

LAWRENCE DRESSLER
516 ELLSWORTH AVENUE
NEW HAVEN, CT 06511
PHONE 203-710-8137

Hon Michael Shea
United States District Court
450 Main Street
Hartford, CT 06103

November 24, 2017

Re: Eliyahu Mirlis v. Daniel Greer, et al
3: 16 CV 000678

Dear Judge Shea:

I hereby request that Daniel Greer's financial documents, deposition(s) and related financial information obtained during post judgment discovery be made publicly available. I further request that the Yeshiva of New Haven's financial documents, deposition(s) and related financial information obtained during post judgment discovery be made publicly available. Finally, I would ask that the videotape deposition of Aviad Hack be made publicly available.

I am writing on behalf of a blog that I publish, ie., www.larrynoodles.com. My blog has been mentioned by the attorneys in a number of court filings on the above case. My blog has been reporting on the above case, and has had hundreds of thousands of views, if not more, since the commencement of the civil action. I have not monetarily profited in any way from my blog.

I first started writing my blog while I was incarcerated in Federal prison. I received an 18 month prison sentence for a very minor role in seven sub-prime mortgage real estate closings, which occurred over a decade ago, in which I made no money other than nominal closing fees. My co-conspirators who made hundreds of thousands of dollars in fraudulent profits were sentenced to less jail time than me, and were able to keep most of their ill begotten gains while the big banks avoided criminal prosecution altogether but were sued for billions by the Justice Department in numerous civil fraud cases.

The purpose of my blog was to bring public attention to many problems in the criminal justice system and to publicize prison life, as nobody is allowed to record what goes on in a prison. I chose the name Larry Noodles because that was the nickname I was given by the inmates while I was incarcerated. I was disciplined because I had cooked a small bag of spiral pasta, ie., "noodles" at the prison warehouse where I worked and broke the prison rules by bringing the pasta back to my cubicle in order to eat for dinner later that evening. I was searched, interrogated, attended a disciplinary hearing, had my privileges curtailed, and was subjected to daily taunts by inmates and guards because of the noodles incident.

I started to write about Daniel Greer approximately one month prior to the commencement of the above civil action. I received information from a former teacher of Greer's yeshiva that caused me to expose Greer's sexual abuse of minors to the public. I would never have imagined that I would be writing about Greer, a man whom I have personally known for over twenty years. At this point I am no longer shocked at Greer's behavior. Over the last several weeks numerous prominent public figures in the government, the entertainment industry, and the media have been

accused of sexual molestation, and have either been terminated or resigned in disgrace.

After the \$21 million jury verdict was rendered against Greer, I called the Clerk's Office and requested a copy of the videotape deposition of Aviad Hack that was played to the jury. The Court Clerk informed me that the Clerk's Office did not have a copy of the videotaped deposition. I was told that I had to obtain the videotape from Attorney Ponvert. I contacted Mr. Ponvert but he never responded to my email.

In the case of Burgess v. Town of Wallingford, et al 3:11-CV-1129 (CSH) (D. Conn. 2012), the Federal District Court addressed the issue of whether deposition transcripts constitute public documents entitled to First Amendment protection. The Plaintiff in Burgess sought to publish deposition transcripts on the internet. The Court stated: "When the materials in question 'are deemed non-judicial, then there is no presumption of public access, and the movant need only make a baseline showing of good cause in order to justify the imposition of a protective order.'" citing Ello v. Singh, 531 F.Supp.2d 552, 583 (S.D.N.Y. 2007).

In the case at bar the videotape deposition of Mr. Hack was entered into evidence during the trial. The videotape deposition should be deemed judicial material. Should not the public have the right to view this crucial piece of evidence that was played to the jury? During deliberations the jury asked that the videotape be re-played. During closing arguments Greer's attorney attacked Avi Hack's demeanor on the videotape. Greer's attorney William Ward argued to the jury: "Remember the long pauses in Avi's testimony? I asked him whether he was molested in high school. He said he needed time to think of something that would jog his memory. Do you really need something to jog your memory in order to remember something like sexual abuse?"

In footnote 17, the Court in Burgess stated: "absent a protective order, 'the discovery rules place no specific limitations on what a party may do with materials obtained during discovery.'" 23 Am. Jur. 2d Depositions and Discovery § 167 (Westlaw update August 2012). Certain courts have thus posited that, 'at a minimum, the governing rules strongly suggest a philosophy which favors free access to discovery materials in the absence of countervailing considerations.'" Flaherty v. Seroussi, 209 F.R.D. 295, 298 (N.D.N.Y. 2001). The language of Burgess would suggest that Attorney Ponvert would not run afoul of any court rules by publicly releasing the videotape deposition of Aviad Hack. I cannot force Mr. Ponvert to release this videotape. I have no other recourse but to ask your Honor to make the videotape available to the public.

Document number 228 filed in this case, ie., the Reply Memorandum submitted by Attorney Sklarz, stated: "Greer commenced a lawsuit against internet blogger Larry "Noodles" Dressler for certain defamatory posts..." (Page 4). I would like to address this statement made by Attorney Sklarz. Mr. Greer filed a four page civil complaint against me on July 19, 2016 in which he alleged the following: "the defendant falsely reported a claim of sexual molestation against Daniel Greer recently settled in the millions of dollars and described said settlement as 'hush money.'" Greer's lawsuit never claimed that my allegation of child molestation was false. Greer's lawsuit took issue with one post about the settlement of a claim for child molestation. Greer did not sue me for multiple "posts" as stated by Attorney Sklarz. Greer has not actively pursued this defamation lawsuit. The last document Greer filed in the defamation lawsuit was a motion to exempt the case from the dormancy docket. Even if Greer won a judgment against me, any monies Greer received would have to be turned over to Mr. Mirlis to satisfy the \$21 million judgment. The Greer lawsuit is nothing short of a SLAPP suit intended to silence me. Greer tried to silence me during the civil trial when he had his attorneys submit a bogus restraining

order to your Honor. Greer never even showed up to the State court hearing that was scheduled for his application for restraining order, just as Greer never filed his extortion lawsuit against Avi Hack, the lawsuit he had served on Avi Hack during Hack's deposition in order to intimidate Hack.

In the Second Circuit decision of US v. Amodeo, 71 F.3d 1044 (1995), the Appellate Court balanced the right to public access to court documents with the right to privacy and stated: "In determining the weight to be accorded an assertion of a right of privacy, courts should first consider the degree to which the subject matter is traditionally considered private rather than public. Financial records of a wholly owned business, family affairs, illnesses, embarrassing conduct with no public ramifications, and similar matters will weigh more heavily against access than conduct affecting a substantial portion of the public. In Joy v. North, 692 F.2d 880 (2d Cir.1982), for example, the involvement of a publicly owned company and management's relationship to the public shareholders weighed in favor of unsealing a special litigation committee's report." Amodeo at 1051, citing Joy: "An adjudication is a formal act of government, the basis of which should, absent exceptional circumstances, be subject to public scrutiny."

Recently the United States District Court for the District of Arizona considered whether the deposition of Sheriff Arpaio, who was recently pardoned by President Trump, should be released to the public. In Flake v. Arpaio, No. CV15-01132, the District Court denied Arpaio's request for a protective order and stated: "Whether or not the public enjoys a presumption of access to Sheriff Arpaio's deposition, the public's legitimate interest in the deposition justifies its release for two reasons. First, the deposition pertains to allegedly illegal conduct of a public official in the exercise of his official duties. There is "a strong public interest in free access to discovery documents where the litigation involve[s] elected officials and the performance of their governmental responsibilities.'" Condit v. Dunne, 225 F.R.D. 113, 117 (S.D.N.Y. 2004) (quoting Flaherty v. Seroussi, 209 F.R.D. 295, 300 (N.D.N.Y. 2001)). Second, and more importantly, Sheriff Arpaio invited media attention in this matter by repeatedly publicizing his investigation of the Flakes and publicly recommending felony charges against them. He issued press releases, held a press conference, and posted a video online. To allow Sheriff Arpaio to engage the media only on his terms would sanction an impermissible double standard. Having heard Sheriff Arpaio's earlier account of his investigation and recommended charges, the public has an interest in hearing his current account, under oath and cross-examination, now that the investigation and charges have been called into question. Cf. Condit, 225 F.R.D. at 114-15, 118-19 (declining to prohibit dissemination of videotaped deposition where deponent publicly accused opposing counsel of bullying during deposition)."

Over the course of this litigation Greer has engaged in behavior similar to Sheriff Arpaio. Greer filed an entirely frivolous defamation lawsuit against me for publicizing his crimes. Mr. Greer has been subjected to court fines and sanctions over the course of the litigation. Greer tried to get me barred from the courthouse with a bogus restraining order. Greer served Avi Hack with an extortion lawsuit during Hack's deposition, which was never filed with the court. According to court documents filed by Attorney Beatman, Mr. Greer transferred assets to his wife that were subject to collection. According to Attorney Beatman, Mr. Greer submitted a sworn affidavit in which he failed to list property that he had owned in Massachusetts. Mr. Greer has forced Mr. Mirlis to file numerous foreclosure actions against Greer owned properties, forcing Mirlis to incur substantial costs for attorneys fees and related litigation. Mr. Greer has hired numerous lawyers to defend him in these collection activities, incurring large fees that could have been

used to compensate the victim of his sexual molestation.

According to media reports, including the Associated Press, Greer's Yeshiva of New Haven has not been accredited nor has it operated with proper DCF licenses for many years. According to media reports, Greer recently reached an agreement with the State of Connecticut not to allow minors at his now defunct school. Greer created at least two websites during this litigation, with many pictures of himself, touting his achievements: www.rabbidanielgreer.strikingly.com and www.rabbidanielgreer.wordpress.com. There is no mention in the Greer websites that Greer was arrested for sexual assault of a minor or that a civil jury awarded \$21 million against Greer. Greer's websites contain numerous references to himself as the current "rabbi" of the now defunct Yeshiva of New Haven and a local community leader. Greer's Yeshiva of New Haven is still listed as an operational Jewish day school on the Torah Umesorah website, the national Jewish organization Orthodox Jews rely on for obtaining important and up to date information on Jewish day schools throughout the country. Nowhere is it mentioned on the Torah Umesorah website that Greer was arrested for sexual assault on a minor, or that Greer was found civilly liable in the amount of \$21 million for sexual molestation.

Greer's websites boast: "Rabbi Daniel Greer, founder of Connecticut's Yeshiva of New Haven School, is a compassionate man with immense civic interest. He has poured his efforts into improving the Edgewood neighborhood, where Yeshiva of New Haven resides, and in doing so he has received awards for his work. Since settling in New Haven, Rabbi Greer has endeavored to make the Edgewood neighborhood a better place to live. He has spearheaded tree-planting initiatives, aided in part by a grant from the City of New Haven. For more than two decades, Rabbi Daniel Greer and his committed Orthodox Jewish congregation have worked hard to make the area safe and habitable for all people. Greer has reached out to private and corporate donors to fund housing renovation projects and has engaged the local community to help in keeping the neighborhood safe. He has established an elementary school that teaches young children to read, write, and do arithmetic, in addition to learning the basics of Orthodox Judaism. 'Without him, this neighborhood probably would have gone to hell,' a resident by the name of William Gallagher is quoted in a September 2000 article in the New Haven Register."

Attorney William Gallagher passed away on December 25, 2013. Attorney Gallagher's clients trust account was drained of close to two million dollars at the time of his death. These client funds were never recovered. Before he died, Gallagher was listed as a director for the following Greer non-profit entities: Edgewood Elm Housing, Inc., Edgewood Village, Inc., and Edgewood Corners, Inc.

Greer currently has a criminal matter pending in which he pleaded not guilty to charges of sexual assault and risk of injury to a minor. The victim in this criminal case is Mr. Mirlis. The case is being reported by the media all over the world. My picture appeared in the Wall Street Journal along with a group of reporters as Greer walked out of the criminal courthouse with his attorney. On July 26, 2017 Greer's criminal defense attorney William Dow gave the following press release: "Rabbi Greer has a long history of positive contributions to the New Haven community, these charges are unfounded. He looks forward to addressing this case in court."

Much like Sheriff Arpaio, Greer has been “repeatedly thrusting into the media himself...” See Flake (“He thereby forfeited any substantial claim to privacy...”). The public has a legitimate interest in the criminal and civil cases against Greer and the Yeshiva of New Haven, especially where Greer has vigorously denied all allegations and has publicly attacked his accusers. Greer was a former police commissioner in the City of New Haven. I attended Greer annual fundraising dinners in which Senator Richard Blumenthal, Mayor Toni Harp, Police Commissioner Dean Esserman and Judge Keyes spoke as honored guests. I met former New York Police Commissioner William Bratton at one of Greer’s dinners. Greer also had many prominent State and local politicians speak as well. Greer rented his office building to the Police Department of the City of New Haven for many years. Greer’s son was appointed by Mayor Harp to the New Haven Community and Police Relations Task Force, and currently serves on this board. Greer received numerous City grants over the years in order to plant trees in his Edgewood neighborhood.

Greer currently operates a number of non-profit public entities which own at least 40 properties in the City of New Haven. Mr. Greer is currently suing the City of New Haven in order to get a tax reduction on all of his properties. Greer’s non-profit 501c entities, such as the Yeshiva of New Haven, are organized under the Internal Revenue Code, and are akin to publicly owned companies, as Greer’s non-profits ostensibly serve a public and charitable purpose. The Yeshiva of New Haven is also subject to the \$21 million jury verdict. “Management’s relationship to the public shareholders weighed in favor of unsealing a special litigation committee’s report.” Amodeo at 1051. There is an even greater need for public transparency for non-profit organizations than for publicly traded companies, as non-profits are supposed to serve the greater good.

Greer made a public spectacle of himself during the civil trial. Greer used his lawyers to mercilessly attack Mr. Mirlis, calling him a “liar” and a “cheat.” Greer’s lawyers also attacked Avi Hack, accusing him of being a liar, with a motive to take over the Yeshiva of New Haven and Greer property. It was Greer who injected his non-profit entities and properties into the case as a part of his defense. Greer invoked his Fifth Amendment right not to answer questions that would incriminate him during the trial. Yet Greer blurted out during cross examination that he did not molest Mr. Mirlis.

Greer has a long history of injecting himself into the national spotlight as a leader and crusader of high moral values. It was Greer who was behind the frivolous religious discrimination lawsuit that was filed in Federal Court against Yale University back in 1998, known as the “Yale Five,” that claimed that Yale did not adequately separate the male students from the female students in the dorms. It was Greer who took pictures of men soliciting prostitutes in New Haven, and posted these pictures under “John of the Week” signs. It was Greer who publicly invited the Guardian Angels to New Haven and live in Greer controlled buildings. It was Greer who started the Edgewood Park Defense Patrol. The New York Times reported that Greer’s son carried a gun while he patrolled the streets back in 2007, much to the consternation of City officials at the time.

It was Greer who testified before the Connecticut State Legislature against same sex marriage and the damage it would cause to children: Greer stated the following to members of the Judiciary Committee: “I wish to reiterate Judaism’s longstanding opposition to any same sex relationships... The Torah perspective on homosexual relationships is informed by biblical disapproval, a strong disapproval. Leviticus 1822 - again, that’s set forth as Exhibit B, where that

negative injunction follows a detailed list of prohibited sexual associations. It is worth perusing. I quote, 'Do not lie with a male as you would with a woman since this is a disgusting perversion.' Casuistry and intellectualisms cannot efface and expunge the wholehearted opposition of the Bible to these prohibited sexual relationships, including homosexuality. These two sections of the Bible form the basis of Connecticut's statutes regarding definitions of marriage and prohibited sexual relationships. Should we choose to abandon the founding principles of Connecticut law? From the purely social perspective, the bills before the committee are ominous... These bills would be a further, perhaps fatal assault on the already imperiled institution of marriage. We hear a lot about the best interest of the child. We didn't have to hear about this 30 or 40 years ago. The family was intact. Also legalizing same sex marriages which, by biological definition, even as to form, can never have anything to do with procreation, would obscure further still the vital link between marriage and children. It would convey the message that childbearing and child rearing are matters entirely distinct and irrelevant to marriage with the emotional uncertainty and instability for the next generation. Shades of Huxley's Brave New World and those tragic consequences, the message is subtle but devastating."

In short, Greer has publicly denied allegations of child molestation, both in the courthouse and in the media. Greer has attacked his accusers in the courtroom and in court filings. Greer denied these allegations even while he invoked his Fifth Amendment right to remain silent. Greer has launched a vigorous, litigious, and costly defense to hinder the collection of the \$21 million jury verdict by Mr. Mirlis. If you added up the value of Greer's personal assets and the assets of the Yeshiva of New Haven you would not even come close to \$21 million. Greer's vigorous defense of his assets can only be motivated by malice towards Mr. Mirlis, and contempt directed at the United States District Court. To allow Greer to abuse the legal process and yet at the same time benefit from it "on his terms would sanction an impermissible double standard." Flake v. Arpaio.

I respectfully request that your Honor allow public access to financial documents, deposition(s) and related financial information of Daniel Greer and the Yeshiva of New Haven obtained during post judgment discovery. I further respectfully request that the videotape deposition of Aviad Hack be made publicly available.

Very Truly Yours,

Lawrence S. Dressler