# JOEL H. HOLT, ESQ. P.C. 

2132 Company Street, Suite 2
Christiansted, St. Croix
U.S. Virgin Islands 00820

Tele. (340) 773-8709
Fax (340) 773-8677
E-mail: holtvi@aol.com

TO: Judge Ross
CC: Greg Hodges
FROM: Joel Holt
DATE: October 23, 2015
RE: Items to Be Dealt With Now Re Your October $15^{\text {th }}$ Memo

On October 15, 2015, you instructed the parties to respond by October 23rd as follows:
Now that we have significantly completed the separation and accounting for the Plaza stores, it is important that we don't lose our momentum. Therefore, as to the other partnership propertiesacknowledged or disputed, I request that the partners through their attorneys submit a list of all other properties that require the attention of the Liquidating Partner or the Court for separation. Please indicate on the list the basis for the assertion that the said property is partnership property.

Additionally, if there are motions pending before the Court that affects the disposition of the claimed partnership property, please identify the motions and indicate when they were filed and if they are fully briefed. Thereafter, I will bring them to the Court's attention for a speedy resolution.

As you know, there are many issues of contested property and amounts that require the further accounting Hamed is allowed to obtain as per the Court's Order - but there are three motions and several asset issues that the Hameds feel can be disposed of now.

## I. Motions

1. Hamed has three pending motions that are presently ripe for disposition, listed in Exhibit A. We can supply the full set of pleadings related to each motion if you would like us to do so. The Statute of Limitations motion for partial summary judgment is fully briefed and would advance matters the most as far as the partnership issues are concerned (basically Hamed believes that there is a 2007 cutoff date for claims between the partners).
2. By a verbal order, you issued a stay of the "claims" discovery, pending the sale of the three stores. We think this issue should be revisited at some point, perhaps
after the new year, as discovery needs to continue before all issues can be resolved.

## II. Asset Issues that can be Disposed of Now

1. One-half acre (approx.) at Estate Tutu in St. Thomas. This parcel has been the subject of recent correspondence. See Exhibit B for three letters. Attorney Hodges has agreed that the acreage at Tutu that is incorrectly titled in the name of United Corp. was a Partnership asset that is now actually owned by Plessen rather than United, stating in relevant part in the attached letter:
your analogy of this nonexistent claim to a purported claim that United Corporation owns the 1/2 acre parcel of land on St. Thomas is also wrong. As the last two bimonthly reports make crystal clear, that land is owned by Plessen. . . (Emphasis added.)

To assist you in understanding the parcel, I have attached documents related to the parcel in Exhibit C. Hamed asks that the parcel be transferred now to Plessen, by a deed from United, so the title will be as stated by Attorney Hodges. Plessen owns the adjacent parcel (Plessen is owned equally by both families) and this small parcel was purchased to provide access to that other, much larger parcel.
2. $\$ 2.7$ million removed by Yusuf. There is no dispute that on August 15, 2012, $\$ 2,784,706.25$ was unilaterally removed from the Partnership's operating bank account by Yusuf. See Exhibit D. Judge Brady has already made findings of fact as to these funds - and that they are the property of the Partnership. (There is no dispute that it is owed, just an accounting offset claimed that can be adjusted later as was the case with the East back rent. See Exhibit D at 2-4, for Judge Brady's Findings of Fact.) Hamed asks either that: (1) the entire \$2.7 million be paid by Yusuf into the Partnership Account overseen by the Master now, or (2) Hamed be paid his one-half directly by Yusuf now - approx. \$1.35 million plus accrued interest. It should be noted that this payment would also moot Hamed's claim against a parcel of property purchased by United (in Estate Diamond) with a portion of these funds. See Exhibit E. Otherwise, this property at Estate Diamond also qualifies as a partnership property that needs to be transferred back to the partnership now.
3. Litigation Fees and Costs removed by Yusuf-It is also uncontested that Yusuf unilaterally removed \$504,591.03 from the Partnership bank account during the litigation between himself and Hamed - which waas paid to a lawyer representing United Corporation against Hamed at the time when United was denying the existence of the partnership. Thus, Yusuf used Partnership funds to pay his/United's lawyer. Judge Brady also commented on this improper diversion of funds in his opinion finding there was a partnership and enjoining Yusuf from any further misconduct. See Exhibit D at 5. The checks totaled \$504,591.03, which are attached as Exhibit F. Hamed asks either that: (1) the entire amount
plus accrued interest be paid by Yusuf into the Partnership Account overseen by the Master now, or (2) Hamed be paid his one-half plus accrued interest directly by Yusuf now.
4. Parcel 4-H at the East Store. There is no dispute that Parcel 4-H Sion Farm was purchased with Partnership insurance proceeds after the 1992 fire. Hamed asks for a private auction using exactly the same format as we used for the Tutu Store.
5. Dorthea Land Investment by the partnership (\$802,966 owed to Hamed on this investment). This is an uncontested amount due to Hamed from a transaction that used Partnership funds to help someone else buy the Dorthea property in St. Thomas. The debt was repaid with interest, with Yusuf doing the closing and receiving these Partnership funds - half of which he was supposed to pay Hamed. Attached as Exhibit $\mathbf{G}$ is Yusuf's handwritten accounting of the amount due Mohammad Hamed from the sale which note he does not dispute that he gave to Hamed, although he has never turned these funds over to Hamed. Hamed asks either the entire amount plus accrued interest be paid to him by Yusuf now.
6. Daas Mortgage ( $\$ 79,000$ owed to Hamed). This is a mortgage to a son-in-law of Fathi's that came from Partnership funds. The accounting is attached as Exhibit H. Briefly, this is what the documents show:

- If you look at page 1 of the spreadsheet everything seems correct on it. (In other words, Daas appears to have paid the partnership in full.)
- At page 10, under the Heading "Attention: Mr. Ahed Daas" (in Yusuf's handwriting), it notes that Yusuf is owed $\$ 203,500$ and Hamed is owed the same.
- But if you look at the highlighted items on the first page, Yusuf had already collected $\$ 79,500.00$ from Daas for his personal use, leaving him being owed only \$124,000 (\$203,500 less \$79,500).
- Daas then paid Plaza Extra a check for the $\$ 327,500$, which was split 50 50 between Hamed and Yusuf ( $\$ 163,750$ each).
- Daas says the $\$ 327,500$ is the $\$ 124 \mathrm{k}$ still due Fathi (after a credit for the first $\$ 79,500$ payment to Fathi) and the $\$ 203,500$ due Hamed.
- In short, Fathi received $\$ 79,500$ more than Hamed on the partnership loan to Daas.

Hamed asks that the entire amount plus accrued interest be paid to him by Yusuf now.
7. Merrill-Lynch Account \#140-21722- There is an account that was created at Merrill Lynch in the name of a nephew of Fathi's (from St. Maartin) with Partnership funds. It still exists today. Fathi Yusuf used it for trading stocks. It should be returned to the Partnership, but Fathi, as Liquidating Partner, refuses to claim it for the Partnership despite repeated demands that he do so. We
believe it is because he wants the nephew to "claim" it and just give it all to him. The nephew did show up in St. Thomas about a year ago, but Merrill Lynch refused to release it because of the TRO in this case. The nephew then had Nizar (Fathi's lawyer) call me. Nothing has happened since then. Clearly this is Partnership funds -- the nephew would be screaming if it was really his. Hamed asks that the entire amount plus accrued interest be recovered into the Partnership Account overseen by the Master now

## Exhibit A

## Three Pending Motions Presently Ripe for Determination

1. Plaintiff Hamed's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment as to Statute of Limitations
a. Motion filed May 13, 2014
2. Hamed's Motion for Attorneys Fees for first VI Supreme Court Appeal by Yusuf
a. Motion filed October 23, 2013
3. Hamed's Motion for Attorneys Fees for second VI Supreme Court Appeal by Yusuf a. Motion filed March 3, 2015
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September 29, 2015
Gregory Hodges
Stefan B. Herpel
Dudley, Topper and Feuerzeig
1000 Frederiksberg Gade - Box 756
St. Thomas, VI 00804
Nizar A. DeWood
The Dewood Law Firm
Eastern Suburb, Suite 101
Christiansted, VI 00820
Re: Tax returns for Sixteen Plus, Peters' Farm and Plessen
Dear Counsel:
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the parcel of land on St. Thomas that he now claims United owns, rather than the Partnership, contrary to his sworn statement in his deposition.


Please get back to me at your earliest convenience on these points.


ATTORNEYS AT LAW

IA Frederiksberg Gade Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas U.S. Virgin Islands 00802

MAILINC ADDRESS:
P.O. BOX 756

ST. THOMAS, VI 00804
TELEPHONE: (340) 774-4422
Telefax: (340) 715.4400

GREGORY H. HODGES
DIRECT DIAL: (340) 715-4405
EMAIL: GHODGES©DIFLAW:COM

October 5, 2015

## VIA EMAIL: holtvi@aol.com

Joel H. Holt, Esq.
Law Offices of Joel H. Holt
2132 Company Street, Suite 2
Christiansted, VI 00820

## Re: Tax Returns for Peter's Farm, Plessen Enterprises, and Sixteen Plus

 Our File No. 6254-1-Dear Joel:

your analogy of this nonexistent claim to a purported claim that United Corporation owns the $1 / 2$ acre parcel of land on St. Thomas is also wrong. As the last two bimonthly reports make crystal clear, that land is owned by Plessen.


GHH:mjb
cc: Nizar A. DeWood, Esq. Carl Hartmann, III, Esq. R:IDOCSS 162541 IDRFTLTR11650033.DOCX

## JOEL H. HOLT, ESQ. P.C.

2132 Company Street, Suite 2
Christiansted, St. Croix
U.S. Virgin Islands 00820

Tale. (340) 773-8709
Fax (340) 773-8677
Email: holtvi@aol.com

October 21, 2015
Gregory Hodges
Dudley, Topper and Feuerzeig 1000 Frederiksberg Fade - Box 756
St. Thomas, VI 00804

## Re: Tax returns for Sixteen Plus, Peters' Farm and Plessen

Dear Greg:
Regarding my letter of September $29^{\text {th }}$ and your response, I would like to note the following points:

2. Additionally, thank you for your clarification that that the $1 / 2$ acre parcel titled in United on St. Thomas belongs to Plessen. Please let me know when you can do the paperwork necessary to transfer this parcel to Plessen or whether you want me to do so (glad to do it).


Please get back to me regarding the transfer of the $1 / 2$ acre parcel to Plessen at your earliest convenience. Thanks.

Cordially,


Joel H. Holt

## IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS DIVISION OF ST. CROIX



## PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF OBJECTION TO LIQUIDATING PARTNER'S BI-MONTHLY REPORTS

In his July $31^{\text {st }}$ report, the Liquidating Partner (Fathi Yusuf) admitted on page 5 that he had not previously provided the required bi-monthly accounting. The delivery of the voluminous accounting filings that was done in one large "document dump" hardly satisfies the obligations to provide meaningful, regular accounting information to Mohammad Hamed. Indeed, this conduct has prevented Hamed from doing his own accounting verification, which he has the right to do under the Liquidation Order, as noted in the August $14^{\text {th }}$ filing asking this Court for more time to complete this task.

However, Hamed would be remiss if he did not also point out that the Liquidating Partner has failed to account for many items, including (1) debts that should be
attributed to him but which he has allocated to the partnership and (2) the identification of assets of the partnership that he has either claimed as his own or abandoned.

By way of example, the Liquidating Partner allocated the purchase cost of two new condensers for the Plaza East store to himself, as they were purchased after the value of the store's equipment had been agreed to. However, he failed to allocate the cost of shipping and installation of these condensers to himself. Instead, he charged these costs to the partnership, which was improper. Of course, this item will be one of the matters addressed in the "claims portion" of the liquidation process. That process will commence once Hamed has had time to review all of the accounting records to determine what other items were improperly charged to the partnership by the Liquidating Partner (to his own benefit).

As for identifying assets, there are problems here as well. For example, in his July $31^{\text {st }} \mathrm{Bi}$-monthly report, the Liquidating Partner fails to identify a significant partnership asset, a Merrill-Lynch account that has in excess of $\$ 300,000$ in it, all of which came from Plaza Extra funds. In this regard, the account was placed in the name of a third party, a relative of Mr. Yusuf, even though the deposits came through partnership funds. Apparently the Liquidating Partner thinks Hamed has forgotten about this account, which is a significant partnership asset.

By way of another example, on pages 3-4 of his July $31^{\text {st }}$ report, the Liquidating Partner identifies a specific parcel of land in St. Thomas as partnership property, but he then claims the land for himself in that same report! Of course, when he was deposed prior to becoming the Liquidating Partner, Mr. Yusuf admitted this parcel was purchased with partnership funds. See Exhibit 1.

Notice of Objection
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Again, these items will become part of the "claims portion" of this liquidation process if not corrected in the Liquidating Partner's final Bi-monthly accounting. However, Hamed wishes to note his objections on the record to this entire accounting now, even though the issues in dispute need not be resolved by the Court at this stage of the liquidation process.

However, once the "claims process" does begin, these items of "self dealing" will warrant this Court modifying its Order that the Liquidating Partner be paid from partnership funds, as at that juncture the only remaining part of the liquidation process will be the adversarial "claims process." Clearly the Liquidating Partner should not be paid for claiming disputed partnership assets for himself.

Dated: August 18, 2015
Joel Holt, Holt, Esq.
Counsel for Plaintiff
Law Offices of Joel H. Holt
2132 Company Street,
Christiansted, VI 00820
Email: holtvi@aol.com
Tele: (340) 773-8709
Fax: (340) 773-8677
Carl J. Hartmann III, Esq.
Co-Counsel for Plaintiff
5000 Estate Coakley Bay,
Unit L-6
Christiansted, VI 00820
Email: carl@carlhartmann.com
Tele: (340) $719-8941$
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## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this $18^{\text {th }}$ day of August, 2015, I served a copy of the foregoing by email, as agreed by the parties, on:

Hon. Edgar Ross
Special Master
\% edgarrossjudge@hotmail.com
Sizar A. DeWood
The DeWood Law Firm
2006 Eastern Suburb, Suite 101
Christiansted, VI 00820
dewoodlaw@gmail.com
Gregory H. Hodges
Law House, 10000 Frederiksberg Gade
P.O. Box 756

ST.Thomas, VI00802
ghodges@dtflaw.com

## Mark W. Eckard

Eckard, P.C.
P.O. Box 24849

Christiansted, VI 00824
Email: mark@markeckard.com

[^0]

## IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS DIVISION OF ST. CROIX

MOHAMMED HAMED by His Authorized ,
Agent WALEED HAMED, ।
Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant, y
vs. ) Case No. SX-12-CV-370
FATHI YUSUF and UNITED CORPORATION, )
Defendants/Counterclaimants, ,
(2)

WALEED HAMED, WAHEED HAMED, MUFEED HAMED, HISHAM HAMED, and PLESSEN ENTERPRISES, INC.,

## Additional Counterclaim Defendants.)

## THE VIDEOTAPED ORAL DEPOSITION OF FATHI YUSUF

was taken on the 2nd day of April, 2014, at the Law Offices of Adam Hoover, 2006 Eastern Suburb, Christiansted, St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands, between the hours of 9:17 a.m. and 4:16 p.m., pursuant to Notice and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

## Reported by:

Cheryl L. Haase
Registered Professional Reporter Caribbean Scribes, Inc.
2132 Company Street, Suite 3 Christiansted, St. Croix U.S.V.I.
(340) 773-8161


## EATHI YUSUF -- DIRECT

A. This is part of the --
Q. Bigger piece?
A. -- of the one he pledge to settle the number I give him at our first meeting.
Q. Okay. And both of those, the smaller piece and the bigger piece, were purchased with money from the supermarket, so they're 50/50.
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And, you know, you keep referring back to the testimony yesterday of Mr. Mohammad Hamed.

Did you hear him say anything that ygu think is incorrect or untruthful?
A. A lot, unfortunate. A lot of what he say, I don't agree with.
Q. Okay. Let me come back to that.

All right. So get ing back to the exhibit in front of you, I'm just going fo read you two more clauses and then we'll be done wifh this one.

The thifd -- the third clause from the bottom says, Whereas the partners have shared profits, losses, deductions, credits and cash --
A. Axcuse me. Where -- where it says that? What page?
Q. The page you're on, right there.
A. This?


## FOR PUBLICATION

## IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS DIVISION OF ST. CROIX



## MEMORANDUM OPINION

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff's Emergency Motion and Memorandum to Renew Application for TRO ("Renewed Motion"), filed January 9, 2013, renewing his September 18, 2012 Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and/ar a Preliminary Injunction. Hearing on the Renewed Motion was held on January 25, 2013 and continued on January 31, 2013. Having reviewed the Renewed Motion, evidence and argument of counsel presented at the hearing, along with the voluminous filings of the parties in support of and in opposition to the Renewed Motion, this matter has been converted to that of a Preliminary Injunction pursuant to Fed. R. Ciy. P. 65(a). Upon review of the record, the Court herein makes findings of fact and conclusions of law, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(a)(2), and GRANTS Plaintiff's Renewed Motion.

## JURISDICTION

This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 4 V.I. Code § 76(a), which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all civil actions regardless of the amount in controversy." Likewise, under 5 V.I. Code § 1261 , courts of reçord are empowered to "declare rights, status, and other legal relations whether or not further relief is or could be claimed .. ...

Mohammad Hamed, by Waleed Hamed y.Fathi Yusuf aníd United Corporation, SX-12-CV-370 Memorandum Opinion and Order
33. Waleed Hàmed testified that Fathi Yusuf utilized Plaźa Extra account fụnds to purchạse and subsequently sell property in Estate Dorothea; St.i Thomas, to which it was̊ aggreed that Hamed was. entitled to $50 \%$ of net proceeds. Although Yusuf's handwritten accounting of sale proceeds ciantirms that Hamd due $\$ 802, \$ 66$, representing $50 \%$ of net proceeds (Pl. Ex. 18), that payment has: never been made to Hamed and the disposition of those sale proceeds is not known to Hamed. Tr.88:8-90:17, Jan. 25, 2013:
34. Each of the three Plaza Extra Supermarkets maintains and accounts for its operations separately; with separate bank accounts. In total, the stores maintain a tötal of


35; On or about August 15, 2012, Yusuf wrote a check signed by himself and his son Mahar Yusuf and made payment to United in the amount of $\$ 2,784,706.25$ from a segregated Plaza Extra Supermarket operating account, despite written objection of Waleed Hamed on behalf of Plaintiff and the Hamed family, who claimed that, among other objections, the unilateral withdrawal violuted the terms of the District Court testraining order in tfie Criminal Action. Tr. 246:1-250:14, Jan. 25, 2013; Pl.Group Ex. 13.
36. Oń the first hearing day, Mahar Yusüuf Presideñt of United Corporation testified "under oath that he used the $\$ 2,784,706.25$ withdrawn from the Plaza Extra operating account to buy three properties on St. Croix in the name of United. On the second hearing day, Mahar Yusuff contradicted his prior teslimony and admitied that those withdrawitheds had actually been used to invest in businesses not owned by United, including a mattress business, but that none of the funds were used to purchase properties overseas. Tr. 250:2'251:15, Jan. 25, 2013; Tr. 118:12-120:2, Jan. 31; 2013:

Mohammad Hamed, by Waleed Hamed v.Fathi Yusuf and United Corporation, SX-12-CV-370
Memorandum Opinion and Order
Page 11 of 23
.7. A restraining order was enterea by the Distriet Cout tht Criminal Action which remains in place and restricts withdrawal of fundss representing profits, from the supermarkets that have been set aside in the Banco Popular Securites brokerage account pending the conclusion of the Criminal Action or further order of that eort, Tr: 41:15\% 42:18; 119:4-12, Jan. 25, 2013. The Criminal Action will remain pending until past tax returns are filed, Tr. 134:15-136:22; 24.2:16-245:5, Jan. 25, 2013. As of January $188_{\text {a }}$ 2013, the brokerage account had a balance of $\$ 43,914,260.04$. Def. Ex: 9 I This Court cannot enforce the restraining order or otherwise control any aspect of the Criminal Action or its disposition:
38. Funds Irom supermarket accounts have also been unized umateraty by rusu, wirnout agrement of Hamed, to pay legal fees of defendants relative to this action and the Criminal Action, in excess of $\$ 145,000$ to the dates of the evidentiary hearing. Tr: 76:582af. Jan. 25, 2013; Pl. Ex. 15, 16. $6^{-12}$
89. Since at least late 2012, Yusuf has threafened to fire Hamed family managers and to close the supermarkets. Tr. 149:20-150:22; 158:18-159:12: 253:25-254:19, Jan. 25, 2013.
40. On January 8, 2013, Yusuf confrönted and unilaterally terminated 15 year accounting employee Wadda Charriez for perceived irregularities relative to her timekeeping records of her hours of employment, threatening to report her stealing if she challenged the firing or sought unemployp̣ent bẹnefitṣ at Department of Labor, Tr. 181:20-185:16., Jan. 25, 2013. Charriez had a "very critical job" with Plaza Extra (Tr 179:17-19, Jan. 25, 2013),

[^1]Ir $^{\prime}$ The operations on the three Elaza Extra Supimarket stores shall continue as they have throughout the years prior to this commencement of this litigation, with Hamed, or his designated representative(s), and Yusuf, or his designated representative(s), jointly Hanaging each store, witheut unilaterall action by either party, or representative(s), affecting the management $t_{\text {e }}$ employees, methods, procedures and operations.
2. No finds will be dishurseat from supernarket operating accafufts withent thé mutual consent of Hamed and Yusuf (or designated representative(s)).
3. All checks from all Plaza Extra Supermarket operating accounts will require two signatures, one of a designated representative of handed and the other wituf or a, designated representative of Yusuf.
i4. A copy of the Order accompanying this Opinion will be provided to the depository ladiks where all Plaza Extra Supermarket operating accounts are helds
\% ${ }_{5}$. Paintiff shall forthwith file a bond in the amount of Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars ( $25,000.00$ ) with the Clerk of the Court, and shall, provitite notice of the posting to Defendants. (Plaintiff's interest- in the "profits" accountis of the business now held at Banco Popular. Securities shall serve as additional security to pay any costs and damages inicurred by Defendants if found to have been wrongfully enjoined.)

Daṭed


ATTEST:


# IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS DIVISION OF ST. CROIX 

| MOHAMMED HAMED, | Plaintiff, | Action for Damages and <br> Declaratory Relief |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| v. |  | File No. SX-14-CV- |
| UNITED CORPORATION, |  |  |
|  | Defendants. |  |

## COMPLAINT

Comes now, the Plaintiff, Mohammad Hamed, and hereby files this Complaint against the United Corporation, alleging as follows:

1. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Title 4 V.I.C. §76(a) and 5 V.I.C. §1261.
2. Plaintiff Mohammad Hamed ("Hamed") is an adult resident of St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands.
3. Defendant United Corporation ("United") a USVI corporation with its business office on St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands. Fathi Yusuf is an officer and director of United. Fathi Yusuf and his wife are the majority shareholders and all of the other shareholders are family members.
4. Fathi Yusuf and Mohammad Hamed are partners in a USVI partnership that operates the three Plaza Extra Supermarkets in the Virgin Islands and has its business office on St. Croix.
5. On or about August 20, 2012, United Corporation acting by and through Fathi Yusuf and his son Mike Yusuf, United's shareholder and president, unilaterally and wrongfully converted $\$ 2.7$ million from segregated Plaza

## Complaint

Page 2
Extra supermarket accounts used to operate the partnership's three stores, placing the funds in a separate bank account of United controlled only by United and the Yusuf family.
6. United was on written notice (1) that the funds should not be so removed, and (2) later, that these funds were improperly diverted from the partnership accounts over the objection of Mohammad Hamed.
7. United then used $\$ 500,000$ of these funds to purchase the following described properties ("Properties") located in St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands in its own name, to wit:

Plot 3-A Estate Enfield Green, Prince Quarter, U.S. Virgin Islands, consisting of 0.067 U.S. acres, as more fully shown on OLG 3173004 dated 06/16/1975 and revised 03/16/1987

Plot 3-B Estate Enfield Green, Prince Quarter, U.S. Virgin Islands, consisting of 0.784 U.S. acres, as more fully shown on OLG 3173004 dated 06/16/1975 and revised 03/16/1987

Plot 4 Estate Enfield Green, Prince Quarter, U.S. Virgin Islands, consisting of 125.995 U.S. acres, as more fully shown on OLG 2650 dated 08/27/1969 and revised 02/25/2000
8. Since the Properties were acquired by United with the use of partnership funds improperly removed from the partnership, Hamed is entitled to a $50 \%$ interest in these Properties, of which he has given notice to all third parties by placing a lis pendens against the property, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A.
9. The plaintiff is entitled to declaratory relief that he owns $50 \%$ of these Properties.

## Complaint

## Page 3

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff seeks the following relief from this Court as follows:

1) Declaratory Relief against United regarding the ownership rights of the plaintiff as to the three Properties in question, declaring that he has a $50 \%$ interest in these Properties.
2) An award of attomey's fees and costs against United; and
3) Any other relief the Court deems appropriate as warranted by the facts and the applicable law.

Dated: July 14, 2014


Carl J. Hartmann III, Esq.
5000 Estate Coakley Bay, L-6
Christiansted, VI 00820
Telephone: (340) 719-8941
Email: carl@carlhartmann.com

# IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS DIVISION OF ST. CROIX 



## NOTICE OF LIS PENDENS

Please take notice that the above entitled action has been filed in the Superior Court of the Virgin Islands and affects the title of the following described properties located in St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands to wit:

Plot 3-A Estate Enfield Green, Prince Quarter, U.S. Virgin Islands, consisting of 0.067 U.S. acres, as more fully shown on OLG 3173-004 dated 06/16/1975 and revised 03/16/1987

Plot 3-B Estate Enfield Green, Prince Quarter, U.S. Virgin Islands, consisting of 0.784 U.S. acres, as more fully shown on OLG 3173-004 dated 06/16/1975 and revised 03/16/1987

Plot 4 Estate Enfield Green, Prince Quarter, U.S. Virgin Islands, consisting of 125.995 U.S. acres, as more fully shown on OLG 2650 dated 08/27/1969 and revised 02/25/2000

Dated: July 14, 2014


Attorney Fees Paid to Joe DiRuzzo, FUERST ITTLEMAN DAVID \& JOSEPH, PL

## 융 EXHIBIT

## Payments After 1/1/2012 to Fuerst Ittlemen from Plaza Account

| Date | Payee | From Account | Amount | Check No. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012-10-19 Fuerst Ittleman | Plaza Extra - Banco Popular | $\$$ | $15,067.26$ | 3979 |
| 2012-10-19 Fuerst Ittleman | Plaza Extra - Banco Popular | $\$$ | $29,011.50$ | 3977 |
| 2012-11-16 Fuerst Ittleman | Plaza Extra - Banco Popular | $\$$ | $99,254.45$ | 4195 |
| 2013-01-21 Fuerst Ittleman | Plaza Extra - Banco Popular | $\$$ | $111,660.24$ | 4642 |
| 2013-02-13 Fuerst Ittleman | Plaza Extra - Banco Popular | $\$$ | $112,383.82$ | 4819 |
| 2013-03-06 Fuerst Ittleman | Plaza Extra - Banco Popular | $\$$ | $82,274.87$ | 5055 |
| 2013-04-03 Fuerst Ittleman | Plaza Extra - Banco Popular | $\$$ | $54,938.89$ | 5193 |

\$ 504,591.03

## こHECK 3977





PAY TO THE ORDER OF<br>WACHOVIA BAMYK, N.A.<br>067006432<br>FORDEPOSIT ONLY<br>FUERST ITTLEMAN PL. 2000037070166





## UNITED CORPORATION

DEA PLAZA EXTRA
(340) 719-1870 PO BOX 3649
ST CROIX, VI 00851


Pay One Hundred Twelve Thousand Three Hundred Eighty-Three and 32/100 Dollars
TOTHE FUERST ITTLEMAN DAVID \& JOSEPH PL
OF: 1001 BRICKELI BAY DRIVE 32ND FLOOR MIAMI, FL 33131

Memo:

PAY TO THE ORDER OF WACHOVIA BANK, N.A. 0650032
FOW DFA\$T OHM
FUERST ITIELEMAN PL 2000037070166
$\cdots \frac{4}{i}$

$$
i, i
$$




> PAY TO THE ORDER OF WACHOVIA BANK, N.A. 067,006432
> for deposit omer
> FUERST ITTLEMAN PL
> 2000037070166


| 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

[^2]
## UNITED CORPORATION

DBA PLAZA EXTRA
(340) 719-1870

PO BOX 3649
ST CROIX, VI 00851

PAY Fifty-Four Thousand Nine Hundred Thirty-Eight and 89/100 Dollars
TOTHE FUERST ITTLLEMAN DAVID \& JOSEEH PL
OF: 1001 BRICKELL BAY DRIVE 32ND FLOOR
MIAMI, FL 33131

Memo:



# PAY TO THE ORDER OF <br> WACHOVIA BANK, N.A. 067006432 <br> FOR DEPOSTT' ONLY <br> Fuierst ittileman pl 2000037070166 














|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |




[^0]:    Jeffrey B. C. Moorhead
    CRT Brow Building
    1132 King Street, Suite 3
    Christiansted, VI 00820
    email : jeffreymlaw @yahoo.com

[^1]:    ${ }^{5}$ Plaintiff has submitted Exhibit 30 with his February 19, 2013 Second Request to Take Judicial Notice and Request to Supplement the Hearing Record, granted by scparate Order. Defendants' opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion did not address Exhibit 30, consisting of two checks in the total sum of more than $\$ 220,000$ in payment to defense counsel in this action, dated January 21, 2013 and February 13, 2013, drawn on a supermarket account by Defendants without Plaintiffs' consent. Although the evidence is cumulative and not essential to the Court's decision herein, it reflects an ongoing practice of unilateral withdrawals and the possibility of continuing unilateral action in the future.

[^2]:    $\leftarrow$
    =HAMD562194

