

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

RAYMOND E BUTLER, II,

Case No. 1:25-cv-04443

Hon. April Perry

Plaintiff,

v.

ELI JACKFINN EDDI a/k/a ELY EDDI, ILANA FINN EDDI, DORINE
MAGENCE, MANUEL MAGENCE, JEFFREY K. GUTMAN,
NACHSHON DRAIMAN, WILLIAM KANTER, JOEL S. ROTHMAN,
MOSHE SOLOVEICHIK, ALAN GREEN, JERRY CHERNEY, SHMUEL
FUERST, HAROLD KATZ, SAMUEL MASLATON, DANIEL BERGMAN,
IRVING BIRNBAUM, ARON STANTON, CHAIM RAJCHENBACH, RIVKA
RAJCHENBACH, AVRUM RAJCHENBACH, MENACHEM SHABAT, AHUVA
SHABAT, RONALD SHABAT, ERIC ROTHNER, COLMAN GINSPARG,
JAMES MAINZER, MARSHALL K. BROWN, JEFFREY FINN, MEIR
“AARON” COHEN, GARRY CHANKIN, NANCY ROSEN, MARK ANTEBI,
BARRY ANTEBI, DAVID R. RAANAN, and ELLIOT E. ANTEBEI.

Defendants.

**PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAR *PRO SE*;
AND
DEMAND FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST OPPOSING
COUNSEL**

Plaintiff Raymond E. Butler II moves this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1654 for leave to appear *pro se* in the above-captioned civil action. In support thereof, and in further support of the pending Motion to Withdraw filed by Attorney Racine Miller (ECF No. 216), Plaintiff states as follows:

1. Plaintiff commenced this civil RICO action (transferred from the Western District of Michigan, Case No. 2:24-cv-00134) and has at **all times** retained the absolute statutory right to prosecute his claims personally or through counsel of his choice. See 28 U.S.C. § 1654 (“In all courts of the United States the parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel...”). This right is fundamental in civil actions and is not subject to the Court’s discretionary denial absent extraordinary circumstances not present here.

2. On September 2, 2025, Plaintiff formally terminated the Michigan Law Firm (counsel Racine Miller) by written termination letter. That termination was unequivocal and immediately effective as to Plaintiff's choice of representation.
3. Consistent with Plaintiff's termination of counsel, Attorney Racine Miller filed a pending Motion to Withdraw as Attorney for Plaintiff (ECF No. 216). That motion remains pending before this Court.
4. Defendants filed a response in opposition to the withdrawal (and/or to Plaintiff's pro se appearance). That opposition is wholly frivolous, lacks any citation to controlling authority, and demonstrates no prejudice, delay, or harm to Defendants or the orderly administration of this case. More egregiously, the opposition appears to be the direct result of threats of blackmail and extortion made by agents of the opposing parties against Plaintiff and/or his former counsel. The clear and improper purpose of these threats is to force Racine Miller and the Michigan Law Firm to remain in the case so that Defendants can continue to exert improper control and influence over Plaintiff's former counsel for their own benefit, rather than permitting Plaintiff to exercise his statutory right of counsel of his choice or to self-representation.
5. This improper opposition is further compounded by the egregious conduct of Defendants' counsel and agents. On January 3, 2025, Shomshon Moskowitz of Cascade Capital Group LLC (who is not counsel of record in this action) sent an unsolicited email directly to Plaintiff's then-counsel Racine Miller, threatening "Rule 11" sanctions and insinuating that his clients would file false reports with "law enforcement" in order to obtain a civil resolution. See Plaintiff's Complaint to the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission of Illinois (ARDC) dated January 5, 2025, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A. Furthermore, John Rhoades, Scott Fryzel, Kevin Conner (of Dykema Gosset, retained to represent CIBC USA) and Julie O'Connor (General Counsel, CIBC USA) — along with Jesse Roth, Shomshon Moskowitz, Nick Callahan and Robin Mahar — engaged in continuous threatening communications with Racine Miller, Michael Haeberle and Katherine London.
6. On September 13, 2024, Jesse Roth sent a letter to Racine Miller at the Michigan Law Firm threatening criminal harassment charges against plaintiff; on September 19, 2024, John Rhoades sent a follow-up letter citing rules of professional misconduct; and on September 20, 2024, Rhoades and Fryzel called the Michigan Law Firm and threatened disciplinary grievances and additional personal litigation. These threats were directed

by CIBC USA General Counsel Julie O'Connor and Cascade Capital Group Associate General Counsel Shomshon Moskowitz in an attempt to interfere with ongoing civil litigation and Plaintiff's attorney-client relationship. See Plaintiff's ARDC Complaint regarding Dykema counsel dated January 5, 2025, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B. All of the foregoing conduct violates Illinois Rule of Professional Conduct ("ILRPC") Rule 8.4(g), which provides that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to "present, participate in presenting, or threaten to present criminal or professional disciplinary charges to obtain an advantage in a civil matter."

7. In addition, Defendants' agents and counsel filed a false report with FBI Special Agent Richard Grout falsely alleging criminal harassment and attempted bank fraud by Plaintiff. This false report was made for the improper purpose of influencing Plaintiff's counsel and interfering with the proceedings in this instant case, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1001. See also Plaintiff's Objection to ECF 101 filed in the related Western District of Michigan action (ECF No. 105, p. 6, n.2) (referencing the FBI agent's statement that he did not believe Plaintiff was in violation of federal law related to the relevant communications at bar).
8. Plaintiff requests that sanctions be imposed in the amount of \$25,000 per counsel that joined in the opposition response. This amount reflects the severity of the egregious nature of the filing, the approximate costs incurred by Plaintiff due to the loss of counsel, and the additional expenses required to prosecute this action pro se while potentially seeking new representation. Plaintiff further demands that this Court refer the matter to the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission of Illinois (ARDC) and the Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission for formal investigation, discipline, and public reprimand of Shomshon Moskowitz, Jesse Roth, John Rhoades, Scott Fryzel, Julie O'Connor, Nick Callahan, Samantha Zuba, Robin Mahar and all other participating opposing counsel and agents for the violations detailed herein and in Exhibits A and B.
9. Defendants' filing is therefore not only legally baseless but was interposed for an improper purpose, namely, to harass Plaintiff, interfere with his statutory right to counsel of choice (including self-representation), and perpetuate Defendants' ability to manipulate and control opposing counsel through blackmail and extortionate tactics. Such egregious conduct warrants the imposition of sanctions against opposing counsel pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 and 28 U.S.C. § 1927. This court gave explicit notice to counsel to withdraw any filings that were frivolous in nature at the hearing on April 9th, 2026, satisfying the notice to cure in rule 11(b). Plaintiff requests that sanctions be imposed in the amount of \$25,000

per counsel that joined in the opposition response. This amount reflects the severity of the egregious nature of the filing, the approximate costs incurred by Plaintiff due to the loss of counsel, and the additional expenses required to prosecute this action *pro se* while potentially seeking new representation.

10. Granting leave to appear *pro se* and granting the pending motion to withdraw will not prejudice Defendants, will not delay the proceedings, and is consistent with the clear statutory command of 28 U.S.C. § 1654. Courts in this Circuit and across the country routinely grant *pro se* status to individual civil plaintiffs upon termination of counsel; denial of such a request exceeds the Court's authority and would constitute reversible error as an abuse of discretion. See, e.g., *Washington v. Sherwin Real Estate, Inc.*, 694 F.2d 1081 (7th Cir. 1982).

11. Plaintiff is fully prepared to prosecute this action *pro se*, has demonstrated familiarity with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and this Court's Local Rules and requests that the Court enter an order forthwith.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Raymond E. Butler II respectfully requests that this Honorable Court:

A. Grant Attorney Racine Miller's pending Motion to Withdraw (ECF No. 216);

B. Grant Plaintiff leave to appear *pro se* in this civil action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1654;

C. Strike or overrule Defendants' frivolous response in opposition in its entirety;

D. Impose sanctions against Defendant's counsel that filed the response in opposition (and each counsel that joined the opposition individually) in the amount of \$25,000 per counsel pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 and 28 U.S.C. § 1927 for filing a frivolous, baseless, harassing, and improperly motivated opposition, reflecting the severity of the conduct and Plaintiff's approximate costs and expenses caused thereby;

E. Refer Shomshon Moskowitz, Jesse Roth, John Rhoades, Scott Fryzel, Julie O'Connor, Nick Callahan, Samantha Zuba, Robin Mahar and all other participating opposing counsel and agents to the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission of Illinois and the Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission for formal investigation, discipline, and public reprimand for violations of ILRPC Rule 8.4(g), 18 U.S.C. § 1001, and related professional misconduct.

E. Direct the Clerk to enter Plaintiff's appearance and update the docket to reflect Plaintiff's *pro se* status and to serve all future filings directly upon Plaintiff; and

F. Grant such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dutifully submitted,

/s/ Raymond Earl Butler II

Raymond E. Butler II

Plaintiff, Pro Se

773-997-0328

RaymondEButler@protonmail.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 and Local Rule 5.5, I hereby certify that on April 29, 2026, I electronically filed the foregoing PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAR PRO SE with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will automatically send electronic notification of such filing to all attorneys of record who are registered CM/ECF users.

/s/ Raymond Earl Butler II

Raymond E. Butler II
Pro Se Plaintiff
14320 Shirley Rd.
Baraga, MI. 49908
773-997-0328
RaymondEButler@protonmail.com

EXHIBIT A

From: Shomshon Moskowitz <smoskowitz@cascadellc.com>

Date: Fri, Jan 3, 2025 at 4:22 PM
Subject: RE: Butler v Eddi et al.

To: Racine Miller <racine@themichiganlawfirm.com>

Cc: Jesse Roth <JRoth@maddinhauser.com>, Josh Freedman <josh@themichiganlawfirm.com>

Racine,

Thank you for your response. I believe these discussions are always more productive over the phone or in person, but if you're unavailable, email will suffice for now. Like you, I am optimistic that we can resolve this matter amicably.

We received an alert from CIBC that on or about January 2, 2025, your client, Raymond Butler, visited a CIBC branch and engaged with a banker in yet another ill-advised attempt to access Menachem Shabat's accounts and financial information. After being denied access, Mr. Butler allegedly began emailing the banker and the banker's father about this matter. These actions are what followed a series of inappropriate text messages sent to Mr. Shabat (attached) and other prior attempts to improperly access the financial information of both Mr. Shabat and Mr. Rajchenbach.

As an attorney, I trust you recognize these actions as, at minimum, harassment and at worst, potentially unlawful. While I suspect these actions are being taken without your knowledge or against your advice, the impact remains the same. My client is deeply concerned for their safety and that of their families and is escalating the matter to law enforcement. I am reaching out to you directly in an effort to de-escalate this situation before it spirals further.

The basis of your client's actions appears to rest on the erroneous claim that the GPN Family Trust (established by Mr. Rajchenbach) and the Doros Generation Trust (established by Mr. Shabat) were created by Jack Finn in 1989. However, even your client's pleadings acknowledge that these trusts were established on April 28, 2008 (*See* Amend Compl. Paragraph 27.) Jack Finn had no role in creating or managing these trusts. His financial interactions with my clients were strictly limited to their acquisition of the Lake Cook Nursing Terrace facility via bank financing and a seller's note. The claims in your client's complaint are, quite simply, baseless.

I do not expect you to take my word at face value. If needed, we can establish a mechanism to verify these facts, though litigation may force the issue. Should that path be necessary, it will become evident that your client's claims are fabricated, and your representation of these misrepresentations in federal pleadings will carry significant consequences. My client is prepared to seek Rule 11 sanctions and any other appropriate relief.

Before we reach that point, I appeal to you, lawyer to lawyer, to critically evaluate your client's claims. Ask Mr. Butler for even a single document—just one—that substantiates his assertion that the GPN or Doros trusts were established in the late 1980s or early 1990s or any of the other innumerable allegations made against my clients in your complaint and pleadings. If no such evidence exists (and I am confident it does not), I urge you to consider redirecting your client's efforts toward resolution rather than perpetuating baseless litigation.

I truly hope that we can find a way to navigate this issue that spares all parties further conflict. Please let me know how you would like to proceed.

As always, feel free to give me a call if you'd like to discuss further.

SHOMSHON MOSKOWITZ

ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL | CASCADE CAPITAL GROUP

3450 Oakton St., Skokie, IL 60076

O: 847.745-7217 | C: 312.961.2336 | smoskowitz@cascadellc.com | Cascadellc.com

NOTE: This email and any attachments hereto, is intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain information which is confidential or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify us by telephone and immediately and permanently delete the original and any copy or printout thereof.



ATTORNEY REGISTRATION AND DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION
of the
SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS

COMPLAINT FORM

Use this form to file a complaint about:

- 1) an Illinois lawyer;
- 2) a non-Illinois lawyer who has provided legal services in Illinois; or
- 3) a non-lawyer who you are claiming has engaged in the unauthorized practice of law in Illinois.

Return the completed form by e-mail, mail or facsimile to:

ARDC
 130 E. Randolph Dr., Ste. 1500
 Chicago, IL 60601-6219
 Phone: (312) 565-2600 or (800) 826-8625
 Fax: (312) 565-2320
 Email: information@iardc.org

or

ARDC
 3161 W. White Oaks Dr., Ste. 301
 Springfield, IL 62704
 Phone: (217) 546-3523 or (800) 252-8048
 Fax: (217) 546-3785
 Email: information@iardc.org

1. Your name: **Raymond Butler**

Street address: **14320 Shirley Rd**

City: **Baraga**

State: **Michigan**

Zip: **49908**

Home phone:

Work phone:

Cell phone: **773-997-0328**

Email address: **rbutler@cannabestinc.com**

2. Name of lawyer/person you want to be investigated: **Shomshon Moskowitz**

Name of law firm or business: **Cascade Capital Group LLC**

Street address: **3450 Oakton St**

City: **Skokie**

State: **IL**

Zip: **60076**

Phone: **847-745-7217**

Email address: **smoskowitz@cascadellc.com**

3. Have you previously contacted the ARDC regarding this matter? Yes No

If yes, when and how did you contact us?

4. Did you employ the lawyer/person you are complaining about: Yes No

4a. If you answered yes to question 4:

When did the employment start?

What was the fee agreement?

How much have you paid the lawyer/person to date?

over

4b. If you answered no to question 4 what is your connection to the lawyer/person?

Shomshon Moskowitz represents Chaim Rajchenbach and Menachem Shabat (and respective family members) personally and professionally as associate general counsel of cascade capital group. The Rajchenbachs and Shabats are opposing litigants in Butler v. Eddi (2:24-cv-00134) and are represented by attorney of record Jesse Louis Roth of Maddin Hauser Roth & Heller, P.C.

5. If your request relates to a court case or other proceeding, please provide the following:

Name of court or agency: **Western District of Michigan & Cook County Chancery Court**

Name of case: **Butler v. Eddi et al & Butler v. Eddi**

Case number: **2:24-cv-00134 & 2022CH00675**

6. Please explain your complaint(s). Include important dates and names of witnesses and others involved. Use additional pages if necessary. Attach copies of documents that support your complaint, such as fee agreements, receipts, checks, letters and court papers.

On 1/3/2025, one of my attorneys in the above referenced matter, Racine Miller of The Michigan Law Firm received the unsolicited and attached email correspondence from Shomshon Moskowitz, an Illinois Attorney who has not appeared and is not on record in either case, state or federal. Mr. Moskowitz is not licensed or admitted to practice in any Michigan courts, yet felt it necessary to directly threaten Racine Miller and myself with "Rule 11" sanctions and insinuating his client will be filing false reports with "law enforcement" in order to obtain a civil resolution.

This is in direct violation of ILRPC Rule 8.4(g) which states:

"provides that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to "present, participate in presenting, or threaten to present criminal or professional disciplinary charges to obtain an advantage in a civil matter."

Futhermore, through counsel Jesse Roth and John Rhodes of Dykema, threats of professional disciplinary charges against Racine Miller were verbally conveyed over the phone as can be corroborated through the attached letters recieved.

Signature: _____



Date: 1/5/2025

EXHIBIT B



ATTORNEY REGISTRATION AND DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION
of the
SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS

COMPLAINT FORM

Use this form to file a complaint about:

- 1) an Illinois lawyer;
- 2) a non-Illinois lawyer who has provided legal services in Illinois; or
- 3) a non-lawyer who you are claiming has engaged in the unauthorized practice of law in Illinois.

Return the completed form by e-mail, mail or facsimile to:

ARDC
 130 E. Randolph Dr., Ste. 1500
 Chicago, IL 60601-6219
 Phone: (312) 565-2600 or (800) 826-8625
 Fax: (312) 565-2320
 Email: information@iardc.org

or

ARDC
 3161 W. White Oaks Dr., Ste. 301
 Springfield, IL 62704
 Phone: (217) 546-3523 or (800) 252-8048
 Fax: (217) 546-3785
 Email: information@iardc.org

1. Your name: **Raymond Butler**

Street address: **14320 Shirley Rd**

City: **Baraga**

State: **Michigan**

Zip: **49908**

Home phone:

Work phone:

Cell phone: **773-997-0328**

Email address: **rbutler@cannabestinc.com**

2. Name of lawyer/person you want to be investigated: **John Rhoades, Scott Fryzel, Julie O'Connor**

Name of law firm or business: **Dykema Gosset**

Street address: **10 South Wacker Drive**

City: **Chicago**

State: **IL**

Zip: **60606**

Phone: **312-876-1700**

Email address: **jrhoades@dykema.com , sfryzel@dykema.com**

3. Have you previously contacted the ARDC regarding this matter? Yes No

If yes, when and how did you contact us? **via request for investigation on 1/5/2025 for Shomshon Moskowitz**

4. Did you employ the lawyer/person you are complaining about: Yes No

4a. If you answered yes to question 4:

When did the employment start?

What was the fee agreement?

How much have you paid the lawyer/person to date?

over

4b. If you answered no to question 4 what is your connection to the lawyer/person?

John Rhoades and Scott Fryzel of Dykema have been retained to represent CIBC USA under the direction of General Counsel Julie O'Connor. Along with Defense Counsel Jesse Roth and Cascade Capital Group Associate General Counsel Shomshon Moskowitz, these individuals all participated in professional misconduct by continuously engaging with threatening communications with my attorney Racine Miller.

5. If your request relates to a court case or other proceeding, please provide the following:

Name of court or agency: **Western District of Michigan & Cook County Chancery Court**

Name of case: **Butler v. Eddi et al & Butler v. Eddi**

Case number: **2:24-cv-00134 & 2022CH00675**

6. Please explain your complaint(s). Include important dates and names of witnesses and others involved. Use additional pages if necessary. Attach copies of documents that support your complaint, such as fee agreements, receipts, checks, letters and court papers.

On 9/13/2024, one of my attorneys in the above referenced matter, Racine Miller of The Michigan Law Firm received the attached letter from Jesse Louis Roth, an Michigan Attorney who has appeared as defense counsel for Chaim Rajchenbach and Menachem Shabat in Butler v. Eddi et al. Mr Roth threatened criminal harassment charges for my inquiry to the bank about my family trusts. he did so again, reiterating the same threats in a later letter dated 12/23/24.

On 9/19/2024 the attached letter was received from John Rhoades of Dykema Gosset and details the same narrative as before, with the addition of thinly veiled threats in the form of citing the rules of professional misconduct. On 9/20/2024 John Rhoades and Scott Fryzel call the Michigan Law Firm under the guise of discussing the matter with Racine Miller, but instead threatend disciplinary greivances to be filed against her and additional litigation personally.

Both of these instances were directed by CIBC USA General Counsel Julie O'Connor and Cascade Capital Group Associate General Counsel Shomshon Moskowitz in an attempt to interfere with ongoing civil litigation and my attorney-client relationship.

This is in direct violation of ILRPC Rule 8.4(g) which states:

"provides that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to "present, participate in presenting, or threaten to present criminal or professional disciplinary charges to obtain an advantage in a civil matter."

Signature: _____



Date: 1/5/2025