1

```
1219ASAFCps
1
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
      SAFFLANE HOLDINGS, LTD., et al.,
 3
 4
                     Plaintiffs,
 5
                 V.
                                               11 CV 1679 (MHD) (DLC)
6
      GAGOSIAN GALLERY,
 7
                     Defendant.
 8
          -----x
9
                                               New York, N.Y.
10
                                               January 9, 2012
                                               2:30 p.m.
11
12
     Before:
13
                         HON. MICHAEL H. DOLINGER
14
                                              Magistrate Judge
15
                                APPEARANCES
16
     AARON RICHARD GOLUB, ESQUIRE, PC
17
           Attorneys for Plaintiff Safflane Holdings, Ltd.
           and Robert Wylde
     BY: NEHEMIAH S. GLANC, ESQ.
18
     WITHERS BERGMAN LLP
19
           Attorneys for Defendant Gagosian Gallery
20
     BY: BRIAN DUNEFSKY, ESQ.
           DARA HAMMERMAN, ESQ.
21
      SNR DENTON US LLP
22
           Attorneys for Defendant Jan Cowles
      BY: DAVID R. BAUM, ESQ.
23
     CHARLES COWLES, Pro Se
24
25
```

1 (In open court)

THE COURT: What is the current posture of this case?

And by "this case," let me make it clear I'm referring to the

Safflane lawsuit against Gagosian, etc.

MR. GLANC: Nehemiah Glanc for Safflane and Robert Wylde from Richard Golub's office. The matter is being settled. I think the only item left is an assignment of our claims, plaintiffs' claims, against Charles Cowles, assigning those claims to Gagosian Gallery, which we are in the midst of negotiating, and hopeful we should have that done this week. Other than that, the matter is settled.

THE COURT: I had thought that these terms had previously been agreed to, including the assignment of whatever claims Safflane has against Mr. Cowles to Gagosian. This has not been reduced to a stipulation?

MR. GLANC: We're in the midst of doing that, Judge.

THE COURT: How complicated can an assignment be?

MR. GLANC: Because we have an indemnification provision somewhere, discussing an indemnification provision. That's the only outstanding matter.

THE COURT: What does the case involve in terms of discovery and other proceedings?

MR. GLANC: In terms of discovery, that was, I believe, both -- I think all sides completed document discovery, if I'm correct. And depositions, there were two

depositions that were taken. And then the matter settled.

THE COURT: Except it hadn't completely settled. I mean, I'm used to statements or representations in this case from various counsel that are, shall we say, not always precise and occasionally not quite accurate. But I'm somewhat surprised, given the fact that there were explicit representations made to me that this case had settled except with regard to claims against Mr. Cowles and that that was being assigned, as part of the settlement, to Gagosian, and now suddenly none of this has happened.

MR. GLANC: It has. The stipulation of dismissal is being signed. I think it's even being filed.

THE COURT: OK. So there's a stipulation of dismissal that dismisses the claims of Safflane and Wylde against Gagosian?

MR. GLANC: Yes.

THE COURT: So they're done. And so at this point, the only thing left is claims by Safflane against Mr. Cowles, right?

MR. GLANC: Correct.

THE COURT: And am I correct in understanding that at a certain point Judge Cote entered a default against

Mr. Cowles?

MR. GLANC: Correct.

THE COURT: Currently, your client either is going to

have to pursue its remedies against Mr. Cowles by way of an inquest or we'll dismiss those claims. When are you prepared to do that?

MR. GLANC: What we're going to do is, we're going to sign that claim against Mr. Cowles.

THE COURT: You have a week to do that. Otherwise you can show up here next week. We will set a date and time for you to do an inquest. This is ridiculous.

Harriet, what does our schedule look like in the next couple weeks?

THE CLERK: Thursday, January 19, we're open all morning. Tuesday the 17th we're open at 2 p.m.

THE COURT: Which date would you like?

MR. GLANC: We'll pick the 19th, Judge.

THE COURT: OK. 19th, 10 a.m., inquest.

Are you going to proceed by affidavit or by live witnesses?

MR. GLANC: I'm not sure, Judge. Again, we were almost -- we are going to have our assignment done. That was the last --

THE COURT: Except that it's not done. You were going to have it done a long time ago. And we're moving forward.

Are you going do it by affidavit, or are you going to do it by live witness, assuming you haven't assigned the claim by then?

	MR.	. GLA1	NC: I	need	d to	discuss	it	with	my	client.	-
cannot	make	that	decis	ion r	nyse:	lf.					

THE COURT: OK. You have until the close of business tomorrow to inform the Court in writing whether you want to proceed by affidavit or by live witness.

By the way, is Gagosian represented here today?

MR. DUNEFSKY: Yes.

THE COURT: You're taking this all in?

MR. DUNEFSKY: I am.

THE COURT: OK. So in the interim, the claims get assigned to Gagosian and Gagosian will appear on the 19th. OK?

MR. DUNEFSKY: I could tell you, if that is the case --

THE COURT: That's the case.

MR. DUNEFSKY: -- we would presume to proceed by affidavit as opposed to live witnesses.

THE COURT: What is the nature of the claims that are being talked about at this time?

MR. DUNEFSKY: It's Safflane's claim against Cowles on the underlying proceeding for breach of contract, essentially, and the measure of damages we would propose is the difference between what Safflane recovered from Gagosian and the fair market value of the painting at the time of the inquest. I think it's as simple as that.

THE COURT: The one specific painting.

MR. DUNEFSKY: Correct, the Tansey.

THE COURT: The Tansey. And is it the case that, whatever the settlement was, that involved a payment of funds? Parenthetically, as I recall, there were two paintings of issue. Was there an allocation of amount to each separate painting?

MR. DUNEFSKY: Not in the settlement agreement.

THE COURT: So are you going to have to then somehow prove what portion of the total amount that was paid is attributable to the paintings?

MR. DUNEFSKY: I presume we would. And we made an argument on that basis in connection with our other default that we moved for. It's in those papers. I could discuss it with you now, or we're happy to present it next week. But we have a theory as to what it should be.

THE COURT: If, as appears to be the case, the application for damages on the Safflane claim is going to be made by affidavit, that would be due, of course, the 19th, as we have said. Any response would be due by the 26th, one week later.

What day of the week is the 19th?

THE CLERK: Thursday.

THE COURT: Thursday, OK.

And then any reply would be due January 30.

Now, you alluded to a motion, as I understand it, for

a default judgment, which is pending on behalf of Gagosian. Is this correct?

MR. DUNEFSKY: That's correct.

THE COURT: And that's also directed at Mr. Cowles.

MR. DUNEFSKY: That's correct.

THE COURT: And to what extent and in what respect do the claims for which the default is being sought differ from the claims that we've referred to as the Safflane claims?

MR. DUNEFSKY: The measure of damages would be different. In the matter Gagosian v. Cowles, default, Gagosian is seeking the amount it paid as damages, plus its attorney's fees. That would not be included in the measure of damages in the proceeding that brings us here today.

THE COURT: I should mention, I have not raised this issue before, I haven't had the parties in front of me in this context, but it is my understanding that although in this case the parties that appeared in the case have consented to my jurisdiction, that to the extent that there is a default application against a defaulting defendant who has not consented, that I am not in a position to enter judgment and that, therefore, whatever decision I would render would be in the form of a report and recommendation. If you have a different understanding of the law on this point, obviously you are free to submit any learning that you have on this point to me. You should certainly do that by the 19th.

MR. DUNEFSKY: I take it you prefer it in advance so you're not wasting your time, potentially, on the 19th?

THE COURT: Well, either way, I'm going to end up making an initial decision. If I had the jurisdiction to do it myself without a report and recommendation it would be a final decision. Otherwise it's going to be a report and recommendation to Judge Cote.

MR. DUNEFSKY: I understand.

THE COURT: But either way, I'll deal with it. So obviously if you can get it in before the 19th, that would be fine. Otherwise, we'll work with what we get.

MR. DUNEFSKY: Understood.

THE COURT: When we get it. But at least it will be here by the 19th.

Are there any other matters that we should address at this time?

MR. DUNEFSKY: I don't believe so. By order it's clear that this was a conference to discuss what's going to happen at the inquest. I believe your Honor has identified all the issues that should arise on the 19th. That's it from our perspective.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. BAUM: Your Honor, David Baum for Jan Cowles. I wanted to introduce Mr. Charles Cowles to the Court.

THE COURT: Greetings and salutations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. BAUM: As your Honor is aware, I merely noted that
although these parties may want to proceed by affidavit and
your Honor noted a response date for that affidavit, I don't
know if Mr. Cowles wants to actually appear in person in
connection with those affidavits, or if he wanted to submit
replies. I thought the matter might be discussed with
Mr. Cowles and the Court.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Cowles, it's up to you. What's your wish at this point procedurally speaking?

MR. COWLES: Well, I'm sorry, I'm not an authority on this, but I just wish the whole thing would disappear.

THE COURT: I have no doubt that that wish is typically shared by defendants in many cases. Alas, we are not magicians here and so the case is not about to disappear, at least as we see it today.

MR. COWLES: I believe the painting is now back at the museum.

MR. GLANC: No, it is not, your Honor.

THE COURT: What is the status of the painting? I had understood that it was to be returned sometime in late December.

MR. GLANC: Within 30 days of late December, I understand.

THE COURT: So that would extend to late January.

MR. GLANC: Yes, sir.

1	MR. COWLES: Do we have a settlement agreement?
2	THE COURT: If, Mr. Cowles, you want to resolve any
3	matters that you have with the various other parties in this
4	litigation, obviously, you are free to attempt to do so. You
5	should discuss that separately with the attorneys after today's
6	session if they're available and see if, by dint of an effort
7	on your part, you can make the rest of the case disappear.
8	That's between you and the attorneys.
9	MR. COWLES: And do I have to ask about a settlement
10	agreement?
11	THE COURT: Do you have to ask? I don't know what you
12	mean by asking about it.
13	MR. COWLES: Do we have a settlement agreement?
14	THE COURT: Are you asking whether you have a
15	settlement agreement with any of the other parties?
16	MR. COWLES: Right.
17	THE COURT: Have you entered into a settlement
18	agreement, to your knowledge?
19	MR. COWLES: Not to my knowledge, no.
20	THE COURT: In that case I don't think you have a
21	settlement agreement. Settlement agreements come when both
22	sides agree to terms of. If you haven't agreed to terms,
23	there's no settlement agreement with you.
24	MR. BAUM: Your Honor, I can probably act as an
25	interpreter for a moment. I believe what Mr. Cowles is asking,

as he has asked me, is, he wanted the settlement agreement between them so he knows what he is being demanded to repay them for.

THE COURT: OK. I follow that.

MR. DUNEFSKY: There is a settlement agreement attached to our motion for default judgment.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. BAUM: No, it's not. Your Honor, it has not been -- it's submitted to the Court, but I do not believe it was provided to the parties. I believe it was sealed.

MR. DUNEFSKY: Your Honor, Mr. Baum by his own admission is not representing a party here, and he happens to be wrong about this, so I take issue with his speaking about this.

MR. COWLES: We represent a party, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Baum, I --

MR. COWLES: Sorry, your Honor.

THE COURT: I know your desires in this matter and I'll deal with them eventually.

Mr. Dunefsky, when you served a copy of the default motion on Mr. Cowles, did you include a copy of the settlement?

MR. DUNEFSKY: We did, yes. Absolutely.

THE COURT: Good. So at this point, what we will look for is, on the 19th, assuming that the assignment is finally finalized, we will look for Gagosian to be submitting whatever

papers it does, and serve a copy, obviously, on Mr. Cowles, and at that point Mr. Cowles will have the week to respond to it.

And two days, then, for a reply. And in the interim, I will endeavor to address the motion for a default judgment by Gagosian's own behalf.

Anything else at this point?

MR. COWLES: I don't think so, no.

THE COURT: OK. And as I said, if you think you can settle whatever claims are pressed against you by -- I assume it's likely to be Gagosian alone, although for the moment part of it is Safflane -- you are free to do so. Indeed, I would encourage it. Do what you can.

MR. COWLES: I'm not aware that they have actually asked me for anything.

THE COURT: OK. You may want to take a little bit of time to discuss with Mr. Cowles.

MR. DUNEFSKY: We're always happy to try to work things out and avoid the Court's involvement if we can.

THE COURT: OK. Go in peace.