

## IN BRIEF

### 2nd Circuit Upholds Transfer of ICE-Detained Tufts Student to Vermont

Twenty-four hours after hearing oral arguments in the case, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit on Wednesday upheld an order requiring a Tufts University student detained by immigration authorities in Louisiana to be transferred to custody in Vermont for removal proceedings.

The Second Circuit said the federal trial court in Vermont is likely the proper venue to consider Rumeysa Ozturk's claim that she was arrested based only on a pro-Palestine op-ed she wrote. The appeals court noted the post-doctoral student was in Vermont and her immediate custodian was unknown when her lawyers filed her habeas petition in Massachusetts.

The U.S. Department of Justice contended that an "unknown custodian" exception to the requirement that petitioners name their immediate custodian did not apply in Ozturk's case because her whereabouts were not a "prolonged secret." But the Second Circuit rejected that argument.

"The government cites no statute or case law for this extraordinary proposition, the practical effect of which would be that for some unspecified period of time after detention—seemingly however long the government chooses to take in transporting a detainee between states or between facilities—a detainee would be unable to file a habeas petition at all, anywhere," Judge Barrington Parker wrote for the court. "Such a rule finds no support in the law and is contrary to longstanding tradition."

Ozturk, who expressed support for Palestine in a student newspaper op-ed, was taken by ICE while walking in a suburb outside of Boston on March 25. The government transported her to Vermont by car and then put her on a plane to Louisiana the following day.

ICE did not disclose where

Ozturk was until nearly 24 hours after her arrest and after her lawyers filed their habeas corpus petition in Massachusetts, which had been her last known location.

"Any confusion about where habeas jurisdiction resides arises from the government's conduct during the twenty-four hours following Ozturk's arrest," wrote Parker, joined by Judges Susan Carney and Alison Nathan.

The DOJ had argued at a hearing Tuesday that the Immigration and Nationality Act precludes judicial review over the decision where to detain a non-citizen pending removal proceedings. That determination is left to the homeland security secretary, the department said in vain.

"These arguments are unlikely to succeed in no small part because our analysis is guided by longstanding principles of statutory interpretation requiring Congress to speak clearly and specifically when it wishes to deprive the federal courts of jurisdiction," Parker wrote. "Repeatedly, including in the INA context, the Supreme Court has declared that we should 'take account . . . of the presumption favoring interpretations of statutes [to] allow judicial review . . . absent clear statement.'"

The Second Circuit ordered that Ozturk be transferred to an ICE in the District of Vermont no later than May 14.

The Second Circuit appeal is *Ozturk v. Hyde*, No. 25-1019.

—Avalon Zoppo

### Deal Watch: A 'Resurgence' In the SPAC Market

The past week was light in mega M&A deals, with only a few deals over \$1 billion announced. IPOs have remained muted over the last several weeks, and debt offerings over \$500 million also appeared to slow down this month.

Meanwhile, the SPAC market has seen a surge. Remember SPACs? The going public vehicle, which has been around since the 1980s, saw an 18-month boom in 2020 through the beginning of 2022, sparking something of a bubble.

In the ensuing years, that bubble receded. Sometimes, a SPAC or two would

» Page 4

## 'The US Is the Client': Legal Experts Refute DOJ Statements On Representing Trump

BY EMILY SAUL

U.S. ATTORNEY General Pam Bondi has likened President Donald Trump to a client, calling Department of Justice attorneys "his lawyers." Interim U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, Ed Martin, has also referred to DOJ attorneys as "President Trump's lawyers."



DIEGO M. RADZINSKI/ALM

U.S. Attorney General **Pam Bondi** likened President Donald Trump to a client, calling DOJ attorneys "his lawyers."

The comments have sparked criticism for their fundamental misunderstanding of the relationship between the president and the DOJ, as two parts of the executive branch.

So who or what is the client of the DOJ? It's absolutely not the president, legal experts say.

## Tariff Challengers Don't Want Their Cases Heard in NYC

BY ALYSSA AQUINO

BUSINESSES and an indigenous tribe fighting President Donald Trump's tariffs are pushing to keep their cases in Florida and Montana—and away from New York, whose U.S. Court of International Trade has already refused to pause the duties for review.

The Trump administration has pushed to transfer those cases to the trade court, which, under 28 U.S.C. § 1581(i)(1)(B), maintains exclusive jurisdiction over laws "providing for... tariffs."

But challengers who filed their lawsuits in district courts in Montana and Florida argue that the jurisdiction clause doesn't apply, as the International Emergency Economic Powers Act—the law used by Trump to enact the duties—allegedly does not provide for tariffs.

"IEEPA authorizes the President to counter foreign threats by imposing the economic sanctions it describes. It does not permit him to order Americans to pay tariffs. IEEPA cannot, therefore, provide the express authorization that would be required to eliminate this Court's... jurisdiction," a group of businesses represented by the New Civil Liberties Alliance told the Florida federal court in a Monday court filing.

"The Department of Justice will continue to vigorously defend President Trump's agenda to

» Page 9

"The universal understanding is that the United States is the client, not the president," said professor Bruce Green, the Louis Stein Chair at Fordham Law School where he directs the Louis Stein Center for Law and Ethics. "I think there is a debate about who gets to make decisions for the client, for the United States," Green added. "But nobody thinks the president is the client of the Justice Department."

The relationship is admittedly unique. As Green put it, there is no "flesh-and-blood client"—the United States is a sovereign and is unable to speak for itself.

"The prosecutor is, in effect, the client and the lawyer for the client, because there's no one else to go to," explained Stephen Gillers, Elihu Root Professor of Law Emeritus at New York University.

The interests of the United States, the client, are interpreted by people, such as individual U.S. attorneys and the attorney general. The president of the United States establishes priorities, which are followed by the administration, including its prosecutors.

That individual prosecutor, observers agreed, has the authority to make a decision on behalf of the public.

But a prosecutor maintains an obligation to "do justice" on behalf of that public, noted Rebecca Roiphe, Joseph Solo-

» Page 4



ALAN SURESH/ELUCK/CC 2.0

The deal comes 13 years after attorney Anthony DiPietro began representing patients of Robert Hadden, an OB-GYN at Columbia University Medical Center and New-York Presbyterian Hospital.

## Columbia Abuse Cases Settled for \$750M; Survivors Praised For Stepping Forward

BY ALYSSA AQUINO

COLUMBIA University will pay hundreds of women \$750 million to resolve claims that it enabled their abuser, the former OB-GYN Robert Hadden, to assault patients under the guise of providing medical treatment. Here, their attorney, Anthony DiPietro,

talks about how he got the deal.

DiPietro announced the settlement on Monday, saying the deal would resolve 576 cases that he had lodged against the university in the Manhattan state court.

The deal comes 13 years after DiPietro first began representing former patients of Robert Hadden, an OB-GYN who practiced at the Columbia University

» Page 7

### Interim Property Distributions In Matrimonial Actions

»3

## DECISIONS OF INTEREST

### Court of Claims

CIVIL RIGHTS: **Motion to dismiss partially granted in case concerning arrest by state trooper.** *Omphalius v. State of New York*, Court of Claims, New York.

### First Department

REAL ESTATE LAW: **Default judgment granted in foreclosure action.** *Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. 20 W. 37 Realty, L.L.C.*, Supreme Court, New York.

LANDLORD-TENANT LAW: **Court dismisses follow up action deeming the case would be prejudicial and confusing.** *562 West 174th Equities v. Mednik*, Civil Court, New York.

FAMILY LAW: **Prior decision upheld; court not inconvenient for matrimonial action.** *R.S.P.S. v. J.S.C.M.*, Supreme Court, Bronx.

### Second Department

REAL ESTATE LAW: **Summary judgment granted in case concerning title of land.** *350 Oakford Street Inc. v. Old Republic National Title Insurance Company* Minnesota, Supreme Court, Kings.

LANDLORD-TENANT LAW: **Court restores possession of apartment to**

tenant. *New York City Housing Authority v. Ingram*, Civil Court, Kings.

### U.S. Courts

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW: **Plaintiff states claim for a constitutional taking; new york law affords him no remedy.** *Sikorsky v. City of Newburgh*, New York, 2d. Cir.

DISCOVERY: **Court grants antitrust litigation plaintiffs supplemental discovery on future damages.** *Iowa Pub. Employees' Ret. Sys. v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Inc.*, SDNY.

CONTRACTUAL DISPUTES: **Court grants plaintiff summary judgment over breaches of financing agreements.** *Northrock Mgmt. LLC v. Cohen*, SDNY.

JUDGES: **Vacatur of recused judge's rulings is proper in putative class action against Peloton.** *Passman v. Peloton Interactive Inc.*, SDNY.

LEGAL MALPRACTICE: **Parties cannot override usual rule that vicarious liability is joint, several liability.** *Applestein v. Kleinhendler*, EDNY.

DECISION SUMMARIES, Page 17  
FULL-TEXT DECISIONS, nylj.com

## INSIDE LAW JOURNAL

Calendar of Events.....	7
Corporate Update.....	5
Court Calendars.....	9
Court Notes.....	10
Decisions.....	17
Disciplinary Proceeding....	9
Expert Analysis.....	3
Judicial Ethics.....	
Opinions.....	6
Lawyer to Lawyer.....	3
Legal Notices.....	15
Outside Counsel.....	4

See page 2 for complete  
Inside lineup.

## HOW COMPETITIVE IS YOUR FOOTPRINT BY PRACTICES?

Ask Legal Compass:  
at.alm.com/legalcompass



ALM. Intelligence



## Build Your Legal Team.

Go to [lawjobs.com](http://lawjobs.com)  
and choose the most  
qualified candidates.

[lawjobs.com](http://lawjobs.com)

Your hiring partner

ALM.

## BONDS

Contact us by phone  
or email at

[info@blaikiegroupp.com](mailto:info@blaikiegroupp.com)

☐ Appeals ☐ Supersedeas  
☐ Discharge Lien ☐ Executor  
☐ Guardian ☐ Lost Instrument

Express Solutions Expressly for  
Bonding Problems Since 1933

THE  
**BLAIKIE**  
GROUP

111 John St., 16th Floor  
New York, New York 10038  
212-962-BOND 212-267-8440

D. Nicholas Blaikie Fayth Vasseur  
Colette M. Blaikie Christine Harding

[www.blaikiegroupp.com](http://www.blaikiegroupp.com)



New York Law Journal Inside

<b>Family and the Law »3</b> <b>Interim Property Distributions in Matrimonial Actions</b> by Joel R. Brandes	<b>Law Firm Management »3</b> <b>Accelerating New Lateral Partners' Integration Using Media Relations</b> by Jordan Friedman and Ivette Delgado	<b>Outside Counsel »4</b> <b>You Are the Product—But Do You Own the Data?</b> by Milton Springut and Jermaine A. Brookshire, Jr.	<b>CORPORATE UPDATE »5</b> <b>Corporate Securities: Activist Proxy Contests: An Evaluation</b> by John C. Coffee  <b>For Ambitious In-House Lawyers, Path to GC Seat No Longer A Straight Line</b> by Trudy Knockless  <b>Online</b> ➤ More Corporate columns are archived at <a href="#">nylj.com</a> .	<b>Nvidia GC's Pay Soars 75%, as Comp Committee Ups Pay Scale for Top Brass</b> by Chris O'Malley  <b>Kohl's Fires CEO For Undisclosed Deal With Vendor</b> by Chris O'Malley	<b>EBay CLO Who Left Last Year Received \$6.5 Million in Severance</b> by Greg Andrews »6
<b>Online</b> ➤ <b>Court Calendars</b>  <b>Civil and Supreme Court calendars</b> for New York and surrounding counties are now <b>available weeks in advance</b> at <a href="#">nylj.com</a> . Search cases by county, index, judge or party name. Important Part information, including addresses, phone numbers and courtrooms are updated daily. <b>Only at nylj.com.</b>				<b>Calendar of Events »7</b>  <b>Online</b> ➤ Submit a legal notice for publication on <a href="#">nylj.com</a> .	

DOJ, FTC Push Agencies to Identify, Rescind Anticompetitive Regulations

BY DAN NOVAK  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

THE LEADERS of the Federal Trade Commission and the U.S. Department of Justice's Antitrust Division on Monday requested that federal agency heads identify anticompetitive regulations to target for elimination.

In a joint letter, FTC Chair Andrew Ferguson and Assistant U.S. Attorney General Gail Slater directed agencies to review regulations for anticompetitive effects, such as those that foster monopolies, build unnecessary barriers for new market participants and limit competition.

The letter follows President Donald Trump's April 9 executive order calling on federal agencies to repeal regulations that reduce competition, entrepreneurship

and innovation. The DOJ created an Anticompetitive Regulations Task Force in late March, as well.

"Anticompetitive federal regulations harm ordinary Americans in many ways," Ferguson and Slater wrote in the letter.

"They lead to higher prices, lower quality goods and services, less innovation, and fewer opportunities to earn a living," the officials added. "The rescission or modification of anticompetitive federal regulations is essential to achieving the economic growth envisioned by President Trump."

The government's leading antitrust enforcers said agencies should focus on removing regulations that harm consumers in health care, energy, technology, agriculture, transportation and government procurement, as well as in other industries. The agencies should submit a list of those



Assistant U.S. Attorney General **Gail Slater**, left, who heads the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, and **Andrew Ferguson**, right, chair of the Federal Trade Commission.

regulations to the DOJ and FTC by June 18, the letter stated.

The DOJ has long stated a desire to eliminate regulations that hinder

competition in both Republican and Democratic administrations. The DOJ task force formalizes the department's prior efforts to eliminate anticompetitive regulations and assist agencies in doing so, said Makan Delrahim, who served as assistant U.S. attorney general in charge of the Antitrust Division during the first Trump administration. "There's not one formal way of looking at new rules, even old rules, for purely their competitive effect," said Delrahim, now a partner at Latham & Watkins. "But they can be pernicious."

The FTC and DOJ can assist other agencies rescinding anticompetitive regulations by providing expertise, helping modify or change existing rules and submitting comments, Delrahim added.

"I see this as a pretty bipartisan effort to use the laws to root out anticompetitive regulation," he said.

Part of the DOJ's role is to promote competition in American markets and the department will provide substantive analysis of any rule's competitive effects based on antitrust law and principles, said former DOJ antitrust attorney Ann O'Brien.

The task force, which is inviting the public to submit anticompetitive regulations for review, is a good chance for industry to have their voice be heard by regulators, O'Brien added.

"I'm always looking for opportunities for clients that I advise to engage with government in an area where they think it's anti-competitive," said O'Brien, a partner at Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton. "I think it's good to be able to do that."

➤ Dan Novak can be reached at [dnovak@alm.com](#).

Zuckerberg's Internal Emails May Doom Meta's Bench Trial Defense, Experts Say

BY SULAIMAN ABDUR-RAHMAN  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

INTERNAL communications from Meta Platforms Inc. CEO Mark Zuckerberg may hurt the company's ability to fight off Federal Trade Commission antitrust claims in court, according to legal observers of the *FTC v. Meta* bench trial.

"The evidence has grown stronger throughout the trial," said Slade Bond, public policy and legislative affairs chair at Cuneo Gilbert & LaDuca. "We are seeing, day after day, fresh new evidence building on the case."

U.S. District Chief Judge James E. Boasberg of the District of Columbia has heard live testimony from multiple witnesses since the trial began April 14, including Zuckerberg and former Meta executive Sheryl Sandberg.

The FTC alleges Meta maintained an unlawful monopoly in social networking services through its 2012 acquisition of Instagram and its 2014 acquisition of WhatsApp.



**Mark Zuckerberg**, CEO of Meta, testifies before the Senate Judiciary Committee during a hearing titled "Big Tech and the Online Child Sexual Exploitation Crisis," in January 2024.

Meta denies the allegations, arguing its acquisitions of complementary apps benefited consumers and that the Menlo Park, California-based company does not have monopoly power in the com-

petitive social networking services market.

Zuckerberg's internal emails contemplating a breakup of Instagram, testimony of TikTok not viewing Meta as a direct com-

petitor and other revelations "completely undercut" Meta's affirmative defenses, said Bond, a former U.S. Department of Justice principal deputy assistant attorney general and former chief counsel of the antitrust subcommittee in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Boasberg "was very critical of Meta's argument that it basically competes with anyone who has Meta's functionality," Bond added. "I think Instagram is a clear-cut candidate for a breakup."

"The FTC's case has gained momentum, and it now has a better than 50-50 chance of winning," Susman Godfrey partner Barry Barnett said Monday. "For two main reasons, Mark Zuckerberg's testimony likely hurt Meta's defense more than it helped. In the first place, any judge hearing the case would worry about a \$1.5 trillion global enterprise that has direct access to 3.35 billion daily users. The worry would heighten if its power lay in the hands of a single person—a

40-year-old college dropout, say. Seeing that person in the witness chair would give that concern a physical presence."

"Nor did [the] substance and manner of Zuckerberg's testimony seem to reassure Chief Judge Boasberg," Barnett added. "On the crucial question—whether Meta/Facebook bought WhatsApp and Instagram so it could keep users despite giving them worse service—Zuckerberg had to fight too many of his own emails and lost credibility as he did so."

The FTC filed a notice Monday asking Boasberg to admit 15 expert reports into evidence.

"Courts presiding over complex antitrust bench trials routinely cite and rely on expert reports," counsel for the FTC wrote in the notice. "Courts may admit expert reports—even when they contain otherwise inadmissible evidence, like hearsay—where the Court sits as the finder of fact. Where there is no jury, 'there is no risk of tainting the trial by exposing a jury to unreliable evidence.'"

Counsel for Meta filed an opposition brief arguing the expert reports are 2,900 pages of "classic inadmissible hearsay" that would "unfairly prejudice Meta."

"If the FTC's expert reports are evidence, then the FTC can use them during post-trial briefing to backfill expert testimony with opinions and supporting materials the expert did not introduce or rely on at trial — and therefore were not subject to Meta's cross examination," Mark C. Hansen of Kellogg, Hansen, Todd, Figel & Frederick and other firm counsel wrote in a brief filed Monday on behalf of Meta.

Boasberg as of Tuesday has not ruled on whether to admit or exclude the FTC's expert reports.

The trial is expected to conclude in July, and Boasberg later in the year may issue a ruling on whether Meta violated Section 2 of the Sherman Act.

➤ Sulaiman Abdur-Rahman can be reached at [aabdur@alm.com](#).

Build and Invest—Not 'Churn and Burn'—Are the Professional Development Keys To Outperforming the Market

BY AMANDA O'BRIEN

AS SURGING revenue and profits amplify a compensation arms race and an ever-present war for talent within the legal industry, firms in the Second Hundred are leveraging culture and professional development in competing with larger ones.

Specifically, law firm leaders emphasized the importance of professional development as a means of recruiting and retaining talent.

Meanwhile, as the market changes rapidly, professional development programs are evolving, with programming increasingly directed towards ultimately enhancing the client experience.

"The adage holds true — firms must learn faster than their clients," observed Clinton Gary, CEO of legal industry consulting firm CREDO. "Firms that have better professional development will more likely deliver greater value, better service, and be positioned to deliver more services, moving them into [a] trusted advisory position."

Marcie Borgal Shunk, president and founder of The Tilt Institute in Houston, also described the importance of keeping up with broader changes to how legal services are delivered, and the impact of this transformation on professional development.

"Historically, we were able to learn and master each piece of information that would serve us well for years or even decades, but because things are changing so much more rapidly than ever before, we don't need to master what we know, we need to master how to learn things every day," she



**Marcie Borgal Shunk**, The Tilt Institute

said. "It's a different skillset, and it's driving professional development."

For firm leaders, meanwhile, recruitment and retention is front of mind when it comes to professional development.

"The reason why this is important is that it's always infinitely easier to help someone who's already here improve rather than churn and burn like some of the bigger firms do," said Jennifer Martinez, chief diversity, equity and inclusion officer at Second Hundred firm Hanson Bridgett. "We make investments in people the same way as we invest in real estate and technology."

Joseph Hanna, hiring partner and diversity task force chair at Second Hundred firm Goldberg Segalla, arrived at a similar conclusion.

"As a recruiting strategy, when I make an offer for the firm, I want the attorney to be here [for] the rest of their career. We want to roll out the red carpet and invest in our lawyers, and that commitment has certainly helped in our retention," Hanna said. "We have our highest attorney count that we've ever had. We're focusing on growth and this professional development piece of that has helped."

And with that retention comes enhanced profitability, Shunk observed.

"Retention is less tangible, but



**Joseph Hanna**, Goldberg Segalla

there is a cost if you are losing people on a regular basis. Retention helps drive the bottom line and increase the financial performance of the firm, and those investments [in professional development] translate into more financially successful law firms," she said.

**Technology and AI**

Generative AI took the legal world by storm in 2024, and while the predicted revolution has yet to fully take hold, Second Hundred firm leaders are not only offering training on generative AI in response to attorney demand, they are also using the technology themselves to innovate on professional development.

Professional development leaders at Hanson Bridgett, Goldberg Segalla, and Lowenstein Sandler all noted increased demand from attorneys for training on how to use AI, as did Gary at CREDO.

Lowenstein, however, has gone a step further, infusing a range of its professional development efforts with technology.

"In terms of all the things we do, these days we're thinking about how we're out in front in innovative thinking and behavior—growth mindsets are really important, and so is habit development," said Patti Scott, director of professional development at the

Second Hundred firm. "These days we know the current professional has to have an authentic and active personality, especially with AI, and they need to combine new habits with using the tools."

According to Scott, the firm has been using AI to help associates "conquer the blank page" when it comes to writing up their self-assessments for reviews; partners have also been using AI to help summarize assessments in preparation to write a final review.

"We have such high participation in the performance review process, it can be difficult for partners to synthesize so many voices. AI can take this lengthy draft review and help summarize it into an impactful career," Scott said.

In addition to adopting a "robust, multilayered training program" for both attorneys and the firm's business support group to use Microsoft CoPilot, the firm has also incorporated technology in day-to-day feedback processes.

"Last year into this year, we piloted a real-time feedback process...[that] gives associates the ability to solicit performance feedback real time through a tool," Scott said Associates can send a form with five standard questions to a supervisor after completing a piece of work. The pilot program confirmed that the feedback form could be filled out in less than 10 minutes, preventing feedback from going stale, and allows attorneys to get feedback before it comes time for individual reviews, Scott said.

The firm has also employed technology in its work-allocation process. Through a program called LS Assign, Lowenstein keeps track of assignments and hours, which Scott noted helps optimize

the firm's attorney utilization.

"We want to look at work assignment and be able to tell a story about what it gets [attorneys] access to," Scott said. "Are they getting runways for mentorship, networking, brand development in the organization? Are they getting exposure to other associates, mid-level associates, partners, people in their practice group and other practice groups, and are more people getting eyes on their work?"

Making a Rainmaker

Personnel at firms noted the importance of business development, marketing, and basic, hard legal skills in their professional development programs.

While hard skill training has remained fairly consistent for some time now, Shunk explained, power dynamics have shifted towards talent, who seek a different type of structure than the traditional apprenticeship model in which young lawyers would be trained one on one by a partner.

As such, Shunk said, firms have shifted towards more programmatic training on "soft skills," including business development and networking.

Teaching attorneys how to network was one new branch of programming highlighted by Hanna at Goldberg Segalla; Lowenstein Sandler's work allocation program ensures attorneys aren't falling through the cracks and are learning to network with partners internally; and Hanson Bridgett's Martinez noted it takes an individualized approach, helping attorneys interested in becoming subject matter and thought leadership experts, as well as in-person "connectors."

Gary and Shunk also noted the rise in demand for leadership-focused training, to help attorneys learn how to navigate managing a team and providing effective feedback to their reports. For example,

Hanson Bridgett's academies train first-years in hard legal skills, mid-levels on business development and other soft leadership skills, and senior associates on the business operations of the firm in preparation for becoming partner.

But not everyone at a law firm wants to be a partner in the traditional sense, Shunk noted, which is driving change in professional development offerings.

"Several years ago, talent began saying, 'We want to do things differently, we don't want the life of a traditional partner, we want more flexibility, we want to work from home, we don't want to work the same number of hours, and perhaps we want partnership tracks that don't look the same,'" Shunk said. "And all of those things put pressure on firms to do things differently."

And with those new paths for attorneys, Gary said, comes an increased need for transparency.

"If firms are going to define alternative 'paths,' then they need to define the map to provide the attorney clarity of responsibilities to get from point A (existing title) to point B (the title or responsibility the attorney wants to get to, and the title the firm needs) and what the firm will do to help them on that journey," Gary explained. "Paths are not about profitability but maximizing talent — success and fulfillment — which maximizes effort, leading to better retention."

**'Profit-Sharing Partner'**

In response to those generational differences and uncertainties, Second Hundred firms are embracing both clarity and flexibility, with one firm even offering a third kind of partnership track to help cultivate the next generation of talent.

Armstrong Teasdale, No. 172 in this year's revenue rankings, has developed a third kind of partnership tier. Responding to

➤ Page 9



Expert Analysis

FAMILY AND THE LAW

Interim Property Distributions  
In Matrimonial Actions

Domestic Relations Law §234 deals with property determinations before or after final judgment in certain matrimonial actions.

It provides, in relevant part, that in any action for divorce, for a separation, for an annulment or to declare the nullity of a void marriage, the court may (1) determine any question as to the title to property arising between the parties; and (2) make such direction, between the parties, concerning the possession of property as in the court's discretion justice requires, having regard to the circumstances of the case and of the respective parties.

Under Domestic Relations Law §234 the determination regarding title to property or direction concerning possession of property may be made in the final judgment or by one or more orders made before or after final judgment, or by both order or orders and final judgment.

In contrast, Domestic Relations Law §236 (B)(5) (a) deals with property determinations and distributions in the final judgment in an action where all or part of the relief granted is divorce, the dissolution, annulment, or declaration of the nullity of a marriage, and in proceedings to obtain a distribution of marital property following a foreign judgment of divorce.

It provides that except where the parties have provided in an agreement for the disposition of their property pursuant to Domestic Relations Law §236 (B)(3), the court, shall determine the respective rights of the parties in their separate or marital property, and shall provide for the disposition thereof in the final judgment.

JOEL R. BRANDES practices matrimonial law in New York City concentrating on appeals. He is the author of the twelve-volume treatise, *Law and the Family New York, 2024-2025 Edition*, and *Law and the Family New York Forms, 2024 Edition* (five volumes), both published by Thomson Reuters, and the *New York Matrimonial Trial Handbook, 2d Edition* (Bookbaby, 2024).

By  
Joel R.  
Brandes



Separate property shall remain such. Marital property shall be distributed equitably between the parties, considering the circumstances of the case and of the respective parties.

In the absence of a final judgment of divorce, the court is without the authority to make property dispositions under Domestic Relations Law §236 (B)(5). (*Brevilus v. Brevilus*, 41 A.D.3d 630, 839 N.Y.S.2d 157 (2d Dep't 2007)).

Unlike jointly owned property or property held as tenants in common property held as tenants by entireties is not subject to partition except by mutual consent to become effective only upon dissolution of the marriage.

In addition, Domestic Relations Law §236(B)(5)(f), provides that, in addition to making determinations and distributions of separate and marital property as set forth in Domestic Relations Law §236(B)(5), "the court may make such order regarding the use and occupancy of the marital home and its household effects as provided in" Domestic Relations Law §234, "without regard to the form of ownership of such property."

Domestic Relations Law §236(B)(5)(f) makes it clear that the court may award a spouse use and occupancy of the marital home and its household effects in divorce actions, even though title to the home remains solely in the name of the other spouse.

The Supreme Court lacks authority under Domestic Relations Law §234 to determine a question as

to the title of property arising between the parties unless there is a valid dispute between them to the title of the property.

Nothing in Domestic Relations Law §234 allows the court to transfer to one spouse property belonging solely to the other. (*Dolphus v. Dolphus*, 39 A.D.2d 829, 332 N.Y.S.2d 974 (4th Dep't 1972); *McGuigan v. McGuigan*, 46 A.D.2d 665, 359 N.Y.S.2d 842 (2d Dep't 1974)).

Determinations as to title under Domestic Relations Law §234 are not discretionary but are governed by the rules of property law, because Domestic Relations Law §234 was a procedural change, not a change of substantive property law or as to the applicable criteria for determining ownership. (*Baum v. Baum*, 72 A.D.2d 781, 421 N.Y.S.2d 601 (2d Dep't 1979)).

"[T]he determination of title questions [is] to be controlled by principles of property law." (*Kahn v. Kahn*, 43 N.Y.2d 203, 401 N.Y.S.2d 47, 371 N.E.2d 809 (1977)).

The legislative history of Domestic Relations Law §234 clearly indicates that the legislature did not intend to alter existing substantive property law principles in enacting this section. Its essential purpose was procedural: to permit a court in a marital action to resolve disputes involving possession and title to property arising as an incident to the marital action. (*Kahn v. Kahn*, 43 N.Y.2d 203, 401 N.Y.S.2d 47 (1977)).

Where appropriate, the court may exclude one spouse pendente lite from the property owned solely by the other or award exclusive occupancy of a jointly owned home after trial, because this is a direction "concerning the possession" of the property within the wording of the statute. (*Watkins v. Watkins*, 19 A.D.2d 872, 244 N.Y.S.2d 86 (1st Dep't 1963); *Schwartzman v. Schwartzman*, 62 A.D.2d 988, 403 N.Y.S.2d 317 (2d Dep't 1978); *Kaplan v. Kaplan*, 66 A.D.2d 834, 411 N.Y.S.2d 406 (2d Dep't 1978)).

A tenancy by the entirety is a form of real property ownership available only to parties married at the time of the conveyance. As tenants by the entirety, » Page 8

LAW FIRM MANAGEMENT

Accelerating New Lateral Partners' Integration Using Media Relations

Immediately integrating a new lateral partner into a law firm's media relations program accelerates the new partner's external business development efforts, as well as the internal mining of new business opportunities within the firm



By  
Jordan  
Friedman



And  
Ivette  
Delgado

Lateral lawyer moves hit a five-year high in 2024, with no sign of slowing down this year. A law firm that immediately integrates a lateral into the firm's strategic communications program will see benefits that include quickly establishing the lawyer's thought leadership in priority areas, as well as the direct generation of new business development opportunities.

Just this month we saw a meaningful cross-selling opportunity arise as a result of a law firm's media relations program. A new lateral partner at a national law firm was preparing for a media interview we coordinated with a reporter at a priority trade publication.

As part of his preparation, he consulted with a client for perspectives. During the conversation, his client told him about four specific services he needed. Coincidentally, the law firm represents another client that provides those services, creating an opportunity for the new hire to connect and engage with the colleague that represents the service provider.

This is a perfect example of the kind of collaboration law firms are looking for from the lateral hires they bring on, and the law firm's quick integration of the new partner into its media relations efforts can be credited for enabling this connection.

Facilitating the Transition  
from the Public Sector  
To Private Practice

Attorneys transitioning from the public sector bring invaluable experience to law firms. But new

JORDAN FRIEDMAN and IVETTE DELGADO are vice presidents at Infinite, a public relations firm that focuses on achieving communications success for law and professional services firms.

lateral partners from the public sector may find navigating the cultures and contours of their new law firms, particularly large ones with multiple offices and practice groups, a significant adjustment. In addition, an attorney joining from the public sector may not have had prior opportunities to engage in business development activities,

For external communications, media coverage can be leveraged to highlight a lateral's strengths in areas of key importance to the firm, allowing the firm to take command and ownership of priority issues in the marketplace.

so he or she may need time to build and hone those skill sets.

Immediately integrating a new lateral from government into a firm's media relations program can quickly provide opportunities for the lateral to build visibility, establish credibility on priority firm matters, and begin contributing to the advancement of the firm's broader strategic goals.

Media coverage secured for laterals can be leveraged internally at firms to ensure that partners throughout the firm are aware of their focus areas, so that laterals can be plugged into priority efforts to serve clients or pursue development opportunities.

For external communications, media coverage can be leveraged to highlight a lateral's strengths in areas of key importance to the firm, allowing the firm to take command

and ownership of priority issues in the marketplace.

Pathways for Integration  
Success Using Media Relations

While every law firm has its own distinct culture and process for lateral partner integration, all firms can swiftly involve new members in their media relations efforts.

Given today's faster-than-ever news cycles and the media's constant need for informed sources for insights and analysis, robust and sustained engagement with reporters can produce meaningful media coverage quickly.

With this in mind, there are several practical steps a firm can take to help pave the pathway for effective lateral integration into the firm's media relations program.

Create a website bio that is succinct but contains specifics: Attorney bios are often the most visited pages on a law firm's website. These pages are not only visited by clients and new business prospects, but by partners within the law firm seeking to learn more about their partners. Specific areas of expertise should be highlighted, as well as representative matters, and, as appropriate, noteworthy elements of personal and professional histories. When possible, avoid large blocks of text, and instead consider the use of bullet points for clarity, impact and pithy delivery.

In addition, regularly update attorney bios to showcase recent successes and awards, as well as thought leadership demonstrated by articles and participation in noteworthy events, conferences and other forums.

Schedule intake sessions with the firm's communications team, including the external PR agency: Intake sessions, which can be conducted very efficiently (often in a half-hour or less) allow the communications team to learn a new lateral partner's specific perspectives and priorities.

By arming the communications professionals with information and insights that can be immediately leveraged with the media, new lateral partners can be "put into play" right away. » Page 9

BONDS

Contact us by phone or email at  
**info@blaikiegroupp.com**

Express Solutions Expressly for Bonding Problems Since 1933

THE  
BLAIKIE  
GROUP

- Appeals
- Discharge Lien
- Guardian
- Supersedeas
- Executor
- Lost Instrument

111 John St., 16th Floor, New York, New York 10038

212-962-BOND 212-267-8440

D. Nicholas Blaikie Colette M. Blaikie Fayth Vasseur Christine Harding

www.blaikiegroupp.com

LAWYER TO LAWYER

For information  
contact  
212-457-7850

FLORIDA ATTORNEY

LAW OFFICES OF RANDY C. BOTWINICK

Formerly of Pazer, Epstein, Jaffe & Fein

CONCENTRATING IN PERSONAL INJURY



RANDY C. BOTWINICK  
34 Years Experience

- Car Accidents
- Slip & Falls
- Maritime
- Wrongful Death



- Defective Products
- Tire & Rollover Cases
- Traumatic Brain Injury
- Construction Accidents



JAY HALPERN  
39 Years Experience

Co-Counsel and  
Participation Fees Paid

Now associated with Halpern, Santos and Pinkert, we have obtained well over \$100,000,000 in awards for our clients during the last three decades. This combination of attorneys will surely provide the quality representation you seek for your Florida personal injury referrals.

MIAMI 150 Alhambra Circle  
Suite 1100, Coral Gables, FL 33134  
P 305 895 5700 F 305 445 1169

PALM BEACH 2385 NW Executive Center Drive  
Suite 100, Boca Raton, FL 33431  
P 561 995 5001 F 561 962 2710

Toll Free:  
**1-877-FLA-ATTY (352-2889)**

From Orlando to Miami... From Tampa to the Keys | www.personalinjurylawyer.ws

GERSONWITZ LIBO  
& KOREK P.C.

New Jersey Office

Let Us Help With Your NJ Injury Litigation

- Over \$1 Billion Recovered on Behalf of Our Clients
- Michael A. Fruhling, ESQ: Board of Governors for the NJAJ
- Jeff S. Korek, ESQ: New Jersey Bar Member

GLK

39 Years Experience

Call 24/7:  
**866-450-4101**

157 Engle Street  
Englewood, NJ 07631  
LAWYERTIME.COM

THE NY NO-FAULT ARBITRATION ATTORNEY  
TO THE PERSONAL INJURY MEMBERS OF THE BAR



**ANDREW J. COSTELLA JR., ESQ.**

CONCENTRATING  
IN NO-FAULT ARBITRATION  
FOR YOUR CLIENTS'  
OUTSTANDING

MEDICAL BILLS & LOST WAGE CLAIMS

SUCCESSFULLY HANDLING THOUSANDS OF NO-FAULT CLAIMS  
Proud to serve and honored that NY's most prominent personal injury law firms have entrusted us with their no-fault arbitration matters

LAW OFFICES OF ANDREW J COSTELLA JR., ESQ.,  
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

600 Old Country Road, Suite 307, Garden City, NY 11530  
(516) 747-0377 | arbmail@costellalaw.com

New York Law Journal



Give Your Clients a Gift with Real Value.

Grant your clients unlimited access to award-winning legal news coverage with an ALM Gift Subscription.

Get Started  
Visit [at.law.com/gift](http://at.law.com/gift)



IN BRIEF

« Continued from page 1

hit in a week, other times, there would be weeks in a row without a new SPAC.

This was not one of those weeks. In the vehicles’ strongest showing since early 2022, there were eight new SPACs from April 28 through May 5. Of those eight, four were done by one duo from one firm.

Ellenoff Grossman & Schole partners Douglas Ellenoff and Stuart Neuhauser worked a full 50% of the SPACs this past week, on its busiest week in years.

Ellenoff told Law.com that the increase in the SPAC market “can be attributed to several factors.”

The number of listed SPACs (that have already completed their IPOs and are in search mode for their DeSPAC partners) has declined substantially over the last few years, while “the number of more mature private companies seeking to go public (and recognize that the IPO market is shut) has increased a lot and overall valuations are much more favorable for these discussions to be productive and proceed,” Ellenoff said in an email.

“In a related development, the amount of capital willing to support these transactions has dramatically increased as well,” he added.

Unlike the surge from 2020 into early 2022, where the market eventually became saturated and some of those SPACs were left waiting for a partner, Ellenoff says this iteration, thus far, is well within the normal bounds for sustainability.

“Yes, while we are ahead of SPAC industry numbers in a standard year (prior to 2021-2023), we are well within the number of publicly-traded SPACs that can transact with private companies looking for liquidity in the public markets,” he wrote. “The macro-dynamic factors are all pointing positively for the moment.”

Ellenoff also said that the use of the SPAC vehicle, aided by the idea that “there needs to be an alternative means of going public other than IPOs and direct listings,” even in the face of some regulatory efforts to “disadvantage” SPACs, is a testament to its viability in the market.

“Today’s resurgence is confirmation that despite those (regulatory) roadblocks, SPACs serve a necessary and important mechanism to go public and access U.S. markets.”

Welcome back, SPACs.

Deals on the Radar

The information regarding the deals below was derived exclusively from Law.com Radar.

Merck KGaA, a science and technology company, has agreed to acquire SpringWorks Therapeutics, a commercial-stage biopharmaceutical company focused on severe rare diseases and cancer, for approximately \$3.9 billion. Sullivan & Cromwell advised Merck, which is based in Darmstadt, Germany. Goodwin Procter advised Stamford, Connecticut-based SpringWorks. Centerview Partners and Goldman Sachs & Co., which acted as joint financial advisors to SpringWorks, were advised by a Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom team including Graham Robinson and Christopher Barlow.

Novartis AG will acquire Regulus, a biopharmaceutical company focused on the discovery and development of innovative

medicines targeting microRNAs, for an initial payment of \$7 per share in cash at closing, or up to \$1.7 billion. Novartis, which is based in Basel, Switzerland, was advised by Covington & Burling partners Catherine Dargan and Michael Riella. Regulus, which is based in Carlsbad, California, was advised by a Latham & Watkins team led by partners Charles Ruck and Daniel Rees.

Sabre Corp., a technology provider to the global travel industry, has agreed to sell its Hospitality Solutions business to TPG for \$1.1 billion in cash. Sabre was advised by a Haynes and Boone team led by partner Dan Malone and associate Joshua Reisman. TPG was counseled by Davis Polk & Wardwell.

SPACs:

Churchill Capital Corp X, a blank-check company founded by former Citi executive Michael Klein, registered with the SEC on April 28 for a \$300 million IPO. The New York-based company, which has applied to list its shares on the Nasdaq, was advised by Ellenoff Grossman & Schole partners Douglas Ellenoff and Stuart Neuhauser. The underwriters, led by BTIG LLC, were represented by White & Case partners Daniel Nussen and Joel Rubinstein.

Wen Acquisition Corp., a blank-check company targeting the fintech sector, filed with the SEC on April 30 to raise up to \$261 million in an initial public offering. The SPAC, which has applied to list its shares on the Nasdaq, was advised by Ellenoff Grossman & Schole partners Douglas Ellenoff and Stuart Neuhauser. Underwriter Cantor Fitzgerald Co. was advised by DLA Piper partner Stephen Alicanti.

Inflection Point Acquisition Corp. III, a blank-check company, registered with the SEC on April 29 for a \$253 million IPO. Underwriter and sole book-running manager Cantor Fitzgerald & Co. was represented by a DLA Piper team led by partner Stephen Alicanti. Counsel information for the SPAC was not immediately available.

MSM Frontier Capital Acquisition Corp., a blank-check company targeting African energy and cement companies, filed with the SEC on April 30 to raise up to \$225 million in an initial public offering. The SPAC, which has applied to list its shares on the Nasdaq, was advised by Ellenoff Grossman & Schole partners Douglas Ellenoff and Stuart Neuhauser. The underwriters, led by SPAC Advisory Partners, were represented by Loeb & Loeb partners David Levine and Mitchell Nussbaum.

ProCap Acquisition Corp, a blank-check company led by the founder of investment firm Professional Capital Management, filed with the SEC to raise up to \$200 million in an initial public offering. The SPAC, which

has applied to list its shares on the Nasdaq, is advised by Reed Smith partners Anne Peetz and Lynwood Reinhardt. Lead underwriter BTIG is represented by Kirkland & Ellis partner Christian Nagler.

Wintergreen Acquisition Corp I, a blank check backed by Cohen & Co., registered with the SEC on April 25 for a \$200 million IPO. The New York-based company, which has applied to list its shares on the Nasdaq, was advised by Ellenoff Grossman & Schole partners Douglas Ellenoff and Stuart Neuhauser. The underwriters, led by Cohen & Co., were represented by Loeb & Loeb partners David Levine and Mitchell Nussbaum.

Wintergreen Acquisition Corp., a blank-check company targeting the TMT industry in Asia, filed with the SEC on April 28 for a \$50 million IPO. The SPAC, which has applied to list its shares on the Nasdaq, was advised by Concord & Sage partner Qin Li. The underwriters, led by D. Boral Capital, were represented by Robinson & Cole partner Er Zhou.

IPOS:

The Growthub Limited, a Singapore-based AgriTech firm, filed with the SEC on May 2 to raise up to \$20.3 million in an initial public offering. Growthub, which has applied to list its shares on the Nasdaq under the ticker ‘TGH.L,’ was advised by Loeb & Loeb partner Lawrence Venick. Underwriter Alexander Capital, which is based in Red Bank, New Jersey, was advised by Akerman partners Christina Russo and Mark Y. Liu.

Debt Offerings:

Alphabet was counseled by Davis Polk & Wardwell in a debt issuance worth \$5 billion. The investment-grade notes were issued in four tranches. The Davis Polk team included partners Alan F. Denenberg and Frank Azzopardi.

Chiyo-da, Japan-based Sumitomo Mitsui Trust Bank was counseled by Davis Polk & Wardwell in a debt offering worth \$2.5 billion. The Davis Polk team included partner Christopher Kodama.

Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson counseled the lead underwriters in connection with Procter & Gamble’s debt offering of \$1.25 billion. Underwriters, which included Citigroup, Morgan Stanley and Goldman Sachs, were advised by a Fried Frank team led by partners Andrew Barkan and Daniel Bursky.

Banco de Credito del Peru was counseled by Davis Polk & Wardwell in a debt offering worth \$750 million. The Davis Polk team included partners Manuel Garcia-diaz and Michael Mollerus.

D.R. Horton was counseled by Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher in a debt issuance valued at \$500 million. The notes come due 2030. Cahill Gordon & Reindel advised underwriters BofA Securities, Mizuho Securities USA, U.S. Bank and Wells Fargo Securities.

Latham & Watkins advised Jefferson Capital Holdings, a purchaser and servicer of consumer charged-off and insolvency receivables, in a debt offering worth \$500 million. The notes come due in 2030. The Latham team was led by partners Marc Jaffe and Erika Weinberg.

—Patrick Smith

Outside Counsel

You Are the Product— But Do You Own the Data?

When Jessie downloaded a fitness app to track her daily runs, little did she realize that she was creating valuable data points that would be aggregated, analyzed, and sold to advertisers.

Though she inputted her heart rate, routes, and personal health information, does Jessie actually own this data? Can she demand its deletion or prevent its sale? These questions highlight the growing tension between personal data and property rights in the digital age.

The Data Ownership Dilemma

In today’s digital economy, personal data has become an incredibly valuable commodity—there are companies that profit from this information—and the question remains: do you actually own your own data?

This distinction matters. When you post on social media, track your fitness on an app, or simply browse websites, you generate data that companies collect, analyze, and monetize. The average American’s personal data is estimated to be worth as high as \$500 - \$7,000 annually to data brokers and technology companies. Without established ownership rights, individuals have limited control over how this information is used or who profits from it.

What Does “Data Ownership” Actually Mean?

According to the United States Office of Research Integrity, at least as it pertains to research, “[d]ata ownership refers to both the possession of and responsibility for information. Ownership implies power as well as control. The control of information includes not just the ability to access, create, modify, package, derive benefit from, sell or remove data, but also the right to assign these access privileges to others.”

MILTON SPRINGUT is a partner at Herrick, Feinstein in its litigation department and intellectual property and technology group. JERMAINE A. BROOKSHIRE, JR. is an associate at the firm.

Bar President

« Continued from page 1

small firm practice for rubber meets the road issues of the average person,” said his close friend, Michael Miller, who was also a former NYSBA president who received mentoring from Pruzansky.

Pruzansky also held a term as president of the Suffolk County Bar Association.

Hank Greenberg, a Greenberg Traurig shareholder and yet another former NYSBA president, called Pruzansky “a model of courageous, principled and independent bar leadership.”

Miller remembered how Pruzansky led the state bar in bringing suit against the federal government, specifically Reno, regarding a portion of the Health Insurance Affordability Act.

At issue was the government’s desire to criminalize the practice of advising clients on how to lawfully dispose of assets to qualify for Medicaid.

“I remember it vividly because this is an area of my practice,” Miller said. “He called it the ‘Granny’s Advisor Goes to Jail Act.’ It was very controversial at the bar; suing the federal government was no small matter.”

Miller said Pruzansky saw it as a right-to-counsel issue, and that he found it perfectly lawful for attorneys, as well as accountants, social workers and financial planners, to advise elderly clients in this way.

Johnson

« Continued from page 1

fare and safety of all our students. I am retiring from Paul Weiss and intend to devote significant time and energy to Columbia.”

“Paul Weiss has been my private law practice home off and on for over 40 years,” he added. “I will miss my colleagues there and appreciate the loyalty and support they have shown me over the years.”

In a statement, Paul Weiss chair Brad Karp noted that Johnson initially joined the law firm more than four decades ago and has left the firm four previous times for government service.

“Jeh has had a long, storied career, both in private practice and public service....I am incredibly grateful to have been partners with Jeh throughout my career



By  
Milton  
Springut



And  
Jermaine A.  
Brookshire, Jr.

However, the question persists as to whether the personal data that you submit for public consumption is something over which you can claim legal ownership—and, further, whether you can exclude others (such as popular social media platforms) from profiting from, or using such data without your consent?

In today’s digital economy, personal data has become an incredibly valuable commodity — there are companies that profit from this information — and the question remains: do you actually own your own data?

The Legal Framework: Can Data Be Property?

Americans are afforded certain inalienable rights (*i.e.*, freedom of speech, rights to due process, and equal protection under the law), and while privacy is implied in our constitutional framework, our legal system has struggled to clearly define data ownership rights in the digital age.

This gap is not surprising. Concerns about data protection emerged alongside the rise of internet technologies, which were not contemplated when our fundamental human rights frameworks were established. This has created a legal gray area where many argue that the right to privacy in the digital age should be treated as a specific legal right to be defined and regulated, rather than assumed to be covered by existing fundamental rights principles.

A salient case which deals with common law conversion and whether it applies to intangibles is *Kremen v. Cohen*, 337 F.3d 1024, 1029-30 (9th Cir. 2003) (California conversion law). To make out a claim for conversion, one must show a property interest in the thing converted. *Id.*

Property is a broad concept that includes every intangible benefit and prerogative susceptible of possession or disposition....We apply a three-part test to determine whether a property right exists: “First, there must be an interest capable of precise definition; second, it must be capable of exclusive possession or control; and third, the putative owner must have established a legitimate claim to exclusivity.” *Id.*

Application of this test suggests that a set of personal data can, indeed, be a form of personal property:

- (a) *it can be defined precisely*—the data points for certain types of information (name, address, credit card number, heart rate, etc.), or more precisely, the association of particular data points (average heart rate) with particular identifying information (name), and their inclusion in a set of data about the person;
- (b) *it is capable of exclusive control*; and
- (c) *it is based on a legitimate claim to exclusivity*—for instance, where the data pertains to a particular person and the person creates a data set about themselves by inputting their data into an app where it was stored in a database and associated with their identity then the data set was created through the efforts of the person over a period of time.

Legislative Approach To Data Rights

Support for treating data as property can be found in the California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018 (the “CCPA”), » Page 6

DOJ’s Client

« Continued from page 1

mon Distinguished Professor of Law at New York Law School.

So the president may define the mission broadly, but the norm is that a prosecutor makes calls on a case-by-case basis.

Those guidelines and traditions are important, because they help a prosecutor avoid substituting their own objective—or the objective of someone who is not their client—for that of the client.

That does not mean the attorney general ignores the president’s directives. It just means ethics and rules control steps taken in response to a directive.

“It would not be illegal for the president to call the attorney general and say, ‘I never liked this guy, why don’t you see if he violated the Internal Revenue Code,’” Gillers opined. “The attorney general is obligated to comply with the order of her boss, so long as doing so does not violate the ethics or rules of the court that licensed her, or where she practices,” Gillers said.

So how does a prosecutor make decisions on behalf of a non-speaking entity?

“The prosecutor is serving as a fiduciary for the public,” said Roiphe. “In order to do that, you follow your ethical obligations,

you follow policy priorities defined by the elected official, and you follow the Department of Justice guidelines and traditions.”

The attorney general is hemmed in by a number of checks and balances: criminal law, legal ethical considerations, rules of professional conduct and the penalties of disbarment, civil liability or criminal prosecution.

The candidate is also nominated, vetted prior to taking the role, to ensure they’re fit and have the knowledge and experience to follow the law and the Constitution. And a lawyer owes a duty to the courts that license them, as well as their client.

“They’re surrounded by other prosecutors who have taken oaths,” Green illustrated. “They have the risk that if they act in their own interest and not in the public interest, they can be disbarred. They could be impeached. Their reputation could be ruined.”

“At the end of the day, somebody has to have decision-making authority,” he added. “There are processes in place to incentivize those people to make disinterested decisions.”

It’s not an exact science, Roiphe said.

“It’s a way of approaching a case that ensures that, as best we can, we achieve uncontroversial goals, like treating like cases alike and not putting innocent

people in prison,” she stated.

Norms, Gillers highlighted, are important to maintaining and ensuring the public maintains trust that the prosecutor is conducting themselves appropriately.

Historically, the relationship between the president and the attorney general or the Justice Department has been an arm’s-length one, in which the president exercises “a narrow scope of authority” over the DOJ, Gillers said.

“Once we establish that separation, we can have confidence that decisions of DOJ are made for legal reasons and that discretion is exercised for legal reasons only and not political reasons,” Gillers said. “If law alone determines the decisions of the Department of Justice, we can have greater confidence that those decisions will be the same from administration to administration.”

“We’re testing that theory now,” he added.

@ Emily Saul can be reached at esaul@alm.com.

Questions? Tips? Contact our news desk: editorialnylj@alm.com

Renew your subscription by phone! Call the New York Law Journal at 1-877-256-2472.

and I thank Jeh immensely for the contributions he has made to the legal profession both inside and outside Paul, Weiss,” Karp said. “As Jeh steps away from Paul, Weiss for the fifth time, Columbia University is lucky to have him as a co-chair of the Board of Trustees, where I know he will continue his career-long commitment to leading with courage and wisdom.”

Johnson was a 2021 recipient of The American Lawyer’s Lifetime Achievement Award.

Columbia University had its own agreement with the White House in late March after Trump suspended over \$400 million in federal funding on the premise that the school was not doing enough to protect Jewish students. As part of that deal to get its funding back, the university agreed to overhaul its protest policies, security practices and Middle Eastern studies

department. Still, the university announced this week that it is laying off nearly 180 employees following the funding cuts.

Johnson will serve alongside David Greenwald, the chairman emeritus of Fried Frank who became co-chair of the board of trustees in 2023.

“There’s no one better suited to co-chair the board of trustees right now than Jeh Johnson, a leader who has spent his career in public service and in private practice navigating some of the most complex and consequential issues imaginable,” said Greenwald.

@ Patrick Smith can be reached at psmith@alm.com.

Have a Move to Announce?

E-mail potential “On the Move” items to pkane@alm.com



# Corporate Update

## For Ambitious In-House Lawyers, Path To GC Seat No Longer A Straight Line

BY TRUDY KNOCKLESS

FOR years, the path for reaching the general counsel seat was predictable: Start in Big Law, transition in-house and climb steadily within a legal department.

But today's GCs aren't just legal authorities—they're strategists, trusted advisers and cultural leaders. That evolution is opening new doors for in-house lawyers, but it's also raising the bar for what the job demands—leadership, visibility and



Jasmine Singh, general counsel of Ironclad

the ability to navigate business, social and political complexity with confidence.

"It's not just legal and regulatory," said Richard Parr, who's been a legal chief for various companies for nearly two decades and currently is GC of the optometry practice network AEG Vision. "It's reputational issues, public policy, economic policy, culture, geopolitical concerns. You have to play across a much broader field."

This expectation of breadth—expert lawyers with the smarts and social intelligence to advise the board on a geopolitical conflict one day and win the trust of a business unit leader disdainful of attorneys the next—has elevated the stature and influence of the GC in the C-suite.

### High-Stakes Decision

But it's also made finding GC candidates who bring the whole package extraordinarily difficult.

As veteran recruiter John Gilmore, managing partner of the legal recruiting firm BarkerGilmore, put it, "Over the last five or six years, it's gone from, 'I need someone with a great resume' to 'I need someone who can dazzle us with their interpersonal skills and leadership ability.'"

Companies' fear of getting the hire wrong is palpable. It's a big reason that more companies are requiring GC candidates to go through

» Page 8

## Nvidia GC's Pay Soars 75%, as Comp Committee Ups Pay Scale for Top Brass

BY CHRIS O'MALLEY

WHEN Timothy Teter left Cooley to become general counsel of the chip designer Nvidia eight years ago, many people outside tech had never heard of it. Today, it's leading the AI revolution.

And Teter's faith in the future of the Santa Clara, California-based company is paying off royally, with his compensation in the 2025 fiscal year, which ended Jan. 26, totaling \$19.2 million.

That's a jump of about 75% from the \$11.0 million Teter earned the year before, according to the company's proxy statement filed late Thursday with the Securities and Exchange Commission.



Nvidia headquarters in Santa Clara, Calif.

Teter, whose salary was \$844,087, received \$17.8 million in stock awards. That's \$8.2 million more in stock than he received the year before, accounting for his sharp rise in pay.

The shares vest over several years, meaning the ultimate return for Teter depends on the stock's long-term performance. But if the stock maintains a fraction of the momentum it's had in recent years, he'll make a fortune. Nvidia's five-year return was nearly 1,500%, and the company now ranks as the world's third-most-valuable company.

Teter's big boost in 2025 pay stems from the fact that the compensation committee's "decided that increases to each (named executive officer's) total target pay were appropriate in light of

» Page 6

### CORPORATE SECURITIES

## Activist Proxy Contests: An Evaluation

By  
John C.  
Coffee



HERE is a small mystery (or, at least, a riddle). Corporate CEOs are sleeping poorly at night because sive hedge funds, which have largely replaced the hostile takeovers of earlier generations.

The number of such engagements continues to rise (and Barclays finds the last three years – 2022 to 2024—have been the "busiest three year period for activists on record"). Typically, these "engagements" will seek to add outside directors, nominated by the activist hedge fund, to the corporate board.

In 2024, 160 different investors launched campaigns, and this number included 45 first-time activists. That rookies are rushing into this field means that many small profits in activism. But should they?

Clearly, activists can succeed. In 2024, 119 board seats were won globally by activists (either by way of settlement or a proxy contest), and some 27 CEOs resigned at companies targeted by activists (also a new record).

Given that the latest research shows that the percentage of stock in U.S. public corporations owned by institutions is now 73.7% (with insiders and affiliates owning only 5.2%), there might seem to be little that target management could do to hold off a well organized engagement by an experienced activist. Not only are retail shareholders largely irrelevant, but the concentration of ownership has increased even more.

Today, the top three institutional shareholders own over 20% of the shares of the typical U.S. public

corporation (on a value-weighted basis), and the top twenty-five institutions hold approximately 50%. This enhanced concentration implies that activist investors may need to assemble only a small number of supporters to win a proxy contest. This may seem to suggest that activists are in the saddle and cannot be easily resisted.

But the foregoing summary considers only some of the evidence. On the other side of the ledger, the rate of success for activists in contested proxy contests is quite low. Why? The basic answer has to be that institutional investors are not monolithic.

Different categories of institutions have different aims, and each markets themselves to different constituencies. This column will in particular contrast the position of activists hedge funds with that of highly diversified index funds (as typified by the Big Three—Black Rock, Vanguard, and State Street).

No suggestion is made that they have any animosity for each other (and even index funds will sometimes vote to oust a failing management), but the Big Three and other indexed investors tend to require clear evidence of managerial failure before they will do so. The burden is very much on the activists to make that showing.

### How the Adversaries Stack Up.

#### A. The Activist's Perspective.

Activists wishing to lead an engagement have three built-in advantages: First, they can provide their allies with a material non-public information that they can lawfully trade on.

Specifically, an activist insurgent knows that if it files a Schedule 13D or 13G, announcing that will soon launch (or even just consider launch-

ing) a proxy contest seeking to place some new directors on a target's board, this public announcement will typically produce a 6% to 7% increase in the target's stock price, net of the market, on the day it is filed with the SEC.

That is a predictable one day reaction, and those who learn of it in advance and trade on it will make an extraordinary short-term profit. And it is basically legal (absent special facts) because no fiduciary duty is breached (because the activist holds no office at the target).

The lure of such a profit may enable the activist insurgent to assemble a "wolf pack" that will support it. This can mean the 5% shareholder who files this Schedule 13D may head a larger, but informal, group that could own as much as another 5% to 10% (for, conceivably, a total of 15%). Put simply,

prove more symbolic than real. So long as the stock market reaction is positive (even if only slightly), the activist can claim a victory and is positioned to undertake further engagements.

Target management is likely to be far more risk averse than the hostile activist. The target's management cannot afford to lose a proxy contest, because a loss would show its lack of support among its own shareholders (and may even attract third party bidders).

Knowing this, an activist with even a weak case may be able to extract some benefit (possibly, more symbolic than real). One such benefit that it can demand is that the target reimburse it for its litigation and proxy costs (which can easily come to several million).

Yes, there is a basic conflict of interest here, as target management

Negotiations will be in private, and a proxy contest will only occur if no settlement can be struck.

life is good for institutions that have friends alerting it to such an engagement.

The insurgent next needs to achieve some settlement with the target, but it does not need to obtain control, and it may even settle for fairly illusory relief. Negotiations will be in private, and a proxy contest will only occur if no settlement can be struck.

Typically, one or two new directors will go on the board, but it is uncommon that a new majority will control the board.

Promises to consider spin-offs of subsidiaries and other structural changes may be made by the target, but the relief so negotiated may

may be using corporate funds (i.e., shareholders' money) to buy peace that protects management's jobs.

Thus, from an ex ante perspective, the activist knows that its expenses have at least a good chance of being reimbursed, even if the case it makes for change is weak. For target management, reimbursement of expenses costs it virtually nothing (because they are paying with the shareholders' money).

To be sure, not all activists are seeking a cheap settlement and some (for example, Elliott Investment Management) are well-heeled, aggressive, and want control. But, at the start of an engagement, one cannot foretell the outcome,

» Page 8

### Looking for an accomplished expert?

ALM Experts has leaders in every discipline.

ONE ultimate resource includes:

- More than **15,000 profiles** of leading expert witnesses
- **4,000 areas** of expertise covering all 50 states

Access to a range of high-profile experts is just a click away.

Your source for experts, consultants & litigation support services.

ALMExperts.com

## Kohl's Fires CEO For Undisclosed Deal With Vendor

BY CHRIS O'MALLEY

IN a stunning ethical and corporate governance crisis, retailer Kohl's said Thursday that it has fired its brand-new CEO, Ashley Buchanan, after learning he steered businesses to a vendor with whom he had a personal relationship.

It now wants Buchanan to fork over \$2.5 million from a \$3.75 signing bonus.

Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin-based Kohl's announced in November that it was hiring Buchanan, and his first day was Jan. 15. Buchanan came



COURTESY PHOTO

Ashley Buchanan came to Kohl's from Michaels, where he'd been CEO since 2020.

from the arts-and-craft supplies retailer Michaels, where he'd been CEO since 2020. He'd previously held leadership roles at Sam's and Walmart.

Kohl's said its board fired Buchanan "for cause" following an investigation by outside counsel and the board's audit committee. That designation means that he will forfeit \$17 million in stock grants he received as "recruitment awards" as well as two-thirds of a signing bonus, the company said. His employment agreement required him to stay 12 months to receive the full \$3.75 million, with the repayment reduced by \$312,500 for every month he worked.

"Mr Buchanan had directed that the company conduct business with a vendor founded by an individual with whom Mr. Buchanan has a personal relationship on highly unusual terms favorable to the vendor," Kohl's stated in a filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

As part of that deal, "he also caused the company to enter into a multi-million dollar consulting agreement wherein the same individual was a part of the consulting team," the company added.

In addition, Buchanan failed to disclose the relationship per the company's code of ethics.

The company provided no further details on Buchanan's unauthorized business relationship.

Buchanan did not respond to a request for comment from Law.com.

» Page 9







## Off the Front / Judicial Ethics Opinions

### Abuse

« Continued from page 1

Medical Center and the Columbia-affiliated New York-Presbyterian Hospital for decades.

In total, DiPietro has filed more than 800 cases against Columbia for hundreds of women, for whom he has obtained a collective \$1 billion, as well as agreements from Columbia to enact new policies to protect their patients, such as allowing chaperoning nurses to anonymously report a doctor, and to publicly notify patients of a chaperone policy.

“If any credit is due in these cases, it’s due to the patients who have been willing to come forward and tell their stories and hold these institutions accountable, because without them, I’m convinced Hadden would still be there, doing this to other patients,” DiPietro said.

When reached for comment late Tuesday, a Columbia representative noted that the university had commissioned an external review, set up a survivors’ settlement fund and revamped its patient safety policies to address Hadden’s abuse.

“We deeply regret the pain that his patients suffered, and this settlement is another step forward in our ongoing work and commitment to repair harm and support survivors. We commend the survivors for their bravery in coming forward,” the representative said in a statement.

For DiPietro, the cases began in 2012, when he received a phone call from a woman who was 7 months pregnant with her first child, and said she had been abused by her OB-GYN. DiPietro met with the

woman, later revealed to be Evelyn Yang, and took on her case.

He admittedly hadn’t known how he was going to handle the claim. Until then, he had primarily taken on wrongful death or birth injury cases. Moreover, it was 2012, before the #MeToo Movement and before the prosecution of Larry Nassar, the physician who abused his position as the team doctor of the U.S. women’s national gymnastics team to assault young athletes.

“I didn’t know what to do, but I had to do something,” DiPietro said.

That something was a civil case, which DiPietro followed up with more civil cases as more women came forward.

As they progressed, the Manhattan District Attorney’s Office investigated Hadden, eventually filing a criminal case in 2016. However, the prosecution resulted in a plea deal that had Hadden surrender his medical license, but he avoided jail completely. Critical of that deal, victims publicly came forward, including Yang, whose interview with CNN came as her husband, Andrew, was running for president.

The public testimonies drew the attention of the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of New York, which filed new criminal charges against the doctor in 2020 that eventually landed him a 20-year prison sentence. But the public testimonies also convinced other women to reach out to DiPietro, including a woman who had moved to Utah and said she had a letter from Columbia’s former Chair of Obstetrics and Gynecology apologizing for Hadden’s assault during an appointment in the 1990s.

“That changed everything, because Columbia had been denying that they had any knowledge of this, and then that letter surfaced,” said DiPietro.

By 2022, DiPietro was able to reach settlements with Columbia for the first batch of cases, the ones he began filing in 2012. Another group of cases was settled in 2023. The most recent settlement closes out the last of DiPietro’s cases over Hadden, he said.

Though the litigation moved quickly over the past few years, DiPietro stressed the slow pace at the beginning.

“Columbia stands alone among institutions that not only cover up sexual exploitation and abuse and are absolutely terrible with how it treats survivors who come forward and report about it,” he said.

He pointed to similar cases against the University of Southern California and the University of California, Los Angeles over their employment of George Tyndall and James Heaps, gynecologists who had similarly been charged with assaulting their patients.

“All of those cases were filed and resolved in a relatively short amount of time, compared to how long Columbia has fought the victims and survivors who came forward in these cases,” DiPietro said.

DiPietro, however, is not yet done with Columbia. The attorney is currently representing over 400 men and boys who say they were abused by Darius Paduch, a former urologist at New York-Presbyterian Hospital. In November, Paduch was sentenced to life in jail for sexually abusing patients from 2007 to 2019.

Allyssa Aquino can be reached at [aaquino@alm.com](mailto:aaquino@alm.com).

### Opinion: 24-197

« Continued from page 6

items at concession stand, but allowing participation in food prep and other behind-scenes activities]; 17-55 [permitting judge may to use skills as logistics expert to plan and manage supplies or donations and to purchase items with donated debit card]; 14-08 [allowing judge to participate in radio station’s fund-raiser placing labels on forms and inputting data into computer]; 09-28 [permitting judge to assist a police sports team with logistics of event to raise funds for charitable organization]; 07-17 [advising judge may serve on planning committee for charity’s fund-raising walk and perform tasks to set up]].

Thus, the judge may help his/her child complete the cookie order sheet, including helping the child record people’s names and other contact information on the order sheet, and may also help the troop and the judge’s co-leader schedule, order cookies, and set up cookie booth(s) where the troop will sell cookies.

However, a judge may not “serve at any booth where fund-raising is taking place” (Opinion 98-15; see also Opinion 23-230 [prohibiting judge from personally volunteering at not-for-profit organization’s exhibit booth, where recruitment occurring]). As we have previously explained, “it would be difficult, if not impossible, to avoid the perception that the prestige of judicial office is being used” for solicitation (Opinion 10-137).

For this reason, the inquiring judge may not be present at the booth to supervise the troop while they interact with potential customers. In our view, the judge’s presence at a fund-raising booth is substantially different from accompanying his/her minor child while the child engages in door-to-door solicitations (cf. Opinion 16-153).

#### 3. Setting Up and Sharing Child’s Cookie Sale Webpage

The judge asks if he/she may assist his/her child in setting up a web-based sale page, by helping the child type a short bio and a statement about him/herself and what the child hopes to learn and earn by selling cookies. The judge also asks if he/she may share the judge’s child’s webpage, either by e-mail or text message, to family members and friends who do not live locally.

As noted above, a judge “may assist with general setup, food preparation, and cleanup” during a not-for-profit organization’s fund-raising dinner, “as long as the judge does not personally participate in the solicitation or collection of funds or other fund-raising activities that occur during the event” (Opinion 10-22).

Therefore, the inquiring judge may assist his/her child in setting up a webpage by helping the child type a bio and personal statement.

Nonetheless, we have said that a judge may not promote the products or services of any organization (see Opinion 21-73), and thus, a judge “must not post, forward or distribute fund-raising

solicitations or invitations to fund-raisers, even if the judge would be sharing a link rather than personally collecting the funds” (Opinion 23-114). As it relates to a judge’s family members, we have said a judge may “create an online fund-raising tool and distribute the link to the judge’s own family members” (Opinion 22-15[B]). We cautioned that “the judge must not share the link with non-family member contacts, even if the judge would not make any comment and would not follow up with the recipient” (id.; see e.g. Opinion 23-140 [barring judge from sharing links for not-for-profit fund-raisers]).

Here, likewise, the inquiring judge may share his/her child’s webpage soliciting cookie sales with family members but may not share such webpage with friends and other non-family members.

#### 4. Delivering Cookie Orders

The judge asks if he/she may accompany his/her child for cookie order deliveries and whether the judge may deliver cookies to customers when the child is not present.

Just as the judge may accompany his/her minor child when the child solicits cookie sales, we conclude that the judge may accompany the child to deliver the cookies that were previously sold (cf. Opinion 16-153). We note that a judge accompanying his/her child to deliver Girl Scout cookies, which have been previously paid for, is likely to be seen as fulfilling parental responsibilities to protect and guide the child, rather than as engaging in impermissible fund-raising activities.

Conversely, we have said a judge should not deliver complimentary tee shirts to sponsors after an organization’s fund-raising event “because this would create an appearance that the judge has impermissibly participated in personally raising funds” (Opinion 09-28). We conclude that a judge delivering cookies to customers when the child is not present will likewise create an appearance of personal participation in fund-raising.

Thus, the inquiring judge may accompany his/her child to deliver cookie orders but may not undertake such delivery to friends, neighbors, or other non-family members in the child’s absence.

#### 5. Collecting Monies for Cookie Orders

The judge asks if he/she may collect monies solicited and collected by troop members for cookie orders to be deposited into the troop bank account, held in the name of the troop.

Clearly the judge may not personally collect cookie sale proceeds directly from customers (see e.g. Opinions 24-120 [prohibiting judge from collecting or punching pre-paid tickets for children’s rides at fund-raising fair]; 23-140 [advising judge may not “collect or accept money either before or during” fund-raising event]; 18-44[B] [barring judge’s personal participation in collection of funds at not-for-profit organization’s concession

stand during sporting event]; 10-22 [advising judge may not participate in collection of funds at volunteer fire department’s annual fund-raiser]).

Here, in contrast, we understand the judge proposes a role that is more analogous to serving as the troop’s treasurer, by accepting monies that have already been paid to troop members for deposit into the troop’s bank account. In our view, such activity does not create an appearance of impermissible participation in fund-raising (cf Opinion 23-91).

Accordingly, we conclude the judge may accept funds solicited and collected by troop members from their cookie sales for deposit into the troop’s bank account.

#### 6. Recording Cookie Orders in Online System

The judge asks if he/she may record the troop’s cookie orders into the “Girl Scout/Little Brownie Baker” online ordering system.

We see no reason to preclude the judge from engaging in this behind-the-scenes data entry task in support of the troop’s fund-raiser (see Opinion 14-08 [permitting judge to place labels on forms and input data into computer for radio station’s fund-raising drive]).

Accordingly, the judge may record the troop’s cookie orders into the “Girl Scout/Little Brownie Baker” online ordering system, provided the activity does not require the judge to contact customers regarding the information received on their orders.

#### 7. Coordinating a Cookie Drop

Finally, the judge asks if he/she may help “coordinate Operation Cookie Drop, where the local Girl Scout troops physically donate unsold boxes of cookies to be shipped to Armed Service members overseas.” The judge indicates that “coordination would include lining up vehicles, helping remove cookie boxes from cars, stacking, organizing and taking inventory.”

A judge may assist a civic organization “by packing food donations and loading them into a truck for storage prior to distribution to needy families” and distributing the donated items (Opinion 10-157). A judge may also “use his/her skills as a logistics expert to plan and to manage supplies or donations as they are received” (Opinion 17-55).

Applying these principles, we conclude that the judge may assist the troop in all aspects of organizing and logistics to donate and ship unsold boxes of cookies overseas and therefore may help coordinate Operation Cookie Drop.

#### DECISIONS WANTED!

The editors of the New York Law Journal are eager to publish court rulings of interest to the bench and bar. Submissions must include a sentence or two on why the decision would be of significance to our readers. Also include contact information for each party’s attorneys. E-mail decisions to [decisions@alm.com](mailto:decisions@alm.com).

#### Have an event to list?

E-mail the details to [pkane@alm.com](mailto:pkane@alm.com)

#### Calendar of Events

##### THURSDAY, MAY 8

###### Brooklyn Women’s Bar Association Foundation (CLE)

###### Women, Their Health & the Law

*Who do doctors really treat when women are patients? Our panel of experts will discuss the profound impact this question has on women’s healthcare today.*

6 p.m - 8:30 p.m.  
1.5 CLE credits (pending)  
Location: Brooklyn Bar Association, 123 Remsen Street, Brooklyn  
Registration: <https://www.bwbafoundation.org/bwbaf-events.htm>

##### THURSDAY, MAY 8

###### New York City Bar (CLE)

###### Fundamentals of Federal Criminal Practice, Part 2

Time Day 2: 1 p.m. – 4 p.m.  
3 CLE Credits  
Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=WEB050825&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: Zoom  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

###### The Past, Present, and (Possible) Future of Mass Arbitration

6 p.m. – 7:30 pm  
CLE credits: 1.5  
In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=ppp050825&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

###### NYC Bar (Non CLE)

###### The Art of Mindful Eating

12:30 pm - 1:30 pm  
Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=MWBL050825&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: Zoom  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

###### Lawyers Connect First Thursday: Live Band Group Sing

6:30 pm - 8:30 pm  
In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=LCGS050825&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

##### FRIDAY, MAY 9

###### NYC Bar (Non CLE)

###### Mindfulness Break

1:15 pm - 1:35 pm  
Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=MWBL050925&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: Zoom  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

##### MONDAY, MAY 12

###### NYC Bar (CLE)

###### Reasonable Accommodations in the Workplace: An Inside View from the EEOC, NYS Division of Human Rights, and NYC Commission on Human Rights

5 p.m. – 6:30 pm  
CLE credits: 1.5  
Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=WEB051225&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: Zoom  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

###### NYC Bar (Non CLE)

###### Transitioning from the Federal Government to Private and Public Sector Roles: An Interactive Workshop and Job Search Program

5 p.m. - 7:30 pm  
Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=CAM051225&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: Zoom  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)  
ADR Forum Series: Ask the Litigators - What Makes for Successful Mediation?  
6 p.m. - 7 p.m.  
Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=ADR051225&mcode=NYLJ>

[tDetail?EventKey=ADR051225&mcode=NYLJ](https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=ADR051225&mcode=NYLJ)  
Location: Zoom  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

##### WEDNESDAY, MAY 14

###### NYC Bar (CLE)

###### White Collar Crime Institute

Event Time: 9 a.m. – 5:30 pm  
Kickoff Reception 6 p.m. – 8 p.m.  
CLE Credits: TBD  
Institute Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/wcc/KickoffReceptionRegistrationLink>: <https://services.nycbar.org/wcc/>  
Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York

###### Federal Bar Council (CLE)

###### Ponzi Scheme! The Unwinding

6:30 pm – 7:30 pm  
Location: Daniel Patrick Moynihan US Courthouse  
1 CLE credit  
<https://fbc.users.membersuite.com/events/a5720928-0078-cb2b-c831-0b480c7c69d5/details>

###### NYC Bar (Non CLE)

###### Owning Your Development & Maximizing the Junior Attorney Experience

12:30 pm - 1:45 pm  
Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=CAM051425&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: Zoom  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

###### The 2025 Milton Handler Lecture on Antitrust

6:30 pm - 7:45 pm  
In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=CMTE051425&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

##### THURSDAY, MAY 15

###### NYC Bar (CLE)

###### Practical Strategies for Mitigating Microaggressions in Legal Practice

9 a.m. - 10:45 am  
CLE credits: 2  
Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=WEB051525&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: Zoom  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

##### FRIDAY, MAY 16

###### NYC Bar (CLE)

###### Insurers’ and Insureds’ Perspectives on Current Issues in D&O Liability 2025

9 a.m. – 12 p.m.  
CLE credits: 3  
Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=WEB051625&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: Zoom  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

###### NYC Bar (Non CLE)

###### Senior Lawyers Chatroom

12 p.m. - 1 p.m.  
Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=SEN051625&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: Zoom  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

##### TUESDAY, MAY 20

###### NYC Bar (CLE)

###### The Do’s & Don’ts of Zoning

Lot Mergers & Development Rights Transfers in New York City  
9:30 am – 12:30 pm  
CLE credits: 3  
Webinar Registration Link: [https://services.nycbar.org/Members/Event\\_Display.aspx?WebsiteKey=f71e12f3-524e-4f8c-a5f7-0d16ce7b3314&EventKey=WEB052025&mcode=NYLJ](https://services.nycbar.org/Members/Event_Display.aspx?WebsiteKey=f71e12f3-524e-4f8c-a5f7-0d16ce7b3314&EventKey=WEB052025&mcode=NYLJ)  
Location: Zoom  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

##### WEDNESDAY, MAY 21

###### NYC Bar (CLE)

###### Marketing and Advertising Law 2025

9 a.m. – 1 p.m.  
CLE credits: 4  
Webinar Registration Link: [https://services.nycbar.org/Members/Event\\_Display.aspx?4&EventKey=WEB052125&mcode=NYLJ](https://services.nycbar.org/Members/Event_Display.aspx?4&EventKey=WEB052125&mcode=NYLJ)  
Location: Zoom  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

###### NYC Bar (Non CLE)

###### Small Firm Chats – Stay Connected with Your Peers and Us!

12 p.m. - 12:45 pm  
Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=SLFC052125&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: Zoom  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

###### Bar@theBar

6 p.m. - 8 p.m.  
In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=BAR052125&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

##### THURSDAY, MAY 22

###### NYC Bar (CLE)

###### Litigating Land Use Article 78 Proceedings in NYC

12 p.m. - 2 p.m.  
CLE credits: 2  
Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=WEB042425&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: Zoom  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

###### NYC Bar (Non CLE)

###### Withholding of Federal Funding Under the Trump Administration

6 p.m. – 7:30 pm  
Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=WFF052225&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: Zoom  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

##### WEDNESDAY, MAY 28

###### NYC Bar (Non CLE)

###### The Afterlives of Books: A Discussion of Rare Books, Collection Histories, and International Cultural Heritage Law

6 p.m. – 7:30 pm  
In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: 42 West 44th St., NY  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

##### THURSDAY, MAY 29

###### Federal Bar Council (CLE)

###### Environmental Justice 101: Past, Present, and Future?

6:15pm – 7:30pm  
Location: Hunton Andrews Kurth, LLP  
CLE Credit TBD  
<https://fbc.users.membersuite.com/events/a5720928-0078-c2d9-c5f3-0b4824802ee4/details>

###### NYC Bar (Non CLE)

###### Yoga for Lawyers

7 p.m. - 7:45 pm  
Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=YOGA052925&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: Zoom  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

##### FRIDAY, MAY 30

###### NYC Bar (Non CLE)

###### Senior Lawyers Chatroom

12 p.m. - 1 p.m.  
Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=SEN053025&mcode=NYLJ>  
Location: Zoom  
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

## Build Your Legal Team.

Go to [lawjobs.com](https://lawjobs.com) and choose the most qualified candidates.

[lawjobs.com](https://lawjobs.com) Your hiring partner





# Expert Analysis / Corporate Update

## Actions

« Continued from page 3

both spouses enjoy an equal right to possession of and profits yielded by the property (*Neiltz v. Neiltz*, 307 N.Y. 882, 122 N.E.2d 924 (1954). Each tenant may sell, mortgage, or otherwise encumber his or her rights in the property, subject to the continuing rights of the other (*V.R.W., Inc. v. Klein*, 68 N.Y.2d 560, 565, 510 N.Y.S.2d 848 (1986)).

When a husband and wife take title to real property a tenancy by the entirety comes into being; and upon the death of one, the surviving spouse takes the entire estate. (*Steltz v. Shreck*, 128 N.Y. 263, 28 N.E. 510 (1891); In re Klatz's Estate, 216 N.Y. 83, 110 N.E. 181 (1915); *Yax v. Yax*, 240 N.Y. 590, 148 N.E. 717 (1925)).

Neither spouse can dispose of any part of the estate to affect the right of survivorship of the other, or make contracts which bind the other, incur expenses for work not essential to preserve the premises, lease the premises to affect the right of the other's possession or subject the property to right of way easements. (*Baker v. Westfall*, 30 Misc. 2d 946, 219 N.Y.S.2d 328 (County Ct. 1961); *Adams v. Holt*, 141 A.D.2d 481, 529 N.Y.S.2d 110 (2d Dep't 1988)).

Although either spouse may mortgage or convey his/her own interest in the property the act will not impair the non-consenting spouse's survivorship interest. (*Wurz v. Wurz*, 27 Abb. N. Cas. 58, 15 N.Y.S. 720 (Sup 1891); *Saxon v. Saxon*, 46 Misc. 202, 93 N.Y.S. 191 (Sup 1905)).

Unlike jointly owned property or property held as tenants in common property held as tenants by entireties is not subject to partition except by mutual consent to become effective only upon dissolution of the marriage.

Compulsory partition is not available to a tenant by the entirety. (*Stewart v. Stewart*, 208 Misc. 795, 144 N.Y.S.2d 637 (Sup 1955)). Once the legal relationship between husband and wife is judicially altered through divorce, annulment, or legal separation, the tenancy by the entirety converts to a tenancy in common (*Kahn v. Kahn*, 43 N.Y.2d, supra, at 207, 401 N.Y.S.2d 47, 371 N.E.2d 809; *Goldman v Goldman*, 95 N.Y.2d 120, 122, 711 N.Y.S.2d 128, 130 (2000)).

In *Kahn v Kahn*, (43 N.Y.2d 203, 401 N.Y.S.2d 47 (1977)) the Court of Appeals addressed the issue of whether, in a matrimonial action that was commenced before the enactment of the Equitable Distribution Law, the court may order the sale of real property held by the parties as tenants by the entirety, even though the marital relationship has not been legally altered.

The Court of Appeals observed that Section 234 of the Domestic Relations Law was derived from Section 1164-a of the Civil Practice Act (L.1953, ch. 698). Unlike the present section, section 1164-a applied only in an action for a separation and made no reference to title questions.

Its sole purpose was to allow a court to decide in the marital action the right of possession of real property held by the husband and wife as tenants by the entirety. Recognizing that a judgment of separation does not dissolve the marriage and terminate a tenancy by the entirety, the legislature sought to prevent any injustice which might arise as a result of a spouse's continued rights as a tenant by the entirety notwithstanding a judicial decree of separation.

For example, a tenant by the entirety may sell, mortgage, or lease his interest in the property without the consent of the other tenant. The legislature feared the obvious harm that could be

caused by a vindictive spouse who transferred or encumbered his interest in the property in an attempt to harass the other spouse. It held that absent such a decree, a tenancy by the entirety is not terminated.

Since section 234 was intended only as a procedural device to permit a court in a marital action to determine questions of possession and title arising within that action, and was not intended to alter existing substantive property

..." (Domestic Relations Law §236 (B)(5)(a-c).

Under the Kahn rule, the Supreme Court may not, absent an agreement by the parties, order the sale or disposition of the marital home owned as tenants by the entities or any other marital asset, pendente lite, for any reason.

And where a judgment of divorce is granted under the irretrievable breakdown grounds in Domestic Relations Law §170(7) no judgment of divorce may be granted unless

Under the Kahn rule, the Supreme Court may not, absent an agreement by the parties, order the sale or disposition of the marital home owned as tenants by the entities or any other marital asset, pendente lite, for any reason.

law principles, it held that unless a court alters the legal relationship of husband and wife by granting a divorce, an annulment, a separation or by declaring a void marriage a nullity, it has no authority to order the sale of a marital home owned by the parties as tenants by the entirety.

The rationale of the Kahn decision was that such property could not be sold without a judgment altering the marriage relationship and changing the tenancy by the entirety, which can not be partitioned, into a tenancy in common, which could be ordered partitioned.

In actions under the Equitable Distribution Law, the Supreme Court may not determine the rights of the parties in their separate or marital property and provide for the disposition thereof in the final judgment unless "... all or part of the relief granted is divorce, or the dissolution, annulment or declaration of the nullity of a marriage..." or a proceeding "... to obtain a distribution of marital property following a foreign judgment of divorce

and until the economic issues of equitable distribution of marital property, the payment or waiver of spousal support, the payment of child support, the payment of counsel and experts' fees and expenses as well as the custody and visitation with the infant children of the marriage have been resolved by the parties, or determined by the court and incorporated into the judgment of divorce.

In *Jancu v. Jancu*, (174 A.D.2d 428, 571 N.Y.S.2d 456 (1st Dep't 1991)), the First Department reversed a pendente lite order directing the sale of the parties' two houses in New Jersey. The order contravened the rule that the courts do not have the authority to direct the pendente lite sale of property owned by parties as tenants by the entirety absent a judgment of divorce, separation, or annulment.

In *Fox v. Fox*, (309 A.D.2d 1056, 765 N.Y.S.2d 906 (3d Dep't 2003)), the Third Department held it is settled that "absent the termination of the marital relationship by judgment of divorce, amendment,

separation or declaration of nullity, courts do not have the authority to direct, pendente lite, the sale of property owned by the parties as tenants by the entirety."

In *Delvito v. Delvito*, (6 A.D.3d 487, 775 N.Y.S.2d 71 (2d Dep't 2004)), the Second Department stated that "It is settled that courts have no authority to order the sale of property held by tenants by the entirety without the parties' consent, unless the legal relationship of husband and wife is first altered through judicial intervention."

It agreed with the wife's contention that the record did not establish that she consented to a sale of the marital residence while the matrimonial action was pending. (To the same effect see *Adamo v. Adamo*, 18 A.D.3d 407, 794 N.Y.S.2d 413 (2d Dep't 2005); *Buddle v. Buddle*, 53 A.D.3d 745, 861 N.Y.S.2d 193 (3d Dep't 2008); *Moran v. Moran*, 77 A.D.3d 443, 908 N.Y.S.2d 661 (1st Dep't 2010); *Taglioni v. Garcia*, 200 A.D.3d 44, 157 N.Y.S.3d 7 (1st Dep't 2021)).

In *FR. v. AR.*, (85 Misc.3d 1257(A), 2025 WL 1143279, unreported disposition (Sup. Ct., 2025)) the court discussed the Kahn decision at length, although the parties did not hold title as tenants by the entirety.

The parties were married in 2007. The plaintiff commenced an action for a divorce on May 11, 2023. Title to the marital residence was acquired after their marriage and before the commencement of the action for divorce and was held solely in the name of the plaintiff.

After the plaintiff commenced the divorce action, he ceased paying the mortgage on the marital residence. The bank then commenced a foreclosure action on March 28, 2024. The Supreme Court granted the defendant's pendente lite application to sell the marital residence.

In this action, title to the marital residence was held solely by the plaintiff - it was not held as

tenants by the entirety. Here, the court did not alter a tenancy by the entirety without altering the status of the parties as husband and wife, because there was no tenancy by the entirety in the residence to alter.

### Conclusion

In *FR. v. AR, supra*, the court observed that some Supreme Court cases ordered that the marital residence held as tenants by the entirety be sold pendent lite based upon equitable principles. There, the Supreme Court found that a line of authority, post Kahn, established exceptions to *Kahn v Kahn*.

It cited *St. Angelo v. St. Angelo*, (130 Misc 2d 583 (Sup.Ct., 1985)) where the marital residence appeared to be in imminent danger of foreclosure; *D.R.D. v. J.D.D.*, (74 Misc 3d 237 (Sup.Ct., 2021)) where the court held that the wife was using the husband's equity as an interest-free loan; *J.H. v. C.H.*, (2024 NY Misc. Lexis 919 at \*3), where foreclosure proceedings were pending; and *Lidsky v. Lidsky*, (134 Misc. 2d 511, 511 N.Y.S.2d 765 (Sup 1986)), where the court held that it had the power to act under Domestic Relations Law §234 to direct the wife to execute documents necessary to secure refinancing of the loan on the marital premises, and that her failure to act would be a wasteful dissipation of assets.

None of the Supreme Court cases that direct the sale of a marital residence held as tenants by the entirety pendente lite, based upon "equitable principles", address the underlying rationale of *Kahn v Kahn*.

That is, property held as tenants by the entirety can not be sold without a judgment altering the marriage relationship and changing the tenancy by the entirety, which can not be partitioned, into a tenancy in common, which can be ordered partitioned.

## Proxy

« Continued from page 5

and if obstacles arise, the activist can settle for a somewhat illusory settlement.

Decades ago, Carl Icahn perfected these techniques, and with each transaction, he became more powerful. To sum up, inside information, expense reimbursement, and the greater risk aversion of target management likely tilt the outcome of activist engagements, but still activists regularly lose.

**B. The Process of Engagement.** Let's start with an easily documented generalization: activists typically seek to resolve an "engagement" through private negotiations, not a proxy contest. Of course, this may partly reflect that proxy contests are costly, much more so than negotiations.

But this cost explanation cannot explain activists' dismal record when they undertake a proxy contest. For example, a comprehensive study by Nikolay Gantchev covering proxy contests between 2000 and 2007 found that activists succeeded in only 29% of their proxy campaigns. See Nikolay Gantchev, *The Costs of Shareholder Activism: Evidence from a Sequential Decision Model*, 107 J. Fin. Econ. 610, at 620 at table 3.

This is not recent data, but, in 2024, Barclays found that activists undertook just ten proxy contests and secured board representation in only three (or 30%)—and they won only six out of 38 seats being contested. So far in 2025, Barclays more recently reports that activists have started two proxy contests against target corporations, winning one and losing the other

(despite the activists obtaining support of both I.S.S. and Glass-Lewis).

This pattern seems to have persisted. Of course, these low rates could change, but they certainly help explain why activists prefer private negotiations to proxy contests. Not only are negotiations cheaper, but activists seem to do better negotiating with a risk-averse management than trying to convince often skeptical shareholders.

But why are target shareholders seemingly so skeptical of activists? Little doubt exists that most target corporations have lagged behind their peers in performance. Hence, one would expect shareholders to favor the activists.

Now, we come to the heart of the matter, and we must note that there are multiple subcategories of institutional investors. In particular, critical differences distinguish activist investors (mainly hedge funds) from indexed investors (which are dominated by the Big Three).

**C. Activists Versus the Indexed.** **1. Activist Funds.** The appearance and growth of activist hedge funds in the late 1980s probably was a consequence of judicial acceptance of the poison pill (which also occurred in that decade). Because the poison pill effectively blocked hostile takeover, the only viable route in response to the pill was to pressure the target by seeking seats on its board.

Delaware courts would not tolerate much interference with the shareholders' right to vote. Still, the activist hedge fund had to learn new skills. The traditional hedge fund simply sought through in-

depth research to identify overvalued or undervalued firms (and sell short the former and buy the latter).

But the activist hedge fund had to act as a turnaround specialist. It also needed to achieve some degree of control (or at least influence) over the target to be able to implement its agenda.

The shift from takeovers to proxy contest implied that much smaller financial institutions could run such a campaign, because they

Although the Big Three and other indexed investors have no motivation to solicit others to oppose the activist's proposals, this role can be left to target management.

did not need to be able to acquire the target, but only to form a coalition among its dissatisfied shareholders sufficient to change corporate policies (and possibly to oust the incumbent management).

In fact, the typical activist hedge fund is not anywhere near the size of a large bank or underwriter. Only Elliott Investment Management (with \$72.7 billion in "assets under management" (or "aum") as of the end of 2024) is of the size that it could regularly be a bidder in traditional takeover battles.

To illustrate, the 10th largest activist fund (Sachem Head Capital Management) has regulatory "aum" of only \$3.3 billion. Given its smaller size, the activist fund's real task is coalition formation, and no more than a dozen activist firms have economic clout at present.

**2. Index Funds.** The Big Three and the other highly diversified asset managers are virtually the opposite of activist funds in structure and strategy:

i. They are huge with Black Rock having, as of late 2024, \$11.6 trillion in "aum"; Vanguard, \$10.4 trillion, and State Street, \$4.7 trillion—or an aggregate of \$26.7 trillion in aum. To draw the obvious comparison, the fifty largest activist funds are estimated to have \$156 billion in aum, while the Big Three alone hold over \$26 trillion—a hundred to one ratio.

Collectively, index funds are

estimated to hold over 33% of all U.S. public stocks. This ensures that virtually any activist engagement with a public corporation will involve the Big Three as major shareholders in the target;

ii. Index funds are passive and resist becoming involved in operational or governance issues (but they do vote, as the SEC requires them to use their voting power). This passivity largely follows from their size. Vanguard informs me that it currently holds over 13,000 stocks (globally), including over 5,000 U.S. issuers. No one can closely monitor that large a portfolio;

iii. While hedge funds charge high fees (with the standard formula being 20% of earnings and 2% of assets under management), index funds compete on the basis of price and hence economize on costs.

what distinguishes GC candidates in competitive searches. And it's not just about visibility during a crisis. Recruiters are also looking for signs of boardroom readiness, strategic thinking and business fluency.

"You need to demonstrate strong business acumen," said Heather Fine, a legal recruiter at Major, Lindsey & Africa. "That means stepping outside of legal—working cross-functionally, leading through influence, gaining exposure to the board and C-suite."

Fine said she often coaches mid-level in-house lawyers to seek out global or business-side roles—not because it fast-tracks them but because it sets them apart. "Leadership, communication and judgment are what make people GCs. Legal skills are assumed. They're table stakes," she added.

That's a message Susan Hackett, the recently retired CEO of the in-house consultancy Legal Executive Leadership, has been delivering for years.

"You need to be seen as the person who can be trusted in a storm," she said. "That means developing judgment, building a network of champions and getting in the room when decisions are made—even if you're not the one talking."

But getting that experience requires more than good timing—it takes initiative.

"You have to take on work that broadens your lens. If you can't get a role in public policy or sustainability, join a project," Parr said. "Go to Capitol Hill for a lobbying day. Volunteer for cross-functional teams. You need to be the person who understands more than just the legal question on the table."

Jason Winnmill, managing partner at Argopoint, a consultancy for legal departments, said companies are looking for GCs who are broad thinkers and can craft pragmatic solutions. "The general counsel is now expected to be the connective tissue between legal risk and business opportunity. It's not just about protecting the company—it's about enabling it to move faster, smarter and more confidently. The best GCs operate with the mindset of a CEO—just one with a law degree," Winnmill said.

"There's no magic formula for becoming a GC anymore," added Gilmore. "I've seen people take all kinds of routes—compliance, corporate secretary, even a stint as CHRO. What matters most is stepping out of your comfort zone and into roles that give you visibility

to the executive team and board."

Hackett added: "The value of the lawyer has grown. That means the skills you need to have has grown. But if you can be the calm in the storm—the one who sees the big picture and moves the conversation forward—that's what makes you a general counsel," Hackett said.

"There's no magic formula for becoming a GC anymore," added Gilmore. "I've seen people take all kinds of routes—compliance, corporate secretary, even a stint as CHRO. What matters most is stepping out of your comfort zone and into roles that give you visibility to the executive team and board."

@ Trudy Knockless can be reached at tknockless@alm.com.

### Letters Welcome

The Law Journal welcomes letters from its readers for publication. They must contain the names and addresses of correspondents. Letters should be of reasonable length and submitted with the understanding that all correspondence is subject to the editorial judgment of the newspaper in considering duplication, length, relevancy, taste and other criteria. Letters may be e-mailed to:

@ adenney@alm.com

## GC Seat

« Continued from page 5

hours of psychological testing. And it's also led many companies to favor outside hires—especially those who are already sitting GCs, thereby demonstrating they're up to the task.

"I can't tell you how many headhunter calls I've received saying, 'We want a sitting GC,'" said Laura Schumacher, a former GC and former vice chair of AbbVie who now serves as a strategic adviser for BarkerGilmore.

The trend has cooled over the past year, in part because the spike in outside hires also prompted a spike in the number of GCs who exited their roles after short tenures, a sign that the hires might not have been a good fit, the search firm Russell Reynolds Associates said in a March 2025 report.

GC hires that don't pan out are always painful for companies, and that's especially so when the person hired was a sitting GC. Such candidates typically forfeit millions of dollars in cash and stock compensation when they leave and expect their new employer to offer signing bonuses and stock awards to make them whole.

Fifty-four percent of Fortune 500 GC hires last year were internal promotions, up from 39% in 2023 and 48% the year before, the Russell Reynolds Associates report found.

### 'No Magic Formula'

Even so, companies aren't picking internal candidates by default, as some once did. And because succession planning is spotty at many companies, internal candidates often have holes in their resumes, such as a lack of experience interacting with the board, that can hinder their chances of landing the top job.

"If you want to be a GC at a large company, you need experience in three key areas: legal, compliance and ethics, and government affairs or public policy," said David Yawman, a former GC of PepsiCo and now an executive coach. "You don't have to specialize in all of them, but you need enough exposure to understand how they interact and how to advise at the highest level."

That kind of exposure doesn't come from staying in your comfort zone. It requires stepping into new environments—sometimes dramatically so. Jasmine Singh, now GC at

Ironclad, left law altogether at one point in her career after realizing litigation wasn't the right fit.

"I moved to Las Vegas and became a fitness instructor," she said during a recent webinar on women in legal leadership. "Eventually I came back to law—transactional this time—and it was the first time I felt like I belonged."

Her story, though unconventional, highlights a point many GCs, recruiters and executive coaches make: Self-awareness and adaptability are just as important as technical skill.

"We're seeing more companies reward people who take on stretch assignments, who show up in times of crisis and who demonstrate they can lead," Gilmore of BarkerGilmore said. "There's no one path, but there are patterns: visibility, versatility and the ability to earn trust."

Gilmore recalled a recent conversation with an in-house lawyer who'd just been hired as GC after successfully handling a high-stakes litigation matter. "He wasn't next in line on paper," he said. "But the board saw him in action. They watched how he handled pressure and said, 'That's our person.'"

That kind of real-time credibility—built through experience rather than title—is increasingly



Disciplinary Proceeding

Matter of Aaron Etra, an attorney

Motion No. 2025-01069

Appellate Division, First Department

Manzanet-Daniels, J.P., Kern, Kennedy, Friedman, Pitt-Burke, JJ.

Decided: May 1, 2025

Jorge Dopico, Chief Attorney, Attorney Grievance Committee, New York (Louis J. Bara, of counsel), for petitioner

Respondent, pro se.



Per curiam — Respondent Aaron Etra was admitted to the practice of law in the State of New York by the First Judicial Department on March 28, 1966. At all times relevant herein, he maintained a

registered business address in the First Judicial Department.

By unpublished order dated October 25, 2024, this Court found respondent guilty of professional misconduct in violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct (22 NYCRR 1200.00) rules 8.4(d) (conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice) and 8.4(h) (other conduct that adversely reflects on fitness as a lawyer) and appointed a referee to conduct a sanction hearing.

By motion dated February 21, 2025, the Attorney Grievance Committee (AGC) seeks an order pursuant to the Rules for Attorney Disciplinary Matters (22 NYCRR) §1240.14(b), immediately suspending respondent from the practice of law. The AGC maintains that respondent, who is 83 years old, suffers from medical infirmities that render him presently unable to defend himself at the sanction hearing or to otherwise practice law. In support of its motion, the AGC submitted an affirmation

from respondent detailing his health issues and consenting to a suspension on medical grounds, and letters from two of respondent’s physicians, corroborating respondent’s medical conditions. Respondent has not opposed the motion.

As the AGC has presented sufficient medical evidence of respondent’s incapacity to practice law, immediate suspension is warranted pursuant to 22 NYCRR 1240.14(b) and this Court’s precedent (see *Matter of Schneider*, — AD3d —, 2025 NY Slip Op 01047 [1st Dept 2025]; *Matter of Olive*, 216 AD3d 59 [1st Dept 2023]; *Matter of Roussin*, 208 AD3d 174 [1st Dept 2022]).

Accordingly, the AGC’s motion should be granted, and respondent suspended from the practice of law in the State of New York pursuant to 22 NYCRR 1240.14(b), effective immediately, and any disciplinary investigation or proceedings against respondent are stayed until further order of this Court. All concur.

Build & Invest

« Continued from page 2

the observation that Gen Z lawyers are less interested in the traditional partnership model at most firms, Armstrong Teasdale managing partner Richard Engel said the firm is looking to make people more comfortable with the responsibilities of being a partner by allowing them to “stick a toe” in before fully committing.

“We call it a profit-sharing partner,” Engel said. “When you see the growth in the income partner ranks seen in the Am Law 200, that’s been the fastest group over the past five or six years, but there’s a lot of transience in that. There’s higher turnover there than in any other area, and one of the things we’ve proposed is, we want to give these folks—who are not ready or not willing to buy in completely and become an owner of the firm—a new tier where they can share the

profits of the firm with a small bit of equity.”

“The main benefit of this is that if you want to see what it’s like to be an owner, you’re going to get a piece of the action and a piece of the upside of the firm, independent of the salary you’re getting or bonuses otherwise,” Engel continued. “A great majority of those jumping in are younger partners...It’s giving them a little taste [of equity]. If they qualify for full equity, some can’t wait for that, but there’s a bit of reticence you’re seeing among transient income partners.”

The firm also added a new role, “Chief of Legal Talent and Practice Management,” in August 2024, which Engel said was entirely focused on professional development, practice growth, and recruitment.

“The only thing we are is our talent,” Engel acknowledged.

Meanwhile, Scott and her colleagues at Lowenstein Sandler have

also noted increased candor among its newest generation of talent, finding many more attorneys in the firm more willing to discuss alternate career paths, such as moving in-house or seeking out a role as a federal prosecutor.

“What has changed [over the years] is attorneys’ willingness at the partner level and associate level to talk about different career paths that might not necessarily mean partnership in the firm,” Scott observed, noting that the firm actively takes steps to help its attorneys progress to positions even outside of the firm, including helping them secure secondments with clients.

“They might be more willing to discuss going in-house...People are sharing that they have other career plans earlier on, so we can help do these things,” Scott said. “We’ve seen such a dramatic change in trust.”

✉ Amanda O’Brien can be reached at aobrien@alm.com.

Kohl’s

« Continued from page 5

According to Kohl’s proxy statement from his Jan. 15 start date through Feb. 1, the end of Kohl’s fiscal year, Buchanan received a salary totaling \$67,045. The document says the company provided the \$3.75 million signing bonus and the \$17 million in stock partly to offset compensation Buchanan forfeited when he left Michaels.

Kohl’s said it has named board chair Michael Bender as interim CEO as it begins a search for a permanent CEO.

When Bachanan started in January, Bender praised him for his “vast retail experience” and said he “will bring a steady, proven,

innovative leader to Kohl’s as we continue to transform the business and drive future growth.”

Kohl’s has been struggling—with sales in its latest fiscal year tumbling 7.2%, to \$15.4 billion, and its stock plunging from \$27 last May to just over \$7. Last month, it closed 27 of its 1,100 stores.

The company said Buchanan’s ouster “is not related to the company’s performance, financial reporting or results of operations, and did not involve any other company personnel.”

Kohl’s SEC filing did not disclose which law firm it hired to investigate Buchanan, and a spokesperson did not immediately respond to Law.com’s inquiry.

The company’s chief legal officer is Jennifer Kent, who joined

the retailer in February 2023.

Kohl’s has seen an exodus of executives in recent years, thanks in part to inflationary pressures that crimped sales.

Michelle Gass had been CEO of Kohl’s for nearly five years when she stepped down in December 2022 to become president of Levi Strauss & Co. A year later, Levi promoted her to CEO.

Also departing in 2022 were Chief Merchandising Officer Doug Howe and Chief Marketing Officer Greg Revelle. CEO Tom Kingsbury, Buchanan’s predecessor, retired last year.

Activist investors have demanded that Kohl’s be put up for sale.

✉ Chris O’Malley can be reached at comalley@alm.com.

Media

« Continued from page 3

We have been able to start generating media opportunities for partners within weeks of conducting intake sessions, since these partners were able to provide commentary on current and often breaking news and developments being reported on by the media.

In our experience, law firm partners who participate in intake sessions realize a significant return on their time investment and greatly increase their chances of media relations success.

Make sure media coverage is effectively leveraged: Communi-

cations teams at law firms need to ensure that they are maximizing the value of the media relations results generated for new lateral partners. Key questions for evaluating whether this is happening:

Is media coverage being uploaded to the news section of the firm’s website, to LinkedIn and to the firm intranet? How is this being done, and how quickly?

Have new lateral partners been informed about how they should leverage media coverage on their own LinkedIn pages and other approved platforms?

Law firms that effectively use a new lateral partner’s media relations results to raise inter-

nal awareness about his or her experience and areas of focus will be able to integrate laterals into their firms significantly faster than firms that don’t take this approach.

To conclude, media relations should not only be viewed as external communications and business development priorities, but as a new lateral integration priority, as well.

Daily columns in the Law Journal report developments in laws affecting medical malpractice, immigration, equal employment opportunity, pensions, personal-injury claims, communications and many other areas.

“The transfer order leaves Appellants with no forum for relief and as such, it is a final order and reviewable in this Court on a de novo basis,” they said.

Monica Tranel, counsel for the tribal members, likened the fight over jurisdiction to a “run around.”

“This issue should be litigated on the merits,” Tranel said in a statement. “Real people are getting hurt every day. This is not a game for people who live on the border and make their living with the long and enduring relationships across the border.”

The cases are *Emily Ley Paper Inc. v. Trump*, case number 3:25-cv-00464, in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Florida and *Webber v. U.S. Department of Homeland Security*, case number 25-2717, in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

✉ Alyssa Aquino can be reached at aaquino@alm.com.

Challengers

« Continued from page 1

confront unfair trade practices in court,” a spokesperson told the New York Law Journal on Wednesday.

The alliance filed suit in Florida following weeks of executive orders that collectively created an up to 25% duty on Canadian and Mexican aluminum and steel goods, a 145% duty on Chinese goods and an at least 10% duty on products on virtually all remaining global imports.

Shortly after that suit landed, several citizens of the Blackfeet Nation filed their own case in the Montana federal court. They similarly questioned IEEPA’s use, while separately arguing that the duties were interfering with their tribal sovereignty.

The Trump administration immediately moved to transfer both cases to the trade court, which has already received multiple lawsuits challenging the duties. In late April, the trade court gave the administration an early win and declined to temporarily stay the

duties for review, finding that an importer hadn’t shown the type of injuries warranting immediate court intervention.

During a Wednesday call, John Vecchione, an attorney with the alliance, panned the motion as an attempt to use “illegal tariffs” to put his clients in a court of the government’s choosing.

“You can’t bootstrap the illegality of the tariffs to move Americans to the court you like, and we believe the court should see it our way,” Vecchione said.

The Florida federal court has yet to decide the administration’s request, but the Montana federal court has approved the transfer. The Blackfeet citizens have since appealed the transfer to the Ninth Circuit, which the White House has challenged on administrative grounds, arguing that the transfer order is not an appealable final one.

On May 2, the tribal citizens argued that a transfer would strand their claims under the Indian Commerce Clause in “no-man’s land.” They further argued that the trade court has no jurisdiction over Indian tribes.

Court Calendars

First Department

APPELLATE DIVISION CALENDAR FOR THE MAY TERM THURSDAY, MAY 8

2 P.M.

24/6075 People v. Juan Perez  
24/237N azor v. Sydney Sol Group  
24/3879 2497 Realty Corp. v. Fuertes  
24/4809 Abramov v. 230 PAS SPE  
24/1482 Salamah v. Grabowska  
24/282(2) Charles Condominiums v. Victor RPM First  
22/3637 People v. Manuel Vega  
18/3935(4) Kyowa Seni Co. v. Ana Aircraft  
24/4761(4) Kyowa Seni Co. v. Ana Aircraft  
24/620 CUCS Housing v. Aymes  
24/1689(2) Isaly v. Garde  
24/2428 Lopez v. NG 645 Madison  
24/327 Skyview Capital v. Conduent Business  
23/3250N Gillard v. Citigroup  
25/253N Anheuser-Busch v. BBSR, LLC  
24/1175N Windward Bora LLC v. Zorilla

CALENDAR FOR THE JUNE TERM TUESDAY, MAY 13

2 P.M.

23/1441(1) People v. Monet Duzant  
25/518 Fortson v. Thompson  
24/2359H, Children  
24/7348 Left v. Blodgett  
24/6942 Zhakiyanov v. Ogai  
23/5131 People v. Kevin Avila  
24/3637 Stein v. Rockefeller University Hospital  
24/1587 Grove Equities v. Diaz  
23/70 People v. Robert Wilson  
25/723 Arencibia v. SilverLining, Inc.

23/4831 Theroux v. Resnicow  
24/2502(2) EXRP 14 Holdings v. LS 14 Ave  
24/2028 People v. David Martin  
24/3651N Blinbaum v. Chan

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14

2 P.M.

23/6308 People v. Ryan Cruzado  
25/1075 Martinez v. City of NY  
24/7155 R., Olga v. Olga M.  
24/3480 Real World v. 393 West Broadway  
24/6199(2) Tahari v. Narkis  
22/2716(1) People v. Rudy Osias  
24/3749 Patel v. Maybank Kim Eng Securities  
24/6455 Gamma USA v. Pavarini McGovern LLC  
19/1916(2) People v. James Rackover  
24/5726 McCann v. Ship Wrecked Bar  
25/561 Island Consolidated v. Grassi & Co.  
17/2055(1) People v. Brandon Vilella  
24/4431 H. G., an Infant v. NYC Transit Authority  
24/3449N Valley National Bank v. 252 W. 31 St. Corp.

THURSDAY, MAY 15

2 P.M.

23/4332 People v. Jared McGowan  
24/52902 Cap Investments v. Frog Investments  
24/4581 S., Lulu v. Rahmel H.  
24/403 Promenade Nelson Apts v. NYS Division Housing  
24/3042 Mevram Services v. Quadrum Hospitality  
22/4348 People v. Juan Cordero  
24/1838 Cuzco v. Broome Property  
24/3765 Certain Underwriters at Lloyd’s v. Itzhak Nissanoff Inc.  
23/5321 People v. Eric Daniel  
24/3437 Staff v. Luen Nam Realty  
24/4546 Jire v. JJ Hoyt LLC  
25/217 PR Productions v. Amazon.com  
20/2165 People v. Donald O’Toole  
24/7606N Bykovtseva v. DTH Capital

TUESDAY, MAY 20

2 P.M.

22/5282 People v. Christopher Walls  
24/1743(3) U.S. Bank v. Chait  
24/2868A/M., Children  
24/1245 Stallard v. NYC Police Department  
24/5495 Miracle NY Properties v. Naylor 18  
23/5124 People v. Kirby Hiciano  
24/1788(2) Singer v. De Blasio  
20/475 People v. Kevin Davis  
24/5160 268 W. 12th Owners Corp. v. Kunst  
25/1377 Ross v. Onegevity Throne Health Tech  
23/406 People v. Chaguona Wood  
21/447 People v. Lazareth P.  
24/3474N Reyes v. City of NY  
25/907N Metropolitan Partners v. Nerney

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21

2 P.M.

23/3142 People v. Anthony Stokes  
24/1121 Tucker v. All Metro Home Care  
24/6625 B., Kevin v. Tanisha H.  
25/666 HSBC Bank v. Amponsah  
24/3461 Yang v. Knights Genesis  
19/5317 People v. Pierre Maycock  
24/3971 Berrones v. 130 E. 18 Owners  
24/5693 People v. Jonathan Hernandez  
25/830 Ceratosaurs Investors v. B2C Alternative Equity  
24/5645 Perez v. Norman’s Cay Group  
22/2018 People v. Jonathan Cedenio  
24/4837 Board of Managers v. Miller  
24/5100 Daniello v. J.T. Magen & Company  
23/4282 People v. Sergio Celleri  
19/2012 People v. Damien Bell  
24/6572(2) One River Run v. Milt  
25/744 Olympic Galleria Co. v. Sitt  
24/1069 People v. Adam Rivera  
25/682N Rosario v. Hallen Construction

THURSDAY, MAY 22

2 P.M.

24/449 People v. Devin Webbert  
23/1164 Stuyvesant Town v. NYS Division Housing  
24/6555 M., Damineh v. Bedouin J.  
24/4926 Weatherspoon v. Mazal Ubracha 101  
19/3413 People v. Hector Hernandez  
24/4837 Board of Managers v. Miller  
24/5100 Daniello v. J.T. Magen & Company  
23/4282 People v. Sergio Celleri  
19/2012 People v. Damien Bell  
24/6572(2) One River Run v. Milt  
25/744 Olympic Galleria Co. v. Sitt  
24/1069 People v. Adam Rivera  
25/682N Rosario v. Hallen Construction

2 P.M.

24/6500N Prospect Capital v. Morgan Lewis  
23/1713 People v. Kamal Dockery  
24/3382 Szymczyk v. Hudson 36  
22/5411 M., Children  
24/2742N avaro v. Joy Construction  
21/633 People v. Sophia Fearing  
24/463 Rubin v. Sabharwal  
24/3348(2) Spin Capital v. Golden Foothill Insurance  
23/2079 People v. Sean Bryan  
20/2147 People v. Pedro Vega  
24/3450 Felton v. St. Joseph Hospital  
24/1168 Providence Construction v. Silverite Construction  
23/629 People v. Dominick Tarazona  
24/5204(3)N Slabakis v. Poyiadjis  
24/3721N Associated Industries v. Farahnik

WEDNESDAY, MAY 28

2 P.M.

23/5635 People v. Joyquin McCall  
24/3476 Toomer v. NYC Housing Authority  
24/5095 J., Jeselle v. Alexis J.  
22/4211 People v. Dante Thomas  
24/3092 Chatham Capital v. Platinum Asset  
24/1510 People v. Shanasier Frasier  
24/4099 Wollman v. Seven Seas Union  
19/2853 People v. Josue Maldonado  
24/1955 People v. Jawaun Sims  
24/4524N ational Community v. Midtown Coalition  
24/2297 Palmer v. City of NY  
24/4520(2)N Arena Limited v. Chalets LLC  
24/5964N Wyse v. Amtruss North America  
24/3801N Idahosa v. MFM Contracting

THURSDAY, MAY 29

2 P.M.

22/5759 People v. Lisandro Cabrera  
23/6739 Abrams v. Abrams  
24/6705 M., J’Quan v. Zhonvel B.  
24/2301 Hasan v. Macerich Company  
23/5980 People v. Rockeem M.  
24/6749 Cooper v. Arbor Realty Trust  
23/6001 Goon v. Grand Central Partnership  
19/2033 People v. Akram Joudeh  
23/4555 McCoy v. Lovovsky  
24/5780 American Infertility of NY v. Kushnir  
23/3936 People v. Kareem Lowndes  
24/5061N Spay, Inc. v. ASMF Holdings  
24/7800(3)N AT&T Mobility v. Grupo Salinas

TUESDAY, JUNE 3

2 P.M.

23/9918 People v. Daniel Citalan  
23/3913(2) 600 Associates v. Illinois Union Insurance  
24/589 P., Juan v. Wendy R.  
24/2304(1) Engley v. 639 Jefferson Place  
24/6083(1) Engley v. City of NY  
24/1734 People v. Jaiden Dechabert  
24/7029(6) Ametek, Inc. v. Goldfarb  
25/1066 Board of Managers v. 45 East 22nd St.  
24/7033 L.S., Children  
22/2375 People v. Charles Kenyatta  
22/2774 People v. Anthony Messina  
24/1568 Tavarez v. 920 E 173rd St.  
24/5424N Passantino v. City of NY

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 4

2 P.M.

22/2808 People v. Kayjon Yizar  
24/5395 Badesch v. Fort 710 Associates  
24/4865 S., Jodeci v. Sheila M.  
24/3927(1) Zhang v. Chu  
24/2373(1) Zhang v. Chu  
24/514 People v. Sterling Stewart  
24/1108 Pereira v. 509 W 34th  
24/7534 Kohler v. West End 84 Units  
24/2207 Cedenio v. Bolyky  
24/741(1) People v. Jeffer Dominguez  
23/6133(1) People v. Jeter Dominguez  
24/3196 Robles-Lopez v. E.S.H. Family Corp.  
25/1321N Stafford v. A&E Real Estate  
24/3247(2)N Board of Managers v. World-Wide Holdings

THURSDAY, JUNE 5

2 P.M.

20/2149 People v. Nicholas Wallace  
17/2821 Etrade Bank v. DelValle  
23/2411 U., Cheryl v. Ehigie U.  
18/3965 People v. Eric Keaton  
20/569 People v. Jevon Eddy  
24/5315 State Division Human Rights v. C & A Central  
23/5737(6) J Carey Smith v. 11 West 12 Realty  
24/7901 Board of Managers v. Park Park Associates  
23/3148 People v. Rigoberto Deleon  
23/4914(2) Alean Harbor v. Assurant Group  
22/2458 People v. Sonia Taylor  
25/569N Ghatak v. McKinsey & Company  
25/1060N 1240 El Grant Highway v. 1240 Edward Grant

\*\*\*

The following cases have been scheduled for pre-argument conference on the dates and at the times indicated:

Renwick, P.J., Manzanet, Kapnick, Webber and Kern, JJ.

TUESDAY, MAY 13

9:30 A.M.

25/214/19 De La Cruz v. Aquinas High School

10 A.M.

15/3982/20 Gaitan v. 18 EAST 18th Street  
65/3697/24 Hofstra v. United Educators

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14

10 A.M.

65/033/20 AT&T Mobility v. Grupo Salinas  
65/585/21 Interbear Fabricators v. C.B. Contracting Corp.  
65/5018/23 Handl NY v. Identity Group  
65/635/22/20 L60 Mott Realty v. Eli Halili LLC

2 P.M.

65/9287/24 PV 1508 CIA v. Singer

65/0032/20 Colliers International v. City Hall Commons LLC

FRIDAY, MAY 16

9:30 A.M.

65/3548/24 Board of Managers v. Malcolm Shabazz Development

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21

10 A.M.

65/0314/24 Exceptional Media v. Chainalysis, Inc.

THURSDAY, MAY 22

10 A.M.

65/3409/23 Davidoff Hutter & Citron LLP v. McLendon

WEDNESDAY, MAY 28

10 A.M.

65/4176/22 BankUnited v. Gray-Line

TUESDAY, JUNE 3

10 A.M.

9153/19 Anderson v. Anderson

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 4

10 A.M.

65/2901/24 Rego Park Lender v. Golyan

FRIDAY, JUNE 20

10 A.M.

813946/21 Liu v. Consolidated Scaffolding Inc.

New York County

SUPREME COURT

Ex-Parte Motion Part And Special Term Part

Ex-Parte Motions Room 315, 9:30 A.M.  
Special Term Proceedings Unsafe Buildings Bellevue Psychiatric Center Kirby Psychiatric Center Metropolitan Hospital Manhattan Psychiatric Center Bellevue Hospital

The following matters were assigned to the Justices named below. These actions were assigned as a result of initial notices of motion or notices of petition returnable in the court on the date indicated and the Request for Judicial Intervention forms that have been filed in the court with such initial activity in the case. All Justices, assigned parts and courtrooms are listed herein prior to the assignments of Justices for the specified actions. In addition, listed below is information on Judicial Hearing Officers, Mediation, and Special Referees.

IAS PARTS

1 Silvera: 300 (60 Centre)  
2 Sattler, J.: 212 (60 Centre)  
3 Cohen, J.: 208 (60 Centre)  
4 Kim: 308 (80 Centre)  
5 King: 320 (80 Centre)  
6 King: 351 (60 Centre)  
7 Lebovits: 345 (60 Centre)  
8 Kotler: 278 (80 Centre)  
9 Waterman-Marshall: 355 (60 Centre)  
11 Frank: 412 (60 Centre)  
12 Stroth: 328 (80 Centre)  
13 Silvera: 300 (60 Centre)  
13 Schumacher 304 (71 Thomas)  
14 Bluth: 432 (60 Centre)  
15 Johnson: 116 (60 Centre)  
17 Hagler: 335 (60 Centre)  
18 Tisch: 104 (71 Thomas)  
19 Sokoloff: 540 (60 Centre)  
20 Kaplan: 422 (60Centre)  
21 Tsa: 280 (80 Centre)  
22 Clynes: 136 (80 Centre)  
22 Schumacher 304 (71 Thomas)  
24 Katz: 325 (60 Centre)  
25 Tingling: 1254 (111 Centre)  
26 Perry, P.: 684 (111 Centre)  
27 Dominguez: 289 (80 Centre)  
28 Tingling: 543 (60 Centre)  
29 Ramirez: 311 (71 Thomas)  
30 McMahon: Virtual (60 Centre)  
32 Kahn: 1127B (111 Centre)  
33 Rosado: 442 (60 Centre)  
34 Ramseur: 341 (60 Centre)  
35 Perry-Bond: 684 (111 Thomas)  
36 Saunders: 205 (71 Thomas)  
37 Engoron: 418 (60 Centre)  
38 Nock: 1166 (111 Centre)  
39 Clynes: 307 (80 Centre)  
41 Moynet: 288 (80 Centre)  
42 Morales-Minera: 574 (111 Centre)  
43 Reed: 222 (60 Centre)  
44 Pearlman: 321 (60 Centre)  
45 Patel: 428 (60 Centre)  
46 Latin: 210 (71 Thomas)<



654985/23 Eggerud v. West End 84 Units LLC Et Al  
655350/17 Elhanani v. Kuzinez  
651935/24 Energo v. 135-137 West 115th St. Housing Dev. Fund Corp.  
151803/24 Escobar v. 24 West Food Corp. D/b/a Food Dynasty Et Al  
652199/22 Estjon v. Blackboard Ins. Co.  
157697/24 Fanas v. Singh  
157599/16 Foacaci v. One East River Pl. Rlty.  
650635/25 Fox Rothschild LLP v. Sparrow  
650611/25 Frink-Hamlett Legal Solutions, Inc. v. Tellock  
156419/20 Gabriele v. Boyarsky  
155149/23 Granby's Funeral Service, Inc. v. Seneca Ins. Co., Inc. Et Al  
154419/24 Guaraca Squisilli v. 164 4 LLC Et Al  
651195/25 Hbc Us Hldgs. LLC v. Nat. Fire & Marine Ins. Co.  
158494/24 Hickman v. NYC Et Al  
190118/25 Hidden v. Allied Bldg. Prods. Corp. Et Al  
654719/24 Imlian Pw Member LLC v. Vlachich LLC  
150561/22 Jones v. Wazadally  
150278/23 Knight v. East Pub Inc. Et Al  
152374/24 Kuvshynov v. Fox News Network  
161333/18 Lackenbauer v. L&K Partners, Inc.  
651249/25 Ladder Cre Finance Reit Inc. v. Gindi  
950711/21 M.L. v. Archdiocese of NY  
655044/22 Ma v. Wang  
805300/20 Mack v. Northern Manhattan Nursing  
161082/22 Maldonado v. Cm & Associates Contracting Inc. Et Al  
152328/17 Mallay v. A.W. & S. Const. Co.  
190095/25 March v. Coty Inc. Et Al  
151982/19 McCann v. Ship Wrecked Bar And Grill  
850505/23 McPl Asset Co., Inc. v. Delucia  
650013/25 Metro. Partners Group Admin. v. Nerney  
158477/22 Moronta v. West 151st St. Rlty. Co. LLC Et Al  
158117/24 Murphy Marshall v. Acp Parent LLC  
151134/23 NY Marine & General Ins. Co. And Certain Underwriters At Lloyd's A/s/o Genesis Y15 Owners LLC v. 26 West 127 Owner LLC Et Al  
655724/23 Old Republic Nat. Title Ins. Co. v. First Choice Settlement of NY  
153364/24 Oleske v. NYS Dept. of Law Et Al  
154776/17 Orj Properties Inc v. Nyhk West 40 LLC  
651471/22 Owen v. Array Us, Inc. Et Al  
159540/23 Palma-Castro v. Madison Plaza Apt. Corp. Et Al  
154851/25 People of The State of NY v. Dailyapp, Inc.  
159248/24 Percaro v. Mail At Smith Haven  
652209/25 Petrossian v. Creative Goods Merchandise LLC  
650756/25 Pirs Restoration D/b/a Paul Davis Restoration v. 61 West 62 Owners Corp. Et Al  
450775/24 Prop. Clerk v. Hernandez  
153115/23 Ro v. Transit Wireless LLC Et Al  
152162/24 Roa v. NYC Et Al  
153678/23 Rodriguez v. The Langston Condominium Et Al  
805384/21 Rudansky v. City Md Et Al  
153222/23 Sarasota Dev. Co., LLC Et Al v. The Board of Mgrs. of The 58-60 Reade St. Condominium Et Al  
154028/19 Sarracco v. NYC Bike Share  
850678/23 Sbt Advantage Bank v. Ma  
154698/25 Schellens v. NYC Et Al  
157481/22 Shinn v. 157 Suffolk St. Jv LLC  
153993/21 Singh v. Campbell  
652433/25 Stifel, Nicolaus & Co., Inc., Acting Through Its Business Div., Eaton Partners v. Aquilo Capital Mgt.  
150855/22 Stoddart v. Dynamic Us Inc.  
153468/24 Terrero v. Green  
453777/21 Nyhk Et Al v. 21647 LLC  
655761/24 Thinkup, Inc. v. Disruptive Prods., Inc. Et Al  
653742/23 Toribio Francisco v. Creston Hills 26 LLC Et Al  
657252/20 Valley Nat. Bank v. Fpg Maiden Lane  
650434/25 Vcs Venture Securities LLC v. Pecoraro  
653071/21 Walgreen Co. v. Kassover  
158684/21 Warner v. Bpp St Owner  
452432/16 Weinhardt v. NYCTA  
151308/25 West 92nd St. Associates LLC v. Lovozovsky  
654094/23 Wheels Up Partners v. Exclusive Jets  
654392/23 Wv Partners LLC v. Hudson Private Corp.  
157001/22 Zhang v. Downing St. Rlty. LLC Et Al

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**

151042/21 1225 East 14th Street v. Lin  
155177/2237 West 20 LLC v. Safe Drive Systems, Inc.  
652032/25 62nd St. Dev. LLC v. Johnson  
161746/24 6448 Rlty. Associates LLC v. Sagi  
655877/24 Aac 555 Grand Concourse LLC v. Amg 555 C & Quicksilver LLC Et Al  
950062/21 Abb v. Police Athletic League Inc.  
652186/24 Abi Seven LLC v. Hand Forged Talloos  
650047/25 Acar v. Amric LLC  
655814/24 Afaf Solar Capital Solutions v. Vleectron  
652020/25 Agostino And Associates P.C. v. Baltas  
156774/24 Aig Prop. Casualty Co. v. Emp Solutions, Inc.  
158261/22 Aig Prop. Casualty Co. v. G.A. Fleet Associates, Inc. Et Al  
950040/21 Ai v. Police Athletic League, Inc.  
157532/22 Alegre v. NYC  
655644/24 Alvarado v. Rezidora LLC Et Al  
158518/20 American Express Nat. Bank v. Miller  
653283/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Acosta-Ovalle  
805441/23 Anderson v. Hudson Pointe At Riverdale Center For Nursing And Rehab Et Al  
154842/23 Armijos v. Ai 229 West 43rd St. Prop. Owner  
654058/24 Art Capital Group LLC Et Al v. Mughabi  
652465/22 Bagirova v. The Nomo Soho Hotel Et Al  
15701/24 Barber v. Loreal USA, Inc. Et Al  
805138/24 Bates v. Mount Sinai Hosp. Et Al  
650388/24 Bellwood NY Inc. v. 119 Ave. A Rlty. Corp. Et Al  
656079/18 Board of Mgrs. of The St. v. Jma Consultants, Inc. D/b/a 151025/25 Bohlens v. Salamon  
161369/23 Brennan Center For Justice At NY Univ. School of Law v. NYC Police Dept.  
850613/23 Brick Air Capital LLC v. Nld Properties, Inc. Et Al  
950049/21 Brr v. Police Athletic League, Inc.  
805147/19 Bryson v. Ting  
161781/24 Cacciatore v. Tisch  
158746/23 Cahn v. Chapler  
805058/24 Calderon v. NY Presbyterian Cornell Medical Center Et Al  
154625/25 Calender v. NYC Et Al  
159634/22 Cachipulla v. Terminal Fee Owner Lp Et Al  
159020/20 Castillo De La Cruz v. 510 East 86th St. Owners

654284/23 Castle Village Owners Corp. v. Girardi  
651150/24 Certain Underwriters At Lloyd's v. Basf Corp. Et Al  
652179/25 Cf Encore Purchaser LLC v. Goldklang  
150151/21 Chica v. Permanent Mission of The  
152739/24 Coles v. NYC Et Al  
652502/22 Collins v. Heavy Camp Records, Inc. Et Al  
155441/22 Colon v. Chesapeake Owners Corp. Et Al  
650598/24 Con Ed Co. of NY v. Tokio Marine Specialty Ins. Co., A Delaware Corp.  
106473/11 Corrigan v. NYCTA  
152496/20 Cruz Fuentes v. 65 Franklin LLC  
158366/20 Cuesta v. Inwood Heights, Inc.  
152296/25D. Boral Capital LLC v. Currenc Group Inc.  
151545/24 Dasilva v. Montes Jr.  
151068/25 Delancey Suffolk Associates LLC v. Alsaidd  
452634/20 Dept. of Environmental Protection of The NYC- Water Board v. Board of Mgrs. of The Crossings Condominium Et Al  
659327/24 Deutsch v. Avangrid, Inc. Et Al  
150628/22 Donovan v. NYCTA Et Al  
151769/24 Dubose v. Good News Rlty., Inc.  
659884/24 Duff v. Royer Cooper Cohen Braunfeld LLC Et Al  
161853/23 Emamian v. Beldock Levine & Hoffman Lp Et Al  
161688/19 Estate of Lara Nadia Anike v. One Union Square East  
850009/21 Evtl Associates LLC v. 219 Ave A NYC LLC A.K.A  
157555/23 Fine Craftsman Group v. Dwyer  
151781/25 Fogges 218 West 147th St. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al  
162594/19 Fontanez v. NYCHA  
659294/24 Fowler v. Ibarra LLC Et Al  
151395/20 Gamble v. Cpv Valley  
654525/16 Gelwan v. Deratafia  
650076/25 Genuine Plumbing And Heating LLC v. Jonis-145 E 35th St. LLC  
150152/25 Gilbertson v. Bryant Park Corp. Et Al  
161655/24 Ginsburg & Misk Lp v. Eshaghpour  
161831/24 Glyn v. Stray Kids Et Al  
161327/24 Gomez v. 235 West 107th St. Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al  
161403/23 Govt. Accountability & Oversight v. Office of The Mayor of NYC  
653208/24 Great American Ins. Co. v. Arch Real Estate Hldgs.  
102057/11 Groz v. NYC Dept. of 320085/23 Guarini v. Guarini Iv  
160867/23 Haggerty v. NYC Et Al  
154012/21 Hecht v. Brandy  
655468/23 Holifield v. Xri Investment Hldgs. LLC Et Al  
151463/25 Holmes v. NYC Et Al  
151470/25in The Matter of The Application of 351 Canal St. LLC v. Niblack  
154128/25in The Matter of The Application of 99 Sutton LLC v. NYC Bd. of Ed. of Standards And Appeals Et Al  
153740/24in The Matter of The Application of Hunter Severini v. NYC Et Al  
161377/24in The Matter of The Trust Created By Howard Alan Wolfson v. Wolfson  
659012/24 Intralinks, Inc. v. Hudson Sustainable Group  
151516/23 Jimenez v. Summit Security Services, Inc. Et Al  
850501/24 Jpmorgan Chase Bank v. Segal  
655820/20 Katzoef v. Bsp Agency  
805089/21 L.E.C. Et Al v. Gavarra  
150990/23 Laby v. Structure Tone  
152329/23 Lending Assets LLC v. Gerbi Esq.  
158244/24 Leonard v. Gc Shl LLC Et Al  
153625/18 Lewis v. NYC  
650791/25 Lignel v. Butler  
653206/23 Linden Associates L.P. Et Al v. Shepherd Buccini  
651023/24 Lipari v. Zigman  
152159/25 Lopez v. NYC Et Al  
655206/23 Lynn v. 126 Columbia Tower 1 LLC Et Al  
154618/20 Manko v. City Univ. of New  
157316/21 Mark Propco LLC v. Jackson Aka Lisa M. Calichio  
160189/23 Minier v. 431 Audubon  
458083/18 Mojica v. NYC  
161530/23 Morel De Jesus v. Mostafa  
654441/24 Mortensen v. Nat. Cable Communications LLC  
153078/17 Nancy Bloosstein v. 87th St. Sherry Associates LLC  
151657/23 NY Marine And General v. NY Firetech Inc.  
156177/21 Noel v. 336 E 95th Rlty. LLC  
152858/20 Noka v. Gashi  
158711/23 Ortiz v. Akam Living Services, Inc.  
651359/25 Oxford Finance LLC v. Mirilis  
153568/23 Parker Interior Plantscape v. Legacy Builders/developers Corp  
162227/24 Patel v. United Dental Corp. Et Al  
655006/22 Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler Lp v. Hoganwilling  
652609/24 Peng v. The Board of Mgrs. of Acmos on Chrystie LLC Et Al  
154048/23 Pennbus Realities v. Ciardullo Architecture & Engineering  
157502/23 Pennbus Realities v. Optimal Strategic Group, Inc. Et Al  
450155/22 Perez v. Silva  
139965/24 Perkins v. Muladze  
151934/23 Pollack v. Kling Phd  
850131/21 Ps Funding, Inc. v. Itay Kahiri LLC Et Al  
151532/25 Ragnathan v. Savino & Smoller P.C. Et Al  
950046/21 Rgg v. Police Athletic League, Inc.  
190083/21 Richard Barthelness And Virginia Barthelness v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co., Et Al  
650655/25 Richards v. Reno  
153010/23 Rosa v. Archdiocese of NY A/v/a Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al  
151576/21 Rosenthal v. Park Hill Tenants Corp. Et Al  
655484/24 Rxr Si Owner LLC v. V Fashionable  
159212/21 Saquisili v. 305 Equities Corp. Et Al  
651267/24 Sotheby's Financial Services California, Inc. v. Bighawk Beverages  
159380/23 Stacy v. NYC Et Al  
655549/23 Steven Gurney-Goldman v. Solli Mgt.  
159022/22 Szpizczynska v. 2057-61 Rlty.  
158126/22 Teperman v. 1411 Ic-Sie Prop. LLC  
652296/23 Tompkins 183 LLC v. All Dimension Home Improvement & Restoration, Inc.  
652042/25 Tontec Int'l Ltd. v. Ddc Enterprise Ltd.  
453299/21 Trump v. Trump  
621967/24 Tsuari v. Miller  
650988/24 U.S. Bank Nat. Assoc. v. Garbarini & Scher  
190283/24 Vargas v. Conopco, Inc., A Subsidiary of Unilever U.S., Inc. And D/b/a Unilever Home & Personal Care USA, Sued Individually And As Successor-In-Interest To Chesebrough Manufacturing Co. A/k/a Chesebrough-Pond's USA Co. Et Al  
655825/24 Vulpes Testudo Fund Et Al v. Gregory Daniel Shinnick Et Al  
160211/22 W. v. Delacruz

# Court Calendars

## C O U R T N O T E S

### NEW NOTE! U.S DISTRICT COURT Southern District

#### Court Seeks Candidates for Criminal Justice Act Panel

The United States District Court for the Southern District of New York is seeking applicants for the SDNY Criminal Justice Act (CJA) Panel. Applications are available on the court's website at <https://www.nysd.uscourts.gov/forms/cja-panel-membership-application>.

The CJA Panel is comprised of private attorneys who are authorized to serve as appointed defense counsel pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3006A. To qualify for a position on the CJA Panel, attorneys must be members in good standing of the bar of the Southern District and have proven experience and competency in the field of federal criminal defense work.

Applications will be reviewed by a committee of attorneys that will forward its recommendations to the Southern District Board of Judges' Defender Services Committee. The Court is committed to increasing the diversity of the applicant pool and encourages qualified female and minority lawyers to apply for positions.

Candidates can apply to be a member of the Foley Square Panel or the White Plains Panel or both. CJA Panel attorneys commit to being "on duty" one day every four to six months if a member of the Foley Square panel and approximately one day every month if on the White Plains panel. On that "duty day," CJA attorneys represent clients when the Federal Defender has a conflict; the hours of duty are from 9:00 a.m. until the closing of the Magistrate Judge's Office, which is sometimes after 5:00 p.m. CJA Panel members serve a three-year term and are reimbursed at the rate of \$175/hour for in-court and out-of-court time.

"We are fortunate to have such talented and skilled attorneys dedicated to providing indigent defendants with the representation to which they are constitutionally entitled," said United States District Judge Vernon Broderick who is Chair of the Southern District's Defender Services Committee.

Southern District Chief Judge Laura Taylor Swain said, "Our exemplary panel of CJA lawyers provides representation that is both excellent and essential. Panel attorneys ensure the protection of defendants' constitutional rights and uphold the Rule of Law. We look forward to being able to invite additional outstanding practitioners to join them in this important work."

Attorneys can also apply for membership on panels that represent defendants in capital cases and in non-trial work, primarily habeas corpus proceedings. In addition, the Southern District also sponsors a mentoring program that helps identify and prepare experienced state court practitioners for appointment to the Panel. While the mentorship program is aimed at increasing the diversity of the Panel, the program is open to all. Contact Peter Quijano at 212-686-0666 or Anthony Ricco at 212-791-3919 for more information on the mentorship program.

### U.S.COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

#### Court Seeks Applications for Federal Public Defender

##### For the Northern District of New York

##### Application Deadline is May 16

The United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit invites applications from qualified candidates for the position of Federal Public Defender for the Northern District of New York. The term of office is four years, with potential for appointment to successive terms. The current authorized annual salary is \$195,200.

The Federal Public Defender, functioning under the authority of 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(g)(2)(A) and the Criminal Justice Act Plan for the Northern District of New York, provides criminal defense services to individuals unable to afford counsel. The Office of the Federal Public Defender for the Northern District of New York has offices in Albany and Syracuse. The Federal Public Defender supervises a staff of assistant federal defenders, federal capital appellate resource counsel, investigators, paralegals, a mitigation specialist, and support personnel.

The website for the office is: Office of the Public Defender Northern District of New York.

Applicants must satisfy the following conditions:

- (1) be a member in good standing in the bar of the state in which the candidate is admitted to practice;
- (2) have a minimum of five years criminal practice experience, preferably with significant federal criminal trial experience, which demonstrates an ability to provide zealous representation of consistently high quality to criminal defendants;
- (3) possess the ability to effectively administer the office, including the following management areas:
  - Budget, procurement, and travel
  - Human resources
  - Space, facilities, and property;
  - (4) have a reputation for integrity; and
- (5) demonstrate a commitment to the representation of those unable to afford counsel.

As the chief executive of the Office of the Federal Public Defender, the Federal Public Defender holds ultimate responsibility for the administration of the Office. The Office serves as a resource center for all practicing federal defense attorneys in the District, providing regularly scheduled training programs as well as advice and counsel when needed. The Federal

Public Defender works nationally with other federal defenders on evolving issues in federal criminal law and other areas of shared concern.

The Second Circuit uses an open and competitive selection process. A Merit Selection Committee will review all applications and interview the most qualified candidates. With consideration of the District Court's recommendation, the Committee will refer the best qualified candidate to the Court of Appeals for selection and appointment. Applicants will be considered without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, sexual orientation, or disability. The selected nominee will be required to complete a background investigation prior to appointment. The Federal Public Defender may not engage in the private practice of law.

Application forms are posted on the Court's website at <http://www.ca2.uscourts.gov>. Completed application packages must be in the format required by the Second Circuit and received no later than May 16, 2025.

### NEW YORK STATE COURT OF APPEALS

#### Scheduling Dates For Primary Election Appeals

The Clerks' Offices of the Court of Appeals and the Appellate Division Departments release the following joint scheduling announcement:

The Departments have scheduled and reserved the following dates to consider appeals related to the June 24, 2025 primary elections:

First Department: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 (Wednesday, May 7, 2025 if necessary)

Second Department: Wednesday, May 7, 2025

Third Department: Friday, May 9, 2025

Fourth Department: Tuesday, May 6, 2025

The Court of Appeals has scheduled Tuesday, May 13, 2025 to consider appeals and motions for leave to appeal related to primary election matters.

All parties, election boards and affected courts are expected to proceed expeditiously with all phases of election matters so that the requirements of these special sessions and the Election Law can be met. Please consult with the respective Clerks' Offices for details about meeting the timing requirements of each Court.

Because there is limited time available between the primary election sessions of the Appellate Division Departments and the Court of Appeals, parties who seek to have matters placed upon the Court of Appeals motions or appeals calendars must contact the Court of Appeals Clerk's Office for filing instructions promptly (usually immediately upon release of the Appellate Division decision).

### U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT

#### Pro Se Electronic Filing of Documents

Parties who are not represented by an attorney (known as self-represented or pro se individuals) are not permitted to electronically file documents in CM/ECF without a court order. The preferred methods of delivery of court filings are United States Mail and hand delivery to the Clerk's Office of either courthouse.

The Eastern District of New York does provide a method of electronic delivery for self-represented parties who cannot mail or hand deliver documents to the courthouse via this link: <https://prose.nyed.uscourts.gov/>. This delivery method replaces any earlier versions and cannot be used to file initial complaints in a new case. All pro se parties who use the electronic delivery method must provide a valid email address and must follow all document filing guidelines which are available on the court's web site: [www.nyed.uscourts.gov](http://www.nyed.uscourts.gov).

Pro se parties may contact the Clerk's Office at either courthouse for assistance:

United States District Court  
Eastern District of New York  
225 Cadman Plaza East  
Brooklyn, NY 11201  
718-613-2665

United States District Court  
Eastern District of New York  
100 Federal Plaza  
Central Islip, NY 11722  
631-712-6060

### NEW NOTE! APPELLATE TERM First Department

#### Filing Dates for the June Term

The JUNE 2025 Term of the Court will commence on JUNE 4, 2025.

The last dates for filing for that term are as follows:

The Clerk's Return, Record on Appeal, Appendices, Notice of Argument and Appellant's Briefs must be filed on or before APRIL 8, 2025.

Respondent's Briefs must be filed on or before MAY 1, 2025.

Reply Briefs, if any, must be filed on or before MAY 9, 2025.

250641/1928 Perry St. Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
250603/17300 West 23rd St. Owners, Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
255474/20301 First Dorm Condo LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
266364/203950 Rlty. Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
252908/124 Third Ave. Leasehold v. The Tax Comm.  
251922/14535-545 Fee LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
263911/19543 B'way Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
252564/1655 East 66th St. Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
251937/1786th St. Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of The

250798/20Greystone Properties West End LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
651339/22 Groner v. Kushner  
240108/24in The Matter of The Application For The Review of An Assessment Under Article 7 of The Real Prop. Tax Law Cpc Headquarters, Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al  
255921/17Jtre W 72 St. LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
256561/23 Lumary LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
151982/19McCann v. Ship Wrecked Bar And Grill  
250260/22 Mo 37 v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
250204/19Moira F. Boccellari Grantor Trust v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
259080/22 Nkm Proscia LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
251949/18 Old Glory Real Estate v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
26495/18 Omni Berkshire Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
257363/17 Oversight Mgt. v. Tax Comm. of The  
251507/21 Stone St. Partners v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
259437/19 The Reade Chambers Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
261040/07 W2001z/ 15cpw Rlty. v. The Tax Comm. of The  
250874/20 Yomtov 26 LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC

**Motion**

240108/24in The Matter of The Application For The Review of An Assessment Under Article 7 of The Real Prop. Tax Law Cpc Headquarters, Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al

**Part 3**

Justice Joel M. Cohen  
60 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-3287  
Room 208

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

654742/20 App Hldgs. Two LLC v. Certain Underwriters At  
651471/22 Owen v. Array Us, Inc. Et Al  
151191/22 Piraesus Bank S.A. v. Notias  
654142/20 Piraesus Bank S.A. v. Notias  
657193/20 Tekiner v. Bremen House Inc.  
656715/22 Vida Longevity Fund v. Suttonpark Capital LLC Et Al

**Motion**

151191/22 Piraesus Bank S.A. v. Notias  
654142/20 Piraesus Bank S.A. v. Notias  
657193/20 Tekiner v. Bremen House Inc.  
656715/22 Vida Longevity Fund v. Suttonpark Capital LLC Et Al

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**

652465/22 Bagirova v. The Nomo Soho Hotel Et Al  
656079/18 Board of Mgrs. of The St. v. Jma Consultants, Inc. D/b/a 653208/24 Great American Ins. Co. v. Arch Real Estate Hldgs.  
650539/22 Greater NY Mutual Ins. Co. v. Skout Monitoring

**Part 6**

Justice Kathy J. King  
60 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-3312  
Room 351

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

805084/24 Aloisio v. Akb Foundation Et Al  
805112/22 Antonelli v. NY Presbyterian Weill Cornell Medical Center Et Al  
805225/17 Baker v. NY Orthopedic  
805262/24 Calchera v. Sardar M.D.  
805217/24 Chakrabarti v. Weill Cornell Center For Reprod.ive Medicine Et Al  
805005/19 Corcoran v. Deipolyi  
805190/22 Delamaza v. Bhardwaj M.D.  
805113/19 E. S. F. A Minor By Her v. Winthrop Univ. Hosp.  
805194/15 Endriss v. Barbara  
805355/21 Epstein v. Calat D.M.D.  
805293/17 Flynn v. Goldenberg  
805414/19 George Chen v. Barakat  
805325/21 Gruppo v. Kiely M.D.  
805105/24 Gutwilling v. Tewari M.D.  
805201/24 Habib v. Brandon J. Godbout  
805171/22 Hegbeli v. Olanescu M.D.  
805229/22 Hermi Orduña As Attorney in Fact For Clorinda Arrascue v. The Mount Sinai Hosp.

805088/22 Hernandez-Clusan v. The NY And Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al  
805329/22 Herrera v. Del Vecchio M.D.  
805356/18 Isaacson v. Pacifico  
805417/19 Kang v. Zatorski  
805063/24 Lesse v. Mount Sinai Hosps. Group, Inc. Et Al  
805110/23 Lezette Nieves As Administrator of The Estate of Esther Nieves v. Northern Manhattan Nursing Home, Inc. Et Al  
805106/24 Macgregor v. Shen Md Phd  
805300/20 Mack v. Northern Manhattan Nursing  
805215/24 Madalinska v. Agnes Radio M.D. Et Al  
805291/19 Morrison v. Johnson  
805235/21 Nathaniel Shapiro v. Riverspring Licensed Home Care Services Agency Inc. Et Al  
805440/23 Nolan v. Dewitt Rehabilitation And Nursing Center Inc Et Al  
805166/22 Odesanya v. Kety Michel  
805074/21 Paley v. Goyal  
805256/22 Pugh v. Duszka M.D.  
805085/18 Rivera v. Chamas  
805147/20 Romano v. Stelzer  
805369/23 Rubinstein v. Chow Dpm  
805240/21 S. v. McManus Au. Et Al  
805099/21 Sadura v. Caridi M.D.  
805382/22 Torbati v. Bauer Dmd  
805002/22 Torres v. Okubadejo M.D.  
805251/23 Trunfel v. Connell M.D.  
805096/19 Weidener v. Mansfield M.D.  
805421/23 Weiss v. Citi Md Et Al

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**

805147/19 Bryson v. Ting  
805058/24 Calderon v. NY Presbyterian Cornell Medical Center Et Al  
805089/22 L.E.C. Et Al v. Gavarra

**Part 7**

Justice Gerald Lebovits  
60 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-3746  
Courtroom 345

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

153881/25 Altschuler v. Watch Fantom, Inc. D/b/a Catapult D/b/a Qortex Inc. Et Al  
650923/22 American Casualty Co. of Reading v. Colony Ins. Co.  
650768/25 American Express Travel Related Services Co., Inc. v. Rochelle Newspapers, Inc.  
157691/23 Grob v. Nitsche  
654498/18 Leverage Builders Group Inc. v. Pc Structures of NY LLC  
654184/21 Precision Fabricators Corp. v. Fpg Maiden Lane  
159207/16 Sarmordi v. Pgref 1 B'way Land

**Motion**

153881/25 Altschuler v. Watch Fantom, Inc. D/b/a Catapult D/b/a Qortex Inc. Et Al

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**

650921/24 Abrams v. The Seaview Assoc. of Fire Island NY Inc. Et Al

653299/23 Bah v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc. Et Al  
161781/24 Cacciatore v. Tisch  
652179/25 Cf Encore Purchaser LLC v. Goldklang  
655005/21 Con Ed Co. of New York, Inc. v. Ace American Ins. Co.  
151545/24 Dasilva v. Montes Jr.  
652085/24 Equinox F&B, Inc. v. The Juice Press  
162481/23 Ford v. Mazal Ubracha 101 LLC  
153767/25 Fuhr v. Smith  
653622/22 Hernandez v. Mi Paso Centroamericano Corp. Et Al  
656185/23 Hope Come Int'l Ltd. v. Royal Promotions Group, Inc.  
656129/18 Itria Ventures LLC v. Beaver St. Pizza LLC  
653206/23 Linden Associates L.P. Et Al v. Shepherd Buccini  
651023/24 Lipari v. Zigman  
650655/25 Richards v. Reno  
655484/24 Rxr Si Owner LLC v. V Fashionable  
152842/21 Sky It Group v. Super Nova 330 LLC  
651029/24 Stargo Mechanical NY Inc. v. Peak Mechanical Solutions Inc. Et Al  
152937/23 The Board of Mgrs. of The 11



159921/20A & L Gaudio Rlty. Inc. v. Nathan Francis Murley *A/k/a* 150952/20Diaz v. Rg3 Rlty. Corp 850358/24Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Whelan 151634/21M13 & M15 Hldgs. v. Athansoon

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**

152496/20Cruz Fuentes v. 65 Franklin LLC 655006/22Patterson Belnap Webb & Tyler Llp v. Hoganwillig

**Part 15**

**Justice Jeanine R. Johnson**  
60 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-4462  
Room 116

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

365343/20Lavitt v. Perlman 365807/23Whelan v. Whelan

**Part 17**

**Justice Shlomo S. Hagler**  
60 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-3283  
Courtroom 335

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

156419/20Gabriele v. Boyarsky 157599/21Jean v. 4181 B'way LLC Et Al 159851/22Jean v. Stellar Mgt. Et Al 159338/28Jordan v. Con Ed Co 150913/20Ye v. Sze

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**

150751/20Amon v. 96th St. Lofs LLC 162594/19Fontanez v. NYCHA 157038/20Melching v. First Lexington Corp. 151274/20Pittman v. Yantiss

**Motion**

150751/20Amon v. 96th St. Lofs LLC 151274/20Pittman v. Yantiss

**Part 19**

**Justice Lisa A. Sokoloff**  
60 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-3979  
Room 540

**Part 20**

**Justice Deborah A. Kaplan**  
60 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-3300  
Courtroom 422

**Part 24**

**Justice Michael L. Katz**  
60 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-3285  
Courtroom 325

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

161270/24Abiah v. Boaf0 320567/21Boaf0-Abiah v. Abiah— 9.30 A.M. 321168/23Rossi v. Barron

**Motion**

161270/24Abiah v. Boaf0 320567/21Boaf0-Abiah v. Abiah— 9.30 A.M. 321168/23Rossi v. Barron

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**

320085/23Guarini v. Guarini Iv 308545/18Zisman v. Levy

**Motion**

308545/18Zisman v. Levy

**Part 26**

**Justice Ta-Tanisha D. James**  
60 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-4462  
Room 438

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

365577/22Haffey v. Haffey 304827/18Tsang v. Ng

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**

365050/24Familit v. Familit

**Part 28**

**Justice Aija Tingling**  
60 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-4372  
Room 543

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

365294/24Engel v. Engel 365306/24Fata v. Duncan III 365538/23Lee v. Verovic 365132/24Neumann v. Neumann 321028/24Osorio v. De Jesus

**Motion**

365306/24Fata v. Duncan III 321028/24Osorio v. De Jesus

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**

365100/24Steiner v. Steiner 321967/24Tsuari v. Miller

**Part 30V**

**Justice Judith N. McMahon**  
60 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-3275

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

805278/20Bui v. Reischner 805226/20De Cicco v. Tormambe 805024/21Genet v. NY And 805114/22Gonzalez v. The NY And Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 800094/11Hurt v. Gambrell 805374/22Kelly Eng v. NYU Langgame Medical Center Et Al 805150/19Kimmelman And v. Smith 805250/20Lara v. Mount Sinai Hosp.

**Part 33**

**Justice Mary V. Rosado**  
60 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-3894  
Room 442

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

161588/24Distefano v. Studio Fuda LLC 157599/16Focacci v. One East River Pl. Rlty. 152374/24Kuvshynov v. Fox News Network 161082/22Maldonado v. Cm & Associates Contracting Inc. Et Al 153678/23Rodriguez v. The Langston Condominium Et Al 157481/22Shin v. 157 Suffolk St. Jv LLC

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**

159701/24Barber v. Loreal USA, Inc. Et Al 650388/24Bellwood NY Inc. v. 119 Ave. A Rlty. Corp. Et Al 152296/25D. Boral Capital LLC v. Currenre Group Inc. 151068/25Delancy Suffolk Associates LLC v. Alsaidd 659884/24Duff v. Royer Cooper Cohen Braunfeld LLC Et Al 650076/25Genuine Plumbing And Heating LLC v. Jonis-145 E 35th St. LLC 161655/24Ginsburg & Misk Llp v. Eshaghpour 158244/24Leonard v. Gc Shl LLC Et Al

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**

158126/22Teperman v. 1411 Ic-Sic Prop. LLC

**Part 34**

**Justice Dakota D. Ramseur**  
60 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-4370  
Room 341

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

450504/16Comm'rs. of The State v. Greystone Mgt. Solutions 150278/23Knight v. East Pub Inc. Et Al 153115/23Ro v. Transit Wireless LLC Et Al

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**

158746/23Cahn v. Chapler 151516/23Jimenez v. Summit Services Inc., Et Al 156177/21Noel v. 336 E 95th Rlty. LLC 151934/23Pollack v. Kling Phd

**Part 37 IAS Part**  
**Justice Arthur F. Engoron**  
60 Centre Street  
646-386-3222  
Room 418

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

451461/24NYC v. The Hartford Co. 451825/23Delacruz v. NYCH&HC Corp. Et Al 154663/22Jean-Charles v. West 146th St. L.P. Et Al 800296/11Lee v. Nejal 805204/20Lee v. NYC NYCH&HC Corp. Et Al 805084/22Lin v. NYCH&HC Corp. 653535/22Mt. Hawley Ins. Co. v. Pathforward Consulting, Inc. 154053/23Nationwide General Ins. Co. As Subrogee of Mari Matsuo 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu v. Suroo Mateo 365088/22Scaglia v. Haart

**Motion**  
321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 365522/24Abogunrin v. Abiha 451203/23Chatelein v. Chatelein 321699/24Garcia Esposito v. Esposito 312251/15Gordon v. Gordon 365058/25Hessler v. Hessler 365379/20Maggan v. Metz 320887/24Sanematsu



190346/17 Nankervis v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co  
190278/23 Ringelberg v. Air & Liquid Systems Corp. Et Al  
190107/23 Rippe v. Abb, Inc.  
Individually And As Successor in Interest To Ite Circuit Breakers, Inc Et Al

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**

190036/18 Avakian v. Aerco International  
190218/18 Bongiovi v. Amchem Prods., Inc.  
190083/21 Richard Barthelmess And Virginia Barthelmess v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co., Et Al  
190022/18 Romano v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co  
190283/24 Vargas v. Conopco, Inc., A Subsidiary of Unilever U.S., Inc. And D/b/a Unilever Home & Personal Care USA, Sued Individually And As Successor-In-Interest To Chesebrough-Manufacturing Co. A/k/a Chesebrough-Ponds A/k/a Chesebrough-Pond's USA Co. Et Al

190360/18 Waldron v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co  
190147/18 Wendy Facas v. Air & Liquid Systems

**Part 29**  
Justice Leticia M. Ramirez  
71 Thomas Street  
Phone 646-386-3016  
Room 311

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
154842/23 Armijos v. Ai 229 West 43rd Street Property Owner

**Part 36**  
Justice Verna L. Saunders  
71 Thomas Street  
Phone 646-386-3733  
Room 205

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
159253/19 Halim v. Battery Wave

**Part 46**  
Justice Richard Latin  
71 Thomas Street  
Phone 646-386-3279  
Room 210

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**  
158817/23 C. v. Rama African Hair Braiding—2:15 P.M.  
150440/23 Rashidi v. Gid Dev. Group Et Al—11 A.M.

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
160787/22 1576 Finest Deli Corp. v. Kookmin Best Ins. Co, Ltd (us Branch) Et Al—11 A.M.  
156319/22 Jacobus v. Hollister Co Et Al—11:30 A.M.  
154618/20 Manko v. City Univ. of New York

151379/22 Napoli v. 50 Hymc Owner—10:30 A.M.  
153523/21 Singh v. 735 Ave. of The Americas LLC Et Al—12 Noon

**Part 55**  
Justice James D'Auguste  
71 Thomas Street  
Phone 646-386-3279  
Room 103

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**  
100044/25 Deloach v. Assurant 100357/25 Marino v. Board of Education of The City School Dist. of NYC  
101393/24 Moncion v. NYC Nypd  
153364/24 Oleske v. NYS Dept. of Law Et Al

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
155177/2237 West 20 LLC v. Safe Drive Systems, Inc.  
655877/24 Aac 555 Grand Concourse LLC v. Amg 555 G C Quickservice LLC Et Al  
158518/20 American Express Nat. Bank v. Miller  
159252/24 Chulco v. 10 West 57th St. Rty. LLC  
952291/23 Doe v. Affleck  
153098/24 Kayan v. Maric Plumbing & Heating, Inc. Et Al  
152792/24 Nagler v. 22579 Owners Corp.  
110961/09 Sun Shan Lee Rty. v. Sapphire Estate  
453018/24 NYC v. The Land And Bldg. Known As 45 West 28th St.  
156833/24 Syulbnik v. Midsummer Theatricals LLC Et Al  
100433/25 Weaver v. The NYCHA

**Motion**  
952291/23 Doe v. Affleck  
453018/24 NYC v. The Land And Bldg. Known As 45 West 28th St.

**Part 58**  
Justice David B. Cohen  
71 Thomas Street  
Phone 646-636-3347  
Room 305

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
151769/24 Dubose v. Good News Rty., Inc.  
654525/16 Gelwan v. Deratafia  
151657/20 NY Marine And General v. NY Firetech Inc  
158711/23 Ortiz v. Akam Living Services, Inc.  
151532/25 Ragnathan v. Savino & Smollar P.C. Et Al

**Part 56**  
Justice John J. Kelley  
71 Thomas Street  
Phone 646-386-5281  
Room 204

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**  
452393/21 Bivona v. Gupta  
805054/24 Grant v. NY Presbyterian Allen Hosp. Et Al  
805384/21 Rudansky v. City Md Et Al

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
805441/23 Anderson v. Hudson Pointe At Riverdale Center For Nursing And Rehab Et Al  
805138/24 Bates v. Mount Sinai Hosp. Et Al  
805015/24 Santiago v. Hudson Hill Center For Rehabilitation And Nursing Et Al

**111 CENTRE STREET**

**Part 25 Guardianship**  
Justice Ilana J. Marcus  
111 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-5675  
Room 1254

**Part 35**  
Justice Phaedra F. Perry  
111 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-3016  
Room 684

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**  
651935/24 Energo v. 135-137 West 115th St. Housing Dev. Fund Corp.

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
652032/25 62nd St. Dev. LLC v. Johnson  
653283/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Acosta-Ovalle  
452634/20 Dept. of Environmental Protection of The NYC Water Board v. Board of Mgrs. of The Crossings Condominium Et Al  
157555/23 Fine Craftsman Group v. Dwyer  
161377/24 In The Matter of The Trust Created By Howard Alan Wolfson v. Wolfson

**Part 31**  
Justice Kathleen C. Waterman-Marshall  
111 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-4296  
Room 623

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**  
659112/24 American Express Travel Related Services Co., Inc. v. Talentcode Mgt. Group, Inc. Et Al  
651213/25 Chesterfield Faring v. Cronin  
652199/22 Estjon v. Blackboard Ins. Co.  
650611/25 Frink-Hamlett Legal Solutions, Inc. v. Tellock  
154419/24 Guaraca Saquisilli v. 164 4 LLC Et Al  
158117/24 Murphy Marshall v. Acp Parent LLC  
151308/25 West 92nd St. Associates LLC v. Lozovsky

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
365107/19 Anonymous v. Meiorowitz  
652502/22 Collins v. Heavy Camp Records, Inc. Et Al  
154128/25 In The Matter of The Application of 99 Sutton LLC v. NYC Bd. of Ed. of Standards And Appeals Et Al  
650988/24 U.S. Bank Nat. Assoc. v. Garbarini & Scher

**Motion**  
365107/19 Anonymous v. Meiorowitz

**32 Mortgage Foreclosure Part**  
Justice Francis A. Kahn, III  
111 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-5607  
Room 1127B

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**  
850142/25527 West Partners LLC v. Our Children's Foundation, Inc. Et Al  
850299/24 Deutsch v. 215 West 138th St. LLC Et Al  
850358/24 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Whelan  
850505/23 McIp Asset Co., Inc. v. Delucia  
850678/23 Sbt Advantage Bank v. Ma  
850294/24 Silverman v. 215 West 138th St. LLC Et Al  
850117/24 Tuebor Reit Sub LLC v. 2338 Second Ave. Mazal LLC Et Al

850001/23 U.S. Bank v. Buco  
850106/24 Wells Fargo Bank v. 11 West 34th St. Owner LLC  
**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
850613/23 Brick Air Capital LLC v. Nid Properties, Inc. Et Al  
850009/21 Ev4 Associates LLC v. 219 Ave A NYC LLC A.K.A.  
850501/24 Jpmorgan Chase Bank v. Segal  
850131/21 Ps Funding, Inc. v. Itay Kahiri LLC Et Al

**Part 38**  
Justice Ashlee Crawford  
111 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-3235  
Room 1166

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**  
650077/19 Follett Time Devices, Inc. v. Gracie Corp.  
653224/23 Hangman NYC LLC v. Malin  
158816/23 Markovic v. Sarpal

**Motion**  
653224/23 Hangman NYC LLC v. Malin  
158816/23 Markovic v. Sarpal

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
151781/25 Fogges 218 West 147th Street v. The Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al  
652762/24 Mep Capital Hldgs. II v. Arclight Films Int'l Pty Ltd.  
651020/21 Structure Tune LLC v. Successor By Merger To Structure Tone, Inc. v. Utica Nat. Ins. Co. of Texas

**Part 42**  
Justice Emily Morales-Minerva  
111 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-3237  
Room 574

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**  
650739/25 1571-1573 Third Ave. LLC v. Taim Upper East LLC Et Al  
655118/24 Celtic Services NYC Inc. v. Seigel  
160234/21 Ortiz v. NYCHA Et Al  
159540/23 Palma-Castro v. Madison Plaza Apt. Corp. Et Al  
153222/23 Sarasota Dev. Co., LLC Et Al v. The Board of Mgrs. of The 58-60 Reade St. Condominium Et Al  
150855/22 Stoddart v. Dynamic US Inc.

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
153787/25 186 Bleeker Prop. Owner LLC v. Figaro NYC LLC  
655644/24 Alvarado v. Rezidora LLC Et Al  
155441/22 Colon v. Chesapeake Owners Corp. Et Al  
161327/24 Gomez v. 235 West 107th St. Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al  
151034/25 In Re The Matter of The Application of Ofit Kurman P.A. v. To Enforce Cplr 3119 Subpoena Served Upon Sgp Bioenergy Hldgs.  
652042/25 Tontec Int'l Ltd. v. Ddc Enterprise Ltd.

**Motion**  
153787/25 186 Bleeker Prop. Owner LLC v. Figaro NYC LLC  
655644/24 Alvarado v. Rezidora LLC Et Al  
155441/22 Colon v. Chesapeake Owners Corp. Et Al  
161327/24 Gomez v. 235 West 107th St. Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al  
151034/25 In Re The Matter of The Application of Ofit Kurman P.A. v. To Enforce Cplr 3119 Subpoena Served Upon Sgp Bioenergy Hldgs.  
652042/25 Tontec Int'l Ltd. v. Ddc Enterprise Ltd.

**Part 47**  
Justice Paul A. Goetz  
111 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-3743  
Room 1021

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**  
159115/21 Alrose 801 LLC v. Alaregi  
150677/25 Baptiste v. The City Univ. of NY Et Al  
156629/24 Bellino v. Hillary Gardens Co. LLC  
154701/24 Boxley v. Live Nation Entertainment, Inc. Et Al  
161392/23 Cabrera v. 529 West 152 St. Housing Dev. Fund Corp Et Al  
153661/24 Chiang v. 485 Madison Ave. LLC Et Al  
150260/24 Dempsey v. NYC Et Al  
151069/22 Eskin v. 60 E. 9th St Owners Corp. Et Al  
151345/23 Farquharson v. Apple Core Hotels, Inc. Et Al  
161642/21 Jarden v. NYC Et Al  
151453/24 Kale v. Belair Corp. Et Al  
161283/19 Leschaeve v. Hescomar Rty. Corp.  
158535/24 Lovejoy v. Pinehurst Mgt. 159262/17 Mulready v. 746 Rty. Corp.  
152989/20 Naramore v. Mount Sinai Health System  
156533/20 Ortega v. Lic 73 Owner 155880/24 Polanco-Mata v. 3800 B'way. Associates LLC Et Al  
159588/23 Quintero v. The Related Companies  
161719/23 Quiziphi Tapia v. The Board of Mgrs. of The Royal Elizabeth Condominium Et Al  
154090/21 Sawyer v. 1120 Fifth Ave. Corp. Et Al  
100146/22 Tharani v. Valentino  
156876/24 The Bronx Freedom Fund v. NYC Et Al  
652375/24 Wall St. Tech. Corp. Aka Wall St. Et Mgt. v. Lampert Capital Markets, Inc. Dba Lampert Capital Advisors

150693/24 Williams v. Astoria 30 LLC  
154297/21 Winiarski v. NYC Et Al  
153914/21 Woroch v. 116 2nd Ave. LLC

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**

158366/20 Cuesta v. Inwood Heights, Inc.  
161853/23 Emamian v. Beldock Levine & Hoffman Lip Et Al  
160867/23 Haggerty v. NYC Et Al  
154012/21 Hecht v. Brandt  
151463/25 Holmes v. NYC Et Al  
153740/24 In The Matter of The Application of Hunter Severini v. NYC Et Al  
101116/24 Molina v. NYC Dept. of Health And Mental Hygiene  
153010/23 Rosa v. Archdiocese of NY A/k/a/Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al  
151576/21 Rosenthal v. Park Hill Tenants Corp. Et Al

**Part 52 City Part**  
Justice Carol Sharpe  
111 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-3742  
Room 1045

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**  
160519/17 Batista v. NYC  
160975/20 Benevento v. NYC  
152057/20 Castillo v. NYC  
158809/24 Daniels v. NYC Et Al  
158869/19 James v. Smith  
450900/16 Jones v. NYCHA  
452708/21 Kim v. NYC  
158684/21 Warner v. Bpp St Owner

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
152159/25 Lopez v. NYC Et Al  
159380/23 Stacy v. NYC Et Al

**Part 62 City Part**  
Justice Ariel D. Chesler  
111 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-3274  
Room 1127A

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**  
153423/19 A v. NYC Et Al  
150093/22 Alvarez Delgadillo v. Shp 69th St.  
154414/21 Ayala v. NYC Et Al  
157586/18 Beron v. City of New York  
150777/25 Billingslea v. NYC Et Al  
152451/21 Bisht v. NYC  
160437/15 Brown v. NYC  
157425/21 Cabral Martre v. Rozenberg  
156978/22 Dalmida v. NYC Et Al  
154987/24 Diaz v. NYCHA Et Al  
151372/22 Easton v. NYC  
453243/21 Evans v. NYC Et Al  
154442/19 Gonzalez v. Con Ed Et Al  
156878/20 Green v. NYC  
150965/22 Green v. NYC  
157024/17 Grueber v. NYC  
151324/18 Guerra v. NYC  
156402/22 Hargrove-Beal v. NYC Et Al  
153797/21 Hensley v. Irving Tenants Corp.  
159523/18 Hutchins v. NYC  
153943/21 Jean-Pierre v. NYC Et Al  
156289/20 K v. NYC  
154345/21 Kapoor v. NYC  
155819/15 Koma v. NYC  
151119/22 Lewis v. NYC Et Al  
158865/22 Lin v. Fire Dept. of NYC Et Al  
157192/22 Martre v. NYC Et Al  
158766/22 Martinez v. NYC Et Al  
155682/20 Mendez v. NYC  
159876/22 O'Hara v. NYC  
451855/19 Olaniyi v. Westbury Rty. Associates  
156692/18 Parker v. NYC  
159656/22 Pena v. NYC Et Al  
157944/19 Pistolesi v. NYC  
159978/23 Reid v. NYC Et Al  
152162/24 Roa v. NYC Et Al  
151819/22 Roulette v. NYC  
154028/19 Sarracco v. NYC Bike Share  
158825/21 Stewart v. NYC Et Al  
153355/21 Ward v. NYC  
451984/22 Williamson v. NYC Et Al

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
102035/11 Grosz v. NYC Dept. of

**Integrated Domestic Violence Part**  
Justice Tandra L. Dawson  
100 Centre Street  
Phone 646-386-3868  
Room 1604

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**  
320523/22 Georgiadis v. Georgiadis

**CRIMINAL TERM**

**Part Tap A**  
Justice Biben  
Phone 646-386-4107  
100 Centre St.  
Room 1100, 9:30 A.M.

**Part Tap B**  
Justice Statsinger  
Phone 646-386-4044  
100 Centre St.  
Room 1100, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 22**  
Justice Mennin  
Phone 646-386-4022  
Fax 212-295-4890  
111 Centre Street  
Room 928, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 23**  
Justice N. Ross  
Phone 646-386-4023  
Fax 212-295-4891  
100 Centre Street  
Room 1307, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 31**  
Justice D. Kiesel  
Phone 646-386-4031  
Fax 212-401-9260  
100 Centre Street  
Room 1333, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 32**  
Justice Carro  
Phone 646-386-4032  
Fax 212-401-9261  
100 Centre Street  
Room 1300, 9:30 A.M.

**Part JHO/Part 37**  
Justice Adlerberg  
Phone 646-386-4037  
100 Centre Street  
Room 1600, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 41**  
Justice Dwyer  
Phone 646-386-4041  
Fax 212-401-9262  
100 Centre Street  
Room 1116, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 42**  
Justice Wiley  
Phone 646-386-4042  
Fax 212-401-9263  
111 Centre Street  
Room 733, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 51**  
Justice Edwards  
Phone 646-386-4051  
Fax 212-401-9264  
100 Centre Street  
Room 1324, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 52**  
Justice T. Farber  
Phone 646-386-4052  
Fax 212-401-9265  
111 Centre Street  
Room 763, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 53**  
Justice Rodney  
Phone 646-386-4053  
100 Centre Street  
Room 1247, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 54**  
Justice Antignani  
Phone 646-386-4054  
111 Centre Street  
Room 621, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 56**  
Justice Drysdale  
Phone 646-386-4056  
111 Centre Street  
Room 724, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 59**  
Justice J. Merchan  
Phone 646-386-4059  
Fax 212-295-4932  
100 Centre Street  
Room 1602, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 61**  
Justice Clott  
Phone 646-386-4061  
Fax 212-401-9266  
100 Centre Street  
Room 1130, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 62**  
Justice M. Jackson  
Phone 646-386-4062  
Fax 212-401-9267  
100 Centre Street  
Room 1111, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 63**  
Justice Hong  
Phone 646-386-4063  
111 Centre Street  
Room 631, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 66**  
Justice Pickholz  
Phone 646-386-4066  
Fax 212-401-9097  
111 Centre Street  
Room 1047, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 71**  
Justice L. Ward  
Phone 646-386-4071  
Fax 212-401-9268  
100 Centre Street  
Room 1104, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 72**  
Justice R. Stolz  
Phone 646-386-4072  
Fax 212-401-9269  
100 Centre Street  
Room 1123, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 73**  
Justice Roberts  
Phone 646-386-4073  
Fax 212-401-9116  
111 Centre Street  
Room 763, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 75**  
Justice Mandelbaum  
Phone 646-386-4075  
111 Centre Street  
Room 583, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 77**  
Justice Obus  
Phone 646-386-4077  
100 Centre Street  
Room 1536, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 81**  
Justice C. Farber  
Phone 646-386-4081  
Fax 212-401-9270  
100 Centre Street  
Room 1317, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 85**  
Justice Hayes  
Phone 646-386-4085  
Fax 212-401-9113  
111 Centre Street  
Room 1523, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 92**  
Justice Mitchell  
Phone 646-386-4092  
Fax 212-295-4914  
111 Centre Street  
Room 1234, 9:30 A.M.

**Part**  
Justice E. Biben  
Phone 646-386-4093  
111 Centre Street  
Room 1333, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 93**  
Justice Scherzer  
Phone 646-386-4093  
100 Centre Street  
Room 1333, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 95**  
Justice D. Conviser  
Phone 646-386-4095  
Fax 212-401-9137  
111 Centre Street  
Room 687, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 99**  
Justice Burke  
Phone 646-386-4099  
Fax 212-401-9270  
100 Centre Street  
Room 1530, 9:30 A.M.

**Part N-SCT**  
Justice Peterson  
Phone 646-386-4014  
Fax 212-401-9272  
100 Centre Street  
Room 218, 9:30 A.M.

**Part IDV**  
Justice Dawson  
Phone 646-386-3579  
Fax 212-884-8938  
100 Centre Street  
Room 1604, 9:30 A.M.

**SURROGATE'S COURT**  
Surrogate Hilary Gindgold  
Surrogate Rita Mella  
31 Chamber's Street  
New York, NY

See court's webpage for information about appearances: Visiting Surrogate's Court 1 NYCOURTS.GOVs

# Bronx County

## SUPREME COURT

### EX PARTE AND URGENT MOTIONS PART

The Following is the List of Sittings in the Ex Parte Urgent Motions Part on the Dates Specified:

**TRIAL TERM**  
718-618-1248

**Day Calendar**

**Court Notices Key to Submission Motion Calendar**

FS = Fully submitted.  
FSN = Fully Submitted, No Opposition  
ADJ=adjourned to the marked date for oral argument in the above calendar part. Answering papers are to be submitted on the original return date in Room 217.

**MENTAL HYGIENE PART**  
Justice Betty Owen Stinson

A Supreme Court calendar will be called and Mental Hygiene Hearings will be conducted at Jacobi Hospital, Pelham Parkway and Eastchester Road, Room 8E20, and North Central Bronx Hospital, 3424 Kossuth Avenue, Room 13A32, on alternate Wednesdays commencing at 9 A.M.

A Supreme Court calendar will be called and Mental Hygiene Hearings will be conducted at Bronx Psychiatric Center, 1500 Waters Place, Thompson Building, First Floor every Wednesday at 10:30 A.M. or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard.

**Mortgage Foreclosure Sales in Supreme Court, Bronx County are no longer conducted in Room 118M. All Mortgage Foreclosure Sales in Supreme Court, Bronx County are conducted in Room B-129 (Ground Floor). Sales will be conducted on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Fridays at 2 P.M. No Mortgage Foreclosure Sales shall be conducted in Bronx County on Thursdays**

**Trial Assignment Part**  
Justice Joseph E. Capella  
Phone 718-618-1201  
Room 607, 9:30 A.M.

**MONDAY, MAY 12**  
814757/21 Abreu Monogro v. L & R  
813108/23 Alejo v. Highbridge House Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al  
32777/18 Allen v. Columbia Florist, Inc.  
807490/21 Barrera v. Sharma  
32978/18 Callender v. Torres  
32535/18 Concepcion v. NYC  
30370/17 Cosme v. NYC  
806931/22 Darkoaa v. 210 Associates  
803126/23 Darlene G. Lanausse v. St. Barnabas Hosp. Et Al  
804119/22 De La Rose-Puello v. Lumber Trans. Corp. Et Al  
24764/18 Delarosa v. Loureiro  
22323/20 Estevez v. Deboe Const. Corp.  
28189/19 F. v. Egbuna  
812737/21 Galloway v. Arthur Clinton Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al  
20292/17 Hernandez v. Western Beef Retail, Inc.  
28913/20 Johnson v. Rosario  
33931/18 M. v. Sconzo  
3231/20 Madera v. 980 Prospect 30166/14 Martinez-Zorilla v. Dreka  
819233/22 McKenzie v. Morrison  
28



26692/20 Jones v. Gedin  
38083/18 Karaboue v. Amani Int'l  
27076/19 Kerl v. Beye  
817694/21 Kyle McIntire v. Gethaun Tibebu Et Al  
25218/19 Lugal v. Vettorino  
27511/20 Lopez v. Sparks  
8133991/21 Luckett v. Purkayastha  
34787/19 Luna v. Richmond County Ambulance  
804712/22 Mahmud v. Mei  
31256/20 Marcelino v. Guivas  
814056/22 Mesa v. Siri  
34112/20 Massey v. Church of Pentecost USA  
35154/20 Mayren v. Urdialez  
304254/15 Medy v. Jean Pierre Trans Inc.  
31250/19 Mendez Martinez v. Express Ambulance Service  
24213/20 Minchala v. Serulle  
807920/22 Muhammad v. Manhattan Beer Distributors, Inc., Et Al  
32555/20 Punes v. Hernandez Grass  
812394/23 Ramirez v. Palmer  
30594/20 Pena Mendez v. Rabhani  
818244/22 Pena v. Martes  
806699/21 Penalo v. Distribute-It Corp. Et Al  
817209/22 Permy v. Zergoun  
25672/20 Pilarte-Polanco v. Bagayoko  
807177/21 Ramirez v. Sanchez  
808764/22 Reyes v. Doe  
809102/22 Rodriguez v. Munoz  
23393/20 Rodriguez v. Gecmap Trucking, Inc.  
2995/18 Rosario v. Holt  
27029/19 Sanchez v. Styles  
812443/22 Santander v. Diboulo  
24503/19 Santiago v. Toure  
31265/20 Shaw v. Maha  
21805/14 Steigelman v. Transervice Lease Corp.  
814206/23 Surgeon v. Afriyie  
300529/17 Tahales v. Perez  
802591/21 Torres-Badillo v. Kofert  
28866/20 Tucker v. Singh  
808720/22 Uddin v. Ortiz  
30266/19 Whittaker v. Staller  
21914/20 Witter v. Cellmark USA  
809349/22 Wright v. Empire Merchants  
811772/22 Young v. Shleppers Hldgs.

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**

30649/17 A. v. Anthony  
807331/21 Abdelaziz v. Uber Technologies, Inc. Et Al  
814607/22 Abraham v. Rios  
800530/24 Agramonte v. Boggi  
807601/21 Ahmed v. Glyde NYC  
817085/22 Ahmed v. Island Ready Mix, Inc. Et Al  
808164/21 Almanzar v. Et Al  
815977/22 Alvarado v. Fejio-Tello  
809622/22 Anaya v. Earth Trading Inc. Et Al  
802342/22 Aponle v. Chm Transport  
807938/22 Ayala v. Urciulio  
806214/21 Bailey v. Munkalia  
29293/20 Balbuena Martinez v. Sarante Jimenez  
807378/22 Banner v. A Touch of Class Et Al  
800638/22 Baskerville v. Eulin  
801912/22 Begom v. Bell  
813982/22 Beiretvide v. Bowen  
801807/22 Blake v. Action Carting Environmental Services  
804186/22 Brooks v. Ya-Dit  
21133/20 Brown v. American United Transportation Inc. Et Al  
801160/22 Bryan v. Ean Hldgs. LLC Et Al  
810932/21 Bryant v. Ali  
811710/22 Cabral v. North Shore Hematology-Oncology Associates  
804944/22 Calderon Marrero v. NY Cross Docking  
816899/21 Campolo v. Nunez Cepeda  
817394/21 Capellan v. Islam  
805947/22 Castillo v. Bsd Tree, Inc. Et Al  
818566/22 Castillo v. Wheelz Up LLC Et Al  
806457/22 Chambers McIntyre v. Salomon  
806911/22 Choe v. Wheatley  
805621/21 Chowdhury v. Rts Hldgs.  
801384/22 Class v. Carvell  
813889/21 Clough v. Barker  
20890/20 Clough v. Barker  
808468/21 Cottone v. Bagayoko  
808465/21 Cruz Villaman v. Beccan  
811544/22 Cuthbert v. Camaj  
807700/22 Dawkins v. Hickman  
808995/21 De Bora De Los Santos v. Lopez  
818851/22 De La Rosa Garcia v. Emg Car Services Corp. Et Al  
23323/19 De Los Santos v. Mia  
807815/22 De Paula v. Santos  
810797/22 Dejesus v. Fofana  
801876/21 Dembele v. Vinalstnyne  
800752/22 Diallo v. Arce  
802688/24 Diaz v. Uber Technologies, Inc. Et Al  
815968/22 Diaz-Plasencia v. Phoenix Risk Mgt. LLC Et Al  
811668/22 Dominguez Nunez v. NYC Et Al  
802139/22 Donatorg v. Ndiaye  
802450/22 Door Dash Inc., For An Order Pursuant To Section 3102 of The Cpr To Compel Preservation And Disclosure Before The Commencement Of An Action v. M&T Bank Et Al  
812869/21 Duran v. Forbes  
800277/23 Edma v. Dembele  
23708/18 Elysee v. Ponce  
806519/22 Espinal v. Hernandez  
813811/21 Espinoza v. Fernandez  
24837/19 Familia v. Yahya  
807109/22 Filis v. Boone  
808098/22 Flores Munoz v. Uber Technologies, Inc. Et Al  
808369/21 Forbes v. Metro.  
Transportation Auth. Et Al  
812620/23 Franco v. Jack Pedowitz Enterprises, Inc. Et Al  
815460/21 Frometa v. Kamladze  
808353/22 Gamble v. Taveras-Grullon  
811054/22 Garcia v. Robles  
806469/22 Garcia-Rivera v. Warma  
23179/19 Geico Ins. Co. v. Manco Equipment Rental Co.  
815278/22 Gomez Jr. v. Nemos Enterprise Group LLC Et Al  
81239/22 Gonzalez v. Checo De La Hoz  
801499/23 Gonzalez v. Cooper  
817356/21 Greenhouse v. Wilson  
806778/22 Guerrero v. Yonko  
809094/22 Guerrero v. Plutus Taxi, Inc. Et Al  
804324/21 Guice v. Salazar  
42019/21 Handy v. Payano  
811910/22 Harmon v. Islam Md  
811962/22 Hernandez v. Irish  
806947/22 Hewitt Hinds v. Burke  
33566/18 Hierro-Collado v. Acevedo  
811634/22 Ho Young v. Uber Technologies Inc. Et Al  
32456/19 J. Ennis  
809636/22 Jimenez v. Academy Lines  
812197/21 Johnson v. Fofanah  
813082/21 Kashem v. Rojas  
808828/21 Kelly v. Pv Hldg. Corp. Et Al  
804762/22 Kerr v. Lowe  
810418/22 Kouame v. Ramos  
808221/22 Latroy v. D & C Freight Corp. Et Al  
815728/21 Laufer v. Uber Technologies, Inc. Et Al  
817548/21 Lee v. Bah  
813639/21 Mann v. Peterson  
808594/21 Martinez v. La Nueva Imagen Transportation  
810847/22 Martinez v. Bautista  
804797/22 McCormick v. Jlj Enterprises, Inc.  
808054/22 McEachern v. Scott  
33063/20 McKay v. Gutierrez  
810087/22 McLaughlin v. Matt Cab Corp Et Al  
810915/21 Mena v. Robertson  
803222/22 Mensah v. Alzabidi  
812494/21 Mercado v. Mendez Santiago  
816479/21 Miller v. Torruella  
804835/24 Miraglia v. Alam  
802376/22 Miranda v. Poysher Jr  
814147/21 Moore v. Vulin  
21903/18 Morales v. Moya

803356/22 Moses v. Romero Duran  
817000/21 Moze v. Dtg Enterprise Inc.  
810543/21 Nam v. Fernandez  
803988/21 Nina v. Garcia  
815587/21 Nunez Jerez v. Garcia  
807435/22 Nunez v. Mack  
815444/21 Olivo v. Leonard  
803738/24 Ortiz v. McM Xpress Inc Et Al  
807684/21 Palacios v. Gao  
814424/22 Paredes Mota v. Lala Trucking Inc Et Al  
803678/22 Parra v. Ryder Truck Rental, Inc. Et Al  
802655/22 Paulino v. Smart Grid Solutions Et Al  
813314/23 Paulino v. Dartee  
812068/22 Peralta Almanzar v. United Parcel Service, Inc. Et Al  
810241/23 Peralta v. Ramirez  
815045/21 Pereyra Batista v. Solorzano  
803097/22 Perez v. Wang  
812081/21 Perez v. Rivera  
813904/22 Perna v. Rolling Frito-Lay Sales  
810896/21 Pimentel v. Cb Livery Leasing  
809347/22 Pineda v. Brito  
815433/22 Polanco v. Rodriguez  
811319/22 Polanco v. Halsey  
816938/21 Pray v. Pray  
810823/21 Price v. Escobar Menjivar  
805554/22 Price v. Tillinghast Jr.  
30846/20 Prospect Auto Sales And v. Vega  
816346/22 Ramirez v. Hambrecht  
81428/18 Rosario v. Lucero  
803069/21 Randall v. American United Transportation Inc. Et Al  
813406/22 Reynoso v. Remigio  
806197/22 Rodriguez v. Guinea Cab Corp. Et Al  
804370/22 Rodriguez v. Gil  
811966/22 Rodriguez v. Akisire  
808385/21 Rodriguez v. Two Trees Mgt. Co. LLC Et Al  
805350/22 Rodriguez v. NYCTA Et Al  
801513/23 Roman v. Doe  
811358/22 Rosario v. Ramjohn Express, Inc., Et Al  
808261/22 Salisbury v. Ali  
814178/21 Sams v. Mohammad  
801013/23 Santana v. Coach Tours  
81116/22 Santana v. Hernandez  
811245/22 Santos v. Frias  
806521/22 Santos v. Cb Livery Leasing LLC Et Al  
813624/22 Sierra v. Koroma  
815492/22 Small v. Morris  
810503/21 Smith v. Parrales  
810485/22 Stewart v. Sarmiento  
814060/21 Talia v. Dtg Enterprise Inc. Et Al  
804753/22 Taveras Torres v. Santos Agramonte  
815955/22 Tawfig v. Canelo  
813702/22 Tineo v. Singh  
25906/19 Toribio Gomez v. Balbuena Martinez  
807259/22 Torres v. Hub Truck Rental Corp. Et Al  
29586/20 Valerio v. Kabba  
802030/22 Ventarola v. Garda Cl Atlantic Inc. Et Al  
804239/22 Villanueva v. Mulaj  
809882/22 Wales v. Uber  
816768/21 Warren v. Uber Technologies, Inc. Et Al  
808156/22 Wooley v. Reyes  
28206/18 Zaman v. Alawag

**MONDAY, MAY 12**

800517/23 Abou v. Ean Holdings  
816599/23 Abrar v. Payamps-Martinez  
811534/23 Adewuyi v. Penske Truck Leasing Co., L.P. Et Al  
815336/23 Al Khawlan v. Md  
35334/20 Andrews v. Caddle  
805146/23 Aquino v. Lynx Logistics LLC Et Al  
801177/24 Aradat v. Citta Car  
817255/23 Araya v. Hooper-Jones  
808084/23 Arias v. Mendez  
816586/23 Arias v. Ibrahimia  
806754/24 Asare v. The Salvation Army Et Al  
804294/24 Attuau v. Knight  
813127/23 Ayukawa v. Ortiz  
804149/22 Baez v. Uber Technologies, Inc. Et Al  
802523/23 Baker v. Ngassaki  
813889/21 Clough v. Barker  
80890/20 Clough v. Barker  
808468/21 Cottone v. Bagayoko  
808465/21 Cruz Villaman v. Beccan  
811544/22 Cuthbert v. Camaj  
807700/22 Dawkins v. Hickman  
808995/21 De Bora De Los Santos v. Lopez  
818851/22 De La Rosa Garcia v. Emg Car Services Corp. Et Al  
23323/19 De Los Santos v. Mia  
807815/22 De Paula v. Santos  
810797/22 Dejesus v. Fofana  
801876/21 Dembele v. Vinalstnyne  
800752/22 Diallo v. Arce  
802688/24 Diaz v. Uber Technologies, Inc. Et Al  
815968/22 Diaz-Plasencia v. Phoenix Risk Mgt. LLC Et Al  
811668/22 Dominguez Nunez v. NYC Et Al  
802139/22 Donatorg v. Ndiaye  
802450/22 Door Dash Inc., For An Order Pursuant To Section 3102 of The Cpr To Compel Preservation And Disclosure Before The Commencement Of An Action v. M&T Bank Et Al  
812869/21 Duran v. Forbes  
800277/23 Edma v. Dembele  
23708/18 Elysee v. Ponce  
806519/22 Espinal v. Hernandez  
813811/21 Espinoza v. Fernandez  
24837/19 Familia v. Yahya  
807109/22 Filis v. Boone  
808098/22 Flores Munoz v. Uber Technologies, Inc. Et Al  
808369/21 Forbes v. Metro.  
Transportation Auth. Et Al  
812620/23 Franco v. Jack Pedowitz Enterprises, Inc. Et Al  
815460/21 Frometa v. Kamladze  
808353/22 Gamble v. Taveras-Grullon  
811054/22 Garcia v. Robles  
806469/22 Garcia-Rivera v. Warma  
23179/19 Geico Ins. Co. v. Manco Equipment Rental Co.  
815278/22 Gomez Jr. v. Nemos Enterprise Group LLC Et Al  
81239/22 Gonzalez v. Checo De La Hoz  
801499/23 Gonzalez v. Cooper  
817356/21 Greenhouse v. Wilson  
806778/22 Guerrero v. Yonko  
809094/22 Guerrero v. Plutus Taxi, Inc. Et Al  
804324/21 Guice v. Salazar  
42019/21 Handy v. Payano  
811910/22 Harmon v. Islam Md  
811962/22 Hernandez v. Irish  
806947/22 Hewitt Hinds v. Burke  
33566/18 Hierro-Collado v. Acevedo  
811634/22 Ho Young v. Uber Technologies Inc. Et Al  
32456/19 J. Ennis  
809636/22 Jimenez v. Academy Lines  
812197/21 Johnson v. Fofanah  
813082/21 Kashem v. Rojas  
808828/21 Kelly v. Pv Hldg. Corp. Et Al  
804762/22 Kerr v. Lowe  
810418/22 Kouame v. Ramos  
808221/22 Latroy v. D & C Freight Corp. Et Al  
815728/21 Laufer v. Uber Technologies, Inc. Et Al  
817548/21 Lee v. Bah  
813639/21 Mann v. Peterson  
808594/21 Martinez v. La Nueva Imagen Transportation  
810847/22 Martinez v. Bautista  
804797/22 McCormick v. Jlj Enterprises, Inc.  
808054/22 McEachern v. Scott  
33063/20 McKay v. Gutierrez  
810087/22 McLaughlin v. Matt Cab Corp Et Al  
810915/21 Mena v. Robertson  
803222/22 Mensah v. Alzabidi  
812494/21 Mercado v. Mendez Santiago  
816479/21 Miller v. Torruella  
804835/24 Miraglia v. Alam  
802376/22 Miranda v. Poysher Jr  
814147/21 Moore v. Vulin  
21903/18 Morales v. Moya

23145/19 Green v. Flatbush Moving Van Co.  
811428/23 Griffin v. Harrison  
807810/24 Guaba v. Lorinda Enterprises Et Al  
801021/24 Gutierrez v. Bujaj  
800848/24 H. v. Santana  
810392/23 Hall v. Rosario  
810753/23 Hanson v. NYCTA Et Al  
29522/20 Haynes v. Carmichael  
813439/23 Henderson v. Miller-Gardner  
801301/24 Hernandez De Rubio v. Campbell's Auto Express Et Al  
817419/23 Holloway v. Singh  
807075/23 Howell v. Doe  
806108/24 Hutchinson-Turner v. Febbo  
803472/24 Ibar v. Thomas  
807986/24 Islam v. Century Maint.  
810241/23 Peralta v. Ramirez  
815045/21 Pereyra Batista v. Solorzano  
803097/22 Perez v. Wang  
812081/21 Perez v. Rivera  
813904/22 Perna v. Rolling Frito-Lay Sales  
813742/23 Johnson v. Jejote  
802823/24 Jordan v. Jung  
811830/23 Karim v. Story  
804563/23 Keene v. Spencer  
805608/24 Kelly v. Suarez  
21303/20 Kerr v. Sanchez Rodriguez  
804726/23 Kim v. Oviawe  
811345/23 Kirk v. American United Transport Inc Et Al  
806540/24 Laing v. City Livery Leasing Bklyn, Inc. Et Al  
24486/15 Lara v. Cortijo  
807053/24 Lavezzari v. Saavedra  
804347/24 Lee v. Martinez Torres  
813254/23 Linares v. Molina  
817359/23 Liriano v. Rittie  
809532/23 Lloyd v. Rhino Freight Systems LLC Et Al  
804100/24 Lopez Gerez v. Winstanley  
817203/23 Lopez Hernandez v. Ramos  
801265/24 Macias-Rodriguez v. Taub  
806582/24 Macri v. Abraham  
808204/24 Major v. Mgm Yonkers, Inc. Et Al  
805537/23 Marino v. Cordero  
809327/23 Marrero v. Fofana  
813093/23 Mbaye v. Chavarriaga  
800540/24 McMillian v. Ward  
806158/24 McNeal v. Pablu  
805245/23 Mejia v. Sima Sea LLC Et Al  
800969/23 Mena v. Uber Technologies, Inc. Et Al  
810947/23 Mercedes Reyes v. Pierson  
809432/23 Milandou v. Singh  
805896/24 Mines v. Polanco  
802114/24 Monaya De Oca Bautista v. Alam  
812111/22 Mootoo v. Winklaar  
802278/24 Moya-Polanco v. Rodriguez  
805395/24 Morales Jr. v. Doe  
28481/20 Morales v. American United Transportation  
811142/23 Morales v. Theus  
809327/23 Marrero v. Fofana  
813882/22 Moses v. Irazzaba  
32896/19 Motta v. Barrie  
802138/23 Munoz v. Rockland Auto Repair, Inc. Et Al  
804866/24 Negron v. 3 Amis Corp. Et Al  
801559/21 Neita v. Seniorcare Emergency Medical  
26020/20 Nivar Saldana v. Harris  
816114/23 Noriega v. East Coast Petroleum, Inc. Et Al  
813338/22 Norman v. Cabrera  
808582/24 Norman v. Lizza  
808229/23 Ortiz v. J & O Xpress Corp. Et Al  
810835/23 Ortiz v. Call-A-Head Corp. Et Al  
23076/19 Owens v. Std Trucking Corp.  
815286/23 Papadopoulos v. Silvia  
807530/23 Pascual v. Uber Technologies, Inc. Et Al  
807903/23 Passanante v. Breeg Taxi Corp. Et Al  
817024/23 Perez v. Capellan Casado  
800272/23 Powell v. Castillo  
812629/23 Puccio v. Burton  
812299/23 Rauls v. Stroman  
815476/22 Redcross v. Mv Transportation Inc Et Al  
802723/24 Reyes Villar v. Ochoa  
27898/18 Riley v. Qlr Five  
803291/24 Rios v. Md  
801681/24 Rivera v. American United Transportation Inc. Et Al  
804385/24 Rivera v. Chowdhury  
25404/20 Rivera v. Feliciano-Casiano  
817039/23 Rodriguez De Villanueva v. Mateo  
812897/23 Rodriguez-Toro v. Sibaweili  
802324/24 Rojas v. Cedenro Martinez  
800747/21 Rojas v. Rodriguez  
809086/24 Roman v. Hub Truck Rental Corp Et Al  
807678/23 Romero v. Lewis  
805753/21 Ronald Fells v. Sarinas Lino & Car Service Inc. Et Al  
810003/21 Rosado v. Miah  
805470/24 Rosado v. Savell  
812582/23 Rosario v. Salomon  
815638/23 Rosario v. Diaby  
803141/24 Ruiz v. Witter  
809341/22 Sanchez v. Harper  
815551/23 Sanchez v. Macagnone  
815247/22 Santistola Castillo Lora v. Solano Corp. Et Al  
816794/23 Sautler v. Monica Mignott  
800571/23 Segarra v. Delia  
813386/23 Shahjahan v. Vasquez  
800826/24 Shakor v. Castillo  
811341/23 Smith v. Ali  
810049/23 Smyth v. Jd Enterprise Inc. Et Al  
25172/20 Solano v. American United  
805514/24 Solomon v. Henry  
34347/20 Soto Tejada v. St. Hilaire  
807146/24 Stagers v. Motor Vehicle Accident Indemnification Corp.  
806604/24 Straker v. UK Import Motors Inc Et Al  
804116/24 Suazo v. Bell  
803935/24 Sukhrum v. Temco Logistics, Inc. Et Al  
21564/17 Darden v. Nerypayano  
805385/23 Defay v. Rosado  
811748/22 Dejesus v. L & W Supply  
814112/22 Diallo v. Carrington  
804507/21 Dieng v. Kim  
804054/24 Dilone v. Stephen J. O'Brien  
814276/23 Dingle v. NYCHA Et Al  
803077/21 Dixon v. NYCTA  
809897/23 Doolan v. Kamran  
804556/21 Dorizad v. Ramsunahi  
804858/24 Dorsey v. T7i, Inc. Et Al  
800287/24 Duran De Hernandez v. Winstanley  
814983/22 Espinal Checho v. Waste Hauling Inc. Et Al  
800160/24 Estudillo v. Ragusa  
804201/24 Evanson v. Lin  
800931/24 Felix v. Bradley Limco, Inc. Et Al  
803782/24 Figue v. Slattery  
810020/23 Flores v. Korucuma  
800030/22 Flores v. Eastern Emerald Group LLC Et Al  
26/19/19 Floyd v. Charles M. Dwyer Inc.  
806367/24 Funez v. Maiga  
816928/23 Garcia v. John Graham  
806626/24 Garcia v. Peterson  
804601/22 Garista v. Hernandez  
801392/24 Gaulke v. Popovic  
29279/18 Gay v. Young  
813001/23 Geliga-Vazquez v. Moussa  
800259/24 Gibson v. Seniorcare Emergency Medical Services Inc. Et Al  
802082/24 Giddings-Cox v. Mateo  
802124/24 Gill v. Lami  
814681/23 Goita v. Klein  
800734/24 Gomez Jimenez v. Abad  
800136/24 Gonzalez v. 360 Pas Owner LLC Et Al  
20411/19 Granda v. Wright  
26429/18 Green v. Manhattan And Bronx Surface NYCTA (mabstoa) Et Al

**Part 12**

**Justice Kim A. Wilson**  
Phone 718-618-1396  
Room 414, 9:30 A.M.

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

809433/23 Bolt v. The Elizabeth Foundation For The Arts Et Al  
803466/22 Britt v. Bronx Sharp Rlty. LLC  
804565/24 Colon v. Munoz Trucking Corp. Et Al

812027/21 Dellicarpini v. Jmdh Real Estate of Newburgh  
809165/22 Florentino v. Neighborhood Renewal Housing Dev. Fund Corp.  
815631/22 Fulano Del Tal v. NYC Et Al  
816646/23 Gadison v. Marinelli  
807756/23 In The Matter of The Application of 1429 Prospect LLC v. NYC Et Al  
812504/23 In The Matter of The Application of 1970 Univ. LLC For A Judgement Under Article 78 of The Civil Practice Law And Rules v. NYC Et Al  
805394/24 In The Matter of The Application of Local 621 v. NYC Dept. of Correction Et Al  
806402/22 Mesa v. Mgsa I LLC.  
815068/22 Mitchell v. 156 Seventh Ave. Group LLC Et Al  
801234/24 Nava v. Hub Meat Market LLC Et Al  
804818/21 Rosario v. 2779 Hldgs. LLC Et Al  
23028/20 Sangare v. Mathura Properties LLC

**Part 14 (MV)**

**Justice John A. Howard**  
Phone 718-618-1244  
Room 708, 9:30 A.M.

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

814341/23 Alam v. Thardak  
807704/23 Allen v. Rpm Courier Systems LLC Et Al  
808754/22 Allen v. August  
820547/23 Alvarez v. Castro  
819850/23 August v. Rodriguez  
801900/21 Bari v. Becaj  
803100/22 Barnes v. Lyft, Inc. Et Al  
814409/22 Bayron Rivera v. Burt  
808376/22 Brown v. Rein  
811777/21 Chapman v. Taylor  
808149/25 Charlie Zamora For An Order Pursuant To Cplr 3102(c) Permitting Disclosure Before Commencing An Action And To Preserve Said Records And Items Until The Final Hearing And Determination of This Court v. Walmart Claims Services, Inc. Et Al  
813423/24 Crescenzi v. 34th St. Partnership, Inc. Et Al  
810857/21 Diallo v. Washington  
805503/24 Diaz v. Moronta Christian  
805509/23 Duran Garcia v. Royal Rose Burtin Kitchen Supply  
24189/18 Espinal v. NYCTA  
805896/24 Ewers-Williams v. Bass  
807970/23 Fabre v. Minervino  
23809/18 Fleming Sykes v. Watson  
816565/22 Garcia Sena v. Avila  
35260/19 Garcia v. Rosario  
808177/23 Garcia v. Perkins  
805938/24 Gonzalez Moronta v. Demko  
806925/21 Grullon v. Moya-Torres  
810893/22 Ibanez v. Docasta  
810304/22 Jackson v. Moro  
810424/22 Karekazi v. Millennium Elevator Enterprises Inc Et Al  
28745/16 L. v. Byrd  
20925/19 Laguerre v. Abreu  
808383/22 Lee v. Acacia Network Community Housing Corp.  
Housing, Inc. Et Al  
32040/18 Lorenzo v. Dickso  
800751/22 Mendez v. Fed. 53 Inc Et Al  
811336/23 Mendez v. Valdez  
35510/20 Meran-Familia v. Dikson  
34283/18 Nadal v. Santana  
28920/19 Neder v. Andrews  
817337/22 Osoria Betances v. Peguero Liberato  
800871/21 Parmar v. David  
804352/23 Perez Belen v. Perkins  
812368/23 Perez v. Edmond  
810795/22 Salgado v. Delarosa  
815974/22 Serrano Ramirez v. Dmp Leasing Corp. Et Al  
26608/18 Swan v. Forester  
42005/23 Thomas v. Brunson  
805794/22 Van Dyke v. Mookadeer  
817568/22 Villanueva v. Perkins  
803079/23 White v. Lennox Hill Hosp. Et Al

**FRIDAY, MAY 9**

6514/07 Gavin v. Moya  
25301/06 Moya v. Samuel  
706307 Price v. Gavin  
818534/22 Toro v. Dhl Express (usa), Inc., D/b/a Et Al

**MONDAY, MAY 12**

22737/18 Duarte v. NYC  
26728/17 Garris v. Saleh  
25410/18 Rios v. Metro.  
Transportation  
27897/17 Sajid v. Patterson  
Transportation  
22385/18 Suazo v. Doe  
810620/22 Trotman v. Torrez-Rodriguez  
26268/18 Ventura v. Lubman

**Part 15 (MV)**

**Justice Ben R. Barbato**  
Phone 718-618-1395  
Room 702, 9:30 A.M.

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

21451/19 Levin v. Cande  
**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
27515/19 Johnson v. Rosario  
800841/22 Paez v. Lassissi  
818069/23 Rodriguez Jacobo v. McM Xpress Inc. Et Al  
**MONDAY, MAY 12**  
24738/19 Buntin v. Martinez  
806160/21 Cedenro v. Mendoza  
21558/17 Connor v. Hurricane Mgt. Corp.  
801186/22 Dogbey v. Bongon Cars Inc. Et Al  
25277/20 Nelson v. Venture Leasing  
26410/20 Pullum v. Venture Leasing LLC

**Part 16**

**Justice Robert T. Johnson**

**Part 18**

**Justice Wanda Y. Negron**  
Phone 718-618-1203  
Room 622, 9:30 A.M.

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

28787/20 Orellana v. Orellana  
**MONDAY, MAY 12**  
816170/22 Gerimici v. Gerimici  
**Part 19A**  
**Justice Alicia Gerez**  
Phone 718-618-1377  
Room 600, 9:30 A.M.

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

33019/18 Harrison v. Morningside Nursing And  
28740/19 Iaconis v. Hughes  
**MONDAY, MAY 12**  
28377/19 Birmingham v. NYCH&HC Corp.  
809418/23 David Escobar v. Morningside Acquisition I  
24405/19 Guerrero v. NYCH&HC And  
27781/19 Martin v. Jewish Home Lifecare  
820383/23 Miguel Alexander Osorio And Francia Peralta Leduc v. Foster M.D.  
24853/19 Serrano Jr. v. St. Barnabas Hosp.  
820480/23 Tirado v. United Odd Fellow And Rebekah Home D/b/a Rebekah Rehab Extended Care Center

**Part 20**

**Justice Veronica G. Hummel**  
Phone 718-618-1240  
Room 703, 9:30 A.M.

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

34822/20 Williams v. Bronx Phase II Housing

**Part 21**  
**Justice Ashlee Crawford**  
Phone 718-618-1435  
Room 401, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 22**

**Justice Marissa Soto**  
Phone 718-618-1193  
Room 709, 9:30 A.M.

**THURSDAY, MAY 8**

30823/18 Lythcott v. Webster Bldg. A LLC Et Al  
30101/18 Mott v. 754-768 Brady Owners Corp. Et Al  
22956/20 Rodriguez v. Aac Cross Country Mail LLC Et Al  
805626/22 Shweta Sharma Et Al v. River Point Towers Co-Op., Inc. Et Al  
815222/21 Smith v. 126 Bruckner Owner LLC Et Al  
**FRIDAY, MAY 9**  
815061/23 Bonilla v. 2435 Rlty. Corp.







CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING

#1 Global Legal Job Site

Ranked by Alexa

Contact: Carol Robertson Phone: 212.457.7850 Email: crobertson@alm.com

**LIQUOR LICENSES**

**NOTICE IS HEREBY** GIVEN that a license, number pending, for beer, wine, and liquor has been applied for by **BANJARA INC.** to sell beer, wine, and liquor at retail in a restaurant under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Law at 390 N Wantagh Ave, Bethpage, NY 11714 County of Nassau for on-premises consumption. Banjara Inc. 390 N Wantagh Ave Bethpage, NY 11714

8102 my1-Th my8

**NOTICE IS HEREBY** given that an On-Premise Catering Establishment Full Liquor License Application ID NA-0524-25-07236 has been applied for by Compass Group USA, Inc and Thompson Hospitality Services, LLC serving beer, wine, cider and liquor to be sold at retail for on premises consumption in a catering establishment for the premises located at 270 Park Ave, 13th Floor NY NY 10017.

8168 my1-Th my8

**NOTICE IS HEREBY** given that an On-Premise Restaurant Full Liquor License, NYS Application ID: NA-0340-25-110739 has been applied for by 30 W 26th Street OP CO LLC serving beer, wine, cider and liquor to be sold at retail for on premises consumption in a restaurant, for the premises located at 30 West 26th Street New York NY 10010.

8166 my1-Th my8

**NOTICE IS HEREBY** given that an On-Premise Restaurant Full Liquor License, NYS Application ID: CL-25-101513-01 has been applied for by GH on the Park LLC & 54 West 40th Realty LLC, as Co-Licensees serving beer, wine, cider and liquor to be sold at retail for on premises consumption in a tavern for the premises located at 54 West 40th Street New York NY 10018.

8164 my1-Th my8

**LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES**

**CHANGING THE NARRATIVE MENTAL HEALTH COUNSELING, PLLC** Art of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/10/2025. Office: New York County. SSNY is designated as the agent of the LLC for service of process. Any legal documents served to the LLC through SSNY will be forwarded to LEGALCORP SOLUTIONS, LLC 11 BROADWAY SUITE 615, NEW YORK, NY 10004. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.

7871 My01 Th J05

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Harrigan Medical PLLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/13/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 261 West 112th St, 3C, New York, NY 10026. Purpose: any lawful act.

7843 A24 Th My29

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Harrigan Medical PLLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/13/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 261 West 112th St, 3C, New York, NY 10026. Purpose: any lawful act.

7843 A24 Th My29

**LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES**

**NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION** of AEP ENGINEERING LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. Application for authority filed with Secretary of State of NY (SSNY) on 11/21/2024. Office loc: NY County. LLC formed in NJ on 10/22/2013. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and mailed to 26 Mountain Way, West Orange, NJ 07052. Cert. of LLC filed with NJ Dept of the Treasury, DORES, 33 W State St, #5th Fl, Trenton, NJ 08606. Purpose: Any lawful activity.

5692 A17 Th My22

**LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES**

3137 BROADWAY LLC. Filed with SSNY on 03/21/2025. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 3137 BROADWAY, NEW YORK, NY 10027. Purpose: Any Lawful

7889 a24-Th my29

**FOUNDATIONS**

The annual return for The Apfelbaum Family Foundation for the calendar year ended December 31, 2024 is available at the office of McLaughlin & Stern LLP at 260 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, (212) 448-1100, for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is William Apfelbaum.

8576 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** Janet Yaseen Foundation. For the calendar year ended 12/31/2024 is available at its principal office located at 812 5th Ave New York, NY 10065 for the inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is Janet Yaseen.

8592 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** JOSEPH J. GRANO JR. SCHOLARSHIP & FOUNDATION For the calendar year ended December 31, 2024 is available at its principal office located at 600 WASHINGTON BLVD STAMFORD, CT 06901 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is MARC MON-TANERO.

8435 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** RUBEN FAMILY CHARITABLE TRUST. For the calendar year ended December 31, 2024 is available at its principal office located at 600 Madison Avenue, 11FL, New York, NY 10022 for the inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is Richard Ruben.

8585 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** The Abstraction Fund. For the calendar year ended 12/31/2024 is available at its principal office located at 66 Hudson Blvd E, Ste 2200 New York, NY 10001 for the inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is Nina Rosenwald.

8589 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** THE ALFRED AND JANE ROSS FOUNDATION For the calendar year ended December 31, 2024 is available at its principal office located at c/o Citrin Cooperman, 50 Rockefeller Plaza, 4th Floor, New York, NY 10020 for the inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is AL-FRED ROSS.

8569 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** THE BARRY AND ALISON GOODMAN FOUNDATION. For the calendar year ended DECEMBER 31, 2024 is available at its principal office located at c/o Citrin Cooperman, 50 Rockefeller Plaza, 4th Floor, New York, NY 10020 for the inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is BARRY GOODMAN.

8578 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** THE EHA FOUNDATION INC. For the year ended 01/31/2024 is available at its principal office located at: Herrick Feinstein LLP, 2 Park Avenue, NY, NY 1016 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. The Principal Manager of the Foundation is Christina M. Mason.

8460 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** THE ELSIE DEL FIERRO TRUST U/A 7/25/79 For the year ended 12/31/2023 is available at its principal office located at: Herrick Feinstein LLP, 2 Park Avenue, NY, NY 1016 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. The Principal Manager of the Foundation is Carolyn R. Caufield.

8453 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** THE SELMA RUBEN FOUNDATION. For the calendar year ended December 31, 2024 is available at its principal office located at 600 Madison Avenue, 11FL, New York, NY 10022 for the inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is Richard Ruben.

8583 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** THE HENRY NIAS FOUNDATION. For the fiscal year ended 11/30/2024 is available at its principal office located at c/o CBIZ ADVISORS, LLC 68 SOUTH SERVICE ROAD SUITE #300 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is Richard Edelman.

8553 my8

**FOUNDATIONS**

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** THE JOSHUA L. MAILMAN CHARITABLE TRUST. For the calendar year ended December 31, 2024 is available at its principal office located at c/o Citrin Cooperman, 50 Rockefeller Plaza, 4th Floor, New York, NY 10020 for the inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is JOSHUA MAILMAN.

8572 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** THE LAWRENCE RUBEN FOUNDATION. For the calendar year ended December 31, 2024 is available at its principal office located at 600 Madison Avenue, 11FL, New York, NY 10022 for the inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is Richard Ruben.

8584 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** THE PARENTING DEVELOPMENT RESOURCE, INC. For the calendar year ended December 31, 2024 is available at its principal office located at 1088 Park Ave 14C New York, NY 10129 for the inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is Virginia Stowe.

8570 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** THE CO LAB DANCE CORP. For the year ended 12/31/2023 is available at its principal office located at: Herrick Feinstein LLP, 2 Park Avenue, NY, NY 1016 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. The Principal Manager of the Foundation is Lauren Post.

8458 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** THE CRAIGMYLE FOUNDATION For the year ended 12/31/2023 is available at its principal office located at: Herrick Feinstein LLP, 2 Park Avenue, NY, NY 1016 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. The Principal Manager of the Foundation is Carolyn R. Caufield.

8454 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** THE FRANCOIS WALLACE MONAHAN FUND For the year ended 12/31/2023 is available at its principal office located at: Herrick Feinstein LLP, 2 Park Avenue, NY, NY 1016 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. The Principal Manager of the Foundation is Christina M. Mason.

8457 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** THE HARWEB FOUNDATION For the year ended 12/31/2023 is available at its principal office located at: Herrick Feinstein LLP, 2 Park Avenue, NY, NY 1016 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. The Principal Manager of the Foundation is David W. Harris.

8455 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** ALEXANDER SOROS FOUNDATION For the calendar year ended 12/31/2024 is available at its principal office located at C/O SOROS FUND MANAGEMENT LLC 250 WEST 55TH STREET NEW YORK, NY 10019 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is MICHAEL VACHON.

8518 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** SOROS FUND CHARITABLE BELE FOUNDATION For the calendar year ended 12/31/2024 is available at its principal office located at C/O SOROS FUND MANAGEMENT LLC 250 WEST 55TH STREET NEW YORK, NY 10019 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is Christopher Naunton.

8523 my8

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF** UBS FOUNDATION USA For the calendar year ended 12/31/2024 is available at its principal office located at 600 WASHINGTON BLVD STAMFORD, CT 06901 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is MARSHA ASKINS.

8467 my8

**COMPLETE YOUR CLE REQUIREMENTS**  
Online. On time. On your schedule.  
Guaranteed Accredited Continuing Legal Education at CLEAdvisor.com

LAWSON  
SICLE

*See Decisions in the News*  
only at  
**NYLJ.COM**

**LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES**

**SQUARE BRIDGE COURT, LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/22/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 108 Soifer Ave, North Bellmore, NY 11710. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose.

7867 a24-Th my29

**STE2 LLC** Articles of Org. filed NY Sec. of State (SSNY) 02/27/25. Office in Nassau Co. SSNY Agent of LLC upon whom process may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to STE2 LLC - Receipts at 341 Baltustrol Circle, Roslyn, NY 11576. Purpose: Any lawful activity.

7831 a24-Th my29

**WHITTMAN 601, LLC.** Filed with SSNY on 04/18/2025. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 60 HORATIO ST, NEW YORK, NY 10014. Purpose: Any Lawful

7841 a24-Th my29

**1514 PROSPECT AVE LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/24/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 10 Main Street, Unit 28, East Rockaway, NY 11518. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.

6851 a3-Th my3

**318 KING AVE BRONX LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 02/27/25. Office: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, c/o John P O'Boyle, 2971 Webster Ave, Bronx, 10458. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.

6852 a3-Th my8

**519 THIRD AVE LLC** Arts. of Org. filed with SSNY on 8/15/2023. Off. Loc.: NEW YORK Co. SSNY desig. As agt. upon whom process may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, C/O Qiang Wang, 1600 Broadway, 12 C New York, NY 10019. Registered Agent: Qiang Wang, 1600 Broadway, 12C, New York, NY 10019. General Purposes.

6897 a3-Th my8

**914 NORTHERN BLVD LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/25/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 3470 Milburn Avenue, Baldwin Harbor, NY 11510. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.

6854 a3-Th my8

**99 JOHN STREET HOLDINGS, LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/01/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Lilly Chang, 75 Mill River Road, Oyster Bay, NY 11771. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose.

6933 a3-Th my8

**ATKINSON VISION CARE LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/17/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 1046 Cramer Court, Baldwin, NY 11510. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.

6849 a3-Th my8

**CARING LINK FAMILY PRACTICE LLC** filed Arts. of Org. with the Sec'ty of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/6/2025. Office: Bronx County. SSNY has been designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: The LLC, c/o Eva Nyarko, NP, 650 E 226th St, Bronx, NY 10466. Purpose: any lawful act.

6890 a3-Th my8

**CLEAR BLUE SKY LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/12/25. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 322 W. 57th Street, #50F, New York, NY 10019. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.

6853 a3-Th my8

**ENCHANTED COTTAGE, LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/24/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 1425 Jerusalem Avenue, Unit 28, Merrick, NY 11566. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.

6850 a3-Th my8

**MIG ALLIANCE, LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/01/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 45 Cecilia Drive, Muttontown, NY 11971. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose.

6932 a3-Th my8

**SHEA UNLIMITED LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/31/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: James Shiel, 33 Lawrence Street, East Rockaway, NY 11518. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose.

6931 a3-Th my8

**BOSOTINA GLOBAL LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/31/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, c/o Lawrence V. Carra, Esq., 170 Old Country Road, Suite 212, Mineola, NY 11501. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.

7486 my17-Th my22

**12 NORTHERN LAC LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 01/15/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, c/o Juan Carlos Segarra, 24-28 95th Street, East Elmhurst, NY 11369. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.

8224 my1-Th ju5

**200 EAST 83 RD STREET PROPERTIES, LLC** Art. Of Org. Filed Sec. of State of NY 4/24/2025. Off. Loc. : New York Co. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY to mail copy of process to the LLC, 200 East 83rd Street, 3A, New York, NY, 10028, USA. Purpose: Any lawful act or activity

8120 my1-Th ju5

**680 WEST 232 ND STREET PROPERTIES, LLC** Art. Of Org. Filed Sec. of State of NY 4/24/2025. Off. Loc.: Bronx Co. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY to mail copy of process to the LLC, 680 West 232nd Street, Bronx, NY 10463, USA. Purpose: Any lawful act or activity.

8121 my1-Th ju5

**BRAINFLUENCE, LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/10/25. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 410 E 74th Street, Apartment 3H, New York, NY 10021. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.

8225 my1-Th ju5

**DSL AND RNW GROUP LLC.** Art. of Org. filed with SSNY 4/14/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process. SSNY shall mail a copy of any process to: c/o C/O National Registered Agents, Inc. 28 Liberty street, NY, NY, 10005. Purpose: Any lawful act or activity.

8081 my1-Th ju5

**GET WIESER, LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/21/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 3000 Marcus Avenue, Suite 3W07, Lake Success, NY 11042. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.

8222 my1-Th ju5

**GET WIESER, LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/21/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 3000 Marcus Avenue, Suite 3W07, Lake Success, NY 11042. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.

8222 my1-Th ju5

**HANOVER SQUARE PROPERTIES LLC.** Filed 2/14/25. Office: NY Co. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 3 Hanover Sq Apt 10a, New York, NY 10004. Registered Agent: United States Corporation Agents, Inc., 7014 13th Avenue, Suite 202, Brooklyn, NY 11228. Purpose: General.

8163 my1-Th ju5

**JOSOY SALES LLC.** A Dom. LLC filed with SSNY on 03/24/2025. BRONX Cty. SSNY is DDI as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail a copy of any proc. Agst. the LLC to: 1247 Croes Ave., Ste. 3, Bx, NY 10472. To engage in any lawful act or activity.

7561 my1-Th ju5

**LEVY DMA REAL ESTATE, LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 02/24/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 33 Hempstead Turnpike, Farmingdale, NY 11735. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.

8219 my1-Th ju5

**SAM 10 LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/23/25. Office: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 1980 Matthews Avenue, 1st Floor, Bronx, NY 10462. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.

8223 my1-Th ju5

**SHINESTONE CAPITAL LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/25/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 48 Lincoln Rd, Plainview, NY 11803. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.

8587 my8-Th ju12

**CHOICE FORGED MECHANICAL LLC** Art. Of Org. Filed Sec. of State of NY 4/3/2025. Off. Loc.: Bronx Co. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY to mail copy of process to The LLC, 970 Morris Park Avenue, Bronx, NY 10462, USA. Purpose: Any lawful act or activity.

7869 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Brawko Coffee Company LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/10/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 228 Park Ave S #882507, New York, NY 10003. R/A: US Corp Agents, Inc. 7014 13th Ave, #202, BK, NY 11228. Purpose: any lawful act.

6874 A03 Th My08

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Colombo Partners LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/4/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 157 Broome Street, 1A, New York, NY 10002. Purpose: any lawful act.

5950 A03 Th My08

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of DORIAN APPAREL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/3/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to Entity Protect Registered Agent Services LLC, 447 Broadway 2nd Fl, #3000, New York, NY 10013. Purpose: any lawful act.

6672 A03 Th My08

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Independent Thinker LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 2/28/2025. Office location: BX County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to PO Box 227, Brooklyn, NY 10451. R/A: US Corp Agents, Inc. 7014 13th Ave, #202, BK, NY 11228. Purpose: any lawful act.

6072 A03 Th My08

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of PUREMETHOD LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 1/22/25. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 400 W 43rd St, Apt 32H, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: any lawful act.

6845 A03 Th My08

**Notice of Formation** of SCANLON SOLUTIONS LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy of State of NY (SSNY) on 10/30/2024. Office Location: NEW YORK County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served against LLC to: THE LLC 320 W 96TH ST APT 5B, NEW YORK, NY, 10025, USA. Reg. Ag.: UNITED STATES CORPORATION AGENTS, INC. 7014 13TH AVENUE, SUITE 202, BROOKLYN, NY, 11228, USA. Purpose: any lawful act.

5422 A03 Th My08

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Smitty SmartyPants Daycare LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 10/26/2024. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 2186 5th Ave #5A, New York, NY 10037. Purpose: any lawful act.

6928 A03 Th My08

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of SKY 3085 REALTY LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/13/2024. Office location: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: SKY 3085 REALTY LLC, 3085 East Tremont Avenue, Bronx, NY 10461. Name and address of the registered agent upon whom process may be served: MIGUEL LUNA, 3085 East Tremont Avenue, Bronx, NY 10461, Purpose: any lawful activities.

7832 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of SAFARI ATELIER NYC LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 10/20/2023. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 900 W 190 St, Apt 15B, New York, NY 10040. Purpose: any lawful act.

2044 A10 Th My15

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of VCARE HOME SERVICES NYC LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/28/2023. Office location: BX County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 1056 Gerard Ave, Bronx, NY 10452. Purpose: any lawful act.

6379 A10 Th My15

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of ANDREA KELLI BRANDS LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/28/2023. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 1051 Port Washington Blvd, Unit 775, Port Washington, NY 11050. Purpose: any lawful act.

7555 A17 Th My22

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of J.L Matias Construction LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 9/13/2024. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 3444 Knox Pl, Apt 3, Bronx, NY 10467. Purpose: any lawful act.

7602 A17 Th My22

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of ST. CLAIRE NATURALS LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 9/12/2022. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 2186 Fifth Ave, #12R, New York, NY 10037. R/A: US Corp Agents, Inc. 7014 13th Ave, #202, BK, NY 11228. Purpose: any lawful act.

7557 A17 Th My22

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of 165-25 Union Tpke LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 5/27/2020. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: EastCor Land Services Inc, 9 Park Place, 1st Floor, Great Neck Plaza, NY 11021, also the registered agent upon whom process may be served. Purpose: any lawful activities.

7833 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of AQUATEK LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 03/27/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: c/o Incorporating Services, Ltd., 3500 S DuPont Highway, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities.

7850 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Bemsha Productions LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 03/26/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Bemsha Productions LLC, 26 Broadway, Suite 1301, New York, NY 10004. Purpose: any lawful activities.

7847 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of BENJAMIN TAYLOR ROSSE LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/04/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 515 West 38th Street, New York, NY 10018. Purpose: any lawful activities.

7848 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of MK Wilkins LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 2/23/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 482 E 74th Street, 3D, New York, NY 10021. Purpose: any lawful act.

7614 My01 Th J05

**Notice of Formation** of PINNACLE MOTORS LLC. Art. Of Org. filed with Sec. of State of NY (SSNY) on 01/28/2025. Office Loc.: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 4 CHELSEA PL APT 4E, GREAT NECK, NY 11021. Purpose: Any lawful activity.

8217 My01 Th J05



## SALES

**NOTICE OF SALE**

**S**UPREME COURT COUNTY OF KINGS BAYVIEW LOAN SERVING, LLC, Plaintiff against JODI CUOMO, et al Defendant(s) Attorney for Plaintiff(s) Fein Such & Crane, LLP, 28 East Main Street, Suite 1800, Rochester, NY 14614. Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale entered June 21, 2017, I will sell at public auction to the highest bidder at the Bronx County Courthouse, Courtroom 711 at 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, New York on May 19, 2025 at 2:15 PM. Premises known as 3186 Ampere Avenue, Bronx, NY 10465. Block 5412 Lot 85. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough and County of Bronx, City and State of New York. Approximate Amount of Judgment is \$166,501.56 plus interest, fees, and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment Index No 35404/2014E. The foreclosure sale will be conducted in accordance with 12th Judicial District's Covid-19 Policies and the Bronx County foreclosure auction rules. The Referee shall enforce any rules in place regarding facial coverings and social distancing. Michael Aspinall, Esq., Referee File # NSRN0077085 a17-Th my8

**NOTICE OF SALE**

**S**UPREME COURT COUNTY OF KINGS HSBC Bank USA, National Association as Trustee for Merrill Lynch Mortgage Investors, Inc., Mortgage Pass-Through Certificates, MLM Series 2006-AF2, Plaintiff AGAINST Roy S. Whitelock, et al., Defendant(s) Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered September 25, 2009, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Kings County Supreme Court, in Room 224, 360 Adams Street, Brooklyn, New York 11201 on May 22, 2025 at 2:30 PM, premises known as 1778 Dean Street, Brooklyn, NY 11233. All that certain plot piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Brooklyn, County of Kings, City and State of New York, Block: 449, Lot: 26. Approximate amount of judgment \$683,121.93 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment Index #16517/2007. For sale information, please visit Auction.com at auction.com or call (800) 280-2832. Jeffrey R. Miller, Esq., Referee Frenkel Lambert Weiss Weisman & Gordon, LLP 53 Gibson Street Bay Shore, NY 11706 01-051150-F00 85122 a24-Th my15 7371

**NOTICE OF SALE**

**S**UPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, NOT IN ITS INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY BUT SOLELY AS TRUSTEE FOR PLAZA RTL TRUST, Plaintiff vs. BARKER PRICT JECT LLC, ET AL., Defendant (s). Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered on April 4, 2025, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at Courtroom 607 of the Bronx County Courthouse, Bronx County, 851 Grand Concourse, NY 10451 on June 9, 2025, at 2:15 PM, premises known as 2506, 2514, 2516, 2518, 2520 BARKER AVENUE, BRONX, NY 10467. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Bronx, County of Bronx and State of New York, Block: 4428, Lot: 10, 13, 14, 114 & 15. Approximate amount of judgment is \$5,541,267.40 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment Index #809792/2021E. If the sale is set aside for any reason, the Purchaser at the sale shall be entitled only to a return of their deposit paid. The Purchaser shall have no further recourse against the Mortgagee, the Mortgagee's attorney, or the Referee. STEPHEN B KAUFMAN, Esq., Referee Roach & Lin, PC, 6851 Jericho Turnpike, Suite 185, Syosset, New York 11791, Attorneys for Plaintiff 8056 my8-Th my29

## LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

**NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION** of Whitehall Strategic Solutions, LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/01/2025. Office location: New York County, LLC formed in Wyoming (WYO) on 03/28/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 26 Park View Row 40-B, New York, NY 10038. Address required to be maintained in WY: 1603 Capitol Ave., Ste. 413, Cheyenne, WY 82001. Arts of Org. filed with the WY Secy. of State, Herschler Bldg. East, Ste. 100 & 101, Cheyenne, WY 82002-0020. Purpose: any lawful activities. 7857 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Will Burrell Events LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/02/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Will Burrell, c/o National Realty, 225 Liberty Street, 31st Floor, New York, NY 10281. Purpose: any lawful activities. 7856 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Galactic Brands NY, LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 02/18/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: GALACTIC BRANDS NY, LLC, 15854 LITTLE MORONGO ROAD, DESERT HOT SPRINGS, CA 92240. Purpose: any lawful activities. 7860 a24-Th my29

## SALES

**NOTICE OF SALE**

**S**UPREME COURT COUNTY OF KINGS Deutsche Bank National Trust Company, as Trustee for Soundview Home Loan Trust 2006-1, Asset-Backed Certificates, Series 2006-1, Plaintiff AGAINST Aixa Muir; et al., Defendant(s) Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered August 25, 2010, I, the undersigned Referee, will sell at public auction at the Kings County Supreme Court, 360 Adams Street, Room 224, Brooklyn, NY 11201 on May 15, 2025 at 2:30PM, premises known as 1192 Bushwick Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11221. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Brooklyn, County of Kings, City and State of New York, Block 3380 Lot 39. Approximate amount of judgment is \$632,451.09 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment Index# 11797/2008. Mark A. Longo, Esq., Referee LOGS Legal Group LLP t/k/a Shapiro, DiCarlo & Barak, LLC Attorney(s) for the Plaintiff 175 Mile Crossing Boulevard Rochester, New York 14624 (877) 430-4792 Dated: March 13, 2025 84965 a17-Th my8 7068

## NOTICE OF SALE

**S**UPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, U.S. Bank Trust, N.A., As Trustee for LSF8 Master Participation Trust, Plaintiff, vs. Pherris Miller as Administratrix and Heir of the Estate of Clinton B. Miller, ET AL., Defendant(s). Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered on January 21, 2020 and an Order to Extend - Time duly entered February 5, 2025, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Bronx County Supreme Court, Courtroom 711, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451-2937 on May 19, 2025 at 2:15 p.m., premises known as 1222 Elder Avenue, Bronx, NY 10472. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough and County of Bronx, City and State of New York, Block 3773 and Lot 16. Approximate amount of judgment is \$408,819.07 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment Index #32652/2017E. Larry Alfonso Arias, Esq., Referee Friedman Vartolo LLP, 85 Broad Street, Suite 1101, New York, New York 10004. Attorneys for Plaintiff. Firm File No. 211476-1 a17-Th my8

**NOTICE OF SALE**

**S**UPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, RFLF 5, LLC, Plaintiff, vs. MAHATTAN RIVER VIEW LLC, ET AL., Defendant(s). Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered on January 25, 2023 and a Decision and Order duly entered on April 1, 2025, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Bronx County Courthouse, Courtroom 711, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451 on June 2, 2025 at 2:15 p.m., premises known as 2086-2088 Bathgate Avenue, Bronx, NY 10457. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Bronx, County of Bronx, City and State of New York, Block 2045 And Lot 15. Approximate amount of judgment is \$1,125,086.83 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment Index #806204/2021E. Jeffrey E. Dinowitz, Esq., Referee Friedman Vartolo LLP, 85 Broad Street, Suite 1001, New York, New York 10004, Attorneys for Plaintiff. Firm File No.: 201287-2 8048 my1-Th my22

**NOTICE OF SALE**

**S**UPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, JP-MORGAN CHASE BANK, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, Plaintiff against NINA VAZQUEZ, et al Defendant(s) Attorney for Plaintiff(s) Fein Such & Crane, LLP, 28 East Main Street, Suite 1800, Rochester, NY 14614. Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale entered September 27, 2019, I will sell at public auction to the highest bidder at the Bronx County Courthouse, Courtroom 711 at 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, New York, on June 9, 2025 at 2:15 PM. Premises known as 3609 Holland Avenue, Bronx, NY 10467-0467, Block 4661 Lot 21. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough and County of Bronx, City and State of New York. Approximate Amount of Judgment is \$599,659.45 plus interest, fees, and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment Index No 380570/2008E. The foreclosure sale will be conducted in accordance with 12th Judicial District's Covid-19 Policies and the Bronx County foreclosure auction rules. The Referee shall enforce any rules in place regarding facial coverings and social distancing. Jose C. Polanco, Referee File # XCAJN0078181 my8-Th my29

## LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of CHLOE'S CAR, LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/03/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: ERESIDENTAGENT, INC., 1 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA, SUITE 1204, NEW YORK, NY 10020, also the registered agent upon whom process may be served. Purpose: any lawful activities. 7835 a24-Th my29

See Decisions of Interest only at NYLJ.COM

## LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

K. ANDRES & MAKAINAG, LLC. Filed: 11/18/24. Office: New York Co. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 110 Thompson St South Store New York, NY 10012 Purpose: General. 6918 A03-Th My08

184/188 EAST 70TH ST. 3C LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/13/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 459 South Oyster Bay Road, Plainview, NY 11803. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 7199 a10-Th my15

235 EAST 22ND STREET 1B LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/13/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 459 South Oyster Bay Road, Plainview, NY 11803. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 7200 a10-Th my15

BROOK BUILDING GROUP LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/02/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, c/o Anthony V. Ferrantello, 50 2nd Avenue, Garden City Park, NY 11040. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 7197 a10-Th my15

Formation of LMSMD CONSULTANTS, LLC filed with the Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/4/2025. Office loc: NY County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. The address SSNY shall mail process to: Loren Scott Michel, 392 Central Park W., Apt. 17D, New York, NY 10025. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 7186 a10-Th my15

GOLD COAST SC, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/17/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 123 Eileen Way, Syosset, NY 11791. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 7202 a10-Th my15

NIS-KAR MANAGEMENT LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/02/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 60 Hillside Avenue, Manhasset, NY 11030. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 7198 a10-Th my15

OAK SARZ LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/01/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 3018 Merrick Road, Wantagh, NY 11793. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 7195 a10-Th my15

613 MONROE LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/04/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 200 Broadhollow Road, Suite 314, Melville, NY 11747. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 7589 a17-Th my22

AMODEO HOLDING LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/16/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Gerard Amodeo, 1104 Mitchel Field Way, Garden City, NY 11530. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 7605 a17-Th my22

FRATICO LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/04/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 200 Broadhollow Road, Suite 314, Melville, NY 11747. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 7588 a17-Th my22

KESHET 30 LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/07/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 105 East 80th Street, New York, NY 10075. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 7591 a17-Th my22

NRG HOUSING LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 10/07/2024. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 29 Archer St, Freeport, NY 11520. Reg Agent: U.S. Corp. Agents, Inc. 7014 13th Ave., Ste 202, Brooklyn, NY 11228. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 7563 a17-Th my22

NUSYSTEM SERVICES LLC. Articles of Organization filed with the Secretary of State of New York (SSNY) on 04/02/2025. Location: New York County SSNY designated as agent for service of process on the LLC. SSNY shall mail a copy of process to: C/O SABAJ LAW PC 121A Nassau Ave, Brooklyn, NY 11222. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 7389 A17-Th My22

Admiral 75, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 8/15/23. Office location: New York Co. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: #9a the LLC, 960 1st Ave, #9a, NY, NY 10021. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 792 a22-Th my22

55 EAST MERRICK LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/10/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 15 Arbor Lane, Rockville Centre, NY 11570. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 7793 a24-Th my29

## LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

BROADWAY BY HOLLAND, LLC Art. Of Org. Filed Sec. of State of NY 4/14/2021. Off. Loc. : Bronx Co. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY to mail copy of process to The LLC, 3152 Albany Street, Bronx, NY 10463, USA. Purpose: Any lawful act or activity. 7840 a24-Th my29

CORNER BISTRO EAST, LLC. Filed with SSNY on 04/02/2025. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: WOTMAN LAW PLLC, 1979 MARCUS AVE, STE 210, LAKE SUCCESS, NY 11042. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 7880 a24-Th my29

FIRSTNEST LLC. Filed with SSNY on 11/20/2024. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 299 PARK AVE, 16TH FL, NEW YORK, NY 10171. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 7881 a24-Th my29

LA RIBA, LLC. Filed with SSNY on 03/18/2025. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 66 W 138TH ST, APT 1D, NEW YORK, NY 10037. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 7886 a24-Th my29

ONE DOMINO 28B LLC. Filed with SSNY on 11/21/2024. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 299 PARK AVE, 16TH FL, NEW YORK, NY 10171. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 7883 a24-Th my29

WEST 57TH 49 LLC. Filed with SSNY on 03/21/2025. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 299 PARK AVE, 16TH FLOOR, NEW YORK, NY 10171. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 7885 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Viva Health LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy of State of NY (SSNY) on 2/27/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 20 Pine Rd, Ste100, Syosset, NY 11791. Purpose: any lawful act. A03-Th My08 6583

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of DMJ VALOR LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/01/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 135 Crossways Park Drive, Woodbury, New York 11797. Purpose: any lawful activities. 7834 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of DUNAMIS GREEN-POINT LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 11/04/25. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The Company, 422D, New York, NY 10023. LLC address in NV: 624 S 10th St, Las Vegas, NV 89101. Arts of Org. filed with the Secy. of State of NV, 401 N Carson St, Carson City, NV 89701. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7126 A17-Th My22

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Divine Shine LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 03/27/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 03/13/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The Company, 401 Federal Street, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities. 7859 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Refined Ground LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/12/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 555 West 23rd St, Apt N10E, New York, NY 10011. Purpose: To engage in any lawful act or activity. 7748 A24-Th My29

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of SPECTRUM SOCIAL LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/04/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: c/o 148 New Dorp Lane, Staten Island, NY 10306. Purpose: any lawful activities. 7838 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Treatuals LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/19/25. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to Entify Protect Registered Agent Services LLC, 447 Broadway 2nd Fl #3000, New York, NY 10013, P/B/A 276 Fifth Ave, Ste 704 FMB 70001, New York, NY 10001. Purpose: any lawful act. 8188 My01-Th J05

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Woodwind Holdings LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 1/7/25. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to Kristin Laura Bertrand, 237 Tulip Ave, Florham Park, NY 10001. Purpose: any lawful act. 8110 My01-Th J05

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of BLOOD DYNAMICS, LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/20/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 450 Riverside Drive, Apt 94, New York, NY 10027. Purpose: any lawful act. 8555 My08-Th J12

Reach your peers to generate referral business

**LAWYER TO LAWYER**

For information, contact Carol Robertson at 212.457.7850 or E-mail crobertson@alm.com

## LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Meaningful Experiences LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 11/14/23. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 1 Stuyvesant Oval, Unit 3A, New York, NY 10009. R/A: US Corp Agents, Inc. 7014 13th Ave, #202, BK, NY 11228. Purpose: any lawful act. 8477 My08-Th J12

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Seriouslyfun, LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/01/25. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to primary business location: 161 Water Street, #2221, New York, NY 10038. Purpose: any lawful act. 8581 My08-Th J12

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of FIVE WINGS REALTY LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 10/02/2024. Office location: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: InCorp Services, Inc., One Commerce Plaza - 99 Washington Ave, Suite 805A, Albany, NY 12210-2822, also the registered agent upon whom process may be served. Address required to be maintained in DE: 131 Continental Drive, Suite 301, Newark, DE 19713. Arts of Org. filed with Charleni Patabanda-Sanchez, Secretary of State, Division of Corporations, PO Box 898, Dover, DE 19903. Purpose: any lawful activities. 8180 my1-Th ju5

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Immortality Hole LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 03/25/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Daniel Yang, 11 West 32nd Street, Store #2, New York, NY 10001. Address required to be maintained in DE: 13 W. Main Street, P.O. Box 953, Felton, DE 19943. Arts of Org. filed with the DE Secy. of State, John G. Townsend Bldg., 401 Federal Street, Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities. 8177 my1-Th ju5

## LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

**Notice of Qualification** of WELBUNATIX LLC. Application for authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 01/03/2025. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Nevada (NV) on 12/03/2010. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 45 W 60th St, #22D, New York, NY 10023. LLC address in NV: 624 S 10th St, Las Vegas, NV 89101. Arts of Org. filed with the Secy. of State of NV, 401 N Carson St, Carson City, NV 89701. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7126 A17-Th My22

**NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION** of Divine Shine LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 03/27/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 03/13/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The Company, 401 Federal Street, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities. 7859 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION** of Divine Shine LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 03/27/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 03/13/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The Company, 401 Federal Street, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities. 7859 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Refined Ground LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/12/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 555 West 23rd St, Apt N10E, New York, NY 10011. Purpose: To engage in any lawful act or activity. 7748 A24-Th My29

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of SPECTRUM SOCIAL LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/04/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: c/o 148 New Dorp Lane, Staten Island, NY 10306. Purpose: any lawful activities. 7838 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Treatuals LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/19/25. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to Entify Protect Registered Agent Services LLC, 447 Broadway 2nd Fl #3000, New York, NY 10013, P/B/A 276 Fifth Ave, Ste 704 FMB 70001, New York, NY 10001. Purpose: any lawful act. 8188 My01-Th J05

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Woodwind Holdings LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 1/7/25. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to Kristin Laura Bertrand, 237 Tulip Ave, Florham Park, NY 10001. Purpose: any lawful act. 8110 My01-Th J05

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of BLOOD DYNAMICS, LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/20/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 450 Riverside Drive, Apt 94, New York, NY 10027. Purpose: any lawful act. 8555 My08-Th J12

Reach your peers to generate referral business

**LAWYER TO LAWYER**

For information, contact Carol Robertson at 212.457.7850 or E-mail crobertson@alm.com

## LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

**NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION** of Kit & Company, LLC, fict. name: Kit & Company MN, LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 03/27/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Minnesota (MN) on 05/20/2021. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: c/o C T Corporation System, 28 Liberty Street, New York, NY 10005, also the registered agent upon whom process may be served. Address required to be maintained in MN: 1792 Pinehurst Avenue, Saint Paul, MN 55116. Arts of Org. filed with the Minnesota Secretary of State, First National Bank Building, 332 Minnesota Street, Ste. N201, Saint Paul, MN 55101. Purpose: any lawful activities. 7851 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION** of Longwood 345 LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 03/28/2025. Office location: Nassau County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 11/08/2024. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: InCorp Services, Inc., One Commerce Plaza - 99 Washington Ave, Suite 805A, Albany, NY 12210-2822, also the registered agent upon whom process may be served. Address required to be maintained in DE: 131 Continental Drive, Suite 301, Newark, DE 19713. Arts of Org. filed with Charleni Patabanda-Sanchez, Secretary of State, Division of Corporations, PO Box 898, Dover, DE 19903. Purpose: any lawful activities. 7836 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION** of LUKAS JOY MANHATTAN FC32 LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 03/24/2025. Office location: Nassau County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 03/24/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Daniel Yang, 11 West 32nd Street, Store #2, New York, NY 10001. Address required to be maintained in DE: 13 W. Main Street, P.O. Box 953, Felton, DE 19943. Arts of Org. filed with the DE Secy. of State, John G. Townsend Bldg., 401 Federal Street, Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities. 7855 a24-Th my29

**NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION** of Dauntless Jones LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 03/31/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 03/12/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: c/o National Registered Agents, Inc., 28 Liberty Street, New York, NY 10005. Address required to be maintained in DE: c/o National Registered Agents, Inc., 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington, DE 19801. Arts of Org. filed with the DE Secy. of State, John G. Townsend Bldg., 401 Federal Street, Suite 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities. 7858 a24-Th my29

MKRP HOLDINGS, LLC. Filed with SSNY on 04/14/2025. Formed in DE on 03/30/2021. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 20 PINE ST #118 NEW YORK, NY 10005. DE SOS: 401 Federal St #4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities. 7878 a24-Th my29

To place an ad in the Real Estate section, Call: 212.457.7795

## LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

**NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION** of Pipes Music LLC, fict. name: The Pipes Music Agency LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/19/2024. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 12/13/2024. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: c/o eResidentAgent, Inc., 1 Rockefeller Plaza, Suite 1204, New York, NY 10020, also the registered agent upon whom process may be served. Address