IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
DIVISION OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF SAPPHIRE BAY CONDOMINIUMS WEST

Plaintiff,

-v-

GEORGE R. SIMPSON, et al.

Defendant.

Civil Number: 2004-62

GEORGE R. SIMPSON

Plaintiff,

-v-

ANDREW CAPDEVILLE and
ALAN R. FEUERSTEIN

Defendant.

Case Number: 2007-51

ALAN R. FEUERSTEIN

Plaintiffs,

-v-

GEORGE R. SIMPSON

Defendant.

CIVIL NUMBER: 2004-134

GEORGE R. SIMPSON

Plaintiff,

-v-

GEORGE WOOD

Defendant.

Civil Number: 2007-102

DEFENDANT'S REPLY TO PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO GEORGE WOOD'S MOTION FOR F.R.CIV.P. RULE 11 SANCTIONS AGAINST PLAINTIFF, GEORGE R. SIMPSON

To Honorable Ronald Buckwalter
Senior United States District Court Judge for the
Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Respectfully submitted,
FEUERSTEIN & SMITH, LLP
Alan R. Feuerstein, Esq.
Office and P. O. Address
17 St. Louis Place
Buffalo, New York 14202-1502
(716) 856-9704 Telephone
(716) 856-9707 Facsimile
FSLLP@aol.com
and
U.S. Virgin Islands Office
Post Office Box 502008
St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands
00805-2008

TO: George R. Simpson, pro se
Post Office Box 775
Hampton Bay, New York 11946

January 10, 2008

COMES NOW, George Wood, by through his counsel, Feuerstein & Smith, LLP, and submits the following to the Court as Defendant's Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to George Wood's Motion for F.R.Civ.P. Rule 11 Sanctions against Plaintiff, George R. Simpson, and in support thereof sets forth the following:

1. Defendant George Wood has made a Motion for F.R.Civ.P. Rule 11 Sanctions against Plaintiff, George R. Simpson. In Defendant's Motion for Sanctions against Simpson, Defendant has alleged that Mr. Simpson has commenced a baseless sanctionable lawsuit against Defendant George Wood and has shown that Plaintiff's Complaint has no merit factually and legally, and that the Complaint filed by Mr. Simpson against Mr. Wood was filed for improper purposes in order to harass and cause unnecessary expense to Mr. Wood. Defendant demanded that the Complaint be withdrawn because the Complaint is not supported by existing law or existing argument for an extension or change in existing law, that his legal contentions are unjustified and that he ignores unfavorable precedence and he is obviously unfamiliar with the law with respect to his alleged claims. Further, the Defendant, Mr. Wood, has alleged that Simpson's claims have no evidentiary support, and are not likely to have any evidentiary support even after a reasonable opportunity for a factual investigation.
2. Mr. Simpson's Opposition was filed on December 13, 2007. His Opposition to Defendant's Rule 11 Sanction Motion alleges as follows:
    a. Plaintiff does not have to engage in discovery because there has been no F.R.Civ.P. 26(f) conference. In response, Defendant states and avers that Mr. Simpson is responsible for pursuing his lawsuit, and his failure to take any action with respect to the prosecution of this case, subjects him to an F.R.Civ.P. 41(b) dismissal as a result of the failure of Simpson to prosecute this case. Additionally, Simpson admits that the Defendant has engaged in extensive discovery, and has supplied over one thousand (1,000) pages in document

productions as required by F.R.Civ.P. 16 and the "initial disclosure" requirements of F.R.Civ.P. 26(a)(1)(B) which describes initial disclosures, and is mandatory.

b. The Plaintiff Mr. Simpson alleges that Defendant's assertion that Plaintiff's Complaint is subject to Rule 11 sanctions is "disingenuous and wrong". Plaintiff has alleged that Defendant's Motion presents the same "hysterical arm waving" allegations of Plaintiff's alleged wrong doing, and states that the Motion for Sanctions is missing any specificity as required by the Federal Rules. He alleges that he has a "right" to sue Kerschner and Sokolow personally despite the fact that he has totally failed to comply with the arbitration requirements as set forth in the by-laws of Sapphire Bay Condominiums West (an issue which is fully briefed before this Court as a part of the Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment).

3. Mr. Simpson has been advised time and time again that actions against members and officers and directors of the Board of Directors of Sapphire Bay Condominiums West cannot be pursued unless the mandatory arbitration provisions in the by-laws of Sapphire are complied with. Mr. Simpson sold his condominium unit at C-4 of Sapphire Bay Condominiums West before commencing this lawsuit, and therefore, any standing that he previously may have had has evaporated.

4. Mr. Simpson has brought multiple lawsuits in different jurisdictions against members and former members of the Board of Directors of Sapphire Bay Condominiums West in retaliation for Sapphire's refusal to allow him to change the style of his front windows at the condominium unit that he formerly owned and, in retaliation for Sapphire commencing a Lanham Act trade name infringement case against Mr. Simpson in the District Court of the Virgin Islands Division of St. Thomas and St. John. That action is presently pending before this Court and all aspects are fully briefed in Sapphire's Motion for Summary Judgment.

5. Recently, in the case of George R. Simpson v. Myrna Golden (case pending in the Superior Court of the Virgin Islands Division of St. Thomas and St. John, civil number ST-04-cv-0000318) Judge Brenda Hollar, Judge of the Superior Court of the Virgin Islands Division of St. Thomas and St. John again explained to Mr. Simpson in her Order of November 20, 2007 that the mandatory arbitration provisions of Sapphire bar claims of the type and nature that he has brought against Mr. Wood and others.

6. In awarding sanctions in the sum of Fifteen Thousand Dollars ($15,000) against Mr. Simpson, the Court again advised Mr. Simpson that there was no jurisdiction over the case that he brought against Myrna Golden because he failed to comply with the mandatory binding arbitration provisions of the Sapphire Bay Condominiums West by-laws. (Exhibit A)

7. Mr. Simpson apparently has the time to commence proceedings against George Wood however, after filing his Complaint he does nothing to pursue his action. The reason he does nothing to pursue his action is because his action is baseless and without merit, and Simpson is only interested in attempting to libel and defame adverse litigants and their attorneys. Attached hereto as Exhibit B is the Motion for F.R.Civ.P. Rule 11 Sanctions against Mr. Simpson in the case of Simpson v. Sokolow (case pending in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York Long Island Division, civil action number 07-2388). Exhibits 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, which are a part of Exhibit "B" are the websites that Mr. Simpson has set up. The websites invite the public to "view" the defamatory Complaints and pleadings that he has filed in various Courts in a clear effort to harm the attorneys and the litigants (www.feuersteinandsmithllpsucks.com, www.alanrfeuersteinsucks.com, www.stephensokolowsuckss.com, www.georgewoodsucks.com, www.andrewcapdevillesucks.com, www.southamptontownsucks.com). Each and every part of the Rule 11 Motion filed in the Eastern District of New York in the case of George R. Simpson v. Stephen Sokolow is applicable in this case

and therefore, Defendant George Wood incorporates Exhibit B by reference as if fully set forth herein.

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully submitted that Rule 11 Sanctions are appropriate and should be imposed against the Plaintiff, George R. Simpson, as a result of his bizarre, vexatious, contumacious, and sanctionable conduct.

DATED: January 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,
FEUERSTEIN & SMITH, LLP

BY: s/Alan R. Feuerstein

Alan R. Feuerstein, Esq.
Office and P. O. Address
17 St. Louis Place
Buffalo, New York 14202-1502
(716) 856-9704 Telephone
(716) 856-9707 Facsimile
FSLLP@aol.com
And
U.S. Virgin Islands Office
Post Office Box 502008
St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands
00805-2008

TO: George R. Simpson
Post Office Box 775
Hampton Bay, New York 11946

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Alan R. Feuerstein, hereby certify that on the 10th day of January, 2008 served the within Defendant's Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to George Wood's Motion for F.R.Civ.P. Rule 11 Sanctions against Plaintiff, George R. Simpson via U.S. First Class Mail directed to the following:

George R. Simpson
Post Office Box 775
Hampton Bay, New York 11946

Honorable Ronald Buckwalter, S.J.
United States District Court
Eastern District of Pennsylvania
Room 14614 U.S. Courthouse
601 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106-1797

s/Alan R. Feuerstein
Alan R. Feuerstein