



April 23, 2026

Steve Dunn  
Chair, Shul Legal Committee  
9540 Collins Avenue  
Surfside, FL 33154

**Re: Threat Letter 4/23/26**

Dear Mr. Dunn,

I am in receipt of the above referenced letter and had asked that you call me to discuss, however as of this writing, there has been no reply from you.

I have taken the time to review the 4/2/26 message that you cited, and find that the comments in same, were to the best of my knowledge, truthful. I have also reviewed your other allegations, and will attempt to address them all below.

For starters, your letter dated 2/25/26 absolutely led me to believe that you were attempting to walk away from the terms of the agreement signed years ago, and that given same, Surfside taxpayers would suffer loses.

It is completely reasonable to read the foregoing agreement, signed over a decade ago, and conclude that the parties intended for the Shul to pay a “required contribution” of well over \$2 million dollars, over a period of “25 equal annual payments.” In reading the agreement, I did not find any provision for interest to be paid related to the aforementioned 25-year payment schedule, and given same I don’t believe that characterizing same as an interest free loan is false.

With respect to the Shul and the election, most, if not all of my recent comments are related to the election lawsuit that the Shul was a party to. Speaking of demonstrable falsities, in said lawsuit, there are not a few false statements about *my* comments, including, but not limited to the statement that I urged only “non-Jewish voters to come out and vote on April 7<sup>th</sup>.” Clearly one big fat, misleading lie, which predictably would incite Jewish animus and hate ...directed at me. Who is defaming whom Mr. Dunn?

Further, as you must know, *after* Rabbi Dov Schochet, a member of the Shul unequivocally opined in the Shul’s own March newsletter that “voting on Chol Hamoed” was permitted, all of the other arguments contained the election lawsuit appeared to have little or no merit.

Regarding your benefits and dark money comments, I am not aware whether the Shul is directly connected to dark money, nor am I aware that the Shul is involved in financially supporting any candidate. The foregoing

notwithstanding, the Shul did in fact, in its election lawsuit, explicitly name Shlomo Danzinger as “the Jewish community’s preferred candidate.” I am not aware that such an endorsement is legally or ethically proper.

You go on to state that I have made “similar statements” to the ones I have addressed above – but failed to specifically identify any. Given same, I have no ability to address your alleged “similar statements” comment at this time.

You further go on to ominously say that my statements, as the mayor of Surfside, and as a resident, “are not protected” because they are demonstrably false – I respectfully disagree.

With respect to your “False Implications of Dishonest Conduct” section, you twist yourself into a pretzel, trying to appear to be victimized with your “taken as a whole” standard. Any general assertion I have made regarding dark money, big donors and favorable votes is true. Any specific statement that I have made, to the best of my knowledge, about the Shul is also true. The totality of my comments is intended to give my residents/readers as much accurate information as is possible – and let them come to their own conclusion regarding the foregoing groups.

While you may want to believe that the Shul’s joining in a lawsuit along with a candidate in the instant race for Surfside mayor, and then also acknowledging him as the Jewish community’s “preferred candidate” in legal documents does not create the impression for some that the Shul is “supporting, promoting, or acting in coordination with a candidate in the current election,” I would have to disagree, and say it probably does – all your wordy protestations to the contrary notwithstanding.

Lastly, you close your letter sadly with thuggish threats – which as time goes on, less and less surprise me. You and I both know that the truth is the truth, that everyone is entitled to speak their mind, and that what you are complaining about is not false information, but unwelcomed information – there is a big difference.

Having said all the above, below is my response to your retraction demand.

Within three (3) days of receipt of this letter, you provide me with specific written statements, related to items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of your retraction list which are demonstrably false.

If I receive same, and conclude that any are in fact demonstrably false, I will happily issue a written retraction for same. What I will not do, is retract any non-false statements which simply make you or others unhappy.

If I do not hear back from you in (3) days, please consider my offer withdrawn.

## **TOWN OF SURFSIDE**



Charles W. Burkett  
Mayor

c.c. Town Manager of Surfside, Mario Diaz  
Town Attorney, Thais Hernandez  
Town elected officials