

IN BRIEF

Justice Department Pursues \$5 Million in Bitcoin Tied to SIM-Swap Thefts

The U.S. Attorney Jeanine Pirro announced Tuesday that the U.S. Department of Justice had filed a civil forfeiture complaint seeking more than \$5 million in Bitcoin that it said was stolen through a series of SIM-swapping attacks victimizing cryptocurrency holders across the country.

And the Justice Department's filing underscored the vulnerabilities of digital assets to cybercrime and its efforts to trace and recover stolen funds. Since 2020, the Justice Department's Computer Crime and Intellectual Property Section, which is leading the case, has secured more than 180 cyber-crime convictions and helped return over \$350 million to victims.

"For crypto holders, the takeaway is simple: Technical safeguards like hardware wallets, multi-factor authentication and carrier-level PIN protections are no longer optional; they're essential," said Darrell P. White, a partner at Kimura London & White in California and counsel in one of the largest crypto civil asset forfeiture cases in U.S. history.

"For companies and investors in the digital asset space, these cases highlight the need for proactive compliance and response protocols before, not after, a breach occurs," White added. "Those who ignore the risk surface created by mobile devices and digital wallets do so at their peril."

The underlying thefts occurred between Oct. 29, 2022, and March 21, 2023, with funds that have been traced to the unauthorized transfer of crypto wallets owned by five victims. And it involved a SIM Swap attack, a technique that allows perpetrators to seize control of a victim's mobile phone number and intercept authentication codes.

After each of the five thefts occurred, the perpetrators moved the stolen funds through multiple crypto wallets and ultimately consolidated them into one wallet that funded an account at Stake.com, an online casino, according to the complaint.

Many of these transactions were circular because they

eventually returned the funds to their original source. The Justice Department alleged that the defendants' actions in the practice are consistent with money laundering utilized to "clean" proceeds of criminal activity.

The Justice Department noted: "Circular transactions obfuscate the origin of funds by inflating the volume of inflows and outflows in an account, making the larger balance (or source of funds) appear to engage in legitimate business."

—Michael A. Mora

CFTC Joins SEC In Withdrawing Cybersecurity Rules

The Commodity Futures Trading Commission will withdraw a Biden-era proposal requiring futures commission merchants and swap dealers to be more resilient to cybersecurity threats, the CFTC said Tuesday.

Acting CFTC Chair Caroline Pham called the rules overly prescriptive and perhaps duplicative of rules set by international regulators and self-regulating organizations.

"Regulated entities, including the vast majority of our swap dealers and FCMs [Futures Commission Merchants] that are part of banking organizations, have already implemented comprehensive enterprise-wide operational resilience programs," Pham stated in a LinkedIn post. "The CFTC will reconsider how potential operational resilience rules would work in practice together with the rules of other regulators, whether foreign or domestic."

The CFTC introduced the Operational Resilience Framework for Futures Commission Merchants, Swap Dealers, and Major Swap Participants in December 2023, partly in response to a large-scale cyber-attack at the financial trading services firm ION Group earlier that year. The proposed rules required regulated entities to establish an information and technology security system, a third-party relationship program and a business

Blue States Agree: Supreme Court Should 'Definitively' Resolve Tariff Case »2

Circuit Lifts Order Shielding Nonprofit Program From NY's Unlicensed Law Practice Rules

BY ALYSSA AQUINO

THE U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit has lifted an injunction preventing New York from enforcing its unauthorized practice



Upsolve operates similarly to nonprofit efforts in other states by training nonlawyers to provide basic legal advice

of law restrictions against a nonprofit whose nonlawyer "justice advocates" provide free legal advice to New Yorkers fighting debt collectors.

The three-judge panel unwound U.S. District Judge Paul Crotty's

May 2022 injunction allowing Upsolve Inc. to open the legal aid program, finding that the judge used the incorrect legal standard to determine whether New York's unauthorized practice of law, or UPL, statutes violated Upsolve's free speech rights.

Crotty had held that the laws restrained Upsolve's speech and that they couldn't be justified under a strict scrutiny review. But the circuit said that Crotty should have applied less demanding intermediate scrutiny to see if the restrictions comport with the U.S. Constitution's free speech protections, as the laws apply to anyone practicing law in New York, regardless of the type of law practiced or the practitioner's message.

"It is clear that the UPL statutes do not license only certain views that the State finds acceptable, nor do they refuse to license or condemn less favored viewpoints," U.S. Circuit Judge Richard Sullivan wrote in the panel's Tuesday decision. Circuit Judges Pierre Leval and Sarah Merriam also sat on the panel.

» Page 2



A still from a promotional video of the planned Legacy Sports Park, 320-acre private family sports and entertainment complex in Mesa, Arizona.

Father-Son Duo Issued Collective 11-Year Prison Sentence for \$284M Fraud

BY ALYSSA AQUINO

U.S. DISTRICT Judge Lewis Kaplan of the Southern District of New York had firm words for the father-and-son duo who bilked investors out of \$284 million to build a massive sports complex in Arizona, sentencing them to jail for a combined 11 years on Tuesday.

Kaplan sentenced Randall "Randy" Miller to 48 months for securities fraud and 24 months for aggravated identity theft, and sentenced his son, Chad Miller, to 36 months

for securities fraud and 24 months for aggravated identity theft.

The sentences are between triple and double the two-year prison sentences that attorneys for the Millers—Timothy Sini of Nixon Peabody and Hector Diaz of Diaz Law—sought in the lead-up to sentencing, with Kaplan firmly rejecting Sini's arguments that Randy Miller had acted in pursuit of a 30-year dream to build a sports facility.

Listening to the defense, "one might've thought that [the Millers] had been convicted of building a wonderful park," said

» Page 4



GABBY JONES-BLOOMBERG

An upcoming U.S. Department Health and Human Services report may suggest a link between Tylenol taken by pregnant women and autism.

2nd Circuit To Hear Appeal in Suits Tying Tylenol to Autism

BY AMANDA BRONSTAD

LAWYERS alleging that prenatal use of Tylenol increases a child's chance of developing autism will attempt to instate their lawsuits next month after a federal judge tossed their scientific experts.

The Oct. 9 oral arguments before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit come as Department of Health and Human Services Secretary Robert Kennedy released a Make America Healthy Again report on Tuesday outlining the Trump administration's objectives to combat chronic diseases in children. According to a Sept. 5 article in the Wall Street Journal, an upcoming HHS report was expected to suggest a potential link between Tylenol, when taken by pregnant women, and autism.

In a livestream of Tuesday's announcement, Kennedy cited autism rates among the 128 issues relating to childhood chronic diseases, such as diabetes and



Ashley Keller, senior partner at Keller Postman



Jay Lefkowitz, partner at Kirkland & Ellis

ultra-processed foods. President Donald Trump, he said, is "particularly concerned" about the rising rate of autism, now at one in 31 kids.

Keller told Law.com there could be opportunities to keep the Second Circuit apprised of new developments, such as the MAHA report and, "depending on what HHS does and when they do it,"

» Page 4

Goldman Sachs' CLO Denies Playing Role in Epstein's Will

BY GREG ANDREWS

GOLDMAN Sachs Chief Legal Officer Kathryn Ruemmler on Tuesday denied having any legal role in the estate of convicted sex trafficker Jeffrey Epstein.

The Manhattan-based investment banking giant issued a statement on her behalf a day after Congress released a trove of Epstein documents, including a January 2019 version of his will that lists Ruemmler as backup executor of his estate.

It lists Ruemmler, who at the time was a litigation partner at Latham & Watkins, as "successor



COURTESY PHOTO

Kathryn Ruemmler joined Goldman Sachs in 2020 and became lead chief a year later.

executor," meaning she would step in if the two executors, longtime Epstein associ-

» Page 7

Cleary Elects New Managing Partner, While Gerstenzang Will Hold New Senior Partner Role

BY PATRICK SMITH

CLEARY Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton is moving to a new leadership structure, after electing longtime partner Jeffrey Karpf to be managing partner starting

in January 2026. Meanwhile, the firm's current managing partner, Michael Gerstenzang, will step into a new role as senior partner next year.

It will be the first time Cleary has had a new managing partner in close to a decade, and it comes

after significant changes in the legal industry and at Cleary. The New York firm moved to a two-tier partnership structure last year and has been more active in lateral recruiting, amid an increasingly aggressive talent market among global elite firms.

» Page 4



COURTESY PHOTO

Jeffrey Karpf has been named managing partner of Cleary, starting in January 2026.

DECISIONS OF INTEREST

First Department

CIVIL PROCEDURE: **Forfeiture of \$40,000 food truck after \$2,600 fine appears partly punitive, excessive.** *City of New York v. Jones, App. Div.*

Second Department

CIVIL PROCEDURE: **Plaintiff denied leave to amend complaint to add defendants' attorney.** *Kelly v. Muss Development, Supreme Court, Kings.*

CRIMINAL LAW: **Identification and statements deemed admissible in criminal action.** *People v. Rodriguez, Supreme Court, Kings.*

CONTRACTS LAW: **Contracts case dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.** *Sellersfunding International Portfolio LTD. v. Major and Minor Detailz Inc., Supreme Court, Kings.*

REAL ESTATE: **Court set asides jury's verdict concerning two-family home.** *Millard v. Miner, Supreme COurt, Kings.*

LANDLORD-TENANT LAW: **Summary judgment denied in landlord-tenant proceeding.** *2921 Ditmars Boulevard LLC v. Ditmars Bake LLC, Civil Court, Queens.*

CIVIL PROCEDURE: **Notice to admit vacated; numerous errors that amounted to manifest abuse of CPLR § 3123.** *Rivela v. Walgreen Eastern Co., Supreme Court, Richmond.*

U.S. Courts

CRIMINAL LAW: **Court's instruction on extraterritorial jurisdiction in commodity fraud case not erroneous.** *U.S. v. Phillips, 2d Cir.*

CIVIL PROCEDURE: **Injunctive relief denied; irreparable injury, likely success on breach claim not shown.** *Elder Techs. Inc. v. Visone, SDNY.*

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW: **Social security benefits case remanded; all improperly weighed medical evidence.** *Gottlieb v. Comm'r of the Soc. Sec. Admin., EDNY.*

DISPUTE RESOLUTION: **Arbitration is compelled; elements of arbitrability satisfied, parties agreed to arbitrate.** *Johnson v. U-Haul Co. of N.Y. and Vermont Inc., NDNY.*

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

INSIDE LAW JOURNAL

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

See page 2 for complete Inside lineup.



Build Your Legal Team.

Go to lawjobs.com and choose the most qualified candidates.

lawjobs.com
Your hiring partner

ALM.

BONDS

Contact us by phone or email at

info@blaikiegroupp.com

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Appeals | <input type="checkbox"/> Supersedeas |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discharge Lien | <input type="checkbox"/> Executor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Guardian | <input type="checkbox"/> Lost Instrument |

Express Solutions Expressly for Bonding Problems Since 1933

THE BLAIKIE GROUP

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

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

www.blaikiegroupp.com



ARTHUR B. LEVINE CO., INC.
SURETY BOND AGENTS

- Litigation Cases
- Trusts & Estates
- Lost Checks, Stocks & Bonds
- Trustees, Receivers & Guardians

370 Lexington Ave., Suite 1101
T: 212-986-7470 | F: 212-697-6091
bonds@LevineCompany.com
www.LevineCompany.com

SURETY BOND SPECIALISTS
Celebrating Over 35 Years!

New York Law Journal Inside

Nonjurisdictional Informal Statement Held Sufficient Under CPLR 5515[1]: Form vs. Content by Elliott Scheinberg »3	Environmental Law »3 Trump EPA's GHG Endangerment Revocation Sparks Legal Challenges by Michael B. Gerrard	Outside Counsel »4 The Appointments Clause, Part 1: The Supreme Court and 'Kennedy' by Anthony Michael Sabino	CORPORATE UPDATE »5 Artificial Intelligence: Risks and Best Practices Relating to Businesses' Use of AI Tools by Jessica L. Lipson, Genny Ngai and Tess Bonoli	After Regulatory Smackdown, Resorts World Las Vegas Brings Aboard Gambling Law Veterans by line By Trudy Knockless	Calendar of Events »7 Online ➤ Today's Tip View the special sections online and download today's paper at the Law Journal Download Center. Only at nylj.com.
Online ➤ Court Calendars Civil and Supreme Court calendars for New York and surrounding counties are now available weeks in advance at nylj.com. Search cases by county, index, judge or party name. Information is updated daily. Only at nylj.com.		Disciplinary Proceeding »4, 6 The Appellate Division, Second Department	Vanguard Replaces GC Who Started in October by Trudy Knockless	Snap General Counsel Who Settled Barrage of Litigation Moving On by Trudy Knockless	Online ➤ Submit a legal notice for publication on nylj.com .
➤ More Corporate columns are archived at nylj.com .					

Blue States Agree: Supreme Court Should ‘Definitively’ Resolve Tariff Case

BY JIMMY HOOVER

THE U.S. Supreme Court should quickly hear President Donald Trump’s appeal of a decision finding his tariff regime illegal, a group of Democratic states told the justices this week.

In their filing, attorneys general from Oregon and 11 other Democratic states challenging Trump’s tariffs agreed with the president that the Supreme Court must needs to act fast to resolve the major global uncertainty over the fate of his taxes on imports from around the world.

Trump is asking the Supreme Court to agree, by as soon as Wednesday, to hear his appeal to salvage his sweeping tariffs after the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit ruled last month that they exceeded his authority.

“[T]he issue is undoubtedly of great national importance,” the states, led by Oregon Attorney General Dan Rayfield, told the court. “Thus, although the Federal Circuit got it right—and although the peti-

tion is littered with inaccuracies, hyperbole, and citations to material outside the summary judgment record—the state respondents agree that this Court should grant expedited review.”

“The Court should take this opportunity to resolve definitively the straightforward question of statutory interpretation presented here,” the states added in their brief. “And it should affirm.”

The president’s top Supreme Court lawyer, U.S. Solicitor General D. John Sauer, is requesting that the justices fast-track the case and hold oral arguments the first week of November.

With assent from blue states, Trump’s bid for an expedited Supreme Court hearing now has the support of both sets of plaintiffs challenging his tariff policies. Last week, a group of businesses said the justices should quickly grant review to resolve the disruptions to American businesses from Trump’s tariffs, which remain in effect as the president pursues his appeal to the high court.

The 7-4 ruling by the Federal



President Donald Trump is asking the Supreme Court to agree, by as soon as Wednesday, to hear his appeal to salvage his sweeping tariffs.

Circuit threatens to remove one of the cornerstone policies of Trump’s second presidency. Trump has warned of economic ruin for the United States if the decision is upheld, with Secretary of Treasury Scott Bessent warning that it would require massive refunds to importers.

Under the Constitution, Congress—not the president—has the authority to “lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises” and to “regulate Commerce with foreign Nations.”

The question for the Supreme Court, should it take up the case, will be whether the 1977 Interna-

tional Emergency Economic Powers Act is a valid congressional authorization of the sweeping tariffs that Trump placed on virtually all U.S. trading partners in a major upheaval of global trade in January and April.

That law allows the president to “regulate... importation” during a declared national emergency.

The Federal Circuit found that Trump had exceeded his authority under IEEPA when he issued the “unbounded” and “ever-changing” tariffs.

Noting that the law doesn’t even use the word “tariff,” the appeals court said Trump could not invoke the statute’s vague authorization to “regulate” trade during a national emergency as a delegation of unlimited power to alter the country’s tariff schedule.

The appeals court also said no previous president has relied on IEEPA to impose tariffs in the nearly 50 years that the statute has been on the books, with the law exclusively having been used to impose specific restrictions on financial transactions of specific

foreign nations that pose a threat to the United States.

The Federal Circuit left the tariffs in place while the Trump administration appeals to the Supreme Court.

In its petition to the justices, the Trump administration criticized the lower court for holding that the IEEPA does not authorize a tariff regime of the scope and sweep Trump announced.

The statute’s delegation of authority to the president to “regulate... importation” to address an “extraordinary threat” is all that is needed, Sauer wrote.

The Federal Circuit’s decision allows judges to weigh the legality of tariffs “based on their own policy views of how much is too much, how long is too long, or how many countries are too many,” Sauer added. “Such judicial second-guessing of the President’s determinations would be improper.”

The case is *Trump v. V.O.S. Selections*, No. 25-250.

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

Chief Justice Roberts Allows Trump to Temporarily Freeze \$4 Billion in Foreign Aid

BY JIMMY HOOVER

CHIEF Justice John Roberts Jr. acted alone Tuesday to let the Trump administration temporarily freeze \$4 billion in foreign assistance that had been appropriated by Congress, despite warnings from aid groups that any delay could put the funds at risk of expiring at the end of the month.

Roberts agreed to place an “administrative stay” on an order from a federal court in Washington, D.C., directing the U.S. Agency for International Development to distribute the funds to various aid groups for assistance programs around the world, from the Congo to Mongolia. The chief justice’s decision will give the full U.S. Supreme Court time to consider the government’s request that it be allowed to freeze the money until it expires on Sept. 30.

In papers opposing the administrative stay, the groups had warned that any delay could risk running



Chief Justice John Roberts Jr.

afoul of the end-of-month deadline, with the government needing to take preparatory steps before the money could be formally “obligated” for its congressionally intended purposes.

U.S. District Judge Amir Ali of the District of Columbia had ordered

the administration to distribute the funds to various aid groups after agreeing with their claim that the president’s decision to freeze appropriated money violated federal law. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit upheld the order.

The Supreme Court is now considering the row over USAID foreign assistance for the second time, having rebuffed the administration in an earlier iteration of the case.

The dispute has raised several novel issues under the Administrative Procedure Act, appropriations statutes and the 1974 Impoundment Control Act, which was enacted after President Richard Nixon unilaterally declined to spend government funds passed by Congress.

Initially, groups challenging President Donald Trump’s decision to freeze spending across the federal government found a useful tool in the impoundment law.

In a decision late last month, however, the D.C. Circuit held that the statute does not give private parties such as aid groups a legal right to sue over presidential impoundments of congressional spending. Instead, the law allows only the comptroller general of the United States, who heads the Government Accountability Office,

to bring such an action.

In light of that development, Trump’s Department of Justice has now accused Ali of ignoring the Impoundment Control Act in his latest order finding that Trump’s foreign aid freeze violated other statutes, including the Administrative Procedure Act.

“[T]hat is an impermissible end-run around the ICA, which reserves these disputes to the political branches and the ICA’s reticulated procedures,” U.S. Solicitor General D. John Sauer wrote in a Supreme Court filing that accused Ali of “brinkmanship” and being “unchastened” by an earlier reversal in the case.

On Aug. 28, Trump invoked ICA’s process for implementing an impoundment by writing a formal proposal to Congress to rescind the \$4 billion in appropriated foreign assistance at issue in the case. By law, Congress has 45 days to consider the proposal before it elapses and the funds are required to be obligated.

The frozen foreign aid, however, is set to expire on Sept. 30, before the ICA’s 45-day deadline. That is why groups such as AIDS Vaccine Advocacy Coalition and the Center for Victims of Torture are demanding the funds’ immediate release while the Trump administration is seeking a stay from the Supreme Court to pause Ali’s injunction.

“These irreparable harms far outweigh any short-duration burden on the government of taking preparatory steps to obligate funds that Congress mandated spending eighteen months ago,” wrote the groups’ attorneys, led by Lauren Bateman of Public Citizen Litigation Group and Daniel Jacobson of Jacobson Lawyers Group.

Roberts has given the groups until 4 p.m. Friday to file a response to the government’s application.

The case is *Department of State v. AIDS Vaccine Advocacy Coalition*, No. 25A269.

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

NY-Based Hospitality Firm Launches in Miami, Responding To Growing Culinary Scene

BY VIVIANNE SERRET

WITH Florida at the forefront of tourism, and Miami’s culture a prime culinary destination, New York-based hospitality law firm Helbraun Levey is looking to add to the state’s landscape with an office in Miami.

The firm has launched an office in Coral Gables to support clients who have established restaurants in South Florida and may be thinking about expanding to Orlando, Tampa Bay and beyond. And Helbraun Levey itself is also looking to expand into those additional markets in Florida.

“When a client asks you to open up an office, you listen,” said David Helbraun, one of the firm’s



David Helbraun, Helbraun Levey

founders and managing partner. “So we came down, and we’ve been coming down for years, investigating the scene, getting to know the people on the ground here and determining if it was the right move for us. And it was a resounding yes.”

With restaurant leasing activity nearly doubling since 2020 and Florida welcoming a record 142.9 million tourists in 2024, the need

has never been greater, according to a news release. The firm exclusively represents the hospitality industry: hotels, chefs, restaurants, quick-serve restaurants, full-service restaurants, retail food spaces and more. It also works with developers who are putting food service establishments into their developments, typically high-end restaurants.

Helbraun, who has been in the hospitality industry since 2005, said there is an explosive growth in food, beverage and tourism throughout all of South Florida fueled by New York City transplants and national developers, and hospitality driven real estate.

“We have just been hearing over and over again, especially over the last five years, how important

and exciting the Florida hospitality industry has become, so much so that our clients started to actually ask us to open up an office down there,” Helbraun said.

The firm’s strategy is to approach restaurants in a variety of ways, recently through word-of-mouth from current clients representing thousands of restaurants around the country. It also partnered with Sandman Savrann PLLC, a leading firm within the hospitality industry.

Sandman Savrann’s three Florida principals—Daniel Benavides, Russ Savrann and Greg Warren—are serving as Helbraun Levey’s regional practice partners: Benavides and Warren offer significant experience as outside general counsel to South Florida-

based restaurants and hotels, and Savrann is a highly regarded hotel attorney with decades of expertise. Attorney Sam Rubert, who has 20 years of expertise in Florida, will also support Helbraun Levey as its local alcoholic beverage attorney, according to a news release.

The firm arrives in the market as Miami-Dade County experienced sustained tourism growth in 2024, attracting over 28 million visitors, the highest number ever recorded in a single year, according to the Greater Miami Convention & Visitors Bureau. Specifically, tourists spent “\$22 billion in the destination, generating \$2.2 billion in local and state tax revenues.”

The county led Florida in occupancy, with it ranking “fourth

nationally in hotel occupancy and third in the average daily room rate metric, reflecting strong tourism demand.”

“Our mission has always been to advise operators at every stage—from pre-opening to growing and scaling brands,” said Joseph Levey, one of Helbraun Levey’s founders, in a statement. “Florida’s momentum presents incredible opportunities for us, and by establishing a stronger presence here, we can provide restaurants, bars and hotels with the same hands-on, practical guidance we’re known for in New York. We are here to be the partner who understands their world.”

@ Vivienne Serret can be reached at vserret@alm.com.

Upsolve

« Continued from page 1

Upsolve, alongside Reverend John Udo-Onkon, a pastor who joined the organization’s legal aid program, had challenged New York’s unlicensed legal practice laws with the help of the Institute for Justice, arguing the restrictions blocked it from providing critical legal services to indebted New Yorkers. In a statement, the Institute for Justice said it would appeal the circuit ruling to the U.S. Supreme Court.

“The government can’t make it illegal to give people advice,” said Robert McNamara, the Institute for Justice’s Deputy Litigation Director.

“Nothing in today’s ruling disagrees with that basic premise, but it does upend the injunction that allowed our volunteers to give that ordinary advice.”

Although the circuit vacated the injunction, it ruled that the UPL statutes regulate Upsolve’s speech, rejecting New York Attorney General Letitia James’ arguments that the state’s unlicensed legal practices laws only regulate conduct. The panel found that the laws, if applied to Upsolve, would prevent it from communicating legal advice, not from researching or developing that advice.

“Indeed, the Attorney General presumably would not seek to enforce New York’s UPL statutes against Plaintiffs if they simply for-

mulated legal advice in their own minds without ever conveying that advice to a client,” Circuit Judge.

The panel stressed that Upsolve’s nonlawyer advocates only provided limited legal advice—how to fill out New York’s one-page form for answering debt-collection actions—and that their nonlawyer advocates weren’t drafting pleadings, appearing in court or filing legal documents.

The circuit analogized the case to *Hines v. Pardue*, a retired veterinarian’s lawsuit challenging Texas requirements for medical professionals to physically examine pets before offering medical advice. In its 2024 ruling, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit found that the rules unconstitutionally

restrict the free speech rights of the retiree, who offered email advice to pet owners.

“In other words, ‘the regulation only kicked in when [the veterinarian] began to share his opinion with his patient’s owner,’” the Second Circuit said, quoting from the Fifth Circuit decision. “Because New York’s UPL statutes likewise only ‘kick in’ when Rev. Udo-Onkon and other Justice Advocates convey their legal advice to a client, the UPL statutes, as applied here, regulate Plaintiffs’ speech.”

The attorney general’s office didn’t respond to a request for comment.

The case has been pending for years, with Upsolve opening the

disputed legal advice program after Crotty issued his injunction. The program functions similarly to nonprofit efforts in other states seeking to address access to justice barriers by training nonlawyers to provide basic legal advice, and a slew of national and local legal services organizations came out in support of Upsolve.

As he issued the injunction, Crotty observed that Upsolve’s program “would help alleviate an avalanche of unanswered debt collection cases.”

In its Tuesday order, the Second Circuit noted that debt collection actions account for roughly a quarter of all suits filed in state court, and that while many cases

are “clearly meritless,” defendants fail to appear in the vast majority of cases.

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

Letters Welcome

The Law Journal welcomes letters from its readers for publication. They 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 Andrew Denney at adenney@alm.com.

Renew your subscription. Call 1-877-256-2472.

Expert Analysis

Nonjurisdictional Informational Statement Held Sufficient Under CPLR 5515[1]: Form vs. Content

An appellant must satisfy three jurisdictional predicates before the Appellate Division may entertain the merits of the appeal: aggravement (CPLR 5511); appealable paper (CPLR 5512) and timeliness of the appeal, referring to the notice of appeal (CPLR 5513). The notice of appeal is addressed in CPLR 5515[1]:

“An appeal shall be taken by serving on the adverse party a notice of appeal and filing it in the office where the judgment or order of the court of original instance is entered except that where an order granting permission to appeal is made, the appeal is taken when such order is entered. A notice shall designate the party taking the appeal, the judgment or order or specific part of the judgment or order appealed from and the court to which the appeal is taken.”

This article examines appellate expansion of CPLR 5520(c) contrary to the canons of statutory construction.

The Unified Rules Notwithstanding Each Department Has Its Own Local Rules

The Appellate Division, Second Department’s preamble to the Unified Rules, 22 NYCRR 1250, which took effect on Sept. 17, 2018, notes that each department provides an excellent summary to the bar that notwithstanding the fact that all four Appellate Division departments agreed to establish practice rules that pertain inter alia, to all matters that are commenced in the Appellate Division, each department, nevertheless, continues to maintain its own local rules:

“On June 29, 2018, the Presiding Justices of the Appellate Division promulgated revised Practice Rules of the Appellate Division. Those rules are effective on Sept. 17, 2018, and shall apply to (1) all matters that are commenced in the Appellate Division, or in which a notice of appeal to the Appellate Division is filed, on or after the effective date, and (2) all matters pending in the

By Elliott Scheinberg



Appellate Division on the effective date, unless otherwise ordered by the court upon a showing that the application of the new rules would result in substantial prejudice to a party or would be manifestly unjust or impracticable under the circum-



Angela Susan Scheinberg

Author’s Note: This article is in honor and in memory of Angela Susan Scheinberg. I was extraordinarily blessed that she was my wife. On 9/11, her life was savagely wrenched from me and from all who knew and loved her. Angela was a paradigm of kindness and integrity, and a beacon of virtue. I also honor every patriotic American murdered that day.

stances. The Appellate Division Rules of Practice are located in Part 1250 of the New York State Rules of Court (22 NYCRR Part 1250).

“While the newly-adopted Appellate Division Rules of Practice are statewide in application, given the differences inherent in practice amongst the four departments of the Appellate Division, each department has also adopted a set of local rules.”

Angela Susan Scheinberg, the author’s late wife who died in the

Sept. 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in New York City. Courtesy photo

The local Rules of Practice of the First Department, are found in 22 NYCRR Part 600.

The local Rules of Practice of the Second Department are found in 22 NYCRR Part 670.

The local Rules of Practice of the Third Department are found in 22 NYCRR Part 850.

The local Rules of Practice of the Fourth Department are found in 22 NYCRR Part 1000.

The Informational Statement Pursuant to §1250.3 Is Not a Jurisdictional Paper

The Unified Rules, 22 NYCRR 1250.3[a] of New York Administrative Code require that a notice of appeal be served with a copy of the judgment or order and an informational statement:

“(a) Initial Filings. Unless the court shall direct otherwise, in all civil matters counsel for the appellant or the petitioner shall file with the clerk of the court of original instance and serve on all parties, together with the notice of appeal or transfer order and the order or judgment appealed from, an initial informational statement on a form approved by the court and in such number as the court may direct. The clerk of the court from which the appeal is taken shall promptly transmit to the Appellate Division the informational statement and a copy of the notice of appeal or order granting leave or transferal and the order or judgment appealed from.”

Notwithstanding §1250.3, The Four Departments Are Not Unified With Respect To Requiring An Informational Statement

The First Department §600.3, Initial Filings, Active » Page 8

ELLIOTT SCHEINBERG is a member of the New York State Bar Association’s Committee on Courts of Appellate Jurisdiction.

LAWYER TO LAWYER

For information contact
212-457-7850

FLORIDA ATTORNEY

LAW OFFICES OF RANDY C. BOTWINICK

Formerly of Pazer, Epstein, Jaffe & Fein

CONCENTRATING IN PERSONAL INJURY

RANDY C. BOTWINICK
34 Years Experience

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

Co-Counsel and Participation Fees Paid

JAY HALPERN
39 Years Experience

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

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

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

ANDREW J. COSTELLA JR., ESQ.

CONCENTRATING IN NO-FAULT ARBITRATION FOR YOUR CLIENTS' OUTSTANDING MEDICAL BILLS & LOST WAGE CLAIMS

SUCCESSFULLY HANDLING THOUSANDS OF NO-FAULT CLAIMS

Proud to serve and honored that New York's most prominent personal injury law firms have entrusted us with their no-fault arbitration matters

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

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

GERSONWITZ LIBO & KOREK P.C.

New Jersey Office

Let Us Help With Your NJ Injury Litigation

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

39 Years Experience

Call 24/7: **866-450-4101**
157 Engle Street
Englewood, NJ 07631
LAWYERTIME.COM

ENVIRONMENTAL LAW

Trump EPA’s GHG Endangerment Revocation Sparks Legal Challenges

On July 29, 2025, at an auto dealership in Indiana, Lee Zeldin, Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), announced a proposal to withdraw the Endangerment Finding for greenhouse gases (GHGs), which has been EPA’s legal basis for using the Clean Air Act to fight climate change.

This action, which will surely be fought in court once it becomes final, raises a host of legal issues.

This article discusses the legal basis for and significance of the Endangerment Finding; Zeldin’s principal arguments for revoking it, and challenges that will be raised to them; the range of possible outcomes in the likely event that this reaches the Supreme Court; and the implications of the various outcomes.

Legal Basis

Section 202(a)(1) of the Clean Air Act of 1970 states, “The Administrator [of EPA] shall by regulation prescribe . . . standards applicable to the emission of any air pollutant from any class . . . of new motor vehicles . . . which in his judgment cause, or contribute to, air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare.”

In 1999, during the administration of President Bill Clinton, an environmental group petitioned EPA to use this authority to regulate GHGs from motor vehicles, which were then the nation’s largest source of GHGs, behind only coal-fired power plants. (They are now the first largest source).

The Clinton administration did not act, and the succeeding administration of President George W. Bush denied the petition. Several

By Michael B. Gerrard



states and others sued, leading to the landmark decision in *Massachusetts v. EPA*, 549 U.S. 497 (2007).

The court found that GHGs fall within the Clean Air Act’s expansive definition of “air pollutant.” It then ruled, “EPA has offered no reasoned explanation for its refusal to decide whether greenhouse gases cause or contribute to climate change... We need not and do not reach the question whether on remand EPA must make an endangerment finding, or whether policy concerns can inform EPA’s

Utilizing this finding, EPA in 2010 and 2011 issued regulations limiting GHGs from automobiles and medium- and heavy-duty vehicles.

actions in the event that it makes such a finding. We hold only that EPA must ground its reasons for action or inaction in the statute.”

On Dec. 15, 2009, the first year of the administration of President Barack Obama, EPA did issue the endangerment finding. It concluded that GHGs from new motor vehicles and engines contribute to the GHGs that “threaten the public health and welfare of current and future generations.”

Utilizing this finding, EPA in 2010 and 2011 issued regulations limiting GHGs from automobiles and medium- and heavy-duty vehicles.

An EPA regulation provides that when an air pollutant is regulated anywhere within the Clean Air Act, that same pollutant must be regulated coming from stationary sources like power plants and factories, 40 C.F.R. Sec. 52.21(b)(50) (iv), so EPA then issued regulations concerning GHGs from new or modified stationary sources.

All of this was challenged in multiple lawsuits. They were heard together by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

That court rejected the plaintiffs’ attacks on the scientific basis for the endangerment finding, ruling that there was ample scientific basis in the record to support EPA’s conclusion.

The court also upheld EPA’s follow-on actions or held that the plaintiffs lacked standing to challenge them. *Coalition for Responsible Regulation v. EPA*, 684 F.3d 102 (D.C. Cir. 2012).

The Supreme Court agreed to review parts of the case, but not the challenge to the endangerment finding. It upheld most of EPA’s actions, except for one portion that affected a small portion of stationary source emissions. *Utility Air Regulatory Group v. EPA*, 573 U.S. 302 (2014).

Shortly afterwards EPA issued its Clean Power Plan, which attempted to shift much electricity generation away from coal-fired power plants toward cleaner sources. While the lawsuits against this action were pending before the D.C. Circuit, in Feb. 2016 the Supreme Court shocked the environmental law world and stayed implementation of the plan.

It did so in a one-paragraph decision that provided no explanation of its reasoning. *West Virginia v. EPA*, 577 U.S. 1126 (2016). A few months later Donald Trump won the presidential election. As he had pledged would happen, in June 2019 EPA repealed the Clean Power Plan.

After Joe Biden became President in 2021, EPA indicated it would be issuing a different rule to control pollution from coal plants rather than reviving the Clean Power Plan. Nonetheless, in June 2022 the Supreme Court ruled that EPA lacked the power to issue the Clean Power Plan.

It announced a legal doctrine, the Major Questions Doctrine, that notwithstanding the literal meaning of a statute, an agency may not act on a matter of “vast political or economic significance” without very explicit authoriza-

» Page 7

HOW COMPETITIVE IS YOUR FOOTPRINT BY PRACTICES?

Ask Legal Compass: at.alm.com/legalcompass

ALM. Intelligence

MICHAEL B. GERRARD is a professor at Columbia Law School and founder and faculty director of the Sabin Center for Climate Change Law, with a joint appointment to the faculty of the Columbia Climate School. Among his books is *Global Climate Change and U.S. Law* (3rd ed., with Jody Freeman and Michael Burger).

Off the Front

Cleary

« Continued from page 1

To lead the firm while navigating the industry changes, Cleary is looking for continuity in Karpf, a capital markets partner who has served two terms on the firm's executive committee. He began his legal career at Cleary in 1994 as an associate, making partner in 2003, according to his LinkedIn profile. He never left.

Cleary said part of Karpf's managing partner role includes making sure the firm deepens its capabilities in practice areas and geographies that matter most to clients. Meanwhile, Gerstenzang will continue to be active with Cleary tech innovations and AI rollout, including liaising with Cleary X, a technology subsidiary.

Gerstenzang has been managing partner since 2017, and he will complete his third final term in that position by the end of 2025.

When asked whether the firm will keep the senior partner position forever, Karpf said it was a wait-and-see situation. "This is something new, but we are not necessarily going to carry it forward," he said. "It made sense in this moment for Michael."

Karpf noted that often, former managing partners seem to "disappear into the ether," and the firm didn't want that for Gerstenzang, who is in his early 60s. "That is not good for continuity," he said. "Michael is too young to be stepping down and wanted to be able to contribute."

Karpf said he's already working closely with Gerstenzang.

"We have a very collaborative culture here, and this [succession] process was no different. I have worked with Michael (Gerstenzang) for the past six months on the transition, and our visions are closely aligned."

The firm's internal process for elections did not include campaigning or "anything divisive," he said, crediting the process for a smooth succession transition. "Unlike some firms, we are very consensus-oriented," he said. "We don't see the departures (after a leadership change) or sudden changes in direction. We are much more about cohesion and continuity."

Speaking on firm strategy going forward, Karpf said that he was "optimistic" about the firm's trajectory, but also acknowledged that he would need to "navigate changes within the firm and the industry."

Part of that, Karpf said, was a continued expansion in New York as well as the continental U.S.

"Growth-wise, this year has been a transformation for us," he said. "Of the 19 lateral partners we have hired, nine are in New York. We have grown from four partners to 14 in the Bay Area, and we are growing in areas our clients are driving us toward: M&A, funds, debt finance, anti-trust, private restructuring."

Cleary previously averaged just over seven laterals per year since 2021, according to ALM lateral data. The 19 people it has hired already in 2025 accelerate that process, though the firm does not intend to stretch too far just yet.

"In New York, we welcomed nine laterals and promoted 10 people to partner," he said. "That is the type of ratio you can expect moving forward."

Karpf also noted the firm's efforts on AI, where it is seeing strong adoption rates among its attorneys and staff, something he feels the firm will be able to leverage moving forward.

"We know we are taking the lead, and we know this technology will change over time and evolve," he said. "The key is to recognize that it is happening and that everyone at Cleary is able to use the technology to improve efficiency and quality."

Gerstenzang, who took over in 2017, led the firm through a period of strong financial growth, even as it trimmed about 12% of its attorney headcount between 2019 (1,235) and 2024 (1,078), according to ALM data.

When he took over, the firm's revenue was roughly \$1.2 billion. Last year, the firm saw \$1.7 billion in revenue, or a 41.6% increase over his tenure. The firm's average profits per equity partner jumped from roughly \$3.1 million in 2017 to \$5.2 million in 2024, an increase of 67.6% over that time.

In a statement, Gerstenzang said that "Jeff is an exceptional leader who embodies Cleary's client-first culture," and that he was confident "Jeff's vision, experience and leadership will continue to propel Cleary forward in the years ahead."

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

Fraud

« Continued from page 1

Kaplan. "The dream isn't a defense ... the fraud, the crime, the scam is committed onto the investors, who they tricked."

"It was a sophisticated scam. They made up documents. It went on for a long time and they both knew exactly what they were doing," the judge said.

He ordered Randy Miller to forfeit \$7.3 million and Chad Miller to forfeit \$4.8 million. Restitution will be determined at a later hearing.

Federal prosecutors had sought a 7-year prison sentence for Randy Miller, who they described as the leader of the scheme, and a 6-year-and-8-month sentence for Chad Miller.

Matthew Shahabian of the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York said that his office sought significant sentences based on the nature of the crime. "It's worth emphasizing that

this wasn't a one-time mistake," he said.

Every time the Millers were told the park wasn't feasible, they forged documents "rather than take no," Shahabian said.

Sini, who represented Randy Miller, and Diaz, who represented Chad Miller, didn't respond to requests for comment. The SDNY prosecutor's office declined to comment.

The office charged Randy and Chad Miller with securities fraud in April. They claimed that the pair inflated revenue forecasts and forged documents to sell \$284 million in municipal bonds to construct Legacy Park. Spread out over 300 acres, Legacy Park was designed to be the largest multi-sports complex in the United States.



Judge Kaplan

The complex, which opened in January 2022, was less profitable than expected and later sold during bankruptcy proceedings for less than \$26 million, with investors only able to recoup \$2.5 million of the quarter of a billion dollars invested. Randy and Chad Miller both pleaded guilty in May.

During sentencing, Sini stressed that the park was real, and—under its new ownership—currently operating in Mesa, Arizona.

"This is not some sort of scheme that was made up," Sini said.

But Kaplan questioned how that information was relevant, noting that Legacy Park wouldn't have been built without the fraud.

"When Lehman Brothers failed ... there wasn't a made-up scheme," said Kaplan. "There was an operating business and a fraud to keep it going."

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

Tylenol

« Continued from page 1

we'll keep our options open to exercise that."

At issue in the Second Circuit appeal is the science. In 2023, U.S. District Judge Denise Cote, of the Southern District of New York, granted summary judgment for the defense after tossing all five of the plaintiffs' general causation experts in the multidistrict litigation, which comprises 600 lawsuits alleging prenatal use of acetaminophen, such as Tylenol, causes autism spectrum disorder and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD).

"While of course judges have a gatekeeping role and determine whether the expert applied his or her methods or principles, it does not include a judge weighing in the studies and deciding which are stronger or weaker," Keller said. "It doesn't include a judge determining one side of a scientific debate is more correct than the other. And it definitely doesn't include a judge making up rules of science."

Keller, of Chicago's Keller Postman, is up against Kirkland & Ellis partner Jay Lefkowitz, in New York, who represents Kenvue, the former Johnson & Johnson subsidiary that makes Tylenol.

Lefkowitz did not respond to a request for comment.

'It Matters to Get This Right'

The litigation is among the most closely watched mass torts in the country given that acetaminophen is practically the only pain reliever that doctors say is safe for pregnant women. Cote allowed the lawsuits to move ahead, rejecting then-Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc.'s move to dismiss the cases under federal preemption.

Plaintiffs had proposed a label change to state: "Some studies show that frequent use of this product during pregnancy may increase your child's risk of autism and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. If you use this product during pregnancy to treat your pain and/or fever, use the lowest effective dose for the shortest possible time and at the lowest possible frequency."

Cote invited the U.S. government, including the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, to review the proposed label. In a 148-page summary judgment opinion, Cote found that the plaintiffs' experts were unreliable.

"The issues explored by this litigation have great public health significance," she wrote. "It matters to get this right. It matters to parents, their children, and their health care providers."

On appeal, Keller's brief criticized the ruling's attempt to make policy decisions, rather than evaluate scientific experts under the Federal Rule of Evidence 702.

"Rule 702 has never granted a district-court judge the power to determine expert admissibility based on her view of the policy consequence, mostly especially when they are of 'great public health significance,'" he wrote.

Keller, who, on Oct. 10, will argue to reinstate lawsuits over heartburn medication Zantac before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit, said the acetaminophen appeal has broader implications about how judges evaluate expert evidence. In Zantac, U.S. District Judge Robin Rosenberg, of the Southern District of Florida, struck all 10 plaintiffs' experts in the multidistrict litigation in 2022.

"One might say there is an increasing trend towards judges interpreting their role as allowing even stricter gatekeeping that is potentially leading to cases being dismissed," he said.

'Unwarranted Expansion of The Judicial Gatekeeping Role'

Acetaminophen plaintiffs got amici support from four law professors, including University of California, Berkeley School of Law Dean Erwin Chemerinsky, who called the ruling "an alarming and unwarranted expansion of the judicial gatekeeping role." American Association for Justice, in a separate amicus brief, focused on the ruling's violation of plaintiffs' Seventh Amendment right to a jury trial.

"Judicial usurpation of the proper role of the jury, as in this case, has become a more common occurrence as a result of an aggressive campaign to devalue and discredit the notion that ordinary Americans should hold powerful corporations accountable," the AAJ brief says. "Empirical research confirms that Americans who serve as jurors are fully capable of properly evaluating and making factual determinations based upon expert testimony."

In response, Kenvue joined more than a dozen other companies, most of which sell or make generic acetaminophen, such as Walmart and CVS, in a combined defense brief insisting Cote's order should be affirmed. Kenvue got the support of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and Lawyers for Civil Justice.

Kenvue's brief says the ruling aligns with the FDA's position and leading medical organizations, such as the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the brief says.

"Plaintiffs' general-causation experts sought to buck the professional consensus, but could do so only by employing unreliable, results-driven methodologies," the brief says.

Amanda Bronstad can be reached at abronstad@alm.com.

Outside Counsel

The Appointments Clause, Part 1: The Supreme Court and 'Kennedy'

Liberty requires accountability." *Department of Transportation v. Association of American Railroads*, 575 U.S. 43, 57 (2015) (Alito, J., concurring). One of the foremost guarantors of that precept is the Appointments Clause of Article II, which provides that "officers of the United States" shall be appointed by the president, with the advice and consent of the Senate. *U.S. Const., Art. II, § 2, cl. 2*. As America rapidly approaches its 250th birthday, the Clause still generates a torrent of litigation, and remains the subject of almost constant adjustment by the U.S. Supreme Court, as well as the lower federal tribunals.

With respect to the former, the first installment of this two-part article shall exposit *Kennedy v. Braidwood Management*, 603 U.S. ____ (No. 24-316) (June 27, 2025), the high court's latest addition to the pantheon of Article II jurisprudence. The latter shall be exemplified in Part II of this writing, in the form of our own Second Circuit's quite recent opinion in *Flinton v. Commissioner of Social Security*, ____ F.4th ____ (No. 23-7715-cv) (2d Cir. July 2, 2025).

The HHS Task Force

In 1984, the Department of Health and Human Services (the "HHS") created the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force, an advisory board currently comprised of sixteen unpaid volunteers, all experts from various fields of medicine. Each member is appointed by the HHS Secretary to staggered four-year terms. For two and one-half decades, the Task Force acted in a strictly consultative role, formulating and publishing recommendations regarding preventive health care services.

That changed in 2010 with the enactment of the Affordable Care Act (the "ACA"), which man-

ANTHONY MICHAEL SABINO is a partner at Sabino & Sabino, P.C., and Professor of Law at Tobin College of Business, St. John's University. Anthony.Sabino@sabinolaw.com.



By Anthony Michael Sabino

dated that most health insurers now extend coverage to certain preventive services without cost sharing, to wit, no copayments, no deductibles, *et cetera*. In effect, the ACA gave the advisory group's recommendations the force of *de facto* regulations. Furthermore, the health care law amended the statutory authorization for the Task Force, recasting it as an "independent" body, ostensibly free from political pressure, wherever practicable. That legislative tinkering proved

Liberty is preserved when we are certain that all Executive Branch officeholders remain accountable to the elected President, and, thereby, to the People they ultimately serve.

to be the spark which ignited the instant controversy.

Braidwood Management, a health and wellness center, self-insured a health plan for its approximately 70 employees. Wishing to exclude coverage for certain medications and institute co-pays and deductibles, Braidwood challenged the advisory board's regulatory authority, claiming that the Task Force members assumed office in contravention of the Appointments Clause. Interestingly, all concerned agreed that these medical experts were, in fact, "officers" of the Executive Branch exercising sizeable power.

'Lucia' and a Legion Of Precedent

In light of this, Justice Brett Kavanaugh defined the question at hand as whether the Task Force was populated by "principal" or

"inferior" officeholders. It has long been axiomatic that the Appointments Clause segregates all Executive Branch appointees according to the manner by which they assume office: "principal" officers (in the main, Cabinet level officials) are named by the president, with the Senate's consultation and accord; and "inferior" officers, whose appointment Congress may vest, by law, "in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments." *Art. II, supra. See United States v. Germaine*, 99 U.S. 508 (1879).

Prominent here is the recent landmark of *Lucia v. S.E.C.*, 585 U.S. 237 (2018), wherein the Supreme Court elaborated upon what distinguishes one from the other: "principal" officers exercise significant authority pursuant to federal law, and are directly accountable to the Chief Executive; in contradistinction, "inferior" officials are subordinate to principal appointees, subject to the supervision of, and possible reversal by, their superiors. *See United States v. Arthrex, Inc.*, 594 U.S. 1 (2021).

Kennedy expounds that the Appointments Clause assures that lesser officeholders, no matter their function, are beholden to a principal appointee, who, in turn, answers directly to the president. The accountability of all inhabitants of the Article II branch to the elected Chief Executive, and, ultimately, to the electorate, is thereby guaranteed. *See Edmond v. United States*, 520 U.S. 651 (1997) (both the President and the Senate must own up to making bad appointments and failing to make good ones). *See also Morrison v. Olson*, 487 U.S. 654 (1988) (the Chief Executive retains control over all those in the chain of command).

Moreover, "[t]he Clause thereby helps protect the independence of the Executive Branch and maintain the Constitution's separation of powers."

'Principal' v. 'Inferior' Officers Defined

Against this backdrop, *Kennedy* concluded that the Task Force's members are inferior

» Page 8

IN BRIEF

« Continued from page 1

continuity and disaster recovery plan.

Pham voted for the proposed rulemaking in 2023 but did note her concerns over the commission setting rules that conflict with or are duplicative of other regulatory regimes.

While Pham approved the proposed rulemaking, "there were certainly outstanding questions about it," said David Wright Tremaine partner Michael McDonald.

He added that Pham's decision to withdraw the framework "paired with the general attitude of deregulation from the [Trump] administration."

McDonald said swap dealers and other industry participants are already regulated as banks and through organizations like

the National Futures Association. Pham is taking the opportunity to make sure the rules are consistent with international regulators as well as other U.S. financial regulators to avoid creating an onerous, duplicative regulatory scheme, McDonald added.

"When we're thinking holistically about regulations, the CFTC has the opportunity to be very nimble because of the size of the agency," McDonald said.

The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission in June also withdrew two proposed rules requiring certain market participants to establish cybersecurity policies and make public disclosures.

The deregulatory moves by both agencies "leaves customers unprotected," said Ben Schiffrin, director of securities policy

at Better Markets. He said the rules were proposed precisely to fill the gaps in the regulatory scheme across international and domestic regulators.

"The cybersecurity threats don't go away just because the proposed rules have been withdrawn," Schiffrin added. "Without these rules it just leaves everybody more vulnerable."

The CFTC has been acting as a single-commissioner agency since Commissioner Kristin Johnson resigned Sept. 3.

Pham has said she will resign from the commission following the expected confirmation of President Donald Trump's pick to lead the CFTC, Brian Quintenz. His nomination is pending before the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry Committee.

—Dan Novak

Disciplinary Proceeding

The Appellate Division, Second Department

Matter of Guljit Kaur Bains, an attorney and counselor-at-law

Motion No. 2022-02194

Appellate Division, Second Department

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

Decided: August 27, 2025

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

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

Per curiam—The Grievance Committee for the Second, Eleventh, and Thirteenth Judicial Districts commenced a formal disciplinary proceeding against the respondent by serving and filing a notice of petition dated July 27, 2023, and a verified petition dated July 26, 2023, containing two charges of professional mis-

conduct. The respondent served and filed a verified answer dated September 15, 2023, admitting the factual allegations but denying any violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct. By decision and order on application dated November 2, 2023, the matter was referred to the Honorable Arthur J. Cooperman, as Special Referee, pursuant to 22 NYCRR 1240.8(b)(1), to hear and report. In a report dated May 22, 2024, the Special Referee sustained both charges in the petition. By notice of motion dated July 11, 2024, the Grievance Committee moves to confirm the report of the Special Referee sustaining both charges of professional misconduct and to impose such discipline upon the respondent as the Court deems just and proper. The respondent submits an affirmation in support of confirming the Special Referee's report and to impose the sanction of a private admonition based on the mitigation submitted.

The Petition

The respondent was a law partner in the law firm Ali & Bains, PC,

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

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

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

» Page 6

Corporate Update

After Regulatory Smackdown, Resorts World Las Vegas Brings Aboard Gambling Law Veterans

BY TRUDY KNOCKLESS

RESORTS World Las Vegas is bringing in new legal leadership, appointing Lou Dorn as chief legal officer and Elizabeth Tranchina as general counsel, as the four-year-old resort works to recover from regulatory penalties and a rocky financial year. Dorn and Tranchina will oversee legal, regulatory, governance and risk-related functions at the \$4.3 billion property—the first resort constructed from the ground up on the Las Vegas Strip in more than a decade. The project includes a casino, 3,500 hotel rooms, a 5,000-seat theater, restaurants and shopping.



Resorts World Las Vegas, which opened in 2021, has 3,500 hotel rooms

The hires follow a March settlement with Nevada gambling regulators that saw Resorts World pay \$10.5 million—the second-largest fine ever imposed in the state—for violations of anti-money laundering rules tied to high-roller activity. Dorn brings more than two decades of experience across casino, hospitality, and regulatory roles. Most recently, he was Bally’s general counsel for North America, overseeing legal operations for 19 casino and resort properties and gaming/sports wagering platforms. His résumé also includes top legal roles at Monarch Casino & Resort, SLS Las Vegas, Aliante Casino and Hotel and the Las Vegas Hilton, along with government roles—Nevada deputy attorney general and Nevada corporate securities chief. “Lou brings an exceptional depth of experience in gaming law and regulatory compliance that will be instrumental as we continue to grow and evolve,” Resorts World Las Vegas Chairman Jim Murren said in a statement. “His leadership will help ensure our operations remain forward-thinking, responsible and built on a strong legal foundation.”

» Page 8

Vanguard Replaces GC Who Started in October

BY TRUDY KNOCKLESS

TONYA Robinson is stepping down as general counsel of Vanguard after just 11 months and is being succeeded by the general counsel of Principal Financial Group. It’s not clear why Robinson—who joined the Malvern, Pennsylvania-based mutual giant from KPMG, where she’d been general counsel since 2017—is exiting. Robinson and the company did not respond to requests for comment on the circumstances of her departure. A Vanguard news release announcing the appointment of Natalie Lamarque, who’s been Principal’s GC since 2022, said Lamarque, who



Tonya Robinson, general counsel of investment management fund Vanguard

will have the title chief legal officer, is taking over for Robinson but doesn’t say why. “I thank Tonya for her service to our clients and crew,” Vanguard CEO Salim Ramji said in the press release. “We are grateful for her contributions and wish her success in the future.” In a cryptic but upbeat LinkedIn post that did not reference Vanguard by name, Robinson wrote, “What a week I tend to show up in this space touting, among other things, the value of transparency and, above all else, gratitude—so it would strain credibility if I now missed the moment. Suffice it to say, I am grateful to have had the opportunity to serve in my latest post. A huge thanks to my many former colleagues who made the experience one of a lifetime.” She closed the post with: “I’m taking a short, much-needed reprieve and will return, ready to go and with news on what’s next.”

» Page 8

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Risks and Best Practices Relating To Businesses’ Use of AI Tools

BY JESSICA L. LIPSON, GENNY NGAI AND TESS BONOLI

Companies are becoming increasingly reliant on artificial intelligence (“AI”) tools, and often entrust such tools with business-critical work such as developing software or making sensitive decisions (e.g., who to hire; who receives key services or benefits). However, such use comes with potential legal and business risks. This article highlights some of the key areas where AI use could go wrong at different stages of the process and provides key practical mitigation tips.

Key Risks of AI Use

- 1. Data Input**
Trade Secrets and Sensitive Business Data. Companies must be mindful when inputting data into AI tools, as such input could compromise trade secrets and expose sensitive business data to third parties. Special Data. Precautions also need to be taken for medical, children’s, or financial information because processing this data could trigger special legal requirements pursuant to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, the Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act, and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, among others.
- 2. AI-Generated Output**
Companies should understand how and what information is being generated by AI tools, because there

JESSICA L. LIPSON is a partner at Morrison Cohen and co-chair of the firm’s technology, data and intellectual property practice. GENNY NGAI is a partner in the firm’s white collar & regulatory enforcement practice. TESS BONOLI is an associate at the firm.

are risks related to the outputs, including:
Incorrect/Deceptive AI-Generated Information: Companies could face regulatory and litigation risks for incorrect or deceptive AI-generated content. For example, in *Moffatt v. Air Canada*, 2024 BCCRT 149, a Canadian tribunal held the airline accountable for inaccurate information generated by a chatbot. Although the monetary damages were minimal, the case highlights potential risks for companies using AI to interact with the public. Inaccurate or deceptive content may also violate state consumer protection and AI laws prohibiting deepfakes or misleading outputs.
Algorithmic Discrimination: Companies may face regulatory scrutiny if they do not implement AI governance to detect algorithmic bias in their outputs (i.e. when algorithms produce discriminatory outcomes). In addition to existing labor and employment laws, many states, like Colorado with its AI Act (effective February 1, 2026), prohibit algorithmic discrimination in “high-risk” areas like healthcare, insurance, lending, and other essential services. Notably, the Colorado AI Act requires AI users in these settings to exercise “reasonable care” to protect consumers from any “known or reasonably foreseeable risks of algorithmic discrimination,” and requires companies to, among other things, conduct risk audits, implement mitigation policies, provide disclosures, and allow for appeals. For example, a health insurer in Colorado using AI to deny claims without these safeguards could violate the law.
Infringement: While the law is still in flux on this point, AI generated outputs could infringe on third-party intellectual property rights, given that even the AI tool creators do not truly understand what part of

the training data used (e.g., novels, news articles) might be reproduced in output (or when).
Breach of Contract/Licenses: Creating and using AI-generated content can also trigger unanticipated contractual obligations. For example, if a company uses AI to generate software code, the company may find that the AI tool used an open-source library without including attribution notices required pursuant to the applicable open-source license. Use of certain open-source materials (e.g., those subject to general public library licenses) can also lead to loss of control of the software code being developed.
3. External Representations
Companies also need to stay aware of their representations to others, including consumers and investors, about their AI use and capabilities. First, many states like

Key Mitigation Measures

There are key measures that companies can take to mitigate the risks above:
Vetting AI Vendors/Contract Management: Vendors should be subject to rigorous security audits (e.g., SOC 2 Type II or similar), and be willing to contractually agree to key terms, including: (1) not to use the business’ data to train models or retain data

While the law is still in flux on this point, AI generated outputs could infringe on third-party intellectual property rights, given that even the AI tool creators do not truly understand what part of the training data used (e.g., novels, news articles) might be reproduced in output (or when).

Colorado, Maine and Utah require businesses to disclose when they use generative AI to communicate with the public. New York also recently implemented a law (NYS Assembly Bill A3008) requiring transparency when businesses use a consumer’s personal data to create personalized algorithmic pricing. Regulatory and criminal authorities are also enforcing against false and misleading statements about AI use and capabilities. In *United States v. Albert Saniger*, 25-CR-157 (JHR) (SDNY) and *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Albert*

processed; (2) use robust encryption standards; (3) indemnify the company against claims relating to intellectual property infringement and data use; (4) comply with lawful data sourcing and output filtering; and (5) cooperate in regulatory actions. Contracts with AI vendors should be reviewed annually to account for any regulatory changes. Additionally, if the business is subject to specific legal requirements (e.g., healthcare, financial services), it should select solutions that already meet industry requirements. It is also advisable to use vendors who publicly

» Page 6

Snap General Counsel Who Settled Barrage of Litigation Moving On

BY TRUDY KNOCKLESS

MICHAEL O’Sullivan, who has served as Snap’s general counsel since 2017, notified the company last week that he will step down at the end of the year. The Santa Monica, California-based parent of Snapchat said in a Securities and Exchange Commission filing that O’Sullivan “confirmed that his decision is not related to any disagreement with us on any matter relating to our accounting, strategy, management, operations, policies, or practices (financial or otherwise).”



Michael O’Sullivan, general counsel of Snap

It’s not clear why O’Sullivan, 59, is leaving. The SEC filing did not provide a reason, and he did not respond to Law.com’s request for comment. A Snap spokesperson added in an email: “After many years at Snap, Mike decided that the end of the year is the right time for him to move on from the company. We’re grateful for his extraordinary leadership and contributions. ... We have initiated a search for our next General Counsel.” O’Sullivan joined Snap four months after the company went public. He came from Munger, Tolles & Olson in Los Angeles, where he’d worked for 21 years. During O’Sullivan’s tenure as GC, Snap grew annual revenue six-fold, to \$5.4 billion, while also experiencing significant legal turbulence. For example, in 2020, the company agreed to pay \$187 million to settle litigation that it misled investors before going public by failing to disclose the full competitive threat posed by Instagram. Two years later, Snap paid \$35 million to settle a class action lawsuit alleging it collected users’ biometric data without proper consent, and last year it paid \$15 million to settle a California Civil Rights Department gender-discrimination lawsuit. The case alleged Snap discriminated against female employees through unequal pay and promotions, retaliation and sexual harassment.

» Page 8

A large graphic featuring a magnifying glass over a circular logo with the text "VerdictSearch". The background is a word cloud of legal terms like "LAW", "COURT", "JUDGMENT", "LIBERTY", "FREEDOM", "CRIME", "JUSTICE", "LEGISLATION", "LAWYER", "COURTHOUSE", "VERDICT", "SENTENCE", "LITIGATION", "ADJUDICATION", "PUNISHMENT", "HONESTY", "COURTROOM", "JURY", "TRIAL", "DEFENSE", "PROSECUTION", "EVIDENCE", "WITNESS", "JUROR", "JUDGE", "CLERK", "SHERIFF", "DEPUTY", "ATTORNEY", "COUNSEL", "PROSECUTOR", "DEFENDANT", "PLAINTIFF", "WITNESS", "JURY", "TRIAL", "DEFENSE", "PROSECUTION", "EVIDENCE", "WITNESS", "JUROR", "JUDGE", "CLERK", "SHERIFF", "DEPUTY", "ATTORNEY", "COUNSEL", "PROSECUTOR", "DEFENDANT", "PLAINTIFF".

Build your case with confidence.

Access 200,000+ verdicts and settlements.

THE leading verdict search platform, including:

- 200,000+ Cases Updated Daily
- National & State Coverage
- Both Plaintiff & Defense Case-Winning Information

Knowing how the rest of the country is handling claims can save your company time and money. Research unique case-winning information, just one click away!

Activate your **FREE TRIAL** today at www.verdictsearch.com/contact-form or call the toll free number 800-445-6823

Expert Analysis / Off the Front

Legal

« Continued from page 3
tion from Congress. *West Virginia v. EPA*, 597 U.S. 697 (2022).

Proposed Revocation

During President Trump’s first term in office, EPA did not follow the calls of some opponents of climate action to revoke the endangerment finding.

However, such revocation was recommended by the Project 2025 report, which has become something of a blueprint for the second Trump administration, and EPA is now moving forward with this action.

Zeldin’s announcement declared several bases, any one of which might in theory be grounds for revoking the endangerment finding.

The one that has received the most attention is an attack on the scientific basis for the revocation. The U.S. Department of Energy retained five scientists who were well known, not as climate deniers, but as climate minimizers.

They acknowledge that climate change is happening, mostly due to the combustion of fossil fuels, but they have long claimed that the dangers of climate change

be filed in the D.C. Circuit, the designated venue for Clean Air Act cases of nationwide applicability. It would ordinarily take on the order of one year for the case to be briefed, argued and decided, so if the lawsuits come in early 2026, the decision would likely come in early 2027.

Then a petition for certiorari to the Supreme Court can be expected. The time between a certiorari petition and a final Supreme Court decision can easily be another year, taking us into 2028. That, of course, is an election year, and it could lead to a president who will want to reverse course once again.

During this entire time there will be considerable uncertainty about the ultimate outcome, making it difficult for companies to engage in long-term planning. This is especially difficult for the motor vehicle industry, which must decide what kinds of vehicles and engines to build several years in advance of each model year.

All of these times assume the usual administrative and judicial procedures. It is of course possible that the Trump administration will try to get by with much less detailed responses to the avalanche of comments it will receive, and that the Supreme

not only motor vehicles but also power plants, other industrial facilities, aircraft, ships, landfills, and oil and gas operations.

However, this would have no bearing on other measures to reduce the sources of GHGs. Most sources of GHG also generate conventional or toxic air pollutants that continue to be regulated by EPA, such as sulfur dioxide and mercury. (A limitation is that it is very difficult to regulate existing sources as opposed to new or modified sources).

Coal-fired power plants also produce wastes that EPA may regulate under other laws, such as coal ash, which could be regulated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and heated water, which is subject to the Clean Water Act.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration sets fuel economy standards for motor vehicles, but may not require electric vehicles. 49 U.S.C. Sec. 32902(h).

The federal government has exclusive authority to regulate emissions from and fuel economy of motor vehicles. The exception is the “California waiver,” which allows EPA to authorize California to set its own standards.

If California receives this waiver, other states may follow the California standards rather than the federal standards. Traditionally EPA has granted this waiver, and states that together amount to about 40 per cent of the automobile market have then utilized the California standards.

However, in June Congress utilized the Congressional Review Act to annul the most recent California waivers. That action is now in litigation, and it is also unclear to what extent this will bar future waivers.

No law prevents motor vehicle manufacturers from voluntarily producing electric vehicles.

Other than with respect to motor vehicles, states are not pre-empted from adopting stronger air pollution standards than EPA. So states could impose severe restrictions on power plants and factories within their own borders.

However, the states have long had this authority, and probably most of the states that wanted to exercise it have already done so.

Revocation would have no effect on the ability of Congress, states or cities to subsidize renewable energy facilities or to expedite their approval. It would not affect the ability of every level of government to use its procurement power to purchase, for their own use, electric vehicles, steel or cement produced using low-emissions measures, or other items.

States and cities would retain their primary control over zoning and land use, as well as transportation patterns, that together have important GHG emission impacts.

Common Law Litigation

A final possible impact of revocation of the endangerment finding could go in the opposite direction of what the fossil fuel industry wants.

In *American Electric Power v. Connecticut*, 540 U.S. 410 (2011), the Supreme Court said that the federal common law of nuisance cannot be used to require reductions in GHG emissions. This was because the Clean Air Act empowers EPA to regulate GHGs, and this displaces the federal common law of nuisance, whose principal purpose is to fill in certain remaining gaps in the law.

As a result, states, counties and cities have filed numerous lawsuits in state courts against the major fossil fuel companies using state common law theories; there are now about 40 such suits pending. None has yet gone to trial; many are now in active litigation.

If the Endangerment Finding is vacated and EPA no longer has the authority to regulate GHGs, there will be an argument that the federal common law of nuisance is no longer displaced with respect to GHGs.

We might then see more lawsuits filed in federal courts under this theory. Federal courts could have broader remedial power than state courts. It is also possible, however, that potential plaintiffs might want to see how some of the pending actions in state court play out.

Some have also argued that the revocation would open the door for California again to issue its own motor vehicle standards.

Conclusion

Zeldin touted the proposed revocation of the Endangerment Finding as “the largest deregulatory action in the history of America.” It will be some time before we know if that works out the way he intended.

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

Calendar of Events

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

NY State Bar (CLE)
Basics of Elder Law Planning
nysba.org/events/basics-of-elder-law-planning-practical-skills-fall-2025/
1 CLE credit, Virtual

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

NY State Bar (CLE)
Everything You Need to Know About Escrow Accounts
nysba.org/events/everything-you-need-to-know-about-escrow-accounts-2/
4 CLE credits, Virtual

THURSDAY SEPT. 11 FRIDAY, SEPT. 12 MONDAY, SEPT. 15

New York City Bar (CLE)
24 - Hour Basic Mediation Training
9 a.m. - 5:30 p.m.
22 CLE credits
In-Person Registration Link: https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=bmt091125&mcode=NYLJ
Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

TUESDAY, SEPT. 16

Federal Bar Council (CLE)
Supreme Court Preview
5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.
Location: Winston & Strawn, 200 Park Avenue; 2 CLE credits
https://fbc.users.membersuite.com/events/a5720928-0078-ce93-f7d9-0b48837b05bb/details

New York City Bar (CLE)
From The Minds of Mediators: How to Prepare For and Mediate an Employment Law Case
9:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.
2 CLE Credits
Webinar Registration Link: https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=WEB091625&mcode=NYLJ
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

New York City Bar (Non CLE)
Visas en Vogue: Threading the Needle of US Immigration Law for Fashion Designers & Models
Panel: 5:15 p.m. - 6:30 p.m.
Fashion Show: 6:30 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.
Reception: 7:30 p.m. - 8 p.m.
In-Person Registration Link: https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=FLS091625&mcode=NYLJ
Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

Have an event to list?
E-mail the details to pkane@alm.com

Have a Move to Announce?
E-mail pkane@alm.com

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

New York City Bar (Non CLE)
Small Law Firm Luncheon
The Productive Practice: Streamline and Scale for Solos and Small Firms
12 p.m. - 2 p.m.
In-Person Registration Link: https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=SLF091725&mcode=NYLJ
Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

New York City Bar (CLE)
Introduction to the Surrogate’s Court: Estate Administration
1 p.m. - 4 p.m.; 3 CLE credits
Webinar Registration Link: https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=WEB091725&mcode=NYLJ
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18

New York City Bar (Non CLE)
Fall Gathering for Solos and Small Firms
6 p.m. - 8 p.m.
In-Person Registration Link: https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=SLF091825&mcode=NYLJ
Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org
America’s Trial: Torture and the 9/11 Case on Guantanamo Bay : A Book Release and Discussion
6:30 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.
In-Person Registration Link: https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=MVA091825&mcode=NYLJ
Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 24

New York City Bar (Non CLE)
vLex Fastcase - Efficient Searching Webinar
3 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
Webinar Registration Link: https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=fas092425&mcode=NYLJ
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

THURSDAY, SEPT. 25

New York City Bar (Non CLE)
Law Student Welcome Reception
6 p.m. - 8 p.m.
In-Person Registration Link: https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=LSWR092525&mcode=NYLJ
Location: 42 West 44th Street,

New York, NY 10036
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

FRIDAY, SEPT. 26

New York City Bar (CLE)
Restaurant Law Conference
9 a.m. - 5 p.m.
CLE Credit: New York: 5.5 Professional Practice; New Jersey: 5.6 General; California: 5.5 General; Pennsylvania: 4.5 General; Connecticut: Available to Licensed Attorneys
In-Person Registration Link: https://services.nycbar.org/RestaurantLaw/
Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

MONDAY, SEPT. 29

New York City Bar (CLE)
Ethical Considerations for Corporate Investigations: Views from All Sides
2 p.m. - 5 p.m.
CLE Credit: New York: 3.0 Ethics; New Jersey: 3.0 Professional Responsibility; California: 3.0 Professional Responsibility; Pennsylvania: 2.5 Professional Responsibility; Connecticut: Available to Licensed Attorneys
Webinar Registration Link: https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=WEB91025&mcode=NYLJ
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

TUESDAY, SEPT. 30

Federal Bar Council (CLE)
Federal Rules Update
5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.
Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square
2 CLE credits
https://fbc.users.membersuite.com/events/a5720928-0078-c800-c20c-0b4884a569d6/details

New York City Bar (Non CLE)
vLex Fastcase - Vincent AI for Estate Planning
3 p.m. - 4 p.m.
Webinar Registration Link: https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=fas093025&mcode=NYLJ
Location: Zoom
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org
BootCamp: Basic Training for Lawyers
9 a.m. - 2 p.m.
In-Person Registration Link: https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=BOOT2025&mcode=NYLJ
Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036
Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or customerrelations@nycbar.org

However, such revocation was recommended by the Project 2025 report, which has become something of a blueprint for the second Trump administration, and EPA is now moving forward with this action

are much overstated, and are not so great as to warrant the rapid transition in the energy system that the great majority of climate scientists have said is necessary in order to avoid catastrophic consequences.

These contrarian scientists issued a report that is a key basis for the proposed revocation. The report has been met with swift condemnation by many others in the scientific community. Several scientists have said that the report mischaracterized their work.

Detailed point-by-point refutations have been issued and more are now in preparation. The National Academies of Sciences announced it will undertake a fast-track review of the report.

The Environmental Defense Fund and the Union of Concerned Scientists have filed a suit in federal court in Massachusetts saying the formation of this group violated the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Meanwhile, the Trump administration disbanded the Congressionally-mandated National Climate Assessment, the most authoritative statement on the risks of climate change to the U.S.

The courts will no doubt be asked to find that the use of this report was arbitrary and capricious.

EPA now also says that the Endangerment Finding and its use to regulate GHGs violate the major questions doctrine announced by the Supreme Court in *West Virginia*. Additionally, EPA argues that the Clean Air Act applies only to air pollutants that cause local and regional problems, as opposed to global problems.

Moreover, EPA says that the impacts of each type of source (e.g. cars and trucks; stationary sources) must be analyzed separately, and that regulation of that source type is permissible only if its emissions can be shown to have a measurable impact on health and welfare in the United States, regardless of the cumulative emissions from all source types.

Next steps

EPA held several public hearings on its proposal during August. It is accepting comments through Sept. 22.

After that, it will need to respond to the substantive comments it received. This would ordinarily take several months. (The Obama EPA proposed the original Endangerment Finding in April 2009; it took eight months to receive and respond to public comments, and published the final rule in Dec. 2009.)

In *Ohio v. EPA*, 603 U.S. 279 (2024), the Supreme Court stayed another important Clean Air Act rule (concerning state “good neighbor” plans) on the grounds that EPA had not adequately responded to one particular comment that had been raised among the hundreds received.

If the EPA responds with the same level of meticulous detail that the Supreme Court demanded in *Ohio*, it will take many months, well into 2026, to issue its final regulation. (EPA will be slowed by the termination or retirement of many of the expert staff who would be called on to write these responses.)

When EPA does issue its final decision, lawsuits will probably follow swiftly. They will have to

Court (as it did in *West Virginia*) will use its “shadow docket” procedures to jump into the case and render a decision very quickly.

Supreme Court scenarios

There are several possible Supreme Court outcomes. Here they are, arrayed from the best to the worst from the perspective of action on climate change.

The best case outcome is that the Supreme Court vacates the revocation of the Endangerment Finding. (Few are predicting this.) Almost as good would be for the D.C. Circuit to vacate the revocation, and for the Supreme Court to refuse to review this decision.

The Supreme Court could also find flaws in the manner in which the Endangerment Finding was revoked and send it back to EPA for further work. In doing so, it could either vacate the revocation or “remand without vacatur,” leaving it standing while EPA reconsiders.

It is also possible that the Supreme Court will uphold the revocation. In doing so, it could find, for example, that the Trump EPA was reasonably persuaded by the views of the five climate-minimizing scientists. (In doing so, the court would be displaying more deference to agency judgments than it did in *Loper Bright v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369 (2024), which overturned the *Chevron* doctrine; but those cases concerned deference to agency interpretations of statutes, not facts).

This could leave the door open for future administrations to reach different judgments based on even newer science. Meanwhile, regardless of what happens with the Endangerment Finding, the Trump administration is not going to be issuing any new GHG regulations anyway.

The worst case scenario would be for the Supreme Court to uphold the revocation in a way that would prevent future administrations from ever using the Clean Air Act to regulate GHGs without further Congressional authorization.

For example, the court could apply the Major Questions Doctrine to find that EPA regulation of GHGs is entirely beyond the power that the Clean Air Act confers on the agency. This would (implicitly at least) seem to overrule *Massachusetts v. EPA*.

That decision was rendered by a five-four vote. All five of the justices who voted with the majority have died or retired. Of the four dissenters, three are still on the court (Chief Justice John Roberts and Justices Clarence Thomas and Samuel Alito), and they have been joined by the three Trump appointees (Justices Brett Kavanaugh, Neil Gorsuch and Amy Coney Barrett).

So far the court has declined several invitations to overrule *Massachusetts*, but there is no telling whether this case will be different. This court has not hesitated to overrule what had previously been seen as solid precedents, e.g. *Chevron v. NRDC*, not to mention *Roe v. Wade*.

Consequences

If revocation of the Endangerment Finding survives the courts, EPA would be unable to use the Clean Air Act to regulate GHGs from any sources. That includes

Ruemmler

« Continued from page 1
ates Darren Indyke and Richard Kahn, were unable to fulfill their responsibilities, The Wall Street Journal reported.

Epstein updated his will on Aug. 8, 2019, two days before he died by suicide in a Manhattan jail cell. That final version no longer included Ruemmler, according to the Journal.

In Tuesday’s statement, Ruemmler said, “I have nothing to do with the estate and have never served in any capacity relating to the estate.”

Court records and other documents have linked the disgraced financier to dozens of prominent individuals, from U.S. politicians and British royalty to Wall Street bankers and celebrities.

The personal and professional associates have not been accused of criminal wrongdoing.

The Journal reported in 2023 that Epstein’s personal calendar showed dozens of meetings with Ruemmler in the years after he

became a convicted sex offender in 2008.

A Goldman Sachs spokesperson told the Journal in 2023 that Ruemmler had a professional relationship with Epstein related to her role at Latham & Watkins. He introduced her to potential legal clients, such as Microsoft co-founder Bill Gates, the spokesperson said.

Latham & Watkins has said Epstein was not a client of the firm.

After Ruemmler’s years of associating with Epstein came to light in 2023, Ruemmler told media outlets, “I regret ever knowing Jeffrey Epstein.”

Ruemmler, 54, is one of the nation’s highest-profile legal chiefs and one of its most highly paid.

She received compensation from Goldman Sachs totaling \$17.6 million in 2024, placing her sixth in Corporate Counsel and ALM Intelligence’s 2025 ranking of highest-paid legal chiefs. She ranked second among women, behind Apple General Counsel Katherine Adams, who earned \$27.2 million.

Goldman Sachs hired Ruemmler in 2020 as global head of regulatory affairs and promoted her the following year to legal chief.

By then, she had a lustrous resume that included serving as associate counsel for President Bill Clinton, deputy director of the Enron Task Force at the Department of Justice and White House counsel for President Barack Obama.

The Journal reported that some bankers inside Goldman have complained to senior management about Ruemmler’s ties to Epstein, given her presence on the firm’s reputational risk committee, which identifies clients and prospective clients the company shouldn’t work with.

According to the Journal, bankers were told those dealings hadn’t involved Goldman and that she had been up front in disclosing her relationship with Epstein to the company.

@ Greg Andrews can be reached at gandrews@alm.com.

Make informed strategic decisions.

Win larger verdicts.

Negotiate from strength.

GET STARTED

verdictsearch.com

Access a database of more than 180,000 verdicts and settlements from the nation's leading provider of verdict and settlement research.

Take VerdictSearch.com for a test-drive and see for yourself how powerful, fast and easy to use it is.

24-HOUR FREE PREVIEW

Expert Analysis / Outside Counsel / Corporate Update

Statement

« Continued from page 3
Management of Causes; Settlement or Mediation Program requires an informational statement:

- Pre-Argument Conference Program**
1. “By order of the court, counsel and the parties, and any additional parties in interest, may be directed to attend a pre-argument conference before a special master or such other person as may be designated by the Appellate Division.
 2. “Within ten days after an order directing a pre-argument conference, counsel for respondent shall file a counter-statement, together with proof of service, setting forth:
(i): “the issues proposed to be raised on the appeal, if respondent disagrees with the issues identified by appellant in the informational statement filed pursuant to (22 NYCRR) §1250.3;
(ii): “the extent to which respondent challenges the assertions made in the informational statement; and
(iii): “an explanation of the grounds for granting the relief sought by respondent.
- The Second Department states §670.3, Initial Filings; Active Management of Causes; Settlement or Mediation Program also requires an informational statement:

- (a) Initial Filings
- (1) In all civil matters, counsel for the appellant or the petitioner shall file the original plus one copy, and serve one copy, of the papers referred to in section 1250.3(a) of the Practice Rules of the Appellate Division (22 NYCRR §1250.3[a]).
- (2) Where an appeal is taken in a criminal matter, the clerk of the court of original instance shall execute an initial information statement on a form approved by the court and shall transmit it together with a copy of the notice of appeal and the order of sentence and commitment, if any, to the clerk of this court.
- (3) An initial informational statement relating to attorney matters shall be filed in connection with attorney disciplinary proceedings instituted in this court and applications made to this court pursuant to sections 690.17 and 690.19 of the rules of this court.
- (4) In all other actions or proceedings instituted in this court, and applications pursuant to CPLR 5704, an initial

informational statement shall be filed.

(5) Where the appeal is taken from an order or judgment issued in an action commenced under the provisions of CPLR 214-g, counsel for the appellant shall so indicate in the “Case Type” section of the informational statement. The clerk of the court from which the appeal is taken shall notify this court when transmitting such an informational statement to this court pursuant to section 1250.3(a) of the Practice Rules of the Appellate Division (22 NYCRR 1250.3[a]).

The local rules of the Third Department, §850.3, Initial Filings; Active Management of Causes; Settlement or Mediation Program provide:

The initial filings required in civil appeals pursuant to section 1250.3(a) of the Practice Rules of the Appellate Division shall not apply to transferred CPLR article 78 proceedings or appeals from the Unemployment Insurance Appeal Board or the Workers’ Compensation Board. [I.e., the informational statement is not required.]

The Fourth Department’s local rules do not require an informational statement (§ 1000.3[a]): “(a) The court does not require the filing of an initial informational statement pursuant to section 1250.3(a) of this Title.”

‘Fernandez v. Nationstar Mtge,’ Nomenclature, The Informational Statement Assumes The Role of A Notice of Appeal

In *Fernandez v. Nationstar Mtge. LLC*, 238 AD3d 486 [1st Dept 2025], a matter of first impression, the First Department held that it had jurisdiction over the appeal notwithstanding that the “plaintiffs filed an informational statement rather than a conventional notice of appeal; the statement indicated the order appealed from, the parties taking the appeal, and that plaintiffs were appealing to this court, rendering the informational statement sufficient (CPLR 5515[1]), [see italicized language in CPLR 5515, above]. As the statement was filed approximately three weeks after notice of entry of the order appealed from, it was sufficiently timely to give this court jurisdiction (CPLR 5513[a]).”

Since the informational statement essentially contains the same basic data required in the notice of appeal, only the name of the paper being different, the First Department allowed the informational statement, a nonjurisdictional

paper, to function as a substitute for the notice of appeal, a jurisdictional paper.

‘Kubiszyn v. Terex Div. of Terex Corp.’

The appellant, in *Kubiszyn v. Terex Div. of Terex Corp.*, 201 A.D.2d 974 [4th Dept 1994], had timely served a notice of appeal, but the county clerk rejected the appellant’s attempt to file it on the ground that a preargument statement had not been included with the notice of appeal.

Citing CPLR 5513, 5514[c], the Fourth Department held that the county clerk erred because “the filing of a preargument statement

CPLR 5520 is a legislative forgiveness statute but limitedly so. It sets forth three scenarios where an appellant’s mistakes made during timely compliance with the taking of the appeal may be forgiven.

is not a jurisdictional prerequisite to taking an appeal and the penalty for failure to file a preargument statement is left to the discretion of this court (22 NYCRR 1000.12[h]).” The Appellate Division held that the appellant’s failure to timely file was thus excusable and granted its motion to extend the time to take the appeal.

‘Soto v. Freda’

Soto v. Freda, 196 Misc 2d 623 [Sup Ct 2003] involved a matter of first impression not too different from *Fernandez*:

“The novel issue raised on these applications is whether a plaintiff has commenced an action when plaintiff’s counsel, on the last day within the statute of limitations, sends an elderly employee to court to file a summons and complaint, together with the necessary filing fee, but the filing is rejected by the county clerk because the employee’s poor vision prevented him from completing a form required by that office. I hold that the attempted filing under such extraordinary circumstances effectuated timely filing when the actual physical filing was accomplished on the next business day.”

Soto applied *Kubiszyn* [at 629]: “The Fourth Department’s decision in *Nicholas W. Kubiszyn v. Terex Division of Terex Corp.*, 201 A.D.2d 974, 607 N.Y.S.2d 832 is also persuasive ... ‘The county clerk erred in rejecting the notice of appeal inasmuch as the filing of a preargument statement is not a jurisdictional prerequisite to taking an appeal (CPLR 5513, 5514 [c]), and the penalty for failure to file a preargument statement is left to the discre-

tion of this court (22 NYCRR 1000.12[h]).’ The court held that the failure to file even a form required by an officially promulgated rule is not jurisdictional. It follows a fortiori that the Index Purchase Cover Sheet form utilized by the New York County Clerk, which he is presumptively free to change from time to time, which differs from those utilized by other County Clerks in New York City and which is likely not utilized at all by some upstate county clerks, does not rise to a jurisdictional level. All of the cases cited by plaintiff, whether close to being on point or not, stand for the notion, basic

to our modern jurisprudence, that cases should be decided on the merits and not whether someone has completed a non-jurisdictional form.”

Lynch v. Betts, 12 Misc 3d 295 [Sup Ct 2006] supplemented that the elderly employee did not have time to take the form back to the office and return that day, and, due to his poor eyesight, asked the clerk to help him fill it out, which the clerk refused.

Unlike *Fernandez*, *Kubiszyn*, *Soto*, and *Lynch* are reverse situations where the jurisdictional filings were properly made but were rejected due to the absence of administrative forms.

Statutes §92, Legislative Intent

Statutes §92 provides, in pertinent part:

“Generally, in the construction of statutes, the intention of the Legislature is first to be sought from a literal reading of the act itself or of all the statutes relating to the same general subject-matter. In this respect, the legislative intent is to be ascertained from the words and language used in the statute, and if language thereof is unambiguous and the words plain and clear, there is no occasion to resort to other means of interpretation.”

“Hence the legislative intent is said to be the ‘fundamental rule,’ ‘the great principle which is to control,’ ‘the cardinal rule’ and ‘the grand central light in which all statutes must be read.’”

“The intent of the Legislature is controlling and must be given

force and effect, regardless of the circumstance that inconvenience, hardship, or injustice may result.”

“Indeed the Legislature’s intent must be ascertained and effectuated whatever may be the opinion of the judiciary as to the wisdom, expediency, or policy of the statute, and whatever excesses or omissions may be found in the statute.”

Statutes §74: Implications From Legislative Silence: ‘If The Legislature Had Intended The Statute To Include The Matter in Question, It Would Have Been Easy for Them To Have Said So and To Have Expressly Included It’

“A court cannot by implication supply in a statute a provision which it is reasonable to suppose the Legislature intended intentionally to omit; and the failure of the Legislature to include a matter within the scope of an act may be construed as an indication that its exclusion was intended.”

“When it is urged that a particular statute should be construed to cover a matter not expressly mentioned in the act, the courts frequently assert that, if the legislature had intended the statute to include the matter in question, it would have been easy for them to have said so and to have expressly included it.

The court reasons that the failure of the Legislature to include the matter within the scope of the act indicates that its exclusion was intended, and the court refuses to insert the matter in the statute on the ground that it has no power to make such judicial legislation.”

“[I]t may be stated generally that, when from the language of an act and circumstances surrounding its enactment it appears that the Legislature has specified the cases to which it shall apply, the failure to specify a particular case indicates that the Legislature did not intend the act to cover such case ...”

CPLR 5520(c)

CPLR 5520 is a legislative forgiveness statute but limitedly so. It sets forth three scenarios where an appellant’s mistakes made during timely compliance with the taking of the appeal may be forgiven. Since CPLR 5520 is clear and unambiguous, it must be strictly adhered to (Statutes §92).

First, taking a direct appeal as of right and an appeal by permission (leave) both require two procedural steps: the timely filing of the notice of appeal or the motion for leave to appeal with the clerk of the court of original

instance followed by service upon the parties. (For situations involving multiple parties, see Court of Appeals Sotto Voce Reverses Groundbreaking Jurisdictional Decision and Solutions ‘Rogowski, Ruisech’)

CPLR 5520(a) provides that if the appellant has, “through mistake or excusable neglect,” performed only one of these two acts, the appellant must make a motion to “the court from or to which the appeal is taken or the court of original instance” for a “grant [of] an extension of time for curing the omission.”

Next, CPLR 5520(b) forgives an appellant who proceeded by an incorrect method, specifically, where the appellant moved for leave to appeal notwithstanding that s/he had the right to take a direct appeal: “Appeal by permission instead of as of right. An appeal taken by permission shall not be dismissed upon the ground that the appeal would lie as of right and was not taken within the time limited for an appeal as of right, provided the motion for permission was made within the time limited for taking the appeal.” (Also see CPLR 5514.)

Notably, the reverse mistake occurs more often, i.e., that appellants take appeals as of right where an appeal by permission should have been taken. Appellate courts often generously, sua sponte, deem such erroneous direct filings into motions for leave to appeal, and grant such leave, e.g., *Anonymous v. Anonymous*, 217 AD3d 619, 619 [1st Dept 2023]; *Neurez, LLC v. City of Middletown*, 216 AD3d 655, 657 [2d Dept 2023]; *Matter of Chemung County Dept. of Social Services v. Kenneth KK*, 288 AD2d 724 [3d Dept 2001]; *Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. St. Louis*, 229 AD3d 116, 126 [2d Dept 2024].

Finally, CPLR 5520(c) specifies only two defects in the notice of appeal that may be discretionarily forgiven: “[w]here a notice of appeal is premature or contains an inaccurate description of the judgment or order appealed from.”

Conclusion

Except for the nomenclature the informational statement, at the heart of *Fernandez*, provides the same basic information required in CPLR 5515—and then some—it is, therefore, not illogical for the Legislature to take another step forward in the future to amend these statutes to state that the timely filing of an informational statement may jurisdictionally satisfy CPLR 5515. CPLR 5515 was last amended in 1975. CPLR 5520 was last amended in 1966. However, until such time as the statute is amended, 5515 needs to be strictly construed in accordance with Statutes §§ 92 and 74.

‘Kennedy’

« Continued from page 4
officeholders, by virtue of the fact that they are directed and supervised by the HHS Secretary. Justice Kavanaugh now turned to examine the “two main sources” of that principal officer’s oversight power.

The majority first posits that an official who is “removable at will by a principal officer...typically qualifies as an inferior officer. So it is here.” Adhering to the historical practice of designating as inferior any appointee “who is removable at will by a principal officer,” the high court explains that, in the case at bar, the Secretary, acting as a department head, populates the board, and enjoys unfettered “authority to remove the Task

est Appointments Clause precedent, the high Court now turned to raise its construct’s second pillar.

Separate and apart from the Secretary’s prerogative to remove at will, *Kennedy* resolved that this Cabinet-level official is empowered by law “to directly review and block Task Force recommendations before they take effect.” This independently “confirms that the Task Force members are inferior officers.” The supreme tribunal then identified three interlocking sources for this authority.

First, as a component of HHS, the Task Force is subject to the “supervision and direction” of the Secretary. *See 42 U.S.C. §202*. Second, a table of governmental organization promulgated in the 1960s, and subsequently codified by Congress, instructs the department head to

found that “the inferior-officer issue is quite straightforward,” when one considers this dual authority in conjunction with controlling Appointments Clause precedent. For all these reasons, the Supreme Court decreed that “there can be no doubt that the Task Force members, who are subject to both forms of control, are inferior officers.”

Conclusion

In the estimation of this writer, *Kennedy* has received far less attention than it rightly deserves. Granted, its narrow focus did not grab headlines in the same manner as did its more illustrious antecedents, most especially *Lucia*. Yet that does not diminish one iota the illumination this latest high Court landmark shines upon the proper resolution of constitutional challenges predicated upon Article II.

One need not consult any empirical studies to tell us that the vast federal bureaucracy is composed of far more “inferior” officers than “principal” appointees. While the former may be subordinate to the latter, it is beyond peradventure that these lesser officials probably have a more direct and immediate impact upon the everyday affairs of countless American citizens and businesses.

Liberty is preserved when we are certain that all Executive Branch officeholders remain accountable to the elected president, and, thereby, to the people they ultimately serve. This requires constant refinement to the contours of Article II. *Kennedy’s* contribution to that noble task should not be minimized, notwithstanding its quiet entry into the field. We are confident that the high Court’s newest pronouncement is destined to resonate in future Appointments Clause controversies, playing a key role in upholding the maxim “liberty requires accountability.”

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.

Resorts World

« Continued from page 5
Dorn added, “Joining Resorts World Las Vegas at such a dynamic time in its growth is an exciting opportunity. Having spent my career navigating the complexities of gaming law and regulatory compliance, I look forward to supporting the resort’s continued success by ensuring we operate with the highest standards of legal integrity and strategic governance.”

Tranchina brings more than two decades of gambling and hospitality regulatory experience. She started out as an assistant attorney general in the Gaming Division of the Louisiana Department of Justice. Most recently, she was general counsel for Investar Bank, where she oversaw legal operations across Louisiana, Texas and Alabama. Before that, she was general counsel at the Rio Hotel & Casino overseeing legal, regulatory compliance and risk.

She succeeds Gerald Gardner who departed in June after serving as legal chief since 2014, when planning for the project was in its early stages. Gardner did not respond to questions from Law.com.

The legal reset comes as the resort works to steadily improve performance after a bumpy start to 2025. First quarter revenue was \$166 million, down 22% from the same period a year earlier, and earnings

before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization was \$10 million, down 75% from a year earlier.

The owner and developer of the resort, Malaysia-based Genting Berhad, has said it is focusing on “recovering and re-establishing” VIP play, improving margins and upgrading hotel and casino offer-management systems.

Results perked up in the second quarter, with revenue rising to \$180 million.

Resorts World Las Vegas and Tranchina did not immediately respond to Law.com’s request for comment.

@ Trudy Knockless can be reached at tknockless@alm.

Robinson

« Continued from page 5
Robinson is a Washington, D.C., insider who, before joining KPMG, held senior roles at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and was a special assistant to President Barack Obama for justice and regulatory policy.

Before that, Robinson spent nearly a decade at Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr, rising to become a partner in litigation and investigations.

At Vanguard, Robinson had succeeded Anne Robinson (no relation), who departed to become general counsel of IBM.

In hiring Lamarque, Vanguard is

bringing aboard a veteran lawyer with deep financial services experience.

She is a former general counsel of New York Life as well as a former assistant U.S. attorney in the Southern District of New York, where she prosecuted insurance fraud, racketeering and money laundering cases.

She started her career as a litigation associate at Debevoise & Plimpton.

Natalie has spent her career ensuring everyday investors get a fair shake and helping people achieve a secure retirement,” Ramji said in the press release. “She is a seasoned executive who brings exceptional legal expertise and a deep understanding of our industry

and the global regulatory environment. We are thrilled to add her leadership and judgment across business, legal, and policy matters to the firm.”

In the release, Lamarque said: “I’ve long admired Vanguard’s reputation for integrity and work to champion everyday investors. I am excited to join Vanguard’s leadership team and to work with the firm’s talented legal professionals to advocate for better access and better investment outcomes, so more people have the chance to realize their financial goals and secure their future.”

@ Trudy Knockless can be reached at tknockless@alm.

@ Trudy Knockless can be reached at tknockless@alm.

Force members at will.” *See Myers v. United States*, 272 U.S. 52 (1926) (the authority to remove is incidental to the appointive power).

In language both memorable and illustrative, the supreme tribunal reminds that the at-will removal power is a powerful tool for controlling Executive Branch subordinates. *See Free Enterprise Fund v. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board*, 561 U.S. 477 (2010). A lesser functionary “must fear and...obey” the principal officer, and avoids subservience by ceding “here-and-now discharge” to the occupant of the higher office (internal quotations and citations omitted). *See Bowsher v. Synar*, 478 U.S. 714 (1986).

In the instant case, the Secretary can “stop any preventive-services recommendation contrary to his judgment from taking effect” by substituting a more pliant appointee for any advisory group member who subsequently proves to be recalcitrant. The investiture of “significant control” in the chief of the HHS, opined Kavanaugh, preordains ranking the Task Force’s members as inferior officers. Having thus erected one column of its new-

oversee all the agency’s constituent parts. Third, statute authorizes this principal appointee to promulgate necessary and appropriate regulations, *see 42 U.S.C. §300gg-92*, including those which may, in fact, nullify some or all of the advisory group’s directives.

This collection of authority “enables the Secretary to review and, if he chooses, directly block any recommendation he disagrees with.” In sum, “the Task Force cannot make any legally binding, final decision on behalf of the United States.” Almost as an aside, Justice Kavanaugh adds that it is unnecessary for the HHS chief to review every decision; it is sufficient that this principal officeholder has the discretion to review whatever the board disseminates.

Nearing its end, *Kennedy* robustly proclaimed that the principal appointee’s at-will removal power, combined with the lawful power to oversee or even block the advisory group’s recommendations, constitute “multiple and mutually reinforcing means by which the Secretary of HHS can supervise and direct the Task Force.” Justice Kavanaugh

Court Calendars

First Department

APPELLATE DIVISION

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

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

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

1 P.M.

28283/19 Pitang v. Underbruckner Realty Co.

MONDAY, SEPT. 15

9:30 A.M.

808881/24 Valerio v. Perez

TUESDAY, SEPT. 16

11:30 A.M.

817949/24 Hudson v. Metropolitan Transportation Authority

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

10 A.M.

652857/24 BH EJ Core v. Core Global Holdings

FRIDAY, SEPT. 26

11 A.M.

150359/25 Feigen v. Hamill

WEDNESDAY, OCT. 8

10 A.M.

656443/22 Bank of Utah v. Aboughazale

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

FRIDAY, OCT. 24

9:30 A.M.

153055/23 McGeehan v. 14th Street HK Realty

CALENDAR FOR THE SEPTEMBER TERM

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

2 P.M.

23/3868 People v. Justin JeanBaptiste

25/1830/2814 Morris v. Ortega

24/4068 R., Serenity

25/747 WarnerMedia Direct v. Paramount Global

24/640 Ramos v. Ford Foundation

25/127 Rodriguez v. FGI Corporation

22/2518 People v. Chevanie Gordon

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

24/483 People v. Kyle Hardison

25/912/23 Halgene Watch v. Alex Capital Fund

24/3308 Vazquez v. NYS Office of Children

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

23/1916 People v. Isaiab Rivera

19/5849 People v. Michael McNeil

24/2499 People v. Amaury Balbi

23/2035 People v. Christopher Maldonado

17/2821 Etrade Bank v. DelValle

24/1354 Glenmede Trust v. Infinity Q Capital

24/3393 People v. Rafael Carrasquillo

25/834 Beals v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese

25/3424N Bodenchak v. 5178 Holdings

24/5447N Cani v. NYC Health and Hospitals

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

TUESDAY, SEPT. 16

2 P.M.

18/4169 People v. Reynaldo Andino

24/2801 Solis v. City of NY

24/7378 B., Christine v. Antonio G.

24/7203 Sanchez v. 1562 Thieriot Ave

24/5008 Julien Farel, LLC v. Stove Properties

24/6181(1) People v. Jeremiah Martinez

24/6135(1) People v. Jeremiah Martinez

24/5778 Fine Creative Media v. Barnes & Noble

25/2604 Green Tree Servicing v. Rivera

24/5490 People v. Romeo Carrion

23/6021 People v. Jose S.

24/7161 Homelink Int'l v. Law Offices of Sanjay Chaubey

24/5680 V., Gloria v. Karen P.

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

24/7129 Fernandez v. Sukhdeep

22/5224 People v. Jorge Louis

22/5592 People v. Chad Hooks

24/4756(3) Ali Baba Hotel v. Prose

25/2532 Freedom Care v. NYS Department of Health

25/874 People v. Eligio Orellana

24/2920N Acevedo v. Citibank

24/7915N Wayman v. CPE Housing Development

23/5732N NYS Division of Housing v. Zara Realty

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 17

2 P.M.

19/5343(1) People v. Brahimia Djaló

24/5969 Spring Scaffolding v. Krall

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

24/6088 Ahsanuddin v. Addo

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

24/4525(2) Rosenblum v. Treitler

23/6436(1) People v. Anthony Balaguer

23/6439(1) People v. Anthony Balaguer

24/2172(2) Cuomo v. Jams, Inc.

24/4821 People v. Joel R.

24/5468N Commonwealth Land v. Sky Abstract

24/6864N Naramore v. Mount Sinai Health

25/3052N Owens v. MTA

THURSDAY, SEPT. 18

2 P.M.

24/1981 People v. Choncey Chance

25/1288 Nturu v. WV Preservation

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

24/5202 Ovalle v. Church Street Construction

24/4715 Pallero v. Romero

23/2655(1) People v. Andre Morris

23/2690(1) People v. Andre Morris

25/798 ARC NYWWPJ001 v. WWP JV

24/5218 Murillo v. Downtown NYC Owner

20/1196 People v. Derrick Harris

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

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

24/3145 Bank NY Mellon v. Kim

24/7555 Brevet Direct Lending v. Aprio LLP

22/5204 People v. Alvin Brown

22/4915 People v. Norman Croncy

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

24/3203 Black v. City of NY

23/1032(1) People v. Markuise McGrier

23/2676 People v. Junior Zorrilla

24/4460N Shanghai Yongrun Investment v. Kashi Galaxi

23/378(3) WGrace v. Sabal

24/6859N Bey v. City of NY

TUESDAY, SEPT. 23

2 P.M.

19/4847 People v. Orlando Correa

24/5381 Amtrust North America v. Insurance Specialty

25/1414 M., Darryl v. Shaniqua D.

25/542 Lee v. Jay Housing Corporation

24/2844 Cerda v. Cydonia W71

21/2475 People v. Carlos Guzman

20/1659 People v. Luis Sastre

24/6871 Gomez v. Thomas

23/6557 J.N., an Infant v. Strong

24/1177 Adago v. Sy

17/1547 People v. Kenneth Ferguson

24/469 People v. Jaytiwon Braxton

24/4927 Lopez v. Rodriguez

24/4087(2) Thorobird Grand v. M. Melnick & Co.

24/5054 State of NY v. Tyrone N.

23/1876 People v. Elijah Santiago

24/4306 Nunez v. Turo, Inc.

24/3780 People v. Sterling Wade

23/5751 People v. Andre Seda

22/4809(1) People v. Liz Thompson

24/4359 Metropolitan Property v. Pentair Residential

24/5245N Charlton v. 92 Pinehurst Avenue

25/24N ARK292 v. Archdiocese of NY

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 24

2 P.M.

20/997 People v. Brian Gutierrez

23/4993(2) 600 Associates v. Illinois Union Insurance

24/6686 D., Luelin

24/2494 Wadsworth Associates v. NYS Division of Housing

25/3876 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY

19/3817 People v. Nicola Fields

23/3512 People v. Shaquille Dinkins

24/2444 Uno & Brokeage v. Inshur, Inc.

24/3645 Brito v. City of NY

20/300 People v. Daniel Newell

24/3875 Gonzalez v. City of NY

24/3068(2) Gu v. Ji

24/6343 People v. Lamar Withall

24/3125 People v. Yusuf Brown

24/7159 Best Work Holdings v. Ma

22/4342 People v. Vadim Shilman

23/1682 People v. Willie Santos

24/2903 Trzuskot v. Johnson

23/571 People v. Javier Rosario

24/5805(1) Molner v. Molner

25/709(1) W.Molner v. Molner

24/7867(6) N. Cohn v. RTW Retailwinds Acquisition

23/6362N N47 Associates v. Jemscro Realty

THURSDAY, SEPT. 25

2 P.M.

24/219 People v. David Young

24/2453 Lewis v. Ganesh

24/202 P.B., Children

25/697 Rivera v. ShopRite of Bruckner

24/7923 Elberg v. International Bank of Chicago

19/4979 People v. David Rivera

24/3834 People v. Pharoah Holmes

23/122 Edwards v. NJ Transit

24/4524 National Community v. Midtown Coalition

24/5438 670 River Realty v. NYS Division of Housing

24/5626 People v. Tariq Gouldbourne

22/2962 People v. Brandon Holley

24/6287 White v. Turitz

22/4917 People v. Melissa Concepcion

23/3553 People v. Franklin Cabrera-Fernandez

24/6313 385 W. Broadway Corp. v. Tax Commission

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

25/1239 Dorilton Capital Management v. Stilus LLC

24/565 People v. Peter Showers

21/3101 People v. Precila Smith

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

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

24/4110N Board of Managers v. 16EF Apartment

APPELLATE TERM

60 Centre Street Room 401

10 A.M.

Commencing with the September 2025 Term, all oral arguments at the Appellate Term, First Department will be in person. Counsel and pro se litigants also have the option to submit.

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 return-

COURT NOTES

INDIGENT LEGAL SERVICES BOARD

Meeting To Be Held on Friday, Sept. 19

Notice is hereby given that the Indigent Legal Services Board (ILSB) will be holding a regular meeting on Friday, September 19, 2025, at 11:00 AM. The meeting will be held at the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, located at 42 West 44th Street, New York, New York.

The meeting will also be available by videoconference and recorded for public viewing. After the meeting is over, ILS will post on its website (<https://www.ils.ny.gov/>) an announcement about the meeting with a link to a recording of it. Those interested in attending can obtain instructions for the WebEx meeting by emailing Liah Darlington (liah.darlington@ils.ny.gov).

NEW YORK CIVIL COURT

Housing Part

Court Seeks Applicants For Housing Court Judgeships

Hon. Douglas Hoffman (Ret.), Chairperson of the Advisory Council for the Housing Part of the Civil Court of the City of New York, today announced that the Advisory Council has begun the process of soliciting applications for Housing Court Judge positions.

In order to encourage interest in applying and to provide sufficient time for a full review of candidates, applications will be accepted through November 6, 2025, at 5 p.m.

Housing Court Judges are appointed to five-year terms. They are required to have been admitted to the New York State Bar for at least five years, two of which must have been in an active and relevant practice. In addition, they must be qualified by training, interest, experience and judicial temperament and knowledge of federal, state, and local housing laws and programs. The present salary for Housing Court Judge is \$216,400 per year.

Persons interested in applying to become a Housing Court Judge may obtain a questionnaire from the courts website, Advisory Council - NY Housing | NYCOURTS.GOV. In as much as November 6, 2025, has been established as the deadline date for submission of such applications, Judge Hoffman encourages all applicants to obtain, complete and submit the original questionnaire as soon as possible. Applications can be emailed to dcainychousing@nycourts.gov and the original mailed to the Office of the Deputy Chief Administrative Judge Adam Silvera, 111 Centre Street, Room 1240, New York, New York 10013. Dated: September 9, 2025

THE BRONX COUNTY

Surrogate Court

Court is Accepting Applications for Deputy Public Administrator

Deadline is Sept. 18

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

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

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

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

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

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

Starting salary: \$139,567.00 Per year

An equal opportunity employer

FIRST DEPARTMENT

Appellate Term

Filing Dates for the October Term

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

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

The Clerk's Return, Record on Appeal, Appendices, Notice of Argument and Appellant's Briefs must be filed on or before August 12, 2025.

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

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

NEW YORK SUPREME COURT CIVIL TERM

New Judicial Assignments and Reassignments

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

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

Counsel are advised to sign up for the court system's E-Track service. E-Track allows counsel to list with the service some or all the firm's cases pend-

ing in the Supreme Court, Civil Branch, New York County, and other counties as well. E-Track provides notification by e-mail of all appearances and adjournments in covered cases that are recorded in the court's electronic case history program, as well as other developments, such as the reassignment of cases and the issuance of decisions and long-form orders. E-Track can also provide appearance reminders should counsel wish to avail themselves of that capability. To sign up for E-Track, counsel should go to the following address:

651649/25Airea LLC v. Hudson Park NY LLC
652213/25Akt Inc v. Gonzalez & Associates Restaurant Group LLC Et Al
152697/23Alvarez v. 355 Sj East 88th St.
655107/24American Transit Ins. Co. v. Aaron Barreto Et Al
659228/24American Transit Ins. Co. v. Barnes
659136/24American Transit Ins. Co. v. Davis
655703/24American Transit Ins. Co. v. Liboria Ayala, Garcia Et Al
655700/24American Transit Ins. Co. v. Reno Stephen Et Al
659100/24American Transit Ins. Co. v. Smith
654038/24Arbp Investor LLC v. 2717 Shell Bark Road
652465/22Bagirova v. The Nomo Soho Hotel Et Al
190152/25Barnwell v. Coty Inc.
D/ba Calvin Klein Fragrances, D/ba Individually And For Its Subsidiaries Noxell Corp. And Calvin Klein Cosmetic Corp. Et Al
158692/25 Beach Lane Mgt. Inc. v. Faye
653519/24 Beauce-Atlas USA Corp., D/ba Les Consts. Beauce Atlas Inc. v. Bolivar Builders
952009/22 Bernard v. Cosby Jr.
157018/25 Blatstein v. Blatstein
652320/25 Bnp Dev. LLC v. 9 Dekalb Fee Owner LLC Et Al
154726/25 Board of Mgrs. of The Norfolk Atrium Condominium v. Suarez
155941/25 Board of Mgrs. of The Peregrine Tower Condominium v. Webb
451326/22 Boerke v. NYC Et Al
160246/19 Bonilla v. Bpp St Owner LLC
156045/20 Braganca-Ferreira v. Srep 10th Ave. Venture LLC
656460/21 Buchman v. 117 East 72nd St. Corp. Et Al
158309/18 Buonocore v. NYC
160676/23 Burnett v. NYC Et Al
154625/25 Calender v. NYC Et Al
656533/22 Catalyst Dev. Group LLC v. Basso 55 Inc. Et Al
156450/24 Chavez v. Trustees of Columbia Univ. Et Al
150154/20 Ching v. Wray-Asaro
154537/25 Cioffi v. The Bronze Owl NYC Et Al
153922/19 Clermont Ins. Co. v. Ninth Ave. Const.
152882/23 Collins v. 160 East 28th & 134 Ninth LLC Et Al
158487/23 Collins v. 36 S Oxford St
152776/22 Cristina De Heeren Noble And William D. Zabel v. The 1200 Fifth Condominium Et Al
156694/25 Donnelly v. West 60th St. Associates LLC Et Al
321057/24 Eid v. Eid
159156/20 Elizabeth Stauber v. Board of Directors of 8
153676/25 Esosa Osamwonyi v. NYC Police Dept. Et Al
152436/15 Evert v. 200 Madison Owner
152909/25 Farrell v. NYC Et Al
153634/25 Fora Financial Warehouse 2024 v. Tim Cretin Logging & Sawmill Corp. Et Al
651593/25 Fortun Vantage Ins. v. Fortun
654667/25 Pti Consulting Tech. LLC v. Workhardt USA LLC
190168/25 Fussell v. Minerals Technologies
652710/25 Galpern v. The Home Depot, Inc. Et Al
159463/25 Garcia v. L'oreal USA, Inc. Et Al
158251/25 George v. Metro. Transportation Auth.
155052/22 Gilbert v. Pristine Bldg. LLC Et Al
150190/22 Gould v. NY Arena Partners
159721/24 Govt. Employees Ins. Co. v. Beach Medical Rehabilitation
155538/23 Green v. Heath
190167/25 Greenberg v. Colgate-Palmolive Co. (for Cashmere Bouquet) Et Al
657563/19 Greenwich Advisory & Co. v. Kranos Corp.
653201/25 Grewal v. Stanton
659879/24 Gs 800 6th LLC Et Al v. Somp America Ins. Co. Et Al
158091/24 Gutierrez v. Bajana
652421/24 Gym Tech Fitness Service v. Jdm Washington St.
150560/25 Hayden v. NYC Et Al
157521/22 Hannant v. Abt
650098/23 Hauppauge Transportation Inc. v. Ability Customs Inc. Et Al
157343/24 Hereford Ins. Co. v. Bethesda
160513/24 Hereford Ins. Co. v. Lewis
158478/25 Hereford Ins. Co. v. Perez
161251/25 Huey v. Hinge, Inc. Et Al
154515/20 Huyer v. NYCHA Et Al
650151/24 Icon III v. Joonbug Prod. ions Inc., D/ba Skynet Media LLC Et Al
652713/24 Intersection Media v. Findlay Facilities
655448/23 Itria Ventures LLC v. Rasik Prods. USA LLC Et Al
805035/24 Jacobs v. The NY And Presbyterian Hosp.
652196/20 Jg Group Hldgs. LLC v. Kahlon
155100/24 Joy v. NYC Et Al
655568/24 Kahlon v. Chalus
653993/25 Kapitus Consulting, Inc. v. H2o Sports Manufacturing LLC Et Al
156765/25 Kerz v. Henderson & Neuberg
160610/24 Kidd v. Rice
160285/25 Klepper v. 118 East 60th Owners, Inc. Et Al
655297/20 Koza v. Mutual Fund Series Trust
157245/25 Krotulov v. Board of Mgrs. of The Ruppert Yorkville Towers Condominium Et Al
652676/23 Law Offices of Alfred S Lui v. Lhen
156249/21 Chami Mahtani v. Con Ed Co. of NY
150116/25 Lopez v. NYC
656414/23 Lux Group Hldgs. Ltd v. 1165 Madison Ave Owner LLC
653948/21 M & E Mott v. Dirty Hands Jewelry Corp. Et Al
151634/21 M13 & M15 Hldgs. v. Athanson
155789/25 Macias v. Chacha
651002/22 Makarewicz Design Ltd. D/ba Mdl Solutions v. Jdp Mechanical, Inc. Et Al
152712/25 Mates Abreu v. Vinicius Vidal De Araujo
156950/25 McGill v. NYS Office of Children And Family Services
151405/21 McPherson v. NYCTA
153598/25 Mendez v. Fooda, Inc.
654093/23 Merama Growth Sa De Cv Sofom Enr v. Andres
653259/25 Monroe Capital Mgt. Advisors v. The Ave. in Allen LLC Et Al
651595/25 Moonlite LLC v. Foresto
156927/25 Moreno v. Groundwork Coffee
190257/24 Morin v. Pfizer Inc. Et Al
151270/20 Nehorayan v. Metro Floral Designs
152611/22 NY Marine And General Ins. Co. Et Al v. Accident Fund Ins. Co. of America Et Al
659014/24 Ningbo Mp Devon Imp. & Exp. Co v. Esquire Footwear Brands
159352/22 NYCTL 2021-A Trust v. 187 St. Maatz LLC Et Al
153659/12 Obfeld v. Parella
154315/25 Onwuka v. Board of Education of The City School Dist. of NYC Et Al
154644/20 Palacios v. Ford Foundation
156999/25 Patel v. Petit-Homme
805038/24 Peapack-Gladstone Bank v. 524 E 119 LLC Et Al

805375/24 Peapack-Gladstone Bank v. 88 E 111 LLC Et Al
453196/22 People of The State of NY v. Vdare Foundation, Inc.
157598/25 Peoples v. Meta Platforms, Inc.
653233/25 Ptp Vii Sub Viii v. Lee-Wen
156806/25 Phipps v. Phipps Jr.
650329/25 Pierre Ambrosino v. A&A Contracting & Prop. Maint. Et Al
160048/21 Pilon v. Mtglq Investors
159036/22 Pope v. Cultivated NY Et Al
152484/22 Qayyem v. The NYCTA Et Al
654368/25 Qualified Industries v. Pen And Frog Social Club LLC
157121/21 Quesada v. Navin
950182/19 R. v. Roman Catholic 151826/21 Ramirez v. NYC Et Al
154332/24 Rembert v. NYC Et Al
153968/21 Rosado v. H.K. Brownstones
450867/18 Sabbagh v. State of NY
160427/22 Samantha Gonzalez v. Repi Holdeo
159297/22 Sanchez Melendez v. Omnibuild Const., Inc. Et Al
160095/18 Schnur v. Balestriere
654813/25 Schulte Roth & Zabel Llp v. 777 Partners LLC Et Al
152901/25 Shulman v. Fahey
850135/25 Sig Rcrs D Mf 2023 Venture LLC v. 501 W 133 LLC Et Al
651606/20 Soucycle Inc. Et Al v. Arch Specialty Ins. Co. Et Al
155312/20 St-Louis v. Harbeck
159743/22 Standford v. Vornado Two Penn Prop.
160173/24 State Farm Fire And Casualty Co. v. Ace Med Supplies Inc. Et Al
150128/24 State Farm Fire And Casualty Co. v. Azamov
160398/24 State Farm Fire And Casualty Co. v. Pierre
156307/24 State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. v. Ewarwo
152832/25 State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. v. Hanna
153339/25 State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. v. Pimental
654073/25 Steffanni v. Dfg Trademark Hldgs. LLC Et Al
651947/21 Strategic Funding Source, Inc. v. The Dallas Flag & Flagpole Co
161143/25 Stroock & Stroock & Lavan Llp v.
161250/25 Stroock & Stroock & Lavan Llp v.
652842/24 Swartz v. Sol Goldman Investments
190240/25 Taylor v. Sumitomo Corp. of Americas Et Al
161461/24 Three Park Bldg. LLC v. Starbuck's Corp.
156462/24 Toosh USA, Inc. v. Takahashi
651525/25 Tusany Legacy Leasing LLC v. Luxurban Re Hldgs. LLC
P/ba Corphousing Group Inc. Et Al
655702/21 Urban Ecospaces, Inc. v. Sisco
651648/25 Uswoy Rlty. LLC v. Hudson Park NY LLC
190129/15 Valley v. A.O. Smith Water Prods. Co.
850426/24 Wells Fargo Bank v. 521 Fifth Ave. Prop. Investors Iv
159860/25 West 56th St. Associates v. NYS Div. of Housing And Community Renewal
450845/16 Williams v. Clifford
156495/25 Williams v. NYC
850154/25 Wilmington Trust v. 505 Bronx Equities LLC Et Al
153097/25 Wilson v. 1199seiu Nat. Benefit Fund
160654/21 Wilson v. NYC Et Al
152501/16 Xie v. Skanska USA Civil, Inc.

E-Filing Submission Part
Adjourned for Working Copies Part
Part 1
Justice Adam Silvera
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3722
Room 300
THURSDAY, SEPT. 11
157922/23 Becquer v. NYCHA
161073/21 Berry v. NYCHA
153425/21 Cyrus v. NYCHA
150119/22 Cyrus v. NYCHA
151933/23 Diaz v. NYCHA
160526/21 K. v. The NYCHA
156899/22 Mitchell v. The NYCHA

Part 2
Justice Lori S. Sattler
60 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3852
Room 212
THURSDAY, SEPT. 11
259983/17 103 Central Park West Corp. v. The Tax Commission of The City of New York
250383/19 14 East 58th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al
240037/23 1567 Media v. The Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al
240070/24 1567 Media v. The Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al
240020/25 1567 Media v. The Tax Comm. of NYC Et Al
254004/20 186 Norfolk LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250278/20 205 East 10th St. Owners Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
262789/17 26/32 J LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250641/19 28 Perry St. Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261418/18 347 West 55th St. LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
257760/17 38 Walker St. v. Tax Comm. of The
266364/20 3959 Rly. Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263863/21 44 W 37 LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261421/18 440 Co. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261428/18 482 Ft. Washington LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 983 Tenants Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
250599/20 Alkal v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
258765/19 Beresford Apts., Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261210/19 Brenwood Corp. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
263911/19 543 B'way. Corp. v. NYC
257746/18 55 East 59th LLC v. Tax Comm. of NYC
250037/20 60 West 57 Rly. Inc. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
261304/18 7 Gramercy Park Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
256516/22 799 Madison Ave. v. The Tax Comm. of NYC
259947/17 9

100716/18 Culpepper v. NYCTA 155228/22 Dasilva v. NYC Et Al 160779/20 Denzinger v. NYC 158646/21 Diagne v. Harlem Center Condominium Assoc., Inc. Et Al 160547/23 E. v. NYCTA 162370/23 Filippone v. The NYCTA Et Al 158312/19 Frame v. NYC Et Al 150280/22 Franco v. NYC Et Al 155952/24 Frey v. NYC Et Al 160365/22 Harris v. Williams 155092/21 Hatem v. The Dakota, Inc. Et Al 156054/22 Heenan v. Sixth Ave. Owner LLC Et Al 150210/22 Hendrix Jackson v. NYCTA Et Al 155830/15 Iharra v. NYC 151669/23 Ishrak v. Mta Bus Co. Et Al 152394/22 Johnnie Leon-Burgos And Clariza Castillo-Alberto v. NYCTA Et Al 451733/19 Johnson v. NYC 157489/18 Kim v. NYCTA 152344/24 Liu v. Mta Bus Co. Et Al 150642/17 Lomando v. NYCTA 160408/24 Lomax v. NYC Et Al 160625/22 Lopez v. The NYCTA Et Al 157045/24 Martell v. NYCTA Et Al 155929/18 Martin v. NYCTA 155678/22 Martinez v. NYC Et Al 157468/22 McCrae v. NYC Et Al 153104/25 McNaught v. NYCTA Et Al 154439/24 Moore v. NYCTA Et Al 157294/22 Morales v. NYC Et Al 158941/17 Myek v. Metro. Transportation 162071/18 Palacios v. Doe 156746/20 Paredes-Mosquera v. NYCTA 158800/22 Patterson v. Perez 160019/21 Perez v. NYC Et Al 15023/24 Perroni v. NYCTA Et Al 153947/18 Piazza v. NYC 158071/21 Raphael v. NYC Et Al 157187/23 Reyes v. NYC Et Al 152649/23 Roa v. 291 Central Park West Partnership L.P. Et Al 157972/24 Rosado v. NYC Et Al 154590/24 Salghini v. NYC Et Al 157705/22 Salvini v. NYCHA 153592/21 Sanchez v. NYCTA 154915/20 Santana v. NYCTA 158860/25 Sawadogo v. NYCTA Et Al 156467/19 Scottdale Ins. Co. v. NYC 156682/18 Sharon Williams v. NYC 160358/24 Sherpa v. NYCTA Et Al 152246/22 Shuster v. NYCTA 156217/20 Singh v. Evangelista 453167/22 Smith v. Perez 160765/24 Sotiropoulos v. NYCTA Et Al 153292/20 Strasser v. Eight-115 Associates 151763/18 Tartaglia v. NYCTA 450525/24 Taylor v. Metro. Transportation Auth. Et Al 159474/23 Thomas v. NYC Et Al 157886/24 Tomlinson v. NYCTA Et Al 155797/21 Tomlinson v. NYCTA 153102/20 Vago v. NYC 158822/18 Williams v. NYCTA 154174/23 Williams v. Acosta 160522/20 Wilson v. NYCTA 155574/24 Zhang v. NYC Et Al

Motion

155929/18 Martin v. NYCTA 156746/20 Paredes-Mosquera v. NYCTA

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

150223/23 Barry v. NYCTA Et Al 151405/21 McPherson v. NYCTA 152484/22 Qayyum v. The NYCTA Et Al 156495/25 Williams v. Clifford

Part 22 Motor Vehicle

Justice Christopher Chin
80 Centre Street
Phone 646-386-3271
Room 136

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

153909/22 Blandon v. Seck 153936/22 Chisholm v. Goodwin 151453/23 Genao v. Rodriguez 153989/24 Guerrero Enriquez v. Isaev 160206/25 Hernandez Arita v. Motor Vehicle Accident Indemnification Corp. 150561/22 Jones v. Wazadally 156899/23 Koprivica v. Perfect Moving And Storage 150471/24 Martinez v. Ortiz 162225/24 Miranda v. Southern Cross LLC Et Al 153342/25 Pyon v. Hassan 157437/15 Silva-Fajardo v. Garcia 156545/21 Strong v. Monzon 161038/21 Suder v. Jackson 152141/25 Thomas v. Singh 153987/24 Waldrop v. Chen 158820/21 Yan v. Martinez

Motion

153909/22 Blandon v. Seck 151453/23 Genao v. Rodriguez 153989/24 Guerrero Enriquez v. Isaev 160206/25 Hernandez Arita v. Motor Vehicle Accident Indemnification Corp. 150561/22 Jones v. Wazadally 156899/23 Koprivica v. Perfect Moving And Storage 162225/24 Miranda v. Southern Cross LLC Et Al 153342/25 Pyon v. Hassan 157437/15 Silva-Fajardo v. Garcia 156545/21 Strong v. Monzon 161038/21 Suder v. Jackson 152141/25 Thomas v. Singh

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

158724/23 American Automobile Ins. Co. A/s/o Westside Tm Corp. D/b/a West End Bar & Grill v. Con Ed Co. of New York, Inc. 15208/24 Arias v. Axel12913 Corp Et Al 154103/23 Avila Rodriguez v. Espinal 159772/22 Bannister v. Martinez Montero 159320/19 Beckford v. NYC 154480/24 Blessmev. Verdejo 158624/22 Brooks v. Jet Taxi Inc. Et Al 450850/24 Brown v. Khan 156616/24 Cabrejo Macias v. Bhuyan 157126/23 Cassinelli v. Master Cooling Service Corp. Et Al 155576/24 Cerda Compress v. Huber 157478/22 Chen v. Stephanie Transportation LLC Et Al 160073/23 Clark Richard v. Werner Enterprises, Inc. Et Al 155829/24 Coa Parra v. Gujjar Limco Corp Et Al 153257/23 Conlon v. Nikiema 156027/24 Dejesus v. Mv Public Transportation, Inc. 151469/22 Donascimento v. Victoria 153264/24 Durg v. Edge Limo Inc Et Al 159998/19 Fodix v. C & J Bus Lines 157738/22 Gadalla v. Ballarini 158091/24 Gutierrez v. Bajana 150261/23 Hairston v. Lyft, Inc. Et Al 157319/24 Harris v. Proctor 160928/23 Hernandez And Carlos Almazan v. Zeitoun 150429/24 Jethwa v. Mohammed 158083/23 Jimenez v. Hernandez 156125/24 Jimenez v. 54th St. Auto Center Inc., Et Al 161286/19 Johnson v. Kamruzzaman 157750/23 Juez v. Carraway 158137/23 Kabulov v. Uo 155303/23 Khan v. Uber Technologies, Inc. Et Al 154545/23 Lin v. Fordebakar 150929/24 Lin v. Furde 159484/22 Lopez v. Perfect Systems Inc Et Al 154513/24 Mac v. Zheng Guo 155139/25 Macias v. Chacha 152522/24 Madsen v. Schilt 160728/21 Magid v. Soby 154255/24 Martinez v. The Metro. Transportation Auth. Et Al 157795/23 Mashtreki v. Walace

152712/25 Matos Abreu v. Vinicius Vidal De Araujo 158080/23 Mitchell v. Joseph 151707/23 Modell v. Uber Technologies, Inc. Et Al 152958/21 Nakamura v. Pan 153071/24 Ordonez v. Thraxton 151809/22 Osvaldo Rosario v. Michael Minick 156999/25 Patel v. Petit-Homme 159453/21 Perez v. Insight Companies, Inc. Et Al 159983/22 Posh v. Hf Mgt. Services 157243/24 Propriete v. Penske Truck Leasing Co. Lp Et Al 157121/21 Quesada v. Navin 154479/22 Reiss v. Arruda 157235/22 Reyes Jr. v. Pereths 155541/23 Ripoll v. Delforno 158434/24 Rivas v. Do 151773/23 Rodriguez Ortiz v. NY Iconic Cruises LLC Et Al 153110/23 Rolle v. Smith 160400/19 Seaman v. Le Noble Lumber Co., Inc. 154085/24 Shipman v. Pal Environmental Safety Corp. Et Al 160520/23 Singh v. Marquee 158786/23 Sani v. Billman 157614/24 Tavarez v. Eros 156591/24 Thorpe v. Fresh Direct, LLC, U.T.F. Trucking, Inc. Et Al 153147/21 Viera v. Inzone Logistics LLC Et Al 153987/24 Waldrop v. Chen 152773/20 Wang v. Feld 451514/24 Zeitoun v. Khan

Part MED-2

Justice Samuel E. Wilkenfeld
80 Centre Street
646-386-3689
Room 106

Early Settlement Part 1

Justice Miles J. Vigilante
80 Centre Street
Room 106

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

161117/20 Anglin v. Extell Dev. Co. 450362/19 Coste v. 400 Walnut Ave. 154003/22 Dargan v. NYCHA 157112/18 De La Cruz v. Pr 247 Wadsworth 150375/20 Evseroff v. Scripps Media 151182/20 Firemans Fund Ins. v. La Interior Remodeling, Inc. 154797/19 Hamm v. Memorial Sloan Kettering 155937/18 Jimenez v. Tei Group, Inc. 157249/19 Madera v. Jabar Rtlty. Corp. 161236/18 Ordaz v. Ksh B'way. Associates 160513/19 Quintana v. 327 East 84th St. 159007/13 Ruisech v. Structure Tone Global 155656/21 Schattner v. 200 East 16th St. Housing Corp. Et Al 155338/18 v. NYC

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

155591/13 Adams v. Electrolux Home Prods., Inc. 152854/20 Aig Prop. Casualty v. Firstservice Residential New 154386/18 Kehoe v. 76 Eleventh Ave. Partners 151274/18 Laudisio v. Ery Tenant LLC 152899/18 Rondon v. 328 W. 44 St. LLC 157180/22 Selavy v. Breslow 653553/16 Stathakos v. Colony Ins. Co. 158806/20 Taitelbaum v. 20125 Owners Corp.

Early Settlement Part 2

Justice Samuel E. Wilkenfeld
80 Centre Street
Room 106

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

155690/24 Edme v. NYC Et Al 157173/23 Glices v. NYC 153091/24 Gomez v. NYC 160758/23 Gonzalez v. NYC 157014/23 Hernandez v. NYC (NYC Dept. of Education) 154181/24 Kinsbruner v. Wallace 153358/24 Moses v. NYC Et Al 162240/23 P. v. NYC Et Al 153769/21 Parson v. NYC Et Al 153701/24 Pena v. The Board of Education of NYC Et Al 150193/23 Persson v. NYC Et Al 152004/24 Polk v. NYC 157124/24 R. v. NYC Et Al 153458/22 Reese v. NYC Et Al

Part 27

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

Part 41

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

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

160974/23 Alvarado v. Rh 528 West 159th St. Lp 653460/22 Board of Mgrs. of 176 East 82nd St. Condominium v. Drk Third Ave. LLC Et Al 652874/24 Boxenbaum v. Witten 159463/23 Brody v. Ues Coffee 650810/25 Certain Underwriters At Lloyds' London Subscribing To Policy # B0595xr6753021 v. Skyworth Contracting Inc. Et Al 652915/24 Chef Tang LLC Et Al v. 519 Third Ave LLC 652939/24 Delshah 60 Ninth LLC v. Ganzcar 450264/23 Dept. of Environmental Protection of NYC Et Al v. Board of Mgrs. of The 37 Lenox Road Condominium Et Al 651940/22 E D Electrical Inc. v. Cbcs 39 LLC Et Al 160450/23 Fugazzi v. Port Auth. of NY And New Jersey Et Al 150089/24 Greenst. v. Jacaranda Club 655580/24 Gurflein v. Luxurban Hotels Inc. Et Al 158801/23 Hicks v. Jenkins Portfolio Companies LLC Et Al 654364/23 Hudson 38 Hldgs. LLC v. Labb Corp. D/b/a Labb Co. Et Al 654174/22 Liu v. Liu—3 P.M. 157602/24 Malleo v. Moon 452304/25 NYS Ins. Fund v. Talenthub Worldwide, Inc. Et Al 157551/24 Nrt NY LLC D/b/a The Corcoran Group v. Preidel 650376/22 Olek, Inc. v. Avalonbay Communities, Inc. Et Al 150560/24 Shimonis v. Gatsby Enterprises—3 P.M. 155957/23 Torres v. NY Univ. Et Al

Motion

652874/24 Boxenbaum v. Witten 652915/24 Chef Tang LLC Et Al v. 519 Third Ave LLC 650629/24 Delshah 60 Ninth LLC v. Ganzcar 160450/23 Fugazzi v. Port Auth. of NY And New Jersey Et Al 157602/24 Malleo v. Moon 157551/24 Nrt NY LLC D/b/a The Corcoran Group v. Preidel

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

159455/25 233 West 113 v. Cook 653560/22 225 Tudor Owners Corp. v. U.S. Internalmodal, Inc. 155591/13 Adams v. Electrolux Home Prods., Inc. 654910/25 Agrify Corp. v. Nature's Miracle Hldg., Inc. 651649/25 Airela LLC v. Hudson Park NY LLC 651669/22 Gurgov v. Bmw of North America 652713/24 Intersection Media v. Findlay Galleries 100898/25 Ochilov v. 829 9th Partners LLC

160398/24 State Farm Fire And Casualty Co. v. Pierre 651648/25 Uswow Rtlty. LLC v. Hudson Park NY LLC

Motion

100898/25 Ochilov v. 829 9th Partners LLC

Part 50

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

Part 51 Matrimonial Part

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

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

305200/19 Duffy v. Defreitas 321286/23 Metzinger v. Tabrizi 321415/23 Murphy v. Trabacchi 321476/20 Riggs v. Riggs 365109/24 Vera v. Milton

Motion

305200/19 Duffy v. Defreitas 321476/20 Riggs v. Riggs

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

320099/22 Javier v. Romeri Javier 365522/23 Selit v. Selt 300243/21 Watson v. Burstein

Motion

300243/21 Watson v. Burstein

Part 65

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

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

151495/23 239 Elizabeth Rtlty. LLC v. Beltrez 150773/24 Alexandre v. Verizon NY Inc. Et Al 952104/23 Cowell v. The Convent of The Sacred Heart School of NY 156358/16 Cunniffe v. Centro Social La Esperanza 159475/20 Drill It NY Corp. v. 495 West 129 158574/23 Dutta v. Silversmith 160608/20 Great Northern Ins. Co. A/s/o Bradley Zipper v. Urban 150599/22 Hinojosa v. Astoria West 154515/20 Huper v. NYCHA Et Al 157256/19 Miran v. NYCHA 157529/17 Pacheco v. Georgetown Eleventh Ave. 150036/21 Philadelphia Indemnity Ins. Co. v. Aco Peerless Corp. 153751/21 Plaza Const. LLC v. Ware Industries, Inc. D/b/a 153530/21 Slater v. Skinner 158013/21 Tiburcio v. 551-565 West 190 Prop. LLC Et Al 154708/22 Wadhawan v. Brus Chambers LLC 159383/19 Whitfield v. NYCHA 150108/22 Ymaj v. Empire State Rtlty. Trust Inc. Et Al 150096/21 Zygmunt v. 215 East 68th St. Lp

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

160246/19 Bonilla v. Bpp St Owner LLC 156045/20 Braganca-Ferreira v. Srep 10th Ave. Venture LLC 154515/20 Huper v. NYCHA Et Al

Part 73R Special Referee

Justice Diego Santiago
60 Centre Street
Room 354

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

304810/19 Chen v. Soo-Hoo Chen 365208/21 Ravichandran v. Renjen

Part 75R Special Referee

Justice Stephen S. Burzio
60 Centre Street
Room 240

Part 81R Special Referee

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

Part 84R Special Referee

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

Part 87R Special Referee

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

Part 88R Special Referee

Justice Deborah E. Edelman
60 Centre Street
Room 158

Part 89R Special Referee

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

71 THOMAS STREET

Part 13

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

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

952050/23 Anonymous v. NY Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952086/23 Arnadopoulos v. Northwell Health Et Al 952047/23 Arnadopoulos v. Northwell Health Et Al 190036/23 Aronson v. Aerco Int'l 952142/23 Bowman v. Cosby Jr. 952110/23 Butelman v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952018/23 Clavijo v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952020/23 Clavijo v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952019/23 Clavijo v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952009/23 Coburn v. NY - Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952021/23 Delaney v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952082/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952030/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952031/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952028/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952025/23 Doe v. NY - Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952026/23 Dwyer v. Wasser 190144/25 Garrett v. 3m Co. Et Al 952051/23 John Doe #1 Et Al v. Paduch 952115/23 Kelly v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952085/23 Kraus v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952129/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952022/23 Lewis v. Start Treatment & Recovery Centers, Inc. Et Al 952082/23 Macknik v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952086/23 Martinez v. Northwell Health Et Al 952023/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952087/23 Nieves v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952024/23 O'Rourke Jr. v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952107/23 Ormond v. Weinstein 190034/19 Porta v. Amchem Prods., Inc. 952025/23 Robins v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952048/23 Sethi v. Northwell Health Et Al 952026/23 Sheehan v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952089/23 Sonneborn v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952229/23 Taylor v. Rzaeva 952034/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952035/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952036/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952004/23 Doe v. NY - Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952037/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952038/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952039/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952040/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952095/23 Doe v. Northwell Health Et Al

952041/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952042/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952047/23 Doe v. Northwell Health Et Al 952043/23 Doe v. NY - Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952045/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952046/23 Doe v. NY - Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952047/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952048/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952049/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952050/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952051/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952052/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952053/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952054/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952055/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952056/23 Doe v. NY - Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952057/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952058/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952059/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952060/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952061/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952062/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952063/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952064/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952065/23 Doe v. NY - Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952066/23 Doe v. NY - Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952067/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952068/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952069/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952070/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952071/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952072/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952073/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952074/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952075/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952076/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952077/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952078/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952079/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952080/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952081/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952082/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952083/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952084/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952085/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952086/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952087/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952088/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952089/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952090/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952091/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952092/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952093/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952094/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952095/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952096/23 Doe v. Northwell Health Et Al 952097/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952098/23 Doe v. Northwell Health Et Al 952099/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952100/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952101/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952102/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952103/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952104/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952105/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952106/23 Doe v. NY - Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952107/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952108/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952109/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952110/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952111/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952112/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952113/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952114/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952115/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952116/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952117/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952118/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952119/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952120/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952121/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952122/23 Doe v. Northwell Health Et Al 952123/23 Doe v. Northwell Health Et Al 952124/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952125/23 Doe v. Northwell Health Et Al 952126/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952127/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952128/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952129/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952130/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952131/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952132/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952133/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952134/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952135/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952136/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952137/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952138/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952139/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952140/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952141/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952142/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952143/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952144/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952145/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952146/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952147/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952148/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952149/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952150/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952151/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952152/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952153/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952154/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952155/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952156/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952157/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952158/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952159/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952160/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952161/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952162/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952163/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952164/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952165/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952166/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952167/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952168/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952169/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952170/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952171/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952172/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952173/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952174/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952175/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952176/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952177/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952178/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952179/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952180/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952181/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952182/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952183/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952184/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952185/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952186/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952187/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952188/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952189/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952190/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952191/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952192/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952193/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952194/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952195/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952196/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952197/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952198/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952199/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952200/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952201/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952202/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952203/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952204/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952205/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952206/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952207/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952208/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952209/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952210/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952211/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952212/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952213/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952214/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952215/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952216/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952217/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952218/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952219/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952220/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952221/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952222/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952223/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952224/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952225/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952226/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952227/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952228/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952229/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952230/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952231/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952232/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952233/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952234/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952235/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952236/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952237/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952238/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952239/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952240/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952241/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952242/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952243/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952244/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952245/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952246/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952247/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952248/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952249/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952250/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952251/23 Doe v. New York- Presbyterian Hosp. Et Al 952

155819/15 Koma v. NYC
450869/18 Lomtevas v. NYC
155382/18 McLaughlin v. NYC
159405/18 Mullings v. NYC Dept. of
156149/16 Parker v. NYC Fire
159978/23 Read v. NYC Et Al
160831/23 Riglietti v. NY Dept. of
Bldgs.
157745/22 Santiago v. NYC Et Al
152681/21 Shang v. 231 W 15 Rlty.
LLC Et Al
157355/21 Smith v. NYC Et Al
155017/22 Stewart v. NYC Et Al
153543/22 Tejeda v. NYC Et Al
151379/24 Vargas v. NYC Et Al
158741/22 Watson v. NYC Et Al

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12
451326/22 Boerke v. NYC Et Al
160581/21 Figueroa v. Unicorn
Const. Enterprises, Inc., Et Al
156249/21 Laxmi Mahtani v. Con Ed
Co. of NY
450845/16 Williams v. NYC

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

CRIMINAL TERM

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

Part Tap B
Justice Statsinger
Phone 646-346-4044
100 Centre St.
Room 1130, 9:30 A.M.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part 71
Justice L. Ward
Phone 646-386-4071
Fax 212-401-9268
100 Centre Street
Room 1104, 9:30 A.M.

Part 72
Justice R. Stolz
Phone 646-386-4072
Fax 212-401-9269
100 Centre Street
Room 1123, 9:30 A.M.

Part 73
Justice Roberts
Phone 646-386-4073
Fax 212-401-9116
111 Centre Street
Room 763, 9:30 A.M.

Part 75
Justice Mandelbaum
Phone 646-386-4075
111 Centre Street
Room 583, 9:30 A.M.

Part 77
Justice Obus
Phone 646-386-4077
100 Centre Street
Room 1536, 9:30 A.M.

Part 81
Justice C. Farber
Phone 646-386-4081
Fax 212-401-9270
100 Centre Street
Room 1317, 9:30 A.M.

Part 85
Justice Hayes
Phone 646-386-4085
Fax 212-401-9113
111 Centre Street
Room 1533, 9:30 A.M.

Part 92
Justice Mitchell
Phone 646-386-4092
Fax 212-295-4914
111 Centre Street
Room 1234, 9:30 A.M.

Part
Justice E. Biben
Phone 646-386-4093
111 Centre Street
Room 1333, 9:30 A.M.

Part 93
Justice Scherzer
Phone 646-386-4093
100 Centre Street
Room 1333, 9:30 A.M.

Part 95
Justice D. Conviser
Phone 646-386-4095
Fax 212-401-9137
111 Centre Street
Room 687, 9:30 A.M.

Part 99
Justice Burke
Phone 646-386-4099
Fax 212-401-9270
100 Centre Street
Room 1530, 9:30 A.M.

Part N-SCT
Justice Peterson
Phone 646-386-4014
Fax 212-401-9272
100 Centre Street
Room 218, 9:30 A.M.

Part IDV
Justice Dawson
Phone 646-386-3579
Fax 212-884-8938
100 Centre Street
Room 1604, 9:30 A.M.

**SURROGATE'S
COURT**

Surrogate Hilary Gindgold
Surrogate Rita Mella
31 Chamber's Street
New York, NY

See court's webpage for information about appearances: Visiting Surrogate's Court | NYCOURTS.GOVs

**Bronx
County
SUPREME COURT
EX PARTE AND
URGENT
MOTIONS PART**

The Following is the
List of Sittings in the
Ex Parte Urgent
Motions Part
on the Dates Specified:

TRIAL TERM
718-618-1248

Day Calendar
**Court Notices
Key to Submission
Motion Calendar**

FS = Fully submitted.
FSN = Fully Submitted, No
Opposition

ADJ=adjusted to the marked
date for oral argument in the above
calendar part. Answering papers
are to be submitted on the original
return date in Room 217.

MENTAL HYGIENE PART

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

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

**MORTGAGE
FORECLOSURE SALES**
Mortgage foreclosure sales in
the Supreme Court of the State of
New York, County of Bronx, are
conducted at the Bronx County
Courthouse, located at 851 Grand
Concourse, Courtroom 711, commencing
at 2:15 p.m.
Auction information is available
at the following link: https://
ww2.nycourts.gov/courts/12/p/
bronx/civil/civil_Foreclosure_/
Information.shtml
Contact Information:
Email: bxforeclosure@nycourts.
gov
Phone: 718-618-1322.

Court Calendars

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

MONDAY, SEPT. 15

32386/20 Anderson v. Islam
305687/10 Bello v. NYCH&HC
28327/20 Boglio v. Gooding
33068/19 Bonilla v. Samb
20702/19 Boyd v. Lora
810536/23 Castro v. Gojcaj
801621/23 Daniel v. Gonzalez
804119/22 De La Rose-Puello v.
Lumber Trans. Corp. Et Al
29168/19 Delacruz v. Galbo
Beverage Distributors
812491/21 Desintonio v. Estrella
34111/19 Diallo v. NYCTA
22605/19 Dume v. Javier
28240/18 Gardner v. Hyncharlie
25017/16 Greene v. Merchants
Automotive Group
30910/17 Hawkins v. 409 Taxi Corp.
80917/23 McPherson v. Klemann
28726/16 Mejia v. Mta Bus Co.
22778/20 Middleton v. Jopal Bronx
20671/20 Miranda v. 1710 Partners
30518/19 Molina v. Prysak
22460/13 Muhlstock v. Hebrew
Home For The Aged
21585/19 P. v. 402-412 West 148th
LLC
20867/18 Palma v. Woodside
Ventures
811496/21 Peralta v. 240 Mt. Hope
Rlty. LLC
812138/21 Perez v. Cooper
26481/20 Petterson v. Balde
23067/16 Quiles v. 363 Prospect Pl.
29391/17 Rivera v. Parkash 2910
LLC
811965/23 Robertson v. Red Hook
160 LLC
817545/21 Rodriguez v. Story Ave.
Hdgs.
800461/21 Rojas v. Emergency Aid
Training, Inc.
21761/19 Santana v. Ventura
Espinosa
303167/16 Turner v. Feliz
22656/20 Ubaldo v. Cisse
811945/21 United Medicine
And Rehabilitation P.C. v.
Yakobashvili
26844/20 Vargas v. Rank
33665/19 Villarronga v. Haxhaj
30314/18 Wilson v. Espinal

ADR Part
Phone 718-618-3081
Room 701A

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

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11
20039/17 Douglin v. Rpai Fordham
Place Retail
26092/18 Gines v. Mendez
202590/21 Lee Sr v. Willrah Rlty.
Corp.
FRIDAY, SEPT. 12
33228/20 Alonso v. 125 Queens
Corp
MONDAY, SEPT. 15
21693/20 Delacruz v. Citimedical I
816208/21 Dominguez v. Whole
Foods Market Group, Inc. Et Al

Part 3

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

MONDAY, SEPT. 15
811620/23 A v. NYC Dept. of
Education Et Al
813094/22 A. v. NYC
30390/20 Adames v. Laundromat At
Burnside
24768/19 Adon v. Catsimaiditis
814573/23 Almonte v. Fishman
812480/22 Bird v. NYC Et Al
803443/24 Boothe v. NYC Et Al
814430/22 Brown v. City
8934/02 Brown v. NYC
25584/17 Browning v. NYC
80957/23 Burgos v. Moshulu
Preservation Corp. Et Al
812366/23 Burke v. NYC Et Al
801837/21 Carr v. NYC Et Al
816360/22 Carrillo v. NYC Et Al
21123/16 Clark v. NYC
809002/23 Clement v. NYC Et Al
818378/22 Colon v. NYCHA Et Al
22877/19 Colon v. NYC
24842/18 Con Ed Co. v. NYC
300970/13 Contreras v. Mendez
802536/23 Cordero Rodriguez v.
NYC Et Al
800921/21 Cordero v. Immaculate
Conception Church
22850/14 Creque v. NYC
816291/22 D v. NYC Et Al
31924/20 D. v. NYC Et Al
813745/23 Davis v. NYC Et Al
805118/22 De Jesus v. NYC Et Al
810914/22 Dejesus Ramirez v. NYC
Et Al
800516/24 Delva v. NYC Et Al
804961/23 Diaz v. Orellana
Guanoluisa
816724/22 Disapio Jr v. NYC
810720/21 Dorce v. NYC Et Al
300641/15 Drakeford v. NYC
22856/17 Elkins v. NYC
806409/23 Elleby v. Jiles
803569/21 Eusebio v. NYC Et Al
21730/20 F. Jr. v. NYC
804058/24 Fortuna v. NYC
33689/19 G.G. v. NYC Et Al
809002/21 Gallishaw v. NYC Et Al
801023/24 Garcia v. NYC Et Al
805877/21 Garcia-Polanco v. NYC Et
Al

808170/23 Glenn v. NYC Et Al
817301/23 Goldmans v. NYC Et Al
812809/23 Gomez v. NYC
803682/22 Gonzalez v. NYC
812609/22 Gounga v. NYC Et Al
812860/22 Gounga v. NYC Et Al
818262/22 Gounga v. NYC Et Al
23840/98 Gueits v. NYC
800446/21 Hammitt v. NYC Et Al
300193/17 Hargits v. NYC
805910/22 Herrera v. NYC
25216/20 Holmes v. NYC Et Al
21467/20 J.R. An Infant By His
Mother v. NYC
810994/22 James v. NYC Et Al
805019/23 Jenny v. NYC Et Al
32918/19 Jimenez v. Hall
802958/21 Johnson v. City
28159/20 Jones v. NYC
802493/23 Kaca v. NYC Et Al
813805/22 Kelly v. NYCHA Et Al
813226/22 King v. NYC
21224/13 Kirk v. NYC
800882/22 Linalv v. Hernandez
800860/22 Lopez v. Grand
Concourse Rlty. Associates
815340/21 Lozano v. NYCHA Et Al
806977/22 Lozano v. NYC
807560/21 Maher v. Maria
803999/22 Maldonado v. Ean Hdgs.
LLC Et Al
801826/22 Manso v. NYC
804134/22 Marshall v. NYC Et Al
25205/16 Martin v. NYC
809653/24 Masone v. NYC; Et Al
802508/22 McCullough v. Advanced
Auto Parts, Inc. Et Al
21266/20 Mendez v. NYC Dept.
23348/19 Mendoza v. NYC Police
806282/23 Mercedes v. NYCHA Et Al
301697/15 Metzler v. NYC
805448/21 Mojica v. NYC
302430/16 Molina v. NYC
20108/19 Montesdeoca v. NYC
805911/24 Morel v. NYC Et Al
816143/21 Morris v. NYC
20583/17 Muniz v. NYC
803139/22 Norris v. NYC Et Al
806588/23 O. v. NYC Et Al
803978/23 Ortiz v. NYC Et Al

800805/21 Ortiz v. NYC
801570/21 Oviedo v. NYC
801779/23 P. v. NYC Dept. of
Education Et Al
33112/19 Penn v. NYC
20047/20 Peralta v. Morales
350007/17 Perez v. NYC Dept. of
26688/20 Perez v. NYC
806698/21 Perez v. NYC Et Al
21198/17 Perry Smith v. NYC
31970/17 Phillip v. NYC
29039/18 Pineda v. Teddy Nissan
LLC
816742/21 Pinero v. NYC Et Al
23026/19 Porter v. NYC
800682/21 Pringle v. City
28313/17 Putney v. NYC
32395/18 Quinones v. NYC
31926/20 R. v. NYC
33603/20 Ramirez v. NYC
81117/22 Ramirez v. NYC
25773/18 Ramirez-Lopez v. NYC
801122/22 Ramos v. NYC Et Al
30458/19 Ramos v. NYC
27714/20 Reid v. NYC
812880/22 Reyes v. NYC Et Al
808605/22 Richards v. NYC Et Al
808189/24 Richards v. NYC Et Al
816268/21 Riggins v. NYC Et Al
813740/23 Riley v. NYC Et Al
808514/23 Rivas-Cruz v. NYC Dept.
of Sanitation Et Al
27011/19 Rivera v. NYC
808116/22 Rivera v. NYC Et Al
813389/22 Rivera v. NYC Et Al
301730/11 Rivera v. NYC
804014/23 Rivera-Colon v. NYC Et
Al

815309/22 Robinson v. NYC Dept. of
Sanitation Et Al
816118/22 Robinson v. NYC Et Al
816976/21 Robinson v. NYC Et Al
26082/19 Robinson v. NYC
809844/21 Rodriguez v. NYC
816735/22 Rodriguez v. NYC Et Al
808953/22 Rodriguez v. NYC Et Al
21567/18 Romero v. NYC
305997/14 Rosa v. Nouveau Elevator
809215/21 Rosado v. NYC
810643/21 Rosario v. NYC Et Al
21215/20 Rossis-Custodio v. NYC
817447/21 Saavedra v. NYC Et Al
303924/14 Saavedra v. NYC
813432/22 Saez Guzman v. NYC
810737/21 Saez v. NYC
25549/20 Santos Guzman v. NYC
Dept. of
24758/20 Sawyer v. NYC Et Al
800683/23 Schwarz v. NYC Dept. of
Education Et Al
32007/20 Sergiacomi v. NYC
32622/20 Sevilla v. NYC
811074/22 Sharp v. NYC Et Al
31384/20 Smith v. St. Michael's
Roman Catholic
808818/23 Sokolova v. NYC Et Al
806432/22 Soprano v. NYC Et Al
804637/22 Soto v. Espinal
81622/12 Spears v. NYC Et Al
25156/17 Spencer v. NYC
816061/21 Spruave v. NYC
813325/23 Stahl v. Netherland Prop.
Assets LLC Et Al
26863/20 Starks v. Carozza
813440/22 Storer v. NYC
22997/20 T-A D.H. v. NYC
28029/19 T. v. NYC
808990/21 Terrero v. NYC Et Al
806802/22 Theriot v. NYC
80457/22 Thomas v. NYC
814354/22 Tlatelpa v. NYC
21907/14 Tompkins v. NYC
812057/23 Torres v. NYC Et Al
22924/18 V. v. NYC
803875/23 Valdez v. NYC Et Al
23983/18 Vargas v. NYC
817206/21 Vasquez v. NYC
804843/22 Vasquez v. Ayala
807473/21 Vasquez-Brennan v. 1118
Wilcox Ave.

818247/23 Villar v. NYC
803731/21 Wagner v. NYC
820525/23 Young v. NYC; Et Al
22944/15 Young v. NYC

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

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11
22590/19 B. v. River Park Bronx
Apartments
815003/23 Deschamps Peralta v.
Eshina Rlty. Corp.
803105/25 Fernandez v. Espinoza
810276/24 Lopez v. Pelinkovic
803793/24 Malachi v. NYCHA
812099/25 Mathis v. 24 Seven
Plumbing Inc. Et Al

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

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11
804361/21 Alvarado v. Wohio Hlbg.
Inc.
32761/19 Ayala v. Uth-United Tech.
Inc.
802851/23 Carr v. Daley
815549/23 Chowdhury v. NYCH&HC
Corp.
32797/20 De La Cruz v. Evers
Marina And Seaplane Base
803163/24 Griensman v. 11-19
Jacobus Associates
807534/24 Sukhial v. Berkshire
Hathaway Specialty
800083/21 Tavarez v. Dal Jeon Rlty.
32478/20 Tejeda Soto v. Barclay St.
Rlty.

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12
801608/25 Acosta v. Diaz
818324/24 Aguilarr v. Ahmed
803483/25 Aguirre v. Hub Truck
Rental Corp Et Al
806525/25 Akhatov v. Liberio Barco
802636/24 Allstate Fire And
Casualty Ins. Co. As Subrogee of
Maverick C. Plunkett v. Shrestha
816998/24 Andrades Valdez v. Ra 280
Dev.
81249/24 Austin v. Reedy
Associates LLC D Et Al
810640/24 Breton v. West Fourth &
Perry Ltd Et Al
813506/24 Brito v. Alice L. Kulick 2
806452/24 Brown v. Nisym Rlty.
Corp.
816147/23 Cassanova v. North
Shore Towers Apts. Inc. Et Al
805276/25 Cea v. Studio Arcade
22240/20 Citizens Bank N.A. v.
Priestly
807570/24 Clarke v. Henry
821158/24 Clarke v. Vital
804397/25 Cohen v. The B'way.
Land Co.
808673/25 Collado v. Sau
809483/24 Cordero Made v.
Crossways Corp. Et Al
810541/24 Cruz v. C Three Logistics
LLC Et Al
815160/24 Diaz v. Fine Fare
801057/25 Disia Crea v. Adm
Trucking Inc. Et Al
801105/25 Estrella-Rodriguez v.
1777 Gc LLC Et Al
800942/24 Fernandez v. Hernandez
812285/24 Fernandez v. Mitr Corp.
Et Al
808652/22 Fuad v. Hernandez
807097/24 George v. 1100 Wyatt LLC
800692/24 Gonzalez v. NY Ice
Cream Truck Inc. Et Al
808385/25 Gonzalez v. Colon
812298/24 Hope v. Francisco
808359/24 Jaquez v. 3934 Park Ave.
816525/24 Jimenez v. Guzman
811164/24 Jimenez v. Sixt Rent A
Car
801182/24 John v. Rodriguez
808372/24 Johnson v. Teddy Cars,
Inc. Et Al
811783/24 L.G. v. Shb Group Hdgs.
Lp Et Al
815222/24 Lanza-Santizo v.
Shoptire Supermarkets Inc.
814089/23 Lema v. HPDc2 Housing
Dev. Fund Co., Inc. Et Al
809140/25 Liranzo v. Gagandeep

818368/24 Lopez v. Fl
Transportation, Inc. Et Al
814488/24 Lopez v. Davis
812338/24 Marquez v. Hunt
810042/24 Marshall v. Power Lift
Auto
808892/24 Martinez v. Lin
818111/24 Martinez v. McLeod
807818/25 Medina v. Sokol
814303/24 Medina v. Lamura Rlty.
LLC Et Al
805176/25 Mendez v. Mike's Heavy
Duty Towing Inc. Et Al
807453/24 Milone v. Pfn Partners
LLC Et Al
802760/24 Minaya Castillo v.
Abughanyeh
806456/25 Morales v. Lumi
Properties
810145/24 Nelson v. 4050-60 White
Plains Rd LLC Et Al
809062/24 Nieves v. Kingsbridge
Associates
811200/24 Odei v. Redzeposki
811749/23 Pachamora v. 2487
Arthur Ave. LLC Et Al
817855/24 Peller v. Grant Spero
820934/24 Perez v. Nunez
816611/24 Pichardo v. Akinwale
810722/24 Polanco Cabrera v. Big
Geyser Inc. Et Al
804218/24 Polley v. Bastardo
817766/24 Quintana v. Mateos
Logistics LLC Et Al
809933/24 Rivera v. West
808040/25 Rodriguez v. Diazcarela
803434/25 Rodriguez v. Silverio
813396/24 Rosario v. New Gold
Equities Corp. Et Al
814745/24 S. v. Torres
804903/25 Samb v. Pilier
821093/24 Sanchez v. Barriola
Mercedes
809712/24 Sandwidi v. Burgos
820750/24 Santaggio v. NYC Et Al
802591/25 Saxson v. Lomoley
820043/24 Seignious v. Jnc 241 Inc.
Et Al

805120/24 Svendsen v. Nwanji
802348/24 Thompson v. Hudson 46
Inc D/b/a Harbor NYC Et Al
809978/24 Velazquez v. Perez
Vargas
820358/24 Vilchez v. 1100 Park Ave.
Co-Op. Corp. Et Al
809504/24 Williams v. Genesis Y 15
Owners
MONDAY, SEPT. 15
65524 Delacruz De Vasquez v. Cruz
Pena
811737/24 Lopez v. Island
Transportation Corp. Et Al
21583/19 R. v. NYCHA
820606/23 Seung Won Hwa v. Rey
Bernal

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

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11
24534/16 Small v. Deutsche Bank
Nat. Trust

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

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12
813453/24 Kelley v. I.Park B'way.
LLC Et Al

MONDAY, SEPT. 15
42020/25

MONDAY, SEPT. 15

7013020 Alston v. NYC Et Al
260489/19Armstrong v. Goldberg
815093/21 Brown v. Riverbay Corp.
21397/19 D. v. NYCHA
814939/21 Farrar v. NYCHA
815952/22 Garcia v. Andrews
20541/19 Garcia v. Satori Laser
Center of Lexington Corp Et Al
26390/19 Nikqi v. Intercontinental
NY Et Al
811338/23 Sprinkle v. NYCHA
809205/22 Veloz v. South Windsor
Rlty. Ltd. Et Al

Part 24

Justice Shawn T. Kelly
Phone 718-618-1248
Room 623, 9:30 A.M.

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

806117/23 Allstate Fire And
Casualty Ins. Co. As Subrogee
of Mario L. Astudillo Tapia v.
Breedlove Jr.
808246/23 Almonte Ascencion v.
Bronx 161 LLC Et Al
813075/23 Alshami v. Abeken Apts.
II LLC
817796/22 Arias Rosario v. Stahl
York Ave Co., L.L.C.
810329/24 Arroyo v. Lakeville
Specialty Produce Co. Inc Et Al
810535/24 Aystestas-Flores v.
Mahmud
811123/24 Batista v. 655 Pelham
Pittsili LLC
818515/22 Bautista v. The Board
of Mgrs. of The 38 Sixth Ave.
Condo. Et Al
807548/25 Biggers v. Marrero Pena
801154/25 Bobian v. Hunts Point
Packing Corp Et Al
816834/23 Broad St. Plaza LLC v.
Axis Surplus Ins. Co.
817303/22 Cascino v. Delta Air
Lines, Inc. Et Al
820593/24 Copin v. Marinel
815746/22 Chamba Calva v. 1007
Ave. P. LLC Et Al
802442/23 Colon Rochez v. Global
1845 B'way. LLC Et Al
819515/24 De Leon v. De La Cruz
817466/22 Estrada v. Rashid
815486/24 Garcia Cuevas v. Amick
Farms LLC Et Al
800216/25 Gonzalez v. 1504
Sheridan LLC Et Al
817202/24 Greenspoon v. 5 Boro
Fleet Corp. And William Machado
820436/24 Guzman v. Almeida
826363/17 Guzman v. Turner Const.
Co.
819419/23 Gyamfi v. Parkash 2454
LLC
821473/24 Kinda v. Roberts
22048/20 Lebron v. B'way. 558 Rlty.
Delta LLC
806183/24 Linares v. Pyramid
Restoration NY LLC Et Al
30428/17 Lopez v. Lendlease (us)
Const.
810778/21 Malpartida Leon v.
Skyline Builders NYC Corp Et Al
802733/24 Marte v. Noxxen Rlty.
Corp. Et Al
816755/22 Montaleza-Rojas v.
Integrity Contracting, Inc. Et Al
804530/23 Nti v. Key Food Stores
Co-Operatives
805543/25 Nunez v. Rios
815281/24 Palomares v. Henry 824
LLC Et Al
808822/24 Parker v. Ely
818334/24 Paulino v. Grid Logistics
LLC Et Al
819425/23 Pena Jimenez v. Lopez
22985/19 Pina v. NYC
816037/22 Ramirez v. 40 Bruckner
LLC Et Al
815193/21 Ramroop v. Port Auth. of
NY And New Jersey Et Al
814592/24 Reed v. Grima
26187/17 Rivas v. 139-06
805522/23 Rodriguez Marval v. West
St Gardens LLC Et Al
815371/24 Rodriguez v. Ae
Distribution
814623/23 Romero Quiroz v. 532
Negate Associates LLC Et Al
813614/23 Santana Urgiles v. West
St Gardens LLC Et Al
818331/22 Smith v. Skanska-Walsh
Et Al
807221/23 Vasquez v. 1407 B'way.
LLC Et Al

Part 25

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

Part 26

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

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

808020/25 Almanzar v. S And S
Refrigeration Co Et Al
802581/21 Alvarez v. North State
Rlty.
806843/25 Belizaire v. Postell Jr
814264/23 Belmar Consulting, Inc.
v. Koko Contracting, Inc. Et Al
806364/23 Bissonauth v. Logic
Fuel Transportation Corp. Et Al
807067/21 Camps v. NYCHA
806864/25 Chowdhury v. Rodriguez
807647/25 Clara Batista As The
Administrator of The Estate
Luiza Batista v. Manhattan
Sbv
810555/23 Cp An Infant Under The
Age of 14 Years By His Mother
And Natural Guardian v. Homes
For The Homeless Inc.
813159/24 Delgado Aguilar v. 120
East 144 Owner LLC Et Al
807941/25 Edwards v. 1085
Washington Partnership
800191/23 Escoto v. NYC Et Al
806625/25 Escotto v. NYCHA
812078/21 Evans v. 2275 Morris
Rlty. LLC Et Al
800747/25 Figueroa v. Kb Transport
& Logistics
801395/25 Freytes v. Daybreak
Independent Services, Inc. Et Al
21156/15 Guzman v. Apollo Radio
Dispatch Inc
800818/21 Henriquez v. Rrr Prop.
Services LLC
807222/24 Illescas v. Builders Group
USA Inc. Et Al
804333/23 Itria Ventures LLC v. Nb
Net Solutions 22 Inc Et Al
821081/24 Iwuagwu v. Lopez
814894/22 Joe v. Tegford Rlty.
800607/25 Jones v. Weldon
804208/25 Jorge v. Lenox Hill Hosp.
And Et Al
805821/23 Keaveney v. Sarafian
Rlty, Inc. Et Al
809236/21 Kendall v. Brown
804120/22 Khan v. Yue Wah Rlty.
Inc.
814035/22 Lantigua v. A.D.S.VF
LLC
814481/22 Levin v. Hudson Manor
Terrace Corp. Et Al
814516/23 Lloyd v. 1715 Nelson Ave.
Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al
812772/25 Liza Torres v.
800484/25 Madera v. Lesan Taxi
Corp. Et Al
815899/22 Martinez v. 555 East 169
Hlgs. LLC Et Al
21084/14 Maurice v. Maurice
813188/23 McFadden v. Ortiz R G
Funeral Home Et Al
804200/24 Medina Gonzalez v.
Highridge Community Housing
Dev. Fund Corp.
807799/23 Mejia v. Centers
Healthcare Ipa
814522/23 Mendoza v. Yonkers
Contracting Co., Inc. Et Al
802507/16 Middleton v. Campbell
808849/22 Moody v. Alfred S.
Friedman Mgt. Corp. Et Al
817156/22 Myrick v. 1255
Longfellow Ave Partners LLC &
Iris House
816819/24 Nova Arias v. Dm
Transportation LLC Et Al
813998/24 Palacios Santillana v.
The George Units LLC
806376/25 Peralta v. Dupont St.
Owner LLC
800164/24 Perea v. 2070 LLC

812319/22 Plascencio De Cruz v.
Timpson Pl. Associates LLC
803838/24 Raposo v. Add Park Inc.
Et Al
801819/25 Restituyo Brito v. L.L.C.
Trucking Corp. Et Al
817966/24 Reyes v. Cogent Waste
Solutions LLC Et Al
806594/25 Reyes v. Fed. Express
Corp. Et Al
820350/23 Sanches Oliveira v.
Judiau Contracting, Inc. Et Al
29570/20 Sota v. American Golf
Corp. D/b/a Pelham Bay Split
Rock Golf Course
801289/25 Stokes v. Valle
803906/21 Thompson v. 560 West
Meat & Produce Corp.
306516/14 Toro v. Hosp.ity Hlgs.
803265/23 Walker v. Flynn & O'Hara
Uniforms, Inc. Et Al
804557/24 Zuna Naula v. Steb Rlty.
Corp.

Part 27

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

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

820880/24 Ferreras v. Clancy
Moving Systems, Inc. Et Al
809284/24 Jimenez-Jimenez v. Cruz
32399/16 Jpmorgan Chase Bank v.
Williams
811959/22 Molina v. Sherman Rlty.
LLC Et Al
800494/25 Solis v. NYC Et Al
380703/13 Wells Fargo Bank v.
Everett
MONDAY, SEPT. 15
815143/23 Brown v. Hyun Corp. Et
Al
32226/15 Carisbrook Asset Hldg.
Trust v. Leone
36595/19 Citigroup Mortgage Loan
v. Dodd
36630/19 Deutsche Bank Nat. Trust
v. Cabrera
35209/18 Hsbc Bank USA v. Khan
36155/20 Lnv Corp. Dba Ny-Lnv v.
Jadov
3570718 Nationstar Hecm
Acquisition v. Ubertini
36554/19 Nationstar Mortgage LLC
v. Woolward
35046/15 Ocwen Loan Servicing v.
Cabeay
35188/14 Onwest Bank N.A. v.
Rodriguez
32200/16 U.S. Bank Nat. v. Huynh
35072/18 U.S. Bank Nat. v. Skeffrey-
Taylor

Part 28

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

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

814238/25 Burgoyne v. Burgoyne
801506/22 Hines v. Benros
811927/23 Mendoza v. Lopez
42013/20 Parker v. Parker
Part 29
Justice Veronica Romero
Guerrero
Phone 718-618-1479
Room 701, 9:30 A.M.
THURSDAY, SEPT. 11
809192/25 Awadallah v. Awadallah
4721/21 Bartley v. Campbell
806370/24 Castro v. De Leon
808427/24 Centeno v. Cohen
812463/24 Puello v. Maxims
814312/22 Stephen v. Canelin
Stephen
819618/23 Thakur v. Thakur
FRIDAY, SEPT. 12
814121/24 Escalona v. Prato
2543/21 Peterson v. Fordjour
808365/23 Somerville-Varice v.
Varice

MONDAY, SEPT. 15

5947/24 Collado v. Fernandez
807807/24 Fleming v. Fleming
809024/25 Guzman Castillo v. Baez
Espinal
82105/24 Katwaru v. Pujols
814024/24 Mitchell v. Mitchell
819611/23 Omoiyakhi v. Omoiyakhi
805769/24 Pressano v. Kantrowitz
Part 30
Justice Erik L. Gray
Phone 718-618-1320
Room 703, 9:30 A.M.
THURSDAY, SEPT. 11
809155/24 Abreu v. Motor Vehicle
Accident Indemnification Corp.
811851/24 Almonte v. Rodriguez
802853/23 Amaris Campo v.
Franklin 33
810434/23 Betances v. Pwb Mgt.
Corp. Et Al
806397/24 Biggins v. Con Ed Co. of
New York, Inc.
810233/23 Bravo Zorrilla v. Qb
Properties LLC Et Al
812649/22 Cabrera v. Macombs
1504
801376/23 Caraballo v. Chv Bedford
Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al
805646/23 Cardenas Lema v. L&M
Builders Group LLC Et Al
812175/24 Cerda v. Melika Sarata
Namalgu Et Al
813671/23 Chavez Torres v. 1824
Anthony Ave. LLC Et Al
813709/21 Chiang v. Segel & Co.,
Inc. Et Al
800943/22 Correa v. Front Wave
Const. Inc. Et Al
811185/24 De Graciano v. Gabriel
805901/24 Diego v. Mott Link LLC
Et Al
812022/21 Dominguez v. 1114
Washington Ave. Rlty. LLC Et Al
812699/21 Duncan v. Port Auth. of
NY And New Jersey
812702/23 Garcia v. Ys 440w57
Owner LLC
810022/23 Hacker v. Jpmorgan
Chase Bank
804607/22 Huaman v. 280 W 155th
St. Owner
807560/23 J.B. v. Daly Ave. LLC And
Et Al
813551/22 Jimenez Tejada v. Cna
Cornerstone, Inc.
817187/23 Jimenez v. 1113 Hldg.
Ltd.
802978/25 Jimenez v. Muccio
803006/23 Karolis v. Mjm
Associates Const. LLC Et Al
811268/23 Lebron v. Loring
Equities, Inc. Et Al
815423/23 Lynch v. River Park
Bronx Apts., Inc. Et Al
805746/22 Maciel v. Design N
Safety Inc Et Al
807085/24 Mendoza Zavala v. 319
West 38th St. LLC Et Al
36374/17 Messina v. Motorola
Solutions, Inc.
803748/23 Mestanza Cordova v. 51
Ash St. LLC Et Al
807203/24 Montalvo v. Ryner
809458/22 Montegudo Parada v.
Crxptelxx 99 West Side
802014/23 Montenegro Rojas v. Ps
Northeast
817426/24 Nevarez v. Dave &
Buckley v. New York, Inc. Et Al
808028/21 Olivera v. Smittell LLC
804885/23 Parapi v. Folor Inc. Et Al
814449/23 Peters v. Gdn Diner
Corp. D/b/a Carle Pl. Diner
816743/24 Pinero Parks v. Virginia
Properties
803822/24 Rodriguez v. Hunts Point
Terminal Produce Co. Assoc.,
Inc. Et Al
819549/23 Santana Garcia v. Ryer
26 LLC
814550/24 Santiago v. Uuganbayar
812543/23 Sirico v. Metro.
Transportation Auth. Et Al
800706/24 Solomon v. 795 Sheva
Rlty. Housing Dev. Fund Corp.,
Inc. Et Al
810317/22 Tovar v. Pgt1241 LLC Et Al
812143/24 Valencia v. Lopez
813359/23 Vasquez Mundaca v.
B'Way. Const. Group LLC Et Al
801166/23 Villa-Farez v. Yates
Restoration Group Ltd. Et Al

816871/24 Whitmore v. Russell
806594/24 Williams v. Lane
808620/21 Zayas v. 1201 B'way. LLC

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

820148/24 Mendez Jr. v. NYC Et Al

Part 31/32

Justice Fidel E. Gomez
Phone 718-618-1203
Room 403, 9:30 A.M.

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

804213/24 Osei-Tutu Mensah v. Md

Part 34

Justice Michael A. Frishman
Phone 718-618-1349
Room 705, 9:30 A.M.

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

806222/23 Campbell v. Babu Md
34252/18 Rheubottom v. Shining
Huang
819672/23 Wv. Alexa L. Cohen

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

803171/23 Diaz v. Rosenfeld M.D.
816193/22 Roman v. Montefiore
Medical Center Et Al

MONDAY, SEPT. 15

800879/25 Apolinaris v. Gold Crest
Care Center, Inc. Et Al
813449/24 Macias v. Riverdale Snf
LLC
809885/25 Marton v. Mount Sinai
Health System, Inc. Et Al
306345/09 Oquendo v. Beth
Abraham Health
807348/23 Parra Jimenez v. United
Cerebral Palsy of NY
808029/25 Patria Alcequiez As
Guardian Ad Litem of Yancarlos
Jimenez Et Al v. Starkey R.N.
819962/23 Rose v. Montefiore
Medical Center Et Al
808632/24 Sesay v. Montefiore
Medical Center Et Al
815754/24 Walker v. Laconia
Nursing Home

Part 35

Justice Raymond P. Fernandez
Phone 718-618-1216
Room 625, 9:30 A.M.

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

802829/24 C. v. Castillo
800576/25 Cristobal v. Shockley
813668/24 Cruz v. Gonzalez
809270/24 German v. 2155 Morris
808106/24 Gordon v. Allahditta
801653/25 Hussain v. Fabian
809976/24 Persaud v. C. Kenneth
Imports
811359/24 Smith v. 2251 NYC LLC
806454/25 Solano v. Kamara

MONDAY, SEPT. 15

820533/24 21765 Carter Rlty. Inc. Et
Al v. Allied Ins. Co. of America Et
Al
816736/25 25754-768 Brady Owners
Corp. v. Paintsil
2746/25 Acevedo v. HPD Section 8
817865/23 Burguillos v. W2001 Z 15
Central Pk West Rlty LLC Et Al
800748/25 Carbuca v. Uber
Technologies, Inc. Et Al
809756/25 Carlos Rosario For An
Order Pursuant To Cplr 3102 (c)
Directing v. Metallized Carbon
Corp Dba Metcar To Preserve
And Provide Petitioners Counsel
With Machine Manufacturer
Maint. Repair And Mechanic
Records of The Subject Machine
Maintained At
819169/24 Coke vs. Bolt
812615/23 De Leon Soto v. Cs Rlty.
Associates LLC Et Al
800814/22 Dinsey v. Sphinx Cab
Corp. Et Al
813191/24 Gomez v. Sedgwick Mgt
LLC Et Al
815110/25 Greater Liberty
Pentecostal Church, Inc. v.
817129/24 In The Matter of The
Application of The American
Transit Ins. Co. v. To Stay The
Arbitration Sought To Be Had By
Luis Carreras Et Al
814999/24 Jordan v. Peguero
800827/22 Losey v. Gueye
815889/24 Males Amaguana v.
Sporfodd 2 Housing Dev. Fund
Corp. Et Al
819900/24 McShane v. Quest
Receivable Servicing
803507/24 Mendoza v. 1760 Boone
Ave. Properties LLC
800545/24 Merino v. Rosen
810728/25 Midland Credit Mgt. v.
Henry
805048/24 Morrison v. R & B Debris
815110/23 Nabathorking v. 59-61
West 36th St. Parking Corp. Et Al
802764/24 Quintero Rico v. Turtle
Bay House Ltd. Liability Co. Et Al
818146/25 Raveshgadoulain v.
Suffolk County Credit Union LLC
Et Al
807117/24 Ruiz v. Gw Universe LLC
Et Al
802749/23 Simpson v. Barreno
814898/25 The Glebe Castle LLC Et
Al v. NYC Dept. of Bldgs. Et Al
818329/23 Winkfield v. Dedicated
Transport
801210/21 Z v. Qlr Nine Inc Et Al

CRIMINAL TERM

Part SCA

Justice Rivera
Phone 718-618-1378
265 East 161st Street
Room 300, 9:30 A.M.

Part T11

Justice Mitchell
Phone 718-618-1076
265 East 161st Street
Room 450, 9:30 A.M.

Part C

Justice Lieb
Phone 718-618-1097
265 East 161st Street
Room 320, 9:30 A.M.

Part IDV-SCT

Justice Flores
Phone 718-618-1067
265 East 161st Street
Room 420, 9:30 A.M.

Part JD/T

Justice Lieb
Phone 718-618-1097
265 East 161st Street
Room 320, 9:30 A.M.

Part TRP

Justice Fabrizio
Phone 718-618-1103
265 East 161st Street
Room 340, 9:30 A.M.

Part 11

Justice Mitchell
Phone 718-618-1076
265 East 161st Street
Room 450, 9:30 A.M.

Part 12

Justice Michels
Phone 718-618-3623
265 East 161st Street
Room 570, 9:30 A.M.

Part 14

Justice Busching
Phone 718-618-1034
265 East 161st Street
Room 660, 9:30 A.M.

Part 15

Justice Tha
265 East 161st Street
9:30 A.M.

Part 16

Justice Bruce
Phone 718-618-1043
265 East 161st Street
Room 540, 9:30 A.M.

Part 17

Justice Thd
Phone 718-618-1106
265 East 161st Street
Room 350, 9:30 A.M.

Part 18

Justice Yearwood
Phone 718-618-3629
265 East 161st Street
9:30 A.M.

Part 19

Justice Collins
Phone 718-618-1058
265 East 161st Street
Room 550, 9:30 A.M.

Part 21

Justice Powell
Phone 718-618-1133
265 East 161st Street
Room 690, 9:30 A.M.

Part 22

Justice McCormack
Phone 718-618-1001
265 East 161st Street
Room 600, 9:30 A.M.

Part 23

Justice Villegas
Phone 718-618-1046
265 East 161st Street
Room 380, 9:30 A.M.

Part 24

Justice Hornstein
Phone 718-618-1073
265 East 161st Street
Room 440, 9:30 A.M.

Part 27 (DV)

Justice Stone
Phone 718-618-1031
265 East 161st Street
Room 590, 9:30 A.M.

Part 28

Justice Clancy
Phone 718-618-3638
265 East 161st Street
Room 560, 9:30 A.M.

Part 29

Justice Rodriguez-Morick
Phone 718-618-1118
265 East 161st Street
Room 430, 9:30 A.M.

Part 31

Justice Zimmerman
Phone 718-618-1022
265 East 161st Street
Room 670, 9:30 A.M.

Part 32

Justice Rosenblueth
Phone 718-618-1019
265 East 161st Street
Room 500, 9:30 A.M.

Part 60

Justice Barrett
Phone 718-618-1007
265 East 161st Street
Room 620, 9:30 A.M.

Part 70

Justice Lewis
Phone 718-618-1103
265 East 161st Street
Room 340, 9:30

25/00126 Matter of the Summary Proceeding By The New York State Commissioner of Transportation, Agent For People v. Bestway Carting, Inc., JFK Long Term Parking, Inc., US Auto Storage, LLC a/a Prime Park JFK

25/00134 Gem Pawnbrokers Corp. v. Charmaine Parrish and "John" "Doe" and "Jane" "Doe"

25/00137 Accelerated Inventory Management, Inc. v. Darren Phillip

25/00148 Matter of the Application of Isabel Lopez, Raul Lopez, and Carmen Galindo v. for a pursuant to article 7A of the Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law, Appointing A Court-Designated Adminstrtr For The Premises Known As: 327 Pearl Street, LLC v. Scott Miller and Lisa Nuttall and Igor Videgain, "John Doe" And/ Or "Jane Doe"

25/00153 Matter of the Summary Proceeding By The New York State Commissioner of Transportation, Agent For People v. Bestway Carting, Inc. and JFK Long Term Parking, Inc. and US Auto Storage, LLC a/a Prime Park JFK

25/00158 Danny Marin v. Heec Equities, LLC, Everest Building Management, and Mark Anthony and Department of Housing Preservation & Development

25/00159 Maurice Louis v. Geico General Insurance

25/00166 Post Lane Ventures, LLC v. Lakesha Monique Vega and Dagonn Bryant, Elijah Bryant, Tamaya Bryant, Quron Oliver, Janaya Bryant, Toby Vega, "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00167 Angelina Ramos v. Marisol Guzman a/a Marisol De La Rosa, Vagnes De La Rosa, Rebecca Osorio and "John Doe and Jada" "Doe"

25/00181 Vanam Realty, LLC v. Naseeb Amir Jones and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00183 Sasha Cochrane v. Wellington At Essex Park Condo and Whispering Woods At Latourette

25/00188 Capital One N.a. v. Margaret Pulgarin and Done Deal Service Corp.

25/00196 P.C.ifs Medical Services, P.C., aao Charles E. Smith v. Country-Wide Insurance Co.

25/00203 Lucy Abosi v. Elizabeth Pierre and Brian Pierre

25/00211 Nabeel Alsade v. Ahmed Elkout and Rabia Hdance and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00212 Burke Physical Therapy, P.C., aao Henry Monasia v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins., Co.

25/00220 Pmv Realty, LLC v. Chestney Kirby and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00231 Venia Jean v. Jose Myrtha Jean and Venance Jean

25/00232 JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.a. v. Dimitrios Papadimitriou

25/00233 Edward Chung v. Alice Wong Manager Federal Standard Abstract, Inc.

25/00235 JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.a. v. Dimitrios Papadimitriou

25/00241 Rhs 26, LLC v. Zhong Hua Li

25/00251 1616 President Street Associates, LLC v. Patricia J. Edwards

25/00253 58/2664 Amboy Realty, LLC v. Bimal Kulasekara and Christine Avino Kulasekara, "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00263 Linden Estates, Inc. v. Annette Hamilton and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00268 Medical Supply of Ny Services, Inc., aao Derrick McDonald v. Electric Insurance Co.

25/00269 Medical Supply of Ny Services, Inc., aao Devon McDonald v. Electric Insurance Co.

25/00270 Isian Owens v. J. Massi Realty, LLC

25/00271 Robert Shurman v. Maria Fallacaro and John Doe and Jane Doe, LLC

25/00272 Phileman St. Germain v. Kristine Ekman

25/00283 Oriak Realty Group, Inc. v. Zeng Zhong Huang

25/00285 Gurmet Kaur v. Emdad Construction Co. and "Xyz Corp.", "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00296 Yanyu Liu d/b/a Shengyu A, Inc. v. Nader Khedr

25/00366 Mohammed Abul Hashem v. Tai Wahed and Savitri Singh, "John Doe" and "Jane Doe" and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00372 Gideon Raviv v. Con Edison

25/00382 Lemena Holdings, LLC v. Wo Kee Noodle, Inc and Xyz Corp.

25/00398 Impacct Preservation, LLC v. Florentina Joseph

25/00402 Jesalu, LLC v. Ishac Maximous

25/00404 Dov Land Usa, LLC v. Carrie Henrichson and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00427 Burke Physical Therapy, P.C., aao Hughes, Sasha v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co.

25/00430 Marshall Kesten, LLC v. Essential Kitchen, Inc.

25/00436 Mohammed Abul Hashem v. Savitri Singh, Seid Lafiah, "John Doe" and Yamina Jaafi, Sued Herein As Jane Doe #1

25/00442 Nostrand Group, LLC v. Yakov Huebner, "John" "Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00443 Glen-Marie David v. Drucilla McLeod and Department of Housing Preservation and Development of the City of New York

25/00447 84 E 52, LLC v. Jamie Morris and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00460 Kimberly Jenkins v. Wioletta Gradzki and Kazimierz Gradzki

25/00476 Matter of the Summary Proceeding By The New York State Commissioner of Transportation, As Agent For People v. Bestway Carting, Inc., JFK Long Term Parking, Inc., and US Auto Storage, LLC, A/K/A Prime Park, LLC

25/00490 Healthwise Medical Associates, P.C., aao Guy, Jean Michel v. Permanent General Assurance Corporation

25/00491 Headlam Medical Professional Corporation aao Hernandez, Christopher v. Hertz Vehicles, LLC

25/00492 Er Physical Therapy, Pc, aao Mary, Scotland v. Nationwide Insurance Company

25/00493 Ach Chiropractic, P.C., aao Pierre, Polynice v. Hereford Insurance Company

25/00496 First Spine Chiropractic of Ny, Pc, aao Faustino, Ramirez v. Unitrin Advantage Insurance Company

25/00497 Longevity Medical Supply, Inc., aao Jones, Belinda v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins., Co.

25/00499 Joel Fried v. Isabel Lopez and Raul Lopez and John Doe and Jane Doe

25/00545 Oceanwood, LLC v. Kenneth Fabian, Lucas Walker Keogh, Jed R. Kronfeld, "John Doe" And/Or "Jane Doe"

25/00567 Burke Physical Therapy, P.C., aao Johnson, Serena Simone v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co

25/00568 272 Himrod Street Bh, LLC v. Abdullah Elgawrony

25/00579 Margaret Chaplin v. Harvey Garrett, Jr.

25/00582 Joe Central Brooklyn, LLC v. Yolanda Johnson

25/00614 197 St. Marks Ave. LLC v. Bernadette Gideon and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00645 Matter of the Application of the Commissioner of the Department of Housing Preservation and Development of the City of New York v. For A Judgment, Pursuant To Article 7A of the Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law, Appointing A Court-Designated Adminstrtr For The Premises Known As: 327 Pearl Street, LLC v. Scott Miller and Lisa Nuttall and Igor Videgain, "John Doe" And/ Or "Jane Doe"

25/00658 Shafai Acupuncture, P.C., aao Moise, Yves v. State Farm Mutual Insurance, Co.

25/00657 Metropolitan Dme, Corp., aao Garcia-Gonzalez, Victor v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company

25/00658 Rise Physical Therapy, P.C., aao Benjamin, Nathaniel v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company

25/00659 Donato D'agosto v. Marcelle Dahon and Michelle Aoun

25/00678 Union Street Flats, LLC v. Danequa Small, "John" "Doe", "Jane" "Doe"

25/00699 Carroll Flats, LLC v. Tasha King and "John" "Doe", "Jane" "Doe"

25/00705 Jefferson Estate LLC v. Monique Shoop

25/00726 347 Lincoln Realty, LLC v. Tonya Hickson

25/00727 Wilmington Trust National Association, Not In Its Individual Capacity, But Solely As Trustee of Mfra Trust 151 v. Fabius Delfius and Derrick Brown, Demetrius Delfus, Allison A. Galloway, Germain Delfeus, Ruhan Noel Mcdonald, Sherley Darius, and Abbigail Brown and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00728 Boulevard Together Master Tenant, LLC v. Jessica Clarke, "John Doe" And/Or "Jane Doe"

25/00737 Rhashan R. Beswick v. Boodial Surbwallie

25/00739 Brooklyn Housing Preservation, L.P. v. Nimah Walker and "Jane" "Doe"

25/00740 Boulevard Together Master Tenant, LLC v. Brian Felix, "John Doe" a/a Carl Felix, "Jane Doe"

25/00751 Luis Alcalá v. Metropolitan Transit Authority (Mta) (Legal Dept.)

25/00770 Mohamed Tibta v. 156 E. 21, LLC and Ammar Omar and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00772 Veronica Cromwell and Tommie Johnson and Nancy Smith and Jerome Brown v. Az 400 Herkimer Street LLC and Amarin Ahmed and Department of Housing Preservation and Development

25/00773 Brownsville Associates v. Rosemarie Garrison and Jerome C. Cutherie, Deshon D. Garrison, Amel G. Garrison and J. Doe

25/00775 459 Chaulcy LLC v. Natanya Hamilton

25/00780 Ft General Construcion Co. v. Trevor Bartley

25/00797 Howard Venue Associates v. Jose Colon-Fernandez

25/00808 Luis Alcalá v. Bay Laundry Deport

25/00809 Derrica D. Kearney v. Paul Notice

25/00864 Alicia R. Ferguson v. Paris Alexandra

25/00896 Anukawke Ketosugbo Md, Pc aao Monique Espinal v. Affmative Direct Insurance Company

25/01297 Luis Alcalá v. Laundry King

25/01350 Department of Housing Preservation and Development v. Kenneth Banks and Seyed A. Moussavi and 22 Hawthorne Street, LLC

25/01373 Us Levin Grp Corp v. Kristine Ekman

25/01374 Weifei Lu v. Fu Ping Jiang

25/01375 Alexandria Kennedy v. Victor J. Capobianco and Jose Frazier

25/01377 Lloyd Nwankwo v. v. 8513 Empire Boulevard Associates and Property Services, LLC

25/01385 Itona Itskov v. Bay Decorators, Inc. and Ken Gams

25/01386 1338 Prospect LLC v. Franklyn Stephen and Denese Stephen, Michael Stephen, Katherine Stephen, Rosita Cunningham, Andrea Reid, Shannon Reid, Crystal Reid a/a Krystal A. Reid, Brian Service, Joshua A. Service, Christina C. Rembert, Visma M. King, "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/01388 1338 Prospect LLC v. Franklyn Stephen and Denese Stephen, Michael Stephen, Katherine Stephen, Rosita Cunningham, Andrea Reid, Shannon Reid, Crystal Reid a/a Krystal A. Reid, Brian Service, Joshua A. Service, Christina C. Rembert, Visma M. King, "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/01398

9TH and 10TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Mincola, NY

Day Calendar

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

9:30 A.M.

Driscoll, J.P., Walsh, Conway, JJ

23/00651 People v. Sean Blank

24/00200 People v. Idalia C.

24/01096 People v. Caridad Delgado

23/00977 Kim Marie Foronjy v. Pc Richard & Son

24/00533 Winnie Woodcliff Park, LLC v. Evgeny Yaroshevsky, a/a Eugene Yaroshevsky, Yelena Yaroshevsky, a/a Lena Yaroshevsky, Et Al.; "John Doe #1" and "Joe Doe #2"

24/00622 John Gil v. Nunzio Brothers

24/01041 Andrew Collieran v. Salvatore Volpe

White Plains, NY

Day Calendar

Dismissal Calendar

MONDAY, SEPT. 15

Driscoll, J.P., Walsh, Conway, JJ.

The Following Cases Have Been Scheduled By The Clerk For Dismissal For Lack of Prosecution. Enlargements of Time May Be Requested Either Via Stipulation Between The Parties, Or By Letter Stating The Reason For Such Request, Addressed To The Clerk of the Court, With A Copy Sent To The Parties To The Appeal.

24/00903 People v. Juan Miguel Mariotti

24/00905 People v. Tabitha Calvitti

Court Calendars

24/01118 People v. Cubby Gibson

24/01236 People v. Jian Wang

25/00245 People v. Dhanesh Ramsaran

25/00411 People v. Pano Andrianis

25/00519 People v. Catherine Wood

24/01077 Primus Automotive Financial Services, Inc. v. Roberta L. Whitfield

24/01082 693 Holdings, LLC v. Auto Body Plug, Inc., "Xyz Corp."

24/01320 Wojciech Kosakowski v. Rtr Financial Services, Inc.

24/01395 Crane Enterprises, LLC v. Michael Crane, "John Doe 1" and "Jane Doe 1", "John Doe 2" and "Jane Doe 2"

25/00066 Veterinary Medical Center of Li, LLC v. Walter Vilkas

25/00067 Scott Brody v. Pound Ridge Painting

25/00105 159 Radford, LLC v. Mario Hernandez and Nancy Lopez

25/00140 Belal Nassar v. Luftnasha German Airline

25/00141 Waynett Roddesha Mcken Aoun

25/00203 Jacqueline Willis

25/00152 Ayou Carson v. Eduardo Martinez

25/00164 Patricia Carino and Michael Hogan v. Jenna Lorandini

25/00165 Attilio S. Carbone v. Daphne Adejedi

25/001871 Mill Road Apts. Inv. Rhipi, LLC v. Lawrence Hall and Tashawn Quintichette, "John Doe", and "Jane Doe"

25/00209 Elias Vasquez v. A.h. Counterpoint & Kitchen Design, LLC

25/00214 Michelle Martino and John Martino v. Jennifer L. Santapira, Charles Frenchies, LLC

25/00223 Riviera Limited Partnership I v. Samantha Zangrillo and Michael Bidetti and Jonathan Thompson

25/00225 West Coast 2014-7, LLC v. Ramon Fernandez, Edward Fernandez, Joseph Zavala, Maria Flores and Glenda Dubon and Naomi K. Joseph-Webster and "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/00227 Board of Directors of Preserve On The Hudson Homeowners Association, Inc. v. Andrea A. Bentley

25/00243 687 Apartments, LLC v. Raquel Green

25/00257 Chizoba Okwor v. The Mailbox Parcel and Shipping

25/00258

25/00274 Built By A & R, LLC v. Margaret Ritschel and Margaret Ritschel As Executrix of the Estate of Donald G. Smith and John Doe 1 Through 3 and Jane Doe 1 Through 3 and James Griesch

25/00282 Luxx Capital, Inc. v. Victor Patrick Inwang, Vix Patrick I'oron, and Pharo Victor Inwang and "John Does #1-2" and "Jane Does #1-2" and Cross River, LLC

25/00286 Town of Babylon v. Thomas Grasso

25/00287 Town of Babylon v. Thomas Grasso

25/00378 Rocco Viti v. Arik Botier and Lena Batin Botier, "John Doe", and "Jane Doe"

25/00395 Us Bank Trust National Association, Not In Its Individual Capacity But Solely As Owner Trustee For Rcf2 Acquisition Trust v. Margaret R. Howell and Victoria Howell, "John Doe", and "Jane Doe"

25/00471 John L. Ciento, Jr. v. Kenneth Lewis, d/b/a J.K. Realty

25/00474 Diamond Development Properties Corp. v. Lisa Purzak, Edward Bundock, "John" "Doe 2" and "Jane" "Doe 1-2"

25/00811 Fredrika Bronsther v. Abc Consulting of Ny Corp.

25/00877 Deborah Lee Rowlinson v. Robert C. Sweeney and Clover Automotive

25/01139 Port Jefferson Crossing LLC v. Wadena Pyatt and Elvis Samaniego, "John Doe" and "Jane Doe"

25/01320 Main Street Lofts Yonkers, LLC v. Mabuwa Chiumbidio

25/01446 Nicholas J. Valenti v. Craig Scott and Renee Scott

25/01460 Wilrox, Inc. v. James Pearson

25/01465 Marguerite R. Jucker v. Vivian Persaud, Dds, Island Dental Associates

Kings County

SUPREME COURT

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

Please see the Justices' information sheets for further instruction regarding Uniform IAS practices and procedures.

Part Assignments/RJI

Intake Part

360 Adams Street
Phone 347-296-1592
Room 282

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

536452/23 1602-1610 Ave. S LLC v. Shemesh

515964/25 Abraham v. Scharf

530757/24 Ayala v. Winter

513550/25 Belfor Long Island v. Lanni

517738/24 Bello-Monegro v. Arevalo Acosta

502177/25 Bernagene v. Rubel

511098/25 Bonas v. NYCTA Et Al

511128/25 Bowen v. Toubenton

517164/25 Bostin v. Fender

508806/24 Chambers v. Wan Da Travel Inc. Et Al

506932/25 Chapman v. Morales

509999/25 Clark v. Horuchi

503913/25 Coleman v. Espinal

502256/25 Content v. Flores

506346/25 Cortoreal-Cruett v. Cortoreal

509080/241D & A Grandview LLC Et Al v. 60 Davidson LLC Et Al

512531/25D. Infant By Father v. Troop Corners Housing Dev. Fund Co. Inc. Et Al

511127/25 Davis v. Nada

512344/25 Debnath v. Barnwell

534445/23 Deme v. Odeko Inc Et Al

501433/25 Dore v. M.S. Sunshine Day Care Center Et Al

513412/25 Espinoza Torres v. He

526247/24 Feng v. Belmont Transport Inc. Et Al

501940/25 Guerrier v. United Natural Foods, Inc. Et Al

505912/24 Hendrickson v. American

520274/25 Weissman v. Winner

510491/25 Hesham v. Pro Park

527707/23 Hsbc Bank USA v. Holness

504262/25 Huang v. St Philips Christian Church

516682/25 Hughes v. Lara

521768/24 Izzirazy v. Honrado D.M.D.

510359/25 Jabeen v. New York-Presbyterian/weill Cornell Medical Center

532322/23 Jaikaran v. Ernesto

513260/25 Joseph v. Mejia

532932/24 Khemey v. U-Haul Titting

513380/25 Kim v. Kobakidze

504839/25 Kramar v. Verizon NY Inc. Et Al

511302/25 Lopez v. Contender Group

509370/25 Lara v. Infinity Contracting Services

517341/25 Lugo Palomino v. Miranda

531908/24 Mayorga v. 517 53rd St. Inc. Et Al

531791/24 Melikov v. Doe

530290/23 Milgram v. Amazon Logistics, Inc. Et Al

508455/23 Millennium Elevator Enterprises, Inc. v. 2170 U

504685/25 Morris v. Anglin

502560/25 Moss v. Susan's Pl.

Health Center Inc. Et Al

514272/24 Muzac v. Walmart Transportation

511282/24 NYSSolar v. Leonidas

516825/25 Ozersky v. Citibank

512747/24 Rios v. Rivera

524045/25 Roc Funding Group LLC v. Affordable Koshler LLC Et Al

516403/25 Salamova v. Michael

Abbound Obgyn Pc Et Al

520794/25 Sarkisyan v. Malik

512245/25 Sarkisyan v. Hatzlacha Supermarket Inc. Et Al

534534/24 Springer v. 2802 Clarendon Partners LLC Et Al

532491/24 Spurrill v. 1400 Hldg. Corp.

10/24 Stephen v. Crown Fried Chicken Pizza

512955/24 The Estate of Giovanna Benvenuto v. Boro Park Operating Co., LLC Et Al

515350/24 The Sea Gate Assoc. v. Cg-3pl Engineering

511282/24 Vazquez v. Doe

526853/24 Velez v. Otavalo

517183/24 Velocity Capital Group LLC v. Air Tel Systems LLC Et Al

507008/24 Velocity Capital Group LLC D/b/a Hunter Caroline Hldgs. LLC v. Jones P Consultant

505636/25 Williams v. Seay

515910/25 Wilson v. Beladajine

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

508061/259215 Rity. LLC v. Post Graduate Center For Medical Health

511907/25 Akhvediani v. Butt

530252/24 Alvarez v. Millian

525047/24 Ameno v. Diocese of Bklyn. Et Al

502089/25 Armstrong v. Moore

529532/24 Balbuenaga De Berrios v. Columbia Heights Neighbors LLC Et Al

527517/24 Balestra v. Wonderfield LLC Et Al

520862/25 Baptiste v. Matheson

515869/25 Bizifund LLC v. Capital Driving Academy LLC Et Al

520292/25 Buckle v. 1588 St. John LLC

506358/25 Cacia v. Richmond County Ambulance Service, Inc. Et Al

534990/23 Cappello Jr. v. Uber Technologies, Inc. Et Al

517580/23 Captain Hldgs. Corp. v. Doe

510559/25 Choudhry v. Betancourt

520056/25 Cose Funding Source LLC v. T. T. Reilly Builders, Inc. Et Al

519368/25 Davis v. NYCHA

506340/25 Diaz v. Traintafillou

505464/25 Duran Duran v. Empire State Dairy LLC Et Al

517440/25 Edwards v. Hayes

506232/25 Elhadad v. East 82nd St. Rty. LLC Et Al

526246/24 Ferrera v. Central Amusement Int'l. Inc. D/b/a Luna Park Et Al

516105/24 Flores v. Kornbluth

506064/24 Flowers v. Hirasiks

520625/25 Fox Capital Group, Inc. v. Easy Energy Systems, Inc.

510136/25 Galarza Alvaracin v. Mmr 1326 LLC Et Al

505965/25 Galarza Ramon v. Nysandy's Np33 LLC

506055/24 Garcia Zarazua v. Bushwalk Mgt. Group

504707/25 Han v. Labranche Family

514900/25 Harris Jr. v. Drive Shack Inc. Et Al

507223/25 Hernandez v. Mount Sinai West

533713/24 Hirsch v. United Leasing & Finance

508152/25 Jean-Louis v. United Parcel Service General Services Co. Et Al

515627/25 Kahan v. Grand Flooring LLC Et Al

503014/25 Khudoykulov v. Castellanos

502644/25 Kleyman Law Group v. Estate of George Kaloidis

518153/24 Leiding Builders Group LLC v. Camlio

527770/24 Ludwick v. Jreruz Corp. Et Al

518178/25 Lugo v. Rodriguez

525722/23 Martin v. Price

517539/25 Matthews v. 21 Duryea Propco

511555/24 Matthews v. Davis

525968/24 Mcn Distributors Inc. v. A&M Heating & Air Conditioning Inc

512257/25 Mukumov v. Medina Martinez

521506/23 Muldrow v. Balde

506695/25 Munoz Hernandez v. Santo Nunez

506178/25 Narine v. Ijogbe

517203/25 Nunez-Acosta v. Dempsey

514349/25 Pena Molina v. Nat. Grid USA Et Al

510340/25 Perez v. Ram Shiw

514490/24 Red Rock Outdoor Advertising - Kcc Prop. Mgt. LLC

513880/25 Rivera v. Stitt

517510/25 Sadovskis v. Gilbane Bldg. Co.

513930/25 Sagesse v. Theodore

531590/24 Sheppard v. Linda Properties L.L.C. Et Al

501991/23 Srouf v. Mann

511925/25 Steele v. Brisma

529642/24 Tidiane Wague As Proposed Administrator of The Estate of Mahamoud Dansogov. Et Al

515079/25 Us Foods Inc. v. Bklyn. Baca LLC

508356/25 Villafana v. Willis Jr.

519389/25 Winston Yarde As Administrator of The Estate of Althea Claudine Yarde v. Prospect Park Operating

500718/25 Yambay v. Rsr Liu Pii Developer Trs LLC Et Al

523974/24 Zinna v. 3072 Cropsey Ave. Corp. Et Al

Part ADR-COMM

Justice Richard Montelione
360 Adams Street
Phone 718-500-4012
Courtroom 574

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

521420/24 Green v. Wilson

527308/24 Rimler v. Weissman

520274/25 Weissman v. Winner

Commercial Division Part 4

Justice Lawrence Knipel
360 Adams Street
Phone 347-296-1630
Room 774

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

514991/21337 Tompkins LLC v. Friedman

523368/1958 Dobbin Funding L.P. v. 58 Dobbin LLC Et Al

517678/23 Abdusoviev v. Center For Creative Minds

500296/20 Bababekov v. Babeck

537587/22 Balazore Teneasaca v. 126 East 86 St. Dev.

503898/23 Bennardo v. Newco Alp Inc. Et Al

515326/24 Columbia Capital Co. v. Li & L Real Estate Dev. LLC Et Al

500795/24 Dundaa v. Borshenko

509142/21 Gibbons v. Kirks

521187/23 Gitsit Solutions v. Fraleg Kuscuszkoo Corp. Et Al

520939/17 Grannum v. Tanaisi's Deli Grocery Corp.

4937/13 Hsbc Bank USA v. Kone

506302/21 Levin v. Kamedina

532572/22 Mattox v. Agape Transportation Inc. Et Al

512092/24 Mount Eden Asset Mgt. Inc. v. Ermajo LLC Et Al

512114/24 Newbank v. Pacific Alliance LLC Et Al

517627/24 Pacific Rblf Reo v. 1270 Jeff LLC Et Al

515316/25 Perez v. Byrne

518735/21 Serrata v. Sweet Home Residence LLC Et Al

514108/24 Smith v. Miller

504160/24 Stormfield Capital Funding I v. Lake St Bklyn. LLC Et Al

500666/21 U.S. Bank Nat. Assoc. v. Sookram

535859/23 U.S. Bank Nat. Assoc. v. 1228 E 51st St. Corp Et Al

517002/24 U.S. Bank Trust Co. v. Murray

535859/23 U.S. Bank Trust Co. v. 1029 Oceanview Ave. LLC Et Al

30184/10 U.S. Bank Trust N.A. As Trustee For Lsf9 Master Participation Trust v. Walker

502705/12 Us Bank Nat. Assoc. v. Vivas

513911/24 Wbl Spol I v. 149 34th St. Rty. Group, Inc. Et Al

525295/23 Wilmington Savings Fund Society v. Zeitonue

500858/21 Yeshiva Or Hadach A/a Yeshiva Ohr Hadach v. Empire Asset Group

Motion

500858/21 Yeshiva Or Hadach A/a Yeshiva Ohr Hadach v. Empire Asset Group

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

505513/19 Alleyne v. Rutland Dev. Group Inc.

500191/20 Board of Mgrs. of The 51 v. 201 Water St. LLC

505784/25 Sig Cre 2023 Venture LLC v. 886 B'way. LLC Et Al

504011/24 Watson v. Hinton

Motion

505513/19 Alleyne v. Rutland Dev. Group Inc.

500191/20 Board of Mgrs. of The 51 v. 201 Water St. LLC

512013/25 HF Rockaway LLC v. Gifrock LLC

504011/24 Watson v. Hinton

Commercial Division Part 6

Justice Lawrence Knipel
360 Adams Street
Phone 347-296-1630
Room 774

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

514991/21337 Tompkins LLC v. Friedman

523368/1958 Dobbin Funding L.P. v. 58 Dobbin LLC Et Al

517678/23 Abdusoviev v. Center For Creative Minds

500296/20 Bababekov v. Babeck

537587/22 Balazore Teneasaca v. 126 East 86 St. Dev.

503898/23 Bennardo v. Newco Alp Inc. Et Al

515326/24 Columbia Capital Co. v. Li & L Real Estate Dev. LLC Et Al

500795/24 Dundaa v. Borshenko

509142/21 Gibbons v. Kirks

521187/23 Gitsit Solutions v. Fraleg Kuscuszkoo Corp. Et Al

520939/17 Grannum v. Tanaisi's Deli Grocery Corp.

4937/13 Hsbc Bank USA v. Kone

506302/21 Levin v. Kamedina

532572/22 Mattox v. Agape Transportation Inc. Et Al

512092/24 Mount Eden Asset Mgt. Inc. v. Ermajo LLC Et Al

512114/24 Newbank v. Pacific Alliance LLC Et Al

517627/24 Pacific Rblf Reo v. 1270 Jeff LLC Et Al

515316/25 Perez v. Byrne

518735/21 Serrata v. Sweet Home Residence LLC Et Al

514108/24 Smith v. Miller

504160/24 Stormfield Capital Funding I v. Lake St Bklyn. LLC Et Al

500666/21 U.S. Bank Nat. Assoc. v. Sookram

535859/23 U.S. Bank Nat. Assoc. v. 1228 E 51st St. Corp Et Al

517002/24 U.S. Bank Trust Co. v. Murray

535859/23 U.S. Bank Trust Co. v. 1029 Oceanview Ave. LLC Et Al

30184/10 U.S. Bank Trust N.A. As Trustee For Lsf9 Master Participation Trust v. Walker

502705/12 Us Bank Nat. Assoc. v. Vivas

513911/24 Wbl Spol I v. 149 34th St. Rty. Group, Inc. Et Al

525295/23 Wilmington Savings Fund Society v. Zeitonue

500858/21 Yeshiva Or Hadach A/a Yeshiva Ohr Hadach v. Empire Asset Group

Motion

500666/21 U.S. Bank National Association v. Sookram

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

505513/19 Alleyne v. Rutland Dev. Group Inc.

500191/20 Board of Mgrs. of The 51 v. 201 Water St. LLC

505784/25 Sig Cre 2023 Venture LLC v. 886 B'way. LLC v. Bklyn. Et Al

504011/24 Watson v. Hinton

Commercial Division Part 8

Justice Leon Ruchelman
360 Adams Street
Phone 347-296-1604
Room 276

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

503545/18 H. v. NYC Dept. of 527707/23 Hsbc Bank USA v. Holness

514466/19 Jiminez v. NYC

FRIDAY, SEPT. 12

534990/23 Cappello Jr. v. Uber Technologies, Inc. Et Al

500604/20 Flowers v. Hirasiks

501991/23 Srouf v. Mann

Commercial Division Part 10

Justice Larry D. Martin
360 Adams Street
Phone 347-296-1634
Room 741

Commercial Division Part 12

Justice Reginald Boddie
360 Adams Street
Phone 347-01-9127-1594
Room 366

THURSDAY, SEPT. 11

515687/242351 Bedford Holding v. Flatbush Funding

510390/23 Aranbayev v. Nektalov

515788/25 Babb v. Christmas

530150/23 Brach v. Goldstein

523589/22 Bukobza v. Buzhaker

500668/14 Chu v. New Atlantic Partnership

526990/25 Council of Elders of Celestial Church of Christ-New York Parish Et Al v. Celestial Church of Christ-New York Parish Et Al

514181/25 Cross River Bank v. Breadberry Lakewood

508718/23 Goldberger v. Mannetta

527098/24 Huebner v. Elberg

528799/24 Itria Ventures LLC v. Gross

535833/23 L&M Pilates Bklyn. Mgmt v. Lerner

512096/21 Michael R Postar, Inc. v. Starr Surplus Lines Inc. Co.

518104/25 Sky Delray LLC v. Kirzner

500236/25 Td Bank v. Y O & Associates Inc Et Al

Motion

515687/242351 Bedford Holding v. Flatbush Funding

510390/23 Aranbayev v. Nektalov

515788/25 Babb v. Christmas

530150/23 Brach v. Goldstein

523589/22 Bukobza v. Buzhaker

500668/14 Chu v. New Atlantic Partnership

526990/25 Council of Elders of Celestial Church of Christ-New York Parish Et Al v. Celestial Church of Christ-New York Parish Et Al

514181/25 Cross River Bank v. Breadberry Lakewood

508718/23 Goldberger v. Mannetta

527098/24 Huebner v. Elberg

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

LIQUOR LICENSES

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that a license, number NA-0524-25-01441, for beer, cider, liquor, and wine has been applied for by the undersigned* to sell beer, cider, liquor, and wine at retail in a restaurant/bar under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Law at 435 E 153rd St, Bronx, New York 10455 for on premises consumption. *El Chicano Sports Bar Corp.) (435 E 153rd St, Bronx, New York 10455) 12414 s11-Th s18

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that a license with Application ID: NA-0240-25-103217, for beer, wine & cider, has been applied for by the under- signed to sell beer, wine & cider at retail in a restaurant under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Law at 2817-19 Broadway, New York, NY 10025 for premises consumption. The company's name is Kim & Bao Trading LLC dba Nai Brother Sauerkraut Fish. 14134 s11-Th s18

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that an On-Premise Catering Establishment Full Liquor License Application ID NA-0346-25-125305 has been applied for by Compass Group USA, Inc serving beer, wine, liquor, mead, and cider to be sold at retail for on premises consumption in a Catering Establishment for the premises located at 120 Park Ave Fl 22 New York NY 10017. 14152 s11-Th s18

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that an On-Premise Catering Establishment Full Liquor License Application ID NA-0346-25-124446 has been applied for by Compass Group USA, Inc serving beer, wine, liquor, mead, and cider to be sold at retail for on premises consumption in a Catering Establishment for the premises located at 731 Lexington Ave FL 6 & 7 New York NY 10022. 14153 s11-Th s18

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that an On-Premise Catering Establishment Full Liquor License Application ID NA-0340-25-126320 has been applied for by Compass Group USA, Inc serving beer, wine, liquor, mead, and cider to be sold at retail for on premises consumption in a Catering Establishment for the premises located at 731 Lexington Ave FL 28 New York NY 10022. 14154 s11-Th s18

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that an On-Premise Restaurant Full Liquor License, NYS Application ID: NA-0340-25-127058 has been applied for by KJUN BUKU Inc serving beer, wine, cider, mead and liquor to be sold at retail for on premises consumption in a restaurant, for the premises located at 334 Lexington Ave New York NY 10016-0907. 14148 s11-Th s18

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that an On-Premise Restaurant Full Liquor License, NYS Application ID: NA-0340-25-127868 has been applied for by GEO Hospitality East Inc. serving beer, wine, cider, mead and liquor to be sold at retail for on premises consumption in a restaurant, for the premises located at 1712 2nd Ave New York NY 10128-3273. 14150 s11-Th s18

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that an On-Premise Restaurant Wine License, NYS Application ID: NA-0240-25-127764 has been applied for by Tachi-339 W 44 LLC serving beer, wine, cider and mead to be sold at retail for on premises consumption in a restaurant, for the premises located at 339 W 44th St West Store New York NY 10036. 14151 s11-Th s18

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that a Tavern Wine License, NYS Application ID NA-0267-25-127136 has been applied for by BK Dumpling UES LLC dba Brooklyn Dumpling Shop to sell beer, wine, mead and cider at retail in a Tavern. For on premises consumption under the ABC law located at 453 East 78th Street New York NY 10075. 14147 s11-Th s18

NOTICE IS HEREBY given that a license, number pending, has been applied for by Foodance the Living Room by Cesare Vangeli Corp to sell beer, wine, and liquor at retail in a tavern under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Law at 690 10th Ave, New York, NY 10019 for on-premises consumption. 14159 s11-Th s18

New York Law Journal assumes no responsibility for any item error in an ad beyond the cost of the ad itself, or for the omission of copy.

FOUNDATIONS

THE ANNUAL RETURN OF THE KOHLBERG FOUNDATION For the 2024 year ended December 31, 2024 is available at its principal office located at PO Box 429, Armonk, NY 10504 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is Nancy McCabe. 14140 s11

THE ANNUAL RETURN OF R&T P FAMILY FOUNDATION For the FISCAL year ended APRIL 30, 2025 is available at its principal office located at BESSEMER TRUST, 1271 AVE OF THE AMERICAS, 42NF FL, NY, NY 10020 for the inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is ROBERT A. PRUZAN. 14142 s11

THE ANNUAL RETURN OF THE HENRY NIAS FOUNDATION for the calendar year ended December 31, 2024 is available at its principal office located at c/o CBIZ ADVISORS, LLC 68 SOUTH SERVICE ROAD SUITE #300 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal manager of the Foundation is RICHARD EDELMAN. 14171 s11

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

BENNY'S BURGERS LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/11/2025. Office loc: NY County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 165 West End Ave, Apt 15N, NY, NY 10023. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 13046 au14-Th s18

ELCORE SOLUTIONS LLC, Art. of Org. filed with SSNY 7/25/25. NY office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent for process. SSNY shall mail copy of process to: c/o The LLC, 146 Hunter Ridge Rd., Massapequa, NY, 11758. Any lawful act/activity. 12994 au14-Th s18

FINAL STEP LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/08/2025. Office loc: Westchester County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 21 Bonaventure Avenue, Ardsley, NY 10502. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 12996 au14-Th s18

KALIGO LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 07/08/25. 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, 57 McKinley Avenue, Albertson, NY 11507. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 12993 au14-Th s18

MANSFIELD WOODSON LLC Articles of Org. filed NY Sec. of State (SSNY) 8/8/25. Office in NY Co. SSNY design. agent of LLC whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to 158 Bank St., Apt. 2A, NY, NY 10014, which is also the principal business location. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 13018 au14-Th s18

NA MARA THREADS LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/07/25. 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, 127 15th Avenue, Sec Cliff, NY 11579. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 13232 au21-Th s25

1 ANCHORAGE WAY 710 LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/18/25. 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, 1 Anchorage Way, #710, Freeport, NY 11520. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 13576 au28-Th o2

SOLAIRE 8K LLC filed Arts. of Org. with the Secty of State of NY (SSNY) on 5/27/2025. 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 Albanese Organization, Inc. 1001 Franklin Ave, Ste 300, Garden City, NY 11530. Purpose: any lawful act. 13899 s4-Th o9

NOTICE OF FORMATION of OPSMYTH LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/26/2025. 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 #711057, New York, NY 10003. P/A: US Corp Agents, Inc. 7014 13th Ave, #202, BK, NY 11228. Purpose: any lawful act. 13527 Au28 Th 002

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

CHERYL KRAVATZ, ESQ., PLLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/05/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the PLLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the PLLC, 16 Maplewood Drive, Plainview, NY 11803. Purpose: For the practice of the profession of Law. 12992 au14-Th s18

MUBARAK LAW PLLC, a Prof. LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 07/22/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Omar Hussein Mubarak, 80 Broad St., 5th Floor, NY, NY 10004. Purpose: To Practice The Profession Of Law. 13028 au14-Th s18

THE LAW OFFICE OF FEILEN AND KATZ, PLLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 06/03/25. Office: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of the PLLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the PLLC, 928 Broadway, Suite 1000, New York, NY 10010. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 13578 au28-Th o2

ELSBERG BAKER MARURI PLLC Articles of Org. filed NY Sec. of StateSSNY 1/26/24. Office in NY Co. SSNY desig. agent of LLC whom process may be served. SSNY shall mail process to 1 Penn Plaza, 40th Fl, NY, NY 10119, which is also the principal business location. Purpose: To Practice Law. 12704 au7-Th s11

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Riccio Chiropractic Wellness PLLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 2/18/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 303 East 76th St, Apt 9, New York, NY 10021. Purpose: any lawful act. 12657 Au07 Th S11

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Warming Light Mental Health Counseling PLLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 5/22/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 169 Madison Avenue, Ste 15150, New York, NY 10016. Purpose: any lawful act. 12642 Au07 Th S11

NOTICE OF FORMATION of OPISO Studio Architecture PLLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) or 7/10/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to PO Box 88, Cooper Station, 93 1st Ave, NY, NY 10276. P/A: 444 Manhattan Ave, Unit 1N, NY, NY 10026. Purpose: any lawful act. 12982 Au14 Th S18

NOTICE OF FORMATION of New York Neuromusculoskeletal Medicine PLLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/18/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 401 W 22nd St., Apt.2, New York, NY 10011. Purpose: to practice the profession of medicine. 12658 au7-Th s11

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Mind Share Therapy LCSW PLLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) or 8/14/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 363 West 30th St, Apt 2D, New York, NY 10001. Purpose: any lawful act. 13883 S04 Th 009

BODY LOGIC MASSAGE THERAPY PLLC, a Prof. LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 09/03/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The PLLC, 252 East Park Avenue, Long Beach, NY 11561. Purpose: To Practice The Profession Of Massage Therapy. 14183 s11-Th o16

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

Kristina White Consulting LLC, Articles of Organization filed with the Secretary of State of New York (SSNY) on 7/22/25. Office location: New York 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: Kristina White Consulting LLC, 239 East 79th Street 5M, NY, NY 10075. Purpose: any lawful act or activity. 12637 Au07 Th S11

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

160 MARVIN AVE REALTY LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/27/2024. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, C/O Christine Raffia-Suris and Associates, 395 North Service Road, Suite 302, Melville, NY 11747. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 12705 au7-Th s11

56 EAST 66TH STREET RES- IDENCE LLC Articles of Org. filed NY Sec. of State (SSNY) 9/11/2019. Office in NY Co. SSNY desig. agent of LLC whom process may be served. SSNY shall mail process to Attn: Shahriar Sedgh, Esq. c/o Sedgh & Zurekman, PLLC, 370 Lexington Ave, Ste 800, NY, NY 10017. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 12703 au7-Th s11

KLM WOODBURY, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 06/05/2025. 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, 38 Berry Hill Road, Oyster Bay Cove, NY 11771. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 12709 au7-Th s11

MANHASSET AVENUE 2-4, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/04/2025. 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, 225 Sands Point Blvd, Port Washington, NY 11050. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 12708 au7-Th s11

MANORHAVEN BLVD 8, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/04/2025. 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, 225 Sands Point Road, Port Washington, NY 11050. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 12706 au7-Th s11

NEW YORK BRAND PRO LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/06/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Kanhiya Kinney Galani, 70 Rt 106 , Jericho, NY 11753. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 12710 au7-Th s11

SHORE ROAD 118-120, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/04/2025. 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, 225 Sands Point Blvd, Port Washington, NY 11050. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 12707 au7-Th s11

Olive LB LLC filed w/ SSNY 6/12/25. Off. in Nassau Co. received. SSNY - desig. as agt. of LLC & mailed to the LLC, 517 Monroe Blvd, Unit 3, Long Beach, NY 11561. Any lawful purpose. 13124 Aug21 th Sept25

67 Wicks Path LLC filed w/ SSNY 8/20/25. Off. in Nassau Co. Process served to SSNY - desig. as agt. of LLC & mailed to the LLC, 138 Liberty Ave, Mineola, NY 11501. Any lawful purpose. 13380 Aug28 th Oct2

NOTICE OF FORMATION of KELLNER CONSULTANTS, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 7/1/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 330 E 38th St, New York, NY 10016. Purpose: any lawful act. 12636 Au07 Th S11

NOTICE OF FORMATION of PRECISION PATH EXPEDITING SERVICES LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/1/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 265 Cherry St, Apt 5E, New York, NY 10002. Purpose: any lawful act. 12675 Au07 Th S11

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Tess Communications LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 6/30/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 501 East 79th St, 8B, New York, NY 10075. Purpose: any lawful act. 12649 Au07 Th S11

Notice of Formations of Ouch Magazine LLC, Filed with Sec. Of NY State, 8/6/2025. SSNY serves as designated agent Location: NY County, whom process may be served and mail copy process against the LLC to 1178 B'way #1333, NYC, NY 10001. Purposes Only Lawful Act. 13215 Au21 Th S25

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Kamford VDC 2026 LLC, Art. Of Org. Filed Secy of State of NY on 08/11/2025. Off. Loc: NASSAU Co. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY to mail copy of process to The LLC, 17 Barstow Rd, STE 206, Great Neck, NY 11021. Purpose: Any lawful act or activity. 12985 Au14 Th S18

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF GEOECONAI LLC, Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 7/3/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 110 West 90th Street, Apt 3G, New York, NY 10024. Purpose: any lawful act. 12833 Au14 Th S18

Notice of Formation of Layer Wave, LLC, Articles of Organization filed with the SSNY on 7/30/2025. Office location: Westchester County. SSNY has been designated as agent of LLC upon whom processes against it may be served and SSNY should mail a copy of process to 222 Purchase St, #209, Rye, NY 10580. Purpose is to engage in any and all business activities permitted under NYS laws. 12986 Au14 Th S18

NOTICE OF FORMATION of MARTIN WELLNESS SOLUTIONS LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/15/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 18 East 127th St, #1, New York, NY 10035. Purpose: any lawful act. 12267 Au14 Th S18

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Bria Cheri LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 5/30/2025. 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 #135373, NY, NY 10003. R/A: US Corp Agents, Inc. 7014 13th Ave, #202, BK, NY 11228. Purpose: any lawful act. 13329 Au21 Th S25

NOTICE OF FORMATION of SOFT RUSH STUDIO 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 110 W 90th St, Apt 3B, New York, NY 10024. Purpose: any lawful act. 12478 Au21 Th S25

NOTICE OF FORMATION of THE DOCUMENTARY HELPLINE LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 7/19/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 545 E 12th St Apt 2B, New York, NY 10009. Purpose: any lawful act. 13251 Au21 Th S25

NOTICE OF FORMATION of 843 E 227 STREET LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 6/26/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to Hope Danville-Quinlan, 106 W 117 St, #5E, New York, NY 10026. P/B/A: 843 E 227 St, Bronx, NY 10466. Purpose: any lawful act. 13219 Au28 Th 002

NOTICE OF FORMATION of EL REY VENTURES LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/17/2024. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 136 Madison Ave, Manhattan, NY 10016. Purpose: any lawful act. 13608 Au28 Th 002

PRIMEROS NORTH AMERICA LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 07/24/25. 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 David M. Glanstein, Esq., Glanstein LLP, 711 Third Avenue, 17th Floor, New York, NY 10017. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 13748 s4-Th o9

PROVISIONAL PLANNED FUNDS LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/29/2025. 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, 306 Glen Cove Road, Carle Place, NY 11514. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 13887 s4-Th o9

155 W 68th Property LLC filed 8/28/25. Cty: New York. SSNY desig. for process & shall mail to: 15 Broad St, #3422, NY, NY 10005. Purp: any lawful. 14135 s12-Th o16

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION of RIVETING STRATEGIES, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 8/14/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to c/o Nucco Filgus Corp., 200 Blvd of the Americas, Ste 104B, Lakewood, NJ 08701. Purpose: any lawful purpose. 13452 Au28 Th 002

NOTICE OF FORMATION of SHINE SANG LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 12/30/2024. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to Northwest Registered agent LLC, 418 Broadway Ste N, Albany, NY 12207. P/B/A: 337 W 30th St, NY, NY 10001. Purpose: any lawful act. 13569 Au28 Th 002

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Z&L 66, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 6/22/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 235 W 56th St, Apt 29G, New York, NY 10019. Purpose: any lawful act. 13106 Au28 Th 002

NOTICE OF FORMATION of 93-04 76th Street LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/31/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 7 Henhawk Rd., Great Neck, NY 11024. Purpose: any lawful activities. 12671 au7-Th s11

NOTICE OF FORMATION of AMHB, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/21/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: c/o AJHollander Enterprises Inc. - 372 Doughty Blvd., Inwood, NY 11096. Purpose: any lawful activities. 12661 au7-Th s11

NOTICE OF FORMATION of BLOODY PINATA LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/01/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: eResidentAgent, Inc., 1 Rockefeller Plaza, Ste. 1204, New York, NY 10020, also the registered agent upon whom process may be served. Purpose: any lawful activities. 12645 au7-Th s11

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Blue Island Homes North, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 7/30/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: the company, 2878 Merrick Rd., Bellmore, NY 11710. Purpose: any lawful activities. 12672 au7-Th s11

NOTICE OF FORMATION of HIGHLINE HEIGHTS LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 03/06/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: HIGHLINE HEIGHTS LLC, 3000 MARCUS AVE, 3E12, NEW HYDE PARK, NY 11042. Purpose: any lawful activities. 12673 au7-Th s11

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Mick Miller LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/08/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: c/o 2211 Southwinds Dr., Naples, FL 34102. Purpose: any lawful activities. 12651 au7-Th s11

NOTICE OF FORMATION of REAL EDGE ADVISORS, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/24/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: eResidentAgent, Inc., 1 Rockefeller Plaza, Ste. 1204, New York, NY 10020, also the registered agent upon whom process may be served. Purpose: any lawful activities. 12668 au7-Th s11

NOTICE OF FORMATION of RECHAN FAMILY, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/28/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: c/o 2211 Southwinds Dr., Naples, FL 34102. Purpose: any lawful activities. 12669 au7-Th s11

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION of WILLLOW GLEN PARTNERS, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/04/2021. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: the Company, 57 Cornwells Beach Rd, Sands Point, NY 11050. Purpose: any lawful activities. 12662 au7-Th s11

NOTICE OF FORMATION of AUTEUR DE VERITE LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/10/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 136 W 129th St, Apt 3F, New York, NY 10027. Purpose: any lawful act. 13904 S04 Th 009

NOTICE OF FORMATION of HAPPY KIND MEDIA LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 6/3/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 447 Broadway, 2nd Fl - #3000, New York, NY 10013. P/B/A: 276 Fifth Ave, Ste 704 PMB 7052, New York, NY 10001. Purpose: any lawful act. 13657 S04 Th 009

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Jessica & The Muze LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 7/31/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to Jessica Godwin, 3333 Broadway, D16G, New York, NY 10031. Purpose: any lawful act. 13882 S04 Th 009

Notice of Formation of Speed Networking, LLC, Articles of Organization filed with SSNY on 12/09/2024. Office Location: Westchester County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Elina Skripochnik, 29 Coutant Drive, New Rochelle, New York 10804. Purpose: any lawful purpose. 13414 S04 Th 009

NOTICE OF FORMATION of TWIN PROP CREATIVE LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 8/1/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 500 West End Avenue, Apt 12A, New York, NY 10024. Purpose: to engage in any lawful act or activity. 13922 S04 Th 009

NOTICE OF FORMATION of THE RED KNOT PRODUCTIONS LLC, Art/Org filed 8/26/25. Ofc loc Nassau County. SSNY designated for svc/pro & shall mail to 108 14 72ND 2ND FLOOR, FOREST HILL, NY 11375. Purpose: Any lawful activity. 13658 s11-Th o16

CSP ROSLYN LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 09/02/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 1011 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10065. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 14073 s11-Th o16

FRGTMENTOT LLC Art. Of Org. Filed Sec. Of State of NY 9/8/2025. Off. Loc. : Nassau Co. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served & shall mail proc. to 129 Verban Ave., Floral Park, NY 11001. USA Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 14136 s11-Th o16

175 E BWAY 7A LLC, Art. of Org. filed with SSNY 8-19-2022. Office Location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC for service of process. SSNY shall mail a copy of any process to, c/o C/O Robinson Brog Leinwand Greene Genovese & Gluck P.C. Attn: Leonard B. Nathanson, 875 Third Ave., 9 Th Fl., NY, NY, 10022. Purpose: Any lawful act or activity. 13907 s4-Th o9

420 LONG ISLAND LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 09/02/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Larry Miller, 23 Pearl St., Valley Stream, NY 11581. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 1

SALES

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT
BRONX COUNTY KIAVI FUNDING, INC., Plaintiff against WESTCHESTER 3148 LLC, et al Defendants(s) Attorney for Plaintiff(s) Kelly Kronenberg, 111 Broadway, Suite 1205 New York, NY 10006, (800) 484-4381. Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale entered July 8, 2025, I will sell at public auction to the highest bidder at the New York County Courthouse, Courtroom 711 at 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, New York on September 29, 2025 at 2:15 PM. Premises known as 3148 Westchester Avenue, Bronx, New York 10461. Block 4237 Lot 5. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, situate, lying and being in the Borough and County of the Bronx, City and State of New York. Approximate Amount of Judgment is \$1,180,540.58 plus interest, fees, and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment Index No 802064/2023E. The foreclosure sale will be conducted in accordance with 12th Judicial District's Covid-19 Policies and the Bronx County foreclosure auction rules. The Referee shall enforce any rules in place regarding facial coverings and social distancing. Sergio Marquez, Esq., Referee File # 02208261
au28-Th s18
13241

NOTICE OF SALE

SUPREME COURT
COUNTY OF KINGS DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST COMPANY, AS INDENTURE TRUSTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE HOLDERS OF THE JAMES MORTGAGE INVESTMENT TRUST 2006-1, MORTGAGE BACKED NOTES, Plaintiff AGAINST MAGALIE PHILANTROPE, ET AL., Defendant(s) Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale duly entered March 3, 2014, I, the undersigned Referee, will sell at public auction at the Kings County Supreme Court, in Room 224, 360 Adams Street, Brooklyn, New York 11201 on September 25, 2025 at 2:30 PM, premises known as 3733 Lyme Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11224. All that certain plot piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Brooklyn, County of Kings, City and State of New York, Block: 7000 Lot: 21. Approximate amount of judgment \$526,002.10 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment Index #13056/2011. Roger Siegel, Esq., Referee FBIN, SUGH & CRANE, LLP 28 East Main Street, Suite 1800 Rochester, NY 14614 SP-SJN335 86725
au28-Th s18
13239

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 FOR THE NYCTL 1998-2 TRUST, Plaintiff, vs. ARVIN G. AMARLIO AS HEIR AND DISTRIBUTOR OF THE ESTATE OF EZER B. GONZALES AND AS EXECUTOR OF THE ESTATE OF EZER B. GONZALES, ET AL., Defendant(s). Pursuant to a Judgment of Foreclosure and Sale dated June 6, 2025 and duly entered on June 10, 2025, I, the undersigned Referee will sell at public auction at Room 130 of the New York County Courthouse, 60 Centre Street, New York, NY 10007 on October 8, 2025 at 2:15 p.m., premises known as 459 West 153rd Street, New York, NY 10031. All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Borough of Manhattan, County of New York, City and State of New York, Block 2068 and Lot 8. Approximate amount of judgment is \$47,608.54 plus interest and costs. Premises will be sold subject to provisions of filed Judgment Index #157754/2019. Robert A. Abrams, Esq., Referee Bronster, LLP, 156 West 56th Street, Suite 703, New York, New York 10019, Attorneys for Plaintiff
s4-Th s25
13492

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

ELEVATION MARKETING, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/14/2025. Office loc: NY County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 447 Broadway, 2nd Floor, #1752, NY, NY 10013. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose.
s4-Th o9
13886

ES PH4B LLC Articles of Org filed NY Sec. of State (SSNY) 8/25/25. Office in NY Co. SSNY desig. agent of LLC whom process may be served. SSNY shall mail process to c/o Nuvorse, 152 West 57th St., 21st FL., NY, NY 10019. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
s4-Th o9
13920

FARMACIA VIVA LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 06/10/2025. Office loc: Bronx County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 5 Schanck Drive, Edison, NJ 08820. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose.
s4-Th o9
13910

G NAIM 40TH LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/29/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Shahin Naim, 2 Cow Ln, Great Neck, NY 11024. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose.
s4-Th o9
13889

G NAIM TR UW 40TH LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/29/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Shahin Naim, 2 Cow Ln, Great Neck, NY 11024. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose.
s4-Th o9
13888

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION of SPRING STREET HOTEL LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/07/2025. Office location: New York County. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: SPRING STREET HOTEL LLC, 447 BROADWAY, 2ND FL. 406, NEW YORK, NY 10013. Name and address of the registered agent upon whom process may be served: REGISTERED AGENT SOLUTIONS, INC., 99 WASHINGTON AVE., STE. 700, ALBANY, NY 12260. Purpose: any lawful activities.
au7-Th s11
12670

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of 89 Blocks Holdings LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/22/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 07/05/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 460 Park Ave. South, 7th Fl., New York, NY 10016. Address required to be maintained in DE: The Corporation Trust Company, Corporation Trust Center, 1209 Orange St., Wilmington, DE 19801. Arts of Org. filed with the DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities.
au7-Th s11
12656

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of CMMT-JSeller 2, LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/15/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 07/14/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: c/o Paracorp Incorporated, 2804 Gateway Oaks Dr. #100, Sacramento, CA 95823. Address required to be maintained in DE: c/o Paracorp Incorporated, 2140 S Dupont Hwy., Camden, DE 19934. Arts of Org. filed with the DE Secy. of State, 401 Federal St., Ste. 3, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities.
au7-Th s11
12646

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of Guernsey Holdings Management Co LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/30/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 02/15/2022. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: National Registered Agents Inc., 28 Elm St., New York, NY 10005. Address required to be maintained in DE: 1209 Orange St., Wilmington, DE 19801. Arts of Org. filed with the DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St. Ste 3, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities.
au7-Th s11
12663

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of Hillcrest Park Avenue LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/12/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in California (CA) on 07/16/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 15260 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 620, Sherman Oaks, CA 91403. Address required to be maintained in CA: 15260 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 620, Sherman Oaks, CA 91403. Arts of Org. filed with Shirley N. Weber, PHD, Secy of State of CA, 1500 11th St., Sacramento, CA 95814. Purpose: any lawful activities.
au7-Th s11
12647

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of INCH BERODAG, LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 6/30/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 6/30/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: eResidentAgent, Inc., 1 Rockefeller Plaza, Ste. 1204, New York, NY 10020, also the registered agent upon whom process may be served. Address required to be maintained in DE: 1013 Centre Rd., Ste. 403S, Wilmington, DE 19805. Arts of Org. filed with the Secy. of State, 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities.
au7-Th s11
12648

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of Kickin Chicken Wooster Rooster LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/11/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 06/16/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Registered Agents Inc., 418 Broadway, Ste. R, Albany, NY 12207. Address required to be maintained in DE: 16192 Coastal Hwy., Lewes, DE 19958. Arts of Org. filed with the Secy. of State, 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities.
au7-Th s11
12650

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of MINK PADEL LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/07/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 07/03/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 244 Fifth Ave. STE #1800, New York, NY 10001. Address required to be maintained in DE: c/o Resident Agents Inc., 8 The Green, STE R, Dover, DE 19901. Arts of Org. filed with the DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities.
au7-Th s11
12665

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

CE 140 CROSBY, LLC APP. for Auth. filed NY Sec. of State (SSNY) 8/22/25. LLC was organized in DE on 1/31/25. Office in NY Co. SSNY desig. as agent of LLC upon whom process may be served. SSNY to mail copy of process to c/o Capstone Equities, 345 Fifth Ave., Ste. 1209, NY, NY 10017. Required org. info: 800 North State, Ste. 304, Dover, DE 19901. Cert. Of Org. filed with SSDE, John G. Townsend Bldg., 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
s4-Th o9
13921

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

49 HARBORVIEW WEST LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/08/2025. 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, 162 Navarrete, 90 Sunset Dr., Hempstead, NY 11550. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose.
au14-Th s18
12995

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

12D STUDIO LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 07/17/25. 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, 141 E. 3rd Street, 12D, New York, NY 10009. Purpose: Any lawful prpose.
au28-Th o2
13579

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

AGENT OF LAUGHTER LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/12/25. 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, 412 East Shore Road, Kings Point, NY 11024. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
au28-Th o2
13575

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

ANTIGUA ROAD LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 09/30/24. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, c/o Michael Tornabe, 112 Clayton Avenue, East Atlantic Beach, NY 11561. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
au28-Th o2
13567

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

C&R 120 J ENTERPRISES LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/05/25. 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, 42-40 Bell Boulevard, Suite 601, Bayside, NY 11361. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
au28-Th o2
13573

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

GALAS EVEN 44TH ST. LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 05/07/25. 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, 2415 Jerusalem Avenue, Suite 106, Bellmore, NY 11706. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
au28-Th o2
13570

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

L & S 3497 LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 02/19/25. 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, 280 Euclid Street, Valley Stream, NY 11580. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
au28-Th o2
13572

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

Notice of formation of 10 Covert Street LLC, a domestic LLC. Arts. of Org. filed with Sec. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/13/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY is designated as agent upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 10 Covert Street, Port Washington, NY 11050. Purpose: Any lawful act.
S11 Th O16
14006

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION of 1975 PAMELA COURT LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 7/11/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 1625 East 33rd Street, Brooklyn, NY 11234. Purpose: any lawful act.
S11 Th O16
13456

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION of DIGITALX CONCEERGE LLC Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 5/27/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 169 S Madison Ave, Ste 15833, New York, NY 10016. R/A: Zen Business Inc., 41 State St, Ste 112, Albany, NY 12207. Purpose: any lawful act.
S11 Th O16
14149

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION of INDIGO MACAW LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 7/19/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 225 Park Ave S #542307, New York, NY 10003. R/A: US Corp Agents, Inc. 7014 13th Ave. #202, BK, NY 11228. Purpose: any lawful act.
S11 Th O16
14145

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION of Memo The Band LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 5/27/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to R/A: Zenbusiness Inc. 41 State St, Ste 112, Albany, NY 12207. Purpose: any lawful act.
S11 Th O16
14095

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION of ERIN MCCASKILL STORYWORK COACHING LLC Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 6/28/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 447 Broadway 2nd Fl. #3000, New York, NY 10013. P/B/A: 233 E 96th St, 6F, New York, NY 10128. Purpose: any lawful act.
Au14 Th S18
12987

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

MN 40TH LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/29/2025. 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, 6 Hamptworth Drive, Great Neck, NY 11024. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose.
s4-Th o9
13891

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION of NEW YORKERS FOR HARNESS RACING LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 8/22/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 450 Lexington Avenue, #1022, New York, NY 10163. Purpose: any lawful act.
S11 Th O16
14132

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

JNPRO PAINTING SERVICES, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 09/09/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY has been designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: Josue A Alvarado Navarrete, 90 Sunset Dr., Hempstead, NY 11550. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose.
s11-Th o16
14182

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

LE CAFE PAM LLC Art. Of Org. Filed Sec. of State of NY 5/22/2025. Off. Loc.: Bronx Co. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served & shall mail proc.: c/o 342 Services LLC, 342 E. 204th Street, Bronx, NY 10467-4706, USA. Purpose: Any lawful purpose.
s4-Th o9
13744

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

Palisade Acquisition III, LLC filed Arts. of Org. with the Secty of State of NY (SSNY) on 4/1/2025. Office: Bronx County. SSNY has been designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served and shall mail process to: The LLC, 225 Crossways Park Dr, Woodbury, NY 11797. Purpose: any lawful act.
s4-Th o9
13902

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

PPN Associates LLC filed Arts. of Org. with the Secty of State of NY (SSNY) on 6/12/2025. 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, 368 Ocean Ave, Lynbrook, NY 11563. Purpose: any lawful act.
s4-Th o9
13901

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of ONECHRONOS INFORMATION SERVICES LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/22/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 07/21/25. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 13 W. Main St, PO Box 953, Felton, DE 19943, also the address required to be maintained in DE, Arts of Org. filed with the DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities.
au7-Th s11
12666

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

App. for Auth. (LP) Virtual Construction Lab LP d/b/a Virtual Construction Lab L.P. App. for Auth. filed w/ Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 7/31/25. LP formed in DE on 7/3/25. Office Location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent of LP upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to 260 W. 39 th St., New York, NY 10018, registered agent upon whom process may be served. Purpose: Any lawful act/activity.
au7-Th s11
12635

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of ALTOGETHER IMPACT LLC. Application for authority filed with NY Secy of State (SSNY) on 4/26/2024. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in DE on 4/8/2024. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to R/A: Corporation Service Company, 251 Little Falls Dr, Wilmington, DE 19808. P/B/A: 2218 Broadway, #218, New York, NY 10024. Cert. of Formation filed with DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St, Ste 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activity.
Au14 Th S18
12984

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of Syracuse Fund II LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/24/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 05/29/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: c/o Crown Acquisitions, LLC, 362 Fifth Ave., Ste. 901, New York, NY 10001. Address required to be maintained in DE: 1209 Orange St., Wilmington, DE 19801. Arts of Org. filed with the DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St., Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities.
au7-Th s11
12660

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

TODE HALL PRODUCTIONS LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/15/2025. 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, 100 Garvies Point Road, Apt 1344 , Glen Cove, NY 11542. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose.
s4-Th o9
13892

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of Valorum Ophthalmology, LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/09/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 05/22/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: 555 Madison Ave., Ste. 11D, New York, NY 10022. Address required to be maintained in DE: Registered Agents Solutions, Inc., 838 Walker Rd., Ste. 21-2, Dover, DE 19904. Arts of Org. filed with the Secy. of State of DE, Div. of Corporations, 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities.
au7-Th s11
12655

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

See Decisions in the News
only at
NYLJ.COM

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of BENCHMARK 250 LLC Appl. for Auth. filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 08/26/25. Office location: NY County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 07/16/25. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to Corporation Service Co. (CSC), 80 State St, Albany, NY 12207-2543. DE addr of LLC: c/o CSC, 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808. Cert. of Form. filed with Secy. of State, John G. Townsend Bldg., 401 Federal St., Ste. 3, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: Any lawful activity.
Aug28 th Oct2
13632

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of ONECHRONOS MARKETS DCM, LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/23/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 07/23/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: TELOS LEGAL CORP. 5500 Main St. Ste. 345, Williamsville, NY 14221. Address required to be maintained in DE: 13 W. Main St., PO Box 953, Felton, DE 19943. Arts of Org. filed with the DE Secy of State, 401 Federal St., Ste. 4, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities.
au7-Th s11
12667

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION of RB PR (USA) LLC. Authority filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 07/24/2025. Office location: New York County. LLC formed in Delaware (DE) on 07/14/2025. SSNY designated as agent of LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: C/O European Investment Management Services, Inc., 11661 San Vicente Bl., Ste. 220, Los Angeles, CA 90049. Address required to be maintained in DE: Paracorp Incorporated, 2140 S. Dupont Hwy., Camden, DE 19934. Arts of Org. filed with the Secy. of State of DE, Div. of Corporations, John G. Townsend Bldg., 401 Federal St., Ste. 3, Dover, DE 19901. Purpose: any lawful activities.
au7-Th s11
12659

lawjobs.com

THE BEST JOBS ON THE BIGGEST LEGAL NETWORK

VerdictSearch



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

ALM.