

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
(Miami Division)
Case No. 25-cv-23202-JB

ZOHRA KHORASHI,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GADI BEER and BETH GELLMAN BEER,

Defendants.

**Plaintiff's Response to Defendants' Motion for Sanctions for
Misrepresentations to the Court**

Plaintiff, Zohra Khorashi, hereby files her response to Defendants' Motion for Sanctions for Misrepresentations to the Court (Doc. 38) filed December 15, 2025. For the reasons set forth herein and in Plaintiff's Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion for Sanctions and/or to Disqualify Defendants' Counsel for Extrajudicial Conduct (Doc. 48), filed January 7, 2026,¹ Defendants' Motion for Sanctions should be DENIED.

Factual Background and Argument

Defendants' arguments for sanctions set forth in Doc. 38 have already been raised and (with some minor non-substantive revisions) fully briefed a second time in their Response in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (Doc. 37) filed December 12, 2025. After first complaining bitterly that "[t]he motion is based on demonstrably false assertions about what this Court ruled,

¹ See also Unsworn Declaration of Christopher C. Sharp, Esq. Under Penalty of Perjury (Doc. 50), filed January 9, 2026.

what defense counsel said publicly, and what governing law permits,” the Defendants, in what is now becoming a recurrent theme in this case, pivoted to the attack and demanded countersanctions based on reckless, distorted and misleading accusations that Plaintiff and her counsel had engaged in wholesale fraud on the court via the improper use of AI-generated research and writing tools to draft the motion:

Even worse, every case that Plaintiff cites to support the request for sanctions for anything more substantial than an uncontested legal standard is either nonexistent or cites to hallucinated quotes. If we view this with charity, it means that the brief was AI generated and Plaintiff’s counsel did not check the cites. The only other explanation is that they knowingly committed fraud upon the court about these cases.

See Response (Doc. 37), at 2.

Defendants’ Motion for Sanctions (Doc. 38) leads off with the same points, just worded a bit differently:

The Plaintiff filed a frivolous motion for sanctions that misrepresents the facts and that relies on case law that does not exist at all and nonexistent quotes from cases that do exist. It has the hallmarks of AI generated work, which is the most innocent explanation for it.

See Defendants’ Motion for Sanctions (Doc. 38), at p. 1, p. 4 (describing certain citations in Plaintiff’s “Frivolous Motion” as “either hallucinated [by AI] or . . . deliberate attempts to mislead the Court”), p. 5 (“it is astonishing bad faith to imply that the Press Release mentioned in the Frivolous Motion is remotely comparable to the conduct at issue in *Wasserman*”) and at p. 7, footnote 2 (“[t]hese misrepresentations regarding cited authority are in addition to Plaintiff’s flagrant mischaracterizations of Defendants’ counsel’s press release, but the

Court can see for itself that such characterizations are not consistent with the press release”).²

Because Defendants’ Motion for Sanctions (Doc. 38) raises the exact same points that were raised three days earlier in their Response to Plaintiff’s Motion for Sanctions (Doc. 37), Plaintiff has already had the opportunity to rebut the recycled arguments in her Reply in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Sanctions and/or to Disqualify Defendants’ Counsel (Doc. 48), filed January 7, 2026, which was supplemented with the Unsworn Declaration of Christopher C. Sharp, Esq. Under Penalty of Perjury (Doc. 50), filed January 9, 2026.

The Declaration provides the Court with a detailed explanation of what the undersigned did to investigate the allegations of possible improper use of AI after they were first raised by Defendants’ counsel Mark Randazza, Esq. during a Local Rule 7.1 meet and confer call on Friday afternoon, December 12, 2025, less than an hour after Defendants’ Response (Doc. 37) was filed via CM/ECF at 3:39 p.m.. See Sharp Declaration (Doc. 50), at ¶¶ 2-9. However, before the undersigned could complete his due diligence and get back to Mr. Randazza with the results, Defendants had already filed their Motion for Sanctions (Doc. 38) via CM/ECF

² Even though this case is still at the pleading stage, it is becoming painfully obvious that the Defendants and their counsel both speak with the voice of the social media echo chamber and smear machine exemplified by websites such as Jewhatedb and Stopantisemitism: partisan, bellicose, intolerant of any opposition to their world-view and devoted to vilifying their perceived enemies and playing the victim rather than accepting any responsibility for their own actions.

on Monday morning, December 15, 2025 at 11:29 am. See Sharp Declaration, at ¶ 10.

During a second Local Rule 7.1 meet and confer call with Mr. Randazza on December 19, 2025, the undersigned summarized his investigation and confirmed for the second time that Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (Doc. 32) was personally drafted by the undersigned with no assistance from AI as Defendants had twice alleged in Doc. 37 and Doc. 37. The investigation also confirmed that there was one Florida Bar case (*Schwartz*) cited on Doc. 32 that was initially identified by Plaintiff through her own inadvertent use of the Google AI search feature which transposed the citation with one from a different *Schwartz* case. See Sharp Declaration, at ¶¶ 11-21. In hindsight, the *Schwartz* case should not have been added to Doc. 32 during the final revisions because that the undersigned relied on Ms. Khorashi's email citing and discussing the case instead of personally downloading and reviewing the case from Westlaw, which would likely have revealed the discrepancy.

There were four other Florida Bar discipline cases (*Norkin, Wasserman, Ray and Martocci*) that were correctly cited in Doc. 32 after Ms. Khorashi initially identified them via a non-AI-assisted Google search, but which Mr. Randazza had specifically criticized as off-point or containing "hallucinated quotes." The reasons for these issues were a little harder to reconstruct, but they appeared to be an oversight that arose when, to save time on the final revisions, the undersigned cut and pasted the citations and parts of Ms. Khorashi's summaries

of the cases from her email and then mistakenly added quotations to some of the verbiage. *See Sharp Declaration*, at ¶¶ 22-23.

As Plaintiff has already discussed in her Reply in Support of Motion for Sanctions (Doc. 48), after the undersigned personally explained to Mr. Randazza on December 19 how the avoidable but minor citation errors happened (and thanked him for bringing them to Plaintiff's attention), the Defendants, for reasons unknown, refused to even consider discussing any options for voluntarily disclosing the issue or addressing possible prejudice before the Court rules on either party's request for sanctions. Instead of making a good-faith effort to address or resolve the issues as required by Local Rule 7.1(a)(3), Defendants conditioned any resolution of their "fraud on the court" accusations on the withdrawal of Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions and payment of more than \$22,000.00 in attorney's fees that were allegedly incurred by Mr. Randazza for responding to the Motion for Sanctions on December 12 and then recycling the same arguments for Defendants' Motion for Sanctions filed three days later on December 15. *See Sharp Declaration*, at ¶ 24.

Based on the facts set forth in the undersigned's Declaration, Plaintiff's Reply (Doc. 48) has already made the legal argument that any citation errors in the Motion for Sanctions were unintentional and the inclusion of a single potentially AI-generated case citation, while regrettable, does not amount to "fraud on the court" nor should it provide any independent basis for countersanctions or any disciplinary referral to the Peer Committee or the Florida Bar. *See Reply* (Doc. 48) at pp. 9-11. For the sake of brevity, those

arguments are incorporated herein by reference and Plaintiff has nothing further to add to her previous arguments as to why the Law Project Press Release provided a good faith factual and legal basis upon which to initially seek sanctions under Local Rule 77.2. See Reply (Doc. 48), at pp. 4-8.

Conclusion

Based on the evidence, Plaintiff's arguments and controlling legal authority, Defendants' Motion for Sanctions Based on Misrepresentations to the Court (Doc. 38) should be DENIED.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher C. Sharp

Christopher C. Sharp, Esq.
Fla. Bar No. 996858
E-Mail: csharpplaw@aol.com
SHARP LAW FIRM, P.A.
1600 West State Road 84, Suite C
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33441
Telephone: (954) 909-4246

Omar Mustafa Saleh

Omar Mustafa Saleh, Esq.
Fla. Bar No. 091216
E-mail: osaleh@cair.com
Secondary: saleh@floridalegalconsulting.com
Syed Ahmed Ali Khan, Esq.
Florida Bar No. 061470
Email: akhan@cair.com
COUNCIL ON AMERICAN ISLAMIC RELATIONS
9000 N.W. 44TH Street, Suite 200
Sunrise, FL 33351
Phone: (954) 272-0490

Dated: January 10, 2026

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on January 10, 2026, the foregoing was electronically filed with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which will automatically send e-mail notification to the following counsel of record.

By: Christopher C. Sharp
Christopher C. Sharp, Esq.

Christopher C. Sharp, Esq.
E-Mail: csharpplaw@aol.com
Secondary Email: chris@csharpplawfirm.com
SHARP LAW FIRM, P.A.
1600 West State Road 84, Suite C
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33441
Telephone: (954) 909-4246
Facsimile: (954) 827-8028

Omar Mustafa Saleh, Esq.
E-mail: osaleh@cair.com
Secondary: saleh@floridalegalconsulting.com
Syed Ahmed Ali Khan, Esq.
Email: akhan@cair.com
Secondary: akanew@yahoo.com
COUNCIL ON AMERICAN ISLAMIC RELATIONS
000 N.W. 44TH Street, Suite 200
Sunrise, FL 33351
Phone: (954) 272-0490

Marc J. Randazza, Esq.
Email: ecf@randazza.com
RANDAZZA LEGAL GROUP, PLLC
2 S Biscayne Blvd #2600
Miami, FL 33131
Phone: (888) 887-1776

Kenneth G. Turkel, Esq.
Email: kturkel@tcb-law.com
TURKEL CUVA BARRIOS, P.A.
100 N. Tampa Street, Suite 1900
Tampa, FL 33602
Phone: (813) 834-9191

Jaclyn S. Clark, Esq.
Email: Jaclyn@thelawfareproject.org
THE LAWFARE PROJECT
633 Third Avenue, 21st Floor
New York, NY 10017
Phone: (212) 339-6995