
              MS. SPIELBERG: Any and all materials.
18
              REFEREE RATNER:
                               That request was do you want
19
     anything.
20
              MR. DIMOPOULOS:
                               Referee Ratner, we are having
21
    the exact same conversation we had with Judge Koba. She
22
     even said and I remember. "I want to see that e-mail."
23
     She looked at the e-mail, she read it. I mean, am I in
    the Twilight Zone?
24
25
                               I agree. We're not dealing
              REFEREE RATNER:
```

with that. Ms. Kassenoff's dealings we already dealt 1 2 I would suggest you reach out to Mr. Dimopoulos and work out or find out from the police in Larchmont 3 when they can accompany your client, or your client has 4 5 the option that she did not want to avail herself of of hiring someone to go with her. It will only be for her 6 7 personal belongings. At this point, The Court is not and did not in 8 the order that was entered struck all of your requests to 9 have him pack up all of her stuff. He's not going to 10 11 have to do that. But I would strongly urge you to contact the Larchmont Police Department. 12 13 And, Mr. Dimopoulos, advise your client that you 14 are to cooperate with Ms. Kassenoff retrieving her personal belongings from the house on a day when the 15 16 children are not present in the house. 17 MR. DIMOPOULOS: We'll be happy to. 18 MS. MOST: Ms. Ratner, did I hear you say that 19 you're ordering an update with Dr. Abrams? 20 REFEREE RATNER: Yes, we are. 21 MS. MOST: Are you doing the order? 22 REFEREE RATNER: If someone wants to submit an 23 order, that would be great. 24 MR. DIMOPOULOS: I'll submit an order. 25 REFEREE RATNER: Thank you.

```
1
              MR. DIMOPOULOS: Thank you for your effort, Your
 2
     Honor.
 3
              REFEREE RATNER:
                               Is there anything else?
              MR. DIMOPOULOS:
 4
                               No.
 5
              REFEREE RATNER: Anything else?
              MS. MOST:
 6
                         No.
 7
              REFEREE RATNER: I haven't given you another
     date because I don't -- I just need -- we're really just
 8
     waiting for the valuation of the -- valuation of the
 9
10
     business.
11
              MS. SPIELBERG: We held the depositions open for
     that valuation and for the documents that are being
12
13
     produced in connection with that valuation. So there may
14
     be another half day on my end.
15
              I don't know where you stand, Gus, but I think
16
     substantially the discovery is complete.
17
              REFEREE RATNER: When will documents be
18
     provided?
19
              MS. SPIELBERG: We need The Court to so order
20
     the protective order.
21
              REFEREE RATNER: As soon as The Court orders --
22
     so orders that.
23
              MR. DIMOPOULOS: As soon as The Court orders the
24
     protective order, I'm assuming within a couple of days.
25
     Greenberg Traurig's lawyer will send the documents to all
```

parties including Mr. DiMarco. He has indicated to me 1 2 not wanting to be bound to -- he may need two or three weeks, perhaps 30 days, to finalize a report. When that 3 report is finalized, we will write to Your Honor and 4 request a trial readiness conference. 5 REFEREE RATNER: Okay. And the only other 6 7 question was what's wrong with Ally's testing. MR. DIMOPOULOS: I think she completed her final 8 session or she's about to complete her final session. 9 You know, it's unbelievable. My client gets an e-mail on 10 this conference from Ms. Kassenoff, "It is so sick that 11 you want me to not help Charlotte with FASNY." You know, 12 13 anyway --14 MS. SPIELBERG: Referee Ratner, can I ask you a 15 question. You may have said this, but I didn't hear you. 16 Is The Court willing to provide guidance as to benchmarks 17 for Ms. Kassenoff? I think that would be helpful for 18 everyone. 19 MR. DIMOPOULOS: She just did an updated 20 forensic. 21 REFEREE RATNER: The Court is -- there will be 22 an updated report from Dr. Abrams and everything will be

determined after we get his updated report.

MS. SPIELBERG: Understood. Thank you for that

23

24

25

clarification.

REFEREE RATNER: Protective order is so ordered. 1 2 So what did they order for Ally, any services? MR. DIMOPOULOS: We don't have a report yet. I 3 believe there's one more session left for the neuropsych 4 and then we'll have Dr. McGuffen's final evaluation, and 5 I'll submit that to The Court once we have it. 6 REFEREE RATNER: One final session with Dr. 7 McGUffen. Any idea when that will take place? 8 9 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Allan, do you have it scheduled 10 already? 11 MR. KASSENOFF: She was away last weekend and the weekend before. So we haven't scheduled the last 12 13 one, but typically they've been on Sundays. So I'm just 14 waiting for her to let me know when she's available. MR. DIMOPOULOS: So hopefully this Sunday. 15 16 REFEREE RATNER: Okay. So she's not -- she has 17 not -- she hasn't completed the final session; is that 18 correct? 19 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Correct. 20 REFEREE RATNER: One more session. 21 MS. SPIELBERG: I would expect it to be a few 22 weeks after the final session, Referee Ratner. These 23 things take some time to render. 24 REFEREE RATNER: And Judge Koba had just a question about the transcript. Is there -- has an appeal 25

been filed?

MR. DIMOPOULOS: Ms. Kassenoff has perfected an appeal of Judge Koba's decision denying the suppression of the text messages as a result of attorney/client privilege. Our responsive brief is due on October 23rd. That appeal is fully perfected. She has asked this Court to release or order the release of the transcripts so she could appeal the August 18th decision after hearing on temporary custody.

MS. SPIELBERG: Referee Ratner, the issue here to bring you up to speed if you haven't been read in yet is that The Court -- I had sent like a half a day here or there of transcripts, and then during a conference with The Court, The Court said that they were to be confidential. Just so that it's clear, I had not sent her the piece of the transcript that was sent to McGuffen.

But in any event, I haven't been representing her on any of these appeals. I'm not sure that she has representation or not. So she'll either do it pro se or with another attorney. I cannot release these transcripts, what's left, until I have a directive from The Court permitting me to do so because The Court has prior told me not to. So I'm stuck between a rock and a hard place. I have a client that wants to file an appeal

that I'm not going to represent her on. 1 REFEREE RATNER: Who will represent her on that 2 3 appeal? I don't know. But she has the MS. SPIELBERG: 4 5 right to file it pro se. 6 MS. MOST: So, Your Honor, the issue with the --7 with Judge Koba's order on transcripts has to do with the fact that a lot of it was Mark Abram's testimony and why 8 would we allow a litigant to have testimony when we don't 9 allow them to have the report. 10 11 REFEREE RATNER: Right. MR. DIMOPOULOS: Your Honor, can I just say 12 13 something about the appeal? 14 MS. SPIELBERG: I just want to say one thing, 15 Gus. The pieces that she had did not refer to the 16 report. So that's why we stopped sending them. 17 the -- obviously if she's going to file an appeal of the

hearing, she's entitled I would think to have transcripts in order to refer to them in order to cite appealable issues to the extent there are any.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Again, I'm not -- I'm not representing her. I don't even know what the issues are entirely that she needs to appeal, but I can't release them even to her counsel, a new counsel, without permission from The Court.

1 MR. DIMOPOULOS: There was a 10-day hearing, 2 Referee Ratner. You know that. We have transcripts probably from about six of those days. 3 MS. MOST: I don't think that many, Gus. 4 5 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Maybe four. So she's going to 6 have to spend upwards of 7 or \$8,000 getting transcripts, 7 records on appeal here, probably seven or eight volumes, probably 40 to \$50,000 for the record on appeal, and we 8 9 have a person who doesn't want to pay \$50 for a zoom 10 call. Not to mention, this appeal will be decided in 11 20 -- the end of 2021, long after there is a final 12 decision. 13 Now, she has a right to appeal, I understand 14 that. We don't have to consent that a pro se litigant is 15 going to have highly, highly confidential testing data 16 and testimony from a forensic. So she's going to have to 17 make a motion. We're not going to consent to that. It's 18 abysmal. 19 MS. SPIELBERG: I would ask for permission for 20 her --21 REFEREE RATNER: How can you ask permission for 22 her? 23 MS. SPIELBERG: I'm going to say -- let me 24 finish. I would be asking that she be permitted to make 25 the motion pro se.

MR. DIMOPOULOS: The motion lies with the 1 2 appellate division, Referee Ratner. It does not lay with the trial court. 3 REFEREE RATNER: Right. 4 I don't think that's true MS. SPIELBERG: 5 because it's the trial court that has issued the order 6 saying that I couldn't give any -- first of all, it 7 wasn't an order. It was in a transcript. It was a 8 directive. I always adhere to directives by The Court. 9 It's not a written order. So I don't know if there's 10 11 anything to appeal or put before the appellate division. MR. DIMOPOULOS: The process is that if you have 12 13 to issue a subpoena, the appellate division has to issue 14 a subpoena for the lower court's record, and when that 15 subpoena gets issued, either I make a motion to quash it 16 for the grounds or she makes a motion to compel 17 compliance with the subpoena. That's the procedure, and I learned it the hard way. 18 19 So your client should consult with an appellate 20 attorney because there's no motion that lies in the lower 21 court for the relief she seeks. 22 REFEREE RATNER: Okay. Anything else? 23 MR. DIMOPOULOS: No. 24 REFEREE RATNER: Okay. I'm not going to give you another date because it will depend on -- we're just

1 really waiting to get the report. Once we get the 2 report, you'll get a date and probably get a trial ready order at the same time. The case is going to go to trial 3 as expeditiously as possible. 4 MS. SPIELBERG: Hold on, Referee Ratner. 5 6 a -- the right to question the Plaintiff on documents -for financial documents produced on his partnership. 7 can't issue the order contemporaneous with those 8 documents being produced within a week or so of that. 9 REFEREE RATNER: Ms. Spielberg, that's not what 10 I said after the report is issued. Thereafter 11 I said. vou would have a final conference and then the trial or 12 13 ready order will issue. 14 You have a few weeks to notice him for 15 deposition, and Mr. Dimopoulos will be able to notice 16 your client for deposition if he wants that or anyone else, either one of you. And I'm not going to wait. 17 18 You're not going to put them out three or four months. 19 They're going to be done within a short period of time. 20 MS. SPIELBERG: No problem. 21 MR. DIMOPOULOS: Thank you. 22 REFEREE RATNER: Okay. Have a nice day. 23 (Proceedings adjourned.)

24

1	THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A TRUE
2	AND ACCURATE TRANSCRIPT OF THE ORIGINAL STENOGRAPHIC
3	RECORD.
4	JENNIFER GRUSEKE, CSR
5	Senior Court Reporter
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18 19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
-	