

MLC . . . Morgenstein . . . Oral Argument of Tuesday, January 10, 2011 at 9:45 AM

Mark Schlachet

to:

Helene Blum

01/06/2012 12:34 PM

Cc:

Margaret Allen, Joseph Smolinsky

Show Details

Dear Ms. Blum--I do hope (having reviewed the Local Bankruptcy Rule and found nothing) an email communication is not in violation of any practice or order, but having lost the call yesterday . . . I was unable to raise a highly pertinent subject of purely procedural note . . . and this is a subject needing attention given the Court's tightness of time.

I have been looking over the briefs and identifying potential areas of focus for Tuesday's argument. In so doing, I have concluded that to adequately argue the issues raised, and particularly those likely to require attention, an adequate period of argument, for both sides in the aggregate, should be 1 hour or more.

I do not know if the Court would or would not agree with this email and I do not know if the Court has available an hour or more for this matter . . . but I would be remiss in my role as an officer of the Court if I did raise this matter at tis time.

Thank you.

Mark Schlachet
3747 South Green Road, Ste.200
Beachwood, Ohio 44118
(216) 896-0714
(216) 514-6406(f)

This e-mail is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521 and is legally privileged. This e-mail message and any files transmitted with it are also subject to the attorney-client privilege and attorney work-product doctrine, and contain confidential information intended only for the person(s) to whom this e-mail message is addressed. If you have received this e-mail message in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone at (216) 896-0714 or by electronic mail to mschlachet@gmail.com and destroy the original message without making a copy. Thank you.

Enclosed Order:

Though the Court is not at all sure that an hour (much less any more time) would be required, it will not impose any particular time. The parties should assume that the Court will have read the papers and be familiar with matter set forth in them, and should limit their argument to matter not fully addressed in the papers.

*S/REG
USBJ
1/6/12*