

RICHARD E. BRODSKY ATTORNEY AT LAW

66 W. FLAGLER STREET, 9TH FLOOR • MIAMI, FLORIDA 33130 • PHONE: 786-220-3328 • RBRODSKY@THEBRODSKYLAWFIRM.COM

BY FAX TRANSMISSION: 212-805-6382

June 16, 2010

Hon. Victor Marrero
United States District Court
Daniel Patrick Moynihan
United States Courthouse
500 Pearl Street
New York, New York 10007-1312

Re: Maridom Limited v. Standard Chartered, etc.,
No. 10-cv-920; Lopez v. Standard Chartered, etc.,
No. 10-cv-919; consolidated with No. 09-cv-118


Dear Judge Marrero:

I write on behalf of my clients, the plaintiffs in the *Maridom* action, referred to above, and, with the authority of Laurence Curran, on behalf of his client, Ricardo Lopez, the plaintiff in the *Lopez* action, referred to above. For ease of reference, these four parties will be referred to in this letter as the "Plaintiffs".

Now pending before the Court is a motion to dismiss filed by the Standard Chartered Defendants (DE 25, No. 10-cv-920). All authorized briefing is concluded. The response of the "Florida Plaintiffs" (those in *Headway*, *Maridom*, *Lopez* and *Valladolid*) to the motion to dismiss was filed on May 3, 2010 (DE 66, No. 10-cv-920).

The Plaintiffs seek leave from the Court to file a sur-reply of no more than two pages with respect to a pertinent decision that was issued on May 5, 2010, two days after the filing of the Florida Plaintiffs' response. We believe that a portion of this decision, in *CRT Investments, Limited v. Merkin*, No. 601052-09 (N.Y. Sup. Ct.), is highly pertinent to the Standard Chartered Defendants' motion to dismiss the misrepresentation claims filed by the *Maridom* Plaintiffs and Mr. Lopez in their respective amended complaints. We wish to bring this aspect of the *CRT* decision to Your Honor's attention and to argue why it supports the viability of our misrepresentation claims.

In accordance with Your Honor's June 8, 2010 endorsement of the *Anwar* Plaintiffs' request for leave to file a sur-reply in No. 09-cv-118, were Your Honor to grant our request, we would not include in our sur-reply any material other than




Hon. Victor Marrero
June 16, 2010
Page 2

reference to the *CRT Investments* decision. We also would have no objection to the Standard Chartered Defendants' being granted the right to file a brief reply to our sur-reply if the Court were to grant us leave to file the sur-reply.

We have consulted with counsel for the Standard Chartered Defendants, who, through Ms. Nelles, have stated that they have no objection to the request as stated herein.


Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,



Richard E. Brodsky

cc: Counsel for Standard Chartered Defendants (by email)
Counsel for Standard Chartered Plaintiffs (by email)
Counsel for other parties in *Anwar* (by email)

Request GRANTED. Plaintiffs are authorized to submit a sur-reply brief not to exceed 2 pages limited to bringing to the Court's attention the pertinence of the state court decision referred to above.	
SO ORDERED:	
6-16-10	
DATE	VICTOR MARRERO, U.S.D.J.