

IN BRIEF

Kirkland Partner's Ear Piercing Marks Turning Point for Bankrupt Retailer

Kirkland & Ellis bankruptcy partner Joshua Sussberg put some skin in the game when he pitched U.S. Bankruptcy Judge Brendan Shannon of Delaware on his plan to find a buyer for Claire's and its North American footprint of roughly 1,500 locations.

The second bankruptcy in seven years was looking grim for the jewelry and accessories retailer, which continued to grapple with the decline of brick-and-mortar sales, profitability issues and new pressure from tariffs. Amid broader economic uncertainty, locating a buyer would be a challenge.

"What all retailers struggle with is who's looking to buy the enterprise and operate it and keep the employees, as opposed to who wants to sit on the sidelines and watch us liquidate retailers," said Cole Schotz, bankruptcy partner Michael Sirota, who practiced with Sussberg when Sussberg was an associate at Weil, Gotshal & Manges. "I could give you 50 examples of those situations."

However, liquidating the 64-year-old retailer wasn't what anyone at the August first day hearing wanted. Kirkland partner Alexandra Schwarzman said she got her ears pierced at Claire's; so did Shannon's daughter, the judge said. Then the Kirkland team held up a picture of Sussberg circa 1995, when he had his ears pierced at Claire's as a high schooler.

"At the end of the hearing, I said, 'Your honor, we are

focused on preserving jobs and keeping stores open for a long time so many people can get their ears pierced. If we can get a deal done, I am willing to get my ears pierced,'" Sussberg recounted. "The judge said, 'I'm going to hold you to that.' He threw down the gauntlet."

Sussberg is known for injecting levity into tense situations. While working on the Toys 'R' Us bankruptcy, Sussberg sang the company's theme song before the court. The toy retailer's ultimate liquidation was among the toughest cases of Sussberg's career, he said.

But Shannon's approval of the sale of Claire's intellectual property and a majority of stores to private equity firm Ames Watson last Monday means that Claire's won't share the same fate. It also meant a new left ear piercing for Sussberg for the first time since high school, as an 11-year store employee pierced his left lobe during the hearing.

Sussberg's high school ear piercing didn't last long. "I think I had it in for six months before my father said, 'That's enough, take that out. You're going to college,'" Sussberg said. "He was laughing when I told this to him."

Will Sussberg's latest piercing last longer? [» Page 7](#)

Columbia's Dilemma Redux [» 6](#)

Trump's Court Blesses Racial Profiling [» 7](#)



Kirkland & Ellis bankruptcy partner Joshua Sussberg had his ear pierced in a recent hearing in the Chapter 11 bankruptcy of jewelry and accessories retailer Claire's.

DECISIONS OF INTEREST

First Department

PRODUCTS LIABILITY: Summary judgments denied in products liability action concerning car systems. *Hoeben v. FCA US LLC*, Supreme Court, New York.

LANDLORD-TENANT LAW: Motion for discovery concerning rent overcharge claims granted. *Dunbar Apartment Holdings LLC v. Johnson*, Civil Court, New York.

CRIMINAL LAW: Motion to dismiss criminal action for violation of speedy trial time denied. *People v. Hylton*, Criminal Court, Bronx.

Second Department

CIVIL PROCEDURE: Default judgment denied; proof of service not admitted. *G and G Funding Group LLC v. Rocco's Landscaping and Concrete Service LLC*, Supreme Court, Kings.

HEALTHCARE LAW: Due process rights not violated for care of patients in hospital. *Hill v. Navas*, Supreme Court, Queens.

LANDLORD-TENANT LAW: Rent demand not defective, however guarantor dismissed from action. *39-49 34th Street LLC v. Ultimate Body Works LTD*, Civil Court, Queens.

U.S. Courts

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW: Injunction vacated, remanded; strict scrutiny misapplied to content neutral UPL statutes. *Upsolve Inc. v. James*, 2d Cir.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION: Court explains grant of arbitration under agreement rather than EFAA. *Montanus v. Columbia Managers Investment Advisers LLC*, SDNY.

CRIMINAL LAW: Habeas relief denied over shooting after funeral killing two, wounding three. *Celestine v. Miller*, EDNY.

CIVIL RIGHTS: Federal claims over red light cameras dismissed; county administrative arm cannot be sued. *Cymbler v. New York State*, EDNY.

CIVIL RIGHTS: Retiree cannot assert right of action under LEOSA to compel ID for concealed gun permit. *Hotaling v. Martuscello*, NDNY.

DECISION SUMMARIES, [Page 17](#)
FULL-TEXT DECISIONS, [nylj.com](#)

INSIDE LAW JOURNAL

Calendar of Events	7
Court Calendars	9
Court Notes	10
Decisions	17
Expert Analysis	3
Lawyer to Lawyer	4
Legal Notices	15
Outside Counsel	4
Perspective	6, 7
Technology Today	5

See page 2 for complete Inside lineup.

Former SDNY Prosecutor Maurene Comey Sues DOJ Over 'Discriminatory' Firing

BY ALYSSA AQUINO

MAURENE Comey, the former federal attorney who prosecuted Ghislaine Maxwell and Sean Combs, sued the U.S. Department of Justice on Monday, claiming she was unconstitutionally fired for "perceived disloyalty."



Maurene Comey argued that she was fired without cause, advance notice or any opportunity to contest in violation of her due process rights and her protections under the Civil Service Reform Act.

Comey criticized her "politically motivated termination" in a 39-page complaint seeking a court order reinstating her to her old position. In it, Comey alleges that multiple DOJ agencies and officials violated her due process rights and fired her in a July email because of her father.

Defendants have not provided any explanation whatsoever for terminating Ms. Comey. In truth, there is no legitimate explanation. Rather, Defendants fired Ms. Comey solely or substantially because her father is former FBI Director James B. Comey, or because of her perceived political affiliation and beliefs, or both," according to the complaint, which was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York.

A representative for the DOJ declined to comment.

Comey was a regular in that courthouse, working over the past decade as an assistant U.S. attorney for the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York. She brought her lawsuit with the backing of two other SDNY alumni, Nicole Gueron, who led the office's civil rights unit until earlier this year, and

Ellen Blain, Gueron's predecessor. Both attorneys are now at the commercial litigation boutique, Clarick, Gueron, Reisbaum LLP. [» Page 6](#)

Online

Read the complaint at [nylj.com](#).



RURAL MIGRANT MINISTRY FACEBOOK (2)

A once-thriving plant where nutrition bars are made has suffered actual harm, and has been a ghost town, since the Trump administration's Sept. 4 immigration enforcement raid, according to Gov. Kathy Hochul.

ICE-Detained Factory Workers 'Desperately Wanted To Call Their Lawyers': NY Governor

BY BRIAN LEE

GOV. KATHY Hochul on Monday condemned the Trump administration's recent immigration enforcement effort at a central New York factory as crossing the line of lawful policing.

Hochul had just visited the owners of Nutrition Bar Confectioners

in Cayuga County, a three-generation family business that was the subject of an enormous raid by the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement on Sept. 4.

Hochul said the owners told her agents misrepresented their justification for aggressively entering the plant, claiming they were looking for homicide suspects. [» Page 4](#)

'Immeasurable Loss': Justice Garguilo, Known for Coordinating Landmark Opioid Litigation, Has Died

BY BRIAN LEE

NEW YORK Supreme Court Justice Jerry Garguilo, a highly-regarded jurist who held no shortage of leadership and administrative roles, passed away unexpectedly at age 74, court system leaders said on Monday. Garguilo, who died Saturday,

had served 16 years on the bench with "unwavering integrity, wisdom, and dedication to the rule of law," a statement by Suffolk County District Administrative Judge Andrew A. Crecca read.

Crecca remembered the Long Islander as "one of the court's most respected and distinguished members."

Among other noteworthy accomplishments, Garguilo was assigned the coordinating justice for New York's landmark opioid litigation, which involved 40 defendants and resulted in \$1.7 billion in settlements across the Empire State's 62 counties.

Garguilo had joined the bench in January 2009 and had [» Page 4](#)



Justice Jerry Garguilo, on the New York bench since 2009, is remembered as one of the court's most respected members.

Disney Faces Onslaught of Children's Online Privacy Litigation

BY KAT BLACK

The Walt Disney Company has been slammed with a wave of class actions targeting its alleged violations of children's digital privacy in the wake of its landmark \$10 million settlement with the Federal Trade Commission, which accused the entertainment giant of breaching federal children's privacy laws by unlawfully collecting data from minors under the age of 13 from YouTube without parental consent.

At least five class action complaints against Disney were filed in California, Washington and New York federal courts between Sept. 5 and Sept. 11, just days after the settlement was announced on Sept. 2. The claims are backed by Spiro Harrison & Nelson; Morgan & Morgan and Milberg Cole. [» Page 9](#)



The four-partner team of Proskauer Rose, from top left clockwise, **Jared Zajac**, **Ron Lovelace**, **Patrick Yingling**, and **Joey Polonsky** of Proskauer Rose

2025 GC Pay Report: Legal Chiefs Feel In the Dark About What They'll Earn

BY GREG ANDREWS AND TRUDY KNOCKLESS

A FUNDAMENTAL change in the way companies compensate top executives that began taking root after the turn of the century is finally facing doubters, especially over whether it's a mistake to apply the approach to general counsel.

At issue is corporate America's devotion to so-called "performance share units," a form of stock grant intended to more closely align executives' interests with those of shareholders.

They work similarly to the restricted stock grants that many companies have made a cornerstone of their executive compensation programs—except [» Page 6](#)

the "premier" bank-facing leverage finance team in that market, noted Justin Breen, co-head of the firm's global finance practice.

Ron Lovelace, Patrick Yingling, Jared Zajac and Joey Polonsky opened the new office [» Page 9](#)

Proskauer Launches Charlotte Office With 4-Partner Cadwalader Finance Team

BY RYAN HAROFF

PROSKAUER Rose has launched in Charlotte with a four-partner finance team from Cadwalader Wickersham & Taft. The group is

the "premier" bank-facing leverage finance team in that market, noted Justin Breen, co-head of the firm's global finance practice.

Ron Lovelace, Patrick Yingling, Jared Zajac and Joey Polonsky opened the new office [» Page 9](#)

the "premier" bank-facing leverage finance team in that market, noted Justin Breen, co-head of the firm's global finance practice.

Ron Lovelace, Patrick Yingling, Jared Zajac and Joey Polonsky opened the new office [» Page 9](#)

the "premier" bank-facing leverage finance team in that market, noted Justin Breen, co-head of the firm's global finance practice.

Ron Lovelace, Patrick Yingling, Jared Zajac and Joey Polonsky opened the new office [» Page 9](#)

the "premier" bank-facing leverage finance team in that market, noted Justin Breen, co-head of the firm's global finance practice.

Ron Lovelace, Patrick Yingling, Jared Zajac and Joey Polonsky opened the new office [» Page 9](#)

the "premier" bank-facing leverage finance team in that market, noted Justin Breen, co-head of the firm's global finance practice.

Ron Lovelace, Patrick Yingling, Jared Zajac and Joey Polonsky opened the new office [» Page 9](#)

the "premier" bank-facing leverage finance team in that market, noted Justin Breen, co-head of the firm's global finance practice.

Ron Lovelace, Patrick Yingling, Jared Zajac and Joey Polonsky opened the new office [» Page 9](#)

the "premier" bank-facing leverage finance team in that market, noted Justin Breen, co-head of the firm's global finance practice.

Ron Lovelace, Patrick Yingling, Jared Zajac and Joey Polonsky opened the new office [» Page 9](#)

the "premier" bank-facing leverage finance team in that market, noted Justin Breen, co-head of the firm's global finance practice.

Ron Lovelace, Patrick Yingling, Jared Zajac and Joey Polonsky opened the new office [» Page 9](#)

the "premier" bank-facing leverage finance team in that market, noted Justin Breen, co-head of the firm's global finance practice.

Ron Lovelace, Patrick Yingling, Jared Zajac and Joey Polonsky opened the new office [» Page 9](#)

the "premier" bank-facing leverage finance team in that market, noted Justin Breen, co-head of the firm's global finance practice.

Ron Lovelace, Patrick Yingling, Jared Zajac and Joey Polonsky opened the new office [» Page 9](#)

the "premier" bank-facing leverage finance team in that market, noted Justin Breen, co-head of the firm's global finance practice.

Ron Lovelace, Patrick Yingling, Jared Zajac and Joey Polonsky opened the new office [» Page 9](#)

the "premier" bank-facing leverage finance team in that market, noted Justin Breen, co-head of the firm's global finance practice.

Ron Lovelace, Patrick Yingling, Jared Zajac and Joey Polonsky opened the new office [» Page 9](#)

the "premier" bank-facing leverage finance team in that market, noted Justin Breen, co-head of the firm's global finance practice.

Ron Lovelace, Patrick Yingling, Jared Zajac and Joey Polonsky opened the new office [» Page 9](#)

the "premier" bank-facing leverage finance team in that market, noted Justin Breen, co-head of the firm's global finance practice.

Ron Lovel

New York Law Journal Inside

Law and the Family »3

Appealability and Reviewability of Court Orders
buy Joel R. Brandes

Online

» Court Calendars

Civil and Supreme Court calendars for New York and surrounding counties are now available weeks in advance at [nylj.com](#). Search cases by county, index, judge or party name. Important Part information, including addresses, phone numbers and courtrooms are updated daily. Only at [nylj.com](#).

Labor and Employment Law »3

Converting the NLRB Into a Labor Court, A Purely Adjudicatory Body
by Samuel Estreicher

Online

» Today's Tip

Outside Counsel »4

Building Bridges To Win With a Multigenerational Workforce
by Letitia Silas

Online

» Today's Tip

View the special sections online and download today's paper at the Law Journal Download Center. Only at [nylj.com](#).

TECHNOLOGY TODAY »5

Artificial Intelligence: Rethinking Your Media Footprint In Age of AI
by Danielle Blustein Hass

What Does GPT-5 Mean for Legal Tech? It's a Mixed Bag
by Benjamin Joyner

Online

» More Technology columns are archived at [nylj.com](#).

Microsoft's Legal Chief: Predicting AI's Impact on Legal Jobs Is 'Hubris'
by Michael Gennaro

Online

» Submit a legal notice for publication on [nylj.com](#).

Perspective »6

Columbia's Dilemma Redux
by Y. David Scharf and David B. Saxe

» Perspective

Trump's Court Blesses Racial Profiling
by Bennett L. Gershman

» Calendar of Events »7

Supreme Court Should Stop State Climate Change Lawsuits, Trump Administration Argues

BY JIMMY HOOVER
WASHINGTON, D.C.

THE TRUMP administration is supporting the oil industry's efforts to beat back a tide of climate change litigation being waged in state courts around the country, urging the U.S. Supreme Court to review a decision allowing a lawsuit against Exxon Mobil to go forward.

Notably, the U.S. solicitor general's office filed its supportive brief Thursday without an express invitation from the U.S. Supreme Court for the administration's views of the case—as is the usual sequence when the federal government asks the court to take up a case to which it is not a party.

In papers filed by Deputy U.S. Solicitor General Sarah Harris, the government argued that state climate change litigation is preempted by both the federal Clean Air Act and the U.S. Constitution. Calling the issue one of "exceptional importance," the brief urged the justices to consider an appeal from Exxon Mobil and Suncor Energy to overturn a Colorado Supreme Court decision allowing a municipality to pursue its climate change lawsuit against the oil companies.

"The need for this Court's review is especially pronounced because respondents' suit is just one of many that have been filed by States and local governments across the country, each proceeding on similar theories of state-law liability," Harris wrote.

"If, as the Colorado Supreme Court held, those theories are consistent with federal law, then every locality in the country could sue essentially anyone in the world for contributing to global climate change," Harris added. "Because the decision below is contrary to the Constitution and to the Clean Air Act, and because it conflicts with the decision of a court of appeals on a frequently recurring issue of exceptional importance, the petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted."

The filing represents a key shift from the Biden administration's position on the question of state climate change litigation, where the office of former U.S. Solicitor General Elizabeth Prelogar argued that similar claims were not preempted by the Clean Air Act.

"After the change in Administration, the United States has reexamined its position on that statutory issue and has determined that state-law claims like those alleged



Suncor oil sands mining operation in Alberta, Canada

here conflict with 'the decisionmaking scheme Congress enacted' in the Clean Air Act," Harris wrote.

"Under the Clean Air Act, as under the Clean Water Act, the amount of acceptable pollution is a matter for EPA and the source State to decide," Harris added, referring to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. "Thus, any attempt to apply Colorado law to emissions from out of State would

conflict with 'the decision-making scheme Congress enacted.'"

The federal government also said the U.S. Constitution prevents state courts from hearing lawsuits based on conduct that occurs primarily out of their jurisdiction.

The high court has for the most part stayed out of the recent effort of plaintiffs to hold massive fossil fuel companies responsible for the effects of greenhouse gas emis-

sions. The court decided a 2021 case in favor of various energy companies but did so on a narrow procedural issue about the power of federal appeals courts to review decisions remanding cases to state courts.

The issue, however, has shown no sign of going away, and the Supreme Court seems increasingly likely to one day wade in amid growing disagreement among lower courts.

As the Trump administration pointed out, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit has recently found similar claims brought by New York City to be preempted by the Clean Air Act.

This lawsuit was filed in state court by the city and county of Boulder, Colorado, in April 2018, alleging the companies are responsible of billions of tons of carbon emissions and are therefore leading contributors to global climate change. The plaintiffs say the companies' activities have harmed the health and safety of Boulder's residents and contributed to more extreme weather patterns, including heat waves, wildfires, droughts and floods.

The lawsuit alleges various common law claims, including public nuisance, trespass, unjust enrichment and civil conspiracy. The municipal plaintiffs are seeking money damages from the companies and remediation of the environmental effects of climate change.

In the first round of litigation, the companies fought in vain to

move the case to federal court. The companies' latest round of appeals followed the state court's decision denying their motion to dismiss the lawsuit.

Invoking its supervisory authority over the trial court, the Colorado Supreme Court held in a May decision that the plaintiffs' state common law claims may proceed. Over the dissents of two justices, the state high court said it was "unpersuaded" that the Constitution precludes the claims.

"[L]itigating Boulder's claims would not upset any balance set by Congress because Boulder's claims do not seek to impose liability for activities that the CAA regulates," the court held, referring to the Clean Air Act. A dissenting justice urged the U.S. Supreme Court to hear the case.

The Trump administration agreed, saying the number of lawsuits against fossil fuel companies "can be expected to multiply if the decision below is allowed to stand."

The oil companies are represented by Kannon Shanmugam of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison.

The Colorado municipal plaintiffs are represented by Marco Simons of EarthRights International.

The case is *Suncor Energy v. County Commissioners of Boulder County*, No. 25-170.

✉ Jimmy Hoover can be reached at jhoover@alm.com.

Kavanaugh Denies Supreme Court Is Deeply Divided

BY LAURA LOREK
WASHINGTON, D.C.

U.S. SUPREME Court Justice Brett Kavanaugh on Thursday pushed back against perceptions of a deeply divided high court.

His interviewer, Ashley Crutcher, a history professor at McLennan Community College in Waco, Texas, revealed that 42% of this term's decisions were unanimous, and fewer than 10% of the roughly 60 cases decided split along what Crutcher called "ideological lines."

"In seven years there, I've never heard someone yell, say something sarcastic or rude," Kavanaugh said of the justices' private conference discussions. "It's a level of respect in the room that's helping us all talk together to find the best answer to all the cases."

The Supreme Court also has a lunch rule that no one can talk about work during post-argument meals, Kavanaugh said. So instead, justices talk about books, movies, their families and other topics, he said. Those talks build personal relationships, he said.

The justice emphasized the court's limited role in American governance, calling it "a mistake to think of the court as something that's going to solve this problem



U.S. Supreme Court Justice Brett Kavanaugh holds up his pocket constitution as he spoke at McLennan Community College in Waco on September 11.

and solve that problem." That responsibility, he said, belongs to Congress, the president and state governments.

Speaking at the community college, Kavanaugh firmly rejected the idea of televising court proceedings, saying he opposes making justices "TV celebrities" and worries about how cameras would change judicial behavior.

The justice said he's "against

that" when asked about allowing C-SPAN to broadcast oral arguments.

"I don't think we want to be TV celebrities, and I think my colleagues and I would be concerned about how that would change the dynamic of how judges behave. People behave differently on TV," Kavanaugh said during a public forum honoring the late Judge Ken Starr.

The justice said the court will maintain its practice of live-streaming audio from oral arguments—an innovation adopted during the COVID-19 pandemic that he believes "worked out well for educating people who are interested in the court."

But television cameras remain off-limits, Kavanaugh said.

"I think television might change the dynamic of that," Kavanaugh said, describing oral arguments as "government at its finest" where justices work to "find the best answer to really difficult issues."

Before the event, about 50 protesters with signs stating "No One is Safe," "Protect Our Democracy" and "Make the Court Supreme Again" lined the street in front of the gym where Kavanaugh was set to speak in the evening.

Consistency builds trust, Kavanaugh said. Like good umpires, judges must apply principles consistently across cases to maintain public respect for the judiciary, he said.

When asked about the biggest threat to American democracy, Kavanaugh focused on education rather than political polarization, calling civic education "the number one thing" needed to sustain democratic institutions.

"Making sure our middle school and high school and college students understand importance of

this and the importance of Congress and the importance of the presidency and the states and how our government operates," he said.

Throughout his talk, Kavanaugh emphasized the importance of the Constitution. He even held up a pocket constitution that he carries with him. He emphasized that the Court must make unpopular decisions to protect constitutional rights, requiring independence from political pressure.

Kavanaugh stressed that the separation of powers protects liberty. "No one person or group of people should have too much power in our system," Kavanaugh said.

The Constitution's genius lies in dividing power among branches and levels of government to prevent concentration of authority, Kavanaugh said.

Kavanaugh also discussed the Constitution's originalism but with a modern application. Constitutional interpretation should be grounded in text, history, and tradition while applying enduring principles to contemporary situations such as the Internet or automobiles, Kavanaugh said.

"It's not frozen in time," Kavanaugh said. "We apply the principles to modern conditions, so we apply the free speech clause to the Internet, we apply the search and seizure protections of the Fourth

Amendment to cars even though the framers had no idea of course about either of those things."

Kavanaugh, who served in the George W. Bush White House before his judicial career, reflected extensively on the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks and Bush's leadership during the crisis. He described how "every day for the next seven plus years was September 11th, 2001," for Bush, who "woke up in the morning thinking how he was going to protect all of us."

The justice also shared personal memories from his time as a Bush administration lawyer, including earning a "100-degree club T-shirt" for completing three-mile runs in extreme Texas heat at the president's Crawford ranch.

The evening program honored Starr, the former independent counsel and Baylor University president who died in 2022. Kavanaugh worked for Starr when he served as U.S. solicitor general.

Alice Starr, Ken Starr's widow, introduced Kavanaugh and recalled how they were supposed to all meet at the White House 24 years ago on Sept. 11, but that luncheon never happened because of the terrorist attacks which unfolded that morning.

✉ Laura Lorek can be reached at lorek@alm.com.

With Market 'Competitive' as Ever, Mayer Brown Adds 6-Lawyer Infrastructure Team

BY ANDREW MALONEY

CALLING the infrastructure market "as competitive as it has ever been," Mayer Brown has added an energy project finance team led by partners from Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati and Vinson & Elkins.

The firm on Wednesday announced the addition of partners Elina Coss and Trevor Shelton, who join along with three associates and one counsel in New York, London, Chicago, Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles.

"Significant demand for infrastructure assets coupled with high investor demand make investing in today's market as competitive as it has ever been," said Joe Seliga, co-leader of Mayer Brown's projects and infrastructure practice in a statement, adding that their expertise will help investors "who are filling the capital gap and fueling the growth of infrastructure as an asset class" in renewable energy.

In an interview on Wednesday, Seliga pointed to the explosion of AI, leading to more data centers



Elina Coss and Trevor Shelton, partners with Mayer Brown

and energy production, as well as emerging technologies in infrastructure, such as autonomous vehicles, small module reactors for nuclear power, or electric vertical takeoff and landing aircraft (otherwise known as "air taxis"). All of these factors are generating

more interest in infrastructure as an asset class.

"While it's historically been thought of as a kind of lower-risk, steady return profile as an asset class, there is a much greater range of opportunities in infrastructure investment, depending on the

nature of the asset and level of risk," Seliga said.

That means Mayer Brown was looking for more depth in the area, particularly when it comes to alternative energy projects. And Coss and Shelton were looking for additional finance expertise, Seliga said.

"We have a strong renewables and alternative energy practice, but they give us substantial depth in terms of the additional experience and client relationships that they have as well as really breadth," he said, adding that the team will also have a presence in several offices, "which is also really attractive to us, given it's a firmwide practice."

Coss, who comes from Wilson Sonsini and joins Mayer Brown in New York and London, counsels sponsors, lenders, developers and investors in financing, acquiring and in the disposition of energy and infrastructure projects. She has particular experience with solar, wind and energy storage, as well as geothermal, nuclear and water sectors, the firm noted.

"We thank Elina for her contribu-

tions to our firm and our clients, and we wish her well," a Wilson Sonsini spokesperson said in a statement.

Shelton, who was a counsel at Vinson & Elkins and joins Mayer Brown as a partner in Los Angeles, has advised on renewable energy projects for more than a decade-and-a-half, with transactions totaling more than \$13 billion in investment, according to the firm. He focuses on counseling investors, sponsors, developers, borrowers and lenders on financings that include tax equity, construction and other kinds of debt and equity. He also has experience in project development, tax credit transfers and other kinds of finance and development deals.

The associates and counsel who came with the partners joined from Wilson Sonsini. Shelton previously worked with the group earlier in his career at Wilson Sonsini.

The additions come on the heels of an announcement earlier last week that Mayer Brown had brought on two mass torts partners from Wilmer, as litigation

continues to spark growth in Big Law. Davina Pujari and Chris Rheinheimer joined Mayer Brown in San Francisco.

Pujari's practice focuses on environmental and white-collar work, as well as class actions. Rheinheimer represents clients in complex environmental, real estate and energy litigation. With firms still awaiting a true transactional bounce, litigation has driven much of the performance in the industry in 2025.

The Mayer Brown additions add to the trend of some of the largest firms making significant investments in mass torts, specifically. "Their extensive trial experience and deep knowledge of environmental and mass tort matters will enhance our ability to serve clients facing complex, high-stakes disputes," added Michael Olsen, the firm's litigation and disputes leader, in a statement on the hires. "Their arrival underscores our commitment to growing our capabilities in California and key markets nationwide."

✉ Andrew Maloney can be reached at amalone@alm.com.

Expert Analysis

LAW AND THE FAMILY

Appealability and Reviewability of Court Orders

An initial appeal is taken from a judgment or order made by a court of original instance. (CPLR 5512(a)). The judgment or order must first be entered. No appeal will lie if the judgment or order appealed from has not been reduced to writing and entered. (*Hatsis v. Hatsis*, 122 A.D.2d 111, 504 N.Y.S.2d 508 (2d Dep't 1986); *Kuhn v. Kuhn*, 129 A.D.2d 967, 967, 514 N.Y.S.2d 284 (4th Dep't 1987); *Jernvra v. Jernvra*, 24 A.D.2d 809, 263 N.Y.S.2d 737 (3d Dep't 1965)).

In *Eaton v. Eaton*, (46 A.D.3d 1432, 848 N.Y.S.2d 786 (4th Dep't 2007)), Supreme Court made a *sua sponte* summary finding that defendant was in civil contempt of its order based on his alleged failure to transfer to plaintiff certain marital property pursuant to the stipulation entered into by the parties in their divorce action, and sentenced defendant to a 30-day term of incarceration.

The defendant appealed from the transcript of the court proceedings. The Appellate Division held that the mandate that a contempt order be reduced to writing is an indispensable requirement, and here, no order was reduced to writing.

Since the defendant purported to appeal from a transcript of the court proceedings rather than from an order, the appeal was dismissed.

No appeal lies from a ruling, as distinct from an order which must be in writing. (Matter of *Grisi v. Shainswit*, 119 A.D.2d 418, 420, 507 N.Y.S.2d 155 (1 Dep't, 1986)).

A ruling, which is not a product of a motion made on notice

JOEL R. BRANDES practices matrimonial law in New York City, concentrating on appeals. He is the author of the 12-volume treatise, "Law and the Family New York," 2024-2025 Edition, and "Law and the Family New York Forms," 2024 Edition (five volumes), both published by Thomson Reuters, and the "New York Matrimonial Trial Handbook, 2d Edition" (Bookbaby). He has been recognized by the New York Appellate Division as a "noted authority and expert on New York family law and divorce."



By
Joel R.
Brandes

Patron, 40 N.Y.2d 582, 388 N.Y.S.2d 890 (1976).

The fact that a case may be appealed does not mean that the issues sought to be reviewed by the appellant will be reviewed by the appellate court. And, as occurred in *Patron v. Patron*, "appealability" will sometimes depend upon "reviewability."

In *Patron v. Patron* (40 N.Y.2d 582, 388 N.Y.S.2d 890 (1976)), the Court of Appeals granted a motion to dismiss the appeal made by the respondent husband. In the companion case of *Klein v. Klein*, the court granted dismissal *sua sponte*.

In each matrimonial action, alimony and counsel fee determinations were made in the Appellate Division, and appeals were taken as of right to the Court of Appeals on the former ground that there had been a substantial modification by which the appellant was aggrieved.

In *Patron*, the wife was aggrieved by a modification that deleted her award of counsel fees. In *Klein*, there were cross appeals, one by the husband from a modification which added an award to the wife for counsel fees, and the other by the wife from a modification which vacated that portion of the order below which held the husband in contempt for nonpayment of arrears under an earlier divorce decree.

Each appeal had been taken as of right pursuant to the provisions of former CPLR 5601 (a) (iii). The Court of Appeals explained that "appealability" depended on the scope of its power to review, which is generally limited to questions of law.

The counsel fee dispositions involved the exercise of discretion as to factual determinations; denying the remedy of contempt presented an instance of "judicial discretion."

The court concluded that the modifications which the appellants complained of were not within its power to review, as neither case involved legal propositions which raised any substantial question of abuse as a matter of law.

The court held that as the determinations challenged » Page 8

The court concluded that the modifications which the appellants complained of were not within its power to review, as neither case involved legal propositions which raised any substantial question of abuse as a matter of law.

the facts it deems essential." (CPLR 4213(b)). A decision resolves an issue on its merits, but does not order any party to do or refrain from doing anything. An order implements a decision by requiring a party to act or refrain from acting consistent with the decision.

Decisions may not be appealed, although appeals may be taken from orders and final judgments (see CPLR 5501 [a]; 5512 [a]); *Charalabidis v. Elnagar*, 132 N.Y.S.3d 129 (2 Dep't, 2020).

There is a distinction between "appealability" and "reviewability." The Court of Appeals has observed that appealability is "the right to be in our court" and reviewability is "the authority of our court once the appeal is before us to consider the issues tendered." (*Patron v.*

the issues tendered» Page 8

LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT LAW

Converting the NLRB Into a Labor Court, a Purely Adjudicatory Body

We may be approaching the end of the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB or Board), the venerable agency that has been administering the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) since 1935.

Labor relations—the rules governing when labor unions can bargain on behalf of workers, what employees can do on their own to protest conditions even if not organized, the economic weapons labor and management can use in economic conflict, and the negotiation and administration of collective bargaining agreements—are set by the NLRB for all private employment, except for rail and air carriers which are governed by the Railway Labor Act of 1926.

The NLRB is a five-member body that adjudicates unfair labor practice (ULP) and representation cases. Board members are appointed for staggered terms by the president with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Act protects Board members against termination before their terms expire except for cause.

The general counsel, who initiates proceedings and represents the agency before the Board and later in court, is also appointed by the president with senatorial consent, but can be fired at-will by the president.

President Donald Trump's removal without cause earlier this year of NLRB Member Gwynne A. Wilcox led to lower court rulings holding the firing unlawful and requiring her reinstatement.

In *Trump v. Wilcox*, No. 24A966, a case on the emergency docket, a majority of the Supreme Court stayed the lower-court orders, indicating that the government was likely to prevail on the merits because Board members exercise "considerable executive authority." A petition for certiorari has not



By
Samuel
Estreicher

yet been filed, and nor has a case on the merits been scheduled for argument.

The court's statement in *Wilcox* is critical because the court has made clear in a number of decisions that, influenced by the so-called "unitary executive" theory underlying Article II of the Constitution, the president has inherent authority, not bound by statutory limits, to remove without cause "principal officers of the United

The court would be composed of two Democrats, two Republicans, and two Independents defined as individuals who have not represented labor or management interests for the previous six years and who otherwise exhibit a reputation for fair-minded, non-ideological professionalism.

States"—heads of all executive departments and other executive officials.

What has not been conclusively determined yet is whether that removal authority extends to non-principal officers of the U.S. like administrative law judges (ALJs) or members of multi-member bodies that do not exercise "substantial executive authority" agencies. The statement in *Wilcox* suggests, however, that the Board's removal protections may not be long for this world.

One hopes that when the court reaches the merits, a majority will be persuaded—and there is a need for members of the labor-management community to file *amicus* briefs urging—that the NLRB performs a

principally adjudicative function, sitting as an administrative tribunal hearing cases on a record compiled in a trial-type hearing before an ALJ, and that whatever executive functions the Board presently exercises can be severed from the NLRA, leaving the rest of the Act intact.

Those executive functions to be severed would include the issuance of regulations, authorization of applications for preliminary injunctive relief under §10(j), and supervision of the regional directors in representation cases.

Since the Board's involvement in these matters is minimal, as a practical matter, these functions would be exercised by the general counsel, who is no longer protected against at-will presidential removal.

These functions could be severed from the Board without undermining its general mission as contemplated by Congress. In other cases where the court has found problems with removal protections it has engaged in severability analysis, and hopefully will do so in this case.

In addition to concerns over the fate of the Federal Reserve System, the Supreme Court may have an incentive to employ this severability approach because at-will presidential removal of members of adjudicatory bodies will likely undermine the integrity of these tribunals.

No one will regard a process as fair if the adjudicator fears removal by the president for any reason, including disturbing a company or interest group supporting the president's party.

At-will removal of adjudicators would have enormous implications for adjudications in New Deal agencies like the NLRB, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), but also for a wide range of Article I or Legislative Courts—tribunals like the U.S. Tax Court, the U.S. Court of Federal Claims, the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces—whose members sit for relatively long terms protected against at-will removal. The justices will have to consider » Page 9

WE ARE PLEASED
TO ANNOUNCE
TWO NEW ADDITIONS
TO OUR GROWING
LAW FIRM

MARY ELIZABETH KELLERMAN,
ESQ. – ASSOCIATE
AND ADAM M. PESKA, ESQ.
– OF COUNSEL

235 Main Street
White Plains, NY 10601

552 Lake Avenue
Greenwich, CT 06830

100 Stony Brook Court, Suite 21
Newburgh, NY 12550

BASHIAN P.C.
ATTORNEYS & COUNSELLORS
AT LAW

(914) 946-5100

WWW.BASHIAN-LAW.COM

- ❖ ESTATE & TRUST PLANNING
- ❖ ESTATE & TRUST ADMINISTRATION
- ❖ WILL & TRUST LITIGATION
- ❖ ARTICLE 81 GUARDIANSHIPS & GUARDIANSHIP LITIGATION
- ❖ APPELLATE PRACTICE
- ❖ BUSINESS LAW & LITIGATION
- ❖ CORPORATE LAW & LITIGATION
- ❖ COMMERCIAL LAW & LITIGATION
- ❖ REAL ESTATE & COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE TRANSACTIONS
- ❖ TAX LAW ❖ HIGH NET WORTH MATRIMONIAL LAW

MARY ELIZABETH KELLERMAN RECEIVED HER JURIS DOCTORATE MAGNA CUM LAUDE FROM ELISABETH HAUB SCHOOL OF LAW AT PACE UNIVERSITY AND IS ADMITTED IN NEW YORK. OUR FORMER LAW CLERK HAS RETURNED TO OUR PRACTICE AS AN ASSOCIATE AND WILL CONTINUE TO WORK ON LITIGATED WILLS, ESTATES AND TRUSTS AND GENERAL BUSINESS LITIGATION AS PART OF OUR LITIGATION GROUP WHILE ALSO FOCUSING ON SOPHISTICATED ESTATE AND TRUST PLANNING AS WELL AS ESTATE ADMINISTRATION. MARY RETURNS TO US WITH GREAT LITIGATION AND TRANSACTIONAL EXPERIENCE.

ADAM M. PESKA WILL BE OF COUNSEL TO THE FIRM AND IS ADMITTED IN NEW YORK BRINGING WITH HIM OVER 20 YEARS OF EXPERIENCE REPRESENTING INDIVIDUAL SMALL BUSINESSES AS WELL AS PUBLICLY TRADED FORTUNE 500 COMPANIES. ADAM HAS PROSECUTED AND DEFENDED OVER 200 CASES IN BOTH NEW YORK STATE COURTS AND FEDERAL COURTS INCLUDING HIGH PROFILE CASES AND INVESTIGATIONS BROUGHT BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES. ADAM IS ALSO ADMITTED TO PRACTICE IN THE U.S. FEDERAL COURTS OF THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK AND THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK. ADAM HAS ALSO SUCESSFULLY WORKED ON APPEALS AT THE APPEALATE DIVISION FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD DEPARTMENTS, AS WELL AS AN APPELLATE TERM FOR THE NINTH AND TENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICTS. MR. PESKA'S AREAS OF PRACTICE INCLUDE: CIVIL LITIGATION, APPELLATE PRACTICE, LABOR LAW, AND COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS. MR. PESKA WILL CONTINUE HIS LITIGATION PRACTICE NOW INCLUDING WILLS, ESTATES, TRUSTS AND GUARDIANSHIP LITIGATION.

SAMUEL ESTREICHER is the Dwight D. Opperman Professor of Public Law and Director of the Institute of Judicial Administration and Center for Labor and Employment Law, NYU School of Law.

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

ROSENTHAL & GOLDHABER, P.C.

JUDGMENT ENFORCEMENT & COMMERCIAL COLLECTIONS

- NY Law Journal 4-Time Winner: Best Judicial Enforcement Provider
- Commercial Collection Litigation
- Post-Judgment Litigation
- NY, National & International

Justice isn't
Complete Until it's
Collected

CONTACT US

631-979-8500 | robert@nycollections.com
www.nycollections.com

GERSOWITZ LIBO & KOREK P.C.

New Jersey Office

Let Us Help With Your NJ Injury Litigation

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

GLK

39 Years Experience

Call 24/7:

866-450-4101

157 Engle Street

Englewood, NJ 07631

LAWYERTIME.COM

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

Building Bridges To Win With A Multigenerational Workforce

By
Letitia
Silas



Today's workforce is a blend of four generations: Boomers, Gen X, millennials and Gen Z. This diversity offers incredible opportunities for creativity, innovation, and growth but also requires strategic leadership to harness these benefits effectively.

This article explores potential generational differences in the workplace by examining expectations employees have for employers in five key areas: the role and responsibility of employers; communication, engagement, and inclusion; job security and advancement; compensation; and work-life flexibility. By understanding these differences (and some commonalities), organizations can foster an environment that motivates, engages and retains employees while driving success in today's business landscape.

Employer Roles And Responsibilities

Boomers entered the workforce at a time when the role of employers was straightforward: provide job security, fair compensation, safety from work hazards and equal employment. These foundational elements were the cornerstones of a "good job" during the prime of their career. Gen X followed with similar basic expectations, but they also demand more. Beyond the basics, Gen X values employers who are mission-driven problem solvers with global impact. An entrepreneurial spirit characterizes this generation, so they are unafraid to challenge the status quo and pursue creative and innovative solutions to problem solving.

Millennials have similar expectations but also tend to demand values alignment in their work, seeking inspiration from their organization's mission and ensuring that business practices align with their personal values. Gen Z has brought a greater expectation

for employers to be socially conscious and responsive. Like Gen X and millennials, they expect values alignment and business accountability. However, Gen Z is distinct in their demand for employers to show genuine care for employees' personal wellbeing, both inside and outside of the organization, through policies that address individual needs while also considering collective demands. They may also expect employers to use

Gen Z has brought a greater expectation for

employers to be socially conscious and responsive. Like Gen X and millennials, they expect values alignment and business accountability.

their platforms and resources to advance or address social justice or sociopolitical issues.

Communication, Engagement and Inclusion

Effective communication is a cornerstone of successful employee relations in any organization, yet what it looks like can vary significantly across generational lines. The workplace communication style experienced by Boomers and Gen X, has traditionally been top-down in their careers. These generations may be accustomed to organizational decisions happening at the very top levels, behind closed doors, and without much input from the employee population. This "need to know" approach, while not always ideal, may be tolerable to these groups.

However, such division often creates barriers to building trust in the organization, especially where

individuals from these generations are responsible for building relationships and influence among millennials and Gen Z.

Boomers and Gen X may also expect communication from employers in the form of policies, procedures, manuals and guidance memoranda. Likewise, the dissemination of information such as business goals, productivity metrics, policy changes, and employer programs is typically executed through official channels like company newsletters, intranet platforms, or email. While this may be an effective means of communication for these groups, it excludes other channels which could unintentionally isolate or exclude some millennials and Gen Z.

On the other hand, millennials tend to value interaction and dialogue, seeking to engage in conversations that allow them to exchange ideas on issues affecting both the business and their individual roles. Connection with leadership in more intimate settings, such as town halls and work groups, is expected and valued. They are accustomed to a collaborative process when it comes to project planning and execution. They also expect their feedback to be taken seriously, considered, and acted upon.

Importantly, millennials closer to Gen Z also now expect inclusion in the organization's decision-making on matters impacting their work. Having grown under the leadership of Boomers and Gen X, this group may be more accustomed to, and therefore tolerant of written, detailed, sometimes lengthy employer communications.

When it comes to communication, Gen Z demands the utmost transparency, convenience, and accessibility. They value and respect interactions that are authentic and relatable yet informed and succinct. Like millennials, they too expect to be heard and included in not only company decision-making on matters impacting their work, but decisions impacting the company's business and brand. Gen Z expects information to be easily accessible via a wide range of commu-

» Page 8

ICE

« *Continued from page 1*
when they were in fact armed with administrative warrants, for routine detainment proceedings.

"The owners were lied to," Hochul said, while also bemoaning that the government allegedly hadn't allowed detainees to consult with attorneys.

In all, 57 people were detained, and Hochul said she was told others are still missing or unaccounted for, some too afraid to return to work.

Most of the people detained at the plant in Cato, a village in the Finger Lakes, were from Guatemala, The Associated Press has reported, citing the advocacy group Rural and Migrant Ministry.

Owners of the 47-year-old family business—whose products are sold in Costco, Walmart and other global retailers—said the workers possessed legal documentation.

The resultant harm from the raid, according to Hochul, left the business struggling to stay afloat, its factory lines idle as of Monday, when it was preparing for growth. Hochul said she toured its new warehouse that's ready to go and contains millions of pounds of ingredients to make nutrition bars.

The business owners said masked armed ICE agents "literally separated people by the color of their skin: white people over here and brown people over there," Hochul related, calling that segregation "cruel," "un-American," and "abhorrent."

An agent had even rounded up a woman who was on the toilet, Hochul said.

Hochul said the owners told her that agents announced they were looking for two violent criminals who were wanted for homicide charges. But she said it was later learned that the agents didn't have judicial warrants.

Hochul said three mothers have been separated from babies who are less than a year old, including a woman who had been nursing her 8-month-old. Hochul called that separation traumatic for the mother, and unhealthy for the child to be weened so abruptly and "shocking."

Hochul said she called Trump administration border czar Thomas Homan for help to "at least" reunite the mothers, but was told he was unfamiliar with the particular circumstances and would look into it. A frustrated Hochul said she's still waiting to hear from Homan.

"I told him in the past that I will help, the state of New York, law enforcement at my disposal will help you, if you truly are working to eliminate the threat of violent individuals from our communities," said Hochul, adding she would not be complicit with harming businesses and "shattering families."

Told of Hochul's remarks, John Sarcone, acting U.S. attorney for the Northern District of New York, told the Law Journal and Law.com that he would refer to his remarks at a Sept. 9 press briefing.

At that time Sarcone warned that employers could expect more large-scale workplace enforcement actions.

"We will aggressively pursue criminal investigations against those who violate our laws by employing non-citizens without authorization. There will be consequences. The bad old days of turning a blind eye are over," Sarcone said, per the AP.

The raid in New York occurred the same day immigration authorities detained 475 people at a manufacturing site in Georgia where Korean automaker Hyundai makes electric vehicles.

As a consequence, the South Korean government said it's investigating potential human rights violations during the raid and detention of Korean workers by U.S. authorities, the BBC reported.

Hochul said the New York raid harmed the family business economically, as well as the region, "and you've also created this chilling effect on other businesses."

The governor said she found it most appalling that the workers weren't given a chance to talk to their lawyers.

"That's what I heard this morning. They desperately wanted to call their lawyers; they were not able to call them. Isn't that as basic as an American right that we have here, that we have in this country? That you can call your lawyer instead of finding yourself on a plane to Guatemala or a detention center in Texas. They even picked up an individual who is an American citizen from Puerto Rico, and held him for a while," the governor said.

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

Garguilo

« *Continued from page 1*
been serving as the presiding justice of the Appellate Term of the Supreme Court for the 9th and 10th Judicial Districts.

He was also Suffolk's designated presiding judge for all asbestos-related litigation in the county.

"This is an immeasurable loss," Crecca said. "Justice Garguilo has presided over some of the most complex and consequential cases in Suffolk County, earning the admiration of colleagues, attorneys, and litigants alike. He will be remembered not only for his legal acumen but also for his compassion, humility, and deep commitment to justice," Crecca said.

Garguilo managed a full caseload both in the Appellate Term and in the Commercial Division of Suffolk County's Supreme Court, the court system said.

Crecca said the dual assignment reflected both Garguilo's "exceptional capability and unwavering commitment to public service."

Known as one of Suffolk's hardest-working judges, Garguilo consistently demonstrated tireless dedication to the fair and efficient administration of justice, the statement read.

He had conducted numerous jury and bench trials, authored many influential court opinions, and resolved countless cases across a wide spectrum of legal matters, Crecca said.

Garguilo, who graduated from Duquesne University School of Law, blee@alm.com.

began his legal career in 1977 as a law clerk to Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justice Louis Mandarino.

He then moved back to Suffolk County to serve as an assistant district attorney from 1977 to 1979.

He spent several decades in private practice, beginning in 1980 with his longtime partnership with Charles Russo. Their practice centered on negligence claims, criminal cases, commercial disputes, and administrative matters.

Visiting hours are Wednesday and Thursday from 3 p.m. to 9 p.m. at St. James Funeral Home. The funeral mass is planned for Friday at 11:30 a.m. at Saints Philip & James Roman Catholic Church in St. James.

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

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.

Technology Today

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Rethinking Your Media Footprint in Age of AI

Lawyers have long managed their digital footprint to market their practices. But as artificial intelligence (AI) becomes more pervasive, they need to start rethinking their approach. In part, that's because search results from ChatGPT, Perplexity, Google's AI Overviews, and other AI tools don't rely on traditional search engine algorithms alone.

To be sure, AI's emergence doesn't mean traditional search is going away any time soon. It still matters. But now, so does making it into sources that AI systems draw from and are trained on. Lawyers who don't appreciate and lean into this change risk becoming less visible to potential clients.

Scoring points with AI

When a chatbot answers a query—about, say, a definition of a complex legal term or rankings of the best trial lawyers—it draws from a variety of sources on the internet. That's why an attorney's media footprint matters more than ever.

To capitalize on these changes, it can be helpful to think of each internet appearance as a potential "point" for AI. For every quote you give, award you win, and blog post you write, you can add to your credibility in the AI ecosystem. Strong, credible mentions increase the chances AI will reference you in its responses.

Advancing the metaphor, these "points" fluctuate in value based on the user's prompt and with

DANIELLE BLUSTEIN HASS is a senior strategist at the international communications firm INFINITE.



ADOBESTOCKS

each update to the chatbot. Not all news sites are weighted equally by AI. Depending on a searcher's question, it may pull from a niche trade publication with less circulation than a large national news source.

A healthcare lawyer who regularly publishes in more niche outlets like Fierce Healthcare may surface more prominently in AI answers around technical subjects than the same attorney with a single quote in a national newspaper.

This doesn't mean your media relations strategies should only prize depth over breadth. It should contain both. There is value in appearances in well-regarded outlets as well as getting quoted in specialized, high-authority outlets that potential clients and AI alike treat as authoritative.

Profile Maintenance More Important Than Ever

In this new era of the internet, credibility is a currency. To capitalize, it's crucial to make sure your website profile accurately reflects your practice and highlights your strengths. In addition to your expe-

rience, your bio should include your latest awards, speaking engagements, accolades, quotes in the media, client testimonials, big cases or deals, and other highlights.

When a chatbot answers a query—about, say, a definition of a complex legal term or rankings of the best trial lawyers—it draws from a variety of sources on the internet. That's why an attorney's media footprint matters more than ever.

pick up engagement signals. **Authentic:** Your online persona must be true to yourself, including everything from your tone and word choice

» Page 7

By
Danielle
Blustein Hass



What Does GPT-5 Mean for Legal Tech? It's a Mixed Bag

BY BENJAMIN JOYNER

WHEN OpenAI's long-awaited new large language model (LLM) GPT-5 was released in early August, it appeared to have a muted impact on the legal tech industry.

At ILTACON 2025, days after the model was introduced, the prevailing attitude was that the release was not a transformative event. While some vendors, such as Spellbook and Relativity among others, immediately incorporated the offering, other developers and users took a wait-and-see approach.

At ILTACON, Jeff Reihl, executive vice president and chief technology officer at LexisNexis, told media that the company had not incorporated the model into its AI-powered products, while Katten Muchin Rosenman practice innovation analyst Matthew Dunne said improvements in the capabilities of foundation models were less important at this point than the ability to leverage them in products lawyers and other staff actually use.

As legal tech vendors and users have had more time to experiment with the model and test it on discrete use cases, GPT-5 has presented a mixed bag for the industry, with distinct benefits and drawbacks.

A Smaller Step

Legal tech users and developers largely agree that GPT-5 represents a step forward from earlier models, if perhaps a smaller step than previous releases.

"I think there were a lot of people after GPT-4 who were sort of talking about every subsequent version of the model doing the same thing that GPT-3.5 did, and I just don't think that's the world we're in," said Joel Hron, chief technology officer of



Jeff Reihl, executive vice president and Chief Technology Officer at LexisNexis

Thomson Reuters, referring to substantial improvements between previous OpenAI releases.

"I think that was a monumental shift in the market of how people thought about the application of AI ... and I think the base model deltas have gotten smaller incrementally over time," he added.

Moreover, improvements to the underlying models are not always helpful or relevant to legal tech use cases. GPT-5 functions as both a traditional generative model and a reasoning model, autonomously determining which mode to use based on factors such as the type of request and the tools required to perform the task.

While this may be impactful for users among the general public who rely on a single model, it can be less helpful or even an impediment for legal users. Part of the value-add provided by many legal tech vendors comes from the ability of their platforms to orchestrate multiple models, determining when reasoning capabilities are required and routing tasks to the most appropriate model based on factors such as output quality, speed and cost.

"We like to be able to control the level of reasoning, because we've got reasoning built into our capabilities already," Reihl told LegalTech News. "What can happen sometimes is, the model's reasoning may interfere with our reasoning and come up with a really bad answer."

What's more, GPT-5 tends to produce longer answers than those provided by previous OpenAI models such as GPT-4.0. These more verbose answers both take longer to generate and can contain irrelevant information, at times making them less helpful than more concise answers that can be delivered more quickly.

Particularly in the context of a multi-model system, where each user request may result in a number of models performing separate back-end tests, any delays caused by one model are likely to cascade, slowing the entire process down for the end user.

Reihl said that LexisNexis has generally used OpenAI models for tasks related to legal research while preferring Claude models for tasks like document drafting and summarization, which has meant the longer answers generated by GPT-5 have not outperformed previous models.

"In the end, with all the testing that we did, the GPT-5 models just did not perform better than the GPT-4 models, and the response time was slower," Reihl said. "It made no sense for us for the use cases that we're testing ... the legal research use cases."

Additionally, top-line performance is only one factor among several in selecting which model will perform a given task. "There's lots of different things that play into how we decide what models are going to be deployed and for what use cases and what locations," Reihl said. "We always have to worry about resiliency and failover and redundancy and all that kind of stuff too."

Discrete Improvements

While top-line model improvements may not have been as extensive as those seen with previous releases, some users have found

» Page 8



Give Your Clients a Gift with Real Value.

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

Get Started
Visit at.law.com/gift

NewYorkLawJournal.com

ALM.

Jon Palmer, Microsoft Chief Legal Officer

Microsoft has laid off 15,000 employees across the globe since mid-May. Just in the tech giant's home state of Washington, the reductions have cost at least 32 company attorneys and five paralegals their jobs, according to state filings obtained by Law.com.

At a public event in July, Microsoft President Brad Smith said AI was "not a predominant factor" in the decision to reduce head count. However, in a follow-up interview with GeekWire, he seemed to suggest otherwise, saying, "Success in life, whether it's for an individual or a company or any kind of institution, is always about prioritization, and it's always about investing in the future."

Palmer likened the rise of AI to the invention of the printing press, which eliminated the work of scribes but created new industries and jobs that would have been impossible to foresee at the time.

Brian Israel, general counsel of the AI company Anthropic, agreed with Palmer's

» Page 8

New York Law Journal

Serving the Bench and Bar Since 1888



Official Publication for the First
And Second Judicial Departments

150 East 42nd Street, Mezzanine Level, New York, N.Y. 10017

Gina Passarella,
Editor-in-Chief of Global Legal Brands

Joe Pavone,
Senior Director of Sales - West, Marketing Solutions

Donald Chalpin,
Global Director of ALM Event Sales & Sponsorships

Andrew Denney,
Bureau Chief

Christine Simmons,
Deputy Bureau Chief

Submissions Editors:
Jade Lopez, Kristie Rearick

Reporters:
Alyssa Aquino, Ryan Harroff,
Brian Lee, Emily Saul

Art Department:
Monika Kozak, Rafal Pytel,
Ryland West, photographer

Decisions:
Jason Ducena, William Thies

Calendars:
Patricia Kane, editor

Production:
Agnieszka Czuj, Susan Ferguson,
Stephen Warren

Web:
Lora Hollien

Copy Desk:
Sean Gossard

BOARD OF EDITORS

Matthew Biben, Sheila Birnbaum,

Sheila Boston, Mary Eaton,

Robert Giuffra, Taa Grays,

Ruth S. Hochberger,

Patricia M. Hynes, Roberta Kaplan,

Victor A. Kovner, Judith Livingston,

Scott E. Mollen, Carolyn Nussbaum,

Thomas Oliva, David Schulz,

Alan Vinegrad, Dwight Yoo,

Mark C. Zauderer

EDITORS EMERITUS

Floyd Abrams, H. Rodgin Cohen,

Robert B. Fiske Jr., Barry Kamins,

Charles G. Moerdler,

Herbert Rubin

ALM:

212-457-9400

800-888-8300

New York City Newsroom: 212-457-7958

Legal Notices: 866-305-3058

ALM SENIOR MANAGEMENT

Bill Carter, CEO

Richard Green, Chief Commercialization Officer

Mark Okean, Chief Financial Officer

Patrick Fuller, Chief Legal Industry Strategist

Erin Dziekan, Chief People Officer

Patrice Coughlin, Chief of Staff

Jimi Li, Chief Technology Officer

Richard Caruso, SVP, Product, Legal

Josh Gazes, SVP, Operations

Gina Passarella, SVP, Content, Legal

READER'S SERVICES

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

For questions regarding reprints
and permissions, call 1-877-257-3382,
e-mail reprints@alm.com,
or visit almreprints.com.

Send decisions of interest to
decisions@alm.com

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

ALM

The New York Law Journal
(ISSN 0028-7326) (USPS 383020)
is published daily except Saturdays, Sundays
and legal holidays by ALM,
150 East 42nd Street, Mezzanine Level,
New York, N.Y. 10017. Periodicals postage paid at
New York, N.Y. and at additional mailing offices.

Designated by the New York Court of Appeals
pursuant to Article VI, Section 28(b)
of the State Constitution.

Designated by the Appellate Divisions,
First and Second Departments,
pursuant to authority conferred on them
by Section 91(1) and (2) of the Judiciary Law.

Designated by the U.S. District Court
for the Southern and Eastern Districts

of New York as a newspaper of general
circulation for the publication of legal notices
in civil and admiralty causes.

Postmaster: Send address changes to the
New York Law Journal, 150 East 42nd Street,
Mezzanine Level, New York, N.Y. 10017. Available
on microfilm and microfiche. Rates on request.
The New York Law Journal® is a registered
trademark of ALM Media Properties, LLC.

In our recent co-authored essay,
"Thoughts on Columbia University's Dilemma and a Proposed Solution," New York Law Journal Online, June 17, 2025, we explored problems relating to the proliferation of Antisemitic disturbances at Columbia and the failure of the University to deal with them effectively. We particularly called out Columbia's University Senate for its unwarranted leniency toward student protesters and urged the University trustees in exercise of their fiduciary responsibilities, to assume a pre-eminent role in the governance of the University, especially with respect to disciplinary matters.

[Author's Note: Both authors were involved on a pro bono basis with the issuance of the Stand Columbia Society's Sunlight Report mentioned in their prior essay, mentioned above.]

The new disciplinary process should be aided by Columbia's incorporation of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's (IHRA) definition of Antisemitism into its antidiscrimination policies. That definition provides that Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews which may be expressed as hatred towards Jews. Many con-

ter issued by the New York state Legislature, which grants them the "full power and authority to direct and prescribe the course of study, and the discipline to be observed in the said college."

The new disciplinary process should be aided by Columbia's incorporation of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's (IHRA) definition of Antisemitism into its antidiscrimination policies. That definition provides that Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews which may be expressed as hatred towards Jews. Many con-

his class "as a soapbox" for anti-Israel protests and one student said Massad described Palestinians as the new Jew and the Jews as the new Nazi." Then President Bollinger issued a statement about "the disturbing and offensive nature of incidents described in the film.

Nevertheless, such criticism of Professor Massad was met by counter-assertions that the Massad controversy was part of a larger campaign to reign in academic freedom.

When the barbarities of Hamas took place on Oct. 7, Professor Massad described them as "awesome" and a "stunning victory of the Palestinian resistance."

Massad wasn't the only one. A visiting Professor at the Department, Mohamed Abdou, who is no longer affiliated, claimed he "was with Hamas and Hezbollah."

It is also claimed that another member of the MESAAS Department, Professor Mahood Mamdani (incidentally the father of the current Democratic Party nominee for Mayor of New York City) acted as a "faculty guard" at the encampment erected by pro-Hamas protesters, preventing Jewish students from accessing Columbia's lawns.

It is evident from reports received from Jewish students that MESAAS remains a Department filled with virulent Antisemitism within a florid anti-Israel environment.

The proposal advanced by the Trump Administration to place the Department in an academic receivership is, in our view, an appropriate recommendation. Such an administrative act is undertaken by a university when it is convinced that an academic department is failing to meet its academic goals or is being mismanaged. Such was the case in the past with Columbia's English Department which was placed into receivership as a result of internal struggles within the department and its failure to maintain excellent levels of teaching and scholarship.

The failure of Columbia in permitting this hot house of Antisemitism to masquerade as a legitimate purveyor of high-level, balanced scholarship, necessitates stronger action on the part of the University.

The failure of Columbia in permitting this hot house of Antisemitism to masquerade as a legitimate purveyor of high-level, balanced scholarship, necessitates stronger action on the part of the University.

temporary examples of Antisemitism are provided, two of which are mentioned as follows:

- denying the Jewish people their rights to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavor, and
- applying double standards by requiring of it a behavior not expected or demanded of any other democratic society.

Critics of the definition suggest that it does not allow for legitimate criticism of Israel, its leaders or its actions.

The purpose of this note is not to decipher the agreement but instead to comment on how it dealt with two principal issues involving Antisemitism at Columbia.

The first issue involved student discipline, an on-going problem, as Columbia has faced often out-of-control demonstrations and building occupations.

In our previous essay, we noted that:

At the center of this is the manner and scope and thoroughness of the student disciplinary process that has been in place to deal with the chaos on campus. Student Discipline at Columbia operates in a diffuse manner. Although Columbia's Trustees have the ultimate fiduciary responsibility in this area, both the Administration and the University Senate have authority to administer discipline for misconduct.

The complexity of a multidisciplinary system, as exists here leads to fragmentation, overlap, poor coordination and disagreement over jurisdiction. Notably, last Spring, the University Senate demanded—and the Administration ceded—exclusive jurisdiction over the protests. Eleven months then elapsed, fraught with procedural slowdowns and the Senate's reluctance to administer discipline, before the processes concluded with expulsions and suspensions.

In that time, the lack of discipline placed Columbia at considerable legal and financial risk. This process has worked poorly at Columbia and the University Senate must shoulder substantial blame.

The Administration is also at fault for caving to the Senate's demands, although recently, its response to the Butler Library demonstrations have been encouraging.

Now, as a result of the agreement, both rule-making and enforcement of student discipline have been moved from the left-leaning and often ineffectual University Senate to the office of the Provost, an important change that should import greater transparency and accountability into the disciplinary process.

Columbia's Trustees ought to be commended for taking this step, as is their prerogative under Columbia's 1810 charter.

Certain faculty members have equated Zionism with genocide; others have outwardly supported Hamas and justified violence against Israel as "resistance."

Jewish students who have come into contact with these faculty members have often been intimidated and silenced and therefore wronged.

At the forefront of the academic faculties embracing a fundamentally rampant anti-Israeli and Antisemitic bias is MESAAS. As far back as 2004, certain pro-Israel students produced a film entitled "Columbia Unbecoming" that alleged that certain Professors affiliated with MESAAS intimidated Jewish students.

One such academic who was a focus of the film was a Palestinian Professor, Joseph Massad, who described Israel as a racist, settler-colonial state.

Massad was accused of using

Perspective



Demonstrators gather at the gates of Columbia University campus in New York on April 30, 2024.

Columbia's Dilemma Redux

BY Y. DAVID SCHARF AND DAVID B. SAXE

GC Pay

« Continued from page 1

in one key way: While restricted stock grant recipients receive a fixed number of shares that typically vest over three to five years, the number of shares that PSU grant recipients ultimately will receive hinges on whether the company hits certain performance targets tied to metrics like revenue growth, profitability and shareholder returns.

"Think of PSUs as a team relay race," Optio Incentives, which sells software that helps companies manage employee equity grants, says on its website. "When the team reaches key company goals together, everyone involved earns shares of company stock, celebrating shared success and teamwork."

That kumbaya spirit has helped win over corporate boardrooms, ballooning the percentage of S&P 1500 companies using PSUs from 30% to 75% over the last 20 years, according to the executive pay consultancy Farent Advisors.

However, Farent is not among those enamored with PSUs. In fact, it's been outspoken in dissenting them since Farent partner Marc Hodak, MIT business professor Andrew Lo and MIT post-doctoral associate Chaoyi Zhao released a study in May that found companies issuing PSUs paid higher executive compensation but achieved lower shareholder returns than companies that issued only other types of equity grants. The study looked at incentive plans and returns from 2008 to 2022.

In a recent interview with Agenda, a publication for corporate members, Hodak called PSUs "by far the most complicated instrument ever devised" in executive compensation—and one that may be doing more harm than good. He called complexity "the enemy of good governance."

Another common criticism of PSUs is that they force board compensation committees to play

soothsayer, setting performance targets for as far as three years into the future without knowing what disruptive forces will challenge the leadership team in that span.

"In response to several macro events that have occurred in rapid succession, including the housing crisis, the financial crisis, and the COVID-19 pandemic, many companies are now revisiting whether PSUs are an appropriate vehicle," Aalap Shah, a managing director for the executive pay consultancy Pearl Meyer, said in a company Q&A in March.

In its October 2023 proxy statement, Microsoft's compensation committee almost seemed apologetic that all of its senior executives took steep pay cuts in the fiscal year that had ended four months earlier.

For example, Brad Smith, the company's president and vice chair, saw his compensation plunge 23% to \$18.1 million, even though the committee said Microsoft had had a "strong year" and that Smith had just quarterbacked to completion the company's \$69 billion purchase of video game maker Activision Blizzard, its largest purchase ever.

"At the beginning of fiscal 2023, we faced a changing global macroeconomic environment, including increasing inflation and rising interest rates, resulting in financial headwinds which created challenges in goal setting for our executive compensation program," the committee said.

"We nonetheless continued to set rigorous performance goals that included meaningful year-over-year growth across our performance metrics and focused on long-term alignment of executive compensation with shareholder interests," the committee said.

In another section of the proxy, the committee described the reduced payouts to executives as "demonstrating our commitment to rigorous goal setting."

Some companies, including

Amazon, never jumped on the PSU bandwagon, a decision it argues

was validated by the Farent-MIT study.

In a section of Amazon's May proxy statement, the company wrote that "tying stock and cash award payouts to a handful of discrete performance criteria is a major source of complexity and confusion in executive pay and results in executive compensation arrangements that lack transparency since they are more difficult to value and more vulnerable to obfuscation."

John Gilmore, managing partner of the search firm Barker Gilmore, said some companies are losing top legal talent by failing to recognize how compensation structures affect retention.

"More often, general counsel leave a company when they feel undervalued by the CEO and/or are not being utilized as a strategic business partner," he said.

Winmill emphasized that GCs should be more active in shaping how they're paid.

"I don't see general counsels proactively making suggestions about a better model," he said. "I don't expect the board ... to have all the answers... But I do believe that chief legal officers as a profession should have a point of view on this, and should be advocating for it."

Overall, GC pay continues to rise, Corporate Counsel and ALM Intelligence reported this summer. Median pay for the 544 legal chiefs included in this year's rankings was \$2.95 million, 8.6% higher than a year earlier. Last year's median of \$2.71 million represented a 7.1% increase from 2023.

But the fact that compensation is increasing isn't a reason to let problems with the current system fester, Winmill said.

"Stock-based compensation is here to stay," Winmill said. "But its structure deserves scrutiny—especially when we're talking about the independence and long-term effectiveness of the general counsel role."

In another section of the proxy, the committee described the reduced payouts to executives as "demonstrating our commitment to rigorous goal setting."

Some companies, including

Perspective



MICHAEL M. SANTIAGO/GETTY IMAGES VIA BLOOMBERG

Federal agents patrol the halls of an immigration court at the Jacob K. Javitz Federal Building in New York in July.

Trump's Court Blesses Racial Profiling

BY BENNETT L. GERSHMAN

It used to be, when the Supreme Court was a respected court, that the court would grant a stay when it really was necessary, such as delaying a prisoner's execution to study the case. Today, the court issues a stay under its emergency docket in virtually any case whenever the Trump administration asks for it.

So it was last week that the court stayed the ruling of a federal judge in Los Angeles that enjoined immigration officials from arbitrarily seizing Hispanic or Latino persons in Los Angeles suspected of being in the United States illegally. The seizures were based on four factors: presence at a particular location, such as a bus stop or car wash; the type of work involved; speaking Spanish or speaking English with an accent; and race or ethnicity. The government did not deny the seizures were based on these four factors.

Under the Fourth Amendment police are allowed to forcibly interfere with a person's liberty based on a reasonable suspicion that the person is committing or about to commit a crime. The suspicion must be based on individualized factors and not group stereotypes. The federal court issued its injunction because the immigration seizures violated the Fourth Amendment.

The Supreme Court did not explain its reasons for issuing the emergency order overturning the injunction. The task of trying to justify what appears to be a misuse of the court's emergency docket was delegated to Justice Brett Kavanaugh, and his effort was not convincing.

Without citing any authorities for any of his numbers, Kavanaugh began by echoing the government's estimates of illegal immigration: 15 million illegal immigrants in the United States, and 2 million of them in the Los Angeles area.

Kavanaugh quoted the claims by Trump's anti-immigration officials that the persons seized work in day jobs "that are attractive to illegal immigrants who do not speak English," such as construction, landscaping, agriculture, and car washes. Kavanaugh relied on the representation of immigration officials that if they learn the person is a U.S. citizen, "they promptly let the individual go."

Although Kavanaugh stated that ethnicity alone would not be enough to furnish reasonable suspicion to seize persons, he said

race "can be a relevant factor." As for seizures of Hispanic or Latino persons lawfully in the country, Kavanaugh was confident that "questioning [these persons] is typically brief," and then choosing his words carefully, said that "those individuals may promptly go free after making clear they are legally in the U.S."

That they "may" promptly go free may be correct; but the question is whether the immigration officials will allow them to go free? Kavanaugh did not mention the numerous examples submit-

Sadly, the court continues to supplicate to an authoritarian president whose regime continues to destroy constitutional values and the rule of law.

ted by the plaintiffs to the federal court of "roving patrols of armed and masked immigration agents jumping out of cars at local car washes, Home Depots, tow yards, bus stops, farms, recycling centers, churches and parks," "tackling people before asking questions, and with guns drawn grabbing people and pushing them up against walls and fences," "demanding identification, and even when proper identification is given, refusing to accept it and let them go."

Kavanaugh added that if an official seizes a person unlawfully because he looks Latino, speak Spanish, and appears to work in a low paying job, "remedies should be available." Yes, remedies should be available. Is that a principled argument for judicial decision-making when constitutional rights are violated?

Kavanaugh concluded that the "proper role of the judiciary" is to "ensure that the Executive Branch acts within the confines of the Constitution," and observed that the court would be stepping outside its proper role "to restrict reasonable Executive Branch enforcement of the immigration laws." But Kavanaugh begs the question: Is the Trump administration's enforcement of the immigration laws "reasonable"?

The dissenters—Justices Sonia Sotomayor, Elena Kagan, and Ketanji Brown Jackson—told it like it is. "The very essence of the government's pattern of conduct is to seize first and ask questions later."

As noted above, the record in the federal district court strongly supports that claim. Trump's armed invasion into the greater Los

Angeles area, the dissent wrote, where nearly fifty percent of the Central District identify as Hispanic or Latino, "has caused panic and fear."

The federal court heard testimony from persons struggling to make ends meet but afraid to go to work, reluctant to attend school meetings and to pick up their children from school. The dissent cited statements from Trump's anti-immigration officials "to just go out there and arrest illegal aliens," "target Home Depot and 7-11 stores," "turn the creativity knob up to 11," "push the envelope," and "if it involves handcuffs on wrists it's probably worth pursuing."

Responding to the government's plea that immigration agents would be "chilled" and "deterring" from stopping suspects

if the injunction was not stayed, the dissent observed that no real chill seemed likely. Kristi Noem, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, called the District Judge an "idiot," and the Chief of Border Protection in Los Angeles encouraged his agents to "go even harder" and continue efforts to "chase, handcuff, and deport" people at car washes and other locations.

In balancing the government's interest against the public's interest, the Trump Justices appear to disregard the government's abuses and violations of immigration laws, discount the rulings of federal judges who have recorded from the testimony of victims the abuses and violations of their constitutional rights and seek to protect these vulnerable people from lawless government actions.

Sadly, the court continues to supplicate to an authoritarian president whose regime continues to destroy constitutional values and the rule of law.

As these Justices sit in their comfortable chambers and ruminate in the shadow of their emergency docket, one wonders whether they ever think about the fate of a person who looks a certain way, speaks a certain way, and works at a certain job that pays very little. Are these justices aware that individuals will lose their freedom because they possess those attributes? Do these Justices even care?

BENNETT L. GERSHMAN is a distinguished professor at the Elisabeth Haub School of Law at Pace University.

Calendar

TUESDAY, SEPT. 16

Federal Bar Council (CLE)

Supreme Court Preview

5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.

Location: Winston & Strawn, 200 Park Avenue; 2 CLE credits

<https://fbc.users.membersuite.com/events/a5720928-0078-c93-f7d9-0b48837b05bb/details>

New York City Bar (CLE)

From The Minds of Mediators: How to Prepare For and Mediate an Employment Law Case

9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

2 CLE Credits; Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=WEB091625&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: Zoom

Contact: 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

New York City Bar (Non CLE)

Visas en Vogue: Threading the

Needle of US Immigration Law for Fashion Designers & Models

Panel: 5:15 p.m. - 6:30 p.m.

Fashion Show: 6:30 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.

Reception: 7:30 p.m. - 8 p.m.
In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=WEB091725&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street
Contact: 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

New York City Bar (Non CLE)

Small Law Firm Luncheon The Productive Practice: Streamline and Scale for Solos and Small Firms

12 p.m. - 2 p.m.

In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=SLF091725&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street
Contact: 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

New York City Bar (CLE)

Introduction to the Surrogate's

Court: Estate Administration

1 p.m. - 4 p.m.; 3 CLE credits

Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=MVA091725&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street
Contact: 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

EventDetail?EventKey=_WEB091725&mcode=NYLJ
Location: Zoom
Contact: 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18

New York City Bar (Non CLE)

Fall Gathering for Solos and Small Firms

6 p.m. - 8 p.m.

In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=SLF091725&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street
Contact: 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

America's Trial: Torture and the

9/11 Case on Guantanamo Bay: A Book Release and Discussion

6:30 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.

In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=MVA091725&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street
Contact: 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

IN BRIEF

«Continued from page 1

"No," he said, "but I'll do whatever it takes for our clients."

—Dan Roe

Newsmax Adopts Change-of-Venue Strategy In Antitrust Lawsuit Against Fox News

Conservative broadcast company Newsmax has voluntarily dismissed its antitrust lawsuit against rival Fox Corp. in Florida to file new claims in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin alleging Fox unlawfully monopolized the right-leaning pay TV news market.

Newsmax's change-of-venue strategy comes a week after U.S. District Judge Aileen Cannon of the Southern District of Florida dismissed its original complaint Sept. 5 for containing impermissible "shotgun" pleadings.

Cannon in her dismissal order suggested Newsmax could file an amended complaint addressing the structural deficiencies, but the plaintiff decided to file new claims in another jurisdiction.

"On a technical matter, Newsmax's complaint against Fox News was dismissed in the Southern District of Florida," Newsmax said Friday in a statement.

"As a result, Newsmax is allowed to refile its complaint in any jurisdiction in which it suffered harm as a result of Fox's actions. Accordingly, on Thursday, September 11, Newsmax refiled its amended complaint in the Western District of Wisconsin."

Kellogg, Hansen, Todd, Figel & Frederick and Godfrey & Kahn on behalf of Newsmax filed the 39-page complaint alleging Fox violated the Sherman Act and Wisconsin state antitrust laws through an "exclusionary scheme to increase and maintain its dominance in the market for U.S. right-leaning pay TV news."

"Fox's conduct has caused competitive injury to Newsmax in several ways, including, but not limited to, stifling Newsmax's pay TV distribution, obstructing its audience and ratings growth, preventing Newsmax from reaching 'critical mass' for major advertising and marketing revenues, all while increasing overall company costs," counsel for Newsmax alleged in the complaint.

Fox has "harmed consumers and competition" by pressuring distributors into anticompetitive agreements that cause consumers to pay higher prices to access right-leaning cable news and "foreclose or delay meaningful competition" from rival conservative TV broadcasters, the complaint stated.

The plaintiff's complaint in Wisconsin federal court names Fox Corp. and Fox News as defendants and contains allegations substantially similar to the claims Cannon dismissed in Florida.

Counsel for Newsmax filed a voluntary notice of dismissal in the Southern District of Florida on Thursday—the same day the plaintiff filed a new complaint in the Western District of Wisconsin.

Kellogg Hansen partner Michael J. Guzman referred to Newsmax's statement Friday when asked why his client filed new claims in Wisconsin federal court rather than Florida.

Florida-based Newsmax seeks treble damages and a permanent injunction that would prohibit Fox's alleged exclusionary conduct.

Spokespeople for Fox did not immediately respond Friday to a request for comment. Counsel for the New York-based defen-

dants have not yet entered an appearance as of Friday.

—Sulaiman Abdur-Rahman

'Libel Tourism'? Conservative Influencer Says Delaware Court Lacks Jurisdiction In French First Couple's Defamation Case

Podcaster Candace Owens has moved to dismiss the defamation suit filed against her in Delaware by French President Emmanuel Macron and his wife Brigitte Macron, claiming the lawsuit is a public relations stunt and "quintessential libel tourism" aimed at stopping Owens from making further comments about the couple and those affiliated with them.

Owens is represented by Marc E. Kasowitz in New York, Santa Monica attorney Noah Balch, Nashville speech defense lawyer Daniel A. Horwitz and Richards, Layton & Fingers directors Blake Rohrbacher, Chad M. Shandler and Katharine L. Mowery, who filed a brief in support of Owens' motion to dismiss that said the Superior Court lawsuit is an attempt to stifle Owens' freedom of speech and bypass France's three-month statute of limitations on defamation claims.

The Macrons, represented by Clare Locke and Farnan LLP, sued Owens in July over a series of podcast episodes focused on the couple that were released in January and February. The case has been assigned to Superior Court Judge Sheldon K. Rennie.

"The French president and his wife cynically avoided filing in their home country," the brief stated. "The reason is clear: this matter is not a legitimate legal action, but rather a transparent ruse orchestrated by plaintiffs' high-priced public relations firm. Had the Macrons actually suffered reputational harm from Mrs. Owens' opinion piece—and were they serious about clearing their names or protecting their reputations—they would have filed suit in France within the applicable limitations period. But legitimate vindication of their rights has never been the Macrons' intent, nor were their reputations injured."

Owens, who lives and records her podcast in Nashville, Tennessee, claimed the Delaware court can't have jurisdiction in the case because the state has no link to her, either of the Macrons, or any relevant witnesses or evidence.

While the LLC and corporation which manage Owens' social media posts and website, respectively, are both Delaware entities and both named as defendants in the lawsuit, Owens' brief claims Delaware law only grants implied consent jurisdiction over cases involving a Delaware LLC if the case involves the LLC's business, which the Macrons' suit does not.

If the Superior Court did have personal jurisdiction over Owens, she argues, it would still be held to France's three-month statute of limitations, requiring dismissal of the case. She told the court the doctrine of forum non conveniens should also be applied, alleging that proceeding in Delaware would involve navigating documents and witness locations outside the state or country as well as interpreting foreign laws.

"This action was brought by citizens of France, against citizens of Tennessee, regarding statements made in Tennessee, that purportedly injured the Macrons in France," the brief stated. "Thus, this case's relationship to Delaware is highly tenuous, and Delaware law will not apply to it."

"Given her penchant for promoting lies and conspiracy theories, it is hardly surprising that Ms. Owens also has lied to her audience about how she will defend the lawsuit," counsel for the Macrons said Monday. "Instead of defending her defamatory statements about President and Mrs. Macron on the merits and proceeding with the discovery process she claimed she couldn't wait for, she is now trying to hide behind legal maneuvering and a motion to dismiss designed to shield her reporting from scrutiny. Unlike Ms. Owens, the Macrons welcome the discovery process and look forward to holding her to account for the reckless falsehoods she continues to knowingly promote."

—Ellen Bardash

Paul Weiss Snags Antitrust Partner Trio From A&O Shearman

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison has recruited a three-partner veteran antitrust group from A&O Shearman, including David Higbee, former co-head of A&O Shearman's antitrust group and executive committee member.

Higbee, alongside Ben Gris and Djordje Petkoski, are joining Paul Weiss' Washington, D.C., office as partners in the firm's antitrust practice, the firm said Monday.

"David, Ben and Djordje are antitrust stars," said Paul Weiss chairman Brad Karp in a statement. "Their arrival further strengthens our market-leading global antitrust capabilities."

The trio focuses on antitrust

Expert Analysis / Technology Today / Outside Counsel

Orders

«Continued from page 3

were not reviewable, they were not appealable. Absent an exercise of discretion so egregious that it can be characterized as an abuse of discretion as a matter of law, the Appellate Division's exercise of discretion is not reviewable by the Court of Appeals.

In *Majauskas v. Majauskas*, (61 N.Y.2d 481, 474 N.Y.S.2d 699) the Court of Appeals observed that whether marital property shall be distributed or a distributive award shall be made in lieu of, or to supplement, facilitate or effectuate a distribution of marital property are matters committed by Domestic Relations Law §236 (B) (5) to the discretion of the trial judge in the first instance.

The authority of the Appellate Division is, as broad as that of the trial judge, and absent an exercise of discretion on its part so egregious that it can be characterized as an abuse as a matter of law, its exercise of discretion is not reviewable by the Court of Appeals (citing *Patron v. Patron*, 40 N.Y.2d 582, 388 N.Y.S.2d 890, 357 N.E.2d 361). Here, the Appellate Division's change in the procedure of payment of the defendant's portion of future pension payments received by the plaintiff was, therefore, beyond its review.

To the same effect see *Lind v. Lind*, (58 N.Y.2d 965, 447 N.E.2d 72, 460 N.Y.S.2d 524) ("...it not appearing that that court abused its discretion or committed an error of law, its determinations of alimony, counsel fees and the use of the marital property are beyond our review (see *Patron v. Patron*, 40 N.Y.2d 582, 388 N.Y.S.2d 890, 357 N.E.2d 361).")

After final judgment, an intermediate order is merged into it and does not survive, unless it comes up for review pursuant to CPLR 5501(a)(1). (*Sawdon v. Sawdon*, 39 A.D.2d 883, 883, 333 N.Y.S.2d 610, 611 (1 Dept., 1972)).

An order awarding pendente lite relief is only designed to provide temporary relief pending the disposition of the matter in a final judgment. Once the judgment of divorce is issued, the support provision in the judgment supersedes the prior pendente lite support order, which is extinguished. (*DeGroat v. DeGroat*, 82 N.Y.S.3d 572 (2d Dept., 2018)).

On entry of a final judgment, the order granting pendente lite relief is no longer appealable. (*Flynn v. Flynn*, 128 A.D.2d 583, 512 N.Y.S.2d 847 (2d Dept., 1987)).

Orders which award pendente

lite maintenance, child support, custody, temporary and exclusive possession of the marital home, and counsel fees are not reviewable on appeal from the judgment of divorce under CPLR 5501 because, if reversed or modified, they would not necessarily affect the judgment. (*Maddaloni v. Maddaloni*, 36 N.Y.S.3d 695 (2 Dept., 2016); *Tekel v. Martone*, 272 A.D.2d 228, 709 N.Y.S.2d 394 (1st Dept., 2000)); *Vickie F v. Joseph G*, 149 N.Y.S.3d 671 (3d Dept., 2021)).

The Civil Practice Law and Rules provide that the order determining a motion must be (1) in writing and (2) must be in the same form whether made by a judge out of court or a court.

An order determining a motion made upon supporting papers must be (3) signed with the judge's signature or initialed by the judge who made it, (4) state the court of which he is a judge and the place and date of the signature, (5) recite the papers used on the motion and (6) give the determination or direction in such detail as the judge deems proper. (CPLR 2219(a)).

CPLR 2219 (a) requires that an order "recite the papers used on the motion." It has been held that the order's failure to recite the papers does not bar an appeal from the order if the party remedies the omission by seeking resettlement of the order, even after an appeal has been taken.

However, if an order omits the recital of papers, a party who fails to timely appeal from it cannot revive his right of appeal by later seeking resettlement and appealing from the resettled order.

A party may not seize upon this omission to circumvent the prohibition against extending the time to appeal contained in CPLR 5514 (subd. (c)). (*Singer v. Board of Educ. of City of New York*, 97 A.D.2d 507, 468 N.Y.S.2d 25 (2d Dept.'1983)).

The transcript of the court's directions at a preliminary conference can have the force and effect of an order of the court. The Uniform Rules provide that at the conclusion of the conference, the court shall make a written order including its directions to the parties as well as stipulations of the parties' attorneys.

Alternatively, in the court's discretion, all directions of the court and stipulations of counsel may be recorded by a reporter. Where the latter procedure is followed, the parties must procure and share equally the cost of a transcript of the preliminary conference unless the court, in its discretion, otherwise provides.

The transcript, corrected, if necessary, on motion or by stipu-

lation of the parties approved by the court, "shall" have the force and effect of an order of the court. The transcript must be filed by the plaintiff with the clerk of the court. (22 NYCRR 202.12 (f)).

No appeal lies from a mere decision. (see *Matter of Sims v. Coughlin*, 86 NY2d 776 (1995); *Gunn v. Palmieri*, 86 NY2d 830 (1995); *Aurora Loan Servs., LLC v. Revivo*, 175 AD3d 622, 622 (2d Dept 2019); *Ryals v. New York City Tr. Auth.*, 104 AD3d 519, 519 (1st Dept 2013); *D & P Realty, Inc. v. Robustiano*, 68 AD3d 1496, 1497 n (3d Dept 2009); *Kuhn v. Kuhn*, 129 A.D.2d 967, 514 N.Y.S.2d 284 (4th Dept. 1987)).

In Charalabidis v. ElNagar, 188 A.D.3d 44, 132 N.Y.S.3d 129 (2d Dept., 2020), during the trial, the Supreme Court orally granted the defendant's motion to disqualify the plaintiffs' counsel, struck the action from the trial calendar, and issued a 60-day stay to enable the plaintiffs to obtain new representation.

The transcript was signed by the court reporter, who certified its truth and accuracy, but was never signed by the justice of the court. A copy of the certified transcript was submitted to the court, but the justice refused to sign a "So ordered" copy of the transcript.

Plaintiffs' counsel then submitted a proposed order of disqualification with notice of settlement pursuant to 22 NYCRR 202.48 and attached a copy of the certified transcript. The court failed or refused to execute the proposed order.

The plaintiffs moved pursuant to CPLR 2221 for leave to reargue the disqualification or, alternatively, pursuant to CPLR 2219 and 22 NYCRR 202.48 to compel the Supreme Court to issue an appealable order. The Supreme Court determined, without any analysis or comment, that the "plaintiff's [sic] motion is denied."

The plaintiffs appealed from their motion to compel the court to issue an appealable order. The Appellate Division affirmed. It noted that although disqualification itself was beyond the scope of its review, the appeal provided it with an occasion to discuss the requirements of CPLR 2219, which governs how motions are to be determined by courts.

Here, the justice failed or refused to later sign the transcript of the proceedings, and therefore, the transcript never qualified as an order for purposes of its enforcement or for an appeal.

Likewise, the justice failed or refused to sign the proposed order that was submitted to him, with a copy of the transcript and with

notice of settlement. Such an order, if signed with or without modification of its proposed language, would have become an enforceable order and subject to appeal.

In an instructive opinion by Justice Mark Dillon, the court observed that on occasions when a court renders a mere decision on a motion, the decision can be converted into an order by the execution of a proposed order with notice of settlement, under the procedures defined by 22 NYCRR 202.48.

An order issued upon notice of settlement must meet the same unyielding criteria of CPLR 2219(a) as an order rendered by a court upon directly determining a motion. When a judge or justice chooses to determine a motion in open court, with parties present, on the record, the transcript of the proceeding becomes the written version of the order subject to the mandates of CPLR 2219(a).

The transcript prepared by the court reporter will reflect, in the normal course, the date of the proceeding, the court where the proceeding is conducted, and the identity of the jurist presiding.

Trial judges and justices, in creating the transcribed record, must be mindful of all other requirements of CPLR 2219 that the court reporter cannot satisfy, including language that the determination is an "order," rather than a mere decision, if an order is what is intended; a full recitation of the papers reviewed by the court in reaching its determination; sufficient direction and detail as to what is being ordered; and the affixation of the judge or justice's signature or initials upon the transcript.

Therefore, when the transcript is to become the written version of an order determining a motion, arrangements must be made for the transcript to be provided to the judge or justice for signature or initials.

Only when the transcript is actually signed or initialed by the judge or justice with the direction that the transcript be entered does it meet the requirements of CPLR 2219(a) to be enforceable as an order, and only then upon its entry does the transcript become an "appealable paper."

Alternatively, when a transcript is used, a party may, as was also done here, provide a copy of it to the judge or justice with a proposed order for signature, with notice of settlement to all parties (see 22 NYCRR 202.48[a]). Under this method, the transcript need not be signed and can be treated as a mere decision, but the accompanying proposed order, once signed

or initialed, becomes enforceable under CPLR 2219(a) and constitutes an appealable paper (see CPLR 5512(a)). The court held that, absent a proceeding pursuant to CPLR article 78, the plaintiffs could receive no relief on this appeal. In the absence of a mandamus proceeding, it was obligated to affirm the order insofar as appealed from.

It noted that on this record, there was no signed enforceable order and, therefore, the time to appeal any such future order has not yet begun to run.

While agreeing that no appeal lies from a mere decision, it appears that the Fourth Department construes CPLR 2219(a) differently than the other appellate departments. In *Matter of Louka v. Shehatou*, 67 A.D.3d 1476, 888 N.Y.S.2d 841 (4 Dept., 2009), the father appealed from an order denying his motion to vacate an amended order entered upon his default, which granted the mother sole legal and physical custody of the parties' children and permanently terminated the father's prior custodial and visitation rights.

Although the determination of the father's motion was contained in a letter, no order was entered. The referee filed the letter with the Family Court Clerk. The letter resolved the motion and advised the father that he had a right to appeal. On the mother's motion to dismiss this appeal, the Appellate Division held that the letter would be treated as an order.

In *Nicol v. Nicol*, 179 A.D.3d 1472, 118 N.Y.S.3d 833 (4th Dep't 2020), the Plaintiff appealed from a decision denying his motion seeking, in effect, a downward modification of his child support obligation, enforcement of certain terms of the parties' separation and settlement agreement, and attorney's fees.

Although not raised by the parties and although it acknowledged that "[n]o appeal lies from a mere decision," the Appellate Division concluded, without discussion, that the paper appealed from met the essential requirements of an order, and treated it as an order (citing *Matter of Louka v. Shehatou*, supra). One judge dissented.

The dissent disagreed with the majority's decision to treat the decision appealed from as an order, citing decisions of the Fourth Department dating back to 1987. It observed that the court had held that "[n]o appeal lies from a mere decision."

It observed that in *Louka v. Shehatou* (67 A.D.3d 1476, 888 N.Y.S.2d 841 (4th Dep't 2009)), the court determined that a letter would be treated as an order since "the Referee filed the letter

with the Family Court Clerk and ... the letter resolved the motion and advised the father that he had a right to appeal."

Although the decision here was filed and resolved the motion, there was no directive in the decision that the plaintiff had the right to appeal from.

Thus, the dissent pointed out that under the majority's determination, an appeal may lie from a mere decision if it was filed and if it resolved the issues presented by the parties.

The appealable paper no longer needs to be labeled as an order, it no longer needs any ordering paragraphs, and the appellant can still appeal even if he or she refers to the paper on appeal as a "decision" in the notice of appeal.

The Fourth Department has construed CPLR 2219(a) this way in subsequent appeals, treating a mere decision as an order where it meets the essential requirements of an order" if it was filed "with the court clerk and ... [it] resolved the [proceeding] and advised the father that he had a right to appeal." (See *Downstairs Cabaret, Inc. v. Wesco Ins. Co.*, 187 A.D.3d 1642, 132 N.Y.S.3d 496 (4th Dept 2020); *Matter of Silas W.*, 171 N.Y.S.3d 290 (4th Dept., 2022); *Geer v. Collazo*, 198 N.Y.S.3d 462 (4th Dept., 2023).

Conclusion

No appeal lies from a mere decision. An order determining a motion must comply with CPLR 2219(a). An order issued upon notice of settlement must meet the same unyielding criteria of CPLR 2219(a) as an order rendered by a court upon directly determining a motion. When a judge chooses to determine a motion in open court on the record, the transcript of the proceeding becomes the written version of the order subject to the mandates of CPLR 2219(a).

The transcribed record must meet all of the requirements of CPLR 2219, including language that the determination is an "order," rather than a mere decision, if an order is what is intended; a full recitation of the papers reviewed by the court in reaching its determination; sufficient direction and detail as to what is being ordered; and the affixation of the judge or justice's signature or initials upon the transcript.

In the Fourth Department, a decision appealed from will meet the essential requirements of an order and will be treated as an appealable order if it is filed with the Court Clerk, resolves the proceeding, and advises the litigant that he has a right to appeal.

Legal Jobs

«Continued from page 5

historical analogy but said he is most concerned about how AI will affect lawyers at the beginning of their careers.

"I'm most worried about the first rungs of the career ladder," Israel said. "The professionals who developed scar tissue and wisdom will have more of a place, but a lot of the ways we train lawyers, at least in private practice, is on a set of tasks that I think are within range of being done much more efficiently by AI."

Sean Burke, a New York City-based partner for the recruiting firm Whistler Partners, told Law.com this summer that he is seeing a marked softening of the job market for early-career in-house lawyers.

He said the weakness stems from companies' discovering that for lower-level legal work, one lawyer using AI can do the volume of work that used to require three or four lawyers.

"There are so many attorneys right now who went in-house, who are in the tech space, who are out of work, and it used to be they would be hired in a month, right?" he said. "And now you're seeing

cycles of six months to a year or longer to get another job. So it's a really tough time."

During Wednesday's panel discussion, Lauren Lennon, general counsel at Scale AI, which provides training data for AI applications, was more skeptical of AI's supposed time-saving potential.

"My role within the company isn't just generating facts about the law," Lennon said. "My role is being a counselor and adviser, or frankly, a therapist, a lot of the time. And that just isn't AI's role. ... I've actually been surprised by how little we actually use it beyond edge cases."

The four panelists agreed that AI has fundamentally changed the expectations for general counsel.

Palmer said GCs now have to consider the global implications of AI development, from differing legal frameworks to the need to maintain public trust.

"That North Star for us, which is trust, has been what we pointed to in almost every conversation internally as we work through an AI-dominated world."

"Don't forget your people skills and building true, real relationships with people around you," she said.

Israel noted that governments worldwide are treating AI as a national security issue. Lennon added that GCs are no longer just legal advisers but policy and busi-

ness influencers because AI's regulatory uncertainty.

"We're not just lawyers anymore," she said. "We are driving a lot of the policy conversations, the business conversations, because of geopolitical issues going on and because of the regulatory—or lack thereof—framework for products and services."

Cathleen Hartge, general counsel of the generative media company Runway, said the fundamentals of good legal judgment still apply, even in the absence of a mature body of AI law.

"You're asking a lot of the same questions in the AI governance realm that you're asking in privacy—around data flows, around having tight contractual restrictions, around use restrictions," she said. "So that's one part that I firmly believe hasn't changed, with the caveat that it's all changing."

Asked what advice she would offer young lawyers entering the field, Lennon said relationship-building will remain critical even in an AI-dominated world.

"Don't forget your people skills and building true, real relationships with people around you," she said.

It in if that's the case."

Model selection for legal tech tools is a dynamic process, with vendors constantly testing the latest iterations of LLMs against each other and swapping them out for specific use cases. Future tweaks to GPT-5 may ultimately see developers incorporate it for tasks where they currently use alternatives. That said, it or any other model is only likely to be adopted in bits and pieces over time, and will often be used in concert with other models from OpenAI and other developers.

"We did not just turn GPT-5 over on every skill and capability of CoCounsel," Hron said. "We did it selectively on a few things where it really shines, and we'll continue to evaluate it against other things over time, as the model continues to evolve."

«Continued from page 5

Benjamin Joyner can be reached at bjoyner@alm.com.

Workforce

«Continued from page 4

nification channels, including social media, group chats, text messages, websites, and email. Low tolerance unnecessarily for detailed or lengthy written communications, Gen Z expects information to be to the point, relevant to them, and engaging. Effective communications for this group utilizes both written and visual content, including video.

Job Security And Advancement

For Boomers, job security is highly valued. They have tradition-

ally experienced career advancement via long hours, hard work, and company loyalty. Their career trajectory often involves climbing the corporate ladder within a single organization. Gen X and millennials, on the other hand, often bring their entrepreneurial spirit to work.

<p

Off the Front / Expert Analysis

Proskauer

« Continued from page 1

for Proskauer, amid a larger build-out of the firm's global finance offerings. That practice, the firm said, has added more than a dozen partners in leveraged finance, private credit, structured credit and fund finance in the past year.

The new Charlotte office is Proskauer's 12th worldwide and, at the moment, is entirely made up of the four new partners from Cadwalader.

Breen said in an interview that the firm brought Lovelace and his team aboard to bolster the firm's position amid a changing financial market.

"It's become increasingly clear to us that the public and private markets are converging," Breen said. "So part of the strategy behind Ron and his team is grabbing what we believe is the premier, largely bank-facing leveraged finance team in that market."

Breen said the group also does work for private credit clients, which "speaks to the entirety of the story about why the strategy is coming together." He added, "It's really important to be extremely credible in all things leverage finance, from syndicated bank bonds to private credit and sort of everything in between on that very large and growing spectrum."

Tim Mungovan, Proskauer's chairman, said in an interview that the firm intends to continue growing its global finance practice, the Charlotte office, and the firm in general.

He said that those goals are "mutually reinforcing" and added that the plan is for the Charlotte office to remain largely finance-focused, but that there may be room for related practices if the right opportunities arise.

According to the firm, the four partners advise banks and financial institutions and between them, offer expertise on leveraged finance, restructurings, asset-based financings, recapitalizations and refinancings.

Lovelace said he and his fellow partners were attracted to Proskauer by the resources and platform it offered them to serve their clients.

"The ability to join up with what is unquestionably the number one private credit shop in the country is just compelling," Lovelace said. "It allows us to bring resources to our clients and friends in Charlotte and across the country, frankly, that we've not had before."

A representative for Cadwalader said in an email to Law.com that "Ron, Patrick, Jared and Joey were wonderful colleagues, and we have really enjoyed working with them for the past 2.5 years. Launching an office is an exciting opportunity, and we wish them the very best."

Lovelace, Yingling, Zajac and Polonsky are the latest in a series of exits from Cadwalader this year, including an eight-partner collateralized loan obligation practice team that left for Orrick Herrington & Sutcliffe earlier this month, three of whom were also from Cadwalader's Charlotte office.

Cadwalader managing committee member Stuart Goldstein told Law.com in August that the firm was "pacing ahead" of its revenue growth for 2024 but declined to give specific numbers for 2025. The firm has also done some hiring, including a new co-head from Sidley Austin for its collateralized loan obligation practice team, the same team that then lost eight partners to Orrick.

Cadwalader also saw the exit of a 14-attorney real estate financial team head to Sidley Austin.

Proskauer has also seen some departures recently, including finance partner Cameron Roper who left for Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison and corporate partner Andrew Houghton who went to Reed Smith earlier this month, both in London. Proskauer has also made its own additions in London, including leveraged finance partner Peter Mason from White & Case, in line with the firm's stated goal of building out its financial offerings.

✉ Ryan Harroff can be reached at rharroff@alm.com.

Disney

« Continued from page 1

man Bryson Phillips Grossman; Ahdoot & Wolfson; Emery | Reddy; and Lynch Carpenter.

Causes of action include violations of the Video Privacy Protection Act, the Federal Wiretap Act, the Pennsylvania Wiretap Act and the New York General Business Law; intrusion on seclusion; trespass to chattels; negligence; unjust enrichment; and invasion of privacy.

"Every child is afforded the most robust protection of their right to privacy," said Timothy Emery, a founding member of Emery | Reddy who is representing the plaintiffs in Seattle federal court, in an emailed statement.

"The law is unequivocally clear on this point."

The suits echo the FTC's allegations against Disney, which contend in a complaint filed by the U.S. Department of Justice that Disney flouted the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA) of 1998 by failing to appropriately

label "kid-directed" content it had uploaded to YouTube as "Made For Kids," which enabled Disney to illegally mine the personal data of minors for use in targeted advertising. All five complaints allege the same COPPA violations, though none have been brought under the federal statute.

COPPA, which tightened its restrictions in April, requires websites, apps and online services to obtain parents' and guardians' "verifiable" consent before collecting the personal information of children under the age of 13. YouTube has required content creators since 2019 to designate videos shared on the platform as "Made for Kids" or "Not Made for Kids" to comply with a settlement it reached with the FTC over similar COPPA claims.

"As children spend increasingly more time on internet-connected devices, it is imperative for streaming companies which produce children's shows to abide by online and digital privacy laws," said Blake Yagman, a partner at Spiro Harrison & Nelson who is representing the plaintiffs in a

New York federal case, in an email. "Because Disney is a household name synonymous with television programs made for minors, they, as much as any company, have a critical obligation to abide by protocols and safeguards intended to protect the data of children who stream and watch their programs."

Yagman said that he anticipates more lawsuits against Disney will follow on the heels of a petition to the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, which was filed today. Plaintiff Ashley Popa, represented by Lynch Carpenter on behalf of her minor children, filed a motion to consolidate the five actions against Disney in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York given that "all arise from the same unlawful invasion of privacy that captured the personal information of thousands (or millions) of children without their parents' consent."

The Walt Disney Company did not return an email seeking comment by press time.

✉ Kat Black can be reached at kblack@alm.com.

Labor Court

« Continued from page 3

whether a ruling in the case of the NLRB or other agencies that ends up requiring all adjudications to be held in tribunals whose members are removable at-will or in Article III courts (where judges must have life tenure) will be practicable and beneficial for our system. In the event the Supreme Court does leave room for a reconstituted NLRB, HR Policy Association's Roger King, Cornell's Professor David Sherwyn and I have recommended, *Labor Board Needs Restructuring, Not Destruction, The Regulatory Review*, May 27, 2025, that Congress amend the NLRB to have the NLRB serve as a purely adjudicatory body, the change to take effect only after the next presidential election.

We envision a six-member adjudicatory agency—call it a Labor Court. The president would appoint the six members with the Senate's consent for six-year terms on a staggered basis.

The court would be composed of two Democrats, two Republicans, and two Independents defined as individuals who have not represented labor or management interests for the previous six years and who otherwise exhibit a reputation for fair-minded, non-ideological professionalism.

A new president might try to stack the deck with his supporters, but the hope is that the specification of criteria for appointment of the independent members would empower the Senators to exercise a necessary check.

The court would take appeals from ULP decisions from the ALJs and regional director decisions in representation cases. Any decision of the court overruling NLRB precedent would require four votes—to curb the constant policy oscillation with each new administration that bedevils the agency, impairs predictability for labor and management alike, and undermines the agency's credibility with reviewing courts.

Regional directors would be appointed by and supervised by the general counsel. The court would sit in three-judge panels, but any member of the court could call for full-bench consideration of the dispute.

The general counsel would be given the sole authority to seek applications for injunctive relief after an expedited ALJ hearing so that these petitions are not based entirely on affidavits from one side of the dispute, a practice which undermines their credibility (especially critical after the Supreme Court's decision in *Starbucks v. McKinney*, 602 U.S. (2024)).

The Labor Court would be shorn of any rulemaking authority or any supervisory authority over the regional directors, which in the history of the agency it has rarely exercised.

The Labor Court could not initiate court actions of any kind. Appeals from the court's rulings could be brought by "aggrieved parties" in the federal courts of appeals under existing venue rules.

A solicitor, appointed by the court, could intervene in those actions to defend the court's decision. Enforcement of the court's

decisions would be handled by the courts of appeals. If the court fails to issue a decision within one year of the filing of a case, either party could bypass the court and go straight to a federal district court where the underlying events occurred.

The members of the Labor Court would sit for six-year staggered terms removable by the president before expiration of their term only for "cause," as under the NLRB currently. They would continue to sit beyond expiration of their term until appointed (or reappointed) by the president with Senate approval.

Two seats would expire March 1 of every odd year. The president we have after this administration could appoint two members after Inauguration and two additional members in March after the midterm elections.

Under the proposed Labor Court, the president would retain effective influence, if not control, over labor policy. The president, it must be remembered, would appoint the members of the Labor Court as well as select its Chair. The general counsel, also the president's appointee, would be removable at-will, and only the general counsel could initiate enforcement actions.

Moreover, unlike some other statutory schemes, a newly-elected president would not be "stuck" for long with a court majority selected by the prior administration, but would be able to pick four members of the court (the quorum needed to overrule precedent) by March following the midterm elections.

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, JJ.

TUESDAY, SEPT. 16

11:30 A.M.

81794/24 Hudson v. Metropolitan Transportation Authority

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

10 A.M.

65285/24 BH Ej Core v. Core Global Holdings

FRIDAY, SEPT. 26

9:30 A.M.

15383/20 Patino v. 51 West 81st Street

11 A.M.

15035/25 Feigen v. Hamill

THURSDAY, OCT. 2

10 A.M.

65448/22 Cyberbit, Inc. v. Cloud Range Cyber

1 P.M.

65067/1/21 Tahari v. Narkis

FRIDAY, OCT. 3

10 A.M.

60311/105 Lee v. Luk

MONDAY, OCT. 6

10 A.M.

81621/22 Martin v. Poe Affiliates, L.P.

12 P.M.

81116/24 Jimenez v. Sixt Rent A Car

WEDNESDAY, OCT. 8

10 A.M.

65644/23 Bank of Utah v. Aboughazaleh

65238/722 Board of Managers v. World-Wide Holdings

FRIDAY, OCT. 17

9:30 A.M.

15305/25 McGehee v. 14th Street HK Realty

CALENDAR FOR THE SEPTEMBER TERM

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 Julian Farell, LLC v. Stove Properties

24/6181(1) People v. Jeremiah Martinez

24/6135(1) People v. Jeremiah Martinez

24/578 Fine Creative Media v. Barnes & Noble

25/2604 Green Tree Servicing v. Rivera

24/5490 People v. Romeo Carrion

23/6021 People v. Jose S.

24/7161 Homeland Int'l v. Law Offices of Sanjay Chatterjee

24/5680 V. Gloria K. Varen P.

24/3072 Emeagwali v. Dept. of Educ. of City of NY

24/7129 Fernandez v. Sukhdeep

22/5224 People v. Jorge Louis

24/4756(3) Al Baba Hotel v. Protec 25/2523 Freedom Care v. NYS Department of Health

25/874 People v. Eligio Orellana

24/2920 Acevedo v. Citibank

24/7915 Wayman v. CPE Housing Development

23/5732 NYS Division of Housing v. Zara Realty

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

2 P.M.

19/5343(1) People v. Brahma Dijalo

24/5959 Spring Scaffolding v. Kuan

25/1203(1) W. Duanxi v. Duanying W.

24/6088 Ahsanuddin v. Addo

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

24/4525(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

24/2112 Eisner v. Posillico Civil

23/5792 K. Dorell v. Dalece L.

24/1428 People v. Steven McEnaney

20/2163 People v. Jose Matias

24/4653 Emissions Reduction v. MCLOUD Technologies

24/4577 McGrane-Mungo v. Dag Hammarskjold Tower

24/4665(1) People v. Christian Compre-Moreno

24/1718 People v. Josian Normil

150386/24 Riabov v. NYU Hosps. Center Et Al
15760/21 Ricci v. Discover Bank Et Al
652234/25 Robinson v. Pearl Delta Funding LLC Et Al
154644/24 Rock Creek Capital v. Pfanner
159427/21 Ruggiero v. Patriot Flooring Supply, Inc. Et Al
651231/25 S&S Szechuan Inc. v. 353 West 46th Owner LLC
159207/16 Sarmordi v. Pgfef I 1633 B'way Land
156528/25 Schuster v. Deckoff
156288/25 Shah v. NYC
654005/25 Siegel v. Merrill Lynch
151136/21 Smartmatic USA Corp. v. Fox Corp.
161040/25 Soluciones En Bastones S.A. De C.V. v. Studebaker Defense Group
634851/25 Sq Advance v. E4 Logics
159217/24 Squizzotto v. Edition Mgt. LLC D/b/a NY Edition Hotel Et Al
154426/25 State Farm Fire And Casualty Co. v. Diaz Vasquez
155317/25 State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. v. Salisbury
650625/24 Stibie Creek Investments v. S3 Partners
654445/25 Straten Lending Group v. Everest Consolidator Sponsor
160948/19 Subway Real Estate LLC v. Majumder
159758/23 Sulkja v. Midtown West B LLC Et Al
654935/24 The First Date v. Rtw Retailwinds Acquisition LLC D/b/a Saadia Direct Et Al
160797/25 The Group Us Mgt. LLC v. James
190006/23 Thomas v. Af Supply USA Inc., Et Al
651544/23 Tiffany And Co. Et Al v. Lloyd's Of London Syndicates 33
155304/25 Timeless Funding LLC v. Lbu Franchise Corp. Et Al
653557/25 Truist Equipment Finance Corp. v. Tebelle
655388/24 Tuttle Rick Lp v. Allied Properties LLC
154432/25 Waverly Real Estate LLC v. Chen
850222/25 Wells Fargo Bank v. David Herzog LLC Et Al
151251/19 Wengui v. Baosheng
190060/25 Yagen v. Bayer
Consumer Care Hldgs. LLC D/b/a Msd Consumer Care, Inc. Et Al

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

159032/21 1160 W 88 LLC v. Coniglio
154714/22 Warren St. LLC v. 122 East St. Condominium
651033/25 270 Park Ave South v. Khanha
651076/25 M Marketing, Inc. Et Al v. Fall
654203/25 Wall St. Suites LLC v. Schlesinger
652623/25 West 141 Millennium LLC v. The Rector
15789/25 West 36th LLC v. Isaraphanich
159023/2570 Battery Park LLC v. NYS Div. of Housing And Community Renewal
158979/25 West 95 B'way Hldgs. LLC Et Al v. Prose
100320/24 Ahabell v. N.Y. Post
154726/19 Access Theater, Inc. v. Battery Dance Corp.
654131/22 Aerastle Ltd. Et Al v. Chubb European Group S.E. Et Al
654590/25 Afk Inc. v. Van Dan USA LLC Et Al
159127/20 Almonte v. NYU Langone Hosps.
654418/25 Alpine Advance 5 LLC v. Enterprise Data Group LLC Et Al
157748/23 Alvarez v. Ca 5-15 West 125th LLC Et Al
151151/24 American Express Travel Related Services Co., Inc. v. Old American Inc.
655732/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Ashley S. Harrison Et Al
655601/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Colimon
655630/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Denton
655621/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Mamun
655623/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Smith
653156/19 Amherst Ins. Co. v. Baez
650632/24 Anders v. Hybrid Auto Ins. Brokerage, Inc. Et Al
153514/20 Archoo v. Bop Ne LLC
651626/24 Riley Retail Solutions v. Ca Global Partners Ltd.
155496/21 Belfand v. Petosa
152399/24 Board of Mgrs. of Central Park Pl. Condominium v. 21647 LLC Et Al
159245/25 Brusco v. NYC Et Al
805373/22 Butler v. Toujier M.D.
158421/25 Byrne v. The American Society For The Prevention of Cruelty To Animals (ascpa) Et Al
159970/21 Calticid v. Hand & Stone Massage And Facial Spa Et Al
153859/25 Carlton Regency Corp. v. Conforti
161798/24 Cavalry Spv I v. Howard
651662/23 Chm
Telecommunications Inc. v. Parks & Parks Utility Const. LLC
153784/21 Cerros v. NYCTA
635385/21 Cooper-Nolaco v. Royal Waste Services Inc. D/b/a Royal Waste Services Et Al
653567/22 Copper Services LLC v. Ksk Const. Group LLC Et Al
159395/25 Crescenzi v. Dept. of Sanitation (dsmny) Et Al
652288/25 Crypta Corp v. Axispoint, Inc.
139762/26 Callinan v. NY Univ.
152482/22 De Ruggiero v. NYC Et Al
652121/20 Derossi v. Yavuz
155939/23 Diaz v. 25 B'way. Office Properties
150147/25 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
160570/25 Donet v. Theubault
Com.
151059/24 Enbergar NY LLC v. Dolch
651666/25 Federation LLC v. Rozen
654760/16 First Commercial Bank v. Grand Grace Hldg.
156392/21 Francis v. Harran Hldg. Corp. Et Al
451666/18 Genetech Bldg. Systems v. Anco Corp.
154566/25 Gidseg v. Jacin Investors LLC Et Al
654646/25 Gn Hospit. Inc. Dba Comfort Suites v. Starr Surplus Lines Ins. Co.
150556/25 Gonzalez v. NYC Et Al
654784/25 Greylag Goose Leasing 1410 Designated Activity Co. Et Al v. Chubb European Group Se Et Al
154784/24 Guaman Rodas v. Uob Rty. (USA) Ltd. Partnership Et Al
651033/23 Haruvi v. Hungerford
651826/23 Harvardsky Prumyslov v. Kozeny
652998/25 Hpec, Inc. v. Startup
651172/19 Invar Int'l Hldg. v. 136 Field Point Circle
654500/25 Itria Ventures LLC v. Mari
190055/22 Kirby v. David Fabricators of NY, Inc.
651615/23 Korpena v. One Penn Plaza LLC
654129/25 La Playatar Uno LLC Et Al v. Coco Hotel I LLC Et Al
157682/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Dept. Et Al
659389/24 Lens Collective v. True Colors United, Inc.
152794/23 Levine v. 190 Riverside Condominium Et Al
153793/22 Litten v. Biergarten America Corp. Et Al
656397/23 London Manhattan Corp. v. Mary The Ketchup, Inc.
151366/22 Mayers v. Tudor City Greens Inc.
805179/21 McCulloch v. Marans Md

65981/24 Mitchell Consultants NY Corp. v. 77 Rty. Owner LLC
150559/25 Mohammed v. NYC Et Al
154844/25 Molina Arrayago v. Interactive Brokers LLC
159902/25 Morales v. NYCTA Et Al
155384/25 Moreno v. Canali U.S. Inc.
156937/25 Moreno v. Hanho USA, Inc.
160403/24 Morroco Chimbio v. Cjs Industries Inc. Et Al
65441/24 Mortensen v. Nat. Cable Communications LLC
158943/25 Munro v. Grillo
156563/25 Nitra Investors LLC v. Keller
100096/25 Obah v. Stavros Niarchos Foundation
154600/24 Ocebfund Hldgs. v. Tks Bldg. Center Hldg.
160163/25 Ogbolu v. Charles Schwab & Co., Inc.
805017/20 Olatunde v. NYCH&HC
650217/23 Omansky v. 300-302 East 119 St. Hdr Et Al
655222/24 Orphion Therapeutics, Inc. v. The Children's Hosp. of Philadelphia Et Al
65074/24 Ott Concessions Mgt. Llc v. Yor Inc Et Al
161873/25 Papademetriou v. Hans Namuth
653057/25 Peachy Medical P.C. v. Grey
154592/25 Perez v. NYC Et Al
15425/25 Persiani v. Persiani
15960/23 Rangel Suarez v. NY Univ.
16081/25 Riggan v. NYC Dept. of Health & Mental Hygiene
15733/21 Roberts v. NY Presbyterian Foundation Inc. Et Al
157480/24 Rucker v. NYC Et Al
158583/25 Sha Home Improvements Inc v. NYC Office of Administrative Trials And Hearings (oath) Et Al
155216/21 Smallis v. NYCTA Et Al
155845/22 Smith v. 595 Dean Et Al
653548/25 Song v. Reganate
65463/25 Spartan Capital Securities v. Barakat
156874/24 Sq Advance v. Carolina Tint & Wrap LLC Et Al
159534/23 State Farm Fire And Casualty Co. v. McGarrell
155318/25 State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. v. Advantage Pharmacy Et Al
15420/25 State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. v. Congacha
152487/24 Storch v. Metro North Commuter RR. D/b/a Mta Metro North RR. Et Al
150768/25 Student Loan Solutions v. Acosta Jr
161269/21 Suite v. Fox
15794/20 Taima v. East 54th St. Properties
15591/24 Timmons v. Checkers Drive-In Restaurants, Inc. Et Al
160969/23 Unitrin Safeguard Ins. Co. v. Nygeacq
158894/24 Vasquez v. Augustus 154369/23 W. v. The Mount Sinai Hosp. Et Al
652398/25 Watts v. Kyle May
15191/02 Where The Heart Is LLC v. Newell's D/b/a Shellpoint
160719/24 Winfrey v. NYC Et Al
156708/25 Winters v. Klaff
155059/16 Wurtenburg v. NYC
158372/21 Yang v. Au Jus Et Al
153273/24 Young v. Good Pal Chantelle D/b/a Hotel Chantelle Et Al

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18

152480/25 112 Equities LLC v. Powell
655786/182 Girls Accy LLC v. Larrea
652059/2522 West 34th St. LLC C/o Sol Goldman Investments LLC v. Kim
155572/2501 West 180 St. NYC LLC v. Rojas
650957/2458 Av. Harmonic Health Inc.
651008/25 Light And Sound Inc. v. Ez Festivals LLC Et Al
157963/21 Alves Do Nascimento v. Topcat Rty. Corp Et Al
157832/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. St. Lukes Roosevelt Hosp. C/o Rock Gomes
157833/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. St. Lukes Roosevelt Hosp. C/o Rock Gomes
156515/23 Anderson v. Lubin
151263/21 Arthurs v. Haven Rooftop
65145/24 Atalaya Capital Mgt. Lp v. Ballard
159250/25 Baldor Specialty Foods v. NYC Et Al
157655/25 Benfield Partners, Inc. v. Home Record LLC Et Al
157656/22 Benfield Partners, Inc. v. Home Record
156662/18 Blandon v. Petit-Freire
160532/20 Block v. Uber Technologies, Inc.
150436/17 Brito v. NYC
152037/20 Cardona v. E.E. Cruz & Co., Inc.
151301/25 Cavalry Spv I v. Tomlinson
651692/23 Crestwood Services LLC v. Soleil Chartered Bank Et Al
160370/25 Finance Hldg. Co. v. Farzam
153799/25 First Flight Helicopters v. NYC Et Al
160200/22 Flores v. Sylbert
161900/24 Fora Financial Advance v. Temp Precision Ltd Et Al
651392/25 Frank Cappaevz v. Antika Pizzeria, Inc.
162478/19 Frovala v. Miller
450155/21 Global Merchant Cash, Inc. v. Global Logistic And Trading LLC D/b/a Global Logistic And Trading Et Al
157100/25 Gonzales v. Jrk Properties LLC Et Al
157807/19 Gordon v. NYC Et Al
15979/24 Govt. Employees Ins. Co. v. Al-Rahma Physical Therapy
651445/23 Grain Bell Express Hldg. LLC v. Inverny Transmission LLC Et Al
152177/23 Guailas Jima v. 1571-1573 Third Ave. LLC Et Al
154488/24 Hamilton Equity Group v. Vzon Tech, Inc. Et Al
152302/23 Hernandez v. Franco
654730/25 Heun v. Friedman Llp
158406/23 Hook v. Coronel
652764/25 Hypowiss Private Bank Geneva Sa v. Jtre4 LLC Et Al
161868/25 In the Matter of The Application of Moog Inc. Et Al v. NYC Police Dept.
452301/25 In the Matter of The Application of the Metro. Transportation Authority. Relative To Acquiring Temporary Easements in Re Prop. Required For The Second Ave. Subway Project - Phase 2 Block 1687 v. Na
153798/25 Interfl. LLC v. Sisco
805027/12 Kats v. Agosto
100494/24 Katz v. NYCHA Preservation & Dev. Et Al
155242/25 Kershaw v. Kershaw
650319/25 Kuun Inc. v. Utica First Ins. Co.
651027/23 Lexington Ins. Co. v. Allstar Security & Consulting, Inc.
156782/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Dept.
452301/25 In the Matter of The Application of the Metro. Transportation Authority. Relative To Acquiring Temporary Easements in Re Prop. Required For The Second Ave. Subway Project - Phase 2 Block 1687 v. Na
153798/25 Interfl. LLC v. Sisco
805027/12 Kats v. Agosto
100494/24 Katz v. NYCHA Preservation & Dev. Et Al
155242/25 Kershaw v. Kershaw
650319/25 Kuun Inc. v. Utica First Ins. Co.
651027/23 Lexington Ins. Co. v. Allstar Security & Consulting, Inc.
156782/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Dept.
452301/25 In the Matter of The Application of the Metro. Transportation Authority. Relative To Acquiring Temporary Easements in Re Prop. Required For The Second Ave. Subway Project - Phase 2 Block 1687 v. Na
153798/25 Interfl. LLC v. Sisco
805027/12 Kats v. Agosto
100494/24 Katz v. NYCHA Preservation & Dev. Et Al
155242/25 Kershaw v. Kershaw
650319/25 Kuun Inc. v. Utica First Ins. Co.
651027/23 Lexington Ins. Co. v. Allstar Security & Consulting, Inc.
156782/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Dept.
452301/25 In the Matter of The Application of the Metro. Transportation Authority. Relative To Acquiring Temporary Easements in Re Prop. Required For The Second Ave. Subway Project - Phase 2 Block 1687 v. Na
153798/25 Interfl. LLC v. Sisco
805027/12 Kats v. Agosto
100494/24 Katz v. NYCHA Preservation & Dev. Et Al
155242/25 Kershaw v. Kershaw
650319/25 Kuun Inc. v. Utica First Ins. Co.
651027/23 Lexington Ins. Co. v. Allstar Security & Consulting, Inc.
156782/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Dept.
452301/25 In the Matter of The Application of the Metro. Transportation Authority. Relative To Acquiring Temporary Easements in Re Prop. Required For The Second Ave. Subway Project - Phase 2 Block 1687 v. Na
153798/25 Interfl. LLC v. Sisco
805027/12 Kats v. Agosto
100494/24 Katz v. NYCHA Preservation & Dev. Et Al
155242/25 Kershaw v. Kershaw
650319/25 Kuun Inc. v. Utica First Ins. Co.
651027/23 Lexington Ins. Co. v. Allstar Security & Consulting, Inc.
156782/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Dept.
452301/25 In the Matter of The Application of the Metro. Transportation Authority. Relative To Acquiring Temporary Easements in Re Prop. Required For The Second Ave. Subway Project - Phase 2 Block 1687 v. Na
153798/25 Interfl. LLC v. Sisco
805027/12 Kats v. Agosto
100494/24 Katz v. NYCHA Preservation & Dev. Et Al
155242/25 Kershaw v. Kershaw
650319/25 Kuun Inc. v. Utica First Ins. Co.
651027/23 Lexington Ins. Co. v. Allstar Security & Consulting, Inc.
156782/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Dept.
452301/25 In the Matter of The Application of the Metro. Transportation Authority. Relative To Acquiring Temporary Easements in Re Prop. Required For The Second Ave. Subway Project - Phase 2 Block 1687 v. Na
153798/25 Interfl. LLC v. Sisco
805027/12 Kats v. Agosto
100494/24 Katz v. NYCHA Preservation & Dev. Et Al
155242/25 Kershaw v. Kershaw
650319/25 Kuun Inc. v. Utica First Ins. Co.
651027/23 Lexington Ins. Co. v. Allstar Security & Consulting, Inc.
156782/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Dept.
452301/25 In the Matter of The Application of the Metro. Transportation Authority. Relative To Acquiring Temporary Easements in Re Prop. Required For The Second Ave. Subway Project - Phase 2 Block 1687 v. Na
153798/25 Interfl. LLC v. Sisco
805027/12 Kats v. Agosto
100494/24 Katz v. NYCHA Preservation & Dev. Et Al
155242/25 Kershaw v. Kershaw
650319/25 Kuun Inc. v. Utica First Ins. Co.
651027/23 Lexington Ins. Co. v. Allstar Security & Consulting, Inc.
156782/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Dept.
452301/25 In the Matter of The Application of the Metro. Transportation Authority. Relative To Acquiring Temporary Easements in Re Prop. Required For The Second Ave. Subway Project - Phase 2 Block 1687 v. Na
153798/25 Interfl. LLC v. Sisco
805027/12 Kats v. Agosto
100494/24 Katz v. NYCHA Preservation & Dev. Et Al
155242/25 Kershaw v. Kershaw
650319/25 Kuun Inc. v. Utica First Ins. Co.
651027/23 Lexington Ins. Co. v. Allstar Security & Consulting, Inc.
156782/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Dept.
452301/25 In the Matter of The Application of the Metro. Transportation Authority. Relative To Acquiring Temporary Easements in Re Prop. Required For The Second Ave. Subway Project - Phase 2 Block 1687 v. Na
153798/25 Interfl. LLC v. Sisco
805027/12 Kats v. Agosto
100494/24 Katz v. NYCHA Preservation & Dev. Et Al
155242/25 Kershaw v. Kershaw
650319/25 Kuun Inc. v. Utica First Ins. Co.
651027/23 Lexington Ins. Co. v. Allstar Security & Consulting, Inc.
156782/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Dept.
452301/25 In the Matter of The Application of the Metro. Transportation Authority. Relative To Acquiring Temporary Easements in Re Prop. Required For The Second Ave. Subway Project - Phase 2 Block 1687 v. Na
153798/25 Interfl. LLC v. Sisco
805027/12 Kats v. Agosto
100494/24 Katz v. NYCHA Preservation & Dev. Et Al
155242/25 Kershaw v. Kershaw
650319/25 Kuun Inc. v. Utica First Ins. Co.
651027/23 Lexington Ins. Co. v. Allstar Security & Consulting, Inc.
156782/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Dept.
452301/25 In the Matter of The Application of the Metro. Transportation Authority. Relative To Acquiring Temporary Easements in Re Prop. Required For The Second Ave. Subway Project - Phase 2 Block 1687 v. Na
153798/25 Interfl. LLC v. Sisco
805027/12 Kats v. Agosto
100494/24 Katz v. NYCHA Preservation & Dev. Et Al
155242/25 Kershaw v. Kershaw
650319/25 Kuun Inc. v. Utica First Ins. Co.
651027/23 Lexington Ins. Co. v. Allstar Security & Consulting, Inc.
156782/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Dept.
452301/25 In the Matter of The Application of the Metro. Transportation Authority. Relative To Acquiring Temporary Easements in Re Prop. Required For The Second Ave. Subway Project - Phase 2 Block 1687 v. Na
153798/25 Interfl. LLC v. Sisco
805027/12 Kats v. Agosto
100494/24 Katz v. NYCHA Preservation & Dev. Et Al
155242/25 Kershaw v. Kershaw
650319/25 Kuun Inc. v. Utica First Ins. Co.
651027/23 Lexington Ins. Co. v. Allstar Security & Consulting, Inc.
156782/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Dept.
452301/25 In the Matter of The Application of the Metro. Transportation Authority. Relative To Acquiring Temporary Easements in Re Prop. Required For The Second Ave. Subway Project - Phase 2 Block 1687 v. Na
153798/25 Interfl. LLC v. Sisco
805027/12 Kats v. Agosto
100494/24 Katz v. NYCHA Preservation & Dev. Et Al
155242/25 Kershaw v. Kershaw
650319/25 Kuun Inc. v. Utica First Ins. Co.
651027/23 Lexington Ins. Co. v. Allstar Security & Consulting, Inc.
156782/25 Law Office of Jack Jaskaran v. NYC Police Dept.
452301/25 In the Matter of The Application of the Metro. Transportation Authority. Relative To Acquiring Temporary Easements in Re Prop. Required For The Second Ave. Subway Project - Phase 2 Block 1687 v. Na
153798/25 Interfl. LLC v. Sisco
805027/12 Kats v. Agosto
100494/24 Katz v. NYCHA Preservation & Dev. Et Al
155242/25 Kershaw v. Kershaw
650319/25 Kuun Inc. v. Utica First Ins. Co.
65102

655401/24 Arnett v. Algin Mgt. Co LLC Et Al
155496/12 Belfand v. Petosa
651074/23 Ben Jacobson Painting v. Argos Real Estate LLC Et Al
153299/24 Board of Mgrs. of Central Park Pl. Condominium v. 21647 LLC Et Al
159577/25 Bukspan v. 255 West 84th St. Owners Corp. Et Al
159395/25 Crescenzi v. Dept. of Sanitation (dsny) Et Al
156843/24 Goodman v. Shvo
654500/25 Itavia Ventures LLC v. Marin
154268/24 Lexis Nexus v. Anderson & Ochs
656397/23 London Manhattan Corp. v. Mary The Ketchup, Inc.
654441/24 Mortensen v. Nat. Cable Communications LLC
156726/25 Pegram v. Metro. Transportation Auth.
654639/24 Sack v. Marks
654231/24 Schusterman v. Sutton House, Inc.
160969/23 Unifirn Safeguard Ins. Co. v. Nyeqasc
153273/24 Young v. Good Pal Chantelle D/b/a Hotel Chantelle Et Al

Motion

159954/25 10 West 17th St. Owner LLC v. 12 West 17th St. Tenants' Corp.
650472/24 Nostrand LLC v. Strongin
655401/24 Arnett v. Algin Mgt. Co LLC Et Al
159577/25 Bukspan v. 255 West 84th St. Owners Corp. Et Al
156843/24 Goodman v. Shvo
154268/24 Lexis Nexus v. Anderson & Ochs
156726/25 Pegram v. Metro. Transportation Auth.
654231/24 Schusterman v. Sutton House, Inc.
THURSDAY, SEPT. 18
650794/23 Asp Watch Guard & Patrol Inc. v. 17th St. Entertainment II LLC Et Al
150436/17 Brutto v. NYC
450155/21 Global Merchant Cash, Inc. v. Global Logistic And Trading LLC D/b/a Global Logistic And Trading Et Al
154488/25 Hamilton Equity Group v. Vzon Tech, Inc. Et Al
156684/25 Harlem Smoke Shop 1 Inc v. NYC Office of Administrative Trials And Hearings Et Al
654730/25 Heun v. Friedman Lip 651072/23 Lexington Ins. Co. v. Alstar Security & Consulting, Inc.
152894/23 Manda Int'l Corp. v. Jm & A Const. Corp. Et Al
190324/20 Petro v. Aerco Int'l, Inc.
162327/14 Tokatssyana v. Victor

Motion

650794/23 Asp Watch Guard & Patrol Inc. v. 17th St. Entertainment II LLC Et Al
156684/25 Harlem Smoke Shop 1 Inc v. NYC Office of Administrative Trials And Hearings Et Al

Part 12

Justice Leslie A. Stroth
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3273
Room 232
TUESDAY, SEPT. 16
602803/07 Aldrich v. Northern Leasing Systems, Inc.
630703/25 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Custon Rx Pharmacy LLC
156445/24 Begun v. 505 Eighth Corp. Et Al
161527/23 Bromberg v. Long Island Rail Road Co. Et Al
160609/19 Cavallo v. 1515 B'way. Owner Lp
15274/25 Elmers v. Cuenin
157364/20 Espinal Cabrera v. 50 Hymc LLC
156100/21 Gonzalez v. S&E Bridge & Scaffold LLC Et Al
154793/23 Guachicula Retto v. Sbgo LLC Et Al
100118/20 Hurtado v. Costco Corp.
157631/22 Iglesia v. 2143 Acp LLC Et Al
154250/24 Karter v. Infinicare Inc. Et Al
151416/24 Linarez v. The NYCHA
151741/24 Lopez v. Vp Capital Hldgs. LLC Et Al
160219/21 Magna Publishing, Inc. v. D'Souza
163182/21 Medina Tejeda v. Caulwell-Wingate Co.
158365/23 Messina v. Seadyc Rly. Co. Et Al
151373/21 Murphy v. NYC Dept. on Transportation Et Al
156122/22 Oztruk v. Clear Air Group Trucking Corp.
156955/22 Polanco v. NYC Et Al
154624/24 Prinzing v. Bierhaus NYC
160782/21 Quedaza v. Ls-14 Ave
153437/20 Rivera v. Stanken Associates Ltd.
159427/21 Ruggiero v. Patriot Flooring Supply, Inc. Et Al
653339/14T Mobile Northeast LLC v. Jomel Associates, Inc.
152737/21 Tobar v. NYCHA
655588/24 Tuttle Yick Lip v. Allied Properties LLC
155661/21 Weiss v. Astor Pl. Associates LLC Et Al

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

150147/25 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
159960/23 Rangel Suarez v. NY Univ.
153326/22 S. v. Gerstle

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18

152284/25 An v. Universal Music Group, Inc., Individually And D/b/a Interscope Capitol Labels Group Et Al

Part 14

Justice Arlene P. Bluth
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3219
Room 432
WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

850372/23 57th St. Vacation Owners Assoc., Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Ferguson

850063/20 57th St. Vacation Owners Assoc., Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Garcia

850129/23 57th St. Vacation Owners Assoc., Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Mohammed

653156/19 Ameriprise Ins. Co. v. Baez

655152/21 Arthur N. Abbey v. Cb Tarter Prop. LLC

850170/22 Customer's Bank v. 517 West Properties LLC Et Al

106036/07 Deutsche Bank Nat. Trust v. Hamilton

85055/23 Deutsche Bank Trust v. Rh 220 West 149 St. Lp Et Al

850466/23 Hsue Suites Owners Assoc., Inc., v. Lind

850005/25 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Cosme

850161/18 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Storey

850491/24 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Turner

850266/23 Hny Club Suites Owners Assoc., Inc., By And Through Its Board of Directors v. Jacobs

850398/23 Keybank v. NYU Langone Hosps.

850114/23 Merchants Bank of Indiana v. W 55 Llc Et Al

157000/22 NYCTL 2021-A Trust And The Bank of NY. Mellon As Colateral Agent And Custodian

v. Wong

65271/22 Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler Lip v. Marcus & Cinelli Lip Et Al

850131/21 Ps Funding, Inc. v. Itay Kahini LLC
850161/24 Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., As Trustee, For Park Pl. Securities, Inc. Asset-Backed Pass Through Certificates, S Eries 2005-Wcw2 v. Nix
852085/21 Wells Fargo Bank v. Namco Rly. Co. L.L.C. Et Al
THURSDAY, SEPT. 18
650522/24 American Ins. Co./A/o Green Ivy Pine St. LLC And A/o 40 Wall St. LLC v. Admore Air Conditioning Corp. Et Al
157652/22 Benfield Partners, Inc. v. Home Record LLC Et Al
157652/22 Benfield Partners, Inc. v. Home Record
652893/20 New Deal Rly. LLC v. 684 Owners Corp.
65424/22 NY Spine & Sport Rehabilitation Medicine v. Jafaar
653302/23 Tedford's Tenancy v. Horizons Investors Corp. Et Al
151107/21 Yoon v. L&L Hldg. Co.

Part 15

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

TUESDAY, SEPT. 16

365354/25 Hung v. Hung
WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

320237/25 Burrows v. Burrows
300536/25 Reynolds v. O'Neill
305016/25 Uccello v. Forman

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18

306930/18 Peacock-Cole v. Peacock-Cole

Part 17

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

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18

150898/21 Locke v. Schindler Elevator Corp. Et Al

Part 19

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

Part 20

ADR

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

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

156532/22 Yee v. Con Ed Co. of New York, Inc. Et Al

Part 24

Matrimonial Part

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

TUESDAY, SEPT. 16

320731/23 Sharma v. Sharma
302162/22 Soriano v. Hernandez

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

302255/23 Cadet v. Belizaire
360261/25 Castel Baixaulli v. Williams

310534/19 Franklin v. Franklin
365381/24 Jean v. James
30008/16 Matthews-Valery v. Valery

31115/11 Mervin v. Leroy
320261/23 Muñizmeici v. Musumeci
321790/22 Rodriguez v. Figueiro Guzman

320621/23 St Louis v. St Louis
321355/23 Turner v. Turner
365013/24 Zweig v. Zweig

Motion

360261/25 Castel Baixaulli v. Williams

310534/19 Franklin v. Franklin
30008/16 Matthews-Valery v. Valery

31115/11 Mervin v. Leroy
321355/23 Turner v. Turner

Part 26

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

TUESDAY, SEPT. 16

322821/21 Foster v. Foster

Part 28

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

TUESDAY, SEPT. 16

365440/24 Bermond v. Bermond

365353/24 De Matos v. De Matos

365269/24 Saxena v. Shrotri

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

320009/24 Depalma v. Depalma

310164/19 Drinker v. Drinker

365340/25 Empson v. Anderson

320563/23 Lee v. Maxwell

365292/25 Markel v. Demel Markel

365104/25 Punj v. Grewal

365734/23 Seelye v. Esquivel

Motion

310164/19 Drinker v. Drinker

365340/25 Empson v. Anderson

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18

365802/23 Clark v. Rumble

365735/23 Dore-Almon v. Almonor

320256/24 King v. Kessler

321794/23 Min-Zarchy v. Zarchy

303349/20 Roscinski v. Rose

365785/23 Samalsking v. Springer

Motion

303349/07 Roscinski v. Rose

Part 30V

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

Part 33

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

TUESDAY, SEPT. 16

160250/24 E.W. Howell Co., Llc v. NYC Dept. of Design & Const. Et Al

157507/24 Ortiz v. Mnk Enterprises LLC

Motion

150349/24 Ortiz v. Mnk Enterprises LLC

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

156527/22 Perfect Transperfect

Translations Int'l, Inc. v. Frei-Pearson

Motion

157507/20 Anzalone v. Empire Office, Inc. Et Al

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

150395/22 Aig Prop. Casualty Co. v. Cohen

151

659445/24 Manhattan Dev. Properties LLC D/b/a Manhattan Dev. LLC v. Via Magna Corp. 162578/19 Melendez v. 275 Canal Spe LLC

152362/18 Myriad Properties, Inc. v. Seneca Ins. Co., Inc.

6502525/25 NY Insulation, Inc. v. Capital Industries, Inc. Et Al 156730/160 Marri v. Con Ed Co. 158639/19 Cahis v. Fairway East 86th St. LLC

159/1623 Peña Nunez v. Ab Oil Services Ltd Et Al

150382/18 Perry v. Sada Three 161049/21 Phagoo v. 140 Bw LLC 452722/21 Piper v. Shulaiman 650528/20 Pisano v. Pisano 100351/19 Porter v. Michael F. Bachner

152885/20 Puca v. Moynihan Station Dev. Corp. Et Al 154302/19 Quiroga v. 277 West 10 Owner

654325/24 Rcn Telecom Services LLC v. The Hallen Const. Co., Inc. Et Al 160913/21 Richardson v. Brand 154619/19 Robertson v. Par Taxi Corp.

158561/19 Rownicki v. Cheever Dev. Corp.

850232/21 Rss Msbam2015-C20 - NY 3w v. 33 W. 46 Rtry 158892/20 Sanders v. Daily News 159389/18 Scaccia v. Brookfield Properties One

154907/16 Singh v. NYC 160575/19 Smith v. NYC 160428/19 Solo Ramirez v. 34-10 Dev. LLC

65476/24 St. Tropez 29b Irrevocable Trust v. Durham 165159/18 State Farm Ins. v. Jahaga

155986/23 Sullivan v. Ortiz 158138/17 Szycner v. Con Edison Co. of New

651207/24T Moriarty & Son, Inc. v. NYC Dept. of Parks & Recreation

Et Al 154653/23 Tectonic Engineering Consultants Geologists & Land Surveyors v. Hap Investments LLC Et Al

151174/23 The Board of Mgrs. of The Walden Condominium v. Clunie

159251/18 Tricomi v. Human First, Inc.

157603/23 Troisi v. Serenity Laser Spa

160226/21 Vega v. NYCHA

162197/24 White & Williams Llp v. Infinity Global

654958/19 Zhang v. 28 St Izumi Japanese

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

654212/25 Amsterdam Ave. Hdgcs. LLC v. Leccese

152128/221819 Weeks Ave. Rtry. Corp. v. Aufile

156413/2214 Lafayette House LLC v. Akas Hdgcs.

153488/2234 West 39th St., Inc. v. Ayazmoond Fabric, Inc. Et Al

159119/21499 Fashion Tower LLC v. Rodco, Inc./a/k/a Rodco, Inc./ NVC Kids Et Al

162197/19 Almonte v. 2100-2102 Amsterdam Ave.

152469/20 American Transit Ins. v. Advanced Comprehensive

452475/21 Baez Done v. Mta Bus Co.

657053/21 Board of Mgrs. of the 23

East 81 Condominium v. Coven

157760/16 Breton v. Dishi

16304/17 Cabral v. NYC

156729/19 Carasco v. Schlesinger

153864/22 Cevallos v. Finkelstein

150089/22 Core Scafold Systems Inc. v. Claremont Hotel, Inc. Et Al

159361/18 Corwin v. NY Univ.

Langone

156773/18 Dolcimascalo v. 701 7th Prop. Owner

805232/23 Don v. Pamouka

154756/20 Dynamic Steel Metal Ltd. v. Masterpiece U.S. Inc.

159279/19 Elelevation 101 v. Adler

158878/19G v. Pret A Manger (USA) Ltd.

154222/19 Gardner v. Novosel

156099/20 Gibson v. Titocity1990 LLC

805371/20 Gordon v. De La Cruz

152968/22 Herfuth v. J & B Cleaners, Inc. Et Al

157648/21 Hidalgo v. Hoge

451016/20 Inane v. Zuppone

157478/20 Joseph v. Office Solution Group

155080/22 Kamal v. Four Thirty Rtry. LLC Et Al

305227/19 King v. Leary

156326/19 Rochdale Ins. Co. v. T.G. Nickel & Associates

152051/20 Rose v. Gaziwoda 118 LLC

159256/20 Roseboom v. 250 West 43 Owner LLC

650740/22 S & Kings Corp. v. Westchester Fire Ins. Co.

15148/20 Santoli v. Eastside

Ventura LLC

656360/19 Scarsola Zubatov

Schaffzin Plc v. Dynamic Credit Partners

10187/18 Spanierman v. 4 Park Ave. Associates

151175/22 Sunbelt Rentals Inc. v. Cec Steel LLC

305427/19 Teller v. Tellier

850276/22 The Bank of NY Mellon Trust Co. v. Kim

158932/21 Titocity1990 LLC v. Rich

150707/19 Turner v. Penske Truck Leasing Co., L.P.

156722/21 Villagomez v. 109

Madison Hdgcs. LLC

302383/19 Waterman v. Waterman

300398/21 Watt v. Jackson

152203/22 Wells v. Kingstone Ins. Co.

158490/22 Zuefle v. Ryder Truck Rental Et Al

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18

158849/17 Alba v. Port Auth. of New

805240/19 Alakkhaverdiyeva v. Tomasa

156505/16 Alvarez v. 471 West 144 LLC

154175/21 Aziz v. NYCTA Et Al

150311/17 Bassan v. Pelas Rtry. Corp.

155621/21 Borrelli v. NYCTA

157149/22 Brache-Moran v. Stf 247 Audubon Ave. Hdg. LLC

15963/22 Carchipula v. Terminal Fee Owner Pl Et Al

158879/20 Carreras Lorenzo v. Mta Bus Co.

157499/16 Casais v. NYC

805145/22 Chan v. NYCH&C/HC/ gotham Health Goveruner Et Al

152751/24 Cirincione v. Amwar

158705/21 Crosby v. Aja Turnpike Properties LLC

155106/22 Crump v. Metro.

Transportation Auth. Et Al

152957/16 Diaz v. NYCTA

16018/20 Dineen v. Elysee Hotel

15815/18 Duley v. NYCHA

80582/21 Duran v. Isabella Geriatric Center, Inc.

450512/16 Edwards v. Collective, Inc.

651433/17 Eighth Ave. Sky. v. Ramesh Bhatia

65087/18 Fima v. Allaham

650077/19 Follett Time Devices, Inc. v. Gracie Corp. 45124/22 Gabelia v. NYCTA Div. of Paratransit Et Al

159244/16 Garcia v. NYC

16007/16 Garcia v. 267 Dev.

80545/17 Germosen v. Hubbard

15963/17 Goldberg v. NYC

65423/20 Goldman v. NYC Strand

15690/21 Gonzalez v. NYC Et Al

15169/16 Harris v. NYCTA

15779/20 Herrera-Mendez v. 125 Broad St. Condominium

65124/24 Hsbc Bank USA v. Chan

15230/18 Hunter v. Schulze

16237/14 June v. Kandel

15673/19 Kim v. Bedouet

15270/21 Kim v. NYC

15172/21 Leslie v. Linde Inc.

15408/19 Lewis v. NYC

15003/21 Lopez v. Green

15789/18 Maldonado v. East 80th Associates

15360/19 Marc Gleitman v. Kushner

15719/22 Marte v. NYC

15782/19 Maxwell v. NYC

15375/16 McAlvey v. NYC

15634/17 Mesel v. Kushner

10297/11 Molina v. NYC

16089/22 Mueller v. Bpp Pcv Owner LLC

15095/22 Munoz v. NYC Et Al

15081/22 Ochigrossi v. Poon M.D.

15119/08 Oliva v. NYCTA

15323/22 Oliviera v. NYCTA

10863/06 Olivo v. Food Emporium

15310/21 Ozari v. Rb Rtry. Capital LLC

15423/16 Perez v. Roza 14w LLC

15959/21 Kardarsa v. Allen-Stevenson School For Boys

15117/22 Nurse v. NYC Et Al

15809/18 Pankow v. Bonide Prods. 95/735/20 S. VNC

15095/22 Rodriguez v. Vs 125

15670/21 Rossi v. Doka USA

15289/17 Ryan v. Board of Mgrs. v. Edelman

15861/21 Santana v. 248 Fordham Road LLC Et Al

15608/19 Spoto v. Matos

15045/17 Stewart v. Goldstein

15739/17 Sun v. Richbourg

15673/16 Tarkan v. Sadiq

16078/20 Tempesta v. Laffey

15134/20 Thomas v. NYC Tansit Auth.

16141/19 Travelers Prop. v. Vema Group

15656/21 Vargas Espinoza v. A S K Standard Transit Corp. Et Al

159412/22 Vazquez v. 116 West 80th St.

15538/21 Rodriguez v. L. V. Meijer

15247/21 Ramon v. 125 Fordham

15856/21 Vargas Espinoza v. A S K Standard Transit Corp. Et Al

159412/22 Vazquez v. 116 West 80th St.

15538/21 Rodriguez v. L. V. Meijer

15247/21 Ramon v. 125 Fordham

15856/21 Vargas Espinoza v. A S K Standard Transit Corp. Et Al

159412/22 Vazquez v. 116 West 80th St.

15538/21 Rodriguez v. L. V. Meijer

15247/21 Ramon v. 125 Fordham

15856/21 Vargas Espinoza v. A S K Standard Transit Corp. Et Al

159412/22 Vazquez v. 116 West 80th St.

15538/21 Rodriguez v. L. V. Meijer

15247/21 Ramon v. 125 Fordham

15856/21 Vargas Espinoza v. A S K Standard Transit Corp. Et Al

159412/22 Vazquez v. 116 West 80th St.

15538/21 Rodriguez v. L. V. Meijer

15247/21 Ramon v. 125 Fordham

15856/21 Vargas Espinoza v. A S K Standard Transit Corp. Et Al

159412/22 Vazquez v. 116 West 80th St.

15538/21 Rodriguez v. L. V. Meijer

15247/21 Ramon v. 125 Fordham

15856/21 Vargas Espinoza v. A S K Standard Transit Corp. Et Al

159412/22 Vazquez v. 116 West 80th St.

15538/21 Rodriguez v. L. V. Meijer

15247/21 Ramon v. 125 Fordham

15856/21 Vargas Espinoza v. A S K Standard Transit Corp. Et Al

159412/22 Vazquez v. 116 West 80th St.

15538/21 Rodriguez v. L. V. Meijer

15247/21 Ramon v. 125 Fordham

15856/21 Vargas Espinoza v. A S K Standard Transit Corp. Et Al

159412/22 Vazquez v. 116 West 80th St.

15538/21 Rodriguez v. L. V. Meijer

15247/21 Ramon v. 125 Fordham

15856/21 Vargas Espinoza v. A S K Standard Transit Corp. Et Al

159412/22 Vazquez v. 116 West 80th St.

15538/21 Rodriguez v. L. V. Meijer

15247/21 Ramon v. 125 Fordham

15856/21 Vargas Espinoza v. A S K Standard Transit Corp. Et Al

159412/22 Vazquez v. 116 West 80th St.

15538/21 Rodriguez v. L. V. Meijer

15247/21 Ramon v. 125 Fordham

15856/21 Vargas Espinoza v. A S K Standard Transit Corp. Et Al

159412/22 Vazquez v. 116 West 80th St.

15538/21 Rodriguez v. L. V. Meijer

15247/21 Ramon v. 125 Fordham

15856/21 Vargas Espinoza v. A S K Standard Transit Corp. Et Al

1

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

TUESDAY, SEPT. 16

651770/2444-5 B'way. Leasing Co., LLC v. 1530 B'way, Chicken LLC

651475/25554 West 174 v. Pv. Parking IV Corp.

159140/25 America First Policy Institute v. Bragg

652659/23 Arliss Owner LLC Et Al v. Twain Time, Inc.

636351/25 Copenhagen v. Ddc Enterprise Ltd. Et Al

155438/24 Fora Financial Advance v. Lakay Homes Ltd. Liability Co. Et Al

652874/22 Itria Ventures LLC v. Nikoli

151251/18 Littman v. Seaver Rty. LLC

156417/22 Lloyd's v. Forty Seventh Fifth Co.

450692/22 NYC Employees' Retirement System v. Findlavor

654005/25 Siegel v. Merrill Lynch

161040/25 Solutions En Bastones S.A. De C.V. v. Studebaker Defense Group

155304/25 Timeless Funding LLC v. Lou Franchise Corp. Et Al

Motion

651770/2444-45 B'way. Leasing Co., LLC v. 1530 B'way, Chicken LLC

450692/22 NYC Employees' Retirement System v. Findlavor

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

653189/21 42651 B'way. Blh LLC v. Abrams

654203/25 Wall St. Suites LLC v. Schlesinger

654590/25 Afk Inc. v. Van Dan USA LLC Et Al

151151/24 American Express Travel Related Services Co., Inc. v. Old American Inc.

159245/25 Brusco v. NYC Et Al

160187/25 De Jesus v. Cvs Pharmacy - Store #10933

652989/25 Hpc Inc. v. Startup Health

159988/25 Kingstone Ins. Co. A/s/o v. Con Ed Co. of New York, Inc.

654512/25 Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center Et Al v. San Rocco Therapeutics

159902/25 Morales v. NYCTA Et Al

654710/22 Mountain Valley Indemnity Co. v. Cunningham

156563/25 Nitra Investors LLC v. Keller

154425/25 Persiani v. Persiani

653435/25 Schripps Baking v. Hotel 57 Services

158535/25 Sha Home Improvements Inc v. NYC Office of Administrative Trials And Hearings (oath) Et Al

653548/25 Song v. Reganato

159534/23 State Farm Fire And Casualty Co. v. McGarrell

Motion

160187/25 De Jesus v. Cvs Pharmacy - Store #10933

159988/25 Kingstone Ins. Co. A/s/o v. Con Ed Co. of New York, Inc.

654512/25 Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center Et Al v. San Rocco Therapeutics

159902/25 Morales v. NYCTA Et Al

654710/22 Mountain Valley Indemnity Co. v. Cunningham

156563/25 Nitra Investors LLC v. Keller

154425/25 Persiani v. Persiani

653435/25 Schripps Baking v. Hotel 57 Services

158535/25 Sha Home Improvements Inc v. NYC Office of Administrative Trials And Hearings (oath) Et Al

653548/25 Song v. Reganato

159534/23 State Farm Fire And Casualty Co. v. McGarrell

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18

152480/25 112 Equities LLC v. Powell

160635/21 1176-178 Lexington Ave. LLC v. Seneca Ins. Co., Inc.

651413/23 3390 Fifth LLC v. Fialkoff

650725/2263 St. Marks Pl. v. Benedek

652326/2470 Amsterdam Associates v. Chelsea House Uws

1 Inc. Et Al

100437/24 Acosta-Pelle v. Esplanade Gardens, Inc.

654888/24 Afk Inc v. Limitless Wireless Inc. Et Al

656525/23 Alified Contracting II Corp. v. Giallombardi

161686/23 Almonte v. Verizon NY Inc.

157832/23 American Transit Ins. Co. v. St. Lukes Roosevelt Hosp. Center A/o Rock Gomes

157801/23 B'way. Leasing Co. v. Harbor Chiropractic & Physical Therapy Pc

152043/25 Baxev. v. 515 West 151st St. Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al

159250/25 Baldor Specialty Foods v. NYC Et Al

151010/24 Benitez v. New Rochelle Tower Developer LLC Et Al

152581/24 Bernard v. 1286-1290 First Ave.

153076/23 Blas v. Zara

156805/24 Bleyer v. 145 West 27th St. Condominium v. 145 West 27th St. Et Al

451686/24 Blue Rock Capital Group LLC v. Rx3 Doses Restoration And Renovations LLC Et Al

154769/23 Bourdier v. 164 B'way. Associates

160647/23 Burnett v. La Casa Nuestra Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al

653369/20 Chicago Title Ins. Co. v. Citi Abstract, Inc. Et Al

154434/24 Choi v. Line LLC

652942/23 Comm's Rs. Of The State Ins. Fund v. Guytec Steel Inc.

654381/23 Crp 4 St. Marks Pl. A LLC Et Al v. Seasoned LLC A/k/a Seasoned Wwc

654125/24 Dunkey-Davis v. Hyndai Motor America

154051/23 Earl v. Honey Beauty Salon

150856/24 Fernandes v. Urban Atelier Group

161900/24 Fora Financial Advance v. Temp Precision Ltd Et Al

153582/23 Great Northern Ins. A/s/o Marianne Lake v. X-Act Contracting Corp.

150258/24 Griset v. Garden Court Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al

650509/23 Grov Equities LLC v. Hair Painters LLC Et Al

155514/22 Hines v. Hpy Savvy Housing Dev. Fund Co., Inc. Et Al

160469/23 Joyce v. Manhattan Chelsea Market LLC.

159580/23 Josefael v. The Tjx Companies, Inc. D/b/a Tj Maxx Et Al

653587/24 Krauss v. Piacentile

650319/23 Kuan Inc. v. Utica First Ins. Co.

154168/22 Lage Industries Corp. v. 17 Leonard Properties LLC Et Al

162520/23 Law Office of Jack Jaskar v. NYC Et Al

160413/23 Lopez v. Hudsonview Terrace Inc Et Al

451439/24 Metro. Transportation Auth. Et Al v. Bauerschmidt Rty. Hdq. Corp.

151946/20 Miller v. Morso Restaurant Bar Cafe

155201/23 Monaco v. Wfp Tower D Co., L.P. Et Al

160705/22 Morgan v. Memorial Hosp. For The Treatment of Cancer And Allied Diseases Et Al

150928/23 Nardello v. Lexington Gardens Owners LLC

161844/17 Nat. Alliance of New v. Lim

Part 27

157011/22 Phc William St. Condo v. 156 William St. Owner LLC Et Al

652130/21 Politi v. Siane

652840/25 Pryor Cashman Llp v. Int'l Institute For The Brain

152677/23 Ramirez De Martinez v. 120-128 Sherman LLC

161023/23 Ray Jr. v. Usta Nat.

Tennis Center Inc. Et Al

150849/24 Regna v. Con Ed of New York, Inc.

652605/24 Richichi v. Gugo LLC

162552/23 Rodriguez v. Ft. George 602

161562/23 Rodriguez v. Consigli Const. Co., Inc. Et Al

156435/22 Second And Third LLC v. Second And Second Prop. LLC

150959/23 Sotelo v. Pavarini

McGover LLC Et Al

151322/19 Starer v. Fairway Group Hdqs.

159566/24 State Farm Fire And Casualty Co. v. Sahadeo

653938/21 Team 86 LLC Et Al

Pison Stream Solutions Inc. Et Al

150476/22 Nyc v. Trinton Structural Concrete, Inc.

158982/25 The Legal Aid Society v. NYC Admin. For Children's Services Et Al

150027/22 Thomas v. AF Supply USA Inc. Et Al

150065/22 Kirby v. David Fabricators of N.Y., Inc.

150056/23 Mosia v. 3m Co. Et Al

TUESDAY, SEPT. 18

365543/22 Karnowski v. Subramanian

150003/22 V. Room 158

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

160613/23 Gorayeb & Associates v. Villalta Jr.

TUESDAY, SEPT. 18

150016/23 Acosta-Pelle v. Esplanade Gardens, Inc.

154884/24 Afk Inc. v. Limitless Wireless Inc. Et Al

150006/23 Barone v. 17 Leonard Properties LLC Et Al

150006/23 Thomas v. AF Supply USA Inc. Et Al

150006/23 Kirby v. David Fabricators of N.Y., Inc.

150056/23 Mosia v. 3m Co. Et Al

TUESDAY, SEPT. 18

150006/23 Gorayeb & Associates v. Villalta Jr.

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

160015/22 Kirby v. David Fabricators of N.Y., Inc.

150006/22 Gorayeb & Associates v. Villalta Jr.

150006/22 Kirby v. David Fabricators of N.Y., Inc.

15

Court Calendars

656332/20 New S & P Enterprises Inc. D/b/a S & P Food World Inc. v. Broad St. LLC A/k/a 100 Broad St. LLC
650217/23 Omansky v. 300-302 East 119 St. Hdcf Et Al
655255/23 Ocea Capital LLC v. Zurco Inc. Et Al
151145/24 Riggio v. Sopexa Food & Wines From France, Inc. Et Al
158129/24 Smith v. 165 Seaman LLC Et Al
651850/21 The Elsa Zegelein Revocable Living Trust v. Bodywork Station NY Inc Et Al
158558/23 Tierney v. Kian III
653402/20 Worthy Lending v. Infinity Contracting

MOTION

100114/25 Kramova v. NYC Dept. of Health and Mental Hygiene
651850/21 The Elsa Zegelein Revocable Living Trust v. Bodywork Station NY Inc Et Al

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18

153427/20 Gurwitz v. Adirondack Ins. Exch.

452906/24 Sales v. Justiniano

Part 42

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

TUESDAY, SEPT. 16

653400/25 Adler Holdings II v. Jacobs
651251/18 B&S Accounting Corp. v. Charm Tax Services LLC

656401/22 Board of Mgrs. of 165 E. 62nd St. Condominium v. Churchill E 62nd LLC Et Al

652992/25 Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. Et Al v. Fallon

156774/25 Orme v. Keller

159620/20 Traina v. MacArthur

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

154714/2422 Warren St. LLC v. 122 East 25th St. Condominium

157891/25/25 West 36th LLC v. Isaraphanich

650581/24 Abrahamson Dpm v. The Guardian Life Ins. Co. of America

65140/21 Ahmed v. Icer of 622 St. Nicholas LLC

655601/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Colimon

652166/25 Federation LLC v. Rozen

652800/24 Firstservice Residential New York, Inc. v. Kay

156516/16M, Robert Goldman & Co., Inc. v. Wilkin

152518/21 Mora v. Site 4 Dsa Owner LLC

150542/21 Red Apple Education Center v. Maxons Restorations, Inc.

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18

651008/25 Ag Light and Sound Inc. v. Ez Festivals LLC Et Al

655145/24 Atalaya Capital Mgt. Lp v. Ballard

651584/25 P. Group General Contractors/developers Inc. v. Shamas Contracting Co. Inc.

651451/24 Dalbir Singh & Associates v. Singh

153799/25 First Flight Helicopters v. NYC Et Al

651392/25 Frank Capezza v. Antika Pizzeria, Inc.

155022/22 Frizalone v. Tishman Construction Corp. of NY Et Al

650948/23 G/Media, Inc. v. Mgidi, Inc.

651664/25 Kossar v. 190 East 72nd Corp. Et Al

156466/21 Lin v. Hsbc Bank USA Et Al

654287/25 Perez v. The Board of Mgrs. of The Langston Condominium Et Al

652325/24 Qian Rhy. LLC v. Global Synergy Ventures LLC Et Al

654191/25 Sindhwani v. Nationstar Mortgage LLC

654934/25 Staffing Group Hdgs. v. Luxurban Hotels, Inc.

Motion

654191/25 Sindhwani v. Nationstar Mortgage LLC

Part 47

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

TUESDAY, SEPT. 16

151211/25 American Express Nat. Bank v. Rafferty

157354/19D Souza v. Hudson Yards Const. II

156522/24 Para Financial Asset Securitization 2021 v. Nouras Food Corp. Et Al

654735/25 Landmark Infrastructure Hdgs. Co. v. Tenth Ave. Yay

651231/25 S&S & Szechuan Inc. v. 353 West 46th Owner LLC

159758/23 Sulkja v. Midtown West B LLC Et Al

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

159032/21 1160 W 88 LLC v. Coniglio

161798/24 Cavalry Spv I v. Howard

160163/25 Gboglu v. Charles Schwab & Co., Inc.

152487/24 Storch v. Metro North Commuter RR. D/b/a Mta Metro North RR. Et Al

153918/24 Timmons v. Checkers Drive-In Restaurants, Inc. Et Al

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18

152511/22 A.F. Supply Corp. v. Fpg Maiden Lane LLC Et Al

156600/24 Acharon v. Tantawan Bloom, Inc. Et Al

161317/18 Allen v. Metro-North Commuter RR. Corp. Et Al

157523/23 Allied Ins. Co. of America As Subrogee of Astraea Mgt. Inc. v. Bleeker Plaza Rhy. Corp. Et Al

154128/24 Antoniou v. The Tix Companies, Inc. Et Al

154690/24 Arce v. Applejack Diner Et Al

15027/24 Berisha v. 150 E 42 Rhy. LLC Et Al

151719/24 Bermeow v. First F & L Rhy. LLC Et Al

157297/24 Bushweller v. Wu

153138/25 Centurion 14b LLC v. Borakov

151926/24 Cruz v. NYCHA

151177/20 D.V. v. NYCHA

654428/25 Davis v. Brandon J. Broderick

158139/25 Debnam v. Metro. Transportation Auth. Et Al

150260/23 Devito v. Boston Properties, Inc. Et Al

159488/24 Duckett-Holmes v. Planned Parenthood of Greater New York, Inc. Et Al

156622/23 Farrugia v. Pollack

162478/21 Frolova v. Miller

161282/23 Gathner v. Metro-North Commuter Railroad Co. Et Al

158573/19 Graham v. Laporte

650859/24 Grassi & Co., Cpas, P.C. v. Drucker

155004/24 Guerrero Bedon v. Sci Funeral Services of New York, Inc. Et Al

161433/23 Herrera v. 181st Washington Heights Associates LLC Et Al

162330/23 Heyward v. Park-Serv

653788/24 Huang v. Li

155014/24 Jones v. NYC Et Al

154657/24 Knight v. 900 Eighth Ave. Garage LLC Et Al

100808/25 Lezon v. NYC Dept. of Education High School For Excellence And Innovation

153337/24 Maloney v. Kel-Tech Const. Inc. Et Al

156126/25 Manca v. Liakas Law P

650480/25 McKinsey & Co., Inc. Et Al v. Nat. Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh
152699/24 Molina Sotelo v. 301 East 45th St. Condominium Et Al
159384/24 Molina v. NYCTA
162517/23 Morales Navas v. Roosevelt Island Operating Corp. Et Al
158071/24 Nascenti Silva v. Judlau Contracting, Inc. Et Al
160716/23 Palaguachi v. Miklos Real Estate LLC Et Al
154466/20 Rich v. H & M Hennes & Mauritz L.P.
150676/20 Rohlfing v. 75 St. Nicholas Pl.
156072/21 Rosenthal v. The Board of Mgrs. of The Charleston Condominium
158337/23 Salcedo v. William Fashion Inc. Et Al
152491/24 Seights v. H. Genesis Y15 Housing Dev. Fund Co., Inc. Et Al
153957/25 Soltis v. The Family Court of The State of NY
160645/24 Sosa v. Island House Tenants Corp. Et Al
154287/24 Storch v. Metro North Commuter RR. D/b/a Mta Metro North RR. Et Al
156461/24 Tyndal v. Metro. Transportation Auth. Et Al
160532/22 Wright v. NYCHA Et Al
160438/23 Young v. Sutton East Tennis Club Et Al

Motion

100114/25 Kramova v. NYC Dept. of Health and Mental Hygiene
651850/21 Elsa Zegelein Revocable Living Trust v. Bodywork Station NY Inc Et Al

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18

153427/20 Gurwitz v. Adirondack Ins. Exch.

452906/24 Sales v. Justiniano

Part 42

Justice Emily Morales-Minerva

111 Centre Street

Phone 646-386-3237

Room 574

TUESDAY, SEPT. 16

653400/25 Adler Holdings II v. Jacobs

651251/18 B&S Accounting Corp. v. Charm Tax Services LLC

656401/22 Board of Mgrs. of 165 E. 62nd St. Condominium v. Churchill E 62nd LLC Et Al

652992/25 Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. Et Al v. Fallon

156774/25 Orme v. Keller

159620/20 Traina v. MacArthur

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

154714/2422 Warren St. LLC v. 122 East 25th St. Condominium

157891/25/25 West 36th LLC v. Isaraphanich

650581/24 Abrahamson Dpm v. The Guardian Life Ins. Co. of America

65140/21 Ahmed v. Icer of 622 St. Nicholas LLC

655601/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Colimon

652166/25 Federation LLC v. Rozen

652800/24 Firstservice Residential New York, Inc. v. Kay

156516/16M, Robert Goldman & Co., Inc. v. Wilkin

152518/21 Mora v. Site 4 Dsa Owner LLC

150542/21 Red Apple Education Center v. Maxons Restorations, Inc.

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18

154714/2422 Warren St. LLC v. 122 East 25th St. Condominium

157891/25/25 West 36th LLC v. Isaraphanich

650581/24 Abrahamson Dpm v. The Guardian Life Ins. Co. of America

65140/21 Ahmed v. Icer of 622 St. Nicholas LLC

655601/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Colimon

652166/25 Federation LLC v. Rozen

652800/24 Firstservice Residential New York, Inc. v. Kay

156516/16M, Robert Goldman & Co., Inc. v. Wilkin

152518/21 Mora v. Site 4 Dsa Owner LLC

150542/21 Red Apple Education Center v. Maxons Restorations, Inc.

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING

LAWJOBS.COM

When results matter

#1 Global Legal Job Site

Ranked by Alexa

Contact: Carol Robertson

Phone: 212.457.7850

Email: crobertson@alm.com

FOUNDATIONS

THE ANNUAL RETURN OF THE MALDEB FOUNDATION INC. for the fiscal year ended April 30, 2025 is available at its principal office located at 39-49 46th Street, Sunnyside, NY 11104-1407 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal manager of the Foundation is M. Joel Mandelbaum 14322 s16

LICOR LICENSES

NOTICE IS HEREBY given a license, NYS Application ID: NA-0340-25-124313 for beer, wine, cider and liquor has been applied for by the undersigned to sell beer, wine, cider and liquor at retail in a restaurant under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Law at 39 Main Street, Tarrytown, NY 10591 for on-premises consumption. Iguanarita LLC 14296 s16 W s23

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION of KLEE CREATIVE LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 8/6/2025. Office location: NY County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to Kee E Lee, 99 John St, Apt 819, New York, NY 10038. Purpose: any lawful act. 14030 S09 T 014

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAPLE RABBIT FARMS LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 8/19/2025. Office location: BX County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to Re-Registered Agent Services, Inc., 54 State St, Ste 804, Bronx, NY, 12207. P/B/A: 137, Washington St, Morristown, NJ 07960. Purpose: any lawful act. 14041 S09 T 014

NOTICE OF FORMATION of PRODUCEDBYJT LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 8/6/2025. Office location: NY County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 120 E 34th St, Apt 7G, New York, NY 10016. Purpose: any lawful act. 13898 S09 T 014

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Prospasource LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/28/2025. Office location: NY County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 300 West 145 St, New York, NY 10039. Purpose: any lawful act. 14053 S09 T 014

NOTICE OF FORMATION of ZARA OSTROFF LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 2/13/2025. Office location: NY County. Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln, Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SNNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SNNY shall mail process to 12 E 62nd St, Apt 4F, New York, NY 10065. Purpose: any lawful act. 13821 S09 T 014

NOTICE OF FORMATION of BYH REAL ESTATE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 8/24/2025. Office location: NY County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 108 W 39th Street, Ste 1006, New York, NY 10018. Purpose: any lawful act. 14173 S16 T 021

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MYLA KR LLC. Arts of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 8/25/2025. Office location: Nassau County. Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln, Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SNNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SNNY shall mail process to 12 E 62nd St, Apt 4F, New York, NY 10065. Purpose: any lawful act. 14037 Sept 9 to Oct 14

NOTICE OF FORMATION of ROSCO COLLISION AVOIDANCE, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with SSNY on 09/11/2025. Office location: Nassau SSNY desg. as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY mail process to 806 CENTRAL AVENUE, WOOD-MERE, NY, 11598. Any lawful purpose. 14307 Sept 16 Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of ROSCO, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with SSNY on 09/11/2025. Office location: Nassau SSNY desg. as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY mail process to 806 CENTRAL AVENUE, WOOD-MERE, NY, 11598. Any lawful purpose. 14308 Sept 16 Tu o21

SALES

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT - COUNTY OF BRONX SAMPURNA JAIN and SAPNA SHAH, Plaintiffs, -against- 3216 SEYMOUR AVE LLC, JR 4 HOLDINGS LLC, "JOHN DOE No. 100" inclusive, the name of the last 100 defendants being fictitious, the true names of said defendants being unknown to plaintiffs, it being intended to designate fee owners, tenants or occupants of the liened premises and/or persons or parties having or claiming an interest in or a lien upon the liened premises, if the aforesaid individual defendants are living, and if any or all of said individual defendants be dead, their heirs at law, next of kin, distributees, executors, administrators, trustees, committees, devisees, legatees, and assignees, lienors, creditors and successors in interest of them and generally all persons having or claiming under, by, through, or against the said defendants named as a class, of any right, title, or interest in or lien upon the premises described in the complaint herein, Defendants. Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale dated August 11, 2025, and entered August 13, 2025, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Bronx County Supreme Court, Courtroom 711, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, New York 10451-2937, on October 27, 2025, at 2:15pm, the premises know as 2408 Grand Avenue, Bronx, New York 10468. All that certain plot, piece of parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Bronx, County of Bronx, City and State of New York, (Block 3199, Lot 146). Approximate amount of judgment is \$573,000, plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to the provisions of the filed Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale under Index #36637/2019E. Sergio Marquez, Esq., Referee Law Offices of Jay S. Markowitz, P.C., Attorney for Plaintiff 185 Hillside Avenue, First Floor, Williston Park, New York, NY 11596. Dated: September 1, 2025 13879 s9-Tu s16

INSPIRE WORDS SPEECH THERAPY PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 07/22/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent of the PLLC upon whom process against it may be served. SNNY shall mail copy of process to: The LLC, 39 W 27th St, New York NY 10001. Purpose: for the practice of the profession of Medicine. 12876 au12-Tu s16

CASE VIEW MEDICAL SERVICES PLLC, a Prof. LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/14/2025. Office: Nassau County. SNNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against it may be served. SNNY shall mail process to: The PLLC, 1575 Hillside Avenue, Ste 100, New Hyde Park, NY 11040. Purpose: To Practice The Profession Of Medicine. 13174 au19-Tu s23

CHRISTINE ROUFAIL, PsyD PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 06/17/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent of the PLLC upon whom process against it may be served. SNNY shall mail copy of process to: The PLLC, 219 Stonehenge Ln Carle Place NY 11514. Purpose: for the practice of Psychology. 13181 au19-Tu s23

MAURI LAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent of the PLLC upon whom process against it may be served. SNNY shall mail copy of process to: The PLLC, 361 Muttontown Eastwoods Road, Syosset, NY 11791. Purpose: For the practice of the profession of Psychology. 13181 au19-Tu s23

MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent of the PLLC upon whom process against it may be served. SNNY shall mail copy of process to: The PLLC, 170 Old Country Road, Suite 502, Mineola, NY 11501. Purpose: For the practice of the profession of Law. 13184 s9-Tu s30

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Dr. Ayan Kumar MD PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 5/23/2025. Office location: NY County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13062 au19-T S 23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 590 5th Avenue, Suite 1118, New York, NY 10036. Purpose: Any lawful act. 13181 au19-Tu s23

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MAURILAW GROUP PLLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SNNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SNNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

220 OUTLOOK LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 06/27/25. Office: Bronx County, SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to: The LLC, 2069 Tremont Avenue, Bronx, NY 10461. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 12884 au12-Tu s16

AB HOLDINGS II LLC, Arts. of Org. Filed Sec. of State of NY 7/18/2025. Off. Loc.: Nassau Co. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served & shall mail proc. c/o Aris Stathis, Alma Bldg, 31-10 37th Ave., Suite 400, Long Island City, NY 11101, USA. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 12891 au12-Tu s16

BRIGHTKEN LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 07/29/25. Office: Bronx County, SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to: The LLC, 7B Edgewater Park, Bronx, NY 10463. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 12880 au12-Tu s16

CARNEGIE HILL 94 LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with NY Sec. of State (SSNY) 8/7/25. Office: NY Co. SSNY design. agent of LLC whom process may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to: Kaplan Fox & Kishner, LLP, c/o Jason P. Reska, 800 Third Ave., 38th Fl., NY, NY 10022. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 12886 au12-Tu s16

EVER BETTER TV, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 07/17/23. Office: Nassau County, SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 55 Brockmeier Drive, Massapequa, NY 11758. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 12878 au12-Tu s16

HOUSE OF JSK LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/07/2025. Office loc: Nassau County, SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 259-23 Union Turnpike, Glen Oaks, NY 11004. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 12894 au12-Tu s16

PRAYLOW HIGH RESULTS LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 07/31/25. Office: Nassau County, SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 1600 Grand Avenue, Unit 2, Baldwin, NY 11510. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 12877 au12-Tu s16

STASI PROPERTIES LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 07/18/25. Office: Nassau County, SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 435 Maple Avenue, Westbury, NY 11590. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 12882 au12-Tu s16

15 UNDERHILL LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/15/24. Office: Nassau County, SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 97 Willow Street, Garden City, NY 11530. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 13177 au19-Tu s23

MFGC LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/06/25. Office: Nassau County, SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 97 Willow Street, Garden City, NY 11530. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 13185 au19-Tu s23

PIERI AVIATION LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/14/2025. Office loc: Westchester County, SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to: Onisiforos Pieri & Michael Pieri, 417 Furnace Dock Rd, Cortland Manor, NY 10567. Purpose: Any lawful Purpose. 13208 au19-Tu s23

PUMPKIN VALLEY LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/11/25. Office: Nassau County, SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 622 Sargent Road, River Vale, NJ 07675. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 13186 au19-Tu s23

UP & DOWN ENTERTAINMENT LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/08/25. Office: Nassau County, SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to: The LLC, 37 Greene St #6, New York NY 10013. Purpose: to engage in any lawful act. 13180 au19-Tu s23

Jayanka 77 Greenwich LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with SSNY on 05/19/25. Off. Loc: New York County, SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail a copy of process to: The LLC, 1965 Broadway, Apt. 20A, New York, NY 10023. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 14066 S09 T 014

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF ZGFP, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 9/3/2025. Office location: NY County, SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to ML Management Partners, LLC, 888 7th Avenue, 4th Floor, New York, NY 10106. Purpose: any lawful act. 14319 S16 T 021

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF Harper Stanton Design LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/17/2025. Office location: Nassau County, SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to Northwest Registered Agent LLC, 418 Broadway, Ste N, Albany, NY, 12207, P/B/A: 112 Northern Blvd, Ste 404, Manhasset, NY 11030. Purpose: any lawful purpose. 14300 S09 T 014

HB ATLANTIC LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with NY Sec. of State (SSNY) 9/12/25. Office: Nassau Co. SSNY design. agent of LLC whom process may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to: The LLC, 73 The Serpentine, Roslyn, NY 11576. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 14300 S09 T 014

NOTICE OF FORMATION of 5196 Associates LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/29/2025. Office location: Nassau County, SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to: The LLC, 57 Massena Avenue, Manhasset, NY 11030. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 14325 S16-Tu o21

RK ACCOUNTING SERVICES LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 09/03/25. Office: Nassau County, SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to: The LLC, 40 California Street, Hicksville, NY 11801. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 14333 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of 82 Tides LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/22/2025. Office location: New York County, SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Kaplan Fox & Kishner, LLP, c/o Jason P. Reska, 800 Third Ave., 38th Fl., NY, NY 10022. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 14343 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of BUCKY NY CONDO, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/29/2025. Office location: New York County, SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to: THE LLC, 250 WEST 57TH ST, 23RD FL, NEW YORK, NY 10107. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14340 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of DOUGLASS JOSEPH HOLDINGS LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/28/2025. Office location: New York County, SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14338 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14352 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MYLA R LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MYLA R LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LONQUO LLC, Art. Of Org. filed with the Sec'y of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/25/25. Office location: Nassau County, Princ. office of LLC: 1 Sycamore Ln., Roslyn Heights, NY 11577. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: DOUGLAS JOSEPH, 25 ORCHARD ST, APT. 202, NEW YORK, NY 10002. Purpose: Any lawful activities. 14341 S16-Tu o21

</div