

## IN BRIEF

### Second Circuit Grants Speedy Review in AG James' Citibank Fraud Case

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit on Wednesday agreed to hear, on an expedited basis, a court order advancing New York Attorney General Letitia James' attempt to hold Citibank N.A. liable for online scams.

Circuit Judges José Cabranes and Steven Menashi, joined by U.S. District Judge Lewis Liman, granted Citi's motion for an interlocutory appeal in a brief two-page order.

Citi, represented by Sullivan & Cromwell, had sought circuit intervention on the heels of a district court order keeping alive a lawsuit seeking to force the banking giant to pay millions of dollars to New Yorkers who have fallen victim to online scams.

Representatives for Citi and James didn't immediately respond to requests for comment.

The state attorney general had brought the case in January 2024, arguing that Citi had failed to enact proper safeguards preventing scammers from accessing customer accounts. James brought the case under the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, or EFTA, a decades-old law requiring banks to refund customers for unauthorized electronic transfers from their accounts.

Citi had pushed for the case's dismissal, claiming that the law doesn't cover online transactions. The bank argued that online transactions are wire transfers that are instead governed by the Uniform Commercial Code, which doesn't hold banks liable for losses if they maintain reasonable security measures to verify customer identities.

The litigation caught the eye of federal regulators, with the U.S. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, under the auspices of the Biden administration, submitting a May 2024 statement of interest supporting James' suit. In it, the agency said that the EFTA could be applied to online transactions that include a wire transfer, such as the transactions that scammers initiate through hacking or phishing attacks.

That rationale was later echoed by U.S. District Judge J. Paul Oetken in his January order refusing to dismiss the case. But after President Donald Trump's return to office, the federal agency withdrew the filing, disclaiming it as an "inappropriate" statement that pushed a "significant new interpretation" of the EFTA.

—Alyssa Aquino

### Sullivan & Cromwell Antitrust Special Counsel Joins Gibson Dunn as Partner

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher has hired Sullivan & Cromwell antitrust special counsel Bradley Smith as a partner in New York, the firm announced Tuesday.

Smith, who handles a range of antitrust issues but specializes in pre-merger notifications under the Hart-Scott-Rodino (HSR) Antitrust Improvements Act, spent his entire 28-year legal career at Sullivan & Cromwell prior to his recent move.

"Brad is an in-demand, well-rounded antitrust lawyer whose experience guiding clients through successful merger clearances will be invaluable—particularly in today's shifting regulatory landscape, where acquirers face significantly heightened demands under the new HSR rules," antitrust and competition

» Page 4



The New York Attorney General's investigation found that Peter and Lydia Brimelow diverted millions of charitable assets for personal benefit, including a castle in West Virginia purchased with VDARE funds.

## 'Personal Piggybank' or 'Political Target'? AG's Suit Against VDARE Leaders Seeks Restitution for Couple's Purchase of Castle

BY BRIAN LEE

A CONTROVERSIAL immigration restrictionist organization and its leaders allegedly engaged in a "shell game" to divert upward of \$2 million in charitable donations to themselves and family, including the purchase of a West Virginia castle they moved into, New York's top prosecutor said in a lawsuit on Wednesday.

In the state Supreme Court of Manhattan, the charities fraud

claim filed by New York Attorney General Letitia James is against the VDARE Foundation, a far-right website that promotes opposition to immigration to the U.S.

Its founder Peter Brimelow and his wife, Lydia are also defendants.

The claim—which has similarities to James' years-long corruption case against the National Rifle Association that ended in December—seeks restitution, penalties and a formal dissolution of VDARE.

» Page 4

## Firm Leasing Activity Reaches Record High At Year's Half

BY BRENDA SAPINO JEFFREYS

WITH major U.S. markets driving activity, law firm leasing activity reached 10 million square feet during the first half of 2025, making it the "strongest start to a year on record" for leasing, and potentially leading to the fourth consecutive year of increased activity, according to a recent report from Cushman & Wakefield.

The first-half leasing activity was 15% higher than during the same period in 2024, the Cushman & Wakefield Legal Sector Advisory Group found in its Legal Sector Q2 Leasing Trends report. The collective 5.4 million square feet of leasing during the second quarter of 2025 was the second-highest quarter on record, trailing only the fourth quarter of 2024.

"It is impossible to know if this pace will continue in the second half of the year, but if it does, then 2025 will be the fourth year in a row that U.S. law firm leasing sets an annual record," the authors wrote in the report.

Major legal markets continue to lead activity, with the Top 10 markets accounting for 61% (6.1 million square feet) of leased space during the first half of the year, with New

York and Los Angeles the leasing leaders.

"The momentum continues for law firms," with a very strong Q2, said David Smith, head of Americas insights at Cushman & Wakefield's Global Think Tank.

The legal industry has been "pretty optimistic" in hiring, and firms are generally "very office-

22%

Of Q2 leasing activity accounts for New York.

8%

For Washington, D.C.

centric," Smith said, with lawyers coming into the office three to four days a week on average.

During the first two quarters of 2025, 33% of all firm leases were expansions, 40% changed square footage only slightly, and 27% decreased footage, which follows recent trends. Among the largest leases, according to Cushman & Wakefield, the square footage allocated to each lawyer continues to vary, because firms

» Page 4

## Long Island Judge Awards Damages Over Refusal To Issue Gun Permit Recommendation Letters

BY EMILY SAUL

A FEDERAL judge on Wednesday awarded retired Long Island corrections officers \$283,000 in damages after a former Nassau County sheriff refused to provide them with letters necessary to obtain firearms.

U.S. District Court Judge Gary Brown of the Eastern District of New York called the actions of ex-sheriff Michael Sposato "disgraceful" and entered the award to plaintiffs.

"It appears that Sposato harbored animus toward deputy sheriffs and officers who retired following an on-the-job injury, entitling them to an enhanced pension, and began routinely denying the issuance of handgun permit recommendations," Brown wrote.

Plaintiffs are all former law enforcement officers who retired due to disabilities stemming from work-related injury. They sued after Sposato declined to give them recommendations for handgun permits, which are com-

» Page 4



Judge Brown



Demonstrators protested last weekend in New Delhi against President Trump's 50% tariffs on India. The Federal Circuit handed importers a restrained victory in their challenge to the tariffs on virtually all global imports.

## Importers' 'Muddled' Victory Invalidating Most Trump Tariffs Tees Up High Court Fight

BY ALYSSA AQUINO

IMPORTERS' victory in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit against President Donald Trump's tariffs was a narrow one that raises questions for the U.S. Supreme Court to resolve, according to trade experts.

Right before the U.S. Labor Day Weekend, the circuit issued its highly anticipated decision in a lawsuit challenging the so-called reciprocal duties that Trump issued on virtually all global imports, as well as his separate duties on the United States' top trade partners, China, Mexico and Canada.

The circuit in a 7-4 decision ruled that Trump had exceeded his authority under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, a decades-old statute imbuing

presidents with emergency trade powers, when he issued the "unbounded" and "ever-changing" tariffs.

The tariffs, which are supported by national emergency declarations over the drug trade, illegal migration and the trade deficit, are composed of a baseline 10% duty on goods from nearly all countries and additional duties reaching up to 50% on other U.S. trading partners. Most of the duties are already in effect.

The decision does not offer any immediate relief for importers, with the Federal Circuit taking the unusual step of sua sponte staying their decision until Oct. 14, for either party to file an appeal to the Supreme Court. For Ryan Majerus, a former Assistant General Counsel at the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative during the

» Page 4

## Sullivan & Cromwell Builds Appellate Practice With NY Partner From Solicitor General's Office

BY RYAN HARROFF

SULLIVAN & Cromwell added a new partner to its Supreme Court and appellate practice, arriving from the Justice Department's Office of the Solicitor General. The new hire, firm co-chair Robert Giuffra said, will help the firm continue to attract new clients as it seeks to become more prominent in the appellate space.



Yaira Dubin

Yaira Dubin started at Sullivan & Cromwell on Tuesday after almost four years as an assistant to the solicitor general and is based out of the firm's New York office. Giuffra said in an interview that the firm is looking to build up its Supreme Court and appellate practice in New York in addition to Washington, D.C., and that bringing Dubin aboard is a part of that goal.

Dubin has already argued multiple times before the

» Page 6

## DECISIONS OF INTEREST

### First Department

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

### Second Department

LANDLORD-TENANT: **Default judgment vacated, eviction proceeding dismissed for incorrect web links.** *Seaview Condo Units, LLC v. Grant*, Civil Court, Kings.

PERSONAL INJURY: **Defendant's defense of open and obvious forklift hazard rejected.** *Cartelli v. Cycle Power Inc.*, Supreme Court, Kings.

CRIMINAL LAW: **Omnibus motion to dismiss criminal case denied.** *People v. Antunez*, Supreme Court, Queens.

INSURANCE LITIGATION: **Inadequate submission of bills allows court to dismiss case.** *Vista Care PT PC v. Ace American Insurance Company*, Civil Court, Queens.

PERSONAL INJURY: **Court finds driver who touched plaintiff was not under supervision of defendants.** *EN v. Saint Joseph's Medical Center*, Supreme Court, Richmond.

### U.S. Courts

DISPUTE RESOLUTION: **Energy company fails to present arbitration provision in a clear, conspicuous manner.** *Sudakov v. CleanChoice Energy Inc.*, 2d. Cir.

CRIMINAL APPEALS: **Court need not explain options to pro se petitioner after dismissing habeas petition.** *O'Neill v. Deml*, 2d. Cir.

CRIMINAL APPEALS: **Panel affirms dismissal of false arrest, malicious prosecution claims against DHS agents.** *Sigalovskaya v. Special Agent Braden*, 2d. Cir.

CIVIL PROCEDURE: **AT&T may amend prohibition of services, substantial evidence claims in TCA case.** *New Cingular Wireless PCS LLC v. The Inc. Vill. of Muttontown*, EDNY.

PRODUCTS LIABILITY: **Medical device amendments to FDCA preempt claims over urinary control system device.** *Gregory v. Boston Scientific Corp.*, EDNY.

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

## INSIDE LAW JOURNAL

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

See page 2 for complete Inside lineup.

## Click Listen Earn

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

Visit CLECenter.com  
to click, listen, earn - anytime  
or Call A CLE Counselor Today at (800) 248-0466

## BONDS

Contact us by phone or email at  
[info@blaikiegroupp.com](mailto:info@blaikiegroupp.com)

Appeals  
 Discharge Lien  
 Guardian

Supersedeas  
 Executor  
 Lost Instrument

*Express Solutions Expressly for Bonding Problems Since 1933*

### THE BLAIKIE GROUP

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

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

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

**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](mailto:bonds@LevineCompany.com)  
[www.LevineCompany.com](http://www.LevineCompany.com)

SURETY BOND SPECIALISTS  
Celebrating Over 35 Years!

## New York Law Journal Inside

Civil Rights and  
The Urban Landscape »3Unusual Suspects  
Scuttling City Solutions  
by Chris Dunn

Online

## Court Calendars

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

Southern District  
Civil Roundup »3The Power and Limits of  
The Legislative Privilege  
by Edward M. Spiro  
and Christopher B. Harwood

## Outside Counsel »4

Seen and Heard:  
Representing the  
Child's Wishes  
by Laurie McPherson  
and Deepti Shenoy

Online

## Today's Tip

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

## CORPORATE UPDATE »5

Risk and Compliance:  
The Black Box and a  
Corporate Duty  
To Explain AI  
by Harshita GaneshTarget Reveals  
Severance Terms  
For Ousted Legal Chief  
by Chris O'Malley

Online

More Corporate columns are archived at [nylj.com](http://nylj.com).

August GC Moves of  
The Month:  
GE Vernova, ACC,  
Anthropic and  
Lennar Make  
Big Hires  
by Greg AndrewsDisciplinary  
Proceeding »6Matter of  
Regina L. Darby  
an attorney  
and counselor-at-law

## Calendar of Events »7

Online

Submit a legal notice for publication on [nylj.com](http://nylj.com).

## THE FINALISTS FOR THE LAW JOURNAL ATTORNEY OF THE YEAR AWARD

'The Art of Coming in Late':  
Finalist Bill Carmody Is Here To Win

BY EMILY SAUL

TO Bill Carmody, everyone is a potential juror. The cab driver, a guest at a dinner party, someone he meets on his travels.

He loves talking to people, any people. In part, because he truly loves people, but also because any one person, in a spontaneous conversation, could one day help him relate to a jury.

"I want to learn from everyone," the Susman Godfrey partner and head of the New York office said. "Listening to people, learning what they think and why they think it... because these are all people that one day, either the same person or people just like them, that I'm going to be charged to persuade."

Conversely, people love talking to Carmody. Also working with Carmody, or simply being near Carmody. Colleague after colleague described a joyfully zealous approach to all aspects of life, be it meticulously planning a cross examination he may scrap at the last second, or appreciating food, wine, art and architecture.

Jurors also love Carmody.

"I do think he connects extraordinarily well with jurors," said legendary lawyer David Boies, with whom Carmody is currently on trial.

Boies, chairperson and founding partner of Boies Schiller Flexner, attributes that ability to Carmody's authenticity and his fastidious preparation, which helps preserve his reputation with jurors.

"Part of his strength with a jury is the fact he doesn't make mistakes, he doesn't get his credibility undermined," Boies said. "And that, combined with his ability to connect with the jury, is very powerful."

Shawn Rabin, a Susman Godfrey partner and friend, recalled after one "very boring" trial that two jurors approached the legal team simply because they were eager to say hello to Carmody.

"It was incredible," Rabin recalled. "The jurors just wanted to, like, meet this guy that was kind of larger than life and managed to have this connection with them."

Carmody tried three of the biggest cases in the United States in

2024. He spoke to the New York Law Journal during yet another—the massive, \$29 billion privacy action against Google on behalf of nearly 100 million Google users. Carmody is co-chairing the Google case with Boies.

## Six Days Notice

Carmody describes his current practice as "the art of coming in late." At 67-year-old, he now parachutes into cases just before trial, be that a couple months or even weeks beforehand.

About 20 years ago, he had six days notice. And he still won the case, with the jury returning a defense verdict in maybe 30, 45 minutes, he recalled.

"It taught me, you know, really more than anything else, that what I do now is doable," he said. "When one is a real trial lawyer, you realize that 90% of what happens before trial doesn't affect the outcome of the trial."

As for his process, Carmody says he creates a war room in his home, and then holes up in a hotel room by himself on location. He'll later

Bill Carmody of  
Susman Godfrey

RYLAND WEST/ALM

be joined by colleagues, but he first ingests the case alone and determines what the jury will care about. Which is not much, he maintained.

"You want to quickly figure out what the truth is, and once you understand what really happened, you can identify the couple of issues that are going to really matter," he explained. "Figure out those things that will really move the needle with the jury, versus thinking about all the different things, exhibits, all the shit that happened during years and years and years of litigation."

"Getting wrapped up like a pretzel," he said, means lawyers "can't see the forest for the trees."

Shawn Raymond, a partner at Susman Godfrey, likened Carmody to a portrait artist who creates a magnificent larger image that, when the observer looks closely, is perfectly executed down to the tiniest stroke.

"Bill is very much about the big picture, the end game," Raymond said. "And boy, there is no small detail when he's getting involved in a case that is going to be overlooked."

Carmody's energy is "infectious," Rabin explained.

"I don't want Bill to be more prepared than me, so then I want to become the most prepared lawyer in the courtroom," he said. "And so, this intensity... spreads across everyone, the most senior partners to the most junior paralegals on the case."

"He always looks out for everybody and makes [trial] an enjoyable experience, which can be very unique in today's world," Rabin added.

Outside the courtroom, he coordinates ebullient dinners for the trial team. » Page 8

'I Bring a Passion to What I Do':  
Finalist Jeffrey Kessler of Winston & Strawn

BY ALYSSA AQUINO

YOU don't need to be an attorney to know about the legal victories of Attorney of the Year finalist Jeffrey Kessler.

Kessler, the co-executive chairman of Winston & Strawn, was one of the lead attorneys in the antitrust cases challenging the National Collegiate Athletic Association's limits on student-athlete pay, which resulted in a \$2.75 billion settlement. He's the attorney who Tom Brady turned to when the quarterback looked to challenge his suspension over "Deflategate."

Kessler represented members of the U.S. women's national soccer team when they were crusading for equal pay and secured the rare, unanimous U.S. Supreme Court ruling striking down the NCAA's limits on education-related pay for student-athletes.

His pro bono work is also well-known—he represented Oscar Pistorius, the South African runner whose legs were amputated below the knee and who sought to run

against non-disabled athletes in the Olympics.

And those are just some of Kessler's more recent wins. His work goes back decades, a type of prolificacy that Kessler attributed to his passion for the law.

"I love what I do, I bring a passion to what I do," Kessler told the New York Law Journal. "If I woke in the morning and didn't enjoy what I was doing, I would retire or do something else."

But a lot of this began by accident.

Kessler's first job out of Columbia Law School had been at Weil Gotshal & Manges. Kessler had joined in 1977, right as partner Ira Millstein—who Kessler described as a mentor—represented Oscar Robertson, the then-president of the National Basketball Players Association, in a lawsuit challenging the National Basketball Association's planned merger and restrictions on player mobility.

Kessler was assigned to that case, which resulted in a settlement that pulled back the NBA's reserve clause limiting player movement. Kessler was then

assigned to another sports case, and then another. As the sports practice in Weil Gotshal grew—under the watch of Jim Quinn, another one of Kessler's mentors—Kessler's work in the sports industry "snowballed" until he was leading cases himself.

Though the sports work was a happy accident, Kessler found that it looped back to why he decided to become a lawyer in the first place. Kessler had been inspired by the Civil Rights Movement and the anti-war protests to take action, and felt that he could make a difference as an attorney.

It had been athletes like Muhammad Ali and Bill Russell who had exposed Kessler's younger self to social justice issues, Kessler said.

Through chance, Kessler wound up applying his legal skills "exactly to the type of issues for athletes" that got him interested in being a lawyer in the first place, he said.

But what makes a successful legal career? Eva Cole, who first began working with Kessler when he joined Dewey Ballantine

Jeffrey Kessler of  
Winston Strawn

RYLAND WEST/ALM

in 2003, pointed to Kessler's willingness to take risks.

Despite his iconic sports case-load, half of Kessler's cases have nothing to do with sports, including one 2012 case alleging that client Panasonic was involved in a \$1.7 billion conspiracy to fix the price of lithium ion rechargeable battery cells.

All the other defendants had settled out of the lawsuit, but Kessler believed he could end the case at the class certification stage. He was right; in March 2018, a federal judge refused to certify the class in

a ruling that notched Kessler one of many of Law.com's Litigator of the Week distinctions.

"We were kind of the last defendant standing, because he so truly believed in the position that we were taking," said Cole, who, as the co-head of Winston & Strawn's antitrust practice, continues to work with Kessler.

David Greenspan, who co-leads Winston & Strawn's sports practice, separately highlighted Kessler's ability to remain calm under pressure. He explained that during an arbitration, an adverse

witness was giving unexpected testimony that "was just killing our case" and rendered Kessler's planned cross-examination useless.

"Our side of the room was anxious. Jeffrey calmly gets up—his blood-pressure never changes—and freelances a new cross-examination," said Greenspan. They ultimately won that arbitration.

Kessler admitted that he's a bit of a performer. He believes that an ability to perform serves him well in front of juries, including » Page 8

'Broader Than Grinding Out Litigation':  
Finalist Jeroen van Kwawegen  
Invests Time in Thought Leadership

BY BRIAN LEE

JEROEN van Kwawegen was into an "enjoyable" legal career in his native Netherlands when he left for New York City at age 27 to be with a girlfriend and enroll at Columbia Law School.

After the relationship flamed out, the now 52-year-old partner in Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossman opted to stay in the U.S., and has since carved out a highly successful career in the shareholder rights and securities class-action space.

He says BLB&G has much to be proud of, especially of late.

The litigator co-led a team that took Elon Musk to trial—and won—in a challenge to his \$55 billion executive pay package at Tesla, a landmark nullification that shook public markets.

More broadly, BLB&G, which also has offices in corporate capital of Delaware and Los Angeles, Chicago and New Orleans, has "professionalized the shareholder bar

in the governance space," said van Kwawegen, a member of the firm's executive team.

It started taking cases to trial when most other litigation would result in settlements, said van Kwawegen, who also heads its corporate governance department.

"That changed the dynamic in a lot of these cases," he said. "We've had six or seven trials the last five years, and sometimes you win, sometimes you lose. We started winning some, including Musk, and the defense bar went completely nuts and changed the law because they felt we were winning too much."

The litigator suggests the pendulum has now swung toward an "anti-shareholder" climate in Delaware, though he said the environment isn't as bad as in Texas or Nevada, as the debate rages on.

He said his firm's governance group doesn't take the daily approach of simply burying itself in litigation, as it's actively involved in thought leadership.

Along those lines, van Kwawegen is a member of the advisory board at both the Millstein Center at Columbia Law School and the Institute for Law & Economics at the University of Pennsylvania's Penn Carey Law School.

He frequently speaks at bar association and industry events on shareholder litigation and corporate governance, and regularly publishes pieces on topics of interest to institutional investors.

"We're very much part of that ecosystem, in part out of need, because the defense bar has always been part of that ecosystem and nobody was really hearing from the shareholder bar, talking about what the interest of institutional investors are," van Kwawegen said.

"In some ways, we see our role and I see my role as broader than just grinding day-to-day litigation, although I really enjoy that," van Kwawegen said.

Although his practice areas concern wealth, van Kwawegen says he did not grow up wealthy,

Jeroen van  
Kwawegen of  
Bernstein Litowitz  
Berger and  
Grossman

RYLAND WEST/ALM

and was the first in his family to attend college.

"I never thought I'd become this hot-shot lawyer doing arguments all over the country, or taking Tesla to trial," van Kwawegen said.

A 1998 University of Amsterdam School of Law grad, he spent 16 months at the Dutch firm Schut & Grosheide before coming to the U.S. and graduating from Columbia Law in 2003.

He then spent six years at Latham & Watkins before joining his current firm in 2009.

Mentoring attorneys, in the

same way senior colleagues embraced him, remains a priority, van Kwawegen said.

The litigator reflected about how a partner in Schut & Grosheide took interest in him as a young associate. He was given "enormous freedom" while being allowed to argue national arbitration cases.

He remembered representing a sesame seed grower from Ethiopia who wasn't getting paid for the seeds he delivered to a Dutch buyer.

Mostly he remembered becoming an honorary member of the partner's family.

"I would go to his house, sit in his garden and we'd review my notes for the next day's arguments. I would have dinner with his family, and then he would kick me out of his house because he still needed to work and I needed to work."

After van Kwawegen's breakup, the Dutch partner thought his protégé would return to the Netherlands, but he was told, "No, I kind of like it here." So I stayed and built career here."

It's quite the understatement. He also prosecuted a stockholder derivative action » Page 8

Expert Analysis

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE URBAN LANDSCAPE

# Unusual Suspects Scuttling City Solutions

Frustration has grown in recent years over the inability to complete major projects aimed at improving the housing, streets, and parks that lie at the core of the urban experience.

Much of this frustration has focused on legal protections adopted decades ago in response to destructive and unchecked public-works projects—for example, the interstate highway system's demolition of Black urban neighborhoods—and on advocates seeking to enforce those protections. Pressure is building to the point that long-reviled strongmen like Robert Moses are seen as models.

To be sure, the current regulatory environment creates substantial hurdles for projects, and those affected by proposed projects routinely sue, too often invoking civil-rights concerns when in truth they simply are doing everything possible to block changes, including ones that would open the door to others coming into their neighborhoods.

But they are not the only culprits, as revealed by two recent examples in New York City where important projects were scuttled. And each example features a dramatic plot twist.

### The Elizabeth Street Garden Intrigue

Just as work was to begin, New York City announced on June 23 that it was abandoning a years-long plan to build affordable housing for seniors on a city-owned plot in Soho, the glitzy Manhattan enclave that has seen little affordable housing built in recent decades.

In 1991 the city leased the full-block plot to an Allan Reiver, who used a building occupying a portion of the plot as an art gallery and developed the adjoining open space into what became known as

*CHRIS DUNN is the former legal director of the New York Civil Liberties Union. After 20 years of authoring the Law Journal's Civil Rights and Civil Liberties column, his new column examines civil rights and urban planning.*

By  
**Chris  
Dunn**



the Elizabeth Street Garden, which over time included sculptures.

In 2013 the city identified the plot as a possible development site for affordable senior housing—dubbed “Haven Green”—after which Reiver opened the garden to the public for limited hours.

As ultimately envisioned, Haven Green would result in a seven-story building occupying a portion of the lot and yielding 123 apartments while leaving about 6,700 square feet of open space fully accessible to the public.

The technical requirements of environmental-review schemes like SEQRA are the basis for many lawsuits brought by project opponents, often delaying projects in ways that imperil them even if the cases lack merit.

Given the nature of the project, it was subject to state and city environmental-review procedures, as specified in the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). That process entails an initial determination—in the form of an Environmental Assessment Statement—about whether a project will have significant impacts in specified areas.

If it is determined a project will not have such impacts, known as a “negative declaration,” the SEQRA process comes to an end.

If, however, the initial assessment identifies significant impacts, the project then must complete a time-consuming and expensive Environmental Impact Statement, which includes a more thorough examination of impacts and a

review of potential remedial measures.

The technical requirements of environmental-review schemes like SEQRA are the basis for many lawsuits brought by project opponents, often delaying projects in ways that imperil them even if the cases lack merit.

In November 2018 the city agency leading the Haven Green project issued a negative declaration, concluding the project would not have environmental impacts that would trigger an Environmental Impact Statement, thus ending the environmental-review process.

Facing eviction and having only a month-to-month lease, the tenant Allan Reiver then sued in New York Supreme Court, primarily claiming that the negative declaration violated SEQRA because, he claimed, the project in fact would have significant adverse impacts, including on available open space in the neighborhood.

His supporters and lawyers also mounted a public-relations campaign that generated substantial attention to the controversy.

Though Reiver won a Nov. 2022 Supreme Court order invalidating the negative declaration on the open-space claim, the First Department reversed in June 2023, and the Court of Appeals affirmed the Appellate Division in a memorandum opinion in June 2024. *Elizabeth Street Garden, Inc. v. City of New York*, 2022 N.Y. Slip Op. 33730(U), 2022 WL 16574849 (Nov. 1, 2022); *Elizabeth Street Garden, Inc. v. City of New York*, 217 A.D. 559, 192 N.Y.S.3d 102 (1st Dept. 2023); *Elizabeth Street Garden, Inc. v. City of New York*, 42 N.Y.3d 992 (2024).

The appellate courts agreed that city officials had adequately considered whether the undisputed reduction in the quantity of open space was offset by an increase in the quality of the remaining open space, including the fact the reduced Haven Green open space would be available to the public free of the limits Reiver had imposed.

By the time the Court of Appeals ended the state litigation in the middle of last year, the » Page 7

**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**

- Car Accidents
- Slip & Falls
- Maritime
- Wrongful Death
- Defective Products
- Tire & Rollover Cases
- Traumatic Brain Injury
- Construction Accidents

Co-Counsel and Participation Fees Paid

**RANDY C. BOTWINICK**  
34 Years Experience

**JAY HALPERN**  
39 Years Experience

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

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

From Orlando to Miami... From Tampa to the Keys | [www.personalinjurylawyer.ws](http://www.personalinjurylawyer.ws)

**GERSOWITZ LIBO & KOREK P.C.**

**New Jersey Office**

Let Us Help With Your NJ Injury Litigation

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

**GLK**

39 Years Experience

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

**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](mailto:arbmail@costellalaw.com)

SOUTHERN DISTRICT CIVIL ROUNDUP

# The Power and Limits of The Legislative Privilege

Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, parties have a right to obtain discovery, including testimony of witnesses pursuant to a notice of deposition, regarding matters that are relevant to a party's claims or defenses and proportional to the needs of the case. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1).

Discovery may be limited or precluded, however, when it implicates an applicable privilege. One such privilege is the legislative privilege, which protects lawmakers against discovery into their legislative acts, particularly where a party seeks testimony that goes to the thoughts and motivations of the lawmakers.

The purpose of the privilege is to allow legislators to debate freely and devote their full attention to their legislative duties without concern that their deliberations and acts could be the subject of discovery in subsequent civil proceedings.

In *DoorDash, Inc., et al. v. City of New York*, 2025 WL 1212075 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 25, 2025), Southern District Magistrate Judge Gary Stein recently addressed the tension between the legislative privilege and the discovery that presumptively is authorized under the Federal Rules.

Plaintiffs (out-of-state food delivery businesses) brought a motion to compel the city to produce certain witnesses for deposition, including City Council members and their staff, in a case arising out of claims that a city ordinance imposing fee caps on services provided by plaintiffs was adopted with discriminatory animus toward out-of-state businesses and therefore unconstitutional.

The city refused to produce the requested witnesses, invoking the legislative privilege, and plaintiffs moved to compel their depositions, arguing that the privilege, even if applicable, should not bar the



By  
**Edward M.  
Spiro**

And  
**Christopher  
B. Harwood**

depositions in their entirety and instead, should be invoked, if at all, on a question-by-question basis.

Stein ultimately concluded that the legislative privilege properly was invoked to preclude the depositions altogether, and denied plaintiffs' motion to compel.

### 'DoorDash Inc. v. City of New York'

The fee cap legislation at issue in *DoorDash* was co-sponsored by

Plaintiffs argued that the depositions should proceed so the city could object on legislative privilege grounds to particular questions during the depositions, and the court could later rule on any unresolved dispute.

two City Council Members—Francisco Moya and Mark Gjonaj—who made multiple public statements that plaintiffs allege show that, in enacting the legislation, the City Council had an animus towards out-of-state businesses, such as plaintiffs, and an intent to protect local economic interests, in violation of numerous constitutional provisions, including the Dormant Commerce Clause.

Following denial of the city's motion to dismiss by Judge Gregory H. Woods, 692 F. Supp. 3d 268 (S.D.N.Y. 2023), the case proceeded to discovery.

Plaintiffs served deposition notices on City Council member Moya, then-former Council member

Gjonaj, and Gjonaj's former chief of staff, Reginald Johnson, under Rule 30(b)(1), which permits plaintiffs to “identify a specific officer, director, or managing agent to be deposed.” (Quoting *In re Terrorist Attacks on Sept. 11, 2001*, 2020 WL 8611024, at \*3 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 27, 2024)).

Plaintiffs also served deposition notices on the city under Rule 30(b)(6), which permits a party to depose “a public or private corporation, a partnership, an association, a governmental agency, or other entity.”

When the city invoked the legislative privilege and refused to produce those individuals for depositions, plaintiffs moved to compel their testimony, and also to compel the city to designate a witness or witnesses to sit for the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition.

### Relevant Legal Principles

The legislative privilege is codified in Article I of the U.S. Constitution as the Speech or Debate Clause and, as Stein explained, provides two “absolute protections” to members of Congress and its staff: “(1) immunity from suit for their legislative acts and (2) protection from being compelled to testify in court and produce information about acts that fall within the ‘legitimate legislative sphere.’” (Quoting *Citizens Union of Cty. of N.Y. v. Att’y Gen. of N.Y.*, 269 F. Supp. 3d 124, 150 (S.D.N.Y. 2017)).

Stein further explained that New York's constitution contains a corresponding Speech or Debate Clause, as does the New York City Charter, and that based on principles of comity, federal courts “have extended the doctrines of legislative immunity and legislative privilege to state and local lawmakers.”

Within the Second Circuit, Stein explained, the privilege has been applied to protect legislators and their staff from compelled disclosure of evidence related to their legislative activity, especially when the testimony sought is related to their thoughts and motivations.

Stein pointed out, however, that the privilege is not absolute. He explained that the party » Page 6

EDWARD M. SPIRO and CHRISTOPHER B. HARWOOD are principals of Morvillo Abramowitz Grand Iason & Anello P.C. EMILY SMIT, an associate at Morvillo Abramowitz, assisted with the preparation of this article.

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

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

Request your **FREE DEMO** today at [at.alm.com/LegalCompass](http://at.alm.com/LegalCompass)

**ALM.** Intelligence | LEGAL COMPASS

**Looking for an accomplished expert?**

**ALM Experts has leaders in every discipline.**

ONE ultimate resource includes:

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

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

**ALMExperts.com**  
Your source for experts, consultants & litigation support services.

**ALM.**

## Off the Front

### Gun Permit

« Continued from page 1

monly referred to as “good guy” letters, following their departures.

Without “good guy” letters, plaintiffs could not receive a Retired Law Enforcement Permit, the judge wrote. They were not permitted to retain their service weapons, as is customary, and had to surrender all handguns in their possession, including personally-owned firearms.

Denial also meant they received credentials with a different colored background, a visible sign to other law enforcement officers that they were precluded from carrying a gun.

The judge’s decision also reveals that Sposato, who left the role of sheriff in 2023, has since “surprisingly” been appointed as Commissioner of Corrections for the County.

In that role, Sposato testified that he will once again assume

responsibility for signing the permit recommendations for retiring officers and deputy sheriffs.

Brown issued his ruling following an inquest and testimony from both sides.

“That letter is an attestation of your character,” lead plaintiff Alexandros Perros testified at the inquest. “It sums up your career. It’s not only for a pistol permit. It attests to who you are and your moral character.”

Perros, who was forced to retire after he was attacked by “an incarcerated mental patient” while saving a hospital staffer, told the court he felt unsafe without the permit when he was approached by former inmates he helped incarcerate.

The more than \$280,000 award includes \$150,000 in punitive damages found solely against Sposato. In his decision, Brown noted that the county has agreed to indemnify Sposato for that cost, “notwithstanding its legal immunity from punitive

damages and in seeming contravention of New York public policy.”

While plaintiffs received “good guy” letters when another sheriff took office, the judge said he was open to considering other forms of injunctive relief, given Sposato’s testimony about his new job.

“Considering Sposato’s unforeseen testimony that he expects to resume control” of issuing recommendation letters, Brown wrote that the status of plaintiff’s initial injunctive relief request “may have become newly relevant.”

Plaintiffs have 30 days to alert the judge about any additional relief sought.

John Carnevale, a Deputy County Attorney representing the defendants, said his office was reviewing the decision.

“We have no further comment at this time,” he said.

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

### Tariffs

« Continued from page 1

first Trump administration, that move may have been taken in light of how split the judges appeared.

“The way they handled the process here may have also reflected the fact that we had such a split among judges in terms of majority opinion. There was seven to four, but a pretty vigorous dissent,” said Ryan Majerus, who also served in the Biden administration’s U.S. Department of Commerce. He is currently a trade partner at King & Spalding.

#### A ‘Limited-Reach’ Decision

The Trump administration’s tariffs rely on a provision of IEEPA allowing a U.S. president to “regulate... importation” in response to an “unusual and extraordinary threat.” The administration has argued that language allows the president to enact new duties, while a group of small businesses claim it can only support economic sanctions, such as trade embargoes. Until Trump entered office, no other U.S. president had used IEEPA to create new duties.

Although seven judges voted against the tariffs, they avoided the broader question of whether IEEPA can be used to create any duties and instead determined that the law couldn’t support Trump’s tariffs, which the jurists found to be “unbounded in scope, amount and duration.”

It is “a limited-reach opinion,” said Andrew Morris, senior litigation counsel at the New Civil Liberties Alliance, the conservative legal group representing the small

business importers challenging the duties.

During a call with the National Law Journal and Law.com, Morris highlighted an additional decision provided by four members of the majority. Penned by Circuit Judge Tiffany Cunningham, the group concluded that the emergency law cannot be used for tariffs.

Morris praised the opinion, calling it “very sound lawyering that eliminates the problem of the administration coming back” with more tariffs.

The duty challengers, who are also represented by former acting U.S. Solicitor General Neal Katyal, intend on pushing their broader challenge as the case continues, according to Morris.

That interpretation of IEEPA has also found support from the libertarian think tank, the Cato Institute.

In a separate interview, Brent Skorup, a legal fellow at the Cato Institute’s Robert A. Levy Center for Constitutional Studies, said the circuit win “wasn’t as clean as we would have liked.”

“The decision here was somewhat muddled,” Skorup said, “that could lead to more litigation about how high is too high.”

#### A High Court Appeal

Tariffs have been a major policy priority for Trump, who has described himself as a “tariff man,” and his administration has signaled that they would seek high court review. But would the Supreme Court accept such a case?

The fact that four judges signed onto a more-than-60-page dissent seemed to raise the chances that the justices would wade into the

issue, according to Majerus.

“Having such vigorous disagreement, I think, almost assures that they’re going to grant cert,” said Majerus.

The dissent, penned by Obama-appointed Circuit Judge Richard Taranto and joined by Chief Judge Kimberly Moore, among others, defends the tariffs based on the president’s foreign policy powers in times of national emergencies.

“The dissent offers a pretty full-throated defense for IEEPA’s authorization for imposing tariffs and could give a roadmap for the Supreme Court, if they were to reverse the Federal Circuit,” Majerus said.

Several trade experts agreed that a high court case would be close, with Reed Smith associate, Justin Angotti, pointing out that both the White House and the tariff challengers are using conservative legal arguments.

The White House has defended the duties based on presidential authority, while challengers—whose New Civil Liberties Alliance attorneys spearheaded the successful legal campaign against Chevron deference—are invoking the major questions doctrine and relying on textual analysis.

“You have these doctrines that the conservative judges of this court use in other opinions, other cases, but you now have two of them on one side and one of them on the other,” said Angotti.

“Even the groups supporting the plaintiffs are not the sort of folks who are anti-administration,” he added.

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

### Castle

« Continued from page 1

The Brimelows’ attorney, Frederick C. Kelly, told the Law Journal the allegations were false, and his client was being “targeted for their political speech.”

James alleged the Brimelows had transferred its most valuable assets to organizations they control when it announced the organization was ceasing operations in July 2024.

But it then illegally continued to solicit donations, James alleged.

At the time, the VDARE website announced Peter Brimelow had resigned as the publication’s editor and from the organization’s board because of “the lethal lawfare waged against us by” James.

Lydia Brimelow was purported to continue as president of the foundation, but only to handle the administrative details of its wind down and to pay lawyers, according to the organization’s announcement.

But the investigation begun by James’ office in 2022 allegedly revealed the Brimelows had used \$1.4 million of VDARE’s charitable funds in 2020 to buy a medieval-style castle in the popular West Virginia tourist town Berkeley Springs.

The castle was purportedly acquired for VDARE’s offices and conferences, but the Brimelows moved their family in and then orchestrated a series of transactions that transferred ownership of the property to companies they owned or controlled, James said.

The arrangements were allegedly structured by Lydia Brimelow’s father, “rubber-stamped” by a board dominated by the Brimelows.

“Charities are intended to serve the public, not to bankroll castles

or pad personal fortunes,” James said in a media statement. “The Brimelows used VDARE like their personal piggy bank, draining millions in charitable assets to enrich themselves. New Yorkers deserve accountability, and we will not allow these bad actors to keep abusing the trust of their donors and the public. My office is taking action to ensure these funds are used for their intended charitable purpose, remove the Brimelows from control, and shut down this fraudulent organization.”

The Brimelows’ attorney likened the lawsuit to James’ civil fraud lawsuit against President Donald Trump, alleging he inflated his wealth.

Kelly said James’ motivation could be explained in Appellate Division, First Department Justice David Friedman’s scathing dissent on Aug. 21 in which he rebukes James for bringing the complaint against Trump, as part of the appeals court voiding Trump’s \$515 million penalty.

“Again and again Justice Friedman called attention to Letitia James’s free speech depredations in his concurrence/dissent,” Kelly said.

“Leopards do not change their spots,” Kelly said of his juxtapose. “What you are seeing is the vindication of Justice Friedman’s dissent in real time, with James again retaliating against people for exercising freedom of speech. VDARE and the Brimelows are being targeted for political speech, period. The ruling class in New York simply cannot abide dissent where issues of race and ethnicity are concerned, and VDARE under the Brimelows’ effort specialized in puncturing the reigning pieties of the day and smashing taboos.”

James’ lawsuit said VDARE’s had just \$150,000 in its coffers

when the Brimelows announced the shuttering.

She said it had sent more than \$1.7 million to a West Virginia corporation created by Lydia Brimelow; nearly \$1.2 million to a now-defunct Connecticut corporation owned by the Brimelows; at least \$39,000 in backdated, unrepaid loans to a for-profit company created and controlled by Lydia Brimelow; and \$230,000 to her father for consulting services, and shut down this fraudulent transaction.

The Brimelows allegedly sold their remaining interest in the castle to the company linked to Lydia Brimelow’s father, and they accepted \$168,000—far below a prior appraised valuation of more than \$600,000.

James said her office’s investigation uncovered communications in which Lydia Brimelow and her father acknowledged the risk of regulatory scrutiny and agreed to reassess the property’s value downward.

VDARE had previously been found in contempt of a judicial order to comply with James’ investigative subpoena. In October, state Supreme Court Justice Sabrina Kraus awarded James’ office a \$43,500 judgment.

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

#### Letters Welcome

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

## Outside Counsel

### Seen ‘and’ Heard: Representing the Child’s Wishes

In recent years, there has been a general consensus that children are entitled to a voice, and representation, in most matters that affect them. Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child provides that “States parties shall assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her views the right to express those views freely in all matters affecting the child...”

The Supreme Court’s landmark decision in *Application of Gault*, 387 U.S. 1 (1967) provided that children are entitled to representation in the context of juvenile delinquency proceedings. States have extended the right to representation to various other contexts—for instance, child protective proceedings, adoption proceedings and child custody proceedings.

Nationally, states take different approaches to children’s representation in Family Law proceedings. Many states use a guardian *ad litem* model, wherein the mandate is to advocate for the child’s best interests.

The role of an attorney for the child is less well defined, with some states providing that an attorney for the child is required to advocate the child’s wishes, and others adopting a hybrid of the role of attorney for the child and guardian *ad litem*. See Howard A. Davidson, “The Child’s Right To Be Heard And Represented,” 18 Pepp. L. Rev. 255 (Jan. 1991).

It has been persuasively argued that, because the two roles are in many cases fundamentally at odds, a dual role of this nature inherently leads to ethical conflicts wherein an attorney representing a child is torn between advocating for the child’s wishes and the attorney’s own concept of the child’s best interests, which may vary from the expressed wishes of the child. See, e.g., Victoria Sexton, “Wait, Who Am I Representing? The Need for States to Separate the Role of Child’s Attorney and Guardian Ad Litem,” 31 Geo. J. Legal Ethics 831

Laurie McPherson is the principal of The McPherson Firm. Deepti Shenoy was formerly a partner at the firm.



By Laurie McPherson



And Deepti Shenoy

(Fall 2018); Barbara Ann Atwood, “Representing Children: The Ongoing Search for Clear and Workable Standards,” 19 J. Am. Acad. Matr. Law 183 (2005).

In New York, where there is a longstanding tradition of providing representation to children in a variety of contexts, the law favors the appointment of attorneys for children, rather than guardians *ad*

It is too often the case that attorneys for children in matrimonial matters take on the role of quasi-forensic evaluators, offering their own judgments in lieu of their clients’ positions.

*litem*, when the child in question is capable of knowing and voluntary judgment.

The Family Court Act provides that an attorney representing a child must adhere to the ethical standards applicable to all attorneys and must zealously advocate the child’s wishes in all proceedings other than juvenile delinquency proceedings, wherein the attorney must zealously defend the child. 22 NYCRR §7.2. In defining the role of the attorney for the child, the Family Court Act provides as follows:

In ascertaining the child’s position, the attorney for the child must consult with and advise the child to the extent of and in a manner consistent with the child’s capacities, and have a thorough knowledge of the child’s circumstances. If the child is capable of knowing,

voluntary and considered judgment, the attorney for the child *should be directed by the wishes of the child, even if the attorney for the child believes that what the child wants is not in the child’s best interests.*

The attorney should explain fully the options available to the child, and may recommend to the child a course of action that in the attorney’s view would best promote the child’s interests. 22 NYCRR § 7.2 (d) (1)-(2) (emphasis added).

It is only when:

...the attorney for the child is convinced *either* that the child *lacks the capacity for knowing, voluntary and considered judgment, or that following the child’s wishes is likely to result in a substantial risk of imminent, serious harm to the child*, the attorney for the child would be justified in advocating a position that is contrary to the child’s wishes. In these circumstances, the attorney for the child *must inform the court of the child’s articulated wishes if the child wants the attorney to do so*, notwithstanding the attorney’s position. 22 NYCRR §7.2 (d) (3) (emphasis added).

This is, and should be, a high bar. As Professors Merrill Sobie and Gary Solomon observe,

The second exception, substantial risk of imminent, serious harm is intended as a high barrier, which must be met before dispensing with adherence to the child-client’s desires. When the child lacks capacity or is in imminent danger, the attorney may instead advocate ‘best interests,’ or at least what the attorney perceives as best interests. Most child abuse cases involve a substantial risk of harm, and frequently an imminent risk. Most, though surely not all, child neglect cases do not pose an imminent substantial threat to the child. 10 N.Y. Prac., New York Family Court Practice §13:13 (2d ed.).

» Page 8

#### IN BRIEF

« Continued from page 1

practice group global co-chair Kristen Limarzi said in a press release.

For his part, Smith said Gibson Dunn’s “premier platform” provided an “outstanding foundation to deepen my practice and begin the next chapter of my career at this pivotal moment in antitrust enforcement,” citing an increasingly complex regulatory landscape for clients due to a January overhaul of HSR Act filing requirements.

Sullivan & Cromwell did not immediately respond to a request for comment on Smith’s departure.

—Dan Roe

#### Judge Rules in Harvard’s Favor To Unfreeze Funding

Harvard University secured a court victory against the Trump administration on Wednesday, when a federal judge ruled the Trump administration’s actions to freeze federal funding to the university were unlawful, and blocked the government from enforcing past or future freeze orders.

District Court Judge Allison Burroughs sided with the university, granting, in part, Harvard’s motion for summary judgment, calling the government’s freeze orders “arbitrary and capricious,” and ruling that

the administration’s termination and freeze orders violated the First Amendment.

All freezes and terminations of funding to Harvard made pursuant to the Freeze Orders and Termination Letters on or after April 14, 2025 are vacated and set aside, according to court records.

The defendants are “enjoined from implementing, instituting, maintaining, or giving any force or effect to Defendants’ Freeze Orders, Termination Letters, and attendant unconstitutional conditions, as well as any terminations of, freezes of, or refusing to grant or to continue federal funding undertaken pursuant to the Freeze Orders and Termination Letters.”

Plaintiffs collectively challenged the decision to freeze and then terminate the grants on three primary grounds, contending that the funding decisions were made in response to “Harvard’s refusal to capitulate to Defendants’ content- and viewpoint-based demands and its subsequent decision to file a lawsuit, in violation of the First Amendment.”

Burroughs granted the summary judgment to plaintiffs on their First Amendment claims for retaliation, unconstitutional conditions, and unconstitutional coercion, and denied defendants’ competing motions.

“Through the government’s statements and actions, the fate of that research has now become intertwined with the issue of antisemitism at Harvard,” Burroughs wrote.

“Antisemitism, like other types of discrimination or prejudice, is intolerable. And it is clear, even based solely on Harvard’s own admissions, that Harvard has been plagued by antisemitism in recent years and could (and should) have done a better job of dealing with the issue,” she wrote. “That said, there is, in reality, little connection between the research affected by the grant terminations and antisemitism.”

Burroughs accused the defendants of using antisemitism as a “smokescreen” to target the university.

“Defendants acted arbitrarily and capriciously when they froze and subsequently terminated funding to Harvard, as they failed to provide a reasoned explanation for how or why freezing and terminating funding would further the goal of ending antisemitism,” Burroughs concluded.

The case, President and Fellows of Harvard College v. the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, is one of two cases the university filed this year against the administration.

Harvard did not respond to request for comment.

—Christine Charnosky

### Leasing

« Continued from page 1

have different requirements for working in the office.

Renewals in 2025 were frequently for a similar amount of space, and many fewer expansions and or downsizes. However, Cushman & Wakefield found that new leases are very rarely for the same amount of space, with 54% of them during the first half of the year expansions and 44% were downsizes.

New leases have been bigger on average in 2025, exceeding the average from 2019 through 2024 by 13%, while renewals have

been smaller by 3% on average. In 2025, according to the report, 19 deals of more than 75,000 square feet were signed during the first six months, representing 63% of the total in 2024, illustrating the strength of the leasing market.

The legal sector, in fact, has been a significant source of leasing demand in recent years, according to the report, because of law firm growth.

The report includes data collected in 93 U.S. markets about leases of all sizes, Smith said.

New York accounts for 22% of Q2 leasing activity, followed by Washington, D.C., with 8%, and

San Francisco and Dallas, each with 6%. Other major markets include Dallas/Fort Worth (5%), Houston and Chicago (each with 4%), Atlanta (3%), Boston (2%), and Philadelphia (1%). Leasing in other markets totaled 39% for the quarter.

New Jersey and Nashville were the most active leasing markets outside of the major markets.

Because the leasing data includes leases from both large and midsize firms, it is clear that it is not just the Am Law 200 firms that are growing.

© Brenda Sapino Jeffreys can be reached at bjeffreys@alm.com.

# Corporate Update

## August GC Moves of The Month: GE Vernova, ACC, Anthropic and Lennar Make Big Hires

BY GREG ANDREWS

A FLURRY of marquee companies filled legal chief openings in August. The month also saw the Association of Corporate Counsel tap a veteran GC to fill its CEO slot.

Here's a rundown of the top moves of the month:

- Cambridge, Massachusetts-based GE Vernova tapped Howmet Aerospace Chief Legal Officer Lola Lin as legal chief, filling an opening created by the surprise departure of Rachel Gonzalez this spring.



Lola Lin

- The Washington, D.C.-based Association of Corporate Counsel hired GE Appliances General Counsel Jason Brown as CEO, succeeding Veta Richardson, who has been at the helm of the nonprofit for 14 years. Richardson announced last year that 2025 would be her final year.



Jason Brown

- Toronto-based Manulife Financial, which operates in the U.S. as John Hancock, hired former senior JPMorgan Chase attorney Mike Coyne as general counsel. He'll succeed Jim Gallagher, who is retiring after more than a decade in the role.



Katherine Lee Martin

- Xylem, a Washington, D.C.-based designer of wastewater-treatment systems, hired Stacy Cozad as chief legal officer, returning Cozad to the C-suite of a major company after her last role, with suburban Indianapolis-based lock-maker Allegion, did not work out. The company replaced her after just three months, an involuntary termination that entitled her to \$1.9 million in severance.



Mike Coyne

- Milwaukee-based water heater manufacturer A.O. Smith is flipping the duties of two of its senior executives—making Paul Jones, its head of corporate development, general counsel, and making its general counsel, James Stern, head of corporate development.



Paul Jones

- San Francisco-based AI developer Anthropic named Jeffrey Bleich, the former legal chief for the self-driving car company Cruise, general counsel. Bleich, who also is a former U.S. ambassador to Australia and was a top legal adviser to President Barack Obama, will be the company's No. 2 attorney and will report to Chief Legal Officer Brian Israel.



Jeffrey Kerr

- Miami-based homebuilding giant Lennar has hired Katherine Lee Martin as its chief legal officer, succeeding Mark Sustana, who is retiring after 20 years in the role. Lennar hired Martin away from Hertz, where she was legal chief for 14 months.

- In the wake of reaching a \$2.8 billion antitrust settlement that will rewrite the economics of college sports, the Indianapolis-based NCAA promoted General Counsel Scott Bearby, a 25-year veteran of the organization, to chief legal officer.

- The Norfolk, Virginia-based nonprofit People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, gave Jeffrey Kerr, its legal chief for three decades, an additional role: chief operating officer of the PETA Foundation.

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

### RISK AND COMPLIANCE

## The Black Box and a Corporate Duty To Explain AI

By Harshita Ganesh



In March 2025, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California permitted a class action lawsuit to proceed against Cigna Corporation due to the company's use of its AI algorithmic claims tool, "PxDx."

The class action suit alleges that the tool automatically denied certain claims without a meaningful review having been conducted by a licensed physician, which was a violation of ERISA fiduciary duties in addition to a violation of California Health & Safety Code Section 1367.01(e), which requires that medical necessity determinations be made by qualified healthcare providers.

While Cigna argued that its process complied with governing plan terms, the court found that the plaintiffs had plausibly alleged unlawful delegation of decision-making to an opaque AI system, thus allowing the case to move forward. See *Kisting-Leung v. CIGNA Corp.*

These kinds of disputes are no longer going to be rare. Across industries, plaintiffs (and potential plaintiffs) are demanding to know how automatic systems are reaching decisions, with courts and regulators showing less and less patience for "black box" answers. For corporate counsel, these cases are a blaring, alarm-sounding warning: if your AI makes a high-stakes decision, and you cannot explain how or why it came to that conclusion, you are in trouble.

Without usable audit trails, contractual rights to vendor transparency, and internal governance over

AI deployment, your company will not may—face litigation risks that standard compliance programs will not cover. In today's environment, the corporate duty to explain is no longer optional as it is becoming a baseline expectation.

For in-house counsel, the biggest shock in emerging AI litigation is not always the allegations. Often, it is realizing how little the company can actually say about its own AI system's decision-making. Why does the "black box" exist?

It exists because of the technical complexity that defies plain language. AI systems, particularly complex learning models, do not think in a linear, step-like fashion. Instead, they operate through complex, often multi-layered statistical and probabilistic correlations that involve millions (or even billions) of parameters.

While a data scientist may be able to trace which variables influenced a decision, translating that into a legally useful, plain language explanation is, to say the least, complicated. For example, a loan approval model might weigh "ZIP code" heavily, but not because it was intentionally coded for geography. It may do so because it correlates with other variables such as income or credit history. Untangling that logic for litigation could require months or even years of forensic analysis.

Second, vendor-controlled systems and trade secret barriers contribute to the existence of the black box. In many corporate deployments, the AI is not even built in-house. More often than not, it is licensed from a vendor.

The contract may provide the company with usage rights, but no visibility into the model's architecture, training data, or decision logic.

Vendors often assert trade secret protections to block disclosure in litigation, leaving the company caught between a discovery order and a breach of contract claim.

Third, inadequate internal logging and audit trails also contribute to this issue. Even when companies own the AI technology, many lack robust auditing and logging. If the system does not log and record which variables mattered most when arriving at a given decision, or if the logs are overwritten after a short period, there is no paper trail to reconstruct that logic.

In litigation, this poses an obvious problem of the absence of evidence, which can quickly evolve into an adverse inference problem, especially in jurisdictions with strict discovery obligations.

### Corporate Counsel's Duty To Ensure Explainability And Manage AI Risks

Courts and regulators are signaling that a company's duty to explain automated decisions is rapidly

becoming a standard expectation, not just a discretionary best practice. We are seeing this in the court's responses to plaintiffs challenging AI decisions as unlawful discrimination unless companies can demonstrate fair, explainable criteria. See *EEOC v. iTutorGroup* (2023).

explanations under federal and state laws. Failure to meet these duties will expose companies to lawsuits, regulatory investigations and potentially severe penalties.

So how, as corporate counsel, does one discharge these obligations? There are three ways counsel can discharge these duties:

First, log granular data: Every decision should be tied to detailed inputs, timestamps, model versions, and explanatory metadata that can be reviewed and produced during discovery.

Second, produce simplified and comprehensible explanations: Wherever possible, AI outputs should be accompanied by explanations or feature-importance scores that explain why a particular decision was made.

Third, document changes: Maintain detailed records of model development, training data, bias audits, and testing results to support defenses against fairness and accuracy allegations. As corporate counsel, you can also protect your company through vendor contracts

since AI models are often outsourced or licensed. As counsel, make sure to negotiate contractual audit rights and receive model explanations that would be sufficient to respond to litigation or regulatory requests. Additionally, insist on vendor cooperation clauses that will require timely and comprehensive assistance in discovery.

Address trade secret and confidentiality issues upfront, with agreed-upon protective

In litigation, this poses an obvious problem of the absence of evidence, which can quickly evolve into an adverse inference problem, especially in jurisdictions with strict discovery obligations.

Address trade secret and confidentiality issues upfront, with agreed-upon protective

Address trade secret and confidentiality issues upfront, with agreed-upon protective

HARSHITA GANESH is a litigation attorney in the Boston office of CMBG3 Law with a strong background in chemical and biochemical engineering.

## Give Your Clients a Gift with Real Value.

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

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

NewYorkLawJournal.com



## Target Reveals Severance Terms for Ousted Legal Chief

BY CHRIS O'MALLEY

STRUGGLING retailer Target will pay former Chief Legal and Compliance Officer Amy Tu about \$3 million in "income continuation payments" over the next 24 months.

Minneapolis-based Target's payouts to Tu are contained in a "transition agreement" the parties negotiated that Target filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission last week.



Amy Tu's last day with Target was June 1, but the company will be paying her until mid-2027.

The company dismissed Tu in May, after only nine months into the job, providing no public explanation for doing so. At the same time, it terminated Chief Strategy and Growth Officer Christina Hennington, classifying each as an involuntarily termination without cause.

Tu's transition agreement also accelerates vesting for various restricted stock awards that Tu would have forfeited had she voluntarily left the company. The filing does not quantify the value of that equity. However, in its proxy statement filed in April, Target estimated the value of accelerated vesting for its most-senior executives, tabbing Tu's at \$4.7 million.

Tu, who signed the transition agreement May 20, did not respond on Tuesday to a request for comment from Law.com.

Tu was Target's second-highest-paid executive in 2024—earning \$10.5 million, despite not joining the company until Aug. 28. Her salary for the final four months of the year totaled \$364,904.

The bulk of the \$10.5 million—\$2.6 million in cash and \$4 million in stock—represented sign-on awards Tu received to offset compensation she forfeited by leaving her last employer, Springdale, Arkansas-based Tyson Foods, where she'd been a senior executive for seven years.

However, her quick exit appears to have wiped out the bulk of her 2024 pay. The proxy says Tu's \$2.6 million in cash was subject to repayment if Tu left by choice or was involuntarily termi-

# New York Law Journal

Serving the Bench and Bar Since 1888



Official Publication for the First  
And Second Judicial Departments

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

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Gina Passarella,<br/>Editor-in-Chief of Global Legal Brands</p> <p>Joe Pavone,<br/>Senior Director of Sales - West, Marketing Solutions</p> <p>Donald Chalphin,<br/>Global Director of ALM Event Sales &amp; Sponsorships</p> <p>Andrew Denney,<br/>Bureau Chief</p> <p>Christine Simmons,<br/>Deputy Bureau Chief</p> <p><b>Submissions Editors:</b><br/>Jade Lopez, Kristie Rearick</p> <p><b>Reporters:</b><br/>Alyssa Aquino, Ryan Harroff,<br/>Brian Lee, Emily Saul</p> <p><b>Art Department:</b><br/>Monika Kozak, Rafal Pytel,<br/>Ryland West, photographer</p> <p><b>Decisions:</b><br/>Jason Ducena, William Thiess</p> <p><b>Calendars:</b><br/>Patricia Kane, editor</p> <p><b>Production:</b><br/>Agnieszka Czuj, Susan Ferguson,<br/>Stephen Warren</p> <p><b>Web:</b><br/>Lora Hollien</p> <p><b>Copy Desk:</b><br/>Sean Gossard</p> | <p><b>BOARD OF EDITORS</b></p> <p>Matthew Biben, Sheila Birnbaum,<br/>Sheila Boston, Mary Eaton,<br/>Robert Giuffra, Taa Grays,<br/>Ruth S. Hochberger,<br/>Patricia M. Hynes, Roberta Kaplan,<br/>Victor A. Kovner, Judith Livingston,<br/>Scott E. Mollen, Carolyn Nussbaum,<br/>Thomas Oliva, David Schulz,<br/>Alan Vinegrad, Dwight Yoo,<br/>Mark C. Zauderer</p> <p><b>EDITORS EMERITUS</b></p> <p>Floyd Abrams, H. Rodgin Cohen,<br/>Robert B. Fiske Jr., Barry Kamins,<br/>Charles G. Moerdler,<br/>Herbert Rubin</p> <p><b>ALM:</b></p> <p>212-457-9400<br/>800-888-8300<br/>New York City Newsroom: 212-457-7958<br/>Legal Notices: 866-305-3058</p> | <p><b>ALM SENIOR MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>Bill Carter, CEO</p> <p>Richard Green, Chief Commercialization Officer</p> <p>Mark Okean, Chief Financial Officer</p> <p>Patrick Fuller, Chief Legal Industry Strategist</p> <p>Erin Dziekan, Chief People Officer</p> <p>Patrice Coughlin, Chief of Staff</p> <p>Jimi Li, Chief Technology Officer</p> <p>Richard Caruso, SVP, Product, Legal</p> <p>Josh Gazes, SVP, Operations</p> <p>Gina Passarella, SVP, Content, Legal</p> <p><b>READER'S SERVICES</b></p> <p>For subscriptions and to purchase back issues, call 1-877-256-2472.</p> <p>For questions regarding reprints and permissions, call 1-877-257-3382, e-mail reprints@alm.com, or visit almreprints.com.</p> <p>Send decisions of interest to decisions@alm.com</p> <p>To access decisions and articles published in the Law Journal, visit nylj.com.</p> |
|---|--|---|

## ALM.

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

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

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

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

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

Postmaster: Send address changes to the New York Law Journal, 150 East 42nd Street, Mezzanine Level, New York, N.Y. 10017. Available on microfilm and microfiche. Rates on request.

The New York Law Journal® is a registered trademark of ALM Media Properties, LLC.

## Sullivan

« Continued from page 1

Supreme Court, Giuffra said, adding that her addition to the New York office will be a benefit to the new clients. That practice is co-led by Jeff Wall, former acting solicitor general, and Giuffra said Dubin is far from the first attorney to join from that government office.

"Yaira will be involved in everything from the legal issues that we have in trial courts, setting those legal issues up for appeals to intermediate courts," Giuffra said. "Then, to the extent that we have to go to the Supreme Court, she would work on all that. I think the thing that's different about this is if you were to look at other firms that are in this space, I'd say virtually all have the Supreme Court litigators in Washington. So the fact that she'll be in New York is different."

Sullivan & Cromwell is involved in several prominent appellate cases, including representing President Trump in the criminal case brought against him over hush money payments made to

adult film star Stormy Daniels and also the civil fraud case brought against him by New York Attorney General Letitia James.

Giuffra, who leads those two cases for Trump, said Dubin will not be working on those cases necessarily as the firm "already has a team for those cases."

Outside of cases involving the president, the firm's other prominent appellate work includes representing FirstEnergy Corp. before the Sixth Circuit in a case regarding the high-profile bribery scandal the company admitted to its role in with former Ohio House Speaker Larry Householder. The firm also successfully got Citibank NA approval to file an interlocutory appeal on Tuesday in a case brought against it by the State of New York for allegedly failing to protect its customers from online wire transfer fraud.

Giuffra said that Sullivan & Cromwell has found increased appellate work a good way to be introduced to new clients and that bringing Dubin aboard is part of the firm's continued commitment to that practice area.

"We're increasingly finding that clients are coming to us post-trial and trying to get us involved in cases," Giuffra said. "In addition, a lot of clients particularly in very high profile, complicated cases are looking to get lawyers who are both the trial lawyers and then the appellate lawyers lined up from the beginning, because they kind of know that there's going to be an appellate battle and the major decision will be in the Supreme Court or in a court of appeals."

Durbin's addition to the firm's New York office comes after some recent shakeups in the partnership, as two partners and a special counsel just departed for other firms. The firm has also recently added some new talent in its London office, including a restructuring partner from Kirkland & Ellis, amid an especially active lateral market.

Giuffra declined to comment on the recent departures from the firm or whether there were more additions coming soon.

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

## Judicial Ethics

### Opinions From the Advisory Committee on Judicial Ethics

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

**Opinion:** 25-57(A)

**Facts/Issue:** A judge asks if he/she may preside in matters where his/her first cousin once removed appears as an attorney.

**Discussion:** The Rules Governing Judicial Conduct require a judge to disqualify in a proceeding where the "judge knows that the judge or the judge's spouse, or a person known by the judge to be within the fourth degree of relationship to either of them, or the spouse of such a person, is acting as a lawyer in the proceeding or is likely to be a material witness in the proceeding" (22 NYCRR 100.3[E][1][e] [emphasis added]).

While a first cousin is a fourth-degree relative under the Rules (see 22 NYCRR 100.0[C]), a first cousin once removed is a fifth-degree relative.

As the attorney here is the judge's fifth-degree relative, the judge may preside so long as he/she can remain fair and impartial. It is good practice to disclose the relationship; should any party object, the decision whether to preside remains discretionary.

**Conclusion:** A judge may preside in matters where a fifth-degree relative appears as an attorney, but should disclose the relationship.

**Authorities:** Opinion 22-10.

**Opinion:** 25-57(B)

**Facts/Issue:** A town justice asks about his/her ethical obligations now that the town has installed video-only cameras in the multi-purpose room that also serves as the judge's courtroom.

**Discussion:** We have advised that a town justice whose town installs video-only cameras in the courtroom should object in writing and notify an appropriate administrative or supervising judge of the town's installation of the cameras in the courtroom. Recognizing that town and village justice courtrooms may be designated for other purposes when court is not in session, we

noted that "one ethically permissible alternative to removing the cameras entirely would be to provide the judge with a simple and effective method to shut down the courtroom cameras, and ensure that they remain off, while court is in session." Whether to propose such an alternative is left to the discretion of the judge, in consultation with court administrators.

**Conclusion:** A town justice must object in writing to the town's installation of cameras in the courtroom and notify an appropriate administrative or supervising judge. Where the courtroom is a multipurpose room, the judge has discretion to consult with court administrators about providing the judge a method of keeping the cameras off during court sessions, instead of removing them.

**Authorities:** Opinion 24-67.

#### DECISIONS WANTED!

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

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.

## Disciplinary Proceeding

### Matter of Regina L. Darby an attorney and counselor-at-law

Motion No. 2025-03172

#### Appellate Division, First Department

Friedman, J.P., González,  
Mendez, O'Neill Levy,  
Michael, J.J.

Decided: August 21, 2025

Jorge Dopico, Chief Attorney, Attorney Grievance Committee, New York (Gina Patterson, of counsel), for petitioner

Respondent, pro se.

*Per curiam*—Respondent Regina L. Darby was admitted to the practice of law in the State of New York by the First Judicial Department on July 7, 1977. Respondent attests that she is also admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court and U.S. District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York. This Court maintains continuing jurisdiction over respondent as the admitting Judicial Department (Rules for Attorney Disciplinary Matters [22 NYCRR] §1240.7[a][2]).

Respondent now seeks an order, pursuant to 22 NYCRR 1240.10, accepting her resignation as an attorney and counselor-at-law licensed to practice in the State of New York. In support of the relief sought respondent submitted her affidavit of resignation which

conforms to the format set forth in Appendix A to 22 NYCRR 1240.10.

Respondent acknowledges that she is currently the subject of an investigation by the Attorney Grievance Committee (AGC) involving two allegations of professional misconduct. The first allegation concerns a commercial matter that was dismissed at least in part due to respondent's failure to appear in court. The second allegation involves respondent commencing an action, subsequently advising the client she could no longer provide representation, but then failing to formally withdraw as counsel.

Respondent accurately attests that the AGC's investigation does not allege that she willfully misappropriated or misapplied client money or property in the practice of law. Respondent attests that she cannot successfully defend against the allegations based upon the facts and circumstances of her professional conduct as described in the affidavit of resignation. Respondent attests that her resignation is freely and voluntarily rendered, without coercion or duress by anyone, and with full awareness of the consequences, including that the Court's acceptance and approval shall result in the entry of an order of disbarment striking her name from the roll of attorneys and counselors-at-law.

Respondent acknowledges that her resignation is submitted subject to any application that may be made by a Committee to any Department of the Appellate Division for an order, pursuant to Judiciary Law §90(6-a), directing that she makes restitution or reimburse the Lawyers' Fund for Client Protection, and she consents

to the continuing jurisdiction of the Appellate Division to make such an order.

Additionally, respondent acknowledges and agrees that pending issuance of an order accepting her resignation, she shall not undertake to represent any new clients or accept any retainers for future legal services to be rendered and that there will be no transactional activity in any fiduciary account to which she has access, other than for payment of funds held therein on behalf of clients or others entitled to receive them. She understands that in the event the Court accepts her resignation, the order resulting from this application and the records and documents filed in relation to the aforementioned allegations, including her affidavit, shall be deemed public records pursuant to Judiciary Law §90(10).

The AGC states that it does not oppose respondent's motion to resign while an investigation is pending. The AGC also does not oppose the relief sought in respondent's motion and recommends her resignation from the practice of law be granted.

As respondent's affidavit conforms with 22 NYCRR 1240.10, the Court accepts her resignation (see e.g. *Matter of Thomas*, 178 AD3d 58 [1st Dept 2019]; *Matter of Hock*, 171 AD3d 173 [1st Dept 2019]; *Matter of Wallen*, 149 AD3d 235 [1st Dept 2017]).

Accordingly, the motion should be granted, and respondent's name is stricken from the roll of attorneys and counselors-at-law in the State of New York, effective nunc pro tunc to May 30, 2025, the date of her affidavit.

All concur.

## Legislative

« Continued from page 3

invoking the privilege bears the burden of establishing it applies, and that district courts within the Second Circuit apply the "Rodriguez" test to determine whether it applies. In applying the Rodriguez test, a court balances four factors:

(i) the relevance of the evidence sought to be protected; (ii) the availability of other evidence; (iii) the "seriousness" of the litigation and the issues involved; (iv) the role of the government in the litigation; and (v) the possibility of future timidity by government employees who will be forced to recognize that their secrets are violable. (Quoting *Rodriguez v. Pataki*, 280 F. Supp. 2d 89, 101 (S.D.N.Y.), *aff'd* 293 F. Supp. 2d 302 (S.D.N.Y.).

#### Application of Relevant Principles to DoorDash

As an initial matter, Stein rejected plaintiffs' threshold argument that it was premature for the court to consider whether the legislative privilege bars the City Council members' depositions in their entirety.

Plaintiffs argued that the depositions should proceed so the city could object on legislative privilege grounds to particular questions during the depositions, and the court could later rule on any unresolved dispute.

Plaintiffs contended that in the Second Circuit, legislative privilege objections are resolved "only after depositions [take] place."

Stein disagreed, finding plaintiffs' approach "incompatible with the privilege's scope and rationale."

He found plaintiffs' argument—"that legislative privilege cannot bar the requested depositions in their entirety but instead can only bar particular questions asked in those depositions that intrude upon privileged matter"—to "rest[] on an overly narrow conception of the legislative privilege doctrine."

Because "[t]he legislative privilege is principally framed to ensure that legislatures are free to make difficult decisions on controversial issues without fear that their decision-making process will later be scrutinized or that their time will be consumed with responding to discovery requests in litigation," Stein found plaintiffs' argument that they should be permitted to "pursu[e] areas of questions that purportedly do not implicate the privilege . . . unavailing."

In any event, Stein found that "plaintiffs' proposed lines of questioning do implicate the privilege because they relate to the City Council witnesses' performance of legislative duties."

He also concluded that requiring City Council members to sit for depositions and postponing

addressing questions of legislative privilege would be "incompatible with the privilege's scope and rationale," because the city will likely object to questions, requiring a second deposition if the court overrules any of the objections, which would "magnify[] the very intrusion that the privilege is intended to minimize."

Having determined that the legislative privilege analysis should be applied pre-deposition, Stein went on to evaluate the city's invocation of the privilege under the Rodriguez balancing test, and he found that four of the five factors weighed in favor of the city.

First, in evaluating the relevancy of the testimony, Stein found that although the information sought from the City Council member

City Council members noticed for deposition were the co-sponsors and alleged to be the "driving force" of the legislation, they played a "far greater role" in the alleged misconduct—and therefore the litigation—than a legislator "who simply voted for the bill."

Stein found the final factor, "the chilling effect on the legislative process," weighed in favor of denying the requested depositions. He noted that plaintiffs' proposed lines of questioning go directly to the legislative process, implicating the legislative privilege.

He concluded that because New York City councilmembers consider significant amounts of impactful and controversial legislation, compelling depositions could chill

Plaintiffs argued that the depositions should proceed so the city could object on legislative privilege grounds to particular questions during the depositions, and the court could later rule on any unresolved dispute.

witnesses is relevant to whether the law was enacted with a constitutionally impermissible purpose, the importance of testimony from the individual legislators is limited because (i) the City Council is made up of 51 members, each with their own intent, and (ii) the constitutionality of the legislation "must be assessed on the basis of the intent of the... council as a whole."

Second, Stein evaluated whether other evidence of intent is available, which he found weighed in favor of the city because plaintiffs have access to a "considerable amount of evidence" related to the intent and purpose underlying the legislation through public sources and non-public materials that the city and third parties already had produced.

He then considered the third factor, "seriousness of the litigation," and concluded that, unlike cases involving race-based discrimination or voting rights, plaintiffs' Dormant Commerce Clause claim—which was at the heart of the discovery demand—"does not present an especially compelling justification for overriding the important interests protected by the legislative privilege."

Stein noted that under this factor, courts must consider the "interest of the public," and he was "not convinced that the public's interest in ferreting out possible evidence of economic protectionism or an infringement of plaintiffs' property rights outweighs the public's interest in preserving the ability of lawmakers to focus on their public duties."

In evaluating the fourth factor, "the role of government in the litigation," Stein agreed with plaintiffs that this factor supported compelling the depositions.

He explained that because the

councilmembers' future willingness to participate in open debate.

After denying plaintiffs' motion to compel Rule 30(b)(1) depositions from the two City Council members and the one staff member pursuant to the Rodriguez balancing test, Stein went on to consider whether the city should be compelled to designate a Rule 30(b)(6) witness or witnesses on the specific deposition topics plaintiffs had noticed.

Stein concluded that the noticed topics "focused on the City Council's deliberations, motivations, and fact-finding" regarding the legislation, which "lie at the heart of the legislative privilege," and he therefore also denied the motion to compel the Rule 30(b)(6) depositions.

Stein agreed with the city that the Rule 30(b)(6) notice "constitute[d] a backdoor attempt to obtain otherwise privileged information and to accomplish indirectly what plaintiffs cannot do directly—question New York City councilmembers about their thought processes in connection with the enactment of the fee cap legislation."

#### Conclusion

Stein's decision in *DoorDash* highlights the protective power of, and significant weight courts afford to, the legislative privilege.

Stein did note, however, that a legislature cannot selectively invoke the legislative privilege, and that "if the city intended to call [the noticed City Council] witnesses at trial to attempt to explain the statements cited in [plaintiffs' complaint] or otherwise rebut plaintiffs' evidence as to the assertedly unconstitutional purpose of the... legislation, the matter would stand on different footing."

## LITIGATION SUPPORT SERVICES

To advertise Litigation Support Services and to receive advertising information,

please contact: **Shawn Phillips**

Phone: 215-557-2340 • [sphillips@alm.com](mailto:sphillips@alm.com)

## Expert Analysis / Corporate Update

### City

« Continued from page 3

city had obtained an eviction order, and Mayor Eric Adams was adamant, notwithstanding the aggressive public-relations campaign, that the project would move forward.

During the state-court litigation, Reiver had died, but his son Joseph Reiver took up the cause and appealed the eviction order. More significantly, in February of this year he and the lawyers who had represented his father filed a federal civil-rights lawsuit in the Southern District of New York.

In that case Joseph Reiver contended the project would destroy works of art protected by the federal Visual Artist Rights Act of 1990 (codified at 17 U.S.C. §§106A et. seq.), which allows an “author” of a protected work of “visual art” to sue to prevent the “destruction of a work of recognized stature.”

In late February, the First Department affirmed the eviction order,

a long-time civil rights leader in New York, whom I worked with at the New York Civil Liberties Union when we were repeatedly suing the Giuliani Administration. Siegel also was the lead lawyer for the Elizabeth Street Garden.

Not to be deterred, Adams then appointed Mastro to be his first deputy mayor, a position that was vacant because the prior first deputy mayor and four other deputy mayors had resigned in February over the mayor’s dalliance with President Donald Trump in conjunction with the dismissal of the federal corruption case against Adams. Mastro’s appointment, which did not require council confirmation, came on March 20, the day Vyskocil rejected the Garden’s request for emergency relief.

Then came the June 23 bombshell announcement that Mastro was pulling the plug on the affordable senior housing project on Elizabeth Street, with the support of Siegel. The affordable-housing providers and former city officials

The May 2021 death of local teacher Mathew Jensen energized the controversy, and in May 2023 the city’s Department of Transportation unveiled plans to make substantial changes to McGuinness Boulevard.

Just as work was about to begin in Aug. 2024, Adams halted the project, claiming it needed further community input.

The next month his chief advisor—Ingrid Lewis-Martin—and the two principals of Broadway Stages—Tony Argento and his sister Gina—had their phones seized by prosecutors.

Shortly afterward, the city reversed course again and moved forward with a partial redesign of McGuinness Boulevard that nonetheless left local residents complaining bitterly about remaining dangers on the roadway.

What lay behind the zigs and zags emerged two weeks ago when Ingrid-Martin and the Argentos were indicted on bribery counts by Manhattan District Attorney Alvin Bragg.

Incredible for both its brashness and meagerness, Gina Argento sent Lewis-Martin \$2,500 by Zelle as a bribe to squash the McGuinness proposal, and the Argentos paid nearly \$11,000 in catering expenses for a mayoral event at City Hall, according to the indictment.

Most colorfully, Lewis-Martin demanded and received a cameo role in the television show “Godfather of Harlem,” which was filmed at Broadway Stages.

The indictment reveals that after her appearance Lewis-Martin texted the Argentos, “thank you. It was everything. I was treated with such lice [sic] and care. It was amazing. One thing off my bucket list. I will get my SAG [Screen Actors Guild] card. Thank you!” *People v. Ingrid Lewis-Martin*, Indictment, 73751/2025 (Supreme Court, N.Y. County).

The day after the Aug. 21 indictment, Adams held a press conference at City Hall where he defended the watered-down McGuinness plan and Lewis-Martin. Standing by his side was First Deputy Mayor Randy Mastro.

#### Looking Forward

New York City mayors play a key role in the urban landscape, and urban-planning issues such as housing, streets, and parks often play a significant role in mayoral elections.

That promises to be the case this fall, as all the candidates have focused on affordable housing, and a proposed charter amendment would give the mayor even more power in zoning decisions.

Frontrunner and Democratic nominee Zohran Mamdani has supported the Green Haven affordable-housing proposal, and last week he announced he would immediately re-start the redesign of McGuinness Boulevard if elected.

No matter the outcome of the election, one can expect close scrutiny of officials in the next administration who are responsible for public projects. Such scrutiny is necessary, much as it also may be necessary to rethink aspects of the current regulatory regime.

who had worked on the project for years were stunned. As one of those officials told the *New York Times*:

The idea that at the 11th hour—after you’ve spent years getting financing lined up, going through litigation, dealing with politics, redesigning the project — you can pull the plug on that kind of deal, what kind of message does that send to people who want to build affordable housing in New York City. Who in their right mind would ever do a deal with these people again?

#### McGuinness Boulevard Bribery

The second New York City public-works project scuttled not by excessive regulation but by government officials is one that touches a nerve for many New Yorkers: an effort to make a dangerous roadway safer. This instance did not involve civil litigation but instead featured a cinematic indictment.

McGuinness Boulevard runs through Greenpoint, Brooklyn and serves as a shortcut between the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway and the Long Island Expressway. The roadway sees heavy traffic and since 1995 has been the scene of the deaths of three cyclists and twelve pedestrians.

For over a decade local residents, under the banner of ‘Make McGuinness Safe’, have pushed the city to take measures to calm vehicle traffic and protect pedestrians and cyclists.

As the city started to respond, an opposing group calling itself Keep McGuinness Moving formed, with reporters uncovering that the group was financed and operated by Broadway Stages, a company that provides sound services for television and movie studios and whose vehicles rely on McGuinness Boulevard.

Disappointing results have sent Target shares on an extended swoon. The stock now trades for around \$95, down from \$160 in October 2024 and an all-time high of \$240 in late 2021.

Some of the retailer’s woes stem from customer pushback to its aggressive commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion.

### Corporate

### Target

« Continued from page 5

nated within three years, and the \$4 million in stock was to vest over five years, contingent on her remaining with the company. The transition agreement says nothing to indicate Target revised those terms.

In return for Target providing the income consideration payments and other benefits in the transition agreement, Tu agreed not to work for a Target competitor for 24 months.

Tu, who is in her late-50s, suc-

ceeded Don Liu, who retired after serving as Target’s legal chief for nearly a decade. Just days before Tu’s termination, Target announced comparable store sales in its latest quarter had plunged 3.8%.

Last month, the Target board replaced CEO Brian Cornell with Michael Fiddelke, a 20-year company veteran who most recently was chief operating officer.

However, Cornell will stick around as executive chair of Target’s board.

The company early this year pulled back on DEI, but that spurred a backlash from DEI devotees who organized a boycott that further crimped sales.

Last month, the Target board replaced CEO Brian Cornell with Michael Fiddelke, a 20-year company veteran who most recently was chief operating officer.

However, Cornell will stick around as executive chair of Target’s board.

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

Need a smart Expert Witness?  
**ALMExperts** has leaders in every discipline.  
 www.almexperts.com  
 888-809-0133

### Calendar of Events

#### MONDAY, SEPT. 8 MONDAY, SEPT. 15

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

##### Residential Real Estate Closings: What You Need to Know From Pre-Contract to Closing - Both Days

Day 1: 2 p.m. – 5:05 p.m.  
 Day 2: 2 p.m. – 5:05 p.m.  
 Both Days CLE credits: 6 credits (3 credits Day 1; 3 credits Day 2)

Both Days Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=WEB90825&mcode=NYLJ>

Day 1 Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=WEB090825&mcode=NYLJ>

Day 2 Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=WEB091525&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: Zoom  
 Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**Monday Night Law Training**  
 Day 1: 5:45 p.m. - 9 p.m.  
 Day 2: 5:45 p.m. - 9 p.m.

Both Days CLE credits: 5.5  
 Day 1 CLE Credit: 2.5 Skills  
 Day 2 CLE Credit: 3.0

Both Days In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=mn1090825&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036  
 Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**Monday Night Law Training**  
 Day 1: 5:45 p.m. - 9 p.m.  
 Day 2: 5:45 p.m. - 9 p.m.

Both Days CLE credits: 5.5  
 Day 1 CLE Credit: 2.5 Skills  
 Day 2 CLE Credit: 3.0

Both Days In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=mn1090825&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036  
 Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**Monday Night Law Training**  
 Day 1: 5:45 p.m. - 9 p.m.  
 Day 2: 5:45 p.m. - 9 p.m.

Both Days CLE credits: 5.5  
 Day 1 CLE Credit: 2.5 Skills  
 Day 2 CLE Credit: 3.0

Both Days In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=mn1090825&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036  
 Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**Monday Night Law Training**  
 Day 1: 5:45 p.m. - 9 p.m.  
 Day 2: 5:45 p.m. - 9 p.m.

Both Days CLE credits: 5.5  
 Day 1 CLE Credit: 2.5 Skills  
 Day 2 CLE Credit: 3.0

Both Days In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=mn1090825&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036  
 Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**Monday Night Law Training**  
 Day 1: 5:45 p.m. - 9 p.m.  
 Day 2: 5:45 p.m. - 9 p.m.

Both Days CLE credits: 5.5  
 Day 1 CLE Credit: 2.5 Skills  
 Day 2 CLE Credit: 3.0

Both Days In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=mn1090825&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036  
 Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**Monday Night Law Training**  
 Day 1: 5:45 p.m. - 9 p.m.  
 Day 2: 5:45 p.m. - 9 p.m.

Both Days CLE credits: 5.5  
 Day 1 CLE Credit: 2.5 Skills  
 Day 2 CLE Credit: 3.0

Both Days In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=mn1090825&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036  
 Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**Monday Night Law Training**  
 Day 1: 5:45 p.m. - 9 p.m.  
 Day 2: 5:45 p.m. - 9 p.m.

Both Days CLE credits: 5.5  
 Day 1 CLE Credit: 2.5 Skills  
 Day 2 CLE Credit: 3.0

Both Days In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=mn1090825&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036  
 Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**Monday Night Law Training**  
 Day 1: 5:45 p.m. - 9 p.m.  
 Day 2: 5:45 p.m. - 9 p.m.

Both Days CLE credits: 5.5  
 Day 1 CLE Credit: 2.5 Skills  
 Day 2 CLE Credit: 3.0

Both Days In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=mn1090825&mcode=NYLJ>

##### 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](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**New York City Bar (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=LSWR092525&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036  
 Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto: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](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**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](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**New York City Bar (Non 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=SLF091825&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036  
 Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**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=fas090925&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036  
 Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**New York City Bar (Non CLE)**  
**Legal Practice and Career**  
 12:30 p.m. - 2 p.m.

Webinar Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=STIMSON25&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street  
 Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**New York City Bar (Non CLE)**  
**33rd Annual Henry L. Stimson Medal Presentation**  
 6 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.

In-Person Registration Link: <https://services.nycbar.org/EventDetail?EventKey=SLF091825&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street  
 Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**New York City Bar (Non 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=SLF091825&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036  
 Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**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=fas093025&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036  
 Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**New York City Bar (Non 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=SLF091825&mcode=NYLJ>

Location: 42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036  
 Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

**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=fas093025&mcode=NYLJ>

Contact: Customer Relations Department, 212-382-6663 or [customerrelations@nycbar.org](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:customerrelations@nycbar.org)

#### MONDAY, SEPT. 29

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

##### Ethical Considerations for Corporate Investigations: Views from All Sides

</

## Attorney of the Year Award / Outside Counsel

## Carmody

«Continued from page 2

Carmody told the Law Journal he likes to “work hard and play hard.” He loves food, wine, and having a good time.

Carmody also drives hard. Rabin recalls one of their first encounters, around 2001, vividly. He and his now-wife flew to Dallas to have dinner with Carmody. Carmody, Rabin recalled, drove easily over 100 miles an hour on a new toll road, with the silently terrified passengers white knuckling it in the back seat.

## Humble Beginnings

Born in New York at what was then the New York Foundling hospital, Carmody was raised in Levittown on Long Island. He is adopted, as are his siblings, a sister and a late brother.

The lawyer describes his beginning as “humble.” His life is very different now, he said, at that point speaking from one of his two homes, this one in the Hamptons. He and his wife, Catherine—once a lawyer and now a screenwriter—spend the winter in Miami Beach.

“Everything Bill has, he has achieved because of his hustle and hard work,” Rabin said. “I think one of the reasons he drives himself so much is because he knows that everything in life he’s had to earn, and he is willing to work harder than everybody else to get it.”

Carmody went to college in at Kings Point—a federal U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, like West Point. After graduation he worked on oil tankers, bringing oil from one refinery to another up and down the coast from Boston to Texas.

He was laid off, and had a ship drop him in Fort Lauderdale. At that point, he says, he knew he wanted to be a lawyer or an architect, but not yet. He stayed

in Miami, slinging drinks at bars and nightclubs.

One of those places, Mutiny, was a legendary private club, the crown jewel of Miami nightlife in the 1970s and 1980s. It was frequented by musicians and drug lords, and inspiration for the movie “Scarface.”

“Cocaine central,” Carmody said. “It was just a wilder, different life to be in Miami.”

“I can either go one way or the other,” Carmody said he realized at the time. “I better take the right path here and get myself to law school better late than never.”

Carmody then followed a girl to Oklahoma. They stopped seeing one another but he stayed in Tulsa, he said, and “got rid of the chip on my shoulder.”

While attending University of Tulsa College of Law, he helped put together another “hot bar, nightclub-place” in Tulsa, the Sunset Grill (now closed).

In the late 1980s after he graduated, Carmody went to work at what was Fulbright & Jaworski, now Norton Rose Fulbright in Texas.

He and another associate, Tim Robinson, broke away and formed Robinson Carmody. Carmody then went out on his own, focusing on business litigation, which is how he met Stephen Susman, founding and name partner of Susman Godfrey.

Carmody has now been there 25 years.

While at Susman, Carmody has secured one of the largest antitrust verdicts in U.S. history, at \$4.7 billion. He won more than \$700 million for the city of Baltimore, holding opioid manufacturers and distributors accountable. He defended Uber in the legal battle between the transportation company and Google/Waymo. He represented WeWork co-founder, Adam Neumann, in litigation with SoftBank.

He won \$61 million on behalf of a client fighting Chevron. He has become a go-to lawyer for hedge

fund managers and some of the top companies in the U.S.

In addition to big wins, he’s extraordinarily creative, his colleagues said.

One example: decades ago, Carmody was representing a client in a case that was supposed to go to trial, but he found out his case was not first on the calendar the following Monday. He wanted to go first, so, over the weekend, his client approached the parties in that other matter. The client asked the parties how much they wanted to settle their case, and then cut them checks.

On Monday, Carmody’s opposing counsel was blindsided when their case was called first. The lawyer felt forced to announce ready, but had not prepared for their expert, and Carmody won.

If he wasn’t a litigator, Carmody said he thinks he’d make movies. He wasn’t aware making movies was a profession when he was younger, he explained.

But he said great lawyering is like making great movies. For example, Clint Eastwood—a “good-to-fair actor” and an “Oscar-winning director.”

Some directors, Carmody said, will do dozens of takes of a movie scene. But Eastwood, or “someone like a Steve Susman,” gets in, nails it, and moves on.

Those unused takes, not unlike pretrial discovery, never see the light of day, he said. He’s not saying that pre-trial discovery is not important or essential, just that some people get bogged down in the minutia.

“To me, it’s like so many people are focused on the wrong issues and points that are just too, too nuanced,” he said.

Asked what motivates him, Carmody said the fear of losing.

“We’re all competitive at the level I’m at right now,” he said. “And I’m obviously a fiduciary to the client and I just want to make sure I’ve given it my best.”

Asked about regrets, Carmody quoted Frank Sinatra’s “My Way,” liting: “Regrets, I’ve had a few...But then again, too few to mention.”

“I never look back,” he added. “Once I’m done with something, I’m done, and I’m looking to the next thing. I’m a natural optimist.”

## Wooing a Jury

Renowned late trial lawyer Gerry Spence was a mentor, Carmody said, and taught him the “power of being authentic.”

Being vulnerable invites other people to be vulnerable, which forms a kind of bond, he explained.

“Being in the courtroom, I’m just being me, not some stylized version of me or someone I’m not,” Carmody said. “It’s a way to really connect and talk to people, in a way they realize is real, you’re a real person.”

Rabin said he once saw Carmody decide in the moment not to do an intensely prepared cross examination because they were nearing the end of a long trial day. Instead, Carmody cut off the cross and asked that court be adjourned.

“Bill already had a sense we had won over the jury at that point,” Rabin said. “It almost made it seem like he was doing the jury a favor and letting them go home that day. Just that simple act of not focusing on the cross, but focusing on what the jury wanted, I think, gained him so much credibility with the jury.”

Asked what makes Carmody so magical with jurors, colleagues also cited the power of being authentic.

“Bill has a really unique ability to relate to anybody,” Raymond said. “You’re talking about one of the most successful business people, most successful trial lawyers. But this is a guy that you can take in a diner, you can take in a factory, you can take wherever, and he’s going to fit in, and it’s due to his authenticity.”

A related piece of that, Raymond said, is Carmody’s ability to make

people feel special. The first case Raymond worked with Carmody, Raymond said Carmody asked him to come to Dallas.

Raymond remembered that Carmody put him up in an apartment, and with his wife, Catherine, organized a “once in a lifetime day” for Raymond. The trio went to the Texas Motor Speedway, where they sat in VIP seats. Carmody had procured “custom-made VIP earphone covers” for the occasion. And then they went to lunch at a celebrated, hard-to-get-into restaurant where Carmody was able to get a table “because, of course, it’s Bill.”

“I think one thing that is very true to Bill is that when you’re with Bill, Bill is not the focus,” Raymond said. “Bill is just focusing on you, and you feel like you end up mattering. I think that that’s just one of the unique ways that he connects with people.”

Jacob Buchdahl, a partner at Susman Godfrey, said Carmody was like “a fish in water” in front of jurors.

“I think Bill loves people,” Buchdahl said. “He loves them for everything that they are, and their differences. He loves getting to know people, loves understanding what makes them tick. And he loves thinking about what will appeal to different kinds of people. I think that that kind of real affection for humanity is what he draws on to connect to them.”

“I think it’s hard to be a great jury lawyer if you don’t like people,” he added.

## Dinosaurs

As for the future of trial lawyering, Carmody doesn’t think it’s dead—it just might look different.

“I’ve heard people say, you know, ‘You guys are dinosaurs,’ and ‘It’s going to be the end of an era,’” he said. “And that may be true, but it’s hard for me to believe that there’s not going to be some other era, because life goes on.”

What will always matter, Carmody said, is being a good communicator who can distill complex concepts. Someone who can take technical, complicated ideas and translate them for a typical layperson.

“I think there’s going to be a new type of communication,” he said, citing a generation of people glued to their phones and communicating digitally.

“When I grew up, we were talking to one another, we weren’t texting under the table,” Carmody noted. “But if that’s the way people are communicating in our life, maybe lawyers who grew up that way present cases differently, but in a way that can effectively communicate with the jurors, you know, because it’ll be a different type of jurors.”

Carmody he’s learned how to communicate with people from many walks of life by talking to them, asking them to teach him about themselves and their worldview.

“A lot of people can tell their own story, but they can’t tell another person’s story,” he said. “As a trial lawyer, I’m always telling someone else’s story.”

Carmody is an archetype of the trial lawyer, Boies said.

“Bill is a lawyer that grew up in a time when lawyers really liked what they did,” he said. “They were very collegial—you fight hard in court, but you go have a drink afterwards.”

For attorneys like Carmody, Boies said: “Your word is your bond. You fight very hard for your client, but you do so within the bounds of realism and civility. And you recognize that you and your opponent are both performing roles in our justice system, and you respect that.”

“We’ve gotten away from some of those principles,” Boies observed.

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

## Kessler

«Continued from page 2

the jury that ultimately broke down the National Football League’s player movement restrictions in the landmark Freeman McNeil suit.

During the trial, Kessler had brought out a white board, wrote down “NFL players” and pressed one of the league’s experts to name another group of people who couldn’t choose where they work or live. The expert couldn’t name any, so Kessler handed him the board and marker and asked if he would write down any of the suggestions Kessler gave.

“I said, ‘How about prisoners?’” Kessler recalled. “How about little children?”

The expert agreed they were similarly restricted, and Kessler tried to get him to write down “prisoners” and “little children” under “NFL players,” Kessler said. Opposing counsel objected.

“I think that made a great impression on the jury,” he said.

Although Kessler’s legal career is impressive, both Cole and Greenspan emphasized his personal bona fides.

Cole credited Kessler with her decision to continue working in law firms. She had been a seventh-year associate at Dewey when she had her first child—“well before... remote work was a real thing”—and asked Kessler if she could work remotely on Fridays and go home at a reasonable hour when she wasn’t traveling or otherwise engaged.

“It was a non-issue,” said Cole. “He’s kind of family-oriented, so he’s really supportive of women attorneys and was ahead of his time on work-life balance. He always believed that as long as people got their work done and were doing really good work, of course they should be able to give equal playing time to their families.”

Greenspan noted Kessler’s dedication to his partners and associates. Like Cole, Greenspan had met Kessler as a young associate at Dewey. As that firm went under

in 2012, many other New York firms began circling Kessler, who was then the head of Dewey’s global litigation department.

“He used his personal leverage not to benefit himself, but to find a way to keep the majority of the Dewey Ballantine litigation department together—lawyers and non-lawyers, too,” said Greenspan. “We have now been at Winston for over 13 years and most everyone is still together.”

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

## Letters Welcome

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

adenney@alm.com

## van Kwawegen

«Continued from page 2

against the board of directors of FirstEnergy Corp., resulting in a \$180 million settlement and unprecedented corporate governance improvements. It’s the largest derivative action recovery ever affirmed by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

He also led the BLB&G trial team that achieved a partial settlement of \$79 million for claims against Columbia Pipeline’s chief executive and financial officers, respectively.

TransCanada, the acquirer in the Columbia Pipeline merger, was found liable for aiding and abetting breaches of fiduciary duties by Columbia’s management, in a 2023 Delaware Court of Chancery ruling reversed by the Delaware Supreme Court earlier this month.

His securities class actions including litigation against Meta Platforms, NVIDIA, and Silicon Valley Bank, as well as breach of fiduciary duty actions involving

Santander, Warner Brothers, Continental Resources, Sirius XM, among others.

His team recently settled a derivative class action against the board and senior executives at Credit Suisse, after filing litigation alleging inadequate risk management procedures. The claim resulted in the closure of Credit Suisse’s prime brokerage in New York. Ultimately the firm merged into UBS.

He intends to continue litigating, but says his “real goal is to have that next generation of people who are now in their mid-30s to mid-40s” achieve their own successes at trial.

“And look—it’s scary because you can also lose,” he said. “But if it wasn’t scary, you wouldn’t have half the fun.”

A member of the military police before attending law school in the Netherlands, van Kwawegen said he adheres to the doctrine of putting as much responsibility and ownership for a particular task as low as possible in the chain of command.

“You find people—motivated, smart—tell them what the objective is, and provide them with means, support, and training to do it, then you let them do it,” he said of his approach with litigation teams.

Also been outspoken about ongoing attacks on the rule of law, van Kwawegen said: “It doesn’t matter whether it’s Republicans or Democrats—but if you don’t have the rule of law when you’re not the dominant political faction, your rights are going to be curtailed in a way that will make it more difficult and less free for you.”

“If there’s no space for people to be different from the norm, whatever that norm in that situation is, I think all of us, including people who are on that particular issue, are poorer for it. Because it allows less freedom of thought, creativity and being different. And the truth is, one of the reasons why I stayed and did not go back to the Netherlands is I felt that freedom here.”

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

## Child

«Continued from page 4

As noted by Professors Sobie and Solomon, cited above, the Legislative Memo associated with the 2009 amendments to the Family Court Act, which replaced the term “law guardian” in the Act with “attorney” or “counsel,” further underscore the legislative intent to provide children with traditional advocacy, as opposed to substituted judgment as to their best interests, in proceedings that affect them. 10 N.Y. Prac., New York Family Court Practice § 2:13 (2d ed.). As stated in the Legislative Memo:

However, almost from its inception, the ambiguous term “attorney for the child,” although defined in section 242 of the Family Court Act as an attorney, has created debate and confusion. The term suggests a role that combines functions of the attorney-advocate with those of a guardian *ad litem*, functions that are inherently incompatible... The result has all too often been misunderstanding and clashing expectations about the actions and intentions of the child’s lawyer, adding needless complexity and confusion to cases involving children.

Although conflicting expectations may continue to exist despite §7.2, Appellate rulings have been clear. Numerous Appellate Division cases have clarified the obliga-

tion of the attorney for the child to provide the child with zealous representation comparable to that provided to the (adult) parties in the litigation.

In *Mark T. v. Joyanna U.*, the Third Department observed that “one of the primary obligations of the attorney for the child” is “helping the child articulate his or her position to the court.” *Mark T. v. Joyanna U.*, 64 A.D.3d 1092 (3d Dep’t 2009). In *Jennifer V.V. v. Lawrence W.W.*, the Third Department stated:

The AFC here wholly failed to fulfill [his] obligations... The only stated basis for his determination to advocate for the children’s best interests rather than for their wishes was their ages. However, it was the AFC’s obligation to “consult with and advise the child[ren] to the extent of and in a manner consistent with [their] capacities” (22 NYCRR 7.2[d][1]). At 10, the older child was certainly old enough to be capable of expressing her wishes, and whether the younger child, at 6, had the capacity to do so was not solely dependent upon her calendar age, but also upon such individual considerations as her level of maturity and verbal abilities.

The court went further in a footnote:

We further note that the AFC’s statement that the children were too young to articulate “position[s] which

they believe[d] to be in their best interest” misapprehends his obligation. 22 NYCRR 7.2 requires an AFC to advocate for a child’s wishes. The rule does not require either the child or the AFC to make any determination as to his or her best interests; that determination is to be made by the court.

In *David v. LoPresti*, the Second Department noted, in remanding the matter for a new hearing:

...the record is insufficient

Attorneys for children must be held to their obligations to provide their clients a voice at all stages in matrimonial and child custody proceedings.

to allow us to make a fully informed determination as to whether relocation was in the child’s best interests. Throughout the course of the proceedings, the attorney for the child failed to advise the Family Court of, much less advocate for, the position of the then 10-year-old child. *David v. LoPresti*, 176 A.D.3d 701 (2d Dep’t 2019).

In *Matter of Payne*, the Third Department further clarified, “To effectively represent and protect a child’s interests, the attorney for the child’s role is twofold: (1) help the child express his or her wishes to the court, and (2) take an active role in the proceedings.” *Matter of Payne*, 166 A.D.3d 1342 (2018).

Notwithstanding these clear legislative and judicial man-

dates, in practice, in matrimonial actions particularly, attorneys for children may sometimes straddle the fence between providing advocacy and advancing their own positions as to the children’s best interests. This may take the form of lukewarm endorsements of their clients’ positions, failure to actively participate in proceedings to ensure that their clients’ wishes are made known and promoted, and offering their own opinions as to the facts and the

course the proceedings should take, without grounds to substitute judgment.

This muddles the distinction between the roles of attorney for the child and guardian *ad litem* in a manner clearly contrary to the legislative intent. While this is certainly not true of every case, and many attorneys for children rigorously abide by their obligations to advocate for their clients, it is too often the case that attorneys for children in matrimonial matters take on the role of quasi-forensic evaluators, offering their own judgments in lieu of their clients’ positions.

In one matter we have observed in recent years, the attorney for the preteen children repeatedly injected the attorney’s view that the mother was alienating the children (who were vociferously opposed to

knowing and voluntary judgment, or where a child stands at substantial risk of imminent, serious harm. Accordingly, in matters where these criteria are not met—which should be few and far between—in the case of children old enough and mature enough to cogently state their preferences, the role of children’s attorneys is strictly limited to zealous advocacy.

Attorneys for children must be held to their obligations to provide their clients a voice at all stages in matrimonial and child custody proceedings. At a minimum, if an attorney intends to offer anything short of enthusiastic and sustained advocacy of her or his client’s position, the attorney must be required to clearly articulate (1) that judgment is in fact being substituted, and (2) the basis for substitution of judgment, which must be either an *inability* on the part of her or his client to clearly, knowingly, voluntarily stake a position, or the *identifiable, substantial, imminent harm* that is likely to result to her or his client if judgment is not substituted. Anything less falls notably short of the legislative and judicial mandates underlying their critically important role.

## Conclusion

Attorneys for children in matrimonial matters must be held to the obligation of zealously advocating the child’s wishes, to protect the critically important role of providing children with a voice in matters that affect them.

# Court Calendars

## First Department

### APPELLATE DIVISION

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

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

**MONDAY, SEPT. 8**

10 A.M.  
65477/424 Hage v. Simmons

**TUESDAY, SEPT. 9**

9 A.M.  
28519/20 Perez v. Tanya Towers, Inc.

10 A.M.  
652275/22 SL 4000 Connecticut v. CBRE

11 A.M.  
303881/10 Fernandez v. Pichardo

**WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10**

2 P.M.  
151987/23 Rivas v. Carrasco

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 12**

1 P.M.  
28283/19 Pitang v. Underbruecker 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

10 A.M.  
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. 4**

2 P.M.  
23/4195 People v. Jamel Richardson

24/7790 Abramovage v. Deutsche Bank Securities

24/7596 W., Children

23/2266 Urban v. Zipper

22/3915 People v. William Hooks

23/410 People v. Reginald Banks

25/2963 Metropolitan Partners v. Nerney

24/6562 Attorney General of State of NY v. Kenny S.

24/5690 Goodman v. Stack

19/3864(1) People v. Ricky Moore

24/4141 Pizzarotti LLC v. MDB Development

24/3762 W., Mary v. Robert W.

22/5296 People v. Tony Manley

24/6055 Trinity Centre v. Subway Real Estate

24/7925 Southerland v. Tavern

18/4233 People v. Sharhonda Hart

24/1076 People v. Joseph Evans

24/7476 Will of Michael Milbaum

25/2493 Baxter v. Gosh

24/5783 Jackson v. Consolidated Edison

22/2494 People v. Aditya Vemulapati

24/5921N Servan v. ES Builders Group

25/482N Distel v. Distel

**TUESDAY, SEPT. 9**

2 P.M.  
21/2877 People v. Creig Blyeden

25/295 Hart v. Cappa

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

23/1932 People v. Lamont Hood

22/5068 People v. Charles Johnson

24/7743(2) Cohen v. Cohen

23/1915 Barone v. Barone

24/3131 Smith v. Global Contact

24/4468 People v. Audwin Dubose E.

24/208 People v. Alexis Flores

24/6393 Macklowe Investments v. MP 57th Dev.

25/1109 R., Cherie

24/5224 Moises-Oritz v. FDB Acquisition

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

18/4467 People v. Rahim Ali

24/6548 Sanchez v. NYC Medical Practice

24/1245 Stallard v. NYC Police Department

24/5244 Britt v. MTA

24/5365 People v. Ignacio Vasquetelles

22/4656 People v. Zachary Louissant

24/3449N Valley National Bank v. 252 W. 31 St. Corp.

24/2059N Aguilera v. City of NY

24/6575N Nordguard Insurance v. 140 W. 28 Owner

**WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 10**

2 P.M.  
17/2377 People v. Christian Jachero

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

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

24/4364 People v. Travis Glasgow

23/5557 People v. Ruben Flores

24/7333 21st Mortgage Corp. v. Lin

24/5992 Brewster v. Hunter

24/4074 State of NY v. Juan P.

24/4733 Yang v. Griffin

22/2304 People v. Augusto Scott

24/3082 People v. Jateise Leak

24/7637 Apex Funding v. Blue Earth Resources

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

22/46 People v. Duntrell Calderon

25/404 Zain v. Isaacson

24/3868 Johnson v. Northeast Agencies

25/1514 Stikeman Elliott LLP v. OL Private Counsel

24/5978 Samsung Electronics v. MPEG LA

23/2650 People v. Jose Alvarado

18/3103 People v. Alfred McCrae

25/1616N Voorham v. Hicks-Voorham

24/4931N Barger v. Malkin

24/5483(3) N. NewRez v. Morton

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 11**

2 P.M.  
23/3868 People v. Justin JeanBaptiste

25/1830 2814 Morris v. Ortega

24/4069 R., Serenity

25/747 WarnerMedia Direct v. Paramount Global

24/6470 Ramos v. Ford Foundation

25/127 Rodriguez v. FGI Corporation

22/5518 People v. Chevanie Gordon

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

24/483 People v. Kyle Hardison

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

24/3308 Vazquez v. NYS Office of Children

25/3999 D., Sandy v. Luis G.

23/1916 People v. Isaijah Rivera

19/3849 People v. Michael McNeil

24/2499 People v. Amary 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

25/424N Bodenbach 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 Sois v. City of NY

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

24/7203 Sanchez v. 1562 Thierot 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

24/129 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 Djalo

24/5969 Spring Scaffolding v. Krall

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

24/6088 Ahnsundinn 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

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

25/2569 Mirza v. College of Mount Saint Vincent

24/5122 Eisner v. Posillio Civil

23/5792 K., Dorell v. Dalece L.

24/1428 People v. Steven McEnaney

20/2163 People v. Jose Matias

24/4653 Emissions Reduction v. MCloud Technologies

24/6476 McGrane-Mungo v. Dag Hammarskjold Tower

24/4577 Dulzen v. Equinox Group

19/4665 People v. Cristian Compres-Moreno

24/1718 People v. Josian Normil

24/4821 People v. Joel R.

24/5468N Commonwealth Land v. Sky Abstract

24/6864N Naramore v. Mount Sinai Health

25/3052N Owens v. MTA

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 18**

2 P.M.  
24/1981 People v. Choncey Chance

25/1288 Nitru 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

22/6290(1) People v. Andre Morris

25/7398 ARC NWWPJW001 v. WWP JV

24/3218 Murillo v. Downtown NYC Owner

20/1196 People v. Derrick Harris

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

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

24/3145 Bank NY Mellon v. Kim

24/7555 Brevet Direct Lending v. Aprio LLP

22/5204 People v. Alvin Brown

22/4915 People v. Norman 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

25/378(3) NGrace v. Sabal

24/6859N Bey v. City of NY

**TUESDAY, SEPT. 23**

2 P.M.  
19/4847 People v. Orlando Correa

24/5581 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

24/3125 People v. Yusuf Brown

24/1759 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

24/5803(1) Molner v. Molner

25/799(1) Molner v. Molner

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

23/6362N N47 Associates v. Jemscor Realty

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 25**

2 P.M.  
24/219 People v. David Young

24/2453 Lewis v. Gaging

24/2022 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. Pharaoh Holmes

20/997 People v. Brian Gutierrez

## 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.

24/2800 Hamilton v. City of NY (NY 162136/2018)

25/1643 Hanslick v. UG2 (NY 156052/2022)

25/566 Haque v. T & S Interiors Corp. (NY 654064/2024)

24/720 Health East Ambulatory v. Country-Wide Insurance (NY 570101/2024)

24/6949 Healy v. Kruger (NY 656130/2020)

23/5020 Healy v. Trinity Hudson (NY 155818/2020)

24/1781 Hemingway Group v. i80 Group (NY 656856/2022)

25/1054 Henriquez v. City of NY (NY 160044/2023)

24/5472N Henry v. TAO Group (NY 154747/2018)

24/6498 Hereford Insurance v. 21 Century (NY 150314/2022)

24/2559 Herman v. Judlau Contracting (NY 652249/2017)

24/5196 Hidalgo v. Hoge (NY 157648/2021)

24/1885 Hinkson v. NY Presbyterian (NY 153104/2018)

25/1985 HNA Holdings v. TSCE 2007 (NY 651573/2020)

25/1358 Holifield v. XRI Investment Holdings (NY 655468/2023)

24/2455 Holness v. Gold Crest (BX 804127/2022)

24/2127 (Z) HSBC Bank v. Wu (NY 850209/2023)

24/4145 Hudson View v. Peleus Insurance (NY 656162/2021)

25/736 Humald v. City of NY (NY 156864/2023)

25/2814 Icahn Partners LP v. Alliance Bernstein LP (NY 155879/2024)

24/6173 Ichapanta v. East Side Home Stead (BX 812540/2021)

24/7468 In the Matter of Estate of Kendall Granville Chen (NY 3902/2018)

24/7464 InkMango, Inc. v. Warren (NY 152802/2024)

25/73 Innovative Securities v. OBEX Securities (NY 650685/2023)

24/6358 Iroha Corporation v. Kookmin Best Insurance (NY 650880/2018)

24/6530 Itzhak v. Briarwood Insurance (NY 651193/2024)

24/5655 Izquierdo v. Amsterdam Avenue Redevelopment (NY 159051/2018)

25/2351 J. F. v. Archdiocese of NY (NY 950249/2019)

24/5788 J.C., an infant v. 2078 Arthur (BX 810563/2021)

24/1845 Jackson v. Law Offices of Peter Sverd (NY 153586/2023)

24/5661 Jane Doe One v. KIPP Academy (BX 70424/2021)

24/4312 Jennings v. City of NY (NY 159776/2017)

24/6590 Jones v. Marshalls (BX 24115/2019)

24/2979 Jones Law Firm v. J Synergy (NY 653730/2023)

24/6361 Judlau Contracting v. City of NY (NY 653528/2022)

24/3617 Judson Realty v. Judson CRE (NY 159388/2020)

24/4398 Justicebacker, Inc. v. Abeles (NY 650374/2017)

24/7944 K., Hind v. Faycal T. (NY 16164/2019)

24/7683 K., Peter v. Mayumi M. (NY 15183/2023)

24/6224 Kapitus Servicing v. Suburban Waste Services (NY 653525/2022)

25/2545 Kapitus Servicing, Inc. v. Ragtime Gourmet Corp. (NY 653529/2022)

25/199 Kassal v. Trump Management (NY 161322/2018)

24/5578 Katz-Wisnudet v. Lower Manhattan District (NY 155252/2021)

25/2079 Keenan v. Bloomberg L.P. (NY 155679/2024)

24/6015 Kelemen v. Duplication Services (NY 160226/2017)

24/3066 Kimmelman v. Smith (NY 801510/2019)

24/4152 Kohl v. Memorial Sloan Kettering (NY 101008/2020)

24/356 (2) Kohli v. Tewari (NY 365297/2021)

24/4765 (2) Kohli v. Tewari (NY 365297/2021)

24/7361 Korpenn LLC v. One Penn Plaza (NY 651615/2023)

25/273 Kozel v. Renali Realty (BX 26198/2020)

25/4541N Laru v. 1201-31 Lafayette (BX 812053/2023)

25/562 (2) Lash v. Modulaire Holdings (NY 655935/2023)

25/840 Lava Media v. Hart (NY 651035/2023)

24/7200 Law Firm of Jennifer Zuch v. Lemus (NY 656077/2023)

24/2963 Law Office of Cyrus Joubin v. Manhattan District Attorney (NY 158168/2023)

25/2994 Lebda v. Touro College School (NY 101271/2024)

24/4532 Lee v. Lee (NY 365055/2018)

24/1665N Lee v. Nejat (NY 800296/2011)

24/3818 Lee v. Zeitlin (NY 654395/2020)

25/1461 Lema v. 1148 Corporation (NY 450994/2018)

23/6567N Leslie Digital Imaging v. Empower Information (NY 652634/2023)

24/6130N Leslie J. Garfield & Co. v. Evans (NY 651854/2021)

25/2403 Liberty Mobility v. Port Authority of NY (NY 151814/2024)

25/995N Lituma v. Liberty Coca-Cola (BX 33275/2020)

24/3189 Lotrean v. 3M Company (NY 153361/2020)

25/715 Lovett v. 2600 Seventh Avenue (NY 100515/2024)

25/1508 Lutfueva v. Services for the Aged (NY 161213/2023)

24/4015 M., Bryanna v. ACS (NY 151020/23)

25/4319 M., Damineh v. Bedouin J. (NY 03089/2020)

25/360 M., Ildefonso v. Ildefonso M. (NY 05622/2021)

24/7874 M., Jerrrell (BX D3396/2023)

24/5498 M., Mayra v. Raoul G. (NY 05012/23)

24/5109 M., Michelle v. Cantabile J. (BX F17113/2022)

25/1784 M., Mylah (NY 15171/2025)

24/6582 M., Rafael v. Kimberly T. (BX V2304/2020)

24/6090 M., Rajah v. Said B. (NY 06767/2021)

24/7939 M.T., Children (NY 09156/2019)

25/436 M. v. Wang (NY 655044/2022)

25/5886 M. v. Wang (NY 655044/2022)

22/4959 Madrid v. Mazur (NY 100881/2020)

24/7758 Malave v. Kini (NY 805456/2017)

25/1984N Malekan v. Malekan (NY 652507/2023)

25/514 Mancilla & Fantone v. Liu (NY 450521/2024)

24/5068 Manhattan Organization v. City of NY (NY 151940/2024)

24/7045 Mantia v. Hofstra University (NY 157061/2021)

24/1643 Markman v. NY-Presbyterian (NY 159286/2021)

24/6747 Martinez v. Martinez (NY 159286/2021)

24/5955 Mather v. HFZ Kik 30th Street (NY 161223/2019)

25/3668 McCough v. Phillips & Associates (NY 153216/2024)

25/1240 McGregor v. Manhattan Nursing Home (NY 158715/2021)

22/1003 McLeod v. NYC Health & Hospitals (BX 33513/2019)

24/5854 Medina v. Medina (BX 810353/2023)

24/3816 Meisenberg v. Sky House (NY 152964/2023)

25/222 Mejias v. Basch (BX 811811/2022)

# Court Calendars

## COURT NOTES

### Continued from page 9

a Merit Selection Committee. The Committee will review applicants using the following criteria: legal competence evidenced by experience with complex legal issues; an aptitude for legal scholarship and writing; familiarity with the courts and court processes; commitment to equal justice under the law; characteristics indicative of a sound judicial temperament; a reputation for integrity, good character and ethical behavior; and physical and mental health sufficient to meet the demands and tenure of the position. The Merit Selection Committee will select a limited number of applicants for interview and will conduct appropriate due diligence inquiries into the candidates' backgrounds and qualifications. Upon a majority vote of the Second Circuit Judicial Council, the Council will forward the Merit Selection Committee's Report with any recommendations or comments to the active judges of the Court of Appeals. The selected nominee will be required to satisfy FBI and IRS background investigations prior to appointment.

### Basic qualifications for consideration include:

1. Membership in good standing of at least one state bar, the District of Columbia bar, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico bar, and never other than membership in good standing of every bar that the applicant has been a member; and

2. A minimum of five years of legal practice experience.

Application forms are posted on the Court's website at <http://www.ca2.uscourts.gov>.

Completed application packages must be in the format required by the Second Circuit and received no later than Sept. 5, 2025.

## NEW YORK STATE COURT OF APPEALS

### Deadline for Amicus Curiae Motions October Session

The Court has calendared appeals in 'Clarke v. Town of Newburgh' (APL 2025-110) and 'Matter of Parker J.' (APL 2025-101) for argument on October 14, 2025. The Court has calendared appeals in Article 13 LLC v. Lasalle National Bank Association (CTQ 2025-1) and Van Dyke v. U.S. Bank, National Association (APL 2025-100) for argument on October 16, 2025. Motions for permission to file a brief amicus curiae in these appeals must be served no later than August 26, 2025 and noticed for a return date no later than

### 24/3534 Rondon v. 328 W. 44 Street (NY 152899/2018)

### 25/3927 Rosario v. Franklin Plaza Apartments (BX 21132/2020)

### 24/3632 Rosario v. Geny Tenants (NY 155290/2015)

### 24/961 Rose Group Park v. Third Church Christ (NY 651390/2019)

### 25/2451 Rosenblatt v. Rosenblatt (NY 320348/2020)

### 24/4858 Paris v. State of NY (NY 137505)

### 24/6401 Parker Colt Administration v. One West Bank (NY 150652/2024)

### 24/7648 (2) Parque Solar v. Enel S.P.A. (NY 656415/2023)

### 24/1511 Partners for Payment De III v. Crooks (BX 380040/2013)

### 24/7802 Patterson v. 786 East 182 (BX 805958/2022)

### 24/4542N PCV42 v. Doe v. NY Presbyterian Hospital (NY 952004/2023)

### 24/5450 Peck v. Milbank LLP (NY 152290/2022)

### 24/5234 Peerenboom v. Marvel Entertainment (NY 162152/2015)

### 24/5261 Pena v. City of NY (BX 23439/2016)

### 24/7931 People of the State of NY v. Sirius XM Radio (NY 453325/2023)

### 24/5358 Peralta v. Hunter Roberts Construction (NY 159317/2018)

### 24/5643 Perez v. Norman's City Group (NY 151886/2024)

### 24/3152 Perez v. Trustees of Columbia University (NY 159472/2017)

### 24/5371 Petro v. Aero International (NY 190324/2020)

### 24/6569 PH-105 Realty v. Elyayan (NY 656160/2016)

### 24/471 Pichardo v. The George Units (NY 15229/2021)

### 24/6417 Pilgrants v. Hudson 888 Owner (NY 152726/2020)

### 23/6617 Scottdale Insurance v. City of NY (NY 654673/2019)

### 24/7807 Sendilber Trading v. Petroleos de Venezuela (NY 650617/2024)

### 25/2002 Serhant LLC v. Federico (NY 652441/2022)

### 25/342N Seymour v. Homanian (NY 154579/2016)

### 23/5765 Shah v. 20 East 64th (NY 153052/2015)

### 23/1470N Sherman v. Zampella (NY 655176/2021)

### 25/1730 Sho-In LLC v. Rivera (NY 656269/2016)

### 24/6594 Shuler v. Cushman (BX 803584/2024)

### 24/4564 Prete v. JJ Hoyt LLC (NY 161724/2019)

### 25/813 Priority Management v. Deutsch (NY 656407/2022)

### 25/596N Pritchett v. American Golf (NY 337398/2019)

### 24/6207 PROF-2013-S3 Legal v. West Fork (BX 26380/2019)

### 24/6629 Quach v. C & A Jerome Realty (BX 20511/2019)

### 24/5598 Quezada v. 3850 Broadway Holding (NY 151965/2018)

### 24/4805 Quezada v. City of NY (NY 158013/2016)

### 24/5837 R., Angelika v. Yolanda K. (BX V30551/2017)

### 25/1160 R., Keira (NY B4648/2021)

### 24/6089 R., Zion (NY K44942/2023)

### 24/7651 Rahal v. Taormina (NY 365553/2023)

### 24/4790 Starr Indemnity v. Monte Carlo (NY 651045/2013)

### 25/2634 State Division of Human Rights v. Metroretrieves 167 (BX 80843/2024)

### 25/2242 State of NY v. JPMorgan Chase (NY 100559/2014)

### 24/551 State of NY v. Kenneth W. (NY 30230/2020)

### 24/6271 State of NY Unified Court v. Civil Service Employees (NY 451438/2024)

### 25/1215 Steinmann v. Steinmann (NY 365126/2024)

### 23/6718 Stuyvesant Town v. NYS Division of Housing (NY 154094/2021)

### 24/6591 Suarez v. City of NY (BX 26291/2024)

### 25/3016 Robles v. 53-63 Walton LLC (BX 24281/2017)

### 25/939 Rockwell v. Bobst (NY 951362/2021)

### 24/6646 Rodriguez v. 167 LLC (BX 304790/2014)

### 24/4829 Rodriguez v. 167 LLC (BX 304790/2014)

### 24/4857 Rodriguez v. CB Developers (NY 155327/2021)

### 24/7708 Romero v. Middleton (BX 27927/2019)

### 24/6233N Taveras v. Tuck-it-Away Associates (NY 159848/2022)

### 24/2846 TD Bank v. A.H. Dental (NY 161295/2021)

### 24/6221 Tejada v. 57th & 6th (NY 157783/2018)

### 24/6875 Teleford v. Port Authority of NY (BX 25178/2016)

### 24/4731 Thomas v. Concourse Rehabilitation (BX 814415/2022)

### 24/2900 Thomas v. Thompson (NY 313421/2011)

### 24/5138N Thompson v. Thompson (NY 313421/2011)

### 25/1750 Thor 138 N. v. Goldberg Weprin Finkel (NY 652448/2018)

### 24/2784 Tilipman v. Korban (NY 652434/2023)

### 25/3423 Tishman v. Himmel & Meringoff (NY 156708/2020)

### 24/2719 Tversky v. Yeshiva University (NY 950111/2019)

### 24/6097 U.S. Bank v. Tiburcio (BX 32237/2017)

### 24/7017 U.S. Bank National Association v. 687 King LLC (BX 803235/2021)

### 24/5899 United Legwear v. All in the Cards (NY 652523/2022)

### 24/5459 URP Maiden Lane v. Valley National (NY 655242/2023)

### 25/1206 U.S. Bank Trust Na v. Santiago (BX 380966/2010)

### 25/2444N Vargas v. Mavino Realty (BX 301063/2011)

### 24/2985N Vasquez v. Bronx Lebanon Hospital (BX 24567/2020)

### 24/3889 Verma v. Department of Education City of NY (NY 156602/2019)

### 25/1100 Villarreal Garza v. Ramirez (NY 300421/2023)

### 24/6584 W., Gail v. Jasmine C. (NY V36177/2016)

### 24/2869 (3) W.A., Children (BX N23439/2023)

### 24/642 Walker v. City of NY (NY 161982/2023)

### 25/2211 Ward v. Times Square Hotel (NY 154353/2022)

### 24/640 Watson v. Intercountry Paving (NY 157377/2014)

### 24/5045 Wells v. Atlantic Garage (NY 154918/2018)

### 24/5953 Wells Fargo Bank v. Hayden (NY 100036/2009)

### 25/3898 Wells Fargo Bank v. UBS AG (NY 654952/2024)

### 24/1151 Will B. Sandler Disclaim v. Swersky (NY 651015/2023)

### 24/4355 Will of Stanley Walker (NY 46132/2015)

### 23/4252 Wilmington Savings v. Brown (NY 157963/2020)

### 25/874 Wilmington Savings Fund v. Obatusin (BX 808811/2022)

### 24/3959 Wilmington Savings Fund v. Scaffidi (BX 35032/2013)

### 24/3274 Wilmington Trust v. EklecCo NewCo (NY 850051/2023)

### 24/1732 Windermere Properties v. City NY (NY 161016/2022)

### 24/3051 Yakuel v. NYC Taxi & Limousine (NY 161865/2023)

### 24/4816 Yakuel v. NYC Taxi & Limousine (NY 154689/2023)

### 24/5299 Yang v. Knights Genesis Group (NY 65118/2021)

### 25/2809 Yolanda Management v. Microalgo, Inc. (NY 650956/2024)

### 24/2488 Your Vet 1 v. Eastman, Cooke & Associates (NY 157678/2023)

### 23/6662 Your Vet 1 v. Eastman, Cooke & Associates (NY 157680/2023)

### 24/3654 ZDG, LLC v. 310 Group (NY 656537/2016)

### 25/1341 Zepa Industries v. 401 West Property (NY 651243/2024)

### 24/7791 Ziff v. Lombardo (NY 952011/2023)

### 24/3895N Zimmerman v. 410-57 Corporation (NY 653569/2020)

### 22/3428N Ramirez v. Askia Yaw (BX 1364/2019)

### 22/12941 People v. Aaron Cedres (BX 2244/2018)

### 24/1808 People v. Albert Holguin (NY 73095/2023)

### 22/5545 People v. Alfredo Colon (BX 71622/2021)

### 24/3522 People v. Ali Hijazi (BX 71849/2023)

### 24/3756 People v. Amadou Diallo (BX 72743/2022)

### 24/2409 People v. Angel Dejesus (BX 71262/2021)

September 8, 2025.

Questions may be directed to the Clerk's Office at (518) 455-7705.

## U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT

### Notice Regarding Change of Procedures Related To Filings Sealed Document in Criminal Matters

Pursuant to Administrative Order 2025-10, effective August 8, 2025, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York will no longer accept sealed documents in CM/ECF in criminal matters. Please see the Court's web site [www.nyed.uscourts.gov](http://www.nyed.uscourts.gov) for Administrative Order 2025-10 and instructions under the Attorney tab. Dated August 8, 2025, by Brenna B. Mahoney, Clerk of Court.

\*\*\*\*\*

### Criminal Justice Act Committee Is Accepting Applications Deadline is Sept. 8

151540/25 Fairchild v. Beau Dietl & Associates The Seaport NYC Et Al  
 152022/25 Figueroa v. Stephens  
 152962/24 Fora Financial Asset Securitization 2021 v. Fox Unltd. Inc. Et Al  
 157859/24 Fora Financial Asset Securitization 2021 v. Tommy Interor Contracting Corp. Et Al  
 158529/24 Fora Financial Warehouse v. Pina Limo Service Inc Et Al  
 654087/25 Galaxy Group Funding Eci U LLC v. Big Ticket Sports  
 156676/22 Gene R. Kazlow D/b/a Kazlow & Kazlow v. Victor  
 659872/24 Girouard v. Massie  
 653777/25 Govt. Employees Ins. Co. v. Allen  
 653815/25 Greene v. Gts Securities 161416/24 Hereford Ins. Co. v. Abreu-Rodriguez  
 152991/24 Hope Community Inc v. Rosario  
 158472/25 Hubbuch v. NYS Office of Court Admin. Et Al  
 652250/25 Hubus v. Metro. Transportation Auth. And Metro-North Commuter RR. Co.  
 101033/21 Hussein v. William J. Robb  
 654011/25 Ibrahim v. Sharhan  
 153726/25 Interli LLC v. Sisco  
 653252/23 Ilria Ventures LLC v. Anecela J LLC Et Al  
 190274/22 Jacqueline Woodson v. A.W. Chesterton Co. Et Al  
 153653/25 Kuschner v. 123-25 East 102nd St. Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al  
 650319/25 Kuun Inc. v. Utica First Ins. Co.  
 651473/20 Lau v. Tykoon Brand Hlgs. LLC  
 159852/23 Lomonaco v. Aci Vi Clarkson LLC Et Al  
 155199/21 Mantranzo Cano v. Hotel Des Artistes, Inc. Et Al  
 153289/25 Mattingly v. Rawal  
 152792/19 McLean v. Ashland  
 152905/25 McLeod v. McBurnie  
 650700/25 Mensil Rty. Corp. v. Blewett  
 850209/24 Murray Boys Rly. v. Singh Petroleum Six  
 654566/25 NY Road Runners, Inc. v. Flow Beverages  
 65354/22 Nextcom Const. Inc. v. Dxa Architecture Studio Plc  
 161145/20 Nieves v. Drax Rly. Corp.  
 656198/160 Shea Partners Llp v. Robert Gladstone  
 653218/21 Paramount Mgt. Group v. Tarb  
 45253/18 People of The State of v. Fischman  
 652616/17 Pjd Corporate Rty., Inc. v. Henry George School of 158403/24 Pw Hldg. Corp. Including All of Its Subsidiaries And Affiliates, Including But Not Ltd. To Avis Budget, LLC, Avis Car Rental, LLC, Budget Car Rental, LLC, Budget Truck Rental, LLC, Payless Car Rental, Inc. And Zipcar, Inc. v. Advanced Recovery Equipment And Supplies  
 654660/25 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan Llp v. Falcone  
 652622/25 Recoop LLC v. Freed  
 156797/25 Rodriguez Alzate v. Chella Luna Inc D/b/a Sugar Freak Et Al  
 655719/24 Scaroia Zubatov Schaffzin Plc v. Paramount Advisory  
 158565/20 Senath v. Illames  
 151246/23 Serna v. Adam's European Contracting, Inc. Et Al  
 158755/22 Sewald v. Complete Transport Systems LLC Et Al  
 153716/21 Shakhder v. The Board of Mgrs. of The St. Tropez Condominium Et Al  
 850401/24 Sig Cre 2023 Venture LLC v. 4 St. Lukes Pl. Inc. Et Al  
 159158/24 Smith v. 386 Park South LLC Et Al  
 654578/25 Square Funding LLC v. 24 Shells Inc Et Al  
 653317/25 Starwood Prop. Mortgage Sub-2 v. Starcup  
 653318/25 Starwood Prop. Mortgage Sub-2 v. Starcup  
 653319/25 Starwood Prop. Mortgage Sub-2 v. Starcup  
 154924/22 State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. A/s/o Phyllis E. Granat v. Maxwell-Kates, Inc. Et Al  
 185655/25 State Farm Fire And Casualty Co. v. Aguilar  
 152310/24 State Farm Fire And Casualty Co. v. Lopez  
 653392/23 Tedford's Tenancy v. Horizons Investors Corp. Et Al  
 160272/25 The Marshall Project, Inc. v. NY Police Dept.  
 155306/25 Timeless Funding LLC v. Snyder Const. LLC Et Al  
 653040/25 Torreyia Partners LLC v. Sandoz Inc  
 157052/23 Valdez v. Central Rug & Carpet Mart  
 151835/25 Valley Nat. Bank v. Holguin  
 155301/21 Volt 304 LLC v. Clickfox, Inc. Et Al  
 154881/22 Wg Three Associates v. Counterevolution  
 850241/22 Wilmington Savings Fund Society v. Milne

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

160580/25 141 Spencer LLC v. NYC Loft Board Et Al  
 652623/25 435 West 141 Millennium LLC v. The Rector  
 160439/22 545 Tenants Corp. v. Board of Mgrs. of 555 West End Ave. Condominium  
 160581/20 614-20 East 9th St. Hdfc v. Braudes  
 650871/24 Academic Health Professionals Ins. Assoc.-A Reciprocal Insurer v. Bhagavanti  
 652814/25 Alan Berman Architect Plc D/b/a Archetype Architecture v. Rockstar Enterprises Inc. D/b/a Rs Design Group  
 190058/21 Alison Holtermann v. Walgreen Eastern Co., Inc. Et Al  
 159975/22 Allocca v. NYCTA Et Al  
 654482/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Augustin  
 655587/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Bacchus  
 654876/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Chaffield  
 655029/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Clyde  
 655084/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Couildaly  
 655033/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Derick Collado Et Al  
 655490/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Diaz  
 655590/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Hunter  
 655137/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Jayden Wiggins Et Al  
 655035/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Marcial Reyes-Manjarez Et Al  
 655032/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Muhammad  
 655410/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Peterson Colas Et Al  
 655600/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Polanco  
 655599/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Rivas  
 655487/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Rivera-Crispin  
 655489/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Royal  
 655591/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Sherif  
 655631/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Williams  
 655592/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Zougrana  
 805135/25 Anagnosctou v. Franco Dds  
 156737/24 Angwang v. NYC Police Dept.  
 650735/22 Anhui Guoci Handbags Co., Ltd. v. Verge Creative Group

158603/25 Aragones Quintero v. Cromwell Capital LLC Et Al  
 650388/24 Bellwood NY Inc. v. 119 Ave. A Rly. Corp. Et Al  
 950109/19 Beneventine v. St. Theresa of The Infant Jesus Et Al  
 156127/24 Board of Mgrs. of Saga House Condominium v. Hanna Jesionowska Practice L.L.C. Et Al  
 156323/20 Bogenstein v. U.S. Bank Nat.  
 150057/25 Bowen v. Barnhart Restoration  
 654087/25 Break Point Public Affairs Inc. Et Al v. Sun  
 160120/20 Brodsky v. NYC Et Al  
 160354/18 C An Infant By Her Fng v. NYC  
 153739/18 C. v. NYC  
 152037/20 Cardona v. E.E. Cruz & Co., Inc.  
 160947/23 Castillo v. 404 Condo  
 656530/22 Catalyst Dev. Group LLC v. Basso 56 Inc. Et Al  
 653812/25 Cdk Global v. Stadium Int'l Trucks, Inc. Et Al  
 653174/25 Cg West 181st St. LLC v. 561 Manhattan Hardware Corp. Et Al  
 450446/25 NYC v. Febre  
 452622/23 NYC v. Grullon  
 655373/24 Continental Stock Transfer & Trust Co. v. Cannna Global Acquisition Corp. Et Al  
 152715/19 Cordoba v. Justice Ave Tower LLC  
 153497/23 Cox v. 36 S Oxford St 1527/16 Cristina De Heeren Noble And William D. Zabel v. The 1200 Fifth Condominium Et Al  
 659376/24 Cy Marine LLC v. Colon 157602/23 D'Ambrosio v. Rxr Hb Owner  
 156667/21 Davodian v. NYC Et Al  
 652668/24 Dga Security Systems, Inc. v. Heaven's Tiny Tots Child Dev. Center Inc.  
 157778/24 Dori v. 24 Hour Fitness USA  
 159859/23 Durakovic v. W2001/15cpw Rly.  
 952256/23 Dwyer v. Wasser  
 153619/19 Eustache v. Board of Education of The  
 152909/25 Farrell v. NYC Et Al  
 654438/25 Fast Sponsor II LLC v. Falcon's Beyond Global  
 151588/24 Flores Velata v. Puerto Rican Family Foundation Inc Et Al  
 155256/25 Flores v. Green  
 159460/25 Forward Financing LLC v. Radioview  
 650948/23 G/o Media, Inc. v. Mgid, Inc.  
 157700/25 Garlington v. Austin  
 159635/24 Govt. Employees Ins. Co. v. Bds Diagnostic Corp. Et Al  
 151793/24 Green v. Overwatch Services LLC  
 100269/23 Gu v. Uber Technologies Inc.  
 452302/23 Hernandez v. Franco  
 651656/23 High Point Prop. & Casualty Ins. Co. v. Guarini  
 850288/24 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Hurwitz  
 850370/24 Hilton Resorts Corp. v. Moore  
 452175/25 In The Matter of The Application of NY Black Car Operators' Injury Compensation Fund Inc. A/v/a NY Black Car Fund As Subrogee of Hassan Sall v. NYC  
 452176/25 In The Matter of The Application of NY Black Car Operators' Injury Compensation Fund Inc. A/v/a NY Black Car Fund As Subrogee of Jamal Suraj v. Arch Ins. Co.  
 451813/25 In The Matter of The Application of NY Black Car Operators' Injury Compensation Fund Inc. A/v/a NY Black Car Fund As Subrogee of Whiteington Cruz Baez v. Tilden Transportation Inc.  
 155519/18 James v. Rcb1 Nominee LLC  
 151782/25 Jones v. Tisch  
 850442/24 Jpmorgan Chase Bank v. 3155 B way. Partners LLC Et Al  
 161183/20 Kaufman v. Hirsch  
 157168/25 Krips v. NYC Dept. of Education Et Al  
 157289/25 Lamura v. Salmoiraghi  
 159637/23 Lynn Michelle Allen v. Fidelity Brokerage Services LLC Et Al  
 157858/23 M M An Infant Under The Age of 14 Years Old By Her Mother And Natural Guardian Jade Newby And Jade Newby Individually v. NYC Et Al  
 151192/23 Mak Chin v. Empire Resorts Inc. Et Al  
 154409/21 Malta v. Evancho  
 153761/25 Marotta v. Tucker  
 151907/25 Merrimack Mutual Fire Ins. Co. v. Fifth Ave. Owners Group LLC Et Al  
 652392/25 Metro. Commercial Bank v. Hiday  
 153971/25 Montero v. Diaz Jr.  
 152515/25 Mvp Delivery And Logistics, Inc. v. Brown Chiari Llp Et Al  
 158126/20 Nemni v. Poole  
 651426/25 Newt-Tso II Spv v. Michael E. Jones M.D.  
 850111/25 NYC Multifamily Portfolio LLC v. 1978-82 Third Ave LLC Et Al  
 850112/25 NYC Multifamily Portfolio LLC v. 20-22 Prince LLC Et Al  
 850110/25 NYC Multifamily Portfolio LLC v. 420 W 51 LLC Et Al  
 850113/25 NYC Multifamily Portfolio LLC v. Major Mott St. Corp. Et Al  
 450275/24 Olmo v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al  
 659695/24 Penny Hart v. Allen Rosenberg Et Al  
 659340/24 Penny Hart v. Allen Rosenberg Et Al  
 453196/22 People of The State of NY v. Vdare Foundation, Inc.  
 154039/23 Pierre v. Diaz  
 150236/19 Pihskioeld v. Jane St. Hotel  
 100473/25 Prendergast v. NYC (cont'd)  
 653716/23 Prime Contractors Inc. v. Ub-United Tech., Inc. Et Al  
 151806/24 Reich v. NYCTA Et Al  
 155791/25 Reyes Jr. v. NYC Et Al  
 655020/23 Reyes v. Aurify Brands  
 655193/24 Richard Kallman As Co-Trustee of The Kallman Family Irrevocable Trust Et Al v. Kineret Kallman As Co-Trustee of The Kallman Family Irrevocable Trust Et Al  
 805388/22 Roopa Unkrishnan Et Al v. Nancy Jasper Et Al  
 653243/23 Rosevine LLC Et Al v. Broza  
 653056/25 Rubin v. Anderson-Song  
 158314/25 S&E Bridge & Scaffold LLC v. Clerk of NY County  
 158135/23 Salazar v. 200 Park 153470/21 Samantha Torres v. NYCHA  
 159862/25 Sanchez v. Chen  
 150836/17 Santos v. NYC  
 653701/23 Shanklin v. Wilhelmnia Models, Inc.  
 160302/16 Shmueli v. Savoy Condominium  
 651573/25 Sig Rers D Mf 2023 Venture LLC v. West 157th St LLC Et Al  
 159807/19 Sutton v. Duenas  
 653004/25 T.R. Joy & Associates Inc. v. Integrated Const. Enterprises, Inc. Et Al  
 805392/23 Tancredi v. Sottile & Megna  
 157341/21 Tejera v. Tejera  
 161645/24 Thau v. Paradise Gourmet Deli & Grill Et Al  
 161316/17 Thies v. Gemini Residential LLC  
 651107/25 Timmons v. Guggenheim  
 155144/25 Tollefsen v. NYCTA Et Al  
 159374/18 Torres v. 120 B way. Hldgs.

655956/24 T&T Const. Inc. v. Hudson Excess Ins. Co.  
 653097/25 U.S. Electrical Services Inc. v. Popkin Electric, Inc. Et Al  
 154736/25 W Design, Inc. Et Al  
 Modern Woodcrafts LLC Et Al  
 154892/22 Wald v. Wald  
 151705/23 Wampustsrik v. 2995 Coney Island LLC Et Al  
 152773/20 Wang v. Feld  
 161486/23 White v. Hernandez  
 155059/16 Wurtenber v. NYC  
 152501/16 Xie v. Skanska USA Civil, Inc.  
 155720/25 Yang v. West 57th St. Funding  
 653307/25 Yangjiang Yangdong Maisons Housewares Co., Ltd v. Lifestyle Int'l  
 160816/23 Yanza Chimbay v. 726 Eight LLC Et Al  
**MONDAY, SEPT. 8**  
 152076/25 21st Century Ins. Co. Et Al  
 654986/23 4media Group, Inc. v. Rxmedical Dynamics  
 154345/23 Aae5b Fund 17 v. Duval & Stachenfeld  
 154362/24 Adams v. NYC Et Al  
 654446/25 Afcu Credit Corp. v. Dhd Offshore Services  
 155811/25 Almonte v. Walker  
 159140/25 America First Policy Institute v. Bragg  
 150410/24 American Express Travel Related Services Co., Inc. v. Amazing Outdoors  
 655413/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Andrea Holder Et Al  
 654471/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Pringle  
 650064/24 Amur Equipment Finance, Inc. v. Dbms Consulting, Inc. Et Al  
 156487/24 Azeizai v. Sparkle Dental Et Al  
 950032/19 Bakhrakh v. Elaine Kaufman Cultural Center  
 160446/19 Bautista v. Fernandez  
 160162/21 Bianna Todorovic v. Roosevelt Island Operating Corp. Et. Ano.  
 150893/25 Bloomingdale Road Recovery, LLC Assignee To Chernywood Enterprises, LLC Assignee To Financial Pacific Leasing, Inc. v. Empire State Masonry  
 650774/25 Borux Int'l Corp. v. American Guarantee And Liability Ins. Co. Et Al  
 158295/22 Caceres v. Boyd  
 190203/25 Carpenter v. Minerals Technologies, Inc. Et Al  
 159021/20 Castro v. 122nd St. Prop. Inc.  
 452260/25 Castro v. Dept. of Housing Preservation And Dev. of NYC  
 100682/25 Cesar v.  
 654333/25 Chertkov v. Cooley Llp  
 654080/25 Citi Private Advisory v. Barrett  
 152882/25 Coleman v. Pochoda  
 152589/22 Constantin v. Brookfield Properties One Wfc Co. LLC Et Al  
 159366/21 De Araujo v. Titanium Const. Services, Inc. Et Al  
 652711/25 Distic. Council 37 v. NYC Et Al  
 651581/25 Doberge Torte LLC Et Al v. Hernandez  
 153606/21 Douglas v. NYC  
 654985/23 Eggerud v. West End 84 Units LLC Et Al  
 151803/24 Escobar v. 24 West Food Corp. D/b/a Food Dynasty Et Al  
 152980/25 Espinal v. Thomaselli  
 154019/24 Fora Financial Asset Securitization 2021 v. Tri State Mgt. Group LLC Et Al  
 154781/24 Fora Financial Warehouse v. Fresh Produce Essentials Corp. Et Al  
 155005/24 Fora Financial Warehouse v. Integrated USA Systems  
 654022/25 Freshlink Prod. Dev. v. Special Delivery Subscription Box LLC  
 161344/15 Friedfeld v. Citibank N.A.  
 152584/21 Gelormino v. Retirement Systems of Alabama Hldg.  
 654505/16 Gelwan v. Derataifa  
 158030/25 Glassman v. Feldman  
 654891/24 Goldberg v. Marcus  
 155313/21 Guarino v. North Shore Towers Apts. Inc. Et Al  
 161476/21 Guthrie v. NYC Et Al  
 152568/25 Guluz v. Combs  
 154564/25 Han v. The NYCTA Et Al  
 160017/25 Hartman Uie Rose & Ratner Llp v.  
 152188/24 Hernandez-Lugo v. Whitehall Ferry Donuts LLC  
 151674/22 Hiddro v. 450 Partners LLC Et Al  
 157372/25 Hodgins v. NY Convention Center Dev. Corp. Et Al  
 653697/24 Hofstra Univ. Et Al v. United Educators  
 101445/24 Hughley v. NYC Dept. of Finance Bp  
 159239/20 In Re Application of The v. NYC Police  
 155557/25 In The Matter of The Application of Carlos Moreno v. NYC Et Al  
 159894/25 In The Matter of The Application of Mepec 132 LLC v. Streamline USA  
 452035/25 In The Matter of The Application of NY Black Car Operators' Injury Compensation Fund Inc. A/v/a NY Black Car Fund As Subrogee of Erack Beaubrun v. Navigators Ins. Co. Et Al  
 652314/25 Itria Ventures LLC v. R1 Solutions, Inc. Et Al  
 655049/24 J&M Coutinho v. Isabell  
 157876/22 James v. One East River Pl. Rty. Co. II  
 156792/24 Jimenez v. 95-101  
 652568/25 John's Mountain LLC Et Al v. The Board of Mgrs. of The Laurel Condominium Et Al  
 650584/25 Kahn v. Fusaris  
 159481/19 Kral v. NYCHA  
 652469/25 Lia Bio v. Graviton Bioscience Corp. Et Al  
 951304/21 Lanza v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al  
 653584/24 Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. Et Al v. Figueroa  
 152854/21 McIntyre v. Newyork-Presbyterian Global Services  
 152905/25 McLeod v. McBurnie  
 160318/21 Medina Tejada v. Cauldwell-Wingate Co.  
 161716/24 Metrospeedy Operations v. Nordstrom  
 654125/25 Modern Bank v. Zepeda  
 190257/24 Morin v. Pfizer Inc. Et Al  
 653535/22 Mt. Hawley Ins. Co. v. Pathforward Consulting, Inc.  
 651664/24 Noho Cultural Society Inc. D/b/a Zero Bond v. Kitchensync LLC Et Al  
 452032/25 NYC Luxury Kitchen & Bath v. Taylor  
 158143/25 Patel v. NYC Dept. of Consumer And Worker Protection  
 654603/17 Ps 90 Board of Mgrs.; v. L&M Dev. Partners  
 151251/25 Quel Sciajau v. 88 St Food Corp.  
 651352/25 Quest Diagnostics Inc. v. Scriber Medicine Corp.  
 154234/25 Res. v. Deutsche Bank Securities  
 655193/24 Richard Kallman As Co-Trustee of The Kallman Family Irrevocable Trust Et Al v. Kineret Kallman As Co-Trustee of The Kallman Family Irrevocable Trust Et Al  
 152476/23 Rissso Villalba v. Hudson 37 LLC Et Al  
 656468/18 Rolando Mechanical Corp. v. 2701 B way. Rly. LLC  
 159999/25 Roth & Roth v. NYCTA Et Al  
 160000/25 Roth & Roth v. NYCTA Et Al  
 159837/25 Roth And Roth v. NYC Fire Dept.  
 158125/22 Rsd857 LLC v. Wright  
 652528/23 Sadis & Goldberg Llp v. Ligonier Capital Co. LLC Et Al

452906/24 Sales v. Justiniano  
 156565/18 Salvesen v. Port Auth. of New  
 157861/19 Sandra L. Sy And Charlene v. Orellana  
 155689/25 Schwarzhorn Re 430 W 15 LLC v. Wb Hldgs.  
 653189/25 Soho Hotel Owner LLC v. La Rubia Raw Bar LLC  
 150074/22 Squatiro v. Tishman Speyer Properties Inc. Et Al  
 152264/25 State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. v. Pitter  
 155649/22 Tavernia v. Ppf Off Two Park Ave. Owner  
 654199/25 The Avanza Group v. Kingdom Logistics  
 161633/23 The City Et Al v. NYC Police Dept. Et Al  
 159209/24 The Spence School v. Phillips  
 651566/25 Tillis v. Zar Rty. NY LLC Et Al  
 161411/19 Travelers Prop. v. Vema Group  
 654164/25 Valentine v. NYCTA  
 152009/24 Vargas v. The Dept. of Education of NYC Et Al  
 160212/24 Vinas v. Argnouat Hldgs., Inc. Et Al  
 653985/24 Wesco Ins. Co. v. Db Ins. Co., Ltd. (us Branch)  
 F/a/a Dongbu Ins. Co., Ltd. (us Branch)  
 155168/25 Whitman v. Moritt

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

651656/23 High Point Prop. & Casualty Ins. Co. v. Guarini  
 157341/21 Tejera v. Tejera  
**MONDAY, SEPT. 8**  
 653923/22 20-22 Prince LLC v. Bruner  
 159366/21 De Araujo v. Titanium Const. Services, Inc. Et Al  
**Part 3**  
**Justice Joel M. Cohen**  
 60 Centre Street  
 Phone 646-386-3287  
 Room 208  
**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**  
 654087/25 Galaxy Group Funding Eci U LLC v. Big Ticket Sports  
 659872/24 Girouard v. Massie  
**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**  
 652623/25 435 West 141 Millennium LLC v. The Rector  
 652301/24 Madison Tower Condominium v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
 157260/19 Mahmood v. Riverside 1795 Associates  
 259113/19 Milt Hldgs. LLC v. The Tax Comm. of NYC  
 160580/25 141 Spencer LLC v. NYC Loft Board Et Al  
 655490/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Diaz  
 151978/25 Bailey v. 1614 Madison Partners  
 159633/23 Bankers Healthcare Group v. Kjahejnouri  
 653444/22 Bavaro v. Runway Towing Corp. Et Al  
 150850/24 Burns v. Bop Se LLC Et Al  
 654898/25 Cavallo v. Mclp Asset Co., Inc.  
 158136/24 Chavez Flores v. 211 West 84th St Owner LLC Et Al  
 650030/19 Conesus Properties LLC v. Photovillage Industries Inc.  
 650023/24 Corporate Collections LLC v. Aci Fed., Inc.  
 652120/13 Derossi v. Yavuz  
 656648/21 Doka USA v. Benedetto Cupo A/v/a Yenedetto Cupo  
 656909/23 Estel America Inc. v. 50 Hymc Owner LLC v. Green  
 152526/25 Garlington v. Austin  
 157709/23 Grob v. Nitsche  
 652423/23 Haight St. Mixed Use Llc v. 411 Haight St. Mezzanine  
 155578/24 Hayward v. Wof Inc.  
 155401/22 Hereford Ins. Co. v. Aag Physical Therapy  
 161832/23 Infinity Auto Ins. Co. v. Torres  
 101265/24 Lichaw v. Lichaw  
 151907/25 Merrimack Mutual Fire Ins. Co. v. Fifth Ave. Owners Group LLC Et Al  
 157130/25 Mmp 309 Owner LLC v. Dzhupanova  
 151616/25 Morales v. Friends Seminary Et Al  
 655866/19 New City Produce v. G&S Produce And Trucking Corp.  
 156888/21 Nisanov v. Marbo Restaurant Inc Dba Yips Restaurant Et Al  
 161363/24 Oliver v. J.K. Campus, Inc.  
 161700/23 P. v. Sco Family of Services  
 161968/24 Pecheux v. The 322 West 57th Condominium Et Al  
 659340/24 Penny Hart v. Allen Rosenberg Et Al

**Motion**  
 652301/16 Ambase Corp. v. 111 West 57th Sponsor LLC Et Al  
 653032/23 Receivables Im Rest v. Gb Restaurant Corp.  
 656511/23 Rosenwald v. 1120 Fifth Ave. Corp.  
 153490/23 Rougier v. Thomas Phifer And Partners  
 152164/25 Salazar v. 160 Front St Associates LLC Et Al  
 654673/21 The Hedaya Capital Group, Inc. v. Park Falls Industrial Mgt. LLC Et Al  
 154201/24 Union Mutual Fire Ins. Co. A/s/o 415 NYC LLC v. Con Ed Co. of New York, Inc.  
 650519/21 Village Rly. LLC v. Lamano West Village LLC  
 159594/24 Walker v. 1324 Forest Ave. Rly.  
 160816/23 Yanza Chimbay v. 726 Eight LLC Et Al  
 652896/21 Zaleski Properties v. 2412 Church LLC Et Al  
**Motion**  
 654898/25 Cavallo v. Mclp Asset Co., Inc.  
 101265/24 Lichaw v. Lichaw  
 157130/25 Mmp 309 Owner LLC v. Dzhupanova  
**MONDAY, SEPT. 8**  
 160848/24 Arroyo v. 7-Eleven, Inc. Et Al  
 651986/23 Be Temerario Group Et Al  
 156760/22 Alonzo v. Doherty  
 152098/22 C. v. Washington Square Southeast Apts., Inc.  
 155723/23 Great American Alliance Ins. Co. v. Fiorella  
 159823/23 Lomonaco v. Aci Vi Clarkson LLC Et Al  
 650998/25 Montfort v. Leslie J. Garfield & Co., Inc.  
 154569/23 Phillips As Father And Natural Guardian To S.P. An Infant v. Eatly America, Inc.  
 154529/23 St. Jules v. Gs Site 25 Hotel  
**Motion**  
 653223/25 Alf Inc v. Sant Baba Karmjot Corp Et Al  
 156760/22 Alonzo v. Doherty  
 152098/22 C. v. Washington Square Southeast Apts., Inc.  
 155723/23 Great American Alliance Ins. Co. v. Fiorella  
 650998/25 Montfort v. Leslie J. Garfield & Co., Inc.  
 154569/23 Phillips As Father And Natural Guardian To S.P. An Infant v. Eatly America, Inc.  
 154529/23 St. Jules v. Gs Site 25 Hotel  
**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**  
 160848/24 Arroyo v. 7-Eleven, Inc. Et Al  
 651986/23 Be Temerario Group Et Al  
 156760/22 Alonzo v. Doherty  
 152098/22 C. v. Washington Square Southeast Apts., Inc.  
 155723/23 Great American Alliance Ins. Co. v. Fiorella  
 650998/25 Montfort v. Leslie J. Garfield & Co., Inc.  
 154569/23 Phillips As Father And Natural Guardian To S.P. An Infant v. Eatly America, Inc.  
 154529/23 St. Jules v. Gs Site 25 Hotel  
**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**  
 650388/24 Bellwood NY Inc. v. 119 Ave. A Rly. Corp. Et Al  
 157600/23 D'Ambrosio v. Rxr Hb Owner Corp. Et Al  
 150236/19 Pihskioeld v. Jane St. Hotel  
 152638/22 Y. v. Linden Hill No 2 Co.-Op Corp. v. And  
**MONDAY, SEPT. 8**  
 100535/25 Amis v. NYC Dept. of Health And Mental Hygiene  
 650642/24 Amur Equipment Finance, Inc. v. Dbms Consulting, Inc. Et Al  
 151337/23 Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. A/s/o Seward Park Housing Corp. v. Darby Const. Services  
 157876/22 James v. One East River Pl. Rty. Co. II  
 152854/21 McIntyre v. Newyork-Presbyterian Global Services v. Nordstrom  
 650205/25 Mowaswes v. Mena Origins LLC  
 656050/21 Unirea Shopping Centre S.A. v. Adamescu  
**Motion**  
 100535/25 Amis v. NYC Dept. of Health And Mental Hygiene  
 151337/23 Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. A/s/o Seward Park Housing Corp. v. Darby Const. Services  
 157876/22 James v. One East River Pl. Rty. Co. II  
 152854/21 McIntyre v. Newyork-Presbyterian Global Services v. Nordstrom  
 650205/25 Mowaswes v. Mena Origins LLC  
 656050/21 Unirea Shopping Centre S.A. v. Adamescu  
**Motion**  
 100535/25 Amis v. NYC Dept. of Health And Mental Hygiene  
 151337/23 Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. A/s/o Seward Park Housing Corp. v. Darby Const. Services  
 157876/22 James v. One East River Pl. Rty. Co. II  
 152854/21 McIntyre v. Newyork-Presbyterian Global Services v. Nordstrom  
 650205/25 Mowaswes v. Mena Origins LLC  
 656050/21 Unirea Shopping Centre S.A. v. Adamescu  
**Part 14**  
**Justice Arlene P. Bluth**  
 60 Centre Street  
 Phone 646-386-3219  
 Room 432  
**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**  
 156676/22 Gene R. Kazlow D/b/a Kazlow & Kazlow v. Victor  
 653392/23 Tedford's Tenancy v. Horizons Investors Corp. Et Al  
**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**  
 156676/22 Gene R. Kazlow D/b/a Kazlow & Kazlow v. Victor  
 653392/23 Tedford's Tenancy v. Horizons Investors Corp. Et Al  
**Part 15**  
**Justice Linda M. Capititi**  
 60 Centre Street  
 Phone 646-386-3848  
 Room 355  
**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**  
 365548/23 Lee v. Cheung  
**MONDAY, SEPT. 8**  
 365204/22 Eng v. Eng  
**Part 11**  
**Justice Lyle E. Frank**  
 60 Centre Street  
 Phone 646-386-3314  
 Room 412  
**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**  
 650024/23 27-10 37th Avenue v. Lb Engineering  
 157552/24 Adler Pollock & Sheehan PC v. Mogul Inc.  
 157796/25 Ashby v. 230-79 Equity Inc.  
 653591/24 Citibank v. Burns  
 151991/24 Goodman v. Bsd 685 NY Propco LLC Et Al  
 652820/25 Grossman v. Zahler  
 65250/25 Hurbs v. Metro. Transportation Auth. And Metro-North Commuter RR. Co.  
 652622/25 Recoop LLC v. Freed  
 157601/21 Ricci v. Discover Bank Et Al  
 101947/19 Rincon v. NYC Police  
 156797/25 Rodriguez Alzate v. Chella Luna Inc D/b/a Sugar Freak Et Al  
 654578/25 Square Funding LLC v. 24 Shells Inc Et Al  
 154924/22 State Farm Fire And Casualty



153095/19Zhang v. Lis Rly. Associates

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

80517/21 Kannadan v. Munawar & Andrews-Santillo

**MONDAY, SEPT. 8**

151059/20Arriga Pablo v. Staggs Const., Inc.  
15747/22Attanasio v. Ab Stable LLC Et Al  
160162/21Biana Todorovic v. Roosevelt Island Operating Corp. Et. Ano.

159825/19Charles v. Caroline Apts. 150589/21 Saba v. Metro-North Commuter RR. Co. Et Al  
155655/18Salvesen v. Port Auth. of New

**Part 73R**

**Special Referee**

Justice Diego Santiago  
60 Centre Street  
Room 354

**Part 75R**

**Special Referee**

Justice Stephen S. Burzio  
60 Centre Street  
Room 240

**Part 81R**

**Special Referee**

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

**Part 84R**

**Special Referee**

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

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

653927/23Shiplon v. Bauble Bar, Inc.

**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

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

150463/21Li 505 East 88th St. LLC v. Milio

**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. 4**

190295/13Brennan v. A.O. Smith Water Prods.  
190001/24Cappellini Jr. v. 3m Co. Et Al  
190401/18Flanzraich v. Abb, Inc.  
190274/22Jacqueline Woodson v. A.W. Chesterton Co. Et Al  
190263/24Soika v. 3m Co. Et Al

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

190058/21Alison Holtermann v. Walgreen Eastern Co., Inc Et Al  
952256/23Dwyer v. Wasser

**MONDAY, SEPT. 8**

190203/25Carpenter v. Minerals Technologies, Inc., Et Al  
190257/24Morin v. Pfizer Inc. Et Al  
190025/16Quirk v. Abb, Inc.

**Part 18**

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

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

950109/19Beneventine v. St. Theresa of The Infant Jesus Et Al  
15828/224In The Matter of The Application of Zackary Logan v. NYC

151782/25Jones v. Tisch  
450275/24Olmo v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al

**Motion**

15828/224In The Matter of The Application of Zackary Logan v. NYC

**MONDAY, SEPT. 8**

950368/20Allen v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al  
95137/221Alverio v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al  
950032/19Bakhrakh v. Elaine Kaufman Cultural Center  
950105/19Bassille v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al  
950440/21 C. v. Archdiocese of NY  
950139/21 Collazo v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese  
950469/21 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY  
950608/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY  
950204/21 Doe v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese  
950694/20 Fleming v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al

951304/21 Lanza v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY Et Al  
950552/20 Morris v. Archdiocese of NY  
950256/20 N. v. Archdiocese of NY  
450275/24 Olmo v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al  
951223/21 Saleh v. NYC Et Al  
950019/20 Washington v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY  
950139/21 Collazo v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese  
950469/21 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY  
950608/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY  
950204/21 Doe v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese  
950694/20 Fleming v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al

**Motion**

950469/21 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY  
950608/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY  
950694/20 Fleming v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al  
950256/20 N. v. Archdiocese of NY  
450275/24 Olmo v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al  
951223/21 Saleh v. NYC Et Al  
950019/20 Washington v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY  
950139/21 Collazo v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese  
950469/21 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY  
950608/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY  
950204/21 Doe v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese  
950694/20 Fleming v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al

**Motion**

950469/21 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY  
950608/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY  
950694/20 Fleming v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al  
950256/20 N. v. Archdiocese of NY  
450275/24 Olmo v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al  
951223/21 Saleh v. NYC Et Al  
950019/20 Washington v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY  
950139/21 Collazo v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese  
950469/21 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY  
950608/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY  
950204/21 Doe v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese  
950694/20 Fleming v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al

**Motion**

950469/21 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY  
950608/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY  
950694/20 Fleming v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al  
950256/20 N. v. Archdiocese of NY  
450275/24 Olmo v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al  
951223/21 Saleh v. NYC Et Al  
950019/20 Washington v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY  
950139/21 Collazo v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese  
950469/21 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY  
950608/20 Doe v. Archdiocese of NY  
950204/21 Doe v. Roman Catholic Archdiocese  
950694/20 Fleming v. Archdiocese of NY Et Al

**Part 23**

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

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

190295/13Brennan v. A.O. Smith Water Prods.  
190001/24Cappellini Jr. v. 3m Co. Et Al  
190401/18Flanzraich v. Abb, Inc.  
190274/22Jacqueline Woodson v. A.W. Chesterton Co. Et Al  
190263/24Soika v. 3m Co. Et Al

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

190058/21Alison Holtermann v. Walgreen Eastern Co., Inc Et Al  
952256/23Dwyer v. Wasser

**MONDAY, SEPT. 8**

190203/25Carpenter v. Minerals Technologies, Inc., Et Al  
190257/24Morin v. Pfizer Inc. Et Al  
190025/16Quirk v. Abb, Inc.

**Part 29**

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

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

158135/23Salazar v. 200 Park  
151705/23Wampustsrik v. 2995 Coney Island LLC Et Al

**Part 36**

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

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

151504/25Fairchild v. Beau Dielt & Associates The Seaport NYC Et Al

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

160302/16Shmueli v. Savoy Condominium  
152501/16Xie v. Skanska USA Civil, Inc.

**MONDAY, SEPT. 8**

161344/15Priedfeld v. Citibank N.A.  
161717/24Hw Dev. 3 v. Board of Mgrs. of The Art Deco Condominium Et Al  
451942/13Walton v. Ecumenical Community

**Part 46**

Justice Richard Latin  
71 Thomas Street  
Phone 646-386-5281  
Room 210

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

161273/21Abrano v. 207 Madison Owners LLC Et Al—10 A.M.  
155819/19Dymnet v. Beress  
158755/22Sewald v. Complete Transport Systems LLC Et Al  
153716/21Shakdher v. The Board of Mgrs. of The St. Tropez Condominium Et Al  
153348/22Vivar Gomez v. Sutton Manor Apts., Inc.

**Motion**

155819/19Dymnet v. Beress  
153348/22Vivar Gomez v. Sutton Manor Apts., Inc.

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

156243/17Dhindsa v. Board of Mgrs. of The—10:30 A.M.  
154858/21 Gomez v. Vornado Rly. Trust Et Al—9:30 A.M.

151475/22Hereford Ins. Co. v. Longevity Medical Supplies  
156968/23 Nahun v. Apple, Inc. Et Al—12:30 P.M.  
160562/22Stringer v. Kim—10 A.M.

**Motion**

151475/22Hereford Ins. Co. v. Longevity Medical Supplies

**MONDAY, SEPT. 8**

150020/23Arostegui v. Nova Const. Services LLC Et Al—11 A.M.  
153456/23Franck v. 509 W 34—11 A.M.  
156633/22Fuentes v. Avalonbay Communities Inc. Et Al—10 A.M.  
150488/23 Gil v. 650 Rly. Assoc LLC Et Al—11 A.M.  
154116/22 Gonzalez Paiz v. 225 East 86th St. Condominium Et Al—10 A.M.  
157744/23 Gwardyak v. Colonial Village Associates—11:30 A.M.  
152193/25Martinez v. Sony Music Entertainment Et Al  
151391/25Martinez v. Universal Music Publishing, Inc. Et Al  
160143/22Maybury v. Fantasia Industries Corp. Et Al—12 Noon  
158611/19Meyers v. Becker & Poliakoff—10:30 A.M.  
153667/24 P. v. Time Square Men's Spa, Inc.—10:30 A.M.  
161905/23 Plencia v. 401 Hotel Reit—3:00 A.M.  
157138/22 Rico Florez v. Dlc Dev. Corp. Et Al—9:30 A.M.  
160246/21 Sanchez v. Rxr Rly. LLC Et Al—11 A.M.

**Motion**

152193/25Martinez v. Sony Music Entertainment Et Al  
151391/25Martinez v. Universal Music Publishing, Inc. Et Al

**Part 55**

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

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

158472/25Hubbuck v. NYS Office of Court Admin. Et Al  
159158/24Smith v. 386 Park South LLC Et Al  
100689/25Stewart v. Bdg Gotham Plaza

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

65702/21 Accredited Surety And Casualty Co., Inc. Et Al v. Illinois Union Ins. Co. Et Al  
152473/18Aguiar v. Home Builders 1 LP  
159803/23Almonte v. Nunez  
655590/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Hunter  
655489/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Royal  
160947/23 Castillo v. 404 Condo  
161843/23 Davis v. 813 Saint Nicholas Ave. Opportunity  
157778/24 Dori v. 24 Hour Fitness USA  
151588/24 Flores Velata v. Puerto Rican Family Foundation Inc Et Al  
159460/25 Forward Financing LLC v. Radiwojvic  
151793/24 Green v. Overwatch Services LLC  
451813/25 In The Matter of The Application of NY Black Car Operators' Injury Compensation Fund Inc. A/k/a NY Black Car Fund As Subrogee of Wellington Cruz Baez v. Tilden Transportation Inc.  
161776/18 Jefferson And Sons LLC v. Mnp, Inc.  
157890/24 Jeffrey Beers Int'l LLC v. Costello  
952200/23 Kyssa v. Sivananda Ashram  
153761/25 Marotta v. Tucker  
110961/09 Sun Shan Lee Rly. v. Sapphire Estate  
451809/25 NYC v. The Land And Bldg. Known As 351 West 44th St.  
157515/24 Trooper 1 v. Cuomo  
155059/16 Wurttemberg v. NYC

**Motion**

159803/23Almonte v. Nunez  
161776/18 Jefferson And Sons LLC v. Mnp, Inc.  
157890/24 Jeffrey Beers Int'l LLC v. Costello  
952200/23 Kyssa v. Sivananda Ashram  
153761/25 Marotta v. Tucker  
110961/09 Sun Shan Lee Rly. v. Sapphire Estate  
451809/25 NYC v. The Land And Bldg. Known As 351 West 44th St.  
157515/24 Trooper 1 v. Cuomo  
155059/16 Wurttemberg v. NYC

**Motion**

159803/23Almonte v. Nunez  
161776/18 Jefferson And Sons LLC v. Mnp, Inc.  
157890/24 Jeffrey Beers Int'l LLC v. Costello  
952200/23 Kyssa v. Sivananda Ashram  
153761/25 Marotta v. Tucker  
110961/09 Sun Shan Lee Rly. v. Sapphire Estate  
451809/25 NYC v. The Land And Bldg. Known As 351 West 44th St.  
157515/24 Trooper 1 v. Cuomo  
155059/16 Wurttemberg v. NYC

**Part 29**

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

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

158135/23Salazar v. 200 Park  
151705/23Wampustsrik v. 2995 Coney Island LLC Et Al

**Part 36**

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

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

151504/25Fairchild v. Beau Dielt & Associates The Seaport NYC Et Al

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

160302/16Shmueli v. Savoy Condominium  
152501/16Xie v. Skanska USA Civil, Inc.

**MONDAY, SEPT. 8**

161344/15Priedfeld v. Citibank N.A.  
161717/24Hw Dev. 3 v. Board of Mgrs. of The Art Deco Condominium Et Al  
451942/13Walton v. Ecumenical Community

**Part 46**

Justice Richard Latin  
71 Thomas Street  
Phone 646-386-5281  
Room 210

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

161273/21Abrano v. 207 Madison Owners LLC Et Al—10 A.M.  
155819/19Dymnet v. Beress  
158755/22Sewald v. Complete Transport Systems LLC Et Al  
153716/21Shakdher v. The Board of Mgrs. of The St. Tropez Condominium Et Al  
153348/22Vivar Gomez v. Sutton Manor Apts., Inc.

**Motion**

155819/19Dymnet v. Beress  
153348/22Vivar Gomez v. Sutton Manor Apts., Inc.

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

156243/17Dhindsa v. Board of Mgrs. of The—10:30 A.M.  
154858/21 Gomez v. Vornado Rly. Trust Et Al—9:30 A.M.

151475/22Hereford Ins. Co. v. Longevity Medical Supplies  
156968/23 Nahun v. Apple, Inc. Et Al—12:30 P.M.  
160562/22Stringer v. Kim—10 A.M.

**Motion**

151475/22Hereford Ins. Co. v. Longevity Medical Supplies

**MONDAY, SEPT. 8**

150020/23Arostegui v. Nova Const. Services LLC Et Al—11 A.M.  
153456/23Franck v. 509 W 34—11 A.M.  
156633/22Fuentes v. Avalonbay Communities Inc. Et Al—10 A.M.  
150488/23 Gil v. 650 Rly. Assoc LLC Et Al—11 A.M.  
154116/22 Gonzalez Paiz v. 225 East 86th St. Condominium Et Al—10 A.M.  
157744/23 Gwardyak v. Colonial Village Associates—11:30 A.M.  
152193/25Martinez v. Sony Music Entertainment Et Al  
151391/25Martinez v. Universal Music Publishing, Inc. Et Al  
160143/22Maybury v. Fantasia Industries Corp. Et Al—12 Noon  
158611/19Meyers v. Becker & Poliakoff—10:30 A.M.  
153667/24 P. v. Time Square Men's Spa, Inc.—10:30 A.M.  
161905/23 Plencia v. 401 Hotel Reit—3:00 A.M.  
157138/22 Rico Florez v. Dlc Dev. Corp. Et Al—9:30 A.M.  
160246/21 Sanchez v. Rxr Rly. LLC Et Al—11 A.M.

**Motion**

152193/25Martinez v. Sony Music Entertainment Et Al  
151391/25Martinez v. Universal Music Publishing, Inc. Et Al

**Part 55**

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

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

158472/25Hubbuck v. NYS Office of Court Admin. Et Al  
159158/24Smith v. 386 Park South LLC Et Al  
100689/25Stewart v. Bdg Gotham Plaza

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

65702/21 Accredited Surety And Casualty Co., Inc. Et Al v. Illinois Union Ins. Co. Et Al  
152473/18Aguiar v. Home Builders 1 LP  
159803/23Almonte v. Nunez  
655590/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Hunter  
655489/24 American Transit Ins. Co. v. Royal  
160947/23 Castillo v. 404 Condo  
161843/23 Davis v. 813 Saint Nicholas Ave. Opportunity  
157778/24 Dori v. 24 Hour Fitness USA  
151588/24 Flores Velata v. Puerto Rican Family Foundation Inc Et Al  
159460/25 Forward Financing LLC v. Radiwojvic  
151793/24 Green v. Overwatch Services LLC  
451813/25 In The Matter of The Application of NY Black Car Operators' Injury Compensation Fund Inc. A/k/a NY Black Car Fund As Subrogee of Wellington Cruz Baez v. Tilden Transportation Inc.  
161776/18 Jefferson And Sons LLC v. Mnp, Inc.  
157890/24 Jeffrey Beers Int'l LLC v. Costello  
952200/23 Kyssa v. Sivananda Ashram  
153761/25 Marotta v. Tucker  
110961/09 Sun Shan Lee Rly. v. Sapphire Estate  
451809/25 NYC v. The Land And Bldg. Known As 351 West 44th St.  
157515/24 Trooper 1 v. Cuomo  
155059/16 Wurttemberg v. NYC

**Motion**

159803/23Almonte v. Nunez  
161776/18 Jefferson And Sons LLC v. Mnp, Inc.  
157890/24 Jeffrey Beers Int'l LLC v. Costello  
952200/23 Kyssa v. Sivananda Ashram  
153761/25 Marotta v. Tucker  
110961/09 Sun Shan Lee Rly. v. Sapphire Estate  
451809/25 NYC v. The Land And Bldg. Known As 351 West 44th St.  
157515/24 Trooper 1 v. Cuomo  
155059/16 Wurttemberg v. NYC

**Part 29**

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

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

158135/23Salazar v. 200 Park  
151705/23Wampustsrik v. 2995 Coney Island LLC Et Al

**Part 36**

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

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

151504/25Fairchild v. Beau Dielt & Associates The Seaport NYC Et Al

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

</

23000/19 Rodas v. W 54-7 LLC  
80011821 Singh v. 645 Barretto St.  
Housing

**Part 13**

**Justice Patsy Gouldborne**  
Phone 718-618-1236  
Room 401, 9:30 A.M.

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

33045/18 Acosta v. Cintas Corp.  
815895/23 Alom v. Bowery  
Residents Committee, Inc. Et Al  
22619/19 Brown v. Langtigua  
80905/22 Casas-Acevedo v.  
Ramirez  
812433/23 Cole v. Hurricane Mgt.  
Corp Et Al  
815151/22 Dodaj v. Velasquez  
810619/23 Edwards v. Integrated  
Security Professionals, Inc. Et Al  
802995/22 Gordon v. Ug Imperial  
Inc. Et Al  
34255/20 Green v. American United  
803931/22 Guzman v. 980  
Westchester Owner LLC Et Al  
25286/19 Hernandez v. Boakye  
808299/22 Hosen v. Lupiz  
22583/18 Islam v. Ciso  
26625/20 Jordan v. Mahray  
818574/23 Mightly v. Lawrence  
22593/19 Montalvo v. Del Carmen  
Alcantara Sr.  
34320/19 Nagi v. Bloom  
22970/20 Perez v. Seto  
805669/21 Polanco v. Hutchinson  
Pswy. Apts., Inc. Et Al  
30025/20 Powell v. Powell  
802593/22 Ramirez v. Arriaga  
3134/18 Reid v. Gomez  
818111/23 Rodriguez v. Whitby  
817574/21 Sanchez v. Bono  
31265/20 Shaw v. Maha  
803709/24 Soto v. Wise  
20227/20 Suarez v. Compaore  
806175/23 Tribuzio v. Mazzeo Jr.  
809349/22 Wright v. Empire  
Merchants

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

808777/22 Cuevas v. Motivate LLC  
Et Al  
812609/21 Dilone v.  
807975/21 Malave v. Ndong  
22420/17 Moss v. Agramonte  
27303/17 Simmons v. NYCTA  
802593/22 Tavarez v. Pagano  
29835/18 Williams v. 2721  
Neighborhood Parking  
2529/16 Williams v. Bronxwood  
Parking Corp.

**Part 12**

**Justice Kim A. Wilson**  
Phone 718-618-1396  
Room 414, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 14**

**Justice John A. Howard**  
Phone 718-618-1244  
Room 607, 9:30 A.M.

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

801900/21 Bari v. Becaj  
801492/24 Bell v. Marchesani III  
812895/21 Birch v. Brisport  
22115/17 Bryson v. Doe  
819681/23 Corcino Moises v.  
Vikrant Contracting And  
Builders Inc Et Al  
811915/22 Cruz Mejia v. 1800 Milk  
22833/15 Diaz v. Ceron  
805509/23 Duran Garcia v. Royal  
Rose Burton Kitchen Supply  
812666/21 Encarnacion v. Castanos  
De Lorbe  
30341/20 Garrett v. Aj Carting Inc  
651407 Gavin v. Yoz  
819180/23 Gonzalez v. Guerrero  
805401/23 Herrera Gamarro v.  
Trinidad  
818093/22 Ibanez v. Dacosta  
812319/23 Kpetigo v. Palis Trucking  
Corp Et Al  
20925/19 Laguerre v. Abreu  
803320/22 Lantigua v. Hibbert  
23497/20 Lattibeaudiere v. Jones  
29064/18 Lorenzo v. Santos  
817005/23 Loria v. Sarr  
807833/21 Manzueta v. Singh  
819430/23 Marmol v. Gytoun Jr.  
810483/21 Mala v. Bernard Auto  
LLC Et Al  
816724/23 McNulty v. Story Towers  
LLC  
23501/06 Moya v. Samuel  
817880/23 Najja Hatchett As  
Guardian of Stephen Siddons v.  
B & F Skilled  
804161/24 Nwachukwu v. Ciminera  
Jr.  
25073/23 Ortiz Avalo v. Rodriguez  
817337/22 Osoria Betances v.  
Peguro Liberato  
32666/19 Ouattara v. American  
United  
811485/23 Paiva v. Barnes  
806515/24 Pedraga v. Nunes  
809594/23 Perez v. Barnes  
7063/07 Price v. Gavin  
807670/24 Priest v. Marchesani III  
812919/21 Quintero Arroyo v. NY  
Cross Docking LLC Et Al  
806291/21 Riddick v. Bronx  
Merchant Funding Service Et Al  
22986/19 Rivera v. Overhill Cab  
Corp.  
804170/22 Rodriguez v. Burns  
815974/22 Serrano Ramirez v. Dmp  
Leasing Corp. Et Al  
26938/19 Sims v. American United  
817193/21 Solano v. Jurgensen  
Trucking  
813480/21 Steed v. Lyft Inc Et Al  
816681/21 Torres v. Jurgensen  
Trucking  
2726/19 v. Satti  
1639/25 Valentin v. Cayuga Centers  
805794/22 Van Dyke v. Mookdaeder  
817194/22 Washington v. Ciminera  
Jr.

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

802856/22 2636 Univ. Rlty. LLC Et Al  
v. Kookmin Best Ins. Co. Ltd Et Al  
817601/24 Aracena v. Fed. Express  
Corp. Et Al  
816422/23 Blanco v. Overing  
Properties, Inc.  
819753/23 Bonilla v. Louis Nine  
Housing Dev. Fund Corp.  
803082/22 C An Infant Under The  
Age of Eighteen Years By Her  
Father v. Dum  
817602/21 Choudhury v. Sacchetti  
816994/21 Diaz v. 3480-3496 B'way  
Associates  
816820/21 Fernandez v. Metro  
Finest Deli, Inc. Et Al  
816978/23 Hampton v. McDonalds  
Et Al  
817818/22 Holmes v. 165-1142 LLC  
817616/21 Medina-Ponce v. 1776  
Castle Hill Apt. Owners  
816894/23 Mendez Roca v. 2150  
Creston Ave  
818841/22 Nolaco v. 2-20 East  
Fordham Road Associates LLC Et Al  
819792/23 Ortega v. Hios Real  
Estate Corp Et Al  
803349/25 Ortiz v. Gleason Ave.  
Associates  
817983/23 Ramos v. Quadrant  
Properties Housing Dev. Fund  
Co., Inc. Et Al  
819239/22 Richardson v. NYCTA Et Al  
817733/22 Rodriguez Hernandez v.  
Bathgate Plaza LLC Et Al  
816375/23 Rodriguez v. Caliente  
Cab Rest. Co., Inc.  
816399/21 Sallus v. Taino Foods,  
Inc. Et Al  
818006/23 Santos v. Bella Vista  
801805/25 State Farm Mutual  
Automobile Ins. Co. Et Al v.  
Englewood Orthopedics Group  
802858/23 Vasquez v. 1515  
Williamsbridge Associates  
818318/23 Williams v. Triple V  
Mechanical Corp. Et Al

**Part 15 (MV)**

**Justice Ben R. Barbato**  
Phone 718-618-1395  
Room 702, 9:30 A.M.

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

806626/24 Garcia v. Peterson  
22466/20 Javier v. Peguero  
29296/19 Montanez v. Kabir

811169/22 Rodriguez v. Bj  
Enterprise LLC Et Al  
25245/19 Ruiz v. Akhadov

**Part 16**

**Justice Fernando Tapia**  
Phone 718-618-1691  
Room 706, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 18**

**Justice Wanda Y. Negron**  
Phone 718-618-1203  
Room 602, 9:30 A.M.

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

813389/24 Elegbade v. Akinyele  
4965/23 Infante v. Infante  
809354/23 Redrovan v. Redrovan  
3103/19 Rodriguez v. Sylvain  
262/21 Roubma v. Roubma  
**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**  
5753/24 George v. Graves  
810444/23 Smith v. Smith  
808501/25 Telfaire v. Phillips

**Part 19**

**Justice Alicia Gerez**  
Phone 718-618-1377  
Room 600, 9:30 A.M.

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

303799/07 Deleon v. Mount Sinai  
Medical  
806911/23 Genus Cowan v.  
33457/20 Lawrence v. Sv Operating  
Three  
31388/18 McManus v. Rose  
21868/18 Thomas v. Plaza Rehab  
And Nursing  
26273/19 Torres v. Gonzalez  
32712/18 Williams v. Bronx Harbor  
Health Care

**Part 20**

**Justice Veronica G. Hummel**  
Phone 718-618-1240  
Room 408, 9:30 A.M.

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

30339/17 Gaurvad v. NYC  
28673/17 Griffin v. Adorno  
20217/16 Hernandez v. Coleman  
805173/25 E. Geico Indemnity  
Co.  
301781/16 Lamb v. Leviso Rlty. Inc.

**Part 21**

**Justice Matthew Parker-Raso**  
Phone 718-618-1435  
Room 405, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 22**

**Justice Marissa Soto**  
Phone 718-618-1193  
Room 709, 9:30 A.M.

**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**

804357/23 Gonzalez v. Bst 2021  
Grand Concourse Owner LLC Et Al  
807404/23 Navarro v. Rvmin

**Part 24**

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

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

805282/24 Arias v. Perez Namina  
820894/24 Arroyo v. Gonzalez Jr  
802358/24 Benda v. Klauad Amara  
1902 Tomlinson LLC Et Al  
801432/25 Cereceda v. Rodriguez  
815383/24 Cherry v. William Rivera  
Et Al  
813551/24 Clarke v. 6485 And 6495  
B'way. Apts.  
817293/22 Crespo Quinones v. 141  
Rlty. Associates LLC Et Al  
817577/21 De La Cruz v. B'way. 85th  
LLC Et Al  
818973/24 Del Valle v. 5530-5572  
Netherland Ave.  
820595/23 Delgado v. McDonald  
817151/22 Falcones Castillo v. Bop  
101 Lincoln Ave. LLC Et Al  
814527/23 Gomez Perez v. Gilbane  
Bldg. Co. Et Al  
811924/23 Guilcapí Alvarado v.  
Turner Const. Co. Et Al  
813314/24 Gutierrez v. NYCH&HC  
Corp. Et Al  
814976/23 Guzman v. The  
Corinthian Condominium Et Al  
803038/25 Hierro-Paulino v. Garcia  
Alvarez  
802674/23 Ienczmonka v. Judlau  
Contracting, Inc. Et Al  
819836/24 Lopez v. Baez Flores  
815860/24 McCormick v. Moreno  
812231/23 Mejia Briones v. West NY  
Restoration, Inc. Et Al  
814008/24 Miller v. Clarke  
802210/25 Mundve v. McFarlane  
24509/71 Ndreu v. NYCHA  
809767/21 Neofitides v. Bonit  
817761/22 Ortega v. HPD2  
Housing Dev. Fund Co. Inc. Et Al  
816510/22 Pavano v. Citywide Auto  
Inc. Et Al  
813590/23 Pimentel Guarango v. B  
Contractors Group LLC Et Al  
811503/21 Pina Ramirez v. 85 Jay  
St.(b'klyn.)  
805070/24 Purnell v. 14  
Morningside Ave. Housing Dev.  
Fund Corp.  
809622/21 Reynoso v. Loring Pl.  
Rlty. LLC  
806532/24 Rivera v. Glen's Towing,  
Inc.  
812352/24 Rodriguez v. Baktidy  
Properties Et Al  
813627/21 Rodriguez v. Mip 57th  
Dev. Acquisition LLC  
807325/24 Rogers v. Saleem Truck  
Leasing Inc Et Al  
816502/24 Rosa v. Mgm Yonkers,  
Inc.  
803034/23 Rosario v. Hunter  
Roberts Const. Group Et Al  
801010/25 Saha v. Mamoon  
819741/24 Santiago Jr. v. Gully II  
27096/19 Sarante v. Courlandt Dev.  
815536/21 Sillah v. Bop Ne LLC Et Al  
804194/23 Singh v. 118 Third Ave.  
LLC Et Al  
817668/22 Solis v. 25-34 Jackson  
Ave. Prop. Owner LLC Et Al  
806147/24 Soltero v. Katembo  
Enterprises  
810358/24 Thomas v. McCloskey  
812540/21 Tigselma Ichapanta v.  
East Side Home Stead  
817944/22 Tlatenchí Poblano v. Rxr  
2413 Third Owner LLC Et Al  
806900/25 Williams v. NYCHA

**Part 25**

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

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

804157/22 Brown v. Wickham 4400  
Associates  
29818/18 Martinez v. Hiller

**Part 26**

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

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

817681/24 Abreu v. Brookfield  
Properties Et Al  
821505/24 Aghematu-Sey v. Hutch  
Tower Two LLC Et Al  
34256/19 Baez v. Jova Rlty. L.L.C.  
27284/20 Bah v. Super Fix NYC  
Corp  
809706/22 Balkon Rlty. Associates  
LLC v. Abreu Magarin  
810387/23 Baltazar v. Mount Hope  
Preservation Apts. 1a Housing  
Dev. Fund Co. Inc.  
813462/24 Becerra v. Domino A  
Partners LLC Et Al  
815137/23 Brown v. Melrose 3  
Associates  
820148/23 Cachique v. Hp Atlantic  
Plaza Towers Housing Dev. Fund  
Co., Inc. Et Al  
20540/19 Carr-Cameron v. Xsport  
Fitness  
805579/25 Chalmers v. Diego  
Beekman Mutual Housing Assco.  
81042/20 Javier v. Peguero  
802219/25 Chinedo v. Zhao

803074/25 Correa v. R.G. Ortiz  
Funeral Home Inc  
803701/24 Cossentino v. Terminal  
Fee Owner Lp Et Al  
809436/25 Cotto v. Healthychy II  
Inc. Et Al  
808446/25 Cox v. Rahman  
819161/22 De La Cruz De Leon v.  
Dia  
800701/23 De Los Santos v. Rajput  
810460/25 Dilone v. Hussey  
818582/24 Dykes v. Pimentel  
Rosario  
811225/25 Em Tee Hldgs. LLC v.  
Skinner  
800463/22 Escudero v. Belmont Ave  
2321 LLC Et Al  
800150/22 Espino v. Inwood 213  
LLC  
801523/25 Ferrin v. Doe  
801311/24 Ferreras v. Sosa  
808391/22 Fulgencio v. 116 Park  
Ave. Rlty. Inc. Et Al  
801846/22 Garcia-Rosado v. 731  
Gerard/valton  
820652/24 Gonzalez v. NYCHA  
803857/25 Guzman v. Guzman  
820128/24 Gyanfii v. NYC  
NYCH&HC/BelleVue Et Al  
810035/21 Halsey v. 2886 Briggs  
Rlty. LLC Et Al  
819466/24 Hernandez v. Hph Court  
818896/24 Huntley v. Prospect  
Transportation  
816015/25 In The Matter of The  
Application of Mc Preservation  
Alliance LLC v. Stewart  
804333/23 Iria Ventures LLC v. Nb  
Net Solutions 22 Inc Et Al  
817991/24 James v. Boomf Mgt.  
Corp Et Al  
811119/25 Ko v. Kincon  
805223/25 Mangan v. Messina  
803002/25 Martinez v. 3530  
Equities LLC  
806261/21 Martinez v. 2001 Story  
Tower A  
801826/25 Medina v. Linda  
Transportation  
800790/22 Mitchell v. Nysandy5  
Nhp32 LLC Et Al  
810061/25 Mpi Plumbing Rlp Corp v.  
1759-63 W. Farms Rd LLC Et Al  
816819/24 Nova Arias v. Dm  
Transportation LLC Et Al  
818340/24 O'ourke v. Dickens  
812765/24 Ortega v. 900 Hove Rlty. 1  
LLC  
814413/23 Osazuwa v. Stylish Nails,  
Inc. Et Al  
815262/24 Osso v. Echo Pl.  
809441/21 Ovalles v. Laxmi Mgt.  
LLC Et Al  
804041/25 Peralta v. Yun  
803671/24 Perez v. 3815-9th Ave.  
Inc.  
820811/24 Plncio v. Moral  
22787/15 Premier Concrete  
Services Inc. v. Arc Electrical  
803339/25 Punjabi-Addeo v. Francis  
800172/25 Ramos v. Jahaira  
Rouzier-Soto Et Al  
803966/25 Rivera-Cruz v. Bell  
818016/24 Rodriguez Bonilla v.  
Common Market Philadelphia  
Inc. Et Al  
300022/17 Rodriguez v. Riverside  
Center Site 5 Owner  
804407/24 Rodriguez v. Jerome Ave.  
Care For The Homeless Housing  
Dev. Fund Corp. Et Al  
808444/25 Rosa v. Zipcar, Inc. Et Al  
803122/21 Salazar v. The Puerto  
Rican Organization To Motivate,  
Enlighten, And Serve Addicts,  
Inc. Et Al  
815734/24 Sanchez v. All American  
School Bus Corp. Et Al  
803661/25 Shannon v. Done Right  
Transportation  
801586/25 Squeeter And v. Young  
24946/20 Steubin v. Parkash 2910  
LLC  
802666/25 Trent v. Rodriguez  
812785/21 Valdez v. Fifth Muzicant  
802296/23 Valencia v. Voda Rlty.  
LLC Et Al  
816930/23 Vasquez Martinez v. 726  
Eighth LLC Et Al  
802051/23 Weinberger v. Sherman  
Cluster Housing Dev. Fund Corp.  
Et Al  
807792/24 Whitfield v. Morningside  
Acquisition II  
816224/23 Wilkinson v. St. Luke's  
Episcopal Church  
819486/23 Vrigoin v. Gowanus  
Union St. LLC Et Al  
806909/25 Zapata Lopez v. Motor  
Vehicle Accident Indemnification

**Part 27**

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

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

813167/25 In The Matter of The  
Petition of J.G. Wentworth  
Originations v. Metro. Life Ins.  
Co. Et Al  
**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**  
815473/24 Deutsche Bank Trust Co.  
Americas v. Bae 193  
Rlty. LLC Et Al  
815473/24 Deutsche Bank Trust Co.  
Americas v. Bae 193 Rlty. LLC Et Al  
813282/24 Lopez Alba v. Champion  
Metal & Glass Inc. Et Al  
832890/09 Nationstar Mortgage LLC  
v. McCallum  
35508/15 Nationstar Mortgage LLC  
v. Shillingford  
815969/24 Ragster v. Edman  
813273/23 Rodriguez v. Prc  
Simpson St.  
817287/23 U.S. Bank Nat. Assoc. v.  
Middleton Sr.

**Part 28**

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

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

1902/25 Abner Vivanco v.  
Komarofsky  
808373/21 Alcantara v. Delacruz  
5883/24 Babatola Anderson v.  
Babatola  
800047/25 Omagbemi v. Okpa  
6470/24 Pesantez v. Bravo

**Part 31/32**

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

**Part 34**

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

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

70303/21 Doe #1 v. Starlite Dance  
Inc.  
810326/25 Giampa v. Montefiore  
Medical Center Et Al  
801479/25 Hinds v. Montefiore  
Medical Center Et Al  
815559/21 Reyes v. Faliszek Md  
24187/20 Riley v. Curato D.O.  
**FRIDAY, SEPT. 5**  
34760/20 Christian v. Split Rock  
Rehabilitation  
816995/21 Henry v. Providence  
Rest, Inc.  
804701/23 K.S.E Et Al v. Montefiore  
Medical Center  
802137/21 McGregor v. Klineova  
801203/22 Williamson v.  
Sternerman M.D.

**Part 35**

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

**THURSDAY, SEPT. 4**

804596/24 Caminero v. 2810 Morris  
Ave. Corp.  
810839/24 Cruz v. 514-518 E 138  
LLC Et Al  
809128/24 Cruz v. NYS Automotive  
Corp. Et Al  
819440/24 Eichmann v. Ayorora  
Alarcon  
803015/25 Garcia v. Abankwah  
819115/23 Ventura v. Viera

812938/25 In The Matter of The  
Application of Raja G. Ogirala To  
Remove To The Supreme Court Of  
The State of NY v. 3563 Rlty.  
LLC  
803823/25 Lamarre Bey v. Kaston &  
Aberle  
803716/25 Marv v. Uber USA LLC  
Et Al  
813717/23 Mazile v. Zerega Rlty.  
LLC  
811090/21 Mendez v. 1159 River  
Ave. Housing Dev. Fund Corp. Et  
Al  
802473/23 Noble v. The Hebrew  
Home For The Aged At Riverdale  
809662/23 Reyes v. Church of Our  
Lady Mt. Carmel  
810018/22 Rodriguez v. Mhl Capital  
II LLC  
800336/23 Ruiz v. Jrm Const. Mgt.  
LLC Et Al  
819412/23 Sarmiento v. Method  
General Contractors LLC Et Al Et Al  
810216/22 Singh v. 108 East Clarke  
Pl.  
802366/24 Solano v. M & A Family  
LLC Et Al  
802587/25 Sosa v. Consol. Bus  
Transit, Inc. Et Al  
811160/24 Sproul v. Paulino-Lancer  
809838/22 Taveras Castillo v. 477  
Madison LLC

**Part 24**

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

**Part 27 (DV)**

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

**Part 28**

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

**Part 29**

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

**Part 31**

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

**Part 32**

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

**Part 60**

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

**Part 70**

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

**Part 71**

**Justice Steed**  
Phone 718-618-1004  
265 East 161st Street  
Room 610, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 73**

**Justice Tba**  
Phone 718-618-1085  
265 East 161st Street  
Room 510, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 75**

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

**Part 77**

**Justice Parker**  
Phone 718-618-1025  
265 East 161st Street  
Room 680, 9:30 A.M.

**Part 78**

# CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING

## LAWJOBS.COM

When results matter

### #1 Global Legal Job Site

Ranked by Alexa

Contact: Carol Robertson Phone: 212.457.7850 Email: croberson@alm.com

#### CITATIONS NY

**SURROGATE'S COURT** — QUEENS COUNTY SUPPLEMENTAL CITATION THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, By the Grace of God Free and Independent To, EILEEN MARY HADAYA, GERARD WALTER HENSHAW, CHRISTOPHER WALTER DORSCH, JARMO EERO JUHAN PIIRAINEN, ELJA ANNELI VUORINEN, OUTI HANNELE SALMINEN, MERI MARJAANA USVALA, MATTI VEIKKO OIKARI, and ANTTI VELLI OIKARI, and if living and if dead to his/her heirs at law, next of kin and distributees whose names and places of residence are unknown and if he/she died subsequent to the decedent herein, to his/her executors, administrators, legatees, devisees, assignees, and successors in interest whose name and places of residence are unknown and to all other heirs at law, next of kin, and distributees of CHARLES VENTURA, a/k/a CHARLES V. VENTURA, the decedent herein, whose names and places of residence are unknown and cannot be ascertained after due diligence. A petition having been duly filed by George Johnson, who is domiciled at 3700 Gait Ocean Drive, Apt. 303, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33308, YOU ARE HEREBY CITED TO SHOW CAUSE before the Surrogate's Court, Queens County, at 88-11 Sutphin Blvd, Jamaica, New York, on 11th day of September 2025, at 11 A.M. of that day, why a decree should not be made in the estate of Charles Ventura a/k/a Charles V. Ventura, lately domiciled at 4834 65th Street, Woodside, New York 11377 admitting to probate a Will dated September 4, 2020 a copy of which is attached, as the Will of Charles Ventura a/k/a Charles V. Ventura deceased, relating to real and personal property, and directing that: Letters Testamentary issue to: George Johnson HON. PETER J. KELLY Acting Surrogate JANEY EDWARDS TUCKER Chief Clerk AUG 11 2025 (Seal) Theresa E. Crowley Attorney for Petitioner Telephone No. (718) 428-9180 Email Address tcrowley@resklaw.com Address of Attorney 160-25 Union Turnpike Fresh Meadows, NY 11366 [Note: This citation is served upon you as required by law. You are not required to appear. If you fail to appear it will be assumed you do not abrogate the relief requested. You have a right to have an attorney appear for you.] 12969 au14-Th s4

#### FOUNDATIONS

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF Hematoma Family Charity Foundation, Inc.** For the fiscal year ended October 31, 2024 is available at its principal office located at 11 Locust Cove LN Kings Point, NY 11024 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is Anita Hematoma. 13654 s4

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF Rexford Fund, Inc.** For the calendar year ended December 31, 2024 is available at its principal office located at 3652 Voaro Way West Palm Beach, FL 33405 for inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is Douglas Schloss. 13897 s4

**THE ANNUAL RETURN OF THE KISCO FOUNDATION** For the 2024 year ended 12/31/2024 is available at its principal office located at PO BOX 429, Armonk, NY 10504 for the inspection during regular business hours by any citizen who requests it within 180 days hereof. Principal Manager of the Foundation is Nancy McCabe. 13436 s4

#### LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

**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

**PRIMEROS NORTH AMERICA LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 07/24/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 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

#### LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

**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

**ELSEBERG BAKER MARURI PLLC** Articles of Org. filed NY Sec. of State(SSNY) 1/26/24. Office in NY Co. SSNY desig. agent of LLC whom process may be served and shall mail copy of 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 Ave, 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) on 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 4th Ave, NY, NY 10276, P/B/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. 6D, New York, NY 10011. Purpose: to practice the profession of medicine. 12658 au7-Th s11

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of TREE OF LIFE NP IN PSYCHIATRY HEALTH PLLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 3/20/2025. Office location: BX County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against PLLC to 2 Fordham Hill Oval, #17B, Bronx, NY 10468. Purpose: any lawful act. 12453 Jy31 Th S04

**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 process to: 16 Maplewood Drive, Plainville, 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. 13023 au14-Th s18

#### LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of Mind Share Therapy LCSW, PLLC. 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 PLLC to 363 West 30th St, Apt 2D, New York, NY 10001. Purpose: any lawful act. 13883 S04 Th O09

#### LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

**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

#### SALES

**NOTICE OF SALE**  
**SUPREME COURT OF SBRONX COUNTY KIVAI FUNDING, INC. et al** against WESTCHESTER 3148 LLC, et al Defendant(s) Attorney for Plaintiff(s) Kelley 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 Bronx County Courthouse, Courtroom 711 at 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, New York on September 29, 2025 at 2:15 P.M. 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 # 02208261/13241 au28-Th s18

#### NOTICE OF SALE

**SUPREME COURT OF KINGS COUNTY OF KINGS DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST COMPANY, AS TRUSTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE HOLDERS OF THE AAMES 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 2:00 P.M. Premises known as 3728 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 #13306/2011. Roger Siegel, Esq., Referee FEIN, SUCH & CRANE, LLP 28 East Main Street, Suite 1800 Rochester, NY 14614 SP-SJN335 86725 13239 au28-Th s18

#### NOTICE OF SALE

**SUPREME COURT 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. AMARILIO AS HEIR AND DISTRIBUTOR, Defendant, 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 9, 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 13492 s4-Th s25

#### LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

#### LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

**App. for Auth. (LP) Virtual Construction Lab LP d/b/a Virtual Construction Lab LP.** 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. 12635 au7-Th s11

#### LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

**App. for Auth. (LP) Virtual Construction Lab LP d/b/a Virtual Construction Lab LP.** 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. 12635 au7-Th s11

See Decisions of Interest only at NYLJ.COM

#### SUMMONS

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK - COUNTY OF NEW YORK** Index No. 452215/2025 - Data Summons Filed: 7/24/25 - SUMMONS WITH NOTICE - Plaintiff designates New York County as the place of trial - Basis of venue is Plaintiff's residence. CLAUDIA MEDDEL DE CERVANTES, Plaintiff - MANUEL CERVANTES - HERNANDEZ, Defendant. -ACTION FOR DIVORCE- To the above named Defendant: YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED to serve a notice of appearance on the Plaintiff's Attorneys within thirty (30) days after the service of this summons is complete and in case of your failure to appear, judgment will be taken against you by default for the relief demanded in the notice set forth below. Dated: July 9, 2025, New York, NY. Morrison & Foerster LLP. By: Jennifer L. Marines, Esq., Attorney for Plaintiff, 250 West 55th St, New York, NY 10019, (212) 468-8000. NOTICE: The nature of this action is to dissolve the marriage between the parties, on the grounds: DRL Section 170 subd. (7) - the relationship between the Plaintiff and Defendant has broken down irretrievably for period of at least six months. The relief sought is a judgment of absolute divorce in favor of the Plaintiff dissolving the marriage between the parties in this action. SWORN STATEMENT OF REMOVAL OF BARRIERS: I, Claudia Meddel de Cervantes, state under penalty of perjury that the parties' marriage was solemnized by a minister, clergyman, or leader of the Society of Ethical Culture, and that I have taken all steps solely within my power to remove all barriers to the defendant's remarriage following the divorce. NOTICE OF ORDER TO MAINTAIN PLAINTIFF'S ADDRESS CONFIDENTIAL. The Plaintiff is permitted to maintain her address confidential for purposes of this action or divorce, and that the plaintiff may utilize the address "c/o Law Offices of Morrison & Foerster LLP. By: Jennifer L. Marines, Esq., Attorneys for Plaintiff, Claudia Meddel de Cervantes, 250 West 55th Street, New York, New York 10019", for service of papers, and such address is deemed her residence for the purposes of this action, and that service of any responsive pleadings and papers shall be made upon the Law Offices of Morrison & Foerster LLP. By: Jennifer L. Marines, Esq., Attorneys for Plaintiff, 250 West 55th Street, New York, New York 10019", the agent for service of papers designated in the summons, and not upon the Plaintiff directly. NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING: To register for e-filing or for more information about how e-filing works: visit: www.nycourts.gov/efile-unregistered or contact the Clerk's Office of Help Center at the court where the case was filed. Court contact information can be found at www.nycourts.gov or at www.nycourthehelp.org. 13225 au21-Th s4

#### LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

**122 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 purpose. 13579 au28-Th o2

**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

**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. 13575 au28-Th o2

**ANTIGUA ROAD LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/30/24. 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. 13567 au28-Th o2

**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, c/o Michael Tornabe, 112 Clayton Avenue, East Atlantic Beach, NY 11561. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 13573 au28-Th o2

**GALAS EVEN 44TH ST LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/07/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 42-40 Bell Boulevard, Suite 601, Bayside, NY 11361. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 13573 au28-Th o2

**49 HARBORVIEW WEST LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/08/2025. Office loc: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process against the LLC may be served. SSNY shall mail process to: The LLC, 162 Cedar Ave, Hewlett, NY 11557. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 12995 au14-Th s18

**56 EAST 66TH STREET RESIDENCE LLC** Articles of Org. filed with the Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) 9/11/2019. Office location: NY Co. SSNY desig. agent of LLC whom process may be served. SSNY shall mail process to Attn: Shahriar Sedgh, Esq., c/o Sedgh & Zuckerman, PLLC, 370 Lexington Ave., Ste. 800, NY, NY 10017. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 12703 au7-Th s11

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** OF GEOCONAI 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

#### LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

**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 copy of 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) 8/9/25. Office in NY Co. SSNY desig. agent of LLC whom process 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, 137 15th Avenue, Sea Cliff, NY 11579. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 13232 au21-Th s25

**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 purpose. 13579 au28-Th o2

**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

**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. 13575 au28-Th o2

**ANTIGUA ROAD LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/30/24. 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. 13567 au28-Th o2

**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, c/o Michael Tornabe, 112 Clayton Avenue, East Atlantic Beach, NY 11561. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 13573 au28-Th o2

**GALAS EVEN 44TH ST LLC.** Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 03/07/25. Office: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent of the LLC upon whom process against it may be served. SSNY shall mail copy of process to the LLC, 42-40 Bell Boulevard, Suite 601, Bayside, NY 11361. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 13573 au28-Th o2

**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. 13572 au28-Th o2

**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 Raffa-Suris and Associates, 395 North Service Road, Suite 302, Melville, NY 11747. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 12705 au7-Th s11

**Olive LB LLC** filed w/ SSNY 8/12/25. Off. in Nassau Co. Process served to 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

#### LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

**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. 13369 Au28 Th O02

**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 O02

**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 AJHolland Enterprises, Inc., 372 Doughty Blvd., Inwood, NY 11096. Purpose: any lawful activities. 12661 au7-Th s11

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of BLODY 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: c/ ResidentAgent, 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: 121 NE 34th St, Unit 1515, Miami, FL 33137. 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 Nuverre, 152 West 57th St, 21st Fl., NY, NY 10019. Purpose: Any lawful purpose. 13920 s4-Th o9

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** OF WILLOW 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 LLC, 5 Schanck Drive, Edison, NJ 08820. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 13910 s4-Th o9

#### LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

**Notice of formation** of 5951 NACH HOME LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 05/20/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 90 Main St, Rear Office, Mineola, NY 11501. Purpose: Any lawful act. 12463 Jy31 Th S04

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** OF DELTAFOX TROT LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 6/2/2025, existence date: 6/14/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 136 Madison Ave, 5th Fl, New York, NY 10016. Purpose: any lawful act. 11841 Jy31 Th S04

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** of StoryVerse Studio LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 7/25/2025. Office location: Nassau County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 70 Ripple Ln, Levittown, NY 11756. Purpose: any lawful act. 12480 Jy31 Th S04

**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 70152, New York, NY 10001. Purpose: any lawful act. 13657 S04 Th O09

**NOTICE OF FORMATION** OF Jessica & The Muze LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 7/3

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

BNENNY'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 or activity. au14-Th s18 12994

KLM WOODBURY, LLC, Arts. of Org. filed with the SSNY on 08/05/2025. 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, 36 Barry 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: Kamhiya 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 08/05/2025. 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, 225 Sands Point Blvd, Port Washington, NY 11050. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 12707 au7-Th s11

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, 136 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 8/11/2025. 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 FORMATION Kamford VDC 2026 LLC. Art. of Org. Filed. Sec. 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 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. 12987 Au14 Th S18

Notice of Formation of Laver 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

To place your ad Contact: Carol Robertson Phone: 212.457.7850 Email: crobertson@alm.com

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF FORMATION OF THE DOCUMENTARY HELPLINE LLC. Arts of Org filed with Secy. of State of NY (SSNY) on 7/18/2025. Office location: NY County. SSNY designated as agent upon whom process may be served and shall mail copy of process against LLC to 945 E 12th St, Apt 2B, New York, NY 10009. Purpose: any lawful act. 13251 Au21 Th S25

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

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

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. R/A: US Corp Agents, Inc. 7014 13th Ave, #202, BK, NY 11228. Purpose: any lawful act. 13527 Au28 Th 002

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 129th St, Apt 3F, New York, NY 10027. Purpose: any lawful act. 13904 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

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. 13888 s4-Th o9

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. 13744 s4-Th o9

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. 13891 s4-Th o9

Palisade Acquisition III, LLC filed Arts. of Org. with the Sect'y 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. 13902 s4-Th o9

PPN Associates LLC filed Arts. of Org. with the Sect'y 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. 13901 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

SDN 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: Samy Naim, 18 Split Rock Drive, Great Neck, NY 11024. Purpose: Any Lawful Purpose. 13890 s4-Th o9

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

SOLAIRE 8K LLC filed Arts. of Org. with the Sect'y 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

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. 13892 s4-Th o9

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. 12984 Au14 Th S18

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. 12670 au7-Th s11

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 07/05/2023. 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. 12656 au7-Th s11

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. 12650 au7-Th s11

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. 12665 au7-Th s11

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 07/21/2025. 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. 12666 au7-Th s11

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. 12667 au7-Th s11

LAWJOBS.COM #1 Global Legal Job Site Ranked by Alexa

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF Valorum Oncology, 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. 12654 au7-Th s11

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. 12655 au7-Th s11

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. 13632 Aug28 th Oct2

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, 545 Fifth Ave., Ste. 1209, NY, NY 10017. Required off: 800 North State St., 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. 13921 s4-Th o9

LIMITED LIABILITY ENTITIES

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF GMMT-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 07/14/2021. 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 95833. 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. 12646 au7-Th s11

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 DE: Registered Agents Solutions, Inc., 838 Walker Rd., Ste. 21-2, Dover, DE 19904. Arts of Org. filed with the Secy. of State of CA, 1500 11th St., Sacramento, CA 95814. Purpose: any lawful activities. 12647 au7-Th s11

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. 12648 au7-Th s11

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF Valorum Management Holdings, 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: National Registered Agents, Inc., 23 Liberty 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. 12653 au7-Th s11

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. 12659 au7-Th s11

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. 12660 au7-Th s11

NOTICE OF QUALIFICATION OF Valorum Biologics, 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 05/22/2025. 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. 12652 au7-Th s11

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., 23 Liberty 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. 12663 au7-Th s11

ALM REPRINTS & LICENSING

Maximize Your Recognition

To compete in today's highly crowded legal marketplace, you need an added edge over your competitors. Highlighting your recognition in ALM publications provides an authoritative and convincing way to impact your target audience. With ALM reprints, e-prints, permissions and plaques, you can showcase the acknowledgement that you have earned and leverage that endorsement.

Order your custom reprints today. Contact: 877-256-2472 | reprints@alm.com

almreprints.com



Reach your peers to generate referral business

LAWYER TO LAWYER

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

