

George E. Pataki
Governor



Judith A. Calogero
Commissioner

New York State Division of Housing and Community Renewal

Office of Rent Administration

Gertz Plaza
92-31 Union Hall Street
Jamaica, NY 11433

August 17, 2006

UD410008HL

UD410009HL

UD410010HL

UD410011HL

UD410012HL

188 E. 93rd St.

New York, NY 10128

Sky Management Corp.
226 E. 54th St., Suite 402
New York, NY 10022
Attn: Ben Ohebshalom
Jon Ohebshalom

Re: Enforcement Case Nos.: UD410008/12-HL

Dear Parties:

This letter is being sent to summarize the conference held July 28, 2006 regarding the above referenced complaints of harassment. The conference was attended by complaining tenants UD410011HL, UD410008HL, UD410012HL and UD410010HL, various tenant observers and members of the Shalom Tenants Alliance, Aliya Feldman of Senator Thomas Duane's office, Justine Almada an aide to Council Member Garodnick, owner agents Ben Ohebshalom and Jon Ohebshalom, managing agent Larry Quinones and owner's attorney James Marino.

UD410011HL provided an overview of the tenants' complaints. She stated because of the owner's actions that there had been at least 64 vacancies in the last three years and five apartments had been eliminated. She stated that tenants had been retaliated against in the past because they had filed complaints.

Complaining tenant UD410010HL stated that on January 30, 2006 there was a major leak in the apartment above his caused by a broken pipe during the renovation to that apartment. The Fire Department was called and shut off the electricity. No one was in the apartment when the leak occurred. The leak occurred because the pipe was not capped. An agent came with a camera to record the damage. Sky Management advised that they would not pay for the damage caused by the leak but he should make a claim on his own homeowner's policy. The tenant has not pursued a claim against management or his insurance company.

Right after the flood, on February 2, 2006 the tenant received a Notice to Cure, accusing him of overcrowding his apartment with possessions. The owner inspected his apartment in March and found no problem with clutter. The matter was not pursued.

The tenant also said there has been a lack of heat and hot water at times and complained that the owner used inexperienced workers, which has caused problems in the past, such as the leak on January 30, 2006.

UD410009HL did not attend the conference but provided authorization for UD410011HL and/or UD410012HL to present his case and provided a statement dated July 27, 2006. The tenant alleged that in April 2004 he was contacted by Sky Management that access was needed based on a leak from apartment 3N in the apartment above his. He allowed access under the condition that UD410011HL could be in the apartment. However, there was no evidence of any leaking from the above apartment into his apartment. Two days later he was again called by Sky Management and told that they had to enter his apartment because of a severe leak from apartment 3N. UD410011HL advised that several hours after the leak was repaired she heard someone in his apartment. UD410009HL returned to find the bathroom ceiling patched but unfinished and the bathroom was in filthy condition with plaster, dust and debris throughout. When the tenant contacted Karen at Sky Management about the unauthorized entry, she denied knowing anything about the incident.

Thereafter, the tenant had trouble having his bathroom painted. An access date was arranged on November 4, 2004. However, the painter stated he only had permission to prime the ceiling, not to paint. When Karen at Sky Management was contacted she advised the tenant that she could not give permission to have the apartment painted. The tenant became so frustrated he painted the apartment himself.

On March 13, 2006 Karen contacted the tenant to request access to repair the fire escape on March 14, 2006. Ben Shalom got on the phone and said it was an emergency and the owner needed immediate access. The tenant asked if UD410011HL could be in the apartment when access was given. Mr. Shalom asked if someone else could be present since there was litigation between the owner and UD410011HL. No appointment was made, yet on March 14, 2006, while the tenant was sleeping, Steve from Sky Management entered the apartment and said he was given permission to enter and oversee the repairs. When the tenant called Sky Management, an agreement was arranged where the tenant was given an extra hour to have his office manager present while the repairs took place.

On June 20, 2006 the tenant received a message at work that access was again needed for fire escape repairs. He called back and asked if entry could be delayed for thirty minutes until his office manager could be present. However, when she got to the apartment, the owner's contractor was already in the apartment doing work.

UD410011HL alleged various incidents demonstrating that the owner harassed her directly, retaliated against her because she filed complaints and/or attempted to "demonize" her to other tenants. The tenant stated there was a major problem with garbage accumulation in 2003 after the owner took title. In September 2003 the tenant filed a building wide complaint with DHCR about this problem, docket number RI410016-B. In response, on November 18, 2003 the owner put up a wall to hide the garbage accumulation behind the wall. This didn't solve the problem and instead created a barrier that obstructed the courtyard and garden and caused tenants to be upset. When tenants called Sky Management to complain, Ben Shalom told them that the wall had been installed in response to UD410011HL's complaint. He told her that if she would withdraw her complaint he would take down the wall. When she agreed, Mr. Ohebshalom edited the withdrawal letter she wrote to DHCR. UD410011HL felt coerced to

withdraw the complaint since tenants were blaming her for the erection of the wall. Tenants were abusive towards her and she received phone calls and e-mails from tenants blaming her.

On November 6, 2003, tenants met with Ben and Jon Shalom at the office of Assemblyman Jonathan Bing to discuss outstanding issues. An HPD inspection resulted following the meeting and the inspectors agreed the garbage was stored improperly and required the owner to provide additional trash cans. As the cans were being provided, the inspectors pointed out that there were air conditioners and gates on windows leading to fire escapes in several windows (UD410011HL believes Ben Shalom pointed this out to the inspectors while alone with them as the inspectors were not at the building to inspect for these items). Mr. Shalom then sent letters to tenants to remove illegal gates and air conditioners and named UD410011HL in this letter in another effort to “demonize” her. However, no efforts were ever made to enforce these letters.

In March 2004, tenants filed another building-wide complaint with DHCR (docket number SB410012-B) which concerned, in part, the condition of plants in the courtyard. Ben Shalom then destroyed the garden in response and blamed the Tenants Association because the complaint stated, “trees are dying”. The owner met with tenants in response to the complaint and by phone call made to UD410011HL by James Marino, offered to allow tenants to replant the garden if tenants would withdraw the complaint. UD410011HL stated a subsequent letter sent by Mr. Marino also attempted to “demonize” her by referencing her failure to respond to the owner’s “generous” offer in a letter sent to the complaining tenants.

UD410011HL alleged she was physically harassed by Ben Shalom in an incident that occurred on June 16, 2005. This incident was discussed at the harassment conference of UD410026HL. This incident and the owner’s response are detailed in the summary letter to that conference dated June 19, 2006.

On April 17, 2004, three days after the owner destroyed the garden and three days after the tenant received a letter from the owner demanding that a web cam UD410011HL had installed to document garbage accumulation in the courtyard be removed, a cascading flood of water entered her bathroom from the ceiling above. The flood originated from the construction in the apartment above. No response to complaints made by the tenant occurred all weekend. On Monday, the owner demanded access because the commercial tenant below her apartment was complaining about a leak.

The tenant stated she has received various threatening letters from the owner including a letter accusing her of trespassing when she allowed an inspector into apartment 1K and Mr. Ben Shalom threatened to come by her apartment every day to see if her door was unlocked. The tenant also received a threatening letter for her to remove the web cam and a letter to remove an “obstruction of the fire escape”. The tenant stated that these letters were just pretexts to harass her as the owner is not concerned about fire safety. On the occasion when the inspector was let into apartment 1K, a violation was issued based on working without a permit. Despite the stop work order, work resumed again once the inspector left the premises. The tenant complained that the Building Department (DOB) does not effectively enforce its regulations. The owner subsequently got a permit on July 16, 2004 which was pre-filed on July 9, 2004 and placed the permit in the window of apartment 1K where only she could see it.

UD410011HL stated that the owner has failed to provide intercom service and hot water service as required by law. The intercom is repeatedly broken and the tenant has had to stay

home on numerous occasions when the owner had workers attempt to make repairs. Since the plumbing has been reconfigured based on renovations that were made, now it takes several minutes for the hot water to reach the apartment after it is turned on. The complaint filed by [UD410011HL](#) states that the problems worsened after the superintendent was removed in August 2004. A violation for inadequate hot water was imposed by HPD based on an inspection conducted on May 9, 2005 (#588293). The landlord then demanded access, which was eventually arranged for July 19, 2005. Despite testing done that date, the tenant stated that no improvement occurred. Another violation was imposed by HPD on February 6, 2006 for inadequate hot water. The tenant stated that the owner falsely certified correction of both hot water violations.

[UD410011HL](#) also alleged that the owner has been attempting to eliminate the Tenants' Association by causing or encouraging tenant association members to vacate and otherwise interfere with their rights to organize and/or file complaints. Tenants have been asked to withdraw from the Association. One tenant was told he wouldn't get back excess security unless he withdrew. Complainant [UD410008HL](#) was initially told he wouldn't get his lease unless he both withdraw from the Association and not make any complaints.

[UD410011HL](#) stated that the owner sought to portray her to other tenants as the reason former superintendent Mario left the building. According to [UD410011HL](#), Mario had been a very diligent super prior to ownership by the Ohebshaloms. Thereafter, he allowed garbage to pile up. Since he left on Labor Day 2004 there has been no resident superintendent. [UD410011HL](#) stated she had nothing to do with Mario leaving the building as she had been a big supporter of his. Currently, superintendent services are not being provided as required as bags of garbage are left out on occasion.

There was a horizontal expansion of the property beginning in July 2005. As a result, a plywood hallway was constructed for tenants to utilize while construction was ongoing. This lasted almost one year and was dangerous, according to [UD410011HL](#). Stairs were constructed with no handrail. Lights were out in the hallway and on one occasion, July 24, 2005, she lost her balance at the top of the stairs and was severely scraped up as a result of her fall. HPD issued a violation for improper lighting in this area on July 5, 2005 and for failure to provide handrails on July 26, 2005.

[UD410008HL](#) stated that he had difficulty getting a lease in his name after the change in ownership. The lease originally was in the name of his brother and stayed in his brother's name after he moved out in 1991. He never had the lease changed over because it was obvious he was the tenant of record. When he asked Ben Shalom for a lease in his name he was initially told he would need to pay a vacancy increase. He was also told that he needed to withdraw from the Tenants' Association and agree to take no legal action against the owner to get a lease. Eventually, the owner took him to court after the tenant began withholding rent which resulted in an agreement whereby the owner provided him a lease in his name and the tenant paid the back rent.

Prior to issuing a lease in [UD410008HL](#)'s name the owner insisted on seeing identification and checks going back many years. Then Mr. Ben Shalom demanded that the tenant produce copies of his tax returns and a statement from his brother giving up rights to the apartment. Despite providing this documentation no lease was provided. The owner offered him \$5,000 to vacate the apartment.

At the time of the conference, **UD410008HL** was withholding rent based on the failure of the owner to repair windows in the apartment which the tenant stated were fifty years old. An agreement was reached at the conference where the owner agreed to provide new windows and a new sink and the tenant agreed to pay one-fortieth of the cost of the windows and sink in his rent and paid the back rent owed.

UD410012HL stated that he has had problems with the Shaloms from the beginning of their ownership. In September 2003 there was a plumbing blockage which had caused water damage in the tenant's bathroom from above. An agreement was reached to repair the leak from above and arrange repair of the bathroom after. While Ben Shalom represented that the repair had been made in apartment 2I, that tenant stated that no repairs had been made. In February 2004 that tenant's apartment was entered without authorization. Since repairs above were not completed, **UD410012HL** refused access to his apartment for repairs to the bathroom. He offered access once the upstairs repairs were done.

The owner brought a court action against him for access. As a result, access dates were agreed upon and the tenant agreed to pay \$200 in attorney's fees to the owner rather than pay his attorney more than that per hour to contest this amount.

The agreement in court did not cover repairs to the bathroom floor which were needed and exposure to lead paint. His family was out of the apartment three days while lead abatement and/or tests took place in March 2005. Then the owner had to come and do further abatement and do repainting causing more disruption. In the beginning of 2006 the tenant noticed that paint was again bubbling up and peeling.

In September 2003 when Ben Ohebshalom was supervising the plumbing repair, the owner brought a renewal lease. The lease was to go into effect in October 2003 and didn't provide for the ninety days notice required by law. When the tenant pointed this out to Ben Shalom, the owner screamed at him and threatened to fill the courtyard up with trash and to get rid of all the pets in the building. Because of the owner's reaction, the tenant thereafter agreed to sign the lease as presented if the owner would get rid of a \$44 charge the tenant felt was inappropriate. The lease was executed on November 6, 2003 at the office of Assemblyman Bing.

In 2005 the tenant also failed to receive a timely renewal lease. The owner refused to accept rent checks, stating that the renewal had been sent and the higher rent was owed. When the tenant asked to see proof of what was sent, the documents presented showed delivery of the mail was addressed to apartment 1L and only a single page and no rider was presented. On January 3, 2006 a proper renewal was sent and the lease went into effect ninety days from then. However, the rent registration provided to DHCR does not properly reflect this renewal.

The tenant also alleged he does not get proper rent receipts. In April 2004 he received some receipts but they didn't reflect the date of payment. It made it appear that he paid his rent late. The tenant has written numerous letters about this problem. He discussed it with new managing agent Larry Quinones without success. He finally got receipts for January through May of 2006 but never received receipts from July 2004 through December 2005 nor June and July 2006.

The tenant alleged that heat has been a problem throughout the Shalom's ownership and was discussed at Assemblyman Bing's office. **UD410012HL** calls in a complaint whenever the heat registers 66 degrees or less in his bedroom. Two heat violations have been written as a

result. When the tenant attended the HPD hearing to determine if the owner should be penalized for providing inadequate heat, the owner falsely claimed there was an access issue. The owner's attorney, David Haberman, asked him about a buyout agreement on that date. The owner signed a consent order agreeing to provide heat for the entire building. However, the tenant believes this issue has not been resolved and problems with heat have been worse since there is no resident superintendent.

The front door to the building was damaged in April 2005. The condition was dangerous as glass was shattered and there were sharp edges. The door was temporarily repaired with duct tape and took two months for the complete repair to take place.

The tenant complained about the manner in which new keys to the lobby door were distributed after that lock was changed. The lock was replaced before keys were given out and as a result his family was locked out temporarily. He finally received two keys at the holdover proceeding for access and was refused a third key.

Other problems included an electrical interruption which wasn't repaired for forty eight hours and an intercom which is constantly breaking down. In June 2005 there was a broken sewer pipe which resulted in raw sewage being spewed into 1660 Third Ave. The owner and commercial tenant disputed who was responsible and the sewage sat until September 2005.

UD410011HL also addressed problems in the common areas which affected all tenants. She stated that the owner's expansion program that began in May 2005 resulted in the garden being eliminated. She does not believe the DHCR decision addressed this issue as that decision found that a change in how the garden was maintained would be de minimis, but here, the entire garden was removed. A new complaint may be filed regarding this issue.

The expansion project also resulted in a lack of space in which to place the garbage. Originally the owner opened a wall between 1656 and 1658 Third Ave. and the former lobby of 1656 was used as a rubbish room. But HPD said that it was impermissible to have an opening between the two buildings. The owner then moved the garbage to the front of the building. At this time there was a major rat infestation in the basement exacerbated by the sewage spill. The rat infestation spread throughout the block and a sanitation violation was issued. The garbage room was then moved to the basement of the 1658 building where it is presently located. Tenants have to go down steep stairs with a handrail only halfway up in order to reach this area. The tenant feels this area is in violation of the Multiple Dwelling Law.

After the sewage spill, HPD found a violation for an open sewer pit. The owner certified this violation as corrected on August 4, 2005 but pictures on August 8, 2005 show the condition was not corrected by that date.

The expansion project has also resulted in a lack of fire safety at the building. The party wall opening between the two buildings was found to be illegal. This rendered the party wall balconies illegal. A constructed combustible plywood tunnel was to serve as the primary and secondary means of egress for various apartments in the 1656 and 1658 buildings which have party wall balconies instead of fire escapes. No fire safety plan was filed until about two months before the conference. The Department of Buildings shut down the project for a period of time based on the fire safety problem from June 2005 to January 2006. This issue was raised at a meeting at Senator Duane's office in February 2006. City agencies then did a joint inspection which required the owner to close the party wall, restore the lobby and build a fire escape. A fire

watch guard was put in place temporarily until these steps could be completed. During this period the owner continued the project and created dangerous conditions at the building by using a flame thrower to heat up the tar, according to [UD410011HL](#). The owner welded a new fire escape to the existing corroded fire escape and used spot welding instead of shop welding according to the tenant. The new fire escape hasn't been painted. A violation still remains for the fire escape. The owner is in default of the DOB violation but there has been no enforcement by that agency. When the tenant tried to file a decrease in services complaint with DHCR about the lack of a fire escape, she was referred to DOB. There is also no light in back of the building which is another unsafe condition.

The owner responded to the tenants' complaints both at the conference and in written answers submitted prior to the conference. Concerning the complaint of [UD410010HL](#), the owner states that this relates to a single incident in early 2006 involving a leak from above, which does not constitute a pattern of harassment. The tenant was given a written notice concerning the cluttered nature of his apartment, he cured this condition and no further action needed to be taken. The subsequent repair work to the tenant's ceiling light fixture has been corrected. The tenant was properly referred to his insurance company to deal with matters of damages.

Concerning the matters raised in [UD410009HL](#)'s letter, the owner gave an emergency 24 hour notice on March 13, 2006 that entry was required on March 14, 2006. Therefore, the owner believes that entry on the 14th was justified given the emergency work needed to be done to the fire escape. Similarly, the owner believes the entry on June 20, 2006 was justified based on the emergency need to repair the fire escape after notice was given. The owner's answer states that the written complaint of the tenant only deals with an isolated incident in 2004, the leak in apartment 3N. The owner denied that repainting of the tenant's ceiling after the leak did not occur or that its contractors were instructed not to do such work.

As to [UD410011HL](#)'s complaint, the owner sought to address what was interpreted as her complaint, the unsightly garbage cans and garbage, by erecting a wall. When tenants became upset at the erection of the wall, an agreement was proposed whereby the owner would take down the wall if the tenant's would withdraw their complaint. The owner responded to the complaint in a way designed to protect itself against the complaint and properly refused to remove the wall unless the complaint was withdrawn.

Similarly, an offer of compromise was made after the tenants filed a complaint with DHCR concerning the garden. Mr. Marino stated that he knew the tenant's weren't going to win on this issue because of agency precedent, and therefore offered to allow the garden to be replanted with the tenants to maintain the garden as a compromise to avoid the nuisance and related costs of having to respond to this issue. Ultimately, the tenants chose not to accept this offer and lost at DHCR on this issue. He phoned [UD410011HL](#) to make this offer because she was the point person on this issue and followed up with a writing to all signatories to the complaint as was required and not based on any intent to "demonize" [UD410011HL](#).

It was pointed out that DOB regulations allow for permits to be issued after the fact and this is what occurred for apartment 1K. [UD410011HL](#) admitted she trespassed into a vacant apartment to allow the inspector into that area which resulted in an incorrect violation being issued.

The owner stated that it had addressed UD410011HL's hot water problems in the past. If she is still experiencing problems the owner would like access to investigate and try and address this issue. It was stated that UD410011HL is the only one complaining about hot water problems. The owner's answer states that of all the hot water complaints made by the tenant, only one resulted in a violation which dates back to May 2005.

Regarding the superintendent, the owner stated the super is currently Brian Sammit. He lives within ten minutes of the building and the owner believes it is in compliance with the Multiple Dwelling Law. The owner's answer stated that the prior super was not fired but left of his own accord. It was stated that UD410011HL had complained about the job he was doing and her comments played a part in his deciding to leave. The owner vigorously defended the work performed by the former super and the DHCR complaint as to this issue was dismissed.

The owner's answer states that the letter to UD410011HL concerning the air conditioning unit was not a threatening one and it was fully within its rights to send such a letter as this type of old-fashioned fire escape could not be blocked by air conditioners or anything else.

The answer states that numerous violations and stop work orders referenced by the tenant have now been dismissed. The violation for low and improper lighting was rectified. The violation concerning the handrail no longer appears on HPD's records. The need for a fire watch has also been removed from the record. The stop work order referenced by the tenant was rescinded.

As to UD410008HL, the issue of his right to succession was not immediately apparent to the owner who properly asked for various forms of proof concerning the relationship and the date the brother vacated. Prior records all showed the brother as the tenant of record. Initially, the owner offered a compromise which would allow the tenant to stay in the apartment if he would pay a vacancy increase. No lawsuit was brought and the tenant was subsequently given a lease in his own name. The owner properly brought a nonpayment action for rent that was due and the stipulation required the tenant to pay all rent without an abatement. The balance of UD410008HL's complaint was resolved at the conference.

As to UD410012HL's complaint, it was stated that the owner had proof that the 2005 renewal was timely mailed. However, due to an error, the proof had the wrong apartment number typed on it, so the owner agreed to the later effective date. The registration concerning this lease will be amended with DHCR.

Regarding the broken front door, the owner ordered a replacement right away but it took time to arrive. The door was laminated so it wasn't dangerous and the duct tape was only meant as a temporary measure.

As to the keys, the owner's intent was to get the keys in and distributed before the lock was changed. However, on September 23rd the lock was broken so it had to be repaired and notices were put up as to how the tenants could obtain the new keys.

The intercom will be investigated and will be repaired as needed. The sewage spill was an accident caused by the commercial property and corrected by the commercial tenant.

It is the owner's position that it has provided UD410012HL with rent receipts as required by law. It was agreed in the future, that rent receipts will be provided each month as required by

Rent Stabilization Code Section 2525.2 which will indicate the date of payment made by the tenant.

The owner's answer states, in regard to heat, that only one violation was issued, despite numerous heat complaints made by the tenant. With regard to that complaint, the owner agreed to a consent order to provide adequate heat and has certified correction with HPD. The owner's position is that it has not been allowed access to inspect and correct any heat problem.

UD410012HL stated that the convectors in his apartment work properly and thus there is not a need for access. The problem is that the boiler shuts off before adequate heat is provided. It was agreed that the heat issue will be monitored once the heating season begins and UD410012HL (or any other tenant) will advise the owner and me of any heating problem that occurs.

The owner's answer states that the owner's holdover action against UD410012HL was fully justified based on the tenant's failure to provide access regarding window guards and peeling paint. The first stipulation resulted in an agreement for the tenant to provide access and a portion of the owner's attorney's fees and the owner was thereafter required to restore the case to the calendar which resulted in a second stipulation with additional dates agreed to for access.

The answer advises that the owner properly remediated lead paint in the apartment as required by Local Law 1. After the initial work was completed, one small area required a second appointment to remediate the remainder.

Regarding the common area issues raised by UD410011HL, the owner stated that the courtyard and garden issues were addressed in the decision to the DHCR complaint. The tenants' PAR was also denied. As to the garbage, a new garbage room has been located in the basement. The owner will look at the handrail to ensure it is being provided for the entirety of the stairs leading to the room but it is believed the handrail is proper. Fire doors are in place as is required by law.

Regarding the fire escape, DOB ultimately felt that the opening made negated the effectiveness of the fire balcony. Fire ladders were then placed. Violations were placed based on the bolts used. Hearings were held on this issue on the day prior to the conference and the week following the conference. The owner is dealing with DOB on this issue and intends to fully comply with any resulting requirements. The owner stated that the heating tools used by the roofers during the fire watch period were safe and did not increase the chances of a fire.

In response, UD410011HL stated that the owner knew, from the meeting at Assemblyman Bing's office on November 6, 2003, that the tenant concern as to the garbage was not how the garbage looked cosmetically, but rather that there were piles of garbage that were overflowing and not being properly contained. Thus, it was disingenuous for the owner to attempt to hide the garbage behind a wall some two weeks later as a means of attempting to address the tenants' concern.

As to the hot water, UD410011HL stated that the owner had people in her apartment for four hours attempting to address the hot water problem previously and she does not see a need for this process to be repeated. It was agreed that if the tenant can show other tenants in her line are having similar problems with hot water, then it will be assumed this is a system-wide problem throughout the line which the owner will have to address. Otherwise, if the problem is confined to UD410011HL, the owner can seek to address it through access to her apartment.

UD410011HL stated that she wants to ensure that the cellar garbage room is legal. As to the fire escape, the owner's architect should know the law and that opening the party wall would be blatantly dangerous to tenants. UD410012HL noted that the sewage spill was ultimately cleaned up by Sky Management employees and not by the commercial tenant.

While this office does not have expertise to determine issues concerning fire safety and whether the garbage room may be legally located in the basement, the legality of these issues will be monitored through the actions taken by the City agencies having primary jurisdiction. Parties should keep me apprised as to any developments in this regard.

An inspection may be conducted after the heating season starts to monitor the delivery of heat and hot water and to view any other problems that may exist at that time including janitorial services and intercom services. Evaluation of whether any further action by this office is required will be made thereafter, based not only on that inspection, but on the totality of the record presented, as summarized in this letter. While this letter has attempted to summarize what I believe are the most important complaints and responses to those complaints, due to the voluminous record, some issues may have been missed. The parties are free to send any corrections, additions, updates, etc. to my attention to be added to the file.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Jon Wallach
Associate Attorney

cc. James Marino, Esq.
Shalom Tenants Alliance