FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 109/08/2017 04:49 RM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 26

INDEX NO. 652586/2017

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 09/08/2017

```
1
 1
 2
    SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
    COUNTY OF NEW YORK - CIVIL TERM - PART 53
 3
    TESS H. WACHS,
 4
                                          Petitioner,
 5
 6
    For an Order, Pursuant to Article 75 of the
    Civil Practice Law and Rules to Modify and/or
 7
    Partially Vacate the Arbitration Award and to
    Confirm the Award as Modified or Partially
 8
    Vacated
 9
                       -against-
10
    RICHARD TIENKEN,
11
                                          Respondent.
     -----X
12
    Index No. 652586/17
                                     60 Centre Street
                                     New York, New York
13
                                     August 21, 2017
14
    BEFORE:
15
                  HONORABLE CHARLES E. RAMOS,
16
    Supreme Court Justice
17
    APPEARANCES:
18
19
    GERARD FOX LAW P.C.
    Attorneys for the Plaintiff
20
    12 East 49th Street, 26th floor
    New York, N.Y. 10017
21
    BY: EDWARD D. ALTABET, ESQ.
22
    THE AUSLANENDER FIRM, P.C.
23
    Attorneys for the Defendant
    43 West 43rd Street, Suite 163
24
    New York, N.Y. 10036
    BY: JUSTIN AUSLAENDER, ESQ.
25
26
```

FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 19/28/2017 04:49 RM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 26

2.3

INDEX NO. 652586/2017

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 09/08/2017

Proceedings

THE COURT: Is there a cross-motion to confirm the arbitration award?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ AUSLAENDER: I did request that relief in the opposition papers.

THE COURT: Okay. Petitioner, I don't think I'm going to grant your motion. This arbitrator was not acting irrationally. His suggestion that the arbitration award could be used in a subsequent petition to dissolve the corporation is an argument that could be made. It's made in the purview of the Arbitration Agreement, because it was a very, very broad Arbitration Agreement and usually the Courts will grant arbitrators an enormous amount of leeway so long as what they do falls within the Agreement to arbitrate.

Yes, it's true, nobody asked for dissolution, but he didn't grant a dissolution. He just basically made a finding, these two folks can't get along with one another. But as far as his determination on the eight causes of action he's absolutely correct. Your client's husband was a 50 percent owner of this company and he and the Respondent ran this company the way they wanted to run it and now all of a sudden the wife comes in and says this was a violation of my husband's rights or my rights. Nonsense. This company was in business, comedy club was in business for what, 30 years?

FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 109/28/2017 04:49 RM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

26

INDEX NO. 652586/2017

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 09/08/2017

Proceedings

MR. AUSLAENDER: Forty.

MR. ALTABET: Forty.

THE COURT: Forty years, now all of a sudden the world is coming to an end.

The motion to set aside the award is denied. Fees were split, I take it, 50-50; everybody had to pay their own share.

MR. AUSLAENDER: That's correct.

THE COURT: He didn't make any adjudication against anybody. The fact that this company did not keep its books and records means that both of them didn't keep the books and records properly.

MR. ALTABET: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Your client's husband was a 50 percent owner, he acquiesced in all of this. The arbitrator's determination was eminently reasonable. The motion is denied.

Thank you very much, folks. Thank you for coming in.

MR. ALTABET: May I be briefly heard on one issue, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. ALTABET: The basis for the --let me put aside the eight causes of action count and let me put aside the dissolution, I understand Your Honor's reasoning. The --

FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 109/28/2017 04:49 RM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 26

INDEX NO. 652586/2017

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 09/08/2017

Proceedings

with respect to the findings that Your Honor just articulated, Mr. Wachs had passed away at the end of 2012, so between 2012 and the date of this arbitration there was only one person, the Respondent, that was managing all of the books and records.

The findings of fact --

THE COURT: But the record is clear this is the way they did business for 40 years. The Respondent had every reason to believe that this was okie dokie. Now the wife comes in and says no, it's not okay. So the arbitrator says, you know what, you're right, it should be done better but neither of you are in a position to prove that you took too much money out of this company. You know, if understated, if they both knew they were understating revenues and overstating expenses and they both took advantage of it, there's no good guy, bad guy here. This is the way they wanted to do things. Maybe the IRS has a problem with them, but I don't.

Motion denied. Thank you very much folks. We're done.

MR. ALTABET: Your Honor, is the the arbitration award confirmed as it is?

THE COURT: You have made a motion to confirm?

MR. AUSLAENDER: I didn't move by cross-motion. I requested the relief in my opposition papers which may have

FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 109/28/2017 04:49 RM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 26

INDEX NO. 652586/2017

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 09/08/2017

5 Proceedings 1 2 been there, but I thought that was proper procedure. THE COURT: You did make that request. 3 MR. ALTABET: I made a fourth cause of action on 4 5 I requested that the arbitration award be confirmed 6 as modified or partially vacated. 7 THE COURT: Then it's confirmed in its original 8 form, no modification. 9 Thank you very much, folks. Good luck. 10 11 12 13 CERTIFICATE 14 15 16 It is hereby certified that the foregoing is a true and accurate 17 transcript of the proceedings. 18 19 20 21 ANGELA BONELLO SENIOR COURT REPORTER 22 23 SUPREME COURT-NEW YORK COUNTY 24 25 26