

ATTN: **MR. WILLIAM MCKENZIE**
C/O THE HONORABLE SHLOMO HAGGLER, J.S.C.

As promised during yesterday's mediation and to assist the Honorable Haggler to memorialize the amiable terms agreed to by parties:

Accept this message as a letter further affirming the order for **one plumber** (who, the “examiner”) to enter and examine my bathroom; **one superintendent** (Adnan Utic) who will wait for the investigative report of the examiner together with a **second Plumber**, will remain at a distance and outside of my Residence. I am willing to further accommodate the “examiner” to be joined by Ms. Laskowitz as a courtesy and as an extension of my good faith dealings.

If the appointed “Plumbing service provider”, or contractor, can responsibly maintain the integrity of the Judge's stipulations, and conduct themselves conversely to the eclectic behavior and actions as exhibited by Ms. Laskowitz; I once again agree (and have never objected to) a scheduled entry of my Premises on Tuesday to help calm any emotional imbalance as exhibited in the Plaintiff’s claims – perhaps the plumber’s assessment can keep their representative under control.

MANDATORY ENTRY: **Tuesday, September 29TH / 9:30 AM EST**

- I once again permit for a plumber (who will cover his shoes, wear a mask, gloves – and per the Honorable Hagler's **ORDER**; saran wrap is an acceptable form of a “disposable coverall” which is also a requirement).

PLEASE NOTE: **Friday, September 18TH / 2:30 PM EST**

- I.** I provided access to my Residence on Friday the 18th, emailed both General Counsel at Manhattan Skyline and Ms. Laskowitz without objection.

II. Plaintiffs, and their third party service provider in this matter do not believe fire egress as a mandatory provision for their tenants, a risk, a breach of contract, and have affirmed that breaking and entering into my apartment through the fire escape by kicking in my air-conditioner as acceptable conduct.

A SECOND REMINDER: The examination of my bathroom ends when the Plumber confirms there is no leak and thereafter will immediately leave my Residence. One additional plumber will remain on standby and permitted to join, a precautionary measure, in the event that a leak has been verified – however will not enter the premises and will wait with the superintendent elsewhere. Upon discovery of a leak, I will absolutely have no objection to any repair, repairmen, and grant any span of time to repair any “rupture” caused by the alleged “banging” and/or constant “drilling” as per the Plaintiffs in this matter. My bed remains intact, has been constructed, however is not material or applicable, and is off limits.

AMENDED REQUEST: I request a stipulation to restrain Ms. Laskowitz from contacting myself to any effect, and the Plaintiff’s prior to October 18TH – the posthaste fashion of a MANDATORY MEDIATION, slated to a New York Supreme Court Calendar is bewildering.

A request on the 24TH of September was immediately scheduled for the 25TH of September – with a three month back-log in the Supreme Court’s duties to protect the quality of life for its people. There is no flood in the building, there is no flood in my Residence, and the last flood I can remember on the cuff was named Sandy.

I have resided here since January and have no knowledge of a “flood” in the North-East Region of America and for good measure – with reference to the incident of the pipe and the mirror – this caused a leak... not a “flood” and was materially misrepresented to raise alarm as a violent “rupture”...

THEREFORE AFFIRMED: The simultaneously entry by multiple servicemen was decided as excessive, as it would conversely serve in the quality of a proper examination in my bathroom (bathtub, toilet and sink). The Plumber's daily affairs were implied as a contaminating element and in the interest of cleanliness and my personal hygiene - I appreciate the Honorable Shlomo's decision to proscribe to this excessive entry presented by Ms. Laskowitz as "State of Emergency", representative for Plaintiffs.

AGREED: This is my Residence, my time, and I sincerely believe General Counsel for Manhattan Skyline and designation of Ms. Laskowitz (of Ingram LLP - who in happenstance, all share the same address) hold credibility of lesser value; this statement in light of the outrageous number of claims which were previously adjudicated, and effectively disposed of in under one hour during the first hearing in this case.

GENERAL AGREEMENT: I agree that the Court's time should be used to address the needs of the greater community, more specifically as the hundreds of claims alleged by Plaintiffs in this matter were previously disposed by the Honorable Shlomo Haggler; **BARRING THE MANDATORY ORDER** which prevents me from destroying buildings.

I believe rule is covered somewhere in the fine print of Federal, State, and Local "order" - but thank you for the reminder. I understand the Honorable Haggler has 20+ years of experience fielding Ms. Laskowitz's claims, complaints, allegations, and there is no question an inequitable bias of opinion exists. With that said, if the Honorable Haggler has more important matters to address - I am happy to better align my calendar with his schedule.

As a formality, I apologize for the unusual request to have lunch – however felt it was appropriate due the count of frivolous claims brought forth in this matter which had placed me in a false light. In line with Haggler's opinion - I will also assume the position of his Honor's ruling of credibility and assume that Ms. Laskowitz enjoys catering to a nine billion dollar real estate mogul (notwithstanding the existence of services she provides for their "in-house Counsel") – without hesitation.

These are the folks who are in fact the ones who are “hiding behind doors” – a high barrier of entry. I have not had the opportunity to physically meet or shake hands with the Hon. Haggler at any point in time; which is why I had suggested a lunch meeting while the Plumber and Ms. Laskowitz can inspect my bathroom, and this way the Plumber can provide his assessment to Plaintiffs in this matter and to the superintendent (Adnan Utic). I have no objection of his right to report any potential ruptures to the second plumber (who will also wait outside of my residence) while the examiner completes his activity. If time permits, barring the extent of what has been previously positioned as excessive amounts of “drilling, banging and a rupture”, whatever damages are caused by the first plumber and Ms. Laskowitz may be repaired – but as previously stated – I want nothing to do with their actions.

FURTHER STATED: The compulsory teleconference held on the 25TH of September was completely unnecessary... I provided a letter to General Counsel (for Plaintiffs) and to Ms. Laskowitz as well that entry was not an issue in response to their request of an “Emergency”.

The voicemail from Mr. Regan left me was avoided to in discussion yesterday, albeit was forwarded to all Parties, Mr. McKenzie – and a third party service provider for the MEWS – who claims that she is a Professional and licensed to practice in The State of New York. In light of Mr. Regan’s voicemail threatening to **“follow me to the end of the World”** – I must insist that a separate stipulation be entered that General Counsel must arrange for a different service provider and bar Ms. Laskowitz from representing Manhattan Skyline as a **“visiting”, “temporarily licensed”**, and overrule on regions which don’t require licensing – generally not permitted to represent Manhattan Skyline in any matter enjoining myself, name, entity, affiliate, or known persons.

The merits for this request, in part, is on the basis of a planned trip to Costa Rica, which holds grounds as I understand a temporary license provision for any standing attorney can be easily obtained in this region and in under 24 hours. I make this request sincerely, while considering the constant harassment, compulsory and mandatory discussions, threats, and on the

merit of nearly one hundred (perhaps tens of thousands of claims which have also been black-lined and re-positioned over the years) were disposed.

In their pleadings, not one instance has brought cause for an award , and in furtherance - any restriction of my rights has not been superimposed beyond local, state and federal law; which generally proscribes to the destruction of buildings.

LASTLY: The \$10 Bond posted by Ms. Laskowitz...

- Was this percentage weighted amount paid to a bondsman?
- Why are these funds being held to my benefit?
- I have not received any money from Plaintiffs, or services from its representatives...
 - ` Where and how have these funds been custodied and/or pilfered?

In line with the order entered by the Honorable Shlomo Hagler J.S.C. who also disposed of each claim and allegation by Plaintiffs in this matter, I also AFFIRM:

- i. Destruction of Buildings is not permitted without a permit;
- ii. Overcooking Salmon without searing is questionable, but not punishable by law, however without proper seasoning warrants a letter of complaint from General Counsel; and
- iii. Smoking cigarettes in the corridors the building is not permitted, anywhere in Manhattan.

/BD

[REMAINDER OF PAGE IS BLANK]