

IN BRIEF

SEC Wiped Gensler's Phone, Loses Trove of Texts Due to 'Avoidable' Errors

The Securities and Exchange Commission wiped nearly a year of text messages from former Chairman Gary Gensler's government-issued phone because of a flawed and misunderstood policy, the agency's internal watchdog said Thursday in a report.



Gary Gensler

And the news drew criticism from Paul Grewal, the chief legal officer of Coinbase. Coinbase is a cryptocurrency exchange that the Biden administration's SEC charged under Gensler for selling unregistered securities. The case against Coinbase and other exchanges were later dropped under new leadership in the Trump administration.

"This isn't some 'oops' moment," Grewal, whose employer sought Gensler's text messages in discovery during litigation against the SEC, alleged on social media. "This was a destruction of evidence relevant to pending litigation. We all deserve better, especially from 'leaders' who see fit to smear others and cast aspersions so freely."

The Office of the Inspector General emphasized in the report that federal records form the backbone of open government, documenting agency actions and decisions, protecting rights and interests and enabling oversight and accountability. In October 2016, the SEC adopted a new "Capstone" approach to managing senior officials' email records, later extending the system to cover text messages in October 2022.

And problems began in July 2023. That's when Gensler's smartphone, with or without his knowledge, ceased communicating with the SEC's mobile device management system. The following month, the Office of Information Technology implemented a new policy to remotely wipe any SEC mobile device that did not communicate with the mobile device management system for at least six weeks.

The OIG determined this policy rested on a faulty assumption: that such devices were

no longer in use, were lost or stolen, and could not reconnect to the SEC network.

On Sept. 6, 2023, Gensler arrived at the SEC headquarters and discovered that his agency-linked applications were missing from his smartphone, according to the report. The report details how unbeknownst to Gensler and the OIT personnel who initially assisted him that morning, his smartphone had been wiped pursuant to the new policy.

"Although the smartphone had been wiped, it would have been possible at that point to retain Gensler's text messages," the OIG found. "However, in an effort to assist Gensler expeditiously, OIT personnel hastily performed a factory reset of the smartphone, which resulted in the permanent deletion of the device's data, including nearly a year's worth of text messages."

The move, according to the OIG report, made it impossible to determine why Gensler's device stopped communicating with the SEC's mobile device management system. And while the SEC took steps to recover to recreate the deleted text messages, the agency was unable to collect most of them. The SEC has since notified relevant federal agencies that it cannot fully respond to certain Freedom of Information Act requests tied to Gensler's text messages.

To prevent similar issues, the OIG recommended strengthening the SEC's management of mobile devices and federal records, including "updating or developing plans, policies, and procedures related to change management, Capstone officials' devices, and the system used to manage mobile devices, among other topics."

—Michael A. Mora

Willkie Private Wealth Co-Chair Dies in E-Bike Accident

Willkie Farr & Gallagher partner Michele Mulrooney was killed Monday in an e-bike accident outside of Aspen, Colorado.

According to the Pitkin County Sheriff's Office,

» Page 4

Scandals Erased, Editors Paid: How Big Law Firms Try To Control Their Wikipedia Pages »2



NYC/YouTube

The lawsuit asks the court to shed light on New York City Administration for Children's Services's "enormous power to separate children from their families" across New York City

Advocate Files Petition for NYC's Child-Removal Info, but Agency Says Data Isn't Easily Retrievable

BY BRIAN LEE

A LEGAL organization advocating for transparency in New York City's child-removal process filed a lawsuit on Thursday for a more comprehensive response to its broad public records request.

The Family Justice Law Center's Article 78 petition in New York State Supreme Court in Manhattan argues the New York City Administration for Children's Services wrongfully denied most of its October 2024 request under

the Freedom of Information Law.

The lawsuit asks the court to shed light on ACS's "enormous power to separate children from their families" across New York City, where it removes about 2,000 children each year, keeping much of the information from view, according to the nonprofit law center's petition.

The law center issued the request in October 2024, asking the city to provide 10 years of information through data, reports, memoranda, and other documents. It had asked for the

» Page 8

Is the Rise Of AI a Real Threat to Associate Jobs?

BY CHRISTINE CHARNOSKY

WHILE the rising investment in artificial intelligence has brought along concerns and predictions about the technology's potential to replace associate jobs, some say the role will instead adapt and evolve alongside the rapidly growing technology.

A recent survey from admissions consulting firm Juris Education revealed that one in five pre-law students fear artificial intelligence could replace their jobs in the future.

Meanwhile, 34% of junior associate lawyers asked about the biggest threat to their legal career this year cited technology replacing humans, according to The American Lawyer's 2025 Midlevel Associates Technology Survey.

Is this fear realistic? Some legal recruiters have said the rise of AI will almost certainly reduce the need for junior associates.

David Nicol, head of legal recruiting group Marsden's U.S. practice, recently told The American Lawyer, "It's pretty clear that the size and structure of law firms is going to change, and I don't really see a future going forward where you're going to require as many junior associates."

Dale Durham, managing director of legal recruiting firm Major, Lindsey & Africa's associate practice group, also noted AI tools equate to added client value, which could come at the expense of slightly leaner associate classes.

» Page 6



BRYAN DERBALLA/BLOOMBERG

The Marmac 306 cable-laying barge was in New York Harbor in July to connect the Empire Wind farm to the city's power grid.

Latham & Watkins Files Lawsuit Challenging Trump Administration's Wind Farm Stop-Work Order

BY SULAIMAN ABDUR-RAHMAN

WASHINGTON, D.C.

AN OFFSHORE wind energy company has filed a lawsuit alleging the Trump administration unlawfully halted construction of a \$5 billion wind farm in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act and Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Latham & Watkins on behalf of Revolution Wind LLC seeks an order temporarily, preliminarily and permanently blocking the U.S. Interior Department from enforcing a stop-work order that impairs development of a massive wind energy project near Long Island, New York.

"The Stop Work Order was issued without statutory author-

'Personal Gripes': Eric Adams' Lawyers Slam Ex-NYPD Commissioner's RICO Suit as Lacking Legal Grounds

BY EMILY SAUL

LAWYERS for Eric Adams moved to dismiss a federal racketeering complaint against the New York City mayor on Thursday, arguing the lengthy lawsuit from a former interim police commissioner violates the rules of civil procedure, fails to credibly establish elements of the claims and is "somehow devoid of substance."

The sharply written motion accuses plaintiff Thomas Donlon of wasting the court's time with "irrelevant and prolix" allegations that are "jumbled, repetitive" and "demonstrably false."

"Rather than conclude that he was removed from the temporary position of Interim Police Commissioner as a result of such feckless and ineffective leadership, plaintiff instead contends that his termination must be the result of retaliation and, somehow, a racketeering conspiracy," wrote Assistant Corp. Counsel Eric Eichen-

holtz, who is representing New York City and other defendants.

Donlon, who served as NYPD Commissioner between September and November of 2024, filed suit against Adams and others in July, alleging that Adams ran the NYPD as a "coordinated criminal conspiracy" and racketeering enterprise that committed myriad crimes and



RYLAND WEST/ALM

Mayor **Eric Adams** is running for reelection as an independent.

permeated "the highest levels of City government."

During his brief time there, Donlon alleged he witnessed cronyism and obstruction, with top officials wielding the power of

» Page 8

Despite Likely End to FTC Noncompete Regulation, Employers Face Enforcement Risks

BY BRENDAN PIERSON

A MONDAY court deadline will likely mark the end of the U.S. Federal Trade Commission's efforts to ban employee noncompete agreements through formal rulemaking, but the agency could still seek to go after such agreements in other ways, legal experts say.

The now-defunct rule was finalized in April 2024 under then-FTC chair Lina Khan, who was appointed by Democratic President Joe Biden, but it was blocked from taking effect by courts in response challenges by employers. It would have rendered noncompete agreements unenforceable except for some existing agreements involving senior executives.

Under Biden, the FTC appealed the court rulings, but under Republican President Donald Trump it put those appeals on hold and asked to consider whether they should continue. Monday marks the deadline in one of those cases, in the Court of Appeals for the 5th Circuit, for the administration to say how it plans to proceed.

The FTC is widely expected to drop the rule. Its current chairman, Andrew Ferguson, voted against it and has explicitly called it an unconstitutional abuse

» Page 8

DECISIONS OF INTEREST

First Department

CONTRACTUAL DISPUTES: **Corporate veil pierced; parent firm liable for agreement's breach, must pay \$179,660.** *Rich v. J.A. Madison LLC, App. Div.*

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW: **Article 78 proceedings challenging parking tickets dismissed.** *Performance Food Group, Inc. v. City of New York, Supreme Court, New York.*

CRIMINAL LAW: **Prosecution complies with compelled discovery; dismissal denied.** *People v. Fraser, Criminal Court, Bronx.*

Second Department

INSURANCE LITIGATION: **Subcontractor's insurer liable for defense of construction manager.** *421 Kent Development, LLC v. Prosight Syndicate 1110, Supreme Court, Kings.*

LANDLORD-TENANT LAW: **Service on petitioner's son not amendable; eviction dismissed.** *489 MM Realty LLC v. Zelaya, Civil Court, Kings.*

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

CRIMINAL LAW: **Motion to dismiss criminal action granted.** *People v. Jackman, Criminal Court, Kings.*

REAL ESTATE LAW: **Motion to dismiss action to quiet title of land granted.** *Andersen v. Bank of New York Mellon, Supreme Court, Richmond.*

U.S. Courts

CIVIL PROCEDURE: **'Reduced sticker shock' theory of harm rejected in suit over event ticket prices.** *Fortune v. Vivendi Ticketing US LLC, SDNY.*

CIVIL PROCEDURE: **Venue in lawsuit over new 'legal mail policy' at BDFD is transferred to WDNY.** *Prisoners' Legal Servs. of New York v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec., SDNY.*

EMPLOYMENT LITIGATION: **Learning disability inadequately alleged to render plaintiff disabled under ADA.** *Logan v. Albany City Sch. Dist., NDNY.*

IMMIGRATION LAW: **Consular non reviewability doctrine applies in action over visa application's denial.** *Al-Harbi v. Rubio, NDNY.*

INSIDE LAW JOURNAL

Calendar of Events.....	6
Court Calendars.....	8
Court Notes.....	9
Decisions.....	17
Disciplinary	
Proceeding.....	3
Expert Analysis.....	3
Lawyer to Lawyer.....	4
Legal Notices.....	15
Outside Counsel.....	4
Verdicts & Settlements.....	5

See page 2 for complete
Inside lineup.

FIND ME AT COURT

No more shouting at the courthouse!

Find Me At Court is a new app that helps you connect with your counterparts quickly, and silently by matching attorneys with the same Case ID.

1

Enter your Case ID

Enter your Case ID. We use it to match you with the other attorney on the same matter.

2

Get matched by location

When your counterpart enters the same Case ID within the courthouse radius, you're instantly paired in the app.

3

Call and meet

Call with one tap to agree on where to meet—before your case starts.



Scan to download the app

Start your 60-day FREE trial today, and make courthouse coordination effortless.

Available on all platforms



New York Law Journal Inside

Trusts and Estates Update »3 Summer Happenings by Ilene Sherwyn Cooper	Disciplinary Proceedings »3 Appellate Division, Second Department	Outside Counsel »4 Taming Shadow AI: What Legal Leaders Must Do by Brian Corbin, Melissa Griffins Paulk and Karun Mahadevan	Verdicts & Settlements »5 \$4.2 million settlement in a worker/workplace negligence case: Trip On Loose Plywood Caused Impaling on Exposed Rebar: Laborer \$3.9 million verdict in a motor vehicle case: Rideshare Driver Claimed Injuries After Being Rear-Ended	Calendar of Events »6 Online Today's Tip Dozens of rulings, in addition to Decisions of Interest, are posted at nycourts.law.com , our affiliate site. Online Submit a legal notice for publication on nylj.com .	Online Have you recently been involved in a major verdict or settlement? Contact the Law Journal now, as your verdict, settlement or arbitration award could be entitled to publication in VerdictSearch's massive database—or further publicity with a front-page article by the Law Journal. Send your submissions to Law Journal bureau chief Andrew Denney at adenney@alm.com or to verdicts@verdictsearch.com .
--	--	---	--	--	---

Scandals Erased, Editors Paid: How Big Law Firms Try To Control Their Wikipedia Pages

BY MOLLY G SMITH

WIKIPEDIA is an unavoidable digital reality for Big Law. The popular online encyclopedia is often one of the top results when a potential client, lateral hire, or journalist searches a firm's name.

That visibility creates both opportunity and risk: firms want their Wikipedia pages to be accurate and up to date, but they must navigate a platform whose rules forbid promotional editing, and where anyone, whether friend or foe, can make changes. According to Wikipedia Statistics, in 2024, people from all over the world made 597 million edits, 72 million of which were in English.

But a close analysis reveals a murky battleground featuring law firm employees, Wikipedia editors, activists and the public who tussle over how law firms are represented to the world.

After analyzing thousands of edits to law firm pages and speaking to multiple sources, Law.com International can reveal how some law firms have used paid editors, often covertly, or been blocked for conflicts of interest, and how details on sex scandals have quietly disappeared, political language has been softened, and hyperbole added, removed, and then reintroduced.

It reveals the uneasy reality law firms face in trying to coexist with a world famous platform that has no stake in their reputations.

The Battleground

Wikipedia prizes neutrality, transparency, and independent sourcing.

Corporate instincts, on the other hand, lean toward brand management, minimising reputational risks, and controlling the public narrative around their employers.

This tension drives the strategies law firms adopt when dealing with their pages. And when managing their Wikipedia presence, law firms tend to fall into three broad camps: hidden, transparent, and hands-off.

Hidden

It is not against Wikipedia's rules for firms to request changes through the platform's "talk" pages, where people discuss what changes were made, and the reasons for making them; what is important to Wikipedia, however, is that firms do not directly edit their own articles.

Law.com's analysis shows that several major law firms, or individuals that can be linked to them, have directly edited their own pages, sometimes openly, but often with the benefit of anonymity.



One Sansome Street, Wikimedia Foundation headquarters since October 2024 in San Francisco

It's a practice that flouts the site's rules, according to Wikipedia editors—it is a lesson that some firms have learned the hard way.

Clifford Chance's page carries a warning that an editor with a "close connection" to the firm has made

changes, a banner that sits at the very top of the page.

Law.com analysis shows at least three edits in 2019 by an account matching the name of a digital marketing executive who worked for the firm at the time. The firm did not respond to requests for comment.

Similarly, in 2024, an account called 'DLAP comms' made a series of edits to DLA Piper's main Wikipedia page. Wikipedia has since blocked the account. A person with knowledge of the firm's approach said that the firm only updates factual details in the right-hand information panel, not the main article text, adding: "We take a transparent approach, and do not update the main content, in line with Wikipedia's guidance."

Wikipedia has also blocked an account by the name 'Quinnemanuel'; in 2009, the account declared it was part of Quinn Emanuel's marketing team and has made several edits. Some of the changes were reversed by an experienced Wikipedia editor.

A person with knowledge of the firm said that the firm explored Wikipedia editing "many years ago but recognised Wikipedia's policies against self-editing", adding "we respect Wikipedia's editorial independence".

The lack of knowledge about

Wikipedia's core values frequently catches firms out.

In 2015, a Wikipedia account was made which immediately made multiple edits to Gibson Dunn & Crutcher's Wikipedia page. The edits largely included adding information on awards and rankings.

The background discussion shows that a user warned the account for facing a possible conflict of interest. Since then, the firm has used official 'talk' page requests, which have not been flagged and are more in line with Wikipedia's policies.

'Talk' pages are Wikipedia's administration pages where editors can discuss improvements to articles or pages.

One account linked to a current employee at A&O Shearman made several edits to legacy firm Allen & Overy's page. The changes were generally small and included updating the headcount and revenue figures and the name of the managing partner.

But these are not the only instances of self-editing.

A person with knowledge of Big Law marketing said that, to help ward off scrutiny around the firms they look after, they often make changes to Wikipedia page via anonymous accounts on mobile devices so it can't be traced back to the firm in question.

Transparent

A Morgan Lewis employee admitted to self editing in 2020, apologising for changes she had made regarding the firm's awards and honours.

In Wikipedia's 'talk' section, the employee addressed changes they made, apologised and stated that they "did not know the rules"; they also invited another editor to undo their edits. A Wikipedia editor replied thanking them for the disclosure and no action was further action was taken on the account.

Gibson Dunn has followed this approach, inviting impartial Wikipedia editors to evaluate any entries for accuracy and neutrality, and make changes where they see fit.

White & Case did the same in 2013: "Hi—This is [name redacted] from White & Case. We would like to ask the community to consider adding a new section to the White & Case page focused on notable alumni. We have noticed other law firms have notable alumni pages and this could make the White & Case Wikipedia page better. White & Case 2013."

Hands Off

Some firms take a completely arms-length, either ignoring or avoiding Wikipedia, ➤ Page 7

AI Disruption Left Judge in Google Antitrust Case Wary of Lowering Boom

BY MICHAEL GENNARO

LEGAL and business reaction is wide-ranging to U.S. District Judge Amit Mehta's decision last week allowing Google to retain its Chrome browser and Android mobile operating system—gateways to billions of users.

Mehta ordered National View, California-based Google to share some of its search data with competitors, and he placed restrictions on multibillion-dollar deals Google cuts to showcase its search engine on smartphones and in web browsers. Yet many observers thought Mehta would come down harder on the company after ruling a year ago that it had illegally monopolized search.

Mehta's 230-page decision, issued Tuesday in the District of Columbia, rejected the structural breakup sought by government lawyers, which would have forced Google to spin off Chrome and Android. The order says that now isn't the time to order remedies with such far-reaching consequences, given that it's far from clear how the disruptive force of AI will reorder the tech landscape.

"Unlike the typical case where the court's job is to resolve a dispute based on historic facts, here the court is asked to gaze into a crystal ball and look to the future. Not exactly a judge's forte," he wrote.

On the opening page of his ruling, Mehta declared, "The emergence of GenAI changed the course of this case," and he noted that tens of millions of people already are using generative AI chatbots to gather information they previously sought through internet searches, a trend developers expect will accelerate as chatbots add features.

"Google is still the dominant firm in the relevant product markets," Mehta wrote. "No existing rival has wrested market share from Google. And no new competitor has entered the market. But artificial intelligence technologies, particularly generative AI ... may yet prove to be game changers."

For lawyers and industry observers, the takeaway is twofold: Google and Big Tech remain under scrutiny, but courts are reluctant to impose remedies that could destabilize markets.

Herbert Hovenkamp, a law professor at the University of Pennsylvania, called the ruling cautious.

"These are very dynamic, rapidly changing markets, and judges would basically be out of their element if they tried to redesign them. And Judge Mehta expresses that several times in the opinion: He does not want to get messed up establishing the structure of an industry," Hovenkamp said.

Hovenkamp said the ruling likely brought relief to Google, whose stock soared to a record high after the ruling, and the tech industry,

while still benefiting consumers.

"Consumers would not be benefited by an order that required Google to divest Chrome. In fact, it could be a real disaster. Nobody exactly knows what would happen, and that's not a good way to create an antitrust remedy," he said.

Bill Kovacic, director of George Washington University's Competition Law Center and a former FTC commissioner, called the ruling a relief for Big Tech and Google but said it was not a "hands-down victory."

"There are complications associated with implementing the information-access remedy that could have competitive consequences that aren't favorable to Google," Kovacic said. He noted that Mehta's ruling includes a carve-out allowing remedies to be revisited if ineffective.

Kovacic said that he believes the judge did not want his ruling to go too far with any remedy because he realizes it will have to withstand scrutiny from an appeals court and likely the Supreme Court.

"The remedy here involves some experimentation and a lot of uncertainty," Kovacic said.

Kovacic said his intuition is that AI companies like OpenAI also were happy with the ruling because forcing Google to share its data opens up new avenues for development of AI.

Ari Paparo, former Google product manager and author of "Yield: How Google Bought, Built, and Bullied Its Way to Advertising

Dominance," said the data-sharing remedy is unlikely to blunt Google's 90% search market share.

"The judge even says as much, noting that competitors will not be able to pay as much as Google for distribution but must compete on 'innovation.' This seems like a fairy tale. The judge was very influenced by the late-breaking advances of AI companies as competitors," Paparo said.

"One frequent criticism of antitrust is that it fights the last battles; in this case the judge was cognizant of the coming battle and chose to take a very light hand on the remedies within that context."

Sean Burke, founding partner of Whistler Partners, a recruiting firm targeting the tech industry, called the ruling "a huge win for Big Tech."

"The message it sends is just business as usual. Keep doing what you're doing. Google is so far ahead of everybody with their search that whatever they create as their custom AI search only has to be like 50% to 70% as good as a competitor, and they'll still dominate," Burke said.

Burke added that AI may never challenge Google enough to topple its dominance.

"ChatGPT created a teeny opening where maybe Google can finally be challenged, and the judge thinks that's enough reason to not break up this monopoly they have. It's ludicrous. They've been dominating for so long, and are so far ahead

of everybody on search that there's no guarantee that this will give anybody even a teeny edge over Google," he said. "We could talk about AI all day, every day. Google still dominates search."

In a statement, Gabriel Weinberg, CEO of the rival search engine DuckDuckGo, slammed the ruling. "We believe Congress should now step in to swiftly make Google do the thing it fears the most: compete on a level playing field," he said.

Sen. Amy Klobuchar, D-Minnesota, used the ruling to promote her American Innovation and Choice Online Act, a bill she's championing aimed at curbing anti-competitive practices by dominant online platforms.

"Today's ruling is a reminder of Google's sweeping power over the online economy, but the limited remedies ordered by the court demonstrate why we need additional rules of the road for Big Tech," Klobuchar wrote.

Latha Duncan, former Lionsgate acquisitions lawyer, said in a post on LinkedIn that there's a "less obvious angle" to the ruling; the questions the ruling raises about whether AI is performing the work regulators have long struggled to do.

"Instead of forcing Google to sell Chrome or dismantle its ad empire, the court leaned on generative AI as proof that the market is already shifting. The logic: OpenAI, Anthropic, and Microsoft are now better

positioned than any search challenger in decades," Duncan wrote.

"In other words, competition is emerging not through legal remedies but through new technologies with balance sheets large enough to fight Google head-on," he wrote.

Duncan added that courts may continue avoiding structural breakups, letting market forces reshape Big Tech's dominance.

"But there's a risk: If judges keep outsourcing antitrust enforcement to the hype cycle of new technologies, what happens when the next disruption doesn't come with a \$13B-plus funding round," he wrote, referencing Microsoft's investment in OpenAI.

The ruling appears to preserve lucrative default-search deals held by Apple and Mozilla, which developed the Firefox browser. Mehta ruled Google can continue paying for placement, just not through exclusive deals.

Apple receives some \$20 billion a year under its deal, while Mozilla receives an estimated half-billion dollars.

Mozilla's interim CEO, Laura Chambers, said in a statement that it was "encouraging to see the Court recognize the risk of unintended consequences when trying to improve search competition—and not just for browsers like Firefox, but for the future of the open web."

@ Michael Gennaro can be reached at mgennaro@alm.com.

Fed Nominee Defends Independence, Will Not Resign From Administration If Confirmed

BY DAN NOVAK

DEMOCRATIC senators expressed deep reservations Thursday about the independence of President Donald Trump's nominee for the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, raising questions about his ties to the president and unwillingness to resign from the administration if confirmed.

Stephen Miran, currently chair of Trump's Council of Economic Advisers, told the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee he would temporarily take an unpaid leave of absence from his position if confirmed to the seven-member Fed board. Miran is being considered for a four-month term ending Jan. 31 to replace former governor Adriana Kugler who resigned in August.

Miran added at his Senate confirmation hearing that he would resign from the council if re-nominated.



Stephen Miran testifies Thursday before the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee during his confirmation hearing to become a governor on the Federal Reserve Board.

"You are going to be technically an employee of the president of the United States, but an independent

member of the board of the Federal Reserve?" said Sen. Jack Reed, D-Rhode Island. "That's ridiculous."

Miran sought to assuage concerns over his independence in his opening testimony, stressing the central bank's importance in setting monetary policy without political input.

"If confirmed, I plan to dutifully carry out my role pursuant to the mandates assigned by Congress," Miran said. "My opinions and decisions will be based on my analysis of the macroeconomy and what's best for its long-term stewardship."

But in a paper published last year, Miran advocated for the president's authority to remove Fed board members at-will. He also supports Trump's desire to lower interest rates.

During the hearing, Miran acknowledged Trump nominated him because they share policy views but said he would only make decisions at the Fed based on impartial economic analysis.

Republican senators sought to portray Miran as an honest and fair economist who was restoring

independence at the Fed.

Sen. Bill Hagerty, R-Tennessee, accused the Biden administration of injecting left-wing policies at the Fed and said Miran will help "steer the Fed away from politics and back toward data-driven monetary policy."

Democrats looked to discredit Miran from the hearing's outset.

The committee's ranking Democrat, Sen. Elizabeth Warren of Massachusetts, called Miran "Donald Trump's puppet" whose tenure at the board would be "tainted."

In a heated exchange with Warren, Miran would not explicitly say that Joe Biden won the 2020 presidential election. He also did not refute Trump's unfounded claims that the Bureau of Labor Statistics faked jobs numbers to make the economy look worse.

"Mr. Miran, you have made clear that you will do or say whatever Donald Trump wants you to do or say," Warren said.

Trump has tested the inde-

pendence of the Fed in unprecedented ways, most prominently by attempting to fire Democratic Governor Lisa Cook on allegations of mortgage fraud. Trump has pressured the central bank for months to lower interest rates and has personally attacked Chair Jerome Powell for keeping rates steady.

If Miran is confirmed and Cook's removal proceeds, a majority of the board would be Trump appointees. Cook sued the Trump administration last month and is requesting that the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia grant immediate injunctive relief to reinstate her on the board.

Thursday's hearing was hastily organized following Miran's nomination in August. Republicans have signaled they want him confirmed before the Fed's next policy meeting on Sept. 16 and 17.

@ Dan Novak can be reached at dnovak@alm.com.

Expert Analysis

TRUSTS AND ESTATES UPDATE

Summer Happenings

As the summer days come to an end, and Fall fast approaches, the Appellate and Surrogate's Courts have been busy at work issuing the following decisions of interest impacting the field of trusts and estates.

Order Granting Summary Judgment Construing Decedent's Will Affirmed

In *In re Fakiris*, the Appellate Division, Second Department, affirmed a decree of the Surrogate's Court, Queens County, which, *inter alia*, granted that portion of the motion by the co-executor of the decedent's estate requesting that the court construe the decedent's will to determine that she was the sole beneficiary of his residuary estate, and thereupon, for summary judgment dismissing the amended objections to the final account of the executors.

The decedent died in 2013 survived by his spouse, who was a nominated co-executor of his estate, and his daughter, among others.

Following the admission of the decedent's will to probate, his co-executors petitioned to judicially settle their account, and objections were filed by the decedent's daughter, who took issue with the designation of the decedent's spouse as the sole residuary beneficiary of the estate.

The decedent's spouse, as co-executor, moved for a construction of the will resulting in the entirety of the residuary estate passing to her, and upon such determination, that the court granted summary judgment dismissing the objections to the accounting for lack of standing.

The objectant cross-moved for, *inter alia*, construction of the will resulting in her being the sole residuary beneficiary of the estate based on the doctrine of judicial estoppel.

Specifically, the objectant argued that the probate petition, which the co-executors had verified and previously submitted to

By
Ilene
Sherwyn
Cooper



the court, described the objectant's interest in the estate as residuary beneficiary.

The Surrogate's Court granted the spouse's motion and denied the cross-motion, determining that the doctrine of judicial estoppel was inapplicable and that a construction of the decedent's will resulted in the entirety of the residuary estate passing to the decedent's spouse.

The court, thereafter, issued a decree dismissing the amended objections to the final account, and the objectant appealed.

The court noted that pursuant to the doctrine of judicial estop-

struction of the will. In particular, the court noted that the evidence submitted in support of the motion established, prima facie, the decedent's intent that his spouse be the sole residuary beneficiary of his estate, and that his daughter be the alternate in the event that his spouse did not survive him.

The court found that the objectant had failed to raise a triable issue of fact on the issue, or to establish that she was the intended sole residuary beneficiary. *Matter of Fakiris*, 2025 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 4087 (2d Dept 2025)

Order Granting Summary Judgment Admitting Will To Probate Reversed

Before the Appellate Division, Fourth Department, in *In re Rodriguez*, was an appeal from a decree of the Surrogate's Court, Monroe County, which, *inter alia*, granted the petitioner's motion for summary judgment dismissing the objections to probate.

Upon review of the record, the court reversed the decree finding that the proof submitted by the petitioner in support of her motion raised triable issues of fact with respect to the decedent's testamentary capacity, his testamentary intent, and whether the will was the product of fraud and undue influence, without regard to the sufficiency of the opposing papers.

More specifically, the court held that the evidence proffered by the petitioner, including sworn testimony and medical records, precluded a finding as a matter of law that the decedent possessed the requisite intent and capacity to execute the propounded instrument.

To this extent, the court found that the surrogate erred in resolving inconsistencies in the record with respect to these issues by crediting the testimony of the attorneys who prepared and supervised the execution of the will.

Additionally, the court determined that petitioner failed to satisfy her burden of establishing the absence of any material fact on the issues of fraud and undue influence, observing that petitioner could not satisfy her burden in moving for summary judgment by merely pointing to

» Page 7

Disciplinary Proceeding

Matter of
Tejinder Singh Bains,
an attorney and
counselor-at-law

Motion No. 2022-02193

Appellate Division,
Second Department

Lasalle, P.J., Dillon, Duffy,
Barros, Connolly, JJ.

Decided: August 27, 2025

David W. Chandler, Brooklyn, NY (Susan Korenberg of counsel), for petitioner.

Law Office of Meredith Heller, PLLC, New York, NY, for respondent.



Per curiam—The Grievance Committee for the Second, Eleventh, and Thirteenth Judicial Districts commenced a formal disciplinary proceeding against the respondent by serving and filing a notice of petition dated July 27, 2023, and a verified petition dated July 26, 2023, containing two charges of professional misconduct. The respondent served and filed a verified answer dated September 15, 2023, admitting the factual allegations but denying any violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct. By decision and order on application dated November 2, 2023, the matter was referred to the Honorable Arthur J. Cooperman, as Special Referee, pursuant to 22 NYCRR 1240.8(b) (1), to hear and report. In a report dated May 23, 2024, the Special Referee sustained both charges in the petition. By notice of motion dated July 12, 2024, the Grievance Committee moves to confirm the report of the Special Referee sustaining both charges of professional misconduct and to impose such discipline upon the respondent as the Court deems just and proper. The respondent submits an affirmation in support of confirming the Special Referee's report and to impose the sanction of a private admonition based on the mitigation submitted.

The Petition

The respondent was a managing partner in the law firm Ali &

Bains, PC, and was a signatory on an escrow account at Chase Bank titled "Ali & Bains, PC, Attorney Trust Account IOLA" with an account number ending in 5892 (hereinafter the escrow account).

Charge one alleges that between June 8, 2018, and March 2, 2020, the escrow account had a rolling shortage of up to \$80,000 and escrow checks disbursed by the respondent during this period cleared against other client funds in the escrow account. Therefore, the respondent misappropriated funds entrusted to him as a fiduciary, incident to his practice of law, in violation of rule 1.15(a) of the Rules of Professional Conduct (22 NYCRR 1200.0).

Charge two alleges that the respondent failed to maintain required bookkeeping records for the escrow account by failing to maintain an accurate ledger or similar record showing the source of all funds deposited, the names of all persons for whom the funds were held, a description and amount of funds held, and the names of all persons to whom such funds were disbursed, in violation of rule 1.15(d) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

The Hearing Record

A hearing was held on March 18, 2024. No witnesses were presented by the Grievance Committee, and the Grievance Committee rested on the 11 exhibits entered into evidence, without objections, to prove its case in chief.

The respondent testified on his own behalf and submitted the testimony of one character witness. The respondent testified that he opened his law firm, Ali & Bains, PC (hereinafter the law firm), with Shahid Ali in 2009. Prior to that, he worked at the Legal Aid Society.

In 2014, the law firm received a Dismissal with Advisement letter from the Grievance Committee concerning the escrow account. Thereafter, according to the respondent, it was agreed that his partner Shahid Ali would solely manage the escrow account, and the respondent no longer issued checks from the escrow account. In 2018, Chase Bank erroneously debited \$180,000 from the escrow account pursuant to a check that was issued for \$100,000. This

error caused the rolling shortage referenced in charge one and was not detected until 2020. Because of this shortage, in 2018, five checks in small amounts also were dishonored from the escrow account. According to the respondent, because Ali had a good relationship with Chase Bank, Ali convinced the bank not to report the dishonored checks. The respondent learned after the incidents that Ali had transferred funds from an operating account of the law firm into the escrow account to cover the deficiencies. The record does not reflect that dishonored check notices were issued by Chase Bank.

In reflecting on the misconduct that led to the Grievance Committee initiating a disciplinary proceeding, the respondent states

"I will never issue an escrow check for the rest of my life. My practice doesn't require any escrow at all. And two, just thinking about closing the barn door after the horse has left, I should have been more vigilant. I should not have accepted what Mr. Ali was telling me at face value. I should have looked for reconciliation. I should have been more aware. I should have been more aware of my duties and I did not do my duties. All I can say is it wasn't intentional and I had no intent to hurt any of my clients, and I also learned that I have a duty, not just an ethical obligation but a moral obligation to make sure that the money that is still present is safeguarded and contained or reach out to the people who did not cash those checks."

The respondent stated that he did not realize how poorly the escrow account was managed until the investigation by the Grievance Committee began and he was asked to provide records and ledgers associated with the escrow account. According to the respondent, he previously had reviewed the escrow account records, but since hundreds of checks were being issued involving transactions of approximately \$45 million dollars, he did not fully understand the account records.

The respondent explained that his area of practice involves public interest work. He represents Sikh Temples in Manhattan

» Page 7

2025

ASSOCIATES' CAMPAIGN

SUPPORTING THE LEGAL AID SOCIETY

We're thrilled to announce that, thanks to the participation of 28 firms and over 1,000 individuals, the 2025 Associates' Campaign was the most successful in recent years, raising nearly \$415,000!

2025 Award Winners

Top Contributors Overall &
Top Contributors from Firms with 200+ NY Associates

Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP
Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP

Top Contributors
(Firms with 1-99 NY Associates)
Morrison & Foerster LLP
Baker & Hostetler LLP
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP

Top Contributors
(Firms with 100-199 NY Associates)
Cooley LLP
Mayer Brown LLP
Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz

Highest Average Associate Donation
Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz

Highest Associate Participation Rate
Rower LLC

Highest Associate Participation Rate
(Firms with 1-99 NY Associates)
Rower LLC

Highest Associate Participation Rate
(Firms with 100-199 NY Associates)
Cooley LLP

Highest Associate Participation Rate
(Firms with 200+ NY Associates)
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP

THE
LEGAL AID
SOCIETY

Thank you to the
2025 Participating Firms
Scan to see all participants



BONDS

Contact us by phone or email at
info@blaikiegrou.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.blaikiegrou.com



LAWYER TO LAWYER

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



Co-Counsel and Participation Fees Paid



JAY HALPERN
39 Years Experience

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

BERNARD D’ORAZIO

& ASSOCIATES, P.C.

NEW YORK CITY

DORAZIO-LAW.COM

JUDGMENT ENFORCEMENT & DEBT COLLECTION LITIGATION



CLM ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, LLC

PO Box 394, Montvale, NJ 07645

Forensic Investigations/Construction Management/Engineering

Craig L. Moskowitz, MBA, MS, PE, CME
PRESIDENT/MANAGING MEMBER

Contact Numbers: 866-432-4677 or 917-270-8822

Email: clmprofessionalengineer@gmail.com

- Slips, Trips and Falls
- Construction Accidents
- ADA Compliance
- Building Code Issues
- Electrocutation Cases

- Construction Defect Matters
- Personal Injury Cases
- Storm Damage Claims
- HVAC/Plumbing Issues
- Vehicular Accident Reconstruction

And more

Payment arrangements/plans available.
SERVING THE ENTIRE STATE OF NEW JERSEY



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 ALM.

Click Listen Earn

Stay compliant from the comfort of your own home or office at CLECenter.com.

With new, accredited content updated daily, seamless online tracking and 24/7 access, CLECenter.com makes compliance easy.

Visit CLECenter.com
to click, listen, earn - anytime

or Call a CLE Counselor Today at (800) 348-0466

Reach your peers to generate referral business Lawyer to Lawyer For information, contact Carol Robertson at 212-457-7850, or email crobertson@alm.com

Outside Counsel

Taming Shadow AI: What Legal Leaders Must Do

BY BRIAN CORBIN, MELISSA GRIFFINS PAULK AND KARUN MAHADEVAN

OpenAI CEO Sam Altman’s recent observation that conversations with Chat-GPT don’t fall under legal privilege raised a point that resonated deeply with lawyers and compliance officers. It underscored how many organizations are already confronting the rapid, and often unmonitored, use of generative AI tools by employees. Much like the early days of shadow IT when unsanctioned messaging apps and cloud platforms spread through enterprises, this current shadow AI introduces a new layer of exposure reaching into litigation, privacy, cybersecurity, contracts, intellectual property, and regulatory compliance.

The challenge for legal leaders is not simply technical. At stake are foundational questions about privilege, data integrity, and professional responsibility. For general counsel and compliance officers, the task is daunting: enabling businesses to capture the benefits of AI while ensuring risk management and compliance structures keep pace.

Defining Shadow AI

Shadow AI refers to using generative AI tools and models outside the visibility or approval of an organization’s governance framework. Employees may reach for these tools out of convenience—such as asking a chatbot to draft contracts, summarize discovery documents, or generate marketing copy—but without oversight, what feels like efficiency can quickly become a compliance nightmare.

BRIAN CORBIN is the global head of strategic services at QuisLex. MELISSA GRIFFINS PAULK is director of data privacy and security solutions at the firm. KARUN MAHADEVAN is a solutions engineer and product manager at NopalCyber, specializing in cybersecurity, automation, and software development.

The regulatory precedent is clear. When financial institutions did not control employees using private messaging platforms for business, regulators imposed billions in fines for failures in supervision and recordkeeping. Shadow AI presents an analogous, but potentially more severe, challenge because it implicates not only record retention but also privilege, privacy rights and intellectual property ownership.

The Expanding Risk Landscape

Shadow AI’s risks fall into several interrelated categories, each carrying real consequences for legal departments and the clients they serve.

Litigation risk arises when employees input case-sensitive

Shadow AI is not a fleeting trend. It reflects a broader reality that employees eager for efficiency will adopt technologies faster than organizations can regulate them.

information into public AI tools. Once shared, this data may lose privileged status and become subject to discovery. Even inadvertent disclosures can complicate preservation and open the door to costly disputes.

Privacy risk is equally acute. Many AI tools retain data in opaque ways, sometimes in jurisdictions far removed from an organization’s regulatory obligations. If employees enter personally identifiable or health-related information into unvetted platforms, the company may run afoul of the GDPR, CCPA, HIPAA, and other frameworks. Unlike with traditional data breaches, information fed into AI models may be impossible to retrieve or delete.

Practical examples are outlined in a recent federal lawsuit accusing tech company Otter.ai of improperly recording conversations via its Otter Notebook transcription

service and using those conversations to train its AI model without explicit permission. The suit alleges invasion of privacy with users providing instances of confidential information being shared without permission with detrimental results.

Cybersecurity risk grows with every unapproved tool introduced into the enterprise environment. Generative AI systems can create hidden vulnerabilities, whether through insecure connections, weak access controls, or new forms of exploitation such as prompt injection and model poisoning.

One example of the cybersecurity risk of shadow AI is a vulnerability codenamed MCPoison by Check Point Research. This security weakness in the AI-powered code editor Cursor could allow an attacker to gain remote access. If a software developer chose to use Cursor when not authorized, it could critically expose the organization.

These exposures often fall outside the CISO’s monitoring systems, leaving blind spots attackers can exploit.

The exposure does not stop there. Contractual breaches may occur if employees inadvertently violate confidentiality clauses or customer agreements by disclosing data to unauthorized AI platforms. Regulatory scrutiny is mounting, with agencies such as the FTC and frameworks like the EU AI Act paying attention to AI usage. And intellectual property risks loom large: once proprietary content enters an external model, ownership over derivative outputs becomes murky, and the possibility of inadvertent infringement escalates.

Finally, shadow AI presents significant reputational and ethical risks. A single lapse can draw board attention, erode client trust, and generate headlines damaging long-term credibility. In the legal sector, where professional integrity is paramount, reputational harm can be as damaging as regulatory penalties.

From Recognition To Response

Banning AI is neither realistic nor productive. The goal must be to bring AI out of the

» Page 7

IN BRIEF

« Continued from page 1

Mulrooney was cycling downhill with a group when she lost control of her electric bike and crashed into an embankment, The Aspen Times reported. She was 64 years old.

“A visionary leader and a founding member of Willkie’s Los Angeles office, Michele’s passion, dedication and unwavering commitment to excellence were instrumental in driving Willkie’s growth, culture and success in Los Angeles and beyond,” Willkie said in a statement Thursday. “We will remember Michele not only for her many professional achievements, but as a compassionate leader, committed mentor and dedicated advocate who touched so many lives at Willkie, in the legal community, in Los Angeles, and beyond,” the firm said, adding that “her legacy will continue to inspire us for many years to come.”

Before joining Willkie’s Los Angeles office in September 2021, Mulrooney was a partner at Venable for nearly 11 years. She was a trust and estates lawyer who co-chaired the firm’s national private wealth group. Prior to her passing, Mulrooney had practiced law for 40 years.

An alumna of the University of Southern California’s Gould School of Law, Mulrooney remained active with the school, and served as a board member of Gould and co-chair of its building committee. She was also a member of the University of California, Los Angeles’ Health System board.

Mulrooney is survived by her two daughters, two stepsons and two grandchildren, among other family members. “While Michele was a brilliant and highly accomplished lawyer,

she took immense pride in her role as a mother,” Willkie said. “Our thoughts are with her loved ones as we join together in honoring an extraordinary leader and remarkable person.”

—Samson Amore

Anthropic Agrees To Pay Record \$1.5 Billion To Settle Author Class Action

Anthropic, the San Francisco-based AI developer behind the Claude chatbot, has agreed to pay \$1.5 billion to settle a class-action lawsuit brought by authors who alleged their works were used without authorization to train the company’s AI models, according to filings submitted Friday in San Francisco federal court.

If the court grants preliminary approval, the settlement would mark the largest publicly reported copyright recovery in history. “It is the first of its kind in the AI era,” said Justin Nelson, a partner at Susman Godfrey, co-lead counsel for the authors.

The settlement would cover about 500,000 works, with authors who opt into the deal eligible for payments of about \$3,000 per title.

The class action was filed in 2024 by authors Andrea Bartz, Charles Graeber and Kirk Wallace Johnson, who claimed Anthropic unlawfully downloaded and stored their copyrighted books, drawn from so-called “shadow libraries,” to train its AI models.

In June, U.S. District Judge William Alsup issued a mixed summary judgment: While concluding that using copyrighted works for AI training could qualify as fair use, he found Anthropic had nonetheless violated rights by retaining more than 7 million pirated books in a central repository.

The parties disclosed late last month that they’d reached

a deal, but they did not disclose terms at that time.

A trial scheduled for December potentially could have saddled Anthropic with damages in the hundreds of billions of dollars.

Under the deal, Anthropic did not admit liability. In a statement, the San Francisco-based company said, “Today’s settlement, if approved, will resolve the plaintiffs’ remaining legacy claims. We remain committed to developing safe AI systems that help people and organizations extend their capabilities, advance scientific discovery, and solve complex problems.”

One of the terms of the settlement is that Anthropic must destroy the downloaded copies of the contested books.

The Author’s Guild, the oldest and largest professional organization for writers in the United States, praised the settlement, saying it paves the way for authors to have more control over the use of their work by AI companies.

The agreement is a “a vital step in acknowledging that AI companies cannot simply steal authors’ creative work to build their AI just because they need books,” said Mary Rasenberger, the organization’s CEO.

If approved, Anthropic will have to pay the settlement in four installments spread out over two years.

Lawyers representing the authors will seek no more than 25% of the settlement in fees, according to the court filing. A 25% cut would be \$375 million.

Arnold & Porter leads the legal team representing Anthropic.

—Michael Gennaro and Michelle Morgante

Have an event to list?

E-mail the details to pkane@alm.com

Have a Move to Announce?

E-mail pkane@alm.com

READER’S SERVICES

For subscriptions and to purchase back issues, call 1-877-256-2472.

For questions regarding reprints and permissions, call 347-227-3382, e-mail reprints@alm.com, or visit almreprints.com.

To track calendar and motion information for individual cases, call MA 3000 at 212-457-4988.

Send decisions of interest to decisions@alm.com

To access decisions and articles published in the Law Journal, visit nylj.com.

Verdicts&Settlements

WORKER/WORKPLACE NEGLIGENCE

Trip On Loose Plywood Caused Impaling On Exposed Rebar: Laborer

Settlement: \$4,228,262

Blaines Santos Velasquez v. RS JZ Driggs LLC and Foremost Contracting and Building LLC, No. 514312/2019

Court: Kings Supreme

Plaintiff Attorney(s): Frank Kelly; Gorayeb & Associates, P.C.; New York NY for Blaines Santos Velasquez

Plaintiff Expert(s): Aric D. Hausknecht M.D.; Neurology; Bronx, NY called by: Frank Kelly
Ashley Simela D.O.; Orthopedic Surgery; Bronx, NY called by: Frank Kelly

Defense Attorney(s): John A. Corring; Law Offices of John A. Corring; New York, NY for RS JZ Driggs LLC, Foremost Contracting and Building LLC
Daniel M. Stewart; Fleischner Potash; New York, NY for RS JZ Driggs LLC, Foremost Contracting and Building LLC

Facts: On May 31, 2019, plaintiff Blaines Santos Velasquez, 37, a concrete laborer, was working at a multi-unit construction site at 658 Driggs Ave. in Brooklyn. He allegedly tripped on loose plywood and fell on exposed rebar impaling him peri-rectally.

Velasquez sued RS JZ Driggs LLC and Foremost Contracting and Building LLC. He alleged that the defendants violated certain safety practices required under the New York State labor law and industrial codes.

Velasquez’s counsel that the construction site was not properly safeguarded and that, as such, it violated Labor Law § 241(6) and Industrial Codes § 23-1.7(e)(2).

The defense contended that the area was safe, that all rebar was capped and guarded and that Velasquez was comparatively negligent.

Injury: Velasquez was removed from the scene by ambulance to Bellevue Trauma Center level 2 trauma, with a perianal puncture wound. He was admitted and a Malecot drain was sewn into place. He was hospitalized for three days and followed up at the hospital twice.

Velasquez was referred to private physicians for follow-up, including neurology and pain management. It was also discovered that he had suffered a disc herniation at L5-S1. He received epidurals and underwent decompression and fusion surgery.

According to plaintiff’s counsel, Velasquez’s future medicals are \$1,852,418.

The defense contended that Velasquez’s lumbar spinal injuries were not related to the accident.

Result: The jury unanimously found that the defendants violated Industrial Code § 23-1.5(c) (3) as it relates to the plywood work service and that this was a substantial factor in causing Velasquez’s accident. It also found that the defendants violated Industrial Code § 23-7(e) (2) as it relates to rebar.

After the jury found for the plaintiff on liability and during the damages phase of the trial, the parties negotiated a settlement. The insurers for RZ Driggs, Accredited Surety and Casualty Co. Inc., will pay \$2 million and Axis Insurance Co. will contribute \$2,228,262. Thus, the settlement totaled \$4,228,262.

MOTOR VEHICLE

Rideshare Driver Claimed Injuries After Being Rear-Ended

Verdict: \$3,900,265

Moazzam R. Gill v. Sigfredo Valladares-Lopez and Fleetwash, Inc., No. 706989/2020

Court: Queens Supreme

Plaintiff Attorney(s): Jason Lesnevec; Law Offices of Michael S. Lamonssoff, PLLC; New York NY for Moazzam R. Gil

Defense Attorney(s): Kevin R. McNiff; Mulholland, Minion, Davey, McNiff & Beyrer; Williston Park, NY for

Facts: On Dec. 4, 2019, plaintiff Moazzam Gill, 50, an Uber driver, was traveling on the Van Wyck Expressway in Queens, transporting a customer, when he claims his vehicle was rear-ended by a van being driven by Sigfredo Lopez. Lopez was driving the van on behalf of his employer, Fleetwash Inc., a mobile truck washing and facility service company.

Gill sustained injuries to his head, back and shoulder, which he attributed to the collision.

Gill sued Lopez and Fleetwater, alleging Lopez had been acting negligently while operating a motor vehicle, and that as his employer and the van’s owner, Fleetwater, was vicariously liable for their employee’s actions.

Defense counsel disputed responsibility for the collision as well as Gill’s injury claims.

Plaintiff’s counsel moved for summary judgment on the issue of liability, and it was granted in Gill’s favor on June 13, 2022. Thus, the matter proceeded to a damages only trial.

Injury: Gill claimed to have struck his head and left shoulder on the driver’s side window during the collision. Gill and his passenger were removed by paramedics and transported by ambulance to a hospital. At the hospital Gill complained of neck, back, shoulder and head pain. X-ray and CT scans showed

no acute findings to his head, neck, back and shoulder and he was released the same day.

Gill began physical therapy a week after the collision. On Dec. 18, 2019, Gill underwent a left shoulder MRI which revealed a partial rotator cuff tear. An additional MRI on Dec. 24, 2019, revealed herniated discs at C5-7 and L4-S1. In June and September, 2020, Gill received two cervical epidural steroid injections for pain management. An EMG showed lumbar and cervical radiculopathy, which may have been the cause of Gil’s reported radiating pain in both his arms and legs.

Gill underwent arthroscopic surgery to repair the rotator cuff with an anchor for his left shoulder. Gill claimed improvement in the range of motion in his shoulder, but that he was experiencing pain.

On Dec. 21, 2020, Gill underwent an anterior cervical discectomy and fusion surgery at the C5-6 and C7 levels. He claimed that his aforementioned radiating arm pain had persisted.

He continued physical therapy and pain management throughout 2021 and into 2024. On June 24, 2024, Gill underwent a percutaneous discectomy surgery at L4-S1, which he claimed only relieved the radiating pain in his right leg. He was recommended for lumbar fusion surgery, which he expressed plans to undergo.

Gill claimed continued left sided headaches, ringing in his left ear and blurry vision in his left eye. He began treatment with a neuropsychologist on Jan. 10, 2020. He received cognitive therapy throughout 2020, until discontinuing the therapy in April 2021 and restarting it in March, 2022.

Though a diffusion tensor imaging brain MRI had shown no abnormalities, a battery of cognitive tests revealed that he suffered a mild traumatic brain injury.

Gill claimed he would require future medical care for the remainder of his life. Physical therapy, pain management, diagnostic testing, injections, surgery, and cognitive therapy were all recommended. He further claimed that he had been unable to return to work since the date of the crash due to his injuries.

Gill sought damages for lost past and future wages, and past and future pain and suffering, as well as future medical expenses.

At trial, defense counsel contested the cause of Gill’s injuries.

The defense’s expert witnesses testified that Gill only suffered from strains and sprains and degenerative disc disease, which pre-dated the crash and a neuropsychologist testifying on behalf of the defense, opined that Gill had not suffered a traumatic brain injury in the collision, as he had not lost consciousness.

Result: The jury found that Gill’s injuries were causally related to the accident. The verdict was unanimous on all questions except for the finding that Gill had a significant limitation of use of an arm, leg, or other body part.

MEDICAL MALPRACTICE

Dentist Had Consent and Cause To Remove Woman's Teeth: Defense

Verdict: \$0.00

Awilda Castro v. Glad Dental, No. 24069/2013

Court: Bronx Supreme

Plaintiffs' Attorney: Ben Babcock; Duffy & Duffy, PLLC; Uniondale NY for Awilda Castro

Defense Attorneys: William S. Spiegel; Rawle & Henderson, PLLC; New York, NY for Guram Yakobashvili, Glad Dental

Facts & Allegations: In October 2012, plaintiff Awilda Castro, 64, a homemaker, went to Glad Dental in the Bronx, for a routine visit with Dr. Guram Yakobashvili. However, over the course of five visits, 18 of her teeth were removed, which she said was done without her consent.

Castro sued Glad Dental and Yakobashvili alleging medical malpractice and negligence.

According to the defense, Yakobashvili argued Castro had extensive bone loss, which suggested a need to remove the teeth. The defense contended that the extractions were not only necessary due to the aforementioned rampant decay and bone loss, but that Yakobashvili had properly obtained the patient’s informed consent verbally and in writing prior to extracting her teeth.

Injuries/Damages: Castro lost 18 teeth. She reported subsequent infections which required further oral surgical procedures to debride the mandibular bone, significant bone loss and the resulting inability to restore the upper and lower arches of her mouth.

She claimed to have suffered embarrassment, anxiety and depression as a result of the experience and underwent counseling.

Result: The jury found Yakobashvili did not depart from the standard of care and rendered a defense verdict.

VerdictSearch

The cases that appear here are derived from VerdictSearch New York, an affiliate of the New York Law Journal. For more detailed reports from VerdictSearch, to request research, or to submit a case for publication, go to VerdictSearch.com or call 1-800-832-1900.

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 contact information for each party’s attorneys. E-mail decisions to decisions@alm.com.

Mr. Manning is consistently lauded by Chambers’ reviewers, who say he is a “superior strategist” with a “steady hand and voice of reason” and a “wealth of knowledge on the EQ (emotional intelligence) side.”

JAMS Welcomes Mediator/Arbitrator

Kenneth A. Manning, Esq.

As a litigator, Mr. Manning handled high-impact cases in toxic tort, product liability, government operations, corporate governance and class actions. As a mediator, he has handled discrimination and hostile work environment claims, workplace fraud, and corporate shareholder and whistleblower disputes as well as complex trusts and estates matters

jamsadr.com/kenneth-manning



Wikipedia

« *Continued from page 2*
leaving their firm’s pages entirely in the hands of the public. They may monitor their pages, but some sources say they avoid editing for fear of sparking scrutiny.

Violating the Rules

Wikipedia’s ‘talk’ pages often show that law firms use hired consultants or PR firms who openly disclose their paid status and propose edits. This aligns with Wikipedia’s rules.

Wikipedia’s conflict of interest (COI) guidelines reads: “Editors with a COI, including paid editors, are expected to disclose it whenever they seek to change an affected article’s content. Anyone editing for pay must disclose who is paying them, who the client is, and any other relevant affiliation; this is a requirement of the Wikimedia Foundation. COI editors are strongly discouraged from editing affected articles directly, and can propose changes on article talk pages instead.”

Jones Day uses Fleishman-Hillard, while Sidley Austin worked with Porter Novelli, according to the talk section.

In 2023, an account called FleishmanHillard posted: “I’m proposing the following edits for Fleishman-Hillard on behalf of Jones Day. I’m a paid editor and aware of the COI guidelines...”

The edits sought to expand the ‘notable alumni’ section of Jones Day’s page.

Another Jones Day employee has also publicly requested edits via the talk page, a method that typically avoids negative flags.

A similar request made by an account claiming to be PR company Porter Novelli requested changes on behalf of Sidley Austin.

DLA Piper confirmed it does not use third-party support but monitors its page internally for inaccuracies.

But not all firms are open about their use of paid editors.

Other firms hire nameless editors who do not disclose their paid status, in direct violation of Wikipedia’s rules. This is according to multiple Wikipedia editors interviewed by Law.com who make a living by making covert edits to business pages. One editor specialises in law firm pages.

On condition of anonymity, the law firm editor told Law.com that law firms of all sizes have employed him to make undisclosed edits.

Such edits included inserting words such “elite”, emphasising accolades while de-emphasising or even removing law firm controversies; one editor said he “knows the balance” and can make pages read positively without immediately drawing the attention of other editors.

Simpson Thacher & Bartlett is one such firm that has faced scrutiny for apparent ‘promotional content’; earlier this year, one editor flagged the firm’s page for being “too flowery”. The firm did not respond to a request for comment.

Similarly, a line describing Quinn Emanuel as “the world’s most prestigious and selective dispute resolution law firm” was removed in 2020, with the editor noting it was unfounded and appeared to have been added by someone at the firm.

‘Vandalism’

The reasons for needing a Wikipedia strategy are evidenced in many examples.

In 2024, one anonymised editor, ‘Sltqrs24’, made changes to Slaughter and May’s page, claiming the firm’s position in the ‘magic circle’ is “disputed”, suggesting it was better described as a ‘silver circle’ firm, adding that the firm’s profit per equity partner had stagnated.

Another editor reversed these changes, suggesting the page had been deliberately made to look worse in favour of its competitors.

They commented on the page’s ‘talk’ section: “Removal of assertions on undisclosed figures. Removal of misrepresentation of source material. Same editor also went on to Linklaters page and changed its description to as being one of ‘four’ rather than ‘five’ magic circle firms. Therefore, user bizarrely trying to re-write the page to recast perceptions in Linklaters’ favour.”

Another account went further, describing these edits as “clear vandalism”.

Controversies Removed

Being an independent and objective source of information, Wikipedia pages are designed to include positive, neutral and negative details on firms.

Womble Bond Dickinson’s page, for instance, contains several details on controversies linked to the firm, including details of negligence, furlough payment disputes, sexual harassment allegations, and references to the Horizon scandal.

This stands in sharp contrast to other firms, where controversies have been erased or diluted.

For example, a 2018 scandal involving a former Latham & Watkins partner has been removed from the firm’s page. The matter concerns ex-partner William Voge, who was alleged to have been involved in a ‘sexting’ controversy that led to his resignation.

Reference to the scandal was removed from the firm’s page in 2021 by an account that was created on in August of that year. This account has only ever made changes to the Latham & Watkins

Wikipedia page, and all of the changes were made on the day of account creation.

The identity of the editor is unknown. The firm did not respond to a request for comment by the time of publication.

Similarly, the controversy surrounding former Freshfields partner Ryan Beckwith has also been erased. An editor requested its removal because Beckwith “was exonerated by the High Court, so no reason to include this, particularly not in this great detail”.

But sometime controversies are left untouched. For instance, Dechert’s Wikipedia page has references to the scandal involving ex-partner Neil Gerrard.

Trump-Related Edits

Law firms with connections to U.S. President Donald Trump or his executive orders often show evidence of this on their Wikipedia pages.

The page for Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, for example, became a hive of activity following the firm’s deal with Trump. The deal sparked back and forth editing from a plethora of independent editors over whether the content was presented objectively or veered into opinion.

In contrast, the Wikipedia page for Milbank, which was one of the firms to make a deal with the U.S. president, has seen all mentions of Trump scrubbed.

On April 23, 2025, an account deleted the information, and it has not been restored since. The firm did not provide a comment by the time of publication.

Because law firms are so deeply enmeshed in politics, particularly around Trump this year, these edits highlight why their Wikipedia entries are vulnerable to political disputes and why firms may want to monitor how they are portrayed.

This vulnerability has attracted the attention of activist groups.

In April, for example, a group of Harvard Law School students organised a Wikipedia ‘edit-a-thon’ focused on Big Law. Their goal was to add information about controversial cases firms might prefer to downplay and to adjust descriptions of campus protests, removing references to antisemitism to create more “neutral” language.

Almost immediately, other editors began reversing those changes, creating a tug-of-war over how the firms should be represented.

Whatever the motivations of the participants, the episode illustrates how contested and politicized Big Law’s online reputations have become—and why law firms might wish they had greater control over their Wikipedia presence.

@ Molly G Smith can be reached at msSmith@alm.com.

Summer

« *Continued from page 3*
gaps in objectants’ potential proof at trial.

Indeed, the court concluded that even if petitioner had satisfied her initial burden on the motion, the objectants’ submissions in opposition to the motion raised triable issues of fact precluding summary judgment. *In re Rodriguez*, 2025 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 3511 (4th Dept 2025).

Accounting Objections Dismissed

Before the Surrogate’s Court, New York County, in *In re Estate of Rockefeller*, was a contested second intermediate accounting by JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A., as trustee of the inter vivos trust created by John D. Rockefeller for the benefit of his granddaughter. The terms of the subject trust

records from 1962 to 1998, which documented the transactions that occurred during that period and which the trustee used to prepare that portion of its accounting. It was then incumbent upon the objectant to demonstrate that the account was inaccurate and incomplete.

With respect to the record-keeping of the trustee, the court noted that the objectant’s claims were two-fold: first, that the trustee did not generate or maintain accurate, contemporaneous records explaining the sale of the oil stocks, and the subsequent purchase of companies that represented a broader pool of industries; and second, that the records produced by the trustee did not establish the accuracy of the account.

As to the first claim, the court opined that a trustee has a duty to keep records of receipts, payments and other transactions, and that if it failed to do so, all presumptions would be resolved against it.

As to the first claim, the court opined that a trustee has a duty to keep records of receipts, payments and other transactions, and that if it failed to do so, all presumptions would be resolved against it.

directed, *inter alia*, that income be accumulated for the benefit of the granddaughter until she attained the age of twenty-one, at which time, it was to be paid to her for life, together with so much of the principal of the trust as the trustee in the exercise of its discretion determined. At its inception, the trust principal was valued at \$100,000, and consisted principally of investments in oil stocks.

The intermediate accounting, which covered the period March 9, 1962 to June 30, 2012, reflected principal growth of approximately \$2 million, income distributions to the granddaughter of over \$1.6 million, and payment of administration expenses and taxes of about \$1 million.

The granddaughter filed objections to the accounting alleging that the trustee failed to keep adequate records of its stewardship, breached its duty of investment prudence, and breached its duty of loyalty by engaging in self-dealing.

At the trial of the matter, the court found that the trustee had established the accuracy of its account by submitting its account and supporting affidavit, the trust file, which included the trustee’s investment diary and transaction

Considered in this context, the court held that the trustee’s record-keeping was not deficient by industry standards, and that the detailed documentation the objectant claimed was lacking was not required to be generated as part of the trust administration process.

Further, although the objectant claimed, and the court noted, certain inaccuracies in the trustee’s records, the court concluded that the irregularities, of which there were very few over a period of many years, were minor and inconsequential, particularly in view of the fact that the trust file was maintained with documents prepared manually prior to computerization of the trustee’s records. Accordingly, the court dismissed the objections related to the records maintained by the trustee.

Additionally, the court found that the objectant had failed to substantiate her claims as to the inaccuracy of the trustee’s account, and the objections on this basis were also dismissed.

Turning to the objections addressed to the investment of trust assets, the objectant alleged that the sale of the oil stocks and investment of the proceeds in various companies was unjustifiable on

the grounds, *inter alia*, that the oil stocks were performing well and were forecast to continue to do so, the companies were riskier investments than the oil stocks, the sale and reinvestment resulted in an immediate decrease in income and principal, and the sales resulted in the trust incurring unnecessary capital gains tax.

Further, the objectant claimed that the sale of the oil stocks contravened the terms of the trust instrument, which allowed the trustee to retain the oil stocks and/or to distribute them in kind.

In addressing these objections, the court found that under all three of the standards governing investment practices during the 50 year accounting period, the test for assessing the trustee’s conduct was prudence not performance.

The court further found that prior to the Prudent Investor Act, diversification was not mandated, but encouraged. Considering the record within this framework, the court noted that the trustee had begun to diversify the trust’s holdings in 1967, and continued thereafter to do so over a period of many years, based on the trustee’s assessment that diversification would mitigate the risk of loss inherent in a portfolio consisting almost entirely of two stocks in the same industry.

Although objectant’s expert testified that diversification was not required, the court found the testimony of the trustee’s witnesses convincingly countered that of the objectant’s expert.

In view of the testimony and documentary evidence on this issue, the court concluded that the objectant had failed to meet her burden of establishing that the trustee had invested imprudently, and therefore, dismissed the objections regarding this issue.

Finally, the court found that the objectant’s allegations of self-dealing were unsupported by the evidence.

The court found nothing in the record that supported the objectant’s assertion that the trustee sold the oil stocks and invested in the companies for its own commercial purposes. Rather, the court held that the record and credible testimony established that the trustee simply acted to diversify the trust assets to protect the beneficiaries.

Accordingly, the objections on the issue of self-dealing were dismissed, and the trustee was directed to settle its decree. *In re Estate of Rockefeller*, 2025 NYLJ LEXIS 2241 (Sur. Ct. New York County 2025).

Shadow AI

« *Continued from page 4*
shadows and into a managed framework. This requires a deliberate approach to integrate AI oversight into broader risk and compliance programs.

The first priority is visibility. Legal, IT, and compliance teams should collaborate on mapping

acceptable experimentation and high-risk behavior.

From there, organizations can establish practical guardrails including clear policies on permissible use, employee training on risks in straightforward language, and introduction of approved, secure AI platforms to replace unvetted tools. Policies alone are insufficient; employees need both guidance and safe alternatives.

improvement rather than static, onetime compliance.

Building Resilience in the AI Era

Shadow AI is not a fleeting trend. It reflects a broader reality that employees eager for efficiency will adopt technologies faster than organizations can regulate them. For legal leaders, the goal must be to transform this challenge into an opportunity: leverage AI’s benefits responsibly while demonstrating the foresight and discipline clients, boards, and regulators expect.

The path forward rests on vigilance, transparency, and adaptability. By identifying risks early, embedding governance into existing compliance structures, and communicating expectations clearly, legal leaders reduce risk exposure while encouraging responsible innovation. With this, they not only protect their organizations from immediate threats but also set the tone for an AI-driven future.

In an environment where technology advances faster than regulation, clarity and oversight are the best tools for resilience. By taming shadow AI today, legal leaders prepare to navigate tomorrow’s uncertainties with confidence.

Shadow AI refers to using generative AI tools and models outside the visibility or approval of an organization’s governance framework. Employees may reach for these tools out of convenience—such as asking a chatbot to draft contracts—but without oversight, what feels like efficiency can quickly become a compliance nightmare.

current AI usage, combining employee surveys with technical monitoring to understand how AI tools are being used. Transparency provides the foundation for effective governance.

The second is risk assessment. Each identified use case should be examined against criteria such as data sensitivity, jurisdictional implications, privilege concerns, fundamental rights and contractual obligations to distinguish between

Equally important is the creation of governance structures that evolve with technology. Cross-functional committees encompassing legal, IT, cybersecurity, and business representatives should regularly revisit policies, adjust controls based on regulatory changes, and ensure the organization’s approach balances innovation with accountability. This governance model should emphasize continuous

respondent took full responsibility for his misconduct and acknowledged he should have taken steps to ensure that the fiduciary funds in the escrow account were protected.

Findings and Conclusion

In view of the evidence adduced at the hearing and the respondent’s admissions, we find that the Special Referee properly sustained both charges. Accordingly, the Grievance Committee’s motion to confirm the Special Referee’s report is granted. In determining an appropriate measure of discipline, we have considered in mitigation, *inter alia*, the respondent’s extensive pro bono work,

the evidence of his positive character, his expressed remorse for his misconduct, his lack of venal intent as the initial shortage was caused by a bank error, and the remedial measures implemented to properly maintain the escrow account. Notwithstanding the mitigation advanced, we find that the respondent failed to honor his obligations as a fiduciary.

Under the totality of the circumstances, we find that the respondent’s conduct warrants a public censure.

All concur.

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

Bains

« *Continued from page 3*
and Nassau County. He also represents victims of domestic violence in both criminal court and family court and performs some landlord/tenant work. He is the general counsel for an organization called United Sikhs. One character witness was called to testify in mitigation and the respondent provided eight character affidavits in support of his good character and reputation.

The Special Referee’s Report

In a report dated May 23, 2024, the Special Referee sustained both charges and found that the



Don’t just settle for the most visibility.

Get the right visibility.

Lawjobs.com Advantage

The Lawjobs.com global network reaches attorneys, paralegals, business development executives, and legal professionals thousands of times a day, including 99% of the NLJ 250.

Experience the new Lawjobs.com today.

LAWJOBS.COM

When results matter

Off the Front

ACS

« Continued from page 1

total number and type of removals sought by ACS, along with the number of removals, broken down by whether they were approved by a judge.

It also asked for the length of time children were in ACS' custody before they were returned to their parents, the race of the children removed, broken down by the type of allegation, and whether it was flagged for review by the agency's "Instant Response Team."

The law center said that after a substantial delay and its filing an appeal, it received a limited spreadsheet providing the number of children removed, by borough, but not broken down based on each statutory provision, as requested. It also received data about children for whom ACS sought a remand, the lawsuit said.

In May, ACS's records appeal officer, attorney Joseph Cardieri, determined that it couldn't provide much of the information because the agency stopped conducting removals with consent prior to the timeframe of the FOIL request, according to its letter, an exhibit in the lawsuit.

The appeals officer wrote that a "diligent search" didn't locate memos, reports and documents,

and that the agency never collected or culled child separations by ZIP code, and doing so would require involving myriad steps that would require a change of the baseline data in a manner not yet undertaken and not required by law.

Also, new computer code would have to be written for much of the information, including a cross-check of race and allegations, and it would be difficult to match race and allegations to removal events for a child, especially if there were multiple investigations or removals, the denial letter stated.

Raw data can't be produced, Cardieri added, because it would require analysis and individual decoding from 3,300 fields of information.

An ACS spokesperson said Friday the agency "strongly believes in transparency and regularly publicizes data related to a variety of performance indicators, including data related to removals made after finding children at imminent risk of harm, broken down by race, ethnicity, and geography."

ACS produces monthly data reports that are posted online, as well as numerous additional reports published online, including one focused on the demographics of families at various stages in the child welfare system.

When the statewide register of child abuse accepts a report

alleging abuse or neglect, ACS is required to respond—and the agency has made progress in reducing the number of families experiencing court involvement and/or removal, the spokesperson said.

Those reports show that abuse and neglect filings have decreased 43%, from 6,202 to 3,461, from 2019 to 2024. They also say the number of children with placements into foster care declined 24% from 3144 in 2019 to 2400 in 2024.

"As the data show, ACS is both diligently carrying out our vital work to keep children safe and making significant progress reducing the number of families experiencing court involvement and separation," the spokesperson said.

Anna Belle Newport, an attorney at the Family Justice Law Center, said in a statement, "The claim that ACS has no documents on its removal practices is incompatible with the pervasive nature of family separations in New York City and indicates that the agency either failed to conduct a diligent search for documents—a basic requirement of the Freedom of Information Law—or improperly withheld important information on how the agency separates families."

📧 Brian Lee can be reached at blee@alm.com.

Adams

« Continued from page 1

the department to retaliate against perceived enemies.

His complaint, which sought federal mentorship of the NYPD, was filed shortly after four other former chiefs alleged similar behavior in other lawsuits.

Adams, who was indicted in a since-dismissed federal public corruption case last year, has denied the claims. The motion to dismiss characterizes the allegations not as causes of action but "personal gripes."

"Plaintiff grouches in his 1,340 plus-paragraph complaint that he was 'disheartened,...'disturbed,'... and 'frustrated,'" the filing observed. He spends eleven paragraphs noting his embarrassment...and six times references his feelings of humiliation.

"Notably, plaintiff's embarrassment and humiliation are not grounds for any of plaintiff's

claims, but may reflect plaintiff's brief, ineffective tenure as Interim Police Commissioner," Eichenholtz wrote.

Donlon's lawyer, John Scola, said his client's allegations "are detailed and specific—exactly what the law requires."

"The City's motion to dismiss is nothing more than a delay tactic designed to shield the public from the truth and protect those in power," Scola added. "Our case will ensure the facts see the light of day."

Donlon, who previously worked at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, departed his role as interim commissioner after his home was raided by federal law enforcement seeking materials he said he obtained decades ago and were unrelated to his work at the NYPD.

Adams' attorney alleged that, in addition to being false, the lawsuit violated Rule 8(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which instructs that complaints be "short and plain."

"Even after amendment, the complaint here is a morass of over 240 pages and 1,375 paragraphs of allegations that are riddled with contradictions, repetition and indecipherable and incomprehensible allegations all while devoting scores of pages to matters unrelated to this case," the defendants argued. "Plaintiff's attempts to connect these digressions to the central allegations of his claims are, quite charitably, a histrionic stretch."

Therefore, the suit should be dismissed for failing to comply with Rule 8, defendants said.

Counsel argued the complaint also failed to state claims under the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Practices Act, failed to legally assert substantive claims, and failed to establish plausible claims.

The case is before U.S. District Judge Jennifer Rearden of the Southern District of New York.

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

Noncompetes

« Continued from page 1

of the commission's power.

That does not mean that employers can ignore the threat of enforcement over noncompetes, however. In February, Ferguson launched a task force within the FTC on labor market issues, specifically calling out noncompetes, along with other restrictions like no-poaching agreements between competitors, as a threat to the fairness of the labor market.

Tobias Schlueter, managing shareholder of Ogletree Deakins' Chicago office, said Ferguson's position "matches the populist views of Vice President JD Vance" on the issue. He said that while Ferguson does not believe that a rule is the right vehicle to go after unfair noncompetes, the commission will look for others.

"Part of what this task force is going to do is figure out what the weapons are," Schlueter said.

One clue to the agency's approach may be in a new complaint and consent decree announced Thursday targeting Gateway Services, a pet cremation company. The FTC brought the case under Section 5 of the FTC

Act, which gives it broad authority to go after anticompetitive conduct, and accused the company of illegally preventing nearly all of its employees from working in the pet cremation industry for a year after leaving.

Under the consent decree, Gateway Services has agreed to end the noncompetes for about 1,800 employees.

Lawrence Pockers, co-chair of Duane Morris' noncompete and trade secrets practice, said the case showed two practices that might draw the current FTC's ire: noncompetes that target low-wage earners, and "one size fits all" noncompetes that apply to almost everyone at all levels of a company.

Pockers said the approach will likely become clearer as the agency pursued more cases.

"The last word has not been written," he said.

Employers must also be mindful of growing state regulation of noncompetes. Currently, California, North Dakota, Minnesota and Oklahoma essentially ban noncompetes, while 34 other states and the District of Columbia have laws restricting their use to some degree, according to the Economic Innovation Group, a research organization.

Restrictions commonly set income thresholds below which noncompetes are presumed invalid. Many states also specifically target noncompetes for doctors or other health care professionals, regardless of pay.

Several states, including Virginia and Wyoming, have passed new restrictions in the last year, while others, including New York, are weighing them. On the other hand, Florida recently passed a law making many noncompetes presumptively enforceable, potentially making it easier for employers to use them there.

Companies with multi-state workforces have sometimes sought to bolster noncompetes with choice-of-law contracts that send disputes to states with favorable laws. But that approach carries risk, as some states prohibit such provisions, and courts may not view them favorably even if they are not explicitly banned.

"Employers just need to continue to be thoughtful and mindful," Schlueter said of the evolving legal landscape. "There is a place [for noncompetes] but it isn't a one-size-fits-all."

📧 Sulaiman Abdur-Rahman can be reached at sabdurr@alm.com.

Court Calendars

First Department

APPELLATE DIVISION

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, J.J.

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

10 A.M.

65477/424 Hage v. Simmons

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

9 A.M.

28519/20 Perez v. Tanya Towers, Inc.

10 A.M.

65227/522 SL 4000 Connecticut v. CBRE

11 A.M.

303881/10 Fernandez v. Pichardo

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

2 P.M.

151987/23 Rivas v. Carrasco

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

1 P.M.

28283/19 Pitang v. Underbruckner Realty Co.

MONDAY, SEPT. 15

9:30 A.M.

808881/24 Valerio v. Perez

TUESDAY, SEPT. 16

11:30 A.M.

817949/24 Hudson v. Metropolitan Transportation Authority

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

10 A.M.

652857/24 BH EJ Core v. Core Global Holdings

FRIDAY, SEPT. 26

11 A.M.

150359/25 Feigen v. Hamill

WEDNESDAY, OCT. 8

10 A.M.

656443/22 Bank of Utah v. Aboughazale

652387/22 Board of Managers v. World-Wide Holdings

FRIDAY, OCT. 24

9:30 A.M.

153055/23 McGeehan v. 14th Street HK Realty

CALENDAR FOR THE SEPTEMBER TERM

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

2 P.M.

21/2877 People v. Creig Bleyden

25/295 Hart v. Cappa

25/511 J., Darren v. Sandra R.

23/1932 People v. Lamont Hood

25/5068 People v. Charles Johnson

24/743(2) Cohen v. Cohen

23/1915 Barone v. Barone

24/3131 Smith v. Global Contact

24/468 People v. Audwin Dubose Jr.

24/208 People v. Alexis Flores

24/639 Macklowe Investment v. MIP 57th Dev.

25/1109 K., Cherie

24/5224 Moises-Ortiz v. FDB

24/6264 Henick-Lane, Inc. v. Stellar Management

18/467 People v. Rahim Ali

24/548 Sanchez v. NYC Medical Practice

24/1245 Stallard v. NYC Police Department

24/524 Britt v. MTA

24/5365 People v. Ignacio Vasquez

22/4656 People v. Zachary Louissant

24/449N Valley National Bank v. 252 W. 31 St. Corp.

24/2059N Aguilera v. City of NY

24/675N Norguard Insurance v. 140 W. 28 Owner

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

2 P.M.

17/2377 People v. Christian Jachero

24/3260 KD-1 Doe v. MC-Doe

24/4579 D., Shainiska v. Gage D.

24/4364 People v. Travis Glasgow

23/5557 People v. Ruben Flores

24/7333 21st Mortgage Corp. v. Lin

24/3992 Brewster v. Hunter

24/4074 State of NY v. Juan P.

24/4735 Yang v. Griffin

22/3304 People v. Augusto Scott

24/3082 People v. Jateise Leak

24/7637 Apex Funding v. Blue Earth Resources

24/6288 C., Damien v. Melissa S.

21/246 People v. Duntrell Calderon

25/404 Zain v. Isaacson

24/3868 Johnson v. Northeast Agencies

25/1514 Stikeman Elliott LLP v. OI Private Counsel

24/5978 Samsung Electronics v. MPEG LA

23/2650 People v. Jose Alvarado

18/5103 People v. Alfred McCrae

25/161N Voorham v. Hicks-Voorham

24/4931N Barger v. Malkin

24/5483(3)N NewRez v. Morton

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

2 P.M.

23/3868 People v. Justin JeanBaptiste

25/1830 2814 Morris v. Ortega

24/4069 R., Serenity

25/747 WarnerMedia Direct v. Paramount Global

24/6470 Ramos v. Ford Foundation

25/127 Rodriguez v. FGI Corporation

22/5518 People v. Chevanie Gordon

24/3861 Costanzo v. Am. Academy of Dramatic Arts

24/483 People v. Kyle Hardison

25/912(2) Halgene Watch v. Alex Capital Fund

24/3308 Vazquez v. NYS Office of Children

25/999D., Sandy v. Luis G.

23/1916 People v. Isaiah Rivera

19/849 People v. Michael McNeil

24/2499 People v. Amaury Balbi

23/2035 People v. Christopher Maldonado

17/2821 Etrade Bank v. DelValle

24/1354 Glenmede Trust v. Infinitly Q Capital

24/3393 People v. Rafael Carrasquillo

25/834 Beals v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese

25/3424N Bodenchak v. 5178 Holdings

24/5447N Cani v. NYC Health and Hospitals

25/1856N NY Life Insurance v. Hancock Life Insurance

TUESDAY, SEPT. 16

2 P.M.

18/4169 People v. Reynaldo Andino

24/2801 Solis v. City of NY

24/7379 B., Christine v. Antonio G.

24/7203 Sanchez v. 1562 Thierot Ave

24/5008 Justien Farel, LLC v. Stove Properties

24/6181(1) People v. Jeremiah Martinez

24/6135(1) People v. Jeremiah Martinez

22/2962 People v. Brandon Holley

24/6287 White v. Turitz

22/4917 People v. Melissa Concepcion

23/3553 People v. Franklin Cabrera-Fernandez

24/6313 383 W. Broadway Corp. v. Tax Commission

24/3063(2) 383 W. Broadway Corp. v. Solomon

25/1239 Dorilton Capital Management v. Stilus LLC

24/565 People v. Peter Showers

21/3101 People v. Precila Smith

25/1064(1)N Phillips v. Uber Technologies

24/3607(1)N Phillips v. Uber Technologies

24/110N Board of Managers v. 16EF Apartment

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

2 P.M.

19/5343(1) People v. Brahima Djalo

24/5369 Spring Scaffolding v. Krall

25/1203(1) W., Duaxni v. Duanying

24/6088 Ahsanuddin v. Addo

25/1604(2) 437 West 36th Street v. ZDJ W 37 LLC

24/5425(2) Rosenblum v. Treitler

23/6436(1) People v. Anthony Balaguer

23/6439(1) People v. Anthony Balaguer

24/2157(2) Cuomo v. Jams, Inc.

25/2569 Mirza v. College of Mount Saint Vincent

24/5122 Eisner v. Posilloic Civil

25/3792 K., Dorell v. Dalece L.

24/1428 People v. Steven McEnaney

20/2163 People v. Jose Matias

24/4653 Emissions Reduction v. MCloud Technologies

24/6476 McGrane-Mungo v. Dag Hammarskjöld Tower

24/4577 Dluzen v. Equinox Group

19/4665 People v. Cristian Compres-Moreno

24/1718 People v. Josian Normil

24/4821 People v. Joel R.

24/5468N Commonwealth Land v. Sky Abstract

24/684N Naramore v. Mount Sinai McGrier

25/3052N Owens v. MTA

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18

2 P.M.

24/1981 People v. Choncey Chance

25/1288 Nirui v. WV Preservation

24/5408 M., Peter v. Fezekza G.

24/5202 Ovalle v. Church Street Construction

24/4715 Pallero v. Romero

23/2655(1) People v. Andre Morris

23/2690(1) People v. Andre Morris

25/798 ARC NYWWPJ001 v. WWP JV

24/3218 Murillo v. Downtown NYC Owner

20/1196 People v. Derrick Harris

25/7 A., Emmanuel v. Evelyn G.

24/4317(2) Gedula 26 v. Lightstone Acquisitions

24/3145 Bank NY Mellon v. Kim

24/7555 Brevet Direct Lending v. Aprio LLP

22/5204 People v. Alvin Brown

22/4915 People v. Norman Croney

23/6788 413 East 187 Holdings v. NYC Dept of Housing

24/3203 Black v. City of NY

23/1032(1) People v. Markuise McGrier

23/2676 People v. Junior Zorrilla

24/460N Shanghai Yongrun Investment v. Kashi Galaxi

25/378(3)

24/6570 Diaz v. New Water Street (NY 157308/2019)
24/5765 DLJ Mortgage Capital v. Adler (NY 850324/2018)
24/6062 Docu v. Imperial (BX 818878/2023)
24/2724 Doe v. Yeshiva University (NY 951363/2021)
24/5303N Doe v. Matta (NY 161657/2023)
24/3052 Doe v. Metropolitan Dental (NY 952062/2023)
24/4518 Dorville v. Structure Tone (NY 154832/2017)
24/7390E, Children (BX V31388/2023)
24/6468E, Ilenox (NY N627/2023)
24/4433N Edward Tyler Nahem Fine Art v. Lee (NY 653982/2023)
24/5085N Edward Tyler Nahem Fine Art v. Lee (NY 653982/2023)
24/5086 Edward Tyler Nahem Fine Art v. Lee (NY 653982/2023)
25/6678 Eiland v. Adams (NY 101111/2024)
25/1400 Ellen's Stardust v. Sturm (NY 651690/2021)
24/4091 Ellerbee v. 61 W. 62 Owners (NY 150003/2013)
25/3633N EPAC Technologies v. Interforum (NY 652032/2021)
24/4742 Epps v. Barfield Realty Corp (BX 24205/2023)
25/2269 Espinal v. City of NY (NY 157193/2024)
24/7087 Etage Real Estate v. Stern (NY 653522/2019)
24/7311N Etage Real Estate v. Stern (NY 653522/2019)
24/4189F, Michayla (NY B4618/2021)
25/2565 F. Regla v. Dustin F. (NY 02238/2019)
25/2566 F. Regla v. Dustin F. (NY V1883/2025)
25/2482 Famula v. Kiewit-Weeks-Massman, A JV (BX 31087/2018)
24/4801 Feliciano v. Caban (NY 151251/2024)
24/6610 Felipe v. City of NY (NY 151388/2021)
25/3351 Fifth Partners v. Foley (NY 161105/2021)
24/6421 Fiondella v. 345 West 70th Tenants (NY 656664/2019)
25/349 Flejext, LLC v. Honeywell International (NY 651078/2023)
24/5361 Flores v. California Fruit 183 (NY 153372/2019)
24/5700 Flores-Grgas v. NYS Office of Children (NY 100007/2024)
24/5599 Foran v. Hewitt School (NY 159931/2017)
24/5706 Forster v. Bejjani (NY 3663/2009)
23/4560 Forster v. Bejjani (NY 3663/2009)
24/2919 Forster v. Bejjani (NY 3663/2009)
24/5961 Franco v. 520 Broadway Company (NY 152467/2018)
24/6799 Francois v. Lamburt (NY 500746/2023)
24/3531 Friedman v. Garnet Wines (NY 155385/2021)
24/4456 Funtl v. Andrews (NY 365586/2021)
24/2062 G. Aaliyah (BX G24377/2022)
23/6751 J.G.R., Children (BX N19245/2023)
25/918 Gamble v. MTA Bus Company (BX 801074/2024)
24/4737 Garanes v. NYC Department of Education (NY 100425/2023)
24/4495 Garcia v. 100 Church Fee Owner (NY 158554/2018)
24/3967 Garcia v. Citymeals-on-Wheels (NY 160938/2016)
24/1294 Gelwan v. De Ratafia (NY 654525/2016)
23/403 Gelwan v. De Ratafia (NY 654525/2016)
23/2464(2) Genna v. Klempner (NY 100530/2021)
24/6273 Georgia Malone & Co. v. E. & M Associates (NY 150660/2014)
24/5316(4) Georgia Malone & Company v. E. & M Associates (NY 150660/2014)
24/1882 Giangrande v. Gracie Gardens Owners (NY 160533/2022)
24/2820 Glenmede Trust v. Infinity Q Capital (NY 160830/2022)
24/4534 GNHC 1703-518 v. Venari Partners (NY 651347/2022)
25/178 Godfrey-Peters v. Dangelo (BX 800050/2024)
24/6360 Goldman v. Icaro Media (NY 151939/2024)
23/4921 Gomes v. Roux (NY 311028/2015)
24/5476 Gomez v. NYC Department of Buildings (BX 812309/2023)
24/2392 Gonzalez v. Deloizzo (BX 815077/2021)
24/4461 Gordon v. Peck (NY 652453/2023)
23/5771 Graves v. Brookdale University Hospital (BX 306857/2008)
24/2569 Greathouse v. Feldon (NY 655307/2023)
24/319 Green v. Whole Foods Market (NY 155089/2020)
24/5167 Greenland Asset v. Microcloud Hologram (NY 651701/2023)
24/319 Greenman v. Miller (NY 650304/2021)
24/5471 Greenwood Mews v. Liberty Insurance (NY 652364/2018)
24/1133 GT Securities v. Nurture Life (NY 652875/2019)
24/3069 Guo v. Henry (NY 101237/2023)
24/5104 Guzman v. 240 West 44th Street Two (NY 157343/2018)
23/866H, Aldin v. ACS (BX V2957/2021)
25/119H, Alisa v. Ayana B. (NY V3085/2021)
25/0125H, Geannette v. John H. (BX V32464/2017)
25/1238H, Yorbis (BX D10841/2024)
24/2800 Hamilton v. City of NY (NY 162136/2018)
25/1643 Hanslick v. UG2 (NY 156052/2022)
25/566 Haque v. T & S Interiors Corp. (NY 654064/2024)
24/720 Health East Ambulatory v. Country-Wide Insurance (NY 570101/2024)
24/6949 Healy v. Kruger (NY 656130/2020)
23/5020 Healy v. Trinity Hudson (NY 155818/2020)
25/1781 Hemingway Group v. 180 Group (NY 656856/2022)
25/1054 Henriquez v. City of NY (NY 160044/2023)
24/5472N Henry v. TAO Group (NY 154747/2018)
24/6498 Hereford Insurance v. 21 Century (NY 150314/2022)
24/2559 Herman v. Judlau Contracting (NY 652249/2016)
24/5196 Hidalgo v. Hodge (NY 157648/2021)
24/1885 Hinkson v. NY Presbyterian (NY 153104/2018)
25/1985HNA Holdings v. TSCE 2007 (NY 651573/2020)
25/1358Holiield v. XRI Investment Holdings (NY 655468/2023)
24/2455 Holness v. Gold Crest (BX 804137/2022)
24/2127(2) HSBC Bank v. Wu (NY 850209/2016)
24/4145 Hudson Vey v. Peleus Insurance (NY 656162/2021)
25/376 Hunold v. City of NY (NY 156864/2023)
25/28141Cahn Partners LP v. Alliancebernstein L.P. (NY 155879/2024)
24/5173 Ichapanta v. East Side Home Stead (BX 812540/2021)
24/7468 In the Matter of Estate of Kendall Granville Chen (NY 3902/2018)
24/7464 InkMango, Inc. v. Warren (NY 152802/2020)
25/73 Innovative Securities v. OBEX Securities (NY 650665/2023)
24/6358 Iroha Corporation v. Kookmin Best Insurance (NY 650880/2018)

24/6530 Itzhak v. Briarwood Insurance (NY 651193/2024)
24/5655 Izquierdo v. Amsterdam Avenue Redevelopment (NY 159051/2018)
25/2351 J. F. v. Archdiocese of NY (NY 950249/2019)
24/6783N J.C., an infant v. 2078 Arthur (BX 810563/2021)
24/1845 Jackson v. Law Offices of Peter Sverd (NY 153586/2023)
24/5661 Jane Doe One v. KIPP Academy (BX 70424/2021)
24/4312 Jennings v. City of NY (NY 159776/2017)
24/6590 Jones v. Marshalls (BX 24115/2019)
24/2979 Jones Law Firm v. J. Synergy (NY 653730/2023)
24/6361 Judlau Contracting v. City of NY (NY 653528/2022)
24/3617 Judson Realty v. Judson CRE (NY 159388/2020)
24/4398 Justicebacker, Inc. v. Abeles (NY 650374/2019)
24/7944 K., Hind v. Faycal T. (NY V6164/2019)
24/7683 K., Peter v. Mayumi M. (NY V5183/2023)
24/6224 Kapituss Servicing v. Suburban Waste Services (NY 653525/2022)
25/3545 Kapituss Servicing, Inc. v. Ragtime Gourmet Corp. (NY 653529/2022)
25/199 Kassai v. Trump Management (NY 161322/2018)
24/7311N Katz-Wisnudet v. Lower Manhattan Dialysis (NY 155252/2021)
25/2079 Keenan v. Bloomberg L.P. (NY 155679/2024)
24/6015 Kelemen v. Duplication Services (NY 160226/2017)
24/3066 Kimmelman v. Smith (NY 805150/2019)
24/4152 Kohl v. Memorial Sloan Kettering (NY 101008/2020)
24/356(2) Kohli v. Tewari (NY 365297/2021)
24/4765(2) Kohli v. Tewari (NY 365297/2021)
24/7361 Korpen LLC v. One Penn Plaza (NY 651615/2023)
25/1279 Kozeli v. Renali Realty (BX 26198/2020)
25/4511N Larue v. 1201-31 Lafayette (BX 812053/2023)
25/362(2) Lash v. Modulaire Holdings (NY 655935/2023)
25/840 Lava Media v. Hart (NY 651055/2023)
24/7200 Law Firm of Jennifer Zuch v. Lemus (NY 656077/2023)
24/2963 Law Office of Cyrus Joubin v. Manhattan District Attorney (NY 158168/2023)
25/2994 Lebda v. Touro College School (NY 101271/2024)
24/4532 Lee v. Lee (NY 365055/2018)
24/1665N Lee v. Nejat (NY 800296/2011)
24/3818 Lee v. Zeitlin (NY 654395/2020)
25/1461 Lema v. 1148 Corporation (NY 450904/2018)
23/6567N Leslie Digital Imaging v. Empower Information (NY 652634/2022)
24/6130N Leslie J. Garfield & Co. v. Evans (NY 651854/2021)
25/2403 Liberty Mobility v. Port Authority of NY (NY 151814/2024)
25/995N Lituma v. Liberty Coca-Cola (BX 33275/2020)
24/3189 Lotrean v. 3M Company (NY 153361/2020)
25/715 Lovett v. 2600 Seventh Avenue (NY 100515/2024)
25/1508 Lutfieva v. Services for the Aged (NY 161213/2023)
24/4015 M., Bryanna v. ACS (NY V510/2023)
25/4319 M., Damineh v. Bedouin J. (NY O3089/2020)
25/360 M., Ildefonso v. Ildefonso M. (NY O5622/2021)
24/7874 M., Jerrell (BX D33064/2023)
24/3499 M., Mayra v. Raoul G. (NY O500/2023)
24/5109 M., Michelle v. Cantabile J. (BX F1713/2022)
25/1784 M., Mylah (NY N1571/2025)
24/6582 M., Rafael v. Kimberly T. (BX T2034/2020)
24/6900 M., Rajah v. Said B. (NY O6767/2022)
24/7839 M.T., Children (NY O9156/2019)
25/436N Ma v. Wang (NY 655044/2022)
25/3586 Ma v. Wang (NY 655044/2022)
25/2795 Madrid v. Mazur (NY 100881/2020)
24/1758 Malave v. Kini (NY 804556/2017)
25/1984N Malekan v. Malekan (NY 652507/2023)
25/514 Mancilla & Fantone v. Liu (NY 450521/2024)
24/5068 Manhattan Organization v. City of NY (NY 151940/2024)
24/7045 Manta v. Hofstra University (NY 157061/2021)
24/1643 Markman v. NY-Presbyterian (BX 20302/2016)
24/4747 Martinez v. Martinez (NY 159286/2021)
24/5955 Mathew v. HFZ Kik 30th Street (NY 161223/2019)
25/3668 McGough v. Phillips & Associates (NY 153216/2024)
25/1240 McGregor v. Manhattan Nursing Home (NY 158715/2021)
22/1003 McLeod v. NYC Health & Hospitals (BX 33513/2019)
24/5854 Medina v. Medina (BX 810353/2023)
24/3816 Meisenberg v. Sky House (NY 152964/2023)
25/222 Mejias v. Basch (BX 81181/2022)
24/4710 Mendez v. City of NY (BX 27362/2020)
25/709N Metropolis Electric Corp. v. Vector Building (NY 155513/2022)
23/732 Miami Firefighters v. Icahn Corp. (NY 657447/2019)
24/1158 Michael Gross Diamonds v. Vakini (NY 651396/2014)
25/4747 Migdale v. Permanent Mission of Uganda (NY 100820/2019)
24/5564 Milchin v. Milchin (NY 305293/2019)
24/6527 Mindley v. State of NY (NY 135007)
24/4279 Moghtadai v. Apis Capital (NY 650287/2020)
25/3017 Molina v. Chatham Towers, Inc. (NY 156785/2021)
24/5803 Molner v. Molner (NY 301261/2012)
24/2789 Moore v. Greystone Properties (NY 154133/2017)
25/1962 Moore v. NJ Transit Corp. (NY 153229/2018)
24/318N Morales v. 58-66 East Fordham (BX 25194/2020)
24/6114 Mt. Hawley Insurance v. Michelle Kuo Corp. (NY 656474/2021)
24/5258 Muce v. City University of NY (BX 818230/2023)
23/6574 Mujal v. Devash LLC (NY 151529/2018)
24/2658 Mulazhdanov v. City of NY (NY 157542/2020)
24/146N Muroff v. Heerdt (NY 80538/2017)
25/3881 Mustafaj v. City of NY (BX 80323/2022)
24/5149 Mycklebeed v. Consolidated Edison (NY 652679/2023)
24/7122 Myers v. Doherty (NY 158850/2022)
23/2698N Myrtle Point v. B3 Ridgewood Holdings (NY 650869/2023)
25/941 Nationstar Mortgage v. O'Connor (BX 35397/2013)
24/4782 Ng v. Figueroa (NY 155023/2018)
25/520 Nicholas Industries v. Nasdi LLC (NY 157677/2018)

COURTNOTES

THE BRONX COUNTY Surrogate Court

Court is Accepting Applications for Deputy Public Administrator

Deadline is Sept. 18

The Bronx County Surrogate, Hon. Nelida-Malave Gonzalez, seeks applicants for the position of Deputy Public Administrator. Under the general supervision of the Public Administrator, the incumbent is responsible for the investigation, documentation, and administration of estates of persons who die intestate in the absence of readily accessible next-of-kin, or estates assigned to the Public Administrator by the Surrogate Court.

Graduation from a college or university with a bachelor's degree and three years of experience in accounting, business management, investments, finance, real estate, law degree or related fields is preferred for candidates applying for the Deputy Public Administrator Position.

Candidates should have knowledge of accounting practices; familiarity with personal assets, methods of determining value, and markets for their disposal, as well as working knowledge of the laws related to the work of the Public Administrator in Bronx County. Incumbent must be bondable.

Interested persons may apply by submitting a cover letter, stating their qualifications and their resume to:

Bronx County Public Administrator, Danielle S. Powell, 851 Grand Concourse, Room 336, Bronx, NY 10451.

Applications must be received no later than September 18, 2025.

Starting salary: \$139,567.00 Per year

An equal opportunity employer

FIRST DEPARTMENT Appellate Term

Posting Dates for the October Term

The October 2025 Term of the Court will commence on Oct. 6.

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 August 12, 2025.

Respondent's Briefs must filed on or before Sept. 4.

Reply Briefs, if any, must be filed on or before Sept. 12.

NEW YORK SUPREME COURT CIVIL TERM

New Judicial Assignments and Reassignments

Hon. Margaret Chan and Hon. Shlomo Hagler have been appointed to the Appellate Division – First Department.

Hon. Denis Reo has been appointed to our court and will oversee Part 65 at 80 Centre Street, Room 307. Justice Reo will assume the inventory of Justice Hagler. Justice Reo's chamber phone number is (646) 274-2610, and part phone number is (646) 386-3887.

Counsel are advised to sign up for the court system's E-Track service. E-Track allows counsel to list with the service some or all the firm's cases pending in the Supreme Court, Civil Branch, New York County, and other counties as well. E-Track provides notification by e-mail of all appearances and

24/1596 Nolan v. State of New York (NY 138961)
25/527 Norris v. Integral Yoga Institute (NY 952220/2023)
25/2936 NYS Division of Human Rights v. Dawn Homes Management (BX 813522/2024)
24/5286 NYS Division of Human Rights v. Engolos LLC (NY 451501/2022)
24/5021 O'Brien v. Tectonic Builders (NY 150670/2019)
24/6858 O'Flaherty v. Columbo (NY 157520/2017)
25/853 Olsahn Frome Wolosky LLP v. Kestenbaum (NY 656174/2023)
25/2895 Olympic Galleria Co. v. Sitt (NY 150391/2021)
24/5046 O'Rear v. Kashanico International (NY 159816/2020)
25/543 Ortiz v. City of NY (BX 21877/2019)
24/7483 Owen v. Johnson (NY 365421/2020)
24/5097 Owens v. New Empire Corp. (NY 654796/2023)
24/5348 Owens v. New Empire Corp. (NY 654796/2023)
24/7851 P., Corby v. Deandra H. (BX V3526/2021)
25/2621 Pacheco v. Catholic Guardian Services (NY 159163/2022)
24/7332 Pacheco v. Georgetown Eleventh (NY 157529/2017)
24/5816 Padilla v. 3521 Dekalb Avenue (BX 312866/2017)
24/3080 Patchell v. Goldman (NY 654533/2021)
25/2624N Panos v. Panos (NY 365148/2021)
25/4729 Paris v. State of NY (NY 137505)
24/4858 Paris v. State of NY (NY 137505)
24/6051 Riederer v. Schulmann Properties (NY 158576/2019)
24/3358 Rivera v. Site 2 DSA Owner (NY 159502/2020)
25/490 Robinson v. Hiatt (NY 151639/2024)
25/160 R. Keira (NY B4648/2021)
24/6089R. Zion (NY N4449/2023)
24/7651 Rahal v. Taormina (NY 365553/2023)
24/5962 Ramirez v. 255 W. 108th Street Corp. (NY 154692/2013)
24/7721 Ramirez v. 79-05/9 Jackson Heights (BX 809408/2021)
24/3492 Ramos v. City of NY (BX 70349/2021)
24/3512 Reclaim the Records v. City of NY (NY 156960/2023)
24/3926 Reyes v. 45 & 47 Wadsworth Ave. (BX 27196/2016)
24/6152 Reyes v. Benton (NY 152207/2022)
24/4858 Riederer v. Schulmann Properties (NY 158576/2019)
24/3358 Rivera v. Site 2 DSA Owner (NY 159502/2020)
25/490 Robinson v. Hiatt (NY 151639/2024)
25/160 R. Keira (NY B4648/2021)
24/6089R. Zion (NY N4449/2023)
24/7651 Rahal v. Taormina (NY 365553/2023)
24/5962 Ramirez v. 255 W. 108th Street Corp. (NY 154692/2013)
24/7721 Ramirez v. 79-05/9 Jackson Heights (BX 809408/2021)
24/3492 Ramos v. City of NY (BX 70349/2021)
24/3512 Reclaim the Records v. City of NY (NY 156960/2023)
24/3926 Reyes v. 45 & 47 Wadsworth Ave. (BX 27196/2016)
24/6152 Reyes v. Benton (NY 152207/2022)
24/4858 Riederer v. Schulmann Properties (NY 158576/2019)
24/3358 Rivera v. Site 2 DSA Owner (NY 159502/2020)
25/490 Robinson v. Hiatt (NY 151639/2024)
25/160 R. Keira (NY B4648/2021)
24/6089R. Zion (NY N4449/2023)
24/7651 Rahal v. Taormina (NY 365553/2023)
24/5962 Ramirez v. 255 W. 108th Street Corp. (NY 154692/2013)
24/7721 Ramirez v. 79-05/9 Jackson Heights (BX 809408/2021)
24/3492 Ramos v. City of NY (BX 70349/2021)
24/3512 Reclaim the Records v. City of NY (NY 156960/2023)
24/3926 Reyes v. 45 & 47 Wadsworth Ave. (BX 27196/2016)
24/6152 Reyes v. Benton (NY 152207/2022)
24/4858 Riederer v. Schulmann Properties (NY 158576/2019)
24/3358 Rivera v. Site 2 DSA Owner (NY 159502/2020)
25/490 Robinson v. Hiatt (NY 151639/2024)
25/160 R. Keira (NY B4648/2021)
24/6089R. Zion (NY N4449/2023)
24/7651 Rahal v. Taormina (NY 365553/2023)
24/5962 Ramirez v. 255 W. 108th Street Corp. (NY 154692/2013)
24/7721 Ramirez v. 79-05/9 Jackson Heights (BX 809408/2021)
24/3492 Ramos v. City of NY (BX 70349/2021)
24/3512 Reclaim the Records v. City of NY (NY 156960/2023)
24/3926 Reyes v. 45 & 47 Wadsworth Ave. (BX 27196/2016)
24/6152 Reyes v. Benton (NY 152207/2022)
24/4858 Riederer v. Schulmann Properties (NY 158576/2019)
24/3358 Rivera v. Site 2 DSA Owner (NY 159502/2020)
25/490 Robinson v. Hiatt (NY 151639/2024)
25/160 R. Keira (NY B4648/2021)
24/6089R. Zion (NY N4449/2023)
24/7651 Rahal v. Taormina (NY 365553/2023)
24/5962 Ramirez v. 255 W. 108th Street Corp. (NY 154692/2013)
24/7721 Ramirez v. 79-05/9 Jackson Heights (BX 809408/2021)
24/3492 Ramos v. City of NY (BX 70349/2021)
24/3512 Reclaim the Records v. City of NY (NY 156960/2023)
24/3926 Reyes v. 45 & 47 Wadsworth Ave. (BX 27196/2016)
24/6152 Reyes v. Benton (NY 152207/2022)
24/4858 Riederer v. Schulmann Properties (NY 158576/2019)
24/3358 Rivera v. Site 2 DSA Owner (NY 159502/2020)
25/490 Robinson v. Hiatt (NY 151639/2024)
25/160 R. Keira (NY B4648/2021)
24/6089R. Zion (NY N4449/2023)
24/7651 Rahal v. Taormina (NY 365553/2023)
24/5962 Ramirez v. 255 W. 108th Street Corp. (NY 154692/2013)
24/7721 Ramirez v. 79-05/9 Jackson Heights (BX 809408/2021)
24/3492 Ramos v. City of NY (BX 70349/2021)
24/3512 Reclaim the Records v. City of NY (NY 156960/2023)
24/3926 Reyes v. 45 & 47 Wadsworth Ave. (BX 27196/2016)
24/6152 Reyes v. Benton (NY 152207/2022)
24/4858 Riederer v. Schulmann Properties (NY 158576/2019)
24/3358 Rivera v. Site 2 DSA Owner (NY 159502/2020)
25/490 Robinson v. Hiatt (NY 151639/2024)
25/160 R. Keira (NY B4648/2021)
24/6089R. Zion (NY N4449/2023)
24/7651 Rahal v. Taormina (NY 365553/2023)
24/5962 Ramirez v. 255 W. 108th Street Corp. (NY 154692/2013)
24/7721 Ramirez v. 79-05/9 Jackson Heights (BX 809408/2021)
24/3492 Ramos v. City of NY (BX 70349/2021)
24/3512 Reclaim the Records v. City of NY (NY 156960/2023)
24/3926 Reyes v. 45 & 47 Wadsworth Ave. (BX 27196/2016)
24/6152 Reyes v. Benton (NY 152207/2022)
24/4858 Riederer v. Schulmann Properties (NY 158576/2019)
24/3358 Rivera v. Site 2 DSA Owner (NY 159502/2020)
25/490 Robinson v. Hiatt (NY 151639/2024)
25/160 R. Keira (NY B4648/2021)
24/6089R. Zion (NY N4449/2023)
24/7651 Rahal v. Taormina (NY 365553/2023)
24/5962 Ramirez v. 255 W. 108th Street Corp. (NY 154692/2013)
24/7721 Ramirez v. 79-05/9 Jackson Heights (BX 809408/2021)
24/3492 Ramos v. City of NY (BX 70349/2021)
24/3512 Reclaim the Records v. City of NY (NY 156960/2023)
24/3926 Reyes v. 45 & 47 Wadsworth Ave. (BX 27196/2016)
24/6152 Reyes v. Benton (NY 152207/2022)
24/4858 Riederer v. Schulmann Properties (NY 158576/2019)
24/3358 Rivera v. Site 2 DSA Owner (NY 159502/2020)
25/490 Robinson v. Hiatt (NY 151639/2024)
25/160 R. Keira (NY B4648/2021)
24/6089R. Zion (NY N4449/2023)
24/7651 Rahal v. Taormina (NY 365553/2023)
24/5962 Ramirez v. 255 W. 108th Street Corp. (NY 154692/2013)
24/7721 Ramirez v. 79-05/9 Jackson Heights (BX 809408/2021)
24/3492 Ramos v. City of NY (BX 70349/2021)
24/3512 Reclaim the Records v. City of NY (NY 156960/2023)
24/3926 Reyes v. 45 & 47 Wadsworth Ave. (BX 27196/2016)
24/6152 Reyes v. Benton (NY 152207/2022)
24/4858 Riederer v. Schulmann Properties (NY 158576/2019)
24/3358 Rivera v. Site 2 DSA Owner (NY 159502/2020)
25/490 Robinson v. Hiatt (NY 151639/2024)
25/160 R. Keira (NY B4648/2021)
24/6089R. Zion (NY N4449/2023)
24/7651 Rahal v. Taormina (NY 365553/2023)
24/5962 Ramirez v. 255 W. 108th Street Corp. (NY 154692/2013)
24/7721 Ramirez v. 79-05/9 Jackson Heights (BX 809408/2021)
24/3492 Ramos v. City of NY (BX 70349/2021)
24/3512 Reclaim the Records v. City of NY (NY 156960/2023)
24/3926 Reyes v. 45 & 47 Wadsworth Ave. (BX 27196/2016)
24/6152 Reyes v. Benton (NY 152207/2022)
24/4858 Riederer v. Schulmann Properties (NY 158576/2019)
24/3358 Rivera v. Site 2 DSA Owner (NY 159502/2020)
25/490 Robinson v. Hiatt (NY 151639/2024)
25/160 R. Keira (NY B4648/2021)
24/6089R. Zion (NY N4449/2023)
24/7651 Rahal v. Taormina (NY 365553/2023)
24/5962 Ramirez v. 255 W. 108th Street Corp. (NY 154692/2013)
24/7721 Ramirez v. 79-05/9 Jackson Heights (BX 809408/2021)
24/3492 Ramos v. City of NY (BX 70349/2021)
24/3512 Reclaim the Records v. City of NY (NY 156960/2023)
24/3926 Reyes v. 45 & 47 Wadsworth Ave. (BX 27196/2016)
24/6152 Reyes v. Benton (NY 152207/2022)
24/4858 Riederer v. Schulmann Properties (NY 158576/2019)
24/3358 Rivera v. Site 2 DSA Owner (NY 159502/2020)
25/490 Robinson v. Hiatt (NY 151639/2024)
25/160 R. Keira (NY B4648/2021)
24/6089R. Zion (NY N4449/2023)
24/7651 Rahal v. Taormina (NY 365553/2023)
24/5962 Ramirez v. 255 W. 108th Street Corp. (NY 154692/2013)
24/7721 Ramirez v. 79-05/9 Jackson Heights (BX 809408/2021)
24/3492 Ramos v. City of NY (BX 70349/2021)
24/3512 Reclaim the Records v. City of NY (NY 156960/2023)
24/3926 Reyes v. 45 & 47 Wadsworth Ave. (BX 27196/2016)
24/6152 Reyes v. Benton (NY 152207/2022)
24/4858 Riederer v. Schulmann Properties (NY 158576/2019)
24/3358 Rivera v. Site 2 DSA Owner (NY 159502/2020)
25/490 Robinson v. Hiatt (NY 151639/2024)
25/160 R. Keira (NY B4648/2021)
24/6089R. Zion (NY N4449/2023)
24/7651 Rahal v. Taormina (NY 365553/2023)
24/596

listed below is information on Judicial Hearing Officers, Mediation, and Special Referees.

IAS PARTS

- 1 Silvera: 300 (60 Centre)
- 2 Sattler: 212 (60 Centre)
- 3 Cohen, J.: 206 (60 Centre)
- 4 Kim: 308 (80 Centre)
- 5 Kingo: 320 (80 Centre)
- 6 King: 351 (60 Centre)
- 7 Lebovits: 345 (60 Centre)
- 8 Kotler: 278 (80 Centre)
- 9 Kapitzi: 355 (60 Centre)
- 11 Frank: 412 (60 Centre)
- 12 Stroth: 328 (80 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 (60 Centre)
- 21 Tsai: 280 (80 Centre)
- 22 Chin: 136 (80 Centre)
- 23 Schumacher: 304 (71 Thomas)
- 24 Katz: 325 (60 Centre)
- 25 Marcus: 1254 (111 Centre)
- 26 James, T.: 438 (60 Centre)
- 27 Dominguez: 289 (80 Centre)
- 28 Tingling: 543 (60 Centre)
- 29 Ramirez: 311 (71 Thomas)
- 30 McMahon: Virtual (60 Centre)
- 31 Klich: 11278 (111 Centre)
- 33 Rosado: 442 (60 Centre)
- 34 Ramsour: 341 (60 Centre)
- 35 Perry-Bond: 684 (111 Centre)
- 36 Saunders: 205 (71 Thomas)
- 37 Engoron: 418 (60 Centre)
- 38 Crawford: 1166 (111 Centre)
- 39 Cynes: 232 (60 Centre)
- 41 Moynce: 327 (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)
- 47 Goetz: 1021 (111 Centre)
- 48 Masley: 242 (60 Centre)
- 49 Chan: 252 (60 Centre)
- 50 Sweeting: 279 (80 Centre)
- 51 Heeding: 122 (80 Centre)
- 52 Sharp: 1045 (111 Centre)
- 53 Borrok: 203 (60 Centre)
- 54 Schechter: 228 (60 Centre)
- 55 d'Auguste: 103 (71 Thomas)
- 56 Kelley: 204 (71 Thomas)
- 57 Kraus: 218 (60 Centre)
- 58 Cohen, D.: 305 (71 Thomas)
- 59 Crane: 248 (60 Centre)
- 61 Bannon: 232 (60 Centre)
- 59 James, D.: 331 (60 Centre)
- 62 Chesler: 11274 (111 Centre)
- 63 Reo: 307 (80 Centre)
- 64 MFP/Kac: 11278 (111 Centre)
- 65 MMP: 1: 11278 (111 Centre)
- 66 Dawsom: 1604 (100 Centre)

PART 40TR

JUDICIAL MEDIATION

On Rotating Schedule:

- 13 Silvera: 300 (60 Centre)
- 13 Adams 300 (60 Centre)

EARLY SETTLEMENT

- ESC 1 Vigilante 106(80 Centre)
- ESC 2 Wilkenfeld 106 (80 Centre)

SPECIAL REFEREES

60 Centre Street

- 73R Santoro: Room 354
- 75R Burzio: Room 240
- 80R Edelman: Room 562
- 82R Woolf: Room 501B
- 83R Sambuco: Room 528
- 84R Feinberg: Room 641
- 88R Lewis-Reisen: Room 324

JHO/SPECIAL REFEREES

80 Centre Street

- 81R Hewitt: Room 321
- 87R Burke: Room 238
- 89R Hoahong: Room 236

SPECIAL REFEREE

71 Thomas Street

- Part 91 Hon. C. Ramos
- Part 93 Hon. Marin

Judicial Hearing Officers

- Part 91 Hon. C. Ramos
- Part 93 Hon. Marin

Supreme Court

Motion Calendars

Room 130, 9:30 A.M.

60 Centre Street

Supreme Court

Motion Dispositions

from Room 130

60 Centre Street

Calendars in the Motion Submission Part (Room 130) show the index number and caption of each and the disposition thereof as marked on the Room 130 calendars. The calendars in use are a Paper Motions Calendar, e-Filed Motions Calendar, and APB (All Papers By) Calendar setting a date for submission of a missing stipulation or motion paper. With respect to motions filed with Request for Judicial Intervention, counsel in e-filed cases will be notified by e-mail through NYSCEF of the Justice to whom the case has been assigned. In paper cases, counsel should sign up for the E-Track service to receive e-mail notification of the assignment and other developments and schedules in their cases. Immediately following is a key that explains the markings used by the Clerk in Room 130.

Motion Calendar Key:

- ADJ—Adjourned to date indicated in Submission Courtroom (Room 130).
- ARG—Scheduled for argument for date and part indicated.
- SUB (PT #)—Motion was submitted to part noted.
- WDN—Motion was withdrawn on calendar call.
- SUB/DEF—Motion was submitted on default to part indicated.
- APB (All Papers By)—This motion is adjourned to Room 119 on date indicated, only for submission of papers.
- SUBM 2—Adjourned to date indicated in Submission Court Room (Room 130) for affirmation or so ordered stipulation.
- S—Stipulation.
- C—Consent.
- C MOTION—Adjourned to Commercial Motion Part Calendar.
- FINAL—Adjournment date is final

60 CENTRE STREET

Submissions Part

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

Submission

- 1 10025/25 Ford v. Jakobson Properties LLC D/b/a Metronest LLC
- 2 100710/25 Shekhem El v. Lerer
- 3 100739/25 The Lunch Box Corp. v. Dept. of Health & Mental Hygiene

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

Submission

- 1 311931/10 Aristova v. Derkach
- 2 101450/24 Kathryn Grace Jordan v. Glenwood Mgt. Corp.

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

Submission

- 1 100951/24 Maresca v. NYC
- 2 100708/25 Ogaard v. Samsung Electronics America
- 3 100366/25 Ross v. The Trustees of Columbia Univ. in NYC
- 4 100190/25 Young v. Metro. NYCTA

Paperless Judge Part

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

- 152076/25 21st Century Ins. Co. Et Al v. Js River Medical Care Pc
- 654986/23 4media Group, Inc. v. Rxmedical Dynamics
- 154345/23 Aaebs Fund 17 v. Duval & Stachenfeld
- 154362/24 Adams v. NYC Et Al
- 654446/25 Afco Credit Corp. v. Dhd Offshore Services
- 155811/25 Almonte v. Walker
- 159140/25 America First Policy Institute v. Bragg
- 150410/24 American Express Travel Related Services Co., Inc. v. Amazing Outdoors
- 655413/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Andrea Holder Et Al
- 654471/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Pringle
- 65464/24 Amur Equipment Finance, Inc. v. Dbnms Consulting, Inc. Et Al
- 156487/24 Azeizat v. Sparkle Dental Et Al
- 22 Chin: 136 (80 Centre)
- 23 Schumacher: 304 (71 Thomas)
- 24 Katz: 325 (60 Centre)
- 25 Marcus: 1254 (111 Centre)
- 26 James, T.: 438 (60 Centre)
- 27 Dominguez: 289 (80 Centre)
- 28 Tingling: 543 (60 Centre)
- 29 Ramirez: 311 (71 Thomas)
- 30 McMahon: Virtual (60 Centre)
- 31 Klich: 11278 (111 Centre)
- 33 Rosado: 442 (60 Centre)
- 34 Ramsour: 341 (60 Centre)
- 35 Perry-Bond: 684 (111 Centre)
- 36 Saunders: 205 (71 Thomas)
- 37 Engoron: 418 (60 Centre)
- 38 Crawford: 1166 (111 Centre)
- 39 Cynes: 232 (60 Centre)
- 41 Moynce: 327 (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)
- 47 Goetz: 1021 (111 Centre)
- 48 Masley: 242 (60 Centre)
- 49 Chan: 252 (60 Centre)
- 50 Sweeting: 279 (80 Centre)
- 51 Heeding: 122 (80 Centre)
- 52 Sharp: 1045 (111 Centre)
- 53 Borrok: 203 (60 Centre)
- 54 Schechter: 228 (60 Centre)
- 55 d'Auguste: 103 (71 Thomas)
- 56 Kelley: 204 (71 Thomas)
- 57 Kraus: 218 (60 Centre)
- 58 Cohen, D.: 305 (71 Thomas)
- 59 Crane: 248 (60 Centre)
- 61 Bannon: 232 (60 Centre)
- 59 James, D.: 331 (60 Centre)
- 62 Chesler: 11274 (111 Centre)
- 63 Reo: 307 (80 Centre)
- 64 MFP/Kac: 11278 (111 Centre)
- 65 MMP: 1: 11278 (111 Centre)
- 66 Dawsom: 1604 (100 Centre)

- 950032/19 Bakhrah v. Elaine Kaufman Cultural Center
- 160446/19 Bautista v. Fernandez
- 160162/21 Biana Todorovic v. Roosevelt Island Operating Corp. Et. Ano.
- 150893/25 Bloomingdale Road Recovery, LLC, Assignee To Cherrywood Enterprises, LLC Assignee To Financial Pacific Leasing, Inc. v. Empire State Masonry
- 650774/25 Borux Int'l Corp. v. American Guarantee And Liability Ins. Co. Et Al
- 158295/22 Caceres v. Boyd
- 190203/25 Carpenter v. Minerals Technologies, Inc., Et Al
- 159021/20 Castro v. 122nd St. Prop. 452260/25 Castro v. Dept. of Housing Preservation And Dev. of NYC
- 100682/25 Cesar v.
- 654333/25 Chertok v. Cooley Llp
- 654080/25 Citi Private Advisory v. Barrett
- 152882/25 Coleman v. Pochoda
- 152589/22 Constantin v. Brookfield Properties One Wfc Co. LLC Et Al
- 153966/21 De Araujo v. Titanium Const. Services, Inc. Et Al
- 652711/25 Dcouncil 37 v. NYC Et Al
- 651581/25 Doberge Torte LLC Et Al v. Hernandez
- 153606/21 Douglas v. NYC
- 654985/23 Eggerud v. West End 84 Units LLC Et Al
- 151803/24 Escobar v. 24 West Food Corp. D/b/a Food Dynasty Et Al
- 152980/25 Espinal v. Thomasselli
- 154019/24 Fora Financial Asset Securitization 2021 v. Tri State Mgt. Group LLC Et Al
- 154781/24 Fora Financial Warehouse v. Fresh Produce Essentials Corp. Et Al
- 155005/24 Fora Financial Warehouse v. Integrated USA Systems
- 654022/25 Freshlink Prod. Dev. v. Special Delivery Subscription Box LLC
- 161344/15 Friedfield v. Citibank N.A.
- 152584/21 Gelormino v. Retirement Systems of Alabama Hldg.
- 65425/16 Gelwyn v. Deratafia
- 158030/25 Goldman v. Feldman
- 654891/24 Glassberg v. Marcus
- 155313/21 Guarino v. North Shore Towers Apts. Inc. Et Al
- 161476/21 Guthrie v. NYC Et Al
- 152568/25 Guluz v. Combs
- 154564/25 Han v. The NYCTA Et Al
- 160017/25 Hartman Ute Rose & Ratner Lp v.
- 152188/24 Hernandez-Lugo v. Whitehall Ferry Donations LLC
- 151674/22 Hidrovo v. 450 Partners LLC Et Al
- 157372/25 Hodgins v. NY Convention Center Dev. Corp. Et Al
- 653697/24 Hofstra Univ. Et Al v. United Educators
- 101445/24 Huhgley v. NYC Dept. of Finance Pvb
- 159239/20 In Re Application of The v. NYC Police
- 155557/25 In The Matter of Carlos Moreno v. NYC Et Al
- 159894/25 In The Matter of The Application of Mepec 132 LLC v. Streamline USA
- 452035/25 In The Matter of The Application of NY Black Car Operators' Injury Compensation Fund Inc. A/k/a NY Black Car Fund As Subrogee of Eroid Beaubrun v. Navigators Inc. Co.
- 652314/25 Itria Ventures LLC v. RI Solutions, Inc. Et Al
- 655049/24 J&M Coutinho v. Isabel
- 157876/22 James v. One East River Pl. Rlty. Co. Et Al
- 156792/24 Jimenez v. 95-101 Thayer St NYC LLC
- 652568/25 John's Mountain LLC Et Al v. The Board of Mgrs. of The Laurel Condominium Et Al
- 650584/25 Kahn v. Fusaris
- 159481/19 Kral v. NYCHA
- 652469/25 L4 Bio v. Gravatin Bioscience Corp. Et Al
- 951304/21 Lanza v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
- 653384/24 Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. Et Al v. Figueroa
- 152854/21 McIntyre v. Newyork-Presbyterian Global Services
- 152905/25 McLeod v. McBurnie
- 160318/21 Medina Tejeda v. Cauldwell-Wingate Co.
- 161716/24 Metrospeedy Operations v. Nordstrom
- 654125/25 Modern Bank v. Zepeda
- 190257/24 Morin v. Pfizer Inc. Et Al
- 653535/22 Mt. Hawley Ins. Co. v. Pathforward Consulting, Inc.
- 651664/24 Noho Cultural Society Inc. D/b/a Zero Bond v. Kitchensync LLC Et Al
- 452032/25 NYC Luxury Kitchen & Bath v. Taylor
- 158143/25 Patel v. NYC Dept. of Consumer And Worker Protection
- 654603/17 Ps 90 Board of Mgrs.; v. L&M Dev. Partners
- 151251/25 Quel Scieajay v. 88 St Food Corp.
- 651352/25 Quest Diagnostics Inc. v. Scipher Medicine Corp.
- 154234/25 Ramos v. Deutsche Bank Securities
- 655193/24 Richard Kallman As Co-Trustee of The Kallman Family Irrevocable Trust Et Al v. Kineret Kallman As Co-Trustee of The Kallman Family Irrevocable Trust Et Al
- 152476/23 Rizzo Villalba v. Hudson 37 LLC Et Al
- 656468/18 Rolando Mechanical Corp. v. 2701 B'way. Rlty. LLC
- 159999/25 Roth & Roth v. NYCTA Et Al
- 160000/25 Roth & Roth v. NYCTA Et Al
- 159837/25 Roth And Roth v. NYC Fire Dept.
- 158125/22 Rsd857 LLC v. Wright
- 655258/23 Sadis & Goldberg Llp v. Ligonier Capital Co. LLC Et Al
- 154230/24 Sales v. Justiniano
- 155655/18 Salvesen v. Port Auth. of New
- 157861/19 Sandra L. Sy And Charlene v. Orellana
- 155689/25 Schwarzhorn Re 430 W 15 LLC v. Web Hldgs.
- 653189/25 Soho Hotel Owner LLC v. La Rubia Raw Bar LLC
- 150074/22 Squatrito v. Tishman Speyer Properties Inc. Et Al
- 152264/25 State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. v. Pitter
- 451507/24 Tavernia v. Ppf Off Frios
- 155649/22 Taveria v. Ppf Off Frios Park Ave. Owner
- 654199/25 The Avanza Group v. Kingdom Logistics

- 150893/25 Bloomingdale Road Recovery, LLC, Assignee To Cherrywood Enterprises, LLC Assignee To Financial Pacific Leasing, Inc. v. Empire State Masonry
- 650774/25 Borux Int'l Corp. v. American Guarantee And Liability Ins. Co. Et Al
- 158295/22 Caceres v. Boyd
- 190203/25 Carpenter v. Minerals Technologies, Inc., Et Al
- 159021/20 Castro v. 122nd St. Prop. 452260/25 Castro v. Dept. of Housing Preservation And Dev. of NYC
- 100682/25 Cesar v.
- 654333/25 Chertok v. Cooley Llp
- 654080/25 Citi Private Advisory v. Barrett
- 152882/25 Coleman v. Pochoda
- 152589/22 Constantin v. Brookfield Properties One Wfc Co. LLC Et Al
- 153966/21 De Araujo v. Titanium Const. Services, Inc. Et Al
- 652711/25 Dcouncil 37 v. NYC Et Al
- 651581/25 Doberge Torte LLC Et Al v. Hernandez
- 153606/21 Douglas v. NYC
- 654985/23 Eggerud v. West End 84 Units LLC Et Al
- 151803/24 Escobar v. 24 West Food Corp. D/b/a Food Dynasty Et Al
- 152980/25 Espinal v. Thomasselli
- 154019/24 Fora Financial Asset Securitization 2021 v. Tri State Mgt. Group LLC Et Al
- 154781/24 Fora Financial Warehouse v. Fresh Produce Essentials Corp. Et Al
- 155005/24 Fora Financial Warehouse v. Integrated USA Systems
- 654022/25 Freshlink Prod. Dev. v. Special Delivery Subscription Box LLC
- 161344/15 Friedfield v. Citibank N.A.
- 152584/21 Gelormino v. Retirement Systems of Alabama Hldg.
- 65425/16 Gelwyn v. Deratafia
- 158030/25 Goldman v. Feldman
- 654891/24 Glassberg v. Marcus
- 155313/21 Guarino v. North Shore Towers Apts. Inc. Et Al
- 161476/21 Guthrie v. NYC Et Al
- 152568/25 Guluz v. Combs
- 154564/25 Han v. The NYCTA Et Al
- 160017/25 Hartman Ute Rose & Ratner Lp v.
- 152188/24 Hernandez-Lugo v. Whitehall Ferry Donations LLC
- 151674/22 Hidrovo v. 450 Partners LLC Et Al
- 157372/25 Hodgins v. NY Convention Center Dev. Corp. Et Al
- 653697/24 Hofstra Univ. Et Al v. United Educators
- 101445/24 Huhgley v. NYC Dept. of Finance Pvb
- 159239/20 In Re Application of The v. NYC Police
- 155557/25 In The Matter of Carlos Moreno v. NYC Et Al
- 159894/25 In The Matter of The Application of Mepec 132 LLC v. Streamline USA
- 452035/25 In The Matter of The Application of NY Black Car Operators' Injury Compensation Fund Inc. A/k/a NY Black Car Fund As Subrogee of Eroid Beaubrun v. Navigators Inc. Co.
- 652314/25 Itria Ventures LLC v. RI Solutions, Inc. Et Al
- 655049/24 J&M Coutinho v. Isabel
- 157876/22 James v. One East River Pl. Rlty. Co. Et Al
- 156792/24 Jimenez v. 95-101 Thayer St NYC LLC
- 652568/25 John's Mountain LLC Et Al v. The Board of Mgrs. of The Laurel Condominium Et Al
- 650584/25 Kahn v. Fusaris
- 159481/19 Kral v. NYCHA
- 652469/25 L4 Bio v. Gravatin Bioscience Corp. Et Al
- 951304/21 Lanza v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
- 653384/24 Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. Et Al v. Figueroa
- 152854/21 McIntyre v. Newyork-Presbyterian Global Services
- 152905/25 McLeod v. McBurnie
- 160318/21 Medina Tejeda v. Cauldwell-Wingate Co.
- 161716/24 Metrospeedy Operations v. Nordstrom
- 654125/25 Modern Bank v. Zepeda
- 190257/24 Morin v. Pfizer Inc. Et Al
- 653535/22 Mt. Hawley Ins. Co. v. Pathforward Consulting, Inc.
- 651664/24 Noho Cultural Society Inc. D/b/a Zero Bond v. Kitchensync LLC Et Al
- 452032/25 NYC Luxury Kitchen & Bath v. Taylor
- 158143/25 Patel v. NYC Dept. of Consumer And Worker Protection
- 654603/17 Ps 90 Board of Mgrs.; v. L&M Dev. Partners
- 151251/25 Quel Scieajay v. 88 St Food Corp.
- 651352/25 Quest Diagnostics Inc. v. Scipher Medicine Corp.
- 154234/25 Ramos v. Deutsche Bank Securities
- 655193/24 Richard Kallman As Co-Trustee of The Kallman Family Irrevocable Trust Et Al v. Kineret Kallman As Co-Trustee of The Kallman Family Irrevocable Trust Et Al
- 152476/23 Rizzo Villalba v. Hudson 37 LLC Et Al
- 656468/18 Rolando Mechanical Corp. v. 2701 B'way. Rlty. LLC
- 159999/25 Roth & Roth v. NYCTA Et Al
- 160000/25 Roth & Roth v. NYCTA Et Al
- 159837/25 Roth And Roth v. NYC Fire Dept.
- 158125/22 Rsd857 LLC v. Wright
- 655258/23 Sadis & Goldberg Llp v. Ligonier Capital Co. LLC Et Al
- 154230/24 Sales v. Justiniano
- 155655/18 Salvesen v. Port Auth. of New
- 157861/19 Sandra L. Sy And Charlene v. Orellana
- 155689/25 Schwarzhorn Re 430 W 15 LLC v. Web Hldgs.
- 653189/25 Soho Hotel Owner LLC v. La Rubia Raw Bar LLC
- 150074/22 Squatrito v. Tishman Speyer Properties Inc. Et Al
- 152264/25 State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. v. Pitter
- 451507/24 Tavernia v. Ppf Off Frios
- 155649/22 Taveria v. Ppf Off Frios Park Ave. Owner
- 654199/25 The Avanza Group v. Kingdom Logistics

60 CENTRE STREET

Submissions Part

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

Submission

- 1 10025/25 Ford v. Jakobson Properties LLC D/b/a Metronest LLC
- 2 100710/25 Shekhem El v. Lerer
- 3 100739/25 The Lunch Box Corp. v. Dept. of Health & Mental Hygiene

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

Submission

- 1 311931/10 Aristova v. Derkach
- 2 101450/24 Kathryn Grace Jordan v. Glenwood Mgt. Corp.

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

Submission

- 1 100951/24 Maresca v. NYC
- 2 100708/25 Ogaard v. Samsung Electronics America
- 3 100366/25 Ross v. The Trustees of Columbia Univ. in NYC
- 4 100190/25 Young v. Metro. NYCTA

Court Calendars

- 161633/23 The City Et Al v. NYC Police Dept. Et Al
- 159209/24 The Spence School v. Phillips
- 651566/25 Tillis v. Zar Rlty. NY LLC Et Al
- 161411/19 Travelers Prop. v. Vema Group
- 654164/25 Valentine v. NYCTA
- 152009/24 Vargas v. The Dept. of Education of NYC Et Al
- 160212/24 Vinas v. Argonaut Hldgs., Inc. Et Al
- 653985/24 Wesco Ins. Co. v. Db Inc. Co., Ltd. (us Branch)
- F/a/Dongbu Ins. Co., Ltd. (us Branch)
- 155168/25 Whitman v. Moritt

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

- 654326/2557th & 6th Ground LLC v. Carnegie House Tenants Corp. Et Al
- 153967/2491 Central Park West Corp. Et Al v. Terenzio
- 651199/17 Abarrotes Mixteca Corp., Inc. v. Brisk
- 653910/25 Ac Ocean Walk v. You
- 650925/23 Ace Prop. & Casualty Ins. Co. Et Al v. Arrowwood Indemnity Co. Et Al
- 155389/22 Asal Hldg. Co. v. Servpro Restoration of Upper Westside
- 650173/22 Ai&T Communications of New York, Inc. v. Twin City Fire Ins. Co. Et Al
- 161859/18 Bailey v. 477 Madave Hldgs. LLC
- 652524/24 Bb Energy USA LLC v. Keyera Energy Inc
- 160902/17 Beitia v. Trump Organization
- 157462/23 Blec v. Devack & Chester
- 651274/25 Chang v. Sollega Inc. Et Al
- 151069/25 Chivalan Leon v. Con Ed Co. of NY Inc. Et Al
- 805146/22 Compagnucci v. Central Park South Associates
- 151709/18 Doe v. Our Lady of Pompeii
- 162052/24 E.W. Howell Co., LLC v. NYC Dept. of Design & Const. Et Al
- 950163/21 G. v. Archdiocese of NY
- 653715/23 Guardhat Inc. v. Cb Technologies, Inc.
- 653606/25 Heritage Rlty. Services v. Amrad
- 150242/22 Joseph McKernan v. World Trade Center Performing Arts Center, Inc. Et Al.
- 850209/22 Jpmorgan Chase Bank v. Kocak
- 850159/24 Jpmorgan Chase Bank v. Schwartz
- 154801/22 Kouadio v. NYCTA
- 653270/25 Kruglov v. McGivney
- 651211/25 Latitude Prop. Group LLC v. American Dream H Hotel LLC Et Al
- 651399/25 Macomb County Retiree Health Care Fund v. Msc Industrial Direct Co., Inc. Et Al
- 157322/24 Martino v. NYC Et Al
- 153043/25 Mendez v. NYC Dept. of Health And Mental Hygiene
- 656925/21 Nichols v. Weinstein
- 652738/25 Nopart Trading v. Polygen Energy
- 160990/25 Ogoblu v. Citibank
- 654233/25 People of The State of NY v. Lipik Consulting
- 452340/25 People of The State of NY v. Nishangman Outdoor LLC
- 154312/25 People of The State of NY v. Rns Device LLC
- 151776/14 P2 Securities Evaluations v. Fillebeen
- 652706/25 Rabbani v. Harbert
- 155620/22 Reynoso De Francisco v. NYC Et Al
- 451636/24 State of NY v. Lugo
- 850579/23 The Bank of NY Mellon Trust Co. v. Lowe
- 157934/25 The Gelayway 151 v. Metro. Transportation Auth. Et Al
- 850032/25 U.S. Bank Trust Co. v. Tientcheu Schwartz Ltd Liability Co Et Al
- 450307/16 Wade v. NYC
- 155664/22 Webb v. Eic Associates Inc. Et Al
- 651404/22 Westport Ins. Corp. Et Al v. Gator Coastal Shopping Centre
- 651222/25 Workhouse 46 LLC v. 21 West 46th St. LLC Et Al

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

- 150841/25 Alvarez Rodriguez v. 55 Broad St. Owner LLC Et Al
- 654299/19 Alatalaya Asset Income Fund II v. Ringel
- 650375/08 Bdc Finance L.L.C. v. Barclays Bank Plc
- 652967/24 Capitol Fire Sprinkler Co. Inc. v. Kbe-Ny LLC Et Al
- 157538/16 Childs v. Sadaf Group
- 157697/23 De Jesus v. H.J.G. Liquor, Inc. Et Al
- 154989/21 Delgado v. Esplanade Gardens, Inc. Et Al
- 158914/25 Diamond Star Group, Inc. v. NYC Dept. of Consumer And Worker Protection
- 652901/20 Empire Apparel LLC v. One Step Up Apparel Group LLC
- 653118/22 Ferster v. Prudential Ins. Co. of America Et Al
- 452059/22 Hinduja Global Solutions, Inc. Et Al v. Hbi Group, Inc.
- 652998/25 Hpec, Inc. v. Startup Health
- 653558/25 Hkgj Associates v. Old Republic Nat. Title Ins. Co.
- 151841/21 Jehle v. Jack Resnick & Sons
- 154275/25 Jt Take Two LLC Et Al v. Tran
- 158707/17 McCord v. Broadwall Mgt. Corp.
- 651459/18 Noor Staffing Group v. All-In-1-Spot With
- 155151/21 Purnavel v. 178 Bruckner Commissary
- 157601/21 Ricci v. Discover Bank Et Al
- 157968/25 Roth & Roth v. NYCTA Et Al
- 151819/22 Roulette v. NYC
- 805082/23 Ryan v. Karan Mehta
- 158854/25 S&E Bridge & Scaffold LLC v. Mollen Esq.
- 157943/23 State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. v. Alvarado
- 150477/25 State Nat. Ins. Co. v. Gumbs
- 156730/22 Vaca Eras v. Terminal Fee Owner Lp Et Al
- 950789/21 Williams v. Riverside
-

15373/21 Roberts v. NY Presbyterian Foundation Inc. Et Al

150967/23 Roldan v. 251 Church St. LLC Et Al

150720/21 Rubio v. We Are Swell Inc.

155810/22 Salinas v. 424 West 33rd St. LLC Et Al

156326/24 Srour v. Shnaider Law Pllc Et Al

157943/23 State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. v. Alvarado

654277/24 Surfside Solutions Inc. v. Green Bee Meds LLC Et Al

654276/24 Surfside Solutions Inc. v. Kgbj LLC Et Al

158603/21 Sykes v. Ricardo LLC

D/b/a Ricardo Steakhouse Et Al

151218/22 Tapia v. 143-45 Wadsworth Ave. Housing Dev. Corporation A/b/a 143-45 Wadsworth Ave. H.D.F.C.

153922/21 NYC Et Al v. Green Castle A. Mgmt Corp. Et Al

155821/22 Thompson v. 124 E 107 St. LLC

161191/21 Villarreal v. Coa 200 E 34th LLC Et Al

155722/23 Wagman v. Fred Smith Plumbing & Heating, Inc. Et Al

157403/22 Walsh v. Moyinhan Interim Tenant

153047/22 Witting v. Kiamie NY Corp.

157845/22 Woody v. Port Auth. of NY New Jersey Et Al

Motion

159092/24 Fairfax Financial Hldgs. Ltd. Et Al v. Exis Capital Mgt., Inc. Et Al

161105/20 Ortega v. Ab Stable LLC

654277/24 Surfside Solutions Inc. v. Green Bee Meds LLC Et Al

Part 34

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

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

656468/18 Rolando Mechanical Corp. v. 2701 B way. Rlty. LLC

155649/22 Tavernia v. Ppf Off Two Park Ave. Owner

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

157834/23 276-W71 LLC v. Board of Mgrs. of 240 West End Ave Condominium Et Al

150054/22 8904 5th Ave LLC v. Mj Engineering & Design LLC Et Al

150418/23 Barrios v. 125 West End Associates

100396/23 Battistotti v. 3095 Owners Corp.

156937/22 Blum v. Hudson River Park Trust Et Al

154257/22 Borgiorno v. Vornado Eleven Penn Plaza Owner LLC Et Al

161233/19 Bradshaw v. Lenox Hill Hosp.

152336/23 Butler v. Menon Investments

154714/22 Callan v. NY Presbyterian Weill Cornell Medical Center

160397/22 Chantiles v. Tavern on The Green Et Al

805146/22 Compagnucci v. Central Park South Associates

159240/22 Eliett Rodriguez v. Archstone Builders LLC Et Al

158777/22 Eusebio v. Figueroa

154340/22 Field v. Homegoods, Inc. Et Al

153505/22 Freund v. 155 West 75 LLC

157206/22 Garcia Guzman v. Nordest Services LLC Et Al

151386/22 Garcia v. NYC Et Al

151199/21 Gashi v. NYC Et Al

152763/22 Giabourani v. Girasole

158720/22 Gordon v. Zuckerbot

158974/21 Great Northern Ins. Co. A/s/o Jacqueline Brogardi v. Bay Restoration Corp.

152861/23 Grillo v. West 66th Investor LLC Et Al

153649/22 Guletdani v. Neuropsychological Services of Astoria Pllc Et Al

154080/23 Hadas v. Hudson View III Associates

158230/22 Halligan v. St. Marks Bros. Inc. Et Al

155319/23 Jablow v. Sutton East Tennis Club Et Al

160484/22 Johnson v. Bre 44 Wall Owner

150502/23 Johnson v. The Port Auth. of NY And New Jersey Et Al

156312/22 Kramer v. Penske Truck Leasing, Co. Et Al

158091/23 Livit v. 129 Macdougall St. Associates, Inc. Et Al

151110/23 Lopez v. Plaza Madison LLC Et Al

155926/22 Low-Ford v. NYCHA (NYCHA)

158845/22 Luperon De Jesus v. Intercontinental St. Nicholas Associates

151992/23 Madry v. Ice Rink Events of NY LLC Et Al

152254/23 Martin v. West 66th Sponsor LLC Et Al

151537/23 May v. 87th St. Rlty. LLC

151862/22 Minahan v. Rvr 520 Master Lessee LLC Et Al

151264/23 Murphy v. NYC School Construction Auth. Et Al

151491/23 Naula Bunay v. Roundsquare Builders LLC Et Al

156001/23 Nazon v. Time Equities, Inc. Et Al

158969/23 Palin v. Corwith

150416/23 Pettus v. Westfront Associates LLC Et Al

655982/19 Rashel Const. Corp. v. NY Dept. of

158447/22 Robles v. Otis Elevator Co.

158186/21 Romero v. 1165 Madison Ave. Owner LLC Et Al

157878/22 Santos v. Amsterdam Nursing Home Corp. (1992)

157675/22 Segovia v. Royal Charter Properties Inc.

159899/22 Sloba v. 153 West 48th St. LLC Et Al

159931/23 Samir v. Armati

152814/22 Taminaz v. Highpoint Developers LLC Et Al

151705/22 Vasquez Guerrero v. Amsterdam Ave. Redev. Associates LLC Et Al

159064/22 Warmus v. 3440 B'way. Ber

151314/22 Wenger v. Flat Rate Movers

152804/23 White v. East Village II Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al

151335/22 Zavala v. 387 Park South L.L.C. Et Al

Motion

153186/22 Garcia v. NYC Et Al

156001/23 Nazon v. Time Equities, Inc. Et Al

Part 37

Justice Arthur F. Engoron
60 Centre Street
646-386-3222
Room 418

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

650656/24 174 Second Equities Corp. v. Biamonte

653384/24 Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. Et Al v. Figueroa

653535/22 Mt. Hawley Ins. Co. v. Pathforward Consulting, Inc.

651437/24 Park Lane LLC v. Core Services Group, Inc. Et Al

Motion

651437/24 Park Lane LLC v. Core Services Group, Inc. Et Al

Part 39

Justice James G. Clynes
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3619
MONDAY, SEPT. 8

152076/25 21st Century Ins. Co. Et Al v. Js River Medical Care Pc

161297/20 Baerga v. Structure Tone (uk), Inc. Et Al

152589/22 Constantin v. Brookfield Properties One Wfc Co. LLC Et Al

151251/25 Quel Sciajou v. 88 St Food Corp.

100710/25 Shekhem et al v. Lerer

150074/22 Squatrito v. Tishman Speyer Properties Inc. Et Al

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

160293/24 Ch Cluster Ncp Phase One LLC v. Aggarwal

160292/24 Ch Cluster Ncp Phase One LLC v. McGarvey

154928/21 Clemente v. 746 Rlty. Corp.

651211/25 Latitude Prop. Group LLC v. American Dream II Hotel LLC Et Al

157421/20 O'Neil v. Park Hotels & Resorts Inc.

150273/21 Soto v. Lot-Less of Fulton St. Inc. Dba Lot-Less Closeouts Et Al

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

650196/24 31 Lp v. Safety Shop, Inc.

156525/24 Adams v. Hunter Roberts Const. Group

151759/21 Allaraj v. Za Restaurant Mgt. LLC

153307/24 Altman v. Lyft, Inc. Et Al

150183/24 B v. New Horizons Preservation

152576/24 Backiel v. Bp Prods. North America Inc Et Al

152049/18 Berrios v. One Vanderbilt Owner LLC

653843/23 Bisono v. Tvt Capital LLC Et Al

653973/24 Board of Mgrs. of Galleria Condominium v. Sky Tower, Inc. Et Al

653843/14 Brigham v. Ancona LLC

159296/23 Castillo v. C & E Associates

651632/24 Charles Dsssr v. Unifor, Inc.

150394/19 Chris Su Rlty. Corp. v. Quaker Ridge Tenants Corp.

155441/22 Colon v. Chesapeake Owners Corp. Et Al

155740/20 Colon-Quiles v. Esplanade 99 LLC.

160896/21 Dawson v. 410 St Nicholas Prop. LLC

156505/21 Defrancesco v. Resnick Seaport

154989/21 Delgado v. Esplanade Gardens, Inc. Et Al

153932/24 Demarco v. Macklowe Properties Sales

160277/23 Distel v. Moroney

157422/21 Du v. Latamie

161461/21 Escobar v. 155 West 23rd St. Properties LLC. Et Al

153083/24 Fernandes Costa v. 125 West 57th St. Prop. Owner

154239/24 Gomez Rodriguez v. Manhattan Constructors

652957/23 Greater NY Mutual Ins. Co. v. Ategrity Specialty Ins. Co.

654019/24 Hcls Consulting LLC v. Pervaiz Hclb Physician Pc

101335/24 Hohri v. Ipc Resiliency Partners

153628/22 Leibler v. Metro-North Commuter RR. Et Al

158707/17 McCord v. Broadwall Mgt. Corp.

151272/21 Mora v. Hirstan Associates LLC

654723/25 NY Princess Cruises 2 LLC Et Al v. Billybey Marina Services LLC Et Al

156299/21 Odain Thomas v. Adax LLC.

157561/23 Reda Water St. LLC v. Mvii

155299/24 Rodriguez v. 521 W 180 LLC Et Al

158797/23 Spantidakis v. Doughnut Plant Mgt.

654207/24 Tommy Hilfiger Retail v. 681 Fifth Ave. LLC Et Al

653079/25 Vourvoulis v. Kalcheim

155186/18 Williams v. Daphne Rlty. Corp.

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

160293/24 Ch Cluster Ncp Phase One LLC v. Aggarwal

160292/24 Ch Cluster Ncp Phase One LLC v. McGarvey

154928/21 Clemente v. 746 Rlty. Corp.

651211/25 Latitude Prop. Group LLC v. American Dream II Hotel LLC Et Al

157421/20 O'Neil v. Park Hotels & Resorts Inc.

150273/21 Soto v. Lot-Less of Fulton St. Inc. Dba Lot-Less Closeouts Et Al

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

650196/24 31 Lp v. Safety Shop, Inc.

156525/24 Adams v. Hunter Roberts Const. Group

151759/21 Allaraj v. Za Restaurant Mgt. LLC

153307/24 Altman v. Lyft, Inc. Et Al

150183/24 B v. New Horizons Preservation

152576/24 Backiel v. Bp Prods. North America Inc Et Al

152049/18 Berrios v. One Vanderbilt Owner LLC

653843/23 Bisono v. Tvt Capital LLC Et Al

653973/24 Board of Mgrs. of Galleria Condominium v. Sky Tower, Inc. Et Al

653843/14 Brigham v. Ancona LLC

159296/23 Castillo v. C & E Associates

651632/24 Charles Dsssr v. Unifor, Inc.

150394/19 Chris Su Rlty. Corp. v. Quaker Ridge Tenants Corp.

155441/22 Colon v. Chesapeake Owners Corp. Et Al

155740/20 Colon-Quiles v. Esplanade 99 LLC.

160896/21 Dawson v. 410 St Nicholas Prop. LLC

156505/21 Defrancesco v. Resnick Seaport

154989/21 Delgado v. Esplanade Gardens, Inc. Et Al

153932/24 Demarco v. Macklowe Properties Sales

160277/23 Distel v. Moroney

157422/21 Du v. Latamie

161461/21 Escobar v. 155 West 23rd St. Properties LLC. Et Al

153083/24 Fernandes Costa v. 125 West 57th St. Prop. Owner

154239/24 Gomez Rodriguez v. Manhattan Constructors

652957/23 Greater NY Mutual Ins. Co. v. Ategrity Specialty Ins. Co.

654019/24 Hcls Consulting LLC v. Pervaiz Hclb Physician Pc

101335/24 Hohri v. Ipc Resiliency Partners

153628/22 Leibler v. Metro-North Commuter RR. Et Al

158707/17 McCord v. Broadwall Mgt. Corp.

151272/21 Mora v. Hirstan Associates LLC

654723/25 NY Princess Cruises 2 LLC Et Al v. Billybey Marina Services LLC Et Al

156299/21 Odain Thomas v. Adax LLC.

157561/23 Reda Water St. LLC v. Mvii

155299/24 Rodriguez v. 521 W 180 LLC Et Al

158797/23 Spantidakis v. Doughnut Plant Mgt.

654207/24 Tommy Hilfiger Retail v. 681 Fifth Ave. LLC Et Al

653079/25 Vourvoulis v. Kalcheim

155186/18 Williams v. Daphne Rlty. Corp.

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

160293/24 Ch Cluster Ncp Phase One LLC v. Aggarwal

160292/24 Ch Cluster Ncp Phase One LLC v. McGarvey

154928/21 Clemente v. 746 Rlty. Corp.

651211/25 Latitude Prop. Group LLC v. American Dream II Hotel LLC Et Al

157421/20 O'Neil v. Park Hotels & Resorts Inc.

150273/21 Soto v. Lot-Less of Fulton St. Inc. Dba Lot-Less Closeouts Et Al

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

650196/24 31 Lp v. Safety Shop, Inc.

156525/24 Adams v. Hunter Roberts Const. Group

151759/21 Allaraj v. Za Restaurant Mgt. LLC

153307/24 Altman v. Lyft, Inc. Et Al

150183/24 B v. New Horizons Preservation

152576/24 Backiel v. Bp Prods. North America Inc Et Al

152049/18 Berrios v. One Vanderbilt Owner LLC

653843/23 Bisono v. Tvt Capital LLC Et Al

653973/24 Board of Mgrs. of Galleria Condominium v. Sky Tower, Inc. Et Al

653843/14 Brigham v. Ancona LLC

159296/23 Castillo v. C & E Associates

651632/24 Charles Dsssr v. Unifor, Inc.

150394/19 Chris Su Rlty. Corp. v. Quaker Ridge Tenants Corp.

155441/22 Colon v. Chesapeake Owners Corp. Et Al

155740/20 Colon-Quiles v. Esplanade 99 LLC.

160896/21 Dawson v. 410 St Nicholas Prop. LLC

156505/21 Defrancesco v. Resnick Seaport

154989/21 Delgado v. Esplanade Gardens, Inc. Et Al

153932/24 Demarco v. Macklowe Properties Sales

160277/23 Distel v. Moroney

157422/21 Du v. Latamie

161461/21 Escobar v. 155 West 23rd St. Properties LLC. Et Al

153083/24 Fernandes Costa v. 125 West 57th St. Prop. Owner

154239/24 Gomez Rodriguez v. Manhattan Constructors

652957/23 Greater NY Mutual Ins. Co. v. Ategrity Specialty Ins. Co.

654019/24 Hcls Consulting LLC v. Pervaiz Hclb Physician Pc

101335/24 Hohri v. Ipc Resiliency Partners

153628/22 Leibler v. Metro-North Commuter RR. Et Al

158707/17 McCord v. Broadwall Mgt. Corp.

151272/21 Mora v. Hirstan Associates LLC

654723/25 NY Princess Cruises 2 LLC Et Al v. Billybey Marina Services LLC Et Al

156299/21 Odain Thomas v. Adax LLC.

157561/23 Reda Water St. LLC v. Mvii

155299/24 Rodriguez v. 521 W 180 LLC Et Al

158797/23 Spantidakis v. Doughnut Plant Mgt.

654207/24 Tommy Hilfiger Retail v. 681 Fifth Ave. LLC Et Al

653079/25 Vourvoulis v. Kalcheim

155186/18 Williams v. Daphne Rlty. Corp.

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

160293/24 Ch Cluster Ncp Phase One LLC v. Aggarwal

160292/24 Ch Cluster Ncp Phase One LLC v. McGarvey

154928/21 Clemente v. 746 Rlty. Corp.

651211/25 Latitude Prop. Group LLC v. American Dream II Hotel LLC Et Al

157421/20 O'Neil v. Park Hotels & Resorts Inc.

150273/21 Soto v. Lot-Less of Fulton St. Inc. Dba Lot-Less Closeouts Et Al

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

650196/24 31 Lp v. Safety Shop, Inc.

156525/24 Adams v. Hunter Roberts Const. Group

151759/21 Allaraj v. Za Restaurant Mgt. LLC

153307/24 Altman v. Lyft, Inc. Et Al

150183/24 B v. New Horizons Preservation

152576/24 Backiel v. Bp Prods. North America Inc Et Al

152049/18 Berrios v. One Vanderbilt Owner LLC

653843/23 Bisono v. Tvt Capital LLC Et Al

653973/24 Board of Mgrs. of Galleria Condominium v. Sky Tower, Inc. Et Al

653843/14 Brigham v. Ancona LLC

159296/23 Castillo v. C & E Associates

651632/24 Charles Dsssr v. Unifor, Inc.

150394/19 Chris Su Rlty. Corp. v. Quaker Ridge Tenants Corp.

155441/22 Colon v. Chesapeake Owners Corp. Et Al

155740/20 Colon-Quiles v. Esplanade 99 LLC.

160896/21 Dawson v. 410 St Nicholas Prop. LLC

156505/21 Defrancesco v. Resnick Seaport

154989/21 Delgado v. Esplanade Gardens, Inc. Et Al

153932/24 Demarco v. Macklowe Properties Sales

160277/23 Distel v. Moroney

157422/21 Du v. Latamie

161461/21 Escobar v. 155 West 23rd St. Properties LLC. Et Al

153083/24 Fernandes Costa v. 125 West 57th St. Prop. Owner

154239/24 Gomez Rodriguez v. Manhattan Constructors

652957/23 Greater NY Mutual Ins. Co. v. Ategrity Specialty Ins. Co.

654019/24 Hcls Consulting LLC v. Pervaiz Hclb Physician Pc

101335/24 Hohri v. Ipc Resiliency Partners

153628/22 Leibler v. Metro-North Commuter RR. Et Al

158707/17 McCord v. Broadwall Mgt. Corp.

151272/21 Mora v. Hirstan Associates LLC

654723/25 NY Princess Cruises 2 LLC Et Al v. Billybey Marina Services LLC Et Al

156299/21 Odain Thomas v. Adax LLC.

157561/23 Reda Water St. LLC v. Mvii

155299/24 Rodriguez v. 521 W 180 LLC Et Al

158797/23 Spantidakis v. Doughnut Plant Mgt.

654207/24 Tommy Hilfiger Retail v. 681 Fifth Ave. LLC Et Al

653079/25 Vourvoulis v. Kalcheim

155186/18 Williams v. Daphne Rlty. Corp.

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

160293/24 Ch Cluster Ncp Phase One LLC v. Aggarwal

160292/24 Ch Cluster Ncp Phase One LLC v. McGarvey

154928/21 Clemente v. 746 Rlty. Corp.

651211/25 Latitude Prop. Group LLC v. American Dream II Hotel LLC Et Al

157421/20 O'Neil v. Park Hotels & Resorts Inc.

150273/21 Soto v. Lot-Less of Fulton St. Inc. Dba Lot-Less Closeouts Et Al

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

650196/24 31 Lp v. Safety Shop, Inc.

156525/24 Adams v. Hunter Roberts Const. Group

151759/21 Allaraj v. Za Restaurant Mgt. LLC

153307/24 Altman v. Lyft, Inc. Et Al

150183/24 B v. New Horizons Preservation

152576/24 Backiel v. Bp Prods. North America Inc Et Al

152049/18 Berrios v. One Vanderbilt Owner LLC

653843/23 Bisono v. Tvt Capital LLC Et Al

653973/24 Board of Mgrs. of Galleria Condominium v. Sky Tower, Inc. Et Al

653843/14 Brigham v. Ancona LLC

159296/23 Castillo v. C & E Associates

651632/24 Charles Dsssr v. Unifor, Inc.

150394/19 Chris Su Rlty. Corp. v. Quaker Ridge Tenants Corp.

155441/22 Colon v. Chesapeake Owners Corp. Et Al

155740/20 Colon-Quiles v. Esplanade 99 LLC.

160896/21 Dawson v. 410 St Nicholas Prop. LLC

156505/21 Defrancesco v. Resnick Seaport

154989/21 Delgado v. Esplanade Gardens, Inc. Et Al

153932/24 Demarco v. Macklowe Properties Sales

160277/23 Distel v. Moroney

157422/21 Du v. Latamie

161461/21 Escobar v. 155 West 23rd St. Properties LLC. Et Al

153083/24 Fernandes Costa v. 125 West 57th St. Prop. Owner

154239/24 Gomez Rodriguez v. Manhattan Constructors

652957/23 Greater NY Mutual Ins. Co. v. Ategrity Specialty Ins. Co.

654019/24 Hcls Consulting LLC v. Pervaiz Hclb Physician Pc

101335/24 Hohri v. Ipc Resiliency Partners

153628/22 Leibler v. Metro-North Commuter RR. Et Al

158707/17 McCord v. Broadwall Mgt. Corp.

151272/21 Mora v. Hirstan Associates LLC

654723/25 NY Princess Cruises 2 LLC Et Al v. Billybey Marina Services LLC Et Al

156299/21 Odain Thomas v. Adax LLC.

157561/23 Reda Water St. LLC v. Mvii

155299/24 Rodriguez v. 521 W 180 LLC Et Al

158797/23 Spantidakis v. Doughnut Plant Mgt.

654207/24 Tommy Hilfiger Retail v. 681 Fifth Ave. LLC Et Al

653079/25 Vourvoulis v. Kalcheim

155186/18 Williams v. Daphne Rlty. Corp.

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

160293/24 Ch Cluster Ncp Phase One LLC v. Aggarwal

160292/24 Ch Cluster Ncp Phase One LLC v. McGarvey

154928/21 Clemente v. 746 Rlty. Corp.

651211/25 Latitude Prop. Group LLC v. American Dream II Hotel LLC Et Al

157421/20 O'Neil v. Park Hotels & Resorts Inc.

150273/21 Soto v. Lot-Less of Fulton St. Inc. Dba Lot-Less Closeouts Et Al

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

650196/24 31 Lp v. Safety Shop, Inc.

156525/24 Adams v. Hunter Roberts Const. Group

151759/21 Allaraj v. Za Restaurant Mgt. LLC

153307/24 Altman v. Lyft, Inc. Et Al

150183/24 B v. New Horizons Preservation

152576/24 Backiel v. Bp Prods. North America Inc Et Al

152049/18 Berrios v. One Vanderbilt Owner LLC

653843/23 Bisono v. Tvt Capital LLC Et Al

653973/24 Board of Mgrs. of Galleria Condominium v. Sky Tower, Inc. Et Al

653843/14 Brigham v. Ancona LLC

159296/23 Castillo v. C & E Associates

651632/24 Charles Dsssr v. Unifor, Inc.

150394/19 Chris Su Rlty. Corp. v. Quaker Ridge Tenants Corp.

155441/22 Colon v. Chesapeake Owners Corp. Et Al

155740/20 Colon-Quiles v. Esplanade 99 LLC.

160896/21 Dawson v. 410 St Nicholas Prop. LLC

156505/21 Defrancesco v. Resnick Seaport

154989/21 Delgado v. Esplanade Gardens, Inc. Et Al

153932/24 Demarco v. Macklowe Properties Sales

160277/23 Distel v. Moroney

157422/21 Du v. Latamie

161461/21 Escobar v. 155 West 23rd St. Properties LLC. Et Al

153083/24 Fernandes Costa v. 125 West 57th St. Prop. Owner

154239/24 Gomez Rodriguez v. Manhattan Constructors

652957/23 Greater NY Mutual Ins. Co. v. Ategrity Specialty Ins. Co.

654019/24 Hcls Consulting LLC v. Pervaiz Hclb Physician Pc

101335/24 Hohri v. Ipc Resiliency Partners

153628/22 Leibler v. Metro-North Commuter RR. Et Al

158707/17 McCord v. Broadwall Mgt. Corp.

151272/21 Mora v. Hirstan Associates LLC

654723/25 NY Princess Cruises 2 LLC Et Al v. Billybey Marina Services LLC Et Al

156299/21 Odain Thomas v. Adax LLC.

157561/23 Reda Water St. LLC v. Mvii

155299/24 Rodriguez v. 521 W 180 LLC Et Al

158797/23 Spantidakis v. Doughnut Plant Mgt.

654207/24 Tommy Hilfiger Retail v. 681 Fifth Ave. LLC Et Al

653079/25 Vourvoulis v. Kalcheim

155186/18 Williams v. Daphne Rlty. Corp.

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

160293/24 Ch Cluster Ncp Phase One LLC v. Aggarwal

160292/24 Ch Cluster Ncp Phase One LLC v. McGarvey

154928/21 Clemente v. 746 Rlty. Corp.

651211/25 Latitude Prop. Group LLC v. American Dream II Hotel LLC Et Al

157421/20 O'Neil v. Park Hotels & Resorts Inc.

150273/21 Soto v. Lot-Less of Fulton St. Inc. Dba Lot-Less Closeouts Et Al

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

650196/24 31 Lp v. Safety Shop, Inc.

156525/24 Adams v. Hunter Roberts Const. Group

151759/21 Allaraj v. Za Restaurant Mgt. LLC

153307/24 Altman v. Lyft, Inc. Et Al

150183/24 B v. New Horizons Preservation

152576/24 Backiel v. Bp Prods. North America Inc Et Al

152049/18 Berrios v. One Vanderbilt Owner LLC

653843/23 Bisono v. Tvt Capital LLC Et Al

653973/24 Board of Mgrs. of Galleria Condominium v. Sky Tower, Inc. Et Al

653843/14 Brigham v. Ancona LLC

159296/23 Castillo v. C & E Associates

651632/24 Charles Dsssr v. Unifor, Inc.

150394/19 Chris Su Rlty. Corp. v. Quaker Ridge Tenants Corp.

155441/22 Colon v. Chesapeake Owners Corp. Et Al

155740/20 Colon-Quiles v. Esplanade 99 LLC.

160896/21 Dawson v. 410 St Nicholas Prop. LLC

156505/21 Defrancesco v. Resnick Seaport

154989/21

**Early Settlement
Part 2**

Justice Samuel E. Wilkenfeld
80 Centre Street
Room 106

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

154537/21 Ahmed v. Ahmed
151265/22 Gerstenfeld v. Delacruz
151846/20 Helvestine v. Bernabe
150336/23 Kelly v. Lawrence Brody
154771/22 Leacock v. Karsch
152726/22 McQuade v. Paris
Gourmet Et Al
160126/22 Messam-Mcallister v. Sorkin
159882/19 Monteferrante v. Islam
153194/23 Morel v. Soltis
156964/19 'O'Rourke v. Cosmo
Provision Co. Inc
450309/23 Obey v. Delacruz
157869/22 Petit v. Meggett Jr
160722/21 Rosario v. Rosenbaum
152729/22 Rozsa v. Fernandez
452338/23 Zaman v. Delacruz

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

155432/23 Cachola v. NYC Et Al
155748/24 Exume v. Ponesse
153022/15 Lane v. NYC
153284/20 Maharaj v. NYC
150651/24 Platt v. NYC Et Al
451402/21 Soto v. NYC Et Al
155760/23 Sullivan v. NYC Et Al
152615/21 Supangkat v. The City of NY Et Al
153037/22 Wedlake v. NYC Et Al

Part 27

Justice Denise M Dominguez
80 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-5625
Courtroom 289

Part 41

Justice Nicholas W. Moyne
80 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3984
Room 327

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

159140/25 America First Policy
Institute v. Bragg
654471/24 American Transit Ins.
Co. v. Pringle
159894/25 In The Matter of The
Application of Mepec 132 LLC v.
Streamline USA
452035/25 In The Matter of The
Application of NY Black Car
Operators' Injury Compensation
Fund Inc. A/k/a NY Black Car
Fund As Subrogee of Erol
Beaurnun v. Navigators Ins. Co.
652043/20 Robinson v. Synergy
Alternative Capital
654164/25 Valentine v. NYCTA
157097/24 Yong Hong LLC Et Al v.
168 Afleck

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

654326/25 57th & 6th Ground LLC
v. Carnegie House Tenants Corp.
Et Al
153967/2491 Central Park West
Corp. Et Al v. Terenzio
653910/25 Ac Ocean Walk v. You
161390/25 Board of Mgrs. of The
209 East 2nd St. Condominium v.
Manhattan Portfolio Owner LLC
160045/18 Chernok v. Related
Companies
151709/18 Doe v. Our Lady of
Pompei

653111/24 Pbm LLC v. 681 Fifth Ave.
LLC

451636/24 State of NY v. Lugo

Motion

161390/25 Board of Mgrs. of The
209 East 2nd St. Condominium v.
Manhattan Portfolio Owner LLC

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

158690/22 425x50 LLC Et Al v. Stella
Tower Condominium F/k/a 435
West 50th St. Condominium Et Al

652998/25 Hpec, Inc. v. Startup
Health
157968/25 Roth & Roth v. NYCTA Et
Al

Motion

158690/22 425x50 LLC Et Al v. Stella
Tower Condominium F/k/a 435
West 50th St. Condominium Et Al

Part 50

Justice J. Machelie Sweeting
80 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-5639
Room 279

Part 51

Matrimonial Part

Justice Lisa S. Headley
80 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3846
Room 122

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

365505/23 De Luca v. De Luca
321528/21 Galvin v. Brill
365064/24 Zheng v. Lu

Motion

365505/23 De Luca v. De Luca
321528/21 Galvin v. Brill
365064/24 Zheng v. Lu

Part 65

Justice Denis M. Reo
80 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3887
Room 307

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

151059/20 Arriaga Pablo v. Stag
Const., Inc.
157472/21 Attanasio v. Ab Stable
LLC Et Al
160162/21 Biana Todorovic v.
Roosevelt Island Operating Corp.
Et. Ano.
159825/19 Charles v. Caroline Apts.
150589/21 Salva v. Metro-North
Commuter R.R. Co. Et Al
155655/18 Salvesen v. Port Auth. of
New

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

160635/15 Liberson v. Feldman
155713/21 Pickney v. 460w34
Owner LLC Et Al

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

151871/17 Bokman v. Manhattan
Motor Cars Inc.
150248/18 N&S Rosen Rlty. v. Khan

**Part 73R
Special Referee**

Justice Diego Santiago
60 Centre Street
Room 354

**Part 75R
Special Referee**

Justice Stephen S. Burzio
60 Centre Street
Room 240

**Part 81R
Special Referee**

Justice Lancelot B. Hewitt
80 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3680
Room 321

**Part 84R
Special Referee**

Justice Jeremy R. Feinberg
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3207
Room 641

**Part 87R
Special Referee**

Justice Joseph P. Burke
80 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-5541
Room 238

**Part 88R
Special Referee**

Justice Deborah E. Edelman
60 Centre Street
Room 158

**Part 89R
Special Referee**

Justice Sue Ann Hoashng
80 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3676
Room 236

**71 THOMAS
STREET**

Part 13

Justice Eric Schumacher
71 Thomas Street
Phone 646-386-3736
Courtroom 304

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

190203/25 Carpenter v. Minerals
Technologies, Inc., Et Al
190257/24 Morin v. Pfizer Inc. Et Al
190025/16 Quirk v. Abb, Inc.
TUESDAY, SEPT. 9
190050/24 Bacic v. Amchem Prods.,
Inc., N/k/a Rhone Poulenc Ag
Co., N/k/a Bayer Cropsience
Inc. Et Al
190055/24 Kmiotek v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co Et Al
190065/24 Kmiotek v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co Et Al
190083/24 Lang v. Amchem Prods.,
Inc., N/k/a Rhone Poulenc Ag
Co., N/k/a Bayer Cropsience
Inc Et Al
190058/24 Lawrence v. Aercro Int'l
190108/24 Logothetis v. American
Blitrite Inc Et Al
190045/24 Martens v. Aercro Int'l
190038/24 Martin v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co Et Al
190106/18 Moore v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co. Et Al
190239/23 Oppici v. Aamco
Transmission
190312/23 Sparring v. Amchem
Prods., Inc., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Bayer
Cropsience Inc Et Al
190089/24 Susan Digiamo As
Administratrix For The Estate of
Salvatore Gambino v. Amchem
Prods., Inc., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Bayer
Cropsience Inc Et Al
190106/24 Weber v. Amchem Prods.,
Inc., N/k/a Rhone Poulenc Ag
Co., N/k/a Bayer Cropsience
Inc Et Al
190118/24 Widercrantz v. Amchem
Prods., Inc., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Bayer
Cropsience Inc Et Al
190045/24 Martens v. Aercro Int'l
190038/24 Martin v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co Et Al
190106/18 Moore v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co. Et Al
190293/23 Oppici v. Aamco
Transmission
190312/23 Sparring v. Amchem
Prods., Inc., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Bayer
Cropsience Inc Et Al
190089/24 Susan Digiamo As
Administratrix For The Estate of
Salvatore Gambino v. Amchem
Prods., Inc., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Bayer
Cropsience Inc Et Al
190277/19 Radovic v. Amchem
Prods., Inc.

Part 23

Justice Eric Schumacher
71 Thomas Street
Phone 646-386-3736
Courtroom 304

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

190203/25 Carpenter v. Minerals
Technologies, Inc., Et Al
190257/24 Morin v. Pfizer Inc. Et Al
190025/16 Quirk v. Abb, Inc.
TUESDAY, SEPT. 9
190050/24 Bacic v. Amchem Prods.,
Inc., N/k/a Rhone Poulenc Ag
Co., N/k/a Bayer Cropsience
Inc. Et Al
190055/24 Kmiotek v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co Et Al
190065/24 Kmiotek v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co Et Al
190083/24 Lang v. Amchem Prods.,
Inc., N/k/a Rhone Poulenc Ag
Co., N/k/a Bayer Cropsience
Inc Et Al
190058/24 Lawrence v. Aercro Int'l
190108/24 Logothetis v. American
Blitrite Inc Et Al
190045/24 Martens v. Aercro Int'l
190038/24 Martin v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co Et Al
190106/18 Moore v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co. Et Al
190293/23 Oppici v. Aamco
Transmission
190312/23 Sparring v. Amchem
Prods., Inc., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Bayer
Cropsience Inc Et Al
190089/24 Susan Digiamo As
Administratrix For The Estate of
Salvatore Gambino v. Amchem
Prods., Inc., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Bayer
Cropsience Inc Et Al
190277/19 Radovic v. Amchem
Prods., Inc.

190150/20 Anglero v. Amchem
Prods., Inc.
190031/15 Deangelis v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co.
190159/20 Goldstein v. Amchem
Prods., Inc., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Bayer
Cropsience Inc Et Al
190170/20 Guccione v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co.
190206/22 Pollock v. Amchem
Prods., Inc., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Bayer
Cropsience Inc Et Al
190277/19 Radovic v. Amchem
Prods., Inc.

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

190150/20 Anglero v. Amchem
Prods., Inc.
190031/15 Deangelis v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co.
190159/20 Goldstein v. Amchem
Prods., Inc., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Bayer
Cropsience Inc Et Al
190170/20 Guccione v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co.
190206/22 Pollock v. Amchem
Prods., Inc., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Bayer
Cropsience Inc Et Al
190277/19 Radovic v. Amchem
Prods., Inc.

Part 18

Justice Alexander M. Tisch
71 Thomas Street
Phone 646-386-3472
Room 104

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

950368/20 Allen v. Archdiocese of
NY Et Al
951372/21 Alverio v. Archdiocese of
NY Et Al
950623/19 Bakhrakh v. Elaine
Kaufman Cultural Center
950105/19 Bassile v. Archdiocese of
NY Et Al
950440/21 C. v. Archdiocese of NY
950139/21 Collazo v. Roman
Catholic Archdiocese
950469/21 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950608/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950204/21 Doe v. Roman Catholic
Archdiocese
950694/20 Fleming v. Archdiocese
of NY
951304/21 Lanza v. Roman Catholic
Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950552/20 Morris v. Archdiocese of
NY
950256/20 N. v. Archdiocese of NY

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

950710/20 Annette Dorothy
Lamacy-Murphy Et Al v.
Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950272/20 Armatiz v. Archdiocese of
NY
160902/17 Beitia v. Trump
Organization
950301/21 Borg v. Archdiocese of
NY Et Al
951046/21 C. v. Archdiocese of NY
950605/20 Cook v. Roman Catholic
Archdiocese
950304/21 Delfino v. The Roman
Catholic Diocese of Bklyn. Et Al
950436/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950108/21 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950743/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950285/20 Ennis v. The Archdiocese
of NY Et Al
950381/20 Felder v. NYC Dept. of
950218/19 Fling v. NYC Et Al
950005/19 Haughtwout v.
Archdiocese of NY
950646/20 Janis v. NYC
950490/21 Kareem v. NYC Et Al
450198/23 Lecruise v. NYC Et Al

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

150592/23 Azogue v. 726 Eighth LLC
Et Al
152642/24 Bonano v. Memorial
Sloan Kettering Cancer Center
Et Al
150501/24 Boyd v. NYCH&HC
Hosp. Corp.
150041/24 Brown v. Jewish Home
Lifecare
155602/22 Canales v. Ipg Lic 49th
Ave Lower Floor Units Prop.
Owner LLC Et Al
151281/24 Chowdhry v. Hilton
Worldwide, Inc. Et Al
151836/24 Davis v. Ms Harrison LLC
Et Al
151933/23 Diaz v. NYCHA
453006/23 Figuero v. NYCHA
160208/23 Gizang-Ginsberg v. Plaza
400 Owners Corp.
150769/24 Gonzalez v. Ormonde
Equities LLC
150731/23 Guzman v. Staples Inc. Et
Al
151997/23 Huk v. Temple Israel of
NY Et Al
159349/22 Jarquin v. NY Developers
& Mgt. LLC Et Al
154388/23 Leon Riano v. Trustees of
Columbia Univ. in NYC Et Al
151570/24 Longas v. Sjp Ts
158603/24 Mogan v. 743 Fifth Ave.
Condominium Et Al
158672/23 Maria Corazza And
Giuliana Weiss v. Suffolk
Restorative Therapy And
Nursing
156371/20 Mauray Rlty. Co. v.
Advantage Wholesale Supply
150010/24 Mendez v. 520 W 136 LLC
Et Al
151969/24 Montes-Deoca v. NYCHA
153314/23 Nguyen v. Block &
Associates
152466/24 Parciak v. 77 Jane LLC Et
Al
152776/20 Pasquini v. T.D. Bank

151871/17 Bokman v. Manhattan
Motor Cars Inc.
150248/18 N&S Rosen Rlty. v. Khan

Court Calendars

950663/21 McKeon v. The USA East
Province of The Society of Jesus,
Inc. Et Al
153043/25 Mendez v. NYC Dept. of
Health And Mental Hygiene
951399/21 Mendez v. The Primitive
Christian Church Et Al
950148/21 Miller-Breland v. NYC Et
Al
950011/20 Paul v. Archdiocese of
NY Et Al
951370/21 Pena v. NYC Et Al
950623/21 Ramos v. Roman
Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950140/19 Ruvotalo v. Archdiocese
of NY
950215/20 S. v. Archdiocese of NY
950874/21 Smith v. The Roman
Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950154/21 Tabone v. Roman
Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950111/19 Twersky v. Yeshiva Univ.
950176/21 W. v. NYC
950665/21 Wolfe v. The USA East
Province of The Society of Jesus,
Inc. Et Al
950245/19 Zayas v. NYC Et Al

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

651375/25 American Transit
Insurance Company v. Greenway
Rx Inc.
651368/25 American Transit Ins.
Co. v. Westchester Radiology &
Imaging
156191/25 Bravo v. NYS Div. of
Housing And Community
Renewal (Dchr) Et Al
950221/20 Connerney v.
Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950348/21 Feldman v. NYC Et Al
950468/21 Gonzalez v. NYC Et Al
453161/21 Lindo v. Chestnut Hldgs.
of NY Inc. Et Al
950739/21 Mickel v. NYC Et Al
950669/20 Morgan v. Archdiocese of
NY
950119/21 Phaire v. NYC Et Al
950210/21 R. v. NYC
453730/24 The Board of Education
of The City School Dist. of NYC
v. Woods Jr.

Motion

651375/25 American Transit
Insurance Company v. Greenway
Rx Inc.
651368/25 American Transit Ins.
Co. v. Westchester Radiology &
Imaging
156191/25 Bravo v. NYS Div. of
Housing And Community
Renewal (Dchr) Et Al
950221/20 Connerney v.
Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950348/21 Feldman v. NYC Et Al
950468/21 Gonzalez v. NYC Et Al
453161/21 Lindo v. Chestnut Hldgs.
of NY Inc. Et Al
950739/21 Mickel v. NYC Et Al
950669/20 Morgan v. Archdiocese of
NY
950119/21 Phaire v. NYC Et Al
950210/21 R. v. NYC
453730/24 The Board of Education
of The City School Dist. of NYC
v. Woods Jr.

Motion

651375/25 American Transit
Insurance Company v. Greenway
Rx Inc.
651368/25 American Transit Ins.
Co. v. Westchester Radiology &
Imaging
156191/25 Bravo v. NYS Div. of
Housing And Community
Renewal (Dchr) Et Al
950221/20 Connerney v.
Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950348/21 Feldman v. NYC Et Al
950468/21 Gonzalez v. NYC Et Al
453161/21 Lindo v. Chestnut Hldgs.
of NY Inc. Et Al
950739/21 Mickel v. NYC Et Al
950669/20 Morgan v. Archdiocese of
NY
950119/21 Phaire v. NYC Et Al
950210/21 R. v. NYC
453730/24 The Board of Education
of The City School Dist. of NYC
v. Woods Jr.

Part 23

Justice Eric Schumacher
71 Thomas Street
Phone 646-386-3736
Courtroom 304

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

190203/25 Carpenter v. Minerals
Technologies, Inc., Et Al
190257/24 Morin v. Pfizer Inc. Et Al
190025/16 Quirk v. Abb, Inc.
TUESDAY, SEPT. 9
190050/24 Bacic v. Amchem Prods.,
Inc., N/k/a Rhone Poulenc Ag
Co., N/k/a Bayer Cropsience
Inc. Et Al
190055/24 Kmiotek v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co Et Al
190065/24 Kmiotek v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co Et Al
190083/24 Lang v. Amchem Prods.,
Inc., N/k/a Rhone Poulenc Ag
Co., N/k/a Bayer Cropsience
Inc Et Al
190058/24 Lawrence v. Aercro Int'l
190108/24 Logothetis v. American
Blitrite Inc Et Al
190045/24 Martens v. Aercro Int'l
190038/24 Martin v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co Et Al
190106/18 Moore v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co. Et Al
190293/23 Oppici v. Aamco
Transmission
190312/23 Sparring v. Amchem
Prods., Inc., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Bayer
Cropsience Inc Et Al
190089/24 Susan Digiamo As
Administratrix For The Estate of
Salvatore Gambino v. Amchem
Prods., Inc., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Bayer
Cropsience Inc Et Al
190277/19 Radovic v. Amchem
Prods., Inc.

190150/20 Anglero v. Amchem
Prods., Inc.
190031/15 Deangelis v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co.
190159/20 Goldstein v. Amchem
Prods., Inc., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Bayer
Cropsience Inc Et Al
190170/20 Guccione v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co.
190206/22 Pollock v. Amchem
Prods., Inc., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Bayer
Cropsience Inc Et Al
190277/19 Radovic v. Amchem
Prods., Inc.

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

190150/20 Anglero v. Amchem
Prods., Inc.
190031/15 Deangelis v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co.
190159/20 Goldstein v. Amchem
Prods., Inc., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Bayer
Cropsience Inc Et Al
190170/20 Guccione v. A.O. Smith
Water Prods. Co.
190206/22 Pollock v. Amchem
Prods., Inc., N/k/a Rhone
Poulenc Ag Co., N/k/a Bayer
Cropsience Inc Et Al
190277/19 Radovic v. Amchem
Prods., Inc.

Part 18

Justice Alexander M. Tisch
71 Thomas Street
Phone 646-386-3472
Room 104

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

950368/20 Allen v. Archdiocese of
NY Et Al
951372/21 Alverio v. Archdiocese of
NY Et Al
950623/19 Bakhrakh v. Elaine
Kaufman Cultural Center
950105/19 Bassile v. Archdiocese of
NY Et Al
950440/21 C. v. Archdiocese of NY
950139/21 Collazo v. Roman
Catholic Archdiocese
950469/21 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950608/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950204/21 Doe v. Roman Catholic
Archdiocese
950694/20 Fleming v. Archdiocese
of NY
951304/21 Lanza v. Roman Catholic
Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950552/20 Morris v. Archdiocese of
NY
950256/20 N. v. Archdiocese of NY

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

950710/20 Annette Dorothy
Lamacy-Murphy Et Al v.
Archdiocese of NY Et Al
950272/20 Armatiz v. Archdiocese of
NY
160902/17 Beitia v. Trump
Organization
950301/21 Borg v. Archdiocese of
NY Et Al
951046/21 C. v. Archdiocese of NY
950605/20 Cook v. Roman Catholic
Archdiocese
950304/21 Delfino v. The Roman
Catholic Diocese of Bklyn. Et Al
950436/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950108/21 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950743/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY
950285/20 Ennis v. The Archdiocese
of NY Et Al
950381/20 Felder v. NYC Dept. of
950218/19 Fling v. NYC Et Al
950005/19 Haughtwout v.
Archdiocese of NY
950646/20 Janis v. NYC
950490/21 Kareem v. NYC Et Al
450198/23 Lecruise v. NYC Et Al

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

150592/23 Azogue v. 726 Eighth LLC
Et Al
152642/24 Bonano v. Memorial
Sloan Kettering Cancer Center
Et Al
150501/24 Boyd v. NYCH&HC
Hosp. Corp.
150041/24 Brown v. Jewish Home
Lifecare
155602/22 Canales v. Ipg Lic 49th
Ave Lower Floor Units Prop.
Owner LLC Et Al
151281/24 Chowdhry v. Hilton
Worldwide, Inc. Et Al
151836/24 Davis v. Ms Harrison LLC
Et Al
151933/23 Diaz v. NYCHA
453006/23 Figuero v. NYCHA
160208/23 Gizang-Ginsberg v. Plaza
400 Owners Corp.
150769/24 Gonzalez v. Ormonde
Equities LLC
150731/23 Guzman v. Staples Inc. Et
Al
151997/23 Huk v. Temple Israel of
NY Et Al
159349/22 Jarquin v. NY Developers
& Mgt. LLC Et Al
154388/23 Leon Riano v. Trustees of
Columbia Univ. in NYC Et Al
151570/24 Longas v. Sjp Ts
158603/24 Mogan v. 743 Fifth Ave.
Condominium Et Al
158672/23 Maria Corazza And
Giuliana Weiss v. Suffolk
Restorative Therapy And
Nursing
156371/20 Mauray Rlty. Co. v.
Advantage Wholesale Supply
150010/24 Mendez v. 520 W 136 LLC
Et Al
151969/24 Montes-Deoca v. NYCHA
153314/23 Nguyen v. Block &
Associates
152466/24 Parciak v. 77 Jane LLC Et
Al
152776/20 Pasquini v. T.D. Bank

151871/17 Bokman v. Manhattan
Motor Cars Inc.
150248/18 N&S Rosen Rlty. v. Khan

151611/23 Paucar Espinoza v. The
NYCHA
152164/23 Pazmino Urgiles v. Joy
Const. Corp. Et Al
150715/24 Pena v. Dy 407 Audubon
LLC Et Al
154346/23 Pistone v. Jp Morgan
Chase Bank
154640/23 Ramirez v. 470 Audubon
Ave Corp.
152878/23 Raspaolo v. Kmr Rlty
LLC Et Al
151736/24 Regalado Delgado v.
Sherman Creek Owner
152741/24 Rodriguez v. Marriott
Int'l, Inc. Et Al
150278/24 Schor v. Go Covenant
LLC Et Al
151082/24 Shark v. 1010 Sixth
Associates LLC Et Al
150436/24 Sole v. Stromboli Pizza
Inc Et Al
151854/24 Vega v. 55 Broad Gc LLC
Et Al
152585/23 Verizon NY Inc. v. Jrcruz
Corp.
155700/23 Yasuca v. Cosmic Rlty.
Partners LLC Et Al

Part 36

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

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

161344/15 Friedfeld v. Citibank N.A.
161717/24 Hw Dev. 3 v. Board
of Mgrs. of The Art Deco
Condominium Et Al
451942/23 Walton v. Ecumenical
Community

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

656925/21 Nichols v. Weinstein
WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10
152574/25 Acheampong v. Roman
Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
100761/25 Cabral v. NYCHA
653730/21 Ecosafe Consultants
Inc. v. Alterior Contracting Corp.
158565/25 First Funds v. Abdullah
155196/23 Hales Dugan v. Hales
157332/25 McNeely v. Just Salad
100832/25 Oppenheimer v. NYCHA/
Section 8 Radpact
655969/20 Spring Bank v. Menexas
655850/21 Ysho Hldg. Inc. v. 274
Bowery Leasehold LLC Et Al

Motion

152574/25 Acheampong v. Roman
Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al
100761/25 Cabral v. NYCHA
653730/21 Ecosafe Consultants
Inc. v. Alterior Contracting Corp.
158565/25 First Funds v. Abdullah
155196/23 Hales Dugan v. Hales
157332/25 McNeely v. Just Salad
100832/25 Oppenheimer v. NYCHA/
Section 8 Radpact
655969/20 Spring Bank v. Menexas
655850/21 Ysho Hldg. Inc. v. 274
Bowery Leasehold LLC Et Al

Part 46

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

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

150020/23 Arostegui v. Nova Const.
Services LLC Et Al
153456/23 Franck v. 509 W 34—11

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

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 646-346-4044
100 Centre St.
Room 1130, 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 646-386-4031
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 Gingold
Surrogate Rita Mella
31 Chamber's Street
New York, NY

See court's webpage for information about appearances: Visiting Surrogate's Court I 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 TBA

A Supreme Court calendar will be called and Mental Hygiene Hearings will be conducted virtually at Bronx Supreme Court-Civil Term, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451, Room TBA, every Wednesday, commencing at a time TBA.

A Supreme Court calendar will be called and Mental Hygiene Hearings will be conducted in person at Bronx Supreme Court-Civil Term, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx NY 10451, Room TBA, every Thursday, commencing at a time TBA.

A Supreme Court calendar will be called and Mental Hygiene Hearings will be conducted virtually for the Community Assisted Outpatient Treatment Calendar at Bronx Supreme Court- Civil Term, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451, Room TBA, every 2nd and 4th Friday of each month, commencing at a time TBA.

MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE SALES
Mortgage foreclosure sales in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Bronx, are conducted at the Bronx County Courthouse, located at 851 Grand Concourse, Courtroom 711, commencing at 2:15 p.m.

Auction information is available at the following link: https://ww2.nycourts.gov/courts/12jd/bronx/civil/civil_Foreclosure_information.shtml

Contact Information:

Email: bxforeclosure@nycourts.gov

Phone: 718-618-1322.

Trial Assignment Part
Justice Joseph E. Capella
Phone 718-618-1201
Room 711, 9:30 A.M.

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

302914/14 Adams v. Hertz Vehicles LLC
22084/14 Bailey v. Ranani
33492/19 Ballard v. Bertram
35100/19 Barksdale v. Gonzalez
33816/18 Barragan v. North Bronx Mgt. LLC
81964/23 Bello-Osagie v. Matrazzo

803852/23 Beyene v. Ribeiro
802809/21 Brito Santos v. Mta Bus Co.
21467/11 Brown v. NYC
27232/18 Diaz v. Vivar-Martinez
25256/18 Diaz v. Seniorcare

Emergency Medical
25167/14 Espada v. Mateo
801944/22 Ferguson v. East 235 Rty. LLC

801760/21 Gilmore v. Greene
34918/19 Gutierrez v. Highbridge
30398/16 Hall v. Genus
313688/21 Hernandez v. Lanese
300954/16 Jackson v. NYC
30235/18 Jimenez v. Nival

304364/14 Jones v. Alford
805399/23 Jones v. Prashad
80667/124 Laureano v. Betancourt
22798/18 Martinez v. Stericycle, Inc.
80592/24 McLendon v. Bronx Center For Rehabilitation And Healthcare

20178/19 McNeill v. Gewirtz
27287/18 Melendez v. Truffles II
24263/19 Nunez-De Molina v. Highbridge Community Housing Dev. Fund Corp.
306348/10 Omaar v. Rodriguez
21240/20 Ortega v. Eugene Smilovic

Housing
802448/21 Pena v. Gupta
22317/18 Perez v. Kings Harbor Multicare Center
23283/16 Presley v. NYC
807655/22 Price v. Red Lobster Hosp.ity LLC
20363/19 Ramaj v. Franciosa

Complex LLC
26420/17 Rodriguez v. Ciovanna
31567/18 Rodriguez v. Giannone
80168/123 Sanchez v. NYCHA Et Al
86350/00 Scott v. St. Barnabas Hosp.
21612/19 Sewell v. Gomez

300996/17 Smith v. Pegram
26961/18 Spigner-Rice v. Schindler Elevator Corp.
817207/22 Topping v. Montefiore Medical Center Et Al
807835/24 Torres v. Al-Jo Real Estate Inc. Et Al
380628/08 U.S. Bank Nat. Assoc. v. Hayling
811190/22 Urrutia v. Thomas P.A.
807523/21 Valentin v. H.E.L.P. USA, Inc. Et Al
29067/18 Ventura v. Marte
802432/21 Wynter v. 600 East 21st St. LLC

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

20869/19 A. v. Polo Lara
803695/22 Abreu v. Oved Bronx LLC Et Al
25974/20 Acevedo v. Great American Care LLC
817893/22 Ameyaw v. Valencia
807798/21 Anderson v. Aac Cross County Mall
809930/21 Bun v. Yerry
805905/23 Correa Jr. v. Montefiore Medical Center Et Al
28994/18 Cruz v. Acacia Gardens Housing
28259/18 Cruz v. Crotona Pkwy. Apts.

310317/11 Disla v. Biggs
210178/08 Gonzalez v. Bah
80837/1221 v. NYCHA Et Al
800586/23 Hernandez v. Kryshtof
304004/14 Hollington v. Reyes
808203/23 Jacobs v. Fordham Nursing And Rehabilitation Center Et Al
805582/22 Jimenez v. Singh
305616/13 Jimenez v. Bhagwati
807988/23 Joseph v. S Ocampo Services LLC Et Al
33691/18 Knight v. Dominick Doria & Son

27951/16 Kubanik v. NYC
31394/19 Larosa v. Diaz
32964/19 Levin v. NYCHA
818506/22 Maldonado v. Mott Haven 140
803271/21 Martinez v. Monaghan
815127/22 Mercredi v. Terron
26657/15 Mike Gregorette And Sons Inc. v. Eom 983 Summit Corp.
812150/22 Nadinga v. Christian
804007/23 Oliver v. NYCHA Et Al
24699/19 Ortiz v. Ullah
250023/16 Oscar v. Pirveli
307473/13 Pacheco v. Lkd Corp.
307682/16 Perez v. Wagner Associates LLC
806707/22 Rankines v. Martinez
27272/17 Reynoso v. NYCHA
27887/19 Ripas v. 13 L&D Rty. LLC
35830/20 Rojas v. Miami Wireless LLC
31210/17 Rosario-Silverio v. Ppc Commercial
25392/19 Seymore v. Byfield
25129/20 Simmons v. Cliffside Properties
20829/20 Simon v. Ki Motors Inc
31821/18 Sky v. Padolina
300003/17 Varriano v. Varriano
24192/13 Velasquez v. Sosa-Escoto
810549/24 Washington v. Silver Star Limo.Com

ADR Part
Phone 718-618-3081
Room 701A

Part 2
Justice Elizabeth A. Taylor
Phone 718-618-1275
Room 710, 9:30 A.M.

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

801587/23 Aponte v. Ptg Const. Corp. Et Al
817074/23 Bonifaz Alvarez v. Real Land Group LLC Et Al
809193/23 Estela v. Ps Northeast
814012/23 Monchez Sandoval v. Archstone Builders LLC Et Al
813058/23 Moreto Ruiz v. Real Land Group LLC Et Al
803065/24 Novoa v. The River House At Sleepy Hollow Condominium Et Al
817222/23 Retamoso Marcatinco v. Joy Const. Corp. Et Al

Part 3
Justice Mitchell J. Danziger
Phone 718-618-1207
Room 707, 9:30 A.M.

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

30127/20 Abel-Bey v. NYC Et Al
30663/20 Abel-Bey v. NYC Et Al
814512/24B.H.M. v. NYC Et Al
818279/24 Bogle v. NYC Et Al
818117/24 Cruz v. Rahman
818856/24 Daily v. NYC Et Al
818236/24 Diaz v. NYC Et Al
805059/24 Duncan v. NYC Et Al
805978/24 Duran v. Ferreras
815065/23 Feliz v. Harlem Furniture One Corp
806249/24 Gibbs v. NYC Et Al
813917/23 Jones v. NYC Dept. of Social Services - Human Resources Admin. - Dept. of Homeless Services Et Al
800338/25 Kinsey v. NYC Et Al
809340/25 Mattison v. NYC Et Al
806374/25 McGrier v. NYC Et Al
807720/24 McNeil v. 5660 B'way. LLC. Et Al
806985/25 Mendoza Medina v. NYC Et Al
805381/25 Perry v. NYC Et Al
802517/25 Polanco De Peralta v. Lopez

802531/24 Ramirez v. NYC Et Al
801004/25 Rampsard v. NYC
811343/23 Robertson v. NYC Et Al
804335/24 Salas v. NYC Et Al
807241/25 Sanchez v. NYC Et Al
811061/25 Santo v. NYC Et Al
809083/24 Smith v. NYC
805527/24T.S. An Infant Under The Age of Fourteen Years By His Father And Natural Guardian Hadrian Saunders Et Al v. The Board of Education of NYC And Or The Dept. of Education of NYC Et Al
802813/24 Trinidad v. NYC NYCH&HC Corp. Et Al
816163/24 Troncoso v. NYC Et Al
810264/25 Wallace v. NYC; Et Al
813296/25 Whitaker v. NYC Et Al

Part 4
Justice Andrew J. Cohen
Phone 718-618-1212
Room 413, 9:30 A.M.

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

805702/23 Santos v. Parkash 2454 LLC Et Al
809290/25 Al1 Hallow Institute v. 813771/24 Amoani v. Garcia Collado
600/25 Barthelemy v. Pultman
813212/24 Bonifacio-Lopez v. Urban-Scape
3547/24 Cadell v. Messina
801446/25 Clark v. Duran
807978/24 Clark v. Obregon
816850/23 Claros v. Owl Asscets Inc.
816838/24 Darsadeg v. Roque
805590/24 Dominguez Sosa v. Quezada Guartambel
811067/22 Dornier v. Copeland
804583/23 Eshra v. Monroe College
820634/24 Flores v. Cherno
809798/22 Frederick v. NYC Et Al
800423/22 Garcia-Quintanilla v. Belfiore Food Corp. Et Al
815939/24 Goldstein v. Estay
804461/25 Gonzalez v. Yan
805460/25 Haynes v. Mina Atea
803499/24 Hernandez v. Fly Rosary Corp. Et Al
816469/24 Holmes v. Mercedes
805058/23 Yank y. 1355 Morris Ave. LLC. Et Al
813585/24 Lambert v. NYCHA
816545/24 Leconte v. Pichardo Rodriguez

802944/25 M.M. v. Antonio
809911/23 Matatov v. American United Transportation, Inc. Et Al
802999/25 Mená Paez v. USA Transportation, Inc. Et Al
803840/25 Millan v. Tiendrebego
813186/24 Mohabeer v. Pierre Jr.

803322/25 Montero v. Woodlawn Cemetery
805287/24 Mutakabbir v. Lewis
806409/24 Nicholson v. Lewis
818695/24 Nunez-Deleon v. Fed. Express Corp. Et Al
814910/24 Ortiz v. Subramaniam
807757/24 Palmer v. Singh
802207/24 Rafael v. 1745 West Farms Road LLC Et Al
818440/24 Rahman v. Rivers
816890/24 Reid v. Morgan
818685/24 Rodriguez v. Coulibaly
807301/25 Rosario Duran v. Cabrera Javier
803040/25 Ruiz v. John Doe (name Being Fictitious
800283/25 Santos v. NYC Et Al
803238/23 Sotamba v. Velvet Healing By Alma Et Al
808523/24 State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. Et Al v. Clarke Md
815435/25 The Bldg. Service 32bj Health Fund v. 65-84 Rego Park LLC
803594/24 NYC v. 4137 White Plains Road
810709/25 NYC v. The Land And Bldg. Known As 1178 East Gun Hill Road
805562/25 NYC v. The Land And Bldg. Known As 1770 Westchester Ave.
808064/25 NYC v. The Land And Bldg. Known As 2957 Middletown Road
809857/25 NYC v. The Land And Bldg. Known As 3754 East Tremont Ave.
811502/25 NYC v. The Land And Bldg. Known As 482 East Tremont Ave.
802774/25 Validum v. Venture Leasing LLC Et Al
803417/25 Weiss v. Ferriola

Part 5
Justice Alison Y. Tuitt
Phone 718-618-1224
Room 415, 9:30 A.M.

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

812366/25 Alvarez Lopez v. Motor Vehicle Accident Indemnification Corp. Et Al
35474/19 Giboyeaux v. Services For The Underserved
303152/15 Lewis v. Clark
818132/22M. v. 2330 Sm LLC Et Al
4319/25 Rivas Arroyo v. NYC Dept. of Finance
814382/23 Rojas v. Hp Sherman Creek Housing Dev. Fund Co., Inc. Et Al
1024/25 Suazo v. NYCHA Murphy Private 998 East 167 St.
814930/25 Valencia View v. John Hancock Assignment Co. Et Al

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

34666/19 Alequin v. Holmes
28304/17 Anderson v. 2246 Hldg. Corp.
811165/22 Guzman Garcia v. 1701 Eastburn Rty. LLC

Part 6
Justice Laura G. Douglas
Phone 718-618-1246
Room 811, 9:30 A.M.

Part 7
Justice Wilma Guzman
Phone 718-618-1288
Room 624, 9:30 A.M.

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

816301/21 Aguirre v. Rigo Limo-Auto
816092/24 Arana v. Sd Tank Lines LLC Et Al
29511/20 Bartley v. McFarlane
816758/21 Bautista-Perez v. Windsor Owners Corp.
811257/22 Boshnjok v. Macy's Corporate Services
811724/24 Brand v. Webster Ave. Affordable LLC Et Al
807117/23 Bravo v. Kodra Const. Corp. Et Al
820000/23 Bravo v. Brp 500 Main LLC Et Al
816907/24 Bryant v. Gamez-Samayoa
805106/25 Casso v. 1757 Tjm Food Corp. Et Al
810975/24 Castro v. Heights Rty. Co LLC Et Al
802498/24 Colon-Perez v. Mace The Great Deli Delight Corp. Et Al
812647/24 Concepcion v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co.
30066/20 Cornelio v. Plaza Associates LLC
300149/19 Creekstone Juban I LLC v. Xl Ins. America, Inc.
820348/24 Cruz v. Fresh Hot Pizza, Inc.
803735/24 Disla v. Three Thousand LLC
810005/24 Donnes v. Mosholu Concourse Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al
810799/21 Duffy v. Pitt
812362/24 Edwards v. Rowe
805351/24 Flores v. 2095 Creston Ave. Rty. LLC Et Al
802136/24 Gaston v. NYCHA
820441/23 Graciano v. Summit Provisions, Inc. Et Al
808164/24 Harrell v. Central Medical Supply Co. Et Al
811003/24 Higgins v. Kho Jason
809685/21 Ioannidis v. Ps Southern Blvd., Inc. Et Al
6783/24 Jackson v. Staten Island Univ. Hosp.
805108/23 Jones v. 1465 Rty.
813603/24 Kola v. Livesay
816635/23 Lara-Franco v. Sibble Jr.
819807/23 Marquez Reyes v. Jrnk LLC. Et Al
819957/24 Marte Rodriguez v. Reyes-M
817793/24 Martinez v. Metro Rty. Leasing LLC Et Al
814054/22 Nr Et Al v. 2120 Mapes Ave Et Al

34897/20 Orellana v. 115 Enterprise Group LLC
816605/23 Padilla v. Valdesia Gardens LLC Et Al
807522/24 Paguy Sanango v. Perez
809811/24 Perez v. Amazon Logistics Inc Et Al
809406/24 Pham v. Mta Bus Co. Et Al

819029/24 Pieter v. Kiswani
803411/22 Pitts v. Mayhew
819244/23 Polanco Cosme v. Northeast Truck Rental And Leasing LLC. Et Al
804851/24 Polanco v. Garcia
820339/24 Potter v. Lovejoy
801089/25 Rosario Espinal v. Mateo Castillo
815964/24 Rosario v. Verizon NY Inc. Et Al
801580/25 Sanchez v. Peralta
810971/24 Sanchez v. Intesar
814816/24 Santos Mota v. Meagan Enterprises LLC Et Al
809656/22 Serrano v. 1815 Savannah Food Corp.
304649/15 Steward v. Kapku Rty. Associates
804496/23 Vasquez v. 1331 Jerome Ave. Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al
816698/24 Ventura v. Andrews 103 LLC Et Al

805559/23 Verity v. Clarke
808606/21 Yank y. 2839 Bainbridge Ave. Associates L.L.C Et Al
808706/22 Yauger-Ferreira v. Reynoso

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

802017/22 Contreras Pena v. Adjei
24667/16 Cruz v. 100 Summit LLC
817557/22L.P. An Infant By Her Mother And Natural Guardian Noemi Calderon Et Al v. Frost Valley Ymca

Part 8
Justice Blanka Perez
Phone 718-618-1205
Room 704, 9:30 A.M.

Part 9/33
Justice Myrna Socorro
Phone 718-618-1625

818274/22 Sarango Barba v. Blue Sky Builders, Inc. Et Al
813014/24 Singleton v. Community Housing Innovations Inc. Et Al
33057/18 Taxis v. 56th Rlty. LLC
35720/20 Torres Acuna v. Lmv II L.P.
801696/25 Torres v. Doe
80237/23 Ulloa v. Tamaklo
34475/19 Vargas v. Trustees of Columbia
818042/22 Velasquez v. Hrv Mgt., Inc. Et Al
815753/21 Vimos v. Y.N.H. Const. Inc. Et Al

Part 25
Justice Mary Ann Brigantti
Phone 718-618-1252
Room 407, 9:30 A.M.

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9
817109/23 Casiano v. R.G. Ortiz Funeral Home Inc. Et Al
806324/23 Castillo-Nunez v. Iyaho Social Services Inc. Et Al
801174/21 Folk v. Andrews Plaza Housing
31909/20 Garcia v. 1152 Sheridan Estates
815082/22 Keteku v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. D/b/a Samsung 837 Et Al
815548/21 Ramirez Juarez v. Helen Grocery Inc., Et Al
809634/22 Taylor v. Carol Housing Co. Inc Et Al
802835/23 Then v. 5660 B'way. LLC Et Al
818476/22 Wilson-Collier v. Jeffmar Mgt. Corp.

Part 26
Justice Paul L. Alpert
Phone 718-618-1617
Room 621, 9:30 A.M.

Part 27
Justice Naita A. Semaj
Phone 718-618-1226
Room 622 9:30 A.M.

MONDAY, SEPT. 8
813604/24 Almanzar v. Rosedale Gardens NY LLC Et Al
36299/19 Athene Annuity & Life v. Rolon
382170/09 Aurora v. Lambert
810467/24 Cipollaro v. Autorama Enterprises Inc. Et Al
380560/11 Deutsche Bank v. Obiamuka
32670/17 Fareverse LLC v. McLean
805295/22 Harris v. NYCHA
30996/20/Mk Prop. Mgt. v. Km Rlty. NY LLC
815454/22 Jpmorgan Chase Bank v. Worghs
811040/24 Lang v. Colon
804325/24 Maldonado v. St. Barnabas Hosp. Et Al
806735/25 McGhee v. Morales
817098/24 Nazario v. 1163 Hldg. Ltd
800668/25 Nieves v. Children's Trans Inc. Et Al
801221/25 Price v. Stop & Shop Supermarket Co.
802925/25 Simonetti v. Gomez
806380/21 Trinity Financial Services v. Brown
380846/12/U.S. Bank N.A. v. Rose
808212/23 Zviely v. The Bronx Standard II LLC Et Al

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9
804352/24 De La Hoz v. 178 Realty Llc
803818/23 Esteves v. Beharry
819062/23 Gonzalez v. At&T Mobility Services
812063/25 K.M. v. For An Order Pursuant To Cplr 1207 Approving of A Settlement of A Claim Brought on Behalf of The Infant 807406/24 Latimer v. Ilu
803241/23 Lauch v. Parks
819359/22 Liverpool v. Md Hutch Owner LLC Et Al
803636/24 Shahaj v. Qadiri's Transport Inc. Et Al
32349/17 U.S. Bank Nat. v. Abu
819139/22 Vasquez v. New Line Structures & Dev. LLC Et Al
808495/23 White v. Pcsb Bank

Part 28
Justice Sarah P. Cooper
Phone 718-618-1254
Room 402, 9:30 A.M.

MONDAY, SEPT. 8
801159/22 Moharrerri v. Vorvis
TUESDAY, SEPT. 9
5277/23 Hawkins v. Hawkins
27681/20 Regalbuto v. Regalbuto
12519/02 Schloss v. Schloss

Part 29
Justice Veronica Romero Guerrero
Phone 718-618-1479
Room 701, 9:30 A.M.

MONDAY, SEPT. 8
5947/24 Collado v. Fernandez
810141/24 Latouche v. Latouche
4964/23 Lombay Miranda v. Nazario
814832/23 Marrero v. Marrero
810353/23 Medina v. Medina
817584/24 Metzler v. Metzler
804757/23 Sanchez v. Rodriguez
815829/24 Seynador v. Pane

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9
802343/23 Adu v. Owusu Adu
817192/24 Castanos v. Payero
881524/24 Eche v. Chikize-Eche
803552/23 Kim v. Lee
805009/25 Salen v. Smits
810481/25 Tormale v. Akenssi

Part 30
Justice Erik L. Gray
Phone 718-618-1320
Room 703, 9:30 A.M.

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9
806099/21 Alvarez v. Riverside Church Corp.
801338/24 Antonetty v. Msc Arena
808862/24 Beato v. Garcia-Mendez
805719/24 Brown v. Doe
805445/24 Canteen v. Grullon
800483/23 Contreras Nunez v. 83-97 Apollo Owner LLC Et Al
806366/25 Contreras v. Marrero
804919/23 Cuencana v. Rock Builders Inc. Et Al
810452/22 Delgado Nunez v. Qbdk Huron
802309/21 Dos Santos v. Arw Rlty. LLC
805224/22 Dulal v. Restoring Communities Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al
812783/23 Galvez v. K S K Const. Group LLC Et Al
811624/21 Genao Cruz v. Northeastern Conference Corp. of Seventh Day Adventists Et Al
810520/23 Gonzales Chiroque v. Cs Utica & Remsen LLC Et Al
803204/24 Gutierrez v. Neighborhood Partnership Housing Dev. Fund Co.
801810/21 Kamara v. Shawmut Woodworking & Supply, Inc. Et Al
811795/23 Kanteh v. Hih2 Owner LLC
805624/21 Kolaj v. Con Ed Co. of New York Inc.
802099/21 Kuilan v. 85 Jay St. (bkbk.)

24783/19 Martinez v. East River Housing Corp.
815184/24 Mejia Fernandez v. Starhill Phase I Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al
816321/23 Mercedes v. Parkash
2911 LLC Et Al
812809/24 Meza v. Hambone Mgt. Corp. Et Al
811152/21 Montenegro Barboza v. Bena
803907/23 Muniz v. Pwp Equities Corp. Et Al
806204/22 Naula Latazela v. Compass Sys Owner LLC Et Al
33794/19 Oliveras v. Automated Conveyor Systems
806689/22 Ortiz Duran v. Crestwood Apt. Owners Corp
805789/23 Ortiz v. The Garcia Law Firm

816577/24 Pelzer v. Mlkp Bronx Rlty. LLC Et Al
813750/21 Ramos v. School St. Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al
814875/23 Remy v. B'way. & 56th St. Associates
811519/23 Requejo Becerra v. Cucs
105 Washington LLC Et Al
808779/24 Santiago v. Parkash 751 LLC
801600/24 Seonarine v. Westward Rlty. LLC Et Al
803074/24 Shuler v. NYCHA
816822/23 Torres v. Ca 2952 Third Ave. LLC Et Al
810333/23 Vasquez v. Vastro Rlty.
812592/23 Velasquez Castro v. Areasco 410
35070/19 Ventura Torres v. 311 Rlty.
802508/24 Washington v. Watkins
800110/24 White v. Eastchester Heights Prop. Owner LLC Et Al
804264/22 Zambrano v. All Star I LLC Et Al

Part 31/32
Justice Fidel E. Gomez
Phone 718-618-1203
Room 403, 9:30 A.M.

Part 34
Justice Michael A. Frishman
Phone 718-618-1349
Room 705, 9:30 A.M.

MONDAY, SEPT. 8
3806/23 Apiou v.
805206/25 Betancourt v.
Pinnacle Multicare Nursing & Rehabilitation Center
800678/25 Figueroa v. Castle Hill Medical of New York, Inc. Et Al
25231/20 Hinck v. Saint Joseph's Medical Center
809678/24 Kitzis v. 150 Riverside Op
2840/18 Koczur v. Adler M.D.
807731/25 McKay v. Montefiore Medical Center
804674/25 Rochester v. Montefiore The Univ. Hosp. For Albert Einstein College of Medicine
818031/24 Thompson v. Montefiore Medical Center
36036/17 Vays v. Montefiore Medical Center

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9
27466/19 Baylor v. Nadel M.D.
810609/22 Calderon v. Pathay M.D.
807970/21 Cavaliere v. Green Md
815396/22 Chacon v. Srinivasan M.D.
807257/22 Clara Diaz v. Montefiore Medical Center Et Al
808059/22 Cuello v. Cooper M.D.
802236/21 Ellison v. Manzione
807107/23 Faith McFall Smith v. Dr. Mark A. Ramirez
812803/21 Fletcher v. Pelham Phwy. Nursing Care And Rehabilitation Facility
807075/21 Ford-Smith v. Montefiore Medical Center Et Al
809039/23 Frazier v. Community Home Care Referral Service Inc. Et Al
803998/21 Garcia v. Nachmann Dpm
26888/20 Gomez v. Ruvo D.O.
25638/19 Gregory Basso v. Montefiore Medical Center
810592/23 Guzman v. Morr Md
813626/22 H. v. Bronxcare Health System Et Al
810499/22 Hung v. Vega Rn
821148/24 Janette Carrio v. Abraham Operations Associates
27712/19 Lanzetta v. Montefiore Medical Center
29606/19 Lopez v. Blum
812679/24 Mathew v. Kings Harbor Multicare Center Et Al
807742/22 Morton v. Montefiore Medical Center
801685/23 Nieradka v. Jasicki Do
801478/24 Nika v. Gold Crest Care Center Et Al
818387/23 Ortiz v. Bronxcare Health System
814051/22 Public Administrator of The County of Richmond v. United Bronx Parents, Inc. (ubp)
La Casita I Mother And Child Program Et Al
817505/22 Remigio v. Choi M.D.
803672/24 Rodriguez v. Morningside Acquisition I
813968/22 Soto v. Montefiore Medical Center Et Al
25226/19 Textidor-Savigne v. Montefiore Medical Center

Part 35
Justice Raymond P. Fernandez
Phone 718-618-1216
Room 625, 9:30 A.M.

MONDAY, SEPT. 8
811093/24 A.R.S. v. Evergreen Estates Housing Dev. Fund Co., Inc.
817221/23 Baron v. Service Tire Truck Center Et Al
805508/25 Bartolomei v. Twin Parks Terrace Et Al
810916/24 Chisolm v. Mr Transportation, Inc., D/b/a Marquis Ambulette Et Al
803492/25 Claudio v. 370 East 149th St.
816217/24 Mata Rosario v. Alvarez
811922/24 Moore v. Little
805409/24 Munoz-Zeas v. 3537 Bainbridge Rlty. LLC Et Al
813037/24 Philp v. Adigun
815322/23 Reese v. Singh
TUESDAY, SEPT. 9
800832/24 Baez v. Pimentel
806876/23 Barrett v. Bayo
2898/25 Barthelemy v. Small
34373/20 Boodoo v. Rodriguez Hernandez
803698/23 Calderon Neira v. Stable
24603/20 Camacho v. Camacho
806611/22 Campbell Individually v. Bronx Phase III Housing Co., Inc. Et Al
809453/25 Cancel v. 950 Fair Food Corp. D/b/a Fine Fare Supermarkets
800030/23 Carbonell v. Sewell
814612/24 De La Cruz Perez v. NYCHA Et Al
806611/25 Delossantos v. Methew
802216/25 Gibbs v. St. Barnabas Hosp.
811112/25 Hurtado Perez v. Rxr Liu Ptl Developer Trs LLC Et Al
810477/24 Jenkins v. Clarke
801211/25 Luciano-King v. Calcutti
812809/24 Madisson v. Don L.W. Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al
800120/25 Mercado v. Francis
808547/25 Ortega v. Deleonveloz
805723/25 Paez Robles v. Rahman
817657/24 Polanco Concepcion v. 509 West 167 St. LLC Et Al
817976/23 Quiroz Guerrero v. Central Properties
810751/25 Rodriguez v. Morales
807642/25 Wilson v. Rigo Limo Auto Corp Et Al

Court Calendars

CRIMINAL TERM

Part SCA
Justice Rivera
Phone 718-618-1378
265 East 161st Street
Room 380, 9:30 A.M.

Part T11 (Trial)
Justice Mitchell
Phone 718-618-1076
265 East 161st Street
Room 450, 9:30 A.M.

Part C
Justice Lieb
Phone 718-618-1097
265 East 161st Street
Room 320, 9:30 A.M.

Part IDV-SCT
Justice Flores
Phone 718-618-1067
265 East 161st Street
Room 420, 9:30 A.M.

Part JD/T
Justice Lieb
Phone 718-618-1097
265 East 161st Street
Room 320, 9:30 A.M.

Part TRP
Justice Fabrizio
Phone 718-618-1103
265 East 161st Street
Room 340, 9:30 A.M.

Part 11
Justice Mitchell
Phone 718-618-1076
265 East 161st Street
Room 450, 9:30 A.M.

Part 12
Justice Michels
Phone 718-618-3623
265 East 161st Street
Room 570, 9:30 A.M.

Part 14
Justice Busching
Phone 718-618-1034
265 East 161st Street
Room 660, 9:30 A.M.

Part 15
Justice Tba
265 East 161st Street
9:30 A.M.

Part 16
Justice Bruce
Phone 718-618-1043
265 East 161st Street
Room 540, 9:30 A.M.

Part 17
Justice Tbd
Phone 718-618-1106
265 East 161st Street
Room 350, 9:30 A.M.

Part 18
Justice Yearwood
Phone 718-618-3629
265 East 161st Street
9:30 A.M.

Part 19
Justice Collins
Phone 718-618-1058
265 East 161st Street
Room 550, 9:30 A.M.

Part 21
Justice Powell
Phone 718-618-1133
265 East 161st Street
Room 690, 9:30 A.M.

Part 22
Justice McCormack
Phone 718-618-1001
265 East 161st Street
Room 600, 9:30 A.M.

Part 23
Justice Villegas
Phone 718-618-1046
265 East 161st Street
Room 380, 9:30 A.M.

Part 24
Justice Hornstein
Phone 718-618-1073
265 East 161st Street
Room 440, 9:30 A.M.

Part 27 (DV)
Justice Stone
Phone 718-618-1031
265 East 161st Street
Room 590, 9:30 A.M.

Part 28
Justice Clancy
Phone 718-618-3638
265 East 161st Street
Room 560, 9:30 A.M.

Part 29
Justice Rodriguez-Morick
Phone 718-618-1118
265 East 161st Street
Room 430, 9:30 A.M.

Part 31
Justice Zimmerman
Phone 718-618-1022
265 East 161st Street
Room 670, 9:30 A.M.

Part 32
Justice Rosenblueth
Phone 718-618-1019
265 East 161st Street
Room 500, 9:30 A.M.

Part 60
Justice Barrett
Phone 718-618-1007
265 East 161st Street
Room 620, 9:30 A.M.

Part 70
Justice Lewis
Phone 718-618-1103
265 East 161st Street
Room 340, 9:30 A.M.

Part 71
Justice Steed
Phone 718-618-1004
265 East 161st Street
Room 610, 9:30 A.M.

Part 73
Justice Tba
Phone 718-618-1085
265 East 161st Street
Room 510, 9:30 A.M.

Part 75
Justice Bruce
Phone 718-618-1043
265 East 161st Street
Room 540, 9:30 A.M.

Part 77
Justice Parker
Phone 718-618-1025
265 East 161st Street
Room 680, 9:30 A.M.

Part 78
Justice Marcus
Phone 718-618-1001
265 East 161st Street
Room 600, 9:30 A.M.

Part 96
Justice Morales
Phone 718-618-1082
265 East 161st Street
Room 460, 9:30 A.M.

Part 99
Justice Tba
Phone 718-618-1085
265 East 161st Street
Room 510, 9:30 A.M.

Part 100
Justice Tba
Phone 718-618-1085
265 East 161st Street
Room 510, 9:30 A.M.

Part 101
Justice Tba
Phone 718-618-1085
265 East 161st Street
Room 510, 9:30 A.M.

Part 102
Justice Tba
Phone 718-618-1085
265 East 161st Street
Room 510, 9:30 A.M.

Part 103
Justice Tba
Phone 718-618-1085
265 East 161st Street
Room 510, 9:30 A.M.

Part 104
Justice Tba
Phone 718-618-1085
265 East 161st Street
Room 510, 9:30 A.M.

Part 105
Justice Tba
Phone 718-618-1085
265 East 161st Street
Room 510, 9:30 A.M.

Part 106
Justice Tba
Phone 718-618-1085
265 East 161st Street
Room 510, 9:30 A.M.

Part 107
Justice Tba
Phone 718-618-1085
265 East 161st Street
Room 510, 9:30 A.M.

Part 108
Justice Tba
Phone 718-618-1085
265 East 161st Street
Room 510, 9:30 A.M.

Part 109
Justice Tba
Phone 718-618-1085
265 East 161st Street
Room 510, 9:30 A.M.

Part 110
Justice Tba
Phone 718-618-1085
265 East 161st Street
Room 510, 9:30 A.M.

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

10 A.M.
Court To Be Held in Brooklyn, NY

Connolly, J.P., Wooten, Taylor and Landicino, J.J.
24/05237 People v. Luna Perez, Gerson J. (N)
23/01624 People v. Tanner, Thomas (ApT)
23/03005 People v. Jackson, Samuel (RI)
24/05798 People v. Lewin, Demar (W)
21/06646 Jimenez v. Kela Tennis, Inc. (W)
21/00440 Ryan v. Guadagnino (RI)
21/01831 Malisheva v. Circle of Friends Home Care, LLC (K)
24/07339 Bank of America, N.A. v. Marquez (S)
24/0928 Spin Capital LLC v. Bridgelink Engineering LLC (N)
24/06248 Spin Capital LLC v. Bridgelink Engineering LLC (N)
23/11716 U.S. Bank National Association v. Gowrie (K)
24/01338 Deutsche Bank Trust Company v. Cahn (S)
24/01339 Deutsche Bank Trust Company v. Cahn (S)
24/05964 Deutsche Bank National Trust Company v. Cahn (S)
24/02341 Balram v. Fiyaazudeen (K)
23/09254 Rowland v. Brooklyn Hospital Center (K)
24/07563 Rowland v. Brooklyn Hospital Center (K)
22/08550 Chen v. Zum Development Inc. (N)
23/01748 Chen v. Zum Development Inc. (N)
24/12340 Strong v. Vassallo (Q)
24/08879 MTGLQ Investors, L.P. v. Foshee (S)
23/08923 Beckett v. Estate of Thomas Beckett (W)
23/09688 Beckett v. Estate of Thomas Beckett (W)
24/05670 Matter of Town of Carmel v. New York City Water Board (P)

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18
10 A.M.
Court To Be Held in Brooklyn, NY

Duffy, J.P., Ford, Golia and Quirk, J.J.
23/06888 People v. Clarke, Antoinette (Q)
23/06972 People v. Clarke, Antoinette (Q)
22/05092 People v. McDonald, Ricardo (K)
23/08307 People v. Aguilera-Varela, Francisco (D)
23/11663 People v. Smith, Anthony W. (S)
21/03211 Gupta v. Long Island Jewish Medical Center (Q)
21/04495 Clancy v. Powell (S)
21/01764 Randolph v. Gholis of Brooklyn Corp. (K)
24/06592 Cohen v. City of New York (Q)
24/04536 Sands v. City of New York (Q)
24/03339 Citibank, N.A. v. Yanling Wu (Q)
24/05705 Citibank, N.A. v. Wu (Q)
23/11424 Matter of Azia v. Town of Shelter Island (S)
22/02233 Romero v. Evergreen Gardens II LLC (K)
24/08812 Willett Avenue LLC v. Village of Port Chester (W)
24/07161 J&T Beach Corp. v. Town of Oyster Bay (N)
21/06878 Ardent Harmony Fund, Inc. v. BDO Trinity Ltd. (N)
24/08983 Matter of John T. Mather Memorial Hospital v. American Transit Ins (K)
24/02559 Hichak v. Grand Plumbing Inc. (O)
21/05041 Kelly-Newhouse v. Chase Meadows Farm LLC (W)
21/07217 Kelly-Newhouse v. Chase Meadows Farm LLC (W)
21/08075 Kelly-Newhouse v. Chase Meadows Farm LLC (W)
19/13081 Dwyer v. Montefiore New Rochelle Hospital (W)
19/13083 Dwyer v. Montefiore New Rochelle Hospital (W)
19/13084 Dwyer v. Montefiore New Rochelle Hospital (W)
19/13085 Dwyer v. Montefiore New Rochelle Hospital (W)
21/05838 Matter of Flushing Main Street Improvements Project (Q)
22/05117 Katsava v. Katsav (N)
23/07101 Greenpoint Mortgage Funding, Inc. v. McFarlane (S)
24/01025 Greenpoint Mortgage Funding, Inc. v. McFarlane (S)
24/08229 Berl v. CNH Operating, LLC (K)
24/08230 Berl v. CNH Operating, LLC (K)
22/00757 Procopio v. Eichle (S)
24/09721 Hirado v. Sturman (Q)
24/07927 New Penn Financial, LLC v. Dancy (N)

FRIDAY, SEPT. 19
10 A.M.
Court To Be Held in Brooklyn, NY

Connolly, J.P., Brathwaite Nelson, Hom and Goldberg Velazquez, J.J.
23/07094 People v. Serva, James (K)
24/06223 People v. Monds, Anaya (N)
22/05501 People v. Kelly, Tyrefe (K)
23/03183 Maيدا v. Diocese of Brooklyn (K)
23/02899 T. v. Diocese of Brooklyn (Q)
19/09843 Benjamin v. LaSalle Bank N.A. (Q)
19/1144 U.S. Bank, National Association v. Benjamin (Q)
24/06259 W. v. Nassau County (N)
24/03397 H. v. County of Nassau (N)
21/02587 Defonte v. Bockowshki (RI)
23/03049 Nationstar Mortgage LLC v. Simhaman (N)
23/10185 Foranace v. Foranace (S)
24/07501 Cacace v. Grandell Rehabilitation and Nursing Center, Inc. (N)
23/04679 Cacace v. Grandell Rehabilitation and Nursing Center, Inc. (N)
22/04316 Perez v. ZZZ Carpentry, Inc. (K)
22/09898 Perez v. ZZZ Carpentry, Inc. (K)
23/09829 DiMiceli v. Credit Shelter Trust (K)
24/03731 DiMiceli v. Credit Shelter Trust (K)
22/05858 Deutsche Bank National Trust Company v. Spencer (O)
24/04837 Moreno v. 105 Lombardy NY, LLC (K)
24/03981 Matter of American Transit Insurance Company v. Bruno Medical Supply (K)

TUESDAY, SEPT. 16
10 A.M.
Court To Be Held in Brooklyn, NY

Barros, J.P., Christopher, Warhit and Voutsinas, J.J.
24/01451 People v. Purdie, David P.

25/00497 Longevity Medical Supply, Inc., aao Jones, Belinda v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins., Co. 25/00499 Joel Fried v. Isabel Lopez and Raul Lopez and John Doe and Jane Doe

25/00545 Oceanwood, LLC v. Kenneth Fabian, Lucas Walter Keogh, Jed R. Kronfeld, "John Doe" And/Or "Jane Doe"

25/00567 Burke Physical Therapy, P.C., aao Johnson, Serena Simone v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co 25/00568 272 Himrod Street Bh, LLC v. Abdullah Elgabar

25/00579 Margaret Chaplin v. Harvey Garrett, Jr.

25/00582 Joe Central Brooklyn, LLC v. Yolanda Johnson

25/00614 197 St. Marks Ave. LLC v. Bernadette Gideon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00645 Matter of the Application of the Commissioner of the Department of Housing Preservation and Development of the City of New York v. For A Judgment, Pursuant To Article 7A of the Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law, Appointing A Court-Designated Administrator For The Premises Known As: 327

25/00655 81 Pearl Street, LLC v. Scott Miller and Lisa Nuttall and Igor Videgain, "John Doe" And/Or "Jane Doe"

25/00656 Shafai Acupuncture, P.C., aao Moise, Yves v. State Farm Mutual Insurance, Co.

25/00657 Metropolitan Dme, Corp., aao Garcia-Gonzalez, Victor v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company

25/00658 Rise Physical Therapy, P.C., aao Benjamin, Nathaniel v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company

25/00659 Denato D'agostin v. Marcelle Dahdan and Michelle Aoun

25/00678 Union Street Flats, LLC v. Danequa Small, "John" "Doe", "Jane" "Doe"

25/00699 Carroll Flats, LLC v. Tasha King and "John" "Doe", "Jane" "Doe"

25/00705 Jefferson Estate LLC v. Monique Shoop

25/00726 347 Lincoln Realty, LLC v. Tonya Hickson

25/00727 Wilmington Trust National Association, Not In Its Individual Capacity, But Solely As Trustee of Mfra Trust 2015-1 v. Fabius Delfus and Derrick Brown, Demetrius Delfus, Allison A. Galloway, Germain Delfeus, Ruhano Noel McDonald, Sherley Darius, and Abbigail Brown and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00728 Boulevard Together Master Tenant, LLC v. Jessica Clarke, "John Doe" And/Or "Jane Doe"

25/00737 Khashan R. Beswick v. Boodlal Survaillie

25/00739 Brooklyn Housing Preservation, L.P. v. Nimakh Walker and "Jane" "Doe"

25/00740 Boulevard Together Master Tenant, LLC v. Brian Felix, "John Doe" a/k/a Carl Felix, "Jane Doe"

25/00751 Luis Alcala v. Metropolitan Transit Authority (Mta) (Legal Dept.)

25/00770 Mohamed Tibta v. 156 E. 21, LLC and Ammar Omar and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00772 Veronica Cromwell and Tommie Johnson and Nancy Smith and Jerome Brown v. Az 400 Herkimer Street LLC and Amarbin Ahmed and Department of Housing Preservation and Development

25/00773 Brownsville Associates v. Rosemarie Garrison and Jerome C. Cutherie, Deshon D. Garrison, Amel G. Garrison and J. Doe

25/00775 459 Chausy LLC v. Natanya Hamilton

25/00780 Fi General Construction Co. v. Trevor Bartley

25/00797 Howard Venue Associates v. Jose Colon-Fernandez

25/00808 Luis Alcala v. Bay Laundry Deport

25/00809 Derrica D. Kearney v. Paul Notice

25/00864 Alicia R. Ferguson v. Paris Alexandra

25/00896 Anukware Ketosugbo Md, Pc aao Monique Espinal v. Affirmative Direct Insurance Company

25/01297 Luis Alcala v. Laundry King

25/01350 Department of Housing Preservation and Development v. Kenneth Banks and Seyed A. Moussavi and 22 Hawthorne Street, LLC

25/01373 Us Levin Grp Corp. v. Kristine Ekman

25/01374 Weifeli Lu v. Fu Ping Jiang

25/01375 Alexandra Kennedy v. Victor J. Capobianco and Josiah Frazier

25/01377 Lloyd Nwankwo v. V 853 Empire Boulevard Associates and Property Services, LLC

25/01385 Ilona Itskov v. Bay Decorators, Inc. and Ken Gams

25/01386 1338 Prospect LLC v. Franklyn Stephen and Denese Stephen, Michael Stephen, Katherine Stephen, Rosita Cunningham, Andrea Reid, Shannon Reid, Crystal Reid a/k/a Krystal A. Reid, Bryant Service, Joshua A. Service, Christina C. Rembert, Visma M. King, "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

2025-01398

9TH and 10TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Mineola, NY

Day Calendar

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

9:30 A.m.

Driscoll, J.P., Walsh, Conway, JJ

23/00651 People v. Sean Blank

24/00200 People v. Idalia C. Villatoro

24/01096 People v. Caridad Delgado

23/00977 Kim Marie Foronjy v. Pc Richard & Son

24/00533 Winnie Woodcliff Park, LLC v. Evgeny Yaroshevsky, a/a/a Eugene Yaroshevsky, Yelena Yaroshevsky, a/a/a Lena Yaroshevsky, Et Al; "John Doe #1" and "Joe Doe #2"

24/00622 John G. v. Nunzio Brothers

24/01041 Andrew Colleran v. Salvatore Volpe

White Plains, NY

Day Calendar

Dismissal Calendar

MONDAY, SEPT. 15

Driscoll, J.P., Walsh, Conway, JJ.

The Following Cases Have Been Scheduled By The Clerk For Dismissal For Lack of Prosecution. Enlargements of Time May Be Requested Either Via Stipulation Between The Parties, Or By Letter Stating The Reason For Such Request, Addressed To The Clerk of the Court, With A Copy Sent To The Other Parties To The Appeal.

24/00903 People v. Juan Miguel Mariotti

24/00905 People v. Tabitha Calvitti

24/01118 People v. Cubby Gibson

24/01236 People v. Jian Wang

25/00245 People v. Dhanesh Ramsaran

25/00411 People v. Pano Andrianis

25/00519 People v. Catherine Wood

24/01077 Primus Automotive Financial Services, Inc. v. Roberta L. Whitfield

24/01082 693 Holdings, LLC v. Auto Body Plug, Inc., "Xyz Corp."

24/01320 Wojciech Kosakowski v. Rtr Financial Services, Inc.

24/01395 Crane Enterprises, LLC v. Michael Crane, "John Doe 1" and "Jane Doe 1", "John Doe 2" and "Jane Doe 2"

25/00066 Veterinary Medical Center of Li, LLC v. Walter Wilkins

25/00067 Scott Brody v. Pound Ridge Painting

25/00105 159 Radford, LLC v. Mario Hernandez and Nancy Lopez

25/00140 Belal Nassar v. Lufthansa German Airline

25/00141 Waymet Roddesha Mcken v. Marcia Jacqueline Willis

25/00152 Ayuu Carson v. Eduardo Martinez

25/00164 Patricia Carino and Michael Hogan v. Jenna Lorandini

25/00165 Attilio S. Carbone v. Daphne Adejedi

25/00187 1 Mill Road Apts. Inv. Rhpi, LLC v. Lawrence Hall and Tashawn Quintichette, "John Doe", and "Jane Doe"

25/00209 Elias Vasquez v. A.h. Countertop & Kitchen Design, LLC

25/00214 Michelle Martino and John Martino v. Jennifer L. Santarpia, Charles Frenchie, LLC

25/00223 Riviera Limited Partnership Iv v. Samantha Zangrillo and Michael Bidetti and Jonathan Thompson

25/00225 West Coast 2014-7, LLC v. Ramon Fernandez, Edward Fernandez, Joseph Zava, Maria Flores and Glenda Dubon and Naomi K. Joseph-Webster and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00227 Board of Directors of Preserve On The Hudson Homeowners Association, Inc. v. Andrea A. Bentley

25/00243 687 Apartments, LLC v. Raquel Green

25/00257 Chizoba Okwor v. The Mailbox Parcel and Shipping

2025-00258

25/00271 Built By A & R, LLC v. Margaret Ritschel and Margaret Ritschel As Executrix of the Estate of Donald G. Smith and John Doe 1 Through 3 and Jane Doe 1 Through 3 and James Griesch

25/00282 Luxx Capital, Inc. v. Victor Patrick Inwang, Vic Patrick Ioron, and Pharo Victor Inwang and "John Does #1-2" and "Jane Does #1-2" and Cross River, LLC

25/00286 Town of Babylon v. Thomas Grasso

25/00287 Town of Babylon v. Thomas Grasso

25/00378 Rocco Viti v. Arik Botier and Lena Batin Botier, "John Doe", and "Jane Doe"

25/00395 Us Bank Trust National Association, Not In Its Individual Capacity, But Solely As Owner Trustee For Rc2 Acquisition Trust v. Margaret R. Howell and Victoria Howell, "John Doe", and "Jane Doe"

25/00401 John L. Ciento, Jr. v. Kenneth Lewis, d/b/a J.K. Realty

25/00404 Diamond Development Properties Corp. v. Lisa Purzak, Edward Bundock, "John" "Doe 2" and "Jane "Doe 1-2"

25/00811 Fredrika Bronsther v. Abc Consulting of Ny Corp.

25/00877 Deborah Lee Rowlinson v. Robert C. Sweeney and Clover Automotive

25/01139 Port Jefferson Crossing LLC v. Wadena Pyatt and Elvis Samaniego, "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/01320 Main Street Lofts Yonkers, LLC v. Mabuya Chiumbidzo

25/01446 Nicholas J. Valenti v. Craig Scott and Renee Scott

25/01460 Wilrox, Inc. v. James Pearson

25/01465 Marguerite R. Jucker v. Vivian Persaud, Dds, Island Dental Associates

Kings County

SUPREME COURT

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 courtoons are listed herein prior to the assignments of Justices for the specified actions.

Please see the Justices' information sheets for further instruction regarding Uniform IAS practices and procedures.

Part Assignments/RJI

Intake Part

360 Adams Street
Phone 347-296-1592
Room 282

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

503032/24A-5 v. Imagine Me Leadership Charter School

529833/24 Acevedo v. 298-304 10th St. Owner LLC Et Al

517329/25 Alam v. Khalil

146/23 Alcala v. U.S. Post Office

507087/25 Almazov v. David

515329/25 Alvarez Suarez v. Cannici

528873/23 Angelides v. Spanakis

511195/25 Avanz Capital Hldgs. v. Arm Consulting Corp. D/b/a Rv Bus Nc Et Al

501062/25 Batista Lora v. Jp Morgan Chase Bank

526252/22 Carrion v. Cruz

501672/25 Castronovo v. 601 79 Owners Corp.

515991/24 Century Lefferts Pl. Partners LLC v. Brice

515975/24 Century Lefferts Pl. Partners LLC v. Carly

515980/24 Century Lefferts Pl. Partners LLC v. Davaud

515988/24 Century Lefferts Pl. Partners LLC v. High

515985/24 Century Lefferts Pl. Partners LLC v. Larrinux

515982/24 Century Lefferts Pl. Partners LLC v. Robert

515996/24 Century Lefferts Pl. Partners LLC v. Spence

506335/25 Cfg Merchant Solutions v. M & A Poultry

23303/10 Citi mortgage v. Sultan

519717/24 Cornojo v. Gomee USA

503489/25 Crawford v. Norgelson

515708/24 Curry v. Elton Owner 1 LLC Et Al

518074/25 Diallo v. Myint

534378/24 Diaz v. Cush

520597/24 Duarte Cuello v. 100 Berry Rity. LLC Et Al

523828/24 Eag An Infant By Her Mother And Natural Guardian Chaneshia Clarke And Eijg An Infant By His Mother And Natural Guardian Chaneshia Clarke v. NYCHA

532758/24 Farkas v. Gili Gardens Et Al

523782/22 Fusion Funding v. Forged Tech. Solutions LLC Et Al

521975/24 G And G Funding Group LLC v. Hawkins Farm Market D/b/a Hawkins Produce Et Al

533609/23 Gabrichidze v. Ortiz

503683/25 Garbusky v. Cipriani USA, Inc.

514965/24 Great Northern Ins. Co. v. M.N.C. General Contractors Corp. Et Al

515797/24 Hernandez v. Kicks Ny

506939/25 Hh Rity. Equities v. Levi

503152/12 Hsbc Bank USA v. Milton Jemmont

534993/24 Ikromov v. Penske Leasing And Rental Co. Et Al

526658/24 Isgnail LLC v. McGuire

522590/25 Khait v. First And Last Names Being Fictitious

513705/25 Kiwak v. Rotenberg

504669/25 Lewis v. Brown

517926/25 Mabry v. Diallo

520735/25 Mantis Funding LLC v. Escence Ltd Et Al

501518/24 Martinez v. Jean-Jacques

520233/25 McCoy-Emory v. Vinokur D.O.

520770/23 Mclp Asset Co., Inc. v. Brathwaite

520781/23 Mclp Asset Co., Inc. v. Brathwaite

531486/24 Miranda Granda v. Me Builders Group

512815/24 Morant v. Dornilus

512163/25 Palomba v. McCabe Collins

McGeough Fowler Levine & Nogan

512570/25 Pena v. Espinal

530598/24 Perez Ramirez Jr. v. Amazon Logistics, Inc. Et Al

513614/25 Perez v. Congregation Oholey Shom

502217/25 Portillo Maldonado v. Abes Rity. LLC Et Al

534306/24 Rosario v. NYCHA

959/23 Shakur v. Robenson

509336/25 Shamsey v. Ingberman M.D.

518763/25 Silverline Services, Inc. v. Affordable Fleet Service

521360/25 Silverline Services, Inc. v. Huezio Produce

535674/24 State Advance v. Town & County Transportation Co. Et Al

513076/25 Smith v. 452 Fifth Owners LLC Et Al

504474/25 Tamah v. Snt Bus Inc. Et Al

537767/23 Trivino v. Target Corp.

512533/24 Tzipora Tsinis A/k/a Tzipora Shimonov v. Bba Mgt.

532384/24 Williams v. Akwaaba Properties Inc. Et Al

509930/25 Wilson v. S. Bertram, Inc.

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

510382/25 Bah v. Ean Holdings

522174/24 Bahr v. 146 Rity. & Mgt. Corp. Et Al

523667/24 Batts v. Penske Truck Leasing Et Al

501944/25 Board of Mgrs. of The 190 South First St. Condominium v. 190 South 1 Investors LLC Et Al

526883/22 Board of Mgrs. of The Henry Cobble Condominium Et Al v. Henry Cobble

528012/24 Bobomurator v. Mel-O-Dey Enterprises LLC Et Al

519766/24 Bousaleh v. Lopez

515071/25 Cablevision Lightpath LLC v. Samadi Md

505165/25 Campbell v. Accord Bus

509435/25 Ceddello v. 9-47 Hall St. Owner LLC Et Al

506565/25 Chait v. Solomon

533142/22 Clark v. 578 Ralph Ave. Housing Dev. Fund Corp.

503685/25 Estevez v. Crunch. Fitness Et Al

534672/24 Farruggio v. Dalal M.D.

505515/25 Fields v. Kr Real Estate Hldgs.

532513/24 Folks v. The Pelham Nail Bar

533211/24 Francis v. Orneas

502673/23 Hidalgo Serrano v. Bhuiyan

511882/25 Hinds v. Kneel Taxi

519011/25 Hoffman v. Reason

521615/25 Johnson v. L. Knife And Son, Inc. Et Al

510267/25 Johnson v. NYC Et Al

513372/25 Kuttuva v. Flohr

534193/24 Lazo Vera v. Fifth Ave. Builders LLC. Et Al

522793/24 Luna v. Schenkel Properties

519774/25 Mantis Funding LLC v. Eat Fresh - Southgate LLC Et Al

519806/25 Mantis Funding LLC v. A & B Express Transit LLC Et Al

521820/24 Mehenni-Benhalfaia v. Gama Service Express Funding LLC

524828/24 Melnyk v. Elite Moving LLC Et Al

501793/25 Miller v. Alida

511810/24 Mosley v. Lefferts415 LLC

514802/25 Rodriguez Acevedo v. Khan

511456/24 Rojas Merchan v. Galaxy Developers LLC Et Al

530239/24 Saakov v. Win Hing Chinese & Mexican Restaurant Et Al

502785/18 San Miguel v. Qb & Son LLC

522058/24 Sanchez Moran v. Northside Housing Corp. Et Al

513590/25 Sharp v. Elaldi

506023/25 Shvelidze v. Kosgei

534966/24 Silvera v. Keane

521365/25 Silverline Services, Inc. v. Kathryn Campbell

506292/25 Singh v. Devenport Cab

504684/25 Tapia v. Quay Plaza LLC Et Al

510214/25 Ternier v. Simon Prop. Group

500473/25 Valbuira v. Ben Noon

514790/24 Velocity Capital Group LLC v. Taylor Tech. Ltd.

527711/24 Viking Ins. Co. of Wisconsin v. Shami

534135/24W. v. Ikea Us Retail LLC

509094/25 White v. Younis

511715/24 Williams v. Tek Beverage Distributors Inc. Et Al

513582/25 Wong v. Cheng

510078/25 Zambuto v. Red Apple Surf Rity. III

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

519566/25 Alhalabi v. Safechoice Inc.

512996/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Bay Medical

521221/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Watts

500725/25 Aurelian v. The Dormitory Auth. of The State of NY Et Al

529373/24 Aviles v. Titan Industrial Services Corp. Et Al

518733/24 Baker Solutions, Inc. v. Little Gyro Kitchen Li Corp Et Al

530646/24 Barton v. Performance Logistics LLC Et Al

524982/24 Birch-Conn v. Doe

515315/23 B'way. Advance v. Exclusive Works Service Group Inc; Exclusive Works Services Corp; Exclusive Handyman Services Et Al

52834/24 Butts v. Clarendon 3420 LLC Et Al

518812/25 Cfg Merchant Solutions v. Essential Foundations Preschool & Learning Center LLC Et Al

535548/24 Chagas De Medeiros v. Excelsior Developers

506170/25 Charlemagne v. Villavicencio

509998/25 Corona v. Al Paris Const. Corp.

501892/25 Debruce v. Islam

510233/25 Eastman v. Wart Rity. LLC

534730/24 El-Roumeim v. Davis

512018/25 Figueroa v. 307 Troutman St. LLC. Et Al

506737/25 Foy v. Dangervil

525740/24 Fusco v. 486 Henry Supermarket Inc. Et Al

506090/24 Garden v. Pact Renaissance Collaborative LLC Et Al

516856/24 Golani v. Demaria

518934/24 Govia v. Greystar Mgt. Services LP

532507/24 Gonzalez v. 2345 Ocean Associates

526546/24 Gordon v. Williams

530582/23 Harrell v. Cartogee Oyi Et Al

50633 Hassan v. Ramiro

519622/24 Holland v. Downer

507096/23 Investment Science v. Bank of America

506479/25 Jobe v. NYCHA

520275/24 Jorge De Martinez v. De La Cruze

5019196/23 Khashudaze v. Skin Cancer & Aesthetic Surgery

512466/25 Kerla Simeon v. 1151 Rity.

521449/24 Kramer v. Babayev

505353/23 Lhry Rity. Equities v. Gibson

505926/25 Laduson v. Rodrigue

506999/23 Mason v. Allied Aviation Services, Inc. Et Al

515892/24 Moreno v. Dolidze

513890/25 Orellana v. L&K Taxi LLC Et Al

508022/25 Orlando v. Rahmatullah

514435/25 Padilla Fernandez v. Jih Builders Group LLC Et Al

517710/21 Persaud v. Franklin Finest Deli Corp. Et Al

511048/25 Philogene v. Paul

516506/24 Portee v. Vaknin

500606/25 Powell v. Derissin

505599/25 Raja v. Freight Five Stars Corp Systems Et Al

500425/25 Robakidze v. Krausz

531468/24 Ross v. Dunkin' Donuts

Franchised Restaurants LLC Et Al

518621/24 Saratoga 155 LLC v. Card

518616/24 Saratoga 161 LLC v. Card

515357/24 Saul v. Wood Freaks, Inc Et Al

521414/22 Suren v. Bais Corporatoin Et Al

511900/25 Syndicate Group USA Inc v. Mission Mechanical LLC Et Al

520682/24 The Estate of Evelyn Brunson v. Cobble Hill Health Center, Inc. Et Al

535338/24 Thompson v. Prince

510863/25 Tortora v. Mati

527186/21 U.S. Bank v. Wesner Georges Et Al

512980/18 U.S. Bank Nat. Assoc. v. Grant

504436/25 Vieux v. Paucar

503899/25 Volk v. A-Kings Hwy. Car Service, Inc. Et Al

526961/24 Wallace v. Modular Capital LLC

511345/25 Whyte v. Gu

Part ADR-COMM

Justice Richard Montelione
360 Adams Street
Phone 718-500-4012
Courtroom 574

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

15924 Green v. Vermont 281 LLC

TUESDAY, SEPT. 9

507648/25 Bucaretsky v. Leichter

520046/24 Congregation Beth Jacob Ohvev Sholom v. Gross

531453/24 Congregation Beth Jacob Ohvev Sholom v. Gross

531111/24 Congregation Beth Jacob Ohvev Sholom v. Ruiz

47/25 Elozer v. World Class Security Services Hldgs. LLC

512477/24 Keith Kohn v. Israel Leichter

512117/24 Keith Kohn v. Leichter

509728/24 Kohn v. Congregation Beth Jacob Ohvev Sholom

530787/24 Kohn v. Leichter

523690/24 Needelman v. Leichter

530071/24 Needelman v. Leichter

530919/24 Needelman v. Leichter

535218/24 Ohel Elozer v. Congregation Beth Jacob Ohvev Sholom

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10

511080/23 515 Bedford LLC v. American Security Ins. Co.

501589/23 Advance Servicing Inc. v. Inter-County Abstract Corp. Et Al

528554/24 Aggressive Energy LLC v. 360 E 72nd St. Owners Corp.

528115/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Scob LLC

508565/24 Bizfund LLC v. Adept Sales Solutions & Consulting LLC Dba All American Promotions & Marketing Et Al

533242/24 Boyd v. Tinaude

500364/25 Cfg Merchant Solutions v. Jmp Industries LLC Et Al

534123/24 Cfg Merchant Solutions v. Pw Advertising LLC Et Al

502502/23 Cfs Enterprises, Inc. D/b/a Cfs Steel Co. v. U.S. Specialty Ins. Co. Et Al

500591/20 Chery v. Mobra Bravo

518336/22 Elliott v. Gale

524161/24 Gfe Ny v. Ci Toys Hldg., Inc. Et Al

503309/24 Graham v. White

500838/22 Hely v. Thg Xinan Crystal Hill

535802/23 High Octane Funding LLC v. 365 Hospity & Entertainment Organization LLC Et Al

5153926/21 Hope v. Pedrosa

503121/23 Hypollite v. Khatoun

535108/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Nextray Medical Imaging Pc

536911/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Nextray Medical Imaging Pc

500163/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Nextray Medical Imaging Pc

502749/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Nextray Medical Imaging Pc

508456/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Nextray Medical Imaging Pc

530111/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Nextstep Healing, Inc.

508108/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Nextstep Healing, Inc.

512981/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Nextstep Healing, Inc.

515051/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Nextstep Healing, Inc.

516289/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Nextstep Healing, Inc.

518869/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Nextstep Healing, Inc.

531898/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Nextstep Healing, Inc., A/a/o Lonell Johnson

504948/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Nextstep Healing, Inc., A/a/o Manuel Ramirez

516483/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Nickhil Gupta

522211/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. North Shore Family Chiropractic Pc

531557/21 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Nyrx Pharmacy.

537476/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Orthopaedics

516465/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Orthopaedics

504328/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Orthopaedics

522417/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Parmar

500342/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Pars Medical Pc

517329/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Passaic Orthopedic Group

504957/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Pda Ny Chiropractic

512337/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Pda Ny Chiropractic

504659/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Physical Therapy of North Queens

510009/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Preferred Medical Pc

508139/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Rally Supply Inc., A/a/o Evelyn Sanders

514982/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Reliable Cpm Surgical Supplies Inc

501805/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Ribeiro Pan Mgt. Plc

510240/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Right Choice Supply

508138/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Right Choice Supply, Inc., A/a/o Jacqueline Gonzalez

514906/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Royak Rehab

504335/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Rutland Medical

531866/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Rutland Medical

508203/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Rutland Medical

509810/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Scob LLC

528115/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Scob LLC

514949/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Scob LLC

500782/25 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Scob LLC

537474/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Scob LLC

523621/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Scob LLC

527419/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Scott Leist De

530556/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Smart Choice Medical P.C.

510245/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Spine & Orthopaedic Rehab Center

520969/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Spine Sports & Interventional Pain Medicine

514964/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Spruce Medical & Diagnostic Pc

501074/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Spruce Medical & Diagnostic Pc

528107/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Supportive Prods.

506608/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Synergy Physical Therapy & Chiropractic Pile

526062/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Tatay Ninong Physical Therapy Pc

515684/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Thompson Medical Pc

550081/24 Kolosova v. Shore View Acquisition

516344/24 Layne v. Eldorado Coffee Roasters Ltd Et Al

515777/25 Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Sentino

521835/23 Melnikova v. Fathkudtinov

531370/22 Ming Chen v. Friscia

509987/23 Mitchell v. Rapid Environmental Services, Inc.

502968/24 North Slope 341 Corp. Et Al v. Santos

505754/22 Perez v. Maxwell Plumb Mechanical Corp Et Al

522033/20 Peticion v. Akal Service, Inc. Et Al

516101/24 Ravenell v. Ungar

505839/23 Richardson v. St. Nick's Alliance Corp.

523438/23 Salcedo Nunez v. Ess NY Corp. Et Al

505004/25 Saniyyah v. Uber Technologies Inc. Et Al

525856/23 Santos v. Calderon Jr

510497/25 Sellersfunding Int'l Portfolio Ltd. v. Gatzies LLC Et Al

534149/23 Sitt v. Yadiid

507647/25 Ventura v. Emmanouilidis

533323/24 Zokirov v. United Parcel Service, Inc. Et Al

Commercial Division

Part 4

Justice Lawrence Knipel
360 Adams Street
Phone 347-296-1630
Room 774

MONDAY, SEPT. 8

504072/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Conrad F Cean Md

531935/21 American Transit Ins. Co. v. New Horizon Sigical Center LLC A/a/o Yasmel Montero

502656/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. New Horizon Surgical Center LLC A/a/o Dashanda Cheatham

503674/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. New Horizon Surgical Center LLC A/a/o Jose Casilla

532244/21 American Transit Ins. Co. v. New Horizon Surgical Center LLC A/a/o Mark Bevans

504003/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. New Horizon Surgical Center LLC A/a/o Melanie Fischer

531940/21 American Transit Ins. Co. v. New Horizon Surgical Center LLC A/a/o Nelson Guridys- Morel

501450/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. New Horizon Surgical Center LLC A/a/o Yongbok Choi

503678/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Surgicore of Jersey City

501448/22 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Surgicore of Jersey City

531107/21 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Surgicore of Jersey City

509593/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Surgicore of Jersey City

509678/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Surgicore Surgical Center LLC A/a/o Socorro Tavarez

5119

**IF YOU'RE
THINKING
OF USING US
YOU
SHOULD**

GUARANTEED
Subpoena Service, Inc.

**1-800-PROCESS
or 908.776.2377**

(FAX) 800.236.2092 - info@served.com - www.served.com



**WE USE
BODY CAMS**

Reasonably Priced Where Available