
From: Valeria Chomsky <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 4:44 PM
To: jeffrey E.; Noam Chomsky
Subject: Tax issues

Could Richard K. talk to Vincent about the release?

There is also a question about the loan that is going to be cancelled that will cause us tax problems, because it will be considered as income, and Vincent is going to consult with a tax person to try to find a way to minimize it.

On Thu, Jan 10, 2019 at 11:21 AM Valeria Chomsky <[REDACTED]> <mailto:[REDACTED]>
> wrote:

I would like to write the following:

There is no "seller's remorse the day after", and I think you and Jason achieved a very good result. =C2 =

My point is about the information we have available, it is not to question the amount of the settlement, but to have the truth established about the assets of the trust on December 31, 2014, since they provided a false information. There is no reason to accept the false information when we have the documents proving it.

And I don't see why the acknowledgements wouldn't be possible.

Valeria

What do you think?

Valeria

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Vincent Isegna <[REDACTED]> <mailto:[REDACTED]> >
Date: Thu, Jan 10, 2019 at 10:30 AM
Subject: RE: URGENT
To: Valeria Chomsky <[REDACTED]>, Jason B. Curtin <[REDACTED]> <mailto:JCurtin@kb-law.com> >
Cc: Noam Chomsky <[REDACTED]> >

Good morning. =C2 =

Yesterday, we discussed at length the choice you faced. You could settle early on acceptable terms but to do so, it required foregoing further investigation into the facts of the case. Or, alternatively, you could choose not to settle

and embark on discovery and a further investigation of the facts. You very clearly chose that further litigation was not in Noam and your best interests because of the stress that would be involved in further litigation and that closure was of paramount importance. Also, the settlement is a very good deal for you. This is not an unusual judgment for a client to make and it is also not unusual to have "seller's remorse" 80% the day after a settlement. I do not think we can rescind the agreement and it doesn't sound like you want to rescind the agreement. We successfully negotiated for a release of you so let's see what we can put into the release. I do not think we will be able to negotiate the acknowledgements you reference.

Feel free to call if you want to talk about this.

Vincent J. Pisegna

Krokidas & Bluestein LLP

600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, MA 02210

Tel: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] <mailto:[REDACTED]>

www.kb-law.com <http://www.kb-law.com/>

From: Valeria Chomsky <[REDACTED] <mailto:[REDACTED]>>
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 10:06 AM
To: Vincent Pisegna <[REDACTED] <mailto:[REDACTED]>>; Jason B. Curtin <[REDACTED]@kb-law.com>
Cc: Noam Chomsky <[REDACTED] <mailto:[REDACTED]>>
Subject: URGENT

Vincent and Jason,

First of all, thank you very much for solving this constant and stressful situation in our life.

I would like to make some comments that I think are of paramount importance.

We keep finding outrageous false information from Ma and Harry, such as that the funds in the Marital Trust was only \$1,000,000 until the Lexington house was sold and incorporated to it. This is a flat lie -- as the documents I sent you prove it (Bainco statement from December 2014 and Harry's e-mail from May 2015, when the Lexington house was sold).

Also outrageous to say that the Trust was providing a house to Noam, when the apartment in Cambridge was bought with half of a mortgage with a commercial institution that we were paying monthly and with half of the funds coming from a loan from the Marital Trust with the highest possible interest rate, when Noam could have bought it himself with the funds from his IRA, that was being distributed to them. The only reason for this loan from the Marital Trust was to have the apartment tied to the trust and not allow to have it as a jointly owned property with me, as Noam requested many times. Requests very well documented in e-mails exchanges.

There are numberless other examples of them acting in bad faith and since it has been a pattern from them, with their father being competent and productive, I have to express my concerns for the future, if Noam and/or I become somehow limited in our cognitive capacities and they try to manipulate again or if Noam dies before me and they contest Noam's will.

Although we preferred a settlement, if we would have gone to court, much more would be discovered and we would have the documents that now we are missing to prove what had been done wrong. With the settlement we won't have access to them anymore.

It seems to me that the moment requires that in their releases they acknowledge explicitly that they recognized all the gifts they have received from Noam in the form of trusts for them, trusts for the grandchildren, the Lexington house, the Wellfleet house, royalties for children and grandchildren, payment of expenses, distributions from Noam's IRA to them, justifying the settlement, and now the Marital Trust where Noam is waiving most of his rights to it, and most important also correct through the documents that I provided (Bainco statement and the email from Harry) that the Marital Trust in December 31, 2014 had a market value of \$5,502,581, and that the Lexington house was sold in May 2015, therefore it was not the proceeds from the house that elevated the assets of the Marital Trust from \$1,000,000 to the current value -- as they falsely stated.

It also should include that they recognize that the money that Noam was left with, it is for him to live his life with his wife and that if some is left (hopefully Noam will live long enough to use it all) they agree that Noam decided to leave in his will only to his wife, Valeria. Therefore with this settlement, they are not going to contest Noam's will or claim any additional funds.

I think we have to address this information, or we will be signing that all the false information they gave us is correct and risk to have more problems in the future.

We accept the agreement, but we don't have to accept their false information.

I should add that the only reason I don't want to go to Court is because I don't want to cause more stress to Noam. Otherwise, I would much prefer to go to Court and have all the issues clarified, as I see the non-clarification of them as potential future problems and accusations.

Valeria Chomsky

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Valeria Chomsky <[REDACTED]> <mailto:[REDACTED]> >
Date: Wed, Jan 9, 2019 at 6:34 PM
Subject: Fake news
To: Vincent Pisegna <[REDACTED]> <mailto:[REDACTED]> >, Jason B. Curtin <[REDACTED]>
law.com <mailto:JC=rtin@kb-law.com> >
Cc: Noam Chomsky <[REDACTED]> <mailto:[REDACTED]> >

One of the main characteristics of so-called "postmodern" societies is to disregard the difference between objective and subjective, truth and lie, reality and fiction.

This case is a striking example of the contempt of objective reality by a large number of people who have preferred to believe the lie that coincides with their previous opinions. The famous "fake news" prevailed over reality, the belief about reason.

The attachment shows the Carol Chomsky Exempt Marital Trust, on December 31, 2014 with a market value of \$2,502,581. <u>

And the email copied below shows that the Lexington house was sold in May 2015.

Something is not right in their allegations. <=>

