

IN BRIEF

Deal Watch: Latham, Paul Weiss Have Big Week as M&A Is Up 20% Year Over Year

Latham & Watkins and Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison both worked multiple multi-billion dollar deals last week, including the \$9 billion buy of Sketchers by 3G Capital, while Stikeman Elliott, Weil, Gotshal & Manges, Vinson & Elkins and Norton Rose Fulbright worked the largest deal of the week, a \$9.1 billion energy deal detailed below.

Last week's "SPAC rally" was short-lived, as there were none reported this past week. There were also no SPAC mergers reported.

In their stead, IPOs managed to bounce back last week, with six new listings. Debt offerings were also en vogue, with 20 being reported over \$500 million, a high for 2025.

Preliminary numbers from The London Stock Exchange Group show that global M&A, through last week, is up 20.32% compared to this time last year. The global value of these deals, at \$1.2 trillion, tops the roughly \$1 trillion in deals done through this point last year.

Much of that success came from the month of March. January saw roughly \$228 billion in deal value, while February was much the same (\$222 billion). March, it seems, was a breakthrough month, with close to \$500 billion in deals (\$497 billion) done in that month alone.

April, with \$257 billion in deal value, was a return to our regularly scheduled programming.

Interestingly, the 20.32% increase in deal value was accompanied by a 13.31% decrease in volume. The deals are fewer and larger.

Thus far this year, Sullivan & Cromwell is leading the pack with \$176 billion in deals touched, followed by Kirkland & Ellis (\$161 billion), Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz (\$135 billion), Latham (\$125 billion) and Freshfields (\$119 billion).

Deals on the Radar

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

Sunoco has agreed to acquire Parkland Co. for approximately \$9.1 billion. Dallas-based Sunoco was advised by Stikeman Elliott, Weil, Gotshal & Manges

and Vinson & Elkins. Parkland, which is based in Calgary, Canada, was represented by Norton Rose Fulbright; Torsys advised Parkland's special committee of independent directors. Goldman Sachs Canada and BofA Securities, which acted as financial advisers to Parkland, were advised by a Sullivan & Cromwell team including partners Stephen M. Kotran and Matthew B. Goodman.

Skechers USA announced that it has agreed to be acquired by 3G Capital for \$9 billion. Skechers, which is based in Manhattan Beach, California, was advised by a Latham & Watkins team led by partners Andrew Clark, Josh Dubofsky and Steven Stokdyk. 3G Capital, which is based in New York, was advised by a Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison team led by partners Scott Barshay, Dotun Obadina and Laura Turano; Kirkland & Ellis also advised 3G with a team including partners Nadia Murad, Jay Ptashek, Scott Rolnik and Andrew Wright. Sullivan & Cromwell advised Greenhill, as the exclusive financial adviser to Skechers.

Liftoff, a company focused on performance marketing and monetization solutions for the app economy, announced that private equity funds managed by Blackstone signed an agreement to sell a minority stake in Liftoff to General Atlantic for \$4.3 billion. Liftoff and Blackstone were advised by a Simpson Thacher & Bartlett team led by partners William Allen and Anthony Vernace. General Atlantic was advised by Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison.

DoorDash has agreed to acquire Deliveroo, a British food delivery company, in a \$3.9 billion deal. San Francisco-based DoorDash was advised by a Latham & Watkins team led by Ed Barnett and Doug Abernethy. Deliveroo, which is based in London, was advised by White & Case.

Coinbase, a publicly traded cryptocurrency exchange, has agreed to acquire crypto options exchange Deribit for approximately \$2.9 billion. Dubai, UAE— » Page 4

Lateral Partner Moves: Ethical Obligations »4

Legal Advocates Concerned About Fate of Indigent Legal Services Fund in New York Budget

BY BRIAN LEE

NEW YORK'S legal community remains concerned about the future of a dedicated fund to assist local governments with a constitutional obligation to provide public defense for those who can't afford private attorneys in criminal and Family Court matters.

A state office that administers the Indigent Legal Services Fund says that concern is elucidated by state fiscal leaders bracing for looming federal cuts and uncertainty under President Donald Trump's second administration.

Portions of the ILS Fund could serve as rainy day funding for the state, given those uncertainties.

The recently enacted 2025-26 state budget includes an authori-



Domenick Napoletano, president of the New York State Bar Association

zation for the Division of Budget to transfer up to \$234 million from the ILS Fund into the state general fund.

An ILS official, speaking on background, said \$114 » Page 10



Rikers Island is a 413-acre jail complex that can accommodate up to 15,000 detainees.

Federal Judge Removes NYC Jails From Full Local Control, Will Appoint Independent Manager

BY ANDREW DENNEY

A FEDERAL judge on Tuesday ruled that she will appoint an outside "remediation manager" to supervise New York City's efforts to reduce violence and civil rights violations at its troubled jail complex on Rikers Island.

In a 77-page ruling, U.S. District Judge Laura Taylor Swain of the Southern District of New York said that the remediation manager will have all the powers granted to city Department of Correction Commissioner Lynelle Maginley-Liddie did and that the two officials will work collaboratively to bring Rikers in line with the provisions of a contempt order that Swain issued

against the city in November 2024 for failure to tamp down violence.

"The Remediation Manager and the Commissioner will, together, address the ongoing violations of the constitutional rights of people in custody in the City's jails," Swain wrote. The remediation manager will not be a city employee and will report directly to the court, the judge said. The manager will be tasked with changing Department of Correction policies and taking necessary disciplinary action to bring it in line with Swain's contempt order.

Swain issued the order in *Nunez v. City of New York*, a 13-year-old class-action suit that the Legal Aid Society and the law firm Emery Celli Brinckerhoff Aba- » Page 10

Combs Trial Judge Signals Privacy Trumps Access Rights To See Intimate Videos

BY EMILY SAUL

THE FEDERAL judge overseeing the sex trafficking trial of Sean "Diddy" Combs signaled on Tuesday that he intends to deny an application from news organizations that reporters be able to view footage of sexual encounters called "Freak Offs."

Prosecutors previously said they intend to admit the sexually explicit videos as evidence of Combs' guilt and would seek to keep those videos from the public.

Robert Balin, a partner at Davis Wright Tremaine, filed a letter on behalf of various media organizations on Monday asking the judge to deny any motion to close the courtroom. The New York Law Journal is not part of the media coalition.

Assistant U.S. Attorney Maureen Comey told U.S. District Court Judge Arun Subramanian that he should deny the request, as the videos themselves are "blackmail material" and could lead to revictimization.

"I'm provisionally denying the application," Subramanian said on Tuesday, but indicated he would read any additional submissions from the parties.

Combs, 55, is charged with racketeering conspiracy, transportation to engage in prostitution, and other



Judge Arun Subramanian

crimes. Prosecutors allege he used his vast business empire to facilitate prolonged sexual encounters between his girlfriends and male escorts, called "Freak Offs," while he watched. Women were coerced into participating, prosecutors say.

The entrepreneur has pleaded not guilty and maintains his innocence.

In a letter to U.S. District Court Judge Arun Subramanian, Balin said that the news organizations were not seeking to publish the exhibits, but needed to view them to determine if the recordings showed evidence of coercion, as prosecutors have alleged. The government has also said Combs used the videos themselves to blackmail his victims into further participation. Combs says the sexual interactions were consensual. » Page 10

Three Am Law 50 Firms Add Investment Fund Partners in NYC

BY JON CAMPISI

THREE Am Law 50 firms—Morgan Lewis & Bockius, Kirkland & Ellis and Mayer Brown—all announced this week the addition of experienced investment fund lawyers in New York during a time where demand for funds expertise and related financial services work has been on the increase.

Morgan Lewis & Bockius has hired partner Tony Zacharski from Dechert. Kirkland & Ellis is bringing on partners Andrew J. Gershon and Semhar M. Woldai from Debevoise & Plimpton and Weil Gotschal & Manges, respectively. Mayer Brown, mean-

while, landed David Kreisler from DLA Piper.

Zacharski has more than two decades of experience counseling clients on everything from new product design and implementation, fund reorganizations » Page 4



David Kreisler, partner with Mayer Brown, and Anthony "Tony" Zacharski, partner with Morgan Lewis & Bockius.

DECISIONS OF INTEREST

First Department

LANDLORD-TENANT LAW: **Court orders landlord to take affirmative action to fix apartments.** *Sales v. Justiniano*, Supreme Court, New York.

REAL ESTATE LAW: **Summary judgment denied; defendant's defenses and counterclaims dismissed.** *City of New York v. Crest Housing Co. LLC*, Supreme Court, New York.

LITIGATION: **Summary judgment partially denied in discrimination action.** *Pinell v. Target Corporation*, Supreme Court, New York.

CRIMINAL LAW: **Reargument denied; evidence suggested officer had probable cause for arrest.** *People v. Ferguson*, Criminal Court, Bronx.

Second Department

LABOR LAW: **Motion to renew denied; 'punch list' offered by plaintiff unavailing.** *Tejada v. Boro Park Koshers Caterers LLC*, Supreme Court, Kings.

MEDICAL MALPRACTICE: **Court allows late notice of claim for medical malpractice action.** *Toponarova v. New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation*, Supreme Court, Kings.

U.S. Courts

INSURANCE LITIGATION: **Art. II Sec. 3 of NY Convention is 'self-executing' under Sup. Ct.'s Medellin test.** *Certain Underwriters at Lloyds, London v. 3131 Veterans Blvd. LLC*, 2d. Cir.

LABOR LAW: **Email sent to UFT members does not constitute campaign literature.** *Arundell v. United Fed'n of Teachers, SDNY*.

DISCOVERY: **Application for sanctions denied; counsel did not behave improperly at deposition.** *Leon v. Anderson's Tree Serv. Inc.*, EDNY.

CIVIL PROCEDURE: **Party that was not a named defendant has no power to remove case from show cause order.** *Morrow v. Delhaize Am. LLC Welfare Benefit Plan*, NDNY.

FEE DISPUTES: **Attorneys' fees awarded; insurer's determination of claim was not properly explained.** *Tindel v. Excellus Blue Cross Blue Shield*, NDNY.

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

The 'Legal Community Is Torn': AG James Urges Unity at Tribute Breakfast

BY EMILY SAUL

THE NATION'S legal community is fractured in deciding how to meet this crucial moment in history but must stand together. New York Attorney General Letitia James said on Tuesday.

"The American legal community is torn," James said in remarks at the annual Cyrus R. Vance tribute breakfast. "Between those who want to fight and those who want to make a deal. And maybe those who are just paralyzed by fear. Or maybe those who keep their head down and hope and pray that it will all go away."

"But lastly, maybe you're a judge," she added, to laughter.

The tribute breakfast is held in honor of the late U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus R. Vance Sr., who served during the Carter administration. Vance resigned the role in protest in 1980, over Operation Eagle Claw, a failed secret mission to rescue American hostages in Iran.

Vance was a president of the City Bar Association of New York and partner in Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett.

In his lifetime, Vance also served as Deputy Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Army, General



N.Y. Attorney General Letitia James

Counsel of the Department of Defense, in addition to other roles.

The Fund for Modern Courts hosts the tribute breakfast to honor individuals who show the integrity, dedication and public service embodied by Vance.

James called Vance's resignation as Secretary of State as an act of "moral clarity and political courage."

"History has looked favorable on Cyrus Vance Sr. for his clarity of decision," she said. "It makes us all wonder how history will record us in this moment of great challenge."

"It's a fragile democracy," James added. "It's up to each and every one of us to use the law and uphold the constitution." » Page 4

INSIDE LAW JOURNAL

Calendar of Events.....	6
Court Calendars.....	10
Court Notes.....	11
Decisions.....	17
Expert Analysis.....	3
Judicial Ethics	
Opinions.....	4, 7
Lawyer to Lawyer.....	3
Legal Notices.....	14
Outside Counsel.....	4
Perspective.....	6
Real Estate Trends.....	5

See page 2 for complete Inside lineup.

Click Listen Earn

Stay compliant from the comfort of your own home or office at CLECenter.com. With new, accredited content updated daily, seamless online tracking and 24/7 access, CLECenter.com makes compliance easy.

Visit CLECenter.com to click, listen, earn - anytime or Call A CLE Counselor Today at (800) 348-0466



Lateral Hires



Benchmark Financials



Strategic Merger Analysis



Diversity Insights



Events & Retreats Insights



Emerging Legal News



Surveys & Reports

Legal Compass: The World's Best Source of Law Firm Data.

Delve deep into legal insights on Financials, Lateral Moves, Diversity, Office Trends... With proprietary, named data on 250,000+ Firms, Lawyers and Companies!

Request your FREE DEMO today at at.alm.com/LegalCompass

ALM. Intelligence | LEGAL COMPASS

New York Law Journal Inside

Artificial Intelligence »3

Categorizing AI Tools To Calibrate Terms And Third-Party Controls

by Laura Land Himelstein

Online

Court Calendars

Civil and Supreme Court calendars for New York and surrounding counties are available at nylj.com. Search cases by county, index, judge or party name. **Only at nylj.com.**

Fraud Law »3

DOJ Enforcement Policy for Digital Assets: Why Compliance Programs Matter

by Richard Weber, Seth Farber and Samantha Osaki

Outside Counsel »4

Lateral Partner Moves: Ethical Obligations

by Barry Temkin and Kate E. DiGeronimo

Online

Today's Tip

Download today's paper at the Law Journal Download Center. **Only at nylj.com.**

REAL ESTATE TRENDS »5

Transactional Real Estate: Tenant Opportunity To Purchase Acts

by Peter E. Fisch and Salvatore Gogliormella

Realty Law Digest

by Scott E. Mollen

Online

More Real Estate Trends columns are archived at nylj.com.



New Yorkers Take Billions in Income to Florida as Migration Patterns Shift

by Kristen Smithberg

Perspective »6

Invoking 'National Security' Does Not Give Trump a Blank Check To Do Whatever He Wants

by Bennett L. Gershman

Calendar of Events »6

Online

Submit a legal notice for publication on nylj.com.

Will Trespass Charges Stick Against Mayor Ras Baraka? Lawyers Weigh In

BY CHARLES TOUTANT
NEWARK, N.J.

NEWARK Mayor Ras Baraka's charge of trespassing at a migrant detention facility could be difficult to dispense with in court, some white-collar criminal lawyers said.

The mayor was charged with Title 18, U.S. Code, Section 13 and N.J.S.A. 2C:18-3 after he accompanied three members of New Jersey's congressional delegation on Friday to visit Delaney Hall, a privately owned facility near Newark's airport.

Interest in the arrest was heightened because it touches on immigration, a divisive topic at the center of President Donald Trump's agenda, and because Baraka is running for governor.

The facility is owned by the GEO Group, which has contracted with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Baraka was arrested outside the

chain link fence that surrounds the facility, and was held for about five hours before he was released.

Baraka quickly lined up a team of lawyers to represent him—Raymond M. Brown of Pashman Stein Walder Hayden in Hackensack, Wanda M. Akin of Wanda Akin Law Office in Newark, and Rahul Agarwal of Friedman Kaplan Seiler Adelman & Robbins in New York. They obtained a preliminary appearance Friday evening before U.S. Magistrate Judge Andre M. Espinosa.

An affidavit from Ricky J. Patel, special agent in charge with United States Department of Homeland Security, said Baraka "did, knowing that he was not licensed or privileged to do so, enter and remain in a place as to which notice against trespass was given."

Videos of the arrest circulated widely, showing a chaotic scene.

Being the mayor doesn't give Baraka any inherent right to inspect the facility, merely because it lies within the city limits, said

Christopher Adams, a white collar defense lawyer at McCarter & English.

"How many countless protesters, peaceful protesters, are charged and convicted of trespass every year? You're allowed to protest, you're allowed to have your voice heard, you're allowed freedom of speech, but when you are told to leave the premises and you don't, that is defiant trespass," Adams said.

Adams said the mayor's defense counsel could take issue with the manner of Baraka's arrest, citing a report that he left the premises when he was told to do so. "I suppose you could argue the facts of that case, but legally, I don't see a legal defense for him. Trespass isn't permitted speech, no matter how much someone agrees with his sentiment. Protest has to be within the confines of the law," Adams said.

Baraka's guilt or innocence on the trespassing charges are



Newark Mayor Ras Baraka, right, speaks with ICE agents at a demonstration outside the Delaney Hall immigrant detention center in New Jersey, on May 7.

dependent on the facts and circumstances, said Robert Scivo, a former federal and state prosecutor who is now a white collar defense lawyer at Mandelbaum Barrett in Roseland.

"Just because he's the mayor doesn't mean that he can enter a federal facility without invitation or beyond the scope of his invitation. That's how I look at it," Scivo said. "If he's adequately warned that he's not welcome to be there, and he

doesn't have the right to do so, then let the facts and circumstances dictate whether the arrest was lawful or not," Scivo said.

Another white collar lawyer, Alan Zegas of Zegas Law in Millburn, thinks Baraka was entitled to see conditions at the detention center and to determine whether the people housed there are having their rights violated. "I think he had a right to show up. He's the mayor of the city," Zegas said.

White collar lawyer Marissa Koblitz Kingman, of Fox Rothschild in Morristown, suggested the evidence against Baraka was weak.

"The federal criminal complaint charges Mayor Baraka with criminal trespass, and states that he 'unlawfully entered and remained in the Delaney Hall facility.' The state's criminal trespass statute is broad, but if the government has evidence to support the charges, it doesn't appear to have been demonstrated in what has been publicly released to date," Kingman said.

U.S. Attorney Alina Habba of the District of New Jersey said after Baraka's arrest that he "committed trespass and ignored multiple warnings from Homeland Security investigations to remove himself from the ICE detention center in Newark, New Jersey this afternoon. He has willingly chosen to disregard the law. That will not stand in this state."

Baraka said in an MSNBC interview after his arrest that his arrest was "about intimidation and bullying. This is moving us slowly towards an authoritarian kind of government here, where they are telling people they can't" » Page 8

'This Is the Best Time To Be a Lawyer': How To Cope When the Rule Of Law Is Under Threat

BY LISA SHUCHMAN

LAW FIRMS have long had a problem addressing mental health issues, but this year, lawyers are feeling added stress, not just because of attacks on law firms but the broader assault on the rule of law.

The shift toward autocracy is happening in a number of places around the world, but no more so, perhaps, than in the U.S., where the Trump administration has launched attacks on immigrants, diversity, academic freedom, trans people, civil rights, the media, individual judges and the overall judiciary, and, of course, lawyers and law firms.

For lawyers, this is not a question of which end of the political spectrum you're on. Most U.S. lawyers, who have to take an oath to uphold the Constitution and are considered officers of the court—

meaning they are responsible for upholding the law and promoting justice—take that responsibility seriously. They are concerned and even anxious about what they perceive to be the weaponization of regulatory agencies and the punitive actions taken against critics of the president and his administration.

But this added anxiety is not being widely addressed by Big Law.

"I think there's a little bit of mental health awareness fatigue at law firms right now," Neel Chatterjee, a prominent litigator at Goodwin Procter, told me, explaining that firms have been dealing with an onslaught of issues affecting mental health for years—at least since the 2008 financial crisis and continuing through the election of Donald Trump in 2016, the U.S. Supreme Court's decision overturning *Roe v. Wade*, ending abortion rights, then the 2019-2022 COVID crisis, subsequent return to » Page 7

Chief Justice Roberts Talks AI, 'Dull' Argument Format, Unfair Criticism

BY JIMMY HOOVER
WASHINGTON, D.C.

CHIEF Justice John Roberts Jr. had hoped the end of the pandemic would mean a return to the normal free-for-all style of U.S. Supreme Court arguments that he made a living delivering while in private practice.

Some of his fellow justices, however, had come to appreciate the debut of "seriatim" questioning that gave each of them designated time to question the advocates without being interrupted by their colleagues. "We compromised, so we said, 'Okay, we'll do both,'" Roberts recounted Monday in a sit-down conversation with outgoing Georgetown Law Dean William Treanor during a law school graduation event.

Although they've somewhat moderated in length this past term, the combination of both open questioning and a second seriatim round has produced marathon hearings in recent years, including roughly five hours of debate in the 2022 affirmative action cases.



Chief Justice John Roberts Jr. isn't a fan of the individual questioning rounds that have come to take up a large portion of Supreme Court arguments.

The chief justice, however, isn't a fan of the individual questioning rounds that have come to take up a large portion of modern Supreme Court arguments, he confessed Monday.

"I don't like one on one, it seems very dull," Roberts said. "On the other hand some of my colleagues like it so that's what we're going to do... because I always try to

accommodate my colleagues."

Roberts and Treanor covered a variety of topics during the hour-long discussion on Georgetown Law's campus in Washington, D.C., but largely avoided any discussion of politically sensitive issues. The chief justice did reemphasize his appreciation of judicial independence, which he described as America's single contribution to

the political history of the world.

"The idea of an independent judicial entity, a coequal branch of government, was an extraordinary revolution," Roberts said, crediting Chief Justice John Marshall and his landmark *Marbury v. Madison* opinion with the innovation.

More than 200 years later, Roberts occupies Marshall's position amid a turbulent time for the judiciary. As Roberts serves his 20th year as chief justice, President Donald Trump and his allies have challenged the authority of the judicial branch, while attacking individual federal judges who have ruled against him.

Roberts has publicly rebuked Trump for his calls to impeach a D.C. federal judge because of his rulings in an immigration case.

The chief justice said criticism of the court can be a "good thing" but suggested that "ad hominem" attacks and "trashing the justices" is unfair. He did not refer to any critics by name.

Roberts most recently spoke about the importance of judicial independence last week. Other justices have raised more pointed concerns about some of the rhetoric from Trump and his allies, even if the president went unnamed.

The most trenchant criticism, however, has come from the court's newest member: Biden-appointed Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson. Speaking at a » Page 9

PEOPLE AND COMMUNITY

New York City Bar Association Unveils Portrait of Betty Weinberg Ellerin



BY ALM STAFF

A PORTRAIT of Betty Weinberg Ellerin, the first woman to be appointed as the deputy chief administrative judge for the New

York court system, was unveiled at the New York City Bar Association on May 6 and will be displayed in the City Bar's landmarked midtown building as part of its "Women on the Walls" initiative. Ellerin, now senior counsel at

Alston & Bird, began serving in the high-level court administration position in 1982. In 1985, Ellerin was the subject of another historical benchmark for New York's courts—she became the first woman appointed as a Jus-

tice of the Appellate Division, First Department. Later, she was elevated to presiding justice of that court.

Speakers at the portrait unveiling included Chief Judge Rowan D. Wilson of the New York State Court

of Appeals, who presented Justice Ellerin with a proclamation, and Appellate Division, First Department Presiding Justice Dianne T. Renwick.

Ellerin joined the City Bar in 1957 after graduating from law

school in 1953, and nearly 70 years later is still a dues-paying member and serves on a committee. Ellerin's portrait is by Patty Horning, pictured with Justice Ellerin, an artist who lives and works in New York City.

Expert Analysis

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Categorizing AI Tools To Calibrate Terms and Third-Party Controls

To effectively leverage artificial intelligence (AI), organizations must navigate a range of complex considerations, including data governance, ethical use, operational deployment, business continuity, intellectual property, privacy, cybersecurity, and more.

By
**Laura Land
Himmelstein**



data extraction from invoices to populate a database for accounts receivable reconciliation.

Processing by deterministic tools generally can be understood, tested, and monitored. Unlike GenAI systems, these deterministic tools do not hallucinate or make up entirely new content or approaches, although they still may produce errors and should be subject to review and quality control—just like all tools (and humans).

Agentic AI refers to a more autonomous form of artificial intelligence capable of making decisions, defining goals, analyzing and adapting to context, and otherwise acting without direct human intervention.

Accordingly, probabilistic tools may produce hallucinations—i.e., outputs that appear plausible but are factually incorrect or fabricated. For example, AI-generated images may depict people with extra fingers or missing limbs.

When used to deliver services or process data for real world purposes, GenAI can pose challenges related to accuracy, bias, and accountability. Organizations that do not utilize sufficient quality control and human oversight over these probabilistic tools risk relying on or disseminating hallucinated and misleading outputs.

This can lead to reputational harm and legal liability, as illustrated by cases in which lawyers submitted court briefs citing fabricated case law—errors that could have been avoided through better human oversight.

Probabilistic reasoning, by definition, makes it challenging to pinpoint causation or intentionally produce specific outcomes.

This is particularly concerning in high-stakes applications, such as healthcare diagnostics or employment decisions, where errors can have serious consequences. Accordingly, regulators and state legislators understandably are considering or already promulgating regulations with guardrails for GenAI use for such purposes.

Agentic AI

Agentic AI refers to a more autonomous form of artificial intelligence capable of making decisions, defining goals, analyzing and adapting to context, and otherwise acting without direct human intervention.

Agentic AI systems may incorporate elements of both deterministic and probabilistic reasoning. Examples include autonomous vehicles, AI-driven financial trading, automated healthcare decision making, and, at the more extreme end, autonomous drones for warfare.

Legal risks associated with agentic AI include the challenge of assigning responsibility and liability for unintended harm, » Page 8

Proper categorization facilitates selection of relevant contract terms and risk management controls, which may become increasingly stringent as AI tools move from deterministic to probabilistic to agentic.

**Deterministic:
Machine Learning and
Robotic Process Automation**

Some tools now referred to as “AI” previously were known by other names, such as RPA or bots. Notwithstanding their AI names, these tools may operate deterministically, meaning their outputs are predictable and based on pre-defined logic and rules.

This category of deterministic tools also includes rules-based machine learning systems and certain trained neural networks with fixed weights. An example of a tool in this category is automated

Probabilistic: Generative AI

GenAI tools—such as those underpinning large language models, probabilistic machine learning, or image-generation systems—leverage advanced probabilistic reasoning. These systems are designed to generate new textual, visual, or auditory content based on patterns identified in large data sets.

Probabilistic systems rely on statistical models to make predictions or generate outputs and select the most likely next element (such as a word, pixel, or sound) based on prior context. Given that decisions are based on probabilities rather than fixed rules, GenAI tools introduce an inherent level of uncertainty in their output.

Laura Land Himmelstein is counsel in Day Pitney LLP’s New York and Stamford offices, where her practice focuses on technology transactions, privacy (CIPP-US), IP licensing, and now AI.

FRAUD LAW

DOJ Enforcement Policy for Digital Assets: Why Compliance Programs Matter

By **RICHARD WEBER,
SETH FARBER
AND SAMANTHA OSAKI**

The Trump administration has continued to implement deep and widespread changes to the Department of Justice (DOJ), including by recently “narrowing [its] enforcement policy relating to digital assets.” Dep’t of Justice, *Ending Regulation By Prosecution Memorandum 1* (Apr. 7, 2025).

Among other developments, in furtherance of Executive Orders 14178 and 14157, Deputy Attorney General Todd Blanche issued a memorandum on April 7, 2025 (the April 7 Memo) that instructs federal prosecutors to (1) “no longer pursue litigation or enforcement actions that have the effect of superimposing regulatory frameworks on digital assets,” and to instead (2) prosecute individuals who “cause financial harm to digital asset investors and consumers” and “use digital assets in furtherance of other criminal conduct, such as fentanyl trafficking, terrorism, cartels, organized crime, and human trafficking and smuggling.” Pursuant to this shift, prosecutors will “as a matter of discretion” refrain from charging “regulatory violations in cases involving digital assets,” including, but not limited to, the following:

- Unlicensed money transmissions under 18 U.S.C. §1960(b)(1)(A) and (B);
- Violations of the Bank Secrecy Act (“BSA”);
- Violations relating to unregistered securities;
- Violations relating to unregistered broker-dealers; and
- Other violations of registration requirements under the Commodity Exchange Act.

Notably, the April 7 Memo contemplates a carve-out whereby the

foregoing may be prosecuted where “there is evidence that the defendant knew of the licensing or registration requirement at issue and violated such a requirement willfully.”

The April 7 Memo further directs prosecutors to refrain from charging violations of the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the Commodity Exchange Act—or the regulations promulgated pursuant to these Acts—where:

- The charge would require the DOJ to litigate whether a digital asset is a “security” or a “commodity,” and
- There is an adequate alternative criminal charge available, such as mail or wire fraud.

Further, turning a blind eye to these obligations today could also lead to more aggressive DOJ scrutiny in the future should enforcement priorities shift.

Exceptions to this policy are required to be approved by the Deputy Attorney General or his designee(s).

Finally, the April 7 Memo instructs prosecutors to close ongoing investigations “that are inconsistent with the foregoing,” disbands the National Cryptocurrency Enforcement Team, a branch of the DOJ’s Criminal Division that had been established to identify, investigate, support, and pursue cases involving the criminal use of digital assets, and it directs the Criminal Division’s Market Integrity and Major Frauds Unit to “cease cryptocurrency enforcement in order to focus on other priorities, such as immigration and procurement frauds.”

While these changes signal a more lenient digital asset enforcement environment, companies must maintain robust cryptocurrency compliance programs for at least the three reasons discussed below. » Page 8

RICHARD WEBER and SETH FARBER are partners at Winston & Strawn. SAMANTHA OSAKI is an associate at the firm. ANNETTE FAVETTA, an associate at the firm, assisted in the preparation of this article.

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





JAY HALPERN
39 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

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

Reach your peers to generate referral business

LAWYER TO LAWYER

For information, contact
Carol Robertson
at 212-457-7850
or email
crobertson@alm.com

Busy preparing for trial? Need an expert witness?

ALMExperts is FREE to help.


- FREE access to thousands of listings of legal experts nationwide in thousands of specialties
- FREE searches by name, region and area of expertise
- FREE access to experts' resumes
- FREE contact information -- get in touch with experts quickly and directly

ALM.EXPERTS

almexperts.com

NEED SOMEONE LOCATED?

CHARLES ERIC GORDON, ESQ.
INVESTIGATIVE COUNSEL
MISSING PEOPLE TRACED RESOURCEFULLY
Emphasis on Difficult and Unusual Cases



185 Froehlich Farm Blvd.
Woodbury, NY 11797
516.433.5065

sleuth32@aol.com

Services to Attorneys Only
Member:
Society of Professional Investigators
World Association of Detectives
NYS Academy of Trial Lawyers
REASONABLE FEES

LAW.COM **EXPERIENCE THE NEW LAW.COM**



PERFECT YOUR PRACTICE

Law.com introduces national and regional news by practice area, from the ALM sources you trust. With real time news, powerful insights, and expert contributors, it's the perfect way to explore the news that matters to you.

ALM.


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



IN BRIEF

« Continued from page 1

based Deribit was advised by a Willkie Farr & Gallagher team led by partners Jared Fertman and Thomas Sharkey. Counsel information for Coinbase was not immediately available.

AvidXchange Holdings, a provider of accounts payable (AP) automation software and payment solutions, has agreed to be acquired by TPG Capital in partnership with Corpay Inc. TPG and Corpay will acquire AvidXchange for \$10 per share in a cash transaction that values AvidXchange at \$2.2 billion. AvidXchange, based in Charlotte, North Carolina, was counseled by a Latham & Watkins team led by New York partners David Beller and Ian Nussbaum and Chicago partner Cathy Birke-land. TPG Capital was advised by Davis Polk & Wardwell and Schulte Roth & Zabel. Corpay was represented by Eversheds Sutherland

IPOs

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

StoneBridge Acquisition II Corporation, a blank check company, registered with the SEC on May 5 for a \$50 million IPO. The SPAC, which has applied to list its shares on the Nasdaq, was advised by Kesse PLLC and Appleby. The underwriters, led by Maxim Group, were represented by a Loeb & Loeb team led by partners David Levine and Mitchell Nussbaum.

Elite Express Holding Inc., a provider of last-mile delivery services in California, registered with the SEC on May 5 to raise up to \$16 million in an initial public offering. The Laguna Hills, California-based company, which has applied to list its shares on the Nasdaq, was advised by a Hunter Taubman Fischer & Li team that included partner Ying Li. The underwriters, led by Dominari Securities, were represented by a Sullivan & Worcester team that included partners David Danovitch and Aaron Schleicher.

CapsoVision Inc., which makes a capsule endoscope system for diagnostic and screening applications, registered with the SEC on May 9 to raise up to \$9 million to list its shares on the Nasdaq. The size of the IPO has not been announced. The Saratoga, California-based company was advised by an O'Melveny & Myers team that included partners Kurt Berney and Portia Ku. The underwriters were represented by an Ellenoff Grossman & Schole team that included partners Richard Anslow, Jonathan Deblinger and Joseph Smith.

Platinum Analytics Cayman Limited, a Singapore-based provider of FX trading software solutions, registered with the SEC on May 9 to raise up to \$9 million in an initial public offering. Platinum Analytics, which has applied to list its shares on the Nasdaq, was advised by Loeb & Loeb; Ogier; Drew & Napier; and Allbright. The underwriters,

led by Kingswood Capital Partners, was represented by Ellenoff Grossman & Schole.

Omada Health Inc., a virtual chronic care provider, registered with the SEC on May 9 to raise up to \$9 million to list its shares on the Nasdaq. The size of the IPO has not been announced. The San Francisco-based company was advised by Latham & Watkins. The underwriters were represented by Davis Polk & Wardwell.

Debt Offerings

Davis Polk & Wardwell advised the joint global coordinators and joint book-running managers in a debt offering valued at 6.8 billion euros (\$7.6 billion). The deal was announced on May 6 by Alphabet. The Davis Polk team included partners Frank Azzopardi and Alan Denenberg.

Jones Day has guided Wells Fargo, as administrative agent, in a debt offering valued at \$5.4 billion. The issuance was announced by San Diego-based Realty Income. The Jones Day team was led by partners David I. Paulson and Michael W. Kobb.

Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton has guided the underwriters, led by Citigroup Global Markets, in a debt offering valued at \$5.35 billion. The issuance was announced May 2 by Citigroup Inc. The Cleary Gottlieb team included partners Jeff Karpf and Jason Factor.

Jones Day advised Wabtec Corporation in a debt offering worth \$2.7 billion. The Jones Day team included partners Brett Barragante, Michael Kobb, Lindsey Nelson and Matthew Waterhouse.

DLA Piper advised Fiserv in a debt offering worth 2.2 billion euros (\$2.4 billion). The underwriters were advised by a Davis Polk & Wardwell team that included partners Matthew Bacal and Daniel Gibbons.

Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton advised Starbucks in a debt offering worth \$1.8 billion. The Cleary Gottlieb team included partners Jeffrey Karpf and Duane McLaughlin. The underwriters, led by BofA Securities, Citigroup and Morgan Stanley, were advised by Willkie Farr & Gallagher.

Cravath, Swaine & Moore advised Booking Holdings, a provider of online travel and related services, in a 1.8 billion euro (\$2 billion) debt offering. The underwriters, led by BNP Paribas and BofA Securities, were advised by a Latham & Watkins team that included partners Benjamin Cohen and Greg Rodgers.

Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom advised J.P. Morgan Securities, Citigroup Global Markets, Morgan Stanley, BofA Securities and HSBC Securities, as the joint lead managers and joint bookrunners, in a \$1.5 billion debt offering. The issuance was announced by Nippon Life Insurance. The Skadden Arps team was led by partner Kenji Taneda.

Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton represented the underwriters in a \$1.2 billion notes offering by AIG. The Cleary Gottlieb team included partners Craig Brod, Synne Chapman, Jason Factor and Jeffrey Karpf. New York-based AIG was advised by Sullivan & Cromwell.

Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton has guided the initial purchasers, including Barclays

Capital, J.P. Morgan Securities and Morgan Stanley, in a debt offering valued at \$1.1 billion. The issuance was announced on April 30 by Orbia Advance Corp., a provider of specialty products in the agriculture, infrastructure, polymer solutions and data communications sectors. The Cleary Gottlieb team included partners Manuel Silva, Jorge Juantorena and Jason Factor. Counsel information for Mexico City-based Orbia was not immediately available.

Davis Polk & Wardwell advised ADP in a debt offering worth \$1 billion. The Davis Polk team included partners Kara Mungovan, Pritesh Shah and Richard Truesdell. The underwriters were represented by Simpson Thacher & Bartlett.

Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom advised Las Vegas Sands in a debt offering worth \$1 billion. The underwriters were advised by a Davis Polk & Wardwell team that included partner Derek Dostal.

Latham & Watkins advised Shift4 Payments Inc. in a debt offering worth \$1 billion. The Latham team was led by partners Marc Jaffe, Ian Schuman, and Adam Gelardi. The underwriters were advised by a Davis Polk & Wardwell team that included partners Hillary A. Coleman, Scott M. Herrig, Aliza Slansky and Caitlin L. Wood.

King & Spalding advised General Motors in a debt offering worth \$750 million. The representatives of the underwriters were advised by a Davis Polk & Wardwell team that included partners Frank Azzopardi, Daniel Gibbons and Mario Verdolini.

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher and De Brauw Blackstone Westbroek N.V. advised LyonellBasell in a \$500 million debt offering. The Gibson Dunn team included partners Hillary Holmes, Cynthia Mabry and Jennifer Sabin. The underwriters, led by BofA Securities, were represented by Davis Polk & Wardwell.

Latham & Watkins advised Host Hotels & Resorts, the nation's largest lodging real estate investment trust, in a \$500 million debt offering. The Latham team included partners Jason Licht, Jocelyn Noll and Ana O'Brien.

FiberLight, a fiber network company based in Alpharetta, Georgia, was counseled by Simpson Thacher & Bartlett in a debt offering valued at \$500 million. The Simpson Thacher team included partners Eli Isak and Toby Chun.

Coca-Cola FEMSA S.A.B. de C.V. was counseled by Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton in a debt offering valued at \$500 million. The Cleary Gottlieb team included partners Manuel Silva and Duane McLaughlin.

Davis Polk & Wardwell has guided the underwriters in a debt offering valued at \$500 million. The issuance was announced by Victor, New York-based Constellation Brands. The Davis Polk team included partners Derek Dostal and Patrick E. Sigmon.

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

—Patrick Smith

Outside Counsel

Lateral Partner Moves: Ethical Obligations

Lateral partner moves are commonplace in the legal profession. Navigating such moves raises tricky and complex issues under the Rules of Professional Conduct (RPC). In addition, partners contemplating lateral moves should be mindful of their fiduciary duties to their current firm. Conversely, law firms should be mindful of their ethical obligations.

This article explains the ethical issues faced by laterally moving partners and their firms in light of recent guidance by the New York State Bar Association and the New York City Bar Association. See New York RPC 1.4 comments 7b-7g; New York City Bar Association Eth. Op. 2023-1, "Ethical Obligations of Lawyers and Law Firms Relating to Attorney Departures" (June 20, 2022).

Ethical Restrictions on Partnerships Agreements

Partners contemplating laterals move should carefully review their partnership agreements. The Rules of Professional Conduct envision lawyer freedom of movement and client choice of counsel. RPC 5.6 prohibits partnership agreements which restrict the right of lawyers to practice. According to RPC 5.6:

A lawyer shall not participate in offering or making: (1) a partnership, shareholder, operating, employment, or other similar type of agreement that restricts the right of a lawyer to practice after termination of the relationship, except an agreement concerning benefits upon retirement...

The New York Court of Appeals has ruled that partnership agreements which unduly restrict lawyer mobility or client choice of counsel are unenforceable.

BARRY TEMKIN and KATE DIGERONIMO are partners at Mound Cotton Wollan & Greengrass. Mr. Temkin is a past chair of the New York County Lawyers Association Professional Ethics Committee and an adjunct professor at Fordham University School of Law. The views expressed in this article are the authors' alone.



By
Barry
Temkin



And
Kate E.
DiGeronimo

In *Cohen v. Lord, Day & Lord*, the plaintiff was a withdrawing law firm partner whose partnership agreement penalized a withdrawing partner's practice with a competing firm. *Cohen v. Lord, Day & Lord*, 75 N.Y.2d 95 (1989). The court ruled that the partnership agreement was void because it unduly restricted the lawyer's freedom of movement, as well as the client's choice of counsel.

Lawyers contemplating a departure should not—prior to giving notice to their firms—inform clients of their intention to change firms.

Pre-Resignation Solicitation of Clients

Of course, partners owe fiduciary responsibilities to their law firms. This fiduciary duty prevents partners from soliciting firm clients prior to formal resignation from the firm.

The seminal case on a departing partner's common-law fiduciary duty to his former firm is *Graubard Mollen Dannett & Horowitz v. Moskowitz*, 86 N.Y.2d 112 (1995). In that case, the founding partner of a small firm left to join a competing practice. The departing partner surreptitiously solicited the business of the firm's largest client prior to giving notice to his partner. This was held to be a breach of the partner's fiduciary duty.

The New York City Bar Association Professional Ethics Committee issued a 2023 opinion reminding New York lawyers not to notify cli-

ents, prior to resignation, of their intention to change firms. According to the City Bar:

we believe that it is settled New York law that, absent unique circumstances, lawyers contemplating a departure should not—prior to giving notice to their firms—inform clients of their intention to change firms. Nor may departing lawyers ask whether clients of the current firm will follow them to the new firm or waive conflicts of interest that might arise upon joining the new firm.

NYC Bar Eth. Op. 2023-1. Thus, departing partners may not solicit clients prior to resignation.

Pre-Resignation Solicitation of Staff

The ban on pre-resignation solicitation also applies to associates and staff. The Appellate Division has ruled that laterally moving partners breached their fiduciary duty to their law firm by soliciting associates. *Gibbs v. Breed, Abbot & Morgan*, 271 A.D.2d 180 (1st Dept. 2000). The departing partners also improperly disclosed to their new firm confidential information about associates' compensation, billing rates, bonuses and billable hours. The court held that it was a breach of fiduciary duty to recruit staff and associates and provide their confidential information to a new firm prior to resignation from their current firm.

The Gibbs court held that laterally moving lawyers may lawfully solicit their *partners* to move with them to the new firm, but they may not solicit associates or staff to move with them.

What Confidential Material Can Be Shared With the New Firm Prior to Resignation?

As noted above, unauthorized pre-resignation disclosure of confidential information to a suitor firm can be a breach of fiduciary duty. But a recruiting firm requires disclosure of certain information prior to making an offer. Recruiting firms have an obligation > Page 7

Judicial Ethics

Opinions From the Advisory Committee on Judicial Ethics

The Advisory Committee on Judicial Ethics responds to written inquiries from New York state's approximately 3,600 judges and justices, as well as hundreds of judicial hearing officers, support magistrates, court attorney-referees, and judicial candidates (both judges and non-judges seeking election to judicial office). The committee interprets the Rules Governing Judicial Conduct (22 NYCRR Part 100) and, to the extent applicable, the Code of Judicial Conduct. The committee consists of 28 current and retired judges, and is co-chaired by the Honorable Debra L. Givens, an acting justice of the supreme court in Erie County, and the Honorable Lillian Wan, an associate justice of the appellate division, second department.

Opinion: 24-201

Facts/Issue: A not-for-profit charitable foundation devoted to medical research would like to honor a judge at its upcoming

fund-raising gala and to establish a research grant in the judge's name. The judge asks if this is permissible.

Discussion: A judge may attend a not-for-profit charitable organization's fund-raising events, but may not be a speaker or the guest of honor. A judge may nonetheless accept an unadvertised award that is ancillary to the event.

In determining whether a judge's name may be used for a grant or scholarship, the crucial factor is whether funds will be directly or indirectly raised in the judge's name. For example, if the organization will raise funds specifically for the grant that will bear the judge's name, or otherwise uses the judge's name in connection with the solicitation of funds, it is impermissible. Conversely, if the organization will solicit contributions only for a general fund without reference to or designation for any particular grant, and later allocates the monies as it sees fit, then

the judge may acquiesce in the naming.

Conclusion: (1) A judge may not be the guest of honor at a not-for-profit charitable organization's fund-raising gala. (2) A judge may allow a not-for-profit charitable organization to establish a grant in the judge's name only if the judge's name will not be used to raise funds for the grant or the organization.

Authorities: Opinions 12-153; 11-63; 11-39; 05-79; 04-86; 99-99; 95-54; 90-159.

Letters Welcome

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

@ adenney@alm.com

Partners

« Continued from page 1

and financial operating company transactions to regulatory filings and disclosures and Securities and Exchange Commission inquiries and investigations. He also specializes in fund governance and often counsels independent trustees.

"I spent my entire legal career at Dechert," Zacharski said in an interview. "I just thought, 'Why don't I see what else is out there?' And I started exploring opportunities. I thought maybe it would be nice to have a change."

Zacharski settled on Morgan Lewis after learning of the firm's culture and realizing that his skills would be a nice compliment to the firm's investment funds group.

"Morgan Lewis just has a great culture of putting clients first, but working very collaboratively with each other and it just seemed like a great fit," he said.

Reached for comment, a Dechert spokesperson said: "We thank Tony for his contributions to the firm and we wish him well."

In a statement announcing the new arrival, Morgan Lewis Chair Jami McKeon said Zacharski's experience, expertise and strategic insight advising a wide array of fund products will help strengthen the firm's ability to guide clients through innovative product development initiatives.

"Tony's strong market reputation, legal and business acumen, and deep industry experience complement our financial services and investment management practices," McKeon said in her statement.

Timothy Levin, leader of the investment management practice at Morgan Lewis, said in his own statement that Zacharski's joining the firm "could not come at a more exciting time, as our clients are busy constructing innovative products to meet clients demands in an environment where the SEC

has expressed that it is open to new ideas."

Zacharski said he started out as a tax lawyer back in 1997 and a couple of years later decided to pivot his expertise over to investment management. He has worked in that space since 1999.

Meanwhile, Kirkland & Ellis announced the hiring of Gershon and Woldai in the firm's liquidity solutions practice within the investment funds group.

Gershon represents investors and sponsor-side clients in secondary transactions, including fund recapitalizations and restructurings, traditional acquisitions, secondary direct and managed fund transactions and tender offers. Gershon was previously a partner at Debevoise & Plimpton.

"Of course, we wish him well at his new firm," a Debevoise & Plimpton spokesperson said when reached for comment about Gershon's departure.

Woldai, who joins the firm from Weil Gotshal & Manges, where she was counsel, advises private investment fund sponsors on fund formation and structuring matters, with a strong focus on secondary transactions. She also represents institutional investors in private fund investments.

Weil Gotshal could not immediately be reached for comment about Woldai.

"Andrew and Semhar are top performers in the secondaries world, and we're delighted to bring them on board as demand for this work only continues to accelerate," Sean Hill, a senior investment funds partner, said in a statement. "They will be a seamless addition to our leading team in the secondaries space."

Jon A. Ballis, chair of Kirkland's executive committee, called Gershon a "leader in the secondaries space," and Semhar a "talented rising star."

"We're excited to have them on our leading secondaries team," he said in a statement.

Tribute

« Continued from page 1

Vance's son, former Manhattan District Attorney Cyrus Vance Jr., now a Baker McKenzie partner, also spoke.

"Thank you for your extraordinary leadership, your friendship, your unwavering integrity and your tireless devotee to the cross of justice..." he said to James. "Everyone

here believes that New York is a far better place for all your work."

Vance was introduced by William Silverman, Chair of the Fund for Modern Courts.

James has served as New York Attorney General since her election in 2018.

Her office successfully secured a finding of fraud against President Donald Trump, his children and companies for under and over valuing his businesses in

order to secure more favorable loan terms.

Since he returned to office, the Federal Bureau of Investigations has opened a formal investigation into James' property records.

Her lawyer, Abbe Lowell, has called the probe the Trump administration's "latest act of improper political retribution."

@ Emily Saul can be reached at esaul@alm.com. X: @emily_saul_

Real Estate Trends

REALTY LAW DIGEST

By
Scott E.
Mollen



Foreclosures—Receiver’s Commissions—“Special Circumstances” May Warrant That Commissions Be Calculated on a Quantum Meruit Basis Pursuant to CPLR 8004(b)—Based On the Record and “The Services Performed By the Receiver, It Would Have Been Manifestly Unfair To Calculate the Receiver’s Commissions Pursuant to CPLR 8004(a)—Old Building in Poor Condition—Inadequate Cash Flow—Receiver Compelled To Act as Property Manager

A plaintiff moved for an order, *inter alia*, discharging a receiver on the grounds that the mortgaged property had been sold at foreclosure and the services of the receiver are no longer necessary. The motion was granted. Based upon “special circumstances,” the court determined that the receiver was entitled to “quantum meruit commissions calculated pursuant to CPLR §8004(b).”

The court noted that pursuant to CPLR §8004(a), “a receiver, except where otherwise prescribed by statute, is entitled to such commissions, not exceeding five percent upon the sums received and dispersed by him, as the court by which he is appointed allows.” It stated that “generally, the foregoing is the maximum amount payable to a receiver....” The statute “has been interpreted to mean that a receiver is not entitled to five percent of all funds received plus five percent of all funds dispersed, rather, the commissions are calculated on the total sums received by him/her....” A receiver is also “entitled to reimbursement of necessary expenses....”

Although “the commissions are to be paid from the sums collected by him/her from the property to which he/she has been appointed....,” CPLR §8004(b) provides that “if, at the termination of a receivership, there are no funds in the hands of the receiver, the court, upon application of the receiver, may fix the compensation of the receiver and the fees of his attorney, in accordance with the respective services rendered, and may direct the party who moved for the appointment of the receiver to pay such sums, in addition to the necessary expenditures incurred by the receiver. This subdivision shall not apply to a receiver or his attorney appointed pursuant to article twenty-three-a of the general business law.” » Page 9

SCOTT E. MOLLEN is a partner at Herrick, Feinstein.

TRANSACTIONAL REAL ESTATE

Tenant Opportunity To Purchase Acts

It is a familiar story: investors see promise for lucrative development in a neighborhood that is ripe for appreciation or already gentrifying. Landlords, often ones with older buildings that may be in need of extensive repairs, see the newfound investor interest in the area as an ideal opportunity to sell their rental stock. They sell their buildings to buyers who upgrade units and increase rents. Rising rents attract further investment in the area.

What were once affordable units become too expensive for the current tenants. New wealthier tenants move in, and the original tenants get outpriced and displaced. Some versions of this cycle have played out in areas throughout the country and across the globe.

There is a chronic need, especially in many of America’s large cities, for affordable housing. But the question of how to accommodate investment and development, on the one hand, and keep housing affordable for low and middle-income tenants, on the other hand, can pose unique challenges.

While tenants can materially benefit when increased investment and new amenities enhance the quality of their neighborhoods, increases in rents and the cost of local goods and services can outpace what tenants are able to afford, leaving tenants with few options other than relocating.

Municipalities have sought to address this phenomenon in different ways, ranging from rent regulation to zoning restrictions to tax

incentives for affordable housing. A small but growing number of cities are attempting to do so by adopting tenant opportunity to purchase acts (“TOPAs”) that afford tenants an opportunity to buy their own buildings.

Under a TOPA, tenants have the first right to purchase their building if the owner lists it for sale or receives an offer from a third-party buyer (See Wilfred Chan, *What If We Made It Easier for Renters to Buy Their Buildings?*, Curbed (March 8, 2023)).

The goal of TOPA laws is to prevent urban displacement and preserve affordability. By giving tenants leverage over the sale of their building, TOPAs aim to give tenants a potential path to homeownership, bargaining power to negotiate with prospective third-party owners about the condition of their buildings and the terms of their tenancies, and ultimately a means for them (including low-income, elderly, and other vulnerable tenants) to stay in their homes (See *What is the Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Act or TOPA?*, Mi Casa Inc., (last visited May 2, 2025)).

Chicago is the latest city to pass TOPA legislation. The Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Block (606) District Pilot Program, more popularly known as the Northwest Side Preservation Ordinance, was hotly contested but overwhelmingly approved by a majority of Chicago’s City Council in September 2024 (See Ariel Parrella-Aureli, *Law Allowing Renters To Buy Their Apartments In Gentrifying NW Side Neighborhoods Gets Update*, Block Club Chicago (Dec. 12, 2024)). The pilot program went into effect in March 2025 and builds off a prior Chicago ordinance that charges developers a demolition surcharge within specified areas (See *Northwest Side Preservation Ordinance*, Chicago.gov (last visited

May 3, 2025)). The Northwest Side Preservation Ordinance operates similarly to TOPA laws enacted or proposed in other cities, although it is currently limited to a specified district in Chicago.

Under the ordinance’s Program Rules (Chicago.gov (Feb. 2025)), the owner of a tenanted property must give the tenant association (or, if no tenant association exists, then each individual tenant) notice of the owner’s intent to sell.

The tenants must receive the notice of intent to sell at least 30 days prior to listing the property for properties with one to four units, and 60 days prior to listing for properties of five units or more.

The owner must also give the tenant association (or, if no tenant association exists, then each individual tenant) notice of any third-party offer to purchase the property (including a copy of any third-party purchase



By
Peter E.
Fisch



And
Salvatore
Gogliormella

or more units, 90 days to form and register a tenant association representing at least 75% of the tenants and to have the tenant association exercise its right of first refusal.

If the tenants exercise this right of first refusal, they have a guaranteed period to conduct due diligence and secure financing—specifically, 60 days for properties with one to four units, and 120 days for properties of five units or more.

However, the tenants must deliver financial assurances to the owner within three to five business days—a lender’s preapproval letter or financial statement evidencing ability to close in the case of properties with one to four units, and a lender’s letter of interest or intent to evidence the pursuit of financing in the case of properties with five or more units—and a deposit in the amount of up to five percent of the purchase price if required by the owner. The tenants’

Taking on the responsibility of building ownership is challenging and requires a high level of engagement and coordination on the part of the tenants.

agreement and specified information regarding the property) within five days for properties with one to four units, and within 10 business days for properties of five units or more.

Unless the property has fewer than three rental units, only a tenant association can exercise the right of refusal. After receiving notice of a third-party offer, the tenants have (i) if there are one or two units, 15 days to exercise their right of first refusal, (ii) if there are three or four units, 30 days to form and register a tenant association representing at least 50% of the tenants and to have the tenant association exercise its right of first refusal, and (iii) if there are five

deposit is forfeited if they fail to act in “good faith.”

The tenants may also elect to assign their right of first refusal or purchase agreement to a third-party representative, which may be a private or governmental entity. Failure of any party to comply with the ordinance’s rules can result in fines against the non-compliant party. Similar to other TOPA laws, the ordinance has exemptions for properties and scenarios that do not trigger TOPA, like assisted housing, public housing, and buildings on which a lender is foreclosing (Chi., Ill., Mun. Code chapter 5-11 (2025)). » Page 8

Rust Belt and Southern Tertiary Markets Lead Rent Growth

BY KRISTEN SMITHBERG

RUST BELT markets and tertiary markets in the South were among the top markets for rent growth year-over-year in the residential rental space, while previously high-flying markets have dropped on Markerr RealRent’s Q1 trends report, which evaluates multifamily and single-family rental trends.

Allentown, Pennsylvania, had the highest year-over-year rent growth at 3.8%, followed by Columbia, South Carolina, and Lexington, Kentucky, at 3.7% each and Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, at 3%. Austin was at the bottom of the list with rents in negative territory at -5.8%, followed by Pensacola, Florida, at -5.3%, Cape Coral, Florida, at -4.4%, Denver at -4.2% and nearby Colorado Springs at -4%.

Markerr projects that the top markets for multifamily rent growth over the next five years will be heavily concentrated in the Rust Belt and Northeast markets, while the same regions that have struggled over the past year with rent growth will continue on that trajectory. The study predicts » Page 6

South Carolina and Idaho Lead in Population Gains As Migration Slows

BY KRISTEN SMITHBERG

IN THE wake of the pandemic, the United States has experienced significant domestic migration shifts due to remote work, housing affordability and regional economic opportunities. In particular, Americans have flocked to warmer climates, expansive natural scenery and more affordable housing options, according to a Placer.ai study.

Mountain and Sun Belt states have seen the highest influx of new residents during this time, led by South Carolina, which drew newcomers equaling 3.6% of its January 2025 population. Idaho was next with a 3.4% net migration percentage of population, followed by Nevada, Montana, Florida, South Dakota, Wyoming, North Carolina and Tennessee. Texas also had a large number of newcomers, although its net migration was just 0.9% because of its large overall population.

Meanwhile, California, New York and Illinois experienced the greatest outflow of people relative to their populations, driven largely by soaring housing costs and the rise of remote work, according to the report.

Since the beginning of 2024, these broad patterns have persisted but at a slower » Page 9

Too many questions, not enough time.

Not enough hours in the day? Let us help.

Research On Call has a team of research professionals on call, ready to help you get the precise information you need to get an edge over the competition.

Same day rush service is available.

To get started, visit VerdictSearch.com or contact the VerdictSearch Research Team at 1-800-445-6823

Global Confidence in US CRE Drops Sharply Amid Policy Turbulence

BY ERIK SHERMAN

AFIRE’S quarterly survey of its members collects their attitudes toward cross-border investment in commercial real estate. The most recent one, from Q1 of 2025, showed significant changes from the end of 2024 — and isn’t the most welcoming news for U.S. CRE markets.

The roughly 180 institutional investors, pension funds, asset managers, and other organizations across 25 countries, which together oversee \$3 trillion in AUM, had been “cautiously optimistic” at the end of last year. However, amid the » Page 7



Grand Central Station in Manhattan. While New York City’s population is rebounding, losses raise questions about growth.

New Yorkers Take Billions in Income to Florida as Migration Patterns Shift

BY KRISTEN SMITHBERG

BETWEEN 2017 and 2022, approximately 30,000 New Yorkers relocated to Florida’s Palm Beach and Miami-Dade counties, bringing with them a total income estimated at \$9.2 billion. Historically, New York City has been a magnet for talent and opportunity, but recent shifts in migration patterns are showing that the future may not replicate past growth trends, according to a report from the non-profit Citizen Budget Commission (CBC).

Both in and out-migration have been significantly impacted by the pandemic, immigration, affordability concerns, quality of life issues and work opportunities, according to the report. The city was already experiencing a population decline that » Page 9

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 Chalphin,
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, Brian Lee, Emily Saul

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

Decisions:
Jason Ducena, William Thiess

Calendars:
Patricia Kane, editor

Production:
Agnieszka Czuj, Susan Ferguson,
Steve 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

Advertising: 212-457-9465

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.

Calendar of Events

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14

NYC Bar (CLE)

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

Federal Bar Council (CLE)

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

NYC Bar (Non CLE)

Owning Your Development & Maximizing the Junior Attorney Experience
12:30 pm - 1:45 pm
Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=CAM051425&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

The 2025 Milton Handler Lecture on Antitrust
6:30 pm - 7:45 pm
In-Person Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=CMTE051425&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: 42 West 44th Street,
New York
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

The 2025 Milton Handler Lecture on Antitrust
6:30 pm - 7:45 pm
In-Person Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=CMTE051425&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: 42 West 44th Street,
New York
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

The 2025 Milton Handler Lecture on Antitrust
6:30 pm - 7:45 pm
In-Person Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=CMTE051425&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: 42 West 44th Street,
New York
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

The 2025 Milton Handler Lecture on Antitrust
6:30 pm - 7:45 pm
In-Person Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=CMTE051425&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: 42 West 44th Street,
New York
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

THURSDAY, MAY 15

NYC Bar (CLE)

Practical Strategies for Mitigating Microaggressions in Legal Practice
9 a.m. - 10:45 am
CLE credits: 2
Webinar Registration Link:
https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=_WEB051525&mcode=NYLJ
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

FRIDAY, MAY 16

NYC Bar (CLE)

Insurers' and Insureds' Perspectives on Current Issues in D&O Liability 2025
9 a.m. – 12 p.m.
CLE credits: 3
Webinar Registration Link:
https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=_WEB051625&mcode=NYLJ
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations

Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

NYC Bar (Non CLE)

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

TUESDAY, MAY 20

NYC Bar (CLE)

The Do's & Don'ts of Zoning Lot Mergers & Development Rights Transfers in New York City
9:30 am – 12:30 pm
CLE credits: 3
Webinar Registration Link:
https://services.nycbar.org/Members/Event_Display.aspx?WebsiteKey=f71e12f3-524e-4f8c-a5f7-0d16ce7b3314&EventKey=_WEB052025&mcode=NYLJ
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21

NYC Bar (CLE)

Marketing and Advertising Law 2025
9 a.m. – 1 p.m.
CLE credits: 4
Webinar Registration Link:
https://services.nycbar.org/Members/Event_Display.aspx?4&EventKey=_WEB052125&mcode=NYLJ
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

NYC Bar (Non CLE)

Small Firm Chats – Stay Connected with Your Peers and Us!
12 p.m. - 12:45 pm
Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=SLFC052125&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

THURSDAY, MAY 22

NYC Bar (CLE)

Litigating Land Use Article 78 Proceedings in NYC
12 p.m. - 2 p.m.
CLE credits: 2

Webinar Registration Link:
https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=_WEB042425&mcode=NYLJ
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=SEN051625&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=WFF052225&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Webinar Registration Link:
<https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=HIST052825&mcode=NYLJ>
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations
Department, 212-382-6663 or
customerrelations@nycbar.org

Perspective



RON ROBERTS/US: IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT VIA WIKIMEDIA COMMONS

If a president, in the name of national security, cannot emasculate due process during wartime, manifestly he cannot round up and deport immigrants during peacetime without affording them due process, an Elisabeth Haub School of Law at Pace University professor writes.

Invoking 'National Security' Does Not Give Trump a Blank Check To Do Whatever He Wants

Judicial Ethics

Opinions From the Advisory Committee on Judicial Ethics

The Advisory Committee on Judicial Ethics responds to written inquiries from New York state's approximately 3,600 judges and justices, as well as hundreds of judicial hearing officers, support magistrates, court attorney-referees, and judicial candidates (both judges and non-judges seeking election to judicial office). The committee interprets the Rules Governing Judicial Conduct (22 NYCRR Part 100) and, to the extent applicable, the Code of Judicial Conduct. The committee consists of 28 current and retired judges, and is co-chaired by the Honorable Debra L. Givens, an acting justice of the supreme court in Erie County, and the Honorable Lillian Wan, an associate justice of the appellate division, second department.

Opinion: 24-202/24-203

Digest: A judge may participate in the appointment or reappointment of the county jury commissioner, even if the commissioner's first-degree relative was the judge's election opponent.

Rules: Judiciary Law § 503; 22 NYCRR 100.2; 100.2(A); 100.3(E)(1); Opinions 23-16; 21-54; 19-128; 19-78; 16-84; 90-136.

Opinion: The inquiring judge serves on a county jury board pursuant to Judiciary Law § 503. The judge asks if it is ethically permissible to participate in the appointment or reappointment process for a prospective or incumbent jury commissioner whose first-degree relative by blood or marriage (i.e. a spouse, parent, or child) was previously an election opponent of the judge. Nothing in the inquiry suggests any particular acrimony during the campaign, and the judge is confident in their ability to be fair and impartial in discharging their judicial duties.

A judge must always avoid even the appearance of impropriety (see

22 NYCRR 100.2) and promote public confidence in the judiciary's integrity and impartiality (see 22 NYCRR 100.2[A]). A judge must disqualify him/herself in a proceeding in which the judge's impartiality "might reasonably be questioned" (22 NYCRR 100.3[E][1]).

We have seldom had the opportunity to address judicial ethics questions concerning a judge's service on a county jury board. Indeed, in Opinion 21-54, we concluded that we cannot advise on whether Part 8 of the Rules of the Chief Judge precludes a county jury board from appointing or reappointing a jury commissioner whose spouse has assumed full-time judicial office within the same county.

Since the present inquiry appears to be a matter of first impression, we turn to our precedent concerning direct political opponents for guidance. We have advised that a judge need not recuse when an attorney appearing before the judge was the judge's unsuccessful opponent in a political campaign a year and a half earlier (see Opinion 90-136). As we explained (id.):

Whether the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned in this case depends on the facts and circumstances, including the time elapsed, the bitterness of the campaign, and the personal quality of the campaign. This Committee is not in a position to pass on such factual issues and the judge must decide for himself or herself whether his or her impartiality might reasonably be questioned. Of course, if the judge doubts his or her ability to be impartial, the judge must disqualify himself or herself.

Likewise, we advised that a judge need not disqualify when an attorney appearing before the judge was the judge's recent election opponent in a now concluded political campaign during which the candidates challenged the sufficiency of each other's nominating

petitions (see Opinion 19-78). We reasoned that the filing of litigation challenging nominating petitions is a "common circumstance in contested election campaigns" that does not by itself establish a level of "bitterness" mandating disqualification (id.). Again, we reiterated that the judge must "decide for himself or herself" whether, in light of the litigation or other circumstances touching upon the bitterness or personal quality of the campaign, his/her impartiality might reasonably be questioned (see id., citing Opinion 90-136; see also Opinion 16-84 [reaching the same conclusion where the attorney who previously represented the judge's election opponent appeared before the judge]).

Here, the potential conflict is far less direct, as the prospective or incumbent jury commissioner was never the judge's election opponent, but is only a first-degree relative of that former election opponent. Moreover, the factual circumstances as described do not evince bitterness or acrimony during the judge's campaign. Accordingly, we conclude there is no reasonable basis to question the judge's impartiality with respect to participating in the appointment or reappointment process for the prospective or incumbent jury commissioner (cf. Opinion 19-128 [concluding that a village trustee's spouse may serve as village court clerk, even though a village trustee may not]). We note that it is ethically immaterial if the judge's spouse volunteered on the campaign of the commissioner's relative's election opponent(s), as "we have routinely acknowledged that spouses retain independent political identities" (Opinion 23-16).

Accordingly, we conclude this judge may participate in the appointment or reappointment of the county jury commissioner, even if the commissioner's first-degree relative was the judge's election opponent.

Partner Moves

« Continued from page 4
to run conflict checks before hiring lateral lawyers.

The New York State Bar Association has provided a road map of sorts as to what information may ethically be disclosed to the suitor firm. According to the NYSBA, a laterally moving partner may disclose:

- (i) the identities of clients or other parties involved in a matter;
- (ii) a brief summary of the status and nature of a particular matter, including the general issues involved;
- (iii) information that is publicly available;
- (iv) the lawyer's total book of business;
- (v) the financial terms of each lawyer-client relationship; and
- (vi) information about aggregate current and historical payment of fees (such as realization rates, average receivables, and aggregate timeliness of payments).

RPC 1.6 [cmt 18B].

Notifying Clients

Both the departing lawyer and the current firm are obligated to give notice to the clients under NY RPC 1.4 [comment 7A]. Rule 1.4 requires lawyers to promptly notify their clients of "material developments in the matter..." RPC 1.4(a). And, as mentioned above, client notice should be generally given after the withdrawing lawyer notifies firm partners of their resignation.

Most authorities favor joint notice to the clients by the current firm and the departing attorney. See, e.g., *Graubard, supra*; NYC Bar Association Ethics Opinion 2023-1, *supra*. The resignation of an attorney with substantial responsibility for the client's matter is generally held to require such notice to the client, both by the departing lawyer and the current law firm. The commentary to RPC 1.4 specifies what information should be disclosed to clients of the departing lawyer:

- (i) the departing lawyer's intention to leave the current law firm and the anticipated date of departure;
- (ii) the departing lawyer's future contact information;
- (iii) with respect to each relevant matter, the fact that the client has the right to choose counsel, and thus has the

option to be represented by the departing lawyer after departure, or to remain a client of the current firm, or to be represented by other lawyers or law firms; and (iv) the fact that the current firm will need the client to inform the firm of its choice of counsel and, if the client wishes to transfer the client's files to the departing lawyer or to another lawyer or law firm, the firm will need the client to authorize the firm (preferably in writing) to transfer the client's files or other property accordingly (unless the client has already notified the firm or the departing lawyer of its choice or has already provided such authorization to transfer the client's files).

RPC 1.4 cmt 7D; NYC Bar Eth. Op. 2023-1.

While the State Bar recommends joint notice from the departing lawyer and their law firm, such notice is not required and may be impractical in certain circumstances. In either event, the above information should be sufficient to discharge the lawyer's and the firm's obligation to notify the client of the change.

The State Bar also proscribes any conduct by the law firm, including in its partnership agreement, to delay or discourage the departing lawyer from providing the requisite notice to potentially affected clients. See NY RPC 1.4 [comment 7F].

What Files May the Departing Partner Take?

Departing partners may not take firm documents or files which do not belong to them. And the departing partner needs client permission to remove client files.

In *Gibbs*, the departing partners were permitted to take copies of their chronological correspondence files and other documents that they own. *Gibbs v. Breed Abbot & Morgan*, 271 A.D.2d 180 (1st Dept., 2000). However, the same lawyers breached their fiduciary duties by sharing with their suitor firm confidential firm records about associate compensation, billable hours, hourly rates and bonuses.

Lawyers may take with them "contact information for clients and others with whom the departing lawyer worked." NYC Bar. Ass. Eth. Op. 2023-1. Accord, ABA Eth. Op. 489. These "should be provided

as these are critical for conflict purposes and consistent with the departing attorney's rights to move and continue to practice law and obligation to contact such clients." According to the American Bar Association, "a departing lawyer [may] retain names and contact information for clients for whom the departing lawyer worked while at the firm, in order to determine conflicts of interests at the departing lawyer's new firm and comply with other applicable ethical or legal requirements." ABA Eth. Op. 489 at 4.

According to the City Bar a lawyer may bring with them: "the lawyer's personal records, address/contact file, research materials and copies of transactional and litigation publicly filed documents." NYC Bar Ass. Eth. Op. 2023-1. In addition, lawyers may remove copies of "their personal (as opposed to firm) form files, copies of litigation and transactional documents that have not been publicly filed."

Conclusion

Departing partners should review their partnership agreements before giving notice to their current firm. Certain restrictions may be invalid to the extent they conflict with the Rules of Professional Conduct, specifically RPC 5.6 and 1.4.

Departing partners should not solicit or notify clients of their lateral move until after they have resigned from their firm.

Transitioning partners are free to consult among themselves prior to a lateral move. However, they should abstain from soliciting or consulting associates or other staff prior to a lateral move. And lateral partners should presumptively limit their disclosure of information to the specific categories envisioned in the commentary to the RPC.

Upon resignation, the departing partner and the firm should endeavor to send a joint notice to clients for which the former had substantial responsibility. The content of that notice is provided in the NYSBA commentary to RPC 1.4.

The organized bar emphasizes that client welfare is paramount. Neither the firm nor the departing partners should interfere with the clients' freedom of choice. Nor should the firm or departing lawyers delay or interfere with an orderly transition in the best interest of the clients.

Off Page 2 / Real Estate Trends

Coping

« Continued from page 2

work mandates, the reelection of Donald Trump in November, and now the intensified attacks on the rule of law.

May is Mental Health Awareness Month in the U.S. In the U.K., this is the beginning of Mental Health Awareness Week, while European Mental Health Week will take place May 19-25. So this is a good time to note the response, or lack of response, by Big Law to yet another threat to the mental health of partners, associates and staff.

The sometimes toxic culture of law firms—the long hours, the pressures of the billable hour, the demands from clients, the bullying by partners, and the concerns of law firm leaders about profitability and even where a firm will land on the Am Law 100 or the Global 200—are by now well-known, especially after Joanna Litt, the widow of a Sidley Austin partner who died by suicide in 2018, famously wrote in *The American Lawyer* "Big Law Killed My Husband," and again when an inquest last year determined that Vanessa Ford, a Pinsents Masons partner in the U.K., had experienced "an acute mental health crisis" before "taking her own life."

And it's not limited to U.S. law firms. Canada published its own study on mental health in the legal profession, and a retired chief justice of Ontario has spoken publicly and written about the harm caused by the myth of the "gladiator lawyer." In Australia, a High Court Judge accused law firms of creating a culture of exploitation.

But at a time when Big Law should be addressing mental health and wellbeing more than ever, lawyers say firms are not doing much. To be sure, some have held town halls, done internal webinars or sent emails to lawyers and staff attempting to justify their decisions, but many have just gone on lockdown, including the firms where mental health intervention may be needed—those that have made deals with the administration.

"They're just doing what we would tell clients to do: 'Don't communicate about this, don't talk about it,' Chatterjee said. 'And you know, everyone wants to talk about it.'"

So the "dissidence" in the legal profession, as Richard Martin calls it, continues. Martin, a former senior law firm partner in London, experienced a mental breakdown in 2011 and now leads the Mindful Business Charter, an initiative to reduce the unnecessary stress in the ways we work. He says partners and associates in law firms have long had to tread a difficult line between their professional obligations—the demands of clients and of being a commercial enterprise—and doing what they consider "the right thing." But they were reassured and guided by their conviction that there is integrity in the profession and by their belief in the rule of law.

But what is happening today feels different because now there is a full frontal attack on law, he said, and the way individual law firms are responding to these attacks is having an impact on lawyer wellbeing. "The importance of communication internally...cannot be underestimated," said Martin, especially in ensur-

ing the wellbeing of the people in your firm.

Even in the U.K., where the large U.S. law firms now generate significant revenue and employ many lawyers, the profession is watching with interest. The may be watching at arms length, but what happens in the U.S. has global ramifications.

While some of the firms that have negotiated deals, including Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, continue to hire partners in London, even bringing two on board last week, some London recruiters are focusing on firms that have not made deals with the Trump administration because lawyers are less interested in joining those firms. The same is true for lawyers in the U.S.

And slowly, news is trickling out about partners and associates leaving those firms. Several associates from Kirkland & Ellis, Simpson Thacher, Latham & Watkins, Willkie Farr, and Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom have resigned, citing their opposition to the firms' deals with Trump. And in recent weeks, firms that have struck deals have witnessed notable partner departures, including Steven Banks and Jeh Johnson from Paul Weiss, and Willkie's longest-serving lawyer, Joseph Baio.

"There are going to be more," Chatterjee predicted.

But that does little to relieve the anxiety and improve the mental health of the industry. And improving lawyer wellbeing makes sense not only on a personal and humanitarian level but on an economic one as well. A firm needs "well lawyers" to do good work, Martin says, and law firm leaders focused on profitability and productivity need to recognize the economic costs associated with having lawyers who are dealing with mental health issues.

In a White Paper recently published by the Mindful Business Charter, a section is devoted to insurers that cover law firms' professional indemnity as well as their health benefits. And these companies, experts at examining data, can show a noticeable increase in professional indemnity claims resulting from lawyer mistakes or poor ethical decisions as well as an increase in health claims for stress-related issues. The two are intertwined, Martin says, as stressed lawyers don't think clearly and are more likely to make mistakes.

Some lawyers, including renowned litigator David Boies, founder and chairman emeritus of Boies Schiller Flexner, say they were surprised that so many large law firms decided to negotiate with Trump, even though those that decided to fight in court—Perkins Coie, Jenner & Block, Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr and Susman Godfrey—have so far been successful. Boies said if law firms had come together to fight, they would have won—and this issue would have quickly disappeared.

But the firms that negotiated have argued that the possibility Trump would suspend their lawyers' security clearances and cancel clients' government contracts would have prevented them from working on many cases, and might have prompted valuable clients needing government clearances for mergers and acquisitions to move to a different firm.

Boies conceded that fighting

can be costly and inconvenient, but he noted that lawyers frequently represent clients who stand up for rights they believe in.

"Principles to which you only adhere when it is easy and costless aren't principles," he told Law.com.

In the absence of most of Big Law putting up a fight, Chatterjee has created Law Firm Partners United, a professional association that gives partners the chance to speak up as individuals. The group, which launched last month and in one day had more than 100 members, now counts more than 860 partners as members. It has so far filed two amicus briefs in support of firms fighting Trump's executive orders and is considering doing more to stand up to attacks on the rule of law.

And in addition to aiding those targeted by the administration, the group also offers lawyers a way to address feelings of anxiety and helplessness at a time when their law firms are unwilling to do so. Collective action, Chatterjee says, lets others know there are others like them, gives lawyers purpose, and provides the rest of the world hope that there are people who will stand up for principles.

General Counsel have formed a similar group, General Counsels United, which amassed more than 500 members just 12 days after its launch.

Chatterjee says lawyers need to be able to separate themselves from their law firms, which are a business, and look at themselves as part of a profession in which they have the right to say what they think is right, as a lawyer and an officer of the court, and as someone who took the lawyers' oath.

On May 1, which is National Law Day of Action in the U.S., lawyers dressed in business attire in cities all over the country gathered in front of federal courthouses to reaffirm their commitment to the rule of law and recite the lawyers' oath they had taken when they first became lawyers. A partner at an Am Law 100 firm who was one of about 2,000 lawyers packed into the plaza in front of the federal courthouse in downtown Manhattan, told me it felt good to be there and say the words. While most lawyers take their professional obligations seriously, she said, reasserting the oath to uphold the Constitution brought this to another level. "It was a big crowd, and it was really meaningful to see so many people who cared and were willing to reassert their oath to uphold the Constitution," she said.

This is what Chatterjee and Martin mean by the power of collective action. Instead of doomscrolling and obsessively reading about the latest threats to the rule of law in the U.S. and elsewhere in the world, there is an opportunity now for lawyers to take action outside of their firms. Selflessness—acting in the service of others—is perhaps the best way to combat anxiety, depression and threats to wellbeing, they say, and lawyers have the skills to take effective action. Many entered the profession because they wanted to make a difference in the world, said Chatterjee. Now is their chance.

"This is the best time to be a lawyer," he said.

@ Lisa Shuchman can be reached at lshuchman@alm.com.

CRE

« Continued from page 5

growing U.S. policy turbulence, tariff plans, and unpredictability, representatives from major investment organizations began to reassess their enthusiasm for property investment in the country. It's important to note that the interviews were taken in March before the major market disruptions in April.

About 42% of those surveyed had a negative outlook for cross-border investments in the U.S. last fall. That jumped to 63% in Q1, coupled with negative answers on whether the economy was on track for a recovery: 27% said yes, 35% said no, and 38% were unsure.

Interestingly, expectations for property investments were stronger than might have been expected, given shifts in outlooks. U.S. property markets still had the perception of being a safe

region for investment, albeit only slightly less so than in 2024. Eighty percent said global political tensions and changes in economic alignments are the greatest threat to safe investment. The portion that expected a major increase in the U.S. CRE investment outlook in 2024 was over 40%. In 2025, that was cut in half. About 45% expected a "notable increase in distressed assets." That number was 85% in Q4 2024.

The top factors influencing the U.S. CRE investment outlook were geopolitics (20%), trade and tariffs (20%), interest rates (14%) and inflation (13%). Then came deregulation (9%), debt pricing (7%), housing affordability (6%), migration trends (6%), energy ecosystem (3%), and climate change (2%).

Top choices for investment holdings were, ranked largest to smallest as follows: multifamily, industrial/logistics, office, healthcare/MOB, other and single-family rental. No num-

bers were distributed with this information.

As for preferred U.S. markets, the top five, from highest to lowest, were Dallas, New York, Miami, Boston, and Atlanta. Then came San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Charlotte, Nashville, Phoenix, and Raleigh. Coming up from behind was Washington, D.C., Denver, San Diego, Tampa, Austin, Chicago, and Houston.

As AFIRE pointed out, though, all these metrics might be changing now, given the shifts in conditions in the U.S. that sharply grew after the close of Q1.

Questions? Tips? Contact our news desk: editor@nylj.com

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

Need a smart Expert Witness?

ALMExperts has leaders in every discipline.

www.almexperts.com

888-809-0133

ONE SOURCE that includes:

Over 15,000 top medical and technical experts in more than 4,000 areas of expertise, covering all 50 States.

Expert Analysis / Real Estate Trends / Off Page 2

Terms

« Continued from page 3

and concerns that some agentic AI tools unleashed without strict rules potentially could act completely independently of human control and possibly cause permanent harm in the physical world.

Therefore, some current and proposed regulatory frameworks seek, at minimum, to require human oversight and transparency in such uses and, for higher risk applications such as medical care or nuclear plant operations, to impose strict guardrails or even restrict use of agentic AI entirely.

Contracting and Third-Party Risk Management

When engaging an AI platform vendor, it is advisable to conduct due diligence to thoroughly understand the AI tool's intended use case and operational features, and then to properly classify the AI tool based on the categories outlined above.

That process will inform the selection of appropriately calibrated contract terms and risk management controls. Although some relevant contract terms and controls are suggested here, please note that this article is not intended to provide a complete set of recommendations or legal advice.

As mentioned above, deterministic tools, such as RPA and traditional machine learning systems,

may not pose any greater risks today than they did in the past, even though some vendors may now describe such tools as "AI" for marketing or other purposes.

These tools may be treated the same as other software applications—for instance, by managing performance risks through thorough testing, monitoring, documentation, service level agreements, reporting, governance, etc.

Nonetheless, such deterministic tools do not necessarily need to be subject to the more robust controls and contract terms appropriate for probabilistic (GenAI) or agentic AI tools that are more prone to hallucinations, bias, and other concerns.

For GenAI or agentic AI (for which strict rules no longer dictate outcomes), additional contractual terms and risk management controls may help control outputs for quality, accuracy, bias, and other parameters. Organizations adopting these tools may consider:

- 1. Human-in-the-loop oversight**, whether maintained by the vendor, the organization using the tool, or both;
- 2. Transparency, documentation and audit rights** (cover topics like training data, weights, model updates, and system limitations) to enable organizations to better understand the AI tool's functioning and approach to generating output; and
- 3. Change notification obligations** requiring AI providers to give advance notice

of material changes in the AI tool, especially when a deterministic (rules-based) AI tool evolves into GenAI or agentic AI, or when the model weights in a GenAI tool are modified. Such notices enable organizations to reassess and manage associated risks, to address regulatory compliance, and to evaluate the impact on contractual obligations with counterparties.

In addition, agentic AI tools capable of acting without human

Accordingly, probabilistic tools may produce hallucinations—i.e., outputs that appear plausible but are factually incorrect or fabricated. For example, AI-generated images may depict people with extra fingers or missing limbs.

intervention or supervision pose heightened risks that may require enhanced safeguards. Although financial, efficiency, and/or competitive pressures may make it impractical to delay rollout of agentic AI, users should weigh the advantages against the heightened risks of AI autonomy and potential for harm, especially considering the current uncertain regulatory environment and still evolving industry safeguards.

Of course, as with any new technology and especially for high-risk use cases, it is wise to consult with knowledgeable advisors and operational experts. Until such risks are thoroughly assessed and controlled, users

may wish to limit initial deployments to lower-stakes use cases and, for higher risk use cases, to include a "human-in-the-loop" to evaluate and sign off on any decisions recommended by the agentic AI tools.

Before implementation, it is best practice to carefully assess risks of harm in a controlled or "sandbox" environment, and, upon implementation, to include trigger controls, such as a "kill switch" or other means for humans to override the agentic AI.

General Controls, Contract Clauses, And Business Continuity

Regardless of classification as described above, all categories of AI tools remain subject to privacy, cybersecurity, consumer protection, and other general laws, regulations, and industry standards, as well as those applicable to specific industries and sectors like finance, insurance, energy, and healthcare.

Accordingly, procedures and best practices in the non-AI world still apply. This means that organizations should document their respective obligations relating to authorized use; documentation, testing, and monitoring; data

security, governance, minimization, transfer, and retention; cyber security and incident response; and other relevant requirements.

From the customer perspective, it is especially important for AI vendor contracts to include meaningful indemnification and liability provisions to incentivize the vendor to implement robust controls, to provide audit rights, to allow the customer to terminate, and to address data return and destruction obligations.

Both AI vendors and customers may benefit from leveraging best practices from business process outsourcing—such as policies and controls addressing implementation, data management, service levels, and change management, as well as robust governance in general—to align on expectations at the outset and as the data, AI tools, and use cases evolve.

In addition, business continuity concerns may be a reasonable concern for customers using some major commercial AI tools that currently are defendants in ongoing intellectual property infringement litigation alleging that copyrighted materials were used without permission or licenses to train large language models for AI tools.

Some allegations have survived defendants' motions to dismiss based on "fair use," with plaintiffs successfully claiming that use of copyrighted materials by such AI tools is commercial in nature and usurps opportunities that rightfully belong to the copyright owners.

These cases are still wending

their way through the courts and this article is not intended to analyze such cases in detail, but rather to point out the related business continuity risk.

Possible remedies in such cases include injunctions prohibiting use of the trained AI tools, which might require retraining of models with licensed data that could limit availability or functionality of the affected AI tools, at least for some period of time.

Organizations concerned about such business continuity risks may wish to plan ahead for alternative AI tools or even prepare to return to human means of production if necessary.

Conclusion

Contracting and third-party risk management for AI tools requires a nuanced understanding of the underlying technologies and their associated risks.

Differentiating between tools using deterministic, probabilistic, or autonomous reasoning is crucial for effective oversight, adherence to relevant regulations, negotiation of appropriate contract terms, and implementation of operational controls.

By thoughtfully and intentionally categorizing AI tools, organizations can tailor their approach to avoid excessive focus on low-risk deterministic tools and to direct resources to managing tools with higher risks as described above—to efficiently and effectively harness the transformative power of AI.

Compliance

« Continued from page 3

be better prepared for such possibilities.

Such programs will help ensure, too, that companies are not held liable under any of the stated carve-outs contemplated by the April 7 Memo (e.g., for "willfully violating any federal requirement").

State and Foreign Regulators Will Continue—And Perhaps Even Increase—Their Enforcement Efforts in The Digital Assets Space

Many states have their own securities laws and anti-fraud statutes that provide independent bases for enforcement. See Rich Weber, Seth Farber, & Samantha Osaki, *What Now for White Collar? As the DOJ Steps Back, Will Others Step Up?*, N.Y.L.J. (Mar. 17, 2025).

For example, state and local enforcers in New York, including New York's Department of Financial Services (DFS), the New York Attorney General's Office, and the New York County District Attorney's Office, have already been enforcers in the digital assets industry.

DFS has signaled its intent to fill the gaps in the wake of the DOJ's new enforcement policies, focusing on consumer protection and ensuring financial services companies' compliance.

For instance, DFS Superintendent Adrienne Harris has emphasized that DFS would "keep running [its] drill" on cryptocurrency

enforcement, and that it intends to remain at the forefront of regulating AI, cryptocurrency, and cybersecurity. Oscar Gonzalez, *DOJ Disbands Crypto Investigation Unit, Another Sign of the Trump Administration's Support of Digital Currency*, ComplianceWeek (Apr. 8, 2025).

Indeed, on April 10, DFS issued a consent order to Block, Inc., a digital asset company that owns a substantial amount of cryptocurrency, with a civil monetary penalty of \$40,000,000 and institution of an independent monitorship, for failing to maintain an effective and compliant AML program, among other deficiencies.

Similarly, the New York Attorney General's and New York District Attorney's Offices have broad authority to bring civil and criminal enforcement actions under New York's expansive Martin Act.

Indeed, a recent decision in an enforcement action brought by the NYAG against Gemini Trust Company and Genesis Global Capital rejected those defendants' arguments that their digital assets were not securities under New York law and upheld the application of the Martin Act on that basis. See Aislinn Keely, *Crypto Firm DCG Can't Dodge NY AG Suit Over Genesis Woes*, Law360 (Apr. 14, 2025).

And, of course, New York is not alone. Regulators in other states who also disagree with the Trump administration's law enforcement philosophies will likely be similarly aggressive.

For example, in a somewhat parallel situation, California Attorney General Rob Bonta recently issued

an "Alert to Businesses" warning them that, although the Department of Justice had paused enforcement of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, "the FCPA remains binding federal law and violations are actionable under California's Unfair Competition Law." Press Release, Cal. Dep't of Justice, Office of the Att'y Gen., *Legal Advisory: Alert to Business on Violations of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act* (Apr. 2, 2025).

It would be no surprise if Attorney General Bonta were to adopt

Fraudsters seek out platforms with lax compliance protocols to move stolen funds quickly and anonymously, and that illegal activity creates a substantial risk for those platforms of regulatory enforcement both today and in the future.

such a stance with respect to enforcement in the digital asset industry in the wake of the DOJ's similar retreat in this area.

Multinational corporations will also remain exposed to foreign agencies that could, in turn, fill in enforcement gaps left by the DOJ. For instance, the United Kingdom's National Crime Agency is increasingly treating digital asset businesses as major players in the fight against serious and organized crime. See Jason G. Allen et al., *Legal and Regulatory Considerations for Digital Assets 34–37*.

In the European Union, the Markets in Crypto Assets Regulation ("MiCA") regulates public offers of crypto-assets. See ESMA, *Markets in Crypto-Assets Regulation*,

<https://www.esma.europa.eu/esmas-activities/digital-finance-and-innovation/markets-crypto-assets-regulation-mica>.

MiCA empowers regulators to impose substantial fines on individuals and entities found to violate its provisions, with penalties ranging from "EUR 5,000,000 in flat sums or from 3% up to 12.5% of the total annual turnover, depending on the scope of the infringement." InnReg, *Markets in Crypto-Assets Regulation (MiCA) Updated Guide*

(2025), <https://www.innreg.com/blog/mica-regulation-guide>.

Weak "Know Your Customer" (KYC)/AML Controls Create a Field Day for Bad Actors

While the April 7 Memo may suggest that the DOJ won't pursue companies that unknowingly allow bad actors to launder funds through their platforms, turning a blind eye to BSA, KYC, and AML obligations—especially when red flags are ignored—effectively opens the door for abuse. Weak KYC is a weak link.

Fraudsters seek out platforms with lax compliance protocols to move stolen funds quickly and anonymously, and that illegal

activity creates a substantial risk for those platforms of regulatory enforcement both today and in the future.

Digital assets continue to serve as vehicles for financing and facilitating a wide spectrum of high-priority criminal conduct, including fentanyl trafficking, terrorism, transnational cartel operations, organized crime, and human trafficking and smuggling.

These are precisely the types of crimes that the April 7 Memo emphasizes as priorities for the current administration. Failure to maintain adequate BSA, KYC, and AML controls also leaves companies vulnerable to private lawsuits, alleging that they failed to prevent illicit activities, which can damage both their reputation and investor trust. See, e.g., Kateryna Perera, *Block Execs Failed To Prevent Illicit Activities, Suit Says*, Law360 (Apr. 18, 2025).

Further, turning a blind eye to these obligations today could also lead to more aggressive DOJ scrutiny in the future should enforcement priorities shift.

Beyond legal risk, enabling the movement of criminal proceeds, even unintentionally, erodes user trust and undermines the integrity of a business. Companies who operate without robust BSA, KYC, and AML controls lack the ability to assess the origins and purposes of the funds moving through their platforms.

Without those controls, companies may not even be aware of the nature of the criminal enterprises they are enabling—let alone able

to halt or report such activity.

Moreover, ongoing and visible compliance efforts in these areas are essential to fostering and maintaining a culture of compliance within an organization. Businesses that begin to selectively deprioritize BSA, KYC, or AML responsibilities send a signal to their employees that compliance is merely a legal checkbox, not a reflection of the organization's core values.

Such a message can create an atmosphere in which other regulatory obligations are viewed as optional or negotiable.

For these reasons, enforcement and compliance surrounding KYC/AML standards are not only about legal adherence—they are central to the integrity of the businesses that implement those controls.

Key Takeaways

While the DOJ's shift in priorities may reduce or narrow certain federal enforcement actions, companies must continue their cryptocurrency compliance programs. Regardless of whether prosecutors choose to enforce relevant federal laws today, the DOJ very well may do so again.

Moreover, recent examples such as DFS's action against Block, Inc., serve as powerful reminders that state and local enforcers may line up to fill in any gaps in enforcement left by the DOJ. Finally, robust compliance programs remain essential to mitigating legal and reputational risks in this evolving regulatory landscape.

Tenant

« Continued from page 5

To assess the practical benefits and challenges of TOPAs, it is helpful to look at the data from Washington, D.C., which has the oldest TOPA laws in the country. The D.C. Policy Center recently released a report analyzing D.C.'s TOPA, which was first enacted in 1980 to address a rental housing crisis (See Yesim Sayin & Emilia Calma, *TOPA's Promise and Pitfalls* (March 13, 2025)). There are four possible outcomes of the TOPA process: (i) the tenants purchase the building and convert it to a condominium, (ii) the tenants purchase the building and convert it into a co-op, (iii) the tenants assign their rights to a third party, either the original buyer or a new landlord of their choice, or (iv) the tenants do nothing or waive their rights, and the owner's original sale proceeds. Approximately 95% of TOPA cases in D.C. have concluded with the tenants' assignment of their rights. This option can be quite favorable to tenants as it allows them to negotiate tangible benefits that they choose from the significant

bargaining power the TOPA statute provides. Taking on the responsibility of building ownership is challenging and requires a high level of engagement and coordination on the part of the tenants. If the tenant association instead assigns its rights to a third party, the tenants can either (i) choose a nonprofit partner or affordable housing developer aligned with their interests to be the new landlord (See Roshan Abraham, *The Unfulfilled Potential of D.C.'s 'Tenant Opportunity To Purchase' Law*, Next City (Dec. 14, 2023)), or (ii) negotiate with interested buyers for building repairs, rent concessions, and cash buyouts, and assign their rights to the buyer with the most favorable offer. Many developers would prefer empty units so they can perform any renovations they want without having to deal with existing tenants. For low-income tenants, a cash buyout from an interested buyer can be especially enticing. In D.C., there are instances of these payments being as high as \$100,000 for each tenant (See Sayin & Calma, *supra*). While much less common, in the rare instances where tenant associations actually buy the building themselves,

a TOPA can afford tenants a path to homeownership that might otherwise be inaccessible to them.

While a TOPA can have substantive benefits for tenants, it can also have very real drawbacks and transaction costs in practice. Most notably, TOPAs can create major delays in the sale process.

A buyer's interest in, or ability to consummate, the sale could be seriously diminished or evaporate entirely in the time it takes the owner to give notice, wait for the tenants to form an association, exercise their right of first refusal, conduct their diligence, and obtain financing—a process during which neither the original buyer nor any subsequent buyer has any certainty that it will even be able to realize on its bid.

In D.C., TOPA proceedings delay transactions by 5.3 months on average, and in some cases have delayed sales by up to 420 days (See Sayin & Calma, *supra*). A delay of that length could easily kill even a highly buyer-friendly deal.

All of this also assumes no legal disputes arise. Should the parties begin litigation during the TOPA process, it could delay a transaction for years. The lengthy TOPA

process also makes appealing buyer-friendly options (like a forward 1031 exchange) impossible and can tie up buyer earnest money deposits for months on end. Adding further complications, title companies are also more hesitant to insure TOPA purchases due to their increased risks.

TOPA laws also create multifaceted issues with financing for all parties involved. These laws create a high degree of uncertainty, which is generally anathema to lenders. Financing commitments and interest rate locks are necessarily time-limited, and interest rates can fluctuate significantly during TOPA's extended timeline. This limits the availability and increases the cost of financing (See Sayin & Calma, *supra*).

The District of Columbia does not have dedicated funding to support tenant TOPA purchases, and it is difficult for tenant associations to secure acquisition or permanent financing without support from the District (See Sayin & Calma, *supra*). Lenders often consider affordable housing to be risky, making them less likely to extend loans to tenant associations (See Chan, *supra*). Without financing,

low- and middle-income tenants have no way to obtain the funds needed to purchase and operate the building on their own.

The uncertainties associated with TOPAs also make lenders less willing to extend loans to tenants' assignees, loans which they often need in order to make the repairs and improvements the tenants demand in exchange for their cooperation.

The scope of D.C.'s TOPA also creates challenges. This TOPA's broad definition of a "sale" means it is also triggered by recapitalizations, refinancings, and certain ownership transfers, "even if control and management of the building remain unchanged" (See Sayin & Calma, *supra*). Equity partners are less likely to invest given their exit may by itself trigger TOPA requirements.

Overall, the data indicates that all of the foregoing issues with D.C.'s TOPA have actually decreased investor interest in D.C.'s multifamily housing market (*Id.*). Fewer sales and the burdens that TOPA imposes on buyers may hurt property values. Developers are less likely to build housing in areas where it is difficult to sell or

where there is downward pressure on pricing, even if those areas are most in need of new housing.

A bill to create a TOPA regime in New York was first introduced in the State Senate in 2021, and has experienced renewed interest as housing has become a critical issue in the 2025 mayoral race (See Celia Young, *Could a Proposed Bill To Help New York Tenants Buy Their Building Finally Become Law?*, Brick Underground (March 28, 2025)).

The bill is largely modeled after D.C.'s TOPA but has some key differences. Unlike D.C.'s, New York's TOPA would come with a dedicated pool of funding to assist tenants with building purchases (Chan, *supra*).

The New York legislation would also "only allow tenants to assign their TOPA rights to a nonprofit or public housing provider" (*Id.*). It is unclear how the TOPA would play out in high-density areas of the state like New York City or whether the TOPA would be limited to specific neighborhoods, like it is in Chicago. In light of the significant implications of such a regime for the affected housing market, any such legislation warrants a careful and thoughtful analysis.

READER'S SERVICES

For subscriptions call 1-877-256-2472.

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

For questions regarding reprints

and permissions, call 347-227-3382,

e-mail reprints@alm.com,

or visit almreprints.com.

Letters Welcome.

The Law Journal welcomes letters from its readers for publication. Letters may be e-mailed to Andrew Denney at adenney@alm.com.

Baraka

« Continued from page 2

come to a public place, they can't go onto a facility to even get a tour. We weren't protesting. Nobody barged in. We behaved peacefully," Baraka said.

Baraka added that the GEO Group, the detention center's private operator, has refused to let

city fire safety and building code inspectors to enter the premises and the city has taken the company to court over that issue.

The lawyers representing Baraka, in a statement, said, "The government has falsely made public statements accusing the mayor of violating the 'rule of law' and has improperly claimed that he is guilty of the trespass charge filed against him. They have invited, indeed

made necessary, this response. We look forward to defending Mayor Baraka in court, and we are confident that vigorous cross examination and the summoning of witnesses will find the mayor fully vindicated."

Defense lawyer Akin, when reached by phone and told that some lawyers felt a case can be made to support a trespassing charge, said, "They weren't there, and they weren't

pry to everything that went on."

Akin added that Baraka remained outside the chain link fence that surrounds the detention center until he was invited inside by officials there, and his arrest took place after he left the enclosure and returned to the area outside the gate.

@ Charles Toutant can be reached at ctoutant@alm.com.

Real Estate Trends / Off Page 2

Realty Law

« Continued from page 5

Thus, the court observed that although generally, “a receiver’s compensation is limited to the funds derived from the property to which he/she is appointed to maintain, such that the party who sought receiver is not ordinarily liable for the receiver’s commissions, upon the existence of special circumstances, the party who sought the receiver may be required to pay some or all of the receiver’s commission....”

The court further stated that “where, as here, special circumstances are demonstrated, the court may direct the party who moved for the appointment of a receiver to pay necessary expenses and compensation which exceeds the money in the receiver’s hands at the termination of the receivership....”

Prior case law held that in determining the existence of special circumstances, courts may consider, *inter alia*, “the degree of necessity of the expenses and the benefit received by the party who moved for the receivership. The court’s discretion in ordering payment of such additional expenses accords with the equities of this situation....” Courts will consider whether expenditures were “necessary and beneficial to the plaintiff for whose benefit the receiver was appointed.”

The court observed that CPLR §8004(b) permits “deviation from the computation methodology prescribed by CPLR §8004(a)” and the courts may award a receiver a commission “calculated using a quantum meruit calculation.” “Quantum meruit compensation means the reasonable value of the services rendered....”

Appellate precedent held that in order to recover on a cause of action “sounding in quantum meruit,” a plaintiff must demonstrate “(1) the performance of services in good faith, (2) the acceptance of the services by the person to whom they are rendered, (3) and expectation of compensation therefor, and (4) the reasonable value of the services allegedly rendered....”

The court also stated that although “there is no appellate authority on this issue, it is clear that the express language of CPLR §8004(b) allows a receiver’s commissions to be calculated based on the quantum meruit calculation....”

The court agreed “with the few state and federal courts that have addressed this issue and likewise holds that if using the calculation methodology prescribed by CPLR §8004(a) to calculate a receiver’s commissions is manifestly unfair—meaning, it is inadequate—the court can calculate his/her commissions based on quantum meruit....”

A prior case found quantum meruit compensation for a receiver to be appropriate where the foreclosure action involved “preservation of an old property in an older neighborhood, which needed constant care and repair to remain code compliant so as to protect the safety and well-being of the tenants” and where there was a “limited rent roll, resulting in the failure to obtain the rent receipts needed to meet the buildings overhead....”

In that case, the receiver had “spent considerable time collecting rents and paying those expenses which were required to protect the interest of the tenants in the building, and...he spent a considerable amount of time in the active management of the property, which is often the case where the building is old and the rent roll is modest...it was unlikely that the receiver could have retained the property manager,” and therefore the receiver was “forced to act as

a rent collector and property manager, and...using CPLR §8004(a) the receiver’s commissions would have only totaled \$893.47.” Therefore, the court awarded the compensation totaling \$5,000.

The court also noted that absent court approval, when a receiver is an attorney, “it is expected under such circumstances that the receiver will perform all of the ordinary legal services connected with his duties in consideration of the commission that he will receive; and that the employment of counsel is unnecessary....” However, a court “may authorize the retention of counsel by a temporary receiver, *nunc pro tunc*, and the payment of an attorneys’ fee.” In such case, courts will consider “the necessity and reasonableness of the fee” including whether “counsel performed duties that are customarily performed and should have been performed, by the temporary receiver....”

In the subject case, documents from the NYC Dep’t of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) showed that between 2004 and 2024, the City had “issued hundreds of violations.” Violations involved problems such as “bed-bug infestations, broken floors, defective bricks, leaks and broken carbon monoxide detectors.” Necessary work included “pointing, replacement of the roof, replacement of the waste lines, and integrated pest management.” If such work had not been performed, HPD would have performed the work “at the owner’s expense” and the owner would have been “liable for fees and penalties.”

The premises had also been the subject of NYS Div. of Housing and Community Renewal (DHCR) violations involving failure “to repair a myriad of building wide issues, including broken steps, broken tiles, defective fire escapes, security issues, and inadequate lighting.” Since there were “insufficient funds” in the receiver’s account, the plaintiff had “agreed to pay for the installation of the new boiler.”

The receiver sought commissions totaling \$177,891.04. The receiver sought compensation for his work at the rate of \$650 per hour and compensation for another individual at \$375 per hour. The receivership account contained \$88,567.65.

The receiver had contacted two property management companies to see if they would manage the property. They apparently declined to manage the property.

The court further explained that “[c]ontrary to plaintiff’s assertions to the contrary, given the extraordinary services performed by (receiver), the long standing conditions existing at (the property) prior to (receiver’s) appointment, the low rent roll..., the amount of time expended by (receiver) to manage (the property) because he cannot retain the property manager, and, in light of the foregoing, the relatively low commissions which would be awarded to (receiver) if calculated using CPLR §8004(a), the court finds that his commissions, if calculated pursuant to CPLR §8004(a), would be too low and thus, manifestly unfair. As such, here (receiver’s) commissions will be calculated on a quantum meruit basis pursuant to CPLR §8004(b).”

The court cited the “significant number of deleterious preexisting conditions such that (the building) was in an advanced state of disrepair and dilapidation.” The receiver had explained that the property had been “neglected” for “more than a decade” and “was in an extreme state of disrepair.” Moreover, the building had “amassed over 400 violations and the rent roll, which was never fully realized, would have never been more than \$31,000—a sum well below what would have been required to reha-

bilitate (the property).” Moreover, the receiver had demonstrated that “attempts by him to retain the management company proved fruitless.”

The receiver had also determined “that any effort to retain counsel to aid him in his receivership...would have been similarly fruitless.” Therefore, the receiver had to “assume” the property’s “management and some of its legal representation.” The receiver had to deal with HPD and DHCR as well as had to arrange for “substantial repairs” and “installation of a new boiler.” Here, “it was clear that (receiver) could not retain the management company and, therefore, had to shoulder the burden of managing the premises himself.”

The court reasoned that under such circumstances, it would be “manifestly unfair” to calculate the receiver’s commissions based on CPLR §8004(a) which would total only about \$59,046.14. The receiver,

In the exercise of the court’s discretion, the court found that it would be “manifestly unjust and inequitable” to order the plaintiff to pay the receiver commissions in excess of the amounts in the receiver’s account.

together with his staff invested 352.5 hours, “mostly dedicated” to the property’s management. The court concluded that the receiver’s commission should be determined pursuant to CPLR §8004(b), based on the value of the services personally provided, plus expenses. The court determined that the receiver should not receive compensation for work he delegated absent court approval.

The receiver’s account contained \$88,567.67. Thus, the court had to determine whether the plaintiff had to pay the receiver the difference between the commission to which the court determined is entitled and the sums in the receivership account.

Since the receiver had spent all funds received by him to repair and maintain the building, the court found that there was “no question” that the receiver had “spent all funds collected by him judiciously and for the benefit of (the plaintiff) and therefore, plaintiff.” However, in the exercise of court’s discretion, the court found that it would be “manifestly unjust and inequitable” to order the plaintiff to pay the receiver commissions in excess of the amounts in the receiver’s account. The court noted, *inter alia*, that the plaintiff had come into possession of the property at a substantial loss.

The court acknowledged that it was approving commissions “in excess of what is customarily awarded” and since the receiver is being compensated for the work that he “performed as receiver, which includes, per his invoice, compensation for the legal work he performed, his application for his appointment as counsel, *nunc pro tunc*, is denied.”

Thus, the court awarded the receiver \$88,567.65 pursuant to CPLR §8004(b) and upon the closing of the receivership account, the receiver will be discharged as receiver.

Comment: The court noted that in an appropriate case, courts may authorize a receiver to retain counsel *nunc pro tunc*.

See *Sunrise Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass’n v. W. Park Avenue Corp.*, 47 Misc. 2d 940 (Sup. Ct. 1965) and *De Santis v. The White Rose Assoc.*, 152 Misc. 2d 567 (Sup. Ct. 1991). In the subject case, the court noted that the receiver’s invoices which were approved included some compensation for the legal work he performed.

In order to be considered for appointment as a receiver, a person needs to be on an approved list of qualified receivers pursuant to Part

36 of the Rules of the Chief Judge. The rules are intended to “ensure that appointees are selected on the basis of merit without favoritism, nepotism, politics or other factors unrelated to the qualifications of the appointee or the requirements of the case.” The rules embody requirements for, *inter alia*, education, training and limits on the number of significant appointments that a receiver may receive within a certain time period.

Experienced lenders and counsel know inclusion on the Part 36 list does not mean that a receiver is necessarily qualified to maintain and protect a subject asset. A Part 36 “qualified receiver” may not have experience in dealing with, e.g., a sizable office building, shopping center, industrial building or a large rent regulated residential property. They may lack experience and expertise required to deal with a large, unfinished, potentially dangerous construction

site or with municipal agencies that regulate rents or compliance with the local building codes and other safety issues. They may also lack experience with respect to commercial or residential leasing or complex insurance issues. Where appropriate, a court may authorize a receiver to retain professionals who do have the required expertise.

For these reasons, a lender may request that a court appoint a receiver who possesses appropriate expertise. When requesting the appointment of a particular receiver, the requesting party should explain the reasons for such request, including the professional credentials of the requested receiver. Generally, courts will consider such requests.

If a court appoints the requested receiver, that receiver must act as an “officer of the court” and not as an “employee or agent” of a foreclosing party that requested his or her appointment (like all receivers). Rather, the receiver must act as a “neutral.”

This case involved a receiver’s inability to hire a management company. A management company could be concerned about the poor condition of the property and/or the lack of adequate cash flow available for its compensation. In certain cases, a foreclosing lender will fund expenses for services necessary to maintain and protect its collateral, the property. As this court noted, when a property lacks cash flow needed to meet expenses, a court may direct payment of such expenses by the party that requested appointment of a receiver.

In addition to the difficulties of hiring a management company for a “problem property,” lenders and judges may find it difficult to find a qualified person to serve as a receiver for such a property.

JY Citizen L.P. v. 333 E. 150 Street Realty LLC, Supreme Court, Bronx County, Case No. 36043/20E. Decided March 21, 2025. Gomez, J.

Commercial Landlord Tenant—“Yellowstone Injunction”—Commercial Condominiums—Court Granted Summary Judgment to Plaintiff On Its Claim for a Declaratory Judgment That Plaintiff Was Not In Default of Its Lease—Court Denied Defendant’s Motion for Attorney Fees, Costs and Expenses—Legal Fee Provision Was “Ambiguous”—Order for Bond Vacated—Construction and Permitting Issues

Migration

« Continued from page 5

started in 2017—then the pandemic exacerbated the issue, causing it to plummet by nearly half a million residents between April 2020 and July 2022. More recently, the population has rebounded by 120,000 residents, but whether that trend will continue remains to be seen, said CBC.

In addition to the pandemic-driven out-migration from the city, the population fell between 2017 and 2021 due to a tighter immigration policy that limited international immigration. Growth since 2022 has been partly due to a reversal of that trend, as a surge of migrants and asylum seekers moved into New York City. With President Trump back in office, international immigration may dampen once again.

Meanwhile, domestic net out-migration slowed to its lowest level since 2015 between 2023 and 2024. During the pandemic, out-migration accelerated among white New Yorkers, households with incomes in the top 40 percent, and millennials. But these groups

This decision involved an action for a “declaratory judgment and injunction... in which plaintiff seeks a declaration that it is not in default of a lease agreement entered into between the parties....”

The defendant owned “two commercial condominium units (units).” It had leased the units to the plaintiff. The plaintiff alleged that after certain construction work had been done on the units, it “cured any alleged default of the lease....” The defendant asserted that the plaintiff defaulted under the lease and it is entitled to attorney fees, costs and expenses pursuant to the terms of the lease.

The court previously granted the plaintiff a “Yellowstone” injunction to the extent that “defendant was enjoined from pursuing summary proceedings to evict plaintiff, taking any action to terminate the subject lease, or otherwise interfering with plaintiff’s occupancy and possession of the premises on the basis of alleged default set forth in a notice to cure...during the pendency of this action.”

The court also ordered the defendant to “cooperate with plaintiff to allow plaintiff to comply with all (NYC) Building Department of Codes, Rules and Regulations.” The order was conditioned upon plaintiff paying all future rents and additional rents in the timely manner and filing an undertaking in accordance with CPLR §6312, in the amount of \$100,000.00.

The defendant had moved for summary judgment. The plaintiff cross-moved for summary judgment.

The defendant claimed that the plaintiff had failed “to complete certain improvements and additions to the premises” and failed to obtain “final sign offs and approvals for work performed” and based on the plaintiff’s “commencement of the instant action.”

The plaintiff countered that there has been no finding that plaintiff is in breach or default of the lease, “there was no time limit in the lease agreement in which plaintiff was to complete the work on the premise and close the open permits, and that there were no damages caused to defendant to which the undertaking in this action would apply.”

The plaintiff also argued that the defendant is not entitled to recover attorneys’ fees, since there is “no basis for awarding defendant any damages on the non-legal fee invoices, and that the bond should be vacated and the action dismissed.” The plaintiff had asserted, *inter alia* that “delays in obtaining requisite ‘sign offs’ on the work were caused by (defendant’s) refusal to execute required documentation, and that plaintiff engaged in litigation to obtain an injunction in response to defendant’s notice the cure.”

The lease provided that “[t]enant, at its own cost and expense, shall obtain all permits, certificates, licenses and approvals, necessary to legally occupy the Demise Premises, or any part thereof, and to operate the business contemplated and the equipment used therefore from the municipal or other governmental authorities and Tenant, at its own cost and expense, shall perform any work, labor or service and furnish all necessary materials necessary or required in order for Tenant to obtain the foregoing and to comply with the same, and Tenant shall hold Landlord harmless from any and every liability for same. All alterations, additions and improvements made by Tenant shall be made in such a manner that they shall be legal installations in accordance with all laws, regulations, conditions, and ordinances of all federal, state, county and

municipal governments and appropriate departments, commissions, boards and offices thereof.”

After the court granted a Yellowstone injunction “permitting plaintiff time to cure any alleged default or failure to adhere to the lease terms,” the plaintiff had obtained “sign offs” for the work at the premises.

The court found that based upon the evidence, “taking into account the lease provisions, plaintiff has sufficiently demonstrated that it is not in default of the terms of the lease agreement.” The court stated that the defendant had “failed to point to sufficient evidence to raise a triable issue of fact” and therefore, the court granted the plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment.

The court explained that the “purpose of posting of an undertaking as a condition to the granting of a Yellowstone injunction is to provide insurance to a defendant should it suffer damages during the time said injunction is in force....” Since the court held that the plaintiff was not in breach or default of the lease, and “there has been no sufficient showing of damages resulting from an erroneous grant of the Yellowstone injunction in this matter,” the court held that the “injunction and the undertaking posted in the form of a bond in the amount of \$100,000.00 are, hereby, vacated.”

The defendant alleged that the lease entitled them to recover such fees, costs and expenses. The court reviewed the lease language and found that the “language is ambiguous as to attorneys’ fees, costs and expenses that arise out of an action brought by a party to the agreement.”

Thus, the court held that the defendant “failed to satisfy its prima facie burden of demonstrating that it is entitled to recover attorneys’ fees and costs under the agreement.” The court noted that “in addition to the issues raised by the ambiguities in the contract..., defendant failed to make a sufficient showing based upon admissible evidence that the ‘additional expenses’ were incurred as a result of the acts and/or omissions of plaintiff that would entitle defendant to recover same under the terms of the lease agreement.” Accordingly, the court held that the defendant was not entitled to summary judgment with respect to its claim for reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs. The court further noted that “despite the court’s determination on the complaint, defendant’s counterclaim survives.”

Comment: Generally, when parties negotiate leases that contemplate construction, alterations and related government permits, parties should consider consulting with contractors and land use experts prior to signing the lease.

Several cases have addressed commercial landlord-tenant disputes involving *inter alia*, unforeseen delays or other problems in obtaining required construction/alteration permits and/or problems with the actual construction.

Disputes in landlord-tenant construction related disputes have included, *inter alia*, claims for breach of contract, breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, rescission based on mutual mistake, fraud in the inducement and latent defects.

NNH Markets Corp. v. 31-18 24th Avenue LLC, Supreme Court, Queens County, Case No. 719555/2022. Decided April 1, 2025. Calorus, J.

The “Realty Law Digest” is a Law Journal feature designed for practitioners in real-property law. Written by Scott E. Mollen and published each Wednesday, it digests significant decisions in the field.

Roberts

« Continued from page 2

judicial conference in Puerto Rico in early May, she criticized the “the relentless attacks and disregard and disparagement” of judges.

“The threats and the harassment are attacks on our democracy—on our system of government,” Jackson added. “And they ultimately risk undermining our Constitution and the rule of law.”

During Monday’s event at Georgetown, Roberts identified the changing technology as the biggest shift over the course of his two decades on the nation’s highest court and singled out artificial intelligence as a potential revolutionary innovation in the field of law.

“I don’t know what the impact on all of you is going to be,” Roberts told an audience of Georgetown’s graduating law class. “I’m glad I’m not starting out right now because I don’t think I would be very good at it.”

Appointed to the court in 2005 by President George W. Bush,

Roberts had long been among its more conservative members. In more recent years, however, he has found himself pushed toward the ideological middle of the court as a result of Trump’s appointment of three conservative justices during his first term.

Still, Roberts has played a key role in some of the biggest conservative legal victories of recent years, from reining in the power of federal agencies to ending the practice of affirmative action in higher education. And crucially, Roberts wrote the court’s majority opinion in *Trump v. U.S.* last July that established broad immunity for former presidents from criminal prosecution.

Roberts began airing some of his concerns with the current rhetoric surrounding judicial legitimacy a month before Trump took office for the second time. Writing in December, Roberts stressed that calls from public officials to defy courts “must be soundly rejected.”

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

Population

« Continued from page 5

have started to return to pre-COVID levels, said CBC.

Those who do leave the city typically stay in the region, heading to suburbs on Long Island and Westchester as well as to nearby states including New Jersey, Connecticut and Pennsylvania. People who move further are typically going to Florida, California and Texas, according to the report.

“The people leaving New York City may be choosing a place offering them a higher value proposition through a better mix of quality of life and cost of living,” said CBC. “Notably, Florida and Texas have lower taxes. While New Jersey and the rest of New York State have relatively high taxes—even if lower than New York City—they apparently offer amenities making the choice to leave worth it for some.”

CBC said the net loss of working- and middle-class residents is likely due to affordability issues and the challenges of raising a family in the city. High taxes may be pushing higher-income households, which pay a disproportionate amount of state and city taxes, to move away, said the report.

Population

« Continued from page 5

pace, said Placer.ai. This could reflect the dampening effect of rising mortgage interest rates as well as the increased push for employees to return to the office. South Carolina and Idaho were slightly surpassed by North Dakota, where modest waves of newcomers make a big impact on the state’s smaller population base. The state offers affordable housing and a strong job market and benefits from the emerging presence of Microsoft and Amazon near Fargo.

Meanwhile, several states that struggled with outflow in the past—including Michigan, Minnesota, Virginia, Ohio and Oregon—began showing minor positive inflow during the year. Placer.ai said that came as home affordability erodes in pandemic-era hot spots like the Mountain states and the Sun Belt, these areas may emerge as new destinations for Americans seeking a lower cost of living.

Residents leaving California and New York tend to settle in nearby

states or in Florida, the study found. Among those leaving New York, 21% moved to New Jersey, 9% to Pennsylvania and 7% to Connecticut. Nearly 30% went to Florida. Those who left California also stayed nearby, with 11.5% moving to Nevada and 9% moving to Arizona. However, 19% moved to Texas and 8% moved to Florida.

In general, CBSA-level data also revealed a balancing domestic migration pattern, with cities that experienced notable outflows flattening considerably and those with strong positive net migration registering flat in-migration since the beginning of 2024. Miami, however, experienced substantial out-migration despite Florida’s status as a domestic migration magnet. Miami, the state’s most expensive housing market, lost 2.6% of its population to domestic net migration between 2020 and 2024 and another 1% between 2024 and 2025.

Of the ten largest CBSAs nationwide, only Phoenix continued to see a net domestic migration gain through 2024, highlighting its continued draw as a relocation hotspot.

Off the Front

Legal Services

Continued from page 1
million will be used for a purpose directly related to the fund, and so the state could decide to reassign as much as \$120 million for a purpose unrelated to public defense.

Domenick Napoletano, president of the New York State Bar Association, issued a statement that said the bar is "outraged by the sweep of \$120 million for Indigent Legal Services to the State's General Fund in this year's final budget at a time when the ability of all New Yorkers to access justice is being placed under enormous stress.

"The maintenance and expansion of this program," the bar leader added, "is vital for those seeking access to justice in our state, and in turn is critical to NYSBA's mission. This transfer would negatively impact the quality of public defense in New York State and would simultaneously deprive rural upstate, as well as New York City, of sorely needed funding to support the quality public defense services for New Yorkers who cannot afford to retain an attorney. This action also sends a signal to our municipalities and public defense

providers that the state may not live up to its commitment to funding constitutionally and statutorily mandated quality public defense."

In 2024-25, Gov. Kathy Hochul's budget, with approval by both legislative houses, had similarly allowed the state Division of Budget to tap into the ILS Fund. But it declined to do so. That year, the state had braced for a fiscal crisis, but it was averted in part by tax receipts coming in higher than anticipated.

The Division of Budget had solely transferred \$80.1 million from the fund to pay for increases to 18-B assigned counsel attorneys—a clear purpose related to public defense.

The state Office of Indigent Legal Services is already at odds with the Trump administration's targeting of diversity, equity and inclusion programs.

In the ILS's recently published annual report, it makes a number of references to the government's pushback of DEI initiatives, and it maintains that the state won't be responsive or chilled in its efforts to promote DEI—as the agency said it believes DEI is crucial to public defense.

Meanwhile, the state budget grants the Office of Indigent Legal Services an additional \$5.5 million in Aid to Localities funding, to target needs of Family Court litigants.

Under Executive laws 832 and 832, ILS staff is to propose a plan

for allocating that funding through its board of directors, which is chaired by Chief Judge Rowan Wilson. The proposal is on its June 13 board meeting.

Wilson has been a staunch supporter of public defense. In a May 2024 Court of Appeals case captioned People v. Watkins, which concerned the effectiveness of a defense attorney in an assault case, Wilson wrote a lengthy separate opinion about defendants deserving "better than bare constitutional sufficiency."

"New York's system of indigent defense is not set up to provide high-quality representation," the chief judge wrote.

"For decades we have been walking a due process tightrope, providing such minimal support for indigent defense that the question is not whether defense counsel has put on the best possible case for a client, but whether the representation was so deficient as to require the trial be redone," Wilson added.

"From the criminal leave applications and cases I have considered," the chief judge concluded, "my impression is that the larger criminal defense providers have navigated their constitutional responsibilities through a system of triage, and the smaller or independent providers have simply struggled."

Brian Lee can be reached at blee@alm.com. X: @bleereporter

NYC Jails

Continued from page 1
dy and Ward filed against the city over brutality in its jails.

A settlement and consent decree were brokered in 2015, which included the appointment of a federal monitor. But conditions in city jails have gradually worsened in the years since, the judge said. So far this year, five people have died at Rikers or shortly after being released from the facility.

"As the record in this case demonstrates, the current rates of use of force, stabbings and slashings, fights, assaults on staff, and in-custody deaths remain extraordinarily high, and there has been no substantial reduction in the risk of harm currently facing those who live and work in the Rikers Island jails," Swain wrote.

Swain did not name a receiver and gave the parties an Aug. 29 to submit up to four names.

The judge's order comes after more than a year and a half of litigation over the plaintiffs' latest

motion for New York City's jails to be placed under control of a court-appointed receiver.

"This decision confirms what we have long argued: transformative change in the City's jails can only occur under the leadership of an independent authority, unbound by the bureaucratic and political forces that have stifled progress for decades," Emery Celli and Legal Aid said in a joint statement. "The receiver will have the authority to implement long-overdue reforms, cut through the Department of Correction's entrenched mismanagement, and finally bring relief to those who continue to endure daily, inhumane treatment."

The U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York, which has been an intervenor in Nunez for most of the case, also filed in support of appointing a receiver in the case.

"Rikers is not working, for its over 7,000 people in custody, the correction officers and staff who work there, or the people of New York," Interim Southern District

U.S. Attorney Jay Clayton said in a statement issued after Swain's ruling. "The Constitutional rights of people in custody are not being protected."

Swain's order constitutes a blow to Mayor Eric Adams' administration, which has resisted motions to place the city's jails under federal receivership.

Speaking to reporters "off topic" at Tuesday news conference at City Hall, Adams said problems with containing violence at Rikers predate his administration and that it has made recent progress in reducing stabbings, assaults and use of force by correction officers.

"We have made a great deal of inroads on Rikers Island. We're going to continue to do so," Adams said. But if the federal judge decides that someone else—we're going to pay millions of dollars, of taxpayers' dollars...I don't have control over that. We're going to follow whatever the federal judge states we must do."

Andrew Denney can be reached at adenney@alm.com. X: @messagetime

Combs

Continued from page 1
"The News Organizations recognize that the videos are sensitive and that some or all of the alleged victims or other participants in the Freak Offs may have meaningful privacy interests," Balin wrote. "But given the central role that the videos may play in the determination of Mr. Combs' guilt or innocence in this case, those privacy interests cannot overcome the public's powerful First Amendment interest in monitoring the judicial process."

"The News Organizations should be permitted to view the videos for themselves and describe their contents to the public," the letter stated.

Should the judge decide to seal the courtroom, Balin asked that pool reporters be present in the room to communicate details to others.

Doug Wigdor, a lawyer for key prosecution witness Cassandra "Cassie" Ventura, opposed the request.

"The News Organizations do not cite any case, and nor are we aware of any authority, granting

this unprecedented request in a sex trafficking case to unseal videos depicting coercive sex acts," Wigdor wrote. "Making the sexually explicit Sealed Videos public will effectively punish Ms. Ventura for testifying and re-traumatize her as the public will watch her abuse when she was at her most vulnerable."

He said his client's privacy interests outweigh the presumptive right to access. Allowing the public to view the videos would also violate Ventura's right under the Crime Victims' Rights Act, he said.

Subramanian directed the parties to brief the matter more thoroughly prior to the start of testimony on Tuesday.

In testimony, Ventura told jurors she met Combs around 2006 after signing with his record label, Bad Boy Records. She was approximately 19 years old, she said.

The two were in an on-again, off-again relationship for over a decade.

Ventura told jurors that Combs eventually took over all aspects of her life, keeping tabs on her, paying her rent, and telling her what to wear.

During the time she was with

him, Ventura said she recorded nine albums. None of those were released.

Ventura said the freak offs, the longest of which lasted for four days, took up all her time. She was expected to be awake the entire time, she said, and took drugs like MDMA and cocaine to continue. She frequently vomited.

"Plainly, the 'Freak Offs' became a job where there was no space to do anything else but to recover and just try to feel normal again," she said.

The singer testified quietly. Heavily pregnant, she took pauses and frequently sighed heavily. Sometimes she cried.

"His eyes would go black," she said when asked to describe an enraged Combs. "The version of him that I was in love with was no longer there."

Combs' defense team in opening statements told jurors that their client had committed domestic abuse and assault, but that did not make him a sex trafficker.

The trial is expected to last eight to 10 weeks.

Emily Saul can be reached at esaul@alm.com. X: @emily_saul_

Court Calendars

First Department

APPELLATE DIVISION CALENDAR FOR THE JUNE TERM WEDNESDAY, MAY 14

2 P.M.
23/6308 People v. Ryan Cruzado
25/1075 Martinez v. City of NY
24/7155 R., Olga v. Olga M.
24/3480 Real World v. 393 West Broadway
24/6199(2) Tahari v. Narkis
22/2716(1) People v. Ruddy Osias
24/3749 Patel v. Maybank Kim Eng Securities
24/6455 Gamma USA v. Pavarini McGovern LLC
19/916(2) People v. James Rackover
24/5726 McCann v. Ship Wrecked Bar
25/561 Island Consolidated v. Grassi & Co.
17/2055(1) People v. Brandon Viella
24/431 H. G., an Infant v. NYC Transit Authority
24/449N Valley National Bank v. 252 W. 31 St. Corp.

THURSDAY, MAY 15

2 P.M.
23/4332 People v. Jared McGowan
24/5290 2 Cap Investments v. Frog Investments
24/4581 S., Lulu v. Rahmel H.
24/403 Promenade Nelson Apts v. NYS Division Housing
24/3024 Mevram Services v. Quadrum Hospitality
22/4348 People v. Juan Cordero
24/1830 Cuzzo v. Broome Property
24/3765 Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's v. Itzhak Nissanoff Inc.
23/5321 People v. Eric Daniel
24/4343 Staff v. Luen Nam Realty
24/4546 Prete v. JJ Hoyt LLC
25/217 JJJ Productions v. Amazon.com
20/2165 People v. Donald O'Toole
24/7606N Bykovtseva v. DTH Capital

TUESDAY, MAY 20

2 P.M.
22/5282 People v. Christopher Walls
24/1743(3) U.S. Bank v. Chait
24/2868 A.M., Children Department
24/1245 Stallard v. NYC Police Department
24/5495 Miracle NY Properties v. Naylor 18
23/5124 People v. Kirby Hiciano
24/1788(2) Singer v. De Blasio
20/2475 People v. Kevin Davis
24/5160 268 W. 12th Owners Corp. v. Kunst
25/1377 Ross v. Onegeivity Throne Health Tech
23/4046 People v. Chaquona Wood
24/3461 People v. Lazareth P.
24/3474N Reyes v. City of NY
25/907N Metropolitan Partners v. Nerney

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21

2 P.M.
23/3142 People v. Anthony Stokes
24/1121 Tucker v. All Metro Home Care
24/6625 B., Kevin v. Tanisha H.
25/666 HSBC Bank v. Amponsah
24/3461 Yang v. Knights Genesis
19/5317 People v. Pierre Maycock
24/3971 Berrones v. 130 E. 18 Owners
24/5695 People v. Jonathan Hernandez
25/830 Ceratosaurus Investors v. B2C Alternative Equity
24/5643 Perez v. Norman's Cay Group
22/5018 People v. Jonathan Cedeno
23/1003 People v. Mariannella Diaz
24/4777N Roberts v. City of NY
23/4703N PanWest NCA2 v. Rockland NCA2

THURSDAY, MAY 22

2 P.M.
24/449 People v. Devin Webbert
23/1164 Stuyvesant Town v. NYS Division Housing
24/6655 M., Damineh v. Bedouin J.
24/2426 Weatherspoon v. Mazal Ubracha 101
19/5413 People v. Hector Hernandez
24/4837 Board of Managers v. Miller
24/5100 Daniello v. J.T. Magen & Company
23/4282 People v. Sergio Celleri
24/19212 People v. Damien Bell
24/6572(2) One River Run v. Milde
25/744 Olympic Galleria Co. v. Sitt
24/1069 People v. Adam Rivera
25/682N Rosario v. Hallen Construction
24/6500N Prospect Capital v. Morgan Lewis

TUESDAY, MAY 27

2 P.M.
23/1713 People v. Kamal Dockery
24/3382 Szymczyk v. Hudson 36
25/5411 M., Children
24/2742N avarro v. Joy Construction
21/633 People v. Sophia Fearing
24/4463 Rubin v. Sabharwal
24/3348(2) Spin Capital v. Golden Foothill Insurance
23/2079 People v. Sean Bryan
20/2147 People v. Pedro Vega
24/3450 Felton v. St. Joseph Hospital
24/1168 Providence Construction v. Silverite Construction
23/629 People v. Dominick Tarazona
24/5204(3)N Slabakis v. Poyiadjis
24/5721N Associated Industries v. Farahnik

WEDNESDAY, MAY 28

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

THURSDAY, MAY 29

2 P.M.
22/5759 People v. Lisandro Cabrera
23/6379 Abrams v. Abrams
24/6705 M., J'Quan v. Zhonvel B.
24/2301 Hasan v. Macerich Company
23/5980 People v. Rockeem M.
24/6749 Cooper v. Arbor Realty Trust
23/6001 Goon v. Grand Central Partnership
19/2033 People v. Akram Joudeh
23/4355 McCoy v. Lovosky
24/5780 American Infertility of NY v. Kushnir
23/3936 People v. Kareem Lowndes
24/5061N Spin, Inc. v. ASMF Holdings
24/7800(3)N AT&T Mobility v. Grupo Salinas

TUESDAY, JUNE 3

2 P.M.
23/3918 People v. Daniel Citalan
23/4993(2) 600 Associates v. Illinois Union Insurance
24/589 P., Juan v. Wendy R.
24/2304(1) Engley v. 639 Jefferson Place
24/6083(1) Engley v. City of NY
24/1734 People v. Jaiden Dechabert
24/7029(6) Ametek, Inc. v. Goldfarb
25/1066 Board of Managers v. 45 East 22nd St.
24/7033 L.S., Children
22/3375 People v. Charles Kenyatta
22/2774 People v. Anthony Messina
24/1568 Tavaréz v. 920 E. 173rd St.
24/5442N Passantino v. City of NY

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 4

2 P.M.
22/2808 People v. Kayjon Yizar
24/5395 Badesch v. Fort 710 Associates
24/4865 S., Jodeci v. Sheila M.
23/3927(1) Zhang v. Chu
24/3273(1) Zhang v. Chu
24/514 People v. Sterling Stewart
24/1108 Pereira v. 509 W 34th
24/7534 Kohler v. West End 84 Units
24/2207 Cedeno v. Bollyky
24/741(1) People v. Jelfer Dominguez
23/6133(1) People v. Jelfer Dominguez
24/3196 Robles-Lopez v. E.S.H. Family Corp.
25/1321N Stafford v. A&E Real Estate
24/3247(2)N Board of Managers v. World-Wide Holdings

THURSDAY, JUNE 5

2 P.M.
20/2149 People v. Nicholas Wallace
17/2821 Etrade Bank v. DelValle
23/2411 U., Cheryl v. Heath U.
18/3965 People v. Eric Keaton
20/569 People v. Jevon Eddy
24/5315 State Division Human Rights v. C & A Central
23/5737(1) J Carey Smith v. 11 West 12 Realty
24/7901 Board of Managers v. Park Associates
23/1348 People v. Rigoberto Deleon
23/914(2) Alcan Harbor v. Assurant Group
22/2458 People v. Sonia Taylor
25/569N Ghatk v. McKinsey & Company
25/1060N 1240 El Grant Highway v. 120 Edward Grant

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

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14

10 A.M.
65033020 AT&T Mobility v. Grupo Salinas
65585221 Interebar Fabricators v. C.B. Contracting Corp.
65501823 Handl NY v. Identity Group
65635220 260 Mott Realty v. Eli Halili LLC

2 P.M.

65928724 PV 1508 CIA v. Singer
65003220 Colliers International v. City Hall Communs LLC

FRIDAY, MAY 16

9:30 A.M.
65354824 Board of Managers v. Malcolm Shabazz Development

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21

10 A.M.
65031424 Exceptional Media v. Chainalysis, Inc.

10:30 A.M.

81274821 Martinez v. Perez

THURSDAY, MAY 22

10 A.M.
65340923 Davidoff Hatcher & Citron LLP v. McLendon

2:30 P.M.

20181/20 Harris v. NY University
80882122 Brevard v. NYSANDY4 NBP15

WEDNESDAY, MAY 28

10 A.M.
65417622 BankUnited v. Gray-Line

THURSDAY, MAY 29

11:45 A.M.
2975520 Santana v. Concordia Pharmacy

FRIDAY, MAY 30

1 P.M.
65288023 Abramson Law Group v. Rosenberg

TUESDAY, JUNE 3

10 A.M.
9153/19 Anderson v. Anderson

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 4

10 A.M.
652901/24 Rego Park Lender v. Golyan

FRIDAY, JUNE 20

10 A.M.
81394621 Liu v. Consolidated Scaffolding Inc.

TUESDAY, JUNE 24

10 A.M.
952142/23 Bowman v. Cosby

APPELLATE TERM 60 Centre Street Room 401 10 A.M.

The following cases are on for argument:

The following cases are on for submission. No appearance is necessary.

New York County

SUPREME COURT

Ex-Parte Motion Part And Special Term Part

Ex-Parte Motions Room 315, 9:30 A.M.

Special Term Proceedings Unsafe Buildings Bellevue Psychiatric Center Kirby Psychiatric Center Metropolitan Hospital Manhattan Psychiatric Center Bellevue Hospital

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

IAS PARTS

1 Silvera: 300 (60 Centre)
2 Sattler, J.: 212 (60 Centre)
3 Cohen, J.: 208 (60 Centre)
4 Kim: 308 (80 Centre)
5 Kingo: 320 (80 Centre)
6 King: 351 (60 Centre)
7 Lebovits: 345 (60 Centre)
8 Kotler: 278 (80 Centre)
9 Waterman-Marshall: 355 (60 Centre)
11 Frank: 412 (60 Centre)
12 Stroth: 328 (80 Centre)
13 Silvera: 300 (60 Centre)
14 Schumacher 304 (71 Thomas)
14 Bluth: 432 (60 Centre)
15 Johnson: 116 (60 Centre)
17 Hagler: 335 (60 Centre)
18 Tisch: 104 (71 Thomas)
19 Sokoloff: 540 (60 Centre)
20 Kaplan: 422 (60 Centre)
21 Tsai: 280 (80 Centre)
22 Lysne: 136 (80 Centre)
23 Schumacher 304 (71 Thomas)
24 Katz: 325 (60 Centre)
25 Tingling: 1254 (111 Centre)
26 Perry, P.: 684 (111 Centre)
27 Dominguez: 289 (80 Centre)
28 Tingling: 543 (60 Centre)
29 Ramirez: 311 (71 Thomas)
30 McMahon: Virtual (60 Centre)
32 Kahn: 1127B (111 Centre)
33 Rosado: 442 (60 Centre)
34 Ramsey: 341 (60 Centre)
35 Perry-Bond: 684 (111 Centre)
36 Saunders: 205 (71 Thomas)
37 Engoron: 418 (60 Centre)
38 Nock: 1166 (111 Centre)
39 Clynes: 307 (80 Centre)
41 Moyné: 327 (80 Centre)
42 Morales-Minera: 574 (111 Centre)
43 Reed: 222 (60 Centre)
44 Peardman: 321 (60 Centre)
46 Patel: 428 (60 Centre)
46 Latin: 210 (71 Thomas)
47 Getz: 1021 (111 Centre)
48 Motta: 242 (60 Centre)
49 Chan: 252 (60 Centre)
50 Sweeting: 279 (80 Centre)
51 Schies: 543 (60 Centre)
52 Johnson: 307 (80 Centre)
53 Borrok: 238 (60 Centre)
54 Schechter: 228 (60 Centre)
55 d'Aughte: 103 (71 Thomas)
56 Kelly: 204 (71 Thomas)
57 Kraus: 218 (60 Centre)
58 Cohen, D.: 305 (71 Thomas)
60 Crane: 248 (60 Centre)
61 Bannon: 232 (60 Centre)
59 James, D.: 331 (60 Centre)
62 Sweeting: 279 (80 Centre)

MPPKahn: 1127B (111 Centre)
MMSJP-1: 1127B (111 Centre)
IDV Dawson: 1604 (100 Centre)

PART 40TR

JUDICIAL MEDIATION

On Rotating Schedule Adams 300 (60 Centre)

EARLY SETTLEMENT

ESC 1 Vigilante 106(80 Centre)
ESC 2 Wilkenfield 106 (80 Centre)

SPECIAL REFEREES 60 Centre Street

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

JHO/SPECIAL REFEREES 80 Centre Street

81R Hewitt: Room 321
87R Burke: Room 238
89R Hoahng: Room 236

SPECIAL REFEREE 71 Thomas Street

Judicial Hearing Officers

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

SUPREME COURT Motion Calendars Room 130, 9:30 A.M. 60 Centre Street

SUPREME COURT Motion Dispositions from Room 130 60 Centre Street

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

Motion Calendar Key:

- ADJ—Adjourned to date indicated in Submission Courtroom (Room 130).
ARG—Scheduled for argument for date and part indicated.
SUB (PT #)—Motion was submitted to part noted.
WDN—Motion was withdrawn on calendar call.
SUB/DEF—Motion was submitted on default to part indicated.
APB (All Papers By)—This motion is adjourned to Room 119 on date indicated, only for submission of papers.
SUBM 3—Adjourned to date indicated in Submission Court Room (Room 130) for affirmation or so ordered stipulation.
S—Stipulation.
C—Consent.
C MOTION—Adjourned to Commercial Motion Part Calendar.
FINAL—Adjournment date is final

60 CENTRE STREET

Submissions Part WEDNESDAY, MAY 14

Submission
1 10041725 Hans-Gaston v. State of NY Office of Temporary And Disability Assistance

THURSDAY, MAY 15

Submission
1 100938/23 Backer v. Parsons
2 10040925 Durand v. NYC Dept. of Health And Mental Hygiene
3 100093/25 Henry-Watt v. Sutphin Supreme Court
4 11016/24 Pierre v. Catholic Charities Community Services
5 100184/25 Ramos v. NYC Dept. of Health And Mental Hygiene

Paperless Judge Part WEDNESDAY, MAY 14

161911/23 360 East 72nd St. Owners Inc. v. Epstein
653894/2485 First A.V. LLC v. A&T Fish And Chips LLC D/b/a The Chippery Et Al
653024/2392 Grove Rly. v. Mickle
453251/21A., S. v. NYC Et Al
453019/24Abrams Fensterman v. To Quash Subpoena
656674/20 Acp Dental Group v. Made in Bklyn. Designs, Inc. Et Al
155591/13 Adams v. Electrolux Home Prods., Inc.
153201/24Advance Service Group v. Harvest Global Services Inc. Et Al
155126/25 Agir Electrical v. Constrafix Inc. Et Al
159312/20 Ahmad v. NYC Et Al
651846/24 Alphasense, Inc. Et Al v. Financial Tech. Partners Lp Et Al
652855/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Chenoa
653040/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Darwin Hanao Et Al

152000/25 Davidoff Hatcher & Citron Llp v. Attal
 150899/24 Delgado v. Dynamic Installation Corp. Et Al
 805325/23 Diane Davenport As Guardian of The Person And Prop. of Evelyn Ledyard v. Lumbaro Md
 154623/24 Domen Hldg. Co. v. Sanders
 150852/22 Eisenberg v. Amazon Logistics, Inc. Et Al
 152958/24 Elliott v. Grappelli
 156939/16 Emitt v. B'way. 371
 650339/25 Engle Power & Gas LLC v. Argo Real Estate LLC Et Al
 156511/21 Enright v. B'way. Palace Theater Co. Et Al
 659875/24 Fab Beauty LLC v. 22 E 14 LLC Et Al
 150359/25 Feigen v. Hamill
 652265/23 First Funds v. Wright
 162153/24 Gates v. USA Guided Tours NY LLC
 659116/24 Gill v. Kore.Ai, Inc. Et Al
 656356/22 Grogden Diamonds Inc. v. Quantum Jewelry LLC
 151431/25 Gonzalez v. Redmond, Inc.
 153638/23 Goodall v. Cheong
 156852/20 Gray v. Smbc Capital Markets, Inc.
 805184/17 Green v. Harlem Hosp. Center
 850005/25 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Cosme
 850004/25 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Fox
 850496/24 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Gallagher
 850006/25 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Harrison
 850492/24 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Hills
 850008/25 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Johnson
 154036/23 Irviss v. NYCTA Et Al
 151764/23 Jackson v. 111 Wall Fee Hldgs. LLC
 156965/24 Jacob Feinberg Katz & Michaeli Consulting Group v. Bazaruto
 952187/23 Jane Doe #1 v. William Burke
 158402/19 Jones v. American Air Liquide Inc.
 850327/24 Jpmorgan Chase Bank v. Little
 654124/24 Kapin v. 284-5 Apt. Inc.
 155538/20 Kerr v. New Girl Scouts, Inc.
 190027/22 Ketterer v. Amchem Prod., Inc., N/A Rhone Poulenc Ag Co., N/A Bayer CropScience Inc. Et Al
 153810/24 King v. Hellman Const. Co., Inc. Et Al
 152560/25 Koste v. Alexander
 157373/20 Kotung v. Leung Chung How Rly. Corp.
 950697/21 Kryhoski v. The NY And Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al
 190127/23 Linde v. Charles B. Chrystal Co., Inc Et Al
 151756/25 Lynch v. Victoria's Secret Stores
 805372/20 M. v. Hosp. For Special Surgery
 159258/22 Mauraasaca-Pallchisaca v. Global 1845 B'way. LLC Et Al
 153842/25 McClain v. NYC Et Al
 154745/20 Mendez v. 550 Washington Owner (de) LLC
 656146/19 Merchant Factors Corp. v. Crush Apparel & Accessories
 153887/23 Meth v. Nordstrom, Inc.
 156387/16 Morocho v. 450 Partners LLC
 193602/21 Newfield v. 940 8th Ave. LLC Et Al
 654533/24 Objective, Inc. v. Semper Capital Mgt.
 155556/18 Pace Univ. v. American Family Home
 156851/24 Padilla v. Marriott Int'l, Inc. Et Al
 157632/22 Pausas - Flores v. 301 East 87th St. Owners, Inc. Et Al
 805284/22 Petrillo v. Su Md
 152434/25 Poff v. Pierce
 155689/17 Polisnelli v. Riverside Center Parcel 2
 451181/25 Port Auth. of NY & New Jersey v. Quin
 153447/20 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart v. Avra Surgical Robotics, Inc.
 151799/21 Ramirez v. 880 B'way. Owner LLC Et Al
 151174/25 Riordan v. 67 Park Ave. Owner's Corp. Et Al
 365074/25 Rofsky v. Rofsky
 151285/20 Rorky v. Carmel Richmond Nursing
 154660/24 Roth & Roth v. NYCTA Et Al
 950107/19 Schlenz v. Dominican Friars Province of
 600951/18 Schnur v. Balestriere
 652547/25 Sherer v. Aegis Capital Corp.
 159114/22 Siama v. NYCTA Et Al
 650460/25 Sirmans v. Td Bank
 153399/23 Smith v. 121 Chambers St. LLC Et Al
 650067/25 State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. v. Bakradze
 153502/25 Stein v. Gelfond
 655832/20 Steiner v. Kemperle
 161860/23 Td Bank v. Law Office of Jack W. Chung
 154232/25 Teuber v. Oxio Corp Et Al
 151476/24 The Board of Mgrs. of St. James's Tower Condominium v. Kemio Corp. Et Al
 151461/24 The Board of Mgrs. of St. James's Tower Condominium v. Sio Properties
 453815/24 NYC Et Al v. Katz
 453816/24 NYC Et Al v. Kuznetsov
 155987/23 Torres v. NY Univ. Et Al
 157537/22 Torres v. NYC Dept. of Education Et Al
 650744/23 Ubs Securities LLC Et Al v. Dondero
 650976/25 Unique Logistics Int'l (NYC) v. Steptoe Llp F/a/a/ Steptoe & Johnson Llp Et Al
 659528/24 United Nations World Tower II Llc v. Petrosyants
 652119/25 Unitedx Corp. v. Gofundadvnce LLC D/b/a Gofund Advance A/a/a Go Fund Advance LLC
 158214/24 Urzua v. NYC Et Al
 659521/24 USA Medlog, Inc. v. NYC Et Al
 850173/22 Valley Nat. Bank v. 152 Sherman Hldg. Lp Et Al
 450027/25 Varianna Reid v. Mta Bus Co. Et Al
 155963/16 Verteille v. Goldman Sachs Headquarters LLC
 154699/25 Wang v. NYC Dept. of Health And Mental Hygiene
 650142/24 Wells Fargo Bank v. 681 Fifth Ave. LLC Et Al
 654201/23 Whitestone Plaza Associates, Inc. Et Al v. Seneca Ins. Co. Et Al

THURSDAY, MAY 15

158725/21 178 East 70th St. LLC v. Levy
 651249/2418 First Ave. Associates v. Koga
 656547/2025 West 26th St., Inc. v. Claudia G. Andrei
 650331/25290 Grand LLC v. The Granddaddy LLC Et Al
 656522/23 Pw Public Relations LLC v. V Wholesalers LLC
 650195/25875 Third Ave. v. Lrb Tenant LLC Et Al
 650919/25 Abm Indus. Groups v. Zamir Equities
 158491/24 Adler v. NYC Et Al
 652472/24 Aerogon LLC Et Al v. Tapests Hldgs, Inc. Et Al
 152473/18 Aguilari v. Home Builders 1 L.P.
 158341/23 Alvarez Alfaro v. Selig Sacks Et Al
 150134/21 Alves v. Brookfield Properties
 650333/25 American Express Nat. Bank v. Regal Wings, Inc.
 160262/21 Amsterco 67 v. The Barbers on Amsterdam Corp Et Al
 650574/25 Arporan v. Delshah Mgt. LLC Et Al

150758/25 Auffray v. Columbia Univ. in NYC Et Al
 151269/22 Barreto v. Dessalines
 190083/25 Black v. Coty Inc., Sued Individually And For Its Subsidiary Rimmel Inc. And/or Rimmel Int'l Ltd Et Al
 152784/23 Board of Mgrs. of St. Charles Condominium II v. Annessa Degraffenreid
 150619/23 Boerke v. Nucor Const. Corp. Et Al
 151871/17 Bokman v. Manhattan Motor Cars Inc.
 155707/22 Borja v. NYC Et Al
 653750/24 Braze, Inc. v. Quidd, Inc.
 160888/18 Burger v. Food Emporium Inc.
 153083/23 Butta v. Striano Electric, Inc. Et Al
 159136/21 Cabrera v. Jpmorgan Chase Bank
 654334/24 Calif 2021-Rtl1 Issuer v. Perlmutter
 158554/24 Cavalry Spv I v. Bradshaw
 151797/22 Chanos v. Tarter
 158399/22 Cheick Konate And Awa Konate As Administrators of The Estates of Alistatsa Kante And Adiaratou Kourouma Et Al v. 1829-1835 7 LLC
 154151/25 Clarke v. Amtrust Ins. Et Al
 850443/24 Computershare Trust Co. v. 21-23 Catherine St Cc LLC Et Al
 161093/19 Curr v. Saks Fifth Ave.
 150713/24 Daniel Szalkiewicz & Associates v. Liu
 157073/24 Danube Logistics USA Inc. v. Chic Home Design LLC
 654296/21 David & Suzanne Kuperhand, Inc. v. Dickson
 654233/24 Diane D'Angelo v. Kwoka
 653451/24 Digital Elements v. Live Wire Dev, Inc.
 155841/23 Douglas S. Walker Et Al v. East W. Brian
 451272/25 Drummond v. The NYCHA
 650033/23 Dunphy v. Giuliani
 161350/23 Edwards v. Blondies Treehouse, Inc. Et Al
 150868/25 Ehrenberg v. Ehrenberg
 650717/24 Enhance Encore Hldgs. LLC v. Powerback Rehabilitation
 655108/24 Essentia Ins. Co. v. James
 161123/15 Evart v. Terzi
 650849/25 Fahy v. Sabre Corp. (sabre Gbl Inc.) Et Al
 154188/23 Flores v. Ibraim
 154146/25 Foxwood Rly. LLC v. NYS Div. of Housing And Community Renewal Et Al
 162478/19 Frolova v. Miller
 850003/16 Fym Millbrook LLC v. Weinberg
 154863/23 Garcia v. NYCTA Et Al
 150036/23 Garcia v. Blvd Bistro 116th St. LLC Et Al
 653892/24 Gemini Residential LLC v. Lapushner
 161132/22 Gil v. Gvs Properties II
 161432/24 Greater NY Mutual Ins. Co. As Subrogee of 116 East 66th St. Corp. v. Sg Renovation Inc. Et Al
 159317/24 Guerrero v. NYC Et Al
 154519/23 H. v. Monclera Children's School Et Al
 652532/14 Harriet Tubman Gardens v. H.T. Dev. Corp.
 153225/22 Hereford Ins. Co. v. 21st Century Chiropractic Care Et Al
 158935/24 Hereford Ins. Co. v. Momoti
 850479/24 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Casale
 850010/25 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Johnson
 850020/25 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Niethamer
 850498/24 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Russell R. Webber
 850480/24 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Toksdorf
 154010/22 Housing Rights Initiative v. Corcoran Group LLC Et Al
 156957/24 Individually And As Mother And Natural Guardian of L.B. v. Brussels Equities Hldg. Ltd. Partnership Et Al
 653910/24 Ink Real Estate Partners, Inc. v. Goncharov
 651469/18 J.G. Jewlry Pte. Ld. v. Tje Jewlry, Inc.
 162004/18 Janiak v. Holliswood 32 LLC Co
 158156/24 Johnson v. Beth Israel Medical Center Et Al
 160345/24 Kaczor v. L'industrie Pizza Ip Holdco
 151603/25 Law Offices of Joel B. Rudin v. NY County Dist. Attorney's Office
 157837/24 Leguillou v. Community Housing Innovations
 650309/24 Linda Ramone, Individually, As A Trustee of The Linda Cummings-Ramone Living Trust And Survivor Trust, And Derivatively on Behalf of Ramones Prod.,ions, Inc. v. Frey
 152373/20 Lopez v. 13-17 Laight NY LLC
 155372/20 Luckey v. Bass Cab Corp. Et Al
 654297/24 M. Hiday & Co., Inc. v. Waterfront Promotional Merchandising LLC Et Al
 805012/23 Maimangyang v. NYCH&HC Corp.
 155211/19 Manhattan Telecommunications v. Coburn & Meredith, Inc.
 156998/18 Martin v. Macy's Real Estate
 651314/25 Massachusetts Snf 4 v. Omega Venture Capitol
 160460/21 Mejia v. 280 West 155 Owner
 157438/17 Mendez v. 512-514 Rly. LLC
 651234/23 Midway Wind v. Siemens Gamesa Renewable Energy, Inc.
 154742/25 Millinery Center Synagogue v.
 650998/25 Montfort v. Leslie J. Garfield & Co., Inc.
 157401/22 Morales v. Rambles Real Estate
 154717/21 Morel Encarnacion v. Village Community School Et Al
 152166/25 Ostrager v. Lipsky
 161993/23 Oxea Group Corp. D/b/a Oxea Capital v. 1253 Pequena Fashion Corp. Et Al
 151618/25 Paribello v. Osaic, Inc. Et Al
 650981/23 Penn Hotel Senior Llc v. Chetrit
 450155/22 Perez v. Silva
 653806/24 Pinnacle Business Funding v. Aaron Carter Electric Inc Et Al
 157958/19 Plaza v. Clune Const. Co. Lp
 162748/15 Price v. Riverside Radio Dispatcher, Inc. Et Al
 154289/25 Quinan v. NYS Div. of Housing And Community Renewal Et Al
 652698/25 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan Llp v. Desktop Mgt. Inc.
 158363/23 Richardson v. Beal
 151237/23 Rocchio v. 116 2nd Ave. LLC Et Al
 150589/21 Salva v. Metro-North Commuter RR. Co. Et Al
 153222/23 Sarasota Dev. Co., LLC Et Al v. The Board of Mgrs. of The 58-60 Reade St. Condominium Et Al
 154090/21 Sawyer v. 1120 Fifth Ave. Corp. Et Al
 160095/18 Schnur v. Balestriere
 160992/20 Seltzer v. Steinberg
 655285/24 Shamayev v. Imola Const., Inc. Et Al
 652275/22 Sl 4000 Connecticut LLC Et Al v. Cbre, Inc.
 805355/24 Spadafora v. Rebagay M.D.
 805279/19 Sragow v. Jaffin
 160364/17 Steward v. 221 West 26th St. LLC Et Al

COURT NOTES

U.S DISTRICT COURT Southern District

Court Seeks Candidates For Criminal Justice Act Panel

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

U.S.COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

Court Seeks Applications for Federal Public Defender For the Northern District of New York Application Deadline is May 16

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

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

190325/23 Castelino v. Paramont Global, F/a/a Viacomcs Inc., F/a/a Cbs Corp., A Delaware Corp., F/a/a Viacom Inc., Successor-Bv-Merger To Cbs Corp., A Pennsylvania Corp., F/a/a Westinghouse Electric Corp. Et Al
 155077/20 Diaz v. Nagua Taxa Inc.
 162464/19 Estevez v. Zhang
 156598/18 Garcia v. Harry
 152890/18 Jimenez v. Baxter Cab Corp. Et Al
 152712/18 Kim v. Aziz
 156123/20 Lawson v. Wahub
 162255/19 Logo v. Isroilov
 160364/20 Mondoc-Green v. Optimist Taxi LLC Et Al
 160842/19 Moynihan v. Srivastava
 450651/20 Peterson v. Alfonsoeca Castillo
 159275/19 Rampersaud v. Dumanyan
 155960/19 Singh v. Vijay & Sharan Cab Corp.
 161059/21 Torres v. Mobasefa Transport, Inc. Et Al
 158820/19 Windley v. NYCTA

THURSDAY, MAY 15
 161751/19 C.N.O. v. NYCHA
 151926/24 Cruz v. NYCHA
 450862/18 Salodikaya v. NYCHA
 152795/23 Santiago v. NYCHA Et Al
 152035/24 Toledo v. NYCHA
 150493/24 Victorino v. NYCHA

Part 2
Justice Lori S. Sattler
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3852
Room 212

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
 653024/23 Grove Realty v. Mickle
 656674/20 Acp Dental Group v. Made in Bklyn. Designs, Inc. Et Al
 650974/16 Balou Entertainment Gmbh v. Encore Int'l Ltd
 651849/23 Jayaram Pllc v. Deejayzoo
 158276/16 Neighborhood Restore Housing v. Surti
 650815/22 Petrolawicz v. Ando Rly. LLC
 651698/23 Spence v. Brosnan Risk Consultants
 656592/20 Surratt Beauty v. Surratt Cosmetics

Motion
 651849/23 Jayaram Pllc v. Deejayzoo
 650815/22 Petrolawicz v. Ando Rly. LLC

256391/17140 Bw LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 264179/14 152 Franklin St. v. The Tax Comm.
 256593/16 Milton Boron v. The Tax Comm.
 260934/19 Pennbus Realities Llc v. The Tax Comm. of The
 204640/00 Return To Home v. Tax Comm.
 264924/17 Rtr Funding Group, Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 261435/18 Seeken 79 Rly. LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 655646/21 Studio 1872 Inc., D/b/a C'est Beau 1872 v. Bond St. Levy LLC Et Al
 266272/20 The 141 Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 251039/20 The Morgan Lofts Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 263863/21 44 W 37 LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 261428/18 440 Co. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 261428/18 482 P. Washington LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 264232/16 578 Ninth Ave. Associates v. The Tax Comm.
 261405/22 591 Rly. LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 260444/16 West 20th St. Tenants v. The Tax Comm.
 261304/187 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 261369/18 736 West 186 St. Owners Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 261214/19 Casts West 57 St. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 263271/17 Chadwin House Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 255347/17 Danielle Apt. Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 654296/21 David & Suzanne Kuperhand, Inc. v. Dickson
 264406/17 Fischer Mills Bldg. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 259920/20 Flagship 600 Owner LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 263110/18 Gracie Sq.-River Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 652532/14 Harriet Tubman Gardens v. H.T. Dev. Corp.
 254991/13 Heights Rly. Associates v. The Tax Comm.
 263196/17 John Caisimaidis v. The Tax Comm.
 253879/15 Kem Mgt. Corp. v. The Tax Comm.
 263934/17 Lde Properties v. The Tax Comm.
 263719/18 Macarthur Properties I LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC

266720/21 Metro. Times Square Associates v. The Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al
 256593/16 Milton Boron v. The Tax Comm.
 260934/19 Pennbus Realities Llc v. The Tax Comm. of The
 204640/00 Return To Home v. Tax Comm.
 264924/17 Rtr Funding Group, Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 261435/18 Seeken 79 Rly. LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 655646/21 Studio 1872 Inc., D/b/a C'est Beau 1872 v. Bond St. Levy LLC Et Al
 266272/20 The 141 Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 251039/20 The Morgan Lofts Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 263863/21 44 W 37 LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 261428/18 440 Co. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 261428/18 482 P. Washington LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 264232/16 578 Ninth Ave. Associates v. The Tax Comm.
 261405/22 591 Rly. LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 260444/16 West 20th St. Tenants v. The Tax Comm.
 261304/187 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 261369/18 736 West 186 St. Owners Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 261214/19 Casts West 57 St. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 263271/17 Chadwin House Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 255347/17 Danielle Apt. Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 654296/21 David & Suzanne Kuperhand, Inc. v. Dickson
 264406/17 Fischer Mills Bldg. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 259920/20 Flagship 600 Owner LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 263110/18 Gracie Sq.-River Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
 652532/14 Harriet Tubman Gardens v. H.T. Dev. Corp.
 254991/13 Heights Rly. Associates v. The Tax Comm.
 263196/17 John Caisimaidis v. The Tax Comm.
 253879/15 Kem Mgt. Corp. v. The Tax Comm.
 263934/17 Lde Properties v. The Tax Comm.
 263719/18 Macarthur Properties I LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC

655646/21 Studio 1872 Inc., D/b/a C'est Beau 1872 v. Bond St. Levy LLC Et Al
 153660/20 Sturt v. NYC
 652671/23 T&C Ip Consultants v. Poulin
 159956/20 Tajian v. NYC Et Al
 655838/23 Tandym Group v. Wright
 150622/24 Tapia v. 116 Convent Ave.
 659662/24 Tastings, Inc. v. Ignite Entertainment Group, Inc.
 654658/22 The Board of Mgrs. of The Paladin Condominium v. Dogramacayan
 152002/24 The Standard Fire Ins. Co. v. Cisneros
 155703/25 Torys Lp v.
 450663/25 Town of Hempstead Et Al v. Hochul
 659787/24 Trachten v. Wolowitz
 650597/23 Trincity Electric Inc. v. 244 E 52 Owner LLC Et Al
 150536/20 Trustees of Columbia v. Rael Automatic Sprinkler
 451628/20 Turchio v. Lacoste, USA Inc.
 850164/23 U.S. Bank Na v. Simpson
 151065/25 Urban Justice Center - Safety Net Project v. Wasow Park
 154813/24 Vargas v. NYC Et Al
 651626/25 Victoria A. LLC v. Lebbos
 158245/20 Wallace v. Uber Technologies, Inc. Et Al
 652564/25 Ward v. A.G.P/alliance Global Partners Et Al
 656507/22 Wgl Midstream Mp v. Meade Pipeline Investment
 154260/24 Whitesell v. John P. Picone, Inc.
 850030/22 Wilmington Trust v. 9th Ave Hotel Prop. Hldg. LLC Et Al
 454083/21 Wilson v. The Armyory Foundation Et Al
 950730/21 Wilson v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
 652422/23 Woiph Lender I LLC v. Regard Recovery LLC Et Al
 155084/17 Wright v. NYCHA
 159994/24 Wu v. Zilka
 154636/25 Xirouchakis v. Ladenburg Thalmann & Co. Inc.
 154565/25 Zang v. Savills, Inc. Et Al

E-Filing Submission Part
Adjourned for Working Copies Part
Part 1
Justice Adam Silvera
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3722
Room 300
WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
 152931/18 Black v. Alfonsocacastill

Motion
 654398/24 Cppib Credit Investments II Inc., Et Al v. Lions Gate Entertainment Corporation
 654398/24 Cppib Credit Investments II Inc., Et Al v. Lions Gate Entertainment Corp.
 653544/21 Tender Touch Health Care v. Truzez LLC

Part 6

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

THURSDAY, MAY 15

805247/24 Antigua v. Kim
 805112/22 Antonelli v. NY Presbyterian Weill Cornell Medical Center Et Al
 100938/23 Backer v. Parsons
 805366/23 Becker v. Yaffe M.D.
 805001/17 Beker v. Glasberg
 805402/21 Berg v. The NY And Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al
 159898/23 Bermudez v. NY Orthopedics Mgt. Partners
 805479/23 Bolan v. Jarnagin M.D.
 805386/23 Borchert v. Hillard M.D.
 153232/24 Cherry-Caldwell v. Kavalier M.D.
 805177/24 Cositore v. Sung M.D.
 805046/24 Ferenczi v. Grayson
 805343/23 Frances Kelly v. Gallina M.D.
 805161/19 Gagliotto v. Dronsky
 100983/22 George v. Mount Sinai
 805253/22 Ghehrarducci v. Struhl M.D.
 805238/20 Green v. Nishimura Md
 805004/24 Grossman v. Garrett M.D.
 805488/23 Harris Scarangella v. Kao M.D.
 805256/24 Hartzog v. De Souza M.D.
 805285/24 Jordan v. Feuerstein M.D.
 805290/20 Judith Suncar As v. Hernandez
 805188/17 Khaimov v. Washington Heights Imaging
 805044/24 Khan v. NYU Langone Hosps.
 805117/24 Kiebowaska v. Mahjoubi Dmd
 805209/22 Kuperman v. Schwab M.D.
 805251/24 Lee Sam v. Boettner M.D
 453288/23 Lee v. Sarasohn M.D.
 805055/24 Lopez v. Tsai Md
 805012/23 Maimangyang v. NYCH&HC Corp.
 805007/21 Marfaat v. Taranow
 805293/23 McCallion v. NY Presbyterian Hosp.
 805294/18 McGoewn v. Korban
 805296/22 Morris v. NYU Langone Hosp. Et Al
 805111/24 Mosquera Alvarez v. Lenox Hill Hosp. Et Al
 805203/20 Opuoru v. Brill
 805257/22 Pradhan v. Nirmal Tejwani
 805364/20 Reinfeldt v. Redstone
 805270/24 Salley v. Kim
 805317/18 Santos v. Mount Sinai Hosps. Group
 805412/21 Sigro v. Adams M.D.
 805168/20 Solovitchik v. Schusterman M.D.
 805143/24 Sosa v. Cantillo Md
 805355/24 Spadafora v. Rebagay M.D.
 805131/22 Taylor v. Moisa-Babii M.D.
 805289/23 Watson v. Unis M.D.
 805184/21 Winkler v. Short M.D.
 159988/23 Yim v. Maestre D.D.S.

Part 7

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14

651489/25 1313 Prop. LLC Et Al v. Dotan
 650944/1830 Grove St. v. Silvering Interiors
 159562/24 Abernathy v. Simmons
 113846/06 Atlantic Mutual Ins. v. Greater N.Y. Mutual Ins.

Court Calendars

THURSDAY, MAY 15
365015/19Milanese v. Milanese
32584/23Pena v. Pichardo Dominguez

Part 17
Justice Shlomo S. Hagler
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3283
Courtroom 335

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
650426/182480 Grand Concourse Fitness v. Wagner Associates LLC
157353/17Engineered Devices Corp. v. Mdb Dev. Corp.
154745/20 Mendez v. 550 Washington Owner (de) LLC

THURSDAY, MAY 15
151871/17 Bokman v. Manhattan Motor Cars Inc.
154146/25 Foxwood Rlty. LLC v. NYS Div. of Housing And Community Renewal Et Al
952053/23 Perednia v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al

154289/25 Quinan v. NYS Div. of Housing And Community Renewal Et Al
150589/21 Salva v. Metro-North Commuter RR. Co. Et Al
150536/20 Trustees of Columbia v. Rael Automatic Sprinkler
160740/21 Zubi v. Hendrickson

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, MAY 14
307507/14 Furman v. Furman—10:30 A.M.

Part 24
Matrimonial Part
Justice Michael L. Katz
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3285
Courtroom 325

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
365395/24 Amrani v. Amrani—11:30 A.M.
301211/17 Borse v. Roy
365560/23 Buckley v. Beck
365704/23 Camilo v. Krypel—9:30 A.M.
32001/22 Franklin v. Gessesse—11 A.M.

365279/24 Lin v. Zhang—9:30 A.M.
365279/24 Lin v. Zhang
365615/23 McCartney v. McCartney
322007/22 Mendez v. Rodriguez
365544/23 Patel v. Chainani—11 A.M.

301878/23 Rodriguez Diaz v. Carvajal—9:30 A.M.
301054/20 Romano v. Romano—10 A.M.
320731/23 Sharma v. Sharma—11 A.M.

365492/22 Voorham v. Hicks-Voorham—10 A.M.
365264/21 Yablou v. Yablou

Motion
301211/17 Borse v. Roy
365279/24 Lin v. Zhang
365615/23 McCartney v. McCartney
322007/22 Mendez v. Rodriguez
365264/21 Yablou v. Yablou

THURSDAY, MAY 15
350006/20 Ader v. Ader—9:30 A.M.
365102/24 Margolies v. Margolies—2 P.M.
365125/24 Santos v. Brown
311287/19 Silvers v. Silvers

Motion
311287/19 Silvers v. Silvers

Part 26
Justice Ta-Tanisha D. James
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-4462
Room 438

THURSDAY, MAY 15
365148/21 Panos v. Panos
306738/19 Park v. Butkow

Part 28
Justice Aija Tingling
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-4372
Room 543

Part 30V
Justice Judith N. McMahon
60 Centre Street
646-386-3275

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
805226/20 De Cicco v. Tornambe
805372/20M v. Hosp. For Special Surgery
451063/25 Mahamadou Sissoho v. Bavaro M.D.
805277/19 Sharma v. Adler

THURSDAY, MAY 15
157477/24 Stumacher v. Medical Liability Mutual Ins. Co. Et Al

Part 33
Justice Mary V. Rosado
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3894
Room 442

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
805061/24 Alice Patton v. Famous Original Rays Pizza 3 Et Al
652855/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Azena
158098/24 Azar v. West 44th Hotel
156334/24 Berkley Ins. Co. A/s/o Theodore Wong v. High Line Const. Group LLC Et Al
160953/22 Bethea v. NYCHA
154999/20 Bierman v. Macys Corporate Services, Inc.
651336/25 Castro v. McS Sales & Service LLC Et Al
158387/22 Cold Spring Advisory Group v. Nat. Securities Corp. Et Al

155130/23 Doumeng v. Rockview Apt. Corp. Et Al
150631/24 Garcia v. The Port Auth. of NY And New Jersey Et Al
151960/24 Hoefling v. Long Island RR.
157876/22 James v. One East River Pl. Rty. Co. II
155818/22 Kaminski v. Arno Ristorante Et Al
158376/22 Kozhukhar v. Gramercy Park Residence Corp. Et Al
162295/23 Landivar v. Catherine-Worth
152660/24 Lewis v. Museum of Arts And Design
152027/22 Lopez v. 196 Willoughby Owner Et Al
162347/23 Lozano Granda v. Suffolk Const. Co., Inc. Et Al
155638/23 Martinez Rodriguez v. New Rochelle Tower Owner LLC Et Al

159258/22 Maurasaca-Pallichisaca v. Global 1845 B Way. LLC Et Al
160470/21 O'Connor v. Fourth Wall Restaurants
156537/21 Opperman v. Stellar Mgt., Inc. Et Al
161105/20 Ortega v. Ab Stable LLC
453283/23 Ovalle Quezada v. 202-4 West 23 St. Corp. D/b/a Chelsea Savoy Hotel Et Al
100321/24 Pesce v. Lapidus
451181/25 Port Auth. of NY & New Jersey, Llc
160011/21 Rizk v. 215 West 28th St. Prop. Owner LLC Et Al
151776/22 Samaniego v. Havesmeyer Owner LLC Et Al
156608/22 Sarmiento Barrera v. One Hudson Park, Inc. Et Al
157777/23 Scarr Pizza v. Hofmann Esq.
156781/24 Sierra v. 860 Fifth Ave. Corp.

161425/18 Sottile v. NYC
157560/22 Traore v. West Side Mbw 201
150144/22 Treles Astudillo v. Unity Const. Group
157330/22 Uguuari Gonzalez v. Suffolk Const. Co., Inc. Et Al
151554/24 Watt v. Bp Prods. North America Inc. Et Al
150884/24 Weintraub v. Siga
154952/20 Yegin v. NYC Bike Share

Motion
151960/24 Hoefling v. Long Island RR.
162295/23 Landivar v. Catherine-Worth
152027/22 Lopez v. 196 Willoughby Owner Et Al
160470/21 O'Connor v. Fourth Wall Restaurants
156781/24 Sierra v. 860 Fifth Ave. Corp.
161425/18 Sottile v. NYC

THURSDAY, MAY 15
155707/22 Borja v. NYC Et Al
151132/22 Gil v. Gvs Properties II
153225/22 Hereford Ins. Co. v. 21st Century Chiropractic Care Et Al
653833/19 Dewitt Rehabilitation And v. Bradley
452352/20 Acquafredda v. NYCTA
160365/20 Escobedo v. Circle Line Sightseeing
150042/11 F.A.M. Capital v. Capital Link Atm
150260/20 Falik v. NYC
805253/19 Fanok v. Moghaddam
155290/15 Francisco Rosario v. Gentry Tenants Co-Op
159244/16 Garcia v. Park Ave Group Equities LLC Et Al
805371/20 Gordon v. De La Cruz
161227/15 Grullon v. Lisa Mgt., Inc.
805020/18H v. Silverstein
155691/19 Howard v. NYC Work Support
805150/21 Huntley v. NYCH&HC And
154784/21 Infante v. Gross
452301/18 James v. NYCTA
152946/20 Kelly v. Solow Bldg. Co. II
154086/19 Lewis v. NYC
150159/18 Linares v. Massachusetts Mutual Life
161338/14 Linda Moore v. East 77th St. Rty. LLC.
651734/19 Lizardo O'S Inc. v. Baha Lounge Corp.
805233/21 Mackey v. Chaudhri M.D.
157882/19 Maxwell v. NYC
151034/20 Manamany v. NYC
805094/18 Meckes v. Choudhri
650625/20 Merchant Factors Corp. v. Biju Int'l
805370/19 Miltello v. Figgie
152167/20 Mills v. Polanco
102977/11 Molina v. NYC
150954/23 Munoz v. NYC Et Al
154015/20 Nicolini v. Rivera
805178/22 Occhiogrossi v. Poon M.D.
157261/18 Ocean Prime LLC v. Morfit
159507/19 Padro-Soler v. 166 East 96th St Owners Corp.
805221/20 Powers v. Arena
653299/20 Quisenberry v. Cleary Patterson
158497/17 Ricardo Estrada Berg-Martinez v. Flaming Saddles NYC #1
805308/17 Richardson v. Garely
805064/21 Rossillo v. United Medical Associates
157514/21 Smith Jr. v. Jane St. Hosp. Lty. Partners LLC Et Al
805018/18 Song v. Marn
805279/19 Sragow v. Jaffin
159879/22 Sunnarl v. Motivate LLC Et Al
451890/19 Torres v. NYCTA
805111/16 Townson v. NYCH&HC And
805340/19 Trinidad v. Rock
157330/21 Reynolds v. Cpg Norfolk Senior Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al
156741/19 Waldovsky v. 15 Hudson Yards Condominium
805412/20 Westmoreland v. Badani
151163/21 Yash v. NYC
654758/19 Yasha Ramen Corp. v. 940 Amsterdam Corp.
155624/19 Yates v. 132 W. 125 Co., LLC
154429/17 Young v. P.S. 71 Associates LLC

Part 34
Justice Dakota D. Ramseur
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-4370
Room 341

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
952362/23 Doe v. Wiley
158734/23 Latin v. Perberger
651484/18 Nat. Funding, Inc. v. Straightline Capital Inc.
153447/20 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart v. Avra Surgical Robotics, Inc.

Motion
952362/23 Doe v. Wiley
158734/23 Latin v. Perberger

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
805184/17 Green v. Harlem Hosp. Center
653960/24 Sdayeb v. Kung
653623/24 Shanghai Pearls & Gems, Inc. D/b/a Ultimate Diamond Co Et Al v. Sdayeb

Motion
653960/24 Sdayeb v. Kung
653623/24 Shanghai Pearls & Gems, Inc. D/b/a Ultimate Diamond Co Et Al v. Sdayeb

THURSDAY, MAY 15
157374/24 Age 1 LLC v. Gwb 179 Rty. LLC Et Al
805320/23 Ahmed v. NYC
NYCH&HC Corp. Et Al
805087/23 Cheng v. NYC NYCH&HC Corp. Et Al
452621/20 Franco v. NYCH&HC And
161851/23 Gunther v. 37-39 West 8 Associates L.P.
159041/22 McNamara v. Cosmic Rty. Partners LLC Et Al
152788/15 Mishkin v. Andrea
157401/22 Morales v. Rambles Real Estate
653535/22 Mt. Hawley Ins. Co. v. Pathforward Consulting, Inc.
450181/21 Ocasio v. NYCH&HC Corp. Et Al
805038/23 Reyes v. Ding M.D.
805134/22 Robinson v. Lakoff M.D.
805306/24 Swaby v. NYC NYCH&HC Corp. Et Al
805298/21 Szymanski v. NYCH&HC Corp. Et Al
450653/25 Town of Hempstead Et Al v. Hochul
651063/23 Uddin v. Abdin

Motion
159041/22 McNamara v. Cosmic Rty. Partners LLC Et Al

Part 43
Justice Robert R. Reed
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3238
Room 222

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
651263/25 Agir Electrical v. Constraf Inc. Et Al
656146/19 Merchant Factors Corp. v. Crush Apparel & Accessories

THURSDAY, MAY 15
652500/19 Fred Mermelstein v. Waspit Group, Inc.
651096/21 Gilbane Residential Const. LLC v. Allied World Ins. Co. Et Al
654614/20 Leane v. Mishcon De Reya Llp
650981/25 Penn Hotel Senior LLC v. Chetrit
655197/24 Rosset Family Legacy Hlths. LLC v. Oakes
657677/19 Tatro v. Amadei
850030/22 Wilmington Trust v. 9th Ave Hotel Prop. Hldg. LLC Et Al
652769/18 Wimbledon Financing Master v. Hallac

Motion
654614/20 Leane v. Mishcon De Reya Llp

Part 40TR
Judicial Mediation
Justice Suzanne J. Adams
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3722
Room 300

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
151743/137-11 East 13th St. v. New School
155884/18 Chapin v. 1818 Nadlan LLC
160631/17 Dunchek v. Tonys Di Napoli Restaurant
651146/18 Eizenstein & Co Inc v. Global Trading LLC
805291/18 Goldstein v. Berenbaum
805088/19 James v. NY Presbyterian Hosp.
152466/22 Joachimczyk v. 72 Wall St. Condominium
156827/23 Kamdar v. Leah Christina Morrison Et Al
653630/20 Kaplan v. Tritt
161340/20 Lagoa v. Hashmat Mgt. Corp.
152425/20 Leonardo v. 211 LLC
155505/20 Marakowitz v. Doe
158506/16 Martinez v. 1380 Housing Dev.
654409/17 Mastiha Corp D/b/a Stage v. 30th St. & 9th Ave.
151136/14 McMahon v. Cobblesstone Lofs
157112/20 Muhammad v. 102 W 107th St. Garage
156701/18 Nadella v. 353-357 B'way. LLC
153078/17 Nancy Bloosstein v. 87th St. Sherry Associates LLC
158035/19 Nathan v. Kane & Moss
151469/21 Nat. Union Fire v. Maitland
157044/21 Petruso v. 185 B'way. Owner LLC Et Al
159330/19 Polanco v. 7 Days Towing Inc
157814/19 Raskin v. Related Mgt.
653913/18 Redhead Builders LLC D/b/a 5. Aran World Inc.
150464/19 Rodriguez v. Fawn East Fourth Llc
805222/18 Sec v. Yoe
152505/21 State Farm Fire And Casualty Co. v. Quinones
150343/19 Torres v. NYCHA
160906/19 Tsounis v. Henegan Const. Co., Inc.
161081/18 Valentzas v. 685 First Rty. Co. LLC

161425/18 Sottile v. NYC
157560/22 Traore v. West Side Mbw 201
150144/22 Treles Astudillo v. Unity Const. Group
157330/22 Uguuari Gonzalez v. Suffolk Const. Co., Inc. Et Al
151554/24 Watt v. Bp Prods. North America Inc. Et Al
150884/24 Weintraub v. Siga
154952/20 Yegin v. NYC Bike Share

Motion
151960/24 Hoefling v. Long Island RR.
162295/23 Landivar v. Catherine-Worth
152027/22 Lopez v. 196 Willoughby Owner Et Al
160470/21 O'Connor v. Fourth Wall Restaurants
156781/24 Sierra v. 860 Fifth Ave. Corp.
161425/18 Sottile v. NYC

THURSDAY, MAY 15
154233/19A v. NYC Et Al
805311/21 Acquafredda v. Frelinghuysen
805240/19 Allakhverdijeva v. Tomasula
156787/18 Andres-Valdez v. 1818 Nadlan LLC
156952/21 Barrientos v. Club Deportivo Dominicano, Inc. Et Al
155653/14 Bravo v. NYC
151506/23 Cohn v. Vogel
653833/19 Dewitt Rehabilitation And v. Bradley
452352/20 Acquafredda v. NYCTA
160365/20 Escobedo v. Circle Line Sightseeing
150042/11 F.A.M. Capital v. Capital Link Atm
150260/20 Falik v. NYC
805253/19 Fanok v. Moghaddam
155290/15 Francisco Rosario v. Gentry Tenants Co-Op
159244/16 Garcia v. Park Ave Group Equities LLC Et Al
805371/20 Gordon v. De La Cruz
161227/15 Grullon v. Lisa Mgt., Inc.
805020/18H v. Silverstein
155691/19 Howard v. NYC Work Support
805150/21 Huntley v. NYCH&HC And
154784/21 Infante v. Gross
452301/18 James v. NYCTA
152946/20 Kelly v. Solow Bldg. Co. II
154086/19 Lewis v. NYC
150159/18 Linares v. Massachusetts Mutual Life
161338/14 Linda Moore v. East 77th St. Rty. LLC.
651734/19 Lizardo O'S Inc. v. Baha Lounge Corp.
805233/21 Mackey v. Chaudhri M.D.
157882/19 Maxwell v. NYC
151034/20 Manamany v. NYC
805094/18 Meckes v. Choudhri
650625/20 Merchant Factors Corp. v. Biju Int'l
805370/19 Miltello v. Figgie
152167/20 Mills v. Polanco
102977/11 Molina v. NYC
150954/23 Munoz v. NYC Et Al
154015/20 Nicolini v. Rivera
805178/22 Occhiogrossi v. Poon M.D.
157261/18 Ocean Prime LLC v. Morfit
159507/19 Padro-Soler v. 166 East 96th St Owners Corp.
805221/20 Powers v. Arena
653299/20 Quisenberry v. Cleary Patterson
158497/17 Ricardo Estrada Berg-Martinez v. Flaming Saddles NYC #1
805308/17 Richardson v. Garely
805064/21 Rossillo v. United Medical Associates
157514/21 Smith Jr. v. Jane St. Hosp. Lty. Partners LLC Et Al
805018/18 Song v. Marn
805279/19 Sragow v. Jaffin
159879/22 Sunnarl v. Motivate LLC Et Al
451890/19 Torres v. NYCTA
805111/16 Townson v. NYCH&HC And
805340/19 Trinidad v. Rock
157330/21 Reynolds v. Cpg Norfolk Senior Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al
156741/19 Waldovsky v. 15 Hudson Yards Condominium
805412/20 Westmoreland v. Badani
151163/21 Yash v. NYC
654758/19 Yasha Ramen Corp. v. 940 Amsterdam Corp.
155624/19 Yates v. 132 W. 125 Co., LLC
154429/17 Young v. P.S. 71 Associates LLC

Part 49
Commercial Div.
Justice Margaret A. Chan
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-4033
Room 252

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
653993/23 Axx C21 LLC Et Al v. Wf Blue LLC Et Al
653387/19 Cassaforite Ltd. v. Johnson
652376/16 Eurotour v. Latour
155402/17 Koutsouthanas v. 22579 Owners Corp.
657183/20 Metsch Rty. Co. LLC v. 792 Restaurant Food Corp.
653775/22 Newage Garden Grove v. Wells Fargo Bank
654164/23 Ordeola v. Townhouse Builders Inc. D/b/a Promont Et Al
653527/22 Ragab v. Shr Capital Partners LLC Et Al
654755/24 Riley v. McEvey
653999/23 William J. Moroney v. Cardinale

THURSDAY, MAY 15
652698/25 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan Llp v. Desktop Metal, Inc.
Part 53
Commercial Div.
Justice Andrew S. Borrok
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3304
Room 238

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
651078/23 Flexjet v. Honeywell Int'l Inc.
THURSDAY, MAY 15
650374/23 Gilbert v. Winston
159160/22 Global Tech Industries Group, Inc., Et Al v. Sls Group
653775/23 Prosignt Specialty Mgt. Co., Inc. Et Al v. Altruus Group
654196/21 Seaton v. Babad
659878/24 Trachten v. Wolowitz
652422/23 Whp Lender I LLC v. Regard Recovery LLC Et Al
Motion
653775/23 Prosignt Specialty Mgt. Co., Inc. Et Al v. Altruus Group

Part 54
Commercial Div.
Justice Jennifer G. Schecter
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3362
Room 228

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
653222/23 Big Real Estate Capital v. Abs Mgt. & Dev. Corp. Et Al
652015/20 Myron J. Berman v. Cohen
650142/24 Wells Fargo Bank v. 681 Fifth Ave. LLC Et Al

THURSDAY, MAY 15
650367/24 Fora Financial Advance v. 4 Pillar Consulting
656226/23 Gerasymenko v. Symbion Power Services U.S., Inc. Et Al
651241/25 King Contracting Group NY Inc. v. Bober
650309/24 Linda Ramone, Individually, As A Trustee of The Linda Cummings-Ramone Living Trust And Survivor Trust, And Derivatively on Behalf of Ramones Prods., Inc. v. Frey
654144/18 McCarter & English v. Nat. Collegiate
651241/25 King Contracting Group NY Inc. v. Bober
654144/18 McCarter & English v. Nat. Collegiate

Part 57
Justice Sabrina Kraus
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-636-3195
Room 218

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
452291/20 Brown v. NYCHA
950494/21 Chien v. Chien
950882/21 R. v. Congregation Kehilath Jeshurun
950343/21 S. v. NYC
950107/19 Schlenz v. Dominican Friars Province of

THURSDAY, MAY 15
950275/21 G. v. NYC
950052/20K. v. Archdiocese of NY
159777/19 Metro. Prop. And v. Sebo Laundry Systems Inc
160364/17 Steward v. 221 West 26th St.
950730/21 Wilson v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al

Part 59
Justice Debra A. James
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3351
Room 331

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
850011/13938 St. Nicholas Ave. v. 936-938 Clifcrest Housing
158270/22Ac Prestige Corp. v. Cross Lake Partners Lp Et Al
150852/22 Eisenberg v. Amazon Logistics, Inc. Et Al
151764/23 Jackson v. 111 Wall Fee Hlths. LLC
651396/16 Kumar v. Neves
654927/19 Robins v. Wenn Ltd
153939/23 Smith v. 121 Chambers St. LLC Et Al
152119/23 Wilson v. 153 Rivington LLC Et Al

Motion
850011/13938 St. Nicholas Ave. v. 936-938 Clifcrest Housing
158270/22Ac Prestige Corp. v. Cross Lake Partners Lp Et Al
150852/22 Eisenberg v. Amazon Logistics, Inc. Et Al
151764/23 Jackson v. 111 Wall Fee Hlths. LLC
651396/16 Kumar v. Neves
654927/19 Robins v. Wenn Ltd
153939/23 Smith v. 121 Chambers St. LLC Et Al
152119/23 Wilson v. 153 Rivington LLC Et Al

Part 60
Commercial Div.
Justice Anar Rathod Patel
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3632
Room 428

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
651846/24 Alphasense, Inc. Et Al v. Financial Tech. Partners Lp Et Al
655662/24 Benchmark Plus Institutional Partners v. Sacchetti
THURSDAY, MAY 15
652472/24 Aerogen LLC Et Al v. Tapjets Hlths. Inc. Et Al
654233/24 Diane D'Angelo v. Kwoka
654297/24M. Hiday & Co., Inc. v. Waterfront Promotional Merchandising LLC Et Al

Part 45
Commercial Div.
Justice Andrea Masley
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3265
Room 242

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
650986/25 Castle Placement v. Forex Express Corp. Et Al
653538/24 Dow Jones & Co., Inc. v. Cision Us Inc
652890/14 Universal Investment v. Bakrie Telecom Pte
THURSDAY, MAY 15
659691/24 Egan Tax And Books Ltd. Et Al v. Dsj Advisory Group
652933/23 Egerton Capital Corp. V. Wh Nagop G LLC
653395/24 Kasselakis v. Tiptree, Inc. Et Al
653029/23 Wh Nagop G LLC v. Weiss

Motion
653395/24 Kasselakis v. Tiptree, Inc. Et Al

Part 5
City Part
Justice Hasa A. Kingo
80 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3374
Room 320

Part 5
City Part
Justice Nancy M. Bannon
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3169
Room 232

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
154232/23 Teuber v. Oxio Corp Et Al

THURSDAY, MAY 15
654974/2246e82 Investment LLC v. Atlas Union Corp. Et Al
653815/20 Atlas Union Corp. v. Bradley
656423/21 Ayres Argentina Master Fund Ltd. v. Tgtl S.A.
650549/24 Gelman v. Gelman
651234/23 Midway Wind v. Siemens Gamesa Renewable Energy, Inc.
652436/24 Processa Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Eliion Oncology, Inc.
650048/23 Riverdale Jewish Center Et Al v. The Bklyn. Union Gas Co. Et Al
653273/24 Thielmann v. Iss Ex, Inc.
656507/22 Wgl Midstream Mp v. Meade Pipeline Investment

Transit Authority
Settlement Part
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3281
Room 408

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
452471/21 Ramdass v. The NYCTA Et Al

80 CENTRE STREET
Part 4
Justice Judy H. Kim
80 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3580
Room 308

190001/17 Capodicasa v. Amchem Prods., Inc.
190336/17 Joann Serrani v. Aereo Int'l, Inc.
190222/16 Pappacoda v. A.O. Smith Water Prods.
190015/20 Smith v. Amchem Prods., Inc.
190049/20 Tracy v. Amchem Prods., Inc.
190026/21 Van Dett v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co Et Al
190180/21 Zullo v. Aereo Int'l

Part 18
Justice Alexander M. Tisch
71 Thomas Street
Phone 646-386-3472
Room 104

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
153815/22 Campbell v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al
452298/24 In The Matter of The Application of NYS - Unified Court System v. Court Officers Benevolent Assoc. of Nassau County Et Al
950697/21 Kryhoski v. The NY And Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al

Motion
452298/24 In The Matter of The Application of NYS - Unified Court System v. Court Officers Benevolent Assoc. of Nassau County Et Al

THURSDAY, MAY 15
85003/16 Fym Millbrook LLC v. Weinberg

Part 23
Justice Eric Schumacher
71 Thomas Street
Phone 646-386-3736
Courtroom 304

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
190153/22 Cerone v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co Et Al
190359/18 Deacon v. Amchem Prods., Inc.
190455/18 Farruggio v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co.
190344/18 Grytten v. Air & Liquid Systems
190380/18 Jane E. Wisted v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co.
190152/18 Jennings v. Amchem Prods., Inc.
190027/22 Ketterer v. Amchem Prods., Inc. N/A/Rhone Poulenc Ag Co. N/A/Bayer Cropscience Inc. Et Al
190127/23 Linde v. Charles B. Chrystal Co., Inc Et Al
190106/18 Moore v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co.
190470/18 Paiz v. Amchem Prods., Inc.
190144/18 Servedio v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co

THURSDAY, MAY 15
190083/25 Black v. Coty Inc., Sued Individually And For Its Subsidiary Rimmel Inc. And/or Rimmel Int'l Ltd Et Al
190001/17 Capodicasa v. Amchem Prods., Inc.
190336/17 Joann Serrani v. Aereo Int'l, Inc.
190222/16 Pappacoda v. A.O. Smith Water Prods.
190015/20 Smith v. Amchem Prods., Inc.
190049/20 Tracy v. Amchem Prods., Inc.
190026/21 Van Dett v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co Et Al
190180/21 Zullo v. Aereo Int'l

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
150825/23 Balcarcel v. West Fourteenth Kitchen LLC
160828/22 Chiguano-Chaluisa v. Brend Restoracion LLC Et Al
156993/23 Chow v. Ritter
158328/23 Cornack v. Pavarini McGovern
158061/23 Gilman v. Aspen Knolls Estates Home Owners Assoc., Inc. Et Al
150731/23 Guzman v. Staples Inc. Et Al

159877/19 Hattva v. Zbs Group Llp
153949/22 Jarquin v. NY Developers & Mgt. LLC Et Al
159798/23 Kerr v. Verizon New York, Inc. Et Al
157438/24 Kiley v. 9 Crosby Mezz
153231/23 Kleman v. One East River Pl. Rty. Co. II
154388/23 Leon Riano v. Trustees of Columbia Univ. in NYC Et Al
153948/23 Margarita v. Aron Rly. Hldgs., Inc. Et Al
156371/20 Mauray Rly. Co. v. Advantage Wholesale Supply
15574/23 Morales Mendoza v. Eo 160 Water LLC Et Al
153142/23 Nguyen v. Block & Associates

152776/20 Pasquini v. T.D. Bank
152164/23 Pazmino Urgiles v. Joy Const. Corp. Et Al
157437/20 Rivera v. Quadrum 38
155205/23 Rosales v. Paragon Jv Prop III LLC Et Al
156418/19 Shared Equities Co., LLC v. Bolanos
157625/23 Vazquez v. American Girl Retail, Inc.
154282/23 Villalona v. 146th Apts. LLC Et Al
151705/23 Wampusrik v. 2995 Coney Island LLC Et Al

THURSDAY, MAY 15
154519/23 H. v. Montelare Children's School Et Al

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
152000/25 Davidoff Hutcher & Citron Llp v. Attal
651535/21 Kerschbaum v. 463 W. 57 St. Ownership Corp.
151292/17 Sarita v. West River Apts. Inc.
160095/18 Schnur v. Balestriere
158947/21 State Farm Fire And Casualty Co. A/s/o Ryan Warren Harvin v. Merchan
157382/20 Walter Sedovic Architect v. Peter Pennoyer Architect. P.C.

THURSDAY, MAY 15
160095/18 Schnur v. Balestriere

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
952187/23 Jane Doe #1 v. William Burke
653891/22 Lee v. I&N 2018 Inc. Et Al—3:30 P.M.
153887/23 Meth v. Nordstrom, Inc.
157632/22 Paucas - Flores v. 301 East 87th St. Owners, Inc. Et Al

THURSDAY, MAY 15
157606/19 Doe v. Lenox Hill Hosp.—10:30 A.M.
150036/23 Garcia v. Blvd Bistro 116th St. LLC Et Al
150468/23 Lilly v. Village Senior Services Corp. D/b/a Villagecaremax Et Al
160469/21 Mejia v. 280 West 155 Owner

Motion
150468/23 Lilly v. Village Senior Services Corp. D/b/a Villagecaremax Et Al

Part 55
Justice James D'Auguste
71 Thomas Street
Phone 646-386-3289
Room 103

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
155087/25 Anonymous v. Anonymous
153130/22 Barbizon 2007 Group Ltd Et Al v. The Board of Mgrs. of The Barbizon/63 Condominium Et Al
155172/25 Brown Rudnick Llp v. Xri Investment Hldgs.
155899/24 Castillo v. The Pierepont Bldg. Co. LLC Et Al
155196/25 Davis v. Northern Manor Services Group
159628/17 Green v. Bowery Presents LLC
150711/24 Guerrero v. NYC Et Al
100417/25 Hans-Gaston v. State of NY Office of Temporary And Disability Assistance
154879/24 Harnick v. Igel Cpa & Associates
150983/20 Harnick v. Ip Mortgage Borrower LLC
155141/24 Levinson v. Sixty East End Owners
153412/24 Liberman v. Aizer
151655/24 Liu v. Dominique Ansel Bakery Et Al
161050/19 Lugo v. NY Community Bank
155652/24 Melgarejo v. Simon
155613/16 Minter v. 569 Hudson LLC
654533/24 Objective, Inc. v. Semper Capital Mgt.
159681/24 Oriani v. Wolfgang's Steakhouse, Inc. Et Al
159043/23 Padilla-Ortiz v. Nat. Restoration Group, Inc. Et Al
151174/25 Riordan v. 67 Park Ave. Owner's Corp. Et Al
153590/23 Rodriguez v. Metro. Transportation Auth. Et Al
153732/20 Sadel v. Equinox Hldgs., Inc.
158434/23 Santacore De Tetta v. 312 W 144 Lp Et Al
652547/25 Sherer v. Aegis Capital Corp. Et Al
157269/22 Sjn Properties v. Board of Mgrs. of Saga House Condominium Et Al
451519/25 NYC v. The Land And Bldg. Known As 204 East 60th St.
656609/19 Woods Lonergan Plc v. Enslay

Motion
155087/25 Anonymous v. Anonymous
153130/22 Barbizon 2007 Group Ltd Et Al v. The Board of Mgrs. of The Barbizon/63 Condominium Et Al
155196/25 Davis v. Northern Manor Services Group
159628/17 Green v. Bowery Presents LLC
150711/24 Guerrero v. NYC Et Al
100417/25 Hans-Gaston v. State of NY Office of Temporary And Disability Assistance
154879/24 Harnick v. Igel Cpa & Associates
150983/20 Harnick v. Ip Mortgage Borrower LLC
155141/24 Levinson v. Sixty East End Owners
153412/24 Liberman v. Aizer
151655/24 Liu v. Dominique Ansel Bakery Et Al
161050/19 Lugo v. NY Community Bank
155652/24 Melgarejo v. Simon
155613/16 Minter v. 569 Hudson LLC
654533/24 Objective, Inc. v. Semper Capital Mgt.
159681/24 Oriani v. Wolfgang's Steakhouse, Inc. Et Al
159043/23 Padilla-Ortiz v. Nat. Restoration Group, Inc. Et Al
151174/25 Riordan v. 67 Park Ave. Owner's Corp. Et Al
153590/23 Rodriguez v. Metro. Transportation Auth. Et Al
153732/20 Sadel v. Equinox Hldgs., Inc.
158434/23 Santacore De Tetta v. 312 W 144 Lp Et Al
652547/25 Sherer v. Aegis Capital Corp. Et Al
157269/22 Sjn Properties v. Board of Mgrs. of Saga House Condominium Et Al
451519/25 NYC v. The Land And Bldg. Known As 204 East 60th St.
656609/19 Woods Lonergan Plc v. Enslay

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
156943/23 Bldg Mgt. Co., Inc. v. Peterside
154623/24 Domen Hldg. Co. v. Sanders
162153/24 Gates v. USA Guided Tours Nys LLC
659116/24 Gill v. Kore.Ai, Inc. Et Al
153842/25 McClain v. NYC Et Al
652358/22 Paulson v. Paulson
655959/24 Schonberger v. Snyder
154971/25 Sternklar v. 601 West End Tenants' Corp.
659521/24 USA Medlog, Inc. v. NYC Et Al

Motion
155087/25 Anonymous v. Anonymous
153130/22 Barbizon 2007 Group Ltd Et Al v. The Board of Mgrs. of The Barbizon/63 Condominium Et Al
155196/25 Davis v. Northern Manor Services Group
159628/17 Green v. Bowery Presents LLC
150711/24 Guerrero v. NYC Et Al
100417/25 Hans-Gaston v. State of NY Office of Temporary And Disability Assistance
154879/24 Harnick v. Igel Cpa & Associates
155141/24 Levinson v. Sixty East End Owners
153412/24 Liberman v. Aizer
159681/24 Oriani v. Wolfgang's Steakhouse, Inc. Et Al
153732/20 Sadel v. Equinox Hldgs., Inc.
451519/25 NYC v. The Land And Bldg. Known As 204 East 60th St.
THURSDAY, MAY 15
650919/25 Abm Industry Groups v. Zamir Equities
152473/18 Aguilar v. Home Builders 1 L.P.
650333/25 American Express Nat. Bank v. Real Wings, Inc.
150619/23 Boerke v. Nucor Const. Corp. Et Al
655750/24 Braze, Inc. v. Quid, Inc.
451272/25 Drummond v. The NYCHA
150868/25 Ehrenberg v. Ehrenberg
161432/24 Greater NY Mutual Ins. Co. As Subrogee of 116 East 66th St. Corp. v. Sg Renovation Inc. Et Al
158935/24 Hereford Ins. Co. v. Momoti
158156/24 Johnson v. Beth Israel Medical Center Et Al
160345/24 Kaczor v. L'industrie Pizza Ip Holdco
651314/25 Massachusetts Sfn 4 v. Omega Venture Capital
151618/25 Paribello v. Osaic, Inc. Et Al
100184/25 Ramos v. NYC Dept. of Health And Mental Hygiene
655285/24 Shameyer v. Imola Const., Inc. Et Al
659662/24 Tastings, Inc. v. Ignite Entertainment Group, Inc.
652564/25 Ward v. A.G.P./Alliance Global Partners v. Muhammer
154636/25 Xirouchakis v. Ladenburg Thalmann & Co. Inc.
154565/25 Zang v. Savills, Inc. Et Al

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
156193/19 D'Antonio v. Rite Aid Hdgts. Corp.
160092/17 Mannino v. Waldorf Exterior
151799/21 Ramirez v. 880 B'way. Owner LLC Et Al
THURSDAY, MAY 15
150758/25 Auffray v. Columbia Univ. in NYC Et Al
156998/18 Martin v. Macy's Real Estate

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
159615/20 Betancourt v. Hudson Square Rly. LLC
805333/22 Bollinger v. Marc Mordecai Liechtung
805379/17 Brandt v. Ahmad M.D.
805066/21 Conceicao v. Doris Mariu Chavez
805325/23 Diane Davenport As Guardian of The Person And Prop. of Evelyn Ledyard v. Lumbaro Md
805418/23 Giordano-Lubrano v. Florman M.D.
451376/22 Krydon v. Cate M.D.
805344/15 Lynn Sare Kornblau v. Sauter
805284/22 Petrillo v. Su Md
805345/22 Vargas v. Rejuvenating Fertility Center Et Al

Motion
805066/21 Conceicao v. Doris Mariu Chavez

THURSDAY, MAY 15
155841/23 Douglas S. Walker Et Al v. Earl W. Brian
805304/23 Fras v. Scoma Md
805208/22 Fuentes v. The Ny And Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al
805250/22 Lee v. Noho Medical
805038/24 Lutter v. Sethi M.D.
805273/22 Ndreinka v. The Ny Grace Square Hosp., Inc.
805367/20 Psonis v. Goldwyn Md
805372/22 Rhamnizadeh v. Weiser Md
805316/21 Roberts v. Goel M.D.
805304/22 Roderick v. Puskas M.D.
805086/21 Rodriguez v. Buffin M.D.
450679/16 Samuel Preschel v. NY Presbyterian Hosp.
805279/19 Sragow v. Jaffin

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

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
153201/24 Advance Service Group v. Harvest Group Global Services Inc. Et Al
653039/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Dominique Dunn Et Al
650539/25 Engie Power & Gas LLC v. Argo Real Estate LLC Et Al
150159/19 King v. Hiasa
161659/23 Levine v. Hosp. For Special Surgery Et Al
650976/25 Unique Logistics Int'l (NYC) v. Steptoe Llp F/k/a/ Steptoe & Johnson Llp Et Al
659528/24 United Nations World Tower II LLC v. Petrosyants

THURSDAY, MAY 15
650574/25 Arporan v. Deishah Mgt. LLC Et Al
158554/24 Cavalry Spv I v. Bradshaw
157073/24 Danube Logistics USA Inc. v. Chic Home Design LLC
100409/25 Durand v. NYC Dept. of Health And Mental Hygiene
653892/24 Gemini Residential LLC v. Lapushner
653806/24 Pinnacle Business Funding v. Aaron Carter Electric Inc Et Al
655838/23 Tandym Group v. Wright
651626/25 Victoria A. LLC v. Lebbos
154260/24 Whitesell v. John P. Pione, Inc.

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
156943/23 Bldg Mgt. Co., Inc. v. Peterside
154623/24 Domen Hldg. Co. v. Sanders
162153/24 Gates v. USA Guided Tours Nys LLC
659116/24 Gill v. Kore.Ai, Inc. Et Al
153842/25 McClain v. NYC Et Al
652358/22 Paulson v. Paulson
655959/24 Schonberger v. Snyder
154971/25 Sternklar v. 601 West End Tenants' Corp.
659521/24 USA Medlog, Inc. v. NYC Et Al

Motion
652358/22 Paulson v. Paulson
154971/25 Sternklar v. 601 West End Tenants' Corp.
155141/24 Levinson v. Sixty East End Owners
153412/24 Liberman v. Aizer
159681/24 Oriani v. Wolfgang's Steakhouse, Inc. Et Al
153732/20 Sadel v. Equinox Hldgs., Inc.
451519/25 NYC v. The Land And Bldg. Known As 204 East 60th St.
THURSDAY, MAY 15
650919/25 Abm Industry Groups v. Zamir Equities
152473/18 Aguilar v. Home Builders 1 L.P.
650333/25 American Express Nat. Bank v. Real Wings, Inc.
150619/23 Boerke v. Nucor Const. Corp. Et Al
655750/24 Braze, Inc. v. Quid, Inc.
451272/25 Drummond v. The NYCHA
150868/25 Ehrenberg v. Ehrenberg
161432/24 Greater NY Mutual Ins. Co. As Subrogee of 116 East 66th St. Corp. v. Sg Renovation Inc. Et Al
158935/24 Hereford Ins. Co. v. Momoti
158156/24 Johnson v. Beth Israel Medical Center Et Al
160345/24 Kaczor v. L'industrie Pizza Ip Holdco
651314/25 Massachusetts Sfn 4 v. Omega Venture Capital
151618/25 Paribello v. Osaic, Inc. Et Al
100184/25 Ramos v. NYC Dept. of Health And Mental Hygiene
655285/24 Shameyer v. Imola Const., Inc. Et Al
659662/24 Tastings, Inc. v. Ignite Entertainment Group, Inc.
652564/25 Ward v. A.G.P./Alliance Global Partners v. Muhammer
154636/25 Xirouchakis v. Ladenburg Thalmann & Co. Inc.
154565/25 Zang v. Savills, Inc. Et Al

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
850115/24973 Amsterdam Ave Funding LLC v. Jo-Al Real Estate, Inc. Et Al
850427/24 Athene Annuity And Life Co. v. 334W175th LLC Et Al
159971/14 Bank Bldg. v. Mehling
152726/18 Barcia v. 36 LLC.
850029/22 Bds III Mortgage Capital J Llc v. B'way Star Rly.
156127/24 Board of Mgrs. of Saga House Condominium v. Hanna Jesionowska Practice L.L.C. Et Al
850613/23 Brick Air Capital LLC v. Nid Properties, Inc. Et Al
850052/22 Chondrite Asset Trust v. 231 E 123 LLC Et Al
850002/24 Citimortgage v. Stewart
850460/24 Citizens Bank Na v. Cohen
850428/24 Citizens Bank v. Morton
850033/25 Citizens Bank v. Cosmo
850431/24 Deutsche Bank Nat. Trust Co. v. Jones
850050/24 Flushing Bank v. A.Z.N. Rly. Llc A/v/a A.Z.N. Rly. L.L.C. Et Al
850330/24 Gulf Harbour Investments Corp. v. Adago
850005/25 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Cosmo
850004/25 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Fox
850496/24 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Gallagher
850006/25 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Harrison
850492/24 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Hills
850008/25 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Johnson
850369/24 Jpmorgan Chase Bank v. Corona
850327/24 Jpmorgan Chase Bank v. Little
850256/24 M/T Bank v. Karp
156387/16 Morochto v. 450 Partners LLC
158597/22 NYCTL 1998-2 Trust And The Bank of NY Mellon As Collateral Agent And Custodian v. Deng
153171/18 NYCTL 2017-A Trust And The v. 104-106 West 132 St.
655763/21 Rss Wrfs2013-C14 - NY 8ba v. 808 B'way. Associates
850483/23 Sachem Capital Corp. v. Enrod Const. & Dev. Corp. Et Al
850089/23 Signature Bank v. Newman
850090/25 Townd Point Mortgage Trust 2020-3 v. Beach
850536/23 U.S. Bank Trust Nat. Assoc. As Trustee of Tiki Series IV Trust v. Gwinn
850236/22 U.S. Bank Trust Nat. Assoc. v. Barashi
850173/22 Yvelly Nat. Bank v. 152 Sherman Hldg. Lp Et Al
850293/24 Wells Fargo Bank v. Sadoff

THURSDAY, MAY 15
850651/23 Blueberry Funding LLC v. Park Place Partners Developments, Inc.
152784/23 Board of Mgrs. of St. Charles Condominium II v. Annessa Degraffonni
850443/24 Computershare Trust Co. v. 21-23 Catherine St Cc Llc Et Al
153171/18 NYCTL 2017-A Trust And The v. 104-106 West 132 St.
655763/21 Rss Wrfs2013-C14 - NY 8ba v. 808 B'way. Associates
850483/23 Sachem Capital Corp. v. Enrod Const. & Dev. Corp. Et Al
850089/23 Signature Bank v. Newman
850090/25 Townd Point Mortgage Trust 2020-3 v. Beach
850536/23 U.S. Bank Trust Nat. Assoc. As Trustee of Tiki Series IV Trust v. Gwinn
850236/22 U.S. Bank Trust Nat. Assoc. v. Barashi
850173/22 Yvelly Nat. Bank v. 152 Sherman Hldg. Lp Et Al
850293/24 Wells Fargo Bank v. Sadoff

THURSDAY, MAY 15
850651/23 Blueberry Funding LLC v. Park Place Partners Developments, Inc.
152784/23 Board of Mgrs. of St. Charles Condominium II v. Annessa Degraffonni
850443/24 Computershare Trust Co. v. 21-23 Catherine St Cc Llc Et Al
153171/18 NYCTL 2017-A Trust And The v. 104-106 West 132 St.
655763/21 Rss Wrfs2013-C14 - NY 8ba v. 808 B'way. Associates
850483/23 Sachem Capital Corp. v. Enrod Const. & Dev. Corp. Et Al
850089/23 Signature Bank v. Newman
850090/25 Townd Point Mortgage Trust 2020-3 v. Beach
850536/23 U.S. Bank Trust Nat. Assoc. As Trustee of Tiki Series IV Trust v. Gwinn
850236/22 U.S. Bank Trust Nat. Assoc. v. Barashi
850173/22 Yvelly Nat. Bank v. 152 Sherman Hldg. Lp Et Al
850293/24 Wells Fargo Bank v. Sadoff

Motion
850651/23 Blueberry Funding LLC v. Park Place Partners Developments, Inc.
152784/23 Board of Mgrs. of St. Charles Condominium II v. Annessa Degraffonni
850443/24 Computershare Trust Co. v. 21-23 Catherine St Cc Llc Et Al
153171/18 NYCTL 2017-A Trust And The v. 104-106 West 132 St.
655763/21 Rss Wrfs2013-C14 - NY 8ba v. 808 B'way. Associates
850483/23 Sachem Capital Corp. v. Enrod Const. & Dev. Corp. Et Al
850089/23 Signature Bank v. Newman
850090/25 Townd Point Mortgage Trust 2020-3 v. Beach
850536/23 U.S. Bank Trust Nat. Assoc. As Trustee of Tiki Series IV Trust v. Gwinn
850236/22 U.S. Bank Trust Nat. Assoc. v. Barashi
850173/22 Yvelly Nat. Bank v. 152 Sherman Hldg. Lp Et Al
850293/24 Wells Fargo Bank v. Sadoff

THURSDAY, MAY 15
850651/23 Blueberry Funding LLC v. Park Place Partners Developments, Inc.
152784/23 Board of Mgrs. of St. Charles Condominium II v. Annessa Degraffonni
850443/24 Computershare Trust Co. v. 21-23 Catherine St Cc Llc Et Al
153171/18 NYCTL 2017-A Trust And The v. 104-106 West 132 St.
655763/21 Rss Wrfs2013-C14 - NY 8ba v. 808 B'way. Associates
850483/23 Sachem Capital Corp. v. Enrod Const. & Dev. Corp. Et Al
850089/23 Signature Bank v. Newman
850090/25 Townd Point Mortgage Trust 2020-3 v. Beach
850536/23 U.S. Bank Trust Nat. Assoc. As Trustee of Tiki Series IV Trust v. Gwinn
850236/22 U.S. Bank Trust Nat. Assoc. v. Barashi
850173/22 Yvelly Nat. Bank v. 152 Sherman Hldg. Lp Et Al
850293/24 Wells Fargo Bank v. Sadoff

Motion
850651/23 Blueberry Funding LLC v. Park Place Partners Developments, Inc.
152784/23 Board of Mgrs. of St. Charles Condominium II v. Annessa Degraffonni
850443/24 Computershare Trust Co. v. 21-23 Catherine St Cc Llc Et Al
153171/18 NYCTL 2017-A Trust And The v. 104-106 West 132 St.
655763/21 Rss Wrfs2013-C14 - NY 8ba v. 808 B'way. Associates
850483/23 Sachem Capital Corp. v. Enrod Const. & Dev. Corp. Et Al
850089/23 Signature Bank v. Newman
850090/25 Townd Point Mortgage Trust 2020-3 v. Beach
850536/23 U.S. Bank Trust Nat. Assoc. As Trustee of Tiki Series IV Trust v. Gwinn
850236/22 U.S. Bank Trust Nat. Assoc. v. Barashi
850173/22 Yvelly Nat. Bank v. 152 Sherman Hldg. Lp Et Al
850293/24 Wells Fargo Bank v. Sadoff

THURSDAY, MAY 15
850651/23 Blueberry Funding LLC v. Park Place Partners Developments, Inc.
152784/23 Board of Mgrs. of St. Charles Condominium II v. Annessa Degraffonni
850443/24 Computershare Trust Co. v. 21-23 Catherine St Cc Llc Et Al
153171/18 NYCTL 2017-A Trust And The v. 104-106 West 132 St.
655763/21 Rss Wrfs2013-C14 - NY 8ba v. 808 B'way. Associates
850483/23 Sachem Capital Corp. v. Enrod Const. & Dev. Corp. Et Al
850089/23 Signature Bank v. Newman
850090/25 Townd Point Mortgage Trust 2020-3 v. Beach
850536/23 U.S. Bank Trust Nat. Assoc. As Trustee of Tiki Series IV Trust v. Gwinn
850236/22 U.S. Bank Trust Nat. Assoc. v. Barashi
850173/22 Yvelly Nat. Bank v. 152 Sherman Hldg. Lp Et Al
850293/24 Wells Fargo Bank v. Sadoff

Motion
850651/23 Blueberry Funding LLC v. Park Place Partners Developments, Inc.
152784/23 Board of Mgrs. of St. Charles Condominium II v. Annessa Degraffonni
850443/24 Computershare Trust Co. v. 21-23 Catherine St Cc Llc Et Al
153171/18 NYCTL 2017-A Trust And The v. 104-106 West 132 St.
655763/21 Rss Wrfs2013-C14 - NY 8ba v. 808 B'way. Associates
850483/23 Sachem Capital Corp. v. Enrod Const. & Dev. Corp. Et Al
850089/23 Signature Bank v. Newman
850090/25 Townd Point Mortgage Trust 2020-3 v. Beach
850536/23 U.S. Bank Trust Nat. Assoc. As Trustee of Tiki Series IV Trust v. Gwinn
850236/22 U.S. Bank Trust Nat. Assoc. v. Barashi
850173/22 Yvelly Nat. Bank v. 152 Sherman Hldg. Lp Et Al
850293/24 Wells Fargo Bank v. Sadoff

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14
161911/23 360 East 72nd St. Owners Inc. v. Epstein
155049/24 Kapoor v. 271 Tenants Corp. Et Al
154446/23 Philadelphia Indemnity Ins. Co. v. Wal-Rich Corp. Et Al
655832/20 Steiner v. Kemperle

THURSDAY, MAY 15
100188/25 Wang v. Poon
Motion
100188/25 Wang v. Poon

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

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

CITATIONS NY

FILE NO. 2025-113 — CITATION — The People of the State of New York by the Grace of God Free and Independent — To: RICHARD A. STEPHENS whose whereabouts are unknown and after due diligence cannot be ascertained, if he be living and if he be dead, to his heirs at law, distributees, executors, administrators, creditors, lienors, his wife or wives or successors in interest and to the unknown heirs at law and next of kin of RICHARD A. STEPHENS, deceased, if they be living, and if they be dead, to his Executors, Administrators, Creditors, and Lienors, their husbands or wives or successors in interest. A petition having been filed by DAVID S. FOSTER, who is domiciled at 100 DeKruif Place, No. 8B, Bronx, New York 10475 THIS RETURN DATE IS A VIRTUAL COURT DATE. IN PERSON COURT APPEARANCES WILL NOT BE PERMITTED ON THE RETURN DATE UNLESS A PARTY NOTIFIES THE COURT THAT IT WISHES TO APPEAR IN PERSON AT LEAST THREE (3) BUSINESS DAYS BEFORE THE SCHEDULED COURT DATE. YOU ARE HEREBY CITED TO SHOW CAUSE by making a virtual appearance before the Surrogate's Court, Bronx County, New York, located at 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, New York 10451, on June 10, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., why the Court should not grant the following relief: A decree in the estate of Linda M. Pollock lately domiciled at 3585 Wilton Avenue, Bronx, N.Y. 10469 admitting to probate a Will dated August 2nd 2022 as the Will of Linda M. Pollock and directing that Letters Testamentary be issued to David S. Foster PLEASE CONTACT THE COURT AT (718) 618-2373-2373 OR VIRTUAL@NYCOURTS.GOV

LIQUOR LICENSES

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that license# NA-0340-25-110055 for liquor has been applied for by the undersigned to sell liquor at retail in a restaurant under the ABC law at 12 W 17th St. NY, NY 10011. NY County for on-premises consumption. IMG Global Inc, 12 W 17th St New York, NY 10011
8451 May7 w May14

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that license# NA-0340-25-11589 for liquor has been applied for by the undersigned to sell liquor at retail in a restaurant under the ABC law at 137 Eldridge St NY, NY 10002, NY County for on-premises consumption. Super Dac Biet LLC, 137 Eldridge St New York, NY 10002
8456 May7 w May14

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that a license, number NA-0340-25-109476 for an On-Premises Liquor License has been applied for by BB43009BB LLC d/b/a Bareburger to sell beer, cider, liquor and/or wine at retail in a restaurant under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Law for premises located at 430 3rd Avenue, New York, New York 10016, County of New York for on premises consumption.
8757 my14-W my21

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that a license, number NA-0240-25-100253 for a restaurant under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Law at retail in a restaurant under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Law at Matsunori Kitchen Restaurant LLC, 201 Allen St, New York, New York 10002 for on premises consumption
8522 my7-W my14

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that an On-Premise Catering Establishment Full Liquor License Application ID: NA-0346-25-11124 has been applied for by Restaurant Associates, LLC serving beer, wine, cider and liquor to be sold at retail for on premises consumption in a catering establishment for the premises located at 620 8th Avenue, 14th and 15th Floors NY NY 10018.
8530 my7-W my14

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that an On-Premise Restaurant Full Liquor License, NYS Application ID: NA-0340-25-109796 has been applied for by Manganaro's Hero Boy LLC serving beer, wine, cider and liquor to be sold at retail for on premises consumption in a restaurant, for the premises located at 213 West 23rd Street New York NY 10011.
8528 my7-W my14

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that an On Premises Tavern Full Liquor License, Application ID: CL-25-101878-01 has been applied for by David Barton Gym Bar LLC d/b/a Shrumz Cafe serving beer, wine, cider and liquor to be sold at retail for on premises consumption in a restaurant, for the premises located at 424 Madison Avenue New York NY 10017.
8527 my7-W my14

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that a Restaurant Wine License, NYS Application ID: NA-0240-25-110805 has been applied for by Gastro 145 Inc d/b/a Bagizza to sell beer, wine and cider at retail in a restaurant. For on premises consumption under the ABC law located at 424 Madison Avenue New York NY 10017.
8527 my7-W my14

DUNNE HOSPITALITY LLC D/B/A 5S NOTICE is hereby given that liquor license number application-NA-0340-25-112629, for beer, Wine & liquor has been applied for by the undersigned to sell liquor at retail in a restaurant under the alcoholic beverage control law at address: 179 Avenue B, NY, NY 10009, New York County for on premises consumption. Name of company and trade name: DUNNE HOSPITALITY LLC D/B/A 5S 179 Avenue B, NY, NY 10009.
8755 my14-W my21

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF JESSICA D'ANGELO, PLLC Application for authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/20/2025. Office location: NY County. PLLC formed in Illinois (IL) on 8/29/2024. SSNY designated as agent of PLLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 444 Elmington Ave, Apt 123, Nashville, TN 37205. Cert. of formation filed with Secy. of State of IL, 501 S Second St, Rm 351, Springfield, IL 62756. Purpose: any lawful activity.
8060 A30 W J04

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF BIENSTOCK COSMETIC SURGERY PLLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/21/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 122 Fulton St., 2nd Fl., New York, NY 10038. Purpose: to practice the profession of dentistry.
8509 my7-W ju11

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF BIENSTOCK COSMETIC SURGERY PLLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/21/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 122 Fulton St., 2nd Fl., New York, NY 10038. Purpose: to practice the profession of dentistry.
8509 my7-W ju11

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF BIENSTOCK COSMETIC SURGERY PLLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/21/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 122 Fulton St., 2nd Fl., New York, NY 10038. Purpose: to practice the profession of dentistry.
8509 my7-W ju11

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF BIENSTOCK COSMETIC SURGERY PLLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/21/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 122 Fulton St., 2nd Fl., New York, NY 10038. Purpose: to practice the profession of dentistry.
8509 my7-W ju11

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF BIENSTOCK COSMETIC SURGERY PLLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/21/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 122 Fulton St., 2nd Fl., New York, NY 10038. Purpose: to practice the profession of dentistry.
8509 my7-W ju11

SAMANTHA FUSCO ACUPUNCTURE PLLC Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/22/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the PLLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 8 Lewis Court, Massapequa, NY 11758. Purpose: For the practice of the profession of Acupuncture.
8097 a30-W ju4

WEST DENTAL PLLC. Filed 4/10/25. Office: NY Co. SSNY desig. as agent for process & shall mail to: 130 E. 63rd St, 1a, NY, NY 10065. Purpose: Dentistry.
8783 my14-W ju18

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF BRAUERHAUS LAW, PLLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/25/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 99 Wall Street, PBM #598, New York, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful act.
7351 A16 W My21

LONGIRO LAW, PLLC, a Prof. LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/12/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: c/o The PLLC, 35 Old Country Road, Ste 205, Garden City, NY 11530. Purpose: To Practice The Profession of Law.
8841 my14-W ju18

Medical Signal Monitoring, LLC filed Arts. of Org. with the Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/18/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: c/o The PLLC, 337 Westbury Rd., Old Westbury, NY 11568. Purpose: Medicine.
8829 my14-W ju18

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

VISION ELITE SUITES RVC LP Certificate filed with the SSNY on 03/11/25. Duration: 12/31/2099. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LP upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LP 925 Hempstead Turnpike, Suite 438, Franklin Square, NY 11010. Name/address of each gen. ptr. available from SSNY. Purpose: Any lawful activities.
7168 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF AAZORA DEVELOPMENT, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/22/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: Jared Epstein, Aurora Capital Associates, 1407 Broadway, 41st Fl., NY, NY 10011, principal business address. Purpose: all lawful purposes.
8791 my14-W ju18

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF AAZORA DEVELOPMENT, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/22/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: Jared Epstein, Aurora Capital Associates, 1407 Broadway, 41st Fl., NY, NY 10011, principal business address. Purpose: all lawful purposes.
8508 my7-W ju11

JAY HOUSE, LLC Filed with SSNY on 04/6/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 2631 MERRICK RD STE 203, BELLMORE, NY 11710. Purpose: Any Lawful purpose.
8151 a30-W ju4

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

95 NASSAU LLC Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/15/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, c/o Francis B. Barker, 155 West 66th Street, Apartment 35E, New York, New York 10023. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
7791 a23-W my28

DORCHESTER 29D 155 WEST 68 LLC Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/03/25. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, c/o Francis B. Barker, 155 West 66th Street, Apartment 35E, New York, New York 10023. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
7788 a23-W my28

JM 3359 LLC Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/15/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 2776 Lincoln Boulevard, Merrick, NY 11566. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
7789 a23-W my28

UNLIMITED REVELATIONS LLC Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 01/27/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 10 Main Street, East Rockaway, NY 11518. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
7787 a23-W my28

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF PARIS COURT OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/25/25. Office location: New York County. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is CT Corporation System, 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful activity.
7148 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF ROTHROCKIN PRODUCTIONS LLC Arts. of Org. filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/21/25. Office location: New York County. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: 230 W. 56th St, Apt 51A, NY, NY 10019. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is Nathaniel Rothrock, 230 W. 56th St., Apt. 51A, NY, NY 10019. Purpose: any lawful activity.
7151 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF CCA DOBBS CROSSING LLC Arts. of Org. filed with NY Dept. of State: 3/26/25. Office location: NY county. Secy. of State designated agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: c/o The Community Preservation Corp., 220 E. 42nd St., 16th Fl., NY, NY 10017, principal business address. Purpose: any lawful activity.
7055 Apr9 w May14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF 3 DIMENSIONAL WEALTH ADVISORY LLC, amended to: JCD Forest Avenue Realty, LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 01/05/2023. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: The Limited Liability Company, 168 Forest Ave., Unit 101, Locust Valley, NY 11560, also the address of Christopher Jon Natale, the registered agent upon whom process may be served. Purpose: any lawful activities.
8512 my7-W ju11

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF GANSEVOORT SQUARE DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS LLC Arts. of Org. filed with NY Dept. of State: 4/24/25. Office location: NY County. Sec. of State designated agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Jared Epstein, Aurora Capital Associates, 1407 Broadway, 41st Fl., NY, NY 10011, principal business address. Purpose: all lawful purposes.
8791 my14-W ju18

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF AAZORA DEVELOPMENT, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 04/22/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: Jared Epstein, Aurora Capital Associates, 1407 Broadway, 41st Fl., NY, NY 10011, principal business address. Purpose: all lawful purposes.
8508 my7-W ju11

JAY HOUSE, LLC Filed with SSNY on 04/6/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 2631 MERRICK RD STE 203, BELLMORE, NY 11710. Purpose: Any Lawful purpose.
8151 a30-W ju4

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

BROADWAY VENTURE GROUP LLC filed Arts. of Org. with the Secy of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/10/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: The LLC, 20 Crabapple Dr, Roslyn, NY 11576. Purpose: any lawful act.
8080 a30-W ju4

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF L. VERE LLC Arts. of Org. filed with NY Dept. of State: 3/31/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. bus. addr.: 225 Lafayette St., #6A, NY, NY 10012. Sec. of State designated agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: Cogency Global Inc., 122 E. 42nd St., 18th Fl., NY, NY 10168. Purpose: all lawful purposes.
7056 Apr9 w May14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF BAKE AND BODY KNEADS LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 1/17/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 228 Park Ave S # 291838, NY, NY 10003. R/OA: US Corp Agents, Inc. 7014 13th Ave, #202, BK, NY 11228. P/B/A: 222 Johnson Ave, Ste 10, BK, NY 11206. Purpose: any lawful act.
8465 My07 W J11

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF CASTALIA MUSIC MANAGEMENT LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/31/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 350 W 51st St Apt 4D, New York, NY 10019. Purpose: any lawful act.
8109 My07 W J11

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF ELEVATE AND IMPACT CONSULTING LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/25/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 333 W 39th St, Room 805, New York, NY 10018. Purpose: any lawful act.
8487 My07 W J11

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF BONBON SAG HARBOR LLC Arts. of Org. filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/26/25. Office location: New York County. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is CT Corporation System, 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful activity.
7133 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF CURTIS ACQUISITION PARTNERS LLC Arts. of Org. filed with New York Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/26/25. Office location: New York County. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: 20 Jay St, #309D, Brooklyn, NY 11201. Purpose: any lawful activity.
7161 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF JOINTCRAFT HOLDINGS NY LLC Arts. of Org. filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/20/25. Office location: New York County. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: 432 Hudson St, NY, NY 10014. Purpose: any lawful activity.
7162 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF BIOMETIC, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with New York Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/26/25. Office location: New York County. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 432 Hudson St, NY, NY 10014. Purpose: any lawful activity.
7162 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF THE SOPHIA LIU LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/19/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail process to: Aazora Development, LLC, 26 Broadway, Suite 1301, New York, NY 10004. Purpose: any lawful activities.
7586 A23 W My28

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF SAVANNA STEVENS LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on July 05, 2024. Office location: New York City County, NY. SSNY is designated for service of process. SSNY shall mail a copy of any process served against the LLC to 11 Stuyvesant Oval, 7F, New York, NY 10009. Purpose: any lawful purpose.
2606 My07 W J11

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

ALDUINO REALTY 197 LLC Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/01/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, PO Box 514, Oceanside, NY 11572. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
7170 a9-W my14

ALDUINO REALTY CENTRAL LLC Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/01/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, PO Box 514, Oceanside, NY 11572. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
7169 a9-W my14

AMSI 55 LLC Art. of Org. filed NY DOS 5/22/01, NY Co. S/S C/O Douglas J. Oliver 21 E. 66th St, 10th Fl, NY, NY 10065. To engage in any lawful act or activity. Last date to dissolve is 12/31/2101.
7072 a9-W my14

ARA NY HOLDINGS LLC Art. of Org. filed NY DOS 9/30/24 NY Co. S/S C/O The LLC 1325 San Mateo Dr, Menlo Park, CA 94025. To engage in any lawful act or activity. Full indemnification.
7074 a9-W my14

CON 37 RADIO CIRCLE LLC Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 02/27/25. Office: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 550 Broadway Avenue, Bronx, NY 10465. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
7166 a9-W my14

DJ OLIVER PROPERTIES LLC Art. of Org. filed NY DOS 5/23/01, NY Co. S/S C/O The LLC 21 E. 66th St, 10th Fl, NY, NY 10065. To engage in any lawful act or activity. Last date to dissolve is 12/31/2101.
7073 a9-W my14

FOX OPERATION SERVICES LLC Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 02/18/25. 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, 151 Fox Boulevard, Merrick, NY 11566. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
7172 a9-W my14

FRANKLIN AVE MOBILE TIRES SERVICES LLC Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 02/18/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 2040 White Plains Road #1042, Bronx, NY 10462. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose.
7184 a9-W my14

LYKF LLC Art. of Org. filed NY DOS 10/11/22, NY Co. S/S C/O The LLC 1 Columbus Pl, Apt 521A, NY, NY 10019. To engage in any lawful act or activity. Perpetual existence. Full indemnification.
7077 a9-W my14

MMVEN LLC Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 02/28/2025. 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, 10 Bond Street, Ste 292, Great Neck, NY 11021. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose.
7182 a9-W my14

NAYA 1177 6TH AVENUE LLC Art. of Org. filed NY DOS 6/19/24, NY Co. S/S C/O The LLC 54 W 56th St, NY, NY 10019. To engage in any lawful act or activity. Managed by 1 or more Managers. Perpetual existence. Full indemnification.
7081 a9-W my14

NAYA 285 MAD LLC Art. of Org. filed NY DOS 11/23/22, NY Co. S/S C/O The LLC 54 W 56th St, NY, NY 10019. To engage in any lawful act or activity. Managed by 1 or more Managers. Perpetual existence. Full indemnification.
7079 a9-W my14

NAYA 304 PARK LLC Art. of Org. filed NY DOS 10/20/22, NY Co. S/S C/O The LLC 54 W 56th St, NY, NY 10019. To engage in any lawful act or activity. Managed by 1 or more Managers. Perpetual existence. Full indemnification.
7078 a9-W my14

NAYA GRAND CENTRAL LLC Art. of Org. filed NY DOS 1/26/24, NY Co. S/S C/O The LLC 54 W 56th St, NY, NY 10019. To engage in any lawful act or activity. Managed by 1 or more Managers. Perpetual existence. Full indemnification.
7080 a9-W my14

TREEHOUSE123, LLC Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/01/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 250 Mill Spring Road, Manhasset, NY 11030. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
7173 a9-W my14

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

VISION ELITE ENTERPRISES LLC Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/07/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 925 Hempstead Turnpike, Suite 438, Franklin Square, NY 11010. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
7167 a9-W my14

WE GHOSTED MEDIA LLC Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/25/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 19 Oden Avenue, East Williston, NY 11596. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
7171 a9-W my14

FIRST FOCUS SOLUTIONS LLC Articles of Org. filed NY Sec. of State (SSNY) 9/30/24. Office in NY Co. SSNY design. Agent of LLC upon whom process may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to The LLC 228 Park Ave S #462667 NY, NY 10003. Purpose: Any lawful activity.
8450 Mar7 w Apr11

2324 YOUNG LLC Filed 4/23/25. Office: Bronx Co. SSNY desig. as agent for process & shall mail to: Timmy Nguyen & Vy Nguyen, 2251 Westervelt Ave, Bronx, NY 10469. Purpose: General.
8776 my14-W ju18

ADMA DESIGN LLC Filed 4/1/25. Office: NY Co. SSNY desig. as agent for process & shall mail to: 34 W 17th St Fl 5, NY, NY 10011. Registered Agent: United States Corporation Agents, Inc., 7014 13th Ave., Ste 202, Bklyn, NY 11228. Purpose: General.
8785 my14-W ju18

ALEX GARAY CONSULTING LLC Filed 4/15/25. Office: NY Co. SSNY desig. as agent for process & shall mail to: 8 Spruce St, Apt 73b, NY, NY 10038. Registered Agent: United States Corporation Agents, Inc., 7014 13th Ave., Ste 202, Bklyn, NY 11228. Purpose: General.
8778 my14-W ju18

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF 17 IRVING LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 03/03/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 10762 Wrightwood Lane, 7820
a23-W my28

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF AFTERBURNER LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Sec. of State of NY (SSNY) on 02/20/2024. Office Location: New York County (Manhattan). SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: AFTERBURNER LLC, PO Box 287292, New York, NY 10128. Purpose: any lawful activity.
A23 W My28

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF COHEN CODNER GROUP LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/17/2024. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 160 East Sunrise Highway #1076, Freeport, NY 11520. Purpose: any lawful act.
7773 A23 W My28

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF RAJAB COLLECTION LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 1/13/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 172 W 127th Street, 705, New York, NY 10027. Purpose: any lawful act.
7777 A23 W My28

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF TRISTATE HEALING STRATEGIES LLC Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 1/28/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 380 Malcolm X Blvd, #71, New York, NY 10027. Purpose: any lawful act.
7825 A23 W My2

SALES

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, SHOREHAVEN HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC., Plaintiff, vs. SHREESA CAMPBELL, ET AL., Defendants. Pursuant to an Order Confirming Referee Report and Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered on December 16, 2024, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Bronx County Supreme Court, Courtroom 711, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451-2937 on June 2, 2025 at 2:15 p.m., premises known as 2102 Benedict Avenue, Bronx, NY 10462. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Bronx, County of Bronx, City and State of New York, Block 3432 and Lot 1634 together with an undivided 0.92593 percent interest in the Common Elements. Approximate amount of judgment is \$40,484.59 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment. Index #815987/2023E. Frank J. Rio, Esq., Referee The Law Offices of Ronald Francis, 30 Broad Street, 37th Floor, New York, NY 10004. Attorneys for Plaintiff 8383 my14-W ju4

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF NEW YORK JPMORGAN CHASE BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, Plaintiff AGAINST STEPHAN GREENBERG, ET AL., Defendants. Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered September 22, 2016, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the New York County Courthouse, Room 116, located at 60 Centre Street, New York, NY on May 28, 2025 at 2:15PM, premises known as 159 West 136th Street, New York, NY 10030. All that certain plot piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, lying and being in the Borough of Manhattan, City, County and State of New York, Block: 1921 Lot: 9. Approximate amount of judgment \$1,752,711.07 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment. Index #850189/2014. Michael J. Good, Esq., Referee Fein, Such & Crane, LLP 28 East Main Street Rochester, NY 14614 CHJNC479 84387 7620 a30-W my21

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, SHOREHAVEN HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC., Plaintiff, vs. SUSAN PEREZ, ET AL., Defendants. Pursuant to an Order Confirming Referee Report and Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered on January 20, 2025, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Bronx County Supreme Court, Courtroom 711, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451-2937 on June 9, 2025 at 2:15 p.m., premises known as 2118 Neptune Court, Unit 6218H, Bronx, NY 10473. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Bronx, County of Bronx, City and State of New York, Block 3432 and Lot 1080 together with an undivided 0.358 percent interest in the Common Elements. Approximate amount of judgment is \$42,945.76 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment. Index #808761/2023E. Mitchell Van, Esq., Referee The Law Offices of Ronald Francis, 30 Broad Street, 37th Floor, New York, NY 10004. Attorneys for Plaintiff 8043 m7-Th my28

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, SHOREHAVEN HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC., Plaintiff, vs. DAVID FALLOON, ET AL., Defendants. Pursuant to an Order Confirming Referee Report and Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered on December 16, 2024, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Bronx County Supreme Court, Courtroom 711, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451-2937 on June 16, 2025 at 2:15 p.m., premises known as 119 Beacon Lane, Unit 200, Bronx, NY 10473. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Bronx, County of Bronx, City and State of New York, Block 3432 and Lot 1634 together with an undivided 0.92593 percent interest in the Common Elements. Approximate amount of judgment is \$39,117.95 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment. Index #815986/2023E. Alexander Shirvak, Esq., Referee The Law Offices of Ronald Francis, 30 Broad Street, 37th Floor, New York, NY 10004. Attorneys for Plaintiff 8383 my14-W ju4

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

PARK AVE ELECTRICAL LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/02/25. Office: New York County SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 2417 JERICHO TPKE STE 287, GARDEN CITY PARK, NY 11040. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 7485 a16-W my21

BP CLUB LLC. Filed with SSNY on 04/25/2025. Office: Nassau County SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 2417 JERICHO TPKE STE 287, GARDEN CITY PARK, NY 11040. Purpose: Any Lawful 8502 m7-W ju11

SALES

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, SHOREHAVEN HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC., Plaintiff, vs. SHREESA CAMPBELL, ET AL., Defendants. Pursuant to an Order Confirming Referee Report and Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered on December 16, 2024, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Bronx County Supreme Court, Courtroom 711, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451-2937 on June 16, 2025 at 2:15 p.m., premises known as 53 Beacon Lane, Unit 141A, a/k/a Unit 141, Bronx, NY 10473. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Bronx, County of Bronx, City and State of New York, Block 3432 and Lot 1634 together with an undivided 0.92593 percent interest in the Common Elements. Approximate amount of judgment is \$40,484.59 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment. Index #815987/2023E. Frank J. Rio, Esq., Referee The Law Offices of Ronald Francis, 30 Broad Street, 37th Floor, New York, NY 10004. Attorneys for Plaintiff 8385 my14-W ju4

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF NEW YORK NYCTL 1998-2 TRUST AND THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON, AS COLLATERAL AGENT AND CUSTODIAN, Plaintiffs against BETHELITE COMMUNITY BAPTIST CHURCH, A/K/A BETHELEITE COMMUNITY CHURCH INC., et al Defendants. Pursuant to an Amended Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale entered herein on February 19, 2020, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the New York County Courthouse located at 60 Centre Street, New York on June 18, 2025 at 2:15 p.m. premises situate, lying and being in the Borough of Manhattan, County of New York, City and State of New York, known and designated as Block 1721 and Lot 31 on the New York County Tax Assessment Map. Said premises known as 36 WEST 123RD STREET A/K/A 36-36 WEST 123RD STREET, NEW YORK, NY. Approximate amount of lien \$2,199,623.88 plus interest & costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment and Terms of Sale. Index Number 131897/2009 ROBERTA E. ASHKIN, Esq., Referee Phillips Lytle LLP Attorney(s) for Plaintiffs 28 East Main Street, Suite 1400, Rochester, NY 14614 8387 my14-W ju4

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, SHOREHAVEN HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC., Plaintiff, vs. YVETTE PERKINS-LEON, ET AL., Defendants. Pursuant to an Order Confirming Referee Report and Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered on December 30, 2024, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Bronx County Supreme Court, Courtroom 711, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451-2937 on June 9, 2025 at 2:15 p.m., premises known as 1927 Beacon Lane, Unit 198B, Bronx, NY 10473. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Bronx, County of Bronx, City and State of New York, Block 3432 and Lot 1632 together with an undivided 0.92592 percent interest in the Common Elements. Approximate amount of judgment is \$42,616.26 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment. Index #808734/2023E. Mitchell Van, Esq., Referee The Law Offices of Ronald Francis, 30 Broad Street, 37th Floor, New York, NY 10004. Attorneys for Plaintiff 8044 my7-Th my28

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON TRUST COMPANY, N.A., AS FHA QUALIFIED TRUSTEE FOR RESCAP LIQUIDATING TRUST, Plaintiff, vs. KOKOU AGBODZI, ET AL., Defendants. Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered on January 26, 2017 and an Order duly entered on December 10, 2024, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Bronx County Supreme Court, Courtroom 711, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451-2937 on June 9, 2025 at 2:15 p.m., premises known as 1927 Beacon Avenue, Bronx, NY 10462. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Bronx, City and State of New York, Block 4261 and Lot 41. Approximate amount of judgment is \$678,170.64 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment. Index #806932/2012E. Cash will not be accepted. Marion Ann Conde Da Silveira, Esq., Referee Knuckles & Manfro, LLP, 120 White Plains Road, Suite 215, Tarrytown, New York 10591, Attorneys for Plaintiff 8045 my7-Th my28

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

SUP OLD COUNTRY RD LLC. Filed with SSNY on 04/18/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 926 CARMANS RD MASSAPEQUA, NY 11758. Purpose: Any Lawful 8154 a30-W ju4

W 44 Restaurant LLC. Filed 5/2/25. Office: NY Co. SSNY desig. as agent for process & shall mail to: c/o Xhafer Sinana, 55 W 44th St, NY, NY 10036. Purpose: General. 8777 my14-W ju18

SALES

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, BOARD OF MANAGERS OF THE SHOREHAVEN HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC., Plaintiff, vs. DAIEMAN SUBERO AND MICHELLE A. BARRROW-SUBERO, Defendant(s). Pursuant to an Order Confirming Referee Report and Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered on March 17, 2025, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Bronx County Supreme Court, Courtroom 711, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451-2937 on June 9, 2025 at 2:15 p.m., premises known as 214 Neptune Lane, Unit 724H, Bronx, NY 10473. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Bronx, County of Bronx, City and State of New York, Block 3432 and Lot 1096 together with an undivided 0.35804 percent interest in the Common Elements. Approximate amount of judgment is \$14,979.80 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment. Index # 805383/2024E. Timothy P. Viollette, Esq., Referee The Law Offices of Ronald Francis, 30 Broad Street, 37th Floor, New York, NY 10004. Attorneys for Plaintiff 8371 my7-W my28

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, SHOREHAVEN HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC., Plaintiff, vs. SHEENA CAMEAU, ET AL., defendant(s). Pursuant to an Order Confirming Referee Report and Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered on January 7, 2025, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Bronx County Supreme Court, Courtroom 711, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451-2937 on June 9, 2025 at 2:15 p.m., premises known as 141 Sunset Boulevard, Unit 1041, Bronx, NY 10473. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Bronx, County of Bronx, City and State of New York, Block 3432 and Lot 1151 together with an undivided 0.3987 percent interest in the Common Elements. Approximate amount of judgment is \$49,446.67 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment. Index #806085/2023E. Heidi Brouman, Esq., Referee Ronald Francis, 30 Broad Street, 37th Floor, New York, NY 10004, Attorneys for Plaintiff 8366 my7-W my28

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, SHOREHAVEN HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC., Plaintiff, vs. 3989 PAULDING LLC, Defendant. Pursuant to an Order Confirming Referee Report and Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered on December 16, 2024, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Bronx County Supreme Court, Courtroom 711, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451-2937 on June 9, 2025 at 2:15 p.m., premises known as 3 Stuyvesant Court, Bronx, NY 10473. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Bronx, County of Bronx, City and State of New York, Block 3443 and Lot 12. Approximate amount of judgment is \$35,458.21 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment. Index #816000/2023E. Jeffrey Pineda, Esq., Referee The Law Offices of Ronald Francis, 30 Broad Street, 37th Floor, New York, NY 10004. Attorneys for Plaintiff 8368 my7-W my28

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF NEW YORK JPMorgan Chase Bank National Association, Plaintiff AGAINST Charles Jones, Gena Lovett, et al., Defendant(s) Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered September 20, 2019, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the New York County Courthouse in Room 130, located at 60 Centre Street, New York, NY on June 4, 2025 at 2:15PM, premises known as 2084 5th Avenue, New York, NY 10011. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of New York, City, County and State of New York, Block: 1726 Lot: 35. Approximate amount of judgment is \$2,323,176.89 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment. Index #850023/2013. Elaine Shay, Esq., Referee McCalla Raymer Leibert Pierce, LLC 420 Lexington Avenue, Suite 840 New York, NY 10170 21-04144NY 84618 8051 my7-W my28

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

EVERSTEAD LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 07/25/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 31 Gainsboro Ln, Syosset, NY 11791. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 7483 a16-W my21

BEST XI FANTASY LLC. Filed with SSNY on 04/21/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: PO BOX 37, 1001 2ND AVE, NEW HYDE PARK, NY 11040. Purpose: Any lawful 8150 a30-W ju4

SHI PROSPERITY GATE LLC. Filed 4/10/25. Office: NY Co. SSNY desig. as agent for process & shall mail to: 21 W End Ave, Apt 4110, NY, NY 10023. Purpose: General. 8781 my14-W ju18

SALES

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, SHOREHAVEN HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC., Plaintiff, vs. KEVIN RYAN, ET AL., Defendants. Pursuant to an Amended Order Confirming Referee Report and Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered on December 31, 2024, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Bronx County Supreme Court, Courtroom 711, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451-2937 on June 9, 2025 at 2:15 p.m., premises known as 56 Heron Lane, Unit 393, Bronx, NY 10473. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Bronx, County of Bronx, City and State of New York, Block 3432 and Lot 1869 together with an undivided 0.60756 percent interest in the Common Elements. Approximate amount of judgment is \$37,649.06 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment. Index #816002/2023E. Steven E. Shapiro, Esq., Referee The Law Offices of Ronald Francis, 30 Broad Street, 37th Floor, New York, NY 10004. Attorneys for Plaintiff 8369 my7-W my28

SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, CITIMORTGAGE, INC., Plaintiff -against- JAMES WILLIAM BRUCE, Defendant(s). Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale entered herein and dated March 20, 2017, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Bronx County Supreme Court, Courtroom 711, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451-2937 on June 9, 2025 at 2:15 p.m., premises situate, lying and being in the Borough and County of Bronx, City and State of New York, bounded and described as follows: BEGINNING at a point on the westerly side of Findlay Avenue, distant 40 feet southerly from the corner formed by the intersection of the southerly side of East 168th Street with the West-168th side of Findlay Avenue; being a plot 100.00 feet by 20.02 feet by 100.00 feet by 20.00 feet. Said premises known as 1211 FINDLAY AVENUE, BRONX, NY 10456. Approximate amount on lien \$470,394.88 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment and Terms of Sale. If the sale is set aside for any reason, the Purchaser at the sale shall be entitled only to a return of the deposit paid. The Purchaser shall have no further recourse against the Mortgagee or the Mortgagee's attorney. Index Number 381498/2010. DAVID LESCH, ESQ., Associate Counsel (LLC) for Plaintiff 47 Hillside Avenue, 2nd Floor, Manhasset, NY 11030 File# 4722.1116 8176 my7-W my28

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, NYCTL 2021-A TRUST AND THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON AS COLLATERAL AGENT AND CUSTODIAN, Plaintiff, vs. LUIS TROCHE, ET AL., Defendant(s). Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale dated February 26, 2025 and entered on February 28, 2025, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Bronx County Supreme Court, Courtroom 711, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451-2937 on June 9, 2025 at 2:15 p.m., all that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough and County of New York, Block 2855 and Lot 28. Said premises may also be described as 126 Jerome Avenue, Bronx, NY. Approximate amount of judgment is \$53,457.54 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment and Terms of Sale. Index #81489/2022E. Sofia Balile, Esq. Referee The Law Office of Thomas P. Malone, PLLC, 60 East 42nd Street, Suite 553, New York, New York 10165, Attorneys for Plaintiff 7590 my7-W my28

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF BRONX, NYCTL 2021-A TRUST AND THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON AS COLLATERAL AGENT AND CUSTODIAN, Plaintiff, vs. LUIS TROCHE, ET AL., Defendant(s). Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale dated February 26, 2025 and entered on February 28, 2025, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at the Bronx County Supreme Court, Courtroom 711, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, NY 10451-2937 on June 9, 2025 at 2:15 p.m., all that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough and County of New York, Block 2855 and Lot 28. Said premises may also be described as 126 Jerome Avenue, Bronx, NY. Approximate amount of judgment is \$53,457.54 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment and Terms of Sale. Index #81489/2022E. Sofia Balile, Esq. Referee The Law Office of Thomas P. Malone, PLLC, 60 East 42nd Street, Suite 553, New York, New York 10165, Attorneys for Plaintiff 7590 my7-W my28

PUBLIC NOTICES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT OF GRIMALDI DEEP SEA ERATOR OF GRANDE CONGO (IMO NO. 9437921) FOR EXONERATION FROM OR LIMITATION OF LIABILITY Civil Action No. 25cv2666 (PKC) NOTICE OF FILING OF COMPLAINT FOR EXONERATION FROM OR LIMITATION OF LIABILITY PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT GRIMALDI DEEP SEA S.P.A. ("Grimaldi"), as owner and operator of the vessel GRANDE CONGO (the "Vessel"), has commenced proceedings in this Court pursuant to the Shipowner's Limitation of Liability Act, 46 U.S.C. §§ 30501 et seq. (the "Limitation Act") with respect to all losses or damages that occurred on or about February 17, 2025, while the Vessel was sailing from Valencia, Spain to Baltimore, Maryland, United States (the "Incident"), the facts of which are more particularly set forth in Grimaldi's Complaint for Exoneration From or Limitation of Liability, and PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that all persons who may have claims relating to the Incident and for which the complaint seeks exoneration and limitation must file their claims and answers with the undersigned Clerk of the Court and must serve their claims and answers to the attorneys for Grimaldi and the Vessel by attention to Robert E. O'Connor of Montgomery McCracken Walker & Rhoads LLP, 437 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10022 on or before August 17, 2025, or be defaulted. Dated: April 4, 2025 New York, New York CLERK OF THE COURT 7116 m9-W my14

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF Dumont BESS, LLC. Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/7/25. Office location: New York County LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 2/20/25. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. DE address of LLC: 1209 Orange St, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Formation filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is C T Corporation System, 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7134 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF Emeral BESS, LLC. Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/7/25. Office location: New York County LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 2/20/25. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. DE address of LLC: 1209 Orange St, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Formation filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is C T Corporation System, 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7135 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF FORTUNE BESS, LLC. Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/7/25. Office location: New York County LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 2/20/25. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. DE address of LLC: 1209 Orange St, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Formation filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is C T Corporation System, 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7136 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF Fried Bacon Producers, LLC. Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/20/25. Office location: New York County LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 3/20/25. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. DE address of LLC: 1209 Orange St, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Formation filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is C T Corporation System, 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7137 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF Heritag Logistics, LLC. The fictitious business name is Heritage Logistics FN, LLC. Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/26/25. Office location: New York County, LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 4/20/25. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. DE address of LLC: 1209 Orange St, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Formation filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is C T Corporation System, 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7138 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF Holly BESS, LLC. Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/7/25. Office location: New York County LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 2/20/25. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. DE address of LLC: 1209 Orange St, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Formation filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is C T Corporation System, 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7139 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF RONJARE, LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/24/17. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 08/09/17. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to the LLC, 844 Alton Rd., Miami Beach, FL 33139. DE addr. of LLC: 3524 Silverside Rd., Ste. 35B, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Secy of State, Div. of Corps. P.O. Box 898, Dover, DE 19903. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 8155 Apr30 w Jun4

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF Gamla NY LLC. Authority filed with NY Dept. of State: 4/14/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. bus. addr.: 1110 NW 1st St., Miami, FL 33128. LLC formed in DE: 4/10/25. NY Sec. of State designated agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. DE address of LLC: 1209 Orange St, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7763 Apr23 w May28

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF 29 Grand BESS, LLC. Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/7/25. Office location: New York County LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 10/6/25. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. DE address of LLC: 1209 Orange St, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Formation filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is C T Corporation System, 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7127 m9-W my14

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF KeyState Corporate Management (NV), LLC. Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 9/14/11. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Nevada (NV) on 9/14/11. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. NV address of LLC: 3883 Howard Hughes Pkwy, Ste 500, Las Vegas, NV 89169. Cert. of Formation filed with NV Secy of State, PO Box 50102, Henderson, NV 89016. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is C T Corporation System, 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7144 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF Little Neck BESS, LLC. Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/7/25. Office location: New York County LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 10/8/24. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. DE address of LLC: 1209 Orange St, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7145 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF MAXIM WORLD USP LLC. Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/14/25. Office location: New York County LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 1/8/16. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. DE address of LLC: 1209 Orange St, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is C T Corporation System, 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7146 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF PORT CHESTER ACQUISITION LLC. Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/25/25. Office location: New York County LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 2/6/25. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. DE address of LLC: 1209 Orange St, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7149 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF R&T Deposit Marketplace, LLC. Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/24/25. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 3/21/25. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. DE address of LLC: 1209 Orange St, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Formation filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is C T Corporation System, 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7150 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF ALBANS BESS, LLC. Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/24/25. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 10/8/24. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. DE address of LLC: 1209 Orange St, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Formation filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is C T Corporation System, 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7153 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF tmr Ventures Management LLC. Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/21/25. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 1/17/25. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. DE address of LLC: 1209 Orange St, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Formation filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7163 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF Gamla NY LLC. Authority filed with NY Dept. of State: 4/14/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. bus. addr.: 1110 NW 1st St., Miami, FL 33128. LLC formed in DE: 4/10/25. NY Sec. of State designated agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. DE address of LLC: 1209 Orange St, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7154 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF TWELVE BELOW II GP LLC. Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/20/25. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

WEST DELANO, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/14/2025. Office loc: Westchester County. SSNY upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 265 Cox Avenue, Tonkers, NY 10704. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 7502 a16-W my21

KONYK LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/15/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent for process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Ivan Konyk, 1005 Bellmore Ave, North Bellmore, NY 11710. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 7564 a17-Th my22

23 WASHINGTON ST LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/15/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, P.O. Box 1064, North Massapequa, NY 11758. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 7790 a23-W my28

530 WEST END AVENUE, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/10/25. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 155 E 38th Street, Suite 2D, New York, NY 10016. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 7792 a23-W my28

AETHERIUM HOLDINGS LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/17/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 2826 Harding Ave, Bellmore, NY 11710. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 8113 a30-Th ju4

124 LAWRENCE STREET LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/07/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 41 DURHAM RD, NEW HYDE PARK, NY 11040. Purpose: Any Lawful 8145 a30-W ju4

2023 COLONIAL LLC, Filed with SSNY on 03/18/2024. Office: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 3331 WHITE PLAINS RD, STE 101, BRONX, NY 10467. Purpose: Any Lawful 8123 a30-W ju4

3500 WHITEPLAINS LLC, Filed with SSNY on 09/30/2024. Office: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 1626 BRONXDALE AVE, BRONX, NY 10462. Purpose: Any Lawful 8125 a30-W ju4

45 DURHAM LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/07/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 41 DURHAM RD, NEW HYDE PARK, NY 11040. Purpose: Any Lawful 8147 a30-W ju4

9SV CAJUN LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/22/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 9 S VILLAGE AVE, ROCKVILLE CENTRE, NY 11570. Purpose: Any Lawful 8152 a30-W ju4

ASV PRIVATE DRIVER LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/21/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 1639 THORNE CT, MERRICK, NY 11566. Purpose: Any Lawful 8135 a30-W ju4

AVC & SONS LANDSCAPING SERVICES, LLC, Filed with SSNY on 01/24/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 2583 BELLMORE AVE, BELLMORE, NY 11710. Purpose: Any Lawful 8132 a30-W ju4

BRB ESTATES LLC, Filed with SSNY on 03/07/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 72 2ND AVE., EAST ROCKAWAY, NY 11561. Purpose: Any Lawful 8139 a30-W ju4

BROADWAY TENNIS VENTURE LLC filed Arts. of Org. with the Secty of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/10/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: The LLC, 15 Haddington Dr, Old Westbury, NY 11568. Purpose: any lawful act. 8079 a30-W ju4

CONDESA, LLC, Filed with SSNY on 11/07/2022. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 72 DEBORA DR, PLAINVIEW, NY 11803. Purpose: Any Lawful 8131 a30-W ju4

CORILY BAYFRONT WEST LLC, Filed with SSNY on 03/20/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 206 ROXBURY RD, GARDEN CITY, NY 11530. Purpose: Any Lawful 8140 a30-W ju4

DREAMLAND DAY CARE NY LLC, Filed with SSNY on 12/17/2024. Office: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 2132 EDENWALD AVE #1, BRONX, NY 10466. Purpose: Any Lawful 8122 a30-W ju4

EAST 57TH GROUP, LLC, Filed with SSNY on 03/17/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 11 BEICH DR, GREAT NECK, NY 11024. Purpose: Any Lawful 8143 a30-W ju4

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

FRIENDS FOR LIFE ON THE GO TRANSPORTATION LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/16/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 5501 MERRICK RD, MASSAPEQUA, NY 11758. Purpose: Any Lawful 8156 a30-W ju4

HBM WV, LLC, Filed with SSNY on 03/11/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 534 BROADHOLLOW RD, STE 302, MELVILLE, NY 11747. Purpose: Any Lawful 8134 a30-W ju4

JACK LIAM LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/23/2025. 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, 62 Springdale Avenue, Massapequa, NY 11758. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 8114 a30-W ju4

NM EXPERT CONSULTING, LLC, Filed with SSNY on 02/07/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 2429 WALLEN LN, BELLMORE, NY 11710. Purpose: Any Lawful 8153 a30-W ju4

SIGNAGE SOLUTIONS LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/11/2025. Office: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 86 PELL PL, BRONX, NY 10464. Purpose: Any Lawful 8124 a30-W ju4

STAR IRON AND STEEL, LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/17/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 1424 PLAZA AVE, NEW HYDE PARK, NY 11040. Purpose: Any Lawful 8136 a30-W ju4

TEDDYLU, LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/04/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 31 WILLOWDALE AVE, PORT WASHINGTON, NY 11050. Purpose: Any Lawful 8148 a30-W ju4

200 CHAMBERS 17G LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 02/19/25. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 255 Marine Boulevard, 2815, Amagansett, NY 11930. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 7165 a9-W my14

315 WEST 92ND STREET LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/06/25. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, c/o BDO, 200 Park Avenue, 38th Floor, New York, NY 10166. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 8821 my14-W ju18

AST PARK LLC filed Arts. of Org. with the Secty of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/25/2025. Office: New York County. SSNY has been designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: The LLC, 4345 Park Ln, Dallas, TX 75220. Purpose: any lawful act. 8830 my14-W ju18

BANGO GARDEN CITY LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/13/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 19 Franklin Ave, Garden City, NY 11530. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 8840 my14-W ju18

BSJC LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/06/25. 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, 175 E. Shore Road, Great Neck, NY 11023. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 8819 my14-W ju18

BSJC LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/06/25. 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, 175 E. Shore Road, Great Neck, NY 11023. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 8819 my14-W ju18

CAMELOT GROVE LLC, Filed 44/25. Office: NY Co. SSNY desig, as agent for process & shall mail to: 8 River Ter 11s, NY, NY 10282. Purpose: General. 8780 my14-W ju18

FULCRUM TREMONT LLC Articles of Org. filed NY Sec. of State (SSNY) 3/11/25. Office in NY Co. SSNY desig. agent of LLC whom process may be served. SSNY shall mail process to 153 E. 96 th St., 1A, NY, NY 10128, which is also the principal business location. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 8818 my14-W ju18

HOMEWRIGHTS DEVELOPMENT, LLC filed Arts. of Org. with the Secty of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/24/2025. Office: New York County. SSNY has been designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: The LLC, 7 Wimbledon Ct, Woodbury, NY 11797. Purpose: any lawful act. 8832 my14-W ju18

Sforza Realty Group LLC filed Arts. of Org. with the Secty of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/26/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: The LLC, 68 Sully Dr, Manhasset, NY 11030. Purpose: any lawful act. 8831 my14-W ju18

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

LOISLANEPARK LLC, Articles of Organization filed with the Secty of State of NY (SSNY) on April 23, 2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to: LOISLANEPARK LLC, 280 Main Street, Farmingdale, New York 11735 Purpose: Any lawful purpose 8833 my14-W ju18

Small Corners LLC filed Arts. of Org. with the Secty of State of NY (SSNY) on 2/25/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: The LLC, 460 Bayview Ave, Inwood, NY 11096. Purpose: any lawful act. 8835 my14-W ju18

STRONG BEACH HOLDINGS, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/05/2025. 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, 72 Armour Street, Long Beach, NY 11561. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 8838 my14-W ju18

WR HONEY ADVISORY SERVICES LLC, Filed 3/18/25. Office: NY Co. SSNY desig. as agent for process & shall mail to: 228 Park Ave S #690423, NY, NY 10003. Registered Agent: United States Corporation Agents, Inc., 7014 13th Ave, Ste 202, Bklyn, NY 11228. Purpose: General. 8784 my14-W ju18

PECONIC ASSETS LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/25/25. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 566 Lexington Avenue, Suite 16B, New York, NY 10022. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 7484 my16-W my21

102 WEST 86 LLC Arts. of Org. filed with SSNY on 3/27/2023. Of. Loc.: NEW YORK Co. SSNY desig. As agt. upon whom process may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 102 W 86th St, New York, NY 10024. General Purposes. 8516 my7-W ju11

173 HILLSIDE AVENUE, LLC, Filed with SSNY on 08/06/2024. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 43 RIDGE RD, ALBERTSON, NY 8489 my7-W ju11

72 MAXWELL AVENUE LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/09/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 72 MAXWELL AVE, OSTERBAY, NY 11771. Purpose: Any Lawful 8503 my7-W ju11

ALF & ROSE ENTERPRISES LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/30/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 376 MADISON AVE, WEST HEMPSTEAD, NY 11552. Purpose: Any Lawful 8496 my7-W ju11

BEYOUTIFUL COLLECTION LLC, Filed with SSNY on 03/27/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 10 SHORE RD, GLENWOOD LANDING, NY 11547. Purpose: Any Lawful 8494 my7-W ju11

CAMPOLO CONSULTING COMPANY, LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/29/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 77 GOLD PL, MALVERNE, NY 11565. Purpose: Any Lawful 8498 my7-W ju11

DIOSCURI GROUP LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/28/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 375 N BEDFORDWAY STE 311, ERICHO, NY 11753. Purpose: Any Lawful 8499 my7-W ju11

DOVER'S ANCHORS AWEIGH ADVENTURES LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/29/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 27 ST. JOHN'S PL, FREEPOR, NY 11520. Purpose: Any Lawful 8495 my7-W ju11

FIG TREE FLORIST LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/29/25. 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, 42 Grove Street, Glenwood Landing, NY 11547. 3060. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 8507 my7-W ju11

HAIR ARTISTRY BY JENN LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/24/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 1900 GRAND AVE STE 100, BALDWIN, NY 11510. Purpose: Any Lawful 8501 my7-W ju11

JAJA GOTHAM, LLC, Filed with SSNY on 01/24/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 23 PEACHTREE LN, ROSLYN HEIGHTS, NY 11577. Purpose: Any Lawful 8490 my7-W ju11

KILLASSER LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/28/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 2631 MERRICK RD STE 203, BELLMORE, NY 11710. Purpose: Any Lawful 8500 my7-W ju11

LIVE SET LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/18/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 224 HOME ST, VALLEY STREAM, NY 11580. Purpose: Any Lawful 8504 my7-W ju11

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

MMS VENTURES RE IX LLC, Filed with SSNY on 11/21/2024. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 320 OCEAN AVE, MASSAPEQUA, NY 11725. Purpose: Any Lawful 8492 my7-W ju11

MMS VENTURES RE X LLC, Filed with SSNY on 11/21/2024. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 320 OCEAN AVE, MASSAPEQUA, NY 11725. Purpose: Any Lawful 8493 my7-W ju11

NEW WASH TOWN LAUNDROMAT LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/21/2025. Office: Bronx County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 3870 WHITE PLAINS RD, BRONX, NY 10467. Purpose: Any Lawful 8488 my7-W ju11

SYCAMORE 68 LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 04/24/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 31A Hillside Lane, Syosset, NY 11791. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 8505 my7-W ju11

TANGY NOODLE LLC Arts. of Org. filed with SSNY on 8/18/2022. Of. Loc.: NEW YORK Co. SSNY desig. As agt. upon whom process may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 135 Aspen Drive, Cedar Grove, NJ 07009. Registered Agent: Leon, 98 8th Ave, Fl 1, New York, NY 10011. General Purposes. 8515 my7-W ju11

VY MANAGEMENT NY LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/10/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 148 MERRICK AVE, STE 9, MERRICK, NY 11566. Purpose: Any Lawful 8491 my7-W ju11

ZITOMER 2 DEVON STREET, LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/24/2025. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 92 WASHINGTON TOWNSEND BLDG, 401 Federal St, Dover, DE 19901. 7076 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Dua Designs, LLC, Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 10/2/24. Office location: BX County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 2072 Creston Ave, #32, Bronx, NY 10453. Purpose: any lawful act. 7192 A16 W My21

NOTICE OF FORMATION of GUARDIAN ANGEL MANAGEMENT LLC, Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/7/2025. Office location: BX County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 394 West 86th St, Apt 11A, New York, NY 10024. Purpose: any lawful act. 8138 A30 W J04

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LE DEIA, LLC, Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/10/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 450 Washington St, #210, New York, NY 10013. Purpose: any lawful act. 8111 A30 W J04

NOTICE OF FORMATION of 2W Holdings LLC, Arts of Org. filed with New York Secy of State (SSNY) on 1/27/25. Office location: New York County. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: POB 1105, NY, NY10276. Purpose: any lawful act. 7159 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF FORMATION of 432 Hudson, LLC, Arts of Org. filed with New York Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/26/25. Office location: New York County. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 432 Hudson St, NY, NY 10014. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7160 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF FORMATION of AMBULNZ NY 6, LLC, Arts of Org. filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/21/25. Office location: New York County. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 187 Wolf Rd, Ste 101, Albany, NY 12205. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is Business Filings Incorporated, 187 Wolf Rd, Ste 101, Albany, NY 12205. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7130 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF FORMATION of BONBON LIC LLC, Arts of Org. filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/24/35. Office location: New York County. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is C T Corporation System, 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7132 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Island Fizz LLC, Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/24/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to Katherine Pich, 24 Michel Avenue, Farmingdale, NY 11735. Purpose: any lawful act. 8404 My07 W J11

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION of KTB Advisory LLC, Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 11/21/2024. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 252 7th Ave, Apt 15B, New York, NY 10001. Purpose: any lawful act. My07 W J11

NOTICE OF FORMATION of LAERTES PUBLISHING SERVICES, LLC, Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/10/2024. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 604 West 138th Street, 3B, New York, NY 10031. Purpose: any lawful act. 8621 My14 W J18

NOTICE OF FORMATION of VALOR REALTY LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 06/14/2002. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: c/o Alter Mantel, LLP, 90 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10016. Purpose: any lawful activities. My7-W ju11

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

GLEN HARBOR PARTNERS, LLC, Filed with SSNY on 04/04/2025. Formed in DE on 04/26/2023. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process & shall mail to: 10 SHORE RD UNIT 405, GLENWOOD LANDING, NY 11547. DE SOS: 401 Federal St #4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful 8129 a30-W ju4

SL HARBORSIDE OWNER 2 & 3 LLC, Cert. of Formation filed in DE 9/16/2022. Authority filed NY DOS 2/14/25/3, NY Co. S/S C/O The 601W Companies 410 Tenth Ave, Mezzanine, NY, NY 10001.DE Agent: Diversified Corporate Services 508 Main St, Wilmington, DE 19804.DE Auth Officer: DE Sec of State Townsend Bldg,401 Federal St, Dover, DE 19901. 7076 a9-W my14

T ALPHONSE LLC, Cert. of Formation filed in DE 12/14/2018. Authority filed NY DOS 3/17/25, NY Co. S/S C/O Thomas Calicchio 540 Palm Way, Delray Beach, FL 33483. DE Agent: Diversified Corporate Services 508 Main St, Wilmington, DE 19804. DE Sec of State Townsend Bldg,401 Federal St, Dover, DE 19901. 7075 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of Nadia Partners (WEA 01) LLC, Authority filed with NY Dept. of State: 4/30/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. bus. addr.: 169 Madison Ave., Ste. 11268, NY, NY 10016. LLC formed in DE: 4/30/25. NY Sec. of State designated agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: Cogeney Global Inc. (CGI), 122 E. 42nd St., 18th Fl., NY, NY 10168. MO and principal business address: 720 W. Business Hwy, 60, Dexter, MO 63841. Cert. of Org. filed with MO Sec. of State, 600 W. Main St., Jefferson City, MO 65102. Purpose: all lawful purposes. 8459 May7 w Jun11

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of Bullrock NxtGenREA, LLC, Authority filed with NY Dept. of State: 5/6/25. Office location: NY County. LLC organized in MO: 8/24/22. NY Sec. of State designated agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: Cogeney Global Inc. (CGI), 122 E. 42nd St., 18th Fl., NY, NY 10168. DE addr. of LLC: 850 New Burton Rd., Ste. 201, Dover, DE 19904. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Sec. of State, 401 Federal St., Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: all lawful purposes. 8461 May7 w Jun11

LIMITED LIABILITIES ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of 63 Madison Leasehold LLC, Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/20/25. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 9/27/24. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 200 Madison Ave, NY, NY 10016. DE address of LLC: 1209 Orange St, Wilmington, DE 19801. Cert. of Formation filed with DE Secy of State, P.O. Box 898, Dover, Delaware 19903. Purpose: any lawful activity. 7128 a9-W my14

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of Air Solutions & Balancing, LLC, Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/13/25. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in New Hampshire (NH) on 12/19/01. SSNY is designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. NH address of LLC: 40 King St, Unit 1, Auburn, NH 03032. Cert. of Formation filed with NH Secy of State, One Commerce Plaza, 99 Washington Ave, Ste 600, Albany, NY 12231. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is C T Corporation System, 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. Purpose: any lawful activity. a9-W my14 7129

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of Nadia Partners (WEA 01) LLC, Authority filed with NY Dept. of State: 4/30/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. bus. addr.: 169 Madison Ave., Ste. 11268, NY, NY 10016. LLC formed in DE: 4/30/25. NY Sec. of State designated agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: Cogeney Global Inc. (CGI), 122 E. 42nd St., 18th Fl., NY, NY 10168. DE addr. of LLC: c/o CGI, 850 New Burton Rd., Ste. 201, Dover, DE 19904. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Sec. of State, 401 Federal St., Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: all lawful purposes. 8459 May7 w Jun11

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of Bullrock NxtGenREA, LLC, Authority filed with NY Dept. of State: 5/6/25. Office location: NY County. LLC organized in MO: 8/24/22. NY Sec. of State designated agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: Cogeney Global Inc. (CGI), 122 E. 42nd St., 18th Fl., NY, NY 10168. MO and principal business address: 720 W. Business Hwy, 60, Dexter, MO 63841. Cert. of Org. filed with MO Sec. of State, 600 W. Main St., Jefferson City, MO 65102. Purpose: all lawful purposes. 8459 May7 w Jun11

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of Innovative Lab Services LLC, Authority filed with NY Dept. of State: 3/5/25. Office location: NY County. Princ. bus. addr.: 6909 Columbus Rd, SW, Granville, OH 43023. LLC formed in DE: 2/27/23. NY Sec. of State designated agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: Cogeney Global Inc. (CGI), 122 E. 42nd St., 18th Fl., NY, NY 10168. DE address of LLC: 850 New Burton Rd., Ste. 201, Dover, DE 19904. Cert. of Form. filed with DE Sec. of State, 401 Federal St., Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: all lawful purposes. 8792 my14-W ju18

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of TWELVE BELOW II LP, The fictitious name is TWELVE BELOW II LP, Authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 3/20/25. Office location: New York County. LP formed in Delaware (DE) on 2/27/23. SSNY is designated as agent of LP upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. DE address of LP: 251 Little Falls Dr, Wilmington, DE 19808. List of names and addresses of all general partners available from SSNY. The name and address of the Reg. Agent is C T Corporation System, 28 Liberty St, NY, NY 10005. Cert. of Limited Partnership filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activity. a9-W my14 7156

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

URBAN ANGLER TRAVEL LLC, Filed: 3/5/25. Office: NY Co. Org. in DE: 02/18/2025. SSNY desig. as agent for process & shall mail to: 381 Fifth Ave, 5th Fl, NY, NY 10016. Foreign add: 611 S Dupont Hwy, Ste 102, Dover, DE 19901. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy Of State Of De. Div Of Corps. John G. Townsend Bldg, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: General. 8782 my14-W ju18

CS Forena LLC Auth. filed 4/23/25. Cty: New York. LLC formed in DE on 9/6/24. SSNY desig. for process & shall mail to: 65 Challenger Rd., #250, Ridgefield Park, NJ 07660. DE addr. of LLC: 16192 Coastal Hwy, Lewes, DE 19958. Cert. of Form.